THE RECENSIONS AND STRUCTURE
OF *SEFER ḤASIDIM*

By Ivan G. Marcus

"*The Book of the Pietists*," wrote Moritz Güdemann in 1880, "is one of those books which are often quoted — and then only in snatches — seldom read in their entirety, and almost never studied."[1] That this observation is no longer true is due in no small measure to Güdemann's own efforts at unraveling some of the book's enigmas.[2] Yet, despite a considerable amount of subsequent scholarly debate, several problems concerning the textual development of the book remain unsolved.

Among these, two separate but interrelated questions are especially perplexing: What is the relationship between the two published versions of the book?[3] Can a substantive structure of the book as a whole be discovered? This essay intends to advance some new observations towards the solution of both problems.

---

[1] Moritz Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der abendländischen Juden während des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit* (1880-88; reprint; 3 vols.; Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968), I, 281.

[2] *Ibid.*, 281-291.

[3] When the book is referred to, regardless of editions, it is called simply "*Sefer Ḥasidim*." References to the first edition, Bologna, 1538, are abbreviated SHB; those to the Parma edition, Hebrew manuscript De Rossi 1133, published by Jehuda Wistinetzki (Berlin: Meqizei Nirdamim, 1891) and reprinted with a new "Introduction" by Jacob Freimann (Frankfurt am Main, 1924), are cited as SHP.

It should be noted that the edition by Reuven Margoliot (Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1957) is closely related to, but not identical with, SHB. Like all other descendants of the first edition, Margoliot's contains evidence of censorship and a partial renumbering of the paragraphs, first introduced in the second edition, Basel, 1581. See Freimann, "Introduction," 9. For the importance of using SHB, see below, n. 35.

Although we shall not eliminate all the difficulties, we hope we will have carried the discussion another step forward.

<div align="center">I</div>

Prior to Güdemann's work, few scholars paid much attention to *Sefer Ḥasidim*. In 1789, H. Y. D. Azulai wrote a learned commentary on it, but he was more concerned with harmonizing rabbinic authorities than with examining the book's historical significance.[4]

For *Wissenschaft* scholars like Zunz and Graetz, the book was something of an embarrassment. Its folkloristic elements included references to the wandering spirits of the dead and to various magical rites, the opposite of their own conception of authentic Jewish culture. To be sure, Zunz mentioned the book and, in passing, supported the view that its author was R. Judah b. Samuel of Speyer,[5] a position which Graetz was later to challenge with as much certainty as futility.[6]

In his discussion of the book, Zunz included a few passages in German translation, and his selectivity betrays the apologetic uses to which the book could be put. For Zunz chose only those sections which deal with a narrow range of subjects: Jewish humility, fair business practices with Gentile and Jew alike, aiding a Gentile threatened by a Jew, not helping an escaped murderer, even if a Jew, not relying on amulets but on God, forgiving insults, kindness of parents to children and respect of children for parents.[7] How broadminded and ecumenical the book

[4] See his *Brit ʿOlam* which was published with *Lev David* (Livorno, 1789), 80a -149a.

[5] Leopold Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* (Berlin, 1845), 136.

[6] H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (13 vols. in 11; 3rd ed.; Leipzig, 1873–1900) VI, 215, especially n. 2 (end).

[7] Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, 135–142, *passim*. Compare his selections with those of others such as Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens*, I, 179–198; Moshe David [Umberto] Cassuto, "Dal Sefer Chasidim," in *Scritti in onore de Dante Lattes* (Rome, 1938) = *La Rassegna Mensile de Israel*, XII (1938), 51–57; Jacob R. Marcus, ed., *The Jew in the Medieval World* (1938; reprint; New York, 1965), 377–378; Curt Leviant, ed., *Masterpieces of Hebrew Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1969), 380–388, and others.

appears from this carefully wrought selection! No reader would suspect that it is also filled with fabulous tales of the supernatural and demonic[8] and with signs of antipathy towards Christians.[9]

Graetz devoted even less space to *Sefer Ḥasidim* than had Zunz, but he was less inhibited in choosing his quotations. After noting that the book contains ethical wisdom, he included summaries of its superstitions, but then proceeded to explain them away. Like Zunz he also felt apologetic about the work. The "insipid" parts, Graetz argued, reflect the isolated nature of Jewish life in France under Philip Augustus. Following his review of passages which deal with wandering spirits of the dead, he implied that such lapses were hardly the Jews' fault. Judah the Pietist [i.e., for Graetz, Judah b. Isaac Sir Leon] was merely a product of his hard times. Unfortunately, Graetz concluded, Judah's disciples "were shaped by his spirit, and, seeing [true] Judaism only through a thick fog, became opponents of free inquiry. Later on, his followers became embroiled in a controversy against the greatest conception of Judaism which grew out of the Spanish school", i.e. Maimonides.[10]

Ill at ease with the superstitious character of *Sefer Ḥasidim*, both Zunz and Graetz made only minor contributions to the solution of its textual problems. Zunz, for his part, correctly pointed out that SHB (the Bologna edition of *Sefer Ḥasidim*) contains passages from Maimonides and other Jewish authors

[8] For examples of this motif, see Joseph Dan, "Sippurim Demonologiyim mi-Kitvei R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid," *Tarbiẓ*, XXX (1961), 273–289; *idem*, "Five Versions of the Story of the Jerusalemite," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XXXV (1967), 99–111; *idem*, "Rabbi Judah the Pious and Caesarius of Heisterbach: Common Motifs in their Stories," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* XXII: *Studies in Agadah and Folk-Literature*, edited by Joseph Heinemann and Dov Noy (Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1971), 18–27.

