



PROJECT MUSE®

Recently Published Books

Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism, Volume 4, 2004, pp.
299-330 (Article)

Published by Indiana University Press
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/ale.2004.0004>



➔ *For additional information about this article*
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/176041>

Recently Published Books

Editor's note: *Aleph* does not publish book reviews in the usual sense, but only notices of varying length, which more often than not are merely informative and non-evaluative. For books published in Hebrew, the English title is given in parentheses only when it is in the book itself. Authors' names are given according to their common English spelling, usually as indicated by the publisher. All notes are by the Editor, unless otherwise indicated. We will be pleased to announce the appearance of new books in areas of interest to our readers. Authors and publishers are invited to send copies of their books to the Editorial Office.

Longue durée

Julius Guttman, **Die Philosophie des Judentums**, mit einer Standortbestimmung von Esther Seidel und einer biographischen Einführung von Fritz Bamberger. Berlin: Jüdische Verlagsanstalt, 2000. 447 pp.

Julius (Yiṣḥaq) Guttman's (1880–1950) classic history of Jewish philosophy appeared in Munich in 1933. It was at once the culmination of the endeavors of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* in this area of study and its funeral oration. A Hebrew version, supervised by the author himself, was published in Jerusalem in 1951. In fact, it was more than a mere translation: two new chapters were added (on Nachman Krochmal and on Franz Rosenzweig), as well as numerous updates and corrections. This Hebrew edition—Guttman's definitive version of his work—was subsequently translated into English (various editions, beginning in 1964) and into French (1994).

The republication of Guttman's masterpiece on German soil, half a century after the Shoah, cannot but rejoice the onlooker. But the joy does not last: the text offered here is Guttman's 1933 German text, without change. The two additional chapters and the other additions or modifications

Guttmann introduced in the 1951 Hebrew version have not been taken into account. Guttmann's dedication to his venerated father was not deemed worthy to be reproduced; the subject index, too, has been omitted.

The book includes a biography of Guttmann by Fritz Bamberger (first published in English in 1960) and a previously unpublished brief survey of historical writing on Jewish philosophy by Esther Seidel (pp. 397–442).

No foreword warns the unsuspecting reader that this volume, published (as the dust jacket affirms) “in time for the fiftieth anniversary of the author's death,” is an outdated version of the *Philosophie des Judentums*, whose republication in this form Guttmann himself would almost certainly not have authorized. From the scholarly perspective, this publication is a shame; morally, it is a betrayal of Guttmann's legacy and memory. The person(s) who compiled the volume (understandably) chose to remain anonymous.

Mordechai Breuer, *אהלי תורה: הישיבה, תבניתה ותולדותיה* (The Tents of Torah. The Yeshiva, Its Structure and History). Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2003. 648 pp.

Mordechai Breuer rightly construes the yeshiva as the Jewish institution of higher learning par excellence, the equivalent of the *madrasa* in Islamic society and of the university in the Christian world. This book traces its history over a thousand years, up to the eve of the Shoah. The first chapter provides terminological clarifications. The second offers a concise survey of the history of the yeshiva, insisting that the prevalent view that the institution changed but little during the course of its existence is erroneous. The third chapter is a systematic survey of the subject matter studied in yeshivot, with varying emphases in various times and places: not only Talmud, but also the code of Alfasi, the *Mishneh Torah*, and commentaries on the Talmud; the chapter also includes a useful paragraph on reference works used in yeshivot. The next chapter considers the study of subjects such as Bible, Mishnah, aggadah, philosophy and musar (these two share a single paragraph!), kabbalah, and piyyut. In every case the discussion is diachronical, providing information on what subjects were studied where and in what period. The fifth chapter tackles

methods of study, with the aim of explaining “the exceptional phenomenon that studies that revolved around the same texts for hundreds of years preserved their vitality” (p. 166). The author finds the answer in the fact that study was always built on a dialectic discussion—one scholar advancing a thesis and another countering with an antithesis, with the discussion being conducted in an atmosphere of full “academic freedom.” Scholars' competence was evaluated on the basis of both their mastery of texts and their analytical capacity, whence the usually positive view of “innovations” (*ḥiddushim*, i.e. novellae). Breuer highlights the methodological differences between the yeshivot of Ashkenaz and those of Spain and Provence. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the former were characterized by a greater freedom of thought and resembled universities in the effort to harmonize ancient texts with innovative interpretations. The Spanish yeshivot were understandably more influenced by philosophy (e.g., the application of Aristotelian logic). The pride of place they gave to *ḥiddushim* and logic eventually led to the rise of *pilpul* (whose precise origin is in dispute), which many considered to be a degeneration of study aimed at truth and which aroused great opposition starting in the eighteenth century. Breuer focuses on the various meanings that were attached to the term *pilpul* and tries to explain how *pilpul* survived over the centuries despite the criticisms leveled against it.

Chapter six gives a lively description of how teaching was done: the language of instruction (often Hebrew); the relationship between master and students and the ways of transmitting knowledge; the relative importance of written and oral knowledge in different periods; the impact of printing on methods of study. The seventh chapter examines the administration and economic organization of the yeshiva. Chapter eight is devoted to the appointment and status of yeshiva deans and teachers and a profile of the student body. Teacher-student relations are further discussed in chapter nine: the goals of study, approbations, and the everyday life of students. Chapter ten takes up further aspects of the life of the students, such as their collective activities, marriage, and travel. Chapter eleven looks at the relationships between the yeshiva and the community and discusses various attitudes to the

sensitive question of remuneration of rabbis. The twelfth and last chapter is a conclusion that tries to place contemporary yeshivot and their problems into a historical context.

From the perspective of the historian of science the appearance of this synthesis is most welcome: it offers a point of departure for understanding how the production and transmission of knowledge were institutionalized within Judaism. One of the intriguing questions it raises is whether and to what extent the yeshivot were influenced by contemporary non-Jewish institutions of higher education, especially the European universities. The author obviously had this question at the back of his mind and makes a number of allusions to similarities and possible influences (see in the index under *universita'ot*). It is to his credit that although he tends to think that the non-Jewish environment indeed influenced the methods of study of the yeshivot, he does not take the “similarities” as demonstrating such influence beyond doubt. This question remains open. Another issue raised implicitly is how secular subjects were studied, notably whether and how they were institutionalized. This question, too, calls for further investigation.

Peter Barker, Alan C. Bowen, José Chabás, Gad Freudenthal, and Y. Tzvi Langermann, eds., **Astronomy and Astrology from the Babylonians to Kepler: Essays Presented to Bernard R. Goldstein on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday** (= *Centaurus* 45 [2003] and 46 [2004] [1]).

It is particularly fitting that *Aleph* take notice of the publication of this Festschrift in honor of one of the most active members of its Editorial Advisory Board. As the title indicates, the Festschrift bears on chapters in the history of astronomy from its inception through the seventeenth century. Of the twenty-four papers, a number are directly related to the concerns of *Aleph*.

