Has Joseph Kaspi’s Commentary on *Sefer ha-Rikma* been Discovered?
A Newly Found Manuscript from the Cairo Genizah

The article is dedicated to Dov and Nancy Friedberg, by whose merit this rare manuscript was first discovered

Introduction[[1]](#footnote-1)

In March 2017, the scholar and well-known benefactor Dov Friedberg invited us to tour the rare books library of the University of Toronto in the course of the Friedberg Genizah Workshop, “Theologians in a Jurist's Robe: Relations between Theology and Law in the Judaeo-Islamic Milieu,” held on March 20–22. As I toured the facility, I examined a manuscript that constitutes a commentary on Yona ibn Jana@h’s *Sefer ha-Rikma* (hereinafter: the *Ha-Rikma* commentary).[[2]](#footnote-2) Ibn Jana@h lived and was active in Spain in the first half of the eleventh century. In his youth, he wrote *Kitab al-Tankih* [Kitab al-Ankih?], which is composed of two books: *Kitab al-Luma*, which takes up various linguistic matters, and *Kitab al-Usul*, a biblical lexicon. These books are seen as the apotheosis of the grammatical and linguistic development of Hebrew in the Middle Ages; most Hebrew dictionaries, grammars, and linguistic works that followed them in the medieval era are based on them.[[3]](#footnote-3) Both were translated into Hebrew by Judah ibn Tibbon in the twelfth century—*Kitab al-Luma* translated into *Sefer ha-Rikma* (hereinafter: *Ha-Riqma*) and *Kitab al-Usul* into *Sefer ha-Shorashim.* *Ha-Rikma,* comprised of forty-six chapters that deal with Hebrew linguistics, grammar, and philology, is based on Judah @Hayyuj’s trilateral root theory. Most of its insights are accepted in modern Hebrew linguistics to this day. The manuscript discussed in this article is a supercommentary on the Hebrew translation of the book. That a commentary on *Ha-Rikma* exists at all is a novelty. We know of no additional commentaries on this work over the generations. Examination of the manuscript shows that it is a thoroughgoing and lengthy commentary on *Ha-Rikma,* discovered only in part.

I have two goals in this article. The first is to survey this Cairo Genizah manuscript that has neither been published nor is known to research and to describe thoroughly both the technical characteristics of the manuscript and the contentual properties of the *Ha-Rikma* commentary with reference to relevant studies. The second goal is to try to determine who wrote this work, i.e., who produced this supercommentary on *Ha-Rikma*, a phenomenon unequaled in the world of medieval linguistic literature. In the course of the inquiry, the dating the manuscript will be explored as well.

Describing the Manuscript

The manuscript was removed from the Cairo Genizah by Solomon Aaron Wertheimer (who also went to the trouble of copying it into his notebook[[4]](#footnote-4)) and is found today in the library of the University of Toronto: Friedberg Collection 017-3.[[5]](#footnote-5) The writing is Middle Spanish [ספרדית בינונית—לא מצאתי מקביל אנגלי למונח זה] on paper. Each page has twenty-two lines. The entire file comprises eight folios written on recto and verso, sixteen pages in all. Paleographic testing dates the manuscript to the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries; an attempt to narrow the dating suggests 1280–1330.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Describing the Contents

Before us are sixteen pages on which we find a commentary on the end of Chapter 20 of Ha-Rikma (the first 2.5 pages), all of Chapter 21 (thirteen pages), and the beginning of chapter 22 (the last half-page). It is a sequential commentary that exhaustively and systematically addresses all of Yona ibn Jana@h’s writings. As stated, the manuscript in our possession is almost certainly only part of an original manuscript hundreds of pages long (ten to fifteen pages of commentary on each of the forty-six chapters of *Ha-Rikma*).

The commentor presents a passage of *Ha-Rikma* and marks it before (the *dibur ha-mat’hil*) and after with two vertically centered dots in order to distinguish the passage from the commentary.

The Commentary Proper—Emending Part of the Manuscript

To give an idea of the nature of the commentary, below I present the first part of Chapter 21 of *Ha-Rikma* alongside my free interpretation and follow with the *Ha-Rikma* commentary along with notes of my own, i.e., a supercommentary on the supercommentary in the manuscript.

