

Torah and Sophia:
The Life and Thought of
Shem Tov Ibn Falaquera

by
Raphael Jospe

*Hebrew Union College Press
Cincinnati, 1988*

© Copyright 1988 by the Hebrew Union College Press
Hebrew Union College — Jewish Institute of Religion

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jospe, Raphael.
Torah and sophia

(Monographs of the Hebrew Union College; no. 11)

English and Hebrew.

Title on added t.p.: Torah ve-sofiyah

“An I. Edward Kiev Library Foundation book”: -- Half t.p. Includes texts and translations of Falaquera’s Sefer ha-nefesh, Shelemut ha-ma’asim, and Bible commentary. Bibliography: p. 485.

1. Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph, ca. 1225-ca. 1295.
2. Philosophy, Jewish.
3. Philosophy, Medieval.
4. Psychology--Early works to 1850.
5. Ethics, Jewish--Early works to 1800.
 - I. Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph, ca. 1225-ca. 1295. Sefer ha-nefesh. English & Hebrew. 1986
 - II. Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph, ca. 1225-ca. 1295. Shelemut ha-ma’asim. English & Hebrew. 1986.
 - III. Falaquera, Shem Tov ben Joseph, ca. 1225-ca. 1295. Bible commentary. English & Hebrew. 1986.
 - IV. Title.
 - V. Title: Torah ve-sofiyah.
 - VI. Series.

B759. F334J67 1987 181'.06 86-29484

ISBN 0-87820-410-5

For my mother, my teacher

לאמי מורתי

A few years ago, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, I had the privilege to present to my father and teacher, Rabbi Alfred Jospe, a Festschrift in his honor (Go and Study: Essays and Studies in Honor of Alfred Jospe). It is with equal pleasure that I dedicate this book to my mother and teacher, Professor Eva Jospe.

I. Edward Kiev Library Foundation

In memory of Dr. I. Edward Kiev, alike distinguished as Rabbi, Chaplain, and Librarian of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, his family and friends established in September 1976 a library Foundation bearing his name, to support and encourage the knowledge, understanding and appreciation of books, manuscripts and other efforts of scholars in Judaica and Hebraica. In cooperation with the Publications Committee of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, the Foundation offers the present study as an I. Edward Kiev Library Foundation Volume.

Table of Contents

Chapter One	The Life and Contribution of Falaquera	1
I.	Falaquera's life and importance	1
II.	Falaquera and poetry	11
III.	Falaquera's language, style, and terminology ...	18
IV.	Falaquera as a critic	29
Chapter Two	The Works of Falaquera	31
Chapter Three	The Philosophy of Falaquera	77
I.	Common themes in Falaquera's work	77
II.	Faith and reason	78
III.	Principles of Judaism	92
IV.	Biblical interpretation	105
V.	The prophet as philosopher-king	111
VI.	The ideal life: Intellectual and moral virtue	115
VII.	On friendship, asceticism, and women	133
VIII.	On education, science and the arts	146
IX.	On creation and proofs of God	156
X.	Providence, divine knowledge, and free will	164
XI.	The problem of evil	171
XII.	The divine attributes	173
Chapter Four	Falaquera's Psychology	181
I.	The sources of <i>Sefer Ha-Nefesh</i>	181
II.	The importance of psychology	189
III.	The definition of the soul	195
IV.	Falaquera's scheme of the soul's faculties	201
V.	Nutrition, growth, and reproduction	211
VI.	Motion and external perception	212
VII.	The faculty of vision	213
VIII.	The faculty of hearing	214
IX.	The faculty of smell	215
X.	The faculty of taste	216
XI.	The faculty of touch	217
XII.	The internal senses	219
XIII.	The common sense	223
XIV.	Imagination	224
XV.	The estimative faculty	226

	XVI. Memory, retention, and recollection	231
	XVII. Appetite or desire	233
	XVIII. Practical intellect	235
	XIX. Theoretical intellect	237
	XX. Grades of theoretical intellect	246
	XXI. Conclusion	262
Appendix A	Sefer Ha-Nefesh: Text	265
Appendix B	Sefer Ha-Nefesh: English Translation	321
Appendix C	Notes to Sefer Ha-Nefesh	351
Appendix D	Shelemut Ha-Ma'asim Annotated Text	411
Appendix E	Falaquera's Bible Commentary	459
Bibliography		485
index		499

Preface

In many respects, the life and thought of Shem Tov ibn Falaquera exemplify the ways in which medieval Jewish rationalists sought to synthesize their fidelity to Torah with their commitment to Western philosophic and scientific wisdom. Falaquera's words in poetry, in fictional accounts of the search for wisdom or dialogues between proponents and opponents of philosophy, in translations of Arabic philosophy, or in defense of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*, eloquently bespeak a love of both Torah and secular wisdom (*hokhmah*; *sophia*) and the sincere belief that both these loves must ultimately be in harmony, if not identical.

Falaquera's prolific works have benefited from various studies over the last century and a half, beginning with the doctoral dissertation of Leopold Zunz, "De Schemtob Palkira" (1820). These studies have focused on a particular work or a specific aspect of Falaquera's thought. This book on Falaquera's life and philosophy continues in that tradition of textual analysis. It includes a critical edition and annotated translation into English of Falaquera's only systematic work, *Sefer Ha-Nefesh* (The Book of the Soul), as well as a critical and annotated edition of his hitherto unpublished ethical work, *Shelemut Ha-Ma'asim* (The Perfection of Actions), and — also for the first time — the surviving fragmentary citations, with English translation, of Falaquera's lost Bible commentary.

Falaquera's psychology is another major focus of this book, reflecting his own philosophic and curricular priorities. This book, however, also attempts to present, on the basis of analysis and comparison of all of Falaquera's extant works, an overview of Falaquera's life, literary activity and philosophy, and thereby to shed light on the process by which philosophy was defended, disseminated and consolidated in Judaism in the century after Maimonides.

The system of transliteration employed generally follows that of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Since a critical edition of *Sefer Ha-Nefesh* is included in the book, and is therefore readily accessible to the reader, citations of this work in other chapters are usually limited to the English translation. In the case of citations of other works by Falaquera, especially of his encyclopedic *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim* (Opinions of the Philosophers), which still exists only in manuscript (I hope to publish an edition of this important work), the Hebrew is often included as well, for the convenience of the reader.

I wish to express my thanks to my teacher, Professor Alexander Altmann, with whom I first had the privilege of studying Jewish philosophy, and to my teacher, Professor Nahum Glatzer, for his kindness over the years and for calling my attention to Leopold Zunz's dissertation on Falaquera. For their original guidance and continued interest and friendship, I am grateful to

Professors Marvin Fox and Alfred Ivry of Brandeis University, who supervised my doctoral dissertation on "Shem Tov ibn Falaquera's Psychology," upon which this study is partially based, and which was dedicated to my late wife Nitzah, זכרונה לברכה.

During my recent sabbatical year in Jerusalem, I was helped repeatedly by Professors Shlomo Pines and Colette Sirat, who generously gave me of their time, read various sections of this book, and offered invaluable advice. Professor Lawrence Berman of Stanford read the manuscript of this book with great care and patience, and was exceptionally kind and helpful in sharing with me his time and knowledge, and in helping me to correct or clarify many passages. These scholars have all contributed to whatever strengths the book may possess, while I, of course, am responsible for its weaknesses.

To my friend, Dr. Stanley Wagner, my thanks for his constant professional support at the University of Denver's Center for Judaic Studies and for his personal friendship. To Professors Michael Meyer and Barry Kogan of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, my appreciation for their patience and encouragement. To Dr. Israel Ta-Shma and the staff of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem, my thanks for their expert assistance and cooperation. To Mordecai Raanan, my gratitude for his friendly help in the printing of this book. To David Louvish in Jerusalem and to Rabbi Faedra Lazar Weiss in Cincinnati, my thanks for their editorial diligence and advice.

Finally, to my children Deena, Ilan, Calanitte, Tamar, Yaron and Uri, my thanks for bearing with me for all the untold hours I spent with Falaquera rather than with them, and most of all, my loving gratitude to my wife Darlene, for everything.

'Erev Shavu'ot 5745

May, 1985

CHAPTER ONE

THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTION OF FALAQUERA

I. FALAQUERA'S LIFE AND IMPORTANCE

Shem Tov ben Yosef ibn Falaquera wrote "in the eighth month (Heshvan) of the year 5024" (October–November, 1263)¹ that he had passed the midpoint of seventy years and was approaching the age of forty. We can thereby establish his year of birth as between 1223 and 1228. Falaquera's last known work refers to events that took place in 5050 (1290),² so that he cannot have died before 1291.

Falaquera was not an original thinker of the first order. But the breadth and depth of his knowledge of Judaism, philosophy and science³ qualify him as an important figure in the development of Jewish philosophy. Unlike Maimonides, who explicitly wrote for an elite intelligentsia, Falaquera wrote most of his works with the explicit aim of raising the cultural level of the Jewish people. It is therefore perhaps precisely such a personality as Falaquera who can best indicate the extent to which philosophy succeeded in finding a home in Judaism. The pioneering philosophical efforts of the earlier luminaries attained an enduring impact on the course of Jewish history and the religious life of the Jewish people, it may be maintained, through the consolidation of those efforts at the hands of Jewish philosophers like Falaquera. Their contribution is no less important for the fact that their light was often a reflected one.

Of similar importance are Falaquera's lucid Hebrew style and poetry, his advanced Hebrew terminology, brilliant interweaving of biblical and rabbinic

1. *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*, p. 9: ויהי בשנת ה' אלפים וארבע ועשרים למנין שמונים העברים ליצירת היצורים, בחודש השמיני מחדשי זאת השנה... ועברו השנים נקודת השבעים וקרבה שנת הארבעים.

The English translations by H. Levine incorrectly list Falaquera's year of birth as c. 1235 (*Seeker*, p. xiv) and the year of composition of the book as 5020 (Thesis, p. 10) and 5025 (*Seeker*, p. 1).

2. *Mikhtav 'al Devar Ha-Moreh*, in *Minhat Qena'ot*, pp. 182–185. The reference is to the anti-Maimonidean agitation of Solomon Petit in 5020 (1290) and his excommunication in July, 1291. See J. Sarachek, *Faith and Reason*, p. 145.

3. Graetz, *Geschichte*, VII, p. 251 says that he was a living encyclopedia, giving accurate information on any point.

statements and ideas with philosophical and scientific expressions, and his critical insight as a commentator, translator and author.

Falaquera's name has been spelled and pronounced in widely divergent manners, in Hebrew as well as in western languages. In the Preface to his edition of *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*,⁴ Ludwig Venetianer lists variants of the name in Hebrew as follows: פלקירא, פלקירה, פלכרה, בלקירה, פלאקיר, פלקרייה. To this list we may add: פלקירי ר' שם טוב בן פלקירא,⁵ פאלקירה,⁶ פלקיירי.⁷ Venetianer lists the following Latin spellings of the name: Palaquéra, Palquira, Palqueira, Palquera, Palkeira, Palkira, Palqira, Phalkira, Phalkera, Phalchera, Falaquera.

Leopold Zunz wrote his doctoral dissertation, "De Schemtob Palkira" (Halle University, 21 December 1820), on the life, doctrines and times of Falaquera.⁸ In Chapter VII, concerning the family "Palkira," Zunz lists the variants of the name as: Palkira, Palkera, Palkeira, Phalkera, Phalkeira, Phalkira, Phalakeira, Phalachera, Phallachara, Falkira, Falchera, Palquira. To these we may add another: Palqera.⁹

The Falaquera family was one of eight aristocratic families in whom Jewish communal authority in Tudela was vested in 1305.¹⁰ Y. Baer suggests that one of the communal leaders, Yosef ben Shem Tov Falaquera, may have been a relative of our Falaquera; in 5048 (1287/8) Yosef was appointed as head *dayyan* to try informers.¹¹

Venetianer,¹² Malter,¹³ and Cowley¹⁴ suggest that the name Falaquera is

4. *Das Buch der Grade* (Berlin, 1894), reprinted by Maqor (Jerusalem, 1970). Cf. his earlier Hungarian book, *A Fokozatok Könyve (Book of Degrees)* (Szeged, 1890), p. 4 n. 1.
5. Yohanan Alemanno. See D. Kaufmann, *Gabirol Studien*, p. 44. Also cf. Moshe Idel, "Seder Ha-Limmud Shel Rabbi Yohanan Alemanno" (*Tarbiz*, No. 3–4 (1979), p. 320), who cites the reference in Alemanno's *Liqqutim* 94b to Falaquera: התורני הפילוסופי המקובל בספירות ובצירופים כשרשי פלקיירי.
6. Duran, *Magen Avot*, p. 30a.
7. *Batei Hanhagat Guf Ha-Bari'* (Tel Aviv, 1950), p. 3. Some have interpreted the honorific "Abba Mari" as meaning that Falaquera had a son. See below, p. 10.
8. A photocopy of the thesis, handwritten in Latin, was graciously lent to me by the Leo Baeck Institute. Prof. Nahum Glatzer kindly called my attention to the thesis.
9. H. Hirschfeld, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Montefiore Library*, p. 87.
10. *Toledot Ha-Yehudim Bi-Sefarad Ha-Nozrit*, p. 131; *Die Juden im Christlichen Spanien* (1929), I:953, 957; *History of the Jews in Christian Spain* (1966), I:229, 425. Cf. Roberta Klugman Barkan, "Falaquera's Balm for Assuaging Grief" (Thesis), p. 7.
11. Baer, *Toledot* etc., p. 501. Also cf. Zunz, Thesis, Ch. VII.
12. Venetianer, *Das Buch der Grade*, Preface, p. vii n. 2.
13. Malter, "Shem Tob Ben Joseph Palquera," *JQR* (N.S.), I (1910–11), p. 155 n. 3.
14. A.E. Cowley, *A Concise Catalogue of the Hebrew Printed Books in the Bodleian Library*, p. 634.

derived from the name of the French city Beaucaire, known in the Middle Ages as Bellicadrum. Isadore Loeb¹⁵ suggests that the name may refer to the name Pulgar. M. Plessner,¹⁶ on the other hand, quotes Millas that the name Falaquera is found in the Catalan language as *Falaquer*, and in the Castilian tongue as *halagüeño*, meaning an attractive person, and suggests that *halagüeño* is related to the Arabic *khalāq* (firm character, steadfast, upright).

