

AN ANALYSIS OF JOSEPH BEN JUDAH'S

SEFER MUSAR

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
degree of Rabbi.

Joseph L. Ginsberg
Hebrew Union College
1937.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	1.
I. The Man.....	1.
II. Works.....	7.
 <u>Chapter I. Use of Sources</u>	10.
I. Use of Maimonides.....	12.
II. Use of Avos de R. Nathan.....	18.
III. Use of Minor Sources.....	25.
 <u>Chapter II. Types of Minor Comments</u>	28.
I. Omissions of Maimonides.....	28.
II. Grammatical Comments.....	31.
III. Talmudic Comments.....	33.
IV. Comment by Biblical Support.....	38.
 <u>Chapter III. The Scheme of Salvation</u>	40.
I. Concept of Torah.....	40.
II. Praise of Torah.....	44.
(A) Worldly Advantages of Torah.....	44.
(B) Praise of Scholars.....	46.
(C) Praise of Means Used to Obtain Torah.....	47.
III. The Reward - or Punishment.....	49.
(A) Resurrection.....	52.
IV. The Rationalization of the Reward.....	53.
 <u>Chapter IV. Practical Aids to Salvation</u>	70.
I. The Golden Mean.....	70.
(A) Imitatio Dei.....	73.
(B) Anger.....	74.
(C) Study.....	74.
II. Physiology and Psychology.....	77.
III. The Metaphysical Basis.....	94.
 <u>Conclusion</u>	98.
 <u>Notes</u>	100.
 <u>Bibliography</u>	127.

INTRODUCTION

I. The Man

The author of Sefer Musar, the subject of our study, refers to himself in his rhymed introduction^{1.} to the work as Joseph ben Yehuda ben Joseph ben Jacob Sefardi.^{2.} He was also called Al-Sabti after his birthplace, Ceuta, in the northwest extremity of Africa.^{3.} The name, al-Braglani, which is substituted for al-Sabti in two of the author's other works, The Healing of Souls, and the Introduction to the Talmud, is considered to be joined to the name of his grandfather, rather than to his own.^{4.} The name by which he was known in Arabic was Abu al-Hajjaj Yusuf ibn Yahya ibn Sham'un al-Sabti al-Magrabī.^{5.} Others have found the name ha-Yisraeli added.^{6.} In addition to this imposing and confusing array of names, our author was also burdened by the weight of ben Aknin. He is addressed this way in one of the letters of Maimonides.^{7.}

In spite of this concrete reference in Maimonides' writings to his disciple, Joseph ben Aknin, Munk for a long time denied the authenticity of this name and claimed it was only a mistake.^{8.} He was forced to take this stand in order to support the thesis he developed that Joseph ben Jehuda, the favorite pupil of Maimonides, to whom the Moreh Nebukim was dedicated and Joseph ben Aknin were two different persons.^{9.}

It is not our purpose to enter into this argument about the identity. We will only indicate a few of the conclusions which have been reached. Megues has this to say on the subject: "As to the identity of Joseph ibn Aknin and Joseph ben Jehuda, a literary controversy, covering many years, was waged between Steinschneider, on the one side, who first claimed this identity, and Munk and Neubauer on the other side. The controversy called forth a battle array of authors, but may be regarded as settled in favor of Steinschneider inasmuch as Munk in 1851 (cf. Archives israelites) and Neubauer 1888 (cf. Berliner's Magazin) admitted the correctness of Steinschneider's view."¹⁰ Bacher also feels that the two were identical because he does not think there would be two men in one generation who had the same name.¹¹ He also points out that Rabbi Israel, a younger contemporary of Joseph's, called him ben Aknin and did not distinguish between him and the disciple of Maimonides'.¹² Furthermore, Bacher mentions the fact that a later unknown commentator on Avos includes one of Joseph's statements from the Sefer Musar and calls him the pupil of Maimonides.¹³

*either
or
both?*

Another argument for the identification of the author of the Sefer Musar with the pupil of Maimonides is the following consideration which I have not seen developed elsewhere. As we shall see later, a very large portion of the material of the Sefer Musar is borrowed directly from Maimonides, both from his commentary on Avos and its

introduction, the Shemonah Perakim and from his other writings. Also, the Sefer Musar, in its philosophical outlook closely resembles Maimonides. Now, although it is possible that some one who had had no contact at all with Maimonides would depend so heavily upon him, it would be much more plausible to assume, especially in view of all the other evidence leading to this conclusion, that he was the disciple of Maimonides. At least it is an additional little bit of evidence to add to that already produced.

The general concensus of opinion to-day, is that Joseph ben Aknin and Joseph ben Jehuda were one and the same person. It is interesting to observe, however, that so late a writer as Waxman denies this identification. He maintains that the R. Joseph ben Judah ibn Aknin, who wrote an introduction to the Talmud, is not the favorite pupil of Maimonides. He offers no evidence whatever to support this view, takes no cognizance of the arguments to the contrary, but merely says the similarity of names and places of residence is misleading.¹⁴ He does not seem to follow Munk who had denied the name ibn Aknin altogether to the disciple of Maimonides, but evidently takes the reference in the letter of Maimonides¹⁵ to be genuine and calls the disciple Joseph ibn Aknin.¹⁶ In view of his very meagre treatment of the subject, his conclusions are not to be taken too seriously.

See to this whole question Epstein in Moses b. Simon (ed. J. Guttmann) II p. 58.

It also does not fall within our purpose to enter into the question of the events of Joseph's life. This work has already been done thoroughly by Munk and Steinschneider.¹⁷ It will be sufficient to mention briefly a few of the outstanding events of his career. He was born in Ceuta, in the province of Fez, in Northwest Africa about the year 1160.¹⁸ At the time of his birth, that part of the world was suffering from the religious persecution of the Almohod Mohammedans under 'Abdal-Mu'min.¹⁹ He was brought up as one of the new Mohammedans who had been forcibly converted. During his youth he was not allowed to practice Judaism openly but received secret instruction in Jewish subjects. He also received a good secular education, studying mathematics, philosophy and medicine.²⁰ About 1185²¹ he left Ceuta and went to Fustat to study under Maimonides. He remained there two years²² and perfected himself in the fields of logic, mathematics, and astronomy. For some unknown reason, he left Maimonides and settled in Aleppo where he married and entered for a while into commercial life, making a business journey and gathering considerable wealth from the undertaking.²³ He returned to Aleppo and became court physician to the king Al-Dhaker Ghazi. When Al-Harizi visited Aleppo in 1217 he found Joseph in the zenith of his glory. He called him the "Western light" and applied to him the words of Scripture, "And Joseph was ruler over the whole land."²⁴ Discounting the medieval

tendency to write in superlatives, it can be seen that Joseph was a person of considerable importance. He used this prestige to defend his Master, Maimonides, and silenced the opposition of rabbis in Bagdad to his works. The master, true to his character, told him to be moderate and begged him not to oppose famous rabbis whose authority was established.²⁵ His death occurred in the year 1226.²⁶

There are several passages in the Sefer Musar which throw some light on Joseph's life. In commenting on Avos 2:4, "Don't separate yourself from the congregation", he makes the following rather bitter remark;²⁷ "But if one sees that the outlook on life of the men of his country has become corrupt and he worries that if he remain with them he may learn their ways and go in their evil paths and be forced to abandon the path of life, it is imperative that he leave them immediately (to go to) another country where the customs of the inhabitants are more right and the outlook on life the proper, middle (i.e. golden mean) one. And if he can not find a country that is near, let him go to one that is distant. If he can not find one at all let him rather go to a desert, a place where no men at all are found". In this comment he is probably thinking of the state of affairs in Fez under the Almohad persecution at the time he decided to leave.²⁸

In his comment on Avos 4:7, "Make not it (the Torah) a crown wherewith to magnify thyself nor a dish wherewith to

??

ל. 72 חלוקה פלג

eat", Joseph enters into a long argument on the question of whether it is permissible to receive money for study or teaching.²⁹ He first of all quotes Maimonides' opinion on the subject.³⁰ The master felt that no one should accept any money for teaching or studying unless he was absolutely forced to do so. Joseph however differs radically on this point. He declares that the early Geonim approved profit from study and that such learned and pious men would surely not permit a forbidden thing. Furthermore, the verse, "Of the fruit of your hands shall you eat; happy and prosperous shall you be,"³¹ clearly proves the point; for study is the fruit of work. He admits that scholars of independent means should not accept any money. But wherever the work of a scholar is found to interfere with his study, it is best for him to accept money. The early Geonim, who lived in generations that didn't like Torah, saw that if pupils had to make a living they would not study and that therefore the Torah would perish. They accordingly decided it would be wiser to permit the receiving of money. With this view Joseph declared himself in perfect agreement.

We know that while he was in Aleppo, Joseph once intended going to Bagdad, opening a school there, and receiving pay for his instruction.³² Maimonides disapproved of the venture heartily and finally dissuaded him from the undertaking. The above passage throws some light on the argument that went on between the two men.

Finally, there are many references in the book to Joseph's profession of physician. Besides the several long passages in which he treats in detailed fashion problems of physiology and health,³³ there are scattered references throughout the book to the science of medicine, extracts from medical books, and quotations from authorities in the field of medicine.³⁴ This work could obviously have been done only by one who was expert in his field. In one passage³⁵ he maintains that it is a great mitzvah to learn and to teach the science of medicine and that the practice of medicine is one of the chief methods of serving God.³⁶

II Works

Because of the lack of the manuscripts of many of his works and the confused state of the references to them, there has been considerable difference of opinion with regard to the listing of Joseph's writings. Munk³⁷ vaguely states that he wrote on biblical subjects, and was the composer of a few pieces of poetry mentioned by Maimonides and Al-Harizi; he attributes only two major works to him: an ethical treatise in Arabic, Medicine for Souls, and a philosophical treatise in Arabic, which has come down to us in Hebrew translation. This treatise does not have a name, but it treats the three problems: necessary existence; the procedure of things from the necessary

existence; the creation of the world. Munk, who it will be recalled, denied the identification of Joseph ben Yehuda with Joseph ben Aknin, does not think that the former was the author of the commentary on the Psalms and the treatise on measures in the written and oral law. Munk had never even heard of the Sefer Musar, the subject of the present study.

Steinschneider³⁸ listed twelve different works by Joseph in the fields of Talmud, medicine, philosophy and poetry. He errs in mentioning both what he calls Sefer Hamusar and a separate commentary on Avos. He did not know the manuscript of the Sefer Musar and merely hints that it may exist in the collection of David Kaufmann in Budapest.³⁹

Bacher⁴⁰ lists four works by Joseph besides the present volume. Two of them in Arabic exist in manuscript in the Oxford library. They are a commentary on Song of Songs and The Book of the Healing of Souls. Another work, which is lost to us, was, judging from the references to it in his other works, a code of laws somewhat like the Mishneh Torah, except that it has only the laws which apply after the destruction of the Temple. The fourth work, also lost, is mentioned once in the Sefer Musar.⁴¹ The title is given in Arabic with the Hebrew translation Ikre' Dathe' Ha Torah.

Our present work, the Sefer Musar, was unknown for many years, as is evidenced by Munk's ignorance of it and Steinschneider's confusion about it. The manuscript was

found in Kaufmann's collection by Bacher and the discovery was brought to public attention by him.⁴² The book was finally published in its entirety by Bacher in 1910. This is the only edition of it that exists, and is therefore naturally the one we use. Bacher claims that it is the first of Joseph's work ever to be published⁴³ but he was evidently unaware of the work of Meqnes which preceded his by 6 years.⁴⁴

There is a note in the manuscript on which Bacher's edition is based giving a few details about it.⁴⁵ The manuscript was finished in 1335.⁴⁶ The scribe's name is given as Avigdor ben Solomon. His teacher's name is mentioned as Nathaniel ben Benjamin. The place of composition is unknown but Enten speculates that it was done in Italy.⁴⁷

From the story of his life, it is evident that Joseph was acquainted with both Arabic and Hebrew. Up to the time of the discovery of the manuscript of Sefer Musar, he was not known to be a Hebrew author. The two manuscripts of his which were at that time extant were both in Arabic.⁴⁸ The present volume however is written in Hebrew, and what is more in a good clear Hebrew style. "Sefer Musar is a good witness to the use of the Hebrew language in his generation in Arabic countries, and also proof of the ability of its author to express himself clearly in Hebrew."⁴⁹

The book is called Sefer Musar, because it is a commentary on the Mishnah tractate, Avos, which is completely made

here:
m. 2
is
complete.

up of Musar, i.e. ethics. Every statement in the book is called a "Musar". If the individual Mishnah statement is split up in the interpretation, each part is called a יערוב

cher 50. The book is a commentary on the first five chapters of Avos, although a few of the statements from the sixth chapter are tacked on at the end. 51. It is known that this latter chapter, known as Perek R. Meir, or Perek Kinyan Torah, did not form part of the original Avos. As late a commentator as Maimonides remarked on this. 52. Joseph, in omitting the sixth chapter was merely following in the footsteps of his master.

Chapter I. Use of Sources

The treatise of the Mishnah known as Avos, or Pirke Avos holds a very important place in Jewish literature out of all proportion to its size. 1. Its importance is shown by the number of editions it has gone through and the number of commentaries written upon it. It made such a lasting impression upon the Jew because of its ethical character. Its effect was to illustrate a type of character, that of the Hasid, resulting from the discipline of Pharasaic Judaism. 2. In later times it came to represent the type of character produced by Talmudic Judaism, the successor of Pharisaism. Because of the semi-philosophical character of some of its sayings it especially attracted the philosophical mind in Judaism. Thus Maimonides used his com-

mentary on the book and his introduction to that commentary the Shemonah Perakim, to develop many of his ethical ideas and some of his metaphysical ideas connected with ethics.^{3.}

Joseph ben Jehouda, in writing his commentary on Avos, was merely following in his master's footsteps. However, in order to justify the new work, he probably felt that he must add something new, something different. He conceived the idea of writing the definitive commentary on Avos. This commentary was to include the best of the previous work on the subject plus his own thoughts and innovations. He therefore did not hesitate to copy copiously from other works. In his introduction^{4.} he states this purpose clearly and names some of the sources he used. These are: The Avos de R. Nathan, the commentary of his master, Maimonides, the commentary of R. Isaac ben Reuben, interpretations of both the early and later Geonim, medieval rabbis, the Beraitha Derech Eretz, sayings of the Greek philosophers and other foreign scholars.

In spite of this imposing list of sources, Joseph made use of two of them mainly. "Rabbi Joseph ben Jehouda built his commentary on Avos on two columns; the first was the Avos de R. Nathan, the second, the commentary of Maimonides."^{5.}

Fully two-thirds of the material of the book is either quoted almost word for word, or paraphrased from these two sources.

— In spite of the acknowledgement of his indebtedness to these two works in his introduction, Joseph does not always bother to indicate the source in the actual text. In fact, the majority of his borrowings from Maimonides are not acknow-

ledged. With regard to the Avos de R. Nathan, most of the quotations are acknowledged, but there is a considerable portion of them that are not.^{6.}

It will be our purpose in this chapter to treat these two main sources separately and show exactly what use Joseph made of them. We will then add a few words on his use of the minor sources.

A. Use of Maimonides

The influence of Maimonides on Joseph cannot be overestimated. The pupil leaned upon his master almost completely for his philosophical ideas.^{7.} Most of this material was taken from the commentary and the Shemanah Perakim. "The commentary of Maimonides, together with the Shemanah Perakim, its introduction, is almost completely swallowed up in the Sefer Musar."^{8.} There is a statement at the end of Joseph's commentary on Song of Songs which indicates that the Mishneh Torah did not come into his hands until he had already started the Sefer Musar.^{9.} In spite of this a few statements from that work found their way into Joseph's commentary. Most of these are from Hilchos th Deoth which contains Maimonides' so-called golden mean writing.^{10.}

With regard to Maimonides' commentary, it is very evident that Joseph had it before him all the time he was writing. There is hardly a page of the Sefer Musar that does not have some quotation from, or some idea suggested by, Maimonides. Most of these extracts from Maimonides are

not given word for word by Joseph. In fact there are only nine^{11.} passages in the entire Sefer Musar where Joseph copies Maimonides in a fairly close fashion, and there is only one^{12.} passage in the book in which he gives a condensed version. As Bacher puts it, "In most places he expands the material when he writes the matters taken from the commentary of the Rambam and also adds his own explanation to it and whatever seems good in his eyes to add. (And the things taken from the Rambam he clothes in ornamental language)".^{13.} The comments of Maimonides are written very briefly, succinctly, and to the point. He does not waste any words in rhetorical excrecences; nor does he clutter up the text with a superfluity of biblical and Talmudic quotation. Joseph's style, however, is the exact opposite of Maimonides'. He never uses one word where two would do. His comments are always long and wordy, with numerous quotations from the Bible and Talmud. As Bacher rather modestly understates it, "In his writings, he does not cut his words short."^{14.}

Joseph, then, in using Maimonides' commentary usually expanded the extracts from it in some way or other. One of his favorite methods was to add Talmudic quotations as illustrations. For instance, in commenting on the phrase, "He who gives wrong interpretations of the Torah, even though he has many good deeds to his credit, will have no portion in the world to come,"^{15.} he quotes one interpretation of Maimo-

nides that the phrase refers to one who despises the Torah, or the scholars or that it refers to one who transgresses the words of the Torah openly.¹⁶ He then proceeds to add a passage from Sanhedrin which explains it as referring to an Apikoros.¹⁷

Again, sometimes, he expands the material by a passage from the Midrash. For example, in commenting on the passage, "Our fathers tried God with ten trials,"¹⁸ he gives the list of ten as enumerated by Maimonides¹⁹ and then adds another list from the Midrash.²⁰

At other times he expands Maimonides by quotations or examples from the Bible. For example, in commenting on the statement, "With ten words was the world created,"²¹ he gives the comment of Maimonides that actually only nine words (or utterances by God) were used but that the word "א'ל'הים" was also counted as one.²² He then proceeds to explain the statement by the verse, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and by the breath of his mouth all their host".²³ Another good example of how Aknin worked is found in his comment on the phrase, "The sword comes to the world on account of delay of justice and perversion of justice and on account of those who interpret the Torah not according to the Halacha."²⁴ He first gives the interpretation of Rambam who merely presents a clear explanation of the three crimes mentioned and what they involve.²⁵ Joseph however adds to the passage by attempting to prove the con-

nection of Torah and the sword by Biblical statements. He quotes the verse, "I will bring a sword upon you that shall wreak vengeance for the covenant."²⁶ This, however, merely establishes the relationship of "sword" with "covenant". His next task is to connect "covenant" with "Torah", and then by indirect relationship, he will have made his point. This he does by quoting the verse, "These are the terms of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the Israelites in the land of Moab besides the covenant which he had made with them at Horeb."²⁷ These covenants clearly refer to the Torah. Ergo, "Torah" is connected with "sword", and there is clear scriptural proof that the sword will avenge the Torah.

