

**The Efodi as a Commentator:
An Analysis of His Commentary
to Part I of The Guide to the Perplexed**

Leonard Sanford Kravitz

**HUC-JIR, Cincinnati, Ohio
March 1954**

U

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"The Efodi as a Commentator: An Analysis of His Commentary
to Part I of The Guide to the Perplexed"

written by Leonard S. Kravitz
(name of student)

1) may (with revisions) be considered for
publication: (yes)
cannot be considered for publication: ()

2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (yes)
may not be loaned by the Library: ()

Samuel Atlas
(signature of referee)

Samuel Atlas
(referee)

February 23, 1954
(date)

Make microfilm when this is requested
for circulation outside of library.

THE EFODI AS A COMMENTATOR: AN ANALYSIS OF HIS COMMENTARY
TO PART I OF THE GUIDE TO THE PERPLEXED

by
Leonard S. ^{an} Kravitz

Submitted in partial fulfill-
ment of the requirements for
the Master of Hebrew Letters
Degree and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
March, 1954

Referee: Dr. Samuel Atlas

"I conjure any reader that he reveal not any secret which he has discovered in this work..."these are the words of Rambam, the greatest Jewish philosopher of the Middle Ages, in the Introduction to his work the Guide for the Perplexed. Yet many of his readers, feeling that they understood Maimonides to such a degree that they could guide others in the Guide, disregarded the author's adjuration, and commenced to write commentaries. Among those who felt themselves to be initiated into the true meaning of the Guide, was the polemicist, grammarian, astronomer (to mention a few of his talents) Isaac ben Moses Ha Levi who was to be known to posterity by two other names, Profiat Duran and Efodi.

Though Efodi contributed to almost every field of Jewish scholarship, from exegesis to responsa and from grammar to philosophy, he is principally known for the polemic he wrote in 1396, 'Don't be like your Fathers', which was addressed to his one time ^{friend} David Bonet who had become a Christian convert, at first through force and then by conviction. "Don't be like your Fathers" was polemic in the form of a satyric poem; Efodi's second polemic, "the Curse of the Nations" was more formal. Later in his life, Efodi was to turn from polemics to philosophy and to write a commentary to the Guide. His commentary is the earliest to be found in most of the standard editions of the Guide, but was not the earliest commentary. He was preceded by Narboni and Caspi.

This essay is an analysis of Efodi's commentary to

Part One of the Guide. First the commentary is analyzed as to sources to indicate that Efodi borrowed heavily from both Narboni and Caspi, while mentioning Caspi only four times by name throughout the course of his commenting upon the seventy-six chapters of Part One, and never once mentioning Narboni. The presence of still another commentator's material (or commentators') is noted in Efodi's work, although the identity of that commentator is unknown to us.

Next the commentary is analyzed as to content. Efodi's work as a commentator of text, i.e., of elucidator of difficult terms and obscure grammatical constructions is next discussed. Efodi's work as commentator of ideas, is examined to find that he considers ^{the Mouth Nebuchim to be} an esoteric guide to esoteric truths ~~to be~~ found in the Torah. For Efodi (and he assumes for Rambam also) the Torah is a philosophical treatise revealing its content to those who have prepared themselves in philosophy and hiding it from the ignorant masses. According to Efodi, Rambam's discussion of homonyms are to reveal to us that the Creation story and especially the story of Adam is an allegory of man's intellectual development. Those chapters which apparently interrupt the treatment of homonyms hint at the Theophany at Sinai which is interpreted as an event which preceded in a philosophical manner to ascertain some knowledge of God. The various names and their meanings for God are known to Efodi; he shares them with us as well as other bits of theology. He also explains his conception of the Torah as the measure of truth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter I - Eiodi's Life and Works	1
Chapter II - The Sources of Part One to Guide	11
CHAPTER III - The Analysis of the Commentary to Part I of the Guide	24
CHAPTER IV - Some Representative Translations of the Commentary	50
Footnotes - Chapter I	94
Chapter II	98
Chapter III	100

CHAPTER I

EPODI'S LIFE AND WORKS

Religious persecutions are not new to the Jewish people nor is apostasy a new phenomenon. Judaism often, too often has had to fight for its life against the attacks of those who would destroy the faith by destroying the bearers of that faith, or those who would destroy the people by destroying their faith. Attacked either by pogrom or polemic, Judaism has defended itself by producing those who would defend the body of Israel - those heroes from Judah Maccabeus to the ר' 319 of our present day, and producing those who would defend the soul of Israel -- the polemicists.

Jewish polemical literature can boast of no more brilliant work than that which appeared in Spain in the year 1396. Spanish Jewry, after a long period of security, began to suffer increasing pressure in the second half of the fourteenth century. These pressures culminated into the open pogroms of 1391 which swept through the aljamas of Castile, Valencia, Majorca and Catalonia. The Jewish communities were shattered, many of the people were slaughtered, their property was confiscated, their synagogues were converted into churches.¹ Not all the Jews died רבן ויזק 8. Many sought escape from the shedding of their blood by receiving the sprinkling of baptismal water. Most of these forced converts returned to Judaism when the sword's point was removed. Others, having found that their New Christian status was more secure than their old Jewish status remained in their

faith. Joined by those who needed no prodding to leap from the disadvantage of the alijama to the advantage of the court, they proceeded to attack their old faith.

Against such New Christians appeared the brilliant satire *ק' ת' כ'אמ'יק*. Directed against a new Christian who had remained true to his new faith though he had been forcibly deprived of his old faith, its satire was so beguiling that the Church used it as an apology.² The New Christian was David Bonet Biongiorno;³ the author was his old friend⁴ Profiat Duran.

Profiat Duran had already gained attention as the author of a work dealing with astronomy and the calendar, *מגן דוד*⁵ under his Hebrew name of *יצחק בן משה*.⁶ Yet fame came to our author under two other names. The first has already been mentioned, and the second was alluded to in the title of his astronomical work *מגן דוד*. Later generations were to quote him neither as *יצחק בן משה* nor as Profiat Duran, but as *מגן דוד* or *מגן דוד*.⁷

The question may be asked: In a period when the names of Jewish scholars were indicated either by their Hebrew names or the first letters of their Hebrew names) e.g., *רבינו משה בן מ'מ' /* or by the place wherein they dwelled e.g., *מגן דוד* of Bertinoro known as *מגן דוד* or *מגן דוד* who lived in Caspe, known as *מגן דוד* or *מגן דוד* of Narbonne known as *מגן דוד*; why did our author have three names: *יצחק בן משה*, Profiat Duran, *מגן דוד*. While it might be argued that an author might be called by his principle work e.g.,

ואולי it would seem that in our author's case, his name preceded his work.

Various attempts have been made to explain the name rendered into English as Profiat but which had a number of spellings. ⁸ ⁹ ¹⁰ It has been explained simply as a name, ¹¹ or as a name relating to a particular town viz, Perpignan, ¹² (Jews had many relationships with Perpignan, as may be seen in Baer-David Bonet to whom ¹³ was addressed was graduated from the University of Perpignan as a physician, in 1390, a year before the outbreaks in Spain. ¹⁴) It has been explained as meaning 'prophet' on the analogy of other medieval Jewish names. ¹⁵ Together with the last name it has been explained as the name given to our author when he became a Christian, ¹⁶ or as a play on the Latin words, perpetuo ¹⁷ duran. ¹⁸ Duran has been explained as d'Oran, "aus Oran in der Barberei" ¹⁹ or relating to the towns of Durango and Durante. ²⁰

Though ²¹ ²² is usually explained as the first letters of the words ²³ ²⁴ such an explanation is not certain. Since we know that ²⁵ was compelled to become a Christian in 1391, ²⁶ it has been conjectured that our author took his name from the statement in ²⁷ ²⁸ ²⁹ ³⁰ ³¹ ³² ³³ ³⁴ ³⁵ ³⁶ ³⁷ ³⁸ ³⁹ ⁴⁰ ⁴¹ ⁴² ⁴³ ⁴⁴ ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ ⁴⁷ ⁴⁸ ⁴⁹ ⁵⁰ ⁵¹ ⁵² ⁵³ ⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ ⁶⁰ ⁶¹ ⁶² ⁶³ ⁶⁴ ⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ ⁶⁷ ⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ ⁷⁰ ⁷¹ ⁷² ⁷³ ⁷⁴ ⁷⁵ ⁷⁶ ⁷⁷ ⁷⁸ ⁷⁹ ⁸⁰ ⁸¹ ⁸² ⁸³ ⁸⁴ ⁸⁵ ⁸⁶ ⁸⁷ ⁸⁸ ⁸⁹ ⁹⁰ ⁹¹ ⁹² ⁹³ ⁹⁴ ⁹⁵ ⁹⁶ ⁹⁷ ⁹⁸ ⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰ ¹⁰¹ ¹⁰² ¹⁰³ ¹⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁹ ¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹ ¹¹² ¹¹³ ¹¹⁴ ¹¹⁵ ¹¹⁶ ¹¹⁷ ¹¹⁸ ¹¹⁹ ¹²⁰ ¹²¹ ¹²² ¹²³ ¹²⁴ ¹²⁵ ¹²⁶ ¹²⁷ ¹²⁸ ¹²⁹ ¹³⁰ ¹³¹ ¹³² ¹³³ ¹³⁴ ¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ ¹³⁷ ¹³⁸ ¹³⁹ ¹⁴⁰ ¹⁴¹ ¹⁴² ¹⁴³ ¹⁴⁴ ¹⁴⁵ ¹⁴⁶ ¹⁴⁷ ¹⁴⁸ ¹⁴⁹ ¹⁵⁰ ¹⁵¹ ¹⁵² ¹⁵³ ¹⁵⁴ ¹⁵⁵ ¹⁵⁶ ¹⁵⁷ ¹⁵⁸ ¹⁵⁹ ¹⁶⁰ ¹⁶¹ ¹⁶² ¹⁶³ ¹⁶⁴ ¹⁶⁵ ¹⁶⁶ ¹⁶⁷ ¹⁶⁸ ¹⁶⁹ ¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹ ¹⁷² ¹⁷³ ¹⁷⁴ ¹⁷⁵ ¹⁷⁶ ¹⁷⁷ ¹⁷⁸ ¹⁷⁹ ¹⁸⁰ ¹⁸¹ ¹⁸² ¹⁸³ ¹⁸⁴ ¹⁸⁵ ¹⁸⁶ ¹⁸⁷ ¹⁸⁸ ¹⁸⁹ ¹⁹⁰ ¹⁹¹ ¹⁹² ¹⁹³ ¹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁵ ¹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁸ ¹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰ ²⁰¹ ²⁰² ²⁰³ ²⁰⁴ ²⁰⁵ ²⁰⁶ ²⁰⁷ ²⁰⁸ ²⁰⁹ ²¹⁰ ²¹¹ ²¹² ²¹³ ²¹⁴ ²¹⁵ ²¹⁶ ²¹⁷ ²¹⁸ ²¹⁹ ²²⁰ ²²¹ ²²² ²²³ ²²⁴ ²²⁵ ²²⁶ ²²⁷ ²²⁸ ²²⁹ ²³⁰ ²³¹ ²³² ²³³ ²³⁴ ²³⁵ ²³⁶ ²³⁷ ²³⁸ ²³⁹ ²⁴⁰ ²⁴¹ ²⁴² ²⁴³ ²⁴⁴ ²⁴⁵ ²⁴⁶ ²⁴⁷ ²⁴⁸ ²⁴⁹ ²⁵⁰ ²⁵¹ ²⁵² ²⁵³ ²⁵⁴ ²⁵⁵ ²⁵⁶ ²⁵⁷ ²⁵⁸ ²⁵⁹ ²⁶⁰ ²⁶¹ ²⁶² ²⁶³ ²⁶⁴ ²⁶⁵ ²⁶⁶ ²⁶⁷ ²⁶⁸ ²⁶⁹ ²⁷⁰ ²⁷¹ ²⁷² ²⁷³ ²⁷⁴ ²⁷⁵ ²⁷⁶ ²⁷⁷ ²⁷⁸ ²⁷⁹ ²⁸⁰ ²⁸¹ ²⁸² ²⁸³ ²⁸⁴ ²⁸⁵ ²⁸⁶ ²⁸⁷ ²⁸⁸ ²⁸⁹ ²⁹⁰ ²⁹¹ ²⁹² ²⁹³ ²⁹⁴ ²⁹⁵ ²⁹⁶ ²⁹⁷ ²⁹⁸ ²⁹⁹ ³⁰⁰ ³⁰¹ ³⁰² ³⁰³ ³⁰⁴ ³⁰⁵ ³⁰⁶ ³⁰⁷ ³⁰⁸ ³⁰⁹ ³¹⁰ ³¹¹ ³¹² ³¹³ ³¹⁴ ³¹⁵ ³¹⁶ ³¹⁷ ³¹⁸ ³¹⁹ ³²⁰ ³²¹ ³²² ³²³ ³²⁴ ³²⁵ ³²⁶ ³²⁷ ³²⁸ ³²⁹ ³³⁰ ³³¹ ³³² ³³³ ³³⁴ ³³⁵ ³³⁶ ³³⁷ ³³⁸ ³³⁹ ³⁴⁰ ³⁴¹ ³⁴² ³⁴³ ³⁴⁴ ³⁴⁵ ³⁴⁶ ³⁴⁷ ³⁴⁸ ³⁴⁹ ³⁵⁰ ³⁵¹ ³⁵² ³⁵³ ³⁵⁴ ³⁵⁵ ³⁵⁶ ³⁵⁷ ³⁵⁸ ³⁵⁹ ³⁶⁰ ³⁶¹ ³⁶² ³⁶³ ³⁶⁴ ³⁶⁵ ³⁶⁶ ³⁶⁷ ³⁶⁸ ³⁶⁹ ³⁷⁰ ³⁷¹ ³⁷² ³⁷³ ³⁷⁴ ³⁷⁵ ³⁷⁶ ³⁷⁷ ³⁷⁸ ³⁷⁹ ³⁸⁰ ³⁸¹ ³⁸² ³⁸³ ³⁸⁴ ³⁸⁵ ³⁸⁶ ³⁸⁷ ³⁸⁸ ³⁸⁹ ³⁹⁰ ³⁹¹ ³⁹² ³⁹³ ³⁹⁴ ³⁹⁵ ³⁹⁶ ³⁹⁷ ³⁹⁸ ³⁹⁹ ⁴⁰⁰ ⁴⁰¹ ⁴⁰² ⁴⁰³ ⁴⁰⁴ ⁴⁰⁵ ⁴⁰⁶ ⁴⁰⁷ ⁴⁰⁸ ⁴⁰⁹ ⁴¹⁰ ⁴¹¹ ⁴¹² ⁴¹³ ⁴¹⁴ ⁴¹⁵ ⁴¹⁶ ⁴¹⁷ ⁴¹⁸ ⁴¹⁹ ⁴²⁰ ⁴²¹ ⁴²² ⁴²³ ⁴²⁴ ⁴²⁵ ⁴²⁶ ⁴²⁷ ⁴²⁸ ⁴²⁹ ⁴³⁰ ⁴³¹ ⁴³² ⁴³³ ⁴³⁴ ⁴³⁵ ⁴³⁶ ⁴³⁷ ⁴³⁸ ⁴³⁹ ⁴⁴⁰ ⁴⁴¹ ⁴⁴² ⁴⁴³ ⁴⁴⁴ ⁴⁴⁵ ⁴⁴⁶ ⁴⁴⁷ ⁴⁴⁸ ⁴⁴⁹ ⁴⁵⁰ ⁴⁵¹ ⁴⁵² ⁴⁵³ ⁴⁵⁴ ⁴⁵⁵ ⁴⁵⁶ ⁴⁵⁷ ⁴⁵⁸ ⁴⁵⁹ ⁴⁶⁰ ⁴⁶¹ ⁴⁶² ⁴⁶³ ⁴⁶⁴ ⁴⁶⁵ ⁴⁶⁶ ⁴⁶⁷ ⁴⁶⁸ ⁴⁶⁹ ⁴⁷⁰ ⁴⁷¹ ⁴⁷² ⁴⁷³ ⁴⁷⁴ ⁴⁷⁵ ⁴⁷⁶ ⁴⁷⁷ ⁴⁷⁸ ⁴⁷⁹ ⁴⁸⁰ ⁴⁸¹ ⁴⁸² ⁴⁸³ ⁴⁸⁴ ⁴⁸⁵ ⁴⁸⁶ ⁴⁸⁷ ⁴⁸⁸ ⁴⁸⁹ ⁴⁹⁰ ⁴⁹¹ ⁴⁹² ⁴⁹³ ⁴⁹⁴ ⁴⁹⁵ ⁴⁹⁶ ⁴⁹⁷ ⁴⁹⁸ ⁴⁹⁹ ⁵⁰⁰ ⁵⁰¹ ⁵⁰² ⁵⁰³ ⁵⁰⁴ ⁵⁰⁵ ⁵⁰⁶ ⁵⁰⁷ ⁵⁰⁸ ⁵⁰⁹ ⁵¹⁰ ⁵¹¹ ⁵¹² ⁵¹³ ⁵¹⁴ ⁵¹⁵ ⁵¹⁶ ⁵¹⁷ ⁵¹⁸ ⁵¹⁹ ⁵²⁰ ⁵²¹ ⁵²² ⁵²³ ⁵²⁴ ⁵²⁵ ⁵²⁶ ⁵²⁷ ⁵²⁸ ⁵²⁹ ⁵³⁰ ⁵³¹ ⁵³² ⁵³³ ⁵³⁴ ⁵³⁵ ⁵³⁶ ⁵³⁷ ⁵³⁸ ⁵³⁹ ⁵⁴⁰ ⁵⁴¹ ⁵⁴² ⁵⁴³ ⁵⁴⁴ ⁵⁴⁵ ⁵⁴⁶ ⁵⁴⁷ ⁵⁴⁸ ⁵⁴⁹ ⁵⁵⁰ ⁵⁵¹ ⁵⁵² ⁵⁵³ ⁵⁵⁴ ⁵⁵⁵ ⁵⁵⁶ ⁵⁵⁷ ⁵⁵⁸ ⁵⁵⁹ ⁵⁶⁰ ⁵⁶¹ ⁵⁶² ⁵⁶³ ⁵⁶⁴ ⁵⁶⁵ ⁵⁶⁶ ⁵⁶⁷ ⁵⁶⁸ ⁵⁶⁹ ⁵⁷⁰ ⁵⁷¹ ⁵⁷² ⁵⁷³ ⁵⁷⁴ ⁵⁷⁵ ⁵⁷⁶ ⁵⁷⁷ ⁵⁷⁸ ⁵⁷⁹ ⁵⁸⁰ ⁵⁸¹ ⁵⁸² ⁵⁸³ ⁵⁸⁴ ⁵⁸⁵ ⁵⁸⁶ ⁵⁸⁷ ⁵⁸⁸ ⁵⁸⁹ ⁵⁹⁰ ⁵⁹¹ ⁵⁹² ⁵⁹³ ⁵⁹⁴ ⁵⁹⁵ ⁵⁹⁶ ⁵⁹⁷ ⁵⁹⁸ ⁵⁹⁹ ⁶⁰⁰ ⁶⁰¹ ⁶⁰² ⁶⁰³ ⁶⁰⁴ ⁶⁰⁵ ⁶⁰⁶ ⁶⁰⁷ ⁶⁰⁸ ⁶⁰⁹ ⁶¹⁰ ⁶¹¹ ⁶¹² ⁶¹³ ⁶¹⁴ ⁶¹⁵ ⁶¹⁶ ⁶¹⁷ ⁶¹⁸ ⁶¹⁹ ⁶²⁰ ⁶²¹ ⁶²² ⁶²³ ⁶²⁴ ⁶²⁵ ⁶²⁶ ⁶²⁷ ⁶²⁸ ⁶²⁹ ⁶³⁰ ⁶³¹ ⁶³² ⁶³³ ⁶³⁴ ⁶³⁵ ⁶³⁶ ⁶³⁷ ⁶³⁸ ⁶³⁹ ⁶⁴⁰ ⁶⁴¹ ⁶⁴² ⁶⁴³ ⁶⁴⁴ ⁶⁴⁵ ⁶⁴⁶ ⁶⁴⁷ ⁶⁴⁸ ⁶⁴⁹ ⁶⁵⁰ ⁶⁵¹ ⁶⁵² ⁶⁵³ ⁶⁵⁴ ⁶⁵⁵ ⁶⁵⁶ ⁶⁵⁷ ⁶⁵⁸ ⁶⁵⁹ ⁶⁶⁰ ⁶⁶¹ ⁶⁶² ⁶⁶³ ⁶⁶⁴ ⁶⁶⁵ ⁶⁶⁶ ⁶⁶⁷ ⁶⁶⁸ ⁶⁶⁹ ⁶⁷⁰ ⁶⁷¹ ⁶⁷² ⁶⁷³ ⁶⁷⁴ ⁶⁷⁵ ⁶⁷⁶ ⁶⁷⁷ ⁶⁷⁸ ⁶⁷⁹ ⁶⁸⁰ ⁶⁸¹ ⁶⁸² ⁶⁸³ ⁶⁸⁴ ⁶⁸⁵ ⁶⁸⁶ ⁶⁸⁷ ⁶⁸⁸ ⁶⁸⁹ ⁶⁹⁰ ⁶⁹¹ ⁶⁹² ⁶⁹³ ⁶⁹⁴ ⁶⁹⁵ ⁶⁹⁶ ⁶⁹⁷ ⁶⁹⁸ ⁶⁹⁹ ⁷⁰⁰ ⁷⁰¹ ⁷⁰² ⁷⁰³ ⁷⁰⁴ ⁷⁰⁵ ⁷⁰⁶ ⁷⁰⁷ ⁷⁰⁸ ⁷⁰⁹ ⁷¹⁰ ⁷¹¹ ⁷¹² ⁷¹³ ⁷¹⁴ ⁷¹⁵ ⁷¹⁶ ⁷¹⁷ ⁷¹⁸ ⁷¹⁹ ⁷²⁰ ⁷²¹ ⁷²² ⁷²³ ⁷²⁴ ⁷²⁵ ⁷²⁶ ⁷²⁷ ⁷²⁸ ⁷²⁹ ⁷³⁰ ⁷³¹ ⁷³² ⁷³³ ⁷³⁴ ⁷³⁵ ⁷³⁶ ⁷³⁷ ⁷³⁸ ⁷³⁹ ⁷⁴⁰ ⁷⁴¹ ⁷⁴² ⁷⁴³ ⁷⁴⁴ ⁷⁴⁵ ⁷⁴⁶ ⁷⁴⁷ ⁷⁴⁸ ⁷⁴⁹ ⁷⁵⁰ ⁷⁵¹ ⁷⁵² ⁷⁵³ ⁷⁵⁴ ⁷⁵⁵ ⁷⁵⁶ ⁷⁵⁷ ⁷⁵⁸ ⁷⁵⁹ ⁷⁶⁰ ⁷⁶¹ ⁷⁶² ⁷⁶³ ⁷⁶⁴ ⁷⁶⁵ ⁷⁶⁶ ⁷⁶⁷ ⁷⁶⁸ ⁷⁶⁹ ⁷⁷⁰ ⁷⁷¹ ⁷⁷² ⁷⁷³ ⁷⁷⁴ ⁷⁷⁵ ⁷⁷⁶ ⁷⁷⁷ ⁷⁷⁸ ⁷⁷⁹ ⁷⁸⁰ ⁷⁸¹ ⁷⁸² ⁷⁸³ ⁷⁸⁴ ⁷⁸⁵ ⁷⁸⁶ ⁷⁸⁷ ⁷⁸⁸ ⁷⁸⁹ ⁷⁹⁰ ⁷⁹¹ ⁷⁹² ⁷⁹³ ⁷⁹⁴ ⁷⁹⁵ ⁷⁹⁶ ⁷⁹⁷ ⁷⁹⁸ ⁷⁹⁹ ⁸⁰⁰ ⁸⁰¹ ⁸⁰² ⁸⁰³ ⁸⁰⁴ ⁸⁰⁵ ⁸⁰⁶ ⁸⁰⁷ ⁸⁰⁸ ⁸⁰⁹ ⁸¹⁰ ⁸¹¹ ⁸¹² ⁸¹³ ⁸¹⁴ ⁸¹⁵ ⁸¹⁶ ⁸¹⁷ ⁸¹⁸ ⁸¹⁹ ⁸²⁰ ⁸²¹ ⁸²² ⁸²³ ⁸²⁴ ⁸²⁵ ⁸²⁶ ⁸²⁷ ⁸²⁸ ⁸²⁹ ⁸³⁰ ⁸³¹ ⁸³² ⁸³³ ⁸³⁴ ⁸³⁵ ⁸³⁶ ⁸³⁷ ⁸³⁸ ⁸³⁹ ⁸⁴⁰ ⁸⁴¹ ⁸⁴² ⁸⁴³ ⁸⁴⁴ ⁸⁴⁵ ⁸⁴⁶ ⁸⁴⁷ ⁸⁴⁸ ⁸⁴⁹ ⁸⁵⁰ ⁸⁵¹ ⁸⁵² ⁸⁵³ ⁸⁵⁴ ⁸⁵⁵ ⁸⁵⁶ ⁸⁵⁷ ⁸⁵⁸ ⁸⁵⁹ ⁸⁶⁰ ⁸⁶¹ ⁸⁶² ⁸⁶³ ⁸⁶⁴ ⁸⁶⁵ ⁸⁶⁶ ⁸⁶⁷ ⁸⁶⁸ ⁸⁶⁹ ⁸⁷⁰ ⁸⁷¹ ⁸⁷² ⁸⁷³ ⁸⁷⁴ ⁸⁷⁵ ⁸⁷⁶ ⁸⁷⁷ ⁸⁷⁸ ⁸⁷⁹ ⁸⁸⁰ ⁸⁸¹ ⁸⁸² ⁸⁸³ ⁸⁸⁴ ⁸⁸⁵ ⁸⁸⁶ ⁸⁸⁷ ⁸⁸⁸ ⁸⁸⁹ ⁸⁹⁰ ⁸⁹¹ ⁸⁹² ⁸⁹³ ⁸⁹⁴ ⁸⁹⁵ ⁸⁹⁶ ⁸⁹⁷ ⁸⁹⁸ ⁸⁹⁹ ⁹⁰⁰ ⁹⁰¹ ⁹⁰² ⁹⁰³ ⁹⁰⁴ ⁹⁰⁵ ⁹⁰⁶ ⁹⁰⁷ ⁹⁰⁸ ⁹⁰⁹ ⁹¹⁰ ⁹¹¹ ⁹¹² ⁹¹³ ⁹¹⁴ ⁹¹⁵ ⁹¹⁶ ⁹¹⁷ ⁹¹⁸ ⁹¹⁹ ⁹²⁰ ⁹²¹ ⁹²² ⁹²³ ⁹²⁴ ⁹²⁵ ⁹²⁶ ⁹²⁷ ⁹²⁸ ⁹²⁹ ⁹³⁰ ⁹³¹ ⁹³² ⁹³³ ⁹³⁴ ⁹³⁵ ⁹³⁶ ⁹³⁷ ⁹³⁸ ⁹³⁹ ⁹⁴⁰ ⁹⁴¹ ⁹⁴² ⁹⁴³ ⁹⁴⁴ ⁹⁴⁵ ⁹⁴⁶ ⁹⁴⁷ ⁹⁴⁸ ⁹⁴⁹ ⁹⁵⁰ ⁹⁵¹ ⁹⁵² ⁹⁵³ ⁹⁵⁴ ⁹⁵⁵ ⁹⁵⁶ ⁹⁵⁷ ⁹⁵⁸ ⁹⁵⁹ ⁹⁶⁰ ⁹⁶¹ ⁹⁶² ⁹⁶³ ⁹⁶⁴ ⁹⁶⁵ ⁹⁶⁶ ⁹⁶⁷ ⁹⁶⁸ ⁹⁶⁹ ⁹⁷⁰ ⁹⁷¹ ⁹⁷² ⁹⁷³ ⁹⁷⁴ ⁹⁷⁵ ⁹⁷⁶ ⁹⁷⁷ ⁹⁷⁸ ⁹⁷⁹ ⁹⁸⁰ ⁹⁸¹ ⁹⁸² ⁹⁸³ ⁹⁸⁴ ⁹⁸⁵ ⁹⁸⁶ ⁹⁸⁷ ⁹⁸⁸ ⁹⁸⁹ ⁹⁹⁰ ⁹⁹¹ ⁹⁹² ⁹⁹³ ⁹⁹⁴ ⁹⁹⁵ ⁹⁹⁶ ⁹⁹⁷ ⁹⁹⁸ ⁹⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰⁰ ¹⁰⁰¹ ¹⁰⁰² ¹⁰⁰³ ¹⁰⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁰⁹ ¹⁰¹⁰ ¹⁰¹¹ ¹⁰¹² ¹⁰¹³ ¹⁰¹⁴ ¹⁰¹⁵ ¹⁰¹⁶ ¹⁰¹⁷ ¹⁰¹⁸ ¹⁰¹⁹ ¹⁰²⁰ ¹⁰²¹ ¹⁰²² ¹⁰²³ ¹⁰²⁴ ¹⁰²⁵ ¹⁰²⁶ ¹⁰²⁷ ¹⁰²⁸ ¹⁰²⁹ ¹⁰³⁰ ¹⁰³¹ ¹⁰³² ¹⁰³³ ¹⁰³⁴ ¹⁰³⁵ ¹⁰³⁶ ¹⁰³⁷ ¹⁰³⁸ ¹⁰³⁹ ¹⁰⁴⁰ ¹⁰⁴¹ ¹⁰⁴² ¹⁰⁴³ ¹⁰⁴⁴ ¹⁰⁴⁵ ¹⁰⁴⁶ ¹⁰⁴⁷ ¹⁰⁴⁸ ¹⁰⁴⁹ ¹⁰⁵⁰ ¹⁰⁵¹ ¹⁰⁵² ¹⁰⁵³ ¹⁰⁵⁴ ¹⁰⁵⁵ ¹⁰⁵⁶ ¹⁰⁵⁷ ¹⁰⁵⁸ ¹⁰⁵⁹ ¹⁰⁶⁰ ¹⁰⁶¹ ¹⁰⁶² ¹⁰⁶³ ¹⁰⁶⁴ ¹⁰⁶⁵ ¹⁰⁶⁶ ¹⁰⁶⁷ ¹⁰⁶⁸ ¹⁰⁶⁹ ¹⁰⁷⁰ ¹⁰⁷¹ ¹⁰⁷² ¹⁰⁷³ ¹⁰⁷⁴ ¹⁰⁷⁵ ¹⁰⁷⁶ ¹⁰⁷⁷ ¹⁰⁷⁸ ¹⁰⁷⁹ ¹⁰⁸⁰ ¹⁰⁸¹ ¹⁰⁸² ¹⁰⁸³ ¹⁰⁸⁴ ¹⁰⁸⁵ ¹⁰⁸⁶ ¹⁰⁸⁷ ¹⁰⁸⁸ ¹⁰⁸⁹ ¹⁰⁹⁰ ¹⁰⁹¹ ¹⁰⁹² ¹⁰⁹³ ¹⁰⁹⁴ ¹⁰⁹⁵ ¹⁰⁹⁶ ¹⁰⁹⁷ ¹⁰⁹⁸ ¹⁰⁹⁹ ¹¹⁰⁰ ¹¹⁰¹ ¹¹⁰² ¹¹⁰³ ¹¹⁰⁴ ¹¹⁰⁵ ¹¹⁰⁶ ¹¹⁰⁷ ¹¹⁰⁸ ¹¹⁰⁹ ¹¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹¹ ¹¹¹² ¹¹¹³ ¹¹¹⁴ ¹¹¹⁵ ¹¹¹⁶ ¹¹¹⁷ ¹¹¹⁸ ¹¹¹⁹ ¹¹²⁰ ¹¹²¹ ¹¹²² ¹¹²³ ¹¹²⁴ ¹¹²⁵ ¹¹²⁶ ¹¹²⁷ ¹¹²⁸ ¹¹²⁹ ¹¹³⁰ ¹¹³¹ ¹¹³² ¹¹³³ ¹¹³⁴ ¹¹³⁵ ¹¹³⁶ ¹¹³⁷ ¹¹³⁸ ¹¹³⁹ ¹¹⁴⁰ ¹¹⁴¹ ¹¹⁴² ¹¹⁴³ ¹¹⁴⁴ ¹¹⁴⁵ ¹¹⁴⁶ ¹¹⁴⁷ ¹¹⁴⁸ ¹¹⁴⁹ ¹¹⁵⁰ ¹¹⁵¹ ¹¹⁵² ¹¹⁵³ ¹¹⁵⁴ ¹¹⁵⁵ ¹¹⁵⁶ ¹¹⁵⁷ ¹¹⁵⁸ ¹¹⁵⁹ ¹¹⁶⁰ ¹¹⁶¹ ¹¹⁶² ¹¹⁶³ ¹¹⁶⁴ ¹¹⁶⁵ ¹¹⁶⁶ ¹¹⁶⁷ ¹¹⁶⁸ ¹¹⁶⁹ ¹¹⁷⁰ ¹¹⁷¹ ¹¹⁷² ¹¹⁷³ ¹¹⁷⁴ ¹¹⁷⁵ ¹¹⁷⁶ ¹¹⁷⁷ ¹¹⁷⁸ ¹¹⁷⁹ ¹¹⁸⁰ ¹¹⁸¹ ¹¹⁸² ¹¹⁸³ ¹¹⁸⁴ ¹¹⁸⁵ ¹¹⁸⁶ ¹¹⁸⁷ ¹¹⁸⁸ ¹¹⁸⁹ ¹¹⁹⁰ ¹¹⁹¹ ¹¹⁹² ¹¹⁹³ ¹¹⁹⁴ ¹¹⁹⁵ ¹¹⁹⁶ ¹¹⁹⁷ ¹¹⁹⁸ ¹¹⁹⁹ ¹²⁰⁰ ¹²⁰¹ ¹²⁰² ¹²⁰³ ¹²⁰⁴ ¹²⁰⁵ ¹²⁰⁶ ¹²⁰⁷ ¹²⁰⁸ ¹²⁰⁹ ¹²¹⁰ ¹²¹¹ ¹²¹² ¹²¹³ ¹²¹⁴ ¹²¹⁵ ¹²¹⁶ ¹²¹⁷ ¹²¹⁸ ¹²¹⁹ ¹²²⁰ ¹²²¹ ¹²²² ¹²²³ ¹²²⁴ ¹²²⁵ ¹²²⁶ ¹²²⁷ ¹²²⁸ ¹²²⁹ ¹²³⁰ ¹²³¹ ¹²³² ¹²³³ ¹²³⁴ ¹²³⁵ ¹²³⁶ ¹²³⁷ ¹²³⁸ ¹²³⁹ ¹²⁴⁰ ¹²⁴¹ ¹²⁴² ¹²⁴³ ¹²⁴⁴ ¹²⁴⁵ ¹²⁴⁶ ¹²⁴⁷ ¹²⁴⁸ ¹²⁴⁹ ¹²⁵⁰ ¹²⁵¹ ¹²⁵² ¹²⁵³ ¹²⁵⁴ ¹²⁵⁵ ¹²⁵⁶ ¹²⁵⁷ ¹²⁵⁸ ¹²⁵⁹ ¹²⁶⁰ ¹²⁶¹ ¹²⁶² ¹²⁶³ ¹²⁶⁴ ¹²⁶⁵ ¹²⁶⁶ ¹²⁶⁷ ¹²⁶⁸ ¹²⁶⁹ ¹²⁷⁰ ¹²⁷¹ ¹²⁷² ¹²⁷³ ¹²⁷⁴ ¹²⁷⁵ ¹²⁷⁶ ¹²⁷⁷ ¹²⁷⁸ ¹²⁷⁹ ¹²⁸⁰ ¹²⁸¹ ¹²⁸² ¹²⁸³ ¹²⁸⁴ ¹²⁸⁵ ¹²⁸⁶ ¹²⁸⁷ ¹²⁸⁸ ¹²⁸⁹ ¹²⁹⁰ ¹²⁹¹ ¹²⁹² ¹²⁹³ ¹²⁹⁴ ¹²⁹⁵ ¹²⁹⁶ ¹²⁹⁷ ¹²⁹⁸ ¹²⁹⁹ ¹³⁰⁰ ¹³⁰¹ ¹³⁰² ¹³⁰³ ¹³⁰⁴ ¹³⁰⁵ ¹³⁰⁶ ¹³⁰⁷ ¹³⁰⁸ ¹³⁰⁹ ¹³¹⁰ ¹³¹¹ ¹³¹² ¹³¹³ ¹³¹⁴ <