In Part I (*Centaurus*, vol. 45): P. Kunitzsch and Y. T. Langermann, “A Star Table from Medieval Yemen” (pp. 159–74), which describes a star list accompanying the *Zij al-muḥaffarī* by the thirteenth-century Yemenite astronomer al-Fārīsī, some of whose manuscripts are in Hebrew letters; G. Freudenthal, “‘Instrumentalism’ and ‘Realism’ as Categories in the History of

Astronomy: Duhem vs. Popper, Maimonides vs. Gersonides” (pp. 227–48), which revisits the notorious question of Maimonides’ epistemology of celestial science; R. Glasner, “Gersonides’ Unusual Position on ‘Position’ ” (pp. 249–63), which points out that Gersonides drew the theoretical content of his notion of position from Aristotelian logic rather than geometry and explains this unexpected choice as the result of his realistic approach to science; J. L. Mancha, “Right Ascensions and Hippopedes: Homocentric Models in Levi ben Gerson’s *Astronomy*. I. First Anomaly” (pp. 264–83), which offers the Latin text of Chapter 22 of Gersonides’ *Astronomy*, along with a translation and commentary; T. Lévy, “Immanuel Bonfils (XIV^e s.): Fractions décimales, puissances de 10 et opérations arithmétiques” (pp. 284–304), which reviews and revises the claims made by Salomon Gandz in 1936 on behalf of Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils of Tarascon as the inventor of decimal fractions.

In Part II (*Centaurus*, vol. 46 [1]): J. Samsó, “Abraham Zacut and José Vizinho’s *Almanach perpetuum* in Arabic (16th–19th C.)” (pp. 82–97), which offers a preliminary survey of manuscripts relating to the diffusion in the Maghreb of the *Almanach* ascribed to Abraham Zacut but probably compiled by José Vizinho, from the seventeenth century onward.

Last, but certainly not least, the Festschrift includes an already outdated list of Prof. Goldstein’s publications (vol. 45, pp. 4–15), including ten books and monographs, 118 articles, and 39 reviews.

Meir Balaban, 1868–1304, **תולדות היהודים בקראקוב ובקאז'ימיר** (A History of the Jews in Cracow and Kazimierz, 1304–1868). Translation from the Polish and edited by Jakub Goldberg. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2002. Two vols., vii+13+1089 pp.

Meir Balaban (1877–1942), the noted historian of Polish Jewry, published the two volumes of his masterly *History of the Jews of Cracow* in Polish in 1931 and 1936. The language barrier has made them inaccessible to most interested readers. It is therefore a most welcome idea to have this monumental work translated into Hebrew. It is easy to imagine how many hurdles had to be—and were—overcome to carry out this enterprise (which stretched over

some twenty years). I cannot judge the accuracy of the translation, but the Hebrew text reads fluently and hardly bears the disturbing marks of a translation. Especially praiseworthy is the fact that the editors made the effort to check the references and restore the original Hebrew texts where Balaban quoted them in translation. The physical production of the book, too, is commendable.

As the title indicates, the history studied here runs from the fourteenth century to the late nineteenth. Balaban's outlook was largely that of a social historian, so we have much information relating to *histoire événementielle*, economic history, judicial history, family history, institutional history, demographic history, etc. Information bearing on the history of ideas must usually be gleaned here and there. Balaban's short paragraphs on the educational system (pp. 355–63, 813–816) give a good idea of the curriculum in the *heder* and yeshiva. Also briefly treated are the kinds of literature studied (pp. 364–70), important rabbis who held posts in Cracow (pp. 371–79, 810–813), the short-lived influence of the Renaissance, and the influence of Sabbateanism, Frankism, and Hasidism (pp. 800–810). Material on Jewish printing in Cracow (pp. 380–391, 816–818) straddles intellectual and economic history and foreshadows modern interest in the subject. In different contexts (pp. 346–350, 831–838), we find interesting information on the university studies (or lack thereof) of Jewish physicians, who may have played a role in transmitting recent scientific or medical knowledge to the Cracow community. The book briefly discusses the arrival of the Haskalah in Poland.

The index of names is detailed but could bear some improvements: some rabbis are entered under their acronyms (e.g., Rambam), while R. Moses Isserles (Rema) must be sought under Isserles. The index of places is very useful, but the absence of an index of book titles, not to mention a subject index, is regrettable.

Balaban referred to various *realia* that made up his environment—buildings, cemeteries, archives, etc.—in the present tense. Few of them still exist today. This makes this book a necrology for the culture it studies and its reading a sad experience.

Antiquity

Pierre Thillet, ed. and trans., **Alexandre d'Aphrodise, "Traité De la providence". Version arabe de Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus**. Lagrasse: Verdier, 2003.

Many of the treatises of Alexander of Aphrodisias (close of the second century CE) were translated from Greek into Arabic; some—including the present treatise—are extant only in these translations. In 1960, Pierre Thillet announced he had discovered a manuscript of Alexander's lost treatise on providence. In his *doctorat d'État* of 1979 (unfortunately not included in the bibliography here), he presented the edited Arabic text and a French translation, as well as substantive studies of the issues raised by the text. Twenty-four years later, after two other scholars had produced editions and translations of this text (H.-J. Ruland in 1976 [an unpublished doctoral dissertation in German] and M. Zonta [Italian] in 1999), Thillet has finally published his (reworked) edition of the Arabic text and a French translation, preceded by a concise introduction, excerpted from the material included in the five volumes of his dissertation. Alexander's treatise exerted a strong influence on thinking about Providence by the Aristotelian school, notably in the philosophical literature in Arabic, including Maimonides (who in his *Guide of the Perplexed* seems to mention Alexander's *On Providence*) and Averroes. Consequently, although Alexander's treatise was not translated into Hebrew, its impact is palpable throughout medieval Hebrew philosophy. The present edition and French translation, along with Zonta's recent edition, will certainly make it easier to get acquainted with this important treatise and identify the marks it left on Hebrew philosophical thought.

Sacha Stern, **Time and Process in Ancient Judaism**. Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2003. 144 pp.

This book advances a strong thesis, which the author qualifies as "radical" (p. 25); the fact that its topic lies at the core of the concerns of *Aleph*, together with the breadth of the book's scope, warrant a relatively detailed notice.

Stern's theoretical vantage point is that of anthropology. Underlying the entire work is the assumption that "[our modern notion of] time is only a man-made, cultural construct," "a reified abstraction," which is not shared by all human cultures (pp. 5, 18–20): Stern sides with scholars who, following Evans-Pritchard, hold that "time in non-modern societies is concrete, embedded, and process-linked" (p. 16). Stern's specific claim in this book is that this also applies to ancient Judaism: the notion of time as "an entity that flows on its own independently from the rest of reality" (p. 16), which he takes to be our modern notion, is not to be found in Judaism before it came under the influence of Greek-Arabic philosophy in the ninth century.

To understand what Stern means by this and many similar statements, I think it would be helpful to read the book out of order. Begin with the first part of Chapter Five (pp. 90–98), which studies the Greek notion, or rather notions, of time. In early Greek sources, *chronos* denotes "an independent, infinite continuum that flows eternally of its own accord and that is endowed with active, quasi-divine qualities which determine the course of events and history" (p. 94). Later philosophers, beginning with Plato, "endorsed" this "prevailing" Greek view of time "as an autonomous substance or entity" (p. 95); so did the Stoics, the Neoplatonists, and other schools, as well as Roman culture in general. Aristotle is a lone exception: defining time as a number of motion, he (implicitly) rejected the "reification of time" (p. 95 and n. 30). This section of Chapter Five introduces us to Stern's central thesis that the "prevailing" Greek and Roman concept of time is absent from pre-medieval Judaism, which lacks the notion of *chronos* "in its general sense (as a flowing continuum, an active agent, a commodity, etc.)" (p. 99).