Many times this tendency of Joseph to enlarge the words of Maimonides is due to his desire that everything shall be crystal clear to the reader and that not a single little detail shall be left in doubt. For example, in commenting on the phrase, "There were ten generations from Adam to Noah,"²⁸ Maimonides merely says that these ten generations are given in the Torah.²⁹ Joseph, however, who took nothing for granted, not even the reader's knowledge of Genesis, goes through the whole list of the ten generations in Biblical fashion, "And Adam begat Seth, and Seth begat Enosh, etc."³⁰

Another good example of how Joseph's commentary clarified the terse expressions of Maimonides is found in con-

nection with the phrase, "A rude man is not one who fears sin nor is an Am Haaretz a saint."³¹ Maimonides tersely explains that a rude man (רוד) is one who has neither wisdom nor ethical qualities; an Am Haaretz, however, refers to one who does not have high intellectual attainments but who does have a bit of the ethical qualities.³² Joseph, however, while accepting Maimonides' definition, goes into more detail and clarifies the matter more. He points out that the word רוד is used because the person in question is empty of any ethical qualities or opinions at all, neither good nor bad, like an unsown field. Therefore, since he knows neither good nor bad he can have no fear of sin. In the same way, the Am Haaretz has many qualities which make him valuable for the welfare of civilization. However since he does not have much wisdom he does not know enough to do more than the law requires and thus become a saint.³³ This is a much clearer and better explanation than that of Maimonides.

In spite of Joseph's very heavy and very obvious dependence on his master, Maimonides there are several passages³⁴ in which he does not hesitate to differ with the master. For instance, in commenting on the phrase, "Judge every man by the scale of merit,"³⁵ he first quotes Maimonides' opinion that these words apply only if the person in question is unknown to us; that is, if we do not know whether he is good or bad, it is only fair to give him the benefit of the

doubt and judge him by the scale of merit. However, Maimonides insists, if the person is known to be wicked, we are no longer under the obligation to so judge him.³⁶ Joseph denies this interpretation. He insists on retaining the full force of the word "every". If we are very strict with the exact, literal meaning of the phrase, he says, we must include every man, even if he is known to be wicked.³⁷ Joseph showed himself to be more lenient in this respect.

Another example: In connection with the phrase, "If I am not for myself who will be for me?"³⁸ Joseph quotes his master's explanation that the phrase refers to the acquiring of wisdom and good deeds in the time of youth; if one waits until he is old, he will no longer have the power, nor the inclination to undertake this strenuous pursuit. Thus, Maimonides says, to be for oneself means to lay up merit and wisdom while one still has the strength.³⁹ Joseph admits the correctness of Maimonides' applying the statement to the acquiring of good deeds and wisdom, but differs with regard to the limiting the time to one's youth.⁴⁰ He says his own interpretation, which includes all the days of one's life, both youth and old age, is a much more correct one.

Sometimes, Joseph's difference with Maimonides leads him into error. In commenting on the phrase, "Study of Torah along with Derech Eretz is seemly,"⁴¹ he quotes Maimonides that Derech Eretz here means wordly occupation, that is, if a man does not have work and make a living he will not be able to study well.⁴² Joseph adds that it is possible to

interpret Derech Eretz here as good behavior, or the usages of polite society, as being able to get along well with men.^{43.} Society will feel kindly disposed towards the one with Derech Eretz, provide him with money, and he will thus be free to study. This is obviously a forced and false interpretation,^{44.} especially in view of what follows in the Mishnah text, "For labor in the two of them makes sin forgotten. And all Torah without work ends in failure and occasions sin." It seems to me that Joseph felt impelled to take this seemingly stupid stand in order to support his position that it was permissible to take money for the study of Torah, without working. I have already mentioned the dispute he had with Maimonides over the matter in the Introduction.^{45.}

H. Use of Avos de R. Nathan

The Avos de R. Nathan is the second of the important sources of the material in the Sefer Musar of Joseph ben Jehouda. "In his commentary he uses first the material of the Masechta Avos de R. Nathan and includes in the Sefer Musar the larger part of its sayings which are related to the sayings of the Mishnah Avos."^{46.} Over a fourth of the actual bulk of the Sefer Musar is made up of quotations from this source. In contrast to his use of Maimonides' commentary where he usually paraphrased the words of the master, or took the idea suggested by Maimonides and wrote it up in a much longer comment, Joseph in his use of the Avos de R. Nathan usually copied the quotation word for

word, merely shortening the quotations from the Bible.⁴⁷ In fact, there are only a few passages⁴⁸ in the entire Sefer Musar in which he shortens the passage from Avos de R. Nathan, leaves out any important amount of material, or paraphrases the words.

The reasons that Joseph copied the Avos de R. Nathan so literally and paraphrased Maimonides are, it seems to me, two. First of all, Joseph had the commentary of Maimonides before him in Arabic⁴⁹ and in translating would not attempt to render it word for word. Whereas in the case of the Avos de R. Nathan, he had a Hebrew manuscript to work with. Secondly, in the case of Maimonides, Joseph was interested solely in ideas, and in attempting to present these ideas as clearly and forcibly as possible, would tend to rewrite and expand and clarify. In the case of the Avos de R. Nathan, however, he used the material for two other reasons: to give variant and additional readings of the Mishnah and to adorn his presentation with illustrative material. Both of these purposes could be adequately served by literal quotation.

There are some interesting examples of Joseph's use of the Avos de R. Nathan for variant and additional readings of the Mishnah. For example in commenting on the Mishnah, "Everyone whose wisdom is more than his (good) deeds resembles a tree whose branches are many and whose roots are few. And the wind comes and uproots him and turns him over. Whereas he whose deeds are more than his wisdom resembles a

tree whose branches are few and whose roots are many. And even if all the winds in the world come and blow against him, they cannot budge him from his place,"⁵⁰ he quotes the statement from the Avos de R. Nathan which reverses the order of the two cases treated and has a slightly different wording.⁵¹ Joseph then goes on to say that he has included the statement from the Avos de R. Nathan, even though it contained no additional material, merely to show the difference in reading between the Mishnah and the Baraitha.⁵²

Another example is found in the comment on, "Tradition is a fence for the Torah. Vows are a fence for saintliness. A fence for wisdom is silence."⁵³ Joseph then quotes the reading from the Avos de R. Nathan which states, in part, that saintliness is a fence for vows.⁵⁴ This seems to be the exact opposite of the Mishnah but Joseph explains the variant reading by saying that if a person is able to separate himself from worldly things (i.e. this is one aspect of saintliness) without a vow to that effect and not break his mental resolution, then this in itself will be a fence for vows inasmuch as he will not run the risk of breaking actual vows. In this way, says Joseph, the apparent contradiction between the Mishnah and the Baraitha is resolved.⁵⁵

A typical example of the use of the Avos de R. Nathan for additional readings is found in the comment on Hillel's statement, "If I am not for myself who will be for me and if I am for myself alone, what am I? And if not now when?"⁵⁶

The author quotes additional sayings by Hillel: "If you will come to my house, I will come to your house," plus its explanation that it refers to people who come early and stay late in the schools and synagogues; God will in every case bless them in the future world.⁵⁷ "If I am here, everyone is here; if I am not here, who is here?"⁵⁸ plus his own explanation⁵⁹ that this refers to a person with much wisdom and deeds who was want to frequent a certain company. If he was the only one found in the place of meeting, it is the same as if all were there. And if he, with his wisdom and deeds were missing, and all the rest of the company were present it is as if no one were there.⁶⁰

Another important use of the Avos de R. Nathan, as we have said, is for illustrative material. For example in commenting on the Mishnah, "Morning sleep and noonday wine and children's talk and sitting in the assemblies of the Amme' Haaretz drive a man out of the world,"⁶¹ Joseph includes⁶² sections from the Avos de R. Nathan which explain what each phrase of the Mishnah means. For example the force of the injunction against morning sleep is that man shall not sleep past the time of the recital of the Shema, for every moment that man sleeps after the recital of the Shema is being wasted when it could be spent in the study of the Torah.⁶³ And so on for the other three items.

In commenting on the phrase, "Do not be easily angered,"⁶⁴ Joseph includes a long section from the Avos de R. Nathan⁶⁵.

which contrasts the patience of Hillel to the erascibility of Shammai.⁶⁶

In commenting on the phrase, "do not rely upon your own understanding,"⁶⁷ he inserts illustrative material from the Baraitha⁶⁸ which demonstrates the superiority of the student who studies the Torah with others over him who studies alone.⁶⁹

In commenting on the phrase, "...the evil inclination... drives a man out of the world,"⁷⁰ Joseph includes a long section from the Avos de R. Nathan⁷¹ which contains Haggadic passages on the strength of the evil inclination, examples of men who were able to overcome it, and various sayings of the rabbis on the subject.⁷²

An interesting aspect of his use of this source is that sometimes in quoting the passage Joseph finds a phrase that needs clarification and adds his own comment. There are thus many passages in which he writes comments on the Avos de R. Nathan in addition to his explanations of the Mishnah. For example, in quoting the passage, "...just as he (the owner) would not wish to spread any bad report about his own property so let not anyone spread a bad report about the property of his friend,"⁷³ he finds it necessary to explain that if the purchase which someone makes from his friend is good and his (friend's) fruits are good and his property is good then he may praise them to the purchaser. However, if someone asks him about the property of his

friend which is inferior, he may not say that they are inferior, but must say: I know nothing about it.^{74.}

Another example. Joseph quotes the passage that he who does not wish to study but is satisfied that others study is an average person but that he who does not wish to study himself and does not wish others to study is a completely wicked person.^{75.} He then hastens to add his own comment that, of course, the former person is also wicked but that since he has at least one good quality about him, namely, that he permits others to study, he^{76.} can not be considered a completely wicked person.

Again, in commenting on the Mishnah, "Everyone whose deeds are more than his wisdom, his wisdom endures; and everyone whose wisdom is more than his deeds, his wisdom does not endure",^{77.} Joseph adds the passage from the Avos de R. Nathan^{78.} which is exactly the same as the Mishnah except that it includes a scriptural proof, "We will do and we will listen."^{79.} Joseph then finds it necessary to explain how the word "listen" really means the acquiring of wisdom or Torah.^{80.} Thus it is evident that in using the Avos de R. Nathan Joseph was often sidetracked from the original Mishnah into discussing side issues brought up by the quoted passage.^{81.} It may be that he allowed himself to bring in this seemingly extraneous material because he considered the Boraitha, Avos de R. Nathan, almost as important as the Mishnah itself and hence worthy of comment. At least, so it seems to me.

In spite of the fact, as has been pointed out, that Joseph used the Avos de R. Nathan mainly for additional and variant readings and for illustrative material, there is one unusual case where Joseph calls the Boraitha passage the Mishnah and uses it to disprove a comment of Maimonides. In commenting on the phrase, "Abraham was tried with ten different trials,"⁸² he gives the list of these ten trials as presented by the master⁸³ which includes the taking of Hagar to Abraham as a concubine. Joseph protests⁸⁴ this list saying the taking of Hagar was really not a trial to Abraham but to Sarah. Furthermore, he says, this list of Maimonides is contradicted by that of the Mishnah (the Mishnah, of course, does not list the trials) and then proceeds to give the list of the ten trials as presented by Avos de R. Nathan.⁸⁵ The question arises, why should Joseph refer to this passage as the Mishnah, especially as in other places he called the Avos de R. Nathan the Boraitha⁸⁶ or Tosefta?⁸⁷ It could be interpreted merely as an error, either on the part of Joseph or the scribe. It seems to me, however, that the word crept in because it was used here in the common Talmudic phrase ל'לון נ'ל'ע as an expression of the previously quoted view being contradicted by the Mishnah or Boraitha. The reason the word "Mishnah" was used by Joseph in this expression instead of "Boraitha" is that the former is much more common in this regard.

III. Use of Minor Sources.

In his introduction,⁸⁸ Joseph says that he intends to include in the Sefer Musar some of the material from "Derech Eretz Rabbah" and Z'eira de Rabbanan and Derech Eretz de ben Azai". This would make it appear as if there were three Borathos of Derech Eretz before him. Bacher believes this is merely a scribal error and that the text should read "Derech Eretz Rabbah de ben Azai and Derech Eretz Z'eira de Rabbanan".⁸⁹ His conjecture may be correct as there are in reality only two Masechtos Derech Eretz extant. The material is included in the text at the end of Perek 4.⁹⁰ The material there is taken from the texts now known to us as Derech Eretz Rabbah and Derech Eretz Zuta.⁹¹

The Derech Eretz material was not scattered through the book in various comments as was the Avos de R. Nathan material. Instead it was attached to the end of Perek 4 in one long passage. Joseph himself gives the reason for the inclusion of this material at the end of the passage, "These are the ethical sayings which we have culled from the little Borathos because they are related in subject matter to the Masechta which we have just commented on. And we have not commented on them (the Derech Eretz sayings) because they are clear in meaning."⁹²

Another question arises: why was this material inserted here at the end of Perek 4 instead of at the end of the book? Joseph also gives the reason for this arrangement, "And we

have seen fit to write them (Derech Eretz sayings) at the end of this fourth Perek and after that to begin to comment on the fifth Perek because its subject matter (Perek 5) is not the same as that of the four Perakim that have passed... and the subject matter of these sayings (Derech Eretz) is related to⁹³ that of the four preceding Perakim".⁹⁴

The mere inclusion of this material because it was related in subject matter to that of Avos shows, it seems to me, that the purpose of the Sefer Musar was not merely that of being a commentary on Avos. It was intended, rather, taking Avos as a basis, of course, to be a sort of handbook of all the ethical material in Judaism that the author could master.

There are scattered throughout the book sixteen⁹⁵ passages from the commentary on Avos of R. Isaac ben Reuben. These quotations are always acknowledged and are usually given in conjunction with another interpretation, either that of his own or that of Maimonides. R. Isaac ben Reuben is most often used as a springboard, from which, after he has been refuted, to jump off to the correct interpretation. Sometimes, however, Joseph uses R. Isaac to refute Maimonides.⁹⁷ The R. Isaac passages are used for minor comments and are not important for an understanding of the book. They are usually just a dissenting opinion dragged in. That Joseph did not have R. Isaac before him constantly when he wrote as he did Maimonides and the

Avos de R. Nathan is evidenced by the poverty of quotations from him.

In addition to the numerous Midrashim that found their way into the Sefer Musar through the Avos de R. Nathan and the few that came by way of the less adorned commentary of Maimonides, there are in all seventeen Midrashic passages which Joseph found for himself.⁹⁸ Most of these passages are from the Tanaitic Midrashim and there is only one from the Rabboth. These Midrashic passages are used for the sole purpose of furnishing illustrative material. There is, however, one instance⁹⁹ in which a Midrashic statement is used to refute an interpretation of Maimonides.

In the same way, many Talmudic passages found their way into the book through its two main sources. In addition many more were garnered by the author and used to decorate his comments with illustrative material. The sources of all these passages are indicated by Bacher in his valuable notes. The number and the range of the quotations show a thorough and wide knowledge of the Talmudic material.

There are several places in the book where the author quotes outside, non-Jewish philosophers and sages.¹⁰⁰ Many of these were quoted secondarily from the commentary of Maimonides. A few of them, however, are first hand quotations.

Chapter II - TYPES OF MINOR COMMENTS

I. Omissions of Maimonides

We have said before that Joseph tended to lengthen his comments to undue dimensions by padding them with numerous examples and rhetorical devices. In this respect he differed from Maimonides who was short, clear, direct in his writing. Maimonides went farther and did not comment at all on many of the statements which he thought self-evident. Sometimes these statements were not at all as self-evident as Maimonides thought and Joseph, in giving simple explanations of these passages, was supplying a real need.

For example, Maimonides does not comment at all on the Mishnah, "Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai had five pupils and these are they: R. Eliezer ben Horkenos, R. Jehoshua ben Hananiah, R. Jose' Ha Cohen, R. Simeon ben Nathaniel, and R. Eleazar ben Arach."¹ Joseph, however, points out very sensibly in a brief, direct, and to-the-point statement that Rabban Jochanan really had many pupils but that the Mishnah mentions only five because these were the most prominent among them.²

Again Maimonides does not comment on the phrase, "And let all who labor with the congregation labor with them for the name of Heaven. For the merit of their fathers is their support, and their righteousness standeth for ever."³ Joseph, however, explains just what is meant by working for

the name of Heaven. He adds the ethical note that the leaders of the congregation should lead the people in the right paths, restrain them from evil ways, and correct them when necessary. The purpose of the leaders should not be to get profit for themselves, to achieve rank and riches, to lord it over the congregation, or to exalt themselves, for every leader who exalts himself over the congregation is exceedingly distasteful to God.⁴ This is a good comment and one which was needed. Joseph goes ahead to explain the very obscure phrase about the merit of the fathers as referring to the merit of the original patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which supports the leaders and enables them to go on the right path. The equally obscure reference to their righteousness standing forever is explained as also referring to the merit of the patriarchs. It was put in the present Mishnah, says Joseph, to reassure those who might fear that the stock of the patriarch's merit had been used up by previous generations and that none would be left to support the present generation. For this reason God reassured the patriarchs that their merit would last for their children and their children's children to the end of all generations.⁵

There are other examples of such simple, clear, direct, and much-needed explanations of the details of the Mishnah text.⁶ It must be admitted, however, that there are many other instances in which Joseph's desire to explain every

detail of the Mishnah text leads him into some very trite, self-evident, and obvious comments. These passages are to be found particularly in connection with those sections of the Mishnah which Maimonides did not think it worth his while to bother with because of their obvious nature, or on which the master's only comment was "self-evident."

For instance, Maimonides merely wrote "evident"⁷ in connection with the phrase, "nor does a shy person learn."⁸ The meaning of the passage is, it seems to me, very evident. But Joseph goes into an explanation of the process of a bashful person's psychology which prevents him from learning as well as one who is more bold.⁹ The psychology is good but the phrase is certainly clear as it stands.

A good example of Joseph's tendency to explain the already obvious is found in his comment on the Mishnah, "More flesh, more worms; more wealth, more care; more men-servants, more theft; more maidservants, more lewdness; more women, more witchcraft; more Torah, more life; He who has acquired a good name has acquired it for himself. He who has acquired words of Torah has acquired for himself the life of the world to come,"¹⁰. Maimonides has no comment at all on this Mishnah.¹¹ He thought the meaning very clear. And so it is. But Joseph launches into an explanation of each detail which adds nothing to what is already stated in the Mishnah.¹²

Again, on the phrase, "Be first to greet every man,"¹³. Maimonides correctly has no comment.¹⁴ But Joseph feels

impelled to add the rather obvious remark that this phrase means every man, even a non-Jew.¹⁵

Again, Maimonides made no comment¹⁶ on the very clear phrase, "...the reward is great and the master of the house is urgent."¹⁷ This is very obviously just a figurative way of speaking of God and the reward he gives to the righteous. But Joseph goes into a long-winded and tedious explanation of this figure of speech.¹⁸ He evidently believed in leaving absolutely nothing to the imagination of the reader. Or perhaps he felt that the reader had no imagination. At any rate, there is nothing so tedious as a detailed explanation of a perfectly simple figure of speech. There are many other examples¹⁹ of Joseph's tendency to be tedious by attempting to explain too much.

II. Grammatical Comments

There are several instances in which Joseph dares to enter into the thorny wastes of grammar and takes it upon himself to give roots and origins of particular words. In one such foolhardy attempt²⁰ he ventures the rash assertion that the root of the word נִפְּלָה is פִּנ , "to be crushed," and that the form is a Niphal. Unfortunately however, the Niphal feminine participle of פִּנ would be נִפְּלָה and the third person feminine singular of the perfect would be נִפְּלָה .²¹ The form, then is not from פִּנ but is a somewhat irregular Niphal feminine participle from the root פִּי .²² Joseph was not far from wrong, however, as the two roots are related.