The only chapter of *Ha-Rikma* that the commentary as found covers in its entirety, as stated, Chapter 21, which deals with morphological ways of creating adjectives by attributing nouns to various categories, mostly by means of the adjectival *yod* (*yod ha-ya@has*. Examples are attribution by location (as in *adomi*), by paterfamilias (*ha-Dani, ha-Shauli,* etc.), by occupation, and so on. Here are his remarks at the beginning of the chapter[[7]](#footnote-7):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Free translation:Chapter 21—adjectival adjacencyBe aware that the object modified will be the grandfather, the family, the country, and the occupation, and sometimes something other than the family: an event or an object, it will descend upon the object of attribution with that which it modifies.And when it modifies a separate noun, an adjectival *yod* is added after it and its beginning changes or may not change. For example, in reference to ‘*ever*—Avram *ha-‘ivri*, and to Geval—*ve-ha-arets ha-givli*; and to Edom—*adomi,* and to Rakhav—*Rakhavi*; and to Dan—*shevet ha-Dani*, and to Gad—*bene ha-Gadi*, and to Asher—*va-yeshev ha-Asheri*. And it was said oddly: *Ve-el ha-Ashuri ve-el Yizra’el*, so the Targum states: “*ve-‘al bet Asher*; and of Makhir—*Makhiri*, and of Shaul—*ha-Shauli*, and of @Hamul—*ha-@Hamuli*.However, the adjectival form of *yamin* is *ha-yemani,* not by way of analogy, and the adjectival form of *semol—ha-semali,* alsonot analogously. And they may have been thinking of *yemani* as modifying *yamin* in order to distinguish it from the modification of Binyamin, namely: *ish yemini.* And they made ha-semali its practice because it contrasts with the other. And to be analogous to @*Hanokh mishpa@hat ha-@Hanokhi.*And I have already found in the Mishnah something similar to this usage, as they said in Tractate Parah: “Rabbi Yehoshua said: I only heard of *shelashit*. They said to him: What does ‘*shelashit’* mean? He replied, thus I have heard it, without explanation. Ben Azzai said: I will explain: If you say *shelishit,* it means ‘the third’ in number to others, but when you say *shelashit* it means one that is three years old. Similarly they said about a vineyard that is *reva‘i*. They said to him: what does *revi‘i* mean? He replied: thus have I heard it without explanation. Ben Azzai said: I will explain: If you say *revi‘i,* it means the fourth in number to others, but when you say *reva‘i* it means four years old.” And they distinguished between <the> two matters by changing the two words. [להלן תרגום של "תרגום" המחבר]An adjective created by adding a suffixal *yod* to a noun maybe indicative of different types of modification of and relationship with the noun: genealogical, geographical, occupational, and, at times, to an event of some kind.When the adjective is derived from a singular noun, a *yod* is added after the noun, sometimes accompanied by possible phonological changes at the beginning of the word (e.g., *‘ever–‘ivri,* *geval–givli*)[[8]](#footnote-8) and sometimes without (e.g., *Dan–ha-Dani*).In contrast, in the adjective derived from *yamin,* changes in vowels take place: instead of *yemini,* *yemani,* and the like, the letter *mem* is also marked with a kamats in *semali* instead of *semoli.*The change may have been made in order to separate the creation of an adjective from *yamin* (*yemani*) from modification of the tribe of Benjamin (*ish yemini*). The adjective *yemani* with a kamats also brings its mate in train; therefore, *ha-semali* is marked not with a holem as one would expect (just as the holem in *be-tokh* is present in @*Hanokhi* as well) but rather with a kamats. As far back as the Mishna, Tractate Para, the principle of vowelic distinction between forms in order to separate one meaning from another is found: The names of the ordinal numbers *shelishi* and *revi‘i* are differentiated from the adjectives *shelashi* (three years old) and *reva‘i* (four years old). | **זה שער כא - הסמיכה היחשׂית****דע כי היחשׂ יהיה אל אבי האב ואל המשפחה ואל הארץ ואל המלאכה, ויש שייחשׂו אל זולת המשפחה: למאורע או לדבר יפול למיוחשׂ עם אשר יתיחשׂ אליו.** **וכאשר תיחשׂ אל שם נפרד תוסיף באחריתו יוד ליחשׂ, ותשנה תחלתו, ואפשר שלא תשנה. תאמר ביחשׂ אל 'עבר' – לאברם 'העברי'; ואל 'גבָל' – 'והארץ הגִבְלי'; ואל 'אדום' – 'אדומי'; ואל 'רֵכָב' – 'רֵכָבִי'; ואל 'דן' – 'שבט הדני'; ואל 'גד' – 'בני הגדי'; ואל 'אָשֵׁר' – 'וישב הָאָשֵׁרִי', ואמרו על דרך זרה: 'ואל הָאֲשׁוּרִי ואל יזרעאל', אמר בו התרגום: 'ועל בית אָשֵׁר'; ואל 'מכיר' – מכירי, ואל 'שאול' – 'השאולי', ואל 'חמול' – 'החמולי'.** **אבל היחשׂ אל 'ימין' הוא 'הימָני', שלא על דרך ההקשה, וכן היחשׂ אל 'שמאל' – 'השמָאלי', שלא כהקשה גם כן.** **ואפשר שהיתה דעתם ביחשׂ אל 'ימין – ימני', להפריש בינו ובין היחשׂ אל 'בנימין', כאשר אמרו: 'איש ימיני',** **והנהיגו עליו 'השמאלי', מפני שזה לעומת זה. והיתה ההקשה להיות כמו 'חנוך משפחת החנוכי'.** **וכבר מצאתי במשנה מה שדומה לשמוש הזה, והוא אמרם במסכת פרה: 'אמר רבי יהושע: לא שמעתי אלא שלשית, אמרו לו: מה לשון שלשית? אמר להם: כך שמעתי סתם, אמר בן עזאי: אני אפרש: אם אומֵר אתה שלישית – לאחרות במנין, וכשאתה אומר שלשית – בת שלוש שנים. כיוצא בו: כרם רבָעי, אמרו לו: מה לשון רבעי? אמר להם: כך שמעתי סתם, אמר בן עזאי: אני אפרש, אם אומר אתה רביעי – לאחרים במנין, וכשאתה אומר רבָעי – בן ארבע שנים' והפרישו בין שני הענינים בהשתנות השתי מלות.** |

Now we emend the manuscript and produce a sequential commentary.

Key to Emendation of the Ha-Rikma Commentary

* Every quotation from *Ha-Rikma* (*dibur ha-mat’hil*) is marked underlined (as Wertheimer was wont to do) and in italics, in addition to presentation of the centered dots in the manuscript: **⬩⬩**
* In brackets […] appear expansions of abbreviations the basis of their context, with discretion used.
* Parentheses (…) indicate the deletion of content in the manuscript (whether the manuscript shows an explicit deletion mark or whether the letters were added to the manuscript ab initio, as in “מילים נשנות” as in, for example, to fill up a line). Each case of deletion is annotated on its merits.
* Downsized parentheses (…) are used for references to verses.
* Words or letters in the emendation that appear in angle brackets <…> are supplemental texts that originate in the manuscript, as annotated in each case.
* In the marginalia are remarks about special features of the manuscript, such as vowel diacritics that appear in the manuscript itself in addition to the commentary in places where this is needed.
* Apart from apostrophes and the aforementioned diacritics, punctuation marks do not appear in the manuscript.

