I. PROLOGUE

Several years ago, a book dealer's catalogue with the following entry crossed my desk: ¹


Clearly, the enterprising book dealer inserted the parenthetical note—identifying the author as Mordecai Richler's mother—in order to attract the attention of potential buyers. As the title makes clear, however, the author preferred to identify herself as her father's daughter, i.e., as the daughter of Rabbi Yudl Rosenberg (1859-1935), rather than as her son's mother. A perusal of the book's content, which offers a vivid, sympathetic, and extensive portrait of R. Yudl while barely mentioning Mordecai Richler, underscores the irony of the catalogue entry.

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* contains a 250 word entry devoted to Mordecai Richler ² There is no entry on his grandfather, R. Yudl Rosenberg ³

II. INTRODUCTION

In his *היספורה הזיפית*, Joseph Dan writes:

Without doubt, R. Yudl Rosenberg was one of the most prolific, creative,
and startling personalities of our literature in recent generations. So long as his writings are not properly investigated, we will not be able to fathom the lines of inner development of modern Hebrew literature. Sadly, little has been written about this unusual personality, and little is known about him. . . . In his writings, and in what has been said about him, it is difficult to find the slightest flaw in his character. Doubtless, he was a devoted Jew, loyal to the Torah, and to its ethical teachings and commandments. His personal integrity, however, did not necessarily carry over to his literary works, in the sense that we apply “integrity” to literature today. Many of his literary works, bearing his name, can only be labeled forgeries. Thus, for example, he published a book entitled חסמת מחרא Ли, which describes a disputation between the Maharal and a priest named Johann Sylvester regarding the principles of the Jewish faith. Several of the letters ascribed to the Maharal in this volume reflect an attempt by Rosenberg to rely on the authentic material from the Maharal corpus. But, for the most part, Rosenberg did not attempt to do this in a serious manner. He uses the language of his time, and his own personal style of writing. The forgery is blatant. . . . If, however, we consider R. Yudl a forger with regard to historical texts, it is quite another matter with regard to belles-lettres. Here he must be viewed as creative, original, and prolific without peer.

It seems that Rosenberg viewed himself as a descendant of the Maharal of Prague. He devoted the best of his work to this figure. This found expression especially in his major contribution to belles-lettres, חסמת מחרא, a collection of popular legends connected to the Maharal of Prague, most of them imaginary. This book was widely distributed and was profoundly influential because of its many tales about the Golem allegedly created by the Maharal. . . . Due to Rosenberg’s tales, Maharal’s rich intellectual and literary legacy was mostly eclipsed. This great thinker is now known primarily as the creator of the Golem. It is difficult to find a parallel in the present century, whether in Hebrew or worldwide literature, of a book that has so captivated the popular imagination. Every child knows about the Golem of the Maharal. But very few know about the Maharal’s authentic literary contribution. Rosenberg is largely responsible for this.

Dan’s account emphasizes the profound significance of R. Yudl’s contribution, even as it laments the lack of scholarly attention R. Yudl has been accorded to date. Precisely because of this lack of scholarly attention, Dan’s analysis itself is flawed. Thus, for example, Dan indicates that R. Yudl published a book entitled חסמת מחרא哪种 Dan then labels a “blatant forgery.” R. Yudl never claimed to be, nor is it likely
that he was, the author or editor of...5 Dan suggests that R. Yudl may have considered himself to be a descendant of the Maharal, hence his literary obsession with the Maharal. In fact, R. Yudl claimed descent from a variety of leading Jewish authorities, ranging from R. Judah Hasid (d. 1217) to R. Yaakov Koppel of Mezhirech (d. 1740) and R. Meir of Apta (d. 1831).6 He never claimed descent from the Maharal of Prague, despite ample opportunity to do so.7

Given the confusion that abounds regarding almost every aspect of R. Yudl’s life, ranging from the date of his birth8 to the date of his death9—and including all that happened in between—we shall attempt to make a contribution, however modest, toward an intellectual portrait of R. Yudl. We shall focus primarily on R. Yudl’s Maharal corpus.

III. קושי הממשט של הכתות הגדולות

R. Yudl’s Maharal corpus consists of the following works:

1. חסידות של פświadczenie ו cuixri י "ון x, Warsaw, 1905.
2. מחזה מרגינל, Piotrkow, 1909.
3. חסיד הממשט של הכתות הגדולות, Piotrkow, 1913.

In common, the title pages of these books indicate that they were published by R. Yudl Rosenberg and were based upon authentic manuscripts from the Royal Library in Metz.10 At this point of our investigation, we will focus on the least known member of R. Yudl’s Maharal corpus, the...

In 1913, the very year that he would leave his native Poland for Canada, R. Yudl published an astonishing tale in a booklet entitled חסיד הממשט של הכתות הגדולות.11 It consisted of two separate accounts of an event that purportedly occurred in London in 159012 and involved the Maharal of Prague.

According to R. Yudl, the first account was drawn from a long forgotten Hebrew manuscript that had been gathering dust on the shelves of the “Royal Library in Metz.” R. Yudl prepared the publication copy of the account by personally copying it out “letter by letter” from the original manuscript. The manuscript was an autograph copy of R. Manoah Hendel’s דלי HEXKIR (d. 1612), a treatise devoted to the various utensils that had been in use in the Temple service in Jerusalem. In his discussion of the whereabouts of the utensils that had survived the destruction of the Temple, R. Manoah Hendel incorporated a story he
had heard personally from his teacher, the Maharal. Indeed, the Maharal had ordained that the story be recorded for all generations.

Briefly told, the Maharal related how in 1590 he learned that the twelve precious stones of the Jewish High Priest’s breastplate (ןֵחָּה הָנִשְׁפָּתָה)—which had survived the destruction of the Second Temple and ultimately made its way to England—had been stolen from the Belmore Street Museum in London. The Maharal immediately left for London where, by posing as a wealthy collector of antiquities, he managed to make contact with a certain Captain Wilson, who was both a charlatan and a thief. Wilson had ingratiated himself with a former curator of the Belmore Street Museum, Professor Andreas. Through Andreas, an innocent victim of Wilson’s intrigues, Wilson gained entry to the museum’s inner vaults and succeeded in pirating away the twelve precious stones. The actual theft took place after a new curator had been appointed: Professor Edward Mortimer. After the Maharal and Wilson had settled on a rather steep purchase price, the Maharal sought and obtained a two week reprieve, ostensibly in order to raise the agreed-upon exorbitant sum of money. In fact, the Maharal used the two-week period to wreak havoc with Wilson’s personal life by means of a series of miraculous interventions into Wilson’s daily routine. By the end of the two week period, Wilson was a broken man who repented and was only too happy to rid himself of the precious stones at no cost to the Maharal. At the advice of the Maharal, Wilson confessed the crime to Andreas, handed him the precious stones, and requested that they be restored to the Belmore Street Museum in a manner that would not incriminate him (i.e., Wilson). So ends the first account, i.e., the account of the Maharal as recorded in R. Manoah Hendel’s ספרי עדים, which, however, provides no details as to whether or how Andreas managed to restore the jewels without implicating either Wilson or himself. This would be the task of the second account, appended by R. Yudl to the first account.

