Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16

Charles H. Manekin
Y. Tzvi Langermann
Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt *Editors*

Moritz Steinschneider. *The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*

Vol I. Preface. General Remarks. Jewish Philosophers

Springer

Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters

Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy

Editor:
Reinier Munk, *VU University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Editorial Board:
Resianne Fontaine, *University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
Robert Gibbs, *University of Toronto, Canada*
Steven Harvey, *Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel*
Warren Zev Harvey, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel*
Albert van der Heide, *VU University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
Arthur Hyman, *Yeshiva University, New York, U.S.A.*
David Novak, *University of Toronto, Canada*
Kenneth Seeskin, *North Western University, Illinois, U.S.A.*
Colette Sirat, *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France*

VOLUME 16

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/5662

Charles H. Manekin • Y. Tzvi Langermann
Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt
Editors

Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters

Vol I. Preface. General Remarks. Jewish Philosophers

Springer

Editors
Charles H. Manekin
Department of Philosophy
University of Maryland
College Park, MD, USA

Y. Tzvi Langermann
Department of Arabic
Bar Ilan University
Ramat Gan, Israel

Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt
Seminar für Orientalistik und
Islamwissenschaften
Ruhr-Universität Bochum
Bochum, Germany

Revised, updated, and translated by Charles H. Manekin, Y. Tzvi Langermann, and Hinrich Biesterfeldt

Translated from Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher, by Moritz Steinschneider, Berlin, Kommissionsverlag des Bibliographischen Bureaus (1893)

ISBN 978-94-007-7313-4 ISBN 978-94-007-7314-1 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013958239

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

Editors' Preface

The bibliographer and literary historian Moritz Steinschneider (1816–1907) produced several works that became instant classics in their respective fields.[1] But his *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher* (*The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Interpreters*; hereafter, *HUe*), published in 1893, was, and remains to this day, his *maximum opus*. It is a work of gargantuan proportions, accurately described by one reviewer as 'colossal' and 'gigantesque,'[2] spanning over a thousand pages of closely-set type, and including approximately seven thousand footnotes. Even the long title fails to describe adequately the work's contents. For Steinschneider expanded the story of the medieval Hebrew translations and their authors to include information about all types of Hebrew adaptations, versions, commentaries, supercommentaries, etc., that pertain to philosophy, science, medicine, and belles-lettres, as well as bio-bibliographical information about their authors. For this reason *HUe* has been for over a century the authoritative account of the transmission and development of Arabic and Latin, and by way of those languages, Greek culture, especially science, to the Jews of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. To paraphrase its author, it is a book not to be read continuously but rather to be consulted repeatedly.[3]

For decades after its completion there was relatively little progress in the field of medieval Hebrew science and the Hebrew translation literature. Almost everything written in these areas was based on *HUe*, or on Steinschneider's studies preceding it. George Sarton referred to Steinschneider's studies so many times in his *Introduction to the History of Science* that he considered it pointless to list his name

[1] A biography of Steinschneider has been a scholarly desideratum for close to a century. Bibliographical details are summed up in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, both s.v. Steinschneider, Moritz. The longest biographical treatment is still Marx 1947. Marx has a very useful bibliography on pp. 294–95. For a list of Steinschneider's writings, see Kohut 1896, Steinschneider's secretary, Adeline Goldberg, published additions to the bibliography in Goldberg 1901, 1905, 1909.

[2] See I. Lévi's review in Lévi 1894.

[3] Steinschneider 1893, xiv.

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1_1, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

in the index.[4] Two lengthy articles in English on medieval Hebrew translations, one published as late as the 1973, were essentially abridgements of Steinschneider.[5] Had Steinschneider decided not to include the fruits of 50 years of manuscript research in the book, or had he not been able, during those 50 years, to learn about so many Hebrew manuscripts—in short, had *HUe* been less the comprehensive masterpiece than it was, then, perhaps, subsequent generations may have taken up the task where Steinschneider left off. As it was, the task seemed to them pretty much completed.

The situation has changed markedly in the last three decades. While there is still no scholar who embraces the entire field as did Steinschneider, there may be no longer any need for one: technological advances in manuscript research and data retrieval, progress made in cognate Arabic and Latin areas of research, and a spirit of collaboration among a small but growing group of scholars, has yielded, and hopefully will continue to yield, important results in this much-neglected area of inquiry. Scholars in Europe, Israel, and the U.S. are studying texts which in many cases have not been touched since Steinschneider made his notes over a century ago. The single most important advance has been made in the accessibility of the data, i.e., the manuscripts themselves. Where once scholars had to travel throughout Europe to inspect Hebrew manuscripts, they can now read microfilms of those manuscripts in one central location, the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (hereafter, IMHM), at the National Library of Israel in Jerusalem. In recent years, more and more Hebrew manuscripts have been digitized and placed online, so that scholars can access them free of charge from wherever they happen to be, as long as they are equipped with a computer and an internet connection.

A great amount of texts and studies has been published in the last century that bear upon the medieval transmission of knowledge, both from the Greek to the Arabic, and from the Arabic to the Latin. In the area of the transmission of Greek thought into Arabic, not only have articles and monographs appeared regularly over the years, but also extensive bibliographies of Arabic medicine and sciences by Manfred Ullmann and Fuat Sezgin, respectively, a book-length article on the Arabic translations, translators, and the disciplines by Gerhard Endress, and a history of the Graeco-Arabic translation movement in Baghdad, with an extensive bibliographic guide, by Dimitri Gutas.[6] As for the European translations from the Arabic (either directly or via the Hebrew), there has been considerable activity by two overlapping groups of scholars: those working within the Latin tradition who are interested in the reception of classical learning among the scholastics, and those working within the Arabic tradition who are interested in its transmission to the Christian West.

Because the pool of Hebrew manuscripts is considerably smaller than its Arabic and Latin counterparts, *HUe* is more comprehensive than Steinschneider's other

[4] See Sarton 1927. Sarton treated Tannery, Cantor, and Duhem in the same category.

[5] See Bevan and Singer 1927, and the 1973 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. "Translators and Translations".

[6] See Ullmann 1970; Sezgin 1967; Endress 1987, 1992; Gutas 1998. According to Gutas, 195, "there is as yet no modern bibliographical survey of the Arabic translations of all the Greek philosophers; Steinschneider's *Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen* remains the only single treatment."

two works on medieval translations. Nonetheless, there has been a spate of activity in recent decades, with scholars taking advantage in particular of the centralization of resources at the IMHM.[7] *HUe*'s comprehensiveness, and the slow but steady progress in the field, suggests that the best way to deal with ongoing research is not by replacing Steinschneider's masterpiece, but by reworking and updating it. *HUe* has held up for a century; it needs now to be revised and transformed to meet the needs of researchers in the twenty-first century.

The present work is itself a "*Bearbeitung*," a version or adaptation, of the section of *HUe* devoted to the Hebrew translations of Judaeo-Arabic philosophy (§§211–217). We offer it as the first part of our larger project to translate, update, and revise, in short, to transform, *HUe* for the modern reader. Our decision to begin not at the beginning of the work, but rather *in medias res* calls for some explanation. Steinschneider, it will be recalled, had already prepared a work in 1845 on the Arabic literature of the Jews, which he published in 1902 as *Die arabische Literatur der Juden*. As a result, he informs the reader in the *Vorrede* that he treats this section less extensively than others. Of all of *HUe* this section was in the most need of revision, first in light of Steinschneider's later work, and then in light of the enormous amount of work done on Judaeo-Arabic sources and their Hebrew translations in the last century, which saw, *inter alia*, the discovery of the Cairo Geniza. The section also contains some of the most important works of medieval Jewish culture, such as Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* and Judah ha-Levi's *Kuzari*.

Our version is based primarily on the German text, but also takes into account the French Mémoire, the additions (*Zusätze*) and corrections that Steinschneider printed in *HUe* and some of Steinschneider's marginal glosses to his own copy, which is in the Steinschneider Collection at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. It is important to emphasize that the present text is a *revision* of *HUe*, and so deviates from the original when new scholarship has come to light that challenges Steinschneider's pronouncements. We have not attempted to distinguish the various strands of *HUe*, or to translate slavishly Steinschneider's original text; the version is based on Steinschneider to a large extent, but not entirely so. On the other hand, overtly supplementary material, composed mostly of additional bibliographical material and commentary, appears within square brackets and in a different typeface [like this]; when we have been unable to identify a reference, we have placed a question mark in square brackets, e.g., [?]. Diagonal brackets enclose Steinschneider's own additions and revisions from the section "Zusätze und Berichtigungen" of *HUe*.

As noted above, Steinschneider was unable to examine personally many of the manuscripts on which he based *HUe*. Today, virtually all Hebrew manuscripts extant have been filmed by the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscrits (IMHM) at the National Library of Israel, Jerusalem. Most of the mss. to which we refer have been inspected by the editors at the IMHM; otherwise information was acquired from the IMHM catalogue, available online at aleph.nli.org.il.

[7] See, for example, Zonta 1996 and Freudenthal 1993; Langermann 1999; Harvey 2000; Zonta 2006.

Like Steinschneider we generally abbreviate references to manuscripts; for major works, however, we expand the references in the supplement to include additional information. This information includes the film number of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts at the Jewish National Library, Jerusalem (IMHM), the major catalogue numbers, and the folios in the ms. where the work in question can be found. The film number of the IMHM appears in curly brackets. The catalogue number, when different from the call number, appears in square brackets.

Steinschneider presented the reader with no less than eight indices: Hebrew titles, Arabic titles, Hebrew wordlist, Arabic wordlist, Name and subject, Translators (arranged chronologically), Anonymous Translations, and Manuscripts. Since the present volume contains only a small section of *HUe* we have provided a name, subject, and manuscript.

It may be useful to sketch out how the three co-authors divided up the work between them, and how the present work evolved. The first step was the preparation of a draft English translation; this task was entrusted to Biesterfeldt. The manuscript then went to Langermann, who stylized the English, checked manuscripts, and wrote virtually all of the supplementary material. In the next stage, Manekin made further stylistic changes, added some supplementary material, expanded and corrected the notes, and wrote the preface and the introduction to the volume. All three editors have reviewed the work and can be held jointly responsible (with Steinschneider) for its virtues and drawbacks.

It is our pleasant duty to acknowledge the US National Endowment of the Humanities, which awarded the Steinschneider project a 3-year collaborative grant, and the Joseph and Rebecca Meyerhoff Center of Jewish Studies at the University of Maryland for significantly funding the project for several years. Hinrich Biesterfeldt wishes to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for two travel grants, in spring 2004 and summer 2005, to Jerusalem to conduct talks with the co-editors of this volume. We hope that this volume will be followed by others until the entire work has been translated, revised, and updated.

References

Bevan, Edwyn Robert, and Charles Joseph Singer. 1927. *The Legacy of Israel* […]. Oxford.

Endress, Gerhard. 1987. Die wissenschaftliche Literatur. In *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie II: Literaturwissenschaft*, ed. by Helmut Gätje, 400–506. Wiesbaden.

Endress, Gerhard. 1992. Die wissenschaftliche Literatur. In *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie: Supplement*, ed. Wolfdietrich Fischer, 3–152. Wiesbaden.

Freudenthal, Gad. 1993. Les sciences dans les communautés juives médiévales de Provence; leur appropriation, leur rôle. *Revue des études juives* 152: 29–136.

Goldberg, Adelaide. 1901. Nachtrag zu G. A. Kohut, Bibliography of the Writings of Prof. Dr. Mor. Steinschneider […] bis 1900. *Zeitschrift für hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:189–191.

Goldberg, Adelaide. 1905. Nachtrag zu G. A. Kohut, Bibliography of the Writings of Prof. Dr. Mor. Steinschneider […] bis 1900. *Zeitschrift für hebraeische Bibliographie* 9:90–92.

Goldberg, Adelaide. 1909. Nachtrag zu G. A. Kohut, Bibliography of the Writings of Prof. Dr. Mor. Steinschneider […] bis 1900. *Zeitschrift für hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:94–95.

Gutas, Dimitri. 1998. *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbâsid Society (2nd-4th/8th-10th centuries)*. London, New York.

Harvey, Steven, ed. 2000. *The Medieval Hebrew Encyclopedias of Science and Philosophy*. Dordrecht, Boston, London.

Kohut, George A. 1896. Bibliography of the Writings of Professor Dr. Moritz Steinschneider. In *Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneider's*, ed. by Moritz Steinschneider, v–xxxix. Leipzig.

Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1999. *The Jews and the Sciences in the Middle Ages*. Aldershot, Hampshire.

Lévi, Isadore. 1894. Review of 'Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen'. *Revue des études juives* 28: 309–311.

Marx, Alexander. 1947. Moritz Steinschneider. In *Essays in Jewish Biography*, 112–184. Philadelphia.

Sarton, George. 1927–48. *Introduction to the History of Science*. Baltimore.

Sezgin, Fuat. 1967-. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden.

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1893. *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters, meist nach handschriftlichen Quellen*. Berlin.

Ullmann, Manfred. 1970. *Die Medizin im Islam*. Leiden, Köln.

Ullmann, Manfred. 1972. *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam*. Leiden.

Zonta, Mauro. 1996. *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico: le traduzioni ebraiche medievali dei testi filosofici antichi*. Brescia.

Zonta, Mauro. 2006. *Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century. A History and Source Book*. Dordrecht.

Editors' Introduction: The Genesis of *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*

The June 3, 1893, issue of the Berlin *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* carried the following announcement:

> In the upcoming days a rather large work is to appear under the auspices of the Commission of the Bibliographical Bureau (*Kommission des Bibliographischen Bureaus*). The table of contents covers two large quarto sides of an offprint that may be obtained *gratis*. The book itself will not be sent for reviewing, as only three hundred copies (retail price, thirty marks) have been produced. Its author may be allowed to say something about the origin and the nature of the work.
>
> The work contains the German version of a French essay that was submitted to the 1884 Prize Competition of the Académie française for the best work on the Hebrew translations in the Middle Ages in their broadest dimensions, namely, including also the commentaries, compendia, etc., of the translations. The essay won the prize. The entire work in two volumes (over 1100 narrowly printed pages) is divided into a general or introductory part (encyclopedias, divisions of the sciences, introductions and guides for study), followed by five sections, namely philosophy, mathematics, medicine, miscellaneous, and "the Jews as transmitters." Each section is divided into four chapters according to authors of the original works: Greeks, Arabs, Jews, Christians. The individual authors are arranged alphabetically. The research extends also to the original authors and the works that were translated, based on data culled from the best and newest sources. But the central endeavor is to attest and discuss the Hebrew translations, of which only an insignificant fraction is available in print, so that the work is mainly concerned with manuscripts, most of which have been examined directly or via communications from experts. The last of eight indices lists these manuscripts according to library.
>
> The work is preceded by General Remarks, from which only the following point may be highlighted: among the translations there are as many original works of Christian origin as those of all the aforementioned three rubrics [i.e., Greek, Arab, and Jewish authors] combined. The title designates the work, not unfittingly, as a contribution to the literary history of the Middle Ages.
>
> Berlin
> Moritz Steinschneider[1]

[1] Pp. 695–6. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are by the present authors.

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1_2, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

The eighty-seven-year-old Moritz (Moshe) Steinschneider had good reasons to wish to present his new book to the public in advance of its appearance. For one thing, he had published the volume privately at his own expense and under the auspices of a society headed by his son, Julius. The colossal size of a book on such a recondite topic would no doubt deter sales, especially if its value for fields other than Jewish literature was not recognized. For another, the size of the book seemed disproportionate to its topic, a judgment with which even Steinschneider would have agreed, had he intended to write a book solely, or even principally, about Jewish translators. The author's comments notwithstanding, the book published in 1893 under the somewhat misleading title, *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher* (*The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Interpreters*, henceforth: *HUe*) was not merely about the Jewish translators, but rather about the corpus of medieval Hebrew philosophical, scientific, and even belletristic works, what Steinschneider called in the French *Mémoire* that preceded *HUe*, the "international" literature of the Jews.[2]

This essay deals with the genesis of *HUe*, a work that Steinschneider contemplated writing for many years, but that, over time, outgrew its initial conception. The work that emerged was not so much the book that Steinschneider had initially intended to write—a monograph on the Jewish translators, with reference to the Hebrew translations and commentaries of foreign originals—but rather a massive reference work for the history of "profane literature" in medieval Hebrew, indeed, a detailed and documented witness of that history, the like of which had never been seen before or was seen since.

The Early Conception of *HUe*: 1845–1860

Steinschneider refers in several places in his writings to a prospectus that he had submitted in 1845 to the Berlin Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden for a work, or works, that would include an essay on Jewish translators. These references are not entirely consistent: they speak either of a single work on the literature of the Middle Ages that was to include sections on the Arabic literature of the Jews, Jewish translators, and Jewish and Muslim polemical literature; or of a trilogy of three works covering the same subjects; or of two works, one on the Arabic literature of the Jews and the other on the Jewish translators.[3] But whatever form the study of Jewish translators was intended to take, the focus was to be mainly, though not exclusively, on the Hebrew translations of Arabic texts. Steinschneider's initial aim in this part of his project appears to have been twofold: to demonstrate the impact of

[2] Steinschneider 1884 (henceforth: *Mémoire*). The *Avant-Propos* was published in Bourel 1987.

[3] Manekin 2000, esp. 144–7.

Arabic literature on Hebrew literature, especially in the fields of philosophy, science, mathematics, and medicine, and to call attention to the existence of Arabic works extant in Hebrew translations. Achieving this aim would present a more accurate picture not only of medieval Jewish literary culture but also of the impact of Hellenistic culture on both medieval Arabic and Jewish cultures. Steinschneider's university education in Vienna, Leipzig, and Berlin (1836–41) had focused on classical and oriental languages and philology, a focus that was reflected in his scholarly writings of this early period, such as his collaboration with Franz Delitzsch on *Etz Hayyim* by Aaron ben Elijah of Nicomedia (1841), his uncompleted Hebrew translation of the Qur'an, his article on circumcision among the Arabs and Muslims (1846), his review of Salomon Munk's *Notice sur Joseph b. Jehouda* (written in Prague, 1844), his articles on Arabic subjects for Pierer's *Universal-Lexikon* (1839–43), among others. Little was known at the time of the extent of Hebrew translations from languages besides Arabic, or for that matter, the extent of Hebrew translations from any languages.

Steinschneider's earliest published references to the proposed study of Jewish translators are found in two footnotes to the comprehensive article on "*Jüdische Literatur*" that he wrote for the Ersch and Gruber encyclopedia in 1845–47. The first speaks of the appearance, "hopefully soon," of "a comprehensive work about the entire Arabic literature of the Jews, and that [literature of the Jews] which is translated from Arabic"[4]; the second refers to an appreciation of the "character and significance of the translation literature" in the *introduction* to his *Bibliotheca judaica-arabica*, i.e., the work on the Arabic literature of the Jews.[5] Here Steinschneider does not speak of a separate work on Jewish translators, but rather a treatment of the translation literature as part of his work on the Arabic literature of the Jews. This is confirmed by a description of that work in 1857 as "a monograph on Jewish literature in the Arabic language, and the translations from that and other languages in the Middle Ages."[6] Given that Steinschneider said that his model for his *Bibliotheca judaica-arabica* was Wüstenfeld's *Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte* (1840), one may assume that his work would have been arranged like Wüstenfeld's: a general introduction, which would have discussed, in addition to Arabic Jewish literature, the importance and character of its Jewish translators; a list of authors with biographical information, followed by their principal works, in turn followed by the Hebrew translations. When Steinschneider finally published a much-expanded *Bibliotheca judaica-arabica* over a half-century later as *Die Arabische Literatur der Juden* (1903), this was more or less the form that it took. However, there was no longer a need to devote a section to the Jewish translators or to the Hebrew translations, since these subjects had been covered several years earlier in *HUe*.

[4] Steinschneider 1850, 384a, n.3.

[5] Ibid., 397b, n. 4.

[6] Steinschneider 1857, 267.

How did a proposed section on Jewish translators in a modestly-sized work on the relation of Arab-Jewish literatures expand exponentially, over the course of several decades, to become a gigantic work mainly on the philosophical and scientific literature of medieval Jews? Certainly, in 1845–47, when Steinschneider's knowledge of Jewish literature was based on out-of-date, incomplete, and often inaccurate catalogues of manuscript collections, limited exposure to primary sources in print, and a meager amount of reliable scholarship, he did not envision that subsequent research would lead him and others to discover so much new material. But in the decade following the publication of the encyclopedic entry *Jüdische Literatur*, Steinschneider catalogued the printed Judaica books of the Bodleian Library (1860), composed a conspectus of its manuscript collection (1857), and catalogued the Hebrew manuscripts of the Leiden library (1858). These catalogues offer detailed accounts of both works and authors. Steinschneider also had visited the British Museum's library and had prepared the catalogues of the private Michael and Saraval collections (the former ended up in Oxford; the latter at the Breslau seminary). The fruits of this decade-long research, and its implications for the study of Jewish translators and translations, are found already in the expanded English version of *Jüdische Literatur* which appeared in 1857 as *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century*.

Here are a few examples of material on translations that were added in the English version of the original encyclopedia article (italics in the original):

> *Manfred* is said to have translated a pseudo-Aristotelian work, as it seems from the Hebrew. The intellectual intercourse between Jews and Christians, in the countries where the language of literature (Latin) was more accessible to the Jews, from its affinity with the vernacular, was far greater than the deficient state of inquiry into that very interesting subject might lead us to suppose…"[7]
>
> Besides their own literature of translations, &c., we are also indebted to the Jews for the preservation of various works in *foreign languages* written in Hebrew characters, amongst which the Arabic, from its affinity, takes of course the first place. The neglect of several valuable contributions to the general history of literature has arisen only from ignorance of the letters in which they were written; through this they have been misinterpreted, and foreign authors have been converted by bibliographers into Jews. Many works of the celebrated *Averroes* (§ 12) in the genuine Arabic are preserved only in Hebrew MSS.; an Arabic lexicon in Hebrew characters, and older than the year 1380, is extant in the Escurial; but no one, as far as we know, even noticed it, at a period when every corner of the libraries was thoroughly examined by Arabic scholars. A *Polish* translation of the Psalms, written as early as 1510, is to be found at Parma; and at a later period even a Turkish work on Muhammedan sects was written in Hebrew characters, and has been recently discovered at Leyden by the author of the present treatise.[8]

Steinschneider also added to the original list of Christian Scholastics whose works were translated into Hebrew the names of Michael Scotus, Vincent of Beauvais, Petrus Hispanus, ("whose compendium of logic has been translated several times"), Thomas Bricot, Augustine, Piccolomini, "and others."[9]

---

[7] Ibid., 63.

[8] Ibid., 66–67.

[9] Ibid., 95. Steinschneider found two of those translations among the Bodleian manuscripts.

As always, Steinschneider deemed knowledge of the translation literature important for an accurate picture of the works in the original language. To hammer home this point, he adds the following comment:

> We will here mention only two examples. The errors about Michael Scotus' translation of the *Liber Animalium*, committed by Buhle and Schneider, might easily have been avoided if the Hebrew translation in the Oppenheim Collection had been known. Supposing the Hebrew title to be correct, this MS contains the Commentary of Averroes; to which neither Jourdain, nor Renan in his great work on Averroes, makes any allusion. Another Hebrew MS., now at Oxford, contains a work by Robert of Lincoln, *De Anima* (unknown to Tanner), in which Albertus Magnus is quoted. A complete answer to those who imagine all Jews in the Middle Ages, except the Arabians, to have been trades-people and privileged usurers is found in the prefatory remarks of Judah ben Moses of Rome (beginning of the fourteenth century); who professes to have translated various short dissertations by several celebrated Christian authors in order to show his brethren that "the Christian nation is not destitute of all true science" as some of them believed. The Jews have never been entirely excluded from the scientific pursuits of their contemporaries, except by force; the general ignorance respecting that part of the literature of the Middle Ages is shown by the fact that a Hebrew translation of a work by Thomas Aquinas has been recently introduced to the public as a great curiosity, and ascribed to a special motive of no value.[10]

Characteristically, Steinschneider begins the comment by emphasizing the significance of the Hebrew translations for historians of Arabic and Scholastic philosophy, yet ends with noting their importance for historians of Jewish culture. He was not one to overemphasize or to exaggerate the Jewish concern with philosophy and science; rather, his main task was to describe, as accurately and objectively as he could, the nature and extent of this concern. This was perhaps one of the reasons why he postponed his study of the Jewish translators. The longer he waited, the more material he and others were discovering.

Another reason for the expansion of the work on Jewish translators was Steinschneider's decision to include not only translations, but also writings related to translations. The term that Steinschneider liked to use was "*Bearbeitung*," which he rendered in French as "adaptation" and in English as "edition" or "version."[11] "*Bearbeitungen*" encompassed for him translations, explications, commentaries, supercommentaries, etc., of a given text. In this expansion he claimed to follow the examples of Wenrich and Flügel, and others.[12] In 1842 Johann Wenrich published his *De auctorum Graecorum versionibus et commentariis Syriacis*, *Arabicis*, *Armeniacis Persisque commentatio*, one year after Gustav Flügel had published his *Dissertatio de arabicis scriptorum graecorum interpretibus*. Both essays answered the call of the Königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen in 1830 to produce a collection "of the references to Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and Persian translations of Greek authors, an accurate account of which we are lacking to this day"; both expanded the survey beyond translations—Flügel spoke of *interpretes*;

[10] Ibid., 96. The reference is to Jellinek 1853; cf. Steinschneider's notice on Shalom 1859 in Steinschneider 1859a.

[11] He actually mentions the word, among others, as one not easily rendered in English. See Steinschneider 1857, vi.

[12] Steinschneider 1884, 13.

Wenrich of *versiones* and *commentarii*, and the latter added an introduction about the background of the translation movement from Greek into Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and Persian. Missing from both works was any reference to Hebrew translations. Three to four years after Wenrich and Flügel had published their essays, and five years after Wüstenfeld had published his *Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte*, Steinschneider submitted his prospectus for his *Bibliotheca judaica-arabica*. The three earlier works played a part not only in his conception of *HUe*, but also, perhaps, in his decision to write it.

Like Wenrich and Flügel, Steinschneider devoted much of his work on translators to the Greek heritage. This may seem strange, since the Jewish translators lacked direct knowledge of Greek texts. In the thirteenth century, for example, Zerachiah b. Isaac translated part of Aristotle's *De anima* into Hebrew, but from Isḥaq ibn Ḥunayn's Arabic translation of his father's Syriac translation; and another part from the translation of 'Isa b. Isḥaq (=Ibn Zurʿah). This appears to have been the only complete Hebrew translation of the *De anima* in the Middle Ages, and had Steinschneider limited himself to translations in the strict sense, he would have concluded his section on the *De anima* there. But in fact, he goes on to consider in the section on "Greek Authors" also the Hebrew versions of Averroes' commentaries, and the Jewish commentaries on these commentaries. None of Aristotle's logical writings was translated into Hebrew in the Middle Ages, either directly from the Greek or indirectly from the Arabic or Latin translations. And yet Steinschneider devotes over sixty pages to Jewish writings on logic in the section on "Aristotle" because these writings are either in the form of commentaries on Averroes' paraphrases of Aristotle, or independent works, commentaries, and paraphrases inspired by Averroes' paraphrases of Aristotle. The Hebrew translations and commentaries of Averroes' *Logical Questions* appear under Aristotle's logic, whereas the Hebrew translations and commentaries of Averroes' *Physical Questions* appear in a section devoted to *Quaestiones* (but still under the philosophy of the Greeks, rather than of the Arabs). Yet this classification does make some sense, for medieval Jewish authors generally viewed Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle, especially the paraphrastic Middle Commentaries, as essentially the works of Aristotle, and their references to Aristotle are usually via the versions of Averroes.

The inclusion of *Bearbeitungen* within the scope of a work about Jewish translators still does not account for the massive difference in size between Steinschneider's essay on the Hebrew translations and his predecessors' essays on the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and Persian translations—especially since the latter translations include many more works. Wenrich's and Flügel's essays are essentially lists of authors and their works, based on the manuscript catalogues, the Renaissance editions of the Latin translations, and some Renaissance translations of Arab historians. The subsequent publication of the works of Arabic and Turkish historiographers and bio-bibliographers, as well as the editions of some original texts, added significantly to our knowledge of the Graeco-Arabic translation movement.[13] When Steinschneider wrote a series

[13] See Gutas 1998. Cf. Rosenthal 1958.

of articles on the Arabic translations from Greek a half-century after Wenrich and Flügel, the picture of the translation movement in its general outlines was more or less complete. What was still often missing from that picture was knowledge based on the original texts. By contrast, Steinschneider based *HUe* on first-hand knowledge of the Hebrew and Arabic manuscripts, and on information about the manuscripts that he had solicited from a network of informants throughout the libraries and private collections of Europe. His mastery of all areas of Jewish literature and bibliography, and his decision to delay the publication of *HUe* until he had first published articles and books on aspects of Jewish science, filled the book with detailed knowledge and swelled it considerably beyond the initial plan for a book on the Jewish translators.

If Steinschneider expanded the scope of the work by including "*Bearbeitungen*" in addition to "*Übersetzungen*," he limited it by excluding the Hebrew translations of Jewish legal, liturgical, and exegetical writings. These belonged to what he termed the "national or religious" literature of the Jews. In the *Avant-Propos* to the *Mémoire*, he gives two reasons for this exclusion: First, most of these translations were taken from Judeo-Arabic works, and these would be discussed in his book on the Arabic literature of the Jews. Second, the "international literature of the Jews," i.e., the philosophical and scientific, had been hitherto neglected:

> The scientific studies [of the Jews] were regarded somewhat like a necessary curiosity; and, as for the translations, there were vague ideas about those that are connected to Arabic literature. It is only in our own day that translations made from Latin originals have been dug up, and it had been surprising to learn that in medical science the Jews made use, at the same time and to the same degree, of Western sources as well as of Arabic ones.
>
> The fact is, one can prohibit the Jews anything but science.[14]

Here, too, Steinschneider signals that the work is primarily interested in the "profane literature" and not in the phenomenon of translation alone. More accurately, Steinschneider wished not only to describe the translations but also their impact in transforming medieval Jewish culture. To do this he had first to catalogue and describe the various *Bearbeitungen*, to layout and characterize the data, as it were, and then to make general observations. This was what Steinschneider set out to do in his work on Jewish translators, and though the final work emerged merely a half-century after he had written his original prospectus, it is safe to say that the basic conception of the projected work was formulated much earlier.

Steinschneider discovered during his work on the Bodleian and Leiden Catalogues that the data was much more considerable than he had thought. Sometime during the 1860s, if not earlier, the mass of material that he had gathered required that he separate the planned work into two: one on the Arabic literature of the Jews, and the other on the Jewish translators. In 1869, he wrote:

> For over twenty years I have been following the points of contact between Arabic and Jewish culture and literature with special attention, and I have been gathering, in particular, material for two partly interrelated works about the Arabic literature of the Jews and the

[14] Steinschneider 1884, 6.

> Jewish translators. A section of the latter will include information about Arabic authors who were in some way accessible or known to the Jews, and their significance; this will also constitute an enrichment of Arabic literary history based on Hebrew and other sources that are rarely used by orientalists, and will throw light on the influence of oriental literature on the occidental.[15]

In fact, the material on the Arab authors was utilized in two works: first *HUe*, and then *Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*. But we are getting ahead of our story.

Collecting the Data for HUe*: 1845–1880*

In the introduction to *HUe* (1893), Steinschneider provides his own explanation for the delay in the composition of the work:

> With ever growing knowledge of the material, however, my hope to get a grasp on it sank. Having to direct the Jewish School for Girls (1869–90), to give lectures at the Veitel Heine Foundation (since 1859), to offer help at the Royal Library (since 1869), to edit the *Hebraeische Bibliographie* (1859–82) and a supplement to Ben Jacob's *Thesaurus* (since 1880, at present arriving at p. 460), and to see to the duties of a large family I had neither the time nor the vigor to digest the immense material. No prospect of publication was acting as an incentive.[16]

This description presents the picture of *HUe* as a work for which the material was collected over decades, a work waiting to be written, unlike the two other books that emerged out of the 1845 prospectus, the *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden* (1877) and *Die arabische Literatur der Juden* (1903). *HUe*, by contrast, was composed—in some ways, compiled—from Steinschneider's notes and essays from the period loosely following the completion of the Leiden and Bodleian catalogues, until he published it in 1893. Steinschneider was indeed busy with personal, professional, and intellectual pursuits during this period that were not immediately connected with his work on Jewish translators. But among the thousands of references found in *HUe*, a large number are due to Steinschneider's own scholarship during this period, most of which he published piecemeal in scholarly journals, and especially in the one he himself edited, *Hebraeische Bibliographie*.

Steinschneider's short comments and longer reviews in *Hebraeische Bibliographie* have already been mined by historians for their insight into the development of his views[17]; they are especially important for his evaluation of the impact of his research on the historiography of Arabic and Latin philosophy and science. As each new monograph in those fields appeared, Steinschneider would check to

[15] Steinschneider 1869a, vii.

[16] *HUe*, x.

[17] See Baron 1950.

see whether the author had taken into account his work on the Hebrew translation tradition. In the early years of *Hebraeische Bibliographie*, the journal had a section devoted to "General Literature" that listed scholarly books which Steinschneider thought had some Jewish connection. This gave the editor the opportunity to comment upon works like Adolf Helfferich's *Raymund Lull und die Anfänge der catalonischen Literatur* (1858), Richard Gosche's *Ghazzali's Leben und Werke* (1859), and Daniel Bonifacius v. Haneberg's essay on the *Theology of Aristotle* (1862). Steinschneider informs us with pleasure that *Raymund Lull* is the first general work to benefit from progress made in Jewish academic scholarship (he notes each reference to his *Jüdische Literatur*), but that its author exaggerates when he claims that hundreds of Latin Scholastic works were translated into Hebrew: "May the history of Jewish translations remain free of such casual hypotheses and exaggerations!"[18] His notice of Gosche's *Ghazzali* is less complimentary because the author only occasionally refers to the scholarship on Hebrew tradition, with which he is familiar primarily through Munk; he is ignorant of the entry on Ghazzali in Steinschneider's *Bodleian Catalogue* (p. 1000), not to mention the enormous amount of material in manuscript.[19] And in his review of Haneberg he bemoans the fact that even when authors wish to avail themselves of scholarship pertaining to the Hebrew tradition, they have difficulty finding the journals, "since Jewish Science is still not organically connected with universities and academies, and virtually nothing of it is represented in the libraries."[20]

Steinschneider could have the satisfaction that some of his research into the Hebrew translators was being utilized by orientalists and historians of scholastic philosophy. In the second edition of *Averroès et l'Averroïsme* (1866), Ernest Renan made use of his Leiden Catalogue, as well as the yet unpublished entry on Averroes from the Bodleian Catalogue, provided to him by the Oxford orientalist Max Müller.[21] On the whole, however, the Jewish translation movement was still widely unknown, and the larger phenomenon of translation and cultural transmission was little studied. Steinschneider's duties as the editor of *Hebraeische Bibliographie* during the first years of that journal left him little time to publish much else, certainly not a monograph on Jewish translators. At the end of 1865 he announced that the bimonthly bibliographical journal would cease publication, hoping that others would continue, perhaps on an annual basis. That hope proved fruitless, and three years later, *Hebraeische Bibliographie* resumed publication, with Steinschneider as editor, and with a slightly different format. Yet the

[18] Steinschneider 1859c, 18: "Möchte doch die Geschichte, namentlich die jüdische, von solchen hingeworfenen Hypothesen und Übertreibungen frei bleiben!"

[19] Steinschneider 1859b, 87: "In unsrer, seit 15 Jahren gesammelten jüdisch–arabischen Bibliothek ist Gazzali ein grösseres Capitel gewidmet."

[20] Steinschneider 1863, 107: "weil die jüdische Wissenschaft noch in keinem organischen Zusammenhang mit Universitäten und Akademien steht, und in den Bibliotheken fast nirgends vertreten ist."

[21] Renan 1866, i; cf. ibid., 67, where Steinschneider's Latin style is pronounced "si obscur" that Renan is not sure whether he understands him.

three-year hiatus had been beneficial for the author, and for his work on the translation project. Between 1866 and 1869, his ongoing inspection of Hebrew manuscript collections provided him with the materials for articles on Jewish and Arab physicians, scientists, and philosophers,[22] culminating in his monograph, *Al-Farabi* (*Alpharabius*), *des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Geschichte der griechischen Wissenschaft unter den Arabern*; *nebst Anhängen*: *Joh. Philoponus bei den Arabern*, *Darstellung der Philosophie Plato's*, *Leben und Testament des Aristoteles von Ptolemaeus*; *grösstenteils nach handschriftlichen Quellen* (Alfarabi, the Life and Works of the Arab Philosopher, With Special Consideration of the History of Greek Science Among the Arabs, and with the Following Appendices: John Philoponus Among the Arabs, A Depiction of Plato's Philosophy, and the Life and Testament of Aristotle by Ptolemy, Mostly Based on Manuscript Sources). Steinschneider's discovery of a Hebrew translation of a work whose author he determined to be Alfarabi led him to attempt to reconstruct the life and works of Alfarabi on the basis of a mosaic of Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin sources. In these publications Steinschneider established the importance of the translation literature not only for orientalists, but for classicists as well; Ptolemy's list of the works of Aristotle, reconstructed from the writings of Arab historiographers on the basis of manuscripts, and translated into Latin by Steinschneider, appeared in volume five of the Prussian Academy's edition of the Works of Aristotle in 1870.[23]

In 1870, Steinschneider published in the library science journal *Serapeum* an article on translators from Arabic sources in the Christian West, the first of a promised series of articles. The article was said to be a by-product of his twenty-five years of research into the medieval Jewish translators, their sources, and their subsequent influence. As part of that research the scholar would frequently be led to investigate whether individual writings of the Arabs reached the Christian West through Jewish intermediaries or not. Though not pertaining to his main theme of the Jewish translations, these ancillary investigations raised questions whose resolution was desirable, and he had already demonstrated the fruits of his labor in articles on the earliest adapter of Arabic works, Constantine the African, and on the Jewish physician, Shabbetai Donnolo. As for the main project, he writes, "and if I am now considering the publication of a monograph on the Jewish translators only with great trepidation, then my discouragement is due to the mass of unquestionably important material, and the hardly favorable time for publishing a voluminous bibliographical work." In the meantime Steinschneider would offer the *Serapeum* readers a series of articles that would serve as "stimulations for an investigation into manuscripts and printed works inaccessible to me."[24] Unfortunately for Steinschneider's project,

[22] See, e.g., Steinschneider 1867a and Steinschneider 1867b.

[23] In Aristotle 1870, 1469–73.

[24] Steinschneider 1870. 291: "und wenn ich jetzt nur sehr zaghaft an die Herausgabe einer Monographie über die jüdischen Übersetzer denke; so liegt die Entmuthigung in der Masse des allerdings wichtigen Stoffes, und in der für ein umfangreiches bibliographisches Werk minder günstigen Zeit"; ibid., 292: "Anregungen zur Untersuchung von mir unzugänglichen Handschriften und Drucken."

Serapeum ceased publication at the end of the year, and so the projected series did not materialize.

Despite his efforts to demonstrate the significance of the translation movements for the literary and cultural history of the medievals, Steinschneider's specialized articles failed to win for them widespread recognition. Particularly galling to him was a short note published in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* by the Austrian orientalist Aloys Sprenger entitled, "Lateinische Uebersetzungen aus dem Arabischen in der Berner Stadtbibliothek."[25] Sprenger recommended as one of the tasks for Oriental Studies the investigation of the influence of Muslim Science on the West, by which he meant the Christian West. Several months later Steinschneider replied to Sprenger's article with his own, entitled, pointedly, "Occidentalische Uebersetzungen aus dem Arabischen im Mittelalter." After somewhat petulantly noting that "Herr Prof. Sprenger has recommended in this volume of the *Zeitschrift*, p. 154, a task for Oriental Studies for which I have been collecting materials for 30 years, and which I have announced in many journals, including the present one,"[26] Steinschneider emphasized yet again the importance of the Latin translation literature for orientalists, supporting his point with many examples from his own investigations. But then he argued for the necessity of broadening the research on the European translation movements beyond the sphere of Latin to include Spanish, Greek and Hebrew texts. The latter would be especially desirable for him, since he had collected biographical and bibliographical material concerning approximately 120 named translators and commentators of Arabic works, in addition to anonymous writers, for a monograph about Jewish translators (and interpreters),[27] especially from the Arabic. The projected monograph was based on hundreds of manuscripts personally inspected and, in part, on his Bodleian Catalogue. Yet because of the sheer mass of material, and because few of the manuscripts had been described accurately, Steinschneider could not expect that the *ZDMG* would publish more than an occasional article based on his work. And so he was left with a real problem: "The material has grown so large for me that at present I do not see how to publish my comprehensive work; nevertheless, I continue to work for a rather dubious future."[28]

[25] Sprenger 1874, 154–5.

[26] Steinschneider 1874, 453: "Hr. Prof. Sprenger hat in diesem Bande d. Zeitschrift S. 154 eine Aufgabe der Orientalistik empfohlen, für welche ich seit 30 Jahren Materialien sammle und in verschiedenen Schriften, u.A. auch in dieser Zeitschrift (1) bekannt gemacht habe." In the note (1) Steinschneider provides references to five volumes of the *ZDMG* and to the *Serapeum* article cited above.

[27] Steinschneider distinguishes between translators (*Übersetzer*) and interpreters (or transmitters) (*Dolmetscher*); the former translate in writing from one language to another; the latter translate orally, often via the vernacular and in collaboration with non-Jews.

[28] Ibid., 456: "Der Stoff ist mir selbst so angewachsen, dass ich für die materiellen Mittel zu einer Veröffentlichung meiner weitausgreifenden Arbeit vorläufig keinen Rath weiss, dennoch für eine sehr zweifelhafte Zukunft fortarbeite."

By 1874 the raw material for Steinschneider's work on the Jewish translators had grown so vast that he was beginning to question whether it could ever be published. How could funding be obtained for such an enormous book on a recondite topic of interest to only a few? His previous books had consisted mainly of catalogues of books and manuscripts, funded by the collection owners. His *Alfarabi* was published in a series under the auspices of the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences, and his *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century* had long been out of print. Under these circumstances, and because of the many professional and familial demands pressing upon him, he decided to turn to another part of his 1845 program for the study of the literary and cultural relations between Jews and others: the theological polemical literature. The resulting work, *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache zwischen Muslimen*, *Christen*, *und Juden* (1877) was close to 500 pages, by far the largest work he had published since the Bodleian Catalogue nearly 20 years before. But, as Steinschneider explains in the book's Preface, much of the work had been composed years earlier. The first draft of Part One (Arabic Works) and Part Two (Authors) had been completed in 1845 and delivered for comments in 1863 to Prof. Hermann Brockhaus, the editor of the *ZDMG*, and to Steinschneider's teacher in Leipzig, Prof. Heinrich Fleischer, at which time the author finished the first five appendices. As the publication was delayed, Steinschneider published in the *ZDMG* the second appendix in 1865 and the fourth appendix in 1874. It is probable that the work was accepted for publication by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft already in the early 1860s. For all its breadth, the work is essentially an extremely learned catalogue of works and authors, more a prolegomenon to a work on Jewish-Muslim polemic than a mature study. This appears to have been Steinschneider's own judgment, for three years later, upon publishing a text and translation of Simeon Duran's anti-Muslim polemic *Qeshet u-magen*, he noted that the earlier monograph had grown out of the notes on sources that he had collected for an introduction to Duran's work.[29] The orientalist Ignaz Goldziher, in a long essay in the *ZDMG* occasioned by the appearance of Steinschneider's monograph, supplied what was missing in that work—an analysis of the main topics of the Muslim polemic against Christians and Jews with illustrative examples.[30] Still, Steinschneider did include substantive scholarly analyses in the appendices, especially in the last and longest concerning Jewish polemics against Islam.

In any event, completion of the "polemical" part of the 1845 prospectus in 1877 enabled Steinschneider to direct some of his energies to writing the work on Jewish translators. So daunting was that task that when he refers to his book on Jewish translators in 1880—by now the work had grown to include around 200 Jewish translators, adapters, and commentators of non-Jewish writings—he remarks ironically, "Maybe I will decide to make multiple copies using a duplicating machine."[31]

[29] Steinschneider 1880a.

[30] Goldziher 1878.

[31] "Islam und Judenthum," 2.

Attempts to Secure Funding, the Schleiden Pamphlet, and the French Mémoire *(1877–84)*

According to Steinschneider's own "official" account of the genesis of *HUe* cited above, the material for the publication lay undigested as late as 1880 because "no prospect of publication was acting as an incentive." He continues:

> Then came the incentive from Paris. The Académie française presented, in 1880, the subject for a prize competition to compile a complete bibliography of the medieval Hebrew translations. This I undertook, in 1884, in a French *Mémoire*, treating sections I–III, with a brief survey on section IV; similarly, in 1886, I undertook another bibliography, on the Arabic translations from Greek, on the basis of the *Fihrist*. However, one writes exactly the way one thinks only in one's mother tongue, and therefore I decided to produce a German version of sections I–III, albeit on the basis of a literal translation that may excuse a number of awkward passages, perhaps also some small errors. Studies of the sources for section IV I made only immediately before the printing.[32]

Steinschneider implies that he made no efforts to secure funding for the book, or write up the material, before the unexpected announcement from Paris: it was in response to that announcement that he wrote a *Mémoire* of the book in French, presented it to the Académie, and then, having won the prize in 1884, set out to publish it in German and complete it, since "one writes exactly the way one thinks only in one's mother tongue."

Yet a somewhat different account can be reconstructed from private letters to Steinschneider during these years. This reconstruction should be considered preliminary because his correspondence has not been completely examined, and tentative because very few of his own letters from this period are available. Whatever conclusions we wish to draw from the correspondence concerning Steinschneider's thoughts and actions during this period must be done mainly through the prism of his interlocutors.[33]

Thus, a letter to Steinschneider in late 1878 from his former student, the historian and folklorist, Joseph Jacobs, shows that Steinschneider had asked Jacobs to explore the possibility of helping him procure financial support for the publication of the work on translations. Jacob's response was that he could personally guarantee the purchase of fifty copies of the "Übersetzunges Literature" (sic) at not more than £1 per copy, but that he could not do more than this.[34] Around the same time Steinschneider floated the idea to Jacobs of publishing a new edition of his *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century*. At first, Jacobs reacted enthusiastically, but his enthusiasm waned after he made inquiries with the publisher Trübner & Co., which published, among other things, orientalist literature (and was

[32] *HUe*, x.

[33] Much of the correspondence to Steinschneider is found at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in the Steinschneider Archives, Arc. 108. Most of it has been microfilmed. We would like to thank Ms. Ellen Kastel, the JTSA Archivist, for her guidance through the collection.

[34] Jacobs to Steinschneider, received Oct. 10, 1878. Jacobs writes to Steinschneider in English.

about to publish Michael Friedländer's translation of Maimonides's *Guide of the Perplexed*):

> With regard to a possible second edition of your *Jewish Literature* I fear that it is impossible in the present depressed state of commerce to get the guarantee (£150 = Reichsmark 3000) which Trübner requires before he would bring it out. Besides, if Cassel's *Lehrbuch* is to be translated into English, the need of the more scholarly work is not so great, as [the] English requires elementary manuals rather than great works of scholarship which could only be appreciated in Germany. Besides, the tone in which you spoke of a second edition led me to think that you prefer bringing out your *Übersetzungsliteratur*. I can still hold to my promise to procure you 50 subscribers in England for it.[35]

As we shall see below, Steinschneider also tried to have a French version of *Jewish Literature* published at this time by the Alliance Israélite. Perhaps he thought that a new edition of his famous book, long out of print, would help raise money for the translation book. During the years 1878 and 1879 he was active in "marketing" his own books, pamphlets, and even offprints by advertising them in his *Hebraeische Bibliographie*; these advertisements ceased in 1880, after the French prize had been announced.

But there may have been another, less pecuniary, reason for Steinschneider to wish to publish a new edition of *Jewish Literature*, one that also bears on the themes stressed in *HUe*, and especially on the oft-cited passage of Steinschneider's introduction, in which he emphatically disavowed any apologetic motives for writing the book.[36]

It will be recalled that *Jewish Literature* included a brief treatment of the scientific-scholarly literature of the Jews during the Middle Ages. In fact, it was the only reliable treatment on that topic, and by 1877 the book was no longer available. But in 1876 an article appeared in Westermann's *Jahrbuch der Illustrirten Deutschen Monatshefte* on "The Significance of the Jews for the Preservation and Revival of the Sciences in the Middle Ages."[37] Its author, the distinguished botanist Matthias Schleiden relates that he had been led by his study of the history of his field to discover, much to his surprise, that the Jews, throughout their history, had been active in various areas of intellectual pursuit. Schleiden was motivated to write his short survey of the Jewish contribution to human knowledge "to make some atonement for a part of the unspeakable wrongs perpetrated by Christians upon the Jews." He declares his intention of following his essay with a historical survey of the "Romance of Martyrdom among the Jews." For some of his information concerning the Jewish contribution to "Wissenschaften" Schleiden relied on communications from Heinrich Graetz and David Rosin of the Breslau rabbinical seminary, whom he thanks in the introduction.[38]

---

[35] Jacobs to Steinschneider, Sept. 12, 1879.

[36] See *HUe*, xxiv. See below, 38.

[37] Schleiden 1876.

[38] See Schleiden 1877, 4–5, the third unaltered edition. See also Charpa 2003, 231.

The timing of the publication of Schleiden's article could hardly have been coincidental. In the late 1870s Germany had witnessed the rise of anti-Semitism, the growth of anti-Semitic political parties, and, from 1877 on, the Berlin *Antisemitismusstreit*. Schleiden's philo-Semitic case for the Jewish contribution to civilization was immediately reprinted by the Deutsch-Israelitischer Gemeindebund in 1877 and went through four separate editions in the space of three years.[39] In 1877, an authorized French translation was published by the Alliance Israélite Universelle, whose secretary, Isidore Loeb (1839–1892), was to play a major role in bringing into existence the French *Mémoire*, the predecessor of *HUe*, as we shall see below. In 1883, an unauthorized English translation of the fourth German edition appeared in Baltimore, which elicited notices and reviews in the general, Jewish, and Christian press, from the New York *Herald Tribune* to the Arkansas *Democrat* in Little Rock.[40] And Schleiden's work did not go unnoticed among the actual practitioners of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*: David Kaufmann (1852–1899), while acknowledging the pamphlet's weaknesses and errors, still argued that its publication was important for furthering the cause of Jewish scholarship, because it brought some of its results to a larger audience.[41]

Steinschneider disagreed with Kaufmann. In a blistering notice in his *Hebraeische Bibliographie* he lists some of Schleiden's more bizarre claims on behalf of Jewish scientific achievements (e.g., Rabbi Gamaliel's use of a telescope, Abu Sahl's discovery of refraction, Johannes Hispalensis's decimal computations, etc.), as well as some of his equally absurd characterizations of medieval Jewish thought (Ḥiwi al-Balkhi was an atheistic-rationalist critic of Scripture; the Zohar ranked freedom of thought higher than dogma and scripture, etc.). Steinschneider lambasts Schleiden's Jewish consultants, Rosin and Graetz, for not directing the well-meaning author to studies where he could have found information about the *true* significance of Jews in the profane sciences (i.e., studies by Steinschneider). What seems to have galled Steinschneider most was Schleiden's self-professed motive for undertaking the research: his desire to make atonement for Christian wrongs perpetrated against the Jews. On this Steinschneider writes:

> The greatest injustice of the Christians consisted and consists in that they have studied and study Judaism not for its own sake, but rather only on account of its relations to Christianity. Herr Schleiden defends Judaism, without having studied it at all. Jews do not need apologetic writings. […] They suffered deeply for centuries on account of their convictions, until religious bickering was pushed into the background by the general progress of humanity. Now prejudice is garbed in racial schematism, whose vapidity will soon have been uncovered by serious science. The martyrdom of the science and the history of Judaism will last a long time because it counts both Jews and their ill-advised friends among its tormentors.[42]

[39] See Schorsch 1972, 43–4.

[40] Schleiden 1883. The "Opinions of the Press" were contained in the copy belonging to Harry Friedenwald of Baltimore, now in the Edelstein History of Science Collection at the National Library of Israel, Jerusalem.

[41] Kaufmann 1890, repr. in Kaufmann 1908–15. Cf. Schorsch 1972.

[42] Steinschneider 1877, 35.

Fifteen years later Steinschneider continued his criticism when a similar pamphlet on Jews and science, based partly on Schleiden's essay, was printed in New York. Schleiden, writes Steinschneider, had composed a panegyric that was worthless for the knowledgeable and dangerous for the undiscriminating public, which feels satisfied by the pamphlet's positive view, and leaves the unimportant "details" to the "pedants." What Schleiden did not realize was that unless general claims flow from a more accurate awareness of the details, they become falsifications of history that are better condemned than praised.[43]

How the dizzying public success of Schleiden's pamphlet affected Steinschneider's own publication plans, if at all, is difficult to say. At the beginning of 1880, Steinschneider wrote to Isidore Loeb about the possibility of issuing a French translation of *Jewish Literature*. Did he write to Loeb because the Alliance had earlier sponsored Schleiden's work? Loeb had sent Steinschneider a copy of the French version of Schleiden three years earlier, with an apology for the author's mistakes, yet with the hope that it would do some good.[44] In any event, Loeb's verdict on a French version of *Jewish Literature* was not encouraging. The book seemed to him too dry and "*algebraisch*" for the French reader, who was not well-informed on the subject. The soon-to-be established *Société des Études Juives* would not publish a French version of *Jewish Literature* since, according to Loeb, it would not be willing to sponsor translations.[45] Steinschneider apparently dropped the plan, although he had not given up the idea of a second, enlarged edition.[46]

Three weeks later Steinschneider received a letter from David Kaufmann that included the following somewhat cryptic lines:

> Concerning the "Translators"—I have written immediately to Löb in *my* own name. We need bones; let others take care of the soup. A Schleiden may, and can, come only after you.[47]

Unfortunately, the correspondence immediately preceding this letter is apparently not extant. Perhaps Steinschneider had confided in Kaufmann his difficulties in raising the funds for the work, and his unsuccessful attempts in having *Jewish Literature* republished or translated into French. Or perhaps he had simply had told Kaufmann of the new French society that would sponsor original and not translated works. In any event, both Schleiden and Loeb had been a topic of their correspondence, with Kaufmann encouraging Steinschneider to focus his energies on the

[43] Steinschneider 1893.

[44] Loeb to Steinschneider, received August 17, 1877. The Loeb file contains typewritten transcriptions of letters, probably prepared for publication by Alexander Marx. Unfortunately, some of the originals are missing, as in this case.

[45] Loeb to Steinschneider, February 22, 1880.

[46] According to Kohut 1896, a second revised and enlarged edition was in preparation (in 1893). Malter's Hebrew translation of *Jewish Literature* follows the earlier versions.

[47] Kaufmann to Steinschneider, March 12, 1880 (rec. March 14).

translations project and not concern himself with popularizations, a task better left for others like Schleiden.

Three days later Steinschneider heard from Loeb:

> Herr Kaufmann of Pest wrote me today about your work: the Jewish translators. Would you most kindly say what sort of work it is, i.e., how you will discuss this subject, how extensive the work is, or would be, when printed, how high would the printing expenses be? Perhaps we may be of some assistance.[48]

The "we" refers to the Comité of the Alliance Israélite, which had previously sponsored the translation of Schleiden's pamphlet. A month later, on April 17, 1880, the Comité voted to allot 500 francs immediately toward Steinschneider's translation book. Loeb, realizing that this was insufficient, told Steinschneider that it was a "beginning" and that he would write to Kaufmann to see if the latter could find additional funding in Pest. Steinschneider then wrote Loeb to determine whether the "beginning" referred to the beginning of assistance from the Alliance. To this Loeb replied that the 500 francs were intended as "une marque de sympathie et déférence," but that would be all.[49] Since Steinschneider does not acknowledge the Alliance's support anywhere in the *HUe*, it is unlikely that he received the subvention because of subsequent events.

But Loeb's assistance did not end there. A week after writing Steinschneider, he informed Adolf Neubauer (1831/2–1907) of Steinschneider's intentions to write a work on Jewish translations. A bibliographer and orientalist, Neubauer was on good terms with Steinschneider, at least since 1877, when the two had become reconciled after a long literary feud. He was also a close friend of and collaborator with the orientalist Ernest Renan (1823–1892), a prominent member of the French Academy. Neubauer immediately took up Steinschneider's cause, writing him a postscript under the heading "très confidentiel":

> P. S. Yesterday I received a letter from M. Loeb in which he writes me that you will publish a book about translators; this work is highly important, and I place at your disposal all my documents concerning Arabic texts as well as translations that are available only in manuscript. Will you permit me to request a subvention from Günzburg and Rothschild in Paris when I am there in September? If you could decide to compose the work in French or Latin, the former being more practical for sales, I could perhaps arrange, through Renan and others, that the Ac[adémie] des Inscriptions designate this work as the Prize Question of this summer, to be delivered at the end of 1881. […] I am certain that you would receive the prize. Let me know the plan of your work so that I can clearly write to Renan how the prize [question] should be formulated. This is urgent, for the Commission on the prize meets already on May 15, and he needs time to discuss the matter with the colleagues.[50]

Neubauer was quite familiar with the Académie's procedure, having himself won in 1867 the Prix Bordin, which had initially been proposed in 1863 by

[48] Loeb to Steinschneider, March 15, 1880 (rec. March 17).

[49] Loeb to Steinschneider, April 18, 1880 and July 4, 1880.

[50] Neubauer to Steinschneider, 24 April 1880 (rec. April 27; mislabeled 1878).

Salomon Munk, Neubauer's scholarly patron from his time of residence in Paris after 1856, and by Renan, whom Neubauer probably met through Munk.[51] Currently, Neubauer was laboring to submit his own essay for another prize: on October 19, 1877, a committee made up of Regnier, Renan, Defrémy, and Bréal had proposed the following topic for the Prix Ordinaire in Oriental Studies for 1880: "Classer et identifier, autant qu'il est possible, les noms géographiques de l'occident de l'Europe qu'on trouve dans les ouvrages rabbiniques depuis le X^{e} siècle jusqu'à la fin du XV^{e}. Dresser une carte de l'Europe occidentale où tous ces noms soient placés, avec des signes de doute s'il y a lieu."[52] The competition was prolonged twice until Neubauer won it in April 1884.[53] So it was natural that Neubauer would think of an academy prize as a way of obtaining money to subsidize the cost of publication of Steinschneider's work, as well as to promote sales. Neubauer contacted Renan straightaway and forwarded Renan's favorable response a month later to Steinschneider: "The Prize Question is underway as you can see from R. [Renan]'s letter [to me]. Please return it to me at your opportunity. I will write as soon as I hear anything."[54] From this point on Neubauer became Steinschneider's "eyes and ears" in Paris, relaying him information that he gleaned from Renan and from the orientalist Joseph Derenbourg, who, like Renan, was a member of the Académie, and who was in scholarly correspondence with Steinschneider.

In the summer months of 1880 it was not a foregone conclusion that the year's Prix Ordinaire would be designated for an essay on Hebrew translations. Derenbourg and Renan, as influential as they may have been, were only two votes; in theory, there could have been an extension of the previous question for another term. On October 10, Neubauer recommended that Steinschneider continue work on the project, for if this year's prize essay were not on the Hebrew translations, he [Neubauer] had been assured that that topic would be proposed after the following summer.[55] In fact, five days later, at the meeting of the Académie, a committee composed of Adolph Regnier, Ernest Renan, Charles Defrémery and Joseph Derenbourg was formed to determine the Prix du Budget for the 1883 award; on October 29, the President of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Edmond Le Blant, announced at a closed meeting of Académie members that the assignment for the annual Prix du Budget was to write a preliminary *Mémoire* enumerating completely and systematically the

[51] The work was published in 1868 as *La Géographie du Talmud*, and subjected to a devastating critique in Morgenstern 1870. The speculation that Neubauer met Renan through Munk is offered by Neubauer's nephew, Adolf Büchler, whose unpublished biographical sketch is found in the Neubauer Archives at the National Library of Israel, JNUL Arc. 4^{0} 1595. The committee that decided the prize in favor of Neubauer (there was one other submission) was composed of Renaud, de Saulcy, Renan and Munk (See *Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1867* 3 (1868): 6.

[52] *Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1877* 5 (1878): 312.

[53] *Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1884* 12 (1884): 186. The committee was composed of Derenbourg, Renan, Barbier de Meynard, and Oppert (p. 6); his was the only submission (p. 4).

[54] Neubauer to Steinschneider, May 22, 1880 (rec. May 26).

[55] Neubauer to Steinschneider, Oct. 10, 1880 (rec. Oct. 12).

medieval Hebrew translations of works of philosophy and science in Greek, Arabic, and even Latin.[56] Two days later, Loeb wrote Steinschneider in a postscript: "You probably know of Derenbourg's intentions for your translators?"[57] The official announcement of the prize came at the Académie's public meeting on November 12, 1880.

Unfortunately, there is no record of the correspondence between Steinschneider and Derenbourg for the years 1877–1881; it may be that Steinschneider either destroyed or returned to their author sensitive communications that might have constituted for Derenbourg a proof of a breach of confidentiality. From Loeb's comment, and from his occasional service as an intermediary between Steinschneider and Derenbourg, it seems that Loeb had discussed the matter of the *Uebersetzer* with Derenbourg, around the same time that Neubauer had discussed it with Renan. However one divides the credit, Loeb, Neubauer, Renan and Derenbourg were all instrumental in getting the French Académie to choose a topic that was tailor-made for Steinschneider's project; even the words "[ouvrages] même latins" in the Prize Question reflects Steinschneider's oft-repeated point about the number of Hebrew translations of Christian authors. The announcement of the competition appeared in the *Revue Critique d'histoire et de littérature* of that year[58] and the *Journal des savants*.[59] Several months later Steinschneider himself drew attention to the competition in *Hebraeische Bibliographie*.[60]

The deadline for submitting the Hebrew translations essay was December 31, 1882. Steinschneider's scholarly output for the years 1881 and 1882 shows a slight tapering off as he began to prepare the *Mémoire*. The most significant casualty of his old-new project was the abrupt cessation, without explanation, of *Hebraeische Bibliographie*. Toward the end of its run, the interval between the date on the journal and its actual publication date had progressively increased; Steinschneider, who blamed the delays on the publisher Julius Benzian, had once before closed down the journal, but this time the closure was permanent. Steinschneider would continue to write notices and book reviews, but henceforth for the journals of others, including *Das Archiv* of his son, Julius.

The *Mémoire* was, of course, to be composed in French, a language that Steinschneider certainly knew—as a young man working on the Bodleian catalogue, he initially preferred to correspond with the head librarian Bulkeley Bandinel in French rather than in English[61]—but in which he had rarely published. Apparently as a "trial run" he began to publish in late 1880 a series of French articles on medieval astronomy in Prince Baldassare Boncompagni's Italian journal devoted to the history of science, the *Bulettino di Bibliografia e di Storia delle scienze matematiche e fisiche*, although he had published several Italian articles previously in the same

[56] *Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1880* 8 (1881): 305, 308–9.

[57] Loeb to Steinschneider, October 31, 1880 (rec. Nov. 2).

[58] *Revue Critique* 10 (1880): 410.

[59] *Journal des Savants* (1880): 716.

[60] Steinschneider 1880b, 137. (This appeared in early 1881.)

[61] See Paucker 1966, 244.

journal.[62] When Steinschneider sent Loeb an offprint of one of these articles, the latter pronounced the French "très clair."[63] Reassured, Steinschneider submitted several months later an article in French on Paul de Bonnefoy to Loeb's newly-founded journal, the *Revue des études juives*. Once again, Loeb's initial reaction was encouraging: "Votre article est une très jolie chose que je suis très heureux d'avoir pour la *Revue*. Le français est bon. Je le repasserai avant de le donner à l'impression. Je vous enverrai l'épreuve."[64] But before the article could be published, Loeb had to send an additional set of proofs to Steinschneider for further revision: he now considered Steinschneider's French to be too Germanic, cautioning that it had to be adapted for the French reader.[65]

One of the sections included by Steinschneider in the *Mémoire* was also intended, initially, to appear as an article in the *Revue*. Shortly before the prize question was publicly announced, Loeb suggested that he prepare a bio-bibliographical investigation of Levi b. Gershom, namely, a chronological arrangement of his work, a chronological table of his astronomical observations and something about his instrument, the Jacob Staff. Steinschneider submitted the article in German, and Loeb himself took responsibility for the translation, sending the author the beginning of the French article during the summer of 1882. The article was supposed to appear in the *Revue des études juives* in 1883. Loeb took the liberty of expanding Steinschneider's terse German, explaining to him that French required more words than German to be comprehensible; pronouns needed to be expanded into nouns; where an article would be sufficient in German, an adjective or complement was required in French. If one removed the addition that he (Loeb) had been compelled to make, the result would not be French.[66] Work on the translation of the article ceased abruptly when Loeb learned from Derenbourg and Neubauer that the premature publication of a part of the *Mémoire* would jeopardize Steinschneider's chances of winning the prize[67]; if the translation was not to appear in the *Revue*, then provisionally it could not be continued, since there was no money to pay the translator.[68] Steinschneider, disappointed, inquired whether Derenbourg thought that it could appear anonymously. Loeb's response was that in any event the journal had decided to accept fewer foreign articles; the mode of expression was so different that the journal's readers

[62] For bibliographical details see Kohut 1896. Italian was one of the first languages that Steinschneider learned, and as a young man he tutored students in Italian. See Marx 1947, 114.

[63] Loeb to Steinschneider, September 30, 1881 (received Oct. 2).

[64] Loeb to Steinschneider, January 31, 1882 (rec. Feb. 2). Cf. Loeb's editorial comments accompanying the revisions on Steinschneider's next French article for the *Révue* (Steinschneider 1882): "Les questions des nos 3, 4, 5, ont principalement pour objet d'obtenir une rédaction qu'on puisse comprendre sans être obligé de recourir aux livres cités, chose très désagréable au lecteur français." Loeb to Steinschneider, August 10, 1882 (rec. Aug. 12).

[65] Loeb to Steinschneider, August 14, 1882 (rec. Aug. 16).

[66] Loeb to Steinschneider, June 26, 1882 (rec. June 28).

[67] Loeb to Steinschneider, October 23, 1882; based on Marx's typescript of the correspondence, rather than the actual letter, which does not appear in the microfilm (see above, n. 51).

[68] Loeb to Steinschneider, October 30, 1882 (rec. June 28).

found such articles incomprehensible; even the translators could not understand them.[69] All was not lost, since Steinschneider incorporated Loeb's translation almost verbatim in the French *Mémoire*, and a German translation (perhaps, the German original) appeared on pages 65–73 of *HUe*.[70]

Neubauer was happy to provide Steinschneider with the more practical information and advice on the Prize Essay. When the December 1882 deadline loomed for its submission, Neubauer assured him that the deadline was customarily extended for *Mémoire*s undertaken by specialists. Neubauer would submit his own *Mémoire* in 1884 after two extensions, alongside of his friend, Steinschneider. After the 1882 deadline passed, Neubauer informed Steinschneider that he would have to wait until the end of 1884 to submit the *Mémoire*. But this created an unexpected problem—and opportunity—for Steinschneider. In October 1882, the Académie proposed another prize, the Prix Brunet, for a work on the Arabic translations from the Greek based on Ibn al-Nadim's *Fihrist*, which had recently been edited.[71] It was Neubauer, then at Oxford, working on the Index to his Bodleian Catalogue, and checking manuscripts for Steinschneider, who informed Steinschneider not only of the Prix Brunet, but also that the question had been designed with Steinschneider in mind:

> You would do best to correspond with me, if you want to know anything about Paris. I draw your attention to the Prix Brunet (3000 Fr.) for 1884, which you could easily handle with your *Mémoire*. It has been deliberately designed for you (in confidence). You only cannot refer from one *Mémoire* to the other, for both will have to be submitted at the same time. You will find the Program in the *Journal des Savants* and later in the *Comptes Rendus* of the Académie des Inscriptions.[72]

One month later, Neubauer wrote Steinschneider that the Prix Brunet would be about "the Arabic translations from the Greek according to the *Fihrist*; that cannot give you much labor with the work you have in hand."[73]

---

[69] Loeb to Steinschneider, March 13, 1883 (rec. March 15).

[70] Loeb's translation, set in type for the *REJ*, appears in the Loeb correspondence in the Steinschneider Archives with the following title: "Les Commentaires de Lévi b. Gerson sur Averroës traduit de l'Allemand." On the title page is written, "Erste Revision eines nicht erschienenen Artikels für die R.É.J. aus dem Jahre 1883 I–III = H. Ueb. 65–73." The first three parts deal with Levi's commentaries on Averroes's commentaries on logic; the fourth part, on Levi's commentaries on two of Averroes's logical questions. This probably was meant to be the first installment of a series of articles on Gersonides' philosophical supercommentaries before Loeb abandoned it. The material was ultimately incorporated in *HUe*. An appendix, from the Latin translation of the *Book of the Correct Syllogism*, appeared in Steinschneider 1892, among the *Endnoten* to *HUe* that were not incorporated within the book.

[71] The edition by Flügel was published posthumously in 1877, with the assistance of Rödiger and Müller.

[72] Neubauer to Steinschneider, January 13, 1883 (rec. Feb. 13), JTSA Arc. 108–8. See *Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1885* 13 (1868): 9: "L'Académie adopte en outre, comme sujet du prix Brunet à décerner en 1885 la question suivante: 'Relever sur le grand catalogue de bibliographie arabe intitulé *Fihrist* toutes les traductions d'ouvrages grecs en arabe. Critiquer ces données bibliographiques d'après les documents imprimés et manuscrits.' Les mémoires devront être déposés au secrétariat de l'Institut le 31 décembre 1884."

[73] Neubauer to Steinschneider, February 9, 1883 (rec. Feb. 12), JTSA Arc. 108–8.

In fact, Steinschneider was nervous about the first competition, since no announcement of the extension had appeared in the *Comptes Rendus* by March 1883. (Neubauer assured him that the decision would indeed be postponed.) And as the December 1884 deadline loomed for both *Mémoires*, Steinschneider was faced with a dilemma: to submit the first *Mémoire* and hope for an extension on the second, or to submit them both together, and hope that the Académie would not take that amiss. After seeking advice from Derenbourg, and hearing nothing in return, he wrote to Neubauer, who responded on 27 November as follows:

> Dear Friend, It is fatal to correspond with Dernb; he places postcards and letters in his nightgown, or in a book, and forgets about them. I now wish to write only concerning business matters, since it seems that D. didn't write you about it, as we had agreed.…
>
> 1. After making an inquiry in the *Institut* I can tell you that the prix Brunet (*Fihrist*) can be postponed; indeed, my and your friends told me that it would in fact be better if both *Mémoires* are not submitted at the same time. The atmosphere against Germans is still not the best, and it is feared that chauvinism will win out and [its proponents] will rely exclusively on matter of form. The *Übersetzer* for this year, then, and the *Fihrist* for the next. What do you think about this? In any event, it would be good if you were to write to D. about it; please don't fail to do this. You can dictate this to your son, if writing is difficult for you; it is absolutely necessary.
>
> 2. It would be better if you send the thing [i.e. the *Mémoire*] to Löb, and that he deliver the *Mémoire* to the Sécretariat; add an accompanying letter with [your] name and a motto inside, and on the outside the motto only [illegible] *Mémoire*. Follow my advice [illegible] so that this or the *Mémoire* is in Löb's hands by the 28th [December].[74]

Derenbourg finally responded to Steinschneider on December 13, but he could not answer Steinschneider's questions whether another essay had been submitted for the prix Brunet (he did not know), or whether it would be problematic to submit two *Mémoires* at once (in principle, he said, it was allowed). He counseled him to send both his works (*Arbeiten*) to Loeb, who would submit them at the proper time. No doubt by this late date Steinschneider had already determined to submit only the first *Mémoire* by the end of 1883 and to wait to take his chances with the second.

In the early months of 1885, Neubauer continued to leak confidential news to Steinschneider on the fate of both prizes. Thus, on March 23, six months before the decision concerning the first *Mémoire* was scheduled to be announced, Neubauer wrote Steinschneider that Renan had expressed regret that Steinschneider hadn't sent at least the Preface to a Frenchman for stylistic revision; the form was inadequate and the text occasionally difficult to comprehend, but the content was worthy of the prize. From this Neubauer inferred that Steinschneider could count on the prize, but said so "in confidence—do not speak yet of it."[75] And five days later he wrote:

> Dear Friend, just a word in confidence. The entire Commission favors giving the prize to you, I now believe the matter is certain. Concerning the *Fihrist*, D. tells me that he will make a report saying that the [submitted] Mémoire is worth nothing, and that the Prize will not be given. You can continue to work, but the thing [i.e. Mémoire] must then be revised, and

[74] Neubauer to Steinschneider, November 23, 1884 (rec. Nov. 27).

[75] Neubauer to Steinschneider, March 23, 1885 (rec. March 25).

> transcribed by another hand than that of your first Mémoire. The members of the Commission marvel at the scholarship of your Mémoire (naturally without knowing your name, except for D. and Renan), but gripe about the 1,500 pages to be read… I beg you to destroy all letters and cards that refer to the prizes because a תקלה for you will be בחיינו or….[76]

Several months later Derenbourg advised Steinschneider that the prize had not yet been won, that he should submit his "*Fihrist*" *Mémoire* to experts in French for stylistic revisions, and that it should be around 300 pages, since the members of the Committee had almost fainted when they saw the length of the first *Mémoire*.[77]

With the first *Mémoire* deposited at the end of 1884, Steinschneider continued to work on the "*Fihrist*" *Mémoire*, which he deposited at the end of 1886. Here, in addition to serving as Steinschneider's informant,[78] Neubauer played an active role in the shaping of the *Mémoire*'s form and content. He suggested to Steinschneider how the work should be arranged, pleaded with him to reduce the number of references, offered suggestions on the French style, and reviewed all parts of the manuscript. As the second *Mémoire* grew, and as parts of it were sent by Steinschneider to colleagues in the history of science for review, Neubauer urged him to condense the manuscript and leave the expanded material for the published work. "For reading it should be at maximum 300 pages, mostly results without much discussion.… Imagine, in view of the many prizes, if people always get 1500 pages to read?"[79]

At one point Neubauer recommended that the "*Fihrist*" *Mémoire* be also sent to Loeb for French revision, which Steinschneider did. The formal announcement that he won the prize was made on 18 November 1887 by the president of the Académie.[80]

When the German version of the "*Fihrist*" *Mémoire* was finally published as *Die Arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*, it did not appear as a single coherent work, like *HUe*, but rather as a series of articles in different scholarly journals. The reason, according to George Kohut, was the high cost of publication.[81] But there is evidence that Steinschneider had already decided that he would be unable to publish the second *Mémoire* as a single book even *before* he submitted it. In that same year, he published in German a long subsection on "Euclid among the Arabs," originally intended for the *Mémoire*, but which he had omitted at Neubauer's suggestion; it is unlikely that he would have done this had he planned to publish a single book. Part of the problem of publishing the second *Mémoire* as a separate monograph may have been that the formulation of the Prize question tied the *Mémoire* to the *Fihrist*, a requirement that Steinschneider apparently found constraining for a general work on the Arabic translations from the Greek. Although the

---

[76] Neubauer to Steinschneider, March 28, 1885 (rec. March 30). Steinschneider underlined "*alle Briefe und Karten*"—but, fortunately for the historian, he did not heed Neubauer's advice.

[77] Derenbourg to Neubauer, June 21, 1885 (rec. June 23), JTSA, ARC 108–8.

[78] E.g., "The decision concerning the rejected Question [i.e. the *mémoire* submitted by the French orientalist Gustave Dugat] is not yet in the *Comptes-rendus*; it will apparently be in the next volume, if a decision is made." Neubauer to Steinschneider, February 10, 1886 (rec. Feb. 12).

[79] Ibid.

[80] See Freudenthal 2011, 206–211, for a chronology of the events.

[81] Kohut 1896, xi.

section on philosophy published later in German by Steinschneider closely follows the *Fihrist*, the sections on mathematics and medicine are independent bibliographical essays that use the *Fihrist* as one source among many. Then there was the issue of Steinschneider's advanced age, weakening eyesight, and familiarity with the manuscript material.

In any event, publication of *Die Arabischen Übersetzungen* in specialist journals had two benefits for *HUe*: Steinschneider's use of the articles to advertise the publication of *HUe*, and the 3,000 francs that he won for the Prix Brunet to help offset the printing costs for *HUe*. When the *HUe* finally appeared in 1893, Joseph Derenbourg reported to the Académie, erroneously, that the work was a German translation of *both Mémoires*.[82] Indeed, Steinschneider had decided to include in *HUe* much information about the Arabic translations from the Greek of works that were subsequently translated into Hebrew.[83]

From *Les Traductions hébraïques* to *Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen*

The *Mémoire* that Steinschneider, via Isidore Loeb, submitted to the Secrétariat of the Académie in December 1884 numbered exactly 1599 pages. After an *Avant-Propos*, table of contents, list of translators and commentators, and a preliminary section on general works (encyclopedias, works on divisions of sciences, and general manuals), the main body of the work is divided into three sections (philosophy, mathematics, and medicine), followed by a five-page *Résumé* of the fourth section that begins on p. 1594: "Several unforeseen circumstances prevented the author from elaborating the considerable material that should have formed the fourth section. The principal subjects are poetry, Hebrew language, and superstition." The manuscript ends abruptly on the last line of p. 1599; there is no internal indication that this is where the *Mémoire* ends, but it could not have continued much further, since the résumé is the last item in the *Table des Matières*. The *Mémoire* has the appearance of a rush job; there are spaces left blank to be filled with the appropriate Hebrew or Arabic, and only a specimen of the footnotes are included, perhaps because Steinschneider ran out of time.[84] On the other hand, the table of contents has more expansive descriptions than its highly condensed and abbreviated counterpart in *HUe*.

---

[82] Joseph Derenbourg's report to the Académie (February 5, 1984), printed in Kohut 1929, 119.

[83] In a letter to Steinschneider (received 4.3.87), Neubauer asks whether Steinschneider intended to wait on the publication of *HUe* until he had heard of the result of the *Fihrist* competition. "Could you then combine the two? Arabic and Hebrew translations?"

[84] It seems that Steinschneider intended to include all the footnotes but ran out of time, or was advised to give only a specimen; the entire text has superscripts indicating references, but the sixty pages of notes (the term "specimen" is writ large, and may be a later addition) reaches only to note 293 of the 297 notes that appear in the section on general works.

Steinschneider's *Avant-Propos* to the *Mémoire* reflects the author's intentions and goals at this stage of the work's composition. The medieval Hebrew translations are important, he writes, because they (a) preserve works no longer extant in the original, or—when the originals have survived—attest to early manuscripts; (b) provide information about the amount and nature of scientific knowledge among medieval Jews; (c) serve as a source for technical scientific terms in medieval Hebrew and in various vernaculars. Steinschneider initially intended to include a separate section for the original works and their authors, but the extent of the material had led him to disperse it throughout the book. (Of course, such a section would have made the second *Mémoire* redundant.) He does not tell us why he chose to arrange the material topically, but he had an important antecedent for a model: the *Fihrist* itself, which arranges its own "international literature" (Chapters Seven and Eight) into philosophy, mathematics (including astronomy), medicine, and belles-lettres.

Neubauer, in his review of *HUe* for the *Jewish Quarterly Review* gave his own explanation why Steinschneider had arranged the work according to subjects, rather than according to translator. Certainly the latter arrangement would have proved "more convenient for those who look for biographies of authors, for literary history or for encyclopedic works." But the arrangement according to subject was necessary because Steinschneider did not limit himself to Hebrew translations, but gave a minute description of the originals from which the translations were made, complete with biographical and bibliographical data, and including not only translations but also commentaries, supercommentaries, and glosses—"and all these could only be made handy by the division into articles."[85]

From the Avant-Propos we also learn of plans not carried out and intentions left unfulfilled not only in the *Mémoire* but also in *HUe*. Thus, in the *Mémoire* the author promises to publish his principal sources, e.g., the prefaces of the translators, some epigraphs, and specimens of translations, with the original text, in a series of appendices. That idea was apparently abandoned, because no such appendices appear in *HUe*. Some of the relevant material is contained in the body of the text or relegated to the footnotes and endnotes; others were published separately. Other material, especially in the prefaces, was printed in Renan and Neubauer's, *Les écrivains juifs français du XIV^e^ siècle*, which appeared in the same year as *HUe*. Steinschneider also notes that before the *Mémoire* is printed, it would need to undergo "une révision stylistique"[86]: he clearly refers to the French version, but had obviously abandoned his intention to publish it. After depositing the second *Mémoire* late in 1886, and after hearing numerous criticisms of his French from Derenbourg, Renan, Loeb, and Neubauer, Steinschneider's six-year "affair" with the French language ended; never again would he write a scholarly work in French.

[85] Neubauer 1894.

[86] *Mémoire*, 20.

In the *Avant-Propos* Steinschneider also expresses the hope that the prize, if he wins it, will enable him to study personally the manuscript collections of several libraries. In fact, Steinschneider did not travel further to manuscript collections during this period, but depended instead upon other scholars' answers to his queries.

Of the latter he relied most upon Neubauer, who now became his "eyes" in some of Europe's Hebrew manuscript collections. During the second half of the decade Neubauer was working on much of the same material as Steinschneider for *Les écrivains juifs français*, but, unlike him, the bachelor librarian from Oxford traveled extensively. From 1886 onward, Neubauer's letters to Steinschneider read like the travelogue of an industrious research assistant who not only aids his supervisor in response to queries, but also takes his own initiative. A few examples:

> If I have a little time I will certainly see in the British Museum if there is anything new concerning translations; perhaps I can do this around the time of Pentecost in Cambridge.[87]
>
> I ought to travel to Italy at the end of February or the beginning of March… Perhaps you have completed a list of שאלות for Italy? You ought to give up the school and concentrate היום קצר.[88]
>
> So to be sufficiently early, I'm sending you a portion of the answers, in between your closely-spaced lines and on the accompanying page… Tomorrow I head for Turin; I don't know whether I can examine everything for you, since people won't be as accommodating there as they are here [in Paris], and I have a mass of MSS to examine for myself… Write me at Parma, [but] I ask you to send sheets only to Oxford.[89]
>
> You presumably received from Parma my letters in which [are answered] your קושיות from Paris and Turin; enclosed is your sheet of paper for Florence and the beginning and end of the ס' הנפש of Aquinas from the Casatense manuscript.[90]
>
> Enclosed are the answers to your שאלות. I thought that your first volume would end with philosophy, and the second would begin with mathematics? … It remains for me to send the translations of Gordon, Arnold, etc., and I will take these with me; in order to make things easier for me, I asked you to provide me with a list of the Hebrew manuscripts which contain translations.[91]

Neubauer sent similar letters to Steinschneider up to the time of the publication of *HUe*, which, as mentioned above, appeared in the same year as *Les écrivains juifs français du XIVe siècle*.[92] For this outstanding and unstinting assistance, Steinschneider rendered his deepest thanks and acknowledgement to Neubauer in

---

[87] Neubauer to Steinschneider, rec. March 4, 1887.

[88] Neubauer to Steinschneider, July 25, 1888 (rec. Jul. 27): The following year Steinschneider tendered his resignation as principal of the Berlin Jüdische Mädchen-Schule to devote his time to writing and research. See Marx 1935.

[89] Neubauer to Steinschneider, November 23, 1888 (rec. Nov. 25).

[90] Neubauer to Steinschneider, January 4, 1889 (rec. Jan. 7).

[91] Neubauer to Steinschneider, August 21, 1889 (rec. Aug. 24).

[92] Neubauer wrote, "Unsere גאולה kommt, Sie mit Übers., ich mit Rabbins Fr." (At this time, Neubauer referred to the book as the second volume of *Les rabbins français*. It would eventually be called, *Les écrivains juifs français du XIVe siècle,* etc.)

the foreword of *HUe*.[93] Neubauer, for his part, could not refrain from referring obliquely to his own contribution in his review of *HUe*.[94]

Despite Steinschneider's intentions to revise significantly the *Mémoire* for publication, roughly 80 % of *HUe* is a literal translation of the *Mémoire*, plus notes. The other 20 % include the fourth and fifth sections, the endnotes, and the indices.[95] The work was published by the Kommissionsverlag des Bibliographischen Bureaus in Berlin in 1893, and printed by H. Itzkowski in 300 copies. Steinschneider's own copy, which contains many marginal glosses and emendations, is now in the Steinschneider Collection of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.[96]

The work garnered a handful of reviews in learned journals by A. Neubauer, I. Lévi,[97] and M. Gaster,[98] but none appeared in Germany. Steinschneider emphasized repeatedly the importance of the Hebrew translation literature for understanding classical and medieval literature in general; the subtitle of *HUe* called it "a contribution to the literary history of the Middle Ages." Yet the work has pretty much remained to this day the possession of a few specialists in the field of the history of Hebrew science and philosophy. The first run of copies was also the last; no further printing was made until 1956, when a photo-offset reproduction by the Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, Graz, appeared.

It is often said that one of Steinschneider's goals in writing *HUe* was to emphasize the contribution of the Jews to Western civilization. Derenbourg, in his aforementioned report to the Académie, implies that Steinschneider's work on the Hebrew translations was born of a desire to demonstrate to the scholarly world the importance of the role of the Jews in transmitting knowledge from the East to the

[93] See *HUe*, xi. "Dr. Ad. *Neubauer* has contributed to my work more than all those mentioned above: his are the accounts on a great number of Paris mss. which have been described here more correctly and accurately than in the catalogue which is partly insufficient. To him I also owe information on mss. of Baron von Günzburg, on some material in Italian libraries, and from mss. in the Bodleian library, where my own older excerpts presented lacunae or raised doubts, or where new acquisitions were concerned. He also forwarded a number of kind communications, concerning Latin mss., of M. *Omont* at the Bibliothèque Nationale and of the Rev. *Macray* in Oxford."

[94] See Neubauer 1894, 147: "Happily, some friends who visit libraries of various countries from time to time, as well as owners of private collections, willingly assisted our painstaking and deserving author."

[95] Steinschneider's completion dates for the various sections of *HUe* are as follows. Section One (Philosophy, preceded by Encyclopedias, Classifications of the Sciences, and Primers): Greeks: January 1889, Arabs, Jews and Christians: July 1889; Section Two (Mathematics): January 1890; Section Three (Medicine): July 1891; Sections Four and Five (Miscellaneous and Jewish Translators): October 1892; Preface: November 1892; Additions and Corrigenda: May 1893; Endnotes and (nine) Indices: May 1893.

[96] Inspected in microfilm at the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts of the National Library of Israel, F 24421. See Berman 1975.

[97] Lévi 1894. Lévi's lavish praise was tempered by the following acute reservations: "il serait loisible de critiquer l'abus des points d'exclamation ironiques motivés par des vétilles, l'âpreté de la censure et le manque de légerté dans la distribution des reproches, l'excès des références oiseuses, qui révèlent le travers du bibliographe vidant ses cartes de fiches…."

[98] Gaster 1894.

West. Solomon Schechter even referred to *Die Mathematik bei den Juden* by the title "The Contribution of the Jews to Mathematics"![99] Yet, while there is no doubt that Steinschneider wanted to correct, or rather, to establish accurately the historical record, and while it is also true that scholarly ignorance of Jewish literature, as well as anti-Jewish prejudice, irritated him greatly, he certainly had no apologetic motives in writing *HUe*. Steinschneider, an ordained rabbi and a committed Jew, detested any nationalist or religious considerations in scholarship. He dismissed the idea that *HUe* could be placed in the service of the struggle for Jewish emancipation and equal rights, and he upheld the cause of objective scholarship with the memorable phrase, "Ich schreibe über Juden, aber nicht für sie, nicht *pro domo*."[100] Although the Jewish contribution to Western civilization interested Steinschneider the scholar, the contribution of Western civilization to the Jews and Judaism, or, to recall his more precise formulation, the influence of foreign literatures on Jewish literature, interested him more. In pointing to the fact that more Christian than Muslim (Arab) authors were translated into Hebrew he remarked, "Für den Geist giebt es kein Ghetto!"[101] The growing impact of Scholastic philosophy, science, and medicine on Jews in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—at a time when Christian persecution and discrimination against Jews in Spain and in Italy had increased—is but one example of the aptness of Steinschneider's remark.

References

Aristotle 1870. *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta. Scholiorum in Aristotelem supplementum*: *Index Aristotelicus*, ed. V. Rose. *Aristotelis Opera*, vol. 5. Berlin.

Baron, Salo. 1950. Steinschneider's Contributions to Historiography. In *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Saul Lieberman, 83–148. New York.

Berman, Lawrence Victor. 1975. *A Reel Guide to the Steinschneider Collection* [*on microfilm*] : *From the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*. [Ann Arbor, Mich.].

Bourel, Dominique. 1987. Les traductions hébraïques du Moyen Age. Un texte de Moritz Steinschneider. *Pardès* 5:117–122.

Charpa, Ulrich. 2003. Matthias Jakob Schleiden (1804–1881): The History of Jewish Interest in Science and the Methodology of Microscopic Botany. *Aleph*: *Historical Studies in Science and Judaism* 3:213–245.

Freudenthal, Gad. 2011. The Aim and Structure of Steinschneider's *Die Hebraeischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*. The Historiographic Underpinnings of a Masterpiece and Their Untoward Consequences. In *Studies on Steinschneider*: *Moritz Steinschneider and the Emergence of the Science of Judaism in Nineteenth-Century Germany*, eds. Reimund Leicht and Gad Freudenthal, 191–212. Leiden, Boston.

[99] Schechter 1915.

[100] *HUe*, xxiv. He is not, however, above making statements reflecting Jewish pride, as this one, on xxiii: "Ein hoher Ritter durfte sich rühmen, nicht lesen und schreiben zu können: der jüdische Illiterat gehörte zum Pöbel (עם הארץ)."

[101] Ibid., xxii.

Gaster, M. 1894. Review of 'Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen' […]. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 26:186–188.
Goldziher, I. 1878. Über muhammedanische Polemik gegen Ahl al-kitab. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 32:341–387.
Gutas, Dimitri. 1998. *Greek Thought*, *Arabic Culture*: *The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbâsid Society* (*2nd-4th*/*8th-10th centuries*). London.
Jellinek, Adolph. 1853. *Thomas von Aquino in der jüdischen Literatur*. Leipzig.
Kaufmann, David. 1890. Die Wissenschaft des Judenthums. *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* 55:161–163, 171–174
Kaufmann, David. 1908–15. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. by M[arcus] Grann. Frankfurt am Main.
Kohut, George A. 1896. Bibliography of the Writings of Professor Dr. Moritz Steinschneider. In *Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneider's*, ed. Moritz Steinschneider, v-xxxix. Leipzig.
Kohut, George A. 1929. Steinschneideriana. In *Studies in Jewish Bibliography and Related Subjects in Memory of Abraham Solomon Freidus* (*1867–1923*), ed. George A. Kohut. New York.
Lévi, Israel. 1894. Review of 'Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen'. *Revue des études juives* 28: 309–311
Manekin, Charles Harry. 2000. Steinschneider's Die hebraeischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters: From Reference Work to Digital Database. *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 7:141–147.
Marx, Alexander. 1935. Steinschneideriana II. In *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, eds. Salo Baron and Alexander Marx, 112–184. New York.
Marx, Alexander. 1947. Moritz Steinschneider. In *Essays in Jewish Biography*, 112–184. Philadelphia.
Morgenstern, J. 1870. *Die französische Académie und die* "*Geographie des Talmuds*." Berlin.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1894. Review of 'Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen'. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 6:146–151.
Paucker, Arnold. 1966. The Letters of Moritz Steinschneider to the Reverend Bandinel. *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 11:242–261.
Renan, Ernest. 1866. *Averroès et lâverroïsme: essai historique*. Paris: 2e édition revue et augmentée. Paris.
Rosenthal, Franz. 1958. Steinschneider's Contribution to the Study of Muslim Civilization. *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 27:67–81.
Schechter, S. 1915. *Seminary Addresses and Other Papers*. Cincinnati.
Schleiden, M. J. 1877. *Die Bedeutung der Juden für Erhaltung und Wiederbelebung der Wissenschaften im Mittelalter* […] 3. unveränderte Auflage. Leipzig.
Schleiden, M. J. 1883. *The Sciences Among the Jews Before and During the Middle Ages*. Baltimore.
Schleiden, Matthias. 1876. Die Bedeutung der Juden für Erhaltung und Wiederbelebung der Wissenschaften im Mittelalter. *Westermann's illustrirte deutsche Monatshefte* 41:52–60, 156–169.
Schorsch, Ismar. 1972. *Jewish Reactions to German anti-Semitism*, *1870–1914*. New York.
Shalom, Abraham ben Isaac. 1859. *Marsilius ab Inghen*. Leipzig.
Sprenger, Aloys. 1874. Lateinische Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen in der Berner Stadtbibliothek. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 28:154–155.
Steinschneider Correspondence. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1850. "Jüdische Literatur." *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, edited by J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber. Section 2, vol. 27, 357–471. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1857. *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century*. London.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1859a. Miscellen. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 2: [54, 56, 71, 110]; 133; 145–148; 148–149; 174–179; 172–174; 125–126; 154–155.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1859b. Notice to Gosche's 'Ghazzali's Leben und Werke'. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 2:86–87.

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1859c. Notice to Helfferich's 'Raymund Lull und die Anfänge der catalonischen Literatur'. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 2:17–18.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863. Notice to Haneberg's essay on the Theology of Aristotle. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 6:107.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1867a. "Hebräische Handschriften in München (K. Bibliothek) über arabische Philosophie," *Serapeum* 28:136–41.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1867b. Wissenschaft und Charlatanerie unter den Arabern im 9. Jahrhundert, nach den hebräischen Quellen. *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie und für klinische Medicin* 36: 357–386, 37: 351–410.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1869a. *Al-Fārābī (Alpharabius) des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften*. Memoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences, 7. série, tome 13, no.4. St. Petersburg.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870. Uebersetzer aus dem Arabischen, ein Beitrag zur Bücherkunde des Mittelalters. *Serapeum* 31:289–298, 305–311.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874. Occidentalische Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen in Mittelalter. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 28: 453–459.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877. Note on M. J. Schleiden's 'Die Bedeutung der Juden für Erhaltung und Wiederbelebung der Wissenschaften im Mittelalter'. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 17: 34–35.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880a. Islam und Judenthum. Kritik des Islam von Simon Duran (1423) aus dem Hebräischen übersetzt und erläutert. *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 7:1–48.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880b. Miscellen. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20: 24, 45–48, 102–104, 134–138.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1882. Une dédicace d'Abraham de Balmes au Cardinal Dom. Grimani. *Revue des études juives* 9:112–117.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1884. Les traductions hébraïques du moyen âge. Paris: Archives de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1889. Miscellen. *Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Literatur* 9:72–85.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1892. Miscellen. *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 37 (3):127–128.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1893. Die Juden und die profanen Wissenschaften: eine Warnung. *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 20:239–245.

The French *Mémoire* of *The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages*. Foreword

The Theme and Its Importance

The importance of *The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages* may be considered from three points of view.

1. They are sources for *translated works*. We have translations whose originals are either totally unknown otherwise, lost, or are found only in other translations that are either inferior or less complete, for example, Arabic works that are found in Latin translations, etc. Even for works that are published in the original, the Hebrew translations represent old manuscripts, sometimes going as far back as the period of the original composition, or are redactions that differ from the published version. The excuse frequently made by the translators that the original was very faulty is not always serious or sincere.

   Considering the Hebrew translations thus as a supplementary source for the history of literature in general—and the extent, number and variety of writings justify this designation, which may seem exaggerated—our program requires us to provide information about the works that were translated, their importance, rarity, authors (concerning whom the translations at times yield information that is otherwise unknown or insufficiently documented) and to call attention to and compare the other translations that may exist.

   At first we intended to assemble the information concerning the authors and the translated works in a special section of our Mémoire, which would also have included the results of some research related to our theme. However, the extent of indispensable material forced us to resist any such temptation and rather to distribute the necessary facts in their proper locations, all the while, however, adding others to the index in order to bring together again the dispersed materials.

   In the course of treating the Hebrew translations, we will also bring into the picture manuscripts of the translated treatise that are in their original language but written in Hebrew characters. We propose as well to gather in an appendix

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1_3, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

other manuscripts that fall into this category, that is to say, works that are found transcribed into Hebrew characters but not, however, translated into the Hebrew language.

