TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF THE HUMANITIES
THE CHAIM ROSENBERG SCHOOL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Editorial Board of the Series

TE'UDA

III

STUDIES IN TALMUDIC LITERATURE IN POST-BIBLICAL HEBREW AND IN BIBLICAL EXEGESIS

Edited by

MORDECHAI A. FRIEDMAN   ABRAHAM TAL

GERSHON BRIN

CONTENTS

Preface

English Summaries

The School of Rabbi Akiba and the School of Rabbi Ishmael in *Sifre* Deuteronomy, Pericopes 1-54

by
Abraham Goldberg

Most modern scholars have accepted the three-fold division and the source theory regarding each division as postulated almost a century ago by David Hoffman. This division separates the large middle section (pericopes 55-303) which is halakhic exegesis from the smaller first (pericopes 1-54) and last (pericopes 304-357) sections which are largely aggadic exegesis. Hoffman attributes the halakhic section to the School of Rabbi Akiba, but sees the two aggadic sections as stemming from the School of Rabbi Ishmael. The present study shows that Hoffman's theory does not stand up to a close analysis of the first section. It can be definitely shown that all the aggadic exegesis in the first section belongs definitely to the School of Rabbi Akiba, as does Aggada generally in all works of the Halakhic Midrash. The same applies to the last section. The only relatively very small part of *Sifre* Deuteronomy which in any way may be attributed to the School of Rabbi Ishmael are the non-aggadic pericopes 31-54 in the first section centered around an halakhic exegesis of the two paragraphs of the *Shema* (Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21). This anomaly in a work which otherwise belongs entirely to Rabbi Akiba may possibly be explained by the fact that the first section of *Sifre* Deuteronomy (up to Deut. 11:10) is not consecutive exegesis to each verse. This section contains selected comments to but a relatively few number of verses. This gives indication that *Sifre* Deuteronomy as such really begins only close to the halakhic part of the book from chapter 12 on. What precedes in *Sifre* Deuteronomy, therefore, may be regarded as a continuation of Numbers, where the Halakha comes from the School of Rabbi Ishmael and the Aggada from the School of Rabbi Akiba.

The Relationship of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Halakhic Sources

by

Yeshayahu Maori

A multiplicity of halakhic additions distinguishes PsJ from the other Palestinian Targumim. The connection between it and halakhic midrash is apparent not only from the material which it has in common with extant midrashim but also from the manner in which this material is incorporated. In accordance with its exegetical purpose, the Targum usually succeeds in presenting a continuous translation despite the fact that the incorporation of the halakhot — which are often at variance with the direct meaning of the Biblical text — is a potential factor for disrupting the sequence. Indeed, there do exist some instances in which the connection between the parts of a verse is interrupted. We have sought to demonstrate that in these instances, it is the literary wording of the halakhic midrash as known from the extant sources, which has caused the disruption. An examination of several passages and a comparison of them with those sources leads us to propose that the translator was familiar with the halakhic midrashim from sources in which their wording and style had already been fixed. This wording influenced the manner in which he incorporated the halakhot.

On the basis of the extant halakhic midrashim we are inclined to propose that the translator was familiar with the Mekhilta of R. Ishamel or a halakhic midrash closely related to it. We are further inclined to propose that PsJ was from the first a literary composition, intended for reading and not for public recital.

Rhetorical Figures in Philo's Allegory

by

Pin'has Carny

According to the common theory of allegory in Philo's time (and during many subsequent centuries) the literal meaning of any allegorical account has no intrinsic value of its own and can be dismissed as soon as the inner, spiritual or higher meaning has been recognized. Most of the scholars who dealt with Philo's allegory took it for granted that his use of the term conformed with common usage.

On the Ancient Form of Midrash Shir ha-Shirim Rabba
(According to Geniza Fragments)

by

Z.M. Rabinowitz

In my book *Ginze Midrash*, I published four pages of Geniza fragments of Midrash Shir ha-Shirim Rabba from the Leningrad Collection. Here I publish one Geniza fragment, consisting of two pages, from the Kaufmann Collection, Budapest, which is a continuation of the same manuscript. This fragment was previously published by Professor Scheiber in *Acta Orientalia Hung.*, XXXIII (1978) but without variants and comments. With the kind courtesy of Professor Scheiber I publish this fragment here with variants based on editio princeps (Pizaro 1519).

