

The Cognates of Joseph Alto.

L Grossmann

Hebrew Union College

Thesis for Graduation
June 1884.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CINCINNATI

LOUIS GROSSMAN

Contents.

Introduction

1. Hb. and Saadja - a parallel - p. 3

2. Conception of the Talmud by Hb. and his predecessors - p. 21

3. Survey of the history of Jewish dogmatics - 29

Saadja, Bachja, Sh. Gerbol, Sh. Safran.

Sh. Eym. and Sh. Land.

Haimeida, Crescas, and Hb. - p. 43

Comparison of their philosophies; the one constructive, the latter ten apologetic.

4. The Cabalistic, its origin in the dissension between the Talmudists and the philosophical schools, a compromise between both. Nachmanides' position towards it. 48

5. Obadiah Crescas' opposition to Aristotelianism, Abulafia's against Christianity. 51

6. The Three Principles - Definition of divine religion - 73
Comprehension of principle, not subscription to dogmas essential.

The Dogmatics of Joseph Albo

Grossmann.

Maimonides is the centre of the history of
med. philosophy. From the beginning of Jewish phil.
and thought with Saadya there is gradual rise,
which has its climax in Maimonides. Albo, though
his position as the last of the Spanish schools of
philosophers is frequently held to be the deteriorated
outgrowth of the Maimonic system. To disprove this
shall be the purpose of the following pages. It
is true Maimonides has brought a vivifying cur-
rent into Jewish thought, which had a refreshing

effect and might not being a rationalization of
 reason, at one point and naturally and judiciously
 is quite similar to him for the profoundly
 egoistic work. It is likewise true that the
 more effects of the Neomantics to find Judiciousness
 is rather true in harmonizing it with Judiciousness
 a way and found which all the overworld has
 it that necessarily. Aristotle says that was
 carefully used for certain affirmations that
 philosophy was his criticism of truth that he said
 was to which he is certain of the religious faith.
 of the of first Neomantics has had, however, the
 same position before him, to receive himself
 doctrine with the words of philosophy. It was found
 at to be given of Neomantics to determine the
 method by which the world is done, that other
 method, not the method, were found by some
 of the overworld with to seem further on. It will
 be asked how, however, that while the method

of Maimonides was exemplary, it lay in the nature of the specific problems he had to solve that, as soon as Aristotelianism was shattered, the bond, assiduously woven by him between it and Judaism, would be useless.

Saadya already felt that such an attempt to harmonize religion and philosophy was of a temporary and relative effect only, at any rate precarious. Speculation without the authority of revelation, he said, cannot lay claim to undisputed reliability, though it may lead to truth. It cannot free itself from the taint of suspicion. Whatever is reached by speculation is not unimpeachable, as revelation has not authenticated it. Instead of coordinating religion and philosophy, he already then preferred to subject philosophy to the guidance of religion; for, then speculation is not liable to run into error, and, in fact, will endorse revelation. Saadya freed himself, however, by this position, for

might it not be asked: If you admit that speculation can bring about religious conviction, was revelation necessary? Divine interposition would be superfluous, if man could arrive at religious truths without it. This question Lessing asked and answered in the same way as Saadja did.

"Revelation was necessary, in order to facilitate the progress of humanity; for though without it mankind could and would have undoubtedly acquired those truths by independent speculation, revelation assisted in bringing them to a speedier recognition." Albo recognized the overwhelming importance of utilizing all the products of reasoning and yielded to them the same value as to revealed truths; but he subjected them to a severe test, before he accorded them this importance. It was not Albo's purpose to construct a bridge between Judaism and philosophical systems. He would rather establish Judaism upon its own basis; he would ascertain

¹⁾ Emmeroth Widoth I, 18. - (Zingsting vol. Manuscript of the 18th century)
84

which in Judaism, in itself are the elements of
 stability; having discovered these the conciliation
 of philosophy was no ultimate necessity. He
 could afford, like Saadya to be without the aid
 of philosophy. If it wished to flourish, speculation
 could separate ^{from} the shade of revelation. If in
 the light of this, the apparent unimportant position
 of Aristotle in Saadya finds its parallel in the
 detachment of that philosopher from absolute author-
 ity in Albo, we might continue the comparison and
 detect other characteristics, which they share. In
 Saadya's time Aristotle had not yet gained a
 footing among the Arabs; it had just then been
 promulgated by Alfarabi. From his continual
 skirmishes, however, with the various schools of
 philosophy, we can perceive, how Saadya was
 disposed toward them. Besides, it lay in the nature
 of Saadya's method of reasoning ^{and} his special
 object, i.e. to break the spirit of Skepticism, which

was flagrant at his time, that he showed forth an
 apodictic system. Atheism ^{And} the corruption of
 his time had made great inroads upon belief.

Authorities hitherto held in great honor, such as
 the Talmud, were rejected. Not only the Talmud,
 the Sacred Scriptures even ^{And} their inspired authors
 were inveighed against. Chiefti Albalchi attacked
 the rites of Judaism. He presented as many as two
 hundred objections to the validity of the Bible ^{And} to
 the truth of revelation. Besides this, skepticism, a
 forerunner to Catholicism, was holding high court,
 many were the expressions of sadness of disgust
^{And} indignation at the superstitious credulity of the
 people. On the other hand the Kabbalists had become
 insolent, in view of the slothful ^{And} inactive Rabbis,
 they had found no one willing to enter into combat
 with them ^{And} they spread themselves proudly. Saadja
 was the first to expose the inconsistencies of Aaron's
 teachings ^{And} to exhibit the validity ^{And} the necessity

of tradition. The Karaites felt the blow which Saadya had administered them. They recognized that they had to deal with a daring opponent and a giant in intellect. Anan had divorced himself from the Talmud; the Bible alone in the Messianic spirit, even in its words and letters was the only criterion of religious truth the only guide for religious precepts. Being anxious to let Talmudism be ridiculed, he made himself guilty of excesses, which turned the laugh upon himself. He disdained tolerating the continuance of Talmudic institutions, new laws took their place. The Calendar hitherto in vogue was abrogated and a loose arrangement took its place; he instituted an abstemious mode of observing the Sabbath, which reminds one of Quakerism.

There were sad breaches, which Saadya took upon himself to repair. It was a difficult task, for this Karaite movement had many followers, mostly of the lower classes. In order to reach these Saadya

wrote his ^{מקומו ודעות} in Arabic, the popular language. It is true there were also benefits in this destructive tendency of Anan's party. First of all, the controversies made it necessary for the Rabbis to look more closely into the Bible, which had been almost superseded by the overwhelming mass of traditional teachings. Further they were impelled to a more intelligent study of the Talmud, from which they gained a deeper insight of its real significance and position, not as an infallible book but as the collection of traditions, whereby the great lawgiver had the divine law could be adapted to exigencies of time and place. Now, we shall see that most of the Jewish philosophers after Saadja anticipated or advocated in one form or another the spirit of Karison, which if Anan had carried out without malice and with due deliberation and with more appreciation of the importance of historical progression, which he sadly lacked, would have gained

a stronger hold on the people than it did. Saadja knew that to beat his opponent he must fight him upon his own ground. He therefore constructed Judaism upon the biblical basis alone, without calling the Talmud or anything of post-biblical origin to its aid. It was to be a rationalistic Judaism, plain & clear, put into the hands of the common people, would contribute towards a better understanding of their religion, would dispel the cloud of mysticisms which had lowered upon them and would enervate the invincible force of the atheist.

Alto had as his to stem the insidious encroachment by Karaism, the detrimental influence of forced converts and of recreant apostates. Among his own coreligionists his time was as much one of anarchy, the contumacious of philosophical pursuit was as bitter as the overheated zeal of the reformatory movement under Aaron. Perhaps it was even worse; for Saadja had opponents, who had some ground of

justification ^{and} could sustain their plan with con-
 sistent ^{and} intelligent arguments. The bigoted Rabbis
 however refused to give a reason, why they proscribed
 the study of philosophy. They had formed the pre-
 judgment that it was the breeder of Skepticism, ^{and}
 that was sufficient cause to prosecute any one, who
 devoted himself unto it. It was Albo's duty, there-
 fore, to put Judaism upon a basis, which should
 be broad enough to embrace all, perspicuous enough
 to be understood by all, rational ^{and} conservative, that
 it might reconcile all, preserve the integrity of
 Judaism ^{and} give it an interpretation, according to
 its spirit ^{and} contents. For this purpose he wrote
 the מקראות, in the Hebrew language, that it might
 have ready admission ^{and} readers among the Jewish
 people - He did not write it in Arabic, for Arabic
 was the scientific language of the Spanish school,
 and he did not wish to enrich the library of the
 philosophers by a new disquisition. He wanted

to meet the people, to enlighten and instruct them. In this lay more practicality and from it greater, more thorough going and more lasting benefits could be expected. Internally Saadya and Albo fought opponents in a reversed position, Saadya as Rabbanite against Philosophers, Albo as philosopher against Rabbanites. In no respect, however, they are alike, in their premises against Christianity. Both denied the truth of the fundamental principles of the Trinity, proved that the basis of Christianity is not in the Bible and that Christianity is no second revelation to displace the first. They differ in their method. Saadya's is analytical, while Albo's is synthetic. Saadya refutes by a sort of process ad absurdum, Albo rejects the claims of Christianity, since it does not fulfill the requirements of a Divine religion.

The greatest of benefits arising from the special circumstances, which conditioned Albo's tendency, can certainly be perceived that the pressure of circumstances, through the conflict with Christians, led to a definition of Judaism in the light of a well-rounded and completely unified body of religious truths.

For this is the parallel to Saadya's case, who was pushed much by the Karaites, so that he finally had to take refuge in the Bible, and this was the source of the greatest good. It required a pressure and a pressure of that kind, coming from Christianity, that a systematic and organic exposition of Judaism was made, in which an internal and necessary connection was shown to exist, that a clear contrast should be made between revealed religion and pseudo truths, so that out of the vague and loosely joined conglomerate of detached

doctrines, there shined be, created a unity of con-
ceptions of divine religion. This also created
Judaism.

