Restoring Rabbi Joseph Kara’s commentary on the Torah

by identifying literary principles and unique linguistic forms

**Introduction**

Rabbi Joseph Kara (c. 1050-1130) is considered one of the more important exegetes in the *peshat* school of northern France of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[[1]](#footnote-1) He, or his family, apparently hailed from Provence. In his youth, he was highly influenced by his uncle (his father’s brother), R. Menahem bar Helbo. He was also in contact with a variety of important cultural centers, including Provence, Ashkenaz, Italy, France, and Spain. He arrived at Rashi’s hometown of Troyes already an accomplished scholar and his comprehensive commentary on the Bible was significantly influenced by Rashi. The consensus is that Kara composed a commentary for most biblical books, not all of which have survived until today.[[2]](#footnote-2)

For many years, scholars assumed that his extant commentaries on the Pentateuch were a collection of glosses on Rashi and not an independent commentary.[[3]](#footnote-3) This assumption was based on the lack of a continuous commentary on the Torah and on terminology that made it seem like his commentaries were written while copying Rashi’s commentary on the Torah.

Urbach was the first to suggest, in a short footnote, that Kara wrote an independent commentary on the Torah.[[4]](#footnote-4) Grossman’s findings, based on the Italian *geniza*, shed new light on the topic and conclusively proved that Kara wrote an independent, continuous, and systematic commentary on the Torah and not just a collection of glosses on Rashi. This is the accepted assumption today.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Grossman’s findings raised the question of the relationship between the local glosses on Rashi’s commentary and the systematic commentary. Grossman suggested that Kara first glossed Rashi’s commentary on the Torah and only later wrote a comprehensive commentary of his own.[[6]](#footnote-6) Novetsky raised a different possibility: Kara only wrote a commentary on the Torah, and others collected independent glosses from this commentary.[[7]](#footnote-7) I believe that we should not discard the possibility that Kara first wrote a continuous and complete commentary on the Torah, and when he copied Rashi’s commentary, he added his own glosses alongside it.[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Reconstructing Kara’s commentary on the Torah**

Much effort has gone into reconstructing part of the commentary on the Torah. The reconstruction attempts were in three directions: finding quotations of Kara’s glosses in later works; finding Kara’s glosses on Rashi’s commentary on the Torah; and finding segments of continuous exegesis in the European *geniza*. Here is a short description of how these items were found:

*Finding quotations*

Bible exegetes in France and Ashkenaz often used and quoted Kara’s commentary. These include commentaries written by famous exegetes such as R. Shmuel b. Meir (Rashbam)[[9]](#footnote-9) and R. Yosef Bechor Shor (Ribash),[[10]](#footnote-10) as well as collections that include commentaries on the Torah based on earlier scholars from France and Ashkenaz.[[11]](#footnote-11) These works – both printed and in manuscript – yielded dozens of remarks attributed to Kara.

Geiger was the first to point out segments of Kara’s commentaries in *Nitey Naamanim* and *Parshandata*.[[12]](#footnote-12) Berliner collated and published nearly 90 such segments in his notebook, *Peletat Soferim*.[[13]](#footnote-13) Poznanski added six segments to Berliner’s list.[[14]](#footnote-14) Mack and Tzeitkin discovered further sections.[[15]](#footnote-15)

*Finding Kara* *glosses on Rashi’s commentary on the Torah*

The study of the many manuscripts of Rashi’s commentary on the Torah yielded glosses written by Kara. These glosses are sometimes found in the margins but are more often integrated within Rashi’s commentary. The identification is often based on an explicit attribution to ‘R. Yosef bar Shimon’ or to ‘R. Yosef Kara’. Grossman noted that when R. Shemaya, Rashi’s ‘secretary’, copied his teacher’s writings, he added Kara’s glosses.[[16]](#footnote-16) Most of these glosses were collated into the ‘Al HaTorah’ edition, edited by Hillel Novetsky.

*The European geniza*

As noted above, Grossman identified continuous sections of Kara’s exegesis on the Torah (on Exodus and Deuteronomy) in manuscript fragments from the thirteenth century, found in the Italian *geniza*, that point to a continuous and systematic commentary.[[17]](#footnote-17) There is also a section that includes a collection of individual glosses on verses from each of the five books of the Torah. These sections, too, were published in full in Hillel Novetsky’s ‘Al HaTorah’ edition.

Given the importance of the commentary, each additional section that can be identified as Kara’s is significant. In this paper, I wish to cautiously propose another method of uncovering Kara’s lost commentary: Identifying glosses quoted in R. Hizkiya bar Manoach’s commentary on the Torah (Hizkuni) based on literary principles and Kara’s unique linguistic forms.

Hizkuni’s commentary is an anthology comprising commentaries from northern France, such as Rashi, Kara, Rashbam, Ribash, *Sefer Hagan*, and more. In his introduction, the author declares that he uses many works for his commentary but does not quote any of his sources by name (except when he refers to Rashi’s commentary).[[18]](#footnote-18)

Scholars have already used Hizkuni’s commentary to correct their versions of extant commentaries: Porges proposed corrections to Rashbam’s commentary based on Hizkuni’s commentary.[[19]](#footnote-19) Kislev dedicated an extensive study to this issue and suggested that the extant Hizkuni texts could help improve the text of Rashbam’s commentary. He demonstrated this with several linguistic corrections and the completion of extant commentaries in the extant Rashbam version.[[20]](#footnote-20) In his comprehensive study on reconstructing lost Rashbam commentaries, Novetsky went so far as to use Hizkuni’s commentary to reconstruct lost sections of Rashbam’s commentary on Genesis 2-17.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Elsewhere, Novetsky pointed to commentaries integrated into Hizkuni’s commentary that can be identified as Kara’s using these methods. Novetsky proposed using this information for two purposes: Reconstructing and improving known commentaries by Kara and reconstructing Kara’s commentaries, which did not survive at all. He offered two cases that exemplify the first goal,[[22]](#footnote-22) but I am unaware of a case where he reconstructed a lost gloss by Kara’s.