ond: to hide the identity of a polemical writer in troubled
 23 Neither of these two seem likely to this writer, for
 our author wished to Judaize his name, he need only have gone
 back to *אברהם* or a combination of the first letters
 such as *אברהם*; if he sought to disguise his identity by
 changing his name, such a change would have been in vain, for
 he reveals his identity in his most famous work by indicating
 his relation to Bonet; while in his more serious attack on
 Christianity *אברהם* he indicates himself as a teacher
 in the house of Chasdai Crescas.²⁴ Moreover he uses *אברהם*
 in *אברהם* and in *אברהם*, neither of which is a
 polemic, (and one of which was earlier 1395, by a year than
אברהם).²⁵

While it has been pointed out that the name Profiat
 26 is not an uncommon first name (nor last name, e.g., Isaac Barfat,
אברהם nor is Duran an uncommon last name, e.g.,
 28 the family of Simon ben Semach Duran, the combination of the two
 29 suspect: "Man hat den Namen selbst dahin gedeutet mit
 künstlichem Scharfsinne eine Anspielung auf seinem Neophytissmus
 darin findend, nämlich perpetuo durans."

This writer offers a tentative hypothesis: In the per-
 secution of 1391 *אברהם* was forced to become a Christian
 and was given the name of Profiat Duran as symbolic of the con-
 version. Returning to Judaism, our author did not go back to
אברהם but took the name *אברהם* with the sentence of
 in mind. As he states in his introduction to *אברהם*
 מיום אשר שבתי אל אבותי יושבתי אשר בספר
 כתיב עברתי, וזה שמי צלתי בארץ ומורתי

II

Just as mystery shrouds the meaning of our author's
life, so mystery shrouds his life. Though born probably in the
last half of the fourteenth century, the exact year is nowhere
given.³¹ We are equally uncertain as to where he was born,
whether in Catalonia,³² Aragon,³³ Perpignan, Montpellier or Cor-
siques.³⁴

In his youth he may have studied in Germany

שמות' בעל' בחירות' בחיות' ה' שיגת' רבות' באשכול'

It has been argued that the theory that he studied in Germany is based on a faulty reading, and we should read אנן 'בדקנ
היה "a Germana quodam Talmudis perito."³⁶ Where he studied Talmud may be uncertain, but that he studied Talmud is certain.

His Talmudical studies were not enough to satisfy our author and he studied philosophy thereby putting himself into opposition with his teachers? אֲנִי מֵחִיטָּה וְעַד הַיּוֹם אֶמְצֵא אֶת הַיְשׁוּבִים לְפָנָיו³⁷
He wishes to find truth which was as he said, "midway between Talmud and philosophy."³⁸

He gives evidence of his philosophical studies by his knowledge of those mathematical studies required as preliminaries to further research.³⁹ To add to his basic knowledge he studied the astronomical works of Abraham Kalshir.⁴⁰ He knew Aristotle thoroughly that he could determine which book of Aristotle was alluded to by Maimonides, e.g., in his commentary to Chapter V: "When the chief philosopher began to investigate and

construct logical arguments concerning very abstruse matter

Our author could point to the precise book of Aristotle which was in Rambam's mind: *הספר השלישי והאחרון*

Rambam quotes one argument of Aristotle, our author could point out another argument that Rambam might have used.⁴² Efodi

had also studied and quotes Plato⁴³ and Galen.⁴⁴ He knew the

Islamic philosophers Avenazer Alfarabi⁴⁵ and Ibn Rashd⁴⁶ and even

know of the difficulties that Al-Gazali (known to him as *אבו חנפלה*)

had gotten into in composing *הכחול*.⁴⁷ Not only was

he familiar with Greek and Arabic philosophers, but he had

studied the earlier Jewish philosophers such as Gersonides⁴⁸ and

Shapi.⁴⁹ His dependence upon the last mentioned will be more

fully developed (as will his dependence upon Narboni whom he does not mention.)

Since the major part of his thesis will deal with Efodi's commentary to the Guide, Part One, in a later chapter, we will deal more fully with his philosophy.

As has already been mentioned, our author was caught up in the cataclysm which swept through Catalonia in 1391. Although there are conflicting reports concerning his conversion, it seems clear that he was a convert for a period of time. How long is not clear.⁵⁰ Efodi determined to sail to Palestine where he could acknowledge Judaism freely or, more probably because he felt it more fitting to return to his faith in the Holy Land (in accordance with his interpretation of Deut. 32:43 which he gives in *האזהרה*).⁵¹ In this determination he was joined by his friend David Bonet Buen Giorno.⁵² Efodi arranged to meet

The name *אברהם* is always used for Al-Gazali

... in the south of France and from one of the seaports they would embark. Arriving first Efodi expected that his friend would soon follow. His expectations were rudely crushed when his friend wrote him, saying that he had met the apostate Solomon Paul de Santa Maria (who prior to his conversion had been known as Rabbi Solomon Levi of Burgos) and had been prevailed upon to remain true to his new religion. Not only did Bonet remain true to his new faith, but he advised Profiat Duran to do the same. Moreover, adding insult to injury, Bonet recounted the praises of his new friend Solomon Paul de Santa Maria who had created all manner of mischief to hurt his ex-coreligionists.

Duran's reply to his ex-friend written in rhymed verse still retains its stinging irony. Even its superscription is telling: 53

Over and over again, Duran tells Bonet "not to be like his fathers and applied reason to 54 and asked what was meant by Garden of Eden story; who denied plurality to God, 55 but followed His Law: 56 Duran tells Bonet, "But not you You should take everything in its simple form, denying reason but not denying plurality to God and by all means forsake His law." Since most of the style is lost in translation, we will give one of the

more penetrating attacks in Hebrew: "אל תחיי כאבוחיך אשר האמינו בה" אחר ושללו ממנו חרבו לנאמר, לא בהרכבה מסוג ומין מה שיוצא עליו באמתה גדרו, או ניהם לא מוסף במספרו ומעו במאמר שמע ישראל ח" אחר וחבינו מחוץ אחר אחדות פשוטה לבר עליה אין לחוסף וממנה אין לדנוע מה שאין הפה יכול לדבר וכבר האזון משמע, ואחל לא כן, האמינהו אחר ושלשה, וחלשה אחר נושא לבטא באחד מסוגיו - ואחל שלשה לא שלש צדדי אף עצמי שלשה מחזירים גב לגב. 57

though *Sefer Chofetz Chaim* is primarily a satire, one should not lose sight of the philosophic underpinnings of the book and the author's familiarity with the Guide for the Perplexed as shown by Joseph Shem Tob in his commentary on it.⁵⁸

After completing his satire, our author did not go to Palestine but went instead back to Spain and served as a tutor in the house of Chasdai Crescas. Crescas, himself the author of a polemic against Christianity,⁵⁹ prevailed upon Duran to write a more formalized polemic against Christianity which was completed about the year 1387.⁶⁰ This book entitled *P'nei Hachochim* with a dedication to Crescas, appeared in twelve chapters giving a dispassionate critique of Christian dogmas. The author's thesis, bolstered by an acquaintance with the New Testament was that Christianity had degenerated in the course of time.⁶¹

Turning away from polemics, our author composed a grammatical work *Sefer Efodi* which appeared in 1403. It is considered his best work, for it is a summary of other grammar with corrections. In it, Efodi attempts to formulate the principles of Hebrew syntax.⁶² Somewhere in this period, Efodi composed his commentary upon the Guide, which commentary will be considered later.

As the beginning of Efodi's life is obscure, so is the end. Toward the end of his life, he may have settled in Perpignan or Spain and there composed the last works of his life.⁶³ As his birthyear is not given, neither is the year of his death. What further facts can be learned about his life will be ascertained from a study of his works.

III

Efodi's works can be divided into three categories: those which are dated, those whose date is ascertainable and those whose date cannot be determined. This is of course an artificial division but it is a convenient way of dealing with the works of a man who wrote in the fields of Bible, Grammar, Philosophy, Astronomy, History and Medicine.⁶⁴

Those works which have a date include קנה ורסמא eulogy for Abraham ben Isaac Ha-Levi, written in Marcheswan 5154-1394 as an condolence letter to the grieving son אבירא אבירא who was a friend of Efodi.⁶⁵ Another work with a date is חשב האבא an astronomical and calendarical work.⁶⁶ As the author mentions the date in the preface we know that it was composed in 5155-1395. The author mentions the date of composition, 1403, in the very end אבירא אבירא,⁶⁷ the grammatical work which was Efodi's best.

Those works which have no date yet which are datable include the satirical letter כתב' כאביות' which has already been considered. Internal evidence suggests the date 1396. Following soon after came כתב' ג' אבירא. How soon is not clear, but since we do know that Crescas induced Efodi to write it, and since Crescas himself had written a polemic in 1396, we may assume that כתב' ג' אבירא⁶⁸ was written in 1397.

Those works whose date of composition cannot be determined include the Commentary on the Guide which will be dealt with in the major part of this thesis, חשב' אבירא the history

persecution since the dispersion. It was quoted by Abarbanel in his work (נחמ ארץ). Eredi wrote three Responsa, two exegetical treatises on 2 Samuel Chapter 14, vv 16,17, and a commentary to one of Ibn Ezra's works, all undatable.

CHAPTER II

THE SOURCES OF PART ONE TO GUIDE

When we began this study, we assumed that the commentary of Efodi to the Guide was original with him. Neither Steinsneider¹ nor Friedlander² who had made studies of the various commentaries to the Guide mentioned that Efodi had been influenced or received his material from any of his predecessors, even though Warblumer in 1948 had pointed out that Efodi copied Caspi without mentioning him: אלה האמוראים הלך בדרכו המאוחר.³ Although we had not seen Warblumer's statement till much later we came to a similar conclusion upon the careful comparison of Efodi with Caspi. We also found Warblumer's statement to be a bit exaggerated, for Efodi does quote Caspi by name four times in the course of his commenting upon the seventy-six chapters of Part One of the Guide. However, Caspi was not the only one copied by our author, Narboni was the recipient of that honor, but the flattery of imitation was all that Narboni received, for he is not mentioned by name by Efodi, even once.

