

A Meshamud* at the University of Toronto**

MEL STARKMAN

Résumé

L'histoire de l'épanouissement intellectuel, universitaire et culturel d'Ontario.* Il en est ainsi de Jacob Maier Hirschfelder, Juif présumément né en Allemagne qui se convertit à l'Anglicanisme et enseigna à l'Université de Toronto au cours de la second moitié du 19^e siècle. Cet article s'insère dans une tentative visant à sauver de l'oubi ou presque un professeur d'Ontario. Dans ce document, Mel Starkman débattrà des données biographiques qu'il est possible de procurer, des oeuvres de Jacob Maier Hirschfelder ainsi que du legs fait au judaïsme par M. Hirschfelder par le biais de ses oeuvres.

Il faut noter que l'obscurité qui entoure Jacob Maier Hirschfelder ne fait qu'augmenter l'intérêt des archivistes, des historiens et des érudits qui se sont penchés sur l'énigme qui entourait sa vie. D'aucuns prétendront qu'il fut Juif avant la lettre (i.e. David Rome du C.J.C.) d'autres pensent qu'il fut un opportuniste, une personne qui se défendit comme il se doit et qui sut s'entourer de protections et accéder à des sphères élevées de la société.

Le fait est qu'il vécut comme un être universel, par son savoir par son apport à l'humanité, par sa connaissance du genre humain, mais et aussi c'est là ce qui retient l'attention des érudits d'aujourd'hui; était-il Juif par ses écrits, par sa pensée ou par les deux? Une autre question se pose également: l'être universel et qui prête le concours de ses connaissances au genre humain a-t-il donc besoin d'être étiqueté de Juif? Le fait n'est pas là tout en y étant. Cette énigme de la nature que fut Jacob Maier Hirschfelder a vécu en force de la Nature et c'est là à peu près tout ce qui se dégage de la recherche faite par Mel Starkman.

The history of the intellectual, academic, and cultural flowering of Ontario has not as yet rescued many individuals from obscurity. One such figure is

* convert from Judaism

** This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Jewish Historical Society, Learned Societies Conference, Halifax, June 1981.

Jacob Maier Hirschfelder, purportedly a German-born Jew, who converted to Anglicanism and taught at the University of Toronto in the second half of the nineteenth century. This article is part of an attempt to rescue a very interesting Ontario teacher from near oblivion. It will discuss what concrete biographical details are extant, his published works, and the legacy of Judaism in this apparent convert from Judaism as determined through his published works.

Jacob Maier Hirschfelder taught Hebrew and Oriental languages at the University of Toronto for forty-five years from 1843 to 1888. To attain such a position he had earlier converted from the religion of his ancestors. After forty-five years of arduous and distinguished service, Hirschfelder made little impression on the University, on the city of Toronto, and not surprisingly, on his erstwhile co-religionists in the nascent Toronto Jewish community. Hirschfelder was and continues to be an enigmatic and elusive figure. There is doubt even that he was born a German Jew and the possibility exists that he came from and was educated in Poland. Those interested in Canadian Jewish history have bandied this minor problem back and forth over the years.

Many questions arise when considering Hirschfelder in his intellectual, social, and religious milieu, in the context of Canadian Higher Education and in the development of Biblical Studies in Canada. Most of these questions will only be touched tangentially here.

Scholars such as John Moir, Stewart McCullough and Frederick Winnett, in their research on Biblical Studies in Canada and the Department of Near Eastern Studies in the University of Toronto have recently opened the books on Hirschfelder.¹ Previously there has been no more than a few lines on him, short biographical dictionary entries and one brief journalistic piece.² A picture of him and his significance is beginning to emerge, a picture obscured by the lack of contemporary documentary materials. The historians of the University of Toronto have mentioned him only in passing.³

David Rome, until recently the Archivist of the Canadian Jewish Congress in Montreal, called Hirschfelder the "First Jewish Professor in Canada."⁴ Rome does not indicate that Hirschfelder was a convert. Apparently Benjamin Sack in his *History of the Jews in Canada* used the Rome article as his source on Hirschfelder,⁵ at least according to Dr. Isidore Goldstick, a prominent Jewish resident of London, Ontario, and a scholar in his own right. Dr. Goldstick disagreed strongly with Rome's contention that Hirschfelder was born Jewish.⁶ To derive Hirschfelder's Jewishness from his name alone was a very tenuous piece of information to go on.⁷ Sack further indicated that Hirschfelder "emerged" from the "tiny nucleus" of Toronto Jewry.⁸ This is misleading since Hirschfelder came to Toronto already a convert. Rome, in cor-

respondence with Goldstick, affirmed his belief that Hirschfelder was of Jewish origin “with profound Jewish interest, and that no flow of baptismal water – possibly endured in the profound spiritual conviction that the peace of an Upper Canadian professorship is desirable – quenched his proud Jewishness or his love of Hebrew and of Torah.”⁹ Further, Stephen Speisman, in his recent *The Jews of Toronto, A History to 1937* wrote that Hirschfelder “was highly respected in his position . . . and he moved socially in the upper stratum of Toronto Christian society.”¹⁰ This statement needs to be somewhat attenuated as will be seen below.

Biographical data on Hirschfelder has indicated that he was born in Baden-Baden, Germany. Nowhere does Hirschfelder himself admit to that, though he did call himself a native of Germany. It is unlikely that Hirschfelder was born in Baden-Baden if he was originally Jewish. The town council was vehemently anti-semitic and Jews were not permitted to live there until 1861.¹¹ Nothing is known of his family background, his upbringing, his education, or, most important, his conversion. He claimed to have been a graduate of the University of Heidelberg and advertised himself as such as early as 1841 in the *Toronto Patriot*.¹² Later he also claimed to be the graduate of an institution whose name translates into English as the Oriental School at Eslinger.¹³ The University of Heidelberg does not have his name on its matriculation rolls.¹⁴ This is not conclusive for he could have attended and missed being on the rolls according to some particular status or under another name. It is difficult to find where the Oriental School at Eslinger was as the English translation does not readily convert to German. It was as yet impossible to uncover where and if there was such a school and whether Hirschfelder did attend there.

So we have a problem. Was Hirschfelder a fraud, a self-educated scholar, who pawned himself off on the academic community at a time when knowledge of and study of grammatical Hebrew and Oriental Languages was at an early stage in Upper Canada? He might have been prevaricating about his background, but his knowledge was sure. He was adept in some eleven cognate languages as well as Latin, Greek German and possibly Polish.