The abovementioned scholars suggested using what we have of Hizkuni to clarify, amend, and improve the extant versions of commentary, but they did not propose reconstructing ‘new’ commentaries that have yet to be identified (except Novetsky’s reconstruction of Rashbam’s commentary).

I wish to take this a step further and try to reconstruct complete glosses of Kara, even in places where he is not named. I claim that places where Hizkuni uses linguistic forms that are characteristic only of Kara and not found in the commentaries of other French exegetes, such as Rashbam, Ribash, and others, can be reasonably viewed as a quote or a reworking of a commentary that was originally Kara’s. I will demonstrate this using a central literary principle formulated by northern France *peshat* exegetes, ‘the anticipatory principle’.

**The anticipatory principle in northern French *peshat* exegesis**

The ‘anticipatory principle’ is one of the important literary principles formulated by *peshat* exegetes in medieval northern France. Over the past few years, several studies have been dedicated to examining it and the scope of its usage.[[23]](#footnote-23) This principle is primarily connected to Rashbam, who defined it already in his first gloss on the Torah (Gen. 1:1):

אך זה הוא עיקר פשוטו לפי דרך המקראות, שרגיל להקדים ולפרש דבר שאין צריך בשביל דבר הנזכר לפניו במקום אחר[…] שלא תתמה.

This is the core plain meaning [of the text], according to the way of the biblical narrative, that something may be explained in one place, where it is unnecessary, for something that is mentioned at a later stage [...] so that you [the reader] do not wonder.

Rashbam related here to the connection between two verses – an earlier one and a later one.[[24]](#footnote-24) According to this gloss, applying the anticipatory principle requires three conditions:

1. ‘Something may be explained in one place, where it is unnecessary’ – The anticipatory verse is not necessary where it is mentioned; it adds nothing within its current context.
2. ‘So that you do not wonder’ – If the anticipatory verse were missing, we would find it hard to understand the later, difficult verse.
3. ‘For something that is mentioned as having occurred at a later stage’ – The anticipatory verse solves the difficulty that arises in the later verse.

Further on, Rashbam presents a classic example of an anticipatory verse – ‘The sons of Noah who came out of the ark were Shem, Ham, and Japheth – Ham being the father of Canaan’ (Gen. 9:18):

כדכתיב 'שם חם ויפת' וכתיב 'וחם הוא אבי כנען', אלא מפני שכתב לפניו 'ארור כנען' (בר’ ט, כה), ואילו לא פורש תחילה מי כנען לא היינו יודעין למה קללו נח.

It says ‘Shem, Cham and Yephet’, and adds that ‘Cham was the father of Canaan’. Later, the Torah tells us that Noah cursed Canaan (Gen. 9:25), and had it not earlier explained who Canaan is, we would not have known why Noah cursed him.

 The verse appears redundant since it is unclear why Cham’s son should be mentioned here (Shem and Yephet’s descendants are not mentioned). The later verse quotes Noah: ‘He said, “Cursed be Canaan; The lowest of slaves shall he be to his brothers” (Gen. 9:25). If we ignore the anticipatory verse, this verse is difficult. As Rashbam says – ‘We would not have known why Noah cursed him’: Who is this Canaan that Noah bothers to curse? The anticipatory verse solves this by explaining to the reader who Canaan is and his relationship to Noah.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Kara defined the anticipatory principle similarly:

שכן נהגו כל הכתובים כולן, על כל מילה שעתידין הבריות לחלוק, והוא מייתר בלשון ומיישר לפניהם דרך.

וכן דרך מקראות רבים, שקודמין ללמדך על דבר שאתה עתיד לתהות עליו.

So is the practice in the entire Bible, that for each verse about which people will disagree in the future, it uses redundant language and smooths the way before them (Gen. 22:13);

So it is in many verses, that it foreshadows to teach you about something you will later wonder about (1Sam. 1:3).

His definition is a little less clear than Rashbam’s, but its upshot is identical and contains the same three requirements presented above.[[26]](#footnote-26)

In the commentaries of Kara, Rashbam, and Ribash, the primary sources for Hizkuni’s work, we find dozens of glosses related to the anticipatory principle.[[27]](#footnote-27)

What was Hizkuni’s attitude toward this principle, and how did he relate to the dozens of times it is mentioned in his predecessors’ commentaries? I meticulously checked each case where the abovementioned exegetes mentioned the anticipatory principle and compared them to what Hizkuni wrote on those verses. In an article that will appear separately, this comparison led to the conclusion that Hizkuni did not pay particular attention to the anticipatory principle. It perhaps did not even identify it as an important principle of the northern French *peshat* school.[[28]](#footnote-28) If I am correct, Hizkuni did not ‘invent’ the glosses related to this principle.

