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By Henry Malter, Dropsie College

Among the difficulties that beset the way of every investigator in the field of Jewish literature, especially that of the Middle Ages, the one arising from misleading titles is not the least perplexing. The multiplicity and variety of books bearing the same title, although entirely different in origin, content, and purpose, which are met with in medieval Hebrew literature, can hardly be paralleled in any of the world's literatures. The underlying cause of this confusion is the peculiar fondness of Hebrew authors for pompous titles for their productions, titles that often have no relation whatever to the subject-matter of their works. The choice of title depended mostly upon the individual author's taste or whim, and the same predilections were often shared by a number of others. Moreover the existence of a book bearing a given name did not prevent an author from appropriating the title for his work. As a result we have, for example, under the name of "Tree of Life," twenty-five books (see Benjacob's Thesaurus, s. v. יִלָּהּ), assignable to twelve different branches of Jew-
ish literature. Equally illustrative of the lack of relationship between title and work are five books bearing the name שירתה יפה ("Lily of Jacob"). Three of them deal with halakic matter, one is devoted to palmistry and physiognomy, and the third undertakes to show "means by which to ascertain any number that another person may be thinking of and other tricks for fun and amusement, also ways of writing and speaking by signs so as not to be understood by any one except those who know the signs."

I. S. Reggio¹ was of the opinion that these symbolic titles were adopted by Jewish writers under the dominating influence of Arabic literature. This may be the explanation in the case of some authors who followed Arabic models²; it is not, however, borne out by the facts when applied to Jewish literature in general. The Arabs usually employed rime titles, a practice not commonly adopted by the Jews. Moreover, symbolic titles occur first and are found mainly in the literature of the Halakah, a branch least influenced by Arabic literature. It is in the domain of Halakah that we meet as early as the twelfth century titles giving no indication of the character of the books, e. g. סוד ההינו by Isaac b. Abba Mari of Marseille (1179-89), and by Baruch b. Isaac of Worms (1200), ירח הדמ"ה

¹ Quoted by Prof. Schechter in his excellent essay on the subject under discussion, *Studies*, I, 277.

² For instance Moses Ibn Ezra's מרחוקה הבשׂ, or Abraham Ibn Ezra's ידות דברון וסודים ממעון.

³ There are some exceptions, as the title of the second work mentioned in the preceding note, that of Abraham b. Hiyya's Ethics which is in full: זוגות נפש ושערמה, בראשית וסודים ממעון, etc. (comp. Luzzatto in *Kerem Chemed*, VII, 77; S. Sachs, *יוחנן עלווה*, 72), and of his mathematical Encyclopaedia: י Hibernate ומדלי ומאירוכת, of which only a fragment is extant; see Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, VII, 84 ff.; *Bibliotheca Mathematica*, 1896, p. 34; *JQR.*, XVI, 743.
by Isaac b. Moses of Vienna (1250). Subsequently this custom spread to all other branches of Hebrew literature, as the instances given show.

There is another class of titles which are still more misleading. The words forming the title would seem to be descriptive of the work; on examination, however, it turns out that the promise of these “descriptive” titles is in no way fulfilled by the books that bear them. Thus from the title “Voice of Song” (�ַלְוַת זְמָה) we might well expect poetry. Instead, the book is an obscure kabbalistic commentary on the תְּלִויָה of Isaac Loria. A book styled בֵּאל מִנה “Balm for the Wound,” the author of which is presumably a physician, turns out to be a commentary on Canticles. These instances which could be readily multiplied, suffice to show that the Hebrew bibliographer can not classify Hebrew books without going beyond their titles.

The foregoing observations were suggested to the writer by his experience with the title of the treatise here published for the first time from a unique manuscript in the British Museum, Add. 27,144 (Margoliouth, Descriptive List of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum, London, 1893, p. 83). The manuscript belonged originally to the Italian bibliophile Joseph Almanzi, upon whose death (1860) it was bought with many other manuscripts of Almanzi’s collection for the British Museum. The author of the work, Shem Tob ben Joseph Palquera, mentions it in his commentary on Maimonides’ Guide, called מָשָּׁה אֲמוֹרָה (Pressburg 1837, p. 131), under the name שלוחם. This is the only reference to our
treatise found in the numerous works of Palquera, and it has always been described among the writings of this author as an exposition on the nature of dreams. Even Steinschneider, the greatest Hebrew bibliographer, suggested (Jewish Literature, London 1857, p. 371, n. 78) that "the monograph שֶמֶת בְּרֵד הָעָלָם of Shemtob Palquera, only known by his own quotation, was probably philosophical, according to the principles which the Arabs and Jews drew from Aristotle's 'De Somno et Vigilia'." When, however, S. D. Luzzatto published his "Bibliothèque de feu Joseph Almanzi" (Hebr. Bibliographie, vols. IV-VI) where the superscription of the present treatise of Palquera is given (VI, 19, No. 251), Steinschneider at once realized his mistake. In a note referring to the book he says: "ce livre est le שֶמֶת בְּרֵד הָעָלָם, v. Catal. p. 2539 et Jewish Literature, p. 371, où j'ai supposé qu'il s'agit d'une onierocritique." As long as no manuscript of the שֶמֶת בְּרֵד הָעָלָם was known, the only information about the work was the passage in Palquera's commentary on the Guide referred to above. This passage dealt with the reliability of dreams.

* So e.g. Jellinek in his Preface to סְדָה תִּבְרֵית, and recently M. David in the Introduction to Palquera's עִמָּה לְאַמְרֵי, Berlin 1902, xi.

* It is the peculiar fate of Palquera's works to have been the occasion for various misconceptions. Thus his encyclopedic work (as yet unpublished) was ascribed by Steinschneider and others to Samuel Ibn Tibbon, until Zunz (Hebr. Bibl., IX, 135 f.) restored it to its real author; see Steinschneider, Hebr. Chers., 5. His work לא יְדִיעַי עַד הָיָה was attributed by some to one Saul b. Simon; see the article on Palquera in the October number, p. 173, n. 42. The author of the article "Philosophical Ethics," JE., V, 254, informs us that Palquera "wrote four works on various ethical questions," among which he enumerates וַאֵלֶּה שְׁמִשָּׁהָו - a work which is in fact, as the title indicates, a general introduction to all secular sciences. On the other hand, Palquera's real book on ethics, שלחַ תִּפְנוּ רֶסֶם, is not mentioned at all. Of the four works mentioned there, only one, the שעַנְיָה לְמִצְלַע אוֹת, represents a system of ethics.
and no other inference could be drawn than that the work was devoted to oneirocriticism. Palquera quotes there the Arabian philosopher Averroes’ defense of the Peripatetics against the accusation that they denied God’s foreknowledge of particulars. The text reads: “How is it possible to ascribe to the Peripatetics the view that God’s eternal knowledge does not extend to the particular, for do they not assert elsewhere that true dreams contain predictions of particular future events and that these predictions are communicated to man in sleep by the eternal all-guiding and all-dominating mind? It is not only with regard to particulars that the Peripatetics claim that God’s knowledge differs in kind from human knowledge, but also with regard to the universals; for our universal notions, like our particular ideas, are the results of the world of phenomena, while the opposite is true of God’s knowledge. This proves conclusively that the divine knowledge is too different from ours and the terms universal and particular cannot be applied to it at all.”

To these words of Aver-

...
roes, Palquera adds: “Although to my mind this view in itself is undoubtedly correct, namely, that God’s Providence embraces all existence, the subject of dreams, too, has convinced me of it; for the fact that particular events are foretold to many in dreams proves beyond doubt that Providence extends also to particulars. On this subject I have written a treatise, which I have called "Treatise of the Dream," a work on education and conduct—something remarkable.”

Assuming from the title investigation I found the passage to be a verbal translation from Averroes' Theology published by Marcus Joseph Müller (Philosophie und Theologie von Averroes, Munich 1859, p. 11, l. 6-13):

 وكيف ينمو على
المشاةين أنهم يقولون أنه سجناء لا يعلم بالذيل القدوم الجزئيات وم يرون
أن الرو벽 الصادقة تتضمن الإشارات بالجزاءات الحادثة في الزمان
المستقبل وأن ذلك اللمتذر يحصل للإنسان في اليوم من قبل اللم
الذين المدبر لكل المستوى عليه وليس برون أنه لا يعلم الجزئيات فقط
على النحو الذي نعلم نحن بل ولا الكتبات، فإن الكتبات المعلمة عندنا
معالجة أيضًا عن طبيعة الوجود والأمر في ذلك اللم بالعكس ولذلك ما قد
اذى الية البرهان أن ذلك اللم مزيّع عن أن يوصف بكميّ أو شرقيّ.

