



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

U

Statement
by author:

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis

X
(yes) (no)

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

X
(yes) (no)

Date December 14, 1960 Avery J. Grossfield
(signature of author)

Library
record

The ~~below~~-named thesis was microfilmed on _____
(date)

For the Library _____
(signature of staff member)

AUTHOR Grossfield, Avery Jonah

TITLE Joseph Kara, his commentary on the book of Joshua.

Will you please tell me who, after almost
thirty years, is interested in reading my
rabbinical thesis?
Avery J. Grossfield

J O S E P H K A R A

HIS COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

A Critical Comparison of Kara's Commentary
with that of
Rashi on the same Book

Submitted to the Faculty of the Hebrew Union College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements leading to the degree of "Rabbi"

AVERY JONAH GROSSFIELD

M A Y 1 9 3 1

T O

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

for giving me
an opportunity to fulfill an ambition

I DEDICATE

these --- my first fruits

IN GRATITUDE AND DEVOTION

C O N T E N T S

I	General Introduction	page 3
II	Joseph Kara	
	A. Meaning of the Name	7
	B. His Life and Training -- as compared with that of Rashi	8
	C. His Relations with Rashi	11
	D. Rashi's Influence over Him	12
	E. Relations with and Influenced by other Exegetes	12
	F. Influenced by Spanish School and other sources	14
	G. His Works --- General Scope --- as compared with Rashi's	15
III	Kara's Commentary on the Book of Joshua --- compared with that of Rashi, for:-	15
	A. Comparative Lengths	16
	B. Citations from Targum, Midrash, etc.	17
	C. Foreign Languages --- "laazim"	22
	D. Grammatical Erudition	25
	E. Principal Characteristics of Interpretation	32
	F. Exegetical Rules	34
	G. General Characteristics --- compared	35
IV	Kara's Influence over Later Exegetes	53
V	His Place in Biblical Exegesis	55
	Bibliography	56
	Notes	58

I

General Introduction

The eleventh century saw the rise of a new school of Bible exegetes in Northern France, a school of Peshatists. Not that the Peshatic method of interpreting Scripture was in itself a new method, for, in truth, it had long passed its seven hundredth birthday. The Babylonian Amoraim had used the term "Peshat", in contradistinction to the term "Derash", to designate the simple, natural sense of a verse or passage (1). But it did not gain much ground and was finally overwhelmed by the Midrashic method. Not until the Karaites began to use the Peshat to prove the validity of their arguments, did the Rabbanites awaken to its merits. Foremost among the latter was Saadia, who translated the Bible into Arabic and added a commentary based on the Peshat. So revolutionary was this step, and so far-reaching was Saadia's influence upon his own and subsequent generations of exegetes, that this period has gone down in history as "The Period of the Peshat" (2). Bacher calls the Peshat "a new method of exegesis" and Saadia "its founder" (3). Saadia's influence is attested to by medieval and modern scholars (4).

The great influence of Saadia and the development of the Peshat were limited, however, to those lands which were under Moslem control. The Jews had complete freedom there, and every possible incentive and stimulus was given to them to pursue their intellectual and scientific researches (5). Such was not the case in the lands which were dominated by Christianity. First, the scientific attitude was not permitted to take root; second, influenced by their neighbors, "there was no such thing as secular science; religion placed its stamp on everything" (6); finally, "Derash --- to carry a Jewish term into an alien field --- was the method always employed by the Christian theologians.

Throughout the medieval ages they adhered chiefly to a spiritual, allegoric, moral and mystic interpretation" (7). So that the Derash was the standard method of Jewish exegesis in those lands until the eleventh century, when the new school of Peshatists, referred to above, made its sudden appearance. Strange to say, this school was self-generated, as it were, and was almost totally independent of the Babylonian-Spanish school (8).

The term "new" as applied to movements and schools of thought, is not an absolute one, but relative. There can be no such thing as an absolutely new school of thought, for there is always some thread, there is always some link, no matter how thin and frail it may be, by which it is connected with that which preceded it. There is no clear-cut line of demarcation to indicate to us where the old ends, and the new begins. The two are inextricably interwoven. In its essence the movement is of the past; it is only with reference to the "chiddushim", the innovations, the so-called "improvements", that we are allowed to use the term "new". And this is as it should be, for unless the chiddushim have their roots in the past, unless they have a background of tradition to uphold them, they will not long endure.