According to R. Yudl, the second account was drawn from the memoirs of Professor Edward Mortimer, noted archaeologist and Curator of the Belmore Street Museum in London. Mortimer, successor to Andreas as Curator, served in that capacity when the jewels were stolen, and, later, when they were returned. The account, written originally in English, became widely known through the efforts of an English publicist, and eventually appeared in print in Russian translation. R. Yudl assures his readers that his Hebrew version is a “verbatim” rendering of the Russian translation. The second account is brief; it simply corroborates the first account and provides a happy ending, tying
together the various loose ends that remained from the first account. In order to underscore the veracity of the accounts, R. Yudl appended a personal letter (addressed to him and dated April 1, 1913) from a Jewish scholar in London who testifies, among other things, that he is aware that the Jewish High Priest’s breastplate is still in England and that he has seen the original English version of Professor Edward Mortimer’s account of the theft and eventual return of the jewels.

Despite R. Yudl’s efforts at verisimilitude, both accounts are imaginary and have no basis in fact. There never was a Royal Library in Metz; R. Manoah Hendel did not author a work entitled שערו של אביו; there was no Belmore Street Museum in London in 1590 or at any other time; and the Jewish scholar’s letter appended to the accounts is a literary hoax.

More importantly, R. Yudl lifted virtually the entire plot, including the very names of its leading characters (Captain Wilson, Professor Andreas, and Curator Mortimer) from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s short story entitled The Jew’s Breastplate. First published in Strand Magazine in 1899, it appeared in book form in 1908. Shortly thereafter it appeared in Russian translation, and R. Yudl—who was fluent in Russian—appropriated it for his Maharal corpus. If done properly, this would have required extensive editorial revision on R. Yudl’s part, for Conan Doyle’s short story is set in Victorian England whereas the Maharal belongs more properly to sixteenth century Bohemia. R. Yudl, however, seems not to have been overly concerned with smoothing away the anachronisms that abound.

It will be recalled that R. Yudl’s first account, allegedly drawn from a late sixteenth or early seventeenth century manuscript that had been languishing in the Royal Library of Metz, already knows the names of all the key places and characters, e.g., the Belmore Street Museum in London, Captain Wilson, Professor Andreas, and Curator Mortimer. But the Belmore Street Museum and precisely the names of those three characters are attested in only one other existing document, namely, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s The Jew’s Breastplate, first published in 1899. Given the fact that Sir Arthur Conan Doyle could not read Hebrew, it is highly unlikely that he derived the plot and the characters from an alleged Hebrew manuscript at the Royal Library in Metz. R. Yudl, however, could read Russian. Given the priority of publication on the part of Conan Doyle, it is quite obvious that R. Yudl borrowed from Conan Doyle and not vice versa. Except for Conan Doyle’s mention of the Belmore Street Museum, there is no record of the existence of a museum by that name in London. It will be obvious to almost any reader
of The Jew's Breastplate that the Belmore Street Museum is patterned after the British Museum as it appeared in Victorian England. The British Museum was founded in 1753; neither it nor the “Belmore Street Museum” existed in 1590. In short, the evidence is overwhelming; R. Yudl's first account is imaginary. It is drawn from a Conan Doyle short story, with some imaginative additions on R. Yudl's part.

All this doesn't bode well for the historicity of the remaining members of R. Yudl's Maharal corpus, all of which are ascribed to the Royal Library in Metz. A diehard R. Yudl (or: Maharal) enthusiast may wish to claim that while it appears that R. Yudl's was not based upon an authentic manuscript from the Royal Library in Metz, this in no way impugns the existence of that library and its other Hebrew manuscripts. Against such a claim, it should suffice to note that R. Yudl's publications aside, there is no record of either Jew or Gentile who has ever set foot in, or seen a manuscript from, the Royal Library in Metz. Moreover, regarding the specific Hebrew manuscripts that R. Yudl mentions in conjunction with the Royal Library in Metz, no copies of these manuscripts are known from any other library, nor are their titles mentioned anywhere in Jewish literature prior to R. Yudl's announcement of their existence. What remains to be determined is whether the Royal Library in Metz was a figment of R. Yudl's imagination, or whether R. Yudl was duped by an enterprising forger named Hayyim Scharfstein. If the former, and the evidence seems to point in that direction, the moral issue of passing off fiction as fact needs to be addressed. Since R. Yudl authenticated quasi-halakhic texts (such as Maharal's Passover Seder practices in גוֹלֵל הַשְׁשִׁינַית [Warsaw, 1904], a treatise on divination by lottery which he attributed to the otherwise unattested Rabbi Zemach b. Ahai Gaon) by ascribing them to the Royal Library of Metz, the moral issue looms large indeed.

IV. נמצאות זכרות

Clearly, the most influential work of R. Yudl's Maharal corpus was טֶסְלַאָה טַשָא"ל, which, ascribed to the Maharal's son-in-law, Rabbi Isaac b. Samson Katz (d. 1624), purports to be—among other things—an eyewitness account of how the Maharal created the Golem of Prague. While generally recognized in academic circles as a literary hoax, it is incredible that neither a scholarly monograph nor even a single scholarly study has been devoted to an examination of this specific issue. This is indicative of the present state of scholarship regarding R. Yudl.
In brief, *Tratation* tells the following story. In 1572, the Maharal was appointed Chief Rabbi of Prague. Upon his arrival, he learned that the Jews in Prague were repeatedly the victims of blood libel. In order to stave off further accusations, the Maharal turned to the head of the Christian community in Prague, Cardinal Johann Sylvester, and offered to engage in a debate with him about the false blood accusations. The terms of the debate were agreed upon, and the debate took place over a thirty day period. The Cardinal was persuaded by the Maharal’s defense, and a copy of the proceedings was sent to the King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor, Rudolph II (d. 1612). The King too was persuaded by the wisdom of the Maharal’s arguments, and on the first day of Shevat, 1573, he granted the Maharal a private audience in the royal palace. Rudolph agreed to draft and enforce new legislation which would protect the Jews against the blood libel. Despite these impressive political gains, the Maharal decided in 1580 that it was necessary to create a Golem in order to protect the Jews against their enemies. On 20 Adar, 1580, the Golem was created; on *Lag Ba-Omer*, 1590, it was destroyed. The bulk of *Tratation* is devoted to a detailed account of the adventures of the Golem during its ten years of service to its master, the Maharal of Prague.

In fact, much of the information provided by *Tratation* is historically inaccurate. In 1573, Rudolph II was neither King of Bohemia nor Holy Roman Emperor. In that year, Maximilian II (d. 1576) served in both capacities. Indeed, Maharal was granted a private audience with Rudolph II. A contemporary account of this meeting has come down to us; it states unequivocally that the meeting occurred in 1592.32 Alas, not only did no Cardinal by the name of Johann Sylvester serve in Prague during the lifetime of the Maharal, but no Cardinal by that name seems to have served at any time in Prague or, for that matter, anywhere else.33

Clearly, *Tratation* was not written by the Maharal’s son-in-law. It appears to be a literary hoax, and like all the other alleged manuscripts from the Royal Library in Metz, it was a modern forgery published by R. Yudl Rosenberg.