Hirschfelder arrived in Quebec in 1837 and lived either in Montreal or Quebec City. He stayed in Lower Canada till 1842, but so far I have found little of him other than he married a “Montreal belle,” Marjory Anne Smith. There is a piece of evidence indicating that he converted on this side of the Atlantic before he came to Toronto.¹⁵ In his application of March 13, 1843 to the Council of the University of King’s College he indicated that

the last six years of my life, have been exclusively devoted in giving instruction in the Sacred Language, Syriac, as well as in the German, my vernacular tongue.¹⁶

That he was a tutor in Upper Canada College is sufficient evidence to indicate he had converted to Anglicanism since an affirming Jew would not have been accorded a position there. That he had taught for six years already means that he had begun teaching at the age of eighteen or nineteen. This is somewhat young to have had the educational background he claimed from Germany; unlikely, but not impossible. To have such a thorough background as he exhibited would tally more with the possibility that he had a Yeshivah education in Poland.

Apparently Hirschfelder was in Toronto in 1841, likely to test the waters before moving entirely to a new city. He advertised in the *Toronto Patriot* of August 8, 1841, offering to give private instruction in Hebrew and German. Applications were to be made at Messrs. J. & J. Mead's Music Salon, and at Messrs. Rowsell's Book Store on King Street. By 1842 he was permanently in Toronto, tutoring at Upper Canada College, although this is not reflected in the admittedly incomplete Upper Canada College records. He tutored in Hebrew and German and derived his stipend entirely from fees paid by his students.

He and his wife (called Fanny) became good friends with the John Howard family of High Park fame.¹⁷ Some of their friends included the Bescobbys, the Rowsells, Larratt Smith, and possibly Dr. Henry Scadding among others. The Howards and their friends, including the Hirschfelders, moved in a second level social circle in Toronto, below that of what might be called the legatees of the Family Compact group. From the Howard Diaries we learn that the Hirschfelders eventually had a family of nine children. We also learn that Hirschfelder was a horticulturalist of some ability and that he played the oboe and the flute. Benjamin Sack wrote that Hirschfelder "won great popularity in intellectual circles in Toronto."¹⁸ While this is possible, how Sack determined this is not evident.

In the Larratt Smith journal of Thursday, July 14, 1842 we find that on the previous evening Dr. Sewell and Hirschfelder had been at the Smith home and

had a great fiddling contest; Sewell and I played our violins and Hirschfelder the flute.

Afterwards we plowed down to a small party at the Rodenhursts where we had a merry time, myself the most lively.¹⁹

In the Scadding Diaries we find that Scadding went to Hirschfelder's and Baron de Fleur was there, as well as Dr. McCaul. They had some fine music according to Scadding.²⁰ So we learn that our Hebrew tutor was somewhat of a bon vivant in the cultural circles of early Victorian Toronto. Would that there were more diaries of the period extant since a total lack of private papers makes our search for the real Hirschfelder very incomplete.

It must have been while he was tutoring at Upper Canada College that Hirschfelder began to memorialize the authorities for a position at King's College. It is highly likely that Hirschfelder moved to Toronto with the object of getting a position at King's College when it began. Hirschfelder was friendly with the masters at Upper Canada College and together with a number of them signed a petition to allow the portrait of John McCaul to be hung in the Public Room of Upper Canada College.²¹ John McCaul had just moved from being the Principal of Upper Canada College to Vice-President and Professor of Classical Literature and Belles-lettres and Logic at the University of King's College. Hirschfelder signed the petition "I. HERSCHFELDER." Had he undergone a name change or what else would account for the singular way of signing his name so differently than he had in 1841 and would in later years. Perhaps someone signed for him.

In January of 1843 Hirschfelder sent what appears to be his first application to King's College. In part it reads

I therefore humbly beg that your Honourable Council will allow me to give lectures on that Language [Hebrew] in Dr. Beavan's room, without whose consent I would not have taken the liberty of either presenting this Memorial, or of mentioning his name. Should your Honourable Council accede to my petition, I may mention that I should be satisfied with whatever rate of terms Your Honourable Council may think proper to fix, and shall expect of course, to look to no one, but the pupils for the payment of fees.²²

A second application followed on March 13, 1843.²³ Again there was the hesitant tone and the putting of his case totally at the mercies of the Council. Allowance has to be made, of course, for the Victorian style of letter writing and official correspondence particularly when asking for the granting of favours, but did not his credentials, his abilities, and his experience allow himself to put himself forward more positively? His initial willingness to accept fees as his total remuneration would come back to haunt him in future years when he made application to have his salary raised and to be accorded a full professorship, a position commensurate with the responsibilities he carried. His second application included the request to teach German.

Finally Hirschfelder was granted the position of tutor.²⁴ The University took advantage of his meek and obsequious approach and continued to take advantage of him though he became decidedly less obsequious and tried through Governmental authorities to have his position improved. His professorial colleagues received several hundred pounds sterling annually while Hirschfelder's income from fees in the first five years of his teaching was only £ 200.²⁵ He was treated as an appendage to the professoriate in a fashion similar to de Sola at McGill.

His classes were apparently highly successful. When the secularized University of Toronto was being created in 1849, Hirschfelder again applied for

the Professorship.²⁶ A Chair of Hebrew had been first on the list of future Professorships in a Council Statute recommended in October 1844.²⁷ Bishop Strachan provided Hirschfelder with a letter of reference when Hirschfelder indicated he was thinking of trying his luck elsewhere. Hirschfelder sent a copy of this letter of reference to Robert Baldwin, the Attorney-General of Canada West, and the political force behind the secularization of the University. Strachan, in his letter, did not specifically recommend a Professorship though he was very positive in his appraisal of Hirschfelder as a Churchman and as a teacher.²⁸

By the 1851 session at the University of Toronto, nearly half of the students at the University of Toronto were taking Hebrew. Several of the denominational colleges were sending their students to Hirschfelder. At the secularized University and after 1853 at the newly created University College Hirschfelder continued to teach until 1888, never being accorded the title of Professor he wanted and continued to petition for. In 1850 he was styled a Lecturer with a salary of £100 per annum, but a reduction of fees from £2 to £1 per student in order to attract enrolment from the various Toronto theological Colleges.

