

loves to communicate happiness to all, especially to the miserable, which begs from sinners only the pleasure of saving and healing them. Rich men take their titles from their best estates and their greatest achievements. God is the Father of mercies. He has infinite goodwill, which seeks an outlet for itself. Both mercy and judgment belong to God (Ps 101<sup>1</sup>), but not in the same sense. He only exerciseth judgment, but He delighteth in mercy. Anger is the background of His nature. His punishments (says a Church Father) 'are the forced offspring of willing faults.' Mercy rejoiceth over judgment, which is His strange work. 'As to full breasts,' says Leighton, 'it is a pleasure to God to let mercy forth.'

The careful student of the Psalms must be deeply impressed by the many references to God's mercy. This is the theme which gives the Psalms their supreme distinction as poetry. It warms and expands the Psalmist's soul; it gives him what, in other writers, we call genius; he exults and revels in his subject. Among 150 psalms there is only one psalm, the 88th, which is written entirely under a feeling of depression, and which ends without one word of consolation: 'as if it were hard for the Lord's love to give us such a warning,' says Adolphe Monod. The spirit, if not the literal refrain, in many of the psalms is, 'for His mercy endureth for ever,' 'mercy shall be built up for ever.' The Psalmist writes like one whose mind is baffled by the opulence of his theme; he adds image to image, and returns again to his darling task. He has a very rich vocabulary for mercy:

in most pagan tongues, there is not one word for it. One could easily discover many fine touches of exegesis in the Psalmist's doctrine of mercy. The translators of our Bible, in Englishing the synonyms for mercy, have combined the richest words in our mother tongue, such as loving-kindness, tender-mercies. The Psalmist loves the law; for, when most severe, it is love threatening, mercy entreating. 'Thy mercy, Lord, is in the heavens' (Ps 36<sup>5</sup>). It is heaven-high, without measure; like the sunshine, so liberal in its light and warmth, it fills all the space between God's throne and sinful man. He is 'plenteous in mercy' (Ps 86<sup>5</sup>), plenteous as God counts plenteousness; it is sovereign mercy in its abundance and generosity. 'God's tender mercies are above (or over) all His works,' like the canopy of the bright, kind, all-embracing skies—

'I say to thee, do thou repeat  
To the first man thou mayest meet  
In lane, highway, or open street,  
That we and all men move  
Under a canopy of love  
As broad as the blue sky above.'

His mercies are without measure or bounds; greater than all His works and ours, greater than creation, and than sin which is our creation. And God's mercy comes to us in the most merciful way, like rain upon the mown grass, like heaven's dew. 'The Lord taketh pleasure in those that hope in His mercy' (Ps 147<sup>11</sup>). Our faith gives pleasure to God. What wonderful mercy is this! 'His mercy endureth for ever.' It embraces and claims the two eternities.

---

## The Sefer Ha-Galuy of Saadya.

BY PROFESSOR W. BACHER, PH.D., BUDAPEST.

ABRAHAM IBN DĀUD closes the short statement which, in his historical work, *Sefer Ha-Kabbala*, he devotes to the Gaon Saadya (see *Medieval Jewish Chronicles*, ed. Neubauer, i. 66) with the following words:—'The rest of the history of Saadya and the benefits he wrought for Israel, behold they are told in the Sefer Ha-Galuy.' That this work, cited by the historian of the twelfth century as a source for the biography of the Gaon,

had Saadya himself for its author, we learn from another Spanish author of that period, the writer on astronomy, Abraham b. Chija († 1136). In speaking of the date of the Advent of the Messiah, the last-named author refers to the circumstance that the Gaon Saadya had also attempted to calculate the Messianic era, namely, in his commentary on Daniel, and in other writings of his, the Book of Dogmas (*Emunoth, Amānôt*), and the

Sefer Ha-Galuy. From these solitary notices of this lost book no correct conception of its contents could be derived. Now it happened in the sixties of the present century that the Karaite scholar Abraham Firkowitsch discovered in a *geniza* in Egypt a fragment of the Sefer Ha-Galuy, of which he published an account. But our first real knowledge of the fragment we owe to Harkavy, who published it in its entirety, along with a very full Apparatus, in the fifth volume of his *Studien u. Mittheilungen aus der kais. Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg* (ed. of the Society, 'Mekize Nirdamim,' Berlin, 1891). He gave a Hebrew translation of the Arabic text, and added a number of other very valuable fragments connected with the Sefer Ha-Galuy, derived from the St. Petersburg and Bodleian libraries.

