

Simon B. Scheyer (1804–1854): a forgotten pioneer of the scientific study of medieval Jewish philosophy

GAD FREUDENTHAL

CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE, PARIS, FRANCE

ABSTRACT Simon B. Scheyer is one of the earliest and most distinguished pioneers of the scholarly study of medieval Jewish philosophy, especially of Maimonides, some of whose works are still used by scholars today. Despite his role as a precursor and his scholarly excellence, he has been all but forgotten by history and has not been the subject of even a single entry in any work of reference. The purpose of this article is to offer Simon Scheyer the place that is his due in the history of Jewish scholarship. I sketch his (tragic) biography, reconstituted from printed and archival sources, and present his work.

SIMON SCHEYER is one of the earliest and most distinguished pioneers of the scholarly study of medieval Jewish philosophy, especially of Maimonides. He is also the only Maimonidean scholar of the first half of the nineteenth century some of whose works are still used by scholars. Yet, neither fate nor history has smiled upon him: his personal life was punctuated by tragic events and, despite his scholarly excellence, he has not been the subject of even a single entry in any work of reference; not even a necrology was published after his premature death (the reason for this will become apparent in the sequel). The purpose of the pages that follow is to offer Simon Scheyer his due place in the history of Jewish scholarship.

Simon B. Scheyer's life

Simon Benedict [Benjamin] Scheyer was born on 21 November 1804 to Benedict Feist Scheyer (1771–12 October 1839), a 'burger of the city of Frankfurt/Main and a merchant', and Vogel (Fanny) Lehren (b.1769), who had

married on 7 July 1799. The couple had five children: Jacob (10 June 1802–25 January 1812); Simon; Solomon Benedikt (b.29 December 1805, d.1880); Sara (b.12 September 1807); Fanny (b.22 September 1808).¹ The Scheyers (whose name was also spelt ‘Scheuer’ or ‘Scheier’) were an established family, who had resided in Frankfurt since the sixteenth century.²

On 5 November 1827 Simon Scheyer matriculated in philosophy at the University of Giessen, where he studied for four semesters (winter semester 1827/28 to summer semester 1829, inclusive).³ He then moved to the University of Bonn, where he matriculated on 27 February 1830 in philology and philosophy;⁴ he remained there until summer semester 1832. The newly

1. Abbreviations:

AZJ= *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*

ISG= Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main (reference given by year, followed by file number).

In searching for traces of Simon B. Scheyer’s short life I was fortunate to get much support and encouragement from colleagues and archivists who willingly devoted their time and expertise to this project. I am much indebted to Dr Rolf Hofmann, who supplied crucial information and took the initiative for further research; he also transcribed archival documents written in Old German script. For her invaluable help with information on Scheyer’s biography I am very grateful to Ms Maike Strobel of the Judaica Department of the Frankfurt University Library. Ms Strobel also directed me to the archival judicial documents concerning Simon and Peppi Scheyer held at the Institut für Stadtgeschichte, Frankfurt am Main (ISG) and preserved in three files: for 1851, no. 336 (Scheyer, Simon); for 1852, no. 347 (Scheyer, Peppi, née Gunzenhäuser); for 1854, no. 335 (Scheyer, Simon). They concern judicial procedures – legalization of Simon and Peppi Scheyer’s ‘illegal’ marriage (see n. 21 and nearby) and the estate settlements of both – and contributed valuable biographical details. Many thanks as well to the director of the Judaica Department of the library, Dr Rachel Heuberger, for her kind and expert assistance. I am grateful to the following archivists who searched after material on S. Scheyer in their archives: Dr Roland Müller, director, municipal archives of Stuttgart, and Ms Elke Machon of the same archive; Dr Eva-Marie Felschow, Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen; Ms Rebecca Bender, University of Bonn; and Ms Inka Arroyo Antezana, The Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem. Last but certainly not least, I am happy to give thanks to my colleagues and friends Margret Frenz, George Y. Kohler and Carsten Wilke for their interest and very helpful hints. All translations from German and Hebrew are my own.

Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main (hereafter ISG), 1851–336 and 1854–335. Simon Scheyer’s date of birth is confirmed by a document preserved in the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People (CAHJP), Jerusalem (shelf number D/Fr3/225–531); I am obliged to Ms Inka Arroyo Antezana of the German Department of CAHJP for her help with this document. Simon Scheyer’s brother Solomon settled in England as a tradesman, where his death in 1880 is recorded in: <https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:2JZF-HW1> (accessed 31 October 2015).

2. A. Dietz, *Stammbuch der Frankfurter Juden: Geschichtliche Mitteilungen über die Frankfurter jüdischen Familien von 1349–1849; nebst einem Plane der Judengasse* (Frankfurt, 1907), pp. 254–7, esp. p. 255.

3. F. Kössler, *Register zu den Matrikeln und Inscriptionsbüchern der Universität Giessen WS 1807/08–WS 1850* (Giessen, 1976), p. 166.

4. See University of Bonn, ‘Jüdische Studierende in Bonn 1818–1918’, at: www3.uni-bonn.de/einrichtungen/universitaetsverwaltung/organisationsplan/archiv/universitaetsgeschichte/juedische-studierende-s (accessed 7 January 2015). Scheyer’s name appears in the following issues of the *Verzeichniss der Studierenden auf der Rheinischen Friedrichs-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn* (in parentheses I note his address as indicated): winter semester 1829/30 (609 Sandkoule); summer semester 1830

founded University of Bonn (1818) was then an avant-garde modern institution, destined to bring ‘culture’ to a backwater region, and it drew some great minds, conscious of their vocation.⁵ The noted Orientalist Georg Freytag (1788–1861), in particular, attracted a number of Jewish students of theology, including Scheyer and some like-minded Jewish friends (of whom more below). However, these young students, mostly future rabbis, also visited lectures by other illustrious Bonn scholars: the historian of Antiquity Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776–1831); the historian Karl Dietrich Huellmann (1765–1846); the famous poet and translator August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767–1845); and the philologist and philosopher Christian August Brandis (1790–1867).⁶

During this period Simon Scheyer was part of a small group of Jewish students who met regularly to practise their preaching skills and, more generally, engage in intellectual exchanges. The story of this group is known mainly from the diary of Abraham Geiger (1810–1874), the future creator of the German Reform movement. He recalls that in late 1829 he and several other Jewish students, who shared a feeling of isolation, decided to establish a ‘speakers’ association’ (*Rednerverein*) to practise preaching. The association’s first nucleus included five individuals: Geiger himself, Salomon Raphael Hirsch (1808–1888), Lion Ullmann (1804–1843),⁷ Moses Hess⁸ and Scheyer. Their small ‘club’, which met for the first time on 6 December 1829, was later

(528 Sandkoule); winter semester 1830/31 (528 Sandkoule); summer semester 1831 (966 Belderberg); winter semester 1831/32 (966 Belderberg); summer semester 1832 (819 Judengasse). In the following semester Scheyer is no longer matriculated in Bonn.

5. M. Richarz, *Der Eintritt der Juden in die akademischen Berufe. Jüdische Studenten und Akademiker in Deutschland 1678–1848* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1974), pp. 91, 106–7.

6. See [Anon.], ‘Notizen über einige gegenwärtige isr. Rabbinern und Gelehrte’, *Israelitische Annalen* 19 (8 May 1840), pp. 166–7 (I am grateful to Carsten Wilke for this reference).

7. C.L. Wilke, *Die Rabbiner der Emanzipationszeit in den deutschen, böhmischen und großpolnischen Ländern 1781–1871* (Munich: K.B. Saur, 2004), pp. 867–8. The ‘club’ and its members are also briefly described in the necrology for Ullmann published in *Der Orient* 42 (17 October 1843), pp. 332–3.

8. This of course is not the famous Bonn-born socialist leader Moses Hess (1812–1875), who entered the University of Bonn a few years later (1835). Not much is known about this ‘second’ Moses Hess. After leaving the University he lived in Trier, where he was a candidate for the rabbinate, but apparently never became one (his name does not appear in Wilke, *Rabbiner*). He held a number of successful sermons, including the first sermon held in German in Trier (4 July 1840); apparently inner-community tensions prevented his appointment as a rabbi. See *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* (hereafter *AZJ*) 4:26 (27 June 1840), p. 373; 4:32 (8 August 1840), p. 465. Hess published a few short articles in learned periodicals (e.g. in *Sulamith* 1834; *Der Orient* 1840, 1841, 1843).

joined by Jakob Frensdorff (1792–1861)⁹ and Abraham Rosenfeld (1806–1867),¹⁰ and possibly by others.¹¹

Geiger and Scheyer were acquainted before they came to Bonn. Both were born in Frankfurt, from where they went together to Bonn in October 1829.¹² In his diary Geiger jotted down a few observations (mostly unflattering) about his fellow students, including Scheyer. Writing about the latter's hesitations concerning his spiritual engagement, Geiger writes that the example of Scheyer (six years his senior) had a deterring effect on him: 'the example of an acquaintance, Simon Scheyer, who leaped from rigid orthodoxy to unbelief, was a warning example for me.'¹³ Nevertheless, when in Bonn and feeling isolated, Geiger found a partner in Scheyer for helpful discussions on theological matters. He writes that, despite his wavering, Scheyer remained a 'theologian' (probably meaning that he remained interested in questions of Jewish theology) and that 'despite a few jealousies and disputes' their 'acquaintanceship' continued (Geiger consistently calls Scheyer an 'acquaintance' (*Bekannter*), not a 'friend').¹⁴ The two also studied non-Jewish philosophical works together, for instance *Hauptpunkte der Logik* by Johann Friedrich Herbart (1808).¹⁵ Commenting on what he thinks each of his fellow students might be able to accomplish within Judaism, Geiger writes of Scheyer that the latter's 'convictions' (*Gesinnung*) are 'fairly good', but that he is unable to inspire his listeners (presumably because of his intellectualism and/or rhetorical shortcomings).¹⁶

Scheyer left the university at the end of the summer semester 1832, presumably going back to Frankfurt. At that point he seems to have been

9. Wilke, *Rabbiner*, p. 334.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 750.

11. [Anon.], 'Notizen', mentions a few more names. On the context of this and similar clubs, see C. Wilke, 'Den Talmud und den Kant'. *Rabbinerausbildung an der Schwelle der Moderne* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2003), pp. 430–31.