Hirschfelder was extremely loathe to appear before any committee that would evaluate his qualifications in the process of determining his request for a Professorship or a raise in salary. He brought forth various arguments of greater or lesser validity, mostly the latter. Who would be qualified to judge his credentials? His former students? Wouldn't that be demeaning? Who else knew his subjects sufficiently? If a younger colleague sat in judgement over him how would he then relate to this colleague who had exercised authority over him?²⁹ Was it stubborn pride or did he fear close examination of his background and education? Once he had achieved a professorship he would not have henceforth have been subject to investigation. That he must have devoutly wished for.

In 1863 his original application (perhaps his testimonials) was brought forward from the Bursar's records by a committee of the University College Council.³⁰ These testimonials, if that is what they were, have not been found since and the College Council report, which is available, indicated that the original fee arrangement was substantially sufficient.³¹ There was a running argument between the College Council and Hirschfelder in that the Council wanted him to lower his fees in the expectation that he would attract more students. He argued that once he lowered his fees he wouldn't be able to raise them again if the extra influx of students never came. Besides, at this time, he was probably overburdened with the number of students he had. Just a couple of years after this he had to drop Arabic and Samaritan from the curriculum.³² Did he have too much on his plate or was there a lack of interest

among the students? One suspects the former.

Thus, in 1863 he had neither his salary raised nor his status upgraded. In addition to his teaching duties he was able to do a fair amount of publishing. This is a tribute to his tireless efforts and in this he began a tradition in the Department of Near Eastern Literature at the University of Toronto, a tradition of publishing even though overburdened with classroom and administrative responsibilities. At least his successor Dr. McCurdy followed in the same practice of extensive teaching and extensive publication.

Over the years Hirschfelder issued a number of publications. Given the lack of personal papers perhaps we can elicit some insight into Hirschfelder by a consideration of his published writings.

In 1845, just two years after he had joined King's College, Hirschfelder produced a 95 page textbook or handbook *A Key To German Conversation*. The work was dedicated to the Rev. John McCaul, then the Vice-President of the University of King's College. The work was intended for students of German who did not have the opportunity of hearing the vernacular. Hirschfelder provided a series of familiar conversations and some grammatical rules. In the preface he states of the student ". . . should he only committ to memory six sentences a day, this alone would enable him, in the space of a year, to converse freely in the language."³³

In about 1855 he produced a 37 page pamphlet *An Essay on the Spirit and Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry*. This work became a textbook in his second year Hebrew classes and also in Albert College.³⁴ Previously he had been using the text by Lowth. In this essay he expressed an abiding love for the magnificence of Hebrew poetry in the Old Testament. This work of his was evidently a labour of love. He traced the origin of poetry in the spirit and history of the Hebrew people, their "natural taste for music" the wondrous geography of the Holy Land, the Temple and its cult. All these furnished "inexhaustible sources from which the most sublime poetic images might be drawn." Ranging over and quoting from the whole of the Old Testament he in particular analyzes the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Book of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the works attributed to Moses, David and Solomon. Besides recounting at length the narrative of Job he analyzes the religious dimensions of this crucial Old Testament work. Hirschfelder was a pious, conservative Christian; as Strachan said, a good Churchman. He insisted on the revealed truth of the Old Testament. However his writing, while occasionally slipping into pedantic antiquarianism, is usually pitched at an interesting level of philological scholarship. What he was saying could be paraphrased as follows: approach the Bible with reverence and, if your bent is to analyze, do so with sound, painstaking, scholarly discipline. Problems are there to be sol-

ved, not glossed over by simplistic or effete, sophisticated rationalizations. The long tradition of careful Jewish and Christian scholarship precluded slipshod textual contradictions, which contradictions, critical writers of the time were so wont to expose and expound upon.

Hirschfelder was not a modern scientific scholar if we accept the semantics of the modern academic discipline. He dealt with the text and not the context. His wide reading is shown by quotations from a great many authorities. Hirschfelder shows a knowledge of comparative methodology, an excellent philological sense and adeptness in a great many languages.

He was without question a conservative in theology and in his general approach. This can be seen in the following, being comments on Bayley and Goethe. Satan and the Lord are discussing Job. In a footnote Hirschfelder wrote

The scene in Heaven has been imitated by Bayley, in his "Festus," and by Goethe in the "Prologue to Faust." It is much to be regretted that a subject like this, where the Deity takes such a prominent part, should ever have been made subservient to the secular drama; but it becomes still more reprehensible when the author so forgets himself as to employ language irreverent and disrespectful to the Deity, such as Goethe puts in the mouth of his ideal demon. Its wit may please some, but its coarseness cannot fail to disgust.³⁶

Hirschfelder also discoursed at length on customs and practices in Old Testament times. Nowhere does he discuss the so-called Wellhausian School of Higher Biblical Criticism, but he is well aware of it and adamant against all such efforts, at least in their conclusions and possible biases, if not the scholarly effort and the concern. Modern scholarship has radically separated theological from critical questions, but on the level of popular parlance Higher Criticism is defended or rejected largely depending on the chosen frame of reference or unconscious bias of the student.

Hirschfelder writes a great deal about the mechanics of poetry as they are manifested in the inspiration of the Old Testament. He adumbrates the core of poetry as follows,

The sacred Hebrew muse . . . maintaining her primitive simplicity, lays down no arbitrary rules of versification with which to fetter the genius of the poet; she requires of her votary neither more or less than that he should find himself in that state of excited and exalted feeling which is necessary to the production of all genuine poetry, and possess the power of delineating his emotions with truth and vigour.³⁷

Among the analytical devices Hirschfelder discusses are Synonymous Parallelism, Antithetic Parallelism, and Synthetic Parallelism.

In 1863 Hirschfelder produced a longer work of 215 pages, *The Scriptures Defended: Being a Reply to Bishop Colenso's Book on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua*. Hirschfelder's was only one of a number of pamphlets that appeared in Canada West critical of the effort of the Bishop of Natal. Con-

verts to Christianity like Hirschfelder, Bishop Hellmuth of Huron, and Charles Freshman seem to have been particularly prolific in the controversy as it manifested itself in the province.