Consider, then, the Jewish sources. The Greek concept of time, Stern maintains, is absent from the Hebrew Bible (pp. 107–12), claims to the contrary notwithstanding. Nor is it to be found in Qumran texts, the Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha (pp. 103–107). We next turn to the early rabbinic sources, to which the book devotes the closest attention (chapters 1–3). Contrary to what many people assume, the rabbinic term *zeman* does not denote "a self-standing or 'pure' entity, a universal dimension, a flow or a

continuum," Stern maintains, but rather "the measurement of the occurrence and length of processes, natural events, and human activities" (p. 29). Not only is there no word for "time" in early rabbinic culture; "the concept itself was alien" to it (p. 31). A thorough search yields no signs of an "implicit awareness" of the notion of "time in general" (pp. 34 ff.). Instead—and this brings us to the positive part of the thesis—"in apparently temporal contexts, such as time-reckoning, early rabbinic literature only assumes the existence of a range of activities, events, and processes, without ever resorting to the abstract synthesis of the time-dimension. ... In all these contexts early rabbinic sources do not assume a notion of time, but only in fact a notion of *process* (more precisely, a notion of many processes)" (p. 34; italics in the original). To substantiate this thesis, Stern reviews numerous sources that have been or could be taken to evince a notion of time and argues in each case that such an interpretation is erroneous. This is notably the case with texts that relate to timing and time-reckoning (Chap. 2): "The times that are provided in the Mishnah and elsewhere are generally expressed in terms of processes, such as human activity and (more commonly) natural phenomena" (p. 47); instead of time, we have merely timing, which is a relationship of simultaneity or precedence between halakhic activities and does not presuppose a "general" notion of time (p. 47). Against his own position in earlier publications, Stern argues that calendars, too, must not be perceived as the outgrowth of the abstract (Greek and our) notion of time; the same applies to chronologies ("long-range time-reckoning" [p. 72]). Rather, calendars and chronologies are related to the coordination or sequential ordering of events and activities (Chap. 3). Much the same holds for Hellenistic Jewish literature (second part of Chapter Five, pp. 98–102): in numerous contexts where one would expect the Greek notion of time to appear, its absence is conspicuous. Josephus, Philo, and some others are notable exceptions, but they do not disprove the thesis, because they were writing under the influence of Greek culture and for readerships informed by it.

The general conclusion is that "[the Greek] concept [of time] was not fundamentally Jewish" (p. 101), a statement that should perhaps be understood

as meaning that it was fundamentally un-Jewish. This conclusion is buttressed in Chapter Four, which juxtaposes early rabbinic notions of time with their counterparts in medieval texts (halakhic and other) that describe (or prescribe) concrete human behavior and *habitus*. Medieval Jewish thinkers (like the Greeks and we moderns) treated time as a precious commodity of finite quantity that must not be wasted, an idea for which one looks in vain in the early rabbinic writings. Stern takes this to mean that the medieval thinkers, unlike the early rabbis, availed themselves of the notion of time “as a category,” “an entity in itself” (p. 86, 87). In the later Middle Ages, he says, we witness a “radical transformation of the rabbinic notion of time” (p. 88), whose source he unsurprisingly detects in the “extraneous tradition of Greek and Muslim philosophy” (p. 89).

Stern’s foray into the Middle Ages highlights three points. First, his analysis accounts for the fact that modern Judaism “switched” from the ancient to the Greek-modern notion of time. Second, it shows that halakhah is compatible with both notions, thus excluding halakhic considerations as a factor in the attitudes analyzed. Third, and very importantly, he makes clear what kind of statements he would have considered as testifying to the Greek-modern notion of time in early rabbinic writings. Central to this group of statements are those that construe time as a scarce commodity. But does such a construal indeed testify unequivocally that time is an “independent entity” as construed by the Greek? Stern’s own analysis casts some doubt on this. For it was after all Aristotle’s notion of time (and not the Greek “prevailing” notion) that influenced the medieval Jewish thinkers mentioned by Stern, above all Maimonides. Aristotle’s view of time as the number of motion is fully endorsed by Maimonides, who more than once underscores that he construes time as an accident of motion (*Guide* 1:52; 1:73; II, Introduction, 15th Proposition; II:13; II:30). But if Maimonides could hold this Aristotelian view, yet also “often refer to time as a scarce resource” (p. 86), then perhaps the contrast postulated by Stern between the Greek “reified” notion of time as an “independent entity” and other notions, including Aristotle’s, was not perceived as such by the historical actors themselves? Perhaps this opposition

is itself a “reification” projected onto the historical reality? More generally, Stern ignores almost completely discussions of time in medieval Jewish philosophical texts. This may be due to the anthropologists’ preference for texts that reflect the concepts of “real people.” But Stern does discuss Greek philosophers. What is more, as the case of Maimonides shows particularly well, medieval Jewish philosophy cannot be strictly separated from halakhah and real life. (Maimonides was aware that some Greek philosophers construed time as having “real existence”; but what troubled him was whether time could be held to have existed before creation; see e.g. *Guide* II:13.)

Stern situates the difference between Greece and pre-medieval Judaism in their wider contexts. Judaism should be viewed as a part of the ancient Near Eastern culture as a whole, from which the Greek concept of time was absent (pp. 112–116). Jewish culture thus conforms to the general contemporary outlook in the Near East. The Greek concept of time, by contrast, has parallels in ancient Iran and in India (pp. 116–120). Stern thus makes the general claim that (with a few exceptions) “the concept of time as a cosmic power and entity in its own right, which we find to be common to ancient Greece (*chronos*), Iran (*Zruuan*), and India (*Kāla*), may thus be identified as a specifically *Indo-European* tradition [to be understood, Stern makes clear, as a linguistic category], which would stand in contrast with the ancient Semitic cultures of Mesopotamia and the Levant, where this concept appears not to have existed” (p. 118). Stern sees the “reification of time” in this tradition as a special case of a characteristic tendency to reify or hypostatize abstract notions, a disposition that has been perpetuated in the Western intellectual tradition (p. 120).

In his last pages, Stern generalizes his findings. “Native Jewish culture” in Palestine resisted Greek influence with respect to the notion of time. Such a “fundamental concept,” however, “would have been much more vulnerable to foreign influence than any highbrow academic discipline” such as law, rhetoric, or philosophy (p. 125), whence one may conclude, by a *mutatis mutandis* reasoning, that a “profound gulf ... separated the early rabbis, and possibly other literate Jews, from the dominant culture of the Graeco-Roman world” (p. 126). The inquiry into notions related to time ends up by bringing out

“something important, perhaps not sufficiently appreciated, about the extent of the cultural isolation of ancient Jews” (p. 126). Paradoxically, Judaism became receptive to the influence of Greek thought at a period when there were hardly any more Greeks around, viz., through the influence of Arabic thought (p. 126).

The reader may now turn to the Introduction, much of which is difficult to follow before one has read the pages on (Stern’s views of) the Greek notion of time. The Introduction argues for the epistemological soundness of the inquiry. Stern argues in some detail that there is a *true* view of time, the object of universal consensus, according to which “*time exists and is real*” (p. 11; italics in the original). Now this strong (and questionable) assumption is quite unnecessary in the present context. Anthropologists need not commit themselves to a position on “what, then, is time?” (pp. 10–12): are the findings of anthropology contingent upon changes in philosophical or physical theories of time? Probably no more than Norbert Elias’ thesis that the “reification of time” goes back to Galileo and Newton can be refuted by showing that the “Newtonian [notion of] absolute time was radically revised in Einstein’s special theory of relativity” (p. 20). But having committed himself to “the true” view, and in the face of the claim made by certain authors that societies all show some, at least implicit awareness “of the general category of time” (p. 16), Stern feels it is necessary to explain that “time is not ‘real’ but only a theoretical abstraction” (p. 17); that societies other than ours can do, and did, very well without it; and that “the absence of a concept of time in non-modern world-views is not as strange or as foolish it might appear at first sight” (p. 18). But all this effort seems to me expended in the wrong place. The discussions within and around the constructivist program in the sociology of knowledge have long ago made clear that the study of the social construction of something does not presuppose any knowledge of Truth. Stern would have strengthened his exposition had he contented himself with juxtaposing the Greek view of time (to which we moderns are indebted) to its absence in ancient Judaism and to whatever notions related to time we find in the latter.