This principle holds true in regards to the "new" school of Bible exegetes, the Peshatists, which made its appearance in Northern France. Rashi, its founder (9), did not give up the Derashic method entirely and use only the Peshat; on the other hand, he did not allow himself to become entirely subservient to it. He tread the middle path and combined the two methods skillfully and judiciously, choosing the one or the other as best suited his purpose, often utilizing both for the same verse (10). He kept the roots of his exegesis embedded in the old Derash, but, at the same time, permitted it to shoot forth its branches in the direction of the new Peshat.

As the movement flourished and progressed , however, and the seeds which Rashi had sown had taken root and he had raised a generation of disciples, the tendency was to utilize the Derash less and the Peshat more. Thus we find that Rashi's younger contemporaries and disciples, including his own sons-in-law and grandchildren, are thorough Peshatists. They elaborated on the process which the master had begun, and, in many instances, even improved on it. This is especially true in the case of his grandson Samuel ben Meir, the Rashbam (11), and, to an even greater extent, in the case of Joseph ben Simeon Kara, Rashbam's "friend and collaborator" (12), who is the subject of this paper. Kara's work exemplifies the extreme development of the Peshat as a method of Biblical exegesis. He "frankly rejected the Midrash, and compared the person making use of it to the drowning man who clutches at a straw" (13).

Kara was one of the young contemporaries and early disciples of Rashi. Until recently, very little was known of him. From time to time scholars have studied the man and his work. Notable among these scholars are Zunz, Geiger, Berliner, Littmann, Eppenstein, Poznanski, and others. The problem that confronted these men was to subject to critical scrutiny the various Kara manuscripts on each of the Biblical books on which Kara commented, and to bring forth the most correct edition of each; as examples we may cite Littmann's work on Kara manuscripts on Ezekiel and Isaiah (14), and Eppenstein's work on Kara commentaries on Joshua (15) and Judges (16). In 1855 Geiger wrote that there had as yet not been found a complete Kara commentary on the Pentateuch, but that he did know of manuscripts on the Prophets (17). In addition to this problem, scholars wanted to evaluate Kara's work as a whole, and to put him into his rightful place in a historical survey of Jewish Biblical Exegesis. This was attempted by Eppenstein, Littmann and Poznanski, among others (18).

For the most part, this work was done with exclusive reference to Kara and his work. Occasionally references would be made to other exegetes and comparisons between them would be brought forward, always with the end in view of clarifying some point in Kara, or of properly evaluating him. These references and comparisons would usually be brought forward to be cited as illustrations to prove some point the editor-critic had in mind. This paper, on the other hand, is an attempt to compare as thoroughly and minutely as possible the commentaries of Kara and Rashi on only one book, the Book of Joshua, in as many categories as possible, to see how far they are similar, how far they differ from each other, and what are their most basic respective characteristics.

This paper, based as it is on a consideration of a comparison of the commentaries on only one book, however, cannot have that broad perspective that would result if the commentaries to all the books were subjected to the same treatment. Conclusions will no doubt be reached concerning Kara and Rashi which our analysis and comparison of the commentaries on the Book of Joshua cause us to think are valid, but which, had we gone into all the commentaries of Kara and Rashi on the Bible, would be considered invalid, or, at least, subject to modification. It is well to bear this constantly in mind, lest we be satisfied ~~xxxxx~~ with what is at best tentative conclusions.