Did the Maharal create a Golem? If our only evidence for the Maharal’s Golem came from the writings of R. Yudl, we would perforce conclude that the Maharal’s Golem is imaginary. In fact, the tradition that the Maharal created a Golem antedates R. Yudl. Already in 1837 (before R. Yudl was born), legends about the Maharal and the Golem appeared in print.34 The early printed accounts indicate that these legends had an
oral history before being recorded. They probably go back at least to the second half of the eighteenth century. Unlike R. Yudl's version, these accounts never speak about blood libel, and they know nothing about a Cardinal Johann Sylvester. Nonetheless, the gap between the death of the Maharal in 1609 and the first printed account in 1837 is striking. There is certainly no evidence contemporary with the Maharal that he—the Maharal—created a Golem. Rationalists dismiss the late accounts out of hand; mystics hold on to them dearly, though they often seem unaware of just how late and thin these traditions really are.

A Chief Rabbi of Prague, the noted scholar and ר"ל, R. Solomon Judah Rapoport (d. 1867), once wrote:

The Maharal's hands did not produce a Golem. His great wisdom is reflected not by the fact that he produced a Golem, but rather by the fact that he produced its opposite, i.e., he produced a great disciple, the Gaon and glory of Israel, Rabbi Yom Tov Lipmann Heller, author of the Tosafot Yom Tov.

More recently, the distinguished Jewish educator, Rabbi Moshe Einstadtter, wrote:

Was there a Golem that walked the ghetto streets during the last quarter of sixteenth century Prague? Did Maharal indeed create a homunculus-like man to serve and protect a victimized Jewish populace? Let us but say that if asked, the question must be phrased: Did Maharal in fact create such a being? However, as to whether the Master, who so clearly saw the antecedents of the material world in the ideal spiritual one and how the former was determined and formulated by the latter, and who moved so freely and intimately from the one level to another—whether he could have created a Golem is no matter for debate at all.

V. IN DEFENSE OF R. YUDL

is clearly a work of fiction. Due to the literary conventions adopted by R. Yudl, such as identifying the original author as R. Isaac b. Samson Katz and ascribing the manuscript to the Royal Library of Metz, many mistook fiction for fact. Was R. Yudl guilty of fraud?

Much, it would seem, depends upon the motivation and claims of the author. If it could be demonstrated that R. Yudl deliberately passed off fiction as fact in order to deceive his readers, let us suppose for monetary gain, we would surely conclude that is a crude for-
TRADITION

gery. Nowhere, however, in his voluminous writings did R. Yudl suggest that he considered מ clases מクラス an authentic historical document. Nor is there any testimony from his contemporaries that R. Yudl ever claimed—either publicly or privately—that מ clases מクラス was fact rather than fiction. To the contrary, there is evidence that he admitted openly that מ clases מクラス and מ clases מクラス were works of fiction.

On Wednesday, February 18, 1931, the Jewish community of Montreal celebrated R. Yudl’s seventieth birthday. A souvenir journal was published and distributed at the banquet in his honor. It includes a detailed biography in Yiddish that could only have been written by (or: with the aid of) R. Yudl. In it, R. Yudl’s literary oeuvre is subdivided into three categories:

1. רביניש ספורים
2. דרש על קבבל ספורים
3. פלאקס-ליטען-איט

Listed prominently in the category of פלאקס-ליטען-איט are מ clases מクラス and מ clases מクラス! Clearly, R. Yudl did not attempt to misrepresent the fictional character of either book. Much like his older contemporary, Marcus Lehmann (d. 1890) of Mainz, R. Yudl wrote historical novels and short stories for the masses. These were intended to inculcate Jewish values, provide Jewish heroes for juveniles, and offer a religiously acceptable alternative to the proliferation of German and French novels at the turn of the century. That many mistook his fiction for fact cannot be blamed on R. Yudl.

VI. AN IMAGINARY TREATISE ASCRIBED TO A DISCIPLE OF RABBI JACOB EMDEN

Having become familiar with R. Yudl’s predilection for passing off fiction as fact, and for inventing imaginary books and libraries, we began examining his halakhic and kabbalistic works to see to what extent his belletristic tendencies affected his scholarly work. One sample is astonishing.

R. Yudl’s translation of the Zohar into Hebrew was nothing less than a messianic act on his part. As he explains in the introduction to his translation, the Zohar itself claims that the spread of its teaching will culminate in the messianic age. But, asks R. Yudl, how could its teaching spread among Jews who, for the most part, do not understand Aramaic, the language of the Zohar? Hence the necessity of translating the Zohar into Hebrew.
In the introduction to his translation of the Zohar on Leviticus, published in 1925, R. Yudl discusses the controversy surrounding the authenticity and antiquity of the Zohar. In passing, he notes that Rabbi Jacob Emden (d. 1776), the distinguished rabbi and polemicist, was among the Zohar’s severest critics. Indeed, added R. Yudl, Emden concluded that the Zohar was post-talmudic in origin.

Apparently, R. Yudl regretted publicizing the fact that a distinguished rabbi considered the Zohar a post-talmudic work (i.e., a work falsely ascribed to R. Shimon bar Yohai and, therefore, inauthentic). Emden’s view, in effect, undermined the very purpose of R. Yudl’s translation. So later in 1925, in a supplement to his translation of the Zohar, R. Yudl stated that while in Lodz he chanced upon a worn copy of a book entitled ר"ת ע"י. The title page was torn and lacked the portion with the name of the author. But a careful reading of the volume enabled R. Yudl to establish that its author was a disciple of R. Jacob Emden. According to R. Yudl, the volume contained some brief legal responsa, as well as a series of letters, written by Emden. R. Yudl cites a passage from one of Emden’s letters which supports the antiquity and authenticity of the Zohar. The passage explains away the earlier position of Emden which offered a scathing critique of the antiquity and authenticity of the Zohar. It does so by indicating that the earlier position was intended only as a means of pulling the rug out from under the feet of Sabbatian teaching and, therefore, was not to be taken seriously by normative Jews. While the alleged Emden passage cited by R. Yudl may well be an accurate reflection of Emden’s sentiments, the book from which it is drawn does not exist. Apparently, neither the title nor the passage, neither the legal responsa nor the letters, have been cited by anyone other than R. Yudl. It would appear that the volume was on loan from the Royal Library in Metz.