Bishop Colenso was an eminent mathematician and dignitary of the Church of England. In the process of producing a vernacular text of the Old Testament for a native group in South Africa (the Hottentots) Colenso claimed to have found variations, contradictions, impossibilities, and absurdities. In the *Leader* of November 20, 1863 the editor states that Colenso's book surpasses *Essays and Reviews* in presumption and boldness. Hirschfelder leapt into print in the columns of the *Leader* seemingly even before he has a copy of Colenso's book. He must have been going by what he read in British and Canadian newspapers or journals. The flavour of Hirschfelder's criticism can be seen from the following:

I must confess that I could hardly bring myself to believe that any one who called himself a Christian could possibly have given expression to such views as are set forth in the book which simply reduce the writings of Moses to the level of the extravagant tales of the impostor Mohammed.³⁸

Comparative religion handled in a tolerant manner was not the fashion of the day. Hirschfelder does admit that his chosen adversary is worthy of respect as misguided as he is. Colenso did argue that the Old Testament still contained "all things necessary for salvation."³⁹ Hirschfelder adverted to the "mushroom" growth of Colenso's ideas. Apparently Colenso started on his researches as late as 1851. Hirschfelder used an old Rabbinic maxim warning wise men to be careful of their words, lest the disciples who came after them discover the place of bitter waters (i.e. false doctrines).⁴⁰ Hirschfelder was incredulous at how this English Divine found contradictions when the mass of Jewish and Christian scholars over the ages found no evidence contradicting the original revelatory nature of the Old Testament.

We can hear the Christian in Hirschfelder speaking as he argued that if Christ believed that the Pentateuch came from Moses how can anyone deny that this was so. When Colenso used the term "story of the Exodus" Hirschfelder was particularly exercised as he would be by the term "the story of England" or "the story of the Peninsular War."⁴¹

After the series of articles appeared in the *Leader* Hirschfelder collected them, added further arguments and notes and produced the book. His effort was favourably reviewed in the *Christian Guardian*.

We much like the spirit of candour and good will with which the author treats the erratic Bishop, and we think every one will admit that he has given a sufficient answer to the arithmetical critic. It is a matter of satisfaction that Colenso's book has received so many, and such complete refutations, and that Canada has produced one so valuable as this.⁴²

Hirschfelder wrote that he intended to produce a second volume on Colenso,

but there is no evidence of that second work.

Hirschfelder's book on Colenso was a pure piece of polemics, somewhat of a trial to read. A glance at the index gives an idea of the range of topics, from the esoteric to the picayune, with a preponderance of the latter. It attests to the change in reading habits that such a series of articles would not today appear in a popular newspaper.

In 1978, Hirschfelder published a 39 page pamphlet on a question of legal exegesis: *A Wife to Her Sister: Being a treatise in which the question, so long and warmly discussed, whether marriage with a deceased wife's sister is prohibited, under the Mosaic Law, is, in a clear and precise manner, placed before the English reader.* This work was based on the passage in Leviticus xviii, 18 "and thou shalt not take a wife to her sister to cause jealousy or enmity . . . in her life time." Hirschfelder marshalled the arguments and scholarly interpretations in a cool, judicious manner and left it up to the reader to decide. Again he strikes a blow against the then prevailing bent to critical analysis. Scripture is "its own interpreter."

We do not generally lay so much stress upon the opinion of commentators – especially as orthodoxy is not always the order in our days – but rather place our chief reliance upon the use of words in Scripture.⁴³

Hirschfelder was averse to the then prevalent practice of treating emendations and interpolations in the traditional text of the Old Testament as evidence of the less than revelatory quality of the text.

But nothing tends to sharpen the mind so much as difficulties.

for the greater they are, the more active is the mind to find a way to overcome them.⁴⁴

Is this not a scientific approach? Apparently not. It is still textual, not form or contextual analysis. Modern scholarship relates the message to the medium.

In 1874 there appeared *The Creation*⁴⁵ followed in 1876 by *The Immortality of the Soul*.⁴⁶ Most of Hirschfelder's articles first appeared in the *Leader*. Following such an appearance, a pamphlet or larger publication ensued. Hirschfelder dealt for a long period of time with the printers and publishers Rowsell and Hutchison. He also ventured into self-publishing.

The final publication that Hirschfelder produced was his two volume work the *Biblical Espositor and People's Commentary*. This was Hirschfelder's *magnum opus* and appeared in the form of a journal he personally issued, as well as handling the subscription details. It seems that the writing was completed before he began to issue the journal. Each journal issue was printed with the same number of pages, (20), and the beginning and the end would come arbitrarily according to the page number and not the content.

Hirschfelder writes with a balanced fervour and can be a delight to read ex-

cept when he deals with minute trivia. Yet this too can be interesting if time and patience permit. This was the last of Hirschfelder's publications and seems to coincide with his retirement from the University of Toronto in 1888. He lived for fourteen more years and one wonders if there were any other unpublished manuscripts. It would be a distinct pleasure to read more of his informative, intellectually stimulating, and poetically adorned prose.

Did his erstwhile co-religionists know of and read his works? One would hope so. Hirschfelder seems to have found himself in a difficult position – a “Meshumed” unacceptable both to himself and the fledgling Jewish community he rejected and a barely tolerated member of the Anglican community of Toronto, both High and Low. He was one of the oldest parishioners of St. Paul's Anglican on Bloor St. and a friend of the Wycliffe Low Church group. In the Jubilee Volume of Wycliffe, Hirschfelder is mentioned as being unable to attend upon the opening of the first Wycliffe College building.⁴⁷ City directories in the 1880's even have him listed as teaching at Wycliffe, while some Calendars of Wycliffe and also Knox College indicate his teaching at those respective institutions.⁴⁸ These entries probably simply indicate that Wycliffe and Kox were sending their students to Hirschfelder for his Hebrew and other offerings.

While some of Hirschfelder's smaller works testify to his continuing Jewish interests, it is his largest work, the *Biblical Expositor and People's Commentary* that provides the most substantial evidence of the living legacy of his heritage continuing despite his conversion. While it is true that many Protestant scholars dug deeply into the Jewish tradition in the nineteenth century, Hirschfelder was decidedly not writing as one newly discovering a rich heritage. Rather it was a heritage he was intimately familiar with and one that he was not willing intellectually to depart from. A swift glance at the index to volume one reflects the comprehensiveness of his Jewish interests, which he wanted to share with his readers.

Hirschfelder was likely precisely what he represented himself as being, a good low to broad Anglican communicant who fructified his writings with what he remembered and continued to study of his origins. His library included “the celebrated 18 volumes and a number of interesting Jewish works.”⁴⁹ The 18 volumes were most likely the Talmud. Given a total lack of papers it is impossible to pin down his psychological state and to answer the speculation that calls itself forth. Are we dealing with an Upper Canadian Marrano?

Hirschfelder indicated that he used Talmudic canons or rules of criticism. He referred at times to the Rabbinic injunction from *Pirke Avoth* (Ethics of the Fathers). Rabbi Abtalion said.