12. A. Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften* (ed. Ludwig Geiger; Berlin, 1878) (= *Abraham Geiger's Leben in Briefen* [Berlin 1878]), vol. 5, p. 17.

13. Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. 5, p. 17. Whether or not Scheyer remained a believer, he seems to have to lived as an observant Jew: in 1838 a traditionalist author refers to him as *torani* (an adjective which implies commitment to traditional Judaism); see *Die Proverbien Salomos, mit Benutzung älterer und neuerer Manuscripte*, ed. L[ipmann] H[irsch] Lowenstein (in Hebrew; Frankfurt am Main: 'Auf Kosten des Verfassers', 1838), p. 121 n. 2.

14. Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. 5, p. 18.

15. *Ibid.*, vol. 5, pp. 24, 44.

16. *Ibid.*, vol. 5, p. 27. See also G.Y. Kohler, *Reading Maimonides' Philosophy in 19th Century Germany: The Guide to Religious Reform* (Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Philosophy 15; Berlin: Springer, 2012), pp. 51–2.

considering his future. A letter to him (dated 12 November 1832) by the Jena professor of philosophy Ernst Christian Gottlieb Reinhold (1793–1855) is preserved, from which we understand that Scheyer had written to him for advice about his readings and his prospects (reprinted in the Appendix).¹⁷ Perhaps to ‘legitimize’ himself in the professor’s eyes, Scheyer raised some queries concerning obscurities in Reinhold’s works. Reinhold replied by remarking on Scheyer’s ‘passion’ for philosophical research but refused to engage in a discussion in writing, suggesting instead that Scheyer spend some time in Jena to engage in a face-to-face conversation. He also gives Scheyer some advice concerning recommended readings. The question of Scheyer’s future is also evoked: ‘should you feel the inner vocation to devote your life entirely to philosophy, this can only be accomplished by taking an academic career.’ Reinhold must have been aware that this ‘career’ would be open to Scheyer only if he decided to be baptized. Reinhold probably thought that Scheyer could follow in the footsteps of Bernhardt Wolff (1799–1851), a converted Jew and prestigious *littérateur* who had been appointed professor at the University of Jena in 1829.¹⁸ Whether or not Scheyer ever went to Jena is uncertain.

In autumn 1833 Scheyer re-contacted his old alma mater, and on 26 October 1833 the University of Giessen awarded him a doctorate *in absentia* and without the submission of a doctoral dissertation.¹⁹ In all his future publications, Scheyer’s name was henceforth preceded by the title ‘Dr.’ So far as I could make out, Scheyer never sought to become a rabbi.

On 24 July 1839, the 35-year-old Simon Scheyer, ‘doctor of philosophy and burger of the city of Frankfurt/Main’, married Jepi (Peppi or Pepi) Gunzenhäuser (Gunsenhäuser) from Offenbach (born in Bayreuth, Kingdom of Bavaria, in 1819).²⁰ The wedding took place in Bockenheim, but was

17. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sig. Autogr.: Reinhold, Ernst 1. The SBB also hold another letter to Scheyer, by Carl von Rotteck (1775–1840), dated Freiburg, 18 November 1834 (Sig. Darmstaedter 2f 1813: Rotteck, Karl Wenzeslaus Rodecker von; 16–17), but it merely concerns some typos in one of von Rotteck’s books that Scheyer brought to the author’s attention; probably the misprints were a pretext to contact Rotteck.

18. See E. Schröder, ‘Wolff, Bernhard’, in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 44 (1898), pp. 9–12; online at [http://de.wikisource.org/w/index.php?title=ADB:Wolff,_Bernhard_\(Improvisator\)&oldid=2084934](http://de.wikisource.org/w/index.php?title=ADB:Wolff,_Bernhard_(Improvisator)&oldid=2084934) (accessed 31 October 2015).

19. F. Kössler, *Verzeichnis der Doktorpromotionen an der Universität Giessen von 1801–1884* (Giessen, 1970), p. 88. I am very grateful to Ms Eva-Marie Felschow of the university archive at Giessen for having advised me that no further information on Scheyer’s doctorate exists.

20. ISG, 1854–335.

legally invalid, because the required prior authorization of the High Senate of Frankfurt had not been solicited; consequently the marriage was not officially recognized, creating many legal problems after Peppi Scheyer's and Simon Scheyer's deaths.²¹ The couple lived in Frankfurt, Simon Scheyer's hometown: the prefaces to his works were all signed there and his address is indicated as Frankfurt in two lists of subscribers to books.²² The couple had two sons, both of whom died in their infancy: Ferdinand (24 April 1840–2 December 1842) and Bertrand (1 January 1844–28 August 1844).²³ Their mother, Peppi, died on 21 January 1849, aged 30. Soon after her death, on 14 May 1850, Scheyer travelled to London: he sailed from Ostend to Dover, arriving on 15 May. The immigration officer noted his profession as 'gentleman' (see Figure 1).²⁴ After staying in London for three or four years,²⁵ he returned to Germany, now to Stuttgart, where he took his life on 21 May 1854 (more details below). So far as I could make out no necrology was published after Scheyer's death, most probably due to the disapproval of suicide in Judaism (and in the other contemporary religions).²⁶ Scheyer's suicide at the age of 49 and the absence of a necrology might be the reason for his life history to fall into oblivion quickly, despite the continued appreciation of some of his works.

No evidence surfaced as to eventual sources of income. Possibly, Scheyer had inherited some wealth, allowing him to live as a rentier.²⁷ Thus in 1850

21. Information from the three ISG files. See also <https://familysearch.org/pal:/MM9.1.1/NZH7-XV1> (accessed 5 January 2015).

22. Of Leopold Dukes, *Zur Kenntnis der neuhebräischen religiösen Poesie* (Frankfurt, 1842) (un-numbered pages at the beginning of the volume); *Talmud Babli, Tractate Berakhot* (ed. E.M. Pinner; Berlin, 1842).

23. ISG, 1851–336.

24. 'England, Alien Arrivals, 1810–1811, 1826–1869'. Documents available at <http://interactive.ancestry.com> (accessed 30 January 2015). Intriguingly, the 'List of Passengers' notes that Scheyer travelled with two other family members, who are not named.

25. The *Staats- und Adress-Handbuch der Freien Stadt Frankfurt* for 1852 (Zweiter Theil: Adress-Handbuch. Siebente Auflage, p. 270) indicates for 'Scheyer, Simon Benedict. Dr. phil. Literatus' the address: 'in England'. In 1854 we already find him in Stuttgart (see below).

26. Not only Jewish but also Christian theologians condemned suicide and often denied a burial to those who took their own lives. (I am indebted to Margret Frenz for drawing my attention to this point.) As late as 1964, the authoritative Catholic *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964), vol. 9, col. 628, indicated: 'Die Kirche verweigert dem überlegten Selbstmörder ihr Begräbnis, gewährt es aber bei unbeheblichem Zweifel an seiner Zurechnungsfähigkeit' (The Church denies its burial to anyone who calculatedly commits suicide, but grants it in cases in which there exist unshakable doubts concerning his accountability.)

27. The sixteenth-century Scheyers were very wealthy, and some of the wealth may have reached Simon Scheyer; Simon Scheyer's father, Benedikt Feist Scheyer, owned a business of 'Manufakturwaren' in Frankfurt, which still existed in 1849; see Dietz, *Stammbuch der Frankfurter Juden*, pp. 254–5, 257.

he purchased the second half of a house in Frankfurt, the first half of which he already owned.²⁸ His secure economic situation seems to be confirmed by the fact that, as just noted, when he arrived in England in 1850 his profession was registered as a ‘gentleman’.²⁹ However, when Simon Scheyer died in 1854, he had many debts, and his creditors could be paid back only with difficulty;³⁰ nor were the possessions he left behind in his house in Frankfurt very valuable.³¹ Although Scheyer does not seem to have worked for his living, he nonetheless seems not to have been a very wealthy person.

First articles on spiritual issues and the translation of Maimonides’ *The Guide of the perplexed*, Part III (1834–38)

Let us now consider Scheyer’s scholarly work in chronological order. Immediately after his return from university to his hometown, Scheyer published two articles in the periodical *Sulamith*, a Mendelssohnian journal whose subtitle describes its goal: *Zeitschrift zur Beförderung der Kultur und Humanität unter den Israeliten* (Journal for the promotion of culture and humanism among Israelites). In 1834, Scheyer sent the editor of *Sulamith* a book review (unsolicited) of the German translation of the Pentateuch published in 1831 by the Reform scholar Joseph Johlson (1777–1851).³² Scheyer praises Johlson for the aims he set himself in his translation: to respect the Hebrew Masoretic text and reflect its every detail in a translation that would both be painstakingly precise and communicate the beauty of the original. He thinks that while Mendelssohn’s translation was satisfactory for its time, Johlson’s sets higher standards of translation. As we will see immediately, Scheyer’s insistence on following the Masoretic text without any emendation is grounded in his view that one’s being a Jew consists of a commitment to the divine origin of the received Pentateuch text. This is also the reason why the precision of

28. ISG, 1851–336. The house was located on Bornheimer Strasse 20 (later renumbered 9). The sale was completed only in 1851, when Scheyer was in London, by means of a power of attorney.

29. In the mid-nineteenth century, the term ‘gentleman’ was used to denote ‘a man of good social position, especially one of wealth and leisure’ (*OED*).

30. ISG, 1854–335.

31. ISG, 1854–335. In addition to 300 books, a globe, a rifle, a violin, two beds, a number of chairs and other household objects.

