

תוכן העניינים

		אסתר אשל
171	קטע חדש של ספר העירים מקומראן (XQpapEnoch) תלמוד תורה, מיסטיקה ואסכטולוגיה: על בית המדרש של הקב"ה במדרש המאוחר	וחנן אשל עדיאל קדרי
181	ההיקשים ההלכתיים כהיקשים דיאלקטיים במשנת הרמב"ם	אבירם רביצקי
197	והמידות שהתורה נדרשת בהן כ־ τόποι אריסטוטליים 'ואשר שם לבו לדבר יוצרינו': ההיגד המתודולוגי של רשב"ם בתחילת פירושו לספר ויקרא ותרומתו להבנת יחסו של רשב"ם לפירושו של רש"י	איתמר כסלו
225	האם הכיר ר' אברהם אבן עזרא את פירושי ר' יוסף קרא לתורה?	אהרן מונדשיין
239	פתיחת הרלב"ג לביאור ספר משלי וגלגולי נוסח החיבור	ברוך ברנר
271	מ'סדר המערכה' ל'סדר המעמדות': גלגוליו של מנהג ליטורגי בימי הביניים	אופיר מינץ-מנור
293		ביקורת ספרים
311	שני 'חיי יוסף'	דניאל שוורץ
327	ספרים שנתקבלו במערכת תקצירים באנגלית	
v		

CONTENTS

Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel	A New Fragment of the <i>Book of Watchers</i> from Qumran (XQpapEnoch)	171
Adiel Kadari	Torah Study, Mysticism and Eschatology: ‘God’s Study Hall’ in the Later Midrash	181
Aviram Ravitsky	Halakhic Arguments as Dialectical Arguments and Exegetical Principles as Aristotelian <i>Topoi</i> in Maimonides’ Philosophy	197
Itamar Kislev	‘Whoever Has Heeded the Words of Our Creator’ – Rashbam’s Methodological Preface to Leviticus and the Relationship between Rashi’s and Rashbam’s Commentaries	225
Aharon Mundschein	Did R. Abraham Ibn Ezra Know the Biblical Commentary of R. Joseph Kara?	239
Baruch Braner	Gersonides’ Introduction to his Commentary on the Book of Proverbs: A Missing Introduction and the Printed Editions of the Commentary	271
Ophir Münz-Manor	From <i>Seder HaMa’aracha</i> to <i>Seder HaMa’amadot</i> – The Emergence and Transformation of a Liturgical Rite in the Middle Ages	293
<i>Book Review</i>		
Daniel R. Schwartz	Two Versions of Josephus’ <i>Vita</i>	311
	<i>Books Received</i>	327
	<i>English Abstracts</i>	v

ENGLISH ABSTRACTS

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE *BOOK OF WATCHERS* FROM QUMRAN (XQpapEnoch)

By Esther and Hanan Eshel

In March 2004 we received for publication a photograph of a fragmentary papyrus preserving five lines of text identifiable as *1 Enoch* 8:4–9:3. The verses in question, which are part of the *Book of Watchers*, describe how the angels heard the cries of people killed as a result of Asa'el's teaching humans to make weaponry. Though this fragment was undoubtedly found at Qumran, there is no way to identify the cave from which it came. Therefore, we suggest labeling it XQpapEnoch.

The publication of this new fragment of *1 Enoch* is important not only as a witness to the existence of another copy in addition to the eleven known Qumran manuscripts of *1 Enoch*, but also because of its contribution to the reconstruction of two Cave 4 Aramaic manuscripts. The various textual witnesses of the *Book of Watchers* 9:1-3 display a great number of variants and corruptions in the Greek versions. The Ge'ez translation also contains corruptions.

Despite their poor preservation, it is possible to read and reconstruct in the three Aramaic witnesses a similar, if not identical, text. This version differs from the Greek translation of Gizeh which contains scribal errors and various omissions. Even though Syncellus' two versions also contain corruptions, it appears that the Greek cited by Syncellus is the closest to the Aramaic source.

If our suggested reconstruction of this new fragment is correct, it apparently preserves part of an extensive description of the harm the Watchers inflicted on humanity.