**The anticipatory principle in Hizkuni’s writings**

Given the above conclusions, it is surprising to find about 20 glosses in Hizkuni that cite the anticipatory principle according to all the criteria. These glosses are not found in other extant commentaries or, if found, are in a completely different formulation.[[29]](#footnote-29) If we are correct in assuming that Hizkuni did not consider the anticipatory principle important and perhaps did not even identify it, these glosses presumably did not originate with him. It is more likely that these too were taken from the collection of commentaries on his desk.

Exegetes who proposed glosses related to the anticipatory principle tended to use set terminology in these glosses.[[30]](#footnote-30) I wish to focus on three phrases that characterize the terminology of commentaries that cite the anticipatory principle: ‘קדם ולמדך’ (‘it foreshadows and teaches you’); ‘לפי שעתיד לומר’ (‘for it will later say’); and ‘שלא תתמה’ (‘so you do not wonder’). These will help us uncover Kara’s lost commentary.

\*\*\*

‘קדם ולמדך’ - *It foreshadows and teaches you*

The phrase ‘קדם ולמדך’ (‘it foreshadows and teaches you’) appears 11 times in extant Kara commentaries.[[31]](#footnote-31) All cite the anticipatory principle. This phrase is unique to Kara and does not appear, even once, in Rashbam’s or Ribash’s writings.[[32]](#footnote-32) It appears seven times in Hizkuni, always connected to the anticipatory principle. Assuming that Hizkuni did not invent glosses related to the anticipatory principle, and based on the fact that this phrase is unique to Kara, we can surmise that the glosses that appear in Hizkuni were taken from Kara’s lost commentary on the Torah. Here are the cases:

1. Regarding Jacob and Esau, the Torah relates: ‘So the boys grew. And Esau was a skillful hunter, a man of the field; but Jacob was a mild man, dwelling in tents’ (Gen. 25:27). Explaining the inclusion of this expositional information, Hizkuni writes:

איש ידע ציד – אומנותו ברמאות שאין צידת חיה ועוף בלא רמיה. ולפי שעתיד לומר בסמוך ‘הביאה לי ציד’ (בר’ כז, ז), **קדם ולמדך** כאן שעשו איש ציד היה.

A skillful hunter – he was skilled in deception, for trapping birds and animals is only through deception. Since it will later say, ‘Bring me savoury meat’ (Gen. 27:7), *it foreshadows and teaches you* here that Esau was a skilled hunter.

The role of the earlier verse is to prevent the reader from being surprised when he reaches the later verse and discovers that Isaac asked Esau to bring him game. The fact that this gloss includes the phrase ‘לפי שעתיד לומר’ (‘for it will later say’), which is also characteristic of Kara’s commentary (see footnote 40, below), supports the claim that its source is Kara’s commentary.

2. Later in the gloss, Hizkuni writes the following:

ישב אהלים […] ולפי שעתיד לומר שהיה רועה את צאן לבן **קדם ולמדך** שאמנתו לרעות צאן.

Dwelling in tents […] Since it will later say that he tended Laban’s flocks, *it foreshadows and teaches you* that he was skilled at shepherding.

Here, too, the earlier verse prevents the reader’s surprise upon reaching the later verse and discovering that Jacob was appointed Laban’s shepherd (see Gen. 30:29). Here, too, the fact that this gloss has the phrase ‘and since it will later say’, which is also characteristic of Kara’s commentary, supports the claim that it is sourced in Kara’s writings.

3. The Torah relates about Esau’s wives: ‘And they brought grief to Isaac and Rebekah’ (Gen. 26:35). Explaining this expositional information, Hizkuni offers two possibilities. First:

ותהיין מרת רוח – לפי שעתיד לומר 'אם לוקח יעקב אשה מבנות חת כאלה מבנות הארץ למה לי חיים' (בר’ כז, מו), **קדם ולמדך כאן** שלא היו נוחות ליצחק ולרבקה.

And they brought grief – Since it will later say, ‘If Jacob takes a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these, of the daughters of the land, wherefore should I live?’ (Gen. 27:46), *it foreshadows and teaches you here* that they did not please Isaac and Rebecca.

This suggests that the role of the introductory verse is to solve a later difficulty – the reason for Rebecca’s complaint against the daughters of Heth (Gen. 27:46). The introductory verse sheds light on Rebecca’s words and explains that she is familiar with daughters of Heth through her acquaintance with her daughters-in-law, Esau’s wives.

Rashbam proposes a similar explanation:

לפי שעתיד לומר 'אם לוקח יעקב אשה מבנות חת כאלה' (בר’ כז, מו), לכך הוצרך לפרש תחילה

Since it will later say ‘If Jacob takes a wife of the daughters of Heth such as these’ [Gen. 27:46], therefore it needed to explain this earlier.

The content of the gloss is similar to the previous one, so perhaps Rashbam was the source of Hizkuni’s comment.[[33]](#footnote-33) However, I think that we cannot ignore the different terminology relating to the anticipatory principle: Hizkuni uses the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, whereas Rashbam uses the phrase ‘therefore it needed to explain this earlier’ (R. Haim Paltiel uses an identical phrase in his commentary, which he definitely took from Rashbam). Remember that the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ appears only in Kara’s commentary and not in Rashbam’s, and it is hard to believe that Hizkuni changed the wording himself. I therefore am convinced that the source of this gloss is Kara’s lost commentary. Below, I will discuss the broader question regarding the relationship between Kara’s commentary and Rashbam’s commentary relating to the anticipatory principle.

