# Introduction

Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος, παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι τοσοῦτον ἀφ᾽ αὑτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύναται λαβεῖν.

But Homer comes first and in the middle and last, in that he gives of himself to every boy and adult and old man just as much as each of them can take.

(Dio Chrysostom, *Orations*, 18:8 [trans. LCL]).

In late antiquity, the Homeric poems and the Torah were identity-forming and canonical texts in Greek and Jewish culture, respectively. Their immense impact manifested itself mainly in the pivotal and almost exclusive role they played in the παιδεία, in the wide sense of the term as it was translated by Roman scholars: *humanitas* – that is, the molding and perfecting of the human being.[[1]](#footnote-1) These texts were at the center of the curriculum of both the novice student and the scholar, and were an important factor in forming social norms.[[2]](#footnote-2)

In the opening of his treatise *Homeric Problems*, Heraclitus (ca. 100 CE) writes the following:[[3]](#footnote-3)

Εὐθὺς γὰρ ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας τὰ νήπια τῶν ἀρτιμαθῶν παίδων διδασκαλίᾳ παρ’ ἐκείνῳ τιτθεύεται, καὶ μονονοὺκ ἐνεσπαργανωμένοι τοῖς ἔπεσιν αὐτοῦ καθαπερεὶ ποτίμῳ γάλακτι τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπάρδομεν· ἀρχομένῳ δ’ ἑκάστῳ συμπαρέστηκε καὶ κατ’ ὀλίγον ἀπανδρουμένῳ, τελείοις δ’ ἐνακμάζει, καὶ κόρος οὐδὲ εἷς ἄχρι γήρως, ἀλλὰ παυσάμενοι διψῶμεν αὐτοῦ πάλιν· καὶ σχεδὸν ἓν πέρας Ὁμήρῳ παρ’ ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ τοῦ βίου.

From the very first age of life, the foolishness of infants just beginning to learn is nurtured on the teaching given in his school. One might almost say that his poems are our baby clothes, and we nourish our minds by draughts of his milk. He stands at our side as we each grow up and shares our youth as we gradually come to manhood; when we are mature, his presence within us is at its prime; and even in old age, we never weary of him. When we stop, we thirst to begin him again. In a word, the only end of Homer for human beings is the end of life. (trans. Russel and Konstan)

A similar concept can be found in rabbinic literature. So, for example, in a baraitha added to the end of tractate Kiddushin, R. Nehorai (second half of the second century CE) states:

רבי נהוראי אומר: מניח אני כל אומנות שבעולם ואיני מלמד את בני אלא תורה,

שאדם אוכל משכרה בעולם הזה וקרן קיימת לעולם הבא.

ושאר כל אומנות אינן כן כשאדם בא לידי חולי או לידי זקנה או לידי יסורין ואינו יכול לעסוק במלאכתו הרי הוא מת ברעב.

אבל התורה אינה כן אלא משמרתו מכל רע בנערותו ונותנת לו אחרית ותקוה בזקנותו.

בנערותו מה הוא אומר? "וקוי ה' יחליפו כח" (יש' מ 31)

בזקנותו מהו אומר? "עוד ינובון בשיבה" (תה' צב 15).

R. Nehorai says: I would set aside all the crafts in the world and teach my  
son naught save the Torah, for a man enjoys the reward thereof in this world and its whole worth remains for the world to come. But with all other crafts it is not so; for when a man falls into sickness or old age or inflictions and cannot engage in his work, lo, he dies of hunger. But with the Torah it is not so; for it guards him from all evil while he is young, and in old it grants him a future and a hope. Of his youth, what does say? “They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength” (Is. 40:31). Of his old age what does it say? “They shall still bring forth fruit in old age” (Ps. 92:15). (trans. Danby)

The difference between R. Nehorai’s statement and that of Heraclitus reflects the essential gap between the attitude of Greek culture toward Homer and of Jewish culture toward the Torah: for Heraclitus the role of Homer ends when one dies, whereas for R. Nehorai the Torah leads man to the World to Come. Yet the similarity between the texts is no less important. R. Nehorai and Heraclitus agree about the centrality of Homer and the Torah in man’s life and believe that their respective texts accompany man from youth through old age, adjusting themselves to his different periods of life.

The centrality of these texts and their undisputed canonical status led to the development of exegetical communities in which these texts were interpreted in a collective effort by dozens of scholars over hundreds of years. In the Alexandrian library in the first centuries BCE, numerous scholars labored at editing the Homeric poems and interpreting them according to philological, rhetorical, grammatical, and literary criteria, especially from the school of Aristotle, while developing sophisticated hermeneutical tools and technical terms. This exegetical tradition continued to evolve during the first centuries of the common era throughout the Roman Empire and was later redacted over hundreds of years into a voluminous exegetical collection, following verse order, which has come down to us mainly through the scholia on the margins of Byzantine manuscripts.

Parallel to the exegetical efforts on the Greek side, dozens of rabbis dedicated themselves during the first centuries CE to interpreting the Torah, using a wide array of exegetical methods. These rabbis were divided into distinct exegetical schools, and their commentaries were collected and redacted during the third century CE into Midrashic compilations, known as the Halakhic Midrashim, which were organized as a line-by-line commentary displaying a rich terminological system. These Midrashim have exerted a crucial impact of the formation of the role of the exegete vis-à-vis the holy text and on exegetical methods in the Jewish culture down to the present times.

The non-allegorical Homeric commentaries and the Halakhic Midrashim which have come down to us are vast and significant corpora. Yet to date they have barely been compared by scholars, despite the fact that the Rabbis were active within a distinct Greco-Roman context, and that Saul Lieberman and David Daube have already noted the similarities between a small number of methods used by the Homeric scholars and the Rabbis.[[4]](#footnote-4) In light of this, the goal of this work is to systematically compare the two corpora for the first time. My argument is that it is possible to point to various ways in which the Greek commentaries deeply impacted the Rabbis’ exegetical approach. Moreover, I will argue that we cannot understand the very appearance of the edited Midrashic compilations and some of their core hermeneutical assumptions without a familiarity with the contemporaneous Homeric commentaries.

In addition to its influence on rabbinic terminology and exegetical techniques, I will demonstrate how Homeric scholarship – as a representative of the literary, rhetorical, linguistic, and didactic discourse of the time – impacted the rabbis’ methods of organizing knowledge and their learning practices, as well as their very understanding of the concept of the canonical text and the role of the commentator. The Rabbis, I will argue, were in many ways part of the exegetical world of their time. Furthermore, the comparison with the Homeric scholarship may also advance our understanding of the background to the development of the distinct approaches of the schools of R. Akiva and R. Yishmael.

The comparison between the two corpora, however, will not only reveal similarities, but will also enhance our understanding of the unique features in the rabbinic exegesis. Indeed, only by understanding how the Rabbis adopted and adapted the hermeneutical principles and methods of Greek scholarship while incorporating them into a different exegetical system can we appreciate the novelty and uniqueness of the rabbinic project.

## Midrash, Scrolls, and Homeric Scholarship

One of the biggest enigmas in the study of rabbinic literature is the seemingly sudden appearance of a rich, fully-crystallized scholastic exegetical corpus, divided into different schools, comprised of the sayings of dozens of sages, and applying well-developed sophisticated hermeneutical techniques and a wide array of technical terms. Is this a product of a continuous evolutionary process; did it result from a “Big Bang” – a dramatic and sudden change during the relevant period; or was there perhaps some kind of combination of the two? In other words: what is the relation between the rabbinic Midrash and the Jewish Biblical commentaries that preceded it?

The fact that almost nothing has survived from the literature of the Pharisees or from the non-allegorical Jewish-Hellenistic commentaries poses great difficulties in reconstructing the development of the Midrash. Various scholars have tried to locate the buds of the Midrash in internal biblical commentary and in the Second Temple literature.[[5]](#footnote-5) Some of these studies have emphasized the similarities in the common narrative expansions and legal traditions, and thus outlined an exegetical continuum.[[6]](#footnote-6) Others, as I shall discuss below, looked to Hellenistic culture for the Midrashic roots.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls significantly advanced the study of the ancient Jewish commentaries. Alongside the genre of rewritings of the Bible that do not explicitly reveal an exegetical thrust,[[7]](#footnote-7) the scrolls also contain commentaries such as the *pesharim*,[[8]](#footnote-8) which follow the order of the verse, differentiated between verse and commentary. These passages include the beginnings of technical terminology, and at times even employ the term “Midrash.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Many scholars have sought to identify in this literature the “missing link” between the Bible and rabbinic Midrash.[[10]](#footnote-10) Some have compared the terms used in the scrolls to those found in rabbinic literature,[[11]](#footnote-11) at times even trying to reconstruct the hermeneutical methods that supposedly lie at the basis of the commentaries of the scrolls and comparing them to the rabbinic *middot* (measures of interpretations).[[12]](#footnote-12) So, for example, Aaron Shemesh writes:

I do not claim that there is an actual literary connection between the formulae in the scrolls and rabbinic midrash, but the comparison is important in order to show that already in the scrolls there are beginnings of fixed exegetical formulae also regarding Halakha, and these represent the first stages of the 'middot' for commenting on the Torah.[[13]](#footnote-13)

There can be no doubt that there are important common features between the exegetical methods of the authors of the scrolls and the rabbis. However, there are also crucial differences. First, unlike the scrolls, the Halakhic Midrashim do not present their commentary as the sole and unequivocal interpretation of a divinely-inspired authority, but rather as a commentary based on human efforts to resolve various difficulties in the biblical text.[[14]](#footnote-14) In addition, Steven Fraade has highlighted several central characteristics of the rabbinic Midrash that seem almost self-evident, but are almost never documented in the scrolls:[[15]](#footnote-15)

1. In the Midrash, numerous traditions are attributed to various named sages. In the scrolls, by contrast, no *specific* commentary is attributed to any individual source, not even to the Teacher of Righteousness.[[16]](#footnote-16)
2. The sages explicitly point out the exegetical methods they use. That is, there is a reflexivity concerning the techniques used by the commentator. A wide range of technical terms present the exact method implemented in a given instance. In the scroll commentaries, on the other hand, the exegetical process is usually implicit. It is indeed possible that this process was based on various methods used during the teaching of the text.[[17]](#footnote-17) However, our interest lies in the textual product, and as noted we do not find in the scrolls an explicit use of the techniques, contrary to the rabbinic texts.
3. Exegetical intertextuality is common in the Midrashim; that is, the creative use of a biblical verse from elsewhere in order to explain a given verse. This technique is relatively rare in the scrolls. This does not mean, as Fraade once again emphasizes, that in the background of these commentaries there was no use of intertextuality; but even if there was, it is not stated explicitly.[[18]](#footnote-18)
4. The Midrashic discourse is dialogical and contains question and answers as well as rhetorical alternatives, which are absent from the scrolls.
5. A distinct feature of rabbinic literature is the appearance of several interpretations for a single verse. In the scroll commentaries only one opinion is quoted, whereas in the Halakhic Midrashim there are explicit disagreements between different sages from different generations within a single editorial framework.[[19]](#footnote-19)

These differences might seem at first to be merely external and technical. In fact, however, they represent a paradigmatic change in the concept of the text and the role of the commentator: the human commentators are external to the commentated texts.

