Restoring Rabbi Joseph Kara’s Commentary on the Torah

through Literary Principles and Unique Linguistic Forms

**Introduction**

Rabbi Joseph Kara (RJK, c. 1050-1130) is considered one of the more important exegetes in the *peshat* school of northern France during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[[1]](#footnote-1) It seems that he, or his family, hailed from Provence. In his youth, he was highly influenced by his uncle (his father’s brother), R. Menahem bar Helbo, and throughout his life he was exposed to several important cultural centers, including Provence, Ashkenaz, Italy, France, and Spain. When his studies brought him to the level of Torah scholar, he arrived at Troyes, and his comprehensive commentary on the Bible was significantly influenced by Rashi who resided there. Most scholars believe that RJK composed a commentary on most of the Bible, of which much did not survive.[[2]](#footnote-2)

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

Urbach was the first to posit, in a short footnote, that RJK wrote an independent commentary on the Torah.[[4]](#footnote-4) Grossman’s findings, which are based on the Italian *geniza*, shed new light on the topic and conclusively proved that RJK 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 a question about the relationship between the local glosses on Rashi’s commentary and the systematic, crystallized commentary. He suggested that RJK first glossed Rashi’s commentary on the Torah, and only later wrote a comprehensive commentary of his own.[[6]](#footnote-6) Novetzky raised a different possibility: RJK 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 RJK first wrote a continuous and complete commentary on the Torah, and, when he copied Rashi’s commentary, added his own glosses alongside it.[[8]](#footnote-8)

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

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

*Finding quotes*

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

Geiger was the first to identify segments of RJK’s commentaries in *Nit’ey 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) Further sections were exposed by Mack and Tzeitkin.[[15]](#footnote-15)

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

A study of many manuscripts of Rashi’s commentary on the Torah yielded glosses written by RJK. These glosses are sometimes found in the margins, but are more often integrated within Rashi’s commentary itself. In many cases, the identification is 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 RJK’s glosses.[[16]](#footnote-16) Most of these glosses were later collated into the *‘Al HaTorah* edition, edited by Hillel Novetzky.

*The European geniza*

As noted above, Grossman identified continuous sections of RJK’s commentary 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 Novetzky’s *‘Al HaTorah* edition.

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

Hizkuni’s commentary is an anthology that comprises commentaries from northern France, such as Rashi, RJK, Rashbam, Rivash, *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 glosses).[[18]](#footnote-18)

Scholars have 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 likewise suggested that the Hizkuni texts could help improve extant versions of Rashbam’s commentary. He demonstrated this through a number of linguistic corrections and completions of glosses that we have in the extant version of Rashbam’s commentary.[[20]](#footnote-20) In his comprehensive study on reconstructing lost Rashbam commentaries, Novetzky 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, Novetzky referred to commentaries identified as RJK’s through the above methods and integrated into Hizkuni’s commentary. He proposed using this information for two purposes: To reconstruct and improve known RJK glosses, and to reconstruct RJK glosses that did not survive at all. He used two examples to demonstrate the first purpose,[[22]](#footnote-22) but I did not find any examples of reconstructing RJK’s missing glosses.

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 Novetzky’s reconstruction of Rashbam’s commentary).

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

**The Principle of Anticipation in northern French *peshat* exegesis**

The ‘Principle of Anticipation’ is one of the important principles revealed by *peshat* exegetes in medieval northern France. Over the past few years, several studies have been dedicated to examining this principle and the breadth of its usage among the exegetes.[[23]](#footnote-23) This principle is primarily connected to Rashbam, who had defined it as early as his first commentary 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.

The plain meaning of the text is, as occurs many times, that something may be explained in one place, where it is not necessary, for something that is mentioned at a later stage [...] so the reader would not wonder.

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

1. ‘As occurs many times, that something may be explained in one place, where it is not necessary’ – The anticipatory verse is not necessary where it is mentioned, it adds nothing within its current context.
2. ‘So the reader would not wonder’ – If the anticipatory verse was missing, we would find it hard to understand the later, difficult verse.
3. ‘For something that is mentioned at a later stage’ – The anticipatory verse solves the difficulty that arises in the later verse.

Further on, Rashbam presents the classical example for the 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, Ham and Yephet’, and adds that ‘Ham 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 had cursed him.

