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Summary

Among the Jewish sages of northern France, the twelfth century saw a shift from Talmudic study and the midrashic exegesis of a few Biblical books to a methodical peshat interpretation of the whole Bible. Rabbi Yosef Kara, a man of wonderfully independent mind, was a leading figure in this movement. He (not Rashi) was the first true peshat commentator, and this thesis demonstrates that his commentary displays many features which have become the cornerstones of modern exegesis, especially in its stress upon context, comparison and realia and its articulation of exegetical principles. Only Kara's commentary on Job has to date received critical attention. This thesis analyses his commentary on the entire Book of Prophets: Joshua, Judges, I-II Samuel, I-II Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets. His innovatory emphasis upon peshat and general rejection of derash are discussed in Chapter 1, with his stress upon textual environment (hibbur ha-mikraoth) and continuous attention to the links between topics. Chapter 2 deals with the style and terminology of his exegetical approach; use of verses and of vernacular languages; literary analyses of Biblical style; manner of resolving contradictions; and interest in realia. Chapter 3 discusses when and how he uses sources like the Aramaic Targumim, and surveys his links with other commentators like Rashi, Helbo, Ben Saruk and Ben Labrat, and his use of their work. His independence of Rashi and the respective conceptions of peshat of Kara, Rashi and Rashbam are established in a long comparison. Some notes on his attitude to the Masoretic text follow. A survey of his works and their scholarly history and a brief account of his life which discusses the epithet kara are provided.
Introduction

Although Biblical exegesis has interested me from my early student days, several considerations have led to my present focus upon the writings of Yosef Kara. First is his exegetical technique. This is most instructive in that he takes the trouble to justify his points in methodological terms, so that study of his work carries one beyond the passage under discussion to a general interpretative approach of great value in its capacity to delineate the text's literary and conceptual qualities. Secondly, the advanced approach to commentary involved in his grasp of his own method. Finally, the fact that this distinguished figure has been little studied.

In entering more deeply into his commentary and becoming acquainted with his style and language, I became aware of his specific quality as a commentator who could recognise and define features of the text which now form the basis for modern interpretations. He does not appear to struggle for exegetical freedom. In many respects the bonds of the Midrash are behind him, and if here and there he cites Midrashim and grapples with them he acts not out of slavishness but out of a sense of obligation to his exegetical predecessors and respect for the Torah which has enabled him to move so far forward.

Not only does he display exegetical independence, he also deploys his commentary in a fresh manner. Some of his comments are founded not only upon their harmony with the text but also on their incongruity with other hypothetical
interactions which he rejects. For this purpose he makes use of fixed linguistic structures.

His apprehension of נָשָׁה commentary is novel and complex. נָשָׁה is arrived at through a punctilious attention to various points - the order and meaning of the verses, anticipatory passages, juxtaposition of sections, context (which he calls נַעֲלֵי图书), and of course his own declarations on the subject. He displays great sensitivity to Biblical style and (as I hope to show) develops a most advanced literary conception of the text.

The purpose of this study is to examine Kara’s exegetical approach in three areas, to each of which a chapter is devoted. (1) נָשָׁה and נַעֲלֵי图书: Kara’s view of these exegetical modes is considered and an attempt is made to define his conception of נָשָׁה. We shall examine the way in which he selects and makes use of Midrashim, and of what he calls נַעֲלֵי图书 or נָשָׁה תְמוּנָה. (2) Kara’s own exegetical approach will then be considered. This will include an examination of his style and principles of interpretation, his use of Biblical verses and of the vernacular, and his notes on the style of the Bible, and in particular on realia and geography. (3) His relation to his predecessors will be the subject of the final chapter. This will include an appreciation of his view of נָשָׁה and נַעֲלֵי图书, and of the Aramaic translations and other rabbis, and his attitude to his contemporaries, especially Rashi and Helbo. An examination of these three areas should enable us to delineate his exegetical approach to the Prophets and to the whole Bible.

Before the various chapters of this study are outlined,
attention must be paid to the scope of Kara's commentaries and to the history of research upon them.

1. The Scope of Kara's Commentaries

Kara comments upon most of the Biblical books. We shall begin with the Pentateuch. Here it emerges that he does not provide a full or continuous commentary but merely supplements the commentaries which were already in existence, especially those of Rashi. His comments appear in Tosafist literature and in the glosses preserved within Rashi. A collection of about 100 pieces is included in Berliner's Peletath Sofrim.¹ His commentaries on the Early Prophets are extant in the Kirchheim MS, which has been published in a scholarly edition by Shimon Apenstein (Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1972); not all the notes are accurate. The commentaries on the Latter Prophets are printed in Mikraoth Gedoloth (pub. Lublin). While the commentaries on Isaiah and Jeremiah in this edition are Kara's,² the text in the Kirchheim MS differs slightly; compare the passages cited by Littmann in the Appendix to his monograph on Kara.³ The commentary on Ezekiel belongs to Kara's 'school', for it was set down by one of his disciples, who notes, for example, "וַיֹּֽאמֶר֩ יִרְשִׁיִּי ֣ רֵעוֹ֑ן" (Ezek. 14:5; 16:27, 30); "וַיָּמֶר֩ יִרְשִׁיֵי ֣ רֵעֶ֗ה" (Ezek. 33:27). But Poznanski⁴ is right to feel that it should be seen as Kara's work on the basis of its exegetical approach, style and method, and phrases like שָׁלַלְתָּה, which serve as characteristic signs by which he may be identified. I too make use of it here as a commentary like any of the others.
As to the Twelve Minor Prophets, some of the extant material is by Kara. Apart from the version in Mikraoth Gedoloth, the commentary on Micah is edited by Gad in his edition of Bechor Shor's commentary on the Pentateuch.

In the Hagiographa, Kara comments on Job, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Ruth, Lamentations and Esther, his work on the last three being edited by Jellink in an edition which also contains Rashbam's commentary, among others. The commentary on Lamentations has also been edited by S. Babar on the basis of several MSS, and the commentary on Ecclesiastes by Einstein. A scholarly edition of the commentary on Job has recently been published by Ahrend.

2. History of Research on Kara's Commentaries

Zunz and Geiger were among the first to draw attention to Kara's exegetical approach, the first surveys of which then began to appear in addition to selective publication of his commentaries. Geiger's collection Nitei Ne'emanim (Breslau 1847) is marred by the fact that not all the commentaries printed as Kara's are in fact his. At the end of the 1880s two monographs were published on Kara's work: Einstein's Introduction to his edition of the commentary on Ecclesiastes, and Littmann's book. Einstein discusses fundamental issues in connection with Kara's exegesis, including the question of his predecessors (his father, his uncle Menahem b. Helbo, who was his teacher, and others), the name Kara and what is known of his family, and the period of Rashi, Kara and Rashbam and the exegetical links between them. He also provides an introduction to the commentary on Ecclesiastes. This survey, like earlier ones, has helped to
establish the principles for the study of Kara. Einstein stresses his paedagogic quality and points out his characteristic turns of phrase and exegetical principles.

A year later, in 1887, Littmann's monograph was published in Breslau. It differs from Einstein's work in being a study in its own right whose intention is to summarise the findings of previous scholars and Littmann's own examination of the manuscripts. It includes an introduction, a biography, a survey of Kara's writings on the various Biblical books, and an account of his links with other writers (Rashi, Helbo, Rashbam) and of his exegetical approach, etc. The rich Appendix contains selected passages from Kara, taken from the Kirchheim MS in the library of the Theological Seminary in Breslau; Littmann explains how he has made use of them in his different chapters.

In 1913 Poznanski published the monograph *Mavo al Hachmei Tzarfath Mefarshei Hamikra* as an appendix to an edition of the commentary of Eliezer of Beaugency on Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets. This 'Introduction' contains an ample chapter on Kara, and despite the passage of nearly 80 years, it remains an important study. Poznanski also published a study of Helbo, Kara's uncle, which complements the chapter in his monograph. Since (on the basis of several descriptions in Kara's commentaries) it is accepted that Helbo was Kara's teacher, the little Helbo material extant is of interest in the study of his disciple.

In his chapter on Kara Poznanski surveys the scope of his Biblical commentary - that is, on which books a commentary exists and where it is published - and then sketches out Kara's exegetical characteristics. Thus he deals (for
instance) with Kara's attitude towards שור, his relation to Rashi, his exegetical principles, his view of Biblical language, and his style. He includes the findings of earlier scholars as to, for example, the extensive use in Kara of שלא תמאנה מקרא קצירה.

The literature contains several more surveys of Kara, like that in Babar's edition of his commentary on Lamentations, etc., but none offers any arresting new points. Epstein, a student of Berliner's, provides a survey of Kara's life and work which has recently been summarised and translated into Hebrew as an introduction to the edition of Kara's commentary on the Early Prophets published by Mossad Harav Kook (1973). Epstein discusses Kara's cultural context and the geographical circumstances of his activity. He lays stress on the teachings of Helbo and on the exegetical approaches of other contemporaries, but his principal interest is Kara's view of שור as compared with ובו. In discussing the Sages of whom Kara makes use in his work, he focusses upon Rashi. The second part of the survey consists of a short discussion of the status of Kara's commentary on each of the Early Prophets. In dealing with questions of realia, chronology, relations to exegetical sources and so on it sketches out his particular approach.

The latest and most comprehensive study of Kara is the Introduction provided by Ahrend to the commentary on Job. It is divided into three parts: a short general introduction to his life and to his exegetical principles, as these are elucidated in previous studies; an account (which constitutes the bulk of the book) of the main lines followed in the commentary on Job; and a discussion by Moshe Katan of French
terms in the commentary. There is also an up-to-date list of indexes and a rich bibliography. Ahrend published this book in preparation for his edition of the commentary on Job, which came out in 1978 and in which he supplies an introduction to Kara's exegesis both in general and in relation to Job. In a private conversation, he expressed his pleasure that I was working on Kara's exegetical approach to the Prophets and approved the line I wished to take.

Some important points about Kara can be found in Twyto's review of Ahrend's book. His main point is that the activity of Jewish commentators in northern France, like Kara and Rashbam, must be understood as the outcome of the contemporary Little Renaissance. More precisely, he holds that there is a link between the ways in which the Bible was studied in Christian circles and the approach of the Jewish Sages. The flowering of was one result of the contact between the two cultures.
3. **Topics Discussed in this Study**

Chapter 1, `Between וְשֵׁם וְדָרָשׁ`, deals with Kara's exegetical method. It discusses the terms which he adopts, in particular those used to distinguish between וְשֵׁם and דָרָשׁ; his ways of proving or clarifying exegetical points; his innovative reliance upon תְמוּנָה; his focussing upon the anticipatory passages that form part of Biblical narrative; and the use he makes of Midrash - how and when he cites the Talmudic Sages.

His intense concern with the subject of וְשֵׁם, and its own importance, makes it necessary to attempt to sketch out a definition of וְשֵׁם as he sees it. This endeavour is made easier by the fact that as a paedagogue Kara keeps his students or readers in mind, and frequently explains or justifies his views. His devotion to וְשֵׁם leads him to give reasons for his comments, which he defines as the plain sense of the text. He appears (as a number of scholars have suggested) to have a mature conception of the nature of בֵּית דָּרָשׁ, as his use of numerous terms and phrases indicate. For example, he comments on I Kings 8:8, וְכָלַּמַּכְרָה בְּאָמָר אֲנֵי יוֹשֵׁב וּבָאֲרוּ שַׁמְעָה שְׁמוֹ הַמָּלִיאֵת וְבִרְרוֹר שֶׁל דָּרָשׁ שלֹא בֵּית תַּנִּיעֵי. The terms מַכְרָה are used by him (generally in isolation) to designate correct interpretations. The phrase כלָּמַּכְרָה seems to me to be a covert attack on those who hold different opinions or who cannot make up their minds between given interpretations. Another term, תְמוּנָה, connotes attention to the internal dynamic of the text and its continuity. The complementary term תְמוּנָה describes the overall work of the commentary and the context and textual
environment. הבור may be achieved, in Kara's opinion, by rigorous precision as to exegetical method. The absence of an abstract definition does not reflect any shortcoming in Kara, since his period was not mature enough to arrive at one. Instead we find combinations of terms and phrases which can in various ways supply what is wanted. Scholars agree that Kara stands out among his contemporaries in northern France both for his striving towards הבור and for his explicit declarations on this subject. He makes a series of references to the priority to be accorded the הבור, and frequently asserts even its exclusive rights. In this he differs vastly from Rashi, for Rashi not merely includes many Midrashim in his commentaries but treats the Midrash as equal if not superior in standing to הבור.

The chapter contains a survey of the places where Kara either gives express preference to the הבור or rejects a and sharply criticises the Midrash. A separate section discusses and illustrates the ways in which he selects a small number of Midrashim which he feels may serve as figurative components of הבור. Following this, three topics are discussed which also reflect his view of הבור: (a) תכלת, that is, the determined and consistent elucidation of the link between topics and the text's continuity. Kara makes his commentary move without a break from one verse to the next by clarifying the context until his discussion becomes a complete whole in which parts of the verses in question are smoothly integrated. (b) Anticipation: that feature of Biblical narrative whereby things are mentioned out of context and explicated by material which appears later. Kara uses the phrases על המתים ובעזים וסדרם later.
explain this phenomenon in terms of the text's overall viewpoint, and (as part of his conception of what וְשָׁם entails) he provides a literary analysis. (c) Juxtaposition: a further piece of evidence in the overall conception and in analysing the text in formal literary terms. My own conclusions as to Kara's view of וְשָׁם appear after a survey of scholarly opinion.

The last part of the chapter examines Kara's handling of his sources. Where does he quote the Midrash precisely, or with slight changes, and where does he summarise it, or even merely cite its central idea? What is his attitude to the Midrash? A number of places in which he is inaccurate, or errs in quoting from the sources, are listed. A list is also supplied of the books and sources available to him.

Chapter 2 describes Kara's exegetical approach as it emerges in the Prophetic Books. There are nine sections. The first describes his exegetical style and terminology. What he says is to be read as a continuous discussion, the commentary forming a paraphrase of the text. It is characterised by longwindedness, appeals to the reader, repetition of arguments and the maintenance of a connection between verses so that a complete picture of the subject under discussion is obtained. An interesting innovation which scholars have not remarked is Kara's use of the second person singular (for the roots י''ר or ט''ל) to give guidance to the reader in various Scriptural principles or textual features which recur in certain contexts. He does not merely direct; he demands that the reader understand what he calls נְתִינוּת חָכְרִית (I Sam. 1:20), and he warns him against mistaken interpretations. According to contemporary practice, his remarks are worked
into the verses which form an integral part of his commentary. I have found a number of places where he openly acknowledges inability to interpret a passage, whether his difficulty is partial and conditional or whether it emerges in a declaration of complete incomprehension. Another stylistic trait is his great variety of language when he cites an Aramaic translation or offers a translation into the vernacular of other commentaries or of Scriptural verses. He does not use fixed terms or phrases (as is customary among other mediaeval commentators) but displays the range characteristic of a teacher before his pupils. The next section details the principal ways in which he makes use of Biblical citations. Places where he quotes wrongly are listed in an appendix.

The third section deals with his use of the vernacular. Here too he is innovative, for he was apparently the first (and perhaps the only) commentator to employ the vernacular not merely to explain an isolated word or idea but to translate phrases and entire verses. He formulates rules not only for specific features in the text but also, and principally, for Biblical style: the repetition of words or of themes, parables and images, alliteration, and so on. It is interesting to note that where passages are duplicated or repeated, Kara defines the considerations involved in the elliptical style whereby something is stated briefly in one place and repeated and expanded elsewhere. Another discovery is that in his view, the literary elements involved in a rhetorical style or rhythm may serve to establish the order of a prophet's addresses.

A separate section distributes into categories most of the
places where Kara compares the text of the Early Prophets with that of Chronicles. Some of these comparisons are undoubtedly instituted out of Kara's profound belief in the integrity of the text and his strong desire to show his pupils that there are no contradictions in the Bible. For this reason he attempts to settle contradictions and cruxes in the Prophets, and here too the essence of his approach is harmonisation. A short discussion then follows of those verses where he offers more than one interpretation (whether his own or someone else's), and of his approach in such cases.

Another feature which is characteristic of Kara, and peculiar to him, has not been noted by scholars: the attention which he pays to the stuff of ordinary life. In this he differs greatly from Rashi and other commentators. While they make the occasional reference, this is not their regular practice. Kara's very concern with realia, not to mention the intensity with which he pursues them, makes him into a precursor of much later exegetical trends. He frequently draws analogies from his life and environment in France, displaying no little expertise as to many concrete matters connected with housekeeping and the kitchen, agriculture, building and shipping, anatomy and medicine, armies and war, and even court etiquette. The last section is devoted to this subject. It also notes his lack of information (as to which he resembles other contemporaries) on the identity of sites in the land of Israel and the surrounding countries, and on the geography of the ancient world in general.

The third chapter examines Kara's relation to his
predecessors, a topic of particular importance inasmuch as no commentator works in an exegetical vacuum. We must not suppose that any commentary can exist which does not draw, consciously or unconsciously, from oral or written exegetical traditions. This is the case with the greatest of exegetes, like Rashi, Rashbam and Saadiah Gaon, and it applies to Kara as well; he too shows the influence of Talmudic literature, various Midrashim, and the commentaries of his predecessors. A few of his explanations are explicitly ascribed to someone else, while others which are in fact taken from another source form an undifferentiated part of his commentary. We therefore consider on what occasions Kara owns to another's authorship, and when he does not; when he notes that a point is disputed; when he cites writers with whom he disagrees (and which ones he selects); and when and how he expresses his own opinion.

After examining his view of נֻנֹ זֶבֶנ and נֻנֹ נְזָר, we discuss his attitude towards the Aramaic translations, which means principally Targum Jonathan (he cites Onkelos on only twenty-four occasions, for the purpose merely of reinforcing his own comment or providing a substitute for it). Targum Jonathan is cited sometimes to strengthen Kara's interpretation and sometimes in order to be rejected. It may be seen that the arrangement of material here reflects exegetical preference, for if he places his interpretation before the reference to Targum Jonathan it means that he gives it priority without rejecting the Targum's solution. When his own comment comes after the Targum's interpretation, the latter is rejected because it is insufficiently founded in the וֹֽוֹ. 
An important central section is devoted to the links between Kara and Rashi, and their commentaries. There is as yet no thoroughgoing study of this topic; although two commentators from the same city and alive at the same time are in question, only one of them has been accorded broad publication. Each mentions the other, and it seems clear that it was Kara who reported Helbo's views to Rashi; it is equally clear that Kara was acquainted with Rashi's grandson Rashbam, a fact which has prompted several scholars to stress the connection between their commentaries on different Biblical books. Some have minimised the significance of Kara's work on the grounds that it is merely an expansion of Rashi, while others claim that it is wholly dependent upon it. Einstein showed at the beginning of this century that these assertions are exaggerated, for Kara not infrequently criticises Rashi, and his commentary is longer and its approach different; but so far no comparative study of their commentaries has probed very deeply or dealt with them in quantitative or qualitative terms. Such an examination in fact establishes considerable differences between them which reflect differences in conception, and so undermines the claim that Kara's work is identical or similar to Rashi's, or a mere copy of it. Kara mentions Sages whom Rashi does not name, makes use of Targumim in many more places than Rashi does, employs the vernacular more extensively, and cites Midrashim which are not to be found in Rashi. He takes a more critical view of טעמי המקרא and מסורה, and of contradictions between the Early Prophets and Chronicles, and (above all) he displays a more advanced conception of דת. Moreover, his commentary is built up as a continuous
exegetical composition, where Rashi and other commentators write isolated notes. Rashi offers nothing to match Kara's style, with its fixed principles and appeals to the reader. We must therefore conclude (and this is a point only now established), that Kara's commentary is an independent work which occasionally includes comments from the older Rashi, and in parallel manner Kara's discussions can be found worked into Rashi's.

Another section deals with Kara's relation to his father's brother R. Menahem bar Helbo (the Rambach), who was also known as Kara. Kara admired his uncle and often quotes him, although frequently for the purpose of rejecting his interpretation. Helbo seems to have influenced him greatly and to have aroused his interest in Yeshu'a, as Poznanski suggests: 'The first distinguished French commentator on the Yeshu'a known to us was Rabbi Menahem bar Helbo'. I then go on to survey the Sages whose interpretations are cited by Kara, generally with approval. The ten sources in question include Rashbam, the grammarians Dunash and Menahem, and R. Shimon. It can be said that Kara endeavours to provide a Yeshu'a commentary on the basis of his own understanding, and only after exhausting his abilities does he turn to earlier commentaries. He then quotes them to support his own point or adopts their language as if it were his own, or adduces them as extra opinions when he has not made up his own mind, sometimes adding his own view either in so many words or by implication.

This study seeks to provide a thoroughgoing and comprehensive elucidation of Kara's exegetical approach. I trust the results will reward my efforts.
Biographical Note

It seems appropriate to title this section in this manner because (most unfortunately) hardly anything is known about Kara's life. Even the little information we possess is insufficiently exact and depends upon indirect evidence.

It is known that Kara lived in Rashi's era, and that on occasion he visited the latter's study hall and was acquainted with Rashbam and Rabbi Yom Tov, who was the son of Riban and Rashi's grandson. Poznanski concludes from this that it is a near-certainty that he was born some 20-30 years after Rashi, i.e. about 4820-4830. But neither the year of his death nor details of his life are known... Thus Yosef Kara was born between 1060 and 1070 in Troyes, Rashi's city, in the Champagne district of northern France. His father's name was Shimon, as Kara himself states in his commentary to Hosea 12:3:

ר' שמעון אבי דביני.

His uncle, Rabbi Menahem ben Helbo, was his principal teacher; he is frequently mentioned in Kara's commentary. Kara spent most of his life in Troyes, although he lived for some time in Worms, and he is known to have taken part in theological disputations with Christians. He apparently wrote commentaries on most of the books of the Bible, and in addition commented extensively on liturgical poems, exerting a great influence in this field on his successors, who often referred to him simply as המפרשים. These meagre facts with regard to his life, his family and his activities are all we possess.

Let us now look at his historical background, so that we may understand the aims and methods of the Jewish
commentators of northern France at the beginning of the twelfth century.' Some discern in this period a kind of minor Renaissance distinguished by a cultural and religious openness which expressed itself in many forms: 'The fundamental problem which engaged the intellectual world of the twelfth century was the problem of the correct relationship between traditional authority and the demands of reason.'

The Christian world sought an explanation of such phenomena as the creation of the world. An historical consciousness came into being, and a movement towards acquiring general and secular knowledge, especially Latin grammar. This blossoming brought about a renewal of the study of the Bible. 'Spiritual' interpretations were discouraged and a new goal appeared, the achieving of a 'literal' commentary - an aim which received added impetus through the inauguration of religious disputations between Jews and Christians. Parallel developments were occurring among the Jews, such as a more deliberate organisation of education and recognition of its requirements; a search after exact texts of the Bible; immense interest in the grammar and linguistics of the Hebrew Bible (corresponding to the Christian world's concern with Latin); the development of various types of commentary, and so on. All these flowed from the general trend of the period and the reciprocal influence of Jews and Christians upon each other. The 'fundamental problem' which we have mentioned found expression in the commentaries of the Jews of northern France in the fixing of the relationship between the authority of the traditional homiletic approach (יומא) and that of the rational, 'plain sense' approach (רמב"ם).
Later we shall deal with the position taken by Kara on this subject and assess his relationship to contemporary commentators. But before the principal concerns of this study are taken up, we must examine the appellation of קארא by which Rabbi Yosef ben Shimon is generally known, and attempt to reach a conclusion on the basis of the accounts which have been given by various scholars.

The name or epithet קארא, which literally means 'reader', is attached both to R. Yosef and to his uncle, Helbo. Its precise significance is unknown. Geiger thinks that it denotes someone who reads the Bible out loud, in parallel with the use of the same appellation for Islamic scholars who read the Koran. That the Bible was thus 'read', says Geiger, emerges from Rashi's comment on Shabbath 11a (cf. Kiddushin 49a). The text statesCornavin]'A [JN'N, and Rashi says, 'זאנו, כתובה דברי ההקב'ה, שבית הקוראים באשרו, and Rashi himself remarks, in discussing the allegorical section of the Song of Songs (7:13), that there are and 'This must mean the synagogue reader. Rashi himself remarks, in discussing the allegorical section of the Song of Songs (7:13), that there are and this reflects the situation in his own time.' Jellink thinks that קארא refers to one who explains texts in accordance with the homiletic, as opposed to a דרש, whose approach is homiletic. Epstein holds that two types of expositors were to be found among the various Jewish communities, both of whom sought to teach Scripture and preach morality: the קארא, who preached in public and interpreted Aggadoth and
Midrashim, and קראים, who were scholars who sought to explain the Biblical text through the ושם. Evidence for this suggestion is to be found in the Pesikta of Rabbi Kahana: ר', נתמימה אמר חוה ענסם דברים, בואו, דברים, kraaim, טורפים, דרשים והברא. This indicates that Kara and Helbo might have been such kraaim, commenting on the Scriptures to people assembled in a synagogue or study house. Epstein further points out that Kara plainly enjoyed asking questions and giving answers, and that he attended more to the general continuity of the text than to its details. Nevertheless the theory is untenable since there is no support for the essentially artificial suggestion that there were two types of preachers. Poznanski¹⁸ thinks that קרא means someone concerned with explaining Scripture, giving lectures in synagogue and fulfilling the roles of both Kraim קרא and דרבא קרא together (in the manner familiar today); this view is based on a phrase used by Kara in his commentary on Isaiah 23:13: מדריר די קראים. This thesis approximates that of S. A. Rappaport,¹⁹ who says of Kara's father, Rabbi Shimon, also known as Kraim קרא, that 'it is likely that this appellation of Kraim קרא was bestowed on him because he made himself well known through his knowledge of Scripture and homiletic commentary, and it somewhat resembles the title of דרשי Kraim which he also possessed as a collector of Midrashim on the Biblical text ... but his son, Rabbi Yosef, also called simply Kraim, seems to have been given the title because of his father, and perhaps because he too was a very great Scriptural commentator...'

Einstein²⁰ shares this opinion. Ahrend²¹ inclines towards it and the similar views of Einstein and Rappaport,
and rejects Jellink and (more strongly) Epstein for interpreting the Pesikta to suggest that teachers of the Bible were classified according to their exegetical approach. Banitte adds that scholars who specialised in the teaching of Scripture were called פֶּטֶרִים in the plural and in the singular קָרָא or נְקָדֵר, connoting one who read lectures to students on the Bible. Examining Kara's language, Banitte points out that he makes extensive use of the root פֶּתֶר. The קָרָא, he suggests, dealt as a rule with the following topics: צִי, Targum Jonathan, Scriptural citations, and the explanation of difficult words. The קָרָא (i.e. נְקָדֵר) glossed such words with the help of the vernacular word-lists which had become available, while the set forth the deeper meaning of the text. This is precisely the distinction between פֶּתֶר and: פֶּרֶשׁ פֶּתֶר and the first relies upon glossaries and the second penetrates into significance.

We may therefore conclude that Kara, like his uncle, was a teacher of Scripture who worked with students. Our evidence with regard to Helbo comes from Kara himself: מִזְאָה ר' מַנָּה גְּלִילֶא אָחָי אַלָּא אֲחָי כָּלַה עֵבֶרִי לְפָנֵי עֵבֶרִי אֲלָפִים וְהַעֲלָמִים זְחָרָי. That the same was true of Kara must be acknowledged not only because the title of קָרָא כָּלַה became so essentially his but also because of his exegetical method, which is suggestive of lectures to students rather than of a commentary organised in writing. The same point emerges from his style of question-and-answer and appeals to the reader, his continuity of interpretation, his use of the vernacular, and other aspects of his work.
Chapter 1
Between וַעֲלֹמֶה and בַּעֲלֹמֶה

I. וַעֲלֹמֶה: An Appraisal

1. Background

The first scholar to discuss the issue of וַעֲלֹמֶה and בַּעֲלֹמֶה in the commentary of Rabbi Joseph Kara was Geiger: 'I have already expressed my opinion as to his general practice, how he toiled most diligently to reveal the וַעֲלֹמֶה, rejoiced when it was found, held fast to it and refused to abandon it.' And again, 'Such was his method, to fasten the וַעֲלֹמֶה with a peg and then secure it with immoveable nails. Yet at times he found that he could not support it, and was not ashamed to admit this' (p. 27). Einstein held a similar view. Apenstein was the first to investigate the subject in depth, and he concluded (a) that although Kara at times cites Midrashim in full, he never does so without giving his own opinion; and where the Midrash is at variance with the וַעֲלֹמֶה he tears into it most vehemently (as in Jud. 5:4; I Sam. 1:17; II Sam. 12:30); (b) that he relies on the Talmud and on Midrashic literature 'in order to arrive at Halachic explanations ... insertions which cast light on the meaning of the text and infuse it with moral points' (p. 11); (c) that he opposes מדרש עדות only on those occasions where the Rabbinic statements run so counter to the וַעֲלֹמֶה 'that they give rise to interpretations far beyond the natural imagination' (p. 11), and distinguishes between Aggadoth which make a moral or didactic point and explanations which border upon the
imaginary world; and (d) that he at times offers his students a Midrash in order to catch their attention and give them enjoyment, and then presents them with a story which he has heard, whose source is unclear (see II Sam. 22:35).

In his study of the French commentators, Poznanski writes as follows on this subject: 'Here we can observe [Kara] progressing a step further than Rashi by stating unequivocally that יְשִׁירָה is of the essence and one may rely only on it; and that יְדִירָה is only an ornament, a decoration used to "bestow on the Torah greater grandeur and might", while in truth it is superfluous'. Here he quotes Kara on I Samuel 1:17, and concludes, 'And thus to Kara truth is only to be found in יְשִׁירָה.' Poznanski further concludes that Kara, wherever he was unable to explain a passage through יְשִׁירָה means, was forced to turn to יְדִירָה; but he is at a loss to explain why Kara sometimes invokes the יְדִירָה without evident need (p. xxxii). He also emphasises the great difference between Rashi and Kara as to the following points: (a) Kara's far smaller number of Midrashim; (b) the quality of the Midrashim, 'for we do not find Kara taking the view that in a given instance there is room for both יְשִׁירָה and יְדִירָה, nor does he ever pursue the יְדִירָה, elsewhere he adds that Kara 'most spiritedly sets the יְדִירָה at a distance'. In contrast to Kara, Rashbam seeks 'to plumb the יְשִׁירָה to its depths' (p. xliii), as he says of himself and as we shall see below. The inference is that Kara fills a gap somewhere between Rashi and Rashbam.

Poznanski's surprise at Kara's use of Midrashim where they are not absolutely required by the text is expressed in
different terms by B. Smalley,7 who also offers a different explanation. Following Rabinowitz,8 she claims that Kara is not consistent in declaring his vehement opposition to Midrashim, since in fact he makes use of a great many.9

In Arugath Habosem, E. E. Urbach makes mention of Kara as a commentator upon liturgical poems, and states, 'In the nature of things he was forced to utilize Aggadah when seeking to explain Piyutim ... but here too he blazed a trail for the ישוע.'10 This comment again indicates that Kara viewed ישוע as the most legitimate and essential approach for his commentaries. Recently, Ahrend has claimed that if we really wish to evaluate Kara's importance and his historical position among Scriptural commentators, we must examine his view of ישוע,11 noting that his approach to this issue is at odds with Rashi's, and that Kara will oppose a Midrash which is not connected to the Biblical text while he is prepared to accept one which supplements the text.12 Rashi interpreted the Torah with the aid of Midrashic glosses; Kara introduced a change in this, as we shall see; Rashbam followed the path of המשנהות והמתיחדות בכל התורה. Rashi felt one must accept the opinions of the Sages whereas Kara was prepared to disagree with them, and was of the opinion that to arrive at the truth one must free oneself from the explanations earlier offered by the Sages and reflect on matters rationally.13

Through an examination of Kara's commentaries, we shall now try to discern his view of ישוע and his position with regard to ישוע: whether he feels that ישוע represents a separate but legitimate exegetical partner of the ישוע, or that it is simply a variation upon the ישוע. These and other
questions will engage us as we continue our discussion.

2. Kara's Evaluation of בקשות over ושם פנינו over ושם פנינו In the Song of Deborah, on the passage ושם פנינו (Jud. 5:4),¹⁴ Kara cites the Sages' remark that the reference is to the Giving of the Torah, and says, כל עמל לא יועטינ' תtoupper ליישבה על אופניי ואין זה פשוט. Let us clarify the concepts involved here. בקשות is applied to points which are clearly derived from the text by the application of linguistic principles, and which are in harmony with the context. ושם פנינו refers to additional glosses which the passage only intimates but which arise from the context and cannot be divorced from it. Kara rejects the Midrashic interpretation here because it deviates from the ושם פנינו and is not suggested by anything in the passage; for what connection can there be between the Giving of the Torah and Deborah's victory over Sisera? The comment is not related to the event in question; in addition, Wert דבריה דשים, שיעטך לאלטרוوح אופים מדברי אגדה. It follows that a prophet does not speak in such a way that we must resort to a homiletic interpretation in order to understand him.¹⁵ In other words, Scriptural passages should be interpreted from the text itself without reliance upon external sources like the Aggada.

We may compare Kara's comment on Wert דבריה דשים (Jer. 8:22): ודם בציר בשוער אופין, הבתרון... ושם הדר מ Veteris :8:22 על אופנים כל כעומר לכל עומר יפושט של מקרר... עלא כה תורה את ליבו ליווש ימכראות על יושב ועלא פשוט. He rejects the Midrash which interprets the balm of Gilead here as a reference to
the prophet Elijah because this does not sit naturally with
the context, and because such a gloss would compel us to
explain Jeremiah 46:11 in similar terms, for in speaking of
the downfall of Egypt it uses a comparable expression. What
connection is there between Egypt and Elijah (who had died
many years before)? Kara's own explanation constitutes both
the קורא and the קורא of the verse.

Kara reiterates his position as to וְיָדֹשׁ vis-a-vis וָשֶׁנָּה in
his best-known passage on this point. Commenting on 1 Samuel
1:17, he cautions us against an
incorrect interpretation of the word יתן, which is not to be
regarded as a petition but as a prophetic statement about the
future. He then brings in and explains the Midrash, through
which (he tells the reader) but it is
introduced for this purpose alone (he prefaces it with the
statement that only if one has no other option
והמסדר שאמור רבותינו
לلاء ועתים על הע\ והמסדר שאמור רבותינו
יאכ\יאכ
cשכנכתה חנוכה שambilו נכתנה על פתרונה כל התורה סלא יכשת ב
דרורתם באים וממקומם אינא תשר רמל ואינא תשר להביא אריא ממוקם
אתור ולא מדרש כי תורם רחוק גמולה גמולה נכתנה נכתנה וראת הרפר לכל היה.
The text should be regarded as complete and comprehensible,
and it need not be clarified by evidence from outside
sources. What then is the function of Midrash? This is his
answer:
ומדרש הממגון כל זה בעברידיו תורה יראיה,veal כל מי ישיאו:
ירד מפרשיHAL מפברא ורגווה ול אתח מדרשו של דבר דומהلاح ששלחתו
שברל הנחרא ומסמקים מיוכ מיצוביו וארות לכל אתח עליב ידיה מחしかし
ואלי שלכל אלו דבר ה', היה חוקר אתר משור דבר ומוסרי ומרורו לַכְּלִם
מה שגן מאמ וטבקשה בכף ומסמרני החפשנה אא תביני יראת ה', דרעת
אלקים מלך

(Proverbs 2:4-5). Hence the Midrash ranks only as
an embellishment to endow the Torah with further glory, but the essence of the text is its קיון. It is worth remarking on Kara's vivid description of those who cling to Midrashim, which was certainly intended both to clarify his own position and render it more acceptable.

Isaiah 4:6 again provides us with an explanation accompanied by a picturesque image: ❝The continuity of the text resembles a chain of hooks and rings.❞

At the beginning of the Book of Samuel, as he comments on I Sam. 1:1, Kara declares that he does not intend to write out even a single Midrash.\(^7\) He explains the phrase תַּשְׁלוֹם כְּכָל סֵפֶרֶשֶׁת, cites a Midrash and concludes, ❝Thus his opposition to Midrash comes after he has employed it, and while he refers readers interested in such an approach to Midrash Samuel, he has hardly concluded his note before he introduces a Midrash in connection with the next verse; and plenty more are to be found later on. What then is his real opinion?❞

Before we answer let us look further at his various statements. When we are told in II Samuel 12:30 that David placed on his own head a heavy gold crown, Kara explains that the function of the passage is to praise David and adds, ❝He}
vehemently condemns the numerous aggadoth (without quoting them) as idle words which do not minister to evil. Despite his great respect for the Sages, he does not hesitate to judge them most harshly. In two places he mentions the principle that one does not question an aggadah, yet he himself does so:

a. He explains the curse laid on Joab (I Kings 2:33) and adds,

רשם לא שאמרים רботיהו אין משיבין לעבר.Agadah...

He then raises several difficulties, and concludes, על כל השדה לפורש מקרה זה אחר מדרשה.

b. In connection with the bull which the false prophets attempted to offer up as a sacrifice on Mount Carmel, Kara writes, without quoting the Midrash, ומרדشت אנדה ר_cutoffライフ. ושגרד בכל, ותמהיה אנדה, לעבד פסח שנותגש "לע" ילא היה אחד מפרים מעכב בדכר, ויהי ראה להשתנהו מכם.Children, אלא שאיאו משוכרים על דכר אנדה. So here too he encounters a difficulty with the Midrash, the fact that animals offered in pagan sacrifices must often have been 'accepted' in a purely physical sense, and is compelled to rest upon the familiar principle that aggadoth must be accepted as they stand.

In other places he shows by persuasive arguments that he is in the right, and therefore dismisses a particular Midrash. Commenting on the phrase לתקופות החמישים (I Sam. 1:20), he says, ויהו אתו שילויו על תופרות זה כל בצל, אנדה, לולא אחרין פתר. He then vigorously attacks the Rabbinical explanation and proves that it is not logical. Truth (it
emerges from his remarks here) is to be found in Biblical language. He is quite aware that must pursue ऋश and cannot distance themselves from what the Sages say. When David reached Nob and sought food, the phrase ऋश लश भोज बिरो लल्का occurs (I Sam. 21:7). As is his wont, Kara first explains this clause himself; he then quotes the Sages' gloss, and rejects it: ऋल पशुतू शल मक्रा आनि गा मूर्म, शन दबिर्म आउं: शैलीत होम मनकोड बोक्ष दौड आई चतूर का दौर देन होम लल्का आल बिरो लल्का. He goes on to raise other difficulties, and shows that the Midrash is an impossibility.

In connection with II Kings 14:25, he writes, ऋप फशुतू तरंश रोतिगीं... होकोश लत हो मक्रा तूतिगा आउं. He explains why the Sages make use of a Midrash to explain the passage, although he himself has suggested a न्युत explanation.

His preference for न्युत फशुत appears even in cases where he does not state his opinion outright. Let us look at some of the expressions which he uses to indicate his position: ऋव फशुतू शल दबर, बल आमर रोहिगीं (Jud. 1:3); concerning the न्युत, he says, ऋ उकर रूमातधि दबर अष्ट्र (Jud. 5:10; II Sam. 19:21; 24:9); ऋत फरत्रिज (II Sam. 10:22); ऋ अन्तर तिलौढ़ तकरातो अन्तिमा बेननीम. एकमेक बिमार मपर्श मण्डिला आहरत (II Sam. 21:4). When the Midrash is famous but not vital, he may remark, ऋवला मन्द्रशृ दौड़िय आइल सहस्त्रा मत्रिम मरोड़ हैं (I Kings 5:10); and we also find ऋवकरा जा आनम आई दौड़िय बरु शेय्यु शैला (I Kings 8:8).  

He expatiates on the topic even more emphatically in
Isaiah 5:9, where he compares himself to King Solomon:

And Kara's deut is the Pesesh.

On occasion, as in II Sam. 8:18, he even prefers an interpretation of which he is uncertain, because it is in line with the Pesesh, to the introduction of a Midrash: אֵין כָּלָה מעמד על בירור או רומח... רומח... רומח... והדורים... תומרי המוכרים (cf. I Kings 1:38). Sometimes he has difficulty with the Pesesh, but nevertheless refuses to cite a Midrash.22

There are places where instead of producing a Midrash he merely hints at it as he rejects it in terms like כלל הדרון או והדורים... פנים אדרת or (in a phrase we have already noted) מדרש ידועין大全 (II Sam. 12:30; I Kings 5:10); or - to direct the reader to the Midrash without quoting it himself - מדרש אנדה זו; כלל גורת תכשא מפורשת באחדת מגילד אשתר (I Kings 19:26): the Midrash is too familiar to require quotation.24

In this connection two points are worth mentioning. For Kara a passage is never dependent on a Midrash, while Rashi may say, מִכְּרַא מִכְּרַא דָּרַשׁ, or otherwise indicate that the text is bound to the Midrash (Lev. 13:55); and there are occasions on which Kara sees a Midrash as being effectively the Pesesh, as in II Sam. 24:15), and still other occasions when a Midrash is the only gloss which he supplies (Jud. 11:26; I Sam. 17:55).

Together with all that has been said, we should note that Kara does bring together Midrashic explanations for short
sections or isolated subjects, after he has first explained them in accordance with the פִּיצֵה. This practice appears only in Isaiah (in 13 places) and in Ezekiel (3 places).26

3. The Annotation of פִּיצֵה and פֶּתַח

We shall now look at the language used by Kara to differentiate between the two methods of פִּיצֵה and פֶּתַח:

a. This is his phrasing wherever the Midrash forms his first gloss:... והדרש אנדה... פִּיצֵה (I Sam. 10:22); or והדרש התכנית... פִּיצֵה (I Sam. 1:1); והדרש רבוהינו... פִּיצֵה (II Sam. 24:1);... והדרש של המקרא רַבִּי... פִּיצֵה (I Sam. 21:7; cf. Jer. 17:2); והדרש רבָּהָא... פִּיצֵה (Josh. 10:13); והדרש רבָּהָא... פִּיצֵה (Jud. 5:4); והדרש רבָּהָא... פִּיצֵה (I Kings 20:6, 7; cf. Jer. 3:14).

b. This is his phrasing used when the פֶּתַח is introduced first:... והדרש פֶּתַח... והדרש (I Kings 8:66); והדרש פֶּתַח... והדרש (I Sam. 1:9); והדרש (II Sam. 1:14); והדרש פֶּתַח... והדרש (Jud. 1:3); והדרש פֶּתַח... והדרש (I Kings 10:7); והדרש פֶּתַח... והדרש (Jud. 6:40; cf. Hos. 1:3); והדרש רַבִּי... פֶּתַח (I Kings 10:7; 17:4); והדרש רַבִּי... פֶּתַח (II Sam. 19:21).... והדרש רַבִּי... פֶּתַח (Jud. 5:10); והדרש (I Sam. 10:7); והדרש (II Sam. 21:4; cf. 12:30). On very rare occasions Kara cites the Midrash without either an introduction or a formal conclusion, and juxtaposes the פִּיצֵה under the following
rubric: ... (Josh. 24:25; Jer. 11:1). More frequently he offers thepression without introduction or conclusions, adding in the Midrash with the formulation וְמַעְרָשׁ תְּלִים נו... (Jud. 12:7) or וְמַעְרָשׁ רָבָתָנו... (II Sam. 8:18); וְמַעְרָשׁ אֲגַדוּ נִבְנוּאָת רֶבְּהָ (I Kings 17:18); וְמַעְרָשׁ נְדֵדָה נַבְרָאָת רֶבְּה (Josh. 14:15).

On most occasions thepression precedes thepression, but while this is Kara's usual practice the Midrash sometimes takes precedence for various reasons - usually because of some paedagogical value, but also to enable Kara more conveniently to attack it, as in Jud. 5:4.²

4. Kara's Selection of Midrashim

In dealing with Kara's handling of Midrashic explanations two questions must be considered. (a) Does he feel that only apression interpretation is legitimate, or is there room forpression as well? (b) To the extent that Midrashic explanations are valid, what are the constraints which entail the rejection of one Midrash and the acceptance of another?

