Know that the principle of all kabbalah is included in these two issues mentioned in the Sefer Yetzirah, the first of them is knowledge of the ten sefirot and the second is knowledge of the twenty-two letters. The one who receives should try to receive the sefirot first in order to receive the divine overflow [shefa] from them and in themselves according to his attributes [middot]. He will cleave to each and every sefiroth separately and he will cleave to all the sefirot together as one so that he will not cut the shoots.¹

(—Abraham Abulafia, Gan Na’ul)

Sefer Yetzirah (BOOK OF FORMATION, hereafter SY) is the oldest known speculative treatise in Hebrew. There are three prime recensions of SY: (1) short, (2) long, and (3) one somewhere in between called the Sa’adian recension in that it was the basis of Sa’adiah Gaon’s commentary of the early tenth century.² Even the longest of these contains something less than 2500 words.

The date of SY’s composition remains a matter of some debate, though most scholars agree that it was written or compiled between the second and sixth centuries. However, Steven M. Wasserstrom has offered a strong case for the ninth century that it was written or compiled between the second and sixth centuries. However, Steven M. Wasserstrom has offered a strong case for the ninth century that it was written or compiled between the second and sixth centuries.

Commenting on SY, Elliot R. Wolfson stated, “Properly speaking, the work should not be described as a single composition, but rather as a composite of distinct literary strands that


Gan Na’ul is one of three commentaries on Sefer Yetzirah by Abraham Abulafia. See below, page 27.


Sa’adiah “did not regard the Sefer Yeziara as a divine, eternal, unchangeable text” (—Joseph Dan, “Three Phases of the History of the Sefer Yezirah,” in Jewish Mysticism, Volume I, LATE ANTIQUITY [Northvale – Jerusalem: Jason Aronson Inc., 1998], p. 165). “Thus, he felt free to edit the text and even omit lines “that were offensive to his concepts” (—ibid).

Aryeh Kaplan adds a fourth recension: the Gra/Ari version; see below, Part III. C.
have been woven together through a complicated redactional process whose stages are not clearly discernable.”

Within a substantial (42-page) paper, Ronit Meroz offers some original hypotheses concerning SY’s composition and meaning. Meroz advances (quoting the ABSTRACT at the head of the article),

1) the assertion that a single subject unites all the discussions in Sefer Yezirah, from beginning to end: namely, the nature of Wisdom, upon which the world stands...

2) a stylistic-linguistic analysis leading to the division of Sefer Yezirah into three “accounts,” around which are crystallized the style and contents of the book as a whole. The Account of the “Sealing of the Ends” is the latest of these accounts and was written by the editor of the book who joined his account with the other two to form a single book.

3) the assertion that the worldview reflected in Sefer Yezirah acknowledges the existence of a secondary power alongside God, that assists Him in the Creation and ongoing existence of the universe (as against doctrines claiming the existence of an additional force in conflict with God).

In a paper presented to the European Association for Jewish Studies (Paris 2014), “Some New Observations Concerning the Context of Sefer Yetsirah,” Tzahi Weiss concludes:

[1] It is possible to understand the singularity of Sefer Yetsirah in two opposing manners: the first is to understand it as a unique composition that had evolved in a known Jewish environment, whose authors or editors succeeded in dispersing most of its identifying Jewish signs. The second possibility is to understand it as a treatise which does not in any way want to conceal its cultural context but rather that this context is unknown to us its readers and interpreters. Since Sefer Yetsirah employs many terms physiological, linguistic, astrological, cosmological and others in order to clarify its various arguments, there is no apparent reason to believe that there is any attempt at concealing involved in this text. It therefore seems that it would be more correct to support the possibility that the singularity of Sefer Yetsirah in the eyes of its readers and interpreters evolves from an estrangement in regard to the cultural context in which its essential foundations evolved.

---

5 The comments of both Steven M. Wasserstrom and Elliot R. Wolfson were made as discussants at the Association for Jewish Studies 33\textsuperscript{rd} Annual Conference (Washington, DC: December 16, 2001), Session 2.4: “Sefer Yezirah: Mystical and Philosophical Intertexts,” Chair: Sarah Pessin.


Refer to Wolfson’s summary, SEFER YETZIRAH: LINGUISTIC MYSTICISM AND COSMOLOGICAL SPECULATION, which is a section of “Jewish Mysticism: A Philosophical Overview” CHAPTER 19 of History of Jewish Philosophy, edited by Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Leaman (London – New York: Routledge, 1997), pages 450-498 (the SY section, pages 463-466).


Joseph Dan describes three phases in the reception of SY:\(^6\)

1. an inexplicable dormant phase from its composition in the fourth century to the tenth century; while it was known, it was not the basis of doctrine or commentary.
2. the philosophic—or rational/scientific—phase beginning in the tenth century when speculation on SY burgeoned, commencing with the commentaries of Shabbatai Donnolo, Sa‘adiah Gaon, Donash ben Tanim, etc.
3. the mystical/magical phase which began in the twelfth century with the Ashkenazi Hasidim, the Unique Cherub Circle and the Iyyun school, then passing to the Provençal and Catalanian kabbalists.

More recently, Tzahi Weiss has proposed a seventh-century composition date for SY, within Christian Syria. Further, he believes that SY was already considered a magical/mystical text within Dan’s first two phases, though he acknowledges the noticeable lack of references to SY in Dan’s “dormant phase.”\(^7\)

Almost all versions of SY have six chapters containing brief, even laconic, statements, similar in tone to the hekhalot texts.\(^8\) It was from the first chapter of SY that kabbalah derived the term sefirot and the notion of these as metaphysical stages of creation. The remaining chapters of SY tell of the powers and correspondences of the twenty-two Hebrew letters.

In 1971, Ithamar Gruenwald noted, although Sefer Yezira is one of the most frequently published works of Jewish esoteric lore, there is no authoritative text available to those who want to study the book. To make a long story short, there are at least three main recensions of the book, and except for one recension (the so-called Saadian recension) all the printed texts are defective.\(^9\)

Gruenwald was commenting on the state of editions in Hebrew, the inadequacies of which would inevitably be reflected—if not compounded—in any translation.

Armed with a more complete array of textual witnesses, many of which were not available to Gruenwald in 1971, A. Peter Hayman produced Sefer Yesira: Edition, Translation and Text-Critical Commentary,\(^10\) which is the most thorough scholarly treatment of the SY text in English to date. The core of Hayman’s book is a synoptic edition of SY in Hebrew and English, offering specific MS versions of the three recensions in a manner similar to Schäfer, Schlüter, and Mutius’ treatment of hekhalot texts in Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur.\(^11\)

Because of its importance—and no doubt because of its brevity—SY has been put into English many times. All of the English translations of SY which I have seen—and a few that I haven’t—are discussed in PART I A-B: TRANSLATIONS. This disparate collection is dealt with in chronological order, starting with the fairly well-circulated translation of Isidor Kalisch (1877) and concluding with Meira Epstein’s Sefer Yetzirah: Translation, Transliteration and Commentary... (2018).

---

7 “Sefer Yesirah” and Its Contexts (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018); see below, page 21.
8 It is interesting to note that, while the hekhalot literature takes up cosmology and cosmogony, reference to SY is entirely—and remarkably—absent therein. Ref. Joseph Dan, “Three Phases of the History of the Sefer Yezirah,” p. 160.
9 In the introduction to “Preliminary Critical Edition....”
PART I A: TRANSLATIONS: 1877 – 1952


Kalisch gives a straightforward translation, showing the English and Hebrew side by side. His notes clarify the ideas and language of SY, often referring to readings from major commentaries and other rabbinic works. The publisher’s forward in the AMORC edition says, “The service Dr. Kalisch rendered in 1877 by his first English translation of the Sepher Yezirah has grown ever greater with the passing years. Other translations, it is true, have a certain merit; none the less, none has surpassed and few have equaled the work which he did.” This comment was written in 1948, but one could have made a case to fully concur until relatively recently (i.e., until Kaplan’s SY published in 1990—see below, Part III. C).

Kalisch translated what appears to be the long version.12 The work is free of any sort of occult agenda—a feature which plagues many of the editions discussed hereafter.


The SY translation appears in Appendix V, § 4. After a perfunctory description of kabbalah, which concludes, “...the book Yetsirah is the oldest Kabbalistic document,” the text of SY is summarized.

The translation itself is qualified: “...not only...the meaning of the expressions but even their translations, is in controversy. Hence, not unfrequently, our rendering must be regarded as our interpretation of the mysterious original.” The translated text is then given in italics, with notes, bracketed or parenthetical words, and explanatory remarks in regular type. What we get is an earnest effort at translation based on a rather terse version of SY (which, for instance, omits the “predominations” of the letters from chapter 4). The notes and additions are more helpful than intrusive, and where he is unsure, Edersheim nobly places a question mark next to his variant renderings.

---

12 The short version, thought by some to be representative of the original text, begins (chapter 1, paragraph 1)

Thirty-two mysterious ways has the Lord, Lord of Hosts, ordained through Scribe, Script, and Scroll. (from Phineas Mordell’s translation)

By contrast, the long version immerses this simple line in a stream of biblical epithets:

In Thirty-two paths of wisdom did Yah, Lord of hosts, God of Israel, the living God, king of the universe, God almighty, merciful, gracious, exalted, Who dwells in an eternity of holiness, holy is His name, create His universe by three enumerations: number, word, and script. (from a partial translation of my own)

Further, with this first paragraph we run into complications with the last several words, which are rendered differently by each translator. Kalisch has “by three Sepharim, namely: 1) S’for; 2) Sippor; and 3) Sapher,” leaving these transliterated in the text to then be explained in his notes. The anonymous Guild Press edition (see below, page 11) ends Mishna Aleph (i.e. paragraph 1), “He creates His world in three forms, In letter, in number, in sound.”

Westcott was an occultist who, with S. L. M. Mathers, was a founding member of the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn. Both Westcott and Mathers put several magical and mystical texts into English in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Most pertinent to Kabbalah are Mathers’ Kabbalah Unveiled (sections of the Zohar after the Latin of Knorr von Rosenroth) and Westcott’s SY, which, in spite of the claim on the title page that the work was “translated from the Hebrew,” appears to have been totally dependent on a Latin version. Arthur E. Waite, in his introduction to the Stenring translation (discussed below), says of Westcott’s SY

It is based on the text of Rittangelius, compared with some other versions. It was prepared for the use of persons described as theosophists, occult and Hermetic students, whose purpose – if any – may have been served by such a production, but is in reality a paraphrase and fulfills few of the conditions required by scholarship.

Although there is a bit of the pot calling the kettle black in Waite’s comments, they do give a fair appraisal of Westcott’s work.

Along with SY, Westcott offers an English translation of The Thirty-two Paths of Wisdom; its inclusion is not explained, nor is the text introduced. From other sources (Waite’s introduction to Stenring for one), we learn that The Thirty-two Paths is a late addition to SY, appended in some Latin versions. In a series of short paragraphs, it tells of the intelligences, powers and virtues of the thirty-two paths, which are the ten sefirot plus the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

Westcott’s connections with the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn afford his treatment of SY a certain pedigree—at least in the eyes of those who involve themselves with Golden Dawn teachings and literature; thus, it has been reprinted far more often than any other version and appears at a large number of sites on the Internet.