Averroes repeats the same in brief at the end of his work, p. 131. More
than a hundred years before Averroes, the same view regarding God’s
knowledge was advanced by Al-Baṭṭalāyāsī (died 1306); comp. Kaufmann, Die
Spuren Al-Baṭṭalāyāsī in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie, Leipzig 1880,
p. 49 f. As is well known, this theory of the incomprehensibility of the
nature of the divine knowledge was accepted also by Maimonides, “Eight

א prova que não há realidade ou abstração de Deus, e há existência da coisa em sua própria forma, de tal modo que o espírito humano não pode compreender a existência real de Deus, nem mesmo o Deus que se figura a si mesmo.

The Hebrew text is quoted from the work of Levi b. Gershom, IV, 6 (ed.

Các labradores, com as suas espadas, viviam no país das encantadas e maiores da água e da terra, e muitos deles eram gentis.

O mundo dos espíritos e dos demônios é completamente diferente do mundo dos homens, e há entre eles uma separação total e permanente.

As coisas que ocorrem nos sonhos são devida e inerente à realidade e à existência de Deus, e não podem ser negadas ou ignoradas.
and from the context that the work was an oneirocriticism, no satisfactory explanation of Palquera’s words following that quotation could be found. Why should a work on the trustworthiness of dreams confine itself to the question of education and conduct? The closing phrase המ שיאתא לכם is, moreover, unintelligible, as there is nothing to which it refers. All these obscurities are, however, cleared up by the superscription put at the head of the treatise by some copyist. Here the title מכורא חפש is dropped and the information is given that the writing of this treatise, dealing with ethics, was due to a dream. The ideas came to Palquera in a dream and on awakening he committed his dream to writing. This explains Palquera’s reference to the work as the “Treatise of the Dream” and his explanatory remark that it deals with education and social conduct. The words麦 שיאתא are thus only the expression of Palquera’s own astonishment at his dream in which he sees additional evidence that God’s providence extends also to individual affairs.

In all probability, the original title was מכורא חפש, as quoted by Palquera, perhaps with the sub-title מכורא זארא חפש דבר שלם ואמת, which was followed by some sort of

Leipzig, 176-79) uses the same argument to prove God’s providence over individuals; comp. also ib., II, 2, and Shemtoc b. Joseph, ת חובש, Venice 1547, fol. 17c.

There is no reason to doubt the truth of this statement. This matter together with others relating to the present treatise will be taken up for detailed discussion in a series of articles which will appear in subsequent numbers of this Review. In the following pages attention will be drawn to the articles in the notes on the respective passages by referring to this note.

The phrase is taken from Esther 9, 30 and epitomizes the whole content of the treatise, מביא שע הוא being interpreted as moral perfection, while מביא stands for the achievement of intellectual perfection (see below). On the usage of the expression רוחבי in mediæval Hebrew literature comp. Harkavy, Studien, V, 118-120, 237, bottom. To his references this title of our treatise may now be added.
a preface, wherein the author related his experience in the dream. A later redactor of the treatise must have considered the title inadequate and the preface unimportant, and therefore epitomized the whole in the superscription before us. The editor's last words are indicative of this procedure. The phrase, it seems, meant to assure the reader that here begins the treatise proper, of which he has omitted nothing.

We turn now to a brief summary of the content. The whole treatise, whether it had its origin in a dream or not, seems to have been inspired by the following passage in Maimonides, "Eight Chapters," c. 4. There, commenting on the verse (Zech. 8, 19), Maimonides continues: "וּהַשְׁמַעְתָּם וְהָפַלְתָּם מִכְלָלָם מֵפְּנִי שִׁמְחַת לְאַלֶּמֶנֶיה לְדָבַרְתָּם...וְחַלְאֶלְתָּם וְהָפַלְתָּם מִכְלָלָם..." "Know that by 'truth' are meant the intellectual virtues, because they are immutable verities...; 'peace' means the moral virtues through which peace is maintained on earth."

He repeats the same in the Commentary on Abot, end of c. 1 (comp. below note 149). Palquera divided the treatise into two parts, each consisting of two chapters. His purpose is in the main to inculcate such conduct as will enable men to attain to both physical well-being and intellectual or spiritual perfection, the reward of which is eternal happiness and bliss in the world to come. In a short introduction he very appropriately opens the discussion by quoting from the Psalms and Proverbs a few verses which, interpreted in the light of his philosophy, allude to the subject of his treatise.

**Chapter I. On Physical Well-being** (שלום הנותן). The human body is comparable to a vessel about to set out for a voyage on the ocean; the soul to the captain who is
to guide its course and to control its movements and who is responsible for its safe arrival in the destined port—the world to come. To insure a safe voyage through a long life there is need of strict observance of hygienic rules, abstinence from over-indulgence in eating and drinking and sexual intercourse. The chapter closes with a quotation from one of the works of the famous Jewish physician Isaac b. Solomon Israeli (died about 950) prescribing a proper diet.

CHAPTER II. ON THE WELL-BEING (OR THE PERFECTION) OF THE SOUL (נושא נפש). There are two degrees in the perfection of the soul. The first, or lower degree, consists in nobility of character, the second, or higher, degree is the achievement of the highest possible intellectuality. Palquera discusses here moral perfection only,

---

22 See above note 10.
23 See below notes 57-59.
24 This distinction in human perfections is based on Maimonides' exposition on the subject in his Guide, II, 27; III, 54, which in turn is a modification of an Aristotelian theory. Aristotle, Ethics, I, 8 f., counts three kinds of perfection, two of which, wealth, being external (ἐκτρός), and health, concern only the body, while the third, consisting in intellectual achievements, concerns the soul. Maimonides goes one step farther, subdividing the perfection of the soul into two distinct parts, the one representing the consummation of the moral qualities (ethico-religious aspect), the other the highest degree of intellectuality (metaphysical aspect). According to this doctrine of Maimonides, moral perfection is not an end in itself, but serves to make man capable of attaining intellectual perfection which is the final aim of human life. This theory is taken up here by Palquera. Having discussed in the preceding chapter those means which assure bodily perfection, he now turns to the discussion of the perfection of the soul. Like Maimonides, he, too, considers morality as the first or preliminary step on the road to real perfection, i.e. intellectuality. This theory, among others, has often brought severe attacks on Maimonides and his followers whose words have been falsely interpreted to mean that by reaching intellectual perfection one can dispense with all ethics and religion, or as Luzzatto in his biased antagonism to Maimonides puts it, "one can commit theft, murder, and adultery, and yet be sure of inheriting the world to come, provided he be a philosopher" (Kerem Chemed, III, 69.
leaving the discussion of intellectual perfection to the second part. The elements that make up the human character, he says, are partly innate, partly acquired by training and education. All good and bad animal instincts are to be found also among men. Just as some animals are amenable to training and domestication, while others always remain wild and vicious, so some men respond readily to reason and persuasion, while others are proof against any influence through education. The natural inclinations of man, which constitute his character, are not the product of the cognitive soul or the intellect; they are blind animal impulses in man. Palquera quotes here opposing views, but denies their validity. The human soul is divided into three parts or functions: the appetitive or lowest soul (ψυχὴ ἀποτάσιος), the spirited or intermediate soul (ψυχὴ ἀπόστολος), and the cognitive or the highest soul (ψυχὴ φιλοσοφική), a theory taken from Plato. The appetitive soul is necessary in order to insure life and the perpetuation of the bottom). It is needless to defend Maimonides against attacks like these. Such an idea never entered the mind of Maimonides or of any of his followers, nor can it be taken as a logical consequence of Maimonides' doctrine as set forth in the chapters criticised. For Maimonides, as well as for his disciples, and among them the author of the present treatise, it is impossible to attain intellectual perfection, that is a true comprehension of God and the universe, without at the same time being a strict observer of all the laws of God as commanded in the Torah. Luzzatto's conclusions have, indeed, been fully refuted by N. Krochmal, Kerem Chemed, IV, 265; comp. also Senior Sachs, Ḥilulai, 67 f. The question whether intellectuality ('ilm) or practical observance of the religious law ('amal) is of higher importance was an object of much controversy also among Arabic writers, on which see the masterly presentation by Prof. Goldziher in the notes on his edition of Pseudo-Babyl's Kitāb maʿānī al-rafs, Berlin 1907, 54-60, particularly, with reference to Maimonides, p. 58.