In another attempt²³ Joseph says that the root of the word **ר'צן** is **רצ**. The root, of course, is not **רצ** which means "to see" or "to spread" but **רצ**, "to float."²⁴ It is a Hiphil form from that root, the Hiphil of **רצ** would be **רצן**.²⁵

Again, Joseph confuses²⁶ the Aramaic word **ר'ו** with the Hebrew word **ר'ו**. The latter is from the Hebrew root **ר'ו** while the former comes from an entirely different root, being an Aphel form of the Aramaic word **ר'ו**.²⁷

In commenting on the phrase, "Make not thyself known to the government,"²⁸ where the word **ר'ע** is translated as government, Joseph makes a very clever and correct remark.²⁹ He connects the word **ר'ע** with the word **ר'ע** found in the Book of Ezra.³⁰ This happens to be exactly right. Both words derive from the same root **ר'ע** "to permit," "to have power."³¹

In another place³² he remarks that the word **ר'צן** may also be read **ר'צן** because the letters **ר'צן** all interchange with each other. It is true that these letters are all gutturals and weak letters and in later Hebrew often become confused with one another. In this particular case, Joseph happens to be exactly right. The word **ר'צן** is merely a variation of **ר'צן**³³ and means the same thing.

In another place, Joseph makes a rather peculiar mistake.³⁴ He says that the word **ר'צן**, "tradition" is from the root **ר'צן** "to bind". In reality it is from the root **ר'צן** "to hand

eternal

over."³⁵ Joseph was evidently led into this mistake because he considered the letter /C of the verb נָּוָה a weak letter which was dropped in forming nouns from the stem.

Joseph shows a rather deep knowledge of the formation of the Niphal conjugation in his comment on the word נָּוָה ³⁶. He remarks that in this form the doghesh in the "vav" represents an original "nun" which has become assimilated. The original form was נָּוָה . This is exactly the explanation that modern scholars give for the presence of the doghesh in the Niphal.³⁷

It becomes evident, therefore, that Joseph seemed to have had a rather considerable knowledge of grammar. What mistakes he did make were probably due, not to his own limitations, but to the limitations of his age. The study of the Hebrew language in a scientific fashion had already made considerable progress, especially in Spain and the Arabic speaking countries, by Joseph's time. But it had not yet reached its maturity. And it would be unfair to judge Joseph by the advanced standards of our age.

III. Talmudic Comments

There is another type of comment which Joseph employs that may be designated as Talmudic because it is reminiscent of some of the comments found in the Gemarra. ~~Under~~ Under this heading may be included those passages in which Joseph attempts to reconcile two seemingly variant opinions, or to explain the reasons for the order of the details of the

Mishnah, or to justify the exact reading of the Mishnah.

For instance, in commenting on the phrase, "A good eye, a lowly spirit (הלע עול) and a docile³⁸ life-force (הולל נול) are the works of the disciples of Abraham, our father."³⁹

Now Joseph raises the question: Why does the Mishnah apply the term הלע to עול and הולל to נול? Why not the opposite? Or why not have one adjective applied to both? He justifies⁴⁰ this exact reading on the grounds that the עול resides in the brain and hence the adjective הלע, "lowly," applies to it fittingly. Whereas the נול has its seat in the heart and the strength of the heat in the heart is wont to urge it after wordly things. Hence the adjective הולל which he interprets as "docile" or "weak" would apply better to the word it actually modifies in the Mishnah.⁴¹

In one Mishnah⁴² Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai is credited with calling R. Eliezer ben Horkenos a plastered cistern that never loses a drop and comparing R. Eleazar ben Arach to a full-flowing spring. Joseph explains⁴³ that by this praise is meant that R. Eliezer, the plastered cistern, never forgot anything that he learned whereas R. Eleazar, the full-flowing spring, was able to add wisdom from his own mind to that which he learned from his master. The latter is obviously a much higher degree of excellence than the former which is merely pure memory power. However the very next Mishnah,⁴⁴ which starts off with the phrase, "He used to say," and is therefore attributed to the scholar mentioned by name in the preceding Mishnah. Rabban Jochanan,

goes on to say that if all the scholars of Israel were placed in one scale of the balance and R. Eliezer b. Horkenos in the other, he would outweigh them all. Now the typical Talmudic question arises: how can both of these Mishnahs be attributed to Jochanan if in one he praises Eleazar more and in the other Eliezer more? There is a seeming contradiction here. The correct resolution of this difficulty, says Joseph,⁴⁵ lies in the fact that in the first Mishnah Jochanan was talking about mental powers and hence praised Eleazar's superior ability. But in the second he was talking about another thing entirely: good deeds and Gemiluth Hasadim. Hence he could praise a separate scholar for each of the two qualities.

Another example of this type of involved Talmudic comment is found on the Mishnah, "Seven qualities are possessed by an uneducated man and seven by a wise man. A wise man does not speak in the presence of one who is greater than he in wisdom, and does not interrupt the words of his associate, and does not hasten to reply. He questions according to the subject and answers according to rule. He speaks of the first thing first, and of the last thing last, and concerning that which he has not heard he says I have not heard. He acknowledges the truth. The opposites of these are found in the uneducated man."⁴⁶ Joseph now proceeds to get himself into the following tangle:⁴⁷ he interprets the first two qualities as being rules of behavior in relation to one's fellow-men, the next three as relating to

last two as being for him and the 3 middle ones referring to him and asks why he is put between the two

an individual's honesty. Now, Joseph asks, why shouldn't the rules relating to study come first instead of being stuck away in the middle? The answer is that the first two qualities are necessary to a pupil before he begins studying because they regulate his relations with all men and hence determine the esteem he will have in the eyes of his teachers. Next come the actual rules of study. And then finally the rules of intellectual honesty which would apply only after the pupil has gained his knowledge.⁴⁸

Besides this kind of Talmudic argument in which difficulties are set up as straw-men for the intellectual delight involved in battering them down, we find in Sefer Musar examples of another type of Talmudic comment in which individual words are squeezed dry in order to extract from them some hidden or unsuspected meaning.

For instance in connection with the Mishnah, "Samuel Ha Katan said (Prov.XXIV:7) 'Rejoice not when thine enemy fall and when he stumbleth let not thine heart be glad: (ib.18):- 'Lest the Lord see it and it be evil in his sight, and he turn away his anger (אֵלֶּיךָ) from him,'" ⁴⁹ Joseph argues ⁵⁰ that the "Vav" in אֵלֶּיךָ could not possibly refer to the wrath of God. For in all expressions of the wrath of God, some form of the verb אָנַח is used. Joseph then quotes several Scriptural citations where the expression so occurs to prove his point. Therefore the "Vav" could only apply to the one against whom the wrath was directed. The suffix would thus

Prov., he tries therefore to elaborate on what we might have meant by that distinction betw. אֵלֶּיךָ and לְךָ . - It is a homiletical explanation.

the otherwise meanings Mishna (not verse Prov.)!

-37-

have an objective and not a possessive meaning.^{51.}

After mishandling this innocent little "Vav" in a manner which would have left the original author of Proverbs gasping, Joseph proceeds to a discussion of just what is meant by the word enemy.^{52.} It obviously could not refer to a non-Jewish enemy, says Joseph, for where in Jewish literature is there any prohibition against rejoicing at the fall of a non-Jewish enemy? Joseph, by the way, does not show himself to be too tolerant here. But we can understand his attitude when we recall the experiences of his youth in Fez. Similarly, the word could not refer to a Jewish enemy, for where is it permitted to hate a Jew so much that he may be considered an enemy? The word obviously has a hidden meaning concealed in it. It refers to some one who has transgressed against one of the precepts of the Torah. If he is observed in the act by one person and there is no other witness present so that he might be brought to justice, the one who observed the act should consider the transgressor as an enemy and is permitted, nay more, it is even considered a Mitzvah, to hate him.

An example of the Talmudic argument of using a seemingly superfluous word in the text in order to extract new meaning from it is found in the comment on the phrase, "Prepare thyself to learn Torah."^{53.} Joseph mentions the interpretation given in the Avos de R. Nathan that just as it is a Mitzvah to prepare oneself to study Torah so is it

likewise a Mitzvah to prepare one's sons and pupils to study.⁵⁴ Joseph now goes on to remark⁵⁵ that the Mishnah as it is really supports this interpretation. For if the injunction were only meant to apply to one person, it would have been sufficient to say; "prepare to study Torah," a short but adequate phrase. The addition of the extra word, "thyself" is evidently meant to include something else, namely, the sons and pupils.⁵⁶

IV. Comment by Biblical Support

There are hundreds of Scriptural quotations scattered through the pages of the Sefer Musar. The author very obviously knew the Bible thoroughly and could quote from it with great facility. Many of these quotations are used to support a point made by the author or are inserted merely as illustrative material in the form of examples. There is a distinct type of comment, however, in which the author uses Biblical quotations to support the ideas of the Mishnah.

This type of comment is found in connection with the phrase, "Keep in view three things and thou wilt not come into the power of sin: know what is above thee: a seeing eye, a hearing ear, and all thy deeds written in a book."⁵⁷ Joseph gives proof for each one of the three things mentioned by means of Biblical quotations.⁵⁸ To prove the existence of the seeing eye, he quotes, "If I ascend to the heavens Thou art there; if I make my bed in Sheol, thou art there also,"⁵⁹

and "He (God) knows what is in the darkness."⁶⁰ To support the concept of the hearing ear he uses, "Then they tried God in their hearts (i.e. inwardly) by demanding food according to their desire,"⁶¹ and a passage several verses removed, "The Lord heard and became angry."⁶² The word "hearts" in the first verse is taken by Joseph to mean that God can hear even the secret meditations of a man's mind. It does not seem to matter to Joseph that, in the Biblical passage, before God is credited with hearing, there interposes a verse which says explicitly that the people spoke aloud, "And they spoke against God and said, 'Can God spread a table in the desert, etc.'"⁶³ In this type of argument, the second half of the verse often contradicts the point supposedly proven by the first half, without perturbing the one who advances the argument. It would be too much therefore to expect the commentator to be influenced by a contradiction a full verse removed. To prove the idea that all deeds are inscribed in a book, he quotes the phrase, "...blot me out of the book Thou hast written."⁶⁴

Another example of this type of comment is the use⁶⁵ of the phrase, "Is not my (God's) word like fire?"⁶⁶ to prove that the Torah may be compared to fire.⁶⁷

Probably the most important type of comment to Joseph himself was that in which he used the words of the Mishnah as the starting point for an exposition of certain philosophical ideas. These comments will be treated in detail in the following chapters.

Chapter III. THE SCHEME OF SALVATION

I. Concept of Torah

In drawing his scattered comments together and trying to construct a picture of his ideas, one finds no idea more emphasized by the author of the Sefer Musar than his concept of Torah. Of course, the very nature of the material he was working on determined this emphasis to a very large extent. For Avos by its very nature contained much material on this subject and on related ideas such as the history of tradition, service of scholars, praise of wisdom, etc. Joseph took this tendency of the book and developed it further. To him the Torah became the instrument of all man's strivings, the means by which the good life could be achieved, the source of human salvation. Such an exaltation of Torah was, of course, quite common in Jewish tradition. But, as we shall see later, Joseph following in the philosophical footsteps of Maimonides gave a new interpretation to Torah.

For his purpose of showing the Torah to be the means by which good life could be attained, Joseph was very wise in his choice of Avos to comment on. Already in the time of the Talmud, the value of Avos for the achievement of the good life was recognized. There is the famous statement, "R. Jehoudah said, 'He who would become a saint must fulfil the words of Nezikin'; Raba said, 'the words of Avos'."¹ Thus the material was well adopted for Joseph's purpose and following Maimonides he made good use of it. To him the

Torah took on the proportions of being a scheme of salvation for mankind. It was only through Torah that man could be saved in this world and achieve the eternal reward of the righteous, the world to come. In one place, Joseph says clearly that the study of the Torah leads to wisdom and the life of the world to come and the payment of the reward.²

The concept of Torah, then, had a central place in Joseph's ideas. In commenting on the phrase, "For you have no better rule than it (Torah)",³ Joseph remarks that one can find no greater thing in all the world than Torah; you eat the interest gained by its study in this world, and the principal thereof is still preserved for you in the world to come.⁴ But by Torah Joseph did not mean merely Jewish tradition. That of course was essential to the concept, but it had far wider implications and included far more than that. The concept of Torah included besides Jewish tradition, philosophy, sciences, the ethical life. There are several places in the book where Joseph defines the concept of Torah. These are very enlightening. In commenting on the phrase, "He who receives upon himself the yoke of Torah has removed from him the yoke of government,"⁵ Joseph finds it necessary to explain just what the yoke of Torah is. He maintains⁶ that it includes not only study, but the service of scholars, the pursuit of good deeds and the keeping away from sin. It is interesting that Joseph here went farther than Maimonides who defined the yoke of Torah merely as continuous study.⁷

In commenting on the phrase, "He who increases Torah, increases life,"⁸ Joseph gives an even more inclusive definition. He defines Torah here as the acquisition of wisdom and good ethical qualities and good deeds in this world.⁹ In another place, he gives as synonyms for Torah: sciences (*חכמה*) and wisdom (*חכמה*).¹⁰ And, again, for the word Torah is substituted wisdom.¹¹ And another example, in commenting on the phrase, "Turn it and turn it for all is in it,"¹² Joseph remarks that all philosophies and all sciences are contained in the Torah. Of course these detailed branches of wisdom are hidden in the Torah. And the method to extract them is hinted at in the repetition of the words, "turn it". One stands for the acquiring of the Torah as it is by verbal tradition (*מסורה*) and the other for forming conclusions from it by means of reason (*מסקנה*).¹³

The duty of man to study Torah and develop his intellect had a sort of cosmic significance for Joseph. For if man neglects the study of philosophy and science¹⁴ and the pursuit of good deeds, turns to idleness and to the desires of this world and goes after the stubbornness of his evil heart, he ruins his soul and causes it to lose the life of the world to come. And he who thus ruins his own soul is looked upon as if he destroyed the entire world. For the world was only created for the sake of man and with him the work of creation was completed; he was the purpose of all created things under the sphere of the moon.¹⁵

In fact Joseph goes so far as to say that the world was created so that man should study Torah and that man was created for the same purpose. In commenting on the phrase, "And he who does not learn deserves killing,"¹⁶ Joseph remarks the world was only created so that man could engage in the study of Torah and the acquisition of good deeds, and if man remains idle and does not indulge in study and acquire good deeds, then he is deserving of death because man was created only in order to study and get good deeds.¹⁷ It is necessary once more to point out Joseph's emphasis. The Mishnaic phrase concerned itself only with learning. Joseph widened the interpretation to include good deeds. His predilection for ethics and the good life is apparent here.

This emphasis of Joseph's on good deeds, that is, we might say, on Torah as a force motivating action is most strikingly illustrated in his comment on the statement, "There are three crowns, the crown of Torah, the crown of the priesthood, and the crown of kingship, but the crown of a good name outweighs them all."¹⁸ A good name, says Joseph, is acquired only by means of the performance of the good deeds commanded in the Torah and the avoidance of the bad deeds warned against there. A man who has wisdom and good deeds is crowned with the crown of a good name and is far more worthy than a king or high-priest or scholar without good deeds.¹⁹ Joseph's comment is not original here, being borrowed from Maimonides' passage on the same Mishnah.²⁰ But this tendency which he borrowed from Maimonides he carried

out faithfully, as we see, in all his interpretations of Torah. Of the three crowns first mentioned, however, Torah is exalted over the other two.²¹ This exaltation of Torah is also an idea borrowed from the master.²²

II. Praise of Torah

The Torah, then, as interpreted by Joseph was the greatest thing in all the world. Man must devote his life to its pursuit. In doing this he will be fulfilling the will of God. For the will of God was interpreted by Joseph as being the pursuit of knowledge and good deeds.²³ However, Joseph sought not only to show it was man's duty to follow the Torah, but tried to make him want to follow the Torah by praising it highly and making it seem desirable. One of the best ways to accomplish this purpose was to point out the advantages to be gained through Torah even in this world.

(A) Worldly Advantages of Torah

The worldly advantages to be gained by the Torah were not presented bluntly by Joseph. It was not a matter of barter: for so much study the student would receive so much material reward. In fact the thought of material reward was not to be present at all in the mind of the student. Joseph, very expressly warns against such an attitude. In commenting on the phrase, "Do not make them (the words of the Torah) a spade to dig²⁴ with,"²⁵ Joseph remarks that the Torah must never be considered a means of livelihood in the

same way that a tool is the means of livelihood of an artisan.^{26.}

Man should think only of earning enough to barely live. And even when he is engaged in business his thoughts should be only for Torah.^{27.}

Thus the purpose in acquiring Torah should never be the material advantage to be gained. And yet at the same time certain material advantages would indirectly accrue to the seeker of Torah. For instance, Joseph remarks that he who studies when he is really so busy that he has little time will gain enough merit by that act to have both the yoke of the government and the yoke of earning a living^{28.} removed from him.^{29.} Again Joseph holds out the hope of material reward to the poor man and assures him that he who fulfils the Torah when poor will be rewarded and made rich. At the same time^{30.} the rich man is warned that if he does not fulfil the Torah while he is rich he will eventually descend in the scale of worldly things and be made so poor that he will not be able to fulfil it at all.^{31.}

Finally, Joseph warns these rich men who have no Torah that their wealth will not endure. The reason he gives for this is very enlightening. Because they have no Torah, they will not live the ethical life prescribed there and thus will not be able to have just relations with men, nay more, they will be harmful to men. Therefore others will have no mercy on them.^{32.} Here again the ethical content of Torah is stressed.^{33.}

(B) Praise of Scholars

Another means employed by Joseph to stress the importance of Torah is to praise the scholars who had achieved it. In one significant passage Joseph argues that those who taught a person Torah are more to be considered his parents than his actual biological parents. Whereas the latter brought his body into the world, the former brought his soul into existence.³⁴ In a rather obvious comment on the phrase, "And drink their words (of the wise men) in with thirst,"³⁵ Joseph dwells on the words of the wise and their preciousness to man.³⁶ He even goes so far as to say that God will perform miracles for those that are engaged in the Torah for its own sake and will personally see to it that their enemies are punished.³⁷

An interesting example of this tendency of Joseph's to praise scholars is found in the comment on, "Who is wise? He who has learned from every man."³⁸ Here the tendency misleads him. The Mishnah obviously refers to learning from all men. But Joseph interprets it merely as teachers and cites the educational advantages to be gained from studying with several teachers.³⁹ In another place the idea of honoring the Torah is widened, following Maimonides,⁴⁰ to include the honoring of the scholars who spread the knowledge of it⁴¹ and the books in which it is written.⁴²

Another example of Joseph's praise of the scholars is found in the comment on the phrase, "Let the reverence for your teacher be as the reverence for heaven,"⁴³ in which he

uses the Talmudic⁴⁴ homily that the \aleph in the verse, "You shall revere the (\aleph) Lord your God,"⁴⁵ is a seemingly superfluous word admitting of extra meaning.⁴⁶ This word was added to include the reverence for scholars. The honor due to scholars was compared to the honor due to God⁴⁷ because the scholars bring the pupils to the life of the future world by teaching them Torah and good deeds.⁴⁸

