

Samuel David Luzzato as Exegete  
with particular reference to his  
Commentary to Deuteronomy

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

Burton E. Levinson  
Hebrew Union College

1 9 3 6

To My Parents

## Bibliography

- Bernfeld, S.      Kämpfende Geister in Judentum, Philadelphia,  
Julius H. Greenstone, 1907. Berlin, Verlag  
von Louis Lamm.
- Elbogen, J.      S.D. Luzzattos Stellung Zur Biblecritik,  
cp. 460-480 in Monatschrift, Jahrgang 8.
- Graetz, Heinrich      History of the Jewish People, Philadelphia,  
Jewish Publication Society, 1895, Vol. V.
- Luzzatto, S.D.      Pentateuco, Commentary to Deuteronomy, Padua,  
1876.  
Oheb Ger, Vienna, 1830  
Penine Shedal, Przemyśl, 1888.  
Hamishtaddel, Vienna, 1847.  
Eingedenkbuch zum Hundertsten Geburtstage,  
Berlin, 1900.
- Margolis and Marx      History of the Jewish People, Philadelphia,  
Jewish Publication Society, 1927.
- Mechkera Hayahadut      Hazefirah, Warsaw, 1913.
- Morais, H.      Eminent Israelites of the 19th Century, Phila-  
delphia, E. Stern & Co., 1880.
- Morais, Sabato      Italian Hebrew Literature, New York, Jewish  
Theological Seminary of America, 1926.
- Rashi      Commentary to Deuteronomy.
- Wickes, William      Hebrew Prose Accents, Oxford Press, 1887.
- Yesode Hatorah. Lemberg, 1880.

### Introduction

The writer of this work has divided it into two sections. The first will concern itself with a survey of the life and work of S. D. Luzzatto: the second concerns itself more particularly with his biblical exegesis as reflected in his commentary to Deuteronomy. The analysis of this work has directed itself into seven classifications. The first deals with his use of Midrash and Agadah: the second centers about his interpretation of the theological material in the book of Deuteronomy: the third is his interpretation of the historical material: the fourth his use of rabbinic and other sources in his comments: the fifth Luzzatto's interpretation of Deuteronomy's halachic material: the sixth that part of the commentary which falls under none of the other headings, which we shall call exegesis: and the seventh and last classification deals with his use of grammar and interpretation of grammatical difficulties. It is the intent of the writer to present an adequate picture of this commentary under these headings; and lastly, to conclude with a description and characterization of Luzzatto's exegesis as reflected in this writing.

## Chapter I

All Israel, as long as Jews will exist, shall always laud the day upon which Samuel David Luzzatto was born. In every age the world has produced men whose earliest infancy foreshadowed their future greatness. S.D. Luzzatto's father must have found the brightest anticipation concerning the child almost from his first utterance. "The question naturally arises," says Sabato Morais in his Italian Hebrew Literature,<sup>1</sup> "under whose guidance were such talents to be entrusted?" We learn from a Psalm, he continues, that the fraternal hand implanted the first seeds which bore such luxuriant fruit. All Europe treasures his productions -- along with those of Mendelssohn and Wessely; while Italy has assigned him a place next to Del Medigo di Rossi and Leon de Modena. For he combined with intellectual acumen and profound knowledge a flow of diction that forced the mind back to the days when Hebrew was a living language.<sup>2</sup> To Luzzatto, that was his life's ideal, his goal, his ambition -- the restoration of Hebrew to its former glory and prestige. In commenting on the products of this brilliant luminary, Morais states that Luzzatto burned with a zeal for Judaism and love of God.<sup>3</sup> He fought vehemently against the dangerous theories of Spinoza. His excellent Italian version of the daily service and of a portion of the Scriptures made his name a by-word in the land of his birth. His contributions to foreign literature, his ready

answers to obtruse questions, his cordial assistance to all men of letters drew him the admiration of students and scholars. It is not surprising therefore that he was called to the College of Padua.<sup>4</sup>

## Chapt. I

### The Life of Luzzatto

S.D. Luzzatto, or Shedal, philologist, poet and biblical exegete, was born at Trieste, Italy on August 22, 1800 and died at Padua, September 30, 1865. His father, though a tanner by trade, had such knowledge of the Scriptures as might help him in furthering the boy's education. At the age of four he studied Talmud under Abraham Eliezer Halevi, chief Rabbi of Trieste and distinguished pilpulist.<sup>5</sup> He also studied ancient and modern languages under Rabbi Mark Isaac Cologna, Leon Vita Saravel and Raphael Baruch Segre whose son-in-law he later became. At an early age, he evinced a taste for poetry and would try his hand at rhymes in Italian and Hebrew. In 1811, he received as a prize Montesquieu's, Considerations Sur Les Causes de la Grandeur des Romains, a work which contributed much to the development of his critical faculties. A discovery of a copy of Onkelos led him to study Aramaic. At the age of 13, Luzzatto was withdrawn from school attending only the lectures in Talmud of Abraham Eliezer Halevi. While reading "Ayn Yakob", he came to the conclusion that the vowels and accents did not exist in the time of the

what kind  
of copy?  
Targ. on his  
study was  
first. correct  
Bib. by +

Talmudists and that the Zohar must be of a later edition. *age then was claimed for it*

In 1814, there began a most trying time for Luzzatto. He had to do all the housework, including cooking, and helping his father in his work as a tanner. By the end of 1815, he had composed thirty-seven poems which form part of his Kinnor Na'im, and in 1817, he completed his Ma'amar Ha-Nikud, a pamphlet on Hebrew punctuation.<sup>6</sup> In 1818, he began to write his Torah Nidreshet, a philosophical, theological work of which he composed only twenty-four chapters, the first twelve being published in Kokche Yizchak.<sup>7</sup>

At first his parents wanted him to follow a trade, but young Luzzatto objected very strenuously. However, in order to avoid earning a livelihood by the performance of menial tasks, he gave lessons which were very difficult to secure. In 1824, he had to depend entirely upon his own resources, supporting himself by giving lessons and contributing to the "Bikkure Ittim". In 1829, he was called to head the Rabbinical College at Padua.

A

Here, we see that his literary efforts found much wider scope and outlet. A commentary to Isaiah, accompanied by an Italian translation was undertaken for the benefit of his pupils.<sup>8</sup> Two eminent German scholars conscious of the value of the masterly production, asked that it be translated into their vernacular. Luzzatto, however eager in his desire to diffuse the Hebrew tongue, rejected the invitation. In this edition of Isaiah,

Luzzatto first took the bold step of reading in 10.25, <sup>7</sup>

*San Isidorus* <sup>8</sup> and in a letter to Rappoport, August 21, 1829, remarks in German: "Was sagen Sie, mein Herr? Ist nicht da, die Wahrheit selbst?" It is of interest to note here the attitude which he expressed towards biblical criticism in a letter to Rappoport dated January 28, 1831: <sup>10</sup> Ich kenne deine Ansicht ~~be~~ <sup>über</sup> ~~etwaiger~~ Irrthümer in der Aufzeichnung der Texte nicht teilen. Wie ich es <sup>u</sup> ~~lante~~ <sup>laut</sup> ~~auspreche~~, so glaube ich es auch in meinen Innern, das im Pentateuch durch die äusserste Sorgfalt, welche zu allen Zeiten für seine Correctheit vorhanden war, auch nicht in einem Buchstaben irgendwäre ein Fehler vor-  
liege. Jedoch muss ich gestehen, dass bei den übrigen Büchern der heiligen Schrift eine solche Sorgfalt nicht immer geherrscht habe und daher oft Schreibfehler vorgenommen sein mögen. Allerdings du bewahst <sup>v</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> Deinem Innern das Geheimnis, dass auch im Texte des Pentateuchs verschiedene Fehler vorhanden seien. Nur willst du keinen Austoss vor Unwissenden damit erregen und daher darüber nicht laut sprechen, worin Du auch ohne Zweifel recht hast."

Before the time of Luzzatto, the study of grammar through the centuries had been woefully neglected; and to Luzzatto is given the credit for calling its attention once again to the Jews of Italy. Thus, in 1836, he published his Grammatica della lingua Hebraica at Padua. But that which seems to have engrossed all his attentions was a desire to present a comprehensive view of



Judaism. To achieve this he composed a work Teologia Morale, a work divided into two hundred lessons. Luzzatto's thoughts may best be illustrated by the following passage taken from the preface: "If in all matters entrusted to my tuition, I have always deemed it a duty to endeavor strenuously that my instructions should suit the degree of culture already attained by the pupils and the important station they will occupy in Society, when I was about preparing a course in moral theology, I felt that the obligation was a still more holy one. My soul was deeply impressed with the imperative necessity of supplying the needs of the future teachers and shepherds of Israel with clear and just ideas of the morality of Judaism, so that they might, in due time, impart in its own purity that religion, which, when drawn from its primary sources, to wit, the holy Scripture and tradition, is eminently social and promotive of the most healthful state of civilization."<sup>12</sup>

One of Luzzatto's most important works is his Oheb Ger,<sup>13</sup> published one year after the assumption of his duties at Padua. In this work he corrects the poor text of Onkelos adding many pertinent remarks regarding the grammar, character, and exegetical peculiarities of the Targum. He was the first among philologists to pay attention to Syriac especially in its relation to Targum as well as to the dialect of the Samaritans, and to the pronunciation of Hebrew. Analysis of the Oheb Ger, its purpose and intent, and scope may best be illustrated by his preface which

the writer takes occasion to paraphrase the text as closely to the original as possible;

" After the Jews returned from Babylon at the end of the seventy year they dwelt among the idolators, they well-nigh had forgot their own tongue. They intermingled among the peoples to a very large extent. Consequently there were few who understood the language of the Torah. They could not speak Hebrew. Thus, in the reading of the Scriptures, it was necessary, to explain the language to the people. The "Meforash" as referred to in Neh. 8 is the Targum. From that time on, though dwelling in their own land securely, Palestine, Aramaic still continued to be spoken among the people. Hebrew was used as medium among scholars and Hebrew was referred to as the *Qere*, for it was no longer the language of the masses and was used only for sacred purposes, while the common language of all the people—the poor and the rich, the priest and the layman was Aramaic. <sup>15</sup> The question arises, 'why did not the people forget it on their return to Palestine?' Jewry did not return as one concerted group, and they came back in straggling numbers, and each small section that came back spoke only Aramaic. And thruout the days of the temple the custom continued of interpreting the Torah orally; it was never written down and became Torah B'al Peh. Then during the Second Temple their were redactors who edited the Torah for the people; and to make it available for the reading public it had to be in Aramaic. The also cam to be written in Aramaic and there was no re-

striction on the use of the language: but there were variants in the language of the Targum since it was a matter that was being passed down from master to disciple. And up to Onkelos, there was neither rote nor rule in regard to the language! !<sup>16</sup>

"Onkelos HaGer, was the individual who took it on himself to make the Torah understood for the masses: to correct erroneous interpretations brought about as a result of handing down the Torah by word of mouth. He learnt the Torah from R. Gamaliel, R. Jochanan ben Zakai; the purpose of his Targum was as he saw it, to remove every obstacle from an understanding of the Torah and to put it into permanent form for the Gerim and the people, and thereby to give glory and honor to Israel: and to remove Israel as a mark of division among the other peoples. He presented his Targum to <sup>read</sup> *נחמיה* and Rabbi Joshua who approved his work, and recognized it as official and authoritative, and <sup>they looked on it as</sup> <sup>standard</sup> <sup>17</sup> all subsequent Meturgemim followed his translation.