We have already noted Kara's disclaimers, as if he absolutely rejected all Midrashic glosses (see especially I Sam. 1:1, 17, 20; I Kings 8:8; Isa. 1:18; 4:6; 5:9); but nevertheless they are found in his work. On what occasions does he think it proper to cite Midrashim? We shall try to show his resort to Midrashim beside apression interpretation is a device selectively employed for exegetical and paedagogic purposes. We shall suggest that he regards the Talmudic expression, איִו מַכְרָא יוֹצֵא מִדָּרֶשׁ (Shabbath 63a; Yevamoth 11a; 24a) as pointing to the greater validity ofpression; but
Midrashic interpretations are not to be completely disregarded since there are Midrashim which contain elements of השם and which help to resolve exegetical difficulties, and these deserve to be considered legitimate.

a. The וּרְשָׁא resolves problems of grammar and syntax

i. Isaiah 5:24: The difficulty here lies in the syntactical construction of the verses; as Kara puts it, מנהג הלשון לתוקף הפועל הפרע. Thus here the passive verb precedes the active one, and the verse ought to read כָּאוֹל לַשׁוֹם אָשׁ וְחַשְׁשֶׁה לָהֵב יִרְדָּה. The Midrash which he cites explains the verses in accordance with common usage: just as stubble, representing the house of Esau, consumes a tongue of fire (the house of Jacob), and dry hay (Esau) weakens the flame (Joseph), so שָׁרַשׁ כָּמַם יִזְהָה, because they have rejected the Torah of God. Despite the fact that the Midrash resolves the difficulty of the verse by invoking accepted linguistic principles, Kara claims that his own previous explanation must be considered the proper because when a point is clear and there is no chance of error, a passive verb may precede the active verb (as Kimchi also remarks), since it is most illogical to have stubble consuming fire.

ii. Isaiah 14:24: Verses 3-23 of this chapter deal with the overthrow of Babylon, and to emphasise the point, we are told of the fall of Sennacherib and his people. Why an oath should be needed here is not clear, nor why God apparently swears with regard to something in the past, when oaths are
normally used to buttress events in the future. Kara notes that the substance of the oath is mentioned in verse 26, but why then is the heading נָשָׁעָה ה' עָמָּתָם not reserved for the beginning of that verse? The text might have spoken first of the destruction of Sennacherib and his people and only afterwards made mention of the oath in accordance with which harm befalls those who injure Israel. Because of this difficulty Kara draws upon the Midrash, which views v. 24 as itself the oath - but not with regard to an event that has already occurred. Its function is rather to prevent Hezekiah from declaring to God, לא יתיו רְוְנֻותיךָ יָזָרֵי שֶׁמֶךָ. God must therefore swear כל şey מַיִתָה: that is, I will execute My plan to bring Sennacherib, just as I have sworn.

iii. Isaiah 43:22: יָשֹׁעַ הָאָרְזֵי עֵדֶק כָּלָעָת יְרוּשָׁלָăm: Kara's first explanation here appears to arise from the text itself, and he describes it as לֹא יִדְמֶשׁ. According to it God formed the people of Israel so that they should declare His praise, but in fact they do not pray (Isa. 58:9; 65:24), and justify themselves by claiming weariness (כֹּל דוֹתָה that has the sense of 'because'). For His part, God asserts that this fatigue is only with regard to His service (דֹּתָה). But the idiom יָשֹׁעַ כִּי in the Bible connotes tiredness from overwork (see Josh.24:13; Isa. 62:8), which would mean that the verb יָשֹׁעַ here is not passive but active, and consequently that כֶּלֶּךָ functions not to give a reason 'because' but rather to indicate a contrast. Thus 'You did not call upon Me, but so wearied Me as to compel Me to send Nebuchadnezzar to conquer the whole world in punishment. And I the Lord have not caused you [the people of Israel] weariness through exaggerated demands for
worship.' The trouble with this explanation, which Kara calls יִנְעַת בָּיִת is that the form לְנָעַת is not found in the Bible as an active verb in the Kal conjugation; and so Kara cites the Midrash. 30

iv. Jeremiah 51:1: לְנָעַת לְנָעַת מָפֶשׁ מָפֶשׁ. The first explanation is a gloss according to which God will arouse a destroying wind against Israel's enemies. 31 The second interpretation offered, headed שֶׁ יָנוּרָיִם (it follows the twenty-ninth principle in the Baraita of the Thirty-Two Principles of Rabbi Eliezer HaGlili), transposes the letters by the AT BaSH method, in which נ is read as נ and כ as ש, and so on. לְנָעַת thus becomes Israel's foes, the מָפֶשׁ מָפֶשׁ. The interpretation involves the difficulty that לְנָעַת יָנוּרָיִם is a construct phrase which requires a place name (the 'dwellers of ---''), as does the parallelism with Babylon. Kara consequently employs an approach which solves the syntactical problem.

b. The הָרֵעַ replaces a unique sense with a more common meaning

i. Isaiah 5:17: רֹעֵי כְּנָשִׁים צֹבָה. The word consists of the noun דֶּרֶךְ (pasture), with the comparative prefix ד and a suffix for the genitive of the third person plural. In the opinion of Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Rashi and others (see on Exod. 3:1; I Kings 5:23), the כְּנָשִׁים meaning here is כְּנָשִׁים (according to their usual practice). Kara quotes the מִדְרָשׁ רְבּוֹתִינוּ (speech) - 'as was spoken of concerning them'. But his הָרֵעַ explanation of כְּנָשִׁים (pasture) explains the word's unusual connotation within this particular context; it relies upon Micah 2:12, כָּעָר בְּתוֹךְ
Kara offers two interpretations. The first, which is consistent with the Midrash (although he does not say so), asserts that לֶשֶׁח (a measure of quantity), אֶל the meaning must be derived from the context, for this is a hapax legomenon connoting victory in battle in the midst of tumult (i.e. שָׁאָר is equivalent to שָׁאָר). The Midrash is rejected since it does not meet the touchstone, which takes grammatical analysis into account, but Kara cites it nevertheless because despite its linguistic failings it represents the most common sense of the word (cf. Jer. 49:19).

c. The ודי accords with the sense
   i. Isaiah 14:8: נִכְבְּרִים שְׂמַח נֶבּוּךְ נָבוֹנָר. According to the first interpretation, the trees too which suffered under Nebuchadnezzar will enjoy a respite and will not be hewn down. But since the whole chapter is rich in images and rhetoric, Kara adds, וָדִי, and explains that the pines represent demons and governors and the cedars kings. In this instance, then, the וָדִי is more appropriate to the sense of the verse.
   ii. Isaiah 14:20: לֹא פַחַד אָתָם בְּכֶנֶרֶת כִּי אָרָץ שֶׁקֶט עָמְרֵי הָרִקָּת. The first explanation, the Midrash, identifies the occasion on which Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the Land and killed its people: when he besieged Jerusalem he gave instructions that all soldiers who showed weakness in battle should be
executed. This is a difficult interpretation for which no evidence can be adduced, especially as it does not account for הַיְשָׁרֶת שָׁחַת; on the contrary, during Nebuchadnezzar's reign his country was strengthened. The gloss explains the passage as referring to the future, the tense therefore being the prophetic past.

iii. Jeremiah 50:6: לָא אֱבֹדֵת חַיּוֹת רַעִיּוֹת הַתַּעֲוֹת הָרָים

In the Midrashic explanation, the mountains represent leaders (as in Micah 6:1); Targum Jonathan too renders מִרְס as מִזְאָבָט שַל מַכָּרַא, וּיוֹשְׁבָת, the nation thrust out upon the mountains, where idol worship had taken place. If we go by the grammar and the syntax of the passage, Kara is correct, but nevertheless the first explanation accords better with the sense of the passage.

d. Thesher resolves textual and literary difficulties

i. Isaiah 26:15: יִשְׁפְּתָן לְנוֹרִי, יִשְׁפְּתָן לְנוֹרִי, חַפְּשָׁתָן, הָצַיְקָה קָזֶּי

Kara's first gloss is a connection with the preceding verse in view of the contrast between the temporary resurrection of the Gentile dead so that they may be judged, after which they return to the underworld, with the eternal resurrection of the dead of Israel. Why, however, at the end of the verse is the phrase וְרָצוּת כֵּלָּהוּ כְּיָדָיו repeated? This difficulty leads Kara to produce the Midrashic explanation which claims that our passage is not a contrasting continuation of verse 14 but itself contains a contrast between the conduct of Israel and that of the Gentiles. When God increases the benefits He bestows upon Israel He gains honour thereby. For example, if He gives a person a son, that
son is circumcised; if He supplies a home, a קָדֹם is affixed to it. On the other hand, when God seeks to bestow benefits upon the Gentiles they distance themselves even further from Him. If He grants one a son, the child grows forelocks, if He gives one a house, he puts idols in it. The drawback of this explanation is that it does not fit the context or the connections between the passages, nor does the end of the verse contrast linguistically with יִשְׂרָאֵל, נְכֹבָּד (there ought to be some passive verb to express the consequence of the heathen’s actions, to match נְכֹבָּד for Israel.)

ii. Isaiah 23:4: כָּלָה, לְךָ, צְיַדְוָל, כְּאַעַר יָם: Kara comments, כָּלָה, לְךָ, צְיַדְוָל, כְּאַעַר יָם: the sea represents Tyre, and when that city is conquered disaster will also befall its protectorates like Sidon. According to the Midrash, the sea itself boasts before Sidon that although it has not been granted children it is willing to remain within the boundaries set for it by God. So much more, therefore, should Sidon, which has been blessed with many children, see to it that they do not sin. (In Jeremiah 5:22 this Midrashic explanation is the sole one given.) This interpretation involves a number of difficulties: (a) If indeed it is the sea itself that is speaking why do we later read מָעֵזוּ צְיַדְוָל, which implies that it is the stronghold which speaks? (b) As the whole chapter deals with Tyre and its downfall, it follows logically that the sea-fortress must refer to Tyre. (c) In view of the fact that the chapter is intended to provide Israel with a lesson from what has happened to others, it seems inconsistent to address a plea to Sidon. Nevertheless, the Midrashic explanation is in harmony with the total
context and the content of the verse.

iii. Isaiah 8:6: The passage contrasts the rule of the house of David with that of Rezin and Remaliah's son. The latter are specifically named, while the Midrash explains that מִי חַשְׁלוֹן חַשְׁלֵלִים לքא לֵא לֵא symbolise the house of David, and that Hezekiah therefore purifies Israel as does a mikveh (ritual bath), which must contain 40 seah - the numerical equivalent of the word לֵא. The passage understands the mention of water as indicating the punishment to befall the kingdoms of Aram and Israel, which are mentioned further on: 'מה ה צֵל הָאֵל מִי הָעָזָה הָעָזָה וּמֵרוֹב הַמָּלָךְ הָאָרָם הוּא כֶלֶד.' (A similar passage is to be found in Jeremiah 17:2).

e. The וְשֵׁש contradicts historical or natural fact

i. Isaiah 10:27: מִי חַשְׁלוֹן חַשְׁלֵלִים מִלְּאֵל שְׁמַע שְׁמַע. Kara opens with a וְשֵׁש explanation according to which the yoke around the neck of the animal will be destroyed by the oil there. This is to be understood as a reference to Sennacherib, who will be destroyed in front of Hezekiah; the relative word מבן takes on the sense of 'because of.' Yet we all know that in reality things work just the opposite way: oil cannot destroy a yoke, but will be blotted out by it (Kimchi makes the same point). Kara therefore cites the Midrash, which understands מבן as introducing a reason: why was Israel worthy of having Sennacherib's yoke removed? - on account of the oil which Hezekiah had lit in the houses of worship and study.

ii. Isaiah 30:32: יִרְדָּה כָּל מְעֹר מְעֹר מַגֵּדָה אָשֶׁר יִנְתֵּהוּ ה', עֲלִיּוֹ:
This verse deals with the inhabitants of various localities who have suffered from the Assyrian conquest; now that they have been delivered, they rejoice with tambourines and harps. The phrase נתקות תונפת refers to the battles waged by Assyria against those particular places in Israel at God's suggestion, (tumult, onslaught) connoting God's raising His hand against them. The Midrash, which Kara cites afterwards, explains the downfall of Assyria in the days of Hezekiah by the fact that it occurred on the night of the 16th of Nisan, when Jews make a wave offering of the barley harvest (עזמה התונפת). Why does Kara invoke the Midrash? Firstly, because it is surprising that after describing the celebration the text should return to the war (according to Rashi the verse is an instance of מקרא מטואר). It is also a fact that in that generation there was no offensive onslaught or any other kind of battle between Assyria and Judah (Israel), only a miracle. The first explanation is considered the מקרא מטואר, since Kara recognises that may be found within מקרא מטואר interpretations, and the war that never was may stand as an image for the magnitude of the redemption, as if bitter fighting had in fact taken place.

iii. Isaiah 31:9: The subject here is the redemption of Israel and the downfall of Assyria during the siege of Jerusalem. According to the מקרא, Assyria's forces will be weakened; unable to flee, they will be destroyed by fire in Jerusalem. The Midrash which Kara cites for the end of the verse understands the fire of the furnace as
representing the Gehenna of the distant future which will have its entrance in Jerusalem. Why does he produce a Midrash which has no connection with Sennacherib’s overthrow? (a) Because the Assyrian army fell at the hand of an angel of God, by miracle, and not in a fire; and (b) the indirect object  ול has two possible references: it may apply to סע, representing the power of Assyria, or to God, in description of His greatness. On the level of the והם, the first difficulty can be solved by recognising in the verse a comparison between the actual punishment inflicted by the angel and a fiery furnace. As to the second difficulty, ול refers to סע (and see Isa. 30:26).

iv. Judges 11:26: נשת עיראל ובשכן וזכותה... יהלום מגדת: וגו'. In the dispute between Jephthah and the Ammonite king as to the land east of the Jordan between the Arnon and the Jabbok, Jephthah asserts that Israel has held the disputed region for some three hundred years and during this whole period Ammon has not concerned itself with it. The problem facing us is how Jephthah arrives at the figure of 300 years. Kara explains that the count begins from the conquest of Joshua, but as he cannot supply a detailed breakdown of the figures he cites a Midrash from Seder Olam which works them out.

v. II Samuel 21:8: ויהawks יвели והו ... ראת האמשת בנו מיכל בת: נשת עיראל וה[right side of page cut out]. This verse contradicts the statement in II Samuel 6:23 that והו ... והו והה לא יהוה לה ילדה עוד ויומת, and Kara is therefore compelled to turn to a Talmudic Midrash which tells us that the children were in fact borne by Merab, not Michal, but
since Michal brought them up they were regarded as hers. Thus the Midrash resolves the contradiction.

vi. A difficult problem which has also exercised many scholars is who kills Goliath, David (see I Sam. 17:57) or Elhanan (II Sam. 21:19). In both texts Kara offers a explanation, but on reaching the name אלוהים he states that this is in fact David,しなון א-ל. (Midrash Ruth Rabbah 2:2). This harmonisation solves the problem.

Similarly in I Samuel 17:55, when Saul asks about David, על ידי הואانون, we must be surprised, since David has been playing for him, and Saul himself has asked Jesse for leave to keep David at his court (I Sam. 16:22). Kara is again forced to rely on the Midrash, and admits עלה על ידי הוואנא א-ל. "..."

f. The שור stands as the sole explanation

There are some places in which Kara cites the Midrash, even as his sole gloss, apparently to catch the reader's attention and allow him to speak in glowing terms of the heroes and personalities of the Old Testament: David's burying the bodies of his enemies (II Sam. 8:13), Solomon's wisdom (I Kings 10:7), the character of Samuel (I Sam. 2:26), and other topics. He also follows the Sages in identifying unnamed persons in Scripture, such as the angel of Judges 2:1 (Pinchas), the angel of Judges 5:23 (Barak), the man of God of I Samuel 2:27 (Elkanah), and so on.

At times the Midrash is introduced only for the reader to be cautioned against it, as in the case which we have already noted, where כל תי (I Sam. 1:17) must be understood as a
statement about the future and not, as in the Midrash, a petition. On other occasions Kara rejects midrashim and aggadoth which attribute unnatural characteristics to objects.34

5. חיבור המקראות (Context)
The most characteristic feature of Kara's commentary is his constant clarification of the textual sequence. By explaining the relationship between one verse and another, he establishes a continuity of interpretation in which even the specific words commented upon become part of the whole composition. He himself calls this, as we have seen, חיבור המקראות (I Kings 8:27); or as he writes elsewhere, את חיבור המקראות וניינן (II Sam. 21:4). This feature has of course been noted by scholars like Einstein,35 Poznanski36 and Ahrend.37 We shall now attempt to trace the sources of this approach, and examine the notable advance made in it by Kara.

Poznanski states that Rashi weaves verses into one another, as in Exodus 25:9; Leviticus 11:34; Deuteronomy 4:44.38 Rashi was apparently the first commentator who thought of handling things in this way. Let us look at Poznanski's citations. In Exodus 25:9, which deals with the Tabernacle, Rashi says on כולם אשר אלים מראת את: he similarly comments, and on the phrase חיבור המקרא השמעלת היינו means לא חיז המקרא ממעל בולא חיז, for which he explains, So also on Leviticus 11:34, he explains, Rashi says, also on דבר ממעל מקרא العليון, for which he explains, and Deuteronomy 4:44, he explains, והנא חזרה, and Deuteronomy 4:44, he explains.
Hence Rashi's interpretation of these verses involves their syntax, their content and their relationship with other passages, but it is in no sense the 'interweaving of verses with one another' which Poznanski attributes to Rashi. Poznanski speaks in the same terms of Kara: 'He is most particular about the organization of a section, its development, and the connection between passages'; and I am of the opinion that he did not grasp the fundamental difference between the two commentators. Exegesis appears to be for Kara not - as it is with Rashi - a matter of distinct explanations focusing upon parts of verses and various isolated words, but rather the continuous paraphrasing of an entire text. Kara opens his explanations with a particular introductory phrase and explains it in such a way that the next phrase follows on naturally, and continues in this manner until the subject is concluded. At times this may involve only a few verses, and on other occasions whole chapters. In general he uses the same phrases when he connects the phrase to be glossed with the explanation. There are innumerable instances of this, as the most cursory examination of his commentary will demonstrate. Here are a number of examples.

I Kings 1:44 ff (phrases from the text are underlined):

We may compare Judges 11:8-9; 18:7-10; and I Kings 1:6-8.
The sequence is not always so lengthy, and it may even be contained within one or two verses. For Judges 10:8, for example, Kara clarifies the point and then in conclusion writes, quoting the next verse. To establish his continuity, he sometimes takes a verse out of order. Thus after explaining Joshua 17:15 he adds, immediately brings verse 18 forward and comments on it; and goes on to create a continuity with verse 16. Similarly in dealing with Judges 13 he explains verse 16, then jumps to verse 19 and returns to verses 17 and 18; at verse 19 he adds a fresh remark not connected with the preceding topic. Sometimes he will explain a single word from the following text since it is associated with the matter in hand, and to maintain continuity he will include it in the discussion.

There are even occasions when, instead of quoting the actual phrase to be glossed, he will simply summarize it in his own words. This happens with the speech of Samuel (I Sam. 12:5) most of which he explains on the basis of a single initial word.

We shall conclude this section with a further characteristic example, his comment on II Samuel 22:6-12:

As he writes on Isaiah 4:6, provides the central criterion for a further interpretation:
There is no doubt that נושה של מקרא represents for Kara an exegetical approach in which the text is clarified in accordance with its general content and continuity. Let us look at some examples.

On the subject of David and the Gibeonites (II Sam. 21:4) Kara writes, עזריםجرائم עונין ממשכת נפשות, thus setting the Talmudic Midrash against the פש, which follows the internal development of the verses.

In response to Hannah's prayer (I Sam. 1:17) Eli says to her that God should grant her request. The word יעז (as we have already noted) can be explained in two ways: as a simple petition and prayer (that God will answer her) or as a prophecy on the part of Eli that God will give her a son. In clarifying the context, Kara shows his preference for the second possibility. (a) In verse 23 it states that God has fulfilled הנותן, which must mean that Eli's statement was a prophecy; (b) in verse 27 Hannah makes a similar declaration; (c) following Eli's words to her, Hannah's mood improves and she eats. In Kara's view, to explain יעז as a prayer and not as a prophecy leads to a misunderstanding of the entire incident; and one must seek an interpretation in line with the פש.

In Isaiah 1:18 we find the phrase 'לכל נא ונוכחה אמר ה'. The word ונוכחה, explains Kara, means to walk נוכחה - in the path of righteousness - and has nothing to do with מדויר יאמר (debate). Similarly יאמר is not directed towards the future, but the present, and this is פש, which involves the internal coherence of a passage.
The phrase reappears in his comment on Isaiah 9, where he shows on the basis of the principle that one must attend to the context that verses 8-10 deal with sin and punishments that fit the crime. 42

Commenting on Isaiah 42:3, he says, "The problem here is the identity of 'n'... In Kara's view, if one takes together all the chapter which speak of 'n'... he must be Cyrus, despite the few isolated verses which allow for a different identification. In Ezekiel 30:11 Kara again speaks of the principle of 'n'... and in its name of this principle he twists verses 10-11 so as to bring out the links between them and the unity of the prophetic chapters on Pharaoh and Egypt (cf. Ezek. 36:13).

Chapter 34 in Jeremiah deals with the release and resubjection of slaves in the time of Zedekiah. Commenting on v. 17, Kara brings a Midrash from Seder Olam according to which there was an initial covenant which set the slaves free and a second covenant, following their re-enslavement, in which a calf was cut in two to suggest the fate of anyone who enfranchised a slave. Kara rejects this interpretation as being contrary to 'n': (a) The chapter speaks of a single covenant, whose purpose was to free the slaves. In line with common practice, and as at the covenant with Abraham (Gen. 15:6), a calf was cut up to inaugurate the covenant; (b) verse 18 begins with a menace against anyone..."
who violates the covenant and afterwards, in a parenthetical clause, reports how it was made (by passing between the pieces) and with whom (the princes of Judah), and states that those who break it will fall into the hands of the enemy.

In some instances נ'נ involves a few isolated verses, but it may also encompass an entire chapter or even consecutive chapters. Kara makes an illuminating methodological comment at one point in the Book of Job (Job כ' חיבורים ופרונונט של מקראות תהלת. ועתה אשכה לפרש :17:9), מינתים דברים של פירושים ממתpción בלוק 쉽, הלופים והحامل את העונין לוחות אדם. He first discusses a topic with regard to its general content, and only afterwards its constituent parts. For example, in Isaiah 35:1, ישוושו מדבר עלי, his initial point is the juxtaposition of the sections on the downfall of Edom and Bozrah (chap. 34) and the rejoicing of Zion and Jerusalem (chap. 35). Only afterwards does he explain the complex form of the verb ישוושו as meaning (i.e. Over Edom and Bozrah).

Sometimes the overall explanation comes after Kara's discussion of separate parts of a verse, as in Isaiah 38:10, פָּקָדָת, where he first explains פָּקָדָת and then goes on to deal with the verse as a whole. We may say that he draws his interpretation from the context, that is, from the sequence of the verses. This operation takes three principal forms:

a. Deriving something from its context.

b. Deriving something from a later reference.

c. Attending to points that are at first unclear but whose meaning is accessible.
a. Deriving something from its context or some other thing

This is one of the thirty-two rules formulated by Menahem ben Saruk in his book on grammar. Kara makes a broader use of it. In Joshua 9:4 we are told of the Gibeonites, and Kara explains that מִדְּרֶךְ הָלְמָד מְעַנְיָּנוּ, for they brought of a sort likely to suggest that they had come from a distant land; יָצָאִים is therefore more suited to the context (see also Targum Jonathan). He explains the word יָצָאִים in Joshua 23:13 as thorns, and adds, רָאִיִּים in Numbers 33:55. He deals with the phrase מִדְּרֶךְ הָלְמָד מְעַנְיָּנוּ in I Samuel 3:13 in similar terms: בְּעָלָה חַתָּּה בֵּם פְּתָרֹנָּה; that is, since the root חָעִי usually means weakness (see Deut. 34:7; Zech. 11:17), and this sense is not appropriate here, the word must be explained in association with its context. Hapax legomena likeособ (II Samuel 1:9), (II Kings 17:9) and others are treated in the same way.

In Jeremiah 3:14 we find היא בְּעָלָה חַתָּּה בֵּם פְּתָרֹנָּה; Kara points out that it would be more reasonable to say אַחֲדָה מַמְשָׁפֶתָה יָצָאִים מְעַנִּים, since a city contains more than a single family, and explains that as this was a period of dispersion a single family might be spread among many cities. The context, he says, supports this view, שהנה בֵּלֶה יָצָאִים מְעַנִּים מַמְשָׁפֶתָה. for verse 16, והנה בֵּלֶה יָצָאִים מְעַנִּים מַמְשָׁפֶתָה, speaks of the opposite state of affairs at a time of redemption as opposed to dispersal.

An example of a different expression used by Kara to describe this contextual feature is to be found in Nahum 3:6, וֹקִלּוּ הַתּוֹרָה וּפוֹרִים נַאֲרָ. For the word רָאִי יָצָאִים מְעַנְיָּנוּ םַמְשָׁפֶתָה, and כּוֹרֹת וּפוֹרִים נַאֲרָ. For the word רָאִי יָצָאִים מְעַנְיָּנוּ; and כּוֹרֹת וּפוֹרִים נַאֲרָ. For the word רָאִי יָצָאִים מְעַנְיָּנוּ; and כּוֹרֹת וּפוֹרִים נַאֲרָ. For the word רָאִי יָצָאִים מְעַנְיָּנוּ.
commentary for the view that it connotes excrement and filth, like רעי (the letter נ being exchanged for כ). He himself prefers to derive it from רואיה (sight), not רואיה like ני being exchanged for כ). The context thus confirms the meaning, which resembles that of the term found in Job 33:21. Kara's phrase, גָּזִּיר תָּאוֹר, is to be understood as meaning that in the subsequent verse or verses there is a word or root that helps to clarify the word in question (see also Ezek. 17:4). A further instance of this point can be found in the explanation of the word תְּנִינָה (Jer. 47:5), which might be understood in terms of נשים (troop, gathering), as Kara explains it in Jer. 5:7 and Mic. 4:14, or in terms of baldness or cutting, as in Jer. 16:6; 41:5. In the present case Kara prefers the second possibility, since the verse opens with the words ולא קרחה אל עזה.

We have now looked at a number of examples in which context and the coherent movement of a passage aid Kara in explaining and interpreting the text.

b. Deriving something from a later reference

This principle is invoked by Kara in many different formulations: וּסוּף מַקְרַא (II Sam. 19:12); צֹוּף הַעֲצָמָּה יָרֵה עֲלֵיוֹ (I Kings 6:5; Jer. 18:18); חָצְרוּ הַעֲצָמָּה יָרֵה עֲלֵיוֹ (I Kings 8:27); כַּה הַשְּׁמֵפֹרֶשׁ כָּפוּף הַעֲצָמָּה (I Kings 9:15). He first mentions it when Joshua commands שָׁמַש נִבְנֵי יִצֶח (Josh. 10:12). He rejects the possibility that Joshua commanded the heavenly bodies directly, since in that case it should say that he spoke to them, instead of to God; and in
accordance with the principle of we find later in the text (v. 14). It is clear from this that Joshua besought God and God charged the sun and moon, and so the initial difficulty is clarified by what comes after.

Similarly in Jeremiah 14:1, which deals with two droughts, Kara notes that generally when Scripture speaks of a drought it informs us during which period it occurred; yet here, where two are in question, we are not told who was the king at the time. Nevertheless, using the principle of (v. 12), we can determine that they must have taken place in the reign of King Zedekiah.

Kara first mentions this principle in Leviticus 26:43, where he explains that if two points are unclear they are always clarified in the order in which they occur: in Joshua 10:10, he says, "International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, 1979, p. 1544. Thus must refer to tumult, as in 1 Samuel 7:10:10. Here again Kara does not employ a single fixed phrase for the principle, but formulates in a number of slightly different ways: 1. דבăr הַתְּמוֹנִים מִן הוֹמִים אֲחָד וּמַפְרַשׁ לְהָמוֹם אֲחָר (II Sam. 22:46); 2. מִן הוֹמִים אֲחָד וּמַפְרַשׁ לְהָמוֹם אֲחָר (I Kings 22:21); 3. מִן הוֹמִים אֲחָד וּמַפְרַשׁ לְהָמוֹם אֲחָר (Jud. 5:24). This last expression also appears in Zechariah 11:17. Verses 16-17 deal with the sins of the
shepherd towards his flock and his consequent punishment, and
the exegetical problem is to determine where the list of sins
ends and the description of the punishment begins. The first
possibility is that verse 16 contains the sins and verse 17
the punishment; the second possibility is that verse 16 and
half of verse 17 as well describe the sins, and that the
punishment comes later. Kara prefers the first option, since
verse 17 opens with "הרי, רועי האלילים," to warn of the impending
punishment, and so it does not make sense to think of it as
the continuation of verse 16. In addition, it is constructed
as a parallelism:

תרב על זרעית, על עין ימיון
ירושע יבש תיבש, עליל ימים חכה חכמה.

In other words, he will be punished by his arm's being cut
off and his eye blinded. Thus Kara consolidates his position
by demonstrating that Biblical modes of expression enable us
to grasp the meaning of one part of a text by reference to
another part.

6. תוקפנות (Anticipations)

Biblical narrative occasionally introduces points that seem
superfluous in their context in order that certain points
which appear later may be grasped through our prior
information. Kara explains cases of this type in his own
characteristic language: קודס 35膻בר את האליג 30 עלא התמה: וכנין עניי חתו על עלי עניי התמרים: ולכרד
1:16 states: Judges, את בנין ירודה מדבר ירודה אשבר בן עז ר Idol רישב את הדין. and
Kara explains:

ולמדך כל שפנינו כל מעיר התמרים... הנא nhé לשבע ענס
בגני ירודה... שלע תמה כשאתה קורא ליוסף ואサラל לא חכמים,
سورו רזו מותון עמלים... (ש"א ט"ו 6) והتمعת לוער מפי.
In the same context, in Judges 4:11, we are told:

In I Samuel 15:6, when Saul asks the Kenites to leave the Amalekites, Kara summarizes the whole issue:

Commenting on I Samuel 3:1, Ker calls, "In his view, then, Samuel's serving God before Eli is mentioned here to prepare us for what subsequently appears strange, namely, that Samuel does not recognize that God is calling to him.

At times Kara uses shortened forms like or קָדָם לְיִמָּדֵד or הקדוםים ואמרו." A different expression is employed in I Samuel 1:3 in connection with

In the same context, in Judges 4:11, we are told:

Kara says:

and Kara says:

On the phrase (I Sam. 13:22), he
At times he deals with this feature of the text without drawing attention to it through any of his characteristic phrases (see Jud. 13:9; 15:1; II Kings 17:1).

On occasion the text ‘anticipates’ in order with regard to a point in the next verse, such as when we are told in I Kings 11:29 that Ahijah wore a new garment, for the following verse describes how he rends it. At other times a piece of information is given several verses early, as when the death of Samuel is recorded in I Samuel 25:1 in order (says Kara) to explain why David was able to curse and threaten Nabal the Carmelite (verse 34). Again, an ‘anticipation’ may be provided for a subject that will only be mentioned after an interval of several chapters, as in Exodus 13:18, where we are told that the children of Israel departed from Egypt armed (וַיַּפֶּן), so that we may understand how weapons were in their possession for the war against Sihon and Og (Exod. 17:8-13). In a few cases Kara even discovers anticipatory information to be carried from one book to another. The first example in this section is an instance of this, for facts given on Heber the Kenite in the Book of Judges illuminate a topic discussed in the Book of Samuel.

Rashi displays some awareness of the use of anticipatory information, for when he comments on (Exod. 13:18), he says, 'המשוער על וגוי ישראל ומסופים... והנה אחריו וגוי ישראל המב случай החלומות שיחה... וגוי ישראל בעלי... וגרש ממציאי מבנים כי להם כל' גוי שוכנו ישראל بكבר.
Elsewhere, in I Samuel 28:3, Rashi points out that has already been reported (I Sam. 25:1), and explains that his death had to be noted earlier on, שזוררנ לדורש במצלה והאר פחת ומר ושמרו על שיאול היה קיים. Kara, as we have seen, further developed and broadened this view of anticipatory information. In this he was followed and strongly supported by Rashbam, who explains it at length at the beginning of his commentary on the Torah: קמד קמד

The advances on this approach made by Rashbam are demonstrated by the term with which he defines the feature in question: הקדמה. Rashi alludes to it; Kara opens it to examination and applies to it, as we have seen, several recurrent expressions like כאן ולמען; and Rashbam defines it.

7. סמיוכות פרישות (Juxtaposition)

The term, which is found in the Sages and in Rashi's commentary, is not found in this form in Kara, quien prefers to speak of חיבור or describe a text as (i.e. סמיוכות בכתיבתה). There is an example in Joshua 24:32-33, where we are told of the burial of Eleazar and of Joseph's remains. At first sight this seems to have no connection with the preceding verses on the final days of Joshua. Kara explains that the passages are juxtaposed because burial constitutes an associative link between them. Elsewhere he
may account for the proximity of two events in terms of common language, the same phrase appearing in both accounts. An example of this is the juxtaposition of the episode of Micah's idol (Judges 17) with the Samson narrative (Judges 16): the phrase נל הַנַּחַל כִּי is found in both.

We can distinguish between two types of linkage: (a) a natural and progressive continuity between sections, and (b) a substantive connection between passages which initially seem quite different.

a. Natural continuity between sections

King Solomon asks in his dream for wisdom (I Kings 3), and immediately afterwards comes the narrative of the two women and the child. Kara points out that the two events are juxtaposed in order to leave the reader in no doubt that the dream has been fulfilled. Similarly, the proximity between the war with Moab and Elijah's ascent to Heaven in a fiery chariot (II Kings 3:1) is meant to demonstrate that Elisha's miracles were double Elijah's. There is a further example in Isaiah 56:10-57:1. Chapter 56 deals with the nation's leaders, who sin through over-indulgence and an improper discharge of their duties. Chapter 57 begins with a lament over the plight of the righteous who perish, and goes on to describe the punishment that awaits the sinful leaders. The continuity is unclear. Why should mention of the righteous be interpolated in the progression from sin to punishment? Kara explains that the leaders are too occupied in guzzling food and drink to attend to God's word and warn the people, and so they do not notice the signs which point to the impending
punishment - the deaths of the innocent righteous. In this way he connects the sections together.

b. Substantive but not readily apparent links
This type can be further subdivided:

i. Rebuke and consolation
On many occasions Kara notes the Scriptural practice of inserting some verses of comfort between two passages of rebuke, thus interrupting the continuity of the text. In his view, the segment which offers consolation does not break up the rebuke but forms an integral part of it.

The first chapter of Isaiah is divided up as follows. Verses 2-15 are words of reproach; 16-20 are consolation; 21-25 are reproach; 26-27 are consolation; and 28-31 are again reproach. On verse 18 Kara writes, מַדֶּהֽוּ כֹּלַ הַכַּרְיָה. The section which offers consolation does not break up the rebuke but forms an integral part of it.

According to Kara (he returns to the point in v. 26), the chapter is an integrated whole and the consolation functions both to soften the rebukes and to set the condemnation of the wicked against the comfort offered to the righteous. An outstanding example of this can be found in Hosea 2:1-2, where the same terms are used for consolation as for the preceding rebuke. In Jeremiah 12:14 too the same verbal form is used, the root נַחַת נְחַת being applied to both the reproach and the consolation, so that the relief promised for
the blow to come is given prominence."

ii. Reward and punishment

In discussing the reward of the righteous (Isa. 4:2), Kara remarks, "The punishment of the wicked is that הقضاء השעון, and the reward of the righteous, וה복 והצלחה (Isa. 3:18), and the reward of the righteous, וה복 והצלחה ה祖先 לנגור רלתarrera דלילת ישראל (Isa. 4:2).

A further example is the prophetic rebuke to Shebna: מרכבות כבוד כלור בית יהודה (Isa. 22:18). In verse 23 we find the corresponding piece of comfort for Eliakim: והיה לכסת כלור לבית יהודה. Here again Kara notes the shared linguistic coinage: כל מוקד שאותה מוצאו פורعونות את השעון אוחז מוצאו פורعونות נקמה עלי הקיסר. It is worth noting that there is one place in which the example is reversed: שאותה מוצאו נקמה לישראל אחר מוצאם בצייד פורعونות, פרעות, לפרסון, ולפרסון וקדמה לפרסון, and Kara notes that it corresponds with verse 18: לא נלך לפני אמך מ" (Isa. 48:22) reads lease מ" הנחה לישראל אחר מוצאם וידיד פורعونות והפרסונים, והפרסונים והפרסון

To sum up, it can be said that Kara is concerned to clarify the link between topics, and that his commentary establishes the exegetical continuiy of the text. He does not explain segments of a verse in isolation from their setting, as the Midrash does, but takes an overall view of the context which is part and parcel of his view of הפרעה, and the broader the context into which his interpretation is integrated the better. We have seen three forms of linkage between passages, arising from context (וכבר הלומד מעניינו),...
from later information (odal hammatzot), and from clarifications elsewhere (odar ha'emet neta'ot ve'mafarshot ne'edot). Kara also deals with textual continuity when he explains anticipatory information (kimchatot) and juxtapositions (hokmatot ha'frishot). Throughout his treatment of the entire topic he acts as a teacher blazing a new trail for himself within the general approach of the French commentators on the mishna. He interprets the text from an all-inclusive viewpoint, with the aim of clarifying and organising its various aspects through a continuous explanation which moves with the text and accompanies it like a shadow.

8. Summary
Here we return to the question with which we began. What is Kara's conception of mishna and shas? It will be easier for us to offer a reply now that we have a general picture of his attitude to the subject and what he has to say on it.

Ahrend supplies a basis for the view taken here. He suggests that Kara is opposed to mishna only when it is presented as the sole mode of interpretation. He is willing to accept a Midrash when its purpose is to supplement a text by adding details, or alternatively, it seems to me, when it contains an educational lesson for his students by justifying the actions of the Patriarchs, offering a solution to difficult problems or contradictions, or speaking in praise of Biblical figures, and so on.

The problem can be viewed from a different perspective if we take into account the historical background against which Kara worked. Twyto points out that in the twelfth century
western Europe entered a 'period of renewal'. In this period, as historians have concluded, 'the fundamental problem which engaged the intellectual world' was 'the problem of the correct relationship between traditional authority and the demands of reason.'

With regard to exegesis, this meant fixing the relationship between דרש and משל ילמים. This is the period of modernists, the אובנים, as Kara calls them in opposition to הנלילים, whereas יסויילו לנתגנוגת הקוריה, he says, that is, they emphasise the words as they actually appear. On this point, Ahrend notes that the אובנים של רשבם (who are the משל ילמים of Rashbam on Genesis 37:2 and the של Rashbam on Exodus 21:1) were those who sought rational explanations which were independent of the Midrash, Talmud and Aggadah, and which were based on the plain sense of the text. Their ambivalent attitude to דרש is one of the characteristic traits of the period. Kara followed in the footsteps of Rashi, most of whose explanations are taken from the remarks of the Sages. Kara himself continued to draw from Midrashic sources, while at the same time his commentary abounds in מעשי interpretations. He was followed by Rashbam, who adheres almost entirely to מעשי although he admits that the Midrash may be of use. He also distinguishes between the two methods of דרש ומשלי and דרש ומשלי; both represent legitimate approaches to the Bible, but the search for מעשי must be given priority. It was indeed the spiritual aim of his generation. The exegetical school of thought which existed in northern France during the twelfth
century, among whose proponents Kara and Rashbam are numbered, attempted, says Twyto, to share in the contemporary spirit "by offering a Jewish expression for the problems that taxed the minds of the Enlightened [טוטאיל] of that generation." Their exegetical approach testifies to this in its attention to the grammar and style of the Bible, search for exact texts, and so forth. Within this school of thought, Kara serves as the connecting link between Rashi and Rashbam. This view is based upon the work of two scholars, Raphael Loewe and Sara Kamin. The first surveys the development of the term peshat in Talmudic literature and states that "peshat, therefore, means authoritative teaching in two possible senses. Either (as in the case of the verb), teaching propounded by an authoritative teacher, or teaching recognised by the public as obviously authoritative, since familiar and traditional" [italics in original]. He goes on to distinguish peshat and derash: "The real distinction between them as nouns seems to be that derash is exegesis naturally, or even experimentally propounded without secondary considerations; if it is popularly received, and transmitted into the body of conventional or "orthodox" opinion, it crystallises into peshat." Sara Kamin considers that "the distinction between peshat and derash was not fully defined or crystallized in Rashi's mind. Yet in the commentary of Rashbam, Rashi's grandson, we find a conscious, consistent distinction between these exegetical categories. We also find in his commentary an exact use of terminology in everything that pertains to the category of peshat, which Rashbam regarded as his sole field of endeavor."
She also remarks that 'with regard to the exegetical category which is not וּפֶשְׁע, Rashbam would appear not to have developed a terminology.' 27 We shall now argue that Kara, who wrote between the time of Rashi and that of Rashbam, makes on this point an advance upon Rashi, but fails to distinguish as firmly between וּפֶשְׁע and יָד as Rashbam does. For the purposes of this discussion we shall define וּפֶשְׁע as a clarification of the text in accordance with its language, syntactical construction, context and content, literary structure and type, and the effects that these components have upon one another. In other words, a וּפֶשְׁע commentary takes into account all linguistic elements in any given combination and finds the meaning of each as part of a whole. 28 The term וּפֶשְׁע does not appear in Rashi's commentary at all, only יָד, in the sense of the literal meaning of a verse. 29 This is not the same thing as the conception of an interpretation based upon a וּפֶשְׁע approach. Despite the fact that the term يָד accompanies many explanations 'which follow the וּפֶשְׁע method as we have defined it, no term denoting this exegetical category is contained in Rashi's vocabulary.' 30 The same is true of Kara, in whose work we find such expressions as (Josh. 24:25; I Sam. 1:17; 21:7).

A difference appears with regard to Midrashim. For Rashi a Midrash which is drawn from the sources does not contradict יָד, which in general are not based upon Rabbinic sources. Hence Rashi regards the expression יָד as synonymous with מְדֶרֶשׁ, or simply מְדֶרֶשׁ אֶגֶד. 31 In Kara we
find a specific view of Midrash which is not in harmony with
the מְדוּרְשֵׁים of the text, and whose function is one of
embellishment: מְדוּרְשֵׁים полגְּדוֹלִים וּרְאוֹת רוּאֵי (I Sam.
1:17). As we have seen, he describes anyone who
מְדוּרְשֵׁים is a man awash in tempestuous waters who grabs
at anything that might save him. The Torah was given in a
form that is perfect and complete, and requires no Midrash;
the messages of the Prophets are lucid and complete, and
neither Midrash nor other external sources need be consulted
to understand them (Jud. 5:4; I Sam. 1:17). While Kara refers
everyone who is interested in Midrashim to the appropriate
books, citing them is not his own intention (I Sam. 1:1).

Sara Kamin concludes that the term מְדוּרְשֵׁים, and
the root מְדוּרָה do not for Rashi denote distinctive
exegetical approaches parallel to מְדוּרְשֵׁים in our
sense. Furthermore, she points out that in Rashi's usage,
the term מְדוּרְשֵׁים in itself denotes the text in its literal
sense ... so that when Rashi uses the term, it does not bear
a variety of value-laden senses with regard to a correct and
true interpretation, etc.' By contrast, Kara appears to
assess an explanation which is according to מְדוּרְשֵׁים as correct
and preferable. This emerges from the following points: (a)
his explicit rejection of the Midrash, of which we have noted
several instances; and (b) his statement that מְדוּרְשֵׁים לָטָרוּת
הַהַרְמִיתָה לְהַעֲמִידָן (I Sam. 1:20). The
word מְדוּרְשֵׁים here is equivalent to מְדוּרְשֵׁים. This implies that
truth must be the foundation of Scripture, and that he is
aware that his commentary differs from and is antagonistic to the accepted Midrashic interpretations. Similarly, when he uses an expression like (I Kings 8:8), he makes his view of the Midrash quite clear (see II Sam. 14:2). The term is informed for him with value judgments as to the more correct, more truthful interpretation. To this should be added the fact that he treats the terms מדרש אנדה and the like as the opposite of פשוטו. Where Rashi attempts "not simply to interpret the text, but rather to interpret it in accordance with the sources," Kara's aim is to interpret it, aided by a critical analysis and selection of what the Sages have to offer. Since he understands פשוטו commentary as a clarification in relation to language, content, context, style and literary structure, his work comes closer to our definition of פשוטו (a term which now connotes the type of approach adopted by his successor, Rashbam), if only because of Kara's critical and selective treatment of the Midrashim of the Sages. While it is true that both their commentaries are founded upon the principle that (I Sam. 17:55), Kara makes more of an issue of it, as when he speaks in such terms as (II Sam. 14:2), נון פשועו ומלילתו ובירורו של דבר (I Kings 8:8), or (I Kings 5:12); or ascribes great importance to a consistent explanation which follows the textual sequence and the context (הויבר המ克拉ית). We can sum up by saying that the very composition of פשוטו commentaries shows that the French Sages adapted themselves to the spirit of the renaissance of the twelfth century. In
Rashi we find only the beginning of an awareness that וְשָׁם and וַזֶּרֶד should be distinguished from each other, \(^9\) while Kara moves much further forward. The distinction is clearer and more conscious, although he does not always succeed in his effort the text without the aid of Midrash. To his mind, וְשָׁם is of the essence and וַזֶּרֶד is merely a decoration; and he takes refuge in Midrash only when he is at a loss for a וְשָׁם explanation, or when the Midrash offers some special educational benefit. In Rashbam we see even a further development, for he makes a conscious and consistent distinction between וְשָׁם and וַזֶּרֶד, and he is the first person to use the term וְשָׁם, \(^9\) even if it is still accompanied by וְשָׁם and מְרוּד. \(^9\) In the history of the development in France of וְשָׁם commentary, then, Kara occupies a place of honour between Rashi and Rashbam.

II. The Use of Rabbinic Midrashim

In addition to the Talmud, numerous Midrashic works were available to Kara as they had been to his predecessor Rashi.\(^9\) In this section we will deal with the ways in which Kara handles his Rabbinic sources and the terms in which he refers to them in his commentary.