An insight into any work of literature
can be had only from a careful considera-
tion of the time, ^{in which it was produced} and the circumstances, which
may have affected the author. A philosophical
work is more than any other, the reflex of
his time: of the tendency of the author's time
and of the character of the author. An essential
distinction between the ancient philosopher and
the thinker of modern times lies in the fact that
the latter generally presents his own sentiment,
a system evolved out of his own mind, while the
former attempted to give faithfully the convictions
of many learned minds besides his own,
or the belief current among the people of his
time. It was his prime duty not only to
conserve religious convictions, but to devote

all his efforts towards a compulsons expo-
 sition and an associations interpretation of it.
 A single proof of this can be gathered from a
 glance over the entire field of Jewish Philosophy.
 But with due appreciation of historical position
 this, however, is not to detract in any way from
 the originality of Jewish Philosophers. For
 each of them we can justly lay claim to a
 good share of originality. Not to speak of it
 but in this purpose to depict in an honest way
 the convictions of Judaism at large, there was
 more appreciation of the responsibility, which
 rest upon the shoulders of intellectual leaders,
 there was sufficient room left for individuality
 to discriminate in arrangement between coordinate
 and subordinate, sufficient room for the power
 of system. If then it was in the purpose of
 the Jewish Philosophers to be faithful to
 the teachings of the Bible and the convictions

of his time, it becomes highly necessary to look carefully into the circumstances under which he came by certain assertions and by certain denials. Standing upon the basis of the Mosiac dispensation and knowing the tendency of his age, it is for the inquirer the easiest thing in the world to conclude upon what is original with the age and what is original with the author. Eliminate all the influences, encouraging and discouraging, and the remainder is personal disposition.

With this in view Saadya's philosophy can be put into its appropriate light; we have only to recollect the turbulence in religious affairs in his time, the dissensions between Rabbanites and Karaites, the prevalence of atheistic conceptions, imitated from the Arab schools, the depressing influence of

coarser mysticism and materialistic tendencies.⁹
 Recognizing that historical place is a vital
 element in shaping thought, a consideration
 of the times after 1391 would throw considerable
 light upon the nature and tendency of the
 philosophy of Joseph Albo. But we will
 defer this for a later consideration. Here we
 merely wish to call attention to the fact that as
 in the case of Saadya we shall find that
 now the circumstances differ from
 each other in their respective periods, what-
 ever the different means they employed, in
 this they all Jewish philosophers agree, that
 they did not sever from the teachings of
 Moses, that they never lost sight of Mt. Sinai.
 With this common starting point and with the same
 goal and aim, it will not be surprising to find
 that many of them maintained kindred teach-
 ings and held similar views. It would not be

⁹ Saadya in his earliest years had been led to write a coarse dissertation on
 the nature of God, representing Him by the grossest anthropomorphism.
 No doubt through the influence of what he saw about him.

difficult to extract out of Saadya's Commentaries
 beneath the three cardinal doctrines of Albo, as
 the quintessence. Like Albo, he starts from reveal-
 ation as the prime source of all knowledge
 and truth. Albo's departure from Saadya
 consists in making creation *ex nihilo* a
 cardinal doctrine. While Albo laid the
 foundation with the existence of God, Saadya
 was induced to posit creation as a funda-
 mental principle by the Mutakallims of his
 time, who held it of the highest importance.
 If his psychology is not as clearly defined, it
 is not so much his fault; we must remember
 he was the pioneer in Jewish philosophy, if not
 the first philosopher of the Middle Ages of both
 Jews and Christians. Still we find a pure
 moral system as the apex of his work. He
 appreciated the importance of the fact that
 an equipoise must be maintained between

the moral and the intellectual powers, he recognized it as the mission of Judasohn to bring man to the attainment of the perfection to which the Deity has destined him.

Turning from Saadja to his immediate successors, Bachja Shv Patudab, Shv Gebriel of the Ego, and Shv David we enter a new field, differing much from Albo's. And the Pumbedita were closed. The last Gaon was dead and the exilarchate was buried with its last bearers. Spain was the heir of the former glory and learning of Babylonia. The study of the Talmud was transplanted to North Africa and thence to Spain. The Spanish rationalism set to work upon the new field of study. The Talmud had not been without its due attention, but the Spaniards gladly spilled to profounder learning. The infusion gave vigor and soon rich fruits were produced.

Dr. Kairuan R. Kassis and Dr. Chanaud
 did much towards reviving the study of the Talmud.
 They wrote commentaries to the
 Babylonian Talmud, with special consideration
 of the Jerusalemite; by means of it throwing
 light upon hitherto unintelligible passages
 in the Babylonian Talmud. What moved these
 Doctors to devote themselves to the study of the
 Talmud Yerushalmi in preference to the Babylonian
 Talmud cannot be given positively. One
 is not likely to detect the probable cause
 from a comparison of the two compilations?

Considering their respective importance
 from their voluminousness of tradition, the
 Babylonian will be granted the precedence;
 but there is no doubt that the tradition recorded
 in the Talmud Yerushalmi is purer, less adulterated
 with foreign elements, the presence of which
 we are likely to suspect, when we remember

the Jerusalem was probably much larger at that time
 so much of it has been lost since

that it was written in Babylonia, which had become almost entirely divorced from Palestine. From this confusion, however the Palestinian Talmud also cannot be freed entirely, as there is also in it sufficient evidence of admixture. In both, however, in the one more, in the other less, conceptions are frequent which, if carefully examined, will be found to be Jewish in origin for the most part, but modified to a great extent by Greek teachings, which have been assimilated to such an extent that the closest scrutiny only will detect them.¹⁾

Whether the teachers of Kairwan were conscious of this or not cannot be proven. The fact, however, remains that for one who pretends to found certain opinions strictly within the biblical dispensation upon the Talmud the greatest caution is advisable. ^{Baruch} Tractatus, even Hieronimus may not have appreciated

¹⁾ Cf. Hamburger, Realencyclopädie d. jüd. Wissenschaften, 982.

the uncertainty of their conclusions from
 Talmudic sentences. They gave to the utter-
 ances of the Saram and Amoraim almost
 as much credence as they gave authority
 to their legal decisions. In fact, it became
 the general practice to do either one of two
 things; either to start independently from
 reason to show that there could be a Judaism
 of speculation ^{and} to strengthen the results of
 philosophy by showing their identity with
 traditional teachings; or the reverse, showing
 that nothing in tradition could be negated
 by philosophy. In both methods the Talmud
 played an important part. It entered
 the mind of no one, not even for a moment,
 perhaps the authority upon which I rely
 so much, can be imagined as not entirely
 pure? Saadya had at the very outset of his
 philosophizing been taught differently

The Karaitic movement forced him to tactics, in the use of which he also stood alone. He himself, perhaps was not entirely persuaded of the real good, which by the force of circumstances he had been the creator of; for his method is with him only a means to reach finally, any how, to rationalistic principles and authority. In fact it was a purpose to disprove those of the Karaites. There was however, no one to take up, what had been thrown incidentally into the way of the Jewish philosophers. Maimonides alone saw the real benefit which would accrue from it, but however much he desired to harmonize philosophy and faith and unadulterated Judaism, he thought it inadvisable to disregard the Talmud.

This was the position of Jewish Philosophy toward the Talmud previous to Albo. Is it astonishing, then, to see him follow the general course of his teacher, Chasdai Crescas, turning himself loose

from the autocracy of Aristotle, was bound to
 attack himself so much the more to the author-
 ity of the Rish. And the Talmud. As for the Bible,
 it was the essentially the basis of all Jewish
 reasoning, reasoning which, it would, in fact,
 amount to be Jewish reasoning, that any one should
 have failed to give to it its proper share of recog-
 nition. The Talmud was the mighty tower, from which
 all could be repelled, it would have been near to
 being a *Thil-felake*: perhaps the tower is not fully safe.
 On the strength of a statement in the Talmud
 He argues that the thirteen principles of Maimonides
 are invalid and insufficient. In order to show
 his faultiness in Maimonides division, especially
 in regard to the special article of the Coming of
 the Messiah. He quotes R. Hillel, who apparently
 denies it. So it would scarcely do to declare the
 pious Rabbi and revered teacher of the Talmud as heretic,
 it follows that there must be a flaw in the reasoning.

¹⁾ שאין להם קטיו לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי חזקיהו מלך יהודה (Shuleh-rin 198)

24
of Raimonides. Such was the implicit faith in the Tal-
mud. Still Hbo is in advance of the rest, for
he distinguishes between what is Ragic and what
is traditional. And carries the distinction through all
his reasoning. He draws from the mass of Jewish
books a few as the most prominent, placing them
as of a value not exactly as results of reasoning,
but rather as distinctively and eminent Ragic
principles; others he holds as of a purely tra-
ditional character, and assigns to them a subordinate
place in his division. It is true he finally,
in quite an orthodox way makes the principles
with their "roots and branches" principles both of
the Bible and of the Talmud, standing equally with
the primary doctrines. Still, it was a considerable
step to call attention to their difference of origin.
And gives evidence of a deal of discrimination
on the part of Hbo. If the time had not yet
come, when this discrimination could be pursued to

its legitimate consequences, it was not Albo's fault. It was at any rate not in Albo's province to pursue his course of reasoning into the field of practice; his was only the philosophic consideration of Jewish principles. He did not live in his lands the recodifications of laws, it was not in his temperament. He did not wield the power that to end cast away what was before. He did not recast it according to a mould of his own. This only a Maimonides could do only a Maimonides possessed sufficient ability and firmness of character and penetrating comprehension for creating a new Judaism of practice, and even he was very careful not to stray too far away from the Talmud.

The philosophy of Bachya, Levi Gibril and Maimonides then ^{embraced} ~~embraced~~ the whole with the philosophy of Albo in the first instance in the reverence and implicit authority they yielded to

the Talmud. Though he took some liberties, Albo had still not emancipated himself entirely from the Talmudic standpoint. Every Jewish philosopher before him had conceived the Talmudic teachings, as did also his predecessors, as a unity, every part of which was inspired by the same beliefs and the same principles. Being accustomed to look upon the Bible as such a unity, of which revelation is the vital element, it was within the line of that reasoning that the Talmud also was such a unity; through its halachic passages one unifying principle must run like a thread. But Albo is not the only one in whose philosophy complete historical conception is a sad want, not to speak of some, whose systems are familiar to us and of whom we might justly expect that they appreciate the historical importance of historical position and action e.g. Mendelssohn. In this blindness to the

vital element in the idea of progression, Albo was
 not far behind all philosophers of the Middle
 Ages, both Jewish and Christian. That the
 Church Fathers had no more highly developed
 conception of history need not be proven, the
 very character of the Middle Ages is sufficient
 proof. Had they taught that the world was
 working out a world-progress, in which every
 step is an element, there would have been
 among the people a profounder respect for
 antiquity, and a more intelligent outlook into
 the future, and a positive conviction of the final
 triumph of justice and humanity. Albo, however,
 can be considered as standing higher than his
 predecessors. In the first chapters of the
Mikra he takes occasion to stamp certain
 beliefs as Jewish, though not essentially Jewish,
 others again as purely and distinctively Jewish.
 Revelation is to him the criterion of religion.

revelation embraces all which is necessary, for
 Judaism. The existence of God, of a divine law,
 and the expectation of reward and punishment is
 all which seems to him implied in revealed religion,
 origin in a divine source, with the motive of retributive
 law, and the active principles of action are almost
 the ultimate principles. Whatever other beliefs
 there may be are secondary, though not less
 obligatory to every adherent. There is a gradation
 here, which however guarded is striking.