"Even during the Mishnah we find that the Turgemonim did not have our language, bearing out the fact that the early Targums were oral, until after the redaction of the Talmud. For with that we see our literature coming down to us in written form. —→

"We find that the Targum was used by such commentators as Rashi and Ramban, two leading "Meforshim."

*when making the Targumim were influenced by the general usage of the people*  
IX

However, these "Meforshim" made use of it only when they needed support for one of their own statements, or as a focal point of an argument.<sup>18</sup>

"Rambam in Moreh Nebuchim began to laud Onkelos, and praise its value. But he, too, only quotes him to a very small extent and there only to get authority for single isolated statements. Following the great "Meforshim", came Rabbi Yitzchok Arama and in his book Akedath Yitzchok, treats of Onkelos, and whilst his predecessors came to a realization that Onkelos represented an important step in the evolution of the language of the Jew and was basic for an understanding<sup>19</sup> and interpretation of the Scripture."

*only used authorities*  
*inadequately*  
*quotes*

However, some years previous, a man had undertaken to write an interpretation of Onkelos. Luzzatto had discovered this volume which was complete from beginning to end with the exception of the author's name and so Luzzatto called it "r/c" the year the volume was copied. The volume undertakes to "explain, interpret and translate the many enigmas and more difficult portions of the Targum."

"In his interpretation Onkelos followed several lines or methods of interpretation. In some instances he would concern himself with the subject and disregard the language, and at other times he might be a strict interpreter of the grammar or he might follow the P'shat: while at other times he might be wont to give an interpretation

in which he was very much alone. Too, on occasion, he would interpret by giving emphasis to some ethical concept or institution.<sup>20</sup>"

In the final words of his preface, Luzzatto ponders at another fact about the Targum. How is it, he queries, that a people who had been so accustomed to read the Targum of the "Sedre" from week to week permitted so many different <sup>versions</sup> *ספרים* to creep in and did not adhere to any one in particular. In many instances, the reader might have been reading from a fallacious "Nusach", or an incorrect version. Luzzatto explains that his contributions about the existence of various "Nuschaoth" might be challenged. However he bases his argument on the findings in the volume *תרגום* and a number of manuscripts turned over to him for perusal by his teacher, Rabbi Sarat<sup>val</sup> ~~Sal~~, *ר' סרסל*. Upon perusal the erudite Luzzatto found a number of versions of the various Targumim. In his Oheb Ger, Luzzatto proceeds in his reading of Onkelos to see where it diverted from the Hebrew text and made note how and when those changes took place.

"The book, Oheb Ger," Luzzatto explains, "is divided into two parts." In the first part Luzzatto informs his reader why Onkelos departed from the Hebrew text and in what instances; in the second part, Luzzatto compares the different version with Onkelos, giving the most plausible version.

In the interesting but concise introduction, Luzzatto indicates that *ר' יצחק*, had already written a volume on Onkelos, called *דברי יצחק*.<sup>21</sup> Luzzatto apologizes and begs



the indulgence of the reader, hoping that they will not disdain him for usurping another's field. He defends his work by stating that <sup>אברהם</sup> did not have the volume <sup>אברהם</sup> nor did he have in his possession <sup>אברהם</sup>. The two volumes differ further in composition and organization, <sup>אברהם</sup> treating Onkelos according to the <sup>אברהם</sup>, while Luzzatto follows another type of organization as indicated above. And finally, Luzzatto admonishes his readers that Oheb Ger is not a complete work and hopes that it may lend to further research. <sup>22</sup> <sup>the Hebrew</sup> <sup>on p. 89 of 72 371K</sup>

While Luzzatto was thus engaged in studying at Padua, a traveler found in the city of Tunis many unedited poems of R. Judah Halevi. He reported the circumstance to Luzzatto, who requested the traveler to spare neither gold nor efforts to purchase them. This he did and at a later date edited <sup>אברהם</sup> <sup>אברהם</sup>, in which he carefully arranged forty-four cantos and three letters brought to light in this most attractive work.

In December 1851, in the city of Gorizia, a Jewish youth of great virtue and talents, Ascolu Graziado celebrated his marriage. Luzzatto, instead of offering a nuptial song, dedicated a volume of scientific researches to him, A Dialogue on the Kabbala and the Zohar and on the Antiquity of the Punctuation and Accentuation of the Hebrew Language. The volume created a stir among the learned of Israel, for it dealt a death blow to doctrines and practices which have blended with Judaism through adverse circumstances. Ordinary individuals might have been tempted to suppress opinions on such an in-

fluence as Kabbalim, but Luzzatto was interested in proclaiming the truth and aware that Kabbalism and Judaism were antagonistic to each other did not hesitate to say so.<sup>23</sup>

Luzzatto was early attracted to the study of Kohelet because of its difficult language.<sup>24</sup> In his study of the book he found himself unsympathetic to the language as well as to its fundamental principles and comes to the conclusion that it was not written by Solomon but by one who falsely attributes the book to him. According to him, the composer's name was Koheleth who wanted to put in the celebrated name of Solomon in place of his. His contemporaries caught him and partially mutilated the text by additions, deviating vocalizations and distorting several passages. Luzzatto also detected the late composition of the book. He also describes the author as a ~~v~~<sup>l</sup>ascillating character, somewhat unhappy, somewhat resigned, preaches the golden mean at the same time recognizing the futility of life. The interspersed "Lebensresultaten" and ethical conclusions he regards as later additions in order to palliate the evil influences of the author.

We have also from his hand an Italian translation of the book of Job, the Pentateuch and the Haphtaroth. Of his Pentateuch commentary he published in 1846 and 1847 in Vienna nine extracts of the Pentateuch edition under the title Mishtaddel, where he assures us: "Ich gehöre nicht zu den Alten und nicht zu den Neuen, bin nicht Orthodox und bin nicht Rationalist, nicht Rabbanit und nicht Karait, ich strebe nach Wahrheit,

nehme sie an von wem immer sie Kommt, verwerfe aber die Lüge<sup>25</sup>  
und käme sie selbst von dem Grössten unter den Grossen."

He had a high opinion of this Mishtaddel, for he says of it:

"Wer den Mishtaddel nicht kennt, weiss Schdal -- Samuel David<sup>26</sup>  
Luzzatto nicht zu beurteilen." In this commentary, Luzzatto

makes no attempt to conciliate Rashbam with the Halachah. It  
is his sole purpose, as he expresses it, to find truth. Even  
where he made a statement of his own only to find later that  
it was made by someone else, he quoted it. He published his  
commentary to Isaiah at the age of 31 "der teilweise in fran-  
zösischer sprach schon 1835 von Professor Rosenmüller in sei-  
nem Jesaias-Commentar Abgedruckt und 1846 den Haphtaroth der  
Viener Pentateuch-Ausgabe beigegeben wurde, erschein damit  
Unterstutzing Albert Colins in Paris vollständig (Padua 1867)."<sup>27</sup>

Luzzatto maintained that the whole of Isaiah was by Isaiah.  
Difference regarding this was one of the main reasons for his  
cleavage with Rapoport.

Luzzatto died at the age of 65, loved by his people and  
mourned by those who knew him even slightly. When we think of  
Luzzatto we think of the important forerunner of scientific  
Jewish scholarship and one of the central figures of modern  
biblical exegesis. He lived a hard life -- had scant means,  
yet nevertheless labored with unceasing ardor and devotion in  
the cause of theology and science. Those who had a personal  
acquaintance with the man say that despite his popularity  
and universal fame, humility and simplicity of heart charac-  
terized the man.

He had  
a profound  
knowledge  
of the  
Hebrew  
language  
and  
was  
a  
great  
scholar.



## Chapter II

### A.

#### Midrash and Aggadah

A careful perusal of Luzzatto's commentary to book of Deuteronomy has revealed that he makes little use of Midrashic and Aggadic interpretation of the biblical verse. Luzzatto as exegete above all was a scientist. The book of Deuteronomy is divided in his introductory comments into five parts. The first part, from 1:1 to 4:40 deals with the reproach and warning to the people not to go astray from the paths of the Torah. The second part from 4:41-43 sums up his warnings and instruction to the people. The Third section is from 4:44 to chap. 28. The fourth section chaps. 29 and 30 concern themselves with the warnings instructions and reproofs to strengthen the covenant. The fifth and last part 31 to <sup>33</sup> ~~the end~~ deals with the death of Moses, departure from the people, duty of Israel to spread Torah in every single generation." The writer wishes to explain here, that he will take occasion to ~~in~~ quote those passages which will best illustrate that

---

classification with which he is dealing at the moment, and will draw certain definite conclusions and inferences based on these passages.