15 Comp. Aristotle's Ethics, VI, 2, beginning.
16 See above note 10.
17 See above note 10.
race. To keep it from excesses, the cognitive soul must have recourse to the services of the intermediate or spirited soul, the source of power and courage. Its services are like those of the dog that assists the hunter in pursuing the game. 18 It is the task of the cognitive soul to control the functions of the two lower souls lest they deviate from the media via, the golden mean; for a perfect character is attainable only through maintaining an equilibrium among these lower functions. 19

Palquera proceeds to point out some of the traits in human nature that go to make up a good character, such as modesty, self-control, and abstemiousness. Whoever possesses these qualities will benefit by instruction and education, and is on the road to intellectual perfection. He, however, that is wanting in character, can never attain to the highest degree of intellectual perfection. It is possible to correct faults of the intellect by proving to any one that his ideas are wrong; but extremely hard to turn a bad character into a good one. To break bad habits requires constant introspection and self-restraint. Man’s love for himself is boundless; living up to the rule of ὑπολογίσαι is, therefore, an extremely difficult art. 20 Men are properly divided into three distinct classes, according as they are governed by one or the other of the phases of the tripartite soul. The majority of men fall a prey to the passions that come from the lowest or appetitive soul. Their sole aim in life is the gratification

18 The same comparison is used by Cazzali, Ἰσραήλ, 67, bottom; Joseph Ibn Akinin, ידיעת היהודים, edited by Bacher, Berlin 1910, p. 108; comp. ib., 176, and below, note 75.
19 See my article on Palquera, JQR., 1910, p. 160, n. 15.
20 This sentence will be discussed in a special article, see note 10.
of their sensual desires. Others are dominated by the intermediate or spirited soul, and this manifests itself in a morbid ambition for honors and power. A minority follow the better impulses of the highest, or cognitive soul, and modestly pursue knowledge and wisdom. However, the three impulses are necessary for the perpetuation of mankind. It is man’s duty to control through his intellect the two lower forces and to keep to the middle course. Palquera gives a few rules on the manner of observing the golden mean. In conclusion, he asserts that all good qualities of character are clearly indicated in Scripture, especially in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.

PART II. CHAPTER I. ON TRUTH. Palquera draws a line between moral truth, or truthfulness in speech and action (אמות ההולות ברבר ישמעון), and speculative, or intellectual, truth (אמות ההולות בצייר), the realization of the true conception of things. This chapter is devoted to the moral aspect of truth. He has little to say on the subject, because truthfulness, as one of the moral qualities constituting character, has been discussed in the preceding chapter. Here he gives little more than a collection of Scriptural verses, Talmudic passages, dicta of Aristotle and others on truth. He quotes from Aristotle, to whom he refers also as הפילוסוף היווד לוייס ‘the famous Greek philosopher’: “Uprightness is the noblest of all moral qualities, outshining even the splendor of the morning and the evening stars.”

Some people, divinely inspired, are capable of sacrificing their very lives for truth. These are exemplified in the patriarchs and the prophets. Solomon puts the proc-

21 See below, note 87.
22 See below, note 95.
lamination of truth into the mouth of God’s “Hokmah” (Prov. 8, 1-8). Love for truth is man’s real life; those who have no regard for truth can hardly be considered real men. Therefore, the Talmud calls the wicked dead (Berakot 18b). Lying is the root of all evils, while righteousness and honesty are the life-spring of all existence. Lying leads to hypocrisy. Said ‘the famous Greek philosopher‘: “The liar is preferable to the hypocrite; for the former sins only in speech, the latter also in his actions; worse than both is the arrogant.”

Chapter II. On Speculative (or Intellectual) Truth. The highest truth in an intellectual sense is to be compared to the sumnum bonum in the ethical sense.” Just as all men aspire to reach the absolute good, so all thinkers seek to attain the absolute truth; while but few succeed. For the acquisition of perfect truth, as is hinted at by David (Ps. 25, 5), is possible only through divine assistance. Two ways lead to the cognition of truth. The first and surest way is through the study of the Torah and the ideas involved in it, such as the existence and unity of God, creatio ex nihilo, God’s Providence over individuals among men and over the species among other creatures, reward and punishment, and other noble teachings expressed or hinted at in the Bible and elaborated in the teachings of the rabbis. Any one who penetrates into the true meaning of the words of the Scriptures will find therein divine secrets and truth which transcend the comprehen-

23 See below, note 114.
24 See the references in note 117.
25 Following Maimonides, Guide, III, 17, 18; see Munk ad locum, 131, n. 1.
sion of the philosophers. Various verses are quoted in support of this assertion.

The second way of acquiring truth, which is only an auxiliary method, is through the study of those doctrines of the philosophers which contain axiomatic truths or "first principles" (מדרכי וחשוה = ἐπεξήγησις ψιθυρίων). The truth contained in these principles proceeds, according to some, from the senses, while, according to others, it emanates from God, the source of all knowledge. The latter view, according to some, is indicated in the fourth of the Eighteen Benedictions: "Thou grantest man wisdom" (הוא תומל לאום דעה) (וְזֶה תּוֹמֵל לְאָם דַּעַה). Whatever is consonant with these principles and does not contradict any of the statements of the Torah or of tradition is acceptable truth.

On the basis of a passage of the Talmud (Erubin 53a), Palquera asserts that our ancestors, living on holy soil and being so near in time to the prophets and the other holy men from whom they received traditional truth direct, were not obliged to resort to the study of the works of the philosophers. We, however, in the diaspora, with minds dulled by oppression and persecution, find it necessary to study the works of the genuine philosophers and to learn their methods of demonstration in order to support thereby what we know already by tradition. Therefore the rabbis say, When a man dies, he is asked whether he has studied philosophy (מלמדו חכמה, Shabb. 31a). Wherever the views of the philosophers contradict the Torah or tradition

---

26 This matter will be taken up for detailed discussion, see above, note 10.

27 Comp. Saadya, Ṣad∞, וְזֶה תּוֹמֵל לְאָם דַּעַה, Leipsic 1864, &11. בֵּינוֹנֵי הָעָלֶמֶנֶג בַּשָּׁם עָנִיּוּם אֱלֹהִים שֵׁיַחַר אֱלֹהִים בֵּשָּׂעִיל יָדַע וְלֹא יָדַע; see also Maimonides, Guide, 1, 71.
they should be rejected, otherwise they are to be accepted. This has been the practice of all the pious men in Israel since the close of the Talmud, some of the Geonim, and many of the Spanish scholars, especially Maimonides; they refuted the doctrines antagonistic to the Torah and spread true knowledge broadcast.

Palquera then enumerates the various branches of science—namely, mathematics, logic, physics, and metaphysics—and recommends them for study in the order given. He quotes, however, the opinion of Maimonides, who requires the study of logic before mathematics (Guide, I, 34). Of the works written on these sciences, those of Aristotle, including with them also the works of his commentators, are the best and the most reliable. This is because Aristotle examined the views of all his predecessors and accepted only what is true or nearest to the truth. However, a passage from Maimonides in which the latter has placed the Stagirite only one degree below the prophets, provokes Palquera’s opposition. “In my humble opinion,” he says, “the master has exaggerated on this point.” The truth is, Palquera continues, that in our days, any one who wishes to add some secular knowledge to the knowledge he has acquired through the study of the Torah must try to understand Aristotle. He should, however, never lose sight of the Torah, for it comes before philosophy (Abot, 3, 11).

In a somewhat lengthy discussion that follows, Palquera tries to show that the final aim of all thinking is the cognition of Him who is the source of all truth and the cause of all existence. In fact, some philosophers assert that, in truth, God alone has existence or reality.

**See below, note 141.**
Again, 'the famous Greek philosopher' is quoted to the effect that metaphysics ought to be named the science of truth because its aim is to reach God, the highest truth. It is obvious, Palquera adds, that since God is the cause of truth, we cannot attain truth if we do not know God, for the effects are known only through their causes.

In a short concluding paragraph, ending with the quotation of a Midrash, Palquera now gives the sum and substance of his thesis. The comprehension of truth must be the ultimate aim of human endeavor. The prerequisites to science in the quest of truth are righteousness, or the life of perfect harmony attained through adherence to the golden mean; mercy, or the conduct that goes beyond the strict requirement of justice; and loving-kindness and charity, the source of peace on earth through which the world exists, as the Psalmist says (Ps. 85, 11-12):

"Mercy and truth are met together,
Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.
Truth springeth out of the earth,
And righteousness looketh down from heaven."

As interpreted by Palquera, the Psalmist’s words, "mercy, righteousness, and peace" stand for the moral qualities; "peace" evidently in the sense of harmony, as used in Greek philosophy, being their final aim; while "truth" represents the highest perfection of the intellect. When character and intellect work in unison, then salvation will be at hand and God's glory will dwell in the land (ib., verse 10).

The above is a brief résumé of the leading thoughts in the present treatise. For details concerning the text and

---

29 See above note 10.
30 Contains an allusion to chapters 1-2. The whole is a philosophic reproduction of Mishnah Abot c. 1, end; see above p. 458.
the relation of the work to other works and other authors. the reader is referred to the notes. It is a habit of Palquera’s, observable in all his productions, to intersperse his discourses with numerous quotations, without specifying the authors. As he himself remarks in one of his works, he quotes only men of the highest rank by their names; minor lights are quoted by some general epithet. In no case are the books of the authors mentioned from which the quotation was taken. It has therefore been no easy task to identify and trace these quotations to their respective sources. Some I have had to content myself with tracing to one or the other of his own works without going back to the original source. A few I could not identify, because the Arabic works from which they are probably taken are not at my disposal. It goes without saying that in Palquera’s text biblical verses, talmudic and midrashic passages, or general allusions to Midrash and Talmud are given without references. The proper references are added in the notes.