[9] For a more recent assessment which reveals the complexity of this problem in *Sefer Ḥasidim*, see Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York: Schocken, 1962), 93–105.

[10] Graetz, *Geschichte*, VI, 216–218. The quotation is on 218. On the problem to which Graetz alluded, the "Maimonidean Controversy," see E. E. Urbach, "Ḥelqam shel Ḥakhmei Ashkenaz ve-Ẓarfat b'Pulmus ʿal ha-Rambam ve-ʿal Sefarav," *Zion*, XII (1947), 149–159.

who were not part of Judah the Pietist's circle. He also noted that some quotations which later authors claimed to be from *Sefer Ḥasidim* were not all found in SHB, and concluded that SHB is probably a later reworking of an original text.[11]

More tenuous, on the other hand, was Graetz' hypothesis that Judah the Pietist was the French Jew, Judah b. Isaac Sir Leon of Paris. He based this identification mainly on late chronicles and on the presence of French vernacular expressions in SHB. He persisted in this position long after his disciple, Moritz Güdemann, had offered strong arguments in favor of Zunz' view.[12]

The first scholar who actually analyzed the different internal layers or sources in SHB was Jacob Reifmann.[13] He found indications of three original sources which he claimed were written by different authors. Moreover, he argued that these components could be distinguished from one another by means of substantive and stylistic criteria.

Applying these, he divided SHB into three original components:[14]

> Book I: paragraphs 1–152
> Book II: paragraphs 153–161
> Book III: paragraph 162 to the end.

As far as content is concerned, Reifmann indicated that the first and third books differ in their attitude toward magic: the first opposes it; the third favors it. The first also differs from the other two in another way, namely, it contains many passages from Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, especially from *Hilekhot Teshuvah*. Reifmann concluded: "All of this shows that [Book I's] author was a partisan of Maimonides in his approach to learning science as a

[11] Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, 125–126.

[12] Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens*, I, 281–291 and cf. Ismar Schorsch, "Moritz Güdemann: Rabbi, Historian, and Apologist," *Year Book of the Leo Baeck Institute*, XI (1965), 54, n. 58. For Zunz' view, see above, n. 5.

[13] See his *Arbaʿah Ḥorashim* (Prague, 1860), 6–23.

[14] *Ibid.*, 6.

means of learning about God..."[15] He also thought there were stylistic differences among the three parts. The first quotes various sources without mentioning their authors, whereas the third usually identifies them. From this, Reifmann inferred that the former took the parallel passages from the latter, not the other way around. As far as Book II is concerned, he thought it is distinguished from the other two by its greater linguistic obscurities. Reifmann suggested that it may have been Eleazar of Worms, Judah the Pietist's main disciple, who wrote Book III, whereas Book I, based as it partially is on III, was written by an author who lived after Eleazar. As to the identity of the author of Book II, he left the problem unresolved.[16]

Twenty years after Reifmann's pioneering, though somewhat impressionistic, efforts, Moritz Güdemann applied himself to the same problem of identifying the original components of *Sefer Ḥasidim*. Not yet in possession of the Parma manuscript, SHP,[17] he nevertheless was able to make a number of major modifications to Reifmann's conclusions.

Güdemann agreed that the original book had not been preserved. He surmised that different authors had used a common source and excerpted from it and that it is three condensations from this source which are found in SHB. Although he thus was in agreement with Reifmann as to the number of sources, he defined them differently. Compare their two analyses:

	Reifmann	*Güdemann*
Book I:	Pars. 1–152	1–161
Book II:	" 153–161	162–469
Book III:	" 162 to the end	1136 to the end

In defense of his division, Güdemann pointed out the following with regard to ed. Bologna. SHB, par. 1 contains the title "*Sefer Ḥasidim*"; par. 162 begins "*Sefer ha-Ḥasidim*"; par. 469 seems to

---

15 *Ibid.*, 7–8: cf. below, pp. 52–3.

16 *Ibid.*, 6–13, especially 13–14.

17 Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens*, I, 284, n. 1; cf. 290–291.

be a conclusion;[18] and par. 1136 states: "zeh hu'ataq mi-Sefer Ḥasidim aḥer." As a result of this rearrangement, however, Güdemann came to the awkward conclusion that the largest part of the book, pars. 470–1135, is derived not from the original, but is a late addition by compilers.[19]

Güdemann went even further than Reifmann by indicating smaller sub-sections within his own Book I. He based this sub-division on a statement in SHB, par. 2 which reads: "The author of this book, who wrote about pietism [ḥasidut], humility ['anavah], and reverence [yir'ah], each in a separate notebook, said..."[20] Searching for these three topics in his Book I [pars. 1–161], he thought he found them in the following order: pars. 2–15 on pietism, 15–153 on humility, and 153–161 on reverence. He therefore criticized Reifmann for excluding pars. 153–161 from Book I and argued that Reifmann failed to appreciate the three-fold table of contents mentioned in SHB, par 2.[21]

Güdemann's reconstruction of the components of SHB is attractive and, at first glance, even plausible, but it raises as many questions as it attempts to answer. Althought it is true, as Güdemann maintained, that SHB, pars. 1 and 162 contain titles, whereas par. 153 does not, that paragraph *ends* with the statement "'Al ken 'arakhti Sefer zeh ha-Yir'ah...," which may indicate the beginning of Book II as Reifmann thought.

