

26
21

MENDELSSOHN
AND THE
RABBINICAL LAW.
BY
CHARLES J. FREUND.

A GRADUATION THESIS,
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE, 1900.

mic. 9/8
1978

T H I S T H E S I S
IS AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED
TO
DR. HERMAN BAAR,
WHOSE FATHERLY GUIDANCE AND
ENCOURAGEMENT MADE POSSIBLE
THE CONTINUATION OF MY STUDIES.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PREFACE.	PAGE	1
INTRODUCTION	"	3
EXEGETIC DIFFERENCES AND AGREEMENTS.	"	7
(SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NOS. 42, 51, 55, 57, 89, 90, 136, 144, 149, 150.)		
AESTHETIC DIFFERENCES.	"	45
(ESPECIALLY NOS. 69 & 70)		
DOGMATIC DIFFERENCES.	"	50
CONCLUSION.	"	56

P R E F A C E.

In the collegiate study of MOSES MENDELSSOHN and his work, my attention was especially drawn to his translation of the Pentateuch. At that time the subject of this Thesis was presented to me and I set to work with all the eagerness that is characteristic of entrance into fields of new studies. For a time the work progressed favorably. Then the discouragements that come when one feels that work undertaken is beyond him, took hold of me, and I wished to abandon it for some easier task. I knew that to suitably present a subject like that of which this Thesis treats, required a knowledge of Hebrew and exegesis, that is only acquired after years of hard and laborious exertion. Such knowledge I could not claim for myself. However that hope which beats within the human breast spurred me on to redouble my efforts, and as a result the present Thesis is presented. The conclusions reached show no finality and are only expressions of present incomplete knowledge. When the maturity that comes with

-2-

years, shall have widened my knowledge, I hope to develop this work in a more detailed manner and thus do greater justice to the subject.

For any success that I may have achieved with this work, I am in large part indebted to Dr. Deutsch. He not only suggested the subject, but also by his encouraging word and ever kind assistance, made possible the completion of this Thesis. To Dr. Deutsch therefore, I extend my heartiest thanks.


I N T R O D U C T I O N.

During the declining years of the Gaonic period, numerous expositions of the Bible were composed. Then it was that SAADIAH GAON wrote his Arabic translation. In the latter part of the eighteenth century a similar condition of affairs existed in Germany. The Jews of that country were inflicted with all kinds of expositions that were supposed to be translations of the Bible. It was under such conditions that MENDELSSOHN undertook to make a simple, pure German translation of Holy Writ.

To SAADIAH'S translation notes were added in order to make the Bible more readily accessible to the people. Frequently the interpretations of the text are arbitrary. GRAETZ in commenting on SAADIAH'S translation says, "The very fact that he does not allow the text to speak its own language, and that he wished to find at one time the Talmudic tradition, at another a philosophical meaning in the words

and the context, necessarily prevented him from giving a true exposition. He impressed the exegesis of Scripture into the service of tradition and of the philosophy of the time, and made the text imply more than the meaning of the words allowed" (Graetz History of the Jews, Vol. III p. 190).

MENDELSSOHN'S translation was made to give his children a thorough education and to introduce the word of God in an undisfigured form. The translation was in the form of a protest against the then prevalent "derushic" expositions which, as previously in the time of SAADIAH, distorted the simple Biblical text to mean almost anything.

It is true that a German translation of the Bible had existed previous to the undertaking of MENDELSSOHN. The fact that the translation was made by a Christian and would therefore contain Christological references, made it inaccessible to the Jewish people. Indeed it was a difficult task to introduce the MENDELSSOHN translation without an edict of  being enunciated against those found using it. The conservatism of the ultra-orthodox made them evidence narrow-

ness in trying to prevent the Jewish people from using a work that saw the light of day only to counteract misinterpretations of God's word and to educate the Jewish people.

From a study of the translation as far as pertained to the work of this Thesis, it is apparent that the object of the translator is to be literal and simple. The translation is at times midrashic, as is evidenced by the introduction of explanatory words and phrases.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE.

In this treatise it is purposed to show MENDELSSOHN'S position in regard to the rabbinical law as studied from his translation of the Pentateuch, compared with the commentaries of RASHI and BIUR.

With ל' ח' תרנ"ו as a guide the first 150 laws
in the Pentateuch were examined in MENDELSSOHN'S translation
and a comparison was made with the tradition as found in the
above mentioned commentaries. The results of the examination
are expressed in the classification of differences or differ-
agree-

ment^tes as explained hereafter.

A P O L O G Y.

Before proceeding with the work, an apology must be made for the text that was used. It is the Vienna edition of the Pentateuch, 1861, (ADALBERT DELLA TORRE). Attention is called to this fact for the reason that in the work on the LOCUS CLASSICUS in Exodus 21⁵, a very important phrase, as found in the EDITIO PRINCEPS, is omitted. It is to be regretted that an EDITIO PRINCEPS was not used. Indulgence is therefore asked for any mistakes, (of which several were found) that may have been overlooked.

CHAPTER I.

EXEGETIC

DIFFERENCES AND AGREEMENTS.

MENDELSSOHN was not exegete enough to set himself over against tradition. This is not to be expected of him. Exegesis was not his specialty. However he is not a slavish follower of tradition though his translation indicates that he was versed in the rabbinical interpretations of the Biblical text. At time ingenious original renderings are the outcome of his own exegesis. The following chapter will indicate the MENDELSSOHNIAN position as evidencing agreement or difference from an exegetical standpoint.

1. Genesis 1²⁸ פָּרָו וְרָבוּ , MENDELSSOHN translates literally. אֶרֶץ is translated as "DIE ERDE" while BIUR with NACHMANIDES translates as כָּל הָאָרֶץ contra דֹּר הַפְּלִגָּה which thinks of אֶרֶץ as only the land known to them. RASHI explains פְּרִיָּה וְרִבִּיָּה as obligatory upon the man and

not the woman; also the process of subduing falls to the lot of man as RASHI learns from the omission of **וְ** in **וַיִּשְׁתַּבֵּחַ**. The translator does not feel this difficulty as forced into the text by this artificial process. Common sense could teach this and it would not be necessary to use such means for the explanation of an apparent fact.

2. Genesis 17 10sq. In these verses we see express command of God to Abraham. No difficulty is found by either MENDELSSOHN or the tradition except it be in the rendering of **וְהָמוּל** in vs. 10; Mendelssohn translates it as an imperative, while RASHI, followed by BIUR, explains it as an infinitive, shortened form of **וְהָמוּלָה**. MENDELSSOHN would explain the imperative as being found in the next vs. in the word **וְהָמוּלָה**.