The celebrities quoted in this treatise by name are Plato, Aristotle, Galen, Isaac Israeli, and Maimonides. Aristotle is also referred to three times (pp. 486, 488, 493) under the epithet “the famous Greek philosopher.” Hippocrates is meant by the phrase הרפואות המרשיחים (p. 474), “the greatest of the physicians” (see below note 58).

A few words about the manuscript may be added here to what was said above (p. 453). It is the sixth number in a codex, paper, 5 by 13/2 inches, containing thirteen different pieces by various authors. It is written in Italian rabbinical characters, dating from various centuries. Our treatise

---

begins on leaf 63a and ends 83b. Unfortunately part of the manuscript is missing between 63b and 64a, a fact that escaped the notice of Luzzatto, who described the codex (see above, p. 454) and also of Margoliouth. In all probability, however, it is only one leaf that is missing, and it belonged to the introduction. The gap is indicated in the following edition by a blank line.

The copyist, it appears, had a rather limited knowledge of Hebrew. A considerable number of mistakes are due to his ignorance. These will be pointed out in the notes on the respective passages.

The treatise is followed by an extract from the סורה החמשה חמשת (“Book on the Elements”) by Isaac Israeli (see above p. 459), which was published by S. Fried, Drohobycz 1900. The extract, in Fried’s edition, p. 12, line 1, to p. 13, line 13, does not fit into the plan of our treatise. Some doubts may be entertained as to whether it was appended to this treatise by Palquera himself, for immediately after this extract there are two other short discourses, both anonymous, which, owing to their style and content, can not possibly be ascribed to Palquera. Luzzatto, however, evidently considered it a part of Palquera’s work, and, as I think, rightly so. There is a lengthy passage from one of Israeli’s works embodied in this treatise (see text, p. 476). This makes it probable that the extract, too, was added by Palquera. There is, moreover, some internal evidence for this assumption. Israeli’s work, the Arabic original of which is lost, was translated into Hebrew before the year 1230 by Abraham Ibn Hisdai of Barcelona. A comparison

---

Both are written in the style of the later Midrashim and may be extracts from such.

Hebr. Bibliogr., VI, 19.
of this translation with the extract at the end of Palquera’s treatise makes it evident that the latter is not taken from Ibn Ḥisdai’s translation, but is an independent translation from the Arabic of Israeli, in all probability from the hand of Palquera. The extract under consideration contains three proofs for the theory that the soul is not merely an accident of the body perishing with it, but a substance with an independent and imperishable existence. Palquera, as it will be remembered, had also discussed the nature and functions of the human soul. He may not have found a convenient place in his text for Israeli’s views, which are also his own, and therefore left them for an appendix.

The two translations of Israeli’s text correct and explain one another at several points, as is shown in the notes. The extract being of importance for the history of Jewish writings on philosophy, it is worthy of publication in the form given to it by Palquera, as an appendix to his ethical treatise.

In submitting this text of Palquera’s treatise, it is hoped that it will prove a welcome contribution to the ethical literature of the Jews. In conclusion, I wish to express my sincere thanks to Prof. Israel Friedlaender, who, while in London, secured for me the photograph of the manuscript, and to the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York, in whose possession the photograph now is, which generously defrayed the expense of obtaining it for my studies.
אגרת שמעה ה"ר שם טוב פלכיה ו"ל.
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אמרה שמעה ה'ר שם טוב פלכיה ו"ל.

5

בז"ש עתידתי המוסמך לאברהם אבינו ימים ארבעים
בז"ש עתידתי המוסמך לאברהם אבינו ימים ארבעים
בז"ש עתידתי המוסמך לאברהם אבינו ימים ארבעים
בז"ש עתידתי המוסמך לאברהם אבינו ימים ארבעים
בז"ש עתידתי המוסמך לאברהם אבינו ימים ארבעים

10

53ב. [מלכד: מ"老太太]

והם הרבים המוסמך לברא ומקימיה דברו, לענה שמעה
והם הרבים המוסמך לברא ומקימיה דברו, לענה שמעה
והם הרבים המוסמך לברא ומקימיה דברו, לענה שמעה
והם הרבים המוסמך לברא ומקימיה דברו, לענה שמעה
והם הרבים המוסמך לברא ומקימיה דברו, לענה שמעה

15

53ב. [מלכד: מ"老太太]

אמר אמיו וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא
אמר אמיו וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא
אמר אמיו וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא
אמר אמיו וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא
אמר אמיו וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא מלשון וידר פסחא

34) Ps. 34, 13.
35) Ib. 31, 20; comp. Talmud Hullin 142.
36) Ib. 34, 14.
37) Comp. Talmud Arakin 15b and Maimonides, Commentary on Abot I, 16.
38) Prov. 13, 3.
39) The passage seems to be a direct quotation from some author;
possibly however, it is only an allusion to 'Arakin 15b, Palquera giving
the thought of the Talmud in his own words, as he does with the Midrash
quoted below, note 41. In Palquera's ספרד, ספרד, 196, the same passage occurs
without reference to any source. The sentence זו הנורה היא הכמאי
ירהי is a play on a legal rule in Baba Mex. 36.
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Here the manuscript is defective, see above p. 468; the content can be supplied, however, at least in part, from the Shabbath, l. c.


42) See above, note 10.

43) The reading is doubtful, but Mr. Gribetz, in his nearest emendation (comp. Gazalli, 124: הממשיכים יוצרו) and is the proper parallel to ממשיכים.

44) Babli Shabb. 152b.

45) Comp. below, note 59.

47) Babli Sanhedrin 107a; comp. Yerushalmi Ketub. V, 8; Palquera’s Arvashah be’emah 14 f.; Gazzali, l. c., 201.

48) The author alludes here to the Aristotelian doctrine that the sense of touch is the lowest of all senses; see below, note 79.

49) This has reference to a passage occurring only in Yerushalmi Yeabam. II, 4 and Wayyikra Rab., XXIV, 6: אָמָרָה רַבּוֹתֵיכַם בְּאֶחָדָם בְּמַעַרְבּוֹתֵיכַם מִיהוּדָה מִי שָׁוָא חוֹרָה מִי תְּרוּחוֹת לִכְרִיתוּן. פְּרַשָּׁה יִרְיָה לִפְשֵׁטָה לִלְמוֹדֶכֶךָ בְּאֶחָדָם בְּמַעַרְבּוֹתֵיכַם מִיהוּדָה מִי שָׁוָא חוֹרָה מִי תְּרוּחוֹת לִכְרִיתוּן. פְּרַשָּׁה יִרְיָה לִפְשֵׁטָה לִלְמוֹדֶכֶךָ מֶלֶךְ מִיהוּדָה מִי שָׁוָא חוֹרָה מִי תְּרוּחוֹת לִכְרִיתוּן. פְּרַשָּׁה יִרְיָה לִפְשֵׁטָה לִלְמוֹדֶכֶךָ מֶלֶךְ מִיהוּדָה מִי שָׁוָא חוֹרָה מִי תְּרוּחוֹת לִכְרִיתוּן. פְּרַשָּׁה יִרְיָה L. c. 201.

Palquera misinterprets the passage taking it to enjoin celibacy, while in fact it is only a general exhortation to holiness and chastity in sexual intercourse. Maimonides, Guide, III, 8, refers to the same passage, but does not use it as an argument for celibacy; comp. Munk, ad locum. Stein-schneider’s suggestion that Palquera remained single (see my article in JQR., 1910, p. 157) gains hereby much in probability.
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כז ותענית ונסיו לא מעשהיה
(תוח) ודיעך ומשההת עגניך והוכיחו והוכיחו מחנהו
ואין נאום וכן ינני בנושא ובכרי נאום יומרא מ׳ (ם) כי
אינו מעשהיה ומושהו לבוש יותר אם אזע לא י采暖 את
היו מתחכם שצמאם (ם) הלא ברוא סותר גא' ומסי
 форме סלמ. וยอดเยี่ยมהמה (66b) אמר (ם) שלמה כלא משלגה
כל מקסמות הواجبים והו כך מביא הנקראים. ואמר כו
Been מ습니다 והרה כי כל מקסמות המועשיםゝ והנה
השלמה (ם) אמר (ם) כי מביא המוסכם המ으면 שמה
הלחן והנה על זה במרך הסדר (ם) ומוסכם המטה נחלתם
והנה משמע כי סלמה (9) והשמו האומר שלמה שלושה
אחות בר nors שיש לעימה אשר הגון כמין שמשני_beš hepatitis
והנה הברון איני זוייב לא ירא. ובו הנה נחלתם הלוכדת
הנה הנה בלואת כי היא הבירהlef שירצה יושב עוד פעמי
(66b) ומבחנה שווה כל כלא ראש כו (ם)