II

The meanings given to the name "Kara" are many and varied. Many scholars have given thought to this question, and it seems that each has good reasons for sponsoring his own theory, and for refuting the theories of the others. We might do well to list some of the main theories propounded:

1. Dukes --- 1847 --- proposes the theory that the term "Kara" may mean "a Karaite" (19).
2. Geiger --- 1855 --- says that Kara was exclusively a Bible exegete (Bibelerklaerer), and was no doubt led to this work by the duties of his position of Bible Reader (Bibelvorleser) (20). Schloessinger says, in line with Geiger, that "The surname 'Kara' is usually taken to be a professional name, meaning 'reader' or 'interpreter' of the Bible" (21).
3. Jellinek --- 1855 --- says "that 'Kara', as contrasted with 'Darshan' means the representative of the 'Peshat' or 'Pashtan'" (22).
4. Littmann --- 1887 --- says that the term "Kara" means, in the Talmud, 'a master of Scripture' (Bibelkundigen) and was perhaps given to Menachem bar Chelbo because of his extraordinary knowledge of the Bible; it then was given to his nephew Joseph and perhaps to the entire family (23). He refutes Geiger's theory, that Joseph was a Bibelvorleser, with the argument that the title would then be לִקְרָא, and, if so, would hardly have been written defective (24). He also refutes Dukes' theory, with the argument that to call him a Karaite would not be in keeping with the period and country in which Joseph Kara lived and worked (25).
5. W. Bacher --- 1900 --- merely makes the statement that "The title 'Kara' (compare 'Mikra' -- Scripture) found already in the Talmud, marks him as a Bible exegete" (26).

6. Eppenstein --- 1906 --- proposes the theory that Joseph Kara was a Bible Teacher ("hatte nach meiner Vermutung den Beruf eines Lehrers der Bibel erwählt") and seeks to prove his contention from several points. First, the term for 'teacher' in the Talmud is 'רִבְנָא', in the combination 'רִבְנָא רִבְנָא' --- 'a teacher of children'. Then, the whole plan of the commentaries, the didactic tone, the fact that Kara is not satisfied with translating single words into French, but translates entire passages, his verbosity as contrasted with Rashi's brevity, and his constant repetition of his so-called "Exegetical Rules", lead one to the theory that he was a Teacher of Bible, that he was pre-eminently a pedagogue. Eppenstein says that he cannot accept the theories of those scholars who maintain that he was a "Bibelvorleser" or an "Erklaerer nach dem Pschat" in contradistinction to Darshan. If as "Bibelvorleser", he agrees with Littmann that the word should be לְרַבֵּן. And he cannot accept Epstein's proof that רִבְנָא is the opposite to רִבְנָא as convincing (27).

7. Poznanski --- 1909 --- says that Joseph was called 'Kara' like his uncle because he busied himself only with Biblical exegesis and not with Talmudical exegesis. He adds that, in his opinion, the name 'Kara' was a common one in France at that time (28).

It is well to stop right here. Where scholars cannot reach an agreement, it would be futile for an amateur to venture an opinion.

"Ueber das Leben Josef Karas ist wenig bekannt" (29). "Little is known concerning the life of Rashi" (30). We find that, in the case of both these men, some of the most important details in their lives are shrouded in mystery. The correctness of even the little information that we do possess does not always meet with agreement on the part of scholars.

1. It is almost certain that Rashi was born in the year 1040 C.E. (31). We also know that the date of his death is 1105 (32). But the date of Kara's birth is not so certain. Littmann says that at the time of Rashi's death Kara must have been between twenty and thirty years of age. That would place the date of his birth between 1075 - 1085 (33). Eppenstein and Poznanski say that Kara was born between 1060 - 1070, when Rashi was between twenty and thirty years of age (34). The numbers "between twenty and thirty years" are the same, but they are not applied to the same person. The latter date of Kara's birth seems to me to be more reasonable, for it allows for a longer period of time in which to cement that intimate friendship between the master and his disciple, which seems to have existed between them. The date of Kara's death is not known (35), but is taken to be between 1130 - 1140 (36).

2. All that we know of Rashi's ancestry is that his maternal uncle was Simeon ben Isaac, known as Simeon the Elder, a learned and revered disciple of Gershon, and that his father Isaac was also a well-educated person (37). As regards Kara's father, all agree that his name was Simeon, in fact, Kara tells us this himself (38), and that he was the brother of Menachem bar Chelbo. All are not agreed, however, as to whether this is the same Simeon who compiled the "Yalkut Shim'oni". Graetz says definitely that he was (39). Littmann is not certain either way (40). It seems, however, that the majority of scholars agree that Joseph Kara's father did not compile the "Yalkut", Liber going so far as to say that it "dates without doubt from the first half of the thirteenth century", about a century and a-half after Rashi (41).