If one disregards the epistemological weakness of the Introduction and attends to Stern’s historical argument itself, the result is impressive: Stern has gone through a great variety of sources and used them to support his “radical” thesis concerning the absence of the Greek-modern notion of time in ancient Judaism. As Stern himself acknowledges, the positive part of the thesis, concerning the notion of “process” through which ancient Judaism captures “aspects of time” or “apparently temporal contexts,” requires “additional elaboration” (p. 4). The truth of the thesis hinges on the interpretation of many different sources and can be assessed only by specialists. But as a good Popperian I would urge that, even if refuted, the strong conjecture put forward in *Time and Process in Ancient Judaism* will have been fruitful in that it directed our attention to and illuminated a neglected yet fundamental aspect of Jewish thought.

Middle Ages

Saadya Gaon, **The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs**. An Abridged Edition. Translated from the Arabic with an Introduction and Notes by Alexander Altmann. New Introduction by Daniel H. Frank. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 2002. 194 pp.

The late Alexander Altmann published his translation of selected chapters from Saadia Gaon’s *Book of Doctrines and Beliefs* in 1946. Two years later, S. Rosenblatt published his full, but inferior, translation. Altmann’s version, which has remained available in *Three Jewish Philosophers* (first published 1977), is now reprinted separately. Altmann’s very short Introduction (here paginated pp. 11–24) is a model of clarity and breadth. Daniel H. Frank’s up-to-date “Select Bibliography” will be useful for neophyte readers; a subject index would have made this small volume even more useful. The omission of Altmann’s dedication to Isaac Heinemann—“Guide, Philosopher and Friend” (preserved in *Three Jewish Philosophers*)—is regrettable: dedications are of both historical and emotional value. I think that when an author is no longer among the living and cannot personally oversee a reprinting, editors—unless they have

very good reasons to the contrary—should view the original dedication as a kind of moral testament, which must be scrupulously reproduced.

Le Guide des égarés. Traité de théologie et de philosophie par Moïse ben Maimoun dit Maïmonide, traduit pour la première fois sur l'original arabe par S. Munk. Nouvelle édition. Préface de Haïm Zafrani. Paris, Maisonneuve et Larose, 2003. XXI+xvi+463+xvi+381+xxiv+532 pp.

The three volumes of Salomon Munk's classic French translation of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* appeared in Paris between 1856 and 1866. They were reprinted in 1970, in a very expensive edition. A cheaper edition was published in the 1970s, but with the omission of almost all of Munk's extremely valuable notes. The present edition presents all of Munk's original *œuvre* in a single soft-cover volume, with a short preface by the late Prof. Haim Zafrani. This very reasonably priced volume is certainly a must for everyone interested in Maimonides (and who reads French).

Haviva Pedaya, הרמב"ן. התעלות: זמן מחזורי וטקסט קדוש (Nahmanides: Cyclical Time and Holy Text). Tel-Aviv: Am Oved Publishers, 2003. 510 pp.

Haviva Pedaya's purpose is to apprehend the complexity of the thought of Nahmanides (Moshe ben Naḥman, 1194–1270), which she construes as an attempt to offer a Jewish theology that responds simultaneously to the challenges posed by the authoritative texts, philosophy, and kabbalah. The two main *topoi* discussed are time (linear and circular) and place (mainly with respect to the Holy Land). Concerning the former (interestingly, time is the subject of another volume reviewed here), Pedaya examines various notions, both implicit and explicit, of cosmic-metaphysical time (cycles of destruction and regeneration of the world, the latter culminating in *bit'allut*, a return to the point of origin, but on a qualitatively higher level [p. 412]) and of historic time. She devotes special attention to Nahmanides' relationship to oral and written traditions of early Jewish mysticism and kabbalah, and presents both the masters from whom Nahmanides may have learned esoteric traditions and the students to whom he may have in turn transmitted his own esoteric teachings.

(It may bear noting that the back-cover blurb intimates that Pedaya herself received esoteric teachings from her grandfather.) This inquiry allows Pedaya to study Nahmanides' views and their subsequent interpretations in the context of continuous traditions of interpretation. (By contrast, the historical context is totally left out—there are few dates in the book.) Specifically, the different construals of the notion of cyclical time (*torat ha-šemiṭot*), according to which the world is destroyed and then, after a period in which it lies waste, is created again, are discussed in detail. In this context Nahmanides naturally drew on current scientific ideas that he integrated into his kabbalistically inspired doctrines.

Marian Gómez Aranda, **Sefarad científica. Ibn Ezra, Maimónides y Zacuto.** La visión judía de la ciencia en la edad media. Tres Cantos: Nivola, 2003. Novatores, vol. 13. 157 pp.

This small volume provides Spanish readers with an introduction to the history of scientific thought among Jews in medieval Spain, followed by three short chapters on Abraham Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, and Abraham Zacut. The book, addressed to the nonspecialist, testifies to the increasing interest in Spain in its Jewish past. The physical production—cover, paper, layout, print, illustrations, etc.—is exceptionally beautiful.

Ephraim Kanarfogel, **“Peering through the Lattices”: Mystical, Magical, and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period.** Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2000. 274 pp.

A “number of tosafists did acquire, perhaps from their ancestors as well as from the German pietists, interest in areas that can certainly be termed mystical. Indeed, these tosafists must be added to the list of medieval rabbinic scholars who pursued spiritual disciplines outside the confines of pure legalism and talmudic studies. The inclusion of tosafists in this group constitutes a significant shift in our view of medieval Jewish intellectual history,” writes Kanarfogel at the end of his Preface (p. 12). These sentences disclose both his historiographical matrix and his main thesis. The former is inspired by the late

Isadore Twersky, who urged that while Judaism is “halakho-centric,” Jewish scholars in all periods sought to give their religiosity spiritual (philosophical or mystical) dimensions as well. The book’s main thesis, which confirms Twersky’s outlook, is that the tosafists, those innovative Talmud scholars in the generations following Rashi, were the depositories of mystical traditions that complemented their Talmud-centered religiosity: “Ascetic practices and mystical and magical teachings were a recognizable part of the spiritual lives of a number of twelfth- and thirteenth-century tosafists” (p. 251), although the magical techniques pursued the goal of controlling material reality as well. The author notes (pp. 33, 161) the “relative absence” of philosophical and scientific study by the tosafists, but alludes briefly to possible rationalist elements in the thinking of Rabbenu Tam (pp. 166ff.). He also mentions “an astrological work with mystical overtones produced by R. Jacob b. Samson, a student of Rashi” (p. 158). In addition to many printed sources and secondary literature, the book also draws on the study of numerous manuscripts.

Matti Huss, *מליצת עפר ודינה לרון וידל בנבנישת: פרקי עיון ומהדורה ביקורתית* (Don Vidal Benveniste’s *Melitsat Efer ve-Dinah*. Studies and Critical Edition). Jerusalem: Magnes Press and the Rabbi David Moses and Amalia Rosen Foundation, 2003. 248 pp.