2. The Hebrew translations may be divided by subject into two groups. One may be called national or religious, since in the Middle Ages nationality and religion were two concepts that, if not identical, were hardly separable. These are works on law (*halakhah*), comprising the divine law which extends as well to religious obligations, approached and regulated from a legal point of view; works of exegesis and hermeneutics; homilies; popular ethics; and religious poetry. However, there are very few examples of the last, because liturgy was ordinarily composed in Hebrew or Aramaic; hymns written in other languages were usually left untranslated.

   This class of translations derives almost exclusively from Arabic originals. It has been deliberately left out of our Mémoire, not only on account of the question that was posed, but also because the present author intends to publish a work dealing with Judaeo-Arabic literature. This is also the reason why he has treated in less detail translations of Arabic works written by Jewish authors. As for Hebrew philology (linguistics, grammar, lexicography), by subject and goal, it belongs to this first class, but by method to the following one.

   The second class of Hebrew translations, which one may call international or general, comprises the sciences. We have divided it into three sections which make up, so to speak, the body of our Mémoire: philosophy, mathematics, and medicine, each with its auxiliary disciplines. In addition, it includes poetry and popular tales from the Orient which, in different periods, made their long way through Jewish literature. We have set aside for everything that does not, strictly speaking, belong to any of the three sections mentioned above, a fourth section (varia). We have not yet introduced a continuous numbering to the paragraphs in all of the sections, since we expect some insertions on the basis of research that we propose to undertake.

   The national studies of the Jews have been down to our time the main subject of studies on the literary history of that race. One tends to look upon their scientific studies more as a necessary curiosity; as for translations, one has a vague idea about those that are connected to Arabic literature. It is only in our day that translations made from Latin originals have been uncovered, and it had been surprising to learn that in medical science the Jews made use, at the same time and to the same degree, of western sources as well as Arabic ones.

   The fact is, one can prohibit the Jews from anything but science.

   Literary exchanges between Jews—we are speaking here of those who remained Jewish—and Christians is scarcely known. Until they come to light, we will have even less of a good idea of the Christian literary treasures that the Jews appropriated. Translations of scientific works must serve as a chief source for the cultural history of the Jews; in addition, they reflect the culture of those countries that afforded asylum to the persecuted and mistreated race. Those countries where the Jews translated nothing had nothing worth translating. One of the most common motives given for the translations was the accusation or reproach foisted on Jews that they possessed no scientific writings. One was not content with the excuse provided by the Exile; one dared to look upon the

science of other nations as a loan to be reclaimed and which was returned to its original owner by means of translation. Let us add here another remarkable fact. Among the flood of alchemical writings from which, baselessly, one wanted to deduce a Jewish origin, hardly one found a Hebrew translator.

3. The translations are important from the linguistic point of view. This is true not only on account of the neo-Hebrew language into which they introduced most of the technical terms they adopted for scientific discussions; here the scientific style was called by the same word that was used for "astronomy" (תונה).

   One reads in the translators' prefaces observations, at times quite subtle, concerning the best method of translating, as well as the differences between the two languages in question. Often the translators will pair the Hebrew term with a translation into the local vernacular (בלעז). The places par excellence where this was done are southern France (Provence), Christian Spain, and Italy; we do not know of even a single translator in Germany and the other barbarian lands of northern Europe in the two centuries concerning which we have information. One begins to assemble and to explain the vernacular expressions that one encounters in the different works of the medieval period as a contribution to the history of the languages in question; those found in the translations are, in general, less corrupt and more intelligible on account of the context.

   We have not neglected this third point of view in our Mémoire, as one may see from the index of Hebrew and foreign words that we propose to include in the final edition of our Mémoire. In the present edition, only in the first section have we been able to fulfill our wish to provide important linguistic material. The remaining two sections require an examination of manuscripts as well as the cooperation of a learned specialist. For the time being, we have been able to provide a few examples in the second section as foreign terminology predominates in medicine owing to the lack of ancient Hebrew works that might have been able to supply medical terms.

The Present Mémoire

In the preceding exposition we have admitted all the directions that may conceivably be linked to the question that was proposed. However, no mere Mémoire can carry this out successfully; that can be accomplished only by a full study. We dare to present before the august Academy the first version of a book of this sort, in the hope that one will find there all that could have been hoped for in a Mémoire, and that its approval would place the author in a position to give this book every possible perfection, especially by means of a personal inspection of a number of manuscripts found in European libraries. Indeed, the information that one owes to several renowned scholars, and which one has not been able to utilize for the present, are no substitute for one's own research.

We shall not fatigue our excellent judges with extensive details concerning all that we have done in order to come close to our goal, both with regard to full

coverage and to the precision of our information. The table of contents and the index of translators that follow this introduction may serve to measure the extent of our research. We have included in our index, but marked with an asterisk, Jewish *commentators*, some of whom are incidentally found in this Mémoire; for others we have set aside an appendix.

The period defined by the question is that of the Middle Ages, which are usually said to end with the fifteenth century. However, we have seen it fit to extend this somewhat, almost to the middle of the sixteenth century, when the studies of the Jews began to turn towards other sources.

We have included commentaries along with the translations, following the example of Wenrich (1842), Flügel (1841), and others. This group of authors has extended our project considerably, but not without profit for the history of translations.

In an introductory section we dealt with a number of works that, in the manner of encyclopedias, contain abridged versions, or which constitute subsidiary sources for the history of translations through the information they contain about the literature. Determining the date of the translations and commentaries is often very difficult, despite the fact that the translators were in the habit of adding to their name the date of completion for their work, and at times the place and country as well. However, copyists did not always take care to reproduce exactly the colophon of the original, including all the details; and the authors of catalogues have not always read their texts correctly, nor did they know very well how to account for the manner of dating.

The date for their work is sometimes given indirectly, by way of the people for whom it was executed. The Arabs have preserved for us a list of the translators of the first period and their patrons; neo-Hebrew literature is in general very lacking as far as exact biographical and bibliographical dates are concerned; modern works have had to collect details scattered over a vast terrain and, by putting them together, to fill in the lacunae left by the documents. The dates of the copies throughout offer us the *terminus ad quem*, but they leave a great deal of room for the time between the composition and the copy, and we have very few manuscripts that were copied soon after their execution. Add to this the difficulty of deciphering the foreign names of the authors as they were transcribed into Hebrew, as well as identifying them—known authors in the history of the literature in question—and there will be no cause for astonishment that, after adopting the results of many studies of others, taking care always to name our sources in the text as well as in the notes (of which we present here a specimen), there was plenty of room left for criticism, as well as for entirely new research. One will be even less surprised by questions and doubts that we have had to abandon without any satisfactory solution, but rather frankly admitting our ignorance, often noting as well the means for achieving our end that were inaccessible for us. We also confess here that we were not able to correct or complete our Mémoires throughout on the basis of the most recent publications (1882–1884).

We have not mentioned all the errors found in our secondary sources—even those of high authority; our list of abbreviations tabulates those most frequently

cited—it often suffices often simply enough to offer our documented results, but at times we have had to enter into a minute discussion or to illustrate something unique that our predecessors misunderstood, for Hebrew literature is full of enigmas, allusions (mainly through the employment of biblical or classical phrases), plays on words, as well as rhetorical amusements behind which one need not seek anything hidden.

For the translations and commentaries that constitute our main theme, we were compelled to note all manuscripts of unedited works (and to indicate how complete they are), on the basis of either inspection or communications from others—we will have to add a few mentioned in catalogues published in the course of our work on the Mémoire—but as for the very small number of printed works, we have indicated the most important editions and commentaries, including the most renowned modern ones. We propose to prepare an index of the manuscripts that are mentioned, arranged according to the libraries to which they belong.

It seems to us to be very important to display the *incipits* and *explicits* (and sometimes selections as well) of unedited works. We had begun to do this in the text; however, the difficulty of a good copy forced us to save this information for the notes. This explains several lacunae in the copy presented to the distinguished Academy.

We have had to borrow a good part of our materials from unedited documents. We would like to publish our principal sources, for example, translators' prefaces, some colophons, and some specimens of translations, if possible, facing their originals, in the appendices to which we have referred on different occasions. The extent of these additions will depend on the means at our disposal for publishing them. A number of supplementary notes, too long for the body of the book, have also been prepared.

The gist of a great number of texts could be rendered into French, but a number of other passages required a literal translation. In view of the peculiarities of the aforementioned Hebrew texts, as well as the scholarly goal of our project, we have been forced, in the first instance, to translate faithfully, often literally. The French reader, who may be offended by the strange style, will not forget that he is hearing a Hebrew author of the Middle Ages, and that it is better to offend stylistic feeling than to falsify history by means of unjustifiable substitutions.

We know that a real Frenchman could have avoided this predicament, and that he would have been able to give a better choice of words for expressing the sense. But what is to be done? The author has not written this work under the illusion that he would pass for a Frenchman. He knows that his work must submit to a stylistic revision before it can be printed. However, charged with a variety of duties, he had to concentrate his efforts first of all upon editing the materials, and he has not been able to write up the last part with the same care as the rest, nor did he have the time to carefully revise the copy that he dared to present to the distinguished Academy.

The transcription of Hebrew names follows the systems of Wolf (1715) and the *Catalogus Librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (1852).

References

Wolf, Johann Christoph. 1715. *Bibliotheca Hebraea*. 4 vols. Hamburg, Leipzig.
Flügel, Gustav. 1841. *Dissertatio de arabicis scriptorum graecorum interpretibus*. Meissen.
Wenrich, Joannes Georgius 1842. *De auctorum Graecorum versionibus et commentariis Syriacis*, *Arabicis*, *Armeniacis*, *Persisque commentatio*. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1852. Steinschneider, Moritz. *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin.

The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages. Preface

The present work is part of a more comprehensive task that I had in mind half a century ago and whose basic outlines are before me in the form of a "prospectus", dated 1849.[1] However, the part that has been accomplished here has grown so substantially that I, in giving account of the subjective and objective aspects of the solution, for internal and external reasons, even more than in the exposition itself, have forced myself to be extremely brief. Much can be left, I trust, to the intelligence of the reader.[2]

While preparing the article "Jüdische Literatur" for the *Realencyclopädie* by Ersch and Gruber (Steinschneider 1844–47), I experienced a lack of sources that meant more than just a lacuna; it pertained to the impact of foreign literatures on the Jewish tradition, an impact that constitutes a major aspect of the final judgment on the latter. The influence of Arabic culture was commonly understood, but blurred by the popular dichotomy between the "Portuguese" (writers exiled from the Iberian peninsula) and the "Germans". It remained to investigate in detail the mutual influence of Jewish and Arabic learning (*Bildung*) in writing, language, commerce of ideas, and customs. The significant role of the Jews as mediators of Arabic scholarship for the Christians had been widely publicized by Jourdain's famous prize essay. It was scarcely realized, however, that Jews actually participated in Christian literature in the fields of philosophy, medicine, mathematics, and popular literature—pp. 471–73 present no less than five translations of a text on *Logic*, perhaps by a future Pope, partly to be used as a basis for disputations.

The "interlinguals," i.e., the translators, are the principal international mediators of cultures. Pierre Daniel Huet, with his essay on the translators that is still cited today,[3]

[1] Cf. Steinschneider 1880, p. 1.

[2] Page numbers in parentheses refer to this present work.

[3] Huet 1661, new edition Huet 1680 (and The Hague, Huet 1683), p. 127: "Intere Judaeorum Magistros, pauci quidem, sed nonnuli tamen huic interpretandi studio se dediderunt…," followed by a two-page enumeration, without proper order, which contains mention of Chanin or Chanan (Ḥunayn) with the son Isaac, p. 127. On p. 128 there is a censure of verbatim translations of the Jews, following the Arab authors. Argelati's *Biblioteca degli volgarizzatori* (together with the

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1_4, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

initiated a series of studies, among which Jourdain's aforementioned *Recherches* (1819) turned out to be epoch-making. These gave, in an indirect way, an outline of the history of the medieval translations of Greek works, particularly those by Aristotle. Greek Antiquity is indeed, as Renan rightly remarks, at the root of every stimulus towards free science.[4] Apart from the Arabic bibliographers whose works have become recently available—Ḥajji Khalifa's *Kashf*, along with Flügel's translation, not satisfactory throughout (1835–58), Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* (1871), now also Ibn abi Uṣaybi'a's *History of Physicians* (1884)—several works offered much helpful material, e.g., Wüstenfeld's *Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte* (1840), later his *Die Übersetzungen arabischer Werke ins Lateinische* (1877), Flügel's *Dissertatio de arabicis scriptorum graecorum interpretibus* (1841), particularly Wenrich's prize essay *De auctorum graecorum versionibus* (1842), unfortunately not making use of any critical method, and finally also Leclerc's *Histoire de la médecine arabe* (1876). The Neo-Hebrew literature was waiting for particular treatment in order to conclude the chain of transmissions. With ever-growing knowledge of the material, however, my hopes to get a grasp on it sank. Having to direct the Jewish School for Girls (1869–90), to give lectures at the Veitel Heine Foundation (since 1859), to offer help at the Royal Library (since 1869), to edit the *Hebraeische Bibliographie* (1859–82) and a supplement to Ben Jacob's *Thesaurus* (since 1880, at present having reached p. 460), and to see to the duties of a large family I had neither the time nor the freshness of mind to digest the immense material. No prospect of publication was acting as an incentive. Then came the initiative from Paris. The Académie Française presented, in 1880, the subject for a prize competition to compile a complete bibliography of the medieval Hebrew translations. This I undertook, in 1884, in a French Mémoire, treating sections I–III, with a brief survey on section IV, as well as, in 1886, another survey on the Arabic translations from Greek, on the basis of the *Fihrist*.[5] However, one writes exactly the way one thinks only in one's own language, and therefore I decided to produce a German version of sections I–III, albeit on the basis of a literal translation that may excuse a number of awkward pas-

---

supplements, five volumes, quarto, 1767) has only now come to my notice; for Hebrew materials it offers precious little information. The *Ensayo de una biblioteca de traductores españoles* by D. Juan Ant. Pellicer y Safocada (1778) treats only 37 more recent authors, among them the Jews Joseph Ẓemaḥ Arias (p. 112) and Menashe b. Israel (p. 140), following Wolfius. José Joaquín Lorga intended to treat the older translators (preface, folio 2, p. 1). It is curious that the Spanish bibliographers claim the late successors of the Jews exiled from Spain as belonging to their literature. A great deal of partiality, combined with little knowledge of Jewish authors, is shown by Augusto Llacayo y Santa María 1878; cf., e.g., p. 58/9, 90. 173, 202, 233, 234 (a physician who first translates Hippocrates, Galen, and Aristotle! perhaps Ḥunayn?), 236, 238/9, 255, 289. There are 73 Hebrew mss. (p. 93).

[4] [1]Cf. Steinschneider 1885 and Steinschneider 1893, §1. [The superscript in the square brackets refers to Steinschneider's numbering of the footnotes in the Preface, which begins anew on each page.]

[5] [2]From this work, the introduction ("Die arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen)" was published in the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft V (Steinschneider 1889) §1–23; the sequel (section I, Philosophy) has been in the hands of the publisher since Easter 1892. From section II (Mathematics) is "Euklid bei den Arabern" (cf. p. 503) (Steinschneider 1886); section III was published as "Griechische Aerzte bei den Arabern" (Steinschneider 1891).

sages, perhaps also some small errors. Studies into the sources to section IV I made only immediately before the printing.

Next to the moral and material advancement given by the High Academy my work is very much indebted to friendly help from so many different sides that I can mention here the names of only those persons who gave assistance on a large scale; for others, my thanks at this place must suffice. Among the scholars who gave me information on manuscripts in public or private collections I mention in the first place my late friend Zunz who as early as 1863 answered a questionnaire in Parma. From 1857 onwards, Prince B. Boncompagni in Rome has extended his well-known inexhaustible liberality also to me. To this I owe a great number of traced manuscript copies, extracts, information on mss. of the Vatican, of the Paris library and of his own, the compiler of whose catalogue, Cavaliere E. Narducci (secretary to the Prince) has also given me various independent reports. I am grateful to Prof. Lasinio in Florence for additional information and corrections of Biscioni (1834–69), and even more so to the Cavaliere P. Perreau, librarian in Parma (1863–88), whose resignation after failing eyesight ended, to my deep regret, his passionately devoted work toward supplementing and correcting De Rossi's catalogue, when the printing of the present work had reached section III, leaving around 30 queries unanswered. Prof. Ignazio Guidi in Rome helped me with more than 30 Vatican mss. to deal with the partly gross mistakes of Assemani, whose catalogue, mostly based on information by Bartolocci and by ignorant "scriptores" working in the Vatican (cf. p. 115, note)—and which fortunately escaped in a few copies from fire, is overdue to be replaced by a better one. The honorable rabbi in Mantua, Marco Mortara, supplemented for me his catalogue of the local congregation's library. Mr. S. J. Halberstam informed me about his mss. which, alas, had to go to Ramsgate. Dr. A. Berliner sent me various notes in the course of his Italian travels. More than all those mentioned here, Dr. Adolph Neubauer contributed to my work: his are the reports on a great number of Paris mss., which have been described here more correctly and accurately than in the catalogue which is partly insufficient; to him I owe information on mss. of Baron von Günzburg, some material in Italian libraries, and mss. in the Bodleian library, either where my older excerpts suffered from lacunae or doubts or where new acquisitions were concerned. He also forwarded a number of kind communications, concerning Latin mss. of M. Omont at the Bibliothèque Nationale and of the Rev. Macray in Oxford.

In adapting the French version and in compiling the index, I had the indefatigable help of a school friend of mine, Miss Ida Zucker, and for the reading of the proofs also the assistance of Miss Dorothea Wormann as well. If in spite of this and other help, an unfortunately considerable number of mistakes remain, particularly concerning numbers, diacritical signs, and the Hebrew passages which the printer did not understand, and if those mistakes are only partly remedied in the supplementary notes (*Zusätze*), then the uncommon intricacy of the typesetting, and also the weakness of my eyes, should be taken into account.

Information on the sources and their use has been made possible by the willing assistance of the officers of the Royal Library. Closer acquaintance with Valentin

Rose, the excellent literary connoisseur and critic, has helped to shortcut and sometimes direct the tiresome investigations.

* * *

The medieval translations that form the subject of this work do not exclude any material, except for possible adaptations of the Halakha from an Aramaic vernacular, as perhaps the הלכות ראו; they extend (other than some more recent Karaite ones, see §561) roughly up to the middle of the sixteenth century, because overcoming the Middle Ages in Jewish Circles took longer than in Christian ones. Therefore, as a rule, more recent translators are excluded, as for instance Saadia b. Levi Azankot (Steinschneider 1852, p. 2227, 1876, p. 62, cf. 1877, p. 120; in Neubauer 1886, n. 1240 and 1438, not yet everything), Solomon b. Isaac Ibn משיש (1593, London, Mont. 265). Consequently a chronological arrangement of the material was prohibited by the fact that many translations, particularly the anonymous ones (over 200, cf. the index), are of uncertain date; the oldest attempts are perhaps doomed to remain in obscurity forever (cf. p. 904). To some extent, the chronological index of those translators whose dates could be ascertained with certainty or high probability promises compensation. A chronological arrangement of authors, as in Wenrich's work (1842), would offer as little use as convenience. Thus, only an arrangement according to disciplines (sections) remained advisable, and within these, according to nations, mostly coinciding with the languages spoken there, and to religions (chapters), whose authors are then listed alphabetically. This can be examined in the outline, whose details are to be found in the alphabetical index.

The material presented here mainly consists of bio- and bibliographical information on the authors on the basis of the best and most recent sources, which are arranged chronologically, and partly on the basis of my own research. Equivalent material on the translators could mostly be obtained only from the translations themselves, only a small part of which has been printed. As to the printed editions and the corresponding mss., no complete bibliography has been aimed at, whereas all that has been presented has to do with the history and character, particularly language and style, of the translations, which means that the index of Hebrew words offers a substantial contribution to a lexicon of scholarly Hebrew, characterized as a desideratum already by the father of all translators (p. 374).[6] The Arabic words that made their way into the Hebrew translations, and that were garbled partly due to the lack of attention to their diacritical dots, peculiarities such as the dot above or beneath the *gimel* for *jim* or *ghayn*, or over the *ẓade* for *ẓa*', require special investigations that I could not conduct in all places. Therefore the index of Arabic words has been arranged according to the Hebrew alphabet.—Also concerning the relation to the European languages some information is hinted at which requires pursuit by a future expert specialist.

[6] [1] Smaller glossaries can be found already in older mss.; e.g., one on logic in Hebrew, Spanish and Arabic, Paris, BN héb 907/5, on philosophy in Hebrew and Italian, Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2906/8; a general glossary, in ms. Schorr-Jellinek (cf. p. 605), fol. 129b–131b, quoting Abraham b. Ḥiyya and Maimonides. For the significance of knowing Neo-Hebrew for Arabic philosophy, cf. Munk 1844, in the *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, II, 179.

My main aim was to indicate as completely as possible the Hebrew mss. in public, i.e., stable, and in mobile, i.e., private, libraries or bookshops, an indication also bearing exterior marking. I have not shunned the painstaking and tiring redaction and correction of an index of the Hebrew mss., mainly of the translations. This index, compiled on the basis of the items underlined by the student Sacerdote, was collated with my lists, partly with the catalogues which made almost universally possible an arrangement according to the single components and repeated correction and supplementation. A number of incorrect digits had already been controlled and corrected in brackets near the page number of the catalogue in question, nevertheless all major mistakes have been corrected in the supplementary notes (*Zusätze*). This index is indispensable for the users of the catalogues or the mss. themselves, since the rectification of information, owing to whose error, ignorance, or deceit much mishap has resulted, constitutes the main task; an exhaustive account of all the wrong information removed would have eclipsed the correct information. In section IV, chapter III, some erroneous assumptions have been taken into consideration and refuted, but not improbable possibilities, such as מלא הפנים in Moscono (Harkavy 1880, p. 23, note 56). As to alleged Jewish authors who are obviously fictitious, I intend to deal with them in a small monograph.

My original plan was to treat authors and translators in separate sections, but that would have led far beyond the subject. Many authors, especially Arabic ones, I have treated in the meanwhile in other places; much material remains unattended to in special preliminary collections ("Christians," "Arabs"). I had already prepared the Arabic literature of the Jews for printing in 1845, so therefore for this work the Jewish authors have been dealt with less extensively. Some material is discussed or briefly hinted at here which would justify, in a broader sense, the title "Contribution to the Literary History of the Middle Ages." The translators are usually evaluated upon their first mention, or in connection with a prominent work, in regard to their overall position and achievement.

The translations lead by necessity on to further adaptations of all kinds: compendia, commentaries (or super-commentaries) and such parts of which that contain the texts in complete translation; Narboni, in his commentaries, has even preserved for us wholesale translations and procured the analysis of a lost work by Ibn Bajja. These bridges to the introduction of foreign ideas constitute what leads to the mediation and amalgamation of foreign material with what was considered to be the heritage. The interpretation that introduces so much, or even more, into the text rather than exposing it is, generally speaking, of the utmost importance in Jewish literature; it is the ground upon which the living individuality and the longed-for future comes to terms with the dead past. Already at an early stage "commentary" and "work" needed sharp differentiation (p. 52, 769), and for this reason the adaptations have been given the same degree of diligent treatment as the translations. The old Arabic commentaries to the Bible compiled by Jewish authors were very lengthy[7]; they offered occasions for the most diverse discussions. The scholarly commentaries

[7] [1]Abraham Ibn Ezra, Introduction to the Pentateuch; Ben Asher 1846, p. 75; below p. 399. A striking pun by Dukes (Rev. Ét. XIII, 34 [?]) calls the "*texte*" a *prétexte* for the commentary.

mostly stick to their specific subject, even the prolix ones by Narboni and Joseph Shem Tov; sometimes they are quite brief and present good readings, variant readings, dates concerning the bibliography and for dating the translations. Here also, certain scholastic phrases of disputation survive (cf., e.g., p. 121); as an introduction to a given commentary we often find the "principal questions" (cf. index, s.v. *kephalaia*). Following the example of Averroes (also in Elijah Delmedigo, Latin; Steinschneider 1881, p. 64) even Paulus de Burgos begins his *Scrutinium* (Wolf 1715 III, p. 902) with the words "*intentio huius tractatus*," whereas Ḥasdai Crescas begins his Spanish polemical work with a phrase from al-Ghazālī (p. 462).

After treatment of monographs there follow encyclopedias, some of which derive their material directly from foreign sources. The general works are treated in the introductory section; several medical works are treated in the supplement to section III, p. 842. I would have done so similarly with section II, were the mathematical encyclopedia by Abraham bar Ḥiyya extant (p. 502). Abraham Ibn Ezra's astrological writings (1148), on the basis of Arabic sources, require a monograph [see recently Sela 1999]. Encyclopedic intimations are also presented by Isaac b. Solomon Ibn Abi Sahula (1490, fol. 15 bff., medicine fol. 37b, psychology, chapter 32).

The notes were meant in the first place to contain indications of the sources and short texts, or quotations. The lack of contemporary literature, particularly of journalistic provenience, of which even the best products remain almost totally unknown to me, will be regretted by some; in the last two years I was sufficiently occupied by the editorship of section IV. I have not been able to treat sufficiently the second part of the "Rabbins," (Renan and Neubauer 1893) having to confine myself to go over the galley proofs. The notes contain some brief occasional references which are easy to trace via the *index rerum*. Because they are so numerous, they were divided into columns the second (p. 42 ff.) of which unfortunately remained without a heading, as in pp. 906–32 with number 12 instead of 13. The superscript after A. refers to the series, and elsewhere mostly to columns or lines. With so many cross-occurrences, it was not easy to avoid repetitions.

The reasons for some peculiarities will soon be understood by the reader; choosing Hebrew instead of Arabic characters for Arabic stemmed from financial reasons. The incorrect orthography in Latin quotations is no surprise to someone who is familiar with mss. and old printed works, therefore I have rarely added a "sic". I represent Arabic *jim* by dj [j], *ḥa*' by 'h [ḥ], *kha*' by kh, *ta*' and *ṭa*' by t, *tha*' by th, *ṣad* by 's, *ẓa*' by ts[ṣ], short *fatḥa* by a. However, the commonly used orthography, as in Alfargani, belongs to those inconsequent usages which one admits without apologies. Quotations retain their original orthography. Diacritical dots have been omitted in well-known names, like Ahmed, but observed in the respective principal occurrence. German orthography follows the shorter form (e.g., -iren, not –ieren); Greek names have been written with a K. Since the sources are so diverse certain inconsequent spellings could easily creep in.—Abbreviations which cannot be readily completed are given above, p. III. For references to the sources I presuppose a certain familiarity on the reader's part. [We have omitted macrons for the sake of uniformity between Arabic and Hebrew transliteration.]

The parts gradually growing and adding to the bulk of this book have forced me to stack some of the material in the "endnotes" and the supplements, particularly because the printing of section IV (as well as of the indexes in two printing houses, involving tedious proof reading) took, against all expectations, all of the months February through November. So several endnotes and all supplements[8] will be published in the *Monatsschrift*, continued by Brann and Kaufmann. A supplement which I have in mind, containing the authors and works not translated, but quoted in Hebrew literature, is planned, if time allows; also to be published elsewhere.

Section V represents a supplement, hardly exhaustive, on a subject that deserves a separate treatment.

Berlin, November 1892

References

Argelati, Filippo. 1767. *Biblioteca degli volgarizzatori*, *o sia Notizia dall' opere volgarizzate d'autori*, *che scrissero in lingue morte prima del secolo XV*. Milan.

Augusto Llacayo y Santa María. 1878. *Antiguos manuscritos de historia*, *ciencia y arte militar*, *medicina y literarios existentes en la Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial*. Seville.

Ben-Asher, Aaron ben Moses, and Jacob ben Nissim. 1846. *Quntres ha-masoret ha-meyuḥas le-Ben-Asher*; *ve-nilvu elav eizeh ha'atakot mi-ferush Sefer Yeẓirah le-R' Ya'akov ben Nissim*; '*im haqdamah*, *he'arot ve-ẓiyyunim mimeni Leib Dukes*. Edited by L. Dukes. Tübingen.

Flügel, Gustav. 1841. *Memoriam anniversariam dedicatae ante hos CCLXXXXVIII annos scholae regiae afranae extra ordinem D.I. Iul*, *MDCCCXXXXI H.L.Q.C. pie celebrandam*. Misenae.

Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1880. *Rav Shemuel ben Hofni and his Works* Zikhron le-Rishonim ve-gam le-Aharonim, vol. 3. St. Petersburg; Leipzig. (Hebrew)

Huet, Pierre Daniel. 1661. *De interpretatione libri duo*: *quorum prior est*, *de optimo genere interpretandi*: *alter*, *de claris interpretibus*. Paris.

Huet, Pierre-Daniel. 1680. *Petri Danielis Huetii De interpretatione libri duo*: *quorum prior est De optimo genere interpretandi*: *alter*, *De claris interpretibus*. Stadae.

Huet, Pierre-Daniel, 1683. *Petri Danielis Huetii De interpretatione libri duo*: *Quorum prior est De optimo genere interpretandi*: *alter De claris interpretibus*. Hagæ-Comitum.

Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, Aḥmad b. al-Qāsim 1884. *Kitāb* '*Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*. Edited by A. Müller. Königsberg.

Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad ibn Isḥaq. 1871. *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Edited by G. Flügel. Leipzig

Jourdain, Amable. 1819. *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote*, *et sur des commentaires grecs ou arabes employés par les docteurs scholastiques*. Paris.

[8] [1]The supplements whose publication begins in the *Monatsschrift* 1893 follow the pagination of the book: 1: p. 44, Preface of the translator of the Sophistics; 2: p. 79, Messer Leon's preface to 3; מכלל יפי: p. 128, De coelo, Solomon Ibn Ayyub; 4: 218, translations of the Ethics; 5: p. 325, Abraham Avigdor, preface to סגלת מלכים (cf. Michael 1891, no. 610); 6: p. 519, Nicomachus; 7: p. 619, Moses of Nismes (printed in Rabb. II); 8: p. 629, Bianchino; 9: p. 653 Galen, De puero epil.; 10: p. 668 Plato, Bleeding; 11: p. 680 Natan, Preface to the Canon; 12: p. 703 Moses Ibn Tibbon, Preface and I, 20 from al-Jazzār; 13: p. 735 Ibn Riḍwān, Elements; 14: Maimonides, Preface to the Commentary to the Aphorisms by Hippocrates 15: p. 829, Roger §1, 16, 26.

Ḥajji Khalifah. 1835–58. *Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum*, *ad codicum Vindobonensium*, *Parisiensium et Berolinensis fidem primum edidit*, ed. G. L. Flügel. Leipzig.
Leclerc, Lucien 1876. *Histoire de la médecine arabe*. 2 vols. Paris.
Michael, Heimann Joseph. 1891. *Ôr ha-hayyîm*: *Umfassendes bibliographisches und literarhistorisches Wörterbuch des rabbinischen Schriftthums*; *aus dem literarischen Nachlasse Heimann Joseph Michael's*; *zum Drucke befördert von dessen Söhnen*. Frankfurt am Main.
Munk, Salomon. 1844. Munk, Salomon. La philosophie chez les Juifs. In *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, ed. A. Franck, 3:350–364. Paris.
Neubauer, Adolf, and A. E. Cowley. 1886. *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the college libraries of Oxford* […] Oxford.
Pellicer y Saforcada, Juan Antonio. 1778. *Ensayo de una biblioteca de traductores españoles*. Madrid.
Renan, Ernest, and Adolf Neubauer. 1893. *Les écrivains juifs français du XIVe siècle*. Paris.
Sahula, Isaac ibn. 1490. *Meshal ha-Qadmoni* (*Ancient Fables*). Soncino.
Sela, Shlomo. 1999. *Astrologiyah ve-farshanut ha-mikra*' *be-haguto sehl Avraham Ibn Ezra*. Ramat Gan.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1844–47. Jüdische Literatur. In *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, eds. J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, 357–471. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1852–1860. *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1876. Statuten. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 16:32–35; 57–62.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877. Zur Kritik und Methode. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 17:120–126.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880. Islam und Judenthum. Kritik des Islam von Simon Duran (1423) aus dem Hebräischen übersetzt und erläutert. *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 7:1–48.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881. Elia del Medigo. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 21:61–71.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1885. Orientalische Uebersetzungen griechischer Autoren. *Das Archiv* 1:17–20.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1886. *Euklid bei den Arabern; eine bibliographische Studie*. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1889. *Die arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*. Beihefte zum Centralblatt f. Bibliothekswesen, no. 5. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1891. *Die griechischen Aerzte in arabischen Uebersetzungen: kritische Bibliographie*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1893. *Die arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*. Beihefte zum Centralblatt für Bibliothekowesen 12. Leipzig.
Wenrich, Joannes Georgius. 1842. *De auctorum Graecorum versionibus et commentariis Syriacis, Arabicis, Armeniacis Persisque commentatio*. Leipzig.
Wolf, Johann Christoph. 1715. *Bibliotheca Hebraea*. 4 vols. Hamburg and Leipzig.
Wüstenfeld, Ferdinand. 1840. *Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte und Naturforscher*. Göttingen.
Wüstenfeld, Ferdinand. 1877. *Die Übersetzungen arabischer Werke in das Lateinische seit dem XI. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen.

General Remarks

Jews and Languages

Jews as mediators of literature and scholarship have been, and still are, the object of a great deal of incorrect and imprecise representation, apart from often-repeated commonplaces, without the basis of precise research.[1] There are numerous instances of supposed Hebrew texts and adaptations which do not fit into the frame of those identified here. K. Sprengel (1792, III, pt. 2, p. 266) talks about Arabic translations from Hebrew (cf., however, Steinschneider 1857b, §22 no. 22); Camus (1800, cf. p. 478) collects general information from Nicolas Antonio, Brucker, and Reinaudot (also in Wolf 1715, I p. 138), coming to the conclusion (p. 427) that the Hebrew translations of Aristotle from Arabic "ne peuvent être que très mauvaises, vu les préjugés des Juifs à l'égard d'Aristote"! When it comes to Jewish matters, one can dispense with logic! On the other hand, Bunsen (1857, p. 282) detects Hebraisms in the Arabic translations, which are simply derived from Syriac,[2] indicating that they are the product of learned Jews. The Hebraisms are an anachronism; certainly no Jewish author is known to be a transmitter from Syriac into Arabic. Masarjis, or Masarjawaih, who has been mixed up with the Syriac author Sergius, has probably merely added Arabic material to the pandects of Aaron. Reinaud (Abū l-Fidā' 1848 I, p. LVIII) and Benfey (1859 I) have pointed out the phenomenon of the Jews as "experts in languages".

What has made the Jews in particular become the people of languages? A nation without a country, but with a Holy Scripture—which was more than any other elevated to the status of a "polyglotte"—is driven gradually to produce translations whose first cause and origin is clouded in legend. The Septuagint is definitely the first positive instance of a translation (Geiger 1865, p. 80). The Hebrew Book of Books itself already contains elements of another language, Chaldaean, spoken by Jews at

[1] Libri 1838, II, p. 153, stresses the commercial factor.

[2] Steinschneider 1878, p. 443; Ibn abī Uṣaybi'a 1884, I, 163. On the *Almagest* and the *Geography* by Ptolemy, cf. p. 522.

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1_5, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

that time. So also did they gradually come to speak the languages of Europe, although in Christian countries they kept to Hebrew when conversing with Jewish foreigners (Steinschneider 1867, p. 8). The complaints about the neglect of Hebrew, voiced by the older philologists and poets, may be understood as referring to literary appreciation and written practice; there can be no doubt about the use of the vernacular at an early stage. Among the Arabs (remarks Abraham Abulafia around 1290; Neubauer 1884, p. 149), the Jews talk Arabic, Greek among the Greeks, Romance vernaculars (לעז) among the Romans, German among the Germans, Turkish among the Turks (תוגרמא, here Tatars?), and so forth. It is very surprising, then, that in Sicily they talk not only the vernacular, and Greek, like the local population, but have retained Arabic from the earlier period of Arab rule. Soon thereafter Mordecai Kimḥi (Neubauer 1885, p. 82) issues this complaint: Alas, in our times the majority of our sons and daughters talk Edomite (the language of the Christians), Arabic and Greek, indeed, the language of every people, but even most men do not understand "Jewish" (II Kings 18, 26); so how should women understand the terms of the Gemara?

The names of the various languages (cf. index s.v. לשון) are important for the original texts from which the translations were made (cf. p. 970): לעז means non-Hebrew, especially the local dialect[3] ערבי, הגרי, ישמעלי and also קדר, all refer to Arabic (Steinschneider 1877b, p. 254). Hagar and Ishmael lead to designations that disparage the nation and religion: "maid-servant" etc. "Should the son of the maid-servant inherit?" writes Ibn Aderet to Jacob (p. 924, cf. 950).[4] Ever since the time of Maimonides, Arabic is characterized as a degenerate form of Hebrew, though its linguistic richness is acknowledged (§4).

The Prefaces of the Translators

The material of interest for the origin and nature of the translations presents itself primarily, as has been said, in the prefaces. These became increasingly stereotypical in form and contents, even where they do not refer back to a classical predecessor, particularly to the "father" of the translators, Judah Ibn Tibbon on Baḥya, and the son Samuel on the *Moreh* [Maimonides' *Guide*].[5] A beginning is made already with Moses Gikatilia on Ḥayyug, and in the course of the thirteenth century translating develops into an art in its own right and with its own principles; Judah al-Ḥarizi, Abraham Ibn Ḥisdai (on al-Ghazālī, p. XXX), Shem Tov b. Isaac on *De anima*, Todros on the *Rhetoric*, the translators of Maimonides' commentary to the Mishna, later on Kalonymos on *Iggeret Baalei Ḥayyim*, and others all discuss this subject.

---

[3] [1] Joseph b. Todros (Halberstam and Steinschneider 1875f, p. 20) designates with הלועזים העלגים ארצות those countries in which Arabic is not understood (cf. Maimonides p. 417).

[4] [2] Agobard, however, puts forward the ancestry from Abraham. Cf. Steinschneider 1857b, p. 345 n. 1b; cf. טיט היין p. 680.

[5] [3] Identical prefaces to different translation are already encountered in Gundisalvi, certainly in Johannes of Capua, perhaps also in Abraham Abigedor (p. 797).

Maimonides, too, in his response to Samuel's letter, and Judah Ibn Bulat (p. 29) [page references are to *HUe*] give instructions to the translator.

Along with the development of the discipline emerges the technical term for translating (העתיק); before this, the terms for composing and translating had the status of shaky synonyms.[6] In addition to the plain designation, metaphors too are used, in which the "sacred" language is set opposite the "impure garment"; hence forms derived from קדש (index s.v. [Not included in this volume]). In one original metaphor, which can be put to use in various senses, [the original is likened to] money from the purse of the nations (below, p. 485). It reminds one of Gibbon's remark (III, chapter 21, [1955, vol. 1, p. 307]): The national pride of the Alexandrian Jews caused them to designate the gold and the jewels that they had stolen so late in history from their Egyptian masters as a sacred heritage of their ancestors.[7]

The Causes and Motives for the Translations

The causes for the translations were quite diverse, for instance the initiative of Jewish sponsors, who are frequently named, the earliest being perhaps Meshullam in Lunel (twelfth century), the most renowned Benveniste b. Lavi (around 1400), but also Christian rulers such as Alfonso (the Spanish interpreters were not unfaithful), Frederic II, Robert of Anjou, Don Pedro III (IV). The last motive for translating serious writings was to attain a new understanding or to disseminate knowledge among coreligionists who did not understand the original texts, taken together with national vindication, for example when confronted by Christian derision of the ignorance of the Jews and their not possessing a literature. In order to combat the pious zeal against "foreign monstrosities" (Isaiah 2:6), one invented the theory, smuggled in and current as early as the twelfth century, of an ancient Israelite wisdom that was supposedly being restored, just as stolen or lost goods are returned to their original owner (below, p. 505, 680, 1003 n. 38; cf. Favre 1856, II, 17, on poetic images, moral lessons p. 851, 885). It is highly probable that this art, too, served as a means of gaining a livelihood. Translators by training supposedly were working as professionals; however, no reference to a honorarium has been found so far (cf. p. 924), whereas it is part of the business of copyists of all kinds of Hebrew manuscripts to acknowledge receipt of their "fee". Ritter, the great historian of philosophy (1844, p. 6), had no right at all to deny the Latin translators of Averroes the "proper love for this work," a statement which perhaps he scarcely would have dared to make so unhesitatingly about a modern mechanical translator—a simple categorical judgment. But about Jews anything may be said that makes them contemptible. Assertions of this sort slap the face of history; they must be confronted with the testimonies of, for instance, Abraham de Balmes, Moses Alatino, and the unselfish

[6] [4] Cf. in the index s.v. הזר, הפך Zunz 1871, p. 435; Zunz 1876, III, 50.

[7] [5] Gibbon, too, knows of Jews only "national pride", even for the period of their struggle against oppression.

devotion of Elijah Delmedigo (Steinschneider 1881, p. 62), to name just a few. Renan intimates that the Latin editors of Averroes' works could buy from Jewish translators "per alcuni danari," and so also the authorship: one must ask, who, in a transaction of this kind, was really doing the dealing (cf. p. 971)?

Requirements and Apologies

The prefaces frequently open with a declaration that can be traced back to Samuel Ibn Tibbon, and that states that it is not the translator's self-conceit that has led him to this undertaking (p. 705 n. 347 etc., p. 752 n. 616b, and p. 904, also in the Anonymus p. 951c, Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 241/3, Kaspi?); Solomon Avigdor (p. 783 n. 141) parodies: "not for foolishness or lack of critical sense."

In translations from Arabic, the motive for translation leads into an inquiry as to how Hebrew has become impoverished on account of the Exile—an idea also stressed by encyclopaedists like Nathan Falaquera (p. 482, Steinschneider 1880, p.18)—whereas Arabic is said to dispose of a great [lexical] wealth, and how, then, Arabic, Chaldaean (Talmudic), or newly coined expressions are unavoidable. The requirements of a good translator are discussed, and the first among them is knowledge of both languages as well as of the discipline in question—Joseph b. Todros raises these requirements in connection with Ḥarizi's translation (p. 431 n. 433). Particular practical instructions are issued in their proper places (cf. §2). According to Samuel b. Ḥofni the translator must pay attention to 81 (?) things (p. 48).[8] A few of the translators' reports concerning original texts, their authors or translators, have some historical interest, more or less; here we call attention only to the information provided by Ibn Ezra concerning translations from Sanskrit (p. 372).

The diligence that is urged upon the translator from all sides secures him a position in the literature which is higher than one might expect. He is (according to Maimonides, p. 417) the companion of the author. Renan's disparaging verdict (Renan 1861, p. 161,[3] p. 204): "L'orient et le moyen âge n'ont jamais concu la traduction que *comme un mécanisme superficiel*," etc., should not be seen as applying to the rule but as an exception, and this not only with regard to Jewish writers. Closer to the truth is Gaspary (1885, I, 187): "The scholarship of the translators was defective; in these (Italian) versions one should not expect a high fidelity in the transmission. The Middle Ages never were able to do this with complete objectivity, and the ancient authors, too, when they appear here in the vernacular, appear travestied to a certain degree." In addition, the Jewish translators were not always sufficiently prepared for whatever discipline they encountered, and they admitted as much, but without underrating themselves. When, for instance, the translator of al-Fārābī's *Sophistics* maintains that there are translators from Arabic who cannot read the words properly, let alone grasp their meaning, this statement should be understood as being due to a lack of knowledge of the subject more than that of the

[8] [1] He has treated the principles of the translator in the introduction to the Pentateuch, according to Harkavy 1880, p. 4, 24 n. 50 a.

language. In the seventeenth century Joseph Delmedigo (1840, p. 92) speaks very disparagingly of the translations from Arabic; he had refused to study Arabic because everything that is beautiful in it, with only a few exceptions, was taken from Greek writings (ibid., p. 34). On the other hand, Zerachiah ben Isaac accuses his contemporary Hillel of obtaining his knowledge only from translations of Arabic writings (Steinschneider 1857a II, p. 129). Falaquera (p. 6) reproves translators for distorting their texts, and the Karaite Aaron b. Joseph (in Wolf 1715, vol. 4, p. 1114), for the same reason, apologizes for his borrowing from others. Another author, Elijah Bashyazi (1835, Art. 6, fol. 49b) traces the doubts concerning the opinions of the Greek philosophers to the Arabic and Hebrew translations, and Leon Joseph (p. 795) does the same in regard of knowledge of the secular sciences in general.

The translators themselves assiduously produce admissions and apologies. Frequently, they say, an incorrect text is responsible for an unsatisfactory translation; this is not just a pretext used by incompetent translators, as an anonymous author sarcastically remarks (p. 770 n. 85, cf., however, p. 795). Rarely was more than one manuscript available. Most of the Arabic texts were written in Hebrew script, and thus they may serve for identification, e.g., the *Meteorology* in Vatican, BA ebr. 378/1 (p. 134). I have registered Hebrew mss. of Arabic translations of Greek authors in Steinschneider 1877a; the sequel dealing with Muslim authors will appear in Steinschneider 1893. Sometimes the original texts to be translated were hard to come by, and they had to be procured from afar, even writings of Jewish authors, such as Maimonides' *Book of Commandments* from Egypt (p. 927). Certain sections of the commentary to the Mishna whose translation was done by an emissary from Rome in the Provence were hard to find (p. 927). In the fourteenth century, the University of Montpellier, on the occasion of whose jubilee the merits of the Jewish scholars were also brought to light recently, prohibited the sale of medical writings to Jews (p. 795). Ibn al-Fawwal explains errors of Hebrew with the pertinent remark (p. 923) that the language of the original exerts a power of attraction upon the translator—one might find in this an analogy to the grammatical [concept of] "attraction".

Quality of the Translations

Generally speaking, the Jewish translators should not fear comparison with any others; on an average they have read or understood their Arabic texts more correctly than Professors Eichhorn (p. 263), Schmölders (p. 296), not to mention Paulus (who translated the commentary on Isaiah of Saadia), and others. In popular literature (§529) one finds deviations from the extant sources which may be explained in opposite directions: on the one hand, we lack the actual original texts used for some of the Hebrew versions, for example, Barlaam (§532), Sendebar (§538), and others, so that the latter display versions whose original texts are unknown, but on the other hand it is conceivable that the adapters of the Hebrew versions, moving over unclaimed ground, allowed themselves the same liberty that their predecessors did for themselves. In scholarly literature, fidelity is sometimes pushed to the extreme of slavish imitation at the cost of meaning; the epigoni see their ideal in the service

of literalness—the same phenomenon everywhere! Solomon Ibn Ayyub (middle of the thirteenth century, p. 928) already sketches the two methods of translation: capturing the meaning, or translating literally.

Deviation from the Original

Intentional alterations made by the translators are difficult to subsume in neat categories; here it should suffice to name just a few and to give some examples. Omissions are prompted by religious or moral offense, by textual strangeness, difficulty, prolixity; Judah Ibn Tibbon omits the Arabic poems, quoted in Gabirol's *Ethics*, which he wanted to replace by Hebrew ones (p. 382); Abraham Ibn Ḥisdai, in [his version of] al-Ghazālī's *Ethics* (p. 343), has by his substitutions preserved sayings of Samuel ha-Nagid. Apart from conscious suppression of Muḥammad[9] and the Qur'an (cf. index), as well as specific Christian expressions, [terms like] "the Prophet" (e.g., p. 341) and "the Book" have crept in, perhaps inadvertently, a trinitarian prayer is translated (p. 795); Caspar etc., the three Magi, make their way incognito by way of Christian surgical texts into Jewish amulets, to be administered in the place of the traditional phylacteries.

Special mention must be made of book titles which in their various translations do not always allow the identification of the original text (e.g., §476); various relations, personal and objective reasons for preferring biblical usage are at work here. Even for those books of Aristotle that were well-known by way of Averroes, a fixed title emerged only at a late stage, although only extremely few different versions existed (p. 51). Only very few Arabic and Latin titles are simply transcribed in Hebrew letters, such as *Kanon*, *Arjuza*, *Ikrabadsin* (*Gerabadin* etc.), *Chirurgia* (*Cirugia* etc.), and relatively few are simply translated. A special investigation is required into the question whether certain titles of original works in Hebrew constitute a direct borrowing, or whether they go back to translations, particularly in cases of fabrications or pseudepigraphical writings.

The translators from Arabic looked around for tools, and already Samuel Tibbon took pains to obtain a renowned dictionary which was used, along with other Arabic writings, by Todros (p. 64, 294).

Hebraisms

The usage of the translators constitutes a significant era in the history of the Neo-Hebrew [i.e., post-Biblical Hebrew] language, much more important for the development of ideas and expressions than the peculiar linguistic excrescences of the Paytanim (liturgical composers), masterfully treated by Zunz. The two genres will occasionally employ identical means; they are only partially comparable to

[9] [1] The copyist of ms. Paris 1298 [?] writes "Moses" in the khuṭba instead of "Muḥammad." Jews have avoided, both from self-consciousness and fear, to call themselves Muḥammad.

medieval Latin. As early as the thirteenth century, attention is paid to the meaning and usage of Hebrew words on the part of the translators (Naḥmanides to Numbers 11:17 אצילות), i.e., by indicating "the language (expression) of the translators" (Isaac Albalag, p. 304; Schorr 1861, 87). The philosopher-Kabbalist Isaac Latif refers repeatedly to words of this sort, which also serve as a source for his own expressions.[10] Commenting on a remark of al-Ghazālī (*Kavvanot* I) on an Arabic technical term (Hebrew מלאכותי), Narboni refers to the translators who coin such terms. The translators from Arabic deserve credit for pre-modern Hebrew style, especially scientific usage. Derenbourg, as related in I. Loeb (1884, p. 302) cautions against "d'attribuer aux Arabes tout ce qui s'est fait de scientifique chez les Juifs du moyen âge," enumerating some Hebrew words which, as "scientific and philosophical" expressions, were created before the beginning of Arabic influence. It all depends, however, upon the meaning; a striking example is Derenbourg's remark that "סבה is older than עלה;" both words have received the abstract meaning of "cause" (cf. Levy 1876, III, 465) only on account of their Arabic homonyms.

The Arabic or Latin word is retained when there is no Hebrew equivalent, especially in the medical literature, and not just for materia medica; this is particularly true for the names of simple drugs from all domains of nature, knowledge of which led towards the literature of the so-called synonyma (p. 838), and, to a lesser degree, for the forms of the compound drugs in the antidotaria (p. 837) and pharmacopoea, not to mention those drugs which are named after their discoverer, author, main ingredient, or effect (for instance, theriac, faruq, soter, translated as מושיע, p. 371); even מתקאל, for a weight, gained currency, according to the testimony of Estori Farḥi (Edelmann 1852, fol. 63b bottom: instead of לערבית read לעברית), in medical translation. To this category also belongs the word "recipe" (commonly קח). As is well known, comparable phenomena could and still can be observed in scientific works written in other languages. To this category belong the plant names in Maimonides' commentary to the Mishna (p. 926). The Arabic or otherwise foreign word is frequently positioned before, or after, a Hebrew word that is synonymous or designates the genus, e.g., הספרדים האנדלוסים (*Moreh* I, 73; in the Arabic, one finds only "Andalusian"); Jacob b. Makhir presents the text of a whole verse in al-Ghazālī (p. 341). Words more easily receive the indigenous form when they are leading terms; some are naturalized to such a degree that they receive a Hebrew plural form, such as קטר ,לחן ,קטב (cf. the Arabic index); others occur only in special cases, as נוע ("genus"), perhaps only in Naḥum, לגזים, "riddles".

Historical Implications

It is too early to utilize the huge mass of the translations for the pragmatic purposes of a history that employs chronology and geography as its "eyes." A few observations must suffice here. In Europe, the translations naturally turn towards Jewish

[10] [1] *Sha'ar ha-Shamayim*, end of preface in Jellinek 1871, and chapter 46, ms. Mn. 46 f. 18; cf. Jellinek, 1862–1867, p. 3, 4.

works in Arabic language; this current began to be exhausted after the epoch-making writings of Maimonides (Munk 1843, p. 8). At first, the fanaticism of the Almohads in Spain drove the heads of Jewish clans, the likes of Josef Kimḥi, Judah Ibn Tibbon, Abraham Ibn Ezra, into neighboring countries then under Christian rule, where they transmitted the Arabic literature of their co-religionists. But as early as the year 1160, Ibn Ezra, roaming the Christian parts of Europe, translated an astronomical work by a Muslim author (p. 572), after he had done work on oriental astrology in 1146–48; he probably wrote on geomancy as well (p. 857). Thus it is readily conceivable how Judah Ibn Tibbon translated logical titles by al-Fārābī (p. 47); Isaac (Crispin), Samuel Ibn Tibbon and al-Ḥarizi translated scholarly and popular titles of Muslim authors; and Jacob b. Eleazar adapted at the same time (around 1200) the fables of Bidpai.

To all appearances the adaptations of Christian works, at first from the Latin, also begins at the end of the twelfth century, with nothing less than 24 medical translations by an anonymous author (1197–99, cf. index); however, this highly unusual case is probably to be explained by the conversion and relapse of the translator (p. 712). Soon thereafter (cf. p. 961), Berachia adapted the *Quaestiones* by Adelard of Bath, and according to unreliable sources, some fables and a lapidarium. We do not have any clue as to his motives. If he ever put his foot on English soil, he still could have not received his inspiration there, given that the local Jews obtained what little learning they had from Northern France until they were expelled. As for some small writings of the Salernitans, one is inclined to date them to the period before the great Arabic physicians, clad in Hebrew garments, dominated the scene. However, one cannot decide here on substantive grounds alone. Jewish translations sometimes blow, like Münchhausen's trumpet, outdated sounds; the dates of the manuscripts remain to be determined. Only after the culmination of the Arabic period, at the seam between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, did Christian texts (or translations), composed in Latin, Spanish, French, and Italian, enter into the circle of attractive implants on Hebrew soil. Judah Romano felt compelled to instruct his co-religionists that scholarship is "also" to be found among the Christians (p. 490). He produced short treatises, of which one was later to be translated back into Latin, by Aegidius de Columna! At the end of the fourteenth century some Jews study at Christian universities; Leon Josef encounters there Talmudic methods of disputation, complains about the lack of knowledge of secular science[s] among the Jews and the materialism of the physicians, and finds the Hebrew translations of scientific writings of the Greeks, the Arabs and the Christians deficient. The only known translator from both Arabic and Latin, Judah Natan, belongs to the middle of the fourteenth century. With few exceptions, the translators from Latin are found in southwestern Europe and Italy; Moses b. Maẓliaḥ and Samuel b. Jacob (thirteenth century (?), p. 718), as well as the baptized John, are from Capua, and some translators into Latin, Faraj and Moses, are from Sicily and Palermo.

There is some uncertainty concerning the few texts whose original language may be Spanish, French or Italian, in part because the translators do not indicate the language, and in part because the Romance words display vernacular forms that depend upon the homeland of the translator, or even that of the copyist. The Neo-Greek

literature is probably represented by one work only (p. 630, cf. 536), and so also Persian literature (p. 754)[11]; there are no direct translations from Syriac (p. 844).

"The most cherished comes last" (אחרון חביב)—this is what some readers may think at this point, readers who have impatiently roamed with us through various languages and nations, expecting to find at least something from Germany, whose language and scholarship the Jews have served well for a century—more than for Arabic [studies] in its time—repeatedly slighted, [enjoying] formal legal equality status by law, but also a preferential hostility that was not what they hoped for; Germany, whose classical authors have been, in the course of this century, adapted to Hebrew poetry and prose (Steinschneider 1871, p. 21 and 1852) in the interest of entertaining and instructing German and German-speaking Jews of all countries in Europe. The German Middle Ages presented the Jews with tortures, the burning of people and of books, double tariff for Emperor and feudal lord at the toll-bar and at the cemetery, amnesty and awards for deserting the ancestral creed and law, superstition for all risks of life, compassion and mercy, too; for some individuals, all that there was in the southern lands, but no scholarship, nor any enlightenment. The duty of the historian is not to keep silent about this surprising fact because it hurts him, but rather to explain it. The literature of translations offers irrefutable testimony; it attests to a widespread zeal that surmounted all obstacles, so that it saved authors from disappearance and oblivion. What [this literature] has to tell about Germany fills, from 1,000 printed pages, not even half a page: logical *quaestiones* by a professor in Heidelberg (died 1394), translated one century later from Latin by a Spanish Jew (p. 469), Old-German names of herbs (p. 339), magical precepts, most likely not by Arnold of Saxony (p. 957); the anonymous author of a philosophical work was in Saxony (p. 140); Solomon b. Judah (from where?) taught for two years (1368) in Germany (p. 426, mentioned here for the first time); excerpts from Jo. Müller's (Regiomontanus') *Ephemerides* (p. 641) appear towards the end of our era in Italy; the "great" Albertus is German by origin only, and his Hebrew adaptations are not even that. Even in Slavic countries it is the fruits of Italian culture that arise in the sixteenth century. German Jews in the Middle Ages shine as students of the northern French [scholars] by means of their erudition in the discipline of the Law, for whose tremulous observation no martyrdom is hard enough. This piety, however, is a sad and gloomy one, without the light of science,[12] like that of their milieu. Asher b. Yeḥiel, fleeing from Germany and elected to be a rabbi in Toledo, felt his need to gain knowledge about astronomy, important for the religious rites, and was instrumental in the production of Isaac Israeli's work (1310) which also contains interesting historical information: at this time, a Christian in Brandenburg who calculated future eclipses had to die at the stake.

---

[11] [1] Gaffarell's "exorbitant curiosities" indulge in fables about a Hebrew translation of one Ḥomer from the Persian of one Hamehalzel (Wolf 1715 I, p. 363); Carmoly (1839 I, 191, cf. Lb. IV, 667 [?]) associates him with Ḥammai Gaon, an equally fabricated figure!

[12] [1] Even from the extremely small scientific material registered by Zunz 1875, p. 166: cf. Steinschneider 1889, some items must be omitted.

The history of the individual sciences in Germany fills the gap of the Middle Ages with long introductions from other countries. Valentin Rose (1874, p. 43), it is true, has stressed the fact that Germans of the sixth-seventh centuries were transmitters of medical literature, producing numerous translations from Greek into Latin[13]; information about Jewish scholars in Europe, however, does not go nearly that far back into the past. German folk literature, Nordic knighthood, the literature of meister- and minne-sang, were far from Jewish thought (p. 968),[14] although one Jewish minnesinger exists, Süsskind of Trimburg, a cherished subject of articles and lectures since 1840, but without substantial gain of information. S. Gelbhaus finds Jewish elements everywhere.[15] I have discovered in Oxford an old German adaptation of the King Arthur saga, printed with Hebrew letters, and some songs may have been preserved by Jews in their script,[16] in a time where, after all, it was only this script that distinguished Jewish German from Christian German. The large field, however, of Judaeo-German, which has been deemed worthy of scholarly treatment only recently, is outside our field of research. Regarding the literary history, it may be added that Judah "the Pious" (died 1217 or 1213) forbids to wrap books in paper on which romances (רומאנץ?) are written. Someone wrapped a humash [Pentateuch] in parchment whereupon futilities, quarrels of the kings of peoples were written in the vernacular (לעזים), and there came a pious person, tore up the parchment and threw it away (*Sefer ha-Ḥasidim*, n. 141). A curious detail is the translation back into Hebrew of two Hebrew (§383) and one Arabic (p. 884) texts; also the translation of their own works by Judah ben Salomo Kohen[17] and Jacob Carsono are rare phenomena.

Historical Matters

We should not draw any hasty conclusions concerning the contents of the translations, since the individuality of the translators and diverse incidental factors determine the choice of subject. We also ought not to infer from the extent of our coverage; due to the poor state of our knowledge, as well as the lesser interest in the subject matter, sections II and III go into detail only in some places. Eventually, in fact, it becomes clear that Jewish thinkers were interested in the main in Averroes' treatments of Aristotle, and that it is they to whom the preservation of those works is mainly due. Opposing him stands al-Ghazālī. In medicine, Avicenna's Canon dominates Hippocrates and Galen; no single Christian author has such a prominent position.

---

[13] [2] When Rose designates the Germans as "barbarians," he does so from the standpoint of the Latin authors.

[14] [3] Cf. Gottschall's verdict on that poetry; cf. further Steinschneider 1871.

[15] [4] Gelbhaus 1887, cf. p. 73–83; 1889.

[16] On the lullaby, fabricated by Zappert himself, cf. Zunz 1876, III, 107 (cf. ibid. 266: "jüdisch und deutsch"); Steinschneider 1863, p. 148.

[17] Delitzsch *ad* ms. Lp. 26[3] recognized that this is not a translation (in the normal sense).

Mathematics was hardly represented up to the middle of the thirteenth century (p. 505). The relation of the Jews to foreign poetry can only be exhaustively treated in a large-scale monograph; here only a few brief remarks must suffice. Jewish poets living in Arabia before Muḥammad's time, occasionally treated by Nöldeke (1864) and in a monograph (1874) by Delitzsch,[18] can hardly be distinguished from the pagan Arabic authors. Later Arabic poetry (cf. the rich anthology compiled by von Hammer in seven volumes) knows precious little about the Jews, who are ridiculed. Abraham Ibn al-Fakhkhar (Steinschneider 1874a, p. 40) and Abraham Ibn Sahl, whose conversion to Islam was not deemed sincere, were writing poetry in Spain in the thirteenth century; the extract from the latter's divan, available in print since 1875 (55 pp.) remain unnoticed [see Ibn Sahl 1875, recently translated into English 1981] (cf. Landberg 1883, n. 178 [?]); another author is the poetess Kasmuna (? Steinschneider 1879, p. 14). Lebrecht (1841), following Gayangos, has brought these poets to light. Philologians and exegetes writing in Arabic from the tenth century onward, Judah Ibn Quraysh, Jonah, Tanḥum, quote Arabic poets, and even the Qur'an, just as Geonim before them do, for linguistic purposes; teachers of morals cite from poems and (ethical) sayings (see above, §V). A Hebrew meter is borrowed from Arabic, probably in the Maghrib, in the tenth century (cf. p. 911). Moses Ibn Ezra writes on the history of Hebrew poetry and rhetoric following the model of Arabic *adab* writings, presupposing the superiority of the Arabic art etc. (Schreiner 1888). The world view of the Jews and their thoughts about life had become very serious; their education had become a scholarly one. Being averse to products of fancy, they allowed for meter and rhyme [only] for the sake of scholarship and admonition, apart from the divine service that was overgrown with hymns. The psalms versified in Arabic by Ḥefez (p. 382), however, were hardly meant for the liturgy. Maimonides is not interested in the language of the wedding songs, but in their contents; frivolous elements in the holy language add profanation to sin (*ad* Abot I, 17). Similar views on songs are quoted already by Alfasi in the name of a gaon (Goldziher 1881, p. 180), and without naming a source also in Elijah di Vidas (chapter 40, fol. 104 b). The favorite student of Maimonides (p. 33) interdicts poetry no less than satire, panegyrics, and love [poems], which are exactly the principal themes of the Arabs. Only the self-appointed translator of the *Moreh*, using Hariri (p. 851), transplants, by means of a witty parody, a piece of frivolity onto Hebrew soil, a frivolity that reached its apogee in Immanuel and lived on despite all the indignation of the rigorists. I am in possession of a number of such very frivolous versets from the hands of L. Dukes, recently deceased, who has written the vita of Ḥarizi and taken him as a model in many aspects. In the fourteenth century, the Spaniard Abu l-Rabi'(Solomon) Ibn Ya'ish compiled a dictionary of the difficult expressions in the works of Arabic poets. Still later, individual serious Arabic poems find their Hebrew translators, as al-Ghazālī's by Gavison (1575 p. 347), an anonymous שער אלערב by Moses b. Isaac Ibn משיש (above, p. XI).

[18] Steinschneider 1865, p. 17; 1874b, p. 28, cf. 1876, p. 90. French translation of poems in Hirschfeld 1883, p. 173 ff.

The great majority by far of the translators worked along the borders of Arabic and Romance cultures, in the Provence and in northern Spain, in southern Italy, and, towards the end of the thirteenth century in Rome. Curiously, it was in the Provence and Sicily during the thirteenth century that the new mysticism, disguised as "tradition" (kabbala), transformed the ten separate intellects of the religious philosophers into aeons (sefirot), installed at their top a triad, borrowed from Christianity, and decorated itself with the false luster of ancient mysticism (numbers and letters mysticism), so as to subjugate the hair-splitting casuistry as well as the world wisdom longing for some outlet, thus darkening the last centuries of the Middle Ages inwardly as well.

Statistics

It is also worthwhile to survey the translations statistically, in round numbers. So far, they consist of the writings of 30 Greek authors, known by their names (almost all of them by way of the Arabic), 70 Arabic authors, apart from 15 anonymous ones, 50 Jewish authors, among them 10 Karaites, 100 Christian authors, apart from 15 anonymous ones (in section II and IV), and texts that are difficult to classify (in III p. 835). The number of texts, not yet counted, is bound to reach several hundred, and the number of extant works in manuscript form would exceed, taking into account multiple copies,[19] a thousand. If it is then a small exaggeration when Helfferich (R. Lull p. 98) counts in the libraries Hebrew translations of Latin writings, particularly scholastic ones, "in the hundreds," it is in fact surprising that far more Christian authors of the Middle Ages are translated than Arabic authors together with their Greek sources. There is no ghetto for the human mind! After all, the canonical law had to take extreme pains to sever the social ties between Jews and Christians (according to a good authority that I have read). Translating was just one branch of the learning as such whose one-sided superior position among Jews, Arabs, and Christians was transferred from the investigation of the Holy Scriptures to that of the secular ones. Under the papal regime in the Provence, there existed a special tax for those Jews who had not trained their children either for scholarship or for commerce (Maulde 1883, 1884, p. 99). The only nobility Jews ever knew, other than that of conviction, was that of scholarship, to which everyone could elevate himself and his children. Ever since antiquity, rabbis have been called "kings," i.e., teachers (Gross 1883, 1884, p. 167). A noble knight was allowed to boast of his inability to read and write: the Jewish illiterate was part of the mob (עם הארץ). When, however, the dignity lowered itself to a paid office of the congregation, and

[19] The enormous number of 90 is curiously to be found for Averroes' Middle Commentary to the *Logic* (p. 59), despite the predominant hermeneutics which is peculiarly Talmudic. In view of the greater number of manuscripts of the *Canon* of Avicenna various translations are conceivable; the printed edition belongs in the [immediate] neighborhood of our period.

the practitioner no longer had another source of income (formerly often that of a physician, cf. Schechter 1892, p. 128), and when the predominant occupation with ritual practice and unrestrained sermonizing took over the office of the rabbi, then rabbis and preachers were portrayed with fine irony (Kaspi, *Testament*) or noble disdain by men of philosophical culture.[20]

The translation of the works of Maimonides led to a struggle, frequently told, for which the zealots paid, literally, with their tongues, the well-known punishment for slander, the Jews generally with the autodafé of the Talmud (1240); the quarrel was terminated by the French expulsion (1306). In its fight against the mixture of the old absolute and unreflected faith with Aristotelianism, colored by the Arabic Neoplatonism, orthodoxy had history on its side; it might be asked, however, whether the past must be acknowledged as supreme judge over the future. Conservatism in its unconditional form is fortunately a rare phenomenon; its limits are manifest everywhere. Have ritual and legal studies consistently closed themselves off against foreign and scholarly influences? After all, candidates for the office of the rabbi in our most recent schools still have to be examined on sexual problems according to Josef Karo! But is it not superstition and heresy to impart emanationist intentions to the prayers? Are not the sefirot themselves a parody of the spheres? In spite of this, the casuist Nahmanides pays homage to the new Kabbala. Or are not the ever-more cumbersome casuistry and asceticism the consequence of an exalted past? The most recent period has thrown a light of historical criticism on that. On the other hand, it has, to my knowledge, not yet been investigated whether the Halakha was touched by Arabic science and its views on natural science. For this, only a few indications can be given here. As is well known, Maimonides gave offense by placing the essence of his philosophizing faith at the beginning of his book of Law. But even in the tenth century Saadia Gaon calculated the partition of the inheritance, in a monograph whose fragment I have retrieved, according to the method of the Muslim scholars which came to be a special branch of Islamic law, called *'ilm al-fara'iḍ*, and furnished its representatives with a surname, *al-Faradī*, which probably also became a family name.[21] Casuists were occupied by the problem whether birds living in trees[22] have to be ritually slaughtered; whether using the astrolabe was allowed on Sabbath; someone finalized the interdiction with the wordplay איסור לאו (astrolabium is not allowed). Jewish mothers were allowed to conduct a hunt on the heads of their children in the afternoon of the Sabbath on the ground [of the theory] that the killed animals allegedly do not procreate their own kind (*Shibbolei ha-Leqet* §126, Zidkiyahu 1886, fol. 48); this is the theory of *generatio aequivoca*, used by Aristotle for mice, by Ibn Ṭufayl even for *Ḥayy ibn Yaqẓān*. In the middle of our century, a German rabbi debated in all seriousness the direction

[20] Moses b. Joshua of Narbonne 1852, *ad* Moreh, fol. 2, 17b, 38; Ḥanokh al-Konstantini in Steinschneider 1872, p. 109; but cf. Zerahiah ha-Levi's sermon in Schorr 1865, 96, and Abravanel 1739, ch. 7 fol. 9b, against the philosophical preachers.

[21] Comparable to this would be the polemics of a Karaite in ms. Brit. Mus. 2575.

[22] Perhaps in connection with the tree maidens (Clouston 1887, I, 182)?

of the Lulab at our antipodes. There is no lack of matching phenomena in our filial religions, e.g., the excommunication of rats which were quite formally given a counsel for the defense.[23] The canonical trial (1649) against a man who went a short way on Sunday to visit his sick mother (Lea 1869, p. 502) destroys the basis for the popular derision of the "Sabbath way." In many things a careful investigation will be needed to decide where one is entitled to speak of "rabbinical ideas," about whose influence the usually thorough Günther speaks (1884, I, 150, referring to the uncritical Bergel). Most difficult is the question of originality in the realm of superstition and the occult sciences. Jews have believed and practiced more than enough of this, but as to the literature, they were in any case not the teachers of the Christians. By giving the devil the standing of a principle, they established a real foundation for superstition[24]; cf. the exceedingly learned "Traité des superstitions," furnished with all authorities, by J. B. Thiers (third edition, Paris 1712), where superstition (I, Chapter 9) is defined as that which cannot be attributed to nature, or God, or the church (!). Yet volumes II–IV treat of superstition that is connected with the sacraments. "Superstitio" is not used, however, exclusively by Christian theologians talking about the Jewish Law (Thiers I, 101) and Jewish religion on the whole. According to Gibbon (IV, 79), the blind superstition and the despicable slavery of the miserable exiled Jews were bound to provoke the disdain of the philosophical emperor Julian; it was soon thereafter, writes Gibbon (p. 81), that the clergy in Jerusalem identified, "by unquestionable tradition," the scenes of all memorable events! "Double measure and double weight" are still to be found among historians, when they report about Jews.

Why does it seem to be a "peculiarity" of the Jews, so often emphasized, that literature and life of foreign origin surfaces again and again? In fact this peculiarity often is only a product of ignorance. The fundamental ideas of the Jews—unity and spirituality of the universal principle, equal rights, and charity—have admitted, and assimilated, many foreign elements, even poisonous elements, much to the confusion of the incessant funeral sermonizers [of the Jewry].

How many and how manifold the subjects are, to whose discussion the translation literature could lead, is shown by the *index rerum*.

The Author's Position

Finally, a word about the orientation of this book. I have conducted my research in the first place for myself; there have always been men who counted scholarship among the activities undertaken for their own sake, much as other people do for other pleasures. Again, in the first place, I am writing for readers of this sort, that is,

[23] Lea 1869, p. 427–30; cf. Moed Qatan 17 in Landau 1884, p. 242.

[24] Gibbon 1854–1855, III, p. 243 (ch. 25 n. 46) talks about a Jewish and a Christian system of the infernal demons, without furnishing a reference for the former.

those who will look up single details, whom I may call "hit and run" readers; this book is not planned for a continuous reading, nor for many buyers, indication of which is the small number of copies, printed at my own expense. Additamenta and corrections should be communicated to me publicly, not privatim; I am too old to utilize them or to take offense with reprimand. I decline any responsibility for eventual extracts from and adaptations [of my work] which aim at "popularizing" my research; there are fields which never will become popular, because understanding them supposes a certain training, and having an interest in them requires a special intellectual orientation. This is part of literary history: what is served to the "people" is often a meager bone on which water is poured. Certain perceptions are neither a natural gift nor something produced; whoever does not cultivate them will not gain anything, nor does he deserve anything.

I am writing about Jews, but not for them, not *pro domo*. Enemies of the Jews will not be instructed, least by history; events of the year 1892 show this quite impressively. The "Manneken Pis" in Brussels is waiting for a worthy companion. Taking into account the culture of the old Jews in the interest of the rights of the contemporary ones would mean to betray the inalienable human right which, for reasons of alleged expediency, may be violated by a majority, but never be removed by law. Not even impartial history can prevent injustice, and who writes this history? The history of the filial religions is one of incessant attempts of matricide; if ever one of them succeeds, then the perpetrators fall together with their deed.

I have here indicated my own position; the unprejudiced reader will not miss it anywhere in the book.

Saying farewell to this book which has demanded the greater half of a long life, is in a way saying farewell to life itself, and every ending reminds us how tiny the individual human being is compared with the universe; but it is precisely this idea that makes us explore the relation between the One and the Universe, a relation that teaches us that the finite becomes part of the infinite, without losing its identity.

References

Abravanel, Isaac. 1739. *Ateret Zeqenim*. Amsterdam.

Abū l-Fidā' Ismā'īl ibn 'Alī. 1848. *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, ed. J. T. Reinaud. Paris.

Bashyazi, Elijah ben Moses. 1835. *Aderet Eliyahu*. Yevpatoriya.

Benfey, Theodor. 1859. *Pantschatantra: fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen, und Erzählungen*. Leipzig.

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias. 1857. *Gott in der Geschichte : oder, Der Fortschritt des Glaubens an eine sittliche Weltordnung*. Leipzig.

Camus, Armand Gaston. 1800. Notice des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale […] concernant l'Histoire des animaux, d'Aristote, traduite en latin par Michel Scotus […]. *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques* […] 6:387–458.

Carmoly, N. 1839. Historische und literarische Analecte: 12. Über mehrere ältere didaktische Gedichte. *Israelitische Annalen* 1:188–91, 312 (Nachträge und Berichtigungen).

Clouston, W A. 1887. *Popular Tales and Fictions: Their Migrations and Transformations:* Edinburgh, London.

Delitzsch, Franz. 1874. *Jüdisch-arabische Poesien aus vormuhammedischer Zeit: ein Specimen aus Fleischers Schule als Beitrag zur Feier seines Jubiläums*. Leipzig.
Delmedigo, Joseph. 1840. *Melo Ḥofenayim*. Edited by A. Geiger. Berlin.
Edelmann, Zevi Hirsch. 1852. *Caftor wa-pherach auctore Pharchi (Parchi)*. Berlin.
Favre, Guillaume, Jacques Adert, Alphonse Favre, Edmond Favre, Auguste Emmanuel Turrettini, Angelo Mai, and August Wilhelm von Schlegel. 1856. *Mélanges d'histoire littéraire*. Geneva.
Gaspary, Adolfo. 1885. *Geschichte der italienischen Literatur*. Strassburg.
Geiger, Abraham. 1865. *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte: in vierunddreissig Vorlesungen*. Breslau.
Gelbhaus, Sigmund. 1887. *Über Stoffe altdeutscher Poesie*. Berlin.
Gelbhaus, Sigmund. 1889. *Mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung in ihrer Beziehung zur biblisch-rabbinischen Literatur.* 1: *Freidanks Bescheidenheit.* Frankfurt am Main.
Gibbon, Edward. 1854–1855. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. 8 vols. London.
Gibbon, Edward. 1955. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. (London 1776–1788). Vol. 40–41. Chicago.
Goldziher, I. 1881. Notiz. Arabische Äußerungen über Gebräuche der Juden beim Gebet und Studium. *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 20:177–83.
Gross, Henri. 1883, 1884. Étude sur Simson ben Abraham de Sens. *Revue des études juives* 6: 167–86, 7: 40–77.
Günther, Siegmund. 1884. *Lehrbuch der Geophysik und physikalischen Geographie 1*. Stuttgart.
Halberstam, S. J., and Moritz Steinschneider. 1875. *Qevuẓat mikhtavim be-'inyanei ha-maḥloqet 'al devar sefer ha-moreh ve-ha-mada'*. Bamberg.
Harkavy, Abraham. 1880. *Rav Shemuel ben Hofni and his Works.* Vol. 1, *Zikhron le-Rishonim vegam le-Aḥaronim*. St. Petersburg; Leipzig. Hebrew.
Hirschfeld, H. 1883. Essai sur l'histoire des juifs de Médine. *Revue des études juives* 7:167–93, 10: 10–31.
Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, Aḥmad b. al-Qāsim. 1884. *Kitāb 'Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, ed. A. Müller. Königsberg.
Ibn Sahl al-Isrā'īlī, Ibrāhīm. 1875. *Dīwān Ibrāhīm ibn Sahl al-Isrā'īlī*. Cairo.
Ibn Sahl al-AndalusI, IbrahIm. 1981. *The Diwan of Abu Ishaq Ibrahim ibn Abu 'Aish ibn Sahl al Israili*. Edited by Arthur Wormhoudt. Oskaloosa, Iowa.
Jellinek, Adolf. 1862–1867. Ginzei ha-Melekh le-Isaac ibn Latif. *Kochbe Jizchak* 28:3–4. Hebrew.
Jellinek, Adolf. 1871. Introduction to Sha'ar ha-Shamayim of Ibn Latif. *Ha-Shahar* 2:81–97. Hebrew.
Landau, Markus. 1884. *Die Quellen des Dekameron*. Stuttgart.
Landberg, Carlo. 1883. *Catalogue de manuscrits arabes provenant d'une bibliothèque privée à El-Medîna et appartenant à la maison E.J. Brill*. Leiden.
Lea, Henry Charles. 1869. *Studies in Church History. The Rise of the Temporal Power.–Benefit of Clergy.–Excommunication*. Philadelphia; London.
Lebrecht, Fürchtegott. 1841. Juden als Arabische Dichter. *Literaturblatt des Orients* 17: 244–254.
Levy, Jacob, Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, and August Wünsche. 1876. *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*. Leipzig.
Libri, Guillaume. 1838. *Histoire des sciences mathématiques en Italie depuis la renaissance des lettres jusqu'à la fin du dix-septieme siècle*. Paris.
Loeb, Isadore. 1884. Bibliographie. *Revue des études juives* 8:285–322.
Maulde, R. de. 1883, 1884. Les juifs dans les états français du pape. *Revue des études juives* 7: 227–51, 8: 96–120.
Moses b. Joshua of Narbonne. 1852. *Be'ur le-Sefer Moreh nevukhim*, ed. J. Goldenthal. Vienna.
Munk, Salomon. 1843. *Commentaire de R. Tan'houm de Jérusalem sur le livre de Habakkouk*. Paris.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1884. Review of Guedemann's 'Geschichte des Erziehungswesen und der Cultur der abendlaendischen Juden', etc., Part Two. *Revue des études juives* 9:144–51.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1885. Documents inédits (suite). *Revue des études juives* 11:80–94.
Nöldeke, Theodor. 1864. *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber*. Hannover.

Renan, Ernest. 1861. *Averroès et l'averroïsme: essai historique*. 2e édition revue et augmentée. Paris.
Ritter, Heinrich. 1844. *Über unsere Kenntniss der arabischen Philosophie und besonders über die Philosophie der orthodoxen arabischen Dogmatiker*. Göttingen.
Rose, Valentin. 1874. Über die Medicina Plinii. *Hermes* 8:18–66.
Schechter, Solomon. 1892. Notes sur Messer David Léon. *Revue des études juives* 24:118–38.
Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1865. Sermon of R. Zerahiah, Pupil of R. Ḥasdai Crescas. *He-Ḥalutz* 7:96–101. Hebrew.
Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1861. Isaac Albalag (Cont.) *He-Ḥalutz* 6:85–94. Hebrew.
Schreiner, Martin. 1888. Le Kitâb al-Mouhâdara wa-l-moudhâkara de Moise b. Ezra et ses sources. *Revue des études juives* 21:98–117; 22: 62–81, 236–249.
Sprengel, Kurt Polycarp Joachim. 1792. *Versuch einer pragmatischen Geschichte der Arzneikunde*. Halle.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1852–60. *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1857a. Notes on the Life of R. Zeraḥya ben Yisḥaq. *Oẓar Nehmad* 2:229–45. Hebrew.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1857b. *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century*. London.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863. *Anfragen*. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 6:128.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1865. Ave-Lallemant: Das deutsche Gaunerthum. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 8:13–7; 113–6.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1867. Abraham Judaeus-Savasorda und Ibn Ezra. Zur Geschichte der mathematischen Wissenschaften im XII. Jahrhundert. *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* 12:1–44.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1871. Über die Volksliteratur der Juden. *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte* 2:1–21.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1872. Hebräische Handschriften in Parma. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 12:31–7; 53–7; 104–20.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874a. Review of 'Geschichte des Unterrichts'. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 14:15–8; 37–45.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874b. Notice on Delitzsch's 'Juedisch-arabische Poesien'. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 14:28.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1876. Anzeigen. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 16:89–92.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877a. Manoscritti arabici in caratteri ebraici. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studi Orientali* 1:65–79, 82–97, 128–341, 333–8, 361–9.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877b. *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden, nebst Anhängen verwandten Inhalts*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 6, no. 3. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1878. Review of 'Histoire de la médecine arabe par Leclerc'. *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte der Medicin und medicinische Geographie* 1:356–64, 437–51.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879. Kulturgeschichte. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 19:11–5
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880. Natan b. Joel Palquera. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 20:17–20
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881. Elia del Medigo. *Hebräische Bibliographie* 21:61–71.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1889. Miscellen. *Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Literatur* 9:72–85.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1893. Schriften der Araber in hebräischen Handschriften, ein Beitrag zur arabischen Bibliographie. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 47:335–84.
Wolf, Johann Christoph. 1715. *Bibliotheca Hebraea*. 4 vols. Hamburg; Leipzig.
Zidkiyahu figlio di, Abraham. 1886. *Sefer Shibole ha-leket*, ed. S. Buber. Vilna.
Zunz, Leopold. 1871. "Verfassen und übersetzen" hebräisch ausgedrückt. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 25:435–48.
Zunz, Leopold. 1875. *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*. 2. Aufl. Berlin.
Zunz, Leopold. 1876. *Gesammelte Schriften*. 3 vols. Leipzig

Part One. Philosophy. Chapter Three. Jews

Charles H. Manekin, Y. Tzvi Langermann, and Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt

|368| §211. [Abraham ben David ha-Levi (Ibn Daud)] In this chapter we deal with a number of treatises that cannot be called philosophical or scientific in the strict sense. Abraham ben David (Arabic: Dā'ūd, in corrupted form, Dior[1]) ha-Levi from Toledo, suffered a martyr's death (shortly after 1180?).[2] |369| [For his milieu and a possible reconstruction of his life, see Gerson Cohen's introductory essay to his edition and translation of Ibn Daud's popular *Sefer ha-Qabbalah* (*Book of Tradition*) Ibn Daud 1967, esp. xvi–xlii; on the possible identification of Ibn Daud with the translator Avendauth, see M. Th. d'Alverny 1954; for the oppposing view, see the literature quoted in A. Eran 1998, 301, n. 1 and 4. The misidentification of Avendauth with Johannes Hispalensis is discussed in

[1] דאור in Ḥasdai Crescas's 'אור ה, treatise 1 (Crescas 1555, fol. 1a; spelled correctly in the Vienna edition, Crescas 1860, fol 4a, last line and Joseph ben Shem Tov's commentary to Prophiat Duran's *Al tehi ke-avotekha* ("Do not be like your fathers") Duran 1844, fol.11b. Cf. Dukes 1843d, 802): האמונה הרמה, p. 82. ‹Cf. 672 below.›

[2] הנהרג in קבוצות מכתבים (see Halberstam and Steinschneider 1875); according to Isaac Israeli יסוד עולם 1846, fol. 86a and Zacuto in the edition of יוחסין in Krakow 1580, fol. 162b): והוא קדש השם ברבים [See ed. Filipowski and Freimann 1924, 220] and הקדוש in Joseph ben Shem Tov, l. c. For the year 1180 (for his astronomical work), see older sources in Wolf 1715, 35, 49; Steinschneider 1852, 676; Guttmann 1879, 1, starts with Yeḥiel Heilprin. [*Seder ha-dorot* 1882]. Nothing is known to me about a generally considered birth year "around 1110." It occurs first with Graetz 1875, VI, 190, as usual with such dates; Schmiedl 1869, 146 (cf. 232 n. 1, "long before Maimonides"), presumably takes his 1110 date from there (without a source).

C.H. Manekin (✉)
Department of Philosophy, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA
e-mail: manekinc@umd.edu

Y.T. Langermann
Department of Arabic, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel
e-mail: tzvilangermann@yahoo.com

H.H. Biesterfeldt
Seminar für Orientalistik und Islamwissenschaften, GB 2/39 Universitätsstrasse 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany
e-mail: Hinrich.Biesterfeldt@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1_6, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

Robinson 2003.] Abraham wrote for a friend who had asked him about the problem of free will (1160) the book אלעקידה אלרפיעה (*The Exalted Creed*),[3] one of the first attempts to achieve a compromise between Jewish belief and the Arabic peripatetic philosophy.[4] ‹On the title cf. Bacher 1892a.› It contains, for instance, an explanation of the ten categories, which are said to be alluded to in Psalm 139 (ed. Ibn Daud 1852, 8), explicitly mentioning the book of Aristotle with the Greek name קטאגוריש as well as an explanation for the meaning of the term, doubtlessly מקולאת in the Arabic text, for which the translator coins the Hebrew term מאמרות (p. 3).[5] In the introduction the author states that Saadia's *Book of Beliefs and Opinions* is the only book that he can recommend to his coreligionists who are interested in theoretical philosophy[6] and who require serious guidance in their attempts to verify their creed.[7] But, he adds, Saadia's book is not sufficient for this purpose, and Ibn Gabirol's *Fountain of Life* does not specifically take the Jewish nation into account,

[3] Isaac Israeli has the Arabic title (the bracketed title האמונה רמה, which is not in יוחסין, is presumably due to the editor); so does Motot; see Schiller-Szinessy's catalogue 1876, vol. 1, 138, 140).

[4] האותות וההסכמה, p. 2; (cf. 83, l. 9; Steinschneider 1887b, 194); cf. 82 and the comparison of Torah and philosophy with two masters, as well as the comparison on 2 with two lights; see the parallels with Dukes, נחל (1853, 51); Steinschneider 1883a, 94. – For the work, see Gugenheimer 1850, see also Gugenheimer 1851, 506; Munk 1859, 268 and 458; Kaufmann 1877a, 241 ff (see n. 6); Guttmann 1879 (Foreward and Table of Contents, 1–8; the book is a reprint of *MGWJ* 1877–78, a fact not mentioned to the reader). A biography of the author as Pinsker's introduction in his ms. 56. – The aforementioned edition of the text (Ibn Daud 1852, 21), where the parts of the soul are mentioned, runs as follows: (1) What is the soul and why do we admit its existence? (2) Is it a substance or an accident? (3) The powers or faculties (p. 23), the vegetative soul (p. 28), the animal soul (p. 26), touch and taste, smell and hearing (p. 27), the common sense (p. 28), המצייר, ומחשב מדמה (p. 29), הרעיוני, הזוכר , (p. 30). These then are the ten faculties of perception (השגות), five external, five internal, then the motive power (מניע), that of the the voluntary movement [reading ההעתק for ההנתק] and that of the natural movement, like pulse and breathing, with the result that there are 19 powers (including the 7 vegetative.) Next follows (p. 30) the proof for the existence of the powers and their specific functions; the rational power (הכח המדבר) and the intellect. Questions: Whether the soul is eternal or originated; whether there is one or many souls (p. 33, cf. p. 36); The rational power is incorporeal, etc., and is imperishable (pp. 34–41). – On polemics against Islam (pp. 77 ff.) see Steinschneider 1877c, 353 (in the Index, on p. 428, detach the reference "p. 368 Pseudo-Abraham ben David"). Kaufmann (1885b, 252) finds relations to the אפהאם of Samuel Ibn Abbas. Cf. Schreiner 1888, 628 ff. On the audacious interpretation of עם, see n. 525 below.

[5] See Steinschneider 1869a, 168; Steinschneider 1870a, 75 n. 2 and n. 410 [sic]. Cf. לשון בעלי הגיון, in opposition to בעלי חכמת הדבור, i.e., mutakallimun, on 75 and, on the same page, הפילוסופים והמדברים; instead of "Sokrates" in 11 read "Hippokrates", see 21, where he is called the greatest of the טבעיים, "Naturforscher," according to Guttmann 1879, 15 n. 2, 3; therefore he associates (p. 58) the טבעיים (p. 15) with the physicians in opposition to the philosophers; however, the term "טבעיים" denotes also natural philosophers (p. 41). Guttmann endeavored to demonstrate Abraham's sources. That of the "eminently striking simile" (23), namely al-Ghazali (see note [4]212), is recognized only on 117.

[6] יונח בו דבור does not mean "has established a system," as Kaufmann 1877a, 250, translates; hence the relationship to al-Ghazali and Judah ha-Levi, 252, is to be modified.

[7] והדעות is in the printed text; but Pinsker 1851, 749, cites והדתות (perhaps a typographical error?), and following this Kaufmann 1877a, 251, without consulting the book itself; in the 1852 edition: והסברות.

etc.[8] The |370| work consists of three treatises: (1) the basic principles of physics and metaphysics, (2) the principles of the Law (or religion), (3) the "medicine of the soul,"[9] i.e., practical philosophy, which leads to felicity: ethics, economics, and politics.[10]

A copy of the work in the original Judaeo-Arabic was still extant between 1485 and 1520.[11] [No portions of the original have been discovered in modern scholarship. An attempt to reconstruct the Judaeo-Arabic terminology underlying the Hebrew translations is part of Eran 1990.]

Jacob Guttmann 1879, 6–7, says about the work: "The often excessive brevity and conciseness of expression, the lack of animation, and the strictly logical presentation, the dry and highly terminological language make, more often than not, even for a trained scholar, difficult reading. For a person less trained in philosophy or logic, looking for light and entertaining reading, it is utterly unsuitable. The scarce attention the book receives in later Jewish literature is at least partly due to that literary peculiarity and the strictly scholarly character of the book." [For two recent monographs on the *Exalted Faith*, see Fontaine 1990 and Eran 1998.]

§212. Samuel Ibn Motot translated (in 1392) the work of Abraham for the renowned Rabbi Isaac ben Sheshet[12] under the title אמונה נישאה. Its only extant manuscript, Mantua, CI 81, was first recognized by Luzzatto.[13] This unedited translation is generally less reliable,[14] but may serve to correct some mistakes of the edited version. Motot displays here the same elegance of expression and generally the same style as in his translation of part of Baṭalyawsī.[15]

§213. Another translation was made at the same time, perhaps some years earlier or later; its title is slightly different: האמונה הרמה.

---

[8] Munk 1859, 269, explains לולי שדבר סרה גדולה as אפתאת "se mettre au dessus de quelque chose." Motot (cited in Luzzatto 1863, 35) translates הטעה הטעאה גדול. Kaufmann 1877a, 243 n. 238, misses the variants; cf. והטעה הרבה מהם of the Karaites in הקבלה ס', fol. 46b, line 12.

[9] הרפואה הנפשית see note [3]1193 in §147.

[10] The פילוסופיא המעשית attains הצלחה through תקון המדות, הנהגה הבית, and נמוסים מדיניים (p. 98) or הנהגות מדיניות (p. 101). – The Torah instructs in a better way than מניחי ספרי המדות. In the Pinsker manuscript, the third treatise is divided into two parts.

[11] In the list brought in Steinschneider 1858, 346 n. 4 (referring to 347), [where there is a reference to an extant Arabic copy of the *Emunah Rabbah*,] the printed edition of the עקרים is mentioned.

[12] Isaac bar Sheshet was rabbi in Barcelona from 1391 to 1395, and then in Algeria, where he died soon after 1406 (Steinschneider 1852, 1155; cf. Steinschneider 1852, 74; 1874e, 82; 1875f, 111). Motot was in Guadalajara in 1370. Was he in Barca in 1392? Did he perhaps accompany Isaac to Algiers? "In Mauritania" (Steinschneider 1852, 2455) is based upon citations. Schiller-Szinessy (1876, 138) concludes from the mention of the Arabic title of the *Emunah Rabbah* in the unedited recension of מגלת סתרים that Motot had not yet translated our book at the time.

[13] Gugenheimer 1851, 506.

[14] Luzzatto, loc. cit.; Mortara 1878, 62.

[15] Kaufmann 1880, 17, 19 (§156). Apparently his translation was soon replaced by another; no explicit quotation is known and no substantial part of it has been published so far. [An annotated edition of the translation was published as a two-volume appendix to Eran 1990.]

Manuscripts: Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 57 (copied according to London, Mon. 274/2); Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 201/8; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 470, cf. Geiger 1837b, 447 n. 45; chs. 1–5 are lacking, according to the ms. catalogue); Turin, BN 156 A V [no longer extant], cf. Peyron 1880, 156;[16] Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 259 (4 folios missing from the middle); Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 341;[17] Vienna, Pinsker 23[18] (still not identified); London, Mon. 274/2 ‹(= Ghirondi n. 14 of the printed catalogue [written 1478])›.[19] [Cincinnati, HUC 922; ‹London, BL Or. 1069›; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. Don. 19/2 Moscow, RSL Günz. 270/2; Moscow, RSL Günz. 678/1 New York, JTS Ms. 2237; New York, JTS Ms. 2238/1; New York, JTS Ms. 2239; New York, JTS Ms. 2243; St. Petersburg, IOS B 451; ‹St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 468›] |371|

This translation was published on the basis of Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 201/8 alone, with German translation, as האמונה הרמה "Das Buch *Emunah Ramah* … verfasst im J(ahre) 4820 (תת"ך sic!)[20] nach E(rschaffung) d(er) W(elt) (1160) mit fortlauf(enden) hebr(äischen) Anmerkungen, und ins Deutsche übersetzt von Simson Weil," Frankf(urt) a.M. 1852, Selbstverlag (104 Hebrew text, V and 134 German), 1852. This edition, which offers brief explanatory notes, but reveals a lack of proper information about the literature and the linguistic background, does not always exhibit an accurate text. An example of an arbitrary substitution is בשותפים in the section title on p. 81 for ברשות (אלקדר ms. f. 184b, see Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 201/8). The typographical errors are not abundant, but there remain a number of sufficiently problematic places so that inspection of the manuscripts retains some value. A lacuna (41), indicated in the margin of the ms. (f. 145), goes back to the original, cf. Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 259.[21] [An edition and English translation based on Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 57, and collated primarily with Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 259 and Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 341, with New York, JTS Ms. 2239, was published by N. Samuelson and G. Weiss in Ibn Daud 1986.]

None of the known manuscripts names the translator, except for London, Mon. 274/2 (and the copy, Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 57, and Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 259),

[16] בן דאמר in the ms.? fil. *Arcotis* in the old catalogue, cited in Wolf 1715, vol. 4, 760 (the reference is missing in Peyron 1880 [because it is noted in Steinschneider 1852, 2086, under "Pasinus"] under 237).

[17] Gugenheimer 1850, v (following the communication of the rabbi and well-known author I. M. Hazan = חזן); he distinguishes, 5, between manuscripts in Portuguese script and in Rashi script (!); Assemani has "rabbin." for both. Assemani confuses this work with an anti-Karaite (Arabic?).

[18] This is apparently not a copy of the St. Petersburg ms. (Gugenheimer 1850, 506; Steinschneider 1852, 2361) since it is complete. So it is copied only with variant readings from the St. Petersburg manuscript.

[19] Luzzatto 1841, 24, n. 1, referring to Bedersi 1865, 16. Cf. Neubauer 1886, no. 1227, and the Additions and Corrections, 1156, where we read "Revision?"

[20] The Hebrew title has תתקד for תתקך; the passage is on 78 (where one should read מפסיק for (מספיק 2,472 years after the giving of the Torah; see Gugenheimer 1850, 2; Guttmann 1879, 1).