3. Both Rashi and Kara received their early Jewish training at their homes, under the guidance of their parents and relatives. Later, Rashi travelled to other schools, in distant cities, in order to get

that richer background which the masters in those places could give to him. From Troyes, his birthplace, he went to Worms and Mayence, where he studied under some of the greatest scholars of the time. By the time Kara had grown up and was eligible to enter the schools for higher learning, Rashi had completed his education and had returned to his native city Troyes, where he established a school of his own. Kara became one of Rashi's pupils and thus became the beneficiary not only of the great learning which Rashi had gained from his own teachers, but of the added knowledge which Rashi's keen mind was able to develop and impart. We thus see that both Rashi and Kara had ample opportunity to study, and that they were both willing, nay, anxious to do so. But Rashi had to travel far afield to gather his sheaves, whereas Kara found them closer to hand.

4. We have definite information concerning Rashi's family. We know that he married while still a student (42), but we do not know the identity of the lady. Judging by the young scholar whom she accepted as her husband and by her children and grandchildren, we may safely assume that she, too, came of fine, cultured stock. Rashi had three daughters, but no sons. Among his many grandchildren, the three most noted for their learning and rabbinical authority were Jacob Tam, the Rashbam, and the Ribam. His sons-in-law and his grandsons were pupils in his school and he was literally the founder of a dynasty of masters of Jewish lore. It was the work of Rashi's descendants, in addition to his own, that made France the great center of Jewish learning for many generations, and it is the work of this most unique family that is included, even to this day, in what may be called "a basic Jewish education." (43). On the other hand, with the exception of one brief statement that Kara may have had a son named Isaac, who left commentaries on several "Ketubim", nothing is known concerning Kara's marriage, his family life, his other descendants, or of their works (44).

5. In the matter of vocation, by means of which they earned their livelihood, we again have definite information concerning Rashi, in contrast to the uncertainty that surrounds Kara. As discussed above (page 7), one theory is propounded that Kara was a לִבְלוֹרֶסֶר, a "Bibelforleser". But we do not know whether this was a position in a Synagogue or in a school, and whether Kara received a stipend for filling this office. Another theory is that Kara was a Bible-teacher, but, again, we do not know whether he was a מְדַבֵּר בְּתוֹכָם, a teacher of children, for which he received שְׂכָר, or whether he taught in the academy of Troyes gratis, בְּתוֹכָם, Torah for its own sake, and derived a livelihood from some other source. As regards Rashi, however, we have definite information that he "accepted no compensation from the community for his services" either as Rabbi or as teacher in the academy, "and he probably lived from what he earned by viticulture" (45).

The relations between Kara and Rashi were of the closest. Kara may have been one of Rashi's pupils, although scholars are not in agreement on this point (46); if so, he certainly was close to him, as in those days masters and their disciples came in contact with each other not only during their hours of study, but during almost every hour of the day (47). Kara was certainly a friend of Rashi's, and visited at his home, and the latter appears to have taken a great interest in the work of the former. Rashi discussed various Biblical passages with Kara, agreeing or disagreeing with him as occasion warranted (48). Later in life, when Rashi was a bedridden invalid, Kara was no doubt one of those younger contemporaries and disciples to whom Rashi dictated his responsa, and who edited or completed his commentaries (49). Rashi and Kara quote each other repeatedly in their respective commentaries (50).