Melīṣat ‘Efer we-Dinah (the Tale of Efer and Dinah) is a literary work, in prose and verse, written by Don Vidal Benveniste in the early years of the fifteenth century. Its first part is a tale of love and desire between an aged man and a young woman, which the second part interprets as an allegory on the rational soul’s destiny in the body. This volume is the first critical edition of the work, together with extensive studies and a commentary. It is of interest to readers of *Aleph* on several counts. For one thing, it was composed in a circle of poets (*‘adat ha-nogenim*) in Saragossa, some of whose members and patrons came from the influential Ibn Lavi family, who played an important role in promoting philosophy and science. This reminds us that science and poetry were not then the “two cultures” they are today. We learn that the “Physics” (presumably one of Averroes’ commentaries) was one of the works the

members of the circle “read” (i.e., studied) together. Some of the poems composed in this circle do in fact draw on contemporary scientific ideas. We have relatively rich information on the interaction among the members of the circle and between the circle and other intellectuals. This may indirectly bear on our understanding of the social interaction between medieval Jewish philosophers and scientists too. *Melīṣat ‘Efer we-Dinah* is a pleasure to read. (Attention: some passages are not for children.)

Eli Yassif, ed., *ספר הזכרונות, הוא דברי הימים לירחמאל* (The Book of Memory, that is The Chronicles of Jerahme’el). Tel-Aviv: The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel-Aviv University, 2001. 553 pp.

The 388 folios of Ms Oxford, Bodleian Library Heb. 11 (Neubauer no. 2797), contain a composite text compiled by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi in northern Germany in the 1320s and 1330s. The Oxford manuscript is for the most part an autograph copy and is also unique. Most of the texts in this anthology relate to Jewish history. Eleazar entitled his anthology *Sefer ha-Zikronot*. His principal source was an earlier anthology, *Sefer Toledot*, compiled about two centuries earlier by a certain Yerahme’el, whom Neubauer identified as Yerahme’el b. Salomon who lived in Italy at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Yerahme’el was an exceedingly learned man, whose rich anthology included notably the *Sefer Yosippon*. Eleazar identifies parts of his own anthology as deriving from *Sefer Toledot*, but in all likelihood he does not identify all; hence we cannot know with certainty which parts of Eleazar’s composition trace back to Yerahme’el’s. From various cross-references we can infer, however, that Eleazar did not copy over all of Yerahme’el’s anthology: from the vantage point of the historian of science it is particularly regrettable that he left out a discussion of music, about which Yerahme’el wrote that it “is a great science, as I explained in the appropriate place” (pp. 28, 118). Eleazar added sundry other texts to Yerahme’el’s *Sefer Toledot*, turning his own anthology into an independent work that reflects his own view of Jewish history.

Eli Yassif offers us a scientific edition of Eleazar’s work: it reproduces only

the first 258 folios of the Bodleian manuscript, which the editor considers to be Yerahme'el's original *Sefer ha-zikronot*. (Omitted are 16 works that Eleazar copied in the same codex, many of them already published separately; see p. 20.) In his Introduction, which could have been written with greater clarity, Yassif describes the work and its sources and makes a case for publishing a relatively arbitrary collection of texts purely because it was compiled by a fourteenth-century author. Although, as Yassif himself notes, the anthology was in no way typical of the reading material of a Jewish intellectual of the fourteenth century, it opens a window onto the thought of the period.

Picatrix. Un traité de magie médiéval. Traduction, introduction et notes par Béatrice Bakhrouche, Frédéric Fauquier et Brigitte Pérez-Jean. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003. 385 pp.

This new French translation of the *Picatrix*, a medieval treatise of magic written in Arabic (apparently in Spain) and translated into Latin in the eleventh century, deserves mention in *Aleph* mainly because it calls attention to a lacuna: the Hebrew versions of the *Picatrix* are still available in manuscript only. The Arabic original (various suggestions, reviewed in the Introduction, have been put forward concerning the identity of its author) was published by H. Ritter in 1932; a German translation was published by Ritter and Martin (Meir) Plessner in 1962. In 1986, David Pingree published the Latin text of the *Picatrix*, which, he showed, was a redaction rather than a translation of the Arabic original. It is this Latin text that is translated here into French (after previous translations into French, Spanish and Italian). The short introduction (pp. 5–38) is well informed, but could have been better organized. The translation is very readable, but the annotation is not as detailed as one would have wished. M. Idel has pointed out that there are two Hebrew versions, actually abridgements, of the *Picatrix*: one made from the Arabic and entitled *Taklit ha-hakam* (Plessner noted that it contains interpolations, presumably by the translator-editor), the other (much shorter) from the Latin. A critical edition of the two Hebrew versions of the *Picatrix*, which became influential after the fifteenth century, seems to be called for. Like most works related to

magic, the text of the *Picatrix* is enigmatic, so the present rendering may prove helpful to the future editor of the Hebrew texts.

Ignace Goldziher, **Sur l'Islam. Origines de la théologie musulmane.** Introduction by Rémi Brague. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 2003. 290 pp.

This book includes eleven articles by Ignace Goldziher (1850–1921), written for nonspecialized readers and originally published in French. As indicated by the title, all of them bear on Islam; the book appears in this section of *Aleph* inasmuch as Goldziher was, as Brague says in his concise and informative introduction (pp. 7–35), “perhaps the greatest Islamologist who ever lived,” on “whose work all later research is grounded.” Goldziher’s scholarly work was intimately linked to his Judaism: not only was he raised in a traditional Jewish milieu (he read classics of medieval Jewish philosophy before his bar mitzva); until he obtained a well-deserved chair at the university (in 1905) he earned his living as secretary of the Neolog community in Pest. An early work on Hebrew mythology (1876) and a series of lectures on Judaism, which he delivered in 1887–88, both of which were ill-received, induced him to abandon the study of Judaism and devote himself exclusively to Islam. Brague (p. 30) makes the interesting suggestion that Goldziher’s famous and influential essay on Islamic orthodoxy’s attitude to the “alien sciences” (1916) was influenced by his own experience in the Jewish community. Goldziher, Brague urges (p. 31), is a welcome counter-example to what he calls the “stupid” thesis, today a tenet of political correctness, that “orientalism” developed in the wake of Western colonialism. It is to be hoped that this book will help make Goldziher’s legacy better known in France.

Azariah de' Rossi, **The Light of the Eyes**. Translated from the Hebrew with an introduction and annotations by Joanna Weinberg. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001. xlix+802 pp.

Azariah de' Rossi (ca. 1511–1577) belongs to that small but select group of Jewish scholars who were equally conversant in Hebrew traditional learning and Italian Renaissance culture. In his rather bulky *Me'or 'einayim*, which is translated here, de' Rossi touched on numerous issues, drawing on his wide and multifarious erudition. He is famous as the first to bring Philo (Yedidyah) to the attention of the Hebrew-reading public. The task confronting the scholar who embarks upon the translation of a book of this kind is very demanding; Joanna Weinberg is to be commended no less for her courage to undertake this daunting work than for her erudition. Her concise introduction presents the little that is known of de' Rossi's biography and notes the difficulties in assessing the purpose and "overarching rationale" of the book. Whatever goal de' Rossi himself had in view, contemporary and later conservatives perceived the book as a threat, inasmuch as it criticizes authoritative texts of Judaism from the standpoint of secular, rational, science. This refers not only to chronology, the topic that was particularly close to de' Rossi's heart, but also to natural science, including astronomy. The present volume is the first translation of *Me'or 'einayim*; we may hope that making it accessible to Renaissance scholars who do not read Hebrew will advance research on it. Weinberg has rendered de' Rossi's often convoluted Hebrew in elegant English. The translation is not slavish, but nevertheless precise (notwithstanding a few slips in the translation of scientific terms); it is easy and agreeable to read. The book is also handsomely produced.

David Ruderman, **מחשבה יהודית ותגליות מדעיות בעת החדשה המוקדמת באירופה** (Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe). Translated from the English by David Louvish. Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center, 2002. 367 pp.