6

5. Exodus 12 MENDELSSOHN translates **בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם** as "ZWISCHEN DEN BEIDEN ABENDEN," (cf Revised Version) as a dual from **עֶרֶב**. RASHI takes a different view of the word **בֵּין**. From him the period is not so extended as to per-

mit the slaughtering of the Paschal lamb at any time between the evenings, but rather anytime between the darkening of the day and the actual setting of the sun. The generally accepted rendering is "twilight."

6. Exodus 12⁸ In the translation of this verse MENDELSSOHN introduces the word "NOCH." Perhaps by this he wishes to show that the meat of the Paschal lamb may not be eaten at any other time, as commanded elsewhere cf. vs. 10: the word ^וחַיִּים is parenthetical, and, says BIUR, connected with preceding ^{בְּ}שֶׁר. The command to eat ^וחַיִּים is found in vs. 18. To show that ^וחַיִּים is parenthetical BIUR says that ^וחַיִּים is connected with ^{בְּ}שֶׁר.

7. Ibid 12⁹ A difficulty is encountered in this verse in the use of the word ^{בְּ}שֶׁל. But this is met by references to passages in which the roasting of the lamb is explained by ^{בְּ}שֶׁל cf. Dt. 16⁷ and the better example where the word ^{שֶׁל} is used with ^{בְּ}שֶׁל viz 2 Chr. 35¹³. BIUR explains ^{שֶׁל} as equivalent of ^{בְּ}שֶׁל. This explanation of ^{בְּ}שֶׁל

is an apologetic one for ^לבט usually refers to cooking and not roasting. This verse might more properly have come under a classification of apologetic differences. But such differences were so few that they may be easily be subsumed under exegetic differences without doing violence to the work.

8. Exodus 12¹⁰ MENDELSSOHN translates literally, and does not notice the difficulties mentioned by RASHI as explanatory of the repetition of the words ^לבֵּרַךְ עַד. It is certain that you could not burn the remnant on the first day of the festival, but would have to leave it till the second morning. This is in explanation of the repetition. (It is interesting to notice that BIUR is silent about this verse.)

9. Ibid 12¹⁵ MENDELSSOHN translates ^ללֹא תֵאָכְלוּ as an imperative. He does not employ the apologetic method of the rabbinical tradition, which explains the eating of ^ללֵחֶם as optional though not permitting the use of leaven.

The apologetic explanation of ^ללֹא תֵאָכְלוּ (which to me seems very reasonable as explaining a difficulty in the

text) as the eve of the feast, is plausible; for, the prohibition to slay the Paschal lamb while leaven remained in the house, could only refer to the eve of the holiday. In BIUR תַּשְׁבִּיתוֹ is translated as "SOLIT IHR AUSGERÄUMT HABEN." Thus he tries to explain away part of the difficulty found in ביום הראשון.

11. Exodus 12¹⁹ MENDELSSOHN translates דְּבַתֵּיכֶם as "dwellings"; while RASHI extends it to imply any territory belonging to Israel; hence houses outside of Palestine are forbidden to contain שֵׁטָו cf Ex. 13⁷.

12. Ibid 12²⁰ In this verse as also in the preceding, MENDELSSOHN fails to notice that שֵׁטָו is different from mere חֻמֶּץ, in that it itself has the power of making other material leaven. Thus, here he translates כְּחֻמֶּץ as "GESAUERTES" which would be but a repetition of vs. 15 in a negative form; whereas RASHI, (and I think rightly so,) refers שֵׁטָו to כְּחֻמֶּץ which is broader than חֻמֶּץ.

כְּחֻמֶּץ, RASHI calls attention to the fact

that this cannot imply everywhere, for כֹּחַלֵּי could not be eaten as $\text{כֹּחַלֵּי תוֹרֵה מִצֵּשֶׁר שְׁנִי}$ except in Jerusalem.

כֹּחַלֵּי were to be eaten with the Paschal lamb. This could only be done in proper places. Hence says BIUR מִשְׁבֹּרֹתֵיכֶם gives permission to eat כֹּחַלֵּי even in places where the Paschal lamb is not slaughtered.

15,16. Exodus 12⁴⁶ MENDELSSOHN translates בֵּית

בֵּית "IN DEMSELBEN HAUSE," thus explaining that the Paschal lamb must be eaten where slaughtered. But בֵּית does not of necessity mean "the house". It can be, as RASHI and BIUR explain, a חֲבֻרָה , a companionable gathering which may meet in the courtyard and if then inconvenienced as e. g. by rain, they may adjourn into the house.

$\text{וְעַד לֹא תִשָּׁבֵר}$, MENDELSSOHN translates as "KEINEN KNOCHEN DARAN BRECHEN." RASHI explains that this refers to a bone on which there is as much meat as an "olive;" hence it implies that if less meat be present the bone may be broken.

17. Ibid 12^{48b} $\text{וְכָל עֵרְלָה לֹא יֵאָכֵל}$ The Rabbini-

cal tradition explains this as an uncircumcised Israelite who remains so because of fatalities resultant on the ceremony of circumcision. The explanation seems farfetched for כל ערל must mean any uncircumcised person and not so limited as this tradition would make it. MENDELSSOHN translates literally and correctly so.

18. Exodus 13² In explanation of פטר כל רחם MENDELSSOHN follows RASHI when he says parenthetically (D.H. WAS ZUERST AUS MUTTERLEIB KOMMT.) This verse is an illustration of MENDELSSOHN'S use of explicative phrases.

21. Ibid 13⁸ MENDELSSOHN (and R.V.) in translation of קז follow NACHMANIDES and MAIMONIDES, who supply וטס after קז RASHI and IBN EZRA explain that קז refers to the fulfillment of the commandments which made Israel worthy of redemption. It seems to me that the supplying of the word וטס renders the text more intelligible without the artificial methods of RASHI and IBN EZRA; even though the latter have the accentuation in their favor, as says BIUR.

22,23. Exodus 13¹³ Here MENDELSSOHN uses the parenthetical explanation of 13² in translation of פטר חמר when he says "every firstborn". And is not the command superfluous seeing that in vs. 2 all "first born of men and beasts are sanctified" and if people wish to enjoy them they must be willing to pay for their release? The use of the term חמר is necessitated by the fact that Israel at that time did not know of any other unclean animals (as beasts of burden).

(Might the phrase רכל פטר חמר be but a transposition of רחם כל פטר חמר?)

24. Exodus 16²⁹ לא יאסא ביתו לא יאסא ביתו MENDELSSOHN translates literally, thus being in opposition to the extended meaning of חקומו as explained by the Rabbis viz Sabbath limit. Of course the command if taken literally, implies that the people should not leave their homes to gather manna.

27. Ibid 20⁴ MENDELSSOHN translates literally.

In this he agrees with NACHMANIDES' explanation of the prohibition not to make idols for his own use; this is necessi-

tated because of the juxtaposition to לֹא תִשָּׂא חֶחֶה. MAIMONIDES explains this making as referring to a prohibition of making for "his own use or even for the use of another." It seems that the latter is a little too extended for in the text is used the word לֹא and if the command were as MAIMONIDES explains it, לֹא would perhaps have been omitted.