1. Parallel Sources

Only at rare intervals does Kara cite Midrashim from two sources; sometimes both are in agreement, sometimes they are at odds with each other. On I Samuel 1:1, on the phrase מִלְּדֹר רְבּוֹתִינוּ מִן הַרְּשָׁמִים זָאָפִים, he writes, מִלְּדֹר רְבּוֹתִינוּ מִן הַרְּשָׁמִים זָאָפִים ומַצָּאִים זָאָפִים שָׁמָרָם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בֶּאָדָם הָדוֹר אָלָא שָׂעָרָה.
This Midrash comes from Megillah 14a; Kara goes on to allude to Midrash Samuel; and this Midrash comes from Daba Bathra 116a (and see II Sam. 14:2). Elsewhere, in I Samuel 17:55, he combines two Midrashim and says, "This is a combination of Midrash Tanhuma and Yoma 72a on the garments of the High Priest. In one place, II Samuel 15:7, he weaves together Midrashim from two tractates, Temurah and Menahoth. However, these occasions on which he presents two possibilities are isolated exceptions.

2. Handling of Sources

The following approaches may be noted:

a. The language of the Midrash and that used by Kara are completely identical. This applies to Midrashim taken both from Midrashic works and from the Talmud.

b. The Midrash is quoted with slight changes of no significance, such as the omission or addition of a single word, the substitution of a synonym, or the transposition of a few words.
c. The Midrash is cited in a highly abridged form. We shall note one example from among many. In Judges 6:1 we find: 

"והשם בר יישאל והנה, and Kara says,"

In Kara's text the Midrash contains 29 words, whereas in the original, Midrash on Psalms 18:1, there are 100 words:

אמור ר', סימרלぬ מסוי צהא רבעה לומן שירין אומר. לא בלום מנהל לק

In this purpose he quotes only the relevant part of the Midrash, and even this he shortens so as not to weary the reader with unnecessary details. In Judges 9:13 he gives a brief version (24 words) of a Midrash which occupies in the original, in Midrash Tanhuma, about 70 words. In other places too he feels it proper to quote only the essence of a Midrash.

d. He conveys the central idea of a Midrash in his own words. When Gideon selects men for battle he separates the last from the rest (Jud. 7:5). These last will not be chosen. While the Midrash states: "ながら תר עוז דמקום הפרשים, ירשו בלום את הילונה" (Yalkut Shimeoni Judges, sect. 62). In another place we find: "יאים זה כלאקורה, ולאו ירא" (I Sam. 2:2), and Kara says, "כלאקורה כתיריה," The Midrash reads: 

בש רוז וozo בה רוח חיות.
e. He adds explanatory remarks, or broadens and clarifies a Midrash. In explaining the verse (I Sam. 25:18), he says: When the servants of Hanun, king of Ammon, ask him, his answer is extended: This is based on a Midrash which says, When we are told of Shimei, [II Sam. 19:21], the Midrash states: Here is what Kara says: Amplifications like this are found throughout his commentary.

f. A quotation from or reference to the Midrash may be
imprecise or mistaken. Let us look at a few examples.

i. Kara asserts that something is present in the Midrash which in fact is not there, as in קרא אומר שמעון חזירין בְּכָל הָעָרָתַה לֹא שָׁבַעַת אֶלָּא לְטוּרֵי קִנֵּי הָעָרָתַה יָשִׁרְאָה. for the Mechilta (מיכלטט) in fact speaks first of the land of Israel and afterwards of Jerusalem. In I Kings 5:15 Kara talks of Solomon, yet the Midrash (Genesis Rabba 85) deals with David. In another instance his quotation from the Midrash reads, מֵאֲשִׂיסָה וּמֵאֲשִׂיסָה וּמֵאֲשִׂיסָה וּמֵאֲשִׂיסָה, or in explaining the word אָטַח (II Sam. 6:19) he writes, אַחַד מְשַׁיֶּשׁ נַחֲנוּ, yet Pesahim 36b states אַחַד מְשַׁיֶּשׁ נַחֲנוּ.

ii. He ascribes a Midrash to מיכלטט when he means מיכלטט and at the same time speaks of Rabbi Akiva instead of Rabbi Ishmael. Elsewhere, in Joshua 15:17, he directs us to Kethuvoth when the correct reference is Sanhedrin 29b.

iii. He quotes a passage from a Midrash which does not exist in that particular place, directs us to a Midrash which contains nothing of what he says, or offers a quotation which does not exist in the sources.

iv. He either does not know or does not understand the Talmud. There are two instances of this; as Poznanski writes, 'His astonishing statements in connection with Talmud and Halachah show how little he dealt with these subjects.' (Mavo, p. xxiv). On the words אלָא נַדְעָר (I Sam. 1:21), Kara says, נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה. This runs counter to the Mishnah in Beitzah 19a: נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה נַדְעָרָה. He explains the root רְדֶּחֶה in (Jud. 14:9) and concludes in surprise,
a comparison is made between two types of Nazirites, or 'ויְדַּע אֱמוֹר נָוֹזֵי שֵׁמְשָׁו מָוהֵר לְהַיֶּמֶה לַמַּחְתִּיסָתָן שְׁכַנּוֹן שְׁמֵשָׁו

3. Annotation of Sources

Although in general Kara does not note his sources, the number of places in which he supplies the name of a tractate or Midrashic work is not inconsiderable. Rarely does he refer a reader to another source without being moderately specific, as in (I Kings 10:19), or (I Kings 18:26). As a rule he quotes the Sages in full. We shall now look at his most common formulations when he quotes from the Midrash: (II Sam. 7:4); (II Sam. 1:14); (Jud. 6:40); (I Sam. 1:9). There are also some quite different phrases like (I Kings 10:19; 16:22; Isa. 28:24; or forms like (II Sam. 22:35; Hos. 1:7); (I Kings 18:26; II Kings 3:1; Jer. 8:23); or (I Kings 5:10; 11:41; Isa. 17:11); and occasionally (I Kings 10:7; Ezek. 30:21); or (I Kings 14:25; Jer. 44:14). A source may be noted at the beginning of the citation, as in (Josh. 10:13; Isa. 29:17), or at the end: (I Sam. 2:27; Ezek. 33:24). A quotation from the Midrash may appear quite baldly: ... or at the end of a quoted passage may come something like. The terms in which Kara adduces Midrashim and the Talmud...
do not differ in principle, except that with regard to the latter his language is broader and more varied, such phrases being added to his stock as תמתה רבבותינו (Josh. 13:3), הפתורו רבבותינו (I Kings 6:1), נחלת רבבותינו דבבר (I Sam. 1:11; cf. Hag. 1:8), or כלברטינן ל-- (Jud. 3:31). We should note that Rashi too employs a variety of terms, but not to the extent that Kara does.

4. Talmudic Literature and Other Works in Kara's Commentary
We shall now review the books of which Kara makes use. He refers to the Mishnah in the following terms: וזכ[resolv]ך ונ' ויעבנה המשכת מדות or יתמשנה (I Kings 6:5). References to the Tosefta are always specific, as in בניותמא ששקלים or בניותמא תמנין. We also find ארובה דרבי נטול the בריתא דל"ב מימת' or בריתא דמ"ט מימת' (II Kings 3:1), and סדר עולמה (Jud. 11:26). Of the Midrashic literature we find מדרש הלכה he mentions המקילתא (I Sam. 25:18; Isa. 6:13) and ספריר (II Kings 12:22; Hos. 4:19). Among Midrashic works we find תנחומא (Jud. 4:3; Isa. 28:24), סדר עולמה רבי (Josh. 10:13), (II Sam. 5:6-8, etc.), (I Kings 17:1; Jonah 1:15), (I Sam. 1:1), (II Sam. 22:29; Isa. 17:11), (Zeph. 2:8), (II Sam. 17:1), (Joel 1:4) and (Zech. 6:3). At times Kara makes use of Midrashic literature without saying so:
As for the Talmud, most of the tractates are mentioned by name, but here again quotations may be offered without Kara's supplying the source. In summary it can be said that in general he is inclined to quote Midrashim in full, although at times he gives a shortened version or adds explanatory notes. We have noted the expressions he uses when quoting from the sources, and it is clear that most, if not all, of the works available to Rashi are also used by Kara. Despite his great expertise with regard to Midrashim, we must remark that on occasion he errs either in the phrasing of a quotation or in his understanding of it.
Chapter 2
Kara's Exegetical Method

I. Style and Terminology

Kara's commentary reads smoothly, for it constitutes a paraphrase of the text. It is notable for its intellectual continuity inasmuch as it does not merely cite the words to be discussed but rather includes them as part of the interpretation. It is also characterised by a long-winded style (in contrast to the stringent brevity of Rashi, for example), appeals to the reader, repetitive assertions and recurrent expressions, and the constant employment of the roots פָּרָשׁ, וּלְמִלָה and לְמִלָּה. In almost every paragraph פָּרָשׁ appears (though at times וּלְמִלָה is found as a substitute) and וּלְמִלָה figures in appeals to the reader to extract new information from a particular place. Through the link which he establishes between different verses, generally by the use of the expression כָּשָׁם שֶׁמַּלְפְּרוּר וְרָוְלָל, Kara offers a complete and unified picture of each topic.

I will later attempt to describe, by means of examples, Kara's characteristic strategy as it finds expression in his comments. For the moment, let us trace his favourite linguistic collocations, the special form by which he always appeals to the reader as he argues his case, the terms in which he speaks of commentaries which he regards as incorrect, and the peculiar force which he imparts to the root פָּרָשׁ. A yet more typical trait is his varied use of language. As we shall see, he draws upon more than twenty different forms when he cites phrases from the Targum, quotes
one verse in order to explain another (see the section on Scriptural style, below), directs himself to other commentaries, or employs foreign terms (ת"לע). Such variety, generally speaking, is more natural to lectures delivered before a congregation than to a systematic commentary employing a set idiom for each subject. Another outstanding characteristic is the great use Kara makes of Scriptural verses. Like any good teacher of the Bible, he weaves these into his commentary to form an integral part of the explanation and produce an enhanced reading, with such skill that they become an indispensable part of the commentary. There is no doubt in my mind that his diffuseness, the repetition of his various assertions, his appeals to the reader, creation of a commentary based on continuity, and use of the roots י"ר and (even more) ול, are all a consequence of his paedagogical bent. He did not see himself merely as an instructor but also, and primarily, as an educator on the basis of the Book of Books.

1. Appeals to the Reader

The primary thrust of Kara's work is an appeal, through the use of the second person singular, to an attentive reader or student. This is accomplished by the insertion of questions or claims nominally posed by the student, to which Kara then responds. At times he opens with a question and answers it, but on other occasions the questions and perplexities appear later in a comment. In this event his favourite expression is חזון תואר or יושם תואר. After the question has been presented he commences his response with the phrase אלל.
He may open with a question and then retort or announce... or he announces... or he announces... or he announces... or he announces... or he announces... or he announces... or he announces... or he announces...

Generally his method is really that of a conversation and an argument with the student, as in Josh. 16:5:

[If you contend..., the text should have said so... and if you maintain..., the text should have said so...; but you are forced to conclude...] We also find this (Josh. 17:16):

On Isaiah 1:18 Kara explains the connection between the rebuke (up to this verse and from verse 21 onwards) and the consolation (in this and the following verse), and in his appeal to the reader (Isa. 7:17; 15:1) he says,

He begs the reader to follow neither the Sages nor his own feeling in the matter, but to read what he himself has to say, which proves that the topics in question are interconnected. All this is done through a direct appeal to the reader.

Let us move on to another example where the appeal is more forceful. When he explains Joshua's command that the sun and the moon should stand still (Josh. 10:12), he writes:

If you contend..., the text should have said so... and if you maintain..., the text should have said so...; but you are forced to conclude...] We also find this (Josh. 17:16):

A perceptive person might here wonder why... He should understand that...]

We also find this (Josh. 17:16):

If you contend..., the text should have said so... and if you maintain..., the text should have said so...; but you are forced to conclude...}
The expression (of necessity) is extensively used by Kara when he feels that the reader is compelled to draw a certain conclusion from the text, even if it is not immediately apparent, since such is the clear demand of the passage. In some instances he appeals to the reader when in essence he is offering an adverse criticism of an erroneous explanation. When we are told of the Gibeonites, (Josh. 9:4), he picks up the word וְניָשָׁה: [This only makes sense if Joshua captured both Jericho and Ai through a ruse, but if you separate the two events, you fall into difficulties. Therefore seek a reason common to both...]

Similarly, when the phrase נְשָׁה כֹּל הָעֵם אֱלֹהִים נִשְׁמָת appears after the battle between Joshua and the Kings of the South (Josh. 10:21), he says:

אֲבֵל אֵלֶּה עַל דַּעְתּ שֶלַּאֶח שֶבֶרְו יִחוּשֶׁךְ וּכְלַיִשָׁרָא...[Don't think for a moment... because if you do, you entangle yourself... Rather we are forced to conclude...]

When Kara appeals to the reader he usually does so by means of the root ידו’, and even more frequently through the root לְמ”ד. Both normally appear in the second person singular in order to draw the attention of the reader to whatever is particularly important.

דּו”א, ידו’, דּו”ב, ידו’ וְלָרֵאכָיו לוֹדוּ שֶכֶר הוֹא’ לְמ”ד appears in the following forms: ידו’ וְלָרֵאכָיו לוֹדוּ שֶכֶר הוֹא’ לְמ”ד
typical word for introducing a point', since this form appears no more than ten times in his commentary. The second root, ל"ז, appears scores of times in various forms, always with the same basic idea: that the reader is being asked to learn from a particular instance something relevant to other passages, or to apply a given important topic to the instance in question. The following forms are the most common:

Mi'cm atah lem'd,丞,丞,י' נצאת lem'd,י' וממצ,י' למד,י' למדך
And so on. With this root he seeks not only to involve the reader but also to make statements about himself: In connection with his uncle, Helbo, he says, זכרו, הממד ולחוד,י' זכרו, הממד ולחוד,י' (I Sam. 10:22); and even of God he says, זכガイドו הממד ... כל ... למד חק (II Sam. 22:35). Whenever he speaks of deriving something from the Midrashim or the Talmud he uses the expression זכרו, הממד ולחוד,י' זכרו, הממד ולחוד,י' and so on.

At times, Kara turns to the reader and instructs him in principles, demands of him an understanding of the הנקיה, לשון הממד,י' (I Samuel 1:20), which are also לישון הממד,י' (I Sam. 3:3), or cautions him to be careful: to adhere to the best explanation and withdraw from mistaken glosses. When he quotes והעלולים (Jud. 19:25) he distinguishes between clear and faltering speech and formulates a general principle:

משערים זה מפורס בדיע הזמיע אלה הממד,י' באה עניבת ההרגה... עצ
Or in another formulation, ותמעה לישון העבר,י (Jud. 5:30): a student must learn to put a given principle into practice elsewhere, as he says explicitly in a number of places:
On several occasions Kara reiterates that comprehension of the language and style of Scripture on the part of the reader is a precondition to the understanding of the written word. He does this twice in general terms, as in

and twice in a direct appeal to the reader:

When he explains the boundaries of the tribe of Benjamin, he appeals to the reader in interesting terms:

He demonstrates that only one possibility exists here, supporting his position with a glance at another instance, and then uses the word (you have deduced) to demand of the student that he thoroughly consider the point and then prove to himself the correctness of the interpretation by examining additional cases. There are instances where Kara actually warns the reader:

(not a word of this passage should be put into the past tense). At the conclusion of an explanation he may say,

He maintains that unless the reader accepts this, no further study of Scripture will be of value.
Somewhat different in nature are those appeals which warn against an incorrect or an erroneous explanation, for in these instances he speaks in unequivocal terms which leave no room for ambiguity. We shall begin with examples in which the appeal is made in a delicate manner. Following an explanation he adds, \( \text{"without taking a stand"} \) (Jud. 3:26; Isa. 22:24). Elsewhere he offers two explanations and points out thereby indicating his own preference; or after citing a midrash he says, \( \text{"לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל"} \)

More bluntly, he says, \( \text{"לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל"} \) (Jud. 6:26), \( \text{"לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל"} \) (Isa. 16:1). These are direct but not as yet critical rejections, and the same is true for this example: \( \text{"לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָшִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם يָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... לְאָדָם לֶאָדָם יָשִּׂרָאֵל... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l... l...
It is Rashi whom he has in mind here, although he does not name him.

Let us look at some other places where he is persuaded of the justness of his own interpretation. In general he uses a fixed phrase, א"מ א"מ, while on several occasions he is even more emphatic: ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ. In another instance he goes even further when after he has given a fuller explanation he rejects a midrash from the Sages and quotes Proverbs 22:17: ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"m.

In defending his interpretation he speaks in these terms: ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"m. Elsewhere we read, ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"m. At the same time, he does occasionally employ an expression indicating doubt whenever he is not sure of the explanation, as in ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ. Sometimes he says, ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"מ ז"m. In one place (Isa. 63:19), Kara gives us his own gloss first and then a second one from R. Yitzhak bar R. Asher,
saying of the latter, thus actually acknowledging that his own explanation is erroneous. When he is completely in the dark he does not hesitate to say so, as in [II Sam. 7:23]. Twice he not only admits that he is at a loss but appeals to the reader to find a solution to the mystery. In Jeremiah 28:1 he attempts to determine in which year of Zedekiah's reign occurred the contest with Hananiah the son of Azzur, and since he can provide only a partial explanation he says,

In one instance we find, (II Sam. 7:23). In Ezekiel 22:5, after admitting that he is unable to supply a gloss, he requests that

2. Textual Embellishment

One of the most distinctive qualities of Kara's commentary is his extensive use of Scriptural verses. Into a continuous discussion he weaves fragments of verses, short (one or two words) or long (four to six words), which then become an integral part of the commentary without which the subject cannot be understood. Only someone who is an expert in the Bible could identify them all without difficulty, for the commentary is saturated with verses from everywhere in Scripture. Let us look at some typical examples, since it must be noted that some expressions appear on fixed occasions while others are simply interwoven into his gloss to become a
In the event that he does not know which of the various explanations which he offers is the correct one, or is completely at a loss as to the meaning of a verse, he quotes from Isaiah 42:16, 'The former times are past, the latter things do come; return, and come unto me; say ye to the mountain, Roll away, and to the hills, Disjoin yourselves: for the Lord will a new thing among you, and his righteousness shall be revealed in the earth' (Josh. 17:5). Elsewhere he prefers another appellation for God: 'A friend of Israel is our Maker and recompenser of righteousness' (Jud. 8:18), while we also find 'The name of the Lord is a strong tower' (I Sam. 9:9). Alternatively, he employs one of the following phrases:

a. 'The doings of the Lord are strong' (I Sam. 13:21), which comes from Psalm 5:9,

b. 'To the mountains be the cause of it' (I Sam. 1:17); from Proverbs 5:6, 'A woman despised is a flashing lamp'.

c. 'An idol of a man, and a stone of man's own heart' (Josh. 9:4; cf. I Kings 8:8; Zech. 14:5); the word נכסה appears in Amos 3:10 and Isaiah 59:14.

d. 'The Lord is the everlasting Father, the websites of the congregation of Jacob' (I Sam. 10:22), a phrase combining fragments from Isaiah 48, v. 17, 'The everlasting foundation of things, and the end of all things' (I Sam. 1:17), this is a quotation from Proverbs 4:27, 'There is a spirit that maketh to run mad, and a spirit that is wise and just.' (Jud. 8:18) comes from Isaiah 8:14, and 'The king shall验 the face of the Lord' (I Sam. 10:17) is taken from Deuteronomy 12:30. In an adjuration to those who are inclined to follow the Midrash (I Sam. 1:17), he says, 'The Lord is not as dead men, nor as the grave' (I Sam. 6:12), a reference to Isaiah 27:12 and Psalms 69:15, 16. On the same subject he points out that the purpose of the Midrash is the hagigal Torah, y'adid, in a phrase from Isaiah 42:21.
If a student of Kara's adopts a plausible but mistaken explanation, he writes, (Josh. 10:21; see Proverbs 6:2), in which comes from Exodus 12:26, in connection with the putting out of a slave's eye by his master. When he wishes a student to continue in the line he has laid down for him he says, (Josh. 10:21), in a phrase taken from Proverbs 1:5.

Up to this point we have looked at instances of various contingencies in which Kara uses fixed expressions. We shall now offer a short list of cases where he works citations from the Bible into his commentary to impart dignity to his text and make it more eloquent:

i. A voice that echoes throughout the world (Jud. 6:16) - a resounding declaration from I Samuel 14:6.

ii. A message of great weight (I Sam. 12:5); a striking phrase from Numbers 22:15.

iii. A commandment that will not be broken (I Sam. 12:20-21; Isa. 1:18), from Psalm 111:8.

iv. A commandment that will not be broken (I Sam. 14:16; Hos. 2:20), from Isaiah 2:4.

v. A commandment that will not be broken (I Sam. 18:23), from Genesis 34:12.

vi. A commandment that will not be broken... (II Sam. 14:32), from Genesis 4:14.

vii. A commandment that will not be broken (II Sam. 23:6-7), from Judges 5:31.
All these are examples of the wide range of words, phrases and verse fragments which Kara knew by heart and used to embellish his commentary.

3. **Stylistic Qualities**

One characteristic which we shall note is the great variety in Kara's phrasology when he employs the vernacular or cites something from the Targum, from other commentators, or even from the Bible itself. As against the practice of some of the mediaeval commentators, he does not use set phrases or
recurrent expressions, and his style is suggestive of a teacher standing before his pupils without an organized lesson, but with a strong urge to express his ideas. It is characteristic of him, as we have seen above, that even when he uses the same expression he changes it somewhat and never repeats himself exactly.

Another stylistic trait which is in fact a function of his exegetical method is the creation of a running commentary between one verse and another so that the whole is like a continuous interpretative composition which is not constantly interrupted by introductory remarks. He generally employs similar phrases to connect the verses, or converts the new דבר הפתוח (introductory words) of the next verse to some part of the comment upon the foregoing verse, such as the conclusion (Jud. 2:20; II Sam. 4:2-8) or—where there is no connection—into part of the ongoing topic (Jud. 13:8; Isa. 1:4, 25). The terms which he deploys near each דבר הפתוח to convert it into a part of the total explanation, without being separated from earlier remarks, are לכו נאמר (Jud. 18:7; Jer. 2:6), הד"ז (in the same way: Jud. 11:8-9; Jer. 4:9), ואתר (Josh. 17:15; Isa. 2:22), ומשה (משה) למעילה פירוש של... וענשו מפרש של... מפרש ורוהל, כלכ"ז (Josh. 16:6; Isa. 30:19; Jer. 3:18), כלכו שמשפר ורוהל, and לפורטל.

The terms in which Kara introduces his comments upon the text constitute a further characteristic of his style. He seldom uses the word פירוש in the sense of explanation, clarification or solution; in his work, the root פירש most commonly signifies a citation. When he quotes another verse,
he says, "Heh, Parashah for all (Josh. 15:2-3), Parashah for all (Josh. 15:4, 5, 12), Parashah and halakhah (Josh. 18:11; Isa. 37:31).

When he cites another commentator, we find "Heh, Parashah (Jud. 5:21; Ezek. 21:20), Parashah and halakhah (Josh. 10:21; Isa. 25:10), while he says of Helbo, "Heh, Parashah (I Kings 1:37; Isa. 1:8)." Citations from the Talmud are introduced with "Heh, Parashah and halakhah (I Sam. 10:22; Hos. 5:2) or "Heh, Parashah and halakhah (Josh. 10:21; Isa. 25:10), and from the Midrash with "Heh, Parashah and halakhah (I Sam. 17:55; Isa. 7:8). On the very rare occasions on which the root "Heh, Parashah is used to connote explanation, it invariably appears in the past tense: "Heh, Parashah" and halakhah (I Sam. 1:22; Isa. 4:6), commentator, "Heh, Parashah (II Sam. 7:23) or Parashah and halakhah (I Kings 9:23). Frequently Kara makes use of the expression "Heh, Parashah usually in order to introduce an explanation or broader clarification of an interpretation already given. For example, in I Samuel 14:33-34, which begins with "Heh, Parashah, there is another place where it is not used, "Heh, Parashah. It appears that he regarded "Heh, Parashah as equivalent to "Heh, Parashah (that is to say, meaning), whenever he did not wish to use the word "Heh, Parashah.

An exceptional and interesting case is presented by the word "Heh, Parashah which is used in Exodus 19:20, "Heh, Parashah, in Scripture it can be found in Ecclesiastes 8:1, "Heh, Parashah and halakhah, while in the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel (5:15) it appears with the common signification of the interpretation of dreams and riddles; Ibn Janach thinks that there it is simply an inversion of the letters "Heh, Parashah."
Another anomaly is presented by the word דִּירֶנָּה in the sense of 'explanation', but generally speaking this is found only in connection with liturgical poems.

Overall, then, Kara prefers the root פַּתָּה to the root פַּרְשָׁה, and the word פַּרְשָׁה seems to him broader and more profound than פַּתָּה. M. Bannitte suggests that the professionals who were known as פָּתָרִים (interpreters) had the individual title of כָּרָא, and that their commentaries were written down in books known as סֵפֶּרֶת הַפָּתָרִים. Rashi attests as much in his note on Ezekiel 21:18, while Kara says on Jeremiah 8:23, (A topic of particular interest is the פָּתָרִים, as Kara calls them in Isaiah 23:13. In Ezekiel 47:19 Rashi speaks of the פָּתָרִים as כָּרָא (I Kings 16:9), and mentions Rashi in the same terms (I Kings 2:5). This is the reason why he so constantly employs the root פַּתָּה and the word פַּרְשָׁה, which differs from פַּרְשָׁה inasmuch as the latter deals more with the general meaning of a verse. It does not draw upon the books of פָּתָרִים (vernacular terms) which were available to the כָּרָא, and which were an important instrument in explaining the texts to French-speaking students. Thus Kara uses פַּתָּה for all his explanations, and also when he quotes from others, as in the following cases: Targum Jonathan; פַּתָּה בֶּן זְוֹן (II Sam. 13:20; Isa. 19:7); פָּתָרִים רֹבֶנָה שְׁלָמוֹ, (II Kings 8:6) and so on. He glosses terms from other languages with פָּתָרִים (I Kings 1:5; Ezek. 11:11). His most common expressions are פָּתָרִים (Josh. 9:8; Isa. 17:11), or the shortened פָּת (Josh. 13:13; Ezek. 11:1), while
we often find פתרון ופשוטו (I Sam. 10:7; Isa. 17:11), נא פתרון (Josh. 13:7; Jer. 46:12), פתרון (Jud. 5:24; Hos. 2:7), פתרון or פתרתי (II Sam. 21:4; Isa. 51:9).

Citations from others are glossed with הפתורה, הפתורין or הפתורים. It is worth noting that the root פתרון appears in the Bible only in the story of Joseph, in the sense of imparting meaning to a dream, while פתר occurs more frequently in various Biblical books and denotes 'explanation' (Lev. 24:12; Num. 15:34; Neh. 8:8).

The term פתר (solution, resolution, explanation), as applied to verses from the Bible, has been dealt with at length by Glass and Kamin. Glass provides an extensive survey of the development in the use of the root פתר and its adoption by Rashi. In his opinion, it expresses the general idea of solving a problem in the text. Sarah Kamin notes that פתר appears more widely in Rashi's works than the term פשוט, and that the tenor of the root is to create 'commentary having internal unity and an intellectual continuity appropriate to the language of the text as a syntactical and conceptual unit'. As we have noted above, in the chapter dealing with פשוט and פתר, investigation of the places where Kara uses פתר makes it clear that these remarks also apply to him, despite the fact that in contradistinction to Rashi, who employs it dozens of times (in the Early Prophets alone some 60 times), פתר occurs in Kara a total of only eight times. In Jeremiah 8:23, having rejected another explanation, he writes, ויאמר החכם מתיישב על אופנים כל כל עיקר לפי פושוט של מקרא... כל כן נתתי את לייבי ליוושם המקראות על יושב על פשוטו (compare Judges 5:4); we read, ויאמר החכם מתיישב על אופנים כל כל עיקר לפי פושוט של מקרא... כל כן נתתי את לייבי ליוושם המקראות על יושב על פשוטו (compare Judges 5:4);
(II Samuel 24:15; cf. I Sam. 17:55 and II Sam. 12:30, where he rejects the Midrash), or מִיְרָשֵׁב חַד עַל הַמַּכֶּרֶם (II Sam. 1:14; 24:1; Jer. 50:6).

Up to this point we have reviewed the exegetical terms used by Kara and the methodology which underlies his style. As we proceed we shall frequently refer back to this subject when we discuss the language he employs in connection with different topics.70

II. Biblical Citations

Kara draws upon Biblical verses for a great variety of reasons. There is no particular system in his deployment of quotations, but the very extensive use he makes of them itself represents a distinguishing characteristic of his commentary. He hardly discusses a single chapter without the use of several quotations, whether from the same chapter or from other books of the Bible. The language with which he introduces such quotations (which he calls בכורות) is equally varied. The most widespread forms are the words כָּלָה (Josh. 8:13; Jer. 2:33) and שָׁלוֹן,72 but he uses many additional forms.73 I note below some of his principal usages for citing verses, together with one or two examples for clarification. His extensive resort to quotation makes it clear that his expertise in the Bible was greater than might be supposed at first glance, even if at times he quotes incorrectly.
1. Citations in Connection with Grammar

Most of the relevant verses have already been cited in our discussion of grammar, although of course the context there is different. Generally speaking and with few exceptions, Kara offers examples to clarify his grammatical principles and explanations of particular forms. When he says חמשתות עיקור עקר (Jud. 14:9; Isa. 10:33; Job 11:6) he provides the illustration

וב כל מקרה הוה אפור ישש יעקופ (עפש', כ"ג 6).7

Elsewhere (Jud. 15:4) he explains the difference in meaning between the הפעל and הפעל with a (causative) conjugations (וֹקֵּל בָּעַל ; והַקֵּל) and illustrates each form with many examples from Exodus, Samuel, Kings and Lamentations. When explaining the meaning of a word or a special form he always provides at least one example. For instance, he explains thatazersה (I Sam. 24:11) connotes ambush and not hunting (בָּעַל), and cites examples to prove his thesis:

כָּמוּ עַל צֶאֶר אֲנִי (בָּר' כ"ט) הַהוֹא הָצֶאֶר צֶאֶר (תֵּש''ג 33)

In other instances he supplies a quotation to show that the verb in question is in fact known to us from other passages. In such cases he uses the word מִגְזָר (derivative), as in Jud. 6:38:

זֶאֶר אָוֹמֵר יוֹר מְגִזְרָה (יוֹר) עַל פְּנֵי הָמִים (שֵׁם', כ"ג 20),

It can be said that in most instances in which Kara must gloss a verb in some conjugated form,7 or a noun, he juxtaposes at least one example from another source to assist in proving his argument, and this is also his practice in connection with any unusual feature.
2. **Embellishments**

I have no intention of repeating here what is said in the section on Kara's style, but wish rather to point out again that, like other members of his generation, he so works Biblical verses into the fabric of his commentary that one cannot distinguish quotation from comment, an achievement made possible by his great expertise and the beauty of his own language. Sometimes he repeats a particular verse when situations recur (as when he is not certain of a gloss), or in any other place where verse fragments may embellish his text.

3. **Parallel Citations from Chronicles to Resolve Contradictions**

This topic too is discussed at more length elsewhere, but it should be mentioned here for its relevance to the present context. On occasion Kara sets the reading found in the Early Prophets against that in Chronicles in order to supply further information, point out differences or resolve contradictions. The issue is stated in a single word, or even in whole verses, and then he generally says, 'ולדה, ' and quotes the pertinent passage. Such quotations are also to be found when he explains a contradiction within the Early Prophets themselves; for example, the question of the conquest of Jerusalem.
4. Legal Rulings

Legal rulings are cited when they may help to make a point clear. The corpse of the king of Ai was taken down from the tree, says Kara. יָגוֹר עַל מַחַל הַגְּזַר (Deut. 20:14). He cites the law in Deuteronomy which states that a corpse must not be left hanging, but interred the same day; and in this way he explains Joshua's action. Elsewhere he explains how Joshua erred by making a peace treaty with the Gibeonites, and thereby transgressed an explicit adjuration, שְׁבָתוּ בַּעֲבוֹר כָּל חַיֵּי הֲנוֹרָיָה מֵמָךְ מַאֲדָל (Josh. 9:7). Kara also quotes the gloss which the children of Israel supply to their own question, וְלֹא כֵּרָבִי אָחָה יִשָּׂרָיִל, which reads,

[Deut 7:2.] מָאָסֵתによּקַט 'סָפַל בִּלְחַדֶּנָּה לְחַדְּבֵיהֶם לְזָאת חַסֵּמָה. [Exod. 23:33]

With regard to the fact that the horses were imported from Egypt he states, להֵשֵב עַל לֵא חַזְיָפֹת. With the same issue, we are told that the גְּזַר לְכַל הָעָרִים הַחֲדָקָות מָּכֵר מָּאָדָּל (Deut. 20:14). Since the Gibeonites had professedly come from a distant land, this commandment ought to have applied to them (Josh. 9:7). Kara also quotes the gloss which the children of Israel supply to their own question, וְלֹא כֵּרָבִי אָחָה יִשָּׂרָיִל, which reads,

Other examples may also be found.

5. 'To Fulfil That Which Was Said' (לקיימים מה שאמרם)

When Kara quotes verses which represent the fulfilment of promises or the coming to pass of things which it had been said God would perform, his usual expression is לקיימים מה שאמרם. When we are told that Joshua left Ai, לֶךְ לְעֵיזָל לוֹזָל, Kara writes, לקיימים מה שאמרו ועִשֵּׂה לְלֵי הַמַּלְכּוֹ לְכַל הַמַּלְכָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִֹׂית לֶיִרְוָי הַמַּלְכָּה (Josh. 8:28). Near the conclusion of the Book of Joshua it says, הוּא לֹא עֵיזָל אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי יַהוָה (Josh. 21:42), and Kara
adds, So also when he explains the heritage of the tribe of Simeon, of which we are told (Josh. 19:1). These are the terms in which Kara comments: (Gen. 49:7). On another occasion, Caleb makes a request of Joshua and concludes, (Josh. 14:12), and Kara puts further words into Caleb's mouth, (Deut. 33:29). When Isaiah speaks of the capture of Ashdod by the king of Assyria (Isa. 20:1), Kara adds that we are also told at this point of the defeat of Ammon and Moab, which had joined with Assyria in the conquest of Samaria, in order (Isa. 16:14). Many other instances might be cited. It may be seen that the quotation is not adduced as a necessary element in the commentary as such; its purpose is rather to demonstrate the importance of faith and the truth of Scripture.

6. Quoting for Miscellaneous Reasons

Quite frequently Kara cites verses in order to provide further relevant details. When the land was divided up we are told that Manasseh received ten shares (Josh. 17:5). Kara explains how and why these were apportioned, and in order to clarify the issue lists the names of the various families...
which belonged to the tribe (Num. 26:29-32). He does the same for the tribe of Levi (Josh. 21:5). Elsewhere, when it is said of Joshua that (Josh. 11:15), Kara writes, These and many other such additions are characteristic of his exegetical method inasmuch as they clarify the commentary and help to generate its continuity.

At times Kara fetches a verse from a remote place in order to explain a difficult text (Josh. 10:10), or supplements a brief passage with material from elsewhere. At the end of Joshua's battle against the Kings of the South, for example, we are told that (Josh. 10:21). In clarification, Kara quotes a complete verse from Exodus 11:7; and so in other instances (I Sam. 15:2). On a few isolated occasions he cites a verse in order to produce its Aramaic translation, as in Joshua 8:13: שחרות וتسمמיה (Gen. 27:33). A phrase in the Song of Deborah, מיקול ויחלישה, is explicated by a citation from Targum Jonathan followed by Targum Onkelos.

7. Errors in Quotations
We have already observed that Kara quotes verses on a great variety of occasions and that such quotations are to be found in every chapter which he discusses. The quality of the citations ought now to be examined. Generally speaking he quotes with precision, but there are many exceptions which can be explained as due to a faulty memory. Some examples are presented in the table on the next page.
The Original Text

Mistakes in the introductory phrase

Jud. 11:40: בנות ישראל
	H Sam. 1:5: גלホテル
	H Sam. 14:30: אם יכו
	Isa. 10:14: והמצאה כד
	Isa. 16:1: על הר בציון

Mistakes in one word

Josh. 17:15: (Ezek. 23:47) וברא אבות
	Jud. 5:13: (Gen. 1:28) וזרד בגדה הים

Omission of one or more words

Josh. 10:13: (Deut. 7:23) גנותם 'עלינו
	Josh. 14:4: (Josh. 13:31) ערי מצרבות עוג
	Jud. 5:4: עליל בואר עוג ולbrahim
	Jud. 5:13: קדמה מארה ושמש על גבול
	Isa. 5:9: (Jos. 19:12) תם אঞ্জד ושמע דברך הבנים
	(Prov. 22:17) ימי טיב אפני

Conflation of two passages

I Kings 7:33: (Job 32:14) ולא עדך אליםMilim
	(Gen. 14:22) הרימוניות לא יכו 'ה

Isa. 43:6: (I Sam. 24:14) רבי אלוהי אל אלה
	(I Chron. 21:13) אל אלה ובייד 'ה... רויכיamedi
In two instances Kara simply reverses the order of the words in the verse, putting a later phrase first or an earlier phrase last. In three places he errs grossly by quoting verses which do not exist. I Samuel 6:6 the root is illustrated by but, such a phrase is to be found in the Bible. Similarly, in II Samuel 5:20 he offers what is alleged to be a quotation, but there are no such verses. Another anomaly occurs when he presents us with the wrong source for a quotation, for in Isaiah 16:4 he says when the citation is actually from Nehemiah 13:2.

These, then, are some of the instances in which Kara is imprecise or even mistaken as to a quotation, but (as we have already noted) such errors result most probably from a faulty memory, and are certainly not the product of design. In principle we can state that he turns quotations from Scripture into an integral part of his commentary because of the assistance they provide in clarifying linguistic forms, presenting parallel texts, demonstrating the fulfilment of promises, and enriching his own text with resounding phrases; but that his preeminent knowledge of the Scriptures and great expertise are occasionally betrayed by a want of care.
III. Use of Foreign Languages

1. Introduction

M. Bannitte, who has studied the glossaries and vernacular expressions found in Biblical discussion in France during the Middle Ages, writes, "In every instance where a rabbi of the Middle Ages who spoke one of the Romance languages relies on the vernacular to explain a Scriptural or Talmudic word or expression, he introduces it with the term "כלע" (in the vernacular)." According to the Talmud (Megillah 17a; Sotah 49b), "כלע" means "ילא"; and Rashi explains in connection with Psalm 114:1 that this refers to any language which is not the Holy Tongue. When Kara glosses the phrase "לע נאם" (Isa. 33:19) he says that when the Israelite exiles reached the various places of their dispersion they did not understand the vernacular spoken there, and so had "כלע" (to produce foreign language lexicons). "כלע" is customarily explained today as an abbreviation of "כלע".

At that period, ספרי פירושות were composed containing hundreds or even thousands of words which were vernacular equivalents of words from the Bible. Bannitte suggests that the Jews who lived in northern France and the Rhine region translated the Scriptures into the local language, but that this translation was transmitted orally rather than in writing. At any rate it is clear that rabbis and those who had to read out the weekly portion in synagogue possessed lists of vernacular equivalents for difficult words, and that teachers used these lexicons when they instructed children in Scripture and Talmud. Rashi calls their compilers
When he invokes their aid to clarify a word or a concept.

It should be kept in mind that a "is not always a precise rendition of the Hebrew word, but it does suggest its approximate sense within the total framework of the translation. Some of the מִשְּׁלְחָה used by Rashi take their origin from the work of Helbo, Kara being the intermediary between them. Helbo must be credited for the presence in Rashi's commentary of some Arabic words, which he had brought from Narbonne - from the house of Rabbi Yehuda, the heir of Rabbi Moshe, and of several provincial forms. Kara himself uses מִשְּׁלְחָה derived from Helbo, of whom Poznanski says, "He was the first to use the vernacular in his interpretations in order to explain difficult and poorly understood words in the Holy Writings, and such foreign terms are to be found in him in profusion." Let us look at some of them, as they are recorded in the commentary of his nephew Kara:

- Judges 2:15: מִשְּׁלְחָה
- Judges 6:2: מִשְּׁלְחָה
- I Kings 6:18: מִשְּׁלְחָה
- I Sam. 13:21: מִשְּׁלְחָה

These examples are from French; now for some from the language of אשכנז, namely German:

- I Sam. 13:21: מִשְּׁלְחָה
- II Kings 16:14: מִשְּׁלְחָה
- (Lev. 14:14)
2. **Modes of Use**

Kara uses לועזים in a great variety of ways which we must now examine:

a. The לועז as the sole gloss offered, without any further explanation:

   ![Example 1](I Kings 6:9)

b. A word of explanation with a לועז to accompany it, as in

   ![Example 2](I Sam. 17:5)

c. A לועז together with Targum Jonathan, as in

   ![Example 3](I Sam. 17:8)

d. A לועז together with a Scriptural quotation:

   ![Example 4](I Sam. 1:16; Psalms 55:18)

e. On occasion, two לועזים from the same language:
The vast majority of Kara's vernacular terms are used to identify objects and provide terms for things from the various spheres of everyday life. For geography, see his comments on "נוף צור" (Josh. 11:2); "נוף צור" (Josh. 22:11); "הנהר" (Josh. 15:9). Agriculture: "יור" (Josh. 17:18); "מפרץ" (Josh. 6:2); "ברקן" (Jud. 8:7); "חטש" (Jud. 9:14); "שמן" (Isa. 2:4); "נהר" (Jer. 2:21). Clothes and ornaments: the fifteen different kinds mentioned by Isaiah in 3:18-23. are also cited for "הכף" (Jud. 3:22); "اهتمامך" (Jud. 3:23); "://" (Jud. 4:18); "חטש" (Jud. 4:21); "ברקן" (Jud. 4:21).

Other foreign terms are intended to explain grammatical points, as in "יהdeer צור שור יאן משמע" (Josh. 18:5): "יומד וחתם" (Jud. 1:19). When we are told of Samson that "הוא יהל" (Jud. 13:5), Kara explains that "יאאפפר לור מפורים צור שור עוזר" (Jud. 13:5). When Eli says to Hannah, "לך" (Jud. 8:26); "לך" (Jud. 4:21). On one occasion he goes so far as to warn the reader against an interpretation based upon an incorrect "לך". When Eli says to Hannah, "לך" (Jud. 8:26); "לך" (Jud. 4:21).
(I Sam. 1:17) Kara explains... כות acces and do...ונק את התרומת הפותרウォים...יתר דנור"ר ב"על בלשון בקשנה נמצאה...ועירם הפרדור והנה התהפשה...יתר לעליתד דנור"ד ב"על ולא שלוש בקשנה...

Often we find Kara explaining whole phrases, or even the spirit of a passage, by means of vernacular terms. Here also we discover what is unique to Kara in his use of the fact that he may deploy entire phrases or clauses in French instead of offering equivalents for isolated words. Several examples are given below:

a. ותחה תחתו והסל בך (I Sam. 1:20): סא"ש הנה}-{ניירין"ך... (I Sam. 1:17) ותחה תחתו והסל בך אדגורה"ט פורטויר"ד פ"יל בה"ז, כלומרишאווית לטרף שנא כר נטוברה תחתו והסל בך.

b. ולא נתנגן, אדגורה"ט... (II Sam. 2:3): ולא נתנגן עליינא"ט. לורי סא"ש אמונא"יר"ש לארוס בלע"י, כלר"ר להקמ להספורים.

c. ובליון מוסף, רואה: (I Sam. 18:8) וו לדו אלımı לילא"ח. מתגונד אינוג חסר עוד כי אט המלוכה...אנקוריא קר אידים לאלים המלוכה שיאורו טוועבע"ז.

d. (Isa. 51:21): (שכורט דוריו) "ב"עלו"ז. איגבריא דאלטני"ז רוז"א פולו"ג.

e. [To explain God's threat against the people in Hos.

3. Vernacular Languages Employed

Generally speaking French constitutes Kara's standard... לשתון (I Kings 6:9). Nevertheless Kara also draws upon other languages.

אשכנז (German). In addition to the passages we have
already quoted from Helbo, we find (Josh. 17:18): ¹⁰³
"םקורנים לו" (Jud. 9:46): "אִּיֶּדֶת אֲשֶׁר נְבָשָׁר קְרִיּוּ רֹד"... ¹⁰⁴
בַּלְשָׁנָה אֲשֶׁר נָהָר; and so on. ¹⁰⁵

But in a Slavic tongue. Found in (Jud. 8:26):
וכל בלשון ערבי: וכל בלשון ערבי: והיה גבר להו: ¹⁰⁶
Arabic. Found in the passage quoted from Helbo, above,
from I Samuel 19:24, and also in Isaiah 14:19:
שָׂוֵרִים לֹא דֶּקֶר אֶלָּמֵשׁ; and so in Ezekiel 39:18.

Bannitute notes that the Rabbis customarily cited words
even from languages they did not understand, as the result of
"a constant inclination towards anthologising and a strong
verbal bent in educational practice."¹⁰⁷ Since Kara lived
his whole life in France it is reasonable to assume that he
did not in fact know German, Slavic or Arabic, and that he
wielded these foreign terms because he was an educator and a
teacher.