Even though the original, La Cabbale tradition secrète de l’Occident, is in French, Papus’ work is included here because it offers an SY translation (of sorts) by an influential occultist which has been circulating in English for some time. Unfortunately, one finds Papus’ treatment of SY (pages 203-48 in the Weiser edition) in the midst of a pseudo-scholarly mess. The entire book is a confusion of elements, Jewish and non-Jewish, many having no connection with kabbalah at all. There are many astounding errors, and the reader is flogged with a continual mystery mongering.
As for the SY section, Papus introduces the text with a verbose and meandering forward followed by an utterly superfluous summary of the text. Finally, there is the text, full of bizarre renderings. Papus gives the three sefarim (SY 1:1) as “number, numbering, and numbered.” He uses E to represent the Hebrew letter aleph in one place, only to use it to represent heh in another. He renders heh-qoph as OCH, and for the Tetragrammaton, yod-heh-vav-heh, he puts YOAH, then IOAH, and later IEVE. To the usual six chapters of SY, Papus saw fit to add a seventh, consisting of a redundant list of correspondences, an account of the derivatives of the letters, and a general résumé. Papus follows SY with not only The Thirty-two Paths of Wisdom but also The Fifty Gates of Understanding. The Fifty Gates is a hierarchic list of features of the universe; Papus’ version is derived from Athanasius Kircher’s Ædipus Ægyptiacus (3 volumes, Rome: 1652-5). Papus’ section on SY concludes with an essay, “The Date of the ‘Sepher Yetzirah’” by Dr. Sair A. C. which advances the notion that SY is from the patriarchal age or earlier on the basis that scholars have not proven otherwise—at least not to the satisfaction of subscribers to the occult tradition.\(^{13}\)

Davidson, P[eter]. The Sepher Jetsirah or Book of Formation, to which is added The Thirty-Two Ways of Wisdom and The Fifty Gates of Intelligence, translated an annotated by P. Davidson (Louisville, White County [GA]: Peter Davidson / Glasgow [Scotland]: Bernard Goodwin, 1896).

Davidson’s work is mentioned on page 30 of Gershom Scholem’s Kabbalah among the English translations of SY. Given the time and place of this publication—Louisville: 1896—the author is most certainly Peter Davidson (1837-1915), one of the prime movers of the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor.\(^{14}\)

I have not seen Davidson’s SY except for scans of the cover, preface, and first page of the text and annotations, all kindly provided by Philip Smith (9/17/2016), who, I believe, aptly describes Davidson’s production as having an “occult agenda.”


Mordell’s thesis regarding SY contains notions which are difficult to credit:

...the Sefer Yetzirah, as the earliest Hebrew grammar, contains...the fundamental rules of Hebrew orthography....

\(^{13}\) Papus’ rendering of eser sefirot belimah (a phrase which opens a series of statements in SY, chapter 1) is “The ten Sephiroth, excepting the ineffable.” It must be conceded that the meaning of belimah or beli mah is open to speculation. Gershom Scholem discussed some of the possible meanings in Origins of the Kabbalah (page 28):

According to some views, the obscure word belimah, which always accompanies the word sefirot, is simply a composite of beli mah—without anything, without actuality, ideal. However, judging from the literal meaning, it should be understood as signifying “closed,” that is, closed within itself.

Further, see Peter Hayman’s comments in “Some Observations of Sefer Yesira (i) Its Use of Scripture,” (Journal of Jewish Studies 352 ([1984]) concerning belimah, where he mentions its likely derivation from Job 26:7.

In her article, “Between Sefer Yezirah and Wisdom Literature” (in Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies, v. 6, no. 18 – Winter 2007, page 103), Ronit Meroz develops the idea that “the sefirot are themselves the belimah.”

\(^{14}\) Refer to Godwin, Chanel and Deveney, The Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor (York Beach: Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1995), in particular pages 22-32.
...according to the Sefer Yetzirah, there are ten double letters, and not only seven, as is believed by all commentators since Saadya.

In spite of the numerous works written on Hebrew orthography since the beginning of the tenth century, there is not one which may be considered as really based on the Hebrew [on which the SY is based].

Many more troubling statements could be quoted; however, I shall leap to Mordell’s conclusion:

Already Abraham Abulafia perceived that the Pythagorean number philosophy is identical with the Sefirot philosophy of the Sefer Yetzirah. The relation they bear to each other is variously explained. A. F. Thimus shares the view that the Pythagorean philosophy is an adaptation from the Sefer Yetzirah. Others hold that the author of Sefer Yetzirah borrowed his philosophy from Pythagoras and Plato. ... Would it be to [sic] bold to conclude that Sefer Yetzirah represents the genuine fragments of Philolaus?

Mordell develops his thesis further in a supplement, “A Solution of the Pythagorean Number Philosophy,” which is included in the Weiser reprint of The Origin of the Letters and Numerals.

Mordell put his English translation and the Hebrew of SY side by side, but his version is unlike any which I have ever seen, especially in chapter 1, paragraph 3, where Mordell’s translation reads, “The ten double letters are...” (the italics are mine). All other readings and translations put the number of double letters of the Hebrew alphabet at seven.15


Stenring refers to his own work as a “word-for-word translation from the Hebrew.” He used a number of SY texts to construct his version. Those parts of the text which Stenring considered “genuine” are printed in ordinary type; those parts which he considered “spurious” are printed in italics. Thus, with Stenring we find the first attempt—in English, at any rate—to separate the long version’s supposed additions from the short version’s presumed original text while presenting both. Stenring supplemented the text with a long section of notes concerning the language of SY, citing numerous alternative readings. He also constructed several charts and tables based on the information in SY.

Stenring’s work on SY seems careful and conscientious, but there are some disquieting statements here and there. A paragraph from the notes section serves well as a summary example:

The 231 Gates

Eighteen hundred years ago, when Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph reduced into writing the secret tradition of the Jews in the “Book of Formation,” he hesitated to unveil the greatest secret of the Kabala, the Arcanum of the Great Symbol, which had been handed down to him from his forefathers. For this reason he embodied it in a riddle (“S.Y.,” II. 4 and 5), which many ancient and modern philosophers have tried in vain to solve. Of all the different tabulations,

15 It is puzzling that, out of all the possible translations, David Meltzer chose Mordell’s quirky rendering to represent SY in The Secret Garden (1976). Alas, this is not the only doubtful aspect of Meltzer’s well-circulated anthology.
claiming to be the Great Arcanum of the Kabala, that we have examined, none is correct. The
token of the original table ONG and NGO was not to be found in any of them. We have
succeeded in solving this riddle. The true Kabalistic Symbol the Great Master Key to the
theoretical and practical Kabala will be found facing p. 24 of the present translation.
[The diagram faces page 21 in the Ktav edition.]

In his introduction to Stenring’s book, A. E. Waite diffuses Stenring’s claims somewhat:
They [those who consider Stenring’s diagram] will come at least across many curious
permutations and will be in agreement with myself that the elaborate Diagram is of
considerable interest, from whatever point of view it is approached, and however they may
interpret Mr Stenring’s statement that absolute knowledge of a single number is “impossible
for a human mind” (p. 37), unless it has opened every Gate of Understanding, i.e., has
acquired “an encyclopedic knowledge of all sciences.”

Waite’s introduction to Stenring is generally pretty good, though limited by his dependence
on Christian sources. He gives a fair account of SY: its background, editions, and content.
Stenring also includes The Thirty-two Paths of Wisdom, saying that his


tabulation of Paths and their titles will be given according to Comtesse Calomira de Cimara
(from her French translation of 1913), and the translation of the tract according to Waite and
Westcott.\textsuperscript{16}

Comment: Israel Regardie on The Thirty-two Paths of Wisdom:

It seems to me, after prolonged meditation, that the common attributions of these
Intelligences is [sic] altogether arbitrary and lacking in serious meaning.


Hall, Manly Palmer. The Secret Teachings of All Ages. An Encyclopedic Outline of Masonic,
Hermetic, Qabalistic and Rosicrucian Symbolical Philosophy (San Francisco: H. S. Crocker
Co., 1928; “Golden Anniversary Edition, Reduced Facsimile,” Los Angeles: The
Philosophical Research Society, 1978.)

(SY translation: pages 114-16)

Hall states that he used Kalisch’s translation as the “foundation” of his “interpretation” of
SY, but that “material from other authorities has been incorporated and many passages have
been rewritten to simplify the general theme.” He consulted a number of other versions of
SY, two of which have been discussed above: Westcott’s and Stenring’s. Hall relied heavily
on Western occult sources, some of which, such as the works of Mme. Blavatsky and Eliphas
Levi, are notoriously capricious.

Doreal, Dr. M[aurice]. Sepher Yetzirah. The Book of Creation. The Kabbalah Unveiled. A Verse
by Verse Analysis (Sedalia: Brotherhood of the White Temple, 1941.)

The second paragraph of Dr. M. Doreal’s foreword reads,

The “Sepher Yetzirah” or “Book of Creation” is usually traced back to the Sixth Century,
though it is much older, being, in fact, one of the earliest of the traditional teachings.
According to legend, it has existed since the beginning of the world; and it is a record and key
to that beginning. Adam was supposed to be its first author; and it was believed to be the record of the lost wisdom of the Pre-Adamic races.

\textsuperscript{16} Waite’s version of The Thirty-two Paths can be found in The Holy Kabbalah, pages 213-219.
Doreal’s typescript is illustrated by fold-out charts of *THE TWENTY-TWO LETTERS* and *THE EMANATION OF THE TWENTY-TWO LETTERS*, along with numerous diagrams through the text. His treatment betrays the influence of Mme. Blavatsky, Wynn Westcott, and S. L. M. Mathers.


My sincere thanks to Paty and the Special Collections staff at the University of California Santa Barbara Library for providing a photocopy of Dyer’s title page.

**Raskin, Saul.** *Kabbalah in Word and Image, with the Book of Creation and from the Zohar* (New York, Academy Photo Offset, Inc., 1952).

Russian-born artist Saul Raskin (1878-1966) produced a series of illustrated books on Jewish themes, for example, *Pirke Aboth, Passover Haggadah, the Book of Psalms, the Siddur, and Kabbalah*.

Raskin’s section in the over-sized *Kabbalah in Word and Image* on SY—with illustrations—appears on pages 5-11. SY is given in “its original Hebrew” followed by two translations, Yiddish and English—all in Raskin’s calligraphic lettering. A note appended to the English version reads,

> The translation into English is made from two Hebrew versions and also two quite different English translations; one by Wynn Westcott, the other by Knut Stenring.

With Raskin we come to the end of a cycle of fairly frequent productions of SY in English. Between *Kabbalah in Word and Image*... and the next SY translation reviewed here, that of *Work of the Chariot*, there is a lapse of nearly twenty years.
PART I B: TRANSLATIONS: 1971 - 2018

The more recent procession of SY translations—that of the last five decades—begins with a relatively obscure, homespun production:


The Work of the Chariot Trust (WC) version was made using all six known textural sources. Some of the versions contain considerable addenda whose language points to the Hasmonean period, circa 130 BCE, and later. The additional material was left out of the redaction the WC used as the basis for its translation.

(—from the Work of the Chariot website: *Sefer Yetzrah*).