c.לך

50) Aboda Zarah 20b; Maimonides, l. c.
51) Hullin 37b. The verse from Ex. 4, 14 is not quoted correctly.
52) Sukkah 52b. Maimonides, Guide, III, 49 (Munk, p. 415), gives the same exposition of the passage.
53) Jerem. 23, 29.
54) Comp. חספיה, 13 and the references given below, note 87.
56) Ib., III, 33 (Munk, 26a, n. 3).
57) Most of the following rules are taken from Maimonides’ famous Epistle on Hygienics, addressed to Al-Malik Al-Afdal, son of Sultan Saladin. This treatise was translated into Hebrew by Moses Ibn Tibbon, a contemporary of Palquera, in 1244, and first published in Kerem Chemed, III, 9-31. In his enumeration of Maimonides’ medical works Ibn ‘Abi ‘Usaliba quotes it under the title רפוי (Regimen sanitatis = Hygienics). Some of the manuscripts of the Hebrew translation bear the corresponding title: פָּרָע (פָּרָע) וּפָרָע (פָּרָע). Steinschneider, Hebr. Ubers., 270, and later in Arabische Literatur der Juden, 214, however, doubts whether this title of Ibn ‘Abi ‘Usaliba is the original one. From
the passage before us it would appear that the Arabic original used by Palquer (comp. below, notes 58 and 59) bore the same title; for the words משמאליהו המאפים are not to be taken simply as a general expression for hygiene—we would then expect מ퍳ם, as is on p. 476, l. 14,—but rather as a direct quotation of Maimonides’ work. Other parallels to the following passages are found in Maimonides’ תקננה, 3-5, and הלא ידיע, pp. 36-38.

58) Refers to Hippocrates; comp. above p. 467: Steinhauser, Hebr. Obere, p. 658, n. 35. The passage is quoted from Maimonides’ Epistle (p. 109), mentioned in the foregoing note, but not from the Hebrew translation of Moses Ibn Tibbon, which is entirely different, running as follows: הנכרי איסורבו מלחמה חמדה מהאכן. מושם הפרשינו נאיך מועצה; comp. ibid., p. 11: הנכרי לקו על ממיר איסורבו כי התמימות של הפרשינו המ mócיתonal; see next note.


60) Judah Ibn Tibbon in his Testament (comp. Gazzali, Ethica, 134, 136. The lines over the words show the chief differences in the translations.
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[Page 475]

[67b] זכרת דודי, דוד, ויהי מכרו שתי. והיה מכרו שתי מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו. והיה מכרו שתיו מכרו שתיו.パーマリンク[68a] מ):-פמאז הנייר מאתי שיאבאל. והנה נייר מימת שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר. והנה נייר שיאבאל מהימי נייר.パーマリンク[69b] בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمرا בתרחיב דمراパーマリンク[70a]

The same rather common-place thought is expressed in the rime quoted by Judah Ibn Tibbon (ib., p. 15) in the name of Samuel Hanagid.


62) Ex. 16, 12.
A
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63) Maimonides’ Epistle, 30.
64) Ib., p. 28; comp. 33.
65) Maimonides, l. c., in the name of Galen: א

 kullanımıאריאב עם הקדים. לא

66) This passage is probably taken from Israeli’s Arabic work on Diatetics parts which exist also in Latin, (Basil 1570) and in Hebrew translations (unpublished) which are not at my disposal; comp. Stein. Schneider, Arab. Liter., p. 40, No. 3.—The text before us offers some difficulties due to incorrectness of copyists. The construction of the first sentence is not clear, nor do the words שלשת עלולות geben any-satisfactory sense. The Aramaic spelling for א嘈ט אזט is used by Palauera also in his other works for מיסא = harrnun imminent, א. g. အ, 14-16 and passim. מיסא is the Aramaic spelling for מיסא, 150 = “obstruction.”
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See note 14.

68) Innate qualities or natural instincts; see above, note 10.

69) In the manuscript here follow the words [בֶּשָּׁאֵם אֶינוֹ] with dots above the letters as a sign of cancellation. The copyist made the mistake through homoioteleuton, but noticed the omission before he proceeded and corrected it.

70) Prov., 17, 10.

71) Ib., 10, 13.

72) Ib., 27, 22; comp. מַכְסֵך, 18a, bottom;תוֹדְעָה יַעֲדוּת, 40; and Gazzali, Ethics, 153.
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בעליא לא תחר עליה תלויה, ולא תשה שעה או פעלה עלייה; אשר יסבך בה עלים ועלא בזיקה פנימה, ופניו יטיפה ועלא בה עלייה; אין לו מון שלם ולא הוא כן. עלייהoleon משם שאמרれている, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, משם שאמרלאיה, sang

73) See above, note 10.
74) Comp. Gazzâlî, Ethics, 66, 120 ff.
75) The passage is somewhat obscure, but becomes clear through a parallel passage in Palmer's "The Development of the Principle of Justice," p. 46, where is followed by ram. The words accordingly denote the movement away from the media via in the direction of the two extremes. The point that Palmer wishes to bring out here is to show that the rational soul whose task it is to check the passions of the appetite soul can do so only through the aid of the intermediate or spirited soul, a theory which is taken from Plato; comp. Edwin Wallace, Aristotle's Psychology, Cambridge 1882, XXXVII, top. The same thought is very frequently expressed by Gazzâlî in his Ethics, pp. 61, 67, 93 et passim, where also the comparison with the dog is made; comp. above, note 18. The whole passage is also in חמקה, ch. 73, sec. 3.
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The words between the two asterisks seem to have been omitted in our treatise through homoioteleuton, as in our Hebrew may have been abbreviated into ידיה. The phrase, כירה למשמיע עמהחרת המה, suggests Abot, V, 11. The whole passage seems rather of Aristotelian than of Platonic origin: comp. Nicom. Ethics, II, 9, p. 1109a II. 24-26: διδ καὶ ἐγγυν ἐγαί σποουαιν εἰν. εν ἑκάστῳ γὰρ τὸ μέσον λαβεῖν ἐγγυν, οἰον ἐκείνῳ τὸ μέσον οἱ πανως ἀλλὰ ἑλλας. Maimonides, " Eight Chapters," 4, quotes the same in the name of the philosophers: comp. Cassáli, Eth. 95: וידעי שיחוגהו על אמהת בוגל המאיצי וה פאואר; comp. Shemtob Ibn Shemtob,ربו, Venice 1547, fol. 49d.


Somewhat similar is the view of Aristotle, Ethics, I, 13, p. 1102b, 1, 29 ff.

The phrase המאת.Look is a combination of Platonic and Aristotelian terminology; see above, note 10.

27) In the ספר המ العالي, p. 46, bottom, this quotation from Plato is fuller and runs as follows: ןוֹל יָנָי מָבוּם [מאעָה] וכָּל הָאָדָם מָבוּם וְאָנִי. וְאָנִי נָשָׁהָר הַרְדָּס הַרְדָּס מַכָּהַּהַמָּה הַרְדָּס (one MS. reads: מַכָּהַּהַמָּה) עשָׁה נָא בָּהֲהַמָּה נָא בָּהֲהַמָּה נָא בָּהֲהַמָּה כְּלָל עָשָׁה נָא יִוָּדֶה וְנָהוּ את רַבֶּה (comp. Guttmann, Die Religionsphilosophie des Abrahom Ibn Daud, Gottingen 1879, p. 219, n. 1), and Abr. Ibn Ezra on Eccles, 7, 3: יזמ השכידי והשמוח על הנפש ערביה, והיה חיי המחמה להטיעו ישועו וновה ודハイ רוח.