[21] Gugenheimer 1850, 2. The editor indicates this by periods […]. On p. 82 of the edition, the fifth example is omitted only perhaps in Munich BS 201. Guttmann thinks he notices several lacunae, especially in chapter 2 towards the end. (Guttmann 1879, 8, 125; see also 29 for the survey, text 3; 107 referring to the text 107). A discussion of the matter would lead too far here.

which begins with an unedited little poem.[22] The epigram runs as follows: "I have done it (sc. the translation) from the Arabic, I, Solomon ben Lavi,[23] but it needs improvement (צריכה הגהה), for I had only one copy of the Arabic original at my disposal which was full of errors;[24] but in order to fulfill your wish, I am sending it to you, imperfect as it is."[25] The last phrase can only be that of Solomon Ibn Lavi who without doubt lived towards the end of the fourteenth century in Ixar (Aragonia).[26]

This translation contains some Arabic words with their explanations: מסאס (25), צבאר (22) which should be read צבר (28), סמאך (28, 35), [27] טנגהאראט (sic)[28] כאל (28) תריאק פרוק (49), [29] טאפרה (read מפרה 55), אפיון (87 opium, German 110 "aphion"), יורדית (ibid. "Viridit");[30] peculiar terms are: האותות,[31] התפשטות, התפשטויות (dimension, 5, 10), שאיפה (27).[32] Some of the material is dubious.[33]

London, Mon. 274/2 and the copy, Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 57 (for part 1),[34] give, alongside the text ⌊372⌋, an anonymous commentary which (according to Guttmann) confines itself to a paraphrase of the passages "presented" (?), but prefers "to keep silent at passages which in fact would require information." Guttmann takes the date 1673 of the ms. straightforwardly as that of the composition.

[Krisztina Szilágyi has found among the Cairo Genizah collections a few pages from a commentary to Aristotle's *Physics* by Ibn Daud, written in Judaeo-Arabic, with Ibn Daud's name clearly displayed. Decades ago, Manuel Alonso 1943, 186, reprinted in Sezgin 2000, noted that Albertus Magnus refers to a work on the *Physics* by Ibn Daud. Thus there may have been a Latin version of the text, though it has not been located so far. There is no record of a Hebrew translation.]

---

[22] Eight strophes, beginning לעין חכמות דעה לרעות ולרדת; a defense of the book, perhaps from the copyist Eliezer Parnas?

[23] Lavi is not לאווי=לוי Levi, as Mortara has in his catalogue 1878, 62; see Steinschneider 1852, 2361 and the citations in Halberstam and Steinschneider 1875, 55.

[24] The stereotypical phrase; for which cf. the Introduction.

[25] Cf. Neubauer 1886, no. 1227.

[26] Responsa of Isaac bar Sheshet after no. 435, also already in no. 395; Isaac would certainly have been quite old.

[27] Thus also Falaquera in הנפש Falaquera 1881, fol. 13b, for the Arabic 'צמאך'; cf. Kaufmann 1884a, 127.

[28] Translated on 36 as טנגהרת, hollow vessels made out of נחשת ציני, most apparently for טנבוראת, zithers (or: drum, cylinder).

[29] פרוק or פארוק is the Syriac translation of σωτήρ, σωτειρά, hebr. מושיע; see Steinschneider 1867b, 102; 1867b, 110; 1871a, 477 n. 67; 1873d, 116 n. 15 cf. 1870g, 82.

[30] וירדיד in Gershon ben Solomon 1801, vol. 2, 2.

[31] Gershon ben Solomon 1801, 2, 26, 31; see n. 4.

[32] נשימה is the usual term; cf. Ibn Gabirol, תקון המדות, Introduction (Ibn Gabirol 1807, fol. 3b); המושאף etc. Falaquera, הנפש, ch. 2 (Falaquera 1984, 78); ch 9 (291) השואף, ch. 18 (310); Duran, מגן אבות (Duran 1785, fol. 56b).

[33] בעלי ההגדלה, does Brüll 1883a, 204, emend to הגדה? The complement by Guttmann (1879, 74, n. 1) is unnecessary.

[34] Gugenheimer 1851, 507; Luzzatto 1868 overlooked the contents of Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 34 listed in 1848f and in 1852, 2361. Guttmann 1879, 8, cites the Michaels catalogue "von Steinschneider und Zunz"!

Trans. Solomon Motot
Moscow, Mantua Comunita Israelitica Ms. ebr. 81 Abraham ben David Ha-Levi, fols. 1–213.

Trans. Solomon b. Lavi
Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Ms. 922 (IMHM F 40275), fols. 1–46.
London, British Library Or. 1069 [Margoliouth 900](IMHM F 5940), fols. 1–130.
London, Montefiore 274/2 (Halb. 222) (IMHM F 5238), fols. 1b–68a.
Moscow, Russian State Library Ms. Guenzburg 270/2 (IMHM F 19031), fols. 19a–122b.
Moscow, Russian State Library Ms. Guenzburg 678/1 (IMHM F 43938, F 18562, F 18477), fols. 1a–71b.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 201/8 (IMHM F 1137), fols. 108b–205b.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Ms. 2237 (Halb. 452) (IMHM F 28490), fols. 1–129.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Ms. 2238/1 (JTSA Acc. 1920) (IMHM F 28491), fols. 1b–116a.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Ms. 2239 (IMHM 28492), fols. 142a–63b.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Ms. 2243 (IMHM F 28496), fols. 1–50.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Huntingdon Don. 19/2 (Uri 328) [Neubauer 1283/2](IMHM F 22097), 161a (margin).
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Mich. 57 (Mich. 52.) [Neubauer 1227] (IMHM F 22041), fols. 1–223.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 468 (IMHM F 52724), fols. 1–128.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 470 (IMHM F 51318, CD 1018), fols. 1a–51b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy B 451 (IMHM 53730), fols. 1–101.
Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Cod. hebr. 156 A V, fols. 42–105.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica 259 (IMHM F 307), fols. 1–60.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica 341 (IMHM F 378), fols. 1–76.

1852. *Das Buch Emunah ramah, oder: Der erhabene Glaube*. Translated by S. Weil. Frankfurt a.M.
1986. *The Exalted Faith*. Translated by N. M. Samuelson. Rutherford.

§214. Baḥya Ibn Paquda. "Beḥai" is the usual, though erroneous, form of the name which, in the absence of anything certainly better, I have assumed. Some recent authors use "Baḥya," a version that is less justified[35] than "Baḥyé"; the latter is preferred by recent Spanish authors, and for that reason, it is used by Munk[36] as well. Baḥiel is also used.[37] [Notwithstanding Steinschneider's preference for "Baḥai," (in his German transliteration: "Bechai") we observe present scholarly convention and use "Baḥya."]

[35] Fürst 1846, 651, conjectures בו יחיי (= Abu Yaḥya), which has no analogy anywhere. Kaufmann 1874, 1, relies on an analogy with יחיי, which is itself an anomaly. – For sources see Steinschneider 1852, 780 ff.; Steinschneider 1862a, 91, and further below.

[36] Munk 1859, 482.

[37] Steinschneider 1862a, 91; Steinschneider's Additamenta et Corrigenda to 1852, 780; Rapoport 1871, 34 combines בחיי with האיי. Cf. Plantavitius <who calls him חי>, cited in Wolf 1715.1:237; cf. Steinschneider 1879b, 65.

Baḥya b. Joseph Ibn Bakuda or Paquda, the judge, probably lived in Saragossa[38] in the second half of the eleventh century, perhaps shortly after Ibn Gabirol, if one of the two knew the work of the other.[39] [Attempts by Yahuda and Goldziher 1913 to place Baḥya in the early twelfth century, because of *inter alia* an alleged dependence on al-Ghazālī, were conclusively refuted by Kokowzow 1927 and Baneth 1938.] Baḥya composed a work, almost unique of its kind, representing a complete theory of Jewish ethics, showing a certain inclination towards asceticism, and introducing it with a philosophical proof of monotheism. However, this introduction evinces a bias against that type of philosophy which sees speculation as humanity's highest calling. Nevertheless, it also takes a stand against a strict and formal observance of the law without regard to intention. According to Baḥya, the latter should act as a motive for the former. Baḥya therefore called his work אלהדאיה אלי פראיצ' אלקלוב ואלתנביה עלי לואזם אלצ'מאוֹר ("Instruction for the duties of the heart and admonition for the obligations of the soul, or, for the obligatory intentions").[40] This complete title is found in Paris, BN Ms. héb. 756, which is one more reason to presume this manuscript to be the first redaction, quite different from the Hebrew translation. Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 96, written in 1191 by Abraham bar Tahor,[40b] has only the first part of the title. Probably the book was called simply "אלהדאיה"[41] and only later the *Book of the Duties of the Heart*.[42] [A full discussion of the Paris and Oxford manuscripts, as well as many (but not all) of the Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts stored in the library at St. Petersburg, can be found in the introduction to the critical edition of the Judaeo-Arabic version by A. S. Yahuda in Baḥya 1912, 1–18; see also Yahuda 1904. In conformance with the scholarly convention of his day, Yahuda transcribed the text (but not the biblical quotations) into the Arabic alphabet; however, all known copies of the original are in Hebrew letters. The recent edition of Rabbi Yosef Qafih in Baḥya 1972 is based on the Paris and the Oxford manuscripts as well as Rabbi Qafih's own manuscript.]

One Hebrew manuscript[43] as well as the title of the edition of 1548 indicate that the author of the Arabic book is unknown and that Baḥya (b. Asher, in the 1548 edition) is one of the two translators (see §215). This led D'Herbelot to confuse it

---

[38] Steinschneider 1895, 64, n. 1; Kaufmann 1874, 4.

[39] Brüll 1883b, 73, collects parallel passages (against Kaufmann 1874, 9 <n. 2>); [Kaufmann claimed that Ibn Gabirol borrowed f rom Baḥya; Brüll argued for the inverse relationship; Kaufmann cites Dukes, II:42, n. 24 to the effect that Baḥya is referring to Isaac ben Levi Ibn Saul, an early twelfth century Spanish poet, in Ḥovot 6:7. To this Steinschneider remarks that] Issac ben Levi, mentioned also by Zunz 1865, 187 (cf. Steinschneider 1873e, 107), is still dubious (see Zunz 1865, 216); Steinschneider 1852, 1739, and note 45 below. — Saragossa as Baḥya's birthplace is considered to be a demonstrated fact by Zunz 1865, 201, but not by Kaufmann 1874, 4.

[40] For the word צ'מאיר cf. Slutzki 1877, xv = מחשבות הלב.

[40b] Uri 1787–1835 does not name the copyist [but Neubauer does]; the owner, Mevorakh ha-Kohen ben Abraham is called אלסדיר, which indicates the East. [According to the Supplement to the Neubauer Bodleian catalogue 1994, 199, the composition of its quires may indicate a Persian origin.]

[41] See Steinschneider 1858, 346.

[42] ס' היחוד in Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica heb. Ms. 231/1 is really the first treatise ("Gate") of our work.

[43] Paris ancien fonds [ms.] 233 (mentioned in Steinschneider 1852, 780) = Paris BN Ms. héb. 672 (according to the catalogue Zotenberg 1866 there are only "varr. curieuses.").

with [the Sufi work of Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī], *Qūt al-Qulūb* but this is unfounded.[44] St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 742[45] contains an Arabic compendium of the Karaite physician Daniel b. Moses ([ms. dated] 1681, 22 Tevet 442). ‹For Baḥya and al-Ghāzālī, see Bacher 1892b, 56, n. 45; Steinschneider 1862b, 51, 1879f, 72.›

[Daniel ben Moses Fayruz, who also bears the name Yerushalmi, is the author of a treatise entitled כתאב אלמרשד ופראיץ' אלקלוב ומעארף אלנפוס והדאיה אלעארפין. The manuscript noted by Steinschneider is in Fayruz's own hand. Another copy is found in the same library, listed as St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 1684. Fayruz's treatise is divided into ten books (*abwāb*) bearing the same titles as those of Baḥya's *Duties*. However, the subdivision of each book into chapters (*fuṣūl*) differs significantly. The texts must be compared closely. Fayruz appears to depend very heavily upon Baḥya, but he has not simply copied anything word for word. Nowhere does Fayruz mention Baḥya by name. In the proemium (f. 2a in St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 742), he states that he has compiled his treatise מן כלאם אלעלמא אלאפאצ'ל החכמים המשכילים הנבונים והטהורים. The passages from the book open with קאל אלמולף, but, according to Arabic usage, that could be Fayruz speaking about himself in the third person. However, the two devotional poems placed at the end of the book are also attributed to אלמולף, and here it seems clear that Fayruz is referring to Baḥya, especially since he has included a poem of his own, with his name indicated in the acrostic, at the beginning of the treatise. The first of these poems, נפשי עז תדרכי, is found at the end of Baḥya's *Duties*. The second, however, ארוממך ה' אלהי ואגדלה שמך, is not. It is relatively rare, but it does display the name Baḥya in the acrostic; see I. Davidson 1924, no. 7524 . Fayruz's treatise poses some challenging questions concerning late medieval notions of authorship, as well as the place of Sufi-type piety within the Karaite communities of the late seventeenth century.] |373|

§215. The first translation of *The Duties of the Heart* is in fact one of the oldest translations from the Arabic because the first part may have been translated already in 1161, one year after Ibn Ezra had translated an astronomical treatise (see §357).[46] The translator Judah b. Saul Ibn Tibbon (or Tabbon?)[47] of Granada (מרימון ספרד) had perhaps left his native country in 1150, a year that saw catastrophic persecutions. Around 1160 he is mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela as a physician in Lunel where the renowned rabbi Meshullam b. Jacob and his equally renowned son Asher had him translate, first of all, the first part of our book and *A Vintage of Pearls* (§221). The translation of our book represents, in a sense, an epochal event in the history of Hebrew literature. From now on, the history of the translations can be traced along more or less certain dates in the century following this translation and even within the

[44] Steinschneider 1852, 780, and the Additamenta et Corrigenda, 1852, xciii; Steinschneider 1862a, 91; Gottlober 1865, 65, repeats the faulty references.

[45] Fürst 1845, 737, in Geiger 1837b, 442 n. 3, on biblical subjects around the year 4610 (= 850), thus read שיש! – whether abbreviation for תשרש? – On Daniel see Steinschneider 1879d 72; 1881e, 84, 85, Steinschneider 1882, 326; not to be pursued here.

[46] Steinschneider 1852, Additamenta to 1497 (2332); Geiger 1856b, 113 – Masha'allah's בקדרות translated by Abraham Ibn Ezra [the attribution to Ibn Ezra has been questioned by Shlomo Sela 1999, 378] appears to be older; an older dated one is not known, nor is an undated one probably to be considered as older, except perhaps for writings on language? See note 51 and Part IV.

[47] On him see Steinschneider 1852, 1374 ff.

Tibbon family itself. In contrast, earlier translations show isolated or less coherent, uncertain, and obscure features. Judah, whom his son (in his prologue to the translation of Maimonides' *Guide*) calls "father of the translators," while later authors call him "head of the translators,"[48] deserves some more of our attention, not to give information about his not very remarkable life,[49] but rather to analyze the prologue to his first work. This was left untranslated in the most recent German translation (1854), although it came to serve as the model for all translators' introductions. Of course we shall, in this brief analysis, not stray from our particular subject.

In a short survey of the vicissitudes of the Jewish literature, Judah stresses the fact that the heads of the Oriental academies (the Geonim) and their contemporaries living under Arab rule made wide use of the Arabic language. Its terminology, in contrast to Hebrew, is rich, and moreover, Arabic is familiar to the general reading public, which does not know Hebrew. In Christian countries scholars have restricted themselves to the study of the Bible and the Talmud because other sciences do not exist there. Meshullam b. Jacob, however, has combined the study of the Law with that of the sciences.[50] He collected, copied [or: translated] (or had copied [or: had translated] והעתיק) works on the sciences of the Law, language, and belief (האמונה), etc. Since he had heard that Baḥya had written a work on the theory of the duties of the heart (תורת חובות הלבבות – so reads the complete title in the author's foreword; the editions leave out the first word), founded on monotheism, he ordered Judah to translate its first book. Judah had previously been asked to translate some |374| works of the Geonim, but he had not let himself be persuaded to do so in view of the demands of an undertaking of this sort, some of which he explains. Not one of the books translated from Arabic into Hebrew has escaped injury at the hands of the translators, he says, and for three reasons:[51] either the translators do not know Arabic thoroughly,[52] or they have not mastered Hebrew, or they do not understand the author. Their translations thus reflect their opinion, and for two reasons: they are not familiar with the particular discipline, and they did not read[53] the book under the guidance of its author or someone who had read it with him. Thus they arrived at an understanding different from that of the author or even found inconsistencies resulting from not reading a work according to its proper arrangement. This, Judah says, has been a pitfall even of great scholars. Finally, Arabic cannot be rendered into Hebrew succinctly, because – as he maintains – Arabic is a comprehensive and clear (צחה) language. In the course of these arguments he remarks, among other things,

---

[48] ראש המעתיקים, according to Gedaliah Ibn Yaḥya; Wolf 1715, 1:455 cites this incorrectly as ראש המדקדקים.

[49] What is known about his life is presented in the preliminary report to the testament Steinschneider 1852, especially viii, where something is found from our preface.

[50] חכמות אחרות, previously חכמה חיצונית = חכמה, see note 55.

[51] Kaufmann 1883a, 231, speaks of a "Kette von Vorgängern"; he knows only of some halakhic writings (he neglects philology); cf. notes 46, 56.

[52] צח in connection with a person is uncommon usage (see n. 521), under 2. בקיאים וצחים בלשון הערבית. only בקיאים, probably unintentionally.

[53] הספר…לא קבל אותו can mean here only the tradition of the contents.

that the translator becomes the father and author of the translated work. He should strive to translate literally, without adding or omitting anything, avoiding, however, formulations that are difficult to understand, etc. This is in fact a piece of instruction to any translator, informed by common sense and linguistic sensitivity. – One of the examples he gives is the translation of Onkelos. The Bible, Mishna and Torah, however, were commented upon, translated into other languages, and given different interpretations. But since we possess both the original texts and the commentaries and translations, the latter have proven to be useful, in their own right and without detriment. The translator assumes responsibility for the author. Baḥya b. Joseph hesitated to compose his book because he felt insufficiently equipped for writing in Arabic.[54] How much more restraint, then, should the translator show when approaching his task! Judah goes on to say that most of his contemporaries tend to criticize and reproach (להתעולל ולהתגולל) anybody who creates something new, be it a translation or an original work, a liturgical poem (פיוט) or any other product of a man of reason. He talks about all this in order to let his readers know that he has taken upon himself this translation – and any possible criticism of it – only in obeisance to the order he had received. He endeavored, he says, not to distort the words of the author, translating literally even phrases with which he felt uncomfortable. When he was unable to translate, he pondered over the proper understanding of the passage, then translated to the best of his ability. When he had doubts, he consulted other works of this particular discipline. In this context, Judah regrets the absence of a (special tool) for the translated work, namely a glossary of |375| terms of the *external sciences* (חכמות חיצוניות)[55] according to the usage of the scholars involved. In the end Judah asks the reader's forbearance with the novel constructions (בנינים) from verbs and nouns that he has coined, due to the limitations of the Hebrew language. Earlier colleagues had done much the same,[56] following the Arabic. Finally, he apologizes for introducing rabbinical formulations (לשון רבותינו) into biblical Hebrew, making use of the former even where he might have found an appropriate biblical formulation.

The translation of the second book of this treatise also has a short prologue. After Judah had translated the first book, Joseph Kimḥi translated the remaining books; he

[54] Baḥya's introduction 1846, 25; 1854, fol. 12.

[55] Judah procures for his son Samuel a teacher of that subject from afar. See Steinschneider 1852, 4. If, as it appears, the word and concept are formed by analogy with ספרים חצוניים (not in the Biblical books: Geiger 1845, 40, Geiger 1857b, 200, Dukes 1846a, 1; cf. Benjacob 1880, 125 no. 523; along with its usage in the singular in Abraham bar Ḥiyya 1851, 6, 13), then the plural form (usually חיצוניות but also חיצונות) is the original. In Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 103 the phrase denotes sorcery and such; in Ibn Ezra it interchanges with נכריות; later it comes to signify Greek philosophy in particular. It is contrasted with the ח' הייחוד as early as 1232 (אגרות of Maimonides, Maimonides 1712, 31). Saadiah in particular is praised for having knowledge of it (Meiri and Lattes 1878, 69; ed. Buber 1885, 32; cf. Berliner 1877b, 227), but also criticized (Moses Taku 1860, 64.) The doubtful author of the commentary on Sefer Yeẓirah (§227; Fürst 1845, 563) already wants to examine Saadiah's rank בחכמה החיצונית שהיא ח' הפילוסופיה, after questions of his had reached Isaac Israeli from the Fayyum on ח' חיצונות. In the end he designates him as incomparable in חכמות החכמוניות פנימיות וחיצוניות (ms. חכמה). More on this elsewhere.

[56] חכמי ההעתקה cf. notes 46, 51.

then translated the first one as well. Later on, Abraham b. David[57] asked Judah to translate the other books too. Judah hesitated to do so for personal reasons, namely, a delicate deference to his rival. However, he later disregarded these, because his earlier scruples were no longer valid after he had translated the first book. – We have thus three different versions of the translated book: one contains the translation of the first book by Ibn Tibbon and the rest by Kimḥi, and two other versions, in which the book in its entirety is the work of one of the translators alone. Judah asks the copyists to indicate, in the beginning, the name of the translator, so that one translator not be held responsible for the mistakes of the other.[58]

§216. Before continuing our discussion of Ibn Tibbon's translation we would like to supply the meager extant information that we have about the translation of his rival and to which we shall return, under Ibn Gabirol (§221). This translation was less successful and was forgotten later on. We would know only the little that Judah relays had not Zunz (1838, 318) by chance recognized a fragment of the seventh treatise in Leipzig, UBL B. H. 39. This was edited, with comparative notes, by Jellinek in his edition of Baḥya 1846, xiv–xxvi.[59] [Kimḥi's name does not appear to be on the fragment in the Leipzig ms., and so the identification is far from certain. This is also true for New York, JTS Ms. 1912, which includes an excerpt from the first treatise and which Alexander Marx identified as belonging to Kimḥi.] The fragment, without the notes, is also edited in the supplement to the edition of 1871 |376| [and in Tsifroni (Baḥya 1948), 627–37.] Some variant readings in the margin of Tibbon's translation in the earlier editions go back, according to Jellinek, apparently to Kimḥi's translation. [Some of these go back, according to Yahuda in his edition, to variants in the Arabic.]

Judah informs us about the character of his own work. Fully aware of the difficulty of his task, he studied the relevant disciplines by himself, then strove to render the meaning faithfully by (morphological) imitation of a given term, even though this meant subjugating the special character of the Hebrew language to that of the Arabic. Arabic words which he retains as such are only few, and they are accompanied by a translation, viz. אלריאצ'י אלאלהי, אלעלם אלטביעי, (read: 2, ed. 1846a; f. 4, ed. 1854c), אלגדל (read: 28, 1846a, resp; f. 13, 1854c). We do not know how much of the technical terminology (especially that of the first treatise), which is otherwise unknown before the twelfth century, goes back to his predecessors. The same applies to the Arabicizing syntax which, however, is not as stilted and obvious as in the school which follows his procedure. There, as in all imitations, it borders upon caricature. [For more on the translation technique of Judah Ibn Tibbon, see M. Sister 1937.]

Kimḥi is a professional philologist and interpreter, possessing a sense of the subtlety of the Sacred Word. He does no more than to render the meaning of his Arabic author in elegant, chosen words, easy to comprehend. Perhaps it was the serious scholarly milieu, formed by Samuel Ibn Tibbon's translation of Maimonides' *Guide* and gradually having grown accustomed to the new arabicized Hebrew,

[57] Of Posquières, died 1198.

[58] Geiger 1856b, 114, interpreting it partially as blame.

[59] A brief characterization in Jellinek in Baḥya 1846, xxi and Geiger, l.c.

which gave preference to Judah's translation, while the edifying and ascetic character of the work secured for it a cherished place in the general public. The *Book of the Duties of the Heart* became a work of devotion; it was copied and edited, printed repeatedly, commented upon and translated. Contemporary scholarship has devoted philological and historical studies to it. The next paragraph lists the most important of these. I shall mention here a compendium (קיצור), probably by a grandson of the same Meshullam who commissioned the translation. This compendium, in which the philosophical part is almost entirely left out, has been ascribed so far to its second editor Jacob da Fano (1614). The first edition remains unknown until today.[60]

[The ascription by Benjacob to "Jacob da Fano" is an error, perhaps because the editor of the 1614 Prague edition, which differs from the 1520 Constantinople edition, was Jacob b. Abraham Katz, confused with Jacob b. Joab Elijah da Fano. Several abridged versions of the Hebrew translation are known. Steinschneider refers here to the one that was by far the most popular, judging from the large number of manuscript copies and printings. It has recently been studied by I. Ta-Shema 1982, who identified the author as Asher ben Shelamiah, an important Provençal talmudist whose mother was the daughter of the same Meshullam who commissioned Ibn Tibbon's translation. Ta-Shema (14 n. 5) lists nineteen manuscripts and mentions the abridgements by Menaḥem ben Aaron Ibn Zeraḥ (Spain, 14th? cent.), and by Jacob Ẓahalon, the latter called, מרגוליות טובות; to these we may add an abridgement by Immanuel ben Joshua Serero of Fez, bearing the title פוקח עורים (New York, JTS Ms. 2290); portions of the *Duties of the Heart* were incorporated by Aaron ben Gabriel of Trebic in his lengthy ethical compilation, in Hebrew and Yiddish, צמח חי, written in 1756 (Moscow, RSL Günz. 545).]

§217. The *Book of the Duties of the Heart* in Ibn Tibbon's translation was first printed, without title-page, at Naples[61] in 1489. Other editions worthy of mention are ed. Isak Benjacob with an introduction by Ad. Jellinek (Leipzig 1846); ed. R. Fürstenthal, with commentary and German translation (Breslau 1835; ed. Em. (Mendel) Baumgarten (German translation) and Abraham Geiger (introduction: "The Ethical Foundation of the *Book of the Duties of the Heart*") (Vienna 1854); a second edition with a different German translation (paraphrase) (Vienna 1856); and David Slutzki (Warsaw 1870), whose installments 7 and 8 contain |377| a collection of philosophical writings, under the title of חכמת ישראל, with an appendix containing the [extant] fragment of Kimḥi's translation as well as some corrections on the basis of the Arabic text of B. Goldberg. These, however, should not be accepted without

[60] See Steinschneider 1852, 782 and Additamenta, xciii; Steinschneider 1863e, 12; Steinschneider 1872b, 83. Berliner 1874a, 17; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 327/1 (following a copy dated 1307), London, BL Add. 26899b, Paris, BN héb 674/1 (Munk 1859, 168 note: "un abrégé"), Paris, BN héb 773/2 (The old Paris catalogue had Eliah b. Samuel for Judah b. Saul; see Steinschneider 1852, xiv.) This should be corrected in the index, 250. Menaḥem Ibn Zeraḥ (1374) interpolated in his *Ẓedah la-Derekh* (treatise 4, five chapters [chapter 5] 8 ff.; see the Warsaw edition 1880, 233–56), an extract in ten brief chapters for the ten penitential days.

[61] Editions are mentioned in Benjacob, the Baḥya 1846 edition, XLI; and Steinschneider 1852, 780 and Additamenta to 1852 (also no. 2555); Benjacob 1880, 169 nos. 129 – 148; Zedner 1867, 72: *Bachye*. [See A. M. Habermann 1951 for a complete bibliography of editions through 1950.]

exacting control.[62] Generally, the editions have not made use of the manuscripts, which are numerous. We mention in particular Paris, BN Ms. héb. 671/1, which, according to the catalogue, offers a great number of variant readings.[63] [Steinschneider's emphasis on the importance of this Paris ms. is based upon the enthusiastic description in Zotenberg's catalogue 1866, 105. However, Zotenberg remarks only that this manuscript exhibits many variants from the *editio princeps* (Naples 1489). In the absence of a critical edition, it is impossible to state how significant these may be. Zotenberg further notes that this manuscript has invocations in rhymed prose not found in any manuscript or printed edition; however, it is unlikely that he actually consulted all or even the majority of the numerous manuscripts.]

In the interest of textual criticism people have begun to consult the Arabic text. In addition to B. Goldberg's publication and some other references, published here and there,[64] Jehiel Judah b. Joseph Moses Levenson has begun to compare the Arabic original with all editions in a Hebrew booklet called חיי לבבות.[64b] ‹Cf. Levinsohn 1885, not available to me.› The author does not indicate the Arabic ms. used by him, but he mentions in his foreword a part of the book (Arabic or Hebrew?) in the library of Cairo. We call attention to the fact that the Paris ms. presents an [Arabic] recension different from the one translated by Judah Ibn Tibbon, and there is no justification for always preferring it.[64c] [The mystery concerning the manuscript utilized by Jehiel Judah Levinsohn can be cleared up, thanks to New York, JTSA Ms. 2240, which contains two separate items bound together: a copy of the Venice 1506 edition, with Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic marginalia in Levinsohn's hand, and a large fragment of books two and three in Judaeo-Arabic, again with marginalia of Levinsohn. On f. 10 of the Judaeo-Arabic manuscript, Levinsohn writes that he received the Judaeo-Arabic manuscript in Alexandria as a gift from Faraj Ḥayyim Mizraḥi, who had obtained it from the Genizah: במתנה לקחתיו מכבוד הרב כ"ש מה"ו פרג חיים מזרחי הי"ו באלכסנדריא אשר נמצא בידו ממקום הגניזה בעיר (?) מצרים]

Ibn Tibbon's text served as the basis for more recent translations into various languages, viz., into Portuguese 1670, Ladino (not Latin) 1712a, Spanish 1610, in Hebrew letters 1713, Italian 1847, Judaeo-German 1716. Already in 1765 a German translation was begun. This is the first attempt by a Jew to make a Jewish text

---

[62] According to Goldberg, xxiv, in Slutzki 1877, the Zohar borrowed from Tibbon's translation the motif of the ass carrying books. Goldberg wanted to read חמאר, and denies the proverb! Qur'an 62, 5, see Dukes 1851, 12, 64, 91; Fürst 1850, 720; Rapoport 1873 on Emden, 30. Steinschneider 1873a, 89; Geiger 1875b, 50.

[63] Among the "Invocations" in the beginning of the treatise, the first starts out with יחיד אשר לו נתכנו עלות וסבות, acrostic of ישיעה חזק וגם אמיץ; the others are shorter. On the alleged "Jehudah ben Tabohi" in the Escorial manuscript according to de Castro 1781, I:171, see Steinschneider 1852, 1375.

[64] The beginning of this manuscript appears in Munk 1838, 45. Baer Goldberg communicates a parable from V, 5 (*Hamaggid* 1852, 255) which also does not figure in the manuscripts. Kaufmann 1874, 5, presents excerpts from the Paris Hebrew ms.

[64b] Geiger 1875c, 207.

[64c] Jacob Reifmann's article 1888 offers remarks and textual emendations (some of them unnecessary), a reference to the quotations from Hebrew literature, an index of the authors and writings quoted, and mention of our book in later literature. I could not conduct a close examination of the matter so far.

available in German, if we do not take into account paraphrases of a German narrative in Hebrew letters.[65] Jo. Ge. Chr. Adler seems to have begun a German translation,[66] and Jakob Roman, in 1643, in collaboration with the Flandrian physician Leon Sia, wanted to publish the Arabic text in Arabic letters with a Latin translation, based upon the Arabic text.[67] [A nineteenth century translation of part of the book into Dutch is found in New York, JTS Ms. 3702. The original Arabic text has been translated into French (Baḥya 1925), Spanish (Baḥya 1994), and English (Baḥya 1973); other translations are generally based on the Hebrew versions.]

From among the Hebrew commentaries two were especially popular: the one by Manoaḥ Haendel 1596, a scholar versed in a great number of various disciplines, and the other, read until our day, by Israel Zamosch (Baḥya 1809.)

Baḥya's work was also discussed in the introductions to some of the editions mentioned here, as well as in histories of literature. David Kaufmann has prepared a monograph, accepted by the Viennese Academy,[68] in which he |378| presents the basic ideas of the work and looks into some problems of textual sources. This is not the place to enter into details.

For an annotated list of the Hebrew versions of *Ḥovot ha-Levavot* and their translations through 1950, see A. M. Habermann 1951. Habermann comments on the Hebrew (and the emendations made on the basis of the Arabic version) based on the 1550 Constantinople edition, which he feels to be of great significance. The principal editions and scholarly translations of Baḥya's work since Steinschneider's day are the following:

1912. Edited by A. S. Yahuda. Leiden.
1948. Edited by A. Tsifroni. Tel-Aviv.
1950. *Les Devoirs du coeur*. Translated by André Chouraqui. Paris.
1972. Edited by Yosef Qafih. Jerusalem. (Judaeo-Arabic with Hebrew translation).
1973. *The Book of Direction to the Duties of the Heart*. Translated by M. Mansoor.

§218. David (Dawud) Ibn Marwan b. Marwan אלרקי (from Raqqa?),[69] the Babylonian, called אלמקמץ or אלמקמאץ (usually al-"Mukammaz", according to Fleischer "Mikma's"), is probably the earliest Jewish theologian to write a philosophical work after the manner of the mutakallimūn. Not much is known about this person.[70] An author of the eleventh century says that Saadia Gaon (died 941) did know something of David (personally?), but the matter is, according to our source, not proven

[65] היסטאריע (Prague 1762); Wolf 1865, 56; Steinschneider 1875c, 64.

[66] Steinschneider 1852, 781 n. 9.

[67] Extracts from a letter in Carmoly 1842, 347, where we find "Sceau", and Carmoly 1844, 189, where we find "Siah" ("Sia" in Wüstenfeld 1840, 3:657 n. 7355f).

[68] Kaufmann 1874. An analysis is found in Eisler 1870–83, 43–57.

[69] So, too, Munk 1859, 474. There is also a Raqqa in Egypt; cf. §48. Since al-Raqqi refers only to the origin it bears no importance in relation to Saadiah. On בבלי see Steinschneider 1864d, 14. אלרבי found in an anonymous writer (Harkavy 1887, 32) is probably a scribal error.

[70] Sources: Steinschneider 1852, 880; Steinschneider 1877c, 68, 103, 314, 340; Weiss 1871, 61–62 (missing from the index, 358) knows it too little.

or established (ברור).[71] He is praised for his knowledge of non-Jewish literature, especially of medicine. Perhaps he is to be identified with the Jewish Mutakallim Abū'l-Khayr Dā'ūd b. Mushāj (corrupted from Marwān, or Muqammaṣ?) whom the Christian Ibn Zurʿa (died 1008) mentions, or David al-Karamsi (אלקרמסי, died 945/6) mentioned by al-Masʿūdī.[72] The Karaites considered him as belonging to their sect, because the two Josephs, in particular Hadassi, quote him.[72b]

[There is now a book-length study of al-Muqammiṣ, including an edition of the surviving portions of the Arabic text of the *Twenty Chapters*, with English translation and analysis by Sarah Stroumsa 1989. Stroumsa argues that there is no textual evidence linking him to the Karaites. We shall take note here only of those publications pertaining to the Hebrew translation that are not included in Stroumsa's study; for fragments of the Hebrew translations Stroumsa relies upon Halberstam's edition of Judah ben Barzillai's commentary on *Sefer Yeẓira*, Judah ben Barzillai 1885, on material brought by I. Ginzburg 1930 and by G. Vajda 1956, 311.]

David composed an Arabic work, cited according to the title עשרון מקאלאת (Twenty Chapters),[72c] in which he proves the unity of God and defends the Jewish law against its adversaries. [Stroumsa 1989, 22 and esp. n. 56, establishes that the title cited is actually *'Ishrūn Maqāla* and not *'Ishrūn Maqālāt*]. He also supplies information about some sects and schools. Only small portions of the work were translated into Hebrew. Judah ben Barzillai al-Barẓeloni (around 1130, probably in Provence) included some snippets in his commentary to the *Sefer Yeẓira* (Judah ben Barzillai 1885) "as they are translated from Arabic." [Stroumsa 1989, 39, observes that some of the passages cited in translation are not found in the extant portions of the original.] Halberstam's edition of this extremely important text was based upon a transcription of the only known manuscript, whose present status, or whereabouts if it exists, remains unknown. Another short passage belongs to an unidentified treatise. [Steinschneider must be referring here to the passage cited by Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 66; unlike the other citations brought by the latter, the name of the book is not specified here. For a list of other writings attributed to this author, see Stroumsa 1989, 20–23.] This citation along with the ninth treatise [of al-Muqammiṣ' compilation] was published by S. D. Luzzatto 1846, 72–78. Half of the tenth treatise was added to this by Fürst 1847.[73] A fragment of the sixteenth chapter was unknown (151).

---

[71] [See Judah ben Barzillai's commentary to the *Sefer Yeẓirah* 1885, 50.] Kaufmann 1877a, 24 (a contemporary of Saadiah's) see Munk 1859, 474. In Goitein 1890, as Karaite. <Cf. also Renan 1893, 380.>

[72] Maimonides 1856, I, 337, commenting on *Guide* I, 71 (conjecture of Frankl's). On Zer'a see Steinschneider 1877c, 147. – קרמסי is indeed reminiscent of קומסי or קמסי (Steinschneider 1877c, 340, 1885c, 528); but a direct connection between מקמץ and קומסי has little probability.

[72b] Steinschneider 1857a, 312 and n. 72c. Harkavy 1878a, 16–17. He does not figure in the so-called "chain of tradition" of the Karaites. See Steinschneider 1858, 388.

[72c] The identification of a "Gaon" in Ibn Ezra with ס'היחוד (already in Sachs 1854a, 71) is also not established by David Kahana 1888, 187–197; on an obscure title כתאב אלצראח see Harkavy 1880, 42–43.

[73] I am quoting from Fürst 1847, 620 (= Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 65 and 77); Fürst 1847, 631 (= Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 80 l. 3); Fürst 1847, 642 (= Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 82). Cf. n. 520 in §258 below. On Judah b. Barzillai see Steinschneider 1867a, 6, where we find the end of Abraham b. Ḥiyya's letter (missing from Sachs's edition 1866a, 315); Renan 1877, 158, should be supplemented accordingly.

These fragments are important for us because they were translated no later than the beginning of the twelfth century. Also their subject matters are of interest, for example, the mention of Aristotle, "the philosopher" in Fürst 1847 (632, 633), the Dualists (בעלי השנים, בעל 632, 633), the Christians (622, 632–43), the classification of the sciences, beginning with |379| theology (620).[74] We name a few particular terms, for instance, the *nomina departiculativa*: כמיה, איכות, אניות (629, 643, 643), later דבר חרוצי and its opposite רוחני (631), כפרנות, כפרנים (622, 633); the Arabic word הנדסה (explained on 629); for חידות מכחישות (632, 647), or מכחשות (Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 80) read מדות?[74b] עולם המגור (Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 151).

§219. Solomon ben Judah Ibn Gabirol (Gabriel), Arabic: Abū Ayyūb[75] Sulaymān Ibn Yaḥyā, Ibn Jabīrūl; Latin: Avi-Gebrol, Avicebrol, Avicebron, Albenzubrun, Jubeyzol[76] from Córdova (living around 1040–50 in Malaga), is the most original philosophical author of both Arabic and Jewish literatures, although he is better known as a Hebrew poet.[77] He is the author of the following:

1. *Fons vitae*, a philosophical work that develops Plotinian theory[78] – he probably knew the work of Plotinus through the pseudo-Aristotelian *Theology of Aristotle* (§128) – towards an original system in which the human will has almost the same function as in Schopenhauer's philosophy.[79] It should be stressed that Ibn Gabirol

---

[74] Kaufmann 1877a, 38, calls David a Jewish *mu'atazil*. On placing the Metaphysics at the forefront, see Steinschneider and 1869b, 170 and 1870a, 73.

[74b] In Kaufmann, l.c., this enigmatic expression, not attested to otherwise, is left unnoticed; he also leaves it uncontested in Kaufmann 1874, 77.

[75] אבו איוב is an accompanying name of Solomon's (Steinschneider 1852, 2316). Sources: cf. Steinschneider 1852, 2313 and the Additamenta, cxxiv; cf. Dukes 1860 and the book ר' שלמה בן גבירול begun upon by S. Sachs (‹48›) 1866b. On 44 ff. we read that the writings that were spuriously attributed [by Arab writers like Ibn Aflaḥ] to King Solomon (Steinschneider 1852, 2296; 1866a, 116, 125) should be attributed to Ibn Gabirol; on ‹48›, that אלמאלקי [from Malaga] has changed to אלמלאך,אלמלך (‘the king”!); and on 47, that the Book of the Five Substances by [pseudo-] Empedocles, the הייחוד of Boethius, and even maybe the חי בן יקטן are claimed for him! See below, §522, n. [12]32. [See Scholem's further refutation of Sachs's hypothesis in his edition of Ibn Aflaḥ's *Sefer ha-Tamar* 1926–27, p. 185 n. 2.]

[76] Cf. Steinschneider 1852, 2649; his date (‹ “Steinschneider 1864a, 96”? ›, in relation to Baḥya, Kaufmann 1884a, 29) is fairly well established by Ṣa'id (c. 1070), who praises Ibn Gabirol as a logician, and lets him die before attaining his 30th year in 450 H. (beginning 28 February 1058). See Neubauer 1887a, 500. The connection between the אזהרות and the poems of a 16-year old Ibn Gabirol is dubious; cf. Brüll 1889, 109.

[77] Steinschneider 1852, 2327; Dukes 1837 and Ibn Gabirol 1858; Geiger 1867b; Steinschneider 1852, 2314 line 1. Sachs 1868 (after Sachs, Senior. 1866b. *Rabbi Shelomoh ben Gevirol u-qezat benei doro*). Zunz 1867, 187–194, 411. 588, Zunz 1867, 7; Steinschneider 1877c, 189 (where quite some information has to be supplemented; see Steinschneider 1879b, 130); on the אזהרות purportedly written in Arabic, see Steinschneider 1879b, 23 no. 44 [Collections of poems of Ibn Gabirol have been edited by Bialik and Ravnitzky 1924–32, Brody, Schirmann, and Ben David 1975, and Yarden 1971–73; 1975–76.]

[78] Joël 1857, 1858, 1859a. Concerning Ibn Gabirol's philosophy and its influence, see also Eisler 1870–83, 57 ff.; Stoessel 1881 (Myer 1888 is fat in volume, meager in critical sense). [For a more recent bibliography of Ibn Gabirol as philosopher see Schlanger 1968 and 1980.] – On Abraham ben David, see Gutmann 1879, 47, 51.

[79] See the article on Ibn Gabirol and Schopenhauer by D. Ascher 1863; cf. Steinschneider 1869b, 170.

does not refer to an explicitly Jewish tradition and its sources, an omission that earns for him the reproach of Abraham ben David (§211).[80] This was no doubt the main reason why the Jews neglected the philosophy of their first poet and that Christians authors who did not suspect a Jew under the garbled form of his name were attracted to him, right down to our own day, when Munk "has rendered the history of the human mind an excellent service by showing that this Avicebron who plays such a great |380| role in medieval Christian philosophy was none else but the Jew Solomon Ibn Gabirol from Malaga."[81] As a matter of fact, we owe to Munk almost everything that we know of this work, and it will suffice to refer for details to Munk's *Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe* 1859. [See now Roberto Gatti's edition 2001, which includes a new edition of Shem Tov b. Joseph Falaquera's extracts, concerning which see below. For an English translation of Falaquera extracts, see Manekin 2007.]

According to Munk (152), the Arabic original is not extant; its title was probably יגבוע אלחיאה. [Not a few quotations from the original (though not always, as it appears, exactly word for word) have been recovered from Moses Ibn Ezra's *Kitāb al-Ḥadīqa*; see Pines 1957/8, 218–33; Fenton 1976.] However, some extant manuscripts have a Latin translation from the Arabic by Johannes Hispalensis with the help of Dominicus Gundisalvus[82]; two Paris manuscripts, (Bibliothèque Nationale, ancien fonds 6552 and Mazarin 510) were discovered by Munk and Dr. Seyerlein (of Ulm), who gives a report in an article in the *Theologische Jahrbücher*, ed. by Bauer and Zeller, vols. 15 and 16; a third ms. is in the Colombina in Sevilla, and I found a fourth in Erfurt.[83] [These four manuscripts were edited by Clemens Bäumker in his critical edition of the Latin text 1892. Schlanger 1970, 16, cites two others: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Urb. Lat. 1427, and Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, oriental ms. 95–21, as well as two Latin epitomes (which are very close), the first of which was edited by Bäumker as the *Epitome Campiliensis* (on which see Sturlese 1979.) Translations of the Latin have been made into English, French, German, Italian, and Hebrew.]

Shem Tov b. Joseph Falaquera in his *Moreh ha-Moreh* displays 15 quotations under the name of Ibn Gabirol. Only in one of them (1837, 96) does he supply as well the title of the book מקור חיים.[84] [Shiffman's conjecture in 2001, 259, was anticipated by Steinschneider.] Nowhere, however, does he refer to a translation proper.

Munk detected in Paris, BN héb ms. 700 extracts conforming to the citations in that commentary, probably translated by Falaquera later on, which he, under the title of לקוטים מן ס' מקור חיים, edited along with a French translation, an introduction,

[80] Is he משוררנו המתפלסף מקונן לאביו [cited in] Abraham b. David 1852, 91? cf. Guttmann 1879, 32. See also Munk 1859, 273.

[81] Renan 1861, 76 [3]100.

[82] Munk 1859, preface, v; Leclerc 1876, II, 380, but not Wüstenfeld 1840, 25 ff. In the Mazarin manuscript: Transtulit Hyspanis (sic) interpres lingua Johannis. Tunc ex arabico, non absque juvante Domingo.

[83] Menéndez y Pelayo 1880, I, 398; Kaufmann 1883b, 312 – Ms. Amplon, fol. 331, Schum 1887: Metaphysicor. sive de fonte vitae libri V.

[84] Dukes 1837, 306 ff. presents all passages except 63 (Steinschneider 1852, 2543). According to Munk 1859, 274, the first does not figure in the לקוטים .

etc., in his *Mélanges* 1859. [Another copy has since been identified in Parma, Biblioteca Palatina 2626 (De Rossi 1283), ff. 90a–107a, and this was utilized by Gatti in his critical edition 2001.] In his very brief preface the translator says that, in his study of the text, he has discovered that the author adopts the ideas of ancient thinkers[85] as they are found in the book of Empedocles on the "five substances" (or rather "the fifth substance," according to Munk).[86] [This is a reference to the pseudo-Empedoclean work that is no longer extant in Arabic; a medieval Hebrew translation of excerpts was published in Kaufmann 1899, 18–51. For a different hypothesis see de Smet 1998. Its relationship to *Fons Vitae* is examined in Schlanger 1968.]

We have already had occasion (§2 and §12) to deal with the terminology of Falaquera. We shall limit ourselves here to a few expressions. He often uses פלוש and derivations for "penetrate,"[87] הגון for ראוי; he forms למות instead of למהות, according to Arabic למיה (par. 17, f. 28b of Munk's edition);[88] נאמרות (f. 10b, par. 7; cf. his commentary on the Guide, f. 66) for "Categories"; ההזון (f. 14a, par. 27 from הזנה!); הרבנות כלומר ההאלוהות (f. 14b, par. 30, see Munk 1859, 55); ...ההשקפה ב (f. 26b, par. 20), מפורקים מן "abstract," "abstracted" (Arabic:מתפרק), אמרה (f. 33 par. 56 and 35b par. 71) מונח בין ידיך (f. 36a, line 6 from the bottom). The Arabic words דהר (f. 10b and f. 13),[89] אניה and גנסות (f. 25, par. 12) occur for מג'אנסה (Munk 1859, 95, cf. 69); the Greek *genos* has found its way into Aramaic.[90] [Schlanger 1968 is a comprehensive monograph on *Fons Vitae*, its doctrines and its sources; it was translated into Hebrew 1980.]

Principal Editions and Translations

1892. Avencebrolis (Ibn Gebirol) Fons vitae ex arabico in latinum translatus ab Iohanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino ex codicibus Parisinis, Amploniano, Columbino. Edited by C. Baeumker. Monasterii: Aschendorff.

1970. *Livre de la source de vie (Fons vitae)*. Translated by J. Schlanger. Paris: Aubier Montaigne.

2001. Fons vitae = Meqor hayyim. Translated by R. Gatti, Testi e studi di filosofia ebraica medioevale; 21. Genova: Il melangolo.

§220. 2. כתאב אצלאח אלאכלאק, "The Refinement of Character Traits" (= Ethics),[91] which correlates the virtues |381| with the five senses. The author affirms that this is his original idea,[92] representing it at the end of his introduction by drawing a

[85] הקדמונים מחכמי המחקר ; to what does באותן refer? To הדעות?

[86] Joḥanan Allemano speaks of ליקוטים of Shem Tov from the book of בן דקלס (Steinschneider 1852, 2319). This should be added to R. Samuel Sarsa's reference to the work by Falaquera cited in Munk 1859, 303. For more on בן דקלס see above §3, n. 84.

[87] See above, §5, n. 50.

[88] For οὗ ἕνεκα or dioti (Munk 1859, 109), *quaritas*, see Steinschneider 1857h, 299, Steinschneider 1860h, 11 (Kaufmann 1877f, 279), together with חלות (חליה *anitas*) in the translation of the *Book of Definitions* by Israeli, below §224, n. 144.

[89] See above §95, n. ^{3}587; §190 n. ^{4}538.

[90] ‹Levy›[, Fleischer, and Wünsche] 1876, I, 348. [Sokoloff 1990, 297]

[91] תקון מדות is commonly: Ethics (see §110); Steinschneider 1852, 2325 (generally, for everything that follows).

[92] In the analysis found in Munk 1859, 168: "L'ensemble [du sujet] est traité d'une manière assez originale"; Geiger 1867b, 86: with a peculiarly playful adaptation, corrected already in *Hebräische*

table or diagram, similar to the square of opposition that can also be found in books on logic. The Hebrew poem on the four elements, inserted after the table in the edition of 1562, exhibits the acrostic אריה[93] but it does not appear in one of the old manuscripts or in the edition of 1550. [The incipit of this poem is: אש ומים איך דבקו]. Ibn Gabirol apologizes (1562, f. 5) for not being able to furnish either intellectual (שכליים) proofs, i.e., those based on formal logic (חכמת הדבר?) or biblical analogies (ההקשות), although he had meant to do so, since "the power of the flesh is weak" כי כח הבשרי חלש כ"ש לאיש אשר כמוני מה שאני בו מריב ההקנטה (?) ומיעוט השגת החפץ. This means that he did not intend to write a wholly popular treatise. Nevertheless, neither his language nor his method is strictly scholarly. He has, however, inserted quite a number of biblical passages that the editors have not always indicated as such. Part 3, chapter 3 on trust in God is not much more than a collection of Biblical verses; sayings (from Ḥunayn Ibn Isḥāq's *Maxims of the Philosophers* (see §200)) are also inserted, and what is particularly noteworthy, many verses from Arabic poetry. I promised to publish these, but I have since given my transcriptions to a student of mine. [The student remains unidentified; perhaps it was A. Löwenthal, who in 1896 published Ḥarizi's translation of Ḥunayn's *Maxims*, with a German translation and with comparisons to Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics*.]

Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 382 probably gives the date of composition as [4]828 (1068), but the first letter of the number has become illegible. The earliest Hebrew sources for the most part point to Saragossa, [4]805 (1045).[94] [Another fairly complete Judaeo-Arabic ms. is New York, JTSA ENA 4038 (identified by Y. Tobi; see his description in 1993, 291–318.)] A few fragments from late manuscripts have also come to light. [The Judaeo-Arabic original was published, along with an English translation, by S. Wise 1901.]

This small treatise was translated under the title תקון מדות הנפש by Judah Ibn Tibbon (between 1161 and 1167?) and was published, together with Baḥya's book on ethics, in Constantinople (around 1550),[95] then in Riva di Trento in 1562 in quarto format, together with Ḥunayn's *Maxims of the Philosophers* and the pseudo-Aristotelian *De pomo*, having a title page with the words גורן נכון (Exodus 2:6) in the top line – a scholarly pun of the editor which was taken up in the reprint of this collection, Lunéville (Ibn Gabirol 1807), in quarto format. S. Silbermann published the book of ethics on its own in Lyck (Ibn Gabirol 1859a), in duodecimo format under the inappropriate title ס' גורן נכון והוא תקון מדות הנפש, based upon a copy of the edition of 1807. B. Goldenberg and L. Dukes furnished Silbermann's edition with some

Bibliographie in some place; Levi b. Abraham follows the arrangment in [והלחשים] בתי הנפש (see Steinschneider 1852, loc. cit.).

[93] Steinschneider 1852, 2326; 1860b. In Steinschneider 1875b, no. 201 אש ומים is a scribal error for עזוב חידות ; see n. 100. [This is corrected in Steinschneider 1895, 89.]

[94] Steinschneider 1852, loc. cit., also clearly ה' in London, BL Add. 26899; ח' in the later Constantinople ed. (also the Lyck ed.) – One passage is provided by Kaufmann 1884a, 37, in Arabic letters.

[95] Munk 1859, 167, considers the Constantinople ed. to be the more recent one. – Composition according to the *editio princeps*, I, 827; see Steinschneider 1852, loc. cit – the title מדות הנפשות is found in Dukes 1860. Should it read הנפשיות?

corrections, on the basis of the original and one manuscript [of Ibn Gabirol's book], but [consulted] two manuscripts of Ḥunayn's collection of sayings.[96] Added to it is a letter of the translator to Asher, son of Meshullam [see the reference in §215 to the study of I. Ta-Shema in the supplementary note *ad loc*.], which I published first in the Michael Catalogue (Steinschneider 1848), 336 – Munk (1859, 168) knows only the Paris copy[97] – which may be regarded as a dedication to our book, and which at the same time completes the foreword of the translator |382| to Baḥya's work (§215). When Judah read the first treatise of Baḥya together with Asher, he, Asher, told Judah that a small treatise of Ibn Gabirol already contains the subject matter of the other nine treatises of Baḥya; and the praise that Judah heaps upon the little book [of Ibn Gabirol] is remarkable. The designation of the sources as מוסרי הפילוסופים has already been stressed. Asher hoped that a translation of Ibn Gabirol's little treatise would replace the treatises of Baḥya. Judah endeavoured to fulfill the wish of both the father and the son by translating according to the same principles. [The "father and son" refer to Meshullam, who commissioned the translation of Baḥya's *Duties of the Heart*, and Asher, according to Steinschneider's supposition of their relationship; see the article of Ta-Shema cited above.] Those places, however, where Ibn Gabirol quotes Arabic verses, Judah left blank, intending to fill them with analogous Hebrew verses by Ibn Gabirol, [Samuel] ha-Nagid, or other poets, or else to compose appropriate verses on his own. He had hoped to put them in the margin when he would find the time. Apparently Judah never found the opportunity to keep this promise. The editors have obscured the gaps that necessarily appear wherever the quoted verse of the poet (המשורר) does not follow.

Among the names of the sages who are quoted we encounter one which is corrupt in all editions and manuscripts, but which I could establish, namely Buzurjmihr (I, 2).[98] The book הקוטי, mentioned also in I, 2, is an Arabic versification of the Psalms by Ḥefeẓ al-Quti, still extant.[99] [This has now been edited with a French translation by Marie-Thérèse Urvoy Ibn Albar al-Quṭi 1994.]

In the *editio princeps* and in several manuscripts the translation starts with a poem[100] which, in the other editions, is placed at the end. In the *editio princeps*, the poem is ascribed to the translator.

---

[96] Cf. Steinschneider 1860b – The tables of contents of the 1562 edition in the margin figure here in the text as small print notes, always appearing at the beginning of the chapter; also parallel passages from מוסרי הפילוסופים.

[97] Paris, BN héb 674/1 [at the beginning is the introdution by Judah Ibn Tibbon], Paris, BN héb 839/8, in the index, 255 to the translation; cf Steinschneider 1852, 1376; also London, BL Add. 26899 and the manuscript owned by Joshua Heschel Schorr, mentioned by Geiger 1857a, 98. The letter cannot immediately be labeled as a prologue.

[98] Steinschneider 1879b, 106 n. 5; "Bazregamhar" in Bar Hebraeus 1886, 411. – אזדשיר cf. n. 139; ארגיאס in *Tiqqun ha-Middot* III, 1 at the end; cf. מוסרי הפילוסיפים II, 19 .ארגאניס

[99] Steinschneider 1870b, 26; Steinschneider 1877c, 414 to 125, no. 1. Does אלקוטי refer to the Arabic name for Goths? Cf. Harkavy and Kaufmann 1878, 132; Loeb 1885, 248.

[100] Beginning עזוב חידות (as in the imitation found in Schiller-Szinessy 1876, I, 54) and line 3 זנח for the false חכמות עזוב – קנה? Cf. Joseph Kimchi שקל הקדש in Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 731 n. 25.

Concerning subject matter and style, the book on the whole offers few difficulties, but we find a number of peculiar words, such as הקנטה (see *HUe*, 381), הפלכיים (אלפלכייה) as it has to be indubitably read,[101] הנפש הדברנית (1807b, f. 7, line 1) , usually (אלנאטקה) המדברת. The Arabic words מלקה (V, 3) and סירגא (towards the end) are corrupted from …? [The text in *HUe* is blank; from Wise's edition of the Arabic we can supply מוקא] and כירגא? חליים המשופם (towards the end, missing in the Lyck edition), perhaps ought to be read העפושיים?

One encounters, however, terms that are specifically coined – we do not know by whom first – to denote the virtues, e.g., סבלנות (I, 2 f. 10 b), that, in *Choice of Pearls* (chapter 10; §221 ff.) are rendered סבל; ציקנות, synonymous with כילות stinginess (V, 2).[102]

§221. 3. (*A Choice of Pearls*). We meet here with a delicate literary problem, feeling like a traveler who takes a road with the conviction that he will face |383| insurmountable obstacles, but who cannot and will not stay behind. Let me first of all confess that I do not wholeheartedly consider the book that I shall review next to be an authentic work of Ibn Gabirol. The reasons for and against [its attribution to him] will soon become evident. The structure of this paragraph will necessarily deviate somewhat from that of others.[103]

[The current consensus appears to reject the attribution of the *Choice of Pearls* (*Mivḥar ha-Peninim*) to Ibn Gabirol and, though the matter is difficult to assess, it seems that Steinschneider's detailed and forceful arguments here had a telling effect. A. M. Habermann 1944, in his very full bibliographical survey of the *Choice*, its printings, recensions, additions to the text, and translations, cautiously notes that he does not see sufficient evidence to justify the attribution to Ibn Gabirol. More recently Yehudah Ratzaby 1988 denies Ibn Gabirol's authorship of the text with a new argument: his own study reveals that the *Sirāj al-Mulūk* of Abū Bakr al-Ṭurṭushi (d. 1126) is a major source for the *Choice* and, on chronological grounds, it is very doubtful that Ibn Gabirol could have made use of that work. (Note Ratzaby's additions to Haberman's bibliography on 98 n. 9.) In a dissenting article in the same journal 1989, Sarah Katz speculates that al-Ṭurṭushi may have used Ibn Gabirol's work. The latest scholarship moves away from the question of authorship: H. Ben-Shammai takes no stand in 1991, going so far as to declare that the question of Ibn Gabirol's authorship is not the important one in investigating the book.]

A collection of aphorisms, almost all of them anonymous, arranged in 64 chapters ("gates") according to subject matter, is extant in a great number of manuscripts too

---

[101] Beginning of the Introduction, הגרמים הפלכיים and הדברים הפלכיים.

[102] On a spurious appendix in the ספר התדיר in London, BL Ms. Harley 5686 (Steinschneider 1852, 2327), see Dukes 1860, 122., also Frankfurt, SUB Oct. 22. Oldest citations of the book are בעל המוסר found in Joseph Kimḥi on Proverbs 15:10 (Kimḥi 1867), 21[ed. Talmage, 1990, 76–7] and maybe וכן אמר המוסר, on 18:12, 25? [ed. Talmage, 92, which reads וכן אמר בספר המוסר, which Talmage takes to refer to משלי הערב, see n. 12]. Cf. המוסרים mentioned by Jonah Gerundi on Prov. 12:9 in Dukes 1850c, 356, which is taken by Dukes for מוסרי הפילוסופים.

[103] Mainly following Steinschneider 1852, 2319 and Additamenta, cf. 1376. See Steinschneider 1859b, 62 [Steinschneider's review of B. Ascher's edition]. Munk 1859, 169, talks about this book very briefly.

many to be enumerated here, and in many editions, some of them accompanied by explanatory notes or a translation.[104]

The first edition was published by Soncino (in Italy) in 1484, with a short commentary, probably by Samson Munay ‹from Joigny? See below, §575, n. 144› [The commentator is indeed Samson of Joighny, according to Richler 2001, 194] called שערי מדות[105] in Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2908, fols. 199a–240b; the ms. was copied in 1338 and also includes the additions (תוספות).[106] This edition is, by the way, the first product of the press of the renowned Soncino family. The second edition of Ibn Gabirol's work, 1739 and 1767, covers the Hebrew text with a Judaeo-German translation. There follow printings with a German translation (Ibn Gabirol 1842), a plagiarized version of which appeared in 1844; a Latin version of 299 aphorisms, published by Jo. Drusius in the third part of his *Apophthegmata* 1591 and 1612; and a collection of 750 aphorisms, fully vocalized, with a Latin translation done by Jacob Ebertus and his son Theodor, published in Frankfurt a.O. 1630. H. Filipowski edited the Hebrew text on the basis of one manuscript, without the additions Ibn Gabirol 1851). B. H. Ascher produced an edition of 652 paragraphs or aphorisms (Ibn Gabirol 1859b) – their arrangement not wholly correct[106b] – on the basis of five manuscripts, again without the additions, but with an English translation, an introduction and many instructive notes, particularly concerning parallel passages (part of them due to L. Dukes).[107] – I have presented a sample of rhymed translations with notes in my book *Manna* (Steinschneider 1847), nos. 87–125. I shall skip the commentaries and the Hebrew compendia.

There is neither an old manuscript nor any edition up to the nineteenth century that names an author or translator. The conjecture of Gaulmyn pointing to Jedaiah ha-Penini (thirteenth century, see Wolf 1715, I, 440) as author was accepted by a recent edition (Ibn Gabirol 1842) and its plagiarized version; it does not merit a refutation. L. Rosenthal 1875, 178, no. 927, strongly rebukes this error and, before presenting an idea to be mentioned presently, says: "All this is wrong. It is Solomon Ibn Gabirol who collected the sayings of the Arabs and translated them into Hebrew,

[104] Steinschneider 1852, l.c.; Zedner 1867, 537, 724; Benjacob 1880, 288 no. 329; Rosenthal 1875, 1002, Hebrew appendix, 178.

[105] Steinschneider 1852, 2323 and 2638 (the title is missing in Benjacob 1880, l.c. and 603); Steinschneider 1859b, 63, we find 1392 instead of the correct 1338. Dukes 1860 does not mention the author.

[106] "This collection (!) is scattered over the old commentary (!)… Many are taken from the ברע ילשמ [compiled by Isaac Ibn Crispin]." Dukes 1860, 87. [The view that Ibn Crispin was the compiler was rejected by Schirmann 1960, II, 60–66.]

[106b] Thus, for example, the following dicta belong together: 8, nos. 36–37 (Steinschneider 1847, 92), page 10, nos. 56–57 (Kimḥi on Proverbs XI, 25 1867, 16 [ed. Talmage, 1990, 54–55], דברי חפץ, ed. Edelman, 1853, 30), nos. 242–43 (see above, 258), nos. 383–89, nos. 414–45 (Dukes 1842, no. 8); whereas 69 consists of two sayings. (Dukes 1842, 3, wrongly has שער ההכרה; cf. n. 117 below). However, it is very difficult to establish a consistent criterion.

[107] A Choice of Pearls Embracing a Collection of the Most Genuine Ethical Sentences, Maxims and Salutary Reflections, B. H. Ascher ed., London 1859b; cf. Steinschneider 1859b, 61; the parallels in Manna are not made use of everywhere.

as every discerning person is aware of." This contention, however, is merely a false conjecture of Filipowski (1851) and has already been rejected in Steinschneider 1852, 2321.

Just as Judah Ibn Tibbon preserved for us the memory of his rival Joseph Kimḥi in his translation of the *Duties of the Heart*, so, too, the latter has |384| preserved the name of the author and the translator of the *Choice of Pearls* – if the foreword is authentic and [textually] correct. This is the next point to be discussed.

Joseph Kimḥi (or Kamḥi?)[108] b. Isaac, father of the two famous grammarians David and Moses, alias "Maestro *Petit*," a name which probably remained within the family,[109] [originally] from Spain, [but living] in Narbonne (perhaps also in Lünel?), was well-versed in Arabic.[110] He composed a Hebrew grammar,[111] commentaries to some books of the Bible, etc. We have mentioned him already as translator of the *Duties of the Heart*. He put the sayings of the *Choice of Pearls* in verse form under the title שקל הקדש (*The Holy Shekel*). [The book is extant in eleven manuscripts: Basel, UB R III 2; Budapest, MTA Ms. Kaufmann 291/4; Budapest, MTA Ms. Kaufmann 528/4; Cambridge, UL Add. 377/8; New York, JTS Ms. 1495/2; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 146 ; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 639; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 50; Paris, BN héb 983/3b; ‹Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2620›, and St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. II 104/9. Steinschneider lists six of these, including Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2620] (according to 1872d, 31, Perreau 1889, 23, deficient);[112] and Rabinowitz Supplement 1887 under 120, now Kaufmann.[112b] Is the copy, which Buxtorf obtained from Jacob Roman in Basel? [It is.]

The importance of the problems relating to this book as well as the absence of a complete edition, a scholarly desideratum, gives us reason to indicate here the extant extracts in detail. [In 1919 Hermann Gollancz edited the text on the basis of Oxford Bodl. ms. Pococke 50, with reference also to Oxford Bodl. ms. Oppenheim 639, and provided an English translation in Kimḥi 1919. Gollancz raised the possibility that Kimḥi was familiar with the Arabic version of the *Mivḥar ha-Peninim* and that he consciously adapated its maxims to his own style.]

There are twenty-seven numbered aphorisms from Oxford, Bodleian Library Mich. 146, of which no. 16 combines two which we call a. and b. [(= ed. Gollancz, nos. 193 and 194)] which were printed by Dukes in 1842, 99, called here "*Dz*." [The ms. is a nineteenth-century copy of aphorisms of *Shekel ha-Kodesh*, made perhaps by Dukes in

---

[108] On the pronunciation see Steinschneider 1871b, 133. On the author, cf. Steinschneider 1852, 1497 ff, where it should be read *Literaturblatt des Orients* 11, 490 [In fact, the references there seem correct, and the correction here, mistaken.] and Additamenta to Steinschneider 1852. (Geiger 1856b, 1858); Berliner 1874b, 22; Neubauer 1876–77b, 178; Frankl 1819–1889, 54.

[109] Geiger 1856b, 97; cf. פרקי צפון, ed. Straschun 1841, I, 47.

[110] On his relationship to Ibn Janaḥ, cf. Bacher 1883, 209. On a passage in ס' הברית (הגיון) see above, §12, n. 273. H. J. Mathews edited ס' הגלוי in Kimḥi 1887.

[111] ס' הזכרון, see Steinschneider 1879, 16, no. 35/3.

[112] Ending in שער הספוק; cf. Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 731.

[112b] Written by Yeḥiel ben Moses אפורה in 1358 (?) in Monte Pulciano ונאצלוף, wrongly גילוף in Vatican BAV ebr. Ms. 46 [actually, the manuscript has 'צלוף, which would be a correct abbreviation: see Freimann 1950, 433;] cf. Dukes 1848a, 309; Zunz 1863, 22 [?].

Hamburg, from transcriptions of M. H. Bresslau – see letter *d* below – that were in turn made from the Oppenheim ms.]

(a) Foreword, introductory poem and 33 numbered aphorisms (The final homonym of chapter one is XII!), in their entirety from Paris, BN ms. héb 983 in Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846 = *Dl*.
(b) 8 unnumbered aphorisms in a little article dealing with our book by Dukes 1850c, 507, 508, 521, 522 = *Dll*.
(c) 33 unnumbered aphorisms in a small collection, edited by H. Edelmann 1852, also with an English paraphrase by M. H. Bresslau, 51 ff; there is no indication which Bodley manuscript was used in this edition (12 aphorisms thereof already in *Dz*. and *Dl*.) = *ED*.
(d) Joseph Kimḥi inserted more than 30 sayings in his commentary on Proverbs, incompletely edited under the ridiculous title ספר חוקה (Breslau 1867). = *Pr*. (with numbering of the chapters and verses which the ignorant editor had not indicated). [The title comes from the last words of the introductory poem of the commentary; the butt of Steinschneider's scorn here is Dov Ber of Dubrove 1867. The commentary was critically edited on the basis of the extant manuscripts by Ephraim Talmage 1990.]

A few of these items were published by Dukes in an article on the last-named book 1850a, 358, 378, 389, 391. Seven of them appear in *a* and *b* as well. There is not a single saying quoted in the various works that does not belong to one of these series.

All manuscripts of the *Shekel ha-Kodesh* begin with a foreword. |385| We had the unusually good chance to be able to make use of five sources from which the foreword was printed,[113] but this *embarras de richesse* does not make things easier, nor does it furnish us with any conclusive evidence. On the contrary, every manuscript presents us with a different picture and, apart from a short passage where Kimḥi speaks in first person, they are all different from one another. When we discuss the main points we notice that the most complete recension (*R* = Rabinowitz [now Budapest, MTA Ms. Kaufmann 528/4]) lacks the Hebrew book title which occurs in the next recension and even in the abbreviated recension (*B* = Uri ms. [now Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 50]).

(a) The author's name, Solomon ben Judah בן גיברול (Gibrol), occurs only in *R*. and in Buxtorf [now Basel, UB R III 2, in fact, it appears in Oxford, Bodleian Library Oppenheim 693 as well.]
(b) The Arabic title, corrupt almost everywhere, is in *R*. מנתכ'ל אלג'והר, probably for מנתכ'ל אלג'ואהר; in Mich. 846 it appears corrupted as מבקאר; מתנדל in Opp.

[113] From the Mich. manuscript (Dukes 1842, 97, the heading is on the whole worthless; cf. Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 728, where we have a wrong conclusion! But see below, b.), Uri manuscript (= *B*, in Wolf 1715, III, 424), Oppenheimer (= *O.*, in Ascher 1859b, xii), *P.* (Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 728), *R*. (in Steinschneider 1875g, 68).

[= Oppenheim 683? But the reading there is מכ'תאר] is indubitably to be read, with Buxtorf, מכ'תאר (and consequently מובחר, "chosen").[114]

(c) The name of the Hebrew translator of the מבחר הפנינים is given, in *O*. and *R*., as Judah b. Saul b. Tibbon "from Sevilla" (אשבילי‍ה). This note is very suspect and perhaps an addition on the part of the copyist. [A. Marx 1927, 436–37, argued on the basis of another manuscript that the note is indeed by Kimḥi. The manuscripts that mention Ibn Gabirol as author of the *Mivḥar ha-Peninim* and Judah Ibn Tibbon as its translator represent a later version of *Shekel ha-Kodesh* made by the author, which was partly rearranged according to the order of *Mivḥar ha-Peninim*.]

(d) All manuscripts have the passage: "I, Joseph b. Isaac (ben, in *R*.) Kimḥi, have translated it into (or, from) the Hebrew language." This could well mean that Kimḥi has versified the Hebrew translation, done in prose, by Tibbon. In Paris, BN héb 983, we find after this passage: "I found (the sayings) in prose (*oratione soluta* מפורדים, or scattered? ‹cf. 885›), partly in Arabic, partly in Hebrew." *R*. has: "I have added sayings from other books."[115] One thereby understands better what follows.

(e) Kimḥi collects sayings that are related to each other, i.e., those that treat the same subject; or else he arranged his additions according to the base text. He divided everything into 22 chapters, according to the number of the Hebrew letters, and concluded every chapter with a distich in homonyms (instead of rhymes) that indicates both the contents and the number of sayings – perhaps an imitation of the *Tarshish* of Moses b. Ezra (according to Dukes 1850a, 728, n. 3). E. Carmoly, who published a list of 22 chapters, dared to state that Kimḥi's book has nothing to do with the *Choice of Pearls* and that all those who identify the two books speak so only from hearsay![116] Has he done more than copy the table of contents? Unfortunately, we have before us only the extracts, noted above, whose second series alone indicates the titles of Kimhi's chapters. The first series indicates the titles of the printed book (with two errors)[117]; the others do not have anything like this. We would understand even if a scholar more punctilious than Carmoly, after having read the foreword of the Paris manuscript, without comparing carefully |386| and having perused the printed book, would have doubted that the latter is reproduced in the former.

The published portions and quotations from Kimḥi's version contain, not counting identical passages, only approximately 100 sayings; one must spend several hours in order to identify even less than half of the sayings in both books.[118] [Gollancz published a table comparing the aphorisms of the *Shekel* (in his edition) to similar ones in the *Choice* (in Asher's edition), see 1919, 126–29; see, however, Marx 1927, who argues that

[114] Thus in the commentary, beginning of the second chapter, Steinschneider 1852, 2321: המובחר מהפנינים *R*.

[115] See Steinschneider 1852, 1498.

[116] Carmoly 1839, 188, and corrections, 312; from there Benjacob 1880, 609–610 no. 1248.

[117] No. 3 ההכרה should read החכמה (Ibn Gabirol 1859b, no. 69) and no. 10 the reverse (no. 208).

[118] More detailed information on the mutual relation in an endnote.

there are two recensions of *Shekel*]. This, however, is sufficient proof of the fact that Kimḥi made use of the *Choice* by including, in his divergent arrangement, at least part of the titles not only of the chapters but also of individual sayings. This is not *prima facie* evident to someone studying the arrangement of the *Choice*, where the arrangement of the sayings under rubrics that are ethical terms is very vague. For example in the *Choice* we find chapter headings such as "commendable habits" (in Asher's English, *urbanity*!) (ch. 38), "guidance to the good path" (ch. 42), "rules (testaments?) of the wise man for his son" (ch. 43), etc. The author has not paired contrary terms, and the identical aphorism is listed as no. 116 in chapter 5 and as no. 648 in chapter 64. Perhaps Kimḥi thought (cf. the end of the foreword) that he had grouped together the material which, to him, seemed to belong to the same subject. All the more, then, must we assume that he did not compile his work in full independence [of the *Choice*], since, even in the extracts, many sayings have the same order of arrangement as in the *Choice of Pearls*, e.g., *Dl*. 7–9 = *Vint*. 15–17. On the other hand, the conflation of various chapters and the re-arrangement of individual aphorisms do not allow us to indicate the exact relationship between the parts of the *Choice* and those parts that have been added from other sources. For instance, Kimḥi counts, in the distich at the end of chapter one, 140[119] lines whereas the *Choice* has 75; perhaps, though, part of this chapter has been taken from others.

Another question cannot be answered: Is the redaction of the *Shekel ha-Kodesh* based on the Arabic original or on *the only Hebrew translation*? Dukes corrects the reading of one aphorism of the *Choice* on the basis of the *Shekel*,[120] but that does not prove dependence: Kimḥi could well use the same Hebrew word as the translator of the *Choice*. The same applies to the similarity between the few aphorisms that we could compare. (The reading ובית שחת in Kimḥi [*Dll*. No. 8, 522] seems to be, however, a variant reading of מבלי צוות no. 544, *Choice*, 108, and not מאין, as on 176.)Kimḥi may have known, and made use of, the prose translation, as the foreword to *R*. seems to indicate; but that does not at all mean that he did not know the Arabic text. On the other hand, the mutual divergences in the known identical aphorisms of both books are not proof of their origin from an Arabic text, for Kimḥi, like any versifier, could and had to work in almost boundless freedom. Finally, his source might be another Arabic or Hebrew text: Nos. 36 and 37, for instance, dealing with the wise and the rich, are attributed in Ḥunayn's *Apophthegms* to Diogenes[121]; Kimḥi (*Dz*. no. 8) applies, so it seems, the [rule] *omnia mea mecum porto*. On his commentary to Proverbs 22:1 (ed. Dubrov, Kimḥi 1867, 30, [ed. Talmage, Kimḥi 1990, 111] Kimḥi adduces no. 540 of |387| the prose version of the *Choice*, in a slightly different version[122]; and that in a way confirms the *argumen-*

[119] לנס Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 729 (should be indicated as XII).

[120] Edelmann 1852, 12, whence Ibn Gabirol 1859b, 66 and 160.

[121] Steinschneider 1847, 89 n. xcvi (thus should read 1873h, 133) and 107; also Weiner 1855, 13 on merchants. – Dukes remarks à propos *Dz*. מעט בשנוי.

[122] בית is presumably ת"חי and in Ibn Gabirol 1859b, one should read שמנה for 80,000 שמנים dinars for agricultural land is presumably too much.

tum a silentio that this commentary was composed before the *Shekel,* which is never mentioned in it. The *Shekel* is at any rate *not* a translation proper but a strongly paraphrasing versification. One example may show this: The simple saying no. 202 "Covetousness is the companion of blindness (delusion)" becomes in Kimḥi (ed. Edelmann 1852, no. 3, [ed. Gollancz, no. 144, 1919] a distich four times as long.[123]

We have analyzed the relation between the *Shekel* and the *Choice* from a historical perspective without trying to characterize the former, either philologically or aesthetically, on the basis of the extracts. Nevertheless, we cannot refrain from remarking that pithy sayings generally lose more than they gain when versified and amplified.[124] Now we have to return to the *Choice*.

Mss of *Shekel ha-Qodesh*

Basel, Universitätsbibliothek R III 2 (Basel 37 (Cat. Allony & Kupfer)) (IMHM F 2569, F 8857), 1a–37b.
Budapest, Magyar tudományos akadémia 291 (IMHM Fiche 78), 256–63.
Budapest, Magyar tudományos akadémia 528 (IMHM Fiche 32), 139–76.
Cambridge, University Library 377 (SCR 774) (IMHM F 16296), 662–91.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 1495 (Ms. 6322/Ms. Acc. 1134) (IMHM F 39179), 61b–75b
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Mich. 146 (Ms. Mich. 846) (Neubauer 1180) (IMHM F 16639), 116a–19a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Opp. 639 (Ms. Opp. 1404) (Neubauer 1180) (IMHM F 19137), 18 fols.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Pococke 50 (Uri 497) (Neubauer 1976) (IMHM F 19138), 1b–32b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 983 (a. f. héb 245) (IMHM F 30343), 10a–21b.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 2620 (De Rossi 1393) (IMHM F 13536), 29a–35b.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 104 (IMHM F 64120), 8 fols.

§222. People have grown accustomed to attributing the lost Arabic original of the *Choice* to Ibn Gabirol[125] without taking into proper account the fact that we have no other testimony than the passage of Kimḥi. That passage remained unknown to all Jewish scholars who used the *Choice*, expressly or tacitly, and their number is great, their authority, considerable.[126] They are led by Judah Ibn Tibbon, who knows the

[123] See n. 126. Dukes 1860, 79 compares the שקל הקודש with the Italian poems of Robert of Anjou.

[124] This can easily verified in the endnote indicated in note 118.

[125] Also Geiger 1867b, 86, 114, 143; Dukes 1860, 51 etc. (Additamenta to Steinschneider 1852, 2321).

[126] Quotations in Dukes at various places, finally Dukes 1860, 80. Cf. also the notes to Ibn Gabirol 1859b, – where we find, 151 no. 202, i.e., Beraḥya's ס' הזכרון as "work treating of the art of Memory!" cf. p. 138 n. 25 ספר הנסיכים (Steinschneider 1852, 2322), according to Dukes שירי שלמה 1858 I, supplement, ix, is only fictitious. – Simon Duran cites מבחר in his commentary to Avot IV, 20 (Duran 1855, fol. 72b), and to V, 12 (fol. 87), but to IV, 24, fol. 74, it is a memory lapse (see Steinschneider 1873e, 563; the commentary to IV, 4 (fol. 60b) includes no. 624, without a reference to the title (Ibn Gabirol 1859b, 183.); cf. Kimḥi, Commentary to Proverbs 12:9 1867, 17 [ed. Talmage 1990, 58] (also *Dll* no. 2); – earlier mentioned by Judah Abbas in Dukes 1860, 82.

book and quotes some of its sayings without referring to either the author or the translator.[127] Falaquera mentions the *Choice* as an example of those books that were composed by the "wise men of the nations," an expression that must be understood to refer to the origin of the aphorisms. That expression proves at least that Falaquera did not think of Ibn Gabirol as the compiler. We have to admit that all this is strange and requires an explanation, if one believes the – not unsuspect – note in Kimḥi's foreword according to the unique ms. *R*. to be correct. [The note appears in several manuscripts.]

This is not all. Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics* contains a number of sayings from the *Choice of Pearls* without any indication of their source,[128] nor do they always exhibit the same wording – and this is of importance for [clarifying] the problem of the translator. Sometimes one can correct the text on the basis of these quotations.[129] In the interpretation of the word דאגה there is a contradiction between no. 140 and Ibn Gabirol III, 2. In the whole text of the *Choice of Pearls* no actual author's name or book title is to be found |388| (for no. 242 Aristotle, see above 258; no. 637 "a book on medicine"), while there is no dearth of names and titles in the *Ethics*. We emphasize four sayings in which Ibn Gabirol names his authorities twice, as does Ḥunayn in his *Apophthegms* (which apparently are used in the *Ethics*): 118 (III, 2 Socrates), 617 (II, 4 Plato), 170 (I, 2 Buzurjmihr, cf. 382), 538 an Indian king (I, 1 Azdashir instead of Ardashir which may easily be explained by the similitude of the Arabic letters).[130] Even if Ibn Gabirol had compiled the *Choice of Pearls* in his youth for his own use, as has been maintained, no reason for the omission of the names can be adduced. Furthermore, the arrangement of the aphorisms, already mentioned, does not fit with the systematic nature of Ibn Gabirol.

It is equally strange that the name of Judah Ibn Tibbon can be found only in that passage of Kimḥi, which makes him an inhabitant of Sevilla, while everywhere else, including the epigraphs of his son Samuel and his grandson Moses, we read from Granada (מרמון ספרד). The language – one can hardly speak of style in the context of such aphorisms – offers no criterion for our problem: nothing is conspicuous, and there are no hints as to the native country or the date of the translator. Some forms, such as הקצפה or התקצפות (no. 121), חמור (172) have always been coined anew in scholarly works. B. Asher (Ibn Gabirol 1859b, 176, n. 544) emphasizes the Aramaic word צוות (society) which also occurs in Baḥya's *Ethics* (X, 3).

[Habermann and Ratzaby, both of them not without some hesitation, accept the identification of Judah Ibn Tibbon as the translator. Ratzaby points out that Judah Ibn Tibbon's formulations of five aphorisms in his translator's introduction to Bahya's *Duties of the Heart* are identical

[127] In both introductions to חובות [i.e., to the first treatise and to the second treatise] three sayings, namely, nos. 20 (והגעת and כפיהם better than the edition), 65 (הוא better), 61; in Steinschneider 1852, 11 nos. 3 (correctly הסדר בהוראה) and 12.

[128] In Ibn Gabirol 1859b, particularly, these parallels are almost entirely neglected.

[129] For example, no. 177 (Ibn Gabirol 1859b, I, 3).

[130] In Ibn Gabirol 1859b, 175 the word has been repeatedly mistakenly printed; the source for this saying in Duran's commentary to *Avot* 4: 4, Duran 1855 (see above, n. 126) is not Joseph Ibn Aknin.

to their formulation in the Hebrew translation of the *Mivḥar ha-Peninim*. But this shows at best that Judah Ibn Tibbon was familiar with that translation, not that he was its author. On the other hand, Ratzaby also calls attention to a British Library ms. (without identifying it, but it is Add. 18684 (Marg. 514/2)), in which a certain R. Solomon Ibn Tafu is named as the translator; this was noted already by Steinschneider in 1852, 2322.]

4. *De anima*? A book on the soul, translated into Latin, perhaps composed by Ibn Gabirol, partly translated from Latin into Hebrew (see above, p. 21) is in the course of publication. [The work was published in 1891 by Steinschneider's student, A. Loewenthal 1891; for the question of its authorship, see above, §4d.]

§223 (Israeli.) Abū Yaʿqūb Isḥāq b. Sulaymān al-Isrāʾīlī (died around the middle of the tenth century; see §479), called in Hebrew sources Isaac ben Solomon Israeli, in Latin sources Ysaacus, is one of the most famous physicians of the Middle Ages. Maimonides (see above, p. 41) values him only as a physician, not as a philosopher. Jacob b. Reuben,[131] a contemporary of Maimonides, bases his interpretation of some biblical verses on Isaac's authority, "for he was a scholar of the Torah and of the seven disciplines[132]; all the wise men of his time as well as those who came after him (קמו תחתיו), those who profess the Torah[133] or another [revelation], call him a 'philosopher,' not as Abraham Ibn Ezra |389| does, a 'babbler' (מהביל).[134] For all his books were well received by the wise men, and they took their arguments from them." Arabic bibliographers name some titles of his philosophical works,[135] e.g., a book on logic which seems to be lost. On the other hand, the Jews preserved some fragments, in Hebrew translation, of books and treatises that remained unknown to the Arabs, probably because they were written only in Hebrew letters for Jewish readers. We shall first deal with two books known to the Arabs.

[A. Altmann and S. Stern, *Isaac Israeli: A Neoplatonic Philosopher of the Early Tenth Century*, Oxford, 1958, is an authoritative study to which we shall refer in the following as either Altmann 1958 or Stern 1958, depending upon the section. (Altmann wrote on the

---

[131] מלחמות of Jacob b. Reuben, Gate 12 (from Paris, BN héb 983/3 where the catalogue indicates the name of Levi Gersonides), fol. 13b of the retracted [?] edition by Stettin (Naḥmanides 1860 [= Rosenthal 1963, 17]); see Naḥmanides 1860, p. 44; Steinschneider 1880, 333 no. 1313.

[132] On the seven sciences (liberal arts) Steinschneider 1857a, 338, n. 49, must be corrected; Joseph Kimḥi (to Prov. 9:1; 1 1867, 12; 1887, 1; Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 337; Dukes 1860, 110) speaks of הכרות, i.e., the sources of knowledge; however, Zeraḥya b. Isaac on this passage (and certainly Immanuel b. Salomon, see Steinschneider 1857a, 351) mean the seven sciences. Carmoly 1840–41, 47, should have Jacob b. Reuben rather than Abū Sahl Ibn Tamīm.

[133] בני תורה וחוצה לה = תוריי, see above §18, n. 79; בן תורה is too recent for "scholar" and does not fit here.

[134] On היצחקי, המבהיל and Isaac b. Yasos (Yashush ? d. 1057) see Steinschneider 1852, 1117; the citations are from Steinschneider 1872d, 58; Bacher 1876, 31 (but not in Bacher 1881, 186); Friedlaender 1877, 130; Gross 1879, 328.

[135] For example, כתאב אלחכמה in eleven sections is mentioned in Wüstenfeld 1840, §101 no. 13: *de philosophia*; also in Leclerc 1876, I, 412; בסתאן אלחכמה in Ḥājjī Khalīfa 1835–58, II, 51 no. 1815; in d'Herbelot 1785 II, 296, under "Yahya Ib. Israel"! (the source is Ḥājjī Khalīfa 1835–58, II, 503: b. Misiḥ [read: Nasuḥ]); Metaphysics ("Théologie" in Leclerc 1876, I, 412), in Hebrew פרדס החכמה. See below, n. 163.

Mantua Text and the *Book on the Elements*; Stern on the *Book of Definitions*, the *Book of Substances*, and the *Book on Spirit and Soul.*) With the exception of the commentary to *Sefer Yeẓira*, no longer attributed to Israeli, the writings discussed below have attracted little scholarly interest during the past half century.]

1. The *Book of Definitions and Descriptions* (כתאב אלחדוד ואלרסום).[136] [See Stern 1958, 3–78, for a discussion and full translation of this work.] In the beginning of Isaac's works, usually given the title *Opera Ysacii*[137] (Lyons, Israeli 1515), we find a Latin translation of this little treatise.[138] Its title is (f. 2): "Collectiones ex dictis philosophorum de differentia inter descriptiones rerum et diffinitiones (sic!) earum et quare philosophia fuit descripta et non definita" etc. It ends, "Hic finiuntur collectiones Ysaac" etc. This title is most probably a literal translation of the text, because it is similar to the titles of other works by Isaac, which he considered to be compilations of the views of the ancient philosophers. In the beginning of the *Tabula* there is the passage, "Liber definitionum ysaac heben amaran philosophi," a confusion of Isaac with his teacher, the Arab physician Isḥāq b. ʿImrān (vulgo ʿAmrān, died around 900),[139] which already occurs in a Hebrew compilation of the thirteenth century.[140] The Latin translator is not named. The list of the translations of Gerard of Cremona contains in the section on *Physica* (because the author is a physician!), no. 55: "De descriptione rerum et diffinitionibus etc." The switch in the wording of the title leads us to surmise that the author of the list did not have the book before him. Some manuscripts contain the printed book under the name of Gerard.[141] There is no direct evidence that Constantinus Africanus translated either this or the following (§225.2) book, as he had done with the other printed works of Isaac. [Steinschneider refers here to Israeli's medical writings; see §479.] This book has yet to be compared with other works of these two translators. |390| Thus we have not found a decisive argument in favor of either one of them.

We face here two difficulties: the loss of the Arabic original, and the peculiar character of this treatise in its Latin translation, which reads more as an

[136] Ḥājjī Khalīfa 1835–58, V, 73 no. 10043, wrongly translated by Flügel; Steinschneider 1865c, 475; Steinschneider 1869a, 5.

[137] Consisting of two parts (cf. Repertorium in Israeli 1515); The title page (at the same time, first folio): "Omnia opera Ysaac," etc.; first counted as six (or five, if ‹*Diaetae*› are considered as one) works of Isaac up to fol. 226, then onward, without a title page, six works (however, incorporated in 1 *de Gradibus*, Constantine's alphab.; see §448) up to fol. 210. Furthermore, a "Repertorium seu indicum omnium operum Ysaac in hoc volumine contentorum coadunatio" (bound in the first place in most copies) with exact pagination, signature a, 10 folia for the first series, A 5 folia for the second.

[138] Most recently: a.d. XV supra M (!) mensi Decembri; a second edition of 1525 (Kayserling 1861, III, 170; Zenker 1846 I, 148, no. 1209) probably does not exist. Perreau (1878–1904, 169, no. 45) has incorrectly: Leida.

[139] Steinschneider 1852, 1115, 1123; on him cf. 1873c 86:73.

[140] ספר היושר, Steinschneider 1852, loc. cit.; Steinschneider 1878a, 130, catalogue no. 307.

[141] As a conjecture in Steinschneider 1865b, 477; hence, probably presented as a fact in Wüstenfeld 1877, 71 *sub* Gerard; cf. 14 n. 3 *sub* Constantin; Leclerc 1876, II, 492: "Dans les imprimés (!) il porte simplement le titre: De diffin."

agglomeration than as a development of ideas. Indeed, it may rather be called a compilation of fragments. [Part of the Arabic was recovered from the Cairo Genizah and was published by Hirschfeld 1902; for criticism of this edition see Stern 1958, 3.][142] Constantinus was less faithful as a translator than Gerard, because he abridged the text, whereas Gerard's Latin, as has been observed, sounds much like Arabic.[143] Our book begins with the explanation of four Arabic terms: anitas (הליה), quidditas, qualitas, and quaritas (למיה).[144] Do these terms occur in the other translations of Constantinus? Had he occasion at other places to make use of them? I do not want to decide whose translation it is; but the comparison of our book with the next (§225) yields some clues for choosing one or the other opinion. ‹The printed edition is incomplete compared with ms. 14,700 and the same Vienna 2325, cf. Bäumker 1892, 126. [?]›

[Gerard de Cremona has been securely identified as the translator of the Latin text found in the printed edition and several manuscripts; an edition of his translation was made by Muckle 1937–38. Stern made several suggestions for improvements to Muckle's edition in the textual annotations to his translation 1958. In addition, there is an anonymous Latin abbreviated version which is based on Gerard's translation; it also was edited by Muckle 1937–38.]

§224. The *Book of Definitions* was known in Spain already in the eleventh century, for the Qāḍī Ṣāʿid al-Andalusī lists it in his article on Isaac Israeli, which the translator of the *Book of the Elements*[145] reproduces. Maimonides quotes it under an abbreviated title (§222).[146]

A treatise (חבור) by Isaac, translated by Nissim b. Solomon, is contained in: London, Mon. 305/4, Milan, BA C 116 Sup., Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 335, Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2105, Vatican, BA ebr. 236/9. Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 335 contains roughly a third of our treatise, namely until the eighth condition (f. 2^3, l. 4 of the Latin).[147]

The explicit of London, Mon. 305/4 displays: בין החקיקה והתכלית נשלם מחברת של יצחק בחקיקת הדברים ותכליתם והפרש (והפרק). [The text of Nissim's Hebrew translation was published by H. Hirschfeld in the Steinschneider festschrift, 1896. Stern 1958, 6, announced the forthcoming publication of his own edition of the text, to appear in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, promising to refute the claim of J. L. Teicher that Nissim worked from the Latin, rather than from the Arabic. However, that publication did not appear in *HUCA*, nor anywhere else; it is not listed in the bibliography of S. M. Stern's writings by Latham and Mitchell 1970.]

We do not know for sure the date and the origin of the translator. A Nissim b. Solomon אגוסתרו (אגוסטרו?) copied mystical works of Eleazar of Worms in Paris, BN

---

[142] 1869a, 5.

[143] Kästner, in Bardenhewer 1882, 25.

[144] De particulativa, see above, n. 88.

[145] הגבולים והרשומים, Dukes 1843c, 231.

[146] Different is חכמת גבולים in Hadassi 1836, ch. 100 (Steinschneider 1858, 49), following which Steinschneider 1852, 1118–1119, is to be corrected.

[147] Beginning אמר יצחק רבים מרואי הספרים הקדמונים וחלוק [וחלוף?] דבורים בתכלית הדברים, and again, גבולי for תכלית.

héb 850.[148] [That Paris manuscript dates from the sixteenth century; hence it is very unlikely that the copyist, Nissim ben Solomon אגושתרו, is the translator of Israeli's writings.] Nissim b. Moses b. Solomon from Marseille, a philosophical writer, lived in the beginning of the fourteenth century[149]; Isaac Latif (end of the thirteenth century) quotes a passage from the book גבולי הדברים (*The Definitions of Things*) by Isaac, apparently from the Arabic text or from another source.[150] [Altmann 1957, 236 n. 2 (cont. from 235), surmises that Ibn Latif cited directly from the Arabic. This same passage is cited by Gershon ben Solomon; see below, supplementary comment on §225. 2.] A historical passage (Latin f. 3^4, last line and f. 4^1) may serve as an example of the two translations: Ysaac testific.: quidem me vidisse in egypto |391| huius modi. *dominibatur* enim eidem quidam ducum de filiis *tolonis* qui dicebatur filius *talix*[151]; et magnificatum est eius imperium, et relaxata est memoria eius et *terruerat* ipsius exercitum: et erat *dux exercitus eius quidam magister* minutorum nomine *bidel*; ms. Halb. אמר יצחק אני ראיתי הדומה לזה במצרים שגבר עליה איש מבני טולון בנו [הנקרא?] אל כליך שגדלה מעלתו ושמו עלה ורבו חיילותיו והיה מושל על חיילותיו שחור כופר שהיה שמו כלאל (sic).

[A second Hebrew translation was identified in two St. Petersburg manuscripts, St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. II A 388 and St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. II A 412 by A. Borisov; the full text was published by A. Altmann 1957.]

Treatise (Part of the Book of Definitions), trans. Nissim b. Solomon

London, Montefiore 305/4 (Halb. 361) (IMHM F 5255), 13a–27b.
Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C 116 Sup. (Kennicott 189) (Bernheimer 14) (IMHM F 12263).
Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Mich. 335 (Ms. Mich. 82) (Neubauer 1318) (IMHM F 22132), 45b–54.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2105 (De Rossi 1246) (IMHM F 13324), 191b–95b.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica ebr. 236 (IMHM F 292), 52a–62a.

Trans. Anonymous

St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 388 (IMHM F 64676), 2 fols.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 412 (IMHM F 64765), 2 fols.

§225. 2 (*Book of the Elements*) כתאב אלאסתקצאת (or, פי אלאסתקצאת, in Moshe Ibn Ezra, *al-Muḥāḍara wa-l-Mudhākara,* f. 79b), lost in the original. In the Lyon

[148] The description of it in the Perreau Catalogue is not precise; see Steinschneider 1881c, 111.