This is the Hebrew translation of David Ruderman's book, published in English in 1995. It deserves mention here because the Hebrew version has one considerable advantage over the original one: the passages quoted from Hebrew sources are presented in the original, rather than English translation. The translator offers a generally faithful rendition of the original and he (or the author?) did a good job in retrieving the original sources and also in adapting the bibliographical references to the norms followed in contemporary Hebrew academic publications. Although the Hebrew itself is somewhat too pedantic to my taste, the book will be of easy and agreeable access to the Israeli reader. (I could not fathom, though, why the [correct] entry "Zamosc, Israel ben Moses Halevi of" in the English index was transmuted into the [erroneous] entry "Zamosc, 'ir be-Polin" in its Hebrew counterpart; perhaps for the same reason that his [its?] dates shifted from 1710–1772 to 1720–1772?) In a short "Foreword to the Hebrew Edition" (pp. 9–13), Ruderman discusses reactions to the English edition of his book.

Moshe Hallamish, Yosef Rivlin, and Raphael Shuchat, eds., **הגר"א ובית מדרשו** (The Vilna Gaon and His Disciples). Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003. 235 pp. in Hebrew + 90 pp. in English.

The Hebrew part of this volume contains fourteen studies on the Vilna Gaon (1720–1797), arranged in three sections. "Halakhah and Commentaries" includes studies on the Vilna Gaon's ideas about worship, Talmud study, midrash, and halakhah. The second section contains five studies of his views on philosophy and kabbalah. That here these two find themselves under the same heading reflects the fact that the Gaon himself occasionally wove philosophy into writings that express mainly kabbalistic ideas. Moshe Idel shows that one of the Gaon's students, Menaḥem Mendel of Shklov, drew on ideas deriving from Maimonides and Abraham Abulafia and suggests that the Gaon himself

may have been familiar with Abulafia's work. It is noteworthy that this influence on Menahem Mendel and perhaps the Gaon includes the view that mathematics is the basis of all other sciences. The third section, "Literature and History," contains two studies. The first, by Yehuda Friedlander, revisits an aspect of the Gaon's attitude toward the Haskalah and examines the controversial issue of whether the Gaon was involved in the fierce condemnation of Wessely's *Divrei šalom we-³emet*. Friedlander's conclusion is that the question of the Gaon's attitude to the early Berlin Haskalah and toward Wessely in particular remains open, although he tends to think that the Gaon did not himself take part in the polemics around *Divrei šalom we-³emet*.

The article most directly relevant to *Aleph* is one of the three in the English section, namely, Alan Brill's study of the Gaon's use of philosophical terminology in his writings. For instance, in many different contexts he uses the notions of the four causes, the active intellect, and *hokhmah*: he borrowed these terms from Maimonides, but gave them a meaning, or rather a variety of meanings, quite different from those they had in medieval philosophy. In the second part of his paper, Brill tries to determine how the editors of the Gaon's various writings handled the philosophical terms, arguing that some of them tended to eliminate such terms, while others may have interpolated additional philosophical terms. In another study, Shaul Stamper discusses how the Gaon of Vilna's popular image was created and perpetuated.

Ingrid Lohmann, ed., *Chevrat Chinuch Nearim. Die jüdische Freischule in Berlin (1778–1825) im Umfeld preußischer Bildungspolitik und jüdischer Kultusreform. Eine Quellensammlung*. Münster, New York, Munich, and Berlin: Waxmann, 2001. Jüdische Bildungsgeschichte in Deutschland, vol. 1. 1491 pp.

Mordechai Eliav, *Jüdische Erziehung in Deutschland im Zeitalter der Aufklärung und der Emanzipation*, translated from the Hebrew by Maika Strobel. Münster, New York, Munich, and Berlin: Waxmann, 2001. Jüdische Bildungsgeschichte in Deutschland, vol. 2. 472 pp.

Andreas Hoffmann, *Schule und Akkulturation. Geschlechtsdifferente*

Erziehung von Knaben und Mädchen der Hamburger jüdisch-liberalen Oberschicht 1848–1942. Münster, New York, Munich, and Berlin: Waxmann, 2001. Jüdische Bildungsgeschichte in Deutschland, vol. 3. 274 pp.

Britta L. Behm, *Moses Mendelssohn und die Transformation der jüdischen Erziehung in Berlin. Eine bildungsgeschichtliche Analyse zur jüdischen Aufklärung im 18. Jahrhundert*. Münster, New York, Munich, and Berlin: Waxmann, 2002. Jüdische Bildungsgeschichte in Deutschland, vol. 4. 309 pp.

Britta L. Behm, Uta Lohmann, and Ingrid Lohmann, eds., *Jüdische Erziehung und aufklärerische Schulreform. Analysen zum späten 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert*. Münster, New York, Munich, and Berlin: Waxmann, 2002. Jüdische Bildungsgeschichte in Deutschland, vol. 5. 398 pp.

The five volumes (two more are in preparation) published in this series, edited by Ingrid Lohmann, Britta L. Behm, and Uta Lohmann, are the results of a research project funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and conducted at the University of Hamburg by the editors (for the project description, see <http://www.erzwiss.uni-hamburg.de/Inst01/Projekt/JF/ilindex.htm#script>). The books, well produced by the Waxmann Verlag, offer materials and studies pertaining to the history of Jewish education in Germany in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

The imposing *Chevrat Chinuch Nearim* (in two parts) is an extremely rich and valuable collection of documents in German (the great majority) and Hebrew, relating to the attempts at pedagogical reform made by Jews in Prussia in the second half of the eighteenth and three first decades of the nineteenth century, and notably the *Freischule* or *Ḥevrat hinnukh ne^carim*, founded by Isaac Daniel Itzig and David Friedländer in 1778. The detailed table of contents of the documents alone occupies some 27 pages (pp. 87–113). As Michael A. Meyer underscores in his introductory essay (in English), the importance of the *Freischule*, a small, tuition-free school for poor, mainly Jewish, children, lies in its being a "mirror of attitudes," meaning Jewish (and non-Jewish) attitudes toward secular education. Shmuel Feiner, for his part, writing (also in English) from the perspective of "the Jewish and Israeli

historian,” notes the acute relevance of the discussions about the legitimacy of including “secular” subjects in Jewish curricula even today (not only in Judaism, one may add). Lohmann emphasizes that the collection includes not only documents bearing directly on the *Freischule*, but also texts related more generally to the debate over modernization and educational politics. Her long introductory essay (pp. 13–84; in German) offers a well-informed and contextualized history of the *Freischule* and of Jewish education in Berlin during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

The bulk of the volume consists of some 700 documents, filling more than 1200 pages, many of them taken from archives and here printed for the first time. They include many rare documents, including some in Hebrew. The volume concludes with a glossary of Hebrew terms (for those unfamiliar with Jewish culture), followed by various indexes of persons whose names appear in the book, an index of topics, and an extensive bibliography. All in all, this is book is model of its kind and will serve historians for many years.

Eliav’s “Jewish Education in Germany” is the authorized translation of his book, first published in Hebrew in 1960. The author assures us that the source material was checked again and that the bibliography has been updated. The first part is devoted to education in the Age of the Enlightenment; the second, to education in the age of the struggle for Emancipation. Some chapters follow a geographical division (the book covers all of Germany), while others follow a division by types of schools. The book has a glossary of Hebrew terms and an index. (I suspect and indeed hope the latter is not complete, because I searched in vain for any term related to science.) It is fortunate that this book is at long last available in the tongue spoken by virtually all its objects of study.

