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A PECULIAR KIND OF PARONOMASIA IN THE TALMUD AND MIDRASH

BY THE LATE J. D. WYNKOOP, AMSTERDAM

TRANSLATED FROM THE DUTCH BY P. VAN DEN BIESEN

God said to Abraham, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to tell them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. Gen. 15, 5. In the same manner we may say to a Talmud scholar: 'Try to fix the number of Tannaim and Amoraim that occur in both Talmuds, Baraita, and the haggadic writings,' for their number is exceedingly great; nor is it easy to decide with certainty which particular saying each sage enunciated or which opinion he favored. Indeed, even as regards well known persons, whose names constantly recur in these different writings, it is obvious that the compilers did not always record with strict accuracy, who said this or who said that; who gave this explanation or who gave that. But, unless this point be ascertained from different documents, independent of each other, or from reliable parallel passages, we cannot be absolutely confident that the person, to whom the saying is attributed, is the author. Every Talmud student knows that an author is often deprived of his claim to a saying with which he had been credited, and that even the very names of sages are frequently open to dispute. I see no sufficient grounds for admitting that every age had its registrar whose business was to
record the opinions and expositions of the sages of his
time, whether as regards the sayings in the Mishna and
Baraitha, or as regards those in the Talmudim and
Midrashim. Only sporadic notices are found of anything
like records and chronicles, such as מניַת תוענות, מֵשְנָה רְבֵי,
עָבָדָו, מֵנִיְת ויָסוֹם, מֵנִיְת מַהְרֵי
etc., and these were the
sources of information for later compilers. But as the
latter lived some centuries later than the authors of the
Halakah and Haggadah, a perfect accuracy on all points
would have been a superhuman achievement. No doubt,
all possible care was taken as regards the sayings them-
selves, specially those of the Halakah (and yet, as Talmud
scholars know, not even these are always free from
inaccuracies); but the names of the sages were regarded
as of minor importance, particularly in the case of non-
halakic statements, and, therefore, cannot be held as in-
controvertible. Now, of the above named works, the
Mishna and Baraita are almost the only ones wherein
very frequently opinions are recorded without the names
of those that advanced them, but in the remaining works
comparatively few anonymous sayings occur. Sometimes
also the name of the sage is very strange and uncommon.

I am of opinion that we should not always take these
names in too serious a manner, and that often the name
or surname of a sage owes its origin to a peculiarity in the
saying attributed to him. For I was, more than once,
forcibly struck by the marked resemblance which the name
or surname of an author betrays to the saying assigned to
him. But I would first like to show, by means of a few
examples, that the compilers of the above-named works
were not averse to the device of effecting a certain con-
sonance or harmony of sound between the names of sages and their sayings.

In the Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 98b, and in the Midrash Rabba Ekhah, ch. I, § 51, the following passage occurs:

What is the name of the Messiah?—The followers of Rabbi Shila say: Shiloh is his name, because it is written, Until Shiloh come (Gen. 49, 10). The followers of Rabbi Jannai say: Jinnon is his name, because it is written, May his name endure forever, may it continue (jinnon) as long as the sun (Ps. 72, 17). The followers of Rabbi Haninah, say Haninah, for it is written: I will show you no favor (haninah) (Jer. 16, 13). Rashi already observed as regards \( \text{Sanhedrin, ibidem} \) that it greatly resembles \( \text{Shiloh} \); and so we may infer from this passage that there were three schools that gave the Messiah \( \text{Messiah} \) a name similar to that of their master.

In the Babylonian Talmud (Berakot 39b) a discussion is recorded between two sages whether the larger of two loaves, though a piece be cut off from it, should be used by preference for the blessing \( \text{ברכה והמותא} \). In the midst of this discussion someone reminds Rabbi Nahman bar Isaac of a Baraitha, containing a compromise between the two opinions; viz. \( \text{מכה הפרושים} \) \( \text{תקח השלמה הב诧} \), ‘If there be two loaves, a larger one with a piece cut off, and a smaller one; both loaves should be taken while the blessing is said.’ Thereupon Rabbi Nahman asked the person who gave the quotation, to tell his name. He replied, \( \text{שלום} \)
It may appear, at first sight, strange that Rabbi Nahman bar Isaac should not have heard of Rabbi Shalman. For, according to *Seder ha-Dorot*, Book III, (Warsaw 1897), Rabbi Nahman was the head of the college at Pumbeditha after the death of Raba. Now, R. Shalman is named before Raba in the Babylonian Talmud, Beșah 56, where his opinion, though based on different grounds, is said to agree with that of Raba, but to be opposed to that of other scholars. R. Shalman, therefore, was older than Raba, because the Talmud on the whole takes account of the chronological order when recording different opinions. Yet, it remains possible that R. Nahman did not know his name, for as appears from the last named passage, he came from a different place. Again, there is the other alternative that R. Nahman knew R. Shalman’s name, and that his question merely served to elicit an answer; just as for instance Rab acted towards Karna: Shabbat 108a.

But be this as it may, Rabbi Nahman bar Isaac playfully alludes to the meaning of R. Shalman’s name, which signifies *peace*, because the latter had effected a compromise between two conflicting opinions. Undoubtedly the phrase שָלָמָה שֵׁשְׁנְתָה is an allusion to the term מַעֲנוּיָה, occurring in the Baraitha and cited by R. Shalman.

It is possible, moreover, that the name of R. Shalman, which seldom is found in the Talmud, owes in some manner or other its origin to the passage וַיְרַגְּמוּ בְּשַׁלְמָהּ בָּבָּא בֶּטְרָא, Baba Batra 136. For, if both sides acquiesce, there is agreement, concord, שלום. And the same
remark applies to the saying of R. Shalman as regards Abaye in Baba Ḳamma 89a.

Let me add the well known saying of R. Pappe, addressed to R. Bebe bar Abaye, or that of Huna, the son of Joshua, addressed to Raba不准，which occurs several times in the Talmud.

ṃśōs ṛāḥaṭīḥ mšōlāmām ṛəmrēth kōl y ṝmlōyitām

‘Because thou hailst from mšōlām (others understand this differently; see Rashi, Rashbam, and Aruk, s. v. ṭē VII), thou sayest, etc.’

It appears, therefore, to me that connection and similarity between the name of an author (or of his birthplace) and the saying attributed to him were liked and appreciated by the redactors of the Talmud and Midrash. And proceeding on this basis, I think, I have discovered in this peculiar use of paronomasia the clue to the explanation of the origin of several names in the halakic and haggadic works, but especially in the latter.

1. In the passage:

广泛的 ḥeṭhuṭ ṭəmrēth kōl ṭē ḥeṭhuṭām ṣmāmā ṭōb

Midrash Shoḥer Ṭob on Ps. 18, 35, the name of Rabbi Joshua seems to have been suggested by the words ṭē ḥeṭhuṭām. From the context we know that one of the Amoraim is speaking; and Amoraim with the name Joshua always have in addition either a surname or a father's name. My conjecture is confirmed by Yalkūṯ, Genesis, ch. 10, where we find the words ṭē ḥeṭhuṭām anonymously recorded.

Once the words ṭē ḥeṭhuṭām had occurred in Midrash Shoḥer Ṭob (quoted above) as the saying of Rabbi Joshua, we find that in Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 6, a father is given to him; and he is now called Rabbi Joshua son of
Rabbi Nehemiah; so also in Midrash Rabba, Lev., ch. 35. His name again occurs with a fresh addition in Midrash Shoḥer Ṭob, on Ps. 80 (the beginning), viz. Rabbi Joshua ha-Kohen son of Rabbi Nehemiah. And finally, we come across his name in Yalkût, II Sam., ch. 162, with the following modification, Rabbi Joshua bar Naḥmani (no doubt an imitation of the name Samuel bar Naḥmani), unless, as the author of Sepher Yohasin thinks, he is to be identified with the above named Rabbi Samuel's brother whom, however, the writer of Seder ha-Dorot could nowhere find.

2. In Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 84, we read:

The same saying occurs anonymously in Yalkût, ch. 140. Probably it was assigned to Rabbi Isaac because it deals exclusively with the Patriarch Isaac.

3. A similar instance we find in the following passage, Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 92:

The saying also recurs anonymously in Yalkût, Gen., chaps. 133, 150. Nowhere, moreover, is Rabbi Benjamin mentioned without a surname or father's name. Thus the conjecture is obvious that the saying was attributed to a sage named Rabbi Benjamin, because it contained something to the credit of the Patriarch Benjamin.

It should be noticed that in Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 78, the same saying is quoted with the name of the well known Rabbi Benjamin affixed to it.

4. It is probably not a mere coincidence that in Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 98, the following phrase is found in connection with I Chron. 5, 14.
See further our note concerning Rabbi Joshua bar Nehemiah, § 1.

5. We read in Midrash Rabba, Ex., ch. i, on 1, 21:

"Rab and Levi dispute the meaning of the term *Houses*. The one maintains that these ‘houses’ are families of priests and *Levites*, the other that they are dynasties of kings."

In the same Midrash Rabba, ch. 48, a portion of this passage is quoted but anonymously and without the word יָלוֹה, viz.

"And what are these houses? a sacerdotal family and a royal dynasty."

We find something similar in Siphre, section [*בַּעֲשַׁר*], § 78.

Also in Soṭah 11b, difference of opinion is expressed on this point, but there the disputants are, instead of Rab and Levi, Rab and Samuel, whose statements on the whole are identical with those in Midrash Rabba, Ex., ch. i. No doubt, the reading of the Babylonian Talmud is the correct one, for the subject treated of in Ex., ch. i, occasioned several other discussions between Rab and Samuel. In Soṭah 11a and 11b, some of their differences are mentioned and one of them is spoken of also in Erubin 53a. Both Rab and Samuel again take part in the same discussion in Midrash Rabba, Exodus. Finally, in Soṭah, quoted above, Samuel is one of the principal exponents of Exodus, chap. i.

The question now arises how shall we in the passage quoted first, viz. Midrash Rabba, Exodus, chap. i, account
for the name Levi, the name of a scholar who, especially on halakic subjects, is often in conflict with Rab? The answer is obvious. Levi is a mistake for Samuel; and this mistake was occasioned by the word הַלִּי, occurring along with the word הבּית.  

6. In Midrash Rabba, Exodus, ch. 51, we read on 33, 8:

In the same place a different explanation is given of this verse by Rabbi Johanan. Both opinions are anonymously quoted in the Jerusalem Talmud, Shekalim 4, 13 and Bikkurim 3, 3. Moreover, in the Babylonian Talmud, Kiddushin 33b, and in Yalkut, Exodus, ch. 393, the saying of Rabbi Ḥama (יְהוֹנָתָן) is attributed to Rabbi Amme (יְהוֹנָתָן). Now, if we take into consideration that Rabbi Ḥama is very seldom, perhaps never, mentioned without his father's name (for Rabbi Ḥama, the principal of the school at Nehardea, 357-372 C. E., is always called רבי חמא מַעְרָא Sanhedrin 17b), the name Amme would seem to be the true reading and the name Ḥama to be a mistake occasioned by its similarity with חמא.

7. In Midrash Rabba, Exodus, chap. 41, and Leviticus, chap. 35, we read:

But Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 6, and Yalkut, II Sam., ch. 162, have the reading רבי יוחנן, Rabbi Johanan, while in Midrash Shōḥer Tob on Ps. 18, 35, and in Yalkut, Gen. ch. 10, and ibidem., Leviticus, ch. 671, the passage occurs anonymously. The probable explanation is that the name Jonathan was suggested to the scribe by the word נִנְתָה מַהְנוּ, all three words being derived from the same stem מַהְנוּ.
The two names Jonathan and Johanan were confounded; a not uncommon error in the Talmud.

8. It cannot well be the work of chance that in Midrash Rabba, Numbers, where frequently subjects are discussed touching the tribe Levi, several sayings are attributed to the well known Rabbi Joshua ben Levi and to Rabbi Jehudah ben Levi, the latter of whom seldom occurs save a few times in chaps. 3, 4, and 7.

9. Nor can it be regarded a pure coincidence that Rabbi Berechiah הוא ברכיה is the principal speaker in Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 39, where the blessings וברכה of Abraham, Gen. 12, 2, 3, and those of Isaac, Gen., 27, 28, are discussed.

So also in Yalkut, where names of authors are scarce, Rabbi Berechiah is mentioned in the discussions on the blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49), of the priests’ blessing (Num. 6, 24), and of the blessing of Moses (Deut. 34).

10. In Midrash Rabba, Song of Songs, 8, 11, we read:

I cannot find the name אתניא elsewhere. It possibly is the name of the sage called אתניא in the Jerusalem Talmud, Gittin 1, 5, who appears to have been a pupil of Rabbi Johanan. But it is more probable that it was a clerical error for אביה, a name which occurs in Midrash Rabba, Ecclesiastes, 9, 11, in Midrash Samuel, ch. 17 (towards the end), in Pesikta de Rabbi Kahana, p. 45b, in Yalkut, Exodus, ch. 362 (towards the end), and ibidem. Psalms, ch. 795. Assuming אתניא to be a mistake for אביה, it was undoubtedly occasioned by the words אתניא חכמים כעינים, for they are omitted in Midrash Rabba, Num., ch. 11, where, moreover, instead of the name אתניא we find אביה.

11. A clerical error of the same kind is found in
Midrash Rabba, Ruth, ch. 5, § 4, on Ruth 2, 12:

יאר הָאָמָה אָשֶׁר בָּאת לָהּ שָׁם

In Pesikta de Rabbi Kahana the name is يִוְּשָׁבָה, and there the editor (S. Buber) already pointed out that שָׁם in Midrash Rabba was a printer’s error, though in my opinion the mistake was made by the scribe. But how did this mistake happen? Probably, it is due to resemblance of שָׁם to לַכַּשָּׁת and to the term שֶׁם which is a few times repeated in this passage.

12. In Midrash Rabba, Ekah, ch. 1, on Lam. 1, 1, we read:

וַיִּוָּלְמֶה אָדָם וָאָבָה וַיַּלְמֶה יִוְּשָׁבָה (Lam. 2, 4)

וַיִּמְרֶה ויִוְּשָׁבָה (Lam. 2, 5)

In this passage, the haggadic interpretation of the three verses, Lam. 1, 1 and 2, 4, 5, is attributed to the well known Rabbi Abba bar Kahana. All the same, יִוְּשָׁבָה also appears as author of the remarks on Lam. 2, 4, 5. If we consider that both verses contain the term יִוְּשָׁבָה ‘enemy,’ and that as well the name יִוְּשָׁבָה as the term יִוְּשָׁבָה is derived from the root יִוְּשָׁבָה ‘to be hostile,’ and that, on the contrary יִוְּשָׁבָה means ‘father,’ it is obvious that here the name יִוְּשָׁבָה owes its origin to the word יִוְּשָׁבָה. Furthermore, it should be noticed that in Yalkut, Hosea, ch. 521, all the three observations are attributed to יִוְּשָׁבָה.

13. Rabbi Simon ben Yoḥai is credited in the tractate Berakot, with several haggadic comments. But among them there is one on Ps. 3, 1

מָמוּד לַרְדוֹר בְּכָהָה מַמְיָא בַּבְּשָׁלֹה ‘A psalm of David, when he fled from Absalom his son,’ which is attributed to Rabbi Simon ben Absalom
both here and in Yalkut, Ps. 3, 1, though in 'En Jacob, Berakot, *ibidem*, the same is again assigned to Rabbi Simon ben Yohai.

It is evident that the name Rabbi Simon ben Yohai is correct and that the scribe substituted that of Absalom, because the verse, commented on, mentions the flight of David before *Absalom*. And of this I am convinced despite the fact that Absalom is the paternal name of several scholars, e.g. Nathan ben Absalom (Berakot 22a), Hanan ben Absalom (Mishna Ketubot 13, 1, cf. Tosaftot, *ibidem*, p. 104b), and Rabbi Simon ben Absalom (Megillah 14a).

14. In Yoma 69b we read:

And a little further:

“*In Palestine they teach: Rabbi Giddel says,* etc.” where no doubt we have an allusion to a passage in the Jerusalem Talmud, Megillah, ch. 3 (towards the end). And again in the same tractate Yoma, but a little higher, we read:

An exposition of the difficulties in this paragraph we find in the commentaries of ‘En Jacob, *ibidem*. As for the variants, in the three passages quoted, they may be removed by reading:

which is the text in Masseket Soferim, ch. 13, § 8. The name שונא probably owes its origin to the word שונא and its insertion into the sentence is all the more intelligible as Rabbi Giddel was the disciple of Rab.

15. Something similar we find in the Jerusalem Talmud, tract. Sukkah 5, and in Yalkut, Jonah, ch. 550:
In Seder ha-Dorot, s. v. יונתן, where the passages containing Rabbi Jonah’s name are registered, this particular phrase is omitted. It is obvious, therefore, that in the citation given above, the scribe makes Rabbi Jonah say something concerning the prophet Jonah which was in reality a saying of Rab or more probably of Rabbi.

16. We read in Shabbat 22a:

The name of Rabbi Samuel of Difte does not occur elsewhere, but the name of Rabbi Jeremiah of Difte is found in the Talmud, and to him is attributed the saying in Sheelot de Rabbi Ahaï, section עליא, ch. 26. It is evident that the name יומא here is due to the saying משמאא.

17. In Baba Mešia 25a, we read:

It is most probable that the surname Magdala’a, מנהלא was occasioned by the word מנהלא. The explanation itself, no doubt, was taken from the Baraitha, which is subsequently quoted to confirm it. I am aware that the name Rabbi Isaac Magdala’a occurs a few times in the Talmud, viz. Yoma 81b, Shabbat 139a, Niddah 27b, 33a. It is also found in the Midrash, e. g. Gen. rabba, ch. 98 (towards the end), Num. rabba, ch. 14, Gen. rabba, ch. 5, in a very difficult and obscure passage, which also occurs in Midrash Gen. rabba, ch. 20, where the word מנהלא is omitted, and where the explanation of Rashi, containing the stem יומא, should be consulted. All the same, I think that in the above quoted passage, Baba Mešia, the surname of Rabbi Isaac Magdala’a has its origin in the statement attributed to him, seeing that the name רב יונתן, Rabbi
Isaac, is very conspicuous in the explanations in the first paragraphs of Baba Mezia, ch. 2.

18. It is remarkable that the term מָסֶל 'olive-press,' Baba Batra 67b, is explained by the sage ר. אבכה רב משל. He is three times mentioned in this tractate, but does not appear elsewhere in the Talmud. If those who identify him with רב אבכה, whose father's name is not stated, be right, the name מָסֶל would seem to have been added because of the term מָסֶל 'olive-press.'

19. In the same tractate 90b we read that Rabbi Jose bar Hanina said to מָנָא, his servant, 'מָנָא אֲרֵא וּרְבִי'. The correct name of the servant is very uncertain. Sepher Yo-hasin has the reading מָנָא. The Munich manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud (see Dikduke Sofrim on this passage) also has מָנָא, and there, moreover, it appears that the Hamburg manuscript and the Pesaro edition read, מָנָא. Is it not probable, therefore, that the name מָנָא in our edition was suggested by the term מָנָא?

20. The Babyl. Talmud, Berakot 53b, contains in the Baraita, שְׁמוֹנָא אַחַת הַרְבִּית, some very strange names of Tannaites, viz. 'יְלֵיאוּ ר. יֵשָׁי, names which greatly resemble each other and do not occur elsewhere in the Talmud. After their names we meet with the following passage:

ר יֵשָׁי אֶמֶר בָּשָׁם שְׁפֹּוחָה סֵפָל לָעָבָרָה כְּדִי יְיָא שְׁפֹּחוֹת סֵפָל לָעָבָרָה

The purport of this saying agrees with that of Rabbi Aha and Rabbi Zilai, ibidem. The name of its author, however, does not occur elsewhere (perhaps it is implied in the saying of Rabbi Nahman bar Isaac). Is it not obvious that the name יֵשָׁי, which is not very pleasing to the ear, was
given to him because of its affinity to the stem סוס, which occurs twice in this passage?

21. In Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 18, we read:

This statement occurs a few times in the Babylonian Talmud, e.g. Shabbat 96a, Berakot 61a, Erubin 18a, Niddah 46b, but always as of Rabbi Simon ben Menashya. The name בנייה, in the passage quoted, is no doubt fictitious, and was suggested by the word אביה, which is the principal word in the whole sentence, and which is used to explain ויב, Gen. 2, 22.

22. In Midrash Rabba, Ex., ch. 21, we find several expositions in connection with the phrase מה تعالى אל, Ex. 14, 15. Among others the passage:

But in Yalkut, ch. 120, we find that, on this passage from Gen., Rabbi Abba bar Hanina says:

In Yalkut, Micah, ch. 551, the same statement is assigned to Rabbi Jose bar Kahana on the authority of Rabbi Abba bar Hanina, and in Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 69, the passage is attributed to Rabbi Abba bar Kahana.

How then can we account for the name of Rabbi Akiba in Midrash Rabba, Exodus? Rabbi Akiba cannot have heard what he says from R. Abba, who lived long after him. No doubt his name is due to its resemblance to the name עקיב, which occurs in the same passage.

23. In the same manner, we can account for the reading בן סרנאה in Shabbat 104b:
For in Tosefta, Shabbat, ch. 12 (edition Zuckermandel), the name is בון סטודא, Ben Satoda (see Blau, Αλτούδικος Ζαυμμετάνυν, 41, n. 1); and so also in the Jerusalem Talmud, Yeabmot 16, 6; but the name is omitted in the parallel passage, Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrin 7, 12. The explanation of this mistake is that in tract. Shabbat, quoted above, there is mention made of בון סטודא לא בארך.

24. It cannot be pure coincidence that the words זא קיו Deut. 27, 26, in the Jerusalem Talmud, Soṭah 7, 4, are explained by one called בר לבעיון בן קיו, who is very seldom or perhaps never heard of again. He is probably to be identified with Rabbi Simon ben Eliakim, whose name occurs a few times in the Talmud (this passage is quoted by Nahmanides on Deut., ibidem).

25. This desire for paronomasia may also account for the use of some very rare and uncommon words. We read in the Babylonian Talmud, Baba Batra 71a:

מרש יהודו בן ניקוס לא רבי והו פירש והו לא פירש

How shall we account, in the Babylonian Talmud, for the use of the genuine old Hebrew word מירש, with the meaning to explain, which is already found in Num. 15, 34? אמר, which is also Aramaic, was the verb one would have expected, or if the idea of elucidation was insisted upon, the word נתמה מירש. No doubt the scribe, in selecting the word מירש, was led by his love of paronomasia. Its connection with the phrase, in which it occurs, is obvious.

26. The same fondness for paronomasia may have led writers to modernize certain names. I refer to a passage in Midrash Rabba, Num., ch. 7:

אמר יהודו אמר פימוק פיניק שלאו...יהיה והיו פמונוקיך וכור

whereas in the same place, ch. 13, we read:

הואי בושר של שמשון בן יהואיב_both שמשון ושמשון וכור
And so the passage is found also in Midrash Rabba, Song of Songs, ch. 4, § 7. Now, it is well known that Rabbi Simon ben Yoḥai, in the Talmud and Mishna, is commonly called Rabbi Simon. In the first of the two citations, therefore, *r' šemḥa 'r can be no one else but *r' šemḥa 'b, named in the second. As, moreover, the prevalent diction in Midrash Rabba, Numbers, is on the whole tolerably pure Hebrew, there is no reason why the name Rabbi Simon should have been Hellenized, and spelled *šemḥa, except for its resemblance to the word *šemḥa, occurring in the same phrase.

27. In some instances, it would seem, the process is reversed, and sayings are recorded, because they contain words resembling the name of the person who is treated of. Thus we read in Sotah 41b:

אָרוֹשׁ בַּעֲלֵי אָדוֹן מְשַׁנֶּר אֲרוֹרָה לְאָרוֹתָהּ כְּרַךְ

Now and then we find in the Talmud the expression בֵּעֵל יַחֵש בַּעֲלֵי אָדוֹן ‘violent men,’ lit. ‘men of the fist,’ a kind of synecdoche for בֵּעֵל יַחֵש ‘men of the arm’; e.g. Sanhedrin 21a. Such also is the explanation of Rashi, viz. בֵּעֵל יַחֵש ‘power.’ But why is not the more common term used; or, rather, why not simply write: מִיתָוָנָה הָוֹנָה ‘from the day that hypocrisy increased,’ after the manner of several sayings which occur at the end of this treatise?
—The answer is obvious. The term אֲרוֹרָה אָרוֹתָה is advisedly chosen, because there is question here of king אֲרוֹרָה.

28. In a similar manner we may account for a statement occurring in Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 85.

שִׁירָא בֵּרֵכַת מְבָרָכָה מְבָרָכָה מְבָרָכָה יִזְהְרָה לֵאָה כְּרַךְ

Rashi explains מְבָרָכָה מְבָרָכָה מְבָרָכָה, ‘caravan,’ sometimes also מְבָרָכָה, מְבָרָכָה, is the more common word for cara-
van. Whether מכרה him occurs elsewhere with this meaning I do not know. But here, I think, it is used because of its resemblance to the name of the speaker ירא him.

29. On the same principle a passage, occurring in the Babylonian Talmud, may be fitly explained: Nedarim 66b. In connection with a certain occurrence, we find the following remark:

**הוה יתיב באמה ב口コミ אבבמה וקמיא דרים רימיא ויהי**

Samuel Edels rightly observes that it is not clear why it is stated that Baba ben Bota was *seated at the door*. His explanation is that, though he was not seated at the door, he was not far from it, and that this vicinity made the woman think that he was referred to in the saying of her husband ירא אבבמה. I, for one, thought that ירא אבבמה was a juridical phrase, not uncommon in the Talmud, and that באמה here is analogous to ירא in Hebrew, which would obviate the difficulty raised by Samuel Edels. But if this were not so (and just now I cannot recollect a parallel instance, nor can I believe that it would have been unknown to such a Talmud-expert as Edels), then באמה has been probably added by the scribe because of its similarity with the name באמה יז לווע. I am confirmed in this opinion by the coincidence that the term באמה does not occur in *Seder ha-Dorot*, where the incident is quoted.

I am bound, however, to point out that it is surprising to find here the name of Baba ben Bota, who, if we may rely on what is recorded in Baba Batra 3b, lived in the days of Herod. If, what is related of him, really took place, we would expect to find it mentioned in a Baraita.

30. In Midrash Rabba, Lev., ch. 1, we read:

**ר יشبכר דcoma מנורא אמר כרי יהאشبכר אני למשי ולחו**
The same saying, but without the words פא"ת "פא"ת occurs in Yalkut, Job, ch. 897. The name of Rabbi Issachar of Chephar-mande is more than once met with in the Midrash; e.g. Midrash Rabba, Esther, ch. 7. I am inclined to think that the scribe, who copied Midrash Rabba, Lev., was reminded by the name Issachar of the passage דא"ת לאוהים פא"ת, Gen. 30, 18, and thus was led to add the words פא"ת פא"ת.

31. Something similar must have happened in Midrash Rabba, Num., ch. 23; where we read:

"ירqueda" אומר מינה יישעיהו. ייוהו נח. יניבר הושע אמש נבר.

This saying occurs also in Midrash Yalkut, Tehillim, ch. 818, but with the following variation:

"ירqueda" אומר מינה יישעיהו ע"ה יבכשת נבר.

The conjecture lies at hand that the speaker in Midrash Rabba, Num., while quoting a saying of Rabbi Joshua, wished to use a phrase resembling the latter's name. Perhaps, he was thinking at the time of Ps. 44, 4.

32. In some cases the scribe appears to have proceeded even further in this direction, and to have aimed at producing a similarity of meaning between the name of the speaker and some word or other occurring in his statement. An instance of this, I think, I have found in Baba Batra 119a, as regards the passage:

"א"יר חידקא שמשת השםני היה ל"ה פר מחלמיי" ר"שכוכה ד"בר.

This saying occurs also in Siphre, ch. 68, and 133 (Vienna 1864). The name Simon ha-Shikmoni does not seem to occur elsewhere. But according to another reading the name is הקמשני. See Dikduke Sofrim on this place.

The uncertainty concerning the name of Rabbi Hidka is even greater. In some manuscripts the name is
missing. In others we find the name of רבי instead of Rabbi Hidka.

I think that the scribe, who took the surname to be קמשורין, or, vice versa, he, who read קמשורין, altered קמשורין into קמשורין. For, as is known, קמשורין (Hebrew קמשורין) is the Aramaic word for thorn, and is equivalent to the Hebrew קמשורין.

33. It is quite possible also that sometimes the name given to a sage was suggested by its resemblance to the subject or purport of a Bible-passage on which he had expressed an opinion. This thought occurred to me while reading a saying, contained in the Midrash of Rabbi Nehunya ben Hakanah (a work unknown to me), and quoted by Nahmanides in his Commentary on Deut. 22, 6. 7. 'If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way, in any tree, or on the ground, with young ones or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young: thou shalt in any wise let the dam go, but the young thou mayest take unto thyself; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest prolong thy days.'

The subject dealt with is the statute known as סלאת חוכך, and in connection with it something is recorded on the authority of Rabbi רהמה, a name which, as far as I know, does not occur elsewhere in Midrash or Talmud. If we further consider that the statute expresses a humane feeling towards animals (רהמה, see Mishna Berakot 5, 3, and Talmud Bab. ibidem, 33b), then it is quite obvious why the sage, who discussed this point, was called Rabbi רהמה, i. e. 'mercy.'

34. Sometimes, it would seem, the name of a sage owes its origin to the initial letters of certain words con-
tained in his saying. An instance of this, I think, is found in Berakot 62b:

רב חנה בר אדה ור אמר אם קסם נאם אודריא איעל בתה

Though the name אדה repeatedly occurs in the Talmud, that of Rabbi Ḥana bar Ada is nowhere to be found. In the Babylonian Talmud, moreover, Megillah 29a, we find the same saying quoted on the authority of רנה. Is it not likely that the name of the sage was suggested to the scribe by the initial letters אדה of the first two words in his saying?

35. We find another instance of this kind of paronomasia in Midrash Rabba, Deut., ch. 2, and in Midrash Shoḥer Tob, ch. 65.

This saying is repeated in Midrash Shoḥer Tob, ch. 4, but without the words: משמית נעילים

ויהי באה שלrabbit שםאל בר纯净ו המה וויי אלא שעירתפלוח

And again the same passage is found in Yalkūt, Tehillim, ch. 69, but there the name of the sage is entirely omitted.

It is well known that Rabbi Samuel bar Nahman, in Midrash Rabba, Deut., ch. 2, is the same person as Samuel ben Nahman in Midrash Shoḥer Tob, ch. 65, and that he is often called Samuel or Rabbi Samuel, without his paternal name; for instance in the second of the two citations given above. Now, Rabbi Papa lived a century after Rabbi Samuel, and, therefore, Rabbi Ḥanina, the son of Papa, could not have addressed a question to Rabbi Samuel. This difficulty is obviated by adopting the reading of Midrash Shoḥer Tob, ch. 4, because Rabbi Ḥanina
(the same as Ḥanina bar Ḥama) was, like Rabbi Samuel, a disciple of Rabbi Jehudah Hanasi.

But what induced the scribe, in the first of the above quoted citations, viz. Midrash Rabba, Deut., ch. 2, and Shoḥer Ṭob, ch. 65, to add the name אָמֵס? A satisfactory answer is furnished by his love for paronomasia. The repetition of the letter כ in the words דֵּנְיָב דִּדְעָג suggested to him the name אָמֵס.

36. In the same manner we may account for the name of Rabbi Papa in Baba Kamma 54b.

37. The same remark applies to the name Rabbi Ḥismael, in Midrash Rabba, Esther, ch. 7.

The same passage recurs in Yalkut but anonymously. I doubt whether the name Ishmael is found elsewhere in the Midrash in connection with a haggadic statement. It was probably suggested by the initial letters of the three words שְׁמֵחַ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל֖וּמָה וּשְׁמָהוּ which, when joined together, produce the name שֵׁמַעְיָא. The letter י need not cause any difficulty when we recollect the derivation of the name.
given in Gen. 16, 11. 'And thou shalt call his name Ishmael (God heareth) because the Lord hath heard thy affliction.'

38. There are also cases in which, it would seem, the process was reversed. The name of the sage induced the scribe to couch his saying in words in which the name might easily be recognized. An instance of this is given us in Midrash Rabba, Num., ch. 17.

The common phrase, in the Talmud, for expressing this saying, would have been: 'יעזר בה עלrownך. And so we find it in all places where the subject is treated to which the statement of Rabbi Isaac refers: Midrash Rabba, Gen., ch. 35; Yalkût, Joshua, ch. 31, and Kings, ch. 193; Babylonian Talmud Moed Katan 9a; comp. Shabbat 30b. The two passages in Yalkût do not even contain the name of the sage. It is quite conceivable that a scribe, fond of paronomasia, seized the opportunity to remodel the saying of Rabbi Isaac, and to express it in words which reproduce the letters of his name.

39. Finally proceeding in the same direction, I think that in some cases the number of the ciphers, signified by the letters of an author's name, played an important part in the recording of his name and saying. An instance of this may be found in Midrash Rabba, Lev., ch. 16.

Rabbi Jose ben Zimra is a well known personality in the haggadah. There is, moreover, often mention in the haggadah of the 248 members of the human body (Mishna Ohalot 18; comp. commentary of Rabbi Simson, ibidem). The passage quoted recurs in Midrash Yalkût, Kohelet, ch. 971. But there, ch. 878, on Ps. 120, the
words ד'לא'ק are omitted, just as in the Babylonian Talmud, Arakin 15b, where several other sayings of Rabbi Jose ben Zimra are recorded.

The inference is obvious. The letters of the name אברים are equivalent to the number 248. This made the scribe think of the term ר"מ, and further induced him to let Rabbi Jose ben Zimra also express an opinion on the subject of the 248 members of the body.

This list of examples illustrating the use of paronomasia in Midrash and Talmud may be enriched by several others. The instances, selected by me, were taken indiscriminately from diverse passages. They suffice, I believe, to prove that the method of recording the names of sages, especially those in the haggadic writings, is not to be judged by a strictly historical standard, and that their sayings are not to be regarded as directly received from the lips of those to whom they are attributed.
THE SECULAR HEBREW POETRY OF ITALY

By A. B. Rhine, Hot Springs, Ark.

CHAPTER IV

THE AGE OF MOSES ḤAYYIM LUZZATTO.

The seventeenth century, as we have seen, was a period of transition. The poets of this period, though but few really deserve the name, are still vacillating between the old and the new, both in style, in versification, and in subject matter. But a great gain has been made in the development of poetry. The Hebrew, both in diction and in style, gradually assumes a more modern form; the new Italian versification introduced, gradually wins favor, and becomes firmly established; and the scope of poetry has widened. The eighteenth century sees the complete conquest of modernity. The Italian form of versification is the sine qua non of the poets, is taken as a matter of course, and the poetic tone becomes more and more secular. The religious feelings which inevitably manifest themselves, since these poets were all intensely religious, run as an undercurrent and not as the main stream. The number of poets also increases, though of many we have only isolated poems published, the greater bulk still remaining in manuscript. And during this century, we meet with truly gifted poets, men inspired, men who sang because they could not help singing, because their poetic souls demanded expression; and it is during this period that we come across the great,
consummate poetic genius in the person of Moses Hayyim Luzzatto.

During the first quarter of the eighteenth century, a number of minor poets continued the work of the seventeenth century poets in clearing the diction and freeing the style from the affectation and artificialities of mediævalism. Eliezer Cohen of Leghorn, in his dramatic poem "Jirai" written in 1680 shows a mastery of free versification. The argument of the poem in brief is this: A rich man glorying in the possession of his wealth meets a poor man equally glorying in his poverty. Each one tries to convince the other of the advantage he possesses, the rich man in the power of his wealth, the poor man in his freedom from care. The dispute waxes so heated that each draws his sword on the other, but the quarrel is settled by a third man who shows the strength and weakness of the position of each combatant and winds up by quoting Solomon's prayer: Give me neither poverty nor riches. These thoughts, however, are couched in smoothly flowing rimes, the poet employing several forms of the Italian stanza as well as the rimed prose of mediæval poets both of which make pleasant reading. Eliezer b. Gerson Hefez (Gentile) whose two poems, a sonnet and a longer poem in terza rima, are extant (Kol 'Ugab, Nos. 5, 11), possesses a fine style and a forcible and poetic diction. Samson Cohen Modon (1679—June 10, 1727) of Mantua, a member of a very prominent family, a man of

---

40 Possibly a brother of Moses b. Gerson Hefez (1664—Venice, 1712), the father of Gerson, the young author of Yad Haruzim. See Neppi-Ghirondi, 239.

41 Della Volta's biography in Kerem Chemed, II; Steinschneider, C. B.; Jewish Encyclopedia, s. v.
wide education both secular and rabbinic, at one time connected with the Mantuan rabbinate though for the most part engaged in commerce, was a master of the sonnet. A moralist and given to the didactic, his Kol Musar (Mantua 1725), a collection of fifty sonnets, is an elegant and finished product, written as it is in a refreshingly fine Hebrew, and perfect in rime and rhythm. These sonnets are philosophic in character, and contain many keen reflections on things of deep human interest. One of his sonnets is addressed to Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto (Introduction to his Introduction to his *Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto*). (The Kol Musar is introduced by the congratulatory poems of David Finzi, rabbi of Mantua and father-in-law of Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto, and of Dr. Kalonymos d'Italia and Dr. Raphael Vita d'Italia.) Isaac Levi (ישראל לוי), a grandson of Leon da Modena and Venetian rabbi, composed a number of epitaphs which, however, lack the brilliancy of his famous grandfather. David Nieto (1654-1728), a native of Venice, who practised medicine and officiated as rabbi at Leghorn whence he was called to London in 1702 to become the Hakam of the Sephardic community, also tried his hand at verse-making and not unhappily. His poem of ten octaves (Kol ‘Ugab, No. 1), though somewhat hyperbolic in tone, betrays deep feelings, and is easy and graceful. The “Reflections” of Joseph Raruch b. Moses Cases, a younger contemporary of Zacuto, physician and rabbi at Mantua, are well written and contain some lyric touches. Fine are the lines:

Fleeter than an eagle's flight
The days rush by and life is o'er;

*Dr. A. Berliner, Introduction to Lilḥot Abanim: Neppi-Ghirondi, pp. 165-76, where he is spoken of as a poet in a large sense.*

*See Neppi-Ghirondi, 129, 254.
An instant, and life's bridge is spanned,
And, lo! we are no more.

(Kol 'Ugab, No. 32). The sonnets of Isaac Vita Cantarini (died 1723) and of his pupil Shabbethai Marini (died 1748), both physicians as well as rabbis of Padua, in honor of Abraham Cohen's Kehunnat Abraham, are graceful, though Cantarini's short poems contained in his Ḫaṣ (Amsterdam 1710) have no poetic value at all. Isaiah Bassani (d. 1739), teacher and staunch friend of Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto, rabbi of Cento, Padua, and Reggio successively, while betraying no poetic depth of feeling, is a master of diction and of a clear, incisive style. His sonnet is finished, his octave is clever, and his elegy on Benjamin Cohen, his father-in-law (d. 1721), in sixty-nine terza rima stanzas is vigorous (Kol 'Ugab, Nos. 6, 14, 64). While

Here, quoting Isaac Pacifico, gives the date of his death as 1742, at the age of over ninety. Fürst, Bibl. Jud., s. v., gives the date of his birth as 1644; he was still living in 1718. Comp. his sonnet in Kehunnat Abraham, Venice 1719. He was an eminent physician sought after by the Italian nobility, as well as the head of the rabbinical college of Padua. He is the author also of Pi Sefarim (which I have not seen). His grandson Ḥayyim Moses Cantarini is likewise spoken of as a poet by Ghirondi who was in possession of his manuscript (Neppi-Ghirondi, p. 102, 238).

The date is given by Neppi, p. 143. Ghirondi, quoting Isaac Pacifico, gives the date of his death as 1742, at the age of over ninety. Fürst, Bibl. Jud., s. v., gives the date of his birth as 1644; he was still living in 1718. Comp. his sonnet in Kehunnat Abraham, Venice 1719. He was an eminent physician sought after by the Italian nobility, as well as the head of the rabbinical college of Padua. He is the author also of Pi Sefarim (which I have not seen). His grandson Ḥayyim Moses Cantarini is likewise spoken of as a poet by Ghirondi who was in possession of his manuscript (Neppi-Ghirondi, p. 102, 238).

He translated Ovid's Metamorphoses into Hebrew octaves, the publication of which was interrupted by his death. His SHIRIM (34 Sonnets) and his rimed version of the Pirkei Abot are still in manuscript. Fürst: Shabbetai Maaini, Literaturblatt des Orients, 1820, c. 124; Bibl. Jud., s. v.

The date is given by Neppi, p. 143. Ghirondi, quoting Isaac Pacifico, gives the date of his death as 1742, at the age of over ninety. Fürst, Bibl. Jud., s. v., gives the date of his birth as 1644; he was still living in 1718. Comp. his sonnet in Kehunnat Abraham, Venice 1719. He was an eminent physician sought after by the Italian nobility, as well as the head of the rabbinical college of Padua. He is the author also of Pi Sefarim (which I have not seen). His grandson Ḥayyim Moses Cantarini is likewise spoken of as a poet by Ghirondi who was in possession of his manuscript (Neppi-Ghirondi, p. 102, 238).

He was a disciple of Zacuto, rabbi of Reggio, and teacher of M. H. Luzzatto. Abraham Kahana in his "Life of Luzzatto" (Hebrew, Warsaw 1898) asserts that Benjamin Cohen, an eminent kabbalist, a favorite disciple of Zacuto's, and himself a fervent poet, exerted a great influence upon Luzzatto both as a kabbalist and as a poet. I have not been able to obtain any of Benjamin Cohen's poems.
the intrinsic poetic value of these men is not great, they emphasized the best elements of the poetic expression of the seventeenth century, and perfected the outer form of Hebrew poetry. The spirit of modernity which was thus struggling for realization was soon to find embodiment in the truly gifted Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto.

Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto (1707-1747), a descendant of an old scholarly family, is the most tragic figure in the history of modern Hebrew poetry. A poet born, a man of splendid natural abilities, he received the most careful education which the wealth of his father, a rich silk merchant of Padua, could obtain for him. A precocious child, he mastered early Hebrew and Latin, the two languages which in Italy at that time, were the standards of Jewish and Christian culture respectively. The restless energy of his mind found expression already in his seventeenth year in a drama “Samson and the Philistines,” of which only fragments are extant, and before he was twenty he had composed 150 Psalms in imitation of the Psalms of David. Both these works, written in a clear, pure, vigorous Biblical Hebrew, simple, direct, easy, and vivid, already foreshadowed the master. Had he followed his natural tendencies, had he devoted himself to the Hebrew muse for which he had been born, he would have been the most imposing figure in Hebrew literature, the Hebrew poet par excellence. Poetry, as his later productions proved, though written in the stress and storm of conflict and strife, was, with him, a part of his soul. There was little of the fit, and all of the nascitur in him. Moreover, it would have spared him the many persecutions, humiliations, and sorrows which rendered his life so tragic. Unfortunately, in 1727, he became possessed of a passion for mysticism, and a burning desire for the study of the
Kabbalah, in which he seems to have been encouraged by his teacher Isaiah Bassani, at that time rabbi at Padua. While his logical mind would under ordinary circumstances have easily seen through the hollowness of the thing, his great, poetic imagination proved his undoing. Fascinated by the glitter and charm of the Zohar, absorbing rather than discerning its mysteries, he mastered them so thoroughly, that he was enabled to write a "Second Zohar," a perfect imitation of the first in language and style, and surpassing it in logic (if logic and Kabbalah are compatible at all), for he endeavored to systematize the mystic teachings! His enthusiasm and poetic fervor soon led him beyond all bounds, in that he began to believe that he had a special guardian angel who appeared before him in nightly visions, and taught him the mystic sciences while a host of higher beings, among them patriarchs and saints, listened to his words of wisdom. Nor could his ardent soul keep such things to himself. A small circle of loyal disciples grouped themselves about him and listened spellbound to his eloquent and glowing as well as erudite interpretation of the Kabbalah according to the new light he had received from his guardian angel. Carried away by his enthusiasm he even intimated to them that he himself was the Messiah! One of his disciples, Jekuthiel Gordon of Wilna who had come to Padua to study medicine, but fell under the magic of the Kabbalah as personified by Luzzatto, could not refrain himself from confiding to a kabbalist in Vienna and to Joshua Höschel, rabbi of Wilna, in 1729, the wonderful powers of Luzzatto. The secret thus leaked out. From that time Luzzatto became the center of strife, contention, and persecution which terminated only with his life.
The tragic career of this remarkable man, resembling, as Graetz suggested, in his life that of Spinoza and in his death that of Judah Halevi, is too well known to need repetition. But crowded as his life was with many activities, among which the Kabbalah claimed the lion's share, he nevertheless found opportunity to respond to the real call of his nature, to that of the muse; and this, it was, that saved him from oblivion. For, busy as a kabbalist, forcible as a moralist, and excellent as a rhetorician, his poetical works are his chief claim to distinction. His poetic spirit found expression in two dramatic poems, Migdal 'Oz (Strong Tower) and La-Yesharim Tehillah (Praise for the Righteous), the former written about 1727, the latter in 1743.

While the dramatic form of poetry had already been introduced in Hebrew literature by Zacuto in his Yesod 'Olam, Luzzatto's Migdal 'Oz is the first romantic drama in Hebrew literature. Luzzatto is the first to strike the keynote of true modernity in that his drama is not, like Zacuto's, a mere pretext, a collection of rimes and sonnets loosely connected with a plot ready made in the midrashic interpretations of biblical texts. With Luzzatto the dramatic form is essential. For the first time in Hebrew literature he undertakes to depict that most intensely dramatic human passion—the passion of love. Hitherto the erotic theme had hardly been touched upon by Hebrew poets. The innate modesty of the Jew, and the sadness and uncertainty of the Jewish life in the Middle Ages, made the subject of love a thing profane. Even that most beautiful and most passionate biblical erotic idyll, the "Song of Songs", has been interpreted by the rabbis as representing the alliance of God, the lover, with Israel, the bride. When a poet did
venture upon this subject, it was only incidental. Spanish poets, and especially Immanuel, early in the fourteenth century, sang of love, after the fashion of their time, but the ingenious licentiousness of the "Mahberet" with its riot of passion, levity, and frivolity was Italian rather than Jewish, and repelled rather than attracted. All through the middle ages, the somberness and seriousness of Jewish life reflected themselves in Hebrew poetry which was in consequence equally somber and serious. But this youth of twenty appeared, and, in an instant, as it were, cleared the atmosphere of the despair of the ages, and breathed into the Ghetto the spirit of love, the love of man for woman, of woman for man, with its sorrows and its joys! This innovation alone was sufficient to revolutionize the character of Hebrew poetry. It is this, above anything else, that stamps Luzzatto as modern. But not alone in matter, but also in manner did Luzzatto prove himself a pioneer, for he created an entirely new style of diction, of expression, of versification. To express real human emotions and human passions, biblical phraseology was altogether inadequate. Hitherto, writers, both in prose and verse, displayed their ingenuity by burying their thoughts beneath an ocean of ready-made biblical phrases, quoted bodily from the Bible and Talmud whether the entire quotation fitted into the context or not. To these were concatenated an endless chain of other complete phrases, with indefinite allusions to the sources quoted, thus forming a whole, ingenious beyond comparison, but puzzling, mystifying, hard to unravel. Scholars writing for scholars, only those thoroughly at home in biblical and rabbinical literature could fathom their meaning; and the style was admired in proportion to its ingenuity and complexity. Luzzatto's
depth of feeling and clearness of vision demanded a clear, incisive style; a free and lucid form of expression. His words, of course, are taken from the Bible, but pure as gold, without the dross of Aramaisms. His phrases are all of his own mintage; they represent his thoughts exactly, accurately. The resultant is an exceedingly graceful, pliable, smooth style, but vigorous and incisive withal. The blank verse which Luzzatto introduced in his drama, with longer and shorter lines of nine and six syllables respectively, is exceedingly rhythmic and musical, and flows softly like the tones of a harp, like the murmur of a brook.

The argument of the Migdal 'Oz written as an epithalamium is highly romantic. Ram, King of the land of the East, promises to give his daughter Salome in marriage to the man who would discover the entrance to a magnificent but inaccessible tower situated on the top of a lofty mountain near his capital. Unaware of this offer, a young foreign prince, Shalom, attracted by the mystery of the tower, explores it and effects an entrance through a secret gate which he leaves ajar. Ziphah, a worthless young fellow of Ram's capital, finding the gate open, enters the tower and then claims his bride from the king, which is granted, and the wedding-day is publicly announced. Meanwhile, Prince Shalom meets the princess and a passionate love springs up between them, though Salome would not prove false to her betrothed Ziphah whom she despises. Adah, the bosom friend of the princess, herself in love with Shalom, discovers the secret attachment and determines upon the ruin of the princess. She arranges a clandestine meeting between Shalom and Salome, hatches a plot against the life of Ziphah in the name of the princess, and then denounces her. The stern king, in accordance with law,
condemns his daughter to be burned, unless some one were to offer his life in her stead. Shalom offers himself in the princess' place, and confesses to having entered the secret tower which he thought was against the law of the land. Thereupon Shalom is recognized as the legitimate suitor for the hand of the princess, Adah confesses her intrigue, and everything ends happily.

Crude as is the conception of the plot, and feeble as is the dramatic action of Migdal 'Oz, it is nevertheless a finished work of art. The hero and the heroine as well as the other persons in the play, while they do not stand close scrutiny as character-drawings, are none the less living men and women. The passions that animate them are real, felt. Both Shalom and Salome are very young, very passionate, and given to ranting, but their monologues are crowded with beautiful thoughts and still more beautiful lines. The heroine is a type of womanly chastity and reserve, and the sentiment throughout the drama is lofty and elevated, chaste and pure, and thoroughly Jewish. The poet indulges in many observations which betray a keen insight into the affairs of practical life and a fine eye for the beauties of nature.

A few lines translated freely are here given by way of illustration:

"O let the rocks of thy majestic height
Whom I have taught to echo with her name
Tell of the sorrows of my heart;
O let each tree, a-murmur with the wind,
Tell of my grief. O let each bird a-wing
Across the eastern hills sing of the gloom
That gathered on my brow."

(Letteris' edition, p. 8).
The soul divine which born 'midst God's Immense expanse, without a fence To bound its vast immensity, E'en though confined within a frame Does loathe its narrowness; unused To limit in its former home.

(ibid., p. 31).

The shepherd boy—who feeds his flocks, How happy is his lot! The leader of his sheep, he walks, Glad even in his poverty, Secure within the shadow lies: His heart and face both twins in joy! All happy though so poor.

His spirit knows not lust of wealth, Nor glory is his soul’s desire; Though thorns and thistles be his food, His happiness does make them sweet. Upon his wretched couch at night He finds repose; the morning finds The bloom of youth upon his cheek. If wasted be the fields or full, If black and stormy be the skies, His heart is firm and troubles not. He fears no ambush, nor does stand In dread of perjured witnesses: All happy though so poor!

(ibid., p. 43).

None can decipher, none can see The heavens' hidden cryptogram;
Yet from between the reason's rifts
The wise may gaze and catch a glimpse.

(ibid., p. 57).

The conceit of the echo responding to certain words of the hero's monologue, thus forming a cryptic sentence of prophecy, is rather factitious from a modern point of view. Luzzatto was very likely influenced by Zacuto who introduced this device in his Tofte 'Aruk. This, however, does not detract from the charm of the poem. Taking into consideration the youth of the poet, Migdal 'Oz stands as a fine work of poetic art, suggestive of still greater possibilities in years of maturity.

La-Yesharim Tehillah (Praise to the Righteous), modeled after Guarini's Pastor Fido, and written in 1743, represents the poet's maturity both in thought and style. It is an allegoric, symbolic drama describing the struggle between right and wrong and the final triumph of the right. While his earlier work is somewhat diffuse, and lacking in depth, this drama is terse and philosophic. The plot, if one may call it such with an almost total absence of dramatic action, is feeble, as is the case with most allegoric plays. Nor is the subject itself altogether new, even in Hebrew literature (cf. Penso's הָּדָּ֥שׁ). But the beauty and perfection of its style, the music and rhythm of its meter, the profundity of thought, and the poetic spirit that pervades every line, render it a masterpiece of the highest rank. Published in 1743, it left its impress upon all subsequent Hebrew literature, and deservedly remains a classic to the present day.

The argument of the allegory is as follows: Truth (Emct) the father of probity (Yosher), betrothed his son
to Fame (Tehillah) the daughter of Multitude (Hamon), while the children were still in their infancy. At the time of their birth, Lust (Taawah), the maid of Truth and living in his house, also gave birth to a son, when the army of Confusion (Mebukah) plundered the city and took the children captive. For fear that his servant's son might be mistaken for that of his own, Truth left a description of him with Judgment (Mishpat) before his death. Many years later, Deceit (Tarmit) who had reared Lust's son, naming him Arrogance (Rahab), succeeded in persuading Multitude that Arrogance was the real son of Truth, and he was accordingly betrothed to Fame. Meanwhile, Probity, unknown and ignored, lived in the same city, and he and Fame fell deeply in love with each other, though Multitude insisted upon marrying her to Arrogance. A great feast was prepared for the occasion of the wedding when a terrific storm broke over the palace of Multitude shaking it to its foundation. Taking this as an omen of God's displeasure, an old man urges Multitude to investigate whether Arrogance be the real son of Truth, after all. This was done in the palace of Judgment, when Reason proves that Probity was the real son of Truth. Arrogance was dismissed in disgrace, and Probity marries Fame.

While there is no attempt at character study, all the dramatis personae being symbolic, Luzzatto evinces a deep insight into human nature. Probity, in his desperate struggle against Arrogance, is upheld and supported by Patience, Reason, and Meditation, while Arrogance is supported by Deceit. Multitude who alone can be the father of Fame, is characterized by Reason as "bending with every wind like a reed in water." His servant is Folly.
Multitude, while heartily in favor of his daughter's marriage with Arrogance, is scared out of his wits at the first sign of danger. At the banquet hall, as the house is shaken by the wind, at a mere suggestion of the old man that Arrogance might not be the real son of Truth, Multitude turns against Arrogance at once. Deceit tries in vain to argue him out of his fear, or to persuade him not to condemn Arrogance before Judgment decided against him. Multitude's mind is already made up. This bit of satire directed against the pliability and uncertainty of popular favor, the poet may have drawn out of his own sad experiences; had he not himself known the varying mood of the people both of praise and condemnation? The underlying basis of the allegory may have been his own philosophy of life. Probity, right, supported by patience and reason; reason based upon the working of the laws of God in the universe must inevitably triumph in the struggle with wrong and falsehood. For a time these may have the upper hand, but the man of probity,

\[\text{.................Whatever haps}\]
\[\text{Stands a pillar of brass and iron,}\]
\[\text{Stands mighty; nor for an instant}\]
\[\text{Leaves his place or stands aside.}\]

(Warsaw edition, 1857, 26). Right will ultimately triumph and even fame will acknowledge him as her own.

Profound and lofty as is the thought of this poem, the extreme simplicity and beauty of the style and the diction in which it is couched add a charm of their own to the drama which captivates the reader. From the first to the last line there is a dignity about it that impresses itself at once even upon the most casual. There is not a superfluous line, not an unnecessary word. Every mon-
ologue or dialogue is an essential part of the poem, and any omission would be detrimental to the whole. The philosophic conceptions of justice, right, and reason are here conveyed in a manner simple, direct, appealing. The dialogue between Reason and Probity in the first and second acts are especially lofty in conception, perfect in execution, and majestic in expression; the monologue of Meditation in the second act may rank with the noblest poetic lines of any language. The great difference between the poet's earlier and later work can be seen at a glance when one compares the pastoral in Migdal 'Oz with that of this play. The second is evidently a copy of the first but is much more refined, more spiritual, more elevated in every respect.

Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto was the darling child of the muses. And thinking of the tragic life and the tragic death of this sweet singer in Israel one cannot but subscribe to the words of Dr. S. Bernfeld: "As one reads these creations of Luzzatto, one cannot rid himself of a feeling of grief, for he thinks then: What might not have become of this richly endowed poet had he been born in a more auspicious time, and had the Jewish people then not been deprived of light and air" (Kämpfende Geister im Judenthum: M. Ch. Luzzatto, p. 29).

In striking contrast with the poetic genius of Luzzatto stands his contemporary Jacob Daniel Olmo of Ferrara (1690-1757). Olmo, a Talmudist and Kabbalist, one of the three favorite disciples of Isaac Lampronti, the Talmudic encyclopaedist, while happy in some of the shorter liturgical poems, was a man incapable of sustained effort and possessed no inspiration or originality. His

* S. Z. Margulies in יסוד עולם, V, 209; Neppi-Ghirondi, p. 137.
‘Eden ‘Aruk (Paradise Prepared) which appeared in Venice simultaneously with Luzzatto's epoch-making La-Yesharim Tehillah, is a long, tedious composition of 277 five-lined stanzas, and is original neither in matter nor in manner. It is an imitation of an imitation. The very fact that the poet chose Moses Zacuto as his model whom he follows slavishly in every detail, in the form of verse, in the stilted, artificial style, with its complexity of homonyms, with its conceit of the echo, only more exaggerated, and in the scheme of the subject itself, shows at once the meagerness of his poetic conception. The central thought of the ‘Eden ‘Aruk is borrowed from the Midrashim and the Zohar (Bereshit Rabba, 62; Tanhum, טנ"ח, sec. 3; Zohar, Bereshit, 38a, 39b, also היזק א and וורח ). The righteous man at the point of death addresses himself to those who surround him. Like Zacuto’s dying sinner, he rails against physicians. "Nature, when allowed free scope, has the power to ward off disease. But when disease and the physician combine against nature, the patient is doomed" (stanzas 1-12). He then addresses his wealth, his wife, and children, and realizes their powerlessness (13-27). He appeals to his righteous deeds to come to his rescue and they respond encouragingly in an echo of his own words (27-34), and then speak plainly of the great reward awaiting him (35-37). The righteous man then goes into ecstasies over the eternal glories in store for him (37-58) when an angel appears before him whom he asks the meaning of his glorious visions to which the angel replies in an echo (58-81). The angel then goes into a lengthy explanation (82-145) of the happiness awaiting him in Paradise, contrasting his life of privation, suffering, and humiliation on account of his righteousness while on earth with the eternal bliss which
is to be his portion in the life to come. Thereupon three
groups of angels appear to greet and welcome him,
when the Shekinah itself addresses his soul, kisses it,
and the righteous man dies in ecstasy (145-158). The
happy dead now describes the seven chambers of Lower
Eden (159-218), the seven divisions of Upper Eden
(219-276), and winds up with a song of thanksgiving
(277).

That there is a great deal of poetic beauty in the
midrashic and kabbalistic conception of Paradise will be
readily admitted. Olmo, however, follows the Midrash and
the Zohar too closely, too literally, to allow any display
of originality, even had he possessed any. His Paradise
is all glitter. Gold, silver, pearls, and diamonds of the
most fantastic brilliancy are plentiful, but there is no
definiteness, no vividness to the description. His hyper-
boles are best illustrated by the quotation from the Talmud
which the poet paraphrases:

    If all the oceans turned into ink,
    If all the reeds assumed the shapes of pens,
    The earth and heaven into scrolls were changed
    And every man a scribe, and each were wise,
    They could not tell the plenitude of glory.

Olmo’s work is a continuation of the work and of the
spirit of Moses Zacuto. Together, they gave a faithful
reproduction of the Jewish conception of hell and heaven.
Unequal though both Zacuto and Olmo were to their task,
only kabbalists of their type with poetic inclination could
have undertaken to reduce to poetic form the mysteries of
the life beyond the grave. In this respect they rendered
Hebrew literature a lasting service. Mediaeval in spirit,
they were the last representatives of mediævalism in con-
ception and in expression. With Olmo the artificial, complex, and involved style in vogue for so many centuries practically died. Henceforth the spirit of Luzzatto with its clearness, simplicity, and naturalness of expression reigns supreme.

The 'Eden 'Aruk is introduced by well and faultlessly written commendatory poems of Abi'ad Sar Shalom Basilea (died 1743), kabbalist, geometrician, and astronomer, of Mantua, enemy of Frances in his Emunat Hakamim and friend of Luzzatto; and of the poet's father-in-law, Mordecai Zahalon (died 1748), physician and rabbi of Mantua.

CHAPTER V
LUZZATTO'S CONTEMPORARIES AND SUCCESSORS

While the personality and genius of M. H. Luzzatto dominates all subsequent Hebrew poetry of Italy, there flourished quite a number of minor poets in the time of Luzzatto who survived him, and in whose work his influence is manifested. Isaac Vita Musati of Ancona (about 1704—after 1800). a semi-religious poet of that period, it is true, shows very little of the new spirit in his Shire Zimrah (Florence 1800), and his poems have but little poetic value. But he is the exception. The spirit of modernity finally triumphed. Nearly all the poets show in thought, diction, and versification, a complete breaking away from the past. Every conceivable Italian meter and rime is employed, no longer as an experiment but as a matter of course. The great bulk of the poetry of that century was occasional. The epitaphamia and elegies

In his Preface to his Shire Zimrah he states that he was 96 at the time of its publication (1800).
alone, written at that time, would form a volume of no small proportions; nor did the Italians neglect to celebrate in song any event of any importance connected with communal life. But even these occasional poems betray in some instances sparks of the divine fire, and are usually written with a finish, an elegance, and an ease that show their authors to have been masters of Hebrew verse.

Foremost among the contemporaries of Luzzatto, and one who caught his spirit most intimately, stands Israel Benjamin Bassani, rabbi of Reggio (1701; Piperno, 1703-Jan. 20, 1790). A son of Isaiah Bassani, the teacher of Moses Hayyim Luzzatto, Israel Benjamin Bassani was thus brought in frequent contact with Luzzatto and consequently imbibed his spirit. Only a few of his poems are included in Piperno's Collection Kol 'Ugab (Leghorn 1846) and some fragments are quoted in Coen's Ruah Hadashah; but these are sufficient to show his power as a stylist, and especially as a lyric poet. His canzona (Kol 'Ugab, No. 3) teems with lyric beauty, and the description of nature to which he devotes several stanzas stamps his lines as poetry of a high order. In another epithalamium (ibid., No. 27) he describes the origin of a spark of electricity (the first mention of the subject in Hebrew poetry), comparing it with the flame of love that produced the affection in the couple in whose honor the poem was composed. Both poems are thoroughly original. The sonnets of his disciple and successor in the rabbinate of Reggio, Isaiah Karmi (ibid., Nos. 25-26), show elegance and finish, as do four of his poems quoted by Coen (Ruah Hadashah, 98-101). To this class belongs the Venetian rabbi Simḥah b. Abraham Calimani (died Aug. 2, 1794), grammarian, linguist, orator, and Talmud-
The author of an allegorical drama, his elegy on Solomon Zalman of Lemberg (Kol 'Ugab, No. 16) shows his great ability in hyperbole but indicates a lack of good taste though the poem reads well and is perfect in rime and rhythm. The sonnet of Samuel b. Moses Cohen, rabbi of Leghorn (ibid., No. 20), shows facility of expression but little ability; while the lines of Malachi Cohen, rabbi of Leghorn (died before 1790), talmudic methodologist, written in honor of the dedication of the synagogue in 1742 (ibid., 21), are not above mediocrity. The same may also be said of his poems contained in the Ḥayyim Frossolone (Leghorn 1746), an order of service adopted by the community of Leghorn to be recited on the 22nd of Shebat of each year in commemoration of the earthquake of 1742. On the other hand, Isaac Hayyim Frossolone (born at Sienna; died Leghorn 1794)” is a master of versification. His epithalamium in eight octaves (Kol 'Ugab, No. 35), really a song of praise of the Talmud (written about 1786), is a finished production, while his other epithalamium (ibid., No. 13) is a fine example of blank verse. Containing fine lines of nature description, it is suggestive of the best passages of Luzzatto, but gives suspicion of being an imitation of Israel Benjamin Bassani (cf. ibid., No. 3), though written with more freedom and grace. Jacob Saraval, rabbi of Venice, later of Mantua (about 1707-April, 1782), is the author of a poem (ibid., No. 23) commemorating the catastrophe which befell the

---

50 I have not seen this drama. Neppi (345-6) states that he had published many other poems. See Steinschneider, C.B., 2595; Mortara, Indice, 9; de Rossi and Fürst, s. v.

51 Landshut, Ammude ha-'Abodah, 173-177: Fürst, Bibl. Jud., I, 320; Mortara, Indice, p. 15.

52 Piperno, in Kol 'Ugab, 80b; Mortara, p. 26.
Jewish community of Mantua in June 1781 when the building collapsed in which numerous guests were assembled at a Jewish wedding, and sixty-five persons were killed, among them the poet's oldest daughter. The poem in 26 sestets gives a vivid and a realistic description of the catastrophe and is naturally full of feeling.

Of greater interest is Abraham Isaac Castello, a type of the self-made man (1726—Aug. 1, 1789). Born at Ancona of poor parents, his father sent him at the age of thirteen to Leghorn where he was at first apprenticed to a tradesman. As it was the boy's habit to sing Spanish and Italian songs while working, his master's attention was attracted to his rich and melodious voice, and recommended him to the authorities of the Jewish community who were then without a cantor, the former cantor having just died. Castello was given the office, and married the former cantor's eldest daughter. Not content, however, with being merely a cantor, he devoted himself assiduously to the study of rabbinic literature and philosophy, developed remarkable powers as a preacher, and was held in high esteem both by Jews and non-Jews who disputed with him on religious and philosophic subjects. He preached usually in Spanish. While his life was a very happy and successful one, his latter days were rendered sad by the untimely death of his eldest son Joseph who died after an illustrious career at the University of Pisa where he took degrees in philosophy and medicine. As a poet, Castello is very happy, though not very deep. His lines are graceful and elegant, his versification masterly, and beautiful lyric stanzas are frequent. Like those of his contemporaries, his verses were occasional, epithalamia and elegies. That he had some difficulty in gaining
recognition as a poet is shown by the following anecdote of his relation to the poet Colbo. Emanuel Colbo, an older contemporary of Castello's, born at Salonica, whence he and his father migrated to Leghorn, and settled there as rabbis, the son also as a physician, had achieved fame as a poet, and his reputation stood in the way of the younger aspirant to poetic honors. The work of the former was praised at the expense of the latter. That the older poet did appreciate the talent of the younger, and was honest enough to admit the latter his equal is shown by the conspiracy they formed to render the senseless critics ridiculous. Upon a certain occasion when both poets were asked to write an epithalamium as was the custom in those days, the two men agreed to exchange poems, so that Colbo's work went by the name of Castello's and vice versa. The critics at once began to extoll the poem attributed to Colbo, and to underrate that of Castello. Thereupon Castello showed the letter of Colbo in which the permission to exchange names was given, and the critics were hushed once for all. As a matter of fact, the quality of the work of the two men is equal. Colbo's stanzas are more artistic (he uses the seven-line stanza (canzonettc) by preference), Castello's are more varied. While Colbo is always serious, Castello is also a satirist at times. Thus in a sonnet he satirizes the fool who

**M. H. Luzzatto wrote a poem in honor of his graduation as a physician from the University of Padua. Colbo who already in 1730 had been living in Leghorn was appealed to by Luzzatto to intercede with the Leghorn rabbis in his behalf. Leghorn was a stronghold of the Kabbalah while Venice was opposed to it since the days of Leon Modena. Kahana, "Life of Luzzatto," 33, 37.**

**Piperno, Kol 'Ugab, Notes 4 and 11. Castello's poems are Nos. 10, 17, 22, 41-44, 53-63, 65; Colbo's Nos. 19, 34.**
dresses in the latest fashion but betrays his foolishness the moment he opens his mouth, and ends with this gibe:

Why royal garments with a boorish voice?
Or change thy voice to suit thy dress,
Or change thy dress to suit thy voice.

(Kol 'Ugab, No. 43). In another sonnet (No. 54) he satirizes the miscarriage of justice. A fly falling in a spider's web is lost; a bird will brush it away with its wing and destroy it. A poor man falling into the meshes of the law is lost; a rich man tears the garment of justice asunder. An epithalamium (Kol 'Ugab, No. 18) written by his son, the brilliant young physician Joseph Castello who died so prematurely, (in a sonnet form with a double sestet), shows that he inherited his father's gift of song.

While all these minor poets, with more or less talent and inspiration sing only on special occasions, sing, as it were, to order, though their poems bear the stamp of modernity and they enlarged the scope of Hebrew poetry, the first truly modern lyric poet is Ephraim Luzzatto. Born at San Danieli, Friuli, in 1729, studying medicine at the University of Padua where he took his degree in 1751, he settled in London in 1763 to practise his profession in the hospital of the Portuguese Congregation. In 1792, on his way to Italy, he died in Lausanne, Switzerland. His poems, under the title of ELLEH BENE HA-NE'URIM (These are the Offspring of Youth, first edition, London 1766; second edition, Vienna 1839), were all written in Italy, the closing poem in Padua. A highly gifted youth, possessed of a sensitive nature, and endowed with the power of imagination and of delicate, artistic expression, Ephraim Luzzatto lent a new note to the severe and
strictly moralizing and didactic Hebrew muse by introducing the romantic lyric into Italian Hebrew poetry. As a Jewish poet he does not, indeed, neglect to sing of themes sacred to the Jewish heart. Thus, in 'Al Har Zion She-Shamem (Mount Zion, Ruined) he bewails in lines stately, dignified, yet soft and tender, the ruins of the Holy City. He addresses himself to all nature, to the stars in their courses, to the sun, the moon, the earth, the sea, the mountains, to arrest their natural functions, and intercede with God in behalf of Zion; when a terrific storm breaks out, and above the din and confusion an angel admonishes him that the cause of Zion's ruin is to be sought in Jewish sinfulness. Equally beautiful are his sonnets (35, 36) on the same subject. His didactic sonnets, teeming with lofty moral and ethical thoughts, are couched in such graceful diction that the severity of their tone is softened by the beauty of the expression. His elegies are free from the extravagances of fancy and the exaggeration of praise so characteristic of most of his contemporaries. He is the first to introduce Metastasio to Hebrew readers, and his translation of La Primavera, following the rime and meter of the canzonette, is a work of art in itself. But it is in his romantic sonnets that he is at his best. Here he gives his poetic fancy free scope. For the first time Cupid and his arrows are introduced to the Jewish reading public in Hebrew (Sonnet 3, p. 9, Letteris' edition); and he treats the subject with the levity, though not with the license so characteristic of Italian poets. Love with him, is not the sacred, divine spark it is with his kinsman Moses Hayyim Luzzatto. With Ephraim Luzzatto it is rather human, all too human. In sentiment his exquisite love sonnets remind one of Petrarch and of the best in Italian literature, and in the delicacy
of diction, beauty of style, and perfection of rime and meter of the best in Hebrew literature. The Orient and the Occident thus meet in the friendliest fashion in this child of sunny Italy. It is to be regretted that his poetic work ceased upon his leaving his native soil. His prosaic duties at the London hospital proved fatal to his poetic inspiration.

Great as was the influence of the spirit of the classic literature upon Ephraim Luzzatto, it is slight compared with the paramount influence of classicism on his younger contemporary, the dramatist Samuel Aaron Romanelli (Sept. 19, 1757—Oct. 17, 1814). A man of unsteady habits, of a restless, roving nature, he left his native city Mantua at an early age, and gave himself up to his Wanderlust. He spent four years in Morocco; returning to Europe, he lived for a time in Berlin (1791), Vienna (1793), London (1799), Lille in France, and returned to Italy about 1800. In the course of his wandering he mastered several foreign languages, and wrote Hebrew and Italian with equal facility. Erratic in his temperament, tactless, and free and outspoken in his religious opinions which were not always orthodox, he made many enemies and but few friends. He eked out a scanty livelihood by teaching, and by writing poems in Hebrew and Italian for special occasions such as weddings, patriotic feasts, and the like. Owing to his roaming propensities and to his inability to make or to hold friends, so that his patrons soon tired of him, his existence was a rather precarious one. He was, perhaps, the first modern Jewish man of

On Romanelli see della Torre in Ben Chananiah, V (1862), p. 27 ff.; Moise Soave in Vessillo Israelitico, 1878, pp. 151-2, and note 2, p. 152; and Dr. Weikert, Preface to Romanelli's translation of Maffei's "La Merope" (Rome, 1904).
letters to live by his pen, if one may call his scant earnings a living. He reminds one strongly of that erratic genius of our day, Naphtali Herz Imber, and of the unhappy career of that other unfortunate master, Solomon Maimon.

This literary Ishmael, however, was a darling child of the muses; and, with the two Luzzatto’s, makes eighteenth century Hebrew poetry memorable. While he has not the softness, the tenderness, the delicacy and the naïveté which makes the older Luzzatto’s dramas so conspicuous, he possesses a more vigorous, more incisive style; and what he lacks in sweetness he makes up in power and strength. Of a similar poetic temperament both, their sources of inspiration vary; Luzzatto is ideal, Jewish, and mystic; Romanelli is Greek and classic; the form is Italian in both. Luzzatto’s symbolisms are ethical and philosophic; Romanelli’s are mythological. Luzzatto’s La-Yesharim Tehillah is, perhaps, the more original of the two, since Luzzatto had to clothe in flesh and blood the abstract virtues, and make them live before his readers; whereas the mythological characters Romanelli employs were ready made for him in classic literature. Still, Romanelli’s interpretation of the Olympian deities are original, and there is no conflict in this meeting of Jew and Greek.

Romanelli’s great melodramatic allegory under the name of Ha-Kolot Yehdalun (Let the Strife Cease), was written as an epithalamium (Berlin, 1791). Two forces are arrayed against each other in apparently deadly conflict; Venus (Nogah), Cupid (Heshek), and Fortune (Osher) on the one hand are arrayed against Jupiter (Zedek), Constance (Hosen), and Glory (Tiferet)
SECULAR HEBREW POETRY OF ITALY—RHINE

Venus, and Jupiter as Justice, are the heroine and hero respectively of this allegory. Venus complains that the intelligent, the followers of Justice, are treating her with contempt because they maintain that Beauty is only a snare to capture the weak-minded. She rebels at the fact that her following has been reduced to the licentious, the foolish, and the fops. Where is the satisfaction in being worshipped by such a class? Jupiter, as the god of Justice, on the other hand, blames Venus for enticing every one away from him, so that people seek only pleasure and not justice and righteousness. Venus, in her contention, is ardently supported by Cupid and Fortune, while the cause of Justice is as ardently embraced by Constance and Glory. The two forces are about to engage in internecine conflict, both supported by Hope, when Peace (Shalom) descends from the heavens to settle the controversy. She declares that Justice and Venus are not incompatible. Both are indispensable for the happiness of mankind, and proves the possibility of their union by pointing to the union of the couple in whose honor the drama was written, as models respectively of wisdom and beauty united. Thereupon the clash of battle ceases (Ha-Kolot Yeḥdalun) and peace reigns supreme.

Such is the theme of this strange drama. The battle is really a battle of words, but in what lofty strain, and in what magnificent diction this conflict of the gods is waged! It is, indeed, a battle worthy of the Olympians. The monologues are stately, dignified, eloquent, and poetic. The arias accompanying the monologues, intended for singing, add a lyric charm to the epic beauty of the drama itself, and serve as a summary of the thought of the preceding
speech. Thus after a lengthy monologue, Cupid sums up his power:

The rustle of each falling leaf,
The cooing of the gentle dove,
The roaring of the angry sea,
They, each and all betoken—love.

(Act I, Scene 7). The monologue of Hope (Act III, Scene 1) and of Peace (ibid.), are particularly striking and forcible. Romanelli, in this poem, shows himself master of style and diction, and the inspiration is sustained from beginning to end."

Romanelli also wrote a number of other poems of which, however, I have not been able to obtain a copy. As a translator he showed great skill in rendering into Hebrew Maffei's tragedy (*La Merope*) (published by Dr. Weikert, Rome 1904)—a translation which retains all the grace and vigor of the original.

Of Romanelli's contemporaries, Elijah Levi and Mattathias Levi son of Moses Zacuto Levi, chief rabbi of Monferrato (died 1833), both of Alessandria, are mediocre. The former is the author of an epithalamium ברכה חיות in 31 stanzas which is rather crude and uncouth in thought, while the epithalamium of the latter ברכה חיות though not quite so crude is an imitation of the work of his older kinsman. The two poems were published together in Leghorn in 1803. Ḥananiah Elḥanan Vita Coen (died 29th of March, 1834), a teacher at Reggio, and later rabbi of Florence, while not a great poet is a master of

**Romanelli also wrote [Lev ha-Ḥamutah](Berlin 1792); [Roh Ḥaynu](Vienna 1793); [Ẓohar ha-Ḥaynu](1793), Letteris in *Bikkurim*, II; Zeitlin, *Bibl. Heb. post-Mend.* I have not been able to obtain a copy of any of these.
versification. As the author of Zemirot Israel and Ruah Hadashah, two works on prosody, he contributed not a little towards the modernization of Hebrew poetry in Italy. In his Ruah Hadashah especially he advocates the abolition of the mediæval meter in which the Yated plays such a prominent part and speaks boldly in behalf of the adoption of a thoroughly modern Italian meter based on the number of vowels in each line without regard to the Shewa. The specimens of his poems with which he illustrates the varieties of the stanza show his thorough mastery of Hebrew verse and a fine sense of poetic appreciation; while his elegy (Kol 'Ugab, No. 24), though somewhat exaggerated, shows him capable of deep feeling.

"See Ruah Hadashah, Reggio 1822."
THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE SYRO-ROMAN CODE

BY V. APTOWITZER,

Israelitisch-theologische Lehranstalt, Vienna

The singular code of laws dating from the fifth century of the Christian era, which was edited and translated by Eduard Sachau and interpreted from the point of view of comparative and historical jurisprudence by K. G. Bruns thirty years ago, has Roman law as its basis, but contains besides a number of legal decisions which are either not to be found in Roman law or which directly contradict it.

Whence come then the non-Roman elements of this code? The answer to this query called forth a controversy which later spread into the neighboring domain of Armenian law and which after a short truce has now commenced anew. It is this circumstance which induces me to set forth the past history of this controversy. For the controversy now beginning, although it will be decisive for the Syro-Roman Code, must nevertheless be fought out on different ground. Thus my review will serve at the same time as an introduction to the new phase of the controversy.

The chief participants in this literary wrangle about the Syro-Roman Code are the Romanist L. Mitteis of

Leipzig and the Orientalist D. H. Müller of Vienna. The former explains the non-Roman elements of the Code from Greek law, while the latter makes them subject to Oriental influence. Yet this is not a conflict between Romanism and Orientalism, since famous students of Roman law also have declared themselves with more or less decisiveness in favor of Oriental influence. Indeed it was a student of Roman law who first traced the influence of Oriental law in the Syro-Roman Code: K. G. Bruns, the commentator of the Code.

Bruns states: "The code as a whole contains only Roman law. The few deviations from known maxims, which are found therein, are mostly based either on sources unknown to us or on misunderstandings or on a different conception of the known legal maxims, but only a few embody independent legal statutes as they were developed in provinces. The only portion of the system which evinces a thorough diversity of basic principles as contrasted with the Roman law is the law of intestate inheritance." This system of inheritance which must have been derived "from a source quite foreign to the Roman" he attempted to compare with the Jewish law of inheritance, but without satisfactory result. He assumed therefore that the whole particularism of this law of inheritance rests on old Syrian common-law.

About ten years later Mitteis, in his "Reichsrecht," attacked the problem of the Syro-Roman Code and formulated the thesis that a great many of its legal notions are derivable from ancient Greek law "and that in its non-

---

* Syr.-röm. RB., p. 302.
* L. c., p. 316.
* Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreiches, Leipzig 1891.
Roman elements which are far more numerous and important than was assumed by Bruns it is preeminently of Greek origin."

In opposition to this thesis, K. Voigt declared himself in 1893 in favor of the Mesopotamian origin of the Syrian particularism, but without going deeper into the question.

Thus the arguments were exceedingly disparate. On the one hand a systematic demonstration, on the other mere assumptions and opinions. It looked therefore as though the hypothesis of Mitteis had won the victory. Indeed it remained unattacked for a full decade, until 1903, when it began to totter rapidly through an energetic advance from the Orientalist line.

In that year D. H. Müller published his book on the Laws of Hammurabi, in an appendix to which he established a series of relations between the Syro-Roman Code and the Code of Hammurabi, invalidating to a large extent the arguments of Mitteis in favor of a Greek origin.

With this the real fight began: evidence was produced against evidence with vivacity and promptness, attack followed upon attack; both combatants received also more or less effective succor. Thus soon after the appearance of Müller's book on Hammurabi, K. Wessely, who stands preeminent in his knowledge of the Greek papyri, declared: "The internal evidence certainly speaks in favor of Müller's demonstration on p. 275 ff. that those passages of the Syro-Roman Code which find no adequate explana-

---

* Reichsrecht, p. 30.
* Die Gesetze Hammurabis und ihr Verhältnis zur mosaischen Gesetzesgebung sowie zu den XII Tafeln, Wien 1903.
* P. 275-285.
tion in Roman law evince traces of influence of the old Semitic laws, by no means traces of Greek law in its process of development."\(^9\)

Against Müller's attacks Mitteis defended his hypothesis in an article in the *Savigny Zeitschrift*,\(^9\) to which Müller answered in a larger treatise printed in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*.\(^9\)

In these two articles the chief battle was fought, although the war did not come to a final conclusion, and even subsequently skirmishes took place along the lines of pursuit and retreat.

In his book on Hammurabi, Müller took cognizance only of the influence of the Code of Hammurabi on the Syro-Roman Code, and hence he omitted any discussion of the system of intestate succession in the latter code, waiting for a more thorough investigation of the cuneiform documents, since the Code of Hammurabi itself contains no ordinances concerning a graded order of heirs. The precariousness of this situation could naturally not escape such a skilful strategist as Mitteis. He shifted therefore the point of gravity of the controversy straightway to the inheritance system and called on Müller to attack this point: "This point must be attacked by anyone who places the Oriental influence in the foreground; and it is just this point, which alone is decisive, that Müller has ignored."\(^12\)

\(^9\) *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, 1904, p. 143.
\(^12\) *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung*, XXV, p. 293.
Müller accepted the challenge and undertook this attack, destroying point after point the proofs of Mitteis in favor of the Greek origin of the Syrian inheritance system. To characterize the arguments and demonstrations on both sides only the weightiest points may be here briefly summarized:

1. As first and most important agreement Mitteis points out the connection between agnatic and cognatic succession, which is found in both the Attic and the Syrian legal systems, but in no other contemporary system of laws, the Jewish law in particular disclaiming it in no dubious terms.

Against this claim Müller points out that the connection between the two inheritance systems did exist originally in Jewish law, and was only subsequently removed from legal practice on account of political and religious motives; that cognatic succession was still demanded by some older Talmudic authorities and formed the prevailing legal practice among the Karaites, whose traditions coincide in many ways with those of the Sadducees.

2. The second demonstration concerns the order of kinship. Here Mitteis, to establish agreement with the Attic order of succession, had to submit the Syrian inheritance law to considerable manipulation; for the latter differs substantially from the Attic system:

a. "According to the Syrian law, daughters and sisters inherit together with sons and brothers; according to the Attic law, the former inherit after the latter.

b. According to the Syrian law, the mother inherits side by side with the sons and daughters; in
c. The Syrian law excludes the descendants of the daughters and sisters from the agnatic lines and relegates them behind these, where they form two independent classes with the right of precedence over the aunts and the whole of the remaining cognation; while the Attic law allows the descendants of previously deceased daughters and sisters to inherit, by virtue of representative action, before the lateral male heirs of a more distant grade—brothers or uncles.”

These deviations Mitteis endeavors, by means of an ingenious but exceedingly artificial demonstration, to trace back to the influence of Roman law, concluding thus: If we accept here the influence of the Roman law as reasonably certain, “then we need only do away with this correction in the Syrian law of inheritance to obtain at once a system which agrees with the Attic law of inheritance in its minutest details.”

To which Müller retorts: Since the Attic succession, as Mitteis himself admits, is identical with that of the Bible and Talmud, then the original Syrian inheritance system, constructed by Mitteis, can after all be derived as well from the Jewish as from the Greek law of inheritance. And is not the Syrian inheritance system with the right of inheritance of the father more akin to the Jewish than the Greek law, which ignores the father’s right of inheritance?

However, as to the deviation of the Syrian from the Attic-Jewish system, it is clearly impossible to consider the right of inheritance of the daughters as an innovation of Constantine in the fourth Christian century, as Mitteis
believes, since the putting of the daughters on an equal footing with the sons, as in the Laws of Hammurabi, was indigenous to Syria long before Constantine, among the Sadducees, in Philo, and much later among the Karaites. Also the right of inheritance of the mother side by side with the sons and daughters can be demonstrated from the Code of Hammurabi, and is still extant among the Karaites.

3. Another demonstration of Mitteis is the so-called "theory of the pure seed." In paragraph one of the London MS. of the Code the following statement is to be found: "For the laws aim to get at the pure seed, and whosoever is the nearest of kin, they allot the heritage to him; in Roman law the term is agnatus, i.e. the near sex. When the near sex is extinct, the female sex, on a par with the soil, takes its place in Roman law known as cognatus, i.e. the sex posterior to the near sex." This reason for the preference of males is derived, according to Mitteis, "from a favorite sentence of Greek natural philosophy," for which he cites some examples.

In rebuttal, Müller maintained that the idea per se is quite evident, nor is it necessary to search for special sources to support it, for also in the Talmud, as he pointed out, the woman is designated as "natural soil." But since Mitteis' hypothesis was defended by his adherents even afterwards on the basis of the "theory of pure seed," Müller with greater force proceeded to hammer away at this theory and to demolish it completely." To start with,

---

15 Semitica, sprach-und rechtsvergleichende Studien, I (1906), p. 30-34.
the expression "pure seed" is doubtful, for in the Syrian text רבי, meaning "pure," can easily be a miswriting from דכרא, meaning "male"—a supposition which is made probable by the contrast: the female sex. However, the Greek passages cited by Mitteis show no traces of "pure seed," and in only one instance, already quoted by Bruns and derived from Aeschylus, is there a bare inkling of the comparison of woman to the soil. Against this we have the testimony of the Amarna letters which prove that as far back as 1500 B. C. this comparison had become proverbial in Syria. In these letters, Abd-Ashirta, a Syrian chieftain, writes twice to the King of Egypt: "My field is like a woman that has no husband, for it has not been cultivated."

This retort was effective. One of the earlier followers of Mitteis' theory broke away from it almost expressly, and even in the newest attempt by the school of Mitteis to save the master's hypothesis concerning the Syro-Roman Code—about which I shall speak later—the theory of "pure seed" is absolutely ignored.

The system of intestate inheritance in the code, which was designated by Mitteis himself as the "only decisive point," gave way to the attack of Müller, and so the question was decided in favor of Oriental influence. Now that the decisive battle was over, Müller could in all tranquility of mind proceed to defend his previous assertions concerning the other non-Roman ingredients of the Syro-Roman Code, being able to strengthen his position through


arguments from manuscripts of the Code, which had been discovered in the mean time.

His last attack on Mitteis' hypothesis Müller accomplished by proving that even if the Code is based on a Greek archetype, nothing is gained for the Hellenistic origin of its non-Roman elements. The proof is convincing. The striking expressions and turns of speech, which should be Greek, are partly also Semitic, thus proving nothing; partly only Semitic and decidedly foreign to the Greek, thus proving the Semitic influence.18

To be sure, Müller's thesis still called forth a few attacks here and there,19 but these attacks were made with inefficient weapons, since the assailants marshaled not their independent arguments, but chiefly relied upon such as had been expressed in the article of Mitteis, without taking into consideration Müller's poignant criticism and counterproofs. Nothing essentially new could be brought forth against Müller's thesis. The most potent objection to it is the improbability of the argumentation from the practice of the Karaites, who did not come into existence before the eighth century. But this objection has no value whatsoever. In the first place, the argumentation from the practice of the Karaites in Müller's demonstration, although engaging a large space, is after all not of such weightiness that with it the real proof stands and falls. It only serves the purpose of a useful luxury. In the second place, the Karaitic traditions actually go back to the Sadducees—a circumstance which Müller himself did

18 Comp. Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1906, column 697, and WZKM., XX, p. 129.
not urge resolutely, but which indeed was established long ago.*

Müller's thesis and its proofs were accepted by Joseph Kohler wholly and without reserve. In his essay published after Müller’s articles he agrees point after point with Müller's deductions, and also adds the evidence of one more coincidence in the Syrian Code and that of Hammurabi. Such additional attestations from Semitic law were produced afterwards also by other men, so that Müller's thesis gathered strength from day to day.

It is extremely characteristic of the convincing power of Müller’s argumentation, that even such an ardent and convinced adherent of Mitteis' hypothesis as Joseph Karst, who thinks that Mitteis has "defended splendidly the Greek legal character" of the Syrian Code and that his theory "as a whole and in its chief features could not be refuted peremptorily"—that even he admits the following:

"Müller’s ingenious inductions have shed light on this domain, marking an advance in so far as they oppose to the rugged Hellenistic theory the irrefutable fact* of the existence of a national Syro-Semitic element in the laws of the Syrian Code. It is the lasting merit of Müller's investigations into the Syrian Code to have recognized and

---

* See Harkavy in the Hebr. translation of Graetz’s Hist. of the Jews, III, p. 495-469, 511; comp. also ibid., p. 501-503.

* Zeitschr. für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, XIX, p. 103 ff.


* Italicized by me.
elucidated the connection and primitive relation existing between the non-Greek ingredients of the Code and the Laws of Hammurabi."

Now it is striking that Robert v. Mayr, in a review of our question in his inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Prague, fails to mention the fact that Kohler, otherwise Müller's opponent, has in this controversy accepted completely the point of view of Müller, and that Karst, a convinced representative of Mitteis' theory, has yielded in so many points to its opponent. Nor does it correspond to facts when v. Mayr thinks, that the point of view of Mitteis "does not seem shaken by the results of the newest investigation." This assertion indeed seems to be in contradiction with his previous remarks in the *Wiener Abendpost*, 1904, p. 349."

Incomparably more important and significant than the direct confirmation through new proofs in detail, is the indirect verification which Müller's theory received through a circumstance which became known later, that the development of law in the Christian Orient was influenced by Jewish law in a powerful manner unparalleled in the history of jurisprudence. This fact could be ascertained after a study of the Armenian law and the codes of three Syrian patriarchs.

That the Mosaic law was incorporated in the Armenian law was known long ago. Already F. Bishoff called attention to this fact in 1862 in his work on the Armenian law." That also traces of Talmudic influence are to be

---

24 Comp. Aptowitzer in *WZKm.*, 1909, p. 392, n. 2.
found in the Armenian Code was made evident afterwards by Joseph Kohler and Joseph Karst, the editor of the Armenian Code. However, it was D. H. Müller who recognized and established beyond any shade of doubt the real magnitude and potency of the Mosaic-Talmudic influence on the old Armenian Code, and also the great weight and full significance that such an influence carries with it. Müller gathered and arranged the citations from the old Armenian Code of Mechitar Gosch, the Armenian bishop of the twelfth century, found scattered in Karst's commentary on the Middle Armenian Code, and after a thorough investigation established the following:

The redactor of the code "excerpted with great skill, the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, and up to a certain point retained the order of the Pentateuch." These excerpts were not made by Gosch himself; he found well-arranged Pentateuchal excerpts already in existence. "The glosses, likewise, accompanying the Bible-texts, presuppose a deep and penetrating knowledge of the Talmudic-Rabbinic exegesis and jurisprudence, which knowledge must already have been deep-rooted and far-reaching. The Talmudic-Rabbinic currents which make themselves evident through the whole work, as far as the adopted Mosaic law is involved, point not alone to a thorough knowledge of the Talmudic-

---

29 My exception to this assertion, in JQR., 1907, p. 613, I have abandoned, proofs having accumulated since to establish the truth of the assumption; comp. HZKM., XXI, p. 257, n. 3.
Rabbinic literature, but also to their early transplantation on Armenian soil. The authoritative recognition of the Code can only be explained when we assume that the elements used by Gosch were already at a much earlier date not only taught in the ecclesiastical schools, but deep-rooted in the public consciousness of law and order.

As to the time and cause of the adoption of the Mosaic-Talmudic law in Armenia, no positive facts were available to Müller, and he could only advance a well-founded hypothesis, which in its main lines was sufficient to explain the singular phenomenon. He starts out with the following fact:

At the fifth synod of Duin in the year 645 the priesthood and the benefices were declared to be hereditary. Then we read at the conclusion of the respective canon: "The foregoing statute from the times of the Roman king Heraclius (610) and the Persian king Chosrow (c. 590) shall have force also here. But as to the practice before their times, it shall not be touched here, for we know nothing definite about it."

Now two circumstances are very striking: (1) the decree that this canon shall have retroactive force; (2) the ignorance of the usage in force before the times of the above-named rulers. The latter is particularly strange since in this synod there must have been assembled bishops of the age of sixty and seventy, who as contemporaries must have had a knowledge of such practice. To which Müller says:

"From this mysterious conduct on the one hand, as from the illegal decree about the retroactive force of the canon on the other, it is to be seen that a bold stroke had been perpetrated here, an arbitrary act which they
wished to carry through, but which they endeavored to conceal as much as possible... At this synod the conflicting interests may have clashed together: the interests of the Church, which sought to free herself from any considerations of clan and family, and the interests of the old priestly families, who in the days of paganism had sought refuge in the fold of the priesthood. The power of the old priestly families was stronger than that of the Church representatives, and consequently the former remained victorious. In this encounter the pagan priestly families found allies among the Jews, who effected a compromise between the Church and the old families on the basis of the Mosaic institution of the Levitical order. Through this alliance it became possible for the Armenian Church to adopt the Mosaic law, her clergy having also a strong personal interest in this adoption. Thus alongside with the hereditary succession of the priesthood and the benefices animal sacrifice also was retained or adopted, manifesting herein the same combination of pagan customs and Mosaic institutions—and here too the “doctores Judaei” are expressly mentioned as those who exerted an influence on the regulation of the sacrificial cult. The priests gained considerably from this last adoption, for they received the same offerings which were prescribed in the Pentateuch as belonging to the priests. Also in other respects they knew how to claim for themselves all the prescriptions in the Mosaic law which aimed to preserve and defend the honor of the priesthood, and to acquire a position for the patriarch which could contend with that of the king. To establish these rites on a firm basis, the “doctores Judaei” were necessary, and these, to
be sure, were consulted, and thus the Mosaic jurisprudence was studied, drawn upon, and interpreted."

Müller's investigations were then continued and perfected by the present writer."

With regard to the history of the adoption I was able to supplement and to strengthen Müller's hypothesis through the additional evidence, that Armenia, which in the days of yore had no distinct and well-marked national laws and hence was fit to become a receptive soil for foreign codes, was exposed centuries long to the influence of the Mosaic and Mosaic-Talmudic law, and that there existed close relations between Armenia on the one hand and the Jewish population of Armenia and of adjacent Babylonia on the other, by which it becomes clear that—as I have established—even a long time before the official adoption at the synod of Duin, alluded to by Müller, in the fourth century already, Mosaic-Talmudic law was very influential in Armenia. I was also able to point out that the Pentateuchal excerpts, presupposed by Müller merely on logical grounds, actually existed in the days of Mechitar Gosch and are still in existence.

As to the adoption itself, I have proved the existence in the Code of Mechitar of a number of agreements with, and borrowings from, the Talmudic law, which Müller had not recognized, and I have established that even in the Middle Armenian Code and in the more recent versions of the old Armenian Code many Talmudic elements are found."
It must be admitted that the Old Armenian Code of Mechitar Gosch contains also Roman-Hellenistic law, but not in the measure which Mitteis and Karst have assumed. For many of their derivations from Greek law have proved to be unjustified and untenable. But even Karst, who is inclined to exaggerate the Roman-Greek influence, admits that the influence of the Mosaic law was much more powerful and much more significant than the Roman-Hellenistic, that in the Code of Mechitar Mosaic law exerts itself with an enduring vigor and with "an import unique in the history of jurisprudence."  

As to the place of currency of the old Armenian Code, it is known that up to within a recent time it was in uninterrupted legal force in Armenia itself, forming a guide for the episcopal courts, that it also underwent different redactions and spread beyond the confines of the country, finding entrance in the colonies, Poland, and the Crimea, as well as among the adjacent Caucasian tribes. "The Code," remarks Kohler, "has a very significant history. It followed the Armenians on their military expeditions—it followed the Armenians far away, wherever their commercial spirit carried them; it paved its way to neighboring peoples."

As in Armenia and in the Caucasus, Jewish law was of potent influence and of quite an eminent import also for the legal systems of the Persian, Babylonian, and Syrian Christians, i.e. for the Nestorian Church. This is shown particularly in the codes of the Nestorian patriarchs Henanisho, Timothy, and Jesubarnun of the seventh,
eighth, and ninth century, published by Ed. Sachau, as I have established conclusively through my examination of those codes.

These codes have already been treated by me in this Review. I only wish to emphasize here that my examination was induced by D. H. Müller, who through a mere cursory glance and hasty perusal of the codes had already recognized that there must be points of contact between them and the Jewish law.

Contemporary with my investigation, J. Partsch instituted an enquiry into the nature of the codes of the Nestorian patriarchs in volume XXX of the Savigny Zeitschrift, and reached a conclusion directly contradictory to mine. According to Partsch, the codes as a whole contained Roman-Greek law; in addition there are also specifically ecclesiastical and legal maxims and only a few traces of the old Syrian common-law.

But Partsch also declares the Nestorian Codes to be a direct crucial test for Mitteis' hypothesis concerning the Syro-Roman Code, expressing the assurance that Mitteis' hypothesis has stood this test splendidly:

"Rarely has a new theory in the history of jurisprudence as that of Mitteis on the Hellenistic character of the civil law in the Syrian Code been subjected to a more searching test as to its truth. It is therefore an inward gratification to the writer of these lines to be able to give first utterance to the fact, that Mitteis' doctrine of the influence of Hellenistic law on the Syrian legal system

---

* New Series, I, p. 225 f.
receives ample new corroboration at the hand of these new sources."

Against this I have proved in a long article in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* that Partsch's assertions and deductions from Greek jurisprudence are devoid of truth and untenable throughout, that the remote similarities, inklings, suggestions, and reminiscences, which should prove the Greek invasion, have no value whatsoever against the perfect agreements which are furnished by the Jewish law—a law which centuries throughout and still at the time of our patriarchs was in good practice in Babylonia, the home of the Nestorian Codes, while the Greek-Roman law could have been known there from the literature at the utmost.

The difference between Partsch's demonstration and my own may here be demonstrated by two examples:

1. P., p. 14: "In the law of conjugal property mention is still traceable of the decision of the Justinian Nov. 97 concerning the equality of *dos* and *donatio*, which apparently has long since gone out of practice (Timothy 62)."

That is correct. In the same paragraph, however, Timothy says: "But we have determined, that the δωρεά shall amount to no more than 400 zuz, by which we have in mind rich people."

Now already the fact of determining δωρεά by a fixed sum is known from no other but the Talmudic law; but, more than that, the sum of 400 zuz with its restriction to "rich people" agrees verbatim with the statement of the Babylonian Talmud that the δωρεά—usually 200 zuz—amounted to 400 zuz in the case of wealthy families. In

the first half of the ninth century, hence exactly during the lifetime of Timothy, the δωρεά was generally in use in some regions of Babylonia to the amount of 400 zuz."

2. P., p. 11: "The patriarch (Timothy) here vindicates for the daughter or sister a right of inheritance of one-tenth of the estate, in case she is not provided sufficiently with a dowry or some other endowment from the father's estate. In the same wise shall the wife after the death of her husband, in case she leaves the household, receive, besides her δωρεά and φιλονή, one-tenth the property acquired during the marital state, or else one-tenth of the property left. These decimals are arbitrary inventions of Timothy (§ 58)."

Upon which I have had the following to say:"

With regard to the portion of the daughter, the decisions of the patriarch agree with the decrees of the Talmudic law in an altogether remarkable manner. Also according to the Talmud the daughter receives as dowry a tenth of her father's estate, from the heirs as well as from her father himself. Besides, the heirs are in duty bound to allow the daughter a suitable alimony. And also here the tenth part is not the original and is only provided for the cases where it is unknown how much the father would have given to his daughter.

** My treatise, p. 84.

** Die syr. Rechtsbücher und das mosaisch-talmudische Recht, p. 72 f.
Timothy § 52:

"When his parents have died, his property is divided in equal parts among his brothers, while the sisters get a tenth part of the property in addition to their portion, if their father has not (provided) for them according to his means and neither in life nor in death has bestowed upon them (what is due to them)."

Talmudic law:

"The daughter that is supported by her brothers, gets a tenth part of the estate, but only when the father cannot be estimated (concerning the amount which he would have given to his daughter), but when this amount can be estimated, we are to be guided by this estimate."

The tenth part as the portion of the daughter in the estate of the father is thus no "arbitrary invention" of Timothy, but a direct derivation from the Talmudic law and Jewish usage. That the tenth part for the widow and the divorced wife is only a further development of this usage scarcely needs any mention here.
A TALMUDIC PROBLEM AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

By Henry Malter, Dropsie College

It is perhaps not too hazardous an assertion that in every branch of the world's ancient and mediaeval literature there are some works that stand out as a query awaiting solution. The problem often centers around the identity of the author, the time, the place, the mode, and the purpose of the original composition, or concerns all these points at once. Jewish literature offers more peculiarities than are known in any other field of ancient and mediaeval literature. It is particularly rich in such enigmatic productions, which have vexed the ingenuity of scholars past and present, and have given rise to new cycles of literature. Leaving the Bible with its immense problems aside, we need point only to the works or collections known as Mishnah and Talmud, and some of their immediate adumbrations, the origin and development of which have not yet been fully cleared up, in spite of the assiduous labors of many generations. For nearly a thousand years the authorities have been divided into two camps even on the question whether the Mishnah and the Talmud were transmitted in written form from the very start or were handed down orally during a period of five centuries. Somewhat nearer to our own time we are confronted by that mysterious book called Yeziyah, by Eldad ha-Dani,
the Zohar, and several other works, which have kept and still keep the pens of the best Jewish scholars busy with new solutions for what seems insoluble. None of the anonymous or pseudonymous works in which Jewish literature abounds, offers, however, so many perplexing difficulties to the investigator, as the work known under the name Tosefta, a collection which has given rise to the most contradictory theories and bitter controversies.

The purpose here is not to give a detailed account of these theories. My chief concern is to present to the reader a synopsis of one of the most complicated talmudic problems and to point out the great importance which one of the proposed solutions may have for our conception of the entire post-biblical history of the development of Judaism. I refer to the works and views of Dr. M. S. Zuckermandel. Before entering upon the discussion of his recent work on the subject we may briefly pass in review the main theories advanced and held regarding the Tosefta, during the last fifty years. For those not familiar with the subject a few words descriptive of the Tosefta may not be out of place by way of preliminary.

The Tosefta (properly a plural: Tösefätä), meaning addition or supplement, is a collection of tannaitic teachings and maxims (halakot). In its present form, it may be called a duplicate of the Mishnah. Like the latter it is divided into six orders or sections, subdivided into treatises bearing, with slight variations, the same titles as the corresponding treatises of the Mishnah. The content, too, is practically the same; the main difference between the two is that the Mishnah presents the traditional law in a highly condensed form, whereas the Tosefta gives, aside from new material, the same maxims more elaborately, adding
some elucidating remark or introducing a new aspect under which a certain law is applicable. In its present, or perhaps in an earlier, redaction the Tosefta is referred to already in the Talmud,¹ where its origin, at least in spirit, is attributed to R. Akiba.

Aside from the specific references to the work as a whole, there are very numerous passages, called Baraitot, scattered throughout the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds, which occur either verbally or in a somewhat different form, also in the Tosefta. The question thus arises, whether these sentences are merely citations from the work before us, with only verbal changes or are taken from some earlier collection, now lost. Both assumptions involve serious difficulties, and of the various solutions offered, none settles the matter definitely.

No less puzzling is the question of the authorship of the extant Tosefta. According to tradition the author of the present Tosefta is the Tanna R. Ḥiyya b. Abba, a pupil of R. Judah ha-Nasi, the compiler of the Mishnah. The first author to credit R. Ḥiyya with this work is the Gaon Sherira (tenth century) in his famous chronological treatise (אנתו ושרירה כל ). His view is repeated by Maimonides in the introduction to his Commentary on the Mishnah, and by others after him. Modern critics, however, reject this view as untenable for various reasons, one of which is that Ḥiyya himself and even his disciple, the Amora Rab,² occur in the Tosefta as speakers, a circumstance that points to a final redactor later than Ḥiyya.

¹ Sanh. 86a; Yoma 70a; see, however, Weiss, Dor, Wilna 1904, II, 197, who denies this.
² See Hoffmann, Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, XI, 126.
Modern research into the problem of the Tosefta was inaugurated by the great talmudic critic Zecharias Frankel, whose thorough discussion of the question in his מנהרה (1859), p. 304-8, and משנה ירושלמית (1870), p. 22-27, gave the impetus to new investigations. In Frankel's theory the Tosefta is a combination of two independent Baraita collections, namely one by R. Hiyya and one by his disciple R. Hoshaya, in which the views of the former are dominant. That the numerous Baraitot quoted in the Talmuds as from the Tosefta differ so widely from the corresponding text of the Tosefta itself, he explains as due to the fact that these Baraitot were taken from the independent collections of R. Hiyya and R. Hoshaya before these were blended together by a later redactor into one text. Subsequently additional material, based on the Talmuds, was freely interpolated.

Not satisfied with the results obtained by Frankel, J. H. Dünner advanced a somewhat complicated theory of his own. The Tosefta, he holds, is the work of some compiler who lived after the conclusion of both Talmuds, or about the beginning of the sixth century. This compiler utilized not only the various Baraitot, found in the Talmuds, but also drew upon old authentic material of tannaitic law, which had originally been the source of the Mishnah, and which was lost after the redaction of the Mishnah had been made and remained unknown during the whole period of the Amoraim. This explains, accord-

* In a fragment of a manuscript belonging to Judge Mayer Sulzberger, which was published by Prof. Schechter, Saadyana, p. 141, n. 1, R. Hoshaya is considered the author of the Tosefta (communication of Prof. Alexander Marx).

* Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1870, 298-308, 355-564.
ing to him, the divergences between the Baraitot quoted in the Talmud and their parallels in the Tosefta.

Both Frankel's and Dünner's views were opposed by I. H. Weiss. He assumed that the compiler, a Palestinian by birth, lived in Babylonia during the last generations of the Amoraim (about 450-70 C. E.) and drew his material from different sources, making liberal use also of the discussions in both Talmuds (Dor, II, 193 ff.).

These theories, and especially those of Dünner and Zuckermandel (see below), were opposed by Adolf Schwarz. Going further he criticises the value of any inquiry into time and authorship of the Tosefta as long as the relation of the Tosefta to the Mishnah was not definitely established. On this point Schwarz in his article "Studien über die Tosifat" propounded a new theory holding that the paragraphs of the Tosefta were in a hopeless state of confusion, and had to be completely rearranged in accordance with the paragraphs of the Mishnah. He followed out this plan in his works "Die Tosefta der Ordnung Moed," I-II, Carlsruhe 1879-82, and "Tosifat juxta Mischnarum Ordinum Recomposita et Commentario Instructa," I, Wilna 1890, Frankf. a-M. 1902.

The exact counterpart of the view of Schwarz was adopted by the late Nehemiah Brüll, who on various occasions shows how the original wording and order of the Mishnah can be reconstructed on the basis of the Tosefta. In a separate article discussing the origin and meaning of the Tosefta, Brüll maintains that it is a product of tannaitic

---

* Monatsschrift, 1874, 464 ff.; 1875, 274 ff.
* Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur, V, 145-8; VII, 140-4; Central-Anzeiger, 1891, 70.
times in a somewhat later redaction, and in its present form, it is referred to in the Talmud.¹

A somewhat different view is taken by David Hoffmann. Unlike Frankel, who claims that the Tosefta originated contemporaneously with the Mishnah, he places the Tosefta somewhat later in time and assumes that just as the original Mishnah of the older Tannaim went through several stages and was subsequently embodied in and superseded by the redaction of R. Judah ha-Nasi, so the original Tosefta may have been absorbed in the later redaction of R. Ḥiyya, which constitutes the Tosefta now extant. The Amoraim of both Talmuds have made frequent use not only of our Tosefta but also of other Tosefta collections no longer in existence. Hoffmann further claims that all the quotations in the Talmuds, which are introduced by the phrase "וַיּוֹהַר הָעָל" (וַיּוֹהַר), "it was taught regarding it" (i.e. the Mishnah), have reference either to our Tosefta, where such passages are found sometimes with mere verbal differences, but far more often with differences in substance—, or they refer to the Toseftot now lost.²

The above summary does not exhaust all the theories that have been advanced regarding the Tosefta; the others, covering the problem wholly or in part may, however, be left out of consideration here. The reader who has followed us so far will certainly have a suspicion that a problem which enjoys so many solutions is in all probability not solvable at all. This is, indeed, the prevailing opinion among the present-day talmudists, perhaps even among those who have volunteered solutions. Not so, however, with Dr. Zuckermandel, the author with whose

¹ Zunz Jubelschrift, p. 94, n. 10; comp. above, note 1.
² Magasin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1882, 152-163.
theory the rest of this paper is concerned. Nearly forty years ago he ventured a new solution to the Tosefta problem, which amazed the scholarly world by its boldness and still more by its far-reaching and radical consequences. Ever since he has unflinchingly stood by his theory, defending it against attacks and constantly strengthening it by adding new proof and argument taken from the great arsenal of the Talmud.

In substance the theory of Dr. Zuckermandel is as follows: The Tosefta is the original Palestinian Mishnah, as compiled by R. Judah ha-Nasi. The famous work known to us under the name of Mishnah is not the original work of R. Judah, but the makeshift of the Babylonian Amoraim, who, living outside of Palestine under different conditions and different customs and practices, felt themselves called upon to modify the code of R. Judah, the authoritative law-book of Palestinian Jewry, in order that it might fit Babylonian conditions and become, as in Palestine, the authoritative code of the people. The changes and alterations, which the Babylonian Amoraim took the liberty of making in R. Judah's Mishnah during a period of several centuries, were of such a thoroughgoing nature that the code which they finally produced, namely the work that goes under the name of Mishnah, and is ascribed to R. Judah, was entirely different from its prototype, the original Mishnah of that Palestinian Tanna, which was preserved to us in a mutilated form and under the wrong name of Tosefta. The Babylonian Talmud which was hitherto thought to be based on the genuine Mishnah of R. Judah, is in fact the mutilator of that Mishnah and the maker of a new one, on which it bases itself.
While this destructive work was going on in Babylonia, the Palestinian authorities were guarding *their* authentic code, compiled by the patriarch R. Judah, that is to say the Tosefta in its original form and content upon which they were basing their own discussions and deductions, the Palestinian Talmud. This accounts for the fact that, as the author believes, in the majority of cases, in which Mishnah and Tosefta are in contradiction, the Palestinian Talmud is found on the side of the Tosefta, while the Babylonian Talmud, as may well be expected, agrees with *its* Mishnah. Passages in the Yerushalmi that run contrary to this rule, and seem to agree with the Mishnah as against the Tosefta, the author endeavors, often with success, to prove to be either outright interpolations or modifications of the original wording for the obvious purpose of making the Yerushalmi agree with the Babli.

An ominous objection here presents itself that the Babylonian Mishnah, and not the Tosefta, happens to be prefixed to the Palestinian Talmud. Assuming the author’s view to be correct, we would have here a gross literary fraud adding, as we may say here, insult to injury, and this in a field from which all Israel is supposed to draw its religious inspiration. The author meets the situation by the assertion that originally neither Tosefta nor Mishnah were prefixed to the Palestinian Gemara. Only in later ages, when the main differences between the two Talmuds had been obliterated by the Babylonian harmonizers, was the Babylonian Mishnah innocently added also to the Palestinian Talmud, a view which finds support in the fact that in the oldest known manuscript of a large portion of the

This is disputed, however, by others who admit that the Babli always agrees with the Mishnah, while the Yerushalmi sometimes agrees with the Tosefta but more frequently with the Mishnah.
Yerushalmi, discovered by Schechter in the Genizah and published recently by Prof. Louis Ginzberg, no Mishnah is attached to the talmudic text.