32. ‘Recension über Die Fünf Bücher Moses, Nach dem masoretischen Texte worttreu übersetzt, mit Anmerkungen. Von J. Johlson. Frankf. a. M. 1831, in der Andreäischen Buchhandlung’, *Sulamith* 8:1 (1834), pp. 51–8, 116–21, 184–91.

the translation mattered most to him. Scheyer articulated this view in a short article in the same year in which he took issue with an article by M. Freistadt (1810–1870) which deals with the question as to whether being a Jew implies a commitment to ‘dogmas’.³³ Here, Scheyer argues that Judaism requires solely the commitment to the view that Moses’ Law is of divine origin.³⁴ Both publications indicate Scheyer’s keen interest and participation in the spiritual-ideological controversies that were hotly debated in contemporary Judaism. His future work would follow similar goals.

In 1838, Scheyer published a German translation of Maimonides’ *Guide*, Part III.³⁵ This translation had been announced already in June 1837 and a call for subscriptions (at 2 thalers) launched.³⁶ The great originality of this translation lies in the fact that, although it was based on Samuel Ibn Tibbon’s Hebrew translation, it also drew on the original Arabic text of Maimonides’ work; the Leiden University Library had put two Arabic manuscripts of the *Guide* at Scheyer’s disposal.³⁷ The Arabic text allowed Scheyer to correct corruptions of, or obscurities in, the received text of the Hebrew translation. In addition to the German title page, the book has one in Hebrew script, which indicates the Arabic name *Dalālat al-ḥa’irin* side by side with the traditional Hebrew title *Moreh nevukim*. In his foreword, Scheyer insists on the importance of drawing on the original Arabic version of the *Guide* for a proper understanding of the text. *En passant*, he harshly criticized the first part of Jacob Raphael Fürstenthal’s (1781–1855) German translation of the *Guide* – based solely on the Hebrew version – that had just been published. (The literary feud that ensued is discussed below.) Scheyer sent a copy of his translation to the founder of the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ movement,

33. [Moritz] Freistadt, ‘Haben die Juden Glaubensartikel oder nicht?’, *Sulamith* 8:1 (1834), pp. 15–19. On Moritz Freystadt (as the name is usually written), see G.Y. Kohler, *Der jüdische Messianismus im Zeitalter der Emanzipation* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), p. 93.

34. S. Scheyer, ‘Einige Bemerkungen über den Aufsatz des Herrn Freistadt: “Haben die Juden Glaubensartikeln oder nicht?”’, *Sulamith* 8:1 (1834), pp. 299–306.

35. S. Scheyer, *Dalalat al-Hairin, Zurechtweisung der Verirrten von Moses ben Maimon*, Ins Deutsche übersetzt mit Zuziehung zweier arabischen Mste. und mit Anmerkungen begleitet (Frankfurt, 1838).

36. *AZJ* 1:13 (30 May 1837), p. 52b. After the work appeared it was sold for 2 thalers and 12 groschen; see also *Israelitische Annalen* no. 35 of 30 August 1839, p. 280. Scheyer originally wished to vocalize the text but had to give up this intention because he could not find competent typesetters. See *Literarische Zeitung* no. 8 (15 February 1837), col. 156; *Repertorium der gesammten deutschen Literatur* 11:13 (1837), p. 170; and Scheyer, *Dalalt al-Hairin*, p. IV.

37. See more on this below; the two MSS are nos 18 and 221. According to the documents listed in n. 54 below, the manuscripts were put at Scheyer’s disposal in November 1837; this means that his collation of the Arabic text and the Hebrew translation were done within a few months only.

L. Zunz (1794–1886), expressing his hope that Zunz would review it in a scholarly journal;³⁸ so far as I know, no such review ever appeared. But at least a reference to Scheyer's translation was added to the 1892 edition of Zunz's *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*.³⁹

Scheyer's translation was very positively reviewed by Leopold Dukes (1810–1891) in the influential *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* (*AZJ*).⁴⁰ Dukes emphasized the significance of Scheyer's having drawn on the Arabic text of the *Guide*, and commented that Scheyer's translation was precise and 'accompanied by most instructive annotations, which reflect [the author's] erudition and enhance the understanding' of the text. Scheyer's work, Dukes concluded, 'is indisputably one of the best and most successful [literary] productions of recent times'. Another laudatory review, albeit less informed, was published by Michael Creizenach (1789–1842), who commended Scheyer for having given priority to translating Part III of the *Guide*, namely because it was particularly relevant to the 'spiritual concerns' of contemporary Judaism (more on this below).⁴¹

Dukes's review triggered a minor literary skirmish. In the review, Dukes included a few short remarks on the indebtedness of medieval Hebrew to Arabic. An article signed 'F.D.', in all likelihood Franz Delitzsch (1813–1890), took issue with Dukes. *En passant* F.D. criticized Maimonides for his view that while the rabbis had been knowledgeable in philosophy, in his (Maimonides') own time, philosophy had reached the Jews via the Arabs (F.D. thinks that philosophy reached the Jews through Persia).⁴² This remark in turn enraged Scheyer: 'This article contains a statement against Maimonides, which must fill any admirer of the great man with irritation and deserves public censure', he wrote. Scheyer set out to refute these 'stupid' (his qualification) affirmations, stressing the enormous respect every Jew should have for Maimonides, mentioning in passing Salomon Maimon's (1753–1800) veneration for the

38. See the Appendix.

39. L. Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt* (Frankfurt, 1892), p. 165 n. 2a.

40. L. Dukes, 'Literarische Uebersichten', *AZJ* 4:11 (14 March 1840), pp. 155–6.

41. Dr Creizenach, 'Über den von Herrn Dr. Scheyer mit Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen herausgegebenen dritten Theil des *More Nebuchim*', *Israelitische Annalen* 6 (8 February 1839), pp. 46–8. Creizenach was a resident of Frankfurt and it seems likely that he and Scheyer were acquainted (see below).

42. F.D. [= Franz Delitzsch?], 'Prüfung einiger von Leopold Dukes zu Sim. Scheyers Uebersetzung des *More gemachten Bemerkungen*', *Der Orient* 14 (4 April 1840), cols 209–13.

author of the *Guide*. Drawing on the Arabic text of Maimonides' *Guide*, he corrected F.D.'s quotations, reiterating that Samuel Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation was erroneous in some places and was printed with numerous errors so that it could not be relied upon without checking the Arabic original.⁴³

Why did Scheyer begin by publishing Part III of the *Guide*? He explains that he did so on the request of 'numerous knowledgeable men' who (correctly in his view) assumed that this part was best suited to attract a wide readership, because it is less abstract and more practical than the others. Scheyer also explains that the spiritual situation of Jews in his time has many analogies with that of Maimonides' times: then, as now, Jews appreciated knowledge and enlightenment; consequently, he opines, the *Guide* will not fail to be useful to his contemporaries.⁴⁴ In general, Scheyer's Foreword clearly reflects his motivation: he expected it would contribute to improving the spiritual orientation of contemporary German Jewry: Scheyer concluded it by expressing the hope that making the *Guide* accessible to the general Jewish public would contribute to the 'salutary aspiration to create a unification of faith and knowledge among his contemporaries'.⁴⁵ As we saw, in his review of Scheyer's book, Michael Creizenach expressed the very same view, so much so that one wonders whether he was not one of the 'numerous knowledgeable men' who encouraged Scheyer to start his undertaking with Part III (both resided in Frankfurt).

It is important to note here that the Jewish community remained Scheyer's social group of reference: as before, he addressed his scholarly work to his brethren, not to the 'general' philosophical community or to the German Orientalists (who, however, occasionally took notice of his work).⁴⁶ Scheyer's turn inwards, towards the spiritual concerns of Judaism, is a fundamental

43. S. Scheyer, 'Bemerkungen über einen im Literaturblatte des Orients 1840 Nr. 14 enthaltenen und F.D. unterzeichneten Aufsatz', *Israelitische Annalen* no. 22 (28 May 1841), pp. 173–4; no. 23 (4 June 1841), pp. 180–81. Of course Delitzsch knew Arabic, but (like most of his contemporaries) he had no access to the Arabic text of the *Guide* and had to draw on the Hebrew translation.

44. Scheyer, 'Vorrede', in *Dalalt al-Hairin*, pp. I–VIII. For a more detailed account of Scheyer's intellectual orientation, see Kohler, *Reading Maimonides' Philosophy*, pp. 52–4, 193–4.

45. Scheyer, 'Vorrede', in *Dalalt al-Hairin*, p. VIII.

46. A lukewarm review of Scheyer's translation of Part III of the *Guide* was published in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 3:162 (September 1839), pp. 78–9. It is signed E.R. (Ernst Reinhold or Emil Rödiger?). I am very grateful to Carsten Wilke for this reference.

difference between him and, for example, Munk, whose work is comparable to Scheyer's.