Another possible derivation for the name may be related to an old French term cited in Rashi's Bible and Talmud commentaries. Rashi's commentary on Genesis 25:25 explains "kullo ke-aderet se'ar" (like a hairy mantle all over) as "full of hair, like a woollen cloak (ṭallit) פלוקירא in *la'az*," which, according to Abraham Berliner,¹⁷ derives from the French "floche," "floquede" (and in turn from the Latin "floccus"), a flock of wool. Rashi also employs variants of the term in his Talmud commentary, once in Qiddushin 82a for the term סריקים (wool-combers, carders)¹⁸ and twice, in Bava Qama 99a and Bava Mezi'a 112a for the term גררא (removing the woolly surface by scraping).¹⁹ "Falaquera" would thus derive from "floche" (a flock of wool), "flochiedre" (a carder) or, more likely, from the infinitive "flochier" (to comb or card wool), a derivation supported by many, but not all, of the manuscript readings.²⁰

Although, as we have seen, the Falaquera family is listed in the communal records of Tudela, Zunz²¹ argued that Falaquera cannot have lived in Catalonia, Provence, or any other territories that were in the hands of the Moors. Falaquera refers in several places (see below) to the calamities of the

15. Loeb, "Polémistes Chrétiens et Juifs en France et en Espagne," *REV*, 18 (1889), p. 63 n. 2.
16. Plessner, "The Importance of Falaquera in the Study of the History of Philosophy" (Hebrew), in *Homenaje a Millas-Vallicrosa* (Barcelona, 1956), II, p. 161 n. 2.
17. This is the reading according to many printed editions. The edition of Abraham Berliner (Berlin, 1866) has פלוקירא with *dalei* rather than *resh*, and his notes list the term as "floche, floquede." While this reading is certainly a distinct possibility, other citations justify our reading with *resh*. Cf. A. Darmesteter, "Les Gloses Françaises de Raschi dans la Bible" (*Révue des Études Juives*, 53 [1907], p. 170), which lists three variants supporting our reading (פלוקירא, פלוקריאה, פלוקיירא), four which support Berliner (פלוקיידא, פלוקיאה, פלוקיאה, פלוקיאה), and also פארגא.
18. Cf. A. Darmesteter and D.S. Blondheim, *Les Gloses Françaises dans les Commentaires Talmudiques de Raschi* (Paris, 1929), #490, p. 68: "Flochiedre" (a carder), a noun-form with the variants being פלוקדורש (plukdurs), פלוקייר (plukiir), פלוקידרא (plukidra), פלוקיירא (plukiirda).
19. *Ibid.*, #491, p. 69: "Flochier" (to comb or card wool), an infinitive verbal form, with the variants being פלוקייר (plukiir), פלוקיר (plukir), פלוקייד (plukiid), פלוקייר (pluchiir), פולקייר (pulkiir).
20. Also cf. Raphael Levy, *Trésor de la Langue des Juifs Français au Moyen Âge* (Univ. of Texas, Austin, 1964), p. 114, "flocheyde, etc."
21. Zunz, Thesis, Ch. 9.

Jews. Therefore, Zunz maintains, since the Moors did not persecute Jews to the same extent as the Christians did, Falaquera's references manifest a Christian environment. But Zunz does not seem to take into account the fact that the unquestionably better treatment of the Jews by the Moors did not prevent such Jews as Judah Ha-Levi from considering themselves to be "in the chains of Arabia."²²

Wherever Falaquera may actually have lived (and nowhere in his writings does he indicate a place of composition)²³ he clearly lived in a time of trouble and misfortune. Baer²⁴ has shown that the establishment of large estates by nobles close to the crown resulted in the loss of rights and property by the Jews of Tudela, who were now subject to physical attack, and whom the feudal lords were too weak to protect from marauders. It was a time of drought²⁵ and increasing religious intolerance, in which the Lateran Council (1215) compelled Jews to wear distinctive clothing and which led subsequently to the burning of the Talmud in Paris and to the Barcelona disputation.

Falaquera made repeated references to such difficulties and troubles in his works.

It is an hour of hardship and oppression; the hand of the nations is strong against us . . . There are no just people in the land . . . Brigands have increased.²⁶

The Jews in particular suffer: "How can the miserable Jew be happy?"²⁷ Referring to the ideal life of intellectual perfection advocated by Maimonides, Falaquera said:²⁸

Its existence is difficult and virtually impossible for a person of the Exile in these times, for it is difficult for him to fulfill the conditions that (Maimonides) mentioned . . . All this is difficult for one who is enslaved, who is in distress and oppression, whose life is the life of sorrow.

The turmoil and instability of the day took their toll on the level of Jewish

22. Ha-Levi, "My Heart is in the East," in Schirmann, *Ha-Shirah Ha-'Ivrit Bi-Sefarad U-ve-Provence*, I:2, p. 489. Cf. Nina Salomon, *Selected Poems of Jehuda Halevi* (Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1928), p. 2, and D. Goldstein, *The Jewish Poets of Spain* (Penguin Books, 1971), p. 128.
23. Steinschneider, *Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher*, 1893 (hereafter: *HU*), p. 2 #5.
24. Baer, *Toledot* etc., pp. 122, 138.
25. Schirmann, *Ha-Shirah Ha-'Ivrit* etc., II:1, p. 329.
26. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 12.
27. Poem, "Ha-yismaḥ ha-yehudi ha-'umlal," in *Mevaqqesh*, p. 19.
28. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, pp. 135–136. Cf. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 21: "... and if God should give me length of days and grant us respite from the fury of troubles . . ."

cultural creativity. This was a time, according to Graetz,²⁹ that was particularly poor in profound intellects. Even the two main representatives of the philosophy of the time, Falaquera and Isaac Albalag, were, in the words of Graetz, no more than mediocre and subject to the errors of their time, and metaphysics was for Falaquera more a matter of erudition and memory than of independent thought.

Venetianer,³⁰ while he was somewhat kinder than Graetz in his choice of words, basically shared his view, and called the thirteenth century the least fertile of medieval Hebrew literature, in which no progress was made in development from the ideas of Maimonides and Ibn Rushd. Despite the fact that Venetianer saw fit to publish Falaquera's *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*, he asserted that the works produced in the thirteenth century are only of bibliographical interest and merely reproduce earlier ideas. Venetianer maintained that philosophy only took on new literary *forms* — poetry, allegory, and prose — but did not develop any new *ideas*. And yet, Venetianer recognized that the thirteenth century produced unprecedented scholasticism and gave practical expression to Maimonides' notion that philosophy is necessary for human happiness. It was a time in which Spanish Jewry gave expression to their love of science and philosophy in poetry, humor, and stories. It was a century which saw the composition in Spain of the *Zohar* and other great works of Kabbalah. Granted that Kabbalah is not philosophy, many of the writings and doctrines of the mystics manifest a thorough familiarity with philosophy.

Malter has maintained that the popularization and dissemination of philosophy go hand in hand with a reduction of its creative originality; breadth was acquired at the expense of depth.

An age in which intellectual interest is keen, is usually characterized on the one hand by an abundance of works on a great variety of themes, and on the other hand, by much mediocrity on the part of their authors . . . The result is literary overproduction.³¹

The century of Falaquera, and Falaquera himself, were thus not marked by originality. But Falaquera accurately and realistically saw himself as serving a different function from innovation, and he explicitly disavowed any originality, in at least some of his works, especially the more encyclopedic works, such as *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim* and *Reshit Hokhmah*: "For among these opinions, there is nothing that I say on my own, but I am only transmitting (or: translating) their

29. *Geschichte*, VII, p. 250. For a more important appreciation of Albalag, cf. G. Vajda, *Isaac Albalag* (1960), and his article on Albalag in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, II:520–521.

30. Preface to *Buch der Grade*.

31. Malter, "Falaquera," p. 154.

views.”³² “Most of my words in this (book) on the sciences are the words of the chief philosophers and experts. I have not innovated anything on my own, but only collected them from the books that are distributed there.”³³ Falaquera similarly disclaimed originality in his Introduction to *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*, which he said was compiled from the books of the latter philosophers, and in which his own words are brief.

Such disclaimers of originality are not, however, always to be taken literally. To disclaim originality was to claim the authority and weight of tradition and precedent for one's position, and served to deflect criticism. Maimonides, who unlike Falaquera has not generally been accused of mediocrity and lack of originality, himself said:

Know that these words which I say in these chapters . . . are not matters which I invented on my own, nor interpretations which I innovated, but rather I gleaned them from the sayings of the sages . . . and from the words of the philosophers.³⁴

Falaquera explains his reason for quoting the opinions of earlier philosophers, in a paraphrase of Aristotle:³⁵

He said: We must be informed of the opinions of the ancients

32. In Introduction to Part II of *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 234a, ms. Leyden f. 33b: “כי אין באלו הדעות שום דבר שאומר אותו מעצמי אלא אני מעתיק דיעותיהם”. He prefaces the *De'ot* in general with a similar disclaimer (ms. Parma f. 5a, ms. Leiden f. 107a): “ואין בכל זה החיבור דבר שאומר אותו מעצמי, אלא כל מה שאכתוב הם דברי ארסטו המפורשים בפירושי החכם בן רשד, כי היה אחרון המפרשים ולקח הנבחר שבפירושיהם והנאות לדברי (לדעת) ארסטו.”
 “In this work there is nothing that I say on my own. Whatever I write is the words of Aristotle or the commentaries according to the commentary of Ibn Rushd, because he was the last of the commentators, and cited the choicest parts of their commentaries which agree with the words of Aristotle.”
 Also cf. *De'ot*, ms. Parma f. 6a, ms. Leyden f. 108a.
33. *Reshit Hokhmah*, Introduction, p. 9: “ורוב דברי בו בחכמות הם דברי ראשי הפילוסופים ובקריאתם. כי לא חדשתים אני מעצמי אלא שקבצתים מהספרים שהם מפורשים שם . . .”
34. *Shemonah Peraqim*, Introduction (ed. Gorfinkle, p. 6). See Malter's discussion of this similarity between Falaquera and Maimonides in “Falaquera,” p. 163, n. 21, and p. 168 n. 31. Malter lists other disclaimers of originality in *Mevaqqesh*, p. 3a; *Ma'alot*, p. 11; and *Zeri Ha-Yagon* (Fürth ed.), p. 11.
35. *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, VI, A, 1, ms. Parma f. 149a, ms. Leyden f. 273b. The reference is to Aristotle, *De Anima*. I, 1, 403b: “For our study of the soul it is necessary . . . to call into council the views of those of our predecessors who have declared any opinion on this subject, in order that we may profit by whatever is sound in their suggestions and avoid their errors.” Cf. Al-Kindi, “On First Philosophy,” p. 103 (English translation by A. Ivry, *Al-Kindi's Metaphysics*, p. 58).

concerning the soul, to be aided by them. Whichever of them we find to be correct, we shall retain; and whichever is not correct, we shall abandon.

But Falaquera's reputation for lack of originality may be somewhat exaggerated, and sometimes the criticism of Falaquera's lack of originality turns out to be somewhat complimentary, in terms of his importance to the history of philosophy. Graetz³⁶ regarded Falaquera as essential "only" as a living encyclopedia of the academic disciplines of his time, and a very faithful one at that, giving accurate information on any point. For some, Falaquera's lack of originality thus became a positive virtue.³⁷ Plessner³⁸ suggested that Falaquera is therefore all the more valuable as a witness to sources otherwise lost in Jewish philosophy. Falaquera was unusual for his time in that he often quoted his sources (for instance, in *Moreh Ha-Moreh* and *De'ot ha-Pilosofim*), thus demonstrating not only intellectual honesty but also a critical understanding of the importance of the history of ideas. (Maimonides, it will be recalled, had been severely criticized for failing to cite his sources, especially in the *Mishneh Torah*).³⁹

Because he was a careful and thorough scholar, Falaquera could suggest that the opponents of Maimonides could not possibly do him justice as long as they were ignorant of the Arabic language in which the *Guide of the Perplexed* was originally written. Because he himself insisted on going back to Maimonides' Arabic sources, Falaquera's own commentary on the *Guide* (*Moreh Ha-Moreh*) was, in Husik's words, "superior to the better known commentaries of Shemtob, Ephodi, and Abarbanel."⁴⁰ Stitskin⁴¹ echoes Malter's words⁴² in praising Falaquera as "the most learned Jewish author of his time."

Falaquera's aim was to popularize philosophy among the Jews, and he largely succeeded in attaining his goal. "His success in popularizing Greek and

36. *Geschichte*, VII, p. 251.

37. Prof. Shlomo Pines similarly suggests that it is Moses ibn Ezra's multiplicity of sources, deriving from Ibn Ezra's lack of originality, that gives his book *'Arugat ha-Bosem* its importance ("Sefer 'Arugat Ha-Bosem: Ha-Qeṭa'im Mi-Tokh Sefer Meqor Hayyim," *Tarbiz*, 27, No. 2-3 [1958], p. 218).

38. "The Importance of Falaquera etc.," pp. 161-162.

39. Cf. I. Twersky, "The Beginnings of *Mishneh Torah* Criticism," in A. Altmann, *Biblical and Other Studies* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 161-182, and *idem*, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides* (Yale University Press, 1980), pp. 102 ff., 518 ff.

40. I. Husik, *History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy*, p. 228.

41. L. Stitskin, "A Thirteenth Century Philosopher" etc., *Tradition*, 7, No. 1 (Winter 1964-65), p. 81.

42. Malter, "Falaquera," p. 170.

Arabic thought among the Jews merits for him a high place in the temple of medieval Jewish learning.”⁴³ “His studies in philosophy, far from making him feel an intellectual superiority and a scorn for the masses, intensified his zealous desire to educate his readers and inculcate virtue in them. In his metaphysical works, his popularizing tendency is most unique for its time.”⁴⁴ Indeed, as Malter points out,⁴⁵ the mere fact that so many of Falaquera’s voluminous works were preserved, many of them in numerous manuscripts, is ample proof of his great popularity, especially when one considers that so many other works of the thirteenth century have been lost.⁴⁶

Falaquera seems to have been appreciated most in modern times by Solomon Munk, who identified the *Fons Vitae* with Ibn Gabirol’s *Meqor Hayyim* on the basis of Falaquera’s translation into Hebrew of selections of the Arabic original. Munk praised Falaquera’s “extensive and profound learning,”⁴⁷ and wrote that

Ibn Falaquera knew — something rather remarkable for those times — to appreciate from a historical point of view the work of our philosopher (i.e., Ibn Gabirol) who, according to him, brought to a close an antiquated system, going back to the philosophers of highest antiquity.⁴⁸

Falaquera’s importance may thus lie in his preservation of historical material. His originality lies not only in his style, terminology and skill as a translator, but also in his treatment of that material,⁴⁹ as well as in his critical-

43. Malter, *ibid.*, p. 169.

44. Barkan, Thesis, p. 19.

45. Malter, *ibid.*, pp. 178–179.

46. Among Falaquera’s works, however, is *not* to be included the commentary *Migdal ‘Oz* to the *Mishneh Torah*, as D.J. Silver maintains (*Maimonidean Criticism and Maimonidean Controversy*, p. 103 n. 3). The author of this was Shem Tov ben Abraham ibn Gaon (1283–1330).