Be cautious in your words, ye wise men, lest ye fall into a great error, and ye reveal a place of pernicious waters, and the disciples that come after you drink of it and die, and the name of heaven becomes thereby profaned.⁵⁰

This seems to be Hirschfelder's own translation and it reads well compared with other translations I have seen. Would a Christian scholar, however well versed in the Jewish tradition, have been wont to use this particular injunction to those handling the sacred texts. Certainly Hirschfelder used the occasional christological expression, but he far more often was wont to employ Jewish maxims as that quoted. To Hirschfelder a Biblical critic should pursue his work in a fashion analogous to a medical doctor, even more so.

The surgeon, by his unskillfulness, inflicts a serious loss upon one person only, but who can tell the unspeakable evil that every ONE careless interpretation of an important passage of Scripture may not be productive of.⁵¹

Unfortunately Hirschfelder was not more "scholarly" or "scientific" in his publications. He did not footnote his works so it is difficult, without close textual analysis, to determine when he was using Talmudic or other traditional and modern sources. He was well steeped in a number of ancient, classical, and contemporary sources. These included the Roman (Pliny) tradition, the French (Marquis Beavoir) tradition, Josephus, the German and English schools and others. There is a distinct polymathic aspect to Hirschfelder as the range of his reading and interests were extraordinarily wide and included the field of psychiatry as it applied to the Bible.

While writing on the Book of Daniel he attempted to verify the historicity of the text wherein it deals with Nebuchadnezzar being depicted as eating grass. Critics of the Old Testament fastened upon this incident to deny the literal truth of the narrative of Daniel or allegorized the specific text. Quoting psychiatric authorities of the nineteenth century like Lauret and Griesinger, Hirschfelder essayed a proof of the correctness of the text indicating that the Babylonian King was afflicted with lycanthropy, an illness wherein the victim feels that he has been turned into an animal, most often a wolf. So he could literally have been trying to eat grass. In conclusion Hirschfelder wrote:

It must now be apparent to every unbiased reader, what ignorance or unbelief has asserted to be impossible, psychology and physics have attested to be perfectly natural, and of common occurrence; and that the teaching of these sources, so far from weighing against the truth of the scripture narrative, on the contrary affords the strongest testimony to its reality.⁵²

Hirschfelder manifested a traditional, normative, Jewish position when he inveighed against the allegorical mode of interception of the Old Testament as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar. Hirschfelder referred more to the Church Father Origen than to Philo. As Hirschfelder put it, allegorical interpretations were unnecessary, not necessarily wrong-headed. Origen had "a great pas-

sion for allegorizing.”

Whenever the slightest difficulty occurred, he [Origen] at once magnified it, so that he might have an opportunity to give his own fanciful interpretation.⁵³

Thinking men of this enlightened age, look for something more substantial than a mere flimsy allegorical exposition, and if modern writers prefer their doubts to Origen's far-fetched allegorical explanation, which make Nebuchadnezzar to mean LUCIFER and the King's affliction to denote LUCIFER'S fall from heaven, there are few who could blame them for doing so.⁵⁴

Hirschfelder's conservatism could have derived from his Jewish background or his adopted Anglicanism. As had others, he pointed to Spinoza as the father of rationalism. To deny the literal truth of the Old Testament was to open the door to scepticism. Spinoza, according to Hirschfelder, did not doubt the Old Testament till after the age of fifteen when he began to evolve his new philosophy and then applied it to the Old Testament finding apparent contradictions. To Hirschfelder it was axiomatic that a new theory, however spurious, would tend to spread widely even as table-rapping did in the nineteenth century.⁵⁵ We are witnessing the same phenomenon today, as pseudoscience displaces science in the popular mind and even in some university courses. The rotten, not cut out, like cancer, tends to grow unchecked. Hirschfelder tried to live up to principles of biblical criticism “equally scientific as the investigations in the other branches of learning.”⁵⁶

There was definitely an enlightened thrust to Hirschfelder's conservatism. It is interesting to speculate as to how much Hirschfelder was in touch with and influenced by the *WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTUMS* in Germany. Nothing of this was specifically mentioned by Hirschfelder. But he was not the hidebound conservative that some of his more polemical pieces seem to indicate or as his successor at the University of Toronto noted. Hirschfelder understood critical to mean a thorough examination of a subject in which all that could be said either for or against would be carefully considered.

To pass judgement upon any question by merely glancing at what may be said against it, is like condemning a person upon hearing only the accusation, without paying any attention to the rebutting evidence.⁵⁷

While rejecting what he called the RATIONALISTIC SCHOOL or THE SCHOOL OF NEWER CRITICISM, Hirschfelder did not deny that certain human errors were possible in the setting down of the Old Testament.

But whilst strenuously upholding the genuineness of the books of the Old Testament, I would not be understood to deny that some INTERPOLATIONS have found their way into the sacred text.⁵⁸

Later scribes were wont to make marginal notations, which subsequent scribes incorporated into the body of the text. Translation into other languages, the various Targums, created a great many more problems, problems

which are still with us today and have fostered many marvellous editions of the Old Testament in a variety of languages underpinned by a vast body of scholarship and research.

Another isomorphism to Jewish concerns was Hirschfelder's bent to push back the authorship of the Old Testament as far as possible. That authorship was a concern to him and that dates were important indicates that he was neither a fundamentalist nor a biblicist, but a scholar working with what he considered to be a divinely inspired, but human document. He wrote at length of the antiquity of the Book of Job among others, including the Book of Daniel with sidelights on the etiology of musical instruments.

Hirschfelder continually returned to the Book of Job. He felt that Job was the most ancient document that has come down to us. He noted that of all the livestock that Job had and lost there was no mention of horses. Horses were well known in the time of David and Solomon. By this argument, as tenuous as it was and is, there was an indication of the antiquity of the Book of Job.⁵⁹ Horses are also mentioned in Miriam's song, which some Christian scholars have considered as one of the oldest parts of the Old Testament. So Job precedes strata on the Pentateuch as such.

Hirschfelder had a profound respect for the Masoretes and the Masoretic Tradition. The purpose of the Masorah (Hebrew for tradition) was to safeguard the integrity of the sacred text of the Bible according to the Hebrew tradition. A standard text of the exact canon was probably extant before 200 B.C.E. Yet for some time there existed diverse manuscripts. The labour over the exact text took the Masoretes centuries of effort. They divided the books, sections, paragraphs, verses, and clauses. They also fixed the spelling, pronunciation, and the cantillation. The Masoretes finished their work in about 800 C.E. Of this punctillious effort Hirschfelder wrote.