There is also additional evidence in support of Reifmann's division. For example, a comparison of the parallel passages in SHB and SHP shows that SHB, par. 153 is the first paragraph of SHP.[22] In other words, the Parma manuscript begins with *Sefer ha- Yir'ah*, and that tract is totally disconnected from the material which precedes it in SHB. Moreover, Güdemann knew of an Oppenheim

----

[18] See below, pp. 38–39.

[19] *Ibid.*, 284–287.

[20] *Ibid.*, 285; SHB. par. 2 reads: ‏ויאמר בעל זה הספר אשר חבר דברי החסידות‏ ‏והענוה והיראה כל אחד במחברת...‏".

[21] Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens*, I, 286.

[22] Güdemann was aware of this but did not see how it might bear on his dentification of the source-units in SHB. See *ibid.*, 291.

manuscript entitled *Sefer ha-Ḥasidut*[23] which contains only SHB, pars. 1–152. Now Güdemann argued that the manuscript was so entitled because pars. 2–15 deal with pietism [*ḥasidut*], the first of the three notebooks, but it is more plausible to assume that the title refers to the entire 152 paragraphs of the manuscript and that they constitute a separate unit.

It finally remains to be seen how valid is Güdemann's interpretation of SHB, par. 2. His assumption that a compiler provided in it a table of contents of the three topics in the following pars. 2–161 does not seem to be a necessary interpretation of that passage. True, pars. 2–15 do dwell on pietism and pars. 153–161 are concerned with reverence, but to define the large intervening section of pars. 16–153 as centered on the theme of humility alone, requires forcing matters too much. Actually, only pars. 15 and 16 explicitly mention that subject, and it is arbitrary to claim that prayers, in par. 18, or repentance, in pars. 19 ff., belong more to the topic of humility than to the more general theme of pietism. In reality, pars. 2–153 contain several passages on the various elements of pietism which call to mind the rubrics and contents of Eleazar of Worms' *Hilekhot Ḥasidut* and *Sodei Razayya*.[24]

The passage in SHB, par. 2 is not a rigid table of contents for pars. 2–161. After all, the text does not say "The author of this book, who wrote on pietism [etc.] *here*, said," but "the author of this book, who wrote on pietism, humility, and reverence, each in a separate notebook, said..." [25] The statement need not be interpreted as a rubric for what immediately follows it. The book is called *Sefer Ḥasidim* in SHB, par. 1, or *Sefer ha-Ḥasidut* in the Oppenheim manuscript, and the compiler is simply noting that the author of this book also compiled topical notebooks on three

23 *Ibid.*, 286. Cf. Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, 126. This manuscript is now at Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hebrew MS Neubauer no. 875, part 3, f. 131ʳ–151ʳ.

24 See Ivan G. Marcus, "The Organization of the *Haqdamah* and *Hilekhoth Ḥasiduth* in Eleazar of Worms' *Sefer ha-Roqeaḥ*," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XXXVI (1968), 92–94.

25 See above, n. 20.

themes. For all of these reasons, Reifmann's definition of Book I [pars. 1–152] is more plausible than Güdemann's [pars. 1–161].

If Güdemann's definition of SHB, pars. 1–161 as Book I is questionable, his description of pars. 162–469 as Book II is even less tenable. This designation is based on an unwarranted assumption about the theme of those paragraphs. Güdemann asserted that his Book II deals with superstitions. He supported this view by pointing to a compiler's apologetic note at the beginning of par. 162 to the effect that what follows teaches about pietism [ḥasidut], not superstitions [darkhei ha-emori].[26] Since the end of par. 469 discusses subjects generally included under that term, e.g., spirits and amulets, and also contains the phrase "sof davar" ["finally"], he took that paragraph to be the conclusion of the unit on superstitions.[27]

True, Güdemann correctly observed that par. 162 shows signs of a new beginning (see above); however, his argument about the definition of pars. 162–469 as a single bloc about superstitions is not valid. In the first place, par. 162's title refers to pietism, not superstitions. Moreover, there is no objective basis for separating pars. 469 from 470: both mention amulets.[28] It is not clear, then, how the phrase "sof davar" in par. 469 constitutes a sign that the so-called unit on superstitions has ended with that paragraph.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to equate the expression darkhei ha-emori with popular magic.[29] and there are other sub-

[26] Güdemann, Geschichte des Erziehungswesens, I, 287.

[27] Ibid.

[28] The theme of most of par. 469 is harmful spirits [mazziqin]. The line in question introduces a short passage which warns against the use of amulets and incantations to ward off such spirits. The end of par. 469 and the beginning of par. 470 follow: סוף דבר אין מזיקים מתגרים אלא במי שמתגרה בהם״ כגון שכתב הוא או אבותיו קמיעות... [par. 470] לאחד בקשו ממנו לעשות קמיע...״

[29] For various denotations of the phrase darkhei ha-emori, see Rashi on B. Shabbat 67a and B. Avodah Zarah 11a, both s.v. darkhei ha-emori; Tosafot to B. Sanhedrin 52b, s.v. ʾela; Sifra (ed. I. H. Weiss), Aḥarei Mot, ch. 13:9, 86a, on Leviticus 18:3; B. Ḥullin 41b; B. Sota 49b; B. Bava Qamma 83a and 91b and see Gerson D. Cohen, "The Soteriology of R. Abraham Maimuni," Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, XXXV (1967), 83–89. For the topical structure of Sefer Ḥasidim, see below.

stantive ways of dividing pars. 162 ff. Oddly enough, pars. 162–469 contain no major section on any topic which could be viewed as superstition per se. Thus, Güdemann's division of SHB, pars. 162 to the end, into a bloc on superstitions and another longer one [pars. 470–1135], which was supposedly added by a later compiler, does not fit the evidence.[30]