Rashi exercised a great influence over Kara and his work, as he did over all with whom he came in contact. Kara owes his predilection for the Peshatic method of exegesis to Rashi, in which, however, the ^V disciple surpassed the master. According to Samuel ben Meir, Rashi had hoped to revise his Biblical commentaries in accordance with a more Peshatic interpretation, but he never had the opportunity to bring this hope to fruition. That which Rashi failed to do, his younger contemporaries accomplished (51), and, among these, Kara was the most eminent. Rashi showed the way to the Peshat, he blazed the trail, as it were, but he was ^{af} afraid to go too far from the familiar paths of the Derash (52). Kara, a younger and more venturesome blood, exceeded his master in courage along this line. Kara repeatedly voices his indebtedness to Rashi in a most respectful and deferential manner. Nevertheless, it would not be wrong to say that, in the give-and-take of scholarly discussion between the two, Kara exerted a great influence over Rashi, even while he was being influenced by him. Eppenstein seems to be of this opinion when he says: "so ist vielleicht ein Einfluss Karas auf Raschi nicht abzuweisen" (53). One of the great beauties in scholarly discussions between master and disciples lies in the fact that, no matter how great the master, he cannot help but learn something or be influenced by his disciples. In grinding the wheat of knowledge, both the upper millstone (the master) and the nether millstone (the disciple) have their rough edges smoothed down and their surfaces polished.

(in what way? and by whom?)

Joseph Kara was influenced to an even greater extent by Menachem bar Chelbo, his paternal uncle and inspiring teacher. Like his nephew Joseph, the uncle, too, bore the name "Kara", or, we ought rather say, that the nephew no doubt received the honor of bearing this name from his uncle, just as he received his education and training in Bible and

exegesis from him. Menachem bar Chelbo was himself an exegete of no mean repute, and he must have given his protege a good grounding in his favorite study. As fate would have it, Kara rewarded Menachem, for the pains the latter took in training him, by assuring the immortality of his name and work. For, were it not for Joseph Kara, the name and the works of Menachem may have sunk into oblivion, for Kara cites him often in his commentaries, "these quotations being almost the only source of knowledge concerning Menachem's exegesis" (54). Although Rashi mentions Menachem and quotes him repeatedly, it seems that they did not know each other personally. Here, too, Kara was the means of saving Menachem to posterity, for Rashi used only those quotations of Menachem which he had gleaned from Kara's works or from his discussions with Kara. Although other methods of interpretation reveal themselves in Menachem's exegesis, it is predominantly Peshatic. In the opinion of Poznanski, Menachem's commentaries are a good example of the beginnings of Peshatic exegesis in France (55 and 56).

Another great exegete under whose influence Kara came was Samuel ben Meir, the Rashbam, one of Rashi's grandsons (57). It was in Rashi's home that they became acquainted (see Rashbam on Genesis XXXVII, 13). Under the gentle guidance of the great master the two studied, and, as time went on, their friendship became stronger. It must have been with great affection and esteem that Samuel called Kara " 1/224 ", "our friend", our comrade" (58). But, as in the case of Kara and Rashi, so here in the case of Kara and Rashbam, not only was Kara influenced by Rashbam, but he, in turn, also influenced the latter (59). For Rashbam applied the exegetical principles which Kara had formulated. While Rashbam's "commentary on the Pentateuch" may be regarded as the foremost production of the exegetical school of Northern France" (60), nevertheless, looked at

*ref. clear writing
this is only that
he was influenced by
his companion*

*Gen 27
about*

from the Peshatic point of view, it falls short of Kara's works, as he uses the Midrash from time to time, which Kara rejected entirely.

Kara no doubt had communication with and was under the influence of all the exegetes of his time, the older ones as well as the younger ones. He makes especial mention of Jechiel of Paris, Yomtob ben Judah (Rashi's grandson), Moses ha-Darshan and others (61).

That which Poznanski says concerning the exegetes in Northern France in general (62) applies, of course, to Kara in particular. He says: "their knowledge of grammar they learned only from the works of Menachem (ben Seruq) and Dunash (ibn Labrat), for they were written in Hebrew; for this reason they often erred in explaining roots and forms (of words); nevertheless, they exerted all their powers to delve into the intricacies of the language They did not know Arabic, but the Targumim were revealed to them, for the Aramaic language, which is closer in spirit to Hebrew than Arabic, was frequent on their lips because of the language of the Talmud". Littmann (63) gives us a complete list of sources that influenced Kara; it is needless to reproduce it here. Suffice it to say that, although so much far-reaching work had been done in Spain, due to the medium in which it had been written, Kara, as all his fellow exegetes in Northern France, could not use it and had to content himself with the works of Menachem ben Seruq and Dunash ibn Labrat; that, like his contemporaries, Kara made much use of the Targumim, of the commentaries and other works of Saadia and other exegetes, and of the works of Sabbetai Donnolo of Italy, Kalir and others. It is evident, of course, that all departments of Rabbinic lore --- the Mishnah, the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds, the Midrashim, both halachik and agadic, and related works were known to him and were frequently referred to.

