

תוכן העניינים

5	כ"ד ספרים, כ"ב ספרים והקורפוס ההומרי	גיא דרשן
23	שבירת מטבעות לשון בסיפור המקראי	יונתן גרוסמן
45	לצורתה הקדומה של סוגיית בבלי, מועד קטן ז ע"ב-ח ע"א	יואב רוזנטל
71	יצר הרע בספרות האמוראית: בחינה מחדש	ישי רוזן-צבי
109	כשירד רבון העולמים למצרים: לתולדותיה של פסקה אחת בהגדה של פסח	שמחה עמנואל
133	ביקורת המדע האריסטוטלי של ר' חסדאי קרשקש וספרו האבוד של אבנר מבורגוס	שלום צדיק
157	ספרים שנתקבלו במערכת	
v	תקצירי המאמרים באנגלית	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Guy Darshan	Twenty-Four or Twenty-Two Books of the Bible and the Homeric Corpus	5
Jonathan Grossman	Deliberate Misuse of Idioms in the Biblical Narrative	23
Yoav Rosenthal	On the Early Form of Bavli <i>Mo'ed Qatan</i> 7b–8a	45
Ishai Rosen-Zvi	Rereading the Yeşer in Amoraic Literature	71
Simcha Emanuel	'When God descended to Egypt': The Story of a Passage in the Passover Haggadah	109
Shalom Zadik	Rabbi Ḥasdai Crescas' Critique of Aristotelian Science and the Lost Book of Abner of Burgos	103
	Books Received	157
	English Abstracts	v

ENGLISH ABSTRACTS

TWENTY-FOUR OR TWENTY-TWO BOOKS OF THE BIBLE AND THE HOMERIC CORPUS

Guy Darshan

According to Josephus and the early church fathers the Bible contained twenty-two books, whereas according to Rabbinic literature and other church fathers it contained twenty-four. Neither number is the exact count of the books, for both are typological and dogmatic numbers. Both systems derive from the Homeric corpus, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which are each divided into twenty-four books. Here, too, the division is typological, independent of the size of the sections (the books of the *Odyssey* are significantly shorter than those of the *Iliad*). According to Ps. Plutarch (*Vita Homeri* 2, 4), the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were divided by Alexandrian scholars in the 3rd-2nd centuries BCE according to the Greek alphabet (from *Alpha* to *Omega*). This explanation of Ps. Plutarch is identical to that of the church fathers (Origen, Athanasius and Jerome) for numbering twenty-two books of the bible (from *aleph* to *taw*). In this article I show how the count of twenty-four books of the Bible was borrowed from the Homeric model and adapted by some ancient authorities to the more Hebraic system of twenty-two books, corresponding to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

DELIBERATE MISUSE OF IDIOMS IN THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVE

Jonathan Grossman

Idioms are the building blocks of any language, both spoken and primarily written. Many authors intentionally change these idioms, thereby incorporating sophisticated wordplay in their works. A known idiom can be altered in three fundamental ways: an unexpected word may be substituted for a familiar one; the syntax may be changed; and the expression may be placed in a new context that provides unique meaning. This article traces the altering of idioms in the biblical narrative, while pointing out how this intentionally contributes to the literary design, for when this phenomenon occurs it surprises the reader, drawing his attention to a meaningful idea.

ON THE EARLY FORM OF BAVLI *MO^oED QATAN 7B-8A*

Yoav Rosenthal

Among the most important findings for the study of the text of the Babylonian Talmud are two fragments from the Cairo Genizah, remnants of a single original manuscript, that contain a significant portion of the first chapter of *Mo^oed Qatan*. These fragments were first

published in the early 1990s by Adiel Schremer, who combined the fragments and published them with an accompanying scholarly commentary demonstrating that the textual variants between this version of *Mo'ed Qatan* and the version found in all other manuscripts of the tractate are exceptional in scope and nature, of a different type than previously known variants found among manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud.