Despite the limitations of their analyses, Reifmann and Güdemann each contributed to the solution of the structure of *Sefer Ḥasidim*. Although Reifmann had little to offer in explaining how the bulk of SHB was organized, his analysis of the beginning of SHB remains plausible: pars. 1–152 belong together; pars. 153–161 are a separate unit. Güdemann, too, could not account for the structure of most of the book, but his stress on the three-topic statement in SHB, par. 2 suggested that there might be other small topical units in the rest of the book as well.[31]

II

A few years after the publication of Güdemann's analysis of ed. Bologna, Jehuda Wistinetzki published the Parma manuscript, SHP, a complete second version of *Sefer Ḥasidim*.[32] This recension of 1983 paragraphs, as against SHB's 1178, offered scholars new data for the study of the original *Sefer Ḥasidim*. At the same time, however, it further complicated the problem. From now on it would not be enough to confine the analysis to SHB alone, as Reifmann and Güdemann did, but one would also have to ask how the two recensions are related to each other as well as to the supposedly lost *Urtext* of *Sefer Ḥasidim*.

The first scholar who showed an awareness of this problem was Solomon Wertheimer. Although he was mainly concerned with

[30] Güdemann did correctly note, however, that the end of SHB, i.e. pars. 1135–1178, contains a separate source entitled "Mi-Sefer Ḥasidim aḥer" ["From another Sefer Ḥasidim"]. On its significance, see below, n. 36.

[31] This notion was also advanced by Abraham Epstein in "R. Shmuel he-Ḥasid," *Kitvei R. Avraham Epstein* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1950), I, 259.

[32] See above, n. 3.

making textual emendations and explanatory glosses in both re-
censions, he also made the general observation that the differences
between SHB and SHP indicate that several versions of *Sefer
Ḥasidim* had probably been compiled by students of Judah the
Pietist.[33]

It was Jacob Freimann who took up the task of comparing the
two published recensions in great detail.[34] He used Wistinetzki's
table of parallels between SHP and SHB and added a reverse
table at the end of his important "Introduction," so that com-
parisons could be made in both directions.[35] He also made use of
a peculiar feature of SHP. Whereas Reifmann and Güdemann had
based their analysis on different titles of the book ("*Sefer Ḥasidim*,"
"*Sefer ha-Ḥasidim*," etc.), Freimann's main point of departure[36]
was the presence of topical rubrics in the second half of SHP,[37]

[33] Solomon Wertheimer, *Leshon Ḥasidim* (Jerusalem, 1897?), 43a, n. 46.

[34] Freimann, "Introduction," *passim*. Prior to this work, Abraham Epstein
also had used SHP, but he did not subject it to a thorough comparative ana-
lysis with SHB. He noted that the Parma manuscript lacked many of the
additions in SHB and concluded: "Therefore, one cannot learn from [SHB]
about the character of the [original] book...." Even though some additions
are found in SHP, Epstein insisted that "[SHP] was edited earlier... and
contains many clues from which one can clarify somewhat the book's sources."
See Epstein, "R. Shmuel he-Ḥasid," I, 258.

[35] Since the tables were based on the first edition of Bologna, 1538, one
encounters some discrepancies if one uses a later, partially renumbered edition
such as that of Reuven Margoliot.

[36] In SHP, Freimann pointed to "Sefer ha-Yirah" (par. 1); "Sefer ha-
Teshuvah," alluded to in par. 13, p. 12 line 30; "Sefer Ḥasidim" (par. 27);
reference to an anonymous book (par. 721); and "Sefer Ḥasidim be-Mishlei
Shlomo" (par. 1792).

As far as SHB is concerned, he referred to a tract on humility (par. 2) and
correctly saw that pars. 1135 to the end, entitled "Mi-Sefer Ḥasidim aḥer,"
actually are based on Eleazar of Worms' *Sefer Ḥokhmat ha-Nefesh*. See Frei-
mann, "Introduction," 12.

[37] The titles of topical units in the main part of SHP, SHP I, are "'Inyanei
shabbat" (par. 589); "'Inyanei sefarim" (par. 638); "'Inyanei lomdei torah"
(par. 747); "'Inyanei ẓedaqah" (par. 857); "'Inyanei kibbud av va-em" (par.
929).
Beginning with 1) "Din herem u'shevu'ah" (par. 1386), we find a large

from which he went on to compare the arrangement of parallel passages on the same topics in both texts. He reached the conclusion that ed. Bologna was a later, more edited, version than the Parma manuscript, a view which has been widely accepted.[38]

Unfortunately, Freimann did not apply the method of content analysis far enough. If one reads both versions and notices what general topics are being discussed, where one ends and another begins, one finds a coherent topical structure in both recensions

number of short blocs of material, SHP II, which have rubrics beginning "gam kan." This phrase indicates that those blocs are appendices to earlier blocs on the same theme. The rubric just listed and three others below do not conform to this formula but, as we shall see, all of those blocs are appendices to related material found earlier in the book. See below, p. 47. The rubrics of the other appendices are 2) "Gam zeh din ne'emanut" (par. 1427);

3) "Gam kan katuv 'inyanei hezeqot ve-onshei adam" (par. 1435);

4) "Gam kan katuv 'inyanei hashba'ot u-mazziqin" (par. 1448);

5) "'Inyanei hezeq ketiv kan" (par. 1461);

6) "'Inyan talmud torah ketiv kan" (par. 1474);

7) "Gam b'khan ketiv 'inyan metim" (par. 1530);

8) "Gam kan katuv 'inyanei tefillah" (par. 1568);

9) "Gam kan 'inyanei shehitah ve-tohorah u-perishut" (par. 1649):

10) "Gam kan katuv 'inyanei zedaqah" (par. 1675);

11) "Gam kan katuv 'inyan kibbud av va-em" (par. 1719);

12) "Gam kan katuv 'inyan sefarim" (par. 1739);

13) "Gam kan katuv 'inyanei shabbat" (par. 1764);

14) "Sefer ha-Ḥasidim be-Mishlei Shlomo" (par. 1792);

15) ["G]am kan katuv 'inyan ishah" (par. 1875);

16) "Gam kan katuv 'inyan ḥasidut" (par. 1924).