(C) Praise of Means Used to Obtain Torah

The Torah is an end so much to be desired and so worthy a possession that means—in other connections thought of as bad—are justified if employed to obtain Torah. For example, presumption⁴⁹ is ordinarily a quality frowned upon in Judaism.⁵⁰ And yet, says Joseph, if the presumption is employed for gaining Torah⁵¹ it is highly to be praised and is considered a great virtue.⁵²

The Mishnah says that, "Envy...drives a man out of the world."⁵³ But Joseph remarks that this applies to envy of wealth and position. If one is envious of wisdom, the envy is highly to be praised for it will lead him to the acquisition of wisdom.⁵⁴

Controversies over material things and worldly ends are bad. But if for Torah, they are justified.⁵⁵

In connection with the Mishnah, "Be bold as a leopard and light as an eagle and swift as a gazelle to do the will of the Father who is in Heaven,"⁵⁶ Joseph narrows the interpretation of God's will to the pursuit of Torah by man. He remarks that these four qualities, which are really those of

living creatures that do not know how to distinguish between good and evil, may nevertheless be worthily employed by scholars in gaining knowledge.⁵⁷

Not only are ~~these~~ ordinarily unworthy means justified to gain the end of Torah, but certain material considerations which men usually look upon as disasters, are declared as necessary for the attainment of Torah. In connection with the phrase, "Hate mastery,"⁵⁸ Joseph quotes a passage from the Avos de R. Nathan⁵⁹ which declares that in order to learn one must be willing to undergo great privation and suffering, even to the extent of appearing foul and repulsive to mankind.⁶⁰ In another place Joseph maintains that the Torah can be gained only by one who is willing to labor hard and suffer much, perhaps even death.⁶¹ And again, Joseph follows Maimonides⁶² in quoting the Midrash⁶³ that the only Torah a man will retain is what he learned in labor and great difficulty.⁶⁴ Another formidable burden is placed upon the prospective student in that he is forbidden to speak too much with women, even with his own wife. For, remarks Joseph, even an ordinary conversation will inevitably turn to matters of sexual intercourse so that the scholar will dissipate his energies upon the body of the temptress instead of concentrating them upon words of Torah and the pursuit of good deeds.⁶⁵

These worldly disadvantages must not only be considered as necessary to the attainment of Torah, but must be accepted in gladness and with rejoicing as a sign of God's favor, for even Abraham, the beloved of God, was sorely tried by Him on

ten different occasions.⁶⁶ Adversity must by no means discourage man to leave the quest of wisdom and good deeds. For let him but remember that the adversity is but for the purpose of doubling the eventual reward.⁶⁷

III. The Reward -- or Punishment

However much the righteous seekers of Torah and good deeds suffer in this world, then, their reward in the next world is sure. There is no denying this without being considered a heretic,⁶⁸ according to Joseph. He has an interesting comment on the phrase, "Be not like servants who serve the master in order to receive a gift."⁶⁹ In this he combines a passage from the Avos de R. Nathan⁷⁰ and the comment of Maimonides on this Mishnah.⁷¹ The result indicates that the master who uttered the Mishnah, Antigonus of Socho had two pupils, Zadok and Boethus. These two misinterpreted the intention of the master who referred to a psychological attitude on the part of man, and took it to mean that there was no future world at all. This they did not dare to reveal to their pupils because of the lack of unity among them it would cause. They also did not dare to deny the Torah altogether because they feared the wrath of the populace would be loosed upon them. Therefore they took a roundabout way to achieve their purpose and claimed that only the written law was valid and that the oral law and interpretations of the rabbis were invalid and surely not given to Moses, i.e. not revealed by God, for if Moses had

received them he would have written them down just as he did the written law. In this way they founded two sects which denied the future world. Joseph points out that such a denial leads to dire consequences. For if there were no reward, there would be no profit to either Torah or good deeds and it would be just as profitable for man to follow the inclinations of his earthly desires and forsake study and good deeds altogether. For this reason, Joseph castigates these sects severely and expresses pious wishes for their utter destruction.^{72.}

There can be no denial of the future world. In commenting on the phrase, "Everything is prepared for the banquet,"^{73.} Maimonides remarks that this is to assure the payment of the reward in the future world.^{74.} Joseph quotes this interpretation and goes on to take the figure of speech in a more literal sense. Man will eat the fruits of his good deeds at the banquet in the future world but the wicked will not be allowed to attend.^{75.} The very ugliness of birth and the terror of death should lead man to seek to acquire the future world through Torah and good deeds.^{76.}

The reward is in the next world but this world and this life is the place and the time to make sure of the future. For this world is the world of study and good deeds. These prepare the rational soul^{77.} which distinguishes man from beast and cleanse it of worldly desires. Therefore, since one has only this world to prepare for the next, not one moment should be wasted, for time once gone, is irrevocably

lost. Wise men pay attention to the worldly things only insofar as they are necessary for their body.⁷⁸ After death it will be too late to think of acquiring good deeds; for the next world is devoted entirely to the payment of the reward and not to acquisition of Mitzvoh.⁷⁹ In this sense, there is no resurrection, that is man should not wait for the period of resurrection to gain his good deeds.⁸⁰

Once death comes, all chance of gaining merit ceases. But God is willing to give every opportunity ^{to man} to gain merit in life. In commenting on the passage, "The reward of a Mitzvah is a Mitzvah,"⁸¹ Joseph explains it in this sense: the reward of a Mitzvah lies in being freed from the tasks of this world so that one has the opportunity to perform another Mitzvoh and thus add to his future reward.⁸² In fact, God is willing to wait for repentance and even considers a repentent sinner as higher than a completely righteous man.⁸³ The reason for this is that the repentent sinner has tasted of sin and yet turned away from it whereas the completely righteous man has never tasted of sin. It is thus possible to cast aspersions upon his righteousness and say that if he had tasted sin he would have succumbed.

We have seen that God gives plenty of opportunity for repentance and acquisition of good deeds in this world. But once the soul leaves the body at the moment of death, the fate is sealed and the wicked receive their punishment. Joseph, in one place, pictures the moaning and mourning that the wicked indulge in when they see the good that God has stored

up for the righteous in the future and when they realize they are to be excluded.⁸⁴ In another place, Joseph remarks that the reason the wicked have security and good fortune in this world is that God does not want them to have any merit left at all in the future world so that they may suffer the more. Consequently, any reward that is due them is granted in this transitory existence.⁸⁵

Although Joseph said above that the wicked are secure in this world and are punished in the next, there are several passages in which he indicates that the wicked will suffer in this world, too. In commenting on the phrase, "Don't be doubtful of retribution,"⁸⁶ Joseph follows Maimonides⁸⁷ in explaining that the passage means that if someone saw a person commit a sin he should not only feel that the sinner will be punished in the world to come--that is taken for granted--but that he should not doubt that punishment will also come in this world.⁸⁸ In another place, he remarks that it is well known to all peoples in all times and places that one who does evil will suffer from that evil during his lifetime.⁸⁹

(A) Resurrection

There are only several passages in Sefer Musar that mention resurrection of the dead, but these few indicate clearly that Joseph himself was not convinced of the doctrine and accepted it only on force of tradition. In one passage he says clearly that from the standpoint of human

reason we can know nothing about resurrection and that it is only a traditional belief.⁹⁰ An interesting example of his avoidance of the belief is found in his comment on the phrase, "Those that are born are for death and the dead are for life,"⁹¹ where the Mishnah clearly speaks of resurrection of the dead. Yet Joseph goes out of his way to give another interpretation to the phrase-- even though his interpretation is obviously very forced. He says that this phrase refers to the fact that all living beings are formed from the four dead elements: fire, water, air, and earth.⁹² However his honesty compels him to attach a little note⁹³ in which he admits it is possible to interpret this phrase as referring to resurrection of the dead.⁹⁴

IV. The Rationalization of the Reward

Joseph maintains that the only way the payment of a future reward to the righteous and the punishment of the wicked can be justified is by a belief in the freedom of man's will. In one passage Joseph remarks that if the belief were held that man is determined in his actions there would be no sense to reward and punishment. If reward and punishment were maintained in connection with a belief in determinism, it would be a reflection on God's justice and this, of course, cannot even be considered. But man has perfect freedom in his choice of either good or evil and no force from outside leads him to choose either.⁹⁵ He refers the reader to a lengthy discussion of the matter

in another work of his which is unfortunately lost.⁹⁶ From this presentation it appears that the whole discussion assumes the aspect of a rationalization for reward and punishment.

In commenting on the phrase, "The store is open,"⁹⁷ Joseph remarks that this refers to the fact that man has it in his own power to do either good or evil, just as one may go into a store and purchase what he pleases.⁹⁸ In commenting on another phrase in the same Mishnah, "And everyone who would borrow let him come and borrow," Joseph follows Maimonides⁹⁹ in saying that in the store, which is this world, anyone may purchase whatever deeds he pleases and there is no one to force him to purchase any particular one.¹⁰⁰

Aside from these scattered references, Joseph has one long passage in which he discusses the problem in detail. This passage is found in connection with the phrase, "And dispose thyself to study Torah,"¹⁰¹ Joseph got the hint to use this passage for this purpose from Maimonides who remarked that he had explained in Perek 8 of his introduction the necessity for man to prepare himself for the Torah.¹⁰² Joseph also took the hint as to the material to be used and incorporated most of the material of Chapter 8 of the Shemonah Perakim in his comment.¹⁰³ It will be well to follow the thread of this argument through in order to see how Joseph reasoned out the problem.

He starts off with Maimonides' opening propositions.

Man is born without either virtue or vice in the same way that he does not have any skill in a particular art at birth. However it is possible that his natural predisposition at birth¹⁰⁴ may incline him towards either virtue or vice. And thus it will be easier for him to go in a certain direction. For instance if his natural constitution,¹⁰⁵ the mixture of his four humors, inclined to dryness, and the quality of his brain has little dampness, he will be able to learn easily, whereas he who inclines towards dampness and fluidity will learn with great difficulty. But these natural inclinations must not be taken in the sense of determinism. For if he who learns easily does not study he will remain ignorant. And if the second who learns only with great difficulty exerts enough effort he will become wise. Thus the natural inclinations of man only show what will be easier for him to do but in no sense determine his accomplishments.

The same holds true with all nine possible mixtures.

Here Joseph leaves Maimonides and interposes a section explaining the various combinations in a man's constitution.¹⁰⁶ The first which is the best is equidistant from the four extremes: warmth, cold, dryness and dampness. The second inclines toward warmth, the third toward cold, fourth to dryness, fifth to dampness. In these last four cases only one of the extremes is predominant. But there are four other possible combinations in which two of the extremes may

predominate: warmth and dryness, warmth and dampness, cold and dampness, cold and dryness. It is impossible that there should be such a mixture as cold and warm or dry and damp. For these are opposite extremes and if one predominates, the other is weak. There are also four humors:^{107.} blood whose nature is warm and damp; red gall, cold and dry; white gall, cold and damp; black gall, cold and dry.

Here Joseph again takes up the thread of Maimonides' argument.^{108.} He points out that absolutely no attention should be paid to the nonsensical and stupid theory that the constellation which is in the ascending at the time of a man's birth determines the future of his life; whether he will be righteous or wicked, rich or poor, and that nothing he does can alter the fate decreed by the stars. This belief is absolutely false. However the things that our scholars have taught are absolutely true and are in agreement with the conclusions of non-Jewish investigators. These are that man is absolutely free to do as he pleases, but that it is easier for him to act in accordance with the inclinations of his natural constitution.

Joseph now offers a number of arguments for free will taken from Maimonides.^{109.} First, if there were no free will, there would be no sense to the Torah and the discipline of wisdom. For the purpose of the Torah is to influence man's acts. Secondly, if there were no free will, if man were merely forced to do what he did, there would be no sense to reward and punishment. Why should a man be punished for

murder or adultery if his actions were forced upon him from above? Thirdly, if there were no free will there would be no sense to the precautionary measures that man takes such as building houses, preparing clothes to wear, using medicine when sick, or shields in war. For if his fate were determined in advance, nothing that he did could alter the decree.

Anyone that believes in this strict determinism denies God and destroys the foundation that the Torah is constructed upon, namely, that man has free will to do as he pleases. He follows Maimonides in interpreting the verse "See I have set before thee this day life and good, death and evil,"¹¹¹ as referring to freedom of the will. Consequently, it is just for God to grant rewards and exact punishments; and it is logical for the Torah to command certain precautionary measures such as the building of battlements for the roof, of a house in order to prevent someone falling off, etc.

All of man's movements are likewise in his own power, resting in two powers of the soul:¹¹² desire, and sensation which aids desire.¹¹³ But all things which are a part of man's physical nature, i.e., whether he is handsome or ugly, tall or short, and all qualities which are a peculiarity of the species of man, such as his walking on two legs, are not in man's power. Also all physical phenomena of nature, (i.e., such as the descent of the rain) are not in man's power.

There is a widely accepted theory that all of man's

movements are controlled by God.¹¹⁴ This is true only in one respect. For instance, if a man throws a stone into the air and afterwards it falls back to the earth, the throwing of the stone is in the power of man to whom God has given the strength to perform this act, and the falling back to earth is in accordance with the will of God. Earth being by nature heavy tends to fall back and fire being light tends to rise. It is true that these natures of earth and fire were created by God. But it is not true that God wills every particular bit of earth to fall or every particle of fire to rise. At the time of creation God gave these elements their natures and after that they act accordingly.

Joseph then goes ahead¹¹⁵ to deny the theory of the Muta¹¹⁶kallimum that every existent thing is renewed continuously in accordance with a specific act of God's will and that if He would will that fire should not burn or that a sword should not cut it would not. So every accident of matter, like color, is renewed at every instant in accordance with the will of God. Joseph says this denies the evidence of the eyes and the senses.

The Jewish idea¹¹⁷ is that God created the nature of all things at the time of the six days of creation and that after that all things happen and act in accordance with their own nature. Even miracles, which seemingly require a direct act of God's will and deviate from the natural course of events, were planned at the time of creation. There is no miracle that was not planned then.

In the same way,¹¹⁸ God planned and created the nature of man during the six days of creation. And thus it is a part of God's will that man as a species arises and sits and moves and rests. But no particular act of any particular man is controlled by God. He merely created the nature of man. After that not one single act of man's is controlled by Him. In this respect the species of man is unique in the universe. Now, since man controls his own actions, the Torah was given to him to influence him to act in a certain way. Bad actions are not a part of man's nature, such as his height, and if he chooses he may depart from them.

Joseph, still following Maimonides in the Shemonah Perakim, Chapter 8, now takes up Biblical passages which seem to indicate that God decreed that men should commit sins. For instance, from the verse, "And they (the Egyptians) will make them (the Israelites) serve, and they will afflict them,"¹¹⁹ it might seem that since God forced the Egyptians to commit the sin He should not have punished them at the time of the Exodus.¹²⁰ However this interpretation is wrong. The verse means merely that God knew that the coming generation of Egyptians would have some righteous and some wicked among it. However this knowledge did not force any individual Egyptian to act wickedly. If he did so it was only of his own free will. The Egyptians, themselves, wished to oppress Israel and, therefore, God was justified in punishing them.

There then follows a series of examples from the Bible¹²¹.

which seem to indicate that God forced men to commit sins, such as his hardening the heart of Pharoah so that he refused to let Israel go. However in all these cases this very act of the prevention of the exercise of man's free will by God was in itself a punishment for former misdeeds. God has many ways of punishing man, even in this world. And one of them is the prevention for a time of the action of his free will so that his punishment may be increased. This is a very subtle point. The punishment does not come for the act committed while the will is suspended. That, of course would be unjust on the part of God. But the punishment is for misdeeds already committed and the suspension of the will is in itself a part of the punishment.¹²²

Joseph leaves Maimonides at this point and strikes out on an explanation of how God knows of possible things whether they will or will not come to pass.¹²³ All things, says Joseph, are divided in two categories: necessarily existent or non-existent things¹²⁴ and possibly existent or non-existent things.¹²⁵ The first category is divided into things that are necessarily existent or non-existent forever and things that are necessarily existent or non-existent for a time and after that possibly existent or non-existent. This second division of things are not predictable because in the future they are only possibilities and it is beyond our knowledge that we may know them with any certainty. However, the first division, those that are necessary forever, are not

so. They may be known with certainty. For instance, the various qualities of man, his ability to procreate, to laugh, to do work, are qualities that last all his life. The fact that sickness may impair one of these abilities does not change the truth of the statement. The sickness is just like a veil that shuts off the light even though it exists. Thus we say attributes are never separated from substance, i.e., warmth from fire, coldness from water, etc. Examples of necessarily non-existent things are found in the fact that the dead do not have life, nor the four elements sensation.

Possibly existent things are divided into two parts. The first consists of those possibilities which are equal, as, for example, whether a newly born child will live long or die young, be wise or foolish. The second consists of probabilities, in which our knowledge inclines us to one in preference to the other of two possibilities, either in a positive or negative fashion. For example we are more inclined to believe that there will be rain on any particular day during the rainy season, but that there will be no rain on any particular day during the dry season.

Joseph now enters into a discussion¹²⁶ of the possibility of man's knowing these forms of existence. Man may know both necessary and possible existences in the past or present. Because his knowledge may be substantiated. However, as for the future, man cannot determine exactly what will happen in the case of possible existences, whether they will

continue to exist or not. This is not due to any fault of man's knowledge; there is nothing man can do to improve his knowledge of them. For by their nature as possibilities it is impossible to determine what will happen to them. They are beyond the range of man's comprehension.

In the case of necessary existences which never change,^{127.} man is able to predict the future with certainty. And our lack of knowledge of the future of this type of existence is not due to any inherent fault of its nature but to man's own lack of knowledge. For these necessary existences are always the same whether we know them or not. This principle holds true with respect to such propositions as: all existent things have as their essential part the four elements, of them were they made up and into them do they disintegrate, as explained in physics;^{128.} the two sides of a triangle together are longer than the third side,^{129.} and the diagonal of a quadrangle is longer than any side, as explained in geometry;^{130.} the sphere of the sun is 147 times greater than the sphere of the earth as explained in astronomy; angels are not body but pure spirits as explained in metaphysics.^{131.} These are always the same and if man does not know them it is only because of his own lack of knowledge.

The things that man prepares against to protect him from danger and the things that he does to gain good from, fall into the category of possible things about which he cannot know the future. Therefore it is correct for him to make this effort.¹³²

However, God knows these possible things in the future just as He knows necessary things. There is no difference to him.¹³³ That we do not know these possible things is due to the deficiency of our comprehension which is unable to grasp them. Our ignorance of them is like our ignorance of those axiomatic and philosophic truths before we learned them.¹³⁴ If we say that God does not know these possibilities exactly in the future, then we are saying that God's knowledge is no better than man's. Anyone who believes this denies the Torah. For there are many verses which say explicitly that God knows the future exactly.¹³⁵

The apparent contradiction between this foreknowledge of God and man's free will is explained away by means of a logical trick. Whenever something is arranged logically in one's mind, in a syllogism, the conclusion of the syllogism necessarily and logically follows from the two premises. But the actual truth of the fact or thing stated in the conclusion is not proven by the logical arrangement. This depends on the truth of the premises, and not on the necessity of the conclusion following from the premises.

For example, in the syllogism: fruits which have the shape of birds and the signs of Levitical cleanliness exist in the world; everything which exists in the world is true; therefore these birds are true--in this syllogism the conclusion necessarily follows from the combination of the two premises in the middle term (existence).¹³⁶

But the truth of these birds does not follow. Because we have not established the truth of the two premises. We know that the second premise--everything that exists in the world --is correct, but we do not know about the first premise --that such birds exist. We are only saying, imagine that they exist.¹³⁷ Thus the actual truth of a fact or thing is different from its necessarily following in a logical formulation.