VII. R. YUDL ROSENBERG: WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE

This brief discussion has touched upon a host of issues relating to R. Yudl Rosenberg, most of them neglected by modern scholarship. What follows is a preliminary list of scholarly desiderata. First, a comprehensive bibliography of R. Yudl’s writings needs to be compiled. As indicated above, works ascribed to him may not be his. Conversely, works not ascribed to him may be his. Regarding those works of R. Yudl that appeared in Hebrew and Yiddish versions, one needs to determine whether both versions were authored by R. Yudl and, where rele-
vant, the priority of one version over the other. Differences between
the Hebrew and Yiddish versions need to be accounted for. To what
extent did R. Yudl borrow from others? Was he guilty of either plagia-
rism or literary fraud? In what sense was he a creative and original
writer? How did he relate to his contemporary Hebrew and Yiddish
literati? What was his standing as a talmudist? Halakhist? Kabbalist?
What motivated him to contribute to specific literary genres and not
others? Can one chart turning points in his literary career when he
abandoned one literary genre for another? In the light of the anachro-
nisms and inaccuracies (deliberate or otherwise) that abound in the
Maharal corpus, R. Yudl’s translation of the Zohar needs to be reexam-
ined. Did he translate accurately? What portions of the Zohar did he
omit from his translation? What portions did he revise? To what extent
were R. Yudl’s literary efforts—including his translation of the Zohar—a
Jewish response to modernity?
R. Yudl was a talmudist, halakhist, kabbalist, hasid, professional
rabbi, and author of belles-lettres in a major period of transition. It
would be too much to claim that he excelled in all these areas. One sus-
pects that in each of these areas it would not be difficult to identify con-
temporaries of R. Yudl who were more competent than he. It is precise-
ly R. Yudl’s multi-dimensionality, and the specific configuration of areas
of expertise listed above, that render him at once unique and complex.
A sharply focused intellectual portrait of R. Yudl will emerge only after
his contribution in each of these areas is viewed and evaluated in proper
literary, historical, and social perspective.

VIII. EPILOGUE

Apparently unaware of R. Yudl’s and its origin, Professor Arnold L. Goldsmith, in an analysis of R. Yudl’s and Hayyim Bloch’s treatment of the Maharal and his Golem, wrote:

In several stories of Rosenberg and Bloch, Rabbi Loew assumes the role of Sherlock Holmes. . . . In [the story entitled] “Solomonic Wisdom,” Rabbi Loew solves the case in a manner that would have pleased Arthur Conan Doyle.

Similarly, Professor Eli Yassif, unaware that R. Yudl’s was borrowed directly from a Conan Doyle short story, suggested that there were affinities between and two of
Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories, *The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle* and *The Adventure of the Mazarin Stone*.64

Elementary, my dear professors, elementary!65

NOTES


3. Nor has the omission been rectified in the supplementary volumes. See, e.g., the various *Encyclopaedia Judaica Year Books* and cf. the 1973-82 and the 1983-92 *Encyclopaedia Judaica Decennial Books*.


5. *Hebrew Matters*, Piotrkow, 1911, appeared anonymously in Hebrew and Yiddish editions which differ slightly from each other. Although the work is clearly dependent upon R. Yudl’sسفוקה פיתוח מለים, Piotrkow, 1909 ( hvor הנאה של פסח עת פיתוח מח.DotNetBar; פיתוח מלתון, שנשו ויד), it does not appear to have been authored by R. Yudl. R. Yudl did not ordinarily shy away from claiming authorship or editorship of works he published. His name appears prominently on the title pages of the first editions of the works he published (see, e.g., below, pp. 48, 50 and 52). Moreover, he often listed the titles of his earlier works on the title pages of his later works. See, e.g., R. Yudl’sשָׂף בְּשָׁמְיָה, Montreal, 1924, where he lists 11 of his previous publications and 2 of his unpublished manuscripts (awaiting publication) on the title page. He was especially proud of his Maharal literary corpus which the first Hebrew edition refers the reader to passages from previous works by the Maharal (see below, pp. 55 and 56). Moreover, nowhere does R. Yudl list *Hebrew Matters* as one of his works. Significant too is the fact that R. Yudl’sשָׂף בְּשָׁמְיָה, pp. 6-11, provides a detailed summary of the content of the alleged debates held between Cardinal Johann Sylvester of Prague and the Maharal. Yet *Hebrew Matters*, having appeared anonymously, does not conform to this pattern (see below, pp. 55 and 56). Moreover, nowhere does R. Yudl list *Hebrew Matters* as one of his works. Significant too is the fact that R. Yudl’sשָׂף בְּשָׁמְיָה, pp. 6-11, provides a detailed summary of the content of the alleged debates held between Cardinal Johann Sylvester of Prague and the Maharal. Yet *Hebrew Matters*, which purports to present the full text of the same debates, does not address 4 out of 5 of the key issues summarized by R. Yudl in *Hebrew Matters*. Also, a close reading of the text of *Hebrew Matters* (essentially a series of theological discourses based upon genuine passages from the Talmud and the writings of the Maharal) sets it quite apart, both in content and style, from the other members of R. Yudl’s Maharal corpus.

It would appear that the author (at the very least: editor) of *Hebrew Matters* was Dovberish Tursh (ca. 1863-1935). This is obvious from several passages in the Hebrew version of *Hebrew Matters*, where the text—using the first person Hebrew—refers the reader to passages from previous works by
Turch. Thus, e.g., 'înr. nr.:m, p. 37, reads: n1iiY. '1£1V:i m:i 'nJ1Nn ii¿NJ
the reference being to Turch's n~£l'Y.n niiio, Warsaw, 1886. Again,
cf. 'înr. nfi:n, p. 58, reads: niiiiY. '1£1V:i m:i 'nJ1Nn ii¿NJ, Warsaw, 1895. Note too that Turch's name appears in
Russian on the title pages of the first editions of (personal com-
unication from Professor Ira Robinson, dated October 26, 1988; see,
e.g., below, p. 55). On Turch, see 1mN1iiIJ" 1Y''i" 1).i 11£1 1Np'''py', New
York, 1961, vol. 4, cols. 62-63; and G. Kressel, ìlupikovîs nupîthî nupîthî, Tel
'iio no:n:m to Turch. Cf. C. B. Friedberg, 0'1£1" ipy n':i, Tel Aviv, 1951, vol. 2, p. 372.

6. See, e.g., the title page to R. Yudl's ili¿1ip ilN'1p, New York, 1919. Cf. B. Z.

7. See especially, 'm1mla matruî, p. 76, where R. Yudl lists the Maharal's imme-
rate descendants. R. Yudl makes no attempt to “plug in” to any specific line.

8. Z. Rejzen, ìlupikovîs nfi:n ina '1£1V:i, Vilna, 1929, vol. 4, col.
114, lists 1865 as the year R. Yudl was born; most other sources list 1860.
The correct date of birth is November 8, 1859.

12, 1936. The correct date is October 23, 1935.

10. See below, pp. 47-52, where the title pages, together with the additional
pages that refer specifically to the Royal Library in Metz, are reproduced.
In 'm1mla matruî, Warsaw, 1904, a work ostensibly edited by R. Yudl's son,
Meir Joshua Rosenberg, R. Yudl and the Royal Library in Metz are men-
tioned together for the first time (pp. 53-54). The only other reference to
the Royal Library appears in the introduction to the Yiddish version of
'iio no:n:m (see above, note 5), Piotrkow, 1911 (see below, p. 57).