This has reference to Aristotle’s *Ethics*, II, 13 p. 1118b, ff. II, 3-4: καὶ δόξην ἀπὸ δικαίου κοινωδικοῦ εἶναι, ὥστε ὅπερ ἂν ἀνθρώποι κοιμοῦν ὑπάρχει, ἄλλα ὅς ὑπάρχει, comp. above, note 48. The idea that the sense of touch, on account of its function in the act of generation, is “a disgrace to humanity” was first introduced into Jewish literature by Maimonides, *Guide*, II, cc. 36, 40 (Munk, 285, n. 31 p. 312), III, cc. 8, 49 (Munk, pp. 53, 415), and has since become a canon with medieval Jewish authors of all descriptions. Kaufmann in his work “Die Sinne,” Leipzig 1884, p. 188 ff., gives a whole collection of passages from various authors who accepted this view and likewise quotes others who opposed it, among them Naḥmanides. To this collection are to be added both Paltner and the anonymous author of the spurious *Kabbalat shabbat barakim* in *Mekhilat trotim*, p. 43 (also in *Kabbalat shabbat barakim*; Leipzig 1859, II, 35), as also the Karaites Eliafi Bashayzi, Odessa 1871, fol. 166b, and Kaleb Afendopolu, see Steinschneider, *Cat. Leyden*, 131. Isaac Abrabanel, *Mish’et Yishuvot*, Amsterdam 1644, fol. 90a, bottom, and Moses Ibn Habib in his commentary on Beda’s *Babion ha’ela* (Efrara 1552, fol. 322a), may also be referred to. Comp. also Ibn Aknin, *Sefirot ha’elot*, 76; Goldsiher, *Kitâb*, 46; Steinschneider, *Polam. Literatur*, 304, where, however, the reference to the commentary of Shemtob Paltura on Maimonides’ *Guide* seems to be a mistake for Shemtob b. Joseph b. Shemtob of the fifteenth century. Among the opponents is to be included the Kabbalist Abraham Sab’a of Lisbon, about 1500, who in his *Rivur ha’eror*, Venice 1523, fol. 8a, col. 2, top, attacks Aristotle in the following words: איה אל בוכא
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P. 5

Of the same opinion is Meir Aldabi of Toledo (1360) in his שבלוקל, אומנה, III, 5, beginning. The Jewish philosophers before Maimonides expressed a higher opinion of the sense of touch. Ibn Gabirol, for instance, תוקן בחרה, pressburg 1896, ii, brings it into relation with the understanding: והיה וה הברוא אושר ואור ממעתי, p. 140, n. 154, and wise, l. c., 33. In the יתדות, pp. 68, 69, Palquer quotes אריסטוס, direetly as saying: דעים של השמש אשאר הוא תורתנו ועתה; comp. also Gazzâli, Ethics, 139.

80) The same is found in the Apophthegms of Honein (מעמי השילוחים), II, 19, No. 10, ed. loewenthal, p. 45: כי היא או מיhaust את האור והברוא ובין. In Gazzâli’s Ethics, 107, the sentence reads: ויהי dello ומפעלי טובים commitments בשתי נושאים זה ובר או אחרון אלולו. Gazzâli’s sentence is found literally in Job.Alemano’s, полно, Halberstadt 1862, p. 210; comp. also Ibn Gabirol’s Ethics, Arabic text, p. 23:

P. 10


81) I do not know to whom the author refers here in particular. In המלכון, 36, nearly the same is quoted in the name of the “prominent ancient philosophers” (_means, השילוחים זכרונות); comp. chapter 10 of Gazzâli’s Ethics.
Ps. 58, 4. The phrase מָצַר בְּעַל הָעֵז is used by Palquera particularly (see below, pp. 489, 490) with reference to the Hagiographa, see his מַעֲרָב בְּעַל הָעֵז, 23, 63, 85, 112, 135; Samuel Ibn Tibbon, יִסְדֵּד וְיִסְדֶּד, Pressburg 1837, pp. 22, 62, 68, 100, 174f. (comp. also 137); Levi ben Gerson, מַעֲרָב בְּעַל הָעֵז, Leipzig 1866, p. 184; the Karaites Aaron ben Elijah, יעִלְוָי, Leipzig 1844, p. 193, and יעִלְוָי גָּזְלֵף, fol. 121d; Simon Duran, רְשֵׁי תַּנְכָּד, II, 149, bottom, III, 49b, 93a, top; Shemtoth Ibn Shemtoth, וּדְשָׁר יִשְׁרָאֵל, Venice 1547, fol. 16a; Moshe Ibn Habib, Commentary on תַּנְכָּד, 40, 16a; Isaac Abrabanel, עֻפָּדִי נְאָבֶה, Amsterdam 1739, p. 16, and וּדְשָׁר יִשְׁרָאֵל, cc. 14, 15.

This usage, as far as I know, was first established by Maimonides, Guide, II, 45 ("Second Degree"; the Hebrew phrase is also in the Arabic original which proves that it was intended as a technical term), to signify a lower degree of divine inspiration than that attributed to the prophetic books; comp. Munk, ad locum, 334, n. 2; Profat Duran, עֵן השוע, 13, top, especially Maimonides, פרָעַשוּב, 12, 4, and the very interesting discussion on the subject by Abraham ben David and his opponent Shemtoth ben Abraham Ibn Geon in תַּנְכָּד, ad locum. Maimonides' view, adopted also by the Karaites Judah Hadassi (תלמוד, Alphabet 53, letter כ'; comp. ib., 242, כא, 275, 40) and Aaron ben Elijah, יעִלְוָי גָּזְלֵף, 169, finds some support in the Talmud, where the order of succession is always יִשְׁרָאֵל בְּעַל הָעֵז; comp. e. g. Rosh hash. 32a (see Tosafot, ib., 2,年に יִשְׁרָאֵל), Baba Batra 13b. There is, however, no statement in the Talmud that the prophetical books rank higher than the Hagiographa as is the case with regard to the Pentateuch, Meg. 27a; comp. עֵן השוע, in Asher Meg., I, c., letter נ'א. The Geonic tradition, quoted by Asheri on Rosh hash. 32a, that the Hagiographa have precedence before the Prophets, does not refer to the books in general but to the place of single verses from the respective books in certain liturgical pieces. In tractate Sopherim, XVIII, 3 (misquoted by Asheri, I, c., see עֵן השוע, ad locum) the Hagiographa are called יִשְׁרָאֵל בְּעַל הָעֵז, and in the
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Musaph Prayer for the New Year's festival, as also in the daily prayers taken from the Hagiographa are always introduced by the verses taken from the Nebiym. See, for example, Ebli, 1891, part I, p. 26; Luzzatto, Kerem Chemed, VIII, p. 7. Ezekiel (II), 7: 11, 12. In the Nebiym the word שְׁנִיָּה is found: תְּנוֹנִי, 1891, p. 69 f., Palquera quotes the same under the name of Aristotle; comp. Bacher, Die Bibelextegese der jüdischen Religionsphilosophen, p. 93, n. 4.

83) Jerem. 1, 5.

84) This and the following sentences are quotations from Aristotle's Ethics, II, 1, beginning; comp. VII, 8, p. 1151a, ll. 11-15. In the Nebiym 69 f., Palquera quotes the same under the name of Aristotle; comp. ebib., 8a. The additional sentence, occurring there, comparing bad habits with paralysed parts of the body (אֵין, see also ib., 43, and Steinschneider, Hebr. Orcen, 843, n. 417) is also taken from the Nicomachean Ethics, I, 13, p. 1102b, ll. 18-21; comp. Cazzali, l. c., 76 f.

85) See above, note 10.

86) See above, notes 10, 20.
The author adds here the Arabic term because there is no adequate expression in Hebrew. The translators of Ibn Ṣaddik (עיו ליעל, ed. Horovitz, 38; comp. Horovitz, Psychologie, 198, n. 165), of Gazzali (Ethics, 92), and Palguera himself (גניזה, 28, 43) use עינו, those of Ibn Daud (I. c., 98) and Maimonides (Eight Chapters, 4) have respectively, while Hillel b. Samuel of Italy (thirteenth century) in בבראשית uses עינו. None of these translations expresses the Greek σωφροσύνη. Al-Jorjani, Ṭaʾrīḥ, ed. Flügel, 156, 1, 24 f., gives the following definition of the Arabic term: "The image of the power which is the medium between the two extremes, which are the source of harm to the soul and which lead to the destruction of the world. "Temperance is a condition in the appetitive faculty which keeps the mean
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between licentiousness (ἀβολασία), which is the latter’s going into excess, and insensibility (ἀναυσόρασία), which is its deficiency. The temperate man is he who acts in conformity with the demands of law and manhood.” Ibn Kutaibah (ninth century), ‘Ufán al-‘Akbâr, ed. Brockelmann, 375 relates:

قال الملطف لابنه يا عزيزي الجبين بين السيئين يعني بين الإفراط والنقص وغير الأمور أوصلت إلى النهاية الجائفة.

“Said Almutarrâf to his son, O my son! the good lies between two evils, that is between excess and deficiency; the noblest part of all things is their mean, and the worst kind of procedure is running.” Comp. Nicom. Ethics, II, 7, p. 1105 b, II, 4 b; Goldziher, Kitâb ma‘âni al-nafs, 18-20; Gazzâli, Ethics, 92; comp. also Sîfré, ḥa‘a‘ara, beginning, and Talmud Men. 98 b; see my article JR., 1910, p. 160, n. 15. To the references given there are to be added Ibn Akinin, ḍârî, p. 26 f.; Moses Ibn Habîb on Naḥum, ḥa‘a‘ara, 24 b; Simon Duran ḥa‘a‘ara, 48 b; Shemtob Ibn Shemtob, ḥa‘a‘ara (Venice), 70, 110, 335 b, 49 d. The immediately following passage ‘al-khâli al-mawdûd, etc., is found verbatim in Maimonides, ibn, 47, 48, and is probably adopted by Palquera from the “Brethren of Purity”; comp. Dieterici, Die Abhandlungen der Ichwan es-Safa, p. 614, bottom:

The respective portion in the

was translated into German by M. Sachs, Die religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien, Berlin 1845, p. 345.