The verse seems redundant since it is unclear why Canaan’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 had cursed him’: Who is this Canaan, that Noah takes pain to curse? The anticipatory verse solves this by explaining to the reader who Canaan is and how he was related to Noah.[[25]](#footnote-25)

RJK similarly defined the Principle of Anticipation:

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.

And this is how it is in all the verses, for each verse that may cause controversy in the future, and it uses redundant language and smooths the way before them (Gen. 22:13).

And so it is in many verses, that it foreshadows and teaches you things you will later wonder about (1Sam. 1:3).

His definition is a bit less clear than Rashbam’s, but its meaning is identical and comprises all three requirements presented above.[[26]](#footnote-26)

In the commentaries of RJK, Rashbam, and Rivash, the primary sources for Hizkuni’s work, we find dozens of glosses related to the Principle of Anticipation.[[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 Principle of Anticipation and compared them to what Hizkuni commented 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 Principle of Anticipation, perhaps not even identifying it as one of the important principles of the northern French *peshat* school.[[28]](#footnote-28) If I am correct, then Hizkuni did not author glosses pertaining to this principle.

**The Principle of Anticipation in Hizkuni’s writings**

Given the above conclusions, it is surprising to find about 20 glosses in Hizkuni that, according to all the criteria, involve the Principle of Anticipation. These glosses are not found in the other extant commentaries, or are found in a completely different formulation.[[29]](#footnote-29) If we are correct in assuming that Hizkuni did not consider, or perhaps did not even identify, the Principle of Anticipation, it is difficult to assume that he added these glosses. It seems more likely that these, too, were taken from the collection of commentaries that were on his desk.

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

\*\*\*

'קדם ולמדך' - *It foreshadows and teaches you*

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

1. Regarding Jacob and Esau, the Torah relates: ‘The boys grew up. And Esau was a skilful hunter, a man of the field; but Jacob was a mild man, dwelling in tents’ (Gen. 25:27). What is the reason for this expositional information? Hizkuni explains:

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 skilful hunter – he was skilled in deception, for trapping birds and animals is only through deception. And 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 specifically asked Esau to bring him game. This gloss includes the phrase ‘for it will later say’, which also characterizes RJK’s commentary (see footnote 40, below), supporting the assumption that its source is RJK’s commentary.

2. Later in the comment, Hizkuni brings the following:

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

Dwelling in tents […] And 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 contains the phrase ‘and since it will later say’, which also characterizes RJK’s commentary (see n. 40, below), supports the assumption that it is sourced in RJK’s writings.

3. The Torah relates about Esau’s wives: ‘And they brought grief to Isaac and Rebecca’ (Gen. 26:35). What is the reason for this expositional information? Hizkuni offers two possibilities. The 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 be explained first’). The content of the gloss is similar to the previous one, so perhaps Rashbam was the source for Hizkuni’s comment.[[33]](#footnote-33) However, I think that we cannot ignore the different use of terminology related to the Principle of Anticipation: Hizkuni uses the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, whereas Rashbam uses the phrase ‘therefore it needed to be explained first’. (R. Haim Paltiel uses an identical phrase in his gloss, which was definitely taken from Rashbam). Remember that we found the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ only in RJK’s commentary, not in Rashbam’s, and it is unlikely that Hizkuni himself changed the wording. Therefore, I believe that the source of this gloss is RJK’s lost commentary. Below, I will discuss the broader question regarding the relationship between RJK’s and Rashbam’s glosses as related to the Principle of Anticipation.

4. Hizkuni also offered a second reason to explain the introduction:

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 could Jacob deceive his father, when Esau’s wives (who are not blind like Isaac) would have exposed his identity and let Isaac know that he is an imposter? The introductory 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. Aron ben Yosi Hacohen, author of the commentary 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. And did one of his wives not feel she should disclose the issue to Isaac so that he [Esau] would not forfeit the blessings? Therefore it says that they ‘brought grief’ and were banished and so were not aware of the covenant at all.[[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’ that does not appear anywhere in *Sefer Hagan* teaches us that Hizkuni’s source was probably RJK. What appears in *Sefer Hagan* and other places is most likely an adaptation of RJK’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 would 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 that it mentions that Jacob ‘heard’ about Reuben’s act. The later verse, from when Jacob blesses his sons, raises the question – How did Jacob know about his Reuben’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 would 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 briefly wrote: '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 at 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 believe that Hizkuni’s source was not Rashbam, but RJK’s lost commentary. First, due to the formulation ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ that is characteristic of RJK 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 would 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 commentary on chapter 35, and there is no resemblance between Rashbam’s wording in our verse and Hizkuni’s gloss. This makes it clear 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 tight 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 would not wonder’, which is also common, mainly in RJK’s commentary (see n. 47, below). This supports the assumption that RJK was the source of the gloss.