Another and not less serious objection is the fact that most of the paragraphs in the Tosefta unmistakably bear the character of explanatory notes on and additions to the corresponding paragraphs of the Mishnah, thus stamping the whole work as a supplement to the latter (as the name Tosefta, "addition," implies) rather than its original text. Dr. Zuckermandel meets this point by claiming that these supplementary or explanatory remarks in the Tosefta have reference to their respective paragraphs, not as they are in the Mishnah, but as they were originally in the Tosefta itself, the source from which they were taken to serve, in a modified form, as the Mishnic text of the Babylonian Talmud. Subsequently, when the Mishnah, as fixed by the Amoraim, had become the recognized code of the Babylonian Jewry, the parallel passages in the Tosefta were gradually left out and only such parts retained as had not been embodied in the Mishnah. The result of this procedure is that to-day neither Tosefta nor Mishnah can be properly understood, when studied independently. The former suffers, because it had been despoiled of such a considerable part of its contents that the remaining portions, aside from inner textual corruptions, naturally lack all coherence. The Mishnah on the other hand is frequently unintelligible because its sections are only fragments of the body of another comprehensive work, the original Palestinian Mishnah, now called Tosefta, and these were changed and modified at the hands of the Babylonian doctors, in order to lend authority to their divergent individual views.

and decisions. To be sure, the Talmud does interpret the Mishnah, rendering its paragraphs intelligible in its own way, but these interpretations are, in our author's opinion, mere sophistry (pi'lpul) and cannot stand the light of modern objective criticism. They not only do not represent the views of the original Mishnah, but, apart from innumerable and unclassifiable distortions, often teach the very opposite of what was intended by the author. In order to understand Mishnah and Tosefta properly, in other words, in order to get back to the original code of R. Judah the patriarch, it is necessary to study, and to compare closely both works not with the purpose hitherto held in view of rearranging the Tosefta so as to accord with the Mishnah (Schwarz), but rather of reconstructing the Mishnah on the basis of the Tosefta.

It is to this work of reconstruction, or more correctly, to pointing the way for such work, that Dr. Zuckermandel has devoted his entire life. In the effort to recover what he considers the only authentic halakic code, the lost Palestinian Mishnah, the groundwork of the entire Oral Law, he has since 1874 been championing his own cause so to speak, undeterred by want of support and encouragement from any of the scholars in this field.

This lack of appreciation on the part of specialists may seem strange to the reader, considering the greater plausibility of the arguments advanced by the learned author for his solution of the problem as compared with the other proposed solutions. One reason for this apparent indifference lies in the implicitness of the author's doctrine. The reader who is not familiar with the literature of the Talmud may feel inclined to think that Dr. Zuckermandel's theory, too, is but a variant on one or the other of the
doctrines reviewed in the preceding pages, and does not call for particular attention except from a merely academic point of view. It is therefore proper to show briefly the exceptional character of this theory. Its intrinsic divergence from other theories and its implications will explain, if not justify, the attitude taken by other scholars and make the reader realize what is actually at stake and how far-reaching are the consequences of our author's position.

Tradition has it that the oral law is the immediate continuation of the written law (Bible) and only second in importance thereto. Nay, there are numerous utterances in Talmud and Midrashim to the effect that the oral law ranks higher than the written. The greatest men in Israel since Ezra, all divinely inspired, were engaged in working out this remarkable system of Jewish lore, handing it down for centuries from generation to generation by word of mouth up to the beginning of the third century or the end of the tannaitic period. The Mishnah, as compiled by R. Judah ha-Nasi, whether originally committed to writing or arranged only for oral transmission, a much disputed question, is the great depository of the best part of all that divine oral science which bygone ages had accumulated. As the Mishnah is the continuation of the Bible, so is the Talmud, properly the Gemara, both Palestinian and Babylonian, the completion and consummation of the Mishnah. The teachers of the Talmud, the Amoraim, were all men of holiness and saintliness, their teachings were begotten of a superior religious spirit, and their decisions have, therefore, become binding upon all Israel down to the present day. These are,

Comp. Babli Gittin 60b; Yerush, Pea II, 4; Pesikta rabbati, ed. Friedmann, v, and the references given there by the editor.
as commonly known, the tenets of talmudic Judaism, they are the basis of all conservative Jewish theology. Now comes Dr. Zuckermandel and declares that the Mishnah, the only genuine text-book of the oral law, had been lost; that the work existing under that name is a spurious fabrication of self-appointed Babylonian authorities, who in order to manufacture a new code have unscrupulously butchered the old, nay even more, that these Babylonian masters, the teachers of all Israel in the Diaspora, in order to give weight to their views and decisions, went so far as to produce from their own imagination any number of fictitious Baraitot scattered in the Talmud, and to attribute them to Tannaim, who never lived or never taught the opinions ascribed to them—, and all ad majorem Dei gloriam, or as the rabbinic phrase runs כְּבָּרָכֵל חֵרֵת הָלָהוֹר הָרָה "to make the Torah great and glorious!" Dr. Zuckermandel's theory would accordingly seem to demand nothing more and nothing less than a revision of the entire post-talmudic Halakah on the basis of the Tosefta and the genuine parts thereof, which are incorporated in the Babylonian Mishnah. All the codes, from that of Isaac Alfasi down to the Shulhan 'Aruk and its latest developments ought therefore to be revised and re-codified, because their paragraphs rest on misstatements of the fundamental code and fallacious deductions.

Looking at Dr. Zuckermandel's theory from the point of view of the extreme conclusions to which it may be carried we are not surprised that as soon as he had announced his doctrine one of the leading opponents came out with a very sharp rejoinder, accusing the author of having gone far beyond the radicalism of Geiger, of stigmatizing the sages of the Talmud as "an organized band of systematic forgers,"
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Well grounded as these accusations may seem in view of the possible implications of this theory, they are nevertheless decidedly unfair to the author. Dr. Zuckermandel, by the way, a very pious, strictly observant Jew, is far from any radicalism of the Geiger sort and is not inspired by any heretical tendencies. It remains, therefore, to be seen, how such a view is compatible with conservative Judaism from the author’s point of view, and here we may listen to the author’s own reconciliation of the contradictions in his position.

In the first place, Dr. Zuckermandel points out that, whatever we may think about the genesis of that Mishnah, it is a commonly recognized fact that the Babylonian Amoraim have often arbitrarily changed and modified the text of the Mishnah, which they interpret. This had been admitted by medieval authorities like Solomon b. Adret and others, whom certainly nobody will accuse of heretical tendencies. Modern scholars, conservative (Rapaport, Frankel) and radical (Abraham Krochmal, Schorr) have expressed the same view, which can readily be substantiated by any number of talmudic passages. Neither is the contention that various Baraitot in the Talmud are fictitious an invention of our author. As early an authority as the Gaon Hai had declared a certain Baraita spurious. It is true that our author’s theory goes much further; for he

12 Schwarz, Monatsschrift, 1874, 464 ff.
13 See Ḥi Ḥi I, 39 ff., particularly VI, 33-47; comp. also Chwolson, Beiträge zur Entwickelungsgeschichte des Judenthums, Leipzig 1910, p. 61; Weiss, l. c., II, 192, whose view regarding the textual changes made in the Mishnah by some Amoraim, especially Rab, is, in its way, not essentially different from that of Zuckermandel.

14 So also, among others, Zerahiah ha-Lewi (twelfth century), נמי, on Pes., ch. 10; comp. Weiss, l. c., III, 196.
does not stop at questioning the authenticity of single Mishnayot and Baraitot, but considers the whole of the Talmud a systematic deliberate modification and recomposition of a Palestinian law-book which happened to fall into the hands of the talmudic redactors. The underlying principle, the permissibility of applying the methods of modern scientific criticism to the Talmud, is, however, the same as that of the early Gaon. Once this principle is admitted, and the Talmud treated as a literary production of the Babylonian scholars, and, like all literature, viewed and examined with a critical eye, no line can be drawn marking the bounds for our application of the method of literary criticism. Our religion restrains us from any criticism of the Bible, because הרה מ לשמה is one of the main principles of the doctrine of Judaism. No such prohibition exists against criticism of the Talmud. The Bible is the word of God, the Talmud the work of men, no matter how great and glorious.

That on account of their redaction of the Mishnah these men should be considered as forgers and falsifiers, is, in the author's opinion, a preposterous conclusion. First of all we know that the conceptions of literary property were not the same in ancient and mediæval times as they are to-day. Authors would often incorporate into their own works the thought and the language of other authors without any consciousness of wrongdoing. It was even considered a meritorious deed thus to give wider circulation to thoughts and opinions found worthy. Who was originator of an idea, was often a matter of indifference. Writers were, on the other hand, as ready to give as they were to take. An author would ascribe his whole work to some name of prominence in order to insure thereby the accept-
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tance of his ideas (pseudepigraphy). In the case before us not even so much can be charged against the Babylonian Amoraim; they did not appropriate anything to themselves, nor did they ascribe their own works to others. What they did was merely to adapt a given code, which they held in high esteem, to the conditions and requirements of their own country and its inhabitants. The methods they resorted to in elaborating the new code out of the old may not find approval to-day. They added to the words of the Tannaim, omitted therefrom, and above all, even when they retained the text unchanged, often, consciously or unconsciously, interpreted it in a way that contradicts all logic, not to speak of the original intent of the Palestinian

13 To assume that there are spurious Baraitot attributed to Tannaim does not necessarily conflict with this statement. Such Baraitot are to be regarded merely as a form of parlance, a part of their method of interpretation. When an Amora had interpreted or misinterpreted a Mishnah so as to make it express a certain idea, he would often, in corroboration thereof, formulate the thought in the style of a Baraita, giving it either anonymously or in the name of a Tanna, whose teachings, as reported elsewhere, he knew or imagined to be in accord with that of his Baraita. Sometimes such a Baraita was produced by an Amora in an effort to overthrow a given interpretation or decision (see, however, the author's "Die Erfurter Handschrift der Tosefta," p. 76, where he adduces a Baraita, in which the very name of the Tanna— רְנָבָן אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף—is supposed to be manufactured!). Very often the quoted Baraitot are amplifications and modifications of a paragraph in the Tosefta (see RSbM on Baba Batra 93a, bottom, s. v. דַּמוֹנַר; Pes. 8b, bottom— where, by the way, the reading in the corresponding passage in the Tosefta, as given in the common editions and in the Vienna MS., seems to me preferable to that of the Erfurt version, ed. Zuckerman, p. 155, lines 1-2, and agrees fully with Yerushalmi Pes. I, I, end).

A rather remarkable instance illustrating the methods of the Talmudists in the formulation of Baraitot, is the one quoted by J. H. Schorr (י. הום, VII, 48) from Yoma 21b, where a haggadic dictum, which is evidently of Persian origin, is also introduced in the form of a Baraita, beginning with the words רְנָבָן אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף אֶלֶף— It is therefore possible that the Baraita in Sanh. 104a, bottom, which is considered by Bacher, Monatsschrift, 1870, 71, as the source of an Arabic anecdote, is likewise of foreign origin.
Tannaim. But is this forgery? Was it their duty to accept blindly and in its entire literalness a code of laws and practices, which in many instances was incompatible with the conditions prevailing among the people in their own country?

There is no ground for the suspicion that they had intended to displace the Palestinian code and to supplant it by one of their own making. On the contrary it was their boundless veneration for the great Palestinian teachers, the Tannaim, and especially for the "holy" compiler of their sayings, R. Judah ha-Nasi, whom they styled רבי יהודה הנשיא (Shabb. 156a), that inspired them with zeal to make the Palestinian Mishnah authoritative also for Babylonian Jewry. As many of the rules and ordinances of that Mishnah were thought to be impracticable under the new conditions, for which they were not intended, they had to resort either to textual changes and alterations or to such interpretations as would seem to derive their logical or illogical deductions from the authoritative words of the Mishnah. The Palestinian Amoraim, naturally, did not have to cope with such difficulties. Their Talmud, following closely the original text of the Mishnah, is, therefore, free from the subtlety and artificiality which is so prominent a feature in the Babylonian Talmud.

That the Mishnah, in its Babylonian redaction, actually superseded the original version and subsequently became

16 Such methods of interpretation, as the author points out, were in vogue throughout the Middle Ages also in other fields of learning. The Mohammedan, Jewish, and Christian scholastics did the same with the philosophy of Aristotle, interpreting his words to agree with their respective religious views. This comparison, however, is not satisfactory, inasmuch as the works of Aristotle have never been considered by the interpreters as a religious code controlling the daily life of the people, as in the case of the Mishnah.
the only authoritative code of the oral law, is due, not to any efforts in this direction on the part of the Babylonian Rabbis, but to the force of historical and political circumstances. The sufferings and persecutions which the Palestinian Jews had to endure under the rule of the Roman Governors, gradually paralyzed their intellectual activity, and Palestine ceased to be the center of Jewish learning. Babylonia, on the other hand, through its two great academies in Sura and Pumbeditha, became the main seat of learning and education for many centuries. It was through the Babylonian scholars that the Palestinian Mishnah has been preserved to posterity; for the Babylonian Mishnah together with the Tosefta, which has also come to us from Babylonia, represent the sum total of the original halakic code of the Palestinian Tannaim. To conclude, it was later ages who, unaware of the historical facts, mistook the Babylonian recension for the real Mishnah and promulgated it as such. Finding the Palestinian Talmud to be at variance with the Babylonian they tried to obliterate the differences by modifying and interpolating the text of the former, with the result that confusion was worse confounded and the problem of the Tosefta remained unsettled to the present day.

The above is the sum and substance of Dr. Zuckermandel's views on the development of the Halakah in general and of his theory on the Tosefta in particular. The question remains, What, if any, are the practical consequences of his views for the religious life of the Jews in the present? Are we to remake the halakic codes and to revise their decisions so as to bring them in accord with the teachings of the Tosefta? Here again Dr. Zuckermandel remains true to the conservative principles of "historical
Judaism" as laid down by his teacher Zecharias Frankel. For the Reformer, he says, the whole question has no bearing whatever on practical life, inasmuch as he has freed himself entirely from the authority of the Talmud and cares not, whether we decide according to the Yerushalmi or the Babli. For the conservative, too, however, the problem and its solution are only of a scholarly and theoretical interest; in practice we stand where history has placed us. The Babylonian Talmud was the instrument by which Providence chose to make the Jew what he is. It was this Talmud that shaped and moulded the lives and characters of millions of our ancestors throughout the generations past, and it is this Talmud that still actuates us in the present. Whether its methods of interpretation were right or wrong from a critical point of view,—historically it has been the "Fountain of Life" for all Israel. It has preserved Israel's unity, against all schismatic tendencies throughout the entire Diaspora, a unity as needful to-day as ever before. Theoretically, however, we cannot close our eyes to the light and we must accept the results of scientific research, even when they contradict our cherished traditions. The restoration of the original text of the Mishnah and a critical revision of the Halakah on the basis thereof is, therefore, a task worthy of scholarly effort.

We may conclude with a brief characterization of the author's works as far as they are related to the subject under discussion. As stated before, he first advanced his theory in a rather casual remark in an article entitled "Lexikalishes und Archäologisches im Talmud." Shortly thereafter he made it the subject of a special article "Verhältniss der Tosifta(!) zur Mischna und der jerusalem-

*Monatschrift, 1874, 32.*
The criticism which these articles called forth from talmudic scholars, made the author realize that in order to carry conviction it was necessary to prepare and publish first a critical edition of the Tosefta itself. Up to that time the text of this work, printed jointly with the Compendium of Isaac Alfasi, was in a hopeless condition and, from a scientific point of view, entirely useless. He therefore devoted several years to the examination of the two Tosefta MSS. preserved in the libraries of Erfurt and Vienna, both dating from the thirteenth century, with the view of editing the whole work critically. In 1876 he published as a preliminary study "Die Erfurter Handschrift der Tosefta(1)." containing a minute description of the MS. and a series of valuable observations, showing the many discrepancies between the text of the latter and that of the common editions. In connection therewith the author endeavors to prove that the authentic readings of the MS. fully corroborated his theory as to the origin of the Tosefta. The same plan was later continued in the publication "Tosefta-Varianten," Trier 1881. In 1880 the promised edition appeared. The merits or demerits of this edition need not be discussed here. The author's great service to the scholarly world through this standard edition has deservedly been recognized by Jewish and Christian scholars alike and it has earned for him a high position in the rank of talmudic authors. In his main hope, however, to see his cherished theory approved and adopted, he met with disappointment. The Tosefta came to life, but the doctrine which it was to confirm seemed to be dead forever. Far from being discouraged by this failure to convince his critics and unwilling to give up what

18 Ib., 189 ff.
was to him incontrovertible truth, he has worked on patiently and quietly for nearly thirty years more, sifting and analyzing every point of difference between Tosefta and Mishnah on the one hand and the two Talmuds on the other, and in 1908-1910 published his great work on the subject in two volumes and a "Supplement," covering altogether 1074 pages, large octavo.

This latest work it is which has occasioned the present article. A discussion of its contents is a task I do not care to undertake. The purpose of this paper was not to present a lengthy review of this comprehensive work, but merely to acquaint the reader with a baffling problem in talmudic literature, and to call attention to the patient and valuable research of a secluded scholar.

If I may venture an opinion, I would say that upon perusing most of the material, I am unable to see, how his opponents will meet the overwhelming evidence in favor of his theory, no matter what the a priori objections be to its ultimate acceptance. I would not make so bold as to pilot others on the great "Ocean of the Talmud"; but when the experts are many, and opinions divergent, the plain sailor may be privileged to choose his captain. For my part I am inclined to agree with Dr. Zuckermandel that the essential to a solution is that it should solve, and to believe that, as the last line of his work hopefully reads, "his theory lives and will live!"


20 I have purposely refrained from burdening this article with numerous notes on details and with references to the many passages in the works and articles of the authors referred to in this exposition. The reader who wishes
to consult the sources, especially those parts of Dr. Zuckermandel's works, in which he elucidates and defends his theory, may, in addition to the references given in the notes here, be referred to the following: Zuckermandel, *Monatsschrift*, 1874, 32; *ib.*, 189 ff.; 1875, 38 ff.; "Die Erfurter Handschrift der Tosefta," Berlin 1876 (enlarged reprint from *Magazin*, II); see particularly Preface and pp. 70-72, 88, 102 f., 107-110, and, against it, Hoffmann, *Magazin*, III, 165; Zuckermandel, *Tosefta-Varianten*, Trier 1881, especially pp. 13-17, 21-27, 40. For the understanding of the author's general position the particularly important references are his Prefaces to his *magnum opus*, "Tosefta, Mishnah und Baraita," quoted above, and the "Supplement" to the same. In the Preface to the second volume he very cleverly and vigorously defends his work against an unfair attack by one of his critics, who reviewed the first volume in the "Literarisches Centralblatt," 1909, No. 10, while in the Preface to the "Supplement" he takes it up with Prof. Bacher, who in his review of the same volume in the "Deutsche Literaturzeitung" 1909, No. 27, highly appreciates the great merits of the work in many directions, but rejects his general theory on the Tosefta. To the credit of the author it should be said that, true to the rabbinical maxim 'דנור חכמה נבואת נשみな', he never loses his temper and never uses a harsh or unkind word against his opponents, although some of them, in no commendable spirit, never mention his name in quoting his edition of the Tosefta, but always refer to the work as "Erfurter Tosefta" or "Tosefta Pasewalker Druck," Pasewalk being an obscure German town, where the work happened to be published. A favorable review appeared by L. A. Rosenthal in Rahmer’s *Literaturblatt*, 1909, No. 6-7. The author himself wrote a review on his two volumes in *Monatsschrift*, 1908, pp. 626 ff., and 1909, pp. 627 ff. Before closing this list, mention must be made of the author's latest publication which is intimately related to the general subject under discussion. I refer to his "Gesammelte Aufsätze," a work in two parts, of which thus far only the first has appeared, Frankf. a.M. (J. Kauffman) 1911, pp. vi + 209. The volume is intended as a continuation of the last mentioned voluminous work. It contains, however, chiefly articles which had been published by the author in the *Monatsschrift* during the years 1869-1874, grouped here somewhat differently and considerably enlarged by new material, so as to form the third volume of his main work on the mutual relation of Tosefta, Mishnah, and Baraita. The second part of this volume is promised for 1912.
A MISCELLANY OF LEXICAL AND TEXTUAL
NOTES ON THE BIBLE

CHIEFLY IN CONNECTION WITH THE FIFTEENTH EDITION OF THE
LEXICON BY GESENIUS-BUHL¹

BY FELIX PERLES, Königsberg

Exactly a hundred years after the publication of the first edition which marks the beginning of modern Hebrew lexicography we are presented with a new—it is the fourth prepared by Buhl—edition of Gesenius' Lexicon. When it is remembered that a century ago Semitic philology was in its initial stages, that the study of the Old Testament was carried on mainly on traditional lines, and that practically nothing was known of Egyptian, Assyro-Babylonian, and South Arabic antiquity, it will be possible to gauge the extent of the labor which has since then been done in the entire province under consideration and of which our Lexicon represents as it were the epitome. The degree of perfection, however, is not merely ascertainable in comparison with the first edition; even when compared with the last edition which appeared five years ago, a substantial progress is to be recorded which, on its external side, reveals itself in an increase of some fifty pages. Wholly new is a comparison of the linguistic material from the South Arabic inscriptions which is the work of O. Weber.

A random perusal of the new edition has resulted in the following additions and corrections: Reverse of the title-page, l. 1: r. iudicis; l. 3: r. ergastula.—P. 54, s. v. ידסנה, there is wanting Zechar. 9, 12 יסיבות התוקה.—P. 127b, s. v. ובש, add: also in New-Hebrew as a verb and in derivatives.—P. 158b, s. v. והד, r.

"die gemeine Hirse."—P. 166a, l. 11 from below, (Syriac) תר ור r. מיהרב.—P. 208b, l. 10 from below, ר"ב r. נבג.—P. 234b, l. 28 from below, ר"ב r. נבג; ibid., l. 3 from below, r. הים.—P. 235b, l. 13 from below, הים ור r. הים ור.—P. 239a, l. 19, Amos 4, 3 r. 4, 5.—P. 243a, l. 5 from below, after "Grünbaum" add: Ges. Aufs., 454.—P. 257b, l. 15 from below, l. Chwolson.—P. 299a, l. 7 (in front of והל) for "u." r. "v."—P. 308a, l. 17, ס"ע r. ס"ע.—P. 324a, l. 20, Prov. 17, 26 r. 11, 24.—P. 366a, l. 20, אשנטיג r. אשנטיג.—P. 376b, s. v. דו II Niph., the strange form יהל (Isa. 56, 3) for יהל is wanting.—P. 382a, l. 10, after the words "bei Grünbaum" add: = Ges. Aufs., 94.—P. 424b, s. v. ס"ע, l. 8 from below, insert in front of "Rob, Sm." : Geiger, Urschrift, 301.—P. 445a, l. 5, remove the words "Perles An. 32 Burst;" from their present position to l. 13 (after Ps. 106, 43).—P. 537b, s. v. ס"ע, add: comp. Perles, in Beiheft II zur OLZ., 1908, col. 14a (on Test. Judah 25, 2).—P. 543b, l. 2 from below, r. ס"ע.—P. 557a, s. v. ס"ע, add: In New-Hebrew ס"ע denotes a woman's being without a husband through force of circumstances.—P. 591a, l. 17 from below, after the words "bei Grünbaum" add: = Ges. Schr., 282 ff.—P. 600a, l. 11 from below, strike out: Perles JQR. 18, 363.—P. 653b, l. 15 from below, ר"ב r. ר"ב.—P. 658a, l. 24, (Syriac) מאר r. מאער.—P. 719a, s. v. כבKal the strange form תקרוב for Ezek. 37, 7 for which we should expect תקרוב is missing.—P. 719b, l. 8 from below, r. כב r. כב.—P. 727b, l. 21, ס"ע r. ס"ע.—P. 752b, l. 8 from below, for "särlich" r. "verzärmt."—P. 758b, l. 5 from below, for ב r. ב.—P. 774a, l. 11, for Dosy r. Lane. —P. 775a, l. 18 from above, insert in front of "Nestle": Geiger, Urschrift, 367.—P. 809b, l. 10 from below, r. נברש.—P. 874a, l. 8 from below, insert in front of "Perles": Geiger, Jüd. Zeitschr., IX, 204.—P. 876a, l. 14, for "a m a r u sehen, also = Signal."
LEXICAL NOTES ON BIBLE—PERLES

In the list of Hebrew words proposed on the basis of conjectural emendations (p. 885) add the following entries: 

speechlessness, s. הנופש, 263b.— web s. Berichtigungen und Nachträge, XIVa, with reference to p. 135b, ונו.— שמלת s. במסת 781a below.

In the German Index note the following corrections: 979a, s. v. “Schlauch,” for שמלת II. — 979b, s. v. “stark,” add: שמלת.

As in the case of the two previous editions, we present in the following pages a series of lexical and textual observations which may be taken as an original contribution to the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Zech. 6, 3 שמלת is explained by a number of scholars in the sense of “red,” since in verse 7 it stands directly for שמלת. It is quite possible that the word stood originally at the outset in verse 2 where it was subsequently replaced by the gloss שמלת, whereas the original שמלת found its way by error at the end of verse 3. The meaning “red” fits in with rabbinic raw meat (Levy, NHWB., 41) the red color of which is expressly alluded to in a number of places, e. g. Pesahim 74b זכר אוכצץ.

The verses Deut. 15, 4-6 are rightly stricken out by Marti (in the new edition of Kautzsch's Bible) as a later gloss, since they contradict verses 6 and II. How are we, however, to explain the wholly superfluous שמלת at the head of verse 4, which is wanting in the Septuagint and Peshitta? It is not too rash to conjecture that in the Greek period a glossator wrote on the margin שמלת, i. e. שמלת; in explanation of נפש ירד (end of verse 3), considering that שמלת is rendered by φίλημ in the Septuagint. The
word being omitted in the two oldest versions, the possibility of a Greek gloss in the present passage will not be contested. The gloss was then copied into the text immediately after and taken for a Hebrew word; it was then natural, when verses 4-6 were received into the text, that the word was drawn to the following.

A similar instance of an originally non-Hebrew gloss being taken for Hebrew on its admission into the text is Ezek. 20, 37 where בירה = Babyl. biritu “bond” was originally intended as an explanation of רעות; see my observation JQR., XVIII, 384, and comp. below on Gen. 22, 13.

ויתוב

Isa. 24, 15 we expect in the place of the difficult הניא rather an apostrophe naming those who are bidden praise the Lord. I therefore conjecture that we should point as “inhabitants of Berytus (Beirut).” It fits in well with the parallel יאש that just this port should be mentioned. It is true, the city does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, but mention is frequently made of it as Beruna and Berutu in the Amarna tablets. The name בירה is simply the plural of בֵּירָה well, as is expressly attested by Stephen of Byzantium. This would also explain the form בירה in the place of בֵּית as we might expect. For the subsequent relations of Berytus and the Jews

6 If my conjecture be right, then the omission of the gloss in the Septuagint and Peshitta would furnish proof for the latter also that the Hebrew text underlying these versions was current for some time side by side with the sources of the Masoretic recension. An analogous case is afforded by the Papyrus Nash proving that, so far as Deuteronomy is concerned, there was circulating in the second post-Christian century a Hebrew text deviating from the Masoretic.

7 Comp. Isa. 42, 10 where in a similar context Kedar and Sela are called upon to praise the Lord.

8 Comp. Winckler, Altertumliche Forschungen, I, 309, n., and 436.

9 S. v. בירת: ἐκκάθη ήπο το εἰνόθρον; ἑσπρ γάρ το ὀρέαρ παρ’ αὕτοις.

10 As a gentilic of the Benjamite city בֵּית בירה frequently.
consult the article by Krauss, *JE.*, II, 647-8, and the literature there adduced.

The word נָטָשָׁ which occurs only Isa. 5, 6 should probably be stricken from the lexicon; it is apparently a mere remnant of the reading נָעַשְׁ. It is true that in present Hebrew text we meet only with the Kal תָּבָשׁ in the sense of "lying fallow," but both the rendering of the Septuagint (ἀνῆρ τῶν ἀμπελῶνα μον) and the following אֲנַמֹר, אֲנַמֹר speak in favor of the supposition that was the original reading. Instances where the two stems נָטָשָׁ and תָּבָשׁ are confounded may be adduced from other places in the Scriptures, e. g. Job 10, 20 where we must read with Lagarde תַּבָּשׁ in the place of תָּוָשׁ, and Job 38, 11 where in the place of נָטָשָׁ we ought certainly to read תָּבָשׁ (comp. my *Analekten*, 87). Perhaps for תָּבָשׁ Jer. 51, 38 we should likewise read נָטָשָׁ. In the present passage, the word נָטָשָׁ may have originated in the following manner: when the faulty reading נָעַשְׁ, אֲנַמֹר had found its way into the text, a copyist wrote above it by way of correction נָטָשָׁ, hence: נָטָשָׁ, אֲנַמֹר. A subsequent scribe mistook the superscribed letters for an omission; in this fashion our masoretic reading arose.

May not the Greek καλάρης for which it is difficult to find a satisfactory Greek etymology be a loan-word going back to נָטָשָׁ? For the transposition of i and r we have abundant examples in the case of foreign words transplanted from one language into another. As for Greek κ for Semitic י, comp.

11 Lam. 1, 7 similarly refers to the ground's lying fallow; comp. מַעְשַׁר. Midrash Echah *ad locum* where it is correctly paraphrased by מִשְׁמָתָה. For the year of rest.

12 Comp. Lev. 25, 4 where we meet with the same expression וְכָרָם אֵלֶּה מִשְׁמָתָה with reference to the year of rest.

13 In addition to the examples given by my father (*Byzant. Zeitschr.*, II, 583) and by myself (*ibid.*, VIII, 544) we might name Syriac מַעְשַׁר וְאָלֶּה מִשְׁמָתָה "inkwell" from καλάρης; Spanish *Argel* (= Algier) from *al-jazīreh*.
καμήλος for נמל. According to Lewy,14 נמל is the prototype of Greek καμήλος; but in view of the special meaning of the latter for which no parallels are to be found anywhere in the Semitic languages, the proposed derivation must be rejected as highly improbable.

Prov. 17, 22 נמל has thus far not been satisfactorily explained. The parallel נמל in the second hemistich suggests that נמל likewise denotes a part of the body. Certain scholars have therefore, on the basis of Peshitta and Targum, proposed in its place נמל or נמל. No change, however, is required: נמל corresponds exactly to Arabic נמל and means “countenance”; accordingly, Prov. 15, 13 נמל represents a variant of the present verse.15

Ps. 12, 4 לשת מרבור נמל does not fit in well with the parallel three hemistichs that precede in which hypocrisy and not grandiloquence is combated. I therefore conjecture that נמל represents a miswritten נמל (comp. Syriac) which, though not occurring elsewhere in Hebrew, might constitute an Aramaism which would comport with our passage. The transposition of נמל into נמל, easily accounted for on graphic grounds (note the similarity in the Old Hebrew script), was due not merely to the circumstance of its being a rare word, but was in addition suggested by the next following verse (4).

It is quite possible that a form from the stem נמל stood in another passage in the Book of Psalms: 15, 3 לא ידנה לע לשת offers both lexical and grammatical difficulties. Perhaps the text

14 Semit. Lehnröter in Griechischen, 18-19.
15 From the stem נמל; comp. לשת, נמל, and the like.
16 Comp. also Eccl. 7, 3.
read originally: "there is no falsehood upon his tongue." Thus also the preposition which it is difficult to construe with a verb would find its explanation. It is not impossible that the correct reading was still extant in the Hebrew copy used by the Greek translator, though he took it for a verb (οὐχ ἤδονασκέν ἐν γνώσει αὐτοῦ). Likewise Sir. 5, 14 (in) χρηματίζω, "which it is safe to say imitates our verse, we should read "lie not with thy tongue." The concluding word (◿) which is wanting in both versions may with certainty be pronounced a later addition.

A verb hitherto unrecognized appears to be extant in Ps. 46, 3. Aside from the fact that the Hiphil (except in the obscure passage Mic. 2, 4) is never used intransitively, the meaning of the stem does not fit the context. According to my judgment, the vocalization alone is erroneous: read תּוֹרָה "when the earth is dissolved" from the stem חָמר which means both "pour out" and "be poured out." Ps. 140, 11 seems likewise to go back to the same stem.

Jer. 25, 25 is still awaiting an explanation; it is wanting in the Septuagint and the Old Latin. Duhm conjectures that it represents a cipher, say for תונמה, which has the same numerical value! Such recourse to gematria in a modern commentary par-

37 אָל (in the place of the expected אֲלָּךְ) before a noun as Job 18, 17 אֲלָּךְ אִשָּׁה. אֲלָּךְ אִשָּׁה אֶלָּךְ אִשָּׁה.

38 For הָעֲבַד in this sense we have instances in New-Hebrew (Cant. rabba, ed. Romm, 156, on 2, 4) אֲבָדוֹת תּוֹרָה שְּרֹאֶל יִכְּלֶב בָּאָבִי וַעֲבַד אִם הָעֲבַד אֲבָדוֹת תּוֹרָה. In the Targum of Proverbs which is dependent on the Syriac Version the verb דֵּלַת and its derivatives occur frequently; in our texts, however, דֵּלַת is disfigured into דֵּלַת (see Levy, Targ. Wbch., I, 162).

39 4, 28 we find likewise אל תּוֹרָה אֲלָּךְ. The whole sentence, however, is missing in both versions; it is probably a misplaced doublet to 5.

40 Comp. the parallel in v. 7 תּוֹרָה אֲלָּךְ.
takes of the nature of a jest. It is quite probable, however, that we are dealing here with a cipher. In the light of the word שָׁנָה in the following verse which is universally acknowledged as a symbol for בְּכֵל (according to the permutation האֲבָהְךָ it is not far-fetched to see in a cryptograph for עלֵם which immediately follows. Now, it is true, עלֵם, according to the, would result in רִבּ. We need not, however, be surprised that this unknown word which has certainly an un-Hebrew sound was at an early period replaced by the otherwise known בְּכֵל which as the name of a king was also graphically quite similar. Now we may understand why the four words בְּכֵל מַלְוָי הָדֶר are wanting in the Septuagint, being nothing else than a doublet of בְּכֵל מַלְוָי.

בְּכֵל מַלְוָי

Ps. 74, 6 בְּכֵל מַלְוָי was apparently chosen intentionally with a view to the Greek ξίρων and χαίρων which designate the two parts of an axe. This allusive play on Greek terms is not surprising in a Maccabean psalm.

לֵז = drive on

Jer. 10, 2 לא רָדַּךְ נֵגוֹמָה אֵלֶּה הָמִים is difficult grammatically; hence the rendering "go" in a number of the versions which probably represents a mere guess from the context. I propose מָלָן in the signification "be driven on, be impelled." This meaning may readily be inferred from the noun מָלָן "an ox-goad"; comp. also Jer. 31, 18 עלֵם אֵלֶּה (similarly Hos. 10, 11). According to Gesenius-Buhl, s. v., the primary meaning of the stem is "goad on."

In Is. 40, 16 מַלָּאוֹה כְּהֵרֵד חָפְצֵמִי the verb is certainly to be rendered "guide" (Septuagint: στηρίζειν aɪτον). The same semantic development from "guide" to "teach" may be witnessed also in מַלָּאוֹה.

Similarly 51, 41 and לֵז כְּהֵרֵד for בְּכֵל מַלְוָי 51, 1.
Prov. 31, 3 הָעַרְבֵּךְ מְלִיתִי. I suggest that in the obscure הָעַרְבֵּךְ there may be present perhaps a derivative from מֹאֵּשָּׁׁא (מֹאֵּשׁ adulterer). The presence of a Greek word in this passage should be nothing strange; it may be taken rather as characteristic of the decadence of Jewish family life in Hellenistic times that the writer intentionally chose a Greek word. Moreover, מְלִיתִי for some form of the verb מֹאֵּשָּׁא occurs in the Midrash (Cant. rabba on 3, 4): מְלִיתִי פָּלַא אֵלֵיהוּ. נְכֹפֶּה מְלִיתִי.

Prov. 31, 10 נְכֹפֶּה מְלִיתִי מְכָרָה is doubly difficult: in the first place we find nowhere else נְכֹפֶּה in the sense demanded by the context here, and secondly the commercial figure of acquiring a wife is least of all to be expected in this chapter. Perhaps we ought to point: מְכָרָה "the place where she may be found" (comp. Zeph. 2, 9 מְכָרָה מְלִיתִי) is more distant than that where corals are found." i. e. she is farther away to seek and more difficult to find. That is poetic and safeguards נְכֹפֶּה its original sense.

מָלִים "multitude, troop" shows exactly the same development of meaning as Assyrian millu (Delitzsch, HW'B., 414a).

Judg. 6, 2 מָלָיָּה הָעַרְבֵּךְ מָלַיָּה אַשָּׁר בָּהִים. So much may be gathered from the context that a hiding-place in the mountains made with human hands must be meant. Perhaps it denotes "subterranean passages," "shafts," comp. Job 28, 10 בֹּצְרָה יִאֹרֶם where many commentators assume the meaning "shafts."


23 The basic meaning: place where something is dug after (יחד).
The figure is wholly appropriate, since a mine with shafts and galleries is similar to a river with its tributaries. Perhaps we ought to take the word נחל in the rather difficult sentence Job 28, 11 in the same sense, i.e. as "shaft," "gallery."

Lam. 2, דנedar נגania יבניאי ותלה ... ותלה יבניאי משמתشاهו מחרים represents a tautology which within one and the same verse is not tolerable. Perhaps the text read originally נחל נגania משמתشاهו מחרים. If that be so, then משמתشاهו מחרים is to be derived from משמתشاهו מחרים נחל, whereas נחל was merely an explanatory gloss on the unusual משמתشاهו מחרים and then admitted into the text through error. The verb משמתشاهו מחרים is used just of deceitful prophecies (Jer. 29, 8, comp. 4, 10). For the juxtaposition of the synonyms משמתشاهו מחרים com. II Chr. 32, 15 אל ישא אתחמה חדקיהוอะלא יבנה אתכמה and in New-Hebrew the standing formula משמתشاهו מחרים.

הנלי, once also הנלי, Biblical Aramaic, "heap of rubbish" (so rather than "dung-hill"), is compared by Gesenius-Buhl conjecturally with Assyrian naamalu (nawalu) "ruin." But this leaves the ending unexplained. I would therefore place it beside Assyrian namalutu (for which, it is true, no example is available at the present moment), from malu (= מלע ), in the sense of "rubbish," properly "filled up ground." Thus far, examples are available only for tamalutu and malu, "heaping up," "terrace," and for the verb mal III"i = "cause to be thrown up" (Delitzsch, HIB', 410a). In the Babylonian Talmud (Baba batra 54a) malu designates directly "rubbish"; comp. also malu Heb. "dam," "earthwork," prop. anything heaped up.

* Or תחאבו which, it is true, occurs in an entirely different sense?
We find תחאבו in the sense of "deceit" (Prov. 26, 26).
I would explain the proper noun masculine לירדס as לירדס, i.e. as a compound מ = ש = RESPONSIBLE ( = Arab. 'amm) and ידה. It is true, the abbreviated form לירדס for מ = ש occurs at present only in Biblical Aramaic; it may nevertheless be assumed that it underlies the place-name ידה Josh. 19, 45. For other proper nouns compounded with מ comp. the literature adduced by Gesenius-Buhl, fifteenth edition, 591 below, s.v. מ II.

Jer. 47, 5 לירדס is rendered in the Targum לירדס. The latter does not presuppose, as has been assumed, a reading לירדס; the translator merely gave to the word the meaning "power," specifically "military power," which is actually extant in the case of Assyrian emukû. Nevertheless, the original reading was probably לירדס, i.e. the original form of לירדס as it still underlies Assyrian Amkarruna (comp. also in the Septuagint 'Assarion by the side of 'Arsarion). The mention of Ekron as one of the cities of the PhilISTian pentarchy is in the first place quite appropriate in the context; secondly, it is suggested by the parallel passage Zeph. 2, 4. The error in our passage arose perhaps in consequence of the fact that the word was abbreviated to לירדס and that the abbreviation was then falsely resolved. Whether the Septuagint read in our passage לירדס may be reasonably doubted. The translator, unable to make sense of לירדס, merely made a guess to which Josh. 11, 22 readily led the way.

Prov. 27, 6 לירדס אבב היער ישוק שותא. The current explanation of לירדס in the sense "abundant" fails to supply an effective contrast to לירדס. On the basis of Ezek. 8, 11 לירדס עני הקמה לעלה I would explain לירדס as "vapor-like" which is an appropriate epithet for the false kisses of an enemy in contrast with a friend's well-meant

Comp. also Jer. 25, 20; Am. 1, 8; Zech. 9, 5, 7.
blows. A good parallel is offered in a similar context by Hos.
6, 4  תמרות בותן בקר.

By the side of ms "bud" (= Arab. *frh*) and mB "fly" (= Syriac *frar*) there seems to have existed in Hebrew a third stem ms which corresponds to Arabic *fariha* and signifies "rejoice": Isa. 35, 2 the parallel verbs indicate with certainty the signification mentioned. Perhaps a play on ms ms "bud" in verse I was intended.

Jer. 10, 13 (= 51, 16; Ps. 135, 7) is grammatically very strange. Perhaps we have to do with an old error, the original reading being ms frar. "He maketh appointed seasons for the rain." Although the word ms ms in this meaning does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, we may justly assume with a view to its frequent occurrence in the tannaitic literature that it also existed in the older stage of Hebrew, since it cannot very well have been borrowed from Aramaic where the word is altogether unknown in a similar meaning. The context in which our verse is found explains how it was replaced by the more common ms. In Jeremiah where ms would on the whole be less appropriate, the entire passage from ms to ms may perhaps have constituted a marginal note calling attention to the parallel in Ps. 135, 7, which subsequently passed into the text itself through error.

The semantic development of the word ms which combines the notions "east," "front," and (in Aramaic) "the first" may perhaps be connected with the manner of orientation of the Hebrews in Palestine. Accordingly the first (= chief) direction constituted the orientation in contrast to the Babylonian conception which placed the chief direction in the north; hence ms

E. g. Abot 5, 9; Rosh ha-shanah 1, 2. In a single passage (Tos. Rosh ha-shanah 1, 12) we find even ms ms "the period of rain showers."
signifies in that language both “north” and “one” (or “first”) and is used interchangeably with iřănū which denotes the direction of the breast (iřtu).

Num. 21, 5 לָלֵּךְ is perhaps an ancient broken plural = kalākilu which denotes the name of a plant. If that be so, we should point לָלֵּךְ and the phrase would then mean bread prepared out of לָלֵּךְ. A similar broken plural is extant in לָלֵּךְ and (according to Hommel) in לָלֵּךְ Josh. 19, 6 (= מִשְׁרָאֵה from מִשְׁרָאֵה).

The stem לָלֵּךְ = Aram. לָלֵּךְ for which only two examples are cited, לָלֵּךְ Job 16, 19 and the purely Aramaic מִשְׁרָאֵה Gen. 31, 47, seems to have stood originally in still another passage: Mal. 2, 5 מִשְׁרָאֵה בַּמֹּכֶסִית is flat and trivial. Once we read מִשְׁרָאֵה, an excellent sense is the result. The graphic similarity of מ and אי and (in the Old Hebrew) of מ and היא occasioned the change, especially since מִשְׁרָאֵה was a rare word in Hebrew. The construction מִשְׁרָאֵה corresponds exactly to the Aramaic Pael מִשְׁרָאֵה which when construed with מ means “testify against.”

From the time of Gesenius, מִשְׁרָאֵה (by the side of מִשְׁרָאֵה) is universally explained as a formation from מִשְׁרָאֵה by means of the suffix -l. This derivation is contradicted by Assyrian šumēlu which, to judge from the vocalization, points to an original šum ’ēlu which, to be sure, is a form baffling explanation. May the conjecture be advanced that the vocalization of the word rests on a popular etymology according to which the word was taken as a compound = šum ili “name of God?” In that case the word may have been borrowed from Assyrian into the

27 Freytag, III, 492a, where also divers other names of plants from the same stem. Perhaps Assyrian kūl kūlānu, as Peiser thinks, goes with it; comp. Muss-Arnolt, 914.
other Semitic languages; the spelling with א would receive a natural explanation. If our theory should prove acceptable, an interesting parallel might be cited from Greek: ἐιδώλημα (from τι and ἰωμα) — "left" shows the identical euphemism in the same concept. One may even go farther and surmise in the Greek term a trace of Oriental influence.

Ezek. 36, 3 דוקס יסוי לואח ויהי יחה he thus far remained a puzzle. Both Septuagint (ἀντὶ τοι ἀγριασθήσω εἰρή) and Peshitta (אֲשֶׁר אָרְצַת רַעְיָה) take יסוי in a sense which alone fits the context and is, moreover, confirmed by יָשָׁה in verse 4. I therefore regard the word as an infinitive Piel the stem יסוי (comp. יָשָׁה Ps. 118, 18 and the like). This stem which meets us otherwise only in Jewish-Aramaic 29 and Arabic 30 may certainly be credited to Ezekiel. In the present passage, the meaning "gaze with malicious

28 Thus, of course, we ought to read, as has long been recognized, for יָשָׁה

29 Pael יָשָׁה "to put in the ban"; נָשָׁה "ban"; נִשָּׁה (so it ought to be pointed) "put in the ban." Levy advocates the vocalization נִשָּׁה; he takes it as a contraction from נָשָׁה and regards נָשָׁה as a denominative verb. This view, however, is untenable; for, in the first place, we find the part. נָשָׁה (Targum Yerush. Deut. 7, 26); secondly, we have in Arabic with the corresponding change of the sibilant שﻤְת (by the side of שﻤְת). Kohut, z. c., has already thought of the Arabic שﻤְת.

30 While in the formation I. we find only שﻤְת "have malicious joy," the forms שﻤְת and שﻤֲת are met with by the side of each other in II., with the meaning "bless a sneezer." Professor Hommel has been kind enough to inform me that, according to the Arab native lexicographers, שﻤְת is the current and better form in the place of שﻤֲת: At the same time he gives expression to a plausible conjecture that the II. form originally meant "execute the evil demons." For שﻤֲת "have malicious joy" he mentions as old instances Hudh. 25, 5; 48, 5; 51, 1; 'Alkama 9, 1.
joy" for which Arabic offers numerous instances is most appropriate.

The proper name שרה 'Sarah' which occurs several times in the book of Ezra is paralleled by the name שרה 'Sarah' in the Assuan papyri (A, 16; E, 18). In a previous review of these papyri I ventured the opinion that the biblical name likewise read originally שרה 'Sarah', though the received form is as old as the Septuagint. The similarity of ב and ר in the Old Hebrew script was especially favorable to the interchange of the two letters. The resolution of the word into שרה 'Sarah' is readily explained from the circumstance that the first element was identified with the name שרה occurring in Est. 1, 14.

TEXTUAL NOTES (ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF THE BIBLICAL BOOKS)

Gen. 1, 26 בּוּכֵל הָאָרֶץ בּוּכֵל הָאָרֶץ interrupts the context in the enumeration of the several species of animals. It has been proposed to read with Peshitta בּוּכֵל הָאָרֶץ בּוּכֵל הָאָרֶץ. It seems to me more plausible to read יָאָר שֵׁר . comp. 1, 20-21; 7, 21.

Gen. 22, 13 רָה אֶלֶּה רָה נָאָ הָאָרֶץ . At one time I thought of emending רָה נָאָ הָאָרֶץ for which all the ancient witnesses read רָה נָאָ הָאָרֶץ into רָה נָאָ הָאָרֶץ. Now, however, the reading רָה נָאָ הָאָרֶץ appears to me to be correct. I regard it as an Aramaic gloss (= מַכָּה , as the Targum ad locum actually reads) for מַכָּה הָאָרֶץ , which was subsequently misunderstood and admitted into the text.

Gen. 31, 13 אֵנִי הוא בּוּמָל אֵנִי הוא בּוּמָל is strange on account of the grammatically impossible article ה in front of אֵנִי . I conjecture that the ה was originally an abbreviation for הָאָרֶץ ; the sentence thus read: I am J., the God of Bethel. It is clear that our verse refers back to Gen. 28, 18-22, and there the text quite unambiguously reads: הָאָרֶץ יָהָה אֵנִי יָהָה אֵנִי. It may further be conjectured, since our chapter from verse 4 on belongs to the Elohist, that v. 31 stood originally immediately after v. 3 to which it is a

\[21\] OLZ., XI (1908), col. 28.

\[22\] See Geiger, Urschrift, 244.
fit sequel and which in point of fact comes from the pen of the Jahvist. On the other hand, v. 14 connects well with v. 12.

Gen. 46, 3 אֲבִיכֵי הַאֲלֹהִים אֱלֹהִי בָּנֶיהָ shows the same difficulty as in the passage just discussed. It may be conjectured that the original read ולא ידוהי אלהי בנים which through a copyist's error remained in the text and was then naturally drawn to the abbreviation 'יה thus forming יְהֹא. Comp. my Analekten, 43-44, where further examples are adduced for catchwords wrongly inserted in the text; many more examples may easily be adduced.

Ex. 5, 12 קֶשֶׁת שֶׁכָּמָן though presupposed by the versions, is quite tautological. I propose יָנָן; comp. verse 7 and especially verse 14 where the verb is used absolutely as in the present passage. The error is due to an aberration of the eye to the word pnn at the end of the following verse.

Lev. 14, 57 is, as far as the style goes, very strange. What is כָּט to mean here? It would have been simpler to say just כִּיוֹן. May not the original have read כֵּיוֹן כּו as we find Deut. 7, 25 כּו in a similar context and Deut. 12, 30 כּו where likewise the original reading will have been כּו unless כּו was a legitimate

See further below on Gen. 46, 3; Isa. 5, 19; I Chr. 29, 22, and my Analekten, 17 ff. (particularly on Ps. 68, 20) and 92, also REJ., XXXV (1897), 59, on Sirach 24, 1.

Verse 13b repeats expressly the admonition contained in verse 3b.
LEXICAL NOTES ON BIBLE—PERLES

synonym for אֵלֶיךָ? May it be further assumed that in our passage also there stood originally אֵלֶיךָ אֲלֹהֵיכֶם? Deut. 33, 11 מַתְנִים קְפִיָּה has so far not been explained on its grammatical side. Every difficulty disappears as soon as we read by simply dividing the words differently: מַתְנִים קְפִיָּה, i.e. מַתְנִים קָפִיָּה, i.e. the loins of them that provoke him; comp. Gen. 49, 9, מַתְנִים קָפִיָּה. According to Wellesz* and Chwolson,** v. 11 belongs right after verse 7b, henceJudah (and not Levi!) is spoken of. That would make the proposed emendation still more probable, since Gen. 49, 9 says just ofJudah מִי קֻדֹם.

Deut. 33, 16 קְבָּאוּתךָ לְאַשָּׁה is a monstrous form which has thus far baffled explanation. It has been proposed to read קְבָּאוּתךָ. According to my judgment, קְבָּאוּתךָ is rather a conflate of the two words קְבָּאוּתךָ and קְבָּאוּתךָ, of which the latter was a gloss on the former. The verb קְבָּאוּתךָ occurs in our chapter twice in addition. It is true that the feminine form still remains a puzzle. For further examples of conflate readings see my Analcten, 82, also OLZ., VIII (1905), 181, on I Chr. 12, 33 where arose out of לוּלָעִיר and לֹאֵז and further below on I Sam. 1, 6 and Lam. 3, 49; comp. also Job 22, 21 where בּ. אַרְזָר is exactly as in our passage, seems to be a conflate of מַּבָּאְד and מַבָּאְד.

Josh. 7, 5 יָרָדָמָם לָפְנֵי הַשָּׁרֶף העִנָּשׁוֹר יָשָׁרָה. For the difficult I would propose the pointing יָרָדָמָם, as actually underlies the rendering of Peshitta (רְאֵם לָפְנֵי הַשָּׁרֶף). The Niphal of מַשְׂרֵר occurs in a similar use and in a similar context II Chr. 14, 12; comp. also Dan. 11, 22. On the side of style, the nearest parallel is Deut. 7, 23 where it is said of the defeated enemy יָרָדָמָם הָנֵחַ נַחַמְתָּה אֵלֶיךָ לֵבָרְקִי... יָשָׁר וָעַל הָשָׁמַיִם.

Josh. 17, 14 הִשְׂרֵר עָלָיו בַּבָּרְכָּנָי תִּשְׂרֵר יָדָיו is strange, the first being absolutely beyond explanation. We must, however, neither strike it out nor emend it into יָדָיו; it is simply an abbre-

* OLZ., VII (1904), col. 341.

** In his "Nachträge" to the "Das letzte Passahmahl Christi," 1898, 184, n. 1.

*** Or did the text read קְבָּאוּתךָ (as Mic. 4, 8 רְאֵם לָפְנֵי הַשָּׁרֶף)?
The expression "בנויה ותא אָשֶׁר" occurs elsewhere Deut. 22, 24; 23, 5; II Sam. 13, 22.

I Sam. 1, 6 may of course be explained after Arab. ra'ama IV vexatit, contumelia afficit, hence "in order to vex her." Nevertheless, it may be assumed that we have to do here with a textual error. The original appears to have read "תא אָשֶׁר ולְעָצָה "on account of her barrenness." The verb נֹמֵר being used in this sense always in combination with הרה, a scribe added by way of explanation the word נֹמֵר; thus from נֹמֵר the incorrect נְעָמָה followed. If that be so, then the following נֹמֵר is to be regarded merely as an explanatory gloss on נְעָמָה.

I Sam. 15, 29 has not received a satisfactory explanation. On the basis of Num. 23, 19 where we read נְעָמָה, I venture to conjecture that we ought to read נְעָמָה for נְעָמָא: "And also God is everlastingly truthful. He will not lie, etc." God is designated "it" exactly as Deut. 32, 4; Ps. 25, 8; 92, 16. The simple נְעָמָה (in the place of נְעָמָא) is met elsewhere: Jer. 15, 18; Am. 1, 11; Ps. 13, 2; 16, 11. A parallel to our passage is Ps. 73, 1 where we should read with Ewald לֵאֵשׁ for לֵאֵשׁ.

I Sam. 23, 16 I would explain: "and he encouraged him." In this sense we find in the Mishna חָכִית אָוַי בָּאוּלָהוֹ. To encourage a person, it was customary to address to him the words חָכִית אָוַי פַלֵּל (on the line of the later חָכִית אָוַי הָעַר).

I Kings 10, 5 I would transpose: "the attendance of his ministers and of his cupbearers, and their apparel." Thus all difficulties of the received text disappear.

The Niphal נַעֲרָמֵר in this sense as Sir. 42, 10 where should be supplied.

Shemiit 4, 3; 5, 9; Gittin 5, 9.
I Kings 12, 10 is perhaps to be pointed comp. Similarly we should read Lam. 3, 28 with Peshitta ; comp. verse 27. The same confusion also underlies Sir. 6, 29 in the Septuagint and 30, 13 in Peshitta.

I Kings 15, 30 (comp. II Chr. 15, 16) contains a difficulty which has thus far escaped attention. The verb cut, "hew," does not fit in with which beyond doubt denotes a metal object, as is shown with clearness by in the passage in Chronicles. One would rather expect an expression like "break in pieces." That would be in Hebrew which is used Deut. 9, 21; Mic. 1, 7; II Chr. 34, 7 with reference to images of idols that are broken in pieces. In our passage the proper form would be . Observe in particular the agreement of Deut. 9, 21 with II Chr. 15, 16, since there as well as here , , and would constitute parallels.

Isa. 5, 19 is strange, since it is wanting in . Perhaps it represents a misconceived abbreviation for , God not being mentioned in the preceding part at all, whereas it would afford a good parallel to in the second half of the verse. See above on Gen. 31, 13.

Isa. 21, 2 I would emend into: "Go up, O Elam, Tyre, and Media." The collocation of Elam, Tyre, and Media is rather strange from a geographical point of view; still an explanation may be found in the circum-

40 Comp. my observation REJ., XXXV (1897), 52.
41 Likewise, Job 32, 8 where is emended by many commentators into receives its simplest explanation if we assume an abbreviated . In a letter, dated April 30, 1903, Professor Hommel expresses his opinion that also Ex. 15, 2 (= Isa. 12, 2; Ps. 118, 14) the original read and that our present text is based on a misconception of the abbreviation. The redundant after in the present text of Isa. 12, 2 was originally a gloss on the abbreviation .
stance that Tyre had withstood a protracted siege at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar and might therefore be apostrophized as a dangerous foe of Babylon.

Isa. 31, 2 ἡ ῥοάς ἡ Ἰωρίς is not to be derived from ἰἱλή “help,” but from ἱνί “court” which fits in excellently with the parallel ἱνί; comp. elsewhere ἱνί and ἱνά in parallelism to ἱνί. The circumstance that the word ἱνί is only met with in late books (Ezekiel and Chronicles) is of no importance; the word occurs also in Arabic, ‘adiratu(n), hence, as may be seen from interchange of sounds, is common Semitic.

Isa. 44, 11 ὅμοια ἡ Ἰωρίς ἡ Ἐλλάδας is difficult both grammatically and exegetically. I would propose the emendation εἴρημα “blush” which would go well with the parallel ἱοῦ. The omission of the plural ending admits of a ready explanation; comp. my Analekten, 29. It is true, we nowhere find in the Old Testament ἥπερις in the sense “blush with shame,” but an instance is available in the Midrash (in connection with a haggadic exposition of ἅπερις ἡ Ἐλλάδας γίνεται ὁ δρόμος: “εἴρημα ἡ Ἐλλάδας ἡ Ἐλλάδας”).

Isa. 60, 4 ἥν ἡ Ἰωρίς ἡ Ἐλλάδας. As far as I know, no objection has been raised by critics to this verse although it offers a great difficulty. It is not quite easy to conceive how an adult person can be carried on the side; for the daughters are certainly not thought of as infants that they should be carried, especially since the sons come of themselves. All difficulties disappear when we read θηρίων: “thy daughters shall be carried in the litter”; comp. 66, 20 where we read exactly in a similar context θηρίων ἡ Ἐλλάδας καὶ ἦλθεν σῷς οἱ νεότητες ... βασίλειον. The Peshitta, likewise, which renders θηρίων by βασίλειον must certainly have read θηρίων. It may be casually noted that 66, 12 ἡ Ἰωρίς ἡ Ἐλλάδας is rendered by Peshitta in the same manner; nevertheless θηρίων there, though possible, is quite unnecessary, for there indeed the writer has in mind the figure of small children (θηρίων). The interchange of β and ἦ in our passage goes back to their similarity in Old

42 Num. rabba 4, 20 (ed. Romm, 14b, below).
Hebrew script; comp. my *Analekten*, 51, on Ps. 69, 11. Further examples: Gen. 9, 7 הב רור for which read with Nestle רור; Josh. 15, 47 הב הנב ת for which the Hebrew margin and the versions have הנב; Ezek. 40, 2 מנכ for which in the Septuagint appears as מנכ; comp. also below on Ezek. 30, 4.

Jer. 1, 15 כל המיתה עלי unlawful, יי היותר. It is very strange that it is said here of the hostile kings that they will place their thrones *upon* the walls of Jerusalem and *upon* all the cities of Judah. The preceding טונה את כל מה שחריר ירלמ precludes our taking the expression figuratively; the former sentence is certainly meant concretely. It is still less plausible to take יי here in a hostile sense = "against," for that would yield a distorted sense, a throne being surely no weapon which may be directed against a wall or city. I therefore propose the reading יי על כל המיתה יי, "and they shall *scale* all her walls round about and *storm* all the cities of Judah." It is true that elsewhere we find יי in this particular sense construed with the accusative: Joel 2, 7 על האמה, Prov. 21, 22 יי נבiros עלה חכם. Shall we perhaps take יי in the present passage (as frequently elsewhere) simply in the sense "march against?" It is certainly clear that in the sequence of letters יל יי the second יי may readily have been omitted; see further below on Eccl. 7, 26.

Jer. 16, 16 הנני שלח לחרים נאם היה רם ואחרי.roll שאלת לחרים שירيم וחודש. While the first רם is superfluous, the second is directly ungrammatical. It seems to me therefore that the original read: 'nn שאלת לחרים נאם היה רם ואחרי. The word רם has here, as Duhm has seen, the meaning "archers," specifically "hunters," as Jerem. 50, 29 and perhaps Job 16, 13; comp. also Gen. 21, 20 (of the *hunter* שאלת לחרים). If this be so, then the word יי represents a subsequent gloss on the unusual יי רם; at a still later period when יי רם was no

42 In Gen. 21, 20 לה is most probably likewise a gloss on לה.
more understood, the same word was likewise inserted in the first half of the verse for the sake of the supposed parallelism.

Jer. 30, 19 הָרֹבִּים אֵלֶּה יִשְׂמֹם וְהַבְּכִרִּים אֵלֶּה אֲנֵה עִיחַ. The overlined words are missing in the Septuagint. This suggests the possibility that הָרֹבִּים represents but a gloss on the less frequent expressions that follow, which indeed is in perfect accord with the sense. The parallel passage Job 14, 14 יָכַר הָבֵית אֲנֵה הֲרֵעָה אֵלֶּה שִׁבְיוֹלָם shows that בכָּר was used not only as an adjective (as in numerous passages), but also as a verb, in the sense “be many.” There, the Septuagint has: πολλάν δὲ γενομένων τῶν πιον οίκοιν, ἵνα δὲ οὐκίσκοι γίνωμαι οὐκ επιστρεται.

Jer. 48, 10 אָדוּר יִשְׂמֹם מַלֹּאכַת אֲנֵה נָבִי comp. Hag. 1, 13 אֲנֵה מַלֹּאכַת. An indirect support for this conjecture is perhaps the fact that the Septuagint renders מַלֹּאכַת by the plural τὰ ἰπχαὶ; hence it read מַלֹּאכַת מַלֹּאכַת with ἥν. Exactly as in this passage מַלֹּאכַת would be the object to the verb הָשָּׁה, we find in New-Hebrew שָׁהוּ מַלֹּאכַת מַלֹּאכַת.

Ezek. 18, 7 מִבְּלָה חָזְק הַבּוֹ קִצּוּב has thus far received no satisfactory explanation. Modern commentators for the most part either take with Cornill הב as a corruption from יבש, or with Nöldeke strike the word out altogether as a dittogram from הבו. It seems, to me, nevertheless, that the text is perfectly in order: הבו is to be taken as a construct state construction with the ancient case ending, hence: a pledge for a debt. Similarly, Ezek. 1, 8 (ketib) and 46, 17 are to be explained in the same manner. The circumstance to which Nöldeke calls attention, that הב is met with elsewhere only in Aramaic, gives us ground for doubting the genuineness of the word least of all in Ezekiel who elsewhere shows a predilec-

It must be owned that the plural ἰπχά occurs elsewhere also for the singular מַלֹּאכַת.

ZDMG., LVII, 418, n. 2.

Comp. Anal. ekten, 73, where further examples are given.
tion for Aramaic expressions in a high degree." Moreover, if we accept Luzzatto's conjecture which is exceedingly plausible, we should read also Jer. 17, 4:

Ezek. 22, 3. In the place of the superfluous and difficult the original perhaps read "ליהי", i.e. "ליהי". The abbreviation was then misunderstood and expanded so as to read "ליהי". Comp. Ex. 20, 5:

Ezek. 23, 24. The words do not fit in well at all and disturb the context. In spite of the fact that the words were read by the versions, I would conjecture that there stood originally at the beginning of the verse. The words dropped out in consequence of an error, and a copyist who noted the mistake wrote the omitted two words at the place proper between the lines introducing them by "ליהי", i.e. "ליהי", whereby he indicated that the words should be inserted after "ליהי". A subsequent copyist mistook this insertion and wrote the letters together with "ליהי" as one word; thus arose "ליהי". By a further error, the two words were subsequently inserted in the wrong place.

For similar examples in Ezek. where in the case of inserted passages a catchword was prefixed and sometimes abbreviated see Rost, OLZ., VII (1904), 390 ff. and 479 ff.; see also further on my note on Ezek. 37, 26.

Comp. Selle, De Aramaismis libri Ezech., 1890; and my own observation above on Ezek. 26, 3) and on Ezek. 37, 11) in OLZ., XII (1909), col. 251 f.

Comp. Analekten, 12, and especially 16 on Ps. 145, 12. For further instances of the abbreviation of the tetragrammaton by means of "ליהי" see further below on Ps. 20, 10; 131, 2.

Comp. in a similar context Jer. 50, 9.
Ezek. 24, 4. ἐσάκεν ταύτισθαι ἀλλὰ ὅλην τὸν νῦν ὁρὸς ὅποτε. It has been long suggested that ἀλλὰ ὅλην τὸν νῦν represents a later addition. This conjecture becomes more probable if we read ἀλλὰ ὅλην “fat tail” in the place of ἀλλὰ ὅλην; thus three choice pieces (ὃς ὁ ὑπεράντος) would appear in collocation, and ἀλλὰ ὅλην would then constitute a suitable explanation. We know from I Sam. 9, 24 where ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας should be read that the ἀλλὰ ὅλην was regarded as a choice piece which was reserved for the guest of honor.

Now the strange reading ὁ θεὸς for which the Septuagint and Peshitta correctly read ἡ ὁθοπονία, is explained: once the false reading ἀλλὰ ὅλην was in vogue, it was natural to change the immediately preceding ἀλλὰ ὅλην into ἡ ὁθοπονία.

Ezek. 30, 4. ὁ βασιλιάς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὃς ἔχει ὁθοπονίαν is perhaps corrupted from ὁ ὁμοίως ἡ ὁθοπονία ὃς ἔχει which fits well with the parallel ἡ ὁθοπονία τῆς ἁληθείας; comp. verse 9 where in a similar context ἡ ὁθοπονία and ἡ ὁθοπονία form a parallel. According to Cornill, we should read ὁ βασιλεὺς for the first ὁ βασιλεὺς also 38, 21. For the interchange of ὁ and ὁ see above on Isa. 60, 4.

Ezek. 37, 14. ἡ ὁθοπονία ἡ ὁθοπονία ὅταν ὁ ὁθοπονία ὅταν is strange. According to the context, we should rather expect a verb meaning “lead,” “bring.” It is therefore not too bold a conjecture to propose the pointing ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὃς ἔχει ὁθοπονίαν; comp. verse 21 ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὃς ἔχει ὁθοπονίαν. Though ἡ ὁθοπονία is nowhere else met with in construction with ὁ, we have examples of this very construction in the case of the synonymous verbs ἡ ὁθοπονία (Isa. 49, 10; Ps. 23, 2) and ἡ ὁθοπονία (II Kings 25, 20).

Ezek. 37, 23. ὁ ὁπερὰ ὁμοίως δεῦμα ὅταν seems to stand in the wrong place. It appears rather to belong immediately after ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὃς ἔχει comp. 18, 31 ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὃς ἔχει. If we thus transpose the words, it becomes unnecessary to change, with Symmachus, ἡ ὁθοπονία ὃς ἔχει into ἡ ὁθοπονία ὃς ἔχει. Indirectly, the transposition is favored by the fact that the Septuagint did not find the three words

50 See Geiger, Urschrift, 380 f.
Lexical Notes on Bible—Perles

Ezek. 37, 26נתהים is unintelligible, superfluous, and wanting in the Septuagint and Peshitta. The Septuagint omits in addition the immediately following words ורהיחי ואמת. Perhaps the text, in the form in which the Septuagint found it, read originally: דנה עלמה ויהיה זמהות והיה פסח ובתוכו לולה. On the basis of passages like Jer. 30, 19; Ezek. 36, 10, 11, a later scribe, it seems, inserted after ורהיחי ואמת the words ורהיחי ואמת, by which he desired to indicate that in the place of ורהיחי והיה the reader should proceed immediately with the following ונהה והיה מ. This gloss והיה את פסח which was erroneously contracted into one word והיה מ which then subsequently was received into the text; see above on 23, 24.

Mic. 5, 13והספורתי שרי is strange. In the first place, the cities have been mentioned in verse 10; secondly, from verse 11 on only objects of idolatrous worship are named. The proposed emendation אייריק suggests the reading שרי "thy (sacred) groves." No example, it is true, is available for יר in this specific sense. On the other hand, the verb משפי is used frequently (comp. Lev. 26, 30; Num. 33, 52) just with reference to the destruction of places of idolatrous worship; in the former place God is the speaker exactly as in our passage. The identical error is present Ezek. 6, 6 where in a similar context we read in our present text והיה מ which we should read with Cornill והיה מ.

Zeph. 3, 20ובשעת הכתוב אוחム is, as has long been recognized, impossibly correct. There is nevertheless no occasion for so radical a change as bpp הכתוב אוחם; we are simply to read ובOfMonthא, which phrase fits the context admirably and is so common that illustrations would be superfluous. For the dropping out of the נ and the resultant joining of the ב

31 The omission of the י after a word ending in a י is another instance of the phenomenon discussed in Analekten, 44 f.; comp. also Luzzatto on Jer. 23, 14. The instances adduced there might be considerably multiplied; comp. e. g. below on Ps. 59, 19.
to the following word we have numerous examples elsewhere; see *Analekten*, 49. In addition to the instances there adduced we may mention also Gen. 30, 11 and *ibid* Gen. 30, 13; comp. also Prov. 13, 10 where I. Kahan proposes for 

\[ \text{Zech. 9, 2} \]
\[ \text{is perhaps corrupted from} \]
\[ \text{The} \] in \[ \text{is probably only a dittogram of} \]
\[ \text{Exactly as in our passage} \]
\[ \text{follow immediately thereon, so is} \]
\[ \text{found also Ezek. 27, 9 by the side of those two cities.} \]

\[ \text{Zech. 12, 8} \]
\[ \text{seems to me to represent a later gloss on the} \]
\[ \text{for the sake of mitigating the bold comparison.} \]
\[ \text{The Targum proceeds similarly in passages like the present.} \]

\[ \text{Ps. 10, 17} \]
\[ \text{The words} \]
\[ \text{have thus far received no satisfactory explanation.} \]
\[ \text{The translation given by Kautzsch: “Thou quickenest their courage” is just as little acceptable. As a matter of fact,} \]
\[ \text{elsewhere only in a reflexive sense, = “direct one’s own mind to something”; it is never used as here with reference to another person’s heart. Nevertheless, it is altogether unnecessary to read, as has been proposed,} \]
\[ \text{All the difficulty disappears if we merely change the pointing: “weigher (fathomer) of their heart”; comp. Prov. 21, 2; 24, 12 where} \]
\[ \text{is used as here as an epithet of the Deity. As far as the sense goes, the nearest parallel to our passage is Ps. 17, 1-3 where the psalmist equally grounds his hope that his prayer may be heard on the conviction that God has proved him. It is quite possible that in the difficult phrase} \]
\[ \text{there is likewise present a corrupt form of} \]
\[ \text{comp. the parallel} \]

\[ \text{The Septuagint (ἐπιμασίαν τῆς καρδίας αἰτῶν) took in the sense of New-Hebrew בְּ אלהי; there is, however, no ground for assuming a specific nominal form בְּ (Krochmal) or בְּ (Chajes). The Talmud (Tos. Berakot 3, 4 and parallels), likewise, interprets in the same fashion as the Septuagint;} \]
Ps. 20, 10 יְהַוֶּהְמִהְשָׁעַת֫וֹת אָמְרוּ יִתְנָנְבִּיםֵרָאָם מִשָּׁעַת֫וֹת אָמְרוּ יִתְנָנְבִּיםֵרָאָם has perhaps arisen out of יִתְנָנְבִּיםֵרָאָם ְנָנְבִּיםֵרָאָם, i.e. יִתְנָנְבִּיםֵרָאָם; comp. above on Ezek. 22, 3.

Ps. 29, 3 כָּלַיִל היה עַל הַמְּיִם is strange when contrasted with the other verses where invariably a quality or effect of the Divine voice is referred to. I therefore conjecture that וכָּלַיִל היה עַל הַמְּיִם should be transposed; the whole passage would thus read כָּלַיִל היה עַל הַמְּיִם ואֲרֻמָּה. The expression כָּלַיִל היה עַל הַמְּיִם will not be taken exception to on the grounds of style when Job 37, 4 כָּלַיִל הָאָמָרְיוֹנְכַּל is compared where כָּלַיִל in a similar context is likewise employed as subject.

Ps. 37, 22 seems to have changed places with verse 26. The latter verse fits in less well in its present location after verse 25 than after verse 21 of which it is a continuation. In the same manner verse 22 goes well with verse 25 for which it gives the reason; it is certainly out of place after verse 21, there being nothing in that verse for which the clause introduced by מי may serve as a reason.

Ps. 45, 11 רבָּרֶא הַר נְחָמִי. The apostrophe to the queen as רבָּרֶא הַר נְחָמִי without further addition is strange. I would therefore suggest that the original read (as in verse 13) רבָּרֶא הַר נְחָמִי. The omission of the word is readily accounted for by haplography (בָּרֶא הַר).

Ps. 48, 10 רֶמֶנָּה יִשְׁמַר וְמִשְׁמַר אֲלִים is strange, because the vocative רֶמֶנָּה יִשְׁמַר וְמִשְׁמַר אֲלִים is in no wise prepared. I should propose the reading רֶמֶנָּה יִשְׁמַר וְמִשְׁמַר אֲלִים; “we liken Thy mercy (in its magnitude) to the seas.” This would do justice to the parallelism: verse 11 לע כָּל חַיְּם מִשְׁמַּךְ “and every creature," hence the sea, the heavens, and the earth as objects of comparison for the infinite greatness of God; comp. the cognate passage Ps. 36, 6-7 where it similarly reads מְשַׁמֵּר אֲלִים וְבָּרֶא הַר. The word בָּרֶא itself, it is true, occurs elsewhere as a figure of greatness in a totally different context: נוֹרָל בָּרֶא שָׁפָר Lam. 2, 13.

*" = "liken unto" as Isa. 40, 18. 25.

** = So read for מִשְׁמַר: Analekten, 62.
Ps. 50, 19. "Thou puttest thy hand forth after ill-gotten wealth" (or perhaps "with evil intention"?). Perhaps we ought to read with Chajes מ"ס which would fit in well with the following verse.

Ps. 51, 6. "I confess openly and make clear my guilt, that Thou mayest justify and clear me.

Ps. 78, 65. For read similarly we find II Sam. 22, 26. For מ"ס I should read conjecturally מ"ס "coming back to his senses" (comp. Syriac מ"ס). Similarly b. Berakot 30b מ"ס, the original reading being מ"ס, the haggadic exposition (from מ"ס) which follows presupposes the reading with מ"ס.

Ps. 88, 17. The text has been long recognized as a scribal error for מ"ס; but no satisfactory explanation has as yet been offered for the fact that just in this passage a superfluous מ"ס was introduced into the text. I take it that the מ"ס moved up from the end of verse 19 where we should read with Peshitta מ"ס. Once the faulty reading of the Masoretic text had come into existence, a scribe at a later period added the missing מ"ס which he placed above the line. By error, it moved further up and so came to be inserted in מ"ס. It is probable that the manuscript in question comprised two whole verses in one line; then indeed מ"ס and מ"ס stood above each other. An error of a quite similar character underlies the text of Job 15, 31-32; comp. Analekten, 82, and further below on Prov. 28, 1.
Ps. 119, 43 nDK 13T 'BO i>Vn bm- As far as I know, the correctness of the text has been questioned by nobody. Nevertheless, the sense in which p'Xfl is used here is very strange; for elsewhere it means only "take something away from someone by violence," but not, as here, "deny something to someone." I therefore suspect that i>Vn in the present passage should be derived from S^x; the omission of the N is a regular feature of verbs S^x. An exact parallel is the passage Eccl. 2, 10: DHD Tlbi'N K^'J'J?l^NEnCK !>31. Ps. 131, 2 'C'BJ"bv b]l3 presents, it is true, no grammatical difficulty; nevertheless, the use of 'C and b]l in two totally different senses in so close a proximity is not quite probable. The ancient versions appear to have had difficulties in understanding the three words: witness their efforts at translating them. All difficulty disappears when we read n (Tlv ha'y) for b]l. It will be found that thus the figure used in the clause preceding is carried out more consistently, the parallelism being of the chiastic order: "I have composed and quieted my soul as a child that is weaned of his mother, even as a weaned child is toward the Lord my soul." As for n, standing for ha'y, see above on Ezek. 22, 3.

Ps. 146, 6 шшмр амр = шш is very weak. We rather expect (as in the immediately preceding verses) the class of men mentioned with whom God keeps faith. I therefore propose to point шшмр: "He keepeth faith with the ungodly." In Exod. 34, 6 it is expressly stated that God shows mercy and truth even to sinners. We find elsewhere quite a number of examples where forms of the stem 'כ and the word ד7IJ? are confounded; so e. g. Ps. 37, 28 where the missing strophe beginning with ש is restored (in part after the Septuagint) by reading שנמיכ for which we should likewise read with Chajes שנמיכ; comp. also my remarks on Ps. sal. 2, in OLZ., V (1902), col. 278.

Ps. 147, 15 סנמיכ מים. The phrase only occurs in this passage; nor is it quite clear what the meaning
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is of the superfluous רְעָה. While our text is attested by the Septuagint, the preposition (רְעָה) is omitted in the Peshitta. I therefore conjecture that רְעָה was originally intended as a gloss on אשרי אָרְמָך, the glossator wishing to indicate that אשרי אָרְמָך here is to be taken in the sense of רְעָה אָרְמָך. By error, the gloss moved down to its place before מֵדִיה.

Prov. 1, 18 תַּחַת הָלְמָן לַאֲרוֹב יֵצֵגָו לְנַמְשָׁה. It is not easy to see what the suffixes in לַאֲרוֹב and לְנַמְשָׁה refer to. It has therefore been proposed to read, on the basis of the Septuagint and a single manuscript in Kennicott’s collection, as in verse 11, לֵדוֹ. But לְנַמְשָׁה still remains a puzzle. I therefore suspect that the original read דְּלַע, comp. 29, 10 חֲנִית דִּישָׁא לְהוֹלָם פָּסַר. Moreover, the synonym לַקֵּק in the parallel passage verse 11 speaks in favor of לְנַמְשָׁה. Once the two words were erroneously welded together into לְנַמְשָׁה, for the sake of the parallelism the suffix of the third person plural had to be appended to דְּלַע likewise.

Prov. 24, 11 חֲנִית לְמַעְתָּה לָמָּשָׁה לָמָּשָׁה אָמְשָׁה יַחְשֹׁר. For לָמָּשָׁה which occurs nowhere else in the sense of “tottering toward something” and, moreover, is rather weak by the side of the plastic כָּחִית, I would read כָּחִית: “that are stretched out.” In New-Hebrew we meet with the phrase כָּחִית לָמָּשָׁה (e.g. Eccl. rabba on 5. 6; Pesikta, ed. Buber, 181a.)

Prov. 25, 1 כֶּם אֵין רְוִי הָרְשֵׁי עָרוֹקִים חַכָּרִים בְּלָה. The superfluous בְּלָה which is missing in the Septuagint as well as in one Hebrew manuscript, belongs to the end of the verse where we should read בְּלָה in consonance with the subject עָרוֹקִים. The mistake arose through בְּלָה being written (as often) defectively: בְּלָה. The missing בְּלָה was then added by a copyist above the line, by mistake was drawn to the word בְּלָה which happened to stand right above it; see above on Ps. 88, 17.

Comp. verse 6 אָרְמָך. THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

The construct state combination לְנַמְשָׁה is paralleled by לְנַמְשָׁה כָּחִית.

Prov. 10, 3.
Prov. 31, 11 is very strange in this context; for which does not fit in well at all we should expect some ideal possession to be mentioned. Perhaps the original read which would fit in well with the parallel. The simplest way to account for the error is to assume that in some texts the word was abbreviated: אָשֵׁל, which then was falsely resolved into אָשֵׁל.

Job 21, 9 שִׁימָנוּת מָמְרוֹד. There is no ground for emending with the versions שִׁימָנוּת; rather read שִׁמְמוּת; comp. 12, 6 quite similarly שִׁימְמוּת לְפֶרֶדְרִים.

Job 31, 33 שָׁאָה כָּמָה נְאֹרָה מְשֹׁשַׁי. Read נְאֹרָה: "If I covered my transgressions before men," to which the parallel is a suitable sequel. For the construction comp. Gen. 18, 17 וַיְהִי הָרְכִּיסָה אֲנָוָא נָאָבְרִים אָשָׁר אָנָי נָעָה. The interchange of ב and מ is to be explained on the basis of the Old Hebrew script; comp Analeken, 52.

Cant. 3, 6 מי גאַוּת עַל הָאֵזֶר כָּתִים וְתוֹם עָשָׂה מַסְפָּרָה מִרְאֶה הַמַּלְכָּה? owes its obscurity to a mistake in the pointing. We ought manifestly to read מַסְפָּרָה: "Who is this that cometh up out of the wilderness like pillars of smoke from the perfume of myrrh and frankincense." The words seem to be a mere gloss on what precedes. The smoke as it comes up straight out of the incense (comp. Ezek. 8, 11) is indeed a fitting object of comparison.

Lam. 1, 14 שַׁנָּה בְּשֵׁשׁ. It is generally agreed to point the first two words on the basis of the versions and the Midrash; but no one has noticed that the word שֵׁשׁ is likewise badly pointed. There cannot be any reasonable doubt that the correct pointing should be שֵׁשׁ (from שֵׁשׁ I Sam. 20, 3): "He hath watched for my steps"; comp. Job 13, 27; 14, 16; 33, 11. The words שְׁנָאָה בַּשֶּׁשׁ express the same as מִשְׁפָּאָה לְחֵלָה in verse 13.
Lam. 1, 20 Mahath Shelah har vayimim, in the present passage the word niD'K dropped out in front of niD3; the whole probably read originally niJD3 niO'N. For the expression comp. Ps. 55, 5. As for the graphic ground for the omission see Analekten, 91.

Lam. 2, 2 niD'K melach tehrir. It is stylistically exceedingly uncommon to find a single object depending upon two verbs asyndetically placed by the side of each other, especially, as is the case here, when the verbs are separated by an additional word. I therefore believe that the original read 'He hath abhorred the land'; to this the following nsScO bbn is indeed a suitable parallel. The word niD'K without the article to designate the land of Judah is found once more Jer. 3, 2. The Hiphil niD3 occurs only once more, Job 21, 10, in a different context; but the Kal is found Jer. 14, 19 exactly as in our passage of God abhorring Zion.

Lam. 2, 4 D'niD'K is strange not only on account of the masculine form of the verb, but particularly for the reason that in the parallel parts of the verse transitive verbs are employed. An old manuscript reads 'He hath abhorred the land'; it will, however, suffice to point out (as Piel); comp. Arabic nassaba used of the horse pricking up the ears.

Lam. 2, 16 D'niD'K is doubly difficult: in the first place, an object is wanting (hence it is that the Septuagint and Peshitta supply the object in translation as if the text read D'niD3; comp. Ps. 35, 25); secondly, D'niD3 is suitable only in the mouth of the Babylonians who actually conquered Judah, but not, as we read now, in the mouth of third parties who remained inactive and...
only gazed at the misfortune of Judah with malicious joy. I therefore am bold enough to propose the reading וַיַּעַצֵּב: "O Bel, O Anu! certainly this is the day that we looked for; we have found, we have seen it." The nations hostile to the Jews thus give thanks to the Babylonian gods for having brought about the overthrow of Judah.* While יִפְסָל occurs several times in the Old Testament, no example is available for עָנָב (if we except the proper name אָנָב). The author of the poem was certainly familiar with the Babylonian religion; the proof is afforded by the peculiar use of הָרַבּ in 4, 10 in the sense of Labartu as a common noun designating demons; comp. my article "Labartu im A. T." in OLZ., VI (1903), 244-45.

Lam. 2, 22 אֶפֶרַע אֶפֶרַע is rendered in the Septuagint ἵππορήσσα which it is certainly difficult to bring into consonance with the meaning of the Hebrew verb. I suspect that the Greek is corrupt: the translator most likely wrote: ἵππορήσσα having had in mind the sense which the word has in New-Hebrew ("strike," "beat," both in the Kal and Piel) unsuitable though the meaning be in the present passage. We find ἰππορήσσει elsewhere for אֶפֶרַע (Isa. 55, 12) and בִּרְכָה (Prov. 17, 18). The two Greek verbs, ἰππορήσσει and ἰππορήσσει, moreover, are confounded elsewhere (Amos 6, 5 B; Ez. 29, 7 A).

Lam. 3, 1 אֲנִי תַּהַבְּרָא עַל֥וֹ בְּשֵׁם עֶבֶרָה I would explain: "I am the man that hath seen affliction in the tribe of His (that is, God's) wrath": שֶׁהָאָבֻמִּים עֶבֶרָה is used here exactly in the same sense as עֶבֶרָה וֹנְכָּר (Isa. 10, 6) and רֹדֶעָרָה (Jerem. 7, 29). The writer means that he was able to study affliction by the means of a typical case.

Lam. 3, 49 עָזִי נְגוֹיָא אֲגַי הָקָם מַעַי הַמַּהוָה. After נִכְהָה מַעַי הַמַּהוָה occurs nowhere else and is grammatically peculiar. I there-

* Comp. Judg. 16, 23 where the Philistines give thanks to their god Dagon for their victory over Samson.

* It is well known that chapters 2 and 4, according to the almost universal opinion of commentators, belong to one and the same author.

Eccl. 1, 8 is simply to be explained: “All words are toiling.” that is to say, no words are adequate to express it fully. With this sense the following goes extremely well. In a similar context we read Sirach 43, 30. Judah Ibn Tibbon, moreover, seems to have taken our passage in the sense indicated; he writes in his translation of Bahya’s “Duties of the Heart” 

Eccl. 5, 2. The second half of the verse is no logical sequel to the first. In the place of we rather expect a word which would indicate the consequences of much talking for the fool. I would therefore read; comp. Prov. 11, 2. Or is in our passage to be derived, as in Jer. 3, 9, from the stem and to be explained as “disgrace”?

Eccl. 5, 16 was read, it is true, by the versions; it is nevertheless peculiar both in form and sense. I do not therefore hesitate to propose. As was frequently omitted.

81 See above on Lam. 2, 2 where a similar error has been noted.
82 I, 10 (ed. Baumgarten-Stern, 34b).
at the end of a word, the Masoretic reading readily followed from

Eccl. 7, 26 אֶרֶץ הָעָרָיו מִצְרָיִם is very awkward; we rather expect in this very part of the verse the mention of a part of the body as a parallel to לע and ירי. The difficulty disappears when we read נַשָּׂאֵה אֶחְיָאֵה and then dropped out by haplography. As for the sense, comp. Prov. 7, 25 where men are warned of the ways of the strange woman.

Neh. 5, 11 cannot possibly be correct. The commentators therefore follow Geiger in reading מִשָּׂא which indeed fits the context admirably, but is nevertheless open to objection, it being difficult to account for the dropping out of the נ. May we not rather read מִשָּׂא מִדָּו as in verse 4 מִשָּׂא הָבֶסֶת יְבֵשֶׁת? It is easy to understand how this rare (originally Babylonian) word would be replaced by מִשָּׂא, particularly if we remember that in the Old Hebrew alphabet נ and ט are quite similar; comp. Lagarde, Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung der Proverbien, on 19, 28; 24, 2; 28, 2; and my Analekten, 50, on Isa. 65, 23.

I Chr. 29, 22 יָשַׁב לְחַיָּהֶנָּה לָנוּ is grammatically peculiar because of the want of an object to יָשַׁב and also for the reason that לָנוּ is superfluous. I suspect that the original read לָו: “and they anointed him to be ruler.” A later scribe mistook לָו for an abbreviated לָו; see above on Gen. 31, 13. Now the parallelistic structure of our verse is completely restored, the

* Ps. 10, 6 some exegetes propose likewise the reading יָשַׁב for אֶרֶץ.
construction of the object with ה occurring three times. The spelling נל for ְל does not, it is true, occur elsewhere in the Old Testament; but that may be a mere accident as the possessive suffix is frequently found spelled with נ.
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The text of this remarkable document which Prof. Schechter has published in the first volume of his 'Documents of Jewish Sectaries' (Cambridge 1910) is unfortunately in a very defective and corrupt condition. The learned editor has succeeded by his numerous and very felicitous emendations in smoothing over many of the difficulties of the text and in making its contents intelligible to the reader. But in a considerable number of passages the corruptions are so deep-seated that they have baffled the ingenuity and skill of Prof. Schechter himself. The difficulties which surround the text and its contents will never be solved adequately without some fresh discoveries, which, as the editor remarks slyly in his Preface (p. iv), might even be made 'almost simultaneously.' I venture nevertheless to give below a few corrections and restorations which occurred to me in the course of a careful perusal of the document, and most of which, I need hardly say, are of a purely hypothetical character.

Page 1, line 16. Read לַגָּם נִבְרַת (= נִבְרַת). The phrase is an adaptation of Deut. 19, 14; comp. p. 5, l. 20.

P. 2, l. 8. Read רְוֹחֵית מְאָה, which would be parallel to the preceding מְשָׁהִים.

l. 10. I would suggest that והיוו = יָם, 'Happenings of eternity.' The phrase would thus be parallel to the preceding והיוו עַלָּם (p. 13, l. 8). The suggestion of the Rev. J. A. Montgomery (p. lix) to combine והיוו with the following מָה in the sense of the Syriac יִרְמָא, is altogether inappropriate. The language of the work is singularly free from all direct Aramaic influences. The
only distinct Aramaism, as distinguished from Mishnic expressions, to be found in the document is אָלְּפָד (Mishnic אָלְּפָד). p. 10, l. 10. Contrast with דַּבְּרֶהוֹ, p. 2, l. 7.

P. 4, l. 2. מַעַלְיָה as in the original passage Ez. 44, 15.

l. 3. הָנָּלִים seems to refer to proselytes of the Sect; comp. Isa. 56, 6; Esther 9, 27.

l. 12. מַגְרוֹר as in Habak. 2, 1. The meaning of the passage seems to be as follows: 'At the completion of the End according to the number of these years, no man must re-join the House of Judah; but every one must stand on his watch-tower. For the wall (of separation) is built, the statute (or the true religion, according to the Sect) is removed (from Judah to Damascus).'</l. 19. (זָהְבִי). The editor’s rendering ‘wall’ does not quite give the exact meaning of the word. The word which means ‘partition,’ seems to be used here in the sense of ‘frail and shaky fence’ as opposed to theיך (l. 12 above) ‘the strong stone fence’ of the Sect. The opponents of the Sect are accused of having removed the ancient boundary at the instigation of ‘the man of mockery,’ the ‘preacher of lies’ (pp. 1, l. 14; 5, l. 20), and of having afterwards erected aץ which they ‘daubed with untempered mortar’ (pp. 8, l. 12; 19, l. 24). In the place of the stringent ruler of the Sect, which the latter claimed to have been the original law of God as revealed to the ancient, their opponent set up a lax discipline which must lead to irreligion.

P. 5, l. 19. בְּהַרְשָׁעַת אַתֶּנֶסָא בְּרַאֲשָׁהְוַת בֵּיהַנֵטימ הֵסָאָל אַתֶּנֶסָא אַתֶּנֶסָא. rd. בְּהַרְשָׁעַת אַתֶּנֶסָא בְּרַאֲשָׁהְוַת בֵּיהַנֵטימ הֵסָאָל אַתֶּנֶסָא.

P. 6, l. 16. בְּהַנָּהֵךְ. The editor emends. Perhaps the text is to be retained, the meaning being that the opponents of the Sect appropriate the property of the Sanctuary for their own use (emax).}

l. 17. לְהַבִּי, etc. Adaptation from Ezekiel 22, 26, with the verbs transposed; so below, p. 12, l. 19 f.

P. 8, l. 6. יְהֹודְלָהְוַת אָיִם בֵּאָר. The editor reads יְהֹודְלָהְוַת אָיִם בֵּאָר. Perhaps rd. יְהֹודְלָהְוַת אָיִם בֵּאָר; comp. Isa. 58, 7.
NOTES ON “FRAGMENTS OF ZADOKITE WORK”—SEGAL


P. 9, l. 11. "of the property," comp. p. 12, l. 10. The editor's emendation (מִומֵד מִומֵד) would be greatly improved by reading בְּכַפָּר. The passage would then read as follows: 'If anything is lost, and it is not known who has stolen it, then in the Meeting-place of the camp in which the theft has been committed, the owner shall adjure by the oath of the curse,' etc. מִומֵד would correspond to בְּכַפָּר (comp. Ps. 74, 8; Soṭah 9, 15 בְּכַפָּר), and would be identical with בְּכַפָּר נוֹז (comp. also Job 30, 23). See the Editor's Introd., p. xxv.

1.16 ff. The Law of Evidence. I would propose to read in 1.21 נוֹז for אָרָר. יִבְשָל נוֹז, or perhaps, as suggested by the editor, נוֹז נוֹז לְשׁוֹנָה, for נוֹז נוֹז לְשׁוֹנָה. I would regard נוֹז נוֹז as an ordinary statute, the transgression of which does not entail the death penalty, in contradistinction to נוֹז נוֹז in 1.17. The law would thus be as follows: If a man commits a capital crime in the presence of one witness, he should be charged by the witness before the Censor who should make a record of the charge. If the man should commit again the same crime in the presence of one witness only, then the matter must be reported to the Censor, and when the man is caught committing the crime a third time, he is to suffer the death penalty. If, however, there are only two faithful witnesses against him, he is only to be excluded from the Purity (whatever that may mean). But if the charge is not one involving the death penalty (halakhah), then two witnesses are sufficient for condemnation to the prescribed penalty, and one for exclusion from the Purity. This requirement of three witnesses in a capital charge, and of two in an ordinary charge, may, perhaps, be based upon a peculiar interpretation of the Scriptural text "at the mouth of two witnesses or at the mouth of three witnesses" (Deut. 17, 6;
The power of the Judge to combine the independent testimony of single witnesses in capital charges is against Rabbinic law; comp. Babil Makkot 6b.

P. 10, l. 18. The editor points הָרַע, and combines it with the following וּמִלָּה: 'And surely none shall,' etc. This cannot possibly be correct. The word should be pointed הָרַע, being a second adjective to the preceding שָׂרֵב: 'a base and vain word.'

L. 20. I think the reading of the text וְשָׁמָּה may be correct. The meaning of the law would be that work which is permitted on the Sabbath, should only be performed in the house and not in the field. Or, perhaps, it is a prohibition against preparing, on week days, Sabbath things in the field. The editor's interpretation that the prohibition is directed against planning work on the Sabbath can hardly be applied to the words לְעֵשָׁה תָּא עַבְוָר, etc.

P. 11, l. 4. D'K'P. K'd. probably D'H'. The final D may be ditto-graphed from the following 2.

L. 23. לָא ... The editor restores השבתת (a misprint for הבשתת ?), though he confesses to be unable to explain the meaning of the passage. I doubt, however, whether the passage has anything to do with the Sabbath. The laws of the Sabbath are concluded in l. 18 with the prohibition respecting sacrifice on the Sabbath. This prohibition leads naturally to the injunction that an unclean person should not be allowed to contaminate the altar (l. 18-21). And this in its turn suggests the law that no unclean person should enter the House of Worship (l. 21-22). Then follows our present passage which seems also to be connected with the House of Worship (l. 22 ff.): בֵּיהֵר עַבְוָרוֹת הַקַּחַת יִקְפּוּא אָם לְעֵשָׁה לְאַל עַבְוָרוֹת אַל עַבְוָרוֹת כָּלָה הָא קָרֵיס הָא ... I would suggest to take הקחל as the subject of the following verbs, and to restore for כָּלָה ... 'And when the trumpets sound forth (to summon to divine service), let the Congregation come early or come late; and let them not disturb the whole service: it is a holy service.' The passage would
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thus contain a prohibition against worshippers filing into the House of Prayer while the Service is in progress. They should either come before the Service begins, or after it is over, when they may form a quorum for a new Service or pray privately; comp. the blowing of the horn on the eve of the Sabbath, Babli Shabbat 35b.

P. 12, l. 5. זריז. I would suggest to read רזח “Men must watch him whether he will relax (from breaking the Sabbath).” The editor’s translation ‘whether lie be healed of it,’ is hardly suitable in this connection.

l. 22-23. תחא...בקך... I would restore as follows: זה מרר מנהוג כהנהלך עבץ והשהות “And this is the usage of the settlement of the camps to walk in them (viz. the laws, understood) in (the period of) the end of wickedness.” Comp. p. 13, l. 20 and p. 6, l. 10. The preceding lines (19-22) speak of the settlement in cities, and form probably the epilogue to the laws contained in pp. 9-12, many of which can only have their application in the larger settlements of the Sect, e.g. the laws relating to evidence and judges (p. 9, l. 16ff.) ; laws relating to the altar and the Sanctuary (p. 11, l. 17 ff.; p. 12, l. 1 f.). The present passage, however, introduces laws relating to the small village settlements (מנהוג), their constitution and their government by the priest or Censor, which extend from p. 13, l. 1 to p 14, l. 12.

P. 13, l. 2. בכם is quite unsuitable to the context. Read probably בכמה ‘And in the place where there are ten.’

l. 10. תירם ... מadelphia. The editor (p. 114, n. 7) remarks that the MS. suggests some such words as לועתי מadelphia תירם or ל אשרא מי תירם. I would, therefore, restore ל אשרא מי תירם “He shall loose all the bonds of their knots, (namely) of him who is oppressed and crushed in his Congregation by the hand of the presumptuous ones.”

l. 16. חא... (קשוח). The editor thinks that חא... points to the reading מחוה; but this would produce no intelligible meaning. I would restore חא עניין ’a sure covenant,’ or contract; comp.
p. 20, l. 12; Nehem. 10, 1 (Heb.); and the Rabbinic הנקן (Babli B. Meši'a 63a) in a slightly different sense. See also Kohut, s. v. The passage will therefore read thus: "No man shall perform a thing as buying or selling, unless he has spoken to the Censor, and he (the Censor) shall make a covenant between the parties."

l. 17. למטה. The editor translates 'to him who expels,' and remarks (p. 151, n. 22): "Perhaps it reads למטה 'open place.'" Neither of these explanations is quite satisfactory. Who expels, and whom? Again, how would 'open place' suit the context? In view of the fact that the whole section beginning in l. 7 (ו יבכיה למטה) and ending in l. 20 (ו יבכיה למטה), deals exclusively with the duties and powers of the Censor, I would make bold to retain the editor's pointing למטה, but to translate the passage as follows: "And so in the case of him who divorces his wife. And he (viz. the Censor) shall ...." The missing words may have contained some enactment that a divorce should only be granted through the Censor. Just as commercial transactions had to be ratified by the Censor (l. 15-16; comp. last note), so also was the Censor's permission required in cases of divorce. ונה in next line may perhaps stand for ונה (note the ונה at the beginning of next word!), which should be compared with Deut. 22, 24. Note also the following (תמאתּו) ... ונההבב ב. The interpretation of the passage as referring to divorce would, of course, be rendered untenable if we accept the editor's theory that our Sect was opposed to divorce (Introd., p. xvii, and note 16 with the references). But no explicit prohibition of divorce is to be found in our text. The passage upon which the editor bases his theory (p. 4, l. 20 ff.), is only directed against polygamy. There is nothing in that passage to prohibit a man from divorcing his wife, if, for example, she is found to be immoral. In such a case the man would have to remain celibate, a condition which would be in complete accordance with the ascetic tendencies of our Sect.
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P. 14, l. 15 ff. Restore as follows: ב^xS ?XU nb J'K"ie>Kninruh ...xbl TIB muj? !?3 C1H lb J'X "IB>K; comp. the editor's notes, p. LIV, § XVIII, 9-11, and additional note to the passage, p. LVIII.

l. 20. Read, perhaps, מבקור.

P. 16, l. 14. The editor suggests ב"ותאך hahokheit after ישראך. Perhaps would be more suitable; comp. ינונכ in the preceding line.

P. 20, l. 17 f. I would restore as follows: הרבי פֶּסִית [ב]עייקב Sherman. בירת אל אָנָבַר אָטָש אל וַעֲרַו לָכָנִים אָשִׂי אָנָחַי. "They who turned from transgression in Jacob, who kept the covenant of God, then spake one to another, that every man might establish his brother"; comp. p. xliv, note 40, and Mal. 3, 16, from which also the following words are derived.

l. 28 f. After 살아ו I would restore as follows: המאן רשע נמ ngắnאני; comp. Dan. 9, 15.

I may add here a few words to supplement the instructive but meager observations of the editor on the linguistic character of the document (Introd., p. xi). The work is written throughout in the biblical style, but needless to say this style was with the author an artificial mode of expression. The imperfect consecutive is used throughout text A, wherever Classical Hebrew would have used it. But in text B, the simple perfect is often found where we should expect the imperfect consecutive; comp. p. 19, l. 30-31; p. 20, l. 11, 23, 31, 32. Likewise, the perfect consecutive is used regularly wherever the classical style requires it. Exceptions are p. 9, l. 17 (contrast l. 19); p. 13, l. 6; p. 14, l. 4, p. 15, l. 8.

The infinitival construction is also very common, e. g. p. 1, l. 4; p. 7, l. 20; p. 15, l. 11. The infinitive is found in a nominal sense in p. 8, l. 5 f. The infinitive is used to express obligation in p. 4, l. 11; p. 9, l. 23.

The genitive is expressed by the construct state. Circumlocution of the genitive is found a few times but only with י, p. 12, l. 6; p. 13, l. 5, 7, 13. A chain of constructs is found in p. 12, l. 18. Apposition is perhaps found in p. 4, l. 6, 9; p. 7, l. 5; p. 20, l. 5, 7.
The relative is alwaysystery— only found once, and that in text B, p. 20, l. 4.

The iteration of an act is expressed by the auxiliary 39p. 9, l. 19. Note the forms p. 6, l. 20, etc. p. 10, l. 1, etc. as an adversative p. 5, l. 8; p. 9, l. 6. So p. 12, l. 4. The numeral stands after the noun in p. 1, l. 9-10, etc. p. 14, l. 21.

In the vocabulary note the use of p. 3, l. 8; p. 6, l. 11; p. 20, l. 14 (contrast l. 1, 28). p. 12, l. 16. 'possession' p. 12, l. 10; perhaps also p. 9, l. 11; comp. above the note on this passage. p. 13, l. 3. ממא p. 12, l. 6; p. 13, l. 2; p. 14, l. 7. הוביחי p. 9, l. 3. p. 4, l. 8, 10. י"ע p. 12, l. 12. To the Mishnic expressions enumerated by the editor add p. 11, l. 10. ממא p. 11, l. 12 (comp. Kohut, s. v., V, 235a). ממא p. 11, l. 13. ממא p. 22. 'while,' but not followed by p. 12, l. 15. Note the form p. 7, l. 5; p. 19, l. 1; p. 14, l. 2, which is still used in "Yiddish," a dialect which has preserved quite a considerable number of colloquial expressions from ancient Hebrew. With the use of 39p. 7, comp. the Rabbinic expression , etc. See Kohut, s. v., VI, 138a.

The Mishnic usages found in this document may, however, be very old. They are certainly anterior to the Christian era. The general purity of the author's style and grammar, the facility with which he writes in flowing Biblical Hebrew, and his adroitness in twisting round biblical phrases and adapting them for his purpose, all prove him to have belonged to a whole circle of writers who cultivated the composition of books in an early and archaic style in imitation of the earlier canonical literature. In other words, the author belonged to the school of writers from which emanated the Palestinian apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical literature which was certainly composed in a tolerably pure Biblical Hebrew, with a more or less large admixture of Mishnic expressions and forms. The language of the present work affords us, therefore, an excellent illustration of the character and style of the Hebrew
originals of such works as the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and even of the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne M. H. Segal

England
STRACK'S "ABODA ZARA"


Strack has published four treatises of the Mishna to serve as text-books for those who wish to be initiated into the post-biblical Jewish literature. One of them has appeared in a third edition, and two in second editions, the best proof of their usefulness. Strack not only gives help to the student by a very careful punctuation, explanatory notes, and a good glossary, but also tries to present as correct a text as possible, with the material accessible to him, which also includes some MSS. Fully conscious that it is at present impossible to present a critical edition, he tries to establish a text which is much nearer to the original than any other (see especially his introduction to *Schabbath*, Leipzig 1890, p. 7). In this he has certainly succeeded, and his texts mean a considerable step forward. One can only express the wish that his promise to continue these editions may be realized in the near future.

The second edition of his *Aboda Zara* is a marked advance upon the first (Berlin 1888). Not only has the text and especially its vocalization been carefully revised, but the apparatus has also been increased by the addition of the vocalized Codex Kaufmann and the editio princeps of the Palestinian Talmud. Among the texts utilized, the Palestinian version prevails, being represented by three important codices. The Babylonian version, on the other hand, is only represented by the Venice edition and occasionally the Munich MS, according to Rabbinowicz. Here the material might easily have been increased by the addition of
Alfasi, the oldest complete witness of this version. Of course, only the editio princeps (Constantinople 1509) is available for critical purposes, as all the later editions are interpolated (see Rabbinowicz, IV, 4-5; מַאֲסֶר לְךָ הַדְּרַסָּה הַחֲלָמוֹד, 130-1). In addition, the Berlin Library possesses an important old MS. of this work (Cat. Steinschneider, No. 6). Alfasi proves, for instance, that the addition in I, 3 (p. 9*, note h) ובו כֹּל לָאֹפָה which occurs in M with the variant ובו כֹּל לָאֹפָה is not characteristic of the Babylonian version, since he did not have it. It is interpolated from a Baraita as it is introduced 14a by אָמַר מַעַלְתָּה. Krauss, MGWJ., 1902, 322, thinks that it was taken from Tosefta I, 4; but there the wording is different. In Alfasi also the addition to II, 1 (p. 11, n. c) is missing, exactly as it is in M. It is taken from Tosefta III, 3. As Strack often gives minute variations, one does not see why they are omitted for the first Mishna; in I, 2 P reads שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ which, though incorrect, ought to have been mentioned, as the confusion between שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ and שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ occurs very often: I, 3 P M read מַלָּאָךְ מִן חַיִּים ; I, 4 (p. 10*, l. 1) P and Alfasi reads פָּסָחִים פָּסָחִים without the article; I, 5 P מָכַלְמֵהַנָּם מָכַלְמֵהַנָּם Alfasi מָכַלְמֵהוֹן מָכַלְמֵהוֹן Aruk מָכַלְמֵהוֹן; I, 6 Alfasi reads תְּרֵכֵּה וּנְקֵה תְּרֵכֵּּהוּ and M reads שְׁבָרִים which reading is supported by as early an authority as R. Hai Gaon in whose מָכַלְמֵהוֹן X, almost the whole of chapter I is incorporated and for which Cod. Berlin 1605 might have been compared. Strack reads שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ : ib. B M read שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ מִן חַיִּים וּמִקְדָּשׁ מִן חַיִּים , but R. Hai and R. Hananel agree with Strack's text: Alfasi reads שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ אָבַר בַּשָּׁם מַשְׁכִּיר שְׁמַעְתֵּךְ וְלָא שִׁכְּרוּת. The addition to I, 8, note, which Tosafot found in some codices but rejected is not found in the majority of codices according to the Tosefot R. Elhanan (Husiatyn 1901, f. 20b) nor in that of R. Tam. After רַב יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל בֶּן אָדָם [B אַלְאָדוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל] is omitted, for בֶּן אָדָם . These remarks, which are partly taken from Rabbinowicz, do not deal with important readings and only refer to the apparatus. As to the text, it is worth mentioning that all corrections introduced by R. Josef Ashkenas of Safed (see MGWJ., 1898, 42 ff.) after collation of numerous MSS., are, as far as I have compared them, found in Strack's text; all he throws out occur only in the apparatus, certainly a splendid testimony for Strack's accuracy and thoroughness. Only one unimport-
ant variant is put in the apparatus, I, 8 (11*, note a) where Ashkenas once more agrees with Codex Kaufmann. So the publication of Adeni's šaláma in the new Wilna edition of the Mishna does not add new material to our text. I have only noted that in I, 7, Maimonides is to be added to the authorities adduced for the reading (p. 10*, note w). Strack observes (p. 4*) that B (the Babylonian Talmud ed. Venice) often agrees with the common text of the Mishna editions, which means that these editions were changed according to the printed text of the Babylonian Talmud. This took place in the earliest known editions, subsequent to that of Naples. So the edition Venice, 1546 (folio) has the addition p. 9*, note h, and omits the words p. 10*, note p (the following leaf is missing in the copy at my disposal). The same text is offered by the edition of Venice 1549 with Obadia Bertinoro's commentary which contains in the copy belonging to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City, all the 6 Sedarim. not merely the last three which Stein- schneider (Cat. Bodl.) and others believed were the only ones printed; comp. also Strack's Introduction to the Talmud, 4th ed., 77. This edition also contains the additions I, 8 (p. 11*, note v) and II, 1 (ib., note c), etc. It seems, therefore, that all the known Mishna editions with the exception of that of Naples are interpolated and thus useless for scientific purposes. Strack has rightly neglected them. It is curious that, as far as we know, the manuscripts containing the text of the Mishna without any commentary (Codd. Cambridge, Kaufmann, Parma) represent the Palestinian version, while those with Maimonides' commentary seem to be independent of both the Palestinian and Babylonian version. Whether they agree among themselves has not yet been investigated.

The translation which Strack has added to the new edition will be a great help to the student, but it is often too literal and unidiomatic, and even lacks clearness. I quote two examples: p. 2, l. 59 Strack translates: "Der Tag, an dem er...vom Meere heimgekehrt ist...nur dieser Tag und dicscr Mann ist verboten" instead of: An dem Tage, an dem jemand von einer Seereise heimgekehrt ist..., und nur an diesem Tage und mit diesem Mann ist es verboten (Geschäfte abzuschliessen). P. 3, l. 11 is unin-
telligible, as it reads at present. To “bestimmt Angegebenes” the addition that it is meant for idolatrous purposes is indispensable. The change from plural to singular p. 1, l. 6, though occurring in the text ought to have been avoided. In the notes appended to the translation, special attention is paid to parallels from classical literature, which are very instructive. Of course, here and there, one must disagree with Strack. Thus, p. 1, note 2, ἄναψεν refers to borrowing of things which are returned as received, ἄναψεν to money or such things the value of which is to be returned. P. 2, note 15: Practical decisions are not mentioned as a basis for discussions, but as the strongest and unmistakable proof for the opinion of its authors (comp. י"א יא B. b. 130b). The glossary which also has been carefully revised is very useful. It is peculiar that it contains an article "הָעַרְבָּה (eigentl. וַעָרָבָה)" since the editor rightly, though against most of his authorities, in this new edition, has always connected it with the following word; יַעֲפוּנָה is rendered in the glossary "jemdn. bitten lassen" while in the translation he has "leißen." Such little inaccuracies will easily be avoided in a later edition. The little book can be warmly recommended and will undoubtedly prove a great help to the student. Strack has once more earned the gratitude of all those who are interested in a scientific study of post-biblical Jewish literature.