Kara was solely a Bible exegete, in contradistinction to Rashi, who also wrote a commentary to almost the entire Talmud. Neither did Kara write a commentary on the Pentateuch, in contrast to Rashi, whose work on the Pentateuch is one of the most important parts of his Biblical commentary. Kara merely wrote marginal notes and glosses to Rashi's manuscripts on the Pentateuch. These were later incorporated by copyists into the body of Rashi's work. Kara wrote commentaries to the early prophets, to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, to ^{all} many of the minor prophets, and to most of the Hagiographa. A complete list of his work is given by various writers, notably Littmann (64). Littmann says that Kara did not write on Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah (65), whereas Poznanski says that Kara did not write on Psalms and Daniel, but that there is no doubt that he did write on Ezra and Nehemiah (66). Kara's work on Chronicles consists of lengthy glosses which were later incorporated into the body of Rashi's commentary. *Rashi wrote me in Chronicles.*

III

With this rather brief and sketchy general introduction to Kara, we come to the purpose of this paper: a comparative analysis of the commentaries of Kara and Rashi on the Book of Joshua. We have compared these commentaries in a number of categories, and have noted their differences or similarities on charts, which are herein incorporated. With these charts before us, we may draw some conclusions, bearing in mind, however, as noted on page 6, that these conclusions are valid only for the Book of Joshua, but not for all of Kara's works, and that if we were to subject the works of Kara and Rashi on other books to the same treatment, we might have to surrender or modify these conclusions. The texts used for this work were as follows:

Rashi's commentary as contained in "Mikraoth Gedoloth", part 7, Warsaw edition, 1874, (known in the library of the Hebrew Union College as "T, Book 191"). Kara's commentary --- the critical edition as edited by S. Eppenstein in "Das Jahrbuch der Juedisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft", volume 5, 1907, Hebrew Section, pp. 39 - 60.

A. Comparative Lengths

According to Eppenstein (57), the only extant manuscript of Joseph Kara's commentary on the Book of Joshua begins with Chapter VIII, verse 13. Eppenstein bemoans the existence of this great deficiency, and rightly so, as because of it a much-desired completeness is precluded, and because of it we miss many interesting and important points in the Book which might otherwise have been revealed to us. Many other, though shorter, lacunae occur, such as in Chapter XV, verses 37-44; Chapter XIX, verses 14-28; and Chapter XXI, verses 19-38. Whether these latter lacunae were caused by the fact that Kara found nothing of worth in the corresponding verses to comment upon, or whether he did comment upon them and his remarks were lost, we cannot say definitely. We may venture an opinion, though, that Kara may not have commented upon them, for they consist of the names of various places which are mentioned in connection with the division of the land. We note that the Rashi text likewise contains many lacunae, which may have been due to the same reason. We cannot however account for the large gap in Rashi, Chapter IX, verse 15 to Chapter X, verse 11, for there the material lends itself to many important comments; in fact, Kara comments on a number of these verses.

In Chapter XVI, verse 1, the Kara manuscript presents two interpretations of the verse. Eppenstein accepts the second one as genuinely Kara's, but not the first. He says:

בכ"י נמצא זה הפירוש קודם החתמה ס"ז ונאשר לפי דעתו דברים אלו אינם
להחמבר, ע"כ שמתים פה בסיכוי הסדר והקורא ידעם לפי דעתו (68).

The following chart "A" shows the comparative lengths of the two commentaries: some verses are commented upon by both men, others are interpreted by the one or the other, and others are not touched by either commentator. It is impossible, however, to make comparisons of actual lengths, for, as we shall see later on, Kara is verbose, whereas Rashi is concise and to the point.