28, 29. Exodus 20^{5a} MENDELSSOHN translates the commandments literally except possibly and extension of the meaning of תַּעֲבֹד when he translates "GOTTESDIENSTLICH VEREHRE." This however is the plain meaning of the text.

30. IBID 20⁷ לֹא תִשָּׂא חֶחֶה, MENDELSSOHN translates "you shall not utter the name of God in vain." This makes use of the verb שָׁוַע as equivalent of דָּבַר (cf שָׁוַע יְהוָה). The TARGUM, followed by the Rabbis, translates שָׁוַע as נִיחַ from the verb נִחַ "to swear;" hence you shall not swear in "vain" or for nothing. NAACHMANIDES extends this to a prohibition forbidding the use of God's name unnecessarily. The translation of שָׁוַע by "VERGEBLICH" is partly at variance with TARGUM,

for the latter translates it in the first part as לֹא יִגְבֹּה the equivalent of $\text{לֹא יִגְבֹּה וְלֹא יִחַס}$ and in the second as לֹא יִשְׁקַר falsely.

31. Exodus 20^{8.9} In the translation MENDELSSOHN inserts the words "STETS" (continually). This is not in the text. He also translates the word תַּעֲבֹד as "KANNST DU ARBEIT-EN" and not as usually translated "shalt thou labor." The work is optional though good for man's welfare.

זָכוֹר has a meaning other than mere remembrance, says BIUR. For it implies action with the mouth in remembering, which is not usually the meaning of the word זָכוֹר in stems other than הִפְעִיל . Remembrance by means of the heart is implied in the word שָׁמַר in the repeated commandments as found in DEUTERONOMY. BIUR calls special attention to the German translation of תַּעֲבֹד as רִשְׁוֹת .

32. Ibid 20¹⁰ $\text{לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה$. In translation of the word וְיִבְהֶמְתָּךְ MENDELSSOHN says "AUCH NICHT DURCH DEIN VIEH, as if it were וְיִבְהֶמְתָּךְ . The same construction is applied to אֵרָךְ . The אֵרָךְ may do his own work, but work for those en-

joined not to perform such labor, is forbidden. MENDELSSOHN translates בשערי as "who maintains himself in thy gates."

This is significant of a great deal says BIUR, for it will then refer to the תושב who alone is permitted to remain in the land because of his performance of the seven commandments of the sons of NOAH.

33. Exodus 20¹² MENDELSSOHN translates נתן לך as "GEBEN WIRD" (prophetic future). MENDELSSOHN in translation of יכון seems to follow RASHI'S explanation that the prolongation of your stay depends on the fulfillment of the command. If you do not honor parents there will be a shortening as learnt from the hermeneutic rule ללא וטכיל יביל הן ללא "in a positive command a negative is implied and in a negative a positive command is implied." BIUR follows RASHI and says יכון means "stay long in their own land" if they obey the commandment and receive an additional reward of prolonged life in the world of eternity.

34. Ibid 20¹³ MENDELSSOHN translates literally.

Unjust taking of life is called murder. (BIUR.).

36. Exodus 20^{13cd.} ^{לֹא תִגְנוֹב} The translation is literal. The rabbinical interpretation is that this stealing refers to kidnapping and is punishable by death as is learnt by the juxtaposition to the two preceding commandments which entail that punishment. This is the result of the hermeneutic rule ^{לֹא תִגְנוֹב} ^{לֹא תִגְנוֹב} ^{לֹא תִגְנוֹב}. BIUR says it also implies the ordinary meaning of .

37. Ibid 20^{13cd.} MENDELSSOHN translates "you shall not say anything against your neighbor as a false witness." This is the generally accepted meaning of the text; BIUR explains it "you should not speak against your neighbor (so that by it "the speaking," you will be a false witness).

40. Ibid 20²² In this verse we have an example of original exegesis. MENDELSSOHN supplies the phrase "MIT DER ZEIT;" also in translation of ^{וְאַתָּה} he says "you shall not build it." In this he does not follow the text for

בְּתֵּינֵי evidently (BIUR) refers to בְּתֵּינֵי which is a feminine plural. (R. V. translates בְּתֵּינֵי by "it" in the text, but says "build them" in the marginal note.

MENDELSSOHN translates כִּי as, "as soon as etc.;" whereas RASHI and TARGUM explain it as "perhaps." Furthermore MENDELSSOHN translates מַחֲבֵר as "MEISEL" (chisel) but RASHI and BIUR say it refers to any instrument of iron which is always called מַחֲבֵר.

42. Exodus 21²⁻⁶ MENDELSSOHN translates עֶבֶד as KNECHT. Why not SKLAVE as in 20¹⁰? עֶבֶד is translated as an adjective and is not to be meant as "slave bought from a Hebrew." With RASHI; MENDELSSOHN translates, לְחַפְּזוֹ as "to freedom". vs. 3 לְחַפְּזוֹ MENDELSSOHN translates as "FÜR SEINE PERSON ALLEIN." This agrees with TARGUM and also RASHI, who explains it as equivalent of "unmarried." The Rabbis explain לְחַפְּזוֹ as making it impossible for the master to give the slave a Canaanitish wife, (to go free with him), though according to vs. 4 he may give him a Canaanitish wife; but she and her offspring remain the property of the master. v. 4. If

the master procure him a wife (viz. Canaanite) she and her children belong to the master; he can only demand his own freedom vs. 6. The master takes the slave before the "GÖTTLICHEN RICHTER; thus MENDELSSOHN translates הַסֵּלֵהִם as divine judges, following the TARGUM which uses the word דִּיןִּי . This rendition of הַסֵּלֵהִם as judges is necessary, for it was by action of the Court that he became a slave and by means of the same process he should be continued as such. Why cannot הַסֵּלֵהִם mean "divine presence" and thus avoid stretching the meaning of the word?

לְעוֹלָם MENDELSSOHN translates as "forever". Thus also TARGUM and R. V. According to RASHI לְעוֹלָם means יָבֵל for in Leviticus where this law is repeated it says "each man shall return to his family." BIUR says לְעוֹלָם is עַד שְׁנַת יוֹבֵל , for לְעוֹלָם is a definite period of time, the longest the Israelites knew. (If MENDELSSOHN'S translation is as explained above why does the translation not agree with the BIUR? The answer to this is found by a reference to the editio princeps where MENDELSSOHN inserts the phrase "BIS ZUR ALLGEMEINEN FREI-

HEITSJAHR." (My attention being called to this fact is due to the kindness of Dr. Deutsch.)