How can we explain these differences? One possibility is that they are the result of chronological and evolutionary processes.[[20]](#footnote-20) Between the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature there is a temporal gap of at least two hundred years. During this “dark” period, Jewish commentaries might have evolved that began to approach the rabbinic model. In other words, it is possible that the rabbinic Midrash is the end product of an exegetical development whose inception may be discerned in the scrolls.

in his studies, Menachem Kister has highlighted the continuum between the Qumran commentaries and those of the rabbis, suggesting that some of the differences are anchored in the gradual transition from the biblical to the post-biblical period.[[21]](#footnote-21) In addition, the period between the composition of the scrolls and the appearance of rabbinic literature also included some momentous historical events that might have impacted the commentaries. So, for example, Kister argues that some of the differences between Qumran and the Rabbis are a result of the failure of the revolts, which created a shift from an impending sense of eschatology to a suspended one, impacting the exegetical goals.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Another significant development that occurred between the writing of the scroll and the appearance of the Halakhic Midrashim was the full canonization of the biblical literature. The fact that it was no longer possible to add books, or even to change the version of the verses, created the need for works that distinguished between the commentators and the canonized text. Moreover, canonization deeply impacts the exegetical methods, as Moshe Halbertal has noted:[[23]](#footnote-23)

Canonizing a text results in increased flexibility in its interpretation, such as the use of complex hermeneutical devices of accommodation to yield the best possible reading.

These explanations emphasize the continuity between the exegetical communities of Qumran and the rabbis. Another direction is to underscore the ideological differences between the two communities. According to Fraade, it is possible to explain some of the differences by assuming a different social structure with differing concepts of authority.[[24]](#footnote-24) The formation of a rabbinic scholarly community that did not have a single authority, such as the Teacher of Righteousness, enabled the development of a dialogical literature. Menahem Kahana has suggested that the effort to confront opinions that undermined the Pharisaic Halakha motivated the creation of Halakhic Midrashim, at the center of which lies the effort to connect the Halakha to the verses. Kahana further suggested that the accumulation of Halakhic details which had no foundation in the literal sense of the verses, and the growing rift between the Biblical law and the Pharisaic Halakha, alongside internal polemics between the different schools, may also provides a reason for the formation of the Halakhic Midrashim.[[25]](#footnote-25)

All these explanations are possible, and moreover are not necessarily mutually exclusive. They explain in different ways the possibility for change, but do not provide a sufficient answer as to why the Halakhic Midrashim were formed in this very specific mold. [[26]](#footnote-26)

A preliminary overview of the Homeric commentaries, which are the product of an intellectual effort by generations of scholars, reveals that all the five above-mentioned distinctive features of rabbinic commentary also appear in these texts:

1. The opinions of the scholars are very often cited with their names. So, for example, hundreds of comments state φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος (Aristarchus says).
2. The Homeric commentaries are transparent and reflexive. The commentators usually note their hermeneutical methods, employing a wide array of technical terms.
3. The Homeric scholars frequently use intertextuality as an exegetical tool. They often use citations from Homer and other authors in order to clarify obscure verses. Aristarchus was even credited with the rule “to clarify Homer from Homer.[[27]](#footnote-27)
4. The Homeric scholarship contains hundreds of questions and answers reflecting a lively dialogue between scholars. It also includes direct references to the reader and the student.[[28]](#footnote-28)
5. A common phenomenon in the Homeric scholarship is the multiplicity of comments on the same words or verses. The editors of the exegetical compilations collected the opinions of various scholars from different periods, sometimes hundreds of years apart. Occasionally the names of the scholars are not stated explicitly and the various opinions are introduced by such terms a ἔνιοι/τινές φησίν (some say) and ἄλλοι φησίν, identical to the rabbinic editorial terms יש אומרים and אחרים אומרים, respectively.[[29]](#footnote-29) Alternative opinions taken from another source are usually introduced in the scholia by the technical term ἄλλως, equivalent to דבר אחר.[[30]](#footnote-30)

This clear similarity between the scholarly product of the Greek scholars and the rabbis justifies and enables a deeper and more comprehensive comparison than previously conducted. It points to the possibility the essential differences between rabbinic exegesis and the earlier Jewish exegesis may be explained in part by the rabbis’ direct or indirect acquaintance with contemporary Greek scholarship.[[31]](#footnote-31)

## Survey of Scholarship

### Rabbinic Literature and the Homeric Commentaries

Many studies have dealt with comparisons between various aspects of Hellenistic culture and rabbinic literature, as well as the impact of Greek on Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic.[[32]](#footnote-32) In the context of the present study, it is important to mention those studies that have focused on the impact of Hellenistic rhetoric on the form and content of the rabbinic *derashot*, and in particular on the *chreia* (χρεία), diatribe, and the *progymnasmata* literature.[[33]](#footnote-33) Yet surprisingly there are almost no studies offering a comparison between rabbinic and Hellenistic commentaries, despite the centrality of biblical exegesis for the rabbis and the large corpus of Homeric scholarship that has survived. The main studies dedicated to this comparison remain those of David Daube and Saul Lieberman, written over sixty years ago. Since scholars have cited and referred to these studies dozens of times, I shall now review them in detail.

In his groundbreaking 1949 article “Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and the Hellenistic Rhetoric,” Daube argued that “in its beginnings, the Rabbinic system of hermeneutics is a product of the Hellenistic civilization then dominating the entire Mediterranean world.”[[34]](#footnote-34) Based on a tradition in the Babylonian Talmud (b.Git. 57a; b.Yom. 71b), according to which Hillel’s teachers Shmaya and Avtalion were converts from Alexandria, Daube sought to argue that Hillel’s seven exegetical principles (*middot*) where derived from Alexandrian rhetorical techniques. Thus קל וחומר originated from *a minori ad maius* and גזרה שווה was derived from analogy.[[35]](#footnote-35) An important point raised by Daube is that while some of these rabbinic methods may seem intuitive, so that there is no reason to assume a genetic link to Hellenistic methods, a deeper examination reveals that several hermeneutical systems lack such methods.[[36]](#footnote-36) The adoption of these methods by both the Jews and the Romans is due to their shared Hellenistic background:

We have before us a science the beginnings of which may be traced back to Plato, Aristotle and their contemporaries. It recurs in Cicero, Hillel and Philo —with enormous differences in detail, yet *au fond* the same. Cicero did not sit at the feet of Hillel, nor Hillel at the feet of Cicero; and there was no need for Philo to go to Palestinian sources for this kind of teaching. As we saw, there are indeed signs that Hillel's ideas were partly imported from Egypt. The true explanation lies in the common Hellenistic background. Philosophical instruction was very similar in outline whether given at Rome, Jerusalem or Alexandria.

Whereas in his 1949 article Daube focused mainly on Hellenistic rhetorical, legal, and philosophical writings, in a later article from 1953 – “Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis” – he dealt directly with exegetical literature.[[37]](#footnote-37) Yet, despite the promising title, in this article Daube barely cited any examples of Alexandrian methods of interpretation, and in fact did not relate at all to the Homeric scholia.[[38]](#footnote-38) Almost all of his examples were taken from authors such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.

In this article Daube compares σύνθεσις and διαίρεσις to מקראות שאין להם הכרע; as well as the method of ἀναστροφή to סרס (transpositions of words or verses).[[39]](#footnote-39) He emphasizes not only the similarities but also the differences in the ways the rabbis and the Greek scholars used these methods. As we shall see throughout this book, although Daube was correct in assuming a Hellenistic background to these rabbinic methods, his analysis of both the Greek and rabbinic sources was at times somewhat superficial, and as a result some are his conclusions are highly problematic.

From the rather meager evidence he presented in both his articles, Daube drew some farfetched conclusions:[[40]](#footnote-40) “[T]he whole Rabbinic system of exegesis initiated by Hillel about 30 B.C. and elaborated by the following generations was essentially Hellenistic.”

It should be noted, though, that at the time Daube wrote his studies, most of the Dead Sea Scrolls were not yet published, and therefore he was not aware of the possibility that part of the rabbinic exegetical system was grounded in the Second Temple literature composed in Palestine.

In several chapters of his book *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, one of the most influential studies in rabbinic scholarship, Saul Lieberman compared Greek and rabbinic commentaries. Lieberman’s discussion is characterized by a tension between the convincing evidence he presents for Hellenistic influence on rabbinic interpretations and his efforts to minimize this impact.[[41]](#footnote-41)

In the chapter “Critical Marks (σημεῖα κριτικά) in the Hebrew Bible,” Lieberman argued that “[i]t is quite apparent that the Rabbis of the second century interpreted the critical marks in the same way that the Alexandrian grammarians treated the critical signs in the classic texts.”[[42]](#footnote-42)

Similarly, in the chapter “Corrections of the Soferim,” Lieberman noted similarities between the emendations of the Jewish scribes and those of the Alexandrian grammarians (in particular Zenodotus), motivated by the need to avoid indecent and improper statements (ἀπρεπές). Yet despite the fact that he claims to have found “exact parallels,”[[43]](#footnote-43) he concludes the chapter with the following statement:[[44]](#footnote-44)

We can hardly assert Alexandrian influence on the Soferim in regard of the above mentioned textual corrections, even if we extend their activity beyond the time set by the Rabbis. It may simply be a natural similarity in human attitudes. Furthermore, there is an immense difference between Greek and the Jewish alterations. The Soferim altered the text only when the honor of the Lord was involved. The Alexandrians changed it whenever it was not in conformity with the manners of the court of the Ptolemies, or the customs of certain Greeks.