B. Citations from Targumim, etc.

We noted above, page 14, that Kara, as well as all the other Bible exegetes of Northern France were familiar with all branches of Rabbinic literature, and that they made frequent use of this material. Chart "B" is a comparative study of all citations of such sources. These citations total up as follows:

	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
Targum	12	16
Babylonian Talmud	12	12
Jerusalem Talmud	1	--
Midrash Rabbah	3	1
Midrash Tanchuma	1	1
Seder Olam Rabbah	1	--
Aboth	1	--
Aboth D'R Nathan	1	--
Mechilta	1	--
"Amru Rabothenu"	1	2
Tosefta	--	1
Sifre	--	1
"Sh'chitas Kadashim"	--	1
"Midrash Agada"	--	1

Handwritten notes:
Handwritten in Kara -
several times for
more liberal and
more liberal and
more liberal and
more liberal and

Comparative Lengths

Kara begins with Chapter VIII, verse 13; Rashi begins with Chapter I, verse 1. Our comparison begins with Chapter VIII, verse ~~XXX~~ 1.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Verses</u>	<u>Kara com- ments on</u>	<u>Rashi com- ments on</u>
8	35	10	15
9	27	12	5
10	43	12	6
11	23	7	5
12	24	3	4
13	33	7	13
14	15	9	4
15	63	16	22
16	10	5	4
17	18	9	12
18	28	13	13
19	51	5	9
20	9	4	3
21	43	6	3
22	34	14	10
23	16	2	2
24	33	10	12
<hr/>			
17	505	144	142

We see that out of the seventeen (17) chapters upon which both Kara and Rashi comment, and out of a total of 505 verses contained in these seventeen (17) chapters, Kara attends to 144 verses, and Rashi attends to 142 verses. Many of these verses are attended to by both Kara and Rashi, while a goodly number are attended to by the one or the other. We can draw no conclusions, however, as to the relative lengths of the two commentators: first, because this ratio may not hold true as regards their works on other Biblical books, and second, because Rashi's comments are very short and concise, whereas Kara is verbose.

Chart "B"

Citations.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
8	13	Targum	Talmud - Megillah 3a-b (Amru Rabotenu)
8	15	Targum	Targum
8	33	Talmud Bavli -- Sotah 36b	
9	4	Midrash Tanhuma	Targum
9	5		Targum
9	14	Targum	
10	12		

Eppenstein comments
on this:

71'c 18 '567' 6d
72'c 18 // 72'c 18 (69)

10	13	Midrash Genesis Rabba VI --- but not verbatim. He often omits words, adds his own words, changes words and synonyms, transposes phrases and clauses. Quotes in extenso.
----	----	--

Seder Olam Rabbah,
Perek 11, Ratner
edition, page 48 (70)

Talmud Bavli -- Abodah
Zara --- 25a

10	21	Targum
10	40	Targum
11	8	Targum

(Note ---

Targum
that Kara does not quote the Targum
correctly. He makes 13,7h
instead of 13,7h, and 13,7h
instead of 13,7h; He may have
done this on purpose, or it may be
an error of copyists.)

11	13	
----	----	--

Midrash Genesis Rabba in
Sidra vayishlach Ya-a-kov.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
11	17		Targum Tosefta
11	18		Midrash Tanchuma (This constitutes Rashi's entire comment).
12	7	Targum	
13	3	Bavli Talmud -- Chulin 60b	Bavli Talmud -- Chulin 60b (quotes more fully than Kara)
13	19		Targum
13	27		Targum
14	10	Talmud "Orechin" 13a	Talmud "Orechin" --- uses the material without giving the source.
14	15	Midrash Genesis Rabbah 58/4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
		Genesis 23/6 and Aboth 5/4	Genesis 23/6 and "Midrash Agada"
15	7	Targum (misquotes)	Targum
15	8	Kara says: <u>כדי לל</u> <u>לפניו</u> , but does not give any reference (71). Might be Aboth D'r Nathan.	
15	9		Targum
15	12, 21	Talmud Jerushalmi - Megillah 70a, (Perek 1, Halacha 1), but not quoted correctly, it seems (72)	Rashi gives no reference; just says <u>למכע לל</u> <u>לפניו</u>
15	15		Talmud Bavli --- Temorah 16a
15	17	Talmud Bavli (Kara quotes Ketuboth, but it is really in Sanhedrin 19b (73)	
15	18		Targum
15	63		Sifre -- does not give reference just says: <u>למכע לל</u> <u>לפניו</u>