These fragments have all the signs of an ancient manuscript dating from the eleventh century; the style is typically Palestinian. They are most valuable in our search after the original version of this Midrash.

Comments and Late Additions in the Babylonian Talmud

by

Jacob S. Spiegel

The Gaonim and early authorities have testified that comments and additional material have been incorporated in the Talmudic text. Some of this additional material has been retained in the printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud. The purpose of this article is to list the passages of the Vilna edition of the Talmud which include such additional material. The list will include only those passages which are identifiable as additional material by the testimony of the Gaonim and other early authorities or by the evidence of Talmudic manuscripts. From this list we may perhaps infer that certain expressions and terms are typical of this material and may be used to classify this material when there is no external evidence. It also becomes evident that the tractrates Baba Meziah, Baba Batra, Berachot, and Menachot (in that order) have the greatest number of such additions. We may now check the number of additions which have been retained in the manuscripts as opposed to the printed editions. After checking the variae lectiones of Dikdukei Sopherim it becomes clear that, here too, tractates Berachot and Menachot include the greatest number of additions.

elsewhere in the Yerushalmi, the Mishna, The Tosefta, The Babylonian Talmud, Maimonides' commentary to the Mishna, etc.

Many other differences are due to the fact that Haraaf dealt very freely with the text. Thus he established new versions in the text according to his own decisions. Here and there he shortened the text, or added words of interpretation.

Many mistakes also crept into his recension, and words were deleted erroneously. Therefore, Haraaf's text of Tr. Shekalim is an eclectic one. It is a new text of the Tr., which displaces the original one.

Responsa of Hai Gaon — New Fragments from the Geniza

by

Mordechai A. Friedman

The article contains the editions of two manuscripts with responsa from Hai Gaon written in Judeo-Arabic.

1. TS NS 324.112, Mosseri L 225 (VII.157): a letter from Hai, dated Nisan 1037, to Nehemiah b. Abraham b. Sahlān of Fustat. The letter is a holograph, written by Hai in his own hand, at the age of 97. It contains his reply to Nehemiah's request to release him from his oath not to serve as ritual slaughterer or cantor. This may be the first published example of a fragment of a document from the Mosseri collection which is matched with a fragment from another Geniza collection.

2. TS 90.2: a page from a collection of responsa of Hai. It contains a responsum concerning a Jew who in his youth transgressed such things as eating camel meat and pork on Yom Kippur. Hai ruled that if he repented in public he must be accepted like any other Jew and can participate in the prayer service on Yom Kippur. The second query consists of three separate questions. This page contains Hai's response to the first and part of the second. The continuation was written on a separate page which I have not identified. The first of these continues the theme of the previous question. May a Gibeonite join in public prayer, and can someone suspected of committing "abominations" in his youth lead the prayers? The second discusses the marriage of an apostate with a Jewish woman who remains faithful to her religion. The third deals with a case of inheritance.

In his responsa R. Hai Gaon quotes Talmudic passages with variants from those found in our texts.

Abaye by rote. Thereby the phrase was extended and interpreted in a new way.

2. The words 'he explained it to me' are editorial language. The phrase indicates that a halakha that had been expressed in an unclear fashion was transmitted more clearly by a certain Amora. Therefore, the editors used this phrase also in reference to Palestinian Amoraim. In some places the phrase was added by rote.

3. The word לייט is used for 'curse'. Rav and Samuel thus intended to curse whoever intentionally lit a candle on the Sabbath next to a door. Rav and Rav Ḥisda also cursed whoever did not follow their rulings concerning prayer and washing the hands. Due to textual variants in some places and changes in halakha in later generations, the word was understood to indicate a decision intended to reject a known halakha. In Abaye's school they phrased rejections made by him לייט עלה אביי. Also, Rav Abahu (Rosh Kalla of Rafram in Pumbadita) used this phrase but in Hebrew translation מגדף בה. In some places transmitters and copyists changed 'R. Abahu challenges', i.e., the Palestinian R. Abahu, to 'he vilifies this' and, as a result of textual variants, mechanical transfers and difficulties in the sugya, also 'R. Jeremiah vilifies this' or 'R. Ḥanina vilifies this'.