6. At the end of the plague of hail, we read: ‘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 question 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 didn’t destroy was eaten by the locust, the hail destroys the hard and the locust 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 locust 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 inform you that what the hail had not destroyed, the locust ate. The hail destroys the hard and the locust eat the soft’).[[37]](#footnote-37) Rashbam’s gloss here is verbally identical to the final part of Hizkuni’s gloss, which can lead us to assume that the entire gloss was taken from Rashbam. However, we should note that 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 RJK and is not found in any of Rashbam’s glosses, and the phase ‘and it will later say’ that characterizes RJK (see n. 40, below) and is very rare in Rashbam. Therefore, I believe that this is an example (one of many) of cases 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 RJK’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 literally 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 Ashtaroth in Edrei’ (Deut 1:4). Hizkuni offers 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 river. The later verse describes the war itself. It is not entirely clear what bothered the exegete when he wrote this gloss and how the earlier verse solves a difficulty in the later one. Perhaps there was some disruption in the process of handing down and copying the gloss. In any case, the terminology that appears in the gloss – ‘since it will later say’, ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, shows that this gloss relates to the Principle of Anticipation. And, since the exegete uses the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’, we can assume that the source of this gloss is RJK’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 RJK’s commentary.[[40]](#footnote-40) In all the appearances, the phrase is related to the Principle of Anticipation. This phrase is found only once in Rashbam and once in Rivash.[[41]](#footnote-41)

The phrase appears in Hizkuni ten times (Gen. 19:15; 25:27a; 25:27b; Ex. 2:5; 9:32; 10:3; 17:10; Lev. 13:2; Num. 13:22); I am fairly sure that nine of these were taken from RJK’s lost commentary, as discussed below.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Four of the cases (Gen. 25:27a; 25:27b; 26:35; Ex. 9:32) also include the phrase ‘it foreshadows and teaches you’ that was 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 RJK’s glosses, supports the theory that these four glosses are sourced in RJK’s lost commentary.

In one case, the gloss found in Hizkuni is not found in the other commentaries we have, and is therefore very likely sourced in RJK’s lost commentary:

8. In 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 teaches you here that they went to the top of the hill with him.

According to this gloss, the information in the earlier verse serves as background for the later mention of Aaron and Hur supporting Moses during the war. Novetzky noted that a similar gloss appears in the Oxford-Munich Anthology[[43]](#footnote-43) in the name of ‘Kara’, leading him to suggest RJK as the source of this gloss. This is supported by the use of the phrase ‘since it will later say’, characteristic of RJK’s glosses.[[44]](#footnote-44)

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

9. ‘And the daughter of Pharaoh came down to bathe in the river; and her maidens walked along by the river-side; 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 at the beginning of the verse sheds light on the word ‘handmaid’ that appears later in the verse. This gloss does not appear in Rashbam or Rivash’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).

Mention of Aaron seems superfluous, since Aaron always accompanied Moses. According to the proffered explanation he was mentioned as an introduction to the next stage of the story, wherein they will both be banished by Pharaoh. This gloss, too, does not appear in either Rashbam or Rivash. 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.[[45]](#footnote-45) And yet, 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 offer glosses relating to the Principle of Anticipation. These two reasons lead us to conclude that the similarity between the glosses is coincidental, and it is RJK’s lost commentary, and not Ibn Ezra, that was 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 RJK’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 waiting for him because of Abraham’s favour.

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 favour.

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 בשרו' (‘Since we have it written “When a man or woman has a sore upon the head or the beard” (Lev. 13:29), here it needed 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), here it needed to say, “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 might suppose that Rashbam was 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 ‘for what is written ahead’; ‘for it will be stated ahead’), and this may point to RJK as the source of these glosses.[[46]](#footnote-46) If we accept the second option, there are two more cases where RJK and Rashbam proposed similar glosses related to the Principle of Anticipation, as discussed below. I tend to accept the second option, but there is no way to conclusively determine whether the gloss was taken from Rashbam with its wording changed, or whether the source was RJK, who offered a similar gloss in his characteristic wording.

