

# The Strange Tale of a Familiar Text

Gilbert S. Rosenthal

One of the great Jewish texts that most Jews and many non-Jews invariably cite is the *mishnah* from Sanhedrin 4:5 that states:

שכל המאבד נפש אחת, מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו אבד עולם מלא. וכל  
המקים נפש אחת, מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו קים עולם מלא.  
Whoever saves a single life, the Torah considers it as if that person had  
saved an entire world. But whoever destroys a single life, the Torah consid-  
ers it as if that person had destroyed an entire world.<sup>1</sup>

Truly, this is one of the most significantly universalistic statements in all of religious literature on the value of a single human being: One human is as precious as an entire world because each single person is a world in miniature and, having been created in the Divine image, contains a particle of God. The *mishnah* in Sanhedrin is dealing with the examination of witnesses in a capital case. Consequently, the sages stress the transcendent importance and value of a single life, so that judges are required to be most careful and meticulous in examining the witnesses and the facts of the case lest we execute a person unjustly and erroneously, and thereby destroy not just a single person but an entire world.

But upon checking our source a bit more carefully, we find that the Hebrew text does not read the way the popular usage would have it. The text in the Albeck edition of the Mishnah states: “Whoever saves a single life in Israel, the Torah considers it as if that person had saved an entire world. But whoever destroys a single life in Israel, the Torah considers it as if that person had destroyed an entire world.”<sup>2</sup> Now that is quite different from the usual translation that is popularly cited and often employed as a slogan for UJA fundraising or other worthy *tzedakah* projects and is even quoted by non-Jewish leaders and theologians. If the words, “in Israel,” are inserted, that focuses a far more parochial and narrow theological light on the text. What, therefore, is the correct, original text? Is the original text the universalistic one? And if so, when were the words inserted that attenuated the universalistic theme and twisted the meaning, projecting a narrow vision of non-Jews? Moreover, who was responsible for the emendation and for what reasons?

The late Professor Ephraim E. Urbach wrote a fascinating essay on the subject in *Tarbiz* over 36 years ago.<sup>3</sup> He came to several notable conclusions. First, he established that the original text in the best old manuscripts in our possession does not include the words, “in Israel.” He noted that the parallel texts vary, with some containing the key words, others deleting them. His meticulous analysis of the various editions of the *mishnayot* as well as of the Talmud Bavli and Talmud Yerushalmi, in addition to *midrashic*, medieval, and early modern printings, indicates that changes were made over the centuries; that some add the crucial words, others do not; that some are hybrids with the words added in one clause of the text but not in the other. He analyzed the role of censors in emending the text, and concluded with a startlingly revealing insight into the economic factors that played a role in the wording of printed texts. It is worth evaluating and updating Urbach’s conclusions and their implications for textual analy-

sis of ancient and classic Hebrew texts.

The most authentic old manuscript of the Mishnah is the Kaufman manuscript where the words, “in Israel” are missing. The first edition of the *Mishnayot* (Naples, 1492) also excludes the words. Raphael Rabinowitz, in his meticulous study of the earliest and most reliable texts of the Talmud, places the words in parentheses and notes that they are missing in *SeMaG* and other early medieval sources. The first editions of the Talmud, however, do include the words. But clearly, the original *mishnah* text did not include the words, “in Israel.”<sup>4</sup>

What of the parallel texts? The passage appears three times in *Avot d’Rabbi Nathan*, edited by Solomon Schechter. In the fullest version, we read the story of a poor widow who approached a certain Benjamin, the *tzaddik*, who administered the local charity fund. She begged for money to feed her family but was told that the coffers were empty. She complained: “If you don’t support me you will kill a widow and her seven children.” Benjamin was so moved that he supported her out of his own money. Subsequently, Benjamin took seriously ill and suffered greatly. Then we read in the text:

אמרו מלאכי השרת לפני הקב"ה, רבונו של עולם, אתה אמרת "כל  
המקיים נפש אחת מישראל כאלו קיים עולם מלא." בנימין הצדיק  
שקיים אלמנה ושבעה בנים, על אחת כמה וכמה, והוא מצטער חולי זה  
על המטה!