43,44,45. Exodus 21⁸ MENDELSSOHN translates with the K^ethib "so that he does not betrothe her to himself." TARGUM translates with the K^eri לְיָמֶיהָ. RASHI also follows K^eri. BIUR with MENDELSSOHN explains K^ethib as the better rendering, for the intion is as the K^ethib, that he does not desire to marry her. The subject of וְיָצָא, when following the K^eri is father who then (b) according to BIUR would have to redeem. According to MENDELSSOHN, וְיָצָא refers to the master as also RASHI and TARGUM. לְעַם גֵּרִי MENDELSSOHN translates as "stranger," RASHI and TARGUM translate it as "another man." לְאִשְׁתּוֹ say RASHI and BIUR refers to either "father" or "master."

46. Ibid 21¹⁰ לֹא יִקַּח MENDELSSOHN renders לֹא יִקַּח as though it were the same as וְנָתַן (The rest of this verse is explained under the heading aesthetic.)

47. Exodus 21¹² MENDELSSOHN translates וְאִשׁ not as "man" but MENSCHEN. Doing this he includes also females and children, as explained by RASHI.

48. Ibid 21¹⁵ MENDELSSOHN translates with the rabbinical tradition, "father or mother." The striking is not fatal but in the nature of wounding.

49. Ibid 21^{18sq.} The translation is literal. The rabbinical interpretation after TARGUM explains שָׂרָפָה as loss of work time equivalent of שְׂרָפָה in vs. 19; in both places TARGUM uses the word שְׂרָפָה. Furthermore TARGUM translates שָׂרָפָה as "must pay the price of healing." Thus also MENDELSSOHN.

51,52. Ibid 21²⁸ In this verse MENDELSSOHN shows his knowledge of exegesis when he explains שָׂרָפָה not in its plain meaning (as R. V. wrongly does). The reason for this is, that the animal had been killed in a manner different from the proper way. It is therefore forbidden to be eaten; this is

self understood. But says MENDELSSOHN, it may not be "GENOSSEN", viz. its flesh may not be used e. g. for mechanical purposes. In translating לֶחֶם as "GENIESEN" and not as "ESSEN," MENDELSSOHN evidently has the purpose of following the tradition (cf. RASHI).

The owner of the animal is free for as the rabbinical tradition has it, this ox must not have been a אֶרֶב and not one about which he was warned viz. מִוֶּעַר in which case the owner also is killed, cf. next vs. vs. 29. MENDELSSOHN translates יָמֻת as though it were יָמִית "UM DAS LEBEN KOMMEN," shall perish. In this he apparently follows the tradition which explains this death as בְּיָדֵי שָׂרִים and not by means of מִוֶּעַר for in this latter case, the phrase usually is מוֹת יָמֻת. Furthermore ransom cannot be given for any death penalty imposed by the court. TARGUM translates יָמֻת as יִתְקַטֵּל "shall be put to death" viz. rendering יָמֻת in its plain meaning R.V. translates "shall be put to death."

53. Exodus 21^{33.4} MENDELSSOHN explains בעל הבית

as "the one on account of whom the pit exists." Accord-

ing to the rabbis this implies "the one instrumental in digging the pit." MENDELSSOHN translates, וְהָיָה לָו "UND DAS TODTE STUCK VIEH IST SEIN" evidently referring to בְּעַל הַבּוֹקֶה.

The tradition appears to refer this לָו to the owner of the animal for it says לַזָּרֵק "the party injured, the sufferer of the damage."

55. Exodus 22⁴ MENDELSSOHN translates יָבִיעַר as "lead". RASHI as "permit to feed by leading into another's field." Thus also "BIUR. R. V. "if a man shall cause a field or a vineyard to be eaten." In this verse MENDELSSOHN makes use of the word "NAMLICH," one of those words he so frequently introduces into the translation. It can only signify that וְשֶׁלֶח is but in apposition to and explanatory of יָבִיעַר. The root יָבִיעַר never means "to lead" except it be for the purpose of feeding; thus MENDELSSOHN'S translation should be, "If a man permit his cattle to feed etc." and R. V. is correct.

56. Ibid 22⁵ The word וְשֶׁלֶח is translated as

"burnt" of English "consume" (by fire). After the word MENDELSSOHN supplies in the translation a word that would be the equivalent of "VERDERBEN," meaning as with BIUR, that produce resting there was destroyed.

57. Exodus 22^{6,7} In vs. 7 MENDELSSOHN introduces a parenthesis ("to swear"). This he does while following the interpretation of RASHI and BIUR. R. V. explains that the man is brought to the judges to see whether he have put etc. MENDELSSOHN seems to be correct for the phrase לֹא אֶשְׁבַּע generally introduces an oath.

58. Ibid 22⁸ In the translation MENDELSSOHN does not define the subjects that belong to the various verbs. R.V. does this once in making the subject for $\text{אֵת הַחֵטְא הַזֶּה יִשְׁמַר כִּי הוּא זֶה}$ "which another challenges to be his." RASHI giving the rabbinical explanation of the verse says that in this case, it is the one who is שׂוֹמֵר who is at fault; he by the testimony of the witnesses is not careless but in fact guilty of theft; because of this testimony he (שׂוֹמֵר) must pay twofold. $\text{בְּאֵת הַחֵטְא הַזֶּה יִשְׁמַר כִּי הוּא זֶה}$

means giving to court to swear; cf previous verse. According to BIUR the subject of יִשְׁמַר is either הַעֵד or הַמְּפָקֵד and the object of יִשְׁמַר is either thief, keeper or witnesses (in case they are found out to swear falsely.)

60. Exodus 20^{13sq.} Following the tradition MENDELSSOHN introduces a parenthesis (EIN SOLCHES LASTVIEH) referring to borrowed cattle. vs. 14. There is a difficulty in the text here; for in preceding verse "borrowed cattle" was spoken of and then in this vs. there is introduced אֵם שְׂכִיר . This can only mean "cattle hired" and not borrowed. In translation of אֵם שְׂכִיר MENDELSSOHN follows tradition and says "VERLUST." Thus the translation of this vs. is exegetic.

61. Ibid 22^{15sq.} The translation is literal. BIUR says לִהְיוֹת does not mean marry but "send her the requisites of marriage." BIUR is wrong in the supposition that the לִהְיוֹת is given to the woman; as cf Genesis 34¹² פָּתָה is translated as "VERFÜHREN" as derived from the ARAMAIC and ARABIC meanings

of this root.

62. Exodus 22¹⁶ MENDELSSOHN translates "SOLLST DU NICHT LEBEN LASSEN." Why not "you shall not keep alive?" The phrase used is stronger than if the usual phrase לֹא יִחְיֶה had been used. The fact that the command is expressed negatively, makes it more conspicuous in the matter of fulfillment. (To me it seems that the force of לֹא יִחְיֶה is similar to that implied in the word לֹא יִחְיֶה in Exodus 1¹⁷; it would thus mean that you may in no way be the means of prolonging the life of the one to be put to death.)