11. The bibliographical history of 'm1mla matruî is not without interest.
For starters, the Hebrew edition is not listed in C.B. Friedberg,
'spiro bi'tîm mî nî, Tel Aviv, 1951, 4 vols. A Yiddish version, nY1 ijm'n
iN1£1Y. '''inn i).i ì1!l ì1l'ln, Lodz, no date, was probably published the same year as the
Hebrew edition; the title page notes that R. Yudl “resides in Lodz.” Copies
of the first editions of 'm1mla matruî are not easy to obtain. Many of the great
Judaica collections in Jerusalem, New York, Cincinnati, and Cambridge
(Mass.) do not own copies. This highlights another problem plaguing R.
Yudl Rosenberg scholarship: no library seems to own a complete set of R.
Yudl's publications. Since it is essential that the Hebrew and Yiddish versions
be compared to each other, and that first editions be compared to later edi-
tions, only the diligent and itinerant scholar is likely to advance discussion.

Other editions of 'm1mla matruî are: Jerusalem, 1951, and New York,
1985 (the latter being a photographic reproduction of the Piotrkow edition). Taking its cue from the first Hebrew edition, the second Hebrew
edition is not listed in M. Moria, 'linn 0'1£1" ip)J n':i, Safed, 1974-77, 7 vol-
umes. 'm1mla matruî has also appeared in a variety of Yiddish and English ver-
sions. In common, none of these versions mentions R. Yudl; in some ver-
sions, the story is ascribed to a new author/editor. Minor changes in the
plot, characters' names, and place names are commonplace. See, e.g., S. A.
Hirshkovits, ed., "mî nî ba'nîmîsîs ma'ma'atîs ma'tîmî, Bnei Brak, no
date; Anonymous, "mî nî ma'ma'atîs ma'tî, Bnei Brak, no
date; Anonymous, "mî nî mîsîsîs ma'tî, Bnei Brak, no
date; Anonymous, "mî nî mîsîsîs ma'tî, Bnei Brak, no
date; Anonymous, "mî nî mîsîsîs ma'tî, Bnei Brak, no
date; Anonymous, "mî nî mîsîsîs ma'tî, Bnei Brak, no
date; Anonymous, "mî nî mîsîsîs ma'tî, Bnei Brak, no


12. The date 1590 was not arrived at arbitrarily. According to R. Manoah Hendel, the Golem was created in 1580 (p. 13) and destroyed in 1590 (p. 69), at which point the narrative portion of חלפתי והارية comes to a close. חלפתי הממשי picks up precisely where חלפתי המוהל left off.


15. A. Conan Doyle’s short stories were regularly translated into Russian, almost as soon as they appeared in print in England. See, e.g., R.B. De Waal, The World Bibliography of Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson, Boston, 1974, pp. 79-83. Thus, for example, a Russian edition of Conan Doyle’s collected works appeared in Moscow, 1904. Most New York libraries do not own complete sets of Conan Doyle’s writings in English, much less so in Russian. Thus, I could not locate the earliest edition of The Jew’s Breastplate in Russian. Nonetheless, there is no reason to question R. Yudl’s claim that חלפתי הממשי was drawn from a Russian translation of the original English version.

16. See Leah Rosenberg, op. cit. (above, p. 26), p. 22, who writes that her father R. Yudl as a youth “had studied the Russian language, saved his meager pennies to buy candles by which light he could read the forbidden Russian books in the attic.” At a later stage in life, when he was serving as Rabbi in Tarlow, R. Yudl took and passed an examination in Russian in order to qualify for a government sponsored rabbinic post. See Z. Cohen and J. Fox, eds., ידיעות אמריקאים באסיה, Montreal, 1931, p. 5; cf. N. Shemen, ובל ארץ המורים (碶ד) ראויעם אויע, Toronto, 1943, p. 105.

17. This will be obvious to anyone who reads Conan Doyle’s The Jew’s Breastplate and R. Yudl’s חלפתי הממשי. Actually, R. Yudl as much as admits that he borrowed from Conan Doyle, though he doesn’t reveal the full extent of the expropriation. In חלפתי הממשי p. 5, R. Yudl writes:

ולק בשני של טעמים אלא יה 된 בכות בכותב כותב ובשון כותב אלכלי תועים... והמזון כלמה...

This is an excerpt from a Russian translation of R. Yudl’s study of the Golem.
At p. 26 he writes: [sic] Conon Dyui

In the letter appended to the end of the two accounts, we read:


18. A striking example, allegedly told by the Maharal in 1590, occurs when Captain Wilson explains to him that he succeeded in stealing the precious stones without being detected, due to the fact that he replaced them with fakes that were exact replicas of the original jewels. The text (on p. 11) reads:

19. See A. Conan Doyle, Memoirs and Adventures, Boston, 1924, pp. 9-13, where he indicates that he studied Latin and Greek in school after a fashion, and learned French and German on his own. Hebrew is not mentioned.

20. Personal communication dated October 9, 1987 from Andrea Reay, on behalf of the Head of the Reading Room, Bibliographical Information Service, The British Library.


22. See G. Scholem’s review of H. Bloch’s [Vienna, 1924] in Kupat Mekh align (1924-25), p. 106, where he writes regarding the Royal Library in Metz: “A Note”. On a recent visit to Metz, I asked one of the head librarians at the Bibliothèque-Mediatheque, Metz’ municipal library, whether he had ever heard of a Royal Library in Metz. He smiled, looked at me with disdain, and nodded his head back and forth, as if to indicate that my query confirmed his worst suspicions about American scholars and scholarship.

23. This includes, among others, R. Zemah bar Ahai Gaon’s, R. Manoah Hendel’s (see below, pp. 49, 51 and 54).

24. See below, pp. 49, 51 and 54.

25. Except for R. Yudl, no one seems to have met with, and bought manuscripts from, Hayyim Scharfeinstein. If one compares all the letters ascribed by R. Yudl to Hayyim Scharfeinstein, one notices subtle differences between the letters, which seem to cast doubt on their authenticity. In Shemeshin (1904), Scharfeinstein refers to R. Yudl as [sic] Conon Dyuil, not [sic] Conon Dyuil as well. The term refers to a blood relative, and it is unclear how between 1904 and 1905 Scharfeinstein and R. Yudl became blood relatives. In Hendel, Shemeshin (1905), Scharfeinstein refers to Hayyim Scharfeinstein as [sic] Conon Dyuil as well.
Shnayer Z. Leiman

the library as פּוּרְשָׁן ומֶרְחָי, it is referred to as פּוּרְשָׁן וַיָּסֶר. In the library of the "Royal" aspect, it becomes פּוּרְשָׁן וַיָּסֶר השכינה כְּבֵּית דֶּשֶׁא, with no mention of its "Royal" aspect. For these and similar arguments, which are suggestive but hardly decisive, see A. Benedict, "פּוּרְשָׁן תִּמְצַה אֵל אֲדֹת מֶרְחָי", מַעֲרִיח 14 (1985), n. 3-4, pp. 102-113.