Thus when we say¹³⁸ that God knows a certain person will be righteous or wicked, he will really be so, because this truth is founded on the essential logic of his behavior. It is not founded on God's forcing him to be either. Man has free will to do whatever he will choose to do but even before birth God knows what choice he will make. Therefore this knowledge of God does not remove man's free will. God merely knows what man, of his own volition, will choose. God's knowledge is this logical knowledge. He figures out what man will do.

The question now arises:¹³⁹ can man at a later time act contrary to the foreknowledge of God? He cannot, not because God prevents him, but because his own nature and desires will lead him to the path predicted, although it was possible that he could have done the opposite. It is true that the two paths were possible alternatives, but God knew the choice man, by his very nature, would make. Thus it is correct for God to have reward and punishment. For, although the knowledge

of the truth of what will come to pass from possible alternatives in a sense causes their existence, it is not in the same necessary, inevitable fashion that the conclusion follows in a syllogism.

So much for the reconciliation offered by the non-Jewish philosophers.¹⁴⁰ Joseph now turns back to Maimonides and follows the argument presented by him.¹⁴¹ It is explained clearly¹⁴² in metaphysics that God does not know with a knowledge that is separate from Him, nor live with a life that is outside His essence, as man knows with a separate knowledge. If God knew with a separate knowledge, and lived with a separate life, there would be no unity to God, but He would be many. This is a false idea. He and His attributes¹⁴³ are one. He is His attributes and His attributes are He. The reason for this, says Joseph, following Maimonides, are too deep and complicated to be gone into now. In consequence of this principle, the Hebrew language does not use the expression חַיִּי ה' (the life of God) as it does the phrase חַיִּי פַּרְוֹה¹⁴⁴ (the life of Pharoah) where the construct relationship would indicate that the life and God were two separate things, the first, attribute, and the second substance. To avoid this misunderstanding that God and His attributes are separate, Hebrew uses חַיִּי ה' ¹⁴⁵ (God lives) to demonstrate that He is His life, and His life He.

Another principle of metaphysics¹⁴⁶ is that our (man's) knowledge is too limited to reach a full understanding of God's knowledge,¹⁴⁷ in the same way that our sight is too

weak to see clearly the full power of the sun's light. And this is a Kal V'Homer argument.¹⁴⁸ If our eyes are too weak to grasp the light of the sun which is only a creation of God, how much the more is our soul too weak to reach a knowledge of God who has created the soul.¹⁴⁹

Joseph now quotes a Midrash¹⁵⁰ which demonstrates that even the angels which are pure spirit cannot reach a full knowledge of God. How much the less can man. And even if we could reach a full knowledge of these attributes of God, we would not be able to bear the knowledge. It is therefore best for man not to attempt to reach these things. We know that God exists and knows but the form of His existence is beyond us. Even the inhabitants of the future world and the angels can't reach this knowledge.

Thus the reconciliation of God's foreknowledge and man's freedom of will is too big a problem for man to handle because he cannot reach an understanding of God's knowledge. The problem remains one of the mysteries of metaphysics.

Joseph says that he enlarged this comment¹⁵¹ because of the great importance of the principle contained in it. The whole concept of Torah depends on the freedom of the will. Man has complete freedom to do as he pleases but the study of the Torah helps him to choose the right path. The study of Torah in this world leads him to the life of the next world. The principle of free will is not only a religious principle but is proven by philosophy also.

There are several minor passages which refer to problems discussed in the long passage above. In one passage,^{152.} following Maimonides,^{153.} Joseph remarks that certain aspects of man's life such as his birth, death, and the granting of reward and punishment, are beyond man's power, but all his deeds and movements are within his power.

In another passage,^{154.} following Maimonides,^{155.} Joseph remarks that the ability of man to learn quickly is an inherent part of his nature dependent upon the quality of his brain. Therefore such a man is called wise (Hocham) and not pious (Hasid). In other words, quickness of comprehension is an intellectual quality and has nothing to do with man's ethical effort. The same applies to the opposite quality, slowness of comprehension. Since these qualities are inherent in man and nothing he does can change his capacity to learn there is no moral stigma attached to dullness, as there is to the susceptibility to anger, for instance, which is also an inherent quality but which can be changed by man's effort.

In connection with the reconciliation of miracles with the concept of the unity of nature (that every event has natural causes; it is not caused by a separate act of God's will) Joseph follows Maimonides^{156.} in another passage^{157.} in maintaining that the nature of things was fixed by God during the six days of creation and that their nature never changes after this. Any event which subsequently seemed to

depart from the natural order of things and consequently was regarded as a miracle was already ordained by God at that time. He then quotes a Midrashic passage which indicates¹⁵⁸ that God had made conditions with the sea at the time of creation that in the future its waters would be split.¹⁵⁹

And finally Joseph points out¹⁶⁰ that only those few people who have conquered their inclination for evil¹⁶¹ and this-worldly things can really be called free. And they alone shall inherit the world to come. The rest are slaves of their worldly desires which will cause them to lose the reward they could have gained through good deeds.

Thus the concept of Torah, and the ideas related to it, was the main point in Joseph's philosophical ideas. The Torah gave man a pattern for life in this world and ushered him into the glories of the future world. It was a complete way of life in itself, as interpreted by Joseph; it was to be regarded as higher than anything else the world contained. It is even more important than one's own wife or parents.

And yet in spite of this high concept of Torah, it was not to be regarded as closed to criticism and evaluative reflection. In an interesting passage,¹⁶² Joseph maintains that there are three things one must do to be the master of a system such as the Torah: (1) learn its fundamental principles, (2) learn its details and rules, (3) defend it from attack. The third is the greatest because it only by hearing

opposing arguments that one can test his own system.
Anyone who does not believe in this third point is
called a gullible fool.

Chapter IV. PRACTICAL AIDS TO SALVATION

I The Golden Mean

Within the scheme of salvation, man may achieve particular virtues by application of the theory of the golden mean. Thus if the range of conduct between haughtiness and self-abasement may be imagined as a straight line the virtue would be in the middle.¹ This idea was taken from the Shemonah Perakim of Maimonides and from the Hilchos Deothth of the Mishneh Torah which contains some of Maimonides' so-called "golden mean" writing.

In one long passage^{1a} devoted to the healing of souls Joseph coordinates his scattered borrowings from Maimonides into a united section. The ancients maintained² that the soul may be healthy or diseased just like the body. The soul is healthy when its condition and that of its faculties³ is such that it performs good deeds. It is diseased when the opposite holds true. The body, however, is healthy⁴ when its condition is such that the soul may perform its functions completely, whether good or bad. There is no ethical significance to the functions of the body. The art of healing bodies is that of the physician. But healing souls is also an art and its practitioners are called kings.⁵

Now, just as those who are sick in body⁶ have their normal sensations perverted and taste bitter as sweet and

sweet as bitter, and long for loathsome foods, so do those who are sick of soul have the ethical dispositions of their heart disturbed and hate what is good and righteous and desire evil deeds. In such a diseased state there is no longer any moral discrimination left to them. Just as physically sick persons consult physicians and receive treatment, so should the morally sick consult the healers of the soul, the sages. And in precisely the same way that the sick of body who do not pay any attention to their physicians die, so are the sick of soul who neglect the advise of their physicians excluded from the future world.

The way to cure these sick souls that have inclined away from the mean to either of the two extremes, the "too much" and the "too little",⁷ is to estimate how much they have left the mean and in which direction and to cause them to incline the same amount in the other direction. This resembles the cure of physicians, who, if they find a patient whose health has been disturbed by an unbalancing of his physical equilibrium one degree to the extreme of warmth, give him medicines of a cold nature which will bring him back to the middle path; then when they have his physical condition balanced properly, they give him other medicines which will keep him on the middle path. These two same steps must be taken in curing sick souls. For example,⁸ if one were too prone to anger, he should be advised to practice the utmost humility and patience until

anger is utterly rooted out of his soul. If he were too haughty, he should practice self-abasement until all haughtiness disappears and the middle path is reached.^{9.}

There are some of these middle paths in ethics, which, although they were righteous ways,^{10.} were forsaken by the extremely pious for the sake of the extreme of the "too much". Such was the behavior of Moses who was not only humble, but exceedingly so. And in the case of other virtues it is better sometimes to be just a little on the right side of the middle path in order to make it harder to go the wrong way. This is known as staying within the strict letter of the law.^{11.}

Some might be misled^{12.} by the extreme asceticism of some of the pious who fasted long, refrained altogether from sexual intercourse, lived as hermits, etc., and consider this type of behavior as the correct type instead of the middle way as advocated above. But the pious took these extreme measures either as a means of restoring the health of their souls, because they had previously gone to the other extremes, or as a precautionary measure so that they would not fall into the evil ways of the people about them. The ordinary person must not use such extreme methods. It would be as dangerous for him as the use of dangerous drugs for the medical layman. Therefore, for all ordinary people, all forms of asceticism is severely condemned.

In fact, the Torah, in all of its laws, both positive and negative, has as its purpose these middle paths in ethics

and life. For example,¹³ the Torah does not say in an extreme fashion: do not eat any creature possessing life. But it moderately allows certain animals to be eaten and prohibits others. It then hedges in this permission with certain regulations about the slaughtering of the animals, etc. And thus the rest¹⁴ of the laws of the Torah will be found to point to this middle path.

The Torah does not intend man to be too extreme in his ethical behavior. Let him follow the laws laid down. They will be enough to make him a pious man. Joseph then quotes the remarkable statement attributed to R. Iddai, "Do not what the law prohibits enough for you that you must take on yourself additional prohibitions".¹⁵

Thus the mean is the rule for the ethical behavior of man. And just as man watches his physical condition and whenever anything is wrong seeks to cure it, so should he be on the lookout for moral diseases in himself. No man is perfect, in this sense of having all his qualities on the middle path, and so every man needs the type of cure described here.

A. Imitatio Dei

Some of the same material is repeated in Joseph's comment on the Mishnah, "Upon three things the world stands, on truth, on judgment, and on peace."¹⁶ Joseph interprets the word peace as meaning the exact balancing of the ethical qualities. He then proceeds¹⁷ on the basis of unacknowledged

quotations¹⁸ from the Mishnah Torah to treat much of the same material found above. The one new point necessary to discuss here is the idea of Imitatio Dei. God is described by many attributes: holy, merciful, compassionate, etc., so that man may follow in His footsteps and try to imitate His behavior.¹⁹ Joseph remarks that anyone who wishes to have all these qualities become a part of him must practice them constantly until they become easy for him to do.

B. Anger

Anger was looked upon by Joseph as an especially bad example of the departure from the middle path. In his comment on, "Don't be easily angered,"²⁰ Joseph first gives a long passage from the Avos de R. Nathan²¹ containing excellent illustrative material on the ugliness of anger and the praiseworthiness of humility. He then explains²² anger as a departure from the middle path. Man should never get angry except over a very important matter.²³ Anger will cause a person to be hated by his fellow-men so that he will not be able to get along in the world. Thus this extreme type of behavior is of the worst possible consequences to the world. A hot temper can even destroy the wisdom of the wise, the prophecy of the prophet.²⁴ A person²⁵ with a hot temper is as bad as an idolator.²⁶

C. Study

The "golden mean" or middle path applies even to the study of the Torah.²⁷ One should not feel that he has to learn everything so that he wears himself out, destroys his

strength, and dulls the keenness of his mind. Nor, on the other hand, is one permitted to abstain from study altogether. The correct procedure is to follow the middle path, neither too much or too little. Most of one's time should be devoted to Torah, but a small portion of it may be used for satisfying the needs of the body. If, however, one goes to the extreme of piety and is able to disregard the needs of his body, without injury to himself, and study all the time---naturally his reward will be increased in the world to come.

In connection with study, it must also be mentioned that Joseph felt²⁸ that the knowledge of all the philosophies and sciences in the world would be of no avail to an individual unless he followed the middle path in deeds. For he would not be fulfilling what his study urged him to do. Whereas an individual who had not studied at all but who had always kept close to the mean in his behavior would really know more than the former learned individual. For he would be fulfilling the purpose of the study.²⁹

There are really three parts to doing good deeds: (1) to know how to do them oneself, (2) to teach and influence one's intimates to do them, (3) to do as much as one can to teach and influence all of Israel to do them. The first man who had merely studied but had not accomplished these three parts is much lower in value than the one who had not studied but acted righteously.

The objection might be raised that study is really more important than deeds because if one did not learn he would

not know how to go about performing good deeds. Several rabbinic statements are now quoted to show that study must precede good deeds and is more important than good deeds. The answer to this objection is: it is true that from one angle study is more important than good deeds. It is the cause of good deeds and the cause, by its very nature, precedes that which is caused. From another angle, deeds are more important because they support study by disciplining the desire for worldly things and preventing ~~the~~ ^{one} from becoming so immersed in the affairs of the body that the individual will not be free to study. And furthermore study is not absolutely essential for the performance of good deeds. It is not necessary that one learn before acting. One may live and act righteously merely by following the example of people round about him. Thus before one learns the reasons for performing good deeds, the habit of performing them can be firmly established in him. Torah may be more important than deeds; but deeds should precede Torah in the order of their acquisition.

Thus, his ethical system of the Torah was not merely a matter of theory to Joseph. He stressed the practical results of the Torah very highly. In another passage³⁰ he treats those who speak a lot but do nothing. If a man praises the commandments and the righteous ones who performed them, he also is obligated to perform good deeds. The Torah in his hands must not be as a shade tree which produces no fruits, but his Torah must be as a tree which produces the numerous

fruits of good deeds. These deeds must go along with the study. They are the end to which study was pointed. And Joseph uses the striking statement, "Words are only pleasant when they come out of the mouths of those who practice what they preach,"³¹ to clinch his point. The pursuit of the Torah was not to be just a barren intellectual pastime, a cloistered study for the select few with no relationship to life. The Torah was to result in the full and righteous life of man, guided by the rule of the "golden mean" in his actions.

II. Physiology and Psychology

In an interesting passage,³² Joseph points out that anyone who allows harm to come to his body really harms his soul also and will thus be prevented from studying Torah. The reason for this is that the organs of the body are the instruments of soul. And the soul, to function to its best advantage, must have healthy, perfect instruments. The science of medicine is therefore very important. It keeps the instruments of the soul in a healthy condition.

This is a very revealing passage. It sums up beautifully Joseph's views on the subject. The health of the body was very important, to be sure, but not for its own sake. The purpose of a healthy body is to insure the unhampered functioning of the soul so that the virtues and good deeds commanded by the Torah, the "golden mean" in ethical behavior, might be acquired.³³ For this reason, Joseph has several passages in the Sefer Musar in which he

goes into the details of physiology and psychology. Man, knowing more about his body and the functioning of his soul, might be better able to keep them in good condition. We have already considered his passage on the healing of souls in the section on the "Golden Mean". The others, in resume, follow.

In his comment on the phrase, "And let all thy actions be for the sake of Heaven,"³⁴ Joseph gives a long passage³⁵ explaining how this may be brought about. Much of the material of Perek 5 of the Shemonah Perokim is incorporated in his comment. First of all it is necessary to keep all of the faculties of one's soul subordinate to the yoke of heaven. Consequently the sole purpose in performing his various bodily functions, movements, speech, etc. should be to attain this end. The end in view in his bodily activities is to keep the body healthy, and the purpose of keeping the body healthy is to enable the soul to have sound instruments with which to work. For the organs of the body are only instruments of the soul.

Here Joseph, following Maimonides, gives advice on the care of the body.³⁶ One should eat only for the benefit of the body, even if the food or drink happens to be distasteful; the sole purpose of eating should not be enjoyment. One should not eat too heavily;³⁷ too much food is a burden on the stomach. Nor should one sleep too much; it prevents him from studying. Too much exercise is not good; a little exercise before meals is all right but it is best to rest

after meals.

Joseph now recommends some methods of bodily cure. For instance if the condition of one's body is two degrees away from the mean towards the extreme of coldness, medicine (warm in nature) should be given him which will counter-balance the defect. Pleasant foods may help one whose appetite is deficient.³⁸ If one's black gall predominates in him so that he becomes melancholy and timid, pleasant music, clothes, food, and enjoyable sights may help. The purpose of all this is to restore the soul's health. Likewise, in the acquisition of wealth, man's purpose should be the health of his body, the pursuit of wisdom, and the giving of charity.

From the above it is evident that the science of medicine and the knowledge of the body is an important way of serving God.³⁹ It keeps the body healthy and enables the soul the better to serve God.

God attached pleasure⁴⁰ to each of the functions of the body so that they should be performed. Thus there is the pleasure in eating so that the body may gain new strength from the food, the pleasure of sexual intercourse so that the species may be preserved. If it were not for the pleasure attached to intercourse no one would wish to indulge in the act because of its repulsive nature.

The art of healing is much more valuable than other arts such as weaving, agriculture, etc. These latter are mere

manual labor, but healing has certain ethical connotations to it. It prevents a man from harming his body by giving in too much to his bodily desires. Anyone who is a slave to his bodily desires is no better than an animal. Thus medicine helps to elevate man. The wise person, in whom reason is predominant rules over his bodily desires, satisfying them only insofar as they are necessary to his health. Such a person expends most of his energy in a pursuit of wisdom and good deeds.

Such a wise person⁴¹ may be called one of the sons of God, that is, he goes in God's ways and is considered on a par with the angels. Just as the angels have no body, so he pays only as much attention to the body as is necessary. This does not mean that abstinence is good. A certain measure of bodily satisfaction is necessary for health. But health is not the end. It is only a means to the more complete attainment of Torah and good deeds.

Just as all man's physical activities must be for the sake of Heaven, so must all his intellectual.⁴² The study of the various types of wisdom is good for it sharpens the mind. For example the five sciences of arithmetic, geometry, music, optics,⁴³ and the science of the movement of heavy bodies,⁴⁴ sharpen the faculties of the soul so that it can learn better. And then there is the science of logic⁴⁵ which enables man to distinguish between true and false, to test proofs, and to prevent error.⁴⁶ Joseph uses a Biblical verse to prove that the use of logic has scriptural authority.⁴⁷ After one

I have been treated!
78 f.)

has mastered these branches of wisdom he may study physics and metaphysics. The latter of which will enable him to reach somewhat of the knowledge of God.⁴⁸ Thus all man's intellectual activity has as its goal the "sake of Heaven".

In a similar fashion⁴⁹ all the words a man utters should be for matters that will help his physical condition, or matters related to study and good deeds.

If a man has this as his ideal and purpose in life he will not waste his energies in many of the trivialities of the world, like building a beautiful home, eating rich foods and the like. He will be satisfied with the humblest station in life and concentrate his efforts on work for the sake of Heaven.

Still following Maimonides, Joseph hastens to add that luxuries and this-worldly things are all right in their place, that is, if they are used merely for the purpose of refreshing tired minds and jaded bodies. These material pleasures can be used advantageously to support the will to study and are thus useful.

If one is able to reach a stage in which this rule is carried out conscientiously⁵⁰ he will attain to the high degree of prophesy. He is really no longer one of the sons of man but rather one of the sons of God. But there are very few in any generation who can achieve so high a degree in the ethical scale. Nevertheless, the rule, "Let all your deeds be for the sake of Heaven," is a good one for man to follow, even when he is performing his bodily functions.