In 1:1, in commenting on the verse *וַיֵּלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִכֹּרֵב אֶל־קָדֵשׁ בַּרְנֵא*

Luzzatto says that "ordinarily it took 11 days to go from Choreb to Kadesh Barnea. But Israel, because of its sins, had hindered herself from reaching the destination for forty years. This is the approach launched by Moses against the people wherever they tarried. However, he never quite explained the phrase to them. and only when he came in sight of the land did he tell them." <sup>29</sup> This interpretation is the traditional, midrashic interpretation and is also given by Rashi.

since  
not  
always  
critical

In 9:21, commenting on *וַיַּעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן־הַיָּם*, Shedal mentions that "perhaps the calf was made with <sup>mud</sup>pitch and clay, dried and hardened by fire and then overlaid with gold: consequently, it would have been necessary to first melt the gold and then grind the calf into bits." <sup>30</sup>

Chesh  
see 10:2  
sculpting

Regarding 32:1 *וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה ה' וַיִּשְׁמַע* we find this comment: "This phrase is spoken, to indicate that those things about to be spoken are fit for the heavens to hear them. His address is to tell them, that he speaks to the heavens." <sup>31</sup>

the point is  
which is  
"heaven"

In 32:2, commenting on *וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה ה' וַיִּשְׁמַע*, he identifies with "thick drops which come with the wind -- and storm. Though Luzzatto does not present it as his own interpretation, he points out that *וַיִּשְׁמַע* means *וַיִּשְׁמַע*, and this is the name of the star called Virgilius, and gives dew.

We can readily see then that though his use of Midrashic Agadic and mythological material is limited, he still differs from the traditional Midrashic comments, in that by its use he re-interprets the Midrashic or Aggadic comments to make it seem more plausible and nearer to a Peshat interpretation.

B.

Theology

In this section the writer has not made a detailed study of Luzzatto's works on the subject. It is the writer's intention to present his attitudes as reflected in the commentary of which this work is a study. And following the procedure outlined above, the writer will quote the interpretation of those verses which best illustrate Luzzatto's interpretation of Jewish theology. At the very outset of his commentary we note in his interpretation of <sup>Ps</sup> 1:1, <sup>Ps</sup> 1:1, he says of it as follows: "God's providence will be visited on Israel. He does not cause his gifts to go from one to the other. It is Israel's and Israel's only. However if Israel should sin, they will be driven out, and if they return to God, He will return to them for He does not forget his covenant."

~~When interpreting Luzzatto's statement that God's providence is only for Israel, he says of it as follows: "God's providence will be visited on Israel. He does not cause his gifts to go from one to the other. It is Israel's and Israel's only. However if Israel should sin, they will be driven out, and if they return to God, He will return to them for He does not forget his covenant."~~

32  
see to their needs.

Shedal in commenting on 1:39 *821 216/183' 18*, presents the more recent and scientific view of the phrase, "knowing good and evil. He takes it to mean that small innocent children did not know or possess the powers of discrimination and goes further to say that not only did the children not possess the powers of discrimination but they were not in the category of men." <sup>33</sup> It might be mentioned that such bible critics as Dr. Moses Bottenwieser also hold this view of "knowing good and evil "

In 4:2 ,in commenting on *206/186*, Luzzatto stated that not only are they to hear the commandments but they are to fulfill them without any change. Luzzatto explains the reason for Moses desiring it since he says former abominations which are right there might be continued and are due to the deviation little by little from normal practices, which in themselves might be alright, i.e. in former times before receiving <sup>34</sup> the law.

In his comment on 4:7, Luzzatto recognizes the commandments as being of two types--one having to do with the relationship between God and man and the other dealing with the relations <sup>35</sup> between man and man.

4:28 *271 2' 224 205/18 2228/* "it is against their will that they will find themselves compelled to worship other Gods as when they will be in Babylon, because of their voluntary idol worship", and expressed the view that it is not <sup>36</sup> as bad as when they made the choice of worshipping abominations.



7:12 *וְכִנְיָנוּ אֵלֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* "when you are his people, He shall guard his covenant with you, for you are helping and serving God, but if you don't do your share, He won't do His; he will punish you but will not destroy his covenant by forsaking you."<sup>40</sup>

10:12 *וְעַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* ---this does not mean that he asked anything easy of you, yet the fact was that He was not asking anything for Himself but for man's own benefit.<sup>41</sup>

~~13:13~~ 14:1 *וְעַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* because you are the son of the most high, you must possess glory and beauty, by not making cuttings and incisions because you represent a legion of God and must not dishonor yourself...by such doings.<sup>43</sup>

18:13 *וְעַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* don't depend on sorcerers seeking them out, but listen to the prophets whom I will set up and who will not ~~not~~ give instructions in opposition to the Torah.<sup>44</sup>

20:19 *וְעַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* other commentators interpret this to mean that no attempt to destroy it should be made--since the army has to sustain itself from the city. Luzzatto disagrees. Josephus Flavius interprets this to mean an omen of Israel's righteousness and mercy and forbearance from cruelty. More of this is expressed in the idea that man should not fell a tree after he has eaten from its fruit. This line of comment means that man should love that which benefits him.<sup>45</sup>

21:7 *וְעַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* for we had seen who shed this blood, we would have killed him --and this is the avowal of complete guiltlessness.<sup>46</sup>



21:23 *א-ו שפ* --hanging is justified but not leaving the body hanging; it will not avail to keep men from sin rather will it arouse them by reason of the cruelty of letting the body hang to curse the judges.<sup>47</sup>

22:5 *א-ו שפ* when a man approaches a nest and sees that the mother rather than escape remains to shelter and protect her children--he should not take the mother--thereby negating a first principle of life. The moral here is that no harm should come from doing a Mitzvah.<sup>48</sup>

~~29:3~~ *א-ו שפ* "And you conducted yourselves as if you did not see and therefore you feared Canaan--so he has led you thru the desert for forty years."<sup>49</sup><sup>50</sup>

32:2 *א-ו שפ* that is the explanation of the parable preceding, that is to say his words are worthy to penetrate the minds of the hearer, just as dew is fit to soak the ground. He draws the listener to Him thru his instruction.<sup>51</sup>

32:7 *א-ו שפ* :means destruction, according to Luzzatto's comment on the verse. The ancients, when they saw the pestilence growing stronger with no apparent reason for it, conceived the idea of evil spirits perpetrating the tragedy.<sup>52</sup>

32:20 *אֲנִי אֶשְׁמַר אֶת אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַר*: I shall no longer watch over  
53 *why etc this passage - there is no special point to it*  
them.

32:37 *אֲנִי אֶשְׁמַר אֶת אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַר*: when their foot does stumble do  
not say that it is an accident -- for it is My vengeance and  
54  
My recompense.

33:2 *אֲנִי אֶשְׁמַר אֶת אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַר*: the meaning is that God was revealed  
to me here in order that I might bless Israel and behold my  
blessing is from the Most High. In *שְׁמַר*, that is the place  
where He was first revealed; behold His glory throws its bril-  
54  
liance from *שְׁמַר*.

34:6 *אֲנִי אֶשְׁמַר אֶת אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַר* -- Luzzatto presents the burial of Moses  
55  
as having been accomplished by the will of God. The same  
view is presented by Rashi, namely, that Moses was buried by  
the will of God, though Rabbi Ishmael, quoted by Rashi, states  
that Moses buried himself.

The above quotations from the commentary *does*, in a mea-  
sure, coincide with the concepts of Luzzatto about God and  
Torah as they reflect themselves in his other works, which  
we glean from other writings of Luzzatto. To begin with, Luz-  
zatto looked upon the Torah as an authentic document, which  
stood as the central principle of Judaism. Upon it rests the  
existence and unity of God, His providence and the messianic  
56  
hope. In his *Logos*, Luzzatto presents six proofs that this  
Torah is an authentic document.



1. we have no documents which contradict Moses.
2. He tells his story in great detail, with great accuracy, and without any inconsistencies.
3. He reveals everything frankly and impartially, and makes no attempt to hide unworthy incidents such as Rachel's theft, the selling of Joseph, the adultery of Reuben, etc.
4. Ptolemy, king of Egypt, had it translated into Greek because he and other ancient people believed it true.
5. Jews, Christians and Moslems believed it true and suffered martyrdom for it.
6. Josephus in his Contra Apion mentions some early books which confirm the Bible account. These books are now lost, but he would never have dared to mention them if they had not been extant and authentic.

He was attacked vehemently for these views but refused to be budged. The messiah he regarded as one of the corner-stones of our faith. <sup>57</sup> In regard to miracles, not only did he accept the Bible miracles but also those recorded by the Rabbinic wonder-workers. Reggio further attacks Luzzatto's view by saying that the Torah could not have been written 3,000 years ago because the art of writing was then unknown. However, Luzzatto blasted Reggio's argument to smithereens by

referring him to Clement of Alexandria who speaks of a phonetic alphabet that was used by the common folk in Egypt and was introduced by Tot, a contemporary of Abraham. And in his second book Herodotus describes a pillar bearing phonetic inscriptions<sup>58</sup> which was erected by Sesostri, a contemporary of Moses.

Among the first principles offered by Luzzatto as basic in the Torah is pity, which is the source of love, right doing. Pity, according to Luzzatto, is also the cause for any hatred of injustice and love of justice. He believed that every attempt to establish right conduct upon any other motive than social instincts would surely fail. We see his complete accord with this in the comments mentioned above, in 21:23 and 22:6. He emphasizes this idea in the expression of the belief that those who show pity deserve a reward.

Luzzatto felt that the Torah presents God not only as a model for imitation but as the very source and authority for the ethical life. He watches over all His creatures to mete out reward and punishment according to their deeds. The doctrine of Providence with its retribution strengthens the characteristic of pity as a powerful motive for doing right. Because the man who has no pity for his neighbor, will, if he is sure of a specific retribution, be very circumspect in his actions, out of pity for himself.<sup>59</sup> Thus, Luzzatto, in the comments mentioned above, strengthens the providential as part of Israel's God, especially as might be gleaned from

his comment on 1:1, 1:9, and 32:20. However, the Torah does not expressly enjoin belief in Providence. But that is because it had already become an established belief since the time of Abraham. Moses, nevertheless, does illustrate God's Providential care by recounting the experiences of Israel in Egypt. We can now understand that the spoiling of the Egyptians was not an immoral act but an instance of divine retribution upon the wicked oppressors. Nor was the extermination of the Canaanites anything less than a divinely ordained punishment for sin. The command to destroy Amalek is another instance of just punishment for perfidy. Divine retribution is of two sorts -- communal and individual. Communal for sins committed in public, individual for secret sins.<sup>60</sup> Thus we have seen briefly what were Luzzatto's basic contributions about Torah, God, and Israel. However, the writer wishes to indicate that wherever it was possible, Luzzatto bolstered these contentions in his interpretive comments in the Bible wherever possible. And here, it is my desire to point out -- that in his commentary to Deuteronomy, he follows these theological dicta as we can readily see from the verse quoted above.

