

1. Introduction

In the introduction to his recently completed translation of *Wars of the Lord*, Feldman suggests that the significance of Gersonides lies in his emphasis upon “religious rationalism in Judaism.” According to Feldman, we see a man who “has taken seriously the fact that he has reason, who believes that this faculty is God-given, and who attempts to understand God with this instrument” (*Wars*, p. 52). Gersonides is the philosopher who attempted to show that philosophy and Torah, that reason and revelation are co-extensive; he is a philosophical optimist who believes that reason was fully competent to attain all the important and essential truths. Thus, according to Feldman, Gersonides is “a most vigorous and consistent defender of human reason in religion” (*Wars*, p. 53).

This trust is reflected in Gersonides’ introductory remarks to *Wars*. There, Gersonides upholds the primacy of reason, attributing to Maimonides the position that “we must believe what reason has determined to be true. If the literal sense of the Torah differs from reason, it is necessary to interpret those passages in accordance with the demands of reason” (*Wars*, p. 98). Gersonides believes that reason and Torah cannot be in opposition: “if reason causes to affirm doctrines that are incompatible with the literal sense of Scripture, we are not prohibited by the Torah to pronounce the truth on these matters, for reason is not incompatible with the true understanding of the Torah” (*ibid*). Thus reason is upheld as a criterion for achieving truth.

2. Biography

Gersonides left few letters and does not talk about himself in his writings; nor is his life discussed at great length by his
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Gersonides' scientific works comprise mathematics and astronomy. His Sefer Ma'aseh Hoshev (The Work of a Counter, 1321) is concerned with arithmetical operations and uses of a symbolic notation for numerical variables. Gersonides' major scientific contributions were in astronomy; his works were known by his contemporaries and influenced later astronomers. His astronomical writings are contained primarily in book 5, part 1 of Milhamot Ha-Shem. In 136 chapters Gersonides reviews and criticizes astronomical theories of the day, compiles astronomical tables, and describes one of his astronomical inventions. This instrument, which he called Megalle 'amuqqot (Revealer of Profundities) and which was called Bacillus Jacobi (Jacob's staff) by his Christian contemporaries, was used to measure the heights of stars above the horizon. The astronomical parts of Milhamot Ha-Shem were translated into Latin during Gersonides' lifetime. One of the craters of the moon, Rabbi Levi, is named after him.

Gersonides was well known as a Halakhist, one who deals with the intricacies of Jewish law. From this respect, his greatest contribution to Judaica was in the area of biblical commentary. His commentary on the Book of Job, completed in 1325, proved to be one of his most popular works and was one of the earliest Hebrew books to be published (in Ferrara, 1477). The commentary, which complements book 4 of Milhamot Ha-Shem, is concerned with the problem of divine providence. Each of the characters in the Book of Job represents a different theory of divine providence; Gersonides' own position is a restatement of Elihu's theory that providence is not directed to particulars but rather to
Gersonides' major philosophical work, *Milhamot Ha-Shem*, was completed in 1329; it had been twelve years in the making. In 1317 Gersonides began an essay on the problem of creation. This problem, which has vexed Jewish philosophers since Philo Judaeus, had recently received elaborate treatment by Maimonides. Gersonides was dissatisfied with Maimonides' discussion and proposed to reopen the issue. This project was soon laid aside, however, for he felt that it could not be adequately discussed without proper grounding in the issues of time, motion, and the infinite. By 1325 his manuscript had developed to include discussion not only of creation but also of immortality, divination, and prophecy. By 1328 it included a chapter on providence as well. Books 5 and 6 were completed, by Gersonides' own dating, by 1329.

As Isaac Husik has pointed out, Gersonides "has no use for rhetorical flourishes and figures of speech ... the effect upon the reader is monotonous and wearisome." His style has been compared to that of Thomas Aquinas and even of Aristotle in its use of a precise, technical vocabulary which eschews examples. In contradistinction to Maimonides, who introduced allegory, metaphor, and imprecise language into his work to convey the ambiguity of the subject matter, Gersonides saw it as his function to elucidate the issues as clearly as possible. Gersonides is the first Jewish philosopher to use this analytic, scholastic method.