Folio F2, recto[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **⬩⬩ Chapter 21 ⬩⬩** |
| 16. | ⬩⬩ **The object modified** **will be the grandfather ⬩⬩** What they said about the grandfather, because the son is not ordinarily attributed to his father with one word but is rather called <son of…>,[[10]](#footnote-10) but it is proper to attribute him to his grandfather.[[11]](#footnote-11) |
| 20 | And <from this>, too,—[[12]](#footnote-12) רה הכתו'[ב] [the text …] that the true attribution goes to three generations, as is written, “Swear to me […] that you will not deal falsely with me or with my kith and kin” (Gen 21:23), and [our] rabbis .ז"ל[[13]](#footnote-13) |
| 22. | “To this point, the father’s pity [is] upon the son.” Indeed, the attribution rises more strongly to the father. |

Folio F2, verso

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | His grandfather and his great-grandfather, but the attribution begins with the grandfather and up.[[14]](#footnote-14) **⬩⬩ and to the family ⬩⬩,** like*ish yemini* [a yemini man] (1 Sam 2:1), denoting someone from the tribe of Benjamin.[[15]](#footnote-15) **⬩⬩And to the land ⬩⬩,** wishing to say: like a *mitsri* [an Egyptian] **⬩⬩ And to the labor ⬩⬩** wishing to say: like my dwelling is pulled up and removed […][[16]](#footnote-16) like a tent of shepherds (Isa 38:12), meaning: of shepherds modifies the labor.[[17]](#footnote-17)  |
| 5.10.15.20.22. | This being shepherding of the shepherding way,[[18]](#footnote-18) and so the sage R. Abraham ibn Ezra wrote in his commentary on Isaiah.[[19]](#footnote-19) This occurs in many cases in Talmudic language, as in *gardi bur ski pakuli pa@hami.*[[20]](#footnote-20)**⬩⬩ something other than the family: an event or an object ⬩⬩** Some interpret “an event” as is interpreted[[21]](#footnote-21) below about Jether the Ishmailite (1 Chron 2:17)[[22]](#footnote-22) This became an event so that he should dwell among them[[23]](#footnote-23); and the meaning of “or to something other than the event, that it would be similar in what he says about it or does as he does, as our rabbis ז"ל said[[24]](#footnote-24) on the verse “which I wrested from the Amorites” (Gen 48:22)—this is Esau, because he commits an Amorite act.[[25]](#footnote-25) And we may further say “to an event or an object”—the word *‘avon pelili* (Job 31:28) from the noun *pelila* (Isa 16:3); *akhzari* from the noun *akhzariyut* (Prov. 27:4), *nokhri* (Ex 21:8) from *be-yom nokhro* (Ob 1:12) and the noun derived from it, *nekhar*[[26]](#footnote-26)(Ben 17:12), and also *elef ragli* (Ex 12:37) from *holekh le-regel* (go to a festival / on a pilgrimage)[[27]](#footnote-27); *‘ariri* (Gen. 15:2) from *‘arirut,* aloneness[[28]](#footnote-28); and also *‘asiri* (Deut 23:3) from ‘asor (Gen 24:55 *inter alia*). **⬩⬩ It will descend upon the object of attribution with that which it modifies ⬩⬩** Hewishes to say: The same event or the same object descends upon the object referred to with the same other reference[[29]](#footnote-29) from which it originates, namely, the same event or object will descend upon the referenced entity even with a totally different reference that befits it, such as a family or a country, as though is found written *‘ivri, ragli,* or *yehudi* or *akhzari* in the one[[30]](#footnote-30) noun[[31]](#footnote-31) relating to a (to a *mem*[[32]](#footnote-32)) to a family and in the second noun referring to an event or a labor or a practice  |

Folio F3, recto

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.5. | *Ha-tova im r‘aa.*[[33]](#footnote-33) **⬩⬩ And when it modifies a separate noun ⬩⬩** He wishes to say: when the attribution of the person to the word *‘ever* or *Geval*,each of which is a separate noun.[[34]](#footnote-34) **⬩⬩ and its beginning changes** **⬩⬩**He wishes to say: as in *ha-‘ivri* (Gen. 14:13) [and] *ha-givli* (Josh 13:5), the segol vowel[[35]](#footnote-35) in the ‘ayin in *‘ever*’ changesinto a hiriq in *‘ivri* and the *schwa* at the gimel [in] *Geval* becomes a hiriq in the word *ha-givli*.[[36]](#footnote-36) **⬩⬩ Or may not change** **⬩⬩** He wishes to say: like *ha-adomi* (1 Sam 21:8),[[37]](#footnote-37) *ha-Rekhavi* (cf. Jer 35:2),[[38]](#footnote-38) *ha-Dani* (Jdg 13:2), *ha-Gadi* (Num 34:14), and their likes, which do not (change—נש' [[39]](#footnote-39)). |
| 10 | Their attribution changed but their vowels did not **⬩⬩[[40]](#footnote-40)** were not yet attributed. **And it was said oddly: *Ve-el ha-Ashuri* ⬩⬩** That is, it should have been voweled *ha-Asheri*.[[41]](#footnote-41) **⬩⬩ not by way of analogy ⬩⬩** meaning,*ha-yemini* would be correct becauseit is appropriate to modify a word that is to its right.[[42]](#footnote-42) |
|  | **⬩⬩Alsonot analogously[[43]](#footnote-43)** **⬩⬩** *ha-semali* should have been voweled with a holem because *semol* precedes the reference.[[44]](#footnote-44) **⬩⬩ In order to distinguish it from the modification[[45]](#footnote-45) of Binyamin ⬩⬩** that is, to differentiate the modification of *yamin* (and שמי'[[46]](#footnote-46)) and of *semol*[[47]](#footnote-47) which was[[48]](#footnote-48) presented as a noun and between the modifier of Benjamin (ש[[49]](#footnote-49)).  |
| 15.20.21. | This being a person’s name.[[50]](#footnote-50) **⬩⬩ And they made ha-semali its practice ⬩⬩** That is, at *yemani*[[51]](#footnote-51) they thus made *semali* the practice [[52]](#footnote-52)becausethe one is contrasted with the other, i.e., left[[53]](#footnote-53) versus right.[[54]](#footnote-54) **⬩⬩ And to be analogous to @*Hanokh*****⬩⬩** That is,*semali[[55]](#footnote-55)* should have come to modify it and to be voweled*semoli.*[[56]](#footnote-56)**⬩⬩ Something similar to this usage ⬩⬩** That is, the usage of the word *ha-yemani.[[57]](#footnote-57)* **⬩⬩ I will explain ⬩⬩** Some read this as *afaresh,*[[58]](#footnote-58) namely, I will explain, and others read it as *efrosh*,[[59]](#footnote-59) (מלשן).[[60]](#footnote-60) |