## Chapter III

### A.

#### Use of Historical Material

In a further perusal of this commentary to Deuteronomy, we can see in certain of his statements a definite attempt to present a view of Jewish history which is accurate, scientific, and logical. In some cases, Luzzatto might even go so far as to challenge the facts, and present a variant view of an event. Yet, as we read this commentary, we are impressed with the fact that he is interested in presenting a panoramic view of Jewish history, the history of the Jews as a complete whole, in toto, rather than as a series of unrelated events. In the following series of Luzzatto's comments the writer of this thesis will quote as nearly as possible those which most aptly bring out the historical character of Luzzatto's commentary.

1:1 *אלה הדברים*-- this verse recalls in summary every time that Moses took it upon himself to speak to the children of Israel, *היו בארץ ובין תהם, משה ים 1/0, ארבעה ודבר עם ה' ה'קל*, all places where Israel tarried and Moses spoke to them. It can readily be seen that Luzzatto, aware of possible inconsistency, always made a definite effort to reconstruct a

61

complete historical scene.

1:1

*p/ el 2011* with this phrase, Luzzatto presents a complete historical picture of the Jew. The "Remez," he says, was made after a chain of events had taken place. He smote Sichon and Og. When God conquered the land before their very eyes and smote mighty kings, Israel became aware then, that they would not be left in the desert.

*This means nothing - the word Remez is not a proper name - early text Israel smote the land and not the people - the text is a later addition - printed at the bottom of each column*

2:19

*על ארץ* Luzzatto makes the interesting observation that *על ארץ* occurs only in reference to those lands which were given to the seed of Abraham. For example, in reference to the people of Canaan, he does not mention driving out the <sup>*עמלק* (v. 23)</sup> ~~Amalek~~, and this implies that even the land of the Canaanites, since they are not of the seed of Abraham, might well be given also to the seed of Abraham.

3:15 According to Luzzatto, Moses in the narrative enlarges and exaggerates the defeat of Og and Bashan. (Luzzatto believes it quite unlikely that Moses wrote this passage, for Moses, Luzzatto claims, wanted above all) to strengthen the Torah in the hearts of the Israelites (in preference to material glory). For the custom of taking spoils did not become extant until the time of David. Luzzatto questions the phrase *על ארץ*, and asks why, when the Israelites had taken so many cities. Thus, the phrase has no connection with the preceding and so it is a later addition. Though Luzzatto believed in the complete authenticity of the "Torah Min Ha-Shemaim", he still did point out historical inaccuracies or where verses and phrases have crept in which belong to a later

*Moses did not preserve this text (for fear it would be an object of reverence) - David the king was the first to take the spoils (2 Sam. 12:30) - Luzzatto was the first to point out that the word Remez is a later addition - printed at the bottom of each column*

*the word Remez is a later addition - printed at the bottom of each column*

"This statement is a contradiction to those who say that these 317 laws were taken from the Egyptians"

period. *where?!*

4:6 *לפי דברי משה* -- this seems to hint at the fact that the laws made by Moses were taken from the Egyptians, and the rest of the peoples in his days. Yet, how could anyone be imbued with such foolishness as to say in regard to Israel

*לפי דברי משה* unless the laws were based on their own, and so reiterated the *לפי דברי משה*, a perfect historical deduction on the part of Luzzatto.

*a wrong interpretation of the whole hence a wrong conclusion*

6:8 *לפי דברי משה* : it is not a *לפי דברי משה*, as one might suppose but logical and true. For we find in reverting back to history that even the *Yishmaelites* had written *לפי דברי משה* on the doorposts of their houses.

*(this against Rastam's statement. See note)*

7:20 *לפי דברי משה* : This is borne out by Joshua 24:12 and is a true incident although omitted in the story of the capturing of the land.

8:1 *לפי דברי משה* -- from this we deduce that upon coming to *לפי דברי משה*, they were not powerful enough but first had to gather strength and multiply, and then drive out the "KENA-ANI".

Again we see here an illustration of Luzzatto's attempt to relate a biblical statement to historical truth and accuracy. *lies to L's own thought. Nothing in the Bible to indicate that they were not sufficient to conquer the land.*

11:11 *לפי דברי משה* -- the land receives its water supply from rains and not from the river and even if a river were extant, it still would be unable to overflow the banks of a hilly country, and therefore is watched over by God who will decide when it should rain and when it should not.



This interpretation is also held by Rashbam and

John Egan

11:29  
 "spoke the blessing." Luzzatto explains from an historical incident how a curse and a blessing occurred in one sentence. According to Luzzatto's comment, six tribes faced יְרֵמֶה, and six on the other side faced Eval -- the Levites and the ark being in the center. Then they turned toward Gerizim and uttered the blessing; then turned toward Eval and uttered the curse. Gerizim is fertile while Eval is not: consequently, when one sees these two he is reminded of the blessing and the curse.

11:30 לחלוק -- not the same one mentioned in Joshua,  
which was near Jericho, and there they were commanded before  
going into the land, but this one is far from Jericho; it is  
near Shechem. Rashi translates לחלוק as לחלוק, "far from", but  
Luzzatto disagrees with him vehemently.

the point of  
difference  
is due to  
the accents  
+ misinterpretation  
hereof

17:14 מלכות נבחרת ונפרדת מן המלוכה. The ques-  
tion here arises, "What is mentioned as a common, natural  
institution, and מלכות as a strange new one?" The difference  
lies here, "in that מלכות was elective from the very midst of  
the people, while the office of מלך was handed down from father  
to son. One reason why the Torah did not set up a monarchy  
as a natural institution was that from youth the young boy  
of royal blood knew he would be destined for kingship and his  
sons after him, and as a result would lead a spoiled life.  
Consequently, the Torah did not wish to emphasize that type

of rule. However, the Torah neither commanded nor prohibited the choice of government left to the people. There were times when it was necessary to secure the government by groups of judges and at times by a single judge. In the case of Samuel -- his sons led a corrupt life so they decided they wanted a monarch. The reason they desired a king was because of the <sup>72</sup>glamour and glory surrounding him.

18: <sup>72</sup>וְהָיוּ לְכָל הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּיָמָיו, part of the priests permanently kept watch in the Temple, while the other sections lived in their own towns and whenever they wished they came to the Temple and served and ate of the sacrifices with the others. However, with David came a change. There were twenty-four watches at a week's interval, and no priest could serve and <sup>73</sup>sacrifice in a watch which was not his own. However, the allowance was still made that a priest could come and make <sup>73</sup>his free-will sacrifice.

23:16 <sup>74</sup>וְלֹא תִקְדֹּשׁ אֶת הָעֶבֶד וְאֶת הַאֲמָלָה: Thou shalt not imprison a runaway. Luzzatto says that the act of letting a runaway become a free man in your house is not an act of sin, but rather shows the <sup>74</sup>פְּדוּתוֹ, for one could not blame a slave for running away in the <sup>74</sup>פְּדוּתוֹ. And from the fact that the Bible contains the phrase, "and he shall remain with thee in the midst of the land" -- we gather it refers to slaves <sup>74</sup>פְּדוּתוֹ. From this comment we not only gather an example of Luzzatto's historical perception, but of his sociological insight. For in this verse he de-



scribes the conditions of the slave institution and how they were in the habit of treating runaway slaves.

26:5      , p'k p'k w'k -- all the n/p' are included as one. They wandered from one nation to the other. The first came from p'k. Rashbam's comment to this verse is similar. 75

Thus we have presented through these historical comments the attempt on the part of Luzzatto to correlate as far as was possible, based on Deuteronomy, all those historical events which concerned themselves with the life of the people during this period. It must be noted that Luzzatto never hesitated to question an historical inaccuracy and attempted to present as complete a history of the Jew as was possible. 2. define  
on  
the basis of  
the text

## B.

### Use of Rabbinic and Other Sources

Upon perusal of the commentary further, we have found the use of rabbinic as well as other sources which he quotes when making some of these interpretive comments. With some he is in whole-hearted accord, while with others he disagrees. In this section the writer will attempt to illustrate the use of some of these sources, quoting from his actual comments.

In his comment on 1:2, interpreting Mose's reproach to Israel, Luzzatto explains that he is supported by other com-

mentators in his viewpoint, viz. Rabbi Obadiah de Sforno and Rashi, though Rashi differs slightly in that he did not present this statement of Moses allegorically. But in this all traditional commentators are similar. Namely, that after Moses's death he was concerned with one fact that after his death they might misinterpret his words, therefore *וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה וְיִסְּרֵל בְּעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*

. Other scholars say that this was not uttered by Moses but was a later addition. Luzzatto states, however, that the commentators merely fell on this solution in view of the fact that they were confronted with serious historical and theological difficulties. Assuming this to be a later gloss, Luzzatto continues, what should have been the intention of these later editors? This contention is held by Spinoza in Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, chapter 8. Luzzatto dis-

agrees with him vehemently. This would imply that Deuteronomy was written after his death. And Luzzatto seriously questions it. <sup>76</sup> Another bone of contention between Luzzatto and the other writers, was that Spinoza stood among those who believed that the Torah, as it stands now, was not written by Moses and this contention Luzzatto explains is upheld by *וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה* <sup>וְיִסְּרֵל בְּעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל</sup> as he might live one to believe. The meaning which *וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה* places on this phrase is, "Behold, he (Moses) explained the Torah which he received between Paran and Tofel, and he explained that which God commanded him <sup>וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה</sup> <sup>77</sup>

And in the end of the fortieth year of wandering, Moses spoke to Israel that which God had commanded him. Sifre's interpretation of this introductory verse stated that Israel would

*וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה*  
*וְיִסְּרֵל בְּעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*  
*וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה*  
*וְיִסְּרֵל בְּעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*  
*וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה*  
*וְיִסְּרֵל בְּעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*  
*וְהָיָה כִּי יָמוּת מֹשֶׁה*  
*וְיִסְּרֵל בְּעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*

have merited getting to Palestine sooner, but because they<sup>78</sup> sinned the place revolved and it took them forty years.