TORAH STUDY, MYSTICISM AND ESCHATOLOGY: 'GOD'S STUDY HALL' IN THE LATER MIDRASH

by Adiel Kadari

This paper deals with the unique vision of the World to Come found in several later midrashim (*Pirqe Mashiah*, *Otiyyot de-Rabbi Akiva*, *Seder Eliyahu*, etc.). They depict the World to Come as a gigantic *bet midrash*, in which God sits and teaches those who have merited being in his presence. The paper reveals the values latent in these texts, and the linkage made between Torah study and mystical and eschatological elements.

The depiction of 'God's study hall' paints an idealized picture of Torah study that includes all members of society. Since real life circumstances prevent certain people from participating in the *bet midrash* experience (women, slaves, etc.), their entrance into the hall of study is delayed until the World to Come.

Alongside this inclusive approach, these midrashim present a mystical-experiential element. In one, God is described as 'pouring out his spirit' on those who are seated in his *bet midrash* (*Seder Eliyahu Rabba*, sec. 4, Ish-Shalom edition, p. 19), and in others, God himself teaches those assembled and 'expounds to them the meanings of a new Torah' (*Bet ha-Midrash* 3, p. 27).

The last section of the paper deals with texts that tend to prefigure and actualize the eschatological vision. These sources dare to go a step further, claiming that it is possible for all to enter 'God's study hall' not only at the End of Days, but also in the present.

HALAKHIC ARGUMENTS AS DIALECTICAL ARGUMENTS AND EXEGETICAL PRINCIPLES AS ARISTOTELIAN *TOPOI* IN MAIMONIDES' PHILOSOPHY

By Aviram Ravitsky

In the introduction to his commentary on the Mishnah, Maimonides treats halakhic modes of argumentation as dialectical arguments. The term Maimonides uses for dialectical arguments, *maqays jadalyyah*, derives from Arabic treatment of Aristotelian logic. In his *Treatise on Logic*, Maimonides describes dialectical arguments as syllogisms which have at least one conventional premise. In the first part of the article I show that Maimonides viewed most of the halakhic world as conventional, and this view enabled him to treat the halakhic arguments as dialectical ones, although he did not think that halakhic arguments could be reduced to syllogistic figures. In the second part of the article I analyze the methodological implication of Maimonides' view, namely the possibility of viewing the thirteen Talmudic principles governing exegesis of the Torah as Aristotelian *topoi*. The *topoi* are formal principles by which the dialectician can display his arguments, which are treated in Aristotle's *Topica*, a book that deals with dialectical argumentation. Indeed, since the 14th century several texts have treated the thirteen Talmudic exegetical principles as Aristotelian *topoi*, in accordance with Maimonides' view.

'WHOEVER HAS HEEDED THE WORDS OF OUR CREATOR' – RASHBAM'S METHODOLOGICAL PREFACE TO LEVITICUS AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RASHI'S AND RASHBAM'S COMMENTARIES

by Itamar Kislev

In studying the commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Pentateuch it is standard practice to consult David Rosin's (1882) edition only, and to essentially ignore the only other extant version, the Berlin edition of 1705. The thesis of this essay is that although the Berlin edition is indeed highly problematic, it is not entirely without value for the reconstruction of Rashbam's commentary. Moreover, comparison of the two versions reveals that Rosin's edition is not without its faults.

The essay illustrates this thesis through the example of one of Rashbam's methodological statements. In Rosin's edition, one such statement, in which Rashbam recommends using Rashi's commentary alongside his own, appears at the end of the book of Exodus. The implication seems to be that Rashbam is endorsing Rashi's commentary as of equal value to his own. A similar statement recommending the use of Rashi's commentary appears at the beginning of the commentary on Leviticus, where Rashbam explains that his commentary on Leviticus is a very brief one. In the Berlin edition these two passages constitute one statement at the beginning of the commentary to Leviticus, while none appears at the end of the com-

mentary to Exodus. Analysis shows that the Berlin version represents the better text. The implication is that Rashbam did not recommend that the reader consult Rashi's commentary throughout, but only that one use it as a supplement where Rashbam remarks explicitly that his commentary is laconic.