The borrowed material in Efodi's commentary is sometimes introduced with the formulae וכן נראה וכן נראה but very often it is lifted bodily. Sometimes additions are made; sometimes not. The question as to how much of the commentary is 'original' is complicated by the fact that the is not always Caspi or Narboni. Apparently Efodi knew of still another commentary on commentaries to the Guide, the identity of which is unknown to this writer. If in the further treatment

of this material, we describe some of the material as 'original' we mean that material which does not occur in either Caspi or Narboni, but which may have been acquired from the unknown commentary or commentaries.

We may note a kind of poetic justice in operation: Caspi, at times borrowed (without mention) from Narboni,⁴ Efodi borrowed from them both and in the end was quoted (without mention) by Shem Tov.⁵

As is easily understood, the borrowing process creates certain problems in the treatment of the material. We were faced with the alternatives of listing line by line every borrowing from Caspi or Narboni which would preclude the attempt to give some coherent picture of his thought (albeit borrowed) or doing this and dealing with that part of the commentary which is 'original' which would give an incomplete statement of his position, or while indicating his borrowing and dependence on others, still try to give as complete a picture of his philosophical position as possible. We have elected to follow the third alternative, arguing "that when a writer uses other sources and bring their opinions without criticizing them, it is indicative that he identifies with them."⁶

We therefore will compare the commentary of Efodi with that of Caspi to bring enough examples to prove that the former borrowed from the latter. We will repeat this process with Narboni and will also give examples of the unknown commentary. Since we will only give examples, we caution the reader from assuming that we have exhausted the extent of the borrowing of the one from the other.

מח"מ: Efridi comments:

אבל כוונת המאמר הזה... ר"ל כוונתו בזה המאמר להעיר איש שיש לו שבע
תנאים רמז לז"כ בגרי כחונח...

Gaspi reads

אבל כוונת המאמר הזה וגו... ר"ל אין כוונתו לאחר מאלו השלש, אבל כוונתו
להכין לזה האיש אשר חזרנו כך וכך והם שבעה תנאים סימן להם שבעה בגרי
כחונח⁷

Chapter One:9

כי חב"ן דבק בנפש, ר"ל דוד כשהיה מחלל שבוש חש"י את אויביו היה
מחלל שיהיו מבוזים ממנו ית"ו ומהו הענין המבוז אצלו ית"ו הוא הבזיון
הנמשי שצורם הפנימי יהיה רע ומבלבל לא הענין חזונו כי לא בשוקי הארץ
ירצה

Gaspi reads:

ולכן נאמר צלמם תבונת כי הבזיון דבק בנפש, ר"ל מצד שחבונת הוא האל, כי
יפול אל האל שהוא בונה אברי האדם והוא יתברך לא בשוקי הארץ ירצה וכן
כחוב, אל תביט אל מראהו, א"כ דויד שהיה אומר שהאל הוא בונה אותם האנשים
פירש בונה נפשם אל רוע ציורם הפנימי⁸

In Chapter 6:1, Efridi:

וכן נאמר אנחנו ר"ל בכמו זה החנצלות שיעשה אריסטוטלס מלה כמלה בן נאמן
אנחנו בעשותנו באורים על ענינים עמוקים מעניני האלוהות ומעניני המעמד
הנבחר(ג) כי צריך לאדם וכו'. ר"ל וכדין היה שינצל אריסטוטלס על עצמו
ואנחנו עצמנו מענין ההריסה כי הוא ענין גדול וסכנה גדולה.

Gaspi reads

וכן נאמר אנחנו ר"ל שכן הוא שזה כשח כמו זה חלשון נאמר אנחנו על עצמו
החנצלות בעשותנו באורים על אלה הענינים העמוקים ענין האלוהות וברין
היה שינצל אריסטוטלס עצמו ואנחנו עצמנו... מעון חריסה כי הוא ענין מיללי
גדול מנשוא⁹.

In Chapter 5:2,3

לכל ענין מוכן ומזומן להתחבר. ר"ל רומז לאשה הנאמרת במעשה ברישית
שהוא הומר הראשון והאיש רומז אל הצורה ולפי שם האיש יאמר על הצורה נאמר
לשם יתברך אין מלחמה כי הוא יצרת הנמצאות כולם וכולם מתאחדות ומתחברות

material, we demand

that material which

, but which may have

or consideration.

We may have

as time has

from them but

Shem Tov.

As is easily

problem in the

in the alternative

from Gaspi or have

more coherent

and definite

which will

or while in

will try to

relation as

alternative,

their opinion

that he identifies

the therefore

Gaspi to bring

from the subject.

and will also

will only give

that we have

from the other.

וכמוהו והאיש גבריאלי כי השכל הנבדל הוא מתחבר עם הצורות השכלות כל
זה וזהות נאמרו בשותף. ר"ל רמו לזה אמר איש את אחיו בענין כרובים
ומעשה מרכבה אשה אל אחותה.

לכל ענין מוכן ומזומן להתחבר לענין אחר ובוה רמו על החומר שכל עצמו
להתחבר עם הצורות 10

Efodi in Chapter 13:2

יעמוד עמוי... וכן אנכי קיים בין השם, בין השם יתברך שהוא השכל הפועל
ובניהם שהם ישראל וזה הפרק רמו לאמרו ביחזקאל בעמדה יעמוד ור"ל
בקיומם יקוימו ור"ל שבקיום הגלגלים יקוימו היסודות וכן אמרו בזכריה
על המלאך העומד בין ההדסים שר"ל שהוא קיום בין ההדסים וכל זה בכלל
מעשה מרכבה

Caspi:

משה

...שכל בזה חאר כשהוא עומד עם ה' או בין ה' ובין ישראל מצד
קיומו שם זמן מה והמעש קיום שכלו בפעל עם השם ית"ל... אמנם אמר בכאן
כי רמו מענין הקיום על אמרו ביחזקאל. בעמדם יעמודו כלומר בקיומם
יקוימו, כי לגלגלים אין מנוחה לתנועת ההעתק, וכן מזה על אמרו בזכריה
על מלאך שהוא עומד בין הדסים וכל זה בכלל מעשה מרכבה 11

Efodi in 14:2

ומזה הענין השלישי ויראו בני וכו'. מפני זה אמר הרב ומה הענין השלישי
ולא ערב זה הפסוק עם האחרים להעירנו כי יש בזה רמו ור"ל ויראו בני
האלהים והם האנשים השכליים נטו בעניני המפורסמות והם "בנות האדם".
גם בזה הפרק רמו לשותף אחר הנאמר במעשה מרכבה באמרו "פני אדם" או
"דמות אדם" שר"ל השכלים המופשטים.

...רמו על השכל הנפרד הנזכר ביחזקאל באמרו "כמראה אדם" ומוזה חנין
השלישי ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם אכן באדם תמותון עשה מעט הברל
בכאן לומר ומה הענין הזה ולא ערבם וחד עם גם בני אדם להעירנו כי יש

...הוא השכל הפועל

...הוא השכל הפועל

...

...הוא השכל הפועל

...

...הוא השכל הפועל

...

...הוא השכל הפועל

...

...הוא השכל הפועל

...

...הוא השכל הפועל

...

...הוא השכל הפועל

בכאן סוד והענין בזה כי אמרו ויראו בני אלהים את בנוה האדם ענין 12
 כמו שבארנו במורק כסף. גם בנוה האדם הם דעות פחותות ונכחות שהיו מוכרין
 עמנו () ... אנו אמרתי אלהים אתם ובני עליון כלכם... ואם אלהים בכאן מלאכים
 כי הנשים גדולי השכל יקראו מלאכים 12

We have taken examples so far from the beginning of the com-
 mentary; we shall now present one from the end: Efodi in Chapter 73:29

ולא יטילו ענין המקרה במחבר אלא מצד הפרדי וכבר קדם בהקדמה ראשונה כי
 הכמות נמצא מחובר לא מצד הפרדי

Caspi:

דע כי מה שהייב לו לכל עצם אין כונתו בעצם המחבר אבל בעצם הפרדי מרמז
 פרט כל אחד מצד עצמו. כי כל עצם מהם אינו בעל כמות מירוש זה צריך להם מצד
 הניחם ענין המקרה במחבר אלא מצד הפרדי וכבר קדם בהקדמה הראשונה 13

Lest we leave with the reader the impression that Efodi never
 acknowledged his dependence on Caspi but merely took his commentary in
 toto or changed a word here and there, ¹⁴ we shall present some examples where
 Efodi gave quasi-acknowledgment by naming Caspi as the ¹⁵ *מחבר* or the *מחבר*
 After the examples of quasi-acknowledgment we shall present those four
 comments of Efodi where he quoted Caspi by name.

Efodi:2:23

הכל אמרו על אדם מונה פניו... ויש מפרשים שרמז בזה הר"ם ז"ל על דבר נסתר
 ממעשה בראשית כי האדם הנזכר שם לא היה אחד רמז לבד הכלל נאמר ר"ל
 איזה איש שיודען שיאיה בתוך ההוא ר"ל שיאיה שכל בפעל ונאמר בעת מה יאיה שכל
 בכח וזהו החביא הרב ז"ל זה הפסוק.

Caspi has the identical statement except for *בין* between *בין* and *בין* and for the last six words, Caspi reads:

ועל זה אמר איוב בדברו על סודותיו וחידומו לו "התקדמו לנצח ויחלוק סודו
 פניו ותשחתו" 15

Instead of *מחבר* material from Caspi is introduced with
 formula *מחבר* in the following example:

Efodi in Chapter 12:3

כלומר הקום על אויביה. יש להקשות מה הכרחו לרמז לפרש הקום על אויביה
 יכול לפרש אהה התקדמו לרמז על ציון וזהו התקדמות נסתר לנצח ולרע כמו

17 We begin our comparison of Efodi with Narboni, the following example catches our attention:

Efodi in

כולם יורה על ענין אחד. ר"ל בענין השתלשלות כל המצוות והקשר קצתו בקצתו כמו הסולם. ענין שני עולם השפלה. ענין שלישי עולם הגלגלים. ענין רביעי עולם המלאכים. ואמרו עולים שירה על השנה הנפרדים גדולה כשיקפו בעולותם ולזה היאר חזק העלייה. ואמרו יורדים ר"ל כשישקפו השכליים בעצמם ובמה שלמטה מהם היא ירידה בערך אל החשבה במקלה שלמעלה מהם. ענין מציאות האל יתב"ו והוא יתב"ו מנוץ קרבות במרחן וזהו רומז כאן.

Narboni reads:

והנה כולם יורה על השתלשלות המצוות וסדר חלקיו ואמרו מצד הרצה יורה על כולם היסודות שהוא כל מה שבנוך גלגל הירח, ואמרו מנוץ השמימה יורה על עולם הגלגלים. והנה מלאכי אלהים יורה על עולם השכלים הנבדלים. ואמרו עולים יורה על כי הם עליו ויורדים עלולים בצירוף ואמרו וזהו ח"ו נצב עליו יורה על ענין שביעי כי הוא יתב"ו חסבה הראשונה. 19

Similarity almost becomes identity in the following example from Chapter One:

Efodi 1:10

והיות מבוקש מהם ר"ל הורדת הרוחניות

Narboni

והיות מבוקש מהם ענינים והוא הורדת הרוחניות 20

We give another example:

Efodi 5:5,56

ויזקק מדותיו. זה רמז לאמרו וכבטו שמלותם, וחשוקותיו ר"ל זה רמז לאמרו אל חגשו אל אשה

This is almost identical with Narboni:

ויזכך מדותיו זכוכך רב. והוא אמרו וכבטו שמלותם וימיה האנוחיות וחשוקותיו הדמיוניות. הוא אמרו אל חגשו אל אשה. 21

Efodi 16:2

כמו שביארנו באמרם הנה מקום אהי. ר"ל שביארנו מקו' שהוא מקום עיון וחשקת שכל. ואחר שדבר בשיתוף צור ולא העליים...

Narboni:

הנה מקום זה, מעלת עיון וחקפת שכל והוא הנרצח בממרו ונצבה על הניד
כמו שהתבאר שם. 23

Here is an example of borrowing further on in the book:-

Efodi 65:1

שחורה ברואה, כי אם יהיה לו דבור התורה דבורו, ואחר שחורה ברואה הנה
אין לו דבור, והוא אמרו חכונה בזה שהדברים המיוחסים לו נכראו.

Efodi 65:4

והוא אחר אם נודע... ר"ל הענין המובן מאת השם יתברך וענין הרצון והחפץ
הם ענין אחר אם שנודע בקול נברא והוא הענין המובן מאת השם ית" (א ו)
דרך מדרכי הנבואה ר"ל הנפעה הכלית והוא ענין הרצון והחפץ

כי אם יהיה לו דבור התורה דבורו, ואחר שחורה ברואה הנה אין לו דבור
והוא אמרו חכונה בזה שדברו המיוחס לו נכרא.

אם בנוי על הרצון והחפץ או בנוי על ענין המובן מאת השם והוא אחר אם
נודע בקול נברא באמצעות הנביא כמרע"ה או נודע מדרכי הנבואה האמיתית
כמו שהתבאר. 23

The most compelling evidences that Efodi copies Narboni is
to be found in the comparison of their commentaries to Chapter 66.

Efodi 66:4

שמכתב הלוחות בליל מעשה בראשית והו לפי דעתו וסובר שהלוחות היו
נמצאות בלוחות בטבע כמער ענינו הטבע כמער נראה יקפה אחת שהיו בו צורות
שונות גם הלוחות רומזות לנפש האדם שהוא כלוח המוכן לכתיבה. דע כי הר
סיני העידו עליו שהנביא הנמצא בו יצויר אליהם הסנה ולכן נקרא החר
ההוא סיני על שם הסנה, וראיתי אחר מאבני החר הזה שהיה מצויר בו הסנה.
בחלית ציור אלהי כגון מהחלף לגוון האבן וחלקתי האבן החזא לחלקים רבים
ונראה בכל אחד ואחד צורת הסנה.

Narboni:

ומה שראיתי אני בעצמי מסכים לזה. אע"פ עליו. דע כי הר סיני העידו
 עליו שהעבדים הנמצאים בו יצויר עליהם חסנה ולכן נקרא ההר ההוא סיני
 על שם חסנה. ואחר מנכבדי ברצילונה מבני חסדאי, הביט עמו מהעבדים החם
 וזרעו לי אחד מחלמירי בני משפחתו וראיתי בו חסנה מצוייר בתכלית הצויר
 ציור חלקי בגוון מחולק לגוון האבן ושברתי האבן לחצאין ונמצא חסנה מצוייר
 בטח כל חלק בפנימיות וכן פעמים רבות עי חס החלקים כדמות חבטנים
 וצדיין חסנה בהם ונפלאותי מזה ושמותי עליו כי הוא ורך להבין כונה חרב ו"ל. 24

הבינו Both Efodi and Narboni see identical meaning in
 ר"ל וזהו רמז כי מצד נאחות הנועותו יחבאר
 מציאות המניע

Narboni:

כי נאחות הנועה מורה על מניע נבול.

and use identical examples to explain theories of vacuum in Chapter 73

Efodi 73:8 והוא רוחק אחד או רחוקים ר"ל - רוחק אחד שיהיה

מסובך בגשם כרוקים אשר בספוג שום מסובך בגשם הספוג

או שיהיה הרוחק עצמו בלתי מסובך מכל גשם בעולם

ונערר ההמר, ג"כ מכל עצם פרדי אע"פ שהעצם ההוא בלתי בעל כחות.

Narboni: וכמו כן מאמין הריקות נחלקו לשני כחות מהם עצמו

שחור מעורב בגשמים ומסתכן בהם ונמצא בהם בפעול ומהם שאמר

שחור בלתי בגשמים כאלו האמר בנקבים הספוגים ואין שם

גשם. 26

For our comparison of Efodi with Narboni we have tried to
 quote those passages which are not only similar in content (as might
 be the case of two thinkers imbued with the same Zeitgeist but also
 which are similar in style and wording, so as to prove that Efodi
 borrowed from Narboni. Further the examples which we have used occur

only in Narboni. Yet we know that Narboni preceded Caspi in time and we have intimated that Caspi used Narboni in the same manner that Efodi used Caspi. Therefore, we will prove that Caspi used Narboni by true examples of Efodi which quote Caspi quoting Narboni. The first example we will use is interesting for it contains an heretical doctrine imputed by Narboni to Maimonides but copied without question by Caspi and Efodi.

In Chapter 10 Maimonides writes :

וכן כשחרר מכה באומה או באקלים כפי רצונו הקדום...

"...רצונו הקדום" is ambiguous. It may either mean 'previous,' 'preceding the event' or 'eternal.' However if Maimonides meant 'eternal,' he would hold the heretical opinion that the punishment inflicted upon the victims of the Deluge, on Sodom, etc., was the inevitable result of the Divine scheme.²⁷ However, Narboni did take it in such a sense:

יבונה הענין הנה בירידה, ר"ל שיחסו ספרי הנביאים ירידת מכה אשר יחויבה הרצון הקדום. וכמו שבחוב בספרו של אדם הראשון לפקידת המעשים²⁸

Caspi, as Werblumer noted, follows Narboni:

וכן כשחרר מכה באומה או באקלים כפי רצונו הקדום אשר יקדימו ספרי הנבואה לספר שהשם פקדו מעשיהם, בזה שתי הערות סודיות, האחת אמרו אומה או אקלים, כי רומז לענין דור המלגה וסדרו וכן לדור המבול והשנית אמרו רצונו הקדום ויסמוך לזה שיקדימו ספרי הנבואה לספר שהשם פקד מעשיהם עתה.²⁹

Efodi in his commentary 10:7 copies Caspi:

וכן כשחרר מכה באומה וכו'... ורמז בזה לשתי סודות האחד לדור המלגה ואנשי סדרו והשנית אמר כפי רצונו הקדום.

In Chapter 36, Maimonides makes the sweeping statement, "You will not find the term **אֱלֹהִים** applied to God except in reference to idolatry." Now it happens that the term **אֱלֹהִים** does occur in Ex. IV:14, XXII:24 and Numbers 12:9 and not in reference to idolatry.³⁰ The commentators thereupon attempt to show that these exceptions are no exception but really do refer to idolatry. Since the **אֱלֹהִים** express ^{in these} three exceptions refer to erroneous opinions and therefore erroneous opinions are equivalent with idolatry, or as Narboni stated:

ומהר חסיד בנדרו הכפירה שמאמר פוסק שהוא חלוק המציאות והאמת
דבר בחלוק מה שהוא.³¹

Rfodi quotes Caspi by name in 36:2

והכפירה חירץ שכבר כתב הרב בזה המקום שהמאמר דעם בטל בו יח
הוא עבוד ע"י³²

Rfodi then proceeds to quote all of Caspi in elucidation of this point.

In commenting on Maimonides' statement in 72

אם יש שם גלגל חקפות וכו' יש בו עיון.

Narboni comments

אמר זה כפי חכמת החכונות אמנם כפי שרשי חכמת הטביות
הנה הוא נמוק כי לא חזיה חנועת החזק מן המרכז ולא אל
המרכז ולא סביב המרכז והאלוה ברא את העולם שלוש בטבע.³³

Caspi

אבל חכמי החכונות הראשונים קודם (הבוכבר) ובטלמיוס לא
היו פניחים לא גלגל (היה) (הקף) ולא גלגל חזן למרכז כי החכונות
הקודמת הייתה אחתית בנזח על שרשים טבעים.³⁴

Efodi in his commentary 72:6 is identical with Narboni, but omits last six words.

As an example of עין חנה עין quotes Efodi almost word for word, adding 35 וחלום ברא חלל במכע בחנועה.

Friedlander's suggestion that Caspi precedes Narboni³⁶ is of course erroneous as indicated by Werblumer's statement (infra) and Abarbavol's remark in Chapter 36 וכבר השתדל נ' כספי וחביא חפודי לייחם אל המאמרים האלה שמן ע"ו בחיותם ובונים על דעות נפסדות... וקצתם לקוחים מדברי חורבנוני. 37 and also the fact that Alfunezer Afrasi's book quoted by Maimonides in Chapter 74 is unknown to Narboni: זה המאמר 38 לא הגיע אלינו but known to Caspi who was quoted by Efodi in 74:26.

That there are many and differing commentaries in Caspi's day and therefore in Efodi's day, is attested.³⁹ It is therefore not unlikely that Efodi knew of another commentary, the identity of which is unknown to us. Since it is unknown, we cannot attest Efodi's dependence upon it. We can, however, give examples of Efodi's quoting a יש המרשים which is neither Narboni nor Caspi. Thus in Chapter V:10 we read of three varying מנדים one which is Narboni and the others are unknown.

And also in V we read of ויש מפרשים שמצור כלכולם החזק חושמי נמו
לחנאות גופניות ויאכלו וישחו בפעל יותר מחק חרואי.⁴⁰

When Caspi is quoted as המחרץ other opinions are quoted.

As we indicated Efodi sometimes follows an opinion other than Caspi as in 73:43 where he gives חירץ הכספי and then follows another group which is not Narboni:

ויש מחרצים שזה אינו חולק עם החקמה השביעית...

Whether these quotes are parts of one unknown commentary⁴¹ or part of various unknown commentaries, cannot be determined.

CHAPTER III

THE ANALYSIS OF THE COMMENTARY TO PART I OF THE GUIDE

Before we can deal with Efodi's method of commenting upon the Guide for the Perplexed, we should ask, why does Efodi write? What perplexities are to be found in a book, ostensibly written to guide those who are already perplexed? Why does Efodi feel that he must guide the would be reader of the Guide? To answer these questions, we must first answer a more basic one, why does any book require a commentary? Why does the literary figure of a commentator exist?

The only explanation is that the commentator must feel that the text which he is interpreting cannot be read with full meaning by the average reader, and that he, the commentator, must stand between the text and the reader to deliver the author's true intent. The commentator feels that he does not add to the text; rather he conceives of himself, as elucidating that which is already in the text, but which for some reason, is obscure to the reader. Obscurities may hid the author's true intent in a number of ways. Perhaps the author's style is difficult, and his language vague. Perhaps grammatical difficulties hide the meaning or perhaps the terms used have various meanings. Is the author dealing in concepts lucid only to the initiated? Or does the author wish to appear lucid to all? To this last point, we shall return.

If the difficulty lies in the author's means of expression, or that of the translator, the commentator may express what he considers the true meaning, with the phrase

٢٤٣ ١١٣٦

"he means to say," assuming that his explanation is the elucidation that the author would make, had he the time and opportunity to make it.

We spoke of the possibility that the author might not have intended to speak to all of his possible readers. To be precise, we should say that the commentator believes that the author wrote an esoteric book purposely obfuscating his writing so as to reveal his meaning to the chosen few (including the commentator) and hide his meaning to the mass (which includes the 'average' reader). If the commentator were to reveal that which is 'hidden,' he would go beyond the author's purpose, but not beyond the author's meaning. (Unless he were to write an esoteric commentary, esoterica to the second power as it were to use Strauss' phrase.) His revelations would be introduced by the word *גלוי* for he would attempt to convince the reader that the author hints at one thing while speaking of another.