The fragment edited by Harkavy contains only the opening lines of the work proper, breaking off there, but these are preceded by the lengthy Preface which Saadya prefixed to the Sefer Ha-Galuy, when he published it a second time with an Arabic translation of the Hebrew in which it was written. This Preface, which is really an apology for the work, gives a detailed account of the book itself, and Saadya even cites some expressions from the latter, in order to defend them against ill-natured criticism. As regards the aim of the Sefer Ha-Galuy, Saadya says expressly that he wrote it owing to the attacks and annoyances to which he was subjected by the partisans of the 'exilearch' (David b. Zakkai; see *Revue des Études Juives*, xxiv. 315). The book consisted of seven sections. In the fourth of these Saadya spoke of his own merits and of what he had been enabled by God's grace to do for his people. This is the part of the book which Abraham Ibn Dâud had in view in the passage cited at the beginning of this paper. In the fifth section Saadya dealt also with the 'future things,' and it must have been here that Abraham b. Chija found the calculation to which he refers. The last two sections (6 and 7) described the persecutions Saadya had to endure, and assailed the authors of these with pitiless satire. The third section was directed especially against the main inspirer of these persecutions, the 'exilearch' David b. Zakkai. The contents of the first two sections were of a more general character, but neither were they devoid of polemical references; the first glorified wisdom (science) and its benefits to the nation, the second

sought to fix the chronology of the biblical period and of the post-biblical centuries down to the close of the Talmud.

The Preface extant in the fragment edited by Harkavy gives details also regarding the *form* of the Sefer Ha-Galuy. Saadya wrote his polemical treatise in the Hebrew language, and attached himself to the methods of the Bible even in external points, dividing the text into verses and inserting the vowel and accentual signs, 'that it might be more easily read and better remembered.' He imitated likewise the narrative style of the Bible, for instance, speaking of himself in the third person, as we see from three of the phrases cited in the Preface, וישקר ויחל סעדיהו, ויער " את רוח סעדיהו, סעדיהו. Moreover, he laid great stress upon the linguistic form of his treatise. For, as he explains in his Preface in quite original fashion, the Sefer Ha-Galuy was not only meant to produce an effect by its contents, but to be an example and model of correct diction and good style, and to awaken in readers a perception of the principles that ensure purity and accuracy in the use of the Hebrew language. In this Saadya, as he himself tells us, had the same object in view as in his earlier works, 'the book on Hebrew poetry' (*i.e.* the second, enlarged, edition of the *Agrôn*) and 'the twelve books on the language' (*i.e.* Saadya's work on grammar, consisting of twelve books) [on the correct interpretation of this passage see *Revue des Études Juives*, xxiv. 310 f., and my *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik*, p. 38]. This aim of the book, to serve as a model for language and style, is expressed by Saadya in such a way that the seven sections spoken of above find alongside of them other three, which do not, however, make up separate portions of the book, but extend over the whole of it, and embrace it all (see *Revue des Études Juives*, xxiv. 314, and the forthcoming number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*).

It was especially the *form* of the Sefer Ha-Galuy that drew upon the Gaon Saadya the attacks which he repels in the present Preface to the second edition. Hostile critics discovered profanity and presumption in his imitation of the style of the Bible, as well as in the external matters of verse-division, vocalization, and accentuation, which were wont to be regarded as pertaining only to Holy Scripture. They charged Saadya with claiming for his work, by the use of these forms, the same authority as belonged to revealed writings.

This dangerous, even if ridiculous, charge is repelled by Saadya in the new Preface to the *Sefer Ha-Galuy*, in which he appeals to the fact that, even after the cessation of prophecy, the sages and teachers of Israel committed to writing, it might be a history of their times, or their own thoughts and ethical precepts, and that the particular works in question resemble in form the Scripture writings. As an illustration of such works Saadya names the book of *Ben-Sira*, which resembles the biblical book of Proverbs. And at the end of his Preface he cites from *Ben-Sira*'s work seven sayings, in order to show what profitable teaching may be extracted from it. These sayings are, as a matter of fact, present in the Greek *Ecclesiasticus*, namely, in the following passages: 5<sup>6</sup>. 6<sup>6</sup> 6<sup>7</sup>. 8<sup>8</sup> 11<sup>28</sup> 6<sup>13</sup> 16<sup>17</sup> 13<sup>12</sup>. Containing as it does these citations from the Hebrew original of *Sirach*, the fragment of the *Sefer Ha-Galuy* was, as it were, the precursor of the more important fragments which were brought to the light in so remarkable a way three years ago, and which directed investigation into new channels.