It might be objected here: Albo was
 not the first to divide Jewish principles into
 those, without which Judaism could not exist
 and into those the denial of which would ^{not} be
 heresy. His teacher Chasdai Crescas and Marginalia
 were fully aware of the comparative and graded
 importance of the tenets; Albo even discusses their
 divisions, draws the fallacies, which he detects
 in them into all sorts of ugly shapes, until

he has succeeded in raising the reader's curiosity, how such gross fallacies could have been tolerated. At any rate, they furnish some material to him for a new construction. Now, to put Albo into a light more just to his talents and to further the proper understanding of the matter it might be necessary to consider the positions of Albo's predecessors as to the doctrinal contents of Judaism.

Properly considered such a review of pre-Albo philosophy may be considered a hurried glance through the history of Jewish dogmatism. We might be thought to deal here really with a matter foreign to the spirit of Judaism; for how can we speak in Judaism of dogmas? Neither the Bible, nor the other parts of scriptures make any mention of articles of faith; Nor can a religion of life and of action; a religion, which man embraces that

were advised and had gained a footing, they gradually became naturalized. Thus at the time of the Hellenists, when Greek manners and customs found imitators, Greek conceptions gained devotees among the Jews; The Sadducees refused to subscribe to the authority of tradition ^{they} did not believe in resurrection, in the Messiah &c. The Essenes, whose existence in Judaism is dissonant with its true spirit, likewise rejected the belief in resurrection. The pressure was felt, ^{and} for the first time, though in rather a crude way, expressions were given to Jewish dogmas, in opposition to these sects. These dogmas were specified in ^{concrete} declarations, in the shape of prayers ^{and} in the various parts of the liturgy. It was doubtless the best way to popularize them. The unity of God was expressed in the daily recital of the ^{שְׁמַיָּה}, the Pivulation of the

by the insertion of the Ten Words into the morning prayer, the belief in the coming of the Messiah and in the Resurrection of the dead by the introduction of special parts, and so also of the belief in a future world. Philo pointed out however: God exists and is the governor of the universe; he is one; the creator of the world, there is only one world and God's providence extends to all things.

The temple was destroyed, the Jewish state was dissolved - Christianity arose and new sects made roads into Judaism. Many were the disputations between Jewish Rabbis and Jew-Christians. Rabbis found it necessary to declare: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself' is the fundamental law of Judaism; another Rabbi, the continuous progress of one kind and the equality of men, another the knowledge of God's voice. The 613 laws of Moses, David was interpreted to have reduced to three,

Isaiah to 6¹, Micah to three ²⁾ and Habakkuk to one ³⁾

All this was an attempt to give in a concise way distinctive teachings of Judaism, with no intention to exhaust them all in a philosophic definition of Judaism. The philosophy of the Middle Ages, however, aimed at precipitating all of the distinctively Jewish into definite principles, well rounded, sufficiently limited to permit of no further condensation and still comprehensive enough to embrace all, which makes Judaism a divinely revealed religion, and gives it its individual character.

Of Saadya we have already spoken, but not of his conception of the principles of the Jewish religion. According to him they are ten. Before we enumerate them, we would again call attention to the distinctive feature of his reasoning, namely from biblical sources only. Still he will be seen to fall unconsciously upon tradition.

¹⁾ Isaiah XXXIII, 15, 16.

²⁾ Micah V, 6-8

³⁾ Habakkuk II-III

The principles of Judaism, according to Saadya are:
 Creation by God; the Unity of God; Revelation;
 Free Will of man; - Sin and Repentance; Immortality;
 Resurrection; Messiah; Retribution, and the Mission
 of man. Now in fact Resurrection and Messiah
 are scarcely biblical. As burning hopes
 of a people of fallen fortune the belief in
 them existed. Saadya could not discountenance
 them. Our Albo was more consistent, he
 would admit nothing to the sanctum of אמונה,
 no matter how deeply rooted it was in the con-
 viction of the people, unless it rooted in Judaism
 also, plucking out which, Judaism would be ripped
 and die; only the what he recognized as having
 a place among the אמונות. Besides yielding to
 popular persuasion, Saadya was on the whole
 influenced by Arabic philosophies and by tradition
 in his eschatological conceptions.

His successors formed a period of their

and kind! It was distinctly an age of poetry
 put existence. It is history first of all.
 When Mr. Webb the Lord of Langham,
 the first Laureate - Joshua Webb, Baron Webb
 here there is a great number of facts, who do
 serve the highest commendation; but are over-
 shadowed by the superior talents of those whom
 he has mentioned, and then, they have no place
 here in the consideration of religious philosophy.
 The more that has been said, it has caught
 it not from the Arabian, but from the family
 of the type challenged the teacher. Nothing
 did, the divine. Symbolizing the Hebrew comes as
 a line of golden fusion. The great power. Things
 of the type of hearing emotion. The modern the
 nature accounts new life; to the identity of
 them fresh mind. The dawn.

This method undoubtedly got the impression of the great problems to find a satisfactory answer to what is of the deepest concern to the human mind. He knew something of the great world which he understood the elements of divine wisdom. He was in his world of beauty and goodness. His contemplative embrace the universe, the law of continuity of existence, from the farthest to the closest, and for each they demand the great satisfaction and an appropriate image.

Voluntarily those thoughts and feelings from their great impression in prayer such as the great Schiele. He many religious pieces of class of the time, which were part of the public work in many official organizations and the religious poems of John a Volon, especially his national religious poems: though they do not work entirely his best piece, because they first from which. That philosophical observations

1739 700

breathed upon by the tender breath of poetic
 inspiration, would bear unmistakable signs of
 his influence, is to be expected. To this another
 circumstance, intimately connected with it, tended
 to modify religious philosophy the more. The
 Jewish philosopher, looking about for world-com-
 pions kindred to his own, is naturally led by
 his dispositions. The choice of the poet will be
 determined evidently by sublimity of conception,
 by flight of imagination and by depth of sentiment.
 In Gehirol and Ichudai Hakri were attracted
 to the two systems: the Platonic and the NeoPlatonic.
 And Ichudai was, in fact, the one who introduced
 the NeoPlatonic philosophy into Europe. We
 may look up to these philosophers with res-
 pect; every thought of theirs was the Echo of
 their strong religious conviction. With true philosophic
 impartiality they threw the light of criticism
 upon everything. Still, since poetry and the sacred

for truth were in their hearts and the threads of feelings led ^{and} merged into the fibres of their minds, ^{they} may not, at times have unconsciously used the lines to their philosophic speculations? The mission of Judaism ^{and} of its people was ^{more} advocated ^{more} eloquently than ^{it} ^{was} ^{by} the ^{words} ^{of} the sparkle of their poetic effusions. On the other hand their opinions were chaste and pure, ^{and} even severely critical. They may have ^{been} ^{at} ^{times} ^{high}, but they constructed a strong scaffolding upon which it was safe to ascend toward the attainment of it.

In a consideration of the history of Jewish dogmatism, the poetic age has little importance. The School did little to enhance a positive conception of Judaism and to put its doctrines into a clear and definite light. Jehuda Halevi was too anti-philosophic in perspective, and took no stock in theorizing; his standpoint was (and it was a

positive (sanction) : the fulfillment of religious duties is the kernel of Judaism. With this he thought he had administered a blow to philosophy, which he claimed, was at any rate unreliable, because of the difference of opinions among its disciples : And so also to the Karaites, for if religious deeds are of prime importance, it is not difficult to nullify Rabbinism. Ceremonialism in Judaism must be regulated and determined by a central authority; it cannot be ~~remitted~~ ^{referred} to individual interpretation. And is no matter, upon which the choice of each individual can decide for himself; it must be positive; and Tradition became a necessity. Shadal Hakavi seemed almost justly for verification to the dissensions among the Karaites, who were early divided into factions without guiding principles. For the science of Jewish dogmatics Shadal Hakavi never intended to do anything; his very first assertion is : that historical evidence, ^{and}

tradition are paramount in the belief in Judaism.
 He disparaged all dogmatic metaphysics and
 put a limit to it, for religion can start from
 revelation only and from the testimony which its
 public promulgation affords.

Between Shmuel and Jehuda Halevi we
 must put a man who was no poet, though his
 philosophy shows that his heart swelled with
 poetic action. It is Bachya Shmuel. His
 efforts are directed toward an idealization of
 Judaism, making belief a matter of subjectivity,
 the duties which conscience prescribes are of an
 higher order than those which a religious code
 imposes. Bachya evolved an ethical system of
 purity and virtue, the motives of which he found
 in the belief in the unity and greatness of God.
 But no more than Shmuel and Jehuda Halevi
 did he undertake to analyze the essence of Judaism.
 Abraham Ibn Ezra was an eclectic and it is

to ascertain a definite idea of his teachings they are so sparse ^{and} indistinct. He delighted in throwing out a hint ^{and} no more. These hints, however are sufficient to stamp him as rather a bold ^{and} incisive critic ^{and} thinker. Prophecy seems already clearing up with him into what became with Maimonides a subjective state. He is a rationalist with a mystic method. Systematic work in the field of philosophy was not to be expected of him.

Abraham Ibn Daud maintained at the time of the birth of Maimonides a proposition, which became afterwards the cornerstone of the noble structure, constructed by the profoundest of Jewish thinkers. Ibn Daud posited that philosophic cognition was the prime duty of man, that it was the principle in Judaism, ^{and} that Judaism need not fear speculation, as the facts of reason ^{and} the results of reasoning are in consonance with the

Judgement first. Judgement is first, the
 all depending on the reality of its practice
 & this. We must remember it has left to
 have up this idea, which, if it was not overgrown
 to him by Shadlow, was at any rate the feeling
 in what his father Mr. Shadlow was so good
 to him as to let him, the relation of religion
 and philosophy he conceives to imply not so
 much that the Bible was always seen to imply
 not harmony with the Christian philosophy
 for in fact he is imperfect except with
 considerable living of ethical life, on the one
 hand, and the application of scientific principles
 on the other. But in the application to
 them he was his ultimate purpose: & they
 felt not such a relation. That they were a
 mechanical influence upon one another, the
 Bible is authoritative in all important questions
 in which experience and the deduction from it

are inadequate, and philosophy regulates all matters of life and knowledge within the control of reason.