66,67,68. Ibid 22²⁴ In this verse there are three commands. The first is gotten by translating the phrase beginning with אִם, not with MENDELSSOHN, as "if", but with the tradition as a command. In this verse MENDELSSOHN introduces "NAMLICH."

71. Ibid 22²⁷ MENDELSSOHN follows BIUR in translation of סִוֵּי (not necessarily as "prince" but as "OBRIGKEIT",

magistracy.

72. Exodus 22²⁸ חֵלֶם is translated as "barn-floor." In a parenthetic MENDELSSOHN again assumes the "DERASHIC" method by saying "namely to bring firstlings and other gifts therefrom." In explanation of חֵלֶם MENDELSSOHN follows NACHMANIDES and RASHBAM as also in וְעַד where RASHI explains it as meaning T-rumah. TARGUM translates חֵלֶם as בְּכֹרִים.

חֵלֶם is explained by the Rabbis not as delay (as ordinarily חֵלֶם would mean and as MENDELSSOHN takes it) but as making one gift precede another that rightly it ought to follow. I cannot see the necessity of forcing this into the text. Why not give the plain meaning?

73. Ibid 22³⁰ "Meat of a torn animal shall you not eat" is MENDELSSOHN'S translation and in this he agrees with RASHI who follows TARGUM רֶבֶשׁ תִּלְוֶשׁ מִן הַיֵּית בָּרָא. But neither of these in my opinion follows the original. I think a better rendering would be, "flesh (found) in a field is אֶרֶץ." This will avoid the necessity of explaining

as TARGUM and RASHI; for, not knowing if an animal has been slaughtered ritually it is certainly not כשר.

74, 75. Exodus 23¹ MENDELSSOHN translates להיות עך as though it were חנף; otherwise he is literal. RASHI says "do not league with the wicked to be and act with him as an unrighteous witness.

The first law, says BIUR, refers to judges who are warned not to accept false testimony, but shall examine carefully and thoroughly.

76, 77, 78. Ibid 23² MENDELSSOHN gives a literal translation. In doing this he differs from the Rabbis who explain this as a reference to decision, in cases of capital punishment, by a decided majority. Here MENDELSSOHN does not feel the necessity of other than explanation according to plain meaning.

The Rabbis explain that in capital cases the decision is asked for first from the דיוט, least experienced judges, so that they should not be influenced by the vote of

the older ones.

Furthermore לרוב רבים is, not to decide capital cases by a majority of one, thereby wronging the accused party.

b. c. MENDELSSOHN translates "in a contest when you announce your opinion, attach not to the majority to pervert judgment." Although not literal, yet MENDELSSOHN follows the tradition which explains this as joining with a majority to decide wrongly. A majority may be followed e. g. good of the defendant. If, however, the majority be going wrong, they must not be followed because they are a majority. One must not fear to speak the truth.

79. Exodus 23³ MENDELSSOHN translates ל as "GE-MEINEN," common. In the repetition of this command in Lv. 19¹⁵ he translates ל as "arm." Perhaps he had some reason for this translation.

80. Ibid 23^{4.5} 5. MENDELSSOHN translates ל as "take care if you leave such a one alone." לך יחזק

"much rather help him unpack." RASHI explains וְחָדַלְתָּ as a question "wilt thou cease to help him?" (thus R. V. in margin.) The TARGUM translates וְחָדַלְתָּ in both places by וְשָׁבַת and וְשָׁבַת "and you withhold in order to leave him." This is exegetically difficult owing to the different meanings of וְשָׁבַת.

7
82. Exodus 23 In explanation of the text the Rabbis frequently employ apologetic methods and MENDELSSOHN in his translation agrees with such explanations. This is one of them. A difficulty is presented in the words וְאִם and וְאִם. It is evident that in this connection the words cannot be taken in their literal meaning. The Rabbis felt this difficulty and in their ingenious way explained וְאִם as "one who, though innocent, has been condemned falsely, may yet have a chance, to free himself; וְאִם here refers to "one who has been acquitted and who may not later be tried for the same offense, even though there be proof of his guilt." The TARGUM also translates in this way. The reason of the Rabbis seems to be a

plausible one and MENDELSSOHN is right in following them.

84. Exodus 23¹¹ MENDELSSOHN introduces the phrase "UND WAS DARAUF WACHST." By this MENDELSSOHN explains the suffix in וְהָיָה (11). Thus also BIUR after NACHMANIDES and RASH-BAM; R. V. says "let lie still."

85. Ibid 23¹² Literal translation except וְהָיָה which is rendered "FESTERN". This is the equivalent of וְהָיָה. Did MENDELSSOHN have in mind the injunction of the prophet to make the Sabbath "a day of delight?"

It might seem that this is a superfluous command for already in the וְהָיָה the Sabbath was enjoined. Its repetition here, says RASHI; is necessary for "this year being Sabbatic you might suppose it to be unnecessary to give rest to the laborer; not so however, "you must let rest."

89,90. Ibid 23¹⁸ MENDELSSOHN translates literally though he could easily (and properly so) have introduced the exegesis which explains וְהָיָה to mean the Paschal lamb;

thus the TARGUM translates it. It is certain that the other sacrifices could be slaughtered while $\sqrt{\text{פסח}}$ was present. Therefore this vs. refers to the Paschal lamb. It is nowhere forbidden to make use of $\sqrt{\text{פסח}}$ in connection with sacrifices.

The TARGUM translates $\sqrt{\text{לֹא תִשָּׁלַח}} \sqrt{\text{מִן הָאֵלֹהִים}}$ "you shall not leave over except on the altar." Thus also RASHI and BIUR (cf Lv.6²)

94. Exodus 23³³ In a MENDELSSOHN translates literally. Before translating b he introduces the explanatory phrase, "DU KONNTEST VERLEITET WERDEN." This is not in the text but can be supplied as derived from the end of the vs. In b MENDELSSOHN does not translate וְלֹא יִשָּׁלַח by any special word. RASHI says וְלֹא יִשָּׁלַח here signifies $\sqrt{\text{וְלֹא יִשָּׁלַח}}$ in the sense of $\sqrt{\text{וְלֹא יִשָּׁלַח}}$. NACHMANIDES says this is not so but וְלֹא יִשָּׁלַח here means "for;" and the vs. is to read "They shall not dwell in thy land it (their dwelling there) will be a snare to you; lest they cause you to sin against me for thou wilt serve their Gods." No matter how you take this vs. it is difficult, especially so if taken literally and as it is.

98. Exodus 27²¹ In the translation, MENDELSSOHN supplies the antecedent of ^{וְהָיָה} and the rest of the vs. literally and in accordance with tradition.