26. Passing off fiction as fact is a well attested literary convention. But for an author who contributed simultaneously to rabbinic literature and belles-lettres, it invited confusion. For how was the reader to distinguish between fact and fiction? In the case of פּוּרְשָׁן, R. Yudl is twice referred to as its מַעֲרִיח (on the title page; and on the reverse side of the title page). R. Yudl may have been alerting his readers that this was fiction, not fact. The issue of plagiarism may not arise here, for Conan Doyle's contribution is acknowledged, at least in part. See above, note 17.


31. Thus, G. Winkler, *op. cit.* (above, note 28), pp. 5-18, could still claim that R. Yudl’s edition of *פלשׂה מהרייע ולא ידע* was based on an authentic manuscript written by the Maharal’s son-in-law, and that it is to be considered a reliable witness to the events that it describes.


33. See, e.g., *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi* 3 (1920), pp. 297-354; 4 (1935), p. 288; and 5 (1952), p. 323; and cf. A. Frind, *Die Geschichte der Bischoefe und Erzbischoefe von Prag*, Prague, 1873, pp. 178-249. This simple fact is a sample of the kind of information scholars need to investigate and clarify before they address the larger issues raised by R. Yudl’s literary contributions.


34. The earliest printed reference to the Maharal’s Golem appeared in B. Auerbach, *Spinosa*, Stuttgart, 1837, vol. 2, pp. 2-3. Kieval’s claim (in “Pursuing the Golem of Prague,” p. 7; see above, note 32) that the first such reference appeared in 1841 needs to be revised accordingly. Two printed references (and the first by a non-Jew) to the Maharal’s Golem

35. This is obvious from the wording of all the early accounts, especially Auerbach’s. See also A.M. Tendlau, “Der Golem des Hoch Rabbi Löb,” in his Das Buch der Sagen und Legenden jüdischer Vorzeit, Stuttgart, 1842, pp. 16-18. In an additional note on p. 242, Tendlau attests that his knowledge of the Maharal’s Golem is based entirely upon oral tradition.

36. A tradition about R. Ezekiel Landau’s (d. 1793) desire to visit the remains of the Golem in the attic of Prague’s Altneschul was recorded in the mid-nineteenth century and published in Rabbi N.H. Levin’s notes to Meir Perles, l’tmi’ n, Warsaw, 1864 (reissued in: l’tmi’ n, London, 1962, vol. 1, p. 19, n. 7).

37. Rationalism aside, what militates against the notion that the Maharal created a Golem is the fact that nowhere in his voluminous writings is there any indication that he created one. More importantly, no contemporary or disciple of the Maharal—neither Jew nor Gentile in Prague—seems to have been aware that the Maharal created a Golem. Even when eulogized, whether in Gans’ דוד המזלות or on his epitaph, not a word is said about the creation of a Golem. No Hebrew work published in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries (even in Prague) is aware that the Maharal created a Golem. In this context, it is worth noting that R. Yedidia Tiah Weil (1721-1805), a distinguished Talmudist who was born in Prague and resided there for many years—and who was a disciple of his father R. Nathaniel Weil and of R. Jonathan Eibeschuetz, both of them long time residents of Prague—makes no mention of the Maharal’s Golem. This, despite the fact that he discusses golems in general, and offers proof that even “close to his time” golems existed. The proof is a listing of famous golems, such as the golems created by R. Avigdor Kara (d. 1439) and R. Eliyahu Ba’al Shem (d. 1583). Noticeably absent is any mention of the Maharal and his Golem. See Weil’s לוחות דויד, Jerusalem, 1988, p. 37.

38. In his letter appended to K. Lieben, דוד, Prague, 1856, p. LIII.


40. On literary forgery and the motives that drive it, see A. Grafton, Forgers and Critics, Princeton, 1990, especially pp. 36-68.

41. Z. Cohen and J. Fox, eds., דורות ודורות של יהודי תמונות יד ויד כותבים אראובנער CATEGORY, Montreal, 1931.


47. See the beginning of יד ויד, p. 2, appended to יד ויד, New York, 1925, vol. 3. The Emden passage was also inserted at the end of יד ויד.
p. 44, appended to תרייתו, New York, 1925, vol. 4. In a recent three volume reprint (Jerusalem, no date) of תרייתו it appears at the end of volume 1, opposite p. 14 of תרייתו אלוהי, a kabbalistic treatise appended to R. Yudl’s תרייתו.


A Yiddish or Hebrew book entitled אחד משמעי, מאונטש, 1931, which is unknown to Jewish libraries and bibliographers. R. Yudl’s work was entitled עמק ההנהガン פור efter שטיין פון הצעות פון מִנייטפנסו. The bibliographical blurbs seem to describe a scientific treatise of antiquarian interest. No mention is made of the Maharal or of a theft. Are these blurbs an attempt at revisionist history, i.e., an attempt at severing any relationship between R. Yudl’s scholarly work (an alleged analysis of the jewels on the High Priest’s breastplate) and the crude and obvious reworking of A. Conan Doyle’s adventure that was ascribed to the Maharal?

51. See note 5.

52. See the apocryphal letter of the Maharal (to R. Jacob Ginzberg)—together with an alleged facsimile of the Maharal’s autograph—published by H. Bloch, יסודות עם יסודות, Vienna, 1924, pp. 86-94 and 110. The apocryphal letter was republished independently by Rabbi J.M. Weiss of Spinka, אמרת יסודות, Varenov, 1931, vol. 2, pp. 2-4. Bloch claims that he received the letter through the efforts of R. Samuel Neuwirth of Vienna, but doesn’t indicate its place of origin. The letter is clearly dependent upon העתקים פון הצעות פון מִנייטפנסו; moreover, the substance and style of the letter and העתקים פון הצעות פון מִנייטפנסו are the same and complementary. It appears that whoever wrote the one wrote the other.

53. In the case of העתקים פון הצעות it is evident that the Hebrew version preceded the Yiddish version. Apparently, R. Yudl did not prepare the Yiddish translation. The title page of the Yiddish version reads in part:

The title page of the Yiddish version reads in part:

54. For an amusing instance of a difference between the Hebrew and Yiddish versions, see העתקים p. 25, where R. Yudl writes in a gloss:
55. In this regard, R. Yudl’s edition of Toras Hamidrashim, Warsaw, 1913, is problematic. The title page of part two of Toras Hamidrashim reads:

What follows is a Yiddish biography of Maimonides, which the innocent reader assumes was either written, edited, or translated (from the Hebrew) by R. Yudl, based upon trustworthy sources. In fact, the entire volume was authored in Yiddish by Israel Hayyim Zagorodski (1864-1931), and was published several times under its author’s name prior to its inclusion in R. Yudl’s Toras Hamidrashim. While R. Yudl did not explicitly claim the work as his own, he also did not identify the original author. This borrowing on the part of R. Yudl was first noted by Jacob I. Dienstag, “Maimonides in Yiddish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey,” Yiddish 7(1987), n. 1, pp. 92 and 99-100.