It is, therefore, impossible to conceive how a spurious book could have found its way into the Hebrew Scriptures among a people displaying such a high degree of veneration for the sacred text.⁶⁰

Hirschfelder occasionally criticized the ancient forebears of his erstwhile co-religionists. He did this in a mild manner, just as would some scholar from within the fold. He cites the oft-quoted lines from Isaiah, noting the stiff-neckedness of the Jews.

The ox knoweth his owner
And the ass his master's crib
But Israel does not know his master
My people doth not consider.⁶¹

Nowhere does Hirschfelder write as if he were trying to convert Jews, which practice was wide-spread among Gentiles of the time, especially by those who had converted themselves. Hirschfelder was totally silent about himself in his

published works. Further, in no way did he identify with local or international Jewry (Klal Yisroel) on any issue. He wrote as an avid Churchman, but out of a special tradition, a tradition of which he wrote with ardour, but which he does not specify as his own. At the end of his long introduction to volume one of the *Biblical Expositor* he paid homage to the ardency of the Jewish people for education even in the Middle Ages “when ignorance and superstition reigned supreme amongst most nations, the literary talent was particularly brilliant among the Jews.”⁶²

Hirschfelder saw the Jews frequently being depicted as departing from their revealed traditions. Thus all the laws were a barrier or a fence to keep the Jews within the fold. That the Jews were wont to behave badly was an accepted fact in Christian lore. But the degree to which the commentator fixed and fixes on the tendency of the Jews to stray from the traditional path is as much a comment on the commentator as it is on the Jewish people. There seems also to be a relationship between the adherence to the value of Jewish values and the proclivity to denial of the historicity of the Old Testament. Hirschfelder valued Jewish values. But, were the Jews more prone to idolatry arising from stiff-neckedness. The convert Hirschfelder wrote:

How much more frequently the Israelites would have sunk into hethenism had these barriers not existed it is impossible to discern.⁶³

He adverted to the incorrigibility of the Jews indicating they often turned back to idolatry. He and others compared the Jews to a she-camel, a legendary “stiff-necked” denizen of the desert.⁶⁴ Many traditional and less than traditional Jewish writers were and are critical of the lapses from religiosity of the Jews so Hirschfelder’s comments provide little insight into his attitude other than that he was fairer to the Jewish people than many another convert. His audience was obviously Gentile and to this audience Hirschfelder brought the lore of the Jewish tradition, particularly Jewish scholarship through the ages. Markedly missing from his writing was any effort to detail the persecutions suffered by Jews over the ages, persecutions resulting in barriers between the religions, barriers beyond theological differences and disputations. These barriers brought bloodshed and led ultimately, in good part, to the Holocaust wherein conversion was no protection from persecution.

Hirschfelder argued at great length that Hebrew was the original language of mankind. These arguments are interesting, but assessable only by a trained linguist. He cited the many ellisions in the language testifying to the infancy of the Hebrew language even as a child speaks in incomplete sentences. According to Hirschfelder, Hebrew had only two tenses for the verbs. The pret-erite expresses both the present and the past.

... until critics can produce a language more simple in its structure and more childlike

in its expressions than the one in which Moses wrote, I must hold to the opinion that Hebrew was the original language.⁶⁵

Sanskrit, according to Hirschfelder, has a neuter gender and its structure “betrays a development and state of high culture, such as one would hardly expect to find in a language claiming to be the primitive language of mankind.”⁶⁶

Hirschfelder also contended that the Mosaic account of creation was the original account and all other Eastern and Near Eastern accounts derived from it. Modern theories have turned this around indicating that the Hebrew account emerged from and was conditioned by the Mesopotamian milieu.

The Isaiah question is a key to how deeply Hirschfelder’s conversion took. Nowhere in his treatment of Isaiah did Hirschfelder refer to the predictions supposedly embedded in Isaiah of the coming of Christ. He did refer to the “prophetic insight of events in the future,”⁶⁷ but these were not tied by Hirschfelder to the rise of Christianity. To Hirschfelder there was only one Isaiah and he vehemently denied a second let alone a third Isaiah whose later writings vitiated the prophecies in Isaiah.

Two suns in one sky were as incredible as two such flaming phenomena as Isaiah, NO!⁶⁸

Apparently Hirschfelder’s polymathism stopped short of realization that modern astronomy is aware of other solar systems that can boast two or more suns in one sky. To Hirschfelder the judgement of the “rationalists” as to there being more than one Isaiah “is determined not by their scholarship, but by the prepossession of their disbelief.”⁶⁹

Hirschfelder discussed and paid high respect to many Rabbinic figures including the Tannaim, the Amoraim and later Jewish teachers. He raised some questions about a few. For instance he doubted the authorship ascribed to one rabbi Rabbah ben Machmani of the fourth century C.E. of the work *Midrash Bereshith Rabbah*⁷⁰ Rashi’s work he praised highly, noting that his commentary was the first Hebrew book published in the new medium of print, but then Hirschfelder wrote that the work was thought by some to be Jarchi’s, not Rashi’s.⁷¹ He explicated at length on the wide and variegated interests of the Jews in the Diasporah singling out medicine and Maimonides for special attention. Hebrew philology, according to Hirschfelder, was a later offshoot of biblical study beginning in the tenth century C.E.⁷² Hirschfelder indicated that many of the modern philologists could learn much from earlier practitioners of the discipline such as Saadia Gaon, the first Hebrew grammarian.⁷³ He also wrote of Rabbi Judah ben Koreish, who he put forward as the first known writer who entered on the investigation of the comparison of languages.⁷⁴

In writing of these figures and topics as well as many others, Hirschfelder was bringing to his audience a sympathetic exposition of important scholar/

teachers in the Hebrew literary tradition. He wrote that he would have discoursed even further on any particular topic and others, but he was afraid he was boring his audience.⁷⁵ What motivated him to relate to his Gentile audience all that he was relating to them, even describing ritualistic practices of the Jews such as the wearing of phylacteries?⁷⁶ Did his audience have a great interest in getting clear, unbiased information on the Jewish tradition?

There are several, at least, wider themes and questions of interest possibly elucidating historical problems of *sui generis* import and/or didactic to our present condition. I will elaborate on a few of those here.