This conclusion seems somewhat apologetic; while Lieberman claims that “there is an immense difference between Greek and the Jewish alterations,” he offers only two examples of alterations by Greek scholars, one of which was made when the honor of a goddess was involved.[[45]](#footnote-45)

Lieberman’s primary discussion of the comparison between Greek and rabbinic commentaries appears in the chapter “Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture.”[[46]](#footnote-46) Thus in order to establish the meaning of difficult and rare words, the rabbis, in a manner analogous to the above-mentioned Hellenistic approach, “often explained the ‘Bible by the Bible’;”[[47]](#footnote-47) used other languages;[[48]](#footnote-48) and “sometimes explained expressions of the Bible by customary usage (i.e. the συνήθεια χρῆσις) of the language.”[[49]](#footnote-49)

Yet in a famous passage Lieberman retreats at the last moment from reaching the conclusions his examples lead him to, stating:

The early Jewish interpreters of the Scripture did not have to embark for Alexandria in order to learn there the rudimentary methods of linguistic research. To make them travel to Egypt for this purpose would mean to do a cruel injustice to the intelligence and acumen of the Palestinian sages. Although they were not philologists in the modern sense of the word they nevertheless often adopted sound philological methods.[[50]](#footnote-50)

Lieberman dedicates most of his discussion to the seven *middot* of Hillel and the thirteen *middot* of R. Yishmael, seeking to prove that the terminology used is in fact derived from Greek. The main terminological parallels to the *middot* are found in rhetorical handbooks and the *progymnasmata* (preparatory exercises).[[51]](#footnote-51) So, for example, Lieberman argues that היקש, a term for analogy, “is the literal equivalent of the Greek παράθεσις.”[[52]](#footnote-52) Similarly the term גזירה שוה, a comparison with the equal, is a rendition of the Greek σύγκρισις κατὰ ἴσον, and the implementation of this method by rabbis and Greeks was similar.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Despite these striking similarities, Lieberman concludes: “We have no ground to assume that the method itself of both logical and verbal analogy was borrowed by the Jews from the Greeks. However, the method and definition of the method – the terminology – are two different things.”[[54]](#footnote-54) In other words, Lieberman sought to limit the Hellenistic influence in these cases to terminology, whereas the methods were independently developed by the rabbis. Yet, as noted by Levine, Lieberman provides no evidence that such methods were previously used in Palestine.[[55]](#footnote-55)

Alongside his discussion of the *middot*, Lieberman pointed to a similarity in the manner in which the rabbis and the Greek rhetors “taught the art of twisting the law according to the required aim and purpose.”[[56]](#footnote-56) It is interesting that in this case Lieberman explicitly argues for influence:[[57]](#footnote-57)

The Jews with their love and devotion to παιδεία would be much more susceptible than the Romans to the sound contribution of the Greeks to learning. They would certainly not hesitate to borrow from them methods and systems which they could convert into a mechanism for the clarification and definition of their own teaching, the instruction and the works of the rhetors were most suitable for the application in the hermeneutics of the אסמכתא (support) type. For this purpose the τέχνη γραμματική and the τέχνη γραμματική were combined and fused into one device.

Only toward the end of the chapter does Lieberman turn to an explicit comparison between the Midrash and Homeric commentaries, focusing on the solution of problems. Most of his discussion is dedicated to a comparison between the technique of ἀναστροφή and the rabbinic word-transposition (סרס), founded, independently, on the same anecdotal solution of Sosibius taken from Athenaeus, which Daube also used in his study.[[58]](#footnote-58) Yet, like Daube, Lieberman does not examine the context and the way this technique functions in the Greek and Rabbinic commentaries, nor the textual and literary concepts which enable the use of such a technique.

Lieberman later adduces only one more example where Aristarchus and the Rabbis solve a problem in a similar fashion.[[59]](#footnote-59) Yet although he discusses only two rather random examples from the Alexandrian commentaries (of Sosibius and Aristarchus), Lieberman concludes the chapter with the following general assertion: “Literary problems were solved in a similar way in the schools of Alexandria and those of Palestine.”[[60]](#footnote-60) However, he refrains from elaborating on the implications of such a statement.

In comparing the Homeric and rabbinic commentaries, Lieberman favored a minimalistic approach, seeking to confine the impact of Hellenistic culture on the rabbis mainly to terminology. Daube, on the other hand, preferred a maximalist view, arguing that all the rabbinic hermeneutical methods were Hellenistic.[[61]](#footnote-61) Yet both Lieberman and Daube based their arguments on a rather small and anecdotal textual foundation. Indeed, in their entire comparison of Hellenistic scholarship and Midrash, they each presented only two examples from the Homeric commentaries,[[62]](#footnote-62) and these came solely from the Alexandrian tradition. Thus they made almost no use of the vast corpus of Homeric scholarship, and hence failed to distinguish between its different layers. In addition, as noted above, they did not provide a systemic examination of how the various methods functioned within the context of Hellenistic scholarship and Midrash, nor of the underlying hermeneutical assumptions.

Despite these criticisms, the pioneering works of Daube and Lieberman revealed for the first time the great potential for comparison between Hellenistic and rabbinic commentaries. Rather than functioning as an incentive and paving the road for further comprehensive studies, however, over the decades following Daube and Lieberman’s publications scholars have rehashed the same examples, while slightly modifying their conclusions. Until very recently (see below), to the best of my knowledge, not a single additional example from the systematic Homeric commentaries has been adduced beyond those cited by Lieberman (Daube, we should recall, did not consult the scholia at all).[[63]](#footnote-63)

Thus, for example, in his discussion of the *middot*, Tauner argued that “[i]t seems highly probable that the learned rabbinical interpreters of Hebrew Scripture were at least aware that explicit interpretive methods similar to their own were in use among those intellectuals of the Greek-speaking world who studied Homer and the classics in the hope of extrapolating from them lessons for their own times.”[[64]](#footnote-64) Yet Tauner regarded the examples presented by Lieberman and Daube as insufficient in order to prove that the Tannaim learned their exegetical methods from Greek rhetors and grammarians.[[65]](#footnote-65) Rather, he argues, they developed their intricate hermeneutical system by themselves, with almost no external influence.[[66]](#footnote-66) Similarly, Feldman argued that the impact of Hellenistic culture on the rabbis in general, and in terms of their commentary in particular, was not as deep as scholars had presumed.[[67]](#footnote-67)

In several studies, E. E. Halevi, following Lieberman, sought to compare what he called “Homeric Midrash” (מדרש הומרוס) and rabbinic Midrash in dozens of topics.[[68]](#footnote-68) In fact, for almost every rabbinic exegetical term and technique he found a Greek parallel. Yet while occasionally illuminating, these parallels are random, lacking in method, analysis and logical order, and Halevi fails to distinguish between earlier and later sources in the Greek or the rabbinic literature. Moreover, despite the dazzling array of Greek sources, Halevi did not make any use of Homeric scholia, but rather only of anecdotal citations of Homeric commentaries found in authors such as Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and Athenaeus.

In two programmatic articles, Philip Alexander discussed the relation between Biblical and Homeric commentaries and the role of Moses and Homer in each of the cultures. However, he relied almost entirely on examples gleaned from previous scholarship, adding virtually no new material.[[69]](#footnote-69) Alexander argued that the rabbis were at home in the Hellenistic culture, and therefore it is not at all problematic to compare the commentaries on Homer and the Bible. However, he did not see much similarity between Aristarchus’ philological-critical approach and that of the rabbis, arguing that the parallels should rather be sought in the allegorical Homeric commentaries.[[70]](#footnote-70)

In his comprehensive introduction to *Seder Olam*, Chaim Milikowsky addressed the relation between rabbinic literature and Greek commentaries.[[71]](#footnote-71) He distinguishes between “interpretive commentary” (פרשנות ביאורית) and “Midrashic commentary” (פרשנות מדרשית): the former adheres to the context and grammar and does not embellish the Biblical story with new narratives, whereas the latter ignores context, grammar, and logic.[[72]](#footnote-72) According to Milikowsky, the roots of “interpretive commentary” can be found in self-standing Jewish-Hellenistic commentaries composed mainly in Egypt, echoes of which may be identified in the writings of Demetrius, Philo, and Josephus. Milikowsky argues that *Seder Olam*, as an example of “interpretive commentary,” is closer to Jewish-Hellenistic literature than to Palestinian precedents.[[73]](#footnote-73) However, regarding the “Midrashic commentary,” he argues that “it is hard to see clear points of contact between it and the commentary which was prevalent in the Hellenistic culture.”[[74]](#footnote-74) In the present study I shall argue that Milikowsky’s convincing argument concerning the Hellenistic impact on *Seder Olam* is also valid for the Halakhic Midrashim, as these at times display traits which he attributed to “interpretative commentaries.”[[75]](#footnote-75)

These studies were based mainly on secondary literature and made almost no use of the Homeric commentaries themselves. However, over the last few years several studies have compared the rabbinic hermeneutical methods with new examples drawn directly from the Homeric scholia. In several studies, Maren Niehoff has pointed to various similarities between Genesis Rabbah, compiled in the fifth century, and the Homeric and Jewish-Hellenistic commentaries. The rabbis addressed redundancies, problems of verisimilitude, and contradictions in similar ways to the Hellenistic scholars.[[76]](#footnote-76) Niehoff emphasizes that the rabbis’ interactions with contemporary Hellenistic scholarship were the main reason for the differences between the scholarly rabbinic commentaries and those found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[[77]](#footnote-77)

In addition, Tzvi Novick noted the similar use of expressions of wonder in the Homeric commentaries and the Halakhic Midrashim (οὐ θαυμαστόν;אל תתמה ) as a rhetorical address to the reader,[[78]](#footnote-78) while Yonatan Moss compared the various approaches to narrative non-linearity in both corpora.[[79]](#footnote-79)

### Homeric Scholarship and Jewish-Hellenistic Biblical Commentaries in Alexandria

Although the main center of Homeric scholarship was in Alexandria, only in recent years have scholars begun to study its impact on Alexandrian Jewish-Hellenistic biblical commentary. Silvey Honigman examined the impact of the Homeric scholarship of The Letter of Aristeas in the second century BCE;[[80]](#footnote-80) Adam Kamesar compared Philo’s commentary to that found in the D scholia;[[81]](#footnote-81) Tzvi Novick discussed the similarity in the use of focalization (perspectival exegesis) in Philo and the Homeric commentary;[[82]](#footnote-82) and Peder Borgen briefly discussed the similarity between the questions and answers in Philo and the Homeric scholars (although he cited only one example from the latter).[[83]](#footnote-83)

Major progress was achieved with publication of Maren Niehoff’s groundbreaking study *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, in which she convincingly demonstrated the deep impact the Alexandrian Homeric commentary had on the Jewish-Hellenistic commentators.[[84]](#footnote-84) This is the first study to make comprehensive and systematic use of the A scholium, which preserves the Alexandrian commentaries, for comparison with Hellenistic biblical commentaries, and accordingly it laid the foundation for the present study.