The angels interceded, declaring, Master of the Universe, You have stated, “Whoever saves a single life in Israel, it is as if he had saved an entire world.” How much more worthy is Benjamin, the *tzaddik*, who has saved a widow and her seven children, and yet he is suffering from illness and is bedridden. At once they begged for mercy and they tore up the decree of death and added 22 years to Benjamin’s life.<sup>5</sup>

Schechter includes the words, “in Israel,” adding a note that they are missing in the earliest manuscripts.

The second time we encounter the phrase is in Chapter 31 of version A where we read:

בעשרה מאמרות נברא העולם. וכי מה צורך לבאי עולם כך? אלא  
ללמדך שכל העושה מצוה אחת וכל המשמר שבת אחד וכל המקיים  
נפש אחת [מישראל] מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו קיים עולם מלא שנברא  
בעשרה מאמרות. וכל העובר עבירה אחת וכל המחלל שבת אחד וכל  
המאבד נפש אחת [מישראל] מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו אבד עולם מלא  
שנברא בעשרה מאמרות.

The world was created by ten sayings. Why was it necessary for all the world’s inhabitants [to utilize ten sayings when one would have sufficed]? To teach us that whoever observes one *mitzvah*, and whoever observes one *Shabbat*, and whoever saves a single life [in Israel], the Torah considers it as if he had saved an entire world that had been created with ten sayings. But whoever commits a single sin and whoever violates a single *Shabbat* and whoever destroys a single life [in Israel], it is as if he had destroyed an entire world.<sup>6</sup>

Note that here Schechter places the crucial words, “in Israel,” in brackets, indicating that not all manuscripts cite these words.

The third citation from *Avot d’Rabbi Nathan* is in Chapter 36 of version B, where we read:

בעשרה מאמרות נברא העולם. . . וכי מה צורך לכל באי עולם שיבואו  
לכאן? ללמדך שכל המאבד נפש אחת מישראל כאילו אבד עולם מלא,  
וכל המקיים נפש אחת מישראל מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו קיים עולם  
מלא.

The world was created by ten sayings. And why was it necessary for all the world’s inhabitants to utilize ten sayings? To teach us that whoever destroys a single life in Israel it is as if he had destroyed an entire world. And whoever saves a single life in Israel, it is as if he had saved an entire world.<sup>7</sup>

Schechter notes that some manuscripts lack the words, “in Israel.” In fact, they are missing from the critical Parma manuscript of 1289 (a text unavailable to Schechter) and from the first printing. Schechter evidently added them from the Oxford manuscript (fifteenth or sixteenth century).

The parallel text is found in the Talmud Baba Batra where the words are included.<sup>8</sup> But they are absent from the Oxford and Hamburg manuscripts of the Talmud, although found in others. Most importantly, Rashi (1040 - 1105) on the passage clearly indicates that his manuscript of the Talmud lacks the key words:

מתורתך למדנו, לפיכך נברא אדם יחידי לומר לך, כל המקיים נפש  
אחת כאילו קיים עולם מלא. וכתוב, קול דמי אחיך: דמו ודם  
זרעיותיו. אף כשאתה מקיים דמי אחיך עמך, מעלה עלך חייו וחיי  
זרעיותיו שמדה טובה מרובה ממדת פורענות.

From Your Torah we have learned, “Therefore Adam was created alone to teach us that whoever saves a life, it is as if he had saved an entire world.” Moreover, it is written (Genesis 4:10), “The voice of your brother’s blood cries out from the earth.” His blood and the blood of his descendants cry out. Therefore, if you save the life of your brother, the Torah considers it as if you had saved not only his life but the life of his descendants, since the quality of good is greater than the quality of punishment.<sup>9</sup>

The *midrash* relates the story of Achan (Joshua 7) who violated Joshua’s orders and plundered the proscribed booty of the people of Jericho.<sup>10</sup> In order to avoid the execution of numerous Israelites who partook of the booty, Achan confessed his sin and was executed. The *midrash* states:

מיד נפל מחלוקת בישראל ועמדו שבט יהודה במריבה והרגו מישראל  
כתות כתות כיון שראה עכן כך אמר בלבו כל המקיים נפש אחת  
מישראל כאילו קיים עולם מלא ואני ע”י נהרגו כמה אנשים מישראל  
אני חוטא ומחטיא מוטב אני אודה לפני הקב”ה ולפני יהושע ואל תבא  
תקלה ע”י.