After having published the translation of Part III of the *Guide*, Scheyer seems to have pursued the translation of the other two parts: remarks in print by himself as well as by friends (who report what they had learned from him) suggest that in the early 1840s a first draft of the translation of Parts I and II (or portions thereof) existed, although they were never published.⁴⁷

Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus in der hebräischen Sprache (1838–42)

In fact, between 1838 and 1842 Scheyer shifted most of his attention to a topic that had little to do with philosophy. The fruit of that labour was published as *Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus in der hebräischen Sprache. Ein Beitrag zum richtigen Verständniß der hebräischen Syntax und der heiligen Schriften, sowie zur Vermeidung der oft gerügten Willkühr bei der Uebertragung der letzteren in die lebenden Sprachen*.⁴⁸ In the subtitle we recognize again one of Scheyer's fundamental concerns, which he had already clearly expressed in the review of Johlson's Pentateuch translation: inasmuch as Scheyer defined Judaism by a complete acceptance of the divinely given Five Books of Moses, which most Jews then read in German translation, it was crucial to have a translation that was free of any error. With his Hebrew grammar, Scheyer intended to contribute to a faithful translation of the canonical and sacred Hebrew originals. Scheyer himself states that he followed the theoretical approach

47. The advert for Part III published in 1837 (see n. 36) states that the 'remaining two [parts] will be cheaper' than Part III, a promise suggesting that they were already in an advanced state of preparation. In 1840 Scheyer quotes from his own translation of Part I of the *Guide*, remarking that it was controlled against the Arabic text. It thus seems that his translation of that part was under way at that time. See Scheyer, 'Bemerkungen über einen im Literaturblatte des Orients', on p. 173, note. In the Foreword to his *Das Psychologische System des Maimonides: Eine Einleitungsschrift zu dessen More Nabuchim* (Frankfurt, 1845), p. IV, Scheyer explains that one of the aims of this work is to allow him to draw on it in his 'soon to be published' sequel to his translation of the *Guide*. In 1848 his friend Raphael Kirchheim remarks that Scheyer had translated the first two parts of the *Guide* but has not yet found a publisher for the translation; see [Raphael Kirchheim], 'Editor's Preface', in Josef Kaspi, *Amudey Kesef u-Maskiyot kesef*, ed. by Salomon Zalman Werbluner (Frankfurt, 1848), p. [vi], note. In October 1842 Scheyer asked for an extension of the loan of the two manuscripts, which, he said, he needed for some more time in order to complete his translation (see below). Today no manuscript of Scheyer's translation seems to exist.

48. Frankfurt am Main: Druck und Verlag von Heinrich Ludwig Bronner, 1842. The book appeared in October 1842; see *AZJ* 6:43 (22 October 1842), p. 643b.

of Simon Heinrich Adolf Herling (1780–1849).⁴⁹ This approach – called the ‘dichotomic system’ – supposes that there are only two tenses in all languages: first, *tempora absoluta*, the basis for all other tenses, which are affirmed to be formed with prefixes and the like; and, second, *tempora relativa*. Scheyer’s book was received with flying colours in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*:⁵⁰ the writer, Ludwig Philippson, said he shared Scheyer’s view that the study of Hebrew grammar needed rejuvenation and commented that Scheyer was the man to lead such a new grammar school. Non-Jewish journals, too, received the book well: ‘we read this work with pleasure and instruction’, one reviewer wrote, describing the book as having resulted from ‘equally great diligence and thorough erudition’.⁵¹ Scheyer again sent a copy to Zunz.⁵²

It remains somewhat puzzling why Scheyer interrupted his work on the *Guide* to write *Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus*. Perhaps it was the appearance of a research article by Herling in 1837, in which the latter applied his theory to the Semitic languages, especially Hebrew, that moved Scheyer to shift his attention to what he may have deemed to be a groundbreaking innovation.⁵³

The failed attempt to pursue the translation of Maimonides’ *The Guide of the perplexed* (1842)

After *Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus* was published, Scheyer intended to pursue his translation of the *Guide*. In early October 1842, he sought to extend the loan of the two Leiden manuscripts that had been put at his disposal. Scheyer addressed a letter (in German; reproduced in the Appendix)

49. On Herling’s biography, see J. Franck, ‘Herling, Simon Heinrich Adolf’, in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, herausgegeben von der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 12 (1880), p. 117. Michael Elmentaler, *Logisch-semantische Studien in der Grammatik des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts. Untersuchungen zur Kategorienlehre von Simon Heinrich Adolf Herling* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996) is devoted to Herling, but discusses only his contributions to the study of German grammar, dating from the 1830s.

50. *AZJ* 7:19 (13 May 1843), pp. 284–5; 7:20 (15 May 1843), pp. 300–301.

51. [Anon.] in *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 37:1 (1844), pp. 460–61. See also the remarks in [Anon.], ‘Review of: Heinrich Ewald, *Hebräische Sprachlehre für Anfänger* (Leipzig, 1842)’, in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 38:4 (1843), pp. 447–50, at pp. 449–50.

52. Appendix, Letter of 17 February 1839.

53. The paper is S.H.A. Herling, ‘Von der Dichotomie in den Tempusformen und wie man dieselbe zu grossem Nachtheile des Verständnisses, besonders in der hebräischen Sprache, übersehen habe’, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 5 (1837), pp. 522–72. Herling spent his entire adult life in Frankfurt (from 1809 to his death) and was active in scholarly circles; it thus seems likely that Herling and Scheyer were acquainted. Another, though less likely, possible explanation for Scheyer’s interruption of his work on the *Guide* is considered below (see n. 70).

to the envoy of the Dutch government in Frankfurt ('gezante' in the Dutch administrative documents), who forwarded it together with his recommendation (in French) to Baron Willem Johan Cornelis Huyssen van Kattendijke (1816–1866), the minister of foreign affairs in The Hague.⁵⁴ Scheyer justified his request by saying that he had been kept from pursuing the translation by 'business and by other urgent literary works'; to support the request, Scheyer sent along two copies of his 'just published work' *Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus* and one copy of his translation of Part III of the *Guide*. The decision on the matter was in the hands of the Ministry of the Interior, which informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (28 November 1842) that Scheyer could keep the manuscripts until May 1843 only; the minister of foreign affairs communicated the decision to Scheyer (1 December 1842). Thereupon the latter tried his luck elsewhere, namely by writing directly to the keeper of Oriental manuscripts at Leiden University Library, H.E. Weyers (1805–1844). His letter is not extant, but Weyers's response, dated 7 February 1843 (reproduced in the Appendix), contains tantalizing allusions to Scheyer's life.⁵⁵ We understand that, as in his letter to the Dutch envoy, Scheyer alluded to unidentified 'unforeseen obstacles' that hampered the completion and the publication of the translation of the remaining two parts of the *Guide*, and, more interestingly, to personal circumstances; these are not explained further, but they obviously much moved Weyers, for they inspired in him 'feelings of compassion and pain' (perhaps the death of Scheyer's firstborn, Ferdinand, in 1842). *En passant*, we also learn that Weyers had to recall the manuscripts because Salomon Munk (1803–1867) had requested them on loan – this, we understand, is when Munk began to work on his masterly critical edition and French translation of the *Guide*: the lives of Scheyer and Munk, the two pioneers of the scholarly study of Maimonides' works in Arabic, thus crossed unbeknownst to them. Weyers promised Scheyer to leave the manuscripts at Munk's disposal for four months only, after which he would be willing to send them back to Scheyer. It does not seem that Scheyer ever received

54. The correspondence is preserved in Den Haag, Nationaal Archief, Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 1813–70, files 1278 and 1283; see the Appendix. I am very grateful to Resianne Fontaine of the University of Amsterdam, who most kindly located these files and obtained copies of them.

55. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sig. Darmstaedter 2b 1840: Weyers, H.E.; 3.

the two manuscripts again, for Weyers died within a year of writing his letter to Scheyer.⁵⁶

Two literary feuds (1839)

Following the publication of the German translation of Part III of the *Guide* Scheyer became involved in two literary skirmishes.

As already mentioned, Scheyer quite strongly criticized Raphael Fürstenthal's German translation of the *Guide* that had just begun to appear.⁵⁷ Although both scholars translated the *Guide* from Samuel Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew version – this made them comparable – Scheyer had the great advantage of checking his translation against Maimonides' Arabic text. In the Foreword to his translation, Scheyer pointed out some serious blunders in Fürstenthal's translation and commentary. In retaliation, the latter printed an eight-page retort, spiritedly entitled 'Nachrede zu einer Vorrede' (Afterword to a Foreword): he added it to the copies of his translation that had not yet been distributed and also distributed it separately.⁵⁸ Fürstenthal, then a prominent *littérateur* nearing his sixtieth birthday, with a considerable number of publications, was naturally offended. He replied *ad hominem*, referring to his critic as 'one Dr. Scheyer' for whom this was 'the first appearance in public', and tried to rebuke the critique as best he could, mostly with fairly ridiculous arguments.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, despite the 'Nachrede', Fürstenthal

56. Munk and Scheyer just missed one another in Bonn, where both studied under Freytag: Munk in the Winter Semester 1828/29, Scheyer from Winter Semester 1829/30. See M. Schwab, *Salomon Munk. Sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1900), pp. 17–18 and n. 4 above.

57. *Moreh nevuḥim (Doctor Perplexorum), oder: Theologisch-philosophische Erörterungen über die Übereinstimmung der mosaischen und rabbinischen Religionsquellen mit der Philosophie, von Moses Maimonides. Aus dem Hebräischen des Ebn Thybbon ins Deutsche übersetzt und kommentirt von R.I. Fürstenthal* (Krotoschin, 1839). It is noteworthy that this work was available in two versions: with the German translation printed in German or in Hebrew characters. See advert in *AZJ* 2:129 (27 October 1838), p. 522. Scheyer's critique is in 'Vorrede', in *Dalal al-Hairin*, pp. II–III.

58. See e.g. W. Zeitlin, *Qiryat Sefer. Bibliotheca Hebraica Post-Mendelssoniana. Bibliographisches Handbuch der neuhebräischen Literatur...* Volume 1: A–M (Leipzig, 2nd edn, 1891), p. 106. In January 1839, Ludwig Philippson, the editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, complains that he received Fürstenthal's 'Nachrede' but not the translation itself; he asks for the latter to be sent to him so that he may review the book. See *AZJ* 3:9 (19 January 1839), p. 221. My impression is that only a small fraction of copies included the 'Nachrede'. Copies including the 'Nachrede' can be identified in catalogues of libraries by the number of pages: in addition to the 392 folios of the work itself, 8 separately numbered pages are indicated. I am grateful to Frederek Musall, Hochschule für jüdische Studien at Heidelberg, for having made available to me the 'Nachrede'.