In the history of Jewish dogmatism Moses Maimonides is as important as his system is prominent and creative in the development of Jewish thought. A comparison with Albo, therefore, must be taken cum grano salis; for we can never claim for Albo the great originality and the powerful energy, such as Maimonides possessed. Their respective positions in Jewish philosophy differ in many ways, among which their profundity of thought is not the least. In fact, Maimonides marks the climax and Albo the close of the period of Spanish-Jewish Philosophizing. Maimonides stands so very high and that greatly in the estimation of all students, that all others dwindled into dwarfs at his side and offer hardly room for comparison with him. Just as his religious Code caused a mighty agitation

in the Jewish world, so also did his *Moreh Nebuchim* mark a turning point and the influence which both have exerted, and the effects which both have brought about, have been thoroughgoing; they marked a new era. Though, at first suffering at the hands of the severest opposition, (a fate, which all great ideas must) in order to benefit ultimately from benchmark criticism and the genuinizing analysis, it became in the end universally recognized as the only sound exposition of Judaism.

Though Joseph Albo cannot measure himself with this intellectual giant, admitting at the same time the undoubted gift, which Albo owes to Maimonides, as do all other Jewish philosophers before him and contemporaries with him, a consideration of their respective methods of treatment of the doctrines of Judaism is allowable. Their points of view ^{were} different.

Raimonides had attempted by all his work to
 previous to the writing of the ^{מורה נבוכים} to bring
 a fresh breeze into the stagnant atmosphere
 of the spiritual life of the Jews; he desired
 to infuse a spirit of vitality into ossified
 Rabbinism and to revive it with the breath
 of truth. All were to be instructed in the
 principles of their religion and correct ideas
 of God, of providence, and the real contents and purpose
 of the ceremonial were to be inculcated.
 In the sad and tempest tossed life, the Jewish people
 had lost grasp of the eternal truths of the Sinaitic
 religion, the varied and confused, Rabbinic and Mid-
 rashic compilations contributing as little towards
 obscuring them. Raimonides' immediate intention
 in the construction of his thirteen principles of
 belief was to instruct the people - not any
 polemic with Christianity and Islam, but
 against the false views, which prevailed in Judaism.

1) Schlessinger - Einführung zu R. Sa. Alberts Briefe. Berlin. 1894.
 vid. Hitz. Gesch. d. Juden. Vol. VI. p. 349

Chas. dai Crescas ^{and} Alfs. his pupil, however, philosophized with a "Tindal"; they had an eye upon circumstances, which were pressing ^{and} important enough to warrant, even to demand special ^{and} careful consideration. The death of Maimonides was to be deplored not only because a brilliant ^{and} true exponent of Judaism has been extinguished ^{and} Judaism has lost a true exponent, but also because it marked the end of the rationalism of his period ^{and} was the occasion of a relapse into ^{and} religious orthodoxy ^{and} bigotry.

A division into parties for and against
Nazimian teachings, which soon grew into bitter
hostility, so that ~~it~~ consumed the vitals of Judaism.
It became the source of much misfortune. Excommuni-
cations were hurled in profusion from both sides and
the friction finally ignited a conflagration, which
spread with such rapidity. The internal discord
became intense - it soon exceeded all bounds.

Discussions were kept upon such other, and in France
the outbreak of the Atlantic Treaty marked such
a high mark, in order to administer a blow
to the rationalistic and philosophical party,
a step was taken, the fatal consequence of which
a little Frenchman had deliberation could not
have calculated upon. The ecclesiastical authorities
were affected to in a luckless moment to
the measures against the followers of Maine
and, citation was made of the Mar. 18th
League to rational tendency. The policy of the
League was aimed. The term of Montpelier
where the unfortunate example of denunciation,
affirmations initiated by others, was made, was
marked by all the cities of the West, which
were found, were publicly burned. The question
did not stop here - The question, where there
likely were other for deeds of character
took a higher interest in the matter.

against heresy. Soon after the condemnation
 of the Nestorians, the Church had occasion
 afforded by informers, of course, to become aware
 of the detrimental and demoralizing influence of
 the Sabians: the pyre soon blazed into the fables
 in the market-place of Paris. The hissing
 pyre did not allay the internal dissension
 of Judaism. The Church was not able to
 prevent more feel that they might blaze the
 more brightly.

But out of this chaos arose a genius, which
 was to displace both philosophy and Sabianism
 by assimilating both, and by devising out of the
 two elements a new and promising dispensation.
 This was the Cabalistic movement. Iamblichus,
 already, combats with vehemence against certain
 beliefs of a magic nature, which were current
 at his time. The school of Isaac the Blind,
 however, was a different phase of what is, at

any rate, a natural proclivity of man.
 Man subscribes, willingly, to the mysterious
 and the enigmatic; the intellect, in its highest
 flights frequently settles upon a cloud in
 the misty air. Caballism is a creation,
 and has its natural foundation in this
 intimate warfare of Judaism and philoso-
 phy. Its Bible is ^{the work} of a Jewish authority,
 and philosophizes. These both parties were to
 be conciliated: the Judaismists, in as much as the
 Cabal was still the basis; the philosophers, since
 they were not deprived of the privilege of
 speculating. The Cabalah lost, however, even
 after its rise, the direction, which had been
 given it by its originators - The peculiar method
 of reasoning, which had to be resorted to,
 in order to arrive at the same results, which
 the much despised philosophical school had
 attained, viz. the pure and unadulterated truth.

ciples of Judaism ^{and} divine religion, still in
 perfect consonance with Rabbinic precepts,
 deteriorated into a play of symbolism, as
 time wore but few to whom the real content
 and purpose of the Cabalah had been disclosed.
 It lay in the nature of such an obscure Commu-
 nism to suffer distortion. It finally came
 to represent a Kosmos of the grossest sort,
 in which all clear reasoning ^{and} unique
 personal thought was disparaged. Imagination
 and fantasy spread to illimitable regions
 and an ordinary share of ideality was in-
 sufficient and powerless to carry one up the
 steep ascent - ^{or phantasmagoria} God ^{אדון} is the nothing, in-
 asmuch as it is impossible for man to know
 anything of Him; only through His creation
 did the ^{אדון} reveal Himself and offer us a
 means to an approximate knowledge of His
 nature - This creation, however, could not be

his work immediately, as the imperfect ^{and} the finite cannot come directly from the perfect ^{and} the infinite. Here we meet an idea, which was a favorite one in the Neo Platonic system of Philo. Emanation, in a graded series one from the other, are the *Ser & machina*, flowing out of God to execute the creation of the world.

The allegorical system of Philo may be considered a sort of forerunner of the Caballah. His views were he based in the Caballistic mysticism, as it also can be seen in the patristic literature.

Some claim that Nachmani, the great head of the congregation at Gerona, was a decided adherent of the Caballistic school. We believe to see in him a real representative of the originally conciliatory movement, of which we spoke above ^{and} which in a later period or perhaps even at his time already grew into the Caballah. The support of Nachmanides

was of consequence to whatever side he might
 take himself - Bachmanides' desire, however,
 was to maintain peace and harmony. He
 recommended deliberation. In consideration of
 the danger, which was continually threatening
 the state, he dissuaded all from doing any-
 thing, which might contribute to the misfortunes,
 which were already already enough upon the
 state of Israel. He begged them to desist from
 a course, which might result ultimately in a schism, which
 they would have cause to deplore grievously.
 But Bachmanides was not entirely impartial;
 his relations with the leaders of the Pal-
 mudic party might have inclined him towards
 it. At any rate, from the fact that Bach-
 manides was a prominent Pal mudist and a
 recognized authority in the study of the Pal mud, would
 conduce towards determining his position in a
 question, in which Pal mudism was involved. It

is said that Trakmanides was initiated into
 the mysteries of the Caballah by Ariel and
 Asa and that he became a pious devotee of
 its teachings. Still, when called upon to defend
 Judaism against Pablo Christiani, not a
 word is offered by any one on either side
 to protest that a Caballistic should not
 be permitted to set forth his wild theories as
 recognized teachings of Judaism. And to place in
 the sacred and responsible position of expositor
 and defender of God's laws. On the contrary,
 Trakmanides displays an unusual character
 of corruption of Judaism. In the course of the
 disputation he denies even the belief in a
 principle Messias and the implicit validity of the
 Agadah, two topics with which Caballism delights
 especially in playing.

In a subsequent discussion in the synagogue
 of Barcelona, he combats symbolisms, which Philo

felt advances in support of the doctrine of the Trinity.
 The position of Nachmanides is least like that
 of the Catalists, who were not able, perhaps,
 to grasp the full meaning of the moral truths,
 to which Nachmanides gave expression. Even
 as a Palamist he is far ahead of his fellow-
 Palamists. He was pervaded by the honest
 purpose of bringing about a reconciliation, and to
 the accomplishment of this end, all his efforts,
 his practical and public, ^{and literary} were devoted.
 He conceived the new school as a middle
 ground, upon which both Palamists and Philo-
 sophes might meet and become reconciled. The
 basis of this system was tradition, tradition of
 the Palamists; its origin was referred to Simon
 ben Yochai ^{and} to Nechunyah ben Hakana, ^{and}
 the method was philosophical; true, in a large
 part, but in the end issuing at the same
 point, where pure philosophy ends. The attempt

immediately in return, heeded by Jacob ben
 Simeon ^{ben} by Jacob Simeon, in Montpellier,
 upon all who would prevent ^{and} in any way
 retard the progress of those who revered the memory
 of Maimonides ^{and} who showed their reverence for
 the great master by a zealous study of philosophy.

The inevitable result came, it was a sad
 spectacle. They did not succeed in displacing one
 another. They fell unitedly, both, soon after, were
 neglected ^{and} neither the Talmud nor the More
 Nuchim were studied. Out of all this time of
 fervent excitement, only one philosopher is worth
 the mention. The name of his work is significant.

ה'תקנ"ח "The battles of the Lord." Gersonides,
 Leon de Barolac has a type of his own, his utter
 indifference to the predispositions of the common
 people ^{and} his great love of truth made him
 an independent character of exceptional originality
 and determination. His conception of immortality

was founded on this: there is an individual,
continuous ^{and} graded existence of the soul, accord-
ing to the degree of perfection it has acquired
in its earthly life. Protonides accepted
prophecy ^{and} miracles as philosophically de-
monstrative, ^{and} hell revelation as an incontrovertible
fact. While starting from the existence of God,
his basis of an original substance, undefined
^{and} abstract is the shell of shells of his system.
In times of persecution ^{and} of internal dis-
union ended in a cessation from all study.