Immediately, arguments broke out between the tribes of Israel so the Tribe of Judah entered the fray and killed groups of Israelites. Once Achan saw what was happening, he said to himself, ‘Whoever saves a single life in Israel, it is as if he had saved an entire world. Because of me, many Israelites have been killed so that I am both a sinner and the cause of sin. It is best if I confess before the Holy One, blessed be He, and before Joshua so that I will forestall further calamities.’

The parallel passage in the *Tanhuma* reads virtually the same, as does the *Yalkut Shimeoni* version.<sup>11</sup> Obviously, the context of the story requires the words, “in Israel.”

What of the later *midrashic* collections? *Pirkei d’Rebbi Eliezer* tells the tale of the daughter of Pharaoh who was afflicted with a type of skin disease.<sup>12</sup> She went down to the Nile to bathe her lesions and saw the infant Moses, crying in his basket, and she put forth her hand to save him. As a result of her compassion she was healed. The *midrash* continues:

אמרה הנער הזה צדיק הוא וקיימתו לחיים וכל המקיים נפש אחת  
מישראל, כאילו קיים עולם מלא וכל המאבד נפש אחת מישראל  
כאילו מאבד עולם מלא, לפי זכתה בת פרעה לידבק תחת  
כנפי השכינה

She said, ‘This lad is a *tzaddik*,’ so she decided to save his life. We know that whoever saves a single life in Israel, it is as if he had saved an entire world, and whoever destroys a single life in Israel, it is as if he had destroyed an entire world. Therefore, Pharaoh’s daughter was privileged to enter beneath the wings of the *Shekhinah*.

There the text clearly requires the words, “in Israel.”

*Seder Eliahu Rabbah* exhorts us to support and sustain a *talmid hakham* and his family because this falls under the rubric of “redeeming a person unharmed” (Psalm 55:19)<sup>13</sup>

שאין לך סם חיים למלאך המות אלא מדת צדקה בלבד, שנאמר כי  
יגרתי וגו', (דברים ט' י"ט), ושנו חכמים במשנה, שכל המקיים נפש אחת  
מעלין עליו כאילו קיים עולם מלא (סנהדרין פ"ד מ"ה), ואומר מתן  
בסתר יכפה אף [וגו'] (משלי כ"א י"ד).

The text continues:

There is no greater elixir of life against the Angel of Death than the quality of *tzedakah*, as it is said (Deuteronomy 9:19): ‘For I was in dread of the Lord’s fierce anger against you,’ *etc.* And the sages have taught in the *mishnah*, ‘Whoever saves a single life, the Torah considers it as if he had saved an entire world.’ (Sanhedrin 4:5) And as it further says, ‘A gift in secret subdues anger.’ (Proverbs 21:14)

Here the context should require the words, “in Israel,” since we are dealing with saving the life of a student of Torah. Yet, strangely, they are missing.

Finally, the *Midrash Mishlei* is a hybrid text, with the words, “in Israel” in the first, but not the

second clause: <sup>14</sup>

וכל המקיים מצוה אחת כאילו מקיים כל התורה כלה. וכל המקיים  
נפש אחת מישראל כאילו מקיים עולם מלא וכל המאבד נפש אחת  
כאלו אבד עולם מלא

Whoever performs one mitzvah, it is as if he had observed the entire Torah. And whoever saves one life in Israel, it is as if he had saved an entire world. But whoever destroys a single life, it is as if he had destroyed an entire world.

Since the context deals with the observance of *mitzvot*, the term, “in Israel,” would seem appropriate. Yet, older manuscripts lack the words entirely whereas others insert them in the first, but not the second clause.

Curiously, Maimonides in his *Mishneh Torah* records both versions. In “*Rotzeah*” he rules that anyone who stands by idly while the blood of a fellow Israelite is shed is to be whipped for failing to act to save a life:<sup>15</sup>

אע”פ שאין לוקין על לאוין אלו מפני שאין בהן מעשה חמורים הם שכל  
המאבד נפש אחת מישראל כאילו אבד כל העולם כולו וכל המקיים  
נפש אחת מישראל כאילו קיים כל העולם כולו.