R. Elijah of Fulda's First Recension of Tr. Shekalim

by

Moshe Assis

R. Elijah of Fulda (=Haraaf, d.1731) is one of the first commentators of the Yerushalmi in modern times. His commentary on Tractate Shekalim appeared in two versions (Frankfurt a.m. 1688/9, Amsterdam 1709/10). Haraaf worked out a new recension of that Tr. in his first publication. This recension was altered slightly with the publication of his second commentary. That first recension is the subject of study of this article.

The author shows that the text of this recension differs greatly from the Krakow edition of the Yerushalmi (1608/9), on which it is based. These differences amount to several hundreds. Some of them derive from the fact that Haraaf also made use of the editions of the Tr. annexed to the Babli, as well as of other sources: parallel sugyot found

Towards the Talmudic Lexicon II

by

Daniel Boyarin

4. מבזק בזרא / מבזר בזרא

It is demonstrated that

חזינן בי מרבעתיה דכוכבא והוה כי מבזר / מבזק ארבעין גריוי בזרא דחרדלא
...(BT BB 73a) is to be translated:

We saw the resting place of a star, and it was like (in size!) the sowing place? of 40 griv of mustard seed.

The passage was correctly understood by the medieval commentators, but distorted by modern lexicographers. Both readings are acceptable √BZQ is a common root in Aramaic, whose primary meaning is *scatter*, thence *sow seed*. √BZR, a hapax in Aramaic, is either a denominative of the primary nown בזרא = seed, or a phonetic variant of √BDR = *scatter*, from whence בזרא is derived. Examples of this semantic process are adduced.

5. Minutae

a. איתקש = grew / was old. In BT BQ 117a we read in Codex Hamburg (and recently published Antonin 861, Tarbiz 49, pp. 298-299), איתקש meaning was old, a verb derived from קשיש = old. This is a hapax, and was replaced in all other witnesses by the gloss סבא הוה.

b. √QT‘ = √QTL

In BT BB 73b קטעתיה is found with the meaning *killed him*. The polysemy of √QTL and Akkadian qatû are compared.

c. אעקר דעתיה

In BT Pesahim 103b, we find אעקר דעתיה as an exact semantic equivalent of common הסיח דעתו.

d. שקיל מזיה = cut his hair.

In BT Meg. 16a, we find the expression שקיל מזיה (= took his hair) for "gave a haircut". Cp. נטל צפרניים in MH.

e. אגדיה. In BT BB 73b, we find Af'el of √NGD, meaning "to float (trans.) ashore".

All the above expressions are unbooked.

This paper continues the author's studies towards the Talmudic Lexicon begun in *Tarbiz* 50.

A Fragment of the "Memar Marqe" in an Unknown Version

by

Z. Ben-Ḥayyim

Memar Marqe, a highly important source for the study of Samaritan theology and the Samaritan Aramaic dialect, has been accessible to the scholary world through a copy prepared for J.H. Petermann in 1868. This copy (kept in the Berlin Library, Ms Or. quart. 522) was made from a Vorlage written in 1531/2 that had been in the possession of the priestly family in Sikem (Nablus). Based on this copy small parts of the Memar were edited and translated, in doctoral dissertations, since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In 1934, David Rettig, a pupil of Paul Kahle, edited another small part of the Memar; he used an additional Ms, unknown until that time. Kahle acquired this Ms on a visit to the Samaritans in 1908, and it remained in his possession. It contains a discontinuous fragment of the Memar in 143 folios.

Rettig's publication demonstrated the existence of a different version of the Memar with respect to content and language. The edition of the whole Memar by J. Macdonald, who had access to Kahle's Ms and included it in his apparatus criticus, did not fulfil our hope that it would enable us to assess accurately the value of this Ms, especially regarding the Samaritan Aramaic.

A few years ago I was asked to identify a fragment of a Samaritan Ms (8 folios) from the D. Yellin collection of the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem (Sam. 8° 47). I could then only state that the Ms contains a part of the Memar in an unknown version. Through the courtesy of Prof. Sergio Noja I was granted in 1977 the opportunity to peruse the Kahle Ms (=K) on microfilm, from which I learned: 1) the above mentioned Sam 8° 47 belongs to the same Ms as K; 2) the Ms B.M. Or 12,296 (=F in Macdonald's edition) is another part (14 folios) of the same Ms; 3) S. Kohn's text of the "Pessach Haggadah" is a part of the Memar in the same recension as K (Sam 8° 47 and Or 12, 296). Moreover both the Ms underlying Kohn's edition and K have been copied from the same Vorlage.