59. Example: Samuel Ibn Tibbon visited Maimonides in Egypt and they revised the translation together, which is thus more authoritative than the Arabic version.

stopped the publication, and no sequel to his translation was published. Ironically, a few decades later, Fürstenthal's and Scheyer's partial translations of the *Guide* found themselves bound together within two covers: in 1920, Louis Lamm (1871–1943), the enterprising Berlin Judaica publisher and bookseller, issued a first complete German translation of the *Guide* which consisted of three partial translations by three translators: Fürstenthal's translation of Part I and Scheyer's translation of Part III, and, sandwiched between these two foes, the translation of Part II by Max Emanuel Stern (1811–1873), originally published in 1864.⁶⁰

There can be little doubt that Scheyer's translation is much superior to Fürstenthal's. Discussing the translations of the *Guide* prior to his own, Salomon Munk writes of Scheyer's translation in 1856 that 'this partial publication, for which the Arabic text was consulted, is the only one which presents a truly scientific character'.⁶¹ Half a century after both translations appeared, the great scholar David Kaufmann (1852–1899), too, praised Simon Scheyer's translation and commentary highly, emphasizing its superiority over Fürstenthal's.⁶² Hermann Cohen, too, had a high opinion of Scheyer's translation.⁶³

The second literary squabble was not over scholarship but over scholarly mores. No sooner was Scheyer's translation published that an article on the first page of the much-read *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* (probably by the editor, Ludwig Philippson, 1811–1889) claimed that Abraham Adler, described as a young theologian competent in both Judaica and Oriental studies, assisted Scheyer in drawing on the Arabic manuscripts of Maimonides' *Guide* for his German translation from Hebrew.⁶⁴ The author of the article

60. *More Nebochim*, 'Wegweiser für Verirrte'. *Theologisch-philosophische Abhandlung zur Klärung der Ideen über mosaische und rabbinische Glaubensdogmen wie zur Erörterung ihrer Uebereinstimmung mit der Philosophie*. Von Moses ben Maimon (Maimonides). Zum ersten Male mit Benützung der französischen Uebersetzung S. Munk's nach dem arabischen Urtexte in's Deutsche übersetzt und mit erklärenden Noten versehen von M.E. Stern. Zweiter Theil (Vienna: Verlag von Jacob Schlossberg's Buchhandlung, 1864). On Louis Lamm, see my 'Louis Lamm (1871–1943): A Short Biography of a Dedicated Judaica Publisher and Bookseller', forthcoming in *Zutot*.

61. *Le Guide des Égarés. Publié pour la première fois dans l'original arabe et accompagné d'une traduction française et de notes critiques, littéraires et explicatives par S. Munk*, vol. I (Paris, 1856), p. iij.

62. D. Kaufmann, 'Der "Führer" Maimûni's in der Weltliteratur' (1898), in his *Gesammelte Schriften* (ed. M. Brann; Frankfurt, 1910), vol. 2, pp. 152–89, at p. 185.

63. See G.Y. Kohler, 'Finding God's Purpose: Hermann Cohen's Use of Maimonides to Establish the Authority of the Mosaic Law', *Journal for Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 18 (2010), pp. 75–105, at p. 90 n. 41.

64. *AZJ* 3:29 (7 March 1839), p. 113.

further writes that all those who know Adler appreciate not only his vast scholarship, but also his character, and remarks that he ‘truly deserved not to be thusly ignored’, obviously having Scheyer in mind. In his ‘Nachrede’, Fürstenthal, too, made two obscure allusions to Adler’s involvement in Scheyer’s translation.⁶⁵ Abraham Jakob Adler (1811–1856), who studied in Bonn under Freytag a few years after Scheyer (1833–36), was indeed a brilliant individual, who later involved himself in radical politics, as a result of which his short life ended in desolation.⁶⁶ So far as I know, Scheyer never reacted to this public accusation.

Almost twenty years later, after Adler’s and Scheyer’s premature deaths, the charge was reiterated in two of Adler’s obituaries. The first obituary is by Leopold Stein (1810–1882), who as rabbi of Frankfurt had first-hand knowledge of the protagonists and the events.⁶⁷ He wrote in a moving obituary of Adler in *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer*, of which he was the editor:

his extensive knowledge of the Oriental languages put him in a particularly good position to take part in the publication of the third Part of Maimonides’ *Guide*, under the editorship [*Redaction*] of the late Dr S. Scheyer. For this work, he [Adler] *entirely* [*ausschließlich*; emphasis in the original] assumed the collation of two manuscripts of the original Arabic text and also supplied most of the notes. That this was his literary property was recognized at the time in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* and it is here again vindicated for him.⁶⁸

The well-known and prestigious Samuel Cahen (1796–1862), who translated the Bible into French, also wrote an obituary of Adler, in which he reiterated the story concerning Adler’s substantial contribution to Scheyer’s translation.⁶⁹ Cahen acknowledges that he borrowed the details of his biographical sketch

65. Fürstenthal, ‘Nachrede’, pp. 1, 8.

66. Wilke, *Rabbiner*, p. 123; M.A. Meyer, ‘Religious Reform and Political Revolution in Mid-nineteenth-Century Germany: The Case of Abraham Jakob Adler’, in C. Wiese and M. Urban (eds), *German-Jewish Thought between Religion and Politics. Festschrift in Honor of Paul Mendes-Flohr on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 59–81.

67. See on him: Wilke, *Rabbiner*, pp. 834–7.

68. [Leopold Stein], ‘Nekrolog, zur Erinnerung an den am 5. Januar 1856 verstorbenen Dr. Abraham Jakob Adler zu Worms’, *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer* 6:1 (January 1856), pp. 14–19, at pp. 15–16 (for the authorship of the necrology, see ‘Sachregister’ at the beginning of the issue, Part B). His disapproval of Scheyer’s scholarly conduct did not keep Stein from reprinting chapter 32 of Part III of the *Guide* in Scheyer’s translation in his journal; see *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer* 7:6 (June 1857), pp. 176–82.

69. See S. Cahen, ‘Nécrologie. Mort de M. le docteur Adler, de Worms’, *Archives israélites* 17 (1856), pp. 131–3.

from Stein, but as he notes that he knew Adler personally his statement acquires an independent value.

Obviously, more than one contemporary thought that Adler's contribution to the translation was somewhere between substantial and crucial.⁷⁰ They also appreciated that in not acknowledging this fact Scheyer had breached scholarly norms. It is also possible, however, that, as Michael A. Meyer suggests, Scheyer 'employed' Adler as a kind of 'research assistant'; having paid him for his work, Scheyer may have felt that he was under no obligation to reward Adler also symbolically by acknowledging his contribution.⁷¹ (Needless to say, in our own day this is a widespread practice.)

Involvement in an ecumenical enterprise (1837)

Parallel to publishing his translation of Maimonides' *Guide* Part III, Scheyer contributed to an ecumenical enterprise: the short-lived inter-confessional (Catholic-Protestant-Jewish) journal *Unparteiische Universal-Kirchenzeitung für die Geistlichkeit und die gebildete Weltklasse des protestantischen, katholischen und israelitischen Deutschland*, whose first issue was published in January 1837, the last on 28 December of the same year.⁷² Prominent intellectuals of the three confessions contributed to this journal, which, however, quickly succumbed to the growing religious conservatism. On the 'Jewish side', a variety of views were represented, ranging from Neo-Orthodox (e.g. S.R. Hirsch) to Reform (e.g. A. Geiger) positions. Scheyer wrote two articles for the journal: one on the relationship between the Jerusalem temple and contemporary synagogues;

70. With this possibility in mind, one may wonder whether Scheyer did not interrupt the translation of the *Guide* after the appearance of the translation of Part III because Adler left Frankfurt in 1839 and took a position as a private tutor in Groß Kanischa (Nagykanizsa), depriving Scheyer of the expertise and energy he needed to continue the project (see [Stein], 'Nekrolog', p. 16). However, it must be remembered that Scheyer worked on his own on the edition of Alharizi's translation of the *Guide* in 1851, comparing it with Ibn Tibbon's and with the Arabic original. This fact speaks against the assumption that Scheyer stopped his work because he was no longer assisted by Adler. The matter will presumably remain unsettled.

71. Meyer, 'Religious Reform and Political Revolution', p. 61.

72. Fortunately, this hard-to-find journal was recently reissued online by the Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung and the Salomon Ludwig Steinheim-Institut für deutsch-jüdische Geschichte. See: urn:nbn:de:0230-20090410994 (accessed 24 September 2015). On the short history of this enterprise and the forces behind it, see E. Mayer, 'An Ecumenical Experiment', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 13 (1968), pp. 135-41; H. Steinsdorfer, 'Eine deutschsprachige interkonfessionelle Kirchenzeitung und die römische Kurie im Jahre 1837', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Bibliotheken und Archiven* 55-56 (1976), pp. 276-314; O. Blaschke, *Katholizismus und Antisemitismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), p. 39.

another one on Jewish dogma and moral theory.⁷³ In the very first sentence of the latter he argues that, notwithstanding the plurality of views expressed by Jews on ‘our revealed religion’, it is an ‘undisputable and undisputed principle that only someone who, in matters of religion, recognizes the contents of the Pentateuch, the first monument of our religion, can be viewed as truly a Jew’. Scheyer’s involvement in this ecumenical enterprise again confirms that the driving force behind his work was religious, not purely scholarly.

Back to Maimonides (I): The monographs *Das psychologische System des Maimonides* (1845) and *Ma’alot ha-nevu’ah* (1848)

In 1845, Scheyer returned to Maimonides and published his well-known monograph *Das psychologische System des Maimonides*.⁷⁴ Scheyer was convinced that underlying and grounding every philosophical system is the author’s view of the human soul, specifically of its cognitive powers. He reminds his readers that Maimonides explicitly writes that he expects the readers of the *Guide* to be instructed in philosophy and that he would not expose the philosophical theories on which he draws. Since contemporary readers are not familiar with the medieval psychological theories on which Maimonides builds, Scheyer explains, he decided to expound them in detail. This would allow him to draw on this exposition in his commentary on the yet-to-appear Parts I and II of his German translation of the *Guide*.⁷⁵ So much for the motivation.