Even though a person is not given lashes for standing by idly while another human being is being killed, since we don’t normally punish for a sin of abstention, this case is so severe because whoever destroys a single life in Israel, it is as if he had destroyed an entire world. But whoever saves a single life in Israel, it is as if he had saved an entire world.

On the other hand, in Sanhedrin, Rambam discusses the warnings issued to witnesses in capital cases and he cites our *mishnah* in Sanhedrin 4:5 without the words, “in Israel”:<sup>16</sup>

לפיכך נברא אדם יחידי בעולם שכל המאבד נפש אחת מן העולם  
מעלין עליו כאילו איבד עולם מלא וכל המקיים נפש אחת בעולם  
מעלין עליו כאילו קיים עולם מלא, הרי כל באי עולם בצורת אדם  
הראשון הם נבראים ואין פני כל אחד מהן דומין לפני חברו.

Therefore, the first human was created alone in this world to teach us that whoever destroys a single life, the Torah considers it as if he had destroyed an entire world. Whoever saves a single life, it is as if he had saved an entire world. For all humans are created in the image of Adam, and yet, no one face is like the face of another.

In the first case, Rambam is dealing with a specific legal ruling applicable to Jews so that the words, “in Israel,” are appropriate; in the second case, he deletes the words because the passage is a moral and religious exhortation that applies to all humans of all faiths and creeds.

What are we to make of all of this? When were changes in the original text made? And what were the reasons for the change and who made those alterations and tampered with the original wording of a sacred text? I believe that political, sociological, religious, and economic factors caused alterations to be made in the text. Note that until the days of Rashi, the ancient

text was untouched and the universalistic meaning of the *mishnah* was preserved.<sup>17</sup> Then the Crusades dealt a traumatic physical and psychological blow to European Jewry and changed its status in Christendom. Furthermore, the Church increasingly marginalized and segregated Jews, especially after the papacy of Innocent III and the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) with its odious Jew badge. When we add to that the infamous blood libels, beginning in 1144 (Norwich) and 1171 (Blois), the forced public disputations in Paris in 1240, in Barcelona in 1263, accompanied by the censorship and burning of Jewish sacred texts, we detect a new reality to Jewish life in Europe. That new reality is, I believe, reflected in the altered text. Jewish attitudes towards Christians were embittered and jaundiced; they looked upon them as pagans, unworthy of being saved either in this life or in the next. Parochialism replaced universalism; narrow interpretations of texts displaced the more liberal and humane interpretations.<sup>18</sup>

But there were other factors that precipitated the change in this most universalistic text. Undoubtedly, the increasingly tight censorship of Hebrew books, starting in the thirteenth century, but especially after the Inquisition instituted its nefarious work, caused both internal and external censorship of texts that could possibly be interpreted as anti-Christian or blasphemous of Jesus and the teachings of the Christian faith. The external censors, often apostate Jews with varying degrees of Hebrew knowledge, were indiscriminate in their censorship of Hebrew books, frequently excising harmless passages that had nothing at all to do with Christianity and were actually directed against ancient pagans. Internal censors from the Jewish community were zealous to make certain that no offense might be taken by Christians at passages that possibly alluded to Jesus and his teachings or the doctrines of the newly formed Christian sect and church. This explains, in part, why there are very few references to either Jesus or the Christians (“Nazarenes”) in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud, and only one reference to a text from the New Testament.<sup>19</sup>

Equally significant was the role scribes and printers played in distorting the correct version of classic texts. Sometimes scribes misunderstood the meaning of the passage; more often than not, they knew the popular understanding of the text and inserted their own interpolations, thereby destroying or perverting the original. And there are cases of *lapsus linguae et calami* causing a distortion of the text, or association (*ashgerah*), whereby the scribe associated words or ideas, one with the other and interpolated words that were not in the original.<sup>20</sup> This happened in the case of the so-called curse in the *Amidah* against the *minim*, taken by some scribes to refer to the *notzrim*, “Judeo-Christians.” It was also true of the *Aleinu* prayer that was clearly pre-Christian in origin but was misinterpreted as an anti-Christian polemic and was consequently censored.<sup>21</sup>