47. *Philosophy and the Philosophical Authors of the Jews*, p. 42; cf. *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe* (Paris, 1857), p. 494.

48. *Mélanges*, p. 274. (Translation by this author).

49. Prof. Alfred Ivry, discussing Moses of Narbonne, similarly writes: “In the light of his copious habit of borrowing, we may legitimately ask in what sense this is Narboni’s own work. The answer to this question must be sought in Narboni’s selection and treatment of sources” (“Moses of Narbonne’s ‘Treatise of the Perfection of the Soul,’” *JQR* 57, No. 4 [1967], pp. 273–274). Ivry suggests that this treatment includes transposition of passages and even sentences of Ibn Rushd, a tendency we also find in Falaquera. Ivry notes (p. 275): “Most of these internal changes do not change the general argument of his sources, and they must simply have seemed to Narboni a more logical presentation of the argument.” Cf. Barkan, Thesis, pp. 14–15: “Each of Falaquera’s works is not a haphazard repetition of scholarly dicta, but an organized development of a given theme.”

historical perceptiveness. Thus, David Kaufmann⁵⁰ wrote that Falaquera

is worthy of serving as a most reliable authority, whose reliability and great knowledge have been confirmed by many examples . . . Not only was he an honest scholar who engaged tirelessly in his work of disseminating philosophic knowledge, but he also was a scholar possessing a clear critical sense for distinguishing sources, for differentiating various opinions and perspectives, and by the criteria of the height of the thirteenth century, he had an excellent sense for the history of philosophy.

Lawrence Berman also calls him an "excellent historian of philosophy."⁵¹

Paradoxically, despite the voluminous character of his works, and his popularity as evidenced by the preservation of so many of his works, we know very little about Falaquera's personal life. Perhaps the modesty which led him to disclaim originality also caused him to refrain from inserting his own personality and biography into his works, with the exception of the aforementioned reference to his age.⁵² References to Falaquera by later authors similarly do not provide any biographical information. Despite the considerations discussed above concerning his place of origin, we have no proof that Falaquera had any fixed abode. Indeed, Malter suggested, on the basis of a passage referring to the need for a poor man to wander about in search of food, that Falaquera himself may have been such a wanderer.⁵³ Wherever he may have lived, Falaquera was in Barcelona in 1291 where he received a copy of the excommunication of Solomon Petit.⁵⁴

We do not know how Falaquera supported himself. It is certainly possible that his extensive poetry may have provided him with some support in his younger years, but we have no evidence to substantiate this possibility, nor do we have most of his poetry, to which he makes reference later on (see below). The repeated references to poverty in such works as *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh* (The

50. Kaufmann, *Mehqarim Ba-Sifrut Ha-'Ivrit Shel Yemei Ha-Beinayim* (Hebrew translation from the German by Israel Eldad; Mosad Ha-Rav Kook, Jerusalem, 1965), p. 78; the original may be found in *Studien Ueber Salomon ibn Gabirol* (Budapest, 1899), pp. 1–2. Cf. Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, I: *Greece and Rome*, Preface, p. vii (Newman Press, Westminster, 1955): "Originality is certainly desirable when it means the discovery of a truth not hitherto revealed, but to pursue originality for the sake of originality is not the proper task of the historian."

51. L. Berman, "Maimonides, The Disciple of Alfarabi," *Israel Oriental Studies*, 4 (1974), p. 267 n. 43.

52. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 9.

53. Malter, "Palquera," p. 157.

54. *Mikhtav 'al Devar Ha-Moreh*, in *Sefer Minhat Qena'ot*, pp. 182–185.

Seeker) give credence to the view that he had personal experience of that condition. His works clearly manifest a knowledge of science and medicine, but again we lack any direct evidence to support the view (of Steinschneider and others) that Falaquera was a physician. In fact, although he had a thorough knowledge of the science, his views of the profession were scarcely complimentary. (Zunz also suggested that Falaquera was a physician.⁵⁵)

We similarly have no evidence to indicate that Falaquera ever married or had a family. With only a handful of exceptions, Falaquera's references to women were virtually uniformly negative and even nasty, and he seems to have had little love for children. Accordingly, Malter and others conclude that he probably never married.⁵⁶ Steinschneider initially indicated that a reference to "Abba Mari Rabbi Shem Tov ben Falaquera" at the beginning of both sections of *Batei Hanhagat Guf Ha-Bari'* and *Batei Hanhagat Ha-Nefesh* should be interpreted as "Abba Mori," i.e., "my father and teacher," and therefore he concluded that Falaquera had a son who copied his father's manuscript, and thus presumably Falaquera was married.⁵⁷ Subsequently, Steinschneider himself rejected this view, and concluded that Falaquera remained single.⁵⁸ Israel Hadaş regarded "Abba Mari" as simply an honorific term⁵⁹ which in no way justifies Levine's conclusion (like Steinschneider's initial view) that Falaquera had a son.⁶⁰ The fact that Levine discovered a poem⁶¹ which is not negative toward women, as is usually the case with Falaquera, is not sufficient reason to overlook the many negative remarks that Falaquera makes

55. Zunz, Thesis, Ch. 10. See the discussion of this question by Stitskin, "Thirteenth Century Philosopher," p. 81 and by Hadaş, "Introduction to *Batei Hanhagat* etc.," *Ha-Rofe' Ha-Ivri*, 2 (1937), pp. 153–154. Klugman, Thesis, p. 9 subscribes to this view, and further suggests that Falaquera "probably studied Latin and possibly some Greek." I am not aware of any textual evidence for such a view.
56. Malter, "Palquera," p. 155.
57. Steinschneider, *Bodleian Catalogue*, #2538. Barkan, Thesis, p. 9 accepts this view and writes: "Assuming the authenticity of this line (i.e. 'Abba Mari'), we can suggest that the Joseph ben Shemtob ibn Falaquera listed in the communal records of Tudela in 1289 may be a possible son of Shem Tob ben Joseph ibn Falaquera."
58. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1894, pp. 1637–1638.
59. "Introduction to *Batei Hanhagat* etc.," pp. 155–156.
60. Levine, *Seeker*, xviii–xix. Levine's Thesis, of which the recent book is a revision, follows Malter's view. It is strange that he should have revised his view, considering that Steinschneider abandoned that position and that Hadaş discussed the question. M. Zobel's article on "Falaquera" in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (German edition, and with minor changes in the new English edition), also followed Steinschneider's original, rather than revised, view. Also cf. Leon Stitskin, *Eight Jewish Philosophers*, p. 135 and p. 187 n. 4.
61. Levine, *Seeker*, p. 86. This poem is not found in any of the printed editions, but does appear in some manuscripts of *Mevaqqesh*. Cf. Levine, *Seeker*, p. 113 n. 103.

throughout many of his works. Levine's statement that the expression "Abba Mari" "makes it quite certain that he did have a son, and presumably a wife"⁶² simply fails to take into account the arguments advanced by Steinschneider, Malter and Ḥadash, and flies in the face of Falaquera's consistent misogyny. Falaquera's misogyny does not necessarily prove, of course, that he was a bachelor. But a positive reference to women is even less proof of his ever having married. Moreover, if, as is suggested in Chapter Two, the "Seeker" may represent Falaquera himself (since the Seeker's curriculum would have made him approximately Falaquera's age at the time of the composition of *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*), and if the "Seeker" is patterned after Kalkol in *'Iggeret Ha-Musar*, we may be able to infer from the fact that Kalkol never married (because he did not want to waste his time or strength on women, or to become entrapped by them),⁶³ that Falaquera himself never married for such reasons.

II. FALAQUERA AND POETRY

As a young man, Falaquera clearly devoted a great deal of time to poetry. Venetianer⁶⁴ concludes from Falaquera's statement in *Mevaqqesh* that he would not engage in any more poetry, that as a youth Falaquera had engaged almost exclusively in poetry, from which he now desisted, and that he only began the serious study of philosophy at the age of thirty. M. David⁶⁵ correctly rejects this view. By the time Falaquera wrote *Mevaqqesh* (between the ages of 35 and 40), he had already composed two important works (*Reshit Hokhmah* and *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*), both of which presuppose a deep understanding of philosophy. Moreover, Falaquera did not, as of the time that he wrote *Mevaqqesh*, stop writing poetry, but merely stopped engaging in it as a career, or stopped writing love songs. *Mevaqqesh* itself contains much verse, and even his last known work (*Mikhtav 'al Devar Ha-Moreh*) contains verse.

Falaquera took great pride in his early poetry. In *Mevaqqesh*⁶⁶ he claims to have climbed to the pinnacle of the palm-tree of poetry, and to have composed more than twenty thousand verses, of which over ten thousand were written down, while many others, though worthy of being written down, were lost. He says that many of his poems were rich in words of Torah. Davidson,⁶⁷ making

62. Levine, *Seeker*, p. xix.

63. *'Iggeret Ha-Musar*, p. 33.

64. Introduction to *Ma'alot*. The statement in *Mevaqqesh*, p. 63 (Levine, p. 91) is: "These are my final poems. From this day forth I have no portion in poetry and no share in songs."

65. Introduction to *Reshit Hokhmah*.

66. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 12.

67. I. Davidson, *'Ozar Ha-Shirah Ve-ha-Piyyut (Thesaurus of Medieval Hebrew*

use of only a number of Falaquera's extant books, identifies in those books alone some seventy-seven poems.

Graetz,⁶⁸ who cannot seem to say much that is positive about Falaquera, says that those rhymes which have become known are poor proof of poetic ability. This judgement is unduly harsh. Some of Falaquera's poems describing the miserable conditions of the Jews are quite moving. Falaquera had a sharp wit, and some of his poems (as well as some of his prose) contain humor, jokes, and puns.⁶⁹

For instance, the rich man counsels the Seeker to accumulate wealth, for a poor man has no respect:⁷⁰

אזי לא תאמין אשתו לקולו
ויהיה בין בני אדם בשפלות
עדי עליי יהי משתין חתולו

Then his wife won't obey him,
And he will be so lowly among men
That his cat will urinate on him.

The science of language, grammar, rhetoric, and poetry are only considered important by foolish people. And so, instead of getting to the truth that language should convey, they never advance beyond its forms:⁷¹

סכל יהי קונה שכל וימנה
עם השלמים. לו חכמה יהי קונה.
אכן יכלה כל ימיו בדקדוק איך
מן המקורים הפועל יהי בונה.

The fool would acquire intelligence and be counted
Among the perfect. Would that wisdom is what he would acquire!
Instead, he spends all his days in grammar — how
From the roots he can construct the verb.

Falaquera's views on the medical profession were similarly negative, and found expression in verse. The physician must deceive people to impress them with the importance of the medical profession to earn a fee. But for their foolishness, men would rely on nature to cure them in sickness:⁷²

Poetry) (Ktav, 1970), IV, p. 476. Also cf. the selections in H. Brody and M. Wiener, *Mivhar Ha-Shirah Ha-Ivrit* (Leipzig, 1922), and in D. Goldstein, *The Jewish Poets of Spain* (Penguin Books, 1971).

68. *Geschichte*, VII, p. 252.

69. M. Waxman, *History of Jewish Literature*, II, p. 59.

70. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 17 (Levine, *Seeker*, p. 16).

71. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 51 (Levine, *Seeker*, p. 73).

72. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 37 (Levine, *Seeker*, p. 49). The same poem is found at the end of Chapter 10 of *Sefer Sha'ashu'im* (*Book of Delight*) by Joseph ben Meir Zabara (late twelfth century, Spain). In the English translation by Moses Hadas (Columbia, 1932) it may be found on p. 142.

אמר זמן לכסיל היה רופא
 תמית בני אדם וקח ממונם.
 לך יתרון על מלאכי מות
 כי הם ימיתון האנוש ובחנם.

Time said to the fool: Be a doctor,
 You can kill people and take their money.
 You'll have an advantage over the angels of death,
 For they kill a man, but for free.

Falaquera advises listening more than speaking:⁷³

דברתך תהיה לבל לא תחטא
 אחת ויהיה שמעך כפלים.
 וראה אשר על כן בראך אל בפה
 אחת וברא לך שתי אזנים.

Let your speech, if you desire not to sin,
 Be one, and let your listening be double.
 And behold, that therefore God created you
 With one mouth but two ears.

He also aims his humor at women:⁷⁴

באשה אל תהי נפשך בטוחה.
 אשה רשת מזרה היא ושוחה.
 ואיכה נאמין עוד כי ישרה
 תהי אשה ומצלע לקוחה?

Let your soul not trust in a woman.
 A woman is a spread net and pit.⁷⁵
 How can we still believe that she is honest,
 For woman was taken from a rib?⁷⁶

Falaquera's humor infected his prose as well as poetry, and sometimes the same theme will be found in both a poem and prose (such as the reference to man's being created with two ears but only one mouth). He inserts a humorous passage into otherwise serious prose works. For example, he argues that to deny the validity of rational speculation because some persons have erred in

73. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 41. See Levine, Thesis, p. 99 n. 102, and *Seeker*, p. 110 n. 73b for possible parallels. A similar expression is found in Falaquera's *Iggeret Ha-Musar*, p. 58: "ואמר החכם לשונך עבדך בעוד שאתה שותק ואם תדבר אתה עבדו. וראה אדם אחד: מדבר הרבה ויאמר לו המעט דבריך כי הבורא ברא לנו שתי אזנים ולשון אחד מפני שנשמע כפלים ממה שנדבר."

Cf. *Musarei Ha-Pilosofim*, 2:2:17 (p. 24).