4. Hizkuni cites also a second reason to explain the description of Esau’s wives:

ועוד: אם היה להם ליצחק ולרבקה נחת רוח מהם היו יושבות בבית אחד, וכשיבא יעקב ליטול את הברכות יהיו מודיעות ליצחק אין זה עשו בכורך. לפיכך **קדם ולימדך כאן** שהיו מורת רוח ליצחק וגרשם מביתו.

In addition, if they had pleased Isaac and Rebecca, they would have dwelt in one house, and when Jacob came to take the blessings, they would have informed Isaac that this is not his firstborn Esau. Therefore, *it foreshadows and teaches you here* that they did not please Isaac, and he had banished them from his home.

According to this second option, the story of Jacob stealing Esau’s blessings raises a problem: How was Jacob able to deceive his father when Esau’s wives (who were not blind like Isaac) would have exposed his identity and let Isaac know that he is an imposter? The anticipatory verse solves this problem by telling us, earlier on, that Isaac had banished his daughters-in-law from his home.

Novetsky (in his edition) suggested that the source of the second gloss is R. Aharon ben Yosi Hacohen, author of the exegetical anthology *Sefer Hagan*, who writes:

לכך הזכיר רעתן, שלא תתמה איך עשתה רבקה ליעקב מטעמים כדי להעביר הברכה מעשו – וליצחק נתחלף עשו ביעקב. ולא הרגישה אחת מנשיו לגלות ליצחק את העניין כדי שלא יפסיד הברכות. לכך כתב שהיו ‘מורת רוח’ ורחקו מעליהן ולא היו יודעות בטיב הברית כלום.

Therefore, he mentioned their wickedness, so you would not wonder how Rebecca prepared savory food for Jacob to transfer the blessing from Esau – and how Isaac confused Jacob for Esau. Neither of his wives noticed to disclose the matter to Isaac so that he would not lose the blessings. Therefore, it says that they ‘brought grief’ and were removed, so they were not at all aware of the covenant.[[34]](#footnote-34)

The content is very similar, and *Sefer Hagan*’s influence on Hizkuni is well-established.[[35]](#footnote-35) However, the singular phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ does not appear anywhere in *Sefer Hagan*, which teaches us that Hizkuni’s source was probably Kara. What appears in *Sefer Hagan* and other places is most likely an adaptation of Kara’s original gloss.[[36]](#footnote-36)

5. Genesis 35:22 relates: ‘And it came to pass, while Israel dwelt in that land, that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah, his father’s concubine; and Israel heard of it.’ Hizkuni writes:

מקרא ד'וישמע' נכתב שלא תתמה לכשתגיע ל'כי עלית משכבי אביך' (בר' מט, ד) לומר מי הגיד לו ליעקב. לפיכך **קדם כאן ולמדך** ששמע.

‘And [Israel] heard of it’ was written so that you will not wonder, when you reach ‘For you went up to your father’s bed’ (Gen. 49:4), who told Jacob. Therefore, *it foreshadows and teaches you here* that he had heard.

The difficulty with the earlier verse is why it mentions that Jacob ‘heard’ about Reuben’s act. The later verse, which appears when Jacob blesses his sons, raises the question – how did Jacob know about his son’s deed? This difficulty is solved by the information given in the introductory verse.

Rashbam similarly explained the relation between the introductory verse and the later verse. This is what he wrote in his gloss on Gen. 1:1:

'וישכב את בלהה פלגש אביו וישמע ישראל' (בר' לה, כב), למה נכתב כאן 'וישמע ישראל', והלא לא נכתב כאן שדיבר יעקב מאומה על ראובן? אלא לפי שבשעת פטירתו אמר 'פחז כמים אל תותר כי עלית משכבי אביך אז חללת יצועי עלה' (בר’ מט, ד), לפיכך הקדים 'וישמע ישראל', שלא תתמה בראותך שהוכיחו על כך בסוף ימיו.

‘Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father’s concubine; and Israel heard of it’ (Gen. 35:22). Why is it written here, ‘and Israel heard of it’, since nothing is written here of Jacob saying anything to Reuben? But on his deathbed, he said, ‘Unstable as water, you shall not excel, because you went up to your father’s bed, then you defiled it – he went up to my couch’ (Gen. 49:4). Therefore this was preceded by, ‘and Israel heard of it’, so you will not wonder when you see that he admonished him for this at the end of his life.

In his gloss on the verse itself, he wrote briefly:

לא נכתב זה אלא להודיעך שבשביל ששמע יעקב את הדבר, אמר לו בשעת צוואתו 'פחז כמים אל תותר כי עלית משכבי אביך' (בר' מט, ד)

This was only written to inform you that since Israel had heard of it, he told him on his deathbed, ‘Unstable as water, you shall not excel, because you went up to your father’s bed’ (Gen. 49:4).