WC’s version has been neither well known nor, until recently, generally available [see the web address shown above]. It is included here in part because it is the version of SY on which David Blumenthal (*Understanding Jewish Mysticism* [1978], pages 13-46) based his translation in no small way.

While Blumenthal made minor revisions and additions here and there, he by and large presented a virtual copy of Work of the Chariot’s translation, while saying, “The translation given here is my own, based upon the Hebrew texts in L. Goldschmidt, *Das Buch der Schöpfung* (Darmstadt: 1969), and *Sefer Yetsira*, anon. ed. (Jerusalem: 1964). I have also used the German translation of Goldschmidt; the English translation of K. Stenring...”

Blumenthal then refers to what must be Work of the Chariot’s edition as “an anonymous, uncopyrighted pamphlet which was sent to me through the mail,” making no mention of Work of the Chariot. My copy of Work of the Chariot’s SY shows “COPYRIGHT – 1971 / WORK OF THE CHARIOT, etc.” on the title page, though, apparently, not all of their editions of SY show this.

There is bound to be some concurrence among translations of the same text, but Blumenthal’s SY is the same as Work of the Chariot’s, word-for-word, through nearly all of the text. Blumenthal retained Work of the Chariot’s unique readings, e.g., “by border, and letter and number” (chapter 1, paragraph 1). Further, Blumenthal used Work of the Chariot’s format in the setting of lines and phrases.

Work of the Chariot’s translation is arresting, all but poetic, though many readings seem interpretive. A few notes follow the text; thereafter is a series of diagrams derived from

---

17 For this time period, books in which the translations of SY are interspersed into—often overwhelmed by—commentary are listed in Part III: COMMENTARIES ON SEFER YEZIRAH: TEXTS & STUDIES, § C. Sources in Print & Kindle: Commentaries by Recent Authors.

For example, Aryeh Kaplan’s edition of SY is listed in Part III because the bulk of the book is the Gra-Ari version of SY spread through Kaplan’s ranging 250+-page commentary. Appendix 1 of Kaplan’s book does, however, offer three unadorned versions of SY.

18 *Understanding Jewish Mysticism*, page 14.

19 My thanks to Miriam Caravella for informing me that her copy of Work of the Chariot’s SY “did not have any copyright or author listed.” (email—02/04/2012)
various chapters of SY. The 1971 edition includes a translation of “Shuo Kua (I Ching): A Discussion of the Trigrams.” Two more versions of SY follow, one in the traditional “square” Hebrew, the other in “the original Gezer or Sinatic Hebrew.” The diagrams are also rendered in these two scripts.

One of the notes explains the motive for the work:

All of the information given in the Book of Formation is here presented in visual form to facilitate meditation in the manner of the Tree of Perfection (Luria):

- a. each Sephirah may be meditated on individually
- b. the central Sephirot may be taken as a group
- c. all of the Sephirots may be taken as a group
- d. the lettered paths are the gates of release between the Sephirot, the Gates are in the Light of the Endless, and the specific letter is given in the Book of Formation.

Through the notes, the nature of various meditations is indicated by reference to the diagrams; lines from the Atharva Veda are offered for comparison with SY.

Work of the Chariot’s publication seems to be entirely for an immediate mystical purpose. There is no introduction, no history, no account of editions of SY, etc., and the sparse notes are not of the usual academic sort.

In 1971, Ithamar Gruenwald published the “Preliminary Critical Edition of Sefer Yezira” in Israel Oriental Studies, volume 1 (Tel Aviv University); of course, the texts are in Hebrew. In a follow-up article, “Some Critical Notes on the First Part of Sefer Yezira” (Revue des Etudes juives, CXXXII, no. 4, 1973), Gruenwald gives English translations and analyses of the first sixteen paragraphs of SY. The article is a bit frustrating in spots: some Hebrew words and quotes are not translated. This is, however, an article of great interest from a reliable scholarly source which touches on many crucial issues.


On the back cover of the paper edition, Joseph Campbell is quoted: “Origins is an interesting and scholarly introduction to the texts of the ancient Mediterranean.” Some may find Origins’ treatment of SY interesting, but it is difficult to see how anyone could find any scholarly value in it. The text is done up as free-form poetry and is neither introduced nor supported by notes. The authors were apparently attempting what has been called a “total translation” in which the authors work

as both poets & scholars, make use of all those “advances in translation technique, notation & sympathy” developed over the last few decades, from the methods of projective verse to those of etymological translation or of that attention to the recovery of the oral dimension of the poem…

(from the “Pre-face to Origins” by Jerome Rothenberg)

Whatever the aim, the “San Francisco Poet” style hardly seems suitable for SY, which is hard dogma in sober, enigmatic language.

Poetic format aside, the individual words chosen in this version are often awkward and affected. For example, Origins has “Spiritwind” for ruah (spirit), and “lawed” presumably for khaqaq (“engraved,” though if pointed differently it could mean “decreed” or “legislated”).

11
Origins’ brand of indulgence infects whole passages, making them stilted and vague. For SY chapter 1, paragraph 7, Origins (p. 59) has

Ten Sefirot made of Nothing
Their appearance is the look of lightning
Their disappearance: They have no end

Aryeh Kaplan (in Sefer Yetzirah: The Book of Creation, page 271—see below, Part III. C) offers the same passage (from the long version):

Ten Sefirot of Nothingness: Their vision is like the appearance of lightning, and their limit has no end.

Comment: David Biale, recounting Scholem’s view:
Translation of Kabbalistic texts is possible because the Kabbalists themselves considered their language a precise, technical vocabulary and not arbitrary and emotive poetry. The texts are not served well by poetic translations; they cry out for scientific philology. (—Gershom Scholem: Kabbalah & Counter-History, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979: page 89)

(anonymous). The Sepher Yetzirah (Bray: Guild Press, 1976.)
With a terse introduction and scant notes (“excluded from the body of the text to avoid any interference between the text and the reader”), this rendition of SY is slim but attractive—more a little work of art and trigger for meditation than a scholarly effort. The frontispiece shows the “Tree of the Sephiroth” from Robert Fludd’s Utruisque Cosmi (Oppenheimii: Aer Iohannis Theodori de Bry, Typis Hieronymi Galleri, 1617/1619), page 157.

Friedman, Irving. The Book of Creation (New York: Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1977.)
Friedman’s reason for translating SY was “to arouse further interest in this most ancient Kabbalistic work by rendering it as simply and accurately as possible.” Friedman was true to his intention. The clear translation is followed by observations of the text which analyze elements of the SY in a broad context of various ancient religions and philosophies. Internal analysis is developed in several short chapters.20

This translation has already been discussed in a rather unfortunate context: as stated, Blumenthal published a slightly revised and expanded version of Work of the Chariot’s translation. Unlike Work of the Chariot, Blumenthal offers extensive notes—some are helpful; some are bewildering. The notes are marred by Blumenthal’s glib, often condescending, style. He addresses his readers as though he (Blumenthal) were the all-wise and pithy professor and we (the readers) were restless college kids who needed to be constantly refocused and jollied into sticking with the material.

20 A certain type of purist might fault Friedman and others for choosing the word “creation” for yezirah. According to convention, “creation” is reserved for briah, and “formation” is applied to yezirah, even as “emanation” is used for azilut and “making” or “action” for asiah.

Heidrick’s stapled photocopy version is based on Kalisch and Knut Stenring, then “adapted to conform to the Golden Dawn correspondences in 1976.”

Within this valuable anthology, Bokser gives us the first eight paragraphs of SY; the translation is based on Gruenwald’s “Preliminary Critical Edition.”

In the midst of this well-considered collection is a translation of SY excerpts, “based upon an eclectic text.” The extracts included were “chosen with a view to making clear [SY’s] basic structure and leading ideas.” An introduction to the text appears on pages 27-29, the translation on pages 117-120. Of the 64 paragraphs established by Gruenwald, Alexander’s translation includes 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 12-19, 23, 25, 27-30, 37, 39, 40, 43, 45, 49, 53, 56-58, 61, and 64.

Hayman’s article offers a summary/analysis of SY, along with a translation of “the earliest manuscript of the Long Recension” and an appendix on “The Structure of the Sefer Yetsira.” This fine piece of work resides in the deep obscurity of a mid-eighties number of the unmilled periodical Shadow, which was not well circulated. This article/translation isn’t even listed in the bibliography to Hayman’s subsequent critical edition and translation of SY (Sefer Yesira [2004]—see below, pages 13-14).

Other articles by Peter Hayman (aka A. P. Hayman and A. Peter Hayman) on SY include


---

22 My sincere thanks to Stephan Pickering for calling my attention to Hayman’s article/translation (email—09/29/2012).
A most disappointing piece by David Meltzer, “A Reader’s Guide of Kabbalah,” appeared in Gnosis Magazine 3: KABBALAH: Exploring the roots of Mysticism (San Francisco: The Lumen Foundation, Fall/Winter 1986/7). Listed there is a rendition of SY which I have not seen. The notice reads

**Thompson, Scott** (translator and editor). *Sepher Yetzirah: Book of Creation.*

A critical edition consisting of a Hebrew-English interlinear translation with collated translations of six previous editions: Lenowitz, Friedman, Kalisch, Mordell, Stenring, and Westcott. (Available through the translator: c/o Valencia Books, 525 Valencia St., San Francisco, CA 94110. $15)

Alas, I sent off my fifteen bucks but never received Thompson’s SY.

**Aryeh Kaplan**’s *Sefer Yetzirah: The Book of Creation* is listed below in Part III. C because, even though it presents four translations of SY, the real bulk of the book is commentary.

Segments of SY appear in **Daniel C. Matt**’s anthology, *The Essential Kabbalah: The Heart and Soul of Jewish Mysticism* (San Francisco: Harper-SanFrancisco [a Division of HarperCollins Publishing, New York], 1995). On pages 75-76, Matt gives his translation of SY chapter 1 paragraphs 1-8; on page 108 there is a compilation of SY chapter 2, paragraphs 2 and 4-6, and chapter 6, paragraph 4. Helpful notes are given in the back of the book explaining the terminology of the passages translated.


The next entry on our list is in many regards the ultimate translation:


Hayman’s introduction discusses the text of SY and its treatment by both religious and academic commentators. Consideration of four pre-kabbalistic commentaries leads up to Hayman’s section, “The Earliest Recoverable Text of Sefer Yesira and the Three Recensions.” This earliest recoverable text “has been created [by Hayman] as a theoretical exercise in order to try to penetrate into the processes which led to the formation of the multitudinous texts of SY which have come down to us” (page 33). The synoptic critical edition and its translation follow specific manuscript versions: short, long, and Sa’adian, presented side by side, with extensive notes and commentary.

---

23 The commentaries of Shabbetai Donnolo, Sa’adiah Gaon, Dunash Ibn Tamim, and Judah ben Barzillai.

On these and other commentaries, see below, Part III: **COMMENTARIES ON SEFER YEZIRAH: TEXTS & STUDIES.**

24 The primary MSS Hayman translates are Parma 2784,14, DeRossi 1390 fols. 36b-38b (short); Vatican Library (Cat. Assemani) 299(8), fols. 66a-71b (long); The Genizah Scroll, Cambridge University Library, Taylor-Schechter K21/56 + Glass 32/5 + Glass 12/813 (Sa’adian). These are supplemented by numerous others.
Hayman’s Sefer Yesira... is the first of a proposed three-volume series: This first book “is concerned solely with the text—with the manuscripts, the recensions, the individual readings within the paragraphs” (page v); the second, a collection of Hayman’s papers on SY; and the third, “a commentary on the content of the book” (page v).