Scheyer then explains Maimonides’ psychological ‘system’ with an emphasis on its internal structure and consistency, rather than from a historical perspective. He mainly follows Maimonides’ *Eight Chapters* (the Introduction to his Commentary on Mishnah, Avot). In passing, he discusses two ‘predecessors’, two early works offering a systematic account of Maimonides’ psychology: the early-thirteenth-century anonymous *Ruah hen* and the late-thirteenth-century *Sha’ar ha-shamayim* (which Scheyer believed not to be by Gershon

73. S. Scheyer, ‘Das Verhältnis des ehemaligen Tempels in Jerusalem zu den heutigen Synagogen’, *Unparteiische Universal-Kirchenzeitung*, nos 40–44 (18 May–1 June 1837); idem, ‘Prolegomenon zu einer künftigen Dogmatik und Sittenlehre für Israeliten’, in *Unparteiische Universal-Kirchenzeitung*, nos 85–87 (22–29 October 1837).

74. See above, n. 47. Of this work, too, he sent a copy to Zunz (see accompanying letter published in the Appendix).

75. *Das Psychologische System*, ‘Vorwort’, pp. I–IV.

ben Shlomo). Four sections follow: the first on the notion of the soul and on its powers; the second on the means by which humans acquire knowledge; the third on the immortality of the rational soul qua acquired intellect and on the notion of the active intellect; and a fourth on the relationship between the rational soul and the desires. Scheyer naturally draws both on the received Hebrew text of *Eight Chapters* and on the Arabic original (in Edward Pocock's edition of 1655). He discusses many philosophical notions, indicating the corresponding Arabic and Hebrew terms. In 1976, Alexander Altmann (1906–1987) described his well-known article 'Maimonides on the Intellect and Scope of Metaphysics' as a sequel to Scheyer's short treatise.⁷⁶

Scheyer's next publication is a very short text (16 pages) in Hebrew: *Ma'alot ha-nevu'ah* (The degrees of prophecy), a commentary on chapter 2:45 of the *Guide*. It was brought to print by an individual who identifies himself on the title page and in the preface as '...פ'.⁷⁷ In that preface, '...פ' refers back to the edition of Kaspi's works in whose publication he was involved, immediately allowing to identify him as Raphael Kirchheim (1804–1889), his would-be anonymity being little more than coquetry. Kirchheim and Scheyer were childhood friends and remained in close touch – both professionally and privately – until Scheyer's death.⁷⁸ In his preface, Kirchheim says that when working on Kaspi's writings, he studied chapter 2:45 of the *Guide*, but found

76. Printed in: A. Altmann, *Von der mittelalterlichen zur modernen Aufklärung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), pp. 60–129, at p. 60 n. In his translation of the *Guide*, Munk, too, praises this treatise (e.g. vol. I, p. 176 n. 5).

77. *Ma'alot ha-nevu'ah, hû perush qashar 'al pereq m" h mi-sefer ha-Moreh le-ha-Rambam z"l, hošeti la-or 'anokhi Q.....* (Rödelheim, 1848). Latin title page: *Commentarius hebraicus in Commentationem Maimonidis „de prophetiae gradibus“*.

78. In the mid-1840s, when Kirchheim revised Werbluner's edition of Joseph Kaspi's *Amudey Kesef* and *Maskiyot kesef*, he and Scheyer worked together, Scheyer helping Kirchheim out with reading the *Guide*. See [Kirchheim], 'Editor's Preface', in Werbluner, *Amudey Kesef u-Maskiyot kesef*, ed. Kaspi (above, n. 47), p. [vi], where Kirchheim gives thanks to Scheyer for having helped him to compare Samuel Ibn Tibbon's translation of *The Guide of the perplexed* with the Arabic original; see also p. 76 where Kirchheim acknowledges that all the observations drawing on the Arabic text of the *Guide* are Scheyer's. (Scheyer seems to have been generous not only with his time: when his wife died, he relinquished his rights to her heritage in favour of his deceased wife's mother, Amalie Gunzenhäuser née Königswärter [ISG, 1852–347]). In the 1850s, Kirchheim in turn helped Scheyer, albeit in more mundane ways. In 1851 Kirchheim, 'a burger and a merchant', described as a *Jugendfreund* of Scheyer, was a witness in a judicial affair concerning the a posteriori regularization of the latter's 'illegal' marriage (see above, n. 21 and the text to it). On 3 April 1854, very shortly before his death, Scheyer borrowed 1,000 guilders from Kirchheim, which the latter claimed after Scheyer's death (ISG, 1854–335).

it very difficult. Knowing his friend Scheyer to have written an as yet unpublished work on Maimonides' views of prophecy (in German), Kirchheim asked Scheyer for the section relating to that chapter. Scheyer obliged and copied the relevant pages for Kirchheim. The latter thereupon translated the text from German into Hebrew and had it published (at his own expense, it seems) by I. Lehrberger (Wolf Heidenheim's successor) in Rödelsheim in 1848. (This is also the publisher who issued *Sefer ha-riqmah* in 1856, a work that Kirchheim again co-edited.) In his own, even shorter preface, Scheyer says that he wrote the commentary upon Kirchheim's request because the older commentators either did not explain that chapter at all or not well enough. He offers his readers an almost sentence-by-sentence running commentary. Scheyer corrects the Hebrew text of the chapter drawing on the Arabic original, and occasionally provides German equivalents of Hebrew terms. The text does not have a proper beginning or end, which confirms that it was extracted from a (now lost) larger work.

Scheyer and Kirchheim collaborated on yet another small project. In 1846, Pincus (Pinhas) M. Heilpern (1801–1863) anonymously published *Even Boḥan*, a highly polemical work essentially directed against Abraham Geiger. Volume 1 consists of a commented edition of *Millot ha-higgayon* ascribed to Maimonides.⁷⁹ *Even Boḥan* reached Kirchheim before it was published, and he stormed: 'No one ever dared amend the text of a work available only in translation [...] without consulting the original and without drawing on any manuscript or old edition, in such an arbitrary fashion and disfiguring it as does the editor of the present work.'⁸⁰ This criticism is obviously similar to the one that Scheyer had directed against Fürstenthal a few years previously. Towards the end of his scathing review article, Kirchheim wrote: 'To conclude, I will present the explanation of a difficult sentence in *Millot ha-higgayon*, by Dr. Scheyer, so as to offer the reader a substitute for the nonsense with which I have so far entertained him.' Unsurprisingly, Scheyer's explanation is based on Maimonides' Arabic text.⁸¹

79. *Even bohan : be'ur milot ha-higgayon le-Rabenu Mosheh ben Maimon...* (Frankfurt am Main, 1846).

80. R. Kirchheim, 'Bericht über eine neue verfälschte Ausgabe des *Millot ha-higgajon* von Maimonides', *Literaturblatt des Orients* no. 31 (30 July 1846), pp. 493–96; no. 32 (6 August 1846), pp. 504–11.

81. Inserted in Kirchheim, 'Bericht', pp. 509–11. In his annotations to Schlosberg's edition of Alḥarizi's translation of Maimonides' *Guide* (see next note), Scheyer drew on this explanation (see p. 23).

Back to Maimonides (2): Annotating Schlosberg's edition of Judah Alḥarizi's Hebrew translation of Maimonides' *The Guide of the perplexed*, Part I (London, 1850–51)

We finally come to the last chapter in Scheyer's life. Scheyer, we saw, arrived in London on 15 May 1850. Why did he move to London? The sources offer no hint on his motivation for this step. The only speculation I can offer is that he might have gone there following a suggestion by Arie Leib (Leon) Schlosberg (d.1899) so as to contribute to the latter's *edicio princeps* of Judah Alḥarizi's translation of Part I of Maimonides' *Guide*. The fact that Scheyer's brother lived in London may have been a contributing factor.

Not much can be said about the circumstances under which Scheyer's and Schlosberg's joint edition, published in London in 1851, only one year after Scheyer's arrival there, was produced.⁸² The one-page preface by Schlosberg (in Hebrew) merely informs us that he heard of the arrival of a manuscript of Alḥarizi's translation of the *Guide* at the Paris library and that he went there immediately and copied it 'very scrupulously' with the intention to publish the text in London. He then praises the 'ornament' of the edition, which will constitute its 'eternal glory', namely the 'knowledgeable comments' by the 'the rabbi [!] and celebrated scholar Dr. Scheyer', who 'is now staying here' (in London).⁸³ Scheyer himself did not write a preface. His annotations (to Part I only), printed below the text, are indeed very scholarly: he compares Alḥarizi's translation with the one by Samuel Ibn Tibbon, and both with the Arabic original, and comments on the differences. Schlosberg only published the remaining two parts after Scheyer's death and thus without the latter's assistance; as a result, only very few notes (which the title page ascribes to Munk) accompany the text. In a one-page statement inserted at the beginning of the third volume (1879), Schlosberg, then apparently in Vienna, where his brother, the printer and publisher Jacob Ha-Kohen Schlosberg, supported him, complained about the manifold troubles he had in bringing the work

82. *Sefer Moreh nevukhim* [...] ne'etaq li-leshonenu ha-qedoshah 'al yede [...] rabi Yehudah be-rabi Shlomoh al-Ḥarizi, 'im he'arot [...] me'et Dr Scheyer [...] hoṣeti la-or Arieḥ Leib Schlosberg [London, 1851]. Latin title page: Rabbi Mosis Maimonidis. *Liber More Nebuchim, sive Doctor Perplexorum*: primum ab autore in lingua arabica conscriptus, deinde a Rabbi Jehuda Alcharisi In Linguam Hebraeam Translatus, nunc vero adnotationibus illustratus a Simone Scheyero Ph. D. e vetere codice Bibliothecae Nationalis Parisiis, primum edidit L. Schlosberg (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1851).

83. Schlosberg (ed.), *Sefer Moreh nevukhim*, 'Foreword', p. [iii]. See also above, n. 24.

to completion. Schlosberg does not even mention the ‘ornament’ of Part I, Simon Scheyer, who had died 16 years earlier, two years after completing their joint project. Schlosberg’s edition of Alḥarizi’s translation, with Scheyer’s notes to Part I, is the only edition of that Hebrew version of the *Guide* to this day (reprinted several times).