Folio F3, verso

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.5.10. | It stems from *hefresh* **⬩⬩**,[[61]](#footnote-61)meaning that I will distinguish between *shelishit* and *shelashit,* even though it should be דומה [[62]](#footnote-62) in view of the content of the wording, i.e., *shelishit* for thefeminine as one says *shelishi* for the masculine. There is an explanation for this here because of the way the wording changes: If I were to say *shelishit,*[[63]](#footnote-63)I would think Israel[[64]](#footnote-64) should search for and request a heifer that would be the third to the others by count, i.e., the third delivered from the womb of its mother, the third of three successive heifers to which its mother gives birth. Such is the meaning of *shelishit*; and to banish from thought the inference that it is a year, namely של(י)שית,[[65]](#footnote-65) and infer a different meaning from it: that [the heifer] should be three years old. They interpreted the word *reva’i* in the same manner*.* **⬩⬩ And they distinguished between <the> two matters**[[66]](#footnote-66) **⬩⬩** That is, third to the others in count is one matter, and a second matter: של(י)שית [[67]](#footnote-67)**—**three years old, *reva’i*—four years old. **⬩⬩** the two words **⬩⬩**That is,*shelashi* [שלשי] and *reva’i*. |

Dating the Manuscript and Identifying the Writer

The manuscript has been dated paleographically at around 1300, as stated.

As for the identity of the author, it is very hard to ascertain but, to the best knowledge in research thus far, no commentary on *Ha-Rikma* of any provenance exists other than Joseph Kaspi’s, which, too, has never been discovered. On several occasions, Kaspi wrote about the *Ha-Rikma* commentary that he had produced, but the main information about his works is his autobiographical book *Kevutsat Kesef*.[[68]](#footnote-68)

Said Joseph ibn Kaspi: When Joseph was come unto[[69]](#footnote-69) [במיספור ההערות השמטתי את הערות המחבר בתרגום שלו] manhood, he laid upon his heart[[70]](#footnote-70) to know wisdom and instruction; to perceive the words of understanding.[[71]](#footnote-71) And Joseph was thirty years old when he[[72]](#footnote-72) understood the art of logic and a bit of the intellectual sciences. And Joseph conceived[[73]](#footnote-73) that he would understand the Torah and all of Scripture [by way] of logic and philosophy in new ways that the first ones did not follow. And Joseph said[[74]](#footnote-74) to create a short book with an explanation of Aristotle’s *Ethics* and Plato’s *Republic*, named *Terumat ha-Kesef.* And also a short book of logic, named *Tseror ha-Kesef*, **after in his youth he created a commentary to *Sefer ha-Rikma*** and Ibn Ezra on the Bible [במקור העברי של הפיסקה: "על התורה" ולא "על התנ"ך"], named *Parashat ha-Kesef*.[[75]](#footnote-75)

As scholars have noted several times, at the outset of his career Joseph Kaspi adhered to the standard conventions of the Sephardi Hebrew linguistics. He regarded Yona ibn Jana@h, rightly, as the most comprehensive and trustworthy representative of Sephardi linguistics. Therefore, it was Kaspi’s first task to produce a commentary on *Ha-Rikma*. Kaspi believed, as he repeated several times, that grammatical and linguistic knowledge is an essential infrastructure for all disciplines, particularly those associated with biblical commentary.

Thus, several pieces of information merge to establish, with strong probability, that the manuscript discovered is indeed Joseph ibn Kaspi’s commentary on Ha-Rikma. They are the following:

1. We know with certainty from Joseph Kaspi that he wrote a commentary on *Ha-Rikma*.
2. It is implicit in Kaspi’s remarks, and accepted in research, that Kaspi produced a commentary on *Ha-Rikma* at the outset of his career: “After **in his youth** he created a commentary to *Sefer ha-Rikma.*” Kaspi is known to have been born in 1280; therefore, the book was written when he was around twenty years of age,[[76]](#footnote-76) in approximately the year 1300.[[77]](#footnote-77) Paleographic examinations of the manuscript show that it was written around the year 1300.
3. We know nothing about any other commentary on *Ha-Rikma* to this day.

Apart from these three pieces of evidence, I will offer several points of comparison between the contents of this manuscript and those of Kaspi’s dictionary *Sharshot Kesef*, which was written decades after he wrote his commentary on *Ha-Rikma*.

One of the most salient and best-known phenomena in Kaspi’s dictionary is his way of finding a semantic common denominator for all occurrences of one root—the “common denominator principle,” as I called it in previous studies.[[78]](#footnote-78) The logical assumption that underlies the principle is that the largest possible number of words should be gathered under one roof, and, for our purposes, multiple words should be grouped under a single underlying explanation. Furthermore, in Kaspi’s opinion, the assumption that many words share a root but are decidedly different from each other, and have wholly unrelated meanings, means that words of one root and different denotations occur by chance. Unable to accept the assumption of randomness in the Hebrew language, Kaspi labors strenuously to find one meaning that will embrace all occurrences of the root.

Here is an example that demonstrates a relationship between the *Ha-Rikma* commentary and *Sharshot Kesef*. In *Sharshot Kesef,* Kaspi invokes the “common denominator principle” to interpret the root *peh-resh-shin* and explains that its underlying meaning suggests buffering and separation: “*Parash,* too, is explained as having an explanation of difference and separation” (p. 1037).[[79]](#footnote-79) The *pi’el* nominative, *perush* (explanation/interpretation), emerges from this root: “The matter of *perush* and *perushim* is something always said about explanations: When we come to explain something, we merely separate it and exclude it from its counterpart; we advise what it is and who it is and how it is.” Namely, the infinitive *lefaresh* and the gerund *perush* are derived from the underling meaning of separation, because one who interprets something separates it and differentiates it from other matters.