Strack has speedily fulfilled his promise to continue his excellent editions of parts of the Mishna, which he gave in his Aboda Zara. There have just appeared two more treatises: Sanhedrin-Makkoth. Die Mischnatraktate über Strafrecht und Gerichtsverfahren nach Handschriften und alten Drucken. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von Prof. D. Dr. Hermann L. Strack. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910. pp. 60 + 56, 8°. The editor follows the same method and principles as in his Aboda Zara and the same general remarks apply to this new work. The apparatus has been increased by the readings of the famous De Rossi MS. 138, which shows a close affinity with the Cambridge MS. edited by Lowe and the Kaufmann MS., and hardly offers any new and striking differences as it does in some other treatises. The Palestinian version, therefore, is represented in the apparatus even stronger than in Aboda Zara. Strack, in the
introduction, expresses his doubts whether the Cambridge MS. actually represents the Palestinian recension of the Mishna, a doubt that was first uttered in 1887 by J. H. Weiss in衲ראז, IV, p. 225-30. However, the three manuscripts are undoubtedly very closely connected with the Mishna text of the Palestinian Talmud and they all form one family. A glance at the variants put together in Krauss' description of the Kaufmann manuscript (MGWJ., 1902) proves this point. The Babylonian version is again systematically represented only by the Venice edition of this Talmud, the Munich MS. being quoted only occasionally according to the Variæ Lectiones of Rabbinowicz. In this respect the new edition of Sanhedrin by Krauss (The Mishna treatise Sanhedrin, edited with an introduction, notes and glossary, Leiden, 1909 (pp. XIII + 61, 8°) offers much more, recording all the important variants collected by Rabbinowicz. But Krauss includes in his apparatus readings of texts which are without any critical value like the later editions of the Palestinian Talmud; their disagreement between one another has as little interest for the construction of the text as the readings of the Wilna edition, where, in the margin, Rabbinowicz also has been excerpted. Strack's principle of an eclectic use of the different texts also recommends itself more than the reprint of the editio princeps given by Krauss. Altogether, the question which is the editio princeps of the Mishna is not quite settled as yet. The Seminary Library has recently acquired 8 leaves (forming the thirteenth quire) of a Mishna edition in square characters without any commentary in octavo, which seems to me to have been printed before the edition of 1492. The leaves contain the end of Baba batra and almost the whole of Sanhedrin and offer a good many very interesting readings, not found in the apparatus of Strack's and Krauss' editions. I will describe this fragment elsewhere. For a second edition, this fragment, as well as the editio princeps of the Talmud (Barco 1496 found, if I am not mistaken, in Munich), and of Alfasi ought to be utilized as well as the variants of Rabbinowicz, which for Makkot are also easily accessible in Friedmann's edition. The oldest known variants, those recorded in the Talmud as for VI, 5 the remark of the Palestinian Talmud also belong into the apparatus.
In the list of authorities p. 6-7 those recorded among the variants ought to be added.

Without going into any further details, I only add a remark about one point, the connection between Sanhedrin and Makkot. On the one hand, this is shown not only by the contents but also by the form (comp. VII, 4, IX, 1 

אֲלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפֵי... אָלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפּוֹן IX, 1 

אֲלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפֵי... אָלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפּוֹן XI 

אֲלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפֵי... אָלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפּוֹן 

with Makkot II, 1 

אֲלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפֵי... אָלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפּוֹן 

and III, 1 

אֲלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפֵי... אָלָלָהּ נַחַשְׁפּוֹן 

according to Hoffmann (Ha-Miseronah I (1887), p. 215) was probably originally the end of Sanhedrin). On the other hand, the Babylonian Talmud expressly mentions Makkot as a separate treatise (Shebu'ot beginning; comp. Hoffmann, Nesikin, p. XIV).

Jewish Theological Seminary of America

ALEXANDER MARX

of America
BERRY’S “OLD TESTAMENT AMONG SEMITIC RELIGIONS”


One reads so often the statement—with variations, of course—that nearly all the doctrines of the Hebrews were derived from Babylonia, that a change is welcome. The present volume, however, offers us more than that. It has merits of its own and is rather instructive, especially for the general reader. The author, though a staunch believer in the divine character of the Old Testament, tries his best to be impartial. He discusses the often ventilated question: What features of the Old Testament teachings are to be considered as distinctively Hebrew, and what features are common to the Hebrews and some other nation or nations. The book is divided into five parts and contains a rather useful, selected bibliography. In the first part the author gives a brief sketch of Semitic history and discusses preliminary problems: To what extent shall chronological matters enter into the discussion? How did the different nations borrow from one another, aside from the Hebrews?

The second part deals with divine nature: personality, unity, and spirituality; the metaphysical attributes of God: eternity, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience; and His moral attributes: faithfulness, righteousness, and love, including mercy and grace.

Personality is prominent in all the Semitic religions. Unity is the especially marked contrast to the common Semitic view, al-
though tendencies in the direction of monotheism are to be noted elsewhere. Spirituality is characteristically Hebrew, although traces of it seem to be found in other religions as well. God is infinitely superior to ordinary human limitation in regard to time, power, space, and knowledge. Polytheism limits the gods in their past history by the belief that they are descended from one another, and to a certain extent by their connection with created material objects. The power of one god is limited by that of others. The idea of local gods is the chief limitation in reference to space. Both limitations imply limitation of knowledge as well. Faithfulness which is the most prominent feature of God's attributes, regarded as a result of His eternity, can only be discerned to a slight extent in any of the other Semitic religions. A conception of righteousness, of impartial justice between individuals and nations, is not met with outside of the Old Testament. Justice was not thought of in dealings with other nations. Still traces of divine justice are found in other religions as well. The attribute of love is found to a large extent in all the religions under consideration. Yet in polytheism, while some of the gods love, others hate.

The third part deals with the conception of sin, salvation through sacrifices, considering certain general features of Semitic sacrifice, the Babylonian teachings of salvation through incantation, and the Hebrew teaching of salvation in other ways. As for sins of ritual nature, the biblical conception shows a marked similarity to the common Semitic ideas and has thus no ethical character. But for the most part another view is presented in the Old Testament. In the teachings of the prophets, psalmists, and wisdom writers emphasis is laid upon sins of an ethical nature. The great difference between the Old Testament system of sacrifices and that of the other Semites consists in the limiting of the sphere of the efficacy of sacrifices: the sins for which the sacrifices make provision, are those done unwittingly. Salvation through incantation was in Babylonia very conspicuous, while prohibited in the Bible. The conception of salvation apart from the sacrifices has no real parallel in other religions.
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The fourth part investigates the conception of future life—the Messianic idea, the meaning of the Hebrew Sheol—and reward and punishment in the future life.

In the fifth part the author summarizes the results and discusses certain conclusions. As for the source of the distinctive elements in the Hebrew teachings, there is no connection with the other Semitic religions. The Old Testament conceptions are far superior. And yet the Hebrews were by no means superior to the other Semites. There seems then to be no human cause for the result; that is clearly evident. A new cause is here in operation. That cause is the special revelation of God.

It cannot be denied that the author shows generally a fair judgment. It would indeed have required more than human ability to construct from the Babylonian fragments of ethical conceptions an ethical edifice such as is presented in the Old Testament. Still there are certain points to which the reviewer takes exception. The views of Neilsen and Lagrange that monotheism was the early Semitic belief, and polytheism a later development, are by no means improbable. It looks indeed as if in a very early Babylonian period Anum was not merely the representative of heaven, but simply ‘the God.’ It is not without significance that the ideogram AN for Anum—in Old Babylonian inscriptions—is used as determinative for designating divine beings, and the abstract noun anātu is a synonym of ilūtu ‘divinity,’ used interchangeably. The earliest triad, Anum, Ellil, and Ea do not stand on an equality in point of origin, as the author contends; in the Code of Hammurabi (Col. XXXVI, 46) Anum is called abu ilt, ‘the father of the gods,’ and this designation has nothing to do with the idea of local gods, as in proper names and in other inscriptions, since the god of Hammurabi was Bel-Marduk, and Anum was only the local god of Uruk. The original character of Anum seems to have been known to the Babylonian scholars even in later times. In the mythological lists (II R 54, No. 3, Obv. 1) we find enumerated many descendants or emanations of Anum, among whom we meet with Lahmu and Lahamu, An-shar and Ki-shar, who according to the Creation-legend were the earliest gods of the Babylonians. In the quoted lists (No. 4, 36) Anum
is identified with AN-SHAR-GAL, one of his emanations, as ʼAnum sha kishashat shame u ʼirsitim, ‘Anum the representative of the totality of heaven and earth,’ corresponding to אַלְוָהַי הַשֵּׁם (Gen. 24, 2), or perhaps more exactly to กַּנֵּה הַאָרֶץ possessor (ibid., 14, 19). He could well be identical with the South-Arabic ilu, by borrowing in one direction or another, if not by common inheritance, and his name was perhaps originally not pronounced Anum but ilu or dingir (comp. the equations in S* Col. II, 19, 20: i-lu = ʼAn-um; di-in-gir = ʼAn-um). If so, it may well be possible that ilu is in every respect identical with Anum, i.e. ilum who is called in the Code of Hammurabi (Col. I, 1) AN ʼi-rum, ‘the high(est) Anum.’

The power, presence, and justice of the Babylonian gods, especially those connected with sun, moon, and stars, were by no means confined to the regions where they dwelt. Did not the Babylonians know that these luminaries shine everywhere? The cities were merely regarded as the central seats of the gods, their inhabitants, being in close relation with the gods, believed themselves to be looked upon by the gods with special favor.

In regard to sacrifices, the Old Testament conception differs from that of the other Semitic religions that no sacrifices can atone for sins, even committed unwittingly, against fellow-men, if there is no possibility of making amends for them, as murder, misconduct with a married woman, etc. God can only forgive sins in this world, if no human beings suffer by them.

WEIR’S “ARABIC PROSE COMPOSITION”

Arabic Prose Composition. By T. H. Weir, B.D., M.R.A.S.,

Lecturer in Arabic in the University of Glasgow. Cambridge:


The road to Arabia is not a pleasant one. There is hardly a proper text-book enabling the student of Arabic to overcome the difficulties encountered at every step, and therefore any guide lending the student a helping hand must be highly welcome. The
present volume is intended to carry the student on from the rudiments of the language to advanced prose. It contains English exercises to be rendered into Arabic and an English-Arabic glossary, and is divided into four parts: Preliminary exercises (Part I) to be used during the study of grammar and syntax; easier prose (Part II) selected for the most part from the Majani-l-'Adab published by the Jesuit Fathers in Beyrout; easier newspaper extracts (Part III) from the weekly edition of the Cairo newspaper Al-Muayad. In these parts any consideration of style has been sacrificed to make the English reflect the Arabic expression as closely as possible. The advanced prose (Part IV) contains extracts from Lord Cromer's 'Modern Egypt,' from 'The Times' and other sources which were reproduced in an Arabic version in the columns of the Al-Muayad. The author attempts in this work to combine the study of modern and classical Arabic.

The book will render assistance to the student thoroughly acquainted with grammar and syntax. The way, however, for one not so far advanced will not be very easy. It would serve its purpose better and be of general use, if it had footnotes throughout the book like that of Socin's 'Translations into Arabic.' The glossary ought to have been like that of Brünnow's Chrestomanthly, especially in indicating in every case whether the verb governs the object directly or by means of certain prepositions. Thus it is not in every respect an ideal text-book. Still in default of something better, we must content ourselves for the time being with this work. The author, being a good Arabic scholar, could do much for the advancement of Arabic studies, if he would give the beginner a Reader with Arabic and English Exercises and at the head of each exercise a list of the words contained therein with short grammatical rules, and thus make the way for the beginner easy and pleasant.

Dropsie College

Jacob Hoschander
SOME NOTES TO DAVIDSON’S POETIC FRAGMENTS FROM THE GENIZAH II

In the poem of R. Hai Gaon recently published by Davidson (see this Review, New Series, I, p. 233 ff.) a few corrections are necessitated by the rime (לכ). In verse 2, instead of לָכָהַלָּא which sounds strange, read הָנָּהַלְךָ. V. 14, instead of הָנָּהַלְךָ read הֶנָּהַלְךָ (=הָנָּהַלְךָ גַּרְבּךָ). V. 15, the reading of the original edition is to be kept. The meaning is “when thou hast been sitting in the gate” [as judge]; comp. Kohut, Aruch, VI, 332. Accordingly, the emendation proposed by D. in verse 18 cannot be accepted. As long as no better proposition is made, I would not change the original reading, only I would divide the last word in this way: מַלְכָּה הָנָּהַלְךָ “one who enfeebles [the hands of others] and likewise shows himself weak,” i.e. one who does not give himself and hinders others from giving (comp. Abot V. 13; for נָהַל see verse 5).

I add here a few more corrections and explanations to the poem of Hai, leaving out such misprints as in verse 3, for example, where we have יִנְמָר for יִנָּמָר. Verse 7, read יִנְמָר for יִנְמָר; there is no reason for changing the biblical expression (Prov. 24, 11). V. 9, the meter requires יִנְמָר. V. 10, read יִנְמָר (“tell me where can you find one who, etc.”). V. 11, read perhaps for יִנְמָר. V. 12, the words יִנְמָר and יִנְמָר are verbal denominatives of יִנְמָר (thousand) and יִנְמָר (hundred); on the other hand, we must read יִנְמָר for לְהָרַק יִנְמָר “how can you forget me [who am so near you] while the greatness of your [helping] arm protects people that are far from you a hundred and thousandfold.” יִנְמָר is placed at the end on account of the rime; for יִנְמָר, moreover, comp. also Ps. 144, 13. V. 16 read לְהָרַק.
in order to scatter them, to estrange them from one another; comp. Deut. 32, 27.

Upon the interesting anonymous poem which Davidson (p. 238 ff.) made accessible to students, I wish to make the following remarks: Page 239, line 1, perhaps the reading of the MS. is to be kept, it is a neologism after the form *makhtal*, as *makhtov*, *makhtov*، and the like. Line 5, I read *nachal* = *l'ishov* for *nachal* meaning: [time, i.e. fate] falls upon its lamb like a locust, etc., comp. Deut. 28, 31; II Sam. 12, 3 ff. Lines 7-8 should, according to my opinion, read:

yetzal ala lavin chanotom mofit nehe'ah.At hamelam hakdimiyot

is here = מִרְכָּז. L. 10, for *me'ak* read *mekah* (st. constr. of *משא*, Ps. 75, 9). Line 11 is in accordance with Isa. 44, 26; note 69 is therefore to be stricken out. Page 240, l. 16, *v'indechani* gives no adequate sense; I read, on the basis of the MS. reading given in note 74, he is as well known in distant lands—in lands furthest away from him—as in the circle of his neighbors. L. 23, read *tov* (infin.) for *torah*. Page 241, l. 32, *ne* is to be inserted: "he never says 'no' when it comes to spending his wealth." L. 36, instead of the unintelligible *כֹּּבָּר* there is no doubt that we ought to read *כָּבָּר* (or כָּבָּרִי) which is used here for the Hebrew *כָּבָּר* (comp. Targum to the Song of Songs, 1, 16; Kohut, *Aruch*, VI, p. 425); indeed, as the superscription indicates, this poem was occasioned by a wedding in which Ibn 'Ata participated. L. 42, for *kollot* we should very likely read *kolei* *אֲדֹנָי שָׁמַיִם*, Ps. 21, 3). Page 242, l. 46, *yidom* is grammatically not permissible; it is perhaps not too hazardous to supply the lacuna with *אַל תֵּאָהוּ* (comp. Deut. 32, 22, and the like). Page 244, l. 14 for *lye* read *leve*. Page 245, l. 6 for *lye* read *la'asher*; subject is *yu* in line 5. Page 247, l. 14, read *nu* for *nu*.

Prague

H. Brody
In addition to the excellent remarks of Dr. Brody, I may give the following corrections to my article: P. 233, v. 3, read נינא. v. 8, read רת. P. 234, v. 11, read תות; v. 12, read לוה; v. 15, read תותת ... תותת. P. 235, v. 19, read התת. Dr. Max L. Margolis called my attention to p. 241, l. 41, which should be corrected into לוב ... לוב. Disregarding such misprints as are occasioned by the omission of a vowel or meteg, only one more serious error need be corrected, viz.: the word הנ on p. 243, l. 2, should read אמה.
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AN ANONYMOUS MEDIAEVAL CHRISTIAN CRITIC OF MAIMONIDES

BY ISAAC HUSIK, Gratz College

I.

It is the great merit of Dr. Jacob Guttmann, Rabbi in Breslau, in addition to his important monographs on the principal Jewish thinkers of the Middle Ages, to have presented clearly and in detail the influence of Jewish philosophical thought on Latin scholasticism.

He has done this in three valuable memoirs having the following titles: *Das Verhältniss des Thomas von Aquino zum Judenthum und zur jüdischen Literatur*, Göttingen 1891; *Die Scholastik des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judenthum und zur jüdischen Literatur*, Breslau 1902; and *Der Einfluss der Maimonidischen Philosophie auf das christliche Abendland*, in the first volume on Moses ben Maimon published by the Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judenthums, Leipzig 1908.

As early as 1863 Joel had pointed out the influence of Maimonides on Albertus Magnus, and Guttmann followed up the investigations begun by Joel and extended them to Thomas Aquinas, the greatest of the Latin scholastics, and the other minor philosophers of the period.

The investigations of Joel and Guttmann have shown that in particular Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas,
who represent in mediæval scholasticism the union of Aristotelianism and Christian dogma, owe a great deal to Maimonides. It is not a matter of conjecture or of speculation, but of clear evidence, plain to any one who is willing to take the trouble to read, say, the demonstrations of the existence of God in the Guide to the Perplexed, and in Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica*. Certain parts in the two writers will be seen to correspond point for point. And if we consider the relative positions of each of these thinkers in his religious and intellectual milieu, this relation between them, in view of Maimonides' chronological priority, is just what would be expected.

Maimonides, as we know, was troubled by the fact that a literal understanding of the Scriptures seemed incompatible with results derived from a study of the philosophy in vogue at the time, i.e. the philosophy of Aristotle. And his purpose, as he tells his disciple Joseph Ibn Aknin, in writing his "Guide" is to help those who are similarly troubled by showing them that the Bible and philosophy are not really incompatible, and that therefore far from being obliged to reject the latter as heretical in its tendency, every thinking Jew is bound to rationalize his belief, i.e. to make it intelligent and not merely mechanical, by sounding the depths of the Scriptures, in which the Aristotelian philosophy is contained. In this undertaking a preliminary study of the various branches of science and philosophy will be of great help to him.

Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas were similarly placed in their generation in relation to the development of Christian thought. From the beginnings of European Christian thought until the latter half of the twelfth century, Plato and St. Augustine were the masters of theolo-
gian and philosopher, and the circle of speculation was limited to a discussion of the nature of God, the persons in the Trinity, the thoughts of God, or the Ideas as eternally prefiguring the world before its creation, and the human soul as a spiritual substance placed in the body from without. All these speculations as dealing entirely with the Intelligible or Spiritual World came in little contact with the facts and processes as observed in the material world, and hence a careful study of the latter was not regarded as important. The result was that speculation in Christian Europe had free rein before the thirteenth century, and there was not a thing one started out to prove about the Intelligible World which he could not without much difficulty succeed in proving. Thus every philosopher proves the existence of the Trinity as a philosophical and not merely theological truth, and St. Anselm even proves by reason that the Incarnation was a necessity.

A change in this state of affairs came about in the latter half of the twelfth century when the complete writings of Aristotle, heretofore unknown in Christian Europe, began rapidly to be translated into Latin from Arabic and Greek.

Aristotle is a different man from Plato. Plato soars to the heights on the wings of imagination and fancy, and so light are the latter that a slight stimulus from an unusually profound observation of life and thought lifts him into the empyrean, and he finds in heaven the πωθορία from which he moves the earth.

Aristotle has his roots in the earth and from it he takes his nourishment. His highest abstractions stand in close relation to the concrete, and his most important investigations deal with the processes of motion, life, thought,
and action in this world. When he crowns this world with a God, it is by a process of reasoning which begins with the process of motion as an observed fact in the material world.

Hence when Aristotle—the Aristotle of the *Physics*, *Psychology*, and the *Metaphysics*—was discovered by the Christian schools of Europe in the latter half of the twelfth century they studied under him, and learned much from his rigorous methods of analysis and demonstration. The easy speculations of an Eriugena, and even in so close an analyst as Anselm, his attempts to demonstrate as rational necessities not merely the existence of God, but also His Trinity, and particularly the most special and most mysterious dogmas of the Church, such as the Incarnation, must have seemed crude to those trained in the school of Aristotle. Hence we see Thomas Aquinas making a division between those truths of religion and theology which can be demonstrated by the reason, and those which cannot. To the latter belong all those doctrines dealing with the intra-Trinitarian relations. It was clear that the relations between philosophy and theology were getting strained, and thinking minds of all shades of opinion were casting about for a *modus vivendi*. Hence there were those who opposed the introduction of the Stagirite into the schools, and gave their undivided allegiance to Augustine. Among those, on the other hand, who were out and out Aristotelians, ready and willing to go all the length of his extreme doctrines, after the fashion of the Arabian Averroes, who was their guiding star in the interpretation of Aristotle, the fashion gained ground of endeavoring to obviate the ire of the vigilant ecclesiastics and disarm all criticism, by stating loudly that their discussions simply
represent the views of the philosophers, and are not meant to replace the doctrines of the Church; that they are quite willing to retract any of their conclusions if they are found incompatible with the accepted religious truth. Having said this they felt free to discuss quite boldly any subject, however daring, and to reach conclusions which in their opinion followed from their premises.

Between these two extreme parties, the latter of which in the course of time found the city of Paris a rather uncomfortable place to stay in, and had the privilege of offering a martyr or two to the cause of free thought, there was the moderate school of compromise, and it counted in its midst two of the best men in the history of mediæval thought. These felt that a student of Aristotle could not wholly go back to Augustine. At the same time they were intensely loyal to Christian dogma, and less dominated by the authority of Aristotle than the Averroists. Their method was therefore, in cases of doubt as to Aristotle's meaning, to adopt an interpretation in favor of Christian dogma, and when Aristotle was clearly opposed to the latter, frankly to repudiate him.

This school, too, was in its beginnings received with disfavor by the strict Churchmen, and some of its doctrines were even condemned by the Bishop of Paris in 1277, but in the end its leaders won the day. There was really no stemming of the tide possible, which was caused by the setting in of the Aristotelian current, bringing a wealth of new and fresh concepts and methods on all topics of human thought to those who were getting weary of turning the wheel of the Platonic Ideas and Universals. And so it was the Dominicans who led in this movement of harmonization: Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas
stand at the very head as the Ibn Daud and the Maimonides of Christian Scholasticism.

Now it was quite natural in the circumstances that both Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas should look about for a similar attempt that was made before them, and they found it in Maimonides' "Guide of the Perplexed." In so far as the specific differences of Judaism and Christianity were not involved, the two scholastics saw no objection in adopting Maimonides' treatment of Aristotle.

As a result of Munk's edition and French translation of Maimonides' "Guide," which made the book accessible to those who could not read the Hebrew or the Latin, and the article of Saisset in the Revue de Deux Mondes, 1862, who speaks of Maimonides as the forerunner of St. Thomas Aquinas, and of the "More Nebukim" as announcing and preparing the "Summa Theologiae"; as a consequence further of the investigations of Joel and Guttmann, some careless writers fond of exaggeration made the unguarded statements that, "without Maimonides there would have been no Albertus Magnus and no Thomas Aquinas," and that, "Maimonides was the teacher of the whole Middle Age." Ueberweg-Heinze's Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie, which is in the history of Philosophy what Gesenius is in Hebrew grammar and lexicography, corrects this error in the last two editions of the second volume (8th ed., 1898; 9th ed., 1905). The late Dr. Wehofer, a Dominican, and Professor at the Minerva, in Rome, inserted in the eighth edition of Ueberweg-Heinze, volume II, p. 283 f., a discussion of the relation of Thomas Aquinas to Maimonides, which is reprinted without modification in the ninth edition of the same work. p. 310 f., under the
supervision of M. Baumgartner, Professor at Breslau, who took the place of Wehofer in revising and bringing up to date the chapter on the “Full Development of the Scholastic Philosophy.”

This discussion is based on a work of Anton Michel: “Die Kosmologie des Moses Maimonides und des Thomas von Aquino in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen,” Philosophisches Jahrbuch, 1891, and lays stress on the differences between the Christian and the Jewish thinker rather than on their agreements and the dependence of the former upon the latter, with the result that an error is made in the opposite direction, in minimizing the debt Thomas Aquinas undoubtedly owes to Maimonides. This oversight and misrepresentation is animadverted by Professor Clemens Baemiker, of the University of Strassburg, the famous editor of Ibn Gabirol’s Fons Vitae, and probably the greatest living authority on the philosophy of the Middle Ages. In reviewing the ninth edition of Überweg-Heinze, II, for the Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie (vol. XXII, 1909, pp. 130 ff.), he calls attention to Wehofer’s addition, which he characterizes as “unglücklich.” He praises the careful (sorgfältig abwägend) discussion of Guttmann on the question at issue, and points out that it should not merely have found a place in the Bibliography, but should have been consulted and made use of in the preparation of the paragraph in Überweg-Heinze. To make the matter of Aquinas’ dependence upon Maimonides quite clear, he presents in parallel columns a few paragraphs from the “Summa Theologica” and the “More Nebukim” respectively, showing that the very passage in Thomas’s Summa dealing with the proofs of the existence of God, which on account of its remarkable conciseness and lucidity is con-
sidered classic. is modeled in part, though in differing style, step by step upon Maimonides.

Recently Pierre Mandonnet, a Dominican of the University of Freiburg, in Switzerland, published the second edition of his very valuable work on Siger de Brabant, the chief of the Parisian Averroists of the thirteenth century. In the second part of the study, Mandonnet edits all the works of Siger at present known, and among them also an anonymous treatise of the thirteenth century, entitled: "Tractatus de Erroribus Philosophorum, Aristotelis, Averrois, Avicennae, Algazelis, Alkindi et Rabbi Moysis."

According to Mandonnet (II, Introd., XIV f.) the work was published with some omissions in Vienna under the name of Aegidius Romanus in 1482. Another edition appeared in Venice in 1581. Possevin inserted it in 1593 in an imperfect state in his Bibliotheca Selecta. D'Argenté in 1755 published an incorrect abridgment of the treatise in his Collectio Judiciorum de Novis Erroribus. Renan edited the portion dealing with the errors of Averroes from a Latin MS. in the Paris National Library in his Averroes et l'Averroïsme. Mandonnet himself in the first edition of his work on Siger, Louvain 1899, published the portion relating to the errors of Aristotle and Averroes, and in his second edition he edits the entire treatise from the same MS. that was used by Renan. Seven MSS. of the work are known, according to Denifle-Chatelain. Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, I, p. 556, of which the only one

---

1 Pierre Mandonnet, O.P.: Siger de Brabant et l'Averroisme Latin au XIIIème Siècle: 1ère Partie, Étude Critique, Louvain 1911. 2ème Partie, Textes Inédits, Louvain 1908. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée. See the present writer’s review of this important work in the Philosophical Review, July 1911.
examined by Mandonnet is that of the Paris National Library, which he used in preparing his edition. The writing, he says, belongs to the end of the thirteenth century, and the text was collated by the copyist.

As the title indicates, the treatise consists of a list of philosophical and theological errors culled from the works of Aristotle, Averroes, Avicenna, Algazali, Alkindi, and Maimonides. There are no philosophical discussions of these errors, or refutations of them, nothing but the statement of the doctrine and the designation of it as an error. It would seem as if the author intended to follow up this bare enumeration of the errors with a second part devoted to the reasons for rejecting them from the point of view of philosophy or theology or both, though he nowhere says so explicitly. His purpose, in fact, is not scientific, but purely religious and apologetic, as we learn from the concluding chapter in which he invokes the name of Jesus and declares that the compilation of the passages of the above-named philosophers which contradict the Catholic faith was made by him because of his reverence for the name of Jesus and detestation of those who oppose him.

"O bone Jesu, ad laudem tuam, ob reverentiam nominis tui, nec non in detestationem contradicentium tibi, te auxiliante, loca in quibus Aristoteles, Averroes, Avicenna, Algazel, Alkindus et Rabbi Moyses nisi sunt contradicere fidei a te traditae, quam solam veram et catholicam reputo. summam in hac prima parte huius opusculi compilavi, ubi dictorum philosophorum vel omnes errores sunt simpliciter comprehensi, vel ad eos qui ibi sunt traditi, poterit diligens inquisitor reducere, quod cum nisi per te fieri potuerit, tibi sit honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen."
The italicized words, "in hac prima parte huius opusculi," seem to indicate that there was to be a second part, but whether he wrote it and it was lost, or he changed his mind and never completed his work, we have of course no means of knowing at the present time.

The treatise used to be attributed to Aegidius Romanus, a pupil of Thomas Aquinas, under whose name it was once edited, and this led Denifle-Chatelain, the editors of the Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, as well as Renan, and Mandonnet in his first edition to acquiesce in this attribution. In his second edition, however, the last named raises a very strong objection, in fact an unanswerable one, against Aegidius' authorship. Not to speak of the fact that the Paris MS. does not assign the treatise to any author, and that John of Paris, Canon of St. Victor, who wrote shortly after the death of Aegidius, does not mention the "De Erroribus Philosophorum" in the catalogue of Aegidius' works which he gives—circumstances purely negative—the following consideration adduced by Mandonnet seems conclusive. On the important question of the unity or plurality of substantial forms the two are absolutely divided. Aegidius Romanus is a believer in the unity of forms like his teacher Thomas Aquinas, holding in fact that the opposite doctrine is not in consonance with the Catholic faith, "ponere pluras formas contradicit fidei Catholicae," whereas the "De Erroribus" is in favor of this very doctrine. Speaking of Aristotle, he says: "Si autem

---

Attention had already been called to this difference in opinion between the "De Erroribus" and Aegidius Romanus as an argument against the authorship of the latter, by Maurice de Wulf in Le traité de unitate formae de Gilles de Lessines, Paris 1902, p. 176, and again in his Histoire de la Philosophie Médiévale, 2nd ed., Paris 1905, p. 388, n., though Mandonnet does not mention it.
intelligit unam naturam simplicem, et quod sit in composito una forma tantum, videtur falsum esse. Mandonnet is therefore justified in rejecting Aegidius as the author of the treatise in question.

The positive side of his investigation of the authorship is also very plausible except in one point. We may agree with him when he lays down the year 1274 as the terminus ante quem, from the consideration that the “De Erroribus” does not yet know the last two books of the Metaphysics, which were probably translated about that date. Similarly plausible is his argument from the sympathetic treatment of Aristotle, refusing, as the author does, to attribute any more errors to him than is absolutely necessary, that the anonymous writer was a Dominican, though one who had not yet quite assimilated the Thomistic point of view, in that he rejects the doctrine of the unity of forms. But when Mandonnet takes a further step in narrowing the limits of the author’s incognito, by making him a Spaniard, and this on the ground of the unusual familiarity he exhibits with Arabic and Hebrew sources, our answer must be that here the learned editor overshoots the mark. An unfortunate blunder is at the basis of the last inference.

It so happens that the anonymous author names as the work of Maimonides from which the errors are drawn, the De Expositione Legum. Mandonnet is naturally puzzled, as every one would be. Everybody knows that the philosophical chef d’œuvre of Maimonides is the More Nebukim. It is also well known that the Scholastics in the thirteenth century, especially Albertus Magnus and Thomas

* There seems to be another difference of opinion between the “De Erroribus” and Thomas Aquinas, which is discussed later in connection with the third error of Maimonides.
Aquinas, made diligent use of this great work, and that the former calls it *Dux Neutrorum*, or *Dubiorum*, in accordance with the Hebrew and Arabic title. If the author of the "De Erroribus" uses instead the *De Expositione Legum*, which no other scholastic seems to have known, it is a circumstance which argues unusual erudition in our incognito, and must have its special explanation, which Mandonnet accordingly provides. In the meantime what is this *De Expositione Legum*, if it is not the *Guide of the Perplexed*? Mandonnet, who cannot be expected to be as learned in Hebrew and Arabic literature as he undoubtedly is in scholastic, though, living in Freiburg, he could easily have made appropriate inquiries, in casting about for a plausible identification, hit upon the *Livre des Préceptes*, which was edited by M. Bloch in the original Arabic in 1888. This is of course the *Sefer Ha-Miswot*. Without apparently making any effort to ascertain the character of this *Livre des Préceptes*, Mandonnet seems to have been inveigled by the partial similarity of titles, and came to the conclusion that the author of the *De Erroribus Philosophorum* drew his Maimonidean philosophy from the *Sefer Ha-Miswot*, and as no one else has done it besides, he must indeed have been very learned, and had best be made a Spaniard.

The intelligent and interested reader will perhaps have guessed by this time that the *De Expositione Legum* is none other than the *Mere Nebukim* in disguise. The title *De Expositione Legum* seems strange perhaps, but no stranger than *De Benedicto Deo*, which is used once by Duns Scotus (*De Rerum Principiis*, qu. 7, artic. 2, No. 26; "*Huius opinionis videtur Rabbi Moyses, qui dicit in libro, qui intitulatur De Benedicto Deo...*"; comp. Guttmann,
Die Scholastik des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judenthum, p. 162, note 1), or De Uno Deo, found in Albertus Magnus (comp. Guttmann, l. c.). In fact "De Expositione Legum" as a title can be easily explained as having been transferred to the entire work from the contents of the third part, which deals in great part with the סענים ומותרי, or the reasons of the commandments, and to which the title is very applicable. We also learn from Perles, who discovered the first Latin translation of Maimonides' "Guide" (see J. Perles, "Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefunde erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen Führers" MGWJ., XXIV (1875), 9 ff.), that, though the MS. itself has no title, the monks of the Kaisheim monastery from which the MS. came into the possession of the Munich Royal library, gave it the name, Rabi Moysis expositio nominum in libris prophectarum. This designation was no doubt suggested to them, as Perles observes, from the author's words in the introduction: "Istius libri prima intentio est explanare diversitates nominum quae inveniuntur in libris propheticarum," corresponding to Ibn Tibbon's, המאמר הזה עניין הרשוש להבר עניין שמות אовые כותרת המאתה. At the same time it may have been an old designation going back to the thirteenth century, and De Expositione Legum is not so far from expositio nominum.

It is now time to show positively that the anonymous critic of Maimonides actually does refer to no other book than the More Nebukim. And this is not very difficult, for he is careful to give us the book and the chapter where the doctrine in question is stated, though in a number of instances the citations are incorrect. That the division of chapters as indicated in the De Erroribus does not tally
with that of the original Arabic as edited by Munk, and of Tibbon's Hebrew translation, need not surprise us, since Perles has shown that the thirteenth century Latin translation is based not upon Tibbon, but upon Ḥarizi, and the chapters in the latter differ slightly from those of the former. The actual differences, however, as they appear in the De Erroribus cannot be explained by reference to Ḥarizi. For where the two Hebrew translations differ in the division of the chapters, as in the first and second parts of the More, the agreement of the Latin treatise where there is such, either in the text or in the margin, is invariably with Tibbon's division and not with that of Ḥarizi, as is indicated later on. Besides in the MS. which Perles examined the numbering of the chapters is quite different again from any of the others, the numbers running consecutively from the beginning to the end of the book, whereas in both Tibbon and Ḥarizi a new numeration begins with every part of the book. The treatise under discussion agrees in the latter respect with the Hebrew translations, but the numbers of the chapters tally only in a few instances. Now and then there is a variant number given in the margin of the Paris MS., which is correct and agrees with Tibbon. It is difficult to tell, therefore, whether the want of correspondence in the numbers is due solely to scribal errors in transcription, or whether it is due to an original difference in the chapter divisions, or to both causes at once.

II.

In the interest of showing that the More Nebukim is the book used, as well as in order to present to those readers who are not in the habit of rummaging among mediæval Latin documents, a brief chapter from the past,
when Jew, Christian, and Mohammedan, all in concert, with Aristotle as their common guide, and their several sacred books as a check, with diligence and enthusiasm pursued the truths of the world, of man, and of God, I shall in the second part of this paper treat of the Maimonidean doctrines to which the author of the *De Erroribus Philosophorum* takes exception.

He approves of Maimonides’ rejection of the eternity of the world as taught by Aristotle, and refers to the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the second book of the *De Expositione Legum* in which Maimonides lays down his view that the world came into being in time. The fifteenth chapter in fact begins in Tibbon’s translation: 

He says there in effect that Aristotle is too clear-headed a logician—he who taught the whole world what it means to demonstrate—to regard his views about the eternity of motion and the world as proved.

In the sixteenth chapter Maimonides says he will be content with endeavoring to show that the traditional Jewish doctrine of creation is not impossible, and that the philosophical arguments against it can be answered: 

The author of the treatise then points out the principle of Maimonides’ criticism of Aristotle’s method of procedure in this matter, which consists in arguing from the process of generation and production after the world has come into existence to the state of affairs at the time of creation, which Maimonides compares in the seventeenth chapter of the second book to a person who, being left alone on 1
desert island soon after birth, should argue when he grew up that conditions in the womb must be the same as those without, and deny the fact of birth.

So far the introductory paragraph in which Maimonides is given his due. It reads in the Latin as follows:

1. Rabbi Moyses, tenens secundum superficiem dicta in Vetere Testamento, discordavit a Philosopho in ponendo aeternitatem motus. Posuit enim mundum incepisse, ut patet per ea quae ait in II. libro De Expositione Legum, cap. XV, et XVI. Unde Aristotelem credentem demonstrare aeternitatem mundi et volentem iudicare de factione rerum post sui productionem, sicut de factione earum in hora creationis, assimilat cuidam parvo volenti iudicare de conditionibus hominis extra uterum, sicut de conditionibus eius in utero, ut patet in eodem libro, cap. XVII. Non ergo in hoc erravit, sed in aliis multis deviavit a veritate firma, et a fide catholica.

The first error of Maimonides is his laying down the opinion that in God there is no multiplicity either in fact or in idea, hence it follows that there is no Trinity in God, for three persons are three things. Maimonides therefore speaks sarcastically of the Christian sages who strain to rationalize the dogma of the Trinity. The references here given are to the first book, chapter XI, which the marginal variant corrects to LI, and to chap. LXXI of the same book, which should be changed to L.

In chapter LI (Harizi 50), Maimonides in fact points out what the term unity implies, and that one must be careful not to smuggle in any kind of plurality in any disguise whatsoever. In chapter L (Har. 49) he insists that belief in a given idea means that one comprehends it, mere verbal reiteration without the corresponding formation of
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A consistent concept is not belief. This he applies to the belief in the unity of God, and in this connection occurs the remark, which so scandalized our author, though there seems no evidence of sarcasm.

The Latin of our treatise reads:

2. Posuit enim in Deo non esse aliquam multitudinem, nec re, nec ratione, ut patet I° libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo XI° (margin: LI°); propter quod sequitur in Deo non esse Trinitatem, cum tres personae sint tres res. Unde ipse, in eodem libro, capitulo LXXI° (read L), quasi deserviveloquitur de sapientibus christianis insudantibus inquirendo de ratione Trinitatis, ac si frivolum esset Trinitatem credere.

The second error of Maimonides is his opinion that the attributes of wisdom and goodness as applied to God have no relation whatsoever to the meaning of similar attributes as applied to a human being, that the similarity is in name only. Our author objects to this on the ground that since our perfections are derived from the perfections of God, and the agent or cause always makes the effect similar to itself, pure homonymity between the divine and the human attributes of the same name is impossible.

The “De Erroribus” agrees in this matter with Thomas Aquinas. See Summa Contra Gentiles I, 33.—“Patet quod non quidquid de Deo et rebus aliis praedicatur, secundum puram aequivocationem dicitur...consideratur enim in huiusmodi nominum communitate ordo causae et causati...”

The reference in the De Erroribus is to the first book, chapter LXXVII, corrected in the margin to LVI, which
tallies with our division. The radical absence of relation
between God and man is in fact the burden of the fifty-
sixth (Har. 55th) chapter of the first book, and the par-
ticular statement indicated by the author of the *De
Erroribus* is the following: נק אמאם זוחס הכותה יכהלה
והרצים וה시스 עליה תעהה טלח בל בול היה הכמה יכהלה ורצים וייס
בכשחתות נומר אשר לא רכית עומ ביכנה כל.

The Latin of the treatise reads:

3. Ulterius erravit circa divina attributa, credens
sapientiam et bonitatem omnino esse aequivoce in nobis et
in Deo, ut patet 1° libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo
LXXVII° (margin: LVI°). Unde et alibi inducit pro se
hoc dictum prophetae dicentis: Cui me fecistis similem?
Hoc autem stare non potest, cum perfectiones nostrae
derivatae sint a perfectionibus divinis; cum semper agens
assimilat sibi passum, inter ea pura aequivoctio esse non
potest.

The third error of Maimonides is his denial that such
perfections as were mentioned above really exist in God,
and hence he says that God does not exist by virtue of
the quality of existence as such, which is added to His
substance, as it is added to the substance of every other
existing thing to make the latter existent. Similarly God
is not living by virtue of the “accident” *life* added to His
substance, nor is He, “able” by virtue of the “accident”
*ability* added to His substance, as is the case with all other
things, but all these attributes are applied to God *per
remotionem*, i. e. in order to exclude their opposites, or, to
indicate not God’s nature, but His causal relation to the
universe, or the manner in which the objects of the world
are affected by Him.
The references here are correctly given to chapters fifty-seven and sixty-one of the first book. In the former (Ḥarizi 56) we find the following discussion pertinent to the subject: "Donm nbyn⁴⁰ KN miK'SobnaD pNE>'¹ djdn rnp dxj?u-kilnwvo lDVjnwnoto levy inwso svnn ...nab ynn ,0^3 «bi'n pi nix'voa«b nxcj Kin p dki ...ssd'Clb lbxiwiarrxbi...noana vb nam ,nbia-ak!>Ma'i,mea &6 &6e>iy ...nuinjnniboa ,baenp roan? cyoa ,0'pinD'rwn nvn btfnninbuSnntwi"itPKai,nia*inbpna t6x Kinnpjjrni«vj inNnr b"j?xi,-inxxbx "ño»bnniKn bar k5>,nainxb mbxn nain nnoNb batrnmil pjjm paa nrbi,nioan^naoo nainni »nbaKin» by nrnab ponp -idkjk>ica ,nnnKa «b ins noKa pmpn 'a,nbi:iKiao sine no bpnn p ponp noKai ,Bnino prn mpo inw sbc ns bai ...tornmrtw "»b noK' djdn enn kS pmp xb noxa vbv iox'1k!>.

Chapter sixty-one (Ḥar. 60) begins with the statement: "mbiyenp umu oba DnoDa D'KVoannbyrvmice i>a."

The Latin text of the De Erroribus reads:

4. Ulterius erravit circa perfectiones tales, non credens eas vere in Deo existere, propter quod, I° libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo LVII°, ait quod Deus est, non in essentia, et vivit non vita, et est potens non in potentia, sed omnia talia dicta sunt de Deo per remotionem, ut innuit eodem libro et capitulo, vel dicta sunt de Deo per causalitatem, ut dicatur Deus vivus, non quod vita sit in eo, sed quia viva causat, ut patet I° libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo LXI°.

Here it would seem the author either did not fully understand the meaning of Maimonides, or if he did, he is once more in disagreement with Thomas Aquinas in a mat-
ter wherein I think the latter was not opposed by the other philosophers of the period.

As I understand Maimonides' meaning, it is this. He is not objecting so much to the belief that such perfections as existence, life, knowledge, power, wisdom, are in God, as to the danger of supposing that these attributes are found in God after the manner of their existence in us. In us all these are "accidents" added to our substance, and we are therefore composite beings, composed not merely of matter and form, but also of substance and accident. Being composite we are also subject to dissolution. The important thing is to prove God's absolute unity. But if we think of these attributes as "accidents" added to His substance. He will also be composite and not an absolute unity. Hence the importance of the notion that in God essence and existence are the same and not distinct as in all created things. A thought as old as Al-Farabi, and adopted in toto by Thomas Aquinas, see Summa Contra Gentiles, I, 22:—

"Omnis res in qua est aliud essentia et aliud esse, est composita. Deus autem non est compositus...Ipsum igitur esse Dei est sua essentia."

The same motives and arguments apply to the other attributes above mentioned, and when Maimonides says:

he means exactly the same as Thomas Aquinas when he says "Deus est ipsa bonitas," "Intelligere Dei est sua essentia," "Deus per nihil aliud intelligit quam per suam essentiam," "Deus est veritas," "Voluntas Dei est eius essentia," "Deus est Amor," "Deus est sua vita," "Deus est sua beatitudo," "Dei potentia est eius substantia." The idea is these attributes are not some thing over and above
the essence of God, as they were believed to be in the case
of natural objects in the created world. They are God’s
essence, which is a perfect unity, and hence it is also mis-
leading to speak in the manner of the Mu‘tazilas who call
them essential attributes and say He is “able” through His
essence, He is “wise” through His essence, He is “living”
and “willing” through His essence, because this too gives
the idea of plurality. A safer form of expression is that
He is One, and with His unitary essence He performs
various functions or activities, instead of giving Him at-
tributes as belonging to His essence. The very best mode of
speaking of God is in the negative form by saying, He is
existent but not through an attribute existence, He is wise
but not through an attribute wisdom, etc. In this way we
on the one hand affirm perfection of God and on the other
guard against introducing plurality into His essence.

The fourth error of Maimonides is his denial of per-
sons in the Deity, and explaining away the phrases in the
Bible which to the Christian are references to the second
and third persons in the Trinity, the Word, and the Spirit.
Thus the words of the Psalmist (Ps. 33, 6):

"By the word of God were the heavens made, and by the
spirit of His lips all the hosts thereof," are to the author
of our treatise indications of the Trinity, the Word and
the Spirit representing the Son and the Holy Ghost respec-
tively. He accordingly finds fault with Maimonides who
understands them metaphorically to stand for the divine
will and purpose.

In this connection the reference is general, indicating
the first book of Maimonides but not the chapter. That
may be due to the fact that in no less than three places in
the first book of the “More,” Maimonides interprets this verse of the Psalms, in chapters twenty-three, sixty-five, and sixty-six.

The Latin reads:

5. Ulterius erravit circa propria personarum, credens Verbum et Spiritum Dei in divinis dici essentialiter tantum. Unde 1° libro De Expositione Legum, exponens illud psalmi: Verbo Domini coeli firmati sunt et spiritu oris eius sumi solum pro divina voluntate et eius essentia, qua coeli sunt facti, cum tamen ea particulariter sumantur.

The fifth error of Maimonides is that he regards the heavenly bodies as animated, saying they are rational beings, and quoting in confirmation of his view the opening phrase of the nineteenth Psalm, "The heavens declare the glory of God," and the passage in Job 38. 7 "When the stars of the morning sang together, and all the sons of God shouted."
Here we notice an agreement with the view of Thomas Aquinas, who also disagrees with Maimonides regarding the nature of the heavenly bodies. He admits that the cause of their motions is an Intelligence or Intelligences, but he differs with Maimonides in the manner of conceiving the relation or connection between these Intelligences and the heavenly bodies which they move. According to Maimonides the relation is immanent or internal, the Intelligences being conceived as souls of the heavenly bodies. Thomas Aquinas regards the relation as external, the Intelligences are the movers, and the heavenly bodies are the moved, "ad hoc autem, quod moveat, non oportet, quod uniatur ei ut forma, sed per contactum virtutis, sicut motor unitur mobili" (Summa Theologica, I, q. 70, a. 3, quoted in Ueberweg-Heinze, II *, p. 311).

The reference given in the De Erroribus is to chap. 5 of the second book of De Expositione Legum, which begins (Har. 6):  

The Latin text of the treatise follows:

6. Ulterius erravit circa supercoelestia corpora, ponens ea animata esse, et dicens ipsa esse animalia rationalia, adducens pro se illud psalmi: Coeli enarrant, etc.; et illud Iob: Cum me laudabant astra matutina. Quae omnia patent II° libro De Expositione Legum, cap. V°.
The sixth error of Maimonides relates to his views concerning the end of the world. While he disagrees with Aristotle, who assumes the eternity of motion, and hence the eternity of the world, Maimonides agrees with him in part, namely, that motion once begun will never cease, or that this world will continue ever to be ruled by the same laws of nature which were once established at the time of creation. And as for the passages in the Prophets which seem to signify the end of the world, such as Isa. 65, 17:

"for behold I create new heavens and a new earth," it is foolish, according to Maimonides, to take them literally, and the context shows, especially to him who is familiar with the style of the prophets, that the reference is not to a different world, but to the same world in which we are, and the prophet’s expression of new heavens and a new earth is a figure of speech for a regenerate and prosperous Jerusalem, as is shown in the sequel ib., 18:

"For behold I create Jerusalem, a rejoicing, and her people a joy.” Similarly he explains the passage in Joel 3, 4:

“The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord,” as referring not to the Day of Judgment, but to the defeat of Sennacherib near Jerusalem, or to the defeat of Gog and Magog near Jerusalem in the days of the Messiah.

The reference given in the De Erroribus is to chapter XIX of the second book of De Expositione Legum, which should be corrected to XXIX (Ḥar. 30), as is evident to any one who will consult that chapter, and it is not neces-
sary to quote any of it here as it is lengthy, and the gist of it has just been given. We may close this point then with quoting the Latin text of the De Erroribus.

7. Ulterius erravit circa motum supercoelestium corporum, et circa eorum innovationem. Nam licet crediderit motum incepisse, credidit tamen ipsum nunquam desinere. Unde credidit mundum nequaquam universaliter innovari; et quod dictum est per prophetam: Erunt coeli novi et terra nova, dicit huiusmodi coelos novos iam esse. Exponens autem illud Ioelis: Sol convertetur in tenebras et luna in sanguinem, antequam veniet dies Domini, magna et terribilis, non de die iudicii, sed de morte Gog et Magog, et de morte Sennacherib, quae omnia patent ex II° libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo XIX° (read XXIX) ubi plane vult tempus et motum nunquam deficere, ut manifestius patet ex alia translatione.

What is meant by the last words in italics (mine) is hard to say. Is it possible that in the thirteenth century there was more than one Latin translation of the “More Nebukim”? That is scarcely likely. Or does it mean that the author has reference to the two Hebrew translations, Ibn Tibbon and al-Ḥarizi, and knowing that his Latin text was based on Ḥarizi, he refers to Ibn Tibbon in which it is made plainer that Maimonides thinks motion and time are everlasting? This seems also unlikely, for if he meant a Hebrew translation, he would scarcely have called it simply, “alia translatio.” Besides we should then have to think of the author as a Christian Hebraist who is not particularly proud of his unusual knowledge, and does not let us see it otherwise. Might he have been a Jewish convert to Christianity, who in his zeal for the adopted religion was eager to defend it against the views of an authority in
philosophy like Maimonides, but who was loathe to say anything which would call attention to his Jewish origin?

In Tibbon’s translation as well as in Harizi’s it appears clearly that Maimonides believed in the eternity of time and motion a parte post, as the following will show (ibid.):

The seventh error of Maimonides is in relation to his views on prophecy. He is of the opinion that the prophetic power is not a privilege bestowed upon an individual by the grace of God purely and simply, but that given a certain natural aptitude, a person may achieve the power of prophecy by intellectual and moral effort.

The reference to Ch. XV. of the second part of De Expositione Legum is properly corrected in the margin to XXXVI (Har. 37).

The Latin text reads:

The eighth error of Maimonides is in his view of divine Omnipotence. He says there are some things God can do and some things he cannot. Among the latter he
cites as an example the production of an accident without a subject, and charges those philosophers whom he calls "separati" (= Mu'tazila) with ignorance of scientific method because they maintain that God can produce an accident without a subject.

The reference is given to the second book chapter XV, which should be corrected to third book ch. XV.

There is a slight inaccuracy here in the presentation of Maimonides' view, especially as regards the reference to the Mu'tazila. This is due to the fact that the author of the treatise does not seem interested in the principles or methods by which Maimonides arrives at his conclusions, but in the conclusions themselves. Hence Maimonides' classifications do not interest him. It is sufficient for him to know that according to Maimonides there are some things God cannot do, to arouse his theological indignation, without endeavoring to grasp the distinctions based upon a sound principle, or to criticise the principle itself.

Thus Maimonides understands by the term "the impossible," that which is logically impossible, or the self-contradictory, which is ultimately the meaningless. It would be absurd to say, he holds, that God can do the impossible, for that would mean that He can do the meaningless, for example, the simultaneous co-existence of opposites. This, he says, no one doubts who understands the matter. There is room for doubt as to whether a given case belongs to the category of the "impossible" or not, and as a matter of fact there is a difference of opinion among philosophers as to whether the existence of accident without a subject belongs to the category of the impossible or not. Thus the Mu'tazila think that God can produce accident without a subject of inherence, though it is not
philosophical analysis that has led them to this conclusion, but theological exigencies.

Though it is true that Maimonides does not think much of the speculations of the Mutakallimun, he does not charge them here with ignorance, as the author of the De Erroribus intimates.

The following are his words:

9. Ulterius erravit circa divinam potentiam. Dicit aliqua esse Deo possibilia, aliqua non; inter quae impossibilia narrat impossibile esse accidens sine subjecto; et quosdiam, quos appellat separatos, quia dixerunt Deum hoc posse, dicit ignorasse viam disciplinalium scientiarum. Haec autem patent II° (read III°) libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo XV°.

The ninth error of Maimonides is in relation to his views of Providence. His opinion is that divine providence extends in man to the individual as well as the species, but in the lower animals and in other things God's providence has to do only with the species, but does not extend to the individual, and the falling of the leaf from the tree is a matter of accident and not of special divine will.

The reference is correctly given to the seventeenth chapter of the third book in which Maimonides expresses his own view as follows:

ואשר אם כי ודא בינה והנה התורה והלכותה, והוה י indebted לברך, והיה יהוה את כל ישותים ומכים, ואת ננוס וחוזר ההוא...

ואשר כן לא יני איטי ומכל שמכים במקים ובר ננוס וחוזר ההוא...

אכל שבר בטלה וחוזר כל שבר: התורה והלכות, וכבר בר ננוס ובא בכל וככל אוכל
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The Latin text of the *De Erroribus* reads:

10. Ulterius erravit circa divinam providentiam. Credidit enim Deum habere providentiam hominum quantum ad speciem et quantum ad singularia; aliorum autem dixit Deum tantum habere providentiam quantum ad speciem, non secundum singularia. Unde casus foliorum de arbore, et aliorum quae contingunt circa singularia talia, noluit subdi ordini divinae providentiae, sed aestimavit omnia talia fieri per accidens, ut ex III° libro *De Expositione Legum* patet, capitulo XVII°.

The tenth error of Maimonides has to do with the influence exerted by God on the human will. Maimonides says that though God could influence or change a given person's will or nature, He does not do so, for if He did, prophetic admonition and the promise of reward and punishment would be useless, God could simply so form the will and nature of man that he should always do what is right. The consequence which follows from this, and which the author of the *De Erroribus* cannot accept, is that man can avoid sin without divine assistance; and divine grace, which is an important Catholic dogma, becomes superfluous. Maimonides' position, our author says, is even worse than that of Pelagius, for according to the latter, although we can live justly without Grace, still it is not superfluous, for grace makes right living easier.

The reference is correctly given to chapter thirty-two, though the book is not indicated. The third is meant, as it is clear that the author follows the order of the *More
Nebukim in the selection of his errors. Maimonides says there in fact:

The Latin text follows:

11. Ulterius erravit circa humanam voluntatem et naturam, ponens quod licet talia a Deo mutari possint, tamen non mutantur, quia tunc frustra esset admonitio prophetarum; credens hominem per se ipsum, absque speciali Dei auxilio posse omnia peccata vitare, et omnes monitiones prophetarum adimplere, ex qua positione videtur sequi gratiam divinam penitus superfluere; propter quod haec positio est peior positione Pelagii, secundum quam licet possemus recte vivere sine gratia, non tamen superfluit gratia; quia eam habendo faciliiori modo recte vivimus. Quod autem sic senserit Rabbi Moyses, ut dictum est, patet per ea quae ait in (III°) libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo XXXII°.

The eleventh and last error of Maimonides is that according to him fornication was permitted before the law was given, from which our author infers that, according to Maimonides, fornication is not a sin according to the law of nature, and it becomes a sin only by divine prohibition. It is not clear to me that this is precisely the opinion of Maimonides. For he does endeavor to give a rational account of the prohibitions of the Bible, to show that they have a basis in nature and in reason. So he shows clearly
that the prohibitions of promiscuous intercourse and the
other laws in the matter of the relations of the sexes have
as their primary motive the perfection of the social life.
Maimonides' remark in connection with the Judah-Tamar
story is purely incidental, and has not the dignity of a
principle, as our author makes it. Maimonides infers from
Judah's conduct that fornication was common in those days
before the law was given, but he does not intimate that it
was proper. From his principles it would rather follow
that it was just as improper before the law as after, since
it prevented the highest development of social life which
is the motive of the law. His remark concerning Judah and Tamar is:

The reference to the forty-ninth chapter of the third
book is correct. The Latin text follows:

12. Ulterius erravit circa humanos actus, ponens for-
nicationem non esse peccatum in iure naturali; sed solum
est ibi peccatum prohibitionis, quod falsum est, cum
matrimonium sit de iure naturali. Unde ante legem, ut
ait licitum erat; propter quod dicit Judam non peccasse cum
Thamar, quia fuit ante tempus legis. Haec autem patent
in IIIº libro De Expositione Legum, capitulo XLIXº.

The above enumeration of the errors of Maimonides,
which forms chapter twelve of the De Erroribus Philoso-
phorum, is followed in chapter thirteen by a brief summary
of the same errors in fifteen propositions:

Capitulum XIII.

In quo summatim colliguntur dicti errores. Omnes
ergo praedicti errores sunt hi:
1. Quod in Deo non est aliqua multitudo, nec re nec ratione.

2. Quod in Deo non est Trinitas.

3. Quod perfectiones in nobis et in Deo dicuntur pure aequivoce.

4. Quod attributa divina non dicunt aliquid positive.

5. Quod verbum dicitur in Deo essentialiter solum.

6. Quod corpora supercoelestia sunt animata.

7. Quod tempus licet incepit, nunquam tamen desinet.

8. Quod motus supercoelestium corporum semper est.

9. Quod mundus nunquam universaliter innovabitur.

10. Quod homo se potest sufficienter disponere ad gratiam prophetiae.

11. Quod Deus non potest accidens facere sine subiecto.

12. Quod divina providentia in aliis quam in homine se extendit quantum ad speciem, non quantum ad singularia; et quidquid circa talia evenit, est per accidens et improvisum.

13. Quod nunquam immutat voluntatem humanam.

14. Quod homo per seipsum potest recte vivere et implere monitiones prophetarum.

15. Quod simplex fornicatio non erat peccatum mortale ante dationem legis.
RETALIATION AND COMPENSATION

By David Werner Amram, Philadelphia

There was a time in the history of the Jewish law when injuries to the person were punished by retaliation. In the words of the old legal formula, "as he hath done so it shall be done to him," (Lev. 24, 19). At a much later period we find the law stated thus: "He who injures the person of another is liable for five elements of damages, to wit, for the actual physical harm, for the pain, for the expense of healing, for the loss of time, and for the shame, or mental suffering": (Mish. B. K. 8, 1). According to the earlier law, there was an adjustment of the equities of the case by the infliction of injuries on the aggressor similar to those which he had caused; according to the later law, by payment for five elements of damages entering into the loss suffered by the victim of the aggression.¹

¹ Modern law recognizes the same elements of damages and, in addition thereto, allows punitive damages where the aggressor acted wilfully or maliciously or with gross negligence. All that the injured person is entitled to is compensation, and punitive damages are falling into disfavor. The motive of the aggressor may be of importance in a criminal prosecution, but should have no bearing on the amount to be paid in a civil suit. A man sustains neither more nor less damage because the motive of the aggressor is or is not malicious. If the motive provokes greater violence and results in greater injury the damage will be greater and accordingly the compensation will be increased whereas the same degree of violence resulting in a trifling injury should not entitle the victim to more than a correspondingly small compensation. The wickedness of the aggressor should be punished in the criminal court.
Between these two legal formulae there lies a period of time within which retaliation was supplanted by compensation. The administrators of the law whose judgments are reflected and practically summed up in the above quoted formula of the Mishnah really interpreted the law of retaliation out of existence. This result was not achieved stante pede, but was the summation of a process of centuries. The decisions of the judges which step by step carried the law to its final form and the reasoning on which they were based are lost. Talmudic discussion on the subject but faintly reflects the thousand nuances of thought based upon the multiplicity and variety of cases that contributed to the general result.

Passing for the present the Talmudic discussion, we are confronted with a problem of some historical interest. If the old law did indeed prescribe retaliation which was eventually superseded by compensation, is it possible to ascertain the stages by which the change took place? And, furthermore, is it possible to determine when it took place?

In primitive times, the foundations for the law of retaliation were laid down by the natural impulse of the injured person to seek vengeance. He satisfied his desire by injuring or killing his aggressor or some one of the aggressor's family or kinsfolk, or by destroying his cattle or his dwelling or in some other way doing him harm. There was no man to stay his hand or curb his will; he did that which was right in his own eyes.² At some time, ³ The story of Samson well illustrates the lawlessness which the law of retaliation may have been intended to curb, and at the same time shows how the legal principle of retaliation already exists in the desire to avenge a wrong. Samson is married to a Philistine woman. His father-in-law gives her to another under circumstances which indicate innocence of wrong on his part, after Samson has shown his spirit by killing thirty of her
who shall say when, in remote antiquity the idea arose that some restraint on this ancient and unbridled right of vengeance was desirable. It may be that this notion took root along with the idea that the blood feud, whereby murder followed murder in an endless chain, should be checked by recognition of the right of sanctuary. Perhaps the one who committed an assault and who, like the murderer, took refuge in some sacred place, might be given into the hands of the pursuing victim, after the priest at the sanctuary had exacted from the injured person a solemn promise to do no more to his assailant than had been done to him. However this may be, we know that the idea of retaliation is common to many primitive peoples and satisfies the fundamental desire for even handed justice. The beginning of the law on the subject may be sought in a regulation that the injured person shall do no more than inflict the same injury on his aggressor, and the extent of his vengeance shall no more be measured by the strength of his impulse.

That the earliest form of the law of retaliation was a simple restriction on the right of revenge by limiting the penalty to the infliction of a similar injury is an assumption supported by the phraseology of the formula in Exodus, wherein by a terse statement of the penalty, a people. Samson then adds to his offense by burning their corn, vines, and olives. The Philistines take vengeance by burning his wife and her father, both innocent of wrongdoing. Samson continues the feud by killing the Philistines who thereupon camp against the tribe of Judah, who are to be held responsible for Samson's deeds in order that the Philistines may "do to him as hath done to us." To the protests of his own tribesmen, Samson retorts, "as they did unto me so have I done unto them" (Judg. 15, 1-11).

The phraseology of the law and its principle are proverbial: נטשה והם את האור (Lev. 24, 19); נטשה והם את האור (Prov. 24, 29); נטשה והם את האור (Obad. 15); נטשה והם את האור (Jer. 50, 29).
limitation is placed on some prior broader right: "Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, bruise for bruise" (Ex. 21, 23-25). According to this formula, retaliation is prescribed for all personal injuries from the gravest to the most trivial, from murder to a bruise. Four classes of injuries may be distinguished in this formula: (1) those resulting in death; (2) those resulting in loss of organs; (3) those resulting in the loss of limbs; (4) those leaving a mark on the body.

With the beginning of the law of retaliation and probably earlier began the law of compensation. For although retaliation is prescribed as the proper remedy, it is not the exclusive remedy. It is stated as the limitation of a prior unbridled right, and does not preclude the infliction of punishments of less severity. The injured always had the right to accept from the aggressor an apology or gift by way of expiation, and he had the right to exact such terms as he sought to impose as a condition of his waiver of the right to retaliate. This right to exact compensation was originally unrestricted, and depended solely on the will of the injured person, but by repetition it became fixed as custom and eventually as a law of compensation it entirely superseded the law of retaliation in which it had its origin.

It is to be assumed that the acceptance of compensation would occur more frequently in cases of minor injuries. These, being the more common and frequent class, would, by reason of the fact that they were settled by payment, tend to become a class distinct from the more serious injuries. The latter would be recognized as within the law of retaliation, although compensation might be accepted for them, whereas the former would eventually
be taken out of the pale of retaliation and be customarily paid for in damages. This seems to have been the state of the practice at the time when the legal formula in Leviticus summed up the law on the subject. "If a man cause a blemish (טומך) in his neighbor, as he hath done so shall it be done to him, breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him" (Lev. 24, 19-20).

Assuming that the text in Leviticus is a summing up of the law at an entirely different time and by an entirely different person than the text in Exodus, it represents a state of the tradition when retaliation was no longer prescribed or permitted in cases of simple injuries, but was restricted to cases resulting in death (Lev. 24, 17), or mayhem, i.e. "breaches," broken limbs, loss of organs (Lev. 21, 19). The significant word used here is "blemish" (טומך) which, as elsewhere defined (Lev. 21, 18-20; 22, 21-25), means physical injury of such nature as would ordinarily be caused by mayhem. The burning, wounding, and bruising mentioned in Exodus is significantly omitted here: the law was no longer applied as of yore, and for the minor injuries omitted from the formula some other redress had been substituted. This could have been nothing else than compensation. What had originally been a matter of choice and grace with the injured person, had now become customary. For serious injuries the law was as formerly retaliation or compensation; for minor injuries it was compensation or nothing.

The code of laws that we are examining shows an advanced state of custom, not merely by inference from the comparison of the formulae of Exodus and Leviticus, but in at least one specific case. "If men strive together, and
one smite the other with a stone or with his fist, and he
die not, but keepeth his bed, if he rise again and walk
abroad upon his staff, then he that smote him shall be
quit; only he shall pay for the loss of his time, and he
shall cause him to be thoroughly healed." It is to be
noted that this case provides a penalty only for temporary
injuries inflicted during a fight in the heat of blood; it is
not concerned with the death or permanent injury of the
injured person. The man inflicting a temporary hurt is
free or quit subject to his obligation to pay for loss of
time and medical expenses.4

We may assume that in a community which recognizes
the right of compensation but not of retaliation in cases
such as this, the practice of accepting compensation for
injuries for which retaliation was permitted, was probably
well known. The custom of compensation having once
been recognized, it must soon have won its way as a sub-
stitute for retaliation in many cases of actual unprovoked
assault, cases in which, as in the one cited, the injury was
not permanent. In such cases the analogy of the rule here
laid down would soon establish a rule of compensation for
bruises, wounds, and burnings which leave no permanent
serious injury and the result would be a custom by which

4 I am inclined to think that the reason for the leniency of the law in
not allowing retaliation in this case, for here surely is a case of wound or
bruise, such as would fall under the classification Ex. 21, 23-25, is that the
person injured is himself partly at fault. This seems to have been the view of
Philo (Yonge's translation, London 1855, 3, 329, "The Law Concerning
Murderers" V). It is not the case of one assaulting the other in which
retaliation would be the rule, but the case of the one who begins the quarrel
being hurt, or the case of two fighting in which neither can be determined
to be the aggressor, and one of them getting hurt. The injured man having
himself been at fault, cannot be permitted to take vengeance by retaliation;
yet the one who struck the effective blow may not be entirely acquitted and
must pay the actual damages sustained.
such cases would always be compromised in this manner. Thus we see one of the steps in the process of legal evolution from the general law of retaliation as set forth in the formula of Exodus 21, 21-23 to the more limited application of this rule to cases of death and mayhem as set forth in the formula of Lev. 24, 19-20.

We have now to consider the case reported in Exodus 21, 22-23, in connection with which the oldest formula of the law of retaliation is found, a case which presents several difficulties. "If men be fighting and strike a woman with child so that she miscarry, and she do not die, she shall surely be punished according as the woman's husband shall lay upon him, and he shall pay in the presence of the judges; but if she die, then thou shalt give life for life." If the woman was injured as the result of a deliberate blow by one of the fighting men, the case is clear enough, as falling within the law of retaliation; if, however, the...
blow was accidental, how shall it be included in the category of cases in which retaliation may be applied? Let us imagine the case of two fighting men in their rage utterly oblivious of their surroundings. A woman approaches, comes within reach, and is hurt. Shall it be said that this is a case in which they shall be held to account, when the woman was guilty of what we should call the grossest negligence in deliberately walking into the danger zone? Surely this cannot have been the intention of the law. I am of the opinion that this decision intended to provide for the special case of the pregnant woman who thrust herself into the melēc notwithstanding the danger to herself, for the purpose of making peace between the contending men, and who was injured either by a blow or by being thrust out of the way. This assumes that the woman had the right to thus attempt to make peace, for if she had no such right, she would certainly not be entitled, under any system of law with which we are familiar, to redress for any injury she received. (We are reminded of the situation depicted in Deut. 25, 11.) Furthermore we are struck by the fact that the law emphasizes that she is pregnant. The matron, not pregnant, or the maid, attempting to interfere would not fall within the purview of this law. Had the pregnant woman special rights which are here reflected? Did her condition give her the right of way? If these queries should be answered in the affirmative, we still have the difficulty arising in the case where she is pregnant but not visibly so. The unique character of this case prevents us from grouping it under any of the known categories of biblical laws. May we not therefore be justified in believing that we have here a survival of some
older laws relating to a time when the rights of women were especially notable?

Diod. Sic., III, 33, cited by Wilutzky, Vorgesch. d. Rechts, I, 26, mentions the fact that among the Ethiopians the person of woman was inviolate, and armed warriors in battle array ceased fighting when elderly women stepped among them commanding peace. Whether this be the result of the dominance of a matriarchal system or not, it is a significant parallel. The pregnant woman on the highway, as perhaps in an earlier state of the law, any matron on the highway, commanding peace, was entitled to absolute obedience on penalty of life or limb.

If the woman dies, the assailant is put to death; if she suffer any serious injury the assailant is punished by retaliation, or (ex hypothesi) by compensation. If she merely miscarries, he must pay the husband the value of the child that aborted, the amount of the damage being fixed by the husband. Here we have a case analogous to the right to exact compensation instead of retaliating, i.e. the right of the victim of an assault. Supposing the assailant refuses to pay the amount demanded by the husband? Under the older law the husband would have retaliated in some way, probably by taking life for the life of his unborn child. The fear of this was probably sufficient sanction to enforce payment of the sum demanded. The payment having been agreed to, was made in the presence of the דְּרוֹד who acted

* In connection with this, note Grimm, "Rechtsalterthümer": If an outlaw flees to women, let him live for their sake. Also the creation of sanctuary on the highway by the presence of vestal virgins. And among the Samoans fighting stops before female heralds. Wilutzky, III, 184. How completely the original meaning of this case is forgotten is shown by the LXX version, Philo "Concerning Murderers" sec. 6 and the version of Josephus Ant. IV, viii. 33.
not judicially but ministerially, merely recording the fact of payment.

The only other biblical case relating to retaliation is that of the false witness in an action for personal injuries. "If the witness be a false witness, he hath testified a falsehood against his brother; then shall ye do unto him as he had purposed to do unto his brother... And thine eye shall have no pity, life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" (Deut. 19, 18-21; see Susannah 1, 62). That such a case would not fall under the law of retaliation in the absence of special provision is obvious, for it is only the one inflicting the injury who is subject to retaliation, and it requires rather nice reasoning to assimilate the law relating to the false witness to that relating to the aggressor. The law in Deuteronomy seems to stand between those of Exodus and Leviticus. Unlike Exodus and like Leviticus, it does not include ordinary wounds and bruises. It differs from Leviticus in mentioning hand and foot, whereas Leviticus uses a general term "breach" to include these and other injuries, the result of the assault.

We may now consider another important point. How far is the matter of retaliation one for judicial cognizance? I am inclined to the opinion that it became so as soon as the law of retaliation was adopted. In the earliest times when each man did what was right in his own eyes, there was no law of retaliation, and punishment was inflicted by the victim or his folk in such manner as to him or them seemed best. But as soon as men awoke to the need of re-

* If בְּמַלְאָה means payment according to the award of the court, may it not be a gloss indicating an advance of the law to this stage from the earlier stage in which the payment was made out of court and for the amount demanded by the husband?
restricting this right by limiting the punishment to retaliation, there must have been some way of enforcing this restriction. There must have been recourse to some tribunal to enable the victim to have his revenge lawfully by retaliation and at the same time to protect the aggressor from excessive punishment. It is thus fairly inferable that the matter was one for the court in very early times. We have proof that it was so at least as early as the existence of the law relating to the false witness recorded in Deuteronomy. There can be no false witnesses except in a trial of a cause. The trial here referred to is of a controversy in which the punishment of retaliation was to have been inflicted if the defendant were to be found guilty. It seems therefore pretty well established that personal assaults were triable offenses where the offense had to be proved and the punishment was then inflicted by the prosecutor under the supervision of the court.

Ancient law does not distinguish between civil and criminal law, and the procedure in both cases is the same. In the case of an ordinary debt, the court determines the liability and then turns the debtor over to the creditor to pay out of his estate or by his personal service. Obviously all this had to be done under the eye of the court. Similarly in cases of assault, the court determined the truth of the charge and then turned the assailant over to his victim for retaliatory punishment. Now, in like manner as the creditor could remit the debt in whole or in part, so the victim of an assault could remit the punishment or accept money in lieu of inflicting it. Before the matter was heard by the court and certainly between judgment and execution, there must, in most cases, have been influences at work for adjusting the difficulty. Mutual friends, benevo-
lent elders, chieftains interested for political reasons in protecting the aggressor and securing him immunity, added to the natural instinct of most men to be placated by gifts, turned the desire for retaliation into willingness to accept compensation and "money became the ransom of a man's life" (Prov. 13, 8). In cases of minor assaults these influences easily prevailed, and it became general custom to settle them by payment of damages, a custom which thereafter became law. In the meantime the more grievous assaults were still punishable under the strict law of retaliation, subject to the right of the victim to accept compensation, and eventually, even in these cases, the custom of compensation prevailed. Even in cases of homicide blood money was taken for the life of the slayer and it required the positive mandate of the law, "Ye shall take no redemption money for the life of the murderer who is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death" (Num. 35, 31), to restore, in this one class of cases, the old law of retaliation which had been superseded by the general practice of compensation in all cases of assault. And the law then stood as follows: for all minor assaults, compensation in damages; for murder, the retaliatory penalty of death; for all grave assaults, retaliation or compensation. In the latter case however, although the law of retaliation was still theoretically in force it had been in practice superseded by compensation. It required but one step more to bring the law to its modern form, i.e. the legal recognition of the right of compensation as the exclusive remedy and the prohibition of retaliation entirely, except in cases of homicide. This step was taken by the Tannaim, and was
followed by the adoption of a fixed scale of prices for various injuries.

Between the close of the biblical canon and the earlier Tannaim the law was as above stated. Retaliation was still legally recognized but practically abandoned. Philo seems to regret this condition and pleads in favor of the old strict law of retaliation which, according to him, made for equality and equity, whereas the acceptance of money compensation tended to unsettle the biblical law. But he recognizes that rigid adherence to the old law is no longer expedient and that the degree of punishment must be determined by the circumstances of each case."

Following Philo we have the dicta of three persons, Jesus, Josephus, and Eliezer b. Hyrcanos, to the effect that the law of retaliation had not been abolished in cases of grave assaults in the nature of mayhem at least as late as the first century of the Christian Era. Jesus said (Matt. 5, 38) : "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say, etc." Had the rabbinical law been fully developed and had it then been generally accepted that eye for eye means money for eye, it is unlikely that he would have completely ignored it.

30 Philo "On special laws, etc." Yonge's trans., III, 348. Bähr, Das Gesetz über falsche Zeugen," 28, is of the opinion that Philo's preference for the old law rather than for the later law is due to his familiarity with other systems of jurisprudence. But the error of Bähr and many others lies in their theory that in Philo's day the rabbinical law had already reached the point stated in Mishnah that "eye for eye" meant "money for eye." The law in Philo's day was as stated above and he is one of the conservatives who tried to stem the tendency of the general custom of accepting compensation from becoming the law and legally superseding retaliation, as it afterwards did. Ritter, "Philo und die Halakah," 21, states that Philo and the Halakah were in conflict and that Josephus took a middle path between them. This likewise assumes what is not true, namely that the Halakah in Philo's time was the same as that stated in Mishnah.
Josephus says (Ant. IV, 8, 35; Whiston's translation):
“He that maimeth any one, let him undergo the like himself, and be deprived of the same member of which he hath deprived the other, unless he that is maimed will accept of money instead of it; for the law makes the sufferer the judge of the value of what he has suffered, and permits him to estimate it, unless he will be more severe.” This statement shows that the law of retaliation is still in force, and it confirms three conclusions reached above: (1) that it applied only to cases of mayhem, (2) that the injured person might accept compensation and that he was the sole judge of the amount, (3) that judicial interference with this right had gone so far as to prevent an unconscionable exercise of it.

In the light of what has been said it will be possible to understand the reason for the opinion of Eliezer b. Hyrcanos that the law of retaliation is to be taken literally, an opinion given at a time when the current of rabbinical opinion had set strongly toward legally recognizing compensation as the sole remedy. The Talmud (B. K. 84a) reports Eliezer as saying “eye for eye, (means) actual (eye for eye)," כו יתא לסייע כגון מבש. When the later jurists came to the discussion of this question, they could not understand the reason for this opinion, and offered explanations which, failing to take the historical point of view, are obviously unsatisfactory. But the fact that Eliezer, who flourished at the end of the first century holds this opinion, even though he is apparently in a minority of one, is significant. He was a rigid conservative who prided himself on the fact that he never offered an opinion that had not been handed down to him by his masters. His dictum therefore indicates that his masters also held it and that through them there was preserved the strict tradition of the old
law of retaliation, even though in common practice the tendency toward compensation had long been in vogue. Eliezer was the last recorded representative of the upholders of the old law based upon a strict construction of the biblical text and ignoring the almost universal practice that had supplanted it. The dominant opinion represented by men like Ishmael b. Elisha and his school, was that the general practice of compensation represented the true meaning of the biblical law and that the biblical law of retaliation had (and here they invoked the aid of a common expedient, a legal fiction) always meant compensation since the time it was first promulgated."

After the eclipse of Eliezer, no other rabbinical voice is reported in favor of the old law of retaliation and the decisions are unanimously in favor of the view that compensation was and always had been the proper remedy. Therefore when the Mishnah was compiled, the law of retaliation was completely ignored and the then well established universal practice of allowing compensation for the injury received, found expression in the text stated at the beginning of this paper, "He who injures the person of another is liable for five elements of damage, to wit: for the actual physical harm, for the pain, for the expense of healing, for the loss of time, and for the shame or mental suffering."

Although the Mishnah became authoritative (Yeb. 42b: הַלְּכַת כֵּמות מְשֹׁמֶה), it did not immediately settle the question

21 See opinion of the school of Ishmael, B. K., 84a, also Simon b. Yohai's opinion (ibid.). For the indentification of the Eliezer here mentioned with Eliezer b. Hyrcanos I am indebted to Dr. Henry Malter who referred me to Weiss' edition of Mekilta, p. 91, and Geiger's discussion in יָנַן, vol. VI, p. 28, and to Dr. Julius H. Greenstone who referred me to Geiger, Ges. Schr., Hal. Section, p. 162, and Weiss, דְּרֵי וֹר רְוֹר וָסִי, I, p. 111.
that had been so long mooted, i. e. how can the written law and the practice be reconciled. The biblical law of retaliation, of divine origin, was theoretically unchangeable; the later law of compensation was the result of centuries of changing interpretation and custom. The old law was thus in fact abolished although, theoretically, because of its peculiar sanction, it could be neither changed nor abolished. The biblical law read "eye for eye"; the universal practice now crystallized into rabbinical law prescribed "money for eye." How shall these inharmonious legal principles be reconciled? The Amoraim cut the Gordian knot by the assumption that the Written Law did not mean what it said; that when Moses prescribed retaliation, he meant and was always understood to have meant, compensation; that "eye for eye" really means "money for eye." By projecting into the distant past their latter-day conception, i. e. by the use of that universal legal expedient, a legal fiction, the Amoraim, while accepting the law as they found it in actual practice, were able to preserve the doctrine of the inviolability of the Written Law. The Gemara clearly reflects the state of uncertainty of the legal mind while this question was being debated. The method of reasoning of the Amoraim shows that the dictum of the Mishnah was not of ancient and unquestioned authority, but rather a new thing still open to debate. Had the Mishnah really reflected the opinion of the Mosaic days there could not have been such painful efforts to explain it as we find in the Gemara, and the opinion of the authorities would have been uniform. Questions of law do not remain in a state of flux for centuries, and although at first they may be subject of bitter controversy, eventually a conclusion is reached and out of the welter of conflicting views an es-
tablished rule arises, which is accepted without question. Such a rule is not open to criticism but merely to expansion. How different it was with the Mishnic rule of compensation the Gemara amply shows. Two classes of opinions may be seen in the report of the debates of the Amoraim, one based on consideration of facts and the other on consideration of words. In the debates in which facts are offered to support the Mishnah, the proponents are defeated and by inference the Mishnah declared to be untenable in the face of the written law, and it is only by the aid of verbal analogies that the proponents of the Mishnah maintain their ground, and this indeed very precariously. For at bottom they are trying to reconcile the irreconcilable, and make "eye for eye" mean "money for eye." The first class of opinions is represented by the Amoraim who support the dicta of Dostai b. Judah, Simon b. Yohai, and the School of Hezekiah, and the second by those supporting the dicta of the School of Ishmael and the School of Hyya, as well as by the opinion of Ashi (B. K. 84a). That the Amoraim really did not understand the reason for the opinion of strict constructionists like Eliezer b. Hyrcanos is clearly shown by the discussion of his dictum in which the opinions of Rabba, Abaye, and Ashi are cited."

"I cite the passage in full to illustrate more clearly. "Rabbi Eliezer said, Eye for eye (means) actual (retaliation)." "Actual (retaliation)? Impossible. Can Eliezer be opposed to all the Tannaim"? Rabba said, He means that the injured person is not to be valued as though he were a slave (in fixing the amount of compensation to which he would be entitled). Abaye answered him, (Is it that you think that otherwise he would be valued) like a freeman? Has a freeman a fixed value? Nay, said Rab Ashi, he (Eliezer) meant to say that we do not estimate the value (of the eye of) the injured person, but that of the aggressor (meaning that as according to the principle of retaliation he should lose his eye, he must now pay as much as it is worth to him to retain it.).
As stated, the Gemara rejects the reasoning based on facts. For instance, it is urged that the law was never meant to be taken literally, because, if a man has a large eye and he puts out the smaller eye of his neighbor it would not be just to allow his eye to be put out, for this is not the equality that the law has in view. To which answer is made that the law says "eye for eye" meaning "eyesight for eyesight," and that therefore the size of the eyes of the parties is irrelevant. So again, it is urged that if a blind man puts out a man's eye, the law could not be literally enforced against him, and therefore it follows that it was never intended to be literally applied, to which answer is made that the law never attempts impossibilities and is intended to apply only to possible conditions, so that wherever the punishment prescribed is impossible, as in the case here cited or in the case of a murder committed by one already mortally wounded, there should be no punishment at all. Finally it is urged that the law was not intended to be taken literally because in putting out the eye of the aggressor he might die and then he would have given "a life and eye for an eye," to which answer is made that before the punishment by retaliation is allowed to be inflicted, the court determines whether the convict is able to stand the punishment and if it be determined that he is strong enough he is punished, and though he may die as a result of it, it cannot be helped for it is no one's fault. Although the Gemara rejects the reasoning based on facts, it approves the reasoning based on mere verbal analogies and peculiarities; for instance the reason known as "the superfluity of texts" (אוריי הר). It is argued that since the law (Lev. 24, 19-20) says first "so shall it be done unto him" and then "thus shall it be
given to him,” it follows that money payment is meant because of the use of the word “given.” The second text being superfluous is intended to modify the meaning of the first by changing the retaliation into compensation. It seems clear from these discussions that the Talmudists resisted every attempt to reinstate the law of retaliation. To them the biblical law of “eye for eye” had become the mere expression of the principle of equality.

In post-Talmudic times the discussions in the Talmud are occasionally referred to, but never reopened. The settled principle of law that compensation is the proper redress for personal injuries is never questioned. See Targum Jer. on Deut. 19, 21 and compare with Onkelos ad loc. Alfasi accepts the principle of compensation absolutely, and does not even find it necessary to refer to the Talmudic discussions (Alfasi, ed. Sulzbach 1766, III, 32a on B. K. VIII). Maimonides (Ḥobel umazzik, 1, 3-6) although accepting the rule of compensation, indicates that he is not satisfied with the Talmudic reasoning whereby the rule is justified. He finds its authority in the common practice which had its origins in Mosaic times and was followed by the courts throughout the generations, הַנַּלְכַּלָתָא לֶעָשֶׂשׂ וְזַז בְּיוֹרָה.

38 See other similar arguments B. K. 84a.
39 This is the effect of the opinion of Ashi (B. K. 84a: שָׁאוּם שֵׁמוֹנָא אָוֹתָה) that the eye of the aggressor was valued and thus the amount to which the injured person was entitled, was ascertained; this amount being what the retention of his eye was worth to the aggressor who was liable to have it struck out. See also opinion of Saadiah on Ex. 21, 24. Saadiah’s statement also shows that the law was not, as the Talmudists argued, always interpreted as in their day, and that literal retaliation was at one time in vogue.
It is needless to say that none of the later law books even suggest retaliation as a proper remedy, the example of contemporary European and Asiatic systems of jurisprudence to the contrary notwithstanding (see Shulḥan ‘Aruk, Ḥoshen Mishpaṭ, 420, and commentaries).

18 Views of the Sadducees. It was supposed upon the authority of a scholion to Meg. Taan., 4, that the Sadducees (Boethusians) held to the literal interpretation. It is not at all unlikely that many of them did so, for, as was shown, even the Pharisees were not unanimous in their opinion, and the old law was not entirely obsolete. But the authority cited for the opinion of the Sadducees has been shown to be of late origin. It seems to me, however, that this citation, while not valuable as a contemporary record, is not to be ignored entirely. There is no doubt that in the days of the Boethusians, retaliation was still recognized as a legal punishment, and it is also quite possible that they as a sect so interpreted the law. For discussion of the scholion referred to see Brüll, Jahrb. 1877, 57; Frankel, Der gerichtliche Beweis, 50; Geiger, URSCHRIFT, 148; Ritter, Philo u. d. Halachah, 133; Graetz, Monatsschr., 1876, 410.

Samaritans. Dr. James A. Montgomery states in reply to my inquiry: “I know of no reference to the lex talionis in Samaritan law. Unfortunately almost nothing has been published on the Samaritan Halakah except Wreschner’s valuable treatise “Samaritanische Traditionen,” Berlin 1888, in which he treats of a Samaritan halakic commentary. But apart from titles on marriage, testimony, and inheritance, the subjects contained in the commentary are ritualistic. None of the halakic material in the European libraries has been published. And the Samaritans have been so long divorced from civil autonomy, which to a certain extent the Jews enjoyed in various conditions, that I doubt if any traditions of the old criminal law have survived in that sect.”

Karaïtes. At least some of the Karaïtes held to the literal meaning of the biblical law (see debate between Ben Zitta and Saadiah reported by Ibn Ezra on Ex. 21, 24). I am indebted to Rabbi Bernard Revel for the following notes on the Karaïtic interpretation. Besides Ben Zitta, Benjamin Nahawendi (מנואנדי, 2, 4) interprets the law literally. Judah Hadassi (middle of twelfth century; שמחון המחבר, 104, alph. 3, 275) accepts the rabbinical opinion. Aaron b. Joseph (המחבר, Ex. 42; Lev. 44a) quotes two Karaïte opinions. According to the first which he himself accepts, for an unintentional injury there is compensation, for an intentional one, retaliation. According to the second, only permanent injuries, such as loss of limb, require retaliation. Aaron b. Elijah (inばかり啮, Ex. 72a; Lev. 69a; also in his תנין עין, p. 179a) states that the
Karaite are divided on the subject of retaliation, there being four opinions: (1) those who take the law literally, (2) those who accept the rabbinic view, (3) those who distinguish between intentional and unintentional injuries, (4) those who hold that the court determines whether retaliation or compensation shall be applied. Solomon (a late Karaite in his Lifetime) mentions only one opinion, namely that the penalty depends on the intention. All the Karaitees agree that Deut. 25, 12 יבשה יבשה יבשה is to be taken literally.
II.

Among the Aryan words—mostly Persian—in the Hebrew-Aramaic text of the Old Testament there are some, forming a group by themselves, which begin with a preposition followed by a noun or a verbal root. Of these prepositions the principal are: patri, pari, ati, ni, vi, fra, and ham. With some of the chief of the words thus formed we purpose to deal in the present article, omitting those which are properly dealt with in the Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon and there fully explained, though as concisely as possible, such as סְאָהִים, סְאָהִים, סְאָהִים, and others.

To begin with, we take the word which in Esther (3, 14; 4, 8; 8, 13) is written סְאָהִים and in Ezra (4, 11) סְאָהִים. The latter has as its first element the preposition pari (Skt. and Achaemenian Persian), pairi (Avestic), = παρί, and is probably incorrect, though such a word might readily be formed. The word as it occurs in Esther has patri (Achaem.), = Skt. prati, Avestic paiti, πατί, πατί, as its first element. Sheghen should probably be seghen סְאָהִים, and is the Avestic vocable which assumes the three forms sāhvēnī, sāhvēnī, and sāhvānē, and means "what is said, a word." It comes from the root which in Avestic is sanh, in Sanskrit sans and sās, and in Achaemenian Persian thah, meaning "to speak, to say," corresponding to the
German and Scandinavian root *sag*, with the same meaning. In Mediaeval Persian this noun became *sakhan*, since almost invariably the Avestic letter transliterated by *hv* is changed into *kh* in the modern language. Then the vocalization became *sakhun*, and is now *suhun*, “a saying, a word.” The original form of *כוה* was therefore in Avestic *paiti-sāẖvēnī*. It is preserved in Armenian as a loan-word in the form *pataskhani* (modern *patskhan*), for *patsakhani* by transposing a vowel. In Armenian it means “an answer,” in Avestic it probably had the sense which it has in Aramaic, “a copy,” as *answering* to and *corresponding* with the original. In the B. D. B. Hebrew Lexicon, p. 1109, several conjectures are given as to the origin of (*תוי or) *םתנ*, but only in the last two lines is an approximation made to the true solution of the problem. The Armenian *patėn* there given has only its first element in common with our vocable. Probably in Hebrew the loan-word should be pointed as then, not as now.

The explanation of the word *הינא* in Isa. 3, 24 is not so easy. From the Septuagint rendering *κιτων μεσοτόρφον* one is inclined to fancy that they had *הינא*, and derived the word from the Avestic *pitu*, “the marrow, the middle,” and the word which occurs in Sanskrit as *nila*, “dark blue,” and doubtless existed in Old Persian also. This, however, can hardly be correct. One must resist the temptation to compare the modern Persian word *patgīr*, “a strainer, a sieve,” and all other compounds with *-gīr*; for, though *l* and *r* may have interchanged in Old Persian, yet the root *-gīr* in the modern language is in Achaem. Persian *garb*, in Sanskrit *grabh* and *grah*. In Achaemenian the *b* is preserved, and in Avestic becomes *w* (*garcw* and *gērcw* being the forms of the root in that dialect). Prob-
ably the first element in יִרָאִיִּים is Av. paiti (as already given under רַאיִים), and the rest comes from the root gar (gal), from which we have Av. garā, “throat,” Skt. gala. The i takes the place of a in Skt. gila, “swallowing,” from the same root. The word may thus mean a garment “up to the throat,” and this would perhaps suit the context, for we require something contrasted with “girding with sackcloth.” Does the Vulgate “fascia pectoralis” contain an approximation to our tentative explanation, or is it a guess?

No other compound of paiti (pāti) requires notice, but there is one in pairi (pāri, pāpi) that should not be passed over in silence. It occurs as רַפי in II Kings 23, 11, and as רֵפֶי in I Chron. 26, 18. The Septuagint and Hexaplar Syriac merely transliterate the word. The B. D. B. Lexicon quotes Gesenius’ Thesaurus as deriving it from the Modern Persian farvār, “summer-house, literally light-bearer.” This shows that no decided improvement upon this suggestion has as yet been made. Gesenius’ habit of comparing Modern instead of Ancient Persian is, with our present knowledge of the old language, somewhat risky, though here it is not really incorrect. In the present instance, if the first element meant “light,” it would be the Modern Persian farr, which comes from the Avestic hvarenō, and from this one could not get the form which occurs in Isaiah. There is, however, no difficulty if we recognize pairi (pāri, pāpi) as the first element in the word, and the root var (in Sanskrit vṛi, “to cover, conceal, shelter”) as the second. In the Avesta the word pairi-vāra actually occurs, meaning “an enclosing wall,” “protection.” The Avestic noun vāra, “enclosure,” is from this verbal root (comp. “wall”). In Sanskrit we have pari-
vūra, “a hedge round a village.” In Armenian from the same root comes paroir, “a circle, a crowd,” and parouel, “to surround, cover, conceal.” In the Targum parwār, parwāl, parwil, means “suburb.” The form given by Gesenius is only one of those now used in Persian and thence borrowed by Ottoman Turkish, for parbār, parpār, parpāraḥ, farvār, and farbāl also occur. They show that the first element is not hvarenō but pairi, as we have pointed out above. The meaning of the word when used in Hebrew is either “environs” or (as in the Revised English Version), “precincts.”

2. We now pass to a small but very interesting group of words in which the preposition atī (Achaem. Pers. atī, Avestic aiti, Skt. ati, Armenian ti) forms the first element. These words are נִגְרָנ (Dan. 3, 2, 3), in the definite plural form in Aramaic, and נִגְרֵנ (Ezra 2, 63; Neh. 7, 65. 70; 8, 9; 10, 1). Let us deal with each of them in turn.

It was considered by most scholars that נִגְרָנ was due to a scribal error, until recent discoveries revealed the occurrence of the word (written נִגְרְנ) in an Aramaic inscription in Egypt. The B. D. B. Lexicon says that the meaning is unknown, and gives no attempt at the etymology. Even as early as the time of the Septuagint version being made, the signification of נִגְרֵנ had been lost. The Peshiṭṭā merely transliterates the word with change of a letter. If the word is Persian, as would seem not unlikely, its Achaemenian form would be ti-pati, in Avestic ti-paṭi. Neither of these actually occurs in what remains of these dialects, but pati in the one and paṭi in the other as a noun means “lord,” “master,” as does the Sanskrit equivalent, paṭi and the Armenian paṭ. In the latter tongue the preposition ati loses its initial vowel and becomes ti. This
does not occur with the same word in Achaem. and Av., or even in Skt., but in Sanskrit the similar preposition *api* (= Gk. ἰνι, Germ. and Eng. be-) becomes *pi* in *pi-dhā*, *pi-nah*, and *pi-dribh*, while the preposition *adi* becomes *dhi* in *dhi-shṭhita* for *adhi-shṭhita*, “stationed over,” and in Pāli the usual form of the Sanskrit *iti*, “thus,” is *ti*. The Avestic *aiti* seldom occurs in composition, and the Achaemenian *ati* with the root *i*, “to go,” only once; but the latter in Kirmānshāḥi Kurdish appears as *ti-at*, “he comes,” with loss of the initial vowel of the preposition. As has been said, in Armenian this initial vowel is always lost and the word *ati* becomes *ti*. In this form it occurs in *ti-air*, “overman,” contracted into *tēr*, “lord”; *ti-kin*, “overwoman,” “lady” (from *kin*, Gk. γυνή, “woman”); *ti-eserkāh*, “over-limits,” “world,” “universe.” Hence *ati-pati* or *ti-pati* would mean “overlord.” That the word denotes some kind of an official is clear from the context. Benfey suggested *ati-paiti* [more correctly this would be *aiti-paiti* in Avestic and *ati-pati* in Achaem. Persian], but could not adduce the further evidence given above in support of the suggestion. Though *ati-pati* does not occur in Sanskrit, yet *ati-rājā* (a similarly formed compound denoting "a supreme king" or "superior to a king"), *ati-strī*, “surpassing a woman,” “ati-mānusha,” “superhuman,” *atindriya* “beyond cognizance of the senses,” and other such words do. We have, from another preposition of similar meaning, *adhi-pati*, “ruler,” *adhi-rājā*, “supreme king,” *adhi-purusha*, “supreme male,” “supreme spirit.” There seems therefore no reason to doubt that we have now ascertained the etymology of the word that occurs only in its plural form קֹלְמָן, and concerning which there has long been doubt.
The recognition of the meaning of the prefixed (*a*)ti in this word helps us to solve the problem presented by the title Tirshatha (םיהנִמ) applied to Nehemiah, and to him only. Here we have the same *ti* to start with. The meaning is clear, for Nehemiah is also called נִמְז, which is the Assyrian *pahātu*, "governor, procurator" (Neh. 5, 11). The latter was subordinate to the *satrap* in the time of Ezra and Esther, and the satrap in Nehemiah's time was Tattenai (Ezra 5, 3; 6, 6, 13), who is called Ushtanni and Ushatanu in the Cuneiform Contract Tablets, and who ruled Syria under the Persian King. Herodotus tells us that Phoenicia, Palestine and Cyprus were included in the fifth satrapy under Darius (Herod. III, 89, 90). Nehemiah ruled only a single city and its adjacent district. Does the word *tirshathā* in any way bear a meaning corresponding to this fact?

The R. D. B. Lexicon proposes as its etymology the Avestic *tarshta*, rendering it by "the feared, the revered." But the root of this word (Avestic *tares, teres*, Sanskrit *tras*) does not mean "to terrify," but "to fear," and its past participle *tarshta* would therefore mean what the modern form of the word (*tarsidah*) does in Modern Persian, i.e. "frightened" (comp. Latin *timidus* from *timeo*). This will hardly suit. Nor will the Peshiṭṭā guess, "chief of the priests." The Septuagint and Vulgate, despairing of discovering the meaning and etymology, merely transliterate the word נִמְז by Ἀθηράθα, Ἀσθηράθα, *Athersatha*.

It seems that *tirshāthā* is intended to represent *ti-shāthrā*, the *r* being transposed as in Tirhakah (*Tirḥakāh וירקה*), the Egyptian form of which name is *Taherkā*, and the Assyrian *Tarkū*. In the same way *ālu* Larsa, "the city of Larsa" becomes in Hebrew *Elassar*. But *ti-shāthrā*
would mean “intendant of the city” (compare the office held in Egypt by Ptah-Ḥotep in the beginning of the Papyrus Prisse, *mer net* “lord of the city”), for the second part of the word is the Avestic *shōithrā*, which implies an earlier *shāthrā*, “city,”—in Modern Persian *shahr*, in Achaem. Persian *khshatra* (and then meaning “province,” the meaning changing just as that of the Hebrew הַעִיר, which in Arabic has become *madīnah* and means not “province” but “city”). Thus *ti-shāthrā* would mean *praefectus urbis*. In Modern Persia every city and village has a similar official at its head, though called by another name.
POETIC FRAGMENTS FROM THE GENIZAH

By ISRAEL DAVIDSON, Jewish Theological Seminary of America

III. FROM A DIVAN OF ‘ALVAN BEN ABRAHAM

The following poetic letters are found in two Genizah fragments. The similarity in the handwriting of the two fragments at once suggested the possibility that they were parts of the same Divan, and on closer examination it became evident that one was actually the continuation of the other. One of the two letters, addressed to Jacob ben Alfarag Almagazili, has its beginning in one fragment and its conclusion in the other.

The interest that attaches itself to these texts lies not so much in their literary and linguistic merits as in the fact, that they give us the names of new men whose importance, though still vague, may become clearer in the light of future discoveries.

Concerning the author, ‘Alvan ben Abraham,’ no information has come to light heretofore, as far as I can

1 T.S., Loan 9, consisting of one leaf, paper, and T.S., Loan 60, consisting of two leaves, paper, each leaf being 19 x 14 c.m.

2 See below, text No. 4, l. 11-12. Not only the context but also the acrostic proves the continuation, for this letter, as far as it goes in T.S. 9, has אֵין לְבָנֵי בֵּית אָבִּי in acrostic, while the beginning of T.S. 60 supplies the remaining רֵיחָן.

3 In transliterating נֵלֶבּ by ‘Alvan, I followed Neubauer and Cowley, Cat. Bodle. II, Index. See, however, Steinschneider, Introduction to the...
ascertain. He seems, however, to have sprung of a family well known in the East, and for this reason, I deem it proper to group here together all the data furnished by the Genizah about this family. In a legal document, coming from “the communities dwelling in the country of Tyre” (הקהילה השוויה במדינת צור), dated the first of Marheshwan 4789 A.M. (1029 C.E.), one of the signatories is יִבְנוֹ נֵה לִית. One of the parties to a marriage contract, dated at Fostát 1378 Sel. (1067 C.E.), is יִתְנְטָרַב נֵעְלֵי and in a similar document, likewise dated at Fostát, 1.4 Sel., the man's name is יִזְיָר נֵעְלֵי. In a report of judicial proceedings, dated at Fostát in 1396 Sel. (1085 C.E.), the names of the parties are מְרַב נֵעְלֵי and מְרַב נֵעְלֵי בּוֹרִיב נֵעְלֵי נוּע. We also have two letters addressed to יִבְנוֹ נֵה לִית and one letter to מְרַב נֵעְלֵי בּוֹרִיב נֵעְלֵי, in which mention is made of יִזְיָר נֵעְלֵי, possibly Judah ben Joseph of Kairwan. Finally we have also a liturgical poem, beginning יִזְיָר נֵעְלֵי בּוֹרִיב נֵעְלֵי, with the acrostic of Jacob ‘Alvan.’

In none of these documents, however, do we find the name of our author, and the only conclusion we may draw

*Neub. Cat., II, 2873, 37.
6 Ibid., 2873, 38.
7 Ibid., 2877, 15.
8 Ibid., 2834, 18.
9 Ibid., 2876, 53: 2878, 5.
10 Ibid., 2876, 70. The address on the reverse side of this letter reads to פָּטְאַט מֶיסֶר אֶבֶּל תַּמְיָן בֶּן עִי...
from them is, that the 'Alvan family flourished in Egypt and in Asia Minor at least as early as 1029. And just as the above mentioned documents are silent about our author so are also the poetic letters printed here for the first time. Nevertheless, there are a few general facts which we may justly deduce from them. It is safe to assume, for instance, that 'Alvan ben Abraham was a religious authority in his community, since he presumed to lay down the law in ritual matters. That he was not the chief religious authority is evident from the fact, that he had to appeal to a certain R. Hananiah for authoritative support. This R. Hananiah, whom 'Alvan addresses as "our master, the father of the Yeshibah," seems to have gone to Aleppo on some communal mission. In his absence, some of his enemies, who were also inimical to 'Alvan, tried to usurp his authority. In fact, one of them, whose name is not mentioned, succeeded, for a time, in getting control of the community and this proved disastrous to the honest men of the congregation. After a while, however, 'Alvan was in a position to write to Hananiah that his authority had again been recognized. Our letters give us no clue whether Hananiah remained in Aleppo or not, but from one of them, addressed to a certain Mukhtar, it seems that the community in which 'Alvan lived again stood in need

This family name is found also in much later times; comp. Stein- schneider, Cat. Bod., 3502, 4304, 6916, 14.

See below, text No. 1, l. 6.

Ibid., 1. 7.

Ibid., 1. 10.

Ibid., 1. 1, 3.

Ibid., 1. 4, 8.

Ibid., No. 2. Unfortunately the last part of the second line in this letter which contained some description of this man is no longer legible.

Ibid., 1. 4-6.

Ibid., No. 3, especially 1. 5, 7.
of a chief religious authority. In that letter he recounts all the misery into which the people have fallen on account of maladministration, and asks Mukhtār to appoint the son of Rabbi Isaac, referring perhaps to Abraham ben Isaac ibn Batah Alrahbi mentioned in the sixth letter. As an historic document, relating to the internal management of Jewish communal life in ancient times, it deserves to be translated, though allowance must be made for its poetic exaggeration.

1. "My intercession has been made void"; he says, "she who was once joyous has been robbed of her joy, and she stumbled and became an object of derision.

2. She has been brought down low, to the ends of all boundaries she is scattered, crushed, and oppressed,

3. Distress has surrounded her, want has encompassed her, and a change of laws has been decreed concerning her.

4. Her graven statutes are changed, she has become cheaper than refuse, and has sunk to the lowest level.

5. They have crushed her with evil devices, choked her with violence and falsehood, and she found no respite from oppression.

6. They plotted to slander her, to torment her with extorting tribute, to crush her like ashes reduced to powder.

7. She had hoped for the shining of a light, but instead of light she grew dark and gloomy, and she resigned herself to the light of heaven.
8. Look at her calamity, with the guidance of thy word guide her, O Master, and choose the scholar, son of Rabbi Isaac, may his soul rest in peace."

All these points, however, do not help us identify either 'Alvan or Hananiah. About the identity of the latter we could easily lose ourselves in conjectures, but it is better to leave the question open and wait for future discoveries in the Genizah to solve it. The other men mentioned in these letters, viz. Jacob ben Jeshua (Alfarag) Almagazili to whom letters 4 and 8 are addressed, Abraham ben Isaac and Isaac ben Jefet ibn Batah (letters 6, 7), perhaps father and son, Hillel ben Ḥar Alḥalabi (from Aleppo ?) also called Abu Alfadl Mazliah (letter 9), and Isaac Al'atar (letter 10) are likewise unknown as far as I can ascertain, and our letters give us no clue to their time or place.

From the specific charges which 'Alvan, in his first

---

Ibid., No. 5. I am tempted to put forth the suggestion, that the expression יָשָׁב הַר מְדֻבֶּשׁ לְעֵינֶיהָ חָרְשָׁת, in line 3, can be taken to mean, that "conversion has been forced upon her." This would lead us to think that 'Alvan is not speaking here of one community but of the whole Jewry, having in mind perhaps the religious persecution which the Jews suffered under the Almohade dynasty. But I reject this hypothesis, because, in the first place, we know of no great Talmudic authority in the twelfth century by the name of Ḥananiah, with whom we could identify our Hananiah, and secondly, the appeal of 'Alvan to Mukhtar to appoint a certain scholar could not apply in the case where the whole Jewish people were concerned. Still the hypothesis was worth stating.

We might, for instance, identify our Hananiah with the father of Sherira. We find also a יָשָׁב לְהַנָּחָת, mentioned together with Sherira, in a document dated at Bagdad 998 (Neub., Cat., II, 2876, 49). This Hananiah cannot be Sherira's father, for the latter could no longer have been alive then. On the other hand, if we go down to a much later period, we find that Ḥarizi, in speaking of the prominent men of Aleppo, mentions חָרְשָׁת (al-fallah) הַנָּחָת מְדֻבֶּשׁ, ed. Kaminka, 365).
letter to Hananiah, brought against his opponents, we incidentally gather fresh proof, that the law which declares an animal with pulmonary lobes adhering to the chest to be unfit for food, was for a long time disputed in many countries. From a Gaonic Responsum, cited in various Halakic works and lately edited more fully from the Genizah, it has been known, that the two Academies of Babylon prohibited the meat of such an animal. The same source, however, tells us also that, while the people of Africa followed the Babylonian Academies, some people in Andalusia and Fez did not observe this restriction, relying upon the authority of R. Jacob ben Mordecai Gaon of Sura, who was reported to have permitted it. From another source, the account of Isaac ben Dorbelo, we further learn that as late as 960, the Jews of Palestine permitted themselves to eat of the meat of such an animal, relying upon the same authority. It was not, therefore, from mere lawlessness that the opponents of 'Alvan allowed themselves to declare such an animal fit for food but because they followed a different school. And it is possible that in this ritual dispute we have one more of

See below text No. 1, 1. 5.

Ginzberg, Gemonica II, 28-31, No. xv. See also Marx, ad. loc., in Z/hB., XIII, 166-167.

Ibid., 1. 17-18, 20. The reading there is שִׁמְעֵנוּ שָׁמָּה מַקְצַת אֲנָדֵלָה וֹרֶם and Harkavy's emendation of מַקְצַת אֲנָדֵלָה for מַקְצַת אֲנָדֵלָה (St. Petersburg 1902, p. 40, n. 13) is very plausible.

See Büchler, Relation D'Isaac b. Dorbelo (REJ., XLIV, 237-243).

Büchler justly remarks (ibid., 241) that the responsum of R. Jacob Gaon, upon which the Palestinians relied, belonged to his earlier activities, while in later life, at the urgent arguments of his colleagues, he modified his opinion.
those variances (תלויי מצהיגים) which existed between the Babylonians and the Palestinians."

(T-S. Loan 9, recto)

1. 

29 It is not mentioned by Müller in his מנהיגים. 

30 Every line consists of three parts, the first two rhyme with each other, while the third rhymes with the third of every other line. Each line has also two letters of the Alphabet in acrostic. For this reason the first line of our fragment must have begun with ק, and the letter in its original state must have had at least eight more lines preceding it, to contain the letters of the Alphabet from ק to ט.

31 The use of קִנָּה as a synonym of קֵיס is unusual. Perhaps it should read קַנָּה.

32 Aleppo. See Schwartz, תבושת האדריאן (Jerusalem 1845), 194: קִרְיָה דֶּרֶךְ בֶּן הָאָב אֵית גִּבְעַת יִשְׁמַעְיָא אלֶּסְפְּלָא אֵית חֲזֻקָה סְנים מָעֲשַׂה.

33 אֶלֶף בַּקָּדָשׁ אַמֶּה איִיזֶר אֲדָמוֹא תָּוּד. 

34 Ec. 6, 10.

35 Ne. 9, 5.

36 The Pu. Pt. of יָרְדֵּנֶה in the sense of magnified, which is not biblical.

37 It pertains to you to extend help. For the use of יָרְדֵּנֶה in the sense of לעיֵד, comp. יָרְדֵּנֶה ולָלִין תָּמוֹר I Sam. 23, 20.

38 It could also be read יָרְדֵּנֶה תָּוְעִית יָשְׁבִּים (Kalir, כְּרִבְּכָה לֶשָּׁק). The indication of the paragraph is found in the MS. Not only is the Alphabetic acrostic ended here, but there is also a transition in subject, from his congratulations to his appeal for help.

39 The MS. is not clear and the last word may read יָרְדֵּנֶה, in which case the meaning would be “to obscure your words.” See יָרְדֵּנֶה z. v.
The use of the conjunction here would seem to show that there are some words missing, and in fact we might expect here a line beginning with to complete the acrostic. But the MS. shows no sign of omission. For this reason, the 5 of the preceding line must be taken as part of the acrostic, and the use of the conjunction is necessitated by this very acrostic.

Comp. Hullin 9a.

MS. reads סלいらっしゃ.

Ps. 107, 18.

Read סליחה.

Comp. Mishnah Baba Met. iv. 1. מֶשֶׁר יִמָּשֵׂץ דַּרְכֵּיהוֹת, "and wait for the morning light.

This expression seems to be common in Gaonic writings; comp., for instance, Ginzberg, Geonica, II, 31, l. 9 מַעַּלְתּוּ פְּלֵסְכֵּנֵה מֵאָנָאָמאָה comp. also the expression קֹרֵאֲתּוּ פְּלֵסְכֵּנֵה Kiddushin 39a.

Comp. Ginzberg, ibid., l. 11-13. ... והוהי מַעַּלְתּוּ פְּלֵסְכֵּנֵה לְיִדֵיָא... ישָׁיִּים מֵאָנָאָמאָה לְאִיטֵי יִדֵיָא קֹדֶשְׁהוֹ... וְגוֹ הַיְּהוָה מִשְׁמֹרֵת וְנוֹכַּחֵי מַעַּלְתּוּ פְּלֵסְכֵּנֵה...

Is. 49, 7. MS. has this word punctuated סְלִיחַתָּה. The more correct reading would be סְלִיחַתָּה.
I assume that this letter was written to Hananiah, because it is inserted between two letters which are distinctly addressed to him. The Alphabetic acrostic is not so regularly distributed, some lines have more letters and some less.

Comp. Hullin 9a.

Comp. Amos 3:10 and Lev. 26, 15.

This is not to be taken in the sense of trembling as in Esth. 4, 4, but in the sense of “injured,” or “neutralized.” Comp. Jastrow, Dictionary, s.v. hrhn.

This phrase has reference to Hananiah himself. ‘Alvan deplores the absence of the great scholar, at a time when faith is on the decline and truth unheeded.

This defective passage may perhaps have read הנבון ותיו שלמה instead of הנבון וгибון שלמה, for there is the remnant of a כ still to be seen. If this is so, it would seem, that in the absence of Hananiah, the community appointed some stranger as its head.

Comp. Pr. 21, 27.

Comp. Targum Is. 11, 6: וויקו ויגו ויי ורי ולנה ילן. Read משאר, pl. c. of מפרץ.  וויקו ויקו ויי ורי ולנה ילן.

Comp. Amos, IIo. 7, 15.

Comp. Targum Is. 8, 8: נבהל מנהיג.  

MS. reads יבר... comp., however, Micah 7, 2.

MS. reads עליה.
The word PlWyaO is the indirect object of the infinitives, and is the direct object, i.e., in his anger he disturbs the faithful people from doing their duty.

Comp. Am. 5, 13.