Could the Guide be considered a book of hidden meanings, which are submerged within the text requiring an astute commentator to bring them to the surface? Examining it, we find, in addition to the problems created by terms and concepts which might be foreign to the reader, grammatical constructions sure to confuse him, both difficulties magnified by the Ibn Ribbon translation of the Arabic into stilted Medieval Hebrew, replete with ambiguities and confusions of number and gender, the statement of Maimonides, that he writes in a manner that the truths contained are, "at one time apparent, and at another time concealed." (1) Further, he warns the reader not to expect, in

discussions of physics and metaphysics, "more than פירוש רמב"ם and those, interspersed amidst other topics" (2). In the directions for the study of the work, Rambam tells us, "Do not content yourself with comprehending its principal subjects, but attend to every term therein, although it may seem to have no connection with the principle subjects" (3).

Surely we may conclude that Rambam's words would serve as hints to one disposed to find hints. Efodi was such a person. We have already pointed out in Chapter Two that Efodi was dependent upon Caspi and Narboni. That they saw hidden meanings in the Guide, which they felt, the author wished to remain hidden is certain. Caspi says, "If any person should blame me for explaining this book contrary to the wish of the author, I answer that I gladly incur this blame because I prefer to serve and benefit every one that will read it. If I have assisted the reader in understanding what might otherwise have remained a *terra incognita*, 'Let Thy curse come upon me' (Gen. 27:13) and let the reader accept my blessing."⁴

Efodi was to make this *terra incognita* known in two general ways. First he was to clear its surface by explaining the terms used, by removing grammatical difficulties and as far as possible elucidating the Ibn Tibbon translation used; second he was to reveal its hidden treasures by explaining those hints which he felt that Rambam left for him (or for Narboni and Caspi) to find.

As was indicated in Chapter One, Efodi was a trained

grammarian. He gives evidence of this in his comments upon Chapter 40. In expounding a verse from Isaiah (40:13), Maimonides takes יְהוָה יִגְדָּל as derived from יִגְדַּל יְהוָה although the form is ambiguous and could derive from the third singular יִגְדַּל יְהוָה .

To explain Maimonides decision, Efodi tells us, "The nun is raphe, he means to say the form is 'He will inform us'."⁵

In Chapter 67, Ramban discusses the possible meanings of יִגְדַּל יְהוָה . Here again Efodi reveals his grammatical training by his comment that Ramban took the verb "as transitive while the other commentators explained it as reflexive."⁶

Inasmuch as the Guide is written in the language of the neo-Aristotelianism of its day, Efodi's task as a commentator is to explain and clarify certain basic philosophical terms. His task is made the more difficult because of limits of Medieval Hebrew which required that certain words have both a philosophical and a related though non-philosophical meaning. For example in discussing the negative attributes in Chapter 58, Ramban tells us, "the negative attributes...do not (describe) ...the essence of the thing which we desire to know, in any way tell us what it is, except indirectly," (לֹא יִגְדַּל). Efodi however takes יִגְדַּל to mean, 'as an accident' and labors in argument to show that negation can give knowledge of accidents but not of substances.⁷ The common philosophical words substance and accident must also be defined: "substance can be applied to every object, even including abstract beings (יִגְדַּל)."⁸ "The definition of accident is that something whose coming into being, and whose passing out of being can be imagined without the decay

of the subject of that accident."⁹ Other common words which have a philosophic meaning must be defined, e.g., 'perfection' is not moral perfection (as Shem Tov thought) but rather "perfection in speculation."¹⁰ The words $\int se$ and $\gamma 7 \Delta$ have specific meanings to Efodi; the former is the hylic intellect¹¹ and the second is the acquired intellect.¹² The Kalam stumbled against the distinction between non-technical and technical usage when they defined "as impossible that which was $\gamma 7 \Delta$ as 'imaginable' instead of 'conceivable'."¹³

Efodi shows a fine grasp of philosophical concepts when he distinguished between the use of $\gamma 7 \Delta k$ by the philosophers and by the Kalam. "The Kalam define $\gamma 7 \Delta k$ as that which may exist and that which may not; the philosopher defines $\gamma 7 \Delta k$ as anything other than God, i.e., all existents. The former takes the definition from the aspect of the thing itself; the latter takes it from the aspect of its causes."¹⁴ Though lacking the technical vocabulary required to distinguish between possible and contingent and finding both senses subsumed in the Hebrew word $\gamma 7 \Delta k$, Efodi has clarified both meanings. Two meanings could also be found the word $\gamma 7 \Delta k$. It could mean 'beginning'; but philosophically it means 'principle'... "within everybody there is a principle which is that body's natural form, for whose sake the body moves to its natural place from whence it had been disturbed by some compelling force."¹⁵

Efodi gives a definition of a word whose meaning is still in the present disputed¹⁶ namely $\rho 7 \Delta k$ whose definition

is that of a synonym which can be applied "without (regard for) progression or succession and without (regard for) strength or weakness."¹⁷

He differs slightly from a modern definition of חומר חומר defined by Efros "as a matter of which something is immediately formed."¹⁸ Efodi defines it as that which exists "after the combination of the constituents."¹⁹ To the former "immediate matter" is the cause; to the latter it is the effect.

Prime matters enters in Efodi's distinction between 'physical form' צורה פיזיקלית and 'body' גוף: "physical form is one thing; body is another, for physical form is comprised by the three dimensions (abstractly) while 'body' is that combination of physical 'form' and prime matters."²⁰

חומר נצחי might be erroneously translated as 'combined thought' if it were to be translated literally; Efodi explains it as that which is understood when "you examine a matter in the very simplest way and explain it in the same manner as those axioms understood by the entire human species."²¹

Lest the reader think that Efodi limited his explanations to philosophical terms, he also identified philosophers. Unhappily his identification were often wrong: He explains פילוסופים

as so called 'because they believed in atomism which is the root of their false ideas.'²² He erroneously identified the Sophists, 'as recent philosopher.'²³ (Unless we consider that he referred to the Sophists of his own day. Else, Efodi's placing the Sophists as סופיסטים contradicts Rambam's obvious reference to Aristotle as one of סופיסטים discussed in

Chapter 71. Compare discussion in Efros p. 98.)

Not all erroneous comments were due to a lack of information, some were due to the lack of an accurate text. When Maimonides arguing against the Kalam doctrine of vacuum, mentioned the sons of Shakir as having compiled a book of problems based on the principle of horror vacui, Efodi reading האיראקא in his text of the Ibn Tibbon translation explained האיראקא as a city.²⁴ When the translation had been changed for euphemistic reasons, Efodi, not having the Arabic originals, proceeded to interpret האיראקא like the substance of the lesser luminaries which is not like the substance of the sphere of the sun.²⁵ He would have been saved the task, had he read האיראקא instead of האיראקא 'sparks'. Efodi's high regard for the text caused him difficulty when in Chapter 73, he interpreted האיראקא .²⁶ He had to justify האיראקא , which Munk²⁷ later was to show as a misreading for the initials of האיראקא . (האיראקא).

The greatest example of Efodi's attempt to justify the text is to be found in Chapter 72. Efodi's text read, as does ours, "The number of spheres encompassing the Universe cannot be less than eighteen." Efodi gives the spheres as "Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Moon and Mercury with a sphere going to each one, these add up to ten."²⁸ Lest the reader wonder how these add to ten, we turn to the notes of Kaufman²⁹ who explains Saturn as האיראקא . Thus we add 5/1/1/1/1...but these add up to nine. Perhaps we should understand האיראקא as 'the five spheres of Saturn and add Saturn. Yet if we do,

Now are we to understand the next part of Efodi's comment,

"Venus and the Sun, with two spheres going to each totaling

six which Kaufman explains as $2 \times 2 = 4$
 $2 \times 1 = 2$
 $\frac{4}{2} = 2$

2x2=4
2x1=2
4/2=2

where apparently the 'two spheres of Venus' are counted alone

without the addition of Venus itself. Efodi's enumeration con-

tinues, "one sphere extending to the Arabot and one to the fixed

stars, totaling eighteen, without doubt." As we have seen doubt

still exists since nine and six and two add up to seventeen.

Perhaps the best alternative would be to return to the textual
version used by Caspi which read, "Not less than seventeen."³⁰

Not only did Efodi have difficulty elucidating some philosophical concepts and identifying some philosophers, he also had difficulty with some philosophical axioms. When Efodi explains the words of Rambam in Chapter 73 "it is impossible... that one substance should penetrate into another," as, they considered as impossible the entrance of one body into another without some protrusion³¹...one may say that such an interpretation is at best imprecise and at worse gives the impression that Efodi missed the point of Rambam's words which should be understood as 'the impossibility of one substance penetrating into another's space, i.e., two things cannot be in the same space at the same time.'

We cannot say that Efodi erred in the last comment, but we can say that he missed the point as he did in commenting on Chapter 74. Taking the text with utmost seriousness, Efodi missed the point of Rambam's irony, "One of the modern Mutakallemin

thought that he had found a very good argument...,³² much better than any advanced, and proceeded to explain why it was very good, "All the other arguments were based on those Kalam propositions which negated God as the Necessary Being since every argument based upon such fallacies must be false, this new argument is 'good' because it is not constructed upon such false bases."³²

Efodi was not limited to commenting upon recondite subjects in a profound style; he was capable of commenting in the manner of Rashi. When Rambam discusses $\int \text{ok}$ and relates it to "the growth of animals, the preservation of their strength and their existence and the support of all their bodily forces, caused by the food they take," Efodi wishes us to understand all the nuances contained in the phrase, for by the growth of animals we are to understand (that food aids them) "in the period of growth"; the preservation of their strength (refers to the aid given by food) in the years of decline'.³³

In making the comparison between the Universe and Man in Chapter 72, Rambam discusses 'the principal organs of man' without becoming immediately explicit. Efodi does, "By Principal parts" he means the liver, the brain and the heart."³⁴

Like Rashi, Efodi had recourse to $\text{P} \int \text{ok}$, as he explains $\int \text{ok}$ $\int \text{ok}$ $\int \text{ok}$ 'Indigo in Old French'.³⁵

Thus far we have illustrated Efodi's work as guide over the surface of the terra incognita which is the Guide. He has cleared up points of grammar and has explained for good or ill, certain terms, concepts and names. In doing this, he has removed those

difficulties which were extraneous to the author's purpose and intent. Efodi has interpreted what Maimonides 'meant to say'. But what of those things which the Rambam did not 'mean to say,' but only hinted at? What of the hidden treasures of the 'terra incognita'?

First Efodi will indicate certain hidden paths which connect one chapter to another, though the two chapters be widely separated. As examples, we are told that parts of Chapter Two³⁶ allude to Chapter Fifteen of Part Three, Chapter Three³⁷ conflicts with Chapter Thirty-Seven of Part One while being connected to Chapter Four. A point raised in Chapter Four³⁸ will be resolved in Chapter Forty-Four while a point in Chapter Five³⁹ requires resolution in Part One, Chapter Twenty-Eight, Part Two, Chapter Twenty-Six, and Part Three, Chapter Four. Variations of the⁴⁰ interpretations of a word in Chapter Seven are noted as occurring in Chapters Twenty-Two and Fifty-Four of Part Three. The⁴¹ problem of Moses' ascension in Chapter Ten is related to the ascensions of Elijah and Elisha in Part Three...

Yet finding the hidden links between chapters are not enough for our commentator, he would go further. With the words of Rambam in mind that the truths "are at one time apparent and at another time concealed," Efodi seeks to find those hints which will reveal the concealed truths and point out the *signs*. Seeking hints, he finds them. If Maimonides, in explaining a homonym, were to quote a number of verses and before one of them say, "in this figurative sense" he must really mean that the verse immediately quoted is different from those which went before

and those which come after."⁴² Even a hint may require still another hint to follow it: e.g., when commenting upon the statement by Rambam in Chapter 54, that God's favor descends upon a man according to the measure of his wisdom or folly, our commentator tells us, "With this the Rabbi has revealed a great secret, and this is the meaning of his (previous) statement, 'this is not the purpose of this chapter, for in every place that the Rabbi says, 'this is not the purpose of this chapter,' he hints at something."⁴³ Along with other commentators, Efodi sees notes to the 'initiated' in פסוק א which is said twelve times in Part One, in the main at the end of the chapter.⁴⁴

Yet obtuse as these 'hints' may be, they are not the only ones that Efodi believes that Maimonides has left for him to find. The 'secrets of the Torah' which Maimonides has promised for Efodi are seen in these verses which Maimonides quotes in his explanation of homonyms and by those verses which he does not quote. As an example of the former: "Behold, I will stand before Thee there upon the rock in Horeb," (Ex. 17:6) is quoted in Chapter 15 which to Efodi reveals that "standing upon a rock" means existing forever".⁴⁵ As an example of the latter, the failure of the Rabbi to mention "and God went up from Abraham" (Gen. 17:22) in a discussion of the word פסוק which has been interpreted as 'the discontinuance of prophecy', is to teach us that "Divine Protection includes prophecy for with the removal of prophecy, there is the removal of the Divine Protection."⁴⁶

Efodi's method of seeing hints in the Guide will become clearer when we discuss his psychology. At that time we shall see how he connects seemingly unconnected verses, sees hints in unexpected places and has the firm conviction that Rambam is not interpreting the usages of certain words in general, but rather is explaining certain definite verses in particular.

Let us leave Efodi's method of commenting and approaching Efodi as a philosopher. We will begin by asking what is truth and what is the role of reason, according to Efodi. He would reply "the definition of truth is the agreement with reality, and the definition of false is the opposite of reality."⁴⁷ Agreeing with Rambam that 'true' and 'false' apply only to necessary truths, Efodi explains why 'good' and 'evil' cannot be applied to necessary truths, nor 'true' and 'false' cannot be applied to conventional truths, by pointing out that the entire question revolves about 'consequences' (or 'antecedents'). 'Necessary truths': describe (present) existents, "They have the necessity of the concept to the conception" (the concept is either in harmony with reality or it is not). 'Good' and 'evil' refer to consequences of action (there can be no agreement of a concept with what will be). Furthermore, conventional (or, apparent) truths are not based on reality but on opinion, "for were there no men there would be no apparent truths, for matters of apparent truths depend upon the agreement of men that one thing is proper and another improper."⁴⁸ To the question

where is truth to be found, Efodi would answer, "between Talmud and Philosophy"⁴⁹ specifically in the Torah which is the happy combination of concepts פ'סוקים and practical applications פ'עושים thereof, "either of which alone would be bitter; (פ'סוקים alone would be bitter) and פ'עושים alone would be bitter to the mass and to the intellectuals".⁵⁰

True ideas of course are those which conform to reality; the Kalam which attracted some of the aforementioned intellectuals erred when it attempted to have reality conform to its ideas.⁵¹

Because the human form exists for wisdom (the possession of true ideas⁵² which is wisdom) will bring eternal life.⁵³ Efodi's conception of the relation of true ideas to salvation is noteworthy as an example of his method of finding 'hints.' Maimonides argues in Chapter 30 that 'hunger and 'thirst' are used in the sense of the lack of wisdom and intelligence." To prove his point he shows that Targum Yonatan translates (לעל פ'א פ'אקל) as (ל'א'A' "You will receive joyfully new instructions from the chosen of the righteous" he continues, saying that (ל'א'א'א'א'א'א'א'A expresses the belief that "righteousness is the true salvation." Now it should be noted that this phrase is mentioned secondarily, that the chapter speaks of פ'א, and only in passing mentions א'א' and א'א' which are interpreted offhand as the 'lack of knowledge.' Note that the first half of the quote from Targum Yonatan proved the point. The last half of the Aramaic translation was explained in a pious manner, "righteousness is the true salvation." Now it

is a hint.

Maimonides continues, "You will see how he gives to every word in the verse some signification referring to wisdom and study." This should be well considered." Efodi sees the 'hint' and 'considers it well,' for he explains the pious statement *לֵב זָכֵן הוּא*, "He means to say that correct ideas, i.e., those which correspond to objective reality, they are the true salvation."⁵⁴ To say the least, the shift from "righteousness" which implies righteous living involving total personality, as the means of salvation to correct ideas held in the mind as the means of salvation is a marked change.

Not only are correct concepts the means of salvation, but he who is well versed in speculation stands, as it were, with God.⁵⁵ With such benefits of knowledge as the goal, we may ask as to the task of reason. Efodi would answer us by saying that Reason's task is to distinguish between matter and form,⁵⁶ to distinguish substance from accident⁵⁷ and to thereby arrive at universal ideas abstracted from any (particularizing) accidents.⁵⁸ To Efodi, this is the import of Maimonides statement in Chapter 73, "He will understand from one matter various things." In further exposition of this statement, Efodi indicates the medieval belief that logic, language and reality are one: "He means to say that he will understand of one object many separate things, namely, the ten categories which can be applied (lit. 'spoken of') to everything in the world and no object can escape being so classified."⁵⁹

The other means of analysis, that of resolving a thing into its causes was also known to Efodi. He was acquainted with

the Aristotelean fourfold system of causes, i.e., the efficient cause, the final cause, the formal cause and the material cause. This is evidenced in Efodi's comment in Chapter 17; for when Rambam says that the "principia of all things are three" Efodi justifies that statement by saying that "the Rabbi does not number among them the efficient cause... (because) he explained it in the chapter before this."⁶⁰

How far can the mind go in search of truth? To Efodi the boundary of the human mind is that point beyond which no logical argument can be brought.⁶¹ Were a man to go beyond the limit, "his comprehension would be confused and his soul might die, unless he be granted 'special aid from Heaven.'"⁶² It is interesting to note that this discussion of the limit of the mind occurs in the discussion of *יצור ראשון*. To Efodi creation of the world is a *יצור ראשון* i.e., no logical arguments can prove it one way or the other. Creation or non-creation, then is to Efodi, an antinomy in the manner of Kant. 'The special aid from Heaven' adds a new dimension in the role of Prophecy i.e., for it is to provide knowledge in those areas where reason has come up against an antinomy.

The high regard manifested toward correct ideas and reason was naturally enough directed toward the philosophers, so that Aristotle... attained to the same knowledge as Moses and Solomon."⁶³ Moses, naturally enough was a philosopher, but he "did not understand the Intelligences and even the Active Intellect was not completely understood by him for such an intellectual attainment is withheld from every possessor of matter

He did, however, attain to the knowledge of (all) the existents of the physical world, and even (attained the knowledge of) the substance of the matter of the spheres, a feat unparalleled by any other sage or philosopher."⁶⁴ Yet to be fair to other philosophers, we should note that "Moses received pure concepts purified of percepts."⁶⁵

We have spoken of pure concepts and correct ideas; what of incorrect ideas? Even though certain incorrect ideas are equivalent to idolatry (as we have seen in Efodi's attempt to justify Rambam's statement that God's anger only refers to idolatry); we need not worry about them⁶⁶ by "the very nature of the soul we forget incorrect ideas easily."

As we speak of the soul, we approach the discussion of Efodi's psychology. To clarify his treatment to understand his method, we must understand the assumptions that Efodi made. First, since he stated that the Torah was the epitome of wisdom, it must be teaching $\rho\iota\sigma\theta\iota\kappa\iota$ to the $\rho\iota\sigma\theta\iota\kappa\iota$. Second, he assumes that Maimonides treatment of homonyms is the correct philosophical explanation of certain specific verses of the Torah. Third, $\rho\iota\sigma\theta\iota\kappa\iota$ is not only the technical term for physica, but is to be taken literally as the philosophical account of creation, and specifically the creation of man and in this opinion he believes that Rambam concurs. Having noted all this, how shall we understand Adam? "That which is spoken of Adam is to be applied to every man."⁶⁷ That which occurred to the First Adam will occur to every man many times even in our

times."⁶⁸ The word Adam refers to the generic name for all mankind.⁶⁹ It would seem that a figurative account but we anticipate. Since Maimonides himself said that, "form was that constituent which gave him (Adam) human perception, and used the verse, 'In the form of God He created him' (Gen. 1:26) the way was left open for Efodi to understand the entire story of Adam as an allegory of man's intellectual development." (It would be more precise to say that Efodi assumed that Rambam thought). Within these two stages, we can understand how Efodi imagined that Rambam left hints for him to find. When Rambam explains דלל as referring to "anything designed and prepared for union with another object" what he really means, according to Efodi, is the דלל spoken of in מלך דלל. She is prime matter, and the 'man' spoken of is form.⁷⁰ This hint is repeated in the discussion of דלל. The verse וְאָדָם בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים is quoted to show that 'brought' is applicable even though prime matter is not a body.⁷¹ (And also the union of form and matter) At this point we must pause and ask whether the account of Adam is totally allegorical? Here Efodi differs from Narboni and Caspi, who hold that it is, for apparently he holds that Adam really existed as an archetype of all men; for Adam, "was a corporeal rational animal as we are today." Even if we were to assume that that which Adam lived through actually, we live symbolically, the position that Adam was a real man seems contradictory to the entire system. But if Adam is form and Eve prime matter, what is the meaning of the Garden of Eden? What of

those things found in the Garden? What of the tree and what of the snake? What was Adam's sin and what was his punishment? What about his descendants? Efodi believes that Rambam's discussion of homonyms will clarify this. In discussing **פִּיטָה** the Rabbi is really referring to Genesis 2:8, 'And He placed Adam there.'⁷² Since he has explained that **פִּיטָה** means level or degree of intellectual attainment, Efodi understands the verse to say that Adam in his innocence had a certain intellectual attainment in that he contemplated pure concepts.⁷³ In discussing **לֵא** we found that Eve was prime matter; in discussing **אֶסֶף** we find that the Garden of Eden is the Body. The serpent is the appetitive faculty, which spreads and has many desires.⁷⁴ This faculty is balanced by the "voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden" (Gen. 3:8). To Efodi, the citation of this verse clearly means "those psychic faculties which are in the body."⁷⁵ The reader should note that Maimonides uses this particular verse to show how **אֶסֶף** may even be applied to a voice; yet for Efodi the matter is reversed: **אֶסֶף** is discussed to explain the specific verse, Gen. 3:8. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil also has an esoteric meaning: it is the knowledge of 'apparent truths'.⁷⁶ "Understand this" is the hint which Maimonides (according to Efodi) gives to alert us that his treatment of the three verbs **אֶסֶף** **לֵא** **אֶסֶף** really refer to God's warning to Adam "Do not eat from it and don't touch it" (Gen. 3:3). To Efodi this clearly means, "Don't comprehend apparent truths." The reader should note that the verse quoted from Genesis is not brought in the discussion in Chapter 18. (Another example of a

verse which is not quoted is the one thought to be the one really referred to.