74. *Iggeret ha-Musar*, p. 34.

75. Proverbs 1:17, 22:14.

76. "Honest," literally "straight," whereas the rib is curved.

their speculation is like denying water to someone who is thirsty, so that he dies, on the grounds that some people have drowned.⁷⁷ And in his defense of the *Guide of the Perplexed*,⁷⁸ he plays on the name of Maimonides' opponent Solomon Petit and calls him *peti* (fool).

Falaquera's fondness for word-plays on names also finds expression at the expense of Judah Hayyuj, whom he calls the "lion's cub" (*gur aryeh*), a play on Jacob's blessing in Genesis 49:9 ("Judah is a lion's cub"), and Jonah ibn Jannah, whom he calls "the winged one" (*ba'al kenafayim*), a play on both the Hebrew *yonah* (dove) and the Arabic *janāḥ* (wing).⁷⁹

Needless to say, much of Falaquera's poetry is serious, and his poems often lament the poor condition of the Jews. The poetry included in such works as *Mevaqqesh* is generally better known than poems in his other works. It is in one of his lesser known works, *Ẓeri Ha-Yagon* (The Balm for Sorrow),⁸⁰ that we find a moving statement of how happiness gives way to sorrow, and sorrow to happiness, in terms reminiscent of the "U-netaneh Toqef" section of the Musaf (Additional) service of the High Holy Days:⁸¹

ראה מקרי זמן בוגד / אנוש אנוש והפלא
 דבר ממך נעלם / אני את אונך גולה
 פרטיו לא אבאר כי / זמני מספור יכלה
 זמן יריק לך מצוק / והטוב ממך יכלה
 ואישיו חולפים יום יום / ואדם כלבוש יכלה
 ומי יוריש ומי יעשיר / ומי ירד ומי יעלה
 ומי מלך ומי הלך / ומי נכבד ומי נקלה
 ומי עליון ומי אביון / ומי שוקט ומי גולה
 ומי נטרף ומי נשרף / ומי נסקל ומי נתלה
 מתי מספר כתבתם לך / ועוד נוסף עלי אלה

Behold the events of time, betraying
 Mortal man, and wonder.
 The thing that is hidden from you
 Will I reveal.
 I cannot explain its details, for

77. *Ma'alot*, p. 75. This is a paraphrase of Ibn Rushd, *Faṣl al-Maqal* (ed. Hourani, p. 6); "The Decisive Treatise," in Lerner and Mahdi, *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, p. 168. Falaquera also refers the reader to *'Iggeret Ha-Vikkuah*.

78. *Mikhtav 'al Devar Ha-Moreh*.

79. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 52.

80. *Ẓeri Ha-Yagon*, Ch. 2, Cremona ed., p. 10a; Ottensosser ed., p. 44.

81. Elsewhere in *Ẓeri Ha-Yagon*, Ch. 3 (Ottensosser ed., p. 68), among many phrases intermixing biblical and rabbinic verses with his own rhymed verse, Falaquera has a phrase reminiscent of the fourth benediction in the daily 'Amidah: ומי שחננו האל: דעה בינה והשכל.

My time will end before counting.
 Time will empty of distress for you,
 And goodness will end for you.
 Its persons pass on day by day,
 Man wears out like clothing.
 Who will become poor, and who will become rich,⁸²
 Who will go down, and who will go up;
 Who is a king, and who is a wanderer,
 Who is honored, and who is despised;
 Who is supreme, and who is poor,
 Who is tranquil, and who is exiled;
 Who is torn, and who is burned,
 Who is stoned, and who is hanged;
 (These) few people have I inscribed for you.⁸³
 There are more in addition to these.

Despite his obvious love — and talent — for poetry, Falaquera resolved, at the time he wrote *Mevaqqesh*, to turn away from the love of his youth and to dedicate himself to a more serious concern with philosophy and science. Falaquera decided to “divorce” poetry; the first part of *Mevaqqesh* (which contains so many poems) would be his parting “writ of divorce.” “From this day forth, I have no portion in poetry.”⁸⁴ He had already indicated this intention to abandon poetry at the beginning of the book,⁸⁵ saying that the red sins of youth became like white wool. The days of youth have flown off like dreams, and he was going to give up love songs, praises of aristocrats, and the songs of riders and wanderers who wander in the desert of desire, and instead to study the truth, weaken his youthful appetite, have his intellect govern his soul, and serve God in joy. On Wednesday (i.e., middle age, which was now approaching) one should prepare for the Sabbath (i.e., the world to come). Divorcing the love of his youth, he now wished to marry the “daughter of wisdom.”⁸⁶

Falaquera’s attitude towards poetry thus seems to have been somewhat ambivalent in his later life. On the one hand, we now find negative references to poetry. The felicitous person should engage already in his youth in the

82. Cf. I Samuel 2:7.

83. These few people — the types mentioned above — are inscribed (in the Book of Life).

84. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 63; Levine, p. 91.

85. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 9; Levine, p. 2. Also cf. the Introductory Poem, *Mevaqqesh*, pp. 6–7 (Levine, pp. 94–95). The same poem is found at the beginning of *De’ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 1b, ms. Leiden f. 104ab, where Falaquera also renounces poetry and denounces it as dross on the intellect’s gold, and as deceiving.

86. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 10.

mathematical sciences and not waste his time with “the vanities of the poets and their lies.”⁸⁷ Falaquera even wrote a poem against poets:⁸⁸

אשאל לאדם בחלום אחזה
אותר הזה הרק והנבזה
מצאצאִיךָ ? וענני
חזה אגרש אם אמת הוא זה.

I asked Adam, in a dream that I had,
Is this empty and despicable one
Of your progeny? He answered,
If that is true, I'll divorce Eve.

He quotes Plato to the effect that poetry does not lead to wisdom but away from it.⁸⁹

But, as has already been mentioned, Falaquera did continue to write poetry, although presumably no more of the love songs of his youth, which he now considered evil. David follows Steinschneider in his view that one cannot take seriously frequent Jewish and Arab claims to have abandoned poetry.⁹⁰

Therefore, while on the one hand we find negative references to poetry, we find on the other hand a continued interest in poets and poetry. Falaquera's dialogue between the Seeker and the Poet⁹¹ preserves this ambivalence. The Seeker states that the poet is intelligent, but should spend his time on truth and not on the vanity of poetry. True knowledge and science constitute man's form and God's image. Poetry is based on vanity, lacks truth, and is reinforced by the lies of the imagination. Wisdom is like the fruit, and poetry is like the leaves of the tree. To this the poet responds that poetry can be the means of teaching good qualities and the praise of God. The song of Moses (“Ha'azinu” — Deuteronomy 32) contains all the principles of the Torah. The Psalms were divinely inspired, and the Song of Songs is called “holy of holies” by the rabbis.⁹² The poet seeks beauty in speech and deed by his very nature.

The Seeker's poet discusses his theory of poetry.⁹³ Poetry is defined as a

87. *Ma'alot*, p. 47; a similar statement is found in *Iggeret Ha-Ḥalom*, p. 485.

88. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 59 (Levine, *Seeker*, p. 87). In the story, an Arab poet has been instructing the King's son in the art of poetry, but now suffers this rebuke from the prince. See Schirmann, II:1 p. 342, and Levine, *Seeker*, p. 113 n. 104, concerning an Arabic source of this poem.

89. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 73. The reference is probably to *Republic*, Book X, 595–600. See discussion in Levine, *Seeker*, Introduction, pp. xxxiii–xxxiv and notes.

90. David, *Reshit Hokhmah*, Introduction, p. vi n. 5.

91. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 56 (Levine, *Seeker*, p. 79).

92. *Shir Ha-Shirim Rabba* 1:1:11, in the name of Rabbi 'Akiva.

93. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 60. Steven Harvey (*Falaquera's Epistle of the Debate*, forthcoming) discusses Falaquera's attitude toward poetry, including this passage. Dr. Harvey

statement composed of imitations of things, which is divided in meter. Poetry makes an impression on the masses because it is based on comparison and therefore arouses the imagination. It utilizes meter because it thus is more beautiful to the imagination. But the poet does not know why some people claim that poetry causes people to mistake something imagined for the thing itself. (This, of course, had been the basis of Plato's opposition to poetry.)⁹⁴

Falaquera lists three types, or degrees, of poetry.⁹⁵ The highest type of poetry is prophetic, such as the aforementioned "Ha'azinu"⁹⁶ and Moses' Song of the Sea.⁹⁷ The second type of poetry is divinely inspired⁹⁸ and includes such poems as the Psalms of David, Proverbs, the Song of Songs. The third type of poetry consists of praises of God composed by poets. But the praise of men is even lower than this, and the wise only resort to the praise of men when it is necessary. Poets of the lowest order (who praise God and men) include: 1) Solomon ibn Gabirol 2) Samuel Ha-Nagid 3) Judah Ha-Levi 4) Moses ibn Ezra 5) Abraham ibn Ezra 6) Isaac ibn Gi'at 7) Moses ibn Kimḥi 8) Judah ben Gi'at 9) Yosef ben Abitur, and many others in Spain, Catalonia and Provence.⁹⁹ Some of these poets composed *piyyutim* (liturgical poetry), but only a few of these should be recited, since one really should only recite the Psalms of David in praise of God.

The positive aspect of Falaquera's ambivalent attitude towards poetry is also brought out by his lament¹⁰⁰ that the quality of Jewish poetry has declined due to the difficulties of exile: "We have fallen into exile. The Holy Spirit¹⁰¹ has been taken from us . . . How can we sing the Lord's song on foreign soil?"¹⁰²

suggests that Falaquera employed poetry and dialogical form in his earlier books, intended for popular audiences, whereas his later books, being purely philosophical and intended for a more limited audience, no longer employ these literary devices.

94. *Republic*, X, 595–600. See above. Cf. Ibn Rushd's Commentary on Plato's *Republic*, and the references to poetry as imitation; Rosenthal ed., p. 33, Eng. trans. by Ralph Lerner (*Averroes on Plato's Republic*), p. 25, and "that the art of poetry has neither the purpose nor the knowledge from which true knowledge comes about" (Rosenthal ed. p. 105, Lerner trans. p. 148).

95. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 61.

96. Deuteronomy 32.

97. Shirat Ha-Yam, Exodus 15.

98. "Be-ruah ha-qodesh," by the holy spirit.

99. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 61. Levine (Thesis, p. 245) does not list Moses ibn Kimḥi in his Hebrew text, and therefore also excludes him from his English text (p. 152), although he does list him in the critical apparatus. But Levine simply omits Judah ben Gi'at from his English text (Thesis, p. 152, *Seeker*, p. 89), although he does list him in the Hebrew.

100. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 61.

101. An expression for the divine inspiration of Biblical poetry. See above.

102. Psalm 137:4. For Ha-Levi's remarks concerning the degradation and decline of the Hebrew language and poetry, cf. *Kuzari* 2:68 ff. Cf. A.S. Halkin, "The Medieval

III. FALAQUERA'S LANGUAGE, STYLE AND TERMINOLOGY

Falaquera's Hebrew style and terminology are a reflection of his philosophical goals. Unlike some of the earlier Jewish philosophers, who were more comfortable expressing themselves in Arabic or who wished to restrict the reading of their books to those who already knew philosophy, Falaquera explicitly states that he wrote in Hebrew to be of maximum benefit:¹⁰³ "My intention is to write about these sciences in our language, because it is better for us to learn them in our language than for us to learn them in the language of another people."¹⁰⁴

Consistent with his aim of demonstrating the harmony that exists between philosophy and Judaism, he freely intermixes, in many of his works, quotes from Greek, Arabic, biblical, and rabbinic sources. Sometimes he incorporates a biblical phrase into his own language, occasionally by giving it a necessary change of person or tense in the verb to make it fit his context. Such usages generally are not forced, but flow smoothly both in idea and language, in his poetry and prose.

An example of Falaquera's ability to interweave diverse strands is a passage from the Introduction to *Reshit Hokhmah*, where he borrows phrases from different parts of Jewish liturgy to prove, in a philosophical context, that knowledge constitutes the ultimate felicity:¹⁰⁵

ועלינו לשבח לאדון הכל אשר הבדילנו מהתועים והורינו דרך הישרה
ההשים לפנינו מחשכים לאורה החונן אותנו דעת להשיג זו ההצלחה.

It is incumbent upon us to praise the Lord of all,¹⁰⁶ who distinguished us from those who err¹⁰⁷ and taught us the correct way,¹⁰⁸ who made dark places into light before us,¹⁰⁹ who grants us knowledge¹¹⁰ to attain this felicity.

Falaquera's language and style have accordingly received wider recognition and appreciation than his philosophical contribution and originality. Zunz

Jewish Attitude Toward Hebrew," in A. Altmann, *Biblical and Other Studies* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 233–248.

103. *Ma'alot*, p. 11 and *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 8. Cf. Halkin, *art. cit.*, pp. 233–248, and Barkan, Thesis, pp. 10–11.

104. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 21. Also cf. Malter, *op. cit.*, p. 170 n. 34.

105. *Reshit Hokhmah*, Introduction, p. 9.

106. Prayer "Alenu" at conclusion of service.

107. From the *Qedushah de-sidra*, "U-va' le-ziyyon go'el."

108. I Samuel 12:23 and Psalm 27:11.

109. Isaiah 42:16.

110. From the daily 'Amidah, the fourth benediction, "atta honen le-'adam da'at".

wrote:¹¹¹ "In est itaque in ejus — sicut Mendelssohnii — scriptis sermonis suavitas, licet vis non desideretur".

Malter opposes Güdemann's characterization of Falaquera's style as dry and monotonous,¹¹² and agrees rather with Kaufmann¹¹³ that his style was good. "A command of a clear style and forceful exposition made the results of his study widely accessible in Jewry. In a democratic spirit, he sought to make his knowledge popular, and rejected Arabic, the literary language of the day, for Hebrew, the tongue better understood by the masses."¹¹⁴ Schirmann also praises Falaquera's style as sharp and witty, and says that Falaquera has excellent literary and descriptive ability.¹¹⁵ Waxman similarly praises Falaquera's skill, particularly in his poetry and humor.¹¹⁶ Roberta Klugman Barkan writes: "Hebrew was his choice of language, and he wrote it with lyric ease in poetry, prose, and essay."¹¹⁷

One of Falaquera's major interests was the translation of philosophical and scientific sources from Arabic into Hebrew. His works are replete with quotes from the Greek and Arab philosophers, which he himself translated. Some of his poems are translations or parallels of Arabic poems (see above). His commentary on Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* (*Moreh Ha-Moreh*; see below) does not rely on the two existing translations, but includes Falaquera's own translation of those passages in which he is interested, which in some cases may be the entire chapter. He translated selections of Gabirol's Arabic *Fons Vitae* as well as the works, or selections of works, of other philosophers (see below).