Niehoff demonstrated how the author of The Letter of Aristeas, Aristobulus, and Demetrius (and the anonymous commentators he cites) – all active during the second century BCE in Ptolemaic Alexandria – engaged with the Homeric scholarship of the day, spearheaded by Aristarchus.[[85]](#footnote-85) In addition, Niehoff demonstrated that Philo himself was fully aware of the Homeric scholarship of his day, and that despite his allegorical approach he made use of terms from the contemporary text-critical and non-allegorical study of the Homeric poem.[[86]](#footnote-86) Moreover, Niehoff convincingly argued that Philo directly polemicizes with Jewish commentators who used the same terminology and the same hermeneutical, literary, and historical methods as their Alexandrian contemporaries, and may even have engaged in textual criticism.[[87]](#footnote-87) Thus Philo, who was a Platonist, does not in fact fully represent Jewish-Hellenistic commentary; indeed, he opposed the common exegetical approaches of his day which embraced an Aristotelian non-allegorical reading of the Bible.

As we shall see throughout the present study, it is possible that these Jewish Hellenistic scholars constitute one of the channels by which the methods of Greek scholarship reached the rabbis.

### Homeric Commentaries and Christian Biblical Commentaries

Several scholars have pointed to the impact of Alexandrian Homeric scholarship on the beginnings of Christian biblical exegesis,[[88]](#footnote-88) and especially on the writings of Origen (185-254CE). As Neuschäfer and other scholars have demonstrated, Origen, who was educated as a grammarian in Alexandria in the early third century, had a deep acquaintance with the Homeric hermeneutical and critical methods, which he applied in his biblical commentaries.[[89]](#footnote-89) Origen even adopted the Alexandrian critical signs for his work on the Hexapla.[[90]](#footnote-90) However, since most of this study will focus on the Halakhic Midrashim and on rabbis who were active decades before Origen arrived in Caesarea, he cannot be regarded as an intermediary between the Hellenistic scholarship and the rabbis. Nonetheless, throughout this study I shall compare the way Origen and the rabbis implemented Alexandrian methods in their respective biblical commentaries.

### Halakhic Midrashim

Alongside the comparative studies, it is important to note the growing scholarship exploring the hermeneutics of the Halakhic Midrashim.[[91]](#footnote-91) Much effort has been invested in defining and cataloguing the various technical terms, with an emphasis on the differences between the schools of R. Akiva and R. Yishmael (see below).[[92]](#footnote-92) Many of these studies have focused on philological aspects, though in recent years there has been an increase in the engagement with the hermeneutical assumption underlying the various terms.[[93]](#footnote-93)

So, for example, Azzan Yadin has dedicated a monograph to each of the schools, emphasizing their divergent hermeneutical assumptions, with a strong emphasis on the terminology typical to each of schools.[[94]](#footnote-94) Ishay Rosen-Zvi has demonstrated in several studies how the focus on micro-hermeneutics – that is, on a detailed and systematic study of the Midrashic terminology – enables us to uncover their wider hermeneutical context.[[95]](#footnote-95) Assaf Rosen-Zvi has recently studied in detail the hermeneutical features of the school of R. Yishmael, focusing on the Mekhilta d’Kaspa.[[96]](#footnote-96) Finally, Menachem Kahana’s monumental edition on the Sifre commentary on Numbers significantly advances our understanding both of the textual tradition and of the hermeneutical methods of this Midrash.[[97]](#footnote-97)

### The Homeric Commentaries

The modern scholarship on the Homeric commentaries is vast.[[98]](#footnote-98) At first, the scholia were perceived as merely ancillary to the study of the Homeric text. Accordingly, scholars devoted their attention mainly to the Alexandrian commentaries, which were perceived as reservoirs of variants of the Homeric text and of lexical assistance in the case of rare words. In addition, scholars also focused on *Quellenforschung,* distinguishing the different sources in the scholia. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, studies were published examining various aesthetic topics in the scholia, although these were usually confined to compilations of sources, with very minimal analysis.[[99]](#footnote-99) Over the last few decades there has been growing interest in the ancient commentaries from a literary perspective, and many studies discuss in depth the various hermeneutical approaches of the Alexandrian school and the bT scholium.[[100]](#footnote-100)

An important development in the study of ancient commentaries in general, and the Homeric commentaries in particular, is Rene Nünllist’s book *The Ancient Critic at Work*, which examines the hermeneutical assumptions of the ancient critics as these are preserved in the scholia and papyri. Among other aspects, Nünllist discusses narrative, time, impact on the reader, and style. His main focus is literary and he makes much use of terms and methods of the field of narratology. This book is indispensable for any student of commentaries in antiquity, including rabbinic Midrash, and it has been used throughout this study. Another important study is Van Thiel’s comprehensive edition of all the fragments of the Alexandrian Homeric scholars, which includes a short commentary as well as a systematic classification of the various fragments according to hermeneutical categories.[[101]](#footnote-101) Recently Francesca Schironi, in her magisterial monograph *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*, has produced a comprehensive and definitive account of Aristarchus’ commentary. This volume is indispensable for any study of Alexandrian Homeric scholarship.[[102]](#footnote-102)

The Present Study

This study focuses on a comparison between the non-allegorical Homeric commentaries and the rabbinic biblical commentaries, especially the Halakhic Midrashim. The choice to focus on the Homeric commentaries is due to the fact that they are relatively well preserved and best represent the Hellenistic hermeneutic approaches, combining rhetorical, literary, grammatical, and didactic methods.[[103]](#footnote-103) The Halakhic Midrashim are the earliest that have come down to us, and accordingly we have preferred them over the Aggadic Midrashim. The fact that the Halakhic Midrashim were edited during the third century CE, and that most of the sages they mention lived in the second century CE, limits the possibility that various methods derived from Homeric scholarship reached the rabbis through the mediation of Christian scholars (unlike the Aggadic Midrashim, especially *Genesis Rabbah*, edited in the fifth century). Thus in cases of striking similarities between the Homeric commentaries and the Halakhic Midrashim, there is a high likelihood that the cause is direct interaction between the rabbis and Hellenistic scholarship.

Alongside the formal similarities noted above, an initial reading of the Homeric scholia alongside the Halakhic Midrashim reveals mainly differences. The most obvious ones are the language and the text interpreted. In addition, a large part of the discussions in the scholia focus on text criticism, accents, and grammar (especially in the A scholium), as well as the aesthetic and literary evaluation of Homer’s poems (mainly in the bT scholium) – topics that are very rarely addressed in the Midrash.[[104]](#footnote-104) The rabbis, on the other hand, tend to deal with legal dialectics and homiletics, which are completely lacking in the Homeric scholarship.

In light of these differences, in order to compare these corpora, it is necessary to turn to the building blocks: that is, to locate similar technical terms reflecting identical exegetical methods. This is the most complicated stage, since it is difficult to anticipate in advance where such terms will be found. Yet once located, the discussion of similar terms grants the comparison a reasonably stable foundation. The comparison of the terms, however, is not a goal in itself.[[105]](#footnote-105) Rather, an analysis of the various terms will help unearth their fundamental hermeneutical assumptions, enabling a more profound comparison of the approaches to language, canonical texts, and the role of the commentator in both corpora.[[106]](#footnote-106) Such a general comparison will also assist in finding further similarities not based on terminology.

In this study I shall first analyze how an interpretive method or term is used in each of the exegetical corpora separately, in order to avoid, as much as possible, curtailing the presentation for comparative purposes. While the discussion of the terms and methods may extend beyond what seems to be immediately necessary for the comparison, this is important for understanding the broader context. Only afterwards will I compare the findings in detail and analyze the similarities and differences. In many cases I will also refer to the rhetorical and grammatical compositions of the period, as well as the works of Philo and the Church Fathers, in order to enrich the discussion and the understanding of the context.

Throughout my study, I shall distinguish between the different sources and layers in both corpora. In the Homeric scholarship, I shall distinguish between the A and bT scholia (see below) and between the approaches of the various ancient critics, such as Aristotle, Aristarchus, Nicanor, Porphyry, and others. In the rabbinic literature, I shall pay close attention to the differences between the schools of R. Yishmael and R. Akiva (see below), attempting when possible to identify the sage to whom a specific method may be attributed. As we shall see, such distinctions will have significant ramifications on dating and contextualizing the diverse impacts of Hellenistic scholarship on the rabbis.

The vast majority of modern scholars of Homeric commentaries have no acquaintance with rabbinic literature. Similarly, scholars of rabbinic literature have little knowledge of the Homeric scholarship, and in particular of the scholia, which has not been translated and is written in a highly technical and elliptic style. In light of this, I have chosen in this book to present a large array of examples from both corpora and to analyze them in detail, in order to expose their richness and make them accessible to a broader readership.

It should be noted that since the choice of topics for comparison was often triggered by the engagement with the rabbinic commentaries, this encourages the examination of the Homeric commentaries in a new light and from angles and perspectives that are not usually addressed by many of the modern scholars.

## Outline of the Book

This study is divided into five thematic chapters: The text as a source of knowledge; stylistic redundancies; questions and answers; textual ambiguities; and order and disorder in the text.

Chapter One examines how the perception of the text as a source of knowledge manifests itself in the commentaries. The first part will address what, according to the commentators, the text aims to teach us; whereas the second part will describe their exegetical efforts to return to the canonical text various traditions which were supposedly derived from it. Beyond concrete comparisons, I shall demonstrate how the rabbis share with the Homeric scholars the mechanism for organizing knowledge around the canonical text.

In Chapter Two, I shall examine the fundamental dispute between the schools of R. Akiva and R. Yishmael regarding redundancies in the Bible against the backdrop of the Homeric, rhetorical, and grammatical literature of the time alongside Jewish-Hellenistic commentaries. The discussion will focus on reduplications, synonyms, transitional phrases, and particles.

Chapter Three will explore the genre of questions and answers in the Homeric and Rabbinic commentaries. I will compare a wide range of questions, noting the striking similarity in the format of the questions and in the methods reflected in the answers.

In Chapter Four, I shall demonstrate how the rabbis and Homeric scholars shared the same grammatical discourse, by examining the different ways with which they address ambiguities in the text.

Chapter Five will focus on how the commentators addressed disorder in the text, particularly through a close analysis of the technique of transposition and its underlying hermeneutical assumption.

## Methodology

### Analogy versus Genealogy

One of the central questions facing any comparative study is whether identified similarities reflect an analogical resemblance or a genealogical link. In the current study, the question is how we can determine whether the similarities in terms and methods between the Homeric commentaries and the Halakhic Midrashim are due to historical and cultural influence reflecting concrete contact, or the result of independent and parallel hermeneutical developments that could occur in any scholarly community interpreting a canonical text.

This question is further sharpened in light of the fact that many of the terms analyzed in this study – such as מלמד, מנין היה יודע, מפני מה, מכאן אמרו – might seem intuitive or “natural.” Some might argue that these are a-temporal terms that can appear in any interpretative community, and thus there is no need to cross the borders of rabbinic literature in search of a historical and cultural context for their appearance. It is interesting to note that, in most cases, those who make such claims do not provide any evidence that these are indeed widespread phenomena (a claim that would require a broad comparative study), but rather place the burden of proof on those who wish to point to an external influence, based on the chronological, geographical, and social proximity of the rabbis and the Greek scholars.