99. Ibid 28² MENDELSSOHN notes with BIUR that ^{וְהָיָה} is a command "to have made" and not as R.V. has it "and thou shalt make." This is simple exegesis as is plain from the following verses "and they (^{וְהָיָה} לָבָא) shall make," and also vs. ^{וְהָיָה} לָבָא.

100. Ibid 28^{28b} MENDELSSOHN translates this "so that the breastplate can not be loosed etc. In this ^{וְהָיָה} is not taken as a command.

101. Ibid 28³² ^{וְהָיָה} MENDELSSOHN translates "so that it should not be torn." RASHI after tradition says this is a negative command. BIUR explains as MENDELSSOHN. This is not necessarily a command but an explanatory reason of 28²⁸.

103. Ibid 30⁷ MENDELSSOHN translates ^{וְהָיָה} as

"cleanse;" thus tradition. **נֶרֶחַ** is translated as "lamps" after RASHI and BIUR.

104. Exodus 30⁹ **זָרָה** is translated with RASHI as "common" as "any other than is proper." TARGUM and IBN EZRA explain **זָרָה** as referring to strange spices" thus taking **זָר** in its literal meaning. JONATHAN BEN UZZIEL paraphrases "spices of strange people."

105. Ibid 30^{13sq.} MENDELSSOHN translates **בִּשְׁקָל** as "NACH DEM SCHEKEL-GEWICHT DES HEILIGTHUMS." In doing this he makes use of the meaning of **שָׁקָל** to explain its use in the phrase. **שָׁקָל** means to weigh and MENDELSSOHN following RASHI gives the above explanation and also makes **שָׁקָל** the coin itself besides its weight.

לִיהוָה MENDELSSOHN translates "DEM EWIGEN ZU EHREN." In vs. 14 the **יהוָה** is also translated in this manner.

In the translation of v. 15 he breaks away from the Massoretic punctuation. He joins **לֹתֵת** with **הַשָּׁקָל** and renders "shall not give less than etc." Thus also BIUR.

108. Exodus 30^{32sq.} In the translation, "MENDELSSOHN supplies "GEMEINES." This he does in accordance with the context for this can only be a prohibition to one who is not properly fitted for anointing. אִשׁ is not a generic term here.

In the latter part of vs. 32 MENDELSSOHN introduces the word "JEDERZEIT" which is not in the text. This is not even mentioned in the commentaries and is another example of the midrashic (simple in its way) character of MENDELSSOHN'S translation. The insertion is evidently made from vs. 31. The translation of אִשׁ as "GEMEIN" is gotten from the prohibition to use the oil לִשְׁמֵנִי in vs. 33.

109, 110. Ibid 30^{37.8} Here MENDELSSOHN makes a parenthesis ($\text{אֲנִי וְאַתָּה וְכָל הָעָם}$). It is interesting to notice this for he thereby shows that he is attending to the different persons spoken to in the vs: BIUR remarks this.

112. Ibid 34²¹ In the literal interpretation MENDELSSOHN follows part of tradition which explains this as reference to Sabbath. Others among the Rabbis refer this to Sab-

batical year. The latter explanation seems farfetched and forced.

113. Exodus 34^{26b} The translation is the same as in 23¹⁹. The rabbinical explanation of the repetition of this command is "that you may not eat etc. In the former case it was "you may not boil etc."

115. Leviticus 1³ MENDELSSOHN translates עולה as "GANZOPFER," since the entire animal is burnt; otherwise it is rendered "burnt offering." BIUR renders קריבנה as equivalent of יקדישנה. Of course this is not necessary except in paraphrastic translation. This rendering is exegetical and implied in "bringing."

120. Ibid 4¹³ MENDELSSOHN (and also TARGUM) translate קהל as "congregation." RASHI and BIUR explain it as referring to "SANHEDRIN." It seems to me that the latter have the better rendering for if קהל were meant here it would be stated. And the use of קהל in b seems to strengthen the position of the commentators. Hence the vs. would mean as explain-

ed by BIUR. "If the SANHEDRIN (teachers) err in their instruction etc."

121. Leviticus 4^{27f} In vs. 28 MENDELSSOHN omits to translate the phrase שָׁמַע ה' וְשָׁמַע. Otherwise he is literal.

122. Ibid 5¹ MENDELSSOHN translates שָׁמַע ה' וְשָׁמַע קוֹל שְׁמִיעָה קוֹל "hears an oath, whereby he is sworn; this last is not in the text but is derived from the statement of the Rabbis of RASHI. This explanation of שָׁמַע is not satisfactory to BIUR; for he thinks that the mere hearing of an oath does not bind one as a witness.

In the translation of שָׁמַע ה' וְשָׁמַע "DIESELBE ABER WEIS EIN ZEUGNISS," the underlined words are not in the text, and, being supplied, show that MENDELSSOHN felt the difficulties of the vs. Here he is at variance with NACHMANIDES who explains שָׁמַע ה' וְשָׁמַע as extension of שָׁמַע ה'. Take this vs. any way you wish and you encounter difficulties.

123. Ibid 2^{2sq.} Here is a literal translation ex-

cept for the translation of וְלֵךְ which is rendered "ES KOMMT IHM IN VERGESSENHEIT," instead of as in another passage "ES IST VERBORGEN."

127. Leviticus 5^{15sq.} 15. In this vs. MENDELSSOHN introduces exegesis in translation of the word $\text{וְשָׁחַ$ as "ENTZIEHT." This he obtains from following RASHI and BIUR who explains this as enjoying of the things that have been improperly taken away from the $\text{וְשָׁחַ$ ". This translation of is better than plain rendering as "SUNDIGEN." MENDELSSOHN applies further exegesis in translation of $\text{וְשָׁחַ$ as a dual. This also is gotten from tradition.

In vs. 16 MENDELSSOHN again renders וְשָׁחַ "ENT ZIEHEN." But he supplies the words "AUS VERS^ECHEN," having in mind. וְשָׁחַ .

129, 130. Ibid 15²¹⁻²³ In v. 21, MENDELSSOHN explains what is meant by $\text{וְשָׁחַ$ "withhold what proper is due him." Thus the translation again takes on the Midrashic character. In thus following RASHI, MENDELSSOHN also follows

the tradition as in translation of v. 23.

In explanation of ^לוּפַעַל חַעַל, BIUR says "treachery toward the owner of an article is also treachery to God Himself."

132,133. Leviticus 6⁶ MENDELSSOHN translates תַּכְבֵּר as though it were vocalized תַּכְבֵּר making the ו' refer to וְהוּא and not as prefix of second person. In rendering thus MENDELSSOHN is supported by BIUR.