Not heeding the warning, Adam inclined after his appetitive faculty and went after apparent truths.⁷⁸ His turning away from rational concepts for which his form was intended was the sin, and the very sin was its own punishment in that he lost the faculty for acquiring rational truths, "for the intellect cannot consider two things at the same time."⁷⁹ Then as Maimonides puts it, "He (Adam) fully understood the magnitude of the loss he had sustained" which Efodi understands as "he realized how precious was the thing he had lost, i.e., true speculation, and he became penitent, as it is written, 'I heard Thy voice and became afraid for I was naked and I hid.'"⁸⁰

Full understanding of the allegory of Adam must be postponed until the discussion by Rambam of /36; for the verse not mentioned, but according to Efodi really referred to, is Gen. 3:24, "And he caused to dwell at the east of the Garden of Eden the Cherubim. We already know that Gan Eden is the body and now Efodi tells us that, "the Cherubim are those psychic faculties which nullify and prevent intellectual perception."⁸¹ The homonym /3 really refers, says our commentator to the verse, "In anguish shall you bring forth a son" (Gen. 3:16) and also "She bore a son" Gen. 4:25. What /3 means is illuminated to Efodi by Rambam's quoting the Midrash, "During the 130 years that Adam was under rebuke, he begot spirits." Interprets Efodi, "The spirits were not demons, but those evils attendant upon following apparent truths and false opinions instead of

properly following after speculative concepts, which are the proper goal of the human form."⁸² It would seem that /א refers to proper philosophic concepts.

פ"א means speculative concepts which are laudable; א"א refers to apparent truths which are not; such is the opinion of the Efodi in interpreting Gen. 6:2, "and the sons of God say the daughters of Adam that they were fair"...Who were the sons of God? They were intellectuals פ"א א"א who foolishly followed after the daughters of Adam א"א א"א apparent truths.⁸³

Another example of Efodi's seeing hints in homonyms interpreted by Maimonides which are then related to specific verses involves the interpretation of the verse after the one quoted above. In discussing א"א Rambam hints at (to Efodi) Gen. 6:3, "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not remain in Adam". To Efodi, this means, "That which remains (after death) are the acquired intellects".⁸⁴ (He anticipates Rambam)

Efodi's penchant for seeing hints extends even to the discussion of the Two Tablets of Stone, "The tablets allude to the soul of man which like a tablet is prepared for writing."⁸⁵ (This is of course the Tabula Rosa of Plato)

The reader should note that Maimonides treats the homonyms in order to negate corporeality from God; Efodi considers Maimonides treatment as explanations of the intellectual development of man.

Having treated of Efodi's position concerning man, we will turn next to Efodi's thought concerning God, i.e., his

theology.

Efodi's method of developing his theology is very similar to his method of developing his psychology. His assumptions are similar, namely, that the Torah is an esoteric book of philosophy which Maimonides is interpreting in an esoteric manner. Nonetheless, Rambam has left hints for the initiated to find. Instead of finding these hints in the homonyms treated, as he did, in developing his psychology, Efodi finds these hints in the main in those chapters of the Guide which apparently interrupt the treatment of homonyms. To Efodi, the homonyms properly understood, explained the intellectual development of man; the topics of these interrupting chapters speak of God. The homonyms referred to specific verses of the Torah; so must the aforementioned topics. To which verses? Why, Rambam gave us a hint when he mentioned in Chapter 5 Aristotle's apology for dealing with profound subjects; what, according to Efodi could be profounder than the Theophany at Sinai, which was surely what Rambam meant.⁸⁶

When Rambam warned the would be theologian to prepare himself in those scenes preliminary to metaphysics, Efodi having already enumerated them in his commentary to the Introduction as *חכמה, אמונה, ופחד*,⁸⁷ immediately saw in the number three, the true explanation of Ex. 19:14, "Be prepared for three days."⁸⁸ Ex. 19:15 "And ye shall wash your garments" was explained by Rambam when he said that the investigator should thoroughly refine his moral character.⁸⁹ When Rambam continued, "He should

subdue his passions," to Efodi, this was the true meaning of the command of Ex. 19:15, "Don't come near a woman."⁹⁰ To find the true explanation of the succeeding verses of the Torah, we must wait, according to Efodi, until Maimonides comes to Chapter 34. For while one might think that Rambam is explaining in a discursive manner the various reasons why metaphysics cannot be made popular, Efodi informs us that the chapter really refers to the Theophany at Sinai, in fact to verse Ex.19:16, "And it came to pass on the third day, when it was morning, that there were thunders and lightnings and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the sound of the Shofar waxed exceedingly loud; and all the people that were in the camp trembled." 'The third day' refers to the period of the study of theology. 'In the morning' means the period of youth. 'Thunders' this refers to the length of study (preparatory to the study of theology) which was the third cause mentioned by Maimonides why metaphysics could not be made popular. 'Lightning' mentioned in the Torah means philosophically the reconditeness of the concept (of God). The mention of the thick cloud clearly refers to the restriction due to the nature of the inquiry upon he who would attain knowledge. What is related of the mountain refers to the head which is the abode of the mind, to which Rambam referred when he discussed as a second reason for the unpopularity of metaphysics, the limitation of intelligence. The Shofar spoken of, is that which Rambam refers in the fifth reason, i.e., the involvement in material pursuits, since Shofar is derived from the root שׂוּף 'beauty', since

the body is dragged in search of it. 'All the people trembled' for all these reasons, and therefore the science of metaphysics is withheld from the mass. (Verse 18 is explained...) Mt. Sinai as being covered by Rambam's fourth cause...that of natural disposition; while 'altogether on smoke' refers to the density of matter. 'Mt. Sinai' (also) refers to the head, "upon which God descended, when human intelligence descended due to the natural heat.... All chapters previous to this one i.e., 31-34 were the preparations (for the ideas of this) chapter, which we have explained."⁹¹

Efodi was recourse to seeing allusions to verses not mentioned in his commentary to chapter 10. It is to this, that we must return to understand the next verse of the description of the Theophany in Exodus. When Rambam says וַיֵּרָא is the entrance of the Divine Presence into a place, the verse not quoted but referred to is, Ex. 19:18, ~~27:16~~.⁹² Moses' ascension according to Rambam and Efodi was to the power of prophecy.⁹³

As we have seen above, to Efodi the speech between God and Moses was the transference of pure concepts devoid of percepts.

When Rambam quotes Ex. 19:22, "And let the priests also, which come near the Lord, sanctify themselves, "as a moral exhortation, Efodi continues what he believes to be the true explanation of the scene at Sinai, by reading philosophical content into it. "He means to say, 'those speculative philosophers who would approach God, i.e., the study of theology and thereby learn of the essence of God, must prepare themselves in the preliminary sciences lest they fall into error."⁹⁴ Those who were

not so prepared did fall into error; they were "the nobles of Israel" (Ex. 24:11). Their error is hinted at by Rambam in his explanation in Chapter Five, "And they saw God." Understanding Rambam's hints, Efodi could give us their precise error, "They conceived of God as the power in the rotation of the sun."⁹⁵

So much for the interpretation of the Theophany; Efodi has other theological ideas. Commenting upon Rambam's statement, "Be firm and steadfast in the conviction that God is the source of all things," Efodi tells us, "When you would wish to understand that God is the source of all being, pause and reflect upon all existents, and then you will know conclusively that God is the source of all being. You will comprehend God according to your ability, for complete knowledge of God's essence is withheld from us, therefore let he who would comprehend God as far as he is able, first consider all individual beings and in the measure that he can understand them, he will understand God, for all being partakes of His spiritual form."⁹⁶

Of one aspect of God's form, Efodi is sure, for he considers it axiomatic that no privation can be attributed to God,⁹⁷ nor can He be considered as possessing accidents.⁹⁸ (Even though Rambam went through arguments to establish these points.)

If all existents partake of God's spiritual form, God governs them indirectly, for His control of the world is done through emanations,⁹⁹ specifically through emanated intermediaries.¹⁰⁰ Such government is required lest, with the various changes in reality, God change.¹⁰¹

moves by necessity a portion of the fire which is in its circumference and that portion moves another so that its ultimate effect reaches the womb of the earth. This is the true explanation."¹⁰⁵

We have noted that Efodi saw in the Guide, the explanation of certain perplexing problems in the Torah. We noted how the story of Creation was really an allegory of man's intellectual development; the Theophany at Sinai, while not an allegory, was not to be taken in its simple meaning but really referred to the steps of the philosophical inquiry as to the possible knowledge of God. Such interpretations of the Torah would remove the perplexity from the religionist who had studied philosophy; would they be meaningful to one who had not? What of the simple, untutored Jew to whom, the story of Adam was the story of the first man; and the appearance of God at Sinai was a literal fact? Was he to be told of the true meaning of the Torah? Efodi would answer no, for "Even were the matter simple, the masses would misunderstand that which we understand correctly."¹⁰⁶ Truth would not be beneficial to the common man, "for were the secrets of the Torah to be broadcast, conviction would be thereby destroyed."¹⁰⁷ The severity of such a position is increased when we consider, that for Efodi, man's perfection i.e., the preservation of the human form required not only deeds, but wisdom.¹⁰⁸ By withholding truth, from the mass Efodi held back half of the prerequisite for salvation for them. The distinction between the $\int$ and the $\oint$ was to be maintained -- even in the next world.

It is always difficult to evaluate another man's thought. The difficulties related to the evaluation of Efodi are manifold. First, he was a commentator,^{and} of necessity, he related his thinking to Maimonides' choice of topics, in the order chosen by Maimonides. It is often difficult to see where Maimonides leaves off and Efodi begins. Second, we noted in our second chapter that Efodi was dependent on Caspi and Narboni, extremely dependent would be a kind way to put it. He was probably dependent upon still another commentator whose identity is unknown to us. Third, this study has only covered Efodi's commentary to Part One of the Guide. Yet, having noted all these difficulties, we may make certain observations; Efodi was a rationalist, considering the Torah an esoteric book teaching philosophy to the initiated and practical deportment to the masses. He considered the Guide as an esoteric work revealing the secrets of the Torah to those who had prepared themselves in philosophy and concealing its truths to those who had not.

To the question as to whether or not the Guide is really an esoteric work, which has been raised by Leo Strauss in his Persecution and the Art of Writing, this writer is not qualified to give an answer. We can report that certain commentators felt that it was, and Efodi was one of them.

CHAPTER I

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. Men thought - that is the popular view (or popular imagination) that he should not attribute his being potentiality in corporeal bodies. This is the meaning of שׁוֹמֵר עַל הַשְׁמָל complete.
2. וְאֵלֶּיךָ יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח (they would deny the existence of God)... For these foolish people believed in corporeality for two reasons: (1) They followed literal meaning of Scripture and it was their opinion that were they to depart from this belief they would thereby reject the truth of the Bible. (2) Even without their following the literal meaning of Scripture, they believed in the corporeality of God because of their confused and erroneous reasoning which held that that which is not corporeal or potency within a corporeal body does not exist. Not to maintain the corporeality of God, was for them, equivalent to denying Him.
3. וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח Now the Guide comes to contradict their belief in corporeality in regard to the second case. What is needed is a logical proof that God is not a Body contra to the twisted reasoning of those fools. Here, however, is not the place for it; it will be explanted at the beginning of Part Two. Here our task will be to upon which they based their concept of God as Corporeal. The Rabbi will explain those passages in such a way as to strip away any and all corporeality.
4. וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח that he is form.
5. וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח that he is different from all other existent by reason of his natural form.
6. וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח (and that is the essence of what that which is is. It is not the definition of natural form for such a definition has already been completed or satisfied by his saying וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח that whereby the thing is what it is, but his saying וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח is an explanation of the definition. The matter which is substantialized in it is the essence of the existent, is that which creates a new category since all essential differences create new categories. ---this is the meaning of וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח the reality of a thing in so far as it is that particular thing. Some explain וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח as the supplement of the definition. For we are able to say that the four elements are the essence of man and that they substantialize a specific essential difference. (a constitutive difference)
7. וְעַתָּה יָשָׁב וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח from the activity of this form (we have) the intellectual attainment.

by reason of the intellectual form which flows from the natural human form it is stated ^{פ'א'A' and behold from the potentiality of the consequent to natural human form inasmuch as the form ^{פ'א'A' is the specific form ^{פ'א'א'A' For the form is per se something corporeal and there is nothing in it comparable to God except through the power or potentiality of the intellectual form which flows from it.}}}

9. ^{ל'א'א'א'א'א'א'א'א'א'א'א'A' (for contempt relates to the soul) when David prayed that God should condemn his enemies, he was praying that they should be contemptible before him. What is the meaning of being contemptible before him? This is spiritual contempt, i.e., that their inner faculty of thinking became bad and confused and not their body, "for God does not desire the thighs of man" Ps. 146.}
10. ^{מ'א'א'א'א'א'A' (may be found in the circumstance) that is their spiritual debasement.}
11. ^{ל'א'א'A' so ^{פ'א'א'A' is either a ^{פ'א'א'A' a homonym or an analogous term. If we take it to mean ordinary shape then it is analogous but if we take it from the meaning in regard to the emerods (for the chief object there was the removal of the injury caused by the emerods and not a change in their shape) then the term would be a homonym. It has already been said about the noun with antecedence and subsequence; for first off it is said about the natural form of things which are influenced by the heavenly causes. (Sphere)}}}
12. ^{ל'א'א'A' properties of natural, (material) bodies for the form spoken of with regard to material (or natural) bodies is midway between the specific form and the outward shape.}
13. ^{ל'א'A' that form is the intellectual one called the Active (Intelligence) and it is the specific natural form.}
14. ^{ל'א'A' His first suggestion is that like ^{ל'א'A' which is a figure or shape which are kinds of qualities, just as ^{ל'א'A' or the verb ^{ל'א'A' can be applied when there is a resemblance between two things in some way.}}}}
15. ^{ל'א'A' (greatness and glory) that God is exalted and elevated above all other existence (or existents) and he moves the wheel of the heavens which are depicted of the throne of God--- and this is alluded to here. ^{ל'א'A' (this explanation refers also to what Ezekiel said about the wheels resembling ^{ל'א'A' in that they were intelligent beings.}}}
16. ^{ל'א'A' (where with that man is essentially different) that in man there is something which makes him totally different from all other animals and that is his intellectual attainment.}

17. Q. In what way that he does not employ sensuous perception. i.e., while he is employing the intellectual attainment and as to whether they are conditions to cognition---this the chapter which is the introduction to Chapter 2 to complete the matter of creation.

CHAPTER 2

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1.

אֵל חָכָם שֶׁ שָׁאֵל (A wise man asked me...) See: He (Rambam) called him, "Behold a wise man" and in his answer, he named and called him, "You are the man who has investigated the beginning of the idea." This is due to the examination of the depth of the question. This is the last advancement (or perfection) for there is a first, and it is impossible to attain the last except by means of the first.
2.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (And whosoever thinks that he understands a book. R/L You O investigator who would think that you understand our Torah which is the guidance of the first and last (generations)).
3.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה כִּי הוּא כִּי הוּא (It is not as you have thought. R/L It is not as you have supposed i.e., that man is like other animals who have no intelligence, as you thought in the beginning of your thinking.
4.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (For commandment is not given to brutes) who are not fit because of their subjects (characters?) to receive intelligence. This is an allusion to Chapter 48 because of Part 2 in the matter of Sayings and Commandments in the saying of them, "And the Lord said to the Fish" of Jonah.
5.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (And not to one who has no intelligence) R/L and also The Commandment does not incur upon him who may potentially receive intelligence and has not moved his intelligence from Potency to act but to him who has brought his Intellect from Potency to Act and through his moral intelligence, does the commandment become incumbent upon him.
6.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (To all objects of intellectual perception). He alludes with this to Chapter 15 of Part Three concerning the impossibles for that which we may think as possible is intellectually impossible, but enough here.
7.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (and was guided solely by reflection and reason.) Thought in this place was the contemplation of pure concepts; they are the cognition which contacts that which is.
8.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (For whose sake it was said...) R/L For the sake of the concepts.
9.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (He had not the power to use the principles of apparent truths) R/L He had not the strength to use (or to deal with) the principles of apparent truths.
10.

אֵל שֶׁ חֲשָׁבָה לְיָדוֹ (When he began to give way to desires which had their source in the imagination...) R/L When it occurred to him to rebel and to make use of apparent truths even though he had not as yet actually used them but rather inclined after his appetitive thought.

11. **וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֵלָיו כִּי טוֹב הָעֵץ הַזֶּה לֵאכֹל** (As he said the tree is good to eat) R/L He himself purposed himself to use apparent truths as he said that it (the tree) was pleasant to the eyes.
12. **וַיִּכְרַח אֱלֹהִים בְּלֹא הַיָּדָא** (He was punished by loss of a part of that intellectual faculty. R/L Immediately, as soon as he had thought to make use of apparent truths, even though he had not as yet used them he was punished by the loss of the intellectual faculty, for the intellect cannot consider two concepts (at the same time) how much the less with two things contradictory one to the other. There the intellectual faculty was taken from him.
13. **וַיִּשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהִים מִן הַיָּדָא** (He therefore transgressed a command with which he had been charged on the score of his reason) R/L Because the intellectual attainment had been taken from him, he transgressed against the commandment with which he had been charged on the score of his reason. This alludes to the chapter on Prophecy and its (related) matters and it is to deal with intellectualism.
14. **וַיִּשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהִים מִן הַיָּדָא** (And having obtained knowledge of apparent truths...) In actual and to pursue bodily pleasures actually and then was he absorbed in matters to which can be applied the terms proper and improper and these matters are apparent truths.
15. **וַיִּשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהִים מִן הַיָּדָא** (Then he fully understood the magnitude of the loss he had sustained.) R/L After he was absorbed in the study of that which is proper and improper, he realized how precious was the thing that he had lost and that is the true speculation and became penitent as it is written, "I heard thy voice and became afraid for I was naked, and I hid."
16. **וַיִּשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהִים מִן הַיָּדָא** (And for this it was said and ye shall be as Elohim) R/L Since now he comprehended the apparent truths, something which he did not do before it was said, Ye shall be as Elohim knowing Good from Evil if so then the difficulty is solved for before he went to deal with apparent truths, he was investigating rational concepts. He had no dealings with apparent truths but after he went after them, then was he deprived of the rational truths and this was the true punishment.
17. **וַיִּשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהִים מִן הַיָּדָא** (Good and evil cannot be applied to necessary truths) R/L In what regard can't they be applied? By reason of their consequences for they are all existents and they are necessarily in existence of the necessity of the concept to the conception. Good and evil can not be applied to them but rather true and false for the definition of truth is the agreement with reality and the definition of false is the opposite of reality. What does it relate to? From the aspect of its actions, just as of the apparent truths the terms good and evil can be applied. For if there were no men there would not be no apparent truths for matters of apparent truths depend upon the agreement of men that one thing is proper and another improper.

18. והתבונן אחריו ותקחנה עיניו (Further observe the passage and their R/L As proof of this (there) For Adam comprehended that there were not only apparent truths, and therefore they said "And their eyes...")

19. והוא לא היה כדרכו קודם (That which was not his previous custom) R/L The revelation (or better the awareness) of the nakedness and the other apparent truths which were not previously regarded as wrong and now were so considered.

20. לא חש חשבה (Not that in regaining the sense of sight) It does not say in Scripture that Adam was an abstract intelligence and then afterward became corporeal for this view would be completely false; he was a corporeal rational animal as we are today. Another interpretation: It is not stated that the sense of sight was renewed for Adam for the sense of sight remained the same both before and after the incident but what was renewed for him was general knowledge.

21. והוא לא היה כדרכו קודם (And God opened her eyes) R/L He brought him to think this for this verse R/L And God opened R/L That the God and the prophet named of God revealed to Hagar that there was a well near that place and this is the revelation of (new) knowledge for if he referred to the sense of sight how could Scripture say, "And God opened her eyes?" It would have to say, "And she opened Her eyes."

22. כמינוי אלו עיניו (As it says, "Who have eyes to see with and see not" R/L The verse that says Open his eyes and yet he will not hear has the same sense as does "Who have eyes...")

23. והוא לא היה כדרכו קודם (It says of Adam, "He changes his face and thou sendest him forth" R/L... The Midrash applies this verse in Job 24:20 to Adam. It would appear from this verse that this is a renewal of sight or some other physical thing. This is not so for the meaning is that when he changed his aim and so forth... Some explain it as an allusion (according to the Ram) to a secret thing of Maaseh Breshit for the Adam mentioned there was not alluded to alone, but the allusion was for the class of all men. For what man purposes or intends the shape (or form) that he be in, that he be an Active Intelligence and after a certain time that he be an Potential Intelligence, and this why the Rabbi brought this verse as proof.

24. והוא לא היה כדרכו קודם (He was permitted to eat of the pleasant ones) that he comprehend all the comprehendibles and that he derive benefit from all the apparent truths with pleasure and security for he had not taken from the apparent truths but only from the necessary ones then he would realize for himself the necessary from the apparent truths with pleasure and security.

CHAPTER 3

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. ^{וְכַדְרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ} (Like the pattern that you showed at the mountain). The pattern of a hand, or the pattern of a hall. All these verses the Rabbi brought and said that they are "pattern and form" and that they in general denote material descriptions like shape and form, but/and this is difficult were in prophetic vision and there was nothing other than the soul (with them) and the Rabbi should have made a second division in the word pattern as he made in the word Temunah likeness and it appears that the Rabbi wished to reveal to us that the matter is spoken of in two different aspects. Under one aspect we may take the matters that are imagined from the aspect that they are imagined as physical (or material) things and under another aspect in that they are abstracted from the state of being material (which makes them) a bit more different than from physical things and all this the Rabbi teaches us in this chapter and perhaps it is possible for me to say that because the Rabbi did not find the word Tavnit as relating to God, the other aspect was not needed to bring this matter to a spiritual matter, but in the word Temunah which is spoken of in regard to God this distinction was necessary to specify the matter in order that we be able to explain it regard to God that he wished to say with it the essence of God, or that we be able to explain that this intelligence was in act (of using other imaginative power) and while it still had with it dependence upon a material thing therefore the Rabbi proposed concerning the structure of the thing and its content and thus you will find concerning the words Nagash and naga which the Rabbi proposed in the verse (above) words approached and touched upon the mouth even though they were in a prophetic vision with the supposition of body to body and understand it (this way).

2. ^{וְכַדְרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ} (and the similitude of the Lord shall he see...) This is difficult vis a vis Chapter 37 where he says "The real essence of God's existence you shall not comprehend and he says the essence of God's existence he does comprehend. It would appear that this would follow after his fifth reason in his introduction (relating to apparent contradictions which exist only as a pedagogical tool, see p.10 in Friedlander) here it is a matter of frivolity and figurative expression but there in Chapter 37 it is way it really is, and further it would appear that, "The similitude of the Lord will he see, means that he will comprehend the final effect of God and then he will comprehend God as much as he is able to comprehend.

^{וְכַדְרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ} (The true form of thing as perceived by the intellect...) He wished the essential, the essence (or true meaning of an existent as it really is and after he mentions

"The similitude...." he brings up the matter of the homonym quality of the verbs *raah*, *hebit* and *hazah* and thus is brought in Chapter 4. *לֵאמֹר* (therefore mean the true essence of God will comprehend) he alludes to the form of existence in its broadest meaning and this is the Divine temunah and all is explained.