DID R. ABRAHAM IBN EZRA KNOW THE BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES OF
R. JOSEPH KARA?

By Aharon Mondschein

It has generally been assumed that Ibn Ezra was not familiar with the commentary of Kara on the Pentateuch. This assumption, based on the facts that Ibn Ezra never mentions Kara's name and that comparison of Ibn Ezra's commentary on the Pentateuch with the few surviving fragments of Kara's commentary failed to reveal any connection between them, did not change even when new fragments of Kara's commentary found in the 'Italian Genizah' were published.

It seems, however, implausible that there was no connection between the two, in view of the following data: Ibn Ezra was born in 1089 and died in 1164, while Kara was born about 1050-1055 and died about 1120-1130. During his travels Ibn Ezra spent several years (probably about 1148-1157) in Provence and then moved to northern France, the center of Kara's activity. It is reasonable to assume that the writings of one of the greatest of French scholars had left enough of an impression to arouse the intellectual curiosity of Ibn Ezra, especially since Kara was one of the founders of the school of *peshat* exegesis in France and Ibn Ezra engaged in exegesis of a similar nature. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that Kara's manifold contributions to the exegesis of liturgical poetry escaped the attention of Ibn Ezra, who was an important author as well as a critic of this type of poetry.

In fact, a closer analysis of some passages in Ibn Ezra's writings, including his attack (in his commentary on Ecclesiastes 1:5) on the liturgical poetry of Elazar ha-Kallir, reveals implicit connections to unique explanations transmitted in the name of Kara. Even if Ibn Ezra did not learn of these explanations directly from Kara's Pentateuch commentary (most of which was lost), he could have become acquainted with them as oral traditions transmitted by Kara's students or those who attended his sermons, or – perhaps even more likely – from his many commentaries on liturgical poetry. We know that these commentaries were disseminated rapidly and copied or cited frequently, and such citations are often clearly recognizable even when they are attributed anonymously to 'the commentator'. Ibn Ezra must certainly have known them well, but when he criticized Kara's explanations he took care not to mention their author's name out of respect for his position and authority – just as he did with Rashi and Rashbam, the remaining sides of 'the French exegetical triangle'.

There is no doubt that when the comprehensive commentaries of Kara on liturgical poetry, which are saturated with interpretations of the numerous biblical verses utilized in these poems, are published in critical editions, it will be possible to reconstruct many of Kara's lost biblical commentaries, to better assess his unique contributions as an exegete in general, and to better appreciate his influence on the exegesis of Ibn Ezra in particular.

GERSONIDES' INTRODUCTION TO HIS COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF
PROVERBS: A MISSING INTRODUCTION AND THE PRINTED
EDITIONS OF THE COMMENTARY

by Baruch Braner

Rabbi Levi Ben Gershom (Gersonides) wrote commentaries on most of Scripture which display his skills as exegete, halachist (primarily in his commentary to the Torah), philosopher and scientist. He approached Biblical wisdom literature (including Proverbs) as a set of guidance manuals intended both for the scholarly and the simple. These books, through a sophisticated textual formulation, combine observations in the area of morals and ethics for the masses and speculative observations concerned with human perfection for the philosophically minded.

Gersonides' introduction to Proverbs is found in manuscript but does not appear in the first edition (Leiria, Portugal 1497), nor in the Mikraot Gedolot edition of Venice 1525 which was based on the Leiria edition, nor in subsequent printings, all of which were based on the Venice edition. The author theorizes, on the basis of surviving copies of the first edition, that the first fascicle of the Leiria edition, which was to contain the introductions of Gersonides and Meiri, was not printed in time for the initial publication and perhaps was never published. This introduction is published here on the basis of manuscripts. Relevant material from Gersonides' other works is presented in the notes.

In the introduction Gersonides informs us of his decision not to present the '*to'alot*', the ethical and speculative inferences from the verses as a separate section, and his decision, for the sake of brevity, to present as a rule only the most reasonable interpretation and to avoid criticizing the interpretations of other commentators.