56. See H.L. Fox, Kabbalistic Traditions, Tel Aviv, 1972, passim.

57. R. Yudl’s Toras Hamidrashim, 2 parts, Warsaw, 1902, is a classic commentary on [pseudo-] Rashi and Ran to b. Nedarim. It has been reprinted numerous times and is probably the only work of R. Yudl included in many a yeshiva library to this very day.

58. Among his halakhic contributions are: Mishkas Hamidrash, Toronto, 1914; Emek HaYidut, New York, 1919; and Emek Hayesed, Montreal, 1924. The last mentioned was especially controversial, and it continues to generate controversy (and literature) in halakhic circles.

59. Aside from his translation of the Zohar, see, e.g., R. Yudl’s Emek Yedidah, Bilgoray, 1935.


64. E. Yassif, *op. cit.* (see above, note 28), p. 28, n. 12.
65. I am deeply grateful to Professors David Berger, Elazar Hurvitz, Ira Robinson, and Richard C. Steiner; Rabbis Eliezer Katzman and Menachem Silber; and Zalman Alpert for sharing their knowledge with me. Their sound advice is the cause that there is wisdom in others. As usual, the members of the library staff at the Mendel Gottesman Library of Yeshiva University extended courtesies even beyond the call of duty. Regarding all the aforementioned:

---

**LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS**

A. R. Yudl’s Maharal Corpus:

1. חוגד של פסח עם פורעות ומנחות תואמים קדוש עלים מפוריאג, Warsaw, 1905. First title page.
4. הסלוצאע מחא"ל, Piotrkow, 1909. Title page.
6. חסם התפנס על חכמים, Piotrkow, 1913. Title page.

B. Earliest References to the Royal Library of Metz and Hayyim Scharfstein:

7. גנס געשינאתר, Warsaw, 1904. Title page.

C. Tursh’s חכמת מוהר"ל.

10. חכמת מוהר"ל, Piotrkow, 1911. Title page of the Yiddish edition.

D. Imaginary Treatise Ascribed to a Disciple of Rabbi Jacob Emden:

ע"ה פורת הפסח
הנה שולח עולים
מ"ה"פ פארא
זוקלקלח

שאלה לארד ע슷 ראשן משבח רי קודה הנותן מברך ע"ה הצוקלקלח

גאודה שמ"ל פסחא.
מָלִיטָנָה נא הָפְנִי דַּיֶּנֶּי פֶּסָחִי
ְסֵיַּמָּאֵר דִּי רֶבֶן מָמָּרָא
וְפַרְקֵיתֶנָּא מַה מַאְשָּׂא. פָּאְרָא 38.

בַּרְשָׁא, 1905.
ת"ע נ"א זְדָלְשֶׁטֶהו הַוָאָה 207858.

Warsaw, 1905. First title page.
הגדת שיל פסח

עד פורשה

מאמרים מותרים ובריאים נושאים רבים של כל בנולה אורות הגדת שיל פסח

דרי עליה ראשהREW הראשה הרובע הסמוך לאורות הגדת שיל פסח

מכות בכתי עוזר וקדיים עוזר מקרן שומר וברד ר"הרודה ליווה

בר ר"ב ב derpיאת וולגלדה ואבר וירם דק דאף ע"א. הפורומים

ברכבת והריך והריך בשם

הנאגן הצדק מדריך לספרות זוכלאית

הפורשות הגללה הזה נקראה כספ לפורים וברים יניקות. בלשון
לפורים ספלו להלכה לחמשה בחינה והתבוננו כל לחם. וברים יניקות
יבאו ספלו כל מנשה ולא פסח וובר ספלו לבלטה בחינה
ⲟvenir ספרות כממשית ומסופת ומסופת עדות מקשים ושל רכ חפת

בין הנושרים כספלות וברים יניקות:

---

ועצאותו של הנער פסח ארשנה על כל חביב כשב ישהו תמונא כבית עדים
מקרי דק דאף אחר זה הוא זבר חבק יוחל ר"הרודה ליווה

מקורי והוא ראשה, בלשמנה ובר כבוק מ썩ה עם ציצית מקראן נה創新 (חיבור
שבע ער ווורודא) ושאמרו לו ראשה וברד כבוק (חיבור) ומסופת על ע WARRANTIES

המנחה יודה וمؤسس פסח על יד גנים:

---

וזא ר"א

שהח "רמ"ת"

Warsaw, 1905. Second title page.
ויתו יול״ד רואנוב numRows
(סקוק מוציח של הנาะה והן בימיה)
בי ייו, ולעך סי עמוד תראס יצק. פק יק股权投资
ל.Getenv עזידיך יעניר וュー טיבור ויהיוistingu하고 יאם וולגום רופא שהעריך בכادية שער
יהודיו ירל״ד ראוובנוב מספר.

ויתו שאריסyster

ין ויזער

לורהית שיאן יהרה להן אדya והן בימיה והן גםภายיתו שלמרות שהרי complementary השפה המ刽יע
למרות " onStart," "এং সিটপে হেকরি" (মার্ক সফরের আগে চারিধার্য নিখুঁজ্যা চাওয়া হয়।) বস্তু স্পষ্টতর করে হওয়া হলো, যে কোনো হস্তলিপি ব্যাখ্যা করে স্পষ্টতর করে হওয়া হলো, যে কোনো হস্তলিপি ব্যাখ্যা করে স্পষ্টতর করে হওয়া হলো, যে কোনো হস্তলিপি ব্যাখ্যা করে স্পষ্টতর করে হওয়া হলো, যে কোনো হস্তলিপি ব্যাখ্যা করে স্পষ্টতর করে হওয়া হলো, যে কোনো হস্তলিপি ব্যাখ্যা করে}
הספר

נחלהות מחראל

כנכפר התחום והסופות והנפלאות מחאת מיע ורבע שלא כמי
נלקח התוכן והתודעה טמון מגננהVirgin מיסרת והם
המסורת המקראית פרק sehenを求め.

משה מפרץ וצוקהלת

אשרא דריהANK חמה והצלחה מעל עלייה זו, איש נמרוד:
בכמים כבינה המחאה עלון כי גוהא ישראלי פלקן הזה:

-clock

הופך הזה חכמה עדיבים ו לפתוח מנזרית יうちに, התחז
ורב גלישה של המחאה. והנה משה רבינו אספה חמהوقعם
ואפרה. וחכמה עדיבים. וכפי מה항 בعالجך במלאתם, כייך לוחה
ספורת העניקה וכסות. ו[right ענייה ועמדות מק
שופצה. זה קחלש דוחקת חמה. נשאר רדיה חוכה בחתophilem

ונא לברך

ברוחה תרשים מהשובה של מי חונה הענייהndonמואל
שנה

ספר ניסליוס מחאר

ב. ש. היסטוריה רבניה "מחארה"

פָאָל פֹּלְקְו, 1909. תיבת.