In *Ha-Rikma*, the work of interest to us, we also encounter this idea. On a *baraita* that Ibn Jana@h cites—“They said to him: What does ‘*shelashit’* mean? He replied, thus I have heard it, without explanation. Ben Azzai said: I will explain [*afaresh*]”—the *Ha-Rikma* commentary adds[[80]](#footnote-80): **“‘I will explain’:** Some read *afaresh* [אפַרש] as meaning ‘I will explain,’ and some read it as *efrosh* [אפַרש], namely, I will separate the meaning of *shelishit* from the meaning of *shelashit.”* Theauthor explains Ben Azzai’s use of the future form of the verb, *afaresh,* in two ways: (a) in the sense of *perush*, in which he wishes to *lefaresh* (explain) the usage of *shelashit*; and (b) in the sense of *lehafrish,* in which Ben Azzai wishes to differentiate *shelishit* from *shelashit*. This semantic distinction recurs in a perfected form in *Sharshot Kesef*, which combines these two meanings of the root peh-resh-shin into one all-encompassing meaning, separation and exclusion.

e. Grammatical terminology: the definite article [לא מצאתי את הסעיפים א'-ד']

The term *heh ha-yedi‘a* is the most common one that denotes the definite article; second to it is *heh ha-da‘at*.[[81]](#footnote-81) A third term, *heh ha-hoda‘a,* is rare and appears several works from Provence and in Kaspi. In the commentary at hand, too, it is *heh ha-hoda‘a* that we encounter most.[[82]](#footnote-82)

f. Swapping of segol/tsere and patah/kamats

In this work, we encounter several substitutions of kamats for patah and of tsere for segol. This phenomenon is also familiar in Rashi’s commentaries and those of additional authors in France and Provence,[[83]](#footnote-83) including Kaspi in his other writings. These substitutions probably indicate that the person doing them did not distinguish between segol and tsere in pronunciation (accent in personal usage) or in essence (in definition and in naming). Notably, these substitutions are not made liberally and, given the consistency that is usually maintained in distinguishing between the vowels, the exceptions appear to be nothing but “slips of the pen” that attest innocuously to the author’s accent:

1. “It should have been voweled ה**אַ**שֵרִי”—in the manuscript, it is voweled הָ**אָ**שֵׁרִי, and the reference is to הָ**אָ**שֵׁרִי, with a patah instead of the kamats.
2. “Some read it as אפַרש”— in the manuscript, the *peh* carries a patah. The reference is to אֲפָרֵשׁ

Here are examples of such substitutions in Kaspi’s other writings:

1. *Sharshot*, דו"ד (p. 425): “And הֻנעה is given with a patah {with a kamats}, as they said: “In pots [*sirot*] and in cauldrons [*devadim*](2 Chr 35:13), because הדלית is with a schwa and is given with a patah {= a kamats}.
2. *Sharshot*, חמ"ר (p. 579) (at the noun חָמֶר: “they will place under the het either a patah {= kamats} or a segol but [will] always [place] a tsere {=segol} under the *mem*, and this is as it says, ‘And foaming grape-blood was your drink [חָמֶר]’ and as is written, ‘Sing [about a fruitful](https://biblehub.com/hebrew/2531.htm) [vineyard’ [כרם חֶמֶר ענו לה],](https://biblehub.com/hebrew/3754.htm) all of which relating to wine.
3. Kaspi’s commentary on Gen 43:6:**הַ**עוֹד לכם אח (Have you yet another brother?)—the *heh* here does not denote puzzlement and question, and also the hehin Eccl 3:21, העולה היא למעלה(Does [the spirit of man] rise upward), and the men of the great assembly interpreted that they placed a **kamats** {= a patah} under it.”

At hand, therefore, are several points of evidence that support the attribution of this commentary on *Ha-Rikma* to Joseph Kaspi and the conclusion that the remnants of his lost commentary on *Ha-Rikma* have come into our possession for the first time.

Did Kaspi write the *Ha-Rikma* commentary in his own hand?

After having proved with reasonable evidence that the *Ha-Rikma* commentary in our possession is Kaspi’s, we now try to determine in whose hand it was written. In my opinion, it is highly probable that the hand is Kaspi’s own. Let’s check the facts: The first book Kaspi wrote was the *Ha-Rikma* commentary; he completed the second, *Parashat ha-Kesef*, a commentary on Ibn Ezra’s commentary on the Torah, at the age of twenty or so. Thus, both works were written around the year 1300. A paleographic examination of the Ha-Rikma commentary in question shows, that the manuscript was completed around the year 1300—exactly when Kaspi wrote the *Ha-Rikma* commentary.[[84]](#footnote-84) Furthermore, the fact that this is a unique document, the only manuscript of this commentary that has been found, shows that the commentary was not known and had no copyists. It is worth noting here that most of Kaspi’s works were not copied in large in numbers and are not well known; thus, this is probably the first copy of the book. If so, who did the writing? The most likely answer is Kaspi himself, who allowed no other hand to perform this task. It does not stand to reason that he produced the commentary “as told to” a scribe. The most reasonable possibility that the handwriting of the *Ha-Rikma* commentary is Kaspi’s and that this is his first attempt at writing—an attempt that led to the writing of many books, some discovered only recently and others awaiting their redemption.

Conclusion

As stated, a commentary on *Ha-Rikma* is a unique phenomenon in the history of medieval Hebrew linguistics and literature. “Everything is dependent on *mazal,* even the Torah in the Ark.”[[85]](#footnote-85) Ibn Jana@h’s *Sefer ha-Rikma*, although the richest and most important work on Hebrew written in the Middle Ages, did not attain the diffusion it deserved and was not very well known; *a fortiori* it was not privileged with commentaries. The *Ha-Rikma* commentary in our possession is of uncommon value and the Almighty allowed it and its author, R. Joseph Kaspi, to find their redeemer.