\*\*\*

'שלא תתמה' – *So you would not wonder*

The phrase 'שלא תתמה' (‘so you would not wonder’) appears 14 times in the extant RJK glosses.[[47]](#footnote-47) In all appearances, the phrase is connected to the Principle of Anticipation. This phrase only appears once in Rashbam, and four times in Rivash.[[48]](#footnote-48) It appears five times in Hizkuni (Gen. 24:42; 24:59; 28:5; 35:22; Ex. 13:18). I suppose, with various degrees of certainty, that four of the appearances were taken from RJK’s lost commentary, as discussed below.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Once 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 would not wonder’ which also characterizes RJK’s glosses supports the theory, offered above, that the source of this gloss is RJK’s lost commentary.

13. This next case is not a new discovery, since the gloss in Hizkuni explicitly appears in the extant fragments of RJK’s commentary. In Ex. 13:18 it 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*’. RJK 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 give a clear and simple explanation, **so you would not wonder** in the war of Amalek and in the war of Sihon and Og and Midian, from where did they have weapons, since [it is written that] Israel had smitten them by the sword.

RJK’s wording makes it clear that he regarded this gloss as related to the Principle of Anticipation. The information that seems superfluous – mentioning that the Israelites were armed (meaning, bearing weapons) when they left Egypt – comes 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. In Hizkuni we read:

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

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

Hizkuni added ‘the wars of the Land of Israel’ that were not mentioned in RJK’s gloss, perhaps alluding to the wars of ‘Sihon and Og’ (as mentioned in RJK). Another option is that he filled in this detail based on Rashbam’s gloss, who admittedly did not speak of the Principle of Anticipation 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’ etc. (Ex. 3:17).

According to this explanation, it seems that Hizkuni’s gloss is based on RJK’s commentary, with a slight adaptation and an addition based on Rashbam. This is another good example of the art of integration that Hizkuni tended to do, weaving different glosses 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 for the later mention of her death. This gloss does not appear in Rashbam or Rivash, making it very likely that it was taken from RJK’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.

And 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]. And 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 come to solve a future difficulty – why Rebecca’s relatives agreed to hand her over to the slave. 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 RJK’s writing than in Rashbam’s. Therefore, we may presume that the source was RJK’s lost commentary, from a gloss similar to what we found in Rashbam.

**RJK and Rashbam**

The two great *peshat* exegetes – RJK and Rashbam – knew each other, but their relationship has not yet been broadly examined.[[50]](#footnote-50) 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 only have 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 exposure of RJK’s lost commentary is accepted, then 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 glosses relating to the Principle of Anticipation and the glosses that I identify as RJK’s.

Regarding RJK’s and Rashbam’s use of the Principle of Anticipation, scholars disagree which of the two influenced the other. Razin and Littman posited that Rashbam devised this method, which then influenced RJK.[[51]](#footnote-51) Touitou asserted that Kara devised the method, but Rashbam broadly and more systematically consolidated it. He argues that Kara formulated the phenomenon 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.[[52]](#footnote-52) Brin, too, believed 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.’[[53]](#footnote-53)

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.[[54]](#footnote-54) Yet, it seems that Rashbam wrote his commentary on the Torah near the end of his life, after Kara’s death.[[55]](#footnote-55) Furthermore, I find both of Touitou’s arguments convincing. Therefore, I believe that Kara was the source who observed this phenomenon, but each of the exegetes ‘took’ it in a different direction, as I demonstrated elsewhere.[[56]](#footnote-56) 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 sections from Hizkuni’s commentary on the Torah, which, I believe, are sourced in RJK’s lost commentary. I based the identification on a literary principle common in RJK’s commentary, the ‘Principle of Anticipation’, and on phrases that are singular to RJK: 'קדם ולמדך' (‘it foreshadows and teaches you’), 'לפי שעתיד לומר' (‘since it will later say’), and 'שלא תתמה' (‘so you would 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 seems that Hizkuni did not himself write these glosses 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 RJK’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 RJK, using them to identify additional sections of his lost commentary that are scattered throughout the anthologies of the Tosafists’ writings on the Torah.
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