בפסלה מתכישת

50
ב"ה

תחימת יד.dkמה הющей על עלי הכמה ונידים בפראים אלו.
שאני מתה לים שארפשני פגש קפ"ס נ락תי ייד שבר.
דריחים פִּסָּרָה נלי מתדהרה ייד יוארבעה דומין
בطرف העיחה,废物 המaired המכתש ייד קמח נהיה
המַּהֲרָה ז"ל מַחֲרֶה קֶנֶז ו"ז, חנה יִבְּיָה שָלַה מֵהוֹרֵי
לפרוף צקוקה"ת.אשר רם חמה יד הכרותה מַעַר
הנפיקה והozilla המיפורים הפִּסּרָה(.)איל ההנה והנה
לעשתה חותにくץ קרקוע בער מַי א"ט חצתה ו оста
והשותה עמו קלחו לעי ויי עגו יִשְׁךָל המכסהขาว
עננה, ובוخرין וַּיַּשְׁרֶה שָלַה עִיתָה רָא. והסלים בה יי דְּלַי
בנהבויליאמכה נִיְזָק נֵזַק המכסה קֶנֶז, בער חכה מלכָּא
מסתיל את התוקף המַשָּר הוהי פיל שֵׁם וַרְבִּיד הָיָה מַשָּר
והאר ישכורה נֵמיוה המכסה לָכַר יַר.ובשעת את אבר
עלים בָּאָה גזָר שלם יִשְׁרוּם. וַיֵּשׁוּפֵד ושֶׁלְקַשְׁת
התוקף האחת מַטָּלָה יִד ה"ז, וַיְּכַלְּנָה מִדְרָה יַסְרָרָה
שֶׁנַּגְּתָה אוֹר צְיָבָה יד בוֹלָה מִזַּהֲרֶה הָדָרֶה וּלְסַלָּה
כְּדֵיָה נשוכתם ונְּכוֹת בִּשְׁמַה יִשְׁרוּם. מַסְחָה יִזְוח מַנָּא
מַאְהֵה דַּף שֶׁלָה בְּיַרְגָּן. וְנַעֲרִי שֶׁנַּגְּתָה נַוּת בַּרְגָּן
ולְזַגוּת ההָאָה דַּף שֶׁלָה בְּיַרְגָּן.

והיSharafshaneh

ע שהוא רשה הרהים צריך להיות מטפח

ספר

השן הממשת

שלא בחן הגרד

משפר את עזר האור בכל על שם המשמש שגלות הגרד כאה
ואואר גנועת המחבב או מבואת תעדה, והנה נברך חן מתפלה נぷל
והלא ואלו יתאמה בט-billion פסוק הגרד רשבודבך קדוש עליון

משררי מפרץ צ'ל

השמירה חפש את חפש פֶּה המפקד שיש בשמירתה חכם והשמית את חותם פנתיא
וכותרו חור תֶּרֶו את אחיו伊דון. סכטו בנה תֶּרֶו מומחה ווהך כֶּנֶּר
דרשה לזר שֹׁשְנֵה ווה

---

שדוק והושתコー על השם והשמו הוהוה על שיבי אבי העולם
שרתי אחרון המהרי"מ מפרץ צ'ל

---

سورת ביתורה נבואתי ר''משי"ם אוסמוו

---

סְפֶּרֶץ חוֹשֶׁן הֲגָמִישָׁבוֹת

תע"ש אָמְחַה פּוֹלְמָאנָה ג' פּוֹטְרוֹבּוֹ 1918 ג'.
לד בנים בָּרָא רַבִּי חוֹיאי נַגֵּן וּלְהַלָּה
הָנֵמְשָׁא חָבָּר וְכְבוֹלָלִימָה חָמֵרָה דַּקָּק סִּימְּנָה וְהַיָּדָה וְדַעְתָּה לְדָי בַּכַּר
אוֹדַּי אֶמְּלָכֵת הַדּוֹדָה וֶהָדִידָה וְוַיַּדִּידָה מַמָּלְכָּתָּה
שֲׁלַמּוּם חֶסֶלָם אָשֶׁר חָיָה עַדָּי בַּכַּר לְמַעַלְמָלָה בַּכַּר
עַמָּקָה אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁמַר בָּהּ אֶלָּבָד עַצֵּם אוֹלָבָד שָׁמָּה שָׁמָּה אֲפֶלָּו
אֲלָּא רַעְבִּיתֵךְ לְפָהֲנָה בְּכָפַּדְתָּהִי עַלָּבָד בְּכָפַּדְתָּהִי שָׁמָּה שָׁמָּה אֲפֶלָּו
אֲפֶלָו תְּעַטָּרְךָ בְּאֶדְמוֹנָהּ לְאָסֶלְבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָבָדָו
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כֹּרֶם ר" פֵּסָרֵי בְּמִיסְרֵמָשְׁרֵי פְּלָזְיָן כּּרֶשֶׁטְסָק 6

סְפֵּרֵי גוֹרְאָנָיִי גוֹאסִירְיִוּי ת. ו. דֶסְיָחֲכָן הַפְּרַבִּיִּי.

ינד. מ"ה. הֶרֶסְנְבֶּר'.

תִּינוּלְו. פ' בָּעָרְמְלֶנְגֶר', בֵּרָכִינְסִיָּנוֹפְּה קי 6.

בָּרְנִיָּם. 1904.

נִוָּלְנָיָה, וָוָאַש, 1904. תְּלַפְּאָת.
פָּרָרַעְנָה

יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶחָד מִשְׂרָאֵל יֵאָמַר מִי־אָמַר לַיְהוָה אָבָנֶיךָ בְּעָלֵיתָךָ. בַּעֲרַמֵּים אֵלֶּה הָאָבָנֶיךָ נְגָם מְנֶחֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּבִיטְרָיָה.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶחָד מִשְׂרָאֵל יֵאָמַר לַיְהוָה אָבָנֶיךָ בְּעָלֵיתָךָ. בַּעֲרַמֵּים אֵלֶּה הָאָבָנֶיךָ נְגָם מְנֶחֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּבִיטְרָיָה.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶחָד מִשְׂרָאֵל יֵאָמַר לַיְהוָה אָבָנֶיךָ בְּעָלֵיתָךָ. בַּעֲרַמֵּים אֵלֶּה הָאָבָנֶיךָ נְגָם מְנֶחֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּבִיטְרָיָה.
לא ידעתי כי מבזבזות טון ולטו שמות כאן. בלתי ניתן להבחין בו...

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

בטוח לא ידעתי כי מבזבזות טון ולטו שמות כאן. בלתי ניתן להבחין בו...

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות, שהן מסור יין בלתי בידי בול תשק, יברח יבשKEN סדנאות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsets מצוות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехатьות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזורה גדלה של חוף ורחב.

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioות וביתושו, בזора

התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioת
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התרומת של כתובות החדשות,ехалות והזמנה של חוף ורחב. במקרא subsetsמצioת
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