TGS reprints brings you a large 14 point font print edition of five complete translations of the Sefer Yetzirah in one volume. The Book of Creation, if authored by Abraham himself, would predate the Bible. This book is the beginning material for mystical Judaism, the Kaballah, and some factions of mystical Christianity. The Sefer Yetzirah is a must for any serious Biblical student and for open minded truthseekers. Even naysayers will have to admit, the Book of Creation is the source of many mystical ideas found in Astrology, Tarot, etc....

This edition includes the translations of Isidor Kalisch, Saadia ben Joseph, G. Scholem, Bill Heidrick, Wm. Wynn Westcott, and Abraham Father of Nations—three of which we can immediately account for from our list above: Kalisch, Westcott, and Heidrick.

Since I have seen only excerpts posted online, I cannot definitely identify the translations ascribed to G. Scholem, Saadia ben Joseph, or Abraham Father of Nations, though I strongly suspect that these would also be found among the translations on our list if the citations given were accurate or more complete. The translation included in the excerpt given at the Hidden Mysteries website is Aryeh Kaplan’s, which is, as it is so frequently, reproduced without attribution.

Another reprint “collection” is Sepher Yetzirah: The Book of Creation, Two Versions, Explaining Jewish Mystical Philosophy and the Cabala (San Diego: The Book Tree, 2006) which reproduces the Kalisch and Stenring translations from 1877 and 1923, respectively.


Hoffman’s “accessible entrée into the world of Kabbalah” (—back cover) begins with SY.

“This excerpt from the Sefer Yetzirah presents chapter 1 in its entirety, highlighting concepts in the five chapters that follow.” (—page 4)


This work describes itself as “New Translations with an Introduction into the Cosmology of the Kabbalah.” The introduction and translations have a “second-language” quality about them (for example, the word reflex is repeatedly used where reflect is obviously meant).

The introduction dresses its description of SY’s cosmology with comments from the Zohar.

---

See above, page 13, for articles which are sure to be included in such a collection.

The book presents Hebrew and English (on facing pages) of the following SY versions:

- 1562 Short Version
- 1562 Long Version
- 1723 Ari Version
- 1806 Short Version
- 1831 Ari Version
- 1862 Ari Version
- 1874 Ari Version

Details on the specific sources are conspicuously—and frustratingly—absent. On the basis of the dates given by Collé and Collé, we might speculate that

- the 1562 versions were published in Mantua by Yaakov ben Naftali Gazolo
- the 1723 was likely published in Constantinople by Yonah be Yaakov and Yeshiah Ashkenazi
- the 1806 was published in Grodno, edited by Menahem Mendel of Sklav
- the 1831 was published in Salonica
- the 1862 might be the version from the edition of Benyamin HaLevi’s *Hemed Elohim* published in Livorno, which contains a vocalized text of the Ari-Gra version
- the 1874 was published in Jerusalem, with GRA commentary


Epstein is a scholar specializing in Abraham ibn Ezra: Epstein has published annotated translations of ibn Ezra’s *Beginning of Wisdom* (ARKAT Publications, 1998) and *Book of Nativities and Revolutions* (ARKAT Publications, 2008). She is also an instructor of astrology: find her website, ASTROLOGY WITH MEIRA, at [bear-star.com](http://bear-star.com).

Epstein has attempted an “all-in-one” introductory edition of SY, choosing—as Kaplan did—the GRA version for her translation. From the preface:

> [M]y goal is to make this text accessible on a simple, primary introductory level, while highlighting fundamental philosophical issues that underly this work. For those who would like to try reading the Hebrew, I have provided English transliteration. ...

> My commentaries reflect and combine the fields of interest that are close to my heart—ancient Jewish mysticism, Pre-Socratic Greek philosophy and Classical Astrology.

Given that Epstein gives “special attention to the underlying philosophical origins” as well as “ancient Jewish mysticism, cosmology and astrology,” and her claim of “highlighting fundamental philosophical issues that underly this work [SY],” the first sentence of her introduction (which also appears on the back cover) is disconcerting:

> *Sefer Yetzirah* (SY) is one of the oldest Jewish mystical-magical texts, which inspired Jewish, as well as Christian mystics through the centuries. (—page 5)

True, SY inspired Jewish and Christian mystics through the ages. I confess that my own description of SY as “the oldest known speculative treatise in Hebrew” is not very informative. However, to designate SY a “mystical-magical text” misses the determination of the best scholarship on the work: We do not—probably cannot—know the original intent of SY. Is it philosophical, mystical, magical, metaphysical, orthographic? We can only know how it was interpreted through its numerous commentaries.
PART II: ACADEMIC STUDIES ON SEFER YEZIRAH
IN ROUGHLY CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

- Hebrew translation from the German by M. Rabinsohn: *Ha-Kabbalah o ha-Philosophia ha-Datit shel ha-Yehudim.* Vilna: 1909.

In *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (Yale University Press, 1988: p. 8), Moshe Idel notes: The first major work devoted to a detailed description of mainly Zoharic Kabbalah and making use of historical, philological, comparative, and conceptual perspectives was Adolphe Franck’s *La Kabbale* ... Franck’s presentation contributed more to the knowledge of Kabbalah in modern Europe than did any other work prior to the studies of Scholem.

The publication data above indicate that Franck’s book has had a wide circulation, and one would rightly infer that it has had a great influence. Chapters 2 and 4 in particular deal with SY. While its appearance preceded much scholarship and many discoveries, Franck’s *Kabbalah* is still considered a worthy survey and analysis of SY and the Zohar. Franck’s treatment of SY is rational: insightful, even if skeptical. His synopsis is straightforward, supported by quotes from the text itself and by passages from Judah Halevi’s commentary on SY. But now, having been made aware by more recent scholars of Franck’s errors, we are inclined to approach this book more to see how far Franck was able to get than to pursue it as a source of reliable information.

Comments:

Gershom Scholem:
These theories in the form in which they have been presented until now—for example, in the widely read book of Adolphe Franck—no longer merit serious scholarly discussion. (Origins of the Kabbalah, p. 6)

Isaiah Tishby:
Franck’s book, particularly in the way it expounds kabalistic ideas, contains a great deal of material that is still of value, although there are a considerable number of mistakes in it. (Wisdom of the Zohar, p. 48)

Moshe Idel:
The sources of important concepts of Kabbalah, according to Franck, were Chaldean and Persian, that is Zoroastrian. Notwithstanding this basic assumption on Franck’s part—which was rejected by subsequent research—he regarded Kabbalah as a uniquely important Jewish phenomenon.... This diagnosis of the role of Kabbalah is strikingly similar to Scholem’s famous perception of the role of Kabbalah as a vital component of Judaism. (Kabbalah: New Perspectives, p. 8)

*The Holy Kabbalah* incorporates


Waite discusses SY at some length in the following sections of *The Holy Kabbalah*:

1. Book II, § I: “Date of the Book of Formation”
2. Book III, § II: “The Book of Formation”

In the first section, Waite gives a survey of the issues concerning fixing a date to SY. He defers to his own introduction to Stenring’s translation of SY to provide bibliographic details, yet in the second section he lists editions and translations. In the second section Waite summarizes the text well enough but again he defers to his introduction to Stenring to provide a conclusion as to the value of SY. The third section surveys commentaries on SY, giving the most attention to Saadia’s commentary and, in particular, its connections—or lack of connections—with later Zoharic Kabbalah. Waite then moves into a discussion of Azriel, then, briefly, Nahmanides and pseudo-Eliezer (of Worms). He concludes with a short list of other commentators.

Waite includes a translation of *The Thirty-two Paths of Wisdom* and a summary of *The Fifty Gates of Understanding* (pages 213-219).

Waite is something of a disappointment to more recent scholars—a disappointment rather than a total write-off—because he exhibited good intuitions but was led astray by the faulty Latin and French translations available to him.

**Comment:**

Scholom:

[Waite’s] work ... is distinguished by a real insight into the world of Kabbalism; it is all the more regrettable that it is marred by an uncritical attitude toward facts of history and philology... (*Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism,* p. 212)


---

We are finally brought to Gershom Scholem, who, in his several studies, presents SY more reliably than any of the writers discussed thus far in PART 2. Scholem was a deep and sympathetic scholar, but one who would not suffer inaccuracy or lubrication. More recent scholars find fault with Scholem's being long on historiography while short on phenomenology—a criticism always accompanied by acknowledgement of the debt owed Scholem's work.

Along with the items listed here, the reader may also pursue the numerous references to SY in Scholem's Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (Jerusalem: Schocken Publishing House, 1941; reprinted frequently, New York: Schocken Books).


On pages 23-30, Scholem describes SY and its historical background. He gives a synopsis of its contents with mention of some general interpretations of the book. He then discusses the problems of dating SY, concluding that it is from the 3rd to 6th century. He enumerates the commentaries on SY and concludes with a summary of the printed editions and translations of the text.


The English edition is an expansion of the Hebrew work, Reshith ha-Qabbalah (Jerusalem: 1948), “more than double its size”; it was updated to include additional research (of Scholem’s) since 1962 (when a revised version was published in German: Ursprung und Anfange der Kabbala, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.) drawn from Scholem’s own special interleaved volume, into which he entered notes, queries, corrections, and additions. [French translation: Les origins de la Kabbale, Paris: 1966.]

In the longest section on SY in Origins of the Kabbalah (pages 24-35), Scholem discusses the dating of SY, then summarizes the fundamental concepts with attention to the language used (including some observations on the term beli mah). There follows a brief survey of the commentaries on SY.

Elsewhere, Scholem discusses SY’s role in the formation of Kabbalah (pages 46-8), its influence on the German Hasidim (pages 97-8), its development as a manual for creating a golem (pages 102-3), and its links with merkabah mysticism (pages 117-8). He notes the commentaries on SY of Joseph ben Shalom (p. 224), Isaac the Blind (pages 257-8), and Nahmanides (pages 388-389).


Chapter 5. The Idea of the Golem

Note CHAPTER 2 in Golem, “Sefer Yezirah,” where Idel begins his discussion of this text with the description, “More than any other text of ancient Jewish mysticism, Sefer Yezirah presented an elaborate cosmology which is grounded in the assumption that combinations of letters are both the technique to create the world and the material for its creation.” (—p. 9)


Within Moshe Idel’s ambitious Absorbing Perfections: Kabbalah and Interpretation (New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 2002), there are several discussions of SY, as in (page 34ff) § SEFER YEZIRAH AND LINGUISTIC CREATIONAL PROCESSES and the subsequent sections through the conclusion of CHAPTER 1, “The World-Absorbing Text,” and elsewhere.


Kann also “explores the interrelationships between” the Zohar and the fiction of S. Y. Agnon, and Abraham Abulafia’s use of language and the poetry of Yona Wallach.