Rashbam states that they went from Choreb to HAR SEIR in eleven days but Israel had sent men to spy out the land and they tarried them forty years. Luzzatto, then, has quoted numerous comments from various other sources, early rabbinic and otherwise, either to bolster his own opinions or to disagree with them. These comments show not only Luzzatto's erudition but amply illustrate an earnest willingness on his part to consider opinions other than his own. In this, he was a true liberal. !!

7:4 *בן איש חור*. This does not refer to a son born by an Israelitish woman at the house of an *אֵלֶּיךָ*. This is not so, for a woman, marrying a *גֵּר*, separates herself from the camp of Israel. But it refers to your son marrying a woman out of the faith -- and her people will further thrust the son from the Lord. This view, Luzzatto says, is opposed by Shimon bar Yochai, who said that *בן* means son of an Israelitish woman. Rabhenu Tam, however, supports Luzzatto stating that *בן* prefers to the *בן*.<sup>79</sup>

7:15 *מִן הַמִּצְרַיִם* -- these refer to the detailed afflictions characteristic of Egypt such as leprosy. And in relation to this he refers to a similar opinion by Plinius, a<sup>80</sup> historic naturalist.

11:30 According to Luzzatto, Ashi showed no knowledge of the punctuation in the Bible, for he fails to recognize that meanings change in relation to punctuation. Rambam did show an understanding of it -- and it was in relation to this

81

that Luzzatto found his interpretation of this verse.

21:4 Rashi and the medieval commentators translated <sup>ל</sup> as meaning <sup>ל</sup> Rambam translated <sup>ל</sup> as meaning <sup>ל</sup> flowing water. Amos 5:24, "let justice flow like water, righteousness like a perennial stream." And this is the reason, Luzzatto explains, that they commanded the <sup>ל</sup> to be cast into a <sup>ל</sup>, so that the water might obliterate the blood as an atonement.

27:2 <sup>ל</sup>. Rashi states that three kinds of stones are referred to here but Sotah <sup>ל</sup> contradicts and says it means three times: one which Moses set up in Moab, one set up by Joshua in the Jordan and one in Gilgal. Rashi's account tallies to an extent with Sotah, except that Moses built all of them. According to <sup>ל</sup> in his Sefer Zekoron, Moses set up twelve stones across the Jordan in Moab and opposite <sup>ל</sup> and doubled them and brought them to Gilgal as a <sup>ל</sup> and this, says Luzzatto, is the correct interpretation. According to the P'shat this reference has no relation to the altar of Joshua.

27:3 <sup>ל</sup>. Ralbag ( <sup>ל</sup> ), said that in Joshua 8, all the things here refer to the <sup>ל</sup>.

28:23 <sup>ל</sup> -- according to Rashi the curses here are the expressions of Moses own thoughts, and are to be found in Megillah 31, in the words of Abayee ( <sup>ל</sup> ). Rashi, in commenting on <sup>ל</sup> says the same thing. This is, therefore, an illustration of free will in thought among the ancients,



## Chapter IV

### A

#### Use of Halacha

The body of Jewish law which we call Halacha has always been a great bone of contention among scholars and theologians. There were those, on one hand, who tried to explain it away, while on the other hand, there were those who advocated its strict observance. Luzzatto has always maintained that the laws hold sway though the life of the Jew was simple, important yet feasible. With this fact well in mind, Luzzatto in his commentary to the Pentateuch attempts to shed his light on this body of Jewish law, strengthening the feeling that these laws were something more than intellectual monstrosities carried down through the ages. To him they were vital and important even as they were thousands of years previously. In this section, the writer will demonstrate by illustration, Luzzatto's reaction to the Halacha.

12:23 חֶמֶץ לֹא יֵאָכַל אֲכָלֵהוּ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא : Luzzatto states that when it was no longer necessary, according to law, to throw blood on the altar then it became essential to give the order not to eat it. The idea of חֶמֶץ expressed here was that it should not be drunk while flowing from a living being. "And," Luzzatto continues, "there exist people today who drink the



blood of their animals." But to forestall such a practice the laws were made more strict. Here, we see that Luzzatto looked upon the injunction regarding blood not as something archaic and outworn but a law which even in the days of Luzzatto was applicable and one possessed with reason. <sup>90.</sup>

13:10 When the verse mentions פסח בדור, we deduce that when an individual went on trial, the case was given for trial to a general body and conviction was based not on single testimony but on the testimony of men. Here, Luzzatto has expatiated a Jewish law which in the last analysis has found the basis of our modern systems of law. <sup>91</sup>

15:4 אחרי כן אמר אלהים אל ישראל אחרי כן אמר אלהים אל ישראל after he said only from the stranger may you take interest, it then occurred to him that the Israelites may only lend to strangers, so this verse was added as an afterthought -- that only if there be no needy among your own people may you lend to strangers. Luzzatto gives here an interpretation based on the Talmud (B. Mezia) <sup>92</sup> and shows this to be an example of keen Halachic foresight.

16:2 אין אין אין אין according to the P'shat The "Pesach" was from the אין and was eaten roasted, all because of the hurried exodus. But the "Pesach" of generations that followed was of אין אין-- could be cooked in water because there existed no necessity for hurry. <sup>93</sup> Luzzatto frequently takes occasion to explain obvious discrepancies as existed in the above injunction. It seemed to be Shedai's fondest hope to make each of these laws, clear, concise, and simple.

דף

of the sheep  
roasted

17:7 *הם לא ידעו* : the judges are unable to determine whether the murder was premeditated or spontaneous. <sup>94</sup>

17:7 *אין להחליט* : the court could not decide here, whether the demands of the creditor in a suit were true and justifiable. <sup>95</sup>

17:9 *אשר יהיה בימיו* . Whoever holds the rule at that particular time whether it be in the hands of *הכהן*, Priests or under a secular ruler. This law, Luzzatto explains, is an illustration of the fact that the law of Israel was flexible and serving the needs of the time. <sup>96</sup>

18:3 *והקדשם* . The body for a sacrificial purpose was divided into three parts: the head, the hinds, and the insides; and from these a present to the Priest was given. <sup>97</sup> *what is the purpose of calling this commandment*

20:6 *אם לא* . . . Did not take out the fruits for eating in Jerusalem. This does not refer to redemption, but if unable to bring them to Jerusalem, he redeems them by money and eats things he buys in Jerusalem. Important thing is the eating in Jerusalem. <sup>98</sup>

20:11 *אם לא* : Luzzatto says that it is improbable that the writer meant that Israel could attack a people without cause. At the beginning of the chapter the writer speaks of making war with the enemies, and by enemies he means those who penetrate their boundaries and threaten to take it away. This when He states, "they shall pay tribute" it is for damage already done. <sup>99</sup>



21:1 *לפי פ'שט* there are two intentions made in the statement in vv.2 and 3; the first is that all Israel is one and the the that no one can atone for blood that has been shed except the one who actually did the killing. And if the killer is not known and if they cannot reach a decision the procedure is as follows: the elders break the calf, a sign that the elders wash their hands and that their hands are clean. The second interpretation is that th<sup>100</sup> they may not kill anyone suspected of a murder.

21:12 *והוא* "and thou shalt bring her to thy father's house." This comment was made in the name of someone else, The meaning here is that he should not compel her to become his bride immediately, but should give her ample opportunity to acclimate herself to the new environment--and shaving of the head as a sign of mourning "for separation from the father's house."

22:17 *לפי פ'שט* The purpose of the court here was to prevent a man from slandering his wife--thus they made the law so stringent and technical. <sup>102</sup> This is not Luzzatto's own statement, but quotes another source. Here again we see the attempt to present a *raison d'être* for Jewish law and so build a bulwark against the attacks of those who claimed that these laws were made with little foresight and had no bearing on the life of the people.

22:21 *לפי פ'שט* according to the P'shat, she played harlot

harlot in her father's house and admitted her non-virginity --  
 a thing highly esteemed in those days. But again sentence is  
 only passed by the evidence of an eye witness, and so Luzzatto  
 reiterates the verse should have read *103* *if this law is maintained that*

23:18 *לֹא יִשְׁלַח אִישׁ אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת אֲבִירָתָהּ*. The verse makes no attempt to  
 prohibit or punish the parties involved, but tries to prevent  
 the existence of the thing itself. In other words, remove the  
 cause and you remove the crime. Purpose of this law, explains  
 Luzzatto, was to increase and strengthen the marriage institu-  
 tion. *104*

23:21 If the "Nochri" is doing business in your land take  
*פֶּלֶא*, if he is poor refrain from so doing. And if the Jew  
 be a successful merchant then also take interest. *105*

24:1 *לֹא יִשְׁלַח אִישׁ אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת אֲבִירָתָהּ* -- because, Luzzatto explains, men  
 should be exchanging wives with one another; and this does  
 away with the possibility of a man driving out his wife and  
 sending her away to her lover. This injunction Luzzatto ex-  
 plains is indicative of the rigidity of the marriage insti-  
 tution. *106*

2 24:15 *וְאִם אִישׁ יִשְׁלַח אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת אֲבִירָתָהּ* From this we may assume  
 that in these olden days father and son exchanging sufferings  
 for a crime endured by the other was prevalent. One one oc-  
 casion a man was found guilty of a crime and was to pay for  
 it with both of his eyes; whereupon he told the executor to  
 blind only one of his eyes and one of his son's. But this in-  
 junction emphasized that each man was to die for his own sin, *107*

*as is indicated by the story of King Amaziah who does not  
 slay the sons of the slayers*



25:3 *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה* -- assume you are the judge -- perhaps the litigator may speak -- and you go forth innocent, the sin shall be upon you -- if you see your brother receiving more punishment than necessary and that's why the law should read -- and thou shalt smite him before his litigator and judge -- who should watch.