4. Major Themes in *Milhamot Ha-shem*

In the introduction to *Milhamot*, Gersonides specifies six questions which he hopes to examine: Is the rational soul immortal? What is the nature of prophecy? Does God know particulars? Does divine providence extend to individuals? What is the nature of astronomical bodies? Is the universe eternal or created? Each question occupies a separate book. Gersonides attempts to reconcile traditional Jewish beliefs with what he feels are the strongest points in Aristotle's philosophy. Although a synthesis of these systems is his ultimate goal, philosophy often wins out at the expense of theology.

Gersonides’ attitude toward previous astronomers, coupled with his faith in human reason, are reflected in his discussion of creation. Maimonides went to great lengths to maintain that the topic of creation is beyond rational demonstration. Gersonides, on the other hand, devotes many chapters in *Milhamot* VI to proving that the Platonic theory of creation out of an eternal formless matter is rationally demonstrable. The question of whether the universe was created or had existed from eternity had been treated by Maimonides in an ambiguous manner; scholars still disagree over whether Maimonides ultimately upheld an Aristotelian, Platonic, or scriptural doctrine of creation. Gersonides' position is unambiguously Platonic. Gersonides argues that the world was created outside of time by a freely willing agent. He must then decide whether the world was engendered *ex nihilo* or out of a preexistent matter. Arguing that *ex nihilo* creation is incompatible with physical reality, he adopts a model drawn from Plato's *Timaeus*. Gersonides interprets the opening of Genesis to refer to two types of matter. *Geshem* is the primordial matter out of which the universe was created; not capable of motion or rest, it was characterized by negation and was inert and chaotic. This matter is identified with the primeval waters described in Genesis. *Homer* is prime matter, in the Aristotelian sense of a substratum always aligned with form. It contains within itself the potentiality to receive forms but is not an ontologically independent entity. Gersonides compares this matter to darkness; just as darkness is the absence of light, this matter represents the absence of form or shape. As noted by Glasner (2015) and Freudenthal (1987), this notion of a body that does not preserve its shape offered several important advantages. First, the space between the spheres, which is subject to continuous change, is filled by the body that does not preserve its shape, and so transmission can be explained by contact. Second, in the context of his theory of creation, this amorphous body is a remnant of the pre-existent entity (thou va-vohu) from which God shaped the world. On this basis Gersonides argues that the world was created out of an eternally preexistent matter.

Gersonides' cosmology forms the backdrop of the other books of *Milhamot*. His predecessor Maimonides had claimed that no valid inference can be drawn from the nature of the sublunar sphere to that of the superlunar sphere. Gersonides, however, rejects the metaphysical bite to the distinction, and argues that inasmuch as both spheres contain material elements, what we know about creation is based on astronomy, and astronomy is fundamentally no different a human science than physics. Astronomy can only be pursued as a science by “one who is both a mathematician and a natural philosopher, for he can be aided by both of these sciences and take from them whatever is needed to perfect his work” (*Wars*, V.1.1, p. 23). Gersonides sees the ultimate function of astronomy to understand God. Astronomy, he tells us, is instructive not only by virtue of its exalted subject matter, but also because of its utility in the other sciences. By studying the orbs and stars, we are led ineluctably to a fuller knowledge and appreciation of God. Astronomy thus functions as the underpinning of the rest of the work.