Marla Segol’s book, Word and Image in Medieval Kabbalah: The Texts, Commentaries, and Diagrams of the Sefer Yetsirah (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012) fulfills the promise of its title in surveying the various recensions of SY, their dating and provenance, the commentaries on them, and—peculiar to Segol’s study—the diagrams which accompany various texts. One of Segol’s main points is that, through analyzing the dispositions of the early commentaries, one must conclude that, for the medieval mystics utilizing SY, magic and religion were not distinct.

---

8 The diagrams which adorn kabbalistic texts and commentaries have not, for the most part, been the focus of study. Some exceptions are

- Busi, Giulio. Qabbalah Viisiva. Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 2005. This work treats well over 100 kabbalistic diagrams from Italian manuscript collections.

Note that none of these works is in English.
In the introduction to “Sefer Yesirah” and Its Contexts: Other Jewish Voices [DIVINATIONS: READING LATE ANCIENT RELIGION] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018) Tzahi Weiss states,

My main goal in this book is to demonstrate that the evolution of Sefer Yeṣirah and its reception have something in common: they point us to an alternative picture of the history of Jewish thought in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. I claim that Sefer Yeṣirah is a rare surviving Jewish treatise written and edited around the seventh century by Jews who were familiar with Syriac Christianity and were far from the main circles of rabbinic learning.  

While advancing some of his own conclusions, even here, in the most recent work given notice, Weiss evocatively expresses the problems of establishing an author, a time, and a place for SY while tracking its shift from being interpreted as a philosophic text to being construed as “a mystical, mythical, and magical treatise.”

Weiss includes Hayman’s translation of the “long version” facing the Hebrew text.

A SELECTION OF ARTICLES:


---

29 “Sefer Yesirah” and Its Contexts,” page 2. See Weiss’ comments quoted above, page 2.
6, number 18 – ESSAYS IN HONOR OF MOSHE IDEL (Cluj: University of Cluj-Napoca, Winter 2007), pages 101-142—online at http://www.jsri.ro/


Part III: Commentaries on Sefer Yezirah: Texts & Studies

In the matter of commentaries on SY (in English) we come up a bit short, especially if we limit ourselves to published material. With the addition of a handful of dissertations, our list of sources becomes a bit more respectable.


Other references to the early SY commentaries:

- Piergabriele Mancuso’s introduction treats the commentaries of Saadia, Ibn Tamim, and Donnolo, in Shabbatai Donnolo’s SEFER HAKHMONI (discussed below – 10th cent.)
- Chapter 3 of Mark Sender’s EMERGENCE OF PROVENÇAL KABBALAH summarizes the commentaries of Saadia, Ibn Tamim, Donnolo, Halevi, and Judah ben Barzillai.

A. Sources in Print: Pre-Kabbalistic Commentaries

The first book-length study to be published in English which deals with a commentary on SY is The Universe of Shabbatai Donnolo by Andrew Sharf (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1976), which is a study of Donnolo’s Sefer Hakmoni, “one of the oldest commentaries on SY and the first Neoplatonic philosophical text written in Hebrew” (Mancuso, page 8). Donnolo was a tenth-century doctor whose medical tracts on herbal prescriptions came to be overshadowed by his cosmological writings, in particular Sefer Hakmoni. Donnolo brought together Jewish and non-Jewish ideas about astronomy and astrology, but fell short of creating a unified, organized system.

Donnolo’s commentary on SY has been published as Shabbatai Donnolo’s SEFER HAKHMONI: Introduction, Critical Text, and Annotated English Translation, by Piergabriele Mancuso (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010). Mancuso’s introduction offers a useful summary of SY recensions and a comparison of the earliest commentaries, namely those of Sa’adiah Gaon, Dunash ibn Tamim, and Donnolo.

Further on Donnolo’s commentary, see Elliot R. Wolfson, “The Theosophy of Shabbetai Donnolo, with Special Emphasis on the Doctrine of Sefirot in His Sefer Hakmoni,” in Jewish History, vol. 6, nos. 1-2 (Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1992); and Joseph Dan, “Medieval

Sa’adia Gaon’s commentary on SY, _Tafsîr Kitâb al-mubâdi_, referred to so often, has still not been published in English.\(^3\) The promising but somewhat misleading title, _Rabbi Saadia Gaon’s Commentary on the Book of Creation_, annotated and translated by Michael Linetsky (Northvale: Jason Aronson Inc., 2002) offers a translation of Saadia’s commentary on _Genesis_ (_PERUSHE RAV SE’ADYA GA’ON LI-VE-RESHIT: Bereshith to Vayetze_).


Sa’adiah’s most notable work, _The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs_ (Arabic: _Kitâb al-Amânât wal-Tiqâdât_ or, in the Hebrew translation of Samuel Ibn Tibbon, _Sefer ha’-Emûnôt ve-ha-Deôt_) has been translated a couple of times:


\(^3\) Ithamar Gruenwald writes, “The two oldest commentaries of _Sefer Yezirah_ are those of Yitzhak Ha-Yisra’eli (died ca. 952) and Sa’ada Ga’on (died 942). Sa’adya had a unique text of _Sefer Yezirah_, which is different from both, respectively, the Short and the Long Versions of the book. See my ‘A Preliminary Critical Edition of SY’ in: _Israel Oriental Studies_ Vol. I (1971). These are not Kabbalistic commentaries in the strict sense of the term, but relevant to the study of Kabbalah.” (email of 01/28/2013)

\(^3\) At the same site there was another page, “SEFER YETZIRAH Bibliography” compiled by Scott Thompson, at [http://www.wbenjamin.org/biblio_yetzirah.html](http://www.wbenjamin.org/biblio_yetzirah.html) (also DEFUNCT), which contained a detailed list of commentaries on _SY_, commencing with Isaac ben Solomon Israeli in the tenth century and concluding with Aryeh Kaplan in the twentieth. It covered to 1995.
The SY commentaries of Donnolo and Sa’adiah are discussed in “Magical Letters, Mystical Planets: Magic, Theosophy, and Astrology in the Sefer Yetsirah and two of its Tenth-century Commentaries” by Marla Segol, in Societas Magica Newsletter, Issue 21 (Spring 2009), online at http://www.societasmagica.org/.

Judah Halevi (c. 1075–1141) included a commentary on SY in his renowned Kuzari: Chapter 4, § 25. The Kuzari has been translated a number of times, but some editions do not include the SY section (for example, Isaak Heinemann’s translation in Three Jewish Philosophers, mentioned above). Translations which include the SY commentary are


Further on Halevi, see


“The Sefer Yetzira,” which is the title of Chapter 4 in Joseph Dan’s ‘Unique Cherub’ Circle (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), begins

The literature of the Unique Cherub circle is devoted, almost exclusively, to the interpretation of Sefer Yetzira. Although we do not understand the main aspects of the circle’s pseudepigraphical framework, its dependence on Sefer Yetzira—without doubt the source of its mystical discourse—is clear and obvious.

Dan points out (p. 37) that SY served as the main source of mystical speculation for Sefer ha-Bahir,32 the Iyyun circle,33 the Provence school as headed by Rabbi Isaac the Blind, and the Ashkenazi Hasidim.34

Dan’s Chapter 12 discusses “The Commentaries on the Sefer Yetzira by Elhanan ben Yakar.”

A section in the midst of Ashkenazi Hasid Eleazar of Worms’ (1176-1238) Sodei Razaya (SECRETS OF RAZIEL) comprises a Perush al Sefer Yetzirah, that is, an “Interpretation of (or Commentary on) the Book of Formation,” which contains passages, purportedly, on how to compose a golem.35 See pages 120-137 in Sodei Razaya: Perirush al Sefer Yetzirah / Secrets of Raziel – Commentary on the Book of Formation, translated by Abraham Broide, integral edition in English ([n.p.]: David Smith, LLC, 2016).

34 For references on the Ashkenazi Hasidim, see the source list in my “Notes on the Study of Early Kabbalah in English,” §5, Hasidei Ashkenaz.

In “Cosmology and Color Symbolism in R. Eleazar of Worms,”36 Natasha Esther Zabolotnaya writes,

For the present context, it is of particular importance to stress that the textual contents of Sefer Yesirah to a large degree can be seen as an underlying structural basis for the cosmological views of R. Eleazar. To put it metaphorically, Sefer Yesirah weaves for him a canvas, and he embroiders on it a pattern of his 73 Gates of Wisdom, his methods of exegesis. As has been noted so many times, R. Eleazar belongs to the commentary tradition that organically absorbed and balanced rationalistic and proto-kabbalistic approaches to this program source of the early Jewish mysticism, namely the philosophical interpretation of Saadya al-Fayumi [= Sa’adiah Gaon], the theosophic commentary of Shabbetai Donollo, and the extensive study of Judah ben Barzilai of Barcelona which aimed to reconcile original perception of the anonymous Sefer Yesirah with rabbinc-midrashic sources.

Note Klaus Herrmann’s article, “An Unknown Commentary on the Book of Creation (Sefer Yezi rah) from the Cairo Genizah and Its Re-Creation among the Haside Ashkenaz,” in Creation and Re-Creation in Jewish Thought [Festschrift in Honor of Joseph Dan on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday], edited by Rachel Elior and Peter Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), pages 103-112.

B. Dissertations & Sources in Print: Kabbalistic Commentaries

R. Isaac the Blind of Provence (d. 1235) wrote “the first systematic treatise of Kabbalah,” namely his Commentary on SEFER YEZIRAH. This commentary is fully analyzed and translated by Mark Brian Sendor in The Emergence of Provençal Kabbalah: Rabbi Isaac the Blind’s Commentary on Sefer Yezi rah, Volumes I & II (Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge: Harvard University, 1994). Volume I is an in-depth discussion of Rabbi Isaac the Blind’s commentary on SY and its milieu; Volume II is an annotated translation of the text.37 Sendor also offers a neat summary of commentaries on SY in his third chapter, “The Reception of Sefer Yezi rah,” discussing Saadia, Dunash Ibn Tamim, Shabbetai Donnolo, Judah Halevi, and Judah ben Barzillai al-Barceloni.


In Mystical Union, Individuality, and Individuation in Provençal and Catalonian Kabbalah (Ph.D. dissertation, New York: New York University, 2001), Yechiel Shalom Goldberg analyzes key passages from R. Isaac the Blind’s Commentary on Sefer Yezi rah, as

---


37 Sendor’s Volume Two can be viewed online at http://www.ma.huji.ac.il/~kazhdan/Shneider/Sendor,MarkBrian.Rabbi.Isaac.the.Blind.onSY.ch.1-2.pdf
well as passages from the commentary of Azriel of Gerona. Refer to Goldberg’s chapter 6, “Azriel of Gerona: A Phenomenology of Individuality,” pages 442-546.

Azriel of Gerona [1167-1238]: Commentary on the Ten Sefirot, Footnotes, Preface and Translation from the Hebrew by Josef Blaha (Praha: Josef Blaha, 2015) presents the work of one of the most important early kabbalists. With Ezra ben Solomon, Azriel founded the Gerona circle, the most prolific group of kabbalists before the Zahar. Other prominent members of this circle were Nahmanides (Moses ben Nahman) and Jacob ben Sheshet.


