

תוכן העניינים

	ביקורת הנוסח כחלק מן הלימוד הפילולוגי-ההיסטורי – לשאלת שני הנוסחים של ספר ירמיה	אלכסנדר רופא
5	הכתיבה בארמית ובעברית במגילות קומראן ובספרים החיצונים:	יונתן בן-דב
27	הרקע בעולם העתיק והחיפוש אחר סמכות יהודית כתובה	
61	הזיקה בין פירושיהם של ראב"ע ורשב"ם: סוגיית מרכיבי הקטורת	איתמר כסלו
81	תמורות ביחסו של הרמב"ם למדרשות חז"ל	יאיר לורברבוים
	אבן שכתוב עליה: תוארי הנפטרים על מצבות בית העלמין	אברהם (רמי) ריינר
123	בוירצבורג 1147-1346	
v	תקצירי המאמרים באנגלית	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Alexander Rofé	Text-Criticism within the Philological-Historical Discipline: The Problem of the Double Text of Jeremiah	5
Jonathan Ben-Dov	Hebrew and Aramaic Writing in the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran Scrolls: The Ancient Near Eastern Background and the Quest for a Written Authority	27
Itamar Kislev	The Commentaries of Ibn Ezra and Rashbam and the Dispute over the Ingredients of the Altar Incense	61
Yair Lorberbaum	Changes in Maimonides' Approach to Aggadah	81
Rami Reiner	'A Tombstone Inscribed': Titles Used to Describe the Deceased in Tombstones from Würzburg between 1147–1148 and 1346	123
	English Abstracts	v

ENGLISH ABSTRACTS

TEXT-CRITICISM WITHIN THE PHILOLOGICAL-HISTORICAL DISCIPLINE: THE PROBLEM OF THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH

Alexander Rofé

The majority view in scholarship explains the existence of a double text in the Book of Jeremiah with the hypothesis of two subsequent editions: the first shorter edition is represented by the LXX, and the second larger one is extant in the MT. The present essay challenges this opinion, arguing that the situation is more complex: hundreds of years elapsed between the first recording of Jeremiah's words and deeds and the last redactions of his book. During this time, various tendencies, sometimes opposing one another, were at work. Thus, it can only be expected that both primary and secondary readings will show in the MT and will be reflected by the LXX. Moreover, as for the question of shorter vis-à-vis longer texts, one should take into account that the practice of condensing previous accounts was well known to scribes of biblical times. In the case of the book of Jeremiah, a compelling instance is the story of the murder of Gedaliah in Jer 40:7-41:18 cut short in 2 Kings 25:23-26.

A sample of the complex relation between the two text-forms shows in Jer 2:17-18 and 23:10. In both cases the MT presents a conflated reading while the LXX runs one single reading. But while in 2:17-18 the LXX preserves the primary reading, in 23:10 the single reading of the LXX is secondary.

The large minus of the LXX in 39:4-13 is examined. The possibility of an expansion (with *Wiederaufnahme*) in the MT is discarded in favor of the alternative solution – a homoeoteleuton (columnar parablepsis) occurred in the LXX or in its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Twelve doublets, extending from one to five verses, are examined. Various arguments submit that in this case too the LXX does not reflect a primary, but a secondary text. The LXX reflects a tendency to omit the second element of the doublet. And in some instances the LXX preserves a reading that is patently secondary.

In the theological realm as well the LXX presents some significant curtailments: (1) in line with the omission of *šēba'ōt* from the divine name in the books Genesis–Judges, the *Vorlage* of the LXX frequently omitted it in Jeremiah. This was apparently done because of opposition to the worship of the heavenly host (cf. Hosea 13:4 in the LXX and Qumran); (2) the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar was deprived of the title 'Servant of the Lord', since by the end of biblical times it was considered as solely due to revered personages such as Moses and David; (3) towards King Zedekiah and his people the LXX reflects a severe condemnation in Chs 34; 37; 38 and a denial of any prospect of survival in exile and of a following restoration in Chs 27; 52. This corresponds to previous doom prophecies to Zedekiah forged by Deuteronomists in Chs 21; 24; 29.

On the other hand, the MT displays some secondary expansions. In addition to the well-known hymnic verses (doxologies) introduced in Ch. 10, there are nomistic glosses

introduced in 28:16; 29:32; and 32:11. These, along with a few minor readjustments elsewhere, aimed at enhancing Jeremiah's role as a devotee to the Torah, and a preacher for its observance.

HEBREW AND ARAMAIC WRITING IN THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND THE QUMRAN SCROLLS:
THE ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN BACKGROUND AND THE QUEST FOR A WRITTEN AUTHORITY

Jonathan Ben-Dov

Recent publications on the Aramaic texts from Qumran lead the way to a comprehensive evaluation of this corpus. The present essay sheds light on the question why some texts were written in Hebrew and others in Aramaic. The answer arises from ideological-literary conceptions of language in Hellenistic Judah, including the corpus of non-Jewish Aramaic literature of the late first millennium BCE. In the view of the Jewish writers of the Hellenistic period, Aramaic was the standard medium for wisdom, science and court narratives, not only in the eastern diaspora at the time of the exile, but also throughout the primordial period of the Patriarchs. Aramaic thus signified antiquity and authority. According to these authors, Hebrew began to be spoken (and written) at the revelation on Mt. Sinai, a transition embodied in the figure of Moses. Thus the writings attributed to pre-Mosaic figures like Enoch, Levi, Amram and Qehat are in Aramaic, while the works of Moses and the prophets are in Hebrew.