Persecution, at the hand of the common enemy was
at its highest. Its severity ^{and} trickish con-
nivances had succeeded in straying many
from their faith ^{and} from their people ^{and} even
in using them against their former brethren.
Apostates flourished ^{and} stretched their venomous
tongues in treacherous delations ^{and} libellous
accusations. Chasdai Crescas, along with his

first Isaac ben Shesheth ^{and} their teacher the
 singular R. Nissim Girondi of Barcelona
 were victims of denunciations, which luckily,
 however, were proved to be without ground.
 It was not until the age of Crescas ^{and} of Albo,
 of the age of which their respective positions ^{and}
 the influences which were exerted upon each
 are well be clearly seen. We have seen that
 of many philosophers, who preceded them, not
 one ^{not one} ^{and} Saadja included, ^{came}
 into direct contact with Christians. They
 reasoned for their own satisfaction ^{and} for the
 purpose of enlightening the Jewish people. The
 tendency of none was a mainly apologetic one,
 as was that of Crescas, but more so as of Albo.
 At the time of these two, the overwhelming in-
 crease of Marranos was sufficient to cast
 a melancholy gloom upon devout Jews; the in-
 crease of pronounced apostates was deplorable

John Ramirez and Paulus de Santa Maria were
 filled with the holy zeal for their new faith and
 they were eager to give evidence of their true
 conversion and of their fidelity. How could
 they do it better than by spreading the gospel
 among their benighted former brethren. The
 most important way to convince was the edge
 of the sword, ridicule and vilification. A
 calm consideration of arguments was not
 to be tolerated; a conscientious discussion of
 disputed points, in order to clear up mis-
 conceptions was not thought of in the heat of
 passion on the side of devout Christians and
 of malice on the part of converts. For the first
 time an apologetic pamphlet, written in Spanish,
 appeared in Spain, — a significant fact as
 it is an index of the agitation which prevailed
 at that period. It went into an impartial
 philosophical discussion on the dogmas of

of Christianity, and disproved the rationality of
 the belief in Incarnation, the Trinity and
 Original Sin. That at such a time as this
 all unfolded in Sages, in Platonic dialectics
 and in philosophic disquisitions was at a
 time it is not surprising; it was a purely
 apologetic period. To combat on the one
 hand against the depreciation and the condemnation
 of Judaism and on the other hand to confirm
 the Jew in his belief and to strengthen him as
 against opposition. There was no scarcity of
 converts on the part of the Apostles. Jerome
 and Paulus of Burgos, and Juan de Espina
 wrote with varying methods for the same purpose
 to alienate the Jew from his ancestral belief.
 Joseph Albo wrote (in Spanish) a religious dis-
 putation in the form of a dialogue between him-
 self and a high dignitary of the Church. Don
 David Hasei also composed a book in the same

And, another in the Province, a certain Isaac
ben Kalonymus, answers Gerónimo's tentative.
Although the Alharonim, Alro's polemic
against Christianity is noticeable.

One can perceive that the philosophy of
the Scholastic as well as the Jewish
was saturated with Aristotelianism, it was
as common to Christian dogmatism
as to Jewish religious philosophical reasoning. At his
time Scholasticism was in its last stages. If
Aristotle had been the foundation of scholastic
philosophy in its brightest days, the few representa-
tives of the Church doctors contemporaneous with
Chasdai Crescas did not and could not emanci-
pate themselves from his authority. Their
dependence upon their predecessors was such a
thoroughgoing one, that he who dealt with them
dealt in reality with Anselm, Albertus Magnus,
Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.

The Jewish Philosophy also, Aristotle had
 reworked entire content. He was far from
 he got at the system of the Hebrew and of
 the Jewish Philosophy; even the anti-philosophy
 of the Jewish Philosophy when are indebted to him
 for a great share of their method. In the
 18th century of Europe. As a result the Jew
 was a minority because at his time the world
 was made of thinking had not yet finished
 his Jewish Philosophy. And did not yet occupy a
 place in Jewish reasoning. And the results
 are not so much to disprove the results
 at which other Jewish Philosophers had arrived
 as to change the questions by which they were
 attained. Chastai gave the sense of great evil
 which Judaism and Jewish doctrine were
 exposed, lay in the development of the power
 and movement, the Philosophy of Aristotle, what
 Christianity and Christian doctrine implied.

the existence of categories, and from the
existence of categories to the existence of
categories as applications to the existence of
categories.

in fine rubricata. *Chelid. maj.*

Aristotelianism is in its essence foreign to Judaism and could be its support by force of interpretation only or, what is more dangerous, by an assimilation of extraneous elements. Now, this system was the naturalized ingredient of Christian dogmatics. Polemics against Aristotelian Christianity were precarious.

Crusade there to put Judaism upon a stronger and independent basis. This was no easy undertaking. It required Herculean courage to lay hands upon a system, which was little less than divine in the estimation of both friends and foes. The teachings of Aristotle were held to be irrefragable. To Scholastics he was the "precursor Christ" in naturalism and to Maimonides his teachings were co-ordinate with the Biblical. It required a gigantic mind to uncover the weaknesses, the fallacies and the errors of Aristotelian principles, to uproot the overwhelming prejudices in his favor

to the Scholastics; for through them the Arabic versions of the works were translated into Latin - Wehrung's History of Philosophy

to destroy the old and build a new foundation. Not
even in 16th century was Chasdai's purpose
recognized in its real importance. Pico de Mirandola
appreciated the work of the Jewish philosopher of
Barcelona; and he continued the battle against
Christianism but he saw it face -

Quite different from Chasdai, in this respect
is the position of Albi. His polemic, in the first
place was directed against the results of Jewish
philosophy more than against their method.
Unlike his, like his predecessors, plainly
follow peripatetic philosophy, nor like his teacher
does he mercilessly deal out blows at it. Albi
was imbued with a totally different spirit. The
many bitter controversies convinced him of the
fact that if Judaism is to present to the attack
a solid front, it must stand on positive ground.

To the inquirer, be he deprecatory, skeptical or
devoted, Judaism must offer that alone, which

is unerring and certain. He, who had witnessed the disputation at Tortosa and the confusion, which but the slightest change of controversial tactics in the argumentation had produced, could appreciate the utter inexpediency of a subversion of the method which was in vogue. So he laid out a new scheme of Jewish principles.

Chadai Crescas posited eight principles in opposition to the thirteen of Maimonides, but a consideration of their nature will show that they have been placed together in harmony with the tenets of Crescas, as a sort of climax of the whole; he placed at the head such principles as are most distinctly anti-Aristotelian. They are the Creation of the World, Immortality, Reward and Punishment, Resurrection, Eternity of the Law, Specifically on preme degree of Messianic prophecy, the High-priests ability to atone by means of golden and silver, and the Coming of the Messiah. In

reference to the Creation of the world in opposition
to the Aristotelian Eternity of matter this is
to be seen also the Immortality of the soul, of
which the assertion of Aristotle has in as much
as the soul is nothing more than the union
of the different activities of an organic body
and one immovable activity directed by design, it
does not exist per se apart from the body.

Thus the Punishment came as a natural
consequence from the doctrine of Immortality.
And the doctrine of Resurrection was closely
intimely with the doctrine of Reward and Punish-
ment, as original with God taught distinctly by
the Prophets these two were united into one, at
least in line. The Revelation of the Law and
its eternity are in essential opposition to the
Aristotelian divine spirit, which cannot enter
into the life of the world. The doctrine of
the specific degree of the prophecy of Moses

aimed in part to call attention to the distinctly Jewish combination of the immediately divine as the traditional, ^{and} besides not only to the present ^{a revelation} but to the actual manifestation of G. I. unto man. The last two have their ground in the Talmud, which plays an important part in Chasdai Crescas.

Chasdai's of position to Aristotle was a ^{hazy} hazy one that even in its culmination the ^{anti} aristotelian tendency is visible, it can only be looked upon as a prejudiced system ^{and} therefore not entirely pure, not philosophic in the real sense of the word. It was, therefore, the part of the pupil to take up the thread, which the master had dropped ^{and} to weave a new web. This Albo did. But Albo was not so severe against Aristotle. He did not attempt a reconstruction of Judaism in the sense in which Chasdai had labored. He merely

aimed to define more positively its contents. The
 events of his day urged him to avoid split-
 ting his ground. Judaism needed all the strength
 it could gather, the zeal of the con-
 verted was glowing; pious monks were striving
 to bring into the fold of the Christian Church,
 the fallen and despised sons of a once glorious,
 but now sadly reduced people. Without that un-
 scrupulous dissection of the Jewish con-
 gregation turned into bitter enemies. Vicente
 Ferrer preached with the convincing power of in-
 situation and won the hearts of his faithful Christian
 auditors. His humble manners, meek bearing and
 sympathetic voice moved those who heard him, and
 he became their master; he could turn their
 righteous indignation into a storm of wrath; were
 to him who stood in the path of the rabid multitude.
 To the Jews Vicente Ferrer was not especially
 friendly disposed, he brought little else than

untold miseries upon them. They were reduced
 socially to the very lowest and despicable position;
 indignities of every description were put upon
 them. The Jews were confined to the Ghetti; they
 were deprived of the right of practising trades,
 of studying medicine; all intercourse with
 Christians was interdicted. The privilege to enjoy
 their jurisdiction according to their own laws
 was withdrawn; they were forced to dress in a
 certain way and the wearing of a certain piece
 of cloth as a 'Jew's mark' was made compulsory.

In the event of an infringement of these edicts,
 a heavy fine was exacted. All through the
 influence of Vicente Ferrer, He kindly invited
 himself into the synagogue; here to preach
 the universal benevolence of the Cross; the
 Sceptic was made a believer by the force of eternal
 damnation in heavens and on earth. Pope
 Benedict XIII was ready to second any attempts

at the conversions of the Jews, his ambitious hopes
 could only be furthered by such charitable
 work in behalf of the Church. An invitation
 was therefore, extended to the most learned
 Doctors of Aragon to take part in a dispu-
 tation. The Apostolic Giovanni de Santa Fe would
 be ready to meet them with arguments why the
 Jews should at once embrace Christianity; he
 would prove it from their Talmud that the Messiah
 had come in the person of Jesus. It was dangerous
 to refuse the invitation. Accordingly sixteen of the
 most prominent Rabbis appeared in Tortosa;
 against them our Albo. It would perhaps, not
 be in place to go at length into the various
 matters debated. Suffice it to say that the Apostolic
 was baffled into a position into which only an
 unscrupulous and perfidious apostate could come.
 Every one of his malicious falsehoods was exposed.
 Even the Pope and the attending prelates turned from

him in disappointment and disgust. The attacks of
Geronimo and a slight misunderstanding in
the tactics to be pursued, led the apprehensive
San Felipe Levi to present a written declara-
tion that the Agadah in the Talmud, to
which Geronimo had referred as intolerant
toward Christianity, was not authoritative and
that he considered himself not bound by it.