The meaning of the whole sentence is: "men of understanding are astounded, wise men are silent when they see men of uprightness, in their (hour of) disgrace, putting his advice into execution."

Comp. I Ch. 20, 8.

MS. reads ד"הוז דוד.

So in MS., perhaps read יבשש יבשס ויכוס; comp., however, below note 91. The meaning of the passage is: "give these people sharp words, and (me) your friend give advice, though this be the third time that I address you."

Comp. Pirke Abot, iv. 23.

In this letter, the Alphabetic acrostic is equally distributed; each line, excepting the last, having three letters.

The purport of this and the next line is that in some previous letters (בשס ויכוס), Alvan had already hinted (תבוצ 시행) at a reconciliation (לימה) between Hananiah and his opponent, and that in this letter he is stating it over again more clearly (לימה) in order to relieve him of all anxiety (דאבה הלימה).

Comp. the expression רדויי רדויו Baba Kamma 82a.
In the MS. the J is added above the line by the same hand.

This is to be taken either in the sense of "who is gathered together" (Job 16, 4), or in the sense of the language of the text (Job 25, 5), i.e., in order to win, or equal your friendship he will make his affection shine upon thee.

Comp. Job 25, 5 and Rashi and Ibn Ezra ad loc.

In the sense of "mishloah.

Comp. Am. 9, 9.

Comp. Ez. 24, 10.

Comp. Job 21, 10.

Comp. Ps. 40, 12.

The only explanation of this passage seems to me to be as follows: 'Alvan assures R. Hananiah that his authority will last to the very day when the prophet Elijah will again appear in this world. But the object of the prophet's appearance is, according to Malachi 3, 24, that 'al va-din in order to win, or equal your friendship he will make his affection shine upon thee.

The expression is therefore an abbreviated form of reference to this sentence, and at the same time it gives the author the letter necessary for the acrostic.

Comp. Mal. 3, 2.

Comp. Deut. 33, 11.

I can find no adequate interpretation of this clause. As a possible, but farfetched, reading I would suggest: "He will smite your enemies while you look on, when you will entreat your God against them: be at rest and do not tremble, for he will hear and answer the prayer coming from you." For comp. Jer. 36, 25.
The Hifil of יָּקְבָּן is a Payyetanic form and has the same meaning as the Kal.

Comp. Is. 12, 5 (Kethib); comp. also Ps. 55, 14.

Comp. Ec. 12, 12.

A rabbinic form for יָּקְבָּן.

Comp. Ben Sira 16, 25. It is used here in the sense of בככנעה. Comp. also Micah 6, 8.

For verbal nouns of the form הָקֵלָה, comp. Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew* (JQR., 1908, 707).

To have the rhyme perfect, this phrase ought to end in קר. This error is indicated in the MS. by the three circles which point to a correction on the margin that is no longer legible. What I am able to decipher reads בחש ... which conveys no meaning.

So in MS.; comp. however, Jud. 16, 28.

Comp. Ps. 18, 26 and the liturgical phrase היה והמש יָה תְמוּנָה (הָן) (דָּוִד).

Comp. on סָנָה, s. v. בֹּקֶד.

Comp. Job 6, 4. MS. reads בּוֹקֶד.
(T-S. Loan 60, fol. 1, recto)

10. And its superscription, or address is. 'Ulwānun is the Arabic for address, or superscription of any writing.

101. We know of two other letters the addresses of which begin with the expression 'ulwānun, which could be rendered as follows: 'This (letter) is to make its way to the well known friend in whom my thoughts are planted.'

102. Infl. and verbal noun of 'ulwānun.
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Comp. Is. 28, 28.

Hof'al of נר. For similar grammatical formation, see Zunz, S. P., 417.

Comp. Ps. 55, 11.

Pl. of בָּרְכָּה; comp. מִכָּל (ed. Lyck), 161a. See, however, Jer. 14, 1.

Comp. p. Shabb. 10b בָּרְכָּה מִכָּל.

Comp. the expression יִרְדָה.

For the sake of the rhyme instead of לְיִרְדָה.

Comp. Is. 59, 9.

Comp. Job 37, 21.

Comp. Ps. 37, 7.

Comp. in the sense of pasturing is Talmudic (Yoma 66a), but here it is used in the sense of guiding.

M.S. reads בָּרְכָּה.
A certain אַבְּרָם הַגָּדוֹל is mentioned in two Genizah letters, one of which was written in 1029 (Comp. Worman, ibid., 734, 739). For other men by the name of אַבְּרָם see Steinschneider, Introduction (JQR., XI, 611). Whether our הֲמוֹנָת is the same family name as הֲמוֹנָת mentioned by Steinschneider (ibid., IX, 238, and XIII, 464) is doubtful.

Pr. 23, 21.
Ibid., 7, 9.

With אֶל instead of acc. is unusual, due here to the acrostic.

Job 19, 23.

Ps. 55, 3.

Hab. 2, 2.

Punctuation found in MS., it modifies לָל, i.e. while my heart was so oppressed, I said to myself," etc.


לָל instead of לָל.

MS. reads בֵּיתָי; comp. above note 47.

בֵּיתָי; comp. Ben Jehuda, מִלּוֹן, vol. I, 471, where other instances are cited.
120 = "Do you know that he is no friend (of mine), when he is gone away?"; comp. יר וילא עליך אתו ונהלך, II Sam. 1, 26.

120 Pass. pt. Hif. of כרך, meaning that which is inscribed, i.e. he despised their words and turned to the letter as a means of communication.

181 Comp. Pr. 17, 18.

182 Comp. Ex. 1, 7.

183 A verbal noun with the objective suffix, i.e. in waiting for him, etc.

184 Comp. Ex. 12, 6.

185 Comp. Ec. 8, 10.

186 Comp. Dn. 12, 7.

187 = "In thy love he is exceedingly wrapped up." Comp. טבוחת לאשך והמו לאשך. Immanual, תורצראיה , Lemberg 1870, 21. MS. reads יבשוך. The use of פעע with ב instead of the acc. is not biblical.
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8 פָּרַיָּוֹלָי הָשָׁפַדְתָּהוּ
9 אַשְׁרָא אֵלָה מַחְשַׁבְתָּהוּ
10 לָהֶם זָה בְּמַעְמֵיתָהוּ
11 אוֹמָא שְׁבַעְתָּה אֵלָה בְּכְתִיבָה
12 חֲזָתָה אֵלָה בְּכְתִיבָה
13 זָהֲמָא מַיְרָדָרוּהָ
14 אֵלָה חָתְמַתַּה
15 בֵּרָדָה הֵמַמְנוּת

.8

1 אַלּוּ בִּנְאָלֹא שִׁירוֹ
2 אַשְׁתָּחָה בְּבֶשָּׁתָה
3 אֶפְסָעַת שְׂלָמַי
4 נְחָתי אֵלָה מַסְי
5 גְּנֵּבְתָם בָּחָטֵנִי
6 שָׁלוֹמְתָיו בּוֹרֵר

139 Comp. above note 89.
140 Comp. Targum Ps. 70, 2.
141 = כְּפֹנָה. I can find no other instance of this usage.
142 Impf. 2 masc. of 010 to deviate from.
143 Comp. ibid., 300.

144 Comp. Job 11, 4.
145 Perf. Kal of רָיָּה, not biblical.
146 Perf. Kal of קָיָּה, not biblical.
147 = הם. they scattered my thoughts. See Jastrow, s.v. בּוֹרֵר.
"though my fear was strong," comp. בַּרְחָת בָּנוֹי Lev. R. 11. The ב is a dittographical error.

This may perhaps be a denom. of שָׁלַח, and the meaning is when I make thy memory superior to everything and when I treasure up (בָּרוּךְ) thy love then listen to me, etc.

Comp. above text No. 4. 1. 3.

Nu. 11. 15.

From here to the end of the MS. the writing is so faded that it seemed hardly possible to decipher any word. It was only by holding the MS. in a certain angle to the light that the following transcription was made. Owing to the very defective state of the text, I refrain from punctuation and annotation.

11. "הנה היה המקרר שלם ושלום.
10. *

1. "והנה היא הגולה והנוקץ בכר כסה ש".
2. "והנה היא מואר כמחושב.

---

194 Comp. JQR., XIX, 739, No. lxx.
195 Ibid., 741, No. Ixxvi.
JAZER AND ITS SITE

Among the biblical names of localities which situated in the territory west of the Jordan fell as inheritance to the tribes Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh there frequently occurs the name of a place Jazer. In revising for publication the geographical part of עָצֶרְיָה יַזֵּר, the writer became convinced that misconstructions can only be avoided by assuming that there were two places called Jazer. This is very easy to prove, but more difficult to determine their exact sites. First of all, however, I must show the reason for coming to this conclusion. To begin with, the passage in Jerem. 48, 32: "In weeping for Jazer, will I weep for thee (Moab)" proves that one of the two places called Jazer at least was situated in Moab. Its geographical site is given by Eusebius: Ιαζερ ten Roman miles from Philadelphia, fifteen from Enylv (Onomastica Sacra, ed. De Lagarde (1887), 264, 98). Accordingly Schwarz, Das Heilige Land, (1852), p. 183: Jazer, according to Eusebius, six hours north of Heshbon. There can be no doubt that it corresponds to the present ruins of Seir. Comp. Hildesheimer, Beiträge zur Geographie Palästinas, 1886, p. 62, note 402. Buhl (Geographie des alten Palästina, Freiburg-Leipzig, 1896, 264) objects, it is true, to this identification on the ground of phonetics. But the name Jazer is also mentioned Num. 32, 3 alongside of Nimrah.

1 The region from Arnon, Wadi-el-Majib, to the Jabbok, Nahr-es-Zerka, the southern boundary of Ammon, was taken by Israel from the Amorites (Num. 21, 24). But before it had been in the possession of Moab and at a still earlier date it belonged to Ammon (ibid., 26, and elsewhere). In the talmudic literature frequent mention is made of יַזֵּר יִתְמָא ; by Ammon is meant the territory of which the Amorites (Sihon) had dispossessed the Moabites. See further below.

2 These ruins are called to-day Hirbet Sār or -Sār.

241
The present Tell Nimrin) and Heshbon. Onkelos according to one recension renders the verse thus:

The genitive following 'the priests,' by which is paraphrased, shows that we have to look for this place in the neighborhood of Nimrin. At all events it must have been situated in this region, i.e. in the Belka which stretches from the Arnon to the Jabbok. On the other hand, we read Num. 21, 32 (the section preceding narrates the conquest of the country from the Arnon to the Jabbok by Israel): “And Moses sent to spy out Jazer, and took the towns thereof, and drove out the Amorites that were there.” But how was it possible for him to send spies into a country that had already been conquered by Israel? Apparently reference is made to a place Jazer that was situated

\[\text{Venice 1517. Rabbenu Bahai in his Bible Commentary (1523) who likewise quotes Onkelos has the following text:}\]

\[\text{The fragmentary Targum has: ...\dots} \]

\[\text{I have found in a relatively old Yemen MS. of the Pentateuch with Onkelos and Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation the following marginal gloss:}\]

\[\text{It thus closely corresponds to the Onkelos text as quoted by Bahai. Compare in this connection Ps.-Jonathan. See also Zunz, Gesammelte Schriften, II (1876), 273, note 1. As to the relation of the various Targumim among themselves, comp. Grünhut, \text{Jerusalem 1906, 82 ff. From the fact, however, that the MSS. do not give this text (comp. Berliner, Targum Onkelos) we may gather that the entire passage is an interpolation from the Jerusalem; comp. Adler, \text{ad locum.}}\]

\[\text{I do not know how to account for the reading (see the preceding note). As to \text{Ps.-Jonathan}, comp. Hildesheimer, \text{l. c., 461. Possibly it is corrupted from \text{Num.}}\]

\[\text{See the preceding note. By this change of name Num. 32, 38 becomes intelligible.}\]

\[\text{Comp. Adler, \text{l. c. Attention may also be called to another point:} \text{Num. 32, 34) which was situated on the upper edge of the Arnon, the present Arä'er, is rendered in the Fragmentary Targum \text{which is so rendered in Onkelos.}}\]
JAZER AND ITS SITE—GRUENHUT

north of the Jabbok, which place was not yet in their hands. It is thus proved conclusively that there were two places called Jazer. But where was this second Jazer situated? Pharhi, l. c. (s. note 7), remarks: יערת תרונ הל ויריד . The text is here evidently in a fragmentary condition. But by reading the text carefully, one can easily find out that in the missing part Pharhi spoke of a number of localities which bore the same name.

Accordingly, Schwarz has confounded matters when he says (l. c., p. 183): "Jazer, according to Eusebius, lies 6 hours north of Heshbon. It still existed in the days of Estori." It is impossible that Estori referred to the Moabite Jazer. Hildesheimer (l. c.) writes: We learn from Pharhi (p. 49b) that Zor’a (Ezr’a) was identified with the biblical Jazer. But to this the following objection is in order: Ezr’a being situated in the north of Bashan, the Scriptural order of narration (Num. 21, 32-33) according to which Jazer was first conquered and then a turn was made in the direction of Bashan, becomes clearly impossible. As for Estori'sذكرنا, we are by no means at a loss for an explanation. The map (Baed.*, p. 194) registers a Tell Zora’a—exactly as written by Estori—not far from the southern edge of Lake Gennesaret. Hence this Jazer was situated in Gilead. And since Ammon whose southern boundary was the Jabbok (Deut. 2, 27) was to be spared we can readily understand how in making a circuit about the territory of Ammon they turned first towards Jazer (Zora’a) and then towards Bashan. The Amorites whom we meet with as well in the territory west of the Jordan were thus a widely ramified people.

The land Jazer which on the north reached as far as Lake Gennesaret formed a narrow strip adjoining the Jordan in the west and on the east the desert. On its south side it reached as far as Maḥanaim, the modern Maḥneh. From here to the Jabbok was the dominion of Ammon. But the Ammonites

* So also Pharhi (הרבדה, Berlin 1852, 49): Beth Nimrah, the present Nimr, is about one hour distance, south of Jazer. See further below. The former was a Gadite town; but in any case it was situated in the Jordan valley "and in the valley Beth Haram (the present Tell-er-Rame) and Beth Nimrah" (Josh. 13, 27). See the map in Baedeker, p. 10.
claimed as well the country lying between the Arnon and the Jabbok. This may be explained in the following way. Originally matters really stood thus. But defeated in a war with Moab, the Ammonites were forced to relinquish to the victor a part of their territory as far as the Jabbok, with the exception of Rabbath-Ammon, called in later times Philadelphia, the modern Amman, and its environs. The victor, however, did not long enjoy his conquered possessions, for when Israel arrived on the scene, the country was in the hands of the Amorites. It is therefore no contradiction if this strip is now ascribed to Ammon and now to Moab. It belonged at different times to both. When at the allotment of the land, Reuben’s possessions extended from the Arnon to Heshbon (Josh. 13, 13 ff.), there remained for Gad whose possessions reached to the lower end of Lake Gennesaret (ibid., 27) the Jordan valley as far as Jabbok; then the land from Maḥneḥ to the north of Tell Zora'a. Ammon and its environs remained as before in the possession of the Ammonites. But as the Jordan valley may with propriety be called half the land of Moab, it might as properly be designated as half the land of Ammon (ibid., 25). Beginning in the north and going down south Gad possessed: Jazer (Zora'a), Gilead, half the land of Ammon (the Jordan valley), and a part of Heshbon, namely its western lowlands, reaching as far as Beth Nimrah. In this order the possessions of Gad are enumerated (ibid., 25-27). But if we do not admit that there was a second Jazer, the order has no sense.

Jerusalem

L. Gruenhut
BOOKS ON RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY


While education as a science is of comparatively recent growth, the laws governing the human soul as well as the methods by which the soul may be guided and directed were recognized and appreciated in most ancient times. Keeping this in mind, our author endeavors in this volume to present the great personalities of the Bible in their capacity as teachers and to investigate the methods which they employed with a view of utilizing these in a practical way in our present system of religious education. Possessed of a reverent appreciation of the Bible and of a keen pedagogic instinct, Professor Kent is eminently fit to deal with this subject, and the result is a most readable and useful manual for teachers.

In dealing with the heroes of Judaism, to which the greater part of the work is devoted, the author recognizes among them three distinct classes of teachers—the Prophets, the Priests, and the Wise Men (comp. Jer. 18, 18), the last including also the sages and the rabbis of post-biblical times. In each case the history and aims of the class under discussion are first given and then the teaching methods employed by the members of the class are discussed. Since this is to be a popular book, little attention is paid to the various opinions regarding the history and functions of the respective characters. It is evident, however, that the author has decided views on all the mooted questions and, like a good teacher, presents them to the reader.
in a positive form. In fact, the teaching ability of our author can be seen in every page—in the systematic arrangement of material, in the lucid presentation of subject matter, and in the exactness with which scientific truths are presented.

Prof. Kent sees the secret of Israel's power in the emphasis that Judaism always placed on teaching. The Bible is characterized throughout by a practical, didactic purpose, as is evident from the very name applied to it in later Judaism. Torah primarily means guidance, instruction. The term is applied in the Bible to the teachings of the prophets, to the directions given by the priests to the people, and to the counsel given by the wise men to their disciples.

Although the function of the prophets was primarily to preach to the people at large and warn them against evils, they were also teachers in the most literal sense of the term. It was especially due to their immediate disciples that their teachings were preserved and their words became effective (comp. Isa. 8, 16. 17a). But even in their public discourses, the prophets employed many of the principles which are regarded to-day of great importance in pedagogy.

That one of the functions of the priests was to teach the law to the people is clear from numerous references in the Bible (Deut. 33, 10; Mic. 8, 11; Jer. 5, 31; Mal. 2, 6. 7). Besides the duty of guarding the oracle, it was also the priest's duty to teach the people how to worship and how to live. As servants of the Temple and as judges, the priests came in close contact with the people and were able to exert a potent influence over them. The author's theory (pp. 54-56) that the different decalogues found in the Bible were the teaching lessons given by the priests to the people is an improved modification of an older theory that these decalogues formed texts for children's instruction.

The existence of a class of men, possessed of practical wisdom and discernment, to whom people turned for advice and instruction, can hardly be doubted. We find reference to such a class of men not only in the Bible, but also in Babylonian and Egyptian history, and even at the present time such persons are
met with in the villages of Arabia. The wise men of Israel, although they dispensed instruction in olden times and some of their parables and sayings are preserved in the Bible, came into prominence only after the Babylonian exile. A most vivid picture of the wise men of later days is preserved by Ben Sira (39, 1-11). The book of Proverbs is a collection of the sayings of these men. They taught small groups of disciples who gathered about them and whom they called sons. They employed in their teachings all the figures of speech which help to carry the lesson home and impress it upon the hearts and minds of the pupils. The universal character of their sayings and epigrams helped to make them the teachers of all future generations. The transformation of these wise men into scribes and later into rabbis was gradual and a natural process. Although busily engaged in the new duties of transcribing and interpreting the sacred texts, the scribes and the rabbis did not forsake the traditions of their class and continued to impart direct instruction to the numerous disciples that came to them. The early rabbinic writings furnish us with numerous examples of the superior methods of instruction employed by these men.

Our author’s treatment of the rabbis and their methods is on the whole fair and sympathetic, although, as might be expected, the author found it necessary to discover the faults of their system in order to show the necessity for the new force that then arose—Christianity. The rabbis placed too much stress on detail, they exalted ritual above character, they made religion not the relation between man and God, but the conformity to certain laws and ceremonies, they did not distinguish between the vital and the trivial. Even granting that all these charges are actually true, which is not the case, as the author himself points out, we venture to suggest that a non-Christian might find in these very charges indications of superior pedagogic principles, which recognize the importance of the concrete, the particular, and the tangible in teaching.

Jesus is designated as a rabbi and in his teachings he employed many of the methods that were in vogue in the rabbinic schools. He refused to write down his teachings, feeling that the most
effective teaching is that given by word of mouth. He employed the object lesson and his statements are always put in the positive and direct form. Teaching was also an important feature in the work of the early apostles. Many of them were the disciples of the rabbis, from whom they learned methods of teaching. They had a function similar to that of the rabbis. It was now their duty to interpret the Scriptures in the light of the new revelation and to demonstrate that Jesus was the Messiah and in order to bring home to the people these new interpretations, they employed various pedagogic methods.

The last chapter of the book is a lucid and comprehensive survey of the problem of religious education in the present. A special appeal is made to the church to realize more fully its duty and to develop the educational institutions connected with it. In an appendix, helpful questions for study are given, in a systematic order.


Primarily a guide for the teacher who uses the author's work by the same name in his class-room, this book will be found valuable and full of suggestive thoughts by all teachers who may consult it. The biographical method in teaching Bible history is especially well adapted for younger children, although the author does not make this distinction. The Jewish teacher will have to modify considerably these lessons, because the author's point of view differs greatly from that which obtains in the Jewish religious school. The Jewish teacher must be concerned mainly with teaching the history of Israel. The heroes of Israel must be presented to Jewish children not merely as men of great qualities of soul, nor even solely as great religious leaders, but also as their own ancestors, as the progenitors of the race to which they belong. There is quite a
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Difference in the character of a lesson on Abraham Lincoln presented in a class-room in England or Germany and the same lesson given to a class of American children. The practical suggestions, however, couched in simple language, that are given in each lesson will be of great benefit to any teacher. The explanatory notes will save the teacher much time and labor that he would have to expend in searching through biblical dictionaries and encyclopedias.

The book contains thirty-five lessons, arranged in three groups, each group ending with a review lesson. A list of proper names and their correct pronunciation is given at the end of the book.


The aim of the author is to give an outline of the history of Israel during the period indicated in the title of the book. The outline is provided with all the paraphernalia usually found in sermon Bibles and similar lessons given in religious periodicals. It may serve some purpose in missionary Bible classes, but it is doubtful whether the thoughtful and intelligent teacher, who seeks information rather than suggestions for sermons, will derive much benefit from this booklet. The whole tendency of the work precludes any scientific or even didactic treatment.

Gratz College

Julius H. Greenstone
PETRIE'S "ARTS AND CRAFTS OF ANCIENT EGYPT"

The World of Art Series. Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt.


The distinguished Egyptologist, Professor Petrie, has prepared for this series a handbook to aid in the understanding of Egyptian art. He lays down the rule that to understand any art we must grasp its conditions and its contrasts. The essential conditions in Egypt are an overwhelming sunshine and its strongest contrasts are between the desert and the prolific verdure of the narrow plain. The brilliancy of light led to adopting an architecture of blank walls without windows, and the results of this system were that the walls were dominated by the scenes that were carved upon them. While the Egyptians were familiar with the arch and used it in brick construction on a large scale, they never employed it in stone buildings.

They built for endurance and worked the hardest rocks, and their structures are characterized by strength, permanence, majesty, harmony tempered with sympathy and kindliness.

In Egyptian art we have to deal with seven revolutions of civilizations and thousands of years. The prehistoric work (8000 to 5500 B. C.) shows more mechanical than artistic ability. This earlier prehistoric civilization was probably connected with Libya and was superseded by a race which came from the East coeval with the first dynasty about 5500 B. C. and gives evidence of a new spirit. The art is no longer clumsy and spiritless but presents vigorous forms full of life and character.
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The pyramid ages (4700 to 4000 B.C.) brought in fresh ideals. The chieftainship had expanded into a kingdom. The early pyramid kings created a social organism, massive and strong, which expressed itself in gigantic pyramids to this day unsurpassed in bulk and accuracy of workmanship. Many royal tombs were sculptured, which constitute a larger treasure of artistic work than remains of any other period of the world's history.

From the sixth to the eleventh dynasty was a period of degeneration, and the monuments show coarseness. At the close of the eleventh dynasty a revival took place, its characteristic being the use of very low relief with faint but clear outlines.

The eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties are the best known ages of the art because of the great quantity of remains at Thebes accessible to travelers and tourists.

Statuary began at an early period probably at the second stage of the prehistoric age. Ivory, limestone, slate, pottery, stick, and paste are the materials used. The earliest dynastic age shows spirited drawings of animals, and just before the first dynasty there are many fine figures of men and women in ivory. To the third dynasty belongs the well known Sheik-el-Beled, one of the best known of the small Egyptian sculptures. The statue of Khafra carved in diorite is one of the grandest works in Egypt. Gradually the work became less conventional and more naturalistic, a movement which reached its culmination under Akhenaten which period showed a distinct revolution probably stimulated by the influence of the contemporary art of Crete and Greece. With the Ramessides an age of decadence set in.

From the point of view of naturalistic art the reliefs are greatly inferior to the statuary. Highly conventional in the eleventh dynasty, there begins a new school showing better figure work and more action. The eighteenth dynasty exhibited another revival of the art which continued development until the twenty-sixth dynasty when there set in a deliberate imitation of the work of the Old Kingdom.

Painting was undoubtedly the earliest art of Egypt, but, being more perishable than sculpture, many of its periods are without
remains. As far as we know, the great age of painting was the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties when the painting of scenes in tombs became very common. In outline drawing, too, the Egyptians had great facility.

Egyptian architecture has never as yet been systematically studied. The earliest construction was of bricks or of palm sticks interwoven. Another form of construction was with papyrus stems, the stems being tied above and below to hold them. The row of heads thus created was copied as an ornament along the tops of walls and was continued in use down to the latest times. The outer form of a temple was always a blank wall on all sides. Originally the granite temples had massive pillars which gave place to more ornamental forms, the principal kind being the palm and lotus and later the papyrus.

The labor of stone working was never shirked. Limestone and soft sand stone were commonly used, but red granite, basalt, alabaster, and diorite were also worked. The quarrying and transportation of the great stones and obelisks has excited the admiration of all ages and the method of raising such stones is partly explained to us by extant reliefs.

Although the supply of gold is probably now exhausted in Mediterranean lands, it was found and used for jewelry in the earliest times and was set in beautiful forms with precious stones. We find bracelets, gold seals, chains, pectoral ornaments, crowns, daggers, earrings, in fact every form of gold jewelry which the modern world knows, and occasionally gold statuettes and silver bowls.

But metals were used for other than ornamental work. Copper was worked from the beginning of prehistoric civilization, and we find pins, chisels, adzes, harpoons, needles, and larger tools at the close of the prehistoric age. All of this copper was shaped by hammering. Later, copper ewers and basins were made. Bronze was found as far back as the third dynasty, but it only came regularly into use in the eighteenth dynasty, 1600 B. C. The source of the tin is unknown. It is probable that it was not from Cornwall and that there were other sources which have been exhausted as in the case of the gold deposits. Lead was worked
in prehistoric times in the form of small figures and other objects and was probably brought from Syria. Antimony was very rare and continues so until about 800 B. C.

Glazed ware begins far back in the prehistoric ages, thousands of years before any examples of glass are known. In spite of statements to the contrary, blown glass is unknown in Egypt before Roman times, the earliest working of any glass materials being about 600 B. C.

Pottery is common from the prehistoric age to the later times, and thousands of forms are known.

The elephant was probably still abundant in southern Egypt in prehistoric times and ivory was much used. Wood was much more common in Egypt than now. The early royal tombs make a large use of wood and beautiful pieces of furniture, chairs, caskets, and beds in wood, have been found. Plaster was constantly used in masonry to fill joints and to level up hollows. It was also used for casting in molds and for making molds. While leather was undoubtedly the earliest form of clothing, linen cloth goes back to prehistoric times and is frequently found wrapped around bodies. Looms were known and on them beautiful tapestries were woven in red, green, blue, brown, and gray.

We have sketched in the briefest outline a work which is in itself an outline, but which indicates the truth of the author's statement that scholars would be amply repaid if they would devote themselves to the collection of materials of the art and technical work of ancient Egypt. A careful study based upon such collections would yield adequate results and would be of the highest importance for the history of art and industry in the other countries of the Mediterranean and the West which were at so early a period and for so long a time associated with Egypt.
The enthusiasm of Robert Hichens for Egypt and for the desert have been made known to the reading world by his novels, his book on Egypt, and other more ephemeral writings. The present volume, beautifully printed by the De Vinne Press and splendidly illustrated, is a well written book of travel. Of scientific discovery there is none to be expected. The author makes observations from time to time of a special Jewish interest; thus he is of the opinion that Jerusalem "despite the growing dominion of the Jew .... is for the Christian," a prediction about which both the Jew and the Moslem may have his reasonable doubts.

Hichens, however, views the Jewish colonists with a sympathetic eye. This is his description of what he calls a colony of German and Polish Jews.

"Toward evening we came to a definite road running straight between tall ranges of eucalyptus-trees. Behind them were plantations of almond and fruit-trees symmetrically arranged, and carefully tended vineyards. In the gold of the evening, flocks of shaggy sheep, herds of small bullocks and goats, were being driven home by fair men, with pale faces, weak eyes, and noses of mark, whose long-haired heads were crowned by hideous hats of soft and dusty felt. We turned to the right, climbed a steep road covered with enormous, firmly fixed stones, passed through an avenue of cypresses, and came into one of those strange little worlds which are scattered about Palestine—'a colony.' This colony was of foreign Jews, Polish and German. The well-built stone houses, many of them with little gardens, were alined on each side of a street rising in steps up the mountain, and as I stood upon the small, grassy terrace—almost like a natural balcony jutting out over an immense view which embraced Lake Huleh, with its papyrus-covered northern shore—on which the camp was pitched, I heard behind me a chorus of Jewish voices lifted in what
seemed an antique evening hymn. The hymn persisted. Up from the plain pattered the flocks and herds. Mares, attended by prancing foals, went by. I heard the baaing of sheep, the lowing of cattle. Dogs barked. Yes, this was a 'home'—a home bathed in the pure air from the mountains. Lights shone from the windows. Jewish mothers were putting their children to bed—little Palestine Jews and Jewesses who knew not the lands of their parents. In the darkness the hymn sounded older, full of pathos—yet full, too, of the strange determination—of the wandering nation that denies and is so often denied. And I thought of the 'songs of Zion,' and I thought of the strange land. Here at least they could sing, strangers though they were."

Dropsie College  

Cyrus Adler
THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM SPAIN

(Additions and Corrections to JQR., XX, 240-71)

The first text which I published was derived from a copy of a Parma MS. made by S. G. Stern and in the possession of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Since this was published Rabbino Maggiore Donato Camerini has been good enough to compare my published text with the original in Parma (Cod. De Rossi 1409). In addition to this I found among my papers another copy made by Prof. Berliner and indicated below by B., whenever it differs from Stern's copy and Camerini's corrections. These collations reveal a certain number of variants, some of considerable importance, others of less significance, but all worthy of record, as their number is not large and the MS. is unique. Dr. L. Ginzberg has been kind enough to make a few suggestions to which I have added his initials.

The MS. reads p. 241, l. 2 IBDDn, l. 7 DnBOl, l. 8 (for nv£4D), l. 11 B. גניאב, l. 14 בושי (מליחות), l. 243, l. 2 בושי, l. 7 בושי (מליחות), l. 13 before some words were added on the margin of which only is read at present; ib., 'מש' (משה) for 'משו' in the MS.; p. 249, l. 3 readニNאא (accordingly p. 253, l. 13: about their number there is no agreement), l. 4 נ MAVI in Guadalajara, l. 8 on the margin: (accordingly p. 254, l. 7 Medina del Campo for Alkendi), l. 14 ובנילילב (for בושי), ib., נבנילילב (accordingly p. 256, l. 8 and note 22 Plasencia (L.G.) comp. Kayserling, Juden in Portugal, p. 111), l. 16 ת'ג'ג ת'ג'ג, l. 24 B. ממיר, l. 26 לומכ, l. 29 שמש (for שמש) in note 22 (ib. comp. Rappaport, ירבד, p. 251, l. 9 read DnBOl, l. 11-12 DnBOl, l. 16 read DnBOl, l. 21 read דנBOl, l. 29 read דנBOl (all this was not enough); p. 252, l. 3 read DnBOl, l. 4
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Note 8. The name of Isaac Besodo occurs in a MS. of M. Straschun which was written in 1490 תְרֵשָׁנָה מַרְאָא וּרְבָּנָא חָכָם והָלָּשׁוֹן יְיִשְׁכּיֶק בְּעוֹלְמַי בֵּית מָחָה לְוָאָשָׁא whom Neubauer identifies with the copyist of Cod. Oxford 411 written in Safed 1506 (REJ., IX, 117; comp. Buber, Introduction to Midrasch Tehillim, p. 109).—Note 9. Perhaps Conforte only wants to say that Jacob Habib was a native of Zamora (L.G.), so that he does not contradict our text. —Note 15. Mr. Schwab kindly informs me that the Paris MS. of Judah Halaz was actually written in 1491, not in 1486, as Neubauer, or in 1440, as he himself had written; see also Liber, REJ., LV, 316.—Note 20. According to the correct reading the name is R. Simon מִסְיָי (not Sarsa) the Chief-Rabbi of Portugal, who died as a martyr in 1506; comp. Graetz, VIII (3d ed.), 387, 484-7; T. M. Tolidano, מְנִיחַ הַלֵּיל (Jerusalem 1911), p. 54, 226.—Note 21. A R. Samuel Zarfati is quoted in Alkabez מִנְחָא הַלֵּיל who may be the one mentioned in our text. R. Samuel Valensi was probably not mentioned because he died before the expulsion (L.G.).

In the second text p. 267, l. 7 from bottom and p. 268, l. 9 read took place (for were proclaimed). As to the mistakes in the dates in this account Prof. Ruehl (Koenigsberg) drew my attention to the fact, that such errors are quite common among the men who write a long time after an event of which they were eye-witnesses and who are otherwise absolutely trustworthy. Thus our author (see note 20) states that the three days of persecution in Lisbon broke out on a Christian holiday April 21. He confused the end of the riot with its beginning (April 19) but remembered that it started on a holiday, the nineteenth being Easter Sunday.
A great part of the Jewish works of all times have not been made accessible by print, though they may have played an important part in the history of this literature. Much has been lost or was destroyed by fanatic persecutors and by unfavorable conditions, but numerous treasures of the large and many-sided literary activity of the Jews are stored in the great Libraries awaiting an editor or at least a scholar who after a thorough research makes them known to his co-workers. Catalogues of manuscripts, therefore, belong to the most important reference-books for the Jewish scholar, and most of the Libraries that can pride themseves on good collections of Hebrew MSS. have realized that it is as important to publish a catalogue of them as it is to spend money on their acquisition. Even of some private collections we have now more or less satisfactory catalogues, like that of the late D. Kaufmann and some parts of E. N. Adler's rich collections, and of Jewish institutions the Jews' College of London has set a good example in Hirschfeld's Catalogue. Of course, there are important and large libraries the treasures of which are only known to a very small extent, like that of Baron Günzburg in St. Petersburg containing over 2000 codices according to Wiener, *Bibliographie der Oster-Haggadah* (St. Petersb. 1902, p. v), and the St. Petersburg Imperial Library. Of American collections almost nothing has been made public so far; yet Columbia College has a fair number of Hebrew MSS. and the New York Seminary has now over 1500 codices. Up to a short time ago, the British Museum collection was only known through the short list of 1893 giving very scant information. The full catalogue by G. Margoliouth therefore was received with great gratification especially as it satisfied all just requirements and showed that the author was fully prepared for his difficult task. The two previous volumes appeared in 1899 and 1905. Now the first section of the third and last volume has been issued separately.
The subject of the present part is a description of the Kabbalistic MSS. of the Museum. Margoliouth gives to them the same careful treatment as to other branches of literature, and it is worth mentioning that 155 large pages are devoted to 132 codices, while in the Paris Catalogue the description of 120 MSS. occupies 30 pages, in Neubauer’s that of 435, 104 columns. Even when allowing for the much more compressed print there, one can readily see how much fuller information we are given on a subject which in general only interests very few scholars and is looked down upon by many. The kabbalistic literature offers special difficulty on account of the numerous anonymous treatises which occur often in different versions and in the case of which it is hard in many instances to determine where they begin and end. Only the master, Steinschneider, has so far given adequate descriptions of kabbalistic manuscripts especially in his Munich Catalogue (second edition, 1895) and in his *Hebraische Bibliographie* as well as in Kobak’s *Jeschurun*, vol. VI (German part). It is a pity that Margoliouth has not constantly had these before him and referred to them when describing his MSS. It is not a question merely of bibliographical references which might be left to the student who consults the book. In many cases the description could be made shorter and at the same time fuller; for instance in the frequent cases where two recensions of a book are known, it would be easy to determine with the help of Steinschneider’s references to which of them a MS. belongs and instead of repeating excerpts that are given elsewhere new material could be added. Altogether the quotations too often contain typical passages that occur everywhere. This is the only point in which I have to criticise the method of this catalogue, which otherwise gives very full and exact details and deserves the same grateful recognition as the preceding volumes. In the following notes I give a number of references which I marked in going over the catalogue cursorily without any intention of completeness. In order not to take too much space, I have tried to be as brief as possible and only seldom give any conclusions and corrections to be derived from the passages quoted. For the same reason, I have given references to the MSS. of the New York Seminary only in two or three cases.
Of Cod. 737 there is a copy in Munich described in Cat. Stein-
schneider No. 81, from which the present description may be
supplemented. For Aegidio de Viterbo, Elias Levita also copied
Cod. Munich 71, and to him he dedicated the first edition of his
Bahur, Rome 1518. It would be interesting to compare whether
the quotation which Zunz, Litg., 324, n. 1, gives from a Paris MS.
of מִשְׁמַר הַבָּהּ occurs here and what poems Eleazar added to the
Hekalot. About the numerical value of the title comp. also
Neubauer, Rabbins, 468 f. For הַנַּחַתי מַסְמֵר (p. 5, n. a) comp.
HB., XIV, 32 ff.; p. 8, No. V, comp. Ha-Karmel, VII, 323.—The
concluding sentence p. 8, col. 1, end, is taken from שְׁעִירָה קְפַה
(דְּבֵת מַתָּנָה, f. 38a) as stated in the printed ed. of the
(see HB., XVII, 53). A similar conclusion existed in the
שַׁנְחַת הָעַברִים
according to Moses of Tachau (Ozar Nechmad, III,
62). The name Abraham הַנַּחַתי for Ibn Ezra was also applied
by Eleazar’s contemporary Abraham b. Azriel (see Kaufmann,
Monatsschrift, 1882, 361 f.). The preface of הַנַּחַתי in Cod. 741
is found also in Cat. Ghirodi, p. 21, No. 65, where it is preceded
by a poem of 79 lines and two smaller ones. Of the הַנַּחַתי
(Cod. 742II) a MS. of the Seminary Library (formerly Halber-
stam 449) contains also Ketubot, Gittin, and Kiddushin. Besides
the edition of Nowydwor 1808, another complete edition appeared
in Warsaw 1879, which contains all the treatises though in different
order (see Wiener, Bibliotheca Friedlandiana, p. 45).—Cod. 743.
VII. The הַנַּחַתי of Ibn Wakkar has been printed very often;
see Steinschneider CB., No. 3323.—For Cod. 745, III, 1-4, comp.
Cat. Munich, 24*. Cod. 745, III, 7b-c, were printed from this MS.
in Kobak’s Jeschurun, III (Hebrew part), p. 55-7; comp. HB., III,
5; to c. comp. also Steinschneider CB., col. 2058.—d is also found
in MS. Munich 112^, 209′ a. o.—For Cod. 746, II, see the elaborate
description in Steinschneider’s Cat. Leyden, p. 360 ff., and HB.,
X, 159; for 746, III, Cat. Munich, p. 145. No. 258; 746, IV
is ascribed to Naḥmanides in Cod. de Rossi 139011 (Kobak’s
Jeschurun, VI, p. 177). The piece beginning מִשְׁמַר הַבָּהּ
occurs elsewhere connected with the following (V); HB., VI, 126,
X, 156-7.—Cod. 7481 may be identical with Cod. Oxford 1832,
which begins with the same words (HB., XIV, 8). In Cod.
Oxford 1965 Neubauer omits this piece altogether. The descriptio
in the old catalogue הערת מנה ת, p. 358 ff., is much fuller than his; comp. also Cat. Hamburg, 233. On the תישבנה ed. Lemberg, comp. Brüll, Jahrbücher, I, 224, HB., XIV, 8.—Of הערת מנה ת, II, as Azulai observed, the MSS. are partly much fuller than the edition. So are e. g. the MSS. of our Seminary. For 752 (and 734, 1) Steinschneider's exhaustive discussion of the complicated question of authorship of the commentary on Sefer Yeşirah in Hebraische Uebersetzungen, p. 394-402, ought to have been consulted. The MS. is evidently identical with the compendium in MSS. Paris 680 and 763 of which beginning and end are given by St., p. 397, No. 200. According to this the doubtful words, 32, col. b, are to be corrected יבמיל ירהש and יבמיל ירהש יבמ. — Of Asher b. David's treatise a lengthy piece of the introduction was published in HB., XII, 80-1; ib., 82-3 some extracts are given, among them some that are found here p. 34.—P. 34, col. 2, for רכז the Paris MS. reads רכז which Bargès, Jellinek, and Goldberg correct into רכז (Brüll, Jahrbücher, IX, 134); comp. also Ch. M. Horowitz, Uralte Toseftas, I, 21-2.—Cod. 752, XII, for יאו יחי, comp. Cod. Parma 1390 (Jeschurun, VI, 170 ff.). The piece beginning יבמיל ירהש יבמיל ירהש יבמ. see HB., XII, 84. On Asher b. David, p. 37, col. 1, n. †, see Ozar Nechmad, III; HB., VII, 69; XII, 79.—P. 37 read יכב ש for יכב ש.—P. 41, col. a. The sentence יבמיל ירהש is from יבמימיל ירהש.xxx (Jellinek, Bet Ha-Midrasch, III, p. 107).—Cod. 753, comp. Cat. Munich, 112; IX, comp. Jeschurun, VI, 180, n. xxx; X was printed in Batarel's commentary on Sefer Yeşirah, ed. Mantua, f. 62a-63b; comp. Jellinek, Bet Ha-Midrasch, III, p. 11; XIII, comp. HB., XII, 110-11; XXI, comp. Cat. Munich, 37.—XXIV. About Shem Tob of Faro and his tract comp. HB., IX, 20-23. The city is also spelled יאשד, see ZfB., XII, 18; XXVII the lines ... יבמימיל ירהש are printed in the Paris Cat., 353, where also the same piece follows them: see also Jeschurun, VI, 172, No. IVc.—Cod. 754. The text was also published lately from another MS. as an appendix to תירס תירס תירס by R. Eleazar of Worms on Haftarot and Megillot, Lemberg 1908.—X belongs to the preceding as shown by the end and the other MSS.; it is partly printed in Epstein's article referred to in the note to IX, p. 45 ff. For the beginning of IX see ib., p. 7.—For XI Eleazar of Worms is actually given as author.
in Cod. Oxf. 1569\textsuperscript{a}. \textit{Ib.}, 2224\textsuperscript{a} it is wrongly ascribed to Nahmanides to whom it is also attributed in a fine parchment MS. of the New York Seminary; comp. also \textit{Cat. Munich}, 393\textsuperscript{a}. This Commentary is an excellent illustration of the statement of R. Jehiel b. Asher (quoted in \textit{Tur Orah Hayyim}, § 113) that the \textit{tefillin} had the custom to count the number of words in the prayers and to investigate why this number was chosen(\textsuperscript{א}ארש \textit{וי ש洛杉ים} \textit{מוסרין} \textsuperscript{ממסר} \textit{מינינ הנות התפליות והבארות} \textit{כנ generado} \textit{.getUsername}). Together with the text of the prayers of the \textit{French} also that of the \textit{English} are denounced; comp. \textit{MGWJ.}, 1876, p. 372 f.; \textit{JQR.}, IV, 23, VI, 352 f. Our MS. also like all the others (\textit{REJ.}, XXIII, 234), reads for \textit{אנה}, R. Samuel is called \textit{קרית התרס}, not \textit{קרית תר}, in our MS.; most frequently \textit{ברני התמיד} is quoted once from a holo-
graph. It seems that his book is excerpted in this commentary as we repeatedly read: \textit{עה מתכ רכ תודפא}, not \textit{מותא} ל\textit{فعال} א\textit{ל איי}, \textit{אלאירי} \textit{כאנ}, and similar phrases. To the authorities quoted \textit{עיין} \textit{לnonnull} \textit{יphthalm וה erotische} \textit{ואנויי} \textit{ר}\textit{어요והי} \textit{אנדרטה} are to be added. Of Saadya his \textit{סידור} are quoted and a passage of his \textit{Prayer Book} the authen-
ticity of which is denied. The curious passage reads:

\begin{quote}
(For Saadya’s opinion see Bondi, \textit{Der Siddur des R. Saadia Gaon}, p. 13). For the additions to \textit{סידור} \textit{ואנויי} \textit{אלהנה}, Cod. 755, \textit{comp. Cat. Munich}, 240. The \textit{Sefer Yeşirah} \textit{סידור} \textit{ואנויי} \textit{אלהנה} is also found in Cod. Oxford 1625\textsuperscript{a}, where Neubauer states that it does not agree with the Arabic original of Saadya. For quo-
tations in XIII see \textit{Cat. Munich}, 209\textsuperscript{a}. From this MS. probably the quotations from \textit{סידור} \textit{ואנויי} \textit{אלהנה} are taken in Hoffmann, \textit{Zur Einleitung in die Mechilta de R. Simon ben Jochai} (Frankfurt a. M. 1906), p. 11-12. It is peculiar that in a MS. of \textit{שער הורים}..."
\end{quote}
in the New York Seminary none of the quotations of this Mekilta occur. The interesting quotation from the שמש of R. Samuel b. Hofni does not occur in the printed text, ed. Weiss (Bet Talmud, II). Cod. 756, Jeschurun, VI, 172-5, is to be compared. XVII. The anonymous ד"נ£ is confused with the younger work of Eleazar of Worms, a confusion which Zunz, Litg., 317 and 324, was the first to clear up. The table of its contents literally agrees with Codex Parma (Jeschurun, VI, 183; Perreau in Cataloghi dei Codici Orientali, p. 129-30, No. 29); comp. Cat. Munich, No. 207'. Of 767 ת"כ only the second part on Leviticus is unique; of Genesis Günzburg has a copy (S. Sachs, introduction to מ' ט, p. 39), a second copy written by Abraham was offered and described in Cat. Schwager and Fraenkel XI (Husiatyn 1906), No. 446 (comp. Peyron, Cat. Turin, p. 213); for quotations see Cat. Munich, p. 230, note. Most of the passages given here also occur in Cat. Schwager, where we find some additional information, e.g. that the commentary on Genesis was finished in Saragossa on Sunday the 13th of Tebet, 5085 (Dec. 30, 1324) (the is misprint). The author finished Leviticus Wednesday, April 24, 1325; הנב והמשה (p. 73, col. a) is to be corrected into והמשה as in the former date. We have here the same dating from the expulsion from France as by Joseph Angelino in MS. Oxf. 1618, to whom Margoliouth wants to ascribe our work. As the author in a marginal note in Cat. Schwager refers to his teacher R. Joseph (who intended to go to Palestine), possibly he was a pupil of R. Joseph Angelino and both lived in France before the expulsion, which they therefore mention in their dates. In the passage p. 72 end, according to Cat. Schwager, France is expressly mentioned. It continues: המדותו מ"ה אלא בבירה אבתי משמש שלreements עם הנב והמשה בברית בступилוה With the passage about the end of the exile in 5088, the one mentioned in Cat. Schwager is to be compared, where the year 5118 as end of Daniel's 1290 days is referred to. The book deserves a thorough examination, perhaps publication. The quota-
tions from Solomon’s great Wisdom might well have been transcribed. That the author of 771 David b. Judah is not the son of the famous R. Judah has been established by Epstein, Das talmudische Lexikon, Breslau 1895, p. 11-12. His was possessed by Luzzatto (Cat. S. D. Luzzatto, Cod. 84).—Cod. 793 read (Genazano); comp. Cat. Munich, 112. The passage about Maimonides is quoted in (Venice 1587, f. 44a-b) where the end is but a MS. of our Library (formerly Halberstam 448) agrees with Margoliouth’s text. Among the authorities quoted are to be added: (of Bertinoro?) and David de Rocca Martino of whom the fanatical author expresses his opinion in the following strong terms:

In the British Museum collection all the branches of the kabbalistic literature are well represented—the older mysticism, the German school of the thirteenth century, the predecessors of the Zohar in Spain and its followers, the school of Israel Loria, besides isolated phenomena like Abulafia and Cordovero. They are all described with equal care by Margoliouth. We hope that the rest of the third volume with the necessary indices which will greatly enhance the value of the catalogue will follow soon and complete a standard work of which the author as well as the British Museum may well be proud.
THE "ROMM" MISHNAH

The famous publishing house of Romm at Wilna, the publishers of the well known standard editions of the Babylonian Talmud, the Midrash Rabba, and many other works, has just finished the edition of a Mishnah to which I would like to draw attention. The edition was started in 1887 by Z. N. Eisenstadt, but was interrupted after the first and the sixth order of the Mishnah had appeared. Now after twenty-two years the Romms have taken up the plan again on a somewhat enlarged scale and carried it through successfully. To the parts that had appeared before and were reprinted from the plates some more commentaries have been added at the end of the parts. The great value of the new edition consists in the correct text of the commentaries, in the valuable commentary of Solomon 'Adeni and that of R. Isaiah Berlin published here for the first time, and in the variations to the text of the Mishnah, besides the numerous other commentaries and glosses that are given on the margin and at the end of the parts.

The text of the Mishnah and the commentaries of R. Obadiah of Bertinoro and R. Yom Tob Lipman Heller are reprinted from the two earliest editions of the latter which combined both commentaries and appeared during Heller's lifetime (Prague 1617; Cracow 1644). Better readings from the first edition of the Bertinoro (Venice 1548) are also given. Such a reprint of an older edition in any other branch of learning would mean a great step backward. But in Hebrew books, curiously enough, this procedure marks a progress in so far as the numerous misprints of the last three centuries and the various efforts, mostly vain, to mend them are eliminated by this method. In the commentary of R. Israel Lipschütz the simple explanations are separated from the longer discussions exactly in the manner followed by the author in his longer commentary on Toharot which appears here for the first time. R. Isaiah Berlin's commentary on Zeraim and
Moed are taken from an Oxford MS. and, like all the works of this early critic, convey valuable information. I cannot enumerate here the many commentaries and glosses that are given in this Mishnah besides those found in the other modern editions, though several of them are of great interest. From the (34) larger printed commentaries that could not be included in this edition, excerpts and selections have been specially prepared by the editors.

The most important of the new additions is the commentary of R. Solomon 'Adeni, which is published here from a MS. of 800 folio leaves. Solomon ben Joshua b. Halfon 'Adeni of Sana'a (Yemen) had emigrated to Palestine and lived in Jerusalem, Safed, and Hebron. A pupil of that famous compiler of Talmud commentaries, R. Bezalel Ashkenazi, he collected in his bulky work much valuable material for the study of the Mishnah. He utilized the text of the Mishnah that R. Joseph Ashkenazi had established after collation of old MSS. (see D. Kaufmann, MGWJ., 1898, 38 ff.) and other sources to correct the edition of Venice 1548 that served 'Adeni as a basis. He excerpted many unedited works a few of which have been printed lately; Sirillo's commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, Meiri on Eduyot, and the notes of R. Sulaiman ibn Ḥuna, whose very valuable comments on the Sifre were published in 1866, may be mentioned from the long list which the author gives in his introduction. He incorporated into his work some books in full. The commentary of R. Abraham b. David on Kinnim with the criticism of R. Zerahia ha-Levi, here called מַמְלֹאות הַמִּשְׁנָה (comp. REJ., LXI 133-4) and R. Asher's commentary have been taken out of 'Adeni's work and printed separately with variants of the former editions. Maimonides' introduction to Toharot which, according to Frankel (תְרֵי יְהוָה, p. 321), alone would suffice to establish its author's fame, 'Adeni gave in the corrected version of his teacher R. Bezalel Ashkenazi. A cursory comparison with Derenburg's and the ordinary editions shows that R. Bezalel went back to the Arabic original in this as in other cases. So in his MS. a unique though unfortunately incomplete copy of which has lately been presented by Judge Sulzberger to the Jewish Theologi-
Seminary, he translated excerpts from Saadya's methodological work on Baba ḳamma (ed. Venice 26d) he translated a responsum of R. Dosa; Baba meši'a (ed. Amsterdam, 207a) he gives Hebrew versions of portions of two Arabic works by an otherwise unknown David b. Saadya, the one containing a criticism of the Halakot Gedolot, the other bearing the title meshi'ot habenuot; and f. 17a, 20a, 24a, 47a, 55c, 62c, 74d; 83d, a. o., responsa of R. Joseph Ibn Migash (the latter author is to be added to Steinschneider, Die arabishe Literatur der Juden). R. Bezalel, it may be added, informs us elsewhere (Responsa, No. 1) that he had in his possession very old MSS. of Maimonides' commentary on the Mishnah. These corrections of R. Bezalel are mostly marked by an old hand in a copy of the first Venice edition of Seder Ṭoharot with Maimonides' commentary in the New York Seminary. The corrections which reach up to the middle of Makshirim and are evidently based on the Arabic original probably are due to R. Bezalel Ashkenazi. In the MS. of 'Adeni's work which I very cursorily examined in Berlin, Maimonides' commentary on Kelim is also included in R. Bezalel's corrected version, but like the copious excerpts from Bertinoro's commentary the editors evidently omitted it. To Maimonides' introduction 'Adeni added a short synopsis by R. Judah b. Moses Albutini (comp. Frumkin, אבנ שלמה, p. 54; his name should be added to Steinschneider's list of Arabic names, JQR., X, 134), from a MS. of 1501, probably holograph, as this author in 1519 in Jerusalem began a commentary, יוהד תומרא, on a part of Maimonides' book. The author's own copy of this book which was seen by Azulai now forms part of the Sulzberger-Collection of the Jewish Theological Seminary. 'Adeni's commentary is not only valuable for his excerpts but also gives a very exhaustive discussion of every point. In the parts that appeared first it is printed on the same page with the text, in the other volumes it is put at the end and printed continuously. It is interesting to observe that 'Adeni at the end of the preface draws attention to the curious coincidence that two scholars, himself at Hebron and Lipman Heller in Germany, had been simultaneously occupied in compiling critical comments on the Mishnah.
Besides the variants and readings to the Mishnah contained in this Commentary of 'Adeni, the editors have given a good deal more of material which goes towards establishing the text of this fundamental work of Talmudic literature. In the volumes that were printed in 1887 only the variants of the Naples edition were added under the text, in the other volumes a much fuller apparatus is given on the margin. Here Lowe's edition of the Cambridge Mishnah, the first editions of both Talmudim and of Alfasi, and Rabbinovicz' Variae Lectiones were utilized for a careful collation which is the more welcome, as many of the books are only found in libraries of first ranks. These collations ought to have been added to the first parts too.

Considering the great care that has been taken to make this edition as complete as possible, it is quite remarkable that the best commentary, that of Maimonides, as well as the older commentaries, like those of Simson of Sens and R. Isaac of Siponte, have been omitted, seemingly because they are printed in the Talmud editions. This, however, does not appear to be a satisfactory reason for their exclusion. It also would have been preferable if the text of the Mishnah had been printed from the Naples edition of 1492, and the Bertinoro from that of Venice 1545. Apart from this, however, there can be no doubt that the new Mishnah will soon establish itself as the standard edition and will be welcomed by every scholar for the valuable material it furnishes towards establishing as well as explaining the text of the Mishnah.

P. S.—While the above was going through the press I found that Solomon bar Joshua 'Adeni whose invaluable Commentary on the Mishnah was discussed above, is also the copyist and in a certain sense the redactor of his master's Rabbi Bezalel Ashkenazi's "Shiṭṭah Mekubbeṣet" on "Seder Ḳodashim, Nedarim and Nazir." The manuscript in the possession of the bookseller Schlesinger of Vienna was described by Jellinek in the first edition of his הנסים המוכרים, Vienna 1877, p. 16 f. Comp. also Epstein in Steinschneider Festschrift, pp. 141-143, where the different texts of the Shiṭṭah to Ḳodashim are discussed. The Amsterdam bookseller, Frederik Muller, in 1870, offered several treatises of Seder Ḳodashim in the first Bomberg edition with MS. notes,
which according to his description can be nothing else but the original or a copy of Rabbi Bezalel's work, though he did not recognize it. See his 4th Bulletin, p. 61, No. 916.
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The work under the above title forms the third volume of the “Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutsch-Oesterreich,” a serial publication undertaken three years ago by the historical commission of the Jewish community of Vienna. It contains, in the first place, a collection of 46 (or rather 54, since 8 of the numbers contain 2 letters each) letters written by various Jews and Jewesses of Prague in November 1619, shortly after the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War. Only six of the letters are written in the Hebrew language, the rest are composed in Judeo-German, which was spoken by nearly all the Jews of Europe at that time. They are all addressed to relatives and acquaintances who resided in Vienna, but, as we see now, were not delivered probably because they were intercepted in the search for political documents. How the bundle of letters happened to come into the state-archives of the Austrian government, where they remained unnoticed nearly 300 years, is a question to which the learned editors confess to have no answer. Certain it is that for a very long time the letters were left untouched until the worms had done their work in eating away the material out of which some of the seals were prepared.

The contents of these letters are of the utmost interest from many a point of view. They represent, to begin with, the first and, perhaps, the only collection of Jewish family-letters of
medieval times. In the variety of content, in the diversity of human relations that are uncovered before our wondering eyes, in the amazing richness of genuine sentiment displayed by the various writers, revealing to us their loves and petty quarrels, their hopes and fears in their political, religious, social, commercial, and private life—these letters can hardly be equaled by any historical document that has been brought to light through the researches of any Jewish historical commission, with the exception, perhaps, of the documents published by the Deutsche hist. Commission. We stand here, as it were, before a series of rapidly moving pictures, in which all classes of the Jewish community of Prague in the year 1619 are vividly presented. We see their business transactions, their social joys and sorrows, we see the cakes they like, the clothes, and—I beg your pardon—even the petticoats they wear. Forgetting ourselves for a moment we feel deeply moved in reading of the sufferings of the brave Roesel Theomim, daughter of a prominent representative of the Jewish community in Vienna, who had died three years before (1616). For some reason she was left with her children in Vienna, where the cholera had broken out, while her husband, Dr. Aaron Lucerna, or, as he is called in Hebrew, Aaron Maor-Katan, was practicing medicine and very busy in trying to fight off small-pox which was ravaging Prague at that time. She implores him to take her to Prague, as she would prefer to die near him, but owing to the insecurity of the roads in the times of war this was impossible. In a long affectionate letter, beginning with the words "Herzliebes Weib, ich hab deine Kines-brief erhalten, ich hab trerin driber gelosen," and so forth, he explains to her the great dangers of a journey at the present time and begs her to wait until spring. At the end he does not forget to admonish her that she should not go out in the evenings alone, for, her husband being far away, people might talk evil about her. What happened afterwards we do not know, except that Dr. Lucerna died in Vienna in 1643. It would lead us too far to indicate the contents even of a small portion of these letters, that cover sixty pages in print. As mentioned before, they are written by men and women from all classes of the Jewish community. Of particular interest are two letters because they are written
by no less a man than the famous Yomtob Lipman Heller, the author of the Tosefot Yomtob on the Mishnah, and his wife Rechle, born Theomim. The great Rabbi who writes here in plain "Jüdisch Teitsch" to his sister-in-law is very anxious to marry off his daughter. He promised to pay 1000 gulden for a son-in-law but would like now to reduce this sum if possible to 800 gulden. I do not know how far the miscarriage of his letter had interfered with the "Shidduch" and whether he succeeded in his attempt to lower the price of his future son-in-law. A conspicuous feature in all these letters is the spirit of love and cordiality in which they are written, the earnestness and religious piety that is discernible even in the ordinary business-letter. Though they were destined to be read only by the nearest relatives, there is nowhere an obscene word as is often the case in private letters written by Germans of that time. Nor is there to be found any harsh expression used by one member of the family against the other. Enoch Hamerschlag, a prominent citizen of Prague, rebukes his son Aaron who had married in Vienna, for devoting too much time to business, neglecting the study of the Torah which is more important than making money. "Had I known that your father-in-law was going to engage you in business instead of making you study the Torah, as he had promised to do, he might have offered me all his fortune, I would never have consented to that marriage. I did not bring you up for business and am afraid that God will punish you for neglecting the study of the Torah. Therefore come back to Prague and I shall engage here the best teacher in town to assist you in your studies" (letter 3a). It is also noteworthy that two letters (Nos. 28 and 29) are written partly in cipher, an enigmatic combination of Hebrew characters contrived for the safe transmission of secrets. No clue whatever could at first be offered by the editors to this cryptography. Several months after the publication of the work, however, Dr. Wachstein renewed his efforts, and this time was rewarded by discovering the device used by the writer and getting thus behind his secrets. In a "Nachtrag" (=Supplement) to the work under discussion published separately during the same year (Leipzig 1911) he betrays them also to the reader, reproducing the two letters in a fully deciphered form. Those, how-
ever, who have suspected some extraordinary secret behind the occult letters will perhaps feel somewhat disappointed upon now learning their content. For the writer of letter No. 28 only inquires whether he could get in Vienna a loan of a thousand Schock (= about 1200 dollars) at "a low rate of interest for a whole year," while letter No. 29 (by the same writer) again shows us the flourishing business of match-making in the Jewish community of Prague. The writer, Judah Katz, obviously anxious to get the mediator's fee, very solicitously recommends to his uncle Abraham Katz in Vienna, a "good-looking learned boy of a fine German family of rabbis, not over fifteen years old" as a prospective bridegroom for the daughter of Abraham's father-in-law. In case the latter should not care for the match, the uncle should approach with the proposal a certain Aaron b. Solomon [Theomim]. The uncle is further requested not to initiate anybody else in the matter, which gives us a hint why the letter was written in cypher. The deciphered portion of the letter is, however, of historical importance, inasmuch as it throws some light on the genealogy and relationship of several prominent rabbis, among them Yomtob Lipman Heller, mentioned therein.

A few words must be said also about the work of the two editors. Aside from a splendid general introduction, in which the historical importance of the documents is pointed out and the idiomatic as well as grammatical peculiarities of their language are minutely discussed, they give also a carefully prepared transliteration of the Hebrew characters with explanatory notes and very learned bio- and bibliographical discourses on most of the persons mentioned in the letters. Of great importance not only for the historian but also for the student of mediæval German philology is the elaborate glossary in which the most difficult words are traced to their origin. The addition of eight tables showing the facsimiles of twenty letters, in full or in part, and of the seals with their inscriptions (in Latin and Hebrew characters) as they were used in the various families deserves special mention. Among the facsimiled letters is also the one written by Lipman Heller and the one written in cipher (No. 29).

The learned editors evidently realized the great importance of their material and therefore felt justified in spending so much
time and labor on its analysis and scientific fructification for the scholarly world. This view will be shared and their labor appreciated by every one who is interested in the history of mediaeval Jewry.


The purpose of this compilation is "to show the purity of Jewish moral teachings and to bring home to the uninitiated some of the beauties of Jewish Ethics, as is contained in the Talmud." The selections are arranged under headings and follow the style of the current quotation-books. The translations are acceptable. The first edition appeared in 1894.


The author seems to have been conscious of the small value of his compilation, when he found it necessary to include in his publication the famous essay on the Talmud of Emanuel Deutsch. The latter covers the first 70 pages which is followed by an introduction (pp. 72-88), in which the author undergoes the trouble of repeating things generally known. The rest of the book consists of the Tales and Maxims, a compilation of talmudic-haggadic passages in which the author gives rather the sense than a literal translation. The arrangement of the content follows the order of the talmudic tractates. The work may have some value for English readers unacquainted with the original. It is obvious that the author is inexperienced in doing literary work in this department. He has a novel method for indicating a page in the Talmud using a Roman II for _verso_, while his phonetic transliteration of proper names are certainly unacceptable. A few instances of his spelling will show it: Hanassa (for ha-Nasi), Beseira, Shotach, Zockai, Shishes, R. Eloser, Brocoth, Shabbboth, etc.
Under the title "Kleine Texte für theologische und philologische Vorlesungen und Übungen" Professor Hans Lietzmann has been editing for several years past a series of small textbooks for the use of professors and students of the respective branches. The texts are usually taken from the Old and New Testament or from the apocryphal and Graeco-Roman theological literature. The two publications of Prof. Staerk are Nos. 58 and 59 in the collection. The first contains a selection of the most important Jewish prayers, as the Shema' with the preceding and following benedictions, the y'§ in its earlier Palestinian version as published by Schechter in the JQR., X, 654 ff., from a MS. of the Genizah, and in the Babylonian version which is in common use, as well as the Sabbath and festival prayers. The arrangement is rather peculiar. After the Musaf-prayer for the Festivals comes the Habdalah (but no Kiddush!), then the prayer for Friday evening, Abinu Malkenu, and two versions of the Aramaic Kaddish which conclude the book. Each prayer is preceded by a short introduction giving the history of the prayer and defining its place in Jewish liturgy. The prayers are vocalized throughout (though not always correctly); short philological and explanatory notes are given under the text only in cases where the respective words are not found in the Hebrew-Aramaic dictionary of Gesenius-Buhl.

The second work is, as its title indicates, a vocalized edition of the Mishnah Berakot. It is worked on the same plan as the preceding number. The notes, however, are here divided into two sections. The upper section is purely philological, explaining (I have noticed a number of errors) Mishnic terms and words not found in the biblical dictionaries, while in the second lower division the attempt is made to acquaint the beginner with the
content of the Mishnah and with the principle underlying the divergent views of the authorities in question. Both publications will on the whole serve their purpose.

_The Significance of Judaism for the Progress of Religion_. Address delivered by HERMANN COHEN, professor of philosophy in Marburg. Berlin-Schoeneberg 1910. 18 pages.

Prof. Cohen tries to define the place of Judaism among the world's religions. He designates morality as the goal towards which religion is advancing, or, as he terms it, the idealization of religion. It, therefore, remains to show that Judaism in its fundamental thoughts is striving after this idealization. The author thus takes up the most important principles of Judaism for a philosophical discussion and examination, arriving at the conclusion, that "the genuine living God, whom the prophets of Israel made to be God of Israel and God of mankind, breathes only in social morality and in cosmopolitic humanity."

Dr. UMBERTO CASSUTO, _La Famiglia Da Pisa_. Estratto dalla _Rivista Israelitica_, anni V-VII. Firenze 1910. 82 pages.

The history of the famous Italian family of Da Pisa has been treated by various authors, especially by the late David Kaufmann in a series of interesting articles in the _REJ._, V, 26-34, recently republished in the _Gesammelte Schriften_, vol. II, from the original German MS. The author of this work, however, has made use of fresh materials, which he discovered in various Italian archives. Cassuto begins his work with the earliest known progenitor of the family, a certain Mattathiah (surnamed מִלְךַ הַנְּכֶסֶת or מִכְבֵּי אלֶ ה de _Synagoga_) of Rome (fourteenth century). The famous banking house of this family had its beginnings in S. Miniato in 1393, when Mattathiah b. Shabbethai da Roma first settled there and engaged in the banking business which in 1406 was considerably extended by his youngest son Jehiel, who opened the main branch of the firm in the city of Pisa. Hereafter the family becomes known under the name of Da Pisa, and the bank established by them takes rank as one of the most important financial institutions of the time and plays no small rôle in the
history of Italy. The author devotes considerable space to the activities and vicissitudes of the bank under the various principalities of Italy. Of greater importance, however, is the fact, brought out prominently by the author, that the members of the family for a period of nearly two centuries were not only leaders in the world of finance but were also very prominent Jewish scholars and communal workers. Especially known as a talmudist was Abraham b. Isaac da Pisa (died 1554), while Jehiel Nissim da Pisa (died 1574) attained prominence through his defense of religion against philosophy in a work entitled נ stain קי, which was published by Kaufmann in 1898. Cassuto briefly reviews the history of the family down to the present time, and includes at the end of the work (pp. 59-61) a genealogical tree reaching to the year 1665, and, what is more valuable, a reproduction of Hebrew, Latin, and Italian documents drawn from archives (pp. 62-82).


The book is a diary describing minutely the author's observations during his travels among the Yemen Jews, covering a period of five months (January to May, 1910). He includes in his account facts of interest bearing on the beliefs and superstitions, religious observances, social customs, and general conditions of the Yemen Jews. Towards the end of the volume is a carefully prepared statistical table showing the number of Jews residing in the various cities and villages of the province as well as their occupations. He visited 150 towns totaling a Jewish population of 12,026. The whole diary proves interesting reading.


Jesus did not intend to bring a new religion and, therefore, did not create any new system of religious rites and ceremonies (Kult). When in spite of this a new religion was promulgated under his name, this religion had of necessity to create for itself also a system of ceremonies. A careful examination of this
Christian system of rites by the author reveals to him the fact that it contains nothing original, that the most important religious institutions of the Church—calendar, week, festivals, liturgy, hours of worship, Christmas, Communion services, worship of saints, etc., were borrowed either from the Jews or the heathen. Having thus stripped the church of all originality, he does not draw any practical consequences, but concludes with the ominous remark that the church began as a Jewish sect and subsequently became a world-religion only through assimilating also the elements of heathendom.

Dropsie College  
HENRY MALTER
POOL'S "KADDISH"


As a specimen eruditionis Dr. Pool's dissertation deserves unstinted praise. The author shows himself a thorough master of his subject; he is at home in the widely ramified literature bearing on his theme (witness the Bibliography on pp. viii-x); he consults the sources at first hand; his notes are replete with references as they should be in a first scholarly attempt in which nothing ought to be taken for granted, testifying to the young scholar's familiarity with the contiguous problems and evidencing the entire range of his studies of which the present effort is naturally but a part. One must not look in a dissertation for startlingly novel results; had the author chosen a slightly different arrangement so as to place at the head of his work a resumé of previous attempts at solving the problem of the origin of the Kaddish, the identity of his conclusions with those of Zunz for instance would have stood out more prominently. The author preferred the deductive method once he had reached his conclusions; thus of necessity the process, naturally inductive, by which he made his way from the fixed stage to its fluid beginnings remains somewhat obscured. We should, however, readily acknowledge our indebtedness to the author for the painstaking industry with which all the facts, the greatest and the smallest, are gathered together; as a store-house of material Dr. Pool's work will have to be consulted by any future student dealing with the beginnings and history of the Kaddish.

For the Kaddish had a history. It was not at first what it came to be in aftertimes. To the modern Jew it is nothing but
a mourners' prayer. In the rituals of the nineteenth century elements borrowed from the old Hashkabah, or prayer for the dead, were dovetailed into it (p. 108, n. 9, with reference to p. 16). In the traditional service, however, the mourners' Kaddish, קדיש יתום, is but one species of a prayer used in the liturgy as an integral part thereof: there is the half-Kaddish (קדיש ירח) or lesser Kaddish (קדיש זומת) which is sung to a variety of tunes in conformity to the occasion, the full Kaddish (קדיש שלם) at the conclusion of certain prayers (its excess over the mourners' Kaddish consists in the paragraph invoking the Divine acceptance of Israel's prayers), the "rabbinical Kaddish" (קדיש רברנא) which is recited by mourners after a portion of Mishnah or haggadic Midrash and which in its tenor and phraseology is in the least reminiscent of the use to which it has been put. In an expanded form, the mourners' Kaddish becomes the burial Kaddish.

Of these various functions of the Kaddish the author treats in Appendixes B, C, and F. How the Kaddish came to be a mourners' prayer the writer concedes to be by no means clear. Prayers for the dead, to effect forgiveness of their sins, are alluded to II Maccab. 12, 44. As fixed prayers they are, however, met with first in Gaonic times, not without protest on the part of some authorities (Hai Gaon and others). Even as late as the sixteenth century a voice rises in protest against the importance attached to the Kaddish as a form of intercession for the dead. "Let the son keep a particular precept given him by his father, and it shall be of greater worth than the recital of the Kaddish" (Abraham Hurwitz, quoted p. 104 f.). Nevertheless, in popular conception the intercessional function of the Kaddish remained in force; a statement in the Mishnah fixing the longest period of suffering in Gehinnom at twelve months, the Kaddish was recited during the first year of mourning (in accordance with later custom, less a month; as Pool rightly adds, "so as not to cast an unworthy reflection on the parent"), evidently for the purpose of mitigating through intercession the deceased's purgatorial suffering.

The bulk of the treatise is devoted to the thesis propounded by Zunz and others which is here elaborated at great length, to the effect that originally the Kaddish, far from being a prayer
for the dead in any of its forms, was rather a prayer which followed the discourse in the synagogue; the latter, attaching itself to the Scriptural lesson, would be largely haggadic, in the nature of an edifying homily, concluding in a peroration which dealt with the glorious future in store for the harassed nation. This consolatory and eschatological peroration was summed up in a prayer having for its central thought the realization of God's sovereignty upon earth, the quintessence of Jewish eschatology. The argument for this thesis is presented with a fullness which leaves nothing to be desired. Though the rabbinic (talmudic) allusions to the response "Blessed be His great name, etc." are post-Christian in date, Dr. Pool takes up the question of the parallels between the Kaddish and the Paternoster to which others have applied themselves, enters into a discussion of the authenticity of the prayer which Jesus is said to have taught his disciples, and arrives at the conclusion that the origins of the Kaddish must be placed in pre-Christian times. All of which is eminently plausible. But we cannot follow the author when he vindicates for both the Jewish and the Christian prayer Essene antecedents. It is true, Dr. Pool is in good company with his theory of the Essenic authorship of the beginnings of the Jewish liturgy; I for one choose not to be enrolled therein. We know precious little about the Essenes; and why we should be compelled to go outside the main body of Judaism for all that is high and lofty and spiritual in the development of Jewish worship I fail to understand.

There are two further propositions which will challenge opposition. The one is the theory concerning the language of the Kaddish. Dr. Pool would make us believe that from the start it was written in the scholastic language which was a jargon, a mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew. He also solves ambulando the problem of the bilingual character of Daniel. To my sense of language, there is nothing of Hebrew in the first (oldest) paragraph of the Kaddish except 장; but 장 has become naturalized in Aramaic as in Greek, and hardly constituted an original element. The congregation responds without invitation from the reader. The other theory born of a straining of the parallelism between the Kaddish and the Paternoster touches the exegesis of the opening words of the Jewish prayer. I cannot
say that Dr. Pool has convinced me; Baer's pointing seems to me to be right, and we ought to render: "Magnified and hallowed be His great name in the world which He created according to His will." The emphasis on the certainty that the will of God placed into the world when it was created shall in the end be realized is a sufficient parallelism to the prayer: "Thy will be done."

What the author has to say upon the schematic construction of post-exilic prayers in Scripture appears to me also to be a bit strained.

Dr. Pool seeks to establish in detail the correct orthography and pronunciation of the wording of the Kaddish in all its forms. A laudable undertaking. Sometimes he appears to go too far afield in trying to ascertain the proper vocalization of a word. An editor of a Greek liturgical text, e.g., will hardly have occasion to bolster up his readings with references to Brugmann's Comparative Grammar of the Indo-European Languages; an ordinary text-book of Greek grammar will suffice. What he has to say on the merits of the superlinear pointing is correct enough. As a matter of fact it may be readily proved that just as the superlinear system is adequate for Hebrew, the Tiberian is ill-suited to Aramaic. But this matter cannot be entered into here. Dr. Pool, however, employs Tiberian pointing. Now the translation from the one system to the other has its pitfalls which the author has not always successfully avoided. Thus מַעֲלוּ אוֹתוֹ is impossible; point מַעֲלוּ אוֹתוֹ. The doubling is inorganic. While exceedingly cautious in the pointing of his own texts, when outside his immediate range he often accepts the current pointing which is wrong. E.g., רְשָׁע should be vocalized רְשָׁע plus the pleonastic suffix -an. (נַעֲשֵׁה, by the way, is מִלְשָׁה, Dr. Pool notwithstanding).

In conclusion it may be permitted to throw out a hint that, just as אֲשֶׁר נִהְיוּ applies to the prophetical lessons, אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ and אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ refer to lessons from the Psalms; comp. at the end of אֲשֶׁר נִהְיוּ, and at the end of אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ: נָהֳר בֵּית הָשָׁבָית הָרְשֹׁעִי פְּרָה. On lessons from the Hagiographa see Zunz, GDV., 2d ed., 7.
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MAX L. MARGOLIS
HEBREW AND YIDDISH

TWO PARALLEL FORCES OF JEWISH CULTURE

BY ISRAEL DAVIDSON, Jewish Theological Seminary of America

The importance of Yiddish as a literature is growing from year to year. Instead of the uneducated public of thirty years ago, it has now for its readers the cultured classes as well. One generation ago Yiddish was regarded a jargon by the people who read it, and the very men who wrote it had the feeling that they were sacrificing their literary talents on the altar of utilitarianism. Those fond of figurative language called Yiddish the "maid-servant" of Hebrew. Today, this maid-servant has become her own mistress; and though she cannot boast of an ancient lineage and a glorious past, she may yet point with pride to a numerous and robust progeny, holding forth the promise of a great future. In the short space of a quarter of a century Yiddish literature has made such rapid strides that it bids fair to outstrip modern Hebrew—not of course in all branches—but at least in poetry and fiction.

This comparison between Yiddish and Hebrew has not been made to excite the odium of the Hebraists, and is not intended as an argument in favor of those who wish to make Yiddish the national tongue of the Jews. To my mind there is no room for this dispute. The question
which language shall have the ascendancy over the other has already been answered. For the past several centuries Yiddish has been the mother tongue of several million Jews; it has shown itself capable of coping with the languages of the nations among whom the Jews were dispersed, while Hebrew has failed. In Palestine, on the other hand, Hebrew has of late become the mother tongue of several thousand Jews, in spite of their Yiddish ancestry. The problem seems therefore to solve itself. As long as the Jews will remain in the dispersion Yiddish will have the ascendancy over Hebrew; if they return to an independent national life on their ancient soil Hebrew will most likely become the dominant language. The comparison I am trying to draw between Yiddish and Hebrew has therefore nothing to do with this controversy, and is intended only to accentuate the remarkable growth of Yiddish. To substantiate this comparison I shall indulge in a few statistical figures.

A little over a decade ago there appeared a comprehensive Bibliography of Hebrew literature from the time of Mendelssohn to the last decade of the nineteenth century (W. Zeitlin, Bibliotheca Hebraica Post-Mendelssohniana. Leipzig 1891-1895). Taking this work as the proper standard by which to gauge the progress of modern Hebrew, I found by actual counting that its whole output, for a period of almost 150 years, consisted of 3160 works. A further classification by subjects showed that the largest number of books belonged to the department of belles-lettres (1038 vols.), history and literary criticism claimed the second place (692 vols.), while philosophy took the third (614 vols.). Philology ranked fourth (431 vols.), science fifth (153 vols.), and journalism a close sixth (151
vols.). The smallest number of books fell to the arts (10 vols.), while seventy-one works were of a miscellaneous character.

Judging from these figures it is evident that modern Hebrew literature is in the main bellettristic, since that class alone comprises a third of its entire output. And yet when we begin to search in it for literary masterpieces, we are astonished to find that their number is exceedingly small. True, we must not apply the standards of European literature to modern Hebrew. We have no right to look for Shakespeares and Goethes among a people with the sorrows of centuries in his heart and the fear of the future in his soul. But we certainly have a right to apply the standards that are of his own making, and when we do, we are painfully surprised to learn how few of the writers recorded in that bibliography attain to greatness. Granting, for instance, that Mapu and Smolenskin are novelists of the first magnitude, how many other names can we place beside theirs? If we be generous we may add Brandstaetter and Braudes, but with these we must halt. In poetry we meet with equal disappointment. Gordon, Kaminer, M. Lebensohn, K. Schapiro, and, in a lesser degree, also Salkinson are worthy of the name of poets, but the rest are merely skilful versifiers to a greater or less degree. And if we add the names of the two great satirists, Erter and Perl, the two great literary critics, Frischman and Kowner, and the two great publicists, Lilienblum and Sokolow, we have reached the end of the list. This, then, is all the originality that the Haskalah movement has bequeathed to Hebrew letters.

Let us look now at the progress which Hebrew literature has made in the past twenty or thirty years. In that
short space of time it has brought forth a host of really
gifted poets such as Boruchowitz, Dolitzky, Katznelson,
Manne, Schneor, Jacob Steinberg, Tchernichovsky, and one
great genius, Bialik, the like of whom Hebrew literature
has not seen in centuries. It has given us excellent story
tellers such as Bershadsky, Judah Steinberg, Feierberg,
and the great Yiddish novelist, Abramowitz, has also re-
turned to the Hebrew fold. It may point with pride to
Aḥad Ha’am, the greatest publicist Hebrew literature has
ever produced, and may also mention Bernfeld and
Klausner. It has also its humorists like Levinsky and its
critics like Berditchevsky and Brainin.

Whence did this wealth of originality suddenly spring
into being? Before this question can properly be answered,
we must look at the still more remarkable growth of Yid-
dish. Starting from very poor beginnings, almost without
any literary traditions, this literature has grown in the
short space of twenty-five years to gigantic proportions.
It is still too young to deserve a biblographical record, but
those that watch its progress must feel that not only has
it equalled in numbers the Hebrew bellettristic literature
of the Haskalah period but that it has surpassed it by far
in strength and living vitality. It certainly keeps pace
with the Hebrew literature of its own period, and in some
points even goes beyond it. Where is the Hebrew artist to
equal Abramowitz, unless we place his own Hebrew works
side by side with his Yiddish? What Hebrew writer can
measure up with the genius of Peretz? Where is the
humorist to parallel Rabinowitz? And Ash, Dienesohn,
Naumburg, Pinski, Reisen, Jonah Rosenfeld, Spektor, and
Weissenberg, each one of these is a name to conjure with.
Behold also the galaxy of great poets. Here we have again
to reckon with Peretz, and may point with pride to such an artist as Frug, who added to his Russian laurels also those of his own people. Morris Rosenfeld is a poet of no mean powers, Schneor is looming up in the horizon of poesy and Yehoash has added in the last year alone five volumes of incomparable poetic beauty to Yiddish literature. In criticism we have Frischman, Niger, and Eliashev, and we must not forget men of such originality and depth as Vinchevsky and Zhitlowsky, not to speak of a host of other men. In fact the number of Yiddish writers is growing so fast, that I am not so sure if at this very moment there be not some half a dozen men somewhere forging their way to fame.

The fact that the extraordinary development of Hebrew and the remarkable growth of Yiddish have occurred in one and the same period of time will at once suggest the probability that there is one cause for both. This, however, is true only in so far that what has stimulated Hebrew has also affected Yiddish literature, but Yiddish had still another force behind it which furthered its growth even to the detriment of Hebrew. The remarkable progress of recent Hebrew literature is undoubtedly to be ascribed to the national movement which has instilled so much vigor in the entire Jewish people. Not only has the literature been affected by it but the very language has experienced a remarkable change. For the past twenty-five years it has kept on expanding almost from day to day. Hebrew speaking societies have sprung up in all quarters, teaching Hebrew in Hebrew is becoming the popular method, and countless new terms have been coined, though in point of style it is much to be regretted that recent Hebrew works have not that purity characteristic of the early produc-
tions. The same movement can also be made responsible for a considerable part of recent Yiddish literature. Since Zionism had to appeal to the large non-Hebrew reading public it was compelled to resort to Yiddish. But the real cause of the rapid growth of Yiddish is a much stronger force than this national movement. It is a force that may well be called international of which the national movement is only one of its many manifestations. It is in fact the characteristic force of the nineteenth century.

The last century will undoubtedly go down in history as the age of pseudo-equality. Pinning their faith to the belief that all men were born equal, the weaker classes tried to equal the stronger, those in bondage tried to become free, the meek tried to inherit the earth, and the ignorant did not hide their heads in shame but claimed that if ignorance was bliss, it was also a virtue. The large masses rose as one man and claimed recognition. Like all elemental forces, this movement of the masses broke down old barriers, and in doing so piled up new bulwarks behind which the common man rose triumphantly, demanding his share in the possessions and government of things mundane.

It was this movement of the masses that shaped the history of Europe and America in the last century. Naturally it embraced the Jews, and Zionism, which is distinctly a movement from below, is only one of the many signs of the awakening of the common people. Already in the middle of the last century, there was an uncommon stir among the Jewish masses, and those that felt the pulse of the people knew that the masses could no longer be ignored. They had to be admitted into the councils of the nation, and the only way of gaining their confidence was
through Yiddish, the tongue of the masses. Hebrew could not serve the purpose, it was the medium of the upper classes. And many a gifted writer abandoned the sacred tongue for the profane dialect. Herein lies the predominance of Yiddish over Hebrew and the secret of its remarkable progress. Being the mouthpiece of the growing masses it has grown along with the masses, and from a mere dialect has become a language showing all the force and vigor of its creators.

The above reflections, strange to say, were borne in upon me not by a work of art, but by a piece of sound philological research, a dictionary of the Hebrew elements in the Yiddish language, made by two men, not born to the profession, since one of them is a poet of high repute and the other, a physician.* The poet Yehoash is really too many-sided to have his name associated merely with a dictionary. His original poetic works alone entitle him to wide recognition, his Yiddish translations of some of the most difficult books of the Bible in themselves mark an epoch in the development of Yiddish literature, while his Yiddish rendering of Hiawatha gives him a prominent place among the promoters of general culture among the Jews. But I must leave to a more facile pen to give an adequate appreciation of all his works and confine my remarks to his dictionary, the latest of his productions.

From the point of the critic, the work has left hardly anything to be desired. It shows great diligence, exactness even in minute details, perfect command of the whole field, lucidity and brevity combined. Even the most pe-

dantic among us will not succeed in finding flaws. The authors must have felt with Voltaire that "a dictionary without quotations is only a skeleton," and have therefore been unsparing in illustrations, and these illustrations make the dictionary quite readable, a qualification not generally expected of such works. The aim which the compilers set before them is twofold, to furnish material for the future Yiddish philologist, and to help those of the Yiddish reading public who have never had the necessary Hebrew training. That they have thoroughly fulfilled this useful task there can be no doubt, but it seems to me that they have unconsciously achieved a third object, which is certainly not less important.

Not many of us happen to be interested in the etymological changes which Hebrew has sustained in going through the crucible of Yiddish, but all of us undoubtedly are interested to know for what class of ideas did Yiddish borrow Hebrew terms. In other words, it is not only the philology of Yiddish that may be studied from this work, but also its psychology. And it may well be worth our while to stop and consider this point more in detail. Examining this work from this point of view, we readily discern that the Hebrew words forming part of the Yiddish language were not adopted at random but were acquired through selection—although the selection may have been unconscious. Religious ideas, for instance, and religious institutions were preferably designated by Hebrew words. Thus, to cite but a few instances "emunah," faith; "asur," ritually prohibited; "aron kodesh," the ark of the Torah; "arba kosot," the four cups of wine prescribed for the first night of Passover. Abstract ideas or philosophic conceptions were likewise expressed in Hebrew, such as
"emet," truth; "sheker," falsehood, "bitul" negation; "ahдут habore," unity of God; "ekut" quality, "mahut" essence. Many biblical, talmudical and mediaeval proverbs were taken bodily into the Yiddish speech, saving thereby the effort of coining new ones. More than four hundred such proverbs are given in an appendix, while the body of the dictionary must contain at least two hundred more. Talmudic legal terms were used freely as a result of the great influence of talmudic law on Jewish life. So familiar were these terms in the mouth of everyone that they were often twisted from their original meaning for satiric or sarcastic purposes. Thus, "en rahāmim baddin," there is no mercy before the law, was changed to "en rahāmim be-karten, there is no mercy in cards; "enah mekuddeshet," literally, she is not betrothed, came to be used in the sense of "I don't care." The talmudic influence on Jewish life is also shown in the use which Yiddish makes of the talmudic prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, and particles. To count them here is useless, for their name is legion. The general knowledge of the Pentateuch among the Jews has likewise been the cause that many biblical expressions have crept into their daily conversation. In admitting his mistakes, for instance, the Yiddish speaking man will unhesitatingly use the opening phrase of the speech which the chief butler addressed to Pharaoh (Gen. 41, 9). Then there are hundreds of words so closely associated with everyday life that they could not altogether be replaced by foreign terms, such, for instance are "oraḥ," a guest; "abēl," a mourner; "bekor," the first born; "get," a divorce; "ḥatan," a bridegroom; "minḥag," a custom; "edut," testimony, and many more. Jewish history likewise contributed its share of ideas, and speaking of the Temple and its de-
struction, for instance, or of the dispersion, or of the priests and prophets, Yiddish immediately reverted to their ancient Hebrew names. Jewish legends and Jewish ethics were likewise not behind in offering their contribution to the stock of ideas. But the two most important causes for the wide dissemination of Hebrew in the Yiddish language are undoubtedly the Jewish liturgy and the Jewish love for emphasis. The knowledge of the Bible and Talmud may be considered general among the Jews, but the knowledge of prayers is truly universal. So deep-rooted are the litanies in his mind that he cannot help reverting to them at every step. As a result hundreds of liturgical expressions have become household words. Of equal influence is the Jewish tendency to indulge in emphasis. A poor man, for instance, may be called in Yiddish by the German equivalent, but a very poor man is entitled to his Hebrew name, "ebyon"; an aristocrat, especially of the haughty kind, is called "adon haggadol," a very cruel man is an "abir leb" or "akzar." A friend may be called by the German name, Freund, but a great friend is an "olieb neeman," great riches are "ošerot," a wife that is a real helpmate is an "eshet ḥayil" and the number of such terms could easily be multiplied into the hundreds. Finally Yiddish resorted to the use of Hebrew, also in cases where euphemism was necessary. We see therefore that, in spite of its outward foreign character, Yiddish is really pregnant with the spirit of the Bible and Talmud, liturgy and law, with the wisdom of the ancient rabbis and the traditions of the Jewish people—a fact which may serve as an additional reason for the force which it showed in successfully resisting for several centuries the influence of other dialects.
Undoubtedly, a closer study of this work may reveal many more observations; the above, however, are sufficient to justify the remark that, if it be true that every great historic movement witnessed a fresh translation of the Bible, it is equally true that every literary revival among the Jews witnessed the compilation of a new dictionary, from Menahem ben Saruk to Spivak and Yehoash.
What most characteristically distinguishes Jews and Greeks, is their respective views of life. That of the former was ethical, that of the latter was cosmological. Of course, neither was exclusive. In the process of the development of their respective ideas, Jews became interested in cosmology and Greeks in ethics. Rabbis of the Mishnic era assiduously cultivated cosmological studies (মメディ pramāṇa), and Greek philosophy ever since Socrates was for the most part ethical. Yet the emphasis has always been laid on the point of view with which they started. Jewish cosmology has always been ethical, while Greek ethics has always been cosmological.

The Jews beheld nature subjectively, and based their view of life on the inner experience, taken as produced by the response of their selves to the external world rather than on the flat observation of the external world itself. The flux of nature, sweeping over their spirit, stirred its chords to feelings pleasant or unpleasant, and out of these notes, registering the impact, they constructed their life-view. Thunder, lightning, and death were not for them merely physical events; nor was it the tremendous noise,
the flashing light, and the sudden disappearance of life that they dwelt upon. Their concern was the shocking, dazzling, and terrifying effects of these phenomena upon their minds. All natural phenomena appeared to them as either physically good or bad, pleasing or painful. But things appeared to them not merely as physically good or bad but also as morally good or bad. Death, they recognized, is bad, and life is good; but why, they also asked, is murder more terrible than natural death, and why is the saving of another's life a pleasure to the saver? By putting this question, they realized the existence of moral good and evil, and began to judge things in these terms. So by means of introspection rather than inspection, from their version of the world rather than its own version of itself, the Jews developed their organized ethical view of life.1

The Greeks, on the other hand, beheld life objectively. They beheld things as they are, without their relation to man and his visions, fears and pleasures. True, the external world produces images in man's mind, stirs up his passions, rouses in him sadness and joy, but these are merely transitory moods and feelings, discovered only by introspection, by absorption in one's self, by digging into one's own nature—acts essentially alien to the spirit of Hellas. The Greek liked to observe the external world rather than to pour forth his soul. There was much in the nature of his country, in its skies and soil, to attract his attention to the world around him. What he saw in the world was a variety of forms with a common background. Life was a chain of interlacing links. Things were necessarily regenerations, producing other things, and events were leading,

1 See D. Neumark, O'VID ncpCTII D^BYD flBpCTl, in rf?»n , XI.
according to law, to other events. This objective appreciation of orderly process gave rise to Hellenic cosmology.

The different points of view, from which Jews and Greeks beheld the world, involved a difference in their conception of reality. What is real, the stable or the changeful, the constant or the flux? The Jews who beheld life subjectively, as it had reflected itself in their own consciousness, saw in it only change and instability, for consciousness is a stream, and the pulse of life is never at rest. Furthermore, their feelings, moods, and states of mind, i.e., their inner reflection of the external world, are a chaotic disorder, capriciously changing without warning. Hence, reality, their consciousness of the world, was conceived by them as in flux. The Greeks, on the contrary, beholding the world objectively, saw the law and order existing in it, the principles governing natural phenomena, the perfect arrangement of the parts of the universe and their harmonic unity of interadaptation. Hence, reality was for them that observable unity, order, and stability of the world. These opposing conceptions of reality have been well summarized by Dr. H. M. Kallen in a recent paper on the subject. "For the Greeks, change is unreal and evil; for the Hebrews the essence of reality is change. The Greek view of reality is static and structural; the Hebrew view is dynamic and functional. The Hebrew saw the world as a history. For them the inwardness of reality lay in the movement of events. The Greeks saw the world as an immutable hierarchy of forms; for them the reality was the inert order of being."

A primary implication of these contrasting conceptions of reality, is the contrast in the conceived nature of divinity. When the Jews began to think of God, asking: "Would
you suppose that the palace has no master?" they inferred that "there must be an eye that sees and an ear that listens," and that the seeing eye and the hearing ear is God. This God moreover is neither outside the world nor the world itself. God is the dynamic essence of the world, life, reality, *natura naturans*. God is reality, and as reality consists in the change of events, so God is changeful. And He is not changed by His own will but by the will and actions of men. "Said the God of Israel, I rule over men, who rules over Me?—The righteous; for I issue a decree, and the righteous man cancels it." God's anger is kindled at the evil doings of men, but He regrets the evil He intended to bring upon them, as soon as they improve their ways. The relation between God and man is personal and mutual. "Return to Me and I will return to you." God appears to man under different forms. He appeared "on the Red Sea as a warrior making war, at Sinai as a Scribe teaching the Law, in the days of Solomon as a young man, and in the days of Daniel as an old man full of mercy." But above all God is the heavenly father. "Go and tell them: 'If you come to me, are you not coming to your heavenly father?'"

The conception of God among the Greeks was of quite a different nature. With the exception of Socrates, whose

---
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theology was independent of his philosophy, all Greek philosophers identify God with some logical or metaphysical term. To Plato God is identical with the Good, a mere term of discourse, without life and personality. If Plato did not explicitly deny the personality of God, as did Spinoza, it was because he never raised that question; he took it as a matter of fact. The God of Aristotle again, does not come into contact with the sublunary world. "God is the primum mobile only in so far as he is the absolute end of the world, the governor, as it were, whose will all obey, but who never sets his own hand to the work." In fact, the relation of Aristotle's God to the world constitutes for scholarship one of the problems of his metaphysics. It is, however, clear that the nature of Aristotle's deity consists of unceasing sleepless contemplation and absolutely perfect activity, an activity that cannot alter, since to a perfect being alteration would involve a loss of perfection. "Evidently then, it thinks that which is most divine and precious, and it does not change; for change would be change for the worse, and this would be already a movement." "Therefore it must be itself that thought thinks, and its thinking is a thinking on thinking." Thus by confirming the function of the Divine Reason to a monotonous self-contemplation, not quickened into life by any change or development, Aristotle merges the notion of personality in a mere abstraction.

The original diversity between the Hebraic and the Hellenic views of being becomes still more patent in their
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ideals of conduct and the end of life. The Jews who had a theory of creation as opposed to the Greek philosophical doctrine of the eternity of matter, the Highest Good was not that to which all things aim to reach but that for the sake of which all things had been created. Now, the purpose of creation has indisputably been declared to be the Torah (הָтоָו). "But for the Torah, heaven and earth would not have existed." Everything in the world was created according to the prescriptions of the Torah. "The Holy One looked in the Torah while creating the world." Hence the Torah is the most adequate guide for human life, for it is the most relevant to human nature. Since "the Laws have been given for the purpose of refining men through them," and since these laws can be realized only in a social organization, the perfect organization of society, based on the precepts of the Torah, is the Highest Good. The task of the individual is to adjust himself to such a social status, to obey the Torah, and thereby to contribute his share to the collectively integrated righteous society. But mere obedience, mere formality, mere practicing of virtue is not sufficient. The individual is not perfect unless the divine virtues, the formal code of ethics, become the acts of his inmost conscience, the spontaneous expression of his nature. "What God wants is the heart." and "when a man performs his duties he shall perform them with a joyful heart." The test of individual perfection is the perfect harmony or coincidence of his con-

14 אלמלאו חזרה לא מתכמים שלום ואור, Peahbim 65b.
15 חכימין היה מ빛נ חזרות וגרמי מהלכים. Gen. r., c. 2.
16 א א לא טנở מ_planes את לרעה בנה את הבריות, Sanhedrin 106a.
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MAIMONIDES AND HALEVI — WOLFSON

science with his deeds and the residing joy therein. "Whenever a man is satisfied with his own right conduct, it is a good omen for him; whenever a man is not satisfied with his own conduct, it is a bad omen for him." The perfect man is the "Beautiful Soul," beautiful because his instinct and righteousness coincide.

To the Greeks, on the other hand, the Highest Good resides in the individual, in the perfection of all his mental and physical qualities and in the attainment of the supreme good of rationality. The state is, of course, necessary, for the faculties essential to the excellence of the individual have in the state their only opportunity of development. But the state as such is not an end but an instrument. "It is perhaps better for the wise man in his speculation to have fellow-workers; but nevertheless he is in the highest degree self-sufficient." And virtues are also merely means of conducing to happiness, in themselves neither good nor bad. "Thus, in place of a series of hard and fast rules, a rigid and uncompromising distinction of acts and affections into good and bad, the former to be absolutely chosen and the latter absolutely eschewed, Aristotle presents us with the general type of a subtle and shifting problem, the solution of which must be worked out afresh by each individual in each particular case." The highest individual perfection is speculative wisdom, the excellence of that purely intellectual part called reason.

"ןל שורק תונם גוזה בשה יבש ימות ל, י anv ז"וח תונם גוזה בשה ימות ל, גוס שורק, ינש תוספת בוזק 3, 4.

Aristotle, Ethics, X, 7.

Dickinson, Greek View of Life, 136.

Comp. Aristotle, Ethics, I, 6.
"The speculative is the only activity which is loved for its own sake as it has no result except speculation."*

These, then, present the most obvious distinctions between the Jewish and the Greek insight. In the first place there was the distinction in their idea of God, who, according to the Jews, was the living One, personally related to man, and who, according to the Greek philosophers, was the Prime Mover, existing outside the world. Then, there was the distinction in their ethical system. To the Jew the aim of life was to live happily as a member of the total polity. To the Greek the essence of man is to be rational. Virtues are good in so far as they conduce to the highest good; and society likewise is merely a means to facilitate man's reaching the Highest Good.

The struggle between these two views of life, which began with the Jews' coming in contact with Greek civilization and resulted on the one hand in Philo's Neo-Platonism and on the other hand in Pauline Christianity, was renewed in the tenth century among the Jews of the Mohammedan countries. The intrusion of Greek philosophical ideas into Jewish thought, chiefly through Arabic channels, gave rise to the need of a new reconciliation between Judaism and Hellenism. The attempt to satisfy that need resulted in the creation of a religious philosophy which, though different from Philo's in content, was very much like it in spirit and general outlook. Like Philo, the philosophers of the Middle Ages aimed at reconciling Jewish religion with Greek philosophy, by recasting the substance of the former in the form of the latter. The principles upon which they worked were (1) that the practical religious organization of Jewish life must be pre-
served, but (2) that they must be justified and defended in accordance with the principles of Greek philosophy. Thus Hellenic theory was to bolster Hebraic dogma, and Greek speculation became the basis for Jewish conduct. The carrying out of this programme, therefore, unlike that of Pauline Christianity, involved neither change in the practice of the religion, nor abrogation of the Law. There was simply a shifting of emphasis from the practical to the speculative element of religion. Philo and the mediaeval philosophers continued to worship God in the Jewish fashion, but their conception of God became de-Judaized. They continued to commend the observation of the Law, but this observation lost caste and became less worthy than the "theoretic life." Practice and theory fell apart logically; instead there arose an artificial parallelism of theoretic with practical obligations.

As against this tendency to subordinate Judaism to Hellenic speculation, there arose a counter-movement in mediaeval Jewish philosophy which aimed to find in Judaism itself satisfaction for the theoretical as well as the practical interest. This movement developed a school which, though appreciative of the virtues of Aristotelianism, still saw their difference in temper and attitude toward life and considered any attempt at reconciliation as a mere dallying with meanings distorted by abstraction from their contexts. As this school aimed to justify Judaism by its own principles, it sought to indicate its characteristic features, and to assert its right to autonomous intellectual existence, the peer of Hellenism, because of its very diversity therefrom. Consequently, the work of this school has a double character. It had, on the one hand, to criticise Greek philosophy and undermine the common belief of its contemporaries in
its absolute truth, and, on the other hand, it had to differentiate and define the Jewish position.

Of the Hellenizers in Judaism, the most typical representative is Moses Maimonides (1135-1204); of the Hebraizers, Judah Halevi (1085?-1140?). These two men represent the opposite poles of Jewish thought in the Middle Ages. Maimonides is a true convert to Aristotelian philosophy. To him the thorough understanding of Aristotle is the highest achievement to which man can attain. Halevi, on the contrary, is full of doubts about the truth of Aristotle’s theories, “which can be established by arguments which are partially satisfactory, and still much less capable of being proved.” Maimonides is ruled by reason, nothing is true which is not rational, his interest is mainly logical. Halevi is ruled by feeling and sentiment, full of scepticism as to the validity of reason, and he is chiefly interested in ethics. Maimonides’ chief philosophic work, “Moreh Nebukim (Moreh Nebucein)” is a formal, impersonal treatment of his philosophy. Halevi’s “Kuzari” (Kuzari) is written in dialogue and its problems are attacked not more scholastico but in the more spontaneous literary and intense fashion of Job. Maimonides’ chief contribution besides his “Moreh” was the codification of the talmudic Law; Halevi’s chief work besides the “Kuzari,” was the composition of synagogal hymns of highly lyrical quality.

In point of time, Halevi preceded Maimonides. Yet in comparing them we must treat Halevi as the critic of the tendency which Maimonides represented, the tendency
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which began long before Halevi and reached its climax in Maimonides. Maimonides may be considered as swimming with the stream, he was the expression of his age; Halevi was swimming against the stream, he was the insurgent, the utterer of paradoxes. Halevi does not criticise any specific system of philosophy. The system portrayed in the opening of the "Kuzari," is a medley of distorted views of Aristotle and Neo-Platonism. But the "Kuzari" is a criticism of philosophy in general, of the philosophic method and temper of Halevi's time, and especially of the universal attempt to identify it with theology and religion.

II

In the introduction to the "Moreh Nebukim" Maimonides describes the book's aim. He intends it "to afford a guide for the perplexed, to thinkers whose studies have brought them into collision with religion, who have studied philosophy and have acquired sound knowledge, and who, while firm in religious matters, are perplexed and bewildered on account of the ambiguous and figurative expressions employed in the holy writings." He does not, however, examine the views of the philosophers with the object of supporting the Jewish traditional interpretation of religious principles. His aim is solely to show that Scriptures and Talmud, correctly interpreted, strictly harmonize with the philosophical writings of Aristotle.

Starting with Aristotle's metaphysics, Maimonides attempts to demonstrate that the scriptural "God" does not differ from the "Prime Cause" of the philosophers. But here he encounters a great difficulty. It had been held by the conservative theologians of Maimonides' time, that the conception of God as Cause necessitates the belief in
the eternity of matter, for if we were to say that God is the Cause, the co-existence of the Cause with that which was produced by that Cause would necessarily be implied; this again involves the belief that the universe is eternal, and that it is inseparable from God." On the other hand, when we say that God is agens, the co-existence of the agens with its product is not implied, for the agens may exist anterior to its product. Maimonides who rejected Aristotle's doctrine of the eternity of matter on purely dialectical grounds, wishing, however, to identify "God" with the "Cause," had to show that the latter view does not necessarily imply the former. His argument is this. If you take terms "cause" and "agens" in the sense of reality, then both terms must necessarily imply the co-existence of the world with God, for God would be called neither "agens" nor "cause" in reality before the actual making of the world began. On the other hand, if you take terms "cause" and "agens" in the sense of a mere potentiality, then in both cases God preceded the world, for God was potentially both the Cause and the agens of the world even before it came into being. Therefore the term "cause" and "agens" are identical. The reason why Aristotle calls God "the Cause," says Maimonides, is to be sought not in his belief that the universe is eternal, but in another motive; it is "in order to express that God unites in Himself three of the four causes, viz., that He is the agens, the form, and the final cause of the universe."

Maimonides adds to his adaptation of Aristotle's conception of God, also an adaptation of Aristotelian cosmological and logical proofs of God's existence. The unso-
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Phrastic Jews, to whom God was the power and the behavior of the universe, felt no need of proof that He exists. To them His existence was self-evident, for His power manifested itself in all the works of nature. "God said to Moses: Do you want to know My name?—I am designated by My actions."

But when Maimonides conceived God as a metaphysical, transcendent entity, proofs of His existence became necessary. Divine actions, according to Maimonides, are merely names used to symbolize God's nature, the only instruments of description that are available. They do not signify His existence in *propria persona*; that must be proved logically and cosmologically. The arguments, moreover, must demonstrate not only that God exists, but also that it is impossible that He should not exist.

God's existence is demonstrated in the proof of the necessity for a Prime Mover. But another difficulty comes. The Bible contains many anthropomorphisms which describe the mode of action of the Divine Being. The question arises whether they are applied to the Deity and to other things in one and the same sense, or equivocally. Maimonides accepts the latter view and seeks carefully to define the meaning of each term taken as an attribute of God, and to give it a transcendental, or metaphysical significance. Maimonides is very strict in this respect. He does not admit the propriety of assigning attributes to God. God is absolute, His existence, His life, and His knowledge are absolute, and there can never be new elements in Him. Consequently, God exists, lives, and knows without possessing the attributes of existence, life, and knowledge. The only way of defining Him is by negative attributes.

*Exod. 3, c. 3.*
You can tell what He is not, but you cannot tell what He is. All we can discover about God is that He is. "In the contemplation of His Essence, our comprehension and knowledge prove insufficient; in the examination of His works, how they necessarily result from His will, our knowledge proves to be ignorance, and in the endeavor to extol Him in words, all our efforts in speech are mere weakness and failure."

With this, however, Maimonides' idea of God comes to a vanishing point. The highest that a man can obtain of the true essence of God is to know that He is unknowable. And the more conscious one becomes of his ignorance of God, the nearer to God he draws, "for just as each additional attribute renders objects more concrete, and brings them nearer the true apprehension of the observer, so each additional negative attribute advances you to the knowledge of God. By its means you are nearer this knowledge than he who does not negate in reference to God, those qualities, which you are convinced by proofs must be negated." God cannot be the object of human apprehension, none but Himself comprehends what He is; hence men should not indulge in excessive prayer to God. "It is more becoming to be silent, and to be content with intellectual reflection, as has been recommended by men of highest culture, in the words, "Commune with your own heart upon your bed, and be still (Ps. 4, 4)," "We cannot approve of those foolish persons who are extravagant in praise, fluent and prolix in the prayers they compose and in the hymns they make in their desire to approach the Creator."
An Aristotelian, though with limitations, in metaphysics, Maimonides is also an Aristotelian in ethics. Though Maimonides accepts the theory of creation ex nihilo, he nevertheless agrees with Aristotle that there is no occasion to inquire into the purpose of the existence of the universe. He considers the question of cosmic purpose as futile. No adequate answer, he argues, can be adduced. Even if we admit that the universe exists for man's sake and man exists for the purpose of serving God, the question remains, What is the end of serving God? God does not become more perfect; and if the service of God is intended for our own perfection, then the question might be repeated, What is the object of being perfect? The question must, therefore, be left unanswered, for "we must in continuing the inquiry as to the purpose of the creation at last arrive at the answer, It was the will of God, or His wisdom decreed it."

But within the limits of the universe as it exists now, the immediate purpose of all things is man, for we notice that in the "course of genesis and destruction" every individual thing strives to reach "its greatest possible perfection," and since "it is clear that man is the most perfect being formed of matter," "in this respect it can hardly be said that all earthly things exist for man."

We may, however, still ask: What is the end of man? Whereo Maimonides replies, with Aristotle, that the end of man is the perfection of his specific form. But there are four varieties of perfection. The earliest in the order of excellence, is perfection in respect of worldly possess-
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ions; the next is perfection in respect of physical beauty and well-being. The third is moral perfection, the highest degree of excellence in character. None of these is the ultimate perfection of man, for ultimate perfection is complete self-sufficiency. How clearly Maimonides here follows the Hellenic tradition is obvious. He takes the individual as unit of supreme excellence, self-sufficient both with regard to other values and with regard to other men. None of these three orders of moral adequacy are self-sufficient with regard to both relations. The first and second perfections are self-sufficient with regard to other persons, for they would exist even if the universe contained only one man, but they are insufficient as regards other values, for when a man has wealth and health, they become merely means conducing to other values. Even moral perfection, virtue, is not self-sufficient, for all principles of conduct concern the relation of man to his neighbor. "Imagine a person being alone, and having no connection whatever with any other person, all his good moral principles are at rest, they are not required, and contribute to man no perfection whatever." They are, therefore, only necessary and useful when man comes into relation with others. Hence self-sufficiency is external to all these, for it must involve no external conditions; it must depend upon nothing but itself. It is to be found in the perfection of the intellect, the development of the loftiest intellectual faculties, the possession of such notions which lead to true metaphysical opinions about God. "With this perception (the right view of God) man has obtained his final object; it gives him true human perception; it remains

"Moreh Neb., III, 60."
to him alone; it gives him immortality; and on its account
he is called man."

Thus the highest perfection of man consists in his be-
coming an "actually intelligent being." The acts conduc-
ting to that are the virtues. Acts are, therefore, in them-
selves neither good nor bad; their moral value is deter-
mained by their furthering or preventing the Highest
Perfection. Hence there is no virtue in doing righteoun-
ness for its own sake. "The multitude who observe the di-
vine commandments, but are ignorant, never enter the royal
palace." Not only are virtues for their own sake unim-
portant, but they are not even the best means of reach-
ing the Highest Perfection. Speculation and knowledge
will lead to it sooner than practice and right conduct. "Of
these two ways—knowledge and conduct—the one, the
communication of correct opinions, comes undoubtedly
first in rank."*1 "For the Highest Perfection certainly does
not include any action or good conduct, but only knowledge,
which is arrived at by speculation, or established by re-
search."

"But one cannot procure all this; it is impossible
for a single man to obtain this comfort; it is only possible
in society, since man, as it is well known, is by nature
social." Hence the object of society is to provide the
conditions favorable to the production of "actually intel-
ligent men." All mankind live only for the few who can
reach the Highest Perfection, just as all earthly beings
exist for men. "Common men exist for two reasons; first.

*1 Ibid.
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*4 Ibid.
*5 Ibid.
to do the work that is needed in the state in order that the actually intelligent man should be provided with all his wants and be able to pursue his studies; second, to accompany the wise lest they feel lonely, since the number of wise men is small."

It is on the basis of this ethical system that Maimonides evaluates the Jewish Law. In its speculative part the Law contains Aristotle’s metaphysics couched in language suitable for the intelligence of the common people. In its practical part, it is a scheme of a social organization planned to produce “actually intelligent beings.” That the practice of the Law will not alone conduce to the Highest Perfection, we have already seen. That must be reached by reason. But Maimonides argues that such practice is meant to prepare the environment favorable to the attainment of the perfection of self-sufficiency. Hence religion and tradition are not superior to reason, for God who endowed man with reason, so that he might reach the Highest Perfection, would not demand of him deeds contrary to this God-given reason. No man, hence, must believe in anything contrary to reason, even though he may see miracles, “for reason that denies the testimony is more reliable than his eye that witnesses the miracles.”