As Glen Most has rightly observed, however, there is nothing “natural” about an interpretative text:[[107]](#footnote-107)

For commentary is not a natural type but is always constructed variously in various social formations, and may therefore be expected to respond differently to different kinds of identifiable exigencies. This constructedness of the form of commentary may well be disguised to a certain extent from its producers and consumers by its very ubiquity, both within their own work and across the spectrum of cultures available for historical and geographical comparison; […] But there is nothing natural about the general form of commentary itself, and no matter how natural a particular form of commentary may seem to its own practitioners in any one place and time, it need not seem at all natural to other practitioners.

It is important to distinguish between commentary as a mental act, where similar structural patterns may be identified across time and cultures, and the textual product, which is firmly anchored in a historical, social, and linguistic context. In light of the assumption that there is no “natural” commentary, one of the goals of the present study is to demonstrate that even certain simple terms and methods that have become almost transparent for us actually have a context and genealogy. The fact that the rabbis do not usually disclose their sources often hinders us from realizing that certain terms and methods are the product of engagement with contemporary Hellenistic scholarship. Only a close comparison with external sources will enable us to examine them afresh.

Moreover, against the argument that these are “natural” interpretative phenomena, so that the similarities between the Homeric and rabbinic commentaries are merely analogical, it is important to note that these phenomena do not appear in every interpretive community. In the context of this study, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Mesopotamian commentaries can serve as control groups. As noted, almost all the exegetical terms and methods discussed in this study are absent from the Second Temple literature composed in Palestine. In light of this, the appearance in rabbinic literature of interpretative techniques not previously documented in Palestine, but which already existed in Hellenistic commentaries, strengthens the argument that this is not merely an analogical resemblance.

Another control group are the Akkadian commentaries, written over several hundred years beginning in the eighth century BCE. These texts present very laconic and technical exegesis, using a limited and fixed terminology, which was used almost unaltered for centuries. Although research on these commentaries is still in its infancy, most of the terms and exegetical techniques have been outlined. Most of the commentaries include incipits: fixed formulas for the citation and presentation of interpretation, as well as for indicating alternative interpretations.[[108]](#footnote-108) Scholars have already noted the Mesopotamian background of certain formulas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic Midrash.[[109]](#footnote-109) There is also a significant resemblance in the scholastic-philological project of the Akkadian, Greek, and rabbinic scholars. This similarity extends to the exegetical structure itself – the format of line-by-line commentaries intended to clarify the core text and resolve textual problems.

However, in the Mesopotamian commentaries there are no parallels to the terms to be discussed in the present study. Moreover, the literary, rhetorical, and aesthetic approaches dealt in this study are quite alien to the exegetical world of the Akkadian scholars, who almost never addressed these aspects, at least not explicitly.[[110]](#footnote-110) Nonetheless, I hope that this study will lay the ground for deeper comparisons between the different scholarly communities, one which is not based only on terminology, and which might expose the debt of the rabbinic commentaries – and possibly even the Hellenistic ones – to their Mesopotamian predecessors.[[111]](#footnote-111)

Thus the appearance of the same hermeneutical approaches in the Homeric and rabbinic commentaries is not at all self-evident. Nonetheless, this is not always sufficient reason to claim influence, since in some cases it is possible to point to similar historical developments that lead to similar exegetical outcomes. There is no doubt, for example, that the canonization and standardization of the Bible was crucial to the development of the rabbinic exegesis, and could itself account for several similar scholarly endeavors (e.g. discussions of *qere* and *ketiv*; plene and defective spelling). Yet even if similar historical developments might lead to similar exegetical outcomes, the fact that these outcomes are presented in identical terminology may point to more than just an analogy. Moreover, the claim that the Homeric scholarship influenced the rabbis could be strengthened by examining the historical and theoretical framework of these terms and techniques. Thus, if one can demonstrate that a certain interpretative technique from the Homeric commentaries is well-grounded in a systematic theoretical framework and is part of a larger hermeneutical network lacking in the rabbinic commentaries, it is likely that this is a result of influence, so that there is a genealogical and not an analogical relation between the two corpora.

In this study I shall argue that the Hellenistic exegetical culture, as represented in the Homeric commentaries, *influenced* the rabbinic commentaries in various ways. The term “influence” has been the subject of extensive criticism in recent years, and accordingly I shall clarify why and how I choose to use it.

One of the main critiques leveled against the term “influence” is that it implies that the influencing party is active whereas the influenced one is passive, merely absorbing the knowledge transferred to it. Another related (and somewhat apologetic) critique is that the claim that one culture influences another might be interpreted as a value judgment: The influencing party is portrayed as original and thus better, while the influenced party is an imitation. In light of this, some scholars prefer to use other terms, such as adaptation, appropriation, accommodation or negotiation that portray the receiving side as active.[[112]](#footnote-112)

I, too, do not consider the absorbing side as passive. On the contrary, influence is a complex process whereby the influenced party adjusts various elements to its own worldview. In this study, I seek to demonstrate that the rabbis adopted terminology and methods from the surrounding scholarly culture, while simultaneously adapting them for their own particular purposes, incorporating them into a very different, and at times even opposite, exegetical framework. The outcome of this process is something new. Indeed, we cannot fully appreciate the uniqueness, novelty, and originality of rabbinic exegesis without understanding the background from which it developed.

The advantage of the term “influence” over other terms that have been suggested is that it does not assume that the changes and adaptations were always a product of a conscious and intentional action on the part of the receiving side, let alone the influencing side. If we were to ask the rabbis themselves whether they had borrowed certain terms and methods from the Hellenistic scholars, in some cases they would indeed acknowledge their debt to Greek precedents they actively and consciously adapted. However, in other cases, especially with regards to broad textual concepts (such as the Bible as a literary text) or very basic terminology (such as מלמד, “he teaches”), they would most probably argue that this is an organic part of their exegetical culture, and has always been such. Yet a comparative historical study reveals that such terms and methods, which were used by Greek scholars over a long period of time (often for centuries) and are well-anchored in systematic theoretical frameworks, appear suddenly (at least based on the material which has come down to us) in the rabbinic commentaries during the second century CE. Nonetheless, even when terms and methods are transferred unknowingly they evolve and change when incorporated into another exegetical community.

This leads us to yet another critique directed at the use of “influence:” the term appears to assume an essentialist perception of two autonomous groups, one of which absorbs elements that organically belong to the other: in our case – a pure (and possible a-temporal) “Jewish culture” infiltrated by foreign elements from a “Hellenistic culture.” This is obviously a very problematic approach, as culture is formed through interactions with other cultures.[[113]](#footnote-113)

The Midrashic literature, which includes an exegetical heritage from the Second Temple period, developed and crystallized in a Greco-Roman world. Accordingly, it is not possible to talk of a pristine and original kernel of “Jewish exegesis” independent of its immediate cultural and historical context. Nevertheless, since our main focus is on *textual products*, and not on Hellenistic/Jewish culture in general, it is indeed possible to distinguish clearly between Hellenistic and Jewish exegetical compositions. Rabbinic exegesis is in many ways a product of its time; but it is certainly not Hellenistic exegesis written in Hebrew. Despite points of resemblance between the corpora in terms, methods, and textual concepts, there are many more differences. This is what makes it possible to isolate in the rabbinic texts those elements that are the result of influence by Hellenistic exegetical culture.

In light of the many differences between the exegetical corpora, we should first address the similarities. This assertion contrasts with that of scholars of rabbinic literature who sought to implement J. Z. Smith’s approach, according to which in comparing communities that share a cultural background, one should assume similarity and explain differences.[[114]](#footnote-114) So, for example, Satlow states:[[115]](#footnote-115)

Given the significant and growing indications that Jews shared much with the larger cultures in which they lived, these similarities cease to require explanation. The thing that needs explaining is difference: How and why are a given group of Jews different from those around them? How and why did they create their own distinctive ethnic identity?

This may be true for a rather broad cultural study, but in the context of this study, which deals with textual products, it should be rejected. Indeed, the assertion that one should assume similarity and explain differences embodies a tinge of laziness. It took the author of the present study several years to unearth similarities between the Hellenistic and rabbinic commentaries, some found in rather unexpected places, whereas most of the differences were evident from the outset. One should linger a while and appreciate the similarities before rushing to underscore the differences.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the Jewish biblical commentaries did not impact the Homeric non-allegorical commentaries, at least in the cases discussed in this study (in later periods they might have had some impact). This does not mean that Jewish and Greek scholars did not exchange ideas, but that it is possible to outline the development of Homeric exegetical terms, methods, and discourses without addressing Jewish exegesis. The opposite is not possible, as we shall see in the following chapters. Thus I use “influence,” as it implies a one-way transfer of knowledge.[[116]](#footnote-116)

There are a variety of possibilities which could explain the transfer of knowledge, since, as noted, the Homeric commentaries actually represent a wide spectrum of Hellenistic culture including rhetoric, grammar, education, literature, and so forth. Thus it is possible that the rabbis were exposed to the methods and terms found in Greek scholarship in different ways: interactions with scholars;[[117]](#footnote-117) direct reading of exegetical, rhetorical, and grammatical texts; elementary Hellenistic education;[[118]](#footnote-118) *Progymnasmata* exercises;[[119]](#footnote-119) acquaintance with exegetical traditions of Alexandrian Jews;[[120]](#footnote-120) daily conversations at the market or the bathhouse;[[121]](#footnote-121) or simply the *Zeitgeist*.

The rabbis, as noted, do not tend to disclose their sources, and any attempt to reconstruct how the knowledge was transmitted will remain somewhat speculative. Nevertheless, in each case study I shall point to the most probable possibilities for the influence of the Hellenistic scholarship on the rabbis. When there is similarity in a complex method, this is more likely to be the result of direct interaction with Greek scholars, whereas similarities in known rhetorical and literary tropes could be the result of more mundane interactions. The main focus of this study is not on locating “smoking guns,” but rather on the smoke itself. Yet at times when there is enough smoke, it is possible to surmise the shape of the gun.

### An Overview of the Homeric Commentaries

Homeric commentary as a systematic discipline begins with Aristotle,[[122]](#footnote-122) who dedicated much effort to solving problems raised against the Homeric text in his treatise Ἀπορήματα Ὁμηρικά (*Homeric questions*), of which only fragments have survived, and in the 25th chapter of his *Poetics*: περὶ προβλημάτων καὶ λύσεων (“On problems and solutions.”) The main novelty of Aristotle’s approach was in regarding the Homeric poems as literature and by reading them in light of the characteristics of the epic genre and in their historical context, without imposing external criteria.[[123]](#footnote-123)

Alexandria became the center of Homeric scholarship after Ptolemy Soter I (ca. 280 BCE) founded the famous library and alongside it the museum.[[124]](#footnote-124) Since various versions of the Homeric poems circulated in antiquity, the scholars devoted much of their efforts to preparing editions based on philological and literary considerations, and developed a wide array of critical signs (σημεῖα)[[125]](#footnote-125) and dividing both the Iliad and the Odyssey into 24 books.[[126]](#footnote-126) In addition, since the manuscripts were written in *scriptio continua*, without any spaces between the words, the scholars also addressed problems concerning the correct accents and word divisions.