The content of this gloss is identical to Hizkuni’s, and one could ostensibly claim that Hizkuni’s source was Rashbam. However, I prefer the theory that Hizkuni’s source was not Rashbam but Kara’s lost commentary. First, the gloss contains the formulation ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ that is characteristic of Kara and never appears in Rashbam’s commentary. Additionally – there is some resemblance between Rashbam’s gloss on Gen. 1:1 and Hizkuni’s gloss: The phrase ‘so you do not wonder’ appears in both places, and the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you here’ in Hizkuni is similar to ‘this was preceded by’ in Rashbam. However, both phrases do not appear in Rashbam’s gloss on chapter 35, and there is no resemblance between Rashbam’s wording in our verse and Hizkuni’s gloss. These data suggest that Rasham’s gloss on this verse is not the source for Hizkuni’s. I think it more likely that Hizkuni took his gloss from an exegete who explained the verse itself than that he took his gloss on Gen. 35 from Rashbam’s gloss on Gen. 1. To these considerations, I would like to add that the wording that appears in Hizkuni’s gloss is very accurate, and seems like a precise quote from some other source. If this is true, we cannot assume that his source was Rashbam, who had worded it differently.

This gloss also includes the phrase ‘so you do not wonder’, which is also common, mainly in Kara’s commentary (see n. 47, below). The presence of this phrase also supports the claim that Kara was the source of the gloss.

6. At the end of the plague of hail, it says: ‘But the wheat and the spelt were not struck, for they are late crops’ (Ex. 9:32). Hizkuni offers the following gloss:

והחטה והכסמת לא נכו – לפי שעתיד לומר ‘ואכל את יתר הפליטה הנשארת לכם מן הברד’ (שמ’ י, ה), ויש פתחון פה לחלוק ולומר הרי כבר נאמר ‘ואת כל עשב השדה הכה הברד’ (שמ’ ט, כה), לכך **קדם ולמדך כאן** שהחטה והכוסמת לא נוכו כי אפילת הנה, שמה שלא שבר הברד אכל הארבה, הברד מקלקל את הקשה והארבה אוכל את הרך.

But the wheat and the spelt were not struck – for it will later say ‘They will devour whatever is left after the hail’ (Ex. 9:25), and one might differ and claim that it already said that ‘the hail struck every herb of the field’ (Ex. 9:25). Therefore, *it foreshadows and teaches you here* that the wheat and the spelt were not destroyed because they are late crops. Whatever the hail did not destroy was eaten by the locusts; the hail destroys the hard, and the locusts eat the soft.

The question here is why the earlier verse mentions plants that were not destroyed by the hail. The gloss presents later verses that raise a difficulty: How can the locusts still have what to eat if the hail struck every herb of the field? This difficulty is solved by the information given in the earlier verse.

Rashbam offers a similar explanation in this case as well: ‘לא נוכו – להודיעך שמה שלא שיבר הברד אכל הארבה. הברד מקלקל את הקשה והארבה אוכל את הרך’ (‘Were not destroyed – to tell you that what the hail had not destroyed, the locusts ate. The hail destroys the hard and the locusts eat the soft’).[[37]](#footnote-37) Rashbam’s gloss here is verbally identical to the final sentence in Hizkuni’s gloss, which could have led us to conclude that the entire gloss was taken from Rashbam. However, Rashbam did not include the exegetical problem in his gloss, only the connection between the earlier verse and the later information. The long sentence that opens Hizkuni’s explanation and introduces the exegetical problem and the contradiction between the verses is not found in Rashbam’s gloss as we have it. It is this sentence that contains the phrase ‘foreshadows and teaches you’ that characterizes Kara and is not found in any of Rashbam’s glosses, and the phrase ‘and it will later say’ that characterizes Kara (see n. 40, below) and is very rare in Rashbam. Therefore, I believe that this is another example (one of many) of a case where Hizkuni integrated quotes from two different exegetes into one gloss: The first part of the gloss (until the words ‘because they are late crops’) is taken from Kara’s lost commentary (and is very likely a direct quote from the original), and the second part of the gloss (from the word ‘Whatever’) was quoted from Rashbam’s commentary.[[38]](#footnote-38)

7. The opening verses to Deuteronomy state: ‘After he had slain Sihon the king of the Amorites, who dwelt in Heshbon, and Og the king of Bashan, who dwelt at Astaroth in Edrei’ (Deut 1:4). Hizkuni brings the following explanation:

אחרי הכתו וגו’ – לפי שכתב לקמן ולא “אבה סיחון מלך חשבון” וגו’ (דב’ ב, ל) ושניהם בשנת הארבעים, **קדם הכתוב ולמדך** כאן שמלחמת סיחון קדמה למשנה תורה.

After he had slain, etc. – Since it will later say, ‘But King Sihon of Heshbon refused’ etc. (Deut 2:30), and both were in the fortieth year, *it foreshadows and teaches you* here that the war against Sihon happened before Deuteronomy.

The earlier verse includes expositional data about Israel’s wars on the eastern side of the Jordan. The later verse describes the war itself. It is not entirely clear what concerned the exegete when he wrote this gloss and how the earlier verse solves a difficulty in the later verse. Perhaps some corruption of the text arose in copying the gloss. In any case, the terminology – ‘since it will later say’, ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, shows that this gloss cites the anticipatory principle. Since it contains the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, we can assume that the source of this gloss is Kara’s lost commentary.[[39]](#footnote-39)

\*\*\*

‘לפי שעתיד לומר’ – *Since it will later say*

The phrase ‘לפי שעתיד לומר’ (‘since it will later say’) appears six times in the extant copies of Kara’s commentary.[[40]](#footnote-40) In all the appearances, the phrase is related to the anticipatory principle. This phrase is found only once in Rashbam and once in Ribash.[[41]](#footnote-41)

The phrase appears in Hizkuni ten times.[[42]](#footnote-42) I am fairly sure that nine of these were taken from Kara’s lost commentary, as discussed below.[[43]](#footnote-43)

Four cases (Gen. 25:27a; 25:27b; 26:35; Ex. 9:32) also include the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ discussed in the previous section (examples 1,2,3,6). The fact that these glosses also include the phrase ‘since it will later say’, also characteristic of Kara’s glosses, supports the assumption that these four glosses are sourced in Kara’s lost commentary.