Gersonides' discussion of immortality of the soul in book 1 must be understood against the backdrop of a notoriously difficult passage in Aristotle's *On the Soul*, book 3, chapter 5 (430a22–25). In this passage Aristotle seems to postulate the existence of an active intellect which is separable from the passive intellect and which is primarily responsible for the intellectual activities of the human soul. But what is the relation between the active and passive intellects, and which, if either, is immortal? Gersonides states and rejects three positions that elucidate a version of the unity of intellect. The import of Gersonides' critique of his predecessors can be reduced to three main issues. From a
from the 12th century on. In the 12th century, discussion of astrology intensified on the grounds that astrology compromised human free will; on the other hand, the wide scale acceptance of astrology by individuals limited to necessary states of affairs or extends to the domain of contingency as well. If the former, then God could not be said to have knowledge of humans, and so divine providence would not be efficacious. But if God does know contingents—in particular, future contingent events—then it would appear that human freedom is curtailed by God's prior knowledge of human actions. The problem of the apparent conflict between divine omniscience and human freedom was discussed by many medieval philosophers. Gersonides does not follow the majority opinion on this issue: rather than claim that God does know particulars and that this knowledge somehow does not affect human freedom, Gersonides argues that God knows particulars only in a certain sense. In an apparent attempt to mediate between the view of Aristotle, who said that God does not know particulars, and that of Maimonides, who said that he does, Gersonides holds that God knows particulars only insofar as they are ordered. That is, God knows that certain states of affairs are particular, but he does not know in what their particularity consists. God knows individual persons, for example, only through knowing the species humanity.

Whereas Maimonides claimed that God's knowledge does not render the objects of his knowledge necessary, Gersonides maintains that divine knowledge precludes contingency. To retain the domain of contingency, he adopts the one option open to him: namely, that God does not have prior knowledge of future contingents. According to Gersonides, God knows that certain states of affairs may or may not be actualized. But insofar as they are contingent states, he does not know which of the alternatives will be the case. For if God did know future contingents prior to their actualization, there could be no contingency in the world.

In book 2, in an attempt to explain how prophecies are possible in a system which denies the possibility of knowledge of future contingents, Gersonides claims that the prophet does not receive knowledge of particular future events; rather his knowledge is of a general form, and he must instantiate this knowledge with particular facts. What distinguishes prophets from ordinary persons is that the former are more attuned to receive these universal messages and are in a position to apply them to particular circumstances.

A further dilemma surrounds the doctrine of divine providence. If God does not have knowledge of future contingents, how can he be said to bestow providence on his creatures? This problem is discussed by Gersonides both in his commentary on Job and in book 4 of Milhamot. In both texts he argues that providence is general in nature; it primarily appertains to species and only incidentally to particulars of the species. God, for example, does not know the particular individual Levi ben Gerson and does not bestow particular providence on him. Rather, inasmuch as Levi ben Gerson is a member of the species humanity and the species philosopher, he is in a position to receive the providential care accorded to those groups.

For Gersonides, the issues of prophecy, omniscience and providence are developed against the backdrop of astrological determinism. Like many thinkers of the late Middle Ages, Gersonides had to confront two opposing sets of traditions: on the one hand, attacks by religious authorities (e.g. Augustine's attack in City of God; Maimonides' letters) on the grounds that astrology compromised human free will; on the other hand, the wide scale acceptance of astrology from the 12th century on. In the 12th and 13th centuries, most Jewish and Christian philosophers supported natural
astrology, the view that the celestial bodies affect sublunar life and existence to some extent at least. That the sun and moon both affect natural cycles and events on earth is unequivocal and represents a classic paradigm of natural astrology. The calculations of natural astrology overlapped those of astronomy, and could be utilized for practical purposes such as fixing the calendar. According to astrologers, each planet and sign of the zodiac has its own character, power and attributes. Inasmuch as the characters of the planets and the signs of the zodiac are opposed to each other, they are engaged in a perpetual power struggle. Thus the position of the planets and their interrelation with the signs of the zodiac, regulate the fate of both individuals and nations. Astrological predictions could apply, then to both individuals as well as to the history of Israel and its place in universal history.

An attack upon astrology as a whole belonged to a much larger conflict, that between the roles of reason and faith. Thus, astrology should not be situated within the context of magic or the occult, but rather should be construed as a robust contender to science. Based on a precise scientific astronomy, astrology was a science accepted from the second to the seventeenth centuries. On the scientific level it prevailed almost uncontested until and including Newton.