With the exception of the section of proverbs (14), all of the blocs that these titles introduce deal with themes found in an earlier bloc in SHP. For some reason, there are three short sections on harmful spirits clustered together (3–5). No. 6 really contains: Study (1474–1506); Pietism (1507–20); Dead (1521- 25); Wonen (1526–29).

38 Among others, see Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (1941; reprint, New York, Schocken, 1961), 369, n. 6; A. Cronbach, "Social Thinking in *Sefer Ḥasidim*," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXII (1949), 1, n. 1; Monford Harris, "Dreams in *Sefer Ḥasidim*," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XXXI (1963), 56, n. 10. (Note, again, that *pace* Harris and others ed. R. Margoliot is *not* identical with SHB.) Cf. also Joseph Dan, "Hasidim, Sefer," *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1972), VII, 1390. See Freimann, "Introduction," 19.

even when there are no topical rubrics in the text.[39] Moreover, the disclosure of this complete topical structure makes it necessary to revise Freimann's conclusions about the relative lateness of ed. Bologna compared with the Parma manuscript. Indeed, as a broad generalization, Freimann's thesis is rather misleading. A re-examination of his arguments and the data will show why his analysis is problematic.

When he focused on the topical rubrics in SHP, Freimann im-mediately saw that some topics with rubrics are duplicated. Moreover, the rubrics of the duplicate blocs or appendices usually begin with the formula "gam kan". For example, there are passages on the Sabbath in SHP, pars. 589–637 and again in pars. 1764–1784. Preceding par. 589, we find the title: "'inyanei shabbat"; just before par. 1764, the title reads "Gam kan katuv 'inyanei shabbat." Freimann correctly saw that SHP contains a number of pairs of thematically related blocs that are separated from each other by vast blocs of other materials.

On the other hand, he noticed that parallels of the passages from the pairs of blocs in SHP are found together in SHB, in one bloc, and without any of the rubrics:[40]

> ...in its appearance ed. Bologna differs in an essential way from our *Sefer Ḥasidim* [i.e. SHP]. There [i.e. SHB] we find two halves of a chapter joined together into one complete thematic unit. This union is characterized by the very same ordering [of passages] as is found in ed. Parma. That is, whatever is earlier there, is also found earlier in ed. Bologna, whatever is later in our text, in a separate chapter, is immediately appended there, without any intervening material. Therefore, in ed. Bologna there is only one chapter on each topic....[41]

From Freimann's words, one would assume that the passages from the pairs of related, though separated, blocs from SHP would

---

[39] Scholem exaggerates the disorder of *Sefer Ḥasidim* by referring to it as "often resembling a mass of casual jottings rather than a coherent literary composition." See his *Major Trends*, 83.

[40] Freimann, "Introduction," 19.   [41] *Ibid.*

be found together in SHB as discrete blocs and in the same order as in SHP. But this is not so. True, there are two blocs on prayer in SHP, pars. 391–585 and 1568–1648, and only one on this topic in SHB introduced by a rubric, but compare how the parallels from material in the two blocs from SHP are found in SHB:

TABLE I[43]

SHP	SHB parallels
391	749
	750
392	751
	752
393	753
394	754
	755
	756
395	756
397	757
1591	758
	759
406	759
407	760
1592	762
1593	763
502	764
1633	765
410	766
411	767

[42] Freimann's comparison of one particular set of parallels in both recensions seemed to offer conclusive evidence that SHB was the later one. Thus in SHP there are two blocs with related titles on harmful spirits. But it is the *first* bloc, pars. 1435–1447, which is headed "Gam kan katuv ʿinyanei hezeqot veʿonshei adam," whereas the second, pars. 1461–1474, begins "ʿinyanei hezeq ketiv kan." In SHB, parallels to some of these paragraphs are found in pars. 458–485. However, parallels to passages from the two blocs in SHP are found in reversed order: parallels from SHP, pars. 1461–1474 *precede* parallels from SHP, pars. 1435–1447. Surely, Freimann reasoned, the irregular order of the rubrics in SHP betrays a compiler's error which the later editor of SHB corrected by reversing the parallel material. See above, n. 37 (end).

[43] See Freimann, "Introduction," 67–68.

The data in Table I indicate that in SHB several parallels from the second bloc in SHP on prayer, pars. 1568–1648, precede material from the first bloc, SHP, pars. 391–585. Moreover, in SHB the parallels from the two blocs are not found as discrete, integral units simply joined together into one bloc but are interwoven together in a fashion that is hard to explain.

There are other striking indications that Freimann oversimplified matters. As mentioned earlier, Freimann found two blocs in SHP on the Sabbath: pars. 589–637 and 1764–1784. If we look for the parallels in SHB, we discover that material from the first bloc is SHB, pars. 262–272, but that the parallels of SHP, pars. 1764–1784 are in SHB, pars. 867–870. In other words, there are two blocs on the Sabbath not only in SHP but also in SHB, and in the Bologna edition they are separated from each other by some six hundred paragraphs. They are not "immediately appended there, without any intervening material," as Freimann claimed; nor is it true that "in ed. Bologna there is only one chapter on each topic."