As a result of this interest, he was particularly interested in developing proper Hebrew terminology for scientific terms. He regarded the existing translations of the *Guide of the Perplexed* by Samuel ibn Tibbon and Judah al-Ḥarizi as inaccurate and as causing the misunderstanding of Maimonides which led to unjustified opposition to philosophy.¹¹⁸ He listed specific problems with the existing translations in an appendix to his commentary on the *Guide*, and maintained that the second translation (i.e., Ḥarizi's) is replete with mistakes, so that it sometimes actually contradicts Maimonides' intentions. Ibn Tibbon's translation, while also faulty, is better than Ḥarizi's, and Falaquera

111. Zunz, Thesis, Ch. 10 pp. 19–20 ("There is in his writings, as in Mendelssohn's, a certain sweetness of language, although forcefulness is not lacking").

112. M. Güdemann, *Das juedische Unterrichtswesen*, I (1875) p. 157.

113. D. Kaufmann, *Gabirol Studien*, pp. 59, 61. Both are quoted by Malter, *op. cit.*, p. 178 n. 52.

114. Malter, *ibid.*, p. 170.

115. Schirmann, *op. cit.*, II, 1, p. 330.

116. Waxman, *History of Jewish Literature*, II, p. 59.

117. Barkan, Thesis, p. 10.

118. Cf. *Mikhtav 'al Devar Ha-Moreh*.

respected Ibn Tibbon as a translator: "I know that if he had paid more attention to the translation, he could have translated more correctly."¹¹⁹ But Al-Ḥarizi is a fool (*peti*).¹²⁰

Therefore, Falaquera developed a terminology which sometimes differs from that of Ibn Tibbon. When using terms with which people may not be familiar, he defines them.¹²¹ Since the problems of translation are particularly pronounced in work which deal with technical subjects, such as medicine, he discusses his approach to translation in *Batei Hanhagat Guf Ha-Bari*, and says ¹²² that he endeavors to include as much as possible, but omits things for which there is no term in Hebrew; for example, he mentions only those foods which have names in Hebrew.

As a careful translator, Falaquera attempted to appreciate the nuances of the terminology he employed. Thus, in the Introduction to *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*,¹²³ he clearly distinguishes between *takhlit* (final purpose, goal) and *tikhlah* (end, completion).

Takhlit (purpose) is the intended cause of something for which we make it, such as our saying that the 'purpose' of a chair is to be sat upon, and this is the fourth cause. Although the term 'purpose' also connotes what the term 'end' (*tikhlah*) connotes, I decided to differentiate between them, so that the reader might not err, for death is the termination (*sof*) of the person and his end (*tikhlah*), but it is not his purpose (*takhlit*).¹²⁴

Such caution led Falaquera occasionally to reject conventional terminology, in order to preserve proper philosophical nuances. For example, he rejects the term *dimmayon* (similarity), which others had adopted to connote imagination or phantasm:

There is a great difference (*hefresh*) between *dimmu* (imagination) and *dimmayon* (similarity), because *dimmu* is a gerund (*shem ha-po'al*), and in truth is actually a verb, because it is the activity (*po'al*) of the imaginative faculty (*koah ha-medammeh*). But when something resembles something else in any manner, it is referred to as its similarity (*dimmayon*)... The form of a sensible object which remains in the common sense (*hush ha-mishtattef*) after (the object itself) is no longer present to the eye is called a phantasm

119. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 158.

120. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 157.

121. For example, *Batei Hanhagat Guf Ha-Bari*, p. 4.

122. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

123. *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 9b, ms. Leyden f. 110b.

124. Cf. Falaquera's similar point in *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 16b, ms. Leyden f. 115b.

(*dimmy*). But the translators have translated it as *dimmayon* (similarity), instead of *dimmy* (imagination, phantasm), and that is an error.¹²⁵

In the appendix to *Moreh Ha-Moreh* concerning errors in the translation of the *Guide*, Falaquera sometimes agrees with one of the two translations (of Ibn Tibbon and Al-Harizi) against the other, and sometimes with neither. But one senses that because he has a higher respect for Ibn Tibbon, he takes him to task on finer points. For instance,¹²⁶ Ibn Tibbon translated אַתָּאָרָה as “his action” (מעשהו) rather than “his impression” (רשמו): “There is a great difference between action and impression, for the act of something incorporeal is called an impression, because it is the impression of form on matter.”

Such a distinction is less linguistic than philosophical. But Ibn Tibbon must take slight nuances into account, since he is translating a philosophical work. The *Guide* was composed carefully and free of mistakes. The translation should also be free of mistakes, that the exact meaning not be lost.¹²⁷

Falaquera was well versed in Hebrew grammar, and sometimes criticizes Ibn Tibbon on purely grammatical grounds.¹²⁸ His knowledge of grammar and the Biblical Masorah led him to note that Maimonides' interpretation of Isaiah 40:13 could not be justified on the basis of the Masoretic text:¹²⁹

“מי תכן את רוח ה' ואיש עצתו יודיענו”. נראה שהרב פירש הפסוק כן: מי הוא שיוכל להשיג כוונת ה' ויודיע לנו רצונו. נראה לפי דבריו כי בספר הרב היתה הנז' רפה, ובספרים שלנו היא דגושה. ור"ל לפירושינו: מי הוא אשר יהיה גדול כל-כך ויתן עצה לה'.

“Who has comprehended the spirit of the Lord; what man was His

125. *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, Introduction, ms. Parma f. 7a, ms. Leyden f. 108b. Cf. Falaquera's discussion of his preference for the term *hiyyuni* over the conventional *ba'al hayyim* preferred by “most of the translators,” in *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 7b, ms. Leiden f. 109a.

126. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 153.

127. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 148.

128. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 152. Ibn Tibbon translated אַתָּאָרָה as “his action” (מעשהו) rather than “his impression” (רשמו): “There is a great difference between action and impression, for the act of something incorporeal is called an impression, because it is the impression of form on matter.”

129. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, “Be'ur Nifla',” p. 172. Falaquera's interpretation is correct on the basis of the Masoretic text, in which the *nun* is accented with a *dagesh*, thus meaning “him” (in which case “*yodi'ennu*” is equivalent to “*yodi'ehu*,” as opposed to the unaccented “*yodi'enu*,” which would mean “to instruct us”). Maimonides' interpretation (“... us”) is thus inconsistent with the Masoretic text. Prof. Nahum Sarna has kindly informed me that Falaquera's suggestion that Maimonides may have had a different, unaccented text is *not* borne out by the Aleppo Codex, which Maimonides used, in which *yodi'ennu* is accented.

counsellor that he might instruct him (*yodi'ennu*).” It seems that the Rabbi interpreted the verse thus: who can comprehend God’s intention and inform us (*yodi'enu*) of His will. It seems from his words that in the Rabbi’s text the letter *nun* was weak (i.e., without a *dagesh*), whereas in our texts it is accented (with a *dagesh*). So our interpretation is: who is so great that he can give counsel to God (*yodi'ennu*).”

Despite his explicit aim of writing in Hebrew, Falaquera admitted that the need for accurate terminology occasionally forced him to invent new terms or to borrow foreign terminology, just as the rabbis in the Talmud employed Greek and Aramaic terms for lack of appropriate Hebrew vocabulary. Even such a rich language as Arabic, he pointed out, needed to employ loanwords.¹³⁰

Examples of Arabic terms used where no suitable Hebrew terms were available can be found in several of Falaquera’s works. Quite a few Arabic terms are employed in *De’ot Ha-Pilosofim*. In *Sefer Ha-Nefesh* we find several such cases. For example, in Chapter 5, he refers to a “plant which flourishes on the surface of the water and is called *ṭuḥlub* (water moss) and water plant.”¹³¹ In Chapter 16, Falaquera states that animals do not have the faculty of recollection, which is a function of the intellect. Instead, animals remember in virtue of a faculty “which has no name” but which in Arabic is called *wahm* (והם), the estimative faculty.¹³² And in Chapter 18, he discusses hearing as perception in a space in the ear known in Arabic as *samak* (סמס), from the motions of the air touching the ear.¹³³ (The Arabic term denotes something high or thick, such as a roof or canopy.)

Sometimes Falaquera uses an Arabic term even when one might think that a common Hebrew term might suffice. For instance, in *Liquṭim Mi-Sefer Meqor Hayyim* (Selections from *Fons Vitae*), Falaquera uses the Arabic *jins* (genus) instead of the Hebrew term *sug*.¹³⁴ He also uses the Arabic *dahar* for eternity,¹³⁵ instead of a Hebrew term. In discussing the fact that Maimonides uses simpler terms at the beginning of the *Guide* than in later sections, where he

130. *De’ot Ha-Pilosofim*, Introduction, ms. Parma f. 6b, ms. Leyden f. 108a.

131. Hebrew text, p. 10. Cf. note 11 to Chapter 5 for a discussion of *ṭuḥlub*.

132. Hebrew text, p. 31. The designation of *wahm* as estimative faculty, as opposed to instinct, is at the suggestion of Prof. Shlomo Pines. This is based on the Latin “estimatio,” based on the Greek terms σύνεσις, Θρόνησις, πρόνοια. See H. Wolfson, “The Internal Senses,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 28 (1935), p. 132, and A.M. Goichon, *Vocabulaires Comparés D’Aristote et D’Ibn Sina* (Paris, 1939) p. 40. The Arabic term’s common usage indicates delusive imagination, conjecture, illusion, foreboding.

133. Hebrew text, p. 35. Steinschneider discusses this term in *HU*, p. 989 n. 5.

134. *Liquṭim* 5:29.

135. *Liquṭim* 3:7.

goes into greater detail, Falaquera uses the Arabic **מצאדרה** for the Hebrew **פתיחה** (beginning, preface).¹³⁶

At other times, of course, he seems actually to have lacked an appropriate Hebrew term. He refers to theriac, an antidote to snake bites, known in Arabic as **טריאקה**.¹³⁷ He mentions, in the context of things that change imperceptibly over thousands of years, two precious stones **דר** and **לולו**.¹³⁸ He refers to a "white fluid called **בלגם**,"¹³⁹ which clearly is an Arabic corruption of the Greek *phlegma*. And he quotes Galen, that by proper regimen one can open the obstruction of the liver and release the hardening of the spleen known in Arabic as **צלאכה**.¹⁴⁰ Falaquera uses the term **מחו** to indicate a black spot on the moon, a blemish which does not have light.¹⁴¹ And he suggests that laughter increases as the muscles (**עצל**) relax.¹⁴²

These clearly are cases of technical terms. At other times, he mentions Arabic terms because of their specific connotations in Islam or because they help him to amplify a concept. Thus, he quotes Ibn Rushd regarding the opinions of the *dahariya* (**דהרייה**), a materialist and atheistic doctrine in Islam.¹⁴³ When discussing God's will, Falaquera informs the reader that the Arabic term *'irada* (**אראדה**) is found in ancient scientific and philosophical books.¹⁴⁴ In the context of a discussion of creation, he says that the term **אבראע** specifically means creation *ex nihilo*.¹⁴⁵ He also informs the reader that mechanics (**חכמת התחבולות**) is known in Arabic as *al-jabr w'al-muqabalah*

136. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:Introduction, p. 10.

137. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:6, p. 87. It should actually be spelled **טריאקה**. In its Aramaic form **תיריקא** it is found in the Talmud (Shabbat 109b, Nedarim 41b). Cf. S. Muentzer, Maimonides' *Treatise on Poisons and Their Antidotes*, Part I, Ch. 4 (Philadelphia, 1966). Also cf. I.M. Rabinowicz, *Traité des Poisons* (Paris, 1935), pp. 31–32, and J. Preuss, *Biblisch-talmudische Medizin* (Berlin, 1911), p. 509, "Theriak."

138. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:14, p. 99. *Durr* means pearls; the root *la'la'* means to shine or glitter, from which is derived *lu'lu'*; also meaning pearls. Cf. Ḥasdai ibn Shaprut's *Letter to the King of the Khazars* (in Judah Ha-Levi, *Sefer Ha-Kuzari*, ed. Zifroni [Schocken, Tel Aviv, 1967], p. 342): "... **וריש בארצנו מוצא לכסף ומוצא לזהב** ... **ומוצא ללאון, כי כן שמו בלשון ישמעאליים**."

139. *Batei Hanhagat Guf ha-Bari'*, Ch. 15 p. 51. See the discussion by Ḥadash, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

140. *Iggeret Ha-Ḥalom*, p. 477. The Arabic term means "hardening."

141. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:19, p. 103. The term means something which is erased, eradicated, wiped off, rubbed out.

142. *Zeri Ha-Yagon* 6:7–10 (Barkan, Thesis, pp. 157–158).

143. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:13, p. 98.

144. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:12, p. 93.

145. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 3:15, p. 124. The printed text mistakenly has *'ibra'* here instead of *'ibda'*. Also cf. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 7.

(אלגבר ואלמקאבלה).¹⁴⁶ Contemplation (Hebrew עצה) is called *ra'y* (ראי) in Arabic.¹⁴⁷

As a careful translator, who tended to be quite literal, Falaquera used terms that closely conveyed the meaning of the original Arabic. In reference to predestination or determinism, he translated *al-qada' w'al-qadar* (אלקצא ואלקדר) as גזרה ושעור ("decree and fate"), preserving the connotation of decreeing or deciding of the Arabic קצי and Hebrew גזר, and the connotation of measuring of the Arabic קדר and Hebrew שעור.¹⁴⁸

Falaquera attempted to bring out subtle nuances in language, especially as they affected philosophical doctrine. He noted that the expression לית שערי in Arabic, translated as מי יתן ואדע, would not be used by someone if he thought he actually knew the truth (an observation he attributes to Ibn Bajja).¹⁴⁹ He asserts that Aristotle used this expression only regarding the question of the eternity of motion (thus supporting Maimonides' claim that Aristotle did not actually claim to have demonstrated eternity). Falaquera notes that Al-Farabi, comparing the matter of which the stars and spheres consist, did not use the term פרק (Hebrew הכרל) but rather אבת (sic) (Hebrew חלוף), which means not "distinction" but "something else."¹⁵⁰

Greek terms also found their way into Falaquera's vocabulary, via the Arabic usage. He employs such terms as מאגניטוס (magnet)¹⁵¹ and קורייל (coral).¹⁵² In *Moreh Ha-Moreh*¹⁵³ Falaquera quotes Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: "וארסטו זכר במאמר הלמד" (Aristotle mentioned in Part "Lamed"). Although the Hebrew *lamed* generally would mean thirty (its numerical value), here it can

146. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 47.

147. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 3:51, p. 135. The term '*ezah* ordinarily means "counsel" or "advice." It is used several times in *Shelemut Ha-Ma'asim* (Ch. 4, p. 7 line 12; Ch. 6, p. 12 lines 27, 40, 45, 46; p. 13 lines 56, 58). The translation as "contemplation" is based on *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 3:51, p. 135: "The felicitous philosopher employs contemplation, wisdom, and intellect . . . The employment of thought for intellectual things is called contemplation (*'ezah*), which in Arabic means opinion (*ra'y*), which is intellectual conception." This is borne out by an examination of the Arabic text (ed. A. Badawi, Kuwait, 1979, p. 353), which has here *al-ra'y*. The Hebrew version of Ibn Rushd's Middle Commentary (ed. L. Berman) has here הסכרא העיונית. The reference is to Aristotle's Θεωρία. Cf. the several meanings of '*ezah* in Jacob Klatzin, *Ozar Ha-Munahim Ha-Pilosofiyim*, 3, pp. 152–153.

148. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 3:17, p. 128.

149. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:15, p. 100.

150. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:19, p. 102.

151. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:72, p. 52.

152. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 99: אלמוגים הנקרא קורייל בלעז.

153. 3:16 p. 125.

only be understood as a literal reference to the Greek "lambda," by which sign Book XII of the *Metaphysics* was also commonly known in Arabic.

Like other Jewish philosophers,¹⁵⁴ Falaquera was aware of the etymology of the term "philosophy." Thus, "the man who is ethically perfect and who studies all existents and strives to know their true reality, who is separated from other men in order to perceive and be united with his Creator, is called in the Greek language 'philosopher,' i.e., a lover of wisdom."¹⁵⁵ And he quotes Al-Farabi that "philosophy" is a Greek term, meaning love of wisdom, composed of the words *phila* and *sophia* פילא וסופיא.¹⁵⁶ When listing the eight parts of logic,¹⁵⁷ he gives the Greek (following the Arabic) as well as Hebrew terms.

Falaquera also knew the etymology of סופיסטאני (sophist), one who defines things in a deficient manner and thus causes people to err.¹⁵⁸ He used the plural form אלספסטאנין as well.¹⁵⁹ He explains that sophistry is called מאמר מזויף (a falsified proposition), and is not the name of a person, but is derived from ספיא (wisdom חכמה) and אסטן (falsification, forgery זיוף).¹⁶⁰

At other times, Falaquera's attempts at etymology were less successful. For example, he maintained that the Hebrew שמע טבעי (from the Arabic אלסמע אלטבעי, which he identifies as Greek), does not refer to שמע (hearing).¹⁶¹

As has already been mentioned, Falaquera occasionally refers to the problem of certain terms or names not being found in Hebrew. Sometimes he therefore cut short a discussion of things which were not commonly available or for which he lacked Hebrew terms. For instance, in a discussion of animals, he says "I omitted what he said about animals, because we do not know their names and they are not prevalent among us."¹⁶² And in a discussion of

154. For example, see Isaac Israeli's first description of philosophy from its name, in *Book of Definitions* (in Isaac Israeli, edited by A. Altmann and S.M. Stern, p. 24).

155. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 102.

156. *Ma'alot*, p. 48. Cf. *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 4a, ms. Leyden f. 106b: "... כי מלת פילוסוף שעניינה אהבת החכמה ..."

Cf. Al-Farabi, *Attainment of Happiness* #53 (in *Alfarabi's Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle*, trans. Muhsin Mahdi, p. 43).

157. *Reshit Hokhmah*, pp. 37–38. This is the section Efros identified as a translation of Al-Farabi's *Ihṣā al-'Ulum*.

158. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 89.

159. *Ma'alot*, p. 76.

160. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 35. His etymology is good. ἡστέον comes from ἔιδω, to take the appearance of something, to make oneself like something. Cf. Al-Farabi, *Philosophy of Plato* #53 (ed. Mahdi p. 57).

161. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 51. Klatzkin (*Oẓar Ha-Munaḥim Ha-Pilosofiyyim*, 4, p. 133) and Efros (*Philosophical Terms in the Moreh Nebukim*, p. 117) derive שמע טבעי from Φυσικά ἀκροάσις, *physica auscultatio*. Cf. S. Munk and M. Friedlander on *Guide of the Perplexed* 1:73 (3rd premise).

162. *De'ot ha-Pilosofim*, Part V, ms. Parma f. 137a: ועזבתי מה שדבר בחיוני שלא נדע שמותם ואינם נמצאים אצלנו.

minerals, "moreover, most of these stones have no name in our language and are not familiar to us since they are not prevalent among us."¹⁶³

Nevertheless, despite such problems, Falaquera clearly did not have difficulty expressing himself in Hebrew, and in fact he developed a terminology that is distinctive and sometimes unique. For instance, the term *yezirah* generally refers to creation or nature, but Falaquera consistently uses the adjectival form *yeziri*¹⁶⁴ to mean ethical or moral, throughout his works. Zunz¹⁶⁵ calls this usage peculiar to Falaquera, and all Klatzkin's examples are taken from Falaquera.¹⁶⁶

The terms *אנשי המחקר*; *חכמי המחקר*; *בעלי המחקר* are sometimes applied only to the Peripatetics or to the *Mutakallimun*. But Falaquera seems to use these terms more loosely to refer in general to philosophers or scientists.¹⁶⁷ "Therefore I decided . . . to explain in this work the opinions of the thinkers (*אנשי המחקר*) about all existents, for they are the wise men who are called true philosophers."¹⁶⁸ Sometimes, instead of one of these terms, Falaquera uses *עיון בעלי עיון* or *מעיינים* for scientists or rationalists.¹⁶⁹

In general, Falaquera's own usage of *נימוס* (from νόμος) is restricted to a religious context, and means religious legislation, and not law in the political sense that the term usually bears. The term is equivalent in many cases to "religion"¹⁷⁰ or to religious authority (*בעל נימוסים*), in opposition to the

163. *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, Part III, ms. Parma f. 120a: *ועוד כי רוב האבנים אין להם שם בלשוננו ואין ניכרות ולא מצואות אצלנו*.

164. Prof. Shlomo Pines explains that Falaquera here is translating literally the Arabic *khulqi* (ethical), from the root *khalaqa*, to create (Hebrew: *yāzar*). Falaquera's *yeziri* additionally involves a play on the ethical connotations of the biblical and rabbinic usage of *yezzer* (cf. Genesis 6:5 and 8:21).

165. Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften* (1876) III, p. 279. See Levine, Thesis, p. 100 n. 103, and Plessner, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

166. *Thesaurus*, II, p. 48.

167. Cf. Steinschneider, *HU* #2, p. 6 n. 43, and *Jewish Literature*, p. 296 n. 3, where he still wrongly identifies *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim* as composed by Samuel ibn Tibbon. Also see Klatzkin, *Thesaurus*, II, p. 184, and Malter, *Sa'adia Gaon*, p. 280 n. 592a. Cf. Ibn Ezra's similarly general use of the term in his commentary to Exodus 31:18:

וכל אנשי המחקר מודים . . .

168. *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, beginning, ms. Parma f. 3a, ms. Leyden f. 106a. Cf. the citation of this passage in Sirat, *Hagut Pilosofit*, p. 304:

על כן ראיתי אני . . . לבאר בזה ההיכור דעות אנשי המחקר בכל הנמצאים, והם החכמים הנקראים פילוסופים האמיתיים.

He also uses the term on the previous page (ms. Parma f. 2b). The scribal error (f. 7a) ascribing the work to Samuel ben Judah ibn Tibbon is, of course, responsible for Steinschneider's initial confusion.

169. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 3:15, p. 124.

170. *Mevaqqesh*, pp. 82, 94. Cf. Plessner, "Namus," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*.

scientist or philosopher (חכם).¹⁷¹ He says that, according to the philosophers, the term refers to prophetic law, and according to the Arabs, it refers to the angel who brings down prophecy.¹⁷² Falaquera also refers to the identification of this term with the angel of death.¹⁷³ (Falaquera is not unique in identifying νόμος with religion, although he perhaps makes the identification in stronger terms than others. Maimonides uses the term for the science of religious law which is the fourth class of political philosophy.)¹⁷⁴ Although Falaquera's own usage of the term is virtually exclusively in a religious context, he does refer to the term in its broader political context, and defines מלאכת הנימוסים as the art of politics, "the ability to put into effect political actions which are beneficial in reaching felicity."¹⁷⁵ Again demonstrating his interest in etymology, Falaquera states that νόμος in Greek means conduct. Whereas money is an inanimate pledge (ערב) and law (nomos נִימוס), the judge is a living law, but both money and the judge are laws in that they regulate portions belonging to people.¹⁷⁶

Falaquera is not always consistent in his terminology, alternating between his own and more common usages. Thus, he interchanges the terms נאמרות and מאמרות for the categories, although his own preference seems to be for נאמרות. In *Reshit Hokhmah*,¹⁷⁷ discussing the philosophy of Aristotle, he generally uses the term נאמרות. He generally also prefers this term in *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, although he does occasionally use the more common מאמרות in that work.¹⁷⁸

Falaquera is similarly sometimes inconsistent in his use of the term משולח for emanation of forms, instead of the more common terms שפע and אצל. He

171. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 97.

172. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 59. The reference is to Ibn Sina, *Fi 'Aqşam al-'Ulum* (On the Division of the Sciences) in *Tis' Rasā'il* (Cairo, 1908), pp. 107–108; translated by Muhsin Mahdi in Lerner and Mahdi, *Medieval Political Philosophy*, p. 97. Cf. L. Berman, *Ibn Bajjah and Maimonides*, p. 95, and M. Plessner, "Namus," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*.

173. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 82: והנימוס יקרא זה הכח מלאך בעל צבאות ומלאך המות.

174. Cf. *Millot Ha-Higgayon* 14:7; Wolfson, "Classification of the Sciences," pp. 311–312, and additional Notes (*Studies*, p. 549). Cf. Ha-Levi, *Kuzari* 4:16, where *nomos* similarly refers to religion or ritual.

175. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 30: מלאכת הנימוסים הוא . . . היכולת להוציא הפעלים המדיניים המועילים בהגעת ההצלחה.

176. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 47. Falaquera discusses this explicitly in *Shelemut Ha-Ma'asim*, Ch. 3, p. 6. Cf. the notes. This view of law is taken from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 5:4. See Levine, *Seeker*, p. 111 n. 83.

177. Pp. 80 ff.

178. 1:52, p. 26. But in 1:72, p. 55, he uses נאמרות when quoting Gabirol, as he does in 2: Introduction, p. 66, when quoting Aristotle. Steinschneider's observation on Falaquera's usage is therefore not entirely accurate (*HU* #12, p. 40 n. 275). In *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma generally has נאמרת where ms. Leyden has מאמר.

generally prefers the term משולח in the *Liqqūṭim*,¹⁷⁹ but sometimes uses one of the other terms¹⁸⁰ or combines משולח with another term.¹⁸¹

Also in the *Liqqūṭim*, Falaquera often uses the term למות instead of the more common איכות to denote quality,¹⁸² and sometimes uses יסוד instead of חומר for matter. Elsewhere¹⁸³ he uses יישוב instead of אקלים for climate, and in several works uses the term חלטים instead of לחות for humors. To designate minerals, he uses דומם and not the term מחצב, which Ibn Tibbon preferred.¹⁸⁴ He sometimes designates the senses as הרגשות rather than חושים.¹⁸⁵ Falaquera uses the term עצם for substance as well as essence.¹⁸⁶

Whereas Maimonides¹⁸⁷ had referred to intellectual perfection as the final goal and ultimate perfection of man by the term *ghayah akhirah*, which Ibn Tibbon translates as תכלית אחרונה, Falaquera¹⁸⁸ uses the term תכלית קצוית, which Malter describes as “one of the many coinages of new philosophic terms peculiar to Palquera.”¹⁸⁹

The fact that Falaquera sometimes fluctuated between his own preference and more common usages of terms did not reduce his desire for precise expression and an accurate understanding of proper terminology. Steinschneider thought that many Jewish writers had understood the reference to the *Kalam* by the Hebrew term חכמת הדברים as meaning dialectics.¹⁹⁰ Falaquera¹⁹¹ again demonstrates his concern for precision and knowledge of Islam and Arabic:

אל מתכלמין העתקתו המדברים ונקרא מדבר כל יודע חכמת הדברים והיא חכמה תביא ראיות לבטל דברי החולקים על הדת מצד חקירת המציאות, כי יש יודע דברי הדת בקבלה באין חקירה וזה נקרא אצלם פקיה, והוא השופט שיודע משפטי הדת. ויש מי שחוקר דברי הדת ומביא אמתתם מצד המציאות וזה נקרא אצלם מתכלם. ואני מצאתי שקורא ארסטו בעל דברים . . . והוא בעל חכמת הנצוח.

Al-Mutakallimun is translated as “the speakers.” One is called a

179. For example, *Liqqūṭim* 4:25: ואם כן יתחייב שיהיו הצורות השפלות משולחות מהצורות העליונות.

180. *Liqqūṭim* 3:12: הראשונה המקפת על כל העצמים היא המחייבת להשפעות מקצת העצמים על מקצתם.

181. *Liqqūṭim* 3:10: מפני היותם תחת השפע הראשון המשולח מהרצון.

182. *Liqqūṭim* 2:17.

183. See Malter, *Yggeret Ha-Halom*, p. 476 n. 66.

184. Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, p. 278.

185. *Ma'alot*, p. 42, *Yggeret Ha-Musar*, p. 44.

186. A.J. Heschel, “Der Begriff des Seins in der Philosophie Gabirols,” p. 71 n. 34.

187. *Guide* 3:54.

188. *Ma'alot*, p. 51.