Such a view, it is clear, could hardly be more Hellenic and still save even a semblance of Judaism. Maimonides was not a rabbi employing Greek logic and categories of thought in order to interpret Jewish religion; he was rather a true mediæval Aristotelian, using Jewish religion as an illustration of the Stagirite’s metaphysical supremacy. Maimonides adheres staunchly to the Law, or course, but
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his adherence is not the logical consequence of his system. It has its basis in his heredity and practical interests; it is not the logical implication of his philosophy. Judaism designated the established social order of life, in which Maimonides lived and moved and had his being; and it was logically as remote from his intellectual interests as he was historically remote from Aristotle. That, naturally, he was unaware of the dualism must be clear. Indeed, he thought he had made a synthesis, and had given scientific demonstrations of poetic conceptions. Therein he was like the Italian priest and astronomer Angelo Secchi, who, while performing his religious services, dropped Copernican astronomy, and, while in the observatory, dropped his church doctrines. Maimonides really saw no incompatibility between his Judaism and his philosophy; he was a Jew in letter and philosopher in spirit throughout his life. As a rationalist he could not but consider that religion and philosophy, both of which seemed reasonable to him, were identical. No doubt it was Moses ben Maimon whom Joseph ben Shem Tob had in mind when he wrote that in spite of the identification by Jewish philosophers, of the contemplative life with the obedience of the Law, that obedience was still assigned as the road to salvation of the common people, while contemplation was reserved for the select theorists.
Diametrically opposed to Maimonides, in insight, in conception of life and destiny, is Judah Halevi. In his discussion of God, His existence, His nature and His relation to the world, Halevi displays, for his time, a remarkable freshness and originality of view. In a period when Hellenic thought dominated Jewish and Arabic intellect, he was, though as familiar with it as the closest student of the Greeks, remarkably free of its influence. He sees clearly, in contradistinction to most Jewish thinkers of his time, the essential differences between the Jewish and the Greek ideas of God, of conduct and of human destiny.

From Philo to Maimonides, Jewish dialecticians were intent upon thinning the concrete formalism of the biblical God to the abstract and tenuous formalism of the Aristotelian Prime Mover. They reduced differences, so far as they could, to expression and terminology, and sought to eliminate whatever more fundamental diversity there remained by explaining it away. They failed to note the tremendous scope of the diversity, how it reached down into the very nature and temperaments of people and spread to the unbounded cosmos itself. Halevi alone among the philosophizing rabbis recognized the ineradicable reality of the difference, and pointed out with unmistakable clearness the essential distinctions between the Prime Mover of the Greeks and God of the Jews.

The Kuzari, a dialogue between the King of the Chazars and a rabbi, in which these views of Halevi's are developed, is not a systematic philosophical work. Its order is conversational rather than structural, and it is less allied
to Plato than to Job. The ideas suggest more than they express; they carry the conviction of insight rather than the force of demonstration. Halevi is less explicit than Maimonides, less careful about making manifest implication of his system. He needs more interpretation than the other. He and those who think like him are genuinely Hebraic. They repudiate the Hellenizing tendency which, to them, vitiates Jewish thought, and they do so often with a critical acumen that anticipates the controversy between the eternalists and the temporalists of our times.

For the Jews, Halevi argues, God is an efficient cause; for the Greeks He is a final cause. Hellenism accepts God as the inert and excellent form of reality; Judaism demands an efficacious relation between man and the personal ground of the Universe. "The philosopher only seeks Him that he may be able to describe Him accurately in detail, as he would describe the earth, explaining that it is in the center of the great sphere, but not in that of the zodiac." The religionist seeks God "not only for the sake of knowing Him, but also for the great benefits which they derive therefrom," for to them God is a personal, spiritual guide in the world. To the philosopher, "ignorance of God would be more injurious than would ignorance concerning the earth be injurious to those who consider it flat;" God has no pragmatic significance for them; He makes no difference in their life and action. To the religionist, ignorance of God implies a difference in one's life. To the philosopher God is merely a logical necessity, a final link, arbitrarily chosen to terminate the otherwise endless chain of potentiality and actuality. "We cannot blame philosophers for missing the mark, since they only arrived at this
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knowledge by way of speculation, and the result could not have been different." To the religionist, God is the satisfying object, an inner need, without whom man cannot dwell upon the earth. When the religionist begins to doubt the existence of God, there is a sudden disruption of all of life's values, and there ensues a state of suspense in which any positive action is impossible. The God of religion is not arrived at by dialectic procedures and the operations of logic. Knowledge of Him is empirical and uncriticised personal and human experience. Judah Halevi further expounds the distinction by the different uses of the two divine names, אֲלֹהִים and יהוה. So early as in the talmudic times, rabbis had distinguished between the meanings of these two names. אֲלֹהִים, they held, expresses the quality of justice (דָּוִד), the unchangeable laws of nature, while יהוה expresses God's quality of mercy (רֶשֶׁת), the God who stands in personal relations with man." Halevi, probably drawing on this ancient commentary, elaborates its intent, by using אֲלֹהִים to designate the philosophical idea of God, and by יהוה the religious. "The meaning of אֲלֹהִים can be grasped by way of speculation, because a Guide and a Manager of the world is a postulate of reason. The meaning of יהוה, however, cannot be grasped by speculation, but only by that intuition and prophetic vision which separates man from his kind and brings him into contact with angelic beings, imbuing him with a new spirit."

The philosophic God, being merely a postulate of reason, is not as inspiring to, as influential in, human action as is the God of a living religion. Truly, the philosopher after
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ascertaining by speculation the existence of an absolute, remote God, acquires a veneration for that absolute Being of his. Rigid dialectic may be merely the starting point, but having once left that starting point, the philosopher may be as full of veneration for his God as the religionist for his. In the opening of the Kuzari, the philosopher speaks about his "veneration of the Prime Cause." Yet, there exists a wide difference between philosophical and religious veneration. The philosopher's veneration is merely an attitude, having no real object for its content. It is merely a psychological phenomenon, akin to the love of the artist toward his handiwork. The veneration of the religionist is directed toward a specific object; it has its source in something external to man; it is the love of the creature to its creator. "Now, I understand how far the God of Abraham is different from that of Aristotle." "Man yearns for the Jewish God as a matter of taste and conviction," hence the religious attitude is native and inherent in man, whilst attachment to אלוהים is the result of speculation, "and the attitudinal quality is merel" acquired. The religionist's veneration for his God, being innate is of lifelong duration, it is a part of his constitution, he lives for his God. To the philosopher, feeling for the divine is a temporal interest which lives besides other interests, but is not in spite of them; it disappears as soon as it becomes discordant with other interests. "A feeling of the former kind (i. e. the constitutional) invites its votaries to give their life for His sake, and to prefer death to His absence. Speculation, however, makes veneration only a necessity as
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long as it entails no harm, but bears no pain for its sake."
There is also a difference in the vital function of these
diverse apprehensions of divinity. Since the religious atti-
tude arises from inner vision, it is active, it determines
man's life, it shapes his deeds, it moulds his destiny. The
veneration of theory, on the contrary, is passive, it is led
and shaped by the residual man, it has no efficacy, and is
attached to no efficacious object. Indeed, it is, perhaps,
ignorant of virtue and is certainly no justification for it.
"I would excuse Aristotle," Halevi makes the rabbi say,
"for thinking lightly about the observation of the Law,
since he doubts whether God has any cognizance thereof."

Such then are the differences between God of philoso-
phy and God of positive religion, and the attitudes they
evoke. But practice may be based on illusion, and inactivity
may yet be truth. Which, then, of these opposed concep-
tions has the greater stronghold in truth? For which, asks
Halevi, is there more evidence? His answer is empirical
and pragmatic. The truer is that which is warranted by
the experience of the many and which serves human pur-
poses most adequately. The conception of a transcendent
Deity is intelligible only to a few, to select ones, to those
who are trained in the art of metaphysical speculation. The
mass of the people do not understand such a God, they
do not understand Him in spite of all the eloquence, all the
ratiocination of philosophers. If the latter reply, "What
of that? Truth has its own justification, regardless of its
intelligibility or unintelligibility to the common masses," they
must recall that one of the proofs they themselves
offer of God's existence is its universal acknowledgment by
men. They claim that the existence of God is deduced from
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reflection upon self-revealing traces of the divine nature in the presentiments of the soul, in the conscience of the human mind." But these presentiments are against the philosophers. The presentiments of the soul are not of the existence of a Prime Mover, of a God who, having once started the motion of the world, has left it to its own fate. They are indications of the existence of a God who is guiding the world, who is taking active part in its machinery. Men call Him "God of the land, because he possesses a special power in its air, soil and climate, which in connexion with the tilling of the ground, assists in improving the species." This is what all mankind have a presentiment of, and for this reason they are so obedient to religious teachers. "The soul finds satisfaction in their teachings in spite of the simplicity of their speech and ruggedness of their similes," while philosophers have never been able to attract the attention of the people. "With their eloquence and fine teachings, however great the impressiveness of their arguments, the masses of the people do not follow them, because the human soul has a presentiment of the truth, as it is said: 'The words of truth will be recognized.'"

As dialectic is a perversion of inner experience coming immediately and empirically, so the argument from design is a perversion of empirical fact. The world has beauty and its parts are harmoniously connected. This points, according to the philosophers, to a Being placed far above the world, from whom alone its simple movement and admirable coördination proceed." Halevi denies the total allegation. The philosophers are mistaken in their descrip-
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tion of the world. The world is not one and harmonious, and its parts do not hang together according to fixed and eternal laws. The world is a chaos, whose sole and miraculous unifying principle is a supreme Will, which is itself unstable and capriciously changing. The world is full of "miracles and the changing of ordinary, things newly arising, or changing one into another." The philosophers fail to observe the irreversible flux and change which permeates nature, because they project their own mental traits therein, and unify the natural diversity through the instrumentality of their intellects. "And this abstract speculation which made for eternity prevailed, and he found no need to inquire into the chronology or derivation of those who lived before him." Thus the unified nature which philosophers speak of is merely an artifact, the result of conceiving it in analogy with the soul. And this speculative nature has been substituted by philosophers for nature as she is.

Moreover, the argument from design is no proof for the existence of God. The order of the universe, if there is any, need not be a created order. Harmony, beauty and unity, the teleologic architectonic need no explanation. They are necessarily self-explaining, for they contain nothing problematic. If the possibility of change and the creation of new things in nature be not granted, then "thy opponent and thou might agree that a vine e.g. grew in this place because a seed happens to have fallen here." If there were no changes in nature, if the world presented no difficult situations, man would never think of God. What rouses questions in our mind, what needs explana-
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tions, is the discord and change in nature. These cannot be explained but by the presupposition of a Supreme Guide, for whom "evidence is found in changes of nature." "It is these that prove the existence of a creator of the world who can accomplish everything."**

In addition to the evidence of novelty, i.e. spontaneity in nature, Judah Halevi presents another proof for the existence of God; this is the history of human experience. Like Socrates, Halevi considers that real science is not physics but ethics. He regards personality and the relation of persons to one another as the essence of reality. But he goes further than Socrates; he takes as the basis of his science not the conduct of individuals but the conduct of humanity in history. He accuses the Greeks of lacking historic sense, of considering the history of each man as beginning with himself."** Therein he is quite the antithesis of the Greek philosophers. The latter reflected upon the purposiveness of nature but saw no teleology in the flux of history; Halevi, on the other hand, denies the purposiveness of nature, but asserts the onward march of history to a clearly-defined end. "Generations come and generations go," and yet history seems to have a purpose; human destiny seems to be guided by some pre-defined plan. God is not the God of the universe only; He is the God of human destiny. This view is stated quaintly, chiefly by use of illustrations drawn from the Bible. "Moses said to Pharaoh: 'The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,' but he did not say: 'The God of heaven and earth,' nor 'My creator
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"In the same way God commenced His speech to the assembled people of Israel: 'I am the God whom you worship, who led you out of the land of Egypt,' but He did not say: 'I am the creator of the world and your creator.'" A review of the experiences of the human race reveals enough empirical evidence to prove the existence of a Supreme Being guiding human actions.

The experience of the race would be sufficient, but private experience, Halevi thinks, also reveals the existence of God. The use of private religious experience as proof was, of course, in vogue among the Arabic philosophers of Halevi’s time. Arisen among the mystic sect of the Sufis, it had been rendered by the powerful arguments of Ghazali the accepted proof of Moslem theology. Halevi makes use of the term personal experience in a sense somewhat different and wider than that given it by Moslem divines. He does not mean the personal experience of the individual generated by certain conditions of mind and body. He means personal experience as revelation or intuition. It is objectively perceptive and contains nothing "mystical." Thus the revelation on Mount Sinai was nothing more or less than the personal experience of the entire Jewish congregation. Not all other religions, hence, are in true sense revealed religions, because the revelation was not to the whole people, severally and collectively. The other religions depend chiefly on the veracity and authority of a single individual whose experience has been conceded as true and regulative. Judaism, on the contrary, is based on the personal experience of each and all of the people. Hence, "the revelation on Sinai, this grand and
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lofty spectacle, cannot be denied."™ "Every one who was present at that time became convinced that the matter proceeded from God direct."™ And the witnesses transmitted their experience to succeeding generations by an unbroken chain of tradition. "Thus all Israel know these things, first, from personal experience, and afterwards through uninterrupted tradition which is equal to the former."™ "The first man would never have known God, if he had not addressed, rewarded, and punished him."™ "Cain and Abel were made acquainted with the nature of His being by communication of their father as well as by prophetic intuition."™

The empiricism is extraordinarily bold, even for our time. For Halevi's position is tantamount to asserting that unless men perceived God, meeting Him face to face, they cannot know Him at all. Thus the knowledge of God is natural knowledge. He appears to individuals and to masses, He speaks, He rewards, He punishes. He is known as other beings are known, by prophetic intuition, and by derived evidence, i. e. by tradition.

Now prophetic intuition and tradition, were lacking to the Greek philosophers. "These things, which cannot be approached by speculation, have been rejected by Greek philosophers because speculation denies everything the like of which it has not seen."™ "Had the Greek philosophers seen them (the prophets) when they prophesied and performed miracles, they would have acknowledged them, and sought by speculative means to discover how to achieve such things."™ The implication is that observation or intuition is
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prior to reason, that reason elaborates but does not discover, that the true is what is perceived, not what is reasoned. Indeed, on this not very clear notion, Haelvi develops a complete theory of race psychology, in which the dominant instruments of explanation are notions concerning perceived environment—the soil, the climate, etc. Reason is merely the tool which manipulates these perceived objects and it is they that are potent in the psychology of race.

The best application of this doctrine is perhaps to be seen in Halevi's discussion of the efficacy of prayer and the use of anthropomorphic terminology. His explanation of the latter is psychological. Using as his text the talmudic saying "The Torah spoke in the language of man," he points out that man cannot grasp metaphysical problems by means of abstract intellect alone, without the assistance of anything that can be conceived or seen, such as words, writing, or any visible or imaginary form. Man shows fear whenever he meets with anything terrible, but not at the mere report of such a thing; he is likewise attracted by a beautiful form which strikes his eye, but not so much by one that is only spoken of. That the prophets should picture God by visible images is, then, inevitable. How very different is this from the Maimonidean identification of anthropomorphisms with metaphysical terms!

Prayer, again, is likewise a psychological necessity. Prayer is not a means of approaching God, to rouse His mercy and assuage His anger, but it is the spontaneous expression of the individual at moments of strong emotions. Jewish metaphysicians have mistaken the prime object of
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prayer and had therefore split hair over such questions as: How is it possible to change God's mind by prayer? Can we praise God sufficiently? The result was Maimonides' condemnation of excessive prayer. According to Halevi, prayer can never be excessive. So long as man feels the need of praying, of pouring forth his accumulated passions and feeling, he cannot be restrained by external barriers. Prayer is the art of self-expression just as are music, dance, and song which often accompany it. It occupies in the Jewish life the same position that music and athletic games used to hold in Greek life. It is a catharsis of the pent-up energies. It is primarily not a petition to God but a voluntary exercise of the soul. The perception or thought of God merely excites prayer, just as the sight of beauty calls forth the practice of other arts: "Prayer is for the soul what nourishment is for the body. During prayer a man purges his soul from all that passed over it, and prepares for the future."

To an empiric and intuitionist like Halevi, the residual problems of the metaphysicians had to seem empty. Denying the absoluteness of design, the adequacy of reason, the unity of the world, insisting on acts, facts, observation, his treatment of the typical problems of Jewish metaphysicians was rather superior and high-handed. There was, for example, the problem of the eternity of matter. We have seen how Maimonides has treated it. No Jewish theologian save RaLBaG" ventured to agree with Aristotle in the doctrine of the eternity of matter. Halevi, however, dismisses the whole problem as futile. If the doctrine merely asserts the existence of an eternal matter, it may be accepted or
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rejected without making any difference in one's view of life. It is primarily a question of observation not of logic or religion, and it must be solved by experimental evidence. And if anybody has proved to his own satisfaction that an eternal non-divine element does exist, what of it? Does it alter his conduct or view of life? What is really of practical importance is whether the historic movement of the world is real or not. The world exists for us in so far as we know it, and do we know it sub specie aeternitatis or sub specie generationis? Assuredly our earliest records of the past date from a certain period, and everything before that period is wrapt in a mist. We may infer what had happened before that time, but that is merely "abstract speculations which make eternity." It is not actual proof. As far as our knowledge goes, we must assume that the world was created in time, though by abstract speculations we may infer that the world is eternal. Hence, "if, after all, a believer of the Law finds himself compelled to admit an eternal matter and the existence of many worlds prior to this one, this would not impair his belief that this world was created at a certain epoch, and that Adam and Noah were the first human beings."

But the philosophers trust that their inferences are as true as the records of events. They say that science is not merely hypothesis, but a true description of things. Halevi proceeds to criticise contemporary science. His criticism, which was undoubtedly inspired by Ghazali's "The Destruction of Philosophy," is mainly a criticism of the scientific method of his time not for the purpose of substituting a new, improved method, but to discredit science. His criticism, therefore, was not like that of
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Bacon's, but rather like that of modern religionists who try to prove the truth of religion by the limitation of science.

The science of the philosophers, he argues, is based on logic rather than on experience. The laws of nature do not really describe the nature of things, but are merely rules of action. Take for example the theory of the four elements which is entirely hypothetical, for we have never seen elementary fire, earth, air, or water. Their real existence can be verified neither by a synthetic nor by an analytic process. "Where have we ever witnessed an igneous or atmospheric substance entering into the substance of the plant or animal, and asserted that it was composed of all four elements?" "Or when did we ever see things dissolve into the four real elements?" Science, it is true, forces us to accept the theory that cold, moisture and dryness are primary qualities, the influence of which nobody can escape; this is, however, only conception and nomenclature; it does not mean that they can emerge from mere theory into reality, and produce, by combination, all existing things."

Had the philosophers merely recorded facts and not undertaken to explain their cause and origin, there would be no objection against them. The philosophers, however, go further than that; they conceive the classified facts as metaphysical abstractions which produce these very facts. They call these abstractions or powers by the name of Nature, and ascribe all the phenomena of the universe to the actions of nature. But "what is Nature?" The common people think it is a certain power which is known only to the philosophers." But "the philosophers know as
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Aristotle defined it as the beginning and primary cause through which a thing moves or rests, not by accidents, but on account of its innate essence." Though these words "astonish those who hear them, nothing else springs from the knowledge of nature." All we notice in the world is things in motion and in rest, which we call by the general name Nature, but the philosophers "mislead us by names, and cause us to place another being on par with God, if we say that nature is wise and active." To be sure, the elements, sun, moon, and stars, have power such as warming, cooling, moistening, and drying, "but these are merely functions." "There is no harm in calling the power which arranges matter by means of heat and cooling, 'Nature,' but all intelligence must be denied to them."

Science being disposed of, the right conception of God and the universe defined, we may turn to Halevi's ethical doctrines. Here, too, he begins with polemic. The real difficulty with science lies in the fact that philosophers' interest in the world is theoretical rather than practical. They consider the knowledge of handling things inferior to the knowledge of "describing things in a fitting manner." And they extend this preference of speculation to action even in the fields of ethics. The highest good, according to the philosopher, is the "Pleasure of God," which is obtained when one "becomes like the active intellect in finding the truth, in describing everything in a fitting manner, and in rightly recognizing its basis." The way of reaching
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it is not by action nor is it prescribed. The philosophers say, "Fashion thy religion according to the laws of reason set up by philosophers, and be not concerned about the word or language or actions thou employest."¹

In criticising this ethical system Halevi and his followers try to prove that reason is unreliable both as a guide in life and as a means of knowing things, that virtues are inefficient if they possess no intrinsic values, that man can never become like the "Active Intellect," and that the "Active Intellect" cannot be the highest happiness.

To begin with, intellect cannot be a guide of life. If all men were to follow their own intellects they would be led to different points, never coming to an agreement. "Why do Christian and Moslem who divide the inhabited world between them fight with one another?"² They do not fight over matters of practice, for in their ethics and worship of God they differ very little, "both serve God with pure intention, living either as monks or hermits, fasting and praying."³ They fight only over speculative creeds and doctrines. It is that speculative element in religion that breeds all kinds of differences of opinion, that causes schisms and dissensions. If men did not rely on their intellect and admitted the fallibility of reason, difference of opinion would be recognized as inevitable, and no man would attempt to force his views upon others. In fact, it is better for the progress of humanity that there exists diversity of opinion.⁴ In short, intellects must differ, and therefore should not determine action.

But not only does reason fail to be a guide of life, it is also fallible as a way of getting a true understanding of

¹ Kuzari I, 1.
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things. There are things in heaven and things in earth that one cannot get by mere reasoning. The unsophisticated person, who does not set the universe in a logical frame-work, who beholds man and nature acting freely in their undelineable boundaries, sees all their irregularities, all their defiance of system and law, in spite of their occasionally apparent regularity. There are miracles in nature and mysteries in human nature, which cannot be grasped and explained by bare reason. Man must possess another faculty to understand them, and he must have recourse to another language to communicate them. There is prophecy, divine influence, and inner vision which are quite different from reason and independent of it. Persons who have not been devoted to study and to the development of their intellect have often been endowed with supernatural powers by which they have been enabled to discover truth which philosophers with their superior intellect have in vain striven after. "This proves that the divine influence as well as the souls have a secret which is not identical with the intellect."

You will say that philosophers, too, recognize the value of moral virtue, and "recommend good and dissuade from evil in the most admirable manner." But what is the moral force that will cause one to do good and desist from doing evil? The philosophers "have contrived laws or rather regulations without binding force, which may be overridden in times of need." Reason alone cannot be a binding force; one's knowledge that by doing evil to others he does evil to himself is not strong enough to overcome his momentary impulses to do evil. These can be over-
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come but by an inhibiting impulse, by a consciousness of responsibility, by a sentiment that certain actions are wrong in themselves. You may say that the fear of punishment will inhibit a man from doing evil, but how can the fear of a remote uncertain pain inhibit man from immediate pleasure? The inhibition of evil conduct must be present in the action just as is the desire to do it. Man would not desist from doing evil unless together with the desire of evil there comes an opposed desire not to do it. What can this opposed desire be if not the same that certain actions are wrong in themselves, that they are prohibited by Authority, and are, "like the work of nature, entirely determined by God, but beyond the power of man?"\textsuperscript{m} The doing of good likewise must be inspired by a social sentiment, by a feeling that "the relation of the individual to society is as the relation of the single limb to the body"\textsuperscript{n} and that "it is the duty of the individual to bear hardships, or even death, for the sake of the welfare of the commonwealth."\textsuperscript{o} Philosophy does not offer such binding forces. Philosophers "love solitude to refine their thoughts"\textsuperscript{p} and do not consider their relation to society as that of the single limb to the body. They have no sense of social obligation. "They only desire the society of disciples who stimulate their research and retentiveness, just as he who is bent upon making money would only surround himself with persons with whom he could do lucrative business."\textsuperscript{q}

But inasmuch as the philosophers recommend moral virtues, the difference reduces itself to this: Do moral virtues exist for intellectual virtues, or intellectual virtues for
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moral? Joseph ben Shemtob (1400-1460), attempts to answer the question. Regarding religion as identical with life he concludes that speculation (ишׁיא) arises for the sake of action, (משה). Though in some sense religious practices are themselves a means to a particular sort of speculation, to the pure or mystical knowledge, i.e. possession of God, most men cannot attain this stage of happiness. Only a few saints, like Simon bar Joḥai and his son (םויי), achieved the heights on which they could be absolved from the practice of the Law. In this case their mere existence was the source and existence of law. But the great majority of men cannot be merged in God in this way, and must subordinate speculation to life.

Thus it is evident that intellectual excellence, the pleasure derived from "finding the truth, from describing everything in a fitting manner, and rightly recognizing its basis," can be attained only after man had completely adapted himself to nature. Play does not begin till after all work is done. But can man completely adapt himself to nature? This would be possible if man were the only being, living on a planet made for his special purposes, and meeting all his needs. But man is placed in a world not altogether fit for his purposes; he must make terms with it; his chief concern is to adjust himself to the universe in order that he may survive in it. And the process of adjustment is an eternal endless process, for each adjustment is only between one small part of man and one small part of the universe, and after the adjustment between any such two parts is completed, there comes forth
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the need of a new adjustment between other parts. Contemplation, therefore, cannot be an end in itself, since man can never adapt himself completely to the universe. Of course, individual persons, instead of adapting themselves to the world, may renounce it, withdraw in caves and deserts and spend their lives in contemplation. But mankind as a whole live in the world and do not retire from it. It is, therefore, not sufficient for man to comprehend things objectively and "describe them in a fitting manner." What he needs is to understand everything in its relation to his purposes. Knowledge must be an instrument for action. "Reason must rather obey, just as a sick person must obey the physician in applying his medicine and advice."

Finally, the philosophers place speculation above action because they consider speculation as the greatest, the only self-sufficient happiness. But speculation can afford man no happiness unless it has its basis in action, unless it has been called forth by some practical motive. In order to derive intellectual pleasure from seeing things as they are, there must first be a problem, a difficulty in seeing those things. Intellectual pleasure consists in the transition from a state of perplexity to that of certainty, in the unraveling of a problem, in the suspense and repose we experience after a state of confusion. "The pleasures of our life consist in the getting of things we desire; and the desire for a thing consists in our being potentially in the possession of that thing but actually deprived of it." We can have no intellectual pleasure unless we are conscious of its com-
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חָרוֹב חַגָּאר וְאֶשֶּר יְמֵנֵא יִפְתַּחְוּ נַחַל הַשֻּׂנָה הַדְּבָר הַבּוּכָה כְּכָל שֶׁחָפָרְשָׁהוּ כְּתוֹנָא שֶׁחָפָרְשָׁהוּ כְּמוֹ אֶשֶּר יְמֵנֵא יִפְתַּחְוּ נַחַל הַשֻּׂנָה הַדְּבָר הַבּוּכָה כְּכָל שֶׁחָפָרְשָׁהוּ כְּתוֹנָא שֶׁחָפָרְשָׁהוּ כְּמוֹ אֶשֶּר יְמֵנֵא יִפְתַּחְוּ נַחַל הַשֻּׂנָה הַדְּבָר הַבּוּכָה כְּכָל שֶׁחָפָרְשָׁהוּ כְּתוֹנָא שֶׁחָפָרְשָׁהוּ כְּמוֹ אֶשֶּר יְמֵנֵא יִפְתַּחְוּ נַחַל הַשֻּׂנָה הַדְּבָר הַבּוּכָה C. Kreskas, 'ה' וֹ הָזָא, ed. Vienna, 55b.
ing. We all take pleasure in our senses, and yet it is not those permanent sensations impressed upon us by external forces that give us the greatest pleasure, but those sensations which we ourselves bring upon us by intention and desire. The mathematician may take pleasure in solving problems, but certainly not in the self-evident truth of the multiplication table. "We see this in the fact that we do not take pleasure in the comprehension of self-evident truths. The reason is because there was no transition from potentiality to actuality, and hence there was no desire to comprehend them." Intellectual pleasure, then, cannot result but from a problem; but how can you have any problem if you have no practical interest in the world, if you already had conquered it, and are going to live in it on mere contemplation?

With this Halevi's criticism of philosophy is completed. His general point of view, it will be gathered, is Hebraic. His implicit standards of criticism involve the empirical method, the voluntaristic assumptions, the historic sense, and the high morality which are embodied in the Jewish Scriptures. But we have not here to deal with his constructive doctrine compounded of religion, tradition, and criticism. Our task has been to separate and exhibit the bearing of two opposed tendencies toward Greek philosophy in the thought of the Jews of the Middle Ages, as these tendencies are expressed in their most representative protagonists, especially Moses ben Maimon and Judah Halevi. Maimonides is Hellenist, Halevi a Hebraist; Maimonides is a rationalist, Halevi an empiricist. Maimon-
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ides subordinates everything to reason, which, for him, is alone the master of man. Halevi, too, serves only one master, but he recognizes and regards the other. He thinks will fundamental but offers reason its proper place. Though he criticises the works of reason, and is skeptical about the validity of theory, he accepts it within limitations, and seeks to conform theory to practice. We cannot know the world as it is, but we can know it so as to live in it. In form, the philosophy of both men, Maimonides and Halevi, is antiquated, yet the substance of their differences is still operative. Maimonides, however, is more truly mediæval; his thought is closely allied to that of the Schoolmen; while Halevi's is old wine that is even now bursting new bottles. Contemporary thought, the whole pragmatic movement, may find its visions foreshadowed in Halevi's discussions. Maimonides intended his book to be the "Guide of the Perplexed," and it can now be taken but for a scholastic apology of religion; Halevi called his work: "Book of Argument and Demonstration in the Aid of the Despised Faith," and it must now be considered the most logical of mediæval expositions of the practical spirit as contrasted with the speculative.
A MOSES LEGEND

By Samuel Krauss, Vienna

The manuscript which sees light here for the first time comes from the valuable collection of manuscripts of Mr. Elkan Adler in London, and its origin is most probably either Persia or Yemen. The few leaves which form the subject of our inquiry are incorporated in a quite bulky volume in quarto which contains heterogeneous matter in great quantity and in motley diversity, and from which I have published an Oriental Ketubba\(^1\) and a version of the well-known Toldot Jeshu.\(^2\)

Our manuscript deserves the name Midrash of the type of many similar edifying stories in the well-known collection of Jellinek; it, moreover, deals with a biblical personage, viz. Moses, and constitutes a series of stories rather than one continuous and uninterrupted story. To judge from the contents, however, our narrative belongs to the large domain of ethical fables (ה responseBody), for the mere reason that, as will be shown, it is a product of the Arabic age.

To facilitate a survey of the contents, I have divided the theme in three chapters.

The first chapter tells the following tale: When Moses was feeding the sheep of Jethro in the wilderness, an angel

\(^1\) ZfhB., V, 29 f.

\(^2\) Krauss, Leben Jesu nach jüd. Quellen, 118 f.
(Others) approached him in the shape of a white wolf (אָתוֹל), and demanded a sheep from him to satisfy his hunger. Moses, the faithful shepherd, refused his demand, claiming that the sheep did not belong to him, whereupon the wolf made him run to Jethro and obtain permission, promising to guard the flock meanwhile. Jethro gave his permission, but when Moses returned to the flock, the wolf had disappeared. The story breaks off at this point, and we are left in the dark as to whether Moses was aware of the angelic nature of the talking wolf. This omission serves to prove that it was not the object of the narrator to show that Moses communicated with transcendental beings, but rather to furnish evidence of Moses' true and faithful discharge of his duties as a shepherd.

The second chapter is considerably larger. A deceitful old man (נַחֲלָה) joins Moses, and they wander together in the wilderness. Altogether they have five loaves of bread, of which they consume two each in two halting-places, while the fifth disappears in the hands of the old man. Being in the sad plight of starvation, Moses performs miracles with the divine staff in his hand: he seizes deer, whose flesh they consume, and whose bones he resuscitates to new life. He also causes water to flow from a rock. Furthermore, it is related as an episode that Moses revived a dead person by means of his staff. In the hand of the old man, however, the staff loses its miraculous power, and thus, as the narrator states, is verified the proverb: Not all men are alike. It is evident that this moral is the point of the story. Another point which is accentuated through the whole piece is the villainy of the old man, who, despite the miracles he witnesses, perseveres in his imposture.
The third chapter furnishes the dénouement: the old man receives his well-deserved punishment. This occurs in the following way: Moses puts up three heaps of dust and transforms them into gold; then, leaving the whole treasure to the avidity of the old man, he departs from him forever. The old man is unable to carry the heavy weight of gold, and espying Bedouins on camels, he solicits their aid, stipulating to give them a third part of the treasure. The Bedouins, however, dispatch the old man to an adjacent city in order to buy bread for them. During his absence they resolve to kill him, which they do, in order to appropriate the whole treasure for themselves. But they pay with their lives for this plot, for the bread was poisoned—probably by the old man who envied them the stipulated reward—, and as a result all of them died. Thus poetical justice receives due emphasis and accentuation at the hand of our narrator.

As is seen from this outline, the first story has no connection whatever with the subsequent trend of the narrative. To be sure, Moses is and remains the hero throughout, and it is certainly the consummate aim of the narrator to bring out in relief the overtowering personality of Moses the man; but while in the first story a divine being, an angel, is employed to bring out the greatness of Moses, in the following stories it is always the deceitful old man who forms the contrast to the great lawgiver. This loose construction can only be explained by the fact that the narrator found certain stories relating to Moses, and from these he adopted and remodeled some which pleased him, rejecting the others as unworthy of his attention.

The narrator no doubt employs familiar fable motives. One need not be surprised that he clothes the angel in
white, since angels are always pictured in white garb; for an example comp. Daniel 10, 5 f. and 12, 6. Nor can we find it inappropriate that he makes the angel assume the shape of a preying beast: the rape of a sheep being involved, temptation in the form of a wolf is particularly fitting. The preying animal was to tempt Moses, in order to test his faithfulness.

As to the disguise or transformation itself, it is a motive quite familiar in the fable literature of all times and all nations. In the Talmud we read of the metamorphosis of Satan, who assumes once the shape of a deer, another time that of a bird, and it appears to us quite superfluous to adduce proof for the existence of such popular notions. But what is of especial interest to us in the wolf scene is the manner in which Moses addresses the wolf: Do animals (מָמָּת) speak? To which his interlocutor replies: Thou who wilt one day be called upon to perform great deeds, who wilt be an eye-witness to the story of the golden calf and the speaking ass of Balaam —thou askest such questions? This dialogue leads us straightway to the source of the story, and this source is none other than Mohammedan.

This fact in itself that the golden calf (ב:וֹי) is represented as an animated and living being, is a Mohammedan notion. The Mohammedan legend maintains that Al-Samiri (known from the Koran as the creator of the calf) took dust from under the hoofs of the horse of Gabriel (the guardian angel of the children of Israel), and threw it into the mouth of the calf, whereupon the calf was endowed with life and began to low. A some-

---

* b. Sanh. 95a.
* 1b., 107a.
* All this is found in Jew. Enc., III, 509.
what similar view is contained in the Rabbinic work Pirke di R. Eliezer, and we know that this book bears the stamp of Arabic influence.

The dialogue between Moses and the wolf leads us distinctly into Arabic territory. Its prototype we meet in the book Ḥayyat al-ḥaywān ("Life of the Animals") by Damīrī. In the part relating to the wolf (di'b)—I, 446-452—a number of wolf fables are cited from various writers, which fables, for example, run as follows: A shepherd tending his flock in the desert sees a wolf approach and seize one of his sheep. While the shepherd attempts to save the victim, the wolf begins to expostulate: Dost thou wish to deprive me of the prey which Allah has apportioned me? To which the shepherd ejaculates: Does an animal speak? And the wolf replies: Did not Allah's prophet proclaim still greater miracles?—According to another story, the wolf had a conversation with three of Mohammed's companions, among them Uḥbān ibn Aus (إِبْن أُوس). While the latter was feeding his herd a wolf came and seized one of his sheep. Uḥbān began to battle with the preying animal, but was astounded at the latter's defense: Dost thou wish to deprive me of the food which God has allotted me?—Does an animal speak?—Does this surprise thee? The wolf then pointed toward Medinah, where the prophet was teaching and preaching, saying: Even greater wonders occur there! Thereupon Uḥbān ibn Aus set out on his way to Medinah, came to Mohammed, and related his adventure to him, and finally embraced Islam. Also a tradition is quoted, according to which Uḥbān is called "he who conversed with the wolf,"

and his children "the children of him who conversed with the wolf."—Again in another tale (according to Bokhâri) not only the wolf (in the manner recorded above), but also the cow speaks. The cow, being overburdened by her master, turns to him with reproach: Was I created to carry loads? My creator has destined me for ploughing! Thus we see a wolf and a cow speaking. And Mohammed says: I believe it, for Abu Bekr and Omar are with me.—Always reference to Mohammed! And so the speaking cow is of especial interest to us, since under the title "Cow" ( diferentes) the second Sura comprises all that which Mohammed, in his customary obscurity and confusion, was able to say of the golden calf, the "red" heifer, and the beheaded heifer.¹

Just as in the Mohammedan tradition Mohammed is apparently glorified through the speaking wolf, so also in the person of our narrator a man was found, who, instead of the false prophet, aimed to apotheosize with the same means the first prophet, the father of all prophets, the great teacher Moses. Also Moses is bewildered: Does an animal speak? And immediately the high rank of Moses is pointed out: Thou forsooth wilt receive the Torah from heaven; thou wilt behold a living calf made out of gold; thou wilt record to posterity the story of Balaam and his loquacious ass: and yet thou art astonished? Our narrative thus proves to be polemical in a considerable degree, breaking a lance with Islam, and this in itself is a proof that it originated under Mohammedan influence.

The Oriental origin of our story is furthermore attested by the fact that the speaking bird likewise forms

¹ For the reference to Damiri I am indebted to my friend B. Heller in Budapest.
a customary motive in the Oriental fables. Thus we find it among others in the last piece of "A Thousand and One Nights," Galland's edition, although the Arabic original does not contain it. The well-known fact of the migration of fairy-tales accounts for the familiarity of the subjects also in the Occident, so that originally there was a reference to the "wonder bird" even in Schiller's "Wallenstein" (Act III, Scene 13); this reference, however, was later obliterated by the poet, while we still find in Turandot "the bird that speaks."

In that part of the narrative which we call the first chapter, there is still another point that may be singled out, viz. the wolf guarding the herd faithfully. Also this motive belongs no doubt to the universal fable literature, but I am not able at present to designate its true source.

In the second chapter, the "staff of Moses" (סמש) forms the most essential element of the story. The thaumaturgical power of the staff is too well-known from the voluminous literature bearing on the subject,\(^9\) and it is scarcely necessary to dwell upon it here. It is only the deeds performed by the aid of the staff that are not known anywhere else.

The element dealing with the deceitful old man accompanying Moses has its counterpart in a similar story contained in the Talmud (b. Giṭṭin 68ab), according to which Ashmedai, the arch-demon, set out on a wandering tour with Benaiah b. Jehoiada, the messenger of Solomon. During this tour some deeds are performed by the demon which are incomprehensible and even repugnant to his

---

\(^9\) R. Köhler, Kleine Schriften, III, 170 f.

\(^{10}\) M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur sem. Sagenkunde, 163 f.; see also my "Antoninus und Rabbi," p. 11, note.
companion, being utterly unjust and calculated to bring divine providence into disrepute. At last the companion is made to understand the true meaning of the "wonderful deeds" of the unearthly being. This theme is a favorite with fairy-tale writers: in French, for instance, we find it under the title of l'ange et l'ermité. The roots of this fable reach out unto remote antiquity, and their receptive soil is the fantastic Orient. The Talmud itself, besides the case already cited, contains many other tales of such "wonderful deeds."

The essence of the Ashmedai story and its predominating idea is this, that God's messenger, a supramundane being, commits unjust, nay cruel, deeds, punishing the just and rewarding the wicked, and his companion, who sees these acts, is astonished and amazed, until an explanation reaches him. All this is a kind of theodicy. In a Judæo-German -book, which has been made accessible to us by modern investigation, the hero of the tale is the pious R. Joshua b. Levi, who is known from the talmudic haggadah, while the prophet Elijah plays the rôle of the thaumaturgist. The narrative begins as following: R. Joshua b. Levi met one day the prophet Elijah, and asked him: What is my lord doing all the time? The prophet

22 References are the expression in a parallel passage in Midrash Tehillim on 78, 12, p. 177, ed. Buber.
23 See esp. Isr. Lévi in REJ., VIII, 64-73, and 202-205; also ib., XLVIII, 275-277. The story of Ashmedai and King Solomon is also found in, and the Genizah fragment forming an Arabic translation of it was printed ib., XLV, 305-308.
25 Grünbaum, Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie, 393 f.
answered: I travel about in the world, from city to city, from country to country. This prologue is apparently derived from the Book of Job; yet it must be remarked that it is missing in all the Hebrew versions, which are very numerous, while the prototype of the Judæo-German book must have contained it.

Now let us proceed to the examination of our text. Moses asks the old man: Whither goest thou? And he answers: I go to and fro in the earth (בֵית). This scarcely admits of a misconstruction, and it is evident that our text bestows on Moses the rôle of the miracle-worker, while the deceitful old man is introduced in the same manner as the demon in the Ashmedai story. It is only when we consider the demon as model that we understand the rôle of the deceitful old man. The thought of Faust and Mephistopheles suggests itself, and this is already of absorbing interest to the universal history of civilization. Still the introductory words remind me of the Ashmedai tale, while the deeds performed by Moses with his staff have their parallel, as mentioned above, nowhere else.

In the absence of a better source let us not omit to point out a slight trace, which is liable to give us a clue to the character of our story. In the great mediæval collection of fables, known under the name *Gesta Romanorum*, we find the following anecdote: Three men travel on the road, and all three possess only one loaf of bread. Says one: Comrades, let the bread belong to him who will dream the most beautiful dream. Two of them fall asleep in order to dream the desired dream, but the third man consumes the bread meanwhile. A violent strife over food

---

38 *Gesta Roman.* ed. Oesterley, p. 436-438; see on p. 728 the unusually large literature, among others also *Toledot Jesu*, which illustrates sufficiently the wide currency of this fable material.
occurs also in the Jewish "Life of Jesus" (Toledot Jeshu, ed. Huldreich, 1705, p. 51); however, here not bread is involved, but a fat goose, for the possession of which Jesus, Peter, and Judas vie with each other, the strife reminding us of the controversy between the apostles and Zebedee's sons (Matth. 20, 24)," and then Peter maintains that he was sitting in his dream near the throne of the Son of God. No less a man than Gaston Paris, the famous authority on fables, to whom we are also indebted for the investigation of the above-mentioned legend of the angel and the hermit, has already proved that a connection exists between this strife and the parable of the "three rings"; and it is the same Gaston Paris who links together the anecdote of Historia Jeschua Nazareni with an anecdote from the Arabic book Nuzhetol Udeba (?) (i.e. nuzhat al-udaba) according to which it was the Jew among those three men who dreamed that he had consumed the bread, and this was naturally the most beautiful dream. The point then to be brought out is this, that in the competition over the bread the Jew is the wisest, which supposition unfortunately does not seem to be borne out in many cases.

In the same chapter, a special detail still calls for our attention. The deers which were captured by means of the staff were not consumed entirely: their bones were left untouched, and these Moses resuscitated to new life. This miracle of Moses does not seem to be simply a copy of Ezekiel's resurrection scene, but it rather rests on a well-circulated belief, according to which certain parts of

---

14 See my "Leben Jesu," p. 162
the body, which control animal life, are tabooed. Even according to the Torah the blood should not be eaten, for the blood is the soul of every flesh (Lev. 17, 14); and so also the Greeks abstained from eating the brains, believing them to be the abode of every sense of life. Even in our own days some savage tribes leave entirely untouched the head, the wings, and the legs of the birds which they seize and consume, offering these parts as sacrifices to their gods and beseeching them that out of these may arise new immortal creatures of the same kind. This is the most essential element in this belief, and it may serve to elucidate certain ordinances in the Torah (e. g. the Passover sacrifice) as well as our anecdote; yet I should have preferred finding our anecdote as a whole in some one Arabic tale, for, after all that has been said, there can be no doubt that also here we must have recourse to Arabic sources. However, the proper source is unknown to me. Thus also I am unable to fit into a larger frame the characteristic trait of Moses, admonishing the deceitful old man after every miracle to think himself before he swears and to consider the sanctity of the oath. The old man swears impudently and wickedly that he has no bread, persevering in this assertion despite the repeated admonitions, until finally he is caught in his own net.

As against the difficulty in identifying the one part of the narrative, it is a great satisfaction to us to be able to state, that in the matter of the youth, who is being killed by the old man, there is ample material in the fable literature to corroborate it. Of this rich material, as we

18 Treated by me in the Hungarian Journal Ethnographia, X, 277 f.

19 ינהו of the Hebrew text need not be a small child, but, according to general usage, may also designate a youth.
shall note soon, only the following three points have been retained in our text: a well (רזע) in the desert;\textsuperscript{m} the youth with money in his hand, who is being slain; and finally the old man, who stands in some connection with the youth. This is all—a mere skeleton, such as the one that remained from the slain deer after its flesh had been consumed. The pathetic tragedy in the story of the youth was equally sacrificed by our narrator, so that only skin and bones are left behind. The narrative in its present form is stripped of its beauty and great import, and the resulting moral is scarcely recognizable. This defacement can be accounted for only through lack of understanding in the author, or else through an unfortunate accident, for deliberate distortion seems to be excluded. The remarkable story, as it appears in the Judaeo-German \textit{"Megillat Esther"},\textsuperscript{m} runs in brief as follows:

It was Moses' habit to roam about in the country, in order to give free play to his meditations. Once upon a time he was sitting far away from a well, which, however, he was able to overlook, ruminating in his usual manner. Suddenly he noticed a man approaching the well, drinking from it, and resuming his way, after dropping a money-bag unknowingly. Immediately after him a poor man came to the well, quenched his thirst, picked up the money-bag, and departed joyfully. Also a third man came the same way, drank, and sat down to rest. Meanwhile the first man became aware of his loss, hastened back to the well, found there the resting man, and with rage and fury demanded his money from him. The latter, knowing him-

\textsuperscript{m} In a truly Jewish spirit it says that Moses goes to the well in order to purify himself after easing his nature. In all the other versions the well serves only to quench the thirst of the wanderers.

\textsuperscript{m} Also in Grünbaum, \textit{Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie}, 215 f.
self innocent, repudiated the accusation with equal vigor, so that a quarrel soon ensued with the result that the first man, who had lost the money, killed the third man, after which he ran away. It is true that Moses, who witnessed all this, hastened to the spot in order to save the innocent man, but he came there too late. With hands raised towards heaven, he entreats God to reveal to him these mysterious workings of fate, and in answer a voice from heaven says: Know that the man who lost the money-bag, although pious and God-fearing himself, inherited it from his father who had robbed it from the father of the man who now found it; and so, by divine Providence, the latter came to his rightful possession. The third man, however, who was slain, although apparently he committed no crime—know that in years gone by he had slain the brother of this man, and there were no witnesses to accuse him; hence I have ordained it so, that the one who lost the money should kill the other at the well, so that his brother might be avenged. Thus the human mind, says God, cannot perceive my measures (ודא), and therefore let no one say that God is unjust.

This graceful eulogy over fate in the frame of a delightful narrative was elaborated poetically by the German poet Gellert. In his poem “Das Schicksal” he narrates the following parable: When Moses stood on the mountain, supplicating God to make His way known to him, God commanded him to look down. When he did so, he saw a mounted soldier descend from his horse and quench his thirst at a well. Scarcely had he gone, when a youth

36 Comp. Exod. 33, 13.
37 “Knabe” agrees with קבּלע of our text and not with “Mann” of the Judaeo-German text.
came running from his herd, and drank from the same source. Here he found the purse which the soldier had lost, and seizing it he returned to his flock. Next came a frail old man, sipped from the well, and, overcome by fatigue, fell asleep. Meanwhile the rider returned, and impetuously demanded his money from the old man. In vain the old man asseverates that he had found nothing: the rider stabs him. Overwhelmed with grief Moses falls on his face, whereupon he hears the divine voice saying:

"Denn wiss, es hat der Greis, der jetzt im Blute liegt,
Des Knaben Vater einst erschlagen,
Der den verlorenen Raub zuvor davon getragen."

The ways of fate are presented in this poem in a genuine poetical manner and with much more precision than in the Judæo-German text: The victim is an old man who cannot defend himself; seemingly he deserves our compassion, in reality, however, he is the slayer of the father of the youth, who had found the money, and thus the latter unconsciously becomes the instrument through which the slayer of his father receives his long-delayed punishment.

Many people have found delight in Gellert's poem, without surmising that the fable which forms the basis of this poem is of Oriental origin. This fact became known in 1860, when it was pointed out for the first time that Gellert's poem bears striking resemblance to a poem by a Persian poet Gami whose Persian text together with an English translation was first published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1860, pp. 10-17. Also according to the Persian poet Moses desires to fathom God's decrees, whereupon God makes him observe these incidents.
at a well: a horseman comes galloping to the well, in the same manner as the prophet Al-Chidr (الخدر) in former days. He divests himself of his raiment, and bathes hurriedly in the water. On leaving, he forgets his purse on the ground near the water. A wanderer wends his way towards the same place, where he beholds the money. and seizing it, he makes haste to depart. After him comes a blind old man, performs the ritual ablutions and also the prayers prescribed to a pilgrim. At this point the horseman comes back, and boisterously demands his money. The blind old man retorts harshly, whereupon he is slain. Moses is startled at the sight of these things, and he entreats God to grant him an explanation.

Then came the Divine Voice: "Oh thou censurer of my ways,

Square not these doings of mine with thy rule!
That young boy had once a father
Who worked for hire and so gained his bread;
He wrought for that horseman and built him his house
Long he wrought in that house for hire,
But ere he received his due, he fell down and died,
And in that purse was the hire, which the youth carried away.
Again, that blind man in his young days of sight
Had spilt the blood of his murderer's father;
The son by the law of retaliation slays him to-day.
And gives him release from the price of blood in the day of retribution."

In Gami's poem as well as in our Hebrew text the motive for seeking the well consists in the ritual ablutions
and the required prayers, and this motive is intelligible only to Jews and Mohammedans. Gellert, the Occidental bard, had to reject such a motive as being beyond the comprehension of his readers, and hence he speaks of drinking from the well. This slight deviation does not, of course, exclude the assumption that he was guided by an Oriental archetype. It is true that he knew no Persian; it is equally true that Gami's poem remained unpublished in his days. Still the scholar who first pointed to Gami* concludes his observations as follows: "Gellert undoubtedly derived his story from No. 237 of the "Spectator," where it was rendered by Hughes as an old Jewish tradition. Both redactions, however, the one by Hughes (=Gellert) as well as the one by Gami, go positively back to a single ultimate source. Which is this? I conjecture that this legend was originally incorporated in an Arabic fable collection, which Gami used directly and which, translated into Hebrew, became known to Hughes. An authentication of both the Arabic original and the Hebrew translation would prove of great interest."

Dr. Cyrus Adler has kindly called my attention to a poem by Thomas Parnell (1679-1717) entitled "The Hermit" (see The Poems of Dr. Thomas Parnell, in The Works of the English Poets, edited by Samuel Johnson, London 1790, vol. XXVII, p. 81), in which two hundred years ago the same matter was poetically treated. In this poem the Hermit is wandering with a Youth and becomes witness of apparently unjust deeds. In a noble house he steals a cup of great value and gives it to an avaricious

---

* H. Brockhaus in ZDMG., XIV (1860), 710.

** The Spectator, III, London, 1753, p. 264; yet the article is not signed by Hughes, but by somebody with an initial C.
landlord. In another noble house he kills the only son of his host; furthermore, on the road, he makes a servant perish in the floods of a rapid stream. To the astonished Hermit he finally explains the motives of his acts, teaching him as follows:

"Then know the truth of government divine,
And let these scruples be no longer thine.

The Maker justly claims that world he made,
In this the right of Providence is laid...."

The wish of the scholar that the source might be identified has not yet, as far as I can see, been realized, and even to-day, after a space of fifty years, it still remains a desideratum. As to the Hebrew source, the Judæo-German text demonstrates sufficiently that the legend was known also in Jewish circles, and our Hebrew text, which contains the rudiments of the legend, shows it in its Hebrew garb. But the Arabic original is still missing. In its stead an additional Persian text has been found which tells the same story in prose.

Also here we have a horseman and religious ablutions, and also here the victim is a blind man. The explanation imparted to Moses runs like this: The father of the money-finding youth was a shepherd to the horseman, and the latter refused him his justly earned wages. In the purse there was exactly the amount that the horseman owed to the shepherd. The blind man, however, had formerly killed the horseman's father, and so the son, by slaying him, had only exercised the right of retaliation.

The horseman, figuring in the Persian texts and also in Gellert's poem, might induce us for a moment to think

* Behrmaner in ZDMG., XVI (1862), 762.
that the *Gesta Romanorum* is the source sought for since most of the stories in this collection turn about a soldier (*miles*). However, this is not the right clue; let us rather keep constantly the Arabic source in mind. Thus I consider it useful to point to a well-known passage in the Koran which seems to contain not alone the story of fate, but also the whole of our Hebrew text. The Koran is a kind of reservoir that has preserved many Jewish legends; but more than that, it is also the living fountain from which spring forth new legends. The Koran may have been instrumental in shaping the Moses legend among the Arabs as it appears in our Hebrew text to-day. The following is related in the Koran, ch. XVIII, verses 59-82:*

Moses goes forth with his servant (Joshua) to the place where the two seas meet.† Near that place the servant forgets his fish, and this takes its way freely in the sea. As they wander farther,‡ Moses desires to eat. Then it dawns upon his servant, that he forgot the fish on the rock on which they lodged during the tide, and that this was nothing else but the doing of Satan.§ Continuing their tour of inspection they encounter Al-Chidr,‖ and Moses begs leave to follow him. The divine man bores a hole in a ship, kills a youth, and builds the wall of a city whose inhabitants refused to give them food. Moses is astounded, and then he is initiated into the mysteries of fate.

---

* This passage in the Koran was already pointed out by A. Geiger and Isr. Lévi; recently it was treated by Wünsche, *Aus Israel's Lehrhallen*, 173 f.
† Hence Moses investigates also here, as well as in the other legends.
‡ The motive of wandering recurs in all the versions.
§ Comp. what was said above concerning the rôle of Satan.
‖ The prophet Elijah.
The relation of Moses to Al-Chidr, the deeds accomplished by Al-Chidr, the explanation, and so forth—all this agrees with what we know from the Talmud and the הַנְשָׂאֲרוֹן-book about Ashmedai and Benaiah, or about Elijah and Moses. But also the motives of our new Hebrew text recur here: the old man resembles Satan of the Arabs; denial of the bread corresponds to the loss of the fish; slaying of the youth; arrival in an inhospitable city, and so on. We may therefore assume that our text was derived from an Arabic original which in one way or another enlarged upon the version of the Koran. The variations in the Hebrew text are conscious and intentional, taking into account the Jewish standpoint and also the high rank of Moses. Equally intentional is the Jewish color given to the story of the speaking wolf.

And now the story of the third chapter still remains to be treated. Its chief feature forms the retribution of the deceitful old man at the hand of the camel-drivers, whom he sought to deprive of their reward. At last he was “the biter bitten.” This familiar quotation forms the key-note after which many products of the fable literature are modeled and cast, e. g. a number of stories by Margaret of Navarre in the “Heptameron” which appeared in 1543. All these narratives, as the “Three Rings” in Lessing’s “Nathan der Weise,” are derived, as is well-known, from the Orient.

At last we come to the investigation of the singular title מִסְתָּפָה על דֶרֶךְ עָשֶׂרִי which constitutes the heading of our narrative. This title is found as heading on every page of the original manuscript, and since this contains nine pages in small quarto, the title recurs nine times, and

**See Büchmann, Geflügelte Worte, 21st ed., p. 156.**
is therefore absolutely certain. In addition, the term יהוֹ רֵעַ עֲשִׂרֵה occurs three times in the text itself: first, when the wolf swears to guard the sheep faithfully, saying: If I eat them, let me be “of the tenth generation”; a second time, when Moses, perceiving that the old man perjured himself, observes, Truly, this man belongs to the tenth generation; a third time, when the author himself observes that the moral which the story aims to propound is this, that men of the tenth generation are heretics. Thus the author operates with the expression “tenth generation” as with a well-known phrase, though we are unable to tell whence he got it. In the Talmud and Midrash it does not occur with this particular connotation. It is true that we find in the Talmud the expression ד' לוֹ ד' ה' וְאֵלֶּה even seems to be a fixed phrase; however, we are unable to establish any connection between these forms of speech and the case before us. The Bible, indeed, offers us the expression יהוֹ רֵעַ עֲשִׂרֵה ready-made in the following sentence: “Even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of the Lord forever” (Deut. 23, 4); yet I do not know any Midrash or commentary on this passage which would stamp these words as a fixed term having a color of its own. Thus nothing remains but to think of the Mishnic expression: Ten generations there were from Adam unto Noah, and ten generations there were from Noah unto Abraham, and all of these were wicked before God (Abot v, 2); and so it seems that, due to an association of ideas, the term “tenth generation” was coupled with the term “wicked

** p. Hag. II, 1, fol. 770, line 72; b. Hag. 14b; Midrash Hagadol on Gen. 1, 1, p. 6, ed. Schechter. Comp. the excellent deductions of Bacher, Ag. der Tann., I, 2d ed., p. 15.

** For proofs see Grünbaum, Beiträge zur Sem. Sagenkunde, p. 47.
generation.” The text itself mentions only the generation of the flood and the generation of the dispersion, both being subjects of repeated mention by the rabbis. This clue is far from being faultless, and we would gladly exchange it for something better. Thus it deserves to be noted that the primitive Christians were called by their enemies “new people” and “third generation” and this is conceivable only when those words conveyed an insult or a curse. Furthermore, a responsum of Hai Gaon is to be taken into consideration which fits our case especially, since it gives information concerning apodogues and had its origin in Arabic soil. In the apologue cited therein for illustration we find it repeated time and again that the lion who committed a robbery receives his punishment in the third generation.

The composition and language of our text are not quite what one would wish. We have already called attention to the fact that the narrative sometimes has a sudden break, and that, for instance, the slaying of the youth is more hinted at than placed in firm relief. As to the language, it is by no means as beautiful as we find it in the collection of narratives ascribed to R. Nissim. Still the author made an effort to imitate the style of the later Midrashim and to write a pure Hebrew which is, as far as I can see, purged of Aramaicisms and Arabisms. However, his style is very clumsy and unwieldy, having neither swing nor poetry. It seems that the author was not a man of literary skill, that he did not belong to the guild of the learned, but was a man of the people who derived pleasure from

---

**Harnack, Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums, 1st ed., book II, ch. 6, with Excurs. (esp. p. 200 f.), where the peculiar expression is explained thoroughly.**

**Hoshavoth ha-Avodim, ed. Lyck, No. 30, p. 13.**
fairy-tales and fables and who, finding a model fitting his purpose, excerpts one thing and disregards another. Certainly literary achievement was not his strong point.

Despite all that, we find him quoting from the Talmud, as e.g. the sentence "כְּכַה אֲמוֹרִי בֵּיסִלָא אַמּוֹת אֵין אָרוֹם יִסְתַּלֵּגְךָ לְעַמְּרָד בֶּהָדוֹשָׁתָם" which, however, is not found anywhere in this wording. The phrase "לֹא כְלַא הָתוֹרָה שִׁימ יִשְׁמַע" to judge by appearance, is not a rabbinical proverb, but some philosophical maxim. The sentence "He who walks with his neighbor four yards will not suffer any punishment" (מעבר עליהאבתהיין) which is cited in the name of the rabbis is likewise not to be found. At the end of the narrative the author, under כֹּמי שְׁאָס נוֹמ (as we have said), introduces a preceding sentence which, however, is not found in our text, but must have been in the larger work which formed the prototype. We shall be able to appreciate the disposition of our author only then, when we shall have found the models which he followed, or did not follow, not in mere fragments, but as a composite whole; for we are absolutely sure that he was a compiler. That which has remained without elucidation in this treatise will probably be explained conclusively by others who are more familiar with folk-lore than the writer of these lines.

This is perhaps the reason why we have in our text numerous dots which have been reproduced by us.
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[Text begins]

[One or more paragraphs or sentences]

[MS. 161.]

[Note or reference]

[Comp. b. Taanit 8a יבכלי ינפנש ביכר; b. Hag. 17a; p. Shabbat VI, end, fol. 8d, l. 27.]

[Fragmentary.]

[Perhaps why?]

[Another reference or note]

[Comp. below, end.]

[MS. שמש in our text is fem. The writer had the Arabic שמש in mind.]

[According to Sefer Ha-Yaḥesh on Shemot (ed. Zolkiew, 1875, p. 53b and 54a) ten years.]
47 Comp. Job 1, 7; 2, 2.
48 Num. 20, 5.
* Perhaps 'אמה?
* קָּבָּלָה, see my Lchnwörter, II, 175, and what I have written in the Nahum Sokolow Jubilee Book (Warsaw 1904), p. 489.
51 Perhaps יִשְׁרָהֵל?
52 יֵשָׁכָר? Comp. below 'לִבּוֹasyarakat' Or is it 'לִבּוֹ? Perhaps נִסָּה is to be connected with 'דָּרָה.
54 Arabism.
55 MS. תֹּנוּךְ.
56 The phrase נָּסָּה occurs frequently in the Talmud, and is derived from the Greek κουλωνία, which the 'Aruk explains by רָמָא (deceit).
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This quotation is unknown to me; it seems to be a philosophical maxim.

Ex. 21, 23.

Citation not identified.

Sing. יִכְבּ.
בניאדד יש עמדה נמלת, אמר כלום והוקב בהוא ראות את הוהלב, שנוי
שהלאים לא אויר לא. אמר אנשה רעיבים, אלאếnו הלשון העבר
שהשגיה את הפשותינו; עוד שחלצד ויחשב כולם ואומחה הוה עיון
להם פס המוח בו המוח; הוא سبحانه בישה שנייה שלום ויו מיהו את
ראהו; ogóle שבא היה ואת אראוה, והם לכלל מן המוח והנהונ
ה площ מצומן, וכל זה כיشهاد שזרו דוריית מפורים, בטן סואפור
שה سبحانه כבשו שנייה שקרין כשרים והם עריר. (חיש ביה ציון
מה להן שמו אלמנתי חזיון. אכדייה חלייבין.)

אומר כל יהיה ערור.

הפי┐מישה שובת ולא בו כוונת.
THE ARYAN WORDS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By W. St. CLAIR TISDALL, Bedford, Beds., England

III.

Having now dealt with those Persian words in the Hebrew-Aramaic text which have as their first element the prefixes pari (pairi), pati (paiti), and ti (for ati), we next turn to the vocables in which we find the preposition ni (īv, in, Russian na). Of these there are four, to wit:—

I. The word Nisht'wan (גַּשְׁתֶּן) occurs in Ezra (4, 7. 18. 23; 5, 5; 7, 11), in both Hebrew and Aramaic passages. The R. V. renders it by 'answer' in Ezra 5, 5, in both text and margin; but this meaning it can hardly bear. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon renders it 'letter,' giving it (with notice of Meyer's doubt on the subject) as a Persian word, probably derived from the root from which in Modern Persian comes navishtah (older nibishtah), 'something written.' This derivation, however, is impossible. For the latter word, in the neuter, actually occurs in the Achaemenian Inscriptions as nipishtam, 'written.' It comes from ni and the root pish, 'to rub,' which is found also in Avestic with the same sense. In Sanskrit this root occurs with the meaning, 'to grind, strike.' It is preserved in Russian too, in which language the past participle na-pis-ano means.
'written' (neut.). Hence the Persian word, if taken into Hebrew or Aramaic, must have retained the p, as it does everywhere else. As this p does not occur here, it is clear that the suggested etymology is wrong.

The root of the word is really sta, 'to stand' (Achaemenian, Avestic, etc.; in Sanskrit sthā), which, with the prefix ni, becomes ni-shta in Achaem., ni-sta in Av., and ni-shta in Sansk. Its causative stem nishtāya occurs in the Achaemen Inscriptions, meaning 'to cause to stand in,' and then 'to enjoin, appoint, command.' The simple form ni-stā occurs at least thrice in the Avestā (Yasht X, 109, 111), meaning 'to be infixed.' The causative verb in Sanskrit means 'to fix in, to give forth,' etc., the past participle, nishtīta, of the simple verb means 'fixed,' 'firm.' The verbal adjective nishtan-vat (nom. nishtāvan) means 'perfect,' 'complete.' This adjective in Avestic would be ništāvant: in the nom. sing. masc. ništāvan (in one form).

The Hebrew-Aramaic vocable would then mean something fixed or enjoined, or 'finished'; it might signify 'statement,' 'report,' 'memorial,' 'document,' but could not mean 'a letter.' The word for 'a letter' in Ezra 5, 6 is 𐤀𐤃𐤂𐤀𐤃iq, which is from the Assyrian ḫirītu, with the same meaning. The LXX render 𐤀𐤃𐤂𐤀𐤃iq by ἀποδοτος, "tax-collector."

2. Nebrasta (ܢܒܪܐܬܐ) occurs in Dan. 5, 5, where it is rendered 'the candlestick.' (It has been taken into New Hebrew in the form שלושא). The B. D. B. Lexicon says it is "probably a foreign word," but gives no suggestions as to its etymology.

On this point, however, there is no room for doubt. The first element is ni, and the root is the Avestic barej (Sanskrit bhrāj, 'to shine, beam, sparkle, glitter'). In
Avestic from the root comes berejya, 'brass': in Sanskrit we have the noun bhrāj, 'light, lustre, splendor.' The compound anu-bhrāj in Skt. means 'to light up, to illuminate.' Another Avestic form of the same root is barās, whence comes barāsa, 'brilliant, brilliancy.' As both j and z in Avestic become š (= sh) before t, the past participle would be barešta or barāšta, to which, if we prefix ni, we get nibarešta or nibarāšta. The final vowel in the actually occurring Aramaic form nebrashtā is doubtless the emphatic termination. The word would mean 'illuminated,' and might thus easily mean 'lamp,' 'chandelier.' It is interesting to notice that the root barej is the Greek φιλ-υ, Lat. flag- {flag-ro, flag-ma = flamma), and the English bright. The Peshitta renders the word by shrāgā, which is the Persian chirāgh, 'lamp.'

3. Nidneh (נידנה) is a word which assumes various forms at the hands of editors in Dan. 7, 15 (Aramaic). Baer has there נידה. Kautzsch has נידנ, Nöldeke and Bevan נידנה, incorporating the fem. pronominal suffix. The word is used as נדה (and also as נידה) in the Talmud and Targums. It occurs as נד or נדה in the Hebrew of 1 Chron. 21, 27, where its meaning is clearly shown to be the sheath of a sword. (It is evidently not the similar word which occurs in Ezek 16, 33 and which is from the Assyrian nadnu, nidnu, nindanu, nudnu, nudunnu, nudinnu, 'a gift, a dowry.') The word which we are now considering does not actually occur in either Avestic of Achaemenian texts, but of its derivation no doubt is possible. The root in Avestic is dā, 'to give, to put' [dā, ri, dare], Skt. dhā. In both languages it is compounded with ni: hence we get Avest. ni-dā, 'to give up, hand over;' Skt. nidhā, 'to deposit, put into, fix in.' Hence in
Avestic we have *nidhaiti*, *nidhāta*, 'a putting off: put down, connected: nature, abundance, stored up'; and in Skt. *nidhāna*, 'receptacle.' This in the form *nidāna* or *nidhāna* must have occurred in Avestic, and probably in Achaemenian too, and is the word we want. It occurs in Pāli also (*nidhāna*, 'receptacle, treasury, store'), and in Modern Persian as an adjective assumes the form *nīhān*, 'hidden,' 'secret.' The word for sheath (of a sword) in Skt. is *pi-dhāna*, from the same root *dhā*, with another prefix *pi* for *api* (Gk. *ini*).

Nebiszāh (נֶבֶזָה) occurs in the Aramaic of Dan. 2, 6; 5, 14. As the Masoretic text is so generally right in the consonants of the foreign words used in it, we are reluctant to make any change in this word; and yet without a slight alteration of a single letter it seems impossible to make it mean anything. But if the second *beth* be considered to be an error for *nūn*, all is clear. The meaning "reward," given in both R. V. and A. V., suits the context, and can be got only by accepting the etymology which we are about to give. Ibn Ezra says that the word means ṑōpōv, and Rashi's explanation, *dōr*nōt (＝ ṑōpa) comes to the same thing. I believe that the word should be written *nibaznah* (ִנִּבָּזָנָה). We recognize *ni* as the first element, and the root *baż* occurs in Avestic with the meaning 'to divide, to bestow.' Another form of the Avestic root is *baj*, 'to break, divide, distribute,' whence comes *bāga*, 'wealth.' [In Achaemenian Persian *baga* means 'a god' as distributing good and evil: the Russian *Bog* (pronounced *Bokh*) is also 'God.'] In Sanskrit the root is *bhaj* and *bhanj*. It is found also in Armenian, in which tongue we have *baż*, 'an impost, tax'; *bażel*, 'to tax'; *bažin*, 'part, share'; *bažanel*, 'to divide, to share.' We thus get *ni* + *bāz*.
To this is added the Avestic noun-ending -ana or anā; which gives us the word nibāsanā, 'a gift,' which in Aramaic would be written ֗הנה.

There is only one other possible derivation, it seems to us. This is to take the root vaz instead of baz or baj. In Avestic the root vaz (= Skt. vah, Lat. veh-ere), 'to carry,' occurs in composition with ni, and ni-vaz means 'to bring down, carry down,' also 'to bring to, lead to, caress'; in Skt. ni-vah is 'to lead to, carry, support.' In Modern Persian the root nivaz means 'to caress, fondle.' Hence, if we take the beth as v, we have nivās-nāh (ניבָש-נה) for an Avestic nivāsanā 'favor,' and thus possibly 'reward.' But of these two suggested derivations we prefer the former to the latter. Either is better than Saadiyah's proposal to derive the word from מ, 'to plunder.'

Having now done with the words beginning with the prefix ni, we turn to those formed from a root or a noun with the prefix apa (Avestic, Achæmenian, and Sanskrit; Gk. ἀπό, Lat. ab), 'from,' 'away from.' There seem to be only two of these in the Bible: מים and מים. We take the latter first, because it has hitherto puzzled translators, including the LXX and the Peshiṭṭā.

1. App'tōm (appiṭam). as the Masoretes and editors (in the MSS. it seems to be written appiṭōs) punctuate the word, occurs only in Ezra 4, 13 (Aram.). The B. D. B. Heb. Lexicon gives Haug's explanation, by which it would come from a Pahlavi word and would mean "in the end" (R. V.), and also Scheftelowitz's, who derives it from path-mā, pl. of the Avestic pathma, which is variously rendered, 'a road, path; stores, provisions.' He would translate 'treasuries.' Neither explanation seems satisfactory, especially
the latter. The true form of the word is doubtless *apatauma*, which in Achaemenian would mean 'progeny.' *Taumā* is the Achaemenian form of the Avestic *taokhma*, 'family,' 'seed,' in Modern Persian *tukhm*. In the Achaemenian Inscriptions, from *nyāka*, 'a grandfather,' is similarly formed *apa-nyāka*, 'ancestor.' This rendering suits the context also, for the clause then runs "And the progeny of the kings will it endamage." If we substitute *v* for 1, the word might be the equivalent of the Skt. *apatyam*, 'offspring." But this is unnecessary, and very unlikely to be correct.

2. *Appadēn* (חָפֵד) occurs only in the Hebrew of Dan. 11, 45. It is generally and correctly taken to be the Achaemenian *apadāna*, and rendered 'Palace.' It comes from *apa* and the root *dā* (Skt. *dhā*), 'to place.' In Sanskrit also we have *apa-dhā*, 'to set apart.' *Apadāna* would therefore mean a building 'set apart' for the king. It is noteworthy that it occurs in Armenian, with only the *d* changed into *r*, being used only in the plural (which in that tongue adds *k'h*) *aparan'k'h*, with the meaning 'a palace.'

There appears to be only one word with the prefix *vi* (which in Avestic takes the place of the Sanskrit *vi*; in Modern Persian it becomes *bī* and *bī*; also in verbs *gu*), 'apart.' Even regarding this vocable there is some doubt whether it is Aryan or purely Semitic. It is the noun *bitān* (בֵיתָן) in the Hebrew of Esther 1, 5; 7, 7, 8. It is each time associated with a garden, and is translated 'palace' by the R. V. Dieulafoy holds that *bitān* ("throne-room") is identical in meaning with *apadāna*, but this is exceedingly doubtful, though no doubt possible.

The word may mean 'palace': but, if so, it is the Assyrian *bitānu* or *bitannu*, which has this sense, being
possibly formed like biṭāni one of the plurals of biṭu, 'house' (cf. īlū, pl. īlānī, etc.). Some, however, read the Assyrian word differently. If they are right, and if biṭānu does not actually occur in Assyrian, then we must look elsewhere for our word. On the other hand, if biṭānu is correctly read in Assyrian, it may be a Persian word taken into the language, as is the case with a number of other words from the same source.

But perhaps it may be preferable to consider biṭān as a Persian rather than a true Semitic word. In Sanskrit and Pāli vitāna occurs, and signifies 'an awning, canopy, cover,' being derived from the root tan (cf. Lat. ten-do, ten-eo, etc.), 'to stretch,'—with vi, 'to stretch out.' In Avestic we do not actually find the word, but it would be vitāna. The root tan, with the above meaning, and the prefix vi, are both used in Avestic; hence there can hardly be a doubt that vitāna meant 'a canopy,' or perhaps a 'marquee' in the royal garden, something of the nature of the present šāmīyāna, though much more magnificent. It was made of 'white stuff, cotton (linen) and violet' hangings, with marble pillars to support it, and a mosaic-work pavement, of which Dieulafoy has discovered the remains. The word biṭān is copied into the Peshītā in both passages where it occurs in Esther, but it does not seem to occur in later Aramaic ("Chaldee"). It seems therefore to have failed to take root in the language, though used in Esther because describing a Persian thing, for which the use of a Persian word was natural and appropriate.
MORE ABOUT THE POETRY OF THE JEWS OF YEMEN

SEVEN YEMENITE POETICAL COLLECTIONS IN NEW YORK CITY

BY WILHELM BACHER, Landes-Rabbinerschule, Budapest

On the basis of eighteen manuscripts and four prints I have offered in my latest work\(^1\) the first comprehensive description of the somewhat remarkable poetical productions of the Jews of Southern Arabia, giving moreover, in a Hebrew division,\(^2\) an inventory of all the poems found in those manuscripts and prints. I was aware that this inventory, despite the great number of sources used for its preparation, could not be complete; my compilation was rather intended to facilitate above everything else the description and study of further poetical collections of Yemen if such should come to light. However, in an unexpected way I myself am in a position now, immediately after the appearance of my treatise, to enrich its contents in a not inconsiderable degree. Through the great kindness of Dr. A. Marx the learned librarian of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York I was offered the use of no less than seven Yemenite divans, which—mostly from the col-

\(^1\) Die hebräische und arabische Poesie der Juden Jemens. In the annual report of the Landes-Rabbinerschule of Budapest for 1909-1910, and also in a separate edition (Straasburg, Karl I. Truebner, 1910).

\(^2\) שיריווֹת שרוי בוֹן ישראֹל אְַָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָ
lection of Mayer Sulzberger—have come into the possession of that institution. I believe that the best way to prove my gratitude for the generosity which was manifested in the transmission of the seven manuscripts is to describe these minutely, supplementing thus the contents of my published monograph.

In the following description I designate the seven New York manuscripts by $N^1$ and so on to $N^7$. Conforming exactly to the four divisions of my inventory I offer a list of contents of every divan in the appendices B-H, while the seven chapters devoted to them contain other information concerning the manuscripts, special emphasis being given to the new Yemenite poems which are not found in the sources employed by me heretofore. Altogether there are over sixty poems in the New York manuscripts with which we form acquaintance for the first time.

Appendix A contains an introduction to the poetical collections, which, however, is only found in two of the New York manuscripts. Also in this introduction, as in the two published in the Hebrew division of my work (p. 51-53), Shibzi is exalted as the most prominent among the Jewish poets of Yemen, as indeed this poet of the seventeenth century had eclipsed his predecessors and become the leading master of his contemporaries as well as of his followers. With regard to the first of the two introductions published by me previously I beg leave to mention here a fact which escaped my notice then. The matter was called to my attention by Dr. S. Klein of Tuzla (Bosnia) and Dr. I. Davidson of New York, and it is to the following effect: The greater part of that introduction, reproduced from a manuscript of the Elkan Adler collection (No. 126), is

* See below, ch. 1.
derived from the eighteenth *makāmah* of Judah Alharizi's *Tahkemoni*. The anonymous writer opens the introduction with a eulogy on the great Yemenite poet Shibzi and adds to his own laudatory words, without further notice, the words which Alharizi uses in his encomium upon the poetry of Solomon ibn Gabirol. From the same *makāmah* he also appropriates, without mention of the source, the exposition of the seven requisites without which a poet cannot be successful. To be sure, he modifies Alharizi's conditions wherever such a course becomes imperative through the peculiar circumstances of the Jewish poetry of Yemen. For the third condition of Alharizi (which warns against emptiness of contents) another one (warning against profanation of holy things against mistakes) is substituted. He also introduces essential changes in the fifth, sixth, and seventh conditions. By virtue of this modification, the author of the introduction was placed in a position to consider himself, in view of less strict conceptions of literary property then prevailing, as the originator of the seven propositions. Also other passages of the introduction show traces of the eighteenth *makāmah* of the *Tahkemoni*.

In appendix J I offer, in conformity with my inventory, a list of Yemenite poems published by Yellin in the He-
breath periodical Hashiloah of 1895, the second year of its publication. Yellin's treatise (נני תוקן) was unknown to me when I dealt with this subject. The general remarks in his preface still deserve perusal, although my comprehensive study has removed most of the queries raised by him. Yellin used a single manuscript, about which, however, he gives no further information. This manuscript is not to be identified with any of the collections of Yemen that have become known thus far. Out of the twenty-four poems printed by Yellin from his manuscript two are new, not appearing anywhere else; and among the poets figuring in the manuscript, which Yellin registers on p. 148, note 1, there are a few names which are missing in my list.

I

N1. This codex, bearing the number 488, belonged to the library of Mayer Sulzberger and comes from the Halberstam collection. It contains 131 small-sized and oblong leaves. Close investigation shows that the originator of this poetical collection received into his own manuscript a large fragment from an older book of poems—i.e. leaves 40-89 with the exception of 70—, for these leaves

1 p. 157: A Hebrew wedding poem of five couplets with the following beginning: מאריס יתמה ממלכה ייחר לארטא רביעי עין טב בך צמחתה. A longer poem (19 couplets) to a friend lamenting their separation; the first five verses show the acrostic שירא.

2 Jepheth b. Meoded; Isaac אמשי. אמשי is probably no other than the אמשי found in my index. The Arab. אמשי signifies silk as does the Hebrew אמשי who appears in the list may be the father of the great Sâlim Shibzi; yet it is possible that the latter himself is meant, the acrostic not being known completely.

3 On p. 56, there is a statement by Isidor Goldblum of Paris that he sold the manuscript for 3 napoleons to Halberstam in Bielitz, in the year 1887.
differ from the rest of the collection in their script and in that they employ the superior (Babylonian) vocalization both for the Hebrew and the Arabic text. But page 40 forms, as far as the contents are concerned, a continuation of the preceding page, while 89, which ends in the middle of a stanza, is continued on page 90 with the close of that stanza. Accordingly, the originator of the greater part of the codex took over the above fragment of an older collection into his own, modeled the latter after the former, and supplied the missing links himself or obtained them from the decayed portions of the older collection. Whether the title-page and preface likewise are derived from the older book or were destined purposely for the new collection as extant in our codex cannot be ascertained. The latter is more probable.

Folio 1, showing ornamental designs on the margin constitutes the title-page: חשחב שירים מכתב וכל הנבדלים שבהם כמשנה חכמים כליל כהאורות החשכ בטעות. This is followed by an apology for the small size of the book, the reason being that the reader may be able to carry it with him without any inconvenience (כשהבך בקרך כך שיוול ולאשו הבהוב). As to place and time of the original of the codex we read: ונהט המלך חסן חסן חסן (?) וה DateFormatter כתים יר_nama בנגלג בן המשה. Thus it was composed at Sana'a in the year 102, that is apparently 2102 of the Seleucid, and hence 1790 of the Christian era. The title-page contains also the wordsếmארא חלויי, by which the writer modestly styles himself weak, and, in addition, a statement that the book was written at the wish of his brother whom, how-

\[\text{Deut. 14. 1.}\]
ever, he fails to name (ד"א"י יי נזע וראוי מ רור ב seçim מ"א"ש).

Folios 2 and 3 offer a table of contents which is defective in the beginning and in the middle (two leaves seem to be missing). The extant parts of the list in which the poems are divided and grouped as in the text itself have reference to pages 28b-33b and 92a-119a.

40-50 contain an introduction to the collection in rhymed prose. I give it in appendix A. This introduction emphasizes as the most important among the poets of the collection Shalom (= Shalem) Shibzi, whose sources were the books of R. Simon b. Johai (i.e. the Zohar) and Bahya (i.e. the commentary on the Pentateuch by R. Bahya b. Asher). Besides this the introduction offers only complaints over the sufferings of the exile and prayers for the Messianic redemption. At the conclusion the author of the introduction, and thus probably the originator of the collection, records his name: Judah b. Joseph נדנש.

The collection proper begins on folio 7 with the words: נתנש לְצַהֲרָה שִׁבְזִי וְתַשְׁבִּית לְאַלְּמַל יִרְעָה יִוָה יִי...
Other characteristics are the same as in most of the older poetical collections of the Jews of Yemen.

In accordance with my inventory of the Hebrew and Arabic poems of the Yemenite Jews, I offer in appendix B a full table of contents of manuscript N1. See especially the table of Shibzi’s poems contained in the first chapter of the inventory. As to the index of the anonymous poems comp. the third chapter of the inventory. The poems of the Yemenite poets are indicated by names and numbers, following the arrangement of the second chapter of the inventory. The names placed under an asterisk belong to the list of the non-Yemenite poets (fourth chapter of my inventory). The above is true also for the description of the other collections in appendices C to H.

My inventory of the Jewish-Yemenite poems receives an increase of three numbers from the present manuscript. These are marked “new” in the list of contents. Two of these new numbers are Hebrew poems by Shibzi. The one (76b) consists of fifteen two-lined couplets (with the rhyme - throughout) and begins as follows: אָבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתְנַהַת עִמּוֹ וּמִיתָנוּ לְקֹהֵן. The acrostic reads אָבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתְנַהַת עִמּוֹ וּמִיתָנוּ לְקֹהֵן. It is an epistle addressed to an anonymous friend, and contains four halakic questions. The fourth couplet reads: סְמֵת חֶבֶר לְשׁוֹרְוָה מָהָרְבָּה גָּרְבָּה יִשָּׂרָאֵל מִצְוָת ("Hear, friend, my song that speaks in the spirit of God who made my tongue eloquent"). The other poem (77b) consists of twelve Hebrew couplets (rhyme: מִצְוָת) with the acrostic אָבִי יִשָּׂרָאֵל. The opening is as follows:

16 See above.

17 This word is missing in the MS.; I have placed it here to restore the connection and meter.
the contents, consisting of rules and precepts for accurate study, including Kabbalah, I cite the following:

The third new number is a Hebrew-Arabic poem containing five stanzas (the second, third, and fifth stanza are Arabic). It is an epistle which, as the opening shows, the poet Saadya addresses to his friend Jepheth. Saadya, probably b. Joseph, is represented in the Yemenite poetic collections by a great number of poems; as to his friend Jepheth, he is probably identical with the Yemenite poet of the same name (Die hebr. und arab. Poesie der Juden Jemens, p. 58). The opening of the poem is as follows:

Saadya probably calls his poem "a classification of the sciences which he embodies in the second stanza," this classification pointing to the wisdom of the Greeks. It is interesting to see how this Yemenite poet of the seventeenth century moves in the spiritual sphere of the Jewish Aristotelians, forming, it is true, a direct transition from this sphere to that of the Kabbalah.
This codex comes likewise from the Sulzberger library and is also marked as "Divan Shibzi," but bears no number. The manuscript is of the same small size as N'. It comes from a single writer who fails to mention his name, but who, at the end of the collection (124a), indicates the day when he finished his work: Sunday, the 21st of Adar sheni, in the year [5]629," hence 1869. By mistake, the paging of the leaves does not begin before the second inscribed folio. On the second side of the unpaged folio the collection opens with the same introduction as found in N'; then follow the same preliminary remarks as well as the Sabbath poem of Judah Halevi which forms the opening feature of N'. Apart from these similarities, however, this manuscript differs considerably from N' both as regards contents and order of succession of the poems. Appendix C indicates the contents of N' in the same manner as appendix B for N'.

Characteristic of this collection is the prominent number of Shibzi's poems: they form much more than half of the total amount of poems. My inventory gets no increase from N'. Only one number is found in this codex whose author does not appear elsewhere in the Yemenite collections: it is a Hebrew poem in praise of the city of Tiberias (119b). The author is revealed in the acrostic: David b. Aaron b. Husein. The writer names a Hakam Samuel from whose lips he heard the poem, for he says in the

\[\text{The number of the year is indicated by points over several letters of the biblical sentence (Deut. 24. 5): } \text{This sentence is chosen on account of the relation of this collection to wedding feasts.}\]

\[\text{The writer names a Hakam Samuel from whose lips he heard the poem, for he says in the}\]
The first stanza reads:

In his seventeen verses he mentions—after due praise to the beautiful situation of the city (הנה נוי יומא תיב נוחלא)—the great men who there found their last resting place: the Tannaites and Amoraim (from Johanan b. Zakkai and his pupils to R. Jeremiah) and also Moses b. Maimon, and finally he showers his blessings upon the great living benefactor of the city, Ḥaim Abulafia. He says in his eulogy that Abulafia rebuilt and fortified the city and that he supports her house of learning. This is the older Ḥaim Abulafia (first half of the eighteenth century) of whom also Azulai says that he remodeled Tiberias in his old age.

This poem, moreover, has already appeared in print. It is the only specimen by which its author—a non-Yemenite poet—is represented in the poetical collection (סומטנ) of Calcutta (1844)—N 138, p. 436-446—which was described by me recently. The text in N offers some variants to the printed text. Codex Kaufmann No. 449

Stanza 15: ויהי חתאו שכלה
כלי יומא ראשה

Comp. REJ., LX, 221 ff.

Strophe 11 is found in MS. N2 as Strophe 8 and vice versa. Both begin with . The version in N2 is more probable, for strophe 11 deals with Tannaites, while strophe 8 mentions Amoraim. In stanza 3 N2 writes rightly ואַֽלְמָּ֣אָה instead of תומָּ֣אָה. In the fourteenth stanza N2 has correctly מַעַּֽדְּאָה מְכָֽמְתָּא instead of מַעַּֽדְּאָה מְכָֽמְתָּא (Calc. is wrong in rendering נַכַּֽדְּאָה מְכָֽמְתָּא). For בַּקָּנֵֽוְּאָה מְכָֽמְתָּא in strophe 16, N2 has rightly בַּקָּנֵֽוְּאָה מְכָֽמְתָּא.

See Weiss, Catalogue, p. 156.
contains numerous poems by David b. Aaron b. Husein, among them also the one treated here (p. 14b) with the heading: "לְשֵׁה אֲרוֹם הָבוֹשִׁי. In the divan ישיבת אלוהים (Oran 1885) David b. Aaron b. Husein belongs to the class of prolific poets, furnishing the greatest number of poems (p. 58, 60, 68, 69, 138, 184).

III

N* This codex of somewhat larger though likewise oblong size bears no number. It has already been described in E. Deinard's catalogue of Mayer Sulzberger's collection of Hebrew manuscripts and old prints (ארו מצרי, New York 1896, p. 8-14). Deinard exhibits also a list of the poems which needs some correction. However, this is scarcely necessary after identifying the several poems in appendix D with the corresponding numbers of my inventory. The manuscript has no title-page, but the first page records the heading נִנָּנִי רָכִּב מְנוּרַם נִנָּנִי. At the end (105b) the author states that he finished the divan Monday, the 22d of Shebat, in the year 2164 (Seleucid era), hence 1852 C. E.* The postscript, half Hebrew half Arabic, is partly effaced, especially at the end where the name of the copyist—Joseph—is given. One passage of this postscript, printed quite faultily by Deinard, reads in reality as follows: "May he who sings from this and finds a plus or minus" judge me according to the scale of merit. I have written the divan in distressing circumstances and at a cheap price for a good friend,

* It is clearly a mistake when he says in the introduction (p. 8) that the poems are partly Hebrew with an Arabic translation; Deinard means here the bilingual poem in which Hebrew interchanges with Arabic strophes.

* These words in Arabic.
Yahya Gayyāt by name." As a matter of fact, the manuscript is legible, though not nicely written. Its columns are embellished with all kinds of very primitive designs, drawn on the blank spaces between the poems as well as between their stanzas. The Hebrew elements of the divan are punctuated (naturally with the Tiberian system, since the compilation was effected in the middle of the nineteenth century), and the pointing bears the characteristics of the Yemenite manuscripts which are due to the transcription from the superior (Babylonian) system (as e.g. lack of the segol, lack of the Sheva compositum). These peculiarities of the system were responsible for the unjust judgment of Deinard concerning it.

This codex contains four poems which are not registered in my inventory. One of them (116b) is printed in Deinard's catalogue (p. 15 f.). It is a contest poem, in which water and wine vie for supremacy in presence of the community (לְאֵמָי יְשַׁם סְגוֹלָה), whereupon a decision is rendered advising the mixing of the two beverages. Zunz calls it a "wine song," indicating its author as Judah without any cognomen. In our manuscript (hence also reproduced by Deinard) there is the following note at the head of the poem: ס’ יִוּדָה בֶּן אָרוֹם. According to a further statement the poem served for recitation on the seventh day of the feast of Passover. The name Judah b.

This is to be explained by the fact that in the first strophe the water also says in its own praise that in it Pharaoh and his army were drowned: וְזֶה כֱָּה נְדִיבִין בָּרוֹא אֵין אַיָּשׁ אֵין מַלְאָךְ מַאֲשֵׁא מָלְאָךְ נְדִיבִין מָגְּדָה כְּרָאוּי. Literaturegeschichte der synagogalen Poesie, p. 564.
Adam was disclosed to the writer of our collection or to the originator of his archetype from the acrostic of the poem, for the initials of the first seven verses yield the two words פֹּרְנְרָנְרָ, while the eighth verse commences with the word דִּינָ. But this last verse shows in the initials of its lines the two words פָּנְנְנָ נֹּבְנָ; hence the poet is not called Judah b. Adam, but Judah b. Elijah.*

Another new number is a Hebrew-Arabic alphabetic poem (40b) whose author is called Joseph in the last stanza but one. It opens with the words: אלָה אָבָרִית נַכְלֵה נֵגוּם אָרְכֶּר אלָלָה נַכְלֵה מַאֲחוֹת and constitutes a prayer for the redemption of oppressed Israel.

An Arabic poem (99a) bears the heading לֵלָם שֶׁפִּיר אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שֻׁרְדֵּה יְחֵר יְרֵון ("By master Sa'îd al-Ṭawîl—the tall—as he was tortured by the Jews of Di'în"). It contains fifteen stanzas, in which the author makes complaint over the injustice that had been inflicted upon him in the above-named place—which I could not identify—putting the Jews there in a very unfavorable light, among them especially a man named Qayyât Ibn Dawûd (verse 6). The poet himself is mentioned in the ninth stanza. He is perhaps identical with שֶׁפִּיר מַחְי who occurs in my inventory (p. 28) as the author of a Hebrew poem. The first stanza follows:

* In Deinard's Catalogue, strophe 2, line 4 has פֹּרְנְרָ instead of פֹּרְנְרָ of the MS. In line 7 of the same strophe Deinard has rightly emended וֹ实训 to וֹ实训. As to the first line of the fourth stanza also, the MS. exhibits the mistake of הַרְוָי for הַרְוָי. The poem was published also in the poetical collection חֲצֵרָה, Oran 1885, p. 158. As to other publications in which it appeared comp. Steinschneider, Rangstreit-Litteratur (Wien 1908), p. 71.
The poet thus had the cognomen Abu Yahya.

Finally mention must be made of an Arabic girdle poem (36b), containing seven stanzas, which has for its subject the yearning after a distant friend and which is perhaps meant to be allegorical. A line of the last stanza reads "אשיד על אוחבי אליחויר ("appear among the learned men of the Jews"). The poem opens as follows:

To the poem commencing on p. 58b, which is identical with the one marked Solomon 3 in my register, our manuscript appends the name of its author, which is not borne out by the poem itself but must be based on tradition. The heading is as follows ("By master Yaha Ibn Sa’id al-Zahirî as he was captured in Thalà"). I have assumed Solomon to be the author of the poem because out of its seven stanzas (counting the introductory stanza as first) the first begins with the letter 5, the third, fourth, sixth, and seventh with the letters שולמה, giving us the word שולמה. In manuscript N° the seventh stanza is missing altogether, and the order of succession of the other stanzas is 1, 2, 3, 6, 5, 4, through which the acrostic is destroyed. Yaha al-Zahirî

* It is also found in N°, p. 116b.
to whom, according to the heading, the poem belongs is one of the older poets of Yemen and known in Hebrew under the name Haim b. Saadya or Zechariah b. Saadya. Ibn Sa'id is the same as "b. Saadya."

IV

N. This codex (as N') belonged to the Halberstam collection of the Sulzberger library and bears the number 489. The manuscript has the same large size as N'. It is no uniform divan, but is made up of larger and smaller fragments of different Yemenite divans. The first, defective folio is written more neatly than the other fragments; and yet this folio, which—because it bears a heading—was placed at the beginning, stands entirely isolated. The most important and probably oldest element of the codex containing 72 leaves altogether is found on folios 19-54 which are provided with superior vowel symbols throughout (the Arabic as well as the Hebrew). Also folio 16 has upper pointing but from a different hand. Other contiguous and closely allied fragments, which differ in their script from those just named and also from each other, appear in the following folios: (1) 2-13, 17-18, 55-66, 68-72; (2) 14-15, 67. In the table of contents (appendix E) I refrain naturally from taking cognizance of the diversity of origin of these different elements, but simply register the contents of the leaves according to their present order of succession,

Yahya Al-Zahiri belongs to the sixteenth century; comp. Steinschneider, Die arabische Literatur der Juden, p. 256. A contradiction to this forms Grünhut's statement in the Monatsschrift, I (1906), 88, according to which Al-Zahiri, in a work on on the possession of Grünhut, names the year אופל (1619) of the Seleucid era = 1307 C. E. as the date of its composition. It seems that a נ fell out after the נ. סטראנס would be 1909 = 1607. Yahya could still have lived in the beginning of the seventeenth century.
just as with the other codices. Owing to the fragmentary character of the different elements, the poems are partly defective, which, however, I do not deem necessary to indicate.

The number of new poems, not mentioned in my inventory, is greater in this than in any of the three previous divans. Of these there are eleven altogether. It is curious to note that among these Yemenite poems we also find the first thirteen distichs of Solomon Ibn Gabirol's grammatical poem (ענפ). These thirteen couplets are offered as an independent poem (64b) with מ (מואת) as verse partition, and bear the head נסרי נאה ("beautiful poem"). Of Yemenite poets the following are named as authors of new poems in cod. N:

David: A Hebrew poem with the acrostic (םירח). It is found after Judah Halevi הראאתה רבה אנ שמעינ (ר' ב' נ) and is marked at the head as an imitation of the latter (נאבך). It contains five verses, the leading one being as follows:

David b. Solomon: A Hebrew poem of twelve couplets (48b), whose initials form the acrostic סלמה. The rhyming word throughout is אוש. It opens as follows:

Solomon b. Shalem (Salim): A poem (53a) without beginning or end, the folio being defective; the preserved distichs however still exhibit the greater part of the acrostic: פנמה. The poem is bilingual: in every couplet one half is Hebrew, the other Arabic.

One Hebrew poem (14a) shows the acrostic בָּנָי שְׁעֵרִית. It seems to be David b. Saadya, for the latter, in acrostics of his Hebrew poems found elsewhere, always writes his patronymic with ב». The poem has for its subject the tabernacle of the feast of Sukkot. The beginning reads as follows:

בָּנָי הַмесַה נֶבֶשׁ שׁפִּיחַת
עֲלוֹ חוֹרְנֵי אֶנֶּנֶא בָּמוֹים.

Another Hebrew poem (70b), of which only the beginning is preserved and which contains a sufficient number of puzzles, fails to mention, in the part that is preserved (opening: אֲנִי עֲנָר הַמִּסְעֵר), the poet himself, while it names his friend or teacher (לְמָלֵל רב) for whom it is intended: מִסְעֵר הָמוֹס זָהָה הָמוֹס זָהָה לְבִי (Saa‘id = Saadya).

The new anonymous poems in N are the following:
A nuptial poem of the customary type, beginning with אָשִׁירֵה, which I never met before (42a). First verse: אָשִׁירֵה לַאֲחֹז בִּכְוָנָע יִשָּׁר שִׁיר מֹמוֹר. Next are three Arabic poems: (1) A short encomium upon frugality containing six couplets (48a). Beginning:

ונִחְשָׁא לְפַלְקֵלִים שָׁנַעָת.
(2) An epistle of fourteen distichs containing various puzzles (48b). Beginning:

עַל מִלְּאֵל פְּיַשְׁרָא מְנַעְשָׁא
(3) An exhortation in six distichs concerning the mode of acquiring knowledge (52a). Beginning:

אָסָמֵחֵנִי מָלְקָה לַאֲלָמוֹס
לַא יִרְדָּא אַלָּה מַמְּאָוָא בַּאֲלָמוֹם.

On page 12b there is a fragment of an Arabic poem whose author is named Al-Hamdi (יוֹלָא אֱלַגְּאָמְדִי).

* See ibid., Hebrew division, p. 18.
V

It comes from the library of Mayer Sulzberger and is labeled No. 476. It contains 155 leaves of uniform, not beautiful, but very distinct script, and is pointed throughout. There is no title-page. The defective folio preceding the paged leaves is derived from another manuscript. The list of contents closing the volume enumerates 19 Sabbath poems, 57 שור= (שוש =) 82 שירות, 8 מילים זמויות and 29 מילים מילים קצט. These are concluded with 19 מילים מילים קצט and 29 מילים מילים קצט pieces. There are thus, omitting the last group, 185 pieces altogether. Eighty-two out of these claim Shibzi as author.

Ten poems are new, yet one of them (116b) is also found in N°, p. 36b. Of the others three Hebrew poems are anonymous, namely: (1) A poem propounding an enigma of six couplets (26a) which opens with the words פַּרְדִּים נְמֶשֶׁהָוָוָו נְמֶשֶׁהוּ and closes with a mild exhortation:

(2) A longer prayer (36a), 23 distichs, in which also the ten Sefirot are mentioned. Beginning:

(3) A short hymeneal poem (132a) in which, after the current apostrophe to the bridegroom found also elsewhere (והוא יהושע חכם המחלע, comp. An. 28; David b. Joseph 1, 3), the first stanza reads:

One anonymous poem (136a) is Arabic and shows the alphabetic order, which is quite frequent in Yemenite

* See above, p. 386.

* See the proverb in Sanhedrin 106a (cited by Rab): נִמְלָא אוֹתָהּ לָו אֱלָוָה (cited by Rab): קרני אורותיה רוחות לי גוונים מים.
poems, by naming the letter in the beginning of each stanza. The first strophe follows:

כאל אָלפָּהָל אֵלְמִּוֹתָהָּ שְׁא אָבָּר בֵּּלָל אָלְּחָה
שְׁא אָבָּר בֵּּלָל אֵלְמִּוֹתָהָּ שְׁא אָבָּר בֵּּלָל אָלְּחָה

The poem belongs to the realm of mysticism and the final strophe is as follows:

אָלְּחָהָּ שְׁאָלִמְּבָּבָּוָה רַפְּיַהְוָהָ שְׁא אָבָּר בֵּּלָל אָלְּחָה
עֶבֶר אָלְּפָּהָלָּו שְׁאָלִמְּבָּבָּוָה רַפְּיַהְוָהָ שְׁא אָבָּר בֵּּלָל אָלְּחָה
אָלְּחָהָּ שְׁאָלִמְּבָּבָּוָה רַפְּיַהְוָהָ שְׁא אָבָּר בֵּּלָל אָלְּחָה.

It is strange what the last line says about the "Zohar," Gospel, and the Torah which contain all virtues." This trinity of holy books is perhaps an application of the Mohammedan designation of the pre-Koranic books of revelation, only that the place of the Psalms זָבָּר (zabûr) is taken by the similarly sounding term for the fundamental work of Jewish mysticism. It is very improbable that the Jewish poet of Yemen, in mentioning here the Gospel, was aware that this constitutes the Sacred Scripture of Christianity." As author of this anonymous poem is perhaps to be considered Saʿīd Manzûr, who will be mentioned soon. To him belong two poems immediately following the above-named.

N° furnishes a new number to the list of Shibzi’s poems. It is a Hebrew poem consisting of fifteen distichs (37a) with the acrostic קְנָטָּא, and constitutes an epistle to his friend Saʿīd (named in the last stanza: מייספָּה)

* Apparently םָגָר is only an Arabism for the Hebrew לְרָא.
* Different indeed is the mention of the Gospel by Shahin. See my Zwei jüdisch-persische Dichter, p. 21, note 3.
in which he advocates the knowledge of the fundamental principles of Kabbalah. Also other poems by Shibzi are inscribed to this Sa'id.

My index of the Jewish poets of Yemen is increased by two new names through this manuscript. One is Sa'id b. Judah: An Arabic poem of fifteen strophes (122b) shows the acrostic sound like those of some Shibzian poems (78-81, 146-147; see also Joseph b. Israel 15). It has for its subject the suffering of the Jews of Sana'a. The poem immediately preceding (121a) belongs perhaps also to Sa'id b. Judah, but the poet is mentioned only in the final stanza (Sa'id who is in need of knowledge). It is a Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem beginning with the words: Subject: complaint over oppression and prayer for redemption.

Sa'id Manzur is the name of the second poet appearing here for the first time. Two poems exhibit the acrostic: One (138a) is Arabic and begins with the following words:

This beginning is similar to No. 119 of Shibzi's poems. There are fifteen stanzas altogether. God is apostrophized as Friend, while the glory of Paradise forms the subject of strophes 5-11. The closing stanza reads:

44 The beginning is as follows:

The second poem by Sa‘id Manzur begins (1390) with the words קָאֵלַת אֲלוֹמַיִית קְוָנֵא which reveal the name of the author. It is a Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem containing eleven stanzas and having for its subject reflections and meditations, especially of the mystic kind. In the ninth strophe the poet styles himself חָיָם אֶלְעָזָאאֶאאא, i. e. Sa‘id of Sana‘a, and speaks furthermore of his study of the Zohar:

(I study the chosen book Zohar in the leafy garden and recognize the deep mysteries which it contains”). We have already spoken of the Arabized appellation of the Zohar.

VI

N°. It comes from the Sulzberger library and bears number 556. This small manuscript, containing only 47 leaves, does not have the usual oblong size of the Yemenite divans, but small 16°. There are two fragments of different origin. Leaves 1-9 are older and provided with upper pointing throughout. Leaves 10-47 are not pointed.* The first fragment contains three, the second eighteen numbers. Out of these twenty-one poems no less than twelve are new, and of these only three are anonymous: (1) an alphabetic liturgical piece (18b) with the beginning מֵסֶר בֵּית אָלָאָמְאָא אָרִיֶּר בֵּית אָלָאָמְאָא; (2) a Hebrew-Arabic girdle

* Only here and there upper pointing.
poem of five stanzas (19b) with the beginning ילע ברכה ישירleveland poem (45a) with which a new group began in the divan from which it is derived and of which it now forms a fragment. It is a religious hymn closing with a prayer for the Messianic redemption. The first lines, which offer a specimen of the bilingual quality of the poem, read as follows:

אמהותיה בלשון יהודיו ובלשון הסבסיבי
שהחי נשמה כלקולות פי המסינה

Of the Yemenite poets already registered in my index the following are represented in N' by new poems:

Shibzi: A Hebrew poem (37b) designated at the head as a hymeneal hymn (יָדֶה לֶאָלָהָה); acrostic כִּים and within the poem ילוד טקה. The beginning reads:

אאור יהלום ברוחך תוכי בל בריתך.

Joseph b. Abigedor: An alphabetic Arabic poem (14b) beginning with the words: אםבכה נָלַקָהּ מי רַמָּח החיא (comp. p. 87, An. 120, 169, 170). In the last stanza but one the poet is named (יוחש בן עביד) with the abbreviation of the patronymic.

Moses b. Sa'id: An alphabetic Hebrew poem (10a) of which the first five stanzas are missing. In the last stanza the poet is named משה יוחש תקם. The poem deals with the Kabbalah. Shibzi's poem following it (p. 87) is intended as a rejoinder to the one preceding it (נכמה).

Solomon b. Abraham: A Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem (6a) of which the end is missing. The ten strophes exhibited here have the acrostic פִּלְשַׁתִּים בן [אב]רָחָם. The strophes beginning with א and ב are missing. The beginning is as follows:
Religious reflections form the subject of the poem.

Identical with Solomon b. Abraham is probably Suleiman b. Abraham whose name appears in the acrostic (סֵלִים בֶּן אָבָרָהָם) of a Hebrew-Arabic poem (22b) in which the exodus from Egypt is celebrated. Beginning:

מַה יַעֲשֶׂה לְיָם מִי הַלַּאֲלָהִי
נָלַח רַבְּאֲלָרִמָא

The following are new names of poets occurring in this codex:

*Harun Ma'usa*: An alphabetic Hebrew-Arabic poem (42b) in couplets, the last but one indicating the name of the poet:

הארץ מעזה האזלו בר יא רוד
ואחיוו באאוסר יא סע“In

The beginning is as follows:

אַל־אָמַרְשׁ מַאֲלָרֵם אֲלָפָמָא
וְיָא עַעֲלָבֵשׁ כּוּבֵל אֲלָוָא

It is a prayer for Israel and against Israel's oppressors. How much the originator of the MS. valued it is shown by the unusual heading which he gave it:  וְהָאִינוּ בֶּזֶר הַשִּׁשָּׁר.
As to Harun Ma'uzza himself, he seems to be no other than the friend of Shibzi to whom the latter dedicated two of his poems. In one of them (No. 163) Ma'uzza is even the subject of great praise. I formerly believed that this man was another friend of Shibzi. Now it is apparent that Shibzi's friend is identical with Harun Ma'uzza, the newly discovered poet, both of whose names Shibzi mentions in that poem. Similarly we must assume that the Ma'uzza to whom Shibzi dedicated a puzzle in rhymes (No. 158) is no other than Harun Ma'uzza.

*Moses b. Hibat*: A Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem (26b) of nine stanzas, the acrostic being *mashebnu b'vah* is probably an abbreviation of the name *Hebr. ha'elah*, Hibat-allah (= Hebr. נחתל), which was customary also among the Jews." The beginning reads:

\[
\text{על הברת חלה} \\
\text{על בן עד(addr)} \\
\text{מלאום אלהו כימי לאומן}
\]

The poem deals chiefly with the revelation on Sinai and the Messianic redemption.

After the poem by Moses b. Hibat follows a Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem (30b) with the title * الوزاء نوابه* and the acrostic *mlamah* in the first five and *vnr* in the last three stanzas. The letter נ represents the full name נריה. This poem therefore belongs likewise to the above-mentioned
Solomon b. Abraham. This hypothesis is confirmed by the circumstance that the first stanza of this poem reads just as the first stanza of the first poem in our manuscript, which also belongs to Solomon b. Abraham:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{סַאַמְתּ} & \quad \text{שַׁחַק} & \quad \text{אַלִיהָ} \\
\text{בֵּשָׁר} & \quad \text{זָרָה} & \quad \text{לַעֲלָה} \\
\text{לְשָׁמָה} & \quad \text{אַתָה} & \quad \text{לַעֲלָה} \\
\text{בּוּתֹסְפִּי} & \quad \text{מִיָּרָה} & \quad \text{לַעֲלָה} \\
\text{רִיחֵם} & \quad \text{לַעֲלָה} & \quad \text{לַעֲלָה}
\end{align*}
\]

Another Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem (34a) is still to be mentioned. Its author is called סַמְתּ in the acrostic and בּוּתֹסְפִּי (= שַׁמְתּ) within the poem itself. This may be the Sulaiman of my inventory. The poem, a friendly epistle, offers praise to a learned friend, whose name is designated twice with the letters שְׁמֹמִים. According to the שְׁמֹמִים system used in the disguise of these names, this would be בֹּרַי, Bòria, a name unknown to me. At the close, a second friend of the poet is mentioned: סְמָתּ, i. e. יָהִי, Yahya. The poem opens with the words סָמַמְתּ אַלְלַלּ הַלָּה הַלָּה.

As a special characteristic of the larger fragment in N° let it be mentioned that in the case of two poems also the melody (Arab. זֶעַר, properly voice") with which they are to be sung is indicated. At the head of the anonymous poem on p. 196 we read: זֶעַר הוֹדֶא עלַא יָעַר יָעַרלָה יָעַרלָה. By probably meant the poem of Sa'id 11 beginning with these words. At the head of Solomon 3 (38b) we find יָעַר יָעַר יָעַר יָעַר יָעַר יָעַר יָעַר, by which is meant the poem in An. 196. Apart from the two, the Yemenite di-vans do not indicate the melody."

---

As to hatif designating a personification of the poetic inspiration see Die hebr. und arab. Poesie der Juden Jemens, p. 45.

Concerning the musical signification of the term see Dozy, Supplément, I, 851.

See Die hebr. und arab. Poesie der Juden Jemens, p. 32.
N'. It comes from the Sulzberger library and bears the number 482. In size as well as in script this codex is distinguished from the customary poetic collection of Yemen. It is not oblong, but small octavo, and the script of the entire manuscript, coming from one and the same hand, is not cursive but quite uniformly square. The first page has a note which probably comes from Deinard: Accordingly, this collection was discovered in the Genizah of Jòbar, a village situated at a distance of twenty-five minutes from Damascus. This village has an old synagogue which is visited on festive occasions by many Jews from Damascus. Also in its make-up this divan, absolutely Yemenite from its contents, is different from other poetical collections of Yemen. It is intended for marriage celebrations only in a secondary degree; primarily the poems contained in it serve for religious holidays. The title-page and the first leaves are missing, as is the end; but since the poems are numbered continuously, it is seen at a glance that those missing at the beginning are the first eight and the opening of the ninth. The close of the last preserved piece (No. 163) is likewise lacking. The first numbers (8-20) are intended for the festival of Passover. At the head of No. 21 (11a) we find the label עניין שלדות, hence for Pentecost; before No. 64 (76b): לאו תקנות עመג; before No. 68 (79b): ענייןهوים; before No. 79 (87b): ענייןumoים. Nêxt follow hymeneal poems without any special title; decidedly as such is to be regarded first No. 89 (94b).

* Only folios 108 and 117 are from a later hand, apparently to replace the two original leaves which somehow became damaged.
* The poems belonging to this group are not concerned with feasts alone.
then the wedding ritual after No. 92 (100a), and further hymeneal hymns beginning with No. 93 (p. 105b). No. 106 (109b) bears the title "ענין שבת" with which most of the divans begin. No. 117 (118b) is labeled "ענין אלה", which can have reference only to the next numbers intended for the close of the Sabbath. No. 120 (120a) is still an Elijah poem, but through a lacuna in the manuscript the numbers 118 and 119 as well as the close of 47 are missing. No. 122 (121a) opens, without epigraph, a series of six poems for feasts of circumcision, whereupon follows the ritual for the redemption of the first-born (ו יָדֵּר מַלְתִּים כְּפַי מְנוֹנִי שָׁאוֹר נוֹחִים בַּקָּח). Numbers 128 (127b) to 135, with which the second part of our divan begins, are again Sabbath poems. Commencing with No. 136 (133a) the poems are on various subjects and without epigraphs. Every number of the collection is provided with the title "מַתַּת" (scil. מ' נ' ), rarer "אָוָה" (scil. א' נ' ). None of them has any pointing. The orthography of the Arabic texts differs from that in the other Yemenite collections through the frequent application of vowel letters, even for short vowels. Characteristic of N' is the circumstance that it contains only nineteen poems by Shibzi, the preponderant part of which (16 pieces) is found in the second part of our divan beginning with No. 128 (124b). It is permissible to assume that in the first part, which forms the basis of our collection and which differs also in its arrangement from the Shibzi collections, Shibzi's poems were avoided purposely, perhaps on account of their mystic allegory.