Zenodotus of Ephesus, the first chief librarian in Alexandria between 285-270 BCE, probably published an ἔκδοσις (edition) of the Iliad in 275BCE. In order to mark his textual emendations he developed a basic system of critical signs, which usually appeared in the left margin of the verse. So, for example, he used the obelus sign (–) to mark an ἀθέτησις, that is to designate a verse as spurious without actually excising it from the edition.[[127]](#footnote-127)

Aristophanes of Byzantium, the pupil of Zenodotus, chief librarian between 189-204 BCE, also published an ἔκδοσις of the Homeric poems and added several critical signs.[[128]](#footnote-128) In addition, he developed the system of accents.[[129]](#footnote-129)

Aristarchus of Samothrace (215-144 BCE), the chief librarian between 175-145 BCE, who due to his zealous philological approach received in antiquity the nickname ὁ γραμματικώτατος, led Homeric scholarship to new heights and became the commentator most identified with the Alexandrian school.[[130]](#footnote-130) He published two editions of the Iliad, as well as editions of many other authors.[[131]](#footnote-131) He was possibly also the first scholar to compose a line commentary (ὑπομνήνατα) that appeared on a separate scroll from the ἔκδοσις, in which he discussed in detail textual and exegetical issues.[[132]](#footnote-132) Various critical signs on the margins of the edition referred the reader to the scroll of the commentary, where the same sign appeared alongside the lemma.[[133]](#footnote-133) In addition to signs indicating various textual emendations (especially ἀθέτησις)[[134]](#footnote-134) or disagreements with Zenodotus, Aristarchus also often used the *diple* sign (>), which appeared alongside verses on which he wished to make exegetical, stylistic, and literary comments.[[135]](#footnote-135) Large parts of Aristarchus’ ὑπομνήνατα, alongside the critical signs, have been preserved (albeit much abridged) in the A scholium.[[136]](#footnote-136)

As already noted, Aristarchus was credited with the hermeneutical rule “to clarify Homer from Homer” (Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν), which, although most likely not coined by him, accurately summarizes his exegetical approach.[[137]](#footnote-137) Thus Aristarchus often explains an obscure word by examining the way Homer uses it in other contexts (see Chapter One). He also argued that one should not use the writing of later authors (e.g. Hesiod, the epic cycle) for interpreting Homer. In addition, several scholars have noted his indebtedness to Aristotle,[[138]](#footnote-138) as manifested, for example, in the perception of the epic as a serious genre that accordingly cannot include ridiculous or inappropriate descriptions; the assumption that the role of poetry is to amaze the reader, and therefore may include a supernatural event as long as it is credible and consistent; and the anchoring of the Homeric language and description in their historical context; as well as in a close focus on lexical issues.

Unlike the Alexandrian philological tradition, other Homeric scholars in the Roman period dealt more with literary and didactic interpretations, preserved – mostly anonymously – in the bT scholium (see below). Another important Homeric commentator was Porphyry (234 to the beginning of the fourth century CE), who in his *Homeric Questions*[[139]](#footnote-139) uses Aristotelian methods to defend Homer from various accusations regarding, for example, inconsistency, contradictions, immorality, and so on. He often cites earlier scholars, and his treatise provides clear evidence for the vitality of the Aristotelian tradition in the third century.[[140]](#footnote-140) It should be noted that Porphyry also dealt with Biblical criticism, focusing mainly on the book of Daniel, in his treatise against the Christians, which is an important example of the way the critical tools developed by Homeric scholars were applied to the Bible.[[141]](#footnote-141)

As noted, most of the ancient Homeric commentaries have not directly come down to us. Our main source, and the basis for much of the present study, are the various scholia preserved in Byzantine manuscripts, usually on the margins, comprising abbreviations and reworkings of various earlier commentaries.[[142]](#footnote-142) As a result, the scholia are formulated in a very laconic and technical style that poses many difficulties.[[143]](#footnote-143) The most important scholia on the Iliad that preserve early material are the A, bT, and D scholia, alongside several papyri, most of which have been collected in Erbse’s authoritative and masterful edition.[[144]](#footnote-144) It is also worth mentioning the huge commentary of the Byzantine scholar Eustathius, bishop of Thessaloniki in the twelfth century, who often preserves early traditions.[[145]](#footnote-145)

#### The A Scholium

Our main source for the commentaries of the Alexandrian scholars is the A scholium, which was written on the margins of the most famous manuscript of the Iliad – the Venetus A (tenth century).[[146]](#footnote-146) This scholium contains over a thousand explicit references to Aristarchus,[[147]](#footnote-147) as well as hundreds to Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and other ancient critics. The manuscript also includes the Aristarchean critical signs, of which the *diple* is the most common. The remainder are signs indicating textual criticism (Obelus, asterix, diple peristigma), and the signs are often followed by ὅτι, short for τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι (“the sign X because…”).[[148]](#footnote-148) At the end of almost every book of the Iliad the scribe added the following subscription:

Παράκειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου Σημεῖα, καὶ τὰ Διδύμου Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, τινὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιακῆς προσῳδίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ καὶ ἐκ Νικάνορος Περὶ στιγμῆς.

Written beside [the text] are Aristonicus’ ‘Signs’ and Didymus’ ‘On the Aristarchean edition’, and also some extracts from Herodian’s ‘Iliadic prosody’ and from Nicanor’s ‘On punctuation.’[[149]](#footnote-149)

Aristonicus’ treatise on signs composed in the Augustan period “was a compilation of excerpts from one of Aristarchus’ commentaries and from other works, focusing on critical signs.”[[150]](#footnote-150) Thus in most cases when a scholium is attributed to Aristonicus, it is likely to have preserved Aristarchus’ opinion, although not necessarily his *ipssima verba*. Didymus (first century BCE) was a renowned scholar who composed many commentaries. His *On the Aristarchean edition* focuses mainly on textual variants[[151]](#footnote-151) And he is considered a reliable witness to Aristarchus only when he cites him explicitly.[[152]](#footnote-152)

Herodian, active in the second century CE, was one of the most important grammarians in antiquity.[[153]](#footnote-153) His main work, partially lost, is the 20 book Καθολικὴ προσῳδία, written in Rome and dedicated to Marcus Aurelius. His notes on the Homeric texts, many of which are based on Aristarchus, deal with prosody: accents, aspiration, long and short vowels, and the division or combination of syllables. Nicanor, the second-century CE grammarian, focused on punctuation in the Homeric poems and developed a system of eight different punctuation marks, whereas previously only two were used. In Chapter Four, I shall discuss his possible impact on rabbinic punctuation of the Bible.

The main basis for the A scholium is these four treatises. Yet the compiler or copyist of the scholium most probably did not have direct access to these treatises. Rather, his source (or the source of his source) was a compilation of all four, probably made in the fourth to fifth century, and referred to by scholars as the *Viermännerkommentar* (VMK).[[154]](#footnote-154) However, the A scholium also contains some comments related to the bT scholia.

#### The bT Scholia

As formulated succinctly by Dickey, “The bT scholia are so called because they are found in manuscript T (eleventh century) and in the descendants of the lost manuscript b (6th century). They contain some Alexandrian material (much of it attributable to Didymus) but seem to come more immediately from a commentary of the late antique period (known as “c”), of which b produced a popular and T a more scholarly version. These scholia are also known as the exegetical scholia, because they are concerned primarily with exegesis rather than textual criticism.” [[155]](#footnote-155) Most of the comments in the bT scholia reflect a distinctly different aesthetic, textual, and literary approach to the Homeric poems to that found in the A scholia, focusing on the received canonical text while avoiding, and even opposing, textual emendations. Thus it includes over 40 refutations of various *atheteseis* of the Alexandrian scholars, mainly based on literary considerations.[[156]](#footnote-156) Unlike Aristarchus, the bT scholia does not limit itself to noting the various stylistic tropes Homer uses but also evaluates them, usually praising him highly. It also includes discussions of Homer’s techniques to excite and engage the reader; analysis of the psychological motivations of the characters; and didactic lessons.[[157]](#footnote-157) The estimated date for the compilation of the bT scholia has ranged from the fourth to the ninth century,[[158]](#footnote-158) yet it is clear that its sources belong mostly to Late Antiquity.

The bT scholia consists of interpretations by many, mostly anonymous, ancient scholars.[[159]](#footnote-159) Martin Schmidt has argued that one anonymous commentator, probably from the third-fourth century, is behind a significant number of comments that share a common worldview.[[160]](#footnote-160)

#### The D Scholium

The D scholium is so called because it was erroneously attributed to Dydmus. It is also known as the *scholia minora* or *scholia vulgate*. This is the only Homeric scholium to have survived as a self-standing commentary, unlike the other scholia which were preserved on the margins of manuscripts of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Many of the notes are lexicographical, some of which could also be found in lexical papyri.[[161]](#footnote-161)

It is worth noting the comments of what scholars have named “Mythographus Homericus,” designating the author of a collection of mythical stories preserved mainly in the D scholia and in some papyri. These stories are linked to lemmata following the order of the Homeric text, as Rossum-Steenbeek notes:[[162]](#footnote-162) “Words (often proper names) of these lemmata serve as starting points to tell narratives about mythical persons, their families and adventures, foundations of places, and the origin of institutions and habits.” In the present study I shall seldom deal with these comments, yet there is much potential in comparing them to the Aggadic Midrashim.