For the criticism of the Geniza text of the Hebrew *Ecclus.* the citations from the latter contained in Saadya's work are of quite peculiar value. The MSS from which these Hebrew *Sirach*-fragments are derived, belong to an epoch not far removed from that of Saadya. If, then, the latter writer quotes the Hebrew *Sirach*, he must have done so from a form of text not essentially different from that of the Geniza fragments. And, as a matter of fact, the language of the Geniza fragments tallies exactly, down even to minutiae, with Saadya's citations (see on this point my article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, xii. 285). In the case of only one of these citations, namely, 11<sup>28</sup>, was the Hebrew text still wanting. But now the passage in question has been published in the last number of the *J.Q.R.* (xii. 471) by Elkan N. Adler, from the Hebrew fragments that have come into his possession, and here, too, the above-mentioned verse (*Sir* 11<sup>28</sup>) corresponds exactly with the quotation in Saadya. The Adler fragments, as also the new fragments just published by Israel Lévi (*R.E.J.* xl. 3), have in some passages vowel and accentual signs, that is, they exhibit the remnant of the pointed form in which Saadya had the Hebrew *Sirach* before him.

The occurrence of citations from the Hebrew *Sirach* in a writing of the Gaon Saadya composed

in the first third of the tenth century could not fail of course to prove very awkward for the hypothesis of Professor D. S. Margoliouth, according to which the Geniza fragments are a retranslation from the Greek and the Syriac, which took its rise so late as the eleventh century. There was but one way of getting rid of this awkward witness, namely, to deny the genuineness of the *Sefer Ha-Galuy*. And Professor Margoliouth has boldly chosen this way. In a long article in last number of the *J.Q.R.* (xii. 502-531), he employs all the resources of learning and ingenuity at his disposal to prove that the Preface to the second edition and to the Arabic translation of the *Sefer Ha-Galuy* is, not what it gives itself out to be in the fragment edited by Harkavy, but that this fragment is a satire which borrows Saadya's name and parodies his style, having been composed by a Karaites after the year 962 for the purpose of covering with ridicule the Karaites' great enemy, the Gaon, who was no longer [he died in 942] alive. This startling attack upon the authenticity of a valuable survival of the literary productions of Saadya is followed, thanks to a commendable arrangement of the editor of the *J.Q.R.*, in the same number (pp. 532-554), by a defence of their authenticity from the pen of the man who had the first call to defend it, namely, Dr. Harkavy, the editor of the fragment. It is far from my intention, in the limited space at my disposal, to give even a brief *résumé* of this notable critical controversy. I may be allowed simply to express the firm conviction that already the issue of the dispute is not doubtful, the attempt of Professor Margoliouth to strengthen his own position by shattering the genuineness of the *Sefer Ha-Galuy* having proved a complete failure. No one who reads without prejudice the fragment edited by Harkavy can entertain the slightest doubt of its genuineness. In contents and language alike it agrees perfectly with what we know of Saadya from other sources. The few lines at the end of the fragment which formed the commencement of the *Sefer Ha-Galuy* proper, exhibit forms of words which to our taste are artificial, but which the taste of Saadya and his contemporaries regarded as finished and correct products of art, the very forms which we find elsewhere too, as Harkavy has well shown. And for Professor Margoliouth to exercise his wit on the specimens of biblical exegesis which the fragment contains, and to pronounce these irrecon-

cilable with Saadya's authorship, is to assume a wrong standpoint towards them. For, as in the case of the word-forms just spoken of, these expositions of Scripture must not be judged from the point of view of modern science. On the contrary, any one who is familiar with the biblical exegesis of Saadya will find, in the expositions to which Professor Margoliouth takes exception, nothing that deviates from Saadya's manner, nothing that does not bear the stamp of his exegetical method. But the other arguments by which Professor Margoliouth seeks to prove that it cannot be the Gaon Saadya that speaks to us in the fragment of the Sefer Ha-Galuy, equally fail to stand the test of more sober consideration. The inadequacy and emptiness of these arguments has been exhibited by Harkavy with all earnestness, and with that thorough acquaintance with the case which, it is needless to say, he possesses.