From N' my inventory reaps a rich harvest, the number of new poems there being twenty-nine. From the hands of non-Yemenite poets we find among them a poem
Yemenite poets are represented here by nine poems:

David b. Saadya: A poem for the feast of Tabernacles which is also found in N⁴ (14a).

Joseph: A Hebrew poem containing four distichs (92b), with the acrostic. Beginning: יִשָּׁהוּ דְמוּ בְּלֵבָּה. אַחַת לְבֵבָּהּ נַעֲדוּ.

Joseph b. Abigedor: An alphabetic poem in distichs half of which is Aramaic and half Arabic (33a). At the close the author styles himself "אֲשֶׁר הוֹסֵבִים לְאֶלְלָה אֲשֶׁר הוֹסֵבִים לְאֶלְלָה." The beginning is as follows: אַשְּבָה הָהַשְּׁבָהּ לְאֶלְלָה לְעַלַּלְלָה.

Joseph b. Israel’s Son: A Hebrew-Arabic girdle poem consisting of six stanzas (97b), which is alphabetic at the same time, naming the letters at the beginning of the verses. The beginning is not quite legible due to the decay of the ends of the leaves. It reads:

The poem contains religious reflections. In the last stanza but one the poet names his teacher Israel, in the last he reveals himself: "לְרָא שֶׁחָי אָבִינוּ אֲסָרִי. This son of the most important poet of Yemen after Shibzi is perhaps

* It is the poem which is found in our Simhat Torah ritual.

* See above.
identical with Israel b. Joseph, who is represented in my index by a poem.

Moses b. Sa‘id: An alphabetic Hebrew-Arabic poem (19a) constituting a prayer for the redemption of Israel from the oppression of the exile. Beginning: אלוהים אשם ואר. The author names himself at the close: למה ת görmek עשה, hence Moses the son of Saadya b. Isaac or also the son of Sa‘id.

Saadya: A Hebrew-Arabic poem (78b) with the acrostic שליח. The opening stanza reads:

It is a prayer for atonement.

Sa‘id b. Suleiman: An Arabic poem (3a) with the name of the author at the close: אני אלשאם לי אלמאאם, but more precisely within the poem: סעדים אלמאאם. Sa‘id b. Suleiman is possibly identical with Saadya b. Solomon, who appears in my index as author of an Arabic poem. Our poem, containing religious reflections, opens with the words: זכויות לאלאי עגשו נາבב מי אלמאאם המשא.

The other new poems in N’ are anonymous and are as follows:


* See Die hebr. und arab. Poesie der Juden Jemens, p. 54.
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Hebrew-Arabic—18a: A poem designated as נַשְׁיָא נֹשֶׁא with the following beginning: שֶׁנֶּאֶזַּי נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה שֶׁנֶּאֶזַּי נֹשֶׁא. Also the other verses repeat the first phrase three times. Without this repetition it would read as follows:

חַלָּל דִּבְּרֵי נֹשֶׁא נֹשֶׁא נֹשֶׁא
נַשְׁיָא נֹשֶׁא נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה
נַשְׁיָא נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה
נַשְׁיָא נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה
נַשְׁיָא נֶשֶׁיָּה נֶשֶׁיָּה

44b: A prayer for the restoration of Israel in the Holy Land; beginning: וַיֶּשֶׁב מֵאָם אֲלֹאֵלַי יַעֲרֵי יִשְׁמַעְתָּו קָוִי וַיִּשֶׁחֲלוֹן רָצוֹן.

81b: A girdle poem of six stanzas constituting a religious hymn. Beginning:

ידִירֵי יָהְרָה קְרֵם וֹתָר בְּנִיָּה
אַבָּהָב הַיָּרָה כִּי תֹּאָכָר לָבַי מְרוֹחַ
שְׁבִּיתָא אַל נוֹרַה בַּהַר לָלֵּגַת זַיִּיתָא

Arabic—2a: An exhortation to exalt God; beginning:

2b: ditto; beginning:

21b: An exhortation to study and an appeal to recognize God’s power and rule over the world; commencing with the following words:

25a: Reflections concerning the eternity of God and the ephemeral character of man. The bulk of the
poem consists of an enumeration of the great personages of the Bible, with the question: Where is Adam? etc. until: Where is Ezra? It opens with

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{where is Adam? etc. until: Where is Ezra? It opens with: }
\end{align*}
\]

36a: A hortatory poem of 39 couplets; beginning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{an am aven bav al'id al'far al'amahoor. }
\end{align*}
\]

47b: A girdle poem consisting of four strophes; beginning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sona kifir al'lezan turin haltid muk al'amboo. }
\end{align*}
\]

Only the first half of the last stanza is in Hebrew, praising the poet's teacher, who is then named more fully in the Arabic second half of the stanza: Musa Ibn Manzur.—66a: A poem of 23 quatrains in which Gen. 24 is told in such a manner that Abraham's servant, the hero of that chapter, appears as narrator without being named. The beginning is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The beginning is as follows: }
\end{align*}
\]

149a: A friendly epistle in 16 couplets; beginning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ba'ala 'alid bi. }
\end{align*}
\]

Special mention is due the poem beginning on p. 42b, which contains 30 strophes, each one having three Arabic and one Hebrew line and the syllabic rhyme being throughout. The first stanza reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The poet, who remains unnamed, tells of his journey during which his caravan was overrun by robbers and all his fortune was lost. Among other things he mentions his saviors in that emergency: Yahya Ibn Musa, Suleiman, and Imran.}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, special mention must be given to a wedding poem on page 97a, which opens thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Finally, special mention must be given to a wedding }
\end{align*}
\]

97a: The stanzas following after that exhibit the acrostic.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{My index knows of a Yahya b. Joseph.}
\end{align*}
\]
with the sobriquet אֱלַא,ן. The poem itself, however, is indicated by me under *Yahya b. Israel* (פִּיר תִּימָן, p. 25); for I have found it in the Aden publication *הספִּיתא תַּנְיָת* (III, 10), where of the stanzas of the poem as it appears in נ' the two with 1 and 5 of the name לֶנִי are missing, and, conjecturing from the two final stanzas, I have completed the patronymic which was absolutely sure to follow the ב of the acrostic.

In order to furnish a survey of the new Yemenite poems appearing in the seven New York manuscripts I deem it proper to add here some figures indicating the total obtained: 1. Shibzi is represented by four new numbers, all in Hebrew; 2. Of the other Yemenite poets already named by me sixteen are represented by 22 new poems; 3. The names of five new poets appear with six numbers; 4. New anonymous poems: 12 in Hebrew, 5 in Hebrew-Arabic, and 9 in Arabic, total 26; 5. Non-Yemenite poets: three already named in my index appear with one poem each, and two new names with one poem each. The total amount of new poems is sixty-three.
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A

Introduction to the Yemenite Poetic Collection in MS. N'
(ditto in N')

The Yemenite Poems

These two words are missing in N3.

Missing in N3.

* derby.

* n3.

* *.

* Missing in N3.
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[S. = Shibzi. An. = the list of anonymous poems in my inventory.]

לען השבת: 7a, °Judah Halevi 23.—7b, °Judah 3.—8a, °Judah Halevi 14.—8b, S. 64.—10b, °Manzūr. —11a, David b. Joseph 2.—12a, David 13.—12b, An. 99.—14a, S. 91.—15a, S. 62.—16a, °Abraham Ibn Ezra 5.—16b, S. 118

אֲנָוָה שִׁוְיָה לַמֶּחֶץ שְׁבֵּת: 18b, Saadya 2.—19a, Abraham Ibn Ezra 27.

לען חוהים: 19b, °Solomon Ibn Gabirol 9.—The same 2.—20a, °Judah Halevi 10.—20b, An. 107.—1b., °Judah Halevi 12.

חלולא שמה: 21a, °Judah Halevi 22.—21b, The same 24.—22b, The same 26.—23a, The same 9.—23b, °Abraham Ibn Ezra 11.—24a, David b. Joseph 1.—24b, An. 127.—25a, An. 28.—25b, Jeshu'ah 1.—1b., °Judah Halevi 7.—26a, אָזְזוּב 2.—26b, אָשָּׁר הַיָּה 12.

חולה יולתת: 27a, No. 2 of the הָלַלְה הַלְּלָה piece of Cod. Ber.—27b-28, A list of other similar poems.


חלולא נשוא: 34a, °Levi.—1b., °Judah Halevi 21.—34b, Solomon b. Sa'īd.—1b., An. 61.—35a, David 12.—35b, Joseph 11.—36a, Abraham b. David 2.—36b, °Moses b.
Maimun 2.—37a, S. 45.—37b, An. 22.—38a, An. 91.—38b, S. 2.*

Judah Halevi 18.—74a to 75b, 99할, compositions, the numbers 1, 3-8 of the list of Cod. Ber.—76a, S. 7.—76b, new.—77b, new.—78a, Joseph b. Haim Hakohen.—79b, An. 188.—80b, An. 178.—83b, S. 111a.—87a, Joseph b. Israel 21.


Joseph b. Haim Hakohen: 119b, Joseph 22.—121a, An. 87.—122a, Simon B. Suleiman.—122b, An. 97.—124a, An. 73.—125b, An. 43.—126a, An. 203.—127a, S. 17.—128a, S. 52 (the close is missing).

* The close of the poem is missing, for a leaf was lost here.
* The end of the poem is missing (as in note 63).
* With the superscription שיביאת, "nightly diversion."

Heading: ת"א"ה נב' ל'גך ג"ג. Hence from one of the late poets of Yemen. What the first word means I do not know; perhaps = "nightly diversion."

* This title "Shibzian poems" I have not found thus far. Yet only the first eight poems of this group bear the name Shibzi.
* With the introductory remarks ור'זוהי ז"ודוי ת"א"ה. The first three strophes of this poem belong thus to Yaḥya al-Zahiri.
* The two leaves following hereupon (127, 128) come from another hand.
Benedictions and texts for the performance of the wedding act.
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Contents of MS. N'.

עונות השבע : 1a, °Judah Halevi 23.—2a, David 13.—1b., An. 29.—3a, S. 91.—4a, S. 111.—4b, S. 29.—5a, S. 131.—6a, An. 84.—6b, S. 64.—8a, S. 136.—9a, S. 108.

From here on we meet the epigraph רושי on every column: 10a, Abraham b. David 3.—10b, David 2.—11a, Judah b. Sa'ıd 3.—11b, The same 1.—12b, °Judah Halevi 13.—13a, S. 57.—13b, An. 12.—14b, S. 43.—15a, °Judah Halevi 21.—15b, S. 178.—16a, S. 1.—16b, Judah b. Sa'ıd 2.—17b, Joseph Ridha Mashta.—18a, Simon b. Sālim 1.—18b, S. 3.—19b, S. 13.—20a, S. 18.—20b, S. 4.—21a, S. 14.—21b, An. 54.—22a, David b. Saadya 6.—23b, S. 19.—24a, S. 36.—1b., An. 170.—25b, S. 177.—26a, S. 21.—27a, An. 97.—27b, S. 158.—28a, Joseph 22.—29b, S. 83.—30a, S. 87.—31b, S. 45.—1b., An. 203.—32a, °Israel b. Moses 9.—32b, °Moses b. Maimun.—33a, S. 12.—33b, Solomon b. Sa'ıd.—34a, S. 24.—34b, An. 18.—35a, S. 35.—35b, Joseph b. Israel 1.—36b, S. 77.—38a, S. 2.

עונות שלומי : 39a, S. 52.

עונות שלמה : 39b, An. 66.—40a, An. 107.—40b, °Judah Halevi 11.—1b., The same 10.—41a, Same 24.—41b, David b. Joseph 3.

ה' שלומי אשכול שירוביאת ° : 42a, S. 56.—45a, S. 126.—44a, Joseph b. Israel 30.—45a, An. 149.—47a, S. 88.—48a, S. 62.—49a, S. 114.—50b, S. 130.—52a, S. 71.—53a, S. 72.—

See above note 68. Quite different poems stand here in this group than in N'.
54b, S. 127.—56a, S. 113.—56b, Joseph b. Saadya 1.—59a, Joseph 2.—59b, An. 183.—61b, S. 150.—63b, S. 172.—65b, S. 40.—67a, S. 117.—68b, S. 181.—70a, S. 11.—71a, Joseph b. Israel 17 (the close is missing).—72a, S. 179.—73b, S. 125.—75a, S. 141.—76b, S. 159.—77b, S. 59.—78a, S. 73.—80a, Judah 1.—81b, S. 86.—83b, An. 165.—84b, S. 98.—86a, S. 61.—87a, S. 112.—89b, S. 168.—91b, S. 70.—93a, S. 121.—95a, S. 167.—97a, Saadya b. Amram 2.—98b, Joseph b. Israel 15.—100b, Abraham 11.—102a, S. 85.—104a, S. 69.—104b, Iwadh Ibn Alnuheibi.—107b, An. 119.—109a, Saadya b. Amram 1.—110a, An. 173.—111a, S. 53.—112a, S. 160.—113b, Joseph b. Israel 19.—115b, S. 105.—117a, S. 123.

119b, new.—120b, Solomon Ibn Gabirol 7.—121a, Joseph 11.—121b, Joseph 1.—122a-123b, 129b, 130b, Table of contents (סנה) with the motto (Ca. 5, 5).

124a-129b, ברכו החכמים.

130 contains various annotations, 131a, the close of a poem.
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תְּלֵי נְשֵׁנָה: 1a, Judah Halevi 23.—1b, David 13.—2a, An. 29.—2b, Samuel 1.—3b, An. 84.—4b, *Judah 3.—5a, Judah Halevi 14.—5b, David b. Joseph 2.—7a, S. 91.—8b, *Abraham Ibn Ezra 11.—9a, Yahya b. Sālim Halevi 9a.—10a, Saadya Hakohen.—11a, S. 136.—11b, המליחת 2.—12a, S. 111.—13a, *Abraham Ibn Ezra 25.—13b, S. 64.—16a, *Isaac.—16b, new.—18b, Saadya 2.

לְעֵי נְתֵנָה: 19a, *Solomon Ibn Gabirol 7.—19b, Same 1.—1b., Same 2.—20a, Same 9.—20b, *Judah Halevi 10.—21a, Same 11.—21b, Hasdai.

רַזֵּי נְשֵׁנָה: 22a, An. 110.—22b, S. 126.—24a, S. 159.—26a, S. 134.—27a, S. 149.—29a, S. 70.—31b, S. 105.—33a, S. 59.—34b, S. 107.—36b, new.—38a, S. 150.—40b, new.—43a, S. 108.—44a, S. 165.—45b, S. 98.—47b, S. 112.—49a, S. 118.—50b, *Judah Halevi 7.—51a, Joseph b. Israel 19.—53a, S. 125.—54b, S. 86.—56b, S. 160.—58b, Solomon 3.—59a, *Abr. Ibn Ezra 5.—60a, An. 186.—61a, An. 188.—62a, SS. 94.—63b, Joseph b. Israel 18.—65b, S. 61.—66b, Saadya b. Joseph 4.—68b, S. 150a.

תְּלֵי נְשֵׁנָה: 70a, An. 18.—1b., Joseph b. Moses 2.—71a, S. 82.—71b, S. 83.—72b, Abraham b. David 2.—73a, S. 35.—74a, S. 58.—74b, S. 57.—75b, S. 142b.—76a, S. 1.—77a, An. 113.—77b, Simon b. Sālim 1.—78b, S. 175.—79a, An. 182.—79b, S. 90.—80b, S. 158.—81a, *Judah Halevi 17.—81b, Same 21.—82a, An. 91.—82b, *Judah Halevi 13.—

At the close of this group there is this statement: המליחת אֲשֶׁר לוֹ כִּי נַחֲצוּ חְטֵרָתוֹ, נַחֲצוּ חְטֵרָתוֹ נַחֲצוּ חְטֵרָתוֹ. Of the latter half of this verse I understand the last two words ("May Haman be placed in anathema!").
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83a, S. 178.—84a, S. 3.—85a, Meir.—85b, An. 203.—86a, An. 22.—87a., An. 73.—86b, Joseph Hādhiri.—87a, ⁰Judah Halevi 2.—87b, S. 44.—88b, ⁰Moses b. Maimun 2.—87b., Solomon b. Sa‘īd.—89a, An. 95.—89b, ⁰Israel b. Moses 3.—90a, Joseph b. Moses 1.—91a, An. 87.—92a, S. 13.—92b, S. 17.

93a, ⁰Judah Halevi 11.—93b, ⁰Solomon Ibn Gabirol 7.—94a, An. 107.—93b., Sa‘īd 6.—94b, ⁰Judah Halevi 10.—94b., ⁰Solomon Ibn Gabirol 9.—95a, An. 66.—95b, הָלוֹלִילוּת 30 (Ber.).

96a, ⁰Judah Halevi 24.—97a, Same 26.—97b, David b. Joseph 1.

98a, חס ווושד 2.—98a., אָבָא 2.—98a., אָבָא 8.—98b., אָבָא 2.—99a, new.—101a, S. 149.—102b-104b, הָלוֹלִילוּת compositions.

105a-106b, Table of contents (מענה השירה). 

Hasdai’s poems on p. 21b has the epigraph לִבְּיַוִּיה סִיוֹת. This poem is built upon a poem of Judah Halevi (No. 19 in the inventory, p. 48), for to the verses of the latter exhibiting the acrostic יִוְיָשָר were added other verses with the acrostic יִוְיָשָר. Here the fifth stanza (with the initials י and י) is missing; instead of that there is this verse at the close: אָלֹהִים בּוֹעֵיר בּוֹעֵיר עֶבֶרֶד. This is the opening verse of another poem (An. 6) which is also built upon Judah Halevi’s poem referred to above. Both poems were published by Yellin ( יֵלִין II, 150 f.) together with an exposition of their relation to the poem of Judah Halevi.
Contents of MS. N

1a, S. 35.— 1b, S. 3.— 2a, Shemaiah.— 1b., S. 118.— 4a, S. 160.— 6a, S. 102.— 8a, Close of a Hebrew poem.— 1b., David b. Joseph 2.— 9a, David 13.— 9b, An. 19.— 10b, "Abraham Ibn Ezra 25.— 11a, An. 99.— 11b, An. 29.— 12b, An. 84.— 13a, Samuel 1.— 14a, new.— 14b, new, close of a poem.— 15a, Close of a poem.— 15b, David b. Joseph 2 (= 8a).— 16a, Saadya b. Amram 2.

הָלְכַּת הַכְּלָלִית: 17a, חומש בהליון compositions, ten numbers.

18a, Close of a Shibzian poem.

וַהֲלַכָּת: 19a, "Solomon Ibn Gabirol 1.— 1b., Same 7.— 20a, S. 84.— 21a, David 15.— 22a, Joseph b. Israel 18.— 23a, Same 19.— 24b, S. 63.— 25a, S. 62.— 25b, S. 135.— 26b, S. 167.— 27b, S. 116.— 28a, S. 40.— 29a, S. 86.— 30b, Saadya al-Zâhiri 2.— 31a, "Abr. Ibn Ezra 5.— 31b, Saadya b. Amram 2.— 32b, S. 134.— 34a, S. 112.— 34b, S. 98.— 36a, S. 117.— 37a, "Judah Halevi 7.— 37b, new.— 38a, Yahya 1.— 38b, "Solomon Ibn Gabirol 2.

הָלְכַּת: 38b, "Judah Halevi 24.— 39a, Same 26.— 39b, Same 5.— 40a, Same 4.— 1b., Same 22.— 41a, Same 9.

נְשָׁרֵי הָלְכַּת: 41a, "Ezra 11.— 41b, Same 7.— 1b., Same 5.— 42a, new.— 1b., Same 9.— An. 182.

43a, Close of a Hebrew poem.— 1b., David 13.— 43b, S. 3.— 44a, An. 22.— 1b., S. 35.— 44b, David 12.— 45a, S. 82.— 1b., S. 58.— 45b, S. 142b.— 46a, An. 75.— 46b, "Israel b. Moses 9.— 1b., Same 3.— 47a, An. 52.— 47b, Abraham
Contents of MS. N°

The defective folios preceding the paged leaves contain on the second page the beginning of Judah b. Sa'id 3.

לעין שבחו 1a, Judah Halevi 23.— Ib., David 13.— Ib, An. 99.— 2a, An. 29.— Ib., °Judah 3.— 2b, An. 84.— 3a,
Samuel 1.— 3b, °Judah Halevi 14.— 4a, David b. Joseph 2. — 4b, An. 19.— 5b, S. 91.— 5a, S. 64.— 7a, S. 29.— 7b,
S. 131.— 8a, S. 136 (end is missing).— 9a, S. 108 (beginning is missing).— 9b, Saadya 2.

והוא נשה 1b., An. 54.— 10b, S. 17.— 11a, °Israel b. Moses 9.— Ib., S. 2.— 11b, Solomon b. Sa'id.— Ib., S.
45.— 12a, Judah Halevi 21.— Ib., Same 2.— 12b, An. 12.— 13b, Joseph b. Israel 1."— 14a, David 2.— 14b, Abraham b.

This poem beginning with the words שבחו של מי נתיבים, in which Ezra and his grave are glorified, is found in the thirty-fifth chapter of the Takhmoni.

At the close of the preceding poem (An. 12) the writer placed the last thirteen distichs of this poem which, like its predecessor, begins with the words דתקר אשת ישע. Those distichs bear the name of the poet: Joseph b.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David 2.</td>
<td>15b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 24.</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ridha Mashta.</td>
<td>16b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah b. Saʿid 1.</td>
<td>17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 18.</td>
<td>17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 31.</td>
<td>18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 178.</td>
<td>18b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 203.</td>
<td>20a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meir.</td>
<td>20b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 32.</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah b. Saʿid 2.</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 58.</td>
<td>22b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 57.</td>
<td>23b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 12.</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 175.</td>
<td>24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David 12.</td>
<td>24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 3.</td>
<td>25a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Levi.&quot;</td>
<td>25b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon b. Sālim 1.</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 19.</td>
<td>27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 35.</td>
<td>27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 87.</td>
<td>28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 43.</td>
<td>29a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 18.</td>
<td>29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 21.</td>
<td>30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph ii.</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 4.</td>
<td>31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David b. Saadya 6.</td>
<td>32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David b. Saadya 6.</td>
<td>32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph 22.</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses b.</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 13.</td>
<td>34a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1.</td>
<td>35a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 82.</td>
<td>35b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon b. Sālim 4.</td>
<td>36a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 9.</td>
<td>38b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon b. Sālim 3.</td>
<td>39b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph b. Israel 3.</td>
<td>40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 158.</td>
<td>40b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 22.</td>
<td>41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 98.</td>
<td>43a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 126.</td>
<td>43b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 102.</td>
<td>46a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 59.</td>
<td>47a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 127.</td>
<td>48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 113.</td>
<td>48b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 72.</td>
<td>49b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 118.</td>
<td>51a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 116.</td>
<td>51b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 150.</td>
<td>53a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 85.</td>
<td>54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saadya b. Amram 1.</td>
<td>55a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 149.</td>
<td>56b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 173.</td>
<td>58b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 114.</td>
<td>59b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 44.</td>
<td>60a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 116.</td>
<td>60b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 110.</td>
<td>61a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 72.</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 106.</td>
<td>63a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 96.</td>
<td>63b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Solomon Ibn Gabirol 9.</td>
<td>64a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same 2.</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same 1.</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 139.</td>
<td>65a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abr. Ibn Ezra 5.</td>
<td>65b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 134.</td>
<td>66b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 53.</td>
<td>67a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 52.</td>
<td>67b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 188.</td>
<td>68a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 70.</td>
<td>69b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 77.</td>
<td>70b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 136.</td>
<td>71a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 179.</td>
<td>72b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 173.</td>
<td>73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 88.</td>
<td>74b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph b. Israel 20.</td>
<td>76a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 11.</td>
<td>77a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 181.</td>
<td>78a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph 2.</td>
<td>79b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph b. Saadya 2.</td>
<td>81b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 130.</td>
<td>83a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 105.</td>
<td>84a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 86.</td>
<td>85b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 62.</td>
<td>86a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 159.</td>
<td>87a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph b. Israel 19.</td>
<td>88b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 103.</td>
<td>90a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 73.</td>
<td>91a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 125.</td>
<td>92b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 94.</td>
<td>93b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 79.</td>
<td>95a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 74.</td>
<td>96a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 117.</td>
<td>97b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saadya b. Amram 2.</td>
<td>98b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An. 170.</td>
<td>99b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 112.</td>
<td>100a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 71.</td>
<td>101a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Israel (שִׁילוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל; the writer replaces יִשְׂרָאֵל with אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל). But the writer repeats the first of those strophes at the end of Joseph b. Israel, then breaks up in the middle of a verse, puts the repeated strophes in parentheses, and excuses himself with the words וְדָרִיָּוּ אַתָּא אֶלֶּה יִשְׁלֹו יִשְׂרָאֵל.קֹבּוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל.
YEMENITE POETRY—BACHER

160.—102b, An. 177.—104a, S. 167.—105a, Joseph b. Israel 15.—106b, An. 183.—107a, An. 174.—108a, S. 168.—110a, S. 172.—111b, S. 61.—112a, S. 124.—113a, S. 121.—114a, An. 199.—115a, S. 182.—116b, new.—117b, S. 123.—118a, S. 56.—119a, Iwadh Ibn Alnuheibi."—121a, new.—122b, new.—124a, Joseph b. Israel 13.—125b, "Judah Halevi 9."—126a, David Halevi.—127b, S. 170.—129a, S. 75.

תנאי: 130a, °Solomon Ibn Gabirol 7.—lb., Jeshu'ah 1.—130b, °Judah Halevi 26.—131a, Same 22.—131b, Same 10.—lb., An. 107.—lb., °Judah Halevi 11.

ترجم: 132a, new.—lb., An. 126.—132b, An. 66.—133a, ואריס 12 and 8.—133b, והוא 6, 8, 2, 11.—134a, ואריס 4.—lb., Judah 2.—135a, An. 181.—136a, new.—138a, new.—139a, new.—141b, Abraham 11.—142b, Zachariah b. Jepheth.—144a, Judah Halevi 13.

תנאים: 144a-147b, 29 compositions.

147b, נמא תשבץ (Benedictions and texts).

153a-155b, List of contents (the end is missing) with the same epigraph as in N.

G
Contents of MS. N

1a, S. 98.—3b, Joseph 17.—6a, new.—10a, new.—12a, S. 87.—14b, new.—16b, Solomon b. Shālim 2.—18b, new.—19b, new.—22b, new.—25b, והוא 6.—26b, new.—30b, new.—37b, new.—38b, Solomon 3.—40b and 41a, Fragments.—42b, new.—45a, new.—47b to 49b, Iwadh Ibn Alnuheibi (the close is missing).

* With an addition at the end.

** Here the epigraph names Abr. Ibn Ezra as author.
Contents of MS. N'

1a, Close of an Arabic poem.—2a, new.—2b, new.—3a, new.—4a, An. 157.’—5a, An. 188.—5b, An. 167.—6b, An. 187.—7b, Imrān Ibn Abulfath.—8b, An. 200.—9b, An. 119.—11a, David 7.—1b., °Judah Halevi 15.—11b, °Abr. Ibn Ezra 15.—12a, new.—12b, An. 106.—13a, David b. Gad 2.—14a, Suleiman b. Balma.—16a, new.—16b, new.—17a, new.—18a, new. 18b, Meir.—19a, new.—20a, An. 159.—21b, new.—23b, An. 186.—25a, new.—26b, An. 176.—29a, °Abraham Ibn Ezra 18.—30b, An. 136.—32b, An. 128.—33a, new.—34b, An. 169.—36a, new.—38b, An. 180.—41b, An. 196.—42b, new.—44b, new.—45b, An. 190.—47b, new.—49a, David 17.—50a, S. 139.—51b, Solomon b. Moses.—52b, Solomon 3.—54a, Joseph b. Saadya 6.—58a, S. 149.’—62b, An. 179.—64b, An. 116.—66a, new.—68b, S. 171.—72a, Joseph b. Israel 21.—76a, Solomon b. Sa'id.—76b, An. 33.—77a, An. 11.—77b, An. 46.—78b, new.—79b, new.—80a, An. 60.—81a, °Abr. Ibn Ezra 9.—81b, new.—83a, An. 35.—83b, An. 13.—84b, new.—85a, David 4.—85b, Hasan Ibn Kantal.—86a, Saadya Tawil.—87a, An. 68.—87b, °Abr. Ibn Ezra 28.—88b, new.—89a, Joseph 3.—90a, new.—91a. Solomon Ibn Gabirol 2.—91b, Eliezer 1.—92a. Solomon Ibn Gabirol 9.—92b, new.—1b., S. 137.—94a, An. 195.—94b, Saadya b. Amram 2.—96b, °Abr. Ibn Ezra 17.’—97a, new.—97b, new.—99b, An. 127.—100a, שבש ברכת (Benedictions and texts).—105b, °Judah Halevi 10.—106a, new.—106a to 107a, ה'ראות 2, 6, 4, 1.—107b,

" With the epigraph קוץ ילאו.

" Epigraph קיוויה ילאו ינידבר על ילאו אedListו.

" First, introduced by מנוול, is a felicitation to the bridegroom (from Ps. 128, 6 and 3; Ps. 41); then follows the same from Cant. 3, 11.
The Poems published by Yellin in the Hashiloah, vol. II.

p. 150-161

Page 150, Ḥasdai.—151, An. 6.—152, Joseph 10.—1b.
—155, S. 21.—156, Joseph 1.—1b., Sa’id 8.—1b., Same 8b.
—157, new.—1b., An. 92.—1b., Sa’id 6.—1b., Ḥudah Halevi

* See D. Kahana's remark in Ḳaḥal, II, 384.
THE ELEPHANTINE DOCUMENTS

By Max L. Margolis, Dropsie College

The beginnings of the Jewish dispersion ascend very high. Long before the final overthrow of the two kingdoms (Israel in 722, Judah in 586) when great masses of the population were transplanted to a foreign soil (Assyria, Babylonia) the migration away from the homeland set in. For the most part it was involuntary. For centuries Palestine was the battle-field of the nations. Jewish captives were sold in the slave market and carried away to distant lands. Of sons of Judah and sons of Jerusalem sold by Tyre and Zidon to Javan we hear from the prophet Joel (4, 4-6) whose date, however, some are inclined to place very low. The Jewish invasion of the land of the Pharaohs, which resulted in the days of Philo in a population of one million souls, had its beginnings in the times of Jeremiah when, shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, a great body of Jews, for fear of Chaldean requitals in consequence of the murder of Gedaliah, left Palestine for Egypt against the advice of the prophet who was forced to join the emigrants (Jerem. 41-43). But, in accordance with a notice in the Epistle of Aristeas which there is no reason to doubt, there was a still earlier migration under Psammetich (probably II, 594-589 B. C.) who is said to have employed Jewish mercenaries in his war with the Ethiopians. The same writer makes mention of a subsequent, apparently voluntary, immigration.
under the Persians, probably synchronous with the Persian conquest of Egypt (Cambyses), thus long antedating the wholesale colonization of Jews by the Ptolemies. Recent finds in Assuan (the ancient Syene, Συήνη, situated at the first cataract) and the island Elephantine just across (with its fortress Παρθένος, Πέρση) go a long way toward substantiating these contentions, revealing as they do the existence of a number of Jewish colonies in Upper Egypt as far back as 494 B.C. tracing their origins to a period anteced- ing the Persian conquest under Cambyses; in point of fact, we shall not go amiss if we ascend still further to the times of Nebuchadrezzar. There are sufficient hints in the documents to that effect.

To the Alexandrian Jews of the time of Philo, who were denounced as aliens by an anti-Jewish gymnasiarch, these finds might have been more than welcome as containing the proof of their establishment in Egypt long ahead of the Greeks. While the importance of the records long buried, conserved we may say, beneath the dry Egyptian soil, cannot be to us of a latter-day of the same practical value, they stand unique, not yielding in interest even to the famous collection of tablets unearthed in the Amarna mound, for the wealth of historical information they contain and the light they shed on so many points of the biblical history and literature.

The documents that have come to light are now accessible to scholars in two monumental publications.1 While

the Assuan papyri edited by Sayce and Cowley consist of interesting legal documents, the Elephantine records—papyri and ostraka—deciphered by Sachau by far transcend them both in the variety of their contents and in the richness of their suggestions. Of course, not even the dry sand of Egypt was able to protect these treasures against the ravages of time; only the fewest records escaped being eaten away by worms, and in many instances much skill and ingenuity had to be exercised in order to piece together the detached fragments.

The characters employed in the Aramaic documents at once arrest our attention. They are the immediate predecessors of the so-called square script of our biblical manuscripts (scrolls, codices) and come nearest to the characters employed in the Palmyrene and Nabatean inscriptions. This specific script was known to us monumentally from inscriptions found in Egypt. Now from

---

3 Occasionally we meet with demotic characters and, on certain ostraka, with late Phoenician.

4 Comp. e. g. Lidzbarski, Handbuch d. Nordsemit. Epigraphik, 478, No. 1 (Table XL, 11), and 449 (Table XXIX, 1). Older (monumental) specimens of the square script are available (Arâk-el-Emir, Gezer, the tomb of the Bene Hezir, ossuaria, Kefr Bir'im); see Chwolson, l. c., 55 ff.; Lidzbarski, l. c., 482 ff. and the literature adduced there; Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel, xxii ff.

5 Comp. Lidzbarski, l. c., 448. Only the first is dated (482 B. C.).
the dates which are so numerous in our documents we learn that the script before us was current in Persian times. Accordingly, we may be certain that if we possessed the documents incorporated in the book of Ezra in their original we should find them written in the same semi-square script of the Elephantine finds. But we may go one step further. According to tradition, the employment of the square script in the scroll of the Law was an innovation by Ezra. It is certainly beyond question that in more ancient times the sacred documents were written in the script which meets us in Old Hebrew monuments and which even at a very late period continued to be used on coins and for the writing of the tetragrammaton; a modification of that script is that which the Samaritans still employ in their Torah scrolls. In the light of the Elephantine finds it is safe to assume that the current script in Palestine in the days of Ezra was none other than the square script in a somewhat archaic form. Tradition thus has everything on its side when it claims that Ezra introduced this script in the sacred scroll: his aim was clearly a twofold one, to make Scripture “understanded of the people” and, on the other hand, to differentiate the Jewish Scriptures from the Samaritan.

*Tosefta Sanhedrin 4, 7: p. Megillah 71b; b. Sanhedrin 21b f.; Zebahim 62a; Origen on Ps. 2, 2; Jerome, Prologus galeatus; Epiphanius, De XII gemmis, § 63.

† Mesha, Siloam, Gezer calendar, etc.


§Comp. e.g. Aquila Ps. 103, 6 (according to C. Taylor, Cairo Genizah Palimpsests, Plate VIII) and Symmachus Ps. 68 (69), 32 (in a recently found fragment; see Mercati, “Framenti di Aquila o di Simmaco?”, Revue Biblique, 1911, 266 ff.). See Origen on Ps. 2, 2; Jerome, Prologus galeatus; Burkitt-Taylor, Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila, 15 f.

∥ Comp. Jerome, Prologus galeatus.
Another point of interest is the nature of the Aramaic language in the Persian era as it is revealed by our documents. It naturally invites comparison with the biblical Aramaic (in Daniel, but particularly in Ezra). If it can be shown that in point of archaism the Aramaic of Ezra is in no way inferior to that of the Egyptian documents the traditional date of the Aramaic narrative in Ezra and in particular the authenticity of the documents incorporated will gain support on the linguistic side at least. Now the linguistic matter proceeding from the Assuan and Elephantine finds, the latter as far as contained in Sachau's advance publication in the Proceedings of the Prussian Royal Academy of the year 1907, has been compared with the biblical Aramaic by Driver (in the 1910 edition of his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*) and Torrey (in his *Ezra Studies, 1910*). In a review published in this magazine (1910, pp. 549, 568) I ventured to say that "it is quite conceivable that if we had access to the autographs of the Aramaic portions of Ezra, their orthography would be much the same as that of the Egyptian documents. The pronunciation of the dentals in Aramaic must have fluctuated for some time, probably for centuries; both the earlier and the later orthography failed to square with the actual pronunciation; where the one erred on the side of archaism, the other was faulty on the side of modernism." My remarks appear to be borne out by the facts as they are shown by the material now complete. The fluctuation in the pronunciation of the dentals is attested by a goodly number of modern spellings. But, if phonetics which is dependent upon orthog-

11 Sachau (p. 262) cites the following examples:ราชז occasionally for ירה, דר תב kaufen,זכר,ארניט,אירן; יוארי,מרבה once for הבה,ברב,אמרית,אירן InputStream error
raphy offers a less certain basis for comparison, the case is different with the syntax; in respect to the latter the Aramaic of the Bible and the Aramaic of Egypt appear on the same level of archaism. Nor is the nature of their vocabulary such as to place them apart. Of course, the documents exhibit a multitude of words for which no analogy can be found in the entire range of known Aramaic; that is to say, we are dealing with *hapax legomena* such as any new find will naturally bring to light. But the circumstance which is of weight is that so many words which have hitherto figured as peculiar to the Aramaic of the Bible re-appear in the Elephantine language. Moreover, both may be characterized as idioms partial to loan-

also אָסָּסְנָן G, 17. With reference to the ב representing Arabic أ and Hebrew א, examples occur with the modern מ in the place thereof: by the side of מַעֲרָיוֹן we find מַעֲרָיוֹן (exactly as in Jerem. 10, 11) and once מַעֲרָיוֹן by the side of מַעֲרָיוֹן. — There is also fluctuation in the matter of the assimilation of מ and ל. Thus we find מַעֲרָיוֹן by the side of מַעֲרָיוֹן, and מַעֲרָיוֹן by the side of מַעֲרָיוֹן. The same fluctuation meets us in biblical Aramaic: מַעֲרָיוֹן by the side of מַעֲרָיוֹן (see Kautzsch, *Grammatik d. Biblisch-Aramäischen*, § 11, 2 and § 42).

Thus both dialects are at one in the restriction of the *status determinatus* to its legitimate use (comp. Sachau, 266, with Kautzsch, § 79) and in the expression of the *iddafeh* (Sachau, 266 f., Kautzsch, § 80). How far the earlier usage persists in as late a dialect as talmudic Aramaic, at least in the earlier strata, has been shown in my *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud*, §§ 43, 44. — Both dialects agree further in the use of the participle with or without מ in the place of a finite verb (Sachau, 273, Kautzsch, § 76; comp. my *Manual*, § 58f). — Examples are available in both dialects of the object preceding the verb (Sachau, 274, Kautzsch, § 84). Comp. the numerous words in the one epistle concerning the building of a ship (Papyrus 8) which have baffled the ingenuity of the editor.

So e. g. מַעֲרָיוֹן (for which the meaning "sure, assured" is now placed beyond doubt), מַעֲרָיוֹן (the negative, also Zenjirli), מַעֲרָיוֹן (meaning still dubious), מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן. outlay, comp. מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן, מַעֲרָיוֹן.
words from the Persian. Both equally affect Hebraisms some of which they share in common; and these Hebraisms, though natural enough in texts proceeding from writers of Hebrew stock, are merely the sign of the older Aramaic which, the higher up it ascends, appears the less to diverge from Hebrew. In style and diction the similarity between the documents of Ezra and the cognate documents from Elephantine is so pronounced as to force upon us the conviction that we are dealing with products of the same period. A more welcome parallel to the language of the Aramaic portions of Ezra could hardly be wished for.

Interesting though the script and the language are in their bearing upon the biblical book of Ezra, it is indeed the matter of the new finds that must be of absorbing interest to every student of the Scriptures. Two official documents may be singled out in particular because of their direct or indirect relation to biblical narrative and biblical law. The first of these documents has been known for

---

13 Comp. the biblical lexica and Sachau, passim.
14 Comp. e.g. ראות, זכריה, etc.
15 Comp. Zenjirli, the Zkr inscription with its imperf. with 1 consecutive.
16 Papyrus 1 (of which Papyrus 2 is a welcome doublet in spite of its defective condition). This document is supplemented by Papyrus 3, a memorandum concerning the reply of Bagoas and Delaiah granting permission to rebuild the destroyed temple with the specification that מנה הלאו (meal-offerings and frankincense) may be offered upon its altar exactly as it was wont to be done in former times (יהלום ותלדו המניעים). Inasmuch as the petition called for permission to offer burnt-offerings ( האר) as well as meal-offerings and frankincense (line 25; comp. line 21), the omission of the third and most important species of sacrifices is significant. Sachau believes that the omission is intentional; he therefore interprets Papyrus 5 (where the petitioners are "Jedaniah b. Gema[riah], Mauzi b. Nathan, Shemaiyah b. Haggi, Hoshea b. Jathom, Hoshea b. Nathun, all told five men, natives of Syene, [domiciled] in Jeb") as a second petition
the last four years from Sachau's advance publication; it is needless to say that in the new edition use has been made of the numerous critical reviews by scholars of renown: much has been retracted, and much on the other hand adhered to with no uncertain emphasis. The document which is dated Marheshvan 20, year 17 of Darius (II) = 407 B.C., is a petition of Jedaniah and his associates the priests of Jeb (Elephantine) addressed to Bagoas (the governor of Judea who is asked to

with a view to revoking the interdict on burnt-offerings. Line 11 of Papyrus 5 is defective and may have contained an allusion to the third species in addition to the meal-offering and frankincense which are specifically referred to. But even when this is granted, the three which are introduced by "but" (םל) are manifestly contrasted with species of sacrificial animals (sheep, ב: a bull, ר: a goat, ג: which follows is difficult of identification) which are still interdicted (לא תקרבו המזבח, the conjectural but made certain by the adverbial particle which follows). Accordingly, the interdict would remain in force with reference to all offerings of the animalic kind. Perhaps this was a compromise. It may be conjectured that the powers at Jerusalem who, by their failure to answer clearly indicated their disapproval of a rebuilding of the temple, may have made protestations to the Persian government thus effecting a restricted permission with regard to sacrifices. According to the Sifre (on Deut. 12, 8) the rabbis were divided in their opinion as to what restrictions the law imposed on the הבות (see also Zebabim 117ab). A limited recognition is given by the Mishnah (Menahot 13, 10) to the temple of Onias (')? which is implied (see Gemara 1096) that no idolatrous worship took place there. There is a reference to the incident of the destruction of the Jeb temple in a further papyrus proceeding from Elephantine which was published in 1904 by Euting (see Sachau, 26 f.). In the Assuan document E, line 14, a certain house is said to be situated near the temple of the God Jeho (יֵהוָה יהוה).

19 Sachau writes Jedoniah. This was correct as long as he derived the verbal form from מ. But in view of the spelling מ made certain by the adversative particle which follows. Just as מ corresponds to מ presupposes מ. Just as מ corresponds to מ would presuppose מ.

20 Thus the name is written by Josephus (Ant. 10, 7) who refers to him as o στράτηγος τοῦ Αρταξερξηος, i. e., as Sachau demonstrates on p. 7, Artaxerxes II Mnemon (404-358 B.C.).
order the restoration of the temple (אֵלֶּה) of Jeb which was destroyed in the month of Tammuz in the

22 Sachau points אָגַּרָע (I presume in view of Syriac  =$gur$ = Assyrian  =$gur$ "later coctus") and derives the word from  =$גָּאָרֶה" gather"; accordingly, אָגַרָע means 'gatherer' (like al-jāmi' in Islam) and is the prototype of the  =$גָּאָרֶה . All of which is exceedingly problematic. The spelling of the word in the Targum with  =$ז$ after the  =$חָלְכָּו (e.g. Judges 6, 25, 28) precludes any other pointing but אָגַרָע (according to the superlinear vocalization in Praetorius' edition אָגַרָע in accordance with the so-called "Syriasm"); since it occurs in the Targum (Hosea 12, 12) for Hebrew  =$גָּאָרֶה (Gen. 31, 47) cannot be rejected. Assyrian  =$הָהָרְרָע "temple" has also been compared. In the Targum, only heathen altars are designated by this word. Of course, such an implication was farthest from the mind of the people of Jeb. See note 23.

23 The divine name, whether by itself or as an element of a proper name, is in all but two instances written with  =$ז$ at the end; it is replaced by  =$חָלְכָּו Assuan E, 14 and in the proper name רָאָשְׁנִי Papyrus 30, line 2. Of course, the spelling with  =$חָלְכָּו precludes the vowel  =$א$ at the end (so Sachau previously) and suggests the vowel  =$ג$ . Sachau reads now  =$ז$ (Jaho, יָהָו, יָהוּ, and even goes to the length of assuming that in the  =$גָּאָרֶה (Mesha Stone, line 18, and inferentially in Scripture) we have a case of a redundant vowel letter and that we should read  =$גָּאָרֶה . Sachau apparently thinks of the Greek transliteration Ἰαω (see Baudissin, Studien z. semitischen Religionsgeschichte, I (1876), 181 ff.; Deissmann, Bibelstudien, 1895, 6). But the Greek  =$א$ may very well represent Hebrew  =$ז$ (comp. ῥασοβατί in Origen; see AJSL., XXVI (1909), 66). In the light of all that has been written on the pronunciation of the tetragrammaton (comp. the summary by G. F. Moore, article "Jehovah," Encyclopædia Britannica, 11th edition, 1911) we may safely adhere to the vocalization רָאָשְׁנִי which is supported by Greek transliterations and by internal grammatical considerations ( =$סָכָּו in combination, רָאָשְׁנִי). The  =$סָכָּו which appears in combination points grammatically to the longer form רָאָשְׁנִי (comp. רָאָשְׁנִי from רָאָשְׁנִי), a Piel form proving רָאָשְׁנִי to be a Hifil. The Elephantine Jews probably pronounced the name רָאָשְׁנִי also when occurring by itself. In English transliteration: יָהָו.
year 14 of Darius (410 B.C.) by the priests\(^2\) of the god ירדהנ. They inform the governor that at the time of the misfortune they sent letters to Johanan the highpriest and his associates the priests in Jerusalem as well as to the brother of Anani (עין) and the Judean nobles (חיהויד) and, on the other hand, to Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanballat (סןבללת) the governor of Samaria; they state distinctly that the letter to Jerusalem remained unanswered. We recognize immediately two biblical personages, Johanan the highpriest\(^2\)

\(^2\) While they designate their own priests as כהנים, thus putting them on a level with their colleagues in Jerusalem (see line 18), they purposely choose the opprobrious term כהנים for the priests of the Egyptian deity. The same distinction is maintained in Scripture (the emendation in Hosea 4, 4 must of course be rejected; the prophet addresses himself in the context to the "legitimate" priests), in the Targum, and in later Hebrew (see the lexica). The name is transliterated as χασμαριμ (implying the pronunciation "Χασμαριμ") comp. the example cited by Kahle, Der MT. des AT. nach der Überlieferung d. babylon. Juden, 1902, 71) in the Septuagint IV Kings. 23, 5 (but Lucian: ἔπειτά;) and in Theodotion Zeph. 1, 4. As is well known, no such opprobrium attaches to the appellation in the older Aramaic or in Syriac (see Lidzbarski's Glossary and the Syriac lexica). The priests of Jeb were conscious of the difference between them and the idolatrous Egyptian priests.

\(^3\) See Sachau on המגדיא which remains difficult. But the general sense is clear.

\(^4\) Derived from the comparativeフラタラ, whereas the biblical סרו goes back to the superlativeフラタמה (Sachau).

\(^5\) If this כהן is to be identified with the son of Elioenai the descendant of Jeconiah (I Chron. 3, 24), אזות will have been the Iranian surname of one of his six brothers mentioned in the same place. There is no need of assuming that Elioenai had eight sons (Sachau). But the identification is problematic. Sumne to say that Anani must have been an important personage.

\(^6\) According to Nehem. 12, 22 Johanan (יוחנן) was the successor (son)
and Sanballat the governor of Samaria, Nehemiah's arch-
enemy3 with whom, however, the highpriestly family was
related by marriage (a son of Joiada, hence a brother of
Johanan, married a daughter of Sanballat). Whether
Sanballat was still alive at the time when our petition was
written, as Sachau assumes, may reasonably be doubted.
Why, it may be asked, did the Jews of Elephantine dispatch
a letter to his sons Delaiah and Shelemiah and not to
Sanballat in person? Perhaps his sons did not succeed him
in the official dignity of governor, though as sons of the
former governor they must have enjoyed a leading position
in their community. As outsiders, the Jews of Jeb may not
have known or cared about the feuds between Samaria and
Jerusalem; to judge from the friendly feeling between the
highpriestly family at Jerusalem and Sanballat, the enmity
could not have been an acute one and may not have survived
Nehemiah. On the whole, the Elephantine document is
helpful in establishing the date of Nehemiah's activity be-
yond a shadow of doubt (see note 27).

of Joiada who in turn succeeded his father Eliashib, (see verse 10 f.; in
v. 23 לָחָזָבָךְ is an abbreviated expression who was the contemp-
orary of Nehemiah (see Nehem. 3, 1 and chapter 13). During Nehemiah's
second visit to Jerusalem which took place some time after 433 B. C. (13,
6; see the commentaries) Eliashib was still highpriest; the interval of time
between that date and 410, some twenty years, would make room for his
two successors. Probably Joiada's ministration was a short one (hence the
phrasing 12, 23). Thus the Elephantine document goes to prove that the
Artaxerxes of Nehemiah was indeed the First (Longimanus, 464-424 B. C.),
and the date of Nehemiah's activity is made certain beyond cavil. Josephus
(Ant. 10, 7) likewise places Johanan's priesthood in the times of Bagoas.

Nehem. 2, 19 and passim.

Nehem. 13, 28.
According to the document, the temple of Jeb had been in existence since the days of the kings of Egypt, that is, was built when Egypt was still autonomous long before the advent of Cambyses who on entering Egypt found the temple standing and, "whereas the temples of the gods of Egypt were destroyed, no hurt was ever done by any man to their own sanctuary." This account unmistakably testifies to the friendliness of the Persian kings for the Jewish religion and is an indirect proof for the authenticity of the Cyrus edict of Ezra 6 the veracity of which has been challenged on flimsy grounds. What Cambyses and the satrap of Darius II could grant to the Jews of Egypt, Darius I and before him Cyrus might certainly be expected to do for the Jews of Jerusalem. The petition of the Jewish elders in Ezra 5 is similar in language, style, and tenor to the Elephantine document. The Jews had their enemies; but their protestations proved futile at the Persian court.

So far the Bible and the new finds square admirably well. But what about the Egyptian temple and the law of Deuteronomy (ch. 12) which renders the existence of a sanctuary alongside that of Jerusalem illegal? Much has been written on this question since Sachau's first publication. It has been maintained that the Deuteronomic code must have been unknown to the Egyptian Jewish colony and hence must have been promulgated after their emigration from their homeland. Nay, the law restricting the sanctu-

Read מְלֶךְ מָלֵךְ מָלֵךְ with Papyrus 2. The whole passage reads as follows: יְמֵי מְלַיִּי מָצְרִים אוֹתַי בְּגֵג אָנָוהּ נַדַּע בַיְּדֵי אֲנָוָהּ אוֹתַי בַּיְּדֵי מְלָתַיָה מָצְוָה אוֹתַי בַּיְּדֵי מְלָתַיָה קָאָה מְלָתַיָהוּ לְאַבִּירוּ אֲנָוָה מְלָתַיָה אוֹתַי בַּיְּדֵי מְלָתַיָה קָאָה מְלָתַיָהוּ לְאַבִּירוּ אֲנָוָה מְלָתַיָה.

1 See the spirited defense against Kosters and others by Eduard Meyer, Entstehung des Judenthums, 1896, whose position is now singularly substantiated by the Egyptian finds.
ary to a single place must have been unknown before the promulgation of Deuteronomy. For had the Egyptian Jews known of such a law they would not have contravened it. Now, with reference to these contentions two points must be had in mind. In the first place, the redactor of the Book of Kings who, it is conceded, wrote with Deuteronomy before him, clearly admits that the law of the single sanctuary had not been in force before 621 and that the "high-places" were tolerated even by the pious kings of Judah. The Egyptian Jews merely followed the custom as they knew it; whether a law had ever existed "on paper" as the Deuteronomist redactor of Kings assumed, it was beyond their ken to ascertain or to trouble themselves about. If, as we shall see in the sequel, the worship at the temple of Jeb was by no means free from objectionable features, the status of the Jeb community would correspond to what Jeremiah has to say about the idolatrous propensities of the very Jews who may have constituted the ancestors, physical or spiritual, of the Elephantine Jews. They were recruited from the rural districts in which each community had its "bamah," its own god," as Jeremiah expresses himself. For so much will be clear, whatever the final word may be on the origin and date of the constituent parts of the Pentateuch—it is largely a literary question—that a reformation like the Josianic could have ripened only at the end of a long contest extending over centuries perhaps; that therefore alongside of the easy-going tendency in favor of the "bamot" there must have gone on a movement which looked upon them with disfavor and which, starting from above, reached the people below but slowly, though in the end it won the day. Whether or no Jer-

\textsuperscript{22} Jerem. 2, 28.
miah took an active part in the promulgation of Deuteronomy, he certainly was no friend of the "bamot"; and just as surely the bulk of the emigrants with whom he went down to Egypt were unable to perceive what wrong there was in building a temple on foreign soil, as little as they were in a position to see any wrong in offering sacrifices to the queen of heaven. The second point is that the Law which was a constitution for the people in their homeland made no provision for an emergency like the one which presented itself to the exiles in Egypt. What Onias did in later times—and his temple was not altogether put under the ban by the doctors of the Mishnah (see note 18)—the Elephantine Jews did long before him. It has been suggested that Onias did not build a new temple, but attached himself to one of the Jewish sanctuaries which existed in Egypt. No one will certainly maintain that Onias was ignorant of Deuteronomy. Friedmann has long recognized that in Ezek. 20 we have an echo of the

22 Jerem. 11.
23 Jerem. 7, 31; 11, 13 and elsewhere.
24 Jerem. 44.
25 The "Urdeuteronomium." In the parenetic framework (Deut. 4: 28-30) the exile and even the restoration are included in the prophet's vista. The composition of the Code must have preceded its discovery by a long stretch of time if its provisions proved unworkable so soon after its promulgation.

26 Whether or no the prophecy Isa. 19, 19 refers to the Onias temple is a disputed point. Cheyne (Introduction to Isaiah, 1895, 105 ff.) places it in the latter years of Ptolemy Lagi. It is interesting to observe how difficulties real or imaginary are brushed aside in order to reconcile the prophecy in question with post-deuteronomic usages and ideas. The least difficulty, it seeme to me, is the conflict with the law of the single sanctuary. Prophets were not so bound to the letter of an ancient law as modern commentators would make us believe they were; hence a law need not be placed late because some prophet seems to ignore or even to contradict it.

struggle between the prophet and the elders of the Golah; while the latter deemed the construction of a temple on Babylonian soil advisable, Ezekiel bent his entire energy to kill the project: in Babylonia there was room for a "little sanctuary," perhaps a place of assembly, a sort of synagogue, but the great temple was to be built on the heights of Zion. It may be questioned whether the Egyptian Jews who refused to listen to Jeremiah's rebukes would have given heed to the counsels of an Ezekiel, had such a one been among them. It is certainly characteristic that Johanan the high priest did not make reply to the letter dispatched by the Elephantine colony. Whatever the attitude of Samaria was, Jerusalem was lukewarm about resurrecting a "bamah" in Egypt.

If any commentary were needed as to the apprehensions which were felt by priests and prophets concerning the local sanctuaries or as regards the religious mixture (syncretism) which went on there, the Elephantine finds admirably supply the want. The temple at Jeb was dedicated to the worship of Jeho, the God of heaven; but with him homage was paid to other deities. Our information comes principally from the great list of names which constitutes Papyrus 18. The document which is perhaps not wholly extant is headed: "In the third of Pamenhotep in the year 5. These are the names of the Jewish host" who

---

\* Ezek. 11, 16.  
\* Ezek. 20, 40.  
\* הוזרא. The phrase occurs elsewhere, so in the Passover rescript. See the reference to the Epistle of Aristaeas at the head of this paper. The Elephantine colony was originally a military one. Hence the divisions which are called סינים (see G. Buchanan Gray on Num. 2, 2).

There were altogether six such companies of which five occur in the Assuan Papyri and one in the Elephantine documents. Four are named after officers bearing Iranian names (Warezat, Artaban, Aturparan, Homadat), while the
gave silver to Jeho the God, every one two shekels of silver.” But in the summary (column 7) we read that of the 31 keresh and 8 shekels contributed only 12 keresh and 6 shekels went to Jeho, while 7 keresh were donated to אֶשְכְּלוֹתָא and 12 keresh to שְׁנִיטו דק. Of these two deities the second is perspicuous enough, שְׁנִיטו דק, formed exactly in the same manner as שֵׁתָה כִּי (Mesha Stone, line 17), is apparently a goddess, the consort of the god אֶשְכְּלוֹתָא. That a god אֶשְכְּלוֹתָא (in the syncretistic system possibly identified with בֵּית אָלֵי) was worshiped by the Elephantine colony is evidenced by such proper names as בֵּית אָלֵי, נְזֶרָא, נְזֶרָא. In the Bible we meet with the name נְזֶרָא Zechar. 7, 12 (the accents are intentionally misleading); comp. also Jerem. 48, 13; “And Moab shall be ashamed of Chemosh, as the house of Israel was ashamed of Bethel their confidence,” where Bethel is placed on a level with Chemosh. As for נְזֶרָא, the first element of the combination, it occurs in the Bible in names of persons and places, but outside Scripture, on Phoenician monuments for instance, as the name of a goddess which is identified with Athena. An-at is of course the female names of the officers after whom the other two companies are called are Babylonian (Iddinnabu, Nabukudurri); according to Sachau, they were likewise placed in command by the Persian government. The companies appear further to have been divided into bodies of a hundred men (מָאָנָא). At the time from which our documents emanate over against the בֵּיתוֹ אֲנָא, i. e. citizens who are not soldiers.

42 Comp. עָנָא כָּנֵי נֶגֶב, בִּילָעְב, מְעַלָּב (Sachau, 82).

43 Stade long ago suspected in the combination one name; see Stade-Siegfried, Hebr. Wbch., 1893, 832a; his emendation בִּילָעְב רָאצָא is repeated ZAW., XXII (1902), 328. It is the merit of Peiser (OLZ., 1901, col. 306 f.) to have recognized in בִּילָעְב שָׁלוֹא the name of a deity and in the whole the equivalent of בָּית-לָעְב-עָנָא.

44 See Baethgen, Beiträge z. semit. Religionsgeschichte, 1888, 52 f.

45 Ibid., 53.
counterpart to An-u, the Babylonian god of heaven, though the occurrence of a goddess Antu(m) in Babylonian is doubted; "Anu was regarded as the father of Ishtar," and it is thought that the latter is meant by "the queen of heaven" in Jeremiah; "it is just as likely, however, that the name of the queen of heaven was Anat." But whether the one or the other, the association of a goddess-consort with הָאִית is strongly reminiscent of the religious attitude of the Jews that went down to Egypt with Jeremiah. Elsewhere in the documents we meet with עֵנְיָה whose identity with הַנַּחֲיָא may be assumed. It is not so easy to place the first element in the combination הַנַּחֲיָא, though וֹאֵיא of II Kings 17, 30 will naturally suggest itself. "Were it not for the fact that the men of Jeb refer to themselves as Judeans one would be tempted to associate them with the later Samaritans. But in the light of what we know from Jeremiah, syncretistic cults obtained in the local sanctuaries of Judah as well. Another deity combined with הַנַּחֲיָא is הַרְמָטִי, comp. also the proper name הַרְמָטִי. The Elephantine Jews could apparently boast of a pantheon; thus a standing formula in their documents is: "the gods (and even "all the gods") may inquire after your welfare," and it is used in domestic communications by one Jew to another."

44 See KAT., 3d ed., 352.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., 441.
47 Sachau, 84.
48 Papyrus 32, line 3.
49 Erman apud Sachau, 83.
50 See Sachau, Index, s. v. Ḥ.aḥ.n.e'ē.ti. At the same time they designate themselves as Arameans (see Index, s. v. אֲרָמִים).
51 Papyrus 27, line 7.
52 Papyrus 34, line 4.
53 See Sachau, 38.
The second official document in which students of the Bible will evince much interest is the Passover rescript (Papyrus 6). It is unfortunately sadly mutilated; but, in view of its importance, it may be reproduced here in full.

1. 

2. Jeda[niah] and his associates, the [J]ew[is]h h[ost], your brother Hanan[iah]. The peace of my brethren the gods (may)

3. And now, in this year, the year 5 of Darius the king, there has been sent by the king to Ars[a]mes (a communication)

4. Now count ye thus fou[r...]

5. gua[rd] (yourselves), and from the day 15 to the day 21 of

6. be ye clean, and guard yourselves, work (ye shall) not

7. ye shall [no]t drink, and whatsoever is leavened (ye shall) not

REVERSE

8. (from) the setting of the sun to the day 21 of Nisa[n

9. (ye shall) enter your chambers and seal (?) between the days

10.

11. my brethren Jedaniah and his associates, the Jewish host, your brother Hananiah
The identity of Hananiah, the sender of the dispatch, cannot be ascertained. He may be the Hananiah mentioned in Papyrus 11 (a letter from Abydos—to the community in Elephantine), line 7: "from the time that Hananiah came to Egypt even until now." But the general purport of the document which is dated from the fifth year of Darius, i.e. 419-18 B.C., is clear. It is a sort of pastoral letter ordering the celebration of the Passover. Sachau thinks that the phraseology attaches itself more closely to Deut. 16 than to Exod. 12. I cannot say that his arguments are convincing. It is certainly far-fetched to see in the expression "enter your chambers" an allusion to "and go unto thy tents" Deut. 16, 7. "To enter" is not "to go," and "chambers" are not "tents." "Count ye" (line 4) is the exact counterpart of "ye shall make your count" Exod. 12, 4, comp. Targum Onkelos, Septuagint, and the halakic works. In line 7, supply with Strack "beer"; he compares Pesahim 3, 1 ( "Egyptian beer"; is of course , a word derived from the same root from which we obtain the Greek word for leaven; it occurs by the way once in the Septuagint, Isa. 19, 10, where the translator read for comp. Mishnah, ibid.). The document has also an indirect bearing on the edict of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7. If an internal matter of the Jewish religion like the keeping of the

Comp. Syriac and Targumic מָחָל הָרָע and Hebrew מָחָל.

Both recensions of the Mekilta (א"ת מָכָת אֲשֶׁר נָכַנְת).—Perhaps on line 4 should be restored to read מָחָל.

Pesahim, 1911, 7.
Passover could be made the subject of a royal rescript to the king's representative in Egypt, Ezra's work of organizing the departure of a large body of Jews to Palestine and of consolidating the inner juridical affairs of Jerusalem in accordance with "the law of his God" was certainly a matter for the consideration of the king. It once more reveals the liberal politics of the Achaemenian rulers and their friendly solicitude for the Jewish religion.

Of the other documents which the Elephantine find has brought to light, the legal documents, private letters, and much else, though shedding much light on the life of the Egyptian Jews of those by-gone days, need not detain us. The best preserved is a promissory note (Papyrus 28). We shall single out here two pieces which should command universal interest. The one is of a literary character, a book, or what in the imperfect condition of the writing material now remains of it. The Jews of Elephantine were not only able to handle the Aramaic for commercial, official, and private purposes, but also for literary objects. They possessed a literature, and that in the Aramaic which they spoke and wrote. It is a pity that but one sample of their literary possessions has come down to us. But that specimen is none other than the Book of the Wise Aḥikar. The name is familiar to us from the apocryphal

---
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The name is written in our documents בֵיהֶז אַחְיָר (the phrase occurs elsewhere) should be explained in accordance with Baba batra 10, 1. Correctly transliterated in the Sinaiticus and the Old Latin (Ἄχικαρ(ος), Ἀχικαρ). See Müller, Beiträge z. Erklärung und Kritik d. Buches Tobit, 1908, 15; Smend, Alter und Herkunft d. Achikar-Romans (continuation of the preceding work), 57, note; Nau, Histoire et sagesse d'Aḥikar l'Assyrien, 1909, 7 (see in all three the further disfigurements which the name underwent in various languages in the course of the transmission of the story).
Book of Tobit where he is spoken of as Esarhaddon's chief cupbearer and keeper of the signet and steward and overseer of the accounts in which capacity he had served also his father Sennacherib. Upon the recommendation of Ahikar, his uncle Tobit is brought to Nineveh; he nurses him in his sickness; together with Nadab his brother's son he appears at the wedding feast of Tobias, the son of Tobit. When upon his deathbed Tobit admonishes his son to show himself merciful and righteous, he draws his attention to the example of their illustrious kinsman: "See, my son, what Nadab did to Ahikar, who nourished him. Did he not go down alive into the earth? and God repaid his shame to his face. And Ahikar went forth into the light, but Nadab entered the everlasting darkness, because he sought to slay Ahikar. For that he did righteousness to me, he went forth out of the snare of death which Nadab had set for him, but Nadab fell into the snare of death and it destroyed him." What is here a mere episode was known in early Christian literature in the form of a book; versions thereof in Syriac, Armenian, Arabic, and Slavonic are extant. Now we meet with it in Aramaic. Whether it is itself a translation (from Assyrian or Hebrew?) it is impossible to tell. It resembles the versions extant in its main features; but naturally often goes its own way. It consists of the story of the wise minister and

---

"Tobit 1, 21.
"Ibid., 22.
2, 10.
11, 18.
14, 10 according to the Sinaiticus.
11 Edited by F. C. Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris, and Agnes Smith Lewis (The Story of Ahikar from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek and Slavonic Versions, Cambridge 1898). On the relation to Aesop see the publications cited in note 65 and the literature referred to in them.
his ungrateful adopted son Nadin as well of a didactic series of proverbs and fables. The whole is written in an easy style befitting a book intended for popular edification. The papyri are defective. The editor has done as well as it was possible for him to do with the material in hand. It will require some further painstaking study, and here and there a point overlooked by Sachau may be rectified. Thus the editor has failed to recognize in מְלֵא מָר מְפֶר (Papyrus 54, line 4) the almost verbal agreement with Prov. 4, 23a: מְלֵא מָשָׁמַר נֶגֶר לְבֵךְ. Sachau renders: “Von jeder Warte aus wache über deinen Mund”; it should rather be translated: “Above all that thou guardest guard thy mouth.” To אל התהشور בְּרֶה מֶשֶר (Papyrus 53, line 3), “Keep not thy son from the rod,” the parallel from Prov. 13, 24 naturally suggested itself to the editor; he might have cited for the next line (וֹקָמַה יְהוּדָא בְּרֶה מַעַר) Prov. 23, 13b. Papyrus 55. line 2 מַעַר is clearly impossible—a plough is nothing light—; read פַּרְנָק “bran” (comp. Syriac parrē and Talmudic מֶרֶא Baba batra 92b and elsewhere) = מַעַר. Baba batra 98b in the proverb ascribed to Bar Sira which in its formulation

(see Schechter, JQR., III (1891), 691)

comes nearer to the Papyrus text than to the parallel Syriac quoted by Sachau.—Ibid., line 12; comp. Jerem. 10, 23.—Ibid., line 13. The example cited on p. 168 from Onkelos (Deut. 28, 56) is not analogous. —Ibid.,

To which the Nadab (Nadab = Nadab = Nadav) of the Sinaiticus comes nearest. See Müller, 11-13; Nau, 8 f.

The whole (story and didactic part) on Papyri 49-59.
line 14; comp. Prov. 5, 21.—Ibid., line 15: 

\[ \text{"lässt jemand Bäume gedeihen in der Finsternis, und nicht sieht (wird gesehen?),"} \]

but "a man that cleaveth" wood in the darkness, and seeth not"; such a man will naturally hurt himself, so will the thief who steals under the covert of the night (comp. Job 24, 16 and 15b). Papyrus 56, line 3, the editor is at a loss to supply the first letter; the text reads "lnrp nj...". Sachau operated with "כָּה חָי as an equivalent of Hebrew יְהֹוָה: but in the Targum Ps. 11, 2; 58, 8; 64, 4 the verb is יָדָע; hence read יָדָע = יָדָע (the d assimilated to the t): "thou hast bent the bow." Papyrus 56, column 2, line 6, reads "תְּלָשׁה כָּבֵר; Sachau renders "Lass dich nicht erkennen als einen grossen (Herrn)"—certainly a harsh construction. Here Sachau operates with the Syriac; but see Sachau Dan. 5, 11. 12. 14 and משחטכ 7, 8 (hence ש for the biblical ש) should suggest the rendering: "Make not thyself over wise," comp. Eccles. 7, 16. Papyrus 57, line 1, we should perhaps point הֵשֵׁב, "with thee." Ibid., line 15, comp. Job. 3, 24.

In 1896 Eduard Meyer expressed the opinion™ that, in accordance with the custom of the Achæmenian rulers, an Aramaic translation must have accompanied royal inscriptions in Syria or Asia Minor, if there were such. The Elephantine finds have brought to light an Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription which Darius I caused to be hewn in the rock in three languages, the Ancient Persian, the Elamitic, and the Assyrian. Sachau who rightly remarks that a translation of that famous inscription was

---

* Comp. e. g. Gen. 22, 3 Onkelos.
* Comp. Eccl. 10, 9.
least expected on the confines of Egypt and Nubia finds that the Elephantine version corresponds most closely to the Assyrian text; the general impression which the style of the translation makes upon him is that it was not the work of a private man, but from the beginning bore official character. We must therefore assume that immediately upon the publication of that document copies in translation were sent to the various nationalities of the empire, as the writer of the Book of Esther expresses himself, "into every province according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their language." Sachau prints in parallel columns his own German translation of the Aramaic and the English translation by King and Thompson of the Assyrian text.

The editor of the Elephantine finds merits the gratitude of all students of antiquity and in particular of all Bible readers, whether scholars or laymen, for the celerity with which so difficult a publication has been accomplished. How much there is yet to be done by way of mere verbal interpretation Sachau knows full well; it is so much the more to his credit that he chose not to delay the publication. The volume devoted to the texts and learned notes is accompanied by a separate folder containing facsimiles in photographic reproduction of all the texts; thus students all the world over are placed in a position to verify Sachau's readings and to submit the documents to fresh editions and commentaries of which the near future is destined to see not a few. The well-known publishing firm of Hinrichs in Leipzig deserves praise for the sumptuous appearance given to this monumental publication."

"1, 22.

[* Since writing the above, I have received through the author's courtesy a paper by Felix Perles printed in O LZ., XIV (1911), col. 497-503. I find
that he has anticipated me in two points (on Papyrus 54, l. 4 and 55, l. 15). Quite plausible is his restoration יִדְרָבָא (Papyrus 6, l. 6); accordingly render "be ye at rest" for "be ye clean."—The correct interpretation of מַר and רַחֵל in note 18 I have derived from Lidzbarski's review in Deutsche Literaturzeitung, No. 47, Nov. 25, 1911.—A smaller edition of the text of the Elephantine documents with notes has been prepared by Ungnad and may be had for the price of M. 3.40. The publisher is Hinrichs.]
RECENT KARAITE PUBLICATIONS


Specimens of Samuel al-Magribi's code al-Murshid (written in Arabic) so far as they have been published, have been reviewed by me in the first series of this Review (see XVI, 405; XVII, 594; XVIII, 560; XX, 631). For the benefit of the readers of the new series I wish to state briefly that Samuel was a physician in Cairo, where he composed his work in the year 1434; that he was the last Karaite author of a complete code in Arabic; that this book, though primarily a compilation, is distinguished by its clear and lucid arrangement of material; moreover, elements from long forgotten Karaite writings having been preserved therein, its publication is very desirable. The Murshid is divided into twelve sections, and of these the second, third, and seventh have been published completely, while of the fourth and sixth only portions have appeared. These have been published as dissertations for the doctorate, based on the Berlin MS. 201 alone (written in 1435, hence one year after its completion), and partly with, partly without, a German translation. Since the appearance of my last review, two new specimens have been published, one of which, named first in the heading, contains a complete section, while the second constitutes only a part of a section; these likewise are dissertations (although this is not stated on the title-pages) and follow only the above mentioned Berlin MS. Both, however, are accompanied by a German translation.
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of VDKK ilTina, that the high-priest must marry only a priestly maiden (p. 12, l. 8 from below, comp. n. 111). This is found already in Levi b. Jepheth (..., comp. n. III), in Aaron b. Joseph's Mibhar, ad loc., and in Aaron b. Elijah's Keter Torah, ad loc. (here: VDKK 11314124912, and is also, by the way, Philo's opinion (see Geiger's conclusions in Maamorim, my edition, p. 134). From Samuel himself proceeds perhaps only the interesting remark that Jehoiada was apparently opposed to that ordinance, having married the king's daughter Jehosheba. But in reality Jehoiada was not high-priest, no such person, and in II Kings 12, 11 means a powerful and influential priest, a position which he obtained as brother-in-law of the ruling monarch. As proof for the latter view may serve the fact that he is not mentioned in the list of high-priests I Chron. 5, 37-40. Interesting are also the habits of his contemporaries (דאידל והלמה) which he mentions, thus p. 4, l. 18, concerning the cutting of the hair of the chin with scissors among priests, and p. 7, l. 8, regarding the alliance with a widow. Of predecessors only Abu—l-Sari, i.e. Sahl b. Masliah, is cited by name, and with him his ספרט ירנן, which is quoted nowhere else (p. 1, l. 15). Sahl accuses here the rabbis of having burned the genealogical documents (יהדותים). Something similar is found in Sappir's ספיר הנב I, 100b. The rabbis (לברנאוין) are quoted twice besides (p. 9, l. 7, and p. 13, l. 9), but without any animosity. Halakic agreements with, or deviations, from the Talmud are pointed out sufficiently in the notes of the editor (comp. among others n. 67, where read § 10; n. 68, r. 78a). The references, on the other hand, to sources and parallels in the Karaite literature are not exhaustive. Thus the first reason why the mother is mentioned before the father in Lev. 21, 2 (p. 2, l. 21) is found not only in Levi b. Jepheth but also in the Mibhar and Keter Torah, ad loc.

* The second reason adduced there (l. 23 ff.), that the wife must be buried first, corresponds to a rabbinic precept (see Ebel Rabbati 11, whence Yoreh Deah, § 354). The editor misunderstood the passage, translating התרח by "protection."
That a college of the elders must consist of ten, with reference to Ruth 4, 2 (p. 23, l. 12), is already mentioned by Anan (ed. Harkavy, p. 111) and Benjamin al-Nahawendi (מכה אנא, fol. 1a, l. 37; comp. my remark REJ., XLV, 69, l. 1), etc. From the last named work some parallels would still have to be drawn, thus that the law makes it incumbent to appoint judges everywhere even in the present (p. 16-17, Nahawendi, fol. 1a below; the conclusions of our author are particularly interesting here), that following Deut. 17, 9 learned people are to be consulted even nowadays in cases of doubt (p. 21, l. 13, Nahawendi, fol. 1 above), etc., etc.

The following remarks concern details: p. 6, concerning the Kitāb al-ʿIbbār see REJ., LI, 155; the Kitāb al-ʿIbbār is not a special treatise by Samuel, but rather forms the third section of his code, see JQR., VIII, 563; on the other hand he was the author of very many piyyuṭim (see MS. Br. Mus., Cat. Marg., II, No. 728, and perhaps also 730, 1º).—P. 64, n. 3, Sahl was not a contemporary of Saadya, but lived after him, see my Karaite Literary Opponents of Saadya Gaon, p. 31.—Ib., n. 4, the allusion is to the neḥāyim who claim to be descendants from David, see for instance the lists by Mordecai b. Nisan, ed. Vienna, fol. 4b, by Pinsker, p. 53, etc.—P. 67, n. 52, concerning the binding force of the laws of purity among Karaites in exile see in addition REJ., XLV, 195.—P. 68, read "Bashyatchi" instead of "Beshizi" and "Hadassi" for "ha-Dassy."—P. 70, n. 103, on "Kjn see ZfhB., III, 93 (where our author is to be added).

The text is published with reasonable accuracy, and the translation is faithful as far as I have examined it, only here and there a more pointed expression could have been employed.

II. While the eleventh section published by Cohn is one of the most interesting of the Murshid, the ninth published by Weiss, which has incest for its subject (אלא kı̂m אֲלֵאמָה מִי אֵלָּדוֹת; the last word cannot be transliterated into Arabic, as the editor does it on the title-page), deals with one of the most difficult chapters of Karaite jurisprudence. This circumstance is emphasized by Samuel himself (p. 1, l. 2: אֲלֵאמָה מִי אֵלָּדוֹת ... לֹא לִשָּׁנָא מִי אֵלָּדוֹת לֹא מְשַׁמֵּהוּ לֹא מָנָל ... מְנָה לֹא מָעֵב). The Karaite precepts regarding the prohibited
degrees of relationship, despite the mitigations obtained in the process of time through necessity, are still very rigorous and render life burdensome. Unfortunately the editor offers us only ten chapters (the entire section contains twenty-three chapters) which besides some introductory remarks (chapt. 1-2) discuss the prohibitions of Lev. 18, 7-14, and this is to be regretted the more since the later chapters contain no doubt, as is the case for instance in Bashyatchi's Adderet, the principles of the Karaite marital law summed up in Samuel's laconic but lucid style. In the first chapter, which Pinsker published long ago (p. 146-148) in the Arabic original with a Hebrew translation, Samuel enumerates the most important teachers of the law who were opposed to the so-called ḫibb-that theory (according to which man and woman are a unit with regard to the prohibited degrees of relationship). The first among them was, as is well known, Abu Yakūb (Joseph) al-BAṣīr, then his pupil Abulfarag Fūrkān b. 'Asad (i. e. Jeshua b. Judah), Abulfadl (i. e. Solomon ha-Nasi), Aaron b. Elijah, Israel ha-Dayyan (or ha-Ma'arabi), and his pupil Jepheth [b. Shāgīr]. Samuel maintains that he relies chiefly on the last two. It goes without saying that also Samuel is an opponent of this theory, as he explicitly states

---

8 At a Karaite synod held in November 1910 at Eupatoria it was decided by a majority of 24 against 7 to allow the marriage between two brothers and two sisters or between a brother and a sister on the one hand and a brother on the other (the Karaites term it ḥamit 'i ḥamit or ḥamit 'a ḥamit and derive the prohibition from Lev. 18, 11), despite the fact that letters to the contrary arrived from Hakams of Troki and Constantinople and from the representatives of the community of Cairo. This resolution has also called forth protests. The Karaite Hassan in Theodosia, Babayeff, who had contracted such a marriage before the resolution of the synod, was deprived of his position. See the Karaimskaya Zhizn ("Karaite Life"), (a Russian-Karaite monthly appearing in Moscow since June 1911), vol. I (June), p. 84. 113; vol. II (July), p. 94.

4 Samuel himself emphasizes here the compact character of his statement (p. 2, l. 3 from below): לאֹ מְנַעְנוּ יָדֵהוּ אֶל לְכָּל אֲשֶׁר רָבָּהּ מִצְוָה וְאֵל־בּוֹ מַעַּמַּת יָדֵהוּ בְּךָ לְכָּל אוֹסָר אֲשֶׁר יִנְעֵה. This, however, agrees with the character of his work in general.
The rabbis are mentioned only once (p. 1, l. 4) and designated as הַרְבֵּי הָעֵדְתָּא ("heretics," not "quarrel-pickers" as Weiss translates). It is noteworthy that in another passage (p. 12, l. 18) an opinion of the "heretics" is quoted which does not come from the rabbis but from Karaites. The point involved is the prohibition of a step-sister derived from Lev. 18, 11: according to some Karaites, a step-sister is prohibited only when her mother bore a child to the father of the step-brother. The view is opposed by Samuel as heretical and yet its originator is no less a person than Anan. His words on that point were known heretofore from Puki's ספר יהודי (Constantinople 1582, fol. 33; quoted by Harkavy, Stud. u. Mitt., VIII, 100) and are now before us in the original of the ספר הנשת (in Schechter's Documents of Jewish Sectaries, II, 20). The editor, however, made as little use of these two publications of Anan as of the two very important Karaite monographs on incest, which of all similar works are the only ones published, namely Puki's work which indeed is very rare, and the extremely important ספר היהרה by Jeshua b. Judah (ed. Markon, St. Petersburg 1908). The latter, to be sure, is mentioned but not utilized, so that the only passage quoted from it by our author (p. 16, l. 7; and אַלְפָּלוֹת אֵלִיָּהוּ ib., l. 12-13, are translated incorrectly) is not pointed out by the editor.

The parallels from Hadassi (which also here assumes the form "ha-Dassy"), Aaron b. Elijah, and Bashyatchi (written "Beshizi" also here) are recorded in the notes in a diligent and satisfactory

---

* The chief aim of this work is to combat the prohibitions against marriage resulting from the practice of the principle of "ascending" (עֶשְּרֵי). According to this principle the prohibitions which are binding on married men through their relationship involve also their wives in all consequences, and vice versa (the latter is acknowledged only by Jeshua, but not by al-Baṣīr), and this often formed a back-door through which the הרוב theory crept in again.
way, but against this the older Karaite literature is a *terra incognita* to the editor, and herein he follows Fürst thoroughly, even to the point of imitating all his orthographic monstrosities; see for instance the list of the authors of alleged Karaite codes in the beginning of the introduction, among whom are found also Malich of Harmli (*sic! this is the founder of sects, Malik al-Ramli, i.e. of Ramla), and Judah b. Koreish; similarly al-Basîr (n. 13) still figures as a contemporary of Saadya, etc.—The translation reads well, but is not altogether exact. Thus some inaccuracies have already been pointed out, and this is not the place to mention others. Only why does the editor so often leave untranslated the Bible verses which he quotes?

With regard to the notes the following is to be observed: n. 13 correctly אָבָא בַּע in the words מַחְכָּא מַכָּא are to be deleted.—n. 16 the words מֵה הַלַּעֲלַה are to be deleted.—n. 73 regarding the prohibition of the niece comp. now Shechter, *Documents*, I, p. XXXVII and the sources cited there.—n. 74 מַה מַע כְּנֶה is not “certainty” but a frequent expression for “doubt” among Karaite authors (see Pinsker, p. 216; Hadassi, for example, uses it also as verb: כְּנֶה פֶּרֶס הַלַּעֲלַה, for Saul doubted; see Gottlober, *A. J. A.* 40, 1946, p. 216 below).—n. 106 read: דֶּרֶךְ מַע כְּנֶה מַע כְּנֶה.—n. 118, the text is correct here.—n. 144 correct also here: מַע דֶּרֶךְ מַע כְּנֶה, “from his law.”

Despite the foregoing strictures acknowledgement is due both editors for their editions, and it to be hoped the unpublished parts may soon become accessible to scholars.

Warsaw

Samuel Poznański
PERSONIFICATIONS OF SOUL AND BODY

A STUDY IN JUDAEO-ARABIC LITERATURE

BY HENRY MALTER, DROPSIE COLLEGE

JUDAEO-ARABIC authors are very fond of variously personifying the human body and soul, both separately and in their relations to one another. The instances are so numerous, the sources from which the various personifications are to be collected so widely scattered, and the aspects under which they were conceived so manifold, that the writer, working without a sufficient library, must at once surrender his ambition of giving an exhaustive study on the subject. Aside from some casual remarks, no attempt has hitherto been made at gathering and grouping the material according to some principle. The following may be taken as a modest beginning in this direction.

The subject is closely connected with the general idea that the universe and man are parallel; that whatever is found in the world without, in the macrocosm, is reflected or finds its counterpart also in the man, the microcosm. This doctrine is very old, being traceable not only to Pythagoras and Plato (Munk, Guide, I, 354, n. 1), but also to the oldest Babylonian literature (Hugo Winckler, Die babylonische Kultur, Leipzig 1902, p. 33). The Talmuds and Midrashim afford numerous instances of analogies

1 See this Review, 1911, p. 459, n. 12, 471, n. 42. A preceding study belonging to p. 457, n. 10, is soon to appear elsewhere.
between parts of the universe and of the human body; see particularly [Avot Rabbah 19], ed. Schechter, c. 31 and the references given there. For several years I have been collecting material on this subject in mediaeval Hebrew literature, and hope to treat it elsewhere. Here I limit myself to the analogy between soul and body without regard to the idea of microcosm.

The oldest instance of personification of soul and body in Jewish literature is, to my knowledge, the passage in b. Nedarim 32b. The "little city, and few men within it" (Eccl. 9, 14-16) is interpreted there as signifying the human body and its limbs, the "great king," who builds bulwarks against the city, is the evil spirit (ין הרוח), and the "poor wise man," who delivers it by his wisdom, yet is remembered by no one, is the good spirit (ייעד נביא). The same interpretation is given by the Targum and Midrash Kohel. rab. on the verses referred to; comp. Bahya, Duties, V, 5, near beginning; Zohar, Yetzirah, III, 234b-235b; Samuel Ibn Tibbon, הפילוסוף, Pressburg 1837, p. 92.

Very ingenious is the metaphor employed in b. Sanhedrin 91a (occurring also in Lev. rab, c. 4, § 5, and Tanhuma, section אושרו) to express the relation between soul and body. They are both compared to two men, one lame, the other blind, who, when called to account for the despoliation of the king's garden which they were appointed to watch, denied the deed on the ground of their physical disabilities. The king, however, placed the lame man on the shoulders of the blind one and demonstrated to them the way in which they had jointly committed the crime. The application is to the flesh and the spirit. When soul and body are arraigned before the Almighty they disown responsibility for their sins in this world. The soul alleges
that it had not the physical organs for committing sin, the body contends that without initiative from the soul it was incapable of any action. God thereupon reunites body and soul and metes out punishment to both together. This beautiful parable found its way also among the Arabs. The "Brethren of Purity," a humanistic society of Arab philosophers of the tenth century, reproduce the story with various embellishments characteristic of these Mohammedan writers and their fondness for vivid imagery. The Arabic superscription of the parable is "Al-Hindi," the Hindoo, thus declaring it to be of Hindoo origin. Steinschneider, however, cites various instances, where Arabic Hindi, Hebrew ידה, and Latin Indus are errors for Yahudi, יהודי, and Judeus (mediaeval spelling), and believes this to be the case also here. The Arabs received the parable from the Jews, not from the Hindoos, as the latter are not known to have applied it to soul and body. This hypothesis is not acceptable. A quotation from Richard Garbe's "Die Sämkhya-Philosophie" (1894), p. 164, (taken from Kārikā 21), kindly communicated to me by Professor George F.

---


3 Il libro di Sidrach, Rome 1872, p. 8, n. 2: "almeno non mi e noto che questa favola fosse applicata dagli Indiani all’ anima ed al corpo"; comp. Hebr. Bibliographie, XIII, 31, especially his posthumous work Rangstreit-Literatur, in Sitzungsbd. d. philos. hist. Klasse d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, CLV (1908), No. IV, p. 58-60, where the question of the origin of the parable is more thoroughly discussed and also some Hindoo parallels quoted. In a recent work, The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and Soul by Louise Dudley (Bryn Mawr College Monograph Series, vol. VIII), the learned authoress, over-anxious to prove her thesis, sees in all her material but Coptic and old Egyptian elements. Her general conclusions (p. 149, against Linow and Steinschneider; comp. also p. 160), as the passage from Garbe’s work shows, are not at all conclusive. The present article, however, was already under print when the above dissertation came to my knowledge, which precludes a discussion in detail.
Moore, proves that the ascription is correct and that the Arabs took the parable from the Hindoos. The passage translated reads as follows:

"The relation between brute creative matter and the spiritual, but inactive, soul is compared to the alliance between the blind and the lame man. Finding themselves hopelessly entangled in a thicket, one took the other on his shoulders and both reached safety. The lame man is the soul. It has the power of vision, but according to the doctrine of the Sāmkhyya-system it can neither move nor act. The blind man is matter. It has the power of movement, and executes all of the world’s actions, but it neither sees nor comprehends."

Through what channels the idea came into the Talmud, I am unable to say. The Brethren of Purity, or the "Noble Friends," as they also call themselves at times, could hardly have had any knowledge of the Talmud, since

* I use the translation "Brethren of Purity," which is commonly met with in the works of European writers, especially those of Dieterici, who has edited and translated into German most of their writings. The real meaning of the arabic 'I’hwan es-Safa is, as Goldziher (Muhammadische Studien, I. 9, n. 1, and more particularly in the periodical "Der Islam," Strassburg 1910, I. 22-26) has proved, "The True Friends"; comp. Steinschneider, JQR., XVII, 581 (357). In Hebrew literature they are mostly referred to by some general epithet, as החברים (ת’יז”), סמך, זכר וברכתי; comp. for instance Moses Ibn Ezra, in the periodical עשת, II, 120, l. 8 from bottom, with Dieterici, Anthropologie, p. 1. 110 f.; see also below, note 32. Falguera is to my knowledge the only author, who, in בקשת, 20b, 45a, top, refers to them as אחיו החברים והברכים וה([...), corresponding to the Arabic אחיו המוחל והحرص הקאמ (‘I’hwan es-Safâ, ed. Dieterici, p. 624, top); comp. also בקשת, 45b. Joseph Albo, Ḥakkerim, III, and one of the versions of Maimonides’ Letter to Samuel Ibn Tibbon (Leipzig 1859, p. 28d) quote by the Arabic כבזם התשובה ורחמים, comp. Kaufmann, Attributenlehre, 336, and Horovitz’ Introduction to Ibn Ḡaddik’s י国网 ת før, VII, n. 31, 32.
there was no Jew in their ranks. Be that as it may they
have been more than generous in their return to the Jews
for what they have taken from the latter. For Jewish
literature abounds in instances of allegories of soul and
body, nearly all of which are taken directly or indirectly
from the works of these humanists. As there is no other
principle to guide us in the arrangement of the following
quotations, they may be grouped historically according to
the authors in whose works they first occur.

In the *Apophthegms* of the Arab Honein b. Ishāk (died
873) *Hippocrates is credited with the sentence: 'sv r6yo
tr»DWDW main nbyoa eyittibn, "the intellect is to the body
as the light is to the eye." This comparison is very fre-
quently met with in the works of Arabic as well as Jewish
authors.

So Avicenna (died 1038) which expresses the same idea.* In a work
of Al-Fārābi (died 950) the comparison is made not with
reference to the human soul or intellect in general, but to
the "active" intellect in particular: blKfiJO SjnenWn Dm
mtnn JO CDETi BIV. Similarly Al-Gazzāli (died 1111),
*Ethics*, 151, 155. In the work mphr tton, attributed to
Ibn Gabirol, at the end of bearr tton, the sentence reads:
Most of the He-
brew authors, drawing a line between the soul (נש) and

* Translated into Hebrew by Judah Al-Harizi under the title »1D1D
* Haneberg, Zur Erkenntnisslehre von Ibn Sina und Albertus Magnus,
Munich 1866, p. 66, § 9; see also Avicenna's Compendium of Psychology
published by Landauer, ZDMG., XXIX, 371, 1. 5.
* The passage is quoted by Hillel b. Samuel (thirteenth century), in
םבכשד הטקס, published by H. Filipowski in סנ, Leipzig 1849,
I, 5. The passage is quoted by Shem Tob Palquera, תו, 76, and by Shem Tob Palquera, תו, 15, who does not
mention Al-Fārābi's work.
the intellect ( Ivb ), carry the simile to both.8 The sentence occurs in its original Arabic form in an anonymous Arabic commentary on Canticles.9 Without mentioning any source the author simply says: 1ro rll ] r p > 6 t e 6 ll e , t e o 6 e . The origin of this comparison is Aristotle's De Anima, II, 1.10

Very frequent is another comparison, likewise of Aristotelian origin,11 following which the soul is a craftsman and the body the tool of his trade. Saadia is here the first Jewish author to make use of this idea, when he says in reference to the soul: שד מה א מ ת נ ל ע ל מ ה ח ה ש יש ישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישו ה ל מ ה ל מ ה שישо

With the Brethren of Purity this comparison has

8 See e. g. Joseph Ibn 'Akkīn, 'Alīn, 103, 174, top, and in Leipzīg 1859, II, 45b; Simon Duran, Talmud, 196, 80b, 83b.
9 Steinschneider's Festschrift, 53, bottom.
10 בֵּי הֵנְסִיקָה מִלּוֹבָד וּלְמִלְּלֵי [l. אֶנְטֵלוּחֵי אֶשְׁנָא].
11 387 בֵּי הֵנְסִיקָה מִלּוֹבָד וּלְמִלְּלֵי [l. אֶנְטֵלוּחֵי אֶשְׁנָא].
12 Zeller, l. c. In the so-called Pseudo-Theology of Aristotle it is repeatedly asserted in the name of the "divine philosopher" Plato that the soul is the real man and the body only the latter's instrument; see the Arabic text, edited by Dieterici, Leipzīg 1882, p. 120 (German translation, 122), 149.
13 387 בֵּי הֵנְסִיקָה מִלּוֹבָד וּלְמִלְּלֵי [l. אֶנְטֵלוּחֵי אֶשְׁנָא].
14 So Ibn Saddīk, 'Alīn, 387, bottom, 75, l. 8: בַּלַּעַת בַּלַּעַת מִלּוֹבָד וּלְמִלְּלֵי [l. אֶנְטֵלוּחֵי אֶשְׁנָא]. (comp. Horovitz, Psychologie, 177, n. 95); Judah Halevi, Kusari, II, 26; Maimonides, Ma'amorot, near beginning: בַּלַּעַת בַּלַּעַת מִלּוֹבָד וּלְמִלְּלֵי [l. אֶנְטֵלוּחֵי אֶשְׁנָא]. (comp. Goldziher, Kitāb ma'ānī al-nafs, 48).
15 387 בַּלַּעַת בַּלַּעַת מִלּוֹבָד וּלְמִלְּלֵי [l. אֶנְטֵלוּחֵי אֶשְׁנָא]. (comp. Goldziher, Kitāb ma'ānī al-nafs, 48); Palquera, יומָכי 3, c. 3; the anonymous author of the commentary on
become almost a habit. They exploit the thought from every possible point of view, even to the extent of making it trivial."

The works of the Brethren of Purity are the chief source also for numerous parables on body and soul. Thus they are compared to a king and his palace, the governor and his province, the mayor and the city, or the house (body) and its inmate, similes which are in turn worked out with minute detail, with points of comparison carried to extremes. A few instances will suffice to illustrate the method. On one occasion where body and soul are compared to the house and its occupants the head is likened to the attic of the house, the eyes and ears are peep-holes, the throat is the corridor, the lungs are the summer-palace, the heart, with its natural warmth, the winter-palace, the stomach is the kitchen, mouth and lips are door and doorposts, the teeth are watchmen, and the tongue is the chamberlain. Where comparison deals with loftier personages each character is given a train of attendants. Thus in the instance in which the soul or the intellect is made the king, the five faculties of the mind, called the “inner” senses,²⁴ become his ministers, the five physical (or “outer”) senses are his soldiers, the ears are the messengers, who bring the


²⁴ See Dieterici, Anthropologie, 5-9, 17, 43, 128; Die Lehre von der Weltseele, 91 f. (Arabic text, ed. Dieterici, 513 f.); comp. also Al-Gazzālī, Ethics, 38: "لا يعلم الروادب:"

²⁵ Al-Fārābī appears to have been the first to introduce a distinction between outer and inner senses: the "حس الظاهرة والباطنة"; see his 'Uyūn al-maṣdū'a, c. 20, apud Schmoelders, Documenta Philosophiae Arabum, Bonn 1836, p. 23. By “inner” senses are understood those functions of the soul or
news to the king, the hands are his servants, and so on." This simile is not original with the Brethren of Purity. It was used earlier, in less detail however, by Al-Fārābī in a treatise on the soul." An interesting parallel to this simile appears in Avicenna's Compendium of Psychology, ZDMG., XXIX, 353: "This presentation is made use of intellect which, according to the opinion of the Arabs, are performed without the assistance of any of the five "outer," bodily senses, as apperception, imagination, cogitation, and retention. The Arabic philosophers differ as to the number of these functions, Al-Fārābī counting four, while our authors, as well as later writers, enumerate five. There is, moreover, much disagreement as to the single functions which are to be included in this number. We are here not concerned, however, in these particulars. For a detailed discussion see Kaufmann, Die Theologie des Bachja, 12-15. Medieval Hebrew authors followed their Arabic masters in all these points. Kaufmann, Sinne, 46 ff., gives a long list of Hebrew authors discussing the functions of the intellect, to which many more can be added. So Dunash b. Tamim (10th century), commentary on Yezirah, London 1902, p. 64; Palqueria, 121, c. 12, 18; Aaron b. Elijah, introduction to the Midrashim, 11, 18; Meir Aldabi, Warsaw 1887, p. 141, col. b (taken from the Shenker of Gerson b. Solomon, Rödelheim 1801, 76, top); Simon Duran, 316 b, 326; Isaac Abrabanel, 21, and others. For the functions of the intellect, which is also found in Arabic sources, so in the works of the Brethren of Purity, ed. Dieterici, 209, bottom. The poet Immanuel of Rome uses "the functions of the intellect" (Maqāma 18, ed. Lemberg 1870, p. 132 b). Berechiah ha-Nakdan, London 1902, p. 52, 146, uses "the functions of understanding." 14 See Dieterici, Anthropologie, 5 ff., 17, 43, 128, especially 53, 56; Weltseele, 33, 46 f., 109 f.; comp. Naturanschauung, 83, Microcosmos, 72, 80.

15 Translated into Hebrew by Zerahiah b. Isaac (1280) under the title "ת persecuted חומץ קָנָה, Königsberg 1836, p. 484; comp. Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, 295 f.

16 See the German translation of Landauer, ib., 391, n. 14, and the parallel, Dieterici, Anthropologie, 35.
This imagery proved a source of inspiration also to the poets of the Synagogue. In discussing some liturgical productions containing similar figures, Steinschneider says with reference to the passage just cited: "For this beautiful description of the human body the Synagogue is indebted to Gazzali." The passage inspired him to a material imitation given below.

Die Augen sind die Führer,
Die Ohren die Kassirer,
Die Zunge ist der Dragoman,
Die Hände Flügelmänner,

---

19 Ib., p. 40; see the many similar pictures, often highly poetical, in the tenth chapter of the work, out of which the following two sentences may be quoted here, as they belong to our subject proper. The one, p. 63, reads: "The sense of comprehension and perception consisting of the outer and inner senses are like soldiers etc.; comp. Lev. rab. 4, § 4; see also Tholuck, Blühtensammlung aus der morgenländischen Mystik, 213; E. H. Plumptre, Ecclesiastes, 12, 3, p. 213 f.

20 Magasin für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1876, p. 191, note.
Jewish philosophers, nurtured in the literature of the Arabs, naturally followed the same line of thought. Thus Bahya Ibn Pakuda's masterful description of the human body as a palace with the intellect as its royal resident attended to by a splendid staff of servants, agrees in its main features, as also in many details, with that of the Brethren of Purity. Abraham Ibn Ezra is another instance of prominent Hebrew authors who took delight in portraying soul and body in Arabic fashion. In Judah Halevi's symbolical description of the Tabernacle and the sacrificial cult (Kuzari, II, 26) "King Intellect" (אינטלקט)

To this category of similes in which the soul always appears as a sovereign with the body as its royal quarters,

**Steinschneider first called attention to Judah Halevi's dependence upon Avicenna, see Hebr. Bibliogr., X, 57, n. 2. Landauer, ZDMG., XXIX, 335 ff., proved it in detail; comp. Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, 18, n. 121; Kaufmann, Theologie des Bachja, 12, n. 4.**


**Horovitz, Psychologie, 174, n. 83, 177, n. 91.**
belongs also the comparison of the soul to a captain steering a vessel (body), a thought that can be traced back to Plato. Here again the Brethren, true to their method, spin a long yarn (see Dieterici, *Macrocosmos*, 107-110), contriving a variety of supplementary analogies to complete the picture. Thus e.g. man's actions are compared to the merchandise with which the vessel is fraught, the world is the ocean, life is a voyage across the sea, death is the haven, and the hereafter is the home of the passengers, or the safe harbor, where captain and craft take their final rest (Dieterici, *Anthropologie*, 17, 43, 127).

It has been pointed out already by Steinschneider (*Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIII, 8) that the works of the Brethren have influenced also the Kabbalah. Thus we find the above simile applied in the *Zohar*, *Exod.*, section לְוָי, 199. The prophet Jonah's going on board of a ship is allegorized as the human soul entering the body. The name Jonah (from יָנוּה = to deceive) is applied to the soul, which is deceived into a calamitous association with the body. "And the ship was like to be broken" (Jonah, I, 4) is taken as an allusion to the frailty of the human body, constantly threatened by the storms of life. The lengthy exposition of the *Zohar* was translated literally into Hebrew and made part of a later Midrash on the book of Jonah. The metaphor is

الجسد كالفناء والنفس كالملاحم والأعمال كالدمامة للقبح والدنيا كالبحر والموت كالساحل والدار الآخرة كديمه القبض والله تعالى كالملك الجبار هناك.

In Jellinek's *Bet ha-Midrasch*, I, 103 f.; comp. Jellinek, ib., p. XIX. For the Aramaic of the Zohar I quote a part of the passage of the Hebrew translation of the Midrash.
very frequently met with in the works of philosophic writers. So Ibn ‘Aknin, קוזין נשדות החבש, II, 45א: השלומים שנין טריך... החום ישיבון נשדות בלשון כמי בר תוהוב כים אוה שלמות הפשיטה... הנשמה מים ידרים. The same, but more elaborately, he says in his ספר נשדות, 173. The whole discussion of Ibn ‘Aknin in the קובץ is found almost verbally in Palquera’s ספר נשדות, c. 3, a work which is wholly based on Avicenna’s Compendium of Psychology mentioned before. פלקרא uses the metaphor also in c. 15 of the same work as also in some of his other works. The Italian author Hillel b. Samuel (thirteenth century), הקראיתAaron b. Elijah (fourteenth century), and the Christian scholastic Thomas Aquinas quote it in the name of Plato.

See Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, 18, n. 122b and p. 989, No. 5.

See his אנרכי ההלכות, JQR., 1910, p. 471, where the simile is quoted as a משל קוצנים, by which the Brethren of Purity are to be understood; see above, note 4; comp. also זר זיון, Hanau 1716, p. 14a-16b, and Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibliogr., XIII, 30.

The editor wrongly ascribes the treatise to Ibn Gabirol; see Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, 22, n. 144. Prof. Louis Ginzberg communicates to me the following passage from the רזונים of Joshua Ibn Shu‘aib (fourteenth century), section ראזון, ed. Constantinople 1523, fol. 27, col. c.: עבצב גברל... הנשמות בחכמה בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנשמות בחכמה... הנ睡前 only proves hereby that he was not well-informed on the subject. For pseudo-Bahya and others see Goldziher, Kitâb, 50. The quotation there from Bahya b. Asher’s commentary on Genesis fully agrees with the passage in Ibn ‘Aknin’s ספר נשדות, 173, referred to above.
Somewhat similar to the above group of metaphors is the one in which the soul is conceived of as a rider and the body as the steed. The world appears here as a race-track, on which the wise are the winners. The same simile is used by Al-Gazzâli, Ethics, 156:

Elsewhere in the same work (p. 134) he compares the body to a chariot which conveys the soul to its celestial abode:

A metaphor found very frequently also in the writings of Avicenna. Among Jewish writers mention may here be made of the anonymous authors of the Kitâb ma‘âni al-nafs and of the fragmentary commentary on Canticles referred to above. Shem Tob Palquera says:

Very remarkable in this connection is a passage in a later Midrash in which the Messianic verse 

\[ \text{verse in question} \]

is applied to the heart as the organ in which the soul resides. For details on this matter see Kaufmann, Sinne, 63, n. 70.

Steinschneider's Festschrift, 58, bottom.

(Zech. 9, 9) is interpreted as a reference to the poor soul riding the body. The original source of this group of similes is Plato's Phaedo.

The spirit of mediaeval gloom and asceticism manifests itself in another group of metaphors in which the body is likened to a prison or dungeon, a grave from which the soul escapes only at the moment of death, an unburied corpse carried on a bier by the soul. Again the body is an idolater, a heretic, a hypocrite, a fool, Satan, devil, a courtesan, with whom the soul, an inexperienced stranger...
in this world, is brought in contact, who takes advantage of the stranger's inexperience and by her demoralizing power brings him to ruin." All this found expression also in Jewish mediæval literature. To collect all passages bearing on the subject would be a tiresome and unprofitable task. Bahya Ibn Pakuda's *Exhortation* (ה lỗi ) alone contains nearly all the epithets of the body enumerated above, while the famous moralizing *Examen Mundi* (הובחת ) of Jedaiah ha-Penini offers a still richer collection of such terms. The figures of the prison, grave, corpse, and the like, which occur frequently also in the works of Philo, were a favorite with the liturgical poets."

There is another category of metaphors intimately related to those under discussion. The Arabs as well as the Jews often substitute the world for the body. Thus the world, too, aside from being represented as an ocean
and as a race-track (see above) it is also spoken of as a
courtesan," a prison," a fortress, a workshop," a harvest-
field, where death is the reaper," and a shaky bridge." 
Jewish literature bristles with parallels." Sometimes the
authors conceive also of the soul as a spiritual world, or,
the world to come, and then soul and body appear as two
opposed worlds, or, in a bolder figure, as two women-rivals.

An Arabic proverb quoted by O. Bardenhewer, Hermetis Trismi-
gisti...de castigatione animae, Bonn 1873, p. 28, reads:

"The world is a prostitute,
one day she is with a spice-dealer,
another with a horse-healer" (baijar = veterinarian).

Comp. Dieterici, Anthropologie, 144.
148 ibaid, 449; Dieterici, Weltsesel, 30.
154 Dieterici, Anthropologie, 43, 127 f.; comp. ibaid, 457:

الننس كالمراح
والجسد كالنزوعة والأعمال كالحب والشر والموت كالحصاد والآخرة
كاليدام.

Some references are given by Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibliogr., IX, 169,
top, XIII, 12 f., 30 f. The eighth chapter of the text begins with
the words: "אכ" ת"ו ו"ו ... והם י"ו ו"ו בנו"ו וי"ו; comp. Chotzner,
JQR., VIII, 419; Palquera, that the whole text begins with ש
ם, 
ם, 
ם, 
ם, and Ibn Hisdai, in his commentary on 
ם, 
ם, 
ם. The latter sentence is quoted
also in ידוע, ed. Hanau 1716, p. 70, top, and by Moses Ibn Habib
in his commentary on ידוע, בהוזה עלשה, 339.
who constantly quarrel with one another. So Gazzâli, *Ethics*, 157:  

Duties, VIII, 3, beginning of the 25th Meditation. Bahya's dependence upon Gazzâli has been proved by A. S. Yahuda, see Goldziher, *RBJ.*, 1904, p. 154 ff.  


Moses. Ibn Ḥabib, 260, bottom, drew, according to Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIII, 30, n. 12, upon Ibn Ḥisdai. Ibn Ḥabib's version, however, is somewhat different (מָכָם נַשְׁלְכִין וּאֵלֶּה תַּשְׁמִית נַחֲטָא). The sentence is quoted also by Samuel Ḥimḥi (1346); see Steinschneider, *ib.*, p. 106.

The ed. pr., Brescia 1491, and ed. Lemberg 1870, p. 149, bottom, have erroneously read שֶׁיַּחְפִּיקוּ שְׁאָרִים which is the reading of ed. Constantinople. Saul b. Simon who first published Palquera's *צְרִי הַבּוֹנָה* (Cremona 1557) and claims to have reproduced its contents from memory (see this Review, 1910, p. 173, n. 42) has embodied in his memory numerous passages from Immanuel's work. Thus the whole lengthy passage in Immanuel's *Makāmas*, from which the above sentences are taken, is reproduced literally, with a few omissions, in the *צְרִי הַבּוֹנָה*, ed. Hanau 7a. There, too, the reading is שֶׁיַּחְפִּיקוּ. The work ought to be republished from the original MS. found in the collection of the late David Kaufmann.
ing, of course, as the better of the two. Immediately before the sentence just quoted Ibn Hisdai quotes the saying of a wise man that this world is the paradise of the wicked and the prison of the righteous: אמאר ה OpenFileDialog. This, too, is found in the works of Al-Gazzâli and Immanuel. Joseph Ibn Saddik, who is also to be mentioned here, has בואמה: נאמר ועל עולם שאוה בות הגרים לפי נגד העולם. Ibn Hisdai is also the source for Immanuel’s נורשיםアクセ本当に חשה. In ימם הימים, i.e., the sentence reads: עם עולם זה קורשים עולם הבא.

The Arabic Humanists often conceive of the body also as a covering, as the outside protection of something more precious that is placed within. Thus they frequently compare the soul in the body to an embryo in the mother’s womb, the chick in the egg, the pearl in the shell, or the

---

*Comp. Dukes, Beiträge, II, 103, addition to p. 56 (in Steinschneider’s Hebr. Obersetzungen, 867, n. 117, erroneously “36”), who refers to a similar conception in the Hitopadesa.*

*The Brethren of Purity attribute the sentence to the Prophet; see Dieterici, Anthropologie, 144; Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibliogr., XIII, 13, n. 8.*

*The older editions have corrupted ירדわ for ישפי ורדה, while ed. Lemberg, 149, bottom, has ישפני ורדה which gives no sense at all.*

*So also in בור ירחונ, l. c.*

*In this form the sentence was made use of by Ibn Habib, l. c. 22 a, top, where, however, the word ירחונ and, perhaps, also a reference to the source were omitted in print, rendering the passage unintelligible; see ib., 33 b (see above, p. 469, note 56) where two other sentences taken from Ibn Hisdai are introduced by וכן אמר (ובאמרו) וה🏳️‍🌈 במשכילו.*
man in the garment." The comparison of the soul with an embryo is not merely the creation of a fertile imagination but part of a well defined system. According to these authors, when the individual soul is sent down from heaven, where she was at one with the universal soul, to join the human body, she is made to forget the wisdom that was hers in the former abode. She must now regain it

That the soul is deprived of her previous knowledge when entering this world is taught already in the Talmud, Niddah 30b: י"ע י' ש"ליאל פ'מה: ור"ש י' ש"ליאל פ'מה... ור"ש י' ש"ליאל פ'מה ליבגי ליבגי... ור"ש י' ש"ליאל פ'מה ליבגי ליבגי. The anonymous author of the Kitāb ma'āni al-nafs, who wrote under the influence of the Brethren of Purity, refers very often to this passage in support of this (Platonic) theory; comp. Goldziher's notes on pp. 28, 56, 62 of that work, where numerous
through her own efforts in her earthly career. At the outset of her career on earth she, therefore, resembles the embryonic soul awaiting development and perfection. The embryonic soul, in virtue of her divine origin, naturally seeks to repossess herself of the lost treasures of wisdom and grandeur, which she can accomplish only through constant application to study and search after truth (αὐτάρκης). Here, however, she meets with the stubborn resistance of her earthly companion. In his low passions and desires he tries to divert her from the right path and to drag her into the mire of worldly pleasures. If she is strong enough to withstand the temptations and subdues the enemy, making him subservient to her higher aims, she fulfills her mission on earth, and on the day of death, departing from the body, she returns to her celestial home, where, in reward of her long struggles and sufferings, she is admitted to the galaxy of angels that surround the throne of God. The death of the body is, therefore, the birth of the soul, the final act in the evolution from embryo to full maturity. If, on the other hand, the soul yields to the seductions of the body, neglects her higher duties, and indulges in sensual desires, she has failed in the purpose for which she was sent. On departing from the body she is denied admittance

parallels from Arabic sources are given, to which the Pseudo-Theology of Aristotle, edited by Dieterici, Leipzig 1882, p. 95 f., may be added; see also the work יְהָ֥חֵלָנִּים, part III, c. 2, ed. Warsaw 1876, p. 42; Jellinek, בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ, I, 154.