In a long passage⁵¹. explaining the difference between the life-spirit and the soul⁵². Joseph goes into certain medieval physiological and psychological concepts in great detail. The life-spirit which is really a light body goes out from the heart to the organs of the body by means of veins or channels.⁵³. The function of this life-spirit is to keep these channels in motion bringing cold air into the body and expelling the warm air. This is the process of life in man. There are two cavities in the heart, both having blood and life-spirit in them. The one on the right, however, has more blood. There are two big channels leading from the left cavity. One goes to the lungs and draws in the cold air which has come there by way of the throat. The cold air is kindled into warmth in the heart by means of the life-spirit. When the heart contracts, the spoiled mist⁵⁴. formed by the warmth in the heart goes out through a channel to the windpipe and so out through the nose. The mouth⁵⁵. never ceases bringing in cold air and expelling warm air in order to keep the heat in the heart going. It works like a bellows.

The second channel⁵⁶. leading from the left cavity of the heart is divided into two parts. One goes to the top of the body and divides into many branches in order to bring the life-spirit to the head. The second accomplishes the same purpose for the lower part of the body. The process of life is kept going by this life-spirit. The proof for this is the fact that it ceases at the moment of death. This is

*Details here were
necessary!*

also shown by the movements of the belly and mouth in breathing which cease at the moment of death, the time when the life-spirit departs.

This life-spirit is found in all animals, but the soul is found in man alone.⁵⁷ Its seat is in the brain. The channel or vein going to the head from the left cavity of the heart divides into many branches and is woven into a covering for the brain. The brain itself is divided into two parts, one towards the front of the head, the other toward the back of the neck. The front half of the brain is divided in two; the two parts reach as far as the cavity in the middle of the brain, called the fissure.⁵⁸ The back part of the brain has only one cavity which reaches the one in the middle of the brain.

This middle fissure of the brain joins the two front cavities to the one in the back. The little veins or channels, which carry the life-spirit, bring it from the network on the brain into the brain by way of the two frontal cavities. From there it moves into the middle fissure where it is purified into a different kind of life-spirit than what it was when it left the heart. From there it passes into the cavity in the back part of the brain. There is a part of the brain shaped like a worm which moves up and down in the middle fissure, opening it when arising and closing it when descending. When the fissure is open the life-spirit from the two front cavities goes to the back cavity. This process goes on when memory occurs. Memory depends on the

*This detailed anatomy
is not relevant here!*

speed of this process. Thus in order to aid memory a man raises his head up so that the fissure might be opened. Thought and concentration, on the other hand, depend on the life-spirit in the front cavities. Thus to aid these processes, one looks down to keep the fissure closed and thus prevent the life-spirit from leaving. The person in whom the life-spirit is purified to a high degree by its stay in middle fissure will be quick, sharp, and clever.

The life-spirit, then, is found in four different places⁵⁹ in the head: in the two front cavities, the middle fissure and the back cavity. The faculty of imagination⁶⁰ is connected with the life-spirit in the two front cavities; the faculty of memory with its presence in the back cavity.

Seven pairs of nerves⁶¹ lead out from the brain. The first leads to the eyes and performs the function of sight.⁶² The second goes to the eyelids and causes them to open and shut. The third to the tongue giving it the sensation of taste. The fourth to the palate. The fifth to the ears, giving them the sensation of hearing. The sixth, to the belly and entrails, and a little of it to the windpipe. The seventh also goes to the tongue but gives it the power of movement. If any one of these nerves is injured the sensation or function of the corresponding organ is injured or destroyed. These seven pairs of nerves serve the life-spirit in the brain as tools for accomplishing its purpose of life. There are, however, many varying opinions on this subject, says Joseph, too numerous to be mentioned in this

connection.

There is a large thick fibre⁶³ with a white covering which issues from the third part of the brain toward the back of the neck and goes down through the vertebrae of the spinal column. Pairs of nerves radiate from each side of this fibre between the vertebrae. There are thirty-one such pairs of nerves and one extra. These nerves control the movements of the hands and feet and the rest of the body. The end of each one of these nerves is joined to a body⁶⁴ made up of three elements: flesh, nerve and the matter that connects the various bones. Each limb and organ has a separate kind of body like this and it is here that man controls the movements of his various parts with his will.

Mental diseases are caused by injuries to the cavities in the two front parts of the brain or to the middle fissure. Examples of various types of these diseases are given.⁶⁵

The soul having its seat⁶⁶ in the brain is contrasted to the life-spirit which has its seat in the heart. But the principle of action⁶⁷ of the soul is in the life-spirit. The life-spirit perishes with the flesh but the soul is eternal.

Joseph now gives his definition of soul: a substance completing a created body which has potential life.⁶⁸ He then comments on each word to explain what he means more thoroughly. The soul is called a substance in order to distinguish it from accidents; the substance tells the truth of a thing. "Completing" is used to show that the soul

bestows functions; matter does not give functions: a knife does not cut because it is metal (matter) but because it is sharp (form). "Created body" is used to distinguish the body of man which was created by God from anything made by man. The soul performs the functions of man's body in the same way that a captain directs the movements of a ship but it does not perish with the body. The soul is not contained in the substance of the body; it is apart from it and uses the body only as a workman uses tools. "Which has potential life" is ^{types} used to distinguish the body of man from other_A of matter like gold and silver which can never have life.

Having explained the concepts of life-spirit and soul separately, Joseph now compares the two.⁶⁹ The former is a body (matter) the latter spirit; one is contained in the body, the other not; one perishes with the body, the other, although its functions stop with death, is eternal. The life-spirit performs the functions of movement, sensation, etc., under the directorship of the soul. It is a second cause, closer to the body than the soul which is a first cause.

Man is composed of three different types of matter: dry, like the bones, veins or channels, and nerves; wet, like the four humours; and the life-spirit in the heart, brain, and nerves. The powers of the soul are dependent on the proper mixture and balance of these various parts of the body. There are three degrees of the life-spirit: the first,

that found in the heart, which controls breathing and the movements of the veins or channels; the second, that found in the front part of the brain, which controls the five sensations and the power of imagination; the third, that found in the middle fissure and back part of the brain, which controls thought and memory.

There are really three divisions to the soul.⁷⁰ The first is the power of growth.⁷¹ It has its seat in the liver where food is digested and assimilated until it turns into blood and replenishes that which is lost to the body because of the heat within and without.⁷² The second power is shared by all living things but is not found in plants. Its seat is in the heart and it controls motion and sensation. The third power is the rational soul⁷³ whose seat is in the cavities of the brain.

This picture of psychology, of course, was not original in any way with Joseph. It is an example of medieval psychology based on the Aristotelian-Arabic psychology such as might be found in, say, Avicenna.⁷⁴ The same might be said of the long exposition of physiology.

There is another important passage⁷⁵ in which Joseph presents some of the other medieval conceptions on psychology. The main ideas of this passage come directly from Maimonides' commentary.⁷⁶ In discussing the importance of the heart in man's make-up, Joseph points out that the soul has five faculties the root of all of which is the heat in

the heart. The first of these faculties is that of nutrition. There are many processes in nutrition and Joseph goes into them in great detail. Only a brief picture of this will be given here. Certain foods are not assimilated by the body but remain as they are.⁷⁷ Other foods are taken into the body and digested in the stomach. Some of this eventually passes out as waste. The rest is taken into the liver and undergoes a second process of assimilation. There it is separated according to its quality, some going out of the liver as the three gall juices, other as blood. The food which passes out as blood undergoes a third process of assimilation and eventually goes into the building up of the various organs and limbs of the body. The lung takes a sort of froth off the blood which is changed in the lung into a white thin liquid which helps the lung to move continuously and draw off the heat of the heart. A discussion of breathing and the function of the heart is now gone into similar to the one in the passage above.⁷⁸

The blood in the third process of assimilation is changed as said above, into the various organs and limbs of the body. The waste from the blood then goes out of the body, through natural openings in the skin, in various forms, from the eyes as a matter resembling pus,⁷⁹ from the ears as wax,⁸⁰ from the nose as a wet discharge, from the palate as spittle, from the skin of the body as perspiration, from the top of the head as hair. This waste is disposed of in

that way if the organs are healthy. If they are diseased or weak, the waste returns to the liver and is sent out from there together with the remnants of the waste left over from the second process of assimilation to the kidneys and thence passes out of the body with the urine. Doctors, thus, analyzing the urine can discover from its appearance what is wrong with the processes of assimilation in the body.^{81.}

There are four powers which serve these three processes of assimilation and nutrition.^{82.} Since the third process of nutrition is necessary for all parts of the body, these four are found acting in all parts of the body. The first is the power of attracting nourishment;^{83.} its nature is warm and dry like that of the green gall. The second is that of retaining the nourishment^{84.} until it is used; it is cold and dry like the black gall. The third is the power of digestion and assimilation^{85.} which changes the nourishment from its own form to that of the organ which needs it; it is warm and moist like the blood. The fourth is the power of repulsion^{86.} of the waste of the nourishment; it is cold and wet like the white juice.^{87.} Related to these powers is that of procreation,^{88.} which forms the embryo in the womb from the remnants of the blood of the second process of assimilation after the sexual act has taken place. Also related is the power of growth^{89.} which causes the organs of the body to grow from the moment of conception until the end of the thirty-fifth year of life. There are also two minor powers which serve

the formation of the embryo in the womb in the same capacity that the power of digestion or assimilation does for the normal human body.⁹⁰

The entire previous section was a discussion of the first faculty of the soul: nutrition. The second faculty, sensation⁹¹, consists of the five senses: sight, hearing, smell, taste and feeling. The organs of feeling consist of the entire body. The other four have specialized organs.⁹² The individual sensations are gathered in the heart and the reports of them sent out to whatever part of the body needs them. The heart is like a king ruling over the senses.

The third faculty is that of imagination.⁹³ This faculty preserves the impressions of the sensations after they themselves have passed away, combines them, separates them and thus forms new groups of sensations, some of which are true, and some of which are false. Examples of such false combinations are: a flying man, or a man walking on water.

The fourth faculty is the appetitive.⁹⁴ This is the faculty by means of which the soul pursues an object through love of it or flees from an object through abhorrence of it. From this faculty arise such qualities of the soul as hate, love, fear, courage, mercy, cruelty and others. This faculty has its seat in the heart and controls and uses the senses and the organs of the body to accomplish its purposes. Sometimes⁹⁵ the purpose of the appetitive faculty can be accomplished immediately by the organs of the body. Sometimes

an interval of time or a long journey may be necessary for the fulfillment of the desire. Again the desire may be expressed in the form of a hope for something to happen in the distant future. Again the appetitive faculty may sometimes accomplish its purpose through the use of reason.

The fifth faculty is that of reason;⁹⁶ this is the faculty which distinguishes between good and evil, attains wisdom, reaches the true state of existing things, and acquires skills. This faculty is divided into thought which resides in the two front cavities of the brain, imagination which resides in the fissure, and memory in the back cavity.⁹⁷ The function of this faculty is twofold: acquisition of practical knowledge and acquisition of theoretical knowledge. The practical may be either mechanical, as for instance the knowledge that one weaves clothing out of wool and flax, or intellectual,⁹⁸ as for instance, whether these mechanical arts are possible and how they may be accomplished, and similar speculations. The theoretical function is the thought by which one reaches the truth of those existing things which do not change in form such as axioms,⁹⁹ i.e., that two is more than one, that the part is less than the whole, etc. These axioms are inherent within us; we do not know how we reached them.¹⁰⁰

The faculty of nutrition may be called the "matter"¹⁰¹ for the faculty of sensation which in turn acts as form for the former faculty. And sensation may be called the "matter" for the imaginative faculty¹⁰² which in turn is the "matter"

for the rational power which is its form and which does not act as matter for any other faculty, but on the contrary is the form for all the preceding forms. The appetitive faculty follows all the others. If a man's soul has not reached the form of reason there is no difference between it and that of an animal. The ethical qualities of the soul must be those whose nature is that of a middle path, the "golden mean", for if the qualities of the soul incline to the extremes, it will be sick and its functions will not be properly fulfilled. And since the heart is the seat of these faculties of the soul as has been explained, and the correct ethical qualities come from the function of these faculties, the heart assumes great importance in the make-up of man.

Joseph now has a section¹⁰³ explaining the various Mitzvos and sins in their relation to the faculties of the soul. All mitzvos and sins related to the five senses are related to the faculties of sensation and the appetitive power. Examples of sins and mitzvos committed by each of the five senses are now given. For example with respect to the sense of hearing, if one hears the sound of the Shofar or the reading of the Megilloh it is a mitzvoh. But if one listens to the religious songs celebrating non-Jewish worship, or hearken to shameful talk, it is a sin. And so with the other senses. Sins and mitzvos of belief or thought are related to the rational power. Mitzvos connected with the rational power: the belief that God is one, that He has no shape, that He is King over all the universe and exercises

providence over it;¹⁰⁴ the belief in the prophets; the belief that the Torah is revealed from Heaven. Sins connected with the rational power are the denial of such beliefs. The faculties of imagination and nutrition have no sins or mitzvos connected with them because their functions are not within the conscious power of man, but perform their duties whether he is awake or asleep. If they perform their functions well they are called healthy, if not, weak; but there is no ethical connotation to their work. But the rational faculty controls all the knowledge a man has, either the causes of existing things, or first principles, or acquired knowledge, or those branches of wisdom which sharpen the intellect. The rational power, then, by its control of the intellectual discipline, can lead a man through its acquisition or neglect of wisdom to either the righteous or evil life. Thus in the final analysis it is the rational faculty which has ultimate control over the destiny of man. It is prepared from the moment of its creation to follow either the path of good or evil, and it has free will to choose either path it wishes. All is in man's power. His destiny and his fate lie within his own hands. This is the meaning of the verse, "Behold, I have placed before thee this day life and good, death and evil."¹⁰⁵

The purpose of these long and seemingly irrelevant comments, then, was not pure pedantry. Joseph went into these detailed discussions in order that his readers might better understand the workings of their minds and bodies.

And on the basis of this better understanding it was hoped that they would be able better to control their minds and bodies for the purpose of forming the correct "middle" patterns of behavior which would lead them eventually to the eternal reward.

III. The Metaphysical Basis

In discussing the process by means of which man can obtain wisdom and thus be in a better position to lead the ethical life, Joseph takes a little excursion into the stratosphere of metaphysics. In commenting on the phrase, "If there is no נִיחָא there is no נִיחָא and if there is no נִיחָא there is no נִיחָא ,"¹⁰⁶ Joseph follows his master in interpreting נִיחָא to mean the process of cognition and נִיחָא to mean the knowledge acquired by that process.¹⁰⁷ Following the suggestion of Maimonides who makes the two equivalent, Joseph launches out into a rather long and wordy exposition¹⁰⁸ of the metaphysical basis of cognition and the cosmic connections of man's cognitive process.

The ideas in this exposition came entirely from Maimonides but the wordiness of the exposition is Joseph's own contribution. In brief the passage is as follows: There are certain branches of knowledge which deal with material things such as mathematics¹⁰⁹ which deals with lines, angles, points, etc. However, in the process of cognition our intellect abstracts the forms of these material things and grasps them as forms separated from matter. In other words

the intellect conceives the forms of material things, not the material things themselves. There are other branches of knowledge which deal with separate forms which have no connection at all with matter. An example is the branch of metaphysics¹¹⁰ which deals with the angels. In these branches it is obvious that man by means of his intellect conceives the forms.

In either case man's potential knowledge of these branches is made actual only by means of the aid of the angel called the Active Intellect.¹¹¹ This angel is mentioned in the Bible, in the verse, "Behold I am about to send an angel before you to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place which I have prepared."¹¹² Joseph interprets the verse as follows: this angel, Active Intellect, is sent to guard man "on the way," namely in this world, to keep man from falling into evil ways and to help him acquire wisdom; the angel is also to bring man to "the place I have prepared," namely to the future world, that is, man will inherit the future world by virtue of his going in the correct paths and gaining wisdom.¹¹³ The ethical content of this metaphysical concept is at once evident. Joseph's intention is to buttress man's ethical behavior by means of cosmic support and aid.

Man must not rebel against this angel for if he does, the angel will turn away from man and no longer help him in his quest for wisdom. Turning away from the angel to

Joseph means going after the material vanities of this world and neglecting the pursuit of good deeds.¹¹⁴ Here, again, the ethical emphasis is clear.

The name of this angel is Gabriel ($\delta\iota\epsilon\gamma\alpha\beta\eta\epsilon\lambda$) composed of the two Hebrew words $\delta\iota\epsilon$ and $\gamma\alpha\beta\eta\epsilon$, meaning men and God. This name shows his true function to teach men the ways of God. Here, again, it must be repeated, the ethical emphasis of this metaphysical concept is emphasized.¹¹⁵

This angel holds the same relationship to man on an intellectual plane as the light of the sun does^{to} the light of the eyes of man on a physical plane.¹¹⁶ The light from the sun makes actual the potential light in the life-spirit which comes to the eyes from the brain. In the same way does Active Intellect, or the angel Gabriel, make actual the potential cognitive qualities in the soul of man. This, then, is the function of Active Intellect, to set in motion, or actualize the intellectual or cognitive faculties of man. Before this happens all knowledge is only potential in man. After the work of Active Intellect, the knowledge becomes actual, completed, perfected.¹¹⁷

Not only does the Active Intellect help man to learn, but its help enables the soul of man better to recognize and understand the very nature of the angel itself. For when the rational soul in man is actualized it begins to resemble the separate intelligences¹¹⁸ which are the angels and begins to achieve the exalted station of the very angel that tutored it.

Here Joseph brings in his theory of cognition that the object of cognition, the process, and the faculty of cognition are all one united act¹¹⁹. when the faculty of cognition is in action. This theory is not original to Joseph, of course. It is the same as that introduced by Maimonides into the Moreh, but in a different connection.¹²⁰ It came into Jewish philosophy by way of Arabic influence.¹²¹

The argument for this theory as presented by Joseph runs as follows:¹²² before a person knows a thing his soul has potential knowledge. And when he does know a thing the knowledge in his soul becomes actual. For instance, if a man knows the form of a staff, that is, the form of the staff separated from its matter is grasped by his intellectual faculty, the potential knowledge in the man's soul becomes actual. And the object of cognition¹²³ thus grasped is the form of the staff, for the object of cognition is not a material thing but the known concept. Not only that, but the object of cognition is the same as the cognitive faculty in action.¹²⁴ For the faculty of cognition is not something separate from the object of cognition. The very essence of the cognitive faculty is its actions. And its actions are the same as the objects of cognition, i.e., the forms of the things grasped in cognition. Thus the three things, the faculty of cognition in action, the process of cognition, and the object of cognition are all the same thing.

Joseph modestly admits that this matter is an extremely difficult one and that it will escape the comprehension of one not well versed in metaphysics. In spite of this he must give credit where credit is due. For, he smugly observes, with the help of God, he has made the matter crystal-clear.¹²⁵

This theory of cognition was brought in only as a side issue. The significant point in this comment for our purpose is that man's quest for knowledge and the good life is given a cosmic support. The benign activities of the Active Intellect form the metaphysical basis to man's quest for salvation. This is Joseph's own particular emphasis and it fits in perfectly with the other aspects of his scheme of salvation that we have examined previously. It is merely a bit of metaphysical window dressing for his other ideas. Throughout the entire commentary his main interest is the ethical life.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, although the book was ostensibly a commentary on Avos, the purpose of the author was to write a handbook of the available ethical material in Judaism. To serve this purpose he borrowed copiously from both the specific commentary of his master, Maimonides, on Avos, and from his general philosophic ideas, from the Avos de R. Nathan, and in lesser quantity, from Derech Eretz and other writings.