Influenced by previous writings on SY, in particular Eleazar of Worms’ Sodei Razaya, § Perush al Sefer Yetzirah, “prophetic” kabbalist Abraham Abulafia (1240-c.1291) wrote three commentaries on SY: Otzar Eden Ganuz (1286), Gan Na’ul (1289), and an untitled commentary. The first two have been put into English:

- Otzar Eden Ganuz – Concealed Treasure of Eden, in four volumes (i.e., Tome 1 of 4, Tome 2 of 4, etc.), translated by Alexandru Munteanu ([n.p.]: David Smith, LLC, 2016).
- Gan Naoul – Locked Garden, edited by Fabrizio Del Tin ([n.p.]: eUniversity.pub, 2018).38

The four volumes of Otzar Eden Ganuz offer more than the commentary on SY with which the text begins (in the first ten sections), for Abulafia adds in discussions of all sorts of topics: the sefirot, letters and names and their permutations, aspects of the soul, messiah, lunar astrology, bits of kabbalah maasit, and accounts of his own life.

Harvey Hames writes,

In his Otzar Eden Ganuz (Treasure of a Hidden Garden), written in Messina in 1285-86, Abulafia mentioned that ‘When I was thirty-one years old, in Barcelona, I was awakened by God from my slumber, and I studied Sefer Yetzirah with its commentaries...’. This period of intense study in Barcelona can be dated to the early 1270’s and provided the impetus for Abulafia’s Kabbalistic writings. Abulafia listed twelve commentaries that he had studied, some of them philosophical in nature, such as those of Sa’adiah Gaon and Dunash ibn Tamim, and others Kabbalistical, such as those of Ezra, Azriel, Nahmanides, and his own teacher Baruch Togarmi. About the latter’s commentary, Abulafia wrote: ‘And my Rabbi and teacher, R. Baruch, his whole commentary [to Sefer Yetzirah] is all numerology, acrostics, letter combinations and conversions’.39

With Haye ha-Olam ha-Ba (Life in the World to Come—1280), and “Abulafia’s great systematic manuals”40, ’Imrei Shefer (Words of Beauty—1291) and Or ha-Shekel (Light of the Intellect—1282), Otzar Eden Ganuz is one of the principal works cited in the major Abulafia studies of Moshe Idol and Elliot R. Wolfson.

An anonymous follower of Abulafia described his unnamed mentor’s techniques within a commentary on SY of sorts called Shaare Tzedek (Gates of Justice—1295), which is often

erroneously attributed to Rabbi Shem Tov Sefardi de Leon due to notations in some manuscripts. Two of the four extant manuscripts of this work are unusual in that, along with giving details on methods to achieve prophetic experience, they offer autobiographical information.

This brief work has been put into English: Shaarei Tzedek – Gates of Righteousness, by Shem Tov Sefardi, translated by Yaron Ever Hadani (Monfalcone: Providence University, 2006).

Gershom Scholem gives the nine-page autobiographical excerpt from Shaare Tzedek (in English) as the conclusion to his “Fourth Lecture” on Abulafia in Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (Jerusalem: Schocken Publishing House, 1941), pp. 147-155.44

Schlomo Blickstein’s Between Philosophy and Mysticism: A Study of the Philosophical-Qabbalistic Writings of Joseph Gikatilla (1248-c.1322) (Ph.D. dissertation, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1983) treats the philosophical-kabbalistic period in Gikatilla’s development, concentrating on his Ginnat ’Egoz, which is fundamentally a commentary on SY. This text stands in contrast with Sha’are Orah, GATES OF LIGHT, which Gikatilla—who was a student of Abulafia—produced in his later theosophical-kabbalistic period.

Another of Joseph Gikatilla’s works, Sefer ha-Niqqud, also amounts, in part, to a commentary on SY. This text is available in English through a project under the general editorship of Giulio Busi, The Kabbalistic Library of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Volume 4: Yosef Gikatilla: The Book of Punctuation – Flavius Mithridates’ Latin Translation, the Hebrew Text, and an English Version, edited with introduction and notes by Annett Martini (Torino: Nino Aragno Editore, 2010). Sefer ha-Niqqud, like Ginnat ’Egoz, is among Gikatilla’s early philosophical-kabbalistic works. It concerns the Hebrew vowels as “the guarantors of motion and thus the mainspring of the process of creation.” Note in particular Martini’s analysis in § Reception of the Sefer Yesirah Within the Sefer ha-Niqqud, pages 83-97.


Samuel Ibn Matut lived in Guadalajara, Spain, where, in 1370, he authored Mašōbēb Natībōt, a Hebrew work incorporating a commentary on Sefer Yesira (= ‘The Book of Creation’), in which he harmonizes Graeco-Arabic philosophy with Jewish mysticism, ‘Kabbalah.’ In his view, these two disciplines compliment (sic) each other both in man’s quest for knowledge of the true nature of reality, as well as in man’s resultant connection to divinity.” (page xii)

Volume Two (Part D) of Sandman’s dissertation contains the annotated English translation of two recensions of the running commentary on SY.


44 Scholem’s translation of the autobiographical portion of Shaare Tzedek has been reproduced many times, e.g.,

quotes from the anonymous neo-Pythagorean Sefer Yesirah, which probably dates from the late Tannaitic or early Amoraic period. This text, which served as the literary basis for his notion of linguistic cosmogony, is interpreted by Shem Tob according to the letter-mysticism of the Commentary on “Sefer Yesirah” written by Isaac the Blind (Sagi-Nahor) (—p. 23)

In the commentary, Shem Tob quotes from a range of kabbalistic writings (for example, Sefer Ha-Bahir, Nahmanides, Sefer ha-Zohar, writings from the Iyyun circle), showing his “predilection for the thirteenth century Spanish kabbalah” (—Ariel, p. 20).

16th cent. The ten brief chapters of the first treatise (of thirty-two) in Moses Cordovero’s voluminous Pardes Rimmonim (ORCHARD OF POMEGRANATES) comprise a commentary on SY titled “Ten and Not Nine.” Cordovero immediately establishes the number of sefirot as ten and the idea of their being emanated beli mah (OUT OF NOTHING, or WITHOUT SUBSTANCE). He goes on to explain SY according to the doctrines of Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai, that is, according to doctrines expressed in various sections of the Zohar. Cordovero returns to SY in the twelfth treatise of Pardes Rimmonim, named “Paths,” that is, the Thirty-Two Paths of Wisdom. Here, Cordovero draws on the SY commentary in Sefer ha-Qanah, which Cordovero attributes to Joseph ben Shalom Ashkenazi (called by Cordovero Yosef ha-Arokh).42

Find Cordovero’s “Ten and Not Nine” in Pardes Rimmonim: Orchard of Pomegranates, Parts 1-4, translated by Elyakim Getz (Monfalcone: Providence University, 2007), pages 3-49; and “Paths” in Pardes Rimmonim: Orchard of Pomegranates, Parts 9-12, translated by Elyakim Getz (n.p. [Belize City]: Providence University, 2010), pages 101-137.43

A commentary attributed to “Chayim Vital,” Sefer Yetzirah – Book of Formation, has been translated by Yair Alon ([n.p.]: David Smith, LLC, 2016). After noting the four versions of SY (“short, long, Saadia, and Gra”), the preface by Baal Even states

In the 16th century, the Ari (Isaac Luria) redacted the text (Short Version) to harmonize it with the Zohar, and then in the 18th century, the Gra (Eliyahu, the Gaon of Vilna) further redacted this, now called the Gra Version.

With the Lurianic commentaries, this edition became perhaps the longest and most complete, giving new glimpses into this ancient holy text.

The title page of the text-with-commentary reads

Book of Formation / Attributed to our Forefather Abraham – may the Peace be with him / According to the version of our Master and Rabbi, the Arizal / With explanations of our teacher and our Rabbi, the great light, The holy Gaon and divine kabbalist, Rabbi Chaim Vital of blessed memory / published for the first time out of an unique manuscript in the world

SY proper is dispersed through the pages of lengthy commentary. Two noticeable features of the commentary are the numerous references to the Zohar and the frequent mention of the kabbalistic parzufim, in particular Zeir Anpin, through whose realm the powers described are revealed.

In his lecture, Sefer Yetzirah: The BeGeD KaPoReT of Chap. 4 (CASSETTE TAPE – Chicago: Yeshivat Benei N’vi’im, 1994), Ariel Bar Tzadok identifies this commentary as being part of the Ktavim Chadashim l’Rabbi Chaim Vital (NEW WRITINGS OF HAYYIM VITAL), which were

42 Kaplan attributes the commentary that Cordovero cites to Abraham ben David of Posquières, Sefer Yetzirah, page 334.
43 Individual treatises (1 through 12) of Pardes Rimmonim, edited by Fabrizio Del Tin, were published in 2018 as separate volumes by eUniversity.pub., a “document management system and collaboration tool.”
Bar Tzadok’s lecture consists of his reading the Hebrew text of SY; CHAPTER 4 and Vital’s commentary sentence by sentence, then translating these into English. Indeed, his translation of the text is generally clearer than that of Yair Alon. Generously intermixed are Bar Tzadok’s further explanations, which are, in the main, edifying.

The commentary of Gaon of Vilna (Elijah ben Solomon Zalman) on SY is discussed in several places:


### C. Sources in Print & Kindle: Commentaries by Recent Authors


Kaplan’s SY is one of the most extensive of the works reviewed in this paper. We are given translations of four recensions: the short and long versions, the Saadia version, and the Gra version—or Gra-Ari version—being the edition produced by Rabbi Eliahu, Gaon of Vilna (GRA, from the initials of Gaon Rabbi Eliahu) according to the text of SY “refined” by Rabbi Isaac Luria (called the ARI, the Lion, from the initials of Eloki Rabbi Isaac, DIVINE RABBI ISAAC). It is the Gra-Ari version on which Kaplan bases his extensive commentary,45 chosen

---

44 The two principle portions of Hayyim Vital’s *Kabbalat-Chadashim* are a commentary on and re-presentation of *Brit Menucha* (COVENANT OF REST) and the suppressed fourth part of *Sha’arei Kedusha* (GATES OF HOLINESS). These sections have been published in English: *Kabbalat-Chadashim* / New Writings: Brit Menucha – COVENANT OF REST / Shaarei Kedusha – GATES OF HOLINESS, translated by Yaron Ever Hadani and Eliyakim Getz (Monfalcone: Providence University, 2006).


—Rabbi Eliyahu Shear of Chessed Ve’Emet,


“Not all of Kaplan’s mathematical insights are original. He drew some of them from a little-known, unpublished commentary to SY, Even Shoham, written by Isaac Ibn Sayyah, who worked in Jerusalem and Damascus early in the 16th century, shortly before the Ari....”

because it is the most consonant with what Kaplan considers to be the kabbalah, namely, Lurianic kabbalah.46

Kaplan offers a magnificent survey of commentaries and interpretations of SY, with all sources fully noted. The book provides a wealth of information and insight into the practical and speculative workings upon SY as no other book reviewed in this paper does. Here, we find The Thirty-two Paths of Wisdom, the 221 Gates according to Eleazar of Worms, the 231 Gates according to later Kabbalists, plus a thorough list of editions, translations and commentaries.47


Glotzer’s book gives SY one paragraph at a time (in English and Hebrew), each followed by an extended commentary. Glotzer freely draws from rabbinic sources ranging from Saadia to Moses Cordovero, Hayyim Vital, and the Gaon of Vilna. This means that the commentary stays within the bounds of traditional Jewish kabbalah, even if straying from the explicit contents of SY.