An examination of the location of the penitential sections in both recensions further weakens Freimann's argument. Here one finds that the relationship of blocs of parallels is the very opposite of Freimann's thesis: material which is *separated* into two blocs in SHB is found *together* in SHP. Thus in the Parma manuscript the paragraphs on atonement are especially concentrated together in pars. 18–74, but in SHB parallels appear partly in pars. 167–230 and partly in pars. 593–704. Once again, the parallels of the two blocs from SHB are not found as separate blocs in SHP but are interwoven together there. Using Freimann's reasoning, should we not conclude that the two penitential blocs in SHB are from an earlier stage of editing than the single bloc in SHP?

III

The existence of evidence contrary to Freimann's thesis raises the question of how many duplicate blocs of related material exist in the Bologna edition as well as in the Parma manuscript. Despite the relative absence of topical rubrics in the former, content analysis reveals the entire topical organization of SHB and the

presence in ed. Bologna itself of more than one recension of material from *Sefer Ḥasidim*. The discovery of the topical structure of SHB (Table II) and SHP (Table III) requires a major revision of Freimann's conclusions that SHP is an earlier editing of *Sefer Ḥasidim* and per se of greater reliability than SHB.

TABLE II
SHB
(An asterisk indicates a rubric in the text)

Topics	Paragraph Numbers
Sefer ha-Ḥasidut	1–152
SHB I	
1. Introduction:	153–230
a. Reverence	153–166
b. Atonement	167–230
2. The Dead	231–244
3. Harmful Spirits	244–247
4. Prayer	248–261
5. Sabbath	262–272
6. Books	273–284
7. Study	285–314
8. Charity	315–334
9. Honoring Parents	335–346
10. Pietism	347–369
11. Ritual Slaughter, Purity	370–372
12. Women	373–394
13. (Business) Trustworthiness	395–402
14. Bans and Oaths	403–440
SHB II (fragmentary)	
1. The Dead	441–457
2. Harmful Spirits	458–485
3. Women	486–521
4. Pietism	522–560
5. Honoring Parents	561–587

SHB III

1.	Introduction:	588–704
	a. Reverence	588–592
	b. Atonement	593–704
2.	The Dead	705–748
* 3.	Prayer	749–825
4.	Ritual Slaughter, Purity	825–841
* 3a.	More on Prayer	842–856
5.	Sabbath	857–871
6.	Books	872–941
7.	Study	942–1020
* 8.	Proverbs of Solomon in *Sefer Ḥasidim*	1021–1030
9.	Charity	1031–1061
10.	(Business) Trustworthiness	1062–1099
11.	Bans and Oaths	1100–1120
12.	Women	1121–1135
*	"Another *Sefer Ḥasidim*"	1135–1178 [end of book]

This outline shows that SHB itself consists of more than one recension! Moreover, SHB I and III have many topical blocs in common which, despite some deviations, are arranged in the same sequence. Three units are missing in SHB III but are found in a partial recension we are calling SHB II: Harmful Spirits, Honoring Parents, and Pietism. The short section of Ritual Slaughter, Purity is located earlier in III than in I; Women and the two blocs (Business) Trustworthiness and Bans and Oaths are found in reverse order. In addition, SHB III contains an interpolation called "Proverbs of Solomon in *Sefer Ḥasidim*." These differences aside, it is remarkable that many of the topical blocs are the same and appear in I and III in almost the same order.

The outline in Table II is also clearly related to the structure of the Parma manuscript and to the rubrics actually found in that edition. A comparative content analysis of SHB I and of the Parma manuscript up to but not including the blocs of appendices at the end reveals the following structure of the main part of SHP:

TABLE III
(An asterisk indicates a rubric in the text)

SHB I	SHP	
Introduction:		
a. Reverence	Reverence	1–17
b. Atonement	Atonement	18–26
	Additions	27-36
	Atonement	37–265
The Dead	The Dead	265/6–363
Harmful Spirits	Harmful Spirits	364–390
Prayer	Prayer	391–585...
Sabbath	* Sabbath	589-637
Books	* Books (see par. 721)	638–746
Study	* Study	747–856
Charity	* Charity	857–928
Honoring Parents	* Honoring Parents	929–974
Pietism	Pietism	975-1065
Ritual Slaughter, Purity	Ritual Slaughter, Purity	1066–1083
Women	Women	1084–1193
(Business) Trustworthiness	(Business) Trustworthiness	1194–1269
Bans and Oaths	Bans and Oaths	1270–1385

Table III indicates that both the large first part of the Parma manuscript, SHP I, and ed. Bologna passed through a similar editorial process; that SHP I and SHB I, II, III basically conform to the same pattern, and that similar topics are found in both of them, in the same order.

The presence in SHB as well as in SHP of more than one recension makes it necessary to revise Freimann's thesis that the Parma manuscript is editorially more primitive than ed. Bologna and that the former is earlier and more authentic than the latter. Freimann oversimplified matters because he did not notice that SHB consists of more than one recension. Indeed, our content analysis of the topics in and parallels between SHB and SHP suggests that the two documents are related to each other in a more complex way than Freimann realized.