He had a well formulated concept of Torah which was broadened, in line with Maimonides, to include not only Jewish wisdom but general wisdom. The emphasis was placed on the actions to be derived from the acquisition of wisdom. These actions constituted the good life which man should live in this world in order to inherit the world to come. Man was free in his actions to choose this life and this freedom in nowise constituted a difficulty with respect to God's omniscience.

These actions were characterized by their nature of being middle paths or "golden means" in behavior. Much practical advice is given to enable man to attain and remain on these middle paths. And finally the whole scheme is dressed up with a cosmic significance.

Although most of the material and ideas of the book are not original, the ethical intent is sustained, and the amount of industry applied is noteworthy.

Notes

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE NOTES

- Bach.: Bacher, W. 701N 720
- Fried.: Friedlander, M. article on Joseph ben Judah ibn Aknin, Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol.VII, p. 267f.
- Mag.: Magnes, J.L. A Treatise by Joseph ibn Aknin
- Wax.: Waxman, M. History of Jewish Literature
- Munk: Munk, M.S. Notice sur Joseph ben Jehouda
- N.A.: מכתב אבות (Containing the commentary on Avos of Maimonides)
- A.R.N.: Avos de R. Nathan, Text I, edited by S. Schechter.
- S.P.: פירוש מנהגים of Maimonides
- M.T.: מנהג תורה of Maimonides.
- M.N.: מנהג נחמיה of Maimonides.

INTRODUCTION

- (1) The introduction to the Sefer Musar is written in the form of a poem of which the rhyme scheme is: a, a; b,b; c, c, etc.
- Why? (2) P.1, 1.1 Magnes errs in thinking this name a mistake. See Mag. p.3, note 2.
- (3) Bach. p. IX.
- (4) Bach. p. VIII.
- (5) Fried. p.267.
- (6) Mag. p.2.
- (7) P'ier Hador, no. 142. Amsterdam, 1756. Quoted by Munk, p.9.
- (8) Munk p.9-10.
- (9) Munk argues that the title "Cohen" attached to the name Joseph ben Aknin, the author of a commentary on the Song of Songs is not mentioned in a single other place as the title of Joseph ben Jehuda, the disciple of Maimonides. He feels that the rabbis attached great importance to the title "Cohen", and that if the two men were identical, it would be found in other references. Munk, p.9-10.
- (10) Mag. p.3, note 1.
- (11) Bach. p.IX.
- (12) Bach. p.XIX.
- (13) Bach. p.XX. It must be pointed out that this is not a very convincing argument. If the mistake in identification had already been made, this unknown author would merely be continuing the error.
- (14) Wax. Vol.2. p.316.
- (15) See note 7.
- (16) Wax. vol.2. p.371.
- (17) See Munk, Notice sur Joseph Jehouda, and Steinschneider, Ersch u. Gruber Series II, Bd. XXXI, p.45ff., and his Arabische Literatur der Juden, (1902) p.228.

- (18) The date of his birth is unknown. But Fried. (p.267) guesses it to be 1160. This seems to agree, on the whole, with Munk's account.
- (19) Fried. p.267; Munk, p.47.
- (20) Munk, p.52.
- (21) Munk treats the problem of the date of his leaving Ceuta on p.34f.
- (22) Munk, p.35.
- (23) Most of these details about the life of Joseph are quoted by Munk, pp.11-18, in a passage extracted from the Tarikh al'-hocama of Al-Kifti, a friend of Joseph's in Aleppo.
- (24) Tahkemoni, XLVI,1, as quoted by Fried. p.268. Munk, p.20. uses the Al-Harizi reference to date Joseph's arrival at Aleppo. Al-Harizi says he had been there about 30 years. This would take his arrival back to 1187.
- (25) Birkat Abraham, Lyck, 1859, and Zichronot, II a letter written by Maimonides in 1192 as quoted by Fried. p.268. 2
- (26) This date is fixed in the Tarik al-Hocama passage.
- (27) Text, p.31, l. 11ff.
- (28) Bach, p. IX.
- (29) Text, pp.117-121.
- (30) N.A. p.119a. Quoted in Text, pp.117-119.
- (31) Psalm 128:2.
- (32) Bach. p.9; Munk p.23.
- (33) These will be taken up in detail in a later chapter.
- (34) Bacher has collected all these references on p.X.
- (35) Text, p.75, l.27ff.
- (36) Bacher has collected several other minor references on p.IX. These may or may not refer specifically to Joseph's life. They are rather dubious.
- (37) Munk, pp.54-56.

- (38) Arabische Literatur der Juden, par 170.
- (39) Ibid., p.230.
- (40) Bach., pp. IX-X.
- (41) Text, p.61, l.17.
- (42) Bach., p.VII.
- (43) Ibid., p.VIII.
- (44) Magnes published the treatise on Necessary Existence, etc., in 1904.
- (45) Text, p. 181.
- (46) 5095 in the Hebrew calendar.
- (47) Quoted by Bach., p.XX.
- (48) Bach., p.IX-X.
- (49) Bach., p.VIII.
- (50) See Text, p.10 line 23, p.20 line 15. This same procedure was used in the Talmud Yerushalmi. Bach., p.XII.
- (51) On pp.179-180 of the text are found portions of Avos 6: 1,2,3,9.
- (52) Hereford, Pirke Aboth, p.148.

CHAPTER I

- (1) Hereford, p.1.
- (2) Ibid.
- (3) Freedom of the will, etc.
- (4) Text, p.1.
- (5) Bach., p.XIV.
- (6) A detailed treatment of the acknowledgement of quotations from Avos de R. Nathan is given in Bach., pp.XIII-XIV.
- (7) These will be indicated in detail in a later chapter.
- (8) Bach., p.XIV.
- (9) Bach., p.XV.
- (10) Bacher on p.XV has correctly indicated these quotations except for one mistake. He says that p.27 line 18-24 are borrowed from Hilchos Deoth 1:3. In reality they come from 1:5.
- (11) *Bacher* These are: p.2 line 22-24 from N.A. p.20b; p.21 line 6-7 from N.A. p.38b; p.30 line 33-34 from N.A. p.47b; p.37 line 22-29 from N.A. 52A; p.83 line 2-6 from N.A. p.62b; p.87 line 8-11 from N.A. 70a; p.89 line 16-20 from N.A. p.73a-b; p.148 line 27-149 line 4 from N.A. 156a-b; p.166 line 18-19 from N.A. p.179b.
- (12) P.54 line 30-32 from N.A. p.58a-b; p.169 line 4-13 from N.A. 182b-183b.
- (13) Bach., p.XV.
- (14) Bach., p.IX.
- (15) Avos, 3:15.
- (16) N.A. p.79b-80a.
- (17) Sanhedrin 99b in Text, p.96.
- (18) Avos, 5:6.
- (19) N.A. p.157a.

- (20) Sifre Deut. Piska 1.
- (21) Avos, 5:1.
- (22) N.A. p.149b.
- (23) Psalm 133:6.
- (24) Avos, 5:10.
- (25) N.A. p.170b-171a.
- (26) Levit. 26:25.
- (27) Deut. 29:1.
- (28) Avos, 5:2.
- (29) N.A. p.153a.
- (30) Text, p.145 line 27f.
- (31) Avos, 2:6.
- (32) N.A. p.51b.
- (33) Text, p.36 line 14-26.
- (34) There are in all ten such passages.
- (35) Avos, 1:5.
- (36) N.A. p.31b.
- (37) Text, p.12, l. 22-25.
- (38) Avos, 1:14.
- (39) N.A. p.38a.
- (40) Text, p.19 line 16f; p.20 line 16-18.
- (41) Avos 2:2.
- (42) N.A. p.47b.
- (43) Text, p.30 line 8-10.

- (44) Hereford, p.41, also feels, although for different reasons, that Derech Eretz here should be interpreted as work or worldly occupation.
- (45) The other passages in which Joseph differs from Maimonides are as follows: p.29 line 13-15; p.29 line 16-20; p.54:1-11; p.136 line 14-17; p.146 line 13-34; p.149 line 7-20; and the long passage on the question of receiving money for study pp.117-121.
- (46) Bach., p.XIII.
- (47) Examples of such quotations are to be found: p.6 line 31-p.7 line 9 from A.R.N. pp.19-20; p.7 line 10-19 from A.R.N. p.21; p.9 line 25-p.10 line 5 from A.R.N. pp.33-34; p.18 line 3-9 from A.R.N. p.52; p.21 line 7-11 from A.R.N. p.56; p.22 line 15-18 from A.R.N. p.75 and many others.
- (48) These are p.2 line 24-p.3 line 6 from A.R.N. pp.8-9; p.3 line 27-p.4 line 2 from A.R.N. p.12; p. 15 line 10-17 from A.R.N. pp.44-45; p.17 line 32-p.18 line 2 from A.R.N. p.51; p.13 line 26-29 from A.R.N. pp.38-39.
- (49) See Bach., p.XIV.
- (50) Avos 3:22.
- (51) A.R.N. p.75. Perek 22.
- (52) Text, p.106 line 24-25.
- (53) Avos, 3:17.
- (54) A.R.N. p.82. Perek 26.
- (55) Text, p.98. line 3-11.
- (56) Avos, 1:14.
- (57) A.R.N. p.55. Perek 12.
- (58) Ibid.
- (59) Text, p.20 line 25-27.
- (60) Other examples of the use of the Avos de R. Nathan for variant and additional readings are as follows: p.40 line 14-26; p.166 line 19-28; p.123 line 2-4; p.92 line 26-28; p.108 line 24-30; p.124 line 28-31; p.125 line 16-32.

- (61) Avos, 3:14.
- (62) Text, p.94.
- (63) A.R.N. p.73. Perek 21.
- (64) Avos, 2:14.
- (65) A.R.N. pp.61-62, Perek 15.
- (66) Text, pp.52-53.
- (67) Avos, 4:18.
- (68) A.R.N. p.87, Perek 29.
- (69) Text, p.128 line 4-12.
- (70) Avos, 2:16.
- (71) A.R.N. p.62-64. Perek 16.
- (72) Other examples of this use of A.R.N. as illustrative material are to be found on pp.40 line 27-41 line 13; p.88 line 18-29; p.57 line 12-15; pp.106 line 27-107 line 7; pp.138 line 16-139 line 10; pp.126 line 26-127 line 8.
- (73) A.R.N. p.62. Perek 16.
- (74) Text, p.59 line 4-11.
- (75) A.R.N. p.126. Perek 40.
- (76) Text, p.163 line 19-21.
- (77) Avos, 3:12.
- (78) A.R.N. p.74-5. Perek 22.
- (79) Exodus, 24:7.
- (80) Text, p.93 line 3-4.
- (81) Other examples of this tendency are to be found: p.21 line 21-23; p.39 line 9-14; p.53 line 29-31; p.55 line 29-p.56 line 1; p.110 line 8-17; p.154 line 22-26; p.160 line 32-161 line 6.
- (82) Avos, 5:4.
- (83) N.A. p.155a.

- (84) Text, p.147 line 10ff.
- (85) A.R.N. p.94-5. Perek 33.
- (86) P.98 line 11; p.106 line 25.
- (87) P.41 line 15.
- (88) Text, p.1 line 9-10.
- (89) Bach., p.XII.
- (90) Text, pp.139-144.
- (91) This material is taken in order from Derech Eretz Rabbah, Perek 4; end of Perek 3 of Derech Eretz Zuta; Per. 1,2,3,4,9 with a few omissions and some sayings from Per.5,6,7,8; some sayings from Derech Eretz Rabbah, Per. 4-9. Perek 3 of Rabbah is the one called Ben Azai, but Joseph applies the name to Perek 4. See Bach., p.XII. For discussion of these names, see Higger, p.19f.
- (92) Text, p.144 line 14-16.
- (93) Bacher's insertion of the word P'jie, "are different from" would destroy the meaning here if the word is taken to refer to the Derech Eretz passages.
- (94) Text, p.144 line 16-18.
- (95) Bacher lists these on p.XVI.
- (96) See p.97 line 20-24; p.99 line 26; p.55 line 5-8; p.97 line 16-17; p.126 line 2.
- (97) See p.29 line 21-24; p.96 line 20-23.
- (98) Bach., p.XIV has indicated the sources of all these passages.
- (99) Text, p.147 line 25-148 line 11.
- (100) Bacher has carefully gathered up all these references on p.XVI.

CHAPTER II

- (1) Avos, 2:9.
- (2) Text, p.39 line 4-5.
- (3) Avos, 2:2.
- (4) Text, p.30 line 11-14.
- (5) Ibid., line 15-20.
- (6) Such passages are found on: p.163 line 30-164 line 3;
p.146 line 7-9; p.151 line 22-152 line 10; p.156 line
8-157 line 7; p.161 line 12ff.; p.161 line 29-32.
- (7) N.A. p.51b.
- (8) Avos, 2:6.
- (9) Text, p.36 line 27-31.
- (10) Avos, 2:8. Joseph's text leaves out a few details that
we have to-day and changes the order of others. See
Hereford, p.48.
- (11) See N.A. p.52b.
- (12) Text, p.38 line 3-28.
- (13) Avos, 4:20.
- (14) See N.A. p.130b
- (15) Text, p.128 line 26-28.
- (16) See N.A. p.63a.
- (17) Avos, 2:20.
- (18) Text, p.84 line 5-12.
- (19) See, for example, p.42 line 32-43 line 6; p.81 line 31-
82 line 4; p.89 line 23-26; p.97 line 11-13; p.98 line
3-8; p.108 line 31-109 line 8; p.115 line 4-13; p.106
line 6-9; p.31 line 3-8; p.92 line 31-33.
- (20) Text, p.176 line 6 ff.
- (21) See Davidson, Hebrew Grammar, p.226.

- (22) Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumin, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, p.741.
- (23) Text, p.37 line 21-22.
- (24) Brown, Driver, and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, p.847.
- (25) See Davidson, p.229.
- (26) Text, p.18 line 29-31.
- (27) Jastrow, p.967.
- (28) Avos, 1:10.
- (29) Text, p.16 line 26-27.
- (30) Ezra, 3:7.
- (31) Brown, Driver, Briggs, p.957.
- (32) Text, p.22 line 5-7.
- (33) Jastrow, p. 1052.
- (34) Text, p.97 line 17.
- (35) Jastrow, p.805.
- (36) Text, p.136 line 23.
- (37) See Davidson, p.89-90.
- (38) So Joseph understands the term. See p.176 line 6ff.
- (39) Avos, 5:21.
- (40) Text, p.176 line 33-177 line 14.
- (41) The distinction between עֲלֵה and נִלָּךְ will be treated in the chapter on physiology.
- (42) Avos, 2:11.
- (43) Text, p.42 line 4-7.
- (44) Avos, 2:12.
- (45) Text, p.42. line 8-11.
- (46) Avos, 5:10.

9

- (47) Text, p.158 line 25-159 line 2.
- (48) Another example of a comment explaining away a supposed difficulty in the Mishnah: p.135 line 3-11.
- (49) Avos, 4:24.
- (50) Text, p.133 line 7-12.
- (51) In view of Joseph's use of the word **אמר** it seems to me that the phrase **אמר לאמר אמר אמר** which occurs in the manuscript but is in reality an addition to the Mishnah text was a note added by Joseph himself, anticipating the comment he was about to make. He evidently noticed the omission of the word which was so important to him and could not resist the impulse to write his observation down.
- (52) Text, p.133 line 13-21.
- (53) Avos, 2:16.
- (54) A.R.N. Perek 17.
- (55) Text, p.73 line 24-27.
- (56) Another example of this type of comment is found on p.89 line 30-90 line 10.
- (57) Avos, 2:1.
- (58) Text, p.29 line 25-31.
- (59) Psalm, 139:8.
- (60) Daniel, 2:22.
- (61) Psalm, 78:18.
- (62) Ibid. 21.
- (63) Ibid. 19.
- (64) Exodus, 32:32.
- (65) Text, p.54 line 20.
- (66) Jeremiah, 23:29.
- (67) Other examples of this type of comment may be found on p.51 line 16ff; p.54 line 25-30; p.54 line 35-55 line 4.

CHAPTER III

- (1) Baba Kamma 30a. See Hereford, p.4.
- (2) Text, p.94 line 25. The statement there is really expressed in the negative which makes the sense even stranger. It says that if man will indulge in certain practices he will be prevented from the study of the Torah and thus be shut off from wisdom, world to come, and reward. This implies, therefore, that the Torah is the only scheme of salvation.
- (3) Avos, 5:24.
- (4) Text, p.179 line 21f.
- (5) Avos, 3:6.
- (6) Text, p.88 line 10ff.
- (7) N.A. p.72b.
- (8) Avos, 2:8.
- (9) Text, p.38 line 15f: חכמה והנהגות טובות ומצוות טובים.
- (10) Ibid., line 31.
- (11) Ibid., p.98 line 26.
- (12) Avos, 5:24.
- (13) Text, p.179, line 10-14.
- (14) Text, p.145 line 3⁷.
- (15) 717 השם הראשון הראוי לציון, והוא שכל המלכות וההנהגה הראויה תהיה כפי המצוות
p.145 line 8-9.
- (16) Avos, 1:13.
- (17) והנהגות שכל המלכות וההנהגה הראויה תהיה כפי המצוות
Text, p.18 line 32-4.
- (18) Avos, 4:17.
- (19) Text, p.127 line 9-13.
- (20) אבל כתר זה הוא מלכות האלהים והמצוות הם כל המצוות
N.A. p.128a.

- (21) Text, p.126 line 14-20.
- (22) N.A. p.128a.
- (23) Text, p.31 line 3f.
- (24) The reading in the manuscript is **לחתך** "to cut". But Bacher changes the reading to **לחבר** on the basis of the comment. See p.202.
- (25) Avos, 4:7.
- (26) Text, p.116 line 24ff.
- (27) Ibid., p.123 line 8-14.
- (28) **סוף קריאה**
- (29) Text, p.36 line 6-10.
- (30) Comment on Avos, 4:10. Text, p.122 line 28-31.
- (31) This was taken bodily from Maimonides. See N.A. p.124a.
- (32) Comment on Avos, 3:21. Text, p.104 line 26ff.
- (33) Another passage pointing out the material advantage of Torah is on p.121 line 18-22. There are a number of Talmudic and Midrashic eulogies of Torah on p.5 line 14-6 line 30.
- (34) Text, p.74 line 1-4.
- (35) Avos, 1:4.
- (36) Text, p.9 line 14-17.
- (37) Text, p.150 line 12-15.
- (38) Avos, 4:1.
- (39) Text, p.107 line 17-19.
- (40) N.A. p.121 line 16-18.
- (41) **החכמים במדבריו אומר**
- (42) Text, p.121 line 16-18.
- (43) Avos, 4:14.