In one case, the gloss found in Hizkuni is absent in the other commentaries we have, and therefore, it is very likely sourced in Kara’s lost commentary:

8. About the war against Amalek, we read: ‘So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, and fought with Amalek; and Moses, Aaron, and Hur went up to the top of the hill’ (Ex. 17:10). In Hizkuni we find:

משה אהרן וחור – **לפי שעתיד לומר** “ואהרן וחור תמכו בידיו” (שמ’ יז, יב), קדם וכתב לך כאן שהם עלו עמו ראש הגבעה.

Moses, Aaron, and Hur – *since it will later say* ‘and Aaron and Hur supported his arms’ (Ex. 17:12), it foreshadows and writes for you here that they went to the top of the hill with him.

According to this gloss, the information in the earlier verse foreshadows the later mention of Aaron and Hur supporting Moses during the war. Novetsky noted that a similar gloss appears in the ‘Oxford-Munich collection’[[44]](#footnote-44) in the name of ‘Kara’, leading him to suggest Kara as the source of this gloss. The use of the phrase ‘since it will later say’, characteristic of Kara’s glosses, supports Novetsky’s claim.[[45]](#footnote-45)

In two other cases, I am fairly certain that the source of Hizkuni’s gloss is Kara’s commentary:

9. ‘And the daughter of Pharaoh came down to bathe in the river; and her maidens walked along by the riverside; and she saw the ark among the reeds, and sent her handmaid to fetch it’ (Ex. 2:5). The following gloss appears in Hizkuni:

ונערתיה – הזכירן כאן **לפי שעתיד לומר** “ותשלח את אמתה”, שהיא אחת מן הנערות.

And her maidens – They are mentioned here *since it will later say,* ‘and she sent her handmaid’, who was one of her maidens.

Mention of the maidens (נערתיה) at the beginning of the verse sheds light on the word ‘handmaid’ (אמתה) that appears later in the verse. This gloss does not appear in Rashbam or Ribash’s commentaries.

10. ‘So Moses and Aaron came to Pharaoh and said to him, “Thus says the Lord God of the Hebrews: How long will you refuse to humble yourself before Me? Let My people go, that they may serve Me”’ (Ex. 10:3). The following gloss appears in Hizkuni:

ויבא משה ואהרן – מה שלא הזכיר בשאר מכות שבאו שניהם שהרי אין צריך שגלוי לכל שאהרן היה עמו בכל דבריו, ומה שהזכירו כאן **לפי שעתיד לומר** שנתגרשו שניהם, דכתיב “ויושב את משה ואת אהרן” (שמ’ י, ח).

So Moses and Aaron came – This was not mentioned in the other plagues, that they both came since there was no need since everyone knows that Aaron was with him in everything, but it is mentioned here *since it will later say* that they were both banished, as it says, ‘So Moses and Aaron were brought again to Pharaoh’ (Ex. 10:8).

The mention of Aaron seems superfluous since Aaron always accompanied Moses. According to the proffered explanation, his mention is for the sake of the next stage of the story, wherein they will both be banished by Pharaoh. This gloss also does not appear in Rashbam and Ribash. In both these cases (9-10), similar content appears in Ibn Ezra’s long commentary on Exodus; Ibn Ezra is famously one of Hizkuni’s sources.[[46]](#footnote-46) However, the phrase ‘since it will later say’ does not appear anywhere in Ibn Ezra’s commentary on the Bible. In addition, Ibn Ezra belongs to a different exegetical school from that of northern France, and he did not make use of the anticipatory principle. For these two reasons, we may conclude that the similarity between the glosses is coincidental, and it is Kara’s lost commentary, and not Ibn Ezra, that is the source of the glosses in Hizkuni.

In two other cases, I find it difficult to determine whether the source of the glosses is Rashbam or Kara’s lost commentary:

11. In Gen. 19:15, we read: ‘When the morning dawned, the angels urged Lot to hurry, saying, “Arise, take your wife and your two daughters who are here, lest you be consumed in the punishment of the city.”’ Rashbam writes:

וכמו השחר עלה – נכתב פסוק זה בשביל שכתוב לפנינו 'השמש יצא על הארץ ולוט בא צוערה' (בר' יט, כג), להודיע שכל כך המתינו לו המלאכים בשביל חיבתו של אברהם.

When the morning dawned – This verse was written for when we read, ‘The sun had risen upon the earth, and Lot came to Zoar’ (Gen. 19:23) to inform us that the angels waited for him because of Abraham’s favor.

In Hizkuni, we find a similar gloss:

וכמו השחר עלה – כתוב זה נכתב **לפי שעתיד לומר** 'השמש יצא על הארץ ולוט בא צוערה' (בר' יט, כג), להודיע שכל כך המתינו לו המלאכים לשחת הערים בשביל חיבתו של אברהם אבינו.

When the morning dawned – this was written *since it will later say,* ‘The sun had risen upon the earth, and Lot came to Zoar’ (Gen. 19:23) to inform us that the angels waited for him before they destroyed the cities because of our father Abraham’s favor.

