



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Graetz. Our author makes it evident that in all the quotations adduced by Rapoport in proof of his conjecture, the name of Kara does not occur in MSS., and even for Simeon we often read Samson. From the extracts of late Midrashim found in the *Yalqut*, e.g., the *Rabba* on Deuteronomy and the *Abkhir*, Herr Epstein is right in concluding that the *Yalqut* was compiled, at the earliest, at the beginning of the thirteenth century; this was also the opinion of Zunz, but our author adduces many more proofs for his conclusion. The bibliography of the *Yalqut* in print and in MSS., partially and entirely, with which Herr Epstein finishes his learned monograph, is a very welcome addition to the essay. A. N.

[P.S.—We are glad to find an opportunity for correcting an erroneous statement made in our Review on Herr Epstein's *Eldad* (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III., p. 542), and to which he kindly drew our attention. We there stated, following a quotation in the *Journal Asiatique*, that R. Jonah, in his dictionary, speaks of *Danites*, whilst in our edition of this Arabic text we adopted the reading of the Rouen MS., where it said: רנל הרני, the Danite, a reading which is also confirmed by Thabbon's translation, who gives דניאני הרני (See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I., p. 98, note 6.)]

Thomas Aquinas and Judaism.

Das Verhältniss des Thomas von Aquino zum Judenthum und zur jüdischen Litteratur (Avicbron und Maimonides). Von Dr. J. GUTTMANN. Göttingen: 1891.

THOMAS AQUINAS was no philosophical fanatic. As Dr. Guttman shows, he adopted Maimonides' theory of creation, though it was opposed to the current and traditional theology of the Church. His tolerance, moreover, was extended to Jews, as well as to their doctrines. He objected to any violent attempts at the conversion of the Jews, and maintained that the persecution of them was only lawful if necessary in self-defence—"Ut eos compellant ne fidem Christi impediant." He pronounced most emphatically against the forced baptism of Jewish children without the consent of their parents, partly on the prudential ground that the Church would suffer in prestige if these children subsequently relapsed to Judaism, and partly on the generous plea that such baptisms infringe the natural rights of parents—"Contra justitiam naturalem esset, si puer, antequam habeat usum rationis, a cura parentum subtrahatur, vel de eo aliquid ordinetur in vitis parentibus." Jews ought to be allowed the free exercise of their religion and the observance of its ceremonies. Necessary intercourse with Jews was quite permissible to pious

Christians, provided that the latter were sufficiently firm in their faith to incur no danger of being shaken in it by familiarity with unbelievers. As to the right of Jews to possess Christian slaves, Thomas gives a twofold answer. On the one hand, no new right of this kind should be granted; but existing rights must not be set aside: "Jus autem divinum, quod est ex gratia, non tollit jus humanum, quod est ex naturali ratione." A similar distinction was drawn by Aquinas on the question of usury, which greatly exercised the Mediæval Church. With regard to the Jewish usurers, Thomas points with satisfaction to the case of Italy, where the Jews did not practise money-lending, being permitted to engage in other enterprises, and suggests that the Jews should be "compelled" (how willingly would they have undergone this compulsion!) to earn their livelihood by industrial occupations. In his *De regimine Judæorum*, Aquinas justifies a less tolerant policy; but Dr. Guttman plausibly urges that he was answering the questions of the Archduchess Margaret of Flanders in her sense rather than in his own. Aquinas favours the retention of the degrading Jew-badge, and bases this opinion, as so many other theologians have done, on the fact that the Mosaic law had already enjoined a distinctively Jewish dress. But the Mosaic fringes were no longer worn by the Jews of his time on their outside garments, and a voluntary uniform is quite another thing than a legally enforced and rather hideous yellow patch.

Turning from Aquinas' views regarding the Jews to his relations with their literature, Dr. Guttman points out that Aquinas escaped one fruitful source of Jew-hatred—he was not instructed by converted Jews. Only in one solitary passage does he quote the Talmud. His knowledge of Judaism and of Jewish interpretations of Scripture was derived from Maimonides and Jerome. In his philosophy he was influenced from the Jewish side by the former of these, and by Ibn Gebirol (Avicbron), and it is to these influences that Dr. Guttman devotes his main attention. The author's present *brochure* is terser and less laboured than some of his previous works. He wisely adopts the newer fashion of displaying in full in the foot-notes the original passages commented on in the text; and, as a secondary advantage, Dr. Guttman's essay will thus be quite intelligible to readers who can read Latin but not German. Interesting, however, as are Dr. Guttman's parallels and contrasts, the interest lies rather in the fact that Aquinas consciously studied the works of two leading Jewish philosophers, and drew occasional inspiration from them, than in the actual points of contact themselves. Therefore I shall only briefly indicate what are the precise parallels elaborated by Dr. Guttman with his usual breadth of philosophical knowledge and depth of critical insight.