- (44) Pesachim 22b as quoted by Bacher, p.125 note 5.
- (45) Deut., 10:2.
- (46) **אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ**
- (47) Text, p.125 line 14-16.
- (48) A passage on the service due to scholars is found on p.9 line 9-13.
- (49) **וְעַתָּה**
- (50) See Avos, 5:23 on which the comment is made.
- (51) Text, p.178 line 27ff.
- (52) This comment is based on Maimonides. See N.A. p.184b-185a.
- (53) Avos, 4:28.
- (54) Text, p.135 line 14ff.
- (55) Text, p.167 line 10ff. This idea is clearly implied in the Mishnah, Avos, 5:19, where the controversy of Hillel and Shammai is given as the example of a controversy for the name of Heaven.
- (56) Avos, 5:22.
- (57) Text, p.177 line 16-23.
- (58) Avos, 1:10.
- (59) A.R.N. Perek 11, p.46.
- (60) Text, p.16 line 1-5.
- (61) Ibid., p.127 line 18-21.
- (62) See N.A. p.187b-188a.
- (63) Koheleth Rabah, 2:16. See Bacher, p.180 note 20.
- (64) Text, p.180 line 25-32.
- (65) Text, p.10 line 22-25.
- (66) See Avos, 5:4 on which this passage is a comment.
- (67) Text, p.148 line 14-24.

- (68) אב'קורס' see p.8 line 16.
- (69) Avos, 1:3.
- (70) A.R.N. p.26. Perek 5.
- (71) N.A. p.26b.
- (72) Text, p.8 line 6-17.
- (73) Avos, 3:20.
- (74) N.A. p.83b.
- (75) Text, p.100 line 32ff.
- (76) Comment on Avos, 3:1, Text, p.85 line 19-86 line 7. Joseph goes into some very realistic details here, describing the art of procreation as a filthy, loathsome thing, the stay of the embryo in the womb, and finally the dissolution of the body in death. He points very realistically the picture suggested in the Mishnah. He even waxes poetic on this point, line 26-27 being in rhymed prose.
- (77) אצ'א עב'א
- (78) Text, p.129 line 23-p.130 line 16.
- (79) Ibid., p.20 line 6-12.
- (80) Another expression of this idea of gaining good deeds in this world: p.129 line 12-19.
- (81) Avos, 4:2.
- (82) Text, p.109 line 21-30. See Mishneh Torah, Hilchos T'shuvah, 9:1.
- (83) Text, p.130 line 27-30.
- (84) Ibid., p.100 line 33-101 line 7.
- (85) Comment on Avos, 4:19. Text, p.128 line 15-23.
- (86) Avos, 1:6.
- (87) N.A. p.33a.

- (88) Text, p.14 line 12f. The exact phrase is: **אל תאמר עקב חטאי לא יבא עליי**
כי יבא עליי חטאי ואם לא יבא עליי חטאי

It may be that my interpretation is wrong, and that the passage merely warns against the psychological feeling of despair on the part of one who may feel the punishment will be too far delayed. Perhaps he is only advising patience--even though it seems too long.

- (89) Text, p.37 line 25-28. This passage is a comment on Avos, 2:7. In this context there can be no doubt that a this-worldly punishment is meant, since such an instance is described in the Mishnah.
- (90) Text, p.136 line 21f.
- (91) Avos, 4:29.
- (92) Text, p.136 line 4-8.
- (93) Ibid., line 8.
- (94) There is one more reference to resurrection, p.20 line 10-12, but it gives no clue as to the author's attitude. It is merely mentioned incidentally.
- (95) Text, p.19 line 16-24.
- (96) The reference is to the Hilchos T'shuvah in his Hukim V' Mishpatim.
- (97) Avos, 3:20.
- (98) Text, p.100 line 14-16.
- (99) See N.A. p.83b.
- (100) Text, p.100 line 24-26.
- (101) Avos, 2:17.
- (102) See N.A. p.59b.
- (103) Text, p.59 line 12-71 line 15.
- (104) **אם לא יבא עליי חטאי**
- (105) **אם לא יבא עליי חטאי**
- (106) Text, p.59 line 30-p.60 line 8.
- (107) **אם לא יבא עליי חטאי**
אם לא יבא עליי חטאי

(108) Text, p.60 line 9ff.

(109) Text, p.60 line 23ff.

(110) **מכח**.

(111) Deut., 30:15.

(112) **כח התאווה וכח ההרגע מס' צו**.

(113) Text, p.61 line 21ff. Joseph is more wordy than Maimonides in this passage.

(114) Text, p.62 line 6ff. Here Joseph follows Maimonides a little more literally.

(115) Text, p.62 line 20ff.

(116) **הג'י ההג'יון מביאין הראיות לחזק דת היסודיים אדמתכחלון**.

(117) Text, p.62 line 28ff.

(118) Text, p.63 line 11ff.

(119) Gen., 15:13.

(120) Text, p.63 line 27ff.

(121) Text, p.64 line 9-p.65 line 17. These are also taken from Perek 8 of the Shemoneh Perokim.

(122) Here follows, taken from Maimonides, the interpretation of another verse which might mistakenly be taken to be related to the previous ones. It is not germane to the present discussion. Text, p.65 line 18-31.

(123) Text, p.66 line 9ff.

(124) **והרי' שמצ'אות' ג'ר' ע'ה'יו' או' ג'ר'ר' ו'א'י'ג'.**

(125) **א'פ'ר' א'פ'ר' ע'ה'יו' ו'א'פ'ר' ע'ל'א' י'ה'יו'.**

(126) Text, p.67 line 14ff.

(127) Ibid., line 31ff.

(128) **מ'ר'ה' ה'ר'א'ש'ית'.**

(129) **כ'ל' ע'ני' מ'צ'ל'ע' מ'ש'ל'ע' ה'י'ח'ז' ג'ר'ז'ל'י' מ'ה'ב'ל'ע' ה'ש'ל'י'.**

(130) **מ'ל'א'כ'ת' ה'מ'ש'ח'ה' . א'ל'כ'ס'ון' ה'מ'ר'ו'ה'ע' .** Bacher reads here **מ'ל'א'כ'ת' ה'מ'ש'ח'ה' for** **ע'ל'א'כ'ת' ה'מ'ש'ח'ה' which is unintelligible.**

(131) נאמר דבר.

(132) This passage p.68 line 11ff., is not altogether clear to me. See Bacher, p.194 on this passage.

(133) Text, p.68 line 29ff.

(134) Here follows a passage, p.69 line 1-14, which more or less repeats the thought of p.68 line 11ff.

(135) Text, p.69 line 15ff.

(136) נאמר דבר כי אבות ה' והתחברו האמוראים
Text, p.69 line 34-5. והוא המקור שבאין הדור

(137) Here Joseph gives examples of two other types of syllogisms, a conjunctive hypothetical syllogism (תנאי הסתלק) and a disjunctive hypothetical syllogism (מכרר) which illustrate the same point made in his first example.

(138) Text, p.70 line 22ff.

(139) Text, p.71 line 1ff.

(140) Ibid., line 20.

(141) Shemonah Perokim, Perek 8, towards the end of the Perek.

(142) נאמר. This might almost be translated, "It is axiomatic".

(143) כן.

(144) Gen., 42:15.

(145) 1st Kgs., 17:12.

(146) Text, p.72 line 3ff.

(147) Maimonides says our knowledge is too limited to grasp God's essence.

(148) This Kal V' Homer argument is not ⁱⁿ Maimonides.

(149) In line 10, Bacher reads עבדא'א'א'א'. See p.195, note on p.72 line 10.

(150) Sifra Levit., Perek 2. This is not in Maimonides.

(151) Text, p.72 line 31ff.

- (152) Text, p.138 line 2-4.
- (153) N.A. p.136b.
- (154) Text, p.162 line 31-163 line 11.
- (155) N.A. p.177a.
- (156) N.A. p.162a.
- (157) Text, p.152 line 15-153 line 8.
- (158) Bereshis Rabba, Perek 5. Bacher says Perek 8.
- (159) This idea, together with the same quotation from the Midrash is found in the Moreh Nebukim, part 1, ch.29.
- (160) Text, p.57 line 25-31.
- (161) 𐤒𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓'
- (162) Text, p.82 line 15-83 line 2.

CHAPTER IV

- (1) See text, p.112 line 11-p.114 line 18.
- (1A) Text, p.31 line 17-35 line 20.
- (2) This section is taken from Shemonah Perakim, Per. 3.
- (3) **זורתה וזורת חלקיה צורות אצבע הקדש האלוהות ...**
- (4) The following passage is original with the author.
- (5) Bacher speculates that this peculiar name may have been given because of the statement in Gittin, 62a, that the scholars were called kings.
- (6) Here Joseph takes up again the thread of Perek 3 of the Shemonah Perakim.
- (7) Joseph here skips the beginning of Perek 4 which explains virtues as the balancing of the ethical scale between the two extremes and continues to follow Maimonides towards the middle of the chapter. ~~This the transition~~ is not good.
- (8) This example, p.32 line 30-35, is taken from the M.T. Hilchos Deoth, 2:3.
- (9) Other examples relating to stinginess and cowardice are now quoted from S.P. Per. 4. See p.33 line 1-24.
- (10) This example taken from M.T. 2:3.
- (11) **לכניס משורת חזין.**
- (12) Text, p.33 line 33ff. Joseph returns here to copying the material in the S.P. Per. 4.
- (13) This is an original example.
- (14) Now follow other examples of the same tendency, i.e., relating to sexual intercourse and the giving of tithes (which is here interpreted as being a guard against niggardliness) etc., taken from S.P. Per. 4. Text, p.34 line 26-35 line 5.
- (15) Yer. Nedarim, 9:1. Taken from S.P. Per. 4.
- (16) Avos, 1:18.
- (17) Text, p.26 line 24-28 line 2.

- (18) The quotations from the M.T. are Hilchos Deoth, 1:4-7. Bacher mistakenly inserts 1:3 and leaves out 1:5. See p.XV.
- (19) M.T. Hilchos Deoth, 1:7.
- (20) Avos, 2:14.
- (21) A.R.N. Per. 15. pp.60-62 with a small omission.
- (22) Text, p.53 line 6ff.
- (23) Joseph differs here with Maimonides (M.T. Hilchos Deoth 2:3) who said one should never get angry even for a very important matter.
- (24) Pesachim, 81a.
- (25) Joseph follows Maimonides here. See N.A. p.57b-58a.
- (26) Other passages on anger are found on p.27 line 6-10; p.36 line 32-34.
- (27) Text, p.84 line 17ff.
- (28) Text, p.91 line 6ff.
- (29) Here Joseph interposes a passage on the concept of God and metaphysics (line 20-29) which has no connection with the subject under discussion except that, since previously he had mentioned various types of philosophy, he now remarks that metaphysics should not be studied until the other branches of philosophy had been mastered.
- (30) Text, p.23 line 29ff.
- (31) Tosefta Yevamos. פ'א'י' פ'ג'ר' ה'י'א'י' מ'נ' ע'ר' צ'ד'ק'
- (32) Text, p.88 line 3-6.
- (33) This idea, of course, is not original with Joseph. He got it from the S.P. Per. 5.
- (34) Avos, 2:16.
- (35) Text, pp.74 line 5-81 line 26.
- (36) Text, p.74 line 20ff.
- (37) The following passage is original with Joseph.
- (38) Here Joseph begins to follow S.P. Per. 5, again.

- (39) Text, p.75 line 26ff. Joseph is still following the S.P. Per. 5, here.
- (40) Here Joseph leaves Maimonides. Text, p.76 line 1.
- (41) Text, p.77 line 1ff.
- (42) Ibid., line 24ff.
- (43) Ibid., line 26. Bacher reads **לואל** here. See his note, p.196.
- (44) **פ'ר הכהן הלאו וז'ל**. I could not find the scientific translation of this term.
- (45) See Bacher, note on p.77 line 28, found on p.196.
- (46) Here Joseph interposes a long passage on the use of logic and its divisions which is not clear to me. It is not very important for our purpose. An excellent thesis could be written on the use of philosophical and logical terms in the Sefer Musar.
- (47) Text, p.79 line 32 ff.
- (48) Here Joseph takes up the thread of Per. 5 of the S.P. once more.
- (49) Text, p.80 line 14ff.
- (50) Text, p.81 line 1. Here Joseph leaves Maimonides again.
- (51) Text, pp. 169 line 14-175 line 12.
- (52) **על...הוה**. Klotzkin translates the latter as "Lebensgeist". See Klotzkin, Thesaurus Philosophicus, Vol. 4, p.25.
- (53) **פ'ר'ל**. There is no exact English equivalent to this word. It seems to be a combination of vein and the channels of the respiratory system.
- (54) **עלזל ז'ל**
- (55) He really means the mouth and nose here.
- (56) Text, p.169 line 28ff.
- (57) Text, p.170 line 4ff.

But it
could also
be included
here!

3K

or 31K)

- (58) **ס'אע**. I could not find the exact technical translation of this term. He refers to the fissure of Sylvius or lateral fissure of the brain.
- (59) Text, p.171 line 3ff.
- (60) **|'N3**.
- (61) **נ/כרז**
- (62) Sight was conceived of by Joseph as the process of the life-spirit going out through the eyes by means of these two hollow nerves. This pair is the only one which is hollow, this sort of structure being required by light. See Bacher, p.212 who in the phrase **וְהָיָה הַקֶּמַח אֵלֶּם הַדְּבָרִים** (p.171 line 11) reads **נ/כר** for **אור**.
- (63) **ג'ט**.
- (64) **פעט**.
- (65) Text, p.172 line 11ff.
- (66) **ערע**.
- (67) **צקר**.
- (68) **פצפ מ'ע'ס'ק ע'ל'ול'ס ה'נה'רא י'ע הכ'חו ל'ב'יו'ת ח'**
Bacher, p.212, note on p.172 line 29 points out that this is an Aristotelian definition.
- (69) Text, p.174 line 8ff.
- (70) Text, p.175 line 1ff.
- (71) This is the same as the plant soul of medieval Aristotelian psychology.
- (72) There is a break in the manuscript here, p.175 line 3. The last part of the discussion on the power of growth is left out as is the first part of the discussion of the second power. He undoubtedly refers, however, to the animal soul or **נח ח'יו'ן**. He undoubtedly wishes to say of the first power that it is shared by all plants and animals, especially as in discussing the second power, he specifically remarks that it is not found in plants. See line 4.
- (73) **ה'נ'פ'ע ב'יו'ר'צ'ת ה'מ'ח'נ'ת ה'ין ס'ול ל'ר'צ**.
- (74) Diesendruck, Z. Oral lectures in Philosophy course. H.U.C.

(75) Text, pp.43 line 20-51 line 6.

(76) S.P. Per. 1.

(77) Text, p.43 line 25.

(78) I.e., pp.169-175.

(79) **קוּבָּה**.

(80) **קוּבָּה**.

(81) Here follows a passage (p.45 line 25ff) on the various diseases arising from the failure of the body to dispose of its wastes in the two above-mentioned ways which is not clear to me. It is not necessary for the presentation of the passage.

(82) Text, p.46 line 14.

The usual

(83) **קוּבָּה**.

Terms:

(84) **קוּבָּה**.

מח, קוּבָּה

(85) **קוּבָּה**.

מח, קוּבָּה

(86) **קוּבָּה וְקוּבָּה**.

(87) Joseph now, p.46 line 24, explains how various diseases arise from the failure of these powers to work properly.

(88) **קוּבָּה וְקוּבָּה**.

קוּבָּה

(89) **קוּבָּה וְקוּבָּה**.

(90) These two are not found in S.P. Per. 1. Joseph omits the seventh power on Maimonides' list, that of the differentiation of the nutritive juices that are needed for sustenance from those that are to be expelled.

(91) Text, p.47 line 4ff.

(92) This follows S.P. Per.1 closely.

(93) **קוּבָּה**. This follows S.P. Per.1 closely.

(94) **קוּבָּה**. This also comes from S.P. Per. 1.

(95) Here Joseph leaves Maimonides.

(96) Text, p.48 line 1. **קוּבָּה וְקוּבָּה**.

- (97) Joseph here contradicts another passage of his (p.171. line 2-8) in which he says **רציון** or **הוא** reside in the two front cavities and **רציון** in the fissure. Here he says the opposite: **רציון** in the two front cavities and **הוא** in the fissure. I am not sure my translation of **הוא** is correct.
- (98) **הרציון והמחשה הם יסוד אלו המלאכות**
- (99) **המחשבות והראיות**
- (100) Here follows a passage on logic (p.48 line 24ff) which is beyond me. Bacher admits his defeat for part of it. See p.191.
- (101) **פסוק**
- (102) **הוא**
- (103) Text, p.49 line 25ff. This section is original with Joseph.
- (104) **הוא**
- (105) Deut., 30:15.
- (106) Avos, 3:21.
- (107) N.A. p.102b.
- (108) Text, p.101 line 31-p.104 line 22.
- (109) **המלאכות והמחשבות**
- (110) **המחשבות והמלאכות**
- (111) **הוא**. This angel is described in M.T. Hilchos Yesode Ha Torah, 4:6. Angels as pure form are described, ibid, 2:3.
- (112) Exodus, 23:20.
- (113) Text, p.102 line 25ff.
- (114) Ibid., line 31ff.
- (115) Text, p.103 line 7ff. Here follows a passage showing the relationship of Daniel to this angel which is not important for our purpose.
- (116) Ibid., line 20ff.
- (117) Ibid., line 28ff.

(118) **הַנְּחִיָּה הַלְוָה** . Bacher's suggestion to read **פְּעִיל** for **נְחִיָּה** is not necessary. Joseph uses the term **נְחִיָּה** for intelligence, i.e., he uses **נְחִיָּה** **הַלְוָה** for "Active Intellect". These "separate intelligences" are the emanations from God which are the forms of the spheres in Maimonides' picture of the cosmos. See M.N. pt. 2, ch. 2-6.

(119) **הַיְרֵא... הוּא הַנְּחִיָּה וְהוּא הַלְוָה**.

(120) See M.N. Pt.I, ch. 68.

Aristotle! (121) See Judah Ha Levi's Cuzari, pt.5. The idea was borrowed from Avicenna.

(122) Text, p.104 line 1-17.

(123) Here Joseph uses **נְחִיָּה** in the sense of object of cognition. See line 5.

(124) Here **נְחִיָּה** is used for the cognitive faculty. See line 8.

(125) Ibid., line 20ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Texts

- Bacher, W. ed. רסין רסו, Berlin, 1910.
Schechter, S. ed. Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, Vienna, 1887.
נחלת אבות (Maimonides' commentary on Avos), Venice, 1543.
Garfinkle, J. The Eight Chapters of Maimonides on Ethics, New York, 1912.
Hereford, R.T. Pirke Aboth, New York, 1925.
Higger, M. The Treatises Derech Eretz, New York, 1935.
Maimonides, מורה נבוכים Vilna (S.P. Gerber), 1909.
Maimonides, משנה תורה Vilna (A.Z. Rosenkranz), 1900.

II. Dictionaries and Grammars

- Klatzkin, J. Thesaurus Philosophicus, Berlin, 1930.
Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, Berlin, 1926.
Brown, Driver, and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Boston, 1928.
Davidson, A.B. Hebrew Grammar, Edinburgh, 1930.

III. General

- Munk, S.M. Notice sur Joseph ben Iehouda, Paris, 1842.
Magnes, J.L. A Treatise by Joseph ibn Aknin, Berlin, 1904.
Steinschneider, M. Die Arabische Literatur der Juden, Frankfurt a.m., 1902.
Friedlander, M. Joseph ben Judah ibn Aknin, Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol.VII, p.267f. New York, 1902.
Waxman, M. History of Jewish Literature, New York, 1936.
Mann, J. Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature, Vol.I, Cincinnati, 1931.