This paper serves as a preliminary study to an edition and translation of the Memar. Sam 8° 47 has been edited in comparison with the extant version according to a photocopy of the Ms written in 1531/2, annotated and translated into Hebrew. In the introduction an attempt has been made to calculate the extent of the original K Ms. Variants of Kohn's text are listed as well.

A Preliminary Study of Mishnaic Hebrew as Reflected in Codex Vatican 32 of Sifre-Bemidbar

by

Moshe Bar-Asher

Ms. Vatican 32 of Sifre-Bemidbar and (Devarim) is considerd to be the most reliable of the Sifre Mss., textually speaking. Its language, however, has not yet been critically examined.

This study discusses a large number of phenomena taken from different aspects of the linguistic tradition of this manuscript:

1) It demonstrates both archaic and unique orthography. For example, מי and מה are attached proclitically to the succeeding word (מה שראו = משראו, מי טומאה = מטומאה); ה״א serves as a *mater lectionis* for shewa (כשהוא = כהשהוא).

2. The Ms. preserves phonological features which have otherwise disappeared. For example,‘(עי״ן) > ḥ (חי״ת), שמעין and לעיניהן appears as שמחין; לחיניהן); i/e/a > u/o before labials and before the liquids r and l (גולח > גלח, פורשנו > פירשנו, טומאה > טימאה, רוב > רב).

3) Both the archaic participle נתקטל (instead of מתקטל) and the neglected form נופעל (in place of נפעל) are preserved.

4) Infrequently one comes across unique features such as the passive participle functioning as a cognate accusative (מושא פנימי) : פירשנו מפורש = פירשנו פרישה.

Although Codex Vatican 32 possesses some odd features, the analysis leads us to conclude that it is also the most reliable ms. from the linguistic point of view.

The Contribution of Samaritan Aramaic to the Elucidation of Hebrew Liturgy of the Classical Period

by

Abraham Tal

The vocabulary of the Hebrew poetry composed in Palestine during the post-Talmudic period is one of the most obscure areas of Hebrew lexicography. Efforts recently made by various scholars to understand the language used by the *payṭanim* of that period have resulted in the

elucidation of many of its vocables which were considered in the past as artificial constructions.

The present paper underlines the role of Samaritan Aramaic as a tool of investigation in this field. Being a spoken language in Palestine during this very epoch, along with Jewish Aramaic, there is good reason to suppose that many of its lexical items reflect the common usage, which constitues one of the linguistic sources of Hebrew liturgical poetry.

A Fragment of an Anonymous Hebrew-Arabic Thesaurus of the Mishnah from the 14th (or 15th) Century

by
Hadassa Shay

This is a fragment of a Hebrew-Arabic lexicon for Mishnaic terms. The Arabic explanations are based mainly on Maimonides' commentary to the Mishnah. Obviously the author was familiar with Tanḥum Hayerushalmi's lexicon to Mishne-Tora. The lexicon is divided into sections, according to subject matter. Each section is divided into 22 paragraphs which follow the letter order of the Hebrew alphabet. In each paragraph the entries are words or combinations of words. In this fragment we have the last part of the 3rd section (תבוסה — פונדקית), which is dedicated to topographical terms. In the 4th section (אסתנים — תימז) there are terms which define a person's quality or profession; it includes also difficult foreign words. The 5th section (טרבל — אסדה) deals with clothes and tools. This is the only medieval Hebrew lexicon known to us which is divided according to subject matter.

Studies in R. Judah the Pious' Exegesis to the Pentateuch

by
Gershon Brin

R. Judah the Pious (1150-1217) was known until now mainly as the author of *Sefer Hasidim* and of some other similar compositions. Several commentaries to the Pentateuch contain quotations from his work. In 1975 I.S. Lange published R. Judah's commentary to the Pentateuch based on two main manuscripts and other sources.

The paper deals with some of R. Judah's methods in interpreting scripture. The examination of his methods and subjects shows that R. Judah was very interested in the questions of writing and of identifying books and other compositions mentioned in the Bible. He also dealt with questions of the composition of the Pentateuch.

In several verses R. Judah identifies portions composed later than the other parts of the text. He ascribes these later parts to Moses' literary works in the fortieth year of the wandering in the wilderness. But in his commentary to three verses of the Pentateuch he speaks explicitly of sections of the Pentateuch which are not Moses'. Examining his words shows that R. Judah had a unique conception about the composition of the Pentateuch.