Glotzer’s translation and extended commentary are preceded by a brief introduction to kabbalah and followed by eight appendices covering particular points of doctrine related to SY, even if only by tradition: the sefirot in the shape of a man, the numerical values of the Hebrew letters, names of God, the thirty-two paths according to Raivad48, the soul and the five faces, and two versions of the 231 gates.

Overshadowed by Kaplan’s SY, which has been reprinted several times, Glotzer’s Fundamentals has not received the attention that it deserves.

Fisdel, Steven Practice of Kabbalah: Meditation in Judaism (Northvale: Jason Aronson Inc., 1996).

In the midst of this “how-to” book, one finds SY chapter 1, paragraphs 1-6 and 8, Hebrew and English, in a chapter entitled, “The Sefirot of the Formless: Imprinting as the Foundation of Creation.” From these SY passages, various meditations are derived: on the names of God listed in SY’s initial segment; on the interrelationship of the letter families (i.e., mothers, doubles, and simples) as introduced in SY’s second segment.


SY, “attributed to Avraham Avinu,” is the focus of CHAPTER 5 in this ranging anthology. After a two-page introduction, Finkel offers “Selections from Sefer Yetzirah with

46 Note the unpublished paper by Gary M. Jaron, “Kaplan’s Error: 1884 Sefer Yetzirah of the GRA and the Fiction of the Natural Array of the GRA” (2017—accessed via Academia.edu).

47 Kaplan’s works do not fare well in the judgment of many academics. For example, Scholem describes Kaplan’s translation and commentary, The Bahir (New York: Samuel Weiser, 1979) as “worthless” (Origins of the Kabbalah, page 51, n. 1). See, however, the Weiss’ comments on Kaplan in “The Story of a Text in Search of a Commentary.” Kaplan’s SY is, however, a favorite among haredi students—as is Leonard Glotzer’s Fundamentals of Jewish Mysticism.

48 Also spelled Rabud or Ravad, Abraham ben David of Posquières (12th century), well-known critic of Maimonides.
Commentary.” The selections are SY 1:1 (on the thirty-two paths of wisdom), 1:6 (on Infinity), 2:1 (on the “Three Groups of Letters”), 4:11 (on space, time, and the soul), 4:12 (on letters and words), and 6:4 (on God’s covenant with Abraham). The commentary is drawn from the Kuzari of Yehudah HaLevi (Chapter 4, § 25), the Pri Yitzchak of Rabbi Yitzchak Eizik of Mohalov (Horodno: 1798), the SY commentary of the Vilna Gaon (known as the GRA, namely Rabbi Eliyahu of Vilna, 1720-1797), and Rabbi Moshe Botarel (1809-1879), along with Finkel’s own insights.


“[A]rtist, musician, writer and rabbi,” Worch writes of himself

Everything I know about God was learned from an Italian biker covered in tattoos.
Everything I know of the mysteries was revealed by Rabbi Shlomo Carlebach.
Everything I know of Torah was acquired drinking the ‘Waters of Siloah’; absorbed while steeping myself in them for 30 years.

(§ ABOUT ME at http://community.livejournal.com/kabbalah_101/profile - DEFUNCT LINK, 01/02/2014: “Purged Account”)

Rabbi Worch kindly informed me⁴⁹ that “drinking the ‘Waters of Siloah’” alludes to studying Mei Hashiloah,⁵⁰ THE LIVING WATERS, a commentary on the Torah by Polish Hasid Rabbi Mordechai Yosef Leiner of Izbicy (1800-1854), who is described by Joseph Weiss as “the most radical of the Jewish mystics” in the Hasidic circles of his time. Mei Hashiloah is quoted “about 35 times in my [Worch’s] commentary to Sefer Yetzira.”⁵²

As to the approach this book takes to SY, Worch’s PREFACE states,

The basic idea is simply this: In the beginning was God’s desire for us. That’s all there is.
Desire. Desire is the stuff of which the universe is made. Sefer Yetzira describes the process.

(—page xiii)

Worch’s lengthy commentary is rich with quoted material from a wide range of rabbinic, kabbalistic, and hasidic sources.


Faierstein’s introduction opens,

“Rabbi Mordecai Joseph Leiner of Izbica was one of the most original thinkers in the history of Hasidism. His theology, based on the concept of determinism, is both unique and controversial.” (—page 3)

Moshe Idel’s preface to Faierstein notes that Mordecai Joseph was one of the major figures

“distancing from the kabbalistic axis in Hasidism in favor of a more individualistic approach” (—page xii).


CHAPTER ONE, Our Patriarch Abraham’s Chapter
Abraham “disqualified the original act of Creation, retroactively bringing about a fresh Genesis born of divine compassion without constriction.”—page xiv.

CHAPTER TWO, Our Matriarch Sarah’s Chapter
“Aleph represents Sarah at the level of Breath, Mem represents Miriam at the level of Water, Shin represents Eve at the level of Fire.”—page 136.

CHAPTER THREE, Rabbi Akiba’s Chapter
“The greatest mystery of Judaism is that of Rabbi Akiba...”—page 182.

CHAPTER FOUR, The Seven Women’s Chapter

CHAPTER FIVE, The Twelve Tribes’ Chapter
“Each tribe has a unique and individual predilection for worshipping God, studying Torah and serving the Jewish People”—page xv.

CHAPTER SIX, Rebbe R. Elimelech’s Chapter
All is “proven by the three trustworthy witnesses”: WORLD, YEAR, and SOUL. Rebbe R. Elimelech = Rabbi Elimelech Weisblum of Lyzensk (or Lzhensk) (1717-1787). R. Elimelech’s Tzetl Koton (from “most versions of the book Noam Elimelech”) is cited—and interpreted—throughout this chapter. Tzetl Koton teaches of “the ideal of imagined and visualized martyrdom,” that is, profound selflessness, which Abraham, Akiva, and Elimelech embodied—pages 446 & 450.

Horowitz, Daniel M. A Kabbalah and Jewish Mysticism Reader (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2016)

Chapter 6, “Ma’aseh Bereshit, Sefer Yetzirah, and Sefer ha-Bahir: The Roots of Kabbalah,” gives excerpts of the first chapter of SY, along with the concluding paragraph of the work, “When our father Abraham came...,” all wrapped in commentary and annotations.

It is refreshing to see a book on Jewish mysticism and kabbalah that does not commence with SY or Book Bahir. Rather, Horowitz places his treatment of SY after a presentation of biblical, apocalyptic, rabbinic, and hekhalot passages.
Part IV: Western Esoteric & “New Age” Treatments of SY

The Western Esoteric Tradition, or Western Mystery Tradition, claims SY as an ancient foundation text. This tradition is epitomized by the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn and exponents of what is called “Hermetic Kabbalah.”

PART I A of the present paper is littered with translations and interpretations by representatives of this tradition: Wm. W. Westcott, Papus, Peter Davidson, Knut Stenring, Manly Palmer Hall, M. Doreal, all within the early wave of efforts to put SY into English. One could make strong case for relocating these works to the selection of books outlined here.

Listed immediately below are works in the esoteric tradition which were published in the period corresponding to our translation survey, PART I B, that is, after 1971.


Chapter III of *The Anatomy of the Body of God* commences Achad’s commentary on SY. After quoting the first four stanzas of “Dr. Westcott’s translation,” Achad states,

> It is well to notice that the ancient Qabalists made a particular point of the fact that there are TEN Sephiroth, neither more nor less. If we examine the formation of the “Tree of Life” in the following Figure (XIII), we shall understand why they were so careful to make this plan.

Beginning with quotes from *The Canon*, Achad provides a broad rationale for the geometric structure of the Tree of Life, noting its proportion's correspondence to the Vesica Pisces, a figure which “possessed an unbound influence on the details of sacred architecture; and it constituted the great and enduring secret of our ancient brethren.” —Weiser edition, 1969, page 23, Achad’s italics)

Achad goes on to treat the twenty-two paths and their correspondence to the Hebrew letters and the *tarot*. This discussion continues into Chapters IV through VI, which draws the symbolism of SY together with that of Aleister Crowley's *Book of the Law*. Chapter V explains Achad’s “wonderful Plan” for a progression of proportionally growing and shrinking Trees of Life and, using the paths’ association with the *tarot* trumps and astrology, for his reversing the order of the paths from the order taught by the Golden Dawn.

Achad’s SY commentary forms the doctrinal basis for various prismatic representations of the Tree of Life, which eventually become “multiplied and crystallized into a Macrocosmic Snow Flake, or Six-fold Star.” (—ibid., page 57)

---


54 *The Book of the Law*, or Liber AL vel Legis, was “received” by Aleister Crowley in 1904 from a præternatural intelligence named Aiwass. It is believed by followers of the doctrine of Thelema (= will), founded by Crowley, that this book announced and initiated a new aeon. Many works discuss the reception of *The Book of the Law*, e.g., Lawrence Sutin’s *Do What Thou Wilt: A Life of Aleister Crowley* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), CHAPTER 4, “The Birth of a New Aeon (1905-05).”


Ponce’s sections on SY may well be the strongest parts of his book, for elsewhere there are numerous errors and omissions.

The first segment on SY (pages 100-111) resides in a discussion of the sefirot; here we find the first twelve paragraphs of SY in English. Ponce attributes the translation to Westcott. Though it is similar, it is not the same as the edition used for review above, namely, the 2nd; perhaps Ponce used Westcott’s 1st edition.

Finally (pages 157-64), we endure The Thirty-two Paths yet again; Ponce calls his presentation a “compilation of the translation of Westcott, Waite, and Stenring.”

Ponce notes,

There are four modern translations of the Sefer Yetsirah in English: W. Wynn Westcott, Phineas Mordell, Knut Stenring (under the title The Book of Formation) & Rabbi A. Joseph. The only work that is at all easily available is the translation by Westcott. It includes a translation of The Thirty-two Paths, but those familiar with the original suggest that it is inferior to the other translations of the Sefer Yetsirah. The absence of any adequate edition of the Sefer Yetsirah in English is typical of the state of affairs of Jewish mystical texts in general. While the texts of Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Tantracism, Shintoism and Sufism are readily available in cheap paper editions, the major texts of Jewish mysticism are mostly untranslated and unpublished.

(Kabbalah, page 284: “Additional notes to footnote 3, page 39”)

The Stenring and Rabbi A[kiva ben] Joseph translations mentioned in Ponce’s note are, in fact, one and the same. Further, Stenring’s “tabulation” of The 32 Paths is already based on Waite and Westcott.

Ponce missed Kalisch, M. P. Hall, and a handful of other translators of SY altogether.

The note is typical of Ponce: He’ll make a pretty good point, only to undermine it with a stunning gaffe. Ponce, more generally, is yet another example of an uncritical pop writer dependent on unreliable translators and commentators.56

Robert Saks comment on Ponce:

...his treatment of German Hasidism is superficial and misses the point on such a basic matter as its concept of the words of prayers as keys, through gematria, to the unity of all creation. ... [I]t is hard to excuse his claim that Moses Cordovero wrote “Lechah Dodi,” his use of pereks as the plural of perek, or his description of Luria as being primarily interested in the practical side of Kabbalah. ... [I]t is impossible to ignore his claim that the Hasidic movement believed that “study was worthless.”