*I cannot understand this. It does not seem to follow from the text.*

25:5 *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*. Why, asks Luzzatto, does it mention *וְהָיָה*? For how, he questions, can we conceive of the possibility of brothers not dwelling together when their inheritance is in proximity to one another. Perhaps on one occasion a fight resulted between himself and his brother's wife and he did not perform the right of *Yebomah* as a result. And after generations had passed they saw that the *וְהָיָה* was growing lax as a result of families living apart so they tried to get their families to live together. We note that in this comment Luzzatto probes the very depths in his attempts to determine what might have been the cause of such a law being brought forth.

*Hebrew 7 1/2 2 1/2 is very much better.*

25:10 *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*. As a punishment his own name will be forgotten and neither will his sons be called by name but as *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה* -- and similarly in the book of Ruth -- the man is called *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*.

26:12 *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*: This instance here is a bit confused according to the classification of Rabenu -- for according to him there were two kinds of Ma'asroth in this verse -- though differentiation is made between them.

*וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*

this is *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*. *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה* refers to *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַיָּדוּעַ וְהַיָּדוּעָה*.



B

Exegetica

In this section the writer merely has incorporated those verses which do not fall into any of the other four classifications but which illustrate his method and manner of interpretation. They show quite laudably his ability as a P'shatist, his desire to make each verse in the Bible live again as a vital influence in the life of the Jew. From these illustrative comments we glean the fact the Luzzatto strained every effort to simplify the complex, to facilitate the difficult, to explain the incomprehensible.

1:12 *באנכי ואני* etc. This does not mean only laborious physical labor but brings in the idea of a burdensome responsibility.  
115

2:4 *לשם* etc. Luzzatto says this does not refer to Edom nor are Esau and Edom identical. And how do we know? Because in Numbers 20 the difference is noted by mentioning the king of Edom and here the king of Edom is not mentioned but rather the children of Esau. However, we may find that a portion of the sons of Esau are subordinate to the king of Edom. However, Luzzatto discerns that this part of the comment does not belong to the comment of Rashbam  
116  
whom he is quoting, but to someone else.

4:20 "Kur Habarzel" -- he said "Kur Habarzel" and not "Kur Hazohor" by that giving a meaning of terror and misery within which it was impossible to stand. Luzzatto comments on the <sup>117</sup> *Boz*.

4:40 Up to this point is the interpretation of the section regarding <sup>the 11 days referred to in 1.2</sup> "Yodh Aleph Yom" and Moses finishes his warning to Israel which is a sort of introduction to ~~the making~~ <sup>the making of the</sup> covenant. <sup>118</sup> And here begins the ~~actual~~ <sup>actual</sup> making of the covenant. <sup>that was made with Israel on the plains of Moab, which verse follows</sup>

9:18 "Voesnapal lifne adonai korishono" -- from Exodus <sup>and not there as assuming,</sup> we rather that Moses was in the mountain two times, once for <sup>verses 10. 10</sup> the *1st* (Ex. 24:11); and once for the second tablets (Ex. 24:28). Here it is stated that Moses spent forty days in prayer and fasting. According to Luzzatto he did not spend forty days for the second tablets in prayer and in fasting since God had already forgiven Israel. Luzzatto states then that all in all 120 days were spent. The second being spent within the recesses of his own tent, and this is not mentioned in Exodus since it was a secret deliberation outside the camp. And here Moses mentions the incidents and when he says "Voesnapal lifne Adonai" he does not say "Bohor" and when he went up a third time the matter was already taken care of and <sup>119</sup> treated.

10:1 *To pick up the ark.* This does not refer to the ark of Bezalel but one which was made for the emergency of the hour. And after the *ark* was made they got rid of it.



The purpose was to keep the tablets before Israel in an open  
120  
ark.

18:8 *לפיכך לא יאכלו* there is a great deal of difference of opinion  
in the comments on this verse both among Jews and Christians, showing  
that he read Christian commentaries. Quoting from another source  
Luzzatto states that he shall eat all except his field and  
and house which he has sold because of his oppressor for the  
father's of the priests can redeem them. Luzzatto states that  
if the sacrifices were too much and they could not eat in the  
set time, then they could sell the sacrifices to the other priests  
or it falls to the *לוי* and the chief priests to divide and dis-  
tribute among the priests ~~and~~ the sales money. L. finds difficulty  
with *(לוי)* and emends it to *לויים*.

19:19 *אשר לא יאכלו* / this does not refer to the death penalty  
for not every *אשר* is put to death. You shall destroy the sin  
from the land for otherwise all Israel would be held guilty. In proof  
of this L. cites 22:24 *אשר לא יאכלו*; if this referred to the sinner  
L. says the text would be *אשר לא יאכלו*. 122

21:25 *אשר לא יאכלו*... raises the question why are the curses  
here spoken before the *אשר לא יאכלו* i.e. Chap. 28:3-6 (*אשר לא יאכלו*) and *Mid.*  
15-19 (*אשר לא יאכלו*) He answers that this chapter and the next throw  
light on each other, counting the blessings and the curses spoken.  
See Joshua 8:33-34. This is no expansion.

28:52 *אשר לא יאכלו* Until the walls go down--this is metaphorically  
speaking; it actually means until the inhabitants of the city are  
125  
no longer able to endure it.

29:9 *אשר לא יאכלו* L. says that we did not find that they answered

Amen or did anything to show that they were accepting the covenant. but inasmuch as they remained to hear the curses it is as if they were accepting, and that is what means. Later on He addresses himself (in v.14, see comment) to those who did not come to that assembly either because of illness or because he left before the meeting is over.<sup>126</sup>

29:14 *לפי מה* the meaning is not a reference to the coming generations for they were not mentioned nor were hinted at in this parashah, but passage refers to that individual who for some reason may have been detained.<sup>127</sup>

32:11 *לפי מה* this ~~thaves~~ the parable of Israel as a field and speaks of them as an *אב* saying he watches over them as an eagle over the young.<sup>128</sup>

32:20 *לפי מה* said in mockery as in the force of the phrase -we will see what good those dreams do them now.<sup>129</sup> (Gen.37:20)

We have thus seen from these illustrative comments of L. his concerted efforts at lucidity and clarity. He escapes involved explanation of the text by reducing it to the simplest understandable form. We can readily see from this method and keen desire at simplification why he has earned for himself the title of being one of the most renowned biurists of the age. A Peshatist in every sense of the term--L. was anxious to render an explanation which might still be pertinent and applicable to the Jewry of his day.

## Chapter V

## A

## Grammatica

As we delve into Luzzatto an attempt to discover a place for him in the hall of scholarship, we see that as a grammarian he stood among the foremost of his day. If we are to compare him with other commentators we are able to observe that he was able to cope far more adequately with troubling phrases which Rashi handled only incompetently and as we look into Ibn Ezra we may also recognize that here he could not attain the depths of understanding which was Ibn Ezra's. The writer has decided to treat and illustrate three aspects of his grammatical comments: the definitive, punctuation, and Targum.

### A. Definitive

{Does not in reality, come under  
caption "Grammatica"

In these comments the writer merely wishes to emphasize Luzzatto's clarity and lucidity in defining words and phrases. However, we can also appreciate them all the more when we realize that certain definitions are such as have been offered by many of our present day Bible critics.

3:15 <sup>16</sup> SNJ<sup>17</sup>: <sup>Scantless</sup> use to elaborate and emphasize the definiteness of the term. For, Luzzatto states, "Nachal" is

בקצה

130

found not only to mean a river but also a "Givrah" or valley.  
We can readily see that Luzzatto's definition in a comment  
such as the above is a clear indication that his best attempts  
are put forward to give definiteness to his terms.

4:6 רון ארבע -- the meaning of the word רון means.  
רססו. Here Luzzatto refers to a comment on Gen.

20:11 where such use of the term was made. This use of  
as meaning surely or verily we find adopted by biblical critics.  
As an example I quote Dr. Battenwieser's translation of Amos  
3:2 רון יסדתי לך ביתי ואת כל בני ישראל: "Verily,  
I have cared more for you than any other of the people's of  
the earth."

6:7 ו/ס/רססו -- this has the meaning of a repetition  
that you shall repeat them two and three times to your sons.

The word רססו, Luzzatto explains comes from the root רסס  
but the "Nun" shows that it ~~may~~ mean constant repetition.

The phrase should really read רססו רססו but was not added  
so as not to make the comment too difficult to fulfill.

7:17 ו/ס/רססו -- any nation dwelling by your side  
it will become your snare -- by worshipping his sidegods.

9:16 ו/ס/רססו -- in the scriptures this does not mean  
angered but "caused sorrow."

14:3 רססו רססו, רססו: is the general name:  
רססו is a type of רססו; the male of the species is רססו  
the female is רססו: רססו when grown up.

רססו is a general term. רססו רססו one is called רססו  
whether male or female of רססו רססו. As regards רססו

they are called עוֹשֵׂי רָע when small -- and עוֹשֵׂי רָע  
 when grown -- but עוֹשֵׂי רָע may apply to both. 135  
 13:14 <sup>by 32</sup> עוֹשֵׂי רָע like עוֹשֵׂי רָע <sup>calving out</sup> some say <sup>does it cannot be said their</sup> has not a  
 single good element in it. However, the phrase not only means  
 passively no good, but violently active doing evil. The lan-  
 guage according to Luzzatto gives active meaning to passive  
 words. Like עוֹשֵׂי רָע meaning also a עוֹשֵׂי. 136

16:6 פִּרְצֵיהֶם עוֹשֵׂי רָע: this does not refer to the ac-  
 tual going out but, according to Luzzatto, ~~does not mean the~~  
~~time of the actual doing of a thing~~ but rather the season  
 preparatory to it. 137

17:3 עוֹשֵׂי רָע -- the <sup>force of x5 is</sup> idea that was not commanded  
 but ~~what~~ just the opposite of what was commanded just as when  
 we say עוֹשֵׂי רָע we mean עוֹשֵׂי. 138

21:18 עוֹשֵׂי רָע -- one that does not do that which he is  
 supposed to do.

139 עוֹשֵׂי רָע -- he who does that which he was told not to  
 do.