[149] Renan 1877, 447, 547, 742; Steinschneider 1877c, 125.

[150] Not in רב פעלים (as noted in Dukes 1847b, 396, probably because he missed the ש"ה in Paris, BN héb 982/4;) but in שער השמים I, 14, where it should be read אין האסיפה הז' and then (Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 46/1, fol. 44b) כי האין אין לו מציאות בשכל כ"ש מחוץ לשכל (כל) כי אין האומר יוכל לומר נעדר אין; for Latif's time cf. Steinschneider 1874e, 83. – In London, Mon. 305/4, fol. 26 כי ההפקד לא יהיה כ"א אחר מציאה כמו הדבר שלאחר שנמצא נפקד כמו האדם שהוא רואה בעיניו לאחר כן נפקד ראות עיניו וככה יאמר על כל דבר שהיה נמצא נפקד כזה וכזה לא יאמר נפקד אין כי אין לה (כך) צורה ברעיון שיאמר במציאה או בהפקד; see Latif I, 14, fol. 167 London, Mon. 305/4 כך נעדר יאמרו עליו נעדר כך וכך כי אין לו מציאות בשכל כ"ש מחוץ לשכל כי האפס לא יתכן היותו אלא אחר מציאות כמו שהיה מצוי ואחר.

[151] Perhaps Jacob Ibn Killis? Steinschneider 1865d, 118, 140. ‹Mortillaro 1837 (extract), 5.›

edition of the Latin works of Isaac it follows the *Book of Definitions* (f. 4[3]) as "Liber aggregatus ex dictis Philosophorum antiquorum de Elementis secundum sententiam Aristotelis et Hippocratis et Galeni de quorum aggregatione et oppositione solicitus fuit Ysaac Salomonis filius israelita." This work appears also as one of Gerard of Cremona's translations, no. 54 [in Wüstenfeld 1877], and some manuscripts name him as translator.[152] No manuscript of the Arabic original is known; it is mentioned both by Ṣaʿid and Maimonides in connection with the previous work, and Moses Ibn Ezra quotes from it.

Abraham Ibn Ḥasdai translated the book for the famous grammarian, the elderly David Kimḥi (around 1210–30) under the full title ספר מחובר ממאמרי הראשונים (הקדמונים) ביסודות על דעת הפילוסוף מאבוקרט וגאלינוס ממה שעיין בקבוצו (וחבורו) יצחק בן שלמה הישראלי[153] הרופא which literally matches the Latin title. Despite Maimonides' critique it was studied. It is found in:

> Manuscripts[154]: Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 576 (without foreword and defective in the end)[155]; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 600; Breslau, Saraval 19. [This manuscript is no longer extant, to our knowledge.] Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4751[3] (f. 37); Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 43/3; Paris, BN héb 325/3; Paris, BN héb 930/6 (the translator's introduction is missing from both manuscripts)[156]; last page of Paris, BN héb 1144 [f. 45a]; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2628 (no proemium); Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2611; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3023; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3524 (formerly Foa 14?; Steinschneider 1865c, 67, Perreau 1889, 61, n. 45); Vatican, Urbinati ebr. 53; – Fischl was in possession of a ms. in 1881 (no proemium).[157] [Milan, BA T 30 Sup.1; Berlin, SPK Or. oct. 516/4; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab II 2615; Rome, BC 2916; St. Petersburg, IOS C 14; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. II A 109; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. II A 195/6; Zürich, ZB Heid. 184] This list includes the translation by Abraham Ibn Hasdai and the anonymous one, perhaps Moses Ibn Tibbon. (See Israeli 1884). Steinschneider assumed that there was only one translation. What makes the matter trickier is that in some manuscripts the poem by the translator Abraham b. Samuel precedes the anonymous translation. The anonymous version is found in the following manuscripts: Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 600 Milan, BA T 30 Sup.; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 43/3 Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 576; Berlin, SPK Or. oct. 516/4; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2611; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3524; Paris, BN héb 1144.

The complete manuscripts begin with a poem of 12 stanzas, beginning קחו (ראו) ספר בא בחידות,[158] in which the translator, Abraham b. Samuel, is named. This is followed by the latter's foreword in rhymed prose. Part of this has been published, though not very accurately, on the basis of the Leiden manuscript alone.[159] I had intended to undertake a complete edition, but since Mr. Fried has announced a publication of the complete translation, I confine myself to a short analysis, neglecting

---

[152] Wüstenfeld 1877, 70; there are four Paris manuscripts that also contain the Liber defin., cf. §224.

[153] הפילוסופים seems to be incorrect; the "philosophus" is Aristotle.

[154] An enumeration is to be found in Steinschneider 1865c, 67 on the Parma ms.

[155] Wolf 1715, III, 583 and 67 n. 163b (IV, 770). The end has 11 folia containing fragments of צמחים, see §66.

[156] Dukes 1847a, 404; Dukes 1848b, 197.

[157] The owner calls the author ר'ש'י', thus mixing him up with Joseph Solomon Delmedigo. The ms. also contains the beginning of ס' שינה וקיצה.

[158] Fried has ראו and the poem at the end; the final poem ראו ספר יקר is different, the fourth strophe? Steinschneider 1865c, 67.

[159] Dukes 1843c, 231; cf. Steinschneider 1858, 37, 1865c, 67.

the textual variants, which are unimportant for our purpose. [The text was published on the basis of the Leiden manuscript by S. Fried in Israeli 1884. Altmann 1958, 133–50 presents an excerpt from the work, with preliminary note, translation, and comments.] The translator starts with the modest declaration that he would not have dared to undertake such a work had he not been commissioned by the great scholar, the "Ornament of the Elderly," David Kimḥi, who wanted to |392| disseminate scholarship. He gave a second reason for taking on the translation, as follows: The author, Isaac b. Salomo, the Israelite, wrote the book in Arabic, but he could well have written it in Hebrew, for he was a great scholar in our Law and one of the most renowned men of our nation – has he not composed a commentary on the book *Yeẓira*, thereby erecting a temple (monument) to himself?[160] One of the Arabic scholars, Ṣāʿid b. Aḥmad b. Ṣāʿid from Cordova, is the author of a splendid work, elegantly written and well-organized, which mentions all famous scholars from all nations beginning with the earliest times, everyone according to his language, his origin, his religion and profession,[161] his rank and position, among them the Jewish scholars about whom he was well-informed. In this work there is the following account (I am reproducing the gist only): Isaac etc., student of Isḥāq b. ʿImrān, the Arab, called סם שעה (= סם סעה״), was a physician in the service of ʿUbaydallāh al-Mahdī, King of Africa[162]; he combined the science of logic with other sciences. He lived more than a 100 years, he did not marry, nor did he seek wealth.[162b] He composed valuable works, e.g., the book *On Foodstuffs* (מאכלים, *Diaetae*); *On Fevers*, which cannot be weighed with gold and silver; *On Urine*; the priceless *Book of the Elements*, and many more, such as the *Book of Definitions and Descriptions*, the *Paradise of Wisdom* on metaphysical (or: theological)[163] problems, and others. He died in 330. [This passage from Ṣaʿid al-Andalusi is translated from the Arabic original in Altmann and Stern 1958, xviii; there the date is given as 320 (= 932).][164] Abraham continues: Since Isaac worked under the order of the ruler, he composed his works in Arabic. For a long time, he remained unknown to the Jewish scholars. Abraham hopes to have his translation inspire other and better translators to render the other works of Isaac. A praise of the *Book on the Elements* follows, and the foreword ends with this remark: Many translators

[160] ובנה לו בית הבחירה, for the sake of rhyme.

[161] אמונתו ואמנתו, a play upon words.

[162] אפריקיה״, here in its restricted sense.

[162b] Ibn abī Uṣaybiʿa 1884, ch. 8, French version in Sanguinetti 1855 (cf. W 1855 tome VI (cf. Wüstenfeld 1840 §26–28), talks about the enormous remunerations which the Syriac (Christian) court physicians received, less complete version in Hammer 1850 and Leclerc 1876.

[163] Cf. n. 135.

[164] The date 330 H. (941/2) is given in letters in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 43/3; the date of the destruction provided by the translator, or rather the copyist, changes between 900 (i.e., 968) and 600 (886!), and is thus worthless. Isaac Lattes (cf. Steinschneider 1852, 1114, 1118) reads 880 (948); cf. Lattes 1878, 69 (the article is missing in the list in Berliner 1877b, 230; Buber in Lattes 1885, 32 does not know the source of the addition to Meïri); the final words זה על…ולא יכלו (omitted in Gross 1879, 326, and hence in Israeli 1884, 54, cf. 11, where there is still more to be corrected) are misinterpretations of ולא נפתח לבו על מאודו, as is to be read for ונכתה. – The year 330 of the older sources should not be emended without cogent reasons.

discuss in their introductions those passages (or rather: those circumstances) that caused them to slip, begging their readers' indulgence; Abraham feels obliged all the more to ask the readers to correct his mistakes.

The book is divided into three treatises: The first sets forth the views of "the philosopher" (Aristotle), the second those of Galen (Hippocrates ⌊393⌋ is quoted on f. 8^4 med., cf. III, 9, 4); the third treats the number and qualities of the elements. The style is almost always engaging: the author presents the possible objections (*quod si contradixerit*, etc.) in order to refute them. In the manner of the Arabs and Jews, his own remarks follow after the opinions he quotes, introduced by the formula: "Isaac says." In the Hebrew one finds instead, "the author says."[165]

According to the catalogue description of Paris, BN héb 325/3, the Latin translation differs "considerably" from the Hebrew. I have compared only a few passages, e.g., the end of the book, and have found them to be the same, almost word for word. One may wish to conclude from this that Gerard is the translator (and hence also of the *Book of Definitions*). In other places there are deviations which, however, do not go as far as the alterations which Constantinus otherwise allows himself. – So far, I have not been able to compare the quotations in Gershon ben Solomon[166] and his contemporary Hillel b. Samuel[167] with a Hebrew manuscript. [The citations in Gershon ben Shlomo's *Sha'ar ha-Shamayim* were matched to the Hebrew edition of the *Book of Definitions* by James Robinson 2000, 258 n. 48, 259 n. 62, and especially 262 n. 80. The citations in Hillel of Verona, *Tagmulei ha-Nefesh,* were matched to the Hebrew edition by G. Sermoneta 1981, 13, 14, and 194.

As mentioned above, fragments of Israeli's *Kitāb al-Jawāhir* (Book of the Substances) preserved in St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab II 2615, were edited by S. M. Stern in *Isaac Israeli*. There is an additional text by Israeli, extant only in Hebrew translation in a single manuscript at Mantua (Mantua, CI Ms. ebr. 28), and it has come to be known as "the Mantua text". Steinschneider took this to be a pseudo-Aristotelian text and discussed it in §123 above. Gershom Scholem first suggested identifying Israeli as the author, and his surmise was confirmed by Alexander Altmann, who published the full text with an accompanying analysis, first in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, then in Altmann 1958, 118–32.

Lynn Thorndike 1923–1966, 658 n. 3 records a *Liber Ysaac de differentia spiritus et animae*, in ms. Venice, San Marco 179, ff. 57–59, 83. Thorndike gives the impression that Israeli is just one in a long line of scholars to whom Quṣta b. Lūqā's tract on the difference between soul and spirit was misattributed. He did not know that Israeli actually wrote a monograph on

---

[165] 1879, 327: "The Latin translation is not verbatim – Israëli himself is quoted (!) – and rather makes the impression of a very brief paraphrase."

[166] Gershon b. Solomon 1547, fol. 12 (Gershon b. Solomon 1801, 14) from Part III (Latin fol. 10: sensus est sec. Tres modos), 1547, fol. 49^2 (Gershon b. Solomon 1801, 63b), where the contradiction of Ali (Ibn Ridwan) is also to be found, going back to what? (cf. Gershon b. Solomon 1547 fol. 10^4?); Gershon b. Solomon 1547 fol. 58 (Gershon b. Solomon 1801, 80), Aldabi 1559, fol. 97^3, Latin I fol. 5^1: si anima esset accidens … ad ebenum et picem.

[167] תגמולי הנפש (Hillel ben Samuel 1874), fol. 2b line 10 from bottom (משני to be read as משלוש) from I, fol. 7 line 14 from bottom proprietas … sec. tres modos, in Steinschneider 1874a, 18, wrongly identified with Gershon b. Solomon 1547, fol. 58, because of the preceding, כושי...כל שחור עורב, but also Latin, fol. 7.

the same theme; hence there is cause to inspect this manuscript, in order to see if it contains a Latin version of Israeli's book. No Latin translation is noted by either Steinschneider or Stern.]

Book of the Elements, trans. Abraham Ibn Ḥasdai

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4751 (Warner 13) (IMHM F 31909), 37a–52a.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 325 (a.f. 158) (IMHM F 20237), 145–61.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 930 (IMHM F 31966), 139a–54a.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2628/6 (De Rossi 207) (IMHM F 13544), 46b–56b.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 3023/8 (De Rossi 771) (IMHM F 13752), 145a–57a.
Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 2914 (Sacerdote 167) (IMHM F 747), 85a–101b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS C 14 (IMHM F 69265), 2a–14a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. Arab II 2615 (Evr. Arab II 1197) (IMHM F 61142), 17 fols.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 195/6 (IMHM F 64329), 1 f.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 40 (IMHM F 65703), 30 fols.
Vatican, Ms. ebr. 53/3 (IMHM F 692), 63b–92a.
Zürich, Zentralbibliothek Heid. 184 (Allony and Kupfer 144) (IMHM F 2720, F 10392).

Trans. Anonymous

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz) Or. oct. 516 (Steinschneider 201) (IMHM F 1971), 89b–116.
Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana T 30 Sup. (Bernheimer 100) (IMHM F 14617), 108b–36b.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 43 (IMHM F 1150), 21a–52a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Huntingdon 576 (Uri 408) (Neubauer 1316/1) (IMHM F 22130), 1–56 fols.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Mich. 600 (Mich. 600) (Neubauer 1368/2) (IMHM F 19402), 69a–85a.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 1144/2 (Paris, Oratoire 140) (IMHM F 15104), 45a.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2611/5 (De Rossi 423) (IMHM F 13312), 61b–77a.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 3524/3 (Parma Perreau 45, Parma Stern 55) (IMHM F 14031), 57b–82b.

§226. 3. A treatise מקאלה פי ישרצו המים, doubtlessly written in Arabic[168] and referring to Genesis 1:20, is known through a number of quotations[169] dating from the twelfth century, as well as through the small fragment of a Hebrew translation that S. Sachs identified in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 47/6 under the wrong title יצירה ס', and published twice.[170] Perhaps the translator could not, or would not, translate more than this initial part. According to the title, or the introductory remark of the translator, this treatise was actually a responsum to somebody who had detected a contradiction in the biblical tale of the origin of the birds. The text breaks off at a passage where the author starts to speak about the elements,[171] concerning which, as is well

[168] E.g., והספר אמר for אלכתאב, cf. מאמר הרוח in Steinschneider 1872a, 403.

[169] Steinschneider 1852, 1116 and Additamenta.

[170] Sachs 1850b, 166 and in Sachs 1850a, 39.

[171] This does not tally with the quotation and the dedication in Ibn Ezra; Dukes 1860, 133; cf.

known, he was in his very element. Probably he endeavored at this point to give a philosophical interpretation of the entire creation. In his introduction to the commentary to the Pentateuch,[172] Ibn Ezra speaks about one Rabbi Isaac who had written two books (or two volumes[173]) on the first chapter of Genesis.[174] There is no sufficient reason to doubt the authenticity of that title, which was also known to Jedaiah Bedersi (ha-Penini)[175] and, therefore, to consider this treatise |394| to be part of a commentary to the whole of Genesis,[176] or to identify this monograph with the work on metaphysical questions.[177] On the other hand, the little treatise – no. 4 below – may have been part of the one under discussion. [For further discussion of the treatise see Stern 1958, 106–7.]

We finally call attention to a passage in which the author maintains that Jesus wanted to be crucified in order to confirm (or uphold) the erroneous opinion of his divinity. [This last sentence may be restated more clearly. Israeli cites a Christian view that Jesus wished to be crucified in order to establish his divinity, as an example of an interpretation that has taken hold on account of consensus, rather than having been established by investigation. As a Jew, Israeli brands this Christian claim "erroneous".]

Treatise on "Let the Waters Increase"

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 43 (IMHM F 1611), 325b–26b.

§226[b]. 4. Munich BS Cod. Heb. 307 contains a small treatise bearing the inexact title, ספר הרוח והנפש… "Book of the Spirit and the Soul and of the Difference Between Them." I have published it in the journal *Ha-Karmel* 1872a and presented the parallel passages from the *Book of Definitions* and the *Book of the Elements*, which were omitted by the Editor [of the Hebrew article], in *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 1872b.[178] This treatise, four pages long, is most probably a fragment of a book or a longer treatise, perhaps the final part of the treatise on Genesis 1 (see §226), although the multiple

---

Steinschneider 1852, 1116, from Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 599.

[172] §1 of the common edition; in Friedlaender 1877, 3 §3 all persons are avoided.

[173] ספרים, probably on account of the rhyme.

[174] The explanation that תהו ובהו means the air (David Kimḥi, in Sachs 1857, 43) comes probably from the פי' יצירה to II, 1; New York, JTS Ms. 1912, fol. 28: כי אמרו היתה תהו ובהו הם האויר השוכן שאינו מתנועע; cf. Sachs 1854a, 67.

[175] In his letter to Solomon b. Adret ומאמר ישרצו המים בשאלה שנעשית; he says יש אצלנו מחיבוריו; did he thus know the whole text, whether in translation?

[176] Cf. Sachs, l.c.

[177] Gross 1879, 328 identifies it with פרדס החכמה (above, n. 135, 163) because of בשאלות; it is astonishing, he says, that Abraham b. Ḥisdai did not know ישרצו and Jedaiah did not know פרדס. The latter, however, talks only about books that he knows, and Abraham does not himself list the writings [but merely translates Ṣā'id]. In Lattes, פרדס החכמה האלוהות (האלוהית in Dukes 1850b, 336) is an addition, and בשאלות does not mean "on inquiries."

[178] To be added: 402 [of Steinschneider 1872a] of the *Lib. def.* fol. 3[2]: 'et propter hoc non consequuntur bestie retributionem,' against the kalām, perhaps against Saadia (see Steinschneider 1841, 1842, 332, cf. Levi b. Abraham in Geiger 1853, 20 bottom, in the ms. התמורה אפ' לפחותי ב"ח); cf. Steinschneider 1857a §12, n. 1 (295); Steinschneider 1858, 182; *further*, נצוץ האורה, lib. Def. 3[1]. – On five הרגשות on 402 cf. Pseudo-Nissi in Pinsker 1860, 8, Steinschneider (1881c, 35).

concluding formulas seem to be due to the copyist. The treatise contains an interpretation, garbled in the manuscripts, of Job 42:15 which Abraham Ibn Ezra, attributing it to Isaac "המהביל", seems to rebuff.[179] In another place (n. 134) Abraham says expressly that Isaac used the foreign sciences in order to explain "living souls" (the plural form is for the sake of rhyming with נפש חיה Gen.1:30, 2:7). [A preliminary note, translation, and comments to this treatise by S. M. Stern are available in 1958, pp. 106–17.]

§227. 5. (Commentary to *Sefer Yeẓirah*) [of Abū Sahl Dūnash Ibn Tāmīm]

[Largely as the result of a series of publications by the late Georges Vajda, the texts discussed here in the entry under Isaac Israeli are now considered definitively to be the work of his student, Dūnash Ibn Tāmīm. Vajda's *Le Commentaire sur le Livre de la Création de Dunaš ben Tamim de Kairouan (Xe siècle)* was recently revised and augmented by Paul Fenton, and we shall refer to this new edition as either Vajda 2002 or Fenton 2002, depending upon the sections referred to (although even the sections originally written by Vajda have been revised by Fenton.) The studies of Luzzatto, Dukes, Sachs, Munk, and Kaufmann, all furnishing material for Steinschneider's own investigation, are briefly reviewed on 15–16 (Fenton). Although attributing the "paternité" of the commentary to Israeli in his earlier writings, Steinschneider came to the conclusion that, in its various versions, it is the work of Dūnash. But because he considered the work to contain "at least parts of a commentary composed by Isaac Israeli," Steinschneider lists it here among Isaac's work; he also seems to have left the question of the authorship of certain passages unresolved (see, e.g., the end of n. 203 below.)

Paul Fenton has also discovered a large portion of the original Judeaeo-Arabic in the second Firkovich collection in St. Petersburg and has announced its publication.]

This text poses some very difficult literary problems for us. The difficulties are complicated by the nature of the extant documents and multifarious because they impinge upon a slew of biographical and bibliographical questions. A number of scholars have touched upon the problem,[180] but it requires a thorough investigation; specifically, it demands a careful examination of the manuscripts to be listed presently. Here we have to confine ourselves to a succinct exposition of the present state of the problem.

The peculiar Hebrew treatise, called the *Book of the Creation* (ס' יצירה), itself presents a problem for the history of literature. It is preserved in two major recensions, both, however, replete with additions and alterations. The book has been printed about one hundred times, as it has been included in books intended for meditation and the edification of the mystics, |395| but as of now there exists no critical edition that makes use of the oldest sources, about which we shall speak. [Though a full critical edition remains a desideratum, scholars as a rule now rely upon Ithamar Gruenwald 1971].

The *Book of the Creation* adopts the theories of the Neo-Pythagoreans who take the numbers and letters as principle of all beings and combines them with monotheism. That is the basic idea of the book, presented in an imaginative manner that may

[179] For 402 Aldabi 1559, fol. 91[1]. – On the subject, cf. §157.

[180] Sources: Steinschneider 1852, 1116; Israeli 1884, 30 ff., has a recapitulation to which N. Brüll 1885 adds more of his own speculation than the sources allow. Kaufmann 1884c, 126, demands a new thorough investigation. The indications concerning the manuscripts by S. Sachs 1850b, 166, are confused; a Carmoly ms. (also in Sachs 1850b) does not exist; Carmoly 1840–41 speaks only of a Paris ms.

be called mystical. But the book does not expound a "speculative" Kabbala in the modern sense of the word, nor is there a reason to date it to the Talmudic era.[181] [The recently published study of Yehuda Liebes 2000 rejects the Pythagorean stamp that Steinschneider and others have placed on the book; moreover, Liebes moves the date of the *Book of Creation* backwards to the pre-Talmudic era. For a critique of Liebes on both points, see Y. Tzvi Langermann 2002.]

The book differs from the Talmudic writings, not only with respect to subject matter, but in methodological approach as well. May it be of foreign origin? There is no sure sign of the tract's existence earlier than the end of the ninth century. Some tenth-century Jewish scholars translated and commented upon it, principally Saadia (§258), though he was not the first to do so. They looked upon it as a source of the ancient philosophy of the Hebrews. According to them, however, it could not be understood without a thorough study of the foreign sciences, and, therefore, they strove to harmonize it with their own (contemporary) philosophical views. These commentaries serve for us as important sources for the text of the book itself, but, at the same time, they are the oldest sources for the history of the foreign sciences among the Jews. It is therefore pertinent to identify the authors of these works. We possess the commentary of Saadia in the Arabic original and in Hebrew translation, but apart from that there are only translations that are attributed to various authors, among whom Isaac is the oldest. This is reason for us to collect here all the information we have on these writings, but, even before that, on the various manuscripts.

As is known, the edition of Anonymous 1562 has two textual recensions in six chapters which, however, are not congruent. The paragraphs of the second recension are not numbered; hence, I quote the paragraph numbers according to the first one.

[An up-to-date account of all the manuscripts connected with Dūnash's commentary, covering all those discussed below and others as well, may be found in Vajda 2002, 24–27. Vajda accepts Steinschneider's analysis in its general contours, but proposes on p. 27 some modifications with regard to the groupings of the manuscripts.]

§228. The manuscripts must be grouped as follows:

(a) Berlin, SPK Or. oct. 243/4 (formerly Luzzatto no. 1), fols. 55–88, attributed, in the beginning and the end, to "Dūnash (דונש) b. Tamim, called Isḥāq al-Isrā'īlī," translated according to the wish (בפיוס) of Samuel Franco b. Yequtiel by Naḥum[182] [ha-Ma'aravi, around 1240?],[183] who introduces the book with a short poem that was published, along with the notes of Luzzatto, by Kaufmann 1885a. The manuscript is defective; the foreword may have already been missing in the original used by Naḥum, but between 60 (where the custos has been cut away, perhaps intentionally) and 61 several leaves are missing, precisely those that contain the

[181] Against Munk 1859, 490 see Steinschneider 1857a, §13; cf. Steinschneider 1852, 552; Steinschneider 1879f, 122, on Kalisch's edition with English translation 1877; Castelli 1880, 13 ff, maintains that the book presents itself as a work of Abraham. His analysis is deserving notice. This is not the place to give details. There is a remarkable parallel to the combinations in the circular diagram given in Günther 1878 235: Kaufmann's remark (1884a 35) allows for objections.

[182] נחום בן שמואל is wrong in Luzzatto 1868, 1.

[183] In the foreword to איגרת תימן, ed. Steinscheider 1875a, 13, Naḥum expects the end of the exile to occur during his own lifetime. Cf. also Steinschneider 1881b, 134; Steinschneider 1877c, 288.

quotations from his [Dūnash's] own mathematical writings. Two |396| passages from this manuscript were published by Dukes.[184] Paris, BN héb 1048/2, fols. 95–107, beginning missing, has the same commentary.[185] According to Munk[186] the author is perhaps Jacob b. Nissim. However, it is only a different translation of the same work.[187] [According to Vajda, Naḥum ha-Ma'aravi is the author.]

(b) Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22 (some lacunae, f. 103–104[b]) and Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3018/3, purportedly by Jacob b. Nissim (of Qayrawan, end of tenth century), translated into Hebrew by Moses b. Joseph b. Moses [of Lucerne] etc. (for more information on his dates, see under Saadia).[188] A copy from Munich by S. Werbluner, now in the Breslau seminary,[189] was in turn copied by S. Sachs. Some extracts from the Munich manuscript were published, without indication of the passages and on the basis of "excerpts done by Landauer" by J. Fürst,[190] and on the basis of other copies, by Jellinek and Dukes.[191] We arrange these quotations according to the Munich ms.[192] [The "arrangement" of which Steinschneider speaks here is found in note 192, which discusses the order of passages in Munich BS Heb. 92. Fenton provides a critical edition of this translation in 2002, 214–48.]

(c) Paris, BN héb 1048/2, fols. 65 ff., purportedly by Abū Sahl Ibn Tāmīm, without foreword, and ending defective. Halberstam[192b] has a copy of it. According to Munk 1851, 46, it is a different translation of *b*, composed by Dūnash (955–56).

---

[184] Ms. 57–59 (in Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 5–9; 9, line 5 corrupt text, line 8 read אחד; line 13 את read אל; line 15 read דל"ת; line 5 from bottom read והם כותבים הנכנאנכי; cf. line 5 and p. 73, line 5 from bottom) on I, 11; ms. 62, line 5 from bottom, 66 Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 41 ff. again multiple corrections to be done (cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 173 and 141).

[185] Beginning fol. 95 השנים (?) והוא קול נולד מן האוויר הוצא מן הריאה ויחתוך אותו ראש הלשון בה; accordingly *c* שירי, see III, line 15, 16.

[186] Munk 1851, 50.

[187] Cf. below on *c*.

[188] Landauer 1845, 180, permits Jacob to precede the commentary by Saadia! In Steinschneider 1852, 1244 (under 'Jakob b. N'.), read "Lb. (= *Literaturblatt des Orient*) VI, 180 [214] 562; VII, 2, 121, 285."

[189] Cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 173, 217, 317, for Judah ben Barzillai, 343, 344. Is Kirchheims's another one? The late Dr. [Louis] Löwe in Brighton owned a ms.

[190] Fürst 1845, 564, has "prologue", but in fact it is an epilogue; cf. §232.

[191] Jellinek 1852, I, 6, 14.

[192] Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22 (beginning fol. 99) prologue, Fürst 1845, 562; fol. 99b beginning commentary (I, 1, 2) in Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, I, 3 ibid., 75; fol. 101b (I, 45) ibid., 78; fol. 102 in Fürst 1845, 564; Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 80; fol. 105 (II, 2) in Ibn Gabirol 1858, XIII; fol. 107 (II, 4) in Fürst 1845, 563 (Munk 1851, 57); fol. 111a, b (III end) in Jellinek 1852 I, 14: והמסיק, cf.§230 end; fol. 112 (IV, 4) in Fürst 1845, 564; fol. 114 (VI, 1) in Fürst 1845, ibid. (where והמחבר is wrongly referred to Saadia), skipped in Jellinek 1852, 6; fol. 114b (VI, 2): וראה מזה in Fürst 1845, ibid.; fol. 115b (end): ובקודם לכן in Jellinek 1852, 6; Continuation: והכלל הענין כי ראיתי in Fürst 1845, 563.

[192b] Halberstam *ad* Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 325 (referring to 214), 237. The copyist Goldblum 1886, 45, 85, tells well-known facts and inaccurate things. Had he consulted the Zotenberg catalogue, he would not have excerpted printed material on Abulafia from Paris, BN héb 1092/15.

Dukes has published two passages thereof, without giving exact references,[193] and without realizing that only one page belongs to the commentary.[194]

The author's quotations from his own works, discussed by Munk,[195] are of some importance for [the history of] Arabic literature; |397| for example, the treatise on computation, called Gobar, is relevant for the history of the Arabic numerals.[196] But the most important quotation, decisive for the problem of the actual, or first, author of these explications [of *Sefer Yeẓira*], seems to be missing from the Paris manuscripts; otherwise it would not have escaped Munk's attention. I have in mind the repeated citation of his work on urine (§479). Munk (50) arrived at an inadmissible result in connection with a hypothesis concerning the Munich manuscript which has proven not to be true.

(d) I own a copy of Schorr's copy of a ms. in Odessa, now Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Reggio 51. [Steinschneider's copy is now in New York, JTS ms. 1912.] In the beginning of the foreword the author calls himself Abū Sahl Dūnash b. Tāmīm. It is a shorter redaction and probably the translation of an Arabic compendium of an unknown scholar. Two of the various dates given (I, 5: 431 of the Arabs, 4800 after the Creation, 6547 of the Romans [Christians]), namely the first and second (= 1040 A.D. which could be the date of composition of the Arabic compendium), are correct. One passage from it (V, 1) was published twice.[197]

---

[193] Ibn Gabirol 1858, Anhang I, II; the first shorter passage (concerning II, 5, 6) refers to Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4, 70, the following passage to II, 2 Berlin ms. 64. – In the first line 4 שממוני in the Berlin ms. שממלא, but with a *waw* above the word, thus שממולא; instead of שונות read שוכנת. The last words in Dukes III, last line, and IV, first line, in the Berlin ms, 63 more correctly משוכנות מחרישות and later 'אילמות אין להם שום אמתת בלשון וכו; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 105 f. שוכנות דומות (cf. the preceding passage in Kaufmann 1877a, 173). For the more detailed discussion of the Arabic nine organs the Steinschneider manuscript [d above?] 29 has only ויש להן שמות בלשון ערבי וימשכו בהן שאר אותיות הערב, and on 30 מפני שכל האותיות חרשות אלמות.

[194] I have indicated the fact that sections IV–VIII do not belong to the context in Steinschneider 1869d, 242 and *ad* Dunash ben Tamim Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22. Guttmann (1882, 78, 105, 260) designates it still as commentary to *Sefer Yeẓirah*, Kaufmann (1877a, 291, without referring to Steinschneider 1869a) as a compilation of Saadia and Baḥya; the Paris catalogue says nothing about it and does not indicate that fol. 93b (the end is given in Ibn Gabirol 1858) breaks off, followed by a lacuna. The insertion of a totally alien passage has probably compelled Munk to overlook the fact that there are two identical works in the same ms. Cf. also Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 327.

[195] Munk 1851, 51 ff.; 53 (*ad* III, 3) במקום אחר זולת בספר הזה, Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4, fol. 74 וכבר בארנו ענין זה בזולת זה המקום, Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 92 fol. 110 b הספר, read 'זולתו בס; מספר זה איך משתנים חלקי אלה היסודות מקצתם למקצת והראינו ראיות מלאכיות נראות לעין; Compendium (Steinschneider, 39) כבר בארנו בזולת זה המקום איכות שינוי חלקי היסודות האלו והעמדנו בזה מופתים מלאכותיים יראו כראות עין; cf. n. 204 below. The anonymous Arabic astronomical al-Manṣūrī in Cod. Persian Uri 77 (Schirmann 1960, II, 618) has, according to Neubauer's communication, the explicit פהד'א שי מן מסאיל הד'א אלפן אג'מלה (?) ומן אראד תפצילה פעליה פי אללואמע אלד'י נט'מנא וסאיר רסאילנא ורסאיל גירנא אלך'.

[196] Steinschneider 1857a, 363, 378. The passage in Reinaud 1849, 399 (from the Mémoires de l'Académie) has also been used by others. On Gobar (cf. n. 215) cf. also Nicoll in Uri 1787, 287; Wöpcke 1855, 12, and 1863, 29 ff. Cantor had previously related Gobar to Jewish Kabbalists; but cf. Th. H. Martin 1864, 68.

[197] Sachs 1850b, 167; Sachs 1854a, 60 (cf. Schorr 1852, 106), on the last שיוחד, read שיוחס? Munich BS hebr. 92, fol. 112 b.

(e) Paris, BN héb 680/10 and Paris, BN héb 763/2[198] contain a compendium that may be only slightly different from the one mentioned before; its date is changed to 4852 (1092)[199]; such changes, however, often are merely due to the copyist; most probably it is not the date of the translation. So far, no study has been made of the relationship of this compendium to the one presented under d).[200]

Manuscripts of the Commentary on *Sefer Yeẓirah,* grouped according to Steinschneider, as modified by Vajda-Fenton:

(a) Trans. Naḥum ha-Ma'aravi

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz) Or. oct. 243 (SD Luzzatto 1) (Steinschneider 78) (IMHM F 2076), 55–87.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 1048 (IMHM F 31659), 65–96, 95–107.
Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense heb. 3105 (Sacerdote 190) (IMHM F 75), 1–31.

(b) Trans. Moses b. Joseph b. Moses [of Lucerne]

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 92 (IMHM F 23120, PH 2495), 99a–116a.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 3018 (De Rossi 769) (IMHM F 13747), [90]a–[100]b.

(c) Another translation

Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Reggio 51 (Neubauer 2250) (IMHM F 20533), 8a–19b.
London, Sassoon 959, 60–94.

(d) A translation of an Arabic version

Jerusalem, Jewish National Library 8^{0}330/29 (IMHM B 277), 269a–267b.
London, British Library Add. 15299 (Margoliouth 752/4) (IMHM F 4935), 11b–16a.
Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana & 103 Sup. (Bernheimer 56) (IMHM F 14621), 28°–35°.
Milan, Biblioteca Braidanza AD. X 52/5 (IMHM F 27757), 69°–98b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 680 (Paris BN ancien fonds 222) (IMHM F 11558), 189b–201a.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 763 (IMHM F 12254), 7a–12a.
Paris, Alliance Israelite Universelle H 55 A (IMHM F 3149), 83°–78b.
Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana P 13 Sup. (Bernheimer 113) (IMHM F 14596), 319a–21b.

---

[198] Both manuscripts are missing from the index 251 under 'Dounach'; ms. 255 in Carmoly, see n. 193 [n. 180?].

[199] Munk 1851, 54; cf. n. 204.

[200] This may serve as a preliminary sample (Paris, BN héb 763/2, fol. 7, Paris, BN héb 680/10, fol. 189b) עוד נפרש הספר בע"ה. א"ה בתחלה בל"ב נתיבות ופירשו כי המקום ב"ה רשם וחקק דרכי החכמות ושבילי ידיעה אמר שמת' (?) אלוה כל המחנות St.; בי' יסודי חשבון והן מא' עד י' וכ"ד נתיבות אשר יסוד הדבור כולו מהם ג' המדברות חקק שבילי החכמה ודרכי סודיה בשבילים אשר סודותיהם בל"ב דרכים והם עשרה מספרים וכ"ד אותיות מורות על כ"ב נעימות; End: מתחלקות לג' צורות נפש מדברת והיא בעלת דעה והשכל ונפש אוכלת ושותה והאדם והבהמה שוים בה ונפש צומחת ומתגדלת והיא מצויה באדם בבהמה ובצמח האדמה וכל אחת מאלו נחלקת לג' חלקים כל הנפש אשר היא בעלת השכל והדעה וחלק אחד סמוך לגלגל הדעת והאחר היא הנפשר המדברת בעצמה והשלישי סמוך לנפש האוכלות והשותה וכן לשאר הנפשות. תם; that is III, 5, thus incomplete; much shorter in the Steinschneider ms., fol. 40, cf. above n. 4, Steinschneider 1872a, 402 and Aldabi 1559, fol. 91.

Additional mss.

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard 38/7 (IMHM F 34447), 77a–89a.
Jerusalem, Jewish National Library 28⁰553 (IMHM B 296 (553=28)), 18a–20b.
London, British Library Or. 6307 (Margoliouth 734) (IMHM F 6538), 3a–106a. (19th cent. copy)
Oxford, Bodleian Library ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 89 (Neubauer 1532) (IMHM F 16900), 37a–41a. (19th cent. copy)
Paris, Alliance Israelite Universelle H 370 A (IMHM F 3319), 1a–43a, 101a–116b. (19th cent. copy)
Paris, Alliance Israelite Universelle H 379 A (IMHM F 3407), 20 fols. (19th cent. copy)
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2784/18 (De Rossi 1390) (IMHM F 13747), 83a–88a.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Ms. 1908–1909 (IMHM F 11006–7), 107 fols. (19th cent. copy)
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Ms. 1912/2 (IMHM F 11010), 54a–84b, 86a–89b. (19th cent. copy)
Prague, Jewish Museum in Prague, Ms. 47 (F 46440). 43 fols. (19th cent. copy)
Prague, Jewish Museum in Prague, Ms. 119/1 (F 46700). 43 fols. (19th cent. copy)
Warsaw, Zydowski Instytut Historyczny 616 (IMHM F 31050). 12 fols. (19th cent. copy)

§229. I pass over the historical problems linked to the authors who are mentioned here and there, e.g., the "Danites" – which were brought into connection with the well-known traveler Eldad [See Vajda 2002, 39 n. 126] – and Abū Yūsuf Ḥisdai b. Isaac, doubtlessly the renowned Cordovan translator of the Dioscorides text.[201] I call attention here to one passage only, |398| one which may be of significance for the provenance of the author.[202] All manuscripts derive directly or indirectly from one tenth-century Arabic work which was probably translated three times (a, b, c) into Hebrew and whose Arabic compendium was perhaps translated twice (d, e) into Hebrew.

The Arabic work represented by the more complete translations contains at least parts of a commentary composed by Isaac Israeli. This follows from two passages where the author refers the reader to his book on urine,[203] and perhaps also to his interpretation of Genesis I.[204] Abraham Ibn Ḥasdai and Jedaiah ha-Penini refer to

[201] Munk 1851, 52 Sachs 1850b, 808; this passage is defective in Munich 92, fol. 103 [and?] the Steinschneider ms., fol. 17. Is the person presented by Jacob b. Reuben in the מלחמות ה', Gate XII, as תלמיד ר' חסדאי, a student of this Ḥisdai?

[202] *Ad* I, 5; ‹Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22›, fol. 102 וכן במדינת קרואן ומהדיה, Schorr (Steinschneider ms., fol. 15) מדינת מצרים וירושלים.

[203] Steinschneider 1869a, 248 and 1879b 55; cf. n. 217. Kaufmann 1884c, 126, has failed to formulate the question precisely and to present my position accurately. ‹Kaufmann gives the passage to V, 3 י"ב פשוטים according to Isaac, Jacob, and Naḥum; 130 משריק in הנמצא ס' IX.›

[204] Munk 1859, 54, conjectures in סדר עולם, Arabic: *tartīb al-ʿālam* (cf. Steinschneider 1863e, 1117); Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Reggio 51 (New York, JTS Ms. 1912/2, fol. 11) אשר חברנוהו והוא מחובר ומסודר בסדר בראשית מן התורה. However, the quotation (*ad* III, 3) in Munk is במקום אחר זולת בס' הזה; in the Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 110b בזולת זה המקום מס' הזה; Bodleian ms. (New York, JTS Ms. 1912/2, fol. 39) בזולת זה המקום, a reference to 1, 10, Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 104. If we had another reference, then it would be to de Elem. III fol. 94. *Ad* III, 2 (Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 109, New York, JTS Ms. 1912/2, fol. 35) he has provided אמ"ש for אש מים שלום; (cf. Sachs 1854a, 66); cf. עושה שלום in Jacob ben Reuben's *Milḥamot ha-Shem* 1860, fol. 10. – He ends this

Israeli's commentary as something that is extant and well-known. Gershon ben Solomon quotes one passage from it directly, giving the title, and another, without the title (based on Naḥum's translation;[205] this furnishes additional evidence that this translator flourished no later than the thirteenth century).

However, the Arabic work, at least as it appears in translation, is not simply the commentary of Isaac. In the preface the author tells us that "our Sheikh Isaac b. Solomon the physician" (cf. infra) corresponded with Saadia Gaon, before he – Saadia – betook himself to Babylon (928), at a time when the author was only 20 years of age. The same Isaac is quoted in the commentary itself,[206] and this most probably refers to Israeli himself, rather than to a grandfather of the same name (unknown), or, even less likely, to a grandson of his, since Isaac remained unmarried. He also is not expressly named as a teacher of the author, but rather as "one of the scholars among our sheikhs."[207] This author, born before 908, cannot be Jacob b. Nissim, who corresponded with Shrira Gaon in 988, as Munk |399| rightly remarks.[208] One would consequently have to assume that Dūnash b. Tamim prepared a redaction based on the commentary of Isaac, but including literal citations from Isaac in some places and inserting the exact words of the first author in some places, so that it is difficult now to decide to whom all of the citations are to be traced, if no other criterion can be found. This solution is not wholly satisfactory, although there is no satisfactory reason why it could not be so. A redaction of this sort is only a preliminary and expedient solution. [Vajda 2002, 34, suggests that Dūnash's work did not borrow from a completed commentary by Israeli, but rather utilized notes taken when the young philosopher was under Israeli's supervision.]

The author, or redactor, had earlier composed an extensive commentary to this work.[209] It later became his exclusive occupation, after he saw the commentary by

---

paragraph with the observation how different this explanation is from that of Saadia; if he meant to dwell upon חכמה טבעית בפ' בראשית, he would need a lot of paper (a large book) and would only attract the blame of the fools. If these are Isaac's words then it was written before מאמר ישרצו.

[205] Gershon ben Solomon 1547, fol. 53[4] (Ed. Heidenheim, Gershon b. Solomon 1801, 69b) on dreams צדקים…בבק; Munk 1851, 48, from Paris, BN héb 1048/2 fol. 74:נאמנו…בהשכמת; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 103[b] צמתים … בשחרית, read אמתים, perhaps צודקים. Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4 is deficient here. The other passage, Gershon b. Solomon 1547, fol. 53[4] (Ed. Heidenheim, 59), is apparently thought by S. Sachs 1854a, 69, to be from another work (while Gross 1879, 324, 327 combines it with the subsequent citation from Galen found in Gershon). In Gershon לרחף על יבכה, תבכה and כלי, read כל…ירבה החום שבהם מחוזק היחום…שלא תרבה, as in Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 7 – Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 100 (Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, fol. 71) read קר מחוץ…על כלי פן תכבה; Steinschneider, fol. 5 קר מחוץ לנשב…כל כל [כלי]…יכבה החום הטבעי…או תחלש אש.

[206] Munk 1859, 48; the passages also figure in the compendium.

[207] Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 71, for which we find זקנינו in the Steinschneider ms., fol. 7 and in the foreword to both translations.

[208] Munk 1859, 47; the quotation from Duran 1865, 6, and 217; cf. Dukes 1840, 35. In חשב האפוד (excerpt after העבור of Abraham b. Ḥiyya) there is ת"נ for the reign of Alexander (in whose place one has ת"ק in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 41[b!]); Munk misses the date by 1 year; cf. Rapoport 1852, 77 where Ephodi is missing.

[209] Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 115[b]; in Jellinek 1852, I, 6 for כיון probably ביאר; the word פירושו does not figure in the ms.; instead of ממנו חלט read נמלט? and cf. n. 210. He sometimes

Saadia Gaon, which he found to be insufficient from a scholarly point of view. He in fact attacks him several times openly, albeit with the respect due to such a venerable scholar (Foreword).[210]

§230. The outward form of our commentary is in fact identical with that of Saadia: The text of the book is in Hebrew, the paraphrase (not throughout) and interpretation in Arabic.[211] These formal components of the book can most easily be isolated in the translation of Moses (*b*), but less so in Naḥum's (*a*), which starts the commentary with פירש. Translation and commentary blend together in the compendium (*d*). Like Saadia (his practice in the Biblical commentaries as well), our author joins together a number of passages belonging to a paragraph that he leaves unnumbered. In a very few cases he splits up a unit of text that appears as a paragraph in our editions, e.g., Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, f. 108[b] [= Fenton, 233] (II: 5), where וזה סימן in the editions seems to be an error. Instead of צופה in the editions and in Berlin, SPK Or. oct. 243/4, 70, the compendium has צורף, p. 34.

The continuation was doubtlessly indicated by Arabic יתלו "follows", for which the compendium usually exhibits the formula תלה בזה ואמר, stemming from the same root, but not customarily used in this context.[211b]

Moses b. Joseph calls the paragraphs of a given chapter *halakhah* ("rule", as does Saadia). Paragraph 2 of chapter 1[212] corresponds to I, 4, 5; in the compendium (St. 11) it is called "second discourse" (מאמר), but the next paragraphs bear the title "chapter" (פרק), as chapter 3 (f. 19=|400| 6), 4 (25=I, 11), 5 (26=I, 11 *bis*, f. 56), 6 (28=II, 2). Page 30 (II, 4) has: : הג' [בהלכה] תלה בהולדה (for which *a* 66 וסמך אל זה הענין ההלכה השלישית). After that the numbering ceases, but under VI, 4, *a*, *b*, and *d* refer to the third "rule" in the beginning of the book.[213] Here and there

---

remarks that he does not want to digress too widely, cf. n. 204; Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 10=75. End of III (Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22), fol. 104[b]; Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4, fol. 61 (not in Steinschneider ms., fol. 25).

[210] Fürst 1845, 563, 564, where (*ad* VI, 1) (Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22), fol. 114 (also in Jellinek 1852, I, 6) המחבר הספר הזה is not Saadia, but the author of the *Yeẓira* himself; the "peut-être" of Munk 1851, 49, is not in the text.

[211] Sometimes תרגומה Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, normally פשטה, sometimes only כמשמעו (Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 78 *ad* I, 4, 5), or בלתי חדוש, also *ad* II, 2 (missing in Ibn Gabirol 1858, XIII). Has the translator abridged here, because he did not want to repeat the text? Then פירושה, for which also חפץ (Arabic 'יריץ?). In Naḥum for both פירוש. Cf. n. 534.

[211b] However, one finds (in the Steinschneider ms., fol. 29, before II, 3) רמאמה הזל דמס דוע in Naḥum (Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4), 64), ואח"כ סמך לזה הדבר (corrupt reading סימן לדבר following Paris in Ibn Gabirol 1858, III); also וסמך אל זה הענין before II, 4 66; ויסמיך לענין זה in Moses b. Joseph (fol. 105, also I, 4, Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 79, line 1 הסמיך and IV, 1, Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22; in Naḥum IV, 1, Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4, fol. 77; אח"כ סמוך לו, read סמך as *ibidem* III, 4 74 and V, 1 79.

[212] Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 78. In Saadia, chapter 2.

[213] (*a*) 79, (*b*) fol. 112, (*d*) 44. At the end of III, 5 (Steinschneider ms., fol. 42) המליך את אות א' (ברוח)...וקשר לו כתר דע כי פירוש שאר ההלכה הזאת מצאנוהו חסר; – has IV, 1 been omitted along with it? Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4, 62 (*ad* I, 11) התחיל הראשון אמר ארבעה אש מרוח...וכאשר השלים הפרק השלישי,

the interpretation repeats part of the text to be explained, probably on the basis of old manuscripts, which were abbreviated by more recent copyists.

§231. A linguistic comparison of the translation calls for a careful examination of all manuscripts – most of them unfortunately incomplete – including a comparison with the quotations in Judah b. Barzillai (*Commentary on Sefer Yeẓirah*, Berlin 1885), who neither names an author nor indicates whether he makes use of a translation available to him which, in any case, is different from *a*–*c*.[213b] Perhaps I shall give some results based on the available excerpts in an endnote. [No such endnote was supplied in this book.] I shall confine myself here mainly to the Arabic words that the translators have taken from the text with or without a Hebrew translation. It is worth remarking that the unknown author himself, when giving a linguistic description of the letters of the two alphabets, Hebrew and Arabic (I, 1 and II, 2) had occasion to use some technical terms or to present Arabic words as examples for the pronunciation of certain letters. He intended to compose a book on how the two languages are related.[214]

In our presentation we follow the order of the book, designating the translations of Naḥum, Moses, and the compendium by *a*, *b*, and *d*, respectively. Of the translation *c* we know next to nothing, other than this: חסאב אלגבאר is translated here by מספר העפר [215]; passage I, 1 is lacking in *a*; in *b* (Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 77) we find only חשבון בני הודו, in *d* 10 הנקרא רפתח (מספר?) הודו הנודע בחשבון האבק.

Preface *b* 99 [= Fenton, 214] (Fürst 1845, 563) חכמת החבור כלומר מוציקי; also I, 11: *a* (65, last line) מוסיקא; *b* 105 [= Fenton, 226]) מוציקי, *d* 29 חכמת הניגון

I, 1, *b* 100b [= Fenton, 216] of the Arabic words (Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 72, 73) קציב and גבהה are translated; *a* 58, 59); Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 8 omits the examples; *d* 6) omits גבהה and does not give a translation.

I, 1, *b* ובעל הלשון אומר בספר הראשון מס' הלשון הנקרא מנטקיאת ובל' יון נקרא רטוריא indubitably for קטאגוריאה, *Categories*; *a* 59 ההגיון אמר בס' ההגיון; ובעל ס' *d* וזה מן ההגיון בס' הא' בשער הא' בשער הקנין; cf. 16 (I, 5) ובעל ההגיון בס' הא' מחכמת המבטא (*a* is corrupt here; *b* I cannot investigate); cf. III, 1, *b* 109 [= Fenton 234]) (!) בעלי הלשון ריטוריאן (see epilogue §232); *a* 71 בעלי ההגיון; *d* 35 בהגיון נאמר. Worth noticing is לשון for מנטק.

I, 3, *a* 60 קפיז (a measure); *b* 75 כורי; *d* 9 משא – *a* 61 סבת הרעש הנקרא זלזלה.[216]

Steinschneider 25 end of פרק 3: הודיעני שכל אלה, up to 29 end of 4 missing in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22, fol. 104b.

[213b] Halberstam in Judah ben Barzillai 1885, XV, assumes, without giving it a second thought, that Judah made the translation himself (cf. §259). A sample passage (V, 1) from Jacob b. Nissim and Abū Sahl is given in Kaufmann 1884a, 35.

[214] *Ad* II, 4 (Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92/22), fol. 107 (Fürst 1845, 563); cf. Munk 1851, 57. ‹Ankle (finger) – reckoning, see Günther 1887, 9, 189.›

[215] Munk 1851, 51, cf. 195. גבאר for חשבון האצבעות cf. Cambridge, UL Add. 1527/2.

[216] Cf. §64, n. 229.

II, 3 (Ibn Gabirol 1858, III) העציות והעץ נקרא בלשון ערב הפה; Berlin Or. 243 (fol 65) מוצא קפא at any rate *one* word, perhaps מצאפרה from צפר *sibilavit* [(= he produced a sibilant)]; |401| then אסליה and חלקיה (Berlin Or. 243: דולוקיה!) *gutturalia*; Munich BS 92 105 [= Fenton, 227]) חלוקות (Kaufmann 1884c, 172).

V, 1, *a* 81 and *d* f. 46) the star names פרקדין and סהיל

VI, 1, *a* 83 and *b* f. 113b [= Fenton, 244] אפריגיון (not in *d* f. 49)

Ibidem *d* 50 מרכז center (current usage already then?), *a* 85 and *b* 114 [= Fenton, 244]) מוצק.[217]

VI, 3 *a* 86 and *d* 54 מאסריקא מאסריקי; *b* f. 115 [= Fenton, 247] גונבים![218]

Among Hebrew words and forms we mention in particular: להנציחו (*b* Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 78, one line before the last), מכוכב (87, line 4, so should be read for מבוכס, 80 line 5 from bottom, ditto Arabic),[219] – *a* 63 תחת מין הטפלה (Ben Asher, Aaron b. Moses and Jacob ben Nissim 1846, 42 הטפילה; Kaufmann 1884c, 141); *b* 104b [= Fenton, 224] קאטיגורס המוסמך; *d* 27 ההצטרפות.

Ibidem *a* מדותיו; *b* ספוריו; *c* תואריו.

II, 2, *a* 64, *c* Ibn Gabirol 1858, iii, line 10: מתלכד, should be read מתלבד from לבד.

II, 2, *b*, i.e., Munich 92 105 [= Fenton, 227]) (Ibn Gabirol 1858, xiii) גושמניות; *a* (ibid. III) גשמיות according to Berlin heb. 92, 64; *d* 28 גופניות.

II, 4, *a* for "to multiply" הכה (תשתכה, Arabic צ'רב), "product" ממון (Arabic מאל); *b* 106 [= Fenton, 229] צרוף and קרן הממון, *d* ערך and היוצא.

III, 5, *a* 77 יצירה ס' בעל על נכנס אצלי כלו ומזה; *b* 111 = [Fenton, 238] כנוס (Jellinek 1852 I, 14, Arabic מדכ'ל or מדכ'כ'ל "interpolated").

VI, 1, *a* 84 הנפש המבטאית; *d* 49 המדברת.

Naḥum writes רוחאני with א consistently, as does the translator of the *Microcosm* (§238).[219b]

§232. We conclude this article with a word on the peculiar published epilogue which is extant only in the translation of Moses.[220] There the author names three very prolific authors – known to him only through their works – who are very prolix: among the Greeks there is Galen, who was a Jew by the name of Gamaliel, living at the time of the Second Temple, since he mentions in his book on nutrition (ספר במאכלות) unleavened bread that one should eat for 7 days in such and such a manner.[221] The author had seen a work on medicine, translated from Hebrew into Latin, with the title (בהקדמתו) "Book of Gamaliel, the Nasi, called Galenus among the Greeks" (הידוע = Arabic אלמערוף). There is no other writer, our author says, as

[217] מוצק has yet to be found in Abraham Ibn Ezra, however, Abraham b. Ḥiyya, (Steinschneider 1861b, 83, 109) already has it; his contemporary Judah b. Barzillai (1885, 246) and Judah Ibn Tibbon (Kuzari Judah Ha-Levi 1869, 88) have the Arabic מרכז = κέντρον; cf. also n. 290.

[218] Steinschneider 1869a, 248 (cf. n. 203) משריק בלע"ז in הנצמא ס' (Polak 1851, X). ‹'meseraice', in Mowat 1887›.

[219] Cf. §192, n. 4554.

[219b] A quotation which up to now has not been recognized as being identical in Judah b. Barzillai (1885, 179 (319)) has משובחים ומחוסנים (from Arabic חסן?), also בעלי תושיה and פנימוני וחיצוני ותיכוני.

[220] Fürst 1845, 563; cf. n. 213.

[221] Kaufmann 1884a, 6, 192.

prolix as Galen, so much so that his prolixity often vitiates the effect of what he wanted to say. This reminds us of Isaac Israeli, who also speaks of Galen's prolixity, "Galen, the master physician."[222]

Galen's counterpart among the Arabs is עמר בן גיהאט (*sic* in the manuscript, printed as גיהאני); perhaps 'Amr al-Jāḥiẓ.[223] The third,[224] Saadia Gaon, is prolix, yet he adorns our book (*Yeẓira* – or his own books?) with philosophy and with rhetorical arguments (טענות רטוריאה?), etc.

Finally we add to the |402| authors quoted in our work in Munk 1851, 54 Euclid (*a* f. 69, *d* f. 33; *b* f. 108 b): Euclid "the philosopher".

§233. Judah ha-Levi b. Samuel,[225] in Arabic, Abū l-Ḥasan[226] from Toledo, lived in Cordova, but a somewhat mystical national sentiment[227] drove him, in his 50th year (1140–50), to emigrate and betake himself to his ancestral fatherland. We can follow his itinerary up to his departure from Egypt. [The details of ha-Levi's departures for the Holy Land were finally clarified in an exhaustive study by Moshe Gil and Ezra Fleischer 2001; Judah ha-Levi 1663. In 1129–30, ha-Levi dramatically announced his plans, and he did leave Spain for North Africa, the first leg of his planned journey, along with Abraham Ibn Ezra. However, while there, ha-Levi received word that Ḥalfon ben Netanel, the Egyptian entrepreneur who was to be his host, was in difficulty and could not receive him. Ha-Levi returned to Spain; only some 10 years later was he able to carry out his plans. Yahalom 2009 and Scheindlin 2008 have recently studied the pilgrimage; while disagreeing on several details, they both agree that ha-Levi reached the Holy Land.] Legend, which also has made him the father-in-law of Abraham Ibn Ezra,[228] tells us that the horse of an Arab crushed him when he recited his famous hymn, the Zionide [ציון הלא תשאלי], at the gates of Jerusalem.[229]

Judah ha-Levi was a physician, but this art did not satisfy his mind, nor did it fulfill the demands of his imagination.[230] He is justly considered the most excellent

[222] §6 (Steinschneider 1879h, 87); cf. Judah b. Samuel Abbas (in Güdemann 1873, 60): ראש הרופאים ואם ארכו דבריו.

[223] Steinschneider 1866b, 237; my conjecture is recorded in Kaufmann 1884a (cf. n. 221) as a fact. On him (died 868/9), cf. Steinschneider 1877c, 122.

[224] In Fürst 1845 יותר עליהן! in the manuscript ואמר אליהן, which is meaningless; in Kaufmann 1884a (n. 221) ואדמה אלימו, the fuller suffix as in Menaḥem b. Solomon (Steinschneider 1877a, 39, n. 3) and later on in Hillel b. Samuel.

[225] Sources: Older ones (up to Judah ha-Levi 1851) in Steinschneider 1852, 1338; Landshuth 1857, 69; Luzzatto 1864, Zunz 1865, 203, 413, 674; Judah ha-Levi 1871; Steinschneider 1877c, 43, 282, 351 (cf. Schreiner 1888, 621); D. Kaufmann 1877a (offprint from 1877a, 118–155); idem 1887, 89; idem 1884b and reprinted Adolph Frankl-Grün 1885.

[226] Thus already mentioned in Moses Ibn Ezra (Steinschneider 1852, 1801, according to which also the country), and by the compilator of the Divan.

[227] D. Kaufmann, the apologist of "Daniel Deronda," calls it a "realistic" trait.

[228] Steinschneider 1880b, 67.

[229] Sources are found in Kaufmann 1877b, 39.

[230] Judah ha-Levi 1851, 29, cf. 128, 130 and further Steinschneider 1860a, 32, and 1880g, 118. He did not write anything on medicine, וכבר ביארנו זה בניתוח (Kuzari IV, 25 ed. Cassell 1853, 355; Arabic ed. Hirschfeld 1887, 276 [= eds. Baneth and Ben Shammai 1977, 180] only בין; Cardinal

Hebrew poet of the Middle Ages. His poems were admired, especially his hymns, of which more than 300 are preserved in almost all Jewish prayer books from Eastern and Northern Europe to India and China,[231] as well as in one of the two collections (diwans) of his poems. In more recent times this Jewish poet has, through Heine, nearly become a popular poet. Jewish theologians appreciated him also for a book that is relevant to the present context, although it is not strictly philosophical.

The Arabic title is actually כתאב אלחג'ה ואלדליל פי אלדין אלד'ליל *The Book of Refutation and Proof of the Humiliated Faith*. It is an apology for the revelation and the Jewish tradition, directed against Islam, Christianity, philosophy and the sect of the Karaites whose theology follows the methods of *kalam*. The author exploits the tradition concerning the conversion of the Khazars to the Jewish religion.

[Khazarite studies have been a lively field in the last few decades, attracting scholars and enthusiasts alike. For a recent and revised overview in English see Brook 2004. Cf. Golb 1988, 1982, and Golden 1980, an expanded version of the author's Columbia doctorate. The International Center of Khazar Studies in Kharkiv, Ukraine, publishes a journal, *Khazarskiy al'manax*. On the web see http://www.khazaria.com/.]

He introduces into his book the king of the Khazars who invites a Muslim, a Christian and a Jewish scholar (called Isaac Sangari in a report on the conversion).[232] |403| In the course of his replies to the king's questions and objections, the Jew expounds a theory which, according to Geiger,[233] is closer to Christianity than to Islam. The book is not known under its original title, but it became famous under the title of a Hebrew translation.

Only one manuscript of the Arabic original is known: Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 284, of which there exists a defective and incorrect copy by Goldberg, ms. Quatremère, now Munich, BS Arab. 936 [Aumer Cat. 421].[234] [The critical edition of D. H. Baneth and H. Ben-Shammai 1977 makes use of many fragments of the original. Nonetheless, the Oxford manuscript listed by Steinschneider remains the only complete copy; it too suffers from a few minor lacunae. There are in addition some indirect textual witnesses. The Ibn Tibbon Hebrew translation is still necessary in order to establish the correct text. The manuscripts and other sources are discussed in the "Introduction" to the edition of

---

paraphrased ומודים בזו חכמי הטבעה ואומרים בפירושם, thus treating תשריח as the second conjugation of the root שרח!

[231] Even profane poems, for example, in the Yemenite rite.

[232] Isaac Sangari's tombstone among the Karaites has been recognized as one of Firkovich's forgeries. Out of confusion people have made Isaac the author of the book; see Steinschneider 1852, 1339 at the bottom, after which, line 7, "Jehudah" should be corrected. On the Khazars see Jacob 1887, 82. Joseph Ibn Ẓaddiq, ed. Neubauer 1887b, 91, places the conversion of the King in the year 740, but also Adda b. Ahava in 761, Aristotle (88) in 3408, Simon ha-Ẓaddiq in 3410 (cf. at the top of 271). I have provided a bibliography of the letter of Ḥisdai Ibn Shaprut (10th cent.) to the king of the Khazars (composed by Menaḥem b. Saruq?) and the aforementioned answer of the latter (Joseph) in the Supplement to Benjacob, Steinschneider 1880, 327 n. 1197.

[233] Diwan in Judah ha-Levi 1851, 75.

[234] Steinschneider 1877c, 44; details in Kaufmann 1877a, 118.

Baneth–Ben-Shammai.] Goldberg has published some long passages[235]; D. Kaufmann (1877a, 119) exhibits a greater number of passages from this copy, partly collated with the Bodleian manuscript. Hartwig Hirschfeld published a complete edition of the text along with a Hebrew translation (Leipzig 1887).[235b] In his work on the three religions Saʿd b. Manṣūr [Ibn Kammūna] adopted large sections from it; others are to be found in an appendix ascribed to him on the differences between the views of Rabbanites and the Karaite views. [Ibn Kammuna's use of the work is discussed by M. Perlmann in 1971; Perlmann also notes parallel passages in his edition of the Arabic text 1967. *Midrash ha-Nagid*, attributed to the grandson of Maimonides, is another Judaeo-Arabic writing to make use of ha-Levi's work; see Langermann 1996d, 293–96.][236] The fifth treatise of this work presents a concise system of scholastic philosophy of the Arabs, the so-called *kalam*, which is relevant for the history of philosophy.[237]

§234. This work was translated twice. Judah Ibn Tibbon's translation under the title ס' הכוזרי *Kuzari* (Cosari, Cosri, Cusri, Kusari, etc.; in Hirschfeld, Chazari) displays the date Lunel, 1167, in a number of manuscripts, and in the editions, beginning with that of G. Soncino (Judah ha-Levi 1506).[238] Some are accompanied by commentaries.[239] The Hamburg edition (Judah ha-Levi 1838, printed in Hannover, furnished with variant readings) lacks the paragraph numbering necessary for tracing quotations; I was unable to consult the Warsaw edition (Judah ha-Levi 1866). We have a Latin translation by Buxtorf (Judah ha-Levi 1660), a Spanish translation of Jakob Abendana (Judah ha-Levi 1663),[240] a German translation with text and notes by H. Jolowicz and D. Cassel and an introduction by the latter (Judah ha-Levi 1853), whose revised version in the edition of 1869 is greatly abbreviated, and finally a German translation from the Arabic (with an introduction on the Khazars) by Hartwig Hirschfeld (Judah ha-Levi 1887). [There is a complete English translation from the Arabic by Hirschfeld (Judah ha-Levi 1905) and a partial one by I. Heinemann (Judah ha-Levi 1947), neither entirely satisfactory. A new English translation, begun by the late Lawrence Berman and completely revised by Barry Kogan is forthcoming. Charles Touati published a French translation (Judah ha-Levi 1994). Three modern Hebrew editions are

[235] Steinschneider 1877c, 44, the prosodic passages II, 78, 80 (cf. Steinschneider 1852, 1339) in Goldberg 1861b, 183.

[235b] Corrections by Goldziher in 1887.

[236] Steinschneider 1879b, 74. n. 107.

[237] Steinschneider 1857a, §14, n. 57; cf. above §176, n. 396. An analysis of the work appears in Eisler 1870–83, Part One (1876), 81 ff.; a brief one in D. Cassell's preface to Judah ha-Levi 1853, vii ff.; see also n. 225 above.

[238] Steinschneider 1852, 1376 no. 6; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 264/6 breaks off at the date (Steinschneider 1875b, 100, does not indicate this; [corrected in Steinschneider 1895, 128.]) – 1171 also in London, Mont. 268 (formerly, Luzzatto 22) [Luzzatto 22 is currently London, Mon. 269.]

[239] Editions, etc., up to 1853 listed exactly in Cassel's ed., Judah ha-Levi 1853, Introduction; Steinschneider 1852, 1340; Geiger 1851, 175; Zedner 1867, 399; Rosenthal 1875, 614; Benjacob 1880, 236 n. 41 ff.

[240] A translation by Jacob Lombroso mentioned in Ghirondi 1853, 201 n. 183, and in Benjacob 1880, n. 47 ff, is probably is a mixup with Abendana.

available: those of Yehudah Even Shmu'el (Judah ha-Levi 1972), accompanied by a very extensive discussion of textual history (including printings and translations), copious notes, and indices; of Yosef Qafih (Judah ha-Levi 1996), which also has a facing re-edition of the Judaeo-Arabic; ; and of Rabbi I. Shailat (Judah ha-Levi 2010).]

Around the year 1420 a Provençal author, Solomon b. Menachem, vulgo Prat (Comprat?) Maimon,[241] read the book with some young students. Three of them went on to compose commentaries that resemble each other not only in their interpretations but also in their very frequent, occasionally important, quotations from philosophical literature. The commentary by Jacob b. ḥ404ḥ Ḥayyim, called Vidal Farissol[242] or קמראט (Comprat), composed in his 17th year (1422) under the title בית יעקב, exists in manuscripts Berlin, SPK Or. Qu. 653 (formerly Kayserling); London, Mon. 268, and New York, JTS Ms. 2287 (formerly Heidenheim Cat., Rodelheim 1833 39, no. 4).

The commentary of Solomon b. Judah, called Solomon Vivas (or Vives) from Lünel, written in his thirteenth year (1424) under the title חשק שלמה, is extant in manuscripts Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 114b[243] (formerly Mortara and Asher 16), Turin, BN A.VI.30 (some errors in [the catalogue of] B. Peyron 204, n. 193), with some extracts also in Cambridge, UL Add. 539/22. [The Turin ms. was badly burned in 1904. The work was edited recently by Dov Schwartz in Solomon ben Judah 2007.]

The commentary of Natanel Kaspi, called Bonsenior Macif of Argentierre,[244] erroneously called עדות לישראל (that is the title of a work of the master which is quoted therein) and composed around the end of 1424, exists in manuscripts Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. Add. 11[245] (formerly Bislichis 18, a copy of which is owned by S. Sachs); Paris, BN héb 677, an autograph[246]; Paris, BN héb 678/1; London, Mon. 269 (formerly Halberstam 1 and Luzz. 22); and Hamburg, SUB Ms. Levy 144 (formerly Asher (1868 cat. 17); Berlin, SPK Or. Qu. 822, ‹Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2255/4› [Budapest, MTA Ms. Kaufmann A 270; Jerusalem, Benayahu V 10; Mantua, CI 19; Milan, BA X 122 Sup.; Moscow, RSL Günz. 263/18; Moscow, RSL Günz. 1443.]

Steinschneider 1879b, 111–115, has an analysis of these three commentaries and supplies references for almost all quotations. As to the variant readings, see §235. [These commentaries have been studied recently by Dov Schwartz 2000; see there for bibliography.]

---

[241] Steinschneider 1876b, 126 ff. On this see Zunz 1876, II, 77, following Hänel; Neubauer 1876, 391; cf. Renan and Neubauer 1877, 636; Wolf 1715, I, 1078 עדות לישראל Commentary on the Kuzari according to Buxtorf and the Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 114a.

[242] Cf. Bardinet 1880, 273 – קמראט appears in Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4). – בשנת טוב משנותי. Cf. Steinschneider 1864b, 27.

[243] Neubauer and Cowley 1886, no. 2383; Neubauer and Driver 1876, n. 54, xix; Renan and Neubauer 1877, 746 to 636; cf. Steinschneider 1878, 127.

[244] On מאציף see Steinschneider 1876b, 132, 1878b, 105, to be added to Gross 1880, 415.

[245] Neubauer and Driver 1876, *loc. cit.*

[246] Dukes 1848c, 571, incorrectly has 1387.

Prat Maimon's Commentary

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz) Or. Qu. 653 (Steinschneider 124) (IMHM F 1777), 157 fols.
London, Montefiore 268 (Halb. 214) (IMHM F 5232), 179 fols.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 2287 (Acc. 95) (IMHM F 28540).

Solomon b. Judah's Commentary

Cambridge, University Library Add. 539 (SCR 268) (IMHM F 15877), 168b–71b.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 114 (Neubauer 2383) (IMHM F 21663), 181 fols.

Netanel Kaspi's Commentary

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz) Or. Qu. 822 (Steinschneider 203) (IMHM F 1750), 1a–216a.
Budapest, Magyar tudományos akadémia Kaufmann A. 270 (IMHM F 15124), 160 fols.
Jerusalem, Hamburg MS. Levy 144 (Hamburg Acc. 1906/11233) (Levy 157) (IMHM F 1584), 1a–172a.
Jerusalem, Benayahu V 10 V 10 (IMHM F 44467), 7 fols.
London, Montefiore 269 (Halb. 1) (IMHM F 5233), 85 fols.
Mantua, Comunita Israelitica Ms. ebr. 81 (IMHM F 799), 220 fols.
Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana X 122 Sup. (Luzzatto 37) (Bernheimer) (IMHM F 12344), 209 fols.
Moscow, Russian State Library Ms. Guenzburg 263 (IMHM F 457198), 288b–92a.
Moscow, Russian State Library Ms. Guenzburg 1443 (IMHM F 48505), 75 fols.
Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Mich. Add. 11 (Neubauer 1229) (IMHM F 22043), 249 fols.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 677 (Oratoire 59) (IMHM F 11555), 1–204.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 678/1 (Paris BN ancien fonds 214) (IMHM F 11556), 1b–176a.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2255 (De Rossi 395) (IMHM F 13419), 17a–172b.

One or the other of these commentaries was known to Judah Moscato, whose extensive commentary קול יהודה, begun in 1573 and printed in Venice after his death (between 1590 and 1594),[247] abounds with quotations of Jewish and other authors.[248] These appear to be taken from one of these commentaries, and so also, perhaps, some of the variant readings.[249]

All of the commentaries printed together with the text, namely those by Isaac Satanow (Judah ha-Levi 1796), Israel Zamosc (Judah ha-Levi 1796)[250] – but not the one by G. Brecher (Judah ha-Levi 1837) – have profited from this learned commentary.

[247] Also Warsaw Judah ha-Levi 1880.

[248] Judah ha-Levi 1853, xxx, especially n. 8 and 85 (Jacob b. Ḥayyim); Steinschneider 1852, 1363.

[249] Judah ha-Levi 1853, xx n. 7, xxvi n. 24 Natanel; Judah ha-Levi 1851, 175.

[250] An unknown edition 1801 כמו שנדפס בווייען in 4^0, probably in Russia, a copy of Pinner, a gift from the Karaite Joseph Solomon b. Moses.

Judah Ibn Tibbon did not write a foreword to his translation, which is generally very reliable. It would require a special monograph to fully characterize this translation.[251] The notes of Jolowicz and Cassel have frequently pointed out and explained its Arabisms. Under the pseudonym M. Sider, I published some extensive articles on the first installments of that edition in Steinschneider 1841, 1842, discussing in particular the Arabisms (1842, 225–34). Here I only point out the Arabic words which can be found among the Hebrew words in the "Index philologicus", without any differentiation between the languages (Judah ha-Levi 1853, 438): אחול, אסתקסאת אנשאדיה, ארדשיר אקלים (read for אשדשיר),[252] אתיר (read for אתור p. 250), בבניא, ברכיה, ברסאם, גוזהר, גראניק, היולי, כנדרוס, מרכז, משאיים (hebraized, on 406, missing from the index), עמש, שטרנג (p. 424).

§235. Judah Ibn Cardinal (קרדינאל, קרדנאל) ben Isaac translated the same book – we do not know under which title – from the Arabic for Joseph b. Baruch, perhaps that scholar who went to Palestine in 1211.[253] In a very brief foreword the translator recounts |405| that the first treatises of his translation were originally brought by Joseph to England. However, they were not returned by the persons who had taken possession of them. Thus, in order to have the complete book, he had to translate it again. He assures us that he has not changed anything substantial in his translation; even if he added or omitted words, he strove never to change the intent. [The citations from the Hebrew *Kuzari* in *Ḥesheq Shlomo* (Solomon ben Judah 2007) do not always match Ibn Tibbon (whose text is conveniently reprinted by Schwartz, but Schwartz makes no comments about these divergences); *Ḥesheq Shlomo* may have made use, at least in some places, of Cardinal; or the variants may have already infiltrated mss of Ibn Tibbon, as Steinschneider suggests.]

Apart from this foreword, as well as a few lines from the beginning of the book that are in some manuscripts of the translation just mentioned,[254] Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 47/5 contains a fragment (IV, 25) which is doubtlessly the same which Moscato found in the margin of some copies of the printed translation by Tibbon. This fragment is printed on the basis of a copy by Werbluner (a man of little scholarship) in Cassel's edition (Judah ha-Levi 1853), 344–61, below Tibbon's translation. [The fragments of Cardinal's translation, culled from various sources, are displayed in the notes to Y. Even-Shemuel's translation.]

Some variant readings in the edition of Ibn Tibbon probably ought to be traced back to this translation, perhaps by way of the three commentaries (§234), which know at least the printed portion of Cardinal's translation (cf. Steinschneider 1879b, 115). In order to characterize this translation we point out the following words, in the order of their appearance in Cassel's edition: ישתבצו (p. 346), גלמים (357 and elsewhere = גשמים, cf. גלמות 357, הגלמי, 361; on the other hand, גרמים 354), עריכה (347), חוצב לו שם, Arabic *quwwa*), כח = 346 and elsewhere) עצמה and עוצמה

[251] Kaufmann 1877a, 169. Hirschfeld 1883a, 88, Kaufmann 1883b, p 107; Hirschfeld 1883b, 172.

[252] גרדשיר; see above, §222, 388, אזדשיר Ardashir, for Yazdagird.

[253] Cf. the citations by Judah ha-Levi 1853, xx; Steinschneider 1852, 1300; Zunz 1865, 324.

[254] Hebrew from various named sources in Judah ha-Levi 1853, xxi; Latin in De Rossi 1803 Parma, BP Parm. 1936 (De Rossi 625); cf. Parma, BP Parm. 2569 (De Rossi 1095).

(ibid. = ערך) סתר המבדיל ,(352 ff., קרום in Tibbon), דקדוק התיכון [הדומה] הרואה (353, מרכז Tibbon), הקרבות (ibid.), טבעה (355 ff., גביות more commonly טבע) נפשים (356), להתפליש (l. להתפלש 357) and מתפלשת (358),[255] (360 "living bodies," the word has been added)[256] רתום ("connected," 360 twice). [For the impact of the *Kuzari* on Jewish intellectual history until 1900 see Shear 2008.]

§236. **Judah b. Nissim** Ibn Malka, or Melka (מלכה),[257] probably from Spain or North Africa (ca. 1365),[258] [The consensus now is that Ibn Malka's *floruit* must be moved up to the middle of the thirteenth century; see M. Idel 1990. A book-length study of Judah b. Nissim is available in Georges Vajda 1954.] and inspired by Neoplatonic teachings,[259] composed a work in three parts: (1) אנס אלגריב "Companion to the Stranger," an introduction to the *Book of Creation* (יצירה, see §227) which consists of two dialogues, the one between the author[260] and his own soul, the other between a |406| student (טאלב) and his teacher; and ten chapters on the human attainment of the perfect science; (2) תפסיר ספר יצירה, a commentary on the *Book of Creation*, according to philosophical principles; (3) תפסיר פרקי ר' אליעזר, commentary on the *Chapters of R. Eliezer*, up to chapter 52 (the author had no more at his disposal), completed in 1365. The Arabic original is extant in Paris, BN Ms. héb. 764 and Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Or. 661c; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Or. 661a; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Or. 661b [all three sections of the work]; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 45 (Neub. 1536; bought by Zunz who had received it from the heirs of N. Krochmal; the end is defective); the original is probably quoted by Samuel Motot (ca. 1370).[261]

---

[255] Especially frequent in Falaquera; see Steinschneider 1889, 75.

[256] גויות in the section on Ibn Ezra in Kaufmann 1877a, 173, 174, who does not take this translation into consideration – as to the problem, see Steinschneider 1881e, 9; see Steinschneider 1857a, 324; 1878a, 21.

[257] Hibat Allāh b. Malkā, Christian writer, 1220 in Egypt, Vatican, BAV Cod. Vat. ar. 157. Different authors are Malkon (Joseph or Ishoyahb bar Malkon b. M., see Steinschneider 1877m, 435), and Malkān, Abū 'l-Barakāt Hibat Allāh in Baghdad (middle of 12th cent. in Ḥājjī Khalīfa 1835–58 VII, 1058 n. 2183).

[258] Wolf 1715, III, n. 753b; IV, 762c; Munk 1838, 16, in Geiger 1836, 158, Munk 1859, 301. Geiger 1844, 442; cf. Steinschneider 1852, 1244, 2455; Steinschneider 1869a, b, c, d, 16.

[259] Munk 1859, 301. Geiger 1844, 443: "Philosophy of Maimonides, with a still stronger symbolical character, mixed with Kabbalistic ingredients."

[260] טאלב אלחיאה פי מותה should not be explained as the Paris catalogue does: "étant encore dans les liens du corps", rather as מי שירצה להחיות נפשו ימיתה (Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq 1896, II, 8); אמר פילוס' מותו ברצונכם ותחיו בטבעכם (Joseph Ibn Zaddik 1854, 41; Ibn Gabirol 1859b, 172 n. 518); חייכם מותכם ומותכם חייכם (Isaac Ibn Ghiyyat מה יתרון in מעמד ליל כיפור). Belonging to a similar category are the sayings which compare knowledge/scholarship and ignorance to life and death, traced even to Aristotle (Ibn Buṭlān, *Polemic*, ch. 2, in Ibn al-Qifṭī 1903, s.v.) and Ptolemy (Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq 1896, II, 11, see Steinschneider 1884, 133). See also §185 n. 482. ‹See also §535 n. 155. ›

[261] *Ad* Exodus 23:21 (Motot 1554, fol. 26[1], next to last line), Steinschneider 1852, 2455, not in the unedited recension (Goldenthal 1851, 7, see Steinschneider 1875v, 16, now Cambridge UL Add.10015.2). – Dukes (1868, 96) erroneously calls him Joseph b. Eliezer. – A passage (Mas'ūdī?) is in Reinaud 1849, Index, 329: "R. Juda." Perhaps from Motot in Jacob ben Ḥayyim, etc. (Steinschneider 1879b, 115, line 1 and Dukes 1848c, 572 n. 12): נסים בן יהודה.

Oxford, Bodl. Opp. Add. Qu. 45 also contains a Hebrew translation[262] of the commentary to the *Book of Creation*. [This was published by Georges Vajda 1974. According to Vajda, one main objective of the abridgment was to remove passages that were deemed theologically obnoxious.] Perhaps Moses Botarel (1409) still knew of it.[263]

[The kabbalist Isaac of Acre prepared a Hebrew translation of the first part of the commentary on the "Chapters of R. Eliezer"; this text, which is accompanied by glosses of the translator, is found in two manuscripts: New York, JTS Rab. 1723, fols. 1a–6a and New York, NYPL Jewish Items XXP/32 (formerly Sassoon 919). This text was edited by Paul Fenton 1993. A different translation of the commentary is found in Moscow, RGB Günz., fols. 258, 286a–298b; it is being studied now by Y. Tzvi Langermann, towards eventual publication. This text is in the same hand and most likely accomplished by the same individual who wrote the shortened translation of the commentary to *Sefer Yeẓirah* published by Vajda (concerning which see above). Indeed, the Moscow manuscript is not a true codex but rather a collection of fragments from diverse sources that have been bound together. It seems most likely that they simply fell out of the same manuscript that eventually found its way to the Bodleian Library.]

§237. (Joseph Ibn ʻAqnin. [Joseph Ibn Simeon of Ceuta, see below]). Joseph b. Judah etc. b. Simeon, or Arabic: Abūl-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf b. Yaḥyā b. Shamʿūn al-Maghribī al-Fāsī,[264] is certainly Joseph Ibn ʻAqnin (עקנין or עכנין).[265] He was a student of Maimonides, later on a very significant physician in Aleppo, where he died in 1226, and a friend of the vizier al-Qifṭī, who dedicated an article (published by Munk) to him and quoted in part by Ibn abī Uṣaybiʿa (II, 213).[266] [S. Munk 1842 argued that Joseph b. Judah Ibn Simeon, whom he identified with the famous pupil of Maimonides, was not the same person as the philosopher Joseph b. Judah Ibn ʻAqnin. This led to a sharp response by Steinschneider 3 years later, and to a scholarly controversy that continued for

[262] Steinschneider 1852, 1244, only following a communication. The beginning appears in Neubauer as אמר התלמיד החיים הנצחיים; end ממקומו...והנהיגך בכחו ובכל עת תהלל.

[263] Steinschneider 1852, 1783; cf. Steinschneider 1869c, 29 against Dukes 1868, 96.

[264] See Steinschneider 1873e, 38 and 40, on Baldi 1874, 37 (cf. 84, l. 1), which escaped Wüstenfeld 1877, 113 – מן מדינתם, also in the commentary on the *Medical Aphorisms*; see Moscow, RSL Günz. 1024/2.

[265] See Steinschneider 1873e, 38 and עקנין ibid., 39; Schiler-Szinessy 1876, I, 154, 190: Steinschneider and Neubauer 1888, 105–12.

[266] Sources: Herbelot Sebti 1785, IV, 203. Rapoport 1830, 77; Wolf 1715, [1.3] 853 (Kohen), [3]938 (872 [3.1] ,ידרפס (Barceloni), [1.3]942 (898 [3].(ויקנקע[c] (Joseph b. Yaḥyah); De Rossi 1807, 106, De Rossi 1839, 84, Geiger 1839b, 439; Nicoll 1787, 562, Wüstenfeld 1840 §212 (cf. 246 and 144, n. 41); Carmoly 1844, 64 (2 different authors), see Geiger 1844, 465; Munk 1842, concerning which see Steinschneider 1845, 66; Fürst 1842, 807; Dukes 1843b, 139 (Ink. A. 1845, 207 and Dukes 1845, 600, already found in Munk 1842, 9 and 55); Geiger 1846, 134 following communication of Rapoport; Neppi and Ghirondi 1853, 171, 193; Steinschneider 1855a, 45; Steinschneider 1852, 1440; Hammer-Purgstall 1850, VII, 555 n. 8134; Steinschneider 1873e, 38 and VII, 1874c, 16 ff. (concerning Güdemann), 1877d, 122 (this is how it should be read in Löwy, ed. Ibn Aknin 1879, vi), Steinschneider 1880a, 11 and 63; Leclerc 1876, II, 166 only according to Munk, to be completed according to Moscow, RGB Günz. 1024; Neubauer 1870, 348, cf. Steinschneider 1883a, 133; M. Löwy, Ibn Aknin 1879 etc. see below (1879); cf. Salfeld 1879, 81; Schechter 1887, x, is not acquainted with these last sources. Steinschneider 1888, 105.

more than a century, with Steinschneider's view gradually losing support. The scholarly consensus is now with Munk, i.e., against identifying the two and for viewing Joseph Ibn Simeon, and not Joseph Ibn Aknin, as Maimonides' pupil. (See Baneth 1957, 1964 ; for other views, published before Baneth's articles, see B. Lewis 1945 and A. Halkin 1950.) Baneth also held that Joseph Ibn Simeon was the author of the metaphysical treatise that Steinschneider describes above, as well as another work unknown to Steinschneider at the time of writing *HUe*, described below (Baneth 1946, 2). (Ibn 'Aqnin is indeed the author of the ethical work טב אלנפוס that is discussed in §10.)]

We have already dealt with Ibn 'Aqnin's ethical work טב אלנפוס, two parts of which were translated into Hebrew (§10).

Ibn 'Aqnin is the author of a little metaphysical treatise, actually untitled, called in the edition after its contents[267] מאמר במחויב המציאות ואיכות סדור הדברים ממנו וחדוש העולם "Treatise on the Necessary Existent, on How Things Emanate From It, and on the Creation of the World,"[268] which is known only through the Hebrew translation of an anonymous author (probably fourteenth century; M. Löwy[269] surmises that it is Isaac ben Nathan). For the most part it is found together with the questions and treatises of |407| Averroes, along with a treatise of al-Ghazālī (§192), in Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4753/4, Leipzig, UBL B. H. 14.[270] Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 36/22; Paris, BN héb 959/8 ‹cf. Isaac b. יושט "Just ou Jost" (!) 1225, Bacher 1890, 128 ms. Epstein [now Jerusalem, JNUL Yah. Ms. Heb. 1 cf. Weiser 1992, 52]›; Moscow, RSL Günz. 305/12.

Moritz Löwy began an edition of these translations on the basis of the Leiden and Leipzig manuscripts, along with a German translation and philological and philosophical notes.[271] [The treatise was edited in its entirety and translated into English in Judah Magnes' doctoral thesis 1904; for criticisms and emendations of this edition, see Baneth 1957.]

In this treatise, probably composed in 1187 in Aleppo, the author addresses his teacher, without doubt Maimonides, whom he had probably queried beforehand, concerning three theses, listed at the beginning of the treatise, and considered from a rational and (theologically) positive point of view.[272] Not very satisfied with the response of his teacher, Yosef attempts at a solution, which he then offers to him.

[Baneth argued that it is most unlikely that Maimonides was the teacher whose responses were deemed by Ibn Simeon to be unsatisfactory, and so the work, according to Baneth, was written before Joseph became Maimonides' pupil in the early 1180s, i.e., while he was still in the Maghreb.]

According to Munk 1842, 47, the translation is done in "a very unclear style." As M. Löwy very aptly remarks, its character is that of the translations of the

---

[267] Leclerc 1876, xi.

[268] Munk 1842, 56 read אבות "principes"! I already emended it to איכות in Steinschneider 1845, 119. Löwy, Ibn Aknin 1879, 8, wishes to attribute Munk's misunderstanding to סדור; concerning סדור והגדרה on 11, see above §146, n. 1179.

[269] Rendered imprecisely by Munk l.c. as *nouveauté* ; חדוש has here the sense of *pi'el* .

[270] Leipzig, UBL B. H. 14: יקיר for יחיי (Steinschneider 1855a, 57).

[271] German title: Drei Abhandlungen v. Jos. b. Jehuda etc. herausg., übersetzt und erläutert v. Moritz Löwy, Berlin 1879; in Commiss. bei B. Baer; 16 Hebrew pages (not the complete first treatise), XVI and 40 pages.

[272] על דעת השכליים...והתוריים; concerning תוריים see Löwy, Ibn Aknin 1879, 12 and §18, n. 79.

second period. These are executed in closer dependence upon the Arabic texts. The transnational themes, so to speak, seemed to justify a literal rendering, too slavishly close to the text, but, on the other hand, too little governed by the laws and usage of the language. The translation contains less Arabic words, because more and more Hebrew synonyms had been introduced and missing elements were continuously replaced. In addition, these translations were meant for readers for whom Arabic had become so foreign that the Arabic word was completely useless. Moreover, Arabic was hardly a living language for the translators; they had learnt it by reading, like an extinct language.

There exists a small number of philosophical works, translated in a similar fashion by unknown translators. Most likely it is the copyists that have dealt with their writings negligently, for it is not be expected that the translator would have omitted his own name, against customary practice and his own vanity, or let us say, ambition. Stylistic similarity, even the usage of certain words, e.g., האותות,[273] and of idiomatic phrases are not enough to attribute all such translations to one and the same person, as long as no particular circumstances support this hypothesis. For our treatise one could adduce as an argument its outward connection to the treatise of al-Ghazālī, translated by Isaac Nathan.

[2. The Silencing Epistle, Concerning the Resurrection of the Dead (*Risālat al-iskāt fī ḥashr al-amwāt* or *Risālat al-iskāt fī tabyīn ḥashr al-amwāt*). This monograph was written in order "to silence" criticism of Maimonides' purported position on the question of the resurrection of the dead, particularly that circulated by Maimonides' arch-rival, Shmu'el ben 'Ali ?, Gaon of Baghdad. Portions of a Judaeo-Arabic treatise defending Maimonides on this issue were published by A. Harkavy in 1897. Baneth surmised that the author was Ibn Simeon 1964, 2. The Hebrew translation, which is complete and bears the title and the name of the author, was discovered by Y. Tzvi Langermann in a codex of philosophical treatises, Moscow, RSL Schneerson Ms. Yevr. 209. For this ms. see Langermann 1996b. The full Hebrew text, as well as the surviving portions of the original and a close analysis (including full bibliography), with an introduction in English, was published by Sarah Stroumsa 1999. The translator is Ḥayyim ben Yehudah Ibn Bibas (or Vivas); the translation was done in Valencia in 1343.]

§238. Joseph ben Jacob (Ibn) Ẓaddiq ('Ẓiddiq'?),[274] in Arabic Abū 'Umar,[275] judge in Cordova (died 1149),[276] composed at the |408| request of a pupil a small dogmati-

[273] See §194, n. 572.

[274] צדיק, perhaps related to Joseph, Steinschneider 1848, Register 333 where we find הצדיק, and צדיק בן צדיק in Abraham b. David (Zacuto 1580, 128b), in Jellinek 1854 Vorrede, vi, צדיק is given as a forename; Frumkin 1874 derives it from צדוק! Cf. יושתו (Justo), Steinschneider 1852, 1541 (Cf. Steinschneider 1862g, 132. – Joseph Zaddiq, see Steinschneider 1858, 123, 419; Zotenberg 1866, 191.

[275] Steinschneider 1871c, 24, n. 2 (not Amr, as in Neubauer 1886, 182, which is to be written עמרו ‹ but with the genitive after abu; [it is a question] whether Jews would dare to employ a kunya with 'Umar›), among others Joseph ben Jacob Ibn Sahl, to whom Bartollocci 1675 attributes העולם הקטן. – Perhaps belonging to חג'אג, cf. Herbelot 1785 Abū 'Umar Ḥajjāj, I, 704, Ḥajjāj Joseph II, 705.

[276] The main sources are Wolf 1715, [1.3]959; [3]849b; De Rossi 1839, 353. Steinschneider 1855b, 103; Steinschneider 1852, 1541; Jellinek on his edition; Beer 1854, and offprint. Grätz 1875 6:25; Zunz

cal work according to the opinions of the philosophers (*the* Philosopher = Aristotle; *De caelo et mundo* is quoted on p. 10), which he called "Microcosmos" (אלעאלם אלצגיר). Man is a microcosm and, therefore, philosophy means his – man's – self-knowledge,[277] by means of which he will come to understand the macrocosm and its Creator. The fourth and last section is more dogmatic. It treats of the deeds of man and their recompense, ending with the resurrection. Eisler presents an analysis of the work in the Jüdisches Centralblatt, ed. by Grünwald, 1886, 1887. This work was not studied much;[278] Maimonides knew it only by name and did not think much of it.[279] [Sarah Stroumsa 1990 reinforces Steinschneider's claim that Maimonides' attitude towards Ibn Ẓaddiq was negative. For a recent examination and summary of Ibn Ẓaddiq's life and works, including a review of studies and editions of the *Microcosm*, see Habermann 2002, 17–51 (Introduction to his English translation of the text). Haberman, 43 n. 3, cites Gershon Cohen 1967, 139f, who argues against the patronym Jacob, noting that Steinschneider himself may have had doubts.]

The Hebrew translation, under the title העולם הקטן is extant in: Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 583; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 491a; Hamburg, SUB Ms. Cod. hebr. 92/7; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 65/4; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2450; [Rome, BC 3089/3; Budapest, MTA Ms. Kaufmann 589].

The Parma ms. does not name the translator. The acrostic Moshe at the end of the Hamburg manuscript led me (in 1847) to surmise that Moses Ibn Tibbon is the translator, but by the time I wrote the article on Ibn Ẓaddiq in the Ersch and Gruber encyclopedia, I realized that there exists a treatise with the same title by the same Moses which seems to be part of a larger work.[280] [A treatise which bears the same title is attributed to Moses Ibn Tibbon; it is found in thirteen mss., including three cited by Steinschneider in n. 280: Paris, BN héb 185/2; Paris, BN héb 893/4; and Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 292/2.] Jellinek put this name on the title page of his edition (Ibn Ẓaddiq 1854), basing himself on the faulty copy in Hamburg.[281] [An edition and German translation was

---

1865, 216 – His year of birth is not known exactly. Jellinek 1854, vi, n. 3, concludes from the fact that he was a student of Isaac, who had died in 1098 (read: 1094), that he must have been born around 1070. But we read in Abraham b. David's *Book of Tradition* יצחק חבר לר' והוא נקרא לר. See also Kaufmann 1880, 34. Leopold Weinsberg 1888 is an abortive attempt to contest the authorship; for a historical error concerning Maimonides see 15. So far, I could not examine the comparative analysis.

[277] See §2 n. 49, §195 n. 597.

[278] The quotations in Ibn Ẓaddiq 1854, viii, begin with David Kimḥi, see n. 282 below. B. Beer cites משרת משה and the ethical treatise ס' הישר without precise editions; see also n. 291 below. Delete Almoli; his יוסף הצדיק is Pseudo-Joseph. Steinschneider 1852, loc. cit.

[279] See §1, n. 291; cf. Kaufmann 1876, 362, (according to which the *Microcosm*, 56, 27 ff. also was utilized in Kuzari II, 2, 80). See Sachs 1854c, 208.

[280] Steinschneider 1852, 2004. Paris, BN héb 185/2 מאמר, Paris, BN héb 893/4 צורת, and under this in the title index; 1878a, 148. The year 1502 (1191) appears in Vatican BA Cod. ebr. 292/2 only in the margin; see Steinschneider 1874b, 101, according to which Renan and Neubauer 1877, 593, must be corrected. Pinsker 1862, 25, assumes Narboni to be the translator of our work. [Actually, Pinsker says that it is not impossible to assume this, but that the matter requires further examination.]