Since there were few Jews in Toronto until the 1880's, with the influx of East European immigrants, there did not develop any early inter-group relationships deriving from a clash of cultures. So attitudes can only be studied from personal, individual, anecdotal materials inadequate for making socio-historical generalizations. Toronto Christians, of whatever denomination, probably regarded Jews according to stereotypes derived from literature and in particular from their religious upbringing, attenuated, if at all, by personal contact with individual Jews. There is no evidence of group hostility to the small Jewish community of Toronto. To use Hirschfelder as a barometer of Gentile reactions to Jews is difficult, given the dearth of personal papers and the fact that he was a convert. But there is ample evidence that he was discriminated against. Had he been born a Christian he would not have been meted out the same treatment, would have been accorded his Professorship and would not so easily been lost in the memory of Toronto and in particular the University he served for forty-five years. It is worthy of note that in the very same Order-in-Council that noted Hirschfelder's retirement and \$1,000 retirement allowance his successor McCurdy was given the Professorship. We also have to take into account Hirschfelder's alleged Germanic background as a possible causative factor in how he was regarded and treated. Toronto was a British city.

Rev. Andrew Baird, in his diary, called Hirschfelder the "Rabbi." this surely denoted respect indicating that Baird considered Hirschfelder as "my teacher." Would Baird have called a Gentile Old Testament lecturer "Rabbi?" Not likely. Obviously some of Hirschfelder's students were aware of the Jewish antecedence of their teacher.

In the history of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Toronto, Professors McCullough and Winnett conclude in a second draft of their brief history thusly:

Academically his prime importance is that with all due recognition of Hirschfelder's pioneer work, it was McCurdy who gave to Oriental Studies in the University of Toronto a structure and a tradition that were to shape the Oriental Department throughout the twentieth century.

There seems to be a slight element of Whiggishness in the McCullough/Winnett paper, i.e. the idea that history evolves in a more progressive direction as time unfolds. As McCurdy changed or established the structure and traditions of the Orientals program he superseded the value of the work of his predecessor. McCurdy is the “father” of Oriental Studies at the University of Toronto, Hirschfelder the less distinguished precursor, the “enigma.” To some extent it was Hirschfelder’s consciously contrived elusiveness that garnered for him the dubious distinction of being that enigma.

Professor John S. Moir, in a draft chapter of his *History of Biblical Studies in Canada* writes:

Throughout this first half-century of biblical studies in Canada when Hebrew and related languages were taught under an older and conservative dispensation – largely uninfluenced by the ferment that was building in Germany and passing to Britain and the United States – the name of Jacob Maier Hirschfelder stands out mainly because of his long association with the University of Toronto.

Yes, Hirschfelder was a conservative and yes, he was uninfluenced by the ferment of higher criticism, but he was aware of it, rejecting it in terms that have to be evaluated in the context of the contemporary and Canadian *Zeitgeist*. Again we must be wary of applying the Whiggish model of history, progress, ever progress, as reason unfolds and science begins to replace religion as the underpinning noumena of society. The *Zeitgeist* did not yet demand that a fetish be made of the scientific approach. It is sad that all that can be said of Hirschfelder is that he is noteworthy merely because of his length of tenure. In conversation Professor Moir has indicated to me that Hirschfelder’s role is taking on further significance in his (Moir’s) work. Apparently Hirschfelder trained his students to be highly adept in the linguistic aspect of their studies and, as a matter of fact, began the tradition which is still characteristic at the University of Toronto programme that linguistic excellence is the foundation of further studies.

Moir further states:

It is noteworthy that Hirschfelder at Toronto was working in a supposedly secular institution, not a religiously affiliated college or seminary, yet this intermixing of biblical and profane subjects was accepted as natural and even normal by most contemporaries thanks to the uncritical and largely uncriticized fusion of religion with national life.⁸⁰

This fusion was beginning to come apart. It is interesting to speculate on what Hirschfelder’s stance would have been had he been active a generation later. I suspect he would have been as avowedly conservative as ever, but just as willing to give consideration to the opposing views and evidence.

There are many more aspects that could be commented on, but I will conclude borrowing John Moir’s phrase, describing the early years of biblical studies in Canada, i.e. that it had achieved an “Honourable Place”, by saying

that Jacob Maier Hirschfelder achieved an honourable place in the history of biblical studies in Canada. To achieve this without gainsaying or denigrating the intellectual traditions of his birthright makes him a notable figure in the early history of the Jewish community of Canada.

NOTES

1. Professor John Moir is writing a History of Biblical Studies in Canada. He kindly provided me with a copy of the first draft of the opening chapter entitled "An Honourable Place." Professors F. V. Winnett and S. McCullough have written a paper entitled "History of Near Eastern Studies (formerly Oriental Languages) in the University of Toronto." The first draft of this paper is in the files of Professor R. S. Harris who is writing the history of the University of Toronto from 1906 on. The second draft of this paper, having much more information on Hirschfelder, is available in the University of Toronto Archives. (UTA)
2. W. S. Wallace, ed., *The Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. 2 vols. Toronto, MacMillan, 1963.
H. J. Morgan, ed., *Canadian Men and Women of the Time. A Handbook of Canadian Biography*. Toronto, Briggs, 1912.
David Rome, "First Jewish Professor in Canada," Reprinted from *The Toronto Daily Hebrew Journal*, UTA, People File, folder on J. M. Hirschfelder. Originally appeared on the English page of *The Toronto Daily Hebrew Journal*, December 12, 1940.
3. W. J. Alexander, ed., *The University of Toronto and its Colleges, 1827-1906*. Toronto, The University Library, 1906.
W. S. Wallace, *The University of Toronto, 1827-1927*. Toronto, The University of Toronto Press, 1927.
4. Rome, *op. cit.*
5. Benjamin Sack, *History of the Jews in Canada. From the Earliest Beginnings to the Present Day*. Montreal, Canadian Jewish Congress. 1945. Printed by Woodward Press. Inc. Montreal, p. 117.
6. Isidore Goldstick to Saul Hayes, September 27, 1956. Dr. Goldstick file of the Jewish Canadiana Collection at the Jewish Public Library of Montreal. (JPL)
7. *Ibid*, Goldstick to Rome, October 8, 1956.
8. Sack, *op. cit.* p. 117.
9. Rome to Goldstick, *op. cit.* October 1, 1956.
10. Stephen Speisman, *The Jews of Toronto, A History to 1937*, Toronto, McClelland & Stewart Ltd. 1979. p. 15.
11. Correspondence to the author from Dr. Jonathan Sperber, Archivist, Leo Baeck Institute, New York.
12. *Toronto Patriot*, August 8, 1841.
13. J. G. Hodgins, ed., *Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada*, 28 vols. Toronto, Warwick Bros. and Rutter, 1894-1910. Vol. 1, 1850, p. 134. (DH)
14. Correspondence to the author from the University of Hiedelberg.
15. Evelyn Miller, an Archivist in Montreal, formerly with the JPL, has written the author that she has seen a memo by Benjamin Hart dated October 7, 1837 in the Canadian Jewish Congress National Archives. This memo mentions a Hirschfelder (no initials) as not being at shul on Saturday. If this is Jacob Maier then it is evident that he converted on this side of the Atlantic.
16. University of King's College records, (K.C.) UTA, A-70-0024 Board of Governors. General Letter Book 2, p.252. Copy in DH, Vol. iv, p. 276.