23:18 עוֹשֵׂי רָע -- <sup>referring to</sup> meaning of the institution was the  
 idea of legalized prostitution for the temple, but the prac-  
 tice resulted in wild, uncontrolled orgies. Israel absolute-  
 ly condemned this institution. 140

23:21 עוֹשֵׂי רָע. The "Ger" living  
 in the midst of the "Kahal" is not referred to here but the  
 traveling merchant. Regarding him you take interest for a  
 loan. However, the Israelites were not business men so it

there +  
 a number  
 2 other  
 from 17  
 given under  
 "examination"  
 really belong  
 to "Exegesis"

why not grammatical note in 26.12? + his understanding  
 p. 57 concludes that he changed his mind as to explanation  
 from his being preparatory as to the form עוֹשֵׂי

141

was difficult to take interest from them.

28:22 Luzzatto, in this comment, takes occasion to explain "what are the various types of blemishes." In Perashah

וְקַלְהֵי, it was seen that these are wheat ailments -- the  
 וְקַלְהֵי וְקַלְהֵי; and so in Amos 4:9 and Hagai 2:17 וְקַלְהֵי is  
 וְקַלְהֵי; וְקַלְהֵי is Arabic meaning "black." 142

31:8 וְקַלְהֵי : וְקַלְהֵי and וְקַלְהֵי both have the meaning of  
 וְקַלְהֵי, so the phrase means וְקַלְהֵי 143

31:16 וְקַלְהֵי this does not mean וְקַלְהֵי, but is also  
 used in conjunction with וְקַלְהֵי -- meaning the strange gods  
 of the land. 144 *only not include the grammatical remark in this  
 edition of "Cyclopedia"*

32:13 וְקַלְהֵי : וְקַלְהֵי the concept set forth here is  
 that by וְקַלְהֵי is meant וְקַלְהֵי -- and by וְקַלְהֵי is meant 145  
 high places -- that is places that are safe from invaders.

We can readily see from the definitive material offered  
 above that Luzzatto is defining words and phrases when con-  
 cepts were not scrupulous in shades of meanings. Especially  
 was he interested in offering accurate, scientific meaning  
 since very often they had a very direct effect on the under-  
 standing of these various concepts. Often two words might  
 apparently mean the same thing, yet -- Luzzatto with his cha-  
 racteristic probing might discover that they carried with  
 them two very different implications. Accase in point here  
 might be Luzzatto's comment on וְקַלְהֵי and וְקַלְהֵי, (21:18).



## B. Punctuation

In the study and analysis of Luzzatto's commentary to Deuteronomy the writer discovered in Luzzatto's comments an illustration of a profound knowledge of Hebrew punctuation. Some bear very definite similarity to the rules and opinions regarding the Hebrew punctuation as set forth by our modern scientific, scholarly minds. Where such comments have illustrated this use and illustration of punctuation the writer will give these verses in full.

11:30 <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ. The word <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ, explains Luzzatto, is in the construct but not in the construct in relation to the word <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ, but rather in relation to the entire phrase. For this reason, in order to show <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ as apart from the rest of the phrase and as punctuated with a disjunctive accent the "pashta". At this point Luzzatto attacks the other commentators, stating that Rashi's comment showed an amazing ignorance of the Hebrew accents and their use. <sup>146</sup> We can readily recognize that Luzzatto's accuracy is established when we refer to the works by modern writers. Thus we see that William Wickes describes the pashta as a <sup>147</sup> "prepositive disjunctive accent."

7 — 13:16 <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ -- the accent is placed as if it were a feminine form but it is a masculine form. With nouns whose gender is <sup>not</sup> known, one places the accent on the penult. But <sup>148</sup> <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ is not a noun; it is a derivative of <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ or <sup>וְ</sup>אֵלֶּיךָ so suggested by Brown Driver Briggs Dict which is in contradistinction

this is not L's statement - he calls it a verb  
- affixes it.

so suggested  
by Brown Driver  
Briggs Dict  
which is in contradistinction  
to it

15:2 <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ לָהּ <sup>וְ</sup>לָהּ. The punctuation and cantillation show an established relationship between <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ and <sup>וְ</sup>לָהּ, though in later generations it appeared as <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ, in Neh. 11:32. According to this explanation of Luzzatto the word <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ should be in the Hiphil, having a causative effect, thereupon giving the meaning as follows: "let a man cause his hand to let go that which is in it." <sup>149</sup>

31:21 <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ לָהּ <sup>וְ</sup>לָהּ. "Today, I know his will which he does." Moses is here speaking of conjecture rather than with decision of thought, so they may not say the sin is already upon us. That is why, Luzzatto states, the "Ba'ale Teomim" placed a "R'bia" over <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ in order to connect <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ with <sup>וְ</sup>לָהּ, and both to be separate from <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ. However, Luzzatto says the words <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ <sup>וְ</sup>לָהּ should be accented with a <sup>וְ</sup>יָדָהּ <sup>וְ</sup>לָהּ accent -- or conjunctive <sup>150</sup> accent.

### C. Syntax

Other than being a renowned and esteemed exegete, Luzzatto will always be remembered as a grammarian who was scientific and accurate in his opinions regarding syntax. Though, as we compare him with Ibn Ezra, <sup>who?</sup> he too, fails to approach the famed scholar. He does demonstrate in this commentary a definite grasp and clear understanding of Hebrew syntax which is in accord with the syntax and grammatical construction presented by the scientific grammarians of

Luzzatto was a fine grammarian

our own day. In this last and final section, the writer besides illustrations of these comments on grammar and syntax will make comparisons from time to time with ibn Ezra's comment, to demonstrate what differences -- if any -- exist between the two men as grammarians.

2:12 *היה* *היה* *היה*, the past tense is used here to denote an event that has <sup>been partly completed, + which will be completed in</sup> ~~already taken place~~, and was a forecast of the future. <sup>near</sup> 151

2:15 *אין* *אין* *אין* -- in words of this type, Luzzatto explains, we find instances where, with suffixes, the *א* is elided and some where it is not elided. 152 Ibn Ezra, in commenting on the same verse does not go to the great lengths of quoting instances where in the avin-avin verbs, one is elided in the conjugation. Ibn Ezra's comment has the same force and accuracy but is terse. He states this word is from the *אין* *אין*, and is a *qual* form. 153

The point is as to the meanings and not suffix  
(a) to destroy  
(b) to scatter  
Ibn Ezra's comment has no place here because this is purely grammatical and L's is "definition"

8:2 *אין* modifies the word *אין* -- which is the important word in this statement and is translated as follows: "He answered you in order to test you." 154

8:10 *אין* *אין* *אין*. According to the P'shat this is not a but an acknowledgement that such shall be your good things and prosperity, that from your own selse shall you recognize God's goodness. 155

9:4 *אין* *אין* *אין*. The "vav" in *אין* is not a connecting conjunction but placed as a matter of

why not cite L's source viz 1272 M. Mendelsohn Aramaic Rashi and Roshan

position to the sentence before. Thus here the word  $\text{ל/כ}$  might be translated as however or "but". L. quotes a number of passages where the Vaw is so used. Here he disagrees with Rashi. <sup>156</sup>

10:11  $\text{ל/כ}$  L. states that this is the same as the Hiphil

$\text{ל/כ}$  L. agrees with Ibn Ezra who says that this word is a  $\text{ל/כ}$  infinitive verb

13:3  $\text{ל/כ}$  The word  $\text{ל/כ}$  says L. refers to a forecast of the future through prophecy while the word  $\text{ל/כ}$  is the doing of miracles. <sup>158</sup>

15:12  $\text{ל/כ}$  idea of  $\text{ל/כ}$  here though a  $\text{ל/כ}$  bears the force of a  $\text{ל/כ}$ , and  $\text{ל/כ}$  must have been a minor and therefore it must be the case of a father selling into bondage. <sup>159</sup>

15:7  $\text{ל/כ}$  L. quoting his Oheb Ger cites the three editions of the Targum as having  $\text{ל/כ}$  meaning to close and L. questions whether the Aramaic  $\text{ל/כ}$  which ordinarily has the meaning of jumping has also the meaning of "to close" and therefore it may be a Hebraism here.

"restraint" or "withholding". Luzzatto shows that <sup>פן</sup> in Yerushalmi has this one meaning. Rabbinic masters disagree with Luzzatto most violently, and believe that it may also have this other varied meaning. <sup>160</sup>

16:18 <sup>פן</sup> goes back to <sup>פן</sup>. Luzzatto here agrees with Rashi. However, it might also be <sup>פן</sup>, "to dwell there," but the words <sup>פן</sup> and <sup>פן</sup> dispel this possibility and so he sees in it the interpretation that these "Shotrim" were set up for all the tribes. <sup>161</sup>

19:19 <sup>פן</sup> -- the word <sup>פן</sup> when it has no name before it refers to man. Onkelos translated <sup>פן</sup> as <sup>פן</sup>. <sup>162</sup>  
Luzzatto says every bad witness is not destroyed but refers to the act or thing. <sup>163</sup>

20:8 <sup>פן</sup> could also be punctuated as <sup>פן</sup>.

26:12 <sup>פן</sup> -- this is not a Hiphil but is a Piel as if it were written <sup>פן</sup>. And this is the rule with the <sup>164</sup>

<sup>פן</sup> -- they are written in the Piel like a Hiphil root.

30:3 The word <sup>פן</sup> as it appears in biblical literature is not from the root <sup>פן</sup> but from <sup>פן</sup> as <sup>פן</sup> is from and the meaning of <sup>פן</sup> wherever it occurs is "Return and restoration of men and people to their original state." <sup>165</sup>

31:6 <sup>פן</sup> -- originally was <sup>פן</sup> meaning "he cease withholding his hand" as in <sup>פן</sup> (Josh. 10:6), then afterward omitted <sup>פן</sup> from the phrase and said <sup>פן</sup>, meaning <sup>פן</sup>, then <sup>פן</sup> was used with the meaning of taking hold. Now, the belt which

presses the skin adds alertness and from it is emphasized that the original meaning in Aramaic was  $\text{קל}$  and  $\text{ל$   $\text{קל}$  meant  $\text{קל}$  -- and then  $\text{קל}$  meant just the opposite of  $\text{קל}$  and derived from they said  $\text{קל}$  meaning "weakness." <sup>166</sup> Up until this point we may well recognize that Luzzatto's interest in grammar limited itself more particularly to the etymologies rather than to syntax itself. There are many instances where when Luzzatto will trace a derivation, Ibn Ezra would fail to comment on that phrase.