Only two and Don Vidal alone were firm
enough to refuse to sign this declaration and
pronounced themselves as clinging to the
full authority of the Agadah. As to the
special, objectionable passages quoted they deemed
it just to say that they ought not to be inter-
preted according to the letter but according
to the spirit. ¹⁾

He is the last of the Jewish philosophers;
his contemporary Joseph ibn Shem tof, can scarcely
be reckoned as a religious-philosopher, as, while

¹⁾ Cf. comp. I, 2.

starting on a rational way, he lands in mystery;
 besides he offers a merely fragmentary con-
 sideration of religious questions, and no rounded
 system. Albi & Hakam presents a unity,
 & matters what we may say of Albi's mode
 of treatment, it is still a unity, an organic
 work, in which certain aspects are prominent,
 others subordinate, according to their nature.
 His style may be diffuse, it may be a
 declamation in a popular style, but he is so much
 the more lucid and distinct. This characteristic
 of his has contributed toward making him the
 favorite of the people, up to our times. He had
 the special talent of presenting abstract subjects
 in a clear, well-defined and easily flowing style.
 Besides he ingeniously introduced striking illus-
 trations and pertinent Agadah and Midrashim, thus
 throwing light and a pleasing light upon every
 thought.

almost the very first of the Chapters of the *Ullian*. Altho lays down the purpose of his book, or rather the result at which he wished to arrive. It has its place there very aptly. So, with this as a guide all his further reasoning becomes clear; it is after that no matter of difficulty to understand the drift of his arguments and no more problematical for the reader, who in the other philosophical works has to wade through *introductiones* and *preparatorie* and reaches out in vain for a line upon which to feel along his way. Altho says: in a divine dispensation three elements are necessary; they are 1) existence of God - 2) the belief that retribution in the shape of reward and punishment exists and 3) the divine origin of the law. These are the principles of a religion, which lays claim to being divine. It will be noticed that the limits are very broad, not without justice. As Altho himself says, he

regarding the extreme delicacy with which the policy
 of principles must be attended, for it requires
 first of all, a careful distinction to make between
 those principles which are common to all nations
 and those which are peculiar
 to each individual system. For example, the
 rights of man, justice, principles, amongst
 nations, are the same in the coming of the Messiah.
 But the same may be provided a justice,
 for it is certain that the Messiah came at
 the time of King Agrippa. For it would seem
 by the testimony he bears that John the Baptist
 a justice. The actual coming is, therefore, as necessary
 to the way of Antioch as the same, were we
 to suppose the belief in the future coming of
 a Messiah in its proper importance, as a more
 firm belief, not as an ultimate principle, in
 some cases becoming embarrassed by others.
 according. Again the change might be brought

(London, p. 98) from the paper you have sent me

against the classification of principles by Maimonides that he neglected to include the important maxim that the world was created ^(from nothing) ~~from nothing~~, as will be remembered, Chasdai did include. The Creation out of existing matter versus Creation *ex ipso* was a question, the occasion of considerable controversy between Judaism and Christianity.

Maimonides was led in his definition of divine religion by the consideration, that inasmuch as there could be in reality only one divine religion, he was at the same time defining Judaism. This definition must be such that it embrace the following: it should have divine authenticity and satisfy human reason and the hopes of man.

Religion ^{springs} flows from God, is imbedded in the heart of man and flows back to its source. That is a truly religious life which appreciating its divine source, arranges all deeds, feelings and

Law is according to the will of God and has lofty,
 great aspirations. His estimate of the Jewish
 position by others, especially by Maimonides and
 the Chasidai, led him to avoid importing foreign
 notions. Exotics do not thrive in foreign soil.
 He himself had introduced certain philoso-
 phical conclusions, which, if they were not
 accepted, the dignity of principles, were at
 any rate important enough to do their
 work. He made principles and in the inter-
 pretation these principles thus received, they
 acquired an new garb, which tended to make
 them changes to the Jewish people. The people
 were accustomed to unalloyed Biblical and
 traditional teachings. Chasidai perceived the
 fault and attempted to improve upon Maimonides
 by rejecting Aristotelianism. The con-
 ception of the term "principle" also modified con-
 siderably. Also says: a principle is that upon

when the existence of a thing depends and without which it cannot be." In the preceding chapter, while justifying his attempt to reason upon Judaism he says: while we acknowledge "One thing in the Torah is true", which every Israelite must believe, speculative investigation is permitted; nay more, should any one hold a certain opinion even contrary to truth in the belief that it is a true one, he cannot be called an heretic. Comprehension of principles of Judaism by the recognition of them makes the Jew, not assent to and subscription to certain dogmas, without inquiry and without deliberate consideration of their content. This M^{rs} held always as his criterion and according to it he went to work to arrange and to classify the principles of Judaism. To him intelligent ^{insight} belief was ~~essential~~ ^{essential} to belief. In this he differs not only from his Jewish predecessors, but the more so from

Scholastic, whose fundamental premise was the rationality of the dogma. Though efforts were made to rationalize, the faith of the Church was absolute truth; and the dogmas had coercive power. The Jew may perform ever so many religious laws, he may subscribe to ever so many tenets, as long as he does not appreciate them, as long as they have not to him the force of conviction, drawn from them and realized by himself, so long he is not a Jew. Alas, therefore, considered this alone a legitimate undertaking, to gather up all those premises, which in the aggregate the Jew could seize hold of with his understanding and by which he could guide his actions and his entire life."

He found the three principles, of the existence of God, of the divinity of the Law and of Retribution, such principles, to the justness of which the reason of man could readily assent. That they were

1) Cf. Schleierger. *Leipziger Conversations-Journal* 1830.

biblical, it was not difficult to prove, even in the
 Talmud he found sufficient proof and support.
 Unlike Maimonides, Albo was not forced to
 twist biblical passages, as he did not attempt
 to import ideas and modes of thinking, which were
 strange and new. The three principles were, each
 individually, without doubt, teachings of the
 Bible; the first two positively, the last not express-
 ly, still little less distinctly. It was, however, a
 more serious task to prove that these three and
 not others and that these three and not more con-
 stituted the essence of Judaism. The motive which
 led Albo to posit three principles only, lay in the
 fact that not only at his time, when desertion
 from Judaism, owing to wilful persecution from
 without and a moral disintegration from within, was
 imminent, but at all times it is independent
 to encumber the mind with too heavy a load. In
 order to facilitate a conception of Judaism, it is

necessary to concentrate its truths into as small a compass as possible. Had he presented a compendium of abstract and abstract premises, he might have succeeded in a metaphysical analysis, scarcely in the presentation of the tenets of a religion which is to offer precepts for life. Instead of facilitating religious comprehension and religious deeds, he would have obstructed them. Herein lies one of the reasons, why the *Al-Karim* was more popular than the *More* and more than any of the books of a philosophical character; not merely because of the simplicity of style and of treatment, but because of the clearly cut idea by which the author was guided throughout, viz. that to benefit the mult.itude, the matter presented must be within their range. With due deference to the profundity of Maimonides we must still acknowledge that Albi's influence upon the Jewish people was more thoroughgoing; on this very account, that

he dealt with a smaller number of generalities
and with obvious ones.

However, he was not as apodictic as,
it might appear, ^{from this sort of treatment} he must have been. He did
elevate three principles at the expense of the
rest. He said: "It is true, I claim for three
of them such an importance that he, who denies
one of them, denies all of them ^{and} denies
the existence of divine religion. But I do not
mean to say that by this the Jew is free from
subscribing to the other principles, to which other
religions philosophers have attributed equal validity,
but which I admit to secondary rank merely.

I concede to them as much binding force for
every Jew as they do; to one they are the legitimate
consequences of the first three principles ^{and} the
belief in all their legitimate consequences is en-
cumbrant upon every Jew, equally with the belief
in the three principal premises. These latter are

the final constituents of every religion, which claims
 to be divine. Such a divine religion must have
 a divine being at its head; without it, besides
 not being divine; it cannot be religion in any
 sense. A divine religion must be guided by
 divine law, or else it possesses no more authen-
 ticity and authority than positive law; it is with-
 out content. Lastly the belief in retribution is a
 belief in the ultimate purpose of the divine dispensation.
 It must be, if religion shall not be inane and a
 bubble. We arrive at these three elements by
 a consideration of the idea of natural religion; so
 far as an investigation of the purely biblical ^{and}
 of the post-biblical, we will ascertain the distinctively
 Jewish. The resulting articles are not additional
 doctrines, whose presence or absence reacts upon the
 existence or non-existence of religion in the general
 sense; they rather condition the correct statement
 of Judaism, in particular. They exhibit the teachings

of Judaism pure and simple. Had Albo coordinated these in a loose way with the primary three, he would have done as more for Judaism and for its eternal conception practically, than his predecessors did, or, what is worse, he would have tacitly acknowledged that it is possible, since Judaism has doctrines, which stand in no relation whatever to that essential part, which makes of a system a divine religion, there could be another religion equal in authenticity with Judaism, even if it varied in those teachings, which have their ground in the historical and traditional.

In the first instance we can say with justice, that Albo had a considerably advanced appreciation of the historical development of Judaism and that he yielded to historical development its share of importance. If Judaism is to be an originally divine religion and is not to be lost

from tradition, as was claimed, must be done, in order to revert to the definite standpoint of revelation, then tradition must be shown to be organically in inner connection with revelation. The chain must be shown binding the present status of Judaism to Judaism. Having demonstrated the logical immediateness of relations between historical Judaism and the teaching of the Bible, he had rescued Rabbinism and repulsed the claims of rival religions. It remained then only to prove in a negative way that certain teachings of Christianity and of Mohammedanism were diametrically opposed to Judaism and were in themselves untenable. The raising of "the branches" to obligatory doctrines and incorporating them among the primitive "principles", therefore, has a deeper meaning and is not a slavish following after Raimondos as Dr. Eisler asserts as disproof of Albo.¹ With this one idea Albo successfully disposed of the Karaites.