In his commentary on Prophets he uses some 270 different
foreign terms. Let us note the main characteristics of his
usage.

a. The word "לעלו" is inserted before or (more commonly)
after the foreign term.¹⁰⁸

b. On occasion the word "לעלו" appears before or after the
foreign term.¹⁰⁹

c. The forms "בַּלְשָׁנָה אֲשֶׁר נְבָשָׁר" (Josh. 17:18;
Jud. 9:46; Jer. 2:21) and the like (Jud. 8:26; I Sam. 19:24;
Isa. 22:18) are very common.

d. The forms "לעלו" (I Sam. 1:20; II Kings 16:14;
Ezek. 11:11) and also appear.

e. At times the word "שָׂוֵרִים" precedes the foreign
term; the name of the language is sometimes appended as well.

f. The formulation נַשְׁמַח לָךְ appears once, in II Sam. 13:26.

g. A foreign term is occasionally introduced without any opening or closing formula (Jud. 8:7; I Kings 6:15; Isa. 27:9; 34:11).

From this list we may draw the conclusion which we have reached in other contexts: that on the whole Kara avoids set formulations and, as befits a teacher, uses different and interchangeable expressions for the same thing.

In summary it can be stated that Kara frequently uses foreign terms to explain nouns or concepts from everyday life, and grammatical forms as well. Usually, as with any teacher of Scripture who is concerned to clarify points for his students, there is an accompanying explanation. Most of his foreign terms are drawn from French, but some also appear from other languages; and he uses all of them with the variety which he exhibits in all other matters. He differs from his contemporaries in offering the translation into French of complete sentences and not just isolated words.
IV. Biblical Style

Kara displays an inclination to define with precision what he calls נתיות הקיריה (I Sam. 1:20), i.e. the rules which underlie the style of the Bible. He considers the reader under an obligation to know the methodology of Scriptural language so as to be able to understand the text: ‘וירשא נל טו סור הדם 통 ינועה כו נ החמ בכון בלשון המ克拉 (I Samuel 3:3).

1. Duplication of Words and Topics

When a word or phrase is repeated Kara does not regard this as superfluous information, but rather gives a reason for the occurrence. For example, in א-ל אלכימ ח 'א-ל אלכימ ח ' הוהי והי יידע יהו עד מצמד אתה ובמעל אתה והי נבטיי לה him (Josh. 22:22) he asks

...לStartPosition לא שפרין פימיי א-ל אלכימ ח ' צ פתר'...

וככ למוקס אחוככ בשתחי ליפורל שליל דברים סבל שפכ תיבת

לפנין כמי אנכימ איוכים... (ישע. מ"ה 25)... אכ כמי השפ לוהי ידע שלא במדל...41.

Of a different nature is the repetition of the word בבל in II Samuel 13:4, whose function, Kara holds, is to stress the daily routine: "アイנ אוומ שטני דל בביר ולא לדוימ אלא בכיר

וככ היה אוומ לא כל מדור.Actor לאacha... Different again are those instances where whole events are repeated. The comment on Jud. 13:12 states the rule clearly:

[When in any Biblical book something is repeated, it is abridged either the first or the second time around; where it is briefly treated on the first occasion, it is discussed at
more length the second time, and vice versa.] In Kara's opinion, no event is simply repeated: retellings are for the sole purpose of adding details to what has already been said.  

Only one exception can be found to this rule, namely, the section dealing with the capture of Kiriat Sefer, which is related in Joshua 15:16 and repeated without any change in Judges 1:12: (the duplication does not supplement the first account, but places it in its chronological position).  

2. The Language of Scripture  
Whenever Kara explains a recurring phrase, idiom, word or linguistic root, he generally uses one of the following expressions: (I Sam. 1:11; Ezek. 29:5); (I Sam. 25:18; Isa. 4:6); or (I Sam. 25:2; Jer. 10:8), and (I Kings 2:35), and (Isa. 4:2; Jer. 50:36).  

In other instances Kara expatiates at more length on Scriptural modes of expression, generally employing the term (it is a rule of Scripture), as in (Isa. 5:18; 2:1; 4:2). When David tells his servants, , Kara writes,  

המה עדכני, רוד, קאה עמנא, קד بمבר, אודינכמס.
By 'your master' he meant himself, but it is a Scriptural rule that a person speaks of himself as if someone else were speaking.] Similarly we find instances in Isaiah where the prophet speaks of himself in the third person, like David, and Kara remarks, 'כַּאֲלִיו הָאָדָם פֹּדָר עַל דִּי.' כַּאֲלִיו הָאָדָם פֹּדָר עַל דִּי. On another point, Kara speaks of the tradition possessed by the Sages that קֵרֵן קֵרֵן מַסְתַּנְנֵי בְּלָשׁוֹן אַדָּד (I Kings 22:7). In some of Jeremiah's addresses he mentions similar prophecies uttered by Ezekiel and says, 'וַיְנַחַם אֶזְקיֵל אַלָּא אֲמִרָה שִׁנְיָה בְּלָשׁוֹן אַדָּד (Jer. 13:26).
Commenting on Isa. 35:9, he adds, 'וְהָעֹלֶה לְךָ לְכָלָּם נֵצֶרּוֹן אֲדָד' He occasionally elaborates on the prophetic style, as when the prophet includes himself with the nation in a rebuke given in the name of God: וְכָּל דַּרְדַּד הַנּוֹכָאִים לְהוֹאָלָם לְכָלָּם אֶלֶם (Isa. 1:18). Where a prophet uses identical language for both a rebuke and the following consolation (Isa. 2:1, 4), or for both a condemnation of idols and a blessing from God (Jer. 10:8), or for the wars of two different nations (Jer. 50:41), Kara explains that he felt the subject matter of his prophecy within his very bones, and therefore spoke thus (Isa. 15:5; 21:3).
To describe the phenomenon of **מקרא קצר** (abbreviated phrases), Kara makes use of one of the following expressions:

1. הָיָה... וַיָּקָר... (Josh. 22:34); הָיָה... וַיְקָר... (I Kings 7:15, 20).
2. וְיָקָר... (I Kings 22:24; II Kings 20:9).
3. וְיָקָר... (I Sam. 14:6; 24:10; 26:10; Jer. 38:5).
4. וְיָקָר... (I Sam. 9:27).
5. וְיָקָר... (I Sam. 14:6; 24:10; 26:10; Jer. 38:5).
6. וְיָקָר... (Josh. 22:34); וְיָקָר... (II Sam. 21:16; II Kings 20:9).

In Joshua 10:21 he uses the phrase **מקרא קצר** briefly:

[The word 'dog' is understood (see Exod. 11:7), and there are many instances wherein verses are shortened and rely on the good sense of the readers.] In this verse Kara adds the missing word on the basis of the similar expression in Exodus, although usually it is context or logic which complete a phrase, as in

1. וַיַּקְרֶשׁ שָׁם... (I Sam. 15:2; cf. Jer. 38:5; Hos. 1:9), where Kara explains
2. וַיַּקְרֶשׁ שָׁם... (I Sam. 24:10) that
3. וַיַּקְרֶשׁ שָׁם... (II Sam. 13:39), where

He says of the phrase

1. וַיַּקְרֶשׁ שָׁם... (II Sam. 13:39), where

There are many places where he passes such incompleteness
over without remark. For example, Joshua 21:10 states יִשָּׂע בָּהּ, when it ought to read יִשָּׂע בָּהּ (cf. 16:8; 13:5, etc.). I do not think that his failure to grapple with these instances is indicative of any lack of consistency on his part, since he declares on more than one occasion that this feature is to be found in numerous places and that one must rely on the good sense of the reader. He therefore takes notice only of those occurrences which seem likely to cause difficulty or be a stumbling block to the reader. There is no suggestion of textual criticism in his approach, as he himself says: שִׁישַׁע בָּהּ התֹּכַר שֶׁשְׁעֵעַּמֶּךָ אָתָּהּ לֶמֶּזֶּר לֶמֶּזֶּר לֶמֶּזֶּר (I Sam. 24:10; Ezek. 34:30).

Rashi describes the phenomenon of מִכְרָא כֵּץ in similar terms. From a total of fifteen observations by Kara on this subject we find in Rashi only five. Some of these are formulated in identical language (Josh. 22:34; I Kings 22:24; II Kings 20:9), while others have a different wording (I Kings 7:15, 20).

4. מִכְרָא מְסוּורֵת

On only five occasions does Kara note the occurrence of a מִכְרָא מְסוּורֵת (reversed phrase) by name. He refers to it thus: מִכְרָא מְסוּורֵת הַזָּה זֶה פְּתַרְנוּ. After pointing out the problem of the defective syntactical sequence he proposes the correct order. We may add that Rashi deals with this issue in only two instances (I Kings 7:18; Ezek. 22:3), and that Kara several times confronts the problem without naming it (I Sam. 3:3; 20:29; II Sam. 17:3).
5. The Expression נבכייס
In a number of places Kara adds the word נבכייס (in amazement) after the introductory phrase of a verse to indicate that it is a question; sometimes he also formulates the question or explains it:

I Sam. 10:11.124 "הנני אומת" בתמייה, כלומר,Bushiel תשיעים מעת שיש אמור בתמייה
(I "הנני אומת" בתמייה, כלומר, "בשיש תשיעים מעות דבר אמור בתמייה" Sam. 14:43).125

Jeremiah 31:19 asks, and Kara explains at length the verse itself and the issue of rhetorical questions:

When a word begins with ה and is followed by וא, know that it is an expression of astonishment.] Kara wishes to clarify for the reader what kind of sentence he is faced with, since verses of this type might be understood as declaratory or imperative. To avoid any misunderstanding of the subject matter, he adds the word בתמייה, without further explanation (Jer. 49:8; Mal. 3:8; etc.).

6. משלי and Simile
In his Mavo Lamikra (I:1:81, pp. 56-57), M. Segal distinguishes among (1) משלי, 'a series of stories which combine into a complete picture' (2) המשל שם פורוי (moral). The דמיון, 'which expresses only the resemblance in image, simile), 'which expresses only the resemblance in
quality or action between the two things compared' (sect. 73, p. 52). Kara does not distinguish between and, but employs both expressions for all three of Segal's concepts. We shall look at several examples. In Jotham's parable of the trees (Jud. 9:9), Kara says, 'לא שחלק בין העצמים למשלח עליהם מלך... אלא משלח הזא לבנגור סזכ משה אכימדק משח. In Joash's parable to Amaziah of Judah (II Kings 14:9) he explains what the is and what the and sums up:

The parable wielded by Isaiah to arouse Hezekiah of Judah against the king of Assyria is defined by Kara as (Isa. 37:24), and he uses the same terms in speaking of similes. In Hosea 5:10 we find the phrase 'איה שרי יוהודא ענשי, נוכל. This is a comparison, pure and simple, and Kara says, 'משלח הז משלח על יוהודא. Similarly, in Isaiah 1:8, in the string of similes about Jerusalem, 'וכמות נבות כמלכות במשלח כעי נזרות... What emerges from all this is that Kara does not distinguish between parables and similes, as can be shown from many other instances.' In the case of phrases which point out resemblances, he notes (Hag. 2:3) that the letter כ serves as an identifying sign:

So also with the most common type of comparison:

Elsewhere (see on Jer. 8:22), Kara adds

еш"ע, כ"א שמה שמתא כמה דבירים שלוכמ שוהים בא אתה של כ"א. והמשלח כבוכל

כ"א. כל מוקד שמתא כמה דבירים שלוכמ שוהים בא אתה של כ"א.
that parables and similes are clearly both techniques whose function is to bestir the people into heeding the prophet's usually unwelcome remarks (he uses מִלַּיְתָה in the sense of 'enigmatic saying'): מִלַּיְתָה הדבר (Jer. 8:22). At times a parable may be more difficult to understand. When Isaiah calls time and time again to the people to listen to him (28:23), Kara explains, лиו שאל פרשצ 20 כולה משל דרימר, 호וא אומר האוזניי וشبهו ומקשיב ב. Nevertheless the prophets make extensive use of this means in order to speak to the people with greater concreteness (see Isa. 8:1).

7. Wordplay
Kara deals with this topic only in a number of places in the Latter Prophets, under the name בעי ענהות נדה ממידה. Let us look at some examples.

a. בעי ענהות נדה ממידה (Isa. 10:30-31). Kara explains, על שם השמישון נפל על הענהות לשוור ענייה כים שוהא אומר, בעי ענהות נדה ממידה, כלמר ממידה שמה כְּדֹר מְסִלָּר וְכָּלְּעֵר. [There is a play upon 'Anathoth' to suggest 'poverty' (עיןיה), just as 'Madmenah' implies 'flight' (נדיה); compare Ekron's being 'rooted up' (הitunes) and Dimon's being filled with blood (דם).]


c. בעי ענהות נדה ממידה (Jer. 6:3). בעי ענהז tor הילוךולו התו. רוע איה ואת ישראל, מרעה והאש התושב שמססת המקרה אליהם יבוא רעים ובכשל חсим. [The word רוע suggests מִרְעה, and after an intervening phrase
the text returns to this expression.] Kara does not define this as a play upon words since there is an interval of five words between the two occurrences of רע and רעים, but it is clear that he considers it a pun, and this holds true for the following example as well.

d. He cites three instances where wordplay may be discerned in spite of the fact that there is a sizeable gap between the components. Commenting on יבוקיע in Jer. 19:7, he says

Despite the distance between the relevant words he sees a play upon words in the repetition of verb, noun or sound.

V. Comparisons and the Resolution of Contradictions Between the Early Prophets and Chronicles

1. Comparisons Between the Early Prophets and Chronicles

Most of the comparisons which Kara institutes with Chronicles begin with Chapter 5 of II Samuel. In general, we can say that he refers to only a few instances in proportion to the great many discrepancies between the Early Prophets and Chronicles. His treatment of the subject can be divided into three categories:

a. Instances where he cites the parallel entry from Chronicles, points out the difference, and leaves it at that.

b. Instances where he cites Chronicles to provide further details as to events narrated in the Early Prophets.

c. Instances where he notes the difference (and occasional contradictions) between the versions and resolves them, in
general by harmonizing the two.

As a rule Kara adopts one of the following expressions when he quotes from Chronicles:

...כדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבכר הימם דבריכו' קדבcrap... (II Sam. 24:12; II Kings 2:4; II Kings 11:6). We shall now examine his commentary in line with the division suggested above, attempting through examples to determine why in one place he remarks a discrepancy without concerning himself with it, and in another devotes a long explanation to differences between the texts; and whether or not he operates on a conscious principle in this matter.

a. Here Kara sets Chronicles against the Early Prophets in regard to a word, part of a verse or a complete verse, without explaining or discussing the difference. He glosses מִּנֵּי כָּלָי זַמְרָה וְשֵׁם, זַמְרָה, כְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם וְכְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם (II Sam. 6:5) as follows: מִנֵּי כָּלָי זַמְרָה וְשֵׁם, זַמְרָה, כְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם וְכְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם. He notes the difference without adding anything, which is especially strange in view of the fact that this is not the only modification found in the text, for in II Samuel the complete phrase is מִנֵּי כָּלָי זַמְרָה וְשֵׁם, זַמְרָה, כְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם וְכְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם whereas in I Chron. 13:8 it is מִנֵּי כָּלָי זַמְרָה וְשֵׁם, זַמְרָה, כְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם וְכְּדַבְּרֵי הָיוֹם - which Kara does not even mention. In the same chapter we are told of David that he was נְבֵרָה, מָלְאָמְרֵר, מָלְאָמָר... (II Sam. 21:20; cf. also 5:9) he says,
but what about the discrepancy between the two epithets, 'stature' as against divisiveness? Elsewhere, in I Kings 15:15, he notes the different appellations for God, the Tetragrammaton in Kings and אלכוס in Chronicles. In Joshua he remarks one difference as to a place name, דאצ עֵלֶפֶּר (Josh. 21:18), but does not discuss it:

These are a few of the instances where he deals with a single disparity among many in a particular passage or a section as a whole (II Sam. 24:17). It emerges from them that he has no consistent method in this area, and that by no means every dissimilarity is explained. And even if we can attribute his inconsistent noting of variations to the fact that he cites Chronicles from memory, it remains unclear why he does not harmonize the various verses.

b. On many occasions Kara cites the parallel segment from Chronicles for its supplementary information, or in order to explain some obscure point or even complete aHKM קוצר. Below are a number of examples.

In the description of the altar which Solomon built, he cites the parallel verses from Chronicles for its account of the copper basin and its dimensions, which Kings does not mention (I Kings 8:16). In another place, II Sam. 6:1, additional information of a different kind is cited. The text states וַיָּסֶר עִנְּיוֹן עַל־כָּל־חָוָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל עִנְּיוֹן עַל כָּל־חָוָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל and it is the word לְפָנֵי שְׁבַחְתָּיוֹת נֵעָיו עָם עֵדֶּן, שֶׁהֶם נַמְלָכָה מְסֹר בְּדָבָרָי יִשְׂרָאֵל... וְזֶה וַיֵּסֶר עִנְּיוֹן עַל כָּל־חָוָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל... Thus הָיָה עִנְּיוֹן עַל כָּל־חָוָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל is explained by the information from I Chronicles 13:1-5.
With regard to the depth of the Copper Sea of Kings, Kara adds an explanation from II Chron. 4:6, from the same source he tells us of the basins. In I Kings 15:7 he goes to trouble to explain a verse from Chronicles, since it might be understood in two different ways, after he has supplied further information to supplement the statement in Kings.

He also fills out several instances of מַמְאָרָה קָצַר in accordance with the parallel verse in Chronicles. In II Samuel 24:1 it says, and Kara explains, מַמְאָרָה קָצַר הָיוּ זה וְתָשֶׁר הָיִהְוּ אָתָּה וְתָזְרוּ כֹּלַת לְאָמְרָה, and here too he completes the thought: 'אֲלֵיהוּ עֹבֶר רוּחַ 'ה וְחָרֵם שְׁמוֹ אָנָּה מַמְאָרָה קָצַר וּבְכָל הַמִּיתָן אָנָּה חַדְלִי עֹבֶר. In other instances he cites Chronicles not in order to supply further information but rather to clarify events and how they have come about, or to explain a difficult verse. On the passage (II Sam. 7:23), he says outright, פָּרָה זוֹ הַלְּאָה חִיּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלָיָהוּ אָלֶיה רֵעֶיהָ הַיְּיִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלֹקָה לְרֹד מַמְאָרָה קָצַר וְתָזְרוּ כֹּלַת לְאָמְרָה וְלָבֶּן מַמְאָרָה קָצַר אֲלֵיהוּ בָּשֹׁם... Similarly, he explains Solomon's name (II Sam. 12:24) through the explication provided in Chronicles, and when he discusses the wreck of Jehoshaphat's merchantmen at Ezion-geber (I Kings 22:49), he draws on Chronicles to account for the disaster: לְפִי שָׁנָהוּ הבֹּקֶר הַקָּדָם שָׁנָהוּ בָּשֹׁם אֲלֵיהוּ בָּשֹׁם וְתָזְרוּ כֹּלַת לְאָמְרָה וְיִשָּׁר הַיְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אֶלָּה הַיְּיִשָּׁר הַיְּיִשָּׁר בָּשֹׁם שָׁנָהוּ בָּשֹׁם... In addition to what has been said above it seems to me
that Kara had an additional purpose, one that he was perhaps
unaware of, in citing parallel verses from Chronicles. On
occasion his quotations consist of entire verses which differ
from the texts of Early Prophets in ways that appear to be
marginal and devoid of significance. Nevertheless they are
quoted, and we must wonder why he should have selected these
verses in particular. Before we attempt an answer let us look
at some examples. When in his dedicatory speech for the
Temple, Solomon speaks of the choice of Jerusalem as the site
of the Temple and the choice of David as king, Kara cites the
equivalent passage from Chronicles (I Kings 8:16; II Chron.
6:5-6). This contains an additional clause, together
with another minor change - but really there is no difference between the two, Chronicles
being an exact repetition of the statement in Kings.

Elsewhere, we are told that Pharaoh's daughter moved
out of the city of David to live elsewhere, and Kara adds
from II Chronicles 8:11 Solomon's reason for changing her
abode: Apparently in all these instances nothing more is involved than the
provision of additional facts, but if this were the case we
would have expected it to be performed in a more methodical
and less sporadic fashion, and that significant information
should be added; but this has not been done.

It seems to me that the additions are made within a very
particular range: either the moral and religious appraisal of
a figure, favourable or unfavourable, or matters connected
with God. 139 In the first two examples above a warm view is
taken of Solomon's conduct and actions, in contrast with the
pejorative impression gained from Chronicles of Joram's
classical, which made him unworthy to be interred in the
royal sepulchre. Let us look at some further instances. We
are told of David that

(II Sam. 8:13), and Kara explains that the renown that
David gained for himself was

this being according to Chronicles. He goes on to remark,

Thus the addition from Chronicles
enables him to offer a favourable appraisal of David. In
contrast to this a critical view is also taken, for

(I Kings 1:1), Kara explains that David felt cold,

Another instance of the condemnation of a king on moral
and religious grounds can be found in the case of Abijam,
whom God punished, says Kara, because he did not destroy the
golden calves (I Kings 15:7). This piece of information is
taken from Chronicles; it is not mentioned in Kings. The case
of Joash is comparable (I Kings 22:49; II Kings 12:3; 14:7,
17). Careful consideration of all these instances will show,
in my opinion, that with the exception of those places where
Kara introduces a passage from Chronicles in order to resolve
a contradiction or explain a difficult passage or other
significant issue, he quotes in order to furnish the
attentive student with appraisals of character on the basis
of moral and religious norms.

c. In quite a few places Kara contrasts the version of the Early Prophets with that of Chronicles (which differs from it only slightly) and resolves the difficulty, usually by a harmonisation. Where necessary, however, he does not hesitate to state that the two versions cannot be reconciled.

In some cases a single letter is the only disparity. The phrase שָׁבַע שָׁהֵי נְבוֹת בָּשָׁבַע שָׁוֶה שָׁהֵי נְבוֹת (II Sam. 10:16) appears in I Chronicles 19:16 as וְשָׁבַע שָׁהֵי נְבוֹת וְשָׁוֶה שָׁהֵי נְבוֹת... There is no contradiction but rather the annotation of two different characteristics in the same person. In contrast to the word מַלְכָּת in I Kings 5:25, II Chronicles 2:9 has מַלְכָּת, and Kara explains the former as an expression for sustenance, as in יָיִלֵל יְשִׁיעַ, and the latter as חַזִּי חַיִּים. The underlying idea, consequently, is identical. The same phenomenon can be found elsewhere, except that the contrast involves a parallel in the Book of Psalms. The words מַלְכָּת in II Samuel 22:36 and מַלְכָּת in Psalms 18:36 are both expressions of humility. In II Samuel 22:46 we find יִהְיֶרֶךְ וּמַלְכַּת יָיִלֵל מָסָגְרֹתִים and in Psalm 18:46 וְיִהְיֶרֶךְ מָסָגְרֹתִים. Kara accounts for this in terms of a transposition of letters, or as he puts it, חַזִּי חַיִּים הפיכות כ모 כמש [which both mean 'lamb'].

In instances when entire words are different Kara again stands by the method of harmonisation. The city שלם, of II Samuel 8:1 is identical with שלם of I Chronicles 18:1. The city פָּרְשֵׁים ofJosh. 21:18 is called עלמה in I Chronicles 6:45.
Actually, says Kara, it is אֻלְמָת, rendered by Targum Jonathan as אֻלְמָת. Apart from the fact that Almon and Bachurim are both located in Benjamin, there are no grounds for regarding them as the same city, but a similarity in name derived from the Targum leads Kara to identify them. 141

Again, the המָדוֹת of I Kings 5:23 is identical with המָדוֹת of II Chronicles 2:15. The metūz of I Kings 10:12 is a floor and it is the same as the המָדוֹת of II Chronicles 9:11. In I Kings 9:8 it says, והָבִית הָזָה יִהְיוּ עַל יוֹרֶם כָּל עָוֹר עַלֵיוֹ שֵׁשׁ ולְשָׁנָה; II Chronicles 7:21 substitutes המָדוֹת for המָדוֹת, which means, says Kara, והָבִית הָזָה אָשָׁר הָוָא עַל יוֹרֶם ... ולְשָׁנָה which means, says Kara, והָבִית הָזָה אָשָׁר הָוָא עַל יוֹרֶם ... ולְשָׁנָה.

He explains the difference between the המָדוֹת of II Samuel 7:19 and the המָדוֹת of I Chronicles 17:17 in this way: תָּודָה פְּתָרוֹנָה שָׁוָה - taking שָׁוָה as rank, lot or status; and then the two verses are easily understood:

... the entire gloss should be studied. Similarly, the disparity between the plural of המְלָכִים (II Sam. 7:23) and the singular of המְלָכִים (I Chron. 17:21) is thus explained: כל לְשׁוֹרֶם מְלָכִים לְשׁוֹרֶם רֵבים ...

We see, therefore, that minor discrepancies between the texts found in different books can be handled by the same method by which greater disparities are resolved, namely, through harmonisation. From this we may conclude that he did not regard the versions as essentially different from one another. 142
On several occasions Kara juxtaposes a verse from the Early Prophets with the corresponding verse from Chronicles, notes the contradiction between them and attempts to resolve it. Most of the contradictions involve numbers—quantities, measures and times—and generally he finds a solution in the Midrash or the Talmud, or (sometimes) a logical explanation which harmonises the different versions.

In the census of the people, Israel is numbered at 800,000 and Judah at 500,000, according to II Samuel 24:9, while in I Chronicles 21:5 Israel has 1,000,000 souls and Judah 470,000. Kara quotes Midrash Samuel (end of section 30) to the effect that they were numbered by the use of paper slips of which there were two series, one for a large census and one for a smaller one, in order to fulfil David's requirements, so that if the smaller one were unacceptable they might show him the larger one.

In another place there is a contradiction as to the number of inspectors set over the people. In Kings they are listed as 3,300 (I Kings 8:30; 9:23), while in II Chronicles 2:17 it is 3,600. Kara's intelligent and logical explanation is that since 3,300 inspectors supervised the work of 150,000 individuals, another 300 had to be added to check on the inspectors themselves. He adds, והḏu ʿashr ʿeš ṭurō ṣḥāḥūyim yodḥ ʿeš ṭurō ṣḥāḥūyim yodḥ [here he notes other contradictions].

By the Midrash he explains the number of stables Solomon had presents another problem. According to I Kings 8:6 there were 40,000, but II Chronicles 9:25 has 4,000, and...
Kara, asking, כנoze תק"י, מ קנ"ו, חתובים הלולו, explains that there existed stables in two different places. One of these contained 4,000 large stables, each one of which held 40 horses, for a sum total of 160,000 horses, while at another location Solomon built 40,000 small stables each of which held 4 horses, so that in reality נמיצא שיגי שגבון אתזר. And if one wishes to know why a two-stable arrangement should have been necessary, he explains that the horses were moved around every so often from one to the other so that they could be cleaned of the refuse that had accumulated. The solution is original and appealing, but in my opinion impracticable. A similar interpretation is offered for the inconsistency in the sums collected from the tribes, for in II Samuel 24:24 fifty silver shekels are taken in and in I Chronicles 21:25 six hundred: נמל מכל שבט ושבעים שכליים: ח"ש שמשלקילין...וירם שלוש מאה שקילים.

In the construction of the Temple it says in I Kings 7:15 that the height of the two pillars was 18 cubits, whereas in II Chronicles 3:15 it is 35 cubits, and the disparity is to be resolved by understanding that the two pillars were cast together, making a total height of 36 cubits; the missing cubit represents the capital of each, each of which measured half a cubit (see 7:22). As to the height of the hall, he introduces an interpretation from Helbo, but it does not resolve the difficulty (see I Kings 6:2-3; II Chron. 3:4). The Talmud's gloss is quoted to settle the contradiction as to the volume of the Copper Sea, which according to I Kings 7:26 contained two thousand ננה (a liquid measure) and to II Chronicles 4:5 three thousand ננה; and
Contradictions with regard to time and the reigns of kings are also pointed out and reconciled, generally with the aid of Midrash Seder Olam or the Talmud.\(^{47}\)

Elsewhere Kara resolves a contradiction between what is said in Joshua 10:14 on the sun and moon's standing still, and the description in Isaiah 38:8 of the sun's nevertheless returning on itself in the reign of Hezekiah. After stating the problem, he says, Hence in fact there is no contradiction, since only once has it occurred that God so acted on a human request - during the time of Joshua. In another instance Kara presents the contradiction and admits his inability to resolve it.

According to II Kings 9:27, Jehu pursued Ahaziah to Megiddo and killed him there, but according to II Chron. 22:9 Ahaziah was found hiding in Samaria. Kara says in his inimitable way, The following case is exceptional. In I Kings 10:26 we are told: The parallel verse in II Chronicles 1:14 is identical with the exception of the word, as against the word of Kings; but this disparity is marginal to the subject. Let us look at what Kara says:

הירドイ שֶׁהוֹנָדוּשׁ היה שליש בֵּית הקָגוֹל (Eruvin 14b).
Chronicles, he asserts, records that Solomon had 1,700 chariots (not 1,400), but this figure is not to be found in any known text or manuscript. It would seem that he depended upon his memory for the verse from Chronicles, and in consequence had to resolve a contradiction which does not exist. It is of interest to note that Rashi describes Solomon's arrangements in similar terms, but without the discrepancy in the figures.

In summary, we have seen that while Kara not infrequently compares and contrasts a verse from the Early Prophets with the equivalent passage from Chronicles, it is not always clear why the parallel is adduced. The practice is justified when it is a question of offering further information, explaining unclear passages or noting discrepancies in order to show that no contradiction is in fact involved; but along with these instances we have observed many cases where discrepancies are remarked without evident reason - and these cases really display no common denominator. It is possible that they consist of points raised by Kara's students as he delivered his lectures, and that he took note of them without actually feeling that they represented difficulties (otherwise he would have expressed an opinion). The fact that he was both a teacher and an educator also supports the theory that many of the additions which he cites from Chronicles are designed to give a final touch to the moral and religious evaluation of Biblical figures by the reader-student.
3. The Resolution of Contradictions and Difficult Passages
Within the Writings of the Prophets Themselves

As we have already observed, Kara's principal means for resolving contradictions or difficult passages likely to cause misunderstanding consists in attempts at harmonisation, both between verses from the Early Prophets and Chronicles and between verses from within the Prophetic Books themselves. But where with regard to Chronicles Kara deals with only a minority of the occurrences, when it is a question of the Early Prophets he is careful to clarify all such issues.¹⁴³ We shall now look at a number of difficult passages and contradictions of various types.

Gideon battles against the Midianites, yet in one verse they are called ישמעאלים (Jud. 8:24). Kara cites the sale of Joseph (Gen. 37:28) to show that ישמעאלים. In the passage on the Gibeonites there is much ambiguity. Are they חטפי עזים והשאיב扪ים (Josh. 9:21) for the congregation as a whole, for the altar (v. 23) or for both (v. 27)? Kara's solution is that initially they served the congregation for a short period, in appeasal, but once the altar had been erected they served it forever. He shows a clear sensitivity and understanding of what is hinted at between the lines, as if he saw the situation unfolding before his eyes. In another instance, Judges 1:18 implies that Jerusalem had been conquered, and so the necessity for its conquest in the days of David is puzzling. Kara explains שאט Ellison שאט אט רבלו.³⁶⁹ Concerning Hannah, we are told that she did not eat of the sacrifices offered in Shilo (I Sam. 1:7). Yet immediately afterwards it says, מעב התנה אתיה,
Kara sets out the problem and its solution: From this we may conclude that Hannah herself did not eat. Absalom says on one occasion, "עניא ли ובנבו ההוכיר שפי" (II Sam. 18:18). Kara points out the difficulty and suggests a solution, finding a way to harmonise the passages in question:

וכי לא היה להם בן שהלא כתוב יולדים לאבישאום שלשה בניים (יב' 27) אלא שאלה היה להם בן דומה בקומות. So also with regard to the statement that Michal had five sons (II Sam. 21:8), which contradicts the earlier declaration that she had no child (6:23). Kara adopts the Talmudic solution:

שישל ידשה אמות ומיכל ידשה אמות ומוהר: סמויה ידשה אמות עליה התורה célיל יום.

Among the officers of Solomon are listed "אילל הברון אלעזר בן צבי" (I Kings 4:4), and Kara writes, "ביית שהגא elev אביה [i.e. Abiathar son of Ahimaaz]," שاهر כה וירשו שולם התויה כה ווהה היה בכוכי עליל מוכנין של א_NUMERICה. This explanation prevents the student from confusing two different characters.

A difficult problem with which modern scholars too must grapple is who actually kills Goliath. David, as we are informed in I Samuel 17, or Elhanan (II Sam. 21:19)? In his predilection for harmonised texts Kara writes, "אלהים זא זא זא שערי נא-ל, but while this rests upon Midrash Ruth Rabbah 2b it does not explain how David came to be called Elhanan as well, nor what connection the passage has with I Chron. 20:5, where there is a further discrepancy. In another instance (I Kings 12:18) he explains that ארון is the ארון of I Kings 5:28, again ignoring Chronicles (II Chron. 10:18), where he
is called חזרה. He likewise resolves the contradiction between the statement in I Kings 22:48 that Edom had no king and the reference to מלך אדום in II Kings 3:9: דוד אלמן לו עיניה של thầy אשיר ממלך. Discrepancies between the Early Prophets and the Pentateuch are also settled. Elisha says to the king of Israel, who is at war with Moab, כל על שוד פלילים (II Kings 3:19): a violation of the explicit commandment in Deut. 20:20. Kara invokes one of his principal paedagogical rules, מימד חנ当たり, to solve the difficulty: העבר עמק סר כל כדי להתلد, על אשא לא קודם מצאנו Гор',ראה ד"ה לחם כל אלו שבכרו את בולע כלכלים והמה נם את עשה להтел נמל כל עין שוד פלילים. In another instance, he resolves the geographical problem posed by Rachel's tomb. According to I Sam. 10:2 it is located on the border between Benjamin and Ephraim, yet Gen. 35:19 places it in Judah, south of Jerusalem. Kara cites an explanation from Tosefta (Sotah, chap. 11), which shows that the verse can be read in a way that does away with the contradiction.

Another type of discrepancy arises in connection with the computation of years, quantities and the like. In Joshua 13:3 we are told that there are five Philistine lords, yet when they are enumerated six are mentioned: חמשי סגני פלישטים: העאשים, והعواדים, והשקולים, וה lilleים, והעקרונים והעלים. Kara notes that this difficulty is raised in the Talmud (Hullin 60b), together with its solution: that ע線上 should really be amalgamated with the beginning of the next verse (מצה - of the south; cf. Josh. 14:4; 17:5; 18:7). A contradiction of a type already encountered in our discussion of Chronicles arises in the episode of the concubine at Gibeah (Jud.
20:48). It states there that 25,100 Benjaminites were killed (v. 35), but since 26,700 had been mustered (v. 15) and 600 fled (v. 47), one thousand men are unaccounted for. After setting out the problem, Kara gingerly grapples with it:

We thus have a solution, but one expressed most warily. In the same way Kara smooths over the difficulty in connection with the numbers of David's fighting force (see on II Sam. 23:39). In II Kings 24:16 it says that 7,000 went into exile, while only two verses before the number given is 10,000. Kara states the difficulty and draws on Jer. 52:28 to resolve it:

Again, he tackles the contradiction in the size of the capitals of the pillars of the Temple, said in I Kings 7:16 to measure five cubits in height and in II Kings 25:17 three cubits, explaining in a logical manner,

His approach to resolving disparities connected with the duration of a king's reign is of interest. On occasion he settles these conflicts with great precision through computation, while there are other situations where he does not hesitate to admit that any solution seems uncertain or difficult, and that he is therefore puzzled by the text. In I Kings 22:52 we are told that
The whole of Kara's gloss deserves attention: The whole of Kara's gloss deserves attention: [If the initial few months of a reign fell at the end of a year, they were sometimes reckoned by the kings of Israel as a whole year of a reign, and sometimes not.] Thus not only does he explain the contradiction but he goes to the trouble of establishing a general rule which underlies the method of reckoning kings' reigns. Frequently he offers a solution from Seder Olam, as with the verse:

In three places he points out that the computation in a text is unclear.

a. In Isaiah 8:23 he deals with the dates of the various exiles and says,

b. Jeremiah 10:1 speaks of two periods of drought whose dates are not clear:

c. Ezekiel 1:1 notes the year, month and day on which Ezekiel began to prophesy, but

It is therefore unclear on what reference point...
his calculation is founded.

He is not afraid to admit unequivocally that he has no explanation, but not before he has outlined the difficulty. In I Kings 10:14 we are told that Solomon possessed משלך והובש ששה פ枥ות שישימו רשב. Commenting on II Chron. 8:11, Kara works it out: 120 from Hiram, 120 from the Queen of Sheba, 420 from a Tarshishian vessel from Ophir - this gives us a total of 660. Josh. 17:5 says that מנה השניה שלד מאור הגלוות והbiosי נשאר מעבר לידו. Kara takes the trouble to calculate the why and how of these ten shares, then cites a solution from the Talmud and comments on it, זוגון דנור דנור ותועובת דנור לשתיביע עליון. He concludes with the phrase he often uses when he lacks an answer, וארום אמת שיש מתשון לגור ממקשה כלמישר. This expression is repeated in his attempt to explain the question which Gideon puts to Zebah and Zalmunna, עימה האנשית אשר והותם בתובר (Jud. 8:18), and which Kara regards as a rhetorical question. He again admits to having no explanation for what is said of the length of Joash's reign: מכן זה מוהר בשון, צדמיו ולא מצאתי: מכנ"ו...לơ וממך תשיה לו לזרר עליון ותשע.

It should be noted that Kara does not deal with the contradiction inherent in the two accounts of David's entering Saul's service, only remarking that he has no explanation for the subject (I Sam. 17:55).
VI. Multiple Glosses

I apply the term 'multiple glosses' simply to those instances where Kara offers more than one explanation. He does this in one of the following ways: (1) In addition to his own gloss he offers one from another scholar; or both come from different commentators. (2) In addition to his own gloss he adduces one or more explanations without naming their source. Two different sets of terms are employed: (a) 'נ"י', י'נ~ ~ or 'mo(t.l; and (b) 'nN 'li and 'nN polY; or the phrases 'כתרים' or 'שלום'.

Explanations from other commentators can be classified as follows (the subject is further discussed below):

a. The extra gloss becomes an additional possibility for the reader, without Kara's taking a stand for or against. Among the commentators used in this way may be named Helbo,159, Rashi,160 Menahem ben Saruk (I Kings 20:27), and Rabbi Meir שליח ציון (I Kings 10:28).

b. The extra gloss is subjected to criticism. Helbo again appears, 'כ"ת פתרו... כ"ת שמתע'. מ"ת א"ה, אב"ה, אבר'י גל (II Sam. 24:6; cf. I Kings 8:27; 16:9), together with Rashi,161 to whom we devote a separate discussion in Chapter 3, and Dunash ben Labrat (II Sam. 13:20; I Kings 19:21). On one occasion Rashi's opinion wins over Helbo's (II Kings 16:14), and on another occasion Kara rejects both: הנה תרבות ר"ה שלמה ו"ת... ותרבות ה' מ"ת (I Kings 18:37).

c. At times Kara notes, as an additional explanation, some gloss which he has 'heard'. In general we can say that it
will be rejected, whether it appears as the first explanation (I Kings 19:19) or (as is usually the case) as the second. Commenting on the phrase חרבנוה (Josh. 11:8), he says, והרוני... הרונים... והרונים... של sortOrder מקופל סוכרים. The explanation which he has 'heard' is dismissed out of hand. In another place we are told (I Sam. 1:27), but it is not at all clear who actually prostrated himself, and Kara writes, "ועם ומעון והתחומים... ומעון ומעון ומעון והתחומים..." Rashi appears to be the source. Kara expresses his own opinion and cites another, albeit in order to reject it, as something which he has 'heard'; and so in other instances. On only two occasions does he introduce an explanation heard from others as the sole gloss. On (Jud. 3:26), he says, רימל ומעון יחיה - again he may be referring to Rashi - and on (I Kings 11:39) he remarks, וה rall המורה לפל, שהורה להב אשר שפירוויה עתיד, וה bulund את בר. Here he says simply instead of his customary ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון, ומעון ומעון. He records that he has learnt these interpretations from others but in only one case does he note the source.

There are several places where he says of himself, וראית, וראית, וראית, and in each instance the reference is to books, as in וראית, ובפיהם את המ Boone וראית (Jud. 6:26; cf. Isa. 16:1); וראית, ובפיהם את המ Boone וראית (I Kings 18:26); וראית, ובפיהם את המ Boone וראית (II Kings 20:13). Once we actually find וראית, ובפיהם את המ Boone וראית (II Kings 3:1); or וראית, ובפיהם את המ Boone וראית (I Kings 20:13).
6:34), which refers to an emended translation. In one place (Jer. 8:23) he applies רָאָיִיתָי, מִצְּרָאִיתָי (נֶפֶר פָּרֹרְדוּתָה), and to the interpretations of the Karaites (Isa. 23:13).

More widespread is the form מִצְּרָאִיתָי, and here again books are in question. It appears five times in connection with the Old Testament itself: I Kings 6:34; II Kings 22:52; II Kings 9:29; Judges 5:4; and II Kings 12:7. It is also used at different times to refer to Midrash Seder Olam (I Kings 11:41; II Kings 12:7), the Pesikta (I Kings 5:10), the Midrash, and other works. Thus we have here first-hand testimony as to points that Kara has heard (with his opinion on them), or that he has seen or found in books in the course of his labours. In essence the expressions מִצְּרָאִיתָי and מִצְּרָאִיתָי are identical. Only once does he use both of them together with מִצְּרָאִיתָי in a single explanation.

There are many occasions on which he offers a multiple gloss without indicating its source, contenting himself with general expressions like סְמֻאֵרִים or רֹשֵׁי אֲמֶרִים. In most instances he uses the phrases מֵר or מֵר מֶר. One can assert, generally, that those explanations which are preceded by מֵר or מֵר מֶר are qualified or dismissed outright by Kara's own gloss.

In Zechariah 9:9 he cites an interpretation under the rubric of קְצֵי פָּרֹרְדוּתָה, and then says, קְצֵי אֲמֶרִים, and proceeds to explain it in another way. In Jeremiah 51:1 he
offers an explanation which is according to נָא שֶל מַכָּרָן, and which he regards as the preferable view, and then adds a midrash under the rubric פָּתַרְיָן יִשְׁרֵית. Sharper expressions of rejection are to be found in places where the verb is employed. He supplies two explanations of Zebah and Zalmunna's exchange with Gideon, (Jud. 8:18). The first is glossed with לה אחרון נן; he then records his own interpretation. The prophet Isaiah speaks of עַע נָוהָן (18:2), נָא שֶל מַכָּרָן... אַוְּרָה שֶׁשֶׁעַשׁ לֶה נָוהָן... טוּעִים וּפָתַרְיֶם. (He uses this phrase once again, in Jer. 50:11.) In one instance he says of an interpretation whose source is given that וְלָא יְפֹנָה לְבָנָה לְשָׁמוּא דְבַר הַפָּתַרְיֵה: that is, he rejects it absolutely (Ezek. 21:20). Again, we may find וְלָא יְפֹנָה לְבָנָה לְשָׁמוּא דְבַר הַפָּתַרְיֵה (Isa. 8:4).

When he uses the expressions עַע נָוהָן so דָּבַר מַכָּר his intention is usually to offer the reader an additional explanation and leave him to decide for himself which he prefers. On five occasions he proclaims his own preference for the explanation cited under the rubric of דָּבַר מַכָּר. In Isaiah 63:19 and Ezekiel 10:20 he sets out one explanation, follows it with another described as דָּבַר מַכָּר, and finally notes that he has heard this latter view from R. Yitzhak bar Asher Halevi (the Riba), and that he considers it the correct one. In Ezekiel 13:19 he provides two interpretations for the phrase לַחֲמִית נְכֶשֶׁת, and gives the preference to the one glossed as דָּבַר מַכָּר. The two last instances are from the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5:10, 13), where he says of the דָּבַר מַכָּר.
explanation that ידוע עיקר. Once he shows a preference for a comment described as על פי עיקר (Ezek. 1:14). Except for these cases, out of a total of about 80 usages each additional explanation represents an alternative. There is an exceptional instance in II Samuel 17:16, where he begins his explanation of דברי הימים with דבר אחד. This suggests that an initial gloss is missing.

VII. Miscellaneous Principles

1. Kara does not give an interpretation more than once. On occasion he says so explicitly, while at other times he simply implies it. In connection with the portion of the tribe of Dan in Judges 18:1 he says, "כשם שפירשותך כזרך זכרון". On the same occasion, when he deals with the name of their city (v. 29), he remarks, "פשוק זה מופרש כזרך כשם ידוע אלא כיוּרָד אָרָי שֵׁם כָּז". Elsewhere he says, "זקינו"; שְׁפִירְשָׁנוּ עלֵילוּ 40; שְׁבִיבר פִירְשָׁנָי בֵּפֵר שְׁפִירְשָׁנָי 40. מבカメラ פִירְשָׁנָי ואין עלינו כלא

There are a few exceptions to this rule, as in "זקינו"; שְׁפִירְשָׁנוּ עלֵילוּ 40 or when the same is used twice, 171, but in general his policy is not to repeat points which have been made earlier on in the commentary. 170 Students of Kara must note this, since it means that no repetition of glosses may be looked for; Kara expects the reader to fill out interpretations on the basis of the partial account which he offers. Explaining a מַקְאֶר, he turns to the reader and says, "כحما מקומה בית 20 מבכם" (Josh. 10:21), and elsewhere he says, "כحما מקומה בית 20 שְׁפִירְשָׁנָי (Josh. 15:19). He demands that the
reader recognize the method underlying the commentary and remember what has already been explained, so that he may clarify for himself what remains unclear.