On the Method of Nachmanides

by

Jacob Licht

Nachmanides (R. Moshe ben Nahman, 'Ramban'), the medieval Biblical commentator, is well known for his habit of quoting and discussing the remarks of his predecessors. To reach a somewhat more precise definition of the feature, a statistical analysis of a representative sample (combined from all the books of the Pentateuch) is given in the paper. It shows that Nachmanides quotes Rashi in 38% and Ibn Ezra in 12% of his comments on individual verses. He quotes other mediaval scholars only very rarely, on special occasions. This concentration on Rashi and Ibn Ezra is with him a matter of deliberate policy, stated (though slightly obliquely) in the poetic introduction to his commentary. It seems, though he does not say so, that he does not quote these two predecessors of his in the majority of his comments, because in most cases he discusses features of the text which the two did not remark upon. Some further aspects of his method are treated in the paper, among them an instance of a comment distinguishing various levels of meaning, and corresponding to three of the *quatuor sensus* of Christian scholars. (The fourth sense, *sensus mysticus*, is well attested in his cryptic remarks of Kabbalistic interpretation, which he does not apply in the particular verse chosen.)

The Profanation of the Holy by the Menstruant Woman and 'Takanat Ezra'

by

Yedidya Dinari

This article deals with separation customs of the menstruant woman from holy things.

The menstruant woman does not pray and does not enter the synagogue so as not to profane the Holy. (In a previous essay in *Tarbiz*, XLIX, p. 302 the author dealt with other aspects of separation.)

These popular customs are found in many sources. The author traces these sources and tries to explain them and the survival of the customs which contradict the Talmud.

Barayta de-Masekhet Nidda is the most important source for these customs. This Barayta and the "Heichalot" Literature were very much accepted by "Hassidei Ashkenaz" and from them the Posqim in Ashkenaz received these customs.

At the same time they also began to return to the immersion (Tevilah) custom of "Baal Keri" before praying and learning.

On Developments of Statements of Amoraim in the Babylonian Talmud

by

Noah Aminoah

Statements and phrases ascribed to Amoraim in several places in the Babylonian Talmud were frequently not made explicit by them. This phenomenon has been discussed by scholars both in the Middle Ages and modern times; H. Albeck studied this phenomenon extensively. I here examine three statements: 1) הריני כבן עזאי 'I am like Ben Azzai'; 2) לדידי מפרשא לי מיניה 'He explained it to me'; 3) לייט עלה, מגדף בה 'he cursed, vilified this'.

1. 'I am like Ben Azzai' was stated explicitly only by Rav (PT Sota IX.2) and R. Yohanan (PT Bikkurim II.2) when they arrived at a new place, in order to make known that they were outstanding scholars. In sugyot of BT Rav's name was changed to Abaye and Rava, because those sugyot were completed by them. Once this phrase is attributed to

But Philo's evaluation of what he thought to be the literal meaning of Scripture and his attitude towards its essence and origin reveal the huge difference between his allegorical interpretation of the Bible and the work of Homer's interpreters. This difference cannot be explained quantitatively by stating that Philo is the first to recognize two or more lasting meanings in the text. In Philo's mind there is an inherent, qualitative correlation between the actual facts of history, their account in Moses' book and the inner meaning they convey, all of which are true and none of which can be dismissed.

In the attempt to draw an outline of what might have been Philo's conception of the immanent and intrinsic relationship between these three truths, this paper investigates two of the main analogies of Philo's allegorical system: 'The soul and the body' and 'The body and its shadow'. The special use he makes of these analogies in order to show the mentioned relation seems to explain in part his unique position in the conception of allegory.

Adaptation of Midrashim in Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch

by

Josefa Rachaman

The quotations from the Midrashim in Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch are varied in character. Sometimes they are literal, without deviations from their sources. Sometimes they do deviate from them and can be interpreted as intentional adaptation with definite tendencies. Here we are dealing with Rashi's tendencies (1) to be accurate in style and content; (2) to formulate explicitly what is implicit in the original Midrashim, and (3) to bring clearer biblical proof texts to the Midrashic arguments.

These tendencies, known so well from Rashi's original comments, are in fact an important common denominator between the original and non-original components of the commentary.

תקצירים באנגלית