32:19  $\text{קל}$  is really  $\text{קל}$  -- as  $\text{קל}$  is  $\text{קל}$  so here too, the letter is elided. <sup>167</sup>

32:24  $\text{קל}$ ; the "heh" and the "Yod" appear here as in the nouns -- not as in verb. So this is a verb derived from a noun meaning "to destroy" or "I shall cut off their ends and I shall consume their remnant." <sup>168</sup>

33:3  $\text{קל}$   $\text{בן}$   $\text{בן}$  --  $\text{בן}$  in Aramaic is "table" and the verb in Arabic is "setting the table"; the meaning, says Luzzatto, "and they sit around a table before you to receive thy words and thy blessing as men sitting at a table looking for food." <sup>169</sup> One cannot help but become impressed as one peruses these grammatical comments again and again that instead of arriving at a meaning through syntactical analysis Luzzatto will trace it back philologically to the Aramaic and Arabic root. His assumption that many of these are based on Aramaic and Arabic roots <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ correct, yet it must be remembered that the Hebrew root as it exists today does not convey that same meaning.



3

32:29 *מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם*. This <sup>expression</sup> use of the ~~parable~~ is found in five places. Here it occurs in the "Niphal". In II Sam. 22:45 it is found in the *הִשְׁמַד*: Psalms 18:45; 66:3 and 81:16 in the Piel. The meaning conveyed by *הִשְׁמַד* is usually found in the Kal. What would it mean then if found in the *הִשְׁמַד* and *הִשְׁמַד*? Most commentators give it the P'shat interpretation as meaning "deceit" and "lies." It is with this interpretation that Luzzatto agrees. It could not have an active meaning here -- since if it were so -- then it would mean that God's enemies blaspheme Him, which Luzzatto says is impossible.

### Conclusion

What, then, may we say in a <sup>e</sup> general way re<sup>a</sup>grading Luzzatto as an exegete? He agrees in principle, method and content with the greater, renowned scholars of Jewish science. He is concise, simple and straightforward and above all a P'shatist in his comments.

*as Luzzatto*  
*was*  
*more*  
*to*  
*be*  
*seen*  
*than*  
*any*  
*other*  
*of*  
*his*  
*time*

Luzzatto was one of the first Jews to devote himself to biblical exegesis. There were Christians before him but for want of critical ability had flung away the true kernels as mere dross. He possessed a true instinct for recognizing the true spirit and form of biblical literature. He called attention to the disturbing elements whilst restoring the original ones. No one better than he understood the construction of the Hebrew language even to the most delicate points.  
171

At the rabbinical college of Padua Luzzatto found many opportunities of engaging zealously in the study of the Bible and ascertaining the true meanings of words. Had he continued he might have made many valuable contributions to Jewish science, but was frightened by his own boldness. If the walls of the Masorah <sup>a</sup> were torn down the text might then become the prey of incompetence and revolution causing direct confusion. He therefore took up an equivocal position and re-erected the works of the Masorah <sup>a</sup> to repair the harm that he might have done. Luzzatto stood among those who occupied themselves in a scientific manner with the Scriptures but he was timid and

fearful pressing close to Sinai.

We can best describe his exegesis in his own words when he states that he approaches the study of Bible not from the standpoint of explaining it "theologisch dogmatisch oder homiletisch-erbaulich" but "humansittlich, nach ehren ewigen veredelnden Gehalte." He possessed a wide range of Jewish and secular learning and wrote Hebrew with a masterly skill. Luzzatto raised the study of the Bible among the Jews to the dignity of a specialty, requiring a man's life-time and profession. Other branches of Hebrew literature found him interested. He was an uncompromising foe of the innovators of the modern Jews and he was equally severe on the medieval worthies. He stood foremost among the early Bible scholars. Thus, do we here conclude our evaluation of Luzzatto, the man, the Jew and the exegete.

finis

NOTES

1. Morais, Sabato, Italian Hebrew Literature, p. 78
2. Ibid., p. 80.
3. " p. 81.
4. # p. 81.
5. Morais, H.S., Eminent Israelites of the 19th Century, p. 212.
6. Ibid., p. 214.
7. Ibid., p. 214.
8. Sabato Morais mentions in commenting, "that only nineteen chapters of the complete work have hitherto been published, though unprinted copies of the complete work are found in the hands of many of our brethren, both in Italy and in Germany." (p. 82)
9. S.D. Luzzatto, Stellung Zur Biblecritik, J. Elbogen. Cp. 460-480 in Monatschrift. Jahrgang 8. Neue Folge. Berlin 1900), p. 462.
10. For other emendations see Samuel David Luzzatto, Ein Gedenkbuch zum hundertsten Geburtstage, Berlin 1900.
11. Morais, Sabato, p. 82.
12. Sabato Morais mentions that this "an Octavo of 135 pages has been translated, and was published serially in the Jewish Index during 1872."
13. Sabato Morais states the opinions in his essay on Luzzatto that the work bears an earlier date but that "we gather from its contents that it was perfected only after his arrival at Padua. (Morais, S., Italian Hebrew Literature, p. 84). The fly-leaf of the book seen by this writer gives the date as 1830 (1831) at Vienna.
14. Samuel David Luzzatto. (In: Juedische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben-Geiger. Vurter Jahrgang, p.15,16. Breslau, 1866.
15. Oheb Ger, preface p. V.
16. Ibid., VI.
17. Ibid., VIII.
18. Ibid., X.
19. Ibid., XI.
20. Ibid., XI.
21. Ibid., XVI.
22. In a note by Prof. Morais in his essay on Luzzatto he states that "Prof. Luzzatto who wrote his Oheb Ger or the so-called Onkel's version and in a beautiful composition apostrophised the supposed proselyte Onkelos; retracted in later years and coincided with the opinions of modern critics."
23. Morais, Sabato, p. 88.
24. Luzzatto, S.D., Ein Gedenkbuch zum Hundersten Geburtstage, p. 73.
25. An English translation of this introduction is to be found in Morais, S., Italian Hebrew Literature, p. 91-152.

26. LUzzatto, S.D. Stellung Zur Bibelcritik--J.Elbogen p.463
27. Hardly had Isaiah been off the press when two celebrities asked that they might be privelege to translate it into German. The request wasnot complied with.
28. Pentateuco, commentary to Deut.--S.D.Luzzatto, p.2
29. ibid. p.3
30. ibid. p.83
31. ibid. p.249 <sup>50</sup> p 9
32. ibid. p.4
33. ibid. p.15
34. ibid. p.37
35. ibid. p.38
36. ibid. p.43
37. ibid. p.57
38. ibid. p.59, <sup>61</sup>
39. ibid. p.63
40. p.67
41. ibid. p.88
42. ibid. p.94 wrong ref. should be p. 90
43. ibid. p.115
44. ibid. p.145
45. ibid. p.158
46. ibid. p.163
47. ibid. p.167
48. ibid. p.169
49. ibid. p.181 180
50. ibid. p.227
51. ibid. p.250
52. ibid. p.255
53. ibid. p.258
54. ibid. p.265 264
55. ibid. p.276 275
56. Mechkere Vol.II p.18f.
57. ibid. p.19
58. ibid. p.5f.
59. Yesode Hatorah, p.21
60. ibid. p.22, 25, 27, 29
61. Pentateuco, p.2
62. ibid. p.3
63. ibid. p.23
64. ibid. p.30
65. ibid. p.37
66. ibid. p.53
67. ibid. p.69 61
68. ibid. p.72
69. ibid. p.94
70. ibid. p.98
71. ibid. p.99
72. ibid. p.138
73. ibid. p.143
74. ibid. p.181
75. ibid. p.198
76. ibid. p.4



77. ibid. p.4
78. ibid. p.6
78. ibid. p.7
79. ibid. p.65
80. ibid. p.68
81. ibid. p.99
82. ibid. p.162
83. ibid. p.203
84. ibid. p.203
85. ibid. p.215
86. ibid. p.253
87. ibid. p.254
88. ibid. p.267
89. ibid. p.266
90. ibid. 108 — 107
91. ibid. p.113
92. ibid. p.122
93. ibid. p.129
94. ibid. p.137
95. ibid. p.137
96. ibid. p.137
97. ibid. p.143
98. ibid. p.150
99. ibid. p.152 — 157
100. ibid. 161
101. ibid. p.165
102. ibid. p.166 — 171
103. ibid. p.173
104. ibid. p.181
105. ibid. p.183
106. ibid. p.185
107. ibid. p.189
108. ibid. p.191
109. ibid. p.191
110. ibid. p.193
111. ibid. p.193
112. ibid. p.199
113. ibid. p.202
114. ibid. p.205 — 204
115. ibid. p.9
116. ibid. p. 19
117. ibid. p.41
118. ibid. p.46
119. ibid. p.82
120. ibid. p.86
121. ibid. p.144
122. ibid. p.152
123. ibid. p.155
124. ibid. p.207
125. ibid. p.221
126. ibid. p.229
127. ibid. p.231
128. ibid. p.253
129. ibid. p.259
130. ibid. p.31

131. ibid. p. 37  
132. ibid. p. 61  
133. ibid. p. 68  
134. ibid. p. 83  
135. ibid. p. 115f.  
136. ibid. p. 116  
137. ibid. p. 131  
138. ibid. p. 135  
139. ibid. p. 165  
140. ibid. p. 181  
141. ibid. 182  
142. ibid. p. 214  
143. ibid. p. 243  
144. ibid. p. 245  
145. ibid. p. 251  
146. ibid. p. 98  
147. Wickes, William, "Hebrew Prose Accents", p. 19  
148. Penateuco, p. 113  
149. ibid. p. 120  
150. ibid. p. 247  
151. ibid. p. 21  
152. ibid. p. 21  
~~153. ibid. p. 21~~  
153. Mikraoth Gedoloth-Vol V p. 29  
154. Penateuco p. 72  
155. ibid. p. 78  
156. ibid. p. 78  
157. ibid. p. 88  
158. ibid. p. 111  
159. ibid. p. 125  
160. ibid. p. 122 — 123  
161. ibid. p. 134  
162. ibid. p. 153  
163. ibid. p. 155  
164. ibid. p. 178  
165. ibid. p. 235  
166. ibid. p. 247  
167. ibid. p. 255  
168. ibid. p. 257  
169. ibid. p. 267  
170. ibid. p. 273  
171. Graetz-History of the Jews-Vol. V p. 623