5. Gersonides' Astrological Determinism

Even a summary reading of Gersonides’ major philosophical work evinces an explicit “belief in” astrology. Gersonide develops his astral determinism in two contexts: in book II of Wars he interweaves astrological motifs into his discussion of divine providence and prophecy, while in Book V astrology occupies a central role in the context of his cosmological speculations. His major concern is the extent to which the stars and planets exerted an influence over human events in general, or more particularly, over those actions that entail human choice. Judicial astrology was based on the assumption that the entire world of nature was governed and directed by the movement of the heavens and the celestial bodies, and that man, as an animal naturally generated and living in the world of nature, was also naturally under their rule.

Langermann emphasizes the teleological nature of astrology for Gersonides, its chief merit being its ability to provide “teleological explanations for the wide variety of stellar motions that are observed to take place” (Wars, Vol III, p. 506). This teleology is reflected in V.2 ch 7–9 where, after listing 27 problems raised by the heavenly bodies, Gersonides suggests that only astrological considerations can furnish satisfactory replies; it is astrology alone that can explain the connection between the two realms. It is worth noting that on this point, Gersonides disagrees with Maimonides over the ultimate purpose of the celestial bodies. For Maimonides it is not possible that a greater entity, the heavens, would exist for the sake of the sublunar world. Gersonides disagrees, maintaining that it is not inappropriate that the more noble exist for the less noble. The stars, he argues, exist for the sake of things in the sublunar world (Wars, V.2.3, p. 194). More explicitly, the heavenly bodies are designed for the benefit of sublunar existence, and they guarantee the perpetuation of life on earth.

This teleology is spelled out in Milhamot II, in which Gersonides is concerned to explain how divine knowledge operates, and to what extent divine foreknowledge of future contingents affects human choice. His major thesis is that divine knowledge is predicated to a great extent upon knowledge of the heavenly bodies, which bodies are in turn “systematically directed toward his [man’s] preservation and guidance so that all his activities and thoughts are ordered by them” (Wars, II.2, p. 33). In support of this teleological cosmology, Gersonides presents an extensive argument to the effect that the celestial bodies have a purpose. On the basis of this argument Gersonides concludes that from the perspective of the teleological structure of the universe, we can understand why the heavenly bodies behave the way they do. This teleology is reflected by a “law, order and rightness” in the universe, implying the existence of an intellect that orders the nature of things: “you see that the domain of the spheres provides, in the best way possible, for the sublunar world” (Wars, V.2.5, p. 137).

As we have seen, the existence of a connection between celestial and terrestrial events was admitted by most everybody, but not everybody agreed on the nature of this connection. Gersonides as well must account for the type of relation obtaining between celestial and terrestrial events. Having articulated the ordering power of the astral bodies, Gersonides describes in Milhamot V.3 the separate intellects and the spheres that they move. The main characteristic of the astral bodies is their luminosity (nitzutz). This luminosity affects their actions and effects (Wars, V.2.3, p. 137). Gersonides is very much aware of the problem of accounting for how the astral bodies can affect actions at a distance. The sun, for example, functions as a paradigm for action at a distance. Once we understand, Gersonides claims, how the activity of heating reaches earth from the sun, we can understand how the particular activities of the other stars reach the sublunar realm as well. By explaining the efficient cause as the light or radiation of the stars, Gersonides can account for weak or strong effects. As Langermann has pointed out, Gersonides’ account furnishes the basis for the introduction of astrological causation into natural philosophy.