2. He may offer an explanation by making a general point, then pinning it down to details and returning to the generalisation, as in a well-structured short lecture. We are told in I Kings 1:22 נָעַר נְמָל מִזְכָּרָה עַל הַפֶּלֶק וְנָתַן חֲגִיבָא כָּא 1:22. Kara first explains this by talking in general terms, והעמה מֵאַתָה לְמַד כָּשָׁנְכָס נְתָן לָדֶבֶר אֶל הַפֶּלֶק יִצְחַק לְהַת שְׁבַע. and then proceeds to detail the reasons: מַפְרִיךְ כָּמָה דֵּרָפָם, אַתָּה שָׁאָר דִּרְךָ נְבָעַד. The structure, then, consists of an opening general point, three considerations to justify it, and a generalising summary. In the same way he explains the verse כְּלֵי לֵא אַשְׁר יָרָאת הַחֲזָה (I Sam. 16:7). The opening generalisation, רָאוּיָה בְּשָׁר דָּוִד אֱלִיָּהוּ שָׁאָר, אִין רוֹאָה אֶלֶךְ נְפָרַי לֵא רוֹאָה שָׁאָר. is followed by the specific point that man's eyes can only see external phenomena, whereas God sees into the heart; and in conclusion he returns to the generalisation.

3. On four occasions in his commentary on the Early Prophets he finds it necessary to use an explanatory drawing or sketch.
a. We read in Judges 21:19, "כשל מيمنינו". The right side of the sketch which follows is not at all clear.²⁸¹

b. I Samuel 14:5 reads, "כש התאחת מתمرافق מול מכסה התאחת, המונד מול ביצת מנה גמל, ה주ד ה عليهم המכת הביצת, והיו ליהל את האזור בוJonathan and his young man carry out their courageous act. Kara writesцовיעו הכה וتبادل היצא ממזר זא ישראל ממזר זא ומברך高峰论坛,..., in order to explain the positions of the armies facing each other against the rock columns.

c. I Kings 6:13 reads, "כשהרまで עשה דלתות עליון שמי וayment אדד, and Kara explains that are the door posts and that (pentagonal) refers to them: המפרשים את מכבר מימייה ויר בין המשקוף العلياון אשר, המשקוף العلياון אשר, בשמם זה.

He goes on to cite Rashi. We should note that this latter interpretation appears in Rashi under the rubric כל sme and that the sketch in Apenstein's edition is incorrect. According to the explanation, and sketch in Rashi, it should appear like this:

What it means is that המשקוף العليון אשר, בשתיים זה.
d. In Isaiah 9:13, Kara explains why the prophet compares the governing power to a כיפה (dome, palm tree) and its subjects to a reed: וְרָאָה כִּי כִּפָּה וְלֹא שָׁנִי רוֹם כִּפָּה: זָה a sketch follows. A ruler is like a dome in that he is over the people: אֶת מַשָּׂאוֹן מֵאָלֶּנּוּ כְּעַל כּוֹנִי שֶׁזַּה and then comes a sketch:

4. He tends to draw attention to the conclusion of his commentary on a particular book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Closing comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>חָסָל סֵפֶר שְׂפַטִּים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>סְלִיק ב', ה' ל' כ' (בְּרוֹדֵד הַנּוֹמָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>נַשָּׂא פִּירֹשׁ בִּירָמִית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>נַשָּׂא פִּירֹשׁ סֵפֶר יְתֹקֵאל חָצֵלָה וְחָזֵלָה לִבְּרָאֵל. הָנְגָּה לִבְּרָאֵל אֲלֵי אֲלֵי הָאֶדֶם הָמוֹשֵׁעַ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>נַשָּׂא פִּירֹשׁ סֵפֶר הַשׁוֹשֵׁשׁ בָּרְכוֹנַתָּם יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>נַשָּׂא פִּירֹשׁ סֵפֶר עַמּוֹנָה אַתָּל פִּירֹשׁ סֵפֶר עַבְדִית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>נַשָּׂא פִּירֹשׁ עַבְדִית אַתָּל פִּירֹשׁ סֵפֶר יֹרֶה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>נַשָּׂא פִּירֹשׁ סֵפֶר יֹרֶה שָׁכָה לֶדֶר מַעְוֹנָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He does not bother to write a closing phrase for every book, nor is his style uniform. Clearly exceptional is the conclusion to Ezekiel. This commentary is attributed to a student of his, a fact which perhaps accounts for its unusual colophon.

VIII. Realia

It would seem that Kara spent most of his life in Troyes, a city in the district of Champagne, whose twice-yearly fairs were known far and wide. These fairs, together with the mode of life natural to an agricultural region, gave Kara ample opportunity to meet people of all types: merchants, artisans, farmers, pedlars, doctors, sailors and soldiers. He knew a great deal about the management of fairs and about techniques for the production of oil and wine, the smelting of iron and gold, the coining of money and construction. It is clear from his commentary that he was alive to whatever occurred in his natural surroundings and interested himself in every aspect of life - nature, the tools used in house and field, social customs and arrangements. This knowledge was of enormous assistance in his study of daily life in the time of...
the Bible, and it must have made it easier for his students to familiarise themselves with various features of the Biblical period. Clearly he was anxious to give them a sense of the realities with which they were dealing in reading the Bible. The following sections contain material related to daily life during the period of the Scriptures, organized according to the various topics which are to be found, either explicitly or implicitly, in Kara's writings.

1. Domestic Economy and Farm Management

Among the things which could be made from the flour produced by threshing was ניקודים (biscuit bread), שיקום עוררملעתה ובשיקום פולי מזאיא וה으שתה בקעימ שיווה שוייתו התנוגר שולט לכלולו ומגיית התנוגר עד שיגון התנוגר המצרייא ואינו מתעפש לOMEM ארוז بشקורי בקולו' (Josh. 9:5; cf. Jud. 7:13; I Kings 14:3). Without doubt this gloss upon the food used by the Gibeonites to prove to Joshua that רוחקה ונגול (Josh. 9:6) depends upon the kitchen fare of Kara's own time. Another baked item is the עוגת ראפין of I Kings 19:6, which is עוגת הפוריה/vndחלוים ... עוגת הפוריה/vndחלוים Kara takes the trouble to explain kitchen utensils like כנור (cauldron), קולוח (pan), כלפת (kettle) and פורר (pot; I Sam. 2:14; Ezek. 24:5), either by describing their form, their purpose or uses or by providing a vernacular term. He knows how to make חרייזר ו השאילו ... של מד שחר מחלוחים שלושים שניים הופים מיים לחריצים ממחמק מקלח Neither was the production of oil foreign to him, and he explains שפומ נקחי שיאב יתנניה נשתננים בחרית אלא שמיל חחיית (I Kings 5:25), כותשה במכחתות יאו מחלשה שפומ כל כה כומышון.
and שֵׁם הַמַּשָּׁה (see II Kings 20:13) as the שֵׁם הַמַּשָּׁה which according to Ezekiel 27:17 was to be found in Israel; Sefer Josippon is adduced in support. He also recognises the use of oil for illumination (Jud. 9:9).

He explains at length points connected with clothes and jewellery. Most of his explanations deal with items of female clothing such as ornaments for the head (Isa. 3:19-20), linen garments like מִשְׁקָלוֹת שֵׁלָבוֹת (Isa. 3:22-23), outer garments, clothes made of expensive fabrics, and so on (Ezek. 27:24), and even bed linen: white linen, feather beds and sheets (II Sam. 17:25; Isa. 3:23). The single item of male apparel which he glosses is the אָפָרָב חֲמָד (II Sam. 6:14), which resembles a dressing gown; he describes how the material is woven and dyed. On the subject of jewellery, he reveals great expertise. He knows the different ways in which gold may be worked into an ornament, either by being beaten flat or by being drawn into a filament, following the process by which it is refined in an earthen vessel and examined for quality. He notes of gold in the Bible that it resembles a contemporary coin: מִשְׁקָלוֹת חֲזָב, רוֹםֵת שֵׁלָנוּ (Jud. 8:26; cf. I Kings 10:16-17). He speaks of ornaments made of precious and coloured stones which are tied by a string around the neck, of bracelets for the hand, of earrings and nose rings, and other jewellery (Isa. 3:18-23; cf. II Sam. 1:24). An item of no less importance in a woman's adornment is perfume, as to which Kara is able to state that it originated from Gilead, from precious stones or from various plants. How is a book produced? He traces the various steps: the sewing together and inscription of
parchment sheets, and the scribal task (Jer. 36:23). He is also acquainted with the work of blacksmiths and of potters. He makes the interesting remark on the pasture to which shepherds bring their flocks that although nutritious feeding can be found in the mountains, good pasturage also exists near inhabited areas because the refuse which people throw away results in the growth of rich vegetation (Ezek. 34:13; 33:13).

Farm management too was known to Kara. He is familiar with the practice of making a feast for the sheep-shearing festival (I Sam. 25:4); he is aware that cattle are worked with a bridle, and horses with a whip. He knows about the custom of hanging a bell between the eyes of a horse as a decoration (I Sam. 3:7; Jer. 19:3; note Zech. 14:20), and can distinguish between horses bred for work and

שׁוָאֵל טוֹבִים וְכָלֹֹּרָוִים לְפֶרֶצֹּת. On another occasion he compares his own מַרְחֹצֹת וּשְׁוָאֵל רוּבְבוּם, in the Song of Deborah: מִלְּיָשָׂר יָשִּׂיָּר רְבוּבִים עַל תַּחַת וּמַקְּסִיָּיו, אַתֹסָּי מִיָּרוּ אֲלִיעָמִים.

Birds: he knows that some nest in trees and others on the ground (Ezek. 31:13). He is familiar with the annual migratory patterns of the stork (I Kings 5:13) and the methods by which fowls are fattened in coops (Jer. 5:27; note Isa. 34:15), and he speaks of the foolishness of the dove, which consists, he says, in the fact that it will build its nest by the river edge, where it is likely to be washed away, and that it will return to its nest even when its fledglings have been taken (Jer. 48:28; Hos. 7:11); and he knows that
the vulture eats carrion (Jer. 12:9).

Animals: he remarks that the wolf usually seizes its prey at night; only when it is especially hungry will it attack by daylight (Jer. 5:6; Hab. 1:8). He understands the disposition of the fox (Ezek. 13:4) and the danger to clothes posed by the moth (Isa. 50:9). On four occasions he makes points about snakes. He knows that a snake sheds its skin once a year, and he considers that different terms found for snakes in the Bible, רָעָבָן, עָפָן, צַלְאַת, פָּתִית, שְׁרוֹף, represent different stages in the snake's maturation (I Kings 5:13; Isa. 14:29; 30:6). He is aware of the existence of poisonous spiders and scorpions, and knows about the ways of river fish (I Kings 5:13; Ezek. 29:3). It need hardly be said that he is acquainted with domestic animals like cows (Jud. 6:25; II Sam. 8:1; Jer. 31:17) and sheep (I Sam. 25:4; Jer. 33:13).

2. Agriculture
On this topic too Kara demonstrates great expertise; he knows about both methods and tools.

Wheat: he explains that it is essential to plough a field before it is sown, since otherwise thorns will sprout and the seeds will be lost. Ploughing also uproots the thorns and thistles which have grown in the field since the previous harvest (Jer. 4:3). Moreover, the organisation of the sowing is important: wheat in the centre, barley around it and spelt at the edge (Isa. 28:25). Immediately after sowing, when the first stems have sprouted, it is customary to cut them so that stronger stems will grow in their stead and the clusters
of grain be firmer in consequence (Amos 7:1). Following the sprouting it is important that the climate be warm and the sun shine, since rain not only hinders the ripening process but also makes the wheat liable to rot when it is stored after the harvest. He knows how a field looks when it has been reaped, with stalks which have not matured (Isa. 37:27) and thorns sprouting. He considers that a certain species of wheat called מיכית המייעית is the best in the world; it grows in only one region in Israel. Its grains are so large, the size of ox kidneys, that they can be counted individually (Ezek. 27:17). Last of all is the threshing of the wheat to produce flour. He explains that the נשף is the tool employed: it is a kind of wide wooden plank into which sharp stones have been sunk. A man sits on top and cows draw it around in a circle, crushing the wheat until the stubble becomes straw (Isa. 28:27). Threshing can also be carried out by beating the wheat with a stick or using a mortar (I Kings 5:25).

The vine: Kara is again able to display a broad knowledge since the Champagne district was famous for its grapes. He knows how a wine-press is hewn out as a round pit in front of the vat into which the liquid flows. He emphasizes the importance of supporting the branches of the vine with pegs and poles (Ezek. 19:11), and distinguishes between the various kinds of grapes and raisins, which can be consumed throughout the year (I Sam. 25:18; Ezek. 27:18). It is interesting to note that he asserts that in Israel grapes ripen before Passover, although this has no basis in fact.
The fig: He distinguishes between moist, fresh figs and the dry ones which are threaded on strings and are called דבלת (I Sam. 30:12; II Kings 20:7). He adds that figs do not ripen all at the same time but בהanja אהל ה. The first to ripen, in the months of Tammuz and Av, are called חנניא, בכרות, while the term קרי is applied to those that ripen in Ellul, which the Sages call קריין חנניא (Isa. 16:9; Amos 8:1).

It is worth noting that Kara knows about scarecrows, which he describes as ממציא יורה אחר الشريف הערמות העמה של עצים אוכל ו сахарית.

He differentiates between tree species which bear fruit and those which do not, and between those which bear early in the season and those which bear late. He knows that remedies may be prepared from trees and plants, and he is acquainted with agricultural instruments: the plough, the pitchfork, the axe and so on (I Sam. 13:21; II Sam. 24:22).

The months of the year are named, he says, in accordance with what takes place in them. תרAnnotation תרAnnotation, for example, חוון גז, is נוב ונהב, because it is מתואガイド, because it is מייחל השтелей...

Of מהרהר נאש של (I Kings 8:2), he says, עלי של השתה_shot, because he says...

האליג📺 ממקישב וنعישיע עז.
3. Construction and Ships

He describes those engaged in construction as 'אדריכלים והarchitects, the wall being built מדרון השרשרת ת' by the architects' apprentices (II Kings 12:12). The month of יyar is the best time for building, מיר י'ארא ספירת ת'ayyil the wall being built מאיר ספירת א"יי עלית אל, and the month is the best time for the month being built עלית אל א"יי. מיר י' א" יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי...

He explains how construction is actually carried on, מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל... מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל... מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל...

providing extensive descriptions in his glosses on the account of the building of the Temple and Solomon's palace (I Kings 6-7): how the blocks were hewn into their exact shapes מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל... מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל... מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל... מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל...

at the quarry itself, either by means of the Shamir מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל עלית אל א"יי... והפי התשע אל הבדל... מיר י' א"יי הספירה אל على...
propulsion; the mast, which must be of sturdy wood, high and straight; the covering which secures the ship and its cargo from rain; and the sails hanging from the masts (27:6). He knows about the crewmen of the ship, such as the caulkers, whose job is to repair of breaches and fissures in the sides to keep the water out (27:9), the divers who measure the depth of the sea with a line to determine whether the ship can or cannot anchor in a port (27:11), and (of course) the captain, who must be an expert on winds and sea currents (sea captains generally came from Tyre: 27:8, 9). Every large ship was fitted out with weapons for defence against pirates (27:10; this point is more applicable to the Middle Ages than to ancient times), and with light boats whose purpose was to transport men and materials from the shore to the larger boat whenever the port was too shallow (27:3, 9). The importance of the sea and its ships to Kara lay in the fact that any mishap or delay in a voyage resulted in an increase in the prices of the merchandise intended for the market of the port city (27:33). There were even lighter boats made of bulrushes (Isa. 18:2), and Hiram of Tyre sent rafts to Solomon (I Kings 5:23), although Kara's explanation that these were logs for building which were tied together and by this means sent by water from Tyre to Israel is perhaps more relevant to his own age than to Solomon's.

4. Anatomy and Medicine

Kara expatiates on the subject of birth a number of times. When the moment of delivery approaches, one places the expectant mother on a special chair (Isa. 37:3), a procedure
especially important for a first-born child, as this is the most difficult birth (Jer. 4:31). He speaks of premature births (I Sam. 1:20), and labours that endanger the mother's life, as when the foetus lies horizontally rather than vertically in the womb at the time of delivery (I Sam. 4:19; cf. II Kings 19:1). After the child is born he is washed to smooth out his skin, and Kara adds that there are countries (France is not one of these) where salt is scattered over the baby to harden the skin; immediately afterwards a nappy is put on and the infant is swaddled (Ezek. 16:4). In connection with the Judgment of Solomon, he points out that there is a very considerable difference in the appearance of the skin of a baby born that very day and one born three days earlier (I Kings 3:18). His last remark in this area is the observation that a nursing woman cannot become pregnant (Hos. 1:9).

Kara also displays some knowledge of anatomy, speaking, for example, of the location of the tooth which lies in the cavity of the jaw (Jud. 15:19), of the intestinal tubes, the digestive tract which lies like a circular well in the human stomach, the effect of age upon bones (I Sam. 14:19), and other points. With regard to the treatment of injuries he draws comparisons from his own time: a wound within which liquid pus or blood has collected must be drained by being softened with oil. This makes it possible to treat the injury or return the bone to its proper position. Broken limbs must be bound and set, using strips of material, until they have healed (Isa. 1:6; Ezek. 30:20; 34:4). Speaking of the effect of salt water on the hair, he makes the curious remark that sea-water causes baldness. Nor does he recoil from
discussing death. He notes that the dead are buried in the clothes in which they were killed (Isa. 14:19) - possibly a custom of his own surroundings; at any rate, Jews are not in question here - and that incense was placed on dead kings to prevent malodorous smells (Jer. 34:5). He also remarks on the stages of decay after death (Ezek. 37:5).

5. Armies and War
Kara displays great understanding of points connected with armies, battle strategy, weapons and fortifications. This may be due to an insight gained from what he saw around him in his own period. In discussing the murder of Eglon (Jud. 3:15) he explains the use of a sword, לֵפַי שֶׁלַחְתָּ הָיוּ הַדָּם מְרִינוּ יָמִים, מִךְּלָה כְּלַעֲמָלָה לֵא הָיוּ עֲנִלָּר מָרִינוּ לֵפַי שְׁדִּידִי נֵכַח אֲדָם לְחַזְקָר חַרְבּ כְּלַעֲמָלָה לֵא שַׁלַּמְּלָה בְּיִמּוֹנָה. Swords and spears are wrapped up tightly to prevent rusting (Ezek. 21:20; Nahum 2:4). Goliath's helmet was made of copper to protect his head, but helmets can also be made of iron (I Sam. 17:5; Ezek. 23:15). The נֵכַח or נֵכַח, a long pole with a piece of material at the top, has two functions: to summon people to an army as it is being formed, and to call for help from nearby cities for a city under siege (Isa. 5:26; 13:2; 30:28; Jer. 4:6).

In connection with David's lament Kara explains the care of a shield, שְׁכַנ דָּרֶךְ בֵּעֵלָי, המִלְחָמָה שְׁמוּשִּׂים את הָמוֹנָה בְּשָׁמְרֶנִי, and its use: נַשָּׁדְמֶנָה יִזְאָם, שְׁליֵילֶם חַזֶּק מֶמְנָה שלָּם יֹכֶל הָמוֹנָה (II Kings 19:32). He distinguishes between a נַשָּׁדְמֶנָה as ציינה מֶנָּה and a מַנָּה as follows: פִּי שְׁלֵיֶם: הַמָּנוֹן שְׁאֵזְיָהוּ מִכָּה המִלְחָמָה את הָמוֹן מְשֶלַּשׁ רַחְוָתָיו... מְנָנָה אֲנִי מַנָּה...
A coat of mail with its metal rings is also described: (Jud. 8:26; cf. II Sam. 8:7). A coat of mail with its metal rings is also described: (Jud. 8:26; cf. II Sam. 8:7). And when Ahab is struck (I Kings 22:34), Kara explains, why it had to be fresh and therefore moist: (I Kings 10:29), and that several chariots together were known as: (I Kings 16:9).

As to unconventional weaponry like the (Jud. 15:15), Kara explains why it had to be fresh and therefore moist: as to unconventional weaponry like the (Jud. 15:15), Kara explains why it had to be fresh and therefore moist: (Jud. 15:15), Kara explains why it had to be fresh and therefore moist:

A slinger is a band of slingers. He recognizes the existence of units of special troops and runners in the army of Israel (II Sam. 3:8; II Kings 11:4; 15:25), and distinguishes between slingers, the marauders and, which is the infantry and cavalry (I Sam. 13:17; Ezek. 24:6). His explanation for is particularly interesting: (I Sam. 17:4). He is not merely the champion who represents his people but also a negotiator between two enemy camps.

Spring was the season for conducting wars,
A scout had specific functions: in an inhabited place, he had to give the alarm by blowing the ram's horn from the top of the tower when he observed the sword of the enemy, and on the battlefield, a scout had specific functions: in an inhabited place, he had to give the alarm by blowing the ram's horn from the top of the tower when he observed the sword of the enemy, and on the battlefield, he had to double the watch and sound the trumpet. As to night encampments, the order of the night watch was as follows: 

Shekel dorim, gevurot mishavonim baleila mitmutim lehem holizim sevibot umotzot shem yovel, uli lehem, gedor shin av dor olam hatlutzim, natev velemon gedolim. 

How were the troops drawn up in battle? The actual attack on a city was conducted from such a siege-mound, for two main reasons: The entrance was narrow and well-protected, and defended by the regular army within the city; and the method of digging beneath the gate or the wall was not always successful.
because it meant exposing oneself for too long a period (Ezek. 21:27). A wall could be breached from a siege-mound, and Kara adds that during the siege of Jerusalem the inhabitants demolished their own homes in order to strengthen fissures in the wall with stones. The wall or gate was subjected to the steady blows of an iron-headed battering ram (Ezek. 21:27; cf. 4:2) or a sort of catapult which Kara describes in detail (Ezek. 26:9). Furthermore, יכין זור rather than 홈ות חיל והותמה שרה ובר שרה ושבר אנשי, התיו הותמה התיוوزارة נשארת התורה פנימית (II Sam. 20:15). Similarly he says of Jerusalem, in connection with הנכין זור that, סבדו מכם המלך וידוהי, הנכין זור והותמה והותמה לפלגין מכם, והותמה קרוי, מילוא וברכיס בנה תזר המנדלב והמתורדה (II Sam. 5:9). As to the מילוא itself, הנכין זור, הנכין זור מילוא על שמה-spanah הותמה ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא ומולא (I Kings 9:15). So it would seem were the cities of Europe fortified in the Middle Ages.

6. The King's Court
As with the earlier topics, here again Kara's approach is of interest and the influence of his surroundings can be detected in indirect ways. First of all, kings customarily make a feast for their retinue upon their coronation.²⁰⁸ In Kara's opinion only the heir to the throne may ride the royal mule (I Kings 1:33), and to have a chariot, horsemen and runners in front of the king belongs to only the קבָּד הבָּר of לֵדוֹר וְלֵדוֹר קִבָּד הַלֵּדוֹר.²⁰⁹ He notes that מי ששמו וידוהיהrown השומע וה確 וה确 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה确 וה确 וה确 וה确 וה确 וה确 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確 וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確か וה確かに death cannot escape his punishment (I Sam.
19:1), but a person who has come to visit the king or who is
on a royal mission may not be killed (I Kings 2:5). He also
explains the functions of the king's servants: the same is true of
usherim מְמֻקָּדֶשׁ לְמַעֲרוֹן וְפֹרְעָה לְמִסְמָר הַשָּׁרוּרָה (I Kings 10:15). The
in-qenenim are responsible for the financial affairs of the
kingdom (II Kings 12:12). They concern themselves with the
maintenance of the king and his household (I Kings 4:5); they
must not be confused with the nairim, who are the king's
representatives in distant regions to forestall any possible
rebellion (I Sam. 10:5; II Sam. 18:6). If a scribe is needed
שָׁוֵה לְמִלְתָּנִי נָבִיא לְפָנָיו דֶבֶרֶם הַרְבָּה שֶׁרְכִיִּים וְכֹרְאָם שֶׁלָּם
שביאים לְפָנָיו דֶבֶרֶם הַרְבָּה אִי אִפְּרֵשׁ לוֹ שֶׁלָּם חַשֶּׁת דָּבָר זֶה מַפְכִּי דָבָר
(II Kings 4:3). Elsewhere he notes that the scribe commits the king's
judgments to writing. The נְשֶׁר וְר is determined by the שֵׁלָם
who must determine how many men can be conscripted from each
city. Kara also explains a number of duties in
connection with the Temple carried out by different
people, such as rabbis, scribes, and others (II Kings 12:10; 23:4), the
פְּקָדִים וְהָעֲצֹת הָעַרְוַה כִּיָּד (II Kings 11:18), and others (II Kings 11:5).
7. Geography

Kara is not very knowledgeable with regard to geography, especially when he deals with the identity of localities in the land of Israel and the surrounding countries; and even as to those places which he can identify he possesses very few facts. Usually he explains the meaning of a place name and draws conclusions from it as to topography, climate and other points. This want of information is characteristic of the contemporary exegesis, both locally and in other places: knowledge of the land of Israel extended only to its famous sites. We shall now look at some instances of his treatment of place names, geographical concepts and scenic descriptions.

He explains דְּנַחְלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּמַּכָּבָם שְׁמוֹי מַופִּיעֵי, as אַשְׁדוֹת מִלְחֵר (Josh. 10:40). Usually מִלְחֵר means מִלְחֵר, and he adds a French gloss in clarification (Josh. 11:2; I Kings 4:11; cf. I Sam. 19:19). אלֹו מִצְאוֹן refers to a plain with many pits מַעֲשַׂר שֵׁהוֹר, but מַעֲשַׂר שֵׁהוֹר is מַעֲשַׂר שֵׁהוֹר (Jud. 9:6). People, he suggests (I Sam. 4:13), sat at crossroads and gazed at pedestrians [to conduct business with them?]. Along roads were placed milestones like מְשֻׁרְשַׁע, and perhaps also מְשֻׁרְשַׁע (I Kings 1:9), but here it seems more likely that Kara was extrapolating from his own period to the distant past. He refers to the city as מַטְרִיסְפִּילֵי (II Sam. 20:19), and there are in addition Uri שָׁעָר, and open towns, Uri שָׁעָר (Jud. 5:7, 11; Isa. 42:11); the latter are also called Uri שָׁעָר (Jud. 10:4). He provides an interesting explanation in connection with the city of יְדַמְגֵּר (I Kings...
The as we have already seen, is a place

Other localities in Israel with which he seems to be
familiar are the hot springs of Tiberias (Josh. 11:8; Zeph. 
1:10), the Sea of Galilee, the Judaeans Hills and Mount
Ephraim (Josh. 11:21; 12:7; Jer. 13:19; Ezek. 4:6), the
Philistine coast (Josh. 13:2) and Jericho (Jud. 1:16). All
other places, as we have noted, are explained in line with
their names. Thus means (I Kings 9:13), and

He offers a similar treatment
of (I Sam. 1:1), and many
others.

In glossing (Jud. 5:21) he makes an interesting
point:

Nevertheless in his commentary on the sections in Joshua
which deal with the dividing up of the land his scanty grasp
of the geography is quite evident. He finds distinctions
between the various expressions which Scripture uses in
describing the boundaries of the tribes, whereas in fact these are
nothing but ways of defining direction and area, and do not
denote specific localities.

On many occasions he also grapples with the geography of the Middle East as a whole, and here too he exhibits only a slight knowledge of places and landscapes. From the Bible itself and other sources he realized the importance of הָיָּה, the Nile (Jer. 46:7), as Egypt's one and only source of water for the whole country, which is generally deficient in rain water. So great is the Nile's significance that Egypt itself is named after the river which at times floods it. Kara also identifies the Scriptural מִדְיָא with Alexandria (Jer. 46:25; Ezek. 30:14), but makes a serious geographical error when he explains that the city of Gaza is to be found in the southwestern corner of Egypt (he bases himself on Joshua 13:3). He commits similar errors in connection with other places, starting with Jerusalem, which he declares to be in the south (Isa. 21:1), while Damascus נְסָרוֹת לָאָרָא (Amos 1:3); it is more accurately to the north-east. He places Tyre and Sidon in the west of Israel (Amos 1:3; Joel 4:4), and Philistia as well, although in truth the former lie to the north and the latter to the south-west, along the sea coast.

He places Ammon, Moab and Edom (also called Yemen) to the south; south-east would be more correct. Elsewhere (Jer. 22:6) he identifies the district of Gilead, from which medicines came, as belonging to Lebanon, when it is actually part of the historical land of Israel, won from Sihon in Transjordan. It must be admitted that there are some places which he identifies correctly, if in general terms, like Tarshish (Jonah 1:3), the land of Cush (Ezek. 30:4, 9),
the isles of Elisha (Ezek. 27:5), Babylon, Medea and Persia (Isa. 41:25; Jer. 50:9; Ezek. 17:4). On one occasion he explains, through a comparison with events of his own time, that people who settle inside another country, not far from the border of their own land, are considered as belonging to their country of origin (Ezek. 23:23).

He displays a general familiarity with the natural cycle whereby vapour rises from the sea, turns into clouds moved by the wind, and finally descends as rain (Jer. 4:11; 10:13); and with the stars and constellations in their array (Amos 5:8, 26; Job 9:9; 38:31).
Chapter 3

Kara's Use of Other Sources in his Commentary upon

Prophets

It may reasonably be asserted that no commentator - and certainly no classical commentator - operates in an exegetical vacuum. We cannot imagine a commentary which does not draw, consciously or unconsciously, upon exegetical tradition, transmitted orally or in written texts. Beyond doubt this is true of the greatest of the commentators like Saadiah Gaon, Rashi and Rashbam: their work displays the influence of Talmudic and Midrashic literature, and of their exegetical predecessors. Kara too draws upon earlier work. Some of his explanations are cited in the name of their originator, while others are integrated without acknowledgment into his continuous commentary.

In this chapter I wish to look at his use of the following sources: the Aramaic Targumim; Rashi; Menahem bar Helbo; Menahem ben Saruk and Dunash ben Labrat; and other commentators whom he mentions. I shall conclude with some notes on his approach to נָוִי תַּפּוֹרָה and נוֹסֵי, מָזָּרָה או. In each case certain questions must be asked. When does he work other people's interpretations into his own commentary without ascription, and when does he acknowledge his source? When commentators are divided on a particular point, when does he mention the dispute, simply give the opinion of one side, or provide his own explanation (or criticism) in favour of another opinion? Does he display a unified method of approach towards these sources? An investigation of these questions
may make it possible to sketch out Kara's working approach towards his predecessors.

I. The Aramaic Targumim

Kara occasionally cites the solutions offered by Onkelos and Targum Jonathan to various problems. He refers to Onkelos on the Torah in 24 places, once by name and on the other occasions through phrases like מְסָרִים, etc.; and invariably he accepts Onkelos's point without dispute. His approach to Targum Jonathan, in his numerous references, is quite different. He makes use of a wide and varied range of phrases when citing Targum Jonathan, generally employing the word תָּרָגּוֹמִים or some variation upon it, or יִשְׁמַעְתָּה תָּרָגּוֹמָה. Frequently he quotes from Targum Jonathan without saying so. Sometimes he draws upon it for a single word, for a phrase or expression, or occasionally for entire verses. His purpose is to explain place names, understand hapaxes and unusual words or parables or poems, or to get rid of difficulties.

What are the different ways in which Targum Jonathan is cited, and how do they differ from one another?

1. Kara first sets down his own gloss and then, in confirmation, Targum Jonathan.

2. On occasions when he has derived his solution from Targum Jonathan, or his exegetical determination arises from Targum Jonathan, he quotes the Targum and then supports it with something from the text, adds to it an explanatory note, or leaves it to stand by itself.
3. He cites Targum Jonathan together with another commentary - that is, Targum Jonathan represents one side in an exegetical dispute. Here two strands can be distinguished: when Kara gives his own interpretation first and follows it with Targum Jonathan, which implies that without dismissing Targum Jonathan entirely he thinks his own version superior; and when he places Targum Jonathan before his own view, which means that he wholly rejects the former.

We shall now describe in more detail the different ways in which Kara makes use of Targum Jonathan.

1. When Kara's Interpretation Appears First, and Targum Jonathan Is Then Cited in Support

When, in his independent endeavour to understand the text, Kara arrives at a particular exegetical determination and the 'right' interpretation, and subsequently finds the same point in Targum Jonathan, his practice is to set down his own gloss first and then to cite Targum Jonathan in confirmation to clinch the וֹד. In these cases, we must note that Kara's interpretation is broader and more comprehensive than that found in Targum Jonathan,\(^\text{17}\) and that the passage cited from Targum Jonathan does not always deal with the verse under discussion. Instead, he uses Targum Jonathan to supply parallels from other verses in support of his view, which does not necessarily overlap with Targum Jonathan on the verse immediately in question.\(^\text{18}\)

For example:
a. **Interpretations wider than that of Targum Jonathan**

i. **Isaiah 54:12**

Rashi and Kimchi show us that אֱכֶדֶת is to be understood as קָרְדָּה, 'burning coal', from the root קָרְדֶה, as in Isa. 50:11, קָרְדָּה, that is, some type of precious stone which can burn like a torch or give light as fire does.19

After Kara has explained that these are precious stones sparkling like fire, and supported this from Targum Jonathan, he further cites the Midrash.20 What are the exegetical choices here? Either 'stones quarried from the rock' (from נֵכֶד) or 'sparkling precious stones'. Kara prefers the second, in view of the fact that verses 11-12 speak of precious stones. אֱכֶדֶת are therefore gems whose preciousness is evinced by their sparkling like fire.

ii. **Jeremiah 38:5**

This verse seems to be incomplete, for אָכָה is a direct object and the preceding verb, יִכְלֹ, requires an indirect object (לָכָה). Some verb corresponding to אָכָה is therefore called for, and Kara explains that the verse is somewhat abridged, and adds יִכְלֹ לְאֶכָה אָכָה לֹדְר. After he has given this explanation, he finds that Targum Jonathan does so as well, and notes this accordingly.

b. **Interpretations wider than Targum Jonathan's, but not on the same verse**

We shall note one instance where after his own interpretation Kara does not cite Targum Jonathan on the verse in question (since he in fact differs from it), but relies for support on Targum Jonathan in connection with a different verse.
Jeremiah 4:3: Karas says:

Targum Jonathan explains with ומשתהו התפדה, unlike Kara, and so he cites in support Targum Onkelos on Deut. 28:65, ולאכזב נפש שררברום הלמות. The exegetical difficulty here is apparent from the different senses advanced in the two Targumim, and here Kara prefers Onkelos.

2. When Kara has Derived his Solution from Targum Jonathan

When Kara derives his explanation from Targum Jonathan, or his exegetical determination has come to him through his study of Targum Jonathan, his practice is to cite Targum Jonathan in one of the following ways:

a. He quotes Targum Jonathan and supports it with a Scriptural reference


Kara takes his gloss of עמק הפגרים from Targum Jonathan: that it means the plain where the corpses of the Assyrian army fell during the siege of Sennacherib, in Hezekiah's reign. To support this, he cites a verse which speaks of פגרים מתים. In accepting Targum Jonathan he effectively rejects other possibilities. One might, for example, take עמק הפגרים as a cemetery in which dead bodies are buried, but he cannot accept this because פגרים פנים or פגרים פנים always has an unfavourable connotation in the Bible since it is connected with punishment or unnatural death for human beings.
is associated with animals.  

ii. In I Kings 6:34 we find both שְׁנֵי עֲלָיִם and דְּזִירָא, צְרִיֶּה. Kara notes that Targum Jonathan renders both as צְרִיֶּה, and says,

ובוֹרָבָּשׁ מַכוֹרָתָם מִשְׁמִיָּם בִּשְׁמִי וְהֵמָּה חַטַּאתָם מַכְוָרוֹתָם (אָרָבָּשׁוּ "), וְכֻלָּהָ תְּשׁוּבָה שְׁמִי עֲלָיִם וְהֵמָּה חַטַּאתָם מַכְוָרוֹתָם כִּלָּהָ שְׁמִי עֲלָיִם צְרִיֶּהוּ מַכְוָרוֹתָם.  

Here Kara moves to a detailed explanation of the two nouns, and returns to the first issue:

וְאַלּוֹת יֵחָר לְוַי אֶפֶם מָנָנָנָן עַל פָּתָרָן ַזָּה שְׂיָמָר הַיָּחְבָּה לָשׁוֹן, 

Thus he defends the Targum and supports it with a detailed clarification which rests upon personal testimony.

b. He quotes Targum Jonathan and adds a note or explanation

When he cites only the solution given by Targum Jonathan and places after it an explanation or note upon part of the Targum, he indicates that this is פְּשׁוּתָה שֶל מַכְרָא and that he adopts it as his own opinion.

1. I Kings 7:33: קָרָא אֲבָרָהָם מְעָשָׁה מְעָשָׁה אֲבָרָהָם מְעָשָׁה מְעָשָׁה מְעָשָׁה. Kara explains: רָצוּן לַיְדוֹ מְעָשָׁה מְעָשָׁה מְעָשָׁה מְעָשָׁה... He then cites Rashi's interpretation, which in his opinion misunderstands the Targum and is consequently misleading, and adds, ...

מָפְגִּינָה מַכְרָא אֲבָרָהָם קָרָא עֵדֶד גָּלְגֵל מְרָכְבָּה... יְרוּאֵה אֲבָרָהָם, יְרוּאֵה אֲבָרָהָם אֲבָרָהָם אֲבָרָהָם אֲבָרָהָם אֲבָרָהָם אֲבָרָהָם.  

[Jonathan, in his opinion, did not think of explaining the chariot here in terms of the obscure Chariot passage in Ezekiel.] It follows from this that the
reference cannot be to the chariot of Ezekiel but to a human artefact, and Kara goes on to explain the Targum. He provides several interpretations for I Sam. 10:12, including the Targum's, of which he says,

\[\text{לַשְׁוֹן} \text{ הַנַּעַר הָיָה} \text{ מֵכְלָלָם}.
\]

ii. Jeremiah 47:3:

\[\text{כִּי} \text{ הָמָרָה} \text{ רְכִבָּה} \text{ יַעַנְתִּי} \text{ פִּriere} \text{ יִשְׂאוּ}.
\]

Kara says:

The word is a hapax. The context makes several interpretations possible - the noise of hooves, loud knockings, or (as in Targum Jonathan: פִּriere יִשְׂאוּ) the marching of horses' hooves. In such a case Kara relies upon the Targum.

c. **He quotes Targum Jonathan without any addition**

In quoting Targum Jonathan on a word, phrase or verse, without any other remark either before or after, Kara indicates that he is in agreement with the Targum and that it constitutes פִּriere של מִקְרָא. It is readily comprehensible, and no clarification is necessary.

Hosea 13:3:

\[\text{כַּהֲרָן} \text{ וְחָטֵנוּ דִּשְׁלֵيم} \text{ מִכְרָא} \text{ נְוֶרָא}.
\]

Kara: The word is frequently found in the Bible in association with the heavens: אִירְוֹתָן שְׁכָמִים - the windows of heaven; and it is also applied to the depression which contains the eyeball and to a dovecote. In the present context it means a chimney - a window to let the smoke out. In view of all these senses, Kara quotes Targum Jonathan for a precise statement as to the meaning of the verse.28
3. Targum Jonathan Together With Another Interpretation

Here we must distinguish between two methods whereby Targum Jonathan is cited together with a dissenting commentary:

a. When Kara places his own interpretation before Targum Jonathan's

In such a case, he indicates that his own interpretation is preferable to that of Targum Jonathan, but that the latter is not to be entirely dismissed.

Isaiah 11:15: בָּלִּים רְאוּ הַיָּמִים.

Kara:

בַּרְחַת נֵדוֹלָת רְאוּ הַיָּמִים. בְּעֵיר מְנַנְּרָת "לְעֵי הַשָּׁדָה" שָׁחֵר לַשׁוֹרָה קִבּוֹצָן לְכֹה "שְׁמִי אֵלֶּה יְרוּשָׁלְיָם לְעֵי יְמֵי". הֲרֵגָת הָרְגָת בּוֹמֵר נְבֵי הָיָה. חָוֵחַ לְעֵי לְמֵימֵר לְמֵי יְמֵי רְאוּ הַיָּמִים.

Kara explains that in the word יֵי the letter ב is a preposition and the word itself is יֵי (heap, collection, large number), and he cites Scriptural passages in confirmation; compare his gloss on Job 30:24. According to Targum Jonathan, however, יֵי is the root, יֵי יִעְסַר בֵּית נְבֵי מְאִיר נְבֵי נְבֵי — that is, יֵי יִעְסַר בֵּית נְבֵי מְאִיר. But Kara has difficulties with this, because it ignores the preposition ב, and should have appeared as יֵי יִעְסַר בֵּית נְבֵי. 29 Here he emphasises the fact that his gloss is to be preferred to that of Targum Jonathan, which he cites second.

b. When he cites Targum Jonathan before his own opinion

In these instances, his intention is to imply that he neither agrees with Targum Jonathan nor thinks that it has any basis in the שְׁמֵי, and that it is therefore to be rejected.

בְּגוֹמָה הַיָּמִים.

Kara:

רֹיוֹנָה יִירָם אָמֵרָה ה, אָרָה בּוֹכֶרְוּ לְעֵי שֶׁאָמְרוּ "נְנִיקָה בִּמְלָאֹפָמָה וּכְתַב, כְּתוֹבָה.."
The view of the Targum is not to be accepted because the נקשות of the text is pointed with קמה and not with קמה. On David's speech at the end of his life, Kara says... [The view of the Targum is not to be accepted because the נקשות of the text is pointed with קמה and not with קמה.] On another occasion when he quotes Targum Jonathan together with another interpretation he says of the latter that he regards the statement in Targum Jonathan that David prophesies the future as רדש. On another occasion when he quotes Targum Jonathan together with another interpretation he says of the latter that he rejects Targum Jonathan. As to אינני יдол לרשוד על קשתיתא בוקעייא, Kara admits that Elsewhere it seems to me that he has not understood the Targum, for in I Samuel 14:19, where Saul says to the priest, יאזו יז, and Targum Jonathan translates קריב יז אדוז (in accordance with 23:9), in the sense of 'inquiring of' the ephod and not hiding it away, Kara (and Kimchi) think that the meaning is 'not to inquire':... eller אווא' להמר אסון ייז כלו' כנוע זיז אליך אתן כנא לא שמך. But this is an exceptional case.

4. Errors
I shall now list several places in which Kara's citation of Targum Jonathan is unclear or mistaken, or his version of the text differs from ours.

a. ולאויעל החות (Jud. 8:13).
Kara: תרובמו על לא מייעל שימשא כלומר על שלא שקהלת השמש. But Targum Jonathan in fact reads - that is, before sunset.

b. ויוודא בעם (Jud. 8:16).
Kara: but Targum Jonathan says "in the sense of breaking them on them.

(II Sam. 1:19).

Kara: Whether by intention or not, Targum Jonathan reads "the Circuit of Israel..."

(II Sam. 3:12).

Kara: Targum Jonathan translates "as it does in 2:23, but there it means 'in the place where he was', while here what cannot possibly mean 'from the place'."

(II Sam. 16:12).

Kara: "It is strange that there is no connection between the Targum and the text.

(II Kings 5:24).

Kara: "It is possible that is taken as 'in a covered place' (so also Metzudath Tzion), although it is actually a locality in Samaria.

To sum up, we can say of Kara's approach to the Aramaic Targumim that (1) in twenty-four places in his commentary upon Prophets he makes use of Onkelos on the Torah, naming him on one occasion only. In all these references Targum Onkelos is given as the sole interpretation. (2) He makes frequent use of Targum Jonathan on the Prophets, sometimes agreeing with it and sometimes dissenting. (3) When he has arrived independently at a gloss similar to the one he then
finds in Targum Jonathan, he sets down first his own interpretation and then a brief account of Targum Jonathan. On occasion he relies upon Targum Jonathan in connection with a verse which is not that under discussion. (4) When he has actually derived his explanation of the text from Targum Jonathan, he quotes the passage in question and then either appends a Scriptural verse in support; adds a note or explanation; or leaves Targum Jonathan to stand by itself. (5) When a gloss from Targum Jonathan is cited together with his own interpretation, the order is of significance: if his own opinion is placed first, it is regarded as the preferable view, although Targum Jonathan is not to be dismissed, but if it comes after the citation from Targum Jonathan, the latter is rejected on the grounds of its insufficient foundation in the שׁוֹד.

II. Rashi

1. Historical Background

Rashi was born in 1040 in Troyes, in the Champagne district. His was a family of scholars, and he spent his youth in his birthplace and later moved to Worms to study in a yeshivah of the Rhine region. Thence he left for Mainz, returned as a consequence of economic difficulties to Troyes, and became there one of the leading figures in the community. His extraordinary expertise in Talmud enabled him to pronounce on many problems of הָלַלה. After some time he started a study circle on the Torah which turned into a yeshivah whose importance increased greatly with the destruction of the Rhine yeshivoth in 1097 at the beginning of the Crusades. As Kara was a native of Troyes it is reasonable to assume
that he knew Rashi and his Beth Midrash, to a greater or lesser extent (as I shall show below), and that there was some interchange of opinions between them on exegetical points. 38 There is some evidence for all this.