In our revision of Freimann's thesis, the various recensions in SHB and SHP are abbreviated as follows: SHB I, II, III refer to the complete (I and III) and partial (II) recensions isolated in ed. Bologna; SHP I is the long first section of material in the Parma manuscript, and SHP II refers to the appendices there. If we notice where the parallels from these blocs are found, a significant pattern emerges and this pattern, in turn, has important implications for our understanding of the relationship between SHP and SHB.

Freimann claimed that the Parma manuscript was an older, more reliable recension than ed. Bologna primarily because topically related blocs are found in SHP I and SHP II and are supposedly synthesized into one bloc in ed. Bologna. Our study of the book indicates that this is only partially correct: the parallels of related passages from the two separated blocs in the Parma manuscript are found together in ed. Bologna, but only in SHB III, as in the case of prayer.[44] Freimann did not see that ed. Bologna contains another recension, SHB I, which does not contain parallels from SHP I and II. Freimann also failed to see that SHP I, the large first part of the Parma manuscript, integrates parallels of passages on related topics from passages found separated in ed. Bologna, SHB I and SHB II/III. This means that the larger part of the Parma manuscript, SHP I, and the last recension of ed. Bologna, SHB III, are both composite sources. Each of these recensions contains an amalgam of passages whose parallels are found in pairs of separated blocs in the other document. From the point of view of simplicity or complexity, there is no reason to give to the large first part of the Parma manuscript any greater preference as a source than to the third recension in ed. Bologna. Editorially they are both of a composite nature.

Unlike the composite nature of the first part of the Parma manuscript, SHP I, and the last recension of ed. Bologna, SHB III, the two other major blocs are simpler in their composition. Thus, the appendices in the Parma manuscript, SHP II, and the first

44 *Ibid.*

complete recension in ed. Bologna, SHB I, usually contain passages whose parallels are found in one other source, not two or more. The parallels to passages in SHP II are usually in SHB II/III alone; those in SHB I are usually found only in SHP I.

Although both documents are alike in containing simpler (SHB I and SHP II) and composite (SHB II/III and SHP I) blocs of material, one additional source was available to the editor of the Parma manuscript which the editor of ed. Bologna lacked. For the Parma manuscript contains a substantial amount of material lacking in ed. Bologna, presumably derived from a source now lost; however, virtually nothing in ed. Bologna is missing from the Parma manuscript.[45]

These observations about the editorial composition of the blocs making up SHP and SHB are represented in Table IV.

TABLE IV[46]

Simpler Sources:
(Unique to   (SHB I)   (Common to SHP I and SHB III) (lost)   (SHP II)
Parma) (lost)

Composite Sources:
                SHP I   SHB III

[45] Cf. *ibid.*, 57–73. Apart from SHB, pars. 1–152, which constitute a special bloc of material (see below), most of SHB is found in some form in SHP. A number of additions should be made to Freimann's table of parallels. The first number is the SHB paragraph; the information in parenthesis refers to the SHP number, including page and line references as needed. The are: 28 (38), 159 (13, p. 11 — top), 299 = 1002 (813), 364 (1044, p. 261, lines 9–11), 369 (1055), 395 (1216), 402 (1259), 589 (14, p. 14, lines 16 ff.). These additions still leave about two dozen passages in SHB for which parallels in SHP have not been found.

[46] This pattern holds for the parallels from the thematic blocs on the Dead, Harmful Spirits, Prayer, the Sabbath, Charity, Honoring Parents, Pietism, Ritual Slaughter, Purity, and Women. For the parallels from blocs on Study and Bans and Oaths, there is the difference that SHB I contains parallels from SHP II as well as SHP I. The blocs on Reverence and Atonement are not found at all in SHP II. These differences suggest the independence of the thematic blocs (*maḥbarot*) which were combined into the recensions we now have.

Both SHP I and SHB III are composite blocs in the two final editions of *Sefer Ḥasidim*, and each contains parallels from more than one of the simpler blocs. In the case of SHP I, the main part of the Parma manuscript, an editor used three sources: 1) a bloc of passages uniquely found in the Parma manuscript and now lost (Unique Parma); 2) parallels from the first recension of ed. Bologna (SHB I); and 3) parallels of material found in the two composite blocs (Common to SHP I and SHB III) also now lost.

On the other hand, the editor of SHB III used 1) the same common source (Common to SHP I and SHB III); and 2) appendices to the Parma manuscript, SHP II. Since there is no significant bloc of material unique to ed. Bologna, no Unique to Bologna source is indicated.

Despite the complexity of the above analysis, several clear conclusions follow from it. First of all, it would appear that the two versions of *Sefer Ḥasidim* which have survived, the Parma manuscript and ed. Bologna, contain only some of the sources which the editors of SHP and SHB used. We no longer have the Unique Parma source nor do we have a separate source which corresponds to material common to SHP I and SHB III.

On the other hand, it is remarkable that of the four recensions which we do have, three of them (SHB I, SHB II/III, and SHP I) have nearly the same topical structure. In two of them, SHB I and SHP I, the table of contents actually is identical. Only one of the four blocs, the appendices to the Parma manuscript, SHP II, does not conform to the topical structure characteristic of the other recensional blocs, and seems to be constructed instead in a random way. The irregularity of this bloc, in comparison with the topical structure found in the others, as well as a reference in that bloc to *Sefer Ḥasidim*,[47] suggests that SHP II was actually appended to one recension of *Sefer Ḥasidim after* that book was compiled.