The weakness of the foundation upon which Professor Margoliouth's hypothesis rests must be evident to anyone who adopts the standpoint of this hypothesis and attempts to read the Sefer Ha-Galuy as if it were a satire parodying Saadya, written by a Karaite opponent of the Gaon. I do not believe that a single reader in the tenth century would have discovered in this 'satire' the polemical aim and the satirical allusions which Professor Margoliouth reads into it. I will bring forward only one instance, which is not mentioned by Harkavy, and which shows how uncritically Professor Margoliouth goes to work with this reading in of allusions. In the oft-mentioned opening lines of the Sefer Ha-Galuy it is said of Wisdom, **האלהים לעונו אצלה וישת לנאוונו**, 'את מעונתה' which Professor Margoliouth (p. 516) renders: 'The Lord God has reserved it for His might, and given to His Gaon its dwelling-place.' These words, he further remarks, 'contain an ambiguity that the Gaon himself would surely have avoided.' But who, on meeting the word **נאוונו** in such a connexion, would think of the title 'Gaon'? Saadya employs **נאוונו** in parallelism with **עונו** because the two expressions are coupled with one another in Holy Scripture (cf. Lv 26<sup>19</sup>, **נאון עונכם**; Ezk 24<sup>21</sup> 30<sup>6, 18</sup> 33<sup>28</sup>). And what right has Professor Margoliouth to translate **וישת** by 'given'? The meaning of the second clause is rather 'and made for His glory its dwelling' (cf. Jer 50<sup>3</sup>, **וישית את-ארצה לשפחה**). And how is one to un-

derstand those portions of the fragment in which particulars are given about Saadya's activity and his writings which tend entirely to his credit? What did his Karaite opponent mean by letting Saadya speak of his refutation of the heretical biblical critic, Chiwi of Balch, which is reckoned even by the Karaites amongst the merits of Saadya?—But it is simply impossible to work out in detail the hypothesis of Professor Margoliouth. The precious fragment, which, as a survival of a lost work of Saadya, is perfectly intelligible, and offers valuable contributions to our knowledge of his life and work, becomes a conglomeration of nonsense if we accept the truth of Professor Margoliouth's hypothesis, and decide to find in the fragment a piece of persiflage at Saadya's expense.

There is just one other question I should like to put to Professor Margoliouth. What bearing has his theory about the Sefer Ha-Galuy upon his hypothesis as to the Hebrew Sirach? It is of no consequence for the age and the currency of the Hebrew Sirach whether the fragments containing quotations from Sirach came from the pen of the Gaon Saadya in the year 934, or from the pen of a Karaite opponent of his thirty years later. Even upon Professor Margoliouth's theory of the Sefer Ha-Galuy, there was in the tenth century, in the epoch of Saadya, a Hebrew text of Sirach, with which the text of the Geniza fragments is in complete accord.

Finally, I may be permitted two separate remarks. Professor Margoliouth (p. 509) renders the expression **דקרוק שראיעהא**, occurring at the end of the *Yezira* commentary of Saadya (ed. Lambert, p. 106, l. 8), by 'a grammar of their sacred books.' Harkavy, in remarking on this peculiar rendering (p. 541), does not reject it decidedly enough. The expression **אחכאם פקההא**, which immediately follows, proves sufficiently that what is in view here is not the grammar of the language of the Bible, but the exact examination and exposition of the biblical commands (Arab. **שראיע** = Heb. **מצות**). **דקרוק** is a term borrowed from the vocabulary of the Talmud (see my *Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung*, p. 23 f.), which perhaps even as early as Saadya's time had the special sense of 'grammatical investigation,' but even so cannot possibly be understood in that sense in the passage in question in the *Yezira* commentary.