12. In Lev. 13:2 it says: ‘When a man has on the skin of his flesh a rising, or a scab, or a bright spot, and it becomes in the skin of his flesh the sore of leprosy, then he shall be brought unto Aaron the priest, or unto one of his sons the priests.’ Rashbam writes:

 לפי שלפנינו יאמר: 'כי יהיה בו נגע בראש או בזקן' (וי' יג, כט), הוצרך כאן לומר בעור בשר

Since below it will say, ‘When a man or woman has a sore upon the head or the beard’ (Lev. 13:29), here it is necessary to say ‘on the skin of his flesh.’

Hizkuni writes:

בעור בשרו – לפי שעתיד לומר לקמן 'נגע בראש או בזקן' (וי' יג, כט) הוצרך לומר כאן בעור בשרו

On the skin of his flesh – *since it will later say* ‘a sore upon the head or the beard’ (Lev. 13:29), it is necessary to say here ‘on the skin of his flesh’.

In both cases (11-12), there is significant linguistic similarity between Rashbam’s gloss and the one that appears in Hizkuni, and we may suppose that Rashbam is the source of the gloss. However, the wording ‘since it will later say’ in these glosses is found only in Hizkuni (the formulation that appears in Rashbam is ‘Since below it will say’; ‘for it will be stated below’), and this may point to Kara as the source of these glosses.[[47]](#footnote-47) If we accept these arguments, there are two more cases where Kara and Rashbam proposed similar glosses connected to the anticipatory principle, as discussed below. I tend to accept the arguments, but there is no way to conclusively determine whether the gloss was taken from Rashbam with its wording changed or whether the source was Kara, who offered a similar gloss in his characteristic wording.

\*\*\*

‘שלא תתמה’ – *So you should not wonder*

The phrase ‘שלא תתמה’ (‘so you do not wonder’) appears 14 times in the extant Kara commentaries.[[48]](#footnote-48) In all appearances, the phrase is connected to the anticipatory principle. This phrase only appears once in Rashbam and four times in Ribash.[[49]](#footnote-49) It appears five times in Hizkuni.[[50]](#footnote-50) I suppose, with various degrees of certainty, that four of the appearances were taken from Kara’s lost commentary, as discussed below.[[51]](#footnote-51)

One case (Gen. 35:22) also includes the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, discussed above (example 5). The fact that this gloss contains the phrase ‘so you do not wonder’, which also characterizes Kara’s glosses, supports the theory offered above that the source of this gloss is Kara’s lost commentary.

13. An additional case is not a new insight since the gloss appearing in Hizkuni is explicitly found in the extant fragments of Kara’s commentary. Ex. 13:18 says: ‘And God led the people about, by way of the wilderness by the Reed Sea; and the children of Israel went up armed [*hamushim*]out of the land of Egypt.’ Exegetes deliberated about the meaning of the word ‘*hamushim*’. Kara wrote:

[…] ומקרא זה לא נכתב כאן כי אם לשבר את האוזן,⁠ **שלא תתמה** במלחמת עמלק ובמלחמת סיחון ועוג ומדין, מאיין היו להם כלי זיין שהכום ישראל לפי חרב.

[...] and this was only written here to clarify, *so you should not wonder* in the war of Amalek and the war of Sihon and Og and Midyan, from where they had weapons, for Israel smote them by the sword.

Kara’s wording makes it clear that he regarded this gloss as related to the anticipatory principle. The information that seems superfluous – mentioning that the Israelites were armed (meaning, bearing weapons) when they left Egypt – came to solve a difficulty later on, when we may wonder how they contended with enemies that awaited them in the desert and on the eastern side of the Jordan river. Hizkuni writes:

[…] ועוד **שלא תתמה** מהיכן באו להם כלי זיין במלחמת המדבר ובמלחמות ארץ ישראל.

[...] and further, *so you should not wonder* from where they had weapons in the war of the desert and in the wars of the Land of Israel.

Hizkuni added ‘the wars of the Land of Israel’ that were not mentioned in Kara’s gloss, perhaps alluding to the wars of ‘Sihon and Og’ (as mentioned in Kara). Another option is that he filled in this detail based on Rashbam’s gloss, who admittedly did not make use of the anticipatory principle here but explained:

וחמושים – בכלי זיין, שהיו הולכים לירש את ארץ כנען, כמו שכתוב למעלה ‘ואומר אעלה אתכם מעני מצרים אל ארץ הכנעני’ וגו׳ (שמ’ ג, יז).

Armed [*hamushim*] – with weapons, as they were on their way to inherit the land of Canaan, as it says above, ‘And I have said: I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt unto the land of the Canaanite…’ (Ex. 3:17).

According to this explanation, Hizkuni’s gloss here is based on Kara’s commentary, with a slight adaptation and an addition based on Rashbam. This is another good example of Hizkuni’s artful integration, weaving different commentaries into a unified one (compare example 6 above).

14. Genesis 24:59 tells us: ‘And they sent away Rebecca their sister, and her nursemaid, and Abraham’s servant, and his men.’ Hizkuni’s gloss says:

ואת מנקתה – בנעוריה. והזכירה עכשיו, שלא תתמה לכשתגיע לפרשת מיתתה (בר' לה, ח) לומר מאין באה.

And her nursemaid – In her youth. And it mentions her now, *so you would not wonder* when you reach the story of her death (Gen. 35:8) and ask where she came from.