¹ Dr. M. Eisler, *Neubefunde in der jüd. Philosophie und Ethik*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 10.

and in a great measure of the Christians

Besides, the "branches" limit the extent of the three generalities, to the pseudo-divine systems Christianity arrogated to itself that it was a second revelation, displacing the first. Also says: Christianity contains the three elements which must be present in a divine dispensation, but these are modified there, so that they are different from what their rational conceptions entails.

The existence of God implies at the same time his unity, his incorporeity, his independence of time and that he is perfect. The belief in revelation implies the omniscience of God, Prophecy and that the Lawgiver is a divine messenger; the belief in retribution is a belief in providence -

In respect to these, both original and derivative doctrines, the belief in them was a matter of necessity for one, who wished "to inscribe himself in the name of Israel" - In this there lay neither

arbitrariness nor anything kindred to the well-known ^{fantastic} fictions. It was all rationalization approved of by the Bible and the acutest reasoning.

It was a matter of the utmost importance for him to prove that his classification first into three and then into eight subdivisions &c had foundation in the Bible or else they could be rejected as illegitimate and arbitrary. The first intimation of such a division he detects in the first chapters of Genesis. There is a gradation in creation from the vegetable, through all the stages of life, culminating in man. God reveals himself for the first time. The second principle is vividly inculcated in God's injunction to Adam and Eve; the final punishment for the transgression of it, is certainly retributive. He goes even so far as to consider the first four chapters a sort of scientific introduction, laying

down these principles, as is the custom in all methodic works, that the method be premised, and the mode of treatment is outlined, in which the subject will be pursued.

The most desirable proof is that his "principles" are the principles of the Sinai revelation. And the demonstration of this he accordingly undertakes. ¹ Starting upon the Palmudic saying

(Maccot 24^a) אנוכי ולא יהיה לך קסי הגבורה שמעונו

Alto says the first ten commandments contain the absolute principles of divine religion. Maimonides holds that the Psalmist meant that they are facts of intuition "Hymenaeographa", the first commandment fixing the belief in the existence, the second in the unity of God, they are properly no part of legislation. But then the question arises, if human reason is self sufficient to eventually arrive at the truth of them, why were they revealed. Maimonides meets this objection by saying that the extravagances of the idolators in

their worship has its origin, in the notion that,
 since the spheres are intelligences, administering
 to God, and on this account adoration is due to
 them, and honor which may be accorded them
 is a veneration due toward God, as God wishes
 them, whom he honors to be held in reverence by
 us, the contrary, however, since in this way
 the story would have had its foundation in an act
 of reason ^{and} could not have denied the existence
 of the unity of God, a revelation of the doctrines
 concerning the nature of God was really unnecessary.
 In fact, however, idolaters considered the Deity a
 force in the body of matter, i.e. the one of the
 spheres; a prophetic demonstration of the fallacy
 of them was unnecessary, as reasoning could furnish
 satisfactory evidence. But there was another ground
 for idolatry, the notion that God was too much exalted
 above this world, that having once created it, he should mingle any
 longer with its affairs, that he had no concern in

mankind, because man is mean and despicable in
 proportion to his exaltedness. The governments
 of the millenar world were, therefore, given to stars
 planets and angels. This gave rise to an extravagant
 superstitious worship of constellations and later of
 pictures and images. This system was conformant
 with reason. It has attempted to eradicate this
 misconception by prophetic inculcation would have
 been fruitless; for those who deny providence and revelation
 will undoubtedly reject the validity of prophecy.
 The only efficient way was to demonstrate the truth of
 providence and of revelation. This God did in the first
 book of the "Pentateuch": "I am the Lord thy God" ^{Ex} "Thou
 shalt have no other Gods before me". In the words:
 "I am the Lord thy God", lies the idea that he is providential,
 and the fact that the people of Israel heard God
 speak, demonstrates that prophetic vision exists.
 "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me" was directed
 against the idolatrous worship of the spheres, giants

Thus by the direct revelation of God, the idea, that God being exalted above the material world, cared not for man, was dispelled. The third principle also was proved distinctly, according to Akko, in "who has brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, inasmuch as God takes cognizance of the deeds of man, and compensates evil and good by reward and punishment. This is evidenced by the visitation which came upon the Egyptians and by the delivery of the Jews.

A very striking citation from the Talmud Akko ingeniously turns to advantage. He is anxious to have the support of the Talmud; he himself recited it and subscribed to its laws implicitly. Aside of this, a discrepancy between his system and the acknowledged authority of the Talmud, would have been dangerous. To lack such a basis, would at his time, have been the death-warrant to all philosophizing. In the passage Sanhedrin 90^a we read *אין אדם יכול להחליט*

האומר אין תחיית המתים מן התורה ואין תורה מן השמים ואפיקורוס :

The denial of the Mosaic origin of the doctrine of resurrection is equivalent to the denial of divine retribution; for, the idea of resurrection, in its wider implication, is the reward ^{and} the punishment of deeds. The second doctrine has as very distinct expressions, while the third not as explicit a one. Still it is obvious how reference was made by speaking of an אפיקורוס to the one, who denies the existence of God, ^{and} who believes in chance; that the ancients meant to express by the term "Epicurean" -

We leave it to each one's judgment, whether Albo succeeded in proving that his three principles were the quintessence of the Sinai revelation. We can claim with justness that had Albo, battling against contemporaneous erroneous and illusory conceptions, attempted less to assure himself ^{and} his reader, that there is nothing illusory ^{and} all purely biblical in his classification, but more

92

that it was philosophically correct, he might
have done more permanent good. It should
be undoubtedly of the greatest concern to the
Jewish philosopher, not to reverse from authority,
to be in harmony with the Bible and tradition, and
it was therefore, incumbent upon Albo, who cer-
tainly that on every step he should be in Moses
train. Albo is too much the Jew; he cannot
confute his problems without a certain prejudgment
in favor of Judaism. ^{he cannot like Descartes begin from the foundation} He proposes to investigate
divine religion and to ascertain its essential elements.
Obviously divine religion and Judaism are identical; his
reasoning must eventually arrive at this; but
he assumes it unconsciously and soon we find
him speaking of Judaism and divine religion indis-
criminately, without having undertaken to prove their
identity. The basis of his system, the existence of
God is an assumption; it is true every religious
philosopher, from the character of the matter with

which he deals, is bound to start from the belief in the existence of God; otherwise there would be no grip in what he handles. And as the first touch the loose construction would collapse. But Albo is not a religious philosopher, until he has accomplished what he undertook, namely the analysis of the religious ideas. Having satisfied himself as to the real contents of religion, in general, the next step would be to show the same contents in Judaism. And then a dogmatic treatment can begin. This in fact is the method, which Haimonides pursued.

It will be remembered that Albo, at the outset of his work defines its purpose thus: "to ascertain the necessary principles of divine religion"; He identified this divine religion in abstract with Judaism. And deemed it superfluous to prove their identity; nay he even takes the Mosaic teachings as criteria by which every religion is to be tested. The reader of

the *Sh'Kairim*, therefore, is not forced to assume a skeptical position, in order to follow the author's reasoning; at no point is his *pius* belief shocked by the least irreverent supposition, ^{artifice} ~~used~~ it is only for argumentation ^{only}. In this *Sh'Kairim* method ^{and} in his judicious sense of tact lies another of the causes which made the *Sh'Kairim* of Albi popular among the Jewish people.

The existence of God as the first of Albi's principles, is asserted by Maimonides as the essence of God

מי שחש כחריב המציאות ויחיה כמצאנו עצמו ועצמו כמצאנו

(More I 57), which has its counterpart in the definition of Spinoza: "Causa sui" is that, whose essence includes existence, or that, the nature of which can be conceived as existing only; or "Substance is which is in se ^{and} is understood to be per se, i.e. the conception of which does not depend upon the conception of any other thing of which it must be made (Spinoza's *Opus* ed. Kirchmann p. 9.)

Compare with this the artifice Maimonides employed in assuring that "the eternity of the world" is a *Sh'Kairim* More II. 1 sc

to these Thomas Aquinas - : "Idea igitur essentialis
est suum esse. Si igitur non sit suum esse,
est ens per participationem, et non per essentialitatem.
Est igitur Deus suum esse, et non solum una
essentia." (Summa theol. I q. 3.)

The eternity of the Law, as a principle
of Judaism, fitted to serve as a distinctive
constituent of Judaism, reveals the character-
istic tendency of Albo's philosophizing. For,
what more proper distinction could be lifted
out of the many, which existed between Judaism,
Christianity and Mohammedanism, than the divini-
ty and the eternity of the Law of Moses. For
this law the Jewish people endured persecution
and suffering for centuries, and not from mere
sentimentality. Christians claimed that the
first revelation, the biblical laws and precepts accord-
ing to its spirit had been abrogated by a new
revelation. Mohammedans, in a way characteristic

to themselves, admitted the truth of the Mosaic revelation, but affected to find in it divine attestation of ^{any} prophetic references to the mission of Mohammed. It was therefore, not only quite appropriate, for, but incumbent upon, them to establish the disputed point firmly, and place it into light beyond a doubt. Maimonides and Chasdai had done the same before him, perhaps even for the same purpose. We have proof that it was their intention to disprove claims of imposture. Chasdai Crescas was not decisive enough, though he gave the doctrine of the divinity of the Law a place in his classification of ultimate principles. Both, however, differ from Albo greatly. Albo, although he attributed to the doctrine of the divine origin of the Law a proportionately higher importance than to the other doctrines, Maimonides and Chasdai do, from his more determinate stand against Christianity, still

yield apparently to Christianity in a very
 weighty respect. It is not presumptuous in assert-
 ing that the Law of God is God's revelation and
 to change it, would be heresy. It recognizes three
 aspects under which a divine law must be
 regarded: in view of the giver, of the recipient
 and in view of the nature of the law itself. As
 to the first aspect, an amelioration or any
 change of a divine law, is a fallacious idea.
 For, what is divine is perfect and needs no modifi-
 cation. With respect to the nature of the law, Mr.
 says, that as the intention of the divine law is to
 give man correct knowledge, such teachings must
 ever possess the same validity, as truth per se
 never changes. It would be absurd ^{in that proposition said at one time to} to designate
 as true, at another dualism, at another the belief
 in the trinity. With regard to the third aspect,
 it will be seen, after some reflection, that the im-
 mutability of the ^{divine} law is a supposition not categorical.