(a) Rashi mentions Kara a number of times:

\[\text{משהו ר' מנמח [ב"ר]} \]
\[\text{כ"כ שמעתי, מרבי יוסף והגנאים;} \]
\[\text{יתב, אמם ל' רבי יוחנן;} \]
\[\text{משהו ר' מנמח שמוח ר' עזריה שמעתי;} \]
\[\text{يمنר ר' מנמח [ב"ר]} \]
\[\text{ו"ל} \]
\[\text{יסי. 64:3;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 10:24;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 64:3;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 64:3;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 64:3;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 64:3;} \]

(b) As we know, Helbo never met Rashi, and his comments were relayed to him by Kara. Rashi quotes Helbo in a number of places, and Kara's role as an intermediary is quite clear:

\[\text{_ve} \]
\[\text{ו"ל} \]
\[\text{יסי. 19:24;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 19:24;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 19:24;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 19:24;} \]
\[\text{יסי. 19:24;} \]

Since he heard Helbo's glosses, it is evident that they cannot have been available to him in written form, and that Kara reported them orally. On several occasions, too, Rashi makes use of Helbo without direct acknowledgment. 43

(c) The acquaintanceship between Rashbam and Kara has already been demonstrated, and I accept Razin's opinion that Kara spent much time in Rashi's house and there became acquainted with Rashbam (for which there is written evidence). 44

M. Ahrend writes that Kara cannot reasonably be regarded as Rashi's pupil, but that the two sages met and exchanged ideas. 44 This may be so, or conceivably the two studied together for a period in Rashi's Beth Midrash in Troyes, so that the connection between them was stronger than is now
apparent; but on these points there is no evidence free of ambiguity. Several scholars have tried to elucidate the link between the commentaries of Rashi and of Kara upon various Biblical books. Some minimise the significance of Kara's work, regarding it merely as an elaboration of Rashi's or a faithful reworking of Rashi with some innovations. One writer goes so far as to assert that in his commentary on the Prophets Kara is entirely dependent upon Rashi, and that only with regard to the Hagiographa is he independent.

At the beginning of this century Apenstein showed that this was an exaggerated view, and he was the first to publish a lengthy study on this topic. In his view, the criticisms of Rashi expressed by Kara in his commentary on the Early Prophets prove that he was not dependent upon him. We may add that Kara's commentary is far longer than Rashi's, and has a different approach. Apenstein details the differences between the commentaries on the Early Prophets, and concludes that just as Rashi influenced Kara, "so in the same manner, if not to a greater extent, Kara influenced Rashi."

Before we examine in more depth the relationship between Kara's commentaries upon the Prophets and Rashi's, it is desirable to set down the general impression created by an initial reading through of both works. Kara's commentary is several times as long as Rashi's, and it is controlled by a leading principle, the wish to follow out the connection between points in the text and discern the Biblical author's continuity of thought. It is not made up of isolated explanations dealing with specific phrases but is a
paraphrase of the entire text. Moreover, Kara's style is peculiar to himself. It involves appeals to the reader and a debate with him through a use of particular expressions and rules which Kara has adopted - none of which is to be found in Rashi.

Taking all these together, we must conclude, even before we examine the subject in detail, that Kara's commentary on the Prophets is in no way an extended reworking of Rashi but an independent commentary which contains many points learnt from teachers and colleagues like Rashi and Helbo.

2. Citations from the Sages Found in Kara and Not in Rashi
   a. Kara quotes Rabbi Meir the Wise at I Kings 10:28; Rashi nowhere mentions him.
   b. The gloss of Rabbi Yitzhak b. Rabbi Eleazar Halevi on I Kings 5:3 does not appear in Rashi.\footnote{A reference number is used here.}
   c. Sefer Josippon is cited by Kara on Jud. 5:21 but not by Rashi.\footnote{Another reference number is used here.}

Two further Sages are admittedly mentioned by Rashi, but it was Kara who told him of their interpretations: Helbo, whom Rashi never met, and who was Kara's uncle, and Eleazar Hakallir, whose liturgical poems, made known to Kara by Helbo, were passed on by him to Rashi, who calls him ר' אלאזר חוקליר.\footnote{Yet another reference number is used here.} It should be said that the scantiness of these references does not prove anything, inasmuch as relatively speaking all of them appear in Kara only very rarely.

3. Use of the Aramaic Targumim
Kara makes use of the Targumim more frequently and for a
wider variety of purposes than does Rashi.\footnote{181}
a. He cites Targum Onkelos only once by name,\footnote{182} all his other references being without identification; there is nothing of this in Rashi.
b. Targum (Talmud) Yerushalmi is cited by Kara in three places: Jud. 5:28; II Sam. 17:19; and Hos. 7:5. Rashi does not refer to it.
c. Targum Jonathan on Prophets is the Targum most often cited by Kara. Not only does he refer to it far more frequently than Rashi does,\footnote{183} but he does not hesitate to attack Rashi with the assertion that the latter has not understood the Targum, \textit{והוא מענהו היאר לכל שטורת אלכפיי נכרוב, והמענה זבר אלכפיי חייתא אוריינר בפורום}.\footnote{184}

4. Use of Midrashim
In this section I do not intend to discuss differences in approach to the Midrash, the manner in which it is used, or when and how Kara cites Midrashim in comparison with Rashi, since these points are discussed in a separate chapter. I wish simply to show that Kara tends to cite the Midrash at greater length than Rashi, whose allusions are brief. As I examined the two commentaries on the Early Prophets, I found that more than thirty Midrashim appear in Kara and not in Rashi,\footnote{185} and that a slightly smaller number of Midrashim is found in Rashi and not in Kara.\footnote{186} This fact of itself indicates that in this area there is no close partnership between the two commentaries, and further support for this surmise comes from the observation that some Midrashim are cited by both, but in connection with different texts.\footnote{187} A
second point is Kara's longwindedness. In II Sam. 21:19, for example, Rashi says that יָרֵךְ אֲבוֹתָיו אֲבוֹתָיו that יָרֵךְ אֲבוֹתָיו אֲבוֹתָיו are seven words. On the following phrase, "יָרֵךְ אֲבוֹתָיו," Kara says, "יָרֵךְ אֲבוֹתָיו" that יָרֵךְ אֲבוֹתָיו אֲבוֹתָיו, this amounts to 25 words. 61

In general, we can say that not only are fewer, and different, Midrashim found in Kara, but that in citing Midrashim identical to Rashi's he quotes them at greater length - a feature characteristic of his style. 62

5. Quotations from the Talmud
As in the foregoing section on Midrashim, we argue here that there are numerous places where Kara quotes from the Talmud as to a range of matters; that these citations are not to be found in Rashi; and that where the two use the same passage Kara generally does so at greater length. That Rashi was a greater expert in Talmud than Kara is here taken for granted. In what follows I have no intention of suggesting otherwise: what we find in Kara is no especial profundity or discussion of points, but simply Talmudic allusions for a variety of purposes. In his commentary on the Early Prophets alone there are about fifty such references which are absent from Rashi. 63 Once again we may find the same passage used by the two commentators in different places. Kara on II Sam. 6:23, for example, is identical with Rashi on 21:8. Here is a single example of Kara's full and lengthy style. In Jud. 5:21 Rashi cites a Midrash in seven words, while in Kara it is
eleven times as long: seventy-six words. While this is an extreme instance, in most cases Kara is much more long-winded than Rashi.64

In every place where Kara speaks of נֵבֶט הָמֶכֶרֶּא Rashi says nothing at all, so that on this head Kara is wholly original. Below we discuss at length Kara's attitude towards נֵבֶט הָמֶכֶרֶּא and מֶסְוָרָה. A comparison of passages in Kara and in Rashi establishes that there are no parallel allusions. As I will show, Kara goes to trouble to find exact texts, and does not accept the Sages' opinion without demur. On the problematic passage in I Sam. 1:9, כִּי לְבִנָּי הָיוֹן יָקרא לְפְנֵי הָרוֹחָה, 6 Rashi writes:יָנֵא יָנֵא. Kara, by contrast, does not hesitate to say explicitly על מספר זה לא נכתב כמי شيء אלא. Both know that in the opinion of the Sages Samuel wrote his own Book, but Rashi does not venture to oppose this in so many words. In two places where it is possible that Kara had a different נֵבֶט הָמֶכֶרֶּא (once as to a קָרָא וּלְתָה and once as to a קָרָא וּלְתָה), nothing at all appears in Rashi.67 Compared with Kara, then, Rashi is conservative in his approach to נֵבֶט הָמֶכֶרֶּא and מֶסְוָרָה, and in this he faithfully reflects his period, as we shall show later.68
7. The Relationship Between the Early Prophets and Chronicles
Kara frequently compares passages in the Early Prophets with parallel passages in Chronicles in order to bring out differences in the text, supplement the information provided in Prophets or settle differing versions. In most instances Rashi does not address himself to the matter. Once again, in those cases where the two commentators resolve outright contradictions, Kara's treatment is generally far longer and more detailed than Rashi's. As for contradictions within the Early Prophets, I have counted eight cases which are reconciled by Kara and which Rashi leaves unmentioned. In one instance each offers a different solution.

8. Use of י"ל (Vernacular)
The extensive use made by Kara of י"ל constitutes one of his principal qualities as a teacher of Scripture who was concerned to teach verses in accordance with their literal meaning. To make things easier for his students, he provided a translation into their own language. In this he followed a path laid down by his predecessors, but made a much greater and more varied use of the technique. As a general rule, we can say that almost all the instances of י"ל found in Kara do not appear in Rashi; in a few places the two commentators use different terms, and in a very few instances their י"ל is similar or identical. Some figures may make these points clearer:

a. י"ל found in Kara and not in Rashi: Early Prophets: 83 instances; Later Prophets: 91 instances. These 174
usages represent several times Rashi's total.

b. In several places, each commentator offers a different 

ליע"ו. In Josh. 9:5, for example, Rashi translates נקודים י נ kHzayim and Kara with אמריכא כליע"ו. In II Kings 18:17, Rashi translates פוסקר'א בליע"ו and Kara with קושי'א. These represent two instances out of 42 in the Book of Prophets.76 Taking (a) and (b) together, then, there are more than 200 instances in which there is no connection between the two commentators as to their use of ליע"ו.

c. In a few places, the ליע"ו is similar or identical in the two commentators. Since the transliteration of French words into Hebrew is in question, differences as to one or two letters are not generally significant. Some of the discrepancies arise from editing practices.77 The total number of instances, 40, is relatively low.78

d. Unlike Rashi, who provides ליע"ו for single words or phrases, Kara is prepared to use it for entire sections of a verse. In I Sam. 1:20, for example, he renders והרה חנה וכלל אזמא'ן ש חנה ואם ידינו' ד אפור'ו' ט פ"ל בליע"ו; and there are other instances elsewhere.79

We must conclude that in the area of ליע"ו Kara stands revealed as wholly independent; and just as it is possible that Rashi influenced him, so may he have influenced Rashi. It should further be remarked that in Rashbam, whose work is later than Kara's, the quantity of ליע"ו is very small.80 Rashbam did not continue in the line laid down by Kara, who was indeed קרן, one who "read" the Torah to his students; and it would appear that the use of Hebrew was correspondingly reinforced.81
9. Reciprocal Allusions

In the Early Prophets, Rashi does not name Kara (as he does in Isaiah and Job, as we noted above in the introductory matter), but he does mention Helbo. It is clear today that Helbo's glosses came to Rashi though Kara, Rashi himself owning that he has heard something. To this should be added the instances in which Rashi makes use of Helbo without naming him. Kara, by contrast, mentions Rashi by name 19 times, as a rule employing the form ידוע ר' הלביה and ל״א. When he cites Rashi's opinions, Kara generally uses the expressions ואריאי' בתרוג' ר' יהונתן or הלמה ז"ל בפירוש. This variety is in no way surprising, for it is characteristic of Kara's entire mode of writing.

Two points should be noted. Kara does not use the root ט"ר when he cites a gloss of Rashi's, as he does when invoking other commentators, and there is no evidence in his work that he heard things directly from Rashi.

10. Degree of Identity Between the Commentaries on Prophets

In every book within Prophets we find identical comments supplied by Kara and by Rashi. The number is generally speaking very low in Joshua and Judges and greater in Samuel and the Latter Prophets; and it increases to an extreme degree in Kings. We must reject Apenstein's opinion with regard to Judges that 'a great part of the glosses are identical in Rashi and in Kara, as is proved from the notes', since examination of the notes indicates that nothing can be shown from them. Secondly, the Book of Judges
contains 21 chapters. On average, Kara glosses about 15 verses in each chapter. He therefore provides about 300 pieces of commentary, and of these only about 50 resemble Rashi's — that is to say, one sixth of the total, hardly 'a great part'.

In Joshua, there are about 20 points of identity or considerable closeness between Rashi and Kara (out of the 16 chapters commented upon). Judges offers two or three points in each chapter, amounting to about 50 instances of significant similarity (only in the Song of Deborah is there a great number of identical glosses). The relationship strengthens in Samuel, for in each chapter there are four or five points of identity or similarity. In the first chapters of Kings the proportion increases to between seven and ten, and from Chapter 6 the identity is so great that it is the points of difference which appear exceptional. It seems reasonable to suggest that Kara's intensive use of Rashi in Kings is responsible for the criticisms he utters of Rashi, most of which are to be found in that book.

In the Latter Prophets, if we except Ezekiel (where I have made no comparison), the situation is as follows. (a) About 15 glosses are cited in Rashi's name; (b) about 10 clearly allude to Rashi; (c) about 100 are partially similar or almost identical in expression; and (d) about 340 are similar in content but not in language.

We must not conclude from this that where the glosses are identical Kara copied from Rashi; it is reasonable to think that exchanges took place between them and that Kara was the source of some of Rashi's interpretations. It should be borne
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in mind that Kara would have seen nothing dishonourable in such borrowing, for as Poznanski makes clear,³ it was customary practice in the period. From everything we have already said, it also emerges that Kara displays no consistent approach in his citations of Rashi. Sometimes he copies from him with punctilious accuracy,⁴ or retains the basic idea with some verbal changes;⁵ and sometimes he cites him with alterations which fall into two categories. Either (a) he expands Rashi by adding explanatory matter (i) to strengthen and clarify his point, or (ii) to introduce a further exegetical element such as translation or Midrashic reference, etc., or (b) he omits something and quotes Rashi only in part.

These different modes exhibit an immense range of variation. The significant point is the distinction in principle between them. This distinction has already been drawn in the comparative sections above, but a more comprehensive view must now be taken as we follow out continuous passages of commentary.

a (i). את עמי העכב (I Kings 3:9). Rashi writes, מתוד שעה Außerdem יש לך עקרון רביה ורבניםLDAP, ואת עמי העכב. Kara writes, שעם רב יש לך עקרון יתיריהם ראויהLDAP, ואת עמי העכב מתוד לדריז􀆹 כדי שידעו זה הוא מי机动 וindsight LDAP. Here Kara repeats what Rashi has to say, with some slight changes and a greater concreteness of expression.

ii. הכרתי וה苄תי (I Kings 1:38). This is an instance of the addition of an exegetical element, for Rashi writes, ומרם, יונתן, ומשהוהו ועלווהו וرأם גריס ודיפה, while Kara
comments,

הנהו ושבעה על החגיגה בטוריה, ולמה López את כל יובל ביכי
זכאי ביה שניב אבר הארץالت הימים ומלכות הורדות כћ החגיגה
במרותי לבלתי סורר מגמהות לפלק' אירגב עם על ממלכת
רגה' (2:נו) ולא אתות חניא לא אשנה אונ الداخل הדיבך
והאנסחי רגא' רבר במעלות גוריא או ראות אאמן
כћ בלפין גורם' לא כאך של איש רגא' (לעומ ס, 4, 5) כך
שהנה בטוריה ורבبية והתנה במלכויות אומר והא אמר גמ
עשר ז'כבו רבר.

[I have made no conditions in my Torah as to wealth and glory
for kings, and I will give them to you whether you deserve
them or not, but long life and the descent of kingship to
posterity have been made dependent upon not swerving from the
commandment, that you may prolong your days in your kingdom,
etc. (Deut. 17:20); and I will not change this condition.
Similarly, as to his children's inheriting his kingdom, God
said, 'Now if you walk before me ... a man shall not be cut
off from you...'; see the discussion in Sifri; and R. Hanina
b. Gamliel said, 'He mentions both wealth and glory, and
makes an end.']

Kara's gloss is

הם העושי ושבעה, שבם חנניה בטוריה, לבלתי סורモノ ממית
הכימא ומית עולם יראד עם על ממלכת גמר' (דברים "ג").

He has shortened Rashi considerably and missed out most of
his points.

Further categorisations of Kara's approach might be
suggested, but this seems unnecessary in view of the emphasis
we have laid on the principal point - the differences,
qualitative and quantitative, between the two commentaries.

11. Kara's Criticism of Rashi

With regard to the Book of Kings, Apenstein claims that "wherever Kara rejects Rashi's opinion with particular force, he cites him by name." As careful reading shows, however, Apenstein contradicts himself, and so it is difficult to determine his actual opinion. Ahrend considers that "Kara did not mention his master Rashi in his commentary unless he wished to disagree with him." To my mind the situation is rather different. On some occasions Kara attacks Rashi by name, and on other occasions he attacks him without identifying him at all. As a rule he is named when Kara quotes his gloss as differing from that of himself or another commentator whose text is also quoted.

a. חטאים (I Kings 1:21).

Rashi writes:

[Writings containing] מִן הַנִּדְרָכָה כִּי אֵל הַשַּׁעֲרָה לוֹ הַיַּעַט (Shem).

[They miss greatness, as one might fling a stone at a hair and miss (Jud. 20:16).] Kara (commenting on דַּעְתּוּ וַעֲפַר נַכְשֵׁת) openly declares that Rashi is in error:

אֲכַל מֵי שְׂפֹתָה חֲתָמִים חֲסִירִים מִן הַמְמַלֵּכָה כָּמוֹ קֹלֶל (בָּאָב).

b.auses (I Kings 7:33).

Here is Rashi:

גֵּרֵי יִנְטָקִים בְּכָל כּוֹבֵד מְרִיבָה עַל מִצְוָת אַוֶּם בַּעַזִּיוֹן שָׁיִיחַ וְעֶרֶב

Kara attacks Rashi's version of the Targum but only after he has set down his own solution. He then quotes Rashi, without naming him, and asserts.

כָּשֶׁר פָּרֵשׁ לָךְ כִּלְשָׁה מַרְכָּבָה חָתוֹם לָךְ כַּל פִּירוֹשִׁית בְּדֶבֶר אָדוֹן

וְאָדָם לָךְ רָזוּנָךְ לָיִן מַשֵּׁה מַכְוָנָה עִיּוֹן לָךְ מַשֵּׁה מַרְכָּבָה

שָׁל בִּכְלָה אָדָם... וּרְאוֹתָה כַּמְרַכָּבָה מַרֲבָּוָה שֶׁל שְׁרוֹת... וּרְאוֹת...
Anyone who offers this solution distorts and overturns the words of God, for how could a sensible man say to someone who does not understand something, "If you wish to know it, look up at the sky, and from what you see there you will grasp this point on earth'? Will he not reply, 'I don't know what is in the sky'?... The chariot here is a chariot for human beings or loads.} Kara's comments are orderly and clear. He supplies his own gloss on the verse, juxtaposed with the Targum's view as interpreted by Rashi, and then he attacks Rashi and gives his own understanding of the Targum. The extremely unfavourable language which he applies to Rashi should be noted: מועוט הכתוב... מפאת כ深化改革 אלוקים هي, אשר התéal קצבייה.

The question arises as to Kara's failure to mention Rashi by name in this clash between their commentaries. In instances like this the answer appears to me quite simple. Where Kara rejects Rashi's opinion in such pungent language, he refrains from naming him - his master - out of tenderness for his honour. Sometimes the rejection is phrased in plural terms against הרפוארím ויהתוררím, when Rashi (or those who offer glosses similar to his) is in question.

c. Here now are two instances in tabular form, (i) Isaiah 2:20 (Kirchheim), and (ii) Jeremiah 50:11.
Kara

...לתפריר ה Walton. לאート גוסט שיאופיינן חאו

לתפריר ה Walton. ושימר איזו אלייל לשים

אליל תוחר.

ולא תחא אשוריה מנה תזכר לפרס ה Walton ה

שתフトן בק שרגים ומינג יא חיריאת משני

ותרמה: אחד שיאנג מיבגי פירוס היגוד והעדימים.

שהלא חנה: אלא לפרס המקראות...

פשנות שביית הנה גוז מעגלתיה שליה ידע שושקית

שתחמא השלול משופר בזר ניכול.

ואז כדרורי, כל אלא פירש חינך שלחר?

Rashi

השתתור ל Walton

גולם בדמח ה Walton

מיניו שרצים שחרים

נראה...

cענה סיא. חשת

הבתכונה אווכלת חמיד.

ורינע במרעה טור שמשMahonת מתרק מערת הטורב...

וכל הפורים כענגל דיא. הענגל חזית בתכואה

ומכיאין ריאיה לדרבריה שענגלות הדות התכואה אווכלת

הייא חתכואה ומשMahonת, איננה ראייה. רטורח הזה...

ואס צדברי הפור. רתוד עשת חור שריי "דיא" זה

כתיב א. לשר דיא, רשה בתכואה ב-505.
i. [Rashi: They will bow down to idols in the shape of burrowing creatures. Kara: People will hide their idols in burrows dug by moles and bats, and do not think that they will bow down to the moles and bats; anyone who interprets thus misleads us and does not understand the vocalisation and שערים.] Kara vehemently rejects the view of שערי. That this means Rashi is clear from what follows, in which the attack shifts from the plural to the singular. Why is Rashi's interpretation so unacceptable? (1) It is not in harmony with שערי והמקרא; and Kara takes the opportunity to declare that שערי והמקרא were given to us as an aid in the interpretation of the text. (2) It is not consistent with the Hebrew language, for wherever 'casting away' is mentioned in the Bible the passage always includes the place involved as an indirect object. By Rashi's account, however, the text does not state where the items are to be thrown.

ii. While Kara initially directs his attack against שערי הMemcpy (in the plural), he immediately changes to the singular with ועשו הראשונה ו텀ות דברי ה coppia, by which Rashi is meant. Why does he combat Rashi's gloss with such vehemence? (1) It is neither rational nor in harmony with the spirit of the text, for it is impossible that a working beast, an animal engaged in threshing, should become fat. It is more likely to grow thin. (2) The word נשת is written with נ, not נ, so that it is not associated with נשת (threshing).
12. Criticism in Which Rashi Is Named

a. On I Kings 18:37, Kara quotes Rashi's gloss with precision, saying

Rashi's interpretation is difficult to accept, and Helbo's is confused.] Here he cites and rejects two opinions.

b. In Isaiah 26:7, both Kara and Rashi explain the verse אורות lanzidim mishirim yer melol zirek felat. Kara begins with his own interpretation and then quotes Rashi and explains why he does not accept him. Both regard the verse as a prayer to God to aid Israel, but both syntax and נ"פ dictate that the word мир ranks as an entreaty and not as an auxiliary to משלול. Rashi's gloss is divorced from the general context, while Kara sees the verse as a continuation of the foregoing verses (which deal with the fall of Rome) and hence as a prophecy that God will make the city of Rome into an ארורות המישרין ישר ומצעל זירה which will serve as a pavement for Israel. Kara's explanation is more wholly a Quân interpretation, and it is in line with the context.

We shall now look at some examples of Kara's naming Rashi without adopting a stance one way or the other.

a. הנחותו של ר' כָּנָבִי (I Kings 2:5).
Kara explains this in a particular way (that the sword was fastened to the waist in the usual manner, but Abner bent down and it slipped), and then cites Rashi, who holds a different opinion (that Abner did not fasten the sword in the normal way). He adds an explanation of Rashi, possibly intended as clarification, but
does not reveal his own opinion of the gloss.

b. והפלת אברהם (I Kings 7:7).

Kara first sets down his own solution and then, with his customary formulation, adds Rashi's opinion, which differs a little from his: he thinks that the whole inner structure was overlaid with cedar wood, and Rashi that only the floor was.

c. נחור המישור (II Kings 11:2).

Kara cites the Targum and then Rashi, without taking any position himself. 106

From what we have just said, it emerges that in these instances Kara feels that Rashi offers a further reasonable interpretation which is not to be rejected, and he leaves the reader to decide which gloss is preferable.

13. Summary

a. Sages are mentioned in Kara who do not appear in Rashi.
b. Kara's use of the Targumim is much greater and more varied.
c. Kara is inclined to quote Midrashim in full (and not, like Rashi, in a shortened form), and many of his Midrashim are not cited by Rashi.
d. The number of quotations offered by Kara from the Talmud (which are not found in Rashi) is very great.
e. Kara deals much more critically than Rashi with questions of שאלות המקרא ונוסת, מсорות, and enters more into comparisons between the Early Prophets and Chronicles (in order to resolve contradictions and apparent contradictions).
f. Kara's use of י"ל differs from Rashi's both quantitatively and qualitatively, for he may render into the
vernacular whole verses or parts of verses, not single words.
g. Kara's commentary is several times the length of Rashi's, and he does not hesitate to criticise Rashi severely, whether by name or not.
h. Kara's commentary is a piece of continuous exegesis which stresses the link between aspects of the text and not, like Rashi's, a series of isolated glosses.\textsuperscript{107}
i. Rashi offers nothing equivalent to Kara's style, with its appeals to the reader and observation of deliberate rules.

Several conclusions emerge from these points:
a. Kara's commentary is in no sense merely an extended reworking of Rashi's, although they certainly influenced each other.
b. Kara's commentary exhibits certain characteristic features of which no hint is found in Rashi.
c. In a number of places (the percentage cannot be determined) Kara influenced Rashi, who worked Kara's opinions into his own commentary.
d. Kara's commentary is an independent work which occasionally contains the opinions of his older contemporary Rashi.\textsuperscript{108}
III. Rabbi Menahem bar Helbo

Rabbi Menahem bar Helbo (the Rambach) was the brother of Kara's father, and Kara's teacher. Where he lived is not certain, but it cannot have been Troyes - Rashi's city - since in that case he would have been acquainted with Rashi personally and his glosses would not have been transmitted to Rashi only as hearsay. He may have lived for some time in southern France, near Narbonne or Toulouse, as he was a pupil of Rabbi Yehuda נבון, the son of Moshe נבון, from whom he cites comments on liturgical poems. He deviated from his teacher in abandoning נבון and turning to נבון. We possess no further details with regard to him, his family or his descendants. According to Kara, in whose commentary most of Helbo's extant glosses are to be found, he had a circle of pupils who stood and listened to his glosses; and this may be why he is also called Menahem Kara (נאר), like his nephew, Yosef Kara, who similarly expounded the נאר. His interpretations seem to have been collected into a book called נראים which Rashi quotes in a number of places. As Rashi says that נראים, it would seem that Helbo's works were not actually available to him, and that he learnt of Helbo's interpretations through Kara, as he himself states in his comments on Isa. 10:24 and 64:3, and on Job 9:17. In a number of places he uses Helbo without acknowledgment.

Helbo was the first person in France to pursue the נראים, and in this he followed a path wholly different from that of his teacher, Rabbi Yehuda נבון. He was acquainted with the work of Menahem ben Saruk, as
Poznanski notes,\textsuperscript{117} and also made considerable use of Targum\textsuperscript{118} and \"לע".\textsuperscript{119}

When Kara mentions Helbo he employs a wide range of epithets: (1) 'ר, מִנְחָה רְחֵלָה אַזֶּה אֵאלָה \(ד\) (2) 'ר, מִנְחָה חוֹק רְחֵלָה (3) וְרַבֶּל.\textsuperscript{120} In quoting from him he uses these verbs: 'וַתְּרַע, \(וַתְּרַע,\) 'וְרַע, \(וְרַע,\) 'וַתְּרַע וְרַע, \(וַתְּרַע וְרַע,\) and (\(ד\)) "וְרַע, \(וְרַע,\) 'וַתְּרַע וְרַע, \(וַתְּרַע וְרַע,\) 'וַתְּרַע וְרַע, \(וַתְּרַע וְרַע,\) In one passage we learn of Helbo's teaching his interpretations to a group of students, as Kara did after him: 'וַתְּרַע וְרַע, 'וַתְּרַע וְרַע, \(וַתְּרַע וְרַע,\) 'וַתְּרַע וְרַע, \(וַתְּרַע וְרַע,\) We may reasonably suppose that Kara was for a period one of his students, as he himself states in his comment on II Sam. 23:5. It should not be thought that only those few glosses which he cites in his uncle's name were what he learnt from him, for there can be no doubt that numerous other glosses are integrated into his work without any acknowledgment - a practice found in many commentators, who cared more about the matter taught than about the author of a particular interpretation and his right to the material. No improper motives need be ascribed here, for as I have already noted, contemporary readers were more concerned with interpretations than with the names of their originators. The glosses which Kara absorbed into his work became his own, the fruits of his own spirit, either because he had so identified himself with them as to adopt them as his own, or because through the process of study they came to seem like his own, and he made no effort to recall from whom he had first heard them.\textsuperscript{132}
Since Helbo's commentary is not extant as such, it is difficult to make comparisons and to examine the degree of his influence upon his nephew. It is possible to compare certain of the glosses which Rashi cites in his name with similar glosses found without attribution in Kara, since Helbo's interpretations were transmitted to Rashi by Kara, who apparently moved to Rashi's Beth Midrash in Troyes after his uncle's death. Examples of comparable texts in this connection include Rashi and Kara upon I Sam. 19:24; I Kings 6:9; Ezek. 12:3; 30:13; 43:20; and Mic. 6:14. In each case, Rashi cites Helbo by name, and almost identical remarks, without any notation of source, appear in Kara. Why are some of Helbo's interpretations given in his name and others not? Can any coherent method be detected here? Why are some interpretations found in Helbo which take their rise from the Talmud or the Midrash attributed to him and not to their ultimate source? In what cases does Kara make use of his uncle's words? We shall try to discuss these and other questions below.

Kara's commentary contains about eighty quotations from Helbo. In most instances they are used to reinforce his interpretations. Occasionally they are set off against the opinions of others, and in these cases Kara does not accept his uncle's view. In another group, Kara considers his own explanation preferable to Helbo's, on grounds of exegetical methodology. Some examples follow:
1. When Kara's Gloss Is More in Accord With the Common Sense of the Text

Hosea 10:15

כִּי יֶשֶׁנָּו בָּשָּׁר: בָּשָּׁר אֲנָֽיִן מַשֵׁמַע לְךָ פָּחוּר
כֹּל בָּשָּׁר מִלְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל. אִדָּם אֲחָר בָּשָּׁר הָזָּה يָשָׁמַע בָּשָּׁר יָשָׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל
כַּלָּם יִשְׂרָאֵל אַפּוּ, בָּשָּׁר חֲבָרָיו נִגְדָּה חֲבָרָיו לְפָנָיו שָׁהֵר.

[R. Menahem explains that שָׁהֵר comes from לֹא ההוּהָבָה but I Yosef son of R. Shimon say that שָׁהֵר cannot depart from its meaning, and that it means that at dawn the king is silenced. An ordinary man is silent when he is asleep, but here a king of Israel will even at dawn or noon be as dumb before Sennacherib.]

2. When Kara's Gloss Is Supported by Something in the Section or the Passage Discussed

a. Jeremiah 47:5

[Helbo thinks the term comes from נוֹדוּדֵי הֵילֵיוֹת (troops of soldiers), but according to the beginning and end of the passage it must mean to lacerate the body out of grief.] b. In II Samuel 24 we are told of David’s census of the people of Israel. The places through which Joab and his colleagues pass to carry out the census are named from verse 5. In verse 6 the word חשׁי shows up. Kara explains it as a place name and then cites Helbo: מכְּמוֹת שֵׁתִיָּשָׁב מוֹתָשׁ - that is, recent settlements. The context makes it fairly clear that a specific place is in question, and so Kara rejects Helbo: אנִי מַנְמוֹת בִּפְתִּחְוָרָו וּזָא.
c. Jeremiah 38:7

Kara, Targum Jonathan and Helbo all understand the construct phrase as meaning 'the servant of the Cushite king', as the Sages also suggest, and do not take Cush as equivalent to עבד מלך הבושי, but the Targum and Helbo think that the reference is to King Zedekiah. How can he be called Cush? The Sages explain this as in Moed Katan 47b. Kara rejects this interpretation because of verse 10, which provides a grammatical refutation: רְבָּעָהְתָּא יִנְאַת עֵבֶד מַלֵּךְ הַבּוֹשִׁי. If a servant of Zedekiah were in question, the text should read רְבָּעָהְתָּא יִנְאַת עֵבֶד מַלֵּךְ הַבּוֹשִׁי, and not רְבָּעָהְתָּא יִנְאַת עֵבֶד מַרְבָּעָה יִנְאַת עֵבֶד מַלֵּךְ הַבּוֹשִׁי. Kara therefore explains that this was a servant not of Zedekiah but of the Cushite king who had apparently been sent as a gift to Zedekiah: 'King [Zedekiah] commanded the servant of the Cushite king'.
Helbo explains that the text deals with idol worship, whose adherents will eventually have to flee to rock crevices, but in view of the context (ח_colour המקרואת) this cannot be accepted, and the word ככי clarifies the passage. What assertions does Kara make with regard to his uncle? His interpretation, he says, (a) contradicts the פושט, in this case the syntax, and (b) is not in harmony with the context. The phrase כללו לכלך הלס מלהאמה does not refer to idolatry but to man himself, and Helbo divides up the sentence (so as to force his interpretation upon it) in a non-פושט way opposed to שעם המקרואת. Nor - since Kara regards the בnoon המקרואת not simply as the few verses immediately preceding, but takes a broader view which includes passages both before and after - is Helbo's opinion supported by the context.

4. When Helbo's View Is Unproved and Not in Accord with Historical Events

Jeremiah 49:20

[Helbo explains that the text which he cites names not Persia but Tiras. Even if the two are identified, historically speaking Persia never ruled over Edom.] In two places Kara rejects Helbo in unambiguous terms because his glosses do not represent the פושט - despite the fact that he does not himself suggest solutions to the difficulties. In I Sam. 13:21 he explains
(following Helbo) what instruments the Israelites brought to the Philistines to sharpen, but rejects Helbo's interpretation of ותורן זָא אֲנִי מְכַפֵּק אָם וְלָעָזָי בִּרְכֵּךְ... In I Kings 18:37 he similarly calls Helbo's view מִצְּנָה.

If we wish to summarise Kara's attitude to his uncle's commentary, we may say that (a) Kara spent a long time with Helbo, and derived from him a great deal of his view of the Torah and his exegetical approach; that (b) many of Helbo's glosses were absorbed into Kara's work without formal acknowledgment, either because he agreed with them or because, as one of the psychological effects of the learning process, he felt that they were his own and did not trouble to recall whence he had derived them; and that (c) in the eighty instances where he names Helbo, he either uses him to support his own view against another opinion, or juxtaposes his interpretation with those of other commentators, and so indicates that he does not accept Helbo, or at any rate thinks his gloss the less eligible. In these cases, his decision against Helbo arises from exegetical and methodological considerations, for he constantly bases himself on issues of Scriptural language and מִצְּנָה.
IV. Menahem ben Saruk and Dunash ben Labrat

Menahem ben Saruk and his opponent, Dunash ben Labrat, wrote their works in Hebrew and are mentioned by name almost thirty times in Kara's commentaries. About a third of these references are to Ben Saruk (מַנְחֶם ben שָׁרֻך) and the rest to Dunash. Since Kara frequently cites the opinions of the two side by side, it seems sensible to discuss them together rather than separately. Sometimes a gloss is mistakenly attributed to Ben Saruk when in fact it is Dunash's, and vice versa, and there can likewise be no doubt that many of their philological interpretations have been absorbed into Kara's work without acknowledgment. The methodical way in which Kara adduces Ben Saruk and Dunash will now be examined.

When Kara explains a particular text, the same gloss is also found in Ben Saruk, and Dunash does not disagree with it, Kara cites it anonymously and so indicates that it constitutes נַחֲשׁוֹן של מקרא, which he himself has arrived at or so taken over from Ben Saruk that it seems like the product of his own spirit. In such cases the gloss stands alone as an explanation of the text, and other exegetical possibilities are rejected in its favour.

In Nahum 3:10 we read רַחֲמֹת וְגוֹיִם. Kara explains that this means נְכָלָל, in harmony with the phrase found in Isa. 40:19. Following Ben Saruk's Machbereth, Rashi says the same. There is another instance in Jonah 1:6, where Kara's explanation of והעיש in terms of מהבנה echoes Ben Saruk's.

When Ben Saruk and Dunash disagree as to a text and Kara gives an explanation as if it were his own, without noting
that it comes from Dunash or recording the opinion of Ben Saruk, the implication is that Dunash's interpretation represents נשות בְּכָל הָרֹתַת and Ben Saruk's does not (and is therefore rejected). For example, in Amos 1:13, Ben Saruk understands הָרֹתַת (hills) and Dunash נְשׁוֹת הָרֹתַת. Kara prefers the latter, for (1) the form הָרֹתַת cannot be paralleled elsewhere in this sense, and Kara always tries to offer interpretations that are in line with common significations; and (2) the context describes acts of exceptional cruelty. The conquest of hills does not fit into this category, whereas the cleaving apart of pregnant women certainly does; and it is mentioned in II Kings 8:12; 15:16; and Hos. 14:1.

It is of interest that wherever Kara mentions disagreement between Ben Saruk and Dunash, he prefers the opinion of the latter. While Ben Saruk's interpretations may have a foundation in the וכות, those of Dunash seem more suited to Kara's exegetical approach. In these cases, Kara first records Ben Saruk's opinion and then Dunash's reasoned view, and finally his own arguments against Ben Saruk. In Isa. 38:14 the phrase כִּסֵּס עֹנֵר appears. Kara cites Ben Saruk for the view that this is a kind of bird and that a transposition of letters has occurred in עֹנֵר, which should read עָנָר. He then quotes Dunash's attack on this, which asserts that עָנָר applies to the sound made by rams (in connection with human beings it comes from עָנֵנָה, a strong urge), and that the verse is an instance of מִכָּרָה קָרָה: it should read כִּסֵּס עָנָר. He goes on to give examples of the numerous places where the letter 1 has been omitted from the
text, reinforcing Dunash's view. Sometimes he cites a gloss in Dunash's name without remarking that Ben Saruk differs from him. For example, in Joel 4:11,カラ引用ダナッシュの解説とタルムでダナッシュとユーフラテの解釈を示し、ダナッシュおよびユーフラテの解釈を示す。Kara quotes Dunash and the Targum for the view that means to gather together—that is, all the nations will assemble from all around—and adds a supporting text from Ezek. 27:19. Ben Saruk, substituting the consonant ה for י, says in his Machbereth that is equivalent to והז. Kara too uses the substitution of letters with a common origin as an exegetical technique, but he prefers to gloss words as they stand, if this is at all possible, and invokes substitution only when he has no other alternative. Hence in this case he gives the preference to Dunash on exegetical and methodological grounds.

In Isaiah 14:19 the phrase מִשְׁלָנוּ נִרְבָּנָא occurs. Kara cites Dunash for the explanation 'stabbed by the sword'. In his Machbereth, p. 99, Ben Saruk explains it in terms of 'burden', from ישוע, to load. Kara prefers the first, for it is in harmony with the context and it is reinforced by a philological comparison with Arabic. Elsewhere he is inclined to Ben Saruk rather than to Dunash. For the phrase in Hos. 8:8, כִּי מִשְׁלָנוּ נִרְבָּנָא, he quotes Dunash's suggestion that the 1 of נִרְבָּנָא is superfluous and should for purposes of interpretation be dropped, as is done in other Scriptural passages. Kara asserts that the 1 in these cases is not superfluous—it is charged with meaning which must be brought out by exegesis; and this is the opinion of Ben Saruk. Why does Kara prefer it? This is not the only place where he speaks in such terms. In both Jud. 6:25 and II
Sam. 13:20 do we find a superfluous , and each time Kara feels that it has significance. It would seem that the sanctity of the text dictates his exegetical policy: to his mind it is not possible that letters in the text should be so devoid of meaning that for purposes of interpretation one may dispense with them. In all the other instances in which there is disagreement between Ben Saruk and Dunash the issue is solely linguistic, but when the sanctity of the text is involved Kara gives the preference to Ben Saruk.

In conclusion, we may say that Kara does not actually quote Dunash and Ben Saruk but gives a free rendering of what they have to say, sometimes compressing it and sometimes expanding it. When the two are at odds, he takes a clear stand in favour of Dunash, in whose commentary he recognises the of the text as his own exegetical approach would define it, if we except one instance in which the text's sanctity is involved. When he records disagreement between Ben Saruk and Dunash, he places Ben Saruk's view first and then gives Dunash's in an expanded form, with supplements, supporting texts and general principles. When the interpretation seems to him simple , his practice is to set it down without any indication of authorship, as the growth of his own spirit.
V. Other Commentators Mentioned by Kara

In this section we shall look at Kara's approach to commentators whom he mentions only a few times: R. Eleazar Hakallir, R. Shimon, R. Meir ben R. Yitzhak "l'~ n'~~", Rabbenu Saadiah, R. Yitzhak bar Elazar Halevi, R. Yitzhak bar Asher Halevi (the Riba), Rashbam, Sefer Josippon. Despite the scantiness of the references, we shall try to describe his attitude to their works.

1. R. Eleazar Hakallir

Five times in his commentary on the Prophets, Kara bases a point upon Kallir. On each occasion he uses him to resolve an uncertainty. We may reasonably suppose that Kallir's liturgical poems became known to Kara through his uncle, who was the first commentator in northern France to deal with liturgical poetry;¹⁴⁷ Kara himself wrote commentaries on Kallir's poems.¹⁴⁸ He is first mentioned in II Kings 11:2, and after that in the Latter Prophets: Isa. 24:22; Jer. 9:1; Zech. 9:16; and Mal. 3:20.

The central problem in Jer. 9:1 arises from the phrase שֶׁיְּהֵן בְּמִדְבָּר מִלְּוֹן אָוַרְוָיִם. Who is the speaker? Is it the prophet, as Rashi (for example) thinks? Kara holds that it is God Himself, speaking in response to the people's remarks in 8:19; and he invokes Kallir in support.¹⁴⁹ He again makes use of him in Zech. 9:16. The subject in verses 13-17, according to both Kara and Rashi, is the Hasmonean wars against the Greeks and the miracles which God wrought for the Hasmoneans - despite the fact that the preceding verses are explained in terms of the King Messiah, so that it would seem
desirable that this gloss should be continued with regard to what follows. With Kallir's aid, Kara changes his mind as to the bearing of the context, his reason being apparently the opposition to eschatological interpretations which he evinces in other passages. These and the other instances make it clear that Kallir carries great authority for Kara, and he draws on him for support and for the settling of exegetical difficulties.

2. R. Shimon

This commentator is mentioned only once by Kara, in Hos. 12:9. His identity poses a problem, and the reference to him differs between the Lublin text, which reads הר עשוור עзвонי אביなどが הכה, and the Breslau MS.: הר עזוור עзвонי אביなどが הכה. We shall try to decide between the two versions.

If we assume that הר עזוור refers to Kara's father, as in the Lublin text, we may point to the fact that Kara mentions his father a number of times in his commentary. But the Breslau reading is also possible, so that two conclusions can be drawn: that the comment ascribed to Kara is not his, but the work of one of his pupils, since הר עזוור is identified as אביなどが; or that it is a marginal note added by a pupil to Kara's commentary which was later interpolated by a copyist. The first hypothesis apparently derives from the supposition that Kara's father was the author of the Midrashic collection known as Yalkut Shimeoni - but it has been proved that this is not the case. And if he were the author, it is strange that the son should not quote the work more often. Nor is the version of the Breslau MS.
reasonable, for nowhere else is there evidence of the existence of such a brother. Probably שמעון should be identified as the brother of Rashi’s mother, who was also known as שמעון חיק, with whom Rashi studied Torah.¹⁸³ The comment on Hosea may fairly be supposed to be Kara’s own, and not the work of a pupil, and so the original allusion must have been נח, שמעון נח, and רבינה פון דניון then gave rise to two versions, for דניון was deciphered as דניון and the Breslau MS. דניון refers to Rashi, for Kara calls him this several times,¹⁸⁶ and so do his other pupils.¹⁸⁷

The text itself involves an exegetical disagreement. Does the verse allude to an historical event of the past or to the contemporary situation? Does נגר connote Jeroboam, son of Nebat, of Ephrat, or the Kingdom of Ephraim (Israel) in the time of the prophet? Kara agrees with the Targum in explaining that the Ephraimites and their deceitful behaviour are in question, and this is מושב של מקרא וה, which contains Midrashic traces. And why does he cite the gloss of ר שמעון, which contains Midrashic traces? Possibly because it is directed more towards the context, that is, to the sins of oppression and deception committed by Jeroboam son of Nebat.