Return to Germany and suicide (Stuttgart, 1854)

Three years after the publication of Alḥarizi’s translation of the *Guide*, Part I, annotated by Scheyer, the latter was back in Germany. Not in his hometown Frankfurt, however, but in Stuttgart, where he lived in a rented apartment.⁸⁴ He seems to have moved to Stuttgart for good, for the inventory of his apartment, created after his death, mentions books and furniture. However, why Scheyer decided to settle in Stuttgart remains a mystery.⁸⁵

It is also in Stuttgart that Scheyer chose to end his life. The ‘Sterberegister’ of Stuttgart records that Simon Benedikt Scheyer, ‘Dr. der Philosophie’, died on 21 May 1854 (buried on 26 May), the cause of death being indicated as *Selbstmord* (suicide).⁸⁶ Another list, the *Totenregister* of Stuttgart, confirms the

84. The address was ‘Eberhard Strasse’ and the rent was 57 guilders and 30 kreuzer (ISG, 1854–335). The 1854 *Adressbuch* for Stuttgart gives the address for ‘Simon Scheyer, Dr. med.’ as ‘Gymnasium Strasse 12 (2nd floor)’. I am indebted to Rolf Hofmann for this finding. However, the attribute ‘Dr. med.’, and the fact that the address is different from the one appearing in the juridical documents, suggests that this was a homonym, a suspicion corroborated by the fact that the entry was still in the *Adressbuch* in 1855.

85. It may be somehow connected to the gas factory established in Cannstatt (near Stuttgart) in 1845, but the nature of this possible connection is not known. At his death Scheyer possessed shares in the *Gasfabrik* in Cannstatt (ISG, 1854–335). Did he have any projects connected to this enterprise? The shares were not of great value, so that it is difficult to imagine why possessing them should have motivated Scheyer to move to Stuttgart. This gas factory, a joint-stock company, began operating in 1845 and gained momentum towards 1853–54 when streets began to be lit by gas. See www.albert-gieseler.de/dampf_de/firmen2/firmadet20289.shtml (accessed 24 September 2015).

86. I am most indebted to Rolf Hofmann, the expert on Jewish graves, for providing me with a copy of the *Sterberegister* (‘Familienregister der jüdischen Gemeinden in Baden, Württemberg und Hohenzollern’, Bestand J 386, Bd. 550). R. Hofmann kindly confirmed that the entry in the ‘Grave List of Jewish Section of Hoppenlau Cemetery in Stuttgart’, compiled by himself and Joachim Hahn, has a typo. This entry reads: ‘Scheyer, Simon ca. 1812–21 May 1853 [*sic*] Stuttgart (suicide) Dr phil from Frankfurt row 13–14 gravesite between grave 1515 and 1516 (no gravestone available [*i.e.* extant])’. Except for the typo (‘1853’ instead of ‘1854’) the information is correct. R. Hofmann further explained to me (email 27 April 2015) that there is an empty space with no gravestone between graves 1515 and 1516, which (on the basis of the sources) he concluded was the place of Scheyer’s grave. The fact that Scheyer’s grave remained unnumbered indicates that there was no tombstone there when the graves were numbered; probably he was buried without any mark on his grave. The list is accessible at: www.alemannia-judaica.de/images/Images%20343/CEM_HOP_GRAVELIST_or.pdf and at www.alemannia-judaica.de/stuttgart_hoppenlaufriedhof_dok.htm (accessed 24 September

date and adds a gruesome detail: Scheyer committed suicide by cutting his throat (*Selbstmord durch Halsabschneiden*).⁸⁷ This was then (as now) a method rarely used to end one's life: in Berlin in 1854, only 5 out of 160 people committed suicide in this way.⁸⁸ It is an extremely violent (and painful) method of self-harm. Why did Scheyer end his life, and in such a horrible way? We recall the tragic deaths of his wife and two sons within a decade, his spiritual 'vacillations' mentioned by Geiger (which may indicate a person subject to mood changes), and Weyers's impression in 1843 that Scheyer was in a troubled psychological state. However, while Scheyer undoubtedly went through very painful and traumatic life events and seems to have been psychologically frail throughout his life, the immediate trigger for his suicide will remain unknown.

Scheyer was apparently buried without a tombstone. The event was not reported in the newspapers; nor was a necrology published.⁸⁹ Not a single biographical entry was ever devoted to Scheyer. This was a tragic end for the first truly scholarly student of Maimonides.

Conclusion: Scheyer's place in the history of the scholarly study of Maimonides' philosophy

Salomon Munk's text edition and French translation of *The Guide of the perplexed* (1856–66) put scholarly research on an altogether new level, on which Maimonidean scholarship continues to build today. However, it was Scheyer who, a decade before Munk, had started the scientific study of Maimonides' philosophy. Time and again he insisted on the need to ground

2015). Scheyer's funeral was led by Moritz Eichberg (1806–1892), a teacher and a well-known cantor in Stuttgart, who acted on behalf of the responsible rabbi (ISG, 1854–335); on Eichberg see https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moritz_Eichberg (accessed 24 September 2015).

87. Municipal Archive, Stuttgart, shelfmark: Bestand 177/1-Standesamt, Totenregister der Innenstadtbezirke, Totenregister 185. The entry adds that Scheyer ('Scheyer, Simon Benedikt, Dr. Phil aus Frankfurt a/m vid [= widower]', 48 years old) succumbed in the *Bürgerhospital* and was buried on 26 May in the Israelite cemetery. The hospital still exists, but its archive does not hold any documents on patients from the 1850s.

88. See E[l]ias Salomon, *Welches sind die Ursachen der in neuester Zeit so sehr überhandnehmenden Selbstmorde und welche Mittel sind zur Verhütung anzuwenden?* (Bromberg: Verlag von Louis Levit, 1861), pp. 124–5.

89. Roland Müller, director of the municipal archive of Stuttgart, and Elke Machon, of the same archive, who kindly sent me a copy of the *Totenregister* with the entry on Scheyer; they also checked the local popular journal *Schwäbische Kronik* (local supplement of *Schwäbischer Merkur*), and found that Scheyer's death is not mentioned. I am very grateful to both of them for their learned support.

a true understanding of Maimonides on the original Arabic text, and not on translations, which are at times faulty and always corrupt to some extent. Scheyer is thus a forerunner of Munk's scientific enterprise and should be remembered as such. As already noted in passing, the main difference between Munk and Scheyer lies more on the sociological plan than on the scholarly level. Scheyer, as Geiger pointed out, remained a 'theologian': his principal concern in life was the spiritual orientation of German Judaism, and it is to his brethren that he addressed his works. Munk, by contrast, was already free of any concern for the spiritual well-being of anyone: following the school of Silvestre de Sacy (1758–1838) in Paris, he was a pure non-theological scholar, whose social group of reference was the international scholarly community, notably of Orientalists. Scheyer never alludes to the nascent *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement, but his work is entirely in line with it. I hope that this article will contribute to giving Simon Scheyer the place that is his due in the annals of Jewish Studies.

No. 1136		PORT OF DOVER,		CERTIFICATE OF ARRIVAL.	
Date of Arrival.	Name and Country.	From what Port arrived.			
1850. 15 May <i>Thames for Belg.</i>	<i>Simon Benedict Scheyer</i> Profession <i>Gentleman</i> Native of <i>Germany</i>	<i>Ocheer</i>	has	a	Passport from the <i>Germany</i> , Government
Signature of the Bearer, <i>S. Simon Benedict Scheyer</i>			Signature of the Port Officer, <i>John Iron</i>		

W. FULTON, PRINTED, DUBLIN.

FIGURE 1 Certificate of arrival in the port of Dover of Simon Benedict Scheyer, gentleman, native of Germany, on 15 May 1850. Simon Scheyer's signature is at the lower left corner.

APPENDIX Letters to and from Simon B. Scheyer

I. Letters addressed to Simon Scheyer

(a) From Ernst Christian Gottlieb Reinhold (1793–1855) to Simon Scheyer, 12 November 1832¹

Ihr Schreiben, geehrter Herr Scheyer, habe ich mit derjenigen Theilnahme gelesen, welche Ihr schöner Eifer für die philosophischen Forschungen und die mir erfreuliche Aufmerksamkeit, die Sie meinen literarischen Bestrebungen gewidmet, mir einflößen mußten. Durch briefliche Unterredungen wird nach meinem Dafürhalten im Bezug auf Verständigung über Meinungsverschiedenheiten, Schwierigkeiten und Dunkelheiten in unserem Untersuchungsgebiete wenig gewonnen. Gestatten es Ihre äußeren Verhältnisse, über welche Sie mir keine nähere Nachricht gegeben haben, so rathe ich Ihnen, für eine Zeitlang Ihren Aufenthalt in Jena zu nehmen, nur im mündlichen Gespräche werden wir unsere Gedanken auf eine für uns Beide ersprißliche Weise mit einander austauschen können, auch der Umgang mit Fries würde Ihnen mannigfaltigen Nutzen gewähren; hier dürften Sie zweckmäßig sich vorbereiten können, um später auf einer andern Universität als akademischer Lehrer im Fache der Philosophie aufzutreten.

Sie hätten gut gethan, wenn Sie auch über Ihre Pläne hinsichtlich Ihrer künftigen Berufstätigkeit mir etwas mitgetheilt hätten. Fühlen Sie den inneren Beruf, Ihr Leben ganz der Philosophie zu widmen, so kann dies doch wohl nur geschehen, indem Sie die akademische Laufbahn betreten.

Meine Darstellung der Metaphysik wird erst im nächsten Sommer erscheinen. Unerwartete Hindernisse, die Führung des Prorectorates, die ich im letzten Sommerhalbjahr übernehmen mußte, eine Brunnencur, die mir der Arzt zur Pflicht machte, und eine Erholungsreise während der Herbstferien haben mich in dieser Arbeit wider meinen Wunsch aufgehalten.