In the 19th century in Europe, internal censorship was sometimes designed to advance the goals of the Emancipation and Enlightenment. Whereas in the past, Jewish publishers were fearful of offending Christian sensibilities, the *Maskilim* who were anxious to curry favor with the government in order to win greater rights for the Jewish community and integration in the emancipation process, deleted the words, “in Israel,” to demonstrate for the government officials the universalism of Judaism. At the same time, they sought to re-educate the Jewish masses in becoming useful and integrated citizens in the non-Jewish society.<sup>22</sup>

Surprisingly, economic factors played a role in the censorship of texts. Urbach noted this

---

remarkable fact in studying the different versions and inconsistencies in the editions of the *Mishnayot* prepared by nineteenth-century publishers. One publisher prepared two editions of the *Mishnayot* in 1833: one was for the Russian-Polish readers where censorship did not expunge the words “in Israel;” the other was for the German “enlightened” readers where the words, “in Israel,” were deleted as befits the more “liberal” and “worldly” West-European audience.<sup>23</sup>

The context in which the text is found also played a role in determining the textual version, as we have noted. For example, in the case of Achan that is discussed in both the *Tanhuma* and *Yalkut*, since the episode affected only the Children of Israel and not the pagan neighbors, “in Israel” is quite appropriate. Similarly, the tale of Pharaoh’s daughter related in *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah*, obviously focuses on saving “Jewish” lives (in this case, Moses’ life); hence, the term, “in Israel,” is proper. We can understand why Rambam utilized both versions of the same text by checking the context. When he discussed the severity of warnings given witnesses in capital cases, he expatiated on the common ancestry of all humanity and quite logically, he deleted the words, “in Israel.” But when analyzing the implications of the commandment, never to stand by idly while the blood of your neighbor is spilled, he inserted the words, “in Israel.” The hybrid versions were indubitably caused by scribal errors.

And how do the more recent versions of the Mishnah and Talmud handle the text? The Horeb edition (1925) deletes the words, “in Israel.” Blackman’s version (1950) substitutes this text: “The person who saves the life of a single human being,” etc. The Pardes edition (1952) includes the words but adds a margin note indicating that other manuscripts do not contain them. Albeck’s edition of the Mishnah (1953) includes the words, “in Israel,” although in his notes, he indicates that they are missing in various manuscripts. Steinsaltz (1974) includes the words and notes in the margin that they are absent in other manuscripts. The Kehati version of the Mishnah (1983) includes them as does the Art Scroll version (1987). The Schottenstein Talmud (1993) includes the words. The Kafah edition of the Mishnah with Rambam’s commentary (1994) is based on the Oxford manuscript (1224), as well as the Yemenite, Paris, and Parma manuscripts, and deletes the words. The Sassoon edition of the Yerushalmi (1999) includes them. Clearly, we find an inconsistent pattern of handing an ancient and sacred text, a fact that I find amazing.

What conclusions may we draw from these data? It is evident that the original text lacked the words, “in Israel” and was broadly universal in outlook. It is also evident that historical events, sociology, religion, polemics, theology, and economics played a role in determining the wording of the passage. Anyone who thinks otherwise, any person who insists on the inviolability of a text — even a sacred one such as the Mishnah — needs a lesson in Realpolitik.<sup>24</sup> The study of the evolution of this famous ancient statement should once and for all dispel the myth that texts are sacrosanct and inviolate. It wasn’t so in the past; to some degree, regrettably, it still is true today. All the more reason, it seems to me, why the search for the authentic and original text of our sacred literature is a necessary *desideratum*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mishnah Sanhedrin 4:5, 37a. The text is not found in the Tosefta, *ad locum*. Curiously, there is an exact parallel in the Kuran, Sura 5:32. I am grateful to Dr. Bernard Zlotowitz and Adam Feinberg for this