[281] Hebrew and German title: *Der Mikrokosmos von R. Josef Ibn Zadik* (sic) etc., Leipzig 1854 (Ibn Ẓaddiq 1854). – According to xv the acrostic proves the translator to be Moses, which is doubtlessly Moses Ibn Tibbon. – According to Reifmann, 1878, 35, the little poem is certainly by Joseph, addressed to a student! For the differences in the terminology of this work and the *Treatise on Logic* (§251) [attributed to Maimonides and translated by Moses Ibn Tibbon], see below n. 285.

published by S. Horovitz 1903; it has been reprinted in J. Haberman's English translation 2002.] In the foreword (XVII–XXII) Jellinek displays some variant readings from the Munich manuscript. D. Kaufmann's German translation of part III 1877a, with the presentation of the most important Hebrew passages, demonstrates just how many better readings can be gained from the manuscripts. There are various reasons for dating this translation before Moses Ibn Tibbon. David Kimḥi[282] seems to quote it, and its style corresponds more to that of Naḥum.[283] Like him, our translator uses the Arabic |409| term נוע (species) in the Hebrew plural; both write the word רוחאני with an א, as in Arabic; the editor substitutes the common Hebrew form.[284] We find the following Arabic words, almost all of them indicated as such: : אבדאע (54, Kaufmann 317), אלתהא (? 45, Kaufmann 271), בנג' (35), ג'והר (6), המח (xv, xxi, should read חמיהּ?),מיד (45), סל (35), צפתין (45), רמק (4). The names of the sciences are also Arabic: (2 מתמאתיקי *lege* מאתי'ארת? הנדסה, מוסיקי).

There are [grammatical] forms, phrases that betray Arabic influence, and other peculiarities which will, perhaps, serve to confirm the assumption that Naḥum is the translator, or point to someone else; the following remarks, arranged according to the order of their appearance in the book, do not pretend to exhaust the matter. The bad state of the text, in which the copyists seem to have blurred some peculiarities, makes our attempt all the more difficult.

[The following textual comments refer to Jellinek, ed. Ibn Ẓaddiq 1854] 1 השכילו (God) has made him intelligible; 5 כוליות=כליאת 25 (כליאת, also in Hillel b. Samuel[285] as a title of the book by Averroes,[286] cf. הנפש הכולית 39, ch. 3); 5 and 49 פשוט odd number,[287] commonly נפרד; 6 נפש חקרנית, which should be read, according to Brüll 1879, 138 n., as דברנית (as in Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics* 1807. 7, line 1 = Arabic נאטקה); 7, ch. 2, line 3 המעשיים והטבעיים;8 הפרקים the differences? (cf. 53, Kaufmann 315);[288] 8, last line (following XVIII) and 46 (according to Kaufmann, 276) דיות (Arabic כפאיה?);[289] 9, last line and 10, line 9 עצומים cf. עצומם11, line 13 (cf. §240); 10 רטוב for לח, an Arabism; 11 נקודה for center (Kaufmann, 311 n. 158), cf. 15 טבור;[290]

[282] See above, n. 278. Kimḥi conflates the two passages.

[283] Steinschneider 1855b, 104 n. 8[a]. More material is found in Reifmann 1884, 31, 1878, 35.

[284] Ibn Ẓaddiq 1854, xvi.

[285] In Steinschneider 1874e, 22, only 5 [of Hillel of Verona's text].

[286] This is also found in Kalonymos, see Steinschneider 1870e, 120; see §429.b

[287] 5, line 7 is missing ופשוט after פשוט; cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 289.

[288] See §157, n. 128.

[289] This also occurs in Ibn Laṭīf ?, see Steinschneider 1874a, 27, *ad* 11 (of Hillel of Verona's text).

[290] Cf. Zeraḥya 1860–90, ch. 5, 30 n. 9: נ' העמצאית; Naḥum (Translation of Dunash's *Commentary on the Sefer Yeẓirah*) has 'מוצק' for the 'center of the world', like al-Ḥarizi. (See n. 216 of §231, however נ' העמצאית in the latter's translation of Maimonides' *Guide* (Maimonides 1851–79) I, 85[2] is generally 'center'); Naḥmanides 1872, 17 יש נקודה פחותה מגרגיר חרדל והוא השמים וכל אשר בם ונקודה אחרת הארץ וכל אשר עליה, tendentious, because elsewhere the uppermost sphere is the image of the greatest, and a mustard seed the image of the smallest (Steinschneider 1875g, 70).

11 יסתפק עליו דבר; 14, line 2 מופתים נחתכים ; [291]14, 18 מתגורר as the opposite of נמזג; 16 ריקם, as Ḥarizi, for ריקות; ibid. מתקומם filling a space; 23, 24, 26, 30 צמחון and plural, besides צמחים; 26 הזרעון; 27 last line הפשוט והקבוץ; 28, line 5 מלפלש[292]; 36, 37 52 רשם for definition;[293] 36 מתמים and foemin.[294] ו410ו 37, 38, 44, 51, 52 אפיסה for Arabic עדם (Kaufmann, 262), as Ḥarizi (see §248 below, n. 425b); 37 הדברים הנקפאים (Arabic אלג׳מאד, see §124); p. 39 האישות, the individuality; 41 מזרח; 44 מאיסה and חלישות; 47 אימות (read אמות, Arabic הליהּ, Kaufmann, 279); 49 כפל for multiply, as in Naḥum (§228); 50 חטיטה (Arabic תחטיט, Kaufmann, 299); 53 למות, as in Nissim b. Moses b. Solomon (§224); 56 ישנות (according to XXI (Kaufmann), 276 ישות?); p. 68 נועם, usually נעימות.[294b]

I have discovered a small fragment of the introduction to another translation, printed 1586. [According to Steinschneider 1852, 1542, the other translation is cited in Jonah Girondi, *Iggeret ha-teshuvah*]; perhaps this was merely begun, and not pursued, or it is a quotation.[295]

---

[291] Al-Ḥarizi has מופת נחתך in his translation to the *Guide* II, 17 (Arabic: II, 16) and II, 12 (Arabic: II, 11) for ברהאן קאטע; Tibbon has מופת חותך as is general usage, cf. the commentary on 9 of Maimonides 1847; still, מופת חותך is already found in Samuel Ibn Tibbon's commentary on Kohelet 3:20; in Zeraḥiah ben Isaac's *Aphorisms of Maimonides* (see Steinschneider 1869a, 236, l. 10.); נחתך על in Isaac Ibn Latif 1860, 37 line 11 (Ibn Latif makes use of the Hebrew translation of the *Microcosm*) and in Steinschneider 1863b, 1 [citing Ibn Latif's Ginzei Melekh]; in an anonymous שער השמים [concerning whose author see Steinschneider 1876, 78; cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 508] ch. 2, ed. Sachs 1851c, 64 (cf. Jellinek 1580, ix); ch. 1 (viii of Luzzatto [Judah ha-Levi 1840) corresponds only with the quotation on 20 אמרו הפילוסופים (whether they are the Sincere Brethren? – on prophets and philosophers cf. Dieterici 1868, 98, 101, 1871, 104 ff., 114, 116; cf. Ibn Zaddiq 1854, 47 המפולפלים הנביאים והחכמים, in Kaufmann 1877a, 278, and Schorr 1842–43, 147 note; liber de Pomo, see above, 269 (§144); See *Theology of Aristotle*, Latin recension, in Haneberg 1862 11); בדרך מופתי נחתך in the anonymous translation of Alfonso, *Quadratur(a)*, see Steinschneider, 1868, 146.

[292] See footnote 255.

[293] Kaufmann 1877a, 313, 314; see also Steinschneider 1869b, 168. Usually גדר (Arabic: חד) is definition (Steinschneider 1869a, 75, Dieterici 1868, 179; הגדר והרושם, Ibn Bulat 1530–1, fol. 11, cf.15 הרושם; fol. 3 ההתרשמיות; לא יוגדר ולא יורשם in Abraham Ibn Daud 1852, 46 bottom (= 1986, 338 (125a)); ד״ע ברושם in Falaquera 1779 is "description". Cf. also the end of al-Fārābī's *Chapters on Logic* (= *Fuṣūl tashtamil* etc.) Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 307/10, fol. 128. Levi ben Gershom stresses in his commentary on the *Isagoge* that Averroes uses רושם for גדר, whereas maestro Geronimo, who has the consent of the anonymous [opposes this?] (See Berlin, SPK Or. Qu. 831/1, fol. 5, according to which Steinschneider 1893 88 [§37, B, I.] should be supplemented.)

[294] Also עלה מתממת is found in Kaufmann 1877a, 315, 320; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 130 (Euclid, *Elements*, at the beginning of Book Two) has המשלימים rather than המתמימים הרושם, which is found in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 36/3, fol. 36, and Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 91/1; cf. השלים והתמים in Averroes's *Sophistics*, trans. by Kalonymos (Steinschneider 1869a, 57, n. 80); ספור…מתמים is found in Aaron ben Elijah 1841, 131, line 5 see below.

[294b] Passage 6 is emended by Brüll 1879, 137, using the passage, similarly corrupted, by the supposed Jacob b. Nissim *ad Sefer Yeẓirah*; in Dunash's commentary (Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 243/4, fol. 59) one reads: בכתיבה ובדבור ובמחשבה ובענינים בעצמם. Cf. the expressions in thought, word, and writing found in Dieterici 1868, 21.

[295] Steinschneider 1852, 1542.

Joseph ben Jacob (Ibn) Ẓaddiq, *Microcosmos*

Budapest, Magyar tudományos akadémia 589 (IMHM F 15015), 1–58.
Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 92 (Hamburg Acc. 1906/11233) (Hamburg 53) (IMHM F 26309), 278b–35a.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 65 (IMHM F 1130), 21b–87a.
Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Mich. 491 (Ms. Mich. 575) (Neubauer 1317/1) (IMHM F 22131), 1a–22b.
Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Opp. 583 (Ms. Opp. 1170) (Neubauer 133105) (IMHM F 22145), 97a–140a.
Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Poc. 280 (Ms. Uri 78) (Neubauer 1270/4) (IMHM F 22084), 29a–32a.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 2450/1 (De Rossi 1174) (IMHM F 13454), 2a–42b.
Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 3089 (Rome Cas I.I.12) (Sacerdote 161) (IMHM F 65), 31a–73b.

§239. Moses [Abulafia] b. Joseph "b. ha-Lāwi" composed a "theological ‹or metaphysical› treatise", מאמר אלוהי, on the First Cause, the Prime Mover, etc., in which he discusses some issues of Arabic philosophy. [G. Vajda called attention to citations from the Arabic original of the theological treatise in a Vatican manuscript of a work by Joseph b. Abraham Ibn Waqar 1948. He published excerpts in 1955.]

Manuscripts Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 10 (with some notes of the copyists); St. Petersburg, RNL Ms. Evr. I 471; New York, JTS Ms. 2341/10 (= Pamplona Estante 6, 21, mentioned in Baer 1929, XII).

[H. Wolfson used the Pamplona ms. for his article on Averroes' lost treatise on the Prime Mover 1950–51, noting (684, n. 5) that it appears to differ in a number of places from the French translation published in Vajda 1948.]

This treatise has perhaps been translated from Arabic by an anonymous author. It must be the writing of Moses ha-Levi who was later attacked by Ḥasdai Crescas and others.[296] Zunz connects this author with the physician Moses b. Meir ha-Levi of the famous Abulafia family in Toledo (died 1255); our Moses b. Joseph is perhaps a cousin of the latter and an elder brother of the famous Todros Abulafia.[297] In any case our Moses is identical with Abū Amram (=Abū ʿImrān) Mūsā al-Lāwī, author of a musical passage quoted by Shem Tov b. Isaac from Tortosa (around 1254–64) without the eulogy for the deceased.[298] [The Judaeo-Arabic original of this passage was found by Y. T. Langermann in Solomon Ibn Yaʿīsh's commentary to Ibn Sīnā's *Qanūn*; see Langermann 1996a.] The Arabic form of the name confirms my assumption

[296] Crescas already in *Light of the Lord* 1.3.3; Zunz 1845, 432. Schlessinger, on Albo 1844, 256, conjectures Moses b. Solomon, the author of 1852) ויואל משה! – Yoḥanan Alemanno (Abraham Yagel?) שבע באר II, 4 Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Reggio 11 cites לאווי ן' משה, apparently based on Crescas or earlier services.

[297] Concerning his year of death, see Salfeld 1869, 138; Steinschneider 1872c, 55 and Jellinek 1876, 13 n 1.

[298] Preface to Zahrawi, Steinschneider 1879d, 43. Since Moses b. Joseph in Paris, BN héb 26 (year 1272) is not called Levi, the conjectured identity (Steinschneider 1875c; 7) should apparently be abandoned.

to some extent that Moses wrote in Arabic, which was still alive in Toledo in the fourteenth century.[299]

Moses b. Joseph, *Theological Treatise*

New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 2341/10 (NY JTS Acc. 834/Pamplona Est. 6. 21) (IMHM F 28657), 170a–76a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Opp. Add. Qu. 10 (Neubauer 1324/5) (IMHM F 22138), 115a–25a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 471 (IMHM F 51318), 52a–62b.

§240. Moses Ibn Ezra b. Jacob, in Arabic: Abū Hārūn Mūsā (b. Abī Iṣḥāq?), member of a famous family in Granada, celebrated as a poet, still alive in 1138,[300] is the author of an unedited work (*Kitāb al-muḥāḍara wa-l-mu<u>dh</u>ākara*, 'The book of conversations and commemorations') on Hebrew poetics which was utilized by later |411| bibliographers.[301] [A critical edition of the work was prepared by N. Bar-On, which later was revised, augmented, and published in 1975 by A. Halkin 1975. For a short history of partial editions, translations, etc., see Fenton 1997, 32–33. (In n. 103 Fenton attributes the copying of Berlin, SPK Or. oct. 464 to Steinschneider, but according to the Berlin Hebrew manuscripts catalogue, the copying was done by his wife, Auguste, which he then reviewed.)] In this work (f. 38b) the author quotes his work אלחדיקה פי מעני אלמגאז ואלחקיקה, "The Garden, on Metaphor and True Meaning."[302] I take this to be the original of the Hebrew treatise ערוגת הבושם[303] ("Bed of Balsam,' not to be confused with a ritual work or a medical treatise of the same title).[304] [Steinschneider's speculation, contested by D. Kaufmann, was verified in 1895 when A. Harkavy announced the discovery of an original Arabic manuscript of the *Ḥadīqa* in the second Firkovitch collection in the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg. This manuscript shows that the title of the medieval Hebrew translation, *Arugat ha-Bosem*, was already given by Moses. A second manuscript from Aleppo was acquired by D. Sassoon in 1913 and at auction by the Jewish National Library (8^0 570) in 1975. A critical edition based on the first manuscript had been prepared but not published by the Russian scholar Paul Kokovzov; Fenton 1997 has announced an edition of the original based on both manuscripts and on several fragments found in various libraries. For a short history of the scholarship, see ibid., 36–40.]

---

[299] Zunz 1845, 427. – Belonging to the Judaeo-Arabic authors of the fourteenth century, for example, is Joseph b. Isaac Israeli around 1324.

[300] Sources: Steinschneider 1852 and Additamenta; Zunz 1865, 202 etc., see Index; Steinschneider1877c, 287, 350 etc.

[301] On the fragment under the title אשכול הכופר in the London edition of 203 ,יוחסין, and in Graetz 1875, VI, 392, see Steinschneider 1873g, 107. I am in the possession of a stencil copy of Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 549, another copy is with S. Landauer; in Petersburg there is an incomplete copy.

[302] The entire passage is in Steinschneider 1881a, 34.

[303] Steinschneider 1852, 1812, 2316. Kaufmann 1880, 30 believes that ער' הבושם was composed in Hebrew; see below.

[304] On the ritual work of Abraham b. Elazar (beg. of the 13th cent.), see Berliner 1874a, I, 2, Perles 1877 (Steinschneider 1877c, 84, and Kaufmann 1882, 316 and 564; the medical work of Judah Rofeh in Cod. Parma 2279/4 (see Perreau 1876–77, 451; Steinschneider 1878a, 138) appears to be confused with the ערוגות הבושם of רמב"ע, and attributed to רמב"ם by Azulai (Steinschneider 1852, 1881); on the book reputedly by Jacob b. Elazar see Steinschneider 1873i, 556.

Fragments of the *Arugat ha-Bosem* are extant in the following:

Manuscripts Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Seld. Sup. A 104; less complete in Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 146, copy of Hamburg, SUB Ms. Cod. hebr. 310a; ‹Vatican, Neofiti 11/27 has an introduction›.

Perhaps this book was not translated in its entirety.[305] The Hamburg manuscript was edited by L. Dukes in the journal ציון 1843a with a supplement to it from Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Seld. Sup. A 104 in 1849, 748.

The fragment displays no development of ideas, but rather a compilation of the sayings of the philosophers. Some names are to be found: Aristotle (121, 159; his *Metaphysics* 135, *De coelo*, etc. 158); Empedocles (134, 158, 175);[306] Hermes, identified with Henoch (123); Plato (121, 138); Pythagoras (in his Golden Treatise);[307] Socrates (120 and 135, his Hymns and Prayers, 175);[308] the Arab Abū Naṣr (translated as אבו ישע) al-Fārābī (in his book המנהג הטוב);[309] [according to Fenton 1997, this is the first time a Jewish philosopher referred to al-Fārābī by name.] ar-Rāzī (158); furthermore an Arabic poet (136);[310] החכמה הקדמונית (Ancient, or Oriental Wisdom? 120).[311] Among Jewish authors only Saadia Gaon is mentioned (137, 158); but he seems to quote Solomon Ibn Gabirol, at least in some places, under the name of "the philosopher," or "the recent (lit. last) philosophers" (121).[312] [Indeed, the only extant portions of the Judaeo-Arabic original of Ibn Gabirol's *Fons Vitae* consist of citations in *al-Ḥadīqa*; see the discussion under the entry for Ibn Gabirol. For a more complete list of Jewish sources mentioned, see Fenton, 193–96.] Very rarely are these sayings followed by biblical passages; only in the chapter on the attributes and the names of God (cf. infra) does he quote many biblical verses.

If the paragraphs translated follow the arrangement of the original, the book shows in its development of ideas some similarity with the *Microcosm* of Josef Ibn Ẓaddiq. It even begins with the analogy between man and every creature because of which man is called the microcosm,[313] and the science whose object he is, philosophy (121).[314] This is followed by a chapter on the unity of God (to which belongs the supplement in Dukes 1849, 748), and other chapters against the ascription of attributes (122 ,כנוי ,תואר)[315] and on the names of God (134). |412| The author repeats here emphatically that the attributes (מדות), particularly those which imply materiality, are to be understood as

---

[305] זה המאמר העתקתי מס' is hardly 'translated'. See 1715, IV, 294.

[306] Steinschneider 1873b (see above §3 n. 84). 1877a, 164, 309, 508.

[307] בחגורתו המשובצת is related by Dukes to the seal inscription in Ḥunayn; obviously it should be read באגרתו; for הוגליס read דיאגוניס, according to Dieterici 1858, 105 (on 118, Prop. 68 *Johannes*) see Steinschneider 1883c, 406.

[308] Steinschneider 1861c, 44; Kaufmann 1877a, 302.

[309] Steinschneider 1869a, 70. Kaufmann 1877a, 238; missing in the Index, 513.

[310] Kaufmann 1877a, 200, thinks first of the Sufis, cf. 15 ,מאמר הייחוד.

[311] Steinschneider 1866c, 432. cf. §13 n. 297.

[312] Sachs 1851b, 59; Kaufmann 1877a, 96, 240, 326, 1880, 29.

[313] 120 (line 6 הגדול האדם העו' must be read הגו' העולם העו'?), where Dukes cites Joseph Ibn Zaddiq (20).

[314] See n. 277.

[315] In the chapters on the names of God, 134: סמוך and נצטרף for relation.

metaphors על דרך העברה (Arabic ʿען אלמגאז), not in their literal sense (ע"ד האמת) (end of 135). This prominent chapter is probably responsible for the Arabic title, mentioned above, of the treatise. The author rebuts "the nations" (the Muslims) and the sectarians (מינים, the Karaites) who reproach Rabbanite Jews for believing in the corporeality of God (137).[316] There is no obvious connection between these chapters and the final ones on movement (157), nature (158), and intellect (159).

Assuming that the Arabic title, אלחדיקה, is that of the original, we find that the entire fragment was translated from the Arabic; but the Hebrew translator substituted "(flower-) bed" for "garden", in order to make use of a biblical phrase. This identification notwithstanding, the only possible assumption would be that the author, more precisely the compilator, had translated all the quotations – these are in fact almost co-extensive with the book – from the Arabic. Thus, Ibn Ezra would have compiled this book and at the same time would have translated this mass of sayings – but for which readers? In his time Spanish Jews did not understand this philosophical language, neither those residing in the Islamic south, nor those living in the Christian north. After the ten categories (הכחות 118 *read* הכחות?)[317] have been named (119) by the author, he adds: "and all of them are to be found in Hebrew." Furthermore, after explaining what "nature" (טבע) means, he finally says (159): Hebrew has neither a name nor a designation (תאר) for it.[318] – Does this fit with an author writing in Hebrew? However, a precise translator could have made these remarks.

[Conclusive arguments for the identification of the translator with Judah al-Ḥarizi have been presented by Fenton 1997, 54–56. The first to suggest this was S. Abramson 1976, contra M. Idel's 1977 identification with Judah Ibn Tibbon.]

It is not appropriate to talk of the *style* of this book. Moses Ibn Ezra, famous for the elegance and dignity of his diction, "a serious thinker who never smiles or jests,"[319]prefers sublime sayings that are almost mystical, probably under the influence of the "Brethren of Sincerity." What remains of the compilator, apart from them, reveals nothing about the genius of the excellent Hebrew poet.[320]

Our treatise was far too little known to allow any conclusion, on the basis of citations, as to when it was translated. Of the quotations, I can identify three or four. David Kimḥi,[321] who does not mention the title, apparently quotes from a slightly divergent text. ‹Josef Kimḥi 1887, 3, mentions the title› Isaac b. Judah, the Babylonian, author of a grammar (1250), names in his preface[322] Moses Ibn Ezra as author of the work ערוגת הבושם, which shows that he knew the Hebrew translation. Joseph b. David

[316] Kaufmann 1877a, 82, 86; missing in Steinschneider 1877c, 351.

[317] Cf. מכת הנמנע, Aaron ben Elijah 1841, 16, 244 = Arabic: מן באב, here perhaps Arabic: פרק? – cf. n. 5.

[318] Zunz 1865, 635, shows that טבע and טבעה as nature already appear in Josippon; however, later it became a technical term; cf. n. 327 below.

[319] Zunz 1865, 202.

[320] Steinschneider 1881a, 34, against Kaufmann 1880, 30.

[321] Kimḥi 1847, s. v. בר does not offer two explanations of the verses, as Dukes provides *ad* 119. The passage under עצב on Job 10:8 is not in the edited fragment.

[322] ס' האשל; De Rossi 1803 no. 1353 confuses him with Isaac b. Judah, translator of Jonah Ibn Jannaḥ, listed as Judah b. Isaac in Dukes *ad* 118; see Steinschneider 1852, no. 1417.

the |413| Greek (1300–1350)[323] certainly quotes from our translation. One author (around the middle of the thirteenth century) seems to have taken two passages from our treatise.[323b] This offers a range of a full century for the translation; but it should be dated not far beyond the middle of the thirteenth century, by which time the terminology of the Tibbonids dominated. The characteristic data which our text – though not entirely free from error – presents are not sufficient for an answer to this question. In the absence of something better, however, some terms, not quoted so far and presented in the order of the fragment, may be specified here.

Page 118 מוצא mineral, cf. מתכות on 119; p. 119 עיון, "substance", perhaps עצום? (cf. §238), גויות,[323c] היולי hyle, מדברי למעלה (Arabic תעאלי; cf. מדברי האומות 'ת, Dukes 1849, 747); p. 120 האומות תושיות;[324] p. 122, line 6 דבר שאינו נעלה (? From מעולל=נעלל, Arabic מעלול?); שנות האחדים[325] p. 123 להחבר על; p. 136 אשר נקרא עפוש (from Arabic עפש worthless thing, or בעוץ'?);[326] p. 157 טבעיים elements (but 158 יסודות);[327] p. 158 תנועה מסובבת; p. 159 בגוף הנקרא פינא בלעז או קליינדרו, *figa* and *coliandro* (coriander); ibid. כח גופיית and עצם פניני (read p. 120 line 12 for הפנימי); ibid. מוקדמות (Arabic מקדמאת); ibid. יתואר ב...,ויולדו תולדות; זקני המפרשים (Arabic שיוך' [?], 1849, 748).

§241. Maimonides. No Jewish author is more renowned than Maimonides as theologian or as philosopher; this holds true for Christian readers as well. ("*R. Moyses*", plainly, is always our Maimonides.) The historians of medieval philosophy have, as a rule, treated his main work as representative of "Jewish philosophy" in general; moreover, they relied upon a Latin translation from Hebrew. We shall not discuss here Maimonides the physician (§481).

In the past half-century abundant sources have become available. More significantly, these have been exploited in a critical fashion by several scholars, most notably Derenbourg, Geiger, and Munk. Now, with regard to the sources, we face an *embarras*

---

[323] On his period see Steinschneider 1857a, 329; 1873d, 111; 1877c, 39, 410; cf. Steinschneider 1879c, 62 – For the quotation see Dukes 1849, 747.

[323b] Jellinek 1854, iii, maintains that כתר שם טוב (Selection I, 33: עצם פניני) is taken from the ערוגות, p. 159 (Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 59/5, fol. 250b has פנימית here and under נפש החכמה in כתר, p. 34, where one finds משלים חסרון).

[323c] Already found in ס' יצירה and in the translation of the Kuzari by Judah Ibn Cardinale, ed. Cassell (Judah ha-Levi 1853), 360), in ערוגת הבשם (cf. Dukes 1843a, 119.); cf. Abraham Ibn Ezra in Kaufmann 1880, 174, for heart, and §248 at the end.

[324] Plural of האותות, see §194 n. 572.

[325] תת'ניה:? or=כפל for multiply?

[326] As an image of the smallest; see Steinschneider 1875g, 73; 'putrefaction' doesn't fit.

[327] Zunz 1865, 635, cites for "Elemente" Saadiah (!), as found in Kirchheim, ed. Taku 1860, 76. But in the citation there from ס' האמונות (Book I, Eighth Theory), the four elements have been added by the paraphrast; Saadia himself only has טבאיע (plural of טביעה' (Arabic, ed. Landauer (Saadia ben Joseph 1880b), 58, penultimate line), whence טבעים 'temperaments', הנמצא, in Polak 1851, viii, for which Ibn Tibbon provides here טבעים (ed. 1859, 37); however, in the Sixth Theory, where Saadia (55) expressly names the elemental qualities, and in the Seventh, Ibn Tibbon translates (34, 35) the term יסודות! For the Arabic expressions for the elements, see Fleischer 1881.

de richesse.[328] This situation relieves us from the duty to give a full-length account of his life[329]; nor can we pursue here the full impact of the system of Maimonides |414| upon Jewish theology. However, we shall indicate, where appropriate, the stimulus [Maimonides' work gave] to the translation of some other works.

[We direct the reader below to recent bibliographical surveys. The most significant discoveries concerning his life and milieu have come from the Cairo Geniza, as well as from a fresh examination of manuscript evidence. For a short survey see Kraemer 2001, and his biographical monograph 2008. A thorough analysis of the biographical data is found in Davidson 2005.]

Maimonides calls himself in Hebrew Moses b. Maimon (which is the Arabic name of his father who had no other Hebrew name), and in Arabic Abū 'Imrān (= Amram) Musā b. Maymūn (or Maimon) Ibn 'Abd Allāh, or 'Ubayd Allāh (translated עובד אלוהים, or עבד האל; *servus dei*). [The Arabic versions of Maimonides are reviewed at length by Steinschneider in his entry on Maimonides in 1852.] He was born in 1135 in Cordova and accompanied his father when he emigrated to Africa; they arrived in 1165 at St. Jean d'Acre. [On the basis of the colophon to Maimonides' autograph commentary to the Mishnah, Rabbi Yosef Qafiḥ and others such as S. Z. Havlin 1985 have argued forcibly that Maimonides was born in 1138; this appears now to be the scholarly consensus.] In Egypt (hence his name Moses Aegyptiacus) he became physician to the princes (not to Saladin personally, as was wrongly deduced from the word "sultan") and to the courtiers, specifically to the *wazīr* al-Fāḍil, (§481, 3); and there he died on December 13, 1204.

Only his great work on Jewish laws and customs is written in Hebrew: the *Repetitio legis* (*Mishneh Torah*), often designated only by the name of the author, which Jews usually vocalize according to the acrostic formed by the initials RaMBaM. We shall deal here only with those theological works of his, colored by Arabic philosophy, that offer, with respect to their form and employment of technical terms, some remarkable perspectives for the history of philosophy and the translations. Ignoring their chronological order, we attend first to his most significant work.

§242. 1. (*The Guide*.)[330] Around the year 1190 Maimonides finished a work in three parts, called דלאלה אלחאירין (*The Guide of the Perplexed*), or briefly אלדלאלה

[328] One should add to the works listed in Steinschneider 1852, 1937–42, and to the Additamenta, some studies of his philosophy (see §250 below); Neubauer edited a "Pseudobiographie" 1882, ‹Gig 1868, Arabic 71–73›;[Since Steinschneider mentions Gig's reportage of popular tales about Maimonides, we direct the reader to the more recent and comprehensive work by Avishur 1998.] Friedlaender 1881–85 provides a complete index of references. – In what follows we provide sources only for new and disputed matters.

[329] Regarding the much-discussed feigned Muhammadanism, see Steinschneider 1852, 1866, 1910; Halberstam 1864, 23 ff.; unnoticed by Friedlaender in Maimonides 1881–85, xxxiii; Steinschneider 1881f, 128. [Some new material has been added to the scholarly controversy since Friedlaender's review of the positions; in recent scholarly biographies Kraemer 2001, 414, accepts the reliability of the story of Maimonides' conversion; Davidson 2005, 17–28, makes a fresh review of the evidence and finds it inconclusive; the conversion " therefore be viewed as unproven at best."] For a chronological overview of the literary activity, see Steinschneider 1852, 1868.

[330] Steinschneider 1852, 1894 ff.

(*The Guide*), of which he probably had sent single parts beforehand to his cherished pupil, Judah b. Judah (Ibn Aknin; §237). [Maimonides' pupil is now thought by most scholars to be Joseph b. Judah Ibn Simeon (Sham'un). See the supplementary notes to §237.] The purpose of this work is to harmonize the Jewish religion with Peripatetic philosophy in its neoplatonic form as it was developed by Arabic philosophers in Spain. Only the latter, Maimonides says, deserve to be called philosophers, in contrast to the theologians (scholastics, מתכלמון, מדברים), who were followed by the Jewish authors of the East, particularly the Karaites (§263). [Maimonides admires Aristotle and his "early" commentators, which include Alexander Aphrodisias and al-Fārābī, but he distances himself from some of the (unnamed) "later" followers.] In Maimonides' view, this philosophy was the esoteric doctrine of the Holy Scripture and thus the key to its only valid interpretation. At the same time it comprises the ultimate purpose of human life in its entirety, because this philosophy leads to the attachment to the Active Intellect, which is the sole form of immortality.

His predecessors had already explicated and elaborated upon the basic views of philosophy to some extent. Maimonides, however, did not want to write a new and wholly systematic work. Instead, he hints (Maimonides 1856, I, 291) that his book, like other esoteric writings, will deliberately employ self-contradiction in order to mask certain ideas from the masses.[331] Sometimes an idea is developed further only at a different place in his book, to which he refers without, however, indicating exactly where it is to be found. This task was taken up by his commentators. Thus an anonymous author compiled a register of such references in which he indicates the relevant chapters.[332] |415| Maimonides writes for those who, like his student, have studied, or are able to study, strictly philosophical works and who are in need of a harmonization of the philosophical views with the divine word that appears to contradict them. He feels, however, obliged to give a succinct summary of the basic views of the mutakallimūn (I, chapters 73 ff.). This excellent part of the book will always remain a principal source for the history of this type of philosophy.[333] [For some time Maimonides' account was a key source for *kalam* doctrines. However, with the publication in the past half century of so many texts and studies pertaining to the *kalam*, Maimonides' survey has lost much of its importance in this respect. On the other hand, scholars have turned their attention to the identification of the specific *kalam* texts that Maimonides exploited; see Michael Schwarz 1992, 1995.] This is followed by an exposition of the basic views of the true philosophers[334] in the form of twenty-five

[331] On Isaiah b. Moses of Salerno, see Halberstam and Steinschneider 1875, 88; also Ibn Tibbon in an unedited fragment of his letter (§243); Maimonides 1856 I, ii.

[332] Printed with Saul Kohen's *Questions* and the index to several chapters of Moses b. Judah (מן הנערים? See Steinschneider 1878a, 101) in Ashkenazi 1574; Steinschneider 1852, 1835ff. Fürst 1849–51, III, 13, outdoes himself in the confusion.

[333] Schmölders 1842, 135, underestimated its significance; see Munk 1859, 323; M. Guttmann 1885, merely reporting the contents.

[334] According to Maimonides 1856 I, ii, "puisé dans les ouvrages d'Ibn Sīnā," but not also from al-Farābī? Concerning some points taken from al-Ghazali, see above, 297. (According to Kaufmann 1876, 359, Maimonides in his *Introduction to Perek Ḥelek* [Maimonides 1654, 57 (Maimonides

propositions placed at the beginning of part II. These attracted, as we have seen (§207), a Muslim commentator. Nonetheless, Maimonides had good reasons to write his book in Hebrew characters.[335] These chapters are full of technical terms for which Hebrew had not yet developed an equivalent which was generally accepted.

The book which was dedicated to a student in Asia, where many manuscripts are still extant,[336] soon enjoyed circulation in the West, including the Provence. [Steinschneider refers in n. 336 to reports of manuscripts of the *Dalala* that were still being studied in the Yemen. Quite a few of these have since been filmed, and some were incorporated in editions and studies. For a full and annotated listing of manuscripts of the *Dalala*, see Sirat 2000 and Langermann 2000.] It was read in the Muslim schools of Fez.[336b] Elsewhere, the text was used to amend the Hebrew translations, down to the end of the thirteenth century (Falaquera, Joseph Gikatilia; §244).[337]

We are indebted to the scholarship and diligence of Munk for an excellent edition (in Hebrew letters) with a French translation, notes, etc.[338] [A second edition based largely on Munk, but prepared also on the basis of scholarship since Munk, was published by I. Joel. The Munk-Joel edition is now the standard edition of the Judaeo-Arabic original. An Arabic edition, based largely on an Arabic manuscript, was published in Turkey by H. Atay (Maimonides 1974b), and reprinted in Cairo (Maimonides 1974a.)]

§243. In the beginning of the ‹thirteenth› century Samuel Ibn Tibbon achieved fame, equal or even greater than that of his father Judah, by translating the *Guide* into Hebrew under the title מורה נבוכים (*Moreh Nevukhim*).[338b] ‹The *Moreh* (and its author) was frequently called מורה צדק, for example, by Levi b. Abraham, in the preface to *Battei ha-Nefesh*, 19 (אוצר הספרות III) [For a more accessible and complete version see Davidson 1940, 84l. 24)]› In a number of letters, some of them in Arabic, the translator addressed the author and asked him about some passages of his translation and others in the text which he found obscure or difficult.

Fragments of this correspondence are extant.[339] I have discovered three unedited pieces in Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b, viz., the end of Samuel's letter, dated

---

1992, 365–66)] uses the מקאצד III, 3 no. 11; *Hebräische Bibliographie* I, 68 [This last reference appears to be an error], 1874b, 101; from Abraham Ibn Daud, see Guttmann 1879, 9, 174, 175, 204, 211, 234; concerning his behavior to his predecessors in general, see Sachs 1851a, 8.

[335] Steinschneider 1885b, 355; cf. below n. 344.

[336] Shapira brought back many copies from the Yemen. [The reference is to Moses Hermann Shapira whose trip to Yemen is described in Kiepert 1880.]

[336b] Ashkenazi 1854, 53.

[337] Concerning Moses b. Solomon of Salerno, see 1875a, 87.

[338] *Le guide des égarés, etc., par Moïse b. Maimoun, or Maimonide, publié etc. et accompagné d'une traduction etc. par S. Munk* (also French alone), 3 parts, Paris 1856, 1861, 1866. The last copies held by his widow were purchased and increased to a price that is exorbitant for actual readers.

[338b] According to Scheyer 1851–79 I, 23, Ibn Tibbon's first translation (?).

[339] See above §13, n. 283, and Steinschneider, *Ha-Karmel* VI, 328 [? This may be a reference to Steinschneider 1866a]. Steinschneider's reference in 1852, 2490, to Paris, BN héb 769/25 (formerly a. f. 272), (missing the end) is not sufficiently clear. Perhaps Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2620 (Rossi 1393) (Perreau 1889, 24: "Samuel," but Moses at the end; the beginning should read

March 1199 and printed further, |416| with a postscript on the translation of the title of the book on *Meteora* (§61) [Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b], an unedited note of Moses Ibn Tibbon on this problem [Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b],[340] and finally a fragment of the answer of Maimonides which talks about the translation of the Arabic passages in question and the doubts of Samuel [Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b]; this piece was also seen by Munk.[341] [Edited by Diesendruck 1936. These and other materials related to Maimonides' correspondence with Samuel Ibn Tibbon are now available in Shailat, ed. Maimonides 1986 II, 511–54.]

Since the *Moreh* is an epoch-making work in the history of translations, and a document that still awaits precise analysis, it is appropriate to enter into details.

Samuel preceded his translation with a foreword which apparently was, in part, written after this correspondence (*vide infra*). In it, he recounts that the scholars of Lunel (בקעת ירימו), headed by Jonathan Kohen (a famous commentator of part of the Talmudic work mentioned before), had asked Maimonides to send them his *Moreh*, if possible in (Hebrew) translation, or else in the original. Upon its receipt they had Samuel translate it. Approaching this difficult task with his weak limited abilities, he adopted two methods: For every dubious word he used the translations of his late father Judah, "the father of translators," and the works on the Arabic language[342] and the Arabic books which he had. Secondly, he consulted the author, writing letters to him, about many doubtful passages. In part, his doubts are due to mistakes in the uncorrected copy of the original. We learn from Samuel's letters that he had returned this copy to have it corrected by a student once or twice until no mistake remained, and he asks Maimonides to certify the revision.[343] With regard to part III, Samuel goes on to write, Maimonides will find some corrections on the basis of a better copy of a section of this part, because the first transcription was done from a copy in Arabic letters,[344] as Samuel had told him already, or from a copy of such a copy. Samuel indicated some places where he suspected an error with ink or with a mark of his fingernail in the margin of the line in question, but not always. He requests that whoever will propose a correction not delete any letter, but rather indicate the

---

תוך שאלתך) is connected with the correspondence? [Actually, the work is a reply by Moses Ibn Tibbon to a question by one of his nephews (the grandchildren of Samuel) concerning his father Samuel's Yikkavu ha-Mayim. See Richler 2001, 463.] Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2301/4, does not include (according to Berliner) two letters, which are reported by the catalogue. [According to Richler, the ms. includes only §§1, 5, and 6 of Shailat, ed. Maimonides 1986, 530 ff.]

[340] Moses cites יקוו המים (Steinschneider 1858l. c.); see also Falaquera *Moreh ha-Moreh*, ch. 2 [ed. Shiffman 2001, 337–41.] The letter is dated אדר שני (Steinschneider 1852, 1900); Samuel mentions at the outset the letter of Maimonides from the middle of סיון (this is how the word should be read in קובץ (Maimonides 1859), II, 26[3] instead of היון, in the Amsterdam edition (Maimonides 1712) 'היו; see Steinschneider 1852, 1940), after he had recovered from an illness. In Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-a, Samuel's letter is placed below that of Maimonides – see also §204, n. 735.

[341] *Guide*, ed. Munk (Maimonides 1856) I, 23 and 437, 438, II, 21, 24, 165.

[342] ספרי דקדוק (?), to which belongs the work not mentioned here כתאב אלעין, see 64 above (§21).

[343] Such an attested autograph is also found in a part of the משנה תורה in גנזי אוקספורד and Steinschneider 1885a, 1, in Stern's translation in Maimonides 1864 II, in Neubauer 1886, table IV.

[344] See n. 335 above.

amendment clearly in the margin. – What an amount of care it was that Samuel demanded in the interest of a good text, and hence a faithful translation! After the foreword he counted the chapters (see below) in order to facilitate the references of his queries to the author and those of the subsequent readers to others. These queries perhaps constituted the basis for the notes about which we will talk. |417|

Maimonides accordingly replied in Arabic as well, at least in part. This part of their correspondence exists in two translations (one of them perhaps by Samuel himself?). Samuel, Maimonides says, has hit upon the incorrect passages and put the right questions which Maimonides answers at the end of the letter in all details. He recognizes Samuel as an apt and adroit translator and tells him (in Hebrew) how he should go about the whole translation.[345] He is surprised that someone born among "barbarians" (עג'ם = עלגים; non-Arabs) would pursue the sciences and understand Arabic so well – but that language, after all, is only a somewhat corrupt form of Hebrew;[346] Samuel is but a "root in barren soil."[347]

Before entering into particulars, Maimonides offers a general rule for all translators. They should render one word by one word only and keep to the order of the sentence.[348] But keeping the word order (in the translation according to the original) is very difficult and leads to an unclear and imprecise translation, so this should not be done. Instead, the translator should first grasp the meaning of the text and then render that meaning[349] clearly in a manner suited to the target language. Often this is impossible without changing the word order and without rendering one word by several words, or, conversely, without omissions or additions of a word. This was the method of Ḥunayn and his son Isḥāq (§197), Maimonides says, and it should be followed by Samuel in translating for his patrons.

After this passage Maimonides enters into the details,[350] presenting the Arabic passages with their Hebrew translations (which Samuel has also inserted).[351] This passage is still unedited. [As indicated above, the entire correspondence is now available in the edition of Shailat (Maimonides 1986).] It ends with an apology in which Maimonides remarks that a translation is an original composition of sorts; hence the

[345] והנה בארתי לך בל' עברי איך תעשה בכל ההעתקה; does he mean thereby the translation of the Arabic passages?

[346] Parallels to this statement are found in Goldziher 1870, 17 (among others in Zeraḥiah on Job 3:6 (Schwarz 1868), 194; see also 16:16, 31:38, on 233 and 265, respectively; Steinschneider 1885b, 120; 1870d, 120).

[347] The awkward passage והגיע כתבי הישיבה may already be translated; הישיבה also fol. 13b = Samuel.

[348] והמאמר … is the plan of ideas (to be dealt with); וסדר הדברים probably = אבל סדר.

[349] ואחר כך יספר ויפרש and two more times יספר for communicate; cf. Ibn Tibbon's introduction בין ספורם על הנקבה for the verb "to state".

[350] Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b delineates at the beginning as well as at the end (fol. 28^2 l. 7 from below after the bracket) the words ובורא העולם ית', before which the addition should be placed. In the edition, fol. 14, and קובץ (Maimonides 1859), fol. 27^2 again as an Arabic passage after צר זמני מאוד.

[351] I have not yet compared all the passages.

translator is, in a way, a co-author.[352] He closes with the admonition not to stick to the translations (פירושים) that he has proposed should he, Samuel, find better ones, and says again that the translator should understand the text before he translates. After this he deals with the passages that Samuel had forwarded to him for explanation. This part has been edited in two copies (one by Munk, the other by Goldberg, without indication of source, perhaps from a different translation?).[353] Maimonides next turns to address Samuel's plan to visit him (no doubt in order to ask him about the translation |418|; as we shall see, Samuel in fact went to Egypt later on) and gives interesting details about his position and work there – this passage has been repeated by almost all biographers. In the editions this passage closes with a remark on the completion of the translation. In the other translation, Maimonides admits that a more precise translation of the title would be הוראת הנבוכים [Instruction of the Perplexed)] but the term מורה (Arabic: דליל) fits better nonetheless [Shailat (Maimonides 1986) II, 523]. Maimonides' enemies distorted the name: the Arabs called it צ'לאלה (that which leads to error), the Hebrew writers, נבוכת המורים (the confusion of the rebels).[354] [The Arabic distortion is reported by 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī, who met Maimonides in Egypt and has left us a very negative impression of their meeting. See Davidson 2005, 426.] The rest of this letter has already been analyzed (§13).

Let us return now to the foreword of Samuel, which became the prototype or source for later translators and which was quoted by other authors when they did not want to repeat its contents.[355] First, Samuel apologizes for having undertaken an arduous task which demands knowledge of both languages. Translation, he states, has four causes, which he compares with those of a building.[356] He refers to the foreword of his father to the translation of Baḥya's book, which discusses the difficulties of this task. Moreover, he confesses that his knowledge of Arabic is but scanty, since he has not been educated among Arabs and in their country. The difficulty of the *Moreh* lies in its profundity, which, in turn, is due to the sciences with which it deals and which are studied in this region (Provence) only to a small degree. Some of it he has read in Arabic books.

He would not have undertaken the translation, were it not for the wise men etc. (see above). He asks the reader to excuse his mistakes, be they grammatical (gender, number) and caused by the Arabic word, or syntactical, as, e.g., the singular form of the verb preceding a noun in the plural, for which there exists an analogy in Hebrew.

---

[352] כי ההעתקה היא מן מהחבור כלומר כי המעתיק הוא כחבר למחבר, in טעם זקנים Ashkenazi 1854, fol. 77b l. 3–6 placed towards the end and corrupted.

[353] טעם זקנים Ashkenazi 1854, fol. 76 ff; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b goes only until תרף דבריהם, fol. 77 last line–77b; see n. 352.

[354] טעם זקנים Ashkenazi 1854, fol. 77b. This passage is not found in Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 280 B-b. – הצורה should read המורה; Steinschneider 1852, Additamenta on 1893. – 'קבוצת מכת Halberstam and Steinschneider 1875, 20 (reprinted in Kobak's גנזי נסתרות Steinschneider 1875d, III, 164; and Kobak's ישרון Steinschneider 1875d, VIII, 36).

[355] Begins לא מהיותי חכם, cf. Joseph Kaspi on the secrets of Ibn Ezra, Steinschneider 1855c, 68.

[356] Cf. Todros, §21 above.

This is correct, the philologists (בעלי הלשון) explain, because the verb refers to every single component of the plural, particularly regarding the words היה and הוא (*copula*). Furthermore, the Arabs do not distinguish between feminine singular and masculine plural predicates, and in the plural forms between masculine and feminine (referring to the *pluralis fractus*). Arabic verbs are connected (יקשר) by prepositions different from those employed in Hebrew; in Arabic the word ת'ם (שם) denotes existence.[357] And then there are idiomatic expressions that are quite common in Arabic and very rare in Hebrew, e.g., על דעתי, which occurs only in Job 10:7.[358] These peculiarities lead astray the translator who aims to reproduce the sense of the text. After having translated the work, Samuel wants to revise it. Maimonides himself uses the word שם, mentioned above, in its Arabic sense, whereupon Samuel's audience who did not know Arabic read *shem* (name). So if the Arabic |419| author, writing in Hebrew, could not avoid arabisms, how could the translator? – A number of words, he says, of whose gender in Hebrew he is not sure, he will consider arbitrarily as masculine or feminine. Words ending in ת-, like איכות, מהות, הפעלות, השתכלות, שלמות, תכלית, and דעת, can be treated as feminine; but since one finds the same form as masculine, e.g., פלצות (Job 21:6), or ראשית (ibid., 8, 7), he will construe them as masculine. Words that alternate between masculine and feminine forms in our texts, he will use alternatively, as they occur to him. Words that allow for two different translations will be translated differently; sometimes he will supply the second meaning in the margin only in one place. In all this he follows his father, just as he does in creating new forms (בנינים בבנות) which do not yet exist, e.g., נתפלסף [התפלסף, מתפלסף?] after the Arabic מתפלסף. After all, authors of scholarly works create new derivations and give to commonly known words different meanings, as long as there is some kind of similarity, even if it is not real, between the two meanings. All this is due to the inadequacy (קוצר, again an arabism) of every language to express the concepts of profound (abstract) sciences. Even the prophets were forced to use metaphors when talking about God, the angels, and other concealed things, as the author of our work himself says. Samuel does not want to change the rhetorical style in order to preserve the meaning intended by the author. Sometimes, in the course of translating, he may not recall the apt or more fitting term, or he may not know it at all. This, however, can happen to more learned and more proficient translators.

Our translator certainly has contemplated the exigencies of his craft thoroughly. Though modern critics[359] find in his translation only a "poor imitation" of the original, its fidelity enables us, possessing but little knowledge of Arabic, to re-translate the book and understand it. On the other hand, it has to be kept in mind that we are talking about a language that was at least half-extinct, whose spirit was not compatible with abstract sciences. As we shall see, Samuel composed a glossary to help the

[357] Samuel refers again below to Maimonides (see Scheyer 1840?, 180; Steinschneider 1857a, 380 n. 81, 1865c, 67.)

[358] Samuel forgot the rabbinic על דעת and even alters it; see below.

[359] Maimonides 1856, preface to the *Guide* part II. Delitzsch 1840, 213, defends the correctness of the editions too vigorously.

reader of this new idiom. He classified the foreign terms used by him and tried to reduce their number.

Characterizing Samuel's translation in detail would mean nothing less than to write a book on the philosophical, or more generally, the scientific style of Hebrew writing that readers of this book eventually developed.[360] A number of Arabic words employed here became full citizens of the Hebrew language, e.g., the mathematical terms (אופק) אפק, אצטוונא, מרכז, הנדסה, קטב[361], קטר; also טלסם, and Hebrew words having the same meaning as Arabic ones: גשם for body, סבה, עלה for cause, קצר, קצור for inability. Other words gained a meaning according to a l420l concatenation of concepts going back to the Greek, like שלילה (סלב) *στέρησις*, *privatio* (*negatio*); מדבר, נאטק, meaning "possessing the capacity to think"; and, in particular, some terms for the sciences, e.g., מנטק ,הגיון, logic; לימודים, תעלים mathesis; also שמושיים, הרגליים (ריאצ'יה), תשבורת (אלג'בר) algebra. Expressions like על מה שהוא עליו (עלי מא הו עליה) are arabisms (§244).

§244. (The Glossary, the Critique). According to the postscript, Samuel finished his translation in Arles on November 30, 1204, 14 days before the death of Maimonides.[362] Doubtlessly it was copied soon and frequently, and perhaps among the great number of extant manuscripts there are some copies of the first edition which may be identified by means of textual variants that will be discussed presently. The translator felt the necessity to compile a glossary of the foreign terms, to which he gave the title (itself an arabism)[363] ביאור מהמלות (ה)זרות, more precisely פירוש מן המלים הזרות, commonly appearing together with the *Moreh* in the manuscripts, and only rarely separately. It appears in the editions of the *Moreh* from 1551 onwards, though the text is not correct. Geiger[364] extracted some additions (and some later supplements) from a manuscript. I do not know of a more recent edition which has made use of this information. Isak Satanow enlarged the glossary with some additions. [The most recent edition by Y. Even Shmuel (Kaufmann) 1987, now included in his one-volume vocalized edition of the Ibn Tibbon translation of the *Guide,* is based on the printed editions and some manuscripts; see p. 8 for details.] Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2730 and Turin, BN 32 A II 12 [, no longer extant,] display a postscript according to which it was completed in Tammuz 893 (1213)[365] while returning from Alexandria, on a boat in the great port

---

[360] On the style of the translator, see, for the time being, Scheyer 1841, 180, against Delitzsch 1840, 209.

[361] For one thing, the old form מהנדז is Persian. See Steinschneider 1864c, 94; Steinschneider 1880f, 60.

[362] Steinschneider 1852, 1874, 2493; Gross 1879, 377, stresses the year 1205 found in Pasini 1749, 49, already in Steinschneider 1852, according to Wolf 1715, IV, 918; Peyron 1880, 80 and 36); but it is only a miscalculation.

[363] פסר ען פ' המלות later? The 1553 Sabbioneta edition has מהמלות זרות in the book, פ' מלות זרות on the title-page; Kalonymos ben Kalonymos cites פתיחתו למלות in his polemical work 1879, 6; (Steinschneider 1862, 118).

[364] Geiger 1837b, 428–32. The important dating under כיהון ist emphasized in Steinschneider 1852, 2492; cf. Steinschneider 1875a.

[365] See §61.

of אלקליבה or לאלקליבה, four *mil* from Tunis. According to the catalogue (Peyron 1880, 37), the Turin ms. has, among other materials, two supplements, otherwise unknown.[366]

The beginning of the introduction to the glossary is not unambiguous: As he was completing (בהשלימי) his translation, Samuel tells us, he sensed the need to compile a glossary,[367] particularly so as the "poet" Judah al-Ḥarizi, who had translated the book ("following our translation", Turin ms.), had done so. The latter had prefaced his translation with two gates (chapters), one of which explains the (difficult) words but contains much unfounded, erroneous and mistaken (מכשולים) material, while the other, which lists the theme (כונת) of each chapter, "is full of stumbling-blocks" (§247). Did Samuel begin his glossary in 1204, but finish it only in 1213? Or was he prevented from completing his plan until his stay on the boat offered him the necessary leisure? This question also touches upon the problem of the date of his rival's translation (§247).

The general remarks with which the alphabetic glossary begins show us the devices, or means, employed by the translator in his classification. These are then illustrated in the foreword by means of selected examples, without strict arrangement.[368] Here, Samuel enumerates the words that require clarification, grouping them into five categories: (1) wholly |421| novel ones (חדוש גמור), the work either of earlier translators or of himself, as, e.g., קוטר and קוטב, taken from Arabic or another language ‹cf. 899 below›; (2) words from the Mishna or the Talmud (the Gemara), which are known only to a few scholars, as אסטיס and סוג; (3) verbs or adjectives derived from known nouns, e.g., verbal forms derived from אמת, in analogy to Arabic, מלאכית (*read*) from מלאכה, as in Arabic, or new verbal conjugations, e.g., נעתק from עתק; (4) homonyms (משותפות, including metaphors, or strictly homonyms, מצד השאלה or מצד הספוק), taken in a specific sense, like איש – this word gives the author reason for a prolonged and severe attack on the "poet" and his table of contents, and, at the same time, a defense against Ḥarizi's remark in his prologue, accusing Samuel of intentionally making the book unclear. "No," he replies, "I have observed the restraint that Maimonides requires from his readers; Ḥarizi, however, who divulges the secrets to the multitude, errs and gives offense." Samuel assures his readers that his pronouncements concerning this deceitful chapter were not instigated by a sense of rivalry – although, to us, the harshness of his tone indeed betrays the sense of rivalry and hurt. Ḥarizi may, according to Samuel, understand Hebrew and Arabic. He is capable of translating texts that are easy to understand (מובנים), such as poetical and linguistic (ספרי לשון) works and chronicles;[369] that is his job and his profession. However, he has taken the gross liberty (הרס) of translating scientific

[366] Peyron took no notice of Steinschneider 1852, 2491.

[367] The extract from the manuscript in the catalogue should be corrected to read: ראיתי שהביאני קוצר לשון עברי.

[368] Steinschneider 1841, 1842, 231.

[369] Al-Ḥarizi translated al-Hariri. See below Part Four, §523. His ספר המבוא (Steinschneider 1852 n.1308, 1880a, 10).

books that he does not understand. Therefore, he errs in translating even very simple words, both in this book[370] and in the introduction to the Mishna commentary of the "Teacher of Justice" (מורה צדק, later on a conventional designation of the author of the *Moreh*). Moreover, Judah makes mistakes concerning Hebrew words in both texts that children would not make; he even confuses the Hebrew ממר with the Arabic. Again, Samuel declares that he is not trying to promote himself by disparaging Ḥarizi (התכבד בקלונו), etc.; (5) The fifth category consists of words to which he has given a new meaning, again by analogy to the Arabic, as, e.g., מצייר, ציור, to designate the representation of a thing according to its reality (Arabic תצור); (6) [The final category consists of] the rendering of sentences of which every single word is known but whose context is difficult to understand for someone who does not understand the (language of the) mathematicians (בעלי חכמת הלימודים). This category is again a field in which the "poet" has sinned.

After these remarks Samuel indicates the amendments that should be made, on the basis of his revised version, to the copies "scattered over the earth." He has substituted על by לפי and כפי, particularly in the idiom על דעת, although it does occur in Job (10:7) (§243, end); some passages, however, may have escaped him. He has supplied the word עליו in the idiom על מה שהוא עליו which is not proper Hebrew. He had used מופת (strict proof) for ראיה (argument) |422| as well, but now he has introduced the latter so that the former always means the same thing. He puts נושא for משכן, and קסם,[371] which is found in Maimonides' "Epistle to Yemen," for כהון. – In the glossary he adds, s.v.: "For when our language (Hebrew) has a certain word, one must not use a foreign word in its place, if there is no particular reason to do so." – He concludes this introduction, or, rather, he introduces the glossary proper, with the remark that he will observe the alphabetical order with regard to the second letter of the word as well. Moreover, he will arrange some (derived) words not according to their root, but rather by their first letter. In fact he takes no notice of the third letter. The first three entries are, איש, איכות איכול (read אכול).

This glossary gives not only a brief explanation of the word and its origin, e.g., a title מגסטי (by Ptolemy) and a people, צאבה, but very often also the scientific definition, giving examples and even going into arguments.

Already in the first entry, איכות, he remarks that it refers to one of the ten categories treated by Aristotle in the book known as ספר המאמרות and that "category" should actually be translated by a participle נאמרות or נאמרים, following the Arabic (we find the latter in Falaquera); but Samuel adopted the word מאמרות from the older translators and authors. Before he enumerates the categories he elucidates seven terms, regularly used by the dialecticians (חכמי המופת); in fact these are the *quinque voces* of Porphyry: סוג, מין, מבדיל, סגולה, מקרה, with the addition of two related terms, definition and description, גדר and חק, the first of which was coined (חדשום) by

[370] Samuel does not provide an example; one such is the nonsensical אחים I, 72, beginning of 82, where he reads אכ'ואן for אנואן; see Maimonides 1856 I, 379. For an example of a more substantial ignorance, see I, 76, where he has מרגישים for אשעריה.

[371] Ed. Maimonides 1873 of his translation, p. 32 מבלתי קסם ונחש and p. 33 צורך הקסם; also found in Naḥum ha-Ma'aravi's translation Maimonides 1629, fol. 98b, 99.

the authors and translators for the Arabic חק. The second, standing for רסם, was introduced, he supposes, for the first time by himself, from which he also derived a verb, as in Arabic. After the ten categories someone has erroneously put the title "Letter *alef*", but all of the preceding material was, in fact, inserted in the entry איכות. [This is not in Even Shmuel's edition.]

Samuel's translation found its critic in Shem Tov Falaquera, who was superior to him, better versed in the literature of Arabic philosophy, and even more committed to [textual] fidelity. In 1280 he wrote a commentary on most of the Arabic *Moreh* in which he retranslated into Hebrew those passages which he chose to explain. Moreover, he collected parallel passages or explanatory material to Maimonides from Arabic philosophers and presented these in Hebrew translation. His main source is Averroes, for whom he employs the shorthand "the aforementioned philosopher." This work was printed in Pressburg [Bratislava] in 1837 under the title *Moreh ha-Moreh* (*Guide to the Guide*) 1837.[372] [See now the edition of Shiffman 2001.] The wealth of quotations it contains is such as to give the semblance of great scholarship to those who took excerpts from it. Falaquera appends three chapters to his commentary: (1) Passages from philosophical works on the human attainment of perfection and the conjunction (with the Active Intellect), mentioned by Maimonides; (2) a resolution of the doubts raised by the |423| translator Samuel concerning Maimonides' views on providence and miracles (*Moreh* III, 51; §243). After giving an abstract of Samuel's treatment, he gives us his own views on the problem in question and, at the same time, corrects a grave mistake in the translation (147) which at first glance only seems to present a minor nuance. (3) Corrections of the Translator. – Fr. Delitzsch began to translate this chapter into German while correcting the Arabic passages without the help of a manuscript, but still adding useful notes.[373] This chapter starts with the remark that a book that has been written with such care must be translated with no less precision in order to preserve the meaning. For many words have an inner (פנימי, mysterious) meaning which is known only to those versed in scholarly works. This is what Maimonides alludes to in his "recommendation" (Maimonides 1856, I, 22) [Pines 1963, 15, translates this "instruction"]. He concludes his remark with the observation that the translator would certainly have corrected this translation had he been aware of his errors.

Samuel's translation lost much of its importance for the text with the appearance of the edition of the [original] text itself and a French translation. Munk did not neglect the help that the Hebrew translation could offer when correct manuscripts were utilized. In any event, the work of Samuel will remain not just one of the most important documents for the history of translations, in the course of which it has served so many for so long as a model. It is also the best guide for acquiring this artificial language. This feature has even been enhanced by the edition of the [Judaeo-Arabic] text.

[372] Steinschneider 1852 and further below; on Averroes cf. A. [2] 101. In Paris there exist four manuscripts among which no. 704 is very correct. Delitzsch 1840, 177 ff. always speaks of a Vienna edition; was there another title-page?

[373] Delitzsch 1840, 177, 225, 257, only goes until 149, I, ch. 2.

§245. (Editions, translations, commentaries.) The Hebrew *Moreh* is one of the first products of the Jewish printing press. It was printed, without indication of place or year, shortly before 1480, probably in Italy,[374] and continuously reprinted thereafter; but already the second edition (1551) is accompanied by three medieval commentaries.

Studied as it was by scholars, the book was at first not popular enough to be translated into modern languages. ‹There is an Italian translation by Jedidiah b. Moses in 1583, on which see Sacerdote 1892.› In 1829[375] Mendel Levin (Maimonides 1829) published a partial Hebrew paraphrase. The Latin paraphrase of the younger Buxtorf (Maimonides 1629) has its merits, considering the time and his limited means.[376] His translation of the title by "Doctor perplexorum" has gained currency; the old Latin translation (§250) exhibits other versions of the title. A German translation of the three parts has recently been supplied by three scholars: I by Fürstenthal (Maimonides 1839), III by Scheyer (Maimonides 1838), with the help of the original text, and II by M. E. Stern (Maimonides 1864), who was able already to make use of the French translation by Munk, as was done also in the Italian translation, begun by D. J. Maroni (Maimonides 1871), the Hungarian translation of Moritz Klein (Maimonides 1878–1890, 1977), and the complete English translation of M. Friedlaender (Maimonides 1881–85), which contains a thorough analysis of the whole work.

[Of the many other translations since Steinschneider, three should be singled out: There is the English version executed by Shlomo Pines (Maimonides 1963), accompanied by an extensive essay on the sources of the *Guide* as well as a proemium by Leo Strauss on how to read the *Guide*. There are notes but they are very sparse. In addition, the *Guide* has been translated twice into modern Hebrew. Rabbi Yosef Qafih published his own translation, with a facing edition of the text in the original (Maimonides 1972). Rabbi Qafih's edition utilizes the Munk-Joel edition as well as a number of other manuscripts, all of them Yemenite. In the introduction, Rabbi Qafih lambasts the medieval translations of Ibn Tibbon and al-Ḥarizi. Significant divergences from those earlier translations are noted *ad loc*. The notes also include much other valuable material, including cross-references to other Maimonidean texts and the rabbi's own Hebrew renderings of pertinent texts by al-Fārābī; perhaps their most useful and original contribution are the numerous cross-references to Saadia, whose writings (especially his biblical translations) seem to have exerted a strong influence upon Maimonides; this was not noticed previously, and its full significance remains to be clarified. Rabbi Qafih's translation alone has been reprinted many times, but the version with the facing Judaeo-Arabic text was printed only once and is no longer available. Michael Schwarz published an elegant and accurate Hebrew translation (Maimonides 2002), accompanied by copious notes, which are particularly strong in all that concerns philosophical terminology and scholarly bibliography. Notice must also be taken of Y. Even-Shmuel's proto-edition of Ibn Tibbon's translation (Maimonides 1935, 1987), described on the title page as a "pointed and corrected publication, on the basis of the first printings, with variants from manuscripts, and compared

[374] Cf. n. 436. Concerning this section see Steinschneider 1852 ff. and Additamenta; Zedner 1867, 579, Benjacob 1880, 300 n. 300 ff. where Lisbon and Venice *sub anno* or 1511 should be deleted; Rosenthal 1875, 860.

[375] Thus Steinschneider 1852, 1618, correctly; 1834, falsely and ibid. 1896.

[376] Delitzsch 1840, 178.

to the Arabic original." His text is accompanied by copious notes, most of which are based upon medieval commentaries. This achievement notwithstanding, an edition of the Ibn Tibbon version remains a desideratum.

Among the other languages that the *Guide* has been translated into are Latin (Maimonides 1520, 1629 ; on the Latin versions see below), Judaeo-German (Maimonides 1839), Italian (Maimonides 1861), Persian (Maimonides 2011), Spanish (Maimonides 1984, 1987, 1988, Hungarian (Maimonides 1878–1890), and Chinese Maimonides 1998.]

Commentary is generally one of the favorite genres of medieval literature and, for special reasons, dominates |424| Jewish scholarly literature.[377] The *Guide* stimulated enterprising spirits to reveal what it sought to hide, and it was easy to find an excuse to trespass on the author's solemn invocation – Samuel Tibbon had already criticized his rival on this very point.[378]

On the other hand, the new style, as well as the knowledge that Maimonides presupposed in his readers, required most of them to look for explanations. The controversy about the new system of theology attracted the attention of those who were not accustomed to an exclusively rational way of arguing. Certainly the book was read openly, and its ideas found their way into the sermons, e.g., those of the translator Jacob Anatoli (מלמד התלמידים), who was the target of Orthodoxy's wrath. So one should not be surprised about the number of commentaries still extant, almost all of them to Samuel's translation, which he himself had already accompanied with notes (unedited, because they are extant only in a few manuscripts).[379]

[The critical notes of Ibn Tibbon to the *Guide* have now been edited in the 1999 master's dissertation of Carlos Fraenkel ; they were studied further in the same scholar's 2001 doctoral thesis and monograph 2007. Fraenkel's painstaking investigation reveals that, in fact, Ibn Tibbon's notes are preserved in quite a few manuscripts, though most manuscripts contain only a few of them, and many are recorded anonymously. Fraenkel's studies contain the most thorough survey yet undertaken on manuscripts of the Ibn Tibbon translation.

Steinschneider comments below that he is referring to only a few of the unpublished commentaries. In fact their number is significant; one should also include under this rubric marginalia to manuscripts, which are very dense in some cases, as well as the few but interesting commentaries and glosses to the Judaeo-Arabic *Dalāla*. The only survey is the one published by Steinschneider himself 10 years after *HUe* in the A. Berliner Festschrift (Steinschneider 1903). The only text of a Hebrew commentary to have been edited since then has been Y. Shiffman's edition of Falaquera's commentary 2001.

Any discussion of commentaries to the *Guide* (and other works as well) must also take into account marginalia and other annotations. Indeed, many commentaries are in fact marginalia that were collected and lightly edited. The most heavily annotated copy of Ibn Tibbon's translation is Sassoon 341; most of the glosses are listed in the catalogue 1932 1:417–419. Another heavily glossed copy which is, however, in a horrible state of disorder, is St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 474. Some copies of the Judaeo-Arabic original bear annotations

[377] Steinschneider 1857a §17 beginning.

[378] Joseph Caspi (Steinschneider 1855c, 67) thinks that Maimonides' prohibition only refers to details, etc.

[379] Steinschneider 1852, 1897, 1900, 2493. Concerning Ms. Turin BN 82 A III 33[, no longer extant,] see Peyron 1880, 77; for citations found in Moses of Salerno (§250). See Steinschneider 1875a, 87; see also the appendix to Falaquera's מורה המורה 1837, 163 ch. 21. An alphabetical list of commentaries of the *Moreh* is provided by Maimonides 1881–85, III, xix ff.

as well; see Langermann 1995. Finally, mention must be made of the extremely dense, often illegible marginalia, to the Arabic-letter copy of the *Guide* found in Istanbul, Carullah 1279; the sources named in the glosses (which too are in Arabic letters) were meticulously listed by the late Franz Rosenthal 1955; one must go through the indices and see if the folios cited fall between 189b–301a, which contain the *Guide*. The notes include citations from some Jewish works that are otherwise lost. A selection of marginalia from the Carullah manuscript, highly critical of Maimonides and of revealed religion and its tenets in general, with Hebrew translation and analysis by Almog Kasher and Y. Tzvi Langermann, appears in Langermann and Kasher 2013.]

The first known commentary is from Italy and dates from the middle of the thirteenth century (§250). Towards the turn of that century (1290), Abraham Abulafia dared to compose a mixture of philosophy and mysticism, arranged according to the chapters of the *More*. It is, in part, an absurd concoction. Two recensions exist. [For a detailed account of recensions and manuscripts of Abulafia's commentary, see Idel 1976.][380] We have seen that shortly beforehand Falaquera had explicated the *Moreh*. The main commentaries, however, belong to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. A critical assessment of this literature would divert us too far from our subject, although it offers interesting details which are highlighted in their appropriate places. We have to confine ourselves to a list of published commentaries, arranged according to date of composition and indicating only the first editions. From among the unpublished commentaries we name only a few and refer for details to the bibliographies.[381] [Once again, the reader is referred to Steinschneider 1903, which lists over sixty Hebrew commentaries to the *Guide*.]

Joseph Kaspi wrote (around 1330) a double commentary, dealing separately with the explanation of the "secrets." See Kaspi 1848. The manuscripts: Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 263/1 and Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 559 contain divergent recensions. [According to Neubauer, Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 559 is Kaspi's commentary, but this is unclear. Other manuscripts: New York, JTS Ms. 2341/3; Paris, BN héb 694; Paris, BN héb 700/8; Turin BN A VI 34, no longer extant; Vienna, ON 35.]

Moses Narboni who, in his commentaries on the philosophical works of the Arabs, never loses sight of the *Moreh*, completed in 1362, after 7 years of uninterrupted work, an interpretation of "the book which has achieved fame among Jews, Christians, and Ismaelites," addressed to an intimate circle of scholars and concentrating on revealing the "secrets", in Soria, according to the epilogue (printed twice, 1880 and 1881) which is missing in the – very inaccurate and defective – edition (1852).[382] Falaquera, Kaspi, and Narboni are the most important basic commentators of the *Moreh*. Profiat |425| Duran ("Ephodaeus", or Isaac b. Moses Levi, cf. section II and III) composed (1391–1403) a short and

[380] See Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 341/8 and [Firkovich's catalogue on] St. Petersburg, RNL Ms. Evr. I 485, "by Abraham b. הרמב"ם."

[381] See in particular Steinschneider 1852, 1897. That הואיל משה comments upon the *Moreh* in Paris, BN héb 214/3 was not noticed by the cataloguer.

[382] Steinschneider 1852, 1975 and Additamenta, 1976 Jellinek 1881, 32–34 without comment. Schorr 1880, 76–88, gives corrections and 88 the epilogue with the correct date. Part I was printed as early as 1791.

simple explanation (ed. 1551);[383] the Paris catalogue (no. 705) did not recognize it. The absence of a foreword gives us no reason to suppose that it is truncated or mutilated.[384] According to Delmedigo, Profiat furnishes the reader with correct answers, but spares the reader the questions, following the style of R. Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi), the famous commentator of the Talmud. [London, BL Or. 1388] ‹Isaac b. Shem Tov, ms. Parma R. 1388 [?]›

Asher b. Abraham, or Bonan Crescas (probably first half of the fifteenth century, ed. 1551),[385] plans to interpret several parts of the book for adolescents,[386] young people who have not yet acquired the sciences that are necessary for the correct understanding of it, but who seek instruction. In his high respect for Maimonides[387] he does not expect to penetrate everywhere into the profound ideas of the book and always combines the admission of his own ignorance with his objections and doubts. He knows the commentaries of Falaquera and Kaspi.[388]

Shem Tov b. Joseph b. Shem Tov composed his commentary in 1488 (cf. I, 74, at the end) with an attitude of reconciliation between reason and law – "the two lights" of which the former is the greater.[389] This is all the more significant as his grandfather was a zealous Kabbalist, and his father objected to some of the basic ideas of Maimonides. In his foreword, he says that he plans to interpret some profound passages and to make use of everything that is correct in the commentaries. As a matter of fact, this foreword already contains a borrowing from Narboni.

Soon afterwards (1493)[390] Don Isaac Abravanel commented upon the greater part of the *Moreh*, leaving, however, his work (ed. 1831–2)[391] without proemium and probably unfinished. He had undertaken the commentary with the intention of opposing some scarcely orthodox interpretations, particularly those of Kaspi,

[383] Anonymous and defective in Vatican, BA Cod. ebr. 297/4. According to Schiller-Szinessy 1876, Cat. I, 155, Profiat was already mentioned by Shem Tov Ibn Shem Tov in 1384. – Sources, see Steinschneider 1852, 2112, Sänger 1865 (on the pronunciation of the name as "Prophet"), 126; Preface to מעשה אפוד Wien 1865 (Duran 1865), see Steinschneider 1869b, 165, 1870a, 109.

[384] As opposed to the editor's introduction to מעשה אפוד Duran 1865, 9.

[385] His נפש אות (see Schönblum 80 B) was written in 1438 in Vatican, BA Cod. ebr. 107/1. [This attribution has been questioned by Gärtig 1995.] Concerning the poems see Steinschneider 1852, 2546. He is probably Asher b. Abraham in Paris, BN héb 706/4 (Zunz 1867, 709). [חרוזים על כ"ה הקדמות of Abraham b. Asher, Steinschneider 1875a, 87; cf. 1880, 132, where one should read Abraham b. Solomon for Asher b. Solomon]. He cites ר' לוי (Gersonides III, 43) and החכם הכולל Rabbi Jedaiah concerning, התחלה ראשון (II, 30).

[386] לבחורים רבי השנים (Preface).

[387] For example, I, 2 (f. 9) III, 51.

[388] Steinschneider 1852, 2547, should read מורה המורה III, 43, 51; see below concerning al-Ḥarizi; Kaspi, for example, I, 5, 21. – אחר השלמת חבורו II, 4 f. 89b.

[389] In the Preface אמרו כי השכל והדת שני מאורות המאור הגדול הוא השכל; see Steinschneider 1875d, 18; Steinschneider 1883–84, 45. He uses Ephodi (Friedlaender, Maimonides 1881–85 III, xxii). ‹A piyyut of Levi (ben Jacob) London, Mon. 192 (103); the sun and moon represent worldly and spiritual authority. (Poole 1884; Lea 1888, I, 4 Honorius of Autun).›

[390] Steinschneider 1852, 1082.

[391] I have still not found the reputed autograph (Steinschneider 1852) in the Crimea that is mentioned in the Firkovich catalogue.

Narboni, and Pr. Duran.[392] The textual passages are often given in paraphrase, but following Tibbon's translation.

After the medieval commentaries, we mention the notes of a famous Polish Talmudist, Mordechai Jafe (1594) to the printed commentaries; the commentary of a philosopher in the Kantian tradition, Solomon Maimon; and that of an industrious and skillful author, Isaac Satanow (1791ff.). Simon Scheyer wrote an interpretation of part II, chapter 45 under the title of מעלות הנבואה, *Commentarius hebraicus etc. de prophetiae gradibus*, Rödelheim 1848, 16.

Among the unedited commentaries we name that of Solomon |426| b. Judah ha-Nasi (1368) who, after having had one Jacob b. Samuel, otherwise unknown, as a student in Germany for 2 years (the name of this country occurs here for the first time), composed a commentary to the *Moreh* for him, in commemoration and gratitude for the honorable treatment that he received:

Manuscripts. London, BD and BM 52; Cambridge, UL Add. 393/2.[393] [Michael Z. Nahorai has prepared an edition of this commentary but has not yet published it.]

In the first decades of the sixteenth century, David b. Judah Messer Leon wrote a commentary under the title of עין הקורא (*Eye of the Reader*); it is found in Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Reggio 41 and Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3546. Günzburg has a fragment of it,[394] rich in quotations (partly borrowed). In David's eyes, Abravanel is an amateur who has read only one book of al-Ghāzālī,[395] while Levi b. Gershom is a heretic whose book deserves to be burnt because he battles against Aristotle and Averroes with trifles.

Commentaries to single parts of the *Moreh* were also written, e.g., to the 25 (or 26) introductory propositions of part II. Authors of such commentaries are (end of the thirteenth century): Jedaia ha-Penini, whose commentary (מדבר קדמות) is known only from his own quotation;[396] Hillel b. Samuel, whose commentary has been edited (1874) along with his philosophical work (Hillel ben Samuel 1874); (end of the fifteenth century:) David b. Yaḥya b. Solomon from Lisbon, a preacher in Corfu;[396b] (sixteenth century): Moses Provençal (Mantua, CI 39).

Perhaps the piece called "Short Explanation," an analysis of the two kinds of lines (hyperbole and asymptote) mentioned in the *Moreh* (I, 73, 410 in Munk's French translation), by Simon Motot (1446–50), Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 36/28 and Vienna, ÖN Vienna, ON 46/3[397] figures in the commentary of Moses Provençal (1549), which was published together with the *Moreh* in Hebrew (Sabionetta, Maimonides 1553) and was translated into Latin by Baroccius (Barozzi 1586) under

[392] והנרבוני והאפוד שניהם נשרפים בבית הדשן, commentary on *Guide* I, 5, p. 15.

[393] Previously almost unknown; not "kabbalistic" (Friedlaender, Maimonides 1881–85 III, xxiii).

[394] See Steinschneider 1865c, 64 (Perreau 1878–1904, 60 n. 44); 1879d, 83; Steinschneider 1888, 86.

[395] Steinschneider 1869b, 79, 80.

[396] Steinschneider 1852, 1283.

[396b] Paris, BN héb 1201/8. The letter to Isaiah Messene b. Joseph (see n. 455) appears in Goldberg 1862b, 23; see Steinschneider 1862f, 4; it is found in Graetz 1875, IV, 466, according to the copy made by Sinzheim; cf. Steinschneider 1869b, 80 on Kayserling 1861, 118; Steinschneider 1879c, 63.

[397] Author of the Algebra according to Christian sources; Steinschneider Berlin 1879b, 57 no. 97/4; on 98 see also Mantua, CI. 10 j.

the name of Moses Narboni and on the basis of an Italian translation (1550) printed in Hebrew letters.[398]

[Maimonides' description (*Guide* I, 73) of the asymptote to the hyperbole engendered a number of elaborations in Hebrew; although similar constructions exist in Arabic and Latin, these were especially necessary for the Hebrew reader, since Apollonius' *Conics* was never translated into Hebrew. Proofs that do not depend upon Apollonius have been collected and studied by Lévy 1989. For a discussion of the matter see Freudenthal 1988.]

§246. (Introduction, versification.) [With the exception of the very last sentence, this entire section is devoted to the work *Ru'aḥ Ḥen*. Steinschneider looks upon that writing as an "introduction" to the *Guide*; it seems likely that a more precise reappraisal would classify it as synopsis of philosophy heavily dependent upon the *Guide*, rather than a tool to prepare one for the study of Maimonides' book. The authorship of the tract has never been determined even though, as Steinschneider can already report, the first generation of modern scholars invested considerable effort in the study of the treatise. A Hebrew University dissertation of Ofer Elior 2010 on the matter is being prepared for publication.]

An anonymous author wrote, probably between 1200 and 1250, a small introductory treatise (numerous printings since 1544) which discusses the basic philosophical ideas that are necessary for understanding the *Moreh*. It is called, after the first two words, חן רוח, *Spirit of Grace*, and it is divided into eleven chapters; the supplement on equivocal, homonymous, and metaphorical[399] terms is probably the work of a different author. This small treatise has been ascribed, without reason, to various authors: one of the three Tibbonids (Judah, Samuel, Moses), Jacob Anatoli, then again another Anatoli,[400] or Zeraḥiah ha-Levi Anatoli, identifying him with an |427| author of hymns in Greece, because Anatoli (*anatolê*) is the translation of Zeraḥiah. This small treatise, however, has no connection to Greece.[401] It has not yet been noted that in chapter 2 and 3 the translation of al-Fārābī's *Book of Principles* has been utilized.[402] The small treatise is already quoted by Abraham Abulafia and in an

[398] Steinschneider 1852, 1983, according to which one should complete the biography of Barozzi by B. Boncompagni (1884), 899.

[399] Cf. Maimonides, *Logic*, ch. 12; the Epitome of Averroes on the Isagoge of Porphyry. Joseph Gikatilla, beginning of the commentary, lists six. For יאמר על סוג ועל מין *Ru'aḥ Ḥen* has שם התאום הוא המותאם, and finally המתאימים. Ibn Arroyo (אהינ"א) added the latter to Menaḥem's גדרים, (Menahem ben Saruq 1854, fol. 90. The explanation of מוטבע found in Menaḥem's גדרים concludes עד כאן; is ר"ח בס' lacking? Menaḥem cites on the word נרדף: וכתב אבו חמד; cf. Steinschneider 1870a, 75.

[400] The supercommentary to Ibn Ezra (see Neubauer 1876–7b, 87, where הח' ר' אנטולי בס' רוח חן) is by Elazar b. Matatya (Berliner 1877a, Berliner 1872, 52 n. 7).

[401] See Steinschneider 1879a, 415, German version in Grünwald 1883, 43. Concerning the Firkovich manuscript see below. On קזאני (Casani) see Steinschneider (Duran 1881), 82 n. 2 (cf. n. 411). Samuel 'ק in London, BD and BM 43. [There is no reference to Samuel Casani in this ms.] The author Solomon in the Maihingen ms. (Perles 1878, 318) is probably a copyist's error for Samuel (Ibn Tibbon).). [As pointed out by Ofer Elior, even if Ruah Henwas not composed in Greece (Byzantium), it apparently reached Jewish readers in that area already in the early stages of its dissemination; see Elior 2010, p. 60. Furthermore, the manuscripts of Ruah Hen copied in Byzantium transmitted a unique tradition of the text and its paratexts; cf. ibid., pp. 180–88.]

[402] Cf. Steinschneider 1869a, 3 השנאה והאהבה with the end of ch. 2, Steinschneider 1869a, 45 with 3 מדרגה הד'. This passage does not appear in Falaquera's *De'ot ha-Filosofim* VIII ch. 2, partly in Moses Ibn Tibbon's Introduction to the Commentary on the Song of Songs.

anonymous medical work (around the end of the thirteenth century);[403] Gershon b. Solomon presents extended excerpts from it.[404]

It found many medieval readers;[405] its manuscripts are almost countless. [The catalogue of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts now lists over a hundred copies, not including commentaries, abridgements, etc.] The first Firkovich collection has no less than ten manuscripts (nos. 491–500); some of them, however, are copies from printed books. In *Ha-Karmel*, Firkovich gives some information on no. 494, which D. Slutzki appropriated for the introduction to his edition (Warsaw, 1865). In his catalogue Firkovich assumes no. 488 to be an autograph!

The small treatise seemed to be important enough to attract commentaries, and not only in the Provence, where one of the students of Prat Maimon (around 1420) or he himself wrote a commentary, the beginning of which, down to the middle of chapter 4, is attributed to Natanel Kaspi in the Paris catalogue (107) on Paris, BN héb 678/1.[406] ‹=Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2255/2; this means that the commentary in the same ms. on Maimonides' *Eight Chapters* is by Natanel›. The beginning tallies with the anonymous commentary in Paris, BN héb 1239/4, whereas the anonymous commentary in the editions 1549, 1566, etc.[407] is different; it contains interpolations from "another commentary" (chs. 3 and 7). But also in Germany a learned Talmudist, Zalman (or Seligman Zion Levi) from Bingen (around 1450–60), wrote a philosophical and mystical commentary[408] which is probably lost, if it is not one of the two anonymous commentaries, published in 1594 and 1620. – From among the editions[409] we mention that of the baptized Jew Joseph Isaac (Cologne 1555), accompanied by a poor translation, and published under the title *Physica hebraea* nunc primum edita, etc.; the vocalization is inexact, but the variant readings sometimes are superior.

The author of the רוח חן quotes from the *Meteorology* under the title of אותות השמים (chapter 7). He talks about the ten categories, and he follows, from among contemporary enumerations, most closely the logic of Maimonides in its translation by Moses Tibbon (1254), both in the order and in the terminology of the two last categories.[410]

---

[403] ס' היושר Steinschneider 1877e, 116. – Cf. Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 210. Steinschneider 1852, 638 and 4036, Steinschneider 1869a, 242, Steinschneider 1874b, 101; Commentary on the Kuzari, Steinschneider 1879b, 113.

[404] Gross 1880, 357; see above 10 (sec. 3) and 69 (sec. 25), Brüll 1880, 166 makes the author of the רוח חן a plagiarist.

[405] Sachs 1853, 157.

[406] Steinschneider 1876b, 128; cf. Steinschneider 1879b, 111. Beginning פ"א הנמצאים ר"ל כל מי שיש אמנם יבאו ר"ל כל זה ראיה ch. 4 להם מציאות.

[407] Steinschneider 1852, 639, n. 4037, 4039 see Additamenta – ch. 5 mentions that Job and the Kuzari should be considered poetical ויכוחים.

[408] Zunz 1845, 166; Berliner 1869b, 85 (cf. 83). Berliner 1878, 81.

[409] Steinschneider 1852, 639; Zedner 1867, 400; Rosenthal 1875, 618. In Benjacob and Steinschneider 1880, 544 n. 99 of Maimonides, according to Lilienthal on Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 297/11 (so it should be read), n. 100 of Shem Tov b. Isaac Shaprut, a ghastly muddle.

[410] See §211 n. 5 and and §240 n. 317. Peculiarly, Saadiah's commentary on Sefer Yezirah (s. §258) and Moses Ibn Ezra (Dukes 1843a), 119. Most of the order of the categories is the same, except for IX and X (cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 64 and 1885, 9). Their denomination includes the terms

|428| Otherwise the style does not have any conspicuous characteristics. The author considers קוטר (chapter 3, no. 1; chapter 6, no. 4) to be a well-known word; היולי is Greek, for which the Hebrew is חומר ראשון (chapter 8); duality, or plurality (that is, in God), is שניות (chapter 6, no. 4); the mineral is דומם; the "higher elements" (היסודות העליונים, chapter 5) seem to be the "higher bodies" (הגרמים, or הגשמים, in other authors). – Perhaps we have spent more time with this little book than one would expect. We have done so because it sums up the most sublime philosophical problems within a very restricted framework, and it illustrates the character of the clear and simple philosophical style of the Tibbonids' time.

[A number of other works may be cited here that are paraphrases of the *Guide*, or parts of it; their kinship to the *Guide* is far more intimate than that of *Ru'ah Hen*.

(a) *Nev'uat ha-Moreh*, a summation of *Guide* II, 32–48, in which Maimonides' theory of prophecy is set forth. (New York, JTS Ms. 2441/8, 130a, 133b; 16th century).
(b) A paraphrase of *Guide* I, 1, 3, and 4, done perhaps by a Karaite. (St. Petersburg IOS B 342a, 123a–b; 18th century).
(c) An odd, incomplete work, parts of which are attributed to "Galen" but which is really compiled from extracts of Ibn Tibbon's translation of *Guide* I, 8–30; II, 47–48; and III, 14. (St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 476; 15th/16th centuries).]

The *Moreh* was versified by Mattithiah Ibn חרטון (Kartin).[411] [In 1885 Steinschneider published a collection of Hebrew poems relating to "Maimonides and his Famous Books" 1885b]

§247. Soon after Samuel (1205–13) the famous poet Judah al-Ḥarizi translated the *Moreh*. This translation was published on the basis of a single ms. (written in Rome 1234)[412] by Leon Schlosberg, part 1 containing notes by Dr. Scheyer which compare the Arabic original and Tibbon's translation (London, Maimonides 1851–79, title in Hebrew), parts 2 and 3 (Hebrew and Latin titles), 1876, 1879.[413] [Paris, BN héb 682 is still the only complete copy of al-Ḥarizi's translation known to exist. It is written in a square Spanish hand of the thirteenth century; the copyist may be Yom Tov ben Shemaia, who also wrote a marginal note on f. 14a. Rome is mentioned but there is no clear indication that the manuscript was copied in that city. There are several long (but unfortunately faint) long marginalia that have not been studied. There is another fragment (five folios) of al-Ḥarizi's translation in New York, M. Lehmann MA 13, containing parts of *Guide* II, 32–33, 38–40. Interestingly enough, someone has copied nearly all of the Judaeo-Arabic text of II, 38 into the margin. Finally, Tübingen, UB Ma. IV 2, a copy of Ibn Tibbon's translation executed in 1343, records several times al-Ḥarizi's translation of a particular phrase in the margins.]

כמה and כמות, איך and איכות, מצטרף and הצטרפות (מצורף), לו and קנין. In the subdivision of Quantity, *Ru'aḥ Hen* has מתפרק, Samuel Ibn Tibbon מתפרד, and Jacob b. Makhir מתחלק. See the table in an Endnote.

[411] Steinschneider 1852, 1898 (correct to read, "Wolf 1715, I, 1681") and Additamenta. Or this is Mattithiah b. Shabbethai (b. Yeḥiel) of Monte Politiano (see Dukes 1848c Steinschneider 1871c, 105 n.2); perhaps the Paytan in Zunz 1865, 579; cf. Schorr 1873, 45, 46 n. 8, 21. His poem מביני עם in Vatican BAV Cod. Vat. ebr. 298, a five-line acrostic, ends הרטום – וברכו את השם המבורך. found in ‹Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. Add. Oct. 59› is *Artom*?

[412] See III, 91. – I will cite (with simpler Arabic numerals) the page numbers.

[413] Cf. Steinschneider 1846a, 279. Steinschneider 1852, 1318 and Additamenta, 1897.

According to the foreword the translation was commissioned by several Provençal scholars (Marseille, according to the manuscript cited by David Conforte, f. 12). But al-Ḥarizi says expressly in his Divan[414] that he had translated the *Moreh* in Spain (ספרד) for one of the noblemen (נסיכים), whom he calls Joseph in the dedicatory poem – we shall see, however, that he dedicated his Divan successively to four different persons in different countries.[415] – Al-Ḥarizi was asked to translate the book in simple, elegant, and easy to understand style. The intelligent scholar (Samuel) had in his translation "intentionally made its meaning obscure." Judah was thus "forced" to translate it (again), promising, however, not to divulge any of the "secrets", nor to intentionally explain anything. He prefaces the translation with two gates (chapters), one of them explaining every foreign word in alphabetical order, the other giving a table of contents. For the moment we shall dwell upon the second gate.

Judah's table of contents was added to Samuel's translation in the manuscripts (under Judah's name) already in the first edition, because Samuel did not replace it with another one. It is, however, abbreviated in several places, e.g., in I, 7 (ילד) where Judah had expressly remarked that Maimonides does not quote two biblical verses (Deut. 32:18 and Ps. 2:7) which should be interpreted as metaphors.[416] This |429| enraged Samuel, as we have seen, and probably more so the orthodox enemies of the school of Maimonides. Nevertheless – and this is an instructive example of how pseudepigraphy works – Samuel's name could still be put in the place of Judah's in Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4800/1, which has מפתח (*clavis*, key) or פתיחה (introduction),[417] as in ‹Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 401/17›, and similarly הקדמה (proemium) and פתיחה in Berlin, SPK Or. Fol. 1057/13. In fact its proper place is in the beginning, not the end, of the book, which is where it is in Schlossberg's edition. This edition agrees with the manuscript mentioned above, also concerning the term פתיחה at the end.[418] Even Narboni (to I, 59) agrees with Samuel's remarks concerning the register, which he calls בכוונותיו ובאוריו על פרקי זה המאמר. In the edition of 1553 it is also called שער בכוונות הפרקים. Incidentally, the register in Vatican, BA Cod. ebr. 262 and in the editions 1553 ff. name Judah as אלחפני. The origin of this manifest mistake is not known; perhaps it is a copyist's error.[419]

In al-Ḥarizi's translation, chapters 26 and 27 of part I are conflated into one, as they were also in Samuel's first version. The sum total therefore counts 177

---

[414] Dukes, 616, Neubauer 1865, 41; Steinschneider 1873h, 89. From ספרד he sent to Maimonides the poem מאתך השר (see my מורה מקום המורה 1885b, 27 n. 41, and see below n. 429); he sent another one to a certain Ḥiyya (Neubauer 1865, 40). 415. Steinschneider 1880e, 134; Steinschneider 1881g, 19.

[415] Steinschneider 1880e, 134; Steinschneider 1881g, 19.

[416] See Steinschneider 1846a, 278; regarding Steinschneider 1852, 1318, see Munich, BS Cod. Hebr 401/7. – Maimonides 1856, 50, takes no notice of al-Ḥarizi's intimation.

[417] Steinschneider 1858, 272.

[418] Or else this piece initially was illegible like I, 72?

[419] Steinschneider 1852, 1307; Geiger 1837c, 390: "Wir wissen nicht, auf welche Autorität etc."; חריזי without אל (Steinschneider 1881e, 134), also is found in Narboni's commentary to the *Guide* I, 59, beginning (1852, 10).

[chapters], which is expressed by ג"ן עד"ן alphanumerically. Contrary to this, the propositions at the beginning of part III are counted as chapter 1 in Schlossberg's edition. Some manuscripts combine chapters 9 and 10 of part II.[420]

§248. Al-Ḥarizi's glossary drew a lot of criticism from his rivals. For us it provides very interesting documentation of the status of the Hebrew language at the time, and thus reveals the influence the scientific translations had on its development. A comparison of both glossaries will lead us to the salient points. First of all, we are taken aback by the awkward arrangement. The entries are arranged haphazardly, sometimes according to the [first letter of the] root, but also according to the first (and second) letter. Samuel seems to be influenced in this regard by his predecessor, but at least he says something about it in his introduction. His arrangement mostly follows the order of roots, while al-Ḥarizi places under the letter ה many words in which the initial ה is not part of the root. Al-Ḥarizi's vocabulary has a greater number of purely Hebrew or Rabbinic (Talmudic) words which, one would suppose, should be sufficiently familiar to readers of a book of this sort (e.g., נגר) so as to lend themselves to the correct interpretation of their particular nuance in a given context. Al-Ḥarizi, "the poet," however, designed his translation for the general public; his entries, most of them consisting of one or two lines, offer a short definition. Samuel, on the other hand, aimed at a limited circle of scholars. He confined his glossary to technical terms or neologisms, but he offers substantive discussions of them. Al-Ḥarizi is more of a purist and stylist, and thus the Arabic does not dominate his own writing.[421] The only Arabic words in his |430| glossary are: קוטר and קוטב, which he had already found in Samuel. He does not translate the Arabic word 'גילג, and has in I, 92 סופסטאנין and in III, 49 עצ'לה (cf. III, 250, in the French translation, Maimonides 1856). He imitates the Arabic מקדמה in his מקודמת s. v. הקדמה, as well as three times in I, 85; hence one has to correct 85b, line 7 מוקדמות accordingly; but since the *pu'al* of *qdm* was not used, other authors have the form מוקדמה, e.g., in Falaquera, beginning of I, 66, where al-Ḥarizi uses הקדמה. The word אנתחל, to falsely appropriate for oneself, or to plagiarize (II, 61, 62), is translated as יתנחל and מתנחל, which do not exist in Hebrew and are not listed in the glossary.[421b] – Ḥarizi translates the name Abū Naṣr (al-Fārābī) אבי ישע (II, 25, 31, where we find בהשגת דרכים for his commentary to the Physics! III, 28; I, 89 אבי נצר is a gloss; I, 95 יושע' ן!).[422] With regard to Arabic personal names he sometimes remarks (e.g., II, 46 Ibn Waḥshiyya) that it is a ישמעאלי.

[420] Steinschneider 1852, 1893, where l. 19 from bottom *vers. Arab.* should read Uri 320 Poc. – Uri 345 is Saadia ben David al-Adeni (1474). [This comment is a bit confusing: the Bodleian ms. that was formerly Uri 320 is presently Poc. 345. The former Uri 345 is currently Hunt. 352, but is not Saadiah ben David. There are several Huntingdon (formerly Uri) mss. that contain al-Adeni's Arabic commentary on the Mishneh Torah.] (Steinschneider 1852, "Conspectus codd. mss. Hebraeorum," 11.)

[421] Cf. I, 92 and Munk, ed. (Maimonides 1856), II, 308, where one finds לקוחות מזולתו, and 310.

[421b] Schlosberg's edition (Maimonides 1851–79), II, 62n.1, mistakenly has מתנחל for מנתחל.

[422] See §158, n. 134. – II, 28 is lacking the citation. The Latin edition has *Albumazer*, the manuscripts Abumasr; Perles (Maimonides 1875), 43.