(“Jewish Mysticism It Ain’t,” in Judaism 23: 4, 1974)

**Suares, Carlo.** *The Sepher Yetsira, Including the Original Astrology according to the Qabala and Its Zodiac* (French original: Editions du Mont-Blanc, 1968; English translation: Boulder: Shambhala Publications, 1976.)

His book on SY is one in a series treating what Suares considers “the three great cabalistic works... [namely] Genesis, The Song of Songs and Sepher Yetsira.” Suares does not believe kabbalah to be mysticism, stating, “...Qabala is a science and ... The Sepher Yetsira is a precise and accurate treatise on the structure of cosmic energy, written in a hidden code.” Suares’ thesis rests on the belief that each Hebrew letter “denotes not only a ‘letter’, but also a proof, a symbol and even a miracle revealing its forgotten ontological origin.”

In a chapter which is repeated in all three books of this series, Suares explains the letter-code as he has discovered, or re-discovered, it. All this, of course, puts something of a spin on Suares’ handling of SY. Each short paragraph of SY is followed by a lengthy explanation, so the text itself is spread in small pieces over some sixty pages. The translation is mannered in a way that serves Suares’ thesis, so it is not always very clear on its own. However, he does include the Hebrew text next to his translation.

See also § י in Tree : 2 — ידוהי, edited by David Meltzer (Santa Barbara: Christopher Books/Painted Cave Books, Summer 1971), pp. 82-163, which includes introductory notes by David Meltzer and the following items from Suares: “The Code,” “The Cipher of Genesis,” “Notes on Biology Functioning with Letters of the Hebrew Alphabet,” and “Sepher Yetsira” (full translation and notes, some of which are reproduced in Suares’ handwriting).


Dr. Paul Foster Case (1884-1954) is reported to have written, “In the study of the Qabalah there is no more important glyph than the Cube of Space with perhaps the exception of the Tree of Life.”

The book summary at Treadwell’s notes that Townley’s work “comes from the school of Western Mysteries of the Builders of the Adytum: an important work for those studying in the B.O.T.A tradition.” B.O.T.A. was founded by Case in 1922; prior to that, Case was a ranking member of the Golden Dawn. Case is most noted for his books on tarot.

Robert C. Stein, practitioner of Thelema, summarizes *The Cube of Space*:

Townley presents an analysis of the Cube of Space based on the Sepher Yetzirah. His cube orients from the center, with three perpendicular axes extending from it, and twelve edges. They are the origin, six directions (from three mother letters extending outward from the origin), and the 12 signs of the zodiac.

Townley elaborates five pairs of opposites (= dimensions). The sephiroth of belimah implies the ten have no end: beginning and end, good and evil, height and depth of the abyss, depth of east and west, depth of north and south. ... Each dimension has two contrasting ends or directions, which may later be related to the front and back of the Tree of Life, or positive and negative existence.

---

57 Case’s quote appears in the review sections for Townley’s *Cube of Space* at both Treadwell’s and Amazon: https://www.treadwells-london.com/shop/cube-space-kevin-townley/ https://www.amazon.com/Cube-Space-Container-Creation/dp/096532187


59 *ibid.*, page 31.
Morello, Bettina. _Timeless Kingdom: A Study in Son of Man, Science and Sefer Yetzirah_ (Bloomington – Central Milton Keynes: AuthorHouse, 2006)

Morello mixes superstrings, M-Theory, and “quantum mechanics” with concepts like the “unique cherub” and tzimtzum.

[Morello] is pioneering a new way of reading mysterious ancient [e.g., New Testament and apocalyptic] texts. ... [Morello] has steeped herself in the ancient texts and allows them to control her. ... There are remarkable similarities between the discoveries of modern physicists and cosmologists and the revelations of the ancient seers...

(—preface by Margaret Barker, page xix)


Reiss sets up his translation/commentary with chapters summarizing “Greek Philosophies on Creation” and “Jewish Theologies of Creation.” The new translation is supplemented by lengthy explanations, complete with diagrams and tables. With its somewhat Rosicrucian tone, Reiss’ “reinterpretation,” has been written more for the “thinker” or “seeker” than for the academic. Alas, his historical and conceptual summaries are often misleading and frustratingly lacking in nuance, e.g., his statement, “The knowledge that we call Kabbalah is based on the doctrine and teachings of Isaac Luria, who was born in Jerusalem during the 16th century” (Ancient Secrets..., page 87). Reiss does go on to mention the Zohar and Moses de Leon.

In “An Excerpt from an Interview with the Author of Ancient Secrets of Creation: Sepher Yetzira, the Book that Started Kabbalah, Revealed,” Dr. Reiss begins

To understand why God chose the aleph, mem, and sheen to be the mother letters of creation, we have to know three things. The first is that the author of Sepher Yetzira understood that the scroll of the Five Books of Moses, called in Hebrew, the Torah, was the blueprint for the world because it contains the story of creation. The second is that Pythagoras found that the harmony of music lays in the ratio of the whole numbers less than four. Among the ratios, \( \frac{1}{2}\) is the ratio of the perfect fifth, the most concordant sound in music.

The third is the very strange statement of the Jewish sages who said that the Torah is written with black fire on white fire. This statement is interpreted to mean that the Torah contains both open and secret knowledge. The actual scroll of the Torah is written in straight lines of black ink letters separated by white spaces, the parchment, itself. The black letters are clearly visible, so the black is the open knowledge, while the white spaces show nothing and represent the hidden wisdom.


While descriptions of the book on the back cover of the book and at Amazon.com indicate a Jewish orientation, sources referred to in Nagy’s introduction (e.g., Eliphas Levi, S. L. M. Mathers, Anna Kingsford, Franz Bardon, Rawn Clark) and the use of Westcott’s version of SY suggest otherwise.

---

Benton, Christopher P. *The Book of the Assembler: A Retranslation and Revisioning of the Sefer Yetzirah, the Ancient Book of Formation* [The Kabbalah Series 2] ([n.p.]: Amazon Digital Services/Stone of Foundation, 2011—Kindle only).

Among Benton’s “First Words” on the subject are these:

[SY] is a fine document, but, nonetheless, it can still be improved. Consequently, there are one or two places where I have made what some will see as radical changes. Most notably in the fifth section of the text, I replace the enumeration of body parts ... with a listing of the twelve acupuncture meridians.


Tenen offers a full summary of the “Meru Hypothesis,” which touches on a proposed general theory as to nature of SY’s contents.

The Meru Project is based on 30 years of research by Stan Tenen into the origin and nature of the Hebrew alphabet, and the mathematical structure underlying the sequence of letters of the Hebrew text of Genesis.  

The back cover of *The Alphabet*... describes Tenen’s thesis:

Tenen examines the Hebrew text of Genesis and shows how each letter is both concept and gesture, with the form of the gesture matching the function of the concept, revealing the implicit relationship between the physical world of function and the conscious world of the concept.

“An Introduction to the Meru Project” at the Meru Foundation website opens,

We have discovered an extraordinary and unexpected geometric metaphor in the letter sequence of B’reshit (the Hebrew text of Genesis), a text which underlies and is held in common by the spiritual traditions of the ancient world. This metaphor models embryonic growth and self-organization. It applies to all whole systems, including those as seemingly diverse as meditational practices and the mathematics fundamental to physics and cosmology.


The first line [of SY] consists of fourteen letters. Usually, the last five letters are grouped together in a single word which would literally mean “without what,” and which is usually translated “nothingness.”  

But if one instead groups together the last eight letters, they are an explicit list of letters used to “unlock” the woven structure of the first verse of B’reshit.

All of this is based on the assumption that “Genesis has an embedded structure: there are recognizable patterns in the distribution of its letters,” and these patterns contain meaning which “can specify physical and psychological states simultaneously.”

---

62 This is the mysterious beli mahl discussed above in note 12.

The prolific DuQuette in the guise of R. Lamed Ben Clifford brings a conversational approach to the “bigger Qabalistic picture.” The gist of DuQuette’s interest is summarized in the introduction:

There are three important features that make the Sepher Yetzirah particularly attractive to the lazy and pretentious. First of all (and most importantly) it is very short and relatively easy to understand. Second, it introduces us to the concept of the 10 Sephiroth, or Emanations that emerge from the primal unity. In later Qabalistic literature the concept of the 10 Sephiroth develops into the Tree of Life, a very helpful schematic, especially for Chicken Qabalists.

(—*The Chicken Qabalah*, page 25)


**THE SEPHER Yetzirah** is a sexual working which is divided into three stages. Each stage represents a process by which the Divine Logos (cosmic consciousness) emanates magickal radiation into manifestation. The stages are as follows; The TRIADIC WORKING, The HEPTADIC WORKING and lastly, The DODECADIC WORKING. The use of this system enables the Adept to manifest the Magickal Will according to the law of qabalistic principles.

... The elements which overshadow and power the sexual ritual of the Sepher Yetzirah are the Triad of the three mother letters; Aleph, Mem and Shin. The candidate is required to search, cultivate, meditate and nurture an understanding of what these three qualitative aspects of cosmic consciousness mean, and to observe how these principles work within the structure of magickal operations.

(—pp. 190-191)


Here we have yet another copy of Westcott’s SY with an introduction composed of an inconsistent array of material pilfered from all-too-familiar sources.


The *Sefer Yetzirah* ... serves as the very foundation stone of the Western Mystery Tradition: much of what is considered gospel by students of Tarot, magic and Kabbalah is derived from one or another particular translation of the *Sefer Yetzirah*.

*Sefer Yetzirah: Magic and Mysticism* explores the deep mysteries of the *Sefer Yetzirah*. By comparing translations of different versions of the text, the mystical meaning hidden in each verse is revealed. Suggested meditations and exercises are provided to aid the spiritual student.

(—back cover)
APPENDIX
(from the 1992 version of “Notes...,” slightly expanded & revised)

For anyone looking to SY for a definitive set of attributions/correspondences among the Hebrew letters, paths on the sefirotic tree, astrological features, etc., there may be some confusion and frustration.

To demonstrate the problem, example sets of attributions, those of the double letters according to various editions of SY, are tabulated below. Three arrangements (I, II, and III) show the attributions in the SY texts at hand, a clear majority of which agree with COLUMN I. Interestingly, no text of SY among those consulted agrees with column IV, the Golden Dawn scheme—not even that of Golden Dawn founder W. W. Westcott.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>♊</td>
<td>♉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>♋</td>
<td>♊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♊</td>
<td>♉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כ</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♉</td>
<td>♊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texts with the arrangement in COLUMN I:
- Donnolo (10th cent.)
- Doria/Lenowitz (1976)
- Friedman (1977)
- Gruenwald (1971)
- Ha Levi (11th cent.)
- Hayman: MSS A & C (2004)\(^66\)
- Papus (1892)
- Suares (1976)
- Work of the Chariot (1971)
- Zohar (13th cent.)

Texts with the arrangement in COLUMN II:
- M. P. Hall (1928)
- Kalisch (1877)
- Westcott (1887/1893)
- ARI/GRA (Kaplan – 1990)\(^67\)

Texts with the arrangement in COLUMN III:
- Stenring (1923)

Texts with the arrangement in COLUMN IV:
- Golden Dawn (late 19th cent.)

---
\(^66\) Added 2017.
\(^67\) Also GRA according to Epstein – 2018, noted 2019.