In this article I propose to return to, and re-examine, one of the *sugyot* found in this important version, a *sugya* for which extreme variants are found. On the basis of a comprehensive and careful comparison of the two textual traditions – that preserved in the Genizah fragments and that of the other manuscripts of the tractate – I wish to demonstrate the possible existence of an early *sugya*, which underlies both textual traditions, and to determine some of the characteristics of this early *sugya*.

REREADING THE *YEṢER* IN AMORAIC LITERATURE

Ishai Rosen-Zvi

The increasing interest in Jewish carnality and sexuality in recent years has influenced many areas of research, one of which is the rabbinic concept of the ‘evil *yeṣer*’ (inclination). Studies increasingly discuss this rabbinic concept in sexual terms, and ‘*yeṣer*’ has become almost synonymous with ‘sexuality’. In this paper I wish to show that this view lacks textual justification. Most rabbinic sources present the *yeṣer* as the enemy of humanity, constantly inducing people to sin and accounting for their difficulty in becoming and remaining servants of God. The *yeṣer* drives one to sexual sins just as it drags to any other sinful acts, as it is an antinomian entity, the enemy of Torah and its commandments.

Nonetheless, the sexualization of the *yeṣer* is not simply a scholarly bias. Rather, it is a result of rabbinic, solely Babylonian and mostly post Amoraic, developments. After mapping this development, the paper further attempts to locate it in a broader Babylonian context: a process of hyper-sexualization which takes place in the Babylonian Talmud alone. The paper ends with an attempt to account for this phenomenon, which is exceptional (at least in the context of ancient Jewish literature). The paper thus wishes to show both the breadth of *yeṣer* discourse in rabbinic literature – including all kinds of human sinfulness – and the depth of the sexualization processes in the Babylonian Talmud – influencing the way not only the *yeṣer*, but reality at large, is pictured.

‘WHEN GOD DESCENDED TO EGYPT’: THE STORY OF A PASSAGE IN THE PASSOVER HAGGADAH

Simcha Emanuel

During the Medieval Period some areas in Europe adopted the recital of a certain section in the Haggadah which began with the words: ‘It was noted: When the Almighty descended to Egypt’. Indeed, there are still communities who presently recite it. Rashi vehemently opposed its recitation. Early French manuscripts of the Haggadah from the 12th and 13th centuries omitted the section. Yet some English manuscripts of the Haggadah contain

it, as do early German Hagaddah manuscripts from before the year 1300, whereas later manuscripts omit it.

Investigation of variant readings of the passage in Haggadot from Germany, France and England confirm that it was recited in France until Rashi's time, but was discontinued due to Rashi's strong opposition. Toward the end of the 13th century, the influence of French customs became dominant even in Germany and its recitation ceased. This change cannot be attributed to French immigration into Germany but rather to the gradual acceptance of French traditions by German Jews.

RABBI ḤASDAI CRESCAS' CRITIQUE OF ARISTOTELIAN SCIENCE AND THE LOST BOOK OF ABNER OF BURGOS

Shalon Zadik

Rabbi Ḥasdai Crescas is known as the first Jewish philosopher to criticize Aristotelian science systematically. The aim of this article is to demonstrate that Abner of Burgos greatly influenced Crescas' criticism of Aristotelian science. Abner stated that it is possible to distinguish between a body and the characteristics attributed to it in Aristotelian physics. Crescas also posits a body with none of the traits that Aristotle attributes to bodies, with the exception, however, of having dimensions and being present in a place.

William of Ockham, one of the earliest critics of Aristotelian science regarding the essence of matter, maintains that matter (not a body, because it does not have any form) exists in actuality and lacks all the attributes that Aristotle ascribed to bodies, with the exception of being dimensional.

I argue that Crescas's method is mostly influenced by Abner and slightly by Ockham, who probably did not influence Abner (since he was at least eighteen years older than Ockham). The significance of this conclusion is that criticism of Aristotelian science in Judaism began at least eighty years before Crescas, approximately at the time that Ockham composed his sharp criticism of Aristotelian science within the context of Christian philosophy.