My second remark concerns the title of the

Sefer Ha-Galuy. Saadya himself renders ספר הגלוי by the Arabic **אַלְכִתְחָאב אַלְמַאָרַד**. Harkavy had explained אַלְמַאָרַד by הגולה, 'the exiled one,' and now (p. 550) supplements his explanation by remarking that אַלְמַאָרַד should be emended to אַלְמַרְרִי. But he forgets that in that case אַלְכִתְחָאב must also be emended to כְּתָאב, if the Arabic title is to signify 'book of the exiled one.' It is my own opinion that the interpretation of the Hebrew title upon which this explanation of the Arabic title rests is a mistaken one. When Saadya called his polemical treatise ספר הגלוי, he borrowed the title in any case from Jer 32<sup>14</sup>, but he understood the word הגלוי not in the sense of הגולה, 'the exiled one,' but probably in the same sense as that in which it was afterwards used by Joseph Kimchi in the title of his grammatical

treatise, which was written in opposition to Menahem b. Saruk and his champion, R. Jacob Tam. Joseph Kimchi himself declares that he gave the name ספר הגלוי to his work, **יַעַן כִּי גִלִיתִי דַעְתָּ רִיבֵי בּו**, 'because in it I have made known my views on the disputed questions.' The title would thus be = 'book of open unfolding,' which is a suitable enough title also for Saadya's treatise, in which he sets forth the calumnies he had to bear from his enemies, and makes his defence against these. The Arabic title, אַלְכִתְחָאב אַלְמַאָרַד, is not a literal rendering of the Hebrew title, but designates the Sefer Ha-Galuy on the ground of its contents as the book that 'drives away' the enemy (= *liber compellens*). This explanation, which I have already proposed in *R.E.J.* xxiv. 314, I still hold to be the correct one.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF GALATIANS.

GALATIANS VI. 7, 8.

'Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life' (R.V.).

#### EXPOSITION.

'Be not deceived.'—Let nothing lead you astray from the conviction that in the conformity of your real aims and actual practice with the dictates of God's Spirit, and in that alone, can you hope for eternal life.—HUXTABLE.

'God is not mocked.'—There is a terrible rebuke implied in the choice of this word [mocked]. It is far stronger than 'deceived.' The word means 'to sneer at,' and here denotes not merely the attempt to impose a cheat upon another, but the open gesture of contempt for one who is an easy dupe.—PEROWNE.

MEN may wrong each other; they may grieve and affront His ministers. But no man is clever enough to cheat God. It is not Him, it is *themselves* they will prove to have deceived. Vain and selfish men who take the best that God and man can do for them as though it were a tribute to their greatness, envious and restless men who break the Church's fellowship of peace, will reap at last even as they sow.—FINDLAY.

'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'—A proverbial expression (Job 4<sup>8</sup>) found also among classical writers (Aristotle, Cicero, etc.), but here spiritual-

ized and applied to the future reward and punishment. The present life is the seed-time, the future life the harvest. Who sows grain will reap grain, who sows tares will reap tares; who sows plentifully will reap plentifully, who sows sparingly will reap sparingly. Those who keep this great truth constantly before their eyes will redeem every hour and use every opportunity to do good.—SCHAFF.

'Unto his own flesh.'—At first sight the metaphor seems to be now slightly changed. Above the reference was to the quality and identity of the seed: here it appears rather to be to the nature of the soil in which the seed is sown. Probably, however, 'unto' denotes simply direction or tendency. If carnal indulgence is the end for which a man lives, moral ruin must be the result. If he aims at the higher life which comes through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the higher life will be his sure reward.—HOWSON.

'To sow to the flesh' is to employ that which is committed to our keeping—our time, our talents, our substance, our opportunities generally, in the service of the flesh, with a view to self-indulgence, present or to come. On the contrary, 'to sow to the Spirit' is to devote all our faculties—mental, corporeal, moral, and incidental, to the advancement of our spiritual interests; in scriptural language, 'to set our affections on things above,' and to exert every power which God hath graciously bestowed on us earnestly and perseveringly for their attainment.—GWYNNE.

'His own flesh' instead of 'the flesh' to bring out the idea of selfishness. Not only is his aim low, but it is directed to mere personal gratification.—DRUMMOND.

'Corruption.'—Employed generically to comprise not only 'the disorganization of the bodily frame,' and 'the ultimate destruction of soul and body in hell,' but 'all those