In Milhamot V.2.8 Gersonides lays out six astrological principles that affect his general cosmological scheme. These can be summarized as follows. First, each astral body exercises a different influence specific to it. Second, astral influence depends upon its position in the zodiac (galgal hamazalot). Third, the longer a star stays in one place in the zodiac, the greater its effect because of the strength of its luminosity. Fourth, astral influence is dependent upon its inclination to the north or to the south; its effect will be strongest when it is in the middle, as evidenced by the sun, whose heat is strongest when it is at the Tropic of Cancer as opposed to being at the Tropic of Capricorn. Fifth, the greater the radiation or luminosity of a star, the stronger its influence. And finally, the closer to earth a star is, the stronger will be its influence (Wars, V.2.8, p. 207–8). These principles function as the underpinnings of his general astronomy as well.
Abraham Bar Hiyya in his conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter to take place in March 1345. Gersonides himself died in 1344, a year before the event predictions. In fact, Gersonides wrote only one astrological text that has survived, a prognostication based on the cyclicity of the heavenly bodies. Gersonides did not [to our knowledge] indulge in eschatological and millennial predictions. Instead, he focused on the regular and cyclic patterns of celestial movements, which he believed could be used to make inferences about human affairs and the future. Gersonides' immediate 13th century predecessors Shem-Tov ibn Falaqua and Judah ben Solomon ha-Cohen discussed this issue against the backdrop of Aristotle's *Gen. Animalia*. In *Gen. Animalia*, Aristotle had established a connection between the life spans and gestation periods of animals and the revolutions of the sun and moon (of the sun). Gersonides argues, the rational order we see in the heavens would be the result of chance, which is unacceptable. The agent intellect thus functions as the link between these celestial bodies and human affairs. The kinds of information it transmits are of an astronomical type, as evidenced in the following example: “it [the agent intellect] knows how many revolutions of the sun, or of the diurnal sphere, or of any other sphere [have transpired] from the time at which someone, who falls under a particular pattern, had a particular level of good or ill fortune...” (Wars, II.6, p. 64). The agent intellect serves as the repository of information communicated by the heavenly bodies. The patterns revealed in this communication between agent intellect and diviner (astrologer, prophet) are from the heavenly bodies which themselves are endowed with intellects and so “apprehend the pattern that derives from them.” Each mover apprehends the order deriving from the heavenly body it moves, and not patterns that emanate from other heavenly bodies. As a result, the imaginative faculty receives the “pattern inherent in the intellects of the heavenly bodies from the influence deriving from them.” This influence derives from the position of the heavenly bodies “by the ascendant degree or the dominant planet [in a particular zodiacal position]” (Wars, II.6, p. 64). However, inasmuch as the heavenly bodies do not jointly cooperate with one another (*lo yishattu*) in this process, it is possible for the communication to be misconstrued.

Of course, as we all know, astrologers often err in their predictions. Astrological errors can be due to several factors. In general, Gersonides claims, we know very little of the order of the heavenly bodies. “In general, it is impossible for man to know the [complete] truth of the order of the sublunar world. This is nicely illustrated in astrology, where frequently false predictions are made. All the more so is it impossible for man to know the general order of the sublunar world by means of its causes so that his knowledge would be perfect” (Wars, I.12, p. 219). In some cases, the information is not transmitted clearly. Why is it that certain communications are received more clearly than others? A constitutionally perfect imaginative faculty receives information from both dominant and weak heavenly bodies. By ‘weak’, Gersonides means that certain celestial bodies are too weak both to bring about events on earth as well as to transmit information about these events. Hence he concludes that information about the future emanates “from the dominant body in the particular proper face (*panim*) in which it has dominance but not from any of the attending planets (*ha-meshartim*)” (Wars, II.7, pp. 69–70). But to constitutionally imperfect imaginative faculties, the information received is only from the dominant heavenly bodies. Hence the overall quality of the information received will differ in the two cases. More specifically, because of the difficulty of obtaining the necessary positions of these bodies by observation, astrologers are often unable to verify their data. Furthermore, since the zodiacal position of a heavenly body at any given time is only repeated once in many thousands of years, astrologers have no access to the repeatability of those events that would be required to verify their knowledge. Furthermore, humans simply do not have sufficient knowledge about the heavenly bodies.