Gazzâli who did not care much for the Brethren of Purity and once stigmatized them as the lowest class of philosophic popularizers (comp. Goldziher, REJ., XLIX, 160), labors under the same conceptions. In his Ethics, 219, he clearly says: תִּתְנָה הָאָדָם הָאֱלֹהִים; comp. the long parable in Palquera's שְׁכַנָּה, 45, and Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, 40, n. 281.
to the heavenly spheres and doomed to eternal wanderings
between heaven and earth."

These ideas are not original with the Brethren of Purity. They are of common occurrence in Neo-Platonic
literature. Various Jewish writers, some even older than
the authors of the Encyclopaedia, move along the same
lines. What is of special interest to us here is that even
the similes themselves, peculiar as they are, were made
use of by Jewish writers. Thus in Bahya's Duties, III.
9, we read: 'והמומר בשלא תמד נהלז
בכללוות בין שני המאורים' which is literally the same as quoted above from the works
of the 'Ihwān.' For the contrast of schoolboy and school
I do not know of any direct parallel in Jewish literature."
The underlying idea, however, namely that the soul was

9 The thought is also familiar in the Talmud; comp. Shabbat 152b: 'אלווהים
והשקטתו של דברי נבואה נגזרות התשובה נושא הבכרה...ESH שימי
ומתת הולכות (לולא אויר הוא זמר בזני היגהぬלמה) אשר זמר זָמָה צוilan
וכללוויות השמיה של זה (וז); comp. also Sifre, 40, קוזה, 139; Kohel. rab.,
3. 21; Saadia, Emunot, ed. Cracow, 137 (whose version of the passage agrees
more with Abot dirabbi Nathan, c. 12), and especially Goldziher, Kitāb, 53 f.;
notes on pp. 65, 66, who quotes also Isaac Israeli (end of ninth century)
and passages from the Zohar. See also Schorr, ידיעות, VIII, 19. The last
pages of Ibn Saddik's Jb BzJ' are devoted to the presentation of this theory;
see Horovitz, Psychologie, 198 ff. It should be noticed that in "קנ"ב
לעלקין קפוץ שלכוס יש" the views are expounded by the Dervish to the docile Prince.
Jedaiah, c. 14 (משהיתו מתקבלים יושר בקולות מרבית הדורות
ל_DRIVE) may also be referred to; comp. Ibn Habīb, ad locum. The
whole matter is closely connected with the theory of the pre-mundane existence
of the soul; comp. Ginzberg, Die Haggada bei den Kirchenwärtern, Berlin
1900, p. 23, 36; Goldziher, l. c., 49.

11 See the Arabic text just quoted; Dieterici, Anthropologie, 17, 44.
126.

12 For the metaphor man and garment see above, p. 463, note 26, the
quotation from Falquera's סקֵכָב and p. 465, note 35, the quotation from
חברה מגדת (Aquinas).
sent down to this world for study and introspection, so as to merit by her own efforts the reward that is intended for her in the world to come, is taught also by Jewish philosophers."

Of a more general character is the conception of the body as a cloud obstructing the light of the sun (soul)" and can be met with in various forms also in the works of Jewish authors." Special emphasis was laid on the personification of the soul as a dove which is ensnared in the mazes of the body." A similar idea is expressed by the author of the commentary on Canticles, in Steinschneider's Festschrift, texts, p. 50, l. 6 from below: The soul is comparable to a dove which is placed between a peacock that is above her and a raven that is under her, the latter pulling her repeatedly downward and the former upward."

In conclusion it must be stated that while in nearly all the instances discussed above the Jewish authors appear to have followed Arabic models, there is a considerable number of metaphors scattered in haggadic and midrashic"

---

19 The authors are too numerous to be quoted. Saadia expounds this idea in the fourth chapter of his Emunot; comp. Horovitz, Psychologie, 45 f., particularly Goldziher, Kitab, 47 f.

20 Dieterici, Anthropologie, 131 f.

21 Comp. Bahya, Duties, VIII, 3, 14th Meditation: which is entirely in the style of the 'Ishma'; the commentary on Canticles, l. c., 50, l. 8, from bottom, 56, l. 14 ff.; Pseudo-Emepdocles in Kaufmann's Studien über Solomon Ibn Gabirol, 22, top:

22 Discussed by Goldziher, Kitab, 49 f.; Der Islam, I, 25. The simile quoted above, p. 464, note 30, is conceived under another aspect and does not belong here.

23 Comp. Kohel. rab. 2, 14, § 2.

24 See Levit. rab., 4, § 8.
literature, which seem to have originated with the Jews. A collection of these similes, however, was not within the scope of the present article. Only a few that bear some semblance to similes treated already may be pointed out in passing. Thus in *Levit. rab.*, 34, § 3, it is reported of Hillel that when he left his disciples he used to say that he is going to attend to his guest in the house. On being asked whether he is troubled with guests every day he answered, Is not that poor soul a guest in the body? to-day she is here, to-morrow she may be gone."

Medieval authors often allude to the soul as a bird kept prisoner in a cage or flying about seeking rest. A similar conception is found already in Sanh. 92a, *Levit. rab.*, 4, § 5: "The Kabbalists designate the

This passage bears strong resemblance to the popular sentence ויהי בכל הז medida, which occurs in *Nebiim* 56, c. 16, and, curiously enough, also in a later Midrash; see Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrasch*, I, 23, and Buber, *Abil M'aor*.

Possibly it is this conception of the soul as a bird that underlies Ezekiel 13, 18-21; see Dudley (as above, note 4), p. 29, n. 25, and especially Steinschneider, *Rasssrecht-Literatur*, 58, n. 1, who considers this conception as the basis for the custom to open a window at the moment of a person's death, so that the soul may fly out. Prof. Ginzberg refers me to the Midrash on Psalms, ed. Buber, p. 102: הקיה ידוהי יוהי השם ויהי אשתו ויהי נשמיה ידוהי השם ויהי נשמיה. Here the soul appears as a kind of flying locust, or a grasshopper, a figure which may be of Greek origin; see e.g. Plato's *Phaedrus*, 248 E; Pseudo-Theology of Aristotle, 10, Dieterici's German translation, 198. The Greek πτερόν means also butterfly, which, because of its rising from the larva, may have been taken as a symbol of life and immortality. The Kabbalist Eleazar of Worms (thirteenth century) in his work דמתשא עלרא, which was published anonymously (Lemberg 1876), refers to this Midrash by citation; see ib., 1d (משה תיתא) and 6b. The work, to which Prof. Schechter called my attention, is a fantastic glorification of the soul, interspersed with kabbalistic mysteries which yield but little for our purpose; comp. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XVII, 53; Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, V, 198.
souls as “holy birds that fly about chirping and praying for the holy people of Israel.” Thus the *Zohar* in a lengthy exposition on the subject (section בַּלֵּךְ, p. 392) interprets the verse נַפְרֵי מֶשָּׁא הָבָת (Ps. 84, 4) as referring to the souls of the righteous that find shelter in the most hidden palace of the divine presence which is called קַן צָרָה. On certain days of the year, particularly in the months of Nisan and Tishri, these souls leave their holy retreat every morning and, fluttering above the various divisions of paradise, praise the Lord and pray for the life of all mankind. Jedaiah ha-Penini, בָּהֲנַת בָּשָׂע, c. 15 says: зָה יָאָר בָּשָׂע מָכָר הָלַבְּדוּת סְיָסוּת בָּיָה וָחָוָד, and Zerahiah ha-Yewani, מְסָא, c. 12 beginning: מַנְעַת מְכִינֶת מַכּוֹן שַׁבִּית וְחָכִית. The metaphor was common, however, also among the Arabs. The historian

---

*Hanhass compositions.* The metaphor is used in Jewish and Arab literature. For example, Jedaiah ha-Penini, בָּהֲנַת בָּשָׂע, c. 15 says: מַנְעַת מְכִינֶת מַכּוֹן שַׁבִּית וְחָכִית. The metaphor was common, however, also among the Arabs. The historian

---

*An epigram in* לוֹחַ תַּנָּא, c. 5, end, reads: מִי חַיָּה תַּנָּא נָזֵר כָּרָדָה וְהָדָר, but this is perhaps only an allusion to Ps. 124, 7.
Al-Mas'udi relates of the pre-Islamitic Arabs that they believed the soul was a bird living in the human body, and that when a person dies the soul continues to flutter about the grave and to bewail the death of its former companion.

Highly poetical is the portraiture of man as a lamp enkindled by the Torah which is a spark of God, the body representing here the wick, while the soul is compared to the oil. So Jedaiah, l. c., c. 15, beginning: The same metaphor is used by Zerahiah ha-Yewani, c. 5, as the sixth of his proofs for reward and punishment in the hereafter. Of a somewhat similar nature is the exposition of the author of the commentary on Canticles, who drew upon Mohammedan sources: "Know that the sperm in which the embryo assumes existence is to be compared to a wick and that the spirit is blown into the former just as the fire is communicated to the latter, so that the lamp burns; this

---

*Les Prairies d'or, III, 310; comp. Derenburg in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, VI, 298. The idea that the soul mourns over the dead body is common also in rabbinical literature; comp. b. Shabbat 152a, bottom, especially p. Yebamot, c. 16, § 3; see also ib. of Berechiah ha-Nafdan, edited by Gollancz, London 1902, p. 50.

*Comp. Shem Tob Ibn Shem Tob, the commentator of Maimonides' *Guide*, section end: יכ יתבמך רימ למש ... אלול ואריו שיאתיו, יתוד, רדוש; see also ib. יתוד, יתוד, יתוד, יתוד, יתוד, יתוד.

*For other similes of this author see ib., end of c. 1.
is what takes place when the soul joins the sperm at the time of coming into existence."

Bahya's representation of the evil spirit as a spider that spreads its network around the window gradually obstructing the light of the sun, and, likewise, his comparison of the soul with an unpolished metallic plate which becomes bright by friction, seem to be of Arabic origin, though I do not know the source at present.

Of doubtless Jewish origin is the symbolical description of the human body and its organs as paralleling the Tabernacle and its various vessels. Already in the New Testament the body is called tabernacle (II Cor. 5, 1, 4; Pet. 1, 13-14); Jewish mediæval authors took up the idea showing the correspondence in detail. The sources are rather numerous and require special treatment."

"Steinschneider Festschrift, 51, bottom; comp. Kusari, II, 26: "

so also Dûnâsh Ibn Tamim in his commentary on the book לְיָהֳלָה, London 1902, p. 71, bottom.

"Duties, VIII, 3, 14th Meditation; comp. b. Sukkah 52a.

"Ib., VIII, 4.

"See Kusari, II, 26 (comp. above p. 46a) and the reference given by Cassel (z) ad locum, p. 129; Abraham Ibn Ezra, on Exod., 26, 1, and especially Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, 997, n. 1. Some of the references in that note are misprinted. Numerous parallels between the vessels of the Tabernacle and organs of the human body will be found in the מְדִרשׁ תְרוּשָא, ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash, III, 175 f.
JEWISH-ARABIC STUDIES

By ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER, Jewish Theological Seminary of America

I. SHIITIC ELEMENTS IN JEWISH SECTARIANISM.*

1. THE RAJ‘A DOCTRINE

In discussing the rôle of the Messianic element in Islam, we have already had occasion to refer to the doc-

trine of *Raj’a* or “Return.” I revert to it now in order to point out the traces which this fundamental Shiitic tenet left in the dogmatic fabric of Jewish sectarianism.

*Raj’a* or “Return” is defined by the Arabic lexicographers as “the returning to the present state of existence after death, before the Day of Resurrection.” It is the belief in the returning to life of certain individuals and is sharply distinguished from resurrection which involves the returning to life of mankind in general. Originally the date set for the “return” of these individuals was forty days after their death. Gradually the time limit was extended and was vaguely fixed in the vast expanse between the moment of death and the day of resurrection. Without entering into the genesis and long-winded development of this remarkable doctrine, we may state that it appears very early in connection with various heterodox teachings clustering around the person of Christ. The *Raj’a* belief is, above all, closely connected with the ancient and widespread doctrine of Docetism which taught that the sufferings and death of Jesus did not take place in reality but were a mere ophthalmic delusion. Accordingly, Jesus’
death is not to be looked upon as the close of his earthly career but as a mere interruption of it, as a temporary disappearance. His condition after this fictitious martyrdom is not that of death, but a state of concealment, of occultation, or, to use the Arabic term, a mere gaiba, an absence. His appearance on earth to take up his interrupted mission and to carry it to triumph is, in consequence, a re-appearance, a “return.”

The influence of this set of conceptions, transmitted through the medium of some obscure heterodox Christian sect, manifests itself already in the beginnings of Islam. The dogma of Docetism, as applied to Jesus, is taught with great emphasis in the Koran and there is reason to believe that the Raj’a doctrine in its larger application was known to Mohammed and probably constituted the original form of the Messianic hope in Islam. In orthodox Islam, however, owing partly to political circumstances, partly to the influence of post-biblical Judaism, the Messianic speculations, which were gradually detached from the person of Jesus, assumed more and more an abstract and impersonal character and the Raj’a doctrine was pushed to the background.

The richer was the soil and the ampler the scope which this dogma found in Shiism. For in Shiism, whose very basis is Messianic, the Messianic hopes were not a mere dogmatic abstraction but an intense and immediate reality. They were not connected, as in orthodox Islam, with some ideal mysterious individuals, who in reality were rather types than individuals, but with definite and living person-

---

* Shiites, II, 28; AbS., I, 327.
* AbS., II, 2, n. 2.
* Sura III, 47-50; IV, 155-156. Comp. AbS., II, 2.
* Shiitic Elements, 195.
ages of flesh and bone, with ‘Alī or his descendants.” These ‘Alidic Mahdis or Messiahs, with scarcely an exception, failed of their purpose and they were ruthlessly persecuted and in most cases cruelly murdered by the governing powers. Here the doctrine of Raj’a and Docetism stepped in as the salvation of Shiism. Transferred from Jesus to the Shiitic Messiahs, it made their death ineffectual by denying its reality and saved the Shiites from disappointment and despair by teaching them to wait and to work for the speedy return of their living though hidden Mahdis. The Raj’a doctrine became of incalculable importance in that it detached the Messianic movements within Shiism which sprang from permanent sources and often involved large and vital issues, from the short-lived ‘Alidic figure-heads and rendered the progress of the cause independent of the fate of the fragile Messiahs. The death of the Mahdī which would otherwise have been identical with the death of the movement became a mere incident. Instead of being the close of the Messiah’s career, it became a stepping stone to his future glory and an auspicious indication that the Mahdī, having temporarily withdrawn, would soon appear, or re-appear, for his final triumph.

The force of this doctrine is seen very early in the history of Shiism. Its introduction into Islam is ascribed by the Arabic historians and theologians to a certain ‘Abdallah b. Sabā who, peculiarly enough, was a Jew of

10 The same tendency originally prevailed in Judaism, the Messiah being identified with David (Hosea 3, 5; Ezek. 34, 23 ff., comp. p. Berakot 2, 4), with Elijah (comp. Friedmann, "Messianische Vorstellungen des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten, Berlin 1904, 69 ff.). A similar tendency is observable in the attempts to assign a definite name to the Messiah; Klausner, l. c., 64 ff.
Southern Arabia. If we are right in combining the different and not wholly harmonious reports about this curious Jewish-Mohammedan heresiarch, he originally applied his doctrine to Mohammed whom he apparently believed to be the Messiah and later transferred it in a more elaborate form to ‘Ali of whom he preached that his violent death was but a delusion and that he would return from his hiding place to fill the earth with justice.

This belief was subsequently applied to every Shiitic pretender. The cases of its application which extend over the whole history of Islam down to the present day are too numerous to be specified in detail. The Raj’a belief became the mainstay and the motive power in every Shiitic movement. It also became the principium divisionis in the formation of Shiitic factions. For after the death of a Messianic candidate his followers invariably split into two camps, into those who believed in the reality of his death and therefore, having recognized the falsity of his Messianic claim to fill the earth with justice, looked out for another Messiah, and into those who thought that his death was a mere delusion and therefore, expecting his own return in person, appointed but a temporary vicegerent. These two factions which often appear as correlative in the history of Shiism are usually designated as the Kitt’iyya, “the assertive ones,” those who assert the reality of the Messiah’s death, and the Wakifyya “the doubtful ones,” those who are doubtful about his death and are inclined to regard it as fictitious.

11 AbS., II, 21 ff.
12 Ib., 14 f.
13 Comp. Shiites, Index, s. v. “Return.”
14 Ib., II, 30 f.
Before turning to our Jewish evidence to show the general application of this dogma within Jewish sectarianism, it may be advisable to illustrate by one particular detail the curious manner in which some of these Shiitic heterodoxies were reproduced in Judaism.

Once the death of the Messiah or Mahdî is denied in its reality and looked upon as a mere disappearance or concealment, it is natural that religious speculation should be called upon to answer the question as to the place in which the Messiah was concealed. Accordingly, the Messiah, during his period of occultation, is placed either in heaven or on earth. The former conception is represented in Islam by the belief, equally attributed to 'Abdallah b. Sabâ, that 'Ali was riding in the clouds, whence he would gloriously "return," a belief which was so deep-seated that, as we are told on reliable authority, faithful Shiites would send up their greetings to the clouds in the thought of thereby addressing themselves to 'Ali.11 More frequently however the Messiah is located in some mysterious spot on earth. Thus the twelfth Imâm of the Shi'a, the Messiah of the present day Shiitic High Church is believed to be hidden in a cave flooded with sun-light12 or in the holy of holies in the mosque of his native town13 or in the legendary cities of Jâbalkâ or Jâbarsâ.14 The 'Abbasid general Abû Muslim, who after his death was regarded by some of his enthusiastic Persian adherents as

18 Ib., II, 42 f.; AbS., I, 325, n: 3.; Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 256.
19 Darmesteter, 48.
20 Infra, p. 496 f.
21 Browne, Tarikh, 287, n. 1; idem, Persia, 246, n. 1, and in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, II, 300a. Both cities figure prominently in the Alexander legend.
the Messiah, was similarly thought to be concealed in a mysterious Copper Castle."

But seclusion and inaccessibility being the primary requirements of a Messianic retreat, it is natural that the hiding place of the Messiah, in preference to any other spot, is located in mountains, more especially in mountain clefts or ridges. This characteristic detail, which has numerous analogies in the folklore of other nations, looms with particular prominence in the legends surrounding the various Shiitic Messiahs. Thus the celebrated Shiitic Mahdi Mohammed Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, a son of ‘Ali by a woman of the Ḥanīfa tribe,—hence his designation as "the son of the Ḥanafite woman,"—who was the object of worship of the once powerful Keisaniyya sect and whose name was the war-cry of a far-reaching and powerful revolutionary movement against the young Caliphate was believed to have disappeared and to reside secretly in one of the ridges of the Radwā mountains in the region of Medinah. Innumerable legends hovered around this Messianic retreat and found literary expression in the poems of the great Keisānītic bards of the seventh century

38 Darmesteter, 43. This castle or, more correctly, citadel of copper (in Persian ru'yin diz) probably stands for the famous City of Copper (madīnat annahās, or madīnat as-sufr, see Yāḳūt, s. v.) known from the Alexander legend. Blochet’s objection (Le Messianisme dans l’hétérodoxie Musulmane, p. 191) is not valid. For Firdausī (quoted by Blochet) was intimately acquainted with the Alexander romance and he may very well refer to the same city. In the company of Abū Muslim are Mazdak and the Mahdī, and all three of them are to appear together, Blochet, l. c., 44.

39 Darmesteter, 32 f.

31 On the Keisānīyya see Index to Shiites, s. v., particularly II, 33 f.

32 On the uprising of Mukhtār, the agent of Ibn Al-Ḥanafiyya (killed in 687), see Wellhausen, Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam, 74 ff.

33 Shiites, II, 36.
In glowing colors do these highly gifted poets picture the Mahdi as dwelling in a glen of the Raḍwā mountains, surrounded by beasts of prey on which eternal peace has descended, holding intercourse with angels and sustained from overflowing fountains of milk and honey, and with genuine religious fervor do they call on him to emerge from his retreat and, preceded by noble steeds and flying banners, return to his believers in order to inaugurate the Messianic age of justice and peace. The vitality of this belief may be inferred from the fact that as late as the time of al-Birūnī (died 1038), three centuries after Mohammed Ibn al-Ḥanafyya, his "return" was still awaited by numerous Mohammedans. Similarly a later Messianic pretender Mohammed b. ‘Abdallah, a great-great-grandson of ‘Ali, who rose in Medinah against the Caliph Mansūr and was killed by him in 762, was believed by many of his followers to be hidden in Ḥājir, likewise a spot in the Raḍwā mountains. In like fashion the Messianic rebel ‘Abdallah b. Mu‘āwiya (d. 747), to whom reference has already been made previously, was thought after his ephemeral triumph and his execution at the hands of Abū Muslim to have concealed himself in the mountains of Ispahan. Abū Muslim

---

*Ibid.,* 35.

*Ibid.,* 37-39. The fountains of milk and honey from which the Mahdi is miraculously fed do not necessarily go back to biblical conceptions, as was conjectured *Shiites,* II, 39, but rather reflect pseudepigraphic ideas, comp. *AbS.,* II, 37, n. 1. On milk (or cream) and honey in the Babylonian religion see Winckler and Zimmern, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament,* 3rd edition, p. 526.

*AbS.,* II, 18.

*Birūnī,* 212, 10.

*Shiites,* II, 87, 17.

*Shiitic Elements,* 305.

*Shiites,* II, 44, 16.
himself, having been treacherously murdered by his ungrateful master, the Caliph Mansūr, was believed to have escaped death and to be hidden in the mountains of Rayy, where in true Messianic style he was miraculously fed. It is true, the mountainous character of the Messianic hiding-place is not an inseparable feature of it. Yet, the frequency and the emphasis with which it is pointed out convincingly demonstrates that this particular detail of the Raj'a doctrine was not a fleeting fancy but a deep-seated belief among Shiitic Mohammedans and sufficiently widespread to penetrate eventually beyond the boundaries of Islam. In the light of these facts we learn to understand the full import of a statement, otherwise unintelligible, relating to the earliest Jewish sectarian of this period, Abū 'Isa al-Iṣfahānī. Abū 'Isa, profiting by a favorable political constellation, rose, in true Mahdistic fashion, against the governing powers to free his people from the yoke of Islam and to usher in the Golden Age. He was killed by the army of the mighty Caliph Mansūr. Yet, as the Karaite Kirdisānī, without being aware of the bearing of his words, informs us, "among his adherents there were people who maintained that he had not been killed, but had merely entered a ridge in the mountains, so that nothing further was heard of him." If Abū 'Isa had had the fortune of finding a Homer as did his fellow-Messiah Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, we should...
probably be fully acquainted with the character and location of the secret abode of this first Jewish Mahdi.

In view of the extreme paucity of our sources, it is not at all surprising that this particular detail, accidentally preserved by Kirkisâni, which so strikingly illustrates the force of Shiitic influence, stands entirely isolated. Yet, the general effect of the Raj'a doctrine can be substantiated by other examples.

Abû 'Isa was succeeded by Yûdğân who, profiting by the bitter experience of his predecessor, kept his peace and died a natural death. Yet, to quote Kirkisâni again, "his adherents maintained that he was the Messiah and that he had not died, and they still hope for his return."

In the second half of the twelfth century, more exactly in 1160, there arose among the Jews in Northern Persia, who were very ignorant and stood in intimate relations to the ultra-Shiitic sect of the Assassins, the celebrated David, or Menahem, ar-Rûhi, or Alroy. He proclaimed himself, or was proclaimed, the Messiah and, followed by many thousands of Jews, tried to overthrow the Mohammedan power and to lead the Jews to Palestine. He found an ignominious death at the hands of a treacherous relative. "In spite of it," to quote a contemporary witness, "the matter was not unraveled to them (i.e. to the Jews),

---

490 THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

---
although it must have become evident to every man of intelligence, so that down to this day, they, I mean the Jews of Amadia, still esteem him more highly than many of their prophets, nay, some of them believe him to be the Messiah, the Expected One. I have seen scores of Persian Jews in Khoy, Silmās, Tabriz, and Marāğa who make his name the object of their most solemn oath. In the same province (Amadia) a large number of them profess a religion which they refer to Menahem, the above-mentioned impostor.

It is clear from the foregoing expositions that the Persian Jews refused to believe in the reality of Alroy's death and continued to wait for his "return." How natural such a belief seemed in that environment may be inferred from the tragicomic sequel which is described by the same writer. When the rumor of Alroy's death reached Bagdad, two swindlers took advantage of the

* Ib., l. 15: Al-muntazar (the Expected One) which is a standing title of the Shiite Mahdis, is applied in Jewish literature, to the Messiah; comp. Goldziher, Kitāb ma‘āni al-nafs, p. 38. In the same way the title al-šā‘īm (he who rises, the Rising One), which is a constant epithet of the Shiite Mahdi, is used of the Messiah; Goldziher, ibid., p. 39. For other examples see Emek habacha, translated by Wiener, Appendix, p. 22, l. 4 and my Selections from the Arabic Writings of Maimonides, p. 22, l. 8. In the Arabic original of his Iggeret Teman Maimonides introduces his account of the French pseudo-Messiah (see later p. 492 and p. 506 f.) with the words: "A Kā‘īm (i.e. Messiah) arose in the interior of France."— Al-kā‘īm al-nafsīt as a combined title of the Messiah is found in a Genizah fragment in Oxford (Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. II, No. 2745, 24).

* This might mean that they regarded Menahem as the originator of the religion they professed or that their religion was designated as "Menahemite." Grätz, VI, 247, follows the latter explanation: "nannten sich Menahemisten und schwuren bei seinem Namen."

* Samuel b. 'Abbās, ibid., p. 22 f.
superstitious credulity of their fellow-Jews to cheat them out of their money. They sent in the name of the dead Messiah, who was believed to be alive and temporarily concealed, letters to the Jews of Bagdad in which they proclaimed his speedy return and announced the exact day on which he would appear to lead them to Palestine."

Though at present unable to determine the connecting link, I have but little doubt that an old Messianic movement in France, briefly mentioned in the Hebrew translation of Maimonides' Iggeret Teman" and described in detail in the original Arabic," belongs to the same category. In the eleventh century there arose in the city of Linon" in the interior of France a Messiah who found numerous followers in the community. They were attacked and plundered by the Gentiles and the Messiah himself was killed. Yet, as Maimonides who is our sole authority for this Messianic movement relates," "some of them maintain to this day annahu ḡaba, that he (merely) became absent," evidently implying that the reality of his death was denied by his adherents."

The great Messianic and sectarian movement inaugurated by Sabbathai Zevi betrays in more than one respect the influence of heterodox Islam."

---

492 THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

Grätz (VI, 246) has missed the point of the whole story by placing it in the life-time of Alroy. See also later p. 504 ff.

Kobes, ed. Lichtenberg, II, fol. 7b, first column, l. 1-2.

MS. of the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (comp. Shiitic Elements, 187, n. 70). The MS. is not paginated.

Written תבש. Perhaps Lyons or Lunel is intended. It is described as a large Jewish community.

See above note 40.

In the Arabic original of his Iggeret Teman.

More about this Messiah see later p. 506 f.

radical heterodox teachings with Messianic or political aspirations, which is so typical of the Sabbathian movement, is characteristically Shiitic. Numerous particulars point in the same direction. In the present instance we are concerned with the Raj'a doctrine which, though not in name, is in substance unmistakably reflected in that great Messianic upheaval. Sabbathai Zevi, after having embraced Islam, died in a small town in Albania in 1676. Yet, many of his adherents denied that he was dead. "Know ye," writes a contemporary Sabbathian missionary, "that Sabbathai Zevi is not dead, albeit all believe of him that he is dead. This is not the case... On the contrary, he is now beginning to manifest himself." "What is most astonishing and utterly incomprehensible to me," declares another contemporary witness of the Sabbathian movement, the physician and scientist Tobias Cohen (d. 1729), "is the fact that there are great and distinguished scholars who still cling to their faith and continue to believe in him even after his death, maintaining that he was the true Messiah and that all that outwardly happened to him was through substitution and delusion, for he is still alive and merely concealed and hidden from the eyes of all living." 

The remnants of the Sabbathians which still survive in the Jewish-Mohammedan Dönmeh sect in Salonica is

---

61 Mordecai of Eisenstadt (about 1679); he had lived in the East where he came in immediate contact with the Sabbathian elements; Grätz, X, 303.

62 (ed. Lemberg 1867), VI, 3: Pialim K.TDn KTI \*h*P'Tnomij? iv* 1)an tnoan trv \Sain hSi \j'j?antAeji not \*no nno rvtronn»n kipib>d<ibikimm nrmS dj ia d>j»bkdiddim vet San 'n will?ton 'a d<j<j?rmriKic\bn»"j>tvn ronsn »nS ia twyiv 'PIbs '3'VO D7VJ1. What is meant by substitution and delusion see later p. 510.
subdivided into three factions of which the two older ones are called, with a Turkish ending, the Izmirlis (i. e. from Izmir = Smyrna, where Sabbathai was born) and the Yakublis (followers of Yakub, see presently). The former who are the original Sabbathians and who still regard Sabbathai Zevi as their Messiah staunchly deny that Sabbathai is dead and they expect his “return” every day. In their religious assemblies they sing in their ancient Spanish dialect:

Sabetay Zevi, Sabetay Zevi,
No ai a utro como a ti,
Sabetay Zevi, Sabetay Zevi
Esperamos a ti.

The Yakublis again owe their name to Jacob Querido, supposedly a son (in reality a brother-in-law) of Sabbathai, whom they believe to be the true Messiah. Like the Shiitic sect of the Kitṭi’iyya, they “assert” that Sabbathai is dead and transfer the Raj’a doctrine to their Messiah Querido whose death they deny and whose return they eagerly expect.

The same belief is found in connection with the Sabbathian impostor Jacob Frank (d. 1791) who spent his early youth in Salonica and came in intimate contact with

---


Grätz, MGWJ., 1884, p. 56. The same sentiments are voiced in a Hebrew song quoted by Danon in פאץ, I, 176.

Grätz, X, 304 ff.

See later p. 498.
the Sabbathian remnants in that city. Frank, after having repeatedly changed his religion, died in 1791. Yet his adherents believed that he was alive, applying to him the Midrashic dictum "our father Jacob has not died."

We have already had occasion to observe that the Messianic expectations of the Shiites are far more intense and immediate than those of the Sunnites or orthodox Mohammedans. This contrast is palpably demonstrated by the fact that in Shiism alone has the Messianic hope found expression in definite ceremonies. The Messiah of the present day Shiitic High Church, of the so-called Twelvers (Ithnā'asharīyya) or Imamites, is Mohammed b. al-Hasan, the twelfth Imam after 'Ali, styled, among many other epithets, al-mahdī al-muntazar kā'im az-samān, "the rightly Guided, the Expected One, the One who rises in the (fulness of) Time." According to the Imamites, Mohammed, who is said to have been born in 873, entered as a child in his native town Ḥilla (near Bagdad) a subterranean passage (called in Persian sardāb)

---

Grätz, Geschichte, X, 378; idem, Frank und die Frankisten, Breslau 1868, p. 11 ff. On the commercial as well as spiritual relations between the Polish, more especially the Podolian, Jews and Turkey see Frank und die Frankisten, p. 16 ff. and Kahana, l. c., Warsaw 1895 (based on the Polish treatise of Alexander Kraushar, Frank i Frankisci, Cracow 1895), p. 45 ff.; p. 53.

Grätz, Frank und die Frankisten, 86.

Shiitic Elements, 195 ff. See now Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 232 f.

The latter title can perhaps more correctly be rendered "the Chief of the Age," Goldziher, l. c., p. 232. On the use of these titles by the Jews comp. above, note 40.

Corresponding to the year 260 of the Hijra. This is unanimously given as the year in which his father al-Hasan died (Shiites, II, 52, l. 28). The Shiites believe that he was born on the same day on which his father died (ibid., l. 33). For other numerous suppositions regarding the date of his birth see ib., p. 52-53.
and was seen no more. It is the dogmatic belief of official Shiism that Mohammed, who in consequence is also styled šāhīb as-sārdāb ("the Master of the Subterranean Passage"), is not dead but concealed in some mysterious spot and his manifestation or "return" is awaited with the keenest expectation. This expectation has crystallized itself in several curious ceremonies. Thus according to a Persian author who wrote two centuries after the disappearance of Mohammed b. al-Ḥasan, the Shiites of his time made regular pilgrimages to this sārdāb calling on the Mahdi to return from his hiding place. A writer who lived in the same age reports as an eyewitness that the ‘Alidic families of the Persian city Kāšān expected every morning the manifestation of Mohammed b. al-Ḥasan. The most prominent among them would sally forth on horseback, bristling with arms, so as to meet the awaited Mahdi, and would return disappointed, having missed their object. The traveler Ibn Baṭūṭa (d. 1377) relates that in his time the Shiites of Ḥilla believed that Mohammed b al-Ḥasan disappeared through the entrance of one of the mosques of that city which was, probably, in consequence

\* \* See above p. 486.
\* \* The fanatical Spanish theologian, Ibn Ḥazm (died 1064), referring to this belief of the Shiites that their Mahdi disappeared in a subterranean passage, biting remarks that they are waiting for him, "not knowing in which privy he may have sunk" (Shiites, I, 77, n. 7). Elsewhere he intimates that this Mahdi was not born at all (Shiitic Elements, 197, n. 44).
\* \* Quoted by Yaḥūṭ, s. v. "Kāšān," IV, 15.
\* \* See later p. 499 ff.
\* \* On the underlying conception see later in the course of this article.
\* \* The translation of this passage quoted by Darmsteter, 49, is not exact.
\* \* Ibn Baṭūṭa, ed. Defrémer and Sanguinetti, II, 98 f. Ibn Baṭūṭa obviously misunderstood the information he received. The Mahdi disappeared through the Sardāb (see also the next quotation in the text). The mosque was subsequently built over it.
of that belief, veiled by a heavy silk curtain." Every night after the afternoon prayer a hundred men would proceed to the governor of the city from whom they would receive a horse,—sometimes it was a mule—saddled and caparisoned. With drawn swords and covered with arms, they would in solemn procession, accompanied by the deafening noise of numerous instruments, carry the animal to the door of the above mentioned mosque and passionately call on the Mahdi to emerge from his retreat, "for corruption hath appeared and injustice is rampant." Similarly the famous North African author and thinker Ibn Khaldûn (d. 1406) incidentally informs us” that the Shiites of Ḥilla continued at his time to practise a similar ceremony, proceeding with a riding animal” to the sardâb through which the Mahdi had once disappeared and loudly calling on him to appear. The ceremony began after the sunset prayer and lasted till the stars appeared thickly in the sky."

"Ibid., p. 97.

"Ib., p. 98. See about this seeming contradiction note 78.

"Which was evidently kept in readiness for that purpose, see later p. 499.

"See later note 88.

"See later in the course of this article.


"wa-kad ḥarrabû markaban, Markab has here obviously the sense of markûb or the modern markaba "a riding animal."

"According to Ibn Baṭṭâ, the ceremony took place "every night" after the afternoon prayer and continued till the sunset prayer. This seemingly contradictory statement and the disagreement with Ibn Khaldûn is explained by the fact that the salât al-magrib (the sunset prayer) which is recited by the orthodox Mohammedans at sunset or, more exactly, four minutes after sunset (Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, London, p. 60), is not recited by the Shiites "before the stars have appeared thickly in the sky." The ceremony, accordingly, started after the afternoon prayer towards the evening and lasted till late in the evening. This late recitation of the magrib prayer is quoted in the anthology of Ibn 'Abdi Rabbihi (d. 
A striking parallel to these Shiitic ceremonies, if not an imitation of them, is still to be observed among the modern Sabbathians of Salonica, the so-called Dönmeh sect. Jacob Querido, of whom mention was made before, was converted to Islam with four hundred of his adherents in 1687. As a faithful Mohammedan he considered it his duty to make a pilgrimage to Mecca and died on the way back in Alexandria. The Yakublis, however, deny that he is dead and anxiously await his return from the holy city of Islam. Not unlike the 'Alides of Kāshān, the elders of that sect still scrutinize the horizon every morning, expecting the manifestation of their Messiah, and it is still one of their customs to send every Saturday a number of women to the seashore where, with crossed arms, they wait for an hour or two, looking out for the blessed ship which should bring Jacob Querido back to his faithful.

940), Al-'ikd al-farid, Cairo 1293 H, I, 269, as one of the parallels between Shiism and Judaism: "The Jews delay the magrib (= מָערִיב) prayer until the stars appear thickly (referring evidently to לְאָן הַחֲבֹרִים), and so do the Rāfīda (= Shiites)."

™ p. 494.
™ Grätz, X, 305.
™ Ib., 306.
™ See above p. 494.
™ Gottheil in Jewish Encyclopedia, IV, 639b (article Dönmeh, last sentence).

™ So Ben Jacob (of Salonica) in אל-אֶלֶף הָעֹדֵד, IV, 33. Grätz, MGWJ., 1884, p. 60 (in an account received indirectly from the Sabbathians): "one woman of the community with her children."

™ Grätz, l. c., states somewhat differently the manner in which Jacob Querido disappeared. The latter had spread the rumor of Sabbathai's death and set himself up as a prophet. Soon afterwards, Sabbathai who had not died but had been merely hidden (see above p. 494) returned to Salonica and denounced Jacob Querido who in consequence had to leave the town. "He actually departed one Saturday morning in order, as he said, to ascend to heaven and he left word that he should be awaited on the seashore."
In connection with the above facts which clearly demonstrate the influence of the Shiitic Raj’a doctrine, attention may be called to a few points of contact between heterodox Islam and heterodox Judaism. I mention them with a great deal of hesitation, for I fully realize the slippery nature of their similitude which, I expressly admit, may be accidental. Yet, the possibility of cause and effect is by no means precluded, and with the increase in our data which are at present so scanty this possibility may grow into probability or even certainty.

As in Judaism, so in Islam the returning Messiah is pictured either as a supernatural being who dispenses with human weapons and smiteth the wicked with the rod of his mouth or as a human conqueror who acts in the way of men. It is not accidental that, in accordance with the latter conception which is predominant in Shiism, the Shiitic Mahdī invariably appears riding, not like the meek and unassuming figure of the post-exilic Messiah on an ignoble ass, but, after the manner of warriors, on a noble horse. Thus, in contrast to ‘Ali, whose return is pictured in supernatural colors, his son Mohammed Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya is heralded on his return by prancing steeds and flying banners. Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya’s champion, the Keisanitic poet Kuthayyir (died 723), who seems himself to have posed

---

Comp. AbS., II, 2 ff. and 18 f.
This is largely due to the fact that in Shiism the Messiah is identified with historic personages.
Occasionally also on a mule (above note 74). In biblical times also, prior to the introduction of the horse, the mule appears as a noble animal used on state occasions and even in war, comp. II Samuel 8, 4, 9; 18, 9; I Kings 1, 33; comp. also Isa. 66, 20.—It is interesting that Bahram Hamavand, the Messiah of the ancient Persians, is expected to manifest himself riding on a cow, Shiitic Elements, 198, n. 51.
AbS., II, 4 ff.
Ib., p. 18, note 5.
as a Messianic personage," announced before his death that after forty days" he expected to return on a full-blooded horse." Similarly, the Persian Shiitic Messiah Bihāfarīd who appeared in the eighth century" but in the tenth century was still believed to be alive" was thought to have ascended to heaven on a dark-brown horse and was expected to return in the same manner to take vengeance on his enemies. The famous Shiitic pseudo-Messiah Muḥanna" (died 780)" made his followers believe "that his spirit would pass into the form of a grizzle-headed man riding on a grey horse and that he would return unto them after so many years and cause them to possess the earth." Nowhere, however, does this particular feature loom so prominently as in the beliefs clustering around the Mahdī of official present day Shiism, Mohammed b. al-Ḥasan. Some pertinent examples have been noted in the foregoing. This particular conception is so intimately bound up with the belief in the return of this Mahdī that

\*\* He claimed to be the prophet Jonah (Shiites, II 26, 28) which in all probability means that he considered himself the forerunner of the Messiah Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya. Jonah, according to an old Jewish conception, is identical with the Ephraimitic Messiah, the forerunner of the Davidic Messiah. Comp. Ṣab‘ah Y. Y. D, ed. Friedmann, p. 97 f. and the editor's remarks in the introduction p. 1 f. and p. 98, note 57. As early an authority as Jerome (Preface to Jonah) records the tradition of the identity of Jonah with the son of the woman of Sarepta.

\*\* See above, note 3.

\*\* Shiites, 24, 10.


\*\* Browne, l. c., p. 309, n. 4; Houtsma, l. c., 30 and 37.

\*\* Birūnī, 211, similarly Shahr., 187 penult.

\*\* On Muḥanna see Shiites, II, 120 f., and the literature enumerated there, to which are to be added Birūnī, 211, and Browne, l. c., 318 ff.

\*\* Browne, l. c., 323.

\*\* See above, p. 496.
at the court of the Safawid Shahs in Ispahan, who became masters of Persia in 1501 and declared Shiism the state religion of the land, two gorgeously mounted horses were always kept ready, the one for Mohammed b. al-Hasan, the other for his lieutenant Jesus.\footnote{Darmesteter, 50. Another example \textit{ib.}, note 39.—The institution of a \textit{faras an-nauba}, a sentry horse, “saddled, bridled and equipped, which was henceforth (beginning with the year 758) always in readiness at the Caliph’s palace in case of emergency” (Browne, \textit{Persia}, 317) offers an interesting parallel to the above, but is, of course, entirely different in origin.}

There can be no doubt that the origin of this conception is to be sought in the ancient Judæo-Christian Messianic speculations and it is not impossible that a trace of their influence is to be found in Arabia prior to Mohammed.\footnote{When Du-Nuwas, the Jewish ruler of Yemen, was routed in battle by the invading Abyssinians in 525, “he directed his horse towards the sea, then, spurring it on, rode through shallow water till he reached the depth and finally threw himself with his horse into it; \textit{this is the last that was known of him}” (Tabari, I, 927 f.; similarly 930, 13). This description which no doubt represents, as was observed by Nöldeke, \textit{Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden}, p. 191, n. 2, the attempt to glorify the end of the last national ruler of Yemen, may possibly reflect old Messianic expectations. The Southern Arabs believed in a Messiah of Himyaritic-Sabean stock “who will bring back the royal power to the Himyarites in justice” (comp. \textit{AbS.}, II, 16, n. 8; \textit{ibid.}, p. 5, n. 6) and the last national king was certainly not unworthy of that honor. Already Beer (\textit{ZDMG.}, IX (1855), p. 793) suggests that the Jews of Arabia looked upon Du-Nuwas as a Messianic personage. His name Pinehas points in the same direction, comp. Goldziher, “\textit{Pinehas-Mansûr},” in \textit{ZDMG.}, LVI, p. 411 f.—According to a slightly different variant of our legend, Du-Nuwas precipitated himself with his horse into the sea from the height of a rock (Grätz, V, 90). Both variants are careful to mention the horse.} But if the instances to be quoted presently from later Jewish sectarianism be more than meaningless coincidences, the connecting link will have to be looked for in Shiism whose influence on Judaism is evident from many other particulars and in which the above Messianic feature has received such great prominence.
Turning to Jewish evidence we find that when Abū 'Īsa al-Iṣfahānī, who, as we have repeatedly seen, exhibits the features of a Shiitic Mahdi, was attacked by the army of the Caliph, he left the magic line drawn by him as a protection around his followers and, riding on a horse, engaged single-handedly in a battle with the Mohammedians.108

Such Messianic associations would also explain the fact that in the accounts of the Messianic adventurer David Reubeni emphasis is laid on the detail that he was riding on a white horse when paying a visit to the Pope109 or that he was passing through the streets of Rome riding on a mule.110

It is perhaps in consequence of similar notions that Sabbathai Zevi is described as riding on a lion when paying a visit to the Sultan.111 The lion, as is well known, is associated in Jewish symbolism with the Messiah.112

108 Shahr., 168.
109 Neubauer, Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, II, 151, 11. 18-19.
110 Grätz, IX, 231.
111 Sasportas, Ḳננפנרא נובע ילב (Odessa 1867), p. 20b. 46b. Sabbathai himself is often represented as a lion, ib., p. 21a ult., 26a, 29b, 47b.
112 Its source is probably Gen. 49, 9. In IV Ezra 12, 31 ff. the Messiah is represented as "the Lion who will spring from the seed of David." Probably as a reflection of these ideas the Messiah is designated by the Falashas as "the son of the Lion" (see AbS., II, 36). It may be mentioned in this connection that in a letter from Jerusalem dated 1528, the father of the two brothers who were supposed to reign over the Falashas is called Phineas (see above, note 101, and AbS., II, 30, n. 4) and designated as the "Son of the Lion," "because of his great strength" (JQR., I (1889), 197). Curiously enough a pseudo-Messiah by the name of אבינו is mentioned by Maimonides in the Arabic original of his Iggeret Teman.—It may be a mere coincidence, yet it deserves to be mentioned that in the conception of the Nuseirī sect who deify 'Ali, the latter appears riding on a lion (Dussaud, Histoire et religion des Nuseirîs, Paris 1900, p. 70).
Finally attention may be called to a curious feature in these Messianic speculations which can be traced both in Judaism and in Islam and offers at all events a striking point of comparison, while the causal connection between them can in the present condition of our sources be nothing but a matter of conjecture. Whether in consequence of the Messiah's association with the heavenly regions or for some other reason, the accomplishment of flying is found in Islam in connection with Messianic manifestations. 'Ali, like his ancient prototype in the apocryphal writings, is believed to be flying through the clouds, and the same accomplishment is attributed to other Messianic and semi-Messianic personages. A curious illustration of this peculiar conception is afforded by a remarkable incident in the history of Islam. The sect of the Râwandiyya from Râwend in Khorâsân which regarded the Caliph Manşûr as a divine incarnation and believed him to be the Mahdi appeared in large numbers in the year 758 before his palace in Hâshimiyya and began to call on him to manifest himself. They believed that they were able to fly and, ascending the roof of the palace, precipitated themselves from it. It is not improbable that similar scenes were to be witnessed simultaneously in other cities. At least the local

107 See AbS., II, 6.
108 On 'Ali in the clouds see Shiites, II, 43 f.; AbS., I. 325, n. 3. Comp. also Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 256.
109 Thus the prophets Khadhir and Elijah are represented as flying to protect the wall erected by Alexander the Great against Gog and Magog. They are both brought in connection with the Mahdi. See the reference in my forthcoming book "Die Chadhirlegende und der Alexanderroman," (B. G. Teubner, Leipzig).
110 Shiites, I, 70, 13 and the literature quoted II, 121, 10 ff. Comp. also Browne, Persia, p. 316.
111 Tabari, III, 418. See van Vloten 48, who also quotes a Byzantine source.
historian of Aleppo not only speaks of the appearance of the Rawandiyya in the year 141 H. (=758) both in Aleppo and in Harran, but also informs us that "they maintained that they were in the position of angels." They ascended, as people narrate, a hill in Aleppo and, having dressed themselves in silken garments, flew from it, so that they broke their bones and perished."

The ultra-Shiitic sect of the Nušeiriyya which worships 'Ali as Creator harbors the same delusion in our own days."

Similar notions are found in connection with Jewish sectarian movements.

The early pseudo-Messiah Serene who arose in the beginning of the eighth century among the Jews of Syria announced, according to the testimony of a contemporary witness, that he would lead the Jews flying to the Land of Promise.

The two impostors, who made their appearance in Bagdad after the death of Alroy, forged letters in the name of the dead Messiah, who was believed to be temporarily hidden, promising to lead the Jews on a certain night.

---

118 Selecta ex historia Halebi, ed. Freytag, Paris 1819, Arabic text, p. 15.
119 This reminds one of the claim of the Shiitic sect of the Khattabiyya "that they would not die, but would be lifted up to heaven," Shiites, I, 69, 10. See also ibid., II, 24, n. 1; 72, 30, and 118, n. 4.
114 See later note 122.
115 Van Vloten, l. c., note 4.
116 Grätz, V, 169 ff.; 457 ff.; Comp. Shiitic Elements, 211.
117 Isidor Pacensis quoted by Grätz, ib., 458.
118 "Messiamque se praedicans, illos ad terram repromissionis volari enuntiat." Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to assume that this conception was suggested or supported by a literal interpretation of Isa. 60, 8: "who are these (returning to Zion) that fly as a cloud and as the doves to their windows?"
119 See above p. 491 f.
A contemporary witness gives an elaborate and striking description of that tragicomical scene. On the appointed night the Jews of Bagdad, having formerly deposited their money with the two swindlers, dressed themselves in green garments and gathered themselves together on the roofs, expecting to fly to Jerusalem. A contemporary witness gives an elaborate and striking description of that tragicomical scene. On the appointed night the Jews of Bagdad, having formerly deposited their money with the two swindlers, dressed themselves in green garments and gathered themselves together on the roofs, expecting to fly to Jerusalem. A contemporary witness gives an elaborate and striking description of that tragicomical scene.

The Rawandiyya in Aleppo dressed themselves on a similar occasion in silken garments (above note 114). The most natural assumption would be that both the Persian sectarianists and the Jews of Bagdad put on festive attire to receive the Messiah in a befitting manner. As for the color, one ought to think of the fact that green as the color of the turban or dress is considered a sign of distinction (comp. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, London, p. 28). There are however, several considerations which suggest a deeper meaning. Thus the pseudo-Messiah Mu‘anna (above note 97) was called by this name ("the veiled one"), because he used to veil himself in green silk (Browne, *Persia*, 318). The Persian heresiarch Beha‘farid (above note 96) claimed that God had dressed him in a green shirt before he sent him down on earth to take up his prophetic mission (ibid., 308). Another author (quoted by Houtsma in *WZKM.*, 1889, 30 ff.) narrates with even greater emphasis that Beha‘farid had in his possession a shirt and a mantle of green silk to which he referred as "Paradise garments" and in which he solemnly attired himself before he manifested himself as a God-sent prophet. In a contemporary description of the conversion of Sabbathai Zevi to Islam which took place in the presence of the Sultan, it is particularly mentioned that, as part of the ceremony, Sabbathai changed his black mantle for a green one (Grätz, X, 220). Sabbathai was probably regarded by the Mohammedans as the precursor of the Mahdi. The Mohammedan Chadir legend which was well known to the Jews, who lived in Mohammedan countries, also suggests some parallels. In the Arabian Nights (ed. Bülak, 1311 H, II, 14; 304th night) a mysterious being "clad in green raiment, with streaming dresses and radiant face" is pictured as flying through the heavens. This being is, as Burton (Arabian Nights, IV, 175, n. 2) suggested, none other than the ubiquitous Khadhir who is also represented as flying elsewhere (above, note 109). Khadhir, "the green prophet," is generally clad in green garments, Lane, *1001 night* (1865), I, 80. Whatever be the true explanation of the above detail, it is certainly not accidental and is very probably rooted in some Messianic notion.
to the Holy Temple on the wings of angels. The confusion and the noise, particularly among the women who had their infants with them, was indescribable. "They did not cease to make attempts at flying until the morning unraveled their shame and their credulity. The two impostors, however, escaped with what they had obtained of the property of the Jews to whom the manner of swindle and the excessive viciousness exhibited by them thus became evident." The year in which this incident took place became known as the "Year of Flying," 'ām ʿat-ṭayārān, and the Jews of Bagdad reckoned a new year from that memorable event.

The following episode, though from a widely different environment, may be mentioned under the same category. The Messianic pretender who arose among the Jews of France and who is known to us from the account of Maimonides, "claimed," to quote Maimonides verbally, "that he was the Messiah. His miracle of legitimation was in their opinion the fact that on one moonlit night he went out, climbed up the tops of some lofty trees in the field and then, throwing himself into the air, descended from tree to tree, as if he were flying. This, he maintained, was meant

---

126 I believe that the original meaning of this statement is that the Jews expected to be endowed with wings of angels and to be able to fly themselves to Jerusalem. This would agree with the rest of the account, according to which the Jews themselves made attempts at flying, and would also form an exact analogy to the belief of the Rāwandiyya (above, note 113).

127 p. 12 read ʿalā ʿalā al-qulūb instead of ʾalā ʿalā.

128 i. e. by the two impostors, read ibid., ʿalā ʿalā instead of ʿalā ʿalā.

129 Ibid., p. 12; comp. Grätz, VI, 246. Samuel ibn 'Abbâs' account is quoted by Abulfeda, see de Sacy's Chrestomathie Arabe, I, 363 f.

127 See above, p. 492.
by the verse in Daniel (7, 13) regarding the Messiah: 'and with the clouds like a son of man was he coming.'

According to a legend which is still believed in Adrianople, Sabbathai Zevi, in order to establish his Messianic claim, "flew in the air like a winged being." The famous Haham Zevi, a staunch opponent of Sabbathai, who was anxious to invalidate these Messianic pretentions, soared in the air and managed to fly between two houses through the windows. Old people in Adrianople still point to the houses which were the scene of this curious aeronautic experiment.

2. Docetism

We have already had occasion to observe that the doctrine of Raj'a necessarily presupposes that of Docetism. The instances quoted in the foregoing in substantiation of the former belief tacitly imply the latter doctrine. Yet the importance of Docetism and the variety of its aspects necessitates an independent discussion of its effects on Judaism.

Docetism is a dogma of ancient Gnostic origin. As was stated above, it was originally connected with Christ.
It teaches that Christ's martyrdom and death were merely fictitious and that the real victim was someone else—usually it was said to have been a devil—who had been substituted for Jesus and had been made to assume his features. This doctrine was widespread in early heterodox Christian circles and was able to maintain itself throughout the ages down to the Albigensian heresy. It was adopted and formulated with great emphasis by Māni. In the belief of the Manichæans, the whole human appearance of Jesus was an apparition, and so were his sufferings. "For it was not he who was crucified, but it was an emissary of the devil ... who, as a punishment for his wickedness, was fastened to the cross by Jesus himself."

Manichæism, whose influence upon Mohammedan dogma can scarcely be doubted, was probably the medium through which Docetism gained access into Islam. At all events the Docetic doctrine is formulated with great precision and emphasis in the Koran.

While, however, in orthodox Islam the Docetic belief, just as in Manichæism, appears always in connection with Jesus, in Shiism it was early transferred to the Shiitic Mahdīs and has in this transformation ever since occupied a preeminent position in the fabric of Shiitic Messianism. When 'Alī had been assassinated in the streets of Kufa, 'Abdallah b. Sabā proclaimed that the real victim was not 'Alī, but a devil who had assumed his features, and he

---

100 Shiites, II, 29.
104 Comp. PRE, XIII, 765, 50 ff.
106 Shiites, II, 29. See Flügel, Mani, 100, 254 ff., 336 f.
108 Compare particularly the prophetology of Islam which is an exact analogy to that of Manicheism. See later in the course of this article.
categorically refused to believe in ‘Ali’s death, though his brain were to be brought to him packed up in a bag. The ultra-Shiitic Nuṣeiriyya sect which worships ‘Ali as a divine incarnation declares, as a well-informed author of the eleventh century apprises us, not only the earthly appearance of ‘Ali but even that of his wife and sons to have been impersonations of Satan. The applications of the doctrine of Docetism within the Shi’a are too numerous to be recorded here with any attempt at completeness. A few illustrations will suffice to demonstrate the wide currency and the wonderful tenacity of this belief. When Ismā’il, the son of the famous Shiitic Imām Ja‘far as-Ṣādik (d. 765), died in the life-time of his father, the latter is claimed to have exhibited in public the body of his son in order that there might be no doubt as to the fact of his death, which precaution, however, did not prevent some enthusiasts from denying his death and from laying the foundation of the overwhelmingly powerful Ismā’iliyya sect. Again, the so-called Mūsāwiyya sect which repudiates the above-mentioned Ismā’il and believes in the return of his younger brother Mūsā (d. 799), puts the following

186 The incident is recorded by several reliable authorities, see AbS., I. 308-309, 322, 324.
160 Shīites, I. 72.
140 The Nuṣeiriyya apply to ‘Ali the words of the Koran (Sura 92, 3): “He begetteth not neither is he begotten,” Dussaud, Histoire et religion des Nuseirs, 54. In a similar manner the Albigensians apply the Docetic belief not only to Jesus but also to his father and mother, PRE., XIII, 765, 50 ff.
144 A number of examples have been collected Shīites, II, 30.
143 Shahr., 146; comp. Browne, Persia 296 and 293. According to a Persian author quoted by Blochet, Le Messianisme dans l’hétérodoxe Musulmane, 49, Ja‘far, on the contrary, declared: “Ismā’il is not at all my son; it is a demon who has come in his figure.”
140 On the return of Mūsā see Shīites, II, 40 particularly note 1.
Docetic utterance into his mouth: "Should anyone relate of me that he nursed me in my illness, washed me after my death, embalmed me, put me in shrouds, let me down into the grave, shook off the dust of my grave, you may call him a liar. If the people should inquire after me (when I have disappeared), then answer: 'He is alive, thanks be to Heaven.' Cursed be every one, who, when asked about me, replies: 'He is dead.'" Perhaps even more characteristic than this positive evidence is the negation of this doctrine on the part of the Imamiyya sect or the Twelvers. The latter, represented by the bulk of Shiism of to-day, believe in the continued existence and future return of the twelfth Imam Mohammed b. al-Hasan; they are, in consequence, anxious to assert that the preceding eleven Imams are in reality dead. An early dogmatist of the sect, the famous Persian theologian Ibn Babuye (d. 991), gives expression to these sentiments by making the following onslaught on the above mentioned apparently prevalent Docetic conception: "Our belief regarding this is that it actually happened to them (i.e. to the eleven Imams) and that their condition was in no wise doubtful to the people... On the contrary, their assassination was witnessed in truth and reality, not as a supposition or delusion, nor as a matter of doubt and uncertainty. He who maintains that they (the Imams), or even a single one among them,

144 Quoted by Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 227.
145 See above p. 495 f.
146 In his catechism of the Imamiyya, MS. British Museum. The Arabic text of the following passage is quoted Shiites, II, 30.
147 It is the general belief of the Imamites, which is only true in part, that all the Imams, except the twelfth and last who is to appear as the Mahdi, died an unnatural death. The descriptions of the martyrdom of the Imams form a favorite theme in shiitic literature. Compare Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 212 f.
pretended (to be dead), does not belong to us and we are not responsible for him." In order to illustrate the inexhaustible vitality of this doctrine, an instance may finally be quoted from the history of modern Babism. When the Bābī apostle Mulla Ḥusein, after having for four months heroically resisted the besieging Persian troops, was mortally wounded in 1848, he called his faithful together and entreated them to persevere in their struggle. "He forbade them to believe in his death. The latter was nothing but a deceptive illusion, for in fourteen days he would rise again. At the same time he ordered his most intimate friends to bury him with utmost secrecy so that no one should know where his body was interred."

Docetism is not entirely unknown to Judaism and is represented there by a few isolated instances. But in orthodox Judaism it has never attained to any historic or dogmatic significance. Hence the comparatively numerous specimens of Docetic belief to be met with in Jewish sectarianism cannot be derived from a Jewish source and, considering the environment in which these sectarian movements arose, they can be safely attributed to Mohammedan or, more correctly, heterodox Mohammedan influence.

---

148 About Babism see later in the course of this article.
149 This is undoubtedly a mistake for forty, see above, notes 3 and 92. Similarly the famous Ḥallāj (see later) was expected to return in forty days (Shīites, II, 114, 26). In Browne's statement regarding Ḥallāj (Persia, 435): "Just before his head was struck off, he bade his disciples be of good cheer, for he would return to earth again in thirty days" "thirty" is a mistake for "forty."

150 F. C. Andreas, Die Babis in Persien, 19 f.
151 Comp. AbS., II, 1, n. 4 and p. 44. Another example which affords a striking analogy to Shiitic conceptions is to be found in the later Midrash Wayēša (about eleventh century). The hangman who was on the point of executing Moses by Pharaoh's command was changed into the form of Moses and killed by an angel in his stead. It might however be questioned whether this legend is genuinely Jewish.
Perhaps this influence may best be illustrated by a modern example. In 1868 there arose among the Jews of Yemen, who, in spite of their rigid orthodoxy, distinctly show the effect of the Mohammedan environment, a Jew by the name of Mari\(^{182}\) Shukr al-Kuheil who pretended to be the Messiah.\(^{182}\) He found numerous adherents not only among the Jews but also among Mohammedans— the latter perhaps regarding him as the Antichrist—, and he created a tremendous sensation throughout the whole East.\(^{184}\) Pursued by the Mohammedan powers, he withdrew, in true Mahdistic fashion, into the mountains\(^{185}\) and declared to be invulnerable, boldly proclaiming: “If you do not believe my assertion that I am the Messiah, then cut off my head from my shoulders.”\(^{185}\) Finally the ruler of Sar‘ā sent his soldiers who sought him out in the mountains and cut off his head, which they sent to the capital.\(^{186}\) Yet his relatives were in no wise dismayed by this dénouement, for al-Kuheil had shrewdly enough forewarned them: “Do not believe that they have cut off my head, for I only make it

\(^{182}\) See on this pseudo-Messiah the account of Jacob Saphir, who was an eye-witness of this Messianic movement, in his מִלְיָה, II, 149 ff. A collection of epistles written by this Messiah and by others about him was published by Saphir under the title גֶּזֶר הַמַּעֲלָה (Wilna 1873). See also the report of the traveler Solomon Reinman, מִלְיָה יָם, Vienna 1884, p. 11 f. An autograph letter of Shukr al-Kuheil was published in facsimile and discussed by Mr. David Sassoon in JQR., XIX, 162 ff.

\(^{184}\) מִלְיָה, 13 f. (in a letter from Aden), 25. That it was Kuheil’s intention to appeal also to the Mohammedans is testified by Saphir, מִלְיָה, II, 151.

\(^{185}\) See particularly Sassoon, I. c.

\(^{186}\) מִלְיָה, 7 and 49.

\(^{187}\) מִלְיָה, 14; see later note 161.
so appear to them." In a letter evidently forged and circulated in the name of the Messiah, the latter refers to his fictitious execution as a proof of the truth of his claim. Saphir and Reinman, the two Jewish travelers from whom we derive our information, bear witness to the fact of his decapitation. But they also relate, without being in the slightest aware of the bearing of the fact, that his followers maintained "that his execution was merely an apparition."

Stepping backward in the flight of ages, we are not a little surprised to find that an almost identical fate befell the Messiah who arose in the same country 700 years earlier and whose appearance formed the occasion and the subject of the Iggeret Teman of Maimonides. When the Messiah, whose end is described by Maimonides in his reply...
to the "wise men" of Marseille, was finally brought before the ruler of Yemen, he boldly declared: "My lord and king, cut off my head and afterwards I shall live as before." His request was fulfilled and, as Maimonides slyly adds, "that poor fellow was killed." Yet, as the same Maimonides informs us, "until this day, there are senseless persons who say that he now lives and will manifest himself."

When the Messianic enthusiast David Molcho had been burned at the stake, it was believed, with a rationalistic modification, that the Pope Clemens had substituted someone else for him. Many gave credit to his miraculous escape and continued to believe in him."

After the death of Sabbathai Zevi there were, to use the words of a well-informed contemporary, "great and distinguished scholars who still cling to their faith and continue to believe in him even after his death, maintain-


189 *Kobes*, 26b, second column: התַּעְנִית אֲשֶׁר אוּרֶה בֵּין אַלְמָאָו וַאוֹתָקָו. MS. Add. 27129 reads simply and no doubt more correctly התענית אֲשֶׁר אוּרֶה הָוָא הָיוָה מָנוֹת; Add. 14763 (British Museum) DTP קְמֵי הָוָא הָיוָה מָנוֹת.

185 מְקַבֶּרֶה—דֶּאָדֵה יֵשׁ חֵסֶר נוֹרוֹת אֲדָמִים נוֹרוֹת היָהוֹ נוֹרוֹת (מְקַבֶּרֶה) is rightly missing in both MSS., for the people altogether denied that he was dead. נוֹרוֹת (like Arabic *yakūnum*) is "to arise, manifest oneself as the *ḥā'īm*," (see above, note 40). The Shiitic Mahdi who conquered Yemen and forced Islam upon the Jews (Grätz, VI, 278) is designated by Maimonides (*Iggeret Teman*, in *Kobes*, p. 1, l. 4) as אֲלָכְפֵּאְו הָאַמָּאָו הָיוָה (Arabic original: אֲלָכְפֵּאְו הָאַמָּאָו הָיוָה).  

186 Grätz, IX, 247.

187 Tobias Cohen Rofe (d. 1729): above p. 493.
ing that he was the true Messiah and all that outwardly happened to him was through substitution and delusion."

It is but natural that the Docetic belief with its power of accommodating reality to theory finds its proper test and application in the case of death and particularly violent death which it is called upon to deny in order to enable the movement whose visible leader or moving spirit had departed to continue under the invisible one. But occasionally, and with a mere difference in detail, Docetism is applied to other phenomena the elimination of which appears desirable. A curious example of the application of this belief is found in connection with Sabbathai Zevi. When this embodiment of a pseudo-Messiah, who was generally believed to be the king of the Jews and an incarnation of the Divinity, had been incarcerated by the Turkish government, the Sabbathian missionaries explained this incongruity by the assertion that it was not Sabbathai in person who had been thrown into prison but the angel Gabriel who had assumed his features, while the Messiah himself ascended to heaven. When again shortly afterwards Sabbathai renounced the religion of his fathers and became a Muslim, the same doctrine was employed to ward off the death-blow which this treacherous act would otherwise have dealt to the movement. It was boldly proclaimed that not Sabbathai Zevi but someone else had apostasized.

180 Sasportas, "Some Thoughts on Sabbathai Zevi," (Odessa 1867), 26: "On the death of Sabbathai Zevi, who was generally believed to be the king of the Jews and an incarnation of the Divinity, the Sabbathian missionaries explained this incongruity by the assertion that it was not Sabbathai in person who had been thrown into prison but the angel Gabriel who had assumed his features, while the Messiah himself ascended to heaven. When again shortly afterwards Sabbathai renounced the religion of his fathers and became a Muslim, the same doctrine was employed to ward off the death-blow which this treacherous act would otherwise have dealt to the movement. It was boldly proclaimed that not Sabbathai Zevi but someone else had apostasized."

180 Ibid., 32b: "On the death of Sabbathai Zevi, who was generally believed to be the king of the Jews and an incarnation of the Divinity, the Sabbathian missionaries explained this incongruity by the assertion that it was not Sabbathai in person who had been thrown into prison but the angel Gabriel who had assumed his features, while the Messiah himself ascended to heaven. When again shortly afterwards Sabbathai renounced the religion of his fathers and became a Muslim, the same doctrine was employed to ward off the death-blow which this treacherous act would otherwise have dealt to the movement. It was boldly proclaimed that not Sabbathai Zevi but someone else had apostasized."
while Sabbathai himself went up to heaven and disappeared.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{119} Already Grätz (X, 222) compares these notions with the ancient Docetic beliefs regarding Christ. But, not being aware of the Mohammedan medium, he is unable to establish the historic connection.

(To be concluded)
INQUIRY INTO THE SOURCES OF KARAITE HALAKAH

By Bernard Revel, Marietta, Ohio

The causes of the Karaite schism and its early history are veiled in obscurity, as indeed are all the movements that originated in the Jewish world during the time between the conclusion of the Talmud Babli and the appearance of Saadia Gaon.

From the meager contemporary sources it would seem that from the second third of the eighth century until the downfall of the Gaonate (1038) the whole intellectual activity of Babylonian Jewry centered about the two Academies and their heads, the Geonim. Of the early Gaonic period the Jewish literature that has reached us from Babylonia is mainly halakic in character, e.g. Halakot Gedolot, Sheeltot, and works on liturgy, which afford us an insight into the religious life of the people. From them, however, we glean very little information about the inner life of the Jews in Babylonia before the rise of Karaism; hence the difficulty of fully understanding the causes which brought about the rise of the only Jewish sect that has had a long existence and has affected the course of Jewish history by the opposition it has aroused.

The study of sects always has a peculiar interest. During the thirties of the last century, the Karaites themselves made accessible to the scholarly world the works of
some of their latter-day authorities, and with the publication of Simhah Pinsker’s epoch-making work “Likk\'ute Kadmoniyot” (1860) the attention of Jewish scholarship was turned to Karaism and its literature. Pinsker, blinded by his discovery of an important phase in the development of Judaism, invented a pan-Karaite theory, according to which the Karaites are to be looked upon as the source of all intellectual achievement of mediæval Judaism (Likk\'ute, I, 4, 32). The Masorah is a product mainly of theirs, and it is among them that we are to look for the beginnings of Hebrew grammar, lexicography, poetry, and sound biblical exegesis. The Rabbanites, since Saadia Gaon, were merely imitators of the Karaites. Pinsker believed that every Jewish scholar, prior to the eleventh century, who busied himself with the study of Bible alone, was a Karaite, and he transformed, accordingly, more than one Rabbanite into a Karaite.

The question of the origin of Karaism, its causes and early development is still awaiting solution. That Karaism is not the result of Anan’s desire to revenge himself on Babylonian official Jewry, need not be said. Karaite literature affords us no data; there is a marked lack of historical sense among them. They have no tradition as to their origin, and their opinions are conflicting (comp. Pinsker, Likk\'ute, II, 98). The belief that Karaism is but an echo of a similar movement during this period in the Islamic world is now generally given up owing to the advance made in the knowledge of the inner development of Islam and, particularly, the nature of the Shiite heterodoxy (see I. Friedlaender, JQR., 1910, 185 ff.).

This question is bound up with the problem of the origin of the Karaite halakah which is of vital importance
for the understanding the history of Tradition; as Geiger (ZDMG., XVI (1862), 716) says, it was always the differences in practice, not in dogma, that caused and sustained divisions in Israel. This is particularly true of the Karaites who differ in nothing but religious practices from the rest of Israel.

The solution offered by Geiger that the Karaites are the descendants of the Sadducees and their halakah Sadducean, is accepted with some modification by many scholars (comp. Poznański, REJ., XLIV (1901), 169). On the other hand, the eclectic nature of the Karaite halakah was recognized by several scholars (comp. S. L. Rapoport in Kerem Chemed, V (1841), 204 ff., and in Kaempf’s Nichtandalusische Poesie, 240; P. Frankl, Ersch u. Gruber, sec. II, vol. 33, 12; Harkavy, in Grätz’ Geschichte, V, 482 ff.; id., Jahrbuch f. jüd. Geschichte u. Literatur, II (1899), 116 ff., and elsewhere). No attempt was, however, made to explain the bulk of the Karaitic halakah, on these lines. I have therefore undertaken the work of tracing the individual Karaite laws to their respective sources, which will, at the same time, be the first exposition of the Karaite laws in general—prefacing it by an examination of the Sadducean-Karaite theory. The term “Karaite halakah” is used here as a convenient one, though, as Kirkisani has unwillingly shown—and any Karaite code testifies to it—the laws on which all Karaites agree are few. The Karaite laws are discussed here not according to subject matter, but such as have common source are grouped together. I begin with Philo, as the relation of Karaite halakah to that of Philo has remained, to my knowledge, hitherto unnoticed. This relation, if established, may prove helpful in the understanding of other
points in the inner history of Judaism during the first centuries of Islam.

For the halakah of Philo, I have used the work of Dr. B. Ritter, "Philo und die Halacha, eine vergleichende Studie," from which most of the citations from Philo in this treatise are taken. Other Philonian laws, not treated by Ritter, are discussed here, but only as they bear on the Karaite halakah.

Not all the early Karaites claimed antiquity for their schism. This is evident from the reply of Salman b. Yeruḥam to Saadia's mention of their late origin (Pinsker, II, 19). Another contemporary of Saadia, Abu Jusuf Yakūb al-Kirkisani, the most reliable historian among the Karaites, gives a date for what he calls the Rabbanite dissension: Jeroboam, to make permanent the power he had usurped and to prevent the Israelites owing allegiance to the house of David, divided the nation by sowing the seed of dissension, perverted the Law, and changed the calendar (I Kings 12, 32). The followers of Jeroboam in later times are called Rabbanites. Those who remained faithful to the original laws were the ancestors of the Karaites. This fanciful explanation found no credence even among the Karaites.
The Karaites, say the Karaites, being at that time the sole authority, introduced many innovations upon his return and changed the true interpretation of the Law. To enforce these new laws, he invented the fiction that besides the Written there is also an Oral Law given to Moses on Sinai and handed down from generation to generation, and that the laws proclaimed by him went back to this real tradition.

The people followed him blindly. But some of them, knowing the false basis of these changes, rejected them and adhered to the ancient Tradition in all its purity; those were the Karaites.4

adds that those who remained faithful to the original faith migrated לונין והם and only few of them, because of their attachment to the Temple, remained in Jerusalem. Yet, as Pinsker (II, 98) remarks, Elias himself put little confidence in this myth. For the origin of this legend, see A. Epstein Eldad ha-dani (Pressburg 1891), p. 1. For later Karaites repeating this story, see Poznański, L. c., p. 163; comp. ZfKB., III, 92 (end) and 93, for the view of a tenth century Karaite (comp. ib., 90 and 172 ff.).

4 As a striking instance of the purely mythological character of the Karaites about their origin and past, I shall illustrate the three strata in the development of the last mentioned Karaite theory of their origin. Sahl b. Mašliha (tenth century) asserts that Karaism goes back to the time of the second Temple, but connects it with no specific event (Pinsker, II, 35). This is still the opinion of Aaron b. Elias (fourteenth century)
On the other hand, most of the Mediæval Jewish scholars seem to agree that Karaism was due to a revival of the Sadducees (Abraham Ibn Daud) or that Sadducean elements are prominent in it (Saadia, Judah Halevi). Saadia Gaon (891-942) was the first to meet the Karaites in open battle and refute their claims for recognition. He states that Karaism is of recent origin (Pinsker, II, 19) and that Anan's breaking with Tradition was due entirely to

in Introduction to his in 1H3, 40. Elias b. Moses Bashyazi a century later connects the schism with the name of Simeon b. Shatah and exclaims: וא שלמה שלמה ב שמחות כנאר אלכיזי והבה עד החנהר והיווה את זמר (intr. to in 1H3, Goslow 1834, 3a). He is followed by his disciple Kaleb Afendopolo in his עתיר רומאתי (quoted in רזרא, Wien 1830, 90). The sixteenth century Karaite prodigy Moses b. Elias Bashyazi (born 1554 and said to have died 1572) amplified this tale by asserting in his משל האלומית (quoted in משל רכסי, 9b ff.) that Judah b. Tabbaï, who had also survived the king's wrath, opposed the innovations introduced by Simeon b. Shatah as also his fiction of an oral law. Judah attracted to his banner all those who remained faithful to ancient traditions. Simeon and Judah each became the head of a school, thus dividing the Jews into two factions. Simeon was succeeded by Abtalion, Abtalion by Hillel who systematized the new laws based on the fiction of the Oral Law. Judah b. Tabbaï was followed by Shemaiah, and Shemaiah by Shammai; those two being the great Karaite teachers from whom the line of succession was never interrupted. Already Jephthah b. Said asserted that Shammai was the teacher of the Karaites (Pinsker, II, 186; comp. ib., I, 6); see also Luzzatto, III (1838), 223; Geiger, ib., IV, 12; Gottlober, Wilna 1865, 5 ff. How foreign this idea was to the early Karaites is seen from what Salman b. Yeruham says of Bet Shammai and Bet Hillel (Z/c/b., IV, 117): ותבודד הר ב מרשא המושי.

personal motives (ib., 103). Yet he adds that the remnants of Zadok and Boethus joined Anan (l. c.). About two centuries later, a time which was decisive in the battle between traditional Judaism and the Karaites, the three great lights of Toledo, Judah Halevi, Abraham Ibn Ezra, and Abraham Ibn Daud, each strove to check the Karaite propaganda in Spain carried on at that time with great zeal by Ibn al-Taras, the disciple of Jeshua b. Judah, and they all assert that Karaism is an offshoot of Sadduceeism. Judah Halevi declares that the Karaite schism arose in the time of John Hyrcanus. The Karaites, says he, are superior to the Sadducees in questions of dogma, but agree with them in important religious questions. Abraham Ibn Ezra also identifies them with the Sadducees. In his commentaries on the Bible, which are strongly anti-Karaitic, he usually styles them רַבּוֹקִים. More emphatic is Abraham Ibn Daud in his Sefer Hakkabalah, where he says that "after the destruction of the Temple the Sadducees dwindled to almost nothing until Anan appeared and strengthened them." Likewise, Maimonides, commenting

---

* That Saadia is meant by כַּיֵּי שָׁדָא, see Pinsker, p. 98; comp. Poznański, JQR., X, 242.  
† Comp. Frankl, MGWJ., XXI (1882), 3 ff.  
‡ Spain was from early Gaonic times infected with Karaism; comp. Ginzberg, l. c., I, 123, note 1; Frankl. MGWJ., 1888, 6 ff.; and Poznański, JQR., XVI, 788-9. Against the view of Hirschfeld (JQR., XIII, 225 ff.) that some relation existed between the Karaites and the Zahirites in Spain, see Goldziher, REJ., XLIII (1901), 6-7.  
§ Kuzari, III, 65. Judah Halevi's view is shared by Abrabanel, הנלע תוב, and S. Duran, מִשְׁנָה אַבְעָה on Abot 1, 3, and II, 21a; 31a.  
* Neubauer, Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, I, 64, The variant דִּינִי does not affect the meaning of the statement.  
** Introduction to his Commentaries on the Bible; Lev. 3, 9; 23, 17, 40. As to the relation of Ibn Ezra to the Karaites, see J. S. Reggio, מִשְׁנָה שב, I (Wien 1834), 42 ff.; see also D. Rosin, MGWJ., XLIII, 76-7.
(Abot I, 3) on the dissension of Zadok and Boethus, adds: "In Egypt they are called Karaites, while in the Talmud they are named Sadducees and Boethusians."

Elias b. Moses Bashyazi, a fifteenth century Karaite, tells us, in the introduction to his Kether ha-Shem, 3a, that it is the opinion of all the Rabbanite scholars that the Karaite schism goes back to Zadok and Boethus.

Much confidence, however, was not placed in this testimony of the Mediæval Rabbanites, that the Karaites descended from the Sadducees, as it is evident that the Rabbanites were often actuated by the desire to stamp their opponents in the eyes of the people as descendants of that hated sect which denied divine Providence and resurrection. In the middle of the last century Abraham

---

12 See his commentary on Hullin 1, 3. On the views of Maim. on the Karaites, see ib. (Budapest 1905), Hungarian part, 164-170; see also the other authors mentioned by Poznanski, REJ., 64, 170, to which may be added Estori ha-Pharbi ha-Kohen, end of ch. 5 (ed. Lunz, p. 61); David Abi Zimra, Responsa, IV, resp. 319; Meiri on Abot 1, 3. See also Responsum No. 34 in the Gaonic collection.

13 Comp. David Messer Leon (published by Schechter), REJ., XXIV, 126. See Weiss, IV, 43. Joseph al-Basir is the only one among the Karaites who identifies the Karaites with the Sadducees (Poznanski, I, c., p. 170). Kirkisani states that the Sadducees revealed part of the truth and that there were no Sadducees in his days (ch. 18, p. 317). Jepheth b. All (Poz., 64, 171-2) and Hadassai (Alphabeta 97, 98) speaks of the Sadducees with contempt. The statement by Jacob b. Reuben (Pinaker, II, 84) that the Karaites are the descendants of the Sadducees was, therefore, taken by him from Joseph al Basir's Katsaj and not from Jepheth b. Ali, as Harkavy (Grätz, Geschichte, V, 474) suggests. Nor is Harkavy (l. c.) right in his assertion that Elias b. Abraham shared this view. See above note 3. Comp. also Pinaker, I, 11-12. The later Karaites claimed that the imputation that they were in some way related to the Sadducees was due to the hatred the Rabbanites bore them. See Kaleb Afendopolo, quoted in
Geiger attempted to prove historically the descent of the Karaites from the Sadducees, and this view constitutes an essential part of his epoch-making theory concerning the internal development of post-exilic Judaism and the history of Jewish sects. His view is accepted by Holdheim, Fürst, Harkavy, Chwolson, and others. A general survey of Geiger's theory will help us better to understand the questions involved.

From the earliest times, says Geiger, two distinct, or, rather, antagonistic currents were at work shaping the history of Judaism. The dualism revealed itself in olden times in the divided nationality of Ephraim (or Joseph) and Judah. Ephraim constituted a worldly kingdom, in constant contact with the neighboring nations and, therefore, in need of a sacrificial and ceremonial religion and a powerful priesthood to protect it from the surrounding heathen influences. Judah, on the other hand, constituted a kingdom politically insignificant, compact and isolated, and less susceptible to foreign influences, with one national sanctuary and a less developed priesthood. Judah escaped the fate of Ephraim and awoke to new life in the sixth century.

---

15 Geschichte d. Karäerthums (Leipzig 1862), I, 8 ff.
16 In Russian periodical "Woschod," 1896, and elsewhere; comp. id., 4, 19.
18 For a more detailed account see Poznański, Abraham Geiger, Leben u. Lebenswerk, Berlin 1910, 352-388.
century B.C. With this new life came a struggle, in which priestly aristocracy and sacerdotal rule were antagonized by tendencies towards religious and political democracy that asserted themselves more and more. Since the establishment of the second commonwealth the priests ruled the nation. There stood at the head of the state a high-priest, descendant of the family of Zadok, the chief of the priesthood in the days of David and Solomon (I Kings, 1, 34; 2, 35; I Chron. 29, 22), members of which had exercised priestly functions ever since the building of Solomon’s Temple. This family and those related to it constituted the nobility of the nation and since the Return controlled the secular as well as the religious life of the people.

This power, blended with the attribute of holiness, soon led the priestly ruling class to disregard the needs and demands of the people. They stood for the ancient laws and observances, which established and asserted their rights and prerogatives, admitting no modification which the times required. They also allied themselves with the Syrians and cultivated tastes and habits distasteful to the people.” With the victory of the Maccabees the government and the high-priesthood passed over to the latter, the Sadducees, the old nobility, joining them. An opposition against them arose among the people, the leaders of which were known as the “Separated” (Perushim), descendants of those who in the days of Zerubbabel and again in the

21 Ib., p. 282 ff.; Jüd. Zeitschr., II, 17 ff.; ZDMG., XIX, 603 ff. An offshoot of the Sadducees, and united with them were the Boethusians, a new aristocratic priestly family called after Simon b. Boethus, high-priest and father-in-law of Herod I (Urschrift. 102, 134 ff., 143 ff.). Herrfeld, Geschichte, II, 387, accepts the view of Azariah dei Rossi that the Boethusians are the Essenes spoken of by Philo and Josephus. See also REJ., III, 113 ff.
time of Ezra separated themselves from heathen surroundings and influences (Ezra 6, 21; 9, 1; Neh. 9, 2). Their aim was to limit the power of priestly aristocracy and turn the government over to the people. The Pharisees recognized the sanctity of priesthood, but contested the centralization of secular power in the hands of the sacerdotal-aristocratic families.

The difference between these two parties, originally small and of a general nature, widened in time. The spirit of rivalry in this politico-religious struggle brought about laws and regulations on the part of the Pharisees intended to check the authority and diminish the privileges of the priests. Personal purity and sanctity of all the people were to take the place of the sanctity of priesthood. The Pharisees devised new rules of interpretation which enabled them to limit and restrict the biblical laws establishing priestly rights. On the other hand, many laws of purity and observances concerning food, originally intended for the priests and the Temple, they made apply to all the people in and outside of the Temple. So the Pharisees did not adhere to the letter of the Law, but taught and expanded the Law with regard to its inner spirit and the needs of the time, whereby they created a new Halakah differing in content as well as in spirit from the ancient, Sadducean, tradition. The majority of the people followed the new Halakah, but the Sadducean teachings found acceptance outside of Judah proper. The Samaritans, descendants of Northern Israel, were not allowed by the leaders of the national party in the time of Zerubbabel to participate in the further development of Judaism (Ezra

**Jüd. Zeitschr., VI, 265 ff.**

**Urschrift, 156 ff., 176, 434 ff.; Nachgelassene Schriften, II, 121 ff.; V (Heb.), 112 ff., 142 ff. and elsewhere.**
4, i ff.). The ancient feud between Ephraim and Judah thus revived. The rejected Samaritans who retained the ancient Israelitish tradition as well as the ancient interpretation of the Law, clung, like the Sadducees, to those traditions and stood for priestly prerogative, characteristic of the religion of Northern Israel and the Sadducees. This accounts for the many practices and interpretations of the law that are common to the Sadducees and the Samaritans.\textsuperscript{m}

But, even in Judah, only the political antagonism between the Pharisees and the Sadducees ceased with the destruction of the Temple. The Sadducees, whose existence as the priestly aristocracy and ruling class depended upon the state and the Temple, ceased to control the life of the people. But the religious differences between these two parties did not disappear.

The victorious Pharisees, who ruled the day, rejected all traditions, preserved by the Sadducees, which tended to affirm the exclusive rights of the priests, and the whole body of traditional law was now made to conform to their views. Not all the Pharisaic teachers, however, agreed to these radical changes, and some of them retained their allegiance to the pre-Pharisaic Halakah. Notably among them are Shammai and his school represented by R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus and Jose the Galilean.\textsuperscript{n}

But official Pharisaism did not heed them. It established as a religious norm the interpretations and laws which emanated from the school of Hillel, the great cham-

\textsuperscript{m} Nachg. Schriften, III, 258 ff., 284 ff.; IV, 65; V (Heb.), 149 ff.; ZDMG., XII, 132 ff. and elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{n} Jüd. Zeitschrift, VIII, 283 ff. and elsewhere; comp. Hoffmann, Magasin 1884, 19.
pion of Pharisaism, who began the systematization of the
new Halakah. Hillel's work was firmly established by R.
Akiba and brought to completion by Judah Ha-nasi. Two
centuries later the center of Judaism was transferred to
Babylonia, and soon all consciousness of an earlier and
differing Halakah disappeared."

Zealously as the Pharisees of the school of Hillel
worked to exclude and annul the laws and traditions tainted
with Sadducean views, traces of the latter are still found
in some of the apocryphal books; in the Greek version of
the Scriptures (LXX); in the Aramaic version, Pseudo-
Jonathan;* in the halakic midrashim from the school of
R. Ishmael, himself a priest and with priestly sympathies,*
and, to a lesser extent, in the later Palestinian halakic
works, Tosefta and Talmud Jerushalmi."

But not only are we able to reconstruct parts of the
Sadducean Halakah through the traces in these works,
but the Sadducean tradition is still alive, its laws are observ-
ed and its practices carried out by their descendants, the
Karaïtes; not only are they the followers and spiritual
heirs of the Sadducees, but their physical descendants.
Doctrines and practices adhered to and observed by a na-
tion do not disappear at the desire of its leaders. Nor
were the Sadducees annulled. The descendants of the
once dominant party continued to live according to the
traditions of their ancestors. The religious unrest prev-

see below.
* כִּי נְהַלָּה וְיַעַשְׂרָה; Urschrift, 434 ff.; Jüd. Zeitschr. IV, 96 ff.; VIII,
284; IX, 8 ff.; XI, 51 ff., and elsewhere.
* See Jüd Zeitschrift, VIII, 291 ff. For the Jerushalmi comp. MGWJ.,
1871, 120 ff.
alent in the Islamic world in the eighth century caused them also to unite and defy their old enemies, the Pharisees. Their leader Anan gave them his name, which was, however, soon changed to the appellation "עמל נהארש or קראים.

Karaism is, thus, not to be looked upon as a late-day revolt against the authority of Tradition caused by outside influence, but is a survival in a somewhat modified form (as by belief in resurrection) of the pre- and anti-Pharisaic tradition. 80

80 D. Chwolson in his Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte d. Judenthums (Leipzig 1910) goes further than Geiger, and asserts that long after the destruction of the Temple, the Sadducees were predominant (pp. 10-22). He bases this view on the assumption that during the time of the Second Commonwealth the Sadducees constituted not only the priestly and secular aristocracy, but also the bulk of the people, their disappearance with the destruction of the State being therefore inconceivable (p. 23 ff.).

Chwolson also believes that it was the people who remained faithful to the Sadducean tradition who are designated in the talmudic literature by the name ног רוחי. This accounts for the mutual hatred that existed between the Am-ha'are and Pharisaic teachers (p. 9). Chwolson adduces the talmudic account (b. Berakot 47b and parallel) of the ceremonies the non-observance of which characterized the Am-ha'are, as proof of the latter being identical with the Sadducees. It is there said that the Am-ha'are does not read the Shema'; that he does not put on the phylacteries; that he does not wear fringes on his garments and that he has no Mesuah on his door. Now the Karaites even up to this day observe none of these ceremonies. Some relationship must exist between the Am-ha'are and the Karaites. As the Karaites are, Chwolson believes, descendants of the Sadducees, a relationship is established between the Am-ha'are and Sadducees.

The facts are, however, not as Chwolson puts them. The Karaites have never rejected the biblical precept of דעה וחיים, even if they differ as to the meaning of בקע and some other details; see, for Anan, Harkavy, מטראות לברון , pp. 7-10, and Schechter, Jewish Sectaries, II, 25, 1-26, 17; Hadassi, Alph. 241 and 364 (136b); Mibhar, Num., ad loc., 84b ff.; נטראות לברון (Neubauer, Aus d. Petersburger Bibliothek), IV, 496 ff.; comp. also Ibn Ezra on Num. 15, 38, 39. Nor is it likely that the Karaites have even denied the duty of reading the Shema'. Abu Isa Isfahani, from whom Anan borrowed several laws (comp. Poznański, REJ. XLIV (1902), 178), taught, according to Kirgisani (comp. Harkavy, עליה וחיים, 9).
The reliability of the traditional account of the origin of the Sadducees and Boethusians (Abot de R. Nathan, ch. 5), rejected by Geiger (Urschrift, 105 ff.) as an apocryphal legend, was vindicated by Baneth in Magasin, IX (1882), p. 1-37; 61-95, where is also shown how far the view of Geiger—that the Sadducees did not reject Tradition but adhered to a more ancient interpretation of the Law—contradicts the explicit statements of Josephus (Ant. XIII, 10, 6; XVII, 1, 4) and all the Talmudic accounts about them.

Before we enter into a discussion of the agreements between the Sadducees and the Karaites which serve Geiger as proofs of the relation of the latter to the former, a few words will not be amiss on the general difficulties connected with the hypothesis, which were ignored by the duty of reading the Shema'. Its reading is enjoined by the later Karaites; see Hadasa, Alph. 15 (15d); see Weiss, IV, 88; L. Löw. Ges. Schr., I, 50. Neither can the Am-haaretz be identified with the Sadducees by his non-observance of the law of Tefillin. The Sadducees accepted the literal interpretation of Deut. 6, 8 (see Weiss, I, 118; Fürst, Geschichte d. Karäerthumt, I, 10; Graetz, III, 3, 395; comp. also Müller, Masechet Soferim, p. 21, note 66). The name אלפיה in Menahot 42b ... פאסר רודא misled Wreschner (Samaritische Traditionen, Berlin 1888, intr., p. VIII) and J. A. Montgomery (The Samaritans, Philadelphia 1908, 136) to believe that the Sadducees interpreted Deut. 6, 8 symbolically. רודא (in Menahot (l. c.) is, as often in the Amoraic literature, equivalent to אלפיה, or was, as usual, substituted therefor by the censor. The parallel passage (Giṭṭin 45b) reads rather than instead of פאסר, which is also the reading of Estori ha-Pharḥi, end of ch. 5. Harkavy (ב(click 142, n. 12) believes that Anan interpreted Deut. 6, 9 literally but referred a view which is held also by the Falashas (Epstein, Bidda ha-Dani, 174).

Comp. also Wellhausen, Die Phariser u. die Sooducēer, Greifswald 1877, 73; G. Holscher, Der Sadduzismus, Leipzig 1906, pp. 9, 33 ff., 107 ff. The general nature of the Sadducees was recently thoroughly discussed by I. Halevy in his דרש את הנשונים, vol. Ic, pp. 358 ff.
Geiger. Geiger believes that all the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees may be brought under one unifying principle, viz., the advocacy of priestly interests by the Sadducees. But if this was the distinctive mark of the Sadducees, what import could this tendency have had many centuries after the destruction of the Temple, when there was no more priestly aristocracy nor prerogative? And how could this issue sustain and keep alive Sadduceism under the appellative שופט קורא until to-day? Nor can we comprehend how Karaism whose basic principle since the days of its first exponent Anan was תַּנָּא בַּיָּהוּ, "Search the Scripture," interpret it according to your own reason, and act accordingly," ignoring tradition,— how Karaism could have descended from Sadduceism which, as Geiger himself asserts, was by its very nature conservative, adhering stringently to ancient tradition.

This Sadducean-Karaite theory of Geiger is closely connected with his hypothesis concerning the existence of an ancient Halakah related to the Sadducean and which was therefore suppressed by the later Pharisees, a view that has been accepted by many scholars. A brief discussion of this hypothesis in relation to Karaism is given here.

The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch is, as Geiger (Urschrift, 162 ff., 451 ff.; N. S., IV, 106 ff.; V (Heb.), 112 ff.) believes, the main depository of remnants and traces of this ancient Sadducean-Samaritan-Karaite Halakah. Ps.-Jon., being a product of Palestine at a time when the more ancient Sadducean traditions had not altogether died out there—though changed to conform to the New Halakah,— still contains much which goes back to

**Harkavy, בֵּית אֱלֹהִים, 132, 176; so Sahl b. Mašlah (Pinaker, II, 33-4); comp. Poznański, REJ., XLIV (1902), 180 ff.**
those ante-Pharisaic traditions. As proof of this view, Geiger (Urschrift, 176 ff.) attempted to show that several Karaite anti-traditional laws are found among the Samaritans and in Ps.-Jon. The following are the main points of agreement which Geiger finds between the Karaite law and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and which he therefore believes to be survivals of the ancient halakah.

According to the traditional interpretation of Lev. 19, 24, the fruit of a tree in its fourth year is, like the "second tithe," to be consumed by the owner within the walls of Jerusalem. This is also the view of Josephus, Ant., IV, 8, 19. Pseudo-Jonathan, however, translates 'ד' ד' ב' 'ד' by ב' ת' א' מ' מ' א' ב' ד' so also on Deut. 20, 6. The Samaritans and Karaites also take ב' ת' א' מ' מ' א' ב' ד' to mean that it is to be given to the priest or redeemed by its owner. Geiger (Urschrift, 181-184) believes this to have been the view of the ancient Halakah. Since this interpretation agrees with the plain meaning of ב' ת' א' מ' מ' א' ב' ד' (comp. Ibn Ezra ad loc.), there is no necessity to assume with Geiger that this interpretation by some Karaites goes back to an ancient tradition.


According to Tradition, two tithes were to be taken every year (except the sabbatical year). The "first tithe" (Num. 18, 21 ff.) and the "second tithe" (Deut. 14, 22 ff.) are to be taken in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years; the "first tithe" and the tithe for the poor (Deut. 26, 12 ff.) in the third and sixth years of every cycle of seven years. Geiger (Urschrift, 176 ff.) contends that the ancient Halakah required the taking of all these three tithes in the third and sixth years, as the Karaites hold. **

Not all; see mm 1113, Deut. 180; Flavius Josephus und die Halacha, Berlin 1885, 16-19. See also Mibbar, Deut., 12a; 23b; and *Mishnah* to the last mentioned place, letters 27-28. According to Anan (Schechter, Jewish Sectories II, p. 5 ll. 10-19) two tithes are to be taken every year. This seems to be the meaning of his words: "פְּרוּ יָנוּלָה" גַּמַּה תַּנּוּ עֵלֵי כְּלֵי בְּרִאָם מִבְּשָׂרֵי הַמִּשְׁמַרְתִּים שָׁלֵּשִׁים מָשְׂרִים מַעֲקֵרָן יָנוּלָה; comp. H. Olitzki, Flavius Josephus und die Halacha, Berlin 1885, 16-19.

A similar view is mentioned in ibid. 18a: כְּלָלָה, see Deut. 18a: בכלי בניו המקדש כחיי עם הרומא.
bases this opinion on Tobit 10, 7, 8 (against which see F. Rosenthal, *Vier Apokryphische Bücher*, Leipzig 1885, 117, note), Josephus *Ant.* IV, 8, 22, Sifre to Deut. 12, 17; 14, 28 (against which see Weiss, *I, 126, note*); but mainly on Ps.-Jon. to Deut. 26, 12-13:

אומר חישונ לפשיא: ואמר הת.getLogger חישון lst תרומת התותמ ומשראה קמאה ליאויẶמשיא תונינא והמשרש סכונית לניוהא לתותמ האורמלאר

ויוכל בעפרים יぱשא: ומשרש התותמ חישון קמאה להא תונינא ליאויараметאר בראוו עלאור דאמגנונ קירשא קומ יבהא קורא קמשרא קמאא ליאויא סכנהא תונינא לניוהא האורמלאר ואכל ספודויאב ספרוהיא לה

As was already pointed out by M. Olitzki (Flavius Josephus und die Halacha, 18, note) and Bassfreund (*MGW J.*, XL 1896, 5 ff.), there is nothing in Ps.-Jon. to these two verses to justify the view of Geiger. What Ps.-Jon. adds to the translation of the text is entirely in agreement with tradition (Sifre, II, 109 and 302) that in the three years after each of the last three years must be removed, the first tithe given to the Levite and the "second tithe" carried to Jerusalem. (See also on the whole Pineles, 173-6, and Gronemann, p. 161 ff.).

Harkavy's suggestion (תובע הפלרכ, 142, note 18) that Ibn Ezra on Deut. 14, 28 meant Anan and the Karaites is thus proved erroneous; comp. also Book of Jubilees 32, 11. For a full refutation of the view of Geiger, see Bassfreund, *MGW J.*, XL (1896), 5-8.

Geiger, on the basis of his theory that R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus and R. Ishmael represent the ancient Halakah related to Sadducean Tradition (see above), sees also in every agreement of Ps.-Jon. with the interpretation of R. Eliezer or R. Ishmael ancient laws, which were changed by the school of R. Akiba (*Urschift*, 447, 472 ff.; Nach. Schriften, IV, 106-7). It was however shown by Gronemann (119, note 2; see also 103, note; 139-140, notes; comp. also Epstein, *MGW J.*, XL (1896), 142) that Ps.-Jon. does not always follow the interpretation of the school of R. Ishmael against that
An agreement between Pseudo-Jonathan and many Karaites, not noticed by Geiger, is their interpretation of Lev. 18, 21 as referring to marriage with a Gentile woman;" see Kirakisani II, 23; Hadassi (Alph. 324): see also Alph. 278, 313 and 364; see also Sifre II, 171 and as Friedmann, Bet Talmud, I, 336-7 (comp. Ginzburger, MGWJ., 1900. 6 ff.), points out, the Mishnah simply meant that this verse is not to be interpreted in public as it adds to the text.

of R. Akiba, his acceptance of the former being mostly conditioned by their being nearer to the plain meaning of the verse; comp. also the view of D. Hoffmann, Zur Einleitung in die halachische Midraschim, pp. 74-76.

This verse, as Frankel (Einfluss, 156) remarks, gave rise to many divergent interpretations. Anan also interpreted this verse allegorically; see Harkavy, Tosef. midrashot לְנוֹן, 207, and Schechter, Jewish Sectaries, II, 32. The interpretation in the Book of Jubilees 30, 7-10 of this verse as referring to one who effects a union between a Jewish woman and a Gentile and that such action is punished by death is found also among the Karaites; so Samuel al-Magrabi (Book of Precepts called אֲלָמָרִית, a unique MS. of the Hebrew translation of the אֲלָמָרִית written in 1722 by Samuel b. Solomon ha-Kohen (see Pinaker, II, 144-5; Gottlober, בְּכָרָה, 202, note) now in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America), 2220: see also Aschkenasi, ad loc.; Aruk, s. v. "וּם, S. L. Rapoport, נְבָלִית, Krakau 1868, p. 283 ff.; Geiger, Urschrift, 304; Nachg. Schriften, IV, 106; Berliner, Onkelos, II, 88 ff. and literature quoted there.
The Karaites agree with Ps.-Jon. to Lev. 1, 4 and 3, 2, against Sifra to 16, 21; Menahot 93a; Tosefta ib., 10, 3 and Philo, II, 241 that סמיה וְיָדָיו: יָדָיו וְסוּמֵיהּ. See Mibhar, Lev., 30a: רַע־עַשֶׁר וּבֵשׁ לְעַנְבִּי וְבֵשׁ לְעַנְבִּי רַע עַשֶׁר וּבֵשׁ לְעַנְבִּי וּבֵשׁ לְעַנְבִּי. So also Mibhar, Lev., 27a, and min 'ron Lev. 1, 4 (3b, end). But see D. Hoffmann, Zur Einleitung in die halachischen Midraschim, Berlin 1887, p. 75, who contends that this interpretation of Ps.-Jon. (which is also favored by the BCS; see Ibn Ezra on Lev. 1, 4) goes back to the school of R. Ishmael.

Ps.-Jon. translates אַחַשֶּׁה חַיוֹת in Deut. 24, 5, against הבֵּית בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ. This is also the interpretation of Ps.-Jon. by many Karaites. See ט' ב עַשֶּׁה בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ אַחַשֶּׁה בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ. So also Mibhar ad loc. (27b). See, however, Mibhar ad loc. (20b). Samuel al-Magrabi (MS. 95a) states that the Karaites are divided on the interpretation of אַחַשֶּׁה חַיוֹת. This deviation of Ps.-Jon. and some of the Karaites from the talmudic interpretation of אַחַשֶּׁה חַיוֹת rests on the plain meaning of that word. See Ibn Ezra ad loc.; comp. Gronemann, l. c., p. 67.

While, as we have seen, the proofs adduced by Geiger do not establish relationship between the ancient Halakah, believed by him to be contained in Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Karaite Halakah, the following consideration, not hitherto noted, arises against any attempt at connecting the Karaite law with the ancient Sadducean Halakah which is believed to be represented in Ps.Jon.:
If the deviation of Ps.-Jon. from our Halakah go back to ancient tradition related to Sadduceism, then we should expect the Karaites—a later name for Sadduceism, according to this view—to be in agreement with such deviations of Ps.-Jon. The following examination of the main halakic divergences of Ps.-Jon. from our Halakah and of the view of the Karaites on these points will show how untenable this view is."

According to Tradition (Mekilta, Mishpatim, i, ed. Fried., 74b; Arakin 18b; p. Kiddushin 59a; Maim. 4, 4) the seventh year in which the Jewish male or female

Ginsburger's edition of Ps.-Jon. (Berlin 1903) is followed here. Most of the differences between Ps.-Jon. and our Halakah are collected by Gronemann, ib. He includes, however, renderings of some passages not being aware that Ps.-Jon. followed in their interpretation the Jerushalmi. Comp. ib., p. 48, in reference to Deut. 17, 5, which is the interpretation of the Jerushalmi. See also Onkelos, ad loc., and Ps.-Jon. on Deut. 22, 24; comp. MGWI., LII (1908), 217, note 1. This also explains Ps.-Jonathan's rendering of Lev. 11, 11: this interpretation which Hoffmann (ZfHeB., VII, 1903, 47) considers to be anti-traditional. But see p. Shebiit 7, 1: the meaning of which, as is evident from what follows there, is that are not to be made objects for trade and gain (see b. Pesahim 23a). Ps.-Jon. in his the meaning of which, as is evident from what follows there, is that are not to be made objects for trade and gain (see b. Pesahim 23a). Ps.-Jon. thus follows the Jerushalmi; comp. also the fragment of a commentary to p. Shabbat published by Poznański in II, 49 and n. 4, and Saadia Gaon on Lev. 11, 11 published by Hirschfeld in JQR., XIX, 140, beginning, in Ps.-Jon. to Deut. 17, 18 (comp. Reifmann, l. c., p. 348) may be a reference to p. Sanhedrin 2, 6 (20c; comp. Tosefta ib., 4, 7: Maim., 3, 1): Ps.-Jon. translates also Deut. 21, 7 in accordance with the interpretation as referring to the murderer. See p. Soṭah 9, 6; comp. b. ib., 38b and Rashi, ad loc. See also on the Halakah of Ps.-Jon. J. Reifman, Bet Talmud, I, 1, 215 ff., 347 ff.; A. Büchler, Die Priester und der Cultus, Wien 1895, 151 ff.; D. Hoffmann, Zur Einleitung in d. halächischen Midraschim, 74-76; id., in ZfHeB., VII (1903), 46-48.
slave is to be released (Ex. 21, 2; Deut. 15, 12) refers not to the Sabbath year (שנה השמכה), but to the seventh year from the commencement of their servitude. Ps.-Jon., however, seems to interpret the "sabbatical year" (Ps.-Jon. to Ex. 21, 7; 22, 2; but see Ps.-Jon. to Ex. 21, 2 and to Deut. 15, 12). The Karaites differing among themselves on the laws of slavery agree with Tradition that refers to the seventh year of servitude. See Samuel al-Magrabi (S. Gitelsohn, Die Civil-Gesetze der Karäer von Samuel al-Magrabi, Berlin 1904, 2, line 1); Afendopolo's appendix to 1-Bxmitcr gc: W>1 -DDJB**T3V yid b» inN'3 nyo liwn D'OB'n13 kw wk nooe> Divra dk D"je> ntjoerino£a n!j.

Geiger holds (Urschrift, 190 ff.) that the ancient Halakah did not distinguish between paid and gratuitous guardians, as does Tradition (B. M. 93a) but made the difference in responsibility depend on the nature of the goods entrusted. It referred Ex. 22, 6-8 to things light in which case the guardian is liable only for lack of ordinary care, and verses 8-13 to things heavy for which the

---

40 So also Josephus (H. Weyl, Die jüdischen Strafgesetze bei Flavius Josephus, Berlin 1900, 122; Oltzski, Magasin, XVI (1889), 78). On the view of Philo, see Ritter, 59, and Weyl, l. c., note 19. The Samaritans also interpret as the seventh year of the servitude (Klumel, Misch-patim, Ein samaritanisch-arabischer Commentar zu Ex. XXI-XXII, 15 von Ibrahim ibn Jakub, Berlin 1902, p. II). They disagree, however, with Tradition in referring Ex. 21, 2-7, to a proselyte (l. c.) a view which is also represented among the Karaites (Jepheth b. Ali quoted in Mibhar, Ex. 40a; Samuel al-Magrabi (Gitelsohn, p. 1, 5)). The Samaritans take וגרוב רוחלך (v. 6) literally (Klumel, p. VII) as do also some Karaites (see בדרות לליהם, 90a; Samuel al-Magrabi (Gitelsohn, 5)).
guardian is responsible even if they were stolen. Ps.-Jon. taking vs. 9-11, against the talmudic interpretation (Mekilta, ad loc.; Baba Meši’a 94b) as referring to a gratuitous guardian and vs. 11, with the Talmud, to a paid guardian, represents according to Geiger (ib.) an intermediate state in the development of the law of guardians.43

All the later Karaites accept fully the traditional interpretation of Ex. 22, 6-15 as referring to four kinds of guardians, so Mibhar, ad loc., 44b-45a; Her, ad loc., 75a-b; and Lev. 5, 1 against Tradition (Sifra ad loc.; Shebuot, ch. 4) as referring to one who is aware of another person swearing falsely or breaking an oath and conceals it (comp. Reifmann, l. c., 313, and Hoffman, Leviticus, I, 199, note).44 The Karaites (Her, ad loc.) interpret this verse like Tradition, as referring to שבעת הגוות.

Geiger (Urschrift, 477) finds support for his view that according to the Sadducees all the work connected

---

43 See RaSHbaM on v. 6; comp. Reifmann, Bet Talmud, I, 219. The view of Gronemann, 77 ff., is improbable, comp. ib., note. For Philo's and Josephus' interpretation of these verses see Ritter, p. 61 ff., and Weyl, p. 130 ff. Hadassi (Alph. 370) refers verses 6-10 to מַסְדָּלִים and verses 10-13 to בַּכֵּלֶל יְהוָה. Benjamin Nehawendi seems also to make this distinction ( mamma יִבְיָס: 36) but contradicts himself. He says (ib., 36): יִבְיָס מַסְדָּלִים נַטְבַּךְ מְמַי וְשֵׁם נֶפֶל יִבְיָס. שַׁמְסָמַר אָם נֵבֶג גַּבֵּג קַמְפוּ וְנוֹ, thus referring verse 11 to מַסְדָּלִים.

44 Philo makes such reticence a capital crime (II, 275; Ritter, p. 47; comp. Werke Philos, II, 114, note 4). This interpretation of Ps.-Jon. seems to have escaped Ritter (l. c.).
with the Red Heifer was to be done by priests only in Ps.-Jon. to Num. 19, 9. 18 (comp. also Brüll, *Bet Talmud*, I, 270).

The Karaites, however, agree with Tradition in the interpretation of *nishamath.* See also Philo II, 253; and Miḥḥar (*ad loc.*, 18b) records the opinion of some Karaites that even *nishamath* (v. 5), which according to Tradition is שֶׁרַעַת מִשְׁתַּחְתָּה (see note 43), does not require a priest.

The Karaites agree with Tradition in the interpretation of "linot" (see also Philo II, 253; and Miḥḥar (*ad loc.*, 18b) records the opinion of some Karaites that even מָכַה (v. 5), which according to Tradition is שֶׁרַעַת מִשְׁתַּחְתָּה (see note 43), does not require a priest.

Ps.-Jon. adds to Period בָּנִי (Lev. 16, 27) the words הָבָּרָה הַבְּרֵי לְכַיִּית לְכַיִּית... which is against the Halakah, as Büchler (*Die Priester und der Cultus*, 153) remarks. The Karaites agree with Tradition. See Miḥḥar, *ad loc.* (28a):

"זְמַעַר יִנְהָה עֲלֵיהֶם לְכַיִּית לְכַיִּית..." Ps.-Jon. differs from Tradition, Yoma 6, 6, in the interpretation of "אֵשֶׁר אַל תִּשְׁתֵּר" (Lev. 16, 22) in ascribing the death of the goat to non-human agency. Geiger (*N. S.*, V, Heb., 115) believes this to have been the ancient interpretation (failing, however, to indicate the reason that

44 Comp. Brüll, *Bet Talmud*, I, 273. Geiger (*l. c.*) quotes also Ps.-Jon. on verses 3, 5, 7, but in the interpretation of v. 5, Ps.-Jon. is in full agreement with Tradition, which also requires נַחֲמָא שֶׁרַעַת to be by a priest (Brüll, *l. c.*, 271, n. 5, notwithstanding). See Parah 4, 4; Tosefta, 4,6; Maim., *Hil. Kiddush Hashabbat*, 3, 2; 4, 17. The view that נַחֲמָא שֶׁרַעַת is represented also in Yoma 42a. As to the slaughtering of sacrifices in general if it need be by a priest, see Ritter, pp. 110-111; see also Büchler, *Die Priester und der Cultus*, 138 ff., and p. 101, n. 2, and p. 155, n. 2. See Yoma 27a and Zebahim 32a; see also Lev. Rabba 22, 4: תְּנַיְּגָא לְכַיִּית לְכַיִּית... .

44 See also Geiger, *Urschrift*, 173 (and Büchler, *l. c.*, 154) as to Ps.-Jon. Ex. 29, 37; 30, 29; against which see the just remarks of Gronemann, 48, note.
might have caused the change in the interpretation of this verse). The Karaite interpretation agrees with that of the Talmud. See Mibhar, ad loc. (27b) ...משלנכו...comp. also מיבחר, ad loc.

According to Tradition (Lev. 7, 16-18) are eaten only two days and the night between (Sifra ad loc.; Zebahim 5, 7; Pesahim 3b; Maimon., 10, 6). It construes מערת הח繳 refers to מערת했. Ps.-Jon. refers to the night after the second day so that are eaten two days and two nights (comp. Ps.-Jon. to Lev. 19, 6). The Karaites are divided on this question. See Mibhar, ad loc. (11b):

דבלدمات לascar ימי ולא הדרה במברך התニー...הנה לשון דר הדת...בכל השישוetrברט יח' לא בהנהר.

But see מיבחר, ad loc. (18b):

הנה לשון דר הדת...בכל השישוetrברט יח' לא בהנהר...בדבר(...vtrbxn rmn.)

In a fragment of a commentary on Lev. which Schechter published in his Saadyana, 144 ff., the author of which Schechter believes to be the famous ninth century Karaite Daniel al Kumsi, the same view is held (ib., p. 146): "...vtrxbxin rmn.)