**Scholia to the Odyssey**

It should be noted that the distinction between the Alexandrian school and the exegetical scholia based on different manuscripts is mainly relevant to the Iliad. The case of the scholia to the Odyssey is more complex. Even in antiquity the Odyssey received less exegetical attention, as the Iliad was considered the more important work. This is also noticeable in the transmission of the commentaries to the Odyssey in the Byzantine manuscripts. The scholia to the Odyssey have also received much less attention by modern scholars, and much work remains to be done in distinguishing the various strata.[[163]](#footnote-163) In recent years Filippomaria Pontani has been preparing a critical addition of the scholia of which three magisterial volumes have already appeared.[[164]](#footnote-164) For the scholia on the rest of the Odyssey, one still has to consult the outdated edition of Dindorf from 1855.[[165]](#footnote-165)

#### Papyri

Several papyri which include a ὑπομνήνατα on the Homeric poems have survived, mainly reflecting the Alexandrian tradition; some even include critical signs and excerpts from Aristarchus’ commentary.[[166]](#footnote-166) The following are the most important papyri for the purposes of the current study:[[167]](#footnote-167) P. Oxy. 8.1086 (first century CE, Commentary to Iliad 2.751-827);[[168]](#footnote-168) P.Oxy. 8.1087 (first century CE, commentary to Iliad 7.75-83);[[169]](#footnote-169) P. Oxy. 221 (second century CE, commentary to Iliad 21 composed by “Amonius the grammarian, son of Amonius.”)[[170]](#footnote-170)

### Halakhic Midrashim

The Halakhic Midrashim are part of the Tannaitic literature, which also includes the Mishna and the Tosefta. They are named “Halakhic midrashim” since, unlike the later Amoraic Aggadic midrashim, many of the commentaries deal with the legal parts of the Torah. Nonetheless, many of the Halakhic midrashim also deal with narrative section and include aggadic derashot.

These midrashim were edited during the third century CE, while most of the sages mention in them were active during the second century, and some even earlier. Yet much of the material is anonymous. The Midrashim follow the order of the verses and comment on almost every word, maintaining a clear distinction between the verse and the interpretation.[[171]](#footnote-171)

As David Zvi Hoffman first noted, the Halakhic Midrashim can be divided into two schools, those of R. Akiva and of R. Yishmael, two sages active during the first half of the second century.[[172]](#footnote-172) This division is based mainly on differences in terminology, hermeneutical methods, and the names of sages, though at times there are also legal and theological differences.[[173]](#footnote-173)

The Halakhic Midrashim attributed to R. Akiva are the following:

Mekhilta of R. Shimon b. Yochai (Rashbi), on the Exodus.[[174]](#footnote-174)

Sifra (except for the Mekhilta to Miluim and ʽArayot), on Leviticus.[[175]](#footnote-175)

Sifre Zuta Numbers.[[176]](#footnote-176)

Part of Sifre Deuteronomy (55-303).[[177]](#footnote-177)

Sifre Zuta Deuteronomy.[[178]](#footnote-178)

The following are the Halakhic Midrashim attributed to the school of R. Yishmael:

Mekhilta d’R. Yishmael, on Exodus.[[179]](#footnote-179)

Mekhilta to Miluim and ʽArayot.[[180]](#footnote-180)

Sifre Numbers.[[181]](#footnote-181)

Part of Sifre Deuteronomy (1-54, 304-357).

Mekhilta to Deuteronomy. [[182]](#footnote-182)

While the Halakhic Midrashim from the school of R. Yishmael are relatively homogenous, those from the school of R. Akiva are diverse and include at least two editions for each book, of which only part have come down to us: Mekhilta d’Rashbi, Sifra, and Sifre Deuteronomy on the one side, and Sifre Zuta to Numbers and Deuteronomy on the other side.[[183]](#footnote-183)

R. Yishmael’s exegetical approach could be defined, following Yonatan Sagiv's succinct formulation, as “comparative midrash” (מדרש משווה), whereas that of R. Akiva as “exhaustive midrash” (מדרש ממצה).[[184]](#footnote-184) In the school of R. Yishmael, the verses were interpreted following explicit and fixed hermeneutical rules and much use is made of other verses for interpreting a particular verse. The school of R. Akiva, on the other hand, shows a preference for an atomistic reading, focusing on specific words or letters without using more general hermeneutical rules. Such an atomistic reading widens the gap between the interpretation and the literal meaning of the verses.[[185]](#footnote-185)

### Editions, Translations, and Abbreviations

Citations of the A and bT scholia are based on Erbse. Those from the first six books of the Odyssey follow Pontani’s edition, while the remainder follow Dindorf’s edition. Citations from the D scholia to the Iliad are based on van Thiel’s edition, and to the Odyssey – on Ernest’s. Translation of the scholia throughout are mine unless otherwise noted.

The translations of the Iliad and the Odyssey follow ????, but I have modified them at times to represent a more literal (and at times awkward) translation in order to facilitate the understanding of the commentaries. Translations of the Bible follow NJPS, at times modified.

Citations from rabbinic literature follow Ma’agarim: The Historical Dictionary Project (http://maagarim.hebrew-academy.org.il/Pages/PMain.aspx), unless stated otherwise. The references are based on the editions cited in the bibliography. I have noted textual variants only when necessary; in order to facilitate the reading, I have occasionally added punctuation and completed abbreviations.

### Abbreviations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sch. | Scholia | Did. | Didymus |
| Il. | Iliad | Ariston. | Aristonicus |
| Od. | Odyssey | Herod. | Herodianus |
| ex. | exegetical | Nic. | Nicanor |
| pap. | papyrus | Hes. | Hesiod |
|  |  |  |  |

1. See Marrou 1956, 98-99 who discusses the widening of the meaning of the term παιδεία in the Hellenistic period. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. על המרכזיות של הומרוס בחינוך היווני ראו יאגר 1945, עמ' 56-35; מארו 1956, עמ' 170-162; ורדניוס 1970; מורגן 1998; הוק 2001; קריביורה 2001 עמ' 197-194; למברטון 2002 (על תפקיד האלגוריה והרטוריקה ההומרית בחינוך); סלויטר 1997; סנדנס 2009; ניהוף 2012ב; פונטני 2011; 2012 (על השימוש בהומרוס על ידי המדקדקים). על המעמד הקנוני של הומרוס ("התנ"ך של היוונים") ראו פינקלברג 2003. על החינוך היהודי בעת העתיקה ומרכזיות התורה בו ראו הירשמן 2009 (וסקירת מחקר מפורטת בעמ' 126-121); ספראי 1976; אברבך תשמ"ב; הצר 2000ב, עמ' 109-39; הצר 2010; שובה תש"י. על תפקיד הטקסטים הקנונייים בפידיאה בעת העתיקה המאוחרת ראו סטרומזה 2012. לדיון משווה בתפקיד הטקסט בהוראה בעת העתיקה אצל יוונים, נוצרים ויהודים ראו סניידר 2000. להשוואה בין מעמדו של הומרוס ומשה בעת העתיקה ראו אלכסנדר 1998. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Heraclitus, Homeric Problems, 1.5-1.7, p. 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. On Liebreman’s and Daube’s research see below. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See e.g.

   זליגמן תש"ם; ורמס 1975א; פישביין 1985; שנאן וזקוביץ 1986; לנסיון לשחזר את הפרשנות היהודית לפני חורבן הבית ראו ברוור 1992; גולדברג תשמ"א; אלבק, תשכ"ט, עמ' 93-84; ליברמן, תשכ"ג, עמ' 189-186; אורבך תשי"ח. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. נציג בולט של גישה זו, שראשיתה בפרויקט הגדול של גינצבורג 1928-1913, והמתמקדת בעיקר במסורות המשותפות, הוא ג'יימס קוגל (יעקב כדורי). ראו קוגל 1998 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. את דרכי הפרשנות הסמויות של המקרא המשוכתב מגדיר יעקב כדורי (תשס"ט, עמ' 385) כך: "אם פסוק מכיל מילה סתומה בעיניו או מונח שנראה לו בעייתי, החבור יכול לצטט את הפסוק בשלמותו ולהחליף את המילה הקשה במילה המתאימה לאופן שבו הוא מבין את משמעות המשפט כולו לחלופין הוא יכול לצטט צירוף מילים סתום ככתבו אך לעטוף אותו במשפט משלו שינהיר את הביטוי הסתום". [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. רוב הפשרים מתוארכים ל-70-100 לפנה"ס. חלקם מורכבים מפרשנות מסודרת לכתובים, כאשר ציטוט הפסוק מלווה בנוסחאות 'פשרו על', 'פשר הדבר'. רוב הפשרים הם על טקסטים נבואיים והם נותנים פירוש אקטואלי או אסכטולוגי. הפרשן הוא אנונימי וסמכותי ונראה שמקור חלק מהם הוא בדברי מורה הצדק שניחן ביכולת לפענח את משמעות הנבואות. לסקירה על ספרות הפשרים ראו ניצן תשס"ט; ברין 2005; יאסן 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. ספרות המחקר על דרכי הפרשנות והטרמינולוגיה הפרשנית במגילות קומראן היא רבת כמות ראו, לדוגמא, פישביין 1973; מאייר 1996 (סקירה כללית); ניצן תשס"ט; שמש תשס"ד; אלדג' 2003; למר 2002; ברנשטיין 1994א; 1996; 1998; ברין 2005 וביבליוגרפיה שם; בוקמוהל 2009 (הוא אף מציע שיש השפעה של הפרשנות האלכסנדרונית על הפרשנות במגילות אך מתעלם מן הפרשנות המסופוטמית); אוסף מאמריו של ברנשטיין 2013, וכן ההפניות בהערה הבאה. לתשומת לב מיוחדת זכה הפירוש המכונה 'פשר בראשית א' (4Q252) ראו ברנשטיין 1979; 1994ב; ברוק 1996; ברוק 2005 (והשוואה לברית החדשה); ורמן ושמש, תשע"א, עמ' 55-54; משילה 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. להשוואה בין פרשנות חז"ל לפרשנות במגילות קומראן ראו, לדוגמא, גולדברג תשמ"א; ורמן ושמש תשע"א, עמ' 71-51 (בעמ' 53 דיון במונח 'מדרש' במגילות כמייצג חיבור); כדורי תשס"ט; פראד, תשס"ז; 1991, עמ' 23-1; 1998; 2006א; 2006ב; 2007ב; שמש תשס"ד; 2000; 2009; קיסטר 1998; תשנ"ט (בייחוד עמ' 335-332); ברנשטיין 1996; ברנשטיין וקויפמן 2005; מנדל 2001; 2006; מילגרום 1989; ברוק 1985; 2000; 2009; הגר 2005; 2011; שיפמן 2005; שרמר 2001; מיליקובסקי תשע"ג, א, עמ' 62-61 וההערות בעמ' 101-99. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. לדוגמא, היו שהצביעו על הדמיון בין התבנית הפרשנית 'כי א' הוא ב'' המצויה בפרשנות המגילות לבין הנוסחה הפרשנית: "אין א' אלא ב'" (ורמן ושמש תשע"א, עמ' 57). יש לציין שליברמן (תשכ"ג, עמ' 186 הערה 19) סבר שהמונח "אין א' אלא ב'" מקביל לפורמולה היווניתB οὐδὲν ἄλλο Α ἤ. עם זאת, לא מצאתי שימוש בפורמולה כזו בפרשנות ההומרית. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. לדוגמא, ברנשטיין וקויפמן 2005 ביקשו לזהות שימוש במגילות במידות כמו קל וחומר ובניין אב לצד טכניקות כלליות יותר כמו הרמוניזציה וחיבור בין פסוקים. השוו מילגרום 1989. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Verman and Shemesh 2011, p. 57 (my translation) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. לנקודה זו ראו, לדוגמא, פראד 1998 (וכן במאמרים רבים נוספים, ראו הערה הבאה); הגר 2005; כהנא 2006, עמ' 10. על ההבדל בין תפיסת הסמכות בקומראן לזו שבפרשנות המקרא באלכסנדריה ראו ניהוף 2012ג, עמ' 457-456. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. פראד, תשס"ז עמ' 279. פראד הדגיש פעמים רבות במאמריו את ההבדלים העקרוניים בין פרשנות חז"ל לפרשנות המגילות ראו הנ"ל 1991; 1998; 2006א; 2006ב; 2007ב.