3. R. Meir ben R. Yitzhak

In I Kings 10:28 Kara makes use of the work of this liturgical poet, whose commentary, like Kallir’s, is called יסוד. Helbo wrote a commentary on his liturgical poems which was apparently passed on to Kara, as he himself notes.¹⁸⁸
The comment is also cited by Rashi, with the rubric 'נין'. The issue involves the וְשֵׁן of the text, the meaning of the word הָעַרְמָה not being clear in context.

4. Rabbenu Saadiah
This commentator is mentioned only once, in Zech. 6:8, but Kara's commentary on the first eight verses of this chapter draw principally upon Rashi. It is not clear whether this is Rabbenu Saadiah הר'א or the Rabbi Saadiah who lived in France or Germany in the twelfth century. In invoking Saadiah Kara possibly follows Rashi, who explains the chariots as the kingdoms of Babylon, Persia and Greece. These rise and fall and serve as a whip against sinful Israel.

5. R. Yitzhak ben R. Elazar Halevi
This Sage is mentioned by Kara at I Kings 5:3. Here too the principle of הלוח המקראות leads Kara to give the preference to R. Yitzhak's comment, although he stands alone in holding the view in question. The word כֶּבֶרְוִים is universally translated and explained as birds of some type, but R. Yitzhak says that it refers to the שֵׁר הֵר (wild ox) inasmuch as the verse deals solely with animals, wild and domestic, and not with birds.

6. R. Yitzhak bar Asher Halevi
A Tosafist who was a pupil of Rashi, this Sage is mentioned twice in Kara's commentary upon Prophets, and Kara prefers the glosses which he heard from him to his own because they seem more nearly the וְשֵׁן of the text.
7. Rashbam (R. Shmuel ben Meir)

In the opinion of David Razin, Kara spent much time in Rashi's house, and it is possible that there he became acquainted with the younger Rashbam. Rashbam quotes Kara a number of times in his commentary. He remarks on Gen. 37:13, קְרָא וַתָּכְבֹּד מֵאִם יָדַעְתָּ הָאָרֶץ. at the end of his commentary on Gen. 24:60 he adds, קָרָא וַתָּכְבֹּד מֵאִם יָדַעְתָּ הָאָרֶץ; while in his comment on Num. 4:10 he rejects Kara's opinion with קָרָא וַתָּכְבֹּד מֵאִם יָדַעְתָּ הָאָרֶץ. Kara quotes from Rashbam in Job 11:17 and Amos 3:12. This is enough to show that they were friends and colleagues. Ahrend also claims that there is a considerable resemblance in the exegetical principles upon which they operate, and earlier Poznanski asserted that Kara's principle that the Bible may mention something which seems superfluous in its context in order to render comprehensible things which appear later is also found in Rashbam, and that Rashbam merely expands it. Despite the points in common displayed by their commentaries, however, we cannot know what relations obtained between them in life, although it seems that each read the other's work and it is possible that they also discussed it.

8. Sefer Josippon

Kara turns to Sefer Josippon four times. In Jud. 5:21 he writes: רָדַם שְׁנֵי אָמְרוֹת וַתִּפְרֹץ נִחּוֹלֵי צְמוּחִים נִמְלָא הָאָרֶץ; but I have not been able to find this passage in Sefer Josippon. In II Kings 20:13 he remarks: וְרָדַם כֵּסֶף יָסְפוּרִים פֶּנֶּה חֹזֵא אַפְרִיטָם; correlate this; compare also Ezek. 27:17 and Hag. 2:7. An
examination of Chapter 36, lines 92-97, and Chapter 45, lines 66-68, of Sefer Josippon shows that this is indeed a quotation from the work, which it itself borrows from Yosef ben Gurion. This enables us to conclude that Sefer Josippon was indeed available to Kara. 170

VI. Kara's Attitude to ותיר and ותיר: Some Notes

In their innocence, these French Sages made no attempt to conceal it if they found something which Ibn Ezra would call "a secret" and people today would turn from in horror as an invalid conception born of Bible Criticism. Not thus were these men, who were certain in their own minds that the truth could not confound their thought' (Geiger). 171 Kara's approach to the Biblical text certainly seems to be woven from clear thinking and a healthy mind, and to be under the control of a critical sense devoid of prejudice. He goes to trouble to search for exact texts, and compares versions. We are told of the Gibeonites that יולכ ויתנייר וותיר and Kara writes: רוח ספרים חפץ' בהר יותינייר ... אליול ילייל מבייאו ... ראות לבריט וול הפועלו אלא אולא, וס באחר הת phầnים שבלא, חמה תכוהה וולת אלקינו ... אול ליב' נוהת ארא תפרים שבח' חמה ויתנייר מברך הלמל מ الانترنت. It is in line with the principles of ותיר and context that he prefers ותיר. Another instance occurs in the Book of Ezekiel, 173 in the phrase ותיר ותיר והוא אל יהוה, ותיר ותיר ותירר. Kara says that there are books in which the word ותיר is missing and that this is appropriate to the context, and indeed Biblia Hebraica notes that there are about thirty manuscripts in which ותיר is absent. Elsewhere, in Jeremiah 25:3, the word ותיר appears
twice in a verse, and Kara suggests a search where on the second occasion might be written, and then the verse would be clearer. However, I have not found any evidence of such a reading. In Zechariah 14:5 we find וְנִשְׁמַט, and Kara notes that this is the text found in the land of Israel, but in books from Babylon the word is pointed וְנִשְׁמַט. The point cannot be resolved, he says, and so we see that two versions exist. In I Kings 6:34 he writes שְׁכַסֵּף מֹנֵהוּ... or again, on II Kings 15:8, ...שׁוּבָה אַתָּה שְׁפָרָה וַחֲזָא... It follows that Kara had available at least one text which varied a little from the one that we have today, and we may reasonably suggest that he had several such texts and that he made comparisons between them. He honours the tradition of the Sages but is not willing to accept it blindly, and makes his points delicately but firmly. According to the Talmud, for example, Samuel wrote the book which bears his name, Judges and Ruth, and Kara concurs, but he raises a question over the verse (I Sam. 9:9), and explains:

Thus he points out the difficulty and cites the solution of the Sages, but casts considerable doubt upon its correctness.

He is little concerned with questions of מַשְׁרוּת and at every point accepts what the Sages say, as in the case of the suspended in (Jud. 18:30), which Baba Bathra explains as a respectful device to conceal Moses'
The same is true as to instances of a certain form (I Sam. 3:13), where he says, הרוחה לא לומדת, כל המילים הללו часовיה. Elsewhere, on II Sam. 12:14, he says of this phenomenon, ישתרו机ון כל הכתובים (I Sam. 8:9), where the כרי is כרוי, and he explains in accordance with the that he comments on that he comments on, where the כרי comes to be understood... Here has the sense of hidden, for in his gloss on v. 12 he says,∂. how seems to him that it does not sit well with the content of a passage. In Josh. 13:3, following the Talmud, he notes of that when you count you find that there are in ancestry. The same is true as to instances of that when you count you find that there are in ancestry. as in (I Sam. 3:13), where he says, הרוחה לא לומדת, כל המילים הללו часовיה. Elsewhere, on II Sam. 12:14, he says of this phenomenon, ישתרו机ון כל הכתובים (I Sam. 8:9), where the כרי is כרוי, and he explains in accordance with the that he comments on, where the כרי comes to be understood... Here has the sense of hidden, for in his gloss on v. 12 he says,∂. how seems to him that it does not sit well with the content of a passage. In Josh. 13:3, following the Talmud, he notes of that when you count you find that there are in ancestry. The same is true as to instances of a certain form (I Sam. 3:13), where he says, הרוחה לא לומדת, כל המילים הללו часовיה. Elsewhere, on II Sam. 12:14, he says of this phenomenon, ישתרו机ון כל הכתובים (I Sam. 8:9), where the כери is כריי, and he explains in accordance with the that he comments on, where the כרי comes to be understood... Here has the sense of hidden, for in his gloss on v. 12 he says,∂. how seems to him that it does not sit well with the content of a passage. In Josh. 13:3, following the Talmud, he notes of that when you count you find that there are in ancestry.
fact six. The sixth, should be attached to the next verse, which now begins with the word מַלְתִּים. I Samuel 12:20 finishes with העבדתך אַתָּה כָּל לַבֵּכְךָ, and verse 21 starts with כל סומוכים Leben ולוף ונתירה לאמת. Kara says, כל תמרה יושר, and indeed the phrases appear in him as a continuous passage, with no break between the verses.

We see, then, that Kara accepts the dicta of the Sages, but does not hesitate to criticise them with regard to questions both of נוֹת and of the notes.

VII. Kara's Attitude to נוֹת: Some Notes

Kara regards נוֹת, which he calls ניקוד, as punctuation signs which mark the syntatic relations between words, so enabling us to understand the status of the various elements of the text, and fix the points where one must pause in reading. In a few isolated cases he treats the נוֹת as a guide to the chanting of a passage which also has a useful function in interpretation, as in Hosea 11:6. With regard to והבלת he says מַנוֹנָה זוּ נַעַתְנָה וַאֲשֶׁר תְּיוֹם הָעִבָּר - and so in other instances. On two occasions he goes much further and says that the prophet shortened or lengthened what he had to say in order to fit it to the chant: וְהָשָׁה שְׁכָנִי פְּעָמִים בְּדַמִּיָּה - and so in other instances. Like some of his contemporaries, he tries to offer interpretations that are in accordance with נוֹת, except for a few cases where it is apparent that he does not agree with the arrangement of the נוֹת. Only four נוֹת are mentioned by him: Only four נוֹת are mentioned by him: נוֹת}. All indicate a firm break, called by Kara אֲמָרְיֵי We shall
look at a few examples. When Gideon is ordered to take

It follows from the above that טעמי המקרא are an aid to
him in future interpretation, as he himself acknowledges: פשרות של מקרא אינן גורו כמפורים, שני, דברים א挞 ש⇐affles והמכרות בדוקות ההיגדרז. In another place, Isa. 2:20, he says, [the vocalisations and accents were provided to assist interpretation]. In three places he apparently disagrees with the decision of the accentuator but does not specifically name the טעמי המקרא, dealing only with the division of the verse. In I Sam. 20:26 we read על או מבאר ומפור אותם כי אם מקרא צוה בלתיしてしまう, על שם, and Kara says that על כז לא יהיה, והנה ידם, the next phrase is על כז לא יהיה, והנה ידם. This means that he does not accept the division made by the accentuator, who designates על כז sebagai a complete phrase. There are similar instances in II Sam. 20:4 and 23:3. We may say in general, then, that his approach to טעמי המקרא is one of respect, but that he is prepared to reject the accentuator's arrangement of the text if it seems to be at odds with the sense.
I have found two anomalous cases. In II Sam. 3:34 the word נַכְפּוֹלָהּ אָוֶּם is accented with a תּוּכָּר, but Kara comments נַכְפּוֹלָהּ אָוֶּם אֵשֶׁת שֵׁיַּמָּה. His interpretation rests upon this נַכְפּוֹלָהּ אָוֶּם אֵשֶׁת שֵׁיַּמָּה, which is not to be found in our texts, so that either a different version was available to him or he is simply in error. In Isa. 1:7 the word שלְּאֵדִיתְךָ נָהָרָבִים is accented with a יִמּוֹלָה above the כ, but according to Kara שלְּאֵדִיתְךָ נָהָרָבִים is no longer extant.
Conclusion

At the end of the eleventh century, and more particularly in the twelfth century, a significant shift occurred among the Jews of northern France in the sphere of Biblical exegesis. Until this time, the Sages had been principally concerned with Talmudic study and with midrashic commentary upon a number of Biblical books. In the period under discussion, however, the Jewish world in general began to display a marked inclination to interpret the Bible in a methodical manner which dealt in succession with each book.

In the present study we have examined the exegesis of a figure who belongs to this period, Rabbi Yosef Kara, with regard to three main issues: his exegetical approach, his attitude towards and and his relation towards his predecessors. From his treatment of various verses a practical sense of the first can be obtained, while the frequently paedagogic character of his mode of argument suggests an explanation for it.

In his note on I Kings 8:8, Kara makes a bold declaration as to the validity of his commentary in terms:

What makes this passage remarkable is its sheer length and the variety of terms employed by Kara to characterise his commentary (these have been discussed above). The phrase connotes what he regards as the proper kind of commentary, in addition to describing it as in style, while is a polemic against
those with different views.

Like other commentators of the period, he makes use of various terms derived from the root כֶ'ש in order to define the nature and aim of exegesis. A good commentary is that which offers help in solving difficulties presented by the text and מַכְּלָא על אָפְגוּלוּ that is to say, is appropriate to the context. The phrase פִּשַׁע indicates that the meaning of the text is achieved when there is a complete accord with the sense which arises from the words - which includes the part they play within the scene described and the conceptual context.

One of Kara's innovations in his commentary is his devotion to נִּיְלָּחַת סֵי המַכְּדָּרָא, as he says on I Samuel 21:4. The term נִיְלָּחַת refers to the content and fundamental conception of a passage or verse, while נִיְלָּחַת involves a concern with the inner dynamics of a passage and the flow from one verse to another; it is complemented by the term סֵי המַכְּדָּרָא, which is applied to the order in which things occur and the textual environment. It is punctilious attention to this 'order' which, in Kara's view, makes it possible to offer a commentary which is well-founded with regard to chronological issues.

Kara's innovatory concern with נִיְלָּחַת emerges as one of the most characteristic lines of approach in his commentary. Clarifications of the order of events and the links between passages abound. His commentary itself does not pause at one סֵי or another, but forms a continuous composition which moves with the text and accompanies it like...
its shadow. His serves as his criterion for a commentary, as he himself explains in a number of places; on occasion he clarifies lengthy passages and even entire chapters in such terms. He displays a clear preference for considering the general sense of the text rather than the individual phrases of, his motive being the wish to arrive at a true and comprehensive interpretation.

Another significant innovation made by Kara in connection with textual continuity and its interpretation is his interest in ‘anticipations’ and concern. He will note that a particular verse in a passage has been placed there on a given point, and usually he explains what might cause bewilderment were it omitted. In his many dealings in this area of exegesis he also notes that wherever there is a later narrative with regard to which the reader may subsequently be puzzled, the passage at present under discussion raises the point earlier on, in an apparently superfluous phrase.

The examination of Kara's attitude to the is made relatively straightforward by his paedagogical approach, which leads him to make appeals to his students or readers and to outline and explain his exegetical views; his attention to the means that he devotes space to accounting for his interpretations and defining them as the of the text.

Kara appears to have possessed an extremely mature and considered conception of the nature of, as his use of a wide range of terms indicates. In his view, may be achieved by the careful use of a number of exegetical
methods. That he does not provide an abstract definition of \( \mathcal{U} \) is not to be regarded as a deficiency in him, for the period of which we are speaking had not arrived at the notion of such definitions; instead, we find a variety of terms and expressions which in combination supply the sense required.

Scholars are agreed that among the commentators of northern France in the period, Kara stands out both for his efforts to achieve a \( \mathcal{U} \) commentary and for his explicit statements on the subject. His commentaries contain a series of declarations that the \( \mathcal{U} \) is to be preferred, and very frequently that it is the sole view to be taken. Here he differs greatly from Rashi, not only because the latter's commentary includes a not insignificant proportion of midrashic interpretation but because Rashi occasionally ranks the Midrash as equal if not superior to the \( \mathcal{U} \). Kara displays both exegetical independence and a conscious deployment of exegetical devices, and he founds his commentary on a harmony with the text.

His dealings with Midrash also involve an innovation. As far as he is concerned, the function of Midrash (and he was acquainted with the bulk of Midrashic literature) is to embellish the Biblical text, and nothing more. He goes so far as to liken those who maintain a midrashic view to drowning men clutching at a straw, or calls the Aggada \( \mathcal{Z} \). He makes use of Midrash only in order to settle the few difficulties which cannot be resolved in \( \mathcal{U} \) terms. Even on these occasions, as Ahrend points out, the Midrash functions as a supplement to the \( \mathcal{U} \), so that Kara is not guilty of inconsistency. As we have already noted, he attacks \( \mathcal{Y} \).
commentary frontally and in the most unambiguous language, indicating the error of such an approach and his determination to eschew it himself.

A fair picture of the relationship between יהוה and יהושע may be obtained if we look at the spirit of the period and its characteristic modes of study. In the twelfth century intellectuals were concerned with establishing the correct balance between traditional authority and human understanding and reason. Widespread searches were made for exact texts of the Scriptures, and a marked interest was taken in the grammar and style of Biblical Hebrew and in the connection between topics in the text. These issues form precisely the commentator's field of endeavour, and the general intellectual tendency of the age is reflected in the exegetical attempt to fix the relationship between יהוה (representing traditional authority) and יהושע (the authority of human reason). Kara was one of those who professed the new principles, and his repudiation of יהוה is clearly stated. It should be noted that when he is engaged in the actual business of interpretation he is not always able to put his principles into practice, and has to be content with declaring his sympathy for the modern approach. It is mostly in key texts that he is careful to act upon his declarations, while on other occasions he may compromise and (for various reasons) cite a midrashic explanation alongside the יהוה.

In Kara's view, then, מֶשֶׁגֶגְעַנְתָּן של מקרא is achieved by attending to a number of points: context, meaning, grammar, order of events, style, anticipations, juxtapositions, and so forth. He is aware of his limitations, admits it when he can
find no explanation, and would modestly have agreed with Rashi in the desire - which represented the spiritual tendency of the period - which represented the spiritual tendency of the period.

On this point, Kara does not resemble a person struggling for exegetical liberty. In many respects the bonds of the Midrash are already behind him, and in citing and grappling with Midrashim he acts not out of compulsion but out of the duty to take his predecessors' work into account and his respect for the Torah which has nourished him and enabled him to take further steps forward. Almost the sole subjection he feels is towards the Biblical text itself. It is he who made the great leap and (together with Rashbam) inaugurated a new exegetical school in twelfth-century northern France.

His distinctive quality lies not only in his advanced conception of spirituality but also in his exegetical approach in general. In the course of his commentary he frequently adopts the first person and addresses the reader in the second person, while everywhere else his work strikes an objective note, neither writer nor reader intruding upon its discussion of difficulties. The main function of his first-person formulations is to give weight to his own as against other people's opinions, while his use of second-person address may reflect the influence of his work as a teacher and the style of argument found in certain parts of Talmudic literature. To his mind (and here again he was the first to think so), anything mentioned in the text is there for the purpose of providing the reader with information necessary to comprehension. He therefore himself issues instructions to
his audience phrased in terms that draw on roots like נְעָר, קְרָר, צְרָר, וְלָה"ז and so on, whose force is that of a teacher's directions to his pupils to note, infer or conclude.

Another most noticeable characteristic which is peculiar to Kara is the series of passages in which, in a variety of phrases, he acknowledges his inability to provide an explanation, his situation ranging from a partial or conditional uncertainty to complete bafflement. Unlike Rashi, who in every one of the few places in which he admits ignorance is defeated by linguistic problems, a rare word or a difficult root, Kara's declarations form a standard feature of his commentary that offers permanent testimony to his integrity and humility. At the same time, passages abound in which he conducts himself like his contemporaries and with remarkable skill fits into his commentary entire verses or parts of verses. He also makes marked use of vernacular phrases, his work as a teacher in a French-speaking country explaining his adoption of this exegetical device.

He shows hardly any interest in providing general introductions to the Biblical books or in questions of editing and so forth. In this he is typical of mediaeval commentators, but he also displays a highly developed literary grasp. His commentary shows a sensitivity to the style of verses and the ways in which they are combined - what he calls נְצֵיבִית הַכְּרָרִי הָעִם; to the structure of Biblical works; to parallelism, particular linguistic formulations, the repetition of words and concepts, and מַקְרָא צְלָר, with regard to which he defines the issues posed by an elliptical
style. He distinguishes between informative, time-fixing verses and the body of a narrative, and between genealogical lists and accounts of someone's life, and (among other points) provides discussions of parable (ऐवम) and metaphor. In many places he must compare the different versions of an event found within a single book or in two different books in order to show that in most cases they can be harmonised.

The intensity with which he clarifies points of realia and other technical issues turns him into a precursor of the trends in study and research characteristic of later periods. In this respect he deviates from the standards of his time and differs greatly from Rashi and other commentators, who may occasionally touch on such questions but do not make a practice of it. He deals with issues connected with geography and borders, the parts and dimensions of the Sanctuary, domestic economy and agriculture, construction and medicine, war and armies, kings and courts, and chronology, displaying throughout expertise and an interesting grasp of the actual.

Like every other commentator, he drew both consciously and unconsciously upon earlier exegetical traditions like those represented by the two Talmuds and the Aramaic Targumim, grammarians and his predecessors in Biblical interpretation, as well as upon the work of his contemporaries. A detailed comparison between his work and Rashi's, with an analysis of their methods, indicates that his commentary is an independent creation marked by features in no way suggested by Rashi. The two authors influenced each other and the remarks of one may be found as an integral part of the commentary of the other, but there is no question of Kara's
work being dependent upon Rashi's. Kara also derived a great deal from his uncle, Helbo, some of whose interpretations are contained in his commentary.

His concern with questions of מִיתָן requires special note. He makes use of parallel versions (Josh. 9:4; II Kings 22:4; Jer. 25:13) and does not prefer one or another text simply because it is supported by the Masoretes, but is willing to consider the possibility that the version before him has not been transmitted with precision.

Kara is remarkable for the way in which his commentary distinguishes and defines elements (or their first beginnings) which have become the cornerstones of modern exegesis. He is an independent commentator and the leader of other כוועו commentators, with a distinctive style and an innovativeness which means that in many respects he was ahead of his generation. His commentary deserves study and would repay publication.
### Appendix

**Abbreviations in Kara's Commentaries***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 24:23</td>
<td>אומנות העולמים</td>
<td>הא&quot;ע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 23:11</td>
<td>אהר-כד</td>
<td>הא&quot;כ (והוא&quot;כ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Sam. 22:3</td>
<td>אלקים</td>
<td>הא&quot;ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 8:33; 22:20</td>
<td>אולפי פים</td>
<td>על&quot;פ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 11:18</td>
<td>אולפי פים</td>
<td>על&quot;פ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 37:18</td>
<td>אפליים</td>
<td>על&quot;פ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Sam. 21:19</td>
<td>בֵּית המקדש</td>
<td>בֵּית המקדש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 9:5</td>
<td>בָּלשׁוֹר עֵם זֶר</td>
<td>בָּלשׁוֹר עֵם זֶר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal. 1:2</td>
<td>בְּעַלְתָּה</td>
<td>בְּעַלְתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal. 1:2</td>
<td>בְּעַלְתָּה</td>
<td>בְּעַלְתָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Kings 5:12</td>
<td>בְּנֵי ישׂראל</td>
<td>בְּנֵי ישׂראל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Kings 20:4</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הוֹוֶל</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הוֹוֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 22:4</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הוֹוֶל</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הוֹוֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 9:27</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הָהֹוֶל</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הָהֹוֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 5:19</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הָהֹוֶל</td>
<td>בְּנֵי הָהֹוֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Sam. 22:24</td>
<td>המקדש ברוכ חוא</td>
<td>המקדש ברוכ חוא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 7:11</td>
<td>המקדש ברוכ חוא</td>
<td>המקדש ברוכ חוא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. 14:9</td>
<td>המ&quot;ר</td>
<td>המ&quot;ר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This list follows S. Ashkenazi and D. Yarden, eds., *Otzar Rashei Tevoth* (Jerusalem 1973). References are generally to the first appearance of each abbreviation.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 6:28</td>
<td>חכמינו</td>
<td>כ&quot;א</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Sam. 6:1</td>
<td>ישראל</td>
<td>כ&quot;ב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 5:13</td>
<td>כדמותנו</td>
<td>כ&quot;ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 13:25</td>
<td>כדמותנו</td>
<td>כ&quot;ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 17:39</td>
<td>כל הראות</td>
<td>כ&quot;ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 8:30, 33</td>
<td>כמוה אפר; 30 כמות</td>
<td>כ&quot;ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 9:9</td>
<td>כומר</td>
<td>כ&quot;ז</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 14:4</td>
<td>כומר</td>
<td>כ&quot;ח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 1:31</td>
<td>transposed</td>
<td>כ&quot;ט</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Kings 15:5</td>
<td>as above</td>
<td>כ&quot;י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 4:9</td>
<td>כמי שוחב להשתתף</td>
<td>כ&quot;יא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 9:27</td>
<td>כהנ</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 13:21</td>
<td>לבוד</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 23:22</td>
<td>ל핀</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 25:9</td>
<td>מתחרים</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Kings 17:9</td>
<td>ו&quot;א</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Kings 11:27</td>
<td>ו&quot;א</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 2:22</td>
<td>על את התמדה</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Sam. 19:21</td>
<td>על את התמדה</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 8:27</td>
<td>עבידה אח</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 7:5</td>
<td>עבידה אח</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 11:4</td>
<td>פלוג</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 13:21</td>
<td>מצירת</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 13:21</td>
<td>פורתון/פורתון</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 10:13</td>
<td>פורתון/פורתון</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 2:21</td>
<td>פורתון/פורתון</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 10:13</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 7:6</td>
<td>רבגון של עלו</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 8:33</td>
<td>שואמה</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 14:10</td>
<td>שוגים</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Sam. 1:5</td>
<td>תירבעי, תירבעי</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 9:16</td>
<td>תולוד לומר</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 14:6</td>
<td>תרגות</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 3:22</td>
<td>תרגות</td>
<td>כ&quot;יב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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14. Kara quotes the glossed phrase as הבנחת משלות אדומים הראות, which is erroneous.
15. Here we can discern the difference between Rashi and Kara, and Kara's advance upon Rashi, in relation to the critical analysis of Scripture.
16. His rejection of the Sages in Jud. 5:4, critical but delicately expressed, should also be noted: ואכן, אשים את הירח, which is erroneous.
18. See Gelles, op. cit., p. 130.
19. According to Geiger, Parshandatha, Hebrew sect., p. 26, " should appear here (it is missing in Apenstein), and the later should be be עלית, which is erroneous. There are some other differences: for example, the word מתי of I Kings 7:33 should be מתי, and in I Kings 8:8, should read read see the texts in question).
20. I Kings 16:26, at on, מתי montage, and in I Kings 13:21; and see Josh. 24:27; I Kings 8:2. In these instances the Targum Jonathan is pure ש"ד.
28. There is one instance, II Sam. 22:38, in which a Midrash is placed between two interpretations.
29. For comparable passages see Isa. 64:1 (מייס תונעת) and Job 14:19 (ונכד פעל ותלפוק).
30. The root יָרָד is an active verb only in the Piel (Josh. 7:3) or Hifil conjugations (Isa. 43:23, 24; Mal. 2:17).
31. כְּפָּר (those who rise up against me) = enemies. See Exod. 15:7; II Sam. 18:31; Ps. 3:2; etc.
32. And note Y. Heinmann, Darchei HaAggadah (Jerusalem 1954), pp. 28-32.
33. I Kings 13:1: הקרך מוהל ני is Ido the prophet; I Sam. 4:12: יְנַח is Saul; Mal. 3:23: דֵּשָּׁה is Elijah.
34. II Sam. 12:30; and note Avodah Zarah 44a. An additional example: I Sam. 21:7.
36. Mavo, p. xxxv.
38. Mavo, p. xvi.
39. He then offers examples from the Prophetic Books and Job (Mavo, p. xxxv). Kara himself uses the expression כל יזרא עָלָה (see Jer. 15:6, 8).
40. See also verse 15 and Jud. 5:15, 16.
41. I Sam. 13:17: the word כְּפָר appears only in v. 23 and in 16:14, where he explains part of verse 13 so as to create a unified topic. Compare II Sam. 4:8, where he explains part of v. 6. II Sam. 21:1 is explained only at v. 4; and 22:7 at v. 5.
42. Other examples: Isa. 58:14; Jer. 12:3; Hos. 4:6; Zech. 5:6; Mal. 2:9. Tyre is compared to the sea in Isa. 23:4.
43. Commenting on Isa. 42:1, Abarbanel identifies the prophet as Ibn Ezra, Cyrus as Saadiah Gaon and the Messiah as Rashi.
44. Isa. 40:3; Jer. 2:5, 9; Job 23:16-17.
46. Isa. 2:1; 39:8; 42:3; and see Kristianpuller, Likutim Miperushei R. Yosef Kara, and A. Epstein, Hahoker, p. 31.
47. Additional examples: Isa. 29:17; Hos. 6:5; 13:5.
48. Everywhere the phrases כל יזרא עָלָה or הֶעָרָז עַלָּם (in ed. S. Babar), and other instances are repeated.
49. In Isa. 37:31 he says, ...ומתָּו עַלּוֹתָו לֵלֶם שַׁיָּא כִּי.
50. See further Isa. 26:7; 34:4; Jer. 48:12; Hos. 2:7; Mic. 4:1.
52. He writes on Hos. 2:7, and see Joel 1:10.

53. Compare II Sam. 22:16; and note I Sam. 25:11. See A. Berliner, Peletath Sofrim, on this verse. See also I Kings 5:32; Isa. 22:16; 28:7; Ezek. 27:9; Joel 3:3. It is possible that Rashi too was aware of this approach (see Isa. 52:12), if we assume that phrases from Kara have not been interpolated into Rashi's commentary. In any case it is clear that Rashbam learned the technique from Kara. See Y. Razin, Perush HaRashbam Hashalem (Breslau 1882), note 12.


56. See further Gen. 26:15-17; Jud. 3:17, 22; 15:1, 5; I Sam. 1:9, 14; 3:1, 10; 28:3, 5; I Kings 18:3, 12; II Kings 17:1, 3.


58. On this point, Poznanski comments (Mavo, p. xvi), that the phrase נלך הליכה in Rashi's use does not have its customary sense, and it is likely that it is an addition of Kara's. See Peletath Sofrim, p. 17.

59 See also Gen. 9:18 (יהוה ונהו).

60. Gen. 1:1; 9:18; 24:1; 25:1, 28; etc. For a detailed list, see Melamed, Mefarshei Hamikra, vol. 1, pp. 461-464; and Poznanski, Mavo, p. xvi.

61. This way of formulating the point is typical of Kara, as we have remarked. In another instance (Gen. 19:15), we find והם צדקו כלנו; see Gen. 25:28, 50:27; and also Jer. 3:15, 18; Hos. 2:17-18; Joel 2:20; Amos 9:13; Mic. 4:1; Zech. 1:15; Mal. 3:12.


63. Berachoth 10a; Yevamoth 4a; Midrash Sifri on פיך, para. 131.

64. Exod. 17:1; Num. 13:1.

65. And note Isa. 2:1; 11:13 (an opposite example is to be found in Isa. 33:23); and also Jer. 3:15, 18; Hos. 2:17-18; Joel 2:20; Amos 9:13; Mic. 4:1; Zech. 1:15; Mal. 3:12.

66. Le Commentaire, pp. 8, 9.


68. A. Twyto, Al Heker Parshanuth Hamikra..., p. 524.

69. Twyto points out that a parallel development occurred among Christians. See his 'Shitato Parshanim shel Rashbam', pp. 61-63. To my mind the suggestion made by Gelles, op. cit., p. 130 (see n. 17, above), that the dual value given by Kara to מַעַל is a consequence of two schools of influence, operative in his youth and in adulthood respectively, should not be accepted.

70. I Sam. 1:20; and see Josh. 17:16, where Kara appeals to מַעַל.

71. Perhaps these are also מַעַל לְבֵל (Rashbam on Deut. 7:7). See Ahrend, Le Commentaire, p. 6, n. 48.

72. See Rashbam on this point (Gen. 37:2).

73. Lev. 13:2. Gelles claims that in theory Kara's position regarding מַעַל is more radical than Rashbam's (Peshat and Derash, p. 133).
74. And see his comment on Gen. 37:2.
75. Al Heker Parshanut Hamikra, p. 526.
78. A comparable view was expressed at the beginning of this century by A. H. Weiss, in Dor Dor Vedorshav (Vienna 1911); and cf. Kara on II Sam. 21:4.
80. Ibid., p. 109.
81. S. Kamin, p. 137; she adds that Rashi has no specific term to denominate an interpretation which is not ליל ינשנ
82. Ibid., p. 195.
83. Ibid., p. 196.
84. This is derived from Kara's use of the word. Just as we have seen that he uses the phrase סנור פקק, so we find ינשנ in the same sense (Jud. 1:3; I Sam. 10:22; I Kings 10:7; 20:7).
85. There is a consensus that Kara borrowed from Rashi the term פсетנ and the root ינשנ (see the discussion, below, and Gelles, Peshat and Derash, p. 132, n. 22, and also p. 14 ff.).
86. S. Kamin, p. 292.
87. Compare Kara's remark, הובב לישב ומכ国土资源 והאנדרטאות לילשנ (Jud. 4:5) with Rashi on Gen. 3:8: בדורי, המקרא דבר מה לשנף לילשנ פקק את האיים. The word ינשנ connotes the Biblical manner and language, as in (I Sam. 25:18) ומכ国土资源 ולילשנ פקק (I Sam. 2:10; and see Prov. 1:6).
88. Compare 5:11, 13. It is worth noting that in three adjacent verses he uses similar language; this is the sort of thing that happens when someone is lecturing. For an analogous case, see his remarks on I Kings 8:2 and v. 8.
89. S. Kamin, p. 299.
90. Gen. 25:17; 46:8; Exod. 6:14; etc.
94. On the topic of kingship, see Midrash Tanchuma, Leviticus (ed. Babar), sect. 2, p. 4.
95. See A. Y. Aigos (Biographical Note, above, n. 29), p. 131.
96. For an allusion to a Midrash associated with this topic, see Midrash Samuel, ed. S. Babar, p. 44.
100. Jud. 5:26, from Genesis Rabba, chap. 48 (ed. H. Albeck); I Sam. 7:9, from Midrash Samuel, p. 83; II Sam. 10:16, from

101. Jud. 11:22, from Gittin 36a; I Sam. 14:45, from Eruvin 81b; II Sam. 2:23, from Sanhedrin 49a; I Kings 7:23, from Baba Bathra 14b.

102. In the Midrash: Josh. 22:7, from Genesis Rabba chap. 35; I Sam. 25:18, from Genesis Rabba chap. 69. In the Talmud: I Sam. 4:19, from Bechoroth 45a; II Sam. 14:26, from Nazir 4b-5a; etc.

103. Section נִפָּי, sect. 19. The Midrash explains the parable and its meaning together, at length; Kara condenses the relevant part and omits the rest.

104. Jud. 11:26, from Seder Olam, chap. 12 (ed. B. Rattner); I Sam. 1:17, from Midrash Samuel, p. 52; II Sam. 24:1, from Pesikta Rabbathi 43a (ed. M. Ish-Shalom). From the Talmud: Jud. 5:21, from Pesahim 118b; Jud. 13:5, from Niddah 30b; etc.


106. I Sam. 22:4, from Tanchuma, Numbers 28; I Kings 7:51, from Yalkut Shimeoni, sect. 186. From the Talmud: Jud. 14:14, from Kethuvoth 2a; I Sam. 1:11, from Nazir 66a; II Sam. 3:27, from Sanhedrin 49a.

107. The Mechilta of Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai (ed. Epstein and Melamed); it should read יהושע 'נ and not נוּי 'נ. See the Jerusalem Talmud, Pesachim 34a.

108. Tanchuma on נִפָּי, sect. 25.


110. II Sam. 21:5, from Genesis Rabba, sect. 40; 24:9 from Midrash Samuel, sect. 30, end (in Kara the Midrash is several times longer; see also v. 15); II Kings 9:29, from Seder Olam, chap. 17; 25:27, from Seder Olam, chap. 28.

111. From the beginning of נִפָּי, in Josh. 22:19; and see S. Apenstein ad loc., n. 6.

112. I Sam. 7:9; and see Midrash Samuel, p. 83; Leviticus Rabba 22:9 (ed. M. Margalioth).

113. I Sam. 25:18; and see D. Z. Hoffmann, Mechilta DeRabbi Shimon ben Yochai (Frankfurt a.M. 1905), p. 12 and the notes there. Elsewhere (I Kings 8:12), when Kara says, מְלָכִי, it appears that he means the Mechilta of Rabbi Ishmael, which is also called 'Sifri'; and see Apenstein, p. 128, n. 7. Compare Hoffmann, x. All this shows that these works were available to Kara, which is an important piece of information.

114. And see Jerusalem Talmud Pesachim 34a. The references to the book in Kara's commentary should be added to Hoffmann's work (n. 113, above), to chap. 1, pp. v, viii.

115. II Sam. 24:15, from Midrash Shocher Tov, lyric 17; Berachoth 62a.

116. I Kings 22:17 directs us to the Mechilta for what is not to be found there; and Josh. 11:21 similarly directs us in vain to the Talmud.

117. I Kings 17:6; Kara produces two opinions, only one of which appears in Sanhedrin 113a.

118. As in Josh. 22:7 and most instances in the Early Prophets. Out of about 110 instances in the Early Prophets in which he cites a Midrash, in only about 35 cases does he mention the source; and of about 150 Midrashic citations
in the Latter Prophets, the source is given in only about 40 cases.

119. As we have noted, Twyto's view is to be rejected here (Al Heker Parshanuth Hamikra, p. 525).

120. The name of the Midrash is given in I Kings 17:18; Isa. 21:15.

121. Compare מְדוּרָת הַכְּפִים (Jud. 6:1; Isa. 15:1); (Isa. 55:4).

122. Compare אֲמָרוּ רַבּוּתִינוּ or מְדוּרָת שְׁמֵרֵי (I Sam. 4:12) or סֶפֶךְ רַבּוּתִינוּ (II Sam. 12:12, and before the collection of Midrashim in Isa. 45:8).

123. Compare עלָמָה וְלָשׁוֹן (II Sam. 19:21; Isa. 43:22).

124. Jud. 11:26; Isa. 19:18; and in various combinations like כל הָיוֹת שְׁמוֹנָה (Josh. 15:8); כל שְׁמוֹנָה (I Sam. 1:22); כל שְׁמוֹנָה (I Sam. 10:22; Jer. 52:6); כל שְׁמוֹנָה (I Sam. 2:27; Isa. 37:36); כל שְׁמוֹנָה (I Kings 15:22);


126. Or נִיטּוּרֹתֵנוּ (Hos. 1:1, 2).

127. Or נִיטּוּרֹתֵנוּ (Jud. 8:28), or נִיטּוּרֹתֵנוּ (Mic. 5:1).


132. Josh. 15:8 (ed. Schechter); Hag. 2:16.

133. I Kings 7:16 (ed. Gruenhut).


135. There are many more references in the Early Prophets, and 9 in the Latter Prophets, as in Isa. 16:4.

136. In the edition of D. Z. Hoffmann; and note I Sam. 25:18. The Mechilta of Rabbi Ishmael should perhaps be mentioned as well; see above, n. 113.


139. Midrash Zuta al Hamesh Megilloth, ed. S. Babar.

140. For example: Sota, Berachoth, Temurah, Gittin, Niddah, Megillah, Nazir, Baba Kama, Zevechim, Moed Katan. On occasion Kara quotes from the Talmud without making his source clear; see Josh. 11:21; I Sam. 7:9; II Sam. 16:10, II Kings 1:17.
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2. Josh. 9:9; Isa. 5:9.
5. Josh. 9:4; I Kings 6:34.
6. This argumentative style may reflect a method of teaching through questions which developed during this period. See A. Twyto, "Shitato Naparshanit shel Rashbam," pp. 60-61.
7. Jud. 5:23; Isa. 9:13; and in the combinations of the verbs הָיָה and והיָה in Isa. 1:18 and והיָה והיָה in Jer. 36:23.
18. II Sam. 12:30; Jonah 1:3 (בָּעָלָת בְּעָרִים).
19. II Sam. 4:8; Isa. 19:22.
22. II Kings 7:23; I Sam. 10:12, 13, 15, 16, 20.
23. I Sam. 13:21; II Sam. 23:5.
27. I Sam. 3:3; Isa. 1:28, 5:9, 11; and especially 18:7: זָהַבְתָה לְבַדָּה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל.
28. Josh. 2:17; and in Isa. 37:31, ...וְהָשֹּׁמֶר לְאִי צֶרֶם וְאַשְׁרָה ...
29. Josh. 11:8; Isa. 63:19; in 16:1 we read, לִשְׁמֹעַ וְתָלְךָ לִבְּךָ עַל עִקְּרֵי אֲמַלֶּת.
31. I Sam. 1:17; I Kings 1:5, 8; and note Isa. 8:4, 4; וַאֲלֵהוּ לַקְּרָב לְעִמָּם לִפְרָט לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
32. I Kings 7:33; and see Jer. 50:11 for more opposition to Rashi.
33. I Kings 7:15, 16; Ezek. 21:20.
34. I Kings 8:2; also II Kings 19:25.
35. Isa. 34:16; similarly 2:22.
36. II Sam. 21:4; or עַד כְּנַי פֹּחָת, לְאִי אַחְרֵי אֲמַלֶּת הָנָבָאָה (Isa. 1:15).
51:9).
38. I Sam. 13:21, on Helbo's gloss.
40. II Sam. 8:18; see Isa. 22:24 for slightly different phrasing.
41. I Kings 6:34; Jer. 7:31 (this contradicts his gloss on II Kings 23:10).
42. I Kings 18:29.
43. II Kings 9:27; Josh. 17:5.
44. Josh. 17:5; Jud. 8:18; Isa. 3:24.
45. I Sam. 10:22; Ezek. 29:1, 21.
46. This is the only time that the word 'שלם appears in Kara's commentary; note I Kings 22:21; Isa. 15:1.
47. Where topics follow one another rapidly: Jud. 10:8; Isa. 1:25.
48. II Sam. 22:7-12; Isa. 22:16; or 'פלש ונהלך (Jer. 11:15).
49. I Kings 1:7, and note 6-8; Jer. 50:11.
50. Josh. 16:6; 'שניש וך (v. 8).
51. I Sam. 13:7; Isa. 27:1, on his commentary to Job.
52. I Sam. 1:3 on Gen. 26:15, and note A. Berliner, Peletath Sofrim, p. 15, and II Kings 25:17.
53. Or in the abbreviated form 'כלו (I Sam. 14:43) or ' הכלו (I Sam. 14:41; Jer. 2:3).
54. II Sam. 7:23, and note I Sam. 1:17 (היה חוק ואחר פשה), and Eccles. 8:1.
55. Harikmah, p. 352 (ed. M. Vilenski), and also Sefer Hashorashim, pp. 414-416 (ed. B. Z. Becher).
56. II Kings 11:2; I Kings 10:28; and note Isa. 24:22.
59. I Sam. 1:3; 10:12; II Sam. 8:18; 23:1. Jer. 49:19 (but this is rare in the Latter Prophets).
60. I Kings 16:9; Isa. 23:13 (פְּרָצוּ הַמִּשׁאָרִים).
61. I Kings 2:5 on Rashi; Hag. 2:15.
62. See the section in Chapter 3, below, on Kara's relationship to the various commentators.
63. Josh. 10:13 (בֹּקָלָם חַסְרֵי; Hos. 4:17.
64. I Sam. 1:17; רַעְלַך כַּתָּמִל (I Sam. 16:12); שֵׁתְפָאֵר (I Sam. 1:17; Isa. 1:28).
65. I Sam. 1:1; Jer. 8:23 (דְּרֵאֵי בְּפָרָנָה חַסְרֵי).
66. I Sam. 1:11; Jer. 22:28 (.EqualTo פְּרָצוּ הַמִּשׁאָרִים).
67. II Sam. 5:21; or 'לְפָרָנָה (I Sam. 4:19; Isa. 8:4).
68. Gen. 40:5, 8, 12, 16, 18, 22; 41:11, 12, 13, 15.
70. For additional terms in other books of the Bible, see M. Ahrend, Perush Rabbi Yosef Kara: Sefer Iyov, pp. 163 ff. See also the Appendix, below, on abbreviations and shortened forms in Kara's commentary.
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74. Note also I Sam. 17:39.
75. In explaining the singular and plural he exemplifies the rules from other passages.
76. II Sam. 24:12; and see the section on the Early Prophets and Chronicles, below.
77. Jud. 1:8 in comparison with II Sam. 5:6-8.
78. Josh. 8:29; the quotation is from Deut. 21:23.
79. Josh. 9:4; the quotation is from Deut. 20:10.
80. I Kings 10:26; the quotation is from Deut. 17:16.
81. I Kings 10:28; the quotation is from Deut. 17:16.
82. The quotation is from Deut. 11:25.
83. Josh. 10:8; 14:9; 18:1; II Sam. 16:22; Isa. 16:14, and note 37:36; Ezek. 4:6.
84. Jud. 5:11; the quotation is from Gen. 49:23. Cf. Jud. 5:13; De 7
85. I Sam. 4:8; II Sam. 13:5 (_APPLICATION); I Sam. 31:12 (APPLICATION).
86. Jud. 1:18: _On the way_ he should be _in the way_. I Sam. 1:1 should be _is in the way_. II Sam. 22:44: he should be _to the King_. Isa. 40:21: he should be _an angel_.
87. In Josh. 18:1 he quotes from Deut. 12:10, 11; the word _is_ missing. In Josh. 15:2, 3 he quotes from a previous chapter (3:16). More than half the verse is missing, apparently because of the repetition of the word שֵׁדֵד. In I Kings 5:4 he quotes from I Chronicles 22:9; three words are missing.
88. I Sam. 7:2, quoting from Ps. 68:60; Hos. 12:5, quoting from Gen. 32:27-28.
89. I Sam. 26:5, quoting from Deut. 20:5-7; Jer. 51:39, quoting from Daniel 5:1 ff.
90. Apenstein suggests in a note that he may have had Jud. 20:38 or 40 in mind.
91. M. Banitte, "Ha-"Laazim" shel Rashi vesheh "Sifrei Hapithronoth" Hatzarfatim Lamikra', Hahistorah shel Am Yisrael, vol. 2, Tekufath HaOfel (Tel Aviv 1973), pp. 170 ff. A brief examination of Kara will confirm that the word _is_ usually follows the vernacular term and only rarely precedes it (Josh. 11:2; 12:7). On the meaning of _is_, see Banitte, "Ha-"Laazim", note 1, and also his Judeo-French and _La'az_, Encyc. Jud. 10 (1971), 423-425, 1313-1315.
92. M. Banitte, "Ha-"Laazim" shel Rashi... p. 171.
93. He relies on Megillah 2, Mishnah 1, and the note in Mahzor Vitri (ed. S. L. Horowitz) which disallows this custom.
94. Compare his article, "Heker Haglosarim Hamikraim...", pp. 5-6.
95. Pithronei Rabbi Menahem..., p. 401.
96. And note ibid., p. 402 and n. 4.
97. This ought to read מַי.ן.
98. See Poznanski, Pithronei Rabbi Menahem, p. 407 and n. 6.
100. We shall offer only two examples for each category. It should be noted that Kara always translates a particular word
in the same way.