189. Malter, “Palquera,” p. 162 n. 16.

190. Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 310 n. 5.

191. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 152.

“speaker” who knows the science of *Kalam*, which is a science which brings proofs to refute the words of those who oppose religion in respect of investigating existence. One who knows religious matters by tradition without investigation is called “faqih”¹⁹² among them (i.e., the Muslims), and he is the judge who knows religious law. But one who investigates religious matters and brings proofs of their truth in respect of existence, is called by them a *Mutakallim*. I have found that Aristotle refers to one who masters words . . . who has mastered the science of dialectics.

IV. FALAQUERA AS A CRITIC

Despite his being an admirer and defender of Maimonides, Falaquera maintained his own intellectual independence and criticized Maimonides and others. For example, Falaquera sometimes maintained that Maimonides did not fully understand Aristotle’s views.¹⁹³ When he disagreed, he stated “but I say” (*v-’ani ’omer*, or *ve-’omer ’ani*). Thus, he disagreed with Aristotle, and used the same expression.¹⁹⁴ In *Guide* 1:57, Maimonides agreed with Ibn Sina that existence is superadded to essence. Falaquera, agreeing with Ibn Rushd, criticizes this view.¹⁹⁵

Falaquera strongly criticizes Maimonides and Ibn Rushd for basing their proofs of the existence of God on the hypothetical premise of eternity, which is a false premise.¹⁹⁶ He therefore rejects the proof of God from motion. Falaquera asserts that Ibn Rushd is wrong in thinking that motion can be possible itself while being necessary in respect of its agent.¹⁹⁷ Maimonides mistakenly attributed Aristotle’s discussion of Plato’s theory of creation to the *Physics*; the discussion is in *De Caelo*, Falaquera states.¹⁹⁸ In *Guide* 2:13, Maimonides used the expression that God created “from nothing” (*me-he’eder; min ’adam*); Falaquera, who explicitly affirms in this passage a Platonic view of creation as the true view of the Torah, suggests that Maimonides should rather

192. The term is *faqih*, and not *faqir* (as in the printed text). See the article “Fakih” in *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 98.

193. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:73, p. 64; 2:13, p. 95, 98; 2:15, p. 100. Cf. Venetianer, *Ma’alot*, p. xi n. 2.

194. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:31, p. 16.

195. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:57, p. 28. See Altmann, “Essence and Existence in Maimonides” (*Studies*, p. 120). Altmann notes that Ibn Rushd’s criticism of Ibn Sina is wrong, because Ibn Sina did not maintain this view.

196. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:71, p. 43; 2:1 p. 77.

197. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 1:73, p. 64.

198. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:13, p. 95.

have said that God created “after non-being,” “after nothing” (*aḥar ha-he’eder, aḥar ha-’ayin; ba’dā ’l-’adam*), as he did in *Guide* 3:20.¹⁹⁹

Falaquera also points out that Maimonides contradicts himself.²⁰⁰ In *Guide* 2:19, Maimonides maintains that the stars and spheres consist of a different matter, but in *Guide* 2:26 he says they consist of the same matter. On a similar question, he criticizes Ibn Rushd for maintaining that the star is at rest, for then the nature of the star would be the opposite of the nature of its sphere.²⁰¹

Falaquera sharply criticizes Maimonides for his statement that Aristotle was correct on all sublunar matters, in *Guide* 2:24. How can Maimonides maintain such a view, in light of Aristotle’s view that prime matter is not generated?²⁰² Falaquera provides various other instances of Aristotle being wrong.²⁰³

Falaquera also labels Maimonides’ views in *Guide* 2:26 as strange and as tending towards the view of eternity.²⁰⁴

199. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:13, p. 97 bottom. See the discussion of creation below, Ch. Three, Section IX, p. 159. Wolfson (*Philosophy of the Kalam*, p. 372) obviates the problem by equating “after” with “from,” based on Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Crescas, but he does not deal with Falaquera’s objections.

200. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:15, p. 102.

201. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:15, pp. 103-104.

202. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:22, p. 106. In *De’ot Ha-Pilosofim*, ms. Parma f. 5b-6a, ms. Leyden f. 107b, Falaquera similarly criticizes Maimonides and Ibn Rushd for asserting that Aristotle was correct on all matters of physics, and that doubts only exist in metaphysics: והנכון שאמרנו במה שאמרנו בעדו. והנכון מה שאמר אלכסנדר המפרש, כי דעותיו מועטות הספקות מדעות זולתו.

“But I say that these sages exaggerated for (Aristotle’s) sake. What Alexander (of Aphrodisias) the commentator said is correct, that (Aristotle’s) opinions are less dubious than the opinions of others.”

203. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:22, pp. 108-109.

204. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* 2:26, p. 114.

CHAPTER TWO

THE WORKS OF FALAQUERA

Falaquera was a prolific writer who occasionally referred in some of his works to his other works, thus enabling us to know of more works which he authored than are extant today.

In *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*,¹ Falaquera refers to seven earlier works which he had composed, in addition to his extensive poetry:

חברתי: (1) הלכות חולין והנהגת הבריאות והנהגת הנפש אשר היא ללב רפאות ותועלת לאברים במאמרים שקולים. (2) ואגרת המוסר המבארת יושר הפעלים. (3) וצרי היגון המשמח אבלים. (4) ומגלת הזכרון זכרתי בה העתים שעברו עלינו כי לעת יום ביום גדודי התלאות יבואו אלינו. (5) ואיגרת הויכוח בביאור ההסכמה אשר בין התורה והחכמה. (6) וראשית חכמה. (7) וספר המעלות. זכרתי בהם תכלית חכמה והתועלות ומעלת בני אדם הגדולות. וזה השיגה יד דעתי בילדותי. ואלה ילדי מחשבותי בבחרותי.

I composed: (1) Rules for the sick and the regimen of health and the regimen of the soul. It is healing for the heart and a benefit for the limbs, in metrical verse. (2) And the *Treatise on Ethics*, which explains proper actions. (3) *Balm for Sorrow*, which gladdens the bereaved. (4) *Scroll of Remembrance*, in which I discuss times past, for at this time hordes of troubles come upon us daily. (5) And the *Treatise of the Disputation*, explaining the harmony between the Torah and philosophy. (6) And the *Beginning of Wisdom*. (7) And the *Book of Degrees*, in both of which I discuss the ultimate purpose of wisdom and (its) benefits and the great qualities of men. This my knowledge was sufficient to attain in my childhood, and these are the children of my thoughts in my youth.

Falaquera's other works, with the exception of his *Mikhtav 'al Devar Ha-Moreh*, cannot be dated. But, on the basis of cross-references, we can place at least some of them in rough chronological order.² But when we attempt, on the

1. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 12 (Levine, *Seeker*, pp. 7–8). Numbers are added.

2. It is strange that none of the works and articles on Falaquera has attempted to list his works in any coherent order, with the exception of Lajos (Ludwig) Venetianer,

basis of these cross-references, to determine such an order, we encounter difficulties with Falaquera himself. For instance, although Falaquera listed as his first work *Batei Hanhagat Guf Ha-Bari'* – *Batei Hanhagat Ha-Nefesh*, in his introduction to this work (p. 57) he refers back to *'Iggeret Ha-Musar*, which therefore may have been composed first, and not second as listed here. Falaquera also omits from this list two other works that may have been composed before the *Mevaqqesh*, namely *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim* and *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*. We know this because he lists here *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*, which mentions *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*,³ which in turn mentions *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*.⁴ Since these two books were composed before *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*, which appears on our list here, they should presumably also have been mentioned.

Falaquera's *Shelemut Ha-Ma'asim* also refers, in its first paragraph, to *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*, and in virtue of its subject matter would seem to have been composed as a sort of sequel to *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*. But there is no evidence to indicate whether it, too, was completed before *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*. In the listing that follows, therefore, we shall preserve the integrity of Falaquera's own order in *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*, even though two of them (Nos. 9, 10) should presumably appear before *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*.

8) *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*

9) *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*

10) *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*

11) *Shelemut Ha-Ma'asim*

In the case of Falaquera's later books, it is not possible to determine the exact dates or order of composition. But we do know that three of these works were probably completed before his *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, which refers to *'Iggeret Ha-Halom*,⁵ *Sefer Ha-Derash*,⁶ and *Perush* on the Bible.⁷ We therefore add to our list:

in his introduction (pp. 9 ff.) to *A Fokozatok Könyve* (Szeged, 1890), but Venetianer's pioneering and valuable information is by now incomplete and in need of revision. On the basis of ms. Munich 402, in which *'Iggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ*, *Reshit Hokhmah*, and *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot* follow sequentially, Venetianer suggests (p. 15) that Falaquera wrote them together as one continuous volume. Falaquera certainly regarded them as related, perhaps as a sort of trilogy. Cf. the cross-references in these works, e.g., his stated intention of composing *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot* (*Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 92) and the earlier statement regarding *Reshit Hokhmah*, *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot* and *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim* at the end of *'Iggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ*.

3. *Ma'alot*, pp. 35, 36, 82.

4. *Sefer Ha-Nefesh*, Int., p. 1.

5. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, 3:19, p. 131.

6. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, 2:26, p. 114.

7. *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 6, refers to his commentary on the Torah and other scripture; p. 145 refers to his commentary on Proverbs. But in *Ma'alot*, p. 39, and *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 10, he refers to points that he "will explain" in the commentary,

- 12) *’Iggeret Ha-Ḥalom*
- 13) *Sefer Ha-Derash*
- 14) *Perush* on the Bible
- 15) *Moreh Ha-Moreh*

We do not have any way to date Falaquera’s translation of selections of Ibn Gabirol’s *Meqor Hayyim*, which he called *Liqquṭim*. His preface to the *Liqquṭim* refers to a pseudo-Empedoclean text, the *Sefer Ha-’Azamim Ha-Ḥamishah* (*Book of the Five Substances*), of which Falaquera also translated selections (*Liqquṭim*). Since he did not refer to his own translation when mentioning the work, we may theorize that the translation of the *Five Substances* came after the translation of Ibn Gabirol’s *Fons Vitae*, and was motivated by Falaquera’s interest in the work as a source for Ibn Gabirol.

We thus add to our list:

- 16) *Liqquṭim Mi-Sefer Meqor Hayyim*
- 17) *Liqquṭim Mi-Sefer Ha-’Azamim Ha-Ḥamishah*

We may then conclude the list with Falaquera’s last known work (1290):

- 18) *Mikhtav ’al Devar Ha-Moreh*

We thus have the complete list of Falaquera’s known works, ordered chronologically, to the extent that the available evidence permits us to establish their order of composition.

Having established, to the extent warranted by the evidence, the probable order of composition of Falaquera’s works, a few words are in order on the content, and editions or manuscripts, of these works.

1) *Batei Hanhagat Guf Ha-Bari’* — *Batei Hanhagat Ha-Nefesh* (Verses on the Regimen of the Healthy Body — Verses on the Regimen of the Soul).⁸ Munk⁹ refers to the work as *’Iggeret Batei Hanhagat Ha-Guf Ve-ha-Nefesh* (Treatise of Verses on the Regimen of the Body and the Soul). Falaquera’s reference to the work in *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*, beginning with “*Hilkhot Ḥolin*,” has led to confusion over the title of the work. Dukes¹⁰ suggested that this phrase indicated a separate book of versification of the Talmudic tractate *Ḥulin*, but most accept the view that “*Ḥolin*” is the equivalent of *ḥolim* (the sick), and that this phrase is not part of the title of the book, but rather refers to its content. As mentioned above, the words “Abba Mari” before Falaquera’s

which may therefore have been written later.

8. Edited with Introduction by S. Munter (*Maḥbarot Le-Sifrut*, Mosad Ha-Rav Kook, Tel Aviv, 1950). An edition with notes by Davidson was published by I. Ḥadash (Chodos) in *Ha-Rofe’ Ha-’Ivri*, 10, No. 2 (1937), pp. 150–170; 11, No. 1 (1938), pp. 113–125; 12, No. 1 (1939), pp. 52–64. An English summary accompanies the texts. References are to Munter’s edition.
9. Munk, *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*, p. 494.
10. Quoted by Malter, “Palquera,” p. 171 n. 36.

name¹¹ also led to confusion as to whether Falaquera had a son who edited this book.

This work is actually a composite of two works, *Batei Hanhagat Guf-Ha-Bari* and *Batei Hanhagat Ha-Nefesh*, although on the basis of Falaquera's reference in *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh* they are generally regarded as two parts of one larger work. The second part has its own preface, in which Falaquera refers to the first part virtually as a separate work.¹² In this preface, Falaquera noted that the content of this book is a paraphrase in verse of themes already found in his earlier *'Iggeret Ha-Musar*.¹³ S. Bernstein¹⁴ noted that the second part has not only many similar themes, but also many similarities in language to Judah Ha-Levi's poem "Im Nafshekha Yeqarah Be-'einekha," and concludes that Falaquera's work is, in effect, a commentary on Ha-Levi's poem. The work is cited several times by Buxtorf in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*.¹⁵

2) *'Iggeret Ha-Musar* (Treatise on Ethics).¹⁶ As has already been noted, although this work is listed in *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh* as Falaquera's second work, the fact that it is mentioned in *Batei Hanhagat Ha-Nefesh* indicates that *'Iggeret Ha-Musar* was Falaquera's first work, and that *Batei Hanhagat Ha-Nefesh* is a poetic version of the earlier work. Like Falaquera's later and larger work, the *Mevaqqesh*, for which *'Iggeret Ha-Musar* is an early model, it takes the form of a *maqama*,¹⁷ and recounts the adventures and discussions of a youth who wanders about in search of wisdom; it is replete with Jewish and Arab ethical maxims, some of which were repeated in the *Mevaqqesh*.¹⁸ The book is also mentioned in *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 58.

3) *Ẓeri Ha-Yagon* (Balm for Sorrow).¹⁹ Virtually all the references to this work in Latin characters spell the first word as *ẓori* or *şori*, reflecting the Hebrew vowel *ḥataf qamaṣ*, which would only be correct for the absolute form

11. *Batei* etc., p. 3.

12. *Batei* etc., p. 57.

13. *Batei* etc., p. 57.

14. Bernstein, "The Influence of Yehudah Ha-Levi on the Ethical Poems of Falaquera" (Hebrew), *Bizẓaron*, 2, No. 11–12 (1941), pp. 3–4.