Gersonides presents a number of fundamental ideas in the introduction, thereby eliminating the need to discuss them in the body of the commentary. Among these principles is his assertion that the Torah directs man towards truth by providing him with true principles on which he can base his own philosophical investigations, for providing a true premise helps avoid a false conclusion. Gersonides presents definitions of the various levels of man's intellectual attainments and asserts that moral perfection is a necessary prerequisite for intellectual perfection; that the Torah aids man in these specific areas; and that God has created His world with immense wisdom, discernible to man, in order to inspire him to understand this wisdom and to enable him to approach intellectual perfection.

In addition the author discusses the text of the commentary on Proverbs itself as published in various editions of Mikraot Gedolot, showing that they are quite corrupt both textually and structurally. He demonstrates that in addition to the usual sorts of printing mistakes textual contamination was caused by the printer confounding the 'explanation of words' and 'explanation of the matter' portions of the commentary. In the layout of the editio princeps (Leiria 1497) these two sections are presented in separate sections, but in the second edition (Venice 1525) the printers changed the layout and garbled the reset work by mingling the two sections. The author presents as an example a much improved text of the commentary on Proverbs 1:1-19 based on MS Paris 247.

FROM *SEDER HAMA'ARACHA* TO *SEDER HAMA'AMADOT* – THE EMERGENCE
AND TRANSFORMATION OF A LITURGICAL RITE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

By Ophir Münz-Manor

The article is dedicated to the liturgical rite known as *Seder HaMa'aracha* (or under its later name *Seder HaMa'amadot*), and to its emergence and transformation throughout the Middle Ages. *Seder HaMa'aracha* is a liturgical assemblage of texts from the Bible, rabbinic literature and other sources, divided according to the days of the week. The purpose of the *Seder* is to establish a representative section for daily study for those who are unable to study Torah on a large scale. A close inspection of the thirty-two manuscripts containing the *Seder* leads to the following conclusions: (1) *Seder HaMa'aracha* was established by Rabbi Eliahu HaZaken of Le Mans, a northern French scholar of the first half of the eleventh century; (2) from the French liturgical rite the *Seder* made its way to the German liturgical rite sometime in the thirteenth century, to the Italian rite in the fourteenth century, and to the Spanish rite in the fifteenth century; (3) the exact contents of the *Seder* vary in the various manuscripts; this diversity suggests that the structure of the *Seder* was perceived as crucial, while its precise contents were determined by various authors and scribes.

TWO VERSIONS OF JOSEPHUS' *VITA*

by Daniel R. Schwartz

Book review on: Folker Siegert, Heinz Schreckenber, Manuel Vogel und der Josephus-Arbeitskreis des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, Münster, *Flavius Josephus: Aus meinem Leben (Vita): Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001, ix + 217 pp.; Steve Mason, *Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary, 9), Leiden, Boston & Köln: Brill, 2001, liv + 287 pp.

In contrast to Niese's 1890 edition of Josephus' *Vita*, which was criticized for giving so much weight to a single manuscript of the tenth century, Thackeray's 1926 Greek-English version of the book took a more eclectic approach, and it is Thackeray's text that underlies the few other editions that appeared subsequently. A sampling of the Greek text offered in the first of these volumes and of that reflected in the second shows that they too take an eclectic approach; that the critical apparatus of the German team's book – which is based upon a new review of Niese's data and also some new evidence – generally provides what is needed to justify its text; and that although Mason's volume does not offer a Greek text, it should at times have given more information about the text it assumes. As for the translations, it appears that although both books claim to offer literal translations that render not only what Josephus said but also how he said it, at times the Germans' translation, while generally accurate, is freer than expected and Mason's, while literal, is at times less than accurate. The more impressive contribution of the latter volume seems to be in its commentary, which offers a treasure trove of material aimed not only at explicating Josephus' book and the events to which it relates, but also, and with more focus, at locating the book within Josephus' own oeuvre and his Hellenistic-Roman context. As for Josephus' Jewish context, more attention to the book by experts in ancient Judaism could bring fruitful results.