101. *Tant quand fut*; cf. also v. 16 (*מעש״ו*), and verses 17 and 18.

102. *Par cela est ce*; note v. 25 and also 15:7; and Jer.


104. Isa. 3:19. Once he even speaks of a gold coin of his own

times: *כוס זהב יד נעה* (Jud. 8:26). It is possible

that Kara contributed from his own storehouse of words to the

collections of French vernacular terms; see M. Lambert and L.

Brandin, *Glossaire Hebreu-Francais du XIIIe siecle* (Paris

1905), pp. 60-83. It emerges that at least one third of

Kara's French terms appear in this book, which, as a work of

the 13th century, postdates Kara. For a supplement, see M.

Lambert, *Habirrim Hanamtzaim Besefer Halaazim*, in Zikaron

LeAvraham Eliyahu (A memorial book for A. A. Harkabi) the

second Hebrew section (St Petersburg 1909), pp. 368-390; and

compare Moshe Katan, *Gloses Francaises*, in M. Ahrend, *Perush

R. Yosef Kara: Sefer Iyov*, pp. 120 ff.

105. Jud. 16:13; I Sam. 17:6; II Sam. 7:8; I Kings 5:23; 6:8,

9; 10:28; Jer. 2:21; Ezek. 27:24.

106. According to Geiger, *Parshandatha*, p. 33, this is an

interpolation by Kara's students and copyists. See also A.

Berliner, *Peletath Sofrim*, German section, p. 20; and Isa.


108. As we have noted, חכזב means אלי וה; see Ps.

114:1. Also relevant are I Sam. 1:15; 17:18; Isa. 2:4.

109. It sometimes appears as למע (Josh. 11:2; I Sam. 7:2;

Isa. 44:25).

110. I Sam. 9:17; I Kings 6:9; Ezek. 16:16; it is found

particularly in the Early Prophets. Sometimes it appears

alone (Isa. 28:16).

111. II Kings 8:15; 12:12; 25:1; Jer. 2:23; cf. לווע (Jer.

23:32).

112. I Kings 7:4, 17, 32, 33; or *שקוירי בוע* (frequently

found in the Early Prophets); Isa. 17:6; Ezek. 1:22, or


2:21.

114. Cf. I Kings 18:37; Jer. 28:6; *לפיו ושמשוב ועב*;

תורשות למך נאם ה׳ אלהי ישראלѣו ועב.* See also Hos. 5:14. In Ezek. 34:31

Kara says of a repetition,

115. Cf. Jud. 17:4; 20:39, where the text repeats the subject

in order to add details.

116. We shall return to this when we discuss the relationship

between the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles.

117. I Sam. 2:10; Isa. 51:9; Jer. 8:22. It is odd that Kara

does not gloss נאם in Hab. 2:6.

118. In each pair of dashes here, the first dash stands for a

word or phrase from the text and the second Kara's

explanation.

119. I Kings 1:33; here he offers an example from Esther 8:8.

There is an additional instance in II Sam. 2:6.

120. Isa. 22:16; and note 49:2; 50:7; Ezek. 1:1.

121. He offers examples from Josh. 9:14; Obad. 1:23.
122. He repeats this in Josh. 22:34; Ezek. 30:6.
123. I Sam. 28:16; I Kings 7:18; Jer. 6:27; Ezek. 2:5; 22:3.
124. And note I Sam. 11:12; 14:30; 22:15; 24:19; 19:17 with
44; II Kings 5:26.
125. See also II Sam. 19:12; I Kings 11:7; Jer. 8:4; Ezek.
30:6.
126. Cf. also II Kings 5:7; Amos 6:12; Job 21:4; and many
other instances.
127. In the parable of the vineyard in Isa. 5:1-7 Kara does
not point out that this is a parable; instead he says that
the vineyard is not a real one, נֶהָרָה הַנֵּרָה בֵּית
שׁוֹרֵא צֶבָּאֹל.
129. Ezek. 1:24, in the comparison for the sound of the
wings. At times Kara uses other phrases like
(דְּרָךְ כָּלִים) (Ezek. 23:25; Hos. 1:6), or מַכָּה (Ezek. 28:13), or מַכָּה (Jer. 10:19), or מַכָּה (Hos. 1:2).
130. II Sam. 6: 5, 7, 16; 7:5; 21:20; 24:3.
131. II Sam. 6:10; 5:9, 21, 24:17; I Kings 15:15.
132. II Sam. 5:21; 6:7, 10, 17; 7:5, 9; 24:3, 12.
133. I Kings 8:22, immediately after the introductory words,
as against II Chronicles 6:12.
134. I Kings 7:23 (ןָּבָרָה).
136. And note also II Sam. 5:9; 21:20, where again he
explains the passage from Chronicles.
137. I Kings 9:24 (לְעֹלָה עֵליֵי).
138. For example, I Kings 9:18, 25; 22:40; and in most
places. A systematic examination, in line with A. Bendavid,
Makholtoth Bamikra, gives an impressive view of the instances
in which Kara adds to our information.
139. II Sam. 7:23 (םַּאֲרֹן בַּשָּׁם).
140. And note II Kings 12:22 (שָׁם בַּשָּׁם נָבָרָה).
141. All the more as II Sam. 3:16 and 16:5 also mention
かない, and Kara notes that it is a place name and is not to
be identified with עֵליֵי. Possibly Kara's
identification stems from an analysis moving from עֵליֵי
to עֲלִיָּה, to the synonymous עֵליֵי עָלִיָּה and
כָּלִים עָלִיָּה.
142. We should note some other passages on which Kara should
have commented, and does not: I Sam. 31:10; II Sam. 5:8; 8:4;
I Kings 3:4-15 - and this is only a sample.
143. I Kings 5:30; 9:23.
144. The resolution of contradictions within the Early
Prophets is discussed separately.
145. See his able explanation, which deals both with the
contradiction in question and with the contradiction as to
the number of governors.
146. And see II Sam. 6:13 on the settling of the
contradiction as to the offering of sacrifices while the Ark
was being carried.
147. I Kings 8:65 - Midrash Genesis Rabbah 35; 15:22 - Seder
Olam 16; II Kings 9:29 - Seder Olam 17.
148. I have counted dozens of such instances and one
exception, I Kings 2:28, where Kara reconstructs events
incorrectly; see Apenstein ad loc.
149. He returns to this in II Sam. 5:6-8 and also in Josh.
15:63. It is also worth looking at Jud. 1:7 (יִרְשָׁב
לָהֶם) (I Kings 19:47), and
(יִיְרַשְׁבוּ).
150. On the following הַשָּׁעָתָּה נבֹעָתָה, Kara writes הקדשה ולא מסכנת plural.

151. Compare I Kings 19:9, where it seems that God Himself speaks to Elijah, yet as the text continues it emerges that God only appeared to him afterwards; note Kara’s solution.

152. And note Jud. 17:7; II Sam. 1:13 for the identity of the Amalekite youth.

153. For support on this point, see I Kings 22:48.


155. He returns to the topic in II Kings 25:17; and note the calculation as to the duration of the feast, Jud. 14:14, 15, 17.

156. Note also II Kings 9:29; and I Kings 15:24, 25, 33; 16:23.

157. Cf. also II Kings 15:30 (בֵּן-שֵׁשׁ יָשָׂרִי וְלִיוֹמָה); II Kings 17:1 (בֵּן-שֵׁשׁ יָשָׂרִי וְלִיוֹמָה); and compare Jud. 11:36 (שליש מהות).

158. II Kings 13:10 (בֵּן-שֵׁשׁ יָשָׂרִי וְלִיוֹמָה).

159. I Sam. 23:22; II Sam. 2:29; I Kings 5:12; II Kings 14:26.

160. I Kings 2:5; 6:31; 7:7; 8:12; II Kings 19:25; but Kara seems to give his own view a slight preference, despite the fact that Rashi’s opinions form both the first and the second explanation.


162. In only two instances, it would seem, does he adopt an explanation which he has ‘heard’ (I Kings 6:34; Isa. 22:24), but of whose correctness he is unsure.

163. I Sam. 10:7; 11:5; I Kings 7:14; 9:24; 19:19. In I Sam. 20:25 and II Sam. 15:7 he does not explicitly reject the offered gloss, but the recording of a second explanation indirectly reveals his own view. In Isa. 16:1; Jer. 7:11, 31; 19:11 he repeats an aggada which he has ‘heard’ as to a burial cave in Jerusalem.

164. Isa. 63:19: שְׁמַעְתָּה מִפְּנֵי רְאֵי לֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. This explanation, which is acceptable to him, is glossed with דבר אֵין מִשָּׁה רוֹמֵא מְאֵי עַבְרֵי. Kara (1) points out נָאוֹת אֶת הַוָּקָה מְאֵי עַבְרֵי וְרָאוּשֶׁה נְכוֹנָה; (2) says of an explanation he has heard, כְּכַלָּה, מֵאוֹת רַחֲמֵי עָלָיו; and (3) offers a different interpretation from the Targum, of which he says, שלא הוא נְכוֹנָה וְיָכוֹזָה מְכַלָּה; that is, he gives it the preference. But as I have remarked, this is a unique case.

165. Jud. 5:10. He uses the expression מֵעֵי יָרָא, four times (I Kings 1:52; II Kings 16:14; Isa. 13:2; 7:17).

166. I Kings 6:34. On one occasion he says, נַלְעָץָה פִּירֵשׁ מִרְּאָה וְנַלְעָץ, Ezek. 29:21).

167. Josh. 24:26; II Kings 4:35; Jer. 51:1; Zech. 9:9 - four times in all.


169. Isa. 32:19; Jer. 48:9; Nahum 2:8; Hab. 1:9; Zech. 10:5; 11:16 - a total of 6 times.

170. Usually in the abbreviated form נ"י (fifty times in Prophets).
171. Usually in the abbreviated form נ"ע (three times in the Early Prophets: Josh. 23:13; I Kings 11:27; 18:30). In the commentary on Ezekiel, which is attributed to a student of Kara's, I have counted twenty-five occurrences, and an additional instance in Amos 3:12; but this latter is an explanation from Rabbenu Shmuel. Kara once uses the expression על ד ידיו ארא (Isa. 40:12) and once uses the expression שלש פעמים (Mal. 2:15).

172. A clear rejection is also to be found in the following places: Isa. 15:5; 22:5; Hos. 11:7. In Isa. 32:19 an explanation glossed דֶּשֶׁך קָנָה is offered. In the other places, the explanation ranks as a possible interpretation, following Kara's own view and second in importance to it.

173. So also in Josh. 24:26; II Kings 4:35. Here Kara clearly dissociates himself from the view of דֶּשֶך קָנָה.

174. I Sam. 13:6 (the phrase comes from the gloss on v. 7).

175. I Kings 9:23; also II Kings 25:17; Jer. 10:16.

176. I Sam. 1:3, in reference to Gen. 26:15; and see A. Berliner, Peletath Sofrim, p. 15.

177. I Kings 11:38 (וְנָתַן אָד). and note II Sam. 7:11 and I Sam. 15:6, where he repeats the explanation from Jud. 1:16; 4:11.


179. A single exception exists of Kara's not explaining a difficult expression (רַחֵם נַעַלָּלי) on its first appearance (I Sam. 18:7), but only later (21:12).

180. This principle is repeated at v. 12; see further I Kings 2:5.

181. See Y. Aharoni, Atlas Karta Letekufath Hamikra (Jerusalem 1964), p. 17, maps 110, 111. Shilo is located between the distant Shechem in the north and the distant Beth-el in the south, and south-east of Lebanon.

182. His second explanation is glossed with דֶּשֶך קָנָה.


184. The explanation is based on Isa. 6:6 (וּבָא רוֹנָה לָךְ).

185. I Sam. 17:18 (רַדֵּי הָתַלְוָל).

186. Josh. 11:8 (מֵשֶׁרֶת מַיָּי); see also Rashi (following Targum Jonathan) on this verse.


189. I Sam. 8:13; Isa. 54:11; Jer. 4:30; 22:6; Ezek. 27:22.


191. II Sam. 8:1; II Kings 19:28; and note Jud. 6:25 (רְיָשׁוֹן).

192. I Kings 5:6 (רְמַשׁוֹן).


194. I Sam. 12:17; Ezek. 34:26; note especially Jud. 6:2 on storage.

195. Isa. 18:5; on the influence of wine, see II Sam. 11:8, 13.

196. Jer. 10:5; see Ezek. 26:5 for fishing in regions covered by the sea.
200. In almost every verse dealing with construction in I Kings chapters 6-7.
201. II Kings 21:13; Isa. 28:17; and note Josh. 17:16.
202. Jonah 4:6; for the differences between a woman who is virgin and a woman who is not, see further I Kings 1:2.
203. II Sam. 1:21; Isa. 21:5: משה מנו שלטיניו הרוב מעלייהו. And note II Sam. 21:16; I Sam. 17:5 (על רמאת נושרת).
204. II Kings 5:2; 9:17 (perhaps on the model of המשאות of I Sam. 13:17).
205. I Sam. 1:1 (עם החורים) with Jer. 6:17; Ezek. 3:17; 33:2-3, 6.
206. Jud. 5:16; for capitulation following a siege, see particularly Jer. 50:15.
207. I Kings 1:19; for a king's characteristics, see I Kings 3:8.
208. I Kings 1:5; in Isa. 36:9 the פרışıים are the horses, not their riders.
209. I Kings 1:22; note also II Sam. 14:12, from ויכי יא´s אבות. II Sam. 8:17; and note Jud. 5:14; Isa. 36:3.
210. II Sam. 8:16; I Kings 4:3; II Kings 18:18; Isa. 36:3.
212. II Sam. 23:25, etc.); Isa. 15:6.
214. And note his explanation of the holy vessels, such as the המיכליים, and בְּרִית of I Kings 7:40, 49, 50.
217. II Sam. 23:25 (שנת החורים, etc.); Isa. 15:6.
218. Amos 1:3; Obad. 1:1. An identical location is given to Jerusalem in Ezek. 21:2.
219. He writes on Bashan and Gilead in similar terms (Mic. 7:14).
Notes to Chapter 3

1. Poznanski notes (Havo, p. xxxv) that (in contrast to Rashi) Kara also makes use of the Jerusalem Targum. Geiger (Parshandatha, Heb. sect., p. 33) owns that while he once thought that Kara knew nothing of the Jerusalem Targum, he does in fact cite it in connection with II Sam. 17:19. There is a further reference in Jud. 5:13 and Hos. 7:5. We may therefore conclude that either the Jerusalem Talmud or a source containing passages from it was available to him, and that he simply calls it "the Jerusalem Targum".


3. Jud. 5:11.

4. Whereas Rashi constantly uses the same phrases:


6. See further Jud. 3:19; 8:21; 9:27; I Sam. 5:11; etc.

7. I Sam. 3:3.

8. II Sam. 23:1.


15. Jud. 8:2; I Kings 2:11.


17. Isa. 1:8; 54:12; Jer. 2:31; 12:1; 14:8; 32:19; 38:5.

18. Isa. 5:5; 41:23; 54:17; Jer. 4:31; 51:39.


20. Pesikta de-Rav Kahana, p. 137.


22. So everywhere in the Bible in connection with human beings. See, e.g., Lev. 26:30; I Sam. 17:46; Isa. 14:19; Amos 8:3; Nahum 3:3.


24. For other instances see Mic. 7:4; 5:13; Nahum 1:12; Zech. 11:12; etc.

25. Gen. 7:11; 8:2; II Kings 7:2, 19; Isa. 24:18; Mal. 3:10.


27. Isa. 60:8.

28. See further Jud. 3:25, 29; Jer. 25:38; etc.


31. II Sam. 23:1.

32. And see Josh. 24:27; Jer. 49:19.

33. I Kings 5:3; and see Jer. 31:14; 48:36.

34. II Sam. 8:18, and the similar I Kings 1:38.

35. See further Hos. 10:15; Mic. 4:8.
36. See also Komlosh, p. 282.
38. It must be remembered that Kara was younger than Rashi by twenty years (or more). See B. J. Gelles, Peshat and Derash in the Exegesis of Rashi (Leiden 1981), p. 131, n. 21, and p. 20.
40. See Poznanski, Al HaRambach, pp. 389-391 and n. 6 (p. 391).
41. A. Berliner, Peletath Sofrim, p. 21. Kara also acknowledges on several occasions that Rashi has heard his opinion and agreed with it. See Peletath Sofrim on Gen. 19:9 (p. 13), and on Num. 17:5 (p. 21), etc.
42. Jud. 2:15; I Kings 5:12.
44. M. Ahrend, in his article in Iyunei Mikra Veparshanuth, p. 184.
45. See Berliner, Rashi al Hatorah, p. 10; Apenstein, Mavo, pp. 13-21; Poznanski, Mavo, p. 32; Ahrend, op. cit.
46. Geiger, Nitei Ne'emanim, pp. 18 ff.
47. Littmann, pp. 9-10.
49. In articles published between 1906 and 1920, now collected as an introduction to Kara on the Early Prophets.
50. Apenstein, op. cit., p. 21ff. When I made a comparative examination of the commentaries of Rashi and of Kara on the Latter Prophets, I found in Rashi comments upon about 60 verses or part-verses which in content resembled Kara's. These comments are preceded by a distinctive opening or heading like יש טטרים (18 times), וַיִּשְׁעָטֶה מִרְּאִי (17), וַיִּשְׁעָטֶה מִרְּאִי מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי (6), וַיִּשְׁעָטֶה מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן (4), וַיִּשְׁעָטֶה מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי (3), and several other headings found 8 times in all. We may reasonably suggest that some at least of these glosses are Kara's and that Rashi worked them into his commentary, or that they were interpolated into it by a later copyist. The references are as follows:
   יש טטרים: Isa. 2:20; 5:30; 6:13; 9:4; 14:20, 21; 40:2;
   וַיִּשְׁעָטֶה מִרְּאִי: 54:12 (see Kara's commentary, printed in Nitei Ne'emanim); 57:8; 59:10 (see Apenstein's assertion in his introduction to Kara on the Early Prophets, p. 21: 'Rashi, after setting down his own gloss, adds his opinion in the form of יִשְׁעָטֶה מִרְּאִי'); 65:11; Joel 2:20; Nahum 3:15, 18; Zeph. 3:12; Zech. 9:7; Mal. 2:15.
   יִשְׁעָטֶה מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן: Isa. 3:4; 23:1; 45:2; 34:4; Hos. 8:9; Mic. 4:8.
   יִשְׁעָטֶה מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי: Isa. 9:10; 26:7; Jer. 6:28; 17:5; 23:32, 36; 48:28.
   יִשְׁעָטֶה מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי: Isa. 3:4; 33:20; Hos. 13:15; Mic. 1:8; see also Berliner's introduction to his scholarly edition, Rashi al Hatorah, p. 10, n. 20.
   יִשְׁעָטֶה מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־אֲמוּרִי מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹוֵן מֶלֶךְ־יֹอ
Miscellaneous: Isa. 32:19; 33:1; 34:4; 40:13; 51:17; Jer. 31:20; Amos 6:5; Mic. 4:6.

52. Mentioned by Rashi on II Kings 20:13; and see I Kings 10:7, where Kara quotes from Ecclesiastus and Rashi does not.
54. See the section on Kara's use of the Aramaic Targumim, above.
55. Jud. 5:11.
56. Here are the places in the Early Prophets alone in which Kara cites Targum Jonathan and Rashi does not: Josh. 12:7; Jud. 5:11; 6:4, 38; 8:1; 13:22; 14:4; 15:5; 18:6, 13, 16; I Sam. 6:19; 12:21; II Sam. 1:19; 17:13; 19:28; 23:1; I Kings 1:52; 2:24; 4:5; 5:3; 6:21; 7:45; 8:2; 19:11; II Kings 3:11; 5:9, 11, 26; 10:27; 11:2, 6. There are also places in which Rashi quotes the Targum in Hebrew and Kara in the original (I Kings 14:14). To all these must be added the places where Kara quotes the Targum without any remark, which is not found in Rashi.
57. I Kings 7:33.
59. E.g. I Sam. 2:30; 13:33; I Kings 17:18; 22:38; II Kings 11:12, etc.
61. On I Sam. 22:35 Rashi cites a Midrash in 28 words and Kara in 62 (double length); on II Sam. 24:9 Rashi's Midrash is 19 words long and Kara's 75 (four times as long); on I Kings 5:10 Rashi's Midrash is 48 words and Kara's 257 (five times the length).
62. It may be worthwhile to point out a consistent variation in terminology: wherever Rashi writes כ"ע Kara uses the term נַאֱלָה. See, e.g., Jud. 11:26; I Kings 7:51; II Kings 19:25; and see Gelles, p. 132.
64. Poznanski asserts that the Jerusalem Talmud was available to Kara but not to Rashi (Mavo, p. xxxv), but this is not correct. See Rashi on II Sam. 21:4, etc.
65. II Sam. 3:34, and see Ezek. 5:7, where Kara provides
evidence of a different text (compare Zech. 14:5). In Hos. 2:8 there is a different vocalisation.

66. II Sam. 3:35.

67. It is worth adding that in I Kings 10:26 Kara sees an apparent contradiction with Chronicles, while Rashi does not, for he writes בְּפִיו אֲמוֹן מֵעָלָיו יִשְׁרָאֵל, which is what we find in Chronicles. He offers a gloss as if the figure were 1700, while he himself says that it was only 1400.

68. "It is worth adding that in I Kings 10:26 Kara sees an apparent contradiction with Chronicles, while Rashi does not, for he writes בְּפִיו אֲמוֹן מֵעָלָיו יִשְׁרָאֵל, which is what we find in Chronicles. He offers a gloss as if the figure were 1700, while he himself says that it was only 1400.

69. II Sam. 5:21; 6:1, 5, 7, 10, 16, 17; 7:5, 9; 8:13; 10:16; 12:24; 24:1, 3, 12, 17, 36; I Kings 1:1; 5:25; 8:16; 15:7; II Kings 22:4 - 22 instances in all. It is of interest that Kara's comment on II Sam. 7:19 resembles the gloss attributed to Rashi on I Chron. 17:17.

70. Rashi does not deal with the contradiction between Joshua and Isaiah; see Josh. 10:14.

71. In I Kings 5:6. Rashi explains the contradiction as to the number of stables in 18 words and Kara in 140 words.

72. For וְזָנָה, see the chapter on Biblical style, where we observe that both terms relate to identical and different passages written in similar and different language.

73. II Sam. 5:21; 6:1, 5, 7, 10, 16, 17; 7:5, 9; 8:13; 10:16; 12:24; 24:1, 3, 12, 17, 36; I Kings 1:1; 5:25; 8:16; 15:7; II Kings 22:4 - 22 instances in all. It is of interest that Kara's comment on II Sam. 7:19 resembles the gloss attributed to Rashi on I Chron. 17:17.


77. E.g., Jud. 3:31, where Rashi renders מְלֹא מִישָׁרְיָם with "מְלֹא מִישָׁרְיָם" and Kara with "מְלֹא מִישָׁרְיָם". or I Kings 11:4, where for "מש" רashi writes ר"מש ו Kara ר"מש.

87. II Kings 18:20; 19:4; and in II Kings 19:25, נ' נו
88. Mavo, p. 16. 89. Isa. 11:8; 25:11; 26:7; 34:14; 36:5 (parallel to II Kings 18:20); 37:4 (parallel to II Kings 19:4); 37:26 (parallel to II Kings 19:25); 38:19 (Kristianpuller); Jer. 35:4 (Paris MS.); 44:30 (Paris MS.); 49:3 (Paris MS.); Hos. 8:6; Mic. 2:7-10 (Breslau); 7:12; Hag. 2:15; Zech. 4:12; 6:11. 90. Isa. 2:20 (Kircheim MS.); 8:1 (Kircheim); 5:1; 8:4 (Kircheim) 14:21; 18:2; 42:3 (Kircheim); 22:18; 37:31; Jer. 50:11; Mic. 7:12 (Breslau); Nahum 3:18; Zech. 9:9; 10:5. 91. Isa. 1:2, 4; 5:1; 6:4; 5:9; 6:10; 7:8, 9, 12; 8:23; 8:1, 5, 6; 19:13; 22:18; 26:3; 4; 28:15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29; 29:1, 3, 9, 17; 30:2, 6; 31:2, 9, 20; 33:1, 4, 6, 7, 18; 34:4, 11, 15; 35:1; 37:27, 29, 36; 40:12, 15, 20; 41:7; 47:1; 49:15, 20; 51:20; 55:13; Jer. 9:25; 15:4; 22:17; 30:21; 46:16; Hos. 10:1; Amos 8:10; Jonah 1:6; Mic. 1:2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15; 2:4; 3:3, 6-7; 4:6, 8, 10; 5:1, 2, 4, 6, 9-10; 6:3; 10, 13, 14; 7:1, 4, 11, 12; Hag. 1:13; Zech. 1:10. 92. Isaiah 1:1, 8, 12, 16, 21, 23, 28, 31; 2:10; 3:8 (as Rashi on Isa. 8:18), 16, 20, 24; 4:4; 5:2, 8, 12, 14, 17, 25, 28, 30; 6:22; 7:2, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20; 8:8, 9, 16, 21, 9:1, 2, 4, 9, 13, 17, 19; 10:1, 7, 25, 26; 11:5; 12:2; 13:2, 3, 5, 10, 15; 22:1, 14, 15, 18, 20, 23, 25, 26:1, 7, 21; 27:1, 8, 11; 28:1, 17, 28 (in Helbo's name); 34:17; 35:8; 10; 36:2, 3, 9, 10; 37:30; 38:11 (as Rashi on 38:1), 15, 17, 40:3, 19, 26, 27; 41:21; 42:9 (as Rashi on 41:22); 43:24; 44:13; 47:1; 48:12; 52:4, 12; 53:4; 54:17; 57:8, 15; 59:13; 60:9; 63:11; 65:4, 20; 66:5, 9. Jeremiah 2:17, 20; 12:9, 16; 14:14; 15:1, 11; 7:4, 5; 23:12; 31:5, 17, 20; 35:2, 4, 7; 39:6; 43:9, 10; 44:14; 48:6, 30, 32, 50:17; 51:11. Hosea 2:5, 15; 4:2; 7, 14, 16, 18; 5:7, 11; 6:5; 7:12, 13, 16; 8:9, 13; 9:9, 14; 10:9, 12; 11:7; 13:5, 8, 10, 15. Joel 4:13, 19. Amos 1:10, 13; 2:6, 7, 11, 12, 16; 3:3; 12, 15; 4:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13; 5:2, 9, 23; 6:2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10; 7:2, 11, 12, 14; 8:4, 5, 8, 9; 9:1, 8 (as Rashi on Amos 8:8). Obadiah 1:6, 11, 13, 19. Jonah 1:3, 6, 8; 2:1, 7, 9; 3:9 (cf. Joel 2:14). Micah 1:15 (Lublin); 2:7, 8; 3:3, 9, 14; 7:13.
Nahum 3:7, 10, 12, 15, 18.
Habakkuk 1:3, 4, 12, 16; 2:4, 5, 6, 8, 19; 3:2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 16, 19.
Haggai 1:1, 2, 7, 8 (see Rashi on Hag. 2:9), 11, 13; 2:3, 12, 19.
Zechariah 1:8, 10; 2:10, 13; 3:3, 7, 9; 4:3, 10, 14; 5:3, 6, 8; 6:2, 6, 7, 12, 15; 7:2, 5, 13; 8:23; 9:5, 7, 8, 12, 16; 10:1, 3, 5, 6, 10; 11:1, 2, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16; 12:2, 5, 12; 13:1, 4, 5; 14:2, 5, 17, 18, 20.
Malachi 1:2, 7; 2:2, 4, 5, 8, 15, 17; 3:2, 11.

93. Mavo, p. xxxiii; and see Ahrend, Yahas Perusho, p. 190 and n. 59.
94. I Kings 7:15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.
99. He suggests that Apenstein was of the same opinion.
100. See verse 12.
102. According to Geiger the reading is ר"ט, and this seems more reasonable (Parshandatha, Heb. sect., p. 26).
103. Kara's remarks also involve an attack upon method: can one learn what is known from that which is not known? See also I Kings 18:26, where in cynical fashion he rejects a נו"ט cited by Rashi.
104. And see Littmann, pp. 10-11.
105. The meaning of this word is also disputed by Ben Saruk and Dunash. See Machbereth Menahem, p. 68, and Teshuvot Dunash, p. 58 (and see also Rabbenu Tam and Kimchi). Cf. Kara on I Sam. 14:27; 15:9.
106. See also I Kings 6:31; 7:7; 8:12, 21; etc.
107. Citing Rashi's glosses on Exod. 25:9; Lev. 11:34; Deut. 4:44, Poznanski regards Kara as Rashi's successor in this area (Mavo, p. xvi). This would seem to be correct, but what in Rashi is an occasional exceptional remark becomes in Kara a regular approach.
108. See especially the Book of Kings, in which the two commentaries overlap considerably - and in most of the cases Kara seems to have copied from Rashi, whether in accord or dissent. His distinctive qualities, however, remain apparent.
110. Poznanski suggests that Helbo's commentaries disappeared two generations after his death as a result of the huge success of Rashi's.
111. Isa. 29:9 (Kirschheim MS.); and see Poznanski, op. cit., p. 391, n. 2, and Mavo, p. xii.
115. I Kings 8:27; II Kings 18:20; and see Poznanski, Mavo, p. xi ff.
116. II Kings 19:29. Helbo's text is here identical with that in Ben Saruk's Machbereth. It is possible that when the gloss was cited in the name of דוד 'א a copyist mistakenly supposed that this referred not only to Helbo but also to Ben Saruk, who bore the same first name. Careful comparison with passages in the Machbereth proves that even in those places in which only the name דוד is used the reference is to Helbo. In three places (II Kings 19:29; Nahum 3:6; Amos 7:7) a gloss is ascribed to Helbo which belongs to Ben Saruk; either that, or Helbo's simply resembled Ben Saruk's and Kara preferred to quote it in his uncle's name. See Poznanski, Pithronei HaRambach, p. 409, n. 5.

117. Poznanski, op. cit., p. 399; and see also II Kings 14:26, in which Helbo's text is identical with Ibn Janach's. See Poznanski, p. 408.

118. I Sam. 1:5.


120. Jud. 2:15; I Sam. 1:5; II Sam. 23:5; II Kings 16:14; Isa. 2:22; 5:5; 13:2; 29:19; 34:16; 38:10; Jer. 35:19.

121. Jud. 6:6; I Sam. 13:21; II Sam. 24:4; I Kings 1:37; II Kings 4:39; Isa. 30:20; Jer. 4:13; Hos. 4:19; etc.

122. I Sam. 23:22; I Kings 5:12; 6:2; II Kings 14:26; Isa. 29:4; Mic. 1:14; etc.

123. II Sam. 2:29; 24:6; II Kings 19:29; Isa. 1:8; Jer. 4:29; Amos 7:9; etc. In II Kings 8:31 the text is confused: רָאָיָה וַתִּמְרְנוּ לְכָלִים דֶּרֶךְ וַתִּמְרְנוּ לְכָלִים. This should presumably read כָּלָיָה וַתִּמְרְנוּ לְכָלִים דֶּרֶךְ וַתִּמְרְנְוּ לְכָלִים. Kara occasionally quotes from Helbo without acknowledgment, as in I Sam. 19:24; II Sam. 17:2; I Kings 6:9 (see Poznanski, op. cit., pp. 402-404), or fails to understand him, as he admits in I Kings 16:9.


126. Jud. 2:15.

127. I Sam. 1:5; I Kings 6:2; Isa. 5:5.

128. I Sam. 13:21; II Sam. 23:5.

129. II Sam. 24:6; II Kings 4:39; Jer. 35:19; 36:23.


131. Jud. 2:15.

132. And see M. Ahrend, Yahas Perusho shel Kara, p. 190, n. 59; and A. Twyto, R. Haim ben Atar VePerusho Or Hahayim al Hatorah (Jerusalem 1982), p. 134.


134. In a number of cases they form the sole gloss: II Sam. 24:4; I Kings 1:37; 18:25.
135. In II Kings 19:4 Kara sets down Helbo's gloss side by side with Rashi's, without indicating his own preference, while in his commentary on Isa. 37:4 he explains the same phrase, citing Rashi alone. (Cf. also II Kings 18:20, in parallel with Isa. 36:5.) In this indirect manner he expresses his opinion. In II Kings 16:14 he explains נִלְטָנ, cites Helbo for the view that this was נִלְטַנָא, and juxtaposes Rashi's rejection of this interpretation.

136. הַדִּיקָה = (1) a deliberate baldness, as in Deut. 14:1; I Kings 18:28; and Jer. 16:6; and (2) an assembly or group, as in Gen. 49:19; Ps. 94:21.

137. See further I Kings 8:27. For other glosses by Helbo which Kara finds unacceptable because of their ולד character, see Isa. 29:19; 30:20; 34:16; 35:8; Jer. 31:5.

138. Helbo's interpretation is in fact found in the Talmud (Yoma 10a).


141. On this point, compare Rashi and Kara on Isa. 19:7; Hos. 10:14; Amos 6:5. See also Kara on Zech. 2:12, where a gloss is cited in the name of Dunash which in fact belongs to Ben Saruk (Machbereth Menahem, p. 78).


143. The formulation is generally זֶה שֶׁאֲשִׁיֵהּ זֶרֶךְ (Isa. 27:11) or זֶה שֶׁאֲשִׁיֵהּ זֶרֶךְ (Isa. 38:14).

144. Amos 7:7; Machbereth Menahem, p. 28, and Teshuvoth Dunash, p. 12; Ezek. 23:24; etc.

145. Isa. 13:22; 28:28; Amos 6:8; Job 33:24; 38:32; and (like the present example) Mic. 1:11.

146. Machbereth Menahem, p. 76; Teshuvoth Dunash, pp. 9-10.

147. A. A. Orbach, Arugath Habosem, vol. 4, pp. 3-5; it should be noted that he is mentioned by Rashi and Kara adds the word כָּל הַלַּיְלָה (see Orbach, p. 18).


149. It should be noted that in Jer. 9:1; Zech. 9:16; and Mal. 3:20 he is called 'רבִּי אִלִּיעֶזֶר הַכְּלֵיָּהָר, in II Kings 11:2 רִבִּי אִלִּיעֶזֶר הַכְּלֵיָּהָר, and in Isa. 24:22 only רִבִּי אִלִּיעֶזֶר הַכְּלֵיָּהָר.

150. Isa. 28:16; 33:1, 18.

151. And see II Kings 11:2; Mal. 3:20.

152. I Kings 8:2, 8; II Kings 19:25; Isa. 2:22; 34:16; Jer. 8:23; Hos. 10:15; and see Poznanski, Mavo Leperush al Yehezkel Vetzrei Asar, pp. 23, 28; and Perush Rashi al Nach, ed. Y. Maharshon (Amsterdam 1935), photocopied ed. (Jerusalem 1972), p. 8, n. 9.


154. A. Apenstein, 'R. Shimon Kara Vehayalkut', Hahoker, 301,
pp. 85 ff.
155. See Tosafoth on Yevamoth 55b, from מנה, and Shabbath 85b. He also wrote liturgical poems; see Rabbenu Simhah's Mahzor Vitry, I-II, ed. S. Halevi Horowitz (Nurnberg 1923), p. 64.
156. II Kings 18:20; 19:4; Hos. 8:6; Zech. 4:12; 6:11; etc.
158. And see A. A. Orbach, op. cit., vol. 5, pp. 4-5.
159. As Ahrend holds (see his scholarly edition, Le Commentaire sur Job de Rabbi Joseph Qara: Etude des Methodes Philologiques et Exegetiques [Hildesheim 1978], pp. 48, 49); he suggests that his commentaries were brought to Northern France by Jewish travellers from the East.
160. S. Poznanski, 'Mi Hu Rav Saadiah Shenizkar etzel Namefarshim Hatzarfatim Lemikra', Hagoren, 9 (1923), 69-89; and 'Citations de Saadia ou attribues a Saadia chez les exegetes de la France septantariane', REJ, LXXII (1921), pp. 113, 134.
161. He is mentioned by Rashi in I Sam. 1:24. It should be noted that the phrase which Kara applies here to R. Yitzhak's commentary, נינו רוח', is also used by him in Jud. 5:23 in connection with a quotation from an unstated source, which is therefore conceivably R. Yitzhak.
162. Isa. 63:19; Ezek. 10:20.
163. Perush Hatorah asher Katav HaRashbam (Breslau 1882), p. xxx; and see n. 1, p. xxviii.
164. This is doubtful, however (see Ahrend, Le Commentaire, p. 3, n. 29), especially as his remarks come as נינו נינו'.
165. And see Rashbam's commentary on Gen. 10:15, where Kara is called רוח', just as in 37:13.
166. See Ahrend, op. cit., p. 4.
167. Poznanski, Mavo, p. xlvi, notes 2, 3.
168. Ahrend concludes that Kara and Rashbam each studied in a different Beth Midrash and were influenced by a different school of thought. As a follower of Helbo, Kara was a 'reader' (קר) of the Torah, while Rashbam was a Talmudist (Le Commentaire, p. 5). Compare A. Twyto, 'AI Heker Parshanuth Hamikra', pp. 525-526.
170. Sefer Josippon, vol. 2, pp. 142-143; this is also cited by Rashi in slightly different language. Ecclesiasticus (ed. Steinschneider, Berlin, 1858), which Kara calls נני ונני, is mentioned at I Kings 10:7, and seems to have been on his desk.
171. Parshandatha, Heb. sect., p. 32.
173. Because the word הנני recurs in verses 13, 14.
175. He does not note in which book.
176. See also the apparent contradiction in I Kings 10:26, the different SPORT in II Sam. 3:34 for SPORT, and the problem of SPORT in II Sam. 3:35. Special interest attaches to I Sam. 9:24, SPORT SPORT; Kara reads this as SPORT, which seems astonishing.
178. Baba Bathra 14b.
179. Baba Bathra 109b; cf. II Kings 8:20, וְגָםָּה.
181. 9:12.
182. Apenstein says that he does not understand the word וְגָםָּה, but I think its meaning is as I have suggested; see also Deut. 32:34, וְעָזָה.
183. Out of the approximately 350 instances of various types of וְגָםָּה which I have found in Prophets, Kara deals with only four: II Sam. 23:20; II Kings 3:24; 18:27; Jer. 2:3.
185. See Kimchi ad loc.; R. Yona ibn Janach (Ribag), Sefer Hashorashim, וְגָם הָתַשׁ בָּחֲשָׁלָה; and also Minhath Shai ad loc. For the Sages, see Sanhedrin 20a.
186. Biblia Hebraica states that some such form appears in eleven manuscripts.
187. Hullin 9b; in the Talmud's thirty-two exegetical principles ("לְבַמּוֹן"), the principle of "שֶׁנָּגִיס וְהָלְכָּה") possibly hints at this.
188. Compare I Sam. 18:26-27, וְגָם הָתַשׁ בָּחֲשָׁלָה.
190. Isa. 43:6; Ezek. 16:6.
191. Jud. 6:25; 12:4; I Sam. 11:6, 7; 24:11; Isa. 26:7; Jer. 9:12; 28:1; Ezek. 1:11, 18; Est. 2:1.
192. Jud. 13:18; II Kings 14:25; and see I Sam. 3:3; Hos. 11:6.
194. וְגָם הָתַשׁ בָּחֲשָׁלָה: Isa. 1:7.
195. Jud. 6:25; and see the similar Jer. 25:1; Est. 2:1.
196. See also Jud. 13:18.
197. I Sam. 21:7.
198. Biblia Hebraica does not record any such reading.
I. Hebrew

1. Works by Kara (See above, Introduction, section 1.)

Both the above contain Kara's commentary on Micah.

Contains Kara's commentary on the Latter Prophets.


Contains about 100 comments on the Pentateuch.

2. Other Primary Sources

כליות השעונים. מחדרות מזרולמה, "מ"מ תשל"ד.
מדרש איגרת הרא"ת. שאבר. רורית תגר"ט.
מדרש בראשית רבה. א-ג. ה' ה'יאדרו. "מ"מ תשל"ה.
מדרש בראשית רבה. ח. 'אלכף. "מ"מ תשל"ו.
מדרש רבה ש"ת. ח. 'אלכף. "מ"מ תשל"ו.
מדרש רבכאמ. מ"מ מרכובות. "מ"מ תש"ג.
מדרש ז"א - על חמש מגילות. 'תאבר. ברל"י. מחדרת מזרולמה, "תאבר. תשל"ה.
מדרש פסיקתא רבתי. 'תאבר. תשל"ה.
מדרש רבכאמ. "תאבר. תשל"ה.
מדרש ח"ת שלחן העצמון ש"ת חוברות. 'תאבר. רורית תגר"ט.
מדרש תנחומת. 'תאבר. רורית תגר"ט. מחדרות מזרולמה, "מ"מ תשל"ו.
פתצוג תרגש "ל הורורית. ג'ראבר הח"ג.
מכילתא דרבי יְשֵׁעיא. מ"מ א-ש-שלמה. רורית תגר"ט. מחדרות מזרולמה,
"מ"מ תשל"ו.
מכילתא דרבי יְשֵׁעיא. "ח"ה האורווריאי ר' רבי. "מ"מ תשל"ו.
מכילתא דרבי שמעון בר יְוִיא. "ח"ה אפיטטיאי ו"צ ממלד. "מ"מ תשל"ו.
(Referred to by Apenstein in connection with Jud. 5:5)
מנחה בר חלב. "מרפ创投יניי רבי מנחם בר חלבי להביני הקורש" ס퍼
ה ULONG לעונות טוקוב. "חא פרוקנפטיי. ו"שא תרט"ד.
מח"ל עונות ז"א "תאבר. תשל"ד.
מנחת "ח"ה סדרי. ח"ה אילכף. "ח"ה"חש"ו-ח"ש"ו.
מנחת רב"א אילכף. א-ב מדרש ש"ת ש"ת ונ adres. ח"ה על護ין. נלי
ירק תרט"ד. מחדרות מזרולמה, "מ"מ תשל"ו.
סדר עולים ז"א. מ"מ יברבר. טרספיאנ"א 1870. מחדרות מזרולמה, "מ"מ
תש"ל.
סדר עולים רבא. 'תאבר. רזיאג"ג.
סדר ל"קוטוין. אי-ב מדרש פטרים ביבליוגרפים. מחדרות
メリולמה, "מ"מ תשל"ז.
ססייתא דרבי ח"מ. ש"ת באבר. לע"א 1868. מחדרות מזרולמה, נני-ירק
תש"ט.
פורק אבות. מ"מ י-ר-י. תש"א 1970.
פורק רבי אליעזר. ש"ת "לורי. ו"שא תרט"ב. מחדרות מזרולמה, "מ"מ
תש"י.
רש"מ פירוש התורה ש"ת ח"ש"ש. ש"ת "לר-י. ברל"י. מחדרה תרט"ב.
מחדרות מזרולמה, "מ"מ תשל"ו.
3. Critical Discussions and Works of Reference

(Apenstein refers to this edition in connection with I Sam. 25:18 and II Sam. 1:18; but not I Sam. 7:6, 9.)
---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

המגירות של עץ ישראל, כר diy,скопפות האולד. "א" תחל"ב.עמ',

170 יאריא.

"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".ת"א 1969.

"ג' ביריא. מתגוררים בפרץ של ר. יוהב קרן."ה ת"אersh.รถ

א' ביריא. פלפוגים הפרתיפוגים לקמדא "הלוגיה של רצון". ספר פונט. "א" תחל"א.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

מכ-קדスペ.

---
旯נמאו. ספרה הגדולה ביותר בכרзон מכרזקי בניימרים. או.

1947. נָעֲנָא נָעֲנָא. בּרְסֶלֶוֹ.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

פְּרֶשֶׂת תָּרְצֵנ. לְיִיּ


---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"פְּרֶשֶׂת תָּרְצֵנ. לְיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִיִי


---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"ב" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.

---
"הלוגיה של רצון"; רolf ספרפנוגות הפרטיפוגים לקמדא".

"א" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב, "ג" תחל"ב.
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