The final cause for error has to do with human free will: as we have seen above, our intellect and choice “have the power to move us contrary to that which is determined by the heavenly bodies” (Wars, II.2, p. 34). Although he admits that on occasion human choice is able to contravene the celestial bodies, nevertheless this intervention is rare, and true contingency is a rare state of affairs indeed in Gersonides’ ontology. Gersonides presents an argument to show that human choice guided by reason can subvert the celestial bodies despite their general ordering of our lives. The heavenly bodies can order human affairs either by virtue of their difference of position in the heavens, or from the difference of the bodies among themselves. Astral bodies, however, will affect different individuals in different ways; they can also affect an individual differently at different times; and finally, two or more bodies can affect a single individual, resulting in multiple influences that can have contrary effects, echoing the scholastic phrase, “sapiens dominabitur astra” [the wise man will be ruled by the stars]”. Gersonides notes that humans can contravene these effects: God has provided humans with “the intellectual capacity (sekhel ba’al takhlit) that enables us both to act contrary to what has been ordered by the heavenly bodies and to correct, as far as possible, the [astrally ordained] misfortunes that befall us” (Wars, II.2, p. 35). Nevertheless, he assures us that whatever happens by chance is “determined and ordered according to this type of determinateness and order” (Wars, II.2, p. 34). Outdoing even Plato’s hierarchical structuring in *Republic IV*, Gersonides argues that the ultimate perfection and ordering of society is due to astrological influence.

The commensurability of the motion of heavenly bodies raises an additional concern, having to do with the uniqueness of individual beings and the doctrine of eternal return. Gersonides’ immediate 13th century predecessors Shem-Tov ibn Falaqua and Judah ben Solomon ha-Cohen discussed this issue against the backdrop of Aristotle’s *Gen. Animalia*. In *Gen. Animalia*, Aristotle had established a connection between the life spans and gestations periods of animals and the revolutions of the sun and moon (Gen. Anim., IV.10, 777b17–778a10). Thus the revolutions of the sun measure not only time but also produce the alternating periods of growth and decay. Eschatological predictions are thus tied to the cyclicity of the heavenly bodies. Gersonides did not [to our knowledge] indulge in eschatological and millennial predictions. In fact, Gersonides wrote only one astrological text that has survived, a prognostication based on the conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter to take place in March 1345. Gersonides himself died in 1344, a year before the event in question. As Goldstein has demonstrated, this conjunction was predicted already by Ibn Ezra, and repeated by Abraham Bar Hiyya in his *Megillat ha-Megalleh* where the conjunction was associated with a date of messianic
6. Conclusion

Gersonides’ philosophical ideas went against the grain of traditional Jewish thought; he also challenged scholastic thought. Glasner suggests that unlike his Christian peers who studied and taught at a university, Gersonides’ academic profile as rooted in applied mathematics and astronomy allowed him to leave metaphysics behind. He offered a serious critique of Aristotle’s theory of motion, thus freeing himself as well from “the grip of Aristotelian physics, and even laid down a basis for an alternative understanding of motion” (Glaser 2015, p. 106). Gersonides reflects the following characteristics: first, his writings demonstrate a fundamental interplay and harmony between astrological and theological beliefs. It is clear that the appeal of astrology lay in the fact that it offered useful information, while it looked and operated like a science. Even the critics of astrology had to agree that the heavens exerted a real influence upon terrestrial events. The complexity of the rules of astrology and internal disagreement among its followers served to increase the respect accorded to the science. Failures did not cause the astrologer to lose faith, just as failures among modern physicists do not lead to loss of faith in science. Gersonides believed that life on earth had a meaning, and that terrestrial events had an order. Astrology was a means of ascertaining that meaning. Gersonides’ views on prophecy, providence, free-will and evil reflected ingredients of this philosophical determinism. Whereas his commentaries occupied a central place in Jewish theology, his philosophical work was rejected. Jewish philosophers such as Hasdai Crescas and Isaac Abrabanel felt obliged to subject his works to lengthy criticism. Only in recent years has Gersonides received his rightful place in the history of philosophy. As scholars have rediscovered his thought and have made his corpus available to a modern audience, Gersonides is once again appreciated as an insightful, ruthlessly consistent philosopher.
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