This study explores the “philosophical scholarship” of R. Joseph Rosen (1858-1936; also known as the Rogatchover). “Philosophical scholarship” is a unique method of learning developed by the Rogatchover for studying Talmud and Halakha, which employs philosophical tools and language. The philosophy the Rogatchover used to create his “philosophical scholarship” is primarily the philosophy of Maimonides’ *Guide to the Perplexed*. Therefore, the crux of this study is an examination of the Rogatchover’s attitude towards the *Guide to the Perplexed*, demonstrating the connections he forged between *the Guide*’s philosophy and his Talmudic and Halakhic thought, and emphasizing the scholarly product of the synthesis between both worlds of thought.

After presenting the Rogatchover’s biography and writings in the first chapter by means of a basic bio-bibliography, the second chapter serves as a comprehensive introduction to the Rogatchover’s scholarly method, and it highlights the primary and original characteristics that shape it. These characteristics are presented by analyzing one unique responsum he wrote (which includes elements of each of the said characteristics) that includes a request to point out the connections (direct or indirect) between most of the characteristics and the notion of “philosophical scholarship”. The characteristics discussed in the chapter are: speedy, shorthanded writing with many references, in response to any petitioner and touching on any Halakhic-religious topic; a synthesis between different topics, usually by identifying one abstract idea that is common to all of them; admiration for Maimonides and his work; commentary by means of “analytic scholarship”, “philosophical scholarship” and “philosophical-theological scholarship” grounded in the philosophy and theology of the *Guide to the Perplexed*; use of the *Guide to the Perplexed*, which he consistently interpreted according to Talmudic/Rabbinic literature, including discussions of a homiletical or *Aggadic* nature; a perception of Halakha as dealing with ontological essences, as well as allowing space for the natural world within the framework of the Halakhic world; integrating Aggadah and homiletics within halakhic discourse; independent halakhic rulings based on the Talmud as part of his strict adherence to Talmudic/Rabbinic discourse, including: a high regard for the Palestinian/Jerusalem Talmud and perceiving everyday reality through the lens of Talmudic/Rabbinic discourse, while at the same time rejecting – and sometimes ignoring completely – the accepted post-Talmudic literature; a critical stance towards commentators of the *Guide to the Perplexed* along with a willingness to accept some of their writings; a measure of influence from the world of Kabbalah and Hasidism; interpretation of customs/Minhagim in a way that grounds them in Talmudic literature and is Halakhically orientated.

The third chapter is dedicated to the Rogatchover’s comments/commentary on the *Guide to the Perplexed*, which serves as a means for characterizing his hermeneutic method for the *Guide to the Perplexed*, and for comparing it to other modes of exegesis. Research has shown that this exegesis is one of the most original of all of the different interpretations to the *Guide to the Perplexed*, and that this originality is the flip-side of a coin that is traditional to the extreme: the way in which the Rogatchover interpreted the *Guide to the Perplexed* according to the Talmudic scholars (per Maimonides’ instructions in the introduction to the book) was what led him to take note of philosophical thinking/thoughts hidden in the Talmud, not only in its Aggadic parts but also in the Talmud’s Halakhic details. The “philosophical scholarship” is but one dimension of a broader hermeneutic approach, which examines Talmudic Halakha in relation to the thought of *the Guide*. The/Our study shows that this interpretation should not be perceived as merely homiletical in its interpretation of the philosophical book, in service of the scholarly-Halakhic discourse: one can see how the Rogatchover felt at home with the philosophical discussions of *the Guide* and was fully aware of the “radical interpretation” of *the Guide*, and that from this framework he perceived himself as someone who fully grasped Maimonides’ view. Even when the Rogatchover chooses to disagree with Maimonides by juxtaposing Talmudic Halakhic rulings to Maimonides’ philosophical approach, he maintains his belief in the philosophical discourse presented in *the Guide* and sees the questions that it presents as relevant to the Talmudic discourse.