Zu einem geordneten Studium der Hauptwerke derjenigen Philosophen, die nach meiner Ansicht auf die Fortbildung der werdenden Wissenschaft förderlich eingewirkt, zunächst von Des-Cartes bis auf die heutige Zeit, woran später das des Platon und des Aristoteles, in Verbindung mit Ciceros philosophischen Schriften sich schließen, kann ich Ihnen unbedingt rathen.

1. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sig. Autogr.: Reinhold, Ernst 1.

Möchte das Schicksal es uns vergönnen, zu einem näheren Einverständnis über die Gegenstände unseres Nachdenkens zu gelangen, und in diesem Einverständnis für die Annäherung an das Ziel der philosophischen Forschung gemeinschaftlich zu wirken.

Mit herzlicher Hochachtung

Ihr ergebener Reinhold

Jena, den 12. November 1832

(b) From Hendrik Engelinus Weyers (1805–1844) to Simon Scheyer, 7 February 1843²

Leide ce 7 Fevrier 43

Monsieur le Docteur!

Je vous dois mes remerciements les plus sincères pour le cadeau que vous avez voulu me faire, tant de votre opuscule «sur la doctrine des temps et des modes dans la langue Hébraïque» que du 3^{me} volume de votre édition intéressante du מורה נבוכים de Maïmonide. Il me fait peine, que des obstacles imprévus vous ont retardé dans la continuation de cet ouvrage, et que par là un usage de nos Manuscrits de plusieurs années ne vous a pas encore suffi pour le terminer. Peu de jours après que je vous avois écrit pour reclamer nos Mss., une lettre m'est venue de Son Excell. le Ministre de l'Etranger, par laquelle je fus consulté sur la possibilité de vous laisser encore ces livres. Ma reponse fut simplement, que moi même je vous avois déjà prié de les restituer, parce qu'un autre Savant m'en avait demandé l'usage; et que je devois donc persister à mes instances, pour ne pas être obligé de refuser un service lequel on désirait avec le plus grand empressement. Quelques semaines après que j'avois envoyé cette réponse à M. le Ministre, votre lettre m'est venue en mains et m'a excité en vérité des sentimens de compassion et de la peine. J'aurais voulu, Monsieur, qu'il me fût libre de vous accorder vos vœux et de vous laisser encore nos Mss. un temps assez long pour vous mettre en état de terminer votre édition. Mais vous pouvez comprendre facilement que ni la promesse, que j'ai faite à M. Munk (car c'est lui, qui m'a demandé les mêmes livres), ni la correspondance avec M. le Ministre, m'ont laissé la liberté de revenir à mes pas, et que donc malgré moi-même je dois maintenant vous presser à remettre les Mss au tems fixé par le Ministre. J'ai pourtant les

2. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sig. Darmstaedter 2b 1840: Weyers, H.E.; 3. The author's text is reproduced unaltered (with the original spelling and grammar).

moyens pour vous consoler d'un espoir pas trop éloigné: c'est à dire, je vous promets, Monsieur, qu'après que M. Munk se sera servi des Mss., aucun autre que vous n'en aura l'usage postérieur. Si donc vous vous hâtez à les renvoyer, moi je me hâterai de même à les expédier à Paris, et l'espace, pour lequel je les accorderai à M. Munk, n'excédera pas le terme de quatre mois. Après l'expiration de celui-ci je suis prêt à les vous renvoyer et les laisser garder de nouveau six mois, et si ce temps ne suffirait pas encore, vous pourriez m'adresser une nouvelle demande, à laquelle si rien ne m'empêcherait de satisfaire, je vous pourrais prolonger le terme, seulement en vous envoyant un nouveau récépissé que je vous prierais de signer.

Voilà le seul, Monsieur, que je puis faire en votre faveur. Soyez assuré de mon estime et ne doutez point, que je puisse vous rendre quelque autre service, vous me trouverez prêt à seconder vos études intéressantes. Croyez moi

Monsieur le Docteur!

Votre très obéissant Serviteur

[H.E. Weyers]

2. Letters by Simon B. Scheyer

I To Leopold Zunz (1794–1896)

(a) Letter dated 17 February 1739³

Herr Dr. Zunz Wohl. in Berlin

Eur. Wohlgeboren ausgezeichnete Leistungen im Gebiete der hebräischen Literatur bewirkten in mir die Ueberzeugung, daß Sie sich für literarische Erzeugnisse dieses Faches interessieren, und ich machte mir daher das Vergnügen Ihnen ein Exemplar der von mir kürzlich erschienenen Bearbeitung des More Nebuchim zuzusenden, welches bei Empfang dieser Zeilen wahrscheinlich bereits zu Ihnen gelangt sein wird. Sollten Sie das Werk einer Beurtheilung würdig halten, so würden Sie mich sehr verbinden, wenn Sie eine solche in eines der öffentlichen Blätter gefälligst einsetzen lassen wollen.

Hochachtungsvoll und ergebenst zeichnet sich

Frankfurt den 17. Februar 1839

Dr. S. Scheyer

3. Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, Leopold-Zunz-Archiv, ARC 4° 792/G22–554.1; G22.

(b) Letter dated 15 June 1842⁴

Er. Wohlgeboren

erhalten durch die Brönnnerische Buchhandlung ein Exemplar meiner soeben erschienenen Broschüre „Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus in der hebräischen Sprache“. Erlauben Sie, daß ich sie Ihrer Aufmerksamkeit empfehle und Sie höflichst ersuche, ein öffentliches Urtheil in einem unsrer jüdischen Tagesblätter darüber auszusprechen. Wäre dieselbe eine philologische Abhandlung, die bloß den Gelehrten vom Fach interessiert, so würde ich Sie nicht darum ersuchen, da ich Ihre Abneigung gegen Recensionen aller Art kenne. Da aber diese Schrift, welche ihrem Wesen nach von allen bisherigen hebräischen Sprachlehren abweicht, einen Gegenstand behandelt, der die ersten und wichtigsten Principien der hebräischen Syntax betrifft, und da sie darum, wenn das System haltbar ist, selbst auf den Unterricht der hebräischen Sprache in den Schulen und den Seminarien influiren könnte, so wäre es im Interesse der wichtigen Sache wünschenswerth, wenn ein Mann von Ihrem Rufe und Ihrer Einsicht ein öffentliches Urtheil darüber abgäbe, das, wenn es beistimmend ist, der Wahrheit im Kampfe gegen die Autorität des Alten eine Stütze, und, wenn es tadelnd ist, jedenfalls dem Publikum wie dem Verfasser höchst belehrend sein würde.

Ergebenster

Dr. S. Scheyer

Frankfurt, 15.6.1842

(c) Letter dated 18 February 1846⁵

Ich benutze diese Gelegenheit, verehrtester H. Dr., Ihnen hierbei mein Ende vorigen Jahres erschienenen Werkchen „Das psychologische System des Meimonides“ zu übersenden, mit dem Wunsche, mir gelegentlich Ihr Urtheil darüber zukommen zu lassen.

In Ihrer Biographie Raschis fand ich keinen Aufschluß über das von Raschi zu Tr. העניית 21.^b erwähnte Buch קיונט' רומי. Vielleicht sind Sie so gütig, mir Ihre Ansicht darüber mitzutheilen.

Es grüßt Sie herzlich Ihr Ergebenster

Dr. S. Scheyer

Frankfurt, 18. Februar 1846

4. Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, Leopold-Zunz-Archiv, ARC 4° 792/G22-554.2, G22.

5. Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, Leopold-Zunz-Archiv, ARC 4° 792/G22-554.3, G22.

*II To Baron Huyssen van Kattendijke, Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs
(1816–1866)*

(a) Letter dated 7 October 1842⁶

ABSCHRIFT

[7 October 1842]⁷

Eu Excellenz

verlangen die Rückgabe der beiden arabischen Manuscripte des Dalalat al Hairin von Maimonides, die mir zur Benutzung bei der deutschen Bearbeitung dieses Werkes, von welcher bereits ein Band erschienen ist, aus der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Leyden bewilligt wurden. Da indessen die beyden übrigen Bände noch nicht vollendet sind, indem theils Berufsgeschäfte, theils andere dringende literarische Arbeiten mich an der ununterbrochenen Fortsetzung dieses Werkes verhinderten, dasselbe auch, wenn es in einer, des wissenschaftlichen Höhepunktes unserer Zeit würdigen, Ausstattung erscheinen soll, bedeutende Stadien und Vorarbeiten nothwendig macht, so bitte ich Eu Excellenz, die Benutzung dieser beiden für meine Arbeit unschätzbaren Manuscripte bis zur Vollendung des ganzen Werkes gnädigst mir auszuwirken.

Diesem Schreiben erlaube ich mir zwei Exemplare meiner jüngst erschienenen Schrift „Die Lehre vom Tempus und Modus in der Hebräischen Sprache“ beizufügen, mit der höflichen Bitte, dass eines derselben der philosophischen Fakultät zu Leyden gefälligst zugesandt werde.

Vielleicht dürfte diese Schrift zur Unterstützung meines ganz ergebenden Gesuches dienen, da die in derselben aufgestellten Principien, die nicht bloss für das hebräische, sondern für den ganzen semitischen Sprachstamm gelten, durch das Studium der arabischen Manuscripte in ihrer Entwicklung gefördert werden und eine tiefere Begründung erhielten.

Mit vollkommenster Hochachtung verharre ich

Er Excellenz

ganz ergebenster

Dr Simon Scheÿer.

6. Den Haag, Nationaal Archief, Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 1813–70, file 1278.

7. The letter (extant is only a hand-written copy, not the autograph) does not carry a date, nor an address. Both are indicated in the recommendation by the envoy of the Dutch government in Frankfurt with which Scheÿer's letter was forwarded to The Hague (not reproduced here). The date of the recommendation is therefore also that of Scheÿer's letter, indicated here in square brackets.