Mentioning Rebecca’s nursemaid seems superfluous and serves as an introduction to the later mention of her death. This gloss does not appear in Rashbam or Ribash, making it very likely that it was taken from Kara’s lost commentary.

15. Biblical exegetes pondered why the Bible presents such a lengthy detailed description of Abraham’s servant’s speech to Laban and his family (Gen. 24:34-49). Hizkuni’s gloss (on Gen. 24:42) reads:

ואבא היום – פר"ש: פרשתו של אליעזר כפולה וכו'. ולפי הפשט: נכפלה, להודיעך כי הוא ספר להם איך השביעו אברהם ואיך אירעה לו רבקה בתפלתו, שאם לא כן תתמה היאך הסכימו לו מיד קרובי רבקה. הוא שנאמר 'ויאמרו מי"י יצא הדבר' (בר' כד, נ).

And I have come today – Rashi says: The pericope of Eliezer is doubled, etc. According to the *peshat*, it was doubled to inform you that he told them how Abraham had made him take an oath and how Rebecca appeared to him [in answer to] his prayer, *for otherwise you would wonder* why Rebecca’s relatives immediately agreed [to his request]. This is as it says, ‘And they said that the thing is from God’ (Gen. 24:50).

According to this explanation, the seemingly superfluous details are mentioned to solve a future difficulty – why Rebecca’s relatives agreed to hand her over to the servant. Rashbam has a similar explanation:

ואומר י״י אלהי אדוני אברהם וגו׳ – כל אריכות דברים להודיעם שמאת הקב״ה יצא הדבר.

And I said, O Lord, God of my master Abraham – All this length is to inform them that the thing is from God.

It seems that Rashbam was Hizkuni’s source, especially since both glosses deal with several verses (Abraham’s servant’s speech) yet were anchored to the same verse (though each related to a different part of that verse). If so, we should note that Hizkuni significantly expanded Rashbam’s gloss (or, perhaps, we currently have a shorter version of Rashbam’s gloss than the original). However, as noted, Hizkuni’s gloss is more detailed than Rashbam’s and also includes the phrase ‘for otherwise you would wonder’, which is more common in Kara’s writing than in Rashbam’s. Therefore, we may presume that the source was Kara’s lost commentary from a gloss similar to what we found in Rashbam.

**Kara** **and Rashbam**

The two great *peshat* exegetes – Kara and Rashbam – knew each other, but their relationship has not yet been broadly examined. One of the more important points of contact between the two was that both methodologically wrote glosses based on the principle of anticipation. Today, we know of only two cases where these two exegetes offered a similar gloss relating to the principle of anticipation (Gen. 26:15; Ex. 2:23). However, if my claim regarding the discovery of elements of Kara’s lost commentary is accepted, we will have significantly expanded the number of parallel glosses in this area: In six of the cases presented above (examples 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15), we saw a similarity between Rashbam’s glosses relating to the principle of anticipation and the glosses that I identify as Kara’s.

Regarding Kara’s and Rashbam’s use of the principle of anticipation, scholars disagree about who influenced whom.[[52]](#footnote-52) Razin and Littman argue that Rashbam devised this method, which then influenced Kara.[[53]](#footnote-53) Touitou asserts that Kara devised the method, but Rashbam broadly and more systematically formulated and applied it. He argues that Kara formulated the principle in a long and convolutive manner, while Rashbam presented it briefly and clearly. Rashbam also repeatedly used the same example, mentioning it many times in his commentary.[[54]](#footnote-54) Brin, too, believes that Kara invented the method, claiming that Kara implemented it with greater success than Rashbam. In addition, he writes that ‘The manner of developing the formula and its sub-types are dozens of times richer in Kara’s commentary than in Rashbam […] Rashbam is not aware of the force of the phenomenon.’[[55]](#footnote-55)

Since we do not have the complete commentaries of these two exegetes, it is difficult to determine who used this principle more than the other. Kara was older than Rashbam, but each mentioned the other in their respective commentaries.[[56]](#footnote-56) However, Rashbam apparently wrote his commentary on the Torah near the end of his life, after Kara’s death.[[57]](#footnote-57) I also find both of Touitou’s arguments convincing. Therefore, I believe Kara was the original exegete to note this phenomenon, but each of the exegetes ‘took’ it in a different direction, as I have demonstrated elsewhere.[[58]](#footnote-58) In any case, the additional data presented in the current paper may contribute to future studies that compare these two exegetes.

**Conclusion**

This paper presented 15 passages from Hizkuni’s commentary on the Torah, which, I believe, are sourced in Kara’s lost commentary. I based the identification on a literary principle common in Kara’s commentary, the principle of anticipation, and on phrases that are singular to Kara: 'קדם ולמדך' (‘it foreshadows and teaches you’), 'לפי שעתיד לומר' (‘since it will later say’), and 'שלא תתמה' (‘so you do not wonder’). The identification was also based on the assumption that Hizkuni did not pay particular attention to the principle of anticipation, perhaps not even considering it one of the more significant principles of the *peshat* school of northern France. Based on this assumption, it is likely that Hizkuni did not write these glosses himself but appropriated them from his predecessors. These glosses do not appear, as formulated, in extant northern French commentaries, leading to the conclusion that their source was Kara’s lost commentary on the Torah.

The presented findings may serve as a basis for a broader study that will examine other literary principles and unique linguistic forms found in Kara, using them to identify additional sections of his lost commentary scattered throughout the anthologies of the Tosafists’ writings on the Torah.
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