17. The John Howard Diaries are in the Baldwin Room of the Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library. (BB) Shirley Morris is editing the Diaries and kindly alerted me to the large number of references to the Hirschfelder family in the Diaries. There is also an earlier compendium by Shirley McManus providing an entry to the Diaries.
18. Sack, *op. cit.* p. 117.
19. Mary Larratt Smith, *Young Mr. Smith in Upper Canada*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1980. p.79. Rachel Grover of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library kindly alerted me to this entry.
20. E. J. Hathaway, *Jesse Ketchum and His Times*. McClelland & Stewart, 1929. p.286. A check on the reference in the Scadding Diaries failed to turn up the specific quote on the cited page.
21. UTA, A-72-0500.
22. K.C. *op. cit.* Footnote 16.
23. *Ibid*,
24. *Ibid*,
25. Moir, p. 32, Footnote 1.
26. K.C. *op. cit.* April 9, 1849. See also DH, vol. viii for paraphrase of letter.
27. DH, *op. cit.* Vol. 5, October 5, 1844, p. 144-145.
28. Hirschfelder to Baldwin, Attorney-General, Canada West, August 27, 1849, 6 pp. enclosing copy of letter of reference. Baldwin Collection, BR.
29. See for example UTA, A-68-0002, January 10, 1881. David Rudkin, the Archivist of the University of Toronto originally alerted me to this letter and the importance of this accession.
30. *Ibid*, Neither in the Senate Minutes nor in DH was it noted that Hirschfelder's Testimonials were brought forward to the University College Council. UTA, A-72-0005, Box 6, 1843, folder 1. There is an old marker indicated "Mr. H's application removed, to be brought forward 18/10/[63]." Perhaps there were no Testimonials as such but only the extant letter of application and if this were so it further throws doubt on Hirschfelder's claimed education since such a background would have lent itself to the compiling of Testimonials.
31. University College Council Memorandum, 3pp., enclosed with a communication from Registrar J. W. Morris of the University of Toronto to the Hon. C. Allyn, Provincial Secretary, April 8, 1859. Public Archives of Canada, (PAC) R.G. 5 C 1 Vol. 598 File 23 of 1859.
32. Calendars, University of Toronto and University College.
33. J. M. Hirschfelder, *A Key to German Conversation*. Toronto, H. & W. Rowsell, 1845. p.v-vi.
34. Moir, *op. cit.* p. 33.
35. J. M. Hirschfelder, *An Essay on the Spirit and Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry*, 1855 p. 1
36. *Ibid*, p. 6.
37. *Ibid*, p. 28.
38. J. M. Hirschfelder, *The Scriptures Defended; Being a Reply to Bishop Colenso's Book on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua*. Toronto, Henry Rowsell, 1863. p. v-vi.
39. *Ibid*, p. v.
40. *Ibid*, p. vii.
41. *Ibid*, p.
42. *Christian Guardian*, June 24, 1863, p. 102, c6.
43. J. M. Hirschfelder, *A Wife to Her Sister: Being a treatise in which the questions so long and warmly discussed, whether marriage with a deceased wife's sister is prohibited under the Mosaic law, is, in a clear and precise manner, placed before the English reader*. Toronto, Rowsell & Hutchison, 1878, 39pp. p. 8.

44. *Ibid.* p. 25.
45. J. M. Hirschfelder, *The Creation Being Two Lectures on the Mosaic Account of the Creation as Recorded in Genesis I*. Toronto, Howsell & Hutchison, 1874. 75pp.
46. J. M. Hirschfelder, *The Immortality of the Soul Being a Critical Investigation of the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul as set forth in the Old Testament*. Toronto, Rowell & Hutchison, 1876. 58pp.
47. The Jubilee Volume of Wycliffe College. Toronto, Printed by the University of Toronto Press, 1927. p. 62.
48. Polk's City Directory, 1886. Also McCullough to Harris letter August 1977. Additions and corrections for the draft history of the Department of Near Eastern Studies. Files of R. S. Harris.
49. The Andrew Baird Papers, Conference of Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Archives United Church of Canada. Baird's Journal 1875-1876. p.29. Rev. Baird was a student of Hirschfelder's. Apparently the Talmud was published at that time in a 18 volume edition.
50. J. M. Hirschfelder, *Biblical Expositor and People's Commentary*. Toronto, Rowsell & Hutchison, 2 vol., 1882-1885. Vol. 1, 315 pp., Vol. 2, 611 pp. Vol. 1, p. lxiii.
51. *Ibid.* p. lxiv.
52. *Ibid.* p. xxviii.
53. *Ibid.* p. xxii.
54. *Ibid.* p. xxxii-xxxiii.
55. *Ibid.* p. cxix.
56. *Ibid.* p. cxx.
57. *Ibid.* p. viii.
58. *Ibid.* p. lxxvii.
59. *Ibid.* p. 105.
60. *Ibid.* p. 43.
61. *Ibid.* p. xc.
62. *Ibid.* p. cxii-cxiii.
63. *Ibid.* p. 277.
64. *Ibid.* p. 278.
65. *Ibid.* p. 11.
66. *Ibid.* p. 18.
67. *Ibid.* p. 158.
68. *Ibid.* p. 167.
69. *Ibid.* p. 166.
70. *Ibid.* p. 279.
71. *Ibid.* p. 288.
72. *Ibid.* p. 282.
73. *Ibid.* p. 282.
74. *Ibid.* p. 283.
75. *Ibid.* p. 294.
76. *Ibid.* p. 271-2.
77. Winnett and McCullough, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
78. *Ibid.* p. 1.
79. Moir, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
80. *Ibid.* p. 36.