15. Cf. Zunz, Thesis, Ch. 11.

16. Edited by A.M. Haberman (Jerusalem, 1936). The Preface was also edited by Steinschneider, *Israelitische Letterbode* (1878–1879), pp. 79 ff.

17. On *maqama*, combining rhymed prose and poetry, cf. R.A. Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs*, p. 327 ff.

18. The youth is Kalkol, who meets Heiman Ha-'Ezraḥi. Cf. I Kings 5:11 and I Chronicles 2:6. Haberman discusses Falaquera's sources, e.g., Gabirol, Ḥunayn b. Ishāq, al-Ḥarizi. Plessner ("Importance of Falaquera," pp. 176–180) discusses several of the sources.

19. The book is now available in a critical edition with annotated English translation and a valuable survey of the consolation genre of literature, in Roberta Klugman Barkan's thesis "Shem Tob ben Joseph ibn Falaquera's 'Sori Yagon' or 'Balm for

of the noun, and not the construct state of the noun in this title, which is vocalized with the *sheva' na'*. The grammatical considerations are borne out by Ottensosser's vocalization, in the Hebrew poem facing the Preface of his edition of this work, and in the text on p. 11.

When *Ẓeri Ha-Yagon* was first published by Rabbi Saul ben Simon (Cremona, 1557), he indicated that he had lost the original manuscript and had reproduced the text from memory and added his own comments which constitute two-thirds of the text.²⁰

The book takes the form of a *maqama*, in rhymed prose interspersed with poetry. Falaquera wrote²¹ that he had composed the book to give pleasure to a person suffering from sorrow and to ease his burden, which is the reason for the title "Balm for Sorrow," and he noted that the book is "strengthened" by quotes from the sayings of the rabbis and the philosophers. The book "most articulately expresses his belief that true faith, philosophic reason and mental well-being, together . . . must govern and guide an individual. It is only when man is so strengthened by his knowledge of reality and by self-discipline that he can find consolation from all his troubles."²²

A.S. Halkin²³ maintains that *Ẓeri Ha-Yagon* was influenced by Galen's "On Dispelling Worry," and agrees with Walzer that large portions of the book show the influence of Al-Kindi's "Letter on the Art of Assuaging Grief." Roberta Klugman Barkan's study has documented these and other sources, including Maimonides' *Fi Tadbir al-Ṣiḥḥa* (*Regimen Sanitatis*), Hunayn ibn Iṣḥaq's *'Adab al-Falāsifa* (*Musarei Ha-Pilosofim*), Ibn Gabirol's *Mivḥar Peninim*, and even Ben Sira.

4) *Megillat Ha-Zikaron* (Scroll of Remembrance), "in which I discuss times past, for at this time hordes of troubles come upon us daily."²⁴ Some manuscripts also refer to this work as *Ḥesed 'El* (God's Kindness).²⁵

Assuaging Grief,' Its Literary Sources and Traditions" (Columbia University, 1971). There are four earlier editions of the book: (a) Cremona, 1557 (with notes by Rabbi Saul ben Simon); (b) Prague, 1612/1622; (c) Hanau, 1716; (d) Fürth, 1854, with Hebrew notes and Judeo-German translation by David Ottensosser. The references are generally to the Barkan or Fürth editions, with some references to the Cremona edition.

20. Cremona ed., p. 2b. Also cf. Malter, "Palquera," p. 173 n. 42, and Munk, *Mélanges*, p. 494 and *Philosophy and Philosophical Authors of the Jews*, p. 43. This has led some to regard Saul b. Simon as the actual author, e.g., Munter, Preface to Maimonides' *Hanhagat Ha-Berit*, p. 14. Cf. Barkan, Thesis, pp. 88–89.
21. Ch. 1, p. 11.
22. Cf. Barkan, Thesis, p. 5.
23. Halkin, "Ibn Aknin's Hygiene of the Soul," *PAAJR*, 14 (1944), p. 65 and n. 195.
24. *Mevaqqesh*, p. 12.
25. Levine, Thesis (Hebrew p. 173, English p. 20).

Presumably a contemporary history of the sufferings of the Jews, this work is not extant.

5) *'Iggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ* (Treatise of the Disputation).²⁶ The full title of the work is *'Iggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ Be-Ve'ur Ha-Haskamah 'asher bein Ha-Torah Ve-ha-Ḥokhmah* (Treatise of the Disputation, Explaining the Harmony Between the Torah and Philosophy). Steven Harvey has prepared a critical edition of the Hebrew text with annotated English translation.²⁷

A Latin translation of the book with French notes and Introduction, has been published by Gilbert Dahan, based on Paris, manuscript Code #6691A.²⁸ The book is mentioned three times in *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*,²⁹ as well as in the list in *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*. At the very end of the book (p. 18) Falaquera expresses his intention of writing three other works: (1) *Reshit Ḥokhmah*, in three parts (a. Ethics; b. A listing and description of the sciences; and c. The necessity of philosophy for felicity); (2) *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*, on the harmony between philosophy and the rabbis; and (3) *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, in which Falaquera will prove the true views and beliefs of the philosophers that every religious person (*ḥasid*) must believe.

The *Treatise of the Disputation* is a popular work, much of which is written in rhymed prose, which depicts a dialogue (or disputation) between a traditionalist, religious Jew (*ḥasid*) and a philosopher, to demonstrate that philosophy is the twin sister of the Torah, and that philosophy is in complete harmony with biblical and rabbinic Judaism.

In this work, Falaquera uses the term *ḥasid* to indicate a moral person, who observes the commandments and has studied the traditional Jewish sources, as opposed to the *ḥakham*, who has studied philosophical and scientific as well as Jewish sources.³⁰ This follows Maimonides' usage, but differs sharply from the

26. There are three editions of the book: (a) by Isaac Akriḥ, Constantinople, 1577; (b) Prague, 1610; (c) by Adolf Jellinek, Vienna, 1875. References are to Jellinek, who used the Prague edition as his text and the Constantinople edition as his variant; Jellinek says that both texts vary from the mss. Y. Dan has shown that the printed editions moderate the sharpness of the debate and are often inconsistent with the manuscripts. Cf. "'Iggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ Le-Falaquera," *Oẓar Yehudei Sefarad*, 6 (1963), pp. 42–46.
27. Harvey, *Falaquera's Epistle of the Debate: An Introduction to Jewish Philosophy* (forthcoming). Harvey discusses at length Falaquera's indebtedness to Ibn Rushd's *Faṣl al-Maqal*.
28. C. Dahan, *Epistola Dialogi: Une Traduction Latine de L'Iggeret Ha-Vikuah de Shemtov ibn Falaquera. Étude et Édition*," *Sefarad*, 39, No. 1 (1979), pp. 47–85; *ibid.*, No. 2, pp. 237–264. Also cf. Munk, *Mélanges*, p. 495.
29. *Ma'alot*, pp. 12, 48, 75.
30. See E. Schweid, *Ha-Rambam Ve-Ḥug Hashpa'ato* (Jerusalem, 1973), p. 197.

more restricted usage of the term in *De'ot Ha-Pilosofim*, as noted by Jellinek³¹ and Sirat:³²

ועל זה העניין מורה שם פילוסוף אצלם ועל זה העניין מורה שם חסיד
בלשונו, והוא מי שקנה מעלות היצירות והשכליות. ומפני שחסר עם הארץ
המעלות השכליות אף על פי שקנה היצירות אמרו חכמים ז"ל לא עם הארץ
חסיד.

This notion is referred to by them by the term "philosopher," but in our language this notion is referred to by the term "*ḥasid*," who is a person who has acquired the ethical and rational virtues. But since an ignorant person lacks the rational virtues, even though he has acquired the ethical ones, the rabbis of blessed memory said: An ignorant person cannot be pious (*ḥasid*).³³

In response to that *ḥasid*, who charges that philosophers mix in with the Torah the false words of the heretics, sectarians and Greek philosophers, the *ḥakham* does not claim that philosophy is infallible, but he rather takes the moderate position that one only takes from philosophy what is true and agrees with religion; one should eat the pomegranate and discard the peel.³⁴ One should learn the truth from anyone, even from those who deny God, as one would take honey from bees. Even the Torah contains a portion of wisdom from a non-Jew (Jethro's advice to Moses, in Exodus 18). Moreover, the *ḥakham* asserts (as Sa'adia had)³⁵ that what one knows through reason is stronger than what one knows through tradition alone.³⁶

6) *Reshit Ḥokhmah* (Beginning of Wisdom).³⁷ A Latin translation of the

31. In Preface to *Ṭggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ*.

32. Sirat, *Hagut Pilosofit*, p. 304. The quote is from Parma-De Rossi f. 4a, Leyden ms. f. 106b.

33. Avot 2:6.

34. This image is quoted several times by Falaquera in the context of accepting only what is true in philosophy, and is taken from BT Ḥagigah 15b: Rabbi Me'ir found a pomegranate; he ate its content and discarded its peel.

35. *Emunot Ve-De'ot*, Introduction, #6. See *Ṭggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ*, pp. 1–13.

36. Harvey, *op. cit.*, in comparing *Ṭggeret Ha-Vikkuaḥ* with Ibn Rushd's *Faṣṭ al-Maqal*, observes: "While Averroes' primary interest can be said to be the need of the philosopher for Islam, Falaquera's interest lies in the need of Judaism for philosophy . . . While Averroes cautions the reader against studying demonstrative books, Falaquera promises to write such books for him."

37. The term *reshit ḥokhmah* is found in Psalms 111:10 and Proverbs 4:7. The book was edited by Moritz David (Berlin, 1902), "Propädeutik der Wissenschaften," on the basis of mss. Munich #45 and #402, Gudemann, and Saraval #19 (Breslau J.T.S. #56). David did not use ms. Vatican 339. Excerpts of *Reshit Ḥokhmah* were published by Steinschneider, *Alfarabi*, pp. 176–185, 224–230. A brief selection was published by J. Klatzkin in his *Anthology of Hebrew Philosophy* (Berlin, 1926), pp. 129–134.

book exists.³⁸ In his Introduction, Falaquera states his purpose in writing the book:³⁹

ואומר כי הכוונה בזה הספר לכלול בו בדברים קצרים מה שצריך מבקש
החכמה לעמוד עליו בתחלת למודו, ויהיה לו כמורה למה שירצה להתלמד.
ועל כן קראתי שמו ראשית חכמה. וחברתי בימי הבחרות עם ספר המעלות.
ורוב דברי בו בחכמות הם דברי ראשי הפילוסופים ובקאייהם, כי לא חדשתי
מעצמי אלא שקבצתי מהספרים שהם מפורים שם.

I say that the intention of this book is to include briefly whatever a seeker of wisdom needs to know at the beginning of his studies, so that it will serve him as a guide for what he wants to study. Therefore I called its name "Beginning of Wisdom." I composed it in my youth along with the *Book of Degrees*. Most of my words in it concerning the sciences are the words of the chief philosophers and those expert (in their words), for I have not innovated anything on my own, but only collected them from the books that are distributed there.⁴⁰

Despite this disclaimer of originality, Falaquera typically does not simply translate the works of others, even when large sections of the work are based on others (such as sections of Part II; see below). He freely intermixed philosophy with quotes from the Bible and rabbinic literature, and himself notes, at the end of the book,⁴¹ that *Sefer Ha-Ma'alot*, which is a sequel to *Reshit Hokhmah* and is similar to it in purpose, also has such an intermixture of sources: "I will allude (*ramaz*) in it to many sayings of the Torah and of the rabbis, concerning which the philosophers agree with us."

Reshit Hokhmah has the following structure:⁴²

38. Paris ms. #6691, along with a translation of *Iggeret Ha-Vikkuah*.

39. p. 9.

40. Waxman, *History of Jewish Literature*, II:316, says that Falaquera "used the material very dexterously and succeeded in giving a general conception of the entire knowledge of the age in a brief and concise manner."

41. *Reshit Hokhmah*, p. 92.

42. See H.A. Wolfson, "The Classification of Sciences in Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy," *HUCA Jubilee Volume*, 1925, pp. 263–315. Wolfson writes (p. 283): "In his *De'ot ha-Pilusufim* he deals only with physics and metaphysics, and of the latter only with the problem of the active intellect. But his *Reshit Hokhmah*, which is devoted to the classification of sciences, contains a complete Aristotelian classification. A similar classification is found in his poem at the beginning of the *Reshit Hokhmah*, and parts of it may also be found in his *Mebakesh*." Plessner ("Importance of Falaquera," p. 164) shows that Part I incorporates translations, sometimes literal, of selections from the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but these are interspersed with biblical and rabbinic quotes.

Introductory Poem (pp. 1–5)

Introduction (pp. 6–9)

PART I: On moral qualities necessary for the study of science (pp. 10–20)

PART II: Enumeration of the sciences (pp. 20–61)

Ch. 1 The purpose of Part II

Ch. 2 How language originates in a people

Ch. 3 The science of language

Ch. 4 The origin of human sciences

Ch. 5 Logic

A. Logic in general

B. The purpose of logic

C. Logical terminology

D. The name of logic

E. The eight parts of logic

Ch. 6 Mathematics

A. Arithmetic

B. Geometry

C. Optics

D. Astronomy

E. Music

F. Mechanics

G. Algebra

Ch. 7 Physics

Ch. 8 Metaphysics

Ch. 9 Politics, Jurisprudence, Dialectics

PART III: The necessity of philosophy for the attainment of felicity (pp. 61–92)

Ch. 1 Elaboration of what is necessary to attain felicity

Ch. 2 The philosophy of Plato

Ch. 3 The philosophy of Aristotle

(In Part II of *Sefer Ha-Mevaqqesh*, the Seeker studies: arithmetic, geometry, optics, astronomy, music, logic, physics, and metaphysics — a curriculum that only partly follows the classification in *Reshit Hokhmah*.)

Whole sections of the book are taken from Arabic works, the sources of some of which have been traced. A passage which is repeated in its entirety in *Mevaqqesh*⁴³ quotes an ethical letter attributed to Aristotle.⁴⁴ Israel Efos

43. *Reshit Hokhmah*, end of Part I, pp. 17–20, and *Mevaqqesh*, pp. 48–50 (Levine, *Seeker*, pp. 68–71). David's footnote (p. 17) mistakenly lists the text as *Mevaqqesh*, p. 21 ff., and this is repeated by Plessner, "Importance of Falaquera," pp. 164–165.