More important is an erroneous reading of the famous *Book of Nabataean Agriculture* by Ibn Waḥshiyya that can be accounted for by Arabic orthography[423] and which leads to a number of literary discussions.[424] Al-Ḥarizi read קטביה for נבטיה, changing the Nabataeans to Egyptians. Another textual corruption is found in III, 44: for עבודת האכזרים המצריים, read האיכרים; III, 46 displays only עבודה המצרית ס'. Naḥmanides quotes this passage in two works, following the translation of al-Ḥarizi.[425]

Let us return to the glossary and discuss the following words: אפיסה, an antonym for קנין (Tibbon שלילה and קנין),[425b] הצעה, הרגש (מורגש, Tibbon חוש and מוחש), חתך, חתך הדין II, 5b, 11; פלוטה = כדור (ballota?), read כידור (cf. II, 15 ff.), מאוזרים, מוסיקא, מוצק explained by עמוד, as the following מצוקים, read מוצקים? The *Book of Conic Sections* is named (I, 91) (מכ'רוטאת) המצוקים החרוטים, but Arabic מרכז is translated as עמוד (II, 17 chapter 12 = 13), מסמרים (poles, cf. קטב), צלע; קניות (in the ethical sense). The following words and forms are not found in the glossary: מתמשלים I, 84, ריקם (there is no word at all under the letter ר'), בעל תשומה וסדר and בעלי העיקרים (אצוליין) I, 85, מסובב 89b, תנועה מסתבבת II, 16; מופת נחתך II, 17 chapter 12;[426] יפוץ (יפיץ') II, 18 for ישפע (cf. the Glossary s.v. שפע), מדע הטבעי II, 19; – to the word אבן השואבת (II, 19) al-Ḥarizi adds מגניט הנקרא. The word וטואט (III, f. 64 Arabic) is translated by Tibbon as שרצים אחרים; probably he did not know what to do with it; al-Ḥarizi (III, 44) explains it as אשקרבט (read אשקרביש?) "scarab", as Munk has it in his translation (230). A close study of this translation, which I could not undertake because of the fine print, might yield some more remarkable details. Here it may suffice to refer to the parallels |431| between al-Ḥarizi and Naḥum and the anonymous translator of Joseph Ibn Zaddik's *Microcosm* (§238).

A final remark on the rivalry between the translators. In 1191 Maimonides wrote a treatise on the resurrection, under the title אגרת or מאמר תחיית המתים in Samuel b. Tibbon's translation. It has been printed repeatedly after 1629.[427] We do not know the date of this translation. A short while ago, two prooemia to it were discovered

[423] הישמעאלים (read: שאכר) בני שאכר I, 86, French 383; see Dernburg 1835, 425. See Steinschneider 1887a, 44.

[424] Maimonides 1856, III, 231; see Steinschneider 1871a, 350, 1885b, 167, 170; 1870c, 119 below. Palladius in the Latin Ghafiqi for פלאחה, maybe because of the agricultural author Rutilius Aemilius Palladius? See Steinschneider 1881g, 55. – The פלאחה, of Qusṭa has been edited, Ramaḍan 1293 (1876) [See, more recently, Qusṭa 1999b]. – See also Steinschneider 1876c, 205 n. 30; עבודה מצרית appearing in Ibn Shu'ayb דרשות Ibn Shuaib 1573, on Genesis and elsewhere leads back to Naḥmanides and al-Ḥarizi.

[425] Commentary on Gen. 13:31 האיברים (see Beer, 1854, 99). דרשה ed. 1872 (Naḥmanides 1872), 5 (read: שהעתקתי) and 36. See Steinschneider 1871a, 499. – In al-Ḥarizi (Maimonides 1851–79), 45 התורך is missing below כופרי, and line 3, read צאבה for איבה; see the citations in Steinschneider 1877c, 296.

[425b] See §23, תטלחום הסיפא in Naḥmanides 17, 1872 השרד.

[426] See §238.

[427] Steinschneider 1852, 1915; 1875b, 201; a longer citation from the lost original is found in Abraham b. Solomon, Steinschneider 1880a, 64. [The Arabic original of the Treatise on Resurrection was discovered and edited first by Joshua Finkel 1939, and most recently by I. Shailat, ed. Maimonides 1986.]

in a ms. (now Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. Add. Qu. 163)[428] which are preceded by the verse מאתך השר sent by al-Ḥarizi (according to his Diwan) from Spain to Maimonides.[429] Al-Ḥarizi begins his short foreword by saying that Maimonides had addressed the following letter (מגלה, for reasons of rhyme?) in Arabic to the (Jewish) communities and that the translator (whose name is not given here) has not rendered the contents clearly[430] – again the same criticism as in the foreword to the *Moreh*. – This translation was retranslated into Arabic, and al-Ḥarizi translated this Arabic version for Meir b. Sheshet ha-Nasi back into Hebrew.[431] After this comes a proemium by the Arabic translator Joseph b. Joel, a friend of Samuel, who had furnished him with the Hebrew translation. Joseph remarks that Hebrew is not sufficient for rendering Arabic writings, and therefore the translation is inevitably unclear. Thus, he says, he was asked to retranslate it into Arabic. The main principle of translation, generally accepted for quite some time, consists in rendering the simple meaning of the text by the appropriate words of the target language; if one is able to put it word for word, then one has risen to the summit of the art. Meaning is the main thing; wording is of secondary importance. What comes next makes us wonder whether we are hearing the Arabic translator, and he is the author of the versified foreword in Hebrew, or whether al-Ḥarizi himself here as well has translated the Arabic foreword. The examples, for their part, are in Hebrew. The word ענין (probably Arabic מעני) must be translated by ענין, כוונה, מעמד and דבר; and the word גוף (ג'סם?) by גשם, גויה (n. 323[c]), גרם, עצם and גוף. What perplexes us completely, however, is the fact that after this proemium there follows none other than the translation printed under Samuel's name, which is closer to his other works than to al-Ḥarizi's; thus the latter's was removed from his translation (or found separately?) and placed in front of Samuel's! A quotation in Naḥmanides could be taken from that translation, but it does not seem to be verbatim at all.[432]

[This confusion led Finkel 1939 to conclude that the story of the re-translation was a work of fiction; Baneth, however, argued that essentially it was correct, and that the passage by R. Joseph was itself translated from the Arabic by al-Ḥarizi as an introduction to his translation in Baneth 1940. In 1980 A. David discovered an unknown translation of the *Treatise on Resurrection* in Jerusalem, JNUL 3942 8°, ff. 1–13, and speculated that it was that of al-Ḥarizi 1978–79. Halkin substantiated the speculation and published the translation on the basis of the Jerusalem and Oxford manuscripts 1980.]

§249. Al-Ḥarizi's *Moreh* sometimes renders the meaning of certain passages more accurately than Samuel's (even where the latter followed more correct readings). Nonetheless, it did not escape the criticism of the friends and enemies of the book,[433]

[428] Neubauer 1881, 99; see the correction in Steinschneider 1881a, 134. ‹Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2785/5 contains al-Ḥarizi's translation of the *Treatise on Resurrection*.›

[429] See above, n. 414.

[430] העמיק העניין ולא סקל המסילה.

[431] ז"ל ששת. For whether this is the son of Sheshet b. Benveniste in Saragossa, see Steinschneider 1873g, 106.

[432] 14 ,דרשה, edition (Naḥmanides 1872), see 137; Naḥmanides 1962, II, 154. This passage is towards the beginning of the actual treatise, fol. 33 [3,4], corrupted in the edition of Maimonides 1761.

[433] See especially Steinschneider 20, 1875 קבוצת מכתבים.

nor was it entirely supplanted by its rival. Apparently it was read more extensively in northern Spain |432| where it is perhaps quoted by Naḥmanides. (See n. 438.) Abraham Maimonides (around 1235) already considered al-Ḥarizi's translation faulty and textually corrupt; we do not know whether this judgment was based on his own criticism or on hearsay.[434] Shem Tov Falaquera[435]criticizes it in a letter dated 1290 and printed anonymously; he[436] talks about both translations, without, however, naming either author. The first one (Tibbon's), he says, has only a few mistakes, and had the learned translator had more leisure, he would have corrected them[437]; the second translation (al-Ḥarizi's), however, contains numerous errors and even the correct parts do violence (to the text), often perverting the meaning into its opposite sense. The translator aimed to explain, but instead he "put a big stone on the bridge" (a play on words), "and I say that whoever receives this translation in his tent, harbors an injustice" (an allusion to Job 11:14).

A number of notes to the *Moreh*, up to part I, chapter 14, under the name of the mystic Joseph Gikatilia (read Chiquitilla) were edited in 1574. They correct, right at the beginning and in fol. 20, line 2, al-Ḥarizi's translation, on the basis of the Arabic text[438]; fol. 22 has the following passage: "The poor man had no clear eye in the science, he thrust himself forward to a place flaming with fire which was not seemly for him."

Al-Ḥarizi's translation was still studied in the fifteenth century by Asher Crescas[439]; but the supposition that Isaac Abravanel took his paraphrased texts from this translation has proven to be erroneous.[440]

A critical assessment of the editions of both translations will arrive at the same judgment as that of Pococke, who summarizes his verdict in few words[441]: "Versio (Harizii) illi ab Aben Tibbon factae postposita fuit, non quod illa Tibbonidae elegantior, sed materiae congruentior fuerit," etc.

§250. (The old Latin translation) Al-Ḥarizi's translation has a historical significance which escaped even Munk, who does not even mention it in the foreword to his *Guide*, although he quotes from it repeatedly in his notes.

Agostino Giustiniani edited (1520) a Latin translation under the title *Dux neutrorum sive dubiorum* (the title page has *Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum*)

---

[434] מלחמות (Maimonides 1859), 9; see Dukes 1845, 616. Perhaps only according to Samuel's criticism?

[435] Geiger 1839a, 416; Steinschneider 1852, 1897; namely, 151, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158; fol. 257 והמעתיק כן הוא פתי, a play on words

[436] 185, Abba Mari 1838 מנחת קנאות. Cf. Steinschneider 1852, 2548.

[437] As in מורה המורה (Falaquera 1837), 155 [= Shiffman, ed. Falaquera 2001], 358–59; see n. 374 above.

[438] Steinschneider 1852, 1463 and Additamenta; cf. Dukes 1845, 616. Steinschneider 1852, 1461 concerning his citation from Naḥmanides.

[439] Commentary on the *Moreh* fols. 3b, 7a, 9b (Ed. Sabbioneta 1553) on I, 37, 38, 47, 48, 52 (וראיתי במורה ר"י חריזי fol. 33b), II, 29, III, 43, 51; not all, according to the page numbers of the Jesnitz edition, Maimonides 1742, found in Straschun 1841–42, 88.

[440] See Landau on Abravanel's commentary on the *Moreh* in Abravanel 1574, II, 32 fol. 21b. The text is closer to Samuel; Scheyer in Kirchheim 1846, 511 on I, 21; see opposing this Scheyer on al-Ḥarizi (Maimonides 1851–79), I, 23.

[441] Preface to *Porta Mosis,* Maimonides 1654, cited in Wolf 1715, I, 856.

1520;[442] this work has been attributed to the editor himself or to Jacob Mantinus. Certain quotations from the *Guide* in some Christian authors of the thirteenth century show, however, that already in that time a Latin translation existed.[443] I have demonstrated that traces can be found as early as the middle of the thirteenth century in southern Italy. |433| Moses b. Solomon of Salerno[444] composed, probably between 1240 and 1250, a commentary to the *Moreh* which he reworked, but did not complete. [According to Caterina Rigo, Moses wrote the commentary in the 1270s.] Only a part of the second recension is known to exist, with notes by his son Isaiah[445] in the manuscripts.[446]

Cambridge, UL Add. 672; Florence, BM-L. Ms. Plut.II.11; ‹London, BD and BM 40/5›; ‹Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 370›; ‹Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 60/1›; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 576; Paris, BN héb 687; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2435; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2910; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3162; St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 482.

The author of the commentary had received in the course of his work, perhaps between the first and the second recension, the glossary of the translator Samuel, which he labels "Introduction," פתיחה or הקדמה. His commentary is in the main a paraphrase with explanations or translations of single words into the vernacular (i.e., Italian). However, he read the Latin translation together with Nicolao da Giovenazzo, probably Nicolo Paglia, Nobile di Giovenazzo, the founder of the Dominican monastery Santa Croce in Trani.[447] [See Sermoneta 1969–70.] On the other hand, we have a report concerning a remark of the Emperor Frederick II on a passage in the *Moreh*.[448] The person to whom this remark was addressed was, according to some manuscripts, none other than al-Ḥarizi. The place where this occurred is also named, perhaps Tropea in Calabria. I do not, however, believe that al-Ḥarizi visited this province in the course of his travels. Other sources name Samuel Ibn Tibbon, that is to say, one translator instead of the other. My surmise[449] is that this translation was commissioned by this same Emperor, for whom Jacob Anatoli translated other works in Naples (§19); and Amari agrees that this is rather plausible.[450] Finally, Perles who studied one manuscript of the Latin translation in Munich, showed that it follows the Hebrew translation of al-Ḥarizi, but in consultation, according to him, with the Arabic text and with the cooperation of a learned Jew.[451]

---

[442] Concerning Justinian see Perles, Maimonides 1875, 3; cf. Steinschneider 1852, n. 1564.

[443] Steinschneider 1852, 1896 and Additamenta, according to Wolf, etc.

[444] Wolf 1715 [1.3] no. 1654, where ממסילתו [rather than מסלרנו] ; De Rossi 1839, 283: Salera; Steinschneider 1852, 1995 under 6555; Firkovitch 1863, 46, 80; Steinschneider 1864e, 64; 1867b, 76; 1884, 24; Perles (see n. 451); Steinschneider, 86; 1877c, 68. Güdemann 1880, II, 170. Not to be confused with Moses b. Solomon from Salonica; see above §48, n. 44 and §87, n. 481.

[445] For a note on this person, see Steinschneider 1875a, 88.

[446] See Steinschneider 1884, l. c.

[447] See Steinschneider 1877b, 68, 68.

[448] See Steinschneider 1864e, 62, 136. 1878a, 136; 1879d, 118; 1880f, 24 and VI. 1884, 25.

[449] Steinschneider 1863c, 31 etc.

[450] Amari 1854, III, 696, 705–8.

[451] Perles 1875 (extract from *Monatsschrift* XXIV 1875); on this see Steinschneider 1875, 86.

Moses b. Solomon of Salerno, Commentary on the *Guide of the Perplexed*

Cambridge, University Library Add. 672 (SCR 701) (IMHM F 17001), 1–139.
Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurentiana Plut.II.11 (IMHM F 17658), 1–132.
London, Beth Din & Beth Hamidrash 40 (IMHM F 4708).
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 60 (IMHM F 1140), 1–329.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 370 (IMHM F 1606), 1–296.
Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Opp. 576 (Ms. Opp. 1163) (Neubauer 1261/1) (IMHM F 22075G), 1a–313b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 687 (ancien fonds 234) (IMHM F 11565), 1–187.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2435 (De Rossi 1369) (IMHM F 13439), 1–195.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2910 (De Rossi 1071) (IMHM F 13803), 1–49.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 3162 (De Rossi 106) (IMHM F 13902), 1–222.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 482 (IMHM F 51349), 1–181.

The extant manuscripts of the Latin *Moreh* have not been investigated sufficiently;[452] perhaps they contain information that is as yet unknown. The translator allowed himself to omit passages that he deemed unimportant, but he also added some comments of his own.[453] For particulars and some extracts which are proof of the inadequacy of the edition, we must refer the reader to the useful article of Perles. Wolf (3rd ed., 782) has already compared the two Latin translations of the introduction. He has called attention (779) to the titles *Directio* and *Director neutrorum, Directio Perplexorum,* und *Demonstrator errantium* which we find in the writings of Raymund Martin (a contemporary of Albertus Magnus), and the baptized Jews Paulus Burgensis and Alfonsus de Spina. Perles remarks that Raymund partly follows the translation of al-Ḥarizi.[454] Thus it was primarily through this translation that the learned Christian world |434| was first acquainted with the philosophy of "Moses Egyptius," and not unprofitably, as M. Joel in his treatise on the connections between Maimonides and Albertus Magnus has shown (Joël 1863).[455]

[Scholarship on the Latin *Guide* has proceeded apace in the last century. The scholarly consensus is that there are three independent translations of at least parts of the *Guide*: *De parabola* (*Guide* 3.29–30, 32–49) (completed 1222–23), *De uno deo benedicto* (Guide 2.1–2), considered by Kluxen 1954 to be completed around 1240, and *Dux neutrorum sive dubiorum*, also from around 1240. In addition, there apparently was a fourth translation, based on the Ibn Tibbon translation, to which Giles of Rome refers, but which is no longer extant. The Perles-Steinschneider-Sermoneta hypothesis, that the Latin translation of the *Guide* was made in southern Italy, perhaps as the result of Jewish and Christian scholars working in tandem, was challenged by Kluxen 1954, who argued for a Provençal location and who connected the translation with the Dominican involvement in the Maimonidean controversy in the late 1230s. This hypothesis was argued against by Gad Freudenthal 1988, 120–29. Schwartz 2002, 46, speculates that the fourth translation originated from southern Italy.

[452] Cambridge Lat. Ms. 1711 is given in Steinschneider 1877b.

[453] Perles (Maimonides 1875), 22.

[454] Maimonides 1875, Anmerkungen, 1, 2.

[455] Joel 1863. See *Hebräische Bibliographie* V, 131. [This appears to be an erroneous reference.].

Recently G. Hasselhof has questioned the attribution of *De Parabola* to Maimonides; rather he considers it an "adoption of Maimonides into a different context," 2001, 262. He does not appear inclined to accept the southern Italian provenance of the translation and concludes that an analysis of the manuscript tradition, of the sort first proposed by Steinschneider, leaves the question of provenance open. See also Hasselhof 2002.]

We think that we should conclude this long entry on the most important Jewish-Arabic work by indicating a few recent publications (apart from those by Munk and Friedlaender already named) that analyze the *Moreh*, or explain the Maimonidean philosophy basing themselves mainly on the *Moreh*, or treat a particular problem in it.

[Steinschneider proceeds to list works on Maimonides and his influence by Scheyer 1845, Joël 1859b, Foucher de Careil 1861, Rubin 1868, Eisler 1870–83, Kaufmann 1877a, Münz 1887,[456] Holub 1884, the latter of which he knows only by the German title.

Needless to say, an enormous amount of literature on Maimonides has appeared in print since 1893. Specialized bibliographies on a number of topics have been prepared by Jacob Dienstag. For a partial listing of studies through 1964, one can consult sections on Maimonides in the English translation of Guttmann's *Die Philosophie des Judenthums* 1964, 405–7. In the second part of Vajda's important annotated bibliography of studies in medieval Jewish philosophy from 1950 to, 1973 Vajda 1972, 1974, Maimonidean studies are discussed on 206–22. Other bibliographies help to bring the field up-to-date: Lachterman 1990 (English studies from 1950–1986); Bitya Ben-Shammai 1991 (Hebrew studies from 1965 to 1990); and Kellner 2004 (English studies from 1991 to 2004). There is also a very extensive bibliography – as well as a detailed discussion of the translation and transmission – in Schwartz 2002, available online at http://press.tau.ac.il/perplexed/].

§251. 2. *Logical Terminology*. Maimonides wrote, certainly in his youth, perhaps still in Spain (before 1160, earlier, that is, than his 15th year), an explication of the terms employed in logic, obliging the wish of a noble theologian who was well versed in Arabic. The treatise contained fourteen chapters, and at their end the explicated terms are enumerated.[457] No complete manuscript of the Arabic original is known to exist. Paris, BN héb 1202/5 (in Hebrew letters) contains only chapters 1–7 under the title מקאלה פי צנאעה אלמנטק, Treatise on the Art of Logic. I discovered chapters 7 and 8 and a fragment of chapter 11 in a book, Bodl. Hunt. 593 (Hebrew letters). Some ⌊435⌋ passages of it are published.[457b] [These fragments were taken from the binding of Bodl. Hunt. 593 and now are in Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Hunt. 632. They were

[456] See also Münz 1887, cf. 203), a popular work. Graetz 1875 VI, 363 ff. – Cf. also Steinschneider 1877c, 355. – The history of the *Moreh* in the struggle concerning the legitimacy of philosophy does not belong here; an interesting note is found in Neubauer 1886, n. 2240, 774; cf. Steinschneider 1857a, 373, on 295. J. H. Weiss discusses Maimonides as a law teacher in his biography 1881; see below Part IV.

[457] For general comments see Steinschneider 1852, 1891 ff and Additamenta on Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 307/6. Reifmann 1884, 17 contests the attribution and emends on the basis of conjecture. Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 388 has Latin terms for chs. 1–5. – With respect to Turin, BN 245 A VII 33 (מלאכ' ההג') [, no longer extant,] see Peyron 1880, 262, where one still has מלות ההגיון [בטקסט "קצר", חבור קצת "argumenta singulorum capitum logicae Maim." Are these the footnotes? See below 681. Pasini 1749, no. CLIX, supplies "Almagest."

[457b] Baer Goldberg 1861, 46; 1862, 62; see Pinsker 1862, 152.

catalogued by Neubauer as Bodl. Opp. Add. Qu. 151. According to B. Richler 1987, the Oxford pages were separated from the manuscript now at Paris. The fragments were published by I. Efros in 1938 as part of his edition of the work 1937–38. Later, M. Türker discovered two complete manuscripts of the work, written in Arabic letters, in Ankara and in Istanbul, and published the text twice Türker 1959–60b, 1961. Efros 1937–38 then published a complete critical edition of the Arabic text, in Hebrew characters, based on Türker's readings and the Paris and Oxford excerpts.

Recently, Herbert A. Davidson has questioned the attribution of the work to Maimonides in Davidson 2001, 118–25, and Davidson 2005, 313–322. As Davidson points out, the first to do so was J. Reifmann; see n. 447.]

The Hebrew translation under the title of מלות ההגיון or ביאור (פירוש) is extant in many manuscripts; there are no less than ten in Paris alone. Some manuscripts bear the abbreviated title הגיון (logic), and even הגיון קצר (concise logic). The printed catalogues have not correctly identified the copies of our treatise that are found in Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2445/2 and Paris, BN héb 1005/3 (הגיון אחר קצר) [a copy of which appears in Paris, AIU 432].[458] Most manuscripts, as well as the numerous editions since 1552, do not name the translator. Some manuscripts end with an epigraph saying that Moses Ibn Tibbon translated the book in Kislev 5015 (Nov. 14–Dec. 13, 1254), from a faulty and deficient manuscript of the original, a statement which we know already to be merely an empty phrase.

[In addition to the translation by Moses Ibn Tibbon, there is one by Aḥituv, a thirteenth-century Jewish physician in Palermo, and one by Joseph Ibn Vivas or Joseph Lorki (see below). The Aḥituv translation was first edited by M. Chamizer 1912, but later corrected on the basis of more material by Efros, who published an edition of the Arabic text (then extant), the three medieval Hebrew translations, and an English translation in 1937–38. Langermann 1995, 381, noted another copy of the Aḥituv translation (incomplete) in Moscow, RSL Günz. 1020/4. Efros based his edition of the Ibn Tibbon translation on the first editions and on eight mss; there are close to eighty manuscripts of this translation, most of which have not been studied, not to mention marginal glosses on other manuscripts. The version of Ibn Vivas is extant in Paris, BN héb 1201/4].

Mss. of Hebrew translations of Maimonides' *Treatise on the Art of Logic* other than by Moses Ibn Tibbon

Trans. Ibn Vives
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 1201 (IMHM F 31369), 63a–75b.

Trans. Aḥituv ha-Rofe
Moscow, Russian State Library Ms. Guenzburg 1020 (IMHM F 48110), 25b–8b.

[458] I know it from the communications of Perreau (1882) and Neubauer. – הגיון קצר in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 307/6 and Hamburg, SUB Ms. Cod. hebr. 292b – הגיון רשב"ץ in Solomon Dubno's handwritten catalogue (Amst Ub ms. Rosenthal 469; see Additamenta to Steinschneider 1852, 1893). Paris, BN héb 1005/3 ends (ch. 13) הנדיב במתנותיו, the last two words are missing in the edition. Slutzki (Saadia ben Joseph 1864), fol. 62b has הנדיבים. – St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 419, according to the catalogue anonymous [Identified in the IMHM catalogue as the Aḥituv translation] fragments of 4 pages, runs as follows in ch. 4: כל שתי גזירות שהנושא (!) שלהן אחר בעצמו אלא שאחת משתינן כוללת והאחרת מחייבת; ch. 9 סבות כל הנמצאות; or is this the composition of Joseph Lorki? See n. 466.

New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America JTSA 2278 (IMHM F 28531), 16 fols.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr I 419 (IMHM F 52721), 4 folios.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica BAV 349 (IMHM F 380), 2a–17a.]

Sebastian Münster edited (Basle 1527) a bad text[459] under the title ס' ההגיון (!) with a Latin translation which, according to Richard Simon (1638–1721), does not contain one single passage that is correct. Richard Simon falsely attributed the translation to *Samuel* Ibn Tibbon.

The first editions are already accompanied by two anonymous commentaries whose date I have not investigated. Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 289/1. See above, §18 [where Steinschneider, following Neubauer, misattributes this commentary on Averroes' *Epitome of Logic* to Narboni, rather than to Mordecai Nathan. For Moses Narboni's commentary on the *Millot ha-Higgayon*, see Hayoun 1983], and the end of §36, where a commentary found in Paris, BN héb 1061/11 may be attributed to Albo. In the fifteenth century the learned Mordechai Khomatiano (or: Komatiano/Comtino) composed in Turkey a commentary according to the wish of his student Isaac Ẓarfati whom he addresses with the same words as does Maimonides in the *Moreh*. This Isaac Ẓarfati is probably the author of a letter, published in print.[460] Khomatiano's commentary is extant in several manuscripts,[461] among others in Paris BN héb 681 where in the end an alphabetic register of the terms that have been discussed is appended. The catalogue attributes this to Khomatiano; however, it does not figure in the manuscripts that have been studied nor in the edition by D. Slutzki (Warsaw 1865). Khomatiano, a famous mathematician, was well versed in logic.

Frankfurt, SUB oct. 55; Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4794/10; Moscow, RSL Günz. 469/1; New York, JTS Ms. 2407/7; New York, JTS Ms. 2875/4; New York, JTS Ms. 3409/8; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 214; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 519; Paris, BN héb 681/4; Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2446/4.

Since this small treatise had already become famous by virtue of its author and, in addition, it was adequately congruent with the principal rules of logic (which, among the Jewish scholars of the North, had been supplanted by the degenerate method of Talmudic studies), Moses Mendelssohn composed a Hebrew commentary. In his introduction he recommends the study of Aristotelian logic and justifies it by referring to Maimonides. The first two printings of this commentary (1761 and 1765) do not display the name of the author; it has been frequently reprinted ever since.[462] M. S. Neumann published a German translation. Another one, with a register of terms (actually by R. Fürstenthal?), was issued by Heilberg in 1828; the translation of W. Heidenheim remains unpublished (manuscript Bodl. Mich. 83). P. Heilprin published (1846) a text, allegedly based upon the rules of textual criticism, but which is in fact abysmal. |436| [The standard edition of Mendelssohn's commentary was edited by H. Borodianski in volume 14 of the Jubilaeumsausgabe of the *Gesammelte*

[459] This tallies with the variants in Geiger 1837a, 435.

[460] See the citations in Steinschneider 1858, 262. Levy 1859, 32; Berliner 1869a, 178. Concerning Graetz 1875, VIII, 447, see Steinschneider 1873g, 108 note; Fürst 1862, II, 301 n. 5.

[461] Steinschneider 1858, 263.

[462] For publications see Zedner 1867, 581; Rosenthal 1875, 863; Benjacob 1880, 332 n. 1292 ff.

Schriften 1929, [23]–119. J. Dienstag published a comprehensive bibliography of editions (28), translations (several into German, one into Italian, Russian, French, and English), commentaries, and studies on the *Logical Terms* in Dienstag 1960.]

The terminology of this small treatise has come to dominate in the Hebrew literature. Thus it achieved in Hebrew letters the goal that had been the original purpose of the Arabic writings. It has often been confused with the logical compendium of Averroes (§17).

Paris, BN héb 1201/4 contains our treatise, translated from Arabic, according to the title, by Joseph b. Joshua Ibn Vives from Lorca, or Joseph Lorki.[463] This translation is dedicated to Ezra b. Solomon Gatigno (or Gatinho), a well-known writer who lived in Saragossa and Agremont (1356–72)[464] and refers elsewhere to his late teacher Joseph Ibn Vives, certainly our translator.[465] According to Simonsen,[466] however, Joseph's work is not a new translation, but a transcript amended by him, if not simply a text plagiarized from Moses Tibbon – which is surprising since Tibbon's translation should have been already well-known at that time. If used cautiously, the manuscript might serve to amend the existing editions. Is there any relation between this recension and the one published by Münster? [Efros 1937–38, 10, calls Simonsen's judgment "unfair"; according to him, while the author did have the Ibn Tibbon text at his disposal he translated directly from the Arabic. There are close to a hundred mss. of the Hebrew translations of Maimonides' treatise on logic, the vast majority of them by Moses Ibn Tibbon. As for the others,

Mss. of Mordecai Khomatiano's commentary on Maimonides' *Treatise on Logic*

Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek oct. 55 (Merzbacher 13) (Carmoly 227) (IMHM F 34036), 1–18.

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4794 (Warner 56) (IMHM F 27912), 251a–66b.

Russian State Library Ms. Günzberg 469 (IMHM F 43040), 1a–64a.

New York, Jewish Theological Seminary 2407 (IMHM F 28660), 85b–95b.

New York, Jewish Theological Seminary 2875/4 (IMHM F 31713), 192a–220b.

New York, Jewish Theological Seminary 3409/8 (ENA 2771) (IMHM F 32094), 192a–220b.

Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Mich. 214 (Ms. Mich. 81) (Neubauer 2187/3) (IMHM F 20469), 129a–68b.

Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Opp. 519 (Ms. Opp. 1026) (Neubauer 1911/8) (IMHM F 18844), 209a–28b.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 681 (ancien fonds 223) (IMHM F 11559), 104b–49b.

Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2446t (De Rossi 556) (IMHM F 13450), 90a–130a.

---

[463] See Dukes 1848c, 358; Dukes 1848c, 454; Steinschneider 1852, 1504, 1892. For a younger Joseph Lorki see §433?

[464] He wrote the Arabic compendium of Averroes in 1356, Paris, BN héb 1008/1.

[465] For the copyist Joseph b. Isaiah (b. Joseph) Messene, see above n. 396b.

[466] Simonsen 1878 68; cf. Steinschneider 1879d, 94 n. 3; see n. 458.

§252. 3. Treatise on Unity.[467] No copy of the Arabic original of this small theological and ethical compendium in three chapters, followed by a chapter addressed to a friend,[468] is known. [Langermann recently found a fragment of the Arabic original in New York, JTS Ms. 9069/4, 19b, and published it as an appendix to 1996c.] But for those who make their judgment only after they have studied the matter there is not the least reason to doubt the authenticity of this treatise in which the author refers to his *Moreh*.[469] It is already quoted by the Hebrew title of מאמר היחוד (perhaps it carried no Arabic title, which would have been something like מקאלה פי תוחיד) by the translator of the Mishna commentary (Ord. II [= Seder Mo'ed], around 1287).[470] It contains an outline of the fundamental philosophical ideas upon which Maimonides had expounded in Hebrew in the first two books of his great Talmudic work. The passages quoted from the Holy Scripture were paraphrased in Arabic in the original, but the Hebrew translator Isaac b. Nathan (middle of the fourteenth century) (§192) did not restore the [original] texts. Instead, he translated the Arabic quotations literally, a fact that was expressly noted by one copyist.[471] This title is signalled in:

Hamburg, SUB Ms. Cod. hebr. 310b; Mantua, CI Ms. ebr. 78b; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 150/1 (with better readings)[472]; New York, JTS Ms. 2274/6; New York, JTS Ms. 2274/6; New York, JTS Ms. 2407/7; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 491b (an 1840 copy of Hamburg, SUB Ms. Cod. hebr. 310b); St. Petersburg, RNL Ms. Evr. I 357; Vatican, BA Cod. ebr. 170/3 (without the Supplement); Vatican, BA Cod. ebr. 171/13.

I have edited the small treatise, first on the basis of a copy in Hamburg made by Dukes (issued in Berlin in only a few copies in 1846), and again in Maimonides 1847, together with a small treatise of Abraham Ibn Ezra, under the title שני המאורות (*The Two Lights*). The text is accompanied by Hebrew notes which cast light upon the style and some other details as well, and by a study in German. It is preceded by a letter of S. L. Rapoport who (erroneously) |437| supposes this treatise to be identical with a pseudepigraphal work (ס' הנמצא) [472b]

The translator has retained some Arabic words from the original: p. 37 אלכ'יאר (ms. for הקישואים), אלכמאה׳ ואלפקע and אלמורי ואלת'מר (ms. for אלמה ותמרים); he translates אלמלא׳ by המלוא (p. 36)[473] and seems to have translated חכים twice (18, 31) erroneously by רופא. The small treatise is full of syntactical Arabisms. For a number of passages, however, where the edition presents us with readings which can hardly be called Hebrew, the Munich manuscript removes all difficulties. [Some select

[467] Steinschneider 1852, 1916 and Additamenta to Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 150/1 1875b.

[468] Not recognized by Geiger (1857a, 100), to the catalogue Paris, BN héb 273/3 (The Index of Zotenberg 1866, 256, provides the wrong number.) [The index refers to Nine Chapters on Unity attributed to Maimonides. Vajda 1950 argued against that attribution.]

[469] Graetz 1875, VI, 461, speaks about it without any knowledge.

[470] A. Börnstein in העבור, Ibn Ezra 1874, 9 n. 12.

[471] Vatican, BA Cod. ebr. 170/3, בזמרת לשונם (Rapoport 1885, 8) should read בשמירת?

[472] For readings see endnote; for 16 ,והסדור . . . וההדרגה last line, the ms. has והמדרגה; see however §146 n. 1179.

[472b] Maimonides 1847, 8 (Hebrew). [No note is provided by Steinschneider.]

[473] Steinschneider 1883a, 144.

quotations and a discussion of the translation are available now in the study of Langermann 1996c. Throughout his long career, Steinschneider never flinched from his firm belief in the authenticity of this treatise, despite the doubts expressed by Graetz; nevertheless, the scholarly consensus is to regard the *Treatise on Unity* as a pseudepigraph. Langermann's article reopens the question.]

Mss. of the *Treatise on Unity* attributed to Maimonides

Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 310 (Hamburg 256/2) (IMHM F 1095), 38a–48a.
Mantua Comunita Israelitica Ms. ebr. 78 (IMHM F 864), 85a–90a.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 150 (IMHM F 1168), 1–15.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 2274 (IMHM F 28527).
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary 2407 (IMHM F 28660), 85b–95b.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Mich. 491 (Mich. 575) (Neubauer 1317/2) (IMHM F 22131), 23a–31a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 357 (IMHM F 50948), 6 fols.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Cod. Vat. ebr. 170 (IMHM F 232), 116a–22a.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Cod. Vat. ebr. 171 (IMHM F 8630), 79a–88a.]

§253. 4. A small Arabic treatise on felicity, in two chapters, is found in Paris, BN héb 719/4, according to the catalogue; it appears to be only a fragment of a more comprehensive work. As far as I know, nobody has studied this ms. which is not noted in Steinschneider 1852 either (col. 1917).

This treatise was translated into Hebrew (by whom, when?) and printed under the title פרקים בהצלחה (Chapters on Felicity) in 1567. Mordechai Tama included it under the inaccurate title פרקים בהצלחה in the collection of legal opinions, translated by him from Arabic in 1765,[474] which led to the belief that Tama himself was the translator.

[A manuscript of the Hebrew translation was identified by Fritz Baer in a codex then at Pamplona, now New York, JTS Ms. 2341/11. Along with the copy of the Judaeo-Arabic original at Paris, it served as the basis of the doctoral dissertation of H. S. Davidowitz. D. H. Baneth considerably revised this thesis for publication, and the two texts were later published in facing columns under their joint authorship, along with an introduction and notes (Maimonides 1939). The Hebrew translator is named as "R. Zeraḥiah ha-Levi" and, after deliberating the various alternatives, Davidowitz (xxvii–xxx) leans towards identifying him with Zerahia ben She'altiel Ḥen; the main difficulty remains the appellation ha-Levi, which is not added to She'altiel Ḥen's name anywhere else. A late copy (1781) of the Hebrew translation is London, London School of Jewish Studies 20.]

The author talks about his *Moreh* and addresses his student (according to S. Rapoport, Joseph Ibn ʿAqnin).[475] From this one may infer that this little treatise was meant to be a kind of appendix to the *Moreh*. There is nothing in it that proves the attribution to be false. The mystical shade which lies over this rather theological, at some points rhetorical, analysis does not directly contradict Maimonides' spirit.

[474] See קובץ תשובות Maimonides 1765 II, 32.

[475] Graetz 1875, VI, 461 "allegedly to Joseph"!

This treatise (מאמר אחד קצר שחבר) is quoted already in the middle of the fourteenth century by Joseph b. Elazar (explaining Genesis 5:34) and somewhat later (as אגרת ההצלחה) by Don Benveniste b. Labi in a letter, so far unpublished.[476]

[Steinschneider's claim that the treatise is authentic was strongly supported by W. Bacher 1896. In support of the authenticity of this writing, Bacher (279, n. 6) even cites a parallel from *Ma'mar ha-Yiḥud*, another tract that Steinschneider alone viewed as authentic! Davidowitz in Maimonides 1939, however, mustered a long series of philological and other arguments (xiv–xxii) against the attribution to Maimonides, and since his publication, the scholarly consensus is that the tract is a forgery. For further bibliography see Dienstag 1986.]

§254. 5. *The Eight Chapters*. Maimonides wrote a commentary in Arabic to the entire Mishnah. The treatise Abot (a compilation of ethical sayings) is preceded by an introduction [in eight chapters] on the soul, its faculties and their use for the attainment of a goal. This introduction was called "Eight Chapters" (שמונה פרקים), after their number.

It was, together with other parts of that commentary, edited in Arabic (with Hebrew letters) and in Latin in *Porta Mosis* by Edward Pococke (Maimonides 1654), and recently with German translation and notes, by M. Wolff (Maimonides 1863, title only with Arabic letters). Numerous corrections were made with the help of H. L. Fleischer.

The commentary to Avot was translated into Hebrew by Samuel Ibn Tibbon. His translation found a place in the Italian prayer book (Maimonides 1484), and again, in a separate printing, small quarto,[477] in |438| the Greek prayer book (Romagna, around 1523 (Maimonides 1523), in an edition of the whole commentary to the Mishna and, finally, in all editions of the Talmud and the Mishna with the commentary of Maimonides.[478] C. C. Uythage translated the commentary to Abot (Maimonides 1683) into Latin; a translation by Jacob Mantinus remains unedited; and there are several German translations from Hebrew of which we name only that by Gotthold Salomon (in Maimonides 1809). Samuel's preface is extant only in part, in two different recensions. According to one of them, Samuel was asked by scholars of his hometown Lünel to translate this commentary, just as they had asked him to translate the *Moreh*. The date of the translation is given only in Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2303/6, which is Tebet 963 (Tebet 1 = Nov. 28, 1202). The eulogy of the

[476] אם לא שתפשר אותם המאמרים כאשר תאוה נפשך ותשים אותם לכל אשר תחפוץ ותתחזק להוציא מהם צורות לא כיון בהם אומרם, ולא [ב]אגרת אחת באגרותיו כתב דברים סותרים דבריך, כי זה במקומות רבים מחבוריו,מהם מהלכות ע"ז ופ"ב מה' תשובה ובפתיחת פ' המשנה ובפרקים אשר הקדים לפ' מס' אבות ובאגרת ההצלחה, Vienna, ÖN Cod. hebr. 72 (Steinschneider 1863d, 14; cf. Steinschneider 1875f, 59), NY JTS Ms. 10762, Oxford – Bodleian Library ms. Opp. Oct. 26, NY JTS Ms. 10762, fol. 10; in London, Mon. 371, fol. 250, ההלצה for ההצלחה.

[477] Steinschneider 1852, 228 n. 1433 with unvocalized text, first one white page, then signature א – ו, 48 pages; small 4^0; read דינין for הדינין in De Rossi 1775, 131. In addition, the British Library possesses an unknown (Zedner 1867, 814?) special printing from the Maḥzor ed. 1485 in gr. 4^0, 23 pages, the beginning without the signature ד יג of the Maḥzor. The cast iron decoration of משה fol. 7b has sprung off on the right.

[478] Steinschneider 1852, nos. 1890 and 2483; Zedner 1867; Rosenthal 1875, 870; Benjacob and Steinschneider 1880, 458 n. 101, 592, n. 828.

deceased appended to the name of Maimonides (he died in December 1204) may have been added at a later date.[479]

[Two translations into modern Hebrew may be mentioned: that of Y. Qafih Maimonides 1962, as part of his edition and translation of the entire commentary to the Mishna; and that of Y. Shailat, *Masekhet Abot* (Maimonides 1994). For an English translation and study, see Joseph I. Gorfinkle 1912; a more recent translation is by Charles Butterworth and Raymond Weiss in Maimonides 1983.] Translations of the remainder of Maimonides' Commentary to the *Mishna*, including the introduction to the chapter called *Ḥeleq* (which is where he enunciates his famous creed of thirteen principles), as well the *Letter to Yemen* and the *Letter on Apostasy*, both of which contain some philosophy, are deferred to paragraph §554, along with the *Book of Commandments* and some miscellaneous correspondence.

§255. Saadia (Gaon) b. Josef from Fayyum (Pithom). [A full accounting of Saadia's literary output, outdated in places but unsurpassed in scope or quality, is available in the book of Steinschneider's student, Henry Malter, *Saadia Gaon, His Life and Works* 1921.] His Arabic name, as it is cited by al-Masʿūdī, was Saʿid Ibn Yaʿqūb al-Fayyūmī. Head of the rabbinical school in Sura near Baghdad (died 941/2),[480] he owed his appointment probably to the renown which he had acquired in Egypt for the scope of his learning as well as his opposition to the Karaites. He was knowledgeable not only in the sciences of his community, but also in those practiced by the Arabs. Abraham Ibn Ezra calls him "the premier speaker on all subjects." In fact, among the Jews he is the first author who is well-versed in the different branches of literature. *Inter alia*, he translated into Arabic and commented upon the entire Old Testament. His commentaries indulge in long digressions, inflated by polemics, on different scholarly subjects; but to our regret they are almost completely lost. [Scholars have debated and continue to debate the question whether Saadia commented upon the entire Torah. In any event, significant portions of his commentaries to Genesis and Exodus have been identified and published: the former by Zucker in Saadia 1984, the latter by Ratzaby in Saadia 1998. Small portions of a Hebrew translation of his commentary to Genesis have been identified in Judah Barceloni's Commentary to *Sefer Yezira*; see Malter 1921, item *c*; another passage was recently identified by Y. Tzvi Langermann in a thirteenth-century text; see his note in 2004.]

We limit our discussion here to only two of his works. The first, written in Egypt, soon met with criticism in his fatherland. Two or three centuries later, however, the first Hebrew translation was replaced by a compilation of a quite different character, printed under his name. The second work marks for us an epochal event in Jewish philosophy; hence we place it first in our entry, but only after this remark: After Maimonides, Jewish philosophy in the East did not rise above the basic doctrines of the mutakallimūn. In fact, we observe that Saadia, building his arguments first from the senses, secondly, from reason, and lastly, from

[479] Steinschneider 1852, 2493. Baneth 1879, 170, 237.

[480] Sources: Steinschneider 1852, 2155 and Additamenta. What publications on his separate writings have meanwhile appeared have not been taken into regard. The dissertation by Taubeles 1888 is not available to me. Moses Taku in his *Keter Tamim* 1860, 69, knows about the imprisonment lasting 13 years.

revelation, just as the mutakallimūn do in their theorizing, goes quite astray, even as far as endorsing the notion of compensation of animals for undeserved pain.[481] It does not follow from this, though, that he should |439| have acknowledged all of the consequences of those doctrines. – Let us now turn to the works themselves:

1. כתאב אלאמאנאת ואלאעתקאדאת (Book of Religions and Dogmas),[482] in ten treatises, written in 933. The title is interpreted wrongly in the Hebrew translation. [Steinschneider gives the title in German as *Buch der Religionen und der Dogmen*. He makes it clear that this is the correct meaning, i.e., that Saadia's book treats of religions. All other modern scholars follow the understanding of the Hebrew translator: Munk, e.g., in his *Mélanges* 1859, has *Livre des croyances et des opinions*; Samuel Rosenblatt called his translation from the Arabic *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions* (Saadia ben Joseph 1948) and Alexander Altmann entitled his abridged edition, translated from the Arabic, *The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs* (Saadia ben Joseph 1946). Finally, Yosef Qafih, in his edition of the Judaeo-Arabic with facing modern Hebrew translatio n (Saadia ben Joseph 1970), points out that the full Arabic title is כתאב אלמכ'תאר פי אלאמאנאת ואלאעתקאדאת, *The Book of the Choicest Beliefs and Opinions*; his Hebrew title reflects this (ספר הנבחר באמונות ובדעות), though he gives the traditional title afterwards in parentheses.][483] Until recently, only one copy of the original was known, Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 148; however, the Petersburg library has just now acquired another manuscript of the Judaeo-Arabic text (Firk. 627, see the following paragraph). [There are currently only two fragments of the work in the Firkovich collection: St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab I 3038 and St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab I 3084. Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Or. 311 is yet another copy.] Joseph Gagnier published a specimen of the original, along with the Hebrew and his Latin translation (Oxford 1711), but even the Bodleian Library does not have a copy. S. Landauer (Saadia ben Joseph 1880b) edited the text on the basis of the two manuscripts, printing it in Arabic letters. Goldziher corrected a number of erroneous transcriptions and other mistakes,[484] stressing all the while the importance of the book for the history of Arabic philosophy.

§256. Saadia's book was translated into Hebrew by Judah Ibn Tibbon (in 1186, according to some manuscripts and the epigraph, missing in other editions, of the rare *editio princeps*, Constantinople 1562) without a translator's preface. The Amsterdam edition (Saadia ben Joseph 1648) adds nothing in the way of textual criticism and interpretation; it even repeats a switch of folia (77 and 78) of the first edition. A very bad edition, though arranged in chapters, with a double commentary full of mistakes by "Leo b. Jeminis" (I. L. Bensew, or Benseeb), was published in Berlin (Saadia ben Joseph 1789).[485] The Leipzig edition (Saadia ben Joseph 1859) purports

[481] Already Steinschneider 1841–1842, 332 and 1846a, 404, which is quoted in Kaufmann 1877a, 503. Cf. also Kaufmann 1877a, 3.

[482] Steinschneider 1852, 2172; 1883d 78; 1872d, 141, 1881g, 19.

[483] Steinschneider 1852, 2174; 1873f, 68, 1875e, 52; השחר IV, 490 ; הכרמל 1873 81; Harkavy 1878a, 104; Landauer (Saadia ben Joseph 1880b), Introduction 5.

[484] Goldziher 1881.

[485] See Loewe 1867 [and Malter 1921, 372–73].

to be a reprint of the *editio princeps*; it contains some notes by Adolph Jellinek, e.g., 23, and is not free from mistakes.[486] I do not have access to the Leipzig edition (Saadia ben Joseph 1864), part of Slutzki's series, accompanied by a short commentary that was continued by Y. Dynes (from p. 87) and an introduction that was omitted in the Cracow reprint (Saadia ben Joseph 1880a), along with the names of the commentators. – The German translation, or rather paraphrase, by Julius Fürst 1845, which omits the last book – appended only later, according to Landauer (p.xx) – is full of mistakes and does not deserve the trouble that has been taken in correcting some of them.[487]

Although the Hebrew translation gave occasion to leave some technical terms in their original Arabic, for instance, theological expressions whose precise meaning may have eluded the translator,[488] almost none are to be found. The word טפרה (Saadia ben Joseph 1859, I, 23) is accompanied by a literal translation which leaves the reader uncertain about the specific meaning.[489] We shall return to this translation. |440|

§257. (The anonymous paraphrase.) The character of another Hebrew translation, or rather paraphrase, already reveals itself in its title: פתרון ספר האמונות והרצב (פילוס) הבינות ממליצת מפענח צפונות.[490] It appears, however, that this translation underwent several redactions, especially with regard to some chapters or less philosophical sections, which were printed from the beginning of the sixteenth century onwards (for which we have to refer the reader to the bibliographical works).[491] These are extant in some manuscripts as well.[492] – This paraphrase has not been published in its entirety, nor have all of the manuscripts been studied:

Manuscripts: Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 599 (deficient). Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 42/3 (deficient in chapter 23; Bloch used a copy); an abbreviated preface in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 65/3; Paris, BN héb 669 (an abbreviated redaction, end deficient).[493] Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3018 (deficient, copy in Halberstam). Vatican, BAV Cod.

---

[486] Steinschneider 1881d, 19; Guttmann 1882, 28 alleges that the *editio prima* was not used at all.

[487] Roest 1877–78; cf. Landauer (Saadia ben Joseph 1880b), 152; on 89 an article "De inleiding … bijdragen," Amsterdam 1838 is quoted. – Fürst depends on Ben-Seëb (Saadia ben Joseph 1789); Bloch (Saadia ben Joseph 1879), 51; cf. Guttmann 1882, 28. On Treatise X cf. Guttmann, 258.

[488] Cf. Goldziher 1881.

[489] Cf. the quotations in Steinschneider 1862b, 143 and 1883d, 78.

[490] Steinschneider 1852, 2175 ff. and Additamenta; Zunz 1872, 4 ff. (1876 III, 231); Bloch 1870.

[491] Steinschneider 1852, 2178 ff, 2224. Jellinek possesses an edition of התחיה [the chapter on Resurrection, which was published separately as *Sefer ha-Teḥiyah ve-ha-Pedut*] (2179) in 12° without place and date, nine folia, a vignette in front. – Zedner 1867, 664 and 91 under Berechiah [Zedner has a question mark after the name]; hence Rosenthal 1875, 159, Benjacob 1880. s.v. 649 התחיה ,456 פדות.

[492] Steinschneider 1852; cf. Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 120/4 [The IMHM catalogue lists fifteen mss. of the "Ten Questions on Resurrection," in Arabic and in Hebrew.] Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 65/6 (ספר המצרף by Berachia) fol. 172. Could "Quaestio R. Elieser Wormat." (!) be de Rossi 286/9? [Actually, it is a copy of the *She'elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim* of R. Jacob ha-Levi he-Ḥasid of Marvège. On this work see Ta-Shma 1988.] – Zotenberg 1866, on Paris, BN héb 416/9, does not notice that "Ten Questions" is the unedited translation [from the *Emunot ve-De'ot*].

[493] Cf. Kaufmann 1883a, 233. The name Berachiah does, of course, not occur in the ms.

Vat. ebr. 266 and Vatican, BAV Cod. Vat. ebr. 269. Heidenheim 1 (where is it now? [In Jerusalem, JNUL Ms. Heb. 28⁰2132; Escorial, Escorial G-IV-6; fragments in Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 1265]).

None of the manuscripts names Berachiah ha-Naqdan (c. 1260, see §275) as the translator. One or two of his works, along with our book, are extant in Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2106. [None of the Parma manuscripts contains both the paraphrase and "one or two" works by Berachiah, but Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2106 contains Berachiah's philosophical treatise, which cites large portions of the paraphrase under consideration. See Gollancz 1902.] Rapoport's conjecture (in his biography of Saadia) that Berachiah paraphrased the Arabic original still will not go away, even after its origin and invalidity have both been demonstrated.[494] The Paris catalogue, speaking of Paris, BN héb 669, cites Berachiah as if his name appears in the manuscript.[495] Talk persists of Berachia's translation,[496] or of "Pseudo-Berachia". It has been suggested that we differentiate between two or even three authors bearing this name in order to distinguish the author of the paraphrase (which is in fact anonymous) from that of the fables etc. True, Berachiah does display some passages from our translation, but he does not present them as his own doing.[497]

We know nothing about the anonymous translator. The published extracts from the paraphrase give no clue as to its [geographical] origin, apart from its very particular literary style to which we shall return.[498]

The problem of the geographical origin of the paraphrase is connected with that of its date. Unfortunately those quotations which one could suppose to be the oldest occur in writings whose own dating is not yet established with certainty. I have found quotations in Jakob b. Reuben's anti-Christian work, which is dated 1170 and written probably in France; but this date has been called into question, and the doubts have not yet been resolved. In any case that work, especially its |441| final section, which contains the quotations, is not much younger.[499] Our translation was exploited in the composition of a hymn on God's unity found in the German liturgy; the identity of its author is uncertain.[500] A third witness is Isaac Naqdan, who knows

[494] Steinschneider 1852, l.c.; Steinschneider 1873b, 80 ff.

[495] Zunz 1872 has erroneously Samuel Tibbon.

[496] Cf. Steinschneider 1873b, 82; 1876c, 151; Kaufmann 1877a, 53, n. 101.

[497] Zunz 1872, 10. Steinschneider 1869d, 92; cf. 1873b, 82.

[498] Geiger 1850, 38, from Munich, Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 42/3 beginning I, 1 in Dukes 1848b, 554 from the Paris ms.; beginning VI in Creizenach 1840–1841 from the Heidenheim ms.; beginning VIII in Steinschneider 1852, 2180, from Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 599 – Bloch 1870, 401 from Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 42/3, and in his book (Saadia ben Joseph 1879), 6, 13, 17, 18, 21, 27, 30, 35, 36, 39, 44, 45, 54, 72, 86, 90, 92, 100; Nachträge II.

[499] Steinschneider 1873b, 84; Neubauer and Driver 1876, Preface (Hebrew), VIII, Joseph b. זבר is most probably Zabara. This person may however have written something as early as 1170.

[500] Cf. the quotations Steinschneider 1852, 504 and 2417; אנעים זמירות is by Judah he-Ḥasid (died 1216 in Regensburg), Zunz 1865, 298. – Bloch 1870, 456, makes the translator the author of the שיר הייחוד; c f. 654, where the arguments are very weak.

a number of philosophical terms taken from it. He probably lived in France,[501] perhaps in Germany, where this translation was known at least from the end of the twelfth century through the first half of the thirteenth. That is the period in which the latest author who quotes from it, Berachiah, lived in France.

Hence this translation probably originated in or near the Provence, since we do not know of any translation from the Arabic that was transmitted from Italy to Germany at that time. Spain is not a possibility, in our view, because the translation lacks a scholarly character. Moreover, its style is reminiscent of the liturgical poetry of the contemporary French and German ritual. As far as its character is concerned, this translation remained an isolated phenomenon. Its language had no influence, and it was almost unknown after the first half of the thirteenth century, even in Germany. There is no trace of it at all in Italy and Spain throughout the Middle Ages. It is the German Elijah Levita (sixteenth century) who probably saw it.[502] [These and other questions connected with the anonymous paraphrase were taken up in Kiener 1986. Kiener dates the translation sometime before the end of the eleventh century, and claims that it originated east of the Provence. He asserts that it was prepared by a Rabbanite scholar, eager to counter Karaite anti-Saadia propaganda, which was flowing out of Byzantium in the form of Hebrew translations of Karaite works; and he emphasizes its linguistic debt to Kallir, its longwindedness, mystical scent, and influence on the German pietists. The text remains unpublished; more manuscripts are available (including the elusive Breslau-Heidenheim copy) than were known or utilized by any student of the text, including Kiener.]

When was it written? Is it older than Judah Tibbon's translation? It probably is, but this has not been sufficiently demonstrated. It is improbable, however, that Ibn Tibbon would have known it, as some have maintained.[503]

With regard to its style, and some striking terms in particular,[504] I refer the reader to the characterizations given by Bloch and Zunz, because I do not think that this kind of style matters for the general history of translations (but see the end of this paragraph). I only make this one remark: The books into which it is divided are called מגלה.[505] It contains only a few Arabic words, like צדר אלכתאב and נסך׳ אלשרע (Steinschneider 1852, 2277–28).

This translation can be of help towards a better understanding of the original. More important is the fact that, according to Landauer, it exhibits one particular

[501] עין לבב…בכח הפעולה; Zunz 1865, 467 (651); Zunz 1872, 4; Steinschneider 1852, 2171; Steinschneider 1873b, 83, presumably the father of Krespia (1242, 3).

[502] Zunz l.c.; Bloch (Saadia ben Joseph 1879), 3, asserts that [the translation] probably belongs to the Orient; he finds in it a tendency towards Syriac (!) in word formation and technical terms; it was, he says, widely read and circulated! – that is completely unfounded; he means, by the way, Chaldean (Bloch 1870, 413, line 5).

[503] According to Bloch (Saadia ben Joseph 1879), 21, Tibbon retained משך. Kaufmann 1883a, 233, even intimates that the translator knew the *Moreh*, therefore he lived after 1190.

[504] Zunz 1872, 7; in Dukes 1848b, 554, always קנין for קנץ. Bloch 1870, 412, 452.

[505] Also in Joseph Albo *Sefer ha-Iqqarim* IV. 1, in Zunz 1872, 4; cf. also Steinschneider 1876c, 151, on a quotation, purportedly from Moses Ibn Tibbon, in Mosconi. – What is אנשי לבנון (אלשיילינו?) in Guttmann 1882, 279, note.

redaction of the text, namely that of the Bodleian manuscript, whereas Ibn Tibbon's translation tallies more with the St. Petersburg manuscript. This means that one should not simply emend it |442| on the basis of the other redaction (as does M. Wolff).[506] Landauer illustrates the differences between the two redactions, especially in the seventh book.[507]

Moses Taku did not find Saadia's name in his manuscript and doubts the authenticity of the work,[507b] but then Moses frequently displays a lack of critical analysis. Saadia's book touches on various opinions which were familiar enough for his contemporary readers so that he could dispense with a more precise presentation. Saadia, who was quite prone to controversy, has as his main concern the refutation of those opinions.[508] A satisfactory translation, accompanied by explanatory notes, such as Landauer has promised, must take into account both [Judaeo-Arabic] texts as well as both translations.

Meanwhile some younger German scholars have attempted to elucidate our book, or parts thereof, in various ways. An indication of their titles and tendencies may round up this section.

M. Eisler 1870–73 presents, in his lectures on the medieval Jewish philosophers, section 2 (Vienna 1876), an analysis of our work

In his dissertation, David Kaufmann treats the theory of (divine) attributes in our book. Later on he incorporated this into his *Geschichte der Attributenlehre* 1877a. He presents an analysis of the texts with notes, using Ibn Tibbon's translation.

Philipp Bloch (Saadia ben Joseph 1879) translated and explained the introduction and the "Cosmology" (Book One), for the most part in the *Jüdisches Literaturblatt*, on the basis of Ibn Tibbon's translation, but also making use of the anonymous one.[509]

J. Guttmann 1882 presents Saadia's philosophy by means of paraphrases or analyses of passages from our book, prefaced by some general observations, and accompanyed with notes which refer to sources and parallel passages. Dr. Simonsen has compared the passages under discussion with the Arabic text and Ibn Tibbon's translation.[510]

David Kaufmann 1883a[511] compared Ibn Tibbon's translation of the introduction (using manuscripts) with the [Judaeo-Arabic] text and the anonymous paraphrase in order to arrive at a judgment on the translation.[512] We wish to underscore his correct observation that Judah is not responsible for many mistakes of the copyists, multi-

[506] Wolff 1878, 695, 707 and Wolff 1880, 73–100. Cf. also Margulies 1882.

[507] Cf. Steinschneider 1852, 2178; Guttmann 1882, 227.

[507b] Kirchheim (Taku 1860), 75. His quotations are recorded in Zunz 1876III, 233.

[508] בעל לשון חדה, Kirchheim (Taku 1860), 79. On polemics against Christianity and Islam cf. Steinschneider 1877c, 341.

[509] Saadia ben Joseph. *Vom Glauben und Wissen: Saadiah' Emunoth*, etc. Munich, 1879.

[510] Guttmann 1882. Cf. Steinschneider 1883d, 77.

[511] 1883a, Saadia's introduction in Ibn Tibbon's translation.

[512] The poem גשה אלי אחי חכמות ובינות, in Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2562 and Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2425 fol. 3a, might well be by Judah.

plied by easily corrected printer's errors. Kaufmann characterizes the paraphrase very well (232) as "variations on Saadian motifs," nevertheless I would not be prepared to call the author a "linguistic artist," because his phrases and metaphors are imitations of quasi-poetry or rhetoric which, even when evaluated within their proper context, i.e., ritual, beg for apologies rather than |443| admiration. By academic standards, this verbose style, whose meaning must be guessed, this self-repeating paraphrase, reminds one of Voltaire's dictum, "Paraphrase is the mark of a poor tongue." The anonymous translator may have been learned, but he did not have the talent that his rival possessed to render ideas and abstract terms in a concise, scientific form. Kaufmann recommends an edition of this paraphrase because it is, as he says, an *incomparable* mine for a lexicon of medieval Hebrew. It exhibits, it is true, a lot of forms and phrases which, due to better taste and an advance in the art of translation, have remained singular instances without imitation. Once one has collected all the expressions and phrases existing in the literature, some amateur specialist may add to them some oddities found in our paraphrase.

Mss. of the Anonymous Paraphrase

Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial G-IV-6. (IMHM F 10467), 103 fols.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 42/3 (IMHM F 1612), 301a–526a.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 65/3 (IMHM F 1130), 20b–1a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Heb. Opp. 599 (Ms. Opp. 1185) (Neubauer 1224) (IMHM F 22038).
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 669 (IMHM 11548), 1–72.
Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 3018 (De Rossi 769) (IMHM F 13747), 75b–90a.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Cod. Vat. ebr. 266 (IMHM F 323), 1b–131a.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Cod. Vat. ebr. 269 (IMHM F 326), 140 fols.

§258. 2. Commentary to the Book of Creation. We have already on another occasion (§227) touched upon the Book of Creation (ספר יצירה). The oldest extant commentary to it is Saadia's, which was written in Arabic. For the original we have only the Bodleian manuscript, Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 256 (formerly Uri 370, of which Dr. Löwe in Brighton possessed a copy; another one was made by B. Goldberg), which carries the title תפסיר כתאב אלמבאדי;[513] some parts of this have been published.[514] [The Arabic text was published by M. Lambert (Saadia ben Joseph 1891) and again by Y. Qafih (Saadia ben Joseph 1972); none of the editions take into account all of the available fragments of the original text. The Arabic manuscripts are as follows: Paris, AIU 170; Paris, AIU 69; Cincinnati, HUC 567; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab I 3070; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 256; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab I 3085; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab II 1068; St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. Arab I 3071; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Heb.d.62]. In a long introduction, eight

[513] תפסיר is omitted in the *Fihrist*, ed. Flügel (Ibn al-Nadīm 1871), 23, who in II, 12 refers only to the reprint in De Sacy 1826 I, 357 (Steinschneider 1852, 2219 ff.). Ibn Janaḥ 1875, 130 גוש, mentioned in Neubauer 1863, 190, quotes יצירה פי ס'.

[514] The end of the introduction in Steinschneider 1852, 2220; on תגין in Goldberg 1867, 37 (cf. Steinschneider 1857a, 323 n. 18); IV, 3 fol. 78 line 6 to 80 line 3 from bottom (promised in Steinschneider 1852, 2221) in Neubauer 1863, 215 ff.; 81, line 5 ff. in 1871, 188.

theories concerning the origin of the world are presented; the eighth is that of the *Book of Creation*, *attributed* to the patriarch Abraham, who, however, is said only to have taught this theory. Only later was it committed to writing by scholars. In this regard it is similar to the case of a part of [King] Solomon's sayings.[515] The seventh and eighth theories contain only part of the truth, which is expressed completely only in the ninth, namely the Torah. This introduction elaborates in a clearer fashion some of the opinions that are refuted in Saadia's *Book of Religions* (i.e., the *Emunot ve-De'ot*)

The work contains the complete Hebrew text, divided into eight chapters, each of which consists of a number of *laws* (הלכות). Each coherent unit of text is accompanied by a translation (תפסיר) and a double commentary (שרח) explaining both the words and the ideas.

We shall not enter here into the problem of the date of composition. We know that the author quotes from several of his own linguistic, exegetical, and legal works.[516] Most probably the book was first written while the author was still in the Fayyūm (i.e., before 928).[517]

§259. A Hebrew translation of this commentary (פירוש ס' יצירה) exists in |444|:

Manuscripts: Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 221 (deficient; a transcription of Werbluner which Kirchheim quotes is now in Breslau, and probably is identical with the one mentioned by Guttmann 1882 (26)? Halberstam possesses a transcription of Chaim Meir Horowitz. Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3018.[518] [New York, JTS Ms. 1911; New York, JTS Ms. 1912; New York, JTS Ms. 1902]

The translator – according to the Parma manuscript, he is "Moses b. Joseph b. Moses ha-Dayyan, b. Nathan ha-Dayyan, b. Moses of Lucena" – translated the work for Aaron b. Elijah b. Isaac.[519] The Jewish community of Lucena was expelled in 1148; we do not know if the translator himself or his ancestors lived there. But neither alternative is likely; the translation may just possibly have been done before 1148, but most probably it is to be dated some four or five generations after 1148.

Recently the problem has become even more complicated. At the end of the commentary of Judah b. Barzillai [1885] (before 1140), there is a postscript which

---

[515] A similar [idea] in the preface to the commentary on Proverbs, see Steinschneider 1870f, 172.

[516] נדה (מצות) פירשנו בענין Ch. II, Halakha 2 (cf. Judah b. Barzillai 1885, 348 *ad* 230; cf. Steinschneider 1852, 2163; Mordechai, Steinschneider 1878c, 66), grammatical writings and commentary on Isaiah in Judah b. Barzillai 1885, 261 (Steinschneider 1852, 2820; Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 221fol. 67, Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92 fol. 87).

[517] Steinschneider 1852, 2221. Cf. Schorr 1862, 73, overlooked by Brüll 1876, 160. According to this, Halberstam's emendation *ad* Judah b. Barzillai 1880, 235, is not satisfactory.

[518] Who has S. G. Stern's copy of this ms.? [According to the IMHM catalogue it may be New York, JTS Ms. 1902.] For Halberstam's copy cf. Judah b. Barzillai 1885, 318–31 *ad* 174, 270 and elsewhere in his and Kaufmann's notes, also used for the text of Sefer Yeẓirah. On Werbluner, cf. ibid., 349 *ad* 320.

[519] Steinschneider 1852, 1837; "Aaron" has been overlooked by De Rossi Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 3018; cf. Dukes 1853, 25. Elijah b. Isaac in Carcassonne, cf. Steinschneider 1862–65, 1:243; Berliner 1877b, 231, incorrectly under Lattes; cf. Steinschneider 1883b, 112; cf. 65 [?].

contains the introduction to and the beginning of the commentary by Saadia up to the end of the first halakha of chapter 1, in a different translation.[520] Judah himself (184) refers to this postscript and remarks that the style of the (unnamed) translator is not good Hebrew (unclear?).[521] At other places in his book Judah quotes probably from the same translation, which I suppose covers the whole book; and it warrants his stern judgment. [The copy recently identified by Langermann in Vatican, BAV Cod. Vat. ebr. 236 does in fact cover parts of the entire book.] Perhaps, however, another translation of parts of the book circulated,[522] since also Moses Taku (around 1230) quotes a passage from the beginning of chapter 4, following yet another translation.[523] Perhaps one of these old |445| translations reached southern Italy, where Moses b. Solomon from Salerno (around 1240) mentions Saadia's commentary, unfortunately without quoting a passage from it.[524] [According to Malter 1921, 355–357, we have evidence for five, perhaps six, translations of Saadia's commentary: (i) that of Moses b. Joseph of Lucena; (ii) two, perhaps three, translations mentioned by Judah b. Barzillai, two of which are cited in his commentary; (iii) the translation employed by Moses Taku; (iv) a translation cited by Berechia ha-Naqdan. See also Habermann 1947, where the author displays in facing columns the two translations of Saadia's introductory essay, using the citations in Judah b. Barzillai for the anonymous version and Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 221 for the Moses b. Joseph rendition. Like most scholars before him, Habermann is no less interested in Saadia's text (sometimes called "the Saadia version") of *Sefer Yeẓirah* as he is in Saadia's commentary. Two recent articles on the Saadia version are by Weinstock 1982 and Allony 1982.]

---

[520] Even beyond the passage on the Categories (Dukes 1853, 3). I wonder whether more was intended. Luzzatto in Pollak 1847 wanted to copy it; imprecisely Steinschneider 1852, 2200 (cf. n. 73). I have made only superficial use of Halberstam's ms. for the Prize Essay. [Perhaps a reference to the original *Mémoire of the HUe?*] The postscript (268) contains a title (238 לעניות הדעת, cf. the introduction XVIII bottom) which apparently goes back to Judah and which fits only a beginning. The following excerpt from נסחא ראשונים with the reference ועשו בו סלוק מסכתא really is too ridiculous; cf., however, 101, 102.

[521] ולא היה לשונו מצחצחת; cf. Zunz 1865, 433. צחות corresponds with Arabic פצאחה (Bacher 1881, 18); for "*grammatica*" Arabic נחו, in Joseph Kimḥi 1888 (in Lebrecht 1847 *ad* Kimḥi 14); cf. Azulai 1852 I, 182 s.v. Sherira בלשון ערבי צח וקורין לו נחאווי; cf. Steinschneider 1869a, 135 n. 9 and above n. 52.

[522] Register of the passages in Halberstam in Judah ben Barzillai 1885, XIII, plus the notes. The text is unfortunately so garbled that often the parallel passages from the other translation are not sufficient to make emendations (230 כמבקרות is not 348 כמפקחות, rather כמותרות). According to Kaufmann, Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 338 perhaps Judah himself is the translator (therefore 347–49 without reservation). However, after 237 Judah did not have the Arabic text; 213 מצינו בס' שנעתק מנוסח ר"ס שלא כסדרן (on the different arrangement and number of chapters cf. 213, 215, 221 מצינו בס' שנעתק, not five ch[apters] [cf. 105] 261; 162 [316] מפירוש לשון ערב, read בלשון, is I, 4, 5, in Saadia II, 1). A second translation is being introduced (255) ויש מי שהחזיר נמי דברי ר"ס ...מן הערבי (on החזיר cf. Zunz 1876 III, 50). – It is questionable whether Judah quotes verbatim throughout, because he is mostly using תרף דבריו (essential contents).

[523] Taku 1860, 66; cf. Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 92, fol. 90, Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 221, fol. 71; IV, 1 (I, 9 of the first recension); the same passage in Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 177 and 342 on the basis of the Munich ms. – I have not investigated from which translation the beginning in Eleazar of Worms Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 81, fol. 242 b) is taken. [Malter 1921, 359, claims that Eleazar drew on Saadia's commentary indirectly, via Judah b. Barzillai's commentary.]

[524] *Ad* Moreh I, 71, cf. Steinschneider 1852, 2221.

As there is little promise of finding a better basis, any observations on the fragmentary and unreliable material of this translation that can be made must be accompanied by some reservations. The completely extant introduction is frequently abbreviated. It offers complete Arabic sentences (Judah b. Barzillai 1885, 214 bottom and 215), as if the translator was not sure what he was doing or had not completed his task. There is also no lack of single Arabic words, often present next to the Hebrew translation: ג'והר (p. 213 last line, 346) אלג'וזא (214, l. 14, probably תאומים is missing after מזל), ג'וזהר (209, 345, cf. supra 494), אלגבאך כמהים (230 l. 12), 'אלגרץ (221 l. 4 from bottom, cf. 346), הנדסה (214 l. 9 read המשל, וכן הדבר פי אל הנדסה, p. 272 read אלהנדסה (in Moses ההנדסה) and בלשון ערבי מהנדס, אלכאציה (230 l. 3 and bottom line, wrongly אלנאץ l. 4 from bottom), מלך (Categ. 248, cf. 353), סקמוני (for 'אסק? 214 line 3 from bottom), בוטנים צנובר (222),[524b] אלשרבי גפני ענבי (230, 348), תמר אלבראני (230, l. 3, 348).

Instead of פירוש we find מדרש (even פתרון מדרשו 229), also פשרון (245, 274), פשר הדבר (214 l. 3 from bottom), שנפשר לך (213 l. 4 from bottom). Finally, we note these forms and expressions: חקרנום 162, l. 6 from bottom, בעלי תושיה 174, 255, 266 (also in Moses b. Joseph), כמו שתפרש 177 (cf. 345 from Moses, and Taku 1860, 66), מתטנף 178, במבטא (logic, cf. 346) 213 one line up דבר מושא 214 l. 1, נזירות l. 12 (from נזור, declination [If this is meant to be an astronomical term, then declination is almost certainly wrong; the word usually refers to retrograde motion.]; one word is missing before), מזל העולה (Arabic אלטאלע) and בזנחו העולה, הגנה בעולה and בעו' האריה l. 17 from bottom; ונקשר ונכשר l. 7 from bottom; 230 עם l. 20 (for Arabic קום, people, cf. 348 אדם),[525] צחורות 349 (for סגולות, also in the anonymous paraphrase of *Emunot* in Zunz 1876, 235).

Mss of the Hebrew translation of Saadia's commentary to *Sefer Yeẓirah*

Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College 567 (IMHM F 19492).
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 92 (IMHM F 23122, PH Scholem 21), 75a–99a.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 115 (IMHM F 23126, PH 90 (selected pages)), 110b–26a.
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 221 (IMHM F 1104), 50b–82b.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 1902 (Loewe Ms. 20) (IMHM F 11000).
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 1911 (IMHM F 11009).
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 1912 (IMHM F 11010), 4a–53a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Heb.d.62 (Ms. Uri 370) (Neubauer 2850) (IMHM F 21397, PH 3417), 13–18.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Poc. 256 (Ms. Uri 370) (Neubauer 1533) (IMHM F 16901).
Paris, Alliance Israelite Universelle H 69 A (IMHM F 3159).
Paris, Alliance Israelite Universelle H 170A (IMHM F 3235).

[524b] Moses translates (p. 347) אשטרובילין; likewise Judah Tibbon, אמונות I beginning 2, ed. Saadia ben Joseph 1562, p. 26 צורה אצטרובולית for שכלא צנובריא of the text, p. 41; compare the Hebrew Euclid and הגולם האילוני in Steinschneider 1864c, 91 n. 14.

[525] The general meaning of the word is not recognized by Guttmann 1879, 151, 160, 162, 185, 223, and he seeks to attribute a particular meaning to it.

Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 3018 (De Rossi 769) (IMHM F 13747), 75b–90a.
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Cod. Vat. ebr. 236 (IMHM F 292), 95a–142a.

§260. The Hebrew commentary, printed under Saadia's name ever since 1562, is, according to Munk,[525b] the greatest insult that one could possibly do to Saadia, a work not worthy of a sublime mind, nay, of a reasonable human being. In fact, this false attribution was already recognized more than a century ago by the learned critic Jacob Emden.[526] We have already remarked that the anonymous author relates a physiognomical anecdote which perhaps derives indirectly from the Arabic *Secretum secretorum*; an incorrect reading in the printed book, substituting Mainz (Mayence) for Athens (§260, 253), led Rapoport to locate the author in Germany. Nobody now upholds the authenticity of this sham ("factum", as Munk calls it); however, it does display quotations under the name of Saadia, and these are probably responsible for the misattribution. In fact, they prove the opposite – something not at all rare! Were it possible to establish a connection between these quotations and one of the two translations, it would be useful for the problem of their dating. |446| A quite different, and now more accessible, source has been discovered, it is true, but we cannot carry out here the difficult and complicated investigation that may lead to a clear conclusion. Since no such clear result is now at hand, we shall, for the time being, explicate the most important points.

In the printed Ps.-Saadia (which we shall call "Ps.") the abbreviation פר"ס (sometimes פ"ר), which is פירש רב סעדיה (R. Saadia explained), appears more than sixty times.[527] According to S. Sachs[528] this abbreviation is ubiquitously a mistake of the copyist for פר"ש (פירש ר' שבתאי), i.e., Shabbetai (Donnolo), author of a commentary (946) which Sachs knew from one copy[529] and which has recently (Florence 1880) been edited by Prof. David Castelli 1880. I cannot agree with this opinion unconditionally. One still has to take into account the manuscripts of Ps. that are complete and arranged differently. Furthermore, the quotations from Sabbatai (Donnolo) in Ps. do not occupy the same place throughout, and a number of them do not have a place at all in the printed Donnolo (the references follow in an endnote). Thus it remains to be investigated whether some of these quotations may possibly be found in one of the two translations of the authentic Saadia. I believe I have found at least one which, however, concerns the text of *Sefer Yeẓira*.

§261. The translation of Moses b. Joseph and even the freer (anonymous) translation which I call, for the sake of brevity, a "paraphrase," differ in their whole character

[525b] Munk 1838, p. 15.

[526] Additamenta to Steinschneider 1852, 2219.

[527] Thus in manuscripts and in the commentaries on the Kuzari, Sachs 1854c, 208, Steinschneider 1875b, 114, penultimate line. ג"ורס – III, fol. 97[b] means סעדיה גרס ור'; cf. ג"ה פר"ס IV fol. 98; in Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 115, fol. 118, end of chapter V אלו עשרים ושתיים [הגר"ס] הגר"ם is Saadia IV, 5 (= V, 3 or) VI fol. 104[3].

[528] Sachs 1854b; Steinschneider 1852, 2238.

[529] Sachs does not give his source. Munich, BS Cod. hebr. 37, copied by Werbluner, contains only ch[apter] 1, as Paris, BN héb 843.

from the anonymous paraphrase of the *Book of Religions* which some wished to attribute to Moses.[530] Moses does not offer a paraphrase, but rather, in the words of Neubauer, "an all too slavish translation."[531] At that time, I had only Halberstam's copy of the Munich manuscript, which is in small script, at my disposal, and this did not allow me to carry out a thorough investigation. Now I have a copy of the introduction and some excerpts, e. g., of the two grammatical passages (see note 531) from the same manuscript. To these, Kaufmann's excerpts in his notes to Judah b. Barzillai may now be added. When we compare Saadia's texts as preserved in the translation to the two redactions of *Sefer Yeẓira,* we see that his version differs from both with regard to the order of chapters. Chapter 7 corresponds to chapter 5 of the second redaction, f. 104[4], line 7 from the bottom אויר רויה גויה; chapter 8 in the beginning נוצר עם is composed of pieces from the end of chapter 3 to 6 of the same redaction; chapter 4 para. 1 = I, 9 of redaction no. 1, eight paragraphs. Chapters 5 (corresponding to 3, 5 *bis*, f. 73 redaction no. 1) and 6 (= V, 2 redaction 1) are not divided into paragraphs (*halachot*). Since the Munich manuscripts are missing chapter 2 and the beginning of chapter 3, I cannot indicate the paragraphs.[532] Saadia's Arabic translation of the text has of course not been |447| retranslated into Hebrew except for words and passages indicated in the commentary. The commentary is called פתרונה and פירושה, and the explanation of single words פשטה;[533] when the meaning is clear it is simply called פשטה כמשמעה.[534]

The translator uses Arabic words from the original, or ones in Hebrew form, as, e.g., פסטטים (I, 1 פסאטיט Arabic?), מלאכות המהנות (מהניה? II, 1, cf. Steinschneider 1869a,

---

[530] S. G. Stern, cf. Steinschneider 1852, 1837. Derenbourg, too, writing in Geiger 1862, 223, wanted to investigate whether the translation was indeed the work of Berachia, the translator of the book *Sefer Yezira* (in Kaufmann).

[531] Neubauer 1863, 219 where the Hebrew translation from Munich is compared with the Arabic grammar (passage IV, 3); פתוחה for מפתוחה is common usage; קבוצה וקמוצה for מצ'מומה, if not a variant reading. – *Ad* II, 2 Arabic in Derenbourg 1871, 207 (cf. Kaufmann (Judah ben Barzillai 1885), 347), cf. Ibn Janāḥ 1880.

[532] The missing part is indicated in the Munich catalogue, according to Derenbourg in Kaufmann (Judah ben Barzillai) 1885, 349 around 12 folia (in the Arabic version chapters 2 and 3 have six paragraphs each). – Quotations in Guttmann 1882, beginning of introduction, 48, other passages 49, 81, 262; opinion 1, 70; opinion 2, 44–46 and 48; opinion 3, 77; opinion 6, 59; opinion 7, 26; opinion 9, 107. – I, I 78, 116, 135; §4 36, 201. II, 1 88; §2 59. III, 1 259. IV, 1 126 *ter*; §3 (astronomical measures) p. 66; §5 (Galen) p. 206; §5 and 6 106; – where? p. 119.

[533] For instance I. 1 פתרונה אתחיל תחלה באימות המלות ואומר פרשתי פלאות החכמה עלומות החכמה...ופירשתי אימות שרשים כאשר הקדמת' כי היסודות יאמר למו שורשים ואמהות ועיקרים וממשים ואחרי כן לעסוק בפירוש הענינים. היסוד הפשוט והמעין והממש והאבן ותחלה למה נקרא חפץ זה הספר המבוקש פלאות ה'. Cf. Introduction, Opinion 2 הקדמ' ויסוד היסוד זה חומר [והחומר?] ואל כולי אלכלי, the last word seems to be Arabic. Immediately afterwards פירשתי אבות אמהות כפי מה שהקדמתי כי אבן הקדומה הנקראת ממש קדמוניות; ibid., 270 only החומר; I. 4 היסודות נקראות אמות ואבות ושרשים ועקרים יסודות וממשים שכל אלה אחד. ופתרתי כובשין שליטין (?) כלומר שכובשין המקומות ופותחין אותן כאמרו ונכבשה הארץ ...ופתרתי גבולי אלכסון קרני זוית...ופרשתי תלי גלגל גדול מתחלק לשניים כי הוא היסוד והשורש בממש הראשון אשר ממנו יצאו כלל הממשים הסוד [היסוד] והשורש בתעלה ראשונה אשר. . . [כל התעלות; see also 270 l. 13] For ממשים see also the other translation, 339 on 155 טבע הממשים and [from Jacob b. Nissim] 246 n. 3 ואין ממשים (Realia); Saadia *Emunot* I. beginning of ch. 8 in Taku 1860, וחידש הגלמים ויצר הממשים 76, Saadia 1864, 37 Leipzig has only the former, as Arabic 58. ממשות see n. [3]469.

[534] For instance I, 4, II, 2, cf. Jacob b. Nissim above n. 211.

246), נתדרג and perhaps נצור (IV, I, 2, Kaufmann (Judah ben Barzillai 1885), 340), מסדר (IV, 3 for מצדר) רדו[535] (ורדוא? VIII), קלפיאה for גידמות or גדמות (VIII from קלף) הנדסא (Introduction, notes 1 and 9 צורה, חבור and הנדסא). In II, 2, where Saadia utilizes Arabic words in order to illustrate his remarks on the letters, the translator adds (?), "and all these words belong to the Arabic language."

Very frequently a phrase or a word is translated and explained by another one, mostly with the use of כלומר, e.g., in the introduction n. 8, וצריך לתוספת אני מספרה זה כלומר ויחתאג' אלי זיאדה אנא ואצפהא בעד הד'א; in Arabic only עתיד אני לספרה אחר זה I, 1 (Kaufmann (Judah ben Barzillai 1885), 339) בערים ממנה כלומר שלא ידעוה and רשמו כלומר ענפו; II, 2 שף עליהם זכר הגלוי כלומר כדי הם לזכרם בגלויים; III, 6 יענון, but for ולו המטריא כלומר המכאיב בקירב ענין כלומר בדרך העברה; ibid. (end of chapter) I, 1 (f. 59, B. f. 81) the Arabic text would seem to have מעני.[536] Frequently we find חכמי התושיה (beginning of the introduction I, 1, 2, also in the paraphrase; §259, end),[537] also סרעף for מחשבה and the like (also in the paraphrase of *Emunot*), I n. 4: מדרך הסרעף והמזמה (paralleled on 271 לפי דעת והמזמה).

We present more details following the order of the book ('P'. refers to the paraphrase in Judah b. Barzillai). Introduction, opinion no. 1 עם שדולם, P. 269 line 1 בחנם; צחצוח הבאור, ועל הרדיפה למה שאמרנו, כלומר על סבר נוהגי מנהג בה n. 2 לרצות פשרונו;[538] P. 448| I, the passage is missing from P.; וכן המקרה בקפוי (for the Arabic גמאד), P. וכן הכל בנבך, perhaps garbled from מתכת? שלש פרידות , P. חלקים; n. 3 גושם (elsewhere, גושמים וגלמים I, 1, גושמי I, 2); לפרש מהם וללמוד מהם על דרך העברה ודמיון, P. 271, line 11 יפטירו ויפשירו ויורו וירמיזו; n. 4 הרוחניים, for animals; P. חיות; cf. n. 5 הרוחניים המדברים, P. נשמת כל חיים מדברים (probably alluding to the prayer נשמת כל חי); n. 6 לכל המזגים והפיתוכים; missing in P. 272; n. 7 זה זולת עובר משני פנים (Arabic ג'איז, cf. Steinschneider 1857b, 121), missing in P.; n. 9 מוקצים אל הארץ, P. 273 סמוכים. – For the following passages the variant readings are missing from P. The quotations in the notes of Kaufmann to Judah b. Barzillai, viz. from I, 1 338 to 119, 339 to 155 (where we find לח ונצוק), I, 4 345 to 209, IV, 1, 2 340–42, IV, 4 345 bottom, offer little material. I note from my excerpts: I, 1 רשול, סדור ועריכה, names of the Categories (see Endnote), פרק ויבדד; end חשבון האישטרונומיא (f. 59, cf. II, 1 f. 64 b); I, 2 עימות and מעומתים (from לעומת), thus also to be read מעומתים in III, 6; המתויכים גוף האדם, and parallel, ממציע האדם; I, 4 ורצה בזה התיוך כי הוא באמצע הכל וקוצב קצבם כן ;[539] טובע טבעם ככה החתים and יונצח (read בעל כורח כל יצור צריכים למו ;[540] עצלות כל חכם מלהוסף עליהם the same ?). II, 1 שער גדול ועצום מן ההכר ינוצח; II, 2 התכפל ; III, 6 f. 70 b דיאפראגמא; IV, 6 עולם קטן;

[535] Cf. Neubauer 1863, 218.

[536] ולכן הועתקו מארבעה ספרי המבטא אחר המבוא למו כלומר איר שהועתק ספר אחד יקראוהו ספר המבוא, כלומר המפתח שמו שלומדו [שלמודו?] תחלה וקלו עליו השאר שלשהמהם על השלשה ענינים, והמבוא (?) הראשון במלות מופרדות אחת אחת, והספר השני בשתי תלות המחוברות מה טיבם מן ההויה, ואחר אלה השני ספרים הועתק ספר שלישי בהקדמות והגבולים והספר הרביעי בהודאה [בהוראה] והראיה. Cf. Dukes 1868, 49; Derenbourg, Geiger 1862, 223, thinks that the translator does not know at all what all this is about.

[537] On תושיה see Steinschneider 1880b, 85.

[538] For another passage cf. n. 523.

[539] Cf. I, 1 ועל טבע זה טובעו in Judah ben Barzillai 1885, 339 *ad* 155.

[540] Incapacity, commonly לאות (Arabic *'ajz*).

IV, 8 האברים [ותועלת] והועלת הנתוח ס' מי שקרא (probably Galen is meant); IV, 12 גזרתו פולשת; V (in Jellinek 1852, 33) המפייטים and (f. 79) קמעניים; VI (Jellinek 1852, 73 Zunz 1865, 318) איול.

§262. (Pseudo-Ibn Ezra.) A small work, tainted with superstition, bearing the title ספר העצמים (Book of Substances, or Beings), is extant in the following manuscripts:

Berlin, SPK Or. oct. 244/4 (Catalogue 56, formerly Luzzatto). Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Mich. 238. Florence, BM-L. Ms. Plut.II.25 (deficient in the end). Mantua, CI Ms. ebr. 78a[541] Parma, BP Cod. Parm. 2615/3. – Schönblum 81 (II, 72).[542] [The latter manuscript has not been identified. Other known manuscripts are Cambridge, UL Add. 1186/7, New York, JTS Ms. 2321/3, New York, JTS Ms. 2323/1, New York, JTS Ms. 2349/1, London, BL Add. 16934, London, BL Add. 27038, Moscow, RSL Günz. 338/3, Naples, BN VE III F12.]

The translator is nowhere named. Samuel Zarzah (1369) displays almost all of chapter 3[543] as well as a long passage from the beginning in which the author tells us what he was told by an eminent religious person "who in the true sense of the word deserves the title philosopher."[544] Zarzah admits[545] that he does not know Arabic. He asked Jacob Ibn Alfandari ben Solomon[546] to translate for him the explication of some passages in Ibn Ezra's commentary to the Pentateuch (the explication is by Solomon Ibn Yaish?[547]; al-Fandari was probably also the translator of the note of Joseph Ibn Wakkar cited in the same passage by Zarzah)[548] as well as the *Book of Substances* by Abraham Ibn Ezra.[548b] [The *Book of Substances* was printed by M. Grossberg 1901; Grossberg used only one manuscript, namely the copy found in the British Library. Jacob al-Fandari is named as the translator in Naples, BN VE III F12, dated 1492 and possibly the earliest copy of the treatise.] |449|

Abraham is also credited with the Arabic *Book of the Substances* by Samuel Ibn Motot (1370) who presents some passages from it in Hebrew. [The passage is found in Milan, BA P 13/7 Sup., fols. 319bff., and corresponds to Grossberg's printing, 12 ff. The text cited by Ibn Motot is almost certainly the same translation found in the manuscripts, though

---

[541] The Mortara Catalogue remarks that Mantua, CI Ms. ebr. 78a, mentioned in Steinschneider 1859a, 93, is ruined by water. See in general Steinschneider 1880b, 71.

[542] Zotenberg 1866 no. 189 (23) emends correctly to הטעמים, according to which Geiger 1866, 187, should be corrected.

[543] ויקרא פ' fol. 62[4] edition (Zarzah 1559). And in מרגליות טובה (Ibn Ezra 1721), fol. 89b. Shem Tov Ibn Mayor (1384) uses Motot; cf. Steinscheneider 1876a, 109.

[544] נשא פ' fol. 93, טובה מרגלית fol. 118 b, namely that in Latin and Greek "He" means God (cf. the quotations in Steinschneider 1862e, 123, and Kaufmann 1877a, 333, 509; cf. Ibn 'Arabi's *Risālat al-Hūwa*, Ḥājjī Khalīfa 1835–58 III, 457 no. 6426; *al-Huwiyya* 1835–58 I, 518 no. 1588 by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Kūfi (after 1475).

[545] בחוקותי fol. 87, מרגלית 113.

[546] On the Alfandari family, cf. Zunz 1845, 425.

[547] The elder, cf. §483.

[548] On פרדגיאת (פרדאריאת) see Steinschneider 1869a, 240; cf. 1873f, 92, 1874f, 91, 1879e, 100.

[548b] On the philosophical views of Ibn Ezra, cf. Krochmal, זמזה יכובנ הרומ (where, however, spurious material is used), Eisler 1870–83, 113 ff.

there are some variant readings.] But this work is not by Ibn Ezra. It may even be the work of a Muslim, perhaps modified by the translator. [The text refers to Jewish ritual and scripture.]

It is divided into six chapters (אופן): (1) On the First Cause; (2) On the influence of the Higher Spheres (of the Separate Intellect) on the Lower ones; (3) On the followers of positive (i.e., not a revealed) creed[549] like the Sabians, the Nabataeans (corrupted into כבט and בוט); (4) On the Soul; (5) On the Animals (not a separate chapter in the Parma manuscript, so that Perreau in his analysis of the work lists only five chapters);[550] (6) On the Spheres.

The traces of this book vanish soon after its translation. No direct quotation is known after the fourteenth century. [However none of the thirteen extant copies are earlier than the fifteenth century. Moreover, with the exception of New York, JTS Ms. 2323/1, all copies are in Italian hand; the JTS manuscript is an Ashkenazi hand, but it mentions Lombardy in the incipit, so it too seems to have an Italian connection. Thus interest in the treatise seems to be concentrated in two very specific moments: the supercommentators to Ibn Ezra's biblical commentary who worked around the middle of the fourteenth century (Zarzah, Ibn Motot), and Renaissance Italy. At least two incipits relay information about the text and its transmission. It was called in Arabic *Kitāb al-Jawāhir*, and it was written by Ibn Ezra for Judah Hallevi. This second point cannot be confirmed from any other source; it may reflect the observation of one reader that the tenor of the text is similar to that of the *Kuzari*. Interestingly both of these manuscripts are missing the last chapter, which deals with astronomy. Here follow the two incipits:

New York, JTS Ms. 2323/1, f. 31a: הספר הזה חברו החכם ראב"ע ז"ל בלשון הגרי ושלחו לחכם ר' יהודא הלוי ולא נמצא בגלילנו זולת ההתחלה מצאתי בישוב (?) לומברדאה העתקתי בידי שנות והקריב"ה לעולה לפ"ג.

Naples, BN VE III F12, f. 104: התחלת ספר העצמים לאבן עזרא ז"ל ספר העצמים כתא"ב אלגוהי"ר(!) לראב"ע ז"ל חברו החכם השלם בלשון הגרי ושלחו לר' יהודה הלוי ז"ל ולא ימצא בארץ הזאת זולת ההתחלה הזאת והעתיקו ר' יעקב אלפנדרי.

Mss. of Pseudo Ibn-Ezra, *Book of Substances*

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz) Or. oct. 244 (Steinschneider 79) (IMHM F 1996), 17–21.
Cambridge, University Library Add. 1186/7 (SCR 575) (IMHM F 17052), 101a–7b.
Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurentiana Plut.II.25 (IMHM F 17666), 1–132.
London, British Library Add. 16934 (Margoliouth 793/12) (IMHM F 5478), 146a–80b.
London, British Library Add. 27038 (Margoliouth 1073/7) (IMHM F 5716), 45a–54a.
Mantua, Comunita Israelitica Ms. ebr. 78 ebr. 78 (IMHM F 864), 91a–99a.
Moscow, Russian State Library Ms. Günzberg 338 (IMHM F 47620), 33a–42b.
Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III F 12 (IMHM F 11526), 104a–7a.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 2321/3 (NY JTS Acc. 2979) (IMHM F 28574), 29a–36b.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 2323/1 (NY JTS Hi 109) (IMHM F 28576), 31a–37b.

[549] נימוסית, n. [4]310.

[550] Perreau 1876–1877, 230. – Beginning הסדה הראשונה איננה גוף; end וזה לרב חלשתם.

New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Ms. 2349/1 (NY JTS Acc. 75327) (IMHM F 28602), 31a–37b.

Oxford, Bodleian Ms. Mich. 238 (Ms. Mich. 316) (Neubauer 1234/3) (IMHM F 22048), 34b–44b.

Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Parm. 2615/3 (De Rossi 1355) (IMHM F 13316), 30a–38a.

[An anonymous defense of creationism. Ms Vatican ebr. 236, ff. 62a-64b, contains a series of refutations of the eternity of the universe. We learn from the incipit that it has been translated from the Arabic by an unnamed individual at the request of "my master and brother Moshe ben Yo'av ": עוררתי בקשתך רבי ואחי/ משה בן יואב רי"ת ונערתי חצני להעתיק הספר הזה/ מלשון ערב ללשון עברי. The translator worked from a borrowed copy of the original. Though he complains that the stipulations imposed upon by the owner (תנאי השאלה) prevented him from copying "part of it", in the very next sentence he states that he "copied it in its entirety". In any event, the one extant manuscript is incomplete, breaking off with the words לא מצאתי יותר תם ונשלם. This, however, could possibly be the comment of the copyist rather than the translator.

The opening sentence names פיתאגרוס וטולמיוס as the authorities who denied the possibility of *creatio ex nihilo*. Though no available Pythagorean text known to us argues against creation, the name of Pythagoras was closely associated with the pagan neoplatonists, so his inclusion is not surprising. The name of Ptolemy, however, makes no sense in this context. טולמיוס must be an error for טימאוס; and indeed the *Timaeus* was one of the major sources for the view of the pre-eternality of matter. Moreover, the *Timaeus* is Plato's most "Pythagorean" text; hence it is much to be expected that "Pythagoras and Timaeus" would be mentioned together in this context. Indeed, later on Plato and "his evil disciples" are named as the authors of this view.

A second school named at the beginning of the treatise is the בעלי התולדות. In their view, the causes of everything are to be traced to the four elements and their mixture (מזג); in other words, they deny the existence of a first cause. Later on a third school of thought is named: that of Aristotle, who considers hyle and form to be "the Agent" (הפועל). The treatise contains both rebuttals (תשובה) of the pernicious doctrines as well as proofs (ראייה) for the existence of a single creator.