Aquinas devotes a special treatise, *De substantiis separatis*, to a full criticism of Ibn Gebirol's characteristic doctrines ("quem," says Thomas, "multi sequuntur") regarding the distribution into matter and form of *substantiæ separatæ* (angels, spiritual beings lower than the divine grade), and Ibn Gebirol's theory that the same identical substance is the underlying basis of material and spiritual beings. Aquinas and the Thomists after him reject these doctrines, but they continued to exercise an influence, since they formed one of the battlegrounds between the Thomists and their opponents the Scotists. Aquinas, however, owed much more to Maimonides than to Avicbron; and Dr. Guttmann occupies two-thirds of his brochure (pp. 31-92) with this topic. It is not merely in the adoption of isolated philosophical doctrines that Aquinas shows his indebtedness to Maimonides, for, as Dr. Guttmann shows, the whole theology of the Christian scholasticism was tinged and moulded by that of his Jewish predecessor. To the Patristic school Plato had been the guiding light, and the teachings of the Church had gradually been brought into harmony with the Platonic system. In the 13th century, however, Aristotle regained the supremacy, but the more pronounced that the predominance of Aristotle became, the more difficult grew the task of reconciling philosophy with religion, the Bible having been proved to agree with Plato and not with Aristotle. Moses Maimonides in his *Guide to the Perplexed* had largely solved this urgent problem by elaborating a harmony between Aristotle and the Scriptures. Maimonides' work was translated into Latin at the beginning of the 13th century, and gave a strong impulse to scholastic movements in the same direction. In this tendency, Saadiah, Judah Halevi and Abraham ibn Daud had led the way, but their works, says Dr. Guttmann, were inaccessible to Aquinas, who was, however, well acquainted with the *Guide* of Maimonides. This is no doubt true, but Thomas, it seems to me, if under no direct obligation to Saadiah, shows a remarkable coincidence with Saadiah's method. In the *Summa Theologica* Aquinas always comes forward with a text, and then proceeds to prove his case by arguments based on reason. This, occasionally in the reverse order, is Saadiah's invariable course; it is certainly not that of Maimonides. Dr. Guttmann takes the points of contact between Maimonides and Aquinas in the following order:—Reason and Revelation, Knowledge of God, God and his Attributes, The Doctrine of Creation, Angels and Prophecy, on many of which subjects Dr. Guttmann shows that Aquinas adopted the conclusions of Maimonides. The third part of the *Guide* is occupied with a more or less rationalistic explanation of the Mosaic ordinances, which are thus forcibly wrenched into accord with the Maimonist philosophy. Aquinas adopts a large part of this section of Maimonides' work. He fully accepts the Jewish philosopher's

doctrine that all the Pentateuchal laws had a rational justification, and were intended to promote a reasonable worship of God. Aquinas accepts Maimonides' well-known theory of the sacrifices, but adds to it in place of the Jewish philosopher's rational exposition a mystical reference to types. He utilises Maimonides' views on many other rites and ordinances; but for a detailed account of these points of agreement I must refer the reader to Dr. Guttman. His essay is a distinct contribution to the history of the influence of Jewish on general philosophy, and forms a worthy continuation of Jellinek's publications regarding Aquinas, and of Joel's able inquiry into the relation of Albertus Magnus to Maimonides.

I. ABRAHAMS.

ד"ר. *Erläuterungen der Psalmen-Haggada von R. Jedaia Penini Bedarschi, lebte im 14. Jahrhundert. Herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung versehen.* Von SALOMON BUBER, Krakau, 1891 (in Hebrew).

WE have lately mentioned this author's indefatigable zeal for the Midrashic literature (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III., p. 769). The present edition of Jedaiah's commentary on a part of the Midrash on the Psalms, issued in honour of Dr. Jellinek's seventieth birthday, will be welcomed by scholars, since the old edition of 1559 is not to be easily obtained. Of course, Jedaiah's philosophical commentary on chapters i.—xxxvii., and cix., will not give us a better understanding of this Midrash, but the work belongs to the better class of rabbinic literature, and the author of it is well known by his ethical work in rhymed prose, called *Behinath Olam*, or "Examination of the World." Herr Buber follows here his usual method in giving a preface on the life and the writings of the author whose work he edits. He enumerates first the MSS. in which this commentary is to be found, continuing with the commentator's biography, and the enumeration of his works. The editor was well prepared for his task, having derived his information from libraries and from various catalogues, and, above all, he had the advantage of being able to make use of the advanced sheets of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, x., xxxi., not yet published, a work which will contain a very detailed article concerning the poet and philosopher of Bézières, the son of the poet Abraham of Bézières, based upon the latest researches.

A. NEUBAUER.