As it is the duty of the legislator to adjust his legislation to the disposition of those, for whom he legislates, and the disposition is conditioned by various elements, a judicious legislator will take these factors ^{carefully} into account. The charge is made, that our idea of God would be insufficient if we were to hold that his law is not valid for all places. such a charge he would extend against God's government of our kind: for is it not a complex of change, alterations, and instability? A charge of the divine law is no possibility merely, it is an ultimate necessity. - May we not detect in this, a sagacious presentiment, of what is now recognized in its full importance - that the Bible and tradition alike contain elements of divine revelation - in both the supreme intellect manifests itself, working efficiently towards the progress of mankind and the realization of God's purpose.

answer, with all of them the verse (Lev. XIII, 1.) "Thou
 shalt not add thereto and thereto nor diminish thence" (לא תוסיף ולא
 תגרע) in a liberal sense. The law of Moses can suffer
 no change, neither in part, nor entirely; it can never be
 modified nor be displaced or invalidated by another divine law.
 It is a law of special application since the prom-
 ulgation of the Mosaic dispensation. Chasidai Crescas declares
 the immutability of the law is as positive as that of
 the Torah. It is precarious to admit that there
 could be another revelation, and thus to countenance a
 claim, which Christianity put forth quite strenuously
 against the Rabbis, however, who faced a tyrannical Pope
 and the Cardinals and Bishops, backed by grim engines of
 torture, and who with a flood of little heresies, stalked
 his life for the vindication of the Talmud, is not to be
 convicted of the charge of playing it into the hands
 of Christianity, nor even of abetting it pernici-
 ously (see note above p. 99). On the contrary, it is what we might
 have expected of a rational and pious thinker, who thought

instead of the more frequent and they intimated to convey that, since these com-
 mandments were given by God to Israel, for so far without the intervention of Moses, it does
 not lie in the power of any prophet to promulgate anything which is contradictory to them, or

to suppose him for a period of time, since man cannot gain the immortality, so
 proper to circumstances can arrest him, while it is in the process of a growth to
 or - to a temporary or extraneous length of circumstances, as a law, the propriety of

abundant in thought, has often a keen eye upon the
 development of his time. It was not the goal, that
 for did not mean, that such a revelation of
 a fundamental character, like that of the law
 of man and nature, the content of which was, "the
 law of man" of question of man in the
 of the earth, and man, the
 of the thought that what was
 in the law of the deity of the law of the deity of
 the change and unity, the unity have been
 from out his face, that he has first when differing
 ground. It was fully aware of the free spirit, the
 infinite aspect of divine law; the absolute law of
 might as the absolute law of truth are as eternal as
 as God; but relatively law, the relatively right, is
 and no longer than the relation itself, which is
 it might be true, the carefully distinguishing between
 even the relative doctrine of Judasism, the law

into positive discussions. We will limit it to an
 exposition of Albo's reasons for ^{and purpose of} en-
 rolling it among his three principles. Since
 the idea of spiritual retribution, is closely con-
 nected with the idea of soul, he treats of the nature
 of the soul first. In this conception of his, he
 departs from the accustomed path. After disposing
 various questions he repeats his teachers opinions.

To settle how lofty the opinions of those is, who say
 the soul intellectual perfection ^{and} see in it
 the final object of the soul accomplished, Albo
 is forced to recognize that in this intellectual perfection
 lies what is conceived by the idea of immortality, ^{and} its
 opposite, ^{and} by divine retribution. For, says he likewise,
 how many would there be eligible? it may happen
 that one only out of a thousand reaches the degree
 of perfection. The soul, with Albo, is a spiritual being,
 destined for the recognition of ^{and} the service of God, but
 not for absolute comprehensions. Just as soon as

would think his lack of ideas in the world
 in an increasingly high degree of devotion. The
 man with deep with the higher spirit he can serve the
 up with confidence many to higher conception, like it
 the law, which would not give satisfaction during
 in the law the difference between the spiritual and the material
 here during, which it has function during life
 continues looking for the body, a working after
 to the end of separation from the body, has a
 and naturally from all fusion into
 the conception of future world that future
 perfect vision the highest state of future life
 the state, is elevated to the highest degree of
 as the cause of law and according to the
 to what that the one through the knowledge of
 I agree with the material and the spiritual
 and a corresponding state of future life
 degree of the higher or lower knowledge of the
 man, can be found the surprise to serve God, in con-

comes and through an habitual catering to the desires
 of the body, is dwarfed proportionately to his lack of
 spirituality; "and through this habit, which his soul
 has acquired in life, is still slave to desires and passions,
 and even in the death of the body cannot abandon
 them. I will be continually attracted to the body, to
 pursue the worldly habits of life. Pain and torture, arising
 from the impotence of the soul and the impossibility now,
 after the death of the body, to satisfy this craving, is
 retribution in the real sense. This is Albi's idea of
 reward and punishment, purely spiritual, free from
 all superstitions and devoid of materiality; ideal, still
 with a firm hold upon reality. He places the dignity
 of man, the realization of his earthly life and the conditions
 of his future life upon his own deeds and thought. If
 man has catered to his lust and to sensuality in this life
 and has changed his soul from the divine will and has
 contrary to its nature, subjected it to the body, it will
 after it has left the body, be subject to it, still in the future.

world; it is a time to a slave to his sensual craving.
 But it is doomed there to follow inane craving, which
 feeds upon itself, since the organs, which served it
 formerly, are dead ^{and} unserviceable. But here it
 will not stop. According to its noble origin, though
 passed a life of wickedness, the soul will
 long to join the universal ^{and} immaterial spirit, but
 its ^{own} nature, on the one hand, will resist it, ^{and}
 on the other hand, having made no preparations pre-
 viously, it lacks the practice ^{and} habit to serve the
 end, without which this ethereal enjoyment is
 impossible. The spiritual alone has permanence; all
 else is bound to return into the void. This is a
 doctrine, replete with wholesome moral instruction, full
 of practical applicability; it gives sufficiently strong
 motives for a righteous life ^{and} offers no chimera
 of disquisitions, but rests on a rational ^{and} practical
 basis. Man himself is his ^{own} judge. God has put
 into his own heart the criterion of his destiny.

he can choose between life and death. Also re-
mained, it is not to be forgotten, in Rabbinical Judaism
in accordance with the Spirit of the Bible.
It cites the Talmud profoundly, and it is not difficult
yet to in to prove an agreement of religious philosophy
with the Bible.

It need scarcely be stated that Alto by
meant a sound conception of a doctrine, which plays
an important part in the belief of every Christian
and Mohammedan, made a striking distinction, which
annihilated all contra arguments, as all much
below in purity and idealism. He revealed the Jewish
doctrine in striking contradistinction. The Christian
doctrine made these as condition of salvation:
1) inner regeneration, 2) mortification of the body
and its sinfulness, and 3) a renunciation of earthly
things; later on by the belief in the Sonship of
Christ, and in the grace of Jesus, who sacrificed him-
self for mankind. This last belief was sufficient

to secure a remission of all sins, ^{and} to ensure future
 bliss. Ethical motives were not offered ^{and}
 little impulse given to deed. It was a state of
 waiting, which the Church attended spiritual ele-
 vation, intellectual progression, a development
 of the divine soul to the highest power, by the aid
 of the body, ^{and} not an unfettering of the soul
 from its prison, with no considerations, whether it has
 fulfilled its destiny by increase of knowledge ^{and}
 cultivation of the moral qualities, a self-con-
 sideration of God, His love ^{and} justice, ^{and}
 not an objective contemplation, was the Jewish idea
 of future life. The horrors of hell fires ^{and}
^{and} tortures have surely no counterparts in Albo's
 idea of how the wicked are condemned. The
 Mohammedan sensual images of the pleasures
 of heaven, is too gross, ^{and} deserves no special
 reputation.

It remains now to free Albo of a charge.

which might be preferred against him. It is
 the first requisite of a philosophic searcher after
 truth to go to his work with no prejudgments,
 to be free from favoritism, to investigate im-
 partially and to embrace that alone which is
 corroborated by absolute proof and satisfac-
 tory evidence. A philosophy with a different
 purpose, is really no philosophy. It is erroneous
 to suppose that Albo was influenced in
 any way, that he pursued ^{his} ~~a~~ certain way of
 reasoning, to arrive at a result desired, to
 strike a blow at Christianity, for instance. It is
 true, he has an apologetic tendency, but it never
 gets the upper hand over him. He never forgets
 his responsibility that it is Judaism, with which
 he is dealing, that it is truth he is to present. No
 one can dispute his conscientiousness, that he does not
 honestly present the true character of Judaism.
 Besides, the Jewish religion-philosopher is tied to the

inspiration, authority of revelation - he may lose him-
 self in vagaries ^{and} wander into regions of abstruse
 thought, he must also revert to positive revelation,
 at once is the trust ^{and} representative religious,
 for God, to whom God's revelation is the guide in
 the excursions of his mind. Maimonides is surely
 faithful to the faith, which the Bible proclaims. It
 is a special gift of his that he feels so keenly
 as a prime constituent of revealed truth is con-
 sidered, that he casts a glaring ^{and} unopposing
 light upon pseudo-truths. This latter lies more
 in the nature of subject truth which he deals,
 whose solemn weightiness will tolerate nothing short
 of purity ^{and} straightforward truth. Maimonides
 not unfrequently casts a side glance at what was
 offensive in systems, which thrust themselves forth
 into the face of men, with arrogance ^{and} assumption.
 Many a page of his More Nebuchim bears the
 mark that its author was led by a certain motive

skillfully concealed, which was not without effect.
 At the same time acceptance of Aristotelian premises,
 and final rejection of them, is as has been referred,
 at the beginning of this paper, a clear evidence that
 Maimonides had his eyes open to the tendency of
 his line. May we not go farther and assert that
 Maimonides introduced a principle into the number
 of 13 principles, one which has obviously no other
 purpose than to quench heathen and more particular
 Christian beliefs. There was no necessity to state
 expressly the incorporeity of God, for this merely
 does not constitute a distinctive doctrine of Judaism.
 The unity of God is an essential and distinctive
 doctrine, and in the idea of unity incorporeity is merged. As
 these are too intimately connected to require for the latter
 a separate statement. Maimonides' evident purpose was
 to declare in unequivocal terms that the God of
 Israel does in no respect tolerate any such person-
 ification, as was the practice at his time. In

Chundri Cracas we have seen the persistent opposition
to Aristotelianism; his position is such a positively
anti-Aristotelian one, that his definition of Judaism
embraces mainly the salient differences of it from
Aristotelianism.