89) See Job 35, 3. The usage is peculiar; see, however, Hadasî, 163, 164, 165.

90) That is truth in thought; comp. above, p. 462, and Hadasî, 35. Ibn Akinin, ‘al-khâli al-mawdûd, 78, l. 25. Maimonides, Eight Chapters, II, 18, al-khâli al-mawdûd, II, 3, claims that right or wrong thinking and opinion even when not followed by any actual deed, are also to be included in the category of lawful or sinful actions, though no command or prohibition is applicable to such actions; comp. Scheyer, Das psychologische System des
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Maimonides, Frankl. a. M. 1845, pp. 103, 105; Rosin, Die Ethik des Maimonides, Breslau 1876, p. 55, n. 1; Ibn Aknin, Сер Моер, p. 49. l. 25 f., p. 50, l. 5; Simon Duran, חמק ביאס, III, 376, 486.

91) Prov. 12, 19.
92) Ex. 23, 7.
93) Deuter. 16, 20.
94) Baba Mez. 49a.
95) Refers to the Stagirite; comp. above p. 467. The passage to which Dr. Husik of the Gratz College called my attention occurs in the Nicomachean Ethics, VI, p. 1129b, II. 27-31: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλὰς κρατίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν εἶναι δοκεῖ ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ ὡς ἐστερεῖ ὦς ἐδεῖς ἢγαμάτιος... καὶ τελεία μάλιστα ἀρετή. It seems to be a quotation from Homer which I have not investigated any further; comp. J. E. C. Weldon, The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle, London 1892, p. 137, n. 1; see also A. Ibn Daud, היזי, 99, 101: אמא ענוה מיולת מנהה רבי.
96) Baba Mez. 49a; Sanh. 97a with slight variants.
97) I do not know to whom he refers nor have I found a parallel in the other works of our author.
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98) Comp. תְּמִיעָה, 51.
99) Prov. 8, 1.
100) Ib., 8, 7-8.
101) Source unknown to me; comp., however, Maimonides, Guide, I, 42.
102) Berakot 186, Maimonides, l. c.; see particularly Goldziher, Kitāb ma'ānī al-nafs, 50. To the interesting references given there may be added Baḥṭayyāsī, 27 and 52: "ואמרו אתור מנהיגון, והائحו הראות עד עין, דוני כה נברא: תעהו Genuine Biblical Are the Two, י"ע, יבש, נברא (100).
103) Ps. 101, 7.
104) Prov. 6, 18.
105) Ib., 6, 19.
106) Ib., 12, 22.
107) Ib., 14, 25.
108) Ib., 26, 28.
109) Palquera seems to have made a mistake here. The passage to which he alludes is in Sifra, section בֵּית הָעָלָה, c. II, § 14, referring to Lev. 19, 14. The author, misled by his memory, brought it in connec-
tion with Deuter. 27, 24; comp., however, Jacob b. Asher (עַוְָה בְּרִית מֶשֶׁר יְזִיעֵהוּ) on Deuter. 27, 18, who quotes the same interpretation in connection with the verse last mentioned, for which I do not know the source; comp. also Hdaasi, אָשֶּׁר, 349, letter 'א', 150, 'ג'.

110) Deuter. 27, 24.

111) Comp. Nicom. Ethics, IV, 7, p. 1127a, l. 28 ff.

112) This is a short rendition of Aristotle, Ethis, I, c., p. 1127b, II. 10-20, where also occurs the exemplification αὐτοὶ μάστερ, σοφάς, ιορδανί; comp. עֲכָּד, 15b. In רֹמִי הָעָלְיוֹנִים, 59, Aristotle is quoted directly and the passage given more in full.

113) Job, 13, 16; comp. b. Soṭah 41b, 42a.

114) Nicom. Ethics, I, c. I have corrected the text of the quotation in accordance with the parallel passage in רֹמִי הָעָלְיוֹנִים, 59, adding and eliminating the word יהו which gives no sense. Comp. Babya, Duties V, 4; VII, 8; Honein’s Apophthegms, I, 3: וּבְּרִית מֶשֶׁר יְזִיעֵהוּ נְעֵר בְּמִלָּה נְעֵר נְעֵר בְּמִלָּה.

115) Abot, I, 17; comp. b. Taan. 7b; Baba Batra 78b; Pesa. 66b.


118) Ps. 25, 5.
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The change in the expression בְּאֶלֶף—בְּmasına—is significant; see above, note 15.

119) See note 82.
120) See note 82.
121) Ps. 119, 18.
122) Ib., 119, 142.
123) Ib., 19, 10.
124) Ib., 119, 144.
126) The text is in disorder. The words בְּאֶלֶף seem to be an erroneous repetition from 1. 16. The sense is: He who grasps the meaning of the Torah (הַחֲבִישֵׁנָה) and knows what it is—“restoring the soul” (Ps. 19, 8)—, and what its precepts are—“righteous and unchangeable”—will realise that it is Truth.
לענלו וכלкупיסים האמתות נוגנה פרעה אדריש (128) גוזה מעל מתת.

התרחשה השנית בעונה ובכוסות לא אשף העם בברכי המש).[129] האמתות מתים שהרבי בוקע על שנא השפתה בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה פורו בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה מהתרחשה השנית הנוגנה לאשף עמותה אנשה בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה [130] ובכוסות לא אשף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה במתרחשה השנית הנוגנה לאשף עמותה אנשה בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה [130] ובכוסות לאAshף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה 

ועליי אוחזים המשכפת ולאיمتاز מסתור Dagger מברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה שהתרחשה השנית הנוגנה לאשף עמותה אנשלכוסות לאAshף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה [130] ובכוסות לאAshף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה [130] ובכוסות לאAshף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה [130] ובכוסות לאAshף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה [130] ובכוסות לאAshף העם בברכי אנשי העולםdictions גוזה 

128) Eccl. 12, 11; comp. Talm. Hag. 3b, to which passage the author alludes.

129) Refers mainly to peripatetic philosophers; comp. Steinschneider, Hebr. Oberz, 6, n. 43.

130) See above note 10.

131) Erubin 53a; comp. יניעון, 66; Ḥazal, Ethics, 153; Maimonides, חקוק, ed. Hamburger, p. 49.

132) See above, note 8a.

133) Baba Batra 158b; comp. Kasari, II, 22, and Paquera, מורה טובה, 186.


135) Shabb. 31b; comp. מתקס, 32b, top: "טמונות השראה אחרונה לברית" ששלמה הגדול ואריס אָבֵּר יֵשָׁו לְכָלְכָלָה בֶּפֶסַח; Maimonides, Guide, III, 54, whence the whole is taken; comp. also Profat Duran, ערעי, 4; Simon Duran, Comm. on Abot, 3, 18.
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[80a] See my article JQR., 1910, p. 168, n. 32, also Simon Duran, I., 2a, and on Abot 4, 25; Shemtob Ibn Shemtob, א"ודאיה, 438.

137) Hagigah 15b.


139) This is an instance of the thoughtlessness or ignorance of our copyist. His original doubtless had the abbreviation מ., which he read against all sense מ. He repeats the same mistake three times in the following. The spelling מ is also to be charged to his account.
Abraham Ibn Hisdai in his introduction to ẓarz¯alī’s, p. 2, has the same praise for Aristotle (from Al-Mas‘udī?): 141. He, too, adds the opinion of Maimonides quoted in the following by Palquera without, however, criticising Maimonides, as does our author; see the following note.

141) Leipsic 1859. II, 28d. The text of Palquera in this quotation is more correct than that in the Hebrew, and agrees more with the one quoted from a manuscript by Kaufmann, Die Spuren des Al-Baẗ’aṣṣai, 39, n. 1. Palquera cites the same passage verbatim in a Ṣaf’al, no. 107, where read ẓal’m, bale’im, as in the present treatise. His criticism of Maimonides in the last-mentioned work, p. 106, is even harsher than it appears here: אכתי בכסא הנהלי מותר דלי ליבוש אישא שדיבר ישון トラ. It shows Palquera’s independence of mind that he did not shrink back from criticising his master, whom he otherwise so greatly admirers, if, as in the case before us, he did not share his views.