It is evident that the appendices did not undergo the same

[47] SHP, par. 1589, p. 388 (bottom).

editorial process as did the other three blocs. Clearly at some time a tradition emerged as to which of the topical notebooks (*maḥbarot*) Judah the Pietist wrote belonged in *Sefer Ḥasidim*, and in which order. Given the absence of any signs of Eleazar of Worms' editoral signature throughout the various recensions,[48] it is plausible to suggest that the topical structure which we have disclosed in three of the four recensional blocs represents the original structure of Judah the Pietist's *Sefer Ḥasidim*.

Further, it is possible that the Parma manuscript and ed. Bologna have not preserved editions of an original *Sefer Ḥasidim*, now lost, but contain at least three recensions of the book itself. This suggestion is supported by a comparison with other writings of *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz* which also seem to have been transmitted in several recensions or collections of material drawn from smaller topical notebooks. Thus, Eleazar of Worms probably composed several penitential tracts, each derived from common sources as well as from some unique to each.[49] So too, his mentor, Judah the Pietist compiled thematic notebooks on various aspects of pietism and may himself have arranged and rearranged specific selections into several recensions. Even if there originally was only one *Sefer Ḥasidim*, now lost, the structure of the original has been preserved in at least three recensions, and it is likely that this structure goes back to Judah the Pietist himself.

In effect, Judah compiled a pietistic code for his followers and scholars should make use of all recensions of that work, as well as of parallels in Judah's biblical commentaries[50] before deciding

[48] See Marcus, "Organization," *passim*.

[49] See Chapter III of Ivan G. Marcus, "Penitential Theory and Practice among the Pious of Germany: 1150–1250," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1975, which will be published as *Piety and Society: The Jewish Pietists of Medieval Germany*.

[50] Basic work needs to be done on the biblical exegesis of Judah the Pietist and his circle. For some of the texts, see the uncritical volume edited by Isaak S. Lange, *Peirushei ha-Torah l'R' Yehudah he-Ḥasid* (Jerusalem, 1975) where one can also find references to the still indispensable manuscripts and printed texts. Two studies which take into account the biblical exegesis of the Rhenish Jewish pietists are H. H. Ben Sasson, "Ḥasidei Ashkenaz 'al Ḥalukat Qinyanim

where the best readings are found. Fortunately scholars have already begun to do this,[51] and should continue to do so until we have a complete critical edition of *Sefer Ḥasidim.*

IV

The preceding analysis leads to a word of caution concerning one extraneous element in ed. Bologna: SHB, pars. 1–152. Unfortunately, this bloc constitutes the bulk of the only book-length translation into English claiming to be *Sefer Ḥasidim.*[52] As indicated, these paragraphs constitute a peculiar unit of *Sefer Ḥasidim* traditions.[53] Unlike the rest of ed. Bologna, the parallels from SHB, pars. 1–152 are not found in clusters in SHP. When parallels exist at all, they are scattered all over SHP I and II, and this kind of distribution is unusual.

Moreover, the interpolations noted by Zunz and others[54] from Maimonides and other writers not belonging to Judah the Pietist's circle are almost all found in these paragraphs. Interestingly, the peculiarly ascetic forms of Rhenish Jewish atonement found in SHP are almost all missing in SHB, pars. 1–152.[55] Instead, we find entire chapters of Maimonides' *Hilekhot Teshuvah.*[56] In view of the Maimonidean orientation of this separate tract, it is possible,

Ḥomriyim u-Nekhasim Ruḥaniyim bein Benei ha-Adam," *Zion,* XXXV (1970), 61–79 and Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the *Sefer Ḥasidim,*" *Association for Jewish Studies Review,* I (1976), 311–357.

[51] See Yizhaq Baer, "Ha-Megamah ha-Datit-ha-Ḥevratit shel *Sefer Ḥasidim,*" *Zion,* III (1937), 26–29; *idem,* "Shenei Paraqim shel Torat ha-Hashgaḥah be-*Sefer Ḥasidim,*" in *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), [Hebrew section], 48, n. 3; Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 327, n. 48; 343, n. 104,; 344, n. 109, etc.

[52] Scholom Alchanan Singer, ed. and trans., *Medieval Jewish Mysticism: Book of the Pious* (Northbrook, Ill. .: Whitehall, 1971).

[53] See above, pp. 36–37.

[54] Zunz, *Zur Geschichte,* 126; Reifmann, *Arba'ah Ḥorashim,* 7; Epstein, "R. Shmuel he-Ḥasid," I, 258, n. 24; Freimann, "Introduction," 17–18.

[55] The exception is that a part of SHP, pars. 72–74, on confessions, is in SHB, pars. 21–22, 621 and 630.

[56] See Freimann, "Introduction," 17.

as Reifmann suggested, that this bloc was compiled by Rhenish or French Jews[57] who rejected the Rhenish Jewish penitential system[58] in favor of the less ascetic views of Maimonides.

For all of these reasons, SHB, pars. 1–152 should be considered the most contaminated part of SHB and should be used with great caution as a source for Rhenish Jewish life and thought.

[57] The French vernacular expressions are mainly found in the first 152 paragraphs. See SHB, pars. 3, 4, 15, 18, 44, 53, 61, 142; but cf. par. 234. The German expressions are found in the main part of the book [SHB I–III], e.g., pars. 205, 208, 668, 775, 898; but cf. par. 1143. See Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens*, I, 287–288 and 273-280. Although Güdemann showed that Rhenish Jewish authors used French as well as German vernacular expressions, he did not realize that phrases from each language are concentrated in different sources in *Sefer Ḥasidim*.

[58] See A. Rubin, "The Concept of Repentance among the Hasidey Ashkenaz," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, XVI (1965), 161–176 and Marcus, "Penitential Theory and Practice."