Hoffmann’s monograph (a doctoral dissertation submitted in 1999) compares the education of Jewish boys and girls in Hamburg during the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century. Concentrating on a few schools attended mainly by the middle and upper classes, Hoffmann shows that Jewish boys were largely educated in the same private schools (“a refuge from anti-Semitism”) as the sons of their fathers’ business partners, where they acquired an essentially general education. Girls,

by contrast, were enrolled in schools that offered some general education, along with Jewish religious subjects; with this background, however, they could not be admitted to a *gymnasium*, still less to higher education. The curious result of this gender-specific education was that the women became the bearers and transmitters of Jewish values within the family.

Behm’s monograph (also a Hamburg doctoral dissertation, 2000) is of direct relevance to the concerns of *Aleph*, inasmuch as it devotes much attention to the gradual introduction of secular learning into the Jewish curriculum, notably in Berlin. Moses Mendelssohn is at the center of this ambitious study. Devoting considerable attention to his early education in Dessau and subsequently in Berlin, Behm points out the formative role of two rabbis, David Fraenkel and Israel Zamosc, and emphasizes that these two belie the common stereotype that Talmud scholars were necessarily ignorant of philosophy and science and opposed to their study. Behm similarly shows that some sons of wealthy families received a secular education even before Mendelssohn’s influence became felt in Berlin. Behm devotes most of her volume to tracing the evolution of Jewish education in Berlin as a result of Mendelssohn’s work and intellectual influence. Her explicit *parti pris* is integrating the development of Jewish education into the history of the German “majority culture”; this comes in some measure at the cost of neglecting the internal Jewish forces at work. The study progresses roughly chronologically as it addresses Mendelssohn’s public activity, the influence of his writings, and the education he gave his own children. It is a well-researched and insightful study of Jewish education in Berlin in its wider context in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The fifth and for the moment last volume in the series is a collection of thirteen essays about Jewish educational reform in the Age of Enlightenment. After the translation (from Hebrew) of a classic essay by Ernst Akiva Simon on philanthropism and Jewish education (1953), the first section deals with modern Jewish schools in the late Haskalah. Four essays discuss the *Freischule* in Berlin and two Jewish schools elsewhere. The second section is devoted to the attempts at educational reform of several maskilim—notably Moses

Mendelssohn, David Friedländer, Aaron Halle-Wolfssohn, Herz Homberg, and Lazarus Bendavid. One essay is devoted to ideas about the education of girls as propagated in the periodical *Sulamith*, which appeared between 1806 and 1848. Regrettably, this volume has no index.

The *Jüdische Bildungsgeschichte in Deutschland* series will undoubtedly make a major contribution to furthering our knowledge of the transformation of Jewish education in Germany during and after the Haskalah. The DFG is to be commended for providing the financial resources that made this major enterprise possible.

Chaim Shenhav, *פרשת לופז: עליתו ונפילתו של רופא המלכה היהודי* (The Lopez Affair). Jerusalem: Keter Books, 2003. 246 pp.

Dr. Rodrigo Lopez (1517–1594) was the descendent of a family of Portuguese Marranos. He arrived in England in 1559 and eventually became personal physician to Queen Elizabeth I. Accused of plotting to poison the queen, he was tried, convicted, and (horribly) executed. The question of his guilt has been the subject of many debates, to which this book is the last addition. Shenhav sets the affair in its historical context and upholds Lopez's innocence.

Modern and Contemporary Periods

Reuven Michael, *ההיסטוריון של העם היהודי* (Hirsch [Heinrich] Graetz. The Historian of the Jewish People). Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik and Makhon Leo Baeck, 2003. 223 pp.

Heinrich Graetz (1817–1891) is, as indicated in the subtitle, “the historian of the Jewish people.” He wrote its first modern full-scale history, thereby putting Jewish historiography on a scientific footing. Graetz's name is thus bound up with the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Reuven Michael offers a biography of Graetz, based on primary sources, notably Graetz's writings (including his journal, which he kept until the age of 40). Graetz's name is associated with that of the seminary in Breslau, where he taught from its

foundation in 1854 until his death. A bibliographical guide at the end of the volume would have been very useful.

Research Tools

Metzler Lexikon jüdischer Philosophen. Philosophisches Denken des Judentums von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart, ed. Andreas B. Kilcher and Otfried Fraisse, with the collaboration of Yossef Schwartz. Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 2003. 476 pp.

This *Lexikon* contains around 200 entries on thinkers whom the editors consider to be “Jewish philosophers.” It was a felicitous idea to arrange the entries in roughly chronological order, allowing the educated layperson to peruse the volume at leisure, from Philo to Sarah Kaufman. Indexes will guide users searching for a specific bit of information. The notion of “Jewish philosophy” is construed here very broadly (as the short introduction by Kilcher makes clear) and includes Kabbalists and other thinkers whom not everyone would classify as philosophers (e.g., Shabbetai Ševi or the Ba'al Shem-Tov). Although the entries naturally vary in authority, most of those I read were of rather good quality. This *Lexikon* is another welcome sign of the growing interest in Jewish intellectual history in Germany.

Collections

John Inglis, ed., **Medieval Philosophy and the Classical Tradition in Islam, Judaism, and Christianity**. London and New York: Routledge Curzon, 2002. 317 pp.

Most histories of medieval philosophy are in fact little more than histories of Christian philosophy, John Inglis complains (p. 1), and one cannot but agree. But the remedy proposed here, namely, describing how students of philosophy within the three monotheistic traditions made use of the Classical philosophical heritage, does not really treat the problem, because it still allows for the study of each tradition in isolation from the others. This is not likely to

lead to the desired more “balanced history.” The result, I am sorry to say, indeed falls well short of the good intentions. In fact, we have here a collection of seventeen essays that deal with various more or less specific questions of medieval philosophy and that more often than not limit themselves to one or the other of the three traditions.

A short introduction by M. Marmura (which constitutes Section One) is followed by Section Two (“Philosophy”): G. S. Reynolds on Ghazzālī’s *Intentions of the Philosophers*; F. Griffel on Averroes’ attitude toward Ghazzālī in his early writings; and B. Kogan on Ghazzālī and Judah Halevi. Section Three (“Neoplatonism”) has D. G. MacIsaac on Proclus; P. Adamson on “Forms of Knowledge in the Arabic Plotinus,” which deals with Plotinian material in Arabic; W. J. Hankey on Boethius and Anselm; S. Pessin on Avicenna’s ideas of “existence as accident”; and T. Williams on Augustine. Section Four (“Creation”) contains T. Kukkonen on “Infinite Power and Plenitude,” an attempt to distinguish two traditions on the necessary and the eternal that moves freely between Aristotle, Philoponus, and Averroes (for historians of medieval science this article, written in the tradition of Hintikka and Knuuttila, will be of particular interest); and a study by D. Burrell that is explicitly limited to Christian philosophy. The six essays in the two last sections (“Virtue” and “The Latin Reception”) are less relevant than the preceding ones to the concerns of *Aleph* and will not be detailed here.

Samuel Kottke and Manfred Horstmanshoff, eds., **From Athens to Jerusalem: Medicine in Hellenized Jewish Lore and in Early Christian Literature.** Rotterdam: Erasmus Publishing, 2000. Pantaleon Reeks no. 33. 279 pp.