- reference. To the best of my knowledge, there is no parallel in early Christian religious writers.
- 2 Hanokh Albeck, *Commentary on Mishnah Sanhedrin* 4:5, p. 182 & notes on page 445.
  - 3 Ephraim E. Urbach, גלגוליו של נוסח תהפוכות, . . . "כל המקיים נפש אחת" של צנוורה ועסקי מדפיסים. *Tarbiz* 40 (1971), pp. 268-284.
  - 4 Kaufman Manuscript of the Mishnah, p. 139. Cf. Raphael Rabinowitz, דקדוקי סופרים, *מבוא לספרות התנאים*, Sanhedrin, p. 100, note *nun*. See J. N. Epstein, בצלם אלהים, (Jerusalem, 1947), p. 56; Yair Lorberbaum, (Tel Aviv: Schocken, 2004), pp. 390-391.
  - 5 *Avot d'Rabbi Nathan* (ed. Schechter), A, chapter 3, p. 17. On the motif of a widow with seven children, see Gerson D. Cohen, "Hannah and Her Seven Sons in Hebrew Literature," in his *Studies in the Variety of Rabbinic Cultures* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), pp. 39-70.
  - 6 *Avot d'Rabbi Nathan* A, chapter 31, page 90.
  - 7 *Ibid.*, B, chapter 36, p. 90.
  - 8 Baba Batra 11a.
  - 9 Rashi on Baba Batra, *s.n.* אתה אמרת
  - 10 *Numbers Rabbah* 23:6.
  - 11 *Tanhuma* (ed. Buber) 2:82, par. 4; *Yalkut Shimeoni* (ed. Hyman), Joshua 18, p. 49.
  - 12 *Pirkei d'Rabbi Eliezar* (ed. Luria), chapter 48, p. 450.
  - 13 *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* (ed. Ish Shalom), chapter 11, p. 53.
  - 14 *Midrash Mishlei* (ed. Buber), 1:10, p. 44. Cf. Burton Visotzky's translation and notes in his, *The Midrash on Proverbs* (New Haven: Yale, 1992), p. 10
  - 15 Rambam, *Mishneh Torah*, "Rotzeah" 1:16.
  - 16 *Ibid.*, "Sanhedrin" 12:3. Strangely, none of the commentators comment on the variation in language.
  - 17 Rabenu Hananel seems to be the exception to this rule (he died in 1056 or 1057), as recorded in our edition of the Talmud Sanhedrin 38a, but Urbach proves that the text is corrupt. It is noteworthy that Menahem Meiri (died 1316) does not have the words, "in Israel." See his *Commentary to Sanhedrin* (ed. A. Sofer), pp. 167-168.
  - 18 Avraham Grossman argues that Rashi, certainly in his later years, in the wake of the horrors of the First Crusade that devastated his native Rhineland, turned bitterly anti-gentile and had a low opinion of Christians. See his, *Rashi* (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center, 2006), pp. 196-202. Perhaps his commentary on Baba Batra dates from a much earlier and happier period in his life.
  - 19 Shabbat 116a-b, citing Matthew 5:17, "I come not to abolish the law but to fulfill it." Cf. also *Tosefta Hullin* 2:24, p. 503 (ed. Zuckerman); Gittin 57a (Munich manuscript); Sanhedrin 107b (Munich manuscript)

- 20 Urbach, *op. cit.*, p. 271.
- 21 See Stefan Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 208-209 & 383 notes 4-5; Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy*, translated by Raymond Scheindlin (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1993), 71ff., 119-120, 220 & passim; Reuven Kimelman, “*Birkat Ha-Minim* and Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity,” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. by E.P. Sanders (2 Vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 2:226-244.
- 22 Urbach, *op. cit.*, pp. 274 ff.
- 23 Urbach, *ibid.* pp. 275 ff. Professor Urbach reveals some fascinating information about a Jewish censor in the employ of the Czarist government named J. Tugenhold.
- 24 A striking recent example of how religious biases can distort and pervert textual meanings, as well as the intent of the author, is the case of the Hebrew translation of Samuel David Luzzatto’s, *Il Giudaismo Illustrato*, originally published in Padua in 1848, and recently translated in Israel. The original text states in Italian (p. 11) that “God’s compassion extends universally and to all His creatures.” “No race is excluded from the law because all humans, according to Judaism’s teachings, are brothers and children of the same God, and created in the image of God.” The recent Hebrew translation has been changed to read: “No race is excluded from the law because *all Jews* are brothers” (my emphasis). See Marc Gopin, “An Orthodox Embrace of Gentiles? Interfaith Tolerance in the Thought of S.D. Luzzatto and E. Benamozegh,” *Modern Judaism* 18,2 (1998), pp. 173-195. Harvey Sukenic brought this article to my attention. Luzzatto, who frequently stressed that his guiding principle in life and scholarship was *emet*, truth, would have been outraged.