...vtrbxn rmn.)

4 Aaron b. Elias, however, contradicts himself. See p. 39c, l. 7 from bottom: והרומס דבלدمات לascar ימי ולא הדרה במברך התニー. Philo, as is evident from the third reason given by him for the law of Lev. 19, 6 (II, 245), agrees with Ps.-Jon. See also Geiger, Nachg. Schr., IV, 38; Reifmann, Bet Talmud, I, 314. Chwolson, Das letzte Passamahl Christi, 35, believes this to have been the Sadducean view; comp. ib., 32, 34. The interpretation of Ps.-Jon. seems to have escaped Chwolson. Another Karaite view is found in the fragment mentioned in the text. Daniel says that the words הא עכ קיריק קמקה (Lev. 1, 2) excluded Gentiles from bringing any sacrifices to be offered for them in the Temple. Other Karaites hold the same view (Mibhar, Lev. 390, ad loc., מיבחר, ad loc., but see תיבר דר רעה by the Karaita
Ps.-Jon. interprets לֹא יִבְרֶה לְךָ (Deut. 17, 16) to mean that he should not have more than two horses (לֹא יִבְרֶה לְךָ) which is against the talmudic interpretation that the King is not to keep more horses than he actually needs (Sifre, ad loc., 105b; Sanhedrin 21a, comp. Brüll, Bet Talmud, II, 25-26). The Karaites agree with the talmudic interpretation. See Mibhar, ad loc. (14b):

חַלָּה קֵינֶה תַּנָּה (Deut. 18, 19) as death by strangulation (Sanhedrin 10, 1; Sifre, ad loc., 108a). Ps.-Jon. translates death by sword. The Karaites agree with Tradition. See Mibhar, ad loc. (22a):

As was already remarked by Jonathan Eibeschütz (Achos ha-ros, 9, 2) Ps.-Jon. in his translation of Deut, 24, 1 is against בָּרָא הָאָדָם לְשָׁרֶת חַיִּים וָעָרָבָה הָאָדָם (Deut. 24, 1) which requires the presence of a court for the execution of a bill of divorce. The Karaites agree with Tradition (see Baba Batra 174b; Arakin 23a: אַחֲרֵי מֵי רֵמוֹשׁ בְּרִית אֱלֹהִים אֶל מֻנָּה; but comp. מַעְרִית לוּ בְּרִית אֱלֹהִים, ad loc.; see the literature in L. Löw, Ges. Schr., III, 235-244) against Ps.-Jon. Anan requires the presence of ten, which constitutes a court according to the early Karaites (see REJ., XLV, 67; 69 note) in case of marriage (מדת לְעַבְּדָה, ed. Harkavy, p. 113) but not for a divorce (לְכָּל לְעַבְּדָה, p. 119). See also Benjamin Nahawendi.

M. Sultanski, Goslow 1858, 118). The later Samaritans shared this view (Wreschner, 61-2). This Karaite law is based on no tradition; see Schürer, Division II, Vol. I (Engl. transl.), 399 ff.

Ps.-Jon. interprets לֹא יִבְרֶה in Deut. 13, 6 also by תַּנָּה, which is against the Mishnah, Sanhedrin 10, 1.

Aaron b. Joseph (Mibhar, Deut. 15a) believes that death here is בִּכְרִי דַּרְשָׁם, basing his view on Jerem. 28, 16.
Elias Bashiatzi (3"u,d^j jT,irr^Nmix) states: fnrc cjh vd irpnn ?3^

ddiolain rpri't^na 1*33 [Bin]

It is, however, most probable that in many instances a writ of divorce would be given in the presence of a 

י"ת to insure legality and publicity, to which custom Ps.-

Jonathan's קוד י"ת may be due. In a recently discov-

ered Assuan papyrus a bill of divorce is said to have been given בְּשֵׁה. See Jahrbuch d. jüdisch-literarischen Gesell-


Ps.-Jon. (so also Fragment Targum) interprets וָנָה אָאָא יִיָּה בָּעֵית הָעֵמ

(Deut. 26, 3) against Tradition (Bikkurim 3, 12; Sifre, ad loc.; so also Josephus, IV, 8, 22) as referring to the high priest (י achie הנבעי ר"מ). The Karaites agree with Tradition. See Mibhar, ad loc., 23a. So also הנבעי ר"מ, "ad loc. 29b).

The Karaites, relying on Nehem. 10, 36, contend that the firstlings (Bikkurim, l. c.). According to Tradition (Bikkurim, 1, 3) they are offered only from the "seven kinds" enumerated in Deut. 8, 8. Philo states that they are brought from the fruits of trees (see Werke Philos, II, 168, n. 2; but see Philo, II, 391); comp. also Book of Jubilees 21, 10 and Josephus Ant. IV, 8, 22.

(To be continued)
R. Huna, according to the Palestinian Talmud, was willing to permit the cultivation of the fields of during the sabbatical year. His colleague R. Mana refused to subscribe to this decision, and his procedure was approved of the following day by another scholar who informed him that the estate in question belonged formerly to Rabbi, who obtained it on lease from Antonine; wherefore it was Jewish property and subject to the same law as Syria, where it was allowed, during the sabbatical year, to eat the produce but not to cultivate the fields.

The scholars who have delved into the problem of Antonine and Rabbi have, of course, also drawn this narrative into the field of their investigation. It has received special attention at the hands of S. Krauss in his work

1. p. Sheb. 6, 1 (36d, l. 24).
3. The estate has לא ע disliked which Krauss (p. 18) endeavors to explain by the Syr. מַעְלָה "cultivated land." Löw (Talm. Arch., II, 540, note 75) puts two interrogation marks to this explanation.
"Antoninus und Rabbi," p. 17 ff. He ventures to identify the locality יָבֹלוֹת, where Rabbi's possessions lay, with modern 'Abellin situated not far (north-westerly) from the Battof plain." He considers it beyond any doubt that all the possessions of Rabbi are to be found only in Galilee.

To begin with, the identification of יָבֹלוֹת with 'Abellin surely lacks foundation. 'Abellin corresponds to another locality of the talmudic literature: אֲבֹלִים (abbreviated, probably in the singular, 'אבולימ), and hence cannot be the same as יָבֹלוֹת (in which, according to Krauss, the ' is original as in יָבֹלוֹת, p. 23). Moreover, there is no other place in Galilee which could be identified with יָבֹלוֹת.

But is it indeed impossible for Rabbi to have had his estates outside of Galilee? Krauss, to be sure, considers it impossible, rejecting even Hildesheimer's very plausible identification of יָבֹלוֹת with גַּלְוַן, i.e. Gaulanitis. Let us, however, examine minutely the above-cited passage in order to ascertain the exact facts.

The passage in the Palestinian Talmud referred to treats of several cities and provinces which, although situated on the verge of the Holy Land, still in certain respects belong to the foreign zone. Immediately preceding are Bozrah, Tyre, then Ammon and Moab. This connection shows that we are to seek also יָבֹלוֹת outside of Palestinian territory proper, by all means outside of Galilee.

* Wien 1910.
* p. 18.
* On the Battof plain, Hebr. כִּנְסֵי בִּילָה נֶמְרוּת, see my conclusions in Mitteil. u. Nachr. des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins, 1908, p. 33 ff.; further Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas, p. 54, note 1, and p. 83.
* Comp. my Beiträge, p. 28, n. 4.
* Beiträge zur Geogr. Pal., p. 55, n. 395.
* Comp. also further below.
How indeed could R. Huna have permitted the cultivation of the fields during the sabbatical year if those fields were situated in Middle Galilee, the Jewish territory proper? And even if Rabbi had the land on lease from Antonine, yet originally it was surely Jewish property, and in this case such a permission is simply impossible.

However, there is also direct proof that Rabbi owned an estate outside of Galilee, in which a passage speaks as being the opposite (הנה = here) of Galilee (הנה = there). Thus the locality involved here is by all means outside of Galilee, which is also confirmed by the contents of the passage, as we shall soon see. Krauss, it is true, looks also for הבתני in Galilee and is ready to identify it with הבתני which is written once—no doubt corruptly— הבתני (the ב at the beginning of the word giving rise to הב). But apart from the impossibility of the explanation הבתני = הבתני it must be

As I see now, Grünhut is of the same opinion in the Israelit, 1911, No. 20, p. 12. He identifies ינני with Gebalane, south-east of the Dead Sea. But this territory is known in the talmudic literature as ינני. See Hildesheimer, Beiträge, p. 55, n. 392.

pointed out that יִשְׂרָאֵל was really not situated in Galilee, but rather at the confines of Galilee and Samaria (sixteen miles distant from Sepphoris), and, furthermore, that the inhabitants of that place were Samaritans. Would Rabbi have had his estate in a Samaritan locality? This is hardly to be imagined.

Introducing a slight change of ד to ב, on the basis of the editio princeps, we should rather read בֵּיתנהי, thus obtaining the name of Batanaea, as indeed the same phenomenon of miswriting בֵּיתנהי to בֵּיתנהי appears in another passage where Batanaea is meant. The basalt soil of Batanaea is known to be very fruitful, and thus we understand that Rabbi exported to Batanaea his produce which grew in Galilee, where prices were high, in order to pay tithes at a lower rate. If Rabbi, as seen from the above, had an estate in Batanaea, he could very well have one in Gaulanitis. But we shall soon see that Rabbi’s estate in Batanaea is identical with that in Gaulanitis. However, be-
fore ascertaining this fact, we must still inquire whether Gaulanitis had Jewish inhabitants during Rabbi's lifetime.

Gaulanitis was the name given to the region of the city תָּוְלָן (Josephus) or פַּעְלוּם (Eusebius), i.e. the biblical פְּלָם (Deut. 4, 43; Josh. 10, 8). This place is generally and justly identified with the locality שֵׁם עֵירֶּנֶּן situated amid "well-watered surroundings" in the transjordanic region (east of יָם). The city פְּלָם was certainly important in the second century, since it struck its own coins. The Tosefta mentions the coins of פְּלָם alongside of those of Sepphoris and Tiberias, and the connection in which the name occurs suggests that Jews lived there. The territory of Golan is also mentioned in the Mishnah. The passage in view proves likewise that Jews resided there, for the devastation of the fruitful land of פְּלָם is alluded to as token of the Messianic era in addition to the divine judgment inflicted upon the great assembly house (יִשְׂרָאֵל) and Galilee. Towards the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century we hear again of a Jewish settlement in the city Gaulon which of course also had a synagogue. The Amora R.
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(continued text)
Jeremiah residing in Tiberias once paid a visit to the city—which is named now נָבָלָה and then נְבָלָה—and rendered there a religious decision." If therefore towards the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century there was still a Jewish community in Gaulon, its existence during Rabbi’s lifetime is to be assumed without further hesitation.—Rabbi owned, as indicated above, an estate in בַּתָנְסא. But the biblical גֹּזְלַת or גֹּזְלָה, i.e. the talmudic גֹּזְלָה or גֹּזְלַת, is situated in בַּתָנְסא, as also Josephus and Eusebius make mention of Gaulon in בַּתָנְסא. Thus it can hardly be doubted any longer that in the passage of the Palestinian Talmud cited at the beginning of this paper we are to read גֹּזְלַת instead of גֹּזְלָה and that under it not Gaulanitis" is meant but the city Gaulon itself which was located in בַּתָנְסא. Rabbi’s estate was situated in בַּתָנְסא, more precisely in or near the city Gaulon. The form of the name גֹּזְלָה corresponds exactly to the Gaulon of Eusebius (the ה at the end = ἡ of the st. emphaticus). The miswriting of ג to ג in the beginning of a word is quite possible and is met also in another local name."

2. גוּנֵה

In the vicinity of Gaulon there were also other Jewish communities during Rabbi’s lifetime, as will be shown subsequently.

comp. p. Beșah 5, 2: ḳנַעַת מַעַרְתָּם גִּבּוֹרְתָּהוּ וְזֵרֶה הָיוּ, such is the correct reading; comp Mordecai on Beșah 5, No. 1דיבר.

28 p. Abodah zarah 2,4 (41c above): רִימִית גָּוֵל לִבְנַכְלָת הָוִי בָּכַייל. סְפֹּרָיו (πιθάριον = pitcher) רַבְרַבְרֵּי מַמְלִיךְ אֹתֶחָן מִי יְיָם מְלַכְתָּה. This happened no doubt during his stay in Gaulon which is mentioned in p. Meg.—As this passage in p. Ab. z. shows, also non-Jews lived there, hence the place is surely Gaulon (and must not be sought in Galilee).


30 p. Mo’ed 4, 3, 82a (middle): מִי יָד מִי יָד נְלָר; see my Beiträge, p. 80, n. 3.
Both Talmuds relate that the inhabitants of ניניוו di-
rected a query to Rabbi concerning the ritual to be used
while fasting and praying for rain. As regards ניניוו we are naturally prone to think of the old biblical Nineveh,
without asking ourselves how a Jewish community could
exist towards the end of the second century in a city which
had long lain in ruins. But even assuming the possibility
of the existence of a Jewish community in Nineveh, could
not the inhabitants of that city find a Jewish scholar nearer
home (in Babylonia) who would have offered them infor-
mation concerning the above-mentioned query? It would
have certainly been unnecessary to go all the way to Sep-
phoris in order to ask Rabbi for a decision.

All these difficulties disappear when we know that
there was a ניניוו also in Palestine, which is usually abbre-
viated to ניניוו but also occurs as ניניוו a number of times. This is modern נואו north of Gaulon (Saḥem ej-jolān)
which was erected from the ruins of the ancient city ניניוו
or ניניוו, known to Greek and Roman writers as ניניוו but
also as Nineveh. Eusebius says of Nineveh that it is a

p. Ber. 5, 2 (63d, l. 35): בַּנַּעַת קֹרֶנֶו (פֶּה-יָם) וּפְרֹתֶנֶו יָאִים אַבָּאָמְו (פֶּה-יָם) לְרוֹבָּא לְדוֹרֶנֶו יָאִים וּלְדוֹרֶנֶו יָאִים-
שָׁלֵהוֹת לְרָוְי יָאִים לְרוֹבָּא בָּבָלָאָמְו; b. Taan. 14a: שָׁלֵהוֹת בָּבָלָאָמְו מְסָפָיהוֹת שָׁלֵהוֹת
וּבָּבָלָאָמְו מְסָפָיהוֹת מַשָּׁה פָּרָמָא הִבָּלָאָמְו כְּוָא

Berlin, Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens etc., p. 53, 2, 5. Berliner remarks however: "Ob das alte biblische N. hier
gemeint sei, ist sehr zweifelhaft." Krauss (Talm. Arch., II, 121, and 233, n. 16) refers the cited localities to the Nineveh which is "outside of
Palestine."

Comp. further below; see also Jerome Onom., 137, l. 3: "Nīnīve in
angulo Arabiae quam nunc corrupte Neneven vocant." Bacher, ApA., III, 519, note, puts "Neven" instead of "Neneven," the former corresponding to the
Hebrew ניניוו.

Thomsen, Loca sancta, 94.

See text, § 1 f.
Jewish city." This statement is confirmed by a number of talmudic passages as well as the ancient monuments discovered at Nawa." That Jews lived in Nawa and its suburbs during the second century is proved by an ordinance contained in the Tosefta* (to be discussed below) which frees that region from the impost on agricultural products.—Among a number of Palestinian cities whose Jewish inhabitants were often harassed by the Roman legions stationed within their boundaries mention is also made of הָנוֹג. Furthermore, several learned men of Nawa are mentioned in the talmudic literature: R. Pelatiah of Nawa (third century);* R. Tanhum of Nawa who is identical with the famous haggadist R. Tanhum (fourth century);* R. Shela (or Saul) of Nawa (fourth century).* R. Judan, an Amora of the fourth century whose domicile

---

* Buhl, 247; Bädeker, 140.

* Πολίς Ιουδαίων.

* Among the ornaments there the seven-branched candlestick has been discovered (Buhl, ib.).

* Tos. Sheb. 3 (4), 9 (p. 66); p. Demai 2, 1 (22d).

* Cant. r. on 2, 2 (§ 5); Lev. r., c. 25, § 5; Lam. r. on 1, 17: וְיָשָׁבוּ אֵלֶּה. רְאוּ אֶל הַלִּבְּבֵנוּ לְכָלַּם. וְתֹלֵשׁוּ אֶל הָכָלִים לְחֶבֶר יוֹרֵא גְנֵוני לְכָלֵּנּוּ.

Comp. on this passage Bacher, *APA.,* III, 78, n. 4.—לִפְדוּתוּ is possibly (comp. Schwarz, אֶלֶף, תָּנָה, 1260, Lemberg 1865) identical with Aere (אֶפֶר) which was 30 Roman miles distant from N. (see Thomsen, *Loca sancta,* p. 16, s. v.) and is known to-day as Epophamus. גְלָלָן means "flint" and we shall see subsequently that in the vicinity of Nawa there was also another place with a similar appellation.—As to קְפָרָה (אפרה) see Hildersheimer, *Beiträge,* p. 8, n. 63. קְפָרָה, as is well known, stands for Ἰπποζ (Thomsen, 73), modern Safiye. Concerning לֹד see Thomsen, 93, s. v. *Neapo.* Lod and Ono are biblical localities (see Buhl, 196 f.).

* Bacher, III, 617, No. 79.

was in Tiberias, escaped to Nawā (probably on account of the persecutions under Gallus). As we learn from another source, the residents of Nawā were oppressed severely about that time, so that the scholars of Nawā (רוביי נאה) had to give them permission to bake bread during the feast of Passover. — The passages cited thus far satisfactorily prove that there was a Jewish community in Nawā or יי"ע from the second to the fourth century. The people of יי"ע who directed a query to Rabbi were no doubt residents of this transjordanic city.

The above-mentioned ordinance concerning the exemption of several localities in the vicinity of Nawā from the tax on agricultural products is—as Büchler has proved beyond any shadow of doubt—to be ascribed to Rabbi. The motives that actuated Rabbi to render this decision can also be surmised. In the passage already cited it is stated that the inhabitants of the city had to fast for rain quite often even after Passover. This, of course, was chiefly due to the climatic conditions of that region, but then it was also due to the fact that the territory of Nawā was stony to the north and east, so that lack of rain could become fatal to the farmers. Rabbi undoubtedly convinced himself personally of these conditions. Since his estate was located in this region, he probably came there very often. During one of his visits to his estate, the residents of Nawā no doubt came to him with the question concerning the fasting for rain; for the statement in the

---

* p. Ket. 11, 1 (34b) (comp. Bacher, ib., 238 f.)
* p. Sanh. 3 end (21b): "רבני רביוהו מפיו עזיאל במשפחת.
* JQR., XIII, 700 ff.
* Comp. e. g. Exner in ZDPV., 1910, p. 129: "Es nimmt... der Niederschlag vom Jordanthal gegen Osten, zur Wüste hin, ziemlich rasch an Intensität ab."
* See Buhl, l. c.
Palestinian Talmud leaves the impression that the people of Nawa came to Rabbi in person: "ואנא שרייל נריב," and Rabbi replied: "לבר עשה עשהו, "go ye, and perform the fasting, only do not change the wording of the prayer."—The patriarch R. Judah I is found on journeys also on other occasions. While in Simonias (Galilee), the inhabitants came to him with a request (ואנא לבעה ...). Rabbi had thus become aware that through the payment of a tax on agricultural products unbearable burdens were placed on the Jews living there, and since, in addition, that region was situated outside the Jewish territory, he exempted the immediate surroundings of the city from taxation, as he also rendered a similar decision in regard to another trans-jordanic locality.

Some of the localities situated in the Nawa zone can be pointed out even to-day. The Baraita names the following seven places:

1. רוש, now probably Sureye, north-east of Nawa.
2. רַעֵר, now perhaps Teraya, south of Sureye.
3. letw (or לֵטַו) is no doubt the Jasim of to-day, north of Nawa.

Comp. for example Gen. r., c. 78, § 15; at Akko; Tanhuma בֵּיתִית, § 3; at Caesarea; see Krauss, Anton. und Rabbi, p. 40 f.


Tos. Sheb. 4, 10 (66, l. 5); p. Demai 2, 1 (22, l. 55): סומאה, to-day Samaḥ on the southern shore of the sea of Galilee (comp. Buhl, 243).

See the map by Fisher-Guth. The name probably means "rock," comp. above.

See the same map.

Ib.
4. ניז is Zeisūn, north of Jamle (נמלס), southwest of Nawā.

5. כות גזים, i.e. "heaps of stone of גזים גזים." י"ג גזים corresponds perhaps to Aṣmān, north of Der'āt; yet this place seems to be too distant from Nawā to be placed in its zone.

6. רכיב ברב נא; if this reading is correct the place could be identified with Ed-dunobe, east of Nawā.

7. נא is beyond identification.

Nawā and its immediate surroundings were properly included in the land of Israel; it is for this reason that priests, who even in the third century still adhered strictly to the laws of purity, were allowed to reside there. The question was only how far this region stretched and where the "outside" began. In order to ascertain this the priests interrogated R. Johanan who informed them in the name of an older Amora that on the "way from Nawā, רቭ is the outermost point." It is impossible to identify this רቭ with the biblical אדريس, for the latter was called Edre'i also in the talmudic period. no doubt corresponds to Dopoa occurring in inscriptions, which is known to-day as

---

See the "Engl. map."—Another Zeisūn is situated north-west of Der'āt (Fischer-Guthe's map). The place lies, however, at too great a distance from Nawā.

Comp. F.-G.'s map; see also Farrer, ZDPV., XIII, p. 200.

Thomsen, Loca sancta, I, 56, s. v.; ZDPV., 1910, p. 42.
Ed-dūr and is located south-east of Nawā. The other extreme point in the vicinity of Nawā, on the “way from Bozrah,” namely Ḍanā, cannot be identified to-day. The name probably designates a garden adjacent to Nawā.
THE ORIGIN OF LETTERS AND NUMERALS
ACCORDING TO THE SEFER YEŞIRAH

By Phineas Mordell, Philadelphia

There is hardly another book in Jewish literature, the Bible and the Talmud excepted, that has been so much commented upon as the Sefer Yeşirah. It has been the subject of deep study, not only to the mystic, who regarded it as the source of esoteric lore, but also to the philosopher and the Talmudist. And yet, despite all the efforts of a large number of scholars of repute for more than a thousand years, the Sefer Yeşirah remains a sealed book. The various commentaries upon it are more apt to bewilder the student than to enlighten him. Indeed, it would seem that every commentator endeavored to read his own views and theories into this little book, with hardly any concern whether they agreed with the text or not.

There is no book in Jewish literature that is so difficult to understand as the Sefer Yeşirah. For it was originally written in an obscure half-mystical style. To make matters worse, the commentators of the eighth or of the ninth century blended the original “Sefer Yeşirah” with an early commentary, which may be referred to as “Sefer Yeşirah II.” It thus happened that all the commentaries written on the “Sefer Yeşirah” since the beginning of the tenth century are chiefly based on this commentary and not on the original Sefer Yeşirah. Although the Sefer Yeşirah is exceedingly hard to understand, the solution of its many difficul-
ties is not impossible. The reason why they have remained so long an unsolved problem is partly due to a lack of knowledge of Hebrew orthography, on which the Sefer Yeşirah is based. In spite of the numerous works written on Hebrew orthography since the beginning of the tenth century, there is not one which may be considered as really based on the Hebrew. For the Hebrew orthography which has been and is still taught, is not Hebrew but Arabic. The Hebrew grammarians under Arabic influence came to believe that those rules of orthography which the Arab grammarians discovered for the language of the Koran hold good also for the language of the Old Testament. When the Honorable Mayer Sulzberger heard me expressing my views on Hebrew orthography, he advised me to make a study of the Sefer Yeşirah which in his opinion constitutes the earliest Hebrew grammar extant. Finding that my views on Hebrew orthography harmonized with those of the Sefer Yeşirah, I made an exhaustive study of it. After many years of study, I reached the conclusion that the Sefer Yeşirah, as the earliest Hebrew grammar, contains not only the fundamental rules of Hebrew orthography, but also an account of the origin of letters and numerals. This account it is my present purpose to set forth.

The first Mishnah reads as follows: שֶׁלָּלֶשׁ מָשָׁחִים נַ norske
לְכָּלְבָּה מַלְכַּת הַכֹּלֶם תַּקָּמִים יִהְוֶה צְבָאֹת בְּשָׁמַר וְפָּרָה תְּבֵית.

“Thirty-two mysterious ways of wisdom has the Lord, the Lord of hosts, ordained through Scribe, Script, and Scroll.”

The thirty-two ways of wisdom are the twenty-two

---

1 I am indebted to Dr. I. Broyde, Miss Henrietta Szold, and Dr. Isaac Husik who have given me valuable aid and suggestions.
letters of the Hebrew alphabet, which represent thirty-two sounds.  

In accordance with the belief of the ancients that the letters are of divine origin, the Sefer Yeşirah explains that the thirty-two ways of wisdom were ordained by God through:

(1) רָשָׁ (Scribe), the man whom God inspired to invent the alphabet;

(2) רָשָׁ (Script), the letters;

(3) רָשָׁ (Scroll), the material on which the letters were displayed.

In order to show how the twenty-two letters of the alphabet constitute the thirty-two ways of wisdom, the author proceeds to the division of the letters in the second and following Mishnahs. He divides them into simple and double sounds, and also into vowels and consonants. The simple letters he called הַדַּמֶּשׁ, and the double, הַדַּמֶּשׁ; the vowels, הַדַּמֶּשׁ (יָדָעָה), and the consonants, הַדַּמֶּשׁ. Altogether they form thirty-two sounds: the twenty sounds of the ten' double letters, and the twelve of the twelve simple letters.

The Sefer Yeşirah emphasizes that the number of the double letters is no less and no more than ten, and the number of the simple letters no less and no more than twelve. The Sefer Yeşirah urges us to investigate and examine the letters, that we may have a clear insight into 

* All the commentators explain that the thirty-two ways of wisdom are the twenty-two letters and the ten Sefirot. Below will be found the reasons why the present writer cannot accept this interpretation.

* Below will be explained that, according to the Sefer Yeşirah, there are ten double letters and not only seven, as is believed by all commentators since Saadya.

* See text, § 3.
the subject. This proves that, at the time when the book
was written, the nature of the letters, or of some of them,
was misunderstood. We know, indeed, that at the time
when the Greek translation of the Bible was made, it was
believed that the \( y \), for example, could be transliterated by
\( e, a, \text{ or } g \), and the translators accordingly rendered it vari-
ously by one of these three sounds.

Arguments have repeatedly been advanced in favor of
the view that the Hebrew \( y \) had not only the sound of the
Arabic ' \( \), but also of the \( \dot{g} \). But according to the Sefer
Yesirah, the \( y \) is a simple letter. If it has the sound of ' \( \)
it is impossible that it should also have the sound of \( \dot{g} \). More-
over, if they was originally a vowel only and had no
sound of \( g \), as maintained by Jerome, it can have only one
vowel sound. If we ascribe to it the sound of \( A \), it is
impossible that it should have also the sound of \( E \) or \( O \),
etc. Furthermore, according to the Sefer Yesirah, the
letters \( ni, \dot{d}, y \) are also simple letters, and each must have
had only one sound and not two as in Arabic.

The author of the Sefer Yeṣirah apparently cautioned
against the very errors and mistakes into which all writers
on Hebrew grammar have fallen. By dividing the twenty-
two Hebrew letters into ten double and twelve simple,
representing thirty-two sounds, the author desired to make
clear how different the Hebrew alphabet is from the
alphabet which is known as Arabic and which the Arabs
themselves used to call \( sūrī \). By \( sūrī \) was apparently meant
Assyrian. The so-called Arabic alphabet consisted origin-
ally of only seventeen letters. It was apparently originally
invented to represent the Assyrian-Babylonian language,
which consisted of seventeen or eighteen sounds. Hence
the name "\( sūrī.\)" When the Arabs, whose original alphabet
was the Himyarite, consisting of twenty-eight letters, adopted the "sārī" alphabet, they gave to some "sārī" letters two or even three sounds, and such letters are each counted now as two or three letters.

As according to the Sefer Yeṣirah the Hebrew alphabet consists of ten double letters and twelve simple, therefore to each double letter must be ascribed two sounds and to each simple letter only one sound without any regard to their value in Arabic.

The best transliteration of the double letters is as follows: $\aleph = e$, $= o$, $z = b$, $= v$, $= g$, $= as$ English $j$ (?), $d = d$, $th$ in "the," $u = u$, $v = v$, $= k$, $= German\, ch\, or\, Arabic\, h$, $= p$, $= f$, or $ph$, $= r$, $= r$ or $Arabic\, g, sh = sh$, $j = French\, j$ (?), $t = t$, $th$ in "think."

The best transliteration of the simple letters is as follows: $h = h$, $= English\, z, h = k\, (Arabic\, h), = t$, $= German\, j$, $l = l, = m, = n, s = s, = a, tz, k$.

After giving this division of the letters, the Sefer Yeṣirah shows how, from these twenty-two letters, all the words that have ever existed or ever will exist can be formed. The purpose of the author was to emphasize the superiority of alphabetic writing over the non-alphabetic writing (ideographic and syllabic) used by all the nations of antiquity, and even now by a great portion of mankind. If we arrange alphabetically all bilateral combinations, as the Sefer Yeṣirah directs, joining $h$ with all letters, $b$ with all letters, etc., there must result a list of 484 combinations ($22^2 = 484$). (See next page.)

* See text, 5, 6, and 7.
Biliteral combinations, upon which all other combinations are based.
Furthermore, by the expression "םייח א"ש יבשות, the Sefer Yesirah indicates that the bilateral combinations can be made the basis of all trilateral combinations. If we desire to arrange all the trilateral combinations that can be formed from the 22 letters, their number will be $22^3$ or 10,648. For this it would be necessary to draw up twenty-two tables with the bilateral combinations, leaving sufficient space between every two combinations for the addition of a letter. On one table an א would have to be added at the beginning of each bilateral combination, and the result would be a complete table of 484 trilateral combinations beginning with an א; on another a ב would be added in the same way, making a complete table of 484 trilateral combinations with the letter ב at the beginning. Proceeding thus with the remaining letters, we should get all possible trilateral combinations that can be made out of the twenty-two letters. In this way two-thirds of the labor otherwise necessary is saved, for adding the third letter is only one-third of the labor required to produce all the trilateral combinations. Should we desire to write all the quadriliteral combinations that can be made out of the 22 letters, we have only to make twenty-two copies of all the trilateral combinations, leaving sufficient space between two successive combinations for the addition of a new letter; then by adding an א at the beginning of each trilateral combination, we shall attain 10,648 quadrilaterals beginning with an א. Proceeding in the same way with ב, we shall obtain 10,648 quadrilaterals beginning with ב, and so forth with the remaining letters, which would give a total of $22^4$, or 234,256. The number of quinqueliteral combinations would amount to $22^5$, or 5,153,632.
The powers of twenty-two up to 12 are as follows:

\[ 484 = 22^1 \]
\[ 10,648 = 22^2 \]
\[ 234,256 = 22^3 \]
\[ 5,153,632 = 22^4 \]
\[ 113,379,904 = 22^5 \]
\[ 2,494,357,888 = 22^6 \]
\[ 54,875,873,536 = 22^7 \]
\[ 1,207,269,217,792 = 22^8 \]
\[ 26,559,922,791,424 = 22^9 \]
\[ 584,318,501,411,328 = 22^{10} \]
\[ 12,855,002,631,049,216 = 22^{11} \]

Thus it is evident that the twenty-two letters will admit of an infinity of combinations and arrangements, sufficient to represent not only all conceptions of the mind, but all words in all languages whatever.

The same results would be obtained, according to the Sefer Yeşirah, by adding a letter at the end of each combination. When a letter is added at the beginning, the process is called ḥōrāh ṭeḇeṭtāl ṣephēn, the table “turns” in front of each letter, as ṣephēn “turning” in front of the .Formatter of ṣephēn becomes ṣeṭān ṣeṭān, and when a letter is added at the end, it is called ḥōrāh ṭeḇeṭtāl ṣeṭān, the table “turns” behind each letters, as ṣeṭān turning behind the .Formatter of ṣeṭān becomes ṣeṭān ṣeṭān. Thus, as either ṣeṭān ṣeṭān or ṣeṭān ṣeṭān ṣeṭān can be formed from the combination by adding an ṣeṭān, so all the triliteral combinations can be made out of the biliteral combinations, by adding an additional letter, either at the beginning or at the end of the biliteral combinations, and the quadriliterals from the triliterals, etc., without the necessity of writing the letters anew, when new combinations are desired.
How infinite numbers of words are formed out of the twenty-two letters, the Sefer Yeširah demonstrates by permutations in which letters never repeat themselves but only change their places. Out of two letters two biliteral words are formed as: ב, נ. Out of three letters six triliteral words are formed as: נ, כ, נ, נ, נ, נ. Out of four letters 24 quadriliteral words are formed as: כ, נ, ב, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ. Out of five letters 120 quintiliteral words are formed, out of six letters 720 six-letter words are formed and out of seven letters 5,040 seven-letter words are formed. The Sefer Yeširah gives the factorials up to that of seven and concludes the Mishnah by saying: “Go and count further, what the mouth is unable to pronounce, and the ear is unable to hear.”

The factorials up to that of 12 are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 &= \ (1) \\
2 &= \ (2) \\
6 &= \ (3) \\
24 &= \ (4) \\
120 &= \ (5) \\
720 &= \ (6) \\
5,040 &= \ (7) \\
40,320 &= \ (8) \\
362,880 &= \ (9) \\
3,628,800 &= \ (10) \\
39,916,800 &= \ (11) \\
479,001,600 &= \ (12)
\end{align*}
\]

* See text, § 8
The factorials up to 36 are given in Rees' Encyclopaedia, art. Cipher. The Mishnah treating of permutation was well explained by all commentators, especially by S. Donolo.

W. Stanley Jevons on the subject of permutation says: 'Thus the letters A, B, C, will make different permutations according as A stands first, second or third; having decided the place of A, there are two places between which we may choose for B; and then remains but one place for C. Accordingly, the permutation of these letters will be altogether 3 x 2 x 1 or 6 in number. With four things or letters A, B, C, and D, we shall have four choices of places for the first letter, three for the second, two for the third, and one for the fourth, so that there will be altogether 4 x 3 x 2 x 1, or 24 permutations. The same simple rule applies to all cases; beginning with the whole number of things, we multiply at each step by a number decreased by a unit .......'

He further says: "Many writers have from time to time remarked upon the extraordinary magnitude of the numbers with which we deal in this subject. Taquet calculated that the twenty-four letters of the alphabet may be arranged in more than 620 thousand trillions of orders; and Schott estimated that if a thousand million of men were employed for the same number of years in writing out these arrangements, and each man filled, each day, forty pages with forty arrangements in each, they would not have accomplished the task, as they would have written only 584 thousand trillions instead of 620 thousand trillions."

¹ The Principles of Science, London 1887, 178, 179.
THE TETRAGRAMMATON AND THE VOWELS

All words arising from the combination of the letters are combined and permuted with the Tetragrammaton, called by the Sefer Yesirah "One Name" הוהי, from which emanated the whole of creation and all languages. According to the Sefer Yesirah, the alphabet did not consist of consonants only, as is held by many Semitic scholars, but had vowels also, the letters of the Tetragrammaton themselves being vowels. Indeed, the ancients transcribed הוהי by the vowels i-e-u-o, and i-a-o-u-i.

To understand how the letters of the Tetragrammaton can be vowels, it is necessary to know what the Hebrew vowels are. Here the view of various writers differ widely. Dunash Ibn Tamim, whose opinion was shared by many Hebrew writers, maintained that the three letters יאע are the original vowels of the Hebrew alphabet; Roger Bacon, Masklef, and others held that the six letters ינהש were originally vowels; and Jerome and many others asserted that the five letters ינהש were the original vowels. In my opinion the original vowels are the four letters ינהש, which are still used as vowels in transcribing other languages in Hebrew characters. The Sefardic Jews, when writing Spanish with Hebrew letters, transcribe a by א; i and e by י; and u and o by י. The Ashkenazic Jews, when writing German with Hebrew letters, transcribe a and o by א, e by י, u by י, and i or j by י. An investigation into the relation of the letters to the vowel points according to the Ashkenazic pronunciation

— See text, § 9.
— Comp. Renan, History of the People of Israel, Boston 1888, I, 69.
— Sefer Yesirah, London 1902, 20, 45, 48.
— See JQR., XV, 336.
led me to the conclusion that y has the sound of a, Ξ of e, and o, ' of German j, and 1 of u, besides its sound of ω.

If this opinion with regard to the original letters be correct, not only an Ξ is hidden under a Ξ of the Tetragrammaton יהוה, as believed by Dunash Ibn Tamim,12 Judah ha-Levi, and Abraham Ibn Ezra, but also an y. In order to understand the secret of the Tetragrammaton, the nature of the n must be better defined. We have seen that many authors since Jerome believed n to be a vowel. This is not the opinion of the Sefer Yeşirah. It counts n among the simple letters, and, consequently, no sound in addition to that of h can be attached to it. On the other hand, the n occurs at the end of words as silent, indicating that it occupies the place of a vowel letter. We must therefore assume that the Sefer Yeşirah considers n to play the same part among the vowel letters as zero does among numerals. As zero is not a digit itself, but only occupies the place of a digit, so the silent n is not a vowel itself, but merely occupies the place of a vowel. In the Tetragrammaton, both the n after the 1 and the n after the ' occupy the place of a vowel letter. The original letters of the Tetragrammaton were בד instead of יהוה.

Now, what is the “great secret,” which the three mother letters (vowels) בד contain according to the Sefer Yeşirah? Dunash Ibn Tamim declared it to be the three vowel letters בד, which he identified with the Tetragrammaton יהוה the “secret name.” In my opinion, בד stands for ]י and ]ל which occurred in the Rashi text of the Sefer Yeşirah (Rashi, commentary on Job 28. 27; S. Sachs, ]י, p. 94) stands for ]י. According to the original Sefer Yeşirah there are four mother letters, בד, crypto-

12 Sefer Yeşirah, London 1902, 45.
grams which should be deciphered by the letters יפנ: the א by א, the ב by the י, the ג by the ר, and the ד by the ס. From these four letters emanated, according to the Sefer Yeṣirah, the four elements, air, water, fire, and earth.

The Sefer Yeṣirah apparently used תבשא as secret characters representing יפנ, because the Hebrew alphabet is arranged with the א at the beginning, the י in the middle, and the ד at the end; while the Arabic alphabet was originally arranged with the א at the beginning, the י in the middle, and the ר and ס at the end. The Arabic alphabet consisted originally of the following seventeen letters:

א ב ג ד ט פ ק ל מ נ ס ת י צ ש ח פ מ מ מ פ מ מ פ מ מ

The fact that the Arabic alphabet has the א at the beginning, and the י in the middle, and the ר and the ס at the end, leads to the conclusion that the arrangement of the Arabic alphabet is older than that of the Hebrew, although the contrary is generally believed to be the case.

The alphabet was anciently believed to symbolize the whole universe. The vowels which were the original letters of the Tetragrammaton, were placed at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the alphabet, to signify that יהוה is the God of the whole universe, that He is the beginning, the middle, and the end.

According to their sounds, we may count, in the Hebrew alphabet, thirty-two letters, divided into five vowels, (י = א, ק = ג, ר = מ, ס = י) and twenty-seven consonants. Each vowel, according to the Sefer Yeṣirah (see text, § 12), stands by itself, but the consonants are dependent on the vowels. The vowels and consonants were made in the form of a “state and arranged like an
army in battle array.” Isaac Taylor says: “Like soldiers on parade the characters in the alphabetic line have been dressed.”

**SEFIROT**

The origin of the alphabet was, and still is, a burning question to scholars. Did it spring from the Egyptian hieroglyphics, or from the cuneiform systems of the Assyrians, or from the hieroglyphics of the Hittites, or from the Syllabary of Cyprus? The Sefer Yeširah answers: “From the Sefirot.”

But what does it mean by Sefirot? On this point endless discussions arose; and it has even been disputed whether they are designed to express theological, philosophical, or physical mysteries. Most of the writers, bent on explaining the Sefer Yeširah in a philosophical way, maintain that by חיש ספירות, the Sefer Yeširah meant the so-called Arabic numerals, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 0. This view is shared by Dunash Ibn Tamim, who, however, admits that some people object to it, and maintain that if the Sefer Yeširah had meant the Arabic numerals, it would have said חיש ספירות: for the cipher is not a digit, there are only nine significant numbers. A much weightier reason for opposing the identification of the Sefirot with the Arabic numerals is the fact that the Sefer Yeširah gives ten as the total number resulting from the addition of the numerals

---

18 The Alphabet, London 1883, I, 125.
14 See text. 14.

Dr. H. Malter calls my attention to the following passage of Abraham Abulafia in Jellinek’s גנבי המכתבים, Leipzig 1853, p. 20: מתוות של חישות, שפירתיו של חכסין אברבוך פגי ררכתי וὗליא המתויו צפירה הצקרוניים. This passage proves that the true meaning of the Sefirot had been known to some Hebrew writers.
1, 2, 3 and 4, and the total of the 9 Arabic numerals added together is 45.

However, there can be no doubt that the Sefirot philosophy of the Sefer Yesirah rested on some system of numeral notation. I have studied various systems of antiquity, and I have found that it harmonizes with a numeral system consisting of a series of strokes from one to four, amounting in all to ten | || | |||, and the zero 0. Indeed, the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 were originally indicated by such a series of strokes, as is well known to all familiar with the old Roman, Greek, and South-Arabian systems of notation. The numeral systems of the Phoenicians, Egyptians, Babylonians, etc., even indicated the numbers 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 by the first four groups of strokes, as | ||| = 5, | || || = 6, | || | || = 7, | || || | | = 8, and | || | || | | = 9. There can be no doubt, therefore, that by the Sefer Yesirah meant 1, 2, 3, and 4 written in strokes, their number amounting, when added together, to ten, and by בולית, it meant zero, which, being a symbol for nothing, is the equivalent of בולית, “nothing” in Hebrew. My belief is that originally the text must have had עשר ספירות בולית = ten digits and zero.

As, according to the Sefer Yesirah, it is possible to express all numbers by the ten Sefirot, we must demonstrate how all numbers, even those higher than nine, may be indicated by the ten strokes. The strokes to indicate numbers were anciently written vertically and horizontally, as — = 10. By means of the strokes and the zero, all numbers may be expressed, as they are expressed by the Arabic numerals. The numbers 10, 20, 30, 40, 50...500

*See text, § 16.
...50000 may be expressed as o, =o, =o,
= o, = o, . . . . . = oo, = oo, = 000. 1907 for
instance would be represented thus: =\nSuch a system of notation is practically the abacus on
paper and apparently was the source of the scientific sys-
tem of notation of the Chinese, and may have been the
source of the Arabic numerals, the origin of which is
admittedly doubtful. To avoid writing too many strokes,
the Chinese made one stroke to represent five units. The
numerals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, o, were written |, ||, |||, ||||, 
\, ||, |||, ||||, o. 1405536 for instance was written
\ = o \ = \ = \ = (see M. Cantor's Mathematische Bei-
träge, Halle 1863, 47 and 47; first table figures 15, 16).
The East-Arabian figures \, \, \, \ (1, 2, 3,
and 4) originated from the primitive numerals
\, \, \, \, \, \, \, \, \, \, . They are only a combination of two, three,
and four strokes, to indicate the respective numbers. The
figure o for 5 originated from the circle, which in the
primitive system of numeral notation was the fifth symbol
representing a zero, and in the South-Arabian system of
numeral notation was a symbol representing ten units.
The East-Arabian figures, \, \, \, \ (6, 7, and 8) are each
a combination of two strokes. The figure \ originated
apparently from a circle and a stroke, and a dot indicated
a zero.

Many writers maintain that only at a later period the
principle of position and the zero was discovered. We are,
however, now certain that in Babylon, many centuries be-
fore the Christian Era, a sexagesimal position was known.

II Some Pythagoreans used the strokes with the principle of position
without a zero in the columns of an abacus (Dr. M. Cantor’s Mathematische
Beiträge, page 202).
In my opinion, the sexagesimal position originated from
the decimal position, and not the reverse; for the earliest
abacus, which was doubtless based on a decimal position,
is older than the sexagesimal system. F. Cajori says: 18
"The principle of position in its general and systematic
application required a symbol for zero. We ask, Did the
Babylonians possess one? Had they already taken the
gigantic step of representing by a symbol the absence of
units?" I am inclined to believe that the zero is as old as
the principle of position.19 The final perfection of the so-
called Arabic system of notation consisted, not in the dis-
covery of the principle of position and the zero, but rather
in pointing out how the primitive principle of position and
the zero can be conveniently used with nine figures, such
as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Although the sexagesimal position was ancienly
known in Babylonia, yet it was used only, in higher mathe-
mathematics, as in astronomy, etc.; for ordinary purposes there was a decimal system of notation, without the principle of position. When we find that in Egypt and Phoenicia only a decimal system of notation was used, without the principle of position, it may not be taken as proof that the decimal position and zero were unknown. A decimal system of notation without the principle of position was in ancient times considered more convenient than a decimal system of notation based upon the principle of position.

When it was, that the primitive numerals, |, ||, |||, ||||, 0, were changed into the figures used by the East-Arabs, to indicate the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. I shall not venture to conjecture. But it is proper to assume, that they may have been known to a few learned men long before they began to be widely used. They may have even been known to the author of the Sefer Yeşirah. Yet by "the author meant, not the Arabic numerals, but the primitive numerals, |, ||, |||, ||||, 0, from which the Arabic numerals originated.

As, according to the Sefer Yeşirah, the alphabet originated from the ten Sefirot, which are, as was demon-

---

As an early Arabian mathematician Mohammed ben Musa Alkharezmi said that the Indians practiced the so-called Arabian system of notation (M. Cantor's Mathematische Beiträge, Halle 1863, page 259), arguments have been advanced that the Indians invented this system, or at least taught it to the Arabs. But it is very doubtful what Mohammed ben Musa meant by Indians. By Indians he might have meant Ethiopians, or any other nation under the torrid zone which the ancients used to denominate as Indians (T. Astle, The Origin and Progress of Writing, London 1784, p. 41; הָרָבָּמ, IX, 354, 439). Or he could have meant Jewish astronomers like Mashaala who was called by Abraham ibn Ezra an Indian sage (יִבְנֵה הַיָּבֵשָׁם) (see M. Stein Schneider, Arabic Literature of the Jews, London 1901, p. 107). As the Arabic numeral system of notation apparently originated from the Sefirot philosophy of the Sefer Yeşirah, it is proper to share the view of those who claim the Hebrews as its inventors (E. Brooks, the Philosophy of Arithmetic, Philadelphia 1876, p. 24).
strated, the first four groups of strokes amounting to ten, we must assume that the first alphabet must have been constructed out of these strokes. This peculiarity harmonizes best with the Libyan-Berberic alphabet, in which we actually find each of the first four groups of strokes: "---, ---, ---, ||, ||, |||| and the circle or is each a letter. Moreover, the other letters of the same alphabet have such forms as point, without a doubt, to their origin in the first four groups of strokes, || || || ||. Two, three, or four strokes are so combined as to indicate the various letters as: \( \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde} \); \( \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde} \); \( \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde} \); \( \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde, } \text{\textasciitilde} \).

Similar to these characters are the linear letters, which have been found on the Egyptian pottery. On this subject, Mr. W. J. Harding King says: "Mr. Evans and Professor Flinders Petrie have shown that certain linear characters which have been found on the Egyptian pottery form a signary in which a large number of the characters are identical with the Libyan and Tifinagh. The linear characters in Egypt are earlier than the hieroglyphics, though a few of the forms may ultimately have been fused with the latter. Evolved at a date when hieroglyphic writing was unknown, they persisted with a strange vitality, and were never absorbed or ousted." It is proper to note that, in some Berberic alphabets, one, two, three, or four dots are placed in various positions, to indicate different letters. The four groups of dots \( \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \), which may be arranged in triangular form \( \cdots \cdots \), as the

---


\(^{25}\) A Search for the Masked Tawareks, London 1903, p. 322.

\(^{26}\) K. Faulman, p. 257-8.
Pythagoreans arranged them, were originally also symbols representing the first four numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. As already demonstrated, the first alphabet invented was similar to that still used by the Berbers, whence the inference, that there may have been a time when the Hebrews also used such an alphabet. May not originally have meant Libyan writing?

According to J. Halévy's decipherment of the Libyan alphabet | or — is א, || or — is י, ||| or — is ק, |||| is ת. According to the Sefer Yeširah (§§ 10, 11, 18, 19, 20, 21) | or — is א, || or — is י, ||| or — is ק, |||| or — is ת. Hence, the vowel-letters ויה were originally indicated by the four groups amounting to ten strokes, |, ||, |||, ||||, or — — — —. If these vowel sounds were originally the numeral words for one, two, three, and four, we may assume that the vowel symbols were invented at the same time as the numerals. The invention of such an alphabet as the Libyan must have consisted chiefly of symbols for consonants, because vowel symbols were already in existence from the time the numerals were invented.

In this way we can understand why the vowels (the Tetragammaton) were originally identical with the ten digitsشير ספורות, ||||||. This is also in harmony with the following quotations from the commentary: "In His great name which is Jehovah נשמו יהוה הוא, "for He comprises the Ten Sefirot."דכו הוה ושלל א"ל ספורות. "When it mentions the 'mothers' (vowels) it means the Sefirot themselves."

---


※ Sanhedrin 21b.

※ Sefer Yeširah, Warsaw 1884, p. 69, 74, 90.
“It was explained in the second chapter that, wherever it says 'mothers,' it alludes to the Sefirot themselves.”

The four elements, air, water, fire, and earth, from which it was anciently believed everything was created, emanated, according to the Sefer Yeširah, from the vowels ק'air; air emanated from the ק, water from the י, fire from the ל, and earth from the告诉他. As the vowels were originally identical with the ten Sefirot, it is from the Sefirot that the whole universe emanated. The Sefirot cosmogony is given by the Sefer Yeširah as follows:

“With 'one,' the living God of the Universe graved and hewed out voice, air, and speech, and this is the Holy Spirit. With 'two' God graved and hewed out void and chaos. Void is a green line that surrounds the whole universe, and chaos refers to viscous stones, sunk in the abyss, whence water comes forth.”

“With 'three' God graved and hewed out mud and clay. He arranged them like a garden bed. He set them up like a wall. He covered them like a pavement, and poured upon them water, and the earth was formed.”

“With 'four' God graved and hewed out the Throne of Glory, the ophanim, the seraphim, the holy animals, and the ministering angels.”

Chaos signified in the ancient cosmogonies the vacant, infinite space out of which sprang all things that exist. Later cosmogonists, such as Ovid, represent it as the confused, shapless mass, out of which the universe was formed into a cosmos, or harmonious order. W. Enfield*

* See text, § 17.
* See text, §§ 18-21.
says: “By Chaos some writers understood water, and make this the first material principle.” He further says: “The theogonists certainly do not suppose God to have been prior in the order of time to matter: they speak of Chaos as eternal, and seem to have been wholly unacquainted with the doctrine of creation from nothing.” This is at variance with the Sefer Yeşirah, which emphasizes the doctrine of creation from nothing by the statement: “He (God) formed existence out of void, something out of nothing” (Mishnah 22). It holds that chaos was not even the first thing created, but was preceded by voice, air, and speech.

The numeral system of the Sefer Yeşirah, as I have explained, may be considered to consist of five symbols, |, ||, |||, ||||, 0, the cipher being the fifth symbol. From this symbol originated the numeral ٠ (5) in the East-Arabian notation. It is identical in form with the letter ٠ (n) of the Arabic alphabet. As the n indicates the absence of a vowel letter, and is similar in its nature to the zero, which indicates the absence of a digit, it is possible that the n originated from the zero. The first primitive numerals |, ||, |||, ||||, 0, were thus primarily identical with the five vowel-letters א יו which were originally the letters of the Tetragrammaton יהוה. The five primitive symbols are the five elements with which God created the universe, the ٠ or the zero being the fifth element, as the Sefer Yeşirah says: “יִזְרָה מַחְתָה מַסָּה עֵשֶׁה אֱוִי אֵין יוֹצָב אֵבָנִים נְוֹלוֹת מַאיָר שְׁאוֹיָה נְוֹסֵס ווֹמִי לַבַּר עֶשֶּׁרָה עֵשֶׁר עֵשֶׁר הָאָדָם

“He formed existence out of void, something out of nothing, and He hewed large stones out of intangible air, thus, twenty-two in number, one in spirit.”

* Ibid., 131.
* See text, § 1 f.
The word הָעָלֶה (void) has the same meaning as בְּלִימָה; it is also equivalent to zero, which symbolizes the creation of something out of nothing. This is in accordance with the teaching of the Pythagoreans who counted the void surrounding the universe as a fifth element (Wilhelm Bauer, *Der ältere Pythagoreismus*, Berne 1897, pp. 83, 84, 88, 89).

We must conclude that the so-called Arabic numerals and the alphabet originated from the ten digits and the zero, or rather from two symbols, 1 0, the stroke and the circle. L. D. Nelme, in his essay on the origin of letters, shows that all elementary characters, or letters, derive their forms from the line and the circle. As I understand the Sefer Yeşirah, it also holds that all written characters originated from a line and a circle, but from a line that was originally a symbol for unity, and a circle that was originally the symbol for zero. Similarly, all cuneiform characters originated from two symbols ˩ 🏵️, those for one and ten.

L. L. Conant says: "Two centuries ago the distinguished philosopher and mathematician Leibnitz proposed a binary system of numeration, the only symbols needed in such a system would be 0 and 1... Leibnitz found in the representation of all numerals by means of two digits 0 and 1 a fitting symbolization of the Creation out of chaos or nothing, of the Universe by the power of the Deity." We have seen that not only a binary system of numeration, but even the decimal system may be expressed by a stroke and a zero. Moreover, it has been

---


*The Number Concept, New York 1896, p. 102.*
pointed out that the alphabet and the so-called Arabic numerals originated from these two symbols. Therefore, the author of the Sefer Yeşirah may have meant by two —, with which God created void and chaos, a digit and a zero; for as the ten digits may be expressed by nine digits and a zero, so may two digits be represented by a digit and a zero. Thus, the Sefer Yeşirah may have believed two digits, 0 and |, a fitting symbolization of the creation, out of Chaos or nothing, of the universe, by the power of the Deity.

Because the zero in the number ten occupies the space of a digit, only nine strokes, not ten, are used; and, therefore, we may say that the numeral system of the Sefer Yeşirah, consists of nine digits and the zero. For || || || ||| 0 = |||||0, and the symbol א expresses the whole numeral system. The latter figure was anciently known in South-Arabia, and it represented, according to Halévy, an י. The Sefer Yeşirah calls the letters “stones” (ד'וי), because they originated from the numerals (Sefirot), which were originally indicated by stones. It is possible, therefore, that the א is the philosopher’s stone, from which the Arabic numerals, the alphabet, and all civilization originated.

Moreover, since in א are united the ten Sefirot, the vowels, and the Tetragrammaton, it apparently symbolized the angel containing the name יהוה referred to in Exodus 23, 20. 21. This angel is chiefly known in kabbalistic literature by the name מטatron, Prince of the Face and is identified with the prophet Elijah.


строен, Lemberg 1860, p. 47b.
He is the "Prince of Creation," or the "Logos," with which God created the Universe. Upon the crown of the head of this angel "The Holy one—Blessed be He" wrote letters with which were created Heaven, earth, seas, rivers, etc., and all the elements of creation. To this angel God intrusted all the secrets of the Law, and of wisdom; and all the mysteries of creation are known to him as they are known to the Creator Himself. As the Arabic numeral system of notation, the vowels, and the Tetragrammaton were originally identical, they all contain the same 'great secret' the revelation of which is forbidden by the author of the Sefer Yeşirah (text, §§ 10, 11, 14). This secret apparently is the angel symbolized by the letter מ, which was anciently written also as מ.

The most mysterious character in Jewish history is the prophet Elijah. It was he who demonstrated that יהוה is the true God and no other. He is called the angel of the Covenant, מלאך הברית. He is believed to be present at the circumcision. It is also believed that he is bound to come and decide all knotty points in the law, and to appear before the true Messiah arrives.

In kabbalistic literature, not only the vowel letters, but all the letters are considered images of angels. In Sefer Raziel (ed. Amsterdam, p. 126) occurs the following:

"Like Adam who engraved letters out of the likeness of those angels who had been driven away, whom the"
Holy One, Blessed be He, rebuked and cast down from the high heavens. He then graved their likeness from Aleph to Taw.”

The vowel letters, however, the letters of the Tetragramaton, are images and pictures of superior angels. Since the cipher ʾ is also a letter of the Tetragrammaton, it is also a picture and image of a superior angel. The angel which the cipher ʾ symbolizes, is apparently Satan ʾש, who appears before God to accuse all mortal beings as he accused Job and Joshua son of Jehozadak (Job 1, 6-12; 2, 1-7; Zechar. 3, 1). Like the cipher ʾ so the zero in the Arabic system of notation, and in the system from which the latter originated, was anciently believed to symbolize the evil deity, or Satan, in contrast to the numeral one 1, which was thought to symbolize the good God, from whom all good emanated. The numeral one 1 and the zero 0 are a fitting symbolization of the two opposing principles concerning which the Sefer Yeširah (§ 23) says as follows:

“Also God set the one over against the other, good against evil, and evil against good; good out of good; and evil out of evil; good testing evil, and evil testing good; good is stored away for the good, and evil is stored away for the evil.”

"It was not very easy to comprehend at first the precise force of the cipher, which, insignificant by itself, only serves to determine the rank and value of the other digits. A sort of mystery, which has imprinted its trace on language, seemed to hang over the practice of numeration, for we still speak of deciphering, and of writing in cipher, in allusion to some dark or concealed art" (The Philosophy of Arithmetic, by John Leslie, Edinburgh 1817, p. 114). “Indeed, in the early history of arithmetic in Europe ...... the system was regarded as belonging to black art and the devil; and it was, no doubt, this popular prejudice that delayed its general introduction into Christian Europe” (E. Brooks, The Philosophy of Arithmetic, Philadelphia 1901, p. 107).
The account of the origin of letters and numerals the author of the Sefer Yeṣirah concludes as follows:

“When Abraham our father arose, he looked and saw and investigated and observed and engraved and hewed and combined and formed and calculated, and his creation was successful. Then the Master of all revealed himself to him, and made a covenant with him and with his seed forever. He made a covenant with him on the ten fingers of his hands, and this is the covenant of the tongue; and on the ten toes of his feet, and this is the covenant of circumcision; and tied the twenty-two letters of the “Torah” to his tongue and revealed to him their secret ...”

The name of Abraham which is mentioned in the closing Mishnah suggested to many commentators that Abraham himself wrote the Sefer Yeṣirah. As such a view is entirely repugnant to the modern critical mind, some writers regard this closing Mishnah as a later interpolation. In my opinion there is no doubt that this Mishnah belongs to the original Sefer Yeṣirah, for it is in perfect harmony with all the original material. The mention of the name of Abraham does not indicate that the Patriarch wrote the Sefer Yeṣirah, but that he was the inventor of the alphabet, the scribe (ሸ獴) mentioned in the opening Mishnah as the person whom God inspired with it.

It is worthy of note that Philo attributes the first invention of letters to Abraham (Rees, Cyclopedia, art. Letter; comp. also Suidas in Abraham and Isidor Hispal, Origg, i. 3).

(To be continued)
THE REFERENCE TO TRELLIS-WORK IN

PSALM 74, 5

A mere glance at this verse reveals numerous difficulties. To begin with the first word יִצָּר scarcely yields a suitable meaning, and in spite of all attempted emendations and interpretations, seems to be out of place, as there is no noun in this verse which can be subject of this verb. *It was perceived, made known, it was seen,* are suggested renderings which have nothing to recommend them. Then the second word אֶכְמוּת is taken by some of the versions as a noun, something like אֲכָמָה.¹ And even when one has succeeded in recasting the text in a more or less Hebraic form, the simile conveyed is so feeble as to be out of harmony with the tenure of the rest of the verses, where the Psalmist employs the strongest terms in describing the cruelty of the enemy. Nor is the lexical difficulty of the expression of הָדָעַת to be lost sight of. In all other places where תּוֹדֵעַ occurs it either stands alone, as in Gen. 22, 13; Jer. 4, 7, or is followed by לָדָע, as in Isa. 9, 17. For לָדָע is never used in Hebrew in the sense of forest, and as לָדָע in our text must denote a thicket, if the ordinary interpretation be adopted, the singular לָדָע can scarcely be appropriate. In the following verse neither the ketib לָדָע nor the kere מַעַע is suitable for the context, as the Psalmist obviously describes an event which took place in the past. It is therefore no wonder that modern commentators are almost unanimous in declaring this word to be corrupt. Some take it to be the ending of a longer word such as

¹ LXX has τὴν εἰσοδον, and Jerome's rendering is in introitu. The variant readings εἰσοδον and εἰσίμ is probably due to the confusion of אָבָט and אָסֵי.
Ehrlich in reading הַטָּמֵא for הַטָּמֵא should have advanced a step further and deleted the 1 in order to make any sense at all, for there is no possibility of taking this clause as a circumstantial one. Although the copyists sometimes confused כ with ג (comp. I Kings 1, 18b, 20), the fact that the Psalmist throughout this Psalm does not use the accusative sign כ, despite the circumstance that in almost every verse there is a determinate noun in the accusative, is sufficient ground to reject this suggestion.

The solution, I believe, lies in the correct interpretation of the expression רָמַסְתַּךְ which in this case ought to be rendered in the wooden trellis-work. No simile is intended in this verse, but a vivid description of what actually took place. The form of רָמַסְתַּךְ or רָמַסְתַּךְ is certainly פל, with the original כ remaining, as in Arabic and Syriac, or heightened to פ, as is usually the case in Hebrew. In I Kings 7, 17, where the decorations and furniture of Solomon's Temple are described, the form שְׁבָעָה occurs which is conceivably a plural of שְׁבָע, and the ordinary form שְׁבָעָה is probably a nomen unitatis of this word. It would thus be identical in form and meaning with Arabic סב "net-work, trellis-work." In verse 5 of this Psalm we would require to emend the text slightly and read רָמַסְתַּךְ instead of רָמַסְתַּך. It is also probable that בַּכֶּן of the versions may be retained as a nomen verbi, as in the case of רָמַסְתַּךְ Num. 10, 2. The corruption of this word very likely arose through the misunderstanding of the expression רָמַסְתַּךְ ככ. For when these words were taken to mean a thicket of trees, the whole verse had to be explained as a simile, and hence the participle was substituted for the infinitive. The ketib in verse 6 would be retained, and read קָנה. Here again the Massoretes had to punctuate this word קָנה in order to make this verse follow the preceding one with some logical sequence.

Having thus restored the text, we should translate the two verses as follows: Let it be known when axes were brought above in the wooden trellis-work, and when they struck down all its carvings together with hatchet and axes. The Psalmist, according to this interpretation, draws the attention of the reader to, or per-
haps invokes God (נש י may be understood) against, the wanton cruelty and ruthlessness of the enemy. He brings to the mind a vivid picture of the spitefulness of the oppressor who used all kinds of iron instruments, with the sole object of vexing the vanquished. The trellis-work of the Temple could have been destroyed quite easily without any instruments, especially as afterwards the Temple was entirely burned down. But the conqueror, to aggravate the mortification of the conquered nation, defiled all that was holy, and knowing, perhaps, that the Hebrews avoided the introduction of iron instruments when building the Temple or erecting an altar (comp. I Kings 6, 1 and Exod. 20, 25), he mocked them by demolishing the ornaments and decorations with hatchet and axes. One cannot help noticing that in this Psalm the author complains against the insults and effrontery of the impudent enemy. He asks God to remember that the enemy reproaches the Lord, and a worthless nation provokes His name (vv. 18, 22).

It is now necessary to explain to what kind of wooden trellis-work the Psalmist refers. One's mind naturally turns to the trellis-work mentioned in I Kings 7 and in the parallel passages of Chronicles. But the trellis-work mentioned there was certainly of metal, and played a minor part in the Temple, for it did not belong to the building itself, but to the furniture and decorations of the Temple. Thus if the ordinary translations and commentaries are to be relied upon no wooden trellis-work existed in Solomon's Temple. There are, however, in the First Book of Kings, chapter 6, a few passages which have not been rightly understood. נִשְׁבַּעַ (6, 18) has hitherto been taken to mean carving, and the verb וַיִּשָּׁבַע has been translated he engraved, carved. Despite the apparent consensus of opinion in this respect, I venture to question the philological soundness of this interpretation, as there is no evidence to support it. Were וַיִּשָּׁבַע to have that meaning, it would stand isolated in Hebrew without a parallel in the cognate languages and dialects. Even in Hebrew this signification of וַיִּשָּׁבַע would be confined to these obscure passages. And this circumstance in itself is sufficient to arouse suspicion. Nor does the context demand this explanation. In Hebrew וַיִּשָּׁבַע has two well-established meanings. In the first
place it denotes *he threw*, *sling*, and occurs several times in the Old Testament, both as a noun and verb. In Arabic, Syriac, and Ethiopic the noun in various forms is of frequent occurrence. The same root with another signification is to be found in *curtains*, *hangings* (Exod. 29, 9, etc.). For in that verse it is evident that the radical meaning must be *he wove*, *plaited*, *twisted*, *intertwined*. With such a signification this verb is frequent in Neo-Hebrew, and is attested in Arabic by the occurrence of *kil'dat(un)* “a sail.” Fraenkel takes *kilv(un)* to be a loan-word, but the form *kil'dat(un)* which does not occur in any other dialect would tend to prove that it is a genuine Arabic root. The explanation of Gesenius that the idea underlying *kilv(un)* and the other meanings of *yil* is *waverings*, is precluded by Hebrew *yil* as pointed out above. For *yil* is so called, not because it *hangs* and *waves*, but on account of the way it is made.

All the cases where the verbs and nouns occur being taken into consideration, it would appear that this root should be recognized in Hebrew with only two meanings: (1) *he threw*; (2) *wove*, *plaited*. The common ground for the origin of these significations is probably the idea of *removing from one place and inserting into another*. With some modification this idea is present in all the significations in the cognate languages. In Arabic *kala'a* (I and VIII conjugations) = *he removed*, *uprooted*, *eradicated*. The meaning *he disentangled* is required in

*The forefeet of my horse got stuck among the stones. I alighted from it, disentangled its forefeet, and mounted it again* (Ibn Bāṭṭah's *Travels*, Vol. IV, p. 9, edition of Defrémer and Sanguinetti). Thus even here the idea is not merely uprooting, but taking out the foot from among the stones and placing it on the smooth part of the road. Out of this the notion of *throwing*, *slinging* could have naturally developed, especially when the one who threw aimed at something. A parallel case is to be found in Arabic *salaka* “he inserted” and Hebrew *'al* “he threw.” So also *sabaka* in Arabic = “he

*Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*, p. 224.
inserted, intertwined,” and in Syriac asbek (Af’el of bek) sometimes = “he threw;” and is chiefly used metaphorically in the sense of “attacked” (comp. Hebrew הנהנוה Gen. 43, 18). Thus we have חכב (h) י ger ba’ denarme yenasbek nasa’ bahdadé “He wishes to arouse strife (lit. sword) and throw men against one another,” i. e. to set one against another (Homilies of Isaac of Antioch, Bedjan’s edition, p. 456, l. 12). In a similar way it is not hard to follow how the idea of “weaving” developed, for in weaving it is necessary to remove from one place and insert into another. And here again one may be permitted to quote the parallel of Arabic sabaka “he inserted,” “wove,” and Syriac asbek “he threw.”

Now the meaning he wove, plaited, intertwined suits לָקַח in I Kings, chapter 6, quite as well as carved. We ought to translate יִצְרָם לְאֵל בְּיִת בָּנֵיהֶם מְכוֹלָלוֹת וְעַרְבֵּהֶם אֶשֶׁר לָקַח And the cedar wood inside the house was an intertwining of gourds and outspread flowers. According to this interpretation the ornaments were not carved out in the walls, but attached to them as a kind of appliqué, and hence they may rightly be called trellis-work, since they were intertwined.

It is these ornaments that the Psalmist had in mind.

Jersey City

B. Halper
RECENT WORKS ON THE LEXICON AND GRAMMAR OF HEBREW-ARAMAIC


The line of demarcation between biblical and post-biblical Hebrew is a fluid one. Mishnic Hebrew projects into the canon, just as biblical Hebrew is met with in Mishnah and Talmud. Saadya was the first to collect in a lexicon a list of biblical hapax legomena which may be explained by the aid of post-biblical Hebrew. When due deduction is made of Scriptural reminiscences in the Mishnah (e. g. Peah 2, 2 = Isa. 7, 25; 4, 9 = Levit. 2, 2; Kelim 1, 9 = Joel 2, 17; Sukkah 5, 4 comp. 1 Chron. 25, 1; Abot 4, 18 = Prov. 3, 5) and the conscious imitation of biblical style (sporadically in prose, as in the historical baraita Kiddushin 66a,
where observe the ἡ consecutive six times; more frequently in poetic (pātānic) pieces, comp. Megillah 6a, Moed ḫatān 25b, Ketubbot 104b, Abodah zarah 24b, Abot derabbî Nathan 38; then in maxims, in the apocalyptic mishnah Soṭah 9, 15, in liturgical pieces with their paralleîsmus membrorum and the like), there is imbedded in the tannaitic literature much of the Old Hebrew vocabulary for which there was accidentally no room in the Scriptures. Scriptural Hebrew is also found in the Hebrew Sirach and in the undoubtedly pre-Christian sectarian document published by Schechter. Not that Scriptural Hebrew persisted in tannaitic times in its pristine purity; but the development from the golden era of the language to its silver stage was a natural one and is witnessed already in the canon. The Mishnic Hebrew is naturally colored by the Aramaic vernacular, but Aramaisms are met with in the Bible some of which ascend into early times; for in the process of mixture—if mixture it be called—not only chronological sequence but also local and dialectal forces must be studied. In the days of Rabbi, Hebrew was still a spoken language in some nooks and corners, as on the other hand the subject-matter of the tannaitic literature brought about a necessary syntactical change as well as an enrichment in the line of particles. So much is certain that the student of the biblical Hebrew finds it necessary to overstep the limits of the canon for the elucidation of the language of the canon itself. The current great lexica of the Talmud and Midrashim inconveniently enough combine the Hebrew and Aramaic material together; moreover the connection with the biblical stage is lost. This evil is now obviated by Ben Iehuda's Thesaurus. This is one feature of the work. Another equally important side to the gigantic work is the record made (in foot-notes) of the native lexicographical expositions of the medieval period. Of the medieval Hebrew lexicographers none is as important as Ibn Janaḥ who is quite modern and whose views deserve to be consulted on every point. Moreover, an insight into the current (traditional?) exegesis of the Jews is gained by consulting the use to which biblical words and phrases have been put in the productions of the great Spanish poets who were themselves no mean exegetes. For with them the third period of the Hebrew sets in; I prefer to call it Neo-Hebrew, while the tannaitic
language should be designated as late Hebrew. In so far as Neo-
Hebrew became the vehicle of rhymed poetry in Arabic meter it
meant a conscious reversion to the Hebrew of the Scriptures. It
is Rapoport who has shown (Introduction to Parhon) how in the
days of Judah Halevi and his fellow-singers Hebrew was ill suited
to the dialectic and philosophico-scientific genre of literature; how
when the Neo-Hebrew muse had taken marvelous flights, the very
same poets reverted to the vernacular when they had to write on
philology or philosophy. It is the merit of the great translators
to have created the Hebrew prose; to what extent the rich trea-
urses of Arabic were drawn upon is well known; it is equally
known how many of the "innovations" became naturalized, a
permanent fixture for all times. Ben-Iehuda has excerpted the
mediaeval poetic and prose works in Hebrew, and his labor, at
present unique, reveals at once the richness of this later stage of
Hebrew. There is hardly a scientific term for which there does
not exist a good Hebrew equivalent, whether a new content has
been put into old material or a new vocabulary coined ad hoc.
Another reversion to biblical Hebrew occurred at the end of the
eighteenth century after the Hebrew of the mediaeval period had
been debased largely through the subject-matter of the latter cen-
turies which was mainly halakic. I am speaking of prose Hebrew,
for poetry, though meter and form changed in the Occident, moved
largely in the channels of the older standards. The Measefim
ushered in the fourth period of the Hebrew, the modern Hebrew,
the language of esthetic and popular practical literature. The
modern European languages naturally exerted a certain measure
of influence, and to that extent Hebrew lost I will not say in
purity—for purity is a standard for pedants—but rather in its
organic native make-up. With the transition of the center of
gravity for Hebrew culture to the Orient, particularly to Palestine,
where the exigencies of circumstances—Palestine represents a
conglomerate of the Jewries of the world—make imperatively for
the cultivation of Hebrew as a living language, Hebrew is return-
ning to its ancient home and is brought once more into contiguity
with its sister dialects, Arabic specifically. In view of what is
really happening in Palestine even the philologist will hesitate to
subscribe to Nöldeke's pronouncement (article "Semitic Lan-
guages,” Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition, p. 622b) that “the
dream of some Zionists, that Hebrew—a would-be Hebrew, that is
to say—will again become a living, popular language in Palestine,
has still less prospect of realization than their vision of a restored
Jewish empire in the Holy Land.” Words belonging to the newest
coinnage and described as actually in use either in the latest liter-
ature or in living popular speech are marked as such in Ben
Lehuda’s Millon. A few examples may not be out of place.

חזריאיה) “macadamized road,” מאכדאמיזד בור, (Aramaic for בור “tin”;
on the principle of utilizing doublets, hence a principle of economy,
then introduced for) “zinc”; אברהם (from the Aramaic ארמנ but
would be more correct) “lead pencil”; אפר “polite,” מלה “politeness” (from the Arabic); אפרב “flirt,” מלה “flirting”; משה “cyclist,” מהלים (but “wheel” is בה, not בה) “bicycle”; ירא “radium”; לובר (“cancer” (איבר used by Ibn
Tibbon); אלב “brown”; זמרת “art of painting”; יזמר “fashion”; וה “ash-
“waiter”; דלי “interest (Inter esse)”; הר (“cancer” (איבר); יר (“transparency”; מזמר (comp. Aramaic) “singer (chanteuse).” The proportion of
new words is after all a small one. It shows how when the total
of the Hebrew vocabulary belonging to all ages and coming from
all corners has been collected—a veritable “gathering of the dis-
persed”—there is but little occasion for innovation. Words with
which we have been familiar in the latter-day literature are proved
to have been current as far back as the tannaitic times when
foreign (principally Greek and Latin) words became naturalized
in Hebrew and Hebraized in form. For this is the sign of a living
language that it can assimilate foreign words and make them available
for new derivatives after the fashion of Hebrew. An unassim-
ilated foreign word remains barren; but a word naturalized and sub-
mitted to the Hebrew cast becomes itself the fruitful parent of new formations. Ben-Iehuda's industry is simply marvelous. What is done for other languages by learned academies and societies working together has been accomplished by the devotion of a single scholar. There will probably be found omissions; I have myself come across a few examples. But where so much is given it is gratuitous to cavil because more is not offered. Ben-Iehuda is at home in the whole range of Semitic philology. He has perused modern grammars and articles scattered in learned magazines. He has an opinion of his own where a difference of views obtains among grammarians and lexicographers. His etymological excursuses will prove valuable. What he has to say on the vocalizations of the names of the consonants ("alef," "gimel," "dalet," etc.) will command itself to judicious scholars, although it must be granted that for such words antedating the nikkud the traditional vowel symbols adjusted to a different phonetic principle should not be used. Elsewhere, likewise, Ben-Iehuda has made errors in the vocalization, not to mention misprints. Misprints abound also in the English. On p. 970a, footnote, read "gemmis" for "genus." The author should use more caution in the future. It is also to be regretted that the author has not followed the Oxford Gesenius (and the mediaeval Hebrew lexica) in placing derivatives under the root, instead of arranging them alphabetically. Perhaps this deficiency can be made good in an appendix. An introduction is to accompany the work upon its completion which will deal with the history of the language in all its phases and an outline of Hebrew grammar. Ben-Iehuda's Millon should be in the hands of every student of the Scriptures and every teacher of Hebrew. It should be a matter of honor for all Jews who love their national tongue to support the author financially, that is by subscribing to the great work now slowly but steadily going through the press.

Professor König's Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon to the Old Testament comes as a fit sequel to a series of works by the same author dealing with the grammar of biblical Hebrew and extending over a period of thirty-seven years (a dissertation on "thought, sound, and accent as the three factors of language-making demonstrated in Hebrew" appeared in 1874 when the author was teaching
school at Döbeln; the monumental Hebrew Grammar in three parts, "Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache mit komparativer Berücksichtigung des Semitischen überhaupt," was published in 1881. 1895. 1897; in 1900 appeared the work on "stylistics, rhetoric, and poetics of the biblical literature," a subject hitherto treated only casually but never on so comprehensive and thorough a scale; the next year was given to the publication of a monograph setting forth the place of Hebrew in the Semitic group of languages, "Hebräisch und Semitisch, Prolegomena und Grundlinien einer Geschichte der semitischen Sprachen"; a short Hebrew Grammar for beginners saw the light in 1908. The chief feature of this Dictionary is that it sums up the author's linguistic studies in connection with the biblical languages, preeminently the Hebrew; as a sort of index to König's Grammar (including the Rhetoric) it will prove more than welcome to students of the Hebrew Scriptures. There is no scarcity of modern Hebrew lexica. English-speaking scholars have their Oxford Gesenius which in the opinion of the writer is the best work of its kind in any European language, though the Germans will persist in using the latest editions of the German Gesenius which because of its up-to-date bibliographical references cannot be dispensed with even by those who possess the English edition. The merits of the English Gesenius consist chiefly in the syntactical matter which is to my knowledge nowhere presented with that fulness of detail. The independent work by Stade-Siegfried had pointed the way in that direction; its basic principle—the elucidation of word-meanings from the Hebrew itself—was a check upon the extravagances of the comparative method which pervaded the earlier German editions of Gesenius—one need only think of the scathing criticism from the pen of Lagarde directed against the "Staatsräte," not to speak of Fürst's etymologies which were really beneath criticism. As a matter of fact, the cognate languages cannot boast of as thorough a range of lexicographical works as does the Hebrew (and biblical Aramaic). Payne-Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus* and Dillmann's Ethiopic Lexicon come perhaps nearest the ideal; the Assyrian Dictionaries operate with the method of elucidating the language on its lexical side from within, quite after the fashion of Stade
and Siegfried for the Hebrew. But we possess no Arabic Lexicon worthy of the name. For Lane is merely a collection of excerpts from the native lexicographers; useful as it certainly is as far as it goes, a Thesaurus of the Arabic tongue on modern lines and with first-hand recourse to the literature is still a desideratum. Whatever of comparative matter adorns the Hebrew dictionaries—it is largely ornamental—comes from dictionaries, and not from the literature, and the element of doubt attaches to it throughout. No wonder that in the recent lexicographical works the comparative "Beiwerk" is signalized as occupying a less important place by the very script in which it is printed or by the parentheses within which it is placed. König has not withstood the temptations of registering the comparative evidence, and with a view to students less familiar with the cognate languages all such matter is transliterated, a custom hitherto adopted for Assyrian only. What constitutes the chief characteristic of König's work, however, is the attention to the semantic development on lines worked out fully in the "Stylistik." Another point is the registration of difficult grammatical forms in alphabetic order. The linguistic matter of the masoretic glosses (such as appear in the manual editions of the Bible) is equally entered. The Aramaic of the Bible is treated in an appendix, with due regard to the Egyptian finds. To students who operate with König's grammatical works—and for an exhaustive mastery of the niceties of Hebrew grammar they should be in the hands of all earnest students of the Scriptures—the Dictionary will be indispensable. No well appointed University or College library should be without them; no "seminar" work should be attempted unless all of them are within easy reach. For private study the student who can ill afford the expense of costly text-books will in probability, at least in English-speaking countries, possess himself of the Oxford Gesenius. For be it said with no disparagement to König's Dictionary: it will prove useful mainly by the side of his other works of which it is a summary, while the other lexica, though in themselves more costly, can be used to advantage in connection with any Hebrew grammar. The professional scholar, the academic teacher for instance, must perforce have them all on his shelves; not the least
reason being the full discussion of mooted problems which he will find in this latest Hebrew Dictionary, that by König.

Caspari's little book is a monograph on the word "Peace" (שלום). "On earth peace," with this expression the advent of the Messianic era is signalized in the song of the heavenly host in Luke 2, 14. The message has its roots in Judaism. The author works backwards from the Hellenistic writings through the prophets and Psalms to the earlier pre-exilic seers until he reaches the prophet of peace par excellence, Isaiah. Two chapters are then devoted to the usage of the verb שלום in the Old Testament and in the cognate dialects and to שלום in proper names and in the formulae of salutation. The last chapter is in the nature of a summary in which the development of the meaning of the Hebrew word for "peace" is sketched. At first an expression for security based on compacts between individuals, it gradually transcends the private connotation by assuming the signification of public safety and welfare within the nation; with the rise of the monarchy and the consolidation of the nation war becomes a national duty concurred in by the prophets, though it cannot be said that empire building was part of the politics of David and his successors; Isaiah is the first to place himself in opposition to the martial spirit of the dynasty by proclaiming the message of the cessation of warfare between nations and the advent of the era of universal peace. "Peace" now assumes a religious signification, and Psalm 85 is its highest expression. God, the author of peace, speaks peace unto his people, and to his saints. His salvation is nigh them that fear him. Peace is an inward harmony with God and righteousness. "Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Just as the programme of universal peace among nations is the precursor of ideas which are seriously taken up in our own day, so is the incorporation of peace in the scheme of salvation a preparation for the Gospel. So far the author whose little study has above all the merit that it is readable throughout proving that even lexicographers need not be the dry-as-dusts that they are currently held to be.
While this work is not specifically devoted to Hebrew-Aramaic, it is certainly inclusive of it. Comp. the Hebrew-Aramaic indexes on pp. 106 f., 200 f. Hebrew-Aramaic loanwords in Ethiopic are discussed on pp. 32-46; the two languages are dealt with along with Arabic and Ethiopic in the essays on words with counter-sense (addād), nouns from biconsonantal roots, interchange of initial n and w or hamza, interchange of initial w or hamza and y, participles and adjectives from "hollow roots" (pp. 67-216). But even in the essay which heads the book (on the language of the Koran, pp. 1-30) the student of Hebrew or Aramaic will find much that will concern him. Thus on p. 3, note 1, the problem of the vowel of the prefix in the imperfect of the Kal is adverted to. Nöldeke is of the opinion that it is not the dialectal i which is met with almost exclusively in the cognate languages that calls for an explanation, but rather the a in Hijāzic nadkuru and in Hebrew בָלָה. Similarly Nöldeke expressed himself in WZKM., IX (1895), 16, note 1; he believes that in primitive Semitic both i and a were used, though in consequence of the operation of analogy (Ausgleichungen) it is difficult to establish their original spheres. Contrast Barth, ZDMG., XLVIII (1894), 4-6, and Brockelmann, Grundriss, I (1908), 560 f. (the latter's strictures against Ungnad, ZDMG., LIX (1905), 766, may be met by the explanation that the imperfect of fa'ula verbs was subsequently assimilated to that of fa'ila verbs; witness the small number of fa'ula verbs preserved in Hebrew and comp. Lagarde, Übersicht, 8). The rules which the Arab grammarians (comp. Ibn Hisham, Banat Sw'ād, ed. Guidi, p. 92 ff.; Sibawaihi, II, p. 275 ff.; see Fleisher, Kleinere Schriften, I, 96 ff.; Howell, II, 11 f.) give for the permissibility of replacing a by i are borne out by Hebrew where i certainly manifested itself first in fa'ila verbs (יִבְרָךְ: בָּלָה contrasted with יִבְרָךְ: בָּלָה by the side of יִבְרָךְ; when the accent advances, is replaced by כֵּנָּה, comp. יִבְרָךְ: בָּלָה but יִבְרָךְ: בָּלָה; hence the singular to כֵּנָּה Exod. 1, 7 is
In the first part of his essay Nöldeke discusses the analogies of Hebrew, and particularly the regular forms, in the Koran. The regular Hebrew verbs, he points out, are accommodated to fa'sala verbs, the rarer מָלַל and the regular מָלַל are proper forms; the in מָלַל should not be placed on the same footing with that in מָלַל; in the former instance i goes back to מָלַל (from מָלַל), comp. by the side of מָלַל: Pinsker, סוכם, 154). Even the dialectal Arabic form nu'buduhum (Fleischer, l. c., 98 (not 198, as Brockelmann, p. 561, writes)) may be paralleled in Hebrew: מָלַל Exod. 20, 5; Deut. 5, 9; מָלַל Deut. 13, 3.—In the third part of the same essay Nöldeke deals with foreign words (chiefly Hebrew and Aramaic) in the Koran to which an arbitrary or mistaken notion was given by the prophet. Thus מָלַל “redemption” became “revelation”; מָלַל “merit, virtue” assumes the meaning of “alms” (comp. on this point, however, Dalman, Worte Jesu, 71; Wellhausen, Skizzen, VI, iv); מָלַל “word” is turned to “religion”; מָלַל “row, proper order” (note 4 on p. 26 deals with מָלַל Isa. 28, 25 with which מָלַל Panamu inscription is compared) to “chapter of the Koran”;

מָלַל = מְדֻנָּה to “sentence, verse”; מָלַל “dwelling” to “almsgiving”; מָלַל “pray” to “bless”; מָלַל “ungodly” or (so in Syriac) “heathen” to “monotheist.”—Of the interesting observations in the essay on the Hebrew-Aramaic loan-words in Ethiopic I would single out the statement (p. 36 note 6) that Arabic kāhin was borrowed from the Aramaic (at first in the sense “priest,” so in Sinaitic inscriptions; in the time of Mohammed it came to mean “diviner”); p. 37, note 3, we learn that Hebrew הבנ originally meant “enter” and that the meaning “gather” which it assumed in the Mishnah was due to contamination with Aramaic הבנ; according to p. 38, note 3, the phrases לא הבנ have nothing to do with הבנ ל, הבנ means “spare”; interesting is the list of Semitic verbs meaning “throw” and then used metaphorically for “reproach, calumniate,” among them מָלַל compared with Ethiopic gadafa “throw,” p. 47, note 3; on p. 52, note 3, Nöldeke rejects the theory of Daiches (JQR., XX (1908), 637 ff.) that in a number of places in the Bible הבנ is used in the sense of “castles, fortified places,”
though he admits that the sense would fit Job 3, 14 admirably and that the connection with mihrab has forced itself on other scholars; “but then the text of Job is so uncertain.”—In the prefatory remarks to his essay on words with counter-sense Nöldeke acknowledges his debt to Landau, but he does not fail to add that neither the critical acumen of that scholar nor his knowledge of the “other” Semitic languages goes very far. Nöldeke follows Geiger in regarding מַחֲבָּב Amos 6, 8 as an intentional correction for the original מַחְיָב; hence it is no case of a did. II Kings 16 (not 6; p. 69, note 2), 14 appears to mean “remove”; “but the text is hardly intact” (comp. Robertson Smith, Semites, 2d ed., 486). A grammatical did. underlies the employment of צַל forms in an active sense (Cant. 3, 8; contrast Bar, Nominalbildung, § 122c). “within” means properly “faceward from the point of view of the god dwelling in the adyton.” Jewish אָרָא, מְאָרָא, נְאָרָא, נָאֶר , prop. “light,” in the sense of “evening” is a clear case of confusion of limits. An emotional counter-sense underlies Hebrew רֹאשׁ “derision,” רֹאשׁ “deride” over against Aramaic דֹּאָה “praise” (but Ezek. 16, 31 seems to presuppose the latter meaning also in Hebrew). A well-known example of euphemistic counter-sense is found in אֵטֶר, אֵט “food” and עַר “pasture” in the sense of “dung” are instances of euphemism for the sake of decency. It is gratifying to see Nöldeke accepting the Septuagintal reading ἔσπρω in Prov. 14, 34. With reference to the etymology of מַסָר, Nöldeke ranges himself on the side of those who assume the original meaning to have been “cover.”—The essay on nouns from biconsonantal roots is introduced by a friendly polemic against Barth and Philippi who among moderns are most pronounced in favor of the theory that the biliteralism of such nouns is only a seeming one, and that in truth they originated in triconsonantal roots; and in a footnote he discountenances the theory that all forms from “weak” roots were primitively so constituted as to reveal the weak
radicals as real consonants (to mention one example, אָכֶלְוַ goes back to original אָכְלֵלְו). As is well known, the problem has been much discussed. The modern biliteralist is, it is true, not to be placed beside Menahem ben Saruk. Still there is much common ground on which they both stand. Nöldeke himself is led by the logic of his theory to assume, if you please, roots consisting of but one consonant followed by a vowel (comp. the nouns “water,” “lamb,” “mouth”). It cannot be maintained that with the means at our disposal the problem is any nearer a definitive solution than it ever was. Either theory is plausible as far as it goes, and either has its insurmountable difficulties. I cannot share Nöldeke’s opinion that the old doctrine of Gesenius is for practical purposes the easier one. The Ewald-Müller-Wellhausen method (let it be so named rather than theory) has great practical advantages. The intricacies of the three classes (א, י, מ) are much more easily taken hold of by the learner if we adopt their method. But, regrettable though it may be, the method breaks down in certain particulars. If מָלֵב and מָלֶב preserve the characteristic stem-vowel, why is the reverse the case in מָלֶב, מָלֶב? Certainly מָלֵב is more easy of explanation if we assume contraction (= יִזָּבִיב); מָלַב may then have been formed direct from מָלַב by lengthening the vowel which was retained. Again, the full forms, comp. e. g. לָבָב (פָּרַר-ונ is apparently a late formation, comp. לָבָב in biblical Aramaic), seem to favor the contraction theory; the long vowel makes the contraction impossible in early Semitic at any rate where long vowels were impossible in closed (hence geminate) syllables. As for the nouns, it is certainly conceivable that when בֵּי-ונ was phonetically developed out of בֵּי-ונ it might be misconceived as בֵּי-ונ and thus lead to בֵּי-ונ. Nöldeke, it is true, does not go as far as Stade; but even his smaller list is open to discussion. The tendency to shift the forms from one class to another is no more than what we find in all forms from the so-called weak roots. Ultimately it is perhaps a question of root-formation (basic theme and determinants). On p. 123 there is a slight error in detail. מָלֵב cannot be a pausal form. On an earlier occasion (ZDMG., XXXVII (1883), 540) Nöldeke pronounced מָלֵב Jerem. 16, 16.
a Piel form. That is certainly correct; it is gratifying to see that herein Nöldéke agrees with Ibn Janáh (s. v.; Ibn Janáh, by the way, rightly accounts for the absence of the dagesh by comparing שִׁפּוּד; comp. also יָשָׁש).—It has long been recognized that in certain instances לְָמ and יְָמ roots are closely related. One need only think of הב and הב (comp. Aramaic and Arabic הב "plant, establish" and Hebrew הנח by the side of רוח). The transition of the one consonant into the other cannot be a matter of phonetics. Some לְָמ roots clearly have their origin in the נ stem of a biconsonantal root. But it cannot be maintained that it is the case universally. Nöldéke would not go so far as to postulate on the basis of parallel forms with dagesh ( הנשׂ by the side of הנשׂ e. g.) parallel לְָמ roots; the very oscillation of the authors of the punctuation should put one on his guard. On the other hand, he cannot understand why לְָמ and לְָמ should not be derived from הב, הב. The ketib form II Sam. 14, 30 is no clue; "how bad our Samuel text is is well known."—The long recognized interchange of initial י and ד in Hebrew is usually viewed as a phonetic phenomenon. But it cannot be maintained that Hebrew really shows an aversion to initial י: comp. י ה "pin, peg"; post-biblical יות נ "careful," etc. Nor can it be said that after a prefix closing with a consonant י is impossible; comp. by the side of יי a form like יי. Nöldéke seems to incline to the opinion that from the very beginning there existed parallel roots with י and ד.—Proceeding from the observation that what is called a participle in Semitic (faith-un e. g.) is really an adjective or noun, Nöldéke approaches the problem of the Hebrew participles like ית, etc. Some are intransitive and might recall the adjectives of the type faith (יִתַּהוּ, יִתָּה, etc.); but there are also transitives. ית Ezek. 32 30 goes well enough with the perf. ית II Kings 16, 7 is pronounced an error of transcription; ית Jerem. 4, 31 was taken by the authors of the vocalization as "sick"; read ית; but there is no necessity to put the accent on the penultimate with Nöldéke), but י is Aramaic י. While י goes well with
the perfect רָא, no such parallelism obtains in the case of רָא, יָד, etc. The רָא forms are peculiar to Hebrew; nevertheless Nöldeke gives a list of Arabic adjectives of the type רָא-עֶשׁ "windy." The problem is really only stated, not solved. With a view to the participles of the N stem (רָא-ה by the side of רָא-ו) the view which Nöldeke mentions in the first place only to reject it may still have something in its favor.—Whether the positions assumed by Nöldeke will meet with universal assent or not, the book is so replete with erudition and sound judgment that no student of the Hebrew or Aramaic language can fail to learn much from the great master of Semitic philology. The grain of scepticism which permeates the book may be welcomed as a check upon all the extravagant theories to be met with elsewhere. "I seek," says the learned author in the Preface, "above all to establish facts, and as for matters which it is really impossible to know, I venture at the most modest conjectures. I leave it to bolder investigators to determine how the characteristic forms of the Semitic languages were developed both phonetically and semantically from their pre-Semitic antecedents. It is an easy matter to construct beautiful systems of linguistic "Prähistorie," but the question always remains whether the real process was not after all a totally different one."


Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Mit den nach Handschriften berichtigteten Texten und einem Wörerbuch. Von Prof. D. Dr.
HEBREW-ARAMAIC LEXICON AND GRAMMAR—MARGOLIS 605


A lengthy review by the present writer of the twenty-seventh German edition of Gesenius-Kautzsch's Hebrew Grammar appeared in the AJSL., XIX (1903), 159 ff., and it is a matter of gratification to him to find that the review is not merely adverted to in the Preface (English ed., p. v) to the new edition, but has been largely acted upon throughout the book itself. Comp. §§ 9v; 10d; 21f (in two places); 26i; 27a; 44c; 61g; 63m; 67cc; 68i; 75dd (but I must disclaim responsibility for the emendation; I merely pointed out that if a transposition be resorted to the vowels should be \( \nu \) and not \( \nu \nu \)); p. 224, n. 2; 228, n. 2; § 91d; p. 288, n. 1 (but "regular" of the Engl. translation obscures the point), not to mention misprints which have been corrected. Of course, it was not to be expected that the learned Halle grammarian whose recent demise is a source of deep regret would accept all criticisms; and so some points remain on which opinions will differ. The Phonology is still largely what it was in the preceding editions; it is the weakest portion of the book and requires re-writing in toto. But Kautzsch's Grammar is nevertheless the best for the ripe student; it can well serve as the basis of class-room instruction, and a teacher who is master of the subject will easily supplement its deficiencies. Its bibliographical references are up-to-date, still more so in the English edition which has had the advantage of many suggestions from so thorough a student of the Hebrew language as Prof. Driver. It is also gratifying to know that Prof. Driver's son, Mr. Godfrey R. Driver, of Winchester College, has had a share in the correcting of the proofs of the Hebrew index and the index of passages. The translator aptly adds the Scriptural proverb: בֵּית הֶבֶם יִשְׁמַר בְּנֵי.—While Kautzsch's book is for the advanced student, no better text-book may be recommended to the beginner than Strack's little Grammar now appearing in its tenth and eleventh edition. The merits of the work are well known: it is eminently concise and practical, yet betrays in every point the author's familiarity with the entire range of theoretical questions.
The Hebrew and German exercises are well chosen and graded; helps are afforded for the study of texts not incorporated in the manual; a short and useful glossary completes the volume. Attention is also paid to the training in reading unpointed texts; one such text is derived from Mapu's מז'ג מדרון. Strack calls attention to Baer's תיקון which may be had for the price of one mark and which will be more than serviceable for the purposes of reading unvocalized texts.—Strack's Manual of the Biblical Aramaic is equally a splendid piece of work both from the theoretical and practical point of view. The cognate matter from the Egyptian Aramaic (chiefly on the basis of the Assuan publication) has been faithfully registered. Both in this book and in the Hebrew Grammar there is a full bibliography which is singularly up-to-date. The Aramaic texts have been revised after a large number of manuscripts; of those with superlinear vocalization full specimens are given. There is also a useful glossary. Surely there will be no room for the regrettable phenomenon recorded by the learned author that out of a hundred German theologians ninety are unacquainted with the biblical Aramaic. A better text-book and a less expensive (the price of the bound volume is but M. 2.50) there is certainly none, if only the will to learn exists.
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Max L. Margolis
RECENT ASSYRO-BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria.


Professor Jastrow, well-known by his publications on Babylonian-Assyrian religion and mythology, publishes in the present volume, in a series of popular lectures, the results of his investigation carried on for a considerable period. The opinions advanced therein are for the most part not new, and are based on the material contained in his well-known work 'The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria.'

In the first lecture, the author surveys the development of Babylonian-Assyrian culture and religion through all periods. In discussing the Sumerian question, he suggests, in a very ingenious way, an intermediate theory between the followers of Halévy and Oppert. We are shown the close relationship between culture and religion in its various aspects—political, social, economic, and artistic—till the advent of the Persians and the introduction of Greek views of the universe.

The second lecture outlines the functions and attributes of the principal Babylonian-Assyrian gods, the development of the pantheon, and the chief factors leading to its formation. Sun, moon, vegetation, storms, and water are the forces with which man is constantly brought into contact. Agriculture and commerce being leading pursuits in the Euphrates valley, it is natural to find the chief deities to be personifications of one or the other of these five forces.
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The third lecture describes divination. We have to distinguish between voluntary divination, by seeking out a sign indicative of future events, and involuntary divination, by which a sign indicating the purpose of the gods is forced upon our notice. Two methods of divination overshadow all others: one the inspection of the liver; the other based on the observation of the phenomena of the heavens. It was believed that the god to whom an animal was sacrificed identified himself with the sacrificial animal, the soul of the god becoming identical with the soul of the animal. And since the liver as a bloody organ was regarded as the seat of the soul, a visible means was obtained for studying the soul of the god. Divination of the liver led to a genuine study of the anatomy of the liver. Hence to the Babylonian 'diviners of the livers' belongs the credit of having originated the study of anatomy, just as their associates, the astrologers, laid the elementary foundations of astronomy.

The fourth lecture deals with the second kind of divination, astrology. Its fundamental factor was the identification of the heavenly bodies with the chief gods of the pantheon. It also assumed co-ordination between occurrences on earth and phenomena observed in the heavens. This theory marks an important advance toward recognition of law and order in the universe: each separate deity is no longer an unrestrained law unto itself. Astrology in Babylonia-Assyria concerned itself only with the fortunes of the country and not with the individual and differed from that of the Greeks which concerned itself with the conditions under which a man was born; for the entire spirit of the Greeks was individualistic. Astrology in Babylonia was doomed as soon as it was recognized that whatever happened in the heavens was the result of inexorable law in nature. This decline of astrology gave rise, on the one hand, to astronomy, setting out to find the laws underlying the phenomena of the heavens, on the other hand to Greek astrology; for, according to the belief of pre-ordained fate, both man and planets move in obedience to forces from which there was no escape.

The fifth lecture delineates the idea and organization of the temples and dwells largely on the various cults practised in them.
In the temple proper the 'house' motif prevails, the sanctuary being the actual dwelling of the god, and organized in every respect like the court of the king. In the brick towers, known as zikkurāt—a term that has the meaning of 'high places'—, the shape and height of which recalls the picture of a mountain, the 'mountain' motif prevails. It must have originated with a people dwelling in a mountainous region who placed the seats of their gods on the mountain tops. Hence it was brought to the mountainless region of the Euphrates by a people entering the valley from some mountainous district.

The sixth lecture discusses the ethics of the Babylonians and their views concerning life after death. The former are illustrated by the code of Hammurabi and other documents, the latter by the Gilgamish epic and the myths of Adapa, Nergal, and Ishtar. In outlining his position on the question of the dependency of the Hebrew religion upon that of the Babylonians, the author contends that, though there is kinship between certain elements of both, its closeness has been exaggerated. Resemblances in myths and traditions are frequently deceptive. And also the form assumed by the biblical traditions presents a noteworthy contrast to the myths and legends of Babylonia and Assyria.

A very valuable addition to the book are the chronological lists, though a great many dates are of ephemeral value. The beautiful illustrations with explanatory notes, facilitating the understanding of the subjects under consideration, add greatly to the merits of the work.

This book, though written in a popular, and even fascinating style, is nevertheless thoroughly scientific, and may be ranked among the prominent works on Babylonian-Assyrian religion which have made their appearance in recent years.

There are a few points, in which the reviewer cannot agree with the author. It is hardly fair to say that monotheism in itself is not the outcome of a deep religious spirit. On the one hand, the recognition of law and order in the universe must lead to the assumption that there is only one supreme will in nature. On the other hand, the whole purpose of religion has always been the ethics, and they are based on the idea that a society, subject to one
and the same law, is created by one and the same god, and must therefore lead to monotheism. The Babylonian priests were in all probability quite aware of the importance of these two ideas, and therefore they made the attempt to establish Marduk as the one god under different names, but could not succeed, owing to the rivalry and jealousy of the priests of the other cults.

There was no need to dwell so largely upon the close relationship between temple and palace. It is by no means specifically Babylonian, and it is very doubtful if it was originally Sumerian, considering that the Sumerian terms for 'ruler' such as lugal, en, umun, and even patesi contain nothing indicative of a religious function. It seems to have been common Semitic and is best exemplified by the ancient history of Israel in which we see that prophets become ex-officio the rulers of the people. Their authority was not a political but a religious prerogative. And it is most likely that the Hebrew term מלך meant originally 'counsellor' = Assyr. māliku from which a denominal verb מלך 'to be king' was derived. And also its synonym רoi, the derivation of which is doubtful, may have been derived originally from a root של = Arabic šara, 'ashara 'to show, to advise,' of which there seems to be a trace in שות (Hosea 8, 4). The ruler was the adviser of the people either by direct communication of a god or by the oracle which only he had the right to consult.

It is improbable that the 'mountain' motif of the zikkurat was brought to Babylonia from some mountainous district. Primitive man living in a valley and looking from afar at the awe-inspiring height of the mountains could easily have fancied that they were the seats of the gods and the links between heaven and earth. Desiring to build for the gods a residence such as they were used to, he erected for them mountain-like edifices. An idea like that could never have occurred to a people living on mountains. They must have seen that there was a great distance between heaven and earth. The reviewer, therefore, believes that the idea of the 'high places' as the dwellings of the gods must have originated with people living in a valley.

The author ought to have been more specific in accusing Talmudic Judaism of reinstating customs and rites that were not
specifically Hebrew. A close comparison of the Code of Hammurabi and of the Talmud justifies the assumption that the Oral Law for the most part may claim the same antiquity as the Old Testament. Besides, are all the biblical laws specifically Hebrew?


This booklet describing the Babylonian-Assyrian, biblical, and Mohammedan conceptions of the future life is written with the tendency to impress upon the mind of the Christian reader that the Christian dogma of hell and paradise, the resurrection, the devils, and the fall of man are entirely of Babylonian origin, consequently of no ethical value. Hence they ought to be blotted out, and give way to a more spiritual conception. But if the Christian reader is going to follow the author's advice to eliminate all the doctrines and ideas which originated in Babylonia, where shall be the dividing line? If all these dogmas are to be abandoned, why not give up the doctrine of immortality of the soul? The author's proposed doctrine 'the soul returns to the hands of God' is nothing but a phrase without any meaning, if there are no other dwelling-places for the soul after death. And is it a reason for rejecting religious ideas, that they had their original home in Babylonia?


This book contains legends of a great many Babylonian cylinder seals in transcription, translated and arranged systematically. They belong for the most part to the period of the Hammurabi dynasty. In the introduction, the author outlines the various kinds of legends found on cylinder seals.

Of special value are the notes contributed by Professor Hommel. The legends are of importance for the history of religion
and Babylonian mythology. They confirm the view that the bearer of a name containing the name of a deity was in most cases the worshiper of this deity. Of the highest significance, of course, are the mythological and symbolical representations on the seals which the author promises to publish as a second part. The reviewer would suggest that these seals seem to have been the escutcheons of the possessors, since the names of the owners are frequently left out altogether. Seals of this kind could have been used by members of the respective families for many generations. But it would be going too far to assume with the author that the legends represent expressions of the popular beliefs which differed from those of official Babylonia. The seal cylinders were manufactured by the priests, the representatives of official Babylonia, and in all probability most of the owners were unable to read the legends.

_Hammurapi und das Salische Recht._ Eine Rechtsvergleichung.
_Von Hans Fehr, Professor in Jena._ Bonn: Marcus and E. Weber’s Verlag, 1910. pp. 143.

The details of this book are of more interest to the student of German law than to the Assyriologist. The deductions, however, involving the much discussed question concerning the shaping of laws by different nations and how far we are justified in assuming borrowing from each other, are of importance for Assyriology. The author compares the Code of Hammurapi with the _Lex Salica_ and shows that they agree in a great many points. And yet the nations which enacted these laws differed in race and language from each other. The conditions under which these laws originated were also quite contrary. How then is their conformity to be explained? The Babylonian Code did not influence the Salic laws through indirect channels. In the main, the latter were even independent of Roman influence. Neither can it be accounted for in the homogeneousness of both the Semitic and German races. They are heterogeneous altogether, as Eduard Meyer has pointed out.

There is only one theory—to assume that the primitive forms of the spiritual and social life are independent of race and nation: the conformity of laws despite non-conformity of race finds its ex-
planation in a general human cause. This theory sounds somewhat mystical, since the author denies that the human mind is in the main formed equally, nor will he admit that there is a common legal consciousness. In his argument, the author seems to have overlooked the quotation of Eduard Meyer (p. 2, note 2) that the laws in the Code of Hammurapi in the main go back to the Sumerians. For if they did not originate with the Semites, how do we know that the Sumerians and the Aryo-Germans were not homogeneous? Accepting the author's conclusions, there would be no justification in asserting the dependency of the biblical legal laws upon the Code of Hammurapi.


The present volume is a valuable piece of work, full of learned and suggestive annotations, quotations from the Babylonian religious literature and thus greatly contributes both to the reading and interpretation of Sumerian religious texts. The presentation, however, of the Sumerian religion on which the author seems to pride himself especially is not of much account and in a good many points wrong altogether.

The volume is divided into five parts. In the first part the author outlines in several sub-divisions the development of the religion of the Sumerians from the oldest times till the introduction of the god NIN-IB into the Sumerian pantheon. The author undertakes to account for the fact of the Sumerians having ascribed to their god all possible attributes, qualities, and frailties of human nature, even their own social institutions and functions: they felt that, in order to understand their woes and afflictions, _god must be man_, for only human nature is capable of understanding human nature. But, though thought of as being intensely
human, the Sumerian god is nevertheless most divine on account of the apparent contradictions which the Sumerian mind discovered in the nature of their god, namely, the androgynous nature of the god and his self-existence, for there must be something in the nature of the god which the human mind cannot comprehend and this 'something' is divine, because 'unthinkable.' By transferring to their god everything that belonged originally to man, the microcosm of the Sumerians was the prototype after which the macrocosm of the god was patterned. In the history of the Babylonian religion we find four epochs: (a) the prehistoric or AN epoch, (b) the Sumerian or Enlil epoch, (c) the Amurritish (Canaanitish)-Babylonian or Marduk epoch, (d) the Assyrian epoch with god An-shar or Ashshur.

The second part deals with NIN-IB, the 'son' of the Nippur trinity during the Enil period at the time of the second dynasty of Ur, and contains transcriptions and translations of nine texts with notes. The author holds that though NIN-IB makes his first appearance under Dungi, there are several reasons to assume that he was one of the most ancient Sumerian gods, the cult and very existence of which had been forgotten till it was revived by Dungi who restored the foundation of the temple of NIN-IB.

The tablets are in a very fragmentary condition. One of the most interesting inscriptions is the hymn published under numbers 2-3, which is identical with a Neo-Babylonian copy with a Semitic translation, published in R. H., p. 123.

Hunting for effect is one of the frailities of human nature, hence pardonable in a popular book, magazine, or lecture, but out of place in a volume of this kind that can only be appreciated by scholars. Was the author puzzled to find a solution for the fact of the Sumerian god being endowed with all possible human attributes that he was obliged to take refuge in the Christological idea as the underlying principle in the development of the Sumerian religion and thus making the Sumerian god the prototype of the Founder of Christianity? Why not reverse the process and say that for the Sumerians man was god, since it is an undeniable fact that hero-worship played a most important part in the development of religions, and every student of Assyriology knows that in
early Babylonian times all the kings were deified? This explanation would indeed be very reasonable, but not startling and original at all! The Sumerians never ascribed to their gods an androgynous nature. But if a god or a goddess has creative power, to the created being, be it god or man, the god is father-mother. The main support for the theory that Enlil displaced Anum rests on a wrong interpretation in the opening lines of the Code of Hammurabi, since in the same passage is repeated again Anum ú Enlil (col. I, 45), cf. also col. XXXII, 45 f. The fact alone that Enlil is always styled a 'son' shows plainly that Anum never ceased to be considered as the highest god whose commands were executed by Enlil and the other gods. Besides no proof is forthcoming that in the seats of the other gods as Sippar, Larsa, Ur, etc., Enlil was recognized as superior to them. It is hardly likely that the religious conceptions in the Sumerian literature were not more or less influenced by the Semites who were at the time of the Enlil epoch already settled in the country. The pure Sumerian epoch may be more appropriately termed prehistoric.


The 171 tablets published in this volume are more of epigraphic and lexical than of historical value, as a great many documents belonging to the same period with similar contents have been published in the last twenty years. The cuneiform signs of these tablets are peculiar, there are several new signs, and they contain many terms and variations of terms not known before. But there are also a few new date formulas and variations of date formulas, and since the chronology of the remote period to which these tablets belong is uncertain, and scholars hold extremely divergent opinions in this respect, any new information, adding a link to the
chronological chain, might make it possible to determine with more definite results the dates of this period.

About half of the tablets are dated, and the undated documents have been assigned to this period on the basis of their palæographical characteristics, their proper names, and contents by Prof. Hilprecht. As to the contents, about 120 consist of accounts, receipts, the remainder of contracts, court proceedings, loans, promissory notes, memoranda, purchases, pay-lists, and lists of officials.

The general plan of this volume is according to the principles characteristic of the series of which it forms a part.

A considerable part of the introduction deals with the dates of this period which the author tries to reconstruct with no definite results. As the most useful part in the introduction we consider 'the List of Cuneiform signs' and 'the System of transcription of cuneiform signs' which are a great help to the student not well acquainted with old-Babylonian palæography. But one cannot be too careful in compiling lists of this kind, if they are to serve their purpose as guide to the student. The least omission and inexactitude cause trouble and delay. The 'List' and the 'System' must be consulted simultaneously, and therefore there should be no omission and the signs in both exactly alike. But this is not the case. The signs omitted in the List are: ág, apin (engan), eburu, gū, kēsh, màr, sā, ṣuḥur, shāb. The signs in the System which are more or less variants of those in the List are: asaru, banšur, bàr, de, dū, doubbin, gān, gār, gūr, kar, kim, ku(g), lag, màr, nIGIN, ri, shu+gi. If these volumes are to serve as textbooks, more care ought to be taken in compiling lists of signs.
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JACOB HOSCHANDER
ARONSTAM'S "JEWISH DIETARY LAWS"

Jewish Dietary Laws from a Scientific Standpoint. A Study by

N. E. ARONSTAM, M. D., Detroit, Mich. New York: BLOCH

This is a brief, popular outline of the principal inhibitions of biblical-talmudic food legislation. It repeatedly asserts the wisdom of these prohibitions and cites certain alleged facts of evolution and of organic chemistry in explanation. The author does not believe that the ritual of Kashrut originated in hygienic considerations; but however originating, its ordinances were later systematized and elaborated from the viewpoint of health. This is the reviewer's opinion also; for the effect is not to be disputed, and the laws are too orderly to be the result of superstition or chance.
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