CHAPTER 4

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. **אֵין כִּי יֵדָע (As to raah it is well known...)** R/L He Even the masses know that 'sight' also refers to intellectual attainment. **וְיָדָע (In this figurative sense is the verb to be applied to God)** R/L in every place where the Rambam says, "In this figurative sense..." it is teach us that that verse is different from all the other verses that he brings and thus here "sight" which is applied to God is different from sight which is applied to man for the former is intellectual attainment. [Quoted by Shem Tob.]
2. **וְיָדָע (Only a corporeal object and in connection with it certain accidents...)** The eyes only see the body and only then one side of it, not all of it, only a part, and that which the eye perceives is only part of the accidents (of the body)... **וְיָדָע R/L** (for while the eye can perceive whiteness and blackness which are the appearance of the body it cannot perceive the other accidents such as heat and cold and others...)
3. **וְיָדָע (and its form...)** R/L Such as roundness squareness and triangularity.
4. **וְיָדָע (God does not perceive with a corporeal organ...)** R/L Since he cannot be perceived by the eyes since he is not a body so he cannot perceive another with eyes but rather he perceives by intellectual viewing. "God does not perceive..." This will be explained in part one, Chapter 44.
5. **וְיָדָע (were explained by the sages in a figurative sense...)** Even though the simple meaning appears to be viewing with the senses. In any case the sages said that it was intellectual viewing, that they were considering his words and scrupulously observing his actions that they might resemble him.
6. **וְיָדָע (Compare also, Look up to heaven)** that you should not think that when it says, "Look up..." the matter was actually this way; not it was in a prophetic vision. Above sentence must refer to really seeing or looking into heaven) **וְיָדָע (or when it said, "Count the stars..."** that he might know as with a seal the (stars) influencing the lower world. On what side it is and this is what the sages meant when they said, in this manner...
7. **וְיָדָע (And Thou canst not look at iniquity...)** This verse is said of God that he does not comprehend iniquity or falsehood at all.

8. $\int \text{And Thou canst not look at iniquity...}$ (And Thou canst not look at iniquity...) This verse is said of God that he does not comprehend iniquity or falsehood at all.

9. $\dots \int \text{And in this figurative sense...}$ (And in this figurative sense...) because of this the Rabbi changed his expression and said, "And in this figurative sense, for he does not only bring a verse, because this verse does not resemble the rest of the verses which he brought but the verse says, "which he saw concerning Jerusalem and thus in a vision, that is by prophetic comprehension or attainment, but this certainly not prophetic attainment (or cognition) for their attainment was blurred until it included of corporeality that which it included. But since this apperception was that of the heart it resembled the other verses but not in any other matter, and it was about this, that he (Rambam) said, "Note this." And this chapter is related to the fifth chapter to explain the matter of, "And they saw God." One may still ask why did he not say "this is to be understood in the figurative sense" of verse mentioned above, i.e., "And they saw the God of Israel" as he did in the case of "And they saw God?" In truth the concept is the same. Perhaps we may say that since the verse joins "And they ate and they drank" too "And they saw (hazah) he teaches that their concept was confused for we are able to say that the verse says, "And they saw the God of Israel R/L they perceived the first cause, though not in its qualities, but now when the text read, "And they ate and they drank, it indicates the corruption of their concept.

CHAPTER 5

Part 1

1. ^{הוא} ^{הוא} ^{הוא} (When the chief philosopher began...) He means Aristotle in his book, the Spheres and the Universe - Caspi, p. 17, bottom.
2. ^{ואם כן} ^{ואם כן} (And so say we... R/L With the very apology which Aristotle made, word for word... Better rendering: - We shall make the same apology as did Aristotle, word for word in fact, in our explanation of the difficult matters concerning Divinity and the Theophany at Sinai
3. ^{אדם לא יתקבץ} ^{אדם לא יתקבץ} (A man should not presume...) R/L just as in the case of Aristotle who apologized for himself and as in the case of us who apologize for ourselves for any kind of presumption for the investigation is great and there is great danger in it, so should any (other) man take care lest he be presumptuous.
4. ^{הוא} ^{הוא} (To this deep matter R/L metaphysics, that he familiarize himself with (those) sciences R/L that he must know to know the quality of the nature of metaphysics and they are the three: ^{הוא} ^{הוא} ^{הוא} There is an allusion to this 'chosen position' in (Exodus) saying "Be prepared for three days which is an allusion to the three sciences.
5. ^{הוא} ^{הוא} (he should thoroughly refine his moral character...) to by "And Ye shall wash your garments."
6. ^{הוא} ^{הוא} (And subdue his passions...) R/L This is alluded to by "Do not come near to a woman."
7. ^{הוא} ^{הוא} (though also retaining the literal meaning, from (Moses) fear of observing...) R/L His first perception was through the agency of an angel and this was means of the imaginative faculty as with the other prophets and so (lit. to this) dread came to him because of the imagined form which existed in his imagination alone and was not outside of the soul (better, and was purely psychological) and this occurred to many prophets in that they were frightened and their limbs trembled. Or we could explain in simply that he was frightened because of the created light which was outside of the soul (better, was objectively evident) because of the (inherent, possible) danger.
7. ^{הוא} ^{הוא} (for having previously hidden his face...) R/L In their saying, by virtue of "He hid his face" he was worthy of having a shining face (Moses face).

8. $\text{לֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַנִּסִּים אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לָהֶם בְּיָדָם בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם}$ (But the nobles of the children of Israel) They did not take the things or words one by one in order, therefore they were presumptuous.

9. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַנִּסִּים אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לָהֶם בְּיָדָם בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם}$ (they perceived incompletely...) R/L they did conceive of the existence of God but their conceptions become confused as we will explain infra.

10. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַנִּסִּים אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לָהֶם בְּיָדָם בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם}$ (For the principle part of the passage comes to be critical of them...) R/L for the principle part of the passage which is "And they saw the God of Israel" had it said "alone" and they would not have said "Beneath his feet" then I would have understood from that passage that the verse comes to inform us that they perceived the existence of God, but in this case (where "beneath his feet is found") there was no perception and this verse does not describe for us the quality of that "seeing" and this is meant by the Rambam's saying "Not to describe in what way they saw," but here in this case where the verse does say "Beneath His feet," it comes to inform us the quality of the "seeing" which included of corporeality that which it did. Another explanation in this manner R/L for the main passage "and they saw the God of Israel and beneath His feet" it comes to criticize their seeing which was confused and mistaken. Not that it comes to describe for us that they perceived the existence of God without corruption or change for if this was the case the text would not continue, "Beneath his feet," but rather, And they saw the God of Israel alone. Rambam saying then, 'Not to describe how they saw' is equivalent to 'Not to tell us what they perceived. There is another version and it is this: 'the main part of the passage is not merely to criticize them -- its explanation is for the main part of the passage which says... "the God of Israel and beneath His feet"... It does not come merely to criticize them the content of their seeing and was not said, that it comes to describe to us how they saw (לֹא יִשְׁכַּח) but rather to describe for us the seeing and its qualities. The error which those nobles of Israel made is according to the Rambam a multiplicity of reasons. There are those who would explain that they perceived that the active intelligence is the immediate cause of prime matter and its mover and in this it partakes of corporeality (?) for the intellect by virtue of it being intellect cannot move (or actualize) matter but there are those who explain that they perceived that God actualized or Moved Primal Matter without mediation, (but) this argument related corporeality to God. The correct explanation is that they erroneously conceived of God as the power in the (sphere or rotation?) of the sun. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַנִּסִּים אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לָהֶם בְּיָדָם בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם}$ Challilah and this is what the Text and power in the revolution of the Sun. "And beneath His feet," and circling about him was the revolution (Or the disk) of the moon, which is the brickwork of sapphires and this was the primal matter and this is corporeality included in this perception.

11. ואם כן היתה נקמתם (And if it was so in their case...) i.e., in the case of the nobles of Israel.

12. ואם כן היתה נקמתם (And also the priests who approached...) R/L Those investigators (better, those speculative philosophers who would wish to approach God, that is to say the study of theology (or metaphysics) and thereby learn about the essence of God must prepare themselves in the preliminary sciences lest harm come to them through their intellects (or better, lest they fall into error) as did the nobles of the children of Israel about this, he teaches in the section about the revelation at Sina, now understand this.

13. בגלל זה עשו כן (Because of this their actions...) R/L Because they erred in their perceptions, the intellectual activities which were actualized by them (the perceptions) were confused and they erroneously affirmed corporeality to that which was more precious than it (corporeality) i.e., to God and behold the text says, "And they ate and they drank" which alludes to corporeality and physical pleasures. (Corporeality here might also be translated 'anthropomorphism') Some interpret that because of their great confusion (as regards) the corporeal, they inclined toward physical delights actually eating and drinking more than the proper amounts.

14. במהלך הדיבור הזה (in the course of the present treatise) R/L in Chapter 28 of this part and in Part Two, Chapter 26 and in Part Three, Chapter 4.

15. אין אור נברא (to lights created for the purpose or angels...) Know Ye that when the Rabbi (Rambam) speaks of the created light (he speaks) of one of two things whether the thing is objectively evident (lit. outside of the soul), of some being such as a tree or darkness or in such a category of something else or if the thing is to be found in the imaginative faculty alone, as something which was found in the imagination of prophets. R/L By this light which is mentioned in this chapter is found in its primary meaning that is that which is objectively evident.

16. אין אור נברא (His saying, or angels...) R/L if you should call that light an angel, for every faculty (or power) is to be called an angel, or any name that you would wish, no harm would ensue. And it seems to me, that if that light should be in the form of an angel as men do in form of a simile or in another form, there is no religious danger involved in it. And after having explained these matters in this chapter he returns to discuss matters of creation.

CHAPTER 7

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. $\text{אֵלֶּיךָ} \int \text{אֵלֶּיךָ} \text{אֵלֶּיךָ}$ (In that he is author of that information)
R/L The teachers is the author (or master) of that information.
2. $\text{בְּעֵינֵינוּ} \text{אֵלֶּיךָ} \text{אֵלֶּיךָ}$ (As we will explain with relation to the homonym 'ben') Behold Rambam does not discuss in any other place the homonymy of the word 'ben' (lit. does not bring) R/L as I will explain in this chapter the homonymy of the word 'ben' which is not R/L really a son and even though the simple meaning of the verse is (that ben refers to) the existence of Seth and "the verse need not go beyond the literal meaning," it alludes even so that with regard to both false and true opinions the word 'ben' is applied, if so his saying of Seth "and he begat a son" R/L that when Adam inclined toward intellectual (or, rational) matters, and brought his intellect from potency to act since his form required that he deal in those intellectual matters, then his natural form begat and the fitting 'ben' for it was the acquisition of concepts. (Reading אֵלֶּיךָ instead of אֵלֶּיךָ , the אֵלֶּיךָ is found in both) But previous to this when He (Adam) was inclining his intellect after apparent truths and false opinions then those 'sons' which he was begetting were not in his image or in this likeness, but were demons and spirits for he was not using his intellect except for (creating the kinds of harm) and the creation of evils, and the statement in the Midrash. During the 130 years that Adam was in rebuke, he begat spirits and demons as if to say he was not using his intellect for speculative concepts, he was thereby begetting spirits for he was not acting according to the purpose (or intention) of his form which is the acquisition of speculative ideas. Now learn this. And this is alluded to in Scripture, "In anguish shall you bear children." One may explain 'ben' in another way: For in another place, Chapter 54 of part three, commenting on the verse, My Mother's sons were angry at me," the explanation of 'Ben' is given as 'psychical faculty' and also in Chapter 22 of Part Three, commenting on the verse, And the B'nai Elohim came to assemble before the Lord', (He interprets 'ben' in a similar manner.
3. $\text{אֵלֶּיךָ} \text{אֵלֶּיךָ} \text{אֵלֶּיךָ}$ (as though he merely resembled man or simulated his outer appearance) R/L As if he resembled man in his outward form (lit. his structural form) or simulated his actions just as the ape simulates the actions of man. And he will prove in the chapter after this next one, that in it he will explain by a hint something of the story of creation.

CHAPTER 8

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. מקום נחמד (A designated place...) R/L And this is its definition: the limit of the boundary, equal and abstract? and space in general as if you were to say (that of) a house or a city.
2. $\text{בְּכָבוֹד וּבְהוֹדָה}$ (And the interpretation of "Blessed is the Glory of God...according to his (A ed), to my (B ed) opinion the glory of the Lord is all the existents for they are the emanations of His exalted level (God's) His exalted nature (over) all existence as if it said, 'The Glory of the Lord is blessed because of its status.
3. כֵּן יִשְׁמַח (And know that every noun...) this is to reveal to us all the homonyms in the story of Creation and this is regard to the Text's usage of כֵּן There which alludes to a place מקום not in the physical sense, but rather to a degree as in its saying "And He placed 'there' the man that He had created, and thus also in "Which he took from 'there' for these two words R/L the degree of reality of speculation (or contemplation) and not physical space and in regard to this the Rabbi alludes and by means of this distinction our Rabbis nicknamed God as Makom when they said, by comment of the Makom, the Makom should be his aid, R/L God and R/L the Highest, Most Honored Rank.
4. כֵּן יִשְׁמַח (Which are suitable for our purpose...) R/L For the explanation of the homogenous nature or those words are suitable to our intention which is to explain the homonyms in the words of Prophecy and its (related) matters.
5. כֵּן יִשְׁמַח (Not as regards the philological usage ...) R/L for it is not our intention to explain all the distinctions to be found in one name (or noun) as do the philologists, such as the Mutakallim and Ibn Genach. This is not our purpose, our purpose is only to explain those words which are required as relating to Prophecy. And anything else which is spoken of in relation to Makom will be spoken of as relation to Kisseh for this is the place of the masters of greatness and power as he will explain (or, as will be explained, reading Niphal)

CHAPTER 9

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. **הָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** ("A glorious throne on high from the beginning") The interpretation of this verse is as follows: "A glorious throne"...refers to the exaltedness of greatness, this glorious (ness) was from the beginning of His being God. (It?) is the place of our Sanctuary" R/L The throne so described is the place of our Sanctuary.
2. **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** (The Omnipotence which brought them into being and moved (s) them R/L That God brought the heavens into being and moves them R/L that He moves the cycle of evenings which by its movement moves all the spheres (Perhaps 'He' moves)
3. **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** (And governs the sublunary world) R/L That God governs the sublunary world by means of the spheres.
4. **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** ("The heavens are My throne...") RL This verse indicates the two divisions: they are: The first God creates and moves and this is the meaning of "The heavens are My throne" for the throne is moved by he who sits in it; and the second is the sublunary world which is influenced by God by means of the spheres and this is the meaning of "And the earth is my footstool RL which is flattened out by his feet which refer to the spheres.
5. **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** (which God distinguished...) RL which God moved that is the cycle of evenings. (can mean lifted up)
6. **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** (and chosen to receive His light and Splendor) RL such as the Sanctuary. Some interpret it in this manner (in the wider sense as any place distinguished by God) For God swore an oath, and this broadening of language was done, for whosoever swears an oath swears by something above him, or at least by himself, and it would appear that the simple meaning of the verse is that God swore an oath by the Throne which is the heavens, but they are beneath him (better, lesser than Him) because of this, it was a metaphor, it would have been more fitting that it said, that God swore by His Essence and His Greatness.
7. **וְהָאֵלֹהִים בְּרִיחַ מִלְּפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ** (but in a wider sense) RL A wider sense would make it appear that Moses Our teacher swore by the heavens which are the Throne of God, and this is impossible by reason of the matters of the oath and its secret meanings that an oath should be made by that which has its essence and existence one thing, if so an oath made by anything other than

Him is nothing. If so how could Moses Our Teacher make an oath by the heavens and the earth, when Our Rabbis had revealed that he who makes an oath by Heaven and Earth, has not said a thing (of worth) Therefore Rambam said that Moses our teacher did not make an oath by the Throne which is the Heaven and the Earth, but rather by the Essence of God (because next word is another word for Essence, perhaps we should translate here as Substance of God) And as proof of his words, we have what our Rabbis say in the Tradition, that the words *אני* are one word not the Throne of God, but one of the proper names of God. And let no one argue (against this) from the verse, "I will lift My hand toward Heaven" which appear as if God were swearing by the Heavens whose Existence is not their Essence, for this is not an oath for the oath was his saying, "As I live forever" or we might say that this was not an oath at all, so Rashi interpreted.

8. *אשר* *אשר* *אשר*...need not be considered as something separate from the God Himself...) RL that which I have mentioned to you, *אשר* *אשר* *אשר* [translated by Friedlander, denoting His Essence and His greatness, or perhaps understood by P as, the attribute of His Essence, His greatness.] Don't believe because of this as do those who believe in (God's) attributes (or better, that God has attributes) as is quoted before us, for there is no need to consider that Omnipotence and Greatness are things separate from God's Essence in the same way that an accident is separate from the substance of the bearer of that accident, nor that the attribute is part of Creation for (attribute in this context refers to something separate from the essence of God,) so God would appear to have existed without a Throne and when so depicted it would appear possible for the (that) accident to remove from Him, for the definition of an accident is something whose coming into being and decay can be imagined without the decay of the subject of that accident; and it would appear that God existed with an accident, and if so it would appear that God is affected for every accident refers to (or better, relates to) something acted upon (or, affected) and also it is impossible to assert that His Omnipotence and His Greatness are part of Creation, for it would follow from this that God created himself (or, would create himself) and this is falsehood and the denial of the truth.

9. *אשר* *אשר* *אשר* (and it is already explicitly stated) RL for the verse already stated and said, that the Throne of God is not separate from Him by, "Thou O Lord remainest forever (lit., sit forever), Thy throne for all generations, this indicates that he means (the Throne to refer to the) Essence and the Greatness of God for if he meant (by Throne) the Heavens (this would be impossible) for they are of possible existence (lit., possible for decay) according to the Torah which was given us in truth, and the eternity of the world would not follow from this, but in Chapter 26 of Part Two,

Rambam interprets this verse to show the world existing eternally and this contradicts the interpretation which he made of this verse (lit., here) The harmonization is this; for he follows after the seventh cause (or, reason) and here it is (used) to hide. Now after he has talked about the matter of the Throne, he talks about ^{וְהָיָה} and ^{וְהָיָה} which are physical matters.

CHAPTER 10

Part 1

(RL stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. **למה לא להאמר בלשון** (For this is not a philological treatise) RL It is not the purpose of this book to explain all the aspects and distinctions in meaning to be found in words as an etymologist might but rather to explain the words mentioned in the prophetic books according to the intent of the interpretation (that we would make) of that (certain) word.
2. **ולכן זה חלק** (namely) RL and this is the third division.
3. **האנשים הנכבדים** (Now we occupy a lowly station...) RL This is the fourth division.
4. **ורצה ית' במה שרצה** (When God pleased...) RL He wanted to create us subject to influencing intermediaries and they are the 'intermediary world
5. **או שכן השכינה במקום** (Or the entrance of the Divine Presence in a certain place) RL There is an allusion to this in the cloud and the fire at Mt. Sinai with the other material beings which were there.
6. **וכן ירדה ואלה** (and thus every ascending and descending which you may find...) RL Every ascending and descending which you may find (as referring to God) they are of this fourth division except for those which he will recount after this which refer to the descent of a misfortune.
7. **וכן כשתרד מכה באומה** (And when a misfortune descends upon a nation...) RL this is the fifth division (perhaps instead of 'division category would be better) There is an allusion to this in the two secret meanings **ה' ית' the first referring to the generation of the separation (the Tower of Babel) and the second 'according to his eternal(?) will - מלך - ית' סוד**
8. **הראשון** (the instances of the first case...) RL the fourth matter which preceded this fifth matter.
9. **אשר עלה משה אל האלהים** (and Moses ascended to the top of the mountain ...) RL which is of the third matter, which is not RL that prophecy departed from him which of the fourth division, only that he turned completely to a glorious and elevated matter and then, prophecy rested upon him. It also alludes to the exaltedness also alluded to in his saying that "going up and descending" are of the third matter and as he will interpret in Chapter 15 of this part. This chapter alludes to what he will say in regard to Elijah "and Elijah ascended in a whirlwind to the Heavens" which he means is of the third matter as "And

... of them all" how words are

...the purpose of this ...
...but rather to explain ...
...according to ...
...of time (make) ...

SECRET (7/10/1981)

... ..
..polistylidn.

... (When God did give the
... influencing influence of
... know the

... (or the
place) at there in
... at the. Since

[illegible][illegible]

... constant (the instantaneous
... which is a constant

...which he means to ...
...to Eliza ...
...of this sort ...
...one of the ...
...to ...
...rested upon ...
...and completely ...
...ported from him ...
...in of the ...
...and women ...

8. *1377 1555* (Were it not for the Divine Will) RL Were it not for the fact that he, RL i.e., man were under the dominion of the intermediaries for otherwise it would follow that He (God?) would involve himself in action and He would (in consequence) change.

CHAPTER 11

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. $\text{לֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ (not mutable in His relation to other things) R/L His knowledge (or concept) of other things does not change.}$
2. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ (for there is no relation existing between Him and any other being) R/L Why doesn't his relation to any other being changed? Because His knowledge of other things is the knowledge of Universals and not the knowledge of Particulars, the knowledge of the former is unchanging, while the knowledge of the latter is changing.}$
3. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ (they do not individually change) R/L that which I said, viz, that there is no permutation among the spheres refers not to a permutation of position for they do so change, but rather that they do not individually change.}$
4. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ ("Who sitteth over the circle of the earth") R/L the rotation of the earth (the word could also mean the circulation of celestial bodies) the word is the description (or attribute) of primal matter which does not pass out of being as do the individual bodies of the heavens; this chapter is related to Chapter 72 of this section. [F translates the individuals of the Heavenly hosts] [F translates אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד as the sphere of the earth]}$
5. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ (the sphere of the earth) R/L its rotation. By this he alludes to the belief in rotation(?)}$
6. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ ("The Lord sat above the flood") He alludes to the confusion and decay of lesser existing beings as individuals but not as species.}$
7. $\text{וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד} \text{ (For that relation to the existing species) R/L For God's concept relates to the existing species and not to the individuals with the exception of the human species. New element of Efodi. Now since he has explained the matter of 'sitting' he will explain the matter of 'rising'.$

the Hebrew words "He means to say."

One of the meanings of *יָשָׁב* is the opposite of *יָשָׁב* sitting) As regards this homonym, the Rabbi does not say that this is its primary meaning i.e., the opposite of sitting even though in the exposition of other homonyms, he has said that such and such was the words prime meaning for the use of the word in the sense of literally 'sitting' is to be found in fewer verses than its meaning of confirmation and verification.

(the execution of a Divine decree) R/L He alludes to what we have already explained that we are suspended in the middle world from the aspect of His action with regard to us, and this is called the 'decree of God.'

(namely, Thou wilt rise up against her enemies...) One may wonder what compelled the Rabbi to interpret ("Thou wilt arise and have mercy upon Zion) (Ps 102:13) in such a manner. He could have interpreted thusly, "Thou shall stir thyself to have mercy upon Zion." Such a bestirring is spoken of as both for good and ill, as we have said in the first part, in the sense of confirmation, "I will establish my words and my promises for good or ill. One might say that the Rabbi did not find a verse that *יָשָׁב* had the meaning of bestirring (for both good and ill(?)) but only for ill, such as "I will arise against the house of Jereboam" and, "And He will arise against the house of evildoers" and therefore he interpreted the verses, "Thou wilt arise against her enemies. And after having explained the meaning of *יָשָׁב* he will explain the meaning of *יָשָׁב*

CHAPTER 12

Part 1

the Hebrew words "He means to say."