1. I fervently thank my student and friend Mr. Uriel Frank, who reviewed the manuscript. Many important insights of his are embedded in this article. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The manuscript was found by Wertheimer, who, after corresponding with Poznanski, realized that it was a commentary on *Ha-Rikma*. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For a broad and thorough description of the lexicon, see Aharon Maman, “Rabbi Yona ibn Jana@h: Ben filosofia le-lashon,” *Leshonenu* 70 (5768): 351–59. Maman calls attention to the influence of the lexicon on succeeding lexicographers and its contribution to biblical philology and commentary. See also D. Freedman, *A Study of the Critical Lexicographical Methods of Yona Ibn Jana@h* (Los Angeles, 1980); Nissan Netzer, “Kevi‘at shorashim mikrai’im ‘al pi leshon @hakhamim—le-darko shel R. Yona ibn Jana@h,”in Me@hkarim ba-lashon ha-‘ivrit u-va-sifrut ha-talmudit,ed. M. Z. Kadari and S. Sharvit,(Ramat Gan 1990), pp. 125–33. On Ibn Jana@h’s linguistic teachings, see, for example, Aharon Maman, in Kadari and Sharvit, pp. 127–28; David Tene, “Le-‘inyan a@hduta ha-historit shel ha-‘ivrit ve-@halukata li-tkufot,” *Me@hkarim ba-Lashon* 1(1985), p. 138; Aharon Maman, “Philology in Andalusia, 950–1223–An Overview,” *Iberia Judaica* I (2009): 99–106. Elnatan Chen, “R. Yona ben Jana@h ke-mefate’a@h u-meshakhlel et torat R. Yehuda @Hayyuj: ‘Ekronot, ve-khelim le-yisumao,” *Proceedings of the International Conference on Medieval Hebrew and Aramaic* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language)*,* pp. 327–55, describes in depth the role and research of Ibn Jana@h as an elaborator on @Hayyuj’s teachings. Dan Becker, “Yona ibn Jana@h u-tluto ba-medakdakim ha-‘arvi’im,” *Leshonenu* 57 (1994): 37–48, dwells on the salient influence of Arab grammarians on *Kitab al-Luma.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Wertheimer often copied manuscripts before selling them to libraries. I availed myself of his coy (hereinafter: Wertheimer) to decipher this manuscript. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The shelf number of the microfilms of the manuscript in the National Library is F70572. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. I thank the paleography expert Benjamin Richler of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM) at the National Library of Israel for taking the time to examine the manuscript. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The wording in *Ha-Rikma,* in the left-hand column, follows the Wilenski edition, pp. 246–247. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. As the author of the commentary explains below, he is referring, for example, to the change of vowel diacritic in the adjective *givli* instead of *gevali*. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The commentary on this chapter begins in the middle of Line 16 of Leaf 2 of the manuscript in the Friedberg Collection. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Some of the ink is missing in the manuscript; it is filled in as corroborated by Wertheimer. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The author explains by *Ha-Rikma* uses the term “grandfather” and not “father”: because one cannot attribute a son to his father categorically; instead, one must write *ben-peloni,* “son of…”. A categorical attribution that yields an adjective begins only with the grandfather. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. In the manuscript, enough ink is deleted to leave room to write six letters or so. The first letter is identifiable with strong probability as *mem.* Wertheimer wrote, ad loc, *mi-ze,* “from this,” and at the next word he inserted three periods for the deleted letters at the beginning of the next word: *---רה*. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. = *zikhronam li-brakha,* may their memory be for a blessing, originating in Bereshit Rabba 54. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. A person’s true lineage ascends to his grandfather, i.e., three generations back as the sages said; but the attribution to the paterfamilias that yields an adjective begins with the grandfather and ascends to previous generations. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. He means that the expression *ish yemini* relates not to the paterfamilias, Benjamin son of Jacob, but to the extended family, the tribe of Benjamin. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. One word is elided here: *mini* [from me] (Isa 38:12). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. In the manuscript, the word מלאכה at the end of the line is given as המ'. Wertheimer expanded this to the full word, as seems probable. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. In Kaspi’s opinion, the *yod* is adjectival. The labor is called *mir‘e,* shepherding, and “of the shepherding way” is a combination of *ro‘eh*, shepherd, and the adjectival *yod.* Thus he writes ad loc: *ro‘i—*an adjective derived from *ro‘eh* [shepherd]. According to Ibn Ezra, *dori* is *megurai,* residential. The meaning of the text is that the prophet laments the peregrination of his home like a shepherd’s tent. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. To be exact, Ibn Ezra ad loc vacillates about whether the *yod* is not suffixal and is the original declension of the word or whether it is adjectival. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. *Gardi* in mishnaic Hebrew denotes a weaver; *bursi* or *burski* a producer of parchment or leather; pa@hami a producer of charcoal, and some say *napa@h; pakuli* (b Berakhot 28b: one who deals in cotton (Rashi ad loc). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Meaning “dangling.” [??] [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. In the full Masoretic rendering: הַיִּשְׁמְעֵאלִֽי. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. This “event” is an occurrence that links the noun to the thing being described, e.g., Jether the Ishmaelite, who is so named because he dwells among the Ishmaelites. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Gen Rabba 97 (Theodor-Albeck edition, p. 1249). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Kaspi interprets the word דָבָר in this sentence in *Ha-Rikma* in two ways: (1)  a characteristic or trait shared by both of those signified: that signified by the noun (e.g., the “Amorite” nation) and that signified by the adjective (e.g., Esau, who is so called because he behaves like the Amorite nation); (b) according to the meaning presented in the next sentence (“And we may further say […]),דָבָר is a name or a word. According to this reading, an adjective is derived from an abstract noun that carries this meaning. Thus, *pelili* (criminal) is derived from *pelila* (counsel, as in offering counsel)*,* *akhzari* (cruel) from *akhzariyut* (cruelty)*,* and so on. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The vowel diacritics in the manuscript are נֵכָר. The adjective נָכְרִי is derived from the noun נֵכָר. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. It is not clear whether the noun chosen by the author is *regel* (festival) and denotes going to a festival, or *rigul* (espionage), meaning going on a spy mission. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. The adjective *‘ariri* is derived from the abstract noun *‘arirut*. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. In the manuscript, the spelling היחש appears to have been corrected to היחס. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. In the manuscript, the word *ha-a@her,* the other, seems more likely than *ha-e@had*, the one, i.e., a *dalet* is more likely than a *resh.* [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. The word *she-ba-shem* (in the noun) in this location is written flush against the next word, and in order to emend it into two words, two periods are added above and below. In regard to this practice, see Malachi Bet-Arye, *Mekorot la-kodikologia ‘ivrit* (ed. Tamar Leiter) (Jerusalem, 1994), p. 376 and note 35. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. To fill in the line, the beginning of the next word is written here; therefore, we placed the “filler” letter in parentheses. In regard to this practice, see Bet-Arye’s remarks on filling in a line by advancing part of the beginning word of the next line (n. 31 above), p. 349 and notes 16 and 17. This recurs farther on (below: filling in a line). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. As stated above (in the footnote relating to Line 12 on the previous page), Kaspi offers two meanings of the word *davar* in *Ha-Rikma,* each meaning yielding a different understanding of the syntax of the sentence. Kaspi here interprets Yona ibn Jana@h’s words according to the first of the foregoing interpretations, in which *davar* is a characteristic shared by both entities signified, and thus the syntax in Ha-Rikma should be: “to something other than the family: to an event or an object, it will descend upon the object of reference with that to which it refers.” The meaning of these things is: the noun that is being modified may be attributed in two ways: It may be described in reference (more personal) to the family or land of origin (as in *‘ivri* or *yehudi*), and it may also (=עִם) be described with a different attribution, one related to a labor, an event, or a practice (e.g., *ragli* or *akhzari*). In contrast, according to the second interpretation of *davar*, a name or a word, *Ha-Rikma* should be construed as follows: (1) to something other than the family: to the event; (2) “it will descend upon the object of reference with that to which it refers.” In this case, Yona ibn Jana@h’s remarks are easier to explain: The noun being modified (e.g., *‘avon pelili,* criminal transgression) traces to the same matter (e.g., *pelila,* counsel) being modified and described. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. I.e., when a person is described with an adjective or a separate noun, e.g., the adjective *givli* from the separate noun Gebal. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. We placed a tsere under the word *‘ever* following the Masoretic usage, and not a segol as stated here. In regard to replacing a tsere with a segol, see below. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. After *yod* is added to adjectives, phonological changes occur at the beginnings of the words as well: *‘ivri* instead of *‘everi and givli* instead of *gevali.* [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. This adjective is derived from the noun *Edom* (Gen 25:30). The author evidently sees no significance in the switch from hataf segol to hataf patah. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. This adjective is derived from the noun *rekhev* (Jer 35:6). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. A line is filled in here. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. In the manuscript, two horizontal dots appear here (at the end of the line). The *dibur ha-mat’hil* begins with two subsequent words: *‘al derekh* […], and the words *terem hityahasu* mark the end of the previous sentence. See discussion below. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Yona ibn Jana@h writes that the adjective derived from the proper noun *Asher* is written *ha-Asheri* in Jdg (1:32) properly, but in 2 Sam (2:9) it appears oddly as *ve-el ha-Ashuri*. In the manuscript, the voweling is ה**אַ**שֵרִי and the reference is to הָ**אָ**שֵׁרִי.The substitution of kamats for patah is discussed below. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. The adjective *ye****ma****ni* should be *ye****mi****ni* because it is derived from the noun *ya****mi****n.* [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. *She-lo be-hakasha.* In the wording before us: *she-lo ke-hakasha gam ken.* [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. The noun form which the modification is derived is *semol* (*mem* with a holem and not with a kamats. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. The letter *shin* dangles at the end of the line. On this practice of “writing superfluous letters between the lines” so as not to go beyond the margin, see Bet-Arye (note 30 above), p. 350 and note 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Filling in a line. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Written in abbreviation: שמא. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. This probably should be emended to *she-hi,* “which is”(and so Wertheimer wrote). [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. To fill in the line, the beginning of the following word (ש') appears here. after which an up-side down ۮ is inserted. On the insertion of a graphic filler in blank space at the end of a line, see Bet-Arye (note 30 above), p. 349 and note 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. The change of voweling at the letter *mem* is meant to distinguish between establishing the modification of *yamin* (*yemani*) and that of Binyamin (*yemini*). [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. So voweled (ימָני) in the manuscript. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. A ligature-*alef* is used, i.e., אל. The letter *mem* is voweled in the manuscript (apparently with a kamats). [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. A ligature-*alef* is used, i.e., אל (at the end of the line). [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. The adjective *yemani,* with a kamats, brings along its mate as well. Therefore, *semali* is voweled not with the original holem but with a kamats. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. שמֹ<אלי>. Here and in the continuation of the line, some ink in the manuscript has been erased; I have filled the lacuna as corroborated by Wertheimer. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. שמֹאל<י>. Were the treatment of *yemani* not carried down to *semali,* *semali* should have been voweled *semoli* with a holem, just as the adjective *@hanokhi* sustains the holem on @Hanoch, as is written (Num 26:5), 'חֲנוֹךְ מִשְׁפַּחַת הַחֲנֹכִי'. Wertheimer suggest that “אך” here should be emended to “אף”. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. I.e., the linguistic phenomenon of the voweling *yemani* as distinct from *yemini* in order to establish a separate meaning. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. So voweled in the manuscript: אפַרש. This appears to be a patah. What is meant is אֲפָרֵשׁ. On the substitution of kamats for patah, see below. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. So voweled in the manuscript: אפְרש. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. This word, the last on the page, is written here (in abridged orthography) and recurs at the beginning of the next page (in full orthography); therefore, I placed it in parentheses. On counter-catchwords, Bet-Arye writes (pp. 259–262 note 30): “Writing a counter-catchword on each and every page of the codex was the most common way of keeping the pages in order.” [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Horizontal periods appear in the manuscript even in the absence of a *dibur mat’hil*. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. This may be read *le-domeh* [לְדוֹמֶה]*,* to be similar, or perhaps *ledomah* [לְדוֹמָהּ]*,* of its likeness. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. So voweled in the manuscript: שלישִית. The diacritical may have been added here because the *yod* is not totally clear due to the *tav* that touches it. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Written with a ligature alef = אל (at the end of the line). [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Based on the context, the passage should read *shelashit* (שלָשית) (so wrote Wertheimer); this is why I placed the *yod* in parentheses) even though the manuscript unquestionably gives *shelishit* ('שלישית'). [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. A dependent *heh*. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. This should read *shelashit* (שלָשית) (as Wertheimer wrote); therefore, we placed the letter *yod* in parentheses, as at Line 8 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. This work of Kaspi’s has come into our possession in two different manuscripts: Ms. Munich 265 (Kesef-Munich group) and Ms. Parma 2478 (Kesef-Parma group). The quotations in this article are harvested from the latter, as copied by Renan (E. Renan, *Les écrivains Juifs Français du XIVe Siècle*, Paris, 1893), pp. 188–98). A comprehensive survey of Kaspi’s books was produced by Steinschneider (M. Steinschneider, *Gesammelte Schriften,* Berlin 1925, pp. 89–127, esp. 90–115). He was succeeded at length by Renan (*Les écrivains Juifs Français,* pp. 135–206), who also described the contents of the works. Gross (H. Gross, *Gallia Judaica*, Paris, 1897, pp. 67–71, 82–5, 248–50, 466–67) surveyed Kaspi’s books on the basis of where they were written. Bacher (“Joseph Ibn Kaspi als Bibelerklarer,” in *Festchrift zu Herman Cohen siebzigsten Geburstag*, Berlin 1912, pp. 119–35) surveyed Kaspi’s books and re-sorted them on a topical basis. Mesch (B. Mesch, *Studies in Joseph ibn Caspi,* Leiden, 1975, pp. 7–58) surveyed Kaspi’s books and attempted to reconcile his findings with the various manuscript versions of Kaspi’s autobiographical *Kevutsat Kesef.* Herring (B. F. Herring, Joseph Ibn Kaspi's *Gevi'a` Kesef:* A Study in Medieval Jewish Philosophic Exegesis, New York, 1978, pp. 13–20) also surveys Kaspi’s books. The most recent and comprehensive survey is Hannah Kasher’s (*Shul@han Kesef le-R. Yosef ibn Kaspi,* Jerusalem, 1995, pp. 18–16); Kasherdescribes what each of Kaspi’s books deals with and dates them to the extent possible. See also Yehiel Zeitkin, “Ma’afyene parshanut ha-mikra be-yetsirotehem shel parshane ha-peshat bene ha-eskola ha-maimonit shel Provence ba-me’ot ha-shelosh-‘esre–arba‘–‘esre,” Ph.D diss., Bar-Ilan University, 2011, pp. 137–69—a thorough investigation of Kaspi’s interpretive oeuvre. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. This hearkens to Genesis 37:23: “And it came to pass, when Joseph was come unto his brethren, that they stripped Joseph of his coat, the coat of many colors that was on him.” [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Eccl 7:2. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Prov 1: 2. “To know wisdom and instruction; to perceive the words of understanding.” Kaspi utilizes the entire verse. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Gen 41: 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Gen 50:7. The original, “*va-ya‘al Yosef*,” means in context that he ‘went up’ – as travel to Israel is traditionally called, but here Kaspi uses the double meaning, in which *va-ya‘al* may also mean *to conceive*. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. Orig. “*va-yomer Yosef*,” in multiple locations. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. The text is copied from Renan. I have not cited alternate versions. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. See below. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. For a biography of Kaspi and all details concerning his year of birth, see Moshe Kahan, “Yosef ibn Kaspi—netunim biografi’im @hadashim,” *Pe’amim* 145 (2016): 143–66, and Kahan, “Joseph Kaspi—from Arles to Majorca Iberia,” *Judaica VIII* (2016): 181–92. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. For elaboration, see Moshe Kahan, *Ha-‘ivrit be-re’i @hokhmat ha-higayon—mishnato ha-logit-ha-pilosofit-ha-balshanit shel Yosef ibn Kaspi* (Ramat Gan, 2019), pp. 110–11; and Kahan, “@Hidushim miloni’im ba-milon *Sharshot Kesef* le-Yosef ibn Kaspi*,” Me@hqarim ba-Lashon 14–15* (2013): 142–56. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. All references to *Sharshot Kesef* are to Ms. Rome-Angelica OR60 (its number at the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: Samekh 11708). [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. F3a, line 20ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. In Ibn Ezra’s commentary on Gen 1:1 for example, *heh ha-yedi‘a* is used in the first interpretation and *heh ha-da‘at* in the second. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. In R. Menahem b. Simon (from Posquières, Provence), in his commentary on Ezek 30:11; in R. Joseph Seniri b. R. Isaac’s commentary on the Former Prophets (Judith Kogel edition, p. 112), and, above all, in Kaspi: in both his commentary on Gen 1:31 and in *Sefer Sharshot*, Shorashimגב"ש (p. 373), קר"ה (p. 3077). Admittedly, Yona ibn Jana@h’s use of the term *hoda‘a*—“in citing the *hoda‘a* about the first noun” [כך?]—may have had some influence here. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. See Hanoch Yalen, “Hagiya Sephardit be-Tsarfat ha-tsefonit be-doro shel Rashi u-va-dorot she-laharav,” *Kuntres le-‘inyene ha-lashon ha-‘ivrit* (Jerusalem, 1964), pp. 16–37; Aharon Gabbai, “Ha-kamats ba-masoret Ashkenaz,” *Nezer ha-Torah 15* (2007): 234; Jacob Laufer,“Gilgule ha-kamats ha-Ashenazi,” *Hitse Giborim 11* (2018): 435–86, notes 27, 101. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. See Howard Kreisel, *@Hamisha kadmone mefarshe R. Avraham ibn ‘Ezra: ha-biurim ha-rishonim ‘al perush ha-Torah le-Ra’ava’* (including R. Joseph ibn Kaspi’s *Parashat Kesef*)edited by and with introductions, together with David Ben Zazon et al. (Beersheva, 2017), p. 89. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Zohar, *Naso* Section 3, 134. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)