134. Ibid 6⁹ The tradition is followed which makes לֹא תֵאָכֵל an imperative and not optional. The vocalization as לֹא תֵאָכֵל would have laid this open to the same remarks as were made about the eating of תֵּאָכֵל on פֶּסַח. V. translates as MENDELSSOHN does.

135. Ibid 6¹⁰ The same remark applicable to תֵּאָכֵל as to לֹא תֵאָכֵל in preceding command.

136. Ibid 6¹³ In following the text literally MENDELSSOHN misses the exegetical remarks that could be made.

He cannot however be taken to task for not explaining this vs. as does BIUR after IBN EZRA "that this offering is not only that of the high priest but also of all the priests on entrance into and continuance of official duties.

138 Leviticus 6¹⁸ MENDELSSOHN with RASHI translates הַזֹּהֵר as "one who brings the sin offering." BIUR following TARGUM and IBN EZRA, explains this as sprinkling in order to make proper atonement. But MENDELSSOHN uses the more generic term.

Besides BIUR explains the word יִשְׂכַּלְכַּל as "enjoy it" (cf MENDELSSOHN'S translation of Ex. 21²⁸ where he shows that he also has this meaning of כָּלֵל in view.)

140. Ibid 7¹⁻⁷ In v. 5 MENDELSSOHN translates וְהִקְטִיר "the priest permits it to go up in smoke upon the altar." Here he renders לְפָנָיו by a pronoun in the singular number. Furthermore וְהִקְטִיר as "permits etc." seems to imply that another can do the work. The TARGUM rendering of וְהִקְטִיר in v. 7 as $\text{וְהִקְטִיר בְּיָדוֹ}$ is interesting that it

(TARGUM) uses the same phrase in explanation of ^{המחש} in 6¹⁸. ^ל say BIUR implies possession by those who officiate with the priest.

141 Leviticus 7¹¹⁻¹⁴ In the translation of ^{על}

^{תודה} in v. 11 MENDELSSOHN uses the same word DANKOPFER as he does in translation of ^{על זבח תודה}. Otherwise literal and no variation to be noted.

142. Ibid 7^{15b}. literal. (In the first part MENDELSSOHN translates ^{תודת שלמים} as "DANK UND FREUDEN OPFER." Why does he insert UND?

144. Ibid 7¹⁸ MENDELSSOHN translates ^{אם יהאכל} as "if however--also on the third day, "GEGESSEN WERDEN SOLLEN"; These underscored words rendered into English are "should have been eaten" and carry out the intention of the rabbinical tradition and not as ordinarily translated "shall be eaten." The use of the pluperfect is more in accord with the sense of the text.

But more interesting than this is MENDELSSOHN's translation of פגול as "VERWORFEN SEIN" in which he follows TARGUM who says פחית. This word is also rendered thus in Ib. 19⁶. TARGUM JONATHAN renders פגול as פגול הוא. פגול according to Redak is "flesh that changes its smell and appearance and becomes fetid and loathsome."

פגול is that which is so because of the fact that the thought at the time of offering, is to use it outside of its time and place. All things considered, MENDELSSOHN accepted rabbinical exegesis.

145,146. Leviticus 7¹⁹ The midrashic character of the translation is again to be noticed in the rendering of the word והבשר as "OPFERFLEISCH." In this MENDELSSOHN follows RASHI and BIUR who say that והבשר is the meat of the זבח שלמים above referred to.

149,150. Ibid 10^{6a} This vs. is the best illustration of MENDELSSOHN's translation as a midrashic work, though his translation was a protest against the existing expositions.

Not satisfied with rendering $\text{וְעַתָּה שְׁׁלַח$ as "you shall not uncover" he introduces the parenthesis (as mourners do). This phrase is not in the text but could be readily supplied by context and rabbinical explanations.

In continuation of the vs. MENDELSSOHN translates, "so that He (namely God) may not be angry." The phrase "namely God" could easily have been omitted had he capitalized "ER."

CHAPTER II.

AESTHETIC DIFFERENCES.

From a careful study it is evident that MENDELSSOHN had reasons other than those of making a pure simple translation. He was caught up among those that were always looking to the aesthetic side of things. The distorted translations of the Bible made it distasteful, and to win back those who were repelled, he tried to show in his translation that what others had made repellant, was in fact far from being so. Thus it is that he manifests his liberalism in contradistinction to those who rendered the text in a manner that would grate on the feelings. Thus his translation assumed an aesthetic character. The limitation of the Thesis may have rendered it impossible to notice more differences under this heading. Perhaps were the work more extended, more such differences would have been met especially in the chapters of Leviticus.

13. Exodus 12⁴³ Here MENDELSSOHN translates נֹכְרִי as "VERSCHONUNGSOPFER" as opposed to his previous translation of UEBERSCHREITUNGSOPFER. In explanation of "FREM- DER" he has the parenthetic phrase, "DER NICHT VON DER NATION IST."

RASHI explains זָכָר as an apostate in the words זָכָר מִן הַכֹּהֲנִים; while TARGUM translates זָכָר מִן הַכֹּהֲנִים as "an apostate Israelite." It is then scarcely possible that MENDELSSOHN follows either of these renderings and consequently gives his own (apparently) more acceptable rendering. Perhaps furthermore MENDELSSOHN did not wish to have it understood that there was any intolerance in the exclusion of the stranger.

14. Ibid 12⁴⁵ זָכָר is translated as "a tolerated stranger (who has not taken upon himself to fulfill all the laws.*)" The phrase MENDELSSOHN employs as explanatory might have been used by him right in the text. With RASHI and BIUR, he supplies זָכָר and translates FREMDLING. The toleration is

permitted, as the parenthetic phrase has it, the **תושב** performs some, not all the rites of the Israelitish nation. He may not participate in the Paschal lamb ceremony for he is not circumcised; and it being expressly stated **כל ערל לוי** he cannot partake of the Paschal lamb. Thus RASHI.

26. Exodus 20³ MENDELSSOHN translates literally even to translation of **על פני** "VOR MEINEM AUGESUCHT." TARGUM translates this as **בר פני** "except me." RASHI explains this as a commandment never to have other Gods, "as long as I exist, viz. forever. It is a commandment not only for that generation but for all time to come (Thus MECHILTA.) The word **אלהים** is only used here as taken by the idolator to represent deity. **אלהים** is not used with the word **עש** but with words which represent it as something which is an idea a "God," not made. **אלהים** in connection with another word as **אמרי** is used (cf. Lev. 19⁴) but not by itself, for **אלהים** is used to refer to "the only God." NACHMANIDES says **על פני** is a shortened form of **על פני הים** for anything made in the

presence of anyone is before him (cf Numb. 3⁴).

46. Exodus 21¹⁰ In this vs. MENDELSSOHN explains the word וְיָשָׁב as "WOHNUNG" dwelling. This he gets from one of the commentators who say this is a shortened form of the noun יָשָׁב "habitation." Perhaps MENDELSSOHN gives this rendition for aesthetic reasons; וְיָשָׁב usually means "sexual intercourse" and WOHNUNG is a euphemism.