One of the meanings of *יָשָׁב* is the opposite of *יָשָׁב* sitting) As regards this homonym, the Rabbi does not say that this is its primary meaning i.e., the opposite of sitting even though in the exposition of other homonyms, he has said that such and such was the words prime meaning for the use of the word in the sense of literally 'sitting' is to be found in fewer verses than its meaning of confirmation and verification.

(the execution of a Divine decree) R/L He alludes to what we have already explained that we are suspended in the middle world from the aspect of His action with regard to us, and this is called the 'decree of God.'

(namely, Thou wilt rise up against her enemies...) One may wonder what compelled the Rabbi to interpret ("Thou wilt arise and have mercy upon Zion) (Ps 102:13) in such a manner. He could have interpreted thusly, "Thou shall stir thyself to have mercy upon Zion." Such a bestirring is spoken of as both for good and ill, as we have said in the first part, in the sense of confirmation, "I will establish my words and my promises for good or ill. One might say that the Rabbi did not find a verse that *יָשָׁב* had the meaning of bestirring (for both good and ill(?)) but only for ill, such as "I will arise against the house of Jereboam" and, "And He will arise against the house of evildoers" and therefore he interpreted the verses, "Thou wilt arise against her enemies. And after having explained the meaning of *יָשָׁב* he will explain the meaning of *יָשָׁב*

the Hebrew words "He means to say."

One of the meanings of *יָשָׁב* is the opposite of *יָשָׁב* sitting) As regards this homonym, the Rabbi does not say that this is its primary meaning i.e., the opposite of sitting even though in the exposition of other homonyms, he has said that such and such was the words prime meaning for the use of the word in the sense of literally 'sitting' is to be found in fewer verses than its meaning of confirmation and verification.

(the execution of a Divine decree) R/L He alludes to what we have already explained that we are suspended in the middle world from the aspect of His action with regard to us, and this is called the 'decree of God.'

(namely, Thou wilt rise up against her enemies...) One may wonder what compelled the Rabbi to interpret ("Thou wilt arise and have mercy upon Zion) (Ps 102:13) in such a manner. He could have interpreted thusly, "Thou shall stir thyself to have mercy upon Zion." Such a bestirring is spoken of as both for good and ill, as we have said in the first part, in the sense of confirmation, "I will establish my words and my promises for good or ill. One might say that the Rabbi did not find a verse that *יָשָׁב* had the meaning of bestirring (for both good and ill(?)) but only for ill, such as "I will arise against the house of Jereboam" and, "And He will arise against the house of evildoers" and therefore he interpreted the verses, "Thou wilt arise against her enemies. And after having explained the meaning of *יָשָׁב* he will explain the meaning of *יָשָׁב*

the Hebrew words "to be" and "to have"

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... (b) (7) (D) ...
... (b) (7) (D) ...
... (b) (7) (D) ...
... (b) (7) (D) ...

[illegible]

CHAPTER 13

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. אמר משה ושמעון pk(Were Moses and Samuel) R/L Were they to be in one time and he says in an exaggerated way, were they to arise from their graves and entreat Me, I would not listen to them, and if so it is ואני לא אשמע. This chapter is related to Chapter 28 of this section.

2. ^{2ND 3RD} ("Stand with Me") R/L Be established (or better, be well versed in) in speculation and in concepts (or intellects) and then You will stand) with Me. And thus I exist between God who is the Active Intelligence and them who are Israel. This chapter alludes to the statement in Ezekial, By their standing (or existing?) they will stand RL by their existing, they will exist RL by the existence of the spheres, the elements will exist and thus also the statement in Zechariah concerning the angel who stands between the myrtles RL that he exists among the myrtles. All of this is the category of the Story of the Chariot. Now having after explained this, he will explain the matter of spoken of in the Story of Creation.

...the Hebrew words "He means to say."

...the Hebrew words "He means to say."

...the Hebrew words "He means to say."

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. **וְהָאָדָם** (And also the generic name, mankind)
This alludes to the 'Adam' spoken of in the story of Creation.

2. **וְהָאָדָם** (It is in this third signification)
Because of this, the Rabbi says and of this third signification, he does not mix this verse with others to warn us that there is an allusion in this (perhaps, hint would be better here) namely, the B'nai Elohim saw, these are the intellectuals inclined after apparent truths which are the B'not Ha Adam, the daughters of the lower orders. (B'nai Elohim are here the upper orders) and in this chapter he alludes to another homonym which is spoken of in the Story of the Chariot, **וְהָאָדָם** or the likeness of **וְהָאָדָם** whose meaning is the Abstract Intelligences and after this he will allude to the matters of the Story of the Chariot.

CHAPTER 15

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. על המעלה (namely, upon the ladder) RL that God stands for ever upon the cycle and by virtue of that which is in it (the cycle) that is, God, He moves it.
2. וכל מי ירצה (All may climb who wish to do so) RL Whosoever wishes to comprehend the Existence of God must (first) comprehend (/) the lower world and afterward examine the intermediary world and then he will comprehend the Existence of God in that He is the mover of the heavens.
3. על המעלה (my statement, behold upon it...) RL that which I said, standing forever upon it, namely at the top of the ladder. It would appear from such an expression that corporeality can be attributed to God; (however) I use this expression only in conformance with the metaphor. In truth our usage of 'upon it' is not correct, even though the Rabbi explained in Chapter 22 that the word 'upon' indicates more of a distinction from (or separation from) corporeality than does the word 'with it' ב , still the word upon על or upon it עליו is not correct for it indicates a certain amount of corporeality.
4. העולה קודם היורד (the ascent before the descent) RL the prophet must first comprehend the essences of beings and cleave to higher things(?) עליו before he can lead the people which is the 'descent'.
5. היורד בזה הענין (the descent to be with what he touched (or better acquired) from the matter to lead and teach the people) RL after having examined the meanings (or, matters) of the essences of beings and having learned them and after having reached the degree of prophecy, then he will attain through that prophecy the way of leadership and immediately having attained (or, comprehended) he must stop his prophetic contemplation (or, speculation) and must lead the people by virtue of that which he has learned about leading (the people) and this is the meaning of 'by that which he has touched' RL by reason of that which he has acquired of leadership (or, leading (the people) when he was examining all the aspects of beings then he must need end his investigation and descend.
6. העולה והיורד (their meanings are identical) RL that both עולה and יורד mean 'existing forever.' As proof of this, "Behold I am standing על upon the rock and in another place (in Scripture) and "Thou standest upon a rock" We have already explained that על and "Thou standest upon a rock" meant remaining (or standing) permanently; if so, it follows that the statement "Behold I am standing upon a rock means existing forever. The chapter which comes after this one explains the homonym 'rock'. על

CHAPTER 16

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. **אמץ וקבע** (Be steadfast and firm in the conviction)

RL When you would wish to understand that God is the source of all being, pause and reflect upon all being (lit. all existents) and then you will know conclusively that that God is the source of all being. You will comprehend God according to your ability for complete knowledge of God's essence is withheld (from us) therefore let he who would comprehend God as far as he is able, first consider individual being and the measure that he can understand them he will understand God, for all being partakes of His spiritual form. (lit. are made the nature of His formal spiritual nature.)

2. **הנה** (We have shown that the words, "Behold a place is with me" contain the same idea) RL As we have shown in Chapter 8, **makom** indicates contemplation and intellectual intuition. After having spoken of the homonym "**zur**" but not having explained it fully, he will come in the succeeding chapter to fully explain it.

(H/L stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. **אמרנו** (We have repeatedly made use of the expression of our sages...) RL of our saying in the Introduction of this Book that it is not proper to teach part of the principia rerum [or, the beginning of nature] to the masses.
2. **אין זה חלק מהאגדה** (this principle was not peculiar to the Sages) RL that of refraining from teaching (metaphysics) to the masses but also was to be found among the philosophers.
3. **...הוא הכולל** (...the principia of all existing transient things are three...) because of this, the Rabbi does not number among them the efficient cause for it is verse "from metaphysics" that God is the beginning (or, source) and the efficient cause as he explained in the chapter before this, and if so he has already mentioned the cause (efficient) and as for the final cause, he did not have to mention it here, for here he mentions only those things which are in the existent (or, being) and not that which is outside of it.
4. **אין זה** (the inherence of privation in matter...) RL were it not for the inherence of the privation of the future form, another (or better, subsequent) form would not come upon the matter, after having put on one form, but the absence of particular form compels (or, requires) that it shed one form and put on another which is the subsequent (lit. future) form. If this be so then, the privation is the cause for its coming into being (efficient cause) and from this aspect the privation which is joined to matter is called the principle; but to be truthful it is not cause of the substance, but only of the accident.
5. **אין זה** (what appears to them to be the true meaning is really the opposite of it...) RL Even were the matter simple, the masses would misunderstand that which we understand correctly.
6. **אין זה** (and mark this, also) RL because of this he brought this chapter after the one on 'Zur' to complete the discussion of the homonym, 'ZUR' and to explain that the word ZUR is spoken of (or, used of) these three principles for it is spoken of concerning matter, form and the absence of particular form and he (Rambam) comes to reveal to us the interpretation of "upon the Zur at Horeb, when Moses our teacher brought forth water from the rock, Zur, for the Zur spoken of here was prime matter and Moses knew and understood the matters of Hule and acted upon (or, worked with) the Hule, the primeval matter (either of the world or eternal) and dealt with it as he wished (or, acted upon) and was removing forms and putting on (it form(s); and this is the key to this statement (or perhaps, treatise

The Hebrew word "the word" is...

...the word "the word" is...

...the word "the word" is...

...the word "the word" is...

...the word "the word" is...

...the word "the word" is...

...the word "the word" is...

and to excuse himself as to how he hid the true meanings (or matters) and did not speak only in hints, he says (in answer) that necessity brought him to this (action) as you will see in this chapter, and since he spoke now for the causes of the principles (or, principle causes) now that which is the principle (or, cause) of another thing must needs touch or contact it, for example the matter with the form, therefore the Rabbi put this chapter next the one on (contact and approaching viz.)

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. $\text{לִפְנֵי הָאֵלֹהִים}$ (as if it resembled the physical approach of the body to another) because of the union of the intelligence and the intellectum.

2. $\text{וַיִּצְלַח$ ("and He caused it to touch my mouth") even though this occurred during a prophetic vision and therefore is not (really) the physical approach of one body to another, still, because it was something imagined it is (to be regarded) as if there was actual physical contact, because prophecy has a relation to the imaginative faculty as we have explained in the chapter upon shape and form.

3. $\text{לִפְנֵי הָאֵלֹהִים}$ (The second meaning of these three words ... RL the second meaning of these three words (the literal trans. of the catch words is, 'the meaning of these three')

4. $\text{לִפְנֵי הָאֵלֹהִים}$ (as will be explained also in "Forasmuch as the people drew near") RL even though this verse was not in prophecy, still we learn from it that 'touching' can be applied to something that is not a body for speech is not a body.

5. $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ ("And Moses alone shall draw near the Lord; but they shall not come nigh") that Moses our teacher could comprehend the Lord which was something that the people were incapable of, and this is indicated by Sinaitic Theophany $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ being in the prophetic vision as is indicated by the homonym $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$

6. $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ (and resting upon it, the Light) the created light which is objective) (lit. the physically created light outside the soul) $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ (while those who remain ignorant of Him, recede from Him) this the Rabbi will reveal in Chapter 54 of this section.

7. $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ (in the chapters of this treatise) in Chapter 59 of this section.

8. $\text{וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ (and understand this) this alludes to two things, the first stated in the Creation Story, "Do not eat from it and do not touch it whose meaning is (lit. sh'RL) (don't comprehend the apparent truths; and also alludes to the chosen position. Ex. 20, "don't touch a hand to it" whose intent is do not confuse your comprehension and also alludes to the statement (his) "and Moses alone approached the thick darkness (verb could be in future tense) that Moses approached the comprehension (or, concept) of God by means of negative attributes, not positive attributes, and this is the meaning of 'thick darkness.'

CHAPTER 19

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. $\text{וְאֶמֶר לְכָל־אֶחָד־מֵהֶם}$ (An omer full for each) this is not one verse but two. The first says, 'and omer full of manna' and the second says 'and omer for each one.'
2. כֹּל־הָאֲרֶץ (all the earth gives evidence of His perfection, this is an elliptical expression; the Rabbi should have said the perfection of all the earth is His glory, one may say that the word Maleh would stand in its place (perhaps he means that the verse would mean 'the fullness of the earth is His glory') and that he means to say the perfection of the earth testifies to His perfection for the perfection of the action indicates the perfection of the agent (or, work, and worker) and the Rabbi interprets כֹּל־הָאֲרֶץ as the perfection of God; (if so) the Rabbi would not have had to interpret כֹּל־הָאֲרֶץ after having said (that) but from this context (or, from this meaning) it follows that כֹּל־הָאֲרֶץ be interpreted as his perfection in the creation and such an interpretation alludes to his saying 'testifies to His perfection'. This chapter is related to Chapter 18 of Part Two through the third part of that chapter.
3. וְהָאֵשׁ הַזֹּאת (the light created for that purpose) RL a glorious (?) created body completely filling the Tabernacle.

CHAPTER 20

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. **וַיִּקָּבַץ** ("and the ark was lifted up" this is not a verse which is the ark was lifted up from off the earth; but the intent is that the ark was elevated)
2. **וַיִּקָּבַץ** (and in the rest of the section) for the word **קָבַץ** is spoken of with regard to elevation of degree in the same manner as **רָם**, but the word **קָבַץ** includes elevation more than does the word **רָם**
3. **וַיִּקָּבַץ** (perhaps my saying...may be difficult for you) many may wonder why the Rabbi asked, 'perhaps my saying... may be difficult for you.' Why more than the other chapters? This however is no difficulty for it was the nature of his (Maimonides') perfection to spread the truth through bringing a matter through all its aspects refers to Rambam's explanation **וְהָיָה כְּשֶׁיִּשְׁמַע אֶת הַשְּׂוֹמֵר אֶת הַדָּבָר** for here he describes four attributes to have one meaning, after having said that Greatness, Degree, dignity and Elevation and so forth.
4. **וַיִּקָּבַץ** (Names and Attributes) RL the meaning of the names of God and the meaning of His attributes. The purpose of this chapter is to explain the homonyms and to explain the statement **וְהָיָה כְּשֶׁיִּשְׁמַע אֶת הַשְּׂוֹמֵר אֶת הַדָּבָר** for all of them denote elevation in rank.

CHAPTER 21

Part 1

(RL stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. פֶּלַם עַם ה' (the people of the Lord spreading) the explanation of "I hear the people of the Lord spreading" is a report. (the antecedent is meant)
2. $\text{בְּאֵרֹא הַלְאָר וְהַלְבָּר}$ (the appearance of the Light and the Divine Presence) RL that there the word וְהַלְבָּר is spoken of in relation to the appearance of the created light in the imagination of the prophet and this is said of "A smoking furnace and a burning lamp, and to the appearance of the Divine Presence and the appearance of the light which are in the imagination of the prophet, the word וְהַלְבָּר is applied, and in a similar manner (is to be understood) the prophecy of Abraham in the statement "and He passed וְהַלְבָּר between the pieces."
3. $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ (according to this figurative usage it is said of) we have already explained that wherever Rambam uses $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ he means to distinguish the first matter (or, meaning) from the second, and thus here where he says $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ as regards to $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ he means that this was not in a prophetic vision but he means that God was saying that all those constellation which decreed evil upon the land of Egypt was through the miracle upheld (and evil transpired)
4. $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ (to everyone who does...) RL the word does not apply only to rational life, but also to anything which does something and goes beyond the limit. (the point of this comment is the difference between 'who' and 'which'. [The Efodi wishes to emphasize that RAMBAM'S statement can also apply to a thing as well as a person.]
5. $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ (translation of this verse from Jer. 23:9) will be given below) RL this is the interpretation of the verse: from the standpoint of the wine (being the subject) that wine is gladden a man and not make him drunk but this wine has gone beyond the limit and made the man drunk RL that the wine has vanquished the man and made him drunk and if so according to this interpretation it is the wine that has gone beyond the limit. Another interpretation is like a man who has gone beyond the limit for the sake of the wine, and in this case the object of $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ is the wine and not the man.
6. $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ (and although this is found in the midst of Agaddic interpretations...) RL even though our rabbis related the object of $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ to God this is not the place to bring them into account.
7. $\text{כִּי הָיָה הַלְבָּר}$ (he sought a conception) RL that he sought and examined with his intellect whether he could comprehend the

Hebrew word "Hebrew word"

...the people of the world...
...the people of the world...
...the people of the world...

(The upper part of the page is blank)

the appearance of the light which is reflected from the surface of the water. The light is reflected from the surface of the water in such a way that it appears to come from a point below the surface of the water. This is the principle of the "bottom" of the water. The light is reflected from the surface of the water in such a way that it appears to come from a point below the surface of the water. This is the principle of the "bottom" of the water.

(according to the father's explanation)

...an agenda for
a prophetic vision
those constitutional
a through the

... of the (improved) ...
... will register of ...
... with ...

... ..
... ..
... ..

(S) (U)

...only out to take
...and relax for him
...and relax for him
...and relax for him

... of the only one who ...
... of the only one who ...
... of the only one who ...
... of the only one who ...

...and the
...is (...avoided
...and of ...

[illegible]

8. *דעת אלהים* (the knowledge of acts attributed to God)
 RL that God redirected Moses' intention from asking as to the
 essence of God, moving him to another matter, that of the acts
 attributed to God. What are these acts that God made known to
 Him? Those are the attributes attributed to God by reason of
 His acts. God answered him in the XIII Middot (attributes)
 which are descriptions of His acts.

make ~~the~~ ND (As I shall explain) in Chapter 24 of this chapter. [F reads '34']

9. וְהָיָה כִּי יֹאמַר (my saying, that it was hidden from him) RL
Rambam says, 'From my saying וְהָיָה כִּי יֹאמַר Lit. 'he hid from
him') don't think that Moses had a debate (or, business) with
God-but rather Moses himself found in his intellect that such
a concept would be withheld from him.

107 (ה) (in one of the chapters of this treatise) RL
he will explain in this part Chapters 31, 32, 33, 34.

11. (unless he be granted special aid from heaven) he would wish to comprehend more than it is his nature to comprehend, his comprehension will be confused and his soul will die so that he will not comprehend at all, 'unless he be granted special aid from heaven, that is an emanation from the Active Intelligence and if according to the natural disposition according to the laws of heavenly bodies (or, causes) then will the special aid from heaven aid him so as prevent the impairment of his intellect in that which he comprehends and knows while he is asking the question too difficult (lit. dear, or precious) for him.

12. *וְאֵלֶיךָ יָשׁוּב* (and this is what he meant when he said, "And I will cover Thee with My hand") RL that I shall aid you so that you do not stumble and die till I will redirect your intention to another matter, namely, the knowledge of the acts attributed to God. If so, according to this interpretation, all this scene was a prophetic concept without a created thing, neither in the imagination or objectively evident (lit. outside the soul) (point of this comment: the scene between Moses and God, as interpreted by Rambam and refracted by Efodi, is that we have the transference of pure knowledge without the intervention of any sensuous qualities, either subjectively or objectively. Pure concepts passed between God and Moses without percepts.)

13. ¹³הַקְדוּשָׁה, הַדְבָר, וְהַנִּיחָא (the glory of God, the word of God, the Divine Presence etc...) these are three divisions that Onkelos

made. They are to explain the created Voice, the created Glory, RL when he conceives the existent intellectum abstracted from all corporeality and every material thing it is called the glory ^{קדו} because of its elevation and preciousness ^{קדו} and when the prophet is dealing with the existent (or, created) voice it is called ^{אמר} the word of God and when the matter is objectively evident, sensuously perceptible, which is the created (or, existent) ^{קדו} glory, he calls it the Divine Presence. ^{שכינה}

14. ^{אמר} (that which passed before him was without doubt some physical object (or, existent) RL According to Onkelos the passage would be more complete than the passage of a body from place to place and the thing that passed was the Kaved, as an object (lit. the created glory) which is called the Divine Presence which is perceptible to the senses. And that which he said, "He called," RL that Moses called Lord, Lord....

15. ^{אמר} (for the thing which passed was something attributed to God, and not God himself.) RL that which serves somewhat as a support to the interpretation of Onkelos who said that the meaning of ^{אמר} was that the physical object ^{אמר} (lit. the created Kavod), is the text, "As my Glory passes," from which it would appear that God himself did not pass by. For the Glory of God is not the Lord. Ramban however argues that the term Glory of the Lord means the Essence of God, as he will explain in Chapter 64 of this part.

16. ^{אמר} (it was the voice which called...) that existent voice was calling the prophet (Moses) that it might inform him of the true meaning of the secrets of existence (or, of the universe) and therefore this voice informed him the attributes of action which are spoken of God in the proper aspects and considerations.

17. ^{אמר} ("A voice saith, cry") the voice itself said, Cry, and the same voice answered, What shall I cry?

18. ^{אמר} (No objection can be raised against that with which we are dealing...) RL It will not harm our position of removing corporeality from God for all these interpretations remove (the attribution of) corporeality from God.

19. ^{אמר} (No sense perception is involved...) RL that which we are speaking of was a prophetic intellectual apprehension without the involvement of sense perception, neither of an objectively evident objective Kavod, nor of a Kavod existing in the imagination nor of voice existing objectively nor of a voice existing in the imagination. This is in conformance with his first interpretation and also with the fifth postulate.

20. ^{אמר} (in addition there was a certain ocular perception...) or perhaps we will say that even though that apprehension...

vision (or, comprehension) was prophetic, there was a certain ocular perception accompanying it from the objectively evident Kaved (or, as F translates material).

הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה (the sight of which would assist intellectual perception...) RL were we to say, since that was a prophetic perception what was the necessity of the Kaved as objectively evident object, then I would say that the prophet required the appearance of that Kaved for by seeing that Kaved would assist intellectual perception (or, would reach a more complete conception) and here Rambam gives us a hint as to what the matter of Kaved Nivrah is.

22. הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה (unless he assumes that in this instance the ocular perception was likewise a prophetic vision) RL which I say in accordance with interpretation of Onkelos who considered it to be a sensuous perception external of the soul (or, an objective sensuous perception) with a prophetic intellectual perception. Now this is the case if we say by the Shechina which Onkelos mentioned when he said *הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה*, he meant the Kaved existing, objectively and apparent to ocular perception, but however if we say that the Shechina mentioned by him is the Kaved existing in the imagination and not external to the soul, and was not the Divine Presence (shehina) but only a Kaved existing in the imagination similar to what we saw about Abraham in the statement a smoking furnace, then we could not say that the Shechina was an ocular perception, in which case the use of *הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה* would be the same as its use in *הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה*.

23. הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה (that in addition there was a perception of Kaved RL or were we to say that the perception was intellectual and with it was an objectively evident voice, having with it ocular perception, and this being in accordance to the last interpretation (or, interpretation) then? he would not have said *הַיָּדוּת הַבְּרִיָּה* the third interpretation, were that voice not in a prophetic vision, for in the prophecy of Moses our teacher, no imaginary voice existed at all, and this was his (Moses) perception? but always the voice that he made was absolutely outside of the soul.

CHAPTER 22

Part 1

stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ (it also denotes...) RL the first division (or meaning) does not allude to the place to which a man comes but rather the approach of one man to another, and the second division alludes to the place whither a man comes, as indicated in the statement "And when Joseph came into the house," and "When Ye shall enter the land."

וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ (which is not a body at all...) for speech is not a body, even if it may be an accident of a body.

וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ (and according to this figurative usage, from the meaning of come in the coming of the Shechina, and "I am coming, and from the meaning "or" His word has come, (we understand) the God of Israel comes.

וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ (In these and similar passages, the meaning of the Shechina is meant) When Rambam uses the word, Shechina, he means the avod existing objectively. (lit. beside the soul)

וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ (His word will come, that is to say...) the fulfillment of those promises, where that good emanates from the intermediaries; this chapter alludes the statement "He brought her to Adam. Gen. 2:22.) for prime matter is not a body, yet the usage of וְהָיָה is correct as in the meaning of וְהָיָה for that which is not a body as Rambam interpreted.

(RL stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. **אין גוף** (to denote the appearance of something incorporeal) RL the commandment performed by one commanded by his word is not a body at all and the word itself is not a body at all. And if they are in a body... **אין גוף** therefore when the commandment is broadcast from the commander even though it is not a body, **אין גוף** is used.
2. **אין גוף** (that is something will come into being which had not existed before...) RL when he (the prophet) said, "Behold the Lord cometh forth from his place," he means, "that His word will be seen, the wonders that he promised through his prophet will come into being."
3. **אין גוף** (for everything new emanating from God is ascribed to his word.) RL because of this I say that his word will become apparent (or better, will come to pass) that is the coming into being of His wonders for all that comes into being is related (or, ascribed) to his Word as it says "By the word of the Lord" and this alludes to His words and saying spoken in the story of creation **אין גוף** and the story of the Chariot, whose coming into being emanated from God (**אין גוף**).
4. **אין גוף** (resembling the actions of kings.) Scripture relates the actions of God to His word because of the similarity with earthly kings and princes with regard to the word; for they command something and the slaves and servants do their bidding, there for Scripture terms the words of God, "His word."
5. **אין גוף** (He does not employ any kind of speech whatsoever) RL speech is one of the human accidents (or, quality) now God has no body and therefore one cannot accurately attribute speech to Him, the word 'speech' is taken to mean His will.
6. **אין גוף** (the discontinuance of that action) RL the removal of that wonder (or, miracle) and the existing glory.
7. **אין גוף** (according to the will of God) RL through the intermediaries, that removal is termed returning. **אין גוף**
8. **אין גוף** (the Divine Presence departed from us) what is that action that I said the removal of which is termed return? It is the removal of the existing Glory which was in our midst.
9. **אין גוף** (the consequence of which is the absence of Divine Protection) RL which is consequent to the removal of the existing Glory. (is) the removal of prophecy. From the removal of prophecy follows the removal of Divine Protection for the prophet leads and guards the nation by God's command, from the dangerous occurrences which come into being by reason of (or, through) the intermediaries (or, means). **אין גוף**

...the word "He means to say."

...the voice thereof shall go like a serpent) the...the appetitive faculty which is the serpent spreads and has many desires, and this is the meaning of 'the spreading and manifestation of something incorporeal.'

...the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden.) RL the psychic faculties which are spread in the Garden that is, the body.

...it applies to incorporeal things) RL It seems to me to say...has added something of which he has not spoken above, namely, the removal of the Divine Presence he says', i.e., ' (or, better, that is to say)

What is described in living beings as walking) RL the removal of a thing is called "walking in living being.

"I will depart and return to my place") RL this is the removal of Divine Protection (or, Providence) One may ask why Rambam did not explain another usage of walking in the sense (or, meaning) of the removal of prophecy, as stated in the verse "and God went up from Abraham" for this certainly was the removal of prophecy (for removal, could use 'discontinuance'. One might say that all are included in the division (of meaning) that he made as regards the discontinuance of Divine Protection, for Divine Protection follows from prophecy and with the discontinuance of Divine Protection there is the discontinuance of Prophecy and vice-versa. Proof of this (is to be found) in the verse, "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against them," and he went"... discontinuance of prophecy is to be found in the verse, even though the Rambam wished to make only two divisions in it, (1) the leprosy and the removal of Divine Protection.

Ye shall walk in His ways...) RL though man is corporeal, the word walking is not fitting for that which is not at all a body (or, corporeal) i.e., God for that reason Rambam explains (His ways) as proper conduct

...the word walking is not fitting for that which is not at all a body (or, corporeal) i.e., God for that reason Rambam explains (His ways) as proper conduct

...the word walking is not fitting for that which is not at all a body (or, corporeal) i.e., God for that reason Rambam explains (His ways) as proper conduct

CHAPTER 24

Part 1

(RL stands for the Hebrew word "He means to say.")

1. קולו כח נחש (The voice thereof shall go like a serpent) the...the appetitive faculty which is the serpent spreads and has many desires, and this is the meaning of 'the spreading and manifestation of something incorporeal.'

2. קולו של ה' אלהים הולך בגן (the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden.) RL the psychic faculties which are spread in the Garden that is, the body.

3. כאלו נאמר (i.e., it applies to incorporeal things) RL It seems to me to say...has added something of which he has not spoken above, namely, the removal of the Divine Presence he says', i.e., ' (or, better, that is to say)

4. הולך בנפש (What is described in living beings as walking) RL the removal of a thing is called "walking in living being.

5. אעבור ואשוב (I will depart and return to my place") RL this is the removal of Divine Protection (or, Providence) One may ask why Rambam did not explain another usage of walking in the sense (or, meaning) of the removal of prophecy, as stated in the verse "and God went up from Abraham" for this certainly was the removal of prophecy (for removal, could use 'discontinuance'. One might say that all are included in the division (of meaning) that he made as regards the discontinuance of Divine Protection, for Divine Protection follows from prophecy and with the discontinuance of Divine Protection there is the discontinuance of Prophecy and vice-versa. Proof of this (is to be found) in the verse, "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against them," and he went"... discontinuance of prophecy is to be found in the verse, even though the Rambam wished to make only two divisions in it, (1) the leprosy and the removal of Divine Protection.

6. ואלך בדרכיו (Ye shall walk in His ways...) RL though man is corporeal, the word walking is not fitting for that which is not at all a body (or, corporeal) i.e., God for that reason Rambam explains (His ways) as proper conduct

הנפילה מן השמים

CHAPTER 25

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. $\text{לֹא הָיָה מָנוּחַ} \text{ (although the object on which the thing remains is not a place) RL even though the place of resting is not a 'place' that is to say a body.}$
2. $\text{וְהָיָה הַיּוֹם} \text{ (and the thing itself is not a living being) RL that the dweller is not a living being, for the "cloud" that is the cloud that dwells is not a living being and the "day" upon which it rests is not a body. For the verse says, "Let a cloud dwell upon it" and the word "upon it" refers to the day which is mentioned in the previous verse and the interpretation of the verse is let darkness and thick darkness stay continually upon that day.}$
3. $\text{וְהָיָה הַיּוֹם} \text{ (the continuance of the Divine Presence) RL the Glory (kavod) created for that purpose (still another attempt to translate those two Hebrew words.) outside of the soul. "And the Glory of the Lord abode," "And for the goodwill of him who dwelt in the bush"...they are the continuance of the Divine presence. "And I will dwell among the children of Israel"...this refers to the continuance of the Divine protection. This chapter alludes to the story of Creation Gen. 3:24 אֵל וַיִּכְרוּבִים וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת הַדֶּרֶךְ אֶל עֵדֶן וַיִּפְּסֵם אֶת הַדֶּרֶךְ אֶל עֵדֶן וַיִּפְּסֵם אֶת הַדֶּרֶךְ אֶל עֵדֶן and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden the cherubim whose meaning is the Shechina which is not a body and they the cherubim are the psychic faculties, which nullify intellectual perception.}$
4. $\text{וְהָיָה הַיּוֹם} \text{ (the light created for that purpose) RL external to the soul.}$

CHAPTER 26

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. ^{וְלֹא} (in this matter...) RL the denial of corporeality. (the Torah speaks according to the language of man.) RL Our holy Torah speaks from God, speaking in homonyms so that the mass of people should accept them (the homonyms) according to the measure of their capacity and the weakness of their faculty of thinking. But the one perfected (in philosophy) accepts them (correctly) for already knows the true meaning of these words (the homonyms). As example of this, when the Torah speaks of the eyes of God, the hand of God and words similar to these, the mass lacking (understanding) or the lesser ones take these words according to their primary meaning of corporeality and they would think that God is (or, has) a body. Challilal! But when the intelligent man considers these words, he will reject the primary meaning of these words which seem to indicate corporeality and take them in another meaning, removed from any meaning of corporeality. (or, with the meaning of corporeality). This chapter is a great root (of explanation) to all those verses which spoke of the meaning of God (or, matter) which spoke of him with homonyms which indicated corporeality according to the first meaning of the homonym. (or, according to the homonym. Originally...) They did this for the sake of the unintelligent mass who would not be able to comprehend the existence of God, had they not attributed corporeality to Him. All the prophets wished to teach the mass that God truly existed, (lit. validate) even though the mass would not comprehend (the existence of God) unless they attributed to Him an excessive amount of Corporeality, for they (the mass) would have denied (God as) the First Cause. The chapter revolves about this point. And even though in Chapter 35 of this chapter, he says something which contradicts this, for there he says that it was necessary to instruct lads and women, that God is not a body, this really is no contradiction for in this chapter, he speaks of the generality of the Torah and of all of the masses of the nation and in Chapter 35 he said, that when we teach them of the existence of God and of His unity, we must state for them the denial (or, rejection of) corporeality, after they know of the Existence of God through any manner that they have received (the knowledge of the Existence of God).
2. ^{וְעָרַב} (and not in sleep...) RL even though the verse says, "Awake, why sleep," it is an exclamation, as if saying why are you as one who sleeps, for God cannot be depicted by sleep (you cannot attribute to Him, Thou sleepest O Lord...)
3. ^{וְהָיָה} (and that which is in harmony with their nature...) RL even though it is not completely good but which is in harmony (or, customary).

CHAPTER 27

Part 1

(R/L stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ (the whole narrative...is introduced as a vision of the night.) RL the way he explains this verse is that the conception was not a perfect prophetic conception but was on a lower level of prophecy, and this is why he mentioned 'in visions' of the night. This is the reason that Onkelos translated the verse $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ as $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ (or, did not hesitate to translate)..]
2. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ (for this passage has what was told to him, Jacob) for the statement, "I will go down with Thee to Egypt" was not a perfect prophecy but (merely) what he thought in his imagination, that He, God, would go down with him into Egypt. Now this prophecy was not (given) while he was conscious for then it would have been with the assistance of the intellect, for had that been the case Onkelos would not have translated it $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ but rather $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$
3. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ (Imaginary accounts) i.e., these imaginary accounts of this prophecy which was an imaginary impression in toto and not a perfect prophecy; therefore Onkelos proposed the word $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ in context instead of using
4. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ (Hence you may infer...) after we have explained $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ which Onkelos translated $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ because this prophecy was faulty, as indicated in the verse, "in visions of the night," you may infer that there is a great difference between that which is spoken of as occurring in dreams or in visions of the night which two are equal in status, both at a lesser level, and that which is spoken of as occurring in a vision or in a manifestation $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ for these two are more perfect as regards prophecy than the two aforementioned.
5. [simply introduced] RL in the matter of vision and manifestation $\text{אֵלָיו אֶת הַלַּיְלָה}$ there is a difference whether it says simply, "And the word of the Lord was..." and "And the Lord said."

CHAPTER 28

Part 1

(RL stands for the Hebrew words "He means to say.")

1. קוּל (the meaning of cause...) the continuation of the effect in the cause. For that which exists for the sake of something else RL that which is caused by something else, that something else is the cause.

2. קוּל (God is their Cause...) that is to say, their Maker, RL God is the cause of those wonders, but when he Rambam says, 'cause' don't think that he is their continual cause for they do not exist forever, but rather they exist for the required time and no more; therefore 'cause' Rambam explains as Maker RL creator.

3. קוּל (He will appear in His might) RL 'might' is an allusion to 'wonders' (and if this be so, Jonathan's interpretation is similar to this one).

4. קוּל (those parts by which contact and motion are effected...) He explains them similarly to his explanation of 'foot.'

5. קוּל (Onkelos considers קוּל as a paraphrase for throne.) קוּל

CHAPTER I

Footnotes

1. Abraham A. Neuman, The Jews in Spain, JPS, Philadelphia, 1942, p. 259ff. Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. IV, Chapter V.
2. Jonathan Friedlander, Jakob Kohn, Maase Efod, Einleitung in Das Studium und Grammatik de Hebraische Sprache von Profiat Duran Wien, Holzworth, 1865, p.7 - from henceforth cited as ME, FK; Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. IV, p.189.
3. בבלי cited in שם of הרב /הרב /הרב edited by P.M. Hielprin, Jakob Fridrich, Frankfurt, 1846.
4. Ibid, p.27.
5. ME, FK, p.97.
6. Ibid., p.2.
7. Ibid, p.3.
8. Ibid, p. 40, note 5.
9. Ibid, p.2.
10. Ibid, p.2.
11. Heinrich Gross, Gallia Judaica, Leopold Arf, Paris, 1897, p.472.
12. Fritz Baer, Die Juden in Spanien, quoted in Neuman, Jews of Spain, Vol. 2, p.308, note 83.
13. M. Sanger quoted in ME, FK, p. 40.
14. Ibid, p. 40, note 9.
15. Abraham Geiger, Melo Chafmaim, Wilzig Berlin, 1840, p. 101. ME, FK, p. 40, Note 9, read Perpetuus durans.
16. Ibid.
17. Geiger, Melo Chafmaim, p. 101.
18. Selig Gronemann, De Profiat Duran Uita Ae Studius, Vratisten 1867, p. 9; J.E. Article Duran
19. ME, FK, p. 4; Graetz, Vol IV, p. 188, Gronemann, p.8
20. ME, FK, p. 41, note 10.
21. Gronemann, p. 9 "Nec non oerisimile est."

22. ME, FK, p. 2

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., p.28.

25. Ibid.

26. Geiger, p.101.

27. Baer I, Index Profit.

28. Geiger, p. 101.

29. Ibid.

30. אבא ד אבא quoted in ME, FK, p. 41.

31. ME, FK, p. 3; Gronemann, p.5.

32. ME, FK, p. 3; Graetz, p.188.

33. ME, FK, p.6.

34. Gronemann, p.6.

35. אבא ד אבא quoted in ME, FK, p.3.

36. Groneman, p.6, note 6.

37. ME, FK, p.3.

38. Commentary to the Guide, אבא ד, comment 16.

System of Notation for Commentary to Guide

1-א	6-ו	11-ז	16-ח	21-ט
2-ב	7-ז	12-ח	17-ט	22-י
3-ג	8-ח	13-ט	18-י	
4-ד	9-ט	14-י	19-י	
5-ה	10-י	15-י	20-י	

henceforth cited as MN, comment -

39. MN אבא ד 3.

40. MN 72 comment 4.

41. MN 5:1

42. MN 74:7

43. MN 74:14

44. NE 74:14.

45. NE 74:26

46. If נחמיה designates Nachmonides, Efodi knew him, HN 69:8

47. NE 71:17

48. 68:7, 72:18.

49. 73:44

50. Graetz, p.189 gives the impression that ה'כ"ט was written in 1391 when actually it was not written until 1396. How long Efodi was a convert it therefore not clear.

51. NF, FK, p.41, note 14.

52. This and the following is a paraphrase of Graetz, Vol. IV, p.189.

53. The reader should compare and note the two different versions of the introduction given in נחמיה and נחמיה . The latter p. 27 is fuller than the former, p.42 (Hebrew Section) and in addition contains Bonet's name as a Christian
 $\text{נחמיה אלוהים ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד}$

54. $\text{נחמיה אלוהים ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד}$ p.4.

55. Ibid, p.2.

56. Ibid, p.8.

57. Ibid, p.2.

58. Included in $\text{נחמיה אלוהים ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד}$ e.g., p.2, comment 12.

59. Graetz, Vol. IV, p.191.

60. NE, FK, p.8.

61. Graetz, Vol, IV, p.

62. Ibid, 192.

63. Ibid.

64. NE, FK, p.5.

65. Ibid, p.6.

66. Ibid, p.7.

67. ३३८ ३४५ p.177 quoted in Gronsman, p.32, note 1.

68. ME, FK, p.8.

69. Ibid, pp.9,10.

CHAPTER II

Footnotes

1. ^{zum} Hebraischen Kommentar² Zur Führer des Maimonides in
2. Guide for the Perplexed, pp XIX,XXIII, Preface to Book Three.
3. Salomon Werblumer, Die Kommentare von Joseph Kaspi 30 Dalalat al Haisin von Moses Maimoni: herausgegeben von Salomon Werblumer Frankfurt on Main, Druck von F.F. Bach, 1848, p.33, Note 1
- 4.
5. Friedlander, Guide, Preface to Book Three, p. XXII, e.g. Chap.IV to פירוש דברי משה Chapter V
6. Professor Atlas in a personal communication.
7. Caspi, p.2-3.
8. Caspi, p.11
9. Caspi, p.18
10. Caspi, p.24
11. Caspi, p.30. The apparent differences disappear when one reflects that קיום דבר (Caspi) requires the action of קיום דבר and that קיום דבר (Efodi) requires that they be in motion קיום דבר (Caspi) כי קיום דבר אינו נשוא
12. Ibid, pp.30-31. Efodi has already equated נפסוקו מלשון מפורסם in 7:2 so that the difference between נפסוקו מפורסם in Efodi and נפסוקו Caspi is not read.
13. Caspi, p.77.
14. For further examples of Efodi's borrowing material without any indication that he does, compare 2:16 to C p.13 top, 4:9 to C p.17 top; 5:1 to C p.17 bottom; 5:10 to C p.20; 5:13 to C. p.20 bottom; 8:5 to C p.25; 9:9 to C p.27 middle 10:7 to C p.29; 1:7 to C p.30, 15:4 to C p.32 to mention a few. Also note infra those cases where Efodi apparently borrows from both.
15. Caspi, p.13 bottom.
16. Caspi, p.30. For "further examples of נפסוקו מלשון מפורסם compare 5:10 to C p.20. In this case, however, Efodi takes a נפסוקו מלשון מפורסם offered by Caspi.
17. Correspondingb respectively to Caspi, p.45,47, p.76, p.77.

18. cf. I.4

19. Since Narboni does not use notation, references to Narboni are given by the page numbers of Sulzbach edition of 1828 - p.7a.

20. p. 10a.

21. Narboni, p. 14a.

22. Narboni, p. 14b.

23. Narboni, p.63b, p.64a.

24. Narboni, p.65a. It is interesting to note that both Efodi and Narboni had positions as teachers in the Chasdai family.

25. Narboni, p.75b.

26. Narboni, p.86b. For further examples of Efodi quoting Narboni cf. Efodi all of 11 esp 1,6 to Narboni, p.17a 36:3 to N p.33b.

27. Friedlander, p.56, Note 3.

28. Narboni, 16b.

29. Caspi, p.29.

30. Friedlander, p.30, Note 2. Efodi also points out usage in Job 42:7; MN 36:2.

31. Narboni, p.33b.

32. Caspi, p.47.

33. Narboni, p. 79a.

34. Caspi, p.73

35. Men Tob, as Narboni is quoted by page - Here of 1872 Edition, p. 111a.

36. Friedlander, p.292, Note 3.

37. Barbarel MN p. 56a.

38. Narboni, p.116a.

39. Caspi, p.83 middle

40. This not Ibn Paloqura's Moreh el Moreh - as evidenced by p.160

41. For further examples of unknown, see 308.

CHAPTER III

FootnotesGuide
to
Notation

1. MN, Friedlander translation, p.3 Hebrew
2. Ibid.
3. Friedlander, henceforth F, p.20.
4. Quoted in F, p.20, Note 2.
5. MN 40:3
6. 67:4
7. 59:8
8. 51:14. For example of definition of essence, see 1:6
9. 9:8
10. 63:6
11. 73:32^(a) Note: In Chapter 73, we find /a' after first completion of alphabet.
12. 73:33
13. 73:70
14. 74:13
15. 72:8 Similar to Narboni $\aleph, \gamma \delta$
16. Compare Efros vs Horowitz quoted in "Philosophical Terms in Meresh Nebukim, Israel Efros, pp. 33-36.
17. MN 56:6
18. Efros, p. 53.
19. 73:72
20. 76:9
21. 73:72
22. 73:108, also quoted in Efros, p.119
23. 73:111
24. 73:24

- 1-F
- 2-a
- 3-(
- 4-3
- 5-a
- 6-1
- 7-3
- 8-a
- 9-0
- 10-1
- 11->
- 12-5
- 13-u
- 14-1
- 15-o
- 16-y
- 17-a
- 18-3
- 19-7
- 20-1
- 21-e
- 22-5
- 23-1,5
- 24-a,5

28. 73:6

29. 73:89

30. Quoted in F, page 338, Note 1.

31. 73:5. F's, p. 292, comment as to distribution of spheres following arrangement: Moon & Venus & each of the remaining five planets & the fixed planets one, last one. This is based on a different version of the Plan that which is basis of this essay

32. Kaufman, p.415.

33. Caspi, p. 73.

34. MN 73:69

35. 74:11

36. 30:1

37. 72:0

38. 73:45

39. 2:6

40. 3:2

41. 4:5

42. 5:14

43. 7:2

44. 10:10

45. 4:1, 21.3

46. 54:1

47. Two in the Introduction, and in Chapters 13,25,26,31,33, 34, 39,40,44 and 45.

48. 15:6

49. 24:5

50. 2:17

51. Ibid.

49. See first chapter.

50. 30:18

51. 73:50

52. 30:1

53. 30:4

54. 30:7

55. 13:2

56. 73:80

57. 75:83

58. 73:82

59. 73:81

60. 17:3

61. 71:28

62. 21:11

63. 59:1

64. 54:2

65. 21:12

66. 54:3

67. 2:25

68. 2:29

69. 14:1

70. 6:1

71. 22:5

72. 8:3

73. 2:7

74. 24:2

75. 24:1

76. 2:11
77. 18:8
78. 2:10
79. 2:12
80. 2:15
81. 25:3
82. 71:2
83. 14:2
84. 40:1
85. 66:4
86. 5:2
87. p. 3, 3152
88. 5:4
89. 5:5
90. 5:6
91. 34:9
92. 9:10
93. 10:10
94. 5:12
95. 5:10
96. 16:1
97. 75:5
98. 52:20
99. 35:8
100. 29:1
101. 10:8
102. 61:5
103. 62:1
104. 62:4
105. 72:2
106. 17:5
107. 71:9
108. 30:6