142) This ẓarz¯alī is none other than ẓarz¯alī. The passage occurs in his Mašaḥid-ul-Falahat, a work in three parts treating of logic, metaphysics, and physics, which I have prepared for publication from a manuscript in the Royal Library of Berlin. ẓarz¯alī begins his metaphysics with the following remark: عادتهم جاربة بتقدم الطبيعية ولكن آثرنا تقديم هذا لأنه اسم وخلاف فيه أثك. “It is customary to treat physics first, but I preferred to treat first of metaphysics, because it is more subject to doubts and the opinions in metaphysical problems differ more widely.” It may be noted in passing that ẓarz¯alī was censured in account of this arbitrary deviation from the accepted rule; comp. Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibl., X, 72 f., and Hebr. Obers., 35, 316, especially Kaufmann, Theologie des Bache Jones, 24, note. Two pages further ẓarz¯alī says (in the Hebrew translation of Judah Nathan Bongdas, manuscript of the same library, the Arabic original offering here a lacuna): הינו הרוח הכח של מהות דיבר וכמו המקרא אומר הוא להלמוד והتجديد במקרא והנמצא במקרא.
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He expresses himself similarly in the introduction to his work, which was published with the first chapter of the part treating of logic by Georg Beer, under the title *Al-Gasālī’s Maḥāṣid Al-Falāṣifat*, Leiden 1888, p. 4:

Wama al-ahdāb faqṣir ʿaqālāmum fihā taʿlī al-hikm wa-al-ṣawāb naʿāir feeh wama al-maṭāriq faqṣir ʿaṭāḥa taʿlī mītiq al-ṣawāb wa-l-ḥakāya naddar fee... Wama... al-maṭāriq faqṣir ʿaṭāḥa taʿlī mītiq al-ṣawāb wa-l-ḥakāya

"As to metaphysics most of their dogmas are contradictory to truth, the correct being an exception; in logic most of the doctrines are on the right way and the false is an exception... In physics truth is mixed with error and what is correct thereof resembles the erroneous" (that is to say, the true doctrine is not discernible from the false in want of proper criteria). This passage was made use of by Palquera, *Maṣbūḥ*, 33b, without reference to the source.

143) Refers to Aristotle.
144) Comp. Abot III, 9.
145) Jerem. 10, 10.; see above, note 10.
146) May refer to Bāṭlāyāsī, see above, note 10.
This lengthy quotation which is the basis for the preceding Personification of God as Truth (see above, note 10) is taken from Aristotle’s Metaphysics ά Ελληνικά οινά πολίθην ης Ἀληθείας. Θεορημακάς μεν γὰρ τέλος ᾿Αληθείας, πρακτικάς δ’ ἐργον’ [καὶ γὰρ λόγω τοῦ πῶς ἔχει σκοπῶς, οἰ τοῦ άληθείας προτέριον τοιοῦτο τῆς θερμάτισθαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοις άλλοις ἐγέραι τῶν αὐτοῦ ἄλλων ἐνακόμων, καὶ τοις δ’ ἐνακόμως διὰ τὸ συνάγων, οἷον τὸ πῦρ θερμάτισθαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοισὶν αὐτοῦ τῆς θερμάτισθαι, ἔστε καὶ ἀληθείας τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτοῦ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀληθείας ἐνακόμων, διὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνακόμως τῶν ἀρχάς ἀναγκαίως ἐκεῖνον τῆς θερμάτισθαι διὰ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῆς θερμάτισθαι, καὶ εἰς ἄλλοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς δ’ ἐνακόμως τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἀλλὰ εἰς τῶν ἀρχάς ἐνακόμως τοῖς δ’ ἐνακόμως, ὡσὶν ἔχει τοῦ ἀληθείας, ἐνακόμως καὶ τῆς θερμάτισθαι.

Palquera’s translation is based either on Averroes’ “Middle” commentary, which contains also extracts of the Aristotelian text and which was used by our author also in his Προτότητα Ελληνικάς οἰνά πολίθην ης Ἀληθείας, Θεορημακάς μεν γὰρ τέλος ᾿Αληθείας, πρακτικάς δ’ ἐργον’ [καὶ γὰρ λόγω τοῦ πῶς ἔχει σκοπῶς, οἰ τοῦ άληθείας προτέριον τοιοῦτο τῆς θερμάτισθαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοις άλλοις ἐγέραι τῶν αὐτοῦ ἄλλων ἐνακόμων, καὶ τοις δ’ ἐνακόμως διὰ τὸ συνάγων, οἷον τὸ πῦρ θερμάτισθαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοισὶν αὐτοῦ τῆς θερμάτισθαι, ἔστε καὶ ἀληθείας τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτοῦ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀληθείας ἐνακόμων, διὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐνακόμως τῶν ἀρχάς ἀναγκαίως ἐκεῖνον τῆς θερμάτισθαι διὰ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῆς θερμάτισθαι, καὶ εἰς ἄλλοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς δ’ ἐνακόμως τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἀλλὰ εἰς τῶν ἀρχάς ἐνακόμως τοῖς δ’ ἐνακόμως, ὡσὶν ἔχει τοῦ ἀληθείας, ἐνακόμως καὶ τῆς θερμάτισθαι.

The thought is rendered throughout with exactness. After ἁρματεία (1. 6), however, a whole sentence of the Greek is omitted. The word ἀληθεία (p. 495, l. 4) ought to be inserted also after ἐνακόμως (ib., l. 3), where it is of essential importance, corresponding to the Greek τῆς τῶν ἀρχάς τῶν ἀρχάς τῶν ἀρχάς. It seems, however, that the equivalent of ἀληθεία in the first place was wanting already in the Arabic translation, for it is omitted also in the translation.
of Moses Ibn Tibbon: (not "Hillel of Verona," as Kaufmann, Attributenlehre, 334, has it; see Steinschneider, Introduction to
Tos. Sofer, n. 13), in which passage, f. 32a, see with reference to that passage above, note 10; comp. also Steinschneider, Hebr. Obers., 174, n. 498. For
the phrase in the phrase of Moses Ibn Tibbon, I. c., has correctly
מַעְלָהּ rather than עָלָהּ. See above, note 139.

148) Mishnah Abot I, end; comp. Maimonides, ad locum: הבכרים gehören קהלם
ברק דיתיה שלמה ומדע몹ת התורה ומדע/providers. comp. ib., 5, 21.

150) Ps. 85, 2.
151) Ib., verse 11.
152) Ib., verse 10.
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(153) *Ib.,* verse 12.

(154) Chapter VIII, § 5.

(155) The manuscript erroneously repeats *after.*

(156) Dan. 8, 12.
APPENDIX

IBN HISDAI

PALQUERA

For a general discussion of this appendix see above, p. 468 f.

The text as compared with that in Israel's Masechet Yeshuot, 12, is in many instances corrupt. I have corrected obvious grammatical mistakes and inserted entire phrases which were evidently omitted by the抄写者 on account of homoioteuton. The whole passage is quoted also by Gerson b. Solomon, Sefer Hasidim, 58a, 59b (ed. Rödelheim, 80a, 82a), and Meir Aldabi, Shemolah, end of c. 6; see Fried. I. c., 51-53. Of the three proofs for the immortality of the soul the third is used also by Joseph Ibn Aknin, the noted disciple of Maimonides, in the fragment printed in Kibbut Yeshuot, Leipzig 1850, II, 45b. Joseph Ibn Saddik, Sefer ha-Shamayim, 34, has the first proof, but in a different form; comp. Horovitz, Die Psychologie etc., 169, n. 64-65; see also ib., 166, n. 58; comp. Aaron b. Eliahu, Tanh. ha-Yesod, c. 109.
motive, when set forth without the words "with two dots above the letters which is to indicate that the scribe wrote it by mistake."

159) The text seems to be corrupt; it is perhaps to be read: מִכֶּלֶת

160) This is the well known Aristotelian definition of the soul (ἡ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ σῶματος φυσικοῦ ὁργανικοῦ), which was accepted by nearly all Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages; see Steinschneider, Magasin.
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f. d. Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1893, p. 256, and my article in the Hebrew Encyclopaedia Haarakot shel HaZvi, II, 209, 215; see also Moses Ibn Ezra, Zion, II, 159, last line; Joseph Ibn Aknin, l. c., and in Sepher Mihir, p. 572, l. 30; Levi ben Gerson, Sefer ha-Mizmorot, II (1866), 249; Simon Duran, Melochot, II; 13a. Avicenna, following Aristotle, gives the same definition

(Numa) כְּּלָּאָל יִלְּסָם f. d. Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1893, p. 256, and my article in the Hebrew Encyclopaedia Haarakot shel HaZvi, II, 209, 215; see also Moses Ibn Ezra, Zion, II, 159, last line; Joseph Ibn Aknin, l. c., and in Sepher Mihir, p. 572, l. 30; Levi ben Gerson, Sefer ha-Mizmorot, II (1866), 249; Simon Duran, Melochot, II; 13a. Avicenna, following Aristotle, gives the same definition

(Numa) כְּּלָּאָל יִלְּסָם

162 The words יִלְּסָם אֶלָּא אֲגַזְזָה הַיָּדוֹ are of essential importance and seem to be omitted here only by the scribe. They are found also in the quotations of Gerson b. Solomon and Meir Aldabi.
פועלתת עבורה גגיה משל הפסד
ולא נגלהו.ادה [85b]
ולא יזרו אס נבבודיה
שוניהם הראות אבר התומך
ואם נבבודיה
אבר התומך
-ish.