Starting with the Book of Jubilees one encounters a shift in the paradigm. The Book of Jubilees domesticates the older Aramaic traditions by converting them into Hebrew and relating them to the authority of Moses. This trend, which necessarily entailed a more intensive study of halakhah and legal matters as well, is best represented with the rise of the so-called 'Moses Pseudepigrapha' at Qumran: *Divrei Moshe* and the Temple Scroll. On the other hand, the Genesis Apocryphon remained free of the Mosaic paradigm, retaining the form of a collection of ancient writings. Representing the spearhead of the new Hebraic paradigm, the Qumran community undertook a comprehensive effort to translate the older Aramaic traditions and incorporate them into the Hebrew body of knowledge.

THE COMMENTARIES OF IBN EZRA AND RASHBAM AND THE DISPUTE OVER THE
INGREDIENTS OF THE ALTAR INCENSE

Itamar Kislev

Abraham Ibn Ezra deals with the number of the ingredients required for the altar incense as commanded in Exod 30:34-38 in both of his commentaries on Exodus. In his short commentary, written in Italy between 1142 and 1145, he presents two possible interpretations as equally valid from the exegetical standpoint, but favors the one that accords with the rabbinic, halakhic tradition, viewing the latter as decisive in such cases. In his longer commentary on Exodus, written in 1153 in France, he offers only a single explanation, which differs from both of those he had presented in his earlier work but which is also in

agreement with the halakhah, this time adding his express opposition to the interpretation offered by Rashbam. Arguing against Rashbam's interpretation of the incense-pericope requires familiarity with several passages in his commentary, giving us reason to believe that during his years in France Ibn Ezra had become thoroughly familiar with Rashbam's commentary on the Pentateuch and had come to sense the need to combat his methodology regarding the relation between the *peshat* of the Biblical laws and traditional halakhah.

CHANGES IN MAIMONIDES' APPROACH TO AGGADAH

Yair Lorberbaum

This article argues that *The Guide of the Perplexed* reflects a profound change in Maimonides' approach to Aggadah. In his early writings, especially in the *Interpretation to the Mishnah* (written between 1161 and 1168) Maimonides argued vigorously that almost all the Aggadot are parables containing inner ('hidden') philosophical truths about physics and metaphysics. A close and careful reading of many paragraphs of the *Guide* (completed cir. 1191) demonstrates that the mature Maimonides no longer holds that view. According to Maimonides in the *Guide*, most of the Aggadah should be taken at its irrational, mythic face value; and even if some *aggadot* are parables, their inner meaning does not correspond to Aristotelian physics and metaphysics. While in his early writing Maimonides criticized the Geonim for marginalizing Aggadah and argued vigorously that the early rabbis were (Aristotelian) philosophers, in the *Guide* he seems to subscribe to the view that the Talmudic 'Sages' (*hakhamim*) were mere lawyers. In his late philosophical writings Maimonides 'returns' to the Geonic view that: 'No questions should be asked about difficulties in the Haggadah'.

The article's point of departure is a passage from the introduction to the *Guide*, in which Maimonides explains why he withdrew from his early plan (described in the introduction to *perek helek*) to write *The Book of Correspondence* - a comprehensive philosophical interpretation 'to all the *aggadot* found in the Talmud and in all the other early rabbinic compilations'. A close and careful reading of his explanation, along with a comparison of his language to the one in *perek helek*, shows that neither technical obstacles nor concerns about concealment explain Maimonides' withdrawal from writing of *The Book of Correspondence*. He made this dramatic change in his literary plans - eventually leading to the *Guide* - because of the deep change in his approach towards Aggadah.

'A TOMBSTONE INSCRIBED': TITLES USED TO DESCRIBE THE DECEASED IN TOMBSTONES FROM WÜRZBURG BETWEEN 1147-1148 AND 1346

Rami Reiner

This article examines a surprising and valuable discovery. In 1988, nearly 1500 Hebrew-inscribed tombstones and tombstone remains were unearthed in Würzburg, Germany. Dating from 1147-1148 through 1346, the inscriptions offer unexpected insight into the life of the Jewish community from the late Second Crusade to the eve of the outbreak of

the Black Plague, which decimated the city's Jewish population and left it uninhabited by Jews for a long time thereafter.

The article is dedicated to the study of the titles used to describe the deceased, divided in the article into four main groups: (1) rabbinical, homiletic titles and literary occupations; (2) communal titles and occupations; (3) personal titles; (4) prefixes to the name of the deceased and titles denoting their age.

A mere four tombstones of children were available for the study, indicating that most of Würzburg's children were not honored with a headstone for their grave. This assumption is reinforced by a listing in the city's *Memorbuch* of some nine-hundred community members who perished in the summer of 1298. The *Buch* often mentions child victims, but these are by and large anonymous. Children were not usually considered to possess independent personalities.

Unlike the children's relative anonymity, rabbis and sages who lived and worked in the city were honored with impressive tombstones. Their relatives also made sure of commemorating themselves with elaborate headstones detailing their pedigree. *Yeled*, *HaRav* and *Rabeinu* are only three of the titles that the article discusses. It is hoped that the detailed analyses found in the article may offer a broad perspective on a medieval Jewish community: on its young and elders, its office bearers and even its social divisions.