The formulations of the arguments, and perhaps some of the strategies as well, are unusual; the text awaits close study. This much, however, can already be said with some degree of certainty: the text bears many similarities to the Saadia's *Beliefs and Opinions* and arose out of the same milieu. Most notable is the pride of place given to Plato's *Timaeus* as the chief authority for the eternity of the world (not mentioned by name in *Beliefs and Opinions*, but certainly the source of the "second school" refuted there), and the complaint registered in both treatises that some Jews have been persuaded to accept Plato's teachings. Note that in *Beliefs and Opinions*, book I, before setting forth his rebuttals of all the schools known to him to have denied creation *ex nihilo*, Saadia mentions additional arguments that he proffered in other writings; and one cannot rule out the possibility that the treatise under discussion is the work of Saadia, perhaps from this refutation of Hiwi al-Balkhi. A full discussion of the plausibility of this suggestion is beyond the purview of this notice. Let it be said briefly that in the extant portions of Saadia's reply to Hiwi there is no discussion of creation; and the fact that a rhymed Hebrew text does exist does not negate the possibility of a prose writing in Arabic as well.

Some of the Hebrew terminology employed is unique to this writing, and the meaning of some words remains a mystery. Here are some examples: והשורש קודם למה שתחתיו בדמות; והשינוי הוא המיחוי ואין המיחוי על אלא על המחודש; המנהג והפיטוס. The translator employs גרם for *jawhar* and מוצא for *madba'*.

This text was first identified by Y. Tzvi Langermann, and his edition, translation and analysis appears in Langermann 2013.

The Karaites

§263. We collect here the writings of the scholars of this sect, because the sources for the few authors to be considered are the same and, accordingly, only with difficulty can one decide to which one of them a given source may relate. Moreover, the character of the translations is quite peculiar, so that the quotations in later works, which are written under the influence of the Rabbanite translations, stand out on account of their strikingly unusual character.[551] [For a recent and authoritative study of the peculiar Hebrew of the Karaite translators, see Simon Hopkins 1992; also noteworthy is the M.A. thesis of A. Maman on the Hebrew of Tobias b. Moses, submitted at Jerusalem, 1978, and his essay on Karaite Hebrew Maman 2003. For an exhaustive treatment of the Karaite translators in their communal and intellectual context, see Zvi Ankori 1956, *passim*. A recent comprehensive guide to Karaite philosophy is surveyed in Ben-Shammai 2003. Maman and B. Shammai's essays are part of the close to thousand-page guide to Karaite Judaism edited by Meira Polliack 2003, and with a comprehensive bibliography by B. Walfish. Walfish and Kizilov have greatly expanded the bibliography in 2010.]

§264. Until recently, it was customary to speak of two Karaite authors by the name of Joseph whose date was not known exactly, but taken approximately to be shortly after Saadia Gaon (941). It would lead us too far to discuss thoroughly all that has been brought forward concerning these authors and their works in Arabic, part of which were translated into Hebrew. Therefore we confine ourselves here to a discussion of a few key points, i.e., to identify, if possible, the authors of some philosophical works translated into Hebrew. We must, however, preface this discussion by some remarks concerning the authors.

The confusion between the two Josephs, or at any rate the uncertainty as to how to distinguish between the two, seems to go back to the twelfth century. The older Joseph, living perhaps around the last years of Saadia (937) or somewhat later, is Joseph al-Qirqisānī, called already in the eleventh century Abū Yaʿqūb.[552] [The confusion of which Steinschneider speaks no longer exists. Al-Qirqisānī's name was Jacob, or, more precisely, Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb. Steinschneider knows of a source that cites precisely this name, but he rejects it; see §266. Throughout the remainder of his entry, Steinschneider erroneously

[551] Secondary literature in Frankl 1819–1889, 24; on the character of the sources cf. especially Steinschneider 1877c, 341 and 1880d, 70. The section "Karaïten" in J. H. Weiss 1871, IV, deals mainly with the legal aspect. As to the chronological dates one misses the results of the most recent literature; cf., e.g., n. 561. [The now standard reference guide is Polliack 2003.]

[552] נחמד Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 26, fol. 114 הזקן אבי יעקב יוסף הידוע אלקרקסאני ז"ל; cf. fol. 109b, 112b דע כי הקרקסאני ז"ל הגיד על מקאל [מקצת] אנשים מן אנשי בצרה ואנשי תוסתאר כי יאסרם [חלב דסומכא ובני מעים]. For older sources on him, cf. Steinschneider 1852, 185; cf. also Pinsker 1860, 169, Appendix, 200; Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 176; according to Fürst 1862 II, 140 in the year 990! – "Josef ben Jakob" in "Moses Kohani" (Pinsker 1860, Appendix, 200; Fürst 1862 II, 207 ff. knows that this man lived in 1125, etc.! Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 193 [wrongly paginated 203]; but Moses Kohani is fabricated from Gikatilia; Geiger 1861, 43, from אשכול (Hadassi 1836), according to Frankl 1876, 650). In the מרשד of Samuel ha-Maʿaravi (Berlin, SPK Or. Oct. 351) we find Joseph and Jacob, the latter of which most probably an imprecise version of Abu Jacob.

refers to "Joseph" Qirqisānī. There are other errors as well in his report, and we shall draw attention to them. However, in the concluding sentence of §266, Steinschneider wisely urges caution with regard to all the conclusions and inferences that he has drawn, given the state of knowledge in his time. Indeed, much of the confusion had been dispelled in his *Die arabische Literatur der Juden*, published 9 years after *HUe*. There al-Qirqisānī receives a lengthy notice (79–84); he is identified as the author of *Kitāb al-Anwār*; and many manuscripts are listed. On the other hand, Steinschneider still gives his name as "Joseph Abū Yaʿqūb". The "second" Joseph, conventionally referred to now as Yūsuf al-Baṣīr, receives a separate entry on 89–91. Al-Qirqisānī's *Kitāb al-Anwār* edited by Leon Nemoy in 1939; see his corrections and emendations 1959–60. An English translation of the first treatise by W. Lockwood, with two important introductory essays by B. Chiesa, is found in Yaʿqūb al-Qirqisānī 1984. Since Nemoy, the most important studies are those by Vajda in the *REJ* and the doctoral dissertation of Haggai Ben-Shammai on al-Qirqisānī and Yefet b. ʻEli 1977. For the works of Yūsuf al-Baṣīr, see Basir 1985, which lists many of Georges Vajda's studies on al-Baṣīr, and David Sklare and Haggai Ben-Shammai's catalogue on the works of Yūsuf al-Baṣīr in the Firkovich collection (Hebrew) (1997).] One quotation has the name Jacob b. Joseph |450| Qirqisānī[553]; among the first Karaites a certain Jacob b. Isaac Qirqisānī is named.[554] The second Firkovich collection, unfortunately little known up to now, contains two Arabic works that were previously known only by title. Firkovich[555] names as the common author of both works "Abū Yūsuf Yaʻakov al-Qirqisānī", for the first one even Jacob b. Isaac b. שמעיה.[556] The second is a commentary to the passages in the Pentateuch which are not concerned with the Law, under the title אלריאץ' ואלחדאיק [*Book of Heaths and Gardens*], allegedly composed in 937. A. Harkavy[557] confirms the author's name and connects the Arabic title with the Hebrew ס' הנצנים (Book of Flowers); this latter has been ascribed to both Joseph Qirqisānī and Joseph b. Noah (?).[558] Perhaps the treatise on the Decalogue, ascribed to Joseph b. Jacob Qirqisānī in ms. Paris BNF héb 755, is part of this commentary? [Indeed the author's name is given in this manuscript as יוסף…המאור קרקסאני; however, it is now believed that the commentary is the work of Elazar b. Eliezer.][559] According to Harkavy the author of the Arabic work quotes Saadia Gaon.

---

[553] In Jacob b. Reuben, Pinsker 1860, 84; cf. 170, appendix, 200 (undecided whether father or son); Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 180; Fürst 1862 II, 112 ascribes most books to him, among others, "Kitab el-Azul (sic!) el-Din," which, he says, refers to Baḥya (cf. Steinschneider 1877c, 412 and further below).

[554] Mordecai ben Nisan 1830, fol. 11b, S. Luẓki 1830, fol. 21 b; Pinsker 1851, 742; see further below.

[555] Firkovich 1871, בני רשף "Bne Reschep" (sic), n. 21. The Arabic is incorrect throughout. – The first work is no. 493, the second nos. 1142 and 1144.

[556] Firkovich 1871, 18, 19; n. 21. היועמש is a misprint, not the Persian ending – היו, as in סימויה, סאקויה, etc. Steinschneider 1870f, 113 note, Steinschneider 1874d, 58 n. 19; cf. the references below n. 628.

[557] Harkavy 1878–80, 2 and 16, 17 (cf. Steinschneider 1880h, 107, 1881d, 13) and Mitteilungen 157 only אלחדאיק; cf. Harkavy 1880, 44 n. 119. Moses Bashyazi *ad* עריות in Neubauer 1866, 64, presents passages from the commentary on the Pentateuch by Joseph.

[558] Cf., however, Steinschneider 1858, 389 under this author; below n. 617. Fürst 1862 I, 144 n. 149 makes נצנים out of נצני (for בצרי).

[559] Fürst 1862 II, Endnotes, 40 n. 25, declares בראשית שרשי הדת ס' appearing in the list of Pinsker 1860, Appendix, p 192, to be unconnected. [Pinsker there suggested that the title gave two names, בראשית ס' and שרשי הדת, for the same book.]

Considering the uncertainty and confusion governing this whole field one may venture the conjecture that the Arabic manuscript has seen a switch of names, so that the name of Joseph, displayed in other sources, would be that of the author, and Abū Yaʿqūb his cognomen. The combination *Abū* Jacob (for *Ibn* J.) with Joseph[560] has been unjustly attacked; but, then again, I do not believe that someone changed the names intentionally in order to arrive at the more common combination.

Finally, there is an author known only as Abū Jacob who is most probably one of the two Josephs. We shall soon return to him, as well as to a second work ascribed to one Jacob and a number of other designations of one or the other Joseph.

§265. (Joseph b. Abraham) Almost everything appertaining to the second Joseph is likewise not free of doubts. He is usually called Joseph b. Abraham ha-Kohen.[561] Firkovich objected to the last element |451| in his name for no good reason.[562] In an Arabic work he also carries the cognomen Abū Yaʿqub.[563] Being blind, he was called with a euphemism common to Jews and Arabs[564] "the seeing" (הרואה, אלבציר).[565] That epithet was applied to Joseph Qirqisānī; this was due to some sort of confusion, probably connected to the titles המאור or המאור הגדול which were attached to his name. This leads us back to the Arabic work that was mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

---

[560] First proposed by me in the *Sabbatblatt* 1846b, 75, also in Munk 1851, 10, without naming the actual author. Chwolsohn, in Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 222, thinks Abu J. Joseph is impossible! In the index of Ḥājjī Khalīfa 1835–58, 1249, there are two [names], and where is Joseph b. Abraham? Cf. Firkovich 1871, 20, 21, and n. 617.

[561] Concerning him cf. the quotations in Steinschneider 1858, 181; Pinsker 1860, 115, appendix 192 ff.; Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 134, 175; Fürst 1862, II, 50–75 (It his hard to tell which of his pair of articles in Fürst 1849–51, II, 109 and III, 163 is more inaccurate); Steinschneider 1877c, 346 n. 12; writings in Frankl 1872, 175. – Harkavy 1880, 4, refers to n. 114, where there is nothing about him, cf. 46 (thus, I presume, one should read 'n. 41' for n. 44 in Frankl 1819–1889, 17; cf. Steinschneider 1881h, 13. J. H. Weiss 1871, 77, 99 still thinks he is a contemporary of Saadia. – On Joseph b. ʿAbd al-Karim (Steinschneider 1858, 182) see Steinschneider 1877c, 39 n. 2, Steinschneider 1882, 325.

[562] According to Firkovich 1871, 20, last line, this is supposed to be evident from the אסתבצאר! -- הכהן in Tobias (?) Steinschneider 1858, 172. Variant reading in חלוק, cf. Steinschneider 1858, 389; Abu Naṣr Joseph Ibn ברהאן אלכהן cf. Steinschneider 1880h, 107, 1881h, 13 and VII; – cf. Joseph Burhan al-Fuluk, Steinschneider 1865a, 31.

[563] אסתבצאר or יהי אור in Firkovich 1871, 21; cf. further below. In the quotation of Jacob התמאני in Firkovich 1871, 18, line 3 from bottom, אבו is missing before יעקב הסומא. Cf. 19; in Pinsker 1860, 51 n. 1, רי יוסף.

[564] Hebrew לשון סגי נהור.

[565] Pinsker 1860, 193 (read יורנו, as in Steinschneider 1858, 182) is based on ויאיר עינינו...מעיר עיני עורים; the beginning of the phrase is typical (Zunz 1865, 628; Verzeichnis 1879b, 141; Gastfreund in 1879, p. 111); בני מקרא מאירים עורים (חלוק Steinschneider 1858, 386, Pinsker 1860 Appendix, 100). Cf. Menaḥem Gizni (on whose period after Maimonides, cf. Steinschneider 1861a, 46, 1863c, 31, 1864d, 15) in Pinsker 1860, n. 51 (thus read instead of 15 in Fürst 1862 II, 18, n. 206); המאיר אפלתינו...יוסף בר אברהם in Moses Bashyazi; Steinschneider 1858, 11. – אשר בחכמתו מאיר כאור. – An allusion is also the title אסתבצאר, cf. n. 553 and further below. – On עיון אלנהוראי in Pinsker 1860 appendix, 193; cf. Steinschneider 1861a, 47, 1864f, 69; Schorr 1862, 82.

§266. The Book of Lights (כתאב אלאנואר),[566] no. 493 of the second Firkovich collection, is – according to its owner – ascribed to Abū Joseph Jacob b. Isaac b. Shemaya al-Qirqisānī and composed in 937. This is very dubious. [As noted above, no one any longer doubts the correctness of the name or date as reported in the Firkovich manuscript.] In an account by Neubauer,[567] the author bears the name "Joseph of Kirkisia"; Israel Maaravi[568] calls him Qirqisānī. Simcha Isaac attributes the book האורים, quoted without a name for the author by Levi, to Joseph b. Jacob Qirqisānī[569]; others speak of a Book המאור or המאור הגדול, written in 910 or 930 by Joseph (הרואה) who, according to them, is earlier than Qirqisānī (later on mentioned in one of the two sources)[570] and engages in a refutation of Saadia Gaon. This then would be Joseph b. Abraham who would not, however, be missing from the list of the Karaite scholars.[571] Nevertheless Simcha Isaac attributes the book המאור הגדול to Qirqisānī. – Moses b. Solomon ha-Levi הצבני [572] is the author of a compendium of the *Book of Lights*, called מכ'תצר אלאנואר. [The current view is that the proper spelling of his name is הצכני; some twenty-two copies of his abridgement have been identified.] Moses Bashyazi, to whom we owe this reference,[573] quotes and |452| translates passages from this Arabic work, saying "Moses b. Solomon relates in the name (משם = בשם) of Joseph Qirqisānī." [As noted, the Arabic text of *Kitab al-Anwār* was edited by Leon Nemoy in 1939. Portions of al-Qirqisānī's *Book of Lights* were translated into Hebrew probably by Moses Bashyazi, son of the great Karaite leader Elijah Bashyazi. To date six small portions of his translation have been registered in the holdings of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts; for the most part they are translations of selected passages that have

[566] אמואר in Firkovich 1871, 20, 21 misprint, cf. Harkavy 1880, 42.

[567] Neubauer 1876, 4.

[568] Ibid., 114.

[569] צ' א' fol. 23, not Urim, as Fürst 1862 II, 57 and 58, and Neubauer 1876, 63 (naming Moses himself as the author); ס' האורים בעל, anonymous in Levi (Pinsker 1860, appendix, 90), missing in the index 209. Fürst 1862 II, 52, 57, 320 presents Arabic סראג', perhaps following Steinschneider 1857a §14 (cf. Steinschneider 1857a, 313, n. 26; against the same title of the Mishna commentary by Maimonides, Steinschneider 1852, 1883; Steinschneider 1879b, 66, cf. Derenbourg 1883). A passage, where the commentators Alexander of Aphrodisias, Yaḥyā al-Naḥwī, Porphyrius, and Galen are mentioned, in Neubauer 1876, 64.

[570] Yefet b. Zair in Mordechai ben Nisan 1830, 11b המאור around the year 930; the ס' הקבלה, copied by Elijah (ben Baruch Yerushalmi, according to Geiger 1864, 19), probably Bashyazi's העתקת התורה, St. Petersburg – Russian National Library Evr. I 751 (cf. also Steinschneider 1858, 237 note); Steinschneider 1882, 332, Pinsker 1851, 742 מאור הקטון around the year 910. [Pinsker has מאור הגדול.]. – בחייו כמו שהוא מזכיר בעצמו in Pinsker 1860, 115 is imprecise.

[571] Mordechai ben Nisan 1830, f. 12 ע"כ דברי המאור הגדול ובינו יוסף הרואה ע"ה

[572] Cf. בני הצ'בן in Japeth b.'Ali ha-Levy Paris, BN héb 283 (Steinschneider 1880d, 92). Fürst 1862 II, 59 (around 1500!), 320: Zikani, page 121 n. 271 ציכאני, in parenthesis צינאני, in place of which the softer form ציגאני is supposed to have been used later on [Fürst has ציכני, in parenthesis ציכאני, "in place of which the softer form סיגאני was used later on."]. Pinsker 115 note צפני is a misprint [in Pinsker: צכני]. Samuel b. Abraham b. Moses ha-Levi אלצבני writ[ing] in 1402 אלריאץ' ואלחדאיק; Firkovich 1871, 21.

[573] Steinschneider 1858, 14, the unnamed source in Pinsker 1860 under 115 (hence Fürst 1862 II, page 121, note 271, where משום occurs instead of משם).

been penned into the margins of the Judaeo-Arabic original. However, by far the largest section of Moses's translation is found in St. Petersburg Oriental Institute of the Russian Academy D4 (IMHM F 69408), a manuscript that has not yet been catalogued at the IMHM. Fols. 3a–64b contain Bashyazi's translation of book VI in the right column, usually headed העתקת משה; the left displays the Judaeo-Arabic. At the bottom of f. 6b Moses reports that he found the manuscript used for the translation in Egypt, but that it was missing an entire quire: אמר משה בשיצי המעתיק עד פה מצאתיו שלם במצרים ומכאן ואלך חסר קונטרוס אחד שלם. Another portion of this translation may be found on fols. 110a–116b of the same manuscript. It may be added that the first section of book VI discusses the "premises of the Alexandrian" (*muqaddamāt al-Iskandarāni*); and it has been suggested that "the Alexandrian" is none other than Philo of Alexandria, whose nonpresence in medieval Jewish philosophical writing is striking.] From this formula it cannot be inferred that Qirqisānī is the author of the basic text of the compendium,[574] since Qirqisānī could well be quoted by Joseph b. Abraham if, as we shall see, the latter was the author of the original work. This, indeed, is the more likely possibility, according to everything which we have collected concerning "the blind one" who would thus have authored the Book of "Lights". Similarly, one has supposed that Isaac the Blind, son of Abraham b. David (beginning of the thirteenth century), is the author of the mystical book "ha-Bahir" (the Shining). [This may be a reference to M. H. Landauer's attribution in the *Literaturblatt des Orients* (1845), col. 215, mentioned by Scholem 1987, 253 n. 116; since Scholem, most scholars prefer to talk of redactors of ha-Bahir. See Anonymous 1994.] However, the date 937 in the ms. Firk. (if it is not simply taken over from manuscript copies of the book אלריאץ' would decide against [the authorship of] Joseph b. Abraham who lived, according to Firkovich and Harkavy, almost a century after Saadia (and Qirqisānī). Harkavy thought that the author of the Book אלאסתבצאר (or יהי אור, *fiat lux*, again an allusion to the blind) polemicizes against Samuel b. Ḥofni (d. 1034).[575] Thus this book is different from the translated compendium of the work on dogmatics.

If I understand correctly the latest information from Harkavy (which does not fully agree with his earlier reports),[576] the *Book of Lights* is an introduction to the commentary on the Pentateuch. It treats the history of the Jewish sects, contains occasional polemics against Christianity and closes with a complete Book of Laws (כתאב אלשראיע). The last item appears to be the *Book of Laws* which Yefet b. Zair attributes to Joseph b. Jacob Qirqisānī.[577]

---

[574] Pinsker (and hence Fürst. l.c.) infers that already Moshe Bashyazi confuses the two Josephs, attributing המאור to Joseph. b. Abraham who, for him, is the elder one.

[575] Harkavy 1878b, 22, Harkavy 1880, 45, where passages from אסמבצאר, 44, are to be found, among which צחה אלאסתדלאל בקולה תע' יהי מאורות are reminiscent of another title (Steinschneider 1858, 71); Pinsker 1860. 196 ס' צחה, in Fürst 1862 II, 56 and 204 *Kitab al-Zichat*! and יהי מאורות from Tobias in Pinsker 1860 93. – The passage on Samuel, elucidated by Harkavy, does away with the combination Samuel b. Sakawijja (sic) and everything else in Fürst 1862 I, 101 II, 61.

[576] Communications in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1881 156; cf. Harkavy 1880, where the ס' המצוות appears as כתאב אלאנואר and the quotation is unclear.

[577] In Mordecai ben Nisan 1830, fol. 11 b; cf. Steinschneider 1858, 181. – Joseph b. Abraham himself quotes his ס' מצוות; cf. Steinschneider 1858, 172 (Fürst 1862 II, 56 *Schira* שראע!).

These involved discussions demonstrate that we can talk about the earliest Karaite authors only with strong reservations.

§267. (The translated writings.) Joseph b. Abraham composed the following works of which the first one is the most important.

1. אלמחתוי (The Encompassing). The original was thought to be lost. D. Kaufmann recently purchased an almost complete manuscript Budapest, MTA Kaufmann A 280; fragments exist in St. Petersburg. [For a sample catalogue and description of the fragments, see Sklare with Ben-Shammai 1997, 77–89. The Budapest ms, which is missing the first chapter, was the basis of Vajda's edition of the Arabic text; on the basis of the St. Petersburg fragments, an edition of the missing material has been prepared by H. Ben-Shammai in the sample catalogue 1997, 113–26.] The Hebrew translation is called ספר הנעימות (Book of Agreeable Things); Hadassi (chapter 258) calls it also זכרון הדתות (Book of Sects?). [On the translation of ספר נעימות see Jacob Mann 1935 II, 290 n. 10.][578]

Manuscripts. Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4779 (a copy in Trigland, no. 24, another one in L. Dukes).[579] Paris, BN héb 670b[580] St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 687; St. Petersburg, IOS B 241b (with compendium); St. Petersburg IOS B 394 (compendium); St. Petersburg, IOS C 103b (with compendium). Ms. of Abraham Misri in Petersburg [= St. Petersburg, IOS B 241b?].[581] |453|

Although this work has been brought closer to us by a century, it has lost nothing of its significance for the history of Arabic and Karaitic dogmatics, for it is the sole extant model of a work of Mu'tazilite *kalam* that could just as easily have been written by a Muslim. The enlightening analysis of the book, which takes into account the compendium (§268) as well, published by F. Frankl in the Sitzungsberichte of the Royal Academy in Vienna,[582] was meant to be followed by an edition based on the original. Unfortunately the industrious and expert scholar in this field died (August 1887) after all of the preparations (for this sequel) had been completed.

The translation continues to be beset by a number of (text-)critical problems. The translator is anonymous. The end of the Leiden manuscript reads ונתקן בירושלים, which may mean that either the work or the translation was written in Jerusalem, or else that this copy was corrected there. We know too little about the translator for us to decide whether his travels took him as far as Jerusalem, something that

[578] Steinschneider 1858, 180 (on ס' המחקר cf. Frankl 1819–1889 15). Concerning Yefet, an egregious misunderstanding occurs in Fürst 1862 II, 71 and Notes, 24, no. 329. An Arabic passage has recently been presented by Schreiner 1888, 650.

[579] Steinschneider 1858, 173.

[580] = ms. Cahen in Munk 1859, 476.

[581] מצרי in Pinsker 1860, Appendix, 195, written in 1672 (Bardach 1869, 54 n. 2), by Jacob b. Mordechai (Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 180, quotes only Pinsker 1860, 98), according to which Misri in Frankl 1872, 9, is to be corrected.

[582] *Ein Mutazilitischer Kalām aus dem 10. Jahrhundert* (above, n. 551); cf. also his article (Frankl 1871). In his essay "Nachricht über das arabische Original des Muḥtawi Josef al Baṣir's, etc." (Frankl 1887) (which I designate hereafter as "Nachricht"), he condiders (14) the work as a comment(ary) on a Mu'tazilite work on the roots of religion. The appendix (17–20) presents a conspectus of the chapters (he counts 40) in the original text and the Hebrew translation.

seems improbable.[583] The translation is the work of a scholar who lived in or in the vicinity of Greece, since he frequently resorts to Greek words.[584] At the beginning of the same manuscript, at the end of the list of forty-five "gates" (chapters), there is an index of the topics that are discussed. I took the trouble to actually count the chapters, a cautionary measure dictated by the number forty given by Simcha Isaac. According to Pinsker, 1860, 195, the Misri manuscript has thirty-five "gates" and three "chapters" (four, according to Frankl's table). St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 687 in Firkovich's catalogue numbers forty-three chapters. Doubtlessly, it was neither the author nor the translator who numbered the chapters. Apparently Pinsker himself added the numbers, erroneously giving two of them the number sixteen (ט"ז and י"ו). He gives no chapter titles at all after no. 3, even though they are displayed in the Leiden manuscript. Frankl divides the work into two parts, with nineteen and twenty-four chapters respectively.[585]

The author himself remarks (chapter 16b is in Pinsker, "That God is abundant")[586]: "We have counted (מנינו) [this theme] among [or: taken it up within] the chapters on theodicy (משערי הצדק והיושר). Others have dealt with it together with the chapter on God's unity.[587] The deviant designation |454| of the final three "chapters" is not to be found in the original; they would have had their counterpart in the Arabic work, had they been the work of the author. Pinsker uses this, without justification, to support his hypothesis that the three "chapters" were supplied either by Joseph's student, Jeshua b. Judah, or else by Tobias, who translated the book. On the basis of this assumption Pinsker maintains that the books משיבת נפש and אוצר נחמד, to which the author refers only in these three chapters, are works of Jeshua. Frankl, whose analysis covers the three last chapters, did not raise this question beforehand. Fürst had the rare luck to hit upon a correct observation of his own; he replies to Pinsker that one can find in the compendium chapters that correspond to those three.[588] Unfortunately he forgets this remark in the course of his very own article, when he presumes that the passages which contain references to the two books just mentioned are interpolations of Jeshua, "as Pinsker has correctly proven!"[589] – But this is a different hypothesis, one which concedes the authenticity of the three chapters, except for the

[583] Frankl 1871, 114; cf. the passage in Pinsker 1860 95; in Fürst 1862 II, endnotes, 16 n. 179; on II, 53 he claims that Joseph died in Jerusalem in 940; no evidence is given.

[584] For instance Steinschneider 1858, 168 פטרטון; cf. Pinsker 1860, appendix, 280, without references; Steinschneider 1875h, 38. Fürst 1862 II, endnote 83, n, 653, intended to collect the Greek words. Frankl's studies on the Greek [material] in Hadassi regrettably were left incomplete due to his premature death.

[585] Frankl 1872, 13; cf. 31, 34.

[586] עשיר = גני, without justification Steinschneider 1858, 182, 185; Steinschneider 1863a, 114. Zeraḥya in Botarel['s commentary on *Sefer Yeẓirah* 1562], fol. 72 (Steinschneider 1852, 1781).

[587] Cf. also in the compendium, end of ch[apter] 21; Steinschneider 1858, 180 n. 3. Fürst 1862 II, 70 infers from variants (which he has not gone into) that the work has not been preserved undamaged! On שער הצדק, see n. 632.

[588] Fürst 1862 II, Notes 24, no. 308.

[589] Fürst 1862 II, 73 and Notes 26, no. 342. – Schorr (1862, 82) had also assumed interpolations; his criticism (cf. Steinschneider 1864d, 14) does not exist for Fürst.

quotations in question, which Jeshua would now have interpolated. Fürst, however, does not tell us whether these interpolations were done in the Arabic original or in the translation, nor whether he adopts Pinsker's opinion that either Jeshua or Tobias is the Hebrew translator. In the end of the section on Jeshua, Fürst completely forgets his objection and his own view; Jeshua is the Arabic author of the three chapters, and in the section on Tobias, this person makes his entry as the translator![590] So we have to deal with two different questions: the authenticity of the three chapters, upon which the authorship of the two books mentioned therein depends, and the identity of the translator.

One quotation, in Steinschneider 1858, 172, which Fürst has forgotten to take into account, proves that the author of one of these chapters is identical with the writer of a passage of the book אוצר נחמד, Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Opp. 26, attributed to Tobias. It is too early, however, to judge whether this compilation was translated from Arabic or is an original, what its sources are, etc. No other manuscript of this work is known to exist.[591] [Tobias b. Moses is now presumed to be the author; a second copy has come to light in ms. St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies C 116.] For the quoted משיבת נפש, see §271.

For us, the question of the translator of the entire book is the more important one. Most of the old Karaite translations do not name the translator; from the first period (until mid-twelfth century) almost none is known by name.[592] Only Tobias (§268), a student of Jeshua and the "translator" par excellence, is well known, but he hardly translated on his own all of the writings that we have (apart from those which are lost or which we do not know), nor even all those which by using Greek words betray their origin in Greece or its neighboring countries.[593] In order to maintain (following |455| Pinsker) that Jeshua was the author of our work, we need additional proof, beyond the few passages in the three chapters, which allow for diverse interpretations. One would rather assume that in the Orient, where the tradition of composing in Arabic continued, the need to translate Arabic works was not yet felt. Perhaps Tobias was the first translator and Hebrew compilator,[594] because he had been in Jerusalem and lived in Constantinople, the only region where Karaite immigration was significant enough to bring about translations. As a matter of fact, the first traces of Karaite literature in Constantinople may be observed approximately in Tobias's time,

[590] II, 186, 188, 189, Notes, 74, 75; Note 543 and 548 as a separate writing, and 206.

[591] Cf. also Frankl 1871, 471 on התקדשתי.

[592] Jacob b. Simon, translator of Jeshua's ערוות, is otherwise unknown; Fürst 1862 II, 196, 203, 206, however, knows everything; Graetz 1875, VI, 95 also follows Pinsker 1860, 219 etc., but cf. Steinschneider 1858, 190.

[593] Fürst 1862 II, 204 names 13 writings of Joseph, among them also those that are only known from quotations. Frankl 1887, 13 points to the speed in which translations were made.

[594] Frankl 1819–1889, 17: calls him the "center". In Frank 1887, 13, he presumes that Jeshua's school (end of the eleventh century), operating from Jerusalem, wanted to support the Karaite propaganda in the West by the speedy production of translations. This presumption is still in need of corroboration from other sides. It is not evident that such translations were done in interlinear form.

[a coincidence] to which we shall return shortly.[595] This period is of interest to us primarily because of an entirely new question, i.e., whether the first Rabbanite translators may have borrowed words and forms from old Karaite translations. I shall tackle this very complicated inquiry when the study of some pertinent manuscripts will be granted to me. [Steinschneider apparently never carried out this intention.]

The character of our translation is described in detail in the Leiden catalogue 1858, 167 ff.; Pinsker 1860, Appendix, 199, has collected a number of unusual words, and Fürst blends them into a stew of mistakes, as is his habit. The translation has a highly Arabicizing character, leaving a great number of Arabic words and even phrases as they are and structuring the Hebrew according to Arabic forms. Attention has already been called to Greek words. Frankl (Nachrede, 7) thinks Tobias is the translator, since he has translated the compendium (§268); the identity of the translator, he says, is "quite evident" – but under current circumstances, as we have explained, a more detailed argumentation would not be superfluous. More important is his remark that the three (or four) final chapters, discussed above, were considerably abridged, probably because Tobias could refer in their place to his own writings משיבת נפש and אוצר נחמד (sic). One may still resolve all of the difficulties if those writings in their principal contents were not written by Tobias, but are rather compilations from Arabic texts, to which Tobias may have added something (§271.5).

Joseph ha-Roeh *Sefer ha-Ne'imot*

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779 (IMHM F 28071).
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670 (IMHM F 11549), 50b–51b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 394 (IMHM F 53555), 44a–63a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 687 (IMHM F 51269).
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241 (IMHM F 53371), 4a–124b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies C 103 (IMHM F 69335), 1b–48a.

§268. 2. כתאב אלתמייז [596] *Book of the Compendium* [?]. The original was assumed to be lost. Recently the British Museum purchased a defective manuscript from |456| [Moses Wilhelm] Shapira (chapters 9–20 and 23–29). In the preceding work the author quotes it under the title אלמנצורי; Joseph Ibn Zaddik, who calls the author Abū Yaʿqub, follows his method in part.[597] [For the question of the identity of אלמנצורי with

[595] Cf. Frankl 1819–1889, 18: "in other countries like (i.e. as) Byzantium no trace"; ibid. 22[2] tenth–eleventh century Egypt and Byzantium; according to Fürst 1862 II, 190 only in the eleventh century. Aharon b. Judah קוסדינו is a contemporary of Solomon ha-Nasi, cf. Steinschneider 1877a, 113. – What does the codex Krim 4 (Steinschneider 1858, 237) contain?

[596] תמהיד in Fürst 1862 II, 57, 64 and 204; according to Notes, 18 n. 201 cod. Mitschri has תמיה; but in Pinsker 1860, appendix, 196, we find תמייה, and according to Firkovich 1871 תמייז. Delitzsch on *Ez Ḥayyim*, ch. 315 has the emendation תמהיד from Jefet, not under this person in Fürst 1862 II, 138 ff.. 64,אלמכ'תצאר and Notes, 24 no. 305 is not attested to, but is found in Delitzsch on *Ez Ḥayyim* ("perhaps in fact referring to this מכ'תצאר has the name אלמחתוי.").

[597] Steinschneider 1858, 185; Steinschneider 1857a, 313, n. 26; hence Pinsker 1860, 196; he misses a passage which is quoted in נעימות. On the method, cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 281. The Arabic title is quoted with difficulty from the Hebrew translation, and Weinberg's deduction (*Mikrokosmos* 1888, 10)

כתאב אלתמייז, see Sklare with Ben-Shammai 1997, 65, which introduces the catalogue and description of the Judaeo-Arabic fragments in St. Petersburg, 65–89.] I shall not comment upon Fürst's hypotheses concerning the title of the work.[598]

The Hebrew translation, which carries the title מחכימת פתי (Psalm 19:8), is extant in the following:

Manuscripts: Paris, BN héb 670/2; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Poc. 213 (defective)[599]; Oxford, Bodl. Ms. Heb.f.12; Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4779/3 (1858, 179). Paris, BN héb 670/2. St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 688, St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 689 (defective). – St. Petersburg IOS B 342b, St. Petersburg, IOS B 241/4, St. Petersburg IOS B 394 Misri.[600] Deinard (1888). [For selections of the Hebrew translation, see Vajda 1976.]

According to the epigraph in the Leiden manuscript the book contains additions by Tobias,[601] who would then be the translator from the Arabic. – The Paris catalogue writes that "this treatise was apparently originally written in Arabic." As a matter of fact, it contains few Arabic words, but stylistically it exhibits many arabisms. The Greek words may just possibly be traced back to the author, but it is easier to assume they were added by Tobias. On the other hand, a double Arabic title does not fit a Hebrew work, and we do not know of any other Hebrew work by this author. Neubauer[602] supposes our book to be identical with אלאסתבצאר, but he himself notes a quotation from the eleventh treatise of the latter[603] which proves that it is not our compendium; in any event, its chapters are not numbered. Neubauer exhibits part of the epigraph of St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 688; he was led to assume, on the basis of the equivocal המעתיק, that the book was translated three times.[604] The manuscript was copied by Elijah b. Isaac who says, towards the end, talking about some historical facts, particularly concerning the Karaites, that 500 Karaite books were burned in Constantinople in 1735; he himself had lost between 50 and 60 books in Gosloff[605] and could not find a complete copy of the copied book. The prototype of this manuscript was copied, not translated, by Elijah b. Barukh Yerushalmi, a well-known copyist (around 1654); Elijah is probably also the

---

is unfounded. That Judah ha-Levi himself knows one single Karaite philosopher (Fürst 1862 II, 51) is a misunderstanding of Pinsker 1860, appendix, 194 כי אינו רואה and only ואולי.

[598] II, 50, 53, 63; cf. Frankl 1872, 8.

[599] First recognized in Steinschneider 1858, 182.

[600] This person (in Pinsker 1860, Appendix, 195) is passed over by Frankl 1872, 9.

[601] Fürst 1862, II, 64, purportedly according to the ms. in Steinschneider 1858; Furkan …! Pinsker 1860, n. 198, had corrected to או ר' ישועה; in Pinsker's text, 219, where reference is made to Steinschneider 1858, "197" should read "179."

[602] Neubauer 1866, 7, 114.

[603] Fürst 1862 II, 56, on nine sections of the Book of Commandments etc. is, as everything else here, of no use.

[604] Neubauer 1866, 108; cf. 8; imprecisely Steinschneider 1877c, 346.

[605] Neubauer 1866, 120 חמישים שיטים; according to St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 689 (659 in Neubauer 1866, 119, is a misprint, cf. 9) או ששים.

author, not translator, of some Hebrew works.[606] He always tried to improve his copies; probably we owe to him also some alterations to the text. He supplies prologues and epigraphs which sometimes have been given more authority than they deserve. In our manuscript, at the end of the foreword, Elijah apologizes for leaving out some words or adding letters, something that the translator Tobias had already done, according to the observation of Elijah Bashyazi (died 1490) in his copy (not "translation"). He (Elijah Bashyazi) has also, according to Elijah b. Baruch, |457| placed the conspectus of chapters at the end of the book. After counting he found them to number thirty-three, and so he marked them with the mnemonic ל"ג השמן (Lev. 14:12). He himself, he says, has put the register at the beginning of the book and indicated the subject of every chapter at its beginning.[607]

Thus there is only one single translator called Tobias, or, to give his full name, Tobias b. Moses, called ha-Oved (Arabic אלעבד, the servant, namely of God), also "the Scholar" (הבקי), from Constantinople, probably the student of Jeshua in Jerusalem (mid-eleventh century?), one of the first translators from Arabic known to us.[608]

Pinsker 1860 (Appendix, 198) gives us the contents of the thirty-three chapters. Generally they tally with the "comprehensive" work (no. 1 in this entry), except for the polemic against the sects, which is not found in the compendium, for that book was directed at those who had no need of it.[609] Since each of the two books refers to the other, it is impossible to decide which one was composed first. Frankl[610] deduces from one passage of the compendium missing from the more elaborate book that the latter is the more recent version.

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779 (IMHM F 28071).
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Heb.f.12 (Ms.Heb.f.12) (Neubauer 2789) (IMHM F 17286).
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Poc. 213 (Ms. Uri 129) (Neubauer 323) (IMHM F 17242).
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670 (IMHM F 11549), 50b–51b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/2 (IMHM F 11549), 77a–107a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 342 (IMHM F 53537), 81a–122b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 394 (IMHM F 53555), 44a–63a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 687 (IMHM F 51269).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 688 (IMHM F 51269), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 689 (IMHM F 51332), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241 (IMHM F 53371), 4a–124b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 241/4 (IMHM F 53371), 180a–226b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies C 103 (IMHM F 69335), 1b–48a.

[606] Geiger 1864, 19; Neubauer 1866, 67; cf. the quotations in Steinschneider 1882, 332. Cf. also Steinschneider 1881h, 13; n. 601 and §271 n. 5.

[607] The index comes first in Steinschneider 1858, 180.

[608] Isaac b. Reuben Barceloni translates in 1078, Moses Ibn Gikatilla (Gramm.), Joseph Ibn Sahl (1123/4). Steinschneider 1857a, 294, n. 13; Judah ben Barzillai 1885, X.

[609] Cf. Frankl 1872, 13 and Steinschneider 1858, 183 וקצרתי הנה העתות.

[610] Frankl 1871, 153; in Frankl 1872, 9, he is indifferent to the question.

§269. (Doubtful works.) Here I collect those works whose author or original language are doubtful, continuing my numbering and beginning with those attributed to one of the two Josephs.

3. פרק צדוק הדין (Chapter on Theodicy):

Manuscripts Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4790[3] (1858, 227). Paris, BN héb 670b, St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 679; St. Petersburg, IOS B 241/5 [formerly belonging to Abraham Mitschri], St. Petersburg, IOS B 241/5; St. Petersburg IOS B 394

The author is not named in the Paris manuscript, copied by Simcha Isaac, who attributes it in his bibliography to Joseph b. Abraham. Pinsker 1860 (Appendix, 198) also takes this to be probable; for Fürst (1862 II, 69) and Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 176, it is a fact that the book is translated from Arabic, which contradicts my opinion (1858, 227). In the Firkovich manuscript there is a note near the beginning by Elijah b. Baruch Yerushalmi[611] who adds to the title, "by R. Aha" (if this is not one of Firkovich's forgeries).[612] The copyist took it for the Book הגבולים, mentioned by Judah Hadassi (as anonymous),[613] whose author was, according to him, Nissi b. Noah. [Concerning this author, see Jacob Mann (Falaquera 1935), II, 305 and 1413.][614] Firkovich refutes this combination with the book הגבולים or חכמת הגבולים in a note; the latter, he says, is a geographical (!) work, whereas our chapter deals with definitions, since a variant reading displays גדרי instead of גבולות, and in fact it contains definitions (according to Firkovich, ninety-four). Our chapter, according to him, refers to ten things that are explained at the beginning of the book (according to Fürst, the ten articles of faith!); it is therefore none other than the book פלס ביאור המצוות or בינת המשכילים, a work on the commandments whose introduction, under the title עשרת הדברים, |458| is found in manuscripts Firkovich 610 and Geiger 12. Nissi, the purported author, lived in 790 and was the first Karaite to write in Hebrew, his predecessors having written in Aramaic. However, some fragments of this introduction, or rather of an introduction to an interpretation of the Decalogue, as well as a part of the latter, edited by Pinsker, are more than dubious.[615] Schorr[616] supposes interpolations in some philosophical terms; I think the piece is more recent.[617] Concerning the identification of Nissi with a

[611] On Elijah, cf. n. 506.

[612] In the Paris catalogue as beginning up to דבר רע also in Steinschneider 1858, and in Pinsker 1860. The writing itself begins with אנחנו נדע בתלחת הדעת; the end is הט לב אל עדותיך.

[613] Ch. 33; but ch. 100 letter ז (cf. Steinschneider 1858, 49) חכמת גבולים – thus not Isaac Israeli, as Steinschneider 1852, 1119 f. 20 has it; cf. §224 and further below.

[614] נסי בן נח in Neubauer 1866, 146; in Firkovich ms. נסי ר' א"ח.

[615] Pinsker 1860, 37 ff., appendix, 2 ff.; cf. the variant readings from the ms. in Geiger 1864, 9 ff.

[616] Schorr 1862, 70. – On ח' המוסר cf. Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 196 (from Muqammiṣ, who wrote in Arabic; cf. Abraham b. Ḥiyya, Steinschneider 1864c, 85). The word תושיה occurs frequently.

[617] Steinschneider 1881a, 35 and VII; cf. Steinschneider 1869a, IX, 1878l, 141 (cf. n. [3]103). Supplement 6 בראשית דברינו; cf. המור Steinschneider 1858, 226; 1870e, 99 (Steinschneider 1872c, 6, 57) Menachem b. Saruk, Steinschneider 1879b, 4. – 2: שכל הכם מליץ ולא כל מליץ חכם; does מליץ replace נביא? The regulations for teachers and students (12) see above 33.

Rabbi Aha (אחא), who is supposed to have been a Masorete,[618] Fürst's explanation of the error is plausible.[619] The introduction (37) has: אני נסי בן נח באין חי [חיל] ולא כח, הנקרא ר' אח להקריב ניחוח; for 40, אח, someone substituted ר' אחא. This kind of rhyme, however, is accepted only in the Franco-German school.[620] The passage seems even more suspicious in view of the fact that Firkovich used it to fabricate a title, composed by Nissi b. Noah in 688.[621] Simcha Isaac seems to have emended it to אחי להקריב ניחוח.[622]

Now if the combined discussion of theodicy along with the interpretation of the Decalogue were to be confirmed – on the basis of their styles, which, however, seem very different to me – one would have every reason to date both of them several centuries after Nissi, in whose name Joseph Bagi (beginning of the sixteenth century) already cites a passage from the introduction.[623]

Finally, we remark that God's ten promises listed in the theodicy are perhaps related to the signs of the Messiah.[624]

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779 (IMHM F 28071).
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4790 (Warner 52) (IMHM F 28074), 13a–41a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Heb.f.12 (Ms.Heb.f.12) (Neubauer 2789) (IMHM F 17286).
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Poc. 213 (Ms. Uri 129) (Neubauer 323) (IMHM F 17242).
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670 (IMHM F 11549), 50b–51b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/2 (IMHM F 11549), 77a–107a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 342 (IMHM F 53537), 81a–122b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 394 (IMHM F 53555), 44a–63a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 679 (IMHM F 51336).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 687 (IMHM F 51269).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 688 (IMHM F 51269), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 689 (IMHM F 51332), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241 (IMHM F 53371), 4a–124b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 241/4 (IMHM F 53371), 180a–226b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241/5 (IMHM F 53371), 228a–50b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies C 103 (IMHM F 69335), 1b–48a.

Nissi talks in the beginning (37) of משכילים הראשונים והאחרונים: Firkovich in Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 141!

[618] According to Karaïte manuscripts; cf. Steinschneider 1880c, 104 and Harkavy 1876, 174; in Strack Stud. und Krit. 1875, 480 vol. 48, or 47 611, 739, אחא is not mentioned. It is not conceivable why Fürst 1862 I, 14 and 152 n. 53 assumes an old Aḥa at all, since he differentiates him from Nissi. Firk. in Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 141 (cf. 196 pagination "206") assumes the existence of two אחא; the masorete, he says, is the more recent!

[619] Fürst 1862 I, 67 and 156.

[620] Steinschneider 1880c, 104.

[621] Harkavy 1874, 1875; the inscription also in Geiger 1875a, 293 (cf. 295); Harkavy 1876, 243, cf. 221. Harkavy has failed to point out the relation to our passage.

[622] Geiger 1864, 11.

[623] Steinschneider 1858, 125; cf. 390 s. v. נסי.

[624] Steinschneider 1877c, 348, 356; cf. שרח אלעתידות, Neubauer 1866, 7; Pinsker 1860, Appendix, 192; for עשר אותות cf. Steinschneider, 1874–1875, 630, 635 (vol. 28), 163 (vol. 29).

§270. 4. שאלות (Questions) which Abū Jacob (Yaʿqūb) put to all scholars of the world, "Israelite and non-Israelite," concerning the central issues of dogma, a work whose Arabic original is not known,[625] in Hebrew [Not a few collections of responsa in Arabic by al-Baṣīr have been identified; however, none of those that have been inspected are the original of the Hebrew שאלות.]:

Manuscripts. Leiden, BR Cod. Or. 4779/5, 104, copy in Trigland. Paris, BN héb 670/4; St. Petersburg, IOS B 67; NY, JTS Ms. 3409. St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 682; St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 684 Tischendorf 5 (defective).[626] Yeraḥmiel Fried in Odessa.

The name Abū Jacob may refer to different Karaite authors, e.g., Joseph b. Noaḥ,[627] Joseph b. Bakhtawi (?),[628] |459| Joseph Qirqisānī, and Joseph b. Abraham, as well as to Isaac b. Bahlul[629] who, as a matter of fact, is straightforwardly credited with our book by the Firkovich catalogue, and by Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 146. Pinsker finally opted for Joseph b. Abraham, and Fürst relays this identification as a fact[630]; and although I do not see any good reason to attribute the *Questions* to any other author, there is still no sufficient basis for [attributing them to] Joseph b. Abraham. According to the title in the Leiden manuscript there are thirteen questions. However, they are not numbered, and, in fact, there are twenty-one. The Firkovich manuscript counts fifteen in the title, 15.[631]

The translation whose author is not named uses few Greek words.

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779 (IMHM F 28071).
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779/5 (IMHM F 28071), 133b–38a.
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4790 (Warner 52) (IMHM F 28074), 13a–41a.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary 3409 (ENA 2771) (IMHM F 53002), 146a–61a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Heb.f.12 (Ms.Heb.f.12) (Neubauer 2789) (IMHM F 17286).
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Poc. 213 (Ms. Uri 129) (Neubauer 323) (IMHM F 17242).
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670 (IMHM F 11549), 50b–51b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/2 (IMHM F 11549), 77a–107a.

---

[625] Fürst 1862 II, 73 makes up the Arabic title "Kitab al-Azul (sic) al-Din" etc.! – In Simcha Isaac: שאלות ותשובות.

[626] Steinschneider 1859a, 93.

[627] Cf. Harkavy 1881; cf. Steinschneider 1858, 389; Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 177; cf. n. 548.

[628] Steinschneider 1858, 184, cf. Steinschneider 1870f, 113; Geiger 1867a; Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 146, 177; בחכאל Steinschneider 1858, 25, cf., however, Firkovich 1871, 22. On the pronunciation of the Persian ending ויה (*wayh*, see n. 556), cf. Ibn al-Nadīm 1871f II, 107; Nöldeke 1876, 753, and De Goeje 1882, 341, according to which my quotation in 1878a, 443, has to be supplemented.

[629] Steinschneider 1858, l.c.; cf. Steinschneider 1862d, 50. For בהלול cf. Stickel 1864, 780 (Steinschneider 1878d, 451; still in the eighteenth century in De Jong and Weijers 1862, 180). – A Jew בהלול still in 1862, cf. Coronel 1864, fol. 95b. – Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 146 assumes גהלול, but Chwolsohn has בהלול.

[630] Frankl 1872, 9, assumes the authorship to be dubious and planned to address the problem elsewhere; Pinsker 1860 115, n. 198; Fürst 1862 II, 73.

[631] Neubauer 1866, 146.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/4 (IMHM F 11549), 121a–34a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 67 (IMHM F 53002), 92a–103b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 342 (IMHM F 53537), 81a–122b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 394 (IMHM F 53555), 44a–63a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 679 (IMHM F 51336).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 682 (IMHM F 51005), 1a–15a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 684 (IMHM F 51374), 1a–15a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 687 (IMHM F 51269).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 688 (IMHM F 51269), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 689 (IMHM F 51332), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241 (IMHM F 53371), 4a–124b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 241/4 (IMHM F 53371), 180a–226b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241/5 (IMHM F 53371), 228a–50b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies C 103 (IMHM F 69335), 1b–48a.

§271. There are several Karaite authors by the name of Jeshua (not to be confused with Joshua).[632] The most famous is Jeshua b. Judah. The Arabic form of his name is very probably Abū l-Faraj Furqan b. Asad[633]; he is supposed to have been the student of Joseph b. Abraham and the teacher of the translator Tobias (that is to say, second half of the eleventh century). The chronological problems besetting that teacher have been resolved by recent research (§264).[634] Other than this, very little is known about his person; everything that Fürst presents[635] is found only in some anonymous works, falsely attributed to him, e.g., in a Hebrew (translated?) commentary to Exodus and Leviticus which is attributed to one Jeshua b. Ali (otherwise unknown), supposedly composed in 1088 (St. Petersburg RNL Ms. Evr. I 588). In another place, I have briefly discussed Pinsker's opinions about the work – which are mutually contradictory.[636]

5. משיבת נפש (Consolation of the Soul), a dogmatic and ethical work similar to the writings of Joseph b. Abraham, is extant in Hebrew (probably translated from Arabic) in the following:

Manuscripts: Paris, BN héb 670a, St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 690, [St. Petersburg, IOS B 339, St. Petersburg, IOS B 241a, St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. II A 40, St. Petersburg, IOS C 103a, St. Petersburg, IOS B 340.]

[632] Kaufmann 1877a, Index, 518: Josua b. Ali (!); for the passage, cf. Steinschneider 1858, 173. – For Jeshua b. Jacob, cf. Steinschneider 1879b. 130.

[633] On Jeshua, cf. the quotations in Steinschneider 1858, 174; Pinsker 1860, 219 A. 169 ff., especially 173; Fürst 1862 II, 168 (Notes, 66), Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 195; Neubauer 1866. 20; Steinschneider 1862d, n. 3; Steinschneider 1877c, 347 8; Bacher 1876, 51.

[634] Elijah Bashyazi (1835, אדרת Pentecost, chapter 6, fol. 42 d [= 1966, fol. 72d–73a)] says *expressis verbis* that he was younger than Levi b. Yefet (cf. Pinsker 1860, A. 172).

[635] 1862 II, 162 ff. – That he was in Jerusalem can supposedly be inferred from Hadassi (Bashyazi 1835), fol. 76, according to Pinsker n. 173 (but no mention of it on 170); cf., however, Firkovich in Gottlober and Chwolson 1865, 185 ("195").

[636] Steinschneider 1877c, 347–48; cf. Neubauer 1866, 20.

St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 690 has been redacted by Elijah (b. Baruch Yerushalmi?); he is then the first person to attribute the work to Jeshua. Following after him in this attribution are Simcha Isaac (who copied the Paris manuscript; nevertheless, Simḥa mentions (צ"א 24[b]) a book by the same title which, he says, is mentioned by Joseph b. Abraham in his *Ne'imot*). It is very improbable that a translator should have given the same title to two different books; therefore, the quotations in the last chapters of the *Ne'imot* have been taken to be interpolations. Frankl assumes Tobias to be their author (§267). |460| Curiously enough, no other medieval author seems to know of the work; therefore, we have too little information about it to enter into a detailed discussion.[637]

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779 (IMHM F 28071).
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4779/5 (IMHM F 28071), 133b–38a.
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Cod. Or. 4790 (Warner 52) (IMHM F 28074), 13a–41a.
New York, Jewish Theological Seminary 3409 (ENA 2771) (IMHM F 53002), 146a–61a.
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Heb.f.12 (Ms.Heb.f.12) (Neubauer 2789) (IMHM F 17286).
Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Poc. 213 (Ms. Uri 129) (Neubauer 323) (IMHM F 17242).
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670 (IMHM F 11549), 109a–20b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670 (IMHM F 11549), 50b–51b.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/2 (IMHM F 11549), 77a–107a.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/4 (IMHM F 11549), 121a–34a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 67 (IMHM F 53002), 92a–103b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 342 (IMHM F 53537), 81a–122b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 394 (IMHM F 53555), 44a–63a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 679 (IMHM F 51336).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 682 (IMHM F 51005), 1a–15a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 684 (IMHM F 51374), 1a–15a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 687 (IMHM F 51269).
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 688 (IMHM F 51269), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 689 (IMHM F 51332), 69a–95a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 241 (IMHM F 53371), 250b–68b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241 (IMHM F 53371), 4a–124b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 241/4 (IMHM F 53371), 180a–226b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 241/5 (IMHM F 53371), 228a–50b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 339 (IMHM F 53458), 16 fols.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 340 (IMHM F 53449), 65–77.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS C 103 (IMHM F 69335), 83b–91a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies C 103 (IMHM F 69335), 1b–48a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 690 (IMHM 51333), 22 fols.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. II A 40 (IMHM F 64039), 9a–20b.

§272. 6. מרפא לעצם (*Healing for the Bones*), on God and His attributes:

Manuscripts: Paris, BN héb 670/6, St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 686, [St. Petersburg, IOS C 103/3, St. Petersburg, IOS C 69/3, St. Petersburg, IOS B 241/2]. – Rabin. 1886 n. 55 [= Cincinnati, HUC 848?]

[637] Fürst 1862 II, 186; extract from *Muḥtawi*! Beginning in Paris שם איום ונורא...יתברך וישתבח ויתהדר; end לכן הננו אתאנו...י"י וכו'.

Perhaps this is translated from Arabic. Hadassi (chapter 33 and 100, in Hadassi 1836 edition, at the end of f. 98)[638] mentions the title; thus it is a work belonging to the first period (before 1148). All that we know about the author is the fact that he lived in Jerusalem, which he says himself, and that he has not visited Babylon or Constantinople. Simcha Isaac (Luẓki) does not know of him; Pinsker attributes the book to Jeshua b. Judah without a valid reason, but with enough [plausibility] for Fürst to gather details about Jeshua's biography from it. In order to make some use of his own manuscript, Firkovich wants to attribute it to Aharon Abū l-Faraj, or even to a tenth-century author.

This treatise is composed of twelve chapters in the Paris manuscript, but in the Firkovich manuscript, according to Pinsker, of three chapters and twenty-five gates, apart from the introduction. The technical terms are frequently given in Arabic and Greek; the former probably derive from the original, the latter may perhaps be due to the translator.[639]

Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College HUC 848 (IMHM F 11336), 29 fols.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale héb 670/6 (IMHM F 11549), 151a–72b.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS B 241/2 (IMHM F 53371), 160b–25a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS C 69/3 (IMHM F 69215), 56a–71a.
St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies IOS C 103/3 (IMHM F 69335), 69a–83a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library RNL Evr. I 686 (IMHM F 51373), 20 fols.

§273. 7. שער הצדק (*Gate of Justice*): St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 683 and St. Petersburg, RNL Evr. I 685[640] (six folia in quarto), contain thirty-four questions, but carry slightly different titles. [Another ms. fragment is St. Petersburg, IOS B 67/5.] The manuscripts name as author חסן b. Mashiaḥ, and Firkovich adds that the book is mentioned, along with five others by the same author, by Judah Hadassi (f. 98 [3]), but he does not notice, or does not want to notice, that these works are mentioned in chapter 258, and the author in chapter 257.[641] In fact Simcha Isaac names this as the title (f. 26) of an anonymous work mentioned by Hadassi, without indicating the author. To me, this title seemed to be that of a chapter rather than of a book, since a part of the extensive book by Joseph b. Abraham (not a single chapter, as in Pinsker)[642] is indicated in the same way. Hadassi's remark may then refer in general to all works treating of the subject of theodicy, e.g., supra, no. 3.

I know too little about this small treatise to decide whether it has been translated from Arabic; but as it seems, the Karaites employed that language when discussing dogmatics, at least in the first period.

---

[638] Cf. Steinschneider 1858, 49; Steinschneider 1877c, 346. – Cf. Pinsker 1860, n. 73 (Fürst II, 1862, 105 cf. 162); beginning (Paris) דע יעזרך האל כי לא נברא האדם; end יי"י ותורתך אמת ברוך.

[639] Fürst 1862 III, 186; "Sefat Jischmael" without reference. Neubauer 1866, 146 has "a *Byzantine* product" – why?

[640] פתרון דברי הדת מדברי הדעת מדברי אדונינו מרע"ה בפסוק ודעת היום; in ms. 683, the title שער הצדק לר' חסון בן משיח precedes, in ms. 685 it follows. The Firkovich ms. catalogue concludes from this that they are not copies from the same prototype.

[641] On the other writings, cf. Steinschneider 1858, 180.

[642] 115 under חסון, cf. n. 577.

The name of the author, as it is assumed on the basis of an erroneous combination, is corrupt almost throughout; Pinsker and Fürst have not taken heed of the evidence that I presented. Ḥasan,[643] or, in the diminutive, |461| Ḥusayn (חסין)[644] b. Mashiaḥ was, according to Sahl,[645] a contemporary of Saadia and probably wrote in Arabic.

Ḥasan ben Mashiaḥ (attributed to), *Sha'ar ha-ẓedeq*

St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies B 67/5 (IMHM F 53002), 103b–7b.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 683 (IMHM F 51005), 15b–20a.
St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 685 (IMHM F 51005), 15b–9b.

Endnotes to Jewish Authors

|999–1000| Endnote 29 (to 386, n. 118) *Choice of Pearls* [In this endnote Steinschneider matches up the aphorisms from published collections, including his book of translated Hebrew poetry, *Mannah* 1847, with those of the *Choice of Pearls* in Ascher's edition. The abbreviations are explained above.]

(A) My *Manna,* the chapter of Ascher's edition of *Choice*, followed by the aphorism number therein [I.e. '§87=1.3' should be read as '*Manna*, aphorism 87, corresponding to *Choice*, ch. 1, aphorism 3.] *Manna*, §87=1.3; §88=1.13; §89=1.16; §90=1.28; §91=1.29; §92=1.36–37; §93=1.42; §94=1.53; §95=1.58; §96=1.57; §97=1.59; §98=1.65; §99=1.66; §100=3.79; §101=3.107; §102=4.111; §103=5.117; §104=20.258; §105=21.268; §106=25.229; §107=25.281; §108=27.310; §109=29.315; §110=31.332; §111=32.328; §112=32.332; §113=32.317; §114=32.350; §115=32.352; §116=32.355; §117 (תולעת); §118 36.376; §119 (תפסות); §120=39.404; §121=43.456; §122=44.502; §123=44.523; §124=44.516; §125=47.563; §126 (*Dz.* 6).

(B) Kimḥi (see above, p. 384) [the chapter numbers from Ascher's edition are omitted]

(a) *Dz.* [1842]: §1=? (*Pr.*: [1990] 8, 9 fol. 11, Dukes 1851, 64); §2=?; §3 (incorrectly listed שער ההכרח)=69; §4=61; 5=?; §6=74; §7=414–15 (*Choice*, p. 166); §8=? (not 36–37); §9=60; §10=208; §11=547? (the first line is not in *ED* 1852, 6; §12=522; §13=523; §14=547? 15=? (*Pr.* 9: 19, f. 13); §16=? (§16b=?); §17=?; §18=601 (cf. 460, 260, where the text is corrupt); §19=310 (read: גזרת הכמה?); §20=436; §21=338; §22=354.

[643] Thus also Ibn Ezra in Friedlaender 1877, Appendix, 26 *ad* Gen. 1, 6.

[644] Steinschneider 1861a, 48, cf. 1862d, 50 n. 3. – Fürst 1862 II A. 14 maintains that חסון represents the vulgar pronunciation of חסאן! משיחת he says, is Arabic and to be pronounced Mashi'h! However, מסיח is originally Hebrew.

[645] Steinschneider 1858, 403, Pinsker 1860, n. 37. Cf. Fürst 1862 II, 46; Gottlober, 168; HB. l.c.; cf. Steinschneider 1858, 390.

(b) *Dl*. [1846b]: §1? (Dukes 1853, 55, Dukes 1844, 536, incorrectly paginaged as 542, from צרי היגון, not in the Cremona edition); §2 = ?; §3b, §4 = ?; §5 = 12?; §6 = 13; §7 = 15 §8 = 16; §9 = 17; §10 = ? (Dukes 1851, 8); §11 = ?; §12 (is the final strophe); §13 = 93; §14 = ?; §15 = 165? §16 = ?; §17 = ?; §18 = 549; §19 = ?; §20 = 178; §21 = ?; §22 = 194; §23 = 204; §24 = 136; §25 –; 27 = ? §28 = 756; §29 = 398; §§30–32 = ? §33 = 370.

(c) *Dll*. [Dukes 1850c]: §1 = 29; §2 = 624 (also *Pr.* 12: 9); §3 = ?; §4 – ? (*ED.* 11); §5 = 50; §6 = 58; §7 = ?; §8 = 544.

(d) *ED*. [H. Edelmann 1852] [§§1, 2, 4, 5 (*Dll*. 7) 11, 16, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 in *Dz*. 1 and 4 in *Dl.* 3 (Paraphrase) = 202; §6 = 63; §§7–10 = ? §12 = 156–157; §§13, 14 = ? §15 = 49; §17 = 264; §18 = 266; §20 = 363; §21 = 364; §23 = ? §27 = ? §30 = 366; §31 = 367; §§32, 33 = ?

(e) *Pr.* [Kimḥi 1990] The aphorisms are numbered according to their sequence in Kimḥi's commentary on Proverbs, with reference to chapter and verse [and page number in the Talmage edition Kimḥi 1990]; then they are matched to other editions and to the Ascher edition of *Choice*: §1, 2:2, 11 *Dz*. 7; §2, §3, §4 חי אדם (Dl 4, 5, 12, or 15?); §5 חכמה בלי מעשה = Ascher, 59. §6, 2:11, 6 = ?; §7 כל איש = 117; §8, 3:16, 17 = 7.25, 7.30 8? 9?; §10, 4:22, 25; §11, 8:11, 37 *Dz*. 1 §12, 10:19, 46 *Dz*. 15; §§13, 14, 11:2, 49 = 14.328–332 [11:15 שר השירים אמר is not *Choice*?] §15, 11:2, 49 = 14.316–317; §16, 11:16, 52 = ib?; §17, = ib. 518. §18 11:25, 54 *ED* 12 §19, 11:25 = ib.158; §20, 12:9, 59 (Dukes 1850a, 507, Dukes 1853, 49 n. 31, where in Sarsa? The anecdote of the King precedes it; see Steinschneider 1870f, §21, 14:12, 70?; §24, 14:30, 74 – 21.594 (Dukes 1850a, 378; §25, 16:32, 86, *Dl* 13; §26 ib. (?); §27, 18:23, 94; 28 בזולתך, 20:6 = 27? (Dukes 1850a, 389); §29, 22:1, 111, prose, = 540 (see 387, n. 122 above [where Steinschneider corrects Ascher's text to read "8000" dinars rather than "80,000"; the proverb here has "1000 gold dinars."]) ; §30, 24:21, 121 = 32.366; §31, 25:14, 128? (corrupt); §32, 25:17, ib. = 405; §33, 27:19, 138 (Dukes 1850a, 391); §34, 29:19, 145 = 244.

In addition, a note to no. 86 (read ממדות טובות?); במעלות הבט Dukes 1853 49, no. 30.

(C) Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics* [Wise's comparison between the aphorisms in Ibn Gabirol's *Ethics* and the *Choice of Pearls* in Wise 1901, 108–113, supercedes Steinschneider's comparison here.]

Endnote 30 (to 428, n. 410) [In this endnote, Steinschneider gives various Hebrew terms for the Aristotelian] Categories. (Key: 'a' refers to *Ru'aḥ Ḥen*, ch. 10; 'b' to *Emunot ve-De'ot* II, 2, according to Judah Ibn Tibbon's translation; 'c' to Samuel Ibn Tibbon's Glossary, s.v. איכות, 'd' to Moses Ibn Tibbon's translation of Maimonides' *Logical Terms*; 'e' to Jacob b. Makhir's translation of Averroes' *Epitome on Logic*; 'f' to the translation of Abraham Ibn Daud's *Emunah Ramah* Ibn Daud 1852, f. 5 ; where מצב is counted fourth; as a result, our numbers 4–6 are counted there 5, 7, 6; cf. the anonymous work cited above on 500. [Actually, this

statement appears to refer to n. 205 on 500, which discusses the *Kelalei Higgayon* of David Ibn Bilia found in the Bodleian, Oxford Mich. 88, ff. 104a–129a; there the order of the Categories is also slightly different from the standard one]; 'g' to the translation of Moses Ibn Ezra's *Arugat ha-Bosem* Dukes 1843a, 118, where our nos. 5–8 are rearranged as 6, 5, 8, 7, cf. Kaufmann 1877a, 64.

1. עצם – everywhere, 2. a, b כמות, even כמה, g 3 – ספירה.a etc. איכות, d איך, g 4 – תואר. a, b, d מצטרף, c הצטרפות והמצורף, e f g 5 – הצטרפות a etc. מתי, b זמן, g עת, in b, g as 6. – 6 a etc. אנה, b מקומות, g מקום, in b f g as 5. – 7 מצב everywhere, in b as 8. – 8 לו, b and g (as 7) קנין. – 9 a, etc. שיפעל, b and g פועל: c and e place 10 before 9. – 10 a etc. שיתפעל, b נפעל, g פעול. – In Saadia Commentary on *Sefer Yeẓirah* there are various translations: יסוד, (Dukes 1853, 25, Kaufmann 1877a, כמויות, איכות, טפול 141), מקום, קניה or נפעל, פועל, קנין, or, יחס, הרכוש והקניה מופעל (Dukes 1853, 3.)

Endnote 31 (to 436) Variants to Maimonides, מאמר הייחוד, see Steinschneider 1892, 86.

Endnote 32 (to 446) Pseudo-Saadia on פר"ס. Steinschneider 1892, 79; Epstein 1892, 75.

References

Aaron ben Elijah. 1841. *'Es hayim: Ahron ben Elia's aus Nikomedien, des Karäers, System der Religionsphilosophie* […] *nebst einem* […] *Tractat des Karäers Kaleb Abba Afendopolo*, eds. F. Delitzsch and M. Steinschneider. Leipzig.

Abba Mari ben Moses ben Joseph Astruc. 1838. *Sefer Minḥat qen'aot*, ed. M. L. Bisliches. Pressburg.

Abraham bar Hiyya. 1851. *Sefer ha-'Ibbur*, ed. Herschel Filipowski. London.

Abramson, Shraga. 1976. "The Translator of Arugat ha-Bosem of Moses Ibn Ezra is Judah Al-Harizi." *Kiryat Sefer* 51:712. Hebrew.

Abravanel, Isaac. 1831–2. *Perush 'al sefer Moreh Nevukhim le-Rabenu Mosheh ben Maimon*, ed. M. Landau. Prague.

Albo, Joseph. 1844. *Sefer 'Iqqarim = Buch Ikkarim*, ed. W. Schlessinger and L. Schlesinger. Frankfurt am Main.

Aldabi, Meir Ben-Yizḥaq. 1559. *Shevilei emunah*. Riva di Trento.

Allony, Nehemiah. 1982. *Sefer Yeẓirah* in Saadia's Version in the Form of a Scroll from the Cairo Genizah *Temirin* 2:9–29.

Alonso, Manuel Alonso. 1943. Notas sobre los traductores toledanos Domingo Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano. *Al-Andalus* 8:155–78.

Altmann, Alexander. 1957. "Isaac Israeli's *Book of Definitions*: Some Fragments of a Second Hebrew Translation." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2:232–42.

Altmann, Alexander, and S. M. Stern. 1958. *Isaac Israeli: A Neoplatonic Philosopher of the Early Tenth Century*. Scripta Judaica. London.

Amari, Michele. 1854. *Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia*. Firenze.

Ankori, Zvi. 1956. *Karaites in Byzantium; the Formative Years, 970–1100*. New York.

Anonymous. 1562. *Sefer Yeẓirah ha-meyuḥas le-Avraham avinu*. Mantua.

Anonymous. 1887. *Masekhet avot de-Rabi Natan*, ed. Solomon Schechter. Vienna.

Anonymous. 1994. *Sefer ha-Bahir al pi kitvei ha-yad ha-qedumim*, ed. Daniel Abrams. Los Angeles.

Ascher, D. 1863. "Salomo Ibn Gabirol in seinem Verhältniss zu A. Schopenhauer." *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* 1 (52):955.

Ashkenazi, Eliezer. 1854. *Ta'am zeqenim: Qovez ḥibburim u-khetuvim ve-shirim be-'inyanei ha-ḥokhmah ve-ha-'emunah ve-ha-mada'*. Frankfurt am Main.

Ashkenazi, Saul Cohen, and Isaac Abravanel. 1574. *She'elot le-he-ḥakham Sha'ul ha-Kohen*. Venice.

Atlas, Elazar. 1888. "The Moon and the Stars, or Rivash and his Contemporaries." *Ha-Kerem* 1:1–26. Hebrew

Avishur, Yitshak. 1998. *Shivḥe ha-Rambam: Sippurim 'amamiyim be-'arvit yehudit u-ve-'ivrit me-ha-mizraḥ u-mi-zefon afrikah*. Jerusalem.

Azulai, Hayyim Joseph David. 1852. *Sifre shem ha-gedolim*, ed. I. Benjacob. Vilna.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1876. *Abraham Ibn Esra's Einleitung zu seinem Pentateuch-Commentar als Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bibelexegese beleuchtet*. Vienna.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1881. *Abraham ibn Esra als Grammatiker. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hebräischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Strassburg.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1883. "Joseph Kimchi et Abulwalid Ibn Ganah." *Revue des études juives* 6:208–221.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1890. "Un manuscrit hébreu intéressant." *Revue des études juives* 20:138–144.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1892a. "Der arabische Titel des religionsphilosophischen Werkes Abraham ibn Dauds." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46:541–544.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1892b. *Die Bibelexegese der jüdischen Religionsphilosophen des Mittelalters vor Maimuni*. Strassburg.

Bacher, Wilhelm. 1896. "The Treatise on Eternal Bliss attributed to Moses Maimûni." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 9:270–289.

Baer, Yitzhak. 1929. *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*. Berlin.

Baeumker, Clemens. 1892. "Jahresbericht über die abendländische Philosophie im Mittelalter. 1890." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 5:113–138.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1489. *[Ḥovot ha-levavot]*. Naples.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1548. *Ḥovot ha-levavot*. Venice.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1610. *Sefer Ḥovot ha-levavot*. Amsterdam.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1670. *Ḥovot ha-levavot = Hobat alebabot = Obrigaçam dos coraçoens: livro moral de grande erudiçaõ & pia doctrina*. Amsterdam.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1712. *Hovot ha-levavot: Livro yamado en Ladino obligasion de los korasones*. Venice.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1716. *Sefer Ḥovat ha-levavot*. Amsterdam.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1765. *Ḥovot ha-levavot.* Fürth.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paḳuda. 1809. *[Ḥovot ha-levavot]: Ḥovat ha-levavot*. Vienna.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1835. *Sefer Ḥovot ha-levavot*, ed. Raphael Jacob Fürstenthal. Breslau.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1846. *Torat Ḥovot ha-levavot*, eds. Isaac Benjacob, and Adolf Jellinek. [Leipzig].

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1847. *I doveri dé cuori*. Firenze.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1854. *Torat Ḥovot ha-levavot*, ed. Emanuel Baumgarten. Wien.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1856. *Torat Ḥovot ha-levavot*, ed. Max Emanuel Stern. Vienna.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1870. *Torat Ḥovot ha-levavot*, ed. David Slutzki. Warsaw.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1871. *Nosafot le-sefer Torat sefer Ḥovot ha-levavot*, *Sifrey Hokhmat Yisra'el*, ed. Baer Goldberg, Joseph Kimḥi, David Slutzki. Warsaw.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1912. *Kitāb al-hidāja 'ilā farā'iḍ al-qulūb des Bachja ibn Jôsef ibn Paquda aus Andalusien*, ed. Abraham Shalom Yahuda. Leiden.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1925–47. *Torat Ḥovot ha-levavot*, trans. Moses Hyamson. [New York].

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1948. *Sefer Ḥovot ha-levavot*, ed. A. Tsifroni. Tel-Aviv.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1972. *Ḥovot ha-levavot: Maqor ve-targum*, ed. Yosef Qafih. Jerusalem.

Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1973. *The Book of Direction to the Duties of the Heart*, trans. Menahem Mansoor. London.
Baḥya ben Joseph ibn Paquda. 1994. *Los deberes de los corazones*, trans. Joaquín Lomba Fuentes. Publicaciones de la Fundación Universitaria Española. Clásicos olvidados 14. Madrid.
Baldi, Bernardino, and Moritz Steinschneider. 1874. *Vite di matematici arabi*. Roma.
Baneth, D. H. 1938. "The Common Teleological Source of Bahye ibn Paqoda and Ghazzali." In *Sefer Magnes*, ed. J. Baer et al., 23–30; English summary, pp. IV-V. Jerusalem. Hebrew.
Baneth, D. H. 1940. "Rabbi Judah Alharizi and the Chain of Translation of Maimonides' Treatise on Resurrection." *Tarbiz* 11:260–270. Hebrew.
Baneth, D. H. 1957. "Philological Observations on Joseph ben Judah Ibn Shim'on's Metaphysical Treatise." *Tarbiz* 27:234–248. Hebrew.
Baneth, D. H. 1964. "Joseph Ibn Simeon, the Important Pupil of Maimonides and Joseph Ibn Aknin." *Oẓar Yehudei Sefarad* 7:11–20. Hebrew.
Baneth, Eduard. 1879. "Maimonides' Commentar zu Pirke Aboth und die Tibbon'sche Übersetzung." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 6:170–178, 237–249.
Bardach, Judah. 1869. *Mazkir li-venai reshef*. Vienna.
Bardenhewer, Otto. 1882. *Die pseudo-aristotelische Schrift über das reine Gute: bekannt unter dem Namen Liber de causis*. Freiburg.
Bardinet, Leon. 1880. "Les Juiveries du Comtat Venaissin." *Revue des études juives* 1:262–292.
Barozzi, Francesco. 1586. *Admirandvm illvd geometricum problema tredecim modis demonstratvm, etc.* Venetiis.
Bartolocci, Giulio. 1675. *Bibliotheca magna rabbinica de scriptoribus, & scriptis Hebraicis, ordine alphabetico Hebraicè, & Latinè digestis*. 5 vols. Rome.
Bashyazi, Elijah ben Moses. 1835. *Aderet Eliyahu*. Yevpatoriya.
Bashyazi, Elijah ben Moses. 1966. *Sefer ha-mitzvot ha-nikra Aderet Eliyahu*. Ramla.
Basir, Joseph ben Abraham ha-Kohen ha-Ro'eh. 1985. *Al-Kitāb al-Muḥtawī de Yūsuf al-Baṣīr*, ed. Georges Vajda and David R. Blumenthal. Etudes sur le judaïsme médiéval 12. Leiden.
Bedersi, Abraham. 1865. *Ḥotam tokhnit*, ed. Samuel David Luzzatto. Amsterdam.
Beer, B. 1854. "Recension und "Anzeige."" *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 3:159–164, 197–203.
Ben-Asher, Aaron b. Moses, and Jacob ben Nissim. 1846. *Quntres ha-masoret ha-meyuḥas le-Ben-Asher; ve-nilvu elav eizeh ha'atakot mi-ferush Sefer Yeẓirah le-R' Ya'akov ben Nissim*, ed. Leopold Dukes. Tübingen.
Ben-Shammai, Bitya. 1991. "Twenty-Five Years of Maimonidean Studies, 1965–1990." *Maimonidean Studies* 2: 17–42. Hebrew.
Ben-Shammai, Haggai. 1977. Shitot ha-maḥashavah ha-datit shel Abū Yūsuf Ya'kub al-Kirkisani ve-Yefet ben 'Ali. PhD thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Hebrew
Ben-Shammai, Haggai. 1991. "New Fragments from the Arabic Original of *Mivḥar ha-Peninim*." *Tarbiz* 60:577–587. Hebrew.
Ben-Shammai, Haggai. 1997. "Lost Chapters of Yūsuf al-Basīr's *al-Muḥtawi* (Tentative Edition)." In *Kitvei ha-Yad be-`Aravit-Yehudit be-Osfei Firkovitch*, eds. David Eric Sklare, and Haggai Ben-Shammai. Jerusalem. Hebrew.
Ben-Shammai, Haggai. 2003. "Major Trends in Karaite Philosophy and Polemics in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries." In *Karaite Judaism: A Guide to its History and Literary Sources*, ed. Meira Polliack, 339–362. Leiden/Boston.
Benjacob, Isaac, and Moritz Steinschneider. 1880. *Oẓar ha-sepharim. Thesaurus librorum hebræorum tam impressorum quam manuscriptorum*. Wilna.
Berechiah ben Natronai. 1902. *The Ethical Treatises of Berachya, Son of Rabbi Natronai Ha-Nakdan*, ed. Hermann Gollancz. London.
Berliner, Abraham. 1869a. "Rabbi Israel Isserlein." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 18:177–181 (Anfang).
Berliner, Abraham. 1869b. "Seligmann Bing Oppenheim." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 9:81–86.
Berliner, Abraham. 1872. *Pletath Soferim: Beiträge zur jüdischen Schriftauslegung im Mittelalter nebst Midrasch über die Gründe der defectiva und plena*. Breslau.

Berliner, Abraham. 1874a. Aus den Bibliotheken Italiens IV. *Magazin für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 1:17–18.
Berliner, Abraham. 1874b. "Joseph Kimchi's Pentateuch-Commentar." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 1:21–22.
Berliner, Abraham. 1877a. "Super-Commentare zu Abraham ibn Ezra. Elasar b. Matatia." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*:145–149.
Berliner, Abraham. 1877b. "Zur hebräischen Abtheilung (S. 054-077)." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 2:219–235.
Berliner, Abraham. 1878. "Introduction to the Commentary of R. Elazar bar Mataya on the Commentary of R' Abraham Ibn Ezra." In *Oẓar tov* 1:81–82. Hebrew
Blau, Joshua, and Haggai Ben-Shammai. 1993. *Hiqre 'ever va-'arav: Mugashim li-Yehoshu'a Blau 'al yede ḥaverav bi-melot lo shiv'im*. Tel Aviv, Jerusalem.
Bloch, Philipp. 1870. "Die zweite Übersetzung des Saadiahnischen Buches 'Emunoth wedeoth' angeblich von Berechjah hanakdan." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 19:401–414, 449–456.
Boncompagni, B. 1884. "Intorno alla vita e ai labori de Francesco Barozzi." *Bullettino di bibliographia e di storia delle scienze matematiche e fisiche* 17:795–848.
Brook, Kevin Alan. 2004. *The Jews of Khazaria*. Second Edition Lanham, Md.
Brüll, N. 1876. "Miscellen. 7. Mischnalehrer von heidnischer Abkunft." *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte* 2:154–165.
Brüll, N. 1879. "Review of D. Kaufmann, 'Geschichte der Attributenlehre,'" etc. *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte* 4:134–151.
Brüll, N. 1880. "Plagiate." *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 2:165–173.
Brüll, N. 1883a. "Review of Ludwig Stein, 'Die Willensfreiheit,' etc." *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte* 5:203–205.
Brüll, N. 1883b. "Zur Geschichte der jüdisch-ethischen Literatur des Mittelalters." *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 5:71–93.
Brüll, N. 1885. "Review of 'Das Buch über die Elemente: Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Religionsphilosophie des Mittelalters von Isak b. Salomo Israeli,'" ed. S. Fried. *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte* 7:107–109.
Brüll, N. 1889. "Neubauer, Anecdota Oxioniensia." *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte* 9:102–113.
Carmoly, Eliakim. 1839. "Historische und literarische Analecte: 12. Über mehrere ältere didaktische Gedichte." *Israelitische Annalen* 1:188–191, 312 (Nachträge und Berichtigungen).
Carmoly, Eliakim. 1840–41. "Iẓḥaqi." *Ẓiyyon* 1:46–47. Hebrew.
Carmoly, Eliakim. 1842. "Histoire des médecins juifs." *Revue orientale* 2:2–24, 96–109, 121–144, 192–205, 265–289, 382–392, 429–452, 464–490.
Carmoly, Eliakim. 1844. *Histoire des médecins juifs 'nciens et modernes.* Bruxelles.
Castro, Don Joseph Rodriguez de. 1781. *Biblioteca española*. Vol. I. Madrid.
Chamizer, M. 1912. "R. Achitubs aus Palermo hebräische Übersetzung der Logica Maimunis." In *Festschrift zu Hermann Cohens Siebzigstem Geburtstage*, 423–456. Berlin.
Coronel, Naḥman Nathan. 1864. *Ḥamishah quntrasim*. Vienna.
Creizenach, M. 1840–1841. "Letter of Simon ben David Oppenheim to Isaac Cremieux." *Ẓiyyon* 1:78–79. Hebrew.
Crescas, Ḥasdai. 1555. *Sefer Or Adonai*. Ferrara.
Crescas, Ḥasdai. 1860. *Or Adonai*. Vienna.
D'Alverny, M.T. 1954. "Avendauth?" In *Homenaje a Millás Vallicrosa*, 19–43. Barcelona.
David, Avraham. 1978–9. "An Unknown Translation of Maimonides' Epistle on Resurrection." *Kiryat Sefer* 53:377–378.
Davidson, Herbert A. 2001. "The Authenticity of Works Attributed to Maimonides." In *Me'ah she'arim: Studies in Medieval Jewish Spiritual Life in Memory of Isadore Twersky*, eds. E. Fleischer, G. Blidstein, C. Horowitz, and B. Septimus, 111–134. Jerusalem.
Davidson, Herbert A. 2005. *Moses Maimonides: the Man and his Works*. New York, Oxford.
Davidson, Israel. 1924. *Thesaurus of Medieval Hebrew Poetry*. 4 vols. New York.

Davidson, Israel. 1940. “L’Introduction de Lévi ben Abraham à son encyclopédie poétique.” *Revue des études juives* 105:80–94.
De Goeje, M. J. 1882. “Die persischen Bruchzahlen bei Beladhori.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 36:339–341.
De Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo. 1775. *Annales hebraeo-typographici sec. XV*. Parma.
De Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo. 1803. *Mss. codices hebraici Bibliothecae* […]. Parmae.
De Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo. 1807. *Dizionario storico degli autoria rabi più celebri e delle principali loro opere*. Parma.
De Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo. 1839. *Historisches Wörterbuch der jüdischen Schriftsteller und ihrer Werke*, trans. C. H. Hamberger. Leipzig.
Delitzsch, F. 1840. “Schem-Tob Palkeira’s Berichtigungen der Übersetzung des Delalet el Hairin Maimuni’s von Samuel ibn Tibbon.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 1:177–180; 225–226; 257–259.
Derenbourg, Joseph. 1871. *Manuel du lecteur, d’un auteur inconnu, publié d’après un manuscrit venu du Yémen et accompagné de notes*. Paris.
Derenbourg, Joseph. 1883. “Review of ‘Sefer-ha-Mitzvoth’,” ed. M. Peritz. *Revue des études juives* 6:307–310.
Dernburg (Derenbourg), Joseph. 1835. “Review of ‘Peter Beer’s Leben und Wirken’.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 1:414–427.
Dienstag, I.J. 1960. “Maimonides’ Treatise on Logic: Editions, Translations, Commentaries, and Studies.” *Areshet* 2:7–34. Hebrew.
Dienstag, I.J. 1986. “Perakim be-Haẓlaḥah Attributed to Maimonides: A Bibliography of Editions, Translations, and Studies.” *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 16:51–56.
Diesendruck, Z. 1936. “Samuel and Moses Ibn Tibbon on Maimonides’ Theory of Providence.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 11:341–366.
Dieterici, Friedrich Heinrich. 1858. *Die Philosophie der Araber im IX. und X. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig.
Dieterici, Friedrich Heinrich. 1868. *Die Logik und Psychologie der Araber im zehnten Jahrhundert*. Leipzig.
Dieterici, Friedrich Heinrich. 1871. *Die Anthropologie der Araber im zehnten Jahrhundert*. Leipzig.
Dukes, Leopold. 1837. *Ehrensäulen und Denksteine zu einem künftigen Pantheon hebräischer Dichter und Dichtungen: ein Versuch mit hebräischen Beylagen und deutschen Übersetzungen*. Vienna.
Dukes, Leopold. 1840. “Hebräische Lexicographie.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 10:21–26, 33–27, 53–28.
Dukes, Leopold. 1842. “Transcriptions from *Sheqel ha-Qodesh*.” *Ẓiyyon* 2:97–100. Hebrew.
Dukes, Leopold. 1843a. “Excerpts from *Arugat ha-Bosem* of Moses ibn Ezra.” *Ẓiyyon* 2:117–123, 134–137, 157–159, 175. Hebrew.
Dukes, Leopold. 1843b. “Literarische Analekten. Nachlese, Notice sur Joseph ben Achnin, etc.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 4:139–140.
Dukes, Leopold. 1843c. “Vorläufige Notiz über Dunasch b. Librat.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 4:167–181, 185–188, 227–233.
Dukes, Leopold. 1843d. “Weltliche Gedichte berühmter Pajtanim der maurisch-spanischen Periode.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 4:801–807.
Dukes, Leopold. 1844. “Literarische Analekten. Poetische Kleinigkeiten.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 5:535–537.
Dukes, Leopold. 1845. “Poetische Kleinigkeiten.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 6:598–600.
Dukes, Leopold. 1846a. *Die Sprache der Mischnah: lexicographisch und grammatisch betrachtet*. Nachbiblische Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache. Esslingen.
Dukes, Leopold. 1846b. “Hebräische Gnomologen. II. Josef Kimchi. Sheqel ha-Qodesh.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 7:727–731.
Dukes, Leopold. 1847a. “Literaturhistorische “Miscellen.”” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 8:404–405.

Dukes, Leopold. 1847b. “Notizen und “Miscellen.” Zusätze zu der Anzeige der Einleitung zum Ikarim von Dr. L. Schlesinger.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 8:406–407.
Dukes, Leopold. 1848a. “Kurze “Anzeige.” 13. Die handschriftlichen hebräischen Werke der K. K. Hofbibliothek zu Wien beschrieben von Albert Kraft […].” *Literaturblatt des Orients*:305–311, 321–325, 342–346, 357–363.
Dukes, Leopold. 1848b. “Literaturhistorische “Miscellen.” 3. Über eine Bearbeitung des ‘Emunot ve-De‘ot’ des Saadja Gaon.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 9:553–554.
Dukes, Leopold. 1848c. “Über den Kommentar des Netanel Nechemjah Caspi zum Buche Kusari des Jehuda ha-Levi.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 9:571–572.
Dukes, Leopold. 1849. “Über ein hebräisches Lexicon des Josef b. David ha-Jewani (des Griechen).” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 10:705–709, 727–731, 745–708.
Dukes, Leopold. 1850a. “Die Famili’e Kimchi. 1. Josef ben Jizchak Kimchi. B. Kommentare desselben zu Mischle.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 11:331–335, 355–359, 376–380, 389–392.
Dukes, Leopold. 1850b. “Literatur- und kulturhistoris’che “Miscellen.””. *Literaturblatt des Orients* 11:336.
Dukes, Leopold. 1850c. “Über einige popular-moralische Werke der späteren hebräische Literatur.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 11:435–440, 458–461, 477–480, 485–488, 505–438, 521–424, 539–441, 550–433, 568–473.
Dukes, Leopold. 1851. *Zur rabbinischen Spruchkunde: eine Sammlung rabbinischer Sentenzen, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlicher Redensarten*. Wien.
Dukes, Leopold. 1853. *Naḥal qedumim*. Hannover.
Dukes, Leopold. 1860. *Salomo ben Gabirol aus Malaga und die ethischen Werke desselben, mit einer Übersicht der meisten ethischen Werke der Araber; ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Araber und Juden des Mittelalters*. Hannover.
Dukes, Leopold. 1868. *Philosophisches aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert: ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Mohamedaner und Juden*. Nakel.
Duran, Profiat. 1844. *Iggeret […]*, ed. Isaac ben Abraham Akrish. Breslau.
Duran, Profiat. 1865. *Ma‘aseh efod*, ed. Yom Tov Friedlaender. Wien.
Duran, Simeon ben Zemaḥ. 1785. *Magen avot*. Livorno.
Duran, Simeon ben Zemaḥ. 1855. *Magen avot*. Leipzig.
Duran, Simeon ben Zemaḥ. 1881. *Setirat emunat ha-Yishme’elim mi-sefer Keshet u-magen*, ed. Moritz Steinschneider. Berlin.
Edelmann, Zevi Hirsch. 1852. *The Path of Good Men: a Collection of Parental Instructions to Children*. Trans. M. H. Bresslau. Jerusalem.
Edelmann, Zevi Hirsch. 1853. *Divre ḥefeẓ*. London.
Efros, Israel. 1937–38. “Maimonides’ Treatise on Logic: The Original Arabic and Three Hebrew Translations.” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. New York
Eisler, Moritz. 1870–83. *Vorlesungen über die jüdischen Philosophen des Mittelalters*. Wien.
Eisler, Moritz. 1886, 1887. “Joseph ibn Zadik und sein Buch Olam hakatan.” *Jüdisches Centralblatt, zugleich Archiv für die Geschichte der Juden in Böhmen* 5:153 ff., 6: 124–132.
Elior, Ofer. 2010. *Ruaḥ Ḥen as a Looking Glass: The Study of Science in Different Jewish Cultures as Reflected in a Medieval Introduction to Aristotelian Science*. Diss. Phil. Hebrew University. Hebrew. and in its Later History
Epstein, Abraham. 1892. “Pseudo-Saadja’s und Elasar Rokeach’s Commentare zum Jezira-Buche: Die Recension Saadja’s.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums.* Jahrgang 37:77–78, 117–120.
Eran, Amirah. 1990. The Philosophical Sources of Abraham Ibn Daud in his Work, Al-Aqidah al-Rafi’ah (The Exalted faith). PhD. Dissertation,The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Hebrew.
Eran, Amirah. 1998. *Me-emunah tamah le-emunah ramah: haguto ha-qedam-Maimonit shel R. Avraham Ibn Da’ud*. Tel-Aviv.
Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph. 1779. *Sefer ha-mevakesh*. The Hague.
Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph. 1837. *Moreh ha-moreh*. Pressburg.
Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph. 1881. *Sefer ha-nefesh*, ed. Israel Chayyim Klein. Warsaw.

Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph. 1935. *Iggeret ha-musar*, ed. Abraham Meir Habermann. Jerusalem.

Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph. 1984. *Shem Tov ibn Falaquera's Psychology: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Sefer ha-nefesh*, by Raphael Jospe. [PhD thesis, Brandeis University, 1978] Ann Arbor.

Falaquera, Shem Tov Ben Joseph. 2001. *Moreh ha-moreh*, ed. Yair Shiffman. Jerusalem.

Fenton, Paul. 1976. "Gleanings from Moses Ibn 'Ezra's 'Maqalat al-ḥadiqa'." *Sefarad* 36:285–298.

Fenton, Paul. 1993. "The Judaeo-Arabic Commentary on Pirqei de Rabbi Eliezer by Judah b. Nissim Ibn Malka with a Hebrew Translation and Supercommentary by Isaac b. Samuel of Acre." *Sefunot* 6:115–165. Hebrew.

Fenton, Paul. 1997. *Philosophie et exégèse dans le Jardin de la méthaphore [sic] de Moïse Ibn 'Ezra, philosophe et poète andalou du XIIe siècle*. Leiden.

Finkel, Joshua. 1939. "Maimonides' Treatise on Resurrection." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 9:57–105 (English), 101–142 (Hebrew).

Firkovich, Abraham. 1871. *Bne reshef*. Vienna.

Firkovich, I. I. A. 1863. "On the Matter of the Authorship of 'Ruaḥ Ḥen'." *Ha-Karmel* 3:47–48, 80. Hebrew.

Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht. 1881. *Studien über Dozy's Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes. 1. (1881)*. Leipzig.

Fontaine, T.A.M. (Resianne). 1990. *In Defence of Judaism: Abraham Ibn David: Sources and Structures of ha-Emunah ha-Ramah*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 26. Assen, Maastricht.

Foucher de Careil, Louis-Alexandre. 1861. *Leibniz, la philosophie juive et la Cabale. Trois lectures à l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques avec les manuscrits inédits de Leibniz*. Paris.

Fraenkel, Carlos. 2001. *Von Maimonides zu Samuel ibn Tibbon: Die Verwandlung des Dalalat al-ha'irin in die Moreh ha-Nevukhim*, Diss. Phil. Freie Universität Berlin 2000. Berlin.

Fraenkel, Carlos. 2007. *Min ha-Rambam li-Shemuel ibn Tibbon: Darko shel Dalalat al- ḥa'irin le-Moreh ha-nevukhim*. Jerusalem.

Frankl-Grün, Adolf. 1885. *Die Ethik des Juda-Halevi*. Berlin.

Frankl, P. F. 1819–1889. "Karaiten oder Karäer." In *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste in alphabetischer Folge von genannten Schriftstellern*, eds. Johann Samuel Ersch and J. G. Gruber, 36.2: 11–24. Graz.

Frankl, P. F. 1871. "Die Stellung Joseph al-Basir's in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 20:114–119.

Frankl, P. F. 1872. *Ein mutazilitischer Kalam aus dem 10. Jahrhundert*. Vienna.

Frankl, P. F. 1876. "Following Firkovitch and Visiting Karaite Literature: Part One." *Ha-Shaḥar* 7:646–650. Hebrew.

Frankl, P. F. 1887. "Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte der Karäer: 1. Nachricht über das arabische Original des Muḥtawi Josef al Baṣir's. Charakteristik des karäischen Übersetzers Tobija hamma'atik. 3. Anhang." In *Fünfter Bericht über die Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin*, 3–20. Berlin.

Freimann, Aron. 1950. "Jewish Scribes in Medieval Italy. In *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*," ed. Saul Lieberman, 248–321. New York.

Freudenthal, Gad. 1988. "Maimonides *Guide of the Perplexed* and the Transmission of the Mathematical Tract, 'On Two Asymptotic Lines' in the Arabic, Latin and Hebrew Medieval Traditions." *Vivarium* 26:113–140.

Friedlaender, Michael. 1877. *Essays on the Writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra*. London.

Frumkin, Aryeh Leib. 1874. *Even Shemu'el*. Vilna.

Fürst, Julius. 1842. "Nachbericht über Josef ben-Jehuda oder Abul 'hagag Jusuf ben Jahja al Sabti al Maghrebi Schüler des Maimonides." *Literaturblatt des Orients* 3:807–809.