After the third chapter sought to clarify the way in which the Rogatchover read and interpreted the *Guide* *to the Perplexed*, the fourth chapter examines the place of the *Guide to the Perplexed* within his Halakhic writing and in so doing presents a unique phenomenon in the history of Halakhic literature. The chapter begins by outlining the gradual process of integrating *the Guide* and its concepts in the Rogatchover’s scholarly writing, but the discussion of his mature “philosophical scholarship” focuses on the Halakhic responsa that he wrote. The reason for this choice is that only a scholarly tendency that transcends the interpretative-scholarly writing, and appears in the real-life genre of responsa, can testify to the scholar’s total belief in the tendency. Indeed, the chapter shows how in integrating *the Guide* into his Halakhic writing, the Rogatchover went beyond mere intellectual acrobatics, attempting to identify legal guidelines with real-life implications. The Rogatchover’s use of the *Guide to the Perplexed* was not limited to a particular method or to a particular type of idea offered by the *Guide to the Perplexed* (such as understanding Halakha based on an Aristotelian assumption or conceptualization, which is a primary method of the “philosophical scholarship”), but rather extended to additional methods and types of ideas that appear in *the Guide* (such as borrowing an idea from Kalam or mentioning *the Guide*’s interpretation of scripture), the primary point being that one can see how this use of *the Guide* was not limited to a particular type of Halakhic responsa and appeared in a variety of topics and contexts: in a responsum to an individual relating to the *Orach Chayim* section of the *Shulchan Aruch*, as well as responsa pertaining to public issues in *Even* *Ha’Ezer*, and also a pressing personal issue with a public dimension. Each of these cases is situated in the study, as much as is possible, within the historical and realistic context in which the problem appeared, thus highlighting the uniqueness of introducing *the Guide* to the discussion. The study emphasizes that the Rogatchover’s use of the *Guide to the Perplexed* cannot be viewed as instrumental, in the service of Halakha, but rather should be understood as an expression of the Rogatchover’s belief according to which the Talmud, Halakha and the issues discussed within them became imbued with the philosophy of the *Guide to the Perplexed*.

After dedicating the preceding chapters to the Rogatchover’s attitude towards the *Guide to the Perplexed*, the fifth chapter discusses his attitude towards *the Guide*’s commentators. The Rogatchover knew a wide array of commentaries of *the Guide*, including some that were printed separately from t*he Guide*’s different editions. In the Rogatchover’s writing, especially in his comments on pages from the Zoltzbach edition of *the Guide* that included the *Narvoni* commentary, Shlomo Maimon’s *Givat Ha’More* (on Part 1), and Yitzchak Satnov’s commentary (on Parts 2 and 3), there are references to a wide array of commentaries on *the Guide*. Despite his critical stance towards *the Guide*’s commentators, the Rogatchover was able to contain their ideas and use them to generate “philosophical scholarship”. The study contextualizes the “philosophical scholarship” created by the Rogatchover through his discussion of the “Spinozism” that appears in *Givat Ha’More* within the broader conversation the Rogatchover had with the modern science and philosophy mentioned in Maimon’s book. A significant part of the chapter will be dedicated to a phenomenon whereby a pair of terms that appear in the commentaries on the *Guide to the Perplexed* are transformed in the Rogatchover’s work into a sort of sub-method within his method of philosophical scholarship – a sub-method that even went on to appear in the work of later Halakhic scholars who were influenced by him. The study makes the claim that recognizing the Rogatchover’s attitude towards *the Guide*’s commentators could impact our understanding of the sources of some of his ideas that were apparently influenced by them.

The epilogue is dedicated to the Rogatchover’s internalization of the philosophy of the *Guide to the Perplexed* and emphasizes the “Halakhic hylomorphism” that tends to appear in his work even without reference or mention of *the Guide*. It points to the benefit of this philosophical thinking for the attempt to solve problems and conceptualize ideas in Halakha, by means of comparative research. It shows how extending the Halakhic language to the philosophical domain enabled the formulation of something that was meant to have been said already in the past, under similar circumstances, but was impossible to fully formulate because the language required to do so did not exist. It also shows how philosophical abstractions the Rogatchover extrapolated from a concrete situation emerged only after he was asked to explain some of his earlier ideas, which were insufficiently clear given the absence of the necessary philosophical terminology, and how this abstraction created an opportunity to bridge the ancient realities of the Talmud with those that appeared in later periods.