This useful and attractive volume contains fourteen papers on the history of medicine, first presented at a conference in Jerusalem in September 1996. Two contributions concern Babylonian medicine: Mark J. Geller on an Akkadian *vade mecum* in the Babylonian Talmud and Marten Stol on maternal imagination during pregnancy in Babylonia. Gynecology is also the subject of the articles by Danielle Gourevitch (the education of midwives) and by Samuel Kottke and Gerhard Baader (pregnancy in talmudic and Greco-Roman

sources). The Talmud also appears in Tīrzah Meacham’s article on the ethics of the use of slaves in physical examination. One section contains a paper on eunuchs in Clement of Alexandria (Manfred Horstmanshoff) and on androgyny in rabbinic literature (Joshua Levinson). Psychology is the subject of three papers: Stephen T. Newmyer on animal psychology in Philo’s writings; Helena Paavilainen on mental changes in old people according to rabbinic sources; and Larissa Trembovler on views of the soul-body relationship in Greek and early Christian philosophy. The last section contains four papers on “healing narratives”: Gary B. Ferngren on demonic etiology of disease in early Christian sources; Nigel Allen on the healing serpent; Jacqueline Lagrée on the medical model in Clement of Alexandria; and Jürgen Helm on medical, religious, and social aspects of the notions of illness in early Christian sources. Very valuable are the two indexes—a general index and an index locorum.

Gideon Freudenthal, ed., **Salomon Maimon: Rational Dogmatist, Empirical Skeptic. Critical Assessments.** Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003. Studies in German Idealism, vol. 2. 304 pp.

Salomon Maimon (1753–1800) was, as the editor of this collection writes, “a philosopher between two cultures”—Jewish and philosophic. The Jewish component in Maimon’s thought consists mainly of the influence of Maimonides (explicating this influence is itself a controversial topic, as Y. Schwartz makes clear in his contribution), but also of kabbalah, hasidism, talmudic culture, and Jewish thought in general. Moreover, as the editor argues in his introduction, Maimon often expressed himself in commentaries, a specific form of philosophical writing that Maimon derived from Judaism and that requires readers to have mastered specific hermeneutic techniques. The philosophical component is that of contemporary European, specifically German, philosophy. Maimon thus partakes of different traditions, so that an attempt to understand his German writings only in the context of contemporary German philosophical may misrepresent his views; conversely, but more obviously, it is impossible to understand his Hebrew writings

without familiarity with European philosophy and science of the late eighteenth century.

Of the ten articles in this collection, the one that addresses the issue of the Jewish component in Maimon's thought most directly is that by Yossef Schwartz, "*Causa materialis*: Salomon Maimon, Moses ben Maimon and the Possibility of Philosophical Transmission." The paper most directly related to science is Gideon Freudenthal's "Maimon's Subversion of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*: There are No Synthetic *a priori* Judgments in Physics," which takes its cue from a study of the status of contemporary rules for compounding motions and forces. The other eight essays bear on strictly philosophical subjects, which often are meta-scientific.

The volume concludes with useful appendices, offering lists of Maimon's works, as well as indexes. It will be very useful for the growing number of Maimon specialists; those who wish to become such can begin at the well-informed presentation given at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/maimon/>.

Rachel Livneh-Freudenthal and Elchanan Reiner, eds., **Streams into the Sea. Studies in Jewish Culture and Its Context Dedicated to Felix Posen**. Tel Aviv: Alma College, 2001. 373 pp.

This volume, published by Alma College in Tel Aviv, intends to "reflect Alma's vision," which the dedicatee has "supported in substance and spirit." Only a few papers are directly relevant to the concerns of *Aleph*. One, by Rachel Livneh-Freudenthal, treats the historiographic views of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* at its very beginning in the short-lived *Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft des Judentums* (1819–1824), whose best-known representative was Leopold Zunz. It describes how the *Verein's* view that *Wissenschaft* could be the "national saga" that would pave the way for Judaism's "return to history" emerged in the context of contemporary Germany and suggests that this view is of renewed relevance today. Another, by Tamar Ross, tackles Rabbi A. I. Kook's scant and allusive statements on the relationship between the truth values of the statements propounded by science and those propounded by religion. After proposing a number of interpretations, the paper tries to come

to grips with R. Kook's views on the relationship between secularism and science. Last but not least, one of Alma's students, Ben Newman, offers "A Letter to Maimonides," which addresses to the twelfth-century sage numerous questions from the perspective of the twenty-first century. Among them, naturally, are questions about the interpretation of biblical passages that seem to contradict science. If nothing else, this letter shows that Maimonides' problems are still alive and well today.

Gary B. Ferngren, ed., **Science and Religion. A Historical Introduction**. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. xiv+401 pp.

This collection of articles is a "by-product" (to use the perfectly appropriate industrial term) of *The History of Science and Religion in the Western Tradition: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Garland, 2000), also edited by Gary B. Ferngren. Of the latter's 103 articles, 27 are reproduced here unaltered, two are expanded versions, and one is new. The title arouses great expectations for a synthesis of, or at least a comprehensive introduction to, the subject of the complex relationships between science and religion. The two short introductory essays seem quite unsatisfactory to me. Most of the rest are short and competent reviews of this or that topic falling under the rubric of "science and religion": medieval science and religion, the Copernican revolution, causation, the Mechanical Philosophy, Newton (why not Boyle?), Darwin, evolution, cosmogonies, creationism. The articles on ecology, gender, and postmodernism reflect recent tendencies in the historiography of science. While some of the themes selected are clearly appropriate, others seem somewhat arbitrary. Generally speaking, there is a tendency to choose only such themes in which the relationship of science and religion is manifest.

Curious, to say the least, is the following. In his Introduction, the editor writes: "The decision to limit the volume's coverage to the West is based on the belief that, underlying the diversity of several streams that have fed Western civilization, there exists a basic substratum, formed by the West's heritage from the classical world of Greece and Rome and the monotheistic traditions of Judaism and Christianity" (p. x). At this point one wonders whether the editor

takes Islam to be polytheistic. Apparently not, for one short chapter is devoted to Islam. By contrast, and despite what the Introduction leads one to expect, no chapter is devoted to Judaism—a term that does not even appear in the index. This is difficult to understand: did Judaism never interact with science? Perhaps the key to the riddle is in the following sentence from the Introduction (immediately following the one just quoted): “The focus on Christian theology reflects the dominance of that religious tradition in European scientific and philosophical thought.” We thus know that “the West” here refers only to Europe and to its extensions (North America, Australia, etc.) and that “religion” is essentially a code for “Christianity.” Specifically, “Western civilization” does not include the civilization that appropriated and developed the Greek tradition during the four or five centuries of the European Dark Age and that gave us “algebra,” “alchemy” and so much more, without which “Western science” would not exist in its present form. The chapter on Islam is presumably no more than a politically correct gesture.

Régis Morelon and Ahmad Hasnawi, eds., **De Zénon d'Élée à Poincaré. Recueil d'études en hommage à Roshdi Rashed.** Louvain and Paris: Editions Peeters, 2004 (Les Cahiers du MIDEO [=Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'Études orientales] 1). xl+909 pages. Index of names.

This imposing Festschrift in honor of Roshdi Rashed will be of particular interest to those concerned with the history of mathematics in any period, with the history of medieval science, or with the distinctive French “epistemological” approach to writing the history of science. The volume contains thirty-seven articles (most of the in French), in addition to an in-depth interview with Rashed and a list of his publications. Two of the contributions may be of special interest to readers of *Aleph*: Gad Freudenthal and Tony Lévy, “De Gérase à Bagdad: Ibn Bahrīz, al-Kind, et leur recension arabe de l'*Introduction arithmétique* de Nicomaque, d'après la version hébraïque de Qalonymos ben Qalonymos d'Arles” (pp. 479–544); Herbert A. Davidson, “Maimonides, Aristotle, and Avicenna” (pp. 719–34).