Fürst, Julius. 1845. "Proben aus Jacob ben Nissim's Einleitung zu seinem Kommentare über das Buch Yezira *Literaturblatt des Orients* 6 (36):562–564.

Fürst, Julius. 1846. "Kurze Anzeige [Critical notice of Benjacob's 1846 edition of *Ḥovot ha-levavot*]. *Der Orient* 7 (41):650–653.

Fürst, Julius. 1847. “Fragmente aus der Religionsphilosophie des David b. Merwan el-Mukammes ha-Babli.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 8:617–622, 631–634, 641–618.
Fürst, Julius. 1849–51. *Bibliotheca Judaica: Bibliographisches Handbuch der gesammten jüdischen Literatur…* Leipzig.
Fürst, Julius. 1850. “Ein jüdisch-deutsches Sprichwort.” *Literaturblatt des Orients* 11 (45):720.
Fürst, Julius. 1862. *Geschichte des Karäerthums, eine kurze Darstellung seiner Entwickelung, Lehre und Literatur* […]. Leipzig.
Gärtig, William G. 1995. “The Attribution of the Ibn Ezra Supercommentary *Avvat Nefesh* to Asher ben Abraham Crescas Reconsidered.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 66:239–257.
Gastfreund, Isaac. 1879. “Two Distinguished Gentlemen.” *Ha-Maggid*:110–111. Hebrew.
Geiger, Abraham. 1836. “Rheinpreußen.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 2:158–163.
Geiger, Abraham. 1837a. “Bibliographie 1. Handschriftliche Vergleichung.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 3:427–436.
Geiger, Abraham. 1837b. “Ausgezeichnete Handschriftensammlung.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 3:441–448.
Geiger, Abraham. 1837c. “Review of ‘Neuhebräische Poesie’.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 3:415–418.
Geiger, Abraham. 1839a. “Review of ‘Sefer Moreh ha-Moreh’.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 4:415–418.
Geiger, Abraham. 1839b. “Review of De Rossi’s ‘Historisches Wörterbuch der jüdischen Schriftsteller und ihrer Werke’.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 4:419–448.
Geiger, Abraham. 1844. “Nissim ben Jakob und sein Sefer ha-mafteach schel manule ha-talmud.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 5:431–445.
Geiger, Abraham. 1845. *Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischnah*. Breslau.
Geiger, Abraham. 1846. “Haleb und die Provence in der ersten Hälfte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts. Erster Artikel. Joseph b. Jehudah ibn Schim’.”.*Der Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts Literaturblatt.* 6:134–139.
Geiger, Abraham. 1850. *Moses ben Maimon: Studien*. Heft 1. Breslau.
Geiger, Abraham. 1853. “Article on R. Levi ben Abraham b. Hayyim and Some of his Contemporaries.” *He-Ḥalutz* 2:12–24. Hebrew.
Geiger, Abraham. 1856b. “Schreiben des Herrn Dr. Geiger an Herrn Ignaz Blumenfeld in Wien.” *Oẓar Neḥmad* 1:96–119. Hebrew.
Geiger, Abraham. 1857a. “Schreiben des Herrn Dr. Geiger an Herrn Ignaz Blumenfeld in Wien.” *Oẓar Neḥmad* 2:86–101. Hebrew.
Geiger, Abraham. 1857b. *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwickelung des Judenthums*. Breslau.
Geiger, Abraham. 1858. “Schreiben des Hernn Dr. Geiger an Herrn Ignaz Blumenfeld in Wien.” *Oẓar Neḥmad* 3:114–128.
Geiger, Abraham. 1861. “Moses Kohen (Gikatilia) bei den Karäern.’ *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 4:43–48.
Geiger, Abraham. 1862. “Aus Briefen.” *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 10:222–240.
Geiger, Abraham. 1864. “Schreiben des Herrn Dr. Geiger an Herrn Ignaz Blumenfeld in Wien (Notes on Pinsker’s ‘Lickute Kadmoniot’).” *Oẓar Neḥmad* 4:8–35. Hebrew.
Geiger, Abraham. 1865. *Das Judentum und seine Geschichte: in vierunddreissig Vorlesungen*. Breslau.
Geiger, Abraham. 1866. “Die hebräischen Handschriften der Pariser Bibliothek.” *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 4:174–189.
Geiger, Abraham. 1867a. Joseph b. Bakhtawi *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 5:177.
Geiger, Abraham. 1867b. *Salomo Gabirol und seine Dichtungen*. Leipzig.
Geiger, Abraham. 1875a. “Brief von Harkavy.” *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 11:292–295.

Geiger, Abraham. 1875b. "Der Islam." *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 11:43–50.
Geiger, Abraham. 1875c. "Umschau." *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 10:207.
Gershon ben Solomon of Arles. 1547. *Sha'ar ha-shamayim*. Venice.
Gershon ben Solomon of Arles. 1801. *Sha'ar ha-shamayim*, ed. Wolf Heidenheim. Rödelheim.
Ghirondi, Mordecai Samuel ben Benzion Aryeh, Efrayim Refa'el Girondi, Hananel Neppi, and Graziadio Nepi. 1853. *Toledot gedolei Yisra'el u-ge'onei Italyah*. Trieste.
Gig, Eliyahu ben Yosef. 1868. *Sefer Ma'aseh sha'ashu'im.* Livorno.
Gil, Moshe, and E. Fleischer. 2001. *Yehudah ha-Levi u-vene hugo: 55 te'udot min ha-Genizah*. Jerusalem.
Ginzburg, I. 1930. "Variantes arabes et hébraiques du traité de philosophie de Daud Ibn Mervan al-Mokommis (Russian)." *Zapiski Kollegi Vostokovedov pri azaitskom muzee* 5:481–506.
Goitein, Hirsch. 1890. *Der Optimismus und der Pessimismus in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie. Eine Studie über die Behandlung der Theodicee in derselben bis auf Maimonides.* Berlin.
Golb, Norman, and Omeljan Pritsak. 1982. *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*. Ithaca, NY.
Golb, Norman. 1988. *Jewish Proselytism: a Phenomenon in the Religious History of early Medieval Europe*. Annual Rabbi Louis Feinberg Memorial Lecture; 10. Cincinnati, OH.
Goldberg, Baer. 1861a. "The Scout. The Voyage in the West." *Ha-Maggid*:46–47. Hebrew.
Goldberg, Baer. 1861b. "Passage from the Book of the *Kuzari* and its Translation into Hebrew." *Ha-Maggid*:183. Hebrew.
Goldberg, Baer. 1862a. "Mi-Fetah Sefatay." *Ha-Mevasser* 2:23. Hebrew.
Goldberg, Baer. 1862b. "On the Subject of the *Millot ha-Higgayon*." *Ha-Maggid*:46–47. Hebrew.
Goldberg, Baer. 1867. "The Mention and Use of *Sefer ha-Tagin* in the Words of R. Saadia Gaon." *Ha-Maggid*:37. Hebrew.
Goldblum, Israel. 1886. "Announcing Books in Manuscript." *Ha-Maggid* 30:45–46, 85–46. Hebrew.
Golden, Peter B. 1980. *Khazar Studies: An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*. Budapest.
Goldenthal, Jacob. 1851. *Die neuerworbenen handschriftlichen hebräischen Werke der K. K. Hofbibliothek zu Wien*. 'Vienna.
Goldziher, I. 1870. *Studien über Tanchum Jeruschalmi*. Leipzig.
Goldziher, I. 1881. "Review of Landauer's edition of Saadia's 'Kitab al-'Amanat'." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 35:773–783.
Goldziher, I. 1887. "Review of Hirschfeld's 'Das Buch Al-Chazari'." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 41:691–707.
Goldziher, I. 1913. "Review of A. S. Yahuda, 'Al-Hidaja 'ila Fara'iḍ al-Qulub'." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 67:529–538.
Gottlober, Abraham Baer, and Daniel Abramovich Chwolson. 1865. *Biqqoret le-toledot ha-qara'im*. Vilna.
Graetz, Heinrich. 1875. *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart.* Vienna.
Gross, H. 1879. "Zur Geschichte der Juden in Arles." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 28: 17–24, 62–69, 121–130, 228–238, 323–332, 350–359, 418–431, 468–474, 541–563.
Gross, H. 1880. "Zur Geschichte der Juden in Arles." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 29:58–67, 167–175, 404–416, 514–528.
Gross, H. 1883, 1884. "Étude sur Simson ben Abraham de Sens." *Revue des études juives* 6:167–86, 7: 40–77.
Gruenwald, Ithamar. 1971. "A Preliminary Critical Edition of *Sefer Yezira*." *Israel Oriental Studies* 19:132–177.
Grünwald, M. 1883. "*Studien und Kritiken im Vereine mit mehreren Gelehrten*." Belovar.
Güdemann, Moritz. 1873. *Das jüdische Unterrichtswesen während der spanisch-arabischen Periode, nebst handschriftlichen arabischen und hebräischen Beilagen*. Vienna.
Güdemann, Moritz. 1880. *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der abendländischen Juden während des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*. Vienna.

Gugenheimer, Joseph. 1850. *Die Religions-Philosophie des R. Abraham ben David ha-Levi*. Diss. Phil. Augsburg. Augsburg.
Gugenheimer, Joseph. 1851. "Über Abraham ben David's Emuna rama." *Der Orient* 12:505–528.
Günther, Siegmund. 1878. *Grundlehren der mathematischen Geographie und elementaren Astronomie*. Mélanges scientifiques 2. München.
Günther, Siegmund. 1887. *Geschichte des mathematischen Unterrichts im deutschen Mittelalter bis zum Jahre 1525*. Berlin.
Guttmann, Jacob. 1879. *Die Religionsphilosophie des Abraham ibn Daud aus Toledo. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie und der Philosophie der Araber*. Göttingen.
Guttmann, Jacob. 1882. *Die Religionsphilosophie des Saadia*. Göttingen.
Guttmann, Julius. 1964. *Philosophies of Judaism; the History of Jewish Philosophy from Biblical Times to Franz Rosenzweig*. London.
Guttmann, Moritz. 1885. *Das religionsphilosophische System der Mutakallimun nach dem Berichte des Maimonides*. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig, Breslau.
Habermann, A. M. 1944. "'Sefer Mivḥar ha-Peninim': Bibliographical Notice." *Sinai* 25: 51–63. Hebrew.
Habermann, A. M. 1947. "Notes on the Study of 'Sefer Yeẓirah'." *Sinai* 20:241–265. Hebrew.
Habermann, A.M.. 1951. "Towards the Investigation of the 'Ḥovot ha-levavot' and its Hebrew Versions." *Sinai* 28, 29:314–329, 359–379. Hebrew.
Hadassi, Judah ben Elijah. 1836. *Sefer Eshkol ha-kofer*. Koslov.
Haendel, Manoah. 1596. *Manoaḥ ha-levavot*. Lublin.
Ḥājjī Khalīfa. 1835. *Lexicon bibliographicum et encyclopaedicum, ad codicum Vindobonensium, Parisiensium et Berolinensis fidem primum edidit*, ed. G. L. Flügel. Leipzig.
Halberstam, S. J., and Moritz Steinschneider. 1875. *Qevuẓat mikhtavim be-'inyanei ha-maḥloqet 'al devar sefer ha-moreh ve-ha-mada'*. Bamberg.
Halberstam, S. J. 1864. "Rabenu Moses (Maimonides) is True and his Torah is True." *Jeschurun (Kobak)* 4:23–36.
Halkin, A. S. 1950. "Ibn 'Aknin's Commentary on the Song of Songs." In *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, ed. Saul Lieberman. New York.
Halkin, A. S. 1980. "Maimonides 'Treatise on Resurrection' in R. Judah al-Harizi's Translation." *Kovetz al Yad* 9:129–150.
Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph Freiherr von. 1850. *Literaturgeschichte der Araber*. Vienna.
Haneberg, Daniel Bonifacius. 1862. "Über das neuplatonische Werk: Theologie des Aristoteles." *Sitzungsberichte der königl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische Classe. Sitzung vom 4. Jan. 1862*.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1874. "Communication." *Ha-Zefirah* 1:95. Hebrew.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1875. "Communication." *Ha-Zefirah* 2:175. Hebrew.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1876. "Masoreten-Verzeichnis." *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 2:174–175.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1878a. "Book Announcement." In *Me'assef Niddaḥim*. St. Petersburg. Hebrew.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1878b. "Samuel b. Chofni und seine Schriften." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 5:14–26, 57–60.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1878–80. *Me'assef Niddaḥim*. St. Petersburg, Vienna. Hebrew.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1880. *Rav Shemuel ben Hofni and his Works* Zikhron le-Rishonim ve-gam le-Aharonim, vol. 3. St. Petersburg, Leipzig. Hebrew
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1881. "Mittheilung." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1:156.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1887. "Kleinere Mittheilungen." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 14:32–33.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham). 1897. "Fragment einer Apologie des maimonidischen "Ma'amar tehiyat ha-metim'." *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie* I:125–28, 181–82.
Harkavy, Albert (Abraham), and Abraham Firkowitsch. 1876. *Altjüdische Denkmäler aus der Krim, mitgetheilt von Abraham Firkowitsch (1839–1872)*. T. 24, no. 1. St. Petersburg.

Harkavy, Albert (Abraham), and David Kaufmann. 1878. “Responsa.” In *Me‘assef Niddaḥim*, ed. Albert Harkavy, 131–132. St. Petersburg.
Hasselhoff, Görge. 2001. “The Reception of Maimonides in the Latin World: The Evidence of the Latin Translations in the 13th–15th Century.” *Materia Giudaica* 6:258–280.
Hasselhoff, Görge. 2002. “Maimonides in the Latin Middle Ages: An Introductory Survey.” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 9:1–20.
Havlin, S. Z. 1985. “On the Biography of Maimonides (Clarifications about his Lineage and Year of Birth).” *Daat* 15:67–79. Hebrew.
Hayoun, Maurice. 1983. “Le commentaire de Moise de Narbonne sur la terminologie logique de Maimonide.” *Daat* 10:33–38. Hebrew.
Heilprin, Jehiel ben Solomon. 1882. *Seder ha-dorot*. Warsaw.
Herbelot, Barthélemy d’. 1785. *Orientalische Bibliothek: Universalwörterbuch, welches alles enthält, was zur Kenntniss des Orients nothwendig ist*. Halle.
Hillel ben Samuel. 1874. *Tagmulei ha-nefesh*, ed. S. J. Halberstam. Lyck.
Hillel ben Samuel. 1981. *Sefer Tagmulei ha-nefesh*, ed. Y. Sermoneta. Jerusalem.
Hirschfeld, Hartwig. 1883a. “Bemerkungen zu Jehuda Ibn Tibbons Übersetzung des Buches Al-Charizi.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 10:88–100.
Hirschfeld, Hartwig. 1883b. “Berichtigungen zu ‘Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen von Professor Dr. David Kaufmann’.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 10:172–175.
Hirschfeld, Hartwig, ed. 1896. “Das ‘Buch der Definitionen’ des Abū Ja‘qub b. Isḥaq Suleiman al-Isra’ili in der hebräischen Übersetzung des Nissim b. Salomon’.” In *Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburstage Moritz Steinschneiders*. Leipzig.
Hirschfeld, Hartwig. 1902. “The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 15:689–693.
Holub, David. 1884. *Toledot rabbeinu Mosheh ben Maimon*. Wien.
Hopkins, Simon. 1992. “Arabic Elements in the Hebrew of the Byzantine Karaites.” In *Genizah Research After Ninety Years: The Case of Judaeo-Arabic*, eds. Joshua Blau and Stefan C. Reif, 93–96. Cambridge.
Ḥunayn ibn Isḥaq. 1896. *Sinnsprüche der Philosophen*, ed. and trans. Abraham Loewenthal. Berlin.
Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, Aḥmad ibn al-Qāsim. 1884 *‘Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā’*, ed. August Müller. Königsberg.
Ibn ‘Aknin, Joseph. 1879. *Drei Abhandlungen*, ed. Moritz Löwy. Berlin.
Ibn ‘Aknin, Joseph (Ibn Simeon, Joseph). 1904. *A Treatise as to 1. Necessary Existence 2. The Procedure of Things from the Necessary Existence 3. The Creation of the World*, ed. Judah Leon Magnes. Berlin.
Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq. 1871. *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. Gustav Flügel. Leipzig.
Ibn Albar al-Quṭi, Ḥafṣ. 1994. *Le Psautier mozarabe de Hafs le Goth*, trans. Marie-Thérèse Urvoy. Toulouse.
Ibn Daud, Abraham ben David Halevi. 1852. *Das Buch Emunah ramah, oder: Der erhabene Glaube*, ed. S. Weil. Frankfurt am Main.
Ibn Daud, Abraham ben David Halevi. 1967. *A Critical Edition with a Translation and Notes of the Book of Tradition (Sefer ha-Qabbalah)*, by Gerson David Cohen. London, Philadelphia.
Ibn Daud, Abraham ben David Halevi. 1986. *The Exalted Faith*. Translated with commentary by Norbert M. Samuelson. Rutherford.
Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir (attributed to). 1901. *Sefer ha-‘Aẓamim*, ed. Menasseh Grossberg. London.
Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meïr. 1721. *Sefer Margoliyyot tovah*. Amsterdam.
Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir. 1874. *Sefer ha-‘Ibbur*, ed. S. J. Halberstam. Lyck.
Ibn Ezra, Moses b. Jacob. 1975. *Sefer ha-‘Iyunim ve-ha-diyyunim*, ed. Abraham Halkin. Jerusalem.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1562. *Goren nakhon, tiqqun middot ha-nefesh…‘im sefer Musarei ha-filosofim ve-sefer ha-tapuaḥ le-Aristoteles*. Riva di Trento.
Ibn Gabirol. Solomon ben Judah. 1767. *Mivḥar ha-peninim*. Berlin.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1807. *Goren nakhon:*[…]*tiqqun middot ha-nefesh* […] *muserei ha-filosofim ve-Sefer ha-Tapuaḥ le-Aristotelis*. Lunéville.

Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1842. *Sefer Mivḥar ha-peninim*. Berlin.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1851. *Mivḥar ha-peninim*, ed. Herschell Filipowski. London.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1858. *Shire Shelomoh: shirim yekarim*, ed. Leopold Dukes. Hannover.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1859a. *Goren nakhon: … tikkun middot ha-nefesh*, ed. Eliezer Lipman Silberman. Lyck.
Ibn Gabirol. Solomon ben Judah. 1859b. *A Choice of Pearls*, trans. B. Ascher. London.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1868. *Cantiques de Salomon Ibn Gabirol (Avicebron)*, ed. Senior Sachs. Paris.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1892. *Avencebrolis (Ibn Gebirol) Fons vitae ex arabico in latinum translatus ab Iohanne Hispano et Dominico Gundissalino. Ex codicibus Parisinis, Amploniano, Columbino*, ed. Clemens Baeumker. Monasterii.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1901. *The improvement of the moral qualities: An ethical treatise of the eleventh century by Solomon ibn Gabirol, printed from a unique Arabic manuscript, together with a translation, and an essay on the place of Gabirol in the history of the development of Jewish ethics.* Translated by Stephen Samuel Wise. New York
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1924–32. *Shirei Shelomoh ben Yehudah ibn Gabirol.* 7 vols. Tel-Aviv.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1970. *Livre de la source de vie (Fons vitae)*, trans. Jacques Schlanger. Paris.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1971–73. *Shirei ha-qodesh le-rabi Shelomoh Ibn Gabirol*, ed. Dov Yarden. 2 vols. Jerusalem.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 1975. *Shelomoh ibn Gabirol: Shirei ha-ḥol*, eds. Hayim Brody, Jefim Schirmann, and Israel Ben-David. Jerusalem.
Ibn Gabirol, Solomon ben Judah. 2001. *Fons vitae = Meqor hayyim*, ed. Roberto Gatti. Testi e studi di filosofia ebraica medioevale 21. Genova.
Ibn Janāḥ, Abū al-Walīd Marwān. 1880. *Opuscules et traités d'Abou'l-Walid Merwan Ibn Djanah (Rabbi Jonah) de Cordoue; texte arabe, publié avec une traduction française par Joseph Derenbourg et Hartwig Derenbourg*. Paris.
Ibn Janaḥ, Jonah. 1875. *The Book of Hebrew Roots*, ed. Adolf Neubauer. Oxford.
Ibn Kammūna, Sa'd Ibn Manṣūr. 1967. *Sa'd b. Manṣūr Ibn Kammūna's Examination of the inquiries into the three faiths: a thirteenth-century essay in comparative religion*, ed. Moshe Perlmann. Berkeley. Arabic.
Ibn Kammūnah, Sa'd ibn Manṣuūr. 1971. *Ibn Kammuna's Examination of the Three Faiths; a Thirteenth-century Essay in the Comparative Study of Religion*, trans. into English, Moshe Perlmann. Berkeley.
Ibn Latif, Isaac ben Abraham. 1860. *Sefer Ẓurat ha-'olam*, ed. Salomo Gottlieb Stern. Vienna.
Ibn Malkah, Judah ben Nissim, *Kitsur 'Ivri shel Kitab uns al-gharib wa-tafsir Sefer Yeẓirah le-Rabi Yehudah ben Nisim ibn Malkah*, *Mekorot u-mehkarim be-toledot ha-Yehudim ba-mizraḥ ve-tarbutam*, ed. Georges Vajda. Ramat Gan.
Ibn al-Qifṭī, 'Alī b. Yūsuf. 1903. *Ta'rīkh al-ḥukamā'*, aufgrund der Vorarbeiten August Müllers herausgegeben von Julius Lippert. Leipzig.
Ibn Shuaib, Joshua. 1573. *Derashot*. Cracow.
Ibn Verga, Solomon, and M. Wiener. 1855. *Sefer Shevet Yehudah*. Hannover.
Ibn Ẓaddiq, Joseph ben Jacob. 1854. *Der Mikrokosmos des Josef Ibn Saddik*, ed. A. Jellinek. Leipzig.
Ibn Ẓaddiq, Joseph ben Jacob. 1903. *Der Mikrokosmos des Josef ibn Saddik*, ed. Saul Horovitz. Breslau.
Ibn Ẓaddiq, Joseph ben Jacob 2002. *The Microcosm of Joseph ibn Ṣaddiq*, ed. Jacob Haberman. Madison, NJ.
Idel, Moshe. 1976. *Kitvei Rav Avraham Abulafyah u-mishnato*. PhD thesis, Hebrew University, [Jerusalem].
Idel, Moses. 1977. "The Identity of the Translator of 'Arugat ha-Bosem' of R. Moses ibn Ezra." *Kiryat Sefer* 51:484–487. Hebrew.
Idel, Moshe. 1990. "The Beginning of Kabbala in North Africa? A Forgotten Document by R. Yehuda ben Nissim ibn Malka." *Pe'amim* 43: 4–15. Hebrew.

Ink, A. 1845. *Literarhistorische Notizen aus I. Aboab's 'Nomologia'. Literaturblatt des Orients* 6:206–208, 239–240.
Israeli, Isaac. 1515. *Omnia opera Ysaac* […] Lyons.
Israeli, Isaac. 1846. *Yesod 'olam*, eds. Baer Goldberg, Loeb Rosenkranz, and David Cassel. Berlin.
Israeli, Isaac. 1884. *Das Buch über die Elemente: Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Religionsphilosophie des Mittelalters von Isak b. Salomo Israeli*, ed. Solomon Fried. Leipzig.
Jacob ben Reuben. 1963. *Milḥamot ha-Shem*, ed. Judah Rosenthal. Jerusalem.
Jacob, Georg. 1887. *Der nordisch-baltische Handel der Araber im Mittelalter: Inaugural-Dissertation*. Leipzig.
Jellinek, Adolf. 1852. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kabbala*. Leipzig.
Jellinek, Adolf. 1854. *Philosophie und Kabbala. Erstes Heft, enthält Abraham Abulafia's Sendschreiben über Philosophie und Kabbalah.* Leipzig.
Jellinek, Adolf. 1876. "Aus meiner Bibliothek." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 16:12–13.
Jellinek, Adolf. 1881. *Kuntras ha-mafteaḥ … mafteḥot u-mar'eh me-qomot le-Talmud bavli vi-Yerushalmi*. Vienna.
Joël, Manuel. 1857. "Avicebron's Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Philosophie." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 6:386–392; 420–431.
Joël, Manuel. 1858. "Wissenschaftliche Aufsätze." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 7:59–72.
Joël, Manuel. 1859a. "Ein weiterer Beitrag zur Auffassung des Mekor Chajim von Gebirol." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 8:24–32.
Joël, Manuel. 1859b. *Die Religionsphilosophie des Mose ben Maimon (Maimonides)*. Breslau.
Joël, Manuel. 1863. *Verhältniss Alberts des Grossen zu Moses Maimonides: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie*. Breslau.
Jong, Pieter de, and Henricus Engelinus Weijers. 1862. *Catalogus codicum orientalium Bibliothecae Academiae Regiae Scientarum*. Leiden.
Judah ben Barzillai. 1885. *Perush Sefer Yeẓirah*, eds. Solomon Joachim Halberstam and David Kaufmann. Berlin. An Early Jewish Defence of Creationism," in H. Ben-Shammai et al, eds., Philosophy, Mysticism and Science in the Mediterranean World (Jerusalem: Israel Academy, 2013), 116–147.
Judah ha-Levi. 1506. *Sefer ha-Kuzari*. Fano.
Judah ha-Levi. 1660. *Liber Cosri continens colloquium seu disputationem de religione* [...] *inter regem Cosareorum, & R. Isaacum Sangarum Judaeum* […]. Basileae.
Judah ha-Levi. 1663. *Cuzary: libro de grande sciencia y mucha doctrina. Discursos que passaron entre el Rey Cuzar y un singular Sabio de Ysrael, llamado. R. Yshach Sanguery. Fue compuesto este libro en la lengua Arabiga*. Amsterdam.
Judah ha-Levi. 1796. *Sefer ha-Kuzari*, ed. I. Zamosc. Vienna.
Judah ha-Levi. 1837. *Sefer ha-Kuzari: Ḥibbero bi-Leshon 'Aravi*. Prague.
Judah ha-Levi. 1838. *Sefer ha-Kuzari*, ed. Isaac Metz. Hamburg.
Judah ha-Levi. 1840. *Virgo filia Jehudae; sive, Excerpta ex inedito celeberrimi Jehudae Levitae Divano*, praefatione et notis illustrata a Samuele Davide Luzzatto. Prague 1840.
Judah ha-Levi. 1851. *Divan des Castiliers, Abu'-l-Hassan Juda ha-Levi*, ed. Abraham Geiger. Breslau.
Judah ha-Levi. 1853. *Das Buch Kusari*, eds. David Cassel and H. Jolowicz. Leipzig.
Judah ha-Levi. 1864. *Divan R. Yehudah ha-Levi*, ed. Samuel David Luzzatto. Lyck.
Judah ha-Levi. 1866. *Ha-Kuzari*, ed. David Slutzki. Warsaw.
Judah ha-Levi. 1869. *Sefer ha-Kuzari. Das Buch Kusari*, ed. David Cassel. Leipzig.
Judah ha-Levi. 1880. *Ha-Kuzari:* […]*'im shene ha-be'urim* […] *kol yehudah ve-'oẓar neḥmad*. Warsaw.
Judah ha-Levi. 1887. *Das Buch al-Chazari des Abu-l-Ḥasan Jehuda Hallewi im arabischen Urtext sowie in der hebräischen Übersetzung des Jehuda Ibn Tibbon*, ed. Hartwig Hirschfeld. Leipzig.
Judah ha-Levi. 1905. *Judah Hallevi's Kitab al Khazari*. London.
Judah ha-Levi. 1947. *Kuzari: The Book of Proof and Argument*. In *Philosophia judaica*, ed. Isaak Heinemann. Oxford.
Judah ha-Levi. 1972. *Sefer ha-Kuzari le-Rabbi Yehudah ha-Levi*, ed. Yehuda Even-Shemuel. Tel Aviv.

Judah ha-Levi. 1977. *Kitāb al-Radd wa-l-dalīl fī l-dīn al-dhalīl*, ed. David H. Baneth and Haggai Ben-Shammai. Jerusalem.
Judah ha-Levi. 1994. *Le Kuzari, apologie de la religion méprisée*, traduit sur le texte original arabe confronté avec la version hébraïque […] par Charles Touati. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Section des sciences religieuses 100. Louvain.
Judah ha-Levi. 1996. *Sefer ha-Kuzari: makor ve-targum*, ed. Yosef Qafih. Kiryat Ono.
Judah ha-Levi. 2010. *Sefer ha-Kuzari*, trans. Isaac Shailat. Ma'aleh Adumim.
Judah ha-Levi. 1871. *Canzaniere sacro di Giuda Levita*, ed. Salvatore De Benedetti. Pisa.
Judah ibn Bulat. 1530–1. *Kelal qaẓar.* Constantinople.
Kahana, David 1888. Name and remnant of the unknown Gaon. *Oẓarha-Sifrut* 2:187–197. Hebrew.
Kalisch, Isidor. 1877. *Sepher Yeẓirah. A Book on Creation; or the Jewish Metaphysics of Remote Antiquity*. New York.
Kalonymus ben Kalonymus ben Meir. 1879. *Kalonymos ben Kalonymos' Sendschreiben an Joseph Kaspi*, ed. J. Perles. München.
Kaspi, Joseph. 1848. "'Amudei kesef u-masqiyot kesef: Shnei perushim 'al Sefer ha-Moreh le-ha-Rambam," ed. Salomon Werbluner. Franfurt am Main.
Katz, Sarah. 1989. "On the Author of 'Mivhar ha-Peninim'." *Sinai* 103:179–182. Hebrew.
Kaufmann, David. 1874. *Die Theologie des Bachja ibn Paquda*. Wien.
Kaufmann, David. 1876. "Review of *Die Ethik des Maimonides* von Dr. David Rosin." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 30:359–366.
Kaufmann, David. 1877a. *Geschichte der Attributenlehre in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie des Mittelalters von Saadja bis Maimuni*. Gotha.
Kaufmann, David. 1877b. *Jehuda Halewi: Versuch einer Charakteristik*. Breslau.
Kaufmann, David. 1880. *Die Spuren al-Baṭlajûsis in der jüdischen Religions-Philosophie*, nebst einer Ausgabe der hebräischen Übersetzungen seiner Bildlichen Kreise. Budapest, Leipzig.
Kaufmann, David. 1882. "Aus Abraham b. Ariel's Arugas ha-Bosem." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 31:316–324, 564–316.
Kaufmann, David. 1883a. "Saadja Alfajjumi's Einleitung zum 'Kitāb al-amānāt wa'l-i'tiqādāt'." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 37:230–249.
Kaufmann, David. 1883b. "Un manuscrit nouveau du 'Fons vitae' d'Ibn Gabirol." *Revue des études juives* 6: 312.
Kaufmann, David. 1884a. *Die Sinne. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Physiologie und Psychologie im Mittelalter, aus hebräischen und arabischen Quellen*. Leipzig.
Kaufmann, David. 1884b. "Jehuda halewi und die Lehre von der Ewigkeit der Welt." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 33:208–214.
Kaufmann, David. 1884c. "Le prétendu Commentaire d'Isaac Israeli sur le Livre Yeçira." *Revue des études juives* 8:126–131.
Kaufmann, David. 1885a. "Commentary on 'Sefer Yeẓirah'." *Oẓar Tov* 8:11–12. Hebrew.
Kaufmann, David. 1885b. "Samuel ibn Abbas dans Abraham ibn Daud." *Revue des études juives* 10:251–252.
Kaufmann, David. 1885. "Notes to the Emendations of A. Epstein into the Commentary of R. Judah Barẓeloni on the 'Sefer Yeẓirah'." *Kovetz al Yad* 2:9–11. Hebrew.
Kaufmann, David. 1887. "Eine Anekdote von Juda Halewi." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 36:89–91.
Kaufmann, David. 1899. *Studien über Salomon Ibn Gabirol*. Budapest.
Kayserling, Meyer. 1861. *Geschichte der Juden in Spanien und Portugal*. Berlin.
Kellner, Menachem. 2004. "Selected Bibliography of Studies on Maimonides," 1991. *Jewish History* 18:243–289.
Kiener, Ronald C. 1986. "The Hebrew paraphrase of Saadia Gaon's ''Kitāb al-amānāt wa'l-i'tiqādāt'." *AJS Review* 11: 1–25.
Kiepert, Heinrich. 1880. "Schapira's Reise in Jemen." *Globus* 38:183–186.
Kimḥi, David. 1847. *Sefer ha-Shorasim le-Rabbi David ben Yosef Kimḥi ha-Sefaradi*, ed. Fuerchtegott Lebrecht. Berlin.

Kimḥi, Joseph. 1867. *Sefer ḥukah: […] be'ur 'al Mishle*, ed. Dob Baer ben Menahem Mendel of Dubrove. Breslau.
Kimḥi, Joseph. 1887. *Sefer ha-Galui*, ed. Henry John Mathews. Berlin.
Kimḥi, Joseph. 1888. *Sefer Zikkaron*, ed. Wilhelm Bacher. Berlin.
Kimḥi, Joseph. 1919. *Shekel hakodesh*, ed. Hermann Gollancz. London, New York.
Kimḥi, Joseph, Moses Kimḥi, and David Kimḥi. 1990. *Perushim le-sefer Mishle le-vet Kimḥ,* ed. Frank Talmage. Jerusalem.
Kirchheim, Raphael. 1846. "Bericht über eine neue verfälschte Ausgabe des מלות ההגיון von Maimonides." *Literaturblatt des Orients* 7:493–496, 504–511.
Kirchheim, Raphael. 1860. "Schreiben des Herrn R. Kirchheim in Frankfurt a. M. an Herrn Ignaz Blumenfeld in Wien [Ketav Tamim von Moses Tachau]." *Oẓar Neḥmad* 3:54–100. Hebrew.
Kluxen, W. 1954. "Literaturgeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médievale* 21:23–50.
Kokowzow, Paul. 1927. "The Date of the Life of Baḥya ibn Paquda." In *Livre d'hommage à la mémoire du Dr. Samuel Poznanski*. Warsaw.
Kraemer, Joel. 2001. "The Life of Moses ben Maimon." In *Judaism in Practice*, ed. Lawrence Fine, 413–428. Princeton.
Kraemer, Joel L. 2008. *Maimonides: The Life and World of One of Civilization's Greatest Minds*. New York.
Lachterman, David. 1990. "Maimonidean Studies 1950–1986." *Maimonidean Studies* 1:197–216.
Landauer, M.H. 1845. "Vorläufiger Bericht über mein Studium der Münchner hebräischen Handschriften." *Literaturblatt des Orients* 6:178–185, 194–196, 212–215, 225–229, 322–327, 341–345, 380–384, 417–422, 471–475, 488–492, 525–528, 542–545, 556–558, 570–574, 587–592, 709–713, 748–750.
Landshuth, Eliezer. 1857. "'*Amude ha-'avodah*." Berlin.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1995. "The India Office Manuscript of Maimonides' Guide: The Earliest Complete Copy of the Judaeo-Arabic Original." *British Library Journal* 21:66–70.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1996a. "The Commentary of Solomon ibn Ya'ish to Ibn Sina's 'Canon'." In *Mi-Ginzei ha-Makhon le-Tazlumei Kitve-Yad*, ed. Avraham David, 63–65. Jerusalem. Hebrew.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1996b. "A New Collection of Medieval Jewish Philosophy." In *Mi-Ginzei ha-Makhon le-Tazlumei Kitve-Yad*, ed. Avraham David, 142–147. Jerusalem. Hebrew.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1996c. "A New Look at 'Ma'amar ha-Yiḥud' Attributed to Moses Maimonides." *Tarbiz* 65:109–128.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1996d. *Yemenite Midrash: Philosophical Commentaries on the Torah*. 1st ed. New York, San Francisco.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 2000. "Supplementary List of Manuscripts and Fragments of 'Dalalat al-Ḥa'irin'." *Maimonidean Studies* 4:31–37.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 2002. "On the Beginnings of Hebrew Scientific Literature and on Studying History through Maqbilot ('Parallels')." *Aleph* 2:169–189.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 2004. "From My Notebooks: A Citation from Saadia's Long Commentary to Genesis, in Hebrew Translation." *Aleph* 4:293–299.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 2013. "An Early Jewish Defence of Creationism." In *Philosophy, Mysticism and Science in the Mediterranean World*, ed. H. Ben-Shammai et al., 11–147. Jerusalem.
Langermann, Y. Tzvi, and Almog Kasher. 2013. "Critical Notes of Muhammad bin Hasan al-Nihmi to Maimonides' Guide." Daat 74–75:237–266. Hebrew.
Latham, J. Derek, and Helen W. Mitchell. 1970. "The Bibliography of S.M. Stern." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 115:226–238.
Lattes, Isaac ben Jacob de. 1878. *Sha'arei ẓiyyon. Oẓar Tov* 1:54–77.
Lattes, Isaac ben Jacob de. 1885. *Sha'arei ẓiyyon*. Jaroslaw.
Lea, Henry Charles. 1888. *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*. New York.
Leclerc, Lucien. 1876. *Histoire de la médecine arabe*. 2 vols. Paris.
Levinsohn, Yehiel. 1885. *Or ḥayyei levavot*. New York.

Levy, Jacob, Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, and August Wünsche. 1876. *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*. Leipzig.
Levy, M. A. 1859. *Don Joseph Nasi Herzog von Naxos*. Breslau.
Lévy, Tony. 1989. "Le chapitre I, 73 du Guide des égarés et la tradition mathématique hébraïque au Moyen Age. Un commentaire inédit de Salomon b. Isaac (édition critique et traduction)." *Revue des études juives* 148:307–348.
Lewis, Bernard. 1945. "Jews and Judaism in Arab Sources (Maimonides)." *Metsudah* 3–4:171–180.
Liebes, Yehuda. 2000. *Torat ha-Yeẓirah shel Sefer Yeẓirah*. Jerusalem.
Loeb, Isadore. 1885. "Notes et mélanges." *Revue des études juives* 10:232–250.
Loewe, L. 1867. "Corrections and Notes to 'Emunot ve-De'ot'." *Ha-Maggid*:37. Hebrew.
Loewenthal, Abraham. 1891. *Pseudo-Aristoteles über die Seele. Eine psychologische Schrift des 11. Jahrhunderts und ihre Beziehungen zu Salomo ibn Gabirol (Avicebron)*. Berlin.
Luẓki, Simḥa Isaac. 1830. *Sefer Oraḥ ḥayyim*. Vienna.
Luzzatto, Samuel David. 1841. *Avnei zikkaron*. Prague.
Luzzatto, Samuel David. 1846. "Selections from Rabenu Saadia Gaon z"l and Morenu David ha-Babli, his Contemporary." In *Halikhot Qedem (Oostersche Wandelingen)*, ed. G. Polak. Amsterdam.
Luzzatto, Samuel David. 1863. *Lezioni di teologia dogmatica Israelitica*. Trieste.
Luzzatto, Samuel David. 1864. *Diẓan R. Yehudah ha-Leẓi*. Lyck.
Luzzatto, Samuel David and Isaia Luzzatto, ed. 1868. *Catalogue de la bibliothèque de littérature hébraïque et orientale de feu M. Joseph Almanzi.* Padua.
Maimonides. 1654. *Porta Mosis*, ed. Edward Pococke. Oxford.
Maimonides, Moses. 1484. *Perush masekhet Avot*. (Soncin).
Maimonides, Moses. 1520. *Rabi Mossei Aegyptij Dux seu director dubita[n]tium aut perplexorum*, trans. Jacob Mantino and A. Giustiniani. Paris.
Maimonides, Moses. 1523. *Perush masekhet Avot*. Soncino.
Maimonides, Moses. 1527. *Logica sapientis Rabbi Simeon*, ed. Sebastian Münster. Basileae.
Maimonides, Moses. 1553. *Moreh nevukhim*. Sabbioneta.
Maimonides, Moses. 1629. *Rabbi Mosis Majemonidis liber Moreh nevukhim = Ductor perplexorum*: *ad dubia & obscuriora Scripturae loca rectiùs intelligenda veluti clavem continens* […], ed. Johann Buxtorf. Basilae.
Maimonides, Moses. 1683. *Explicatio Rabbi Mosis Maimonidis cordubensis super Patrum, sive Seniorum Judæorum sententias, complectens octo capita*. Leiden.
Maimonides, Moses. 1712. *Iggerot u-she'elot u-teshuvot*. Amsterdam.
Maimonides, Moses. 1742. *Moreh nevukhim:* […] *'im perush Shem tov u-ferush Efodi [u]-ferush Ibn Kreskas*. Jessnitz.
Maimonides, Moses. 1761. *Beur millot ha-higgayon*. Frankfurt an der Oder.
Maimonides, Moses. 1765. *Sefer Pe'er ha-dor* […] *teshuvot u-she'elot*, ed. Mordekhai Tamah. Amsterdam.
Maimonides, Moses. 1791. *Moreh nevukhim*. Berlin.
Maimonides, Moses. 1809. *Ḥelqat meḥoqeq*: *shemonah peraqim*, ed. Gotthold Salomon. Dessau.
Maimonides, Moses. 1829. *Moreh nevukhim*, ed. Mendel Levin. Zolkiew.
Maimonides, Moses. 1838. *Dalalat al-ḥa'irin*, Zurechtweisung der Verirrten. Frankfurt am Main.
Maimonides, Moses. 1839. *Moreh nevukhim*, ed. Raphael Jacob Fürstenthal. Krotoszyn.
Maimonides, Moses. 1847. *Shnei Me'orot: Ma'amar ha-yiḥud le-ha-Rambam*, ed. Moritz Steinschneider. Berlin.
Maimonides, Moses. 1851–79. *Moreh nevukhim*, ed. Léon Schlosberg with notes by Simon Scheyer. London.
Maimonides, Moses. 1856. *Le guide des égarés*, ed. Salomon Munk. Paris.
Maimonides, Moses. 1859. *Qovez teshuvot ha-Rambam ve-iggerotav*, ed. Abraham ben Aryeh Lichtenberg. Leipzig.
Maimonides, Moses. 1863. *Mose ben Maimun's (Maimonides) Acht Capitel*, ed. Moritz Wolff. Leipzig.

Maimonides, Moses. 1864. *Moreh nebochim = Wegweiser für Verirrte*: Theologisch-philosophische Abhandlung, ed. Max Emanuel Stern. Wien.
Maimonides, Moses. 1871. *La guida degli smarriti: trattato di teologia e di filosofia di Moisè ben Maimon*, ed. Salomon Munk. Livorno.
Maimonides, Moses. 1873. *Iggeret Teiman*, ed. David Holub. Vienna.
Maimonides, Moses. 1875. *Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundene erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen 'Führers'*, ed. J. Perles. Breslau.
Maimonides, Moses. 1878–90. *A tévelygk útmutatója*, trans. Mór Klein, Papa/Nagybecskerek.
Maimonides, Moses. 1881–85. *The Guide of the Perplexed of Maimonides*, trans. Michael Friedlaender. London.
Maimonides, Moses. 1912. *The Eight Chapters of Maimonides on Ethics (Shemonah Peraqim): A Psychological and EthicalTreatise*, ed. Joseph Gorfinkle. New York.
Maimonides, Moses. 1935. *Moreh ha-nevukhim*, ed. Yehuda Even-Shemuel. Tel Aviv.
Maimonides, Moses. 1939. *Peraqim be-hazlaḥah ha-meyuḥasim le-RamBam z"al*, eds. Harry Solomon Davidowitz and D. H. Baneth. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1946. *Iggerot ha-Rambam: mikhtavei Mosheh ben Maimon u-mikhtavei benei doro elav*, ed. D. H. Baneth. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1962. *Mishnah 'im perush Rabbenu Mosheh Ben Maymon, maqor ve-targum*, ed. Yosef Qafih. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1963. *The Guide of the Perplexed*, trans. Shlomo Pines. Chicago.
Maimonides, Moses. 1972. *Moreh nevukhim. Dalalat al-ḥa'irin: Maqor ve-targum*, ed. Yosef Qafih. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1974a. *Dalalat al-ḥa'irin*, ed. Hüseyin Atay. Cairo.
Maimonides, Moses. 1974b. *Delâlet ül-hâ'irîn*, ed. Hüseyin Atay. Ankara.
Maimonides, Moses. 1983. *Ethical Writings of Maimonides*, trans. Raymond L. Weiss and Charles E. Butterworth. [New York 1975] Reprint. New York.
Maimonides, Moses. 1984. *Guía de perplejos = Moreh nevukhim.* Madrid.
Maimonides, Moses. 1986. *Iggerot ha-Rambam*, ed. Yitzhak Sheilat. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1987. *Sefer Moreh ha-nevukhim*, ed. Yehudah Even-Shemuel. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1988. *Guía de descarriados*. Madrid.
Maimonides, Moses. 1992. *Haqdamot ha-Rambam la-Mishnah*, ed. Isaac Shailat. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1994. *Masekhet Avot 'im perush Rabbenu Mosheh ben Maimon*, ed. Isaac Shailat. Jerusalem.
Maimonides, Moses. 1998. *Mi tu zhi jin*, trans. Foude Yu. Jinan.
Maimonides, Moses. 2002. *Moreh nevukhim*, trans. Michael Schwarz. Tel-Aviv.
Maimonides, Moses. 2011. *Rāhnamā-yi sargashtigān = Dalālat al-ḥā'irīn*, eds. David Shofet, Yedidiyah Ezraḥiyan, and Kamran Khavarani. Los Angeles.
Malter, Henry. 1921. *Saadia Gaon, His Life and Works*. Philadelphia.
Maman, Aharon. 2003. "Karaite Hebrew." In *Karaite Judaism: A Guide to its History and Literary Sources*, ed. Meira Polliack, 485–505. Leiden/Boston.
Manekin, Charles Harry. 2007. *Medieval Jewish Philosophical Writings*. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge, New York.
Margulies, S. H. 1882. "Kritische Bemerkungen zum Wortlaut des 'Emunot wedeot'." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 15:123–135.
Martin, Thomas-Henri. 1864. *Les Signes numéraux et l'arithmétique chez les peuples de l'antiquité et du moyen âge.* Rome.
Marx, Alexander. 1927. "Gabirol's Authorship of the 'Choice of Pearls' and the Two Versions of Joseph Kimhi's 'Shekel Hakodesh'." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 4:433–448.
Menahem ben Saruq. 1854. *Maḥberet Menaḥem: hu' sefer rishon asher ḥubar 'al shorshei leshon ha-qodesh*, ed. Herschell Filipowski. London.
Mendelssohn, Moses. 1929. *Gesammelte Schriften. Jubiläumsausgabe*, eds. Ismar Elbogen, Julius Guttmann, Eugen Mittwoch, Fritz Bamberger, Haim Bar-Dayan, Simon Rawidowicz, Bruno Strauss, and Leo Strauss. Berlin.
Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. 1880. *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*. Madrid.

Morales, L. 1886. “Aus dem Buch der ergötzenden Erzählungen des Bar-Hebraeus.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 40:410–456.
Mordecai ben Nisan. 1830. *Sefer Dod Mordekhai*. Vienna.
Mortara, Marco. 1878. *Catalogo dei manoscritti ebraici della biblioteca israelita della comunità di Mantova*. Livorno.
Mortillaro, Vincenza. 1837. *Lettera a Silvestre de Stach*. Palermo.
Motot, Samuel. 1554. *Perush ‘al perush he-ḥakham Rabbi Avraham Ibn ‘Ezra: be-ferush ḥamishah ḥumshei Torah*. Venice.
Mowat, John L. G. 1887. *Alphita, a Medico-botanical Glossary from the Bodleian manuscript, Selden B. 35*. Oxford.
Muckle, Joseph Thomas. 1937–8. “Isaac Israeli, Liber de Definicionibus.” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 12/13: 299–340.
Müller, August. 1880. “Arabische Quellen zur Geschichte der indischen Medizin.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 34: 465–556.
Munk, Salomon. 1838. *Notice sur Rabbi Saadia Gaon et sa version arabe d’Isaie: et sur une version persane manuscrite de la Bibliothèque Royale*[…]. Paris.
Munk, Salomon. 1842. *Notice sur Joseph ben-Iehouda, ou Aboul’hadjadj Yousouf ben-Ya’hya al-Sabti al-Maghrebi, disciple de Maïmonide*. Paris.
Munk, Salomon. 1851. *Notice sur Abou’l-Walid Merwan Ibn Djana’h et sur quelques grammariens hébreux du X et XI siècle* […]. Paris.
Munk, Salomon. 1859. *Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe, renfermant des extraits méthodiques de la Source de vie de Salomon ibn-Gebirol (dit Avicebron)*. Paris.
Münz, Ignatz. 1887. *Die Religionsphilosophie des Maimonides und ihr Einfluss*. Diss. Phil. Leipzig. Berlin.
Myer, Isaac. 1888. *Qabbalah. The philosophical writings of Solomon ben Yehudah Ibn Gebirol, or Avicebron, and their connection with the Hebrew Qabbalah and Sepher ha-Zohar, with remarks upon the antiquity and content of the latter and translations of selected passages from the same. Also, an ancient lodge of initiates, translated from the Zohar, and an abstract of an essay upon the Chinese Qabbalah contained in the book called the Yih king, a translation of part of the mystic theology of Dionysios the Areopagite, and an account of the construction of the ancient Akkadian and Chaldean universe, etc. Accompanied by diagrams and illustrations*. Philadelphia.
Nahmanides, Moses. 1860. *Vikuaḥ ha-Ramban, be-‘inyan ha-emunah lifnei melek u-sarim, u-be’ur Ramban al hineh yaskil avdi*, ed. Moritz Steinschneider. Berlin.
Nahmanides, Moses. 1872. *Torat ha-Shem temimah*, ed. Adolph Jellinek. Wien.
Nahmanides, Moses. 1962. *Kitvei Rabbeinu Mosheh ben Naḥman*, ed. Charles Chavel. Jerusalem.
Nemoy, Leon. 1959–60. “Corrections and Emendations.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 50:3–71–383.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1863. *Notice sur la lexicographie hébraique, avec des remarques sur quelques grammairiens postérieurs à Ibn-Djanah*. Paris.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1865. *Melekhet ha-shir*. Frankfurt am Main.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1866. *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek: Beiträge und Dokumente zur Geschichte des Karäerthums und der karäischen Literatur*. Leipzig.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1870. “Joseph b. Aqnin.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 19:348–355, 395–401, 445–448.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1876. *Report on Hebrew-Arabic Manuscripts at St. Petersburg*. Extracted from the Oxford University Gazette, vol. 7.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1876–7a. “Ein Sammelwerk in der Bodleiana.” *Israelitische Letterbode* 2:177–179.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1876–7b. “Handschriften in kleineren Bibliotheken.” *Israelitische Letterbode* 2:83–94.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1881. “Vorrede zu Maimonides’ ‘Teḥiyyat ha-Metim’.” *Israelitische Letterbode* 7:99–101.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1882. “Une pseudo-biographie de Moise Maimonide.” *Revue des études juives* 4:173–188.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1886. *Facsimiles of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Illustrating the Various Forms of Rabbinical Characters*. Oxford.

Neubauer, Adolf. 1887a. “Collectaneen von Adolf Neubauer.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 36:498–508.
Neubauer, Adolf. 1887b. *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes*. Oxford.
Neubauer, Adolf, Malachi Beit-Arié, and R. A. May. 1994. *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library: Supplement of Addenda and Corrigenda to vol. I (A. Neubauer’s catalogue)*. Oxford.
Neubauer, Adolf and S. R. Driver. 1876. *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters*. Oxford.
Neubauer, Adolf, and A. E. Cowley. 1886. *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford*[…] Oxford.
Nöldeke, Theodor. 1876. “Bibliographische Anzeige [Review of ‘Kalilag und Damnag’].” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 30:752–772.
Pasini, Giuseppe. 1749. *Codices manuscripti Bibliothecae Regii Taurinensis Athenaei per linguas digesti, & binas in partes distributi, in quarum prima Hebraei, & Graeci, in altera Latini, Italici, & Gallici*. Turin.
Perles, Joseph. 1875. *Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen “Führers”*. Breslau.
Perles, Joseph. 1877. “Das Buch Arugath habbosem des Abraham b. Afri.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 26:360–373.
Perles, Joseph. 1878. “Eine hebräische Handschrift der Fürstlich Oettingen-Wallerstein’schen Bibliothek.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*:317–324.
Perreau, Pietro. 1876–1877. “Correzioni ed aggiunte al Catalogo Derossiano.” *Bollettino Italiano degli Studi Orientali*, pp. 147–148, 202–206, 229–232, 286–288, 311–315, 351–353, 412–416, 451–455; new series, 1877–82, pp. 24–29, 91–95, 344–348, 484–486.
Perreau, Pietro. 1889. *Cataloghi dei codici orientali di alcune biblioteche d’Italia stampati a spese del Ministero dell pubblica istruzione*. Firenze.
Peyron, Bernardino. 1880. *Codices hebraici manu exarati Regiae Bibliothecae quae in Taurinensi Athenaeo asservatur*. Rome.
Pines, Shlomo. 1957/8. “‘Sefer Arugat ha-Bosem’: the Excerpts from ‘Sefer Meqor Ḥayyim’.” *Tarbiz* 27: 218–33. Hebrew.
Pinsker, Simḥah. 1851. “Mittheilung über einen arabischen Auszug aus dem Werke ‘Ḥovot ha-levavot’.” *Der Orient* 12:737–749.
Pinsker, Simḥah. 1860. *Lickute Kadmoniot: zur Geschichte des Karaismus und der karäischen Literatur*. Vienna.
Pinsker, Simḥah. 1862. “A Few Notes.” *Ha-Maggid*:151–152. Hebrew.
Polak, G. I. 1847. *Halikhot qedem*. Amsterdam.
Polak, G. I. 1851. *Hebreeuwsche lettervruchten*. Amsterdam.
Polliack, Meira. 2003. *Karaite Judaism: A Guide to its History and Literary Sources*. Leiden, Boston.
Poole, Reginald Lane. 1884. *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought in the Departments of Theology and Ecclesiastical Politics*. London.
Qirqisānī, Ya‘qūb. 1939. *Kitāb al-Anwār wa’l-marāqib: Code of Karaite law*, ed. Leon Nemoy. 5 vols. New York.
Qusṭā ibn Lūqā. *al-Filāḥa al-rūmiyya*, ed. Wā’il ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Ubayd. Ṭab‘a 1. Amman.
Rapoport, Solomon Judah Leib. 1830. *Toledot Rabbeinu Natan Ish Romi* […]. Vienna.
Rapoport, Solomon Judah Leib. 1852. *‘Erekh milin ‘al seder a.-b.: kolel be’ur kol shemot ‘azmiyim shel anashim me-‘amim, araẓot u-meqomot, yamim u-neharot. Kerekh rishon, kolel kol ot A*. Prague.
Rapoport, Solomon Judah Leib. 1871. “Correspondence to H. Heiman.” *Ha-Shaḥar* 2:33–38. Hebrew.
Rapoport, Solomon Judah Leib. 1873. *Naḥalat Yehudah: kollelet teshuvot le-hasaggot R’M Kunitz z’l be sefer Ben Yohai al sefer Mitpaḥat Sefarim le-Yafetz* […]. Lemberg.
Rapoport, Solomon Judah Leib, S. J. Halberstam, and Samuel David Luzzatto. 1885. *Iggerot Shir asher heriẓ ha-Rav Shir z’l el Rashdal mi-shenat 593 ‘ad shenat 620*. Przemysl.

Ratzhaby, Yehudah. 1988. “The Arabic Sources of Mivḥar ha-Peninim.” *Sinai* 102:97–160. Hebrew.
Reifmann, Jacob. 1878. “Analekten.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 5:36–37.
Reifmann, Jacob. 1884. “Prozedor.” *Oẓar Tov* 7:17–50. Hebrew.
Reifmann, Jacob. 1888. “Haprozdor (‘al odot sefer ‘Torat ḥovot Halevavot’).” *Oẓarha-Sifrut* 2:47–86.
Reinaud, Joseph Toussaint. 1849. *Mémoire géographique, historique et scientifique sur l’Inde antérieurement au milieu du XIe siècle de l’ère chrétienne; d’après les écrivains arabes, persans et chinois*. Paris.
Renan, Ernest. 1861. *Averroès et l’averroïsme: essai historique*. 2e édition revue et augmentée. Paris.
Renan, Ernest, and Adolf Neubauer. 1877. *Les rabbins français du commencement du quatorzième siècle*. Paris.
Renan, Ernest, and Adolf Neubauer. 1893. *Les écrivains juifs français du XIVe siècle*. Paris.
Richler, Benjamin. 1987. “Hebrew Manuscripts That Were Separated” *Asufot* 1:105–148.
Richler, Benjamin. 2001. *Hebrew Manuscripts in the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma*. Jerusalem.
Robinson, James T. 2000. “Gershon ben Solomon of Arles ‘Sha‘ar ha-shamayim’: Its Sources and Use of Sources.” In *The Medieval Hebrew Encyclopedias of Science and Philosophy: Proceedings of the Bar-Ilan University Conference*, ed. Steven Harvey, 248–274. Dordrecht, Boston, London.
Robinson, Maureen. 2003. “The History and Myths surrounding Johannes Hispalensis.” *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 80: 443–470.
Roest, M. 1877–78. “Eenige Blicken in Fürst’s vertaling van Saadja’s Emunoth Wedeoth von R.” *Israelitische Letterbode* 3:88–96, 142–151.
Rosenthal, Eliezer, and M. Roest. 1875. *Catalog der Hebraica und Judaica*. Amsterdam.
Rosenthal, Franz. 1955. “From Arabic Books and Manuscripts V: A One-Volume Library of Arabic Philosophical and Scientific Texts in Istanbul.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 75:14–23.
Rosenthal, L. 1875. *Anhang Yode’a Davar: Bibliographisches Verzeichniss eines grossen Theiles der L. Rosenthal’schen Bibliothek, etc.* Amsterdam.
Rubin, Salomo. 1868. *Spinoza und Maimonides: ein psychologisch-philosophisches Antitheton*. Wien.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1562. *Sefer ha-Emunot ve-ha-De‘ot*. Constantinople.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1648. *Sefer ha-Emunot ve-ha-De‘ot*. Amsterdam.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1789. *Ha-Emunot ve-ha-De‘ot*, ed. Judah Leib Ben Ze’ev. Berlin.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1845. *Emunot we-dëot; oder, Glaubenslehre und Philosophie*. Leipzig.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1859. *Ha-Emunot ve-ha-De‘ot*. Leipzig.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1864. *Ha-Emunot ve-ha-De‘ot*, ed. David Slutzki. Leipzig.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1879. *Vom Glauben und Wissen: Saadiah’s Emunoth we-deoth (Einleitung und Kosmologie)*, ed. Philipp Bloch. Munich.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1880a. *Ha-Emunot ve-ha-De‘ot*. Krakow.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1880b. *Kitāb al-amānāt wa’l-i‘tiqādāt*, ed. S. Landauer. Leiden.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1891. *Commentaire sur le Séfer Yesira, ou Livre de la création*, ed. Mayer Lambert. Paris.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1946. *The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs*, trans. Alexander Altmann. Philosophia judaica. Oxford.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1948. *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions*, trans. Samuel Rosenblatt. Yale Judaica Series. New Haven.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1970. *Sefer ha-Nivḥar be-emunot u-ve-de‘ot: maqor ve-targum*. New York.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1972. *Sefer Yeẓirah (Kitāb al-Mabādi’): ‘im perush ha-gaon Rabbenu Se‘adyah Bar Yosef Fayyumi, makor ve-targum*. Jerusalem.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1984. *Perushei Rav Se‘adyah Ga’on li-Ve-reshit*, ed. Moshe Zucker. New York.
Saadia ben Joseph. 1998. *Perushei Rav Se‘adyah Ga’on le-Sefer Shemot: Maqor ve-Targum*, ed. Y. Ratzaby. Jerusalem.
Sabbataï, Donnolo. 1880. *Il commento di Sabbatai Donnolo sul Libro della creazione, pubblicato per la prima volta nel testo ebraico, con note critiche e introduzione,* ed. David Castelli. Firenze.

Sacerdote, Gustavo. 1892. *Una versione italiana inedita del Moreh Nebukhim di Mosheh ben Maimon*. Rome.
Sachs, Senior. 1850a. *Ha-Teḥiyyah*. Berlin.
Sachs, Senior. 1850b. Literarische Analekten. I. Isaac Israeli oder Abū Sahl Dunas b. Temim. *Literaturblatt des Orients* 11:166–169.
Sachs, Senior. 1851a. "Maymuni." *Ha-Teḥiyah* 1:8–35. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1851b. "Notes of the Publisher." *Ha-Teḥiyah* 1:57–62. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1851c. "Sha'ar ha-shamayim, ch. 2." *Ha-Teḥiyah* 1:63–65. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1853. "Letter 9." *Kerem Hemed* 7:152–223. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1854a. "Letter 9." *Kerem Hemed* 8:54–76. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1854b. "Letter 15." *Kerem Hemed* 8:97b–102. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1854c. "Letter 26." *Kerem Hemed* 8:191–212. Hebrew.
Sachs, Senior. 1857. *Ha-Teḥiyyah*. Berlin.
Sachs, Senior. 1866a. "Letter from Abraham bar Hiyya to Judah. b. Barzillai." *Ha-Levanon* 3:315–317. Hebrew
Sachs, Senior. 1866b. *Rabbi Shelomoh ben Gevirol u-qeẓat benei doro*. Paris.
Sachs, Senior. 1868. *Cantiques de Salomon Ibn Gabirol (Avicebron)*. Paris.
Salfeld, Siegmund. 1869. "Die jüdischen Erklärer des Hohenliedes, IX.–XVI. Jahrhundert." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 9:110–113, 137–142.
Salfeld, Siegmund. 1879. *Das Hohelied Salomo's bei den jüdischen Erklären des Mittelalters. Nebst einem Anhange: Erklärungsproben aus Handschriften*. Berlin.
Sänger, Max. 1865. "Die Aussprache von 'Profet'." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 8:126–127.
Sanguinetti, B. R. 1855. "Troisième extrait de l'ouvrage arabe d'Ibn Aby Ossaïbi'ah, sur l'Histoire des Médecins, traduction française, accompagnée de notes." *Journal asiatique* 5:401–468.
Sassoon, David Solomon. 1932. *Ohel Dawid: Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the Sassoon Library, London*. London.
Scheindlin, Raymond P. 2008. *The song of the distant dove: Judah Halevi's pilgrimage*. Oxford, New York.
Scheyer, Simon B. 1841. "Bemerkungen über einen im Litteraturblatt des Orients 1840 Nr. 14 enthaltenen und F.D. [Franz Delitzsch] unterzeichneten Aufsatz." *Israelitische Annalen* 3:173–174, 180–181.
Scheyer, Simon B. 1845. *Das psychologische System des Maimonides. Eine Einleitungsschrift zu dessen More Nebuchim*. Frankfurt am Main.
Schiller-Szinessy, Salomon Marcus. 1876. *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts Preserved in the University Library, Cambridge*. Cambridge.
Schirmann, Jefim. 1960. *Ha-Shirah ha-'ivrit bi-Sefarad u-ve-Provans: mivḥar shirim ve-sippurim meḥorazim 'arukhim u-mevo'arim be-zeruf mevo'ot, mafteḥot ve-ẓiyyurim*. Mahadurah sheniyah metuqenet. Jerusalem; Tel-Aviv.
Schlanger, Jacques. 1968. *La Philosophie de Salomon ibn Gabirol: Étude d'un néoplatonisme*. Leiden.
Schlanger, Jacques. 1980. *Ha-Filosofia shel Shelomo Ibn Gabirol*. Trans. Joseph Ur. Jerusalem.
Schmiedl, A. 1869. *Studien über jüdische, insonders jüdische-arabische Religionsphilosophie*. Wien.
Schmölders, August. 1842. *Essai sur les écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes et notamment sur la doctrine d'Algazzali*. Paris.
Scholem, Gershom. 1926/27. "Sepher ha-Tamar by Abū Aflah of Syracuse." *Kiryat Sefer* 3:181–221. Hebrew.
Scholem, Gershom Gerhard. 1987. *Origins of the Kabbalah* [*Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala*, Berlin 1961]. Princeton.
Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1842–43. "Midrash Soferim. Toledot Rabbenu Shlomo Yitzhaq." *He-Ḥalutz* 2:111–112, 112–114, 147–150. Hebrew.
Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1852. "Letter Inquiring into Massoretic Matters," etc. *He-Ḥalutz* 1:97–116. Hebrew.
Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1862. "Review of Pinsker's 'Liqqutei Qadmoniyot'." *He-Ḥalutz* 6:56–85. Hebrew.

Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1873. "Unknown Poets and Poems." *He-Ḥalutz* 9:43–57. Hebrew.
Schorr, Joshua Heschel. 1880. "Beware, Sages!" *He-Ḥalutz* 11:76–88. Hebrew.
Schreiner, Martin. 1888. "Zur Geschichte der Polemik zwischen Juden und Muhammedanern." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 42:591–675.
Schum, Wilhelm. 1887. *Beschreibendes Verzeichniss der Amplionianischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt*. Berlin.
Schwartz, Dov. 2000. "The *Kuzari* Renaissance in Jewish Philosophy (The Thought of the School of *Kuzari* Commentators in Early Fifteenth-Century Provence)." In *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature*, eds. Isadore Twersky and Jay Harris. Cambridge, Mass.
Schwartz, Yossef. 2002. *Lekha Dumia: Meister Eckhart Kore be-Moreh ha-Nevukhim*. Tel Aviv.
Schwarz, Israel. 1868. *Tiqvat enosh: zeh Sefer Iyyov. Miqra' qodesh mugah 'a. p. ha-masorah 'im targum ḥadash bi-meliẓat leshon Germanya*. Berlin.
Schwarz, Michael. 1992, 1995. "Who were Maimonides' Mutakallimun? Some Remarks on 'Guide of the Perplexed' part 1, chapter 73." *Maimonidean Studies* 2:159–209, 3:143–72.
Sela, Shlomo. 1999. *Astrologiyah ve-farshanut ha-mikra' be-haguto sehl Avraham Ibn Ezra*. Ramat Gan.
Sermoneta, G. 1969/70. "The Notes of R. Moshe b. Shlomo of Salerno and Nicolo of Giovenazzo to Guide I, 52–53." *Zion* 20:212–240.
Sezgin, Fuat. 2000. *Dominicus Gundissalinus (12th c.) and the Transmission of Arabic Philosophical Thought to the West: Texts and Studies selected and reprinted*. Frankfurt am Main.
Shear, Adam. 2008. *The Kuzari and the Shaping of Jewish Identity, 1167–1900*. Cambridge, New York.
Silvestre de Sacy, Antoine Isaac. 1826. *Chrestomathie arabe, ou, Extraits de divers écrivains arabes* […]. 2. éd. Paris.
Simonsen. 1878. "Maimonides' logische Terminologie." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 18:68.
Sirat, Colette. 2000. "Une liste de manuscrits préliminaire à une nouvelle édition du 'Dalalat al-Ḥayryn'." *Maimonidean Studies* 4:109–133.
Sister, M. 1937. "Einige Bemerkungen über Bachja's Stil im 'Kitāb al-hidāja ʾilā farāʾiḍ al-qulūb' und dessen Übersetzung durch J. ibn Tibbon." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 81:86–93.
Sklare, David Eric, and Haggai Ben-Shammai. 1997. *Kitvei ha-yad be-'aravit-yehudit be-osfei Firkovitch*. Jerusalem.
Slutzki, David. 1877. *Nosafot le-sefer Torat ḥovot ha-levavot*. Warsaw.
Smet, Daniel de. 1998. *Empedocles arabus: une lecture néoplatonicienne tardive*. Brussels.
Sokoloff, Michael. 1990. *A dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine period*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash, and Targum. Ramat-Gan.
Solomon ben Judah. 2007. *Perush qadmon le-Sefer ha-Kuzari: 'Heshek Shelomoh' le-R. Shlomoh ben Yehudah mi-Lunil*. Ramat-Gan.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1841–1842. "Die neueste Ausgabe des Cusari." *Literaturblatt des Orients* 2:289–295, 331–333, 345–349, 537–545, 3:177–182, 193–197, 209–214, 225–235, 673–681, 707–710, 811–816, 822–827.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1845. "Review of Munk's 'Notice sur Joseph b. Judah'." *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums* 2:76–80, 108–120.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1846a. "Review of 'Quntres Devarim 'Atiqim'." *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums* 3:196–200, 274–80, 399–400.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1846b. "Zur Namenkunde." *Sabbat-Blatt für Belehrung, Unterhaltung und Kenntniss jüdischer Zustände*. 3:75–80.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1847. *Manna*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1848. *Ozrot Chajim: Katalog der Michael'schen Bibliothek*. Hamburg.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1852 [-1860]. *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1852. *Ẓava'at R' Yehuda Ibn Tibbon ve-Ẓava'at ha-Rambam u-Mishlei Ḥakhamim*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1855a. "Josef (ibn) Aknin." In *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, eds. J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, 45–58. Leipzig.

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1855b. “Josef ben Zaddik, oder ibn Zaddik.” In *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, eds. J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, 103–104. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1855c. “Josef Caspi.” In *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, eds. J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, 58–73. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1857a. *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century, with an Introduction to Talmud and Midrasch*. London.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1857b. “Notes on the Life of R. Zeraḥiah ben Yisḥaq.” *Oẓar Neḥmad* 2:229–245. Hebrew.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1858. *Catalogus codicum Hebraeorum Bibliothecae Academiae Lugduno-Batavae*. Leiden.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1859a. “Die Tischendorfschen Handschriften.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 2:92–93.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1859b. “Notice to B. Asher’s Edition and Translation of ‘Mivḥar ha-Peninim’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 2:61–62.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1860a. “Note to Ms. 4 of Mortara’s Catalogue of the Community Library of Mantua.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 3:32.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1860b. “Notice on 1859 Lyck Ed. of Ibn Gabirol’s ‘Tiqqun Middot ha-Nefesh’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 3:43.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1861a. “Die Tischendorfschen Handschriften.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 4:45–48.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1861b. “Einzelschriften.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 4:108–120.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1861c. *Zur pseudepigraphischen Literatur: insbesondere der geheimen Wissenschaften des Mittelalters*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862a. “Allgemeine Literatur.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:89–92.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862b. “Cataloge.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:143.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862c. “Der Berliner Pentateuch vom Jahre 1705.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:79–80.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862d. “Die Tischendorfschen Handschriften.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:45–54.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862e. “Journallese.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:123–124.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862f. “Note on ‘Ha-Mevasser’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:4.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1862g. “Note on Judah Ha-Kohen.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 5:131–132.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863a. “Liber de causis.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 6:110–114.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863b. “Note on ‘Kochbe Jizchak’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 6:1–2.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863c. “Note to M. Joel’s ‘Verhältniss Alberts des Grossen zu Maimonides’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 6:31.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863d. “Note to M. Soave, ‘Controversia tenutasi a Tolosa (sic) alla presenza dell’ antipapa Benedetto XIII, etc.’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 6:461–462.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1863e. “Notes to Halberstam’s review of Perles, R. Salomon b. Adret.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 6:12–13.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1864a. *Ha-Nesher* 4:96.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1864b. “Bibliographie. Periodische Literatur.” Oẓar Nehmad,” Vol. 4. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 7:25–28.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1864c. “Die Encyclopädie des Abraham bar Chijja.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 7:84–95.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1864d. “Die Tischendorfschen Handschriften.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 7:11–16.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1864e. “Kaiser Friedrich II. über Maimonides.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 7:62–66; 136.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1864f. “Ascher b. David b. Abraham b. David.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 7:68–69.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1865a. “Borhan al Fuluk.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 8:31–32.

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1865b. “Die Mittleren Bücher der Araber und ihre Bearbeiter.” *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* 10:456–498.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1865c. “Hebräische Handschriften in Parma. Nach Mittheilungen von P. Perreau.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 8:26–30; 62–69; 95–103; 122–125; 146–150.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1865d. “Jakob ibn Killis (Kels?) der Wesir.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 8:118–122; 140–146.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1866a. “Antiquities. The Prayer of R’M Attributed to Maimonides.” *Ha-Karmel* 6:350. Hebrew.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1866b. “Harib, Sohn des Zeid, und Garib, Sohn des Said. Zur Geschichte der mathematischen Wissenschaften im 10. Jahrhundert.” *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* 11:235–243.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1866c. “Ist Ibn Esra in Indien gewesen?” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 20:427–432.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1867a. “Abraham Judaeus-Savasorda und Ibn Ezra. Zur Geschichte der mathematischen Wissenschaften im XII. Jahrhundert.” *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* 12:1–44.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1867b. “Donnolo. Pharmokologische Fragmente aus dem 10. Jahrhundert, nebst Beiträgen zur Literatur der Salernitaner, hauptsächlich nach Handschriften hebräischer Quellen.” *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie und für klinische Medicin* 38:65–91; 42: 80–124.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1869a. *Al-Fārābī (Alpharabius) des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften*. Mémoires de l’Académie impériale des sciences, 7. série, tome 13, no.4. St. Petersburg.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1869b. “Anzeige.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 9:79–80, 164–170.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1869c. “Eine Disputation im X. Jahrhundert.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 9:26–29.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1869d. “Miscellen.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 9:23–26, 59, 90–93, 115–116, 170–175, 147–152
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870a. “Anzeige.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 10:72–82, 109–111.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870b. “Chefez al-Kuti.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 10:26–27.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870c. “Das Königbuch des Kalonymos.” *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 8:118–122.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870d. “Goldziher’s Studien u. Tanchum Jeruschalmi.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 10:111.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870e. “Hebräische Handschriften in Parma,” etc. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 10:96–104.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870f. “Miscellen.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 10:23–27; 86; 112–113; 120; 139–142; 171–172; 172–173.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1870g. “Note to ‘Anzeige’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 10:82.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1871a. “Die toxicologischen Schriften der Araber bis Ende des XII. Jahrhunderts. Ein bibliographischer Versuch, grossentheils aus handschriftlichen Quellen.” *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie und für klinische Medicin* 52:340–375; 468–503.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1871b. “Hebräische Handschriften in Spanien und Portugal.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 11:133–137.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1871c. “Miscellen.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 11:55–57; 75–76; 76–79; 103–104; 105–106; 141–142.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1872a. “Ancient Matters.7. The Treatise on Spirit and Soul by Isaac Israeli (Hebrew).” *Ha-Karmel* N.S. 1:400–405.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1872b. “Ascher ben David [Addenda to *H. B.* VII, 69; X, 157].” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 12:79–85.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1872c. “Hebraeische Handschriften in Parma.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 12:31–37; 53–57; 104–120.

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1872d. “Isak Israeli b. Salomo.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 12:57–58.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873a. “Anzeige.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:87–91.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873b. “Berachja der Fabeldichter.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:80–85.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873c. “Gafiki’s Verzeichniss einfacher Heilmittel.” *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie und für klinische Medicin* 77:507–548, 85:132–171, 355–370, 86:98–149.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873d. “Gifte und ihre Heilung, eine Abhandlung des Moses Maimonides auf Befehl des äegyptischen Wezirs (1198) verfasst […].” *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie und für klinische Medicin* 77:61–120.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873e. “Josef ibn Aknin.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:38–43.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873f. “Miscellen.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:16–18; 43–44; [64–65]; 68–69; 91–94; 115–116; 136–140.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873g. “Scheshet b. Benveniste.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:106–110.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873h. “Volksliteratur und Poesie.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 13:65–67; 87–91; 112–15; 129–136.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1873i. “Zu Kalila we-Dimna. I. Jacob ben Elasar, der bisher unbekannter Uebersetzer ins Hebräische; II. Parallelen.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 27:553–565.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874a. “Brief an Halberstam.” In *Sefer Tagmulei ha-Nefesh*, ed. S. Halberstam. Lyck, 7–27.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874b. “Exegese [Reviews].” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 14:99–103; 124–131.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874c. “Geschichte des Unterrichts [Review].” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 14:15–18, 37–45.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874d. “Mischle Sindabar, Hippocrates & Mose de Palermo.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 14:12–15; 53–60.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874e. “Namenkunde.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 14:81–82.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874f. “Poeten und Polemiker in Nordspanien um 1400.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 14:77–79; 95–99.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1874–1875. “Apokalypsen mit polemischer Tendenz.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 28: 627–659, 29: 162–166.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875a. “Anzeige.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 15:11–14, 41–45, 86–89.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875b. *Die hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München*. Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae monacensis. tomus I, pars 1. Munich.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875c. “Miscellen.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 15:14–18; 36–37; 61–68; 89–94; 112–113; 133–136.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875d. *Pereq mi-sefer Leviyat Ḥen le-Rabbi ben Avraham ben Ḥayyim im he‘arot me’et M.S.S. [Steinschneider]. Milḥemet ha-dat. qevuẓat mikhtavim: be-‘inyenei ha-maḥloqet ‘al devar sefer ha-Moreh ve-ha-Mada‘. Jeschurun* 3:17–57.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875e. “Periodische Literatur.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 15:49–52.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875f. “Poeten und Polemiker in Nordspanien um 1400.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 15:54–60.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875g. “Typen I. Das Grösste und Kleinste.” *Jeschurun* 8:65–75.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1875h. “Verhältnisse der Juden in Griechenland zur Landessprache [Review].” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 15:37–41.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1876a. “Bibliographie [Review].” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 16:63–65; 106–111.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1876b. “Frat (Prat?) Maimon und seine Schüler.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 16:126–132.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1876c. “Jehuda Mosconi.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 3:94–100; 140–153; 190–206.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1876d. “Note on Bacher’s Abraham ibn Esra’s ‘Einleitung zu seinen Pentateuch-Kommentar’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 16 (77–78).

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877a. "Menachem b. Salomo." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 17:38–41; 131–134.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877b. "Miscellen." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 17:13–14; 44; 62; 66–69; 94–95; 126–128.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877c. *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden, nebst Anhängen verwandten Inhalts*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. 6, no. 3. Leipzig.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877d. "Zur Kritik und Methode." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 17:120–126.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1877e. "Zur medicinischen Literatur." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 17: 56–62; 114–17.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1878a. *Catalog der hebräischen Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg* […]. Hamburg.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1878b. "Judaica." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 18:100–110.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1878c. "Literaturgeschichte [Review.]." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 18:62–66.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1878d. "Miscellen." *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte der Medicin und medicinischen Geographie* 1:123–126, 126–130; 131; 131–137; 137–138; 356–364; 437–451.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879a. "Candia. Cenni di storia letteraria." *Il Mosè* 2:411–416, 456–462.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879b. *Die Handschriften Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879c. "Jehuda Moscono und einige griechische Zeitgenossen und Homonymen (Mose Kapuzzato, Mose b. Elia (Galiano), Mose b. Jehuda (Galiano), D. Pardoleone, Jos. Kilti, Elia Philosoph b. Elieser)." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 19:57–64.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879d. "Miscellen." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 19:15–23; 40–44; 72; 93–95; 118–119; 136.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879e. "Note on Chaim Vital's 'Sefer ha-Tekhunah'." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 19:99–102.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879f. "Review of 'Jezira'." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 19:122–123.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879g. "Talmud [Review.]." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 19:70–72.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1879h. "Zur medizinischen Literatur. II. Asaf." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 19:35–38, 64–70, 84–89, 105–109.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880a. "Abraham ben Salomo." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20:7–12; 39–42; 61–65.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880b. *Abraham ibn Esra (Abraham Judaeus, Avenare). Zur Geschichte der mathematischen Wissenschaften im XII. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880c. "Communication from Harkavy Concerning Petersburg Manuscripts." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 14:104.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880d. "Karaitische Literatur." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20:69–72; 91–99; 121–124.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880e. "Miscellen." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20:24; 45–48; 102–104; 134–138.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880f. "Note on G. Rülf, Zur Lautlehre der aramäisch-talmudischen Dialekte." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20:60.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880g. "Note on Steinschneider, Moritz, 'Abraham ibn Esra'." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20:118.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1880h. "Note on Harkavy's 'Me'asef nidaḥim'." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 20:107–108.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881a. "Anzeige." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:26–35.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881b. "Anzeige." "Miscellen." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:133–136.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881c. Jochanan Alemanno, Flavius Mithridates und Pico de la Mirandola. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:109–115; 130–132.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881d. Judaica. *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:9–21.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881e. "Miscellen." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:82–88.

Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881f. “Note to Friedlaender’s Translation of the Guide.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:128.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881g. “Note to Schwab’s ‘Al-Harizi et ses pérégrinations en terre sainte’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:19–20.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1881h. “Notice on Harkavy’s ‘Mittheilungen aus Petersburger Handschriften’.” *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 21:13–14.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1882. “Zur Namenkunde mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Karaiten.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 31:324–332.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1883a. “Abraham Bibago’s Schriften.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 32:79–96, 125–144, 239–140.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1883b. “Medizinische Handschriften im Besitz des Herrn Halberstam.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 10:101–112.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1883c. “Review of Dieterici, ‘Die sogenannte Theologie des Aristoteles’.” *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* 4:405–407.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1883d. “Review of Guttmann, ‘Die Religionsphilosophie des Saadia’.” *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*:77–78.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1883–4. “Purim und Parodie.” *Israelitische Letterbode* 9:44–58.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1884. *Etudes sur Zarkali: astronome arabe du XIe siècle et ses ouvrages*. Rome.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1885a. “Additions to ‘Moreh Maqom ha-Moreh’: A Collection of Poems Relevant to Maimonides and His Famous Works, Both Printed and Unprinted.” *Kovetz al Yad* 2:1–6 (article 9, separately paginated).
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1885b. “Moreh Maqom ha-Moreh: A Collection of Poems Relevant to Maimonides and His Famous Work’s, Both Printed and Unprinted.” *Kovetz al Yad* 1:1–32.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1885c. “Notizen.” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 34:528–529.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1887a. “Die Söhne des Musa ben Schakir.” *Bibliotheca mathematica: Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Mathematik*, Neue Folge 1:44–7.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1887b. “Zu Alexander von Aphrodisias.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 14:190–195.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1888. “Zur Frauenliteratur.” *Israelitische Letterbode* 12:44–95.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1889. “Miscellen.” *Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Literatur* 9:72–85.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1892. “Pseudo-Saadia’s Commentar zum Buche Jezira.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 19:79–85.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1893. *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters, meist nach handschriftlichen Quellen*. Berlin.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1895. *Die hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München*. 2. grossenteils umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, beschrieben von M. S. *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis; tomus 1, pars 1.* Munich.
Steinschneider, Moritz. 1903. “Die hebraeischen Commentare zum ‘Führer’ des Maimonides.” In *Birkat Avraham. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstage A. Berliner’s*, ed. A. Freimann and M. Hildesheimer, 345–363. Frankfurt am Main
Steinschneider, Moritz, and Adolf Neubauer. 1888. “Josef ibn Aknin.” *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 14:105–112.
Stickel, G. 1864. “Nachschrift zu Meier’s Die Werthbezeichnungen auf muhammedanischen Münzen.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 18:775–780.
Stössel, David. 1881. *Salomo ben Gabirol als Philosoph und Förderer der Kabbala dargestellt*. Inaugural-Dissertation Leipzig. Leipzig.
Straschun, M. 1841–42. “Letter on Rabbi Shem Tov, the Commentator of the ‘Guide of the Perplexed’.” *Pirḥei Ẓafon* 1:46–48, 2:77–89. Hebrew.
Stroumsa, Sarah. 1989. *Dawud ibn Marwan al-Muqammiṣ’s ‘Twenty Chapters’ (‘Ishrūn Māqala)*. Leiden, New York, København, Köln.

Stroumsa, Sarah. 1990. “Note on Maimonides’ Attitude Towards Joseph ibn Ẓaddiq.” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought (Shlomo Pines Jubilee Volume II)* 9:33–38. Jerusalem. Hebrew.
Stroumsa, Sarah. 1999. *Reshito shel pulmus ha-Rambam ba-mizraḥ: Iggeret ha-hashtaqah ‘al odot Teḥiyat ha-Metim le-Yosef ibn Shim‘on*. Jerusalem.
Sturlese, Loris. 1979. “L’ ‘Epitome Campililiensis’ del Fons vitae di Avicebron; note sul testo e sulla tradizione manoscritta.” *Palaeographica diplomatica et archivistica. Studi in onore di Giulio Battelli* I. Rome, 429–453.
Ta-Shma, Israel. 1982. “The Abridgement of the Duties of the Heart by Rabbenu Asher ben Shelamiah of Lunel.” ‘*Alei Sefer*. 10:13–24. Hebrew.
Ta-Shma, Israel. 1988. “‘She’elot u-Teshuvot min ha-Shamayim’:”’ The Collection and its Additions.” *Tarbiz* 47:51–66. Hebrew.
Tabrīzī, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. 1981. *Sharḥ-i Bīst va panj muqaddima dar iṯbāt-i Bārī-i ta‘ālā az kitāb-i Dalālat al-ḥā’irīn-i Ibn-i Maymūn*, eds. Mahdi Muḥaqqiq and Ja‘far Sajjād. Teheran.
Taku, Moses. 1860. “Schreiben des Herrn R. Kirchheim in Frankfurt a. M. an Herrn Ignaz Blumenfeld in Wien [Ketav Tamim von Moses Tachau].” *Oẓar Neḥmad* 3:54–100.
Taubeles, S. A. 1888. *Saadia Gaon*. Halle.
Thorndike, Lynn. 1923–1966. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*. 8 vols. Vol. 1. New York.
Türker, Mubahat. 1960. “Musa ibn-i Meymun’un al-Maqāla fi ṣinā ‘at al-manṭiq’ inin arapça asli.” *Review of the Institute of Islamic Studies* 1.2: 9–64.
Türker, Mubahat. 1961. *Musa ibn-i Meymun’un al-Maqāla fi ṣinā‘at al-manṭiq’ inin arapça asli.* Ankara.
Uri, Johannes, Alexander Nicoll, and E. B. Pusey. 1787–1835. *Bibliothecae Bodleianae codicum manuscriptorum orientalium* […] *catalogus*. 2 parts in 3 vols. Oxford.
Vajda, Georges. 1948. “Un champion de l’Avicennisme: le problème de l’identité de Dieu et du Premier moteur d’après un opuscule judéo-arabe inédité du XIIIe siècle.” *Revue Thomiste* 48:480–504.
Vajda, Georges. 1954. *Juda ben Nissim ibn Malka, philosophe juif marocain*. Collection Hespéris 15. Paris.
Vajda, Georges. 1955. “The Doctrine of R. Moses b. Joseph Halevi on Providence.” *Melilah* 5:163–168. Hebrew.
Vajda, Georges. 1956. “On the Conflict between Philosophy and Religion – the Ideas and Methods of R. Ya’aqov ben Shelomo Ẓarfati.” *Tarbiz* 24:307–322 ; iv–v (English summary). Hebrew.
Vajda, Georges. 1972. “Les études de philosophie juive du moyen âge depuis la synthèse de Julius Guttmann (première article).’ *Hebrew Union College Annual* 43:125–147.
Vajda, Georges. 1974. “Les études de philosophie juive du moyen âge depuis la synthèse de Julius Guttmann (deuxième article).” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 45:205–242.
Vajda, Georges, and Paul Fenton. 2002. *Le Commentaire sur le Livre de la création de Dunas ben Tamim de Kairouan (X^e siècle)*. Paris-Louvain.
Vajda, Judah Aryeh (Georges). 1950. “Nine Chapters on Unity Attributed to Maimonides.” *Kovetz al Yad* 15:103 = 137. Hebrew.
Vajda, Judah Aryeh (Georges). 1976. “From the ‘Maḥkimat Peti’ of the Karaite Joseph ha-Roeh.” *Kovetz al Yad* 8:283–291. Hebrew.
Walfish, Barry, and Mikhail Kizilov. 2010. *Bibliographia Karaitica. An Annotated Bibliography of Karaites and Karaism. Karaite Texts and Studies*. Leiden.
Weinsberg, Leopold. 1888. *Der Mikrokosmos: ein angeblich im 12. Jahrhundert von dem Cordubenser Joseph ibn Zaddick verfasstes philosophisches System: nach seiner Echtheit untersucht*. Breslau.
Weinstock, Israel. 1982. “Towards a Clarification of the Nature and the Transmission of *Sefer Yeẓirah* in the Saadia Version.” *Temirin* 2:31–39.
Weiser, R. 1992. *Sefarim mi-Sefarad*. [Jerusalem].

Weiss, Isaac Hirsch. 1871. *Dor dor ve-dorshav, hu sefer divrei ha-yamim le-Torah shebe-ʻal peh ʻim qorot sofreha ve-sifreha*. Vienna.
Weiss, Isaac Hirsch. 1881. *Toledot Rabbeinu Mosheh ben Rabbeinu Maimon*. Vienna.
Woepcke, Franz. 1855. *Recherches sur l'histoire des sciences mathématiques chez les Orientaux, d'après des traités inédits arabes et persans* […]. Paris.
Woepcke, Franz. 1863. *Mémoire sur la propagation des chiffres indiens*. Paris.
Wolf, G. 1865. "Zur Geschichte jüdischer Buchdruckereien in Oesterreich." *Hebraeische Bibliographie* 8:55–69.
Wolf, Johann Christoph. 1715. *Bibliotheca Hebraea*. Hamburg, Leipzig.
Wolff, Moritz. 1878. "Bemerkungen zum Wortlaute der Emunot we-Deot." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 32:694–707.
Wolff, Moritz. 1880. "Bemerkungen zum Wortlaute der Emunot we-Deot." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 7:73–100.
Wolfson, Harry Austryn. 1950–51. "Averroes' Lost Treatise on the Prime Mover." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23. 683–710.
Wüstenfeld, Ferdinand. 1840. *Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte und Naturforscher*. Göttingen.
Wüstenfeld, Ferdinand. 1877. *Die Übersetzungen arabischer Werke in das Lateinische seit dem XI. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen.
Yaʻqūb al-Qirqisānī, Abū Yūsuf. 1984. *Yaʻqūb Al-Qirqisānī on Jewish Sects and Christianity: A Translation of "Kitāb al-anwār," Book I. With two introductory essays by Bruno Chiesa*, trans. Wilfrid Lockwood. Judentum und Umwelt 10. Frankfurt am Main.
Yahalom, Joseph. 2009. *Yehuda Halevi: Poetry and Pilgrimage*. Jerusalem.
Yahuda, Abraham Shalom. 1904. *Prolegomena zu einer erstmaligen Herausgabe des Kitāb al-Hidāja 'ilā farā'iḍ al-qulūb* […] von Bachja ibn Josef ibn Paquda aus dem Andalus, nebst einer grösseren Textbeilage. Frankfurt am Main..
Zacuto, Abraham ben Samuel. 1580. *Yuḥasin*. [Krakow].
Zacuto, Abraham ben Samuel. 1924. *Yuḥasin ha-shalem,* eds. Hersch E. Filipowski and Alfred Freimann. Frankfurt am Main.
Zarza, Samuel ibn. 1559. *Sefer Meqor ḥayyim*. Mantua.
Zedner, Joseph. 1867. *Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum*. London.
Zenker, Julius Theodor. 1846. *Bibliotheca orientalis. Manuel de bibliographie orientale*. Leipzig.
Zerah, Menahem. 1880. *Ẓedah la-derekh*, ed. Naftali Herz. Warsaw.
Zeraḥiah ha-Yevani. 1860–90. *Sefer ha-Yashar: Das Buch vom rechten Lebenswandel*, ed. Isaac Kauffmann. Frankfurt am Main.
Zotenberg, Hermann. 1866. *Manuscrits orientaux. Catalogues des manuscrits hébreux et samaritains de la Bibliothèque impériale*. Paris.
Zunz, Leopold. 1838. "Additamenta." In *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur*, ed. F. Delitzsch. Grimma.
Zunz, Leopold. 1845. *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*. Berlin.
Zunz, Leopold. 1863. "Toledot Rabbi Azariah min ha-Adumim." In *Sefer Me'or 'Einayim of Azariah di Rossi*, eds. Isaac A. Benjacob, and Z. H. Jaffe, 1–30. Vilna.
Zunz, Leopold. 1865. *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*. Berlin.
Zunz, Leopold. 1867. *Nachtrag zur Literaturgeshichte der synagogalen Poesie*. Berlin.
Zunz, Leopold. 1872. "Analekten." Saadia's *Emunot ve-De'ot*, ältere Übersetzung. *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 10:4–10.
Zunz, Leopold. 1876. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Leipzig.

Appendix: Conspectus of the Contents of *Die Hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

Part One. Philosophy (§§14–309)

Chapter One. Greeks (§§14–148)

Aristotle (§§14–147)

A. Logic (§§14–44)
   al-Fārābī (§15)
   Averroes (§§16–43)
   1. Organon (§§17–43)
      a. Epitome (§§17–18)
      b. Middle Commentary (§§19–41)
         i. Translations of Books I-V (§19)
         ii. Translation of Books VI and VII (§20)
         iii. Supercommentaries (§§22–40)
            1. Jedaiah ha-Penini? (§22)
            2. Levi ben Gershom (§23–25)
            3. Judah b. Isaac Cohen (§26)
            4. Abraham Avigedor (§26)
            5. Moses da Rieti (§27)
            6. Judah Messer Leon (§§28–29)
            7. Abraham Farissol (§30)
            8. Joseph ibn Shem Tov (§34)
            9. Anonymous (§34)
            10. Eli Habillo (§35)
            11. Manoaḥ Sho'ali (§36)
            12. Anonymous, Joseph Albo, Solomon ha-Levy, Anonymous (§36)
            13. Anonymous Commentaries on *Isagoge*, *Categories*; *De Interpretatione* (§37)
            14. Abraham Bibago's Commentary on Post. An. (§38)
            15. Anonymous Commentaries on Post. An., Topics (§39)
            16. Joseph Kaspi's Compendium (§§40–41)
      c. Long Commentary (§42)
   2. Logical Questions (§43)
   3. Logical Questions by Abūl-Qāsim ibn Idrīs, Abū'Abdarraḥman b. Ṭāhir, Ibn Ṭumlus, Abū 'l-Abbās Aḥmad b. Qāsim (§44)

B. Physical Writings (§§45–75)
   I. Physics – Averroes (§§45–54)
      a. Epitome (§45)
         a. Commentaries (§§46–47)
            1. Jedaiah ha-Penini (§46)
            2. Solomon ha-Levi (§47)
      b. Middle Commentary (§48)
         a. Supercommentaries
            1. Isaac Albalag (§49)
            2. Bonsenior (§50)
            3. Levi b. Gershom (§51)

4. Moses Narboni (§52)
5. Shem Tov b. Josephb. Shem Tov ibn Shem Tov (§52)
6. Student of Michael Cohen (§52b)
7. Anonymous (§52b)
8. Elijah Delmedigo (§52b)

c. Long Commentary (§53–54)
   a. Supercommentaries.
      1. Shalom b. Joseph (§54)
      2. Abraham Bibago (§54)
      3. Moses Almosnino (§54)
      4. Compendium of Judah Messer Leon (§54)

II. De Caelo (§55–59)
   a. Themistius (§55)
   b. Averroes (§§56–59)
      a. Epitome (§56)
         1. Commentary – Levi ben Gershom (§57)
      b. Middle Commentary (§58)
         1. Supercommentaries
            a. Moses Narboni (§59)
            b. Anonymous (§59)
            c. Moses Comtino (§59)
            d. Jedaiah ha-Penini (§59)

III. De Generatione – Averroes (§60–60b)
   a. Epitome. (§60)
      a. Commentary – Levi ben Gershom. (§60)
   b. Middle Commentary (§60b)
      a. Supercommentaries (§60b)

IV. Meteorology Aristotle, trans. Samuel ibn Tibbon (§§61–65).
   a. Epitome (§62)
      a. Commentary – Levi ben Gershom (§63)
   b. Middle Commentary (§64)
   c. Miscellaneous works of dubious origin (§65)

V. De Mineralibus (§65)

VI. De Plantiis of Nicolaus (§66)
   a. Averroes (Levi b. Gershom) (§66)

VII. De Animalibus – Averroes (Levi) (§67)

VIII. De Anima – Averroes (§§68–73b)
   a. Epitome (§69)
      a. Commentary – Levi ben Gershom (§69)
   b. Middle Commentary (§70–71)
      a. Supercommentaries
         1. R. Porfas (§72)
         2. Shalom b. Joseph (§72)
         3. Judah Messer Leon (§72)

Part Two. Mathematics (§§310–413)

Chapter One. Greeks (§§310–336)

Chapter Two. Arabs (§§337–372)

Chapter Three. Jews (§§374–387)

Manuscript Index

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

General Index

C.H. Manekin et al. (eds.), *Moritz Steinschneider. The Hebrew Translations of the Middle Ages and the Jews as Transmitters*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 16,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7314-1, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013