50. Ibid 21²⁰ וְיָשָׁב is a Canaanitish servant.
" וְיָשָׁב "SO WIRD ES GERACHT." By means of GEZERA SHAVA this death is through the sword וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב וְיָשָׁב (Lev. 26). According to this verse we see that the same punishment is not given as if he had killed a free man for in that case the phrase used is וְיָשָׁב (21¹²) the equivalent of strangulation. When MENDELSSOHN translates "SO WIRD ES GERACHT," probably he means the death.

69,70. Ibid 22²⁷ וְיָשָׁב MENDELSSOHN translates "EIN GOTTLICHES WESEN (cf translation to 22¹⁹). R. V. trans-

lates as "gods" and in the margin as "judges." This is gotten from following the tradition as explained by RASHI and BIUR.

But MENDELSSOHN'S translation is very interesting for reasons other than above explanations. By translating as he does he brings forth the broadmindedness of the Jewish religion, in that it prohibits the blaspheming of the divinity of another religious body. This again illustrates the purpose MENDELSSOHN had in producing his translation. It was to set aright the errors prevalent about the narrowness of the Jews.

CHAPTER III.

DOGMATIC DIFFERENCES.

It cannot be exactly stated that in the following examples MENDELSSOHN varies with the tradition on dogmatic grounds. It is only to be understood that he shows reliance on the text as indicative of the divine Will expressed in human language. Let the examples speak for themselves.

3. Genesis 32³³ ^{לֹא יֵאָכְלוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל} MENDELSSOHN translates "DARUM ESSEN DIE KINDER ISRAELS NICHT DIE SPANNADER." Here the word ^{לֹא} is rendered as expressing a customary action. For MENDELSSOHN this phrase does not express a command but is rather an express statement of a custom among the Israelites. It seems that MENDELSSOHN is right in translating as he does for the negative JUSSIVE is usually introduced by the word ^{לֹא} and not ^{לֹא}. BIUR also feels the difficulty in the word ^{לֹא} and in order to be on the safe side

explains 1° custom; in remembrance of the combat (thus IBN EZRA) and 2° command; for it having been a custom among the sons of Jacob not to eat this part, it was later forbidden to their descendants. TARGUM and R. V. translate לֹא יֵאָכְלוּ "do not eat."

4. Exodus 12² הַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה MENDELSSOHN translates as "this month". TARGUM translates חֹדֶשׁ. From Commentaries it is evident that the meaning is rather "this moon," God being depicted as pointing to the new moon, (וְהָיָה) as explained by BIUR having the significance from the phrase וְהָיָה חֹדֶשׁ. But MENDELSSOHN has the right in this for cf 12⁶ וְהָיָה חֹדֶשׁ must be translated as "month." The variation is but trivial; however it is an interesting example of how the minutest details of the text were not overlooked.

In this vs. MENDELSSOHN does not seem to notice the difficulty implied in לִכְסוֹן הוּא; is it the first of the month? Evidently Tishri is the first month cf. Exodus 34²² and 23¹⁶; but first, so explains BIUR is לִכְסוֹן הַחֹדֶשׁ. It is certain that this is the first month for from it the

other months are reckoned cf Exodus 19¹, Numb. 10¹¹, 29¹.

25. Exodus 20² Translation is literal. According to RASHI this 'כִּי refers to God revealing himself on SINAI as the same God who caused the exodus and is referred to at that deliverance as גִּבּוֹר מְלַח מַחֲמֵה; the aspect of רַחֲמִים is here brought into prominence. The revelation is to Moses and through him to the people.

This vs. as studied from the view point of BIUR is interesting for more than one reason. It involves a dogmatic question in that it is equivalent to a statement "I who am (was, and will be etc.) According to some this command is rather an express statement of an article of faith acknowledging the existence of God. The consensus of opinion is that it is a commandment.

39. Ibid 20²⁰³ / כִּי is translated as "NEBEN MICH ZU SETZEN." This is the equivalent of the rendition of RASHI who supplies the word עֵמִיד after אֶתְּנוּן לֵךְ can have no meaning if translated literally and hence must be supplied as

in RASHI, "דמות לעמוד" In his exegetical remark MENDELSSOHN is correct. BIUR with TARGUM explains it as equivalent of עול. But I think the translation as it stands is better than either of these two explanations. If MENDELSSOHN wrote this BIUR to Exodus why do not translation and commentary agree?

59. Exodus 22^{9sq.} 10. שבעת יקוק is translated as "EID BEI DEM EWIGEN WESEN (cf English an oath by God.)" Did MENDELSSOHN imply the same when he translated as above or does his translation imply more than is usually taken as meaning of שבעת יקוק. MENDELSSOHN translates ולקח as this with RASHI, BIUR, and TARGUM as meaning oath. 12. MENDELSSOHN translates ענין ידיו as "EINEN BEWEIS" in agreement with BIUR who says ענין is a portion of the torn body" to prove the truth of his statements.

86,87. Ibid 23¹³ The name of false gods may not be mentioned by you nor can you permit an idolator to swear by one for you. שם אל the name of the idolator's god must not

be heard with you as the cause of its being said.

75 ל MENDELSSOHN translates as "DURCH DEINEN MUND".
as RASHI. BIUR says you may not mention the name at all (cf
JOSH 23¹⁷).

91,92. Exodus 23¹⁹ MENDELSSOHN translates liter-
ally. b. The word '73 is generalized (after tradition) to
mean any young animal.

The reason for this law is not given, says BIUR;
but it is sufficient for us to know that it is a divine com-
mand. We must be satisfied with this and not search for a
reason.

128. Leviticus 5¹⁷ Here MENDELSSOHN does not take
the text as it is but renders in the following manner, "if a
person sin, namely he does one of the things, which the Eternal
forbid, and does not know in how far he has sinned, and must
atone for his misdeed." In the translation of the phrase תִּטָּהַר

ל שר יהוה MENDELSSOHN introduces an example of his
dogmatic exegesis, for according to him all laws are of divine

-55-

origin even if expressed through man. This has been shown in his paraphrasing of this verse.

His rendition of b is a following of the tradition.

R. V. translates $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁפֹּךְ דָּמָו}$ as "and he shall bear his iniquity."

C O N C L U S I O N .

We have thus come to the conclusion of our work. Our Thesis is temporarily finished and the position of MENDELSSOHN as exegete has partially been shown in this necessarily meagre manner. We leave the work not with any feeling that would enable us to say $\gamma\delta\eta$, "we have finished with you," but rather in words that will express our hope at some future time again taking up and finishing to our own entire satisfaction and that of everybody else.