    כהנא (2006, עמ' 11-10) מציין עוד כמה הבדלים בין פרשנות המגילות למדרשי ההלכה: מדרשי ההלכה כתובים בעברית משנאית בעוד שפרשנות קומראן משתמשת בלשון הקרובה ללשון המקראית; הפירוט ההלכתי במדרשי ההלכה הוא מפורט הרבה יותר מזה שבקומראן; במקרים רבים הפרשנות במדרשי ההלכה רחוקה יותר מהמשמעות הפשוטה של הטקסט. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. This is also an important difference between the Rabbinic and Mesopotamian exegesis. As Frahm notes (2011, 377): “[T]he commentators in the Assyrian and Babylonian tradition always remain anonymous”. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. לדעת פראד המחברים הכתתים נמנעים באופן עקיב מלהציג את הטכניקה שהובילה ליצירת ההלכה, גם במקרים בהם ברור שעומדת מאחוריה פעילות פרשנית. לדעתו, הסיבה לכך היא אידיאולוגית ונובעת מכך שמקור הסמכות של ההלכות החדשות הוא בהתגלות. לעומת חז"ל שהדגישו את התהליך הפרשני ואת כוחו של הדרשן. שמש תומך בעמדתו של פראד ומעיר: "חשיפת המהלכים הפרשניים מכירה מעצם מהותה באפשרות להציע פירושים אחרים, ואת זה בדיוק מחברי המגילות מבקשים למנוע" (שמש וורמן, תשע"א, עמ' 64). המקרים בהם כותבי המגילות חושפים את את ההגיון הפרשני מצויים בהקשרים פולמוסיים (שם). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. פראד תשס"ט, עמ' 270, 279. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. לאפשרות שבפשר חבקוק (א, 16-ב, 10) מוצגות שלוש הצעות פירוש מובחנות לחבקוק א 5 ראו וייגולד 2012, הדן גם במקומות נוספים בספרות בית שני שבהם מוצגים כמה אפשרויות פירוש. פילון מציג לעתים עמדות נוספות, אולם זהו חלק מהרצאת דבריו הסמכותית (ראו פראד 1991, עמ' 16). בדרשה על שמשון של פסוידו-פילון (כג) המחבר מונה כמה אפשרויות פירוש ודוחה אותן. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
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     היו שהצביעו על דמיון בטכניקות כמו השימוש באטימולוגיות, פילולוגיה יוצרת ועוד (ראו פראם 2011, עמ' 380-377; ליברמן 1987). חוקרים שונים הצביעו על הדמיון בין 'פשר' ל-*pišru* (גבאי 2012, עמ' 305-298 והספרות המובאת שם, ראו גם פראם 2011, עמ' 375-374); 'מדרש' ו- *mašʾaltu*וכן 'מדרש חכמים' ו-*mašʾaltu ummâni* (גבאי 2012, עמ' 310. ראו גם מנדל 2006; פראם 2011, עמ' 378). לאחרונה ניתח אורי גבאי (2012, עמ' 308-305; 2014) את הדמיון בין המונח *kayyān(u)* למונחים המדרשיים 'ודאי' ו-'ממש' המשמשים להצעת פירוש מילולי וכן הצביע על הדמיון בדרכי ציטוט הטקסט בפרשנות קומראן ובפרשנות האכדית באמצעות המינוחים 'אשר אמר' ו-*ša iqbû* וכן 'כי הוא אשר אמר' ו-*kī* *iqbû*. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
110. Gabbai 2015a. [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
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112. ראו לדוגמא את מאמרו המתודולוגי של סטלו 2008 הדוחה את השימוש במונח השפעה וכן דבריו של רוסמן 2001. באופן דומה מוס 2012ב, עמ' 249-245. ראו גם דיונו המתודולוגי המקיף של דורינג 2006 והספרות המתודולוגית הרבה המובאת שם. [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
113. In light of this problem Satlow (2008, 43) suggest to focus on people and not on abstractions: “Terms such as “Judaism” or “Jewish culture” immediately imply a model of culture that separates “Jewish” from “non-Jewish” culture. Unless used with extensive qualifications, the terms obscure the ongoing messy negotiations that constitute culture. At the same time, they obscure agency. Jews exist, not Judaism.” Yet as we are dealing with textual products one can paraphrase Satlow’s formulation: ‘Jews exist, and so does Jewish commentary.’ [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
114. See Smith 1990, especially 36-55. [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
115. Satlow 2008, 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
116. לאור העובדה שניתן לעקוב באופן מדוייק יחסית אחר התפתחות הפרשנות ההומרית בקרב המלומדים היוונים אני מתקשה לקבל את ההנחה שהדמיון הוא תוצר של תופעה אמורפית מעין מה שלבדיי אלכסנדר (2001, עמ' 127) מכנה common cultural pattern in ancient Mediterranean. אלכסנדר ממשיך וטוען:
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     אולם בהקשר של המחקר הנוכחי העוסק במונחים טכניים ומתודות שפותחו בקרב אליטה של מלומדים יוונים בתוך מסורת פרשנית בת מאות שנים קשה לקבל את ההנחה שמדובר בחלק מתרבות ים-תיכונית. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
117. על נואמים יוונים בארץ ישראל ראו גייגר תשנ"ב. לסקירה כללית של חכמי יוון בארץ ישראל ראו הנ"ל תשע"ב. יש לציין כי מוכרים כמה מלומדים הומריים שמוצאם מארץ ישראל: (א) דורותאוס מאשקלון, שפעל ככל הנראה בתקופת אוגוסטוס וטיבריוס, חיבר, לפי עדותו של פורפיריוס (שאלות הומריות [מקפייל], 9.90, עמ' 146), חיבור לקסיקלי מקיף על המילה κλισίον (מגורי המשרתים) אצל הומרוס. כפי שמציין גייגר (תשע"ב, עמ' 207), יתכן וזה היה רק חלק מתוך חיבורו הכולל Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις. ראו עוד איפוליטו 2005 (עם אוסף הפרגמנטים). (ב) פרשן הומרוס נוסף מארץ ישראל הוא פטולומיאוס מאשקלון אשר פעל כנראה במאה הראשונה לספירה. הוא השתייך לאסכולה של אריסטרכוס. נשתמרו לא מעט מהערותיו הפרשניות, העוסקות רובן בהטעמות. חלק גדול מההערות נשתמר בסכוליה A המבוססת על הרודיאנוס. ראו רצטי 2003 (כולל אוסף של כל הפרגמנטים) וכן גייגר תשע"ב, עמ' 280-279. (ג) לאוינומאוס מגדרה, פילוסוף קיני שהיה פעיל במחצית הראשונה של המאה השניה לספירה, מיוחס בסודא חיבור בשם 'על הפילוסופיה לפי הומרוס'. חלק מכתביו נשמרו בספריה בקיסריה. הוא מוכר בספרות חז"ל כאבנימוס הגרדי ולמעשה הנו איש הרוח היווני היחיד מלבד פרוקלוס שמוזכר בשמו בספרות חז"ל. ראו גייגר תשע"ב, עמ' 251-248.

     לבסוף, יש לציין שאפיון שנגדו כתב יוספוס את חיבורו הפולמוסי, היה בין השאר מלומד הומרי ידוע שחיבר חיבור לקסיקוגרפי בשם Γλῶσσαι Ὁμηρικαί. על אפיון ראו דלירי 2003; ואן דר הורסט 2002. יוספוס עצמו דן כמה פעמים בכתבי הומרוס ב'נגד אפיון', וכמה מהערותיו הן, כפי שמציין פונטני (2012, עמ' 67 הערה 140), אחד משלושה או ארבעה המקורות העתיקים החשובים ביותר ביחס להיסטוריה של הטקסט ההומרי בעת העתיקה. על פי יוספוס בספרות ההומרית ישנן סתירות הנובעות מכך שנמסרה בעל פה וקובצה רק מאוחר יותר. לעומת זאת במקרא אין סתירות שכן כותביו נכחו באירועים עליהם הם דיווחו. הוא טוען עוד כי הספרות היוונית אומנם מרבה להשתמש בשנינויות ותחבולות רטוריות אך דבר זה מכסה על כך שאין בה אמת היסטורית (נגד אפיון, א, 27-19). יוספוס מציין בעקבות זנודוטוס כי המילה נומוס איננה מופיעה בכתבי הומרוס (שם ב, 155-154) והוא אף מבקר את הפרשנות האלגורית היוונית (שם, ב 256-255). [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
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123. On Aristotle as a Homeric commentator see Richardson 1992; Schironi 2009 and Niehoff 2011, 9 and bibliography ibid, n. 32. On Aristotles *Homeric questions* see Hinterlang 1961. [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
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136. לפרגמנטים נוספים מכתביו של אריסטרכוס שהשתמרו בחיבורים לקסיקליים ביזנטיים ראו שירוני 2004. לאוסף המקיף של כל הפרגמנטים ראו ואן ת'יל 2014.

     קרטס ממאלו [↑](#footnote-ref-136)
137. For refernces see below p. XXX [↑](#footnote-ref-137)
138. Schironi 2018; 2009; Richardson 1980; 1995; Schenkeveld 1970; Niehoff 2011, 11 n. 43. [↑](#footnote-ref-138)
139. The first book of the tretease has been preserved in its entirety and fragments of the rest (at least two) are known from various fragments, especially in the bT scholia. For a short survey of this work see MacPhail 2011, 1-12.

     למהדורה ותרגום של הספר הראשון ראו שאלות הומריות (שלונק), למהדורה חדשה לפרגמנטים על האיליאדה עם תרגום לאנגלית ראו שאלות הומריות (מקפייל). לשאר הפרגמנטים ראו שאלות הומריות (שרדר). [↑](#footnote-ref-139)
140. לצד חיבור זה, המתאפיין בגישה ספרותית פילולוגית, חיבר פורפריוס שני פירושים אלגוריים לקטעים מהאודיסאה – 'על מערת הנימפות' ו'על הסטיקס' – כנראה בהשפעת תורתו הניאופלטונית של פלוטינוס מורו.
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