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
17	5	Bavli Talmud, Baba Bathra 118 b	Bavli Talmud, Baba Bathra 118b
17	11	Targum	Targum
17	18		Talmud Bavli Baba Bathra 118a
18	1, 14		quotes <u>הנהר יפה</u> <u>פ"ג</u> <u>פ"ג</u>
19	13		Targum
19	29	Targum	Targum
22	7	Midrash Genesis Rabba 32; Yalkut Shimon 22 (is not exact in quoting)	
22	8		Rashi says <u>הנהר יפה</u> <u>פ"ג</u> but does not give source, which I cannot locate.
22	19	<u>הנהר יפה</u> gives no source (74)	
22	15	Talmud Bavli Sabbath 88a Sotah 34a	
24	26	Targum Talmud Makoth 11a	Targum Talmud Makoth 11a
24	27	Targum	Targum
24	30		Talmud Sabbath 105b Makoth 11a
24	32	Talmud Sotah 13b	Talmud Sotah 13b
24	33	Talmud Baba Bathra 111b, 116b	Talmud Baba Bathra 111b, 116b

C. Foreign Languages

Concerning Rashi, Liber says: "Since the Bible and the Talmud made appeal to readers of another time and another language than those in which they were written, Rashi's first duty was to explain them, then, if necessary, translate them, now to add clearness to the explanation, now to do away with it wholly. These translations, sometimes bearing upon entire passages, more often upon single words, were called 'glosses', Hebrew 'laazim' (better, 'leazim'), the plural of 'laaz'. They were French words transcribed into Hebrew characters, and they formed an integral part of the text. Rashi had recourse to them in his teaching when the precise Hebrew expression was lacking, or when he explained difficult terms, especially technical terms of arts and crafts. The use of a French word saved him a long circumlocution. Sometimes, the laaz followed a definition or description, in a striking manner giving the meaning of the word or expression.

"In employing these French laazim, Rashi introduced no innovation. His predecessors, especially his masters, had already made use of them Rashi extended the use of the laazim, developing this mode of explanation; and the commentaries of his disciples, who continued his method, are strewn with French words " (75). It is needless to add that Kara also used laazim in his commentaries.

In studying the laazim of both Kara and Rashi in their respective commentaries on the Book of Joshua (Chart "C"), we find that in but two instances do both give a laaz on the same verse, namely: Chapter IX, verse 5, and Chapter XI, verse 2. In Chapter IX, verse 5, they differ with each other in the translation of the Hebrew word פ'ר'ר'ל. In Chapter XI, verse 2, they translate the Hebrew word ל'ר'ר'ל into the same French word, but the spelling of the French word differs in each commentary. This may be due to the carelessness of the later copyists, as suggested by Liber (76).

Chart "C".Foreign Languages

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
8	18		"כירון" - שפיר"ו בלע"ז
9	5	"נקדים" - בשק"ס בלע"ז	"נקדים" - ארשי"ץ בלע"ז לשון חזק
11	2	בלע"ז קונסרידש (שכונות דוד)	קונסרידש בלע"ז (פלכי דוד)
(Note the difference in the spelling of the same word)			
12	7	סירייל בלע"ז	
13	2		"גלילות הפלשחים" - מרקא"ש בלע"ז
15	7		"רונל" - פולוש בלע"ז
15	9	"וחאר" - בלע"ז "אדריצבס"	

and Eppenstein
translates "adrecevet,
gerade richten"

15	19		"ארץ הנוב" - שייקא בלע"ז
15	47		"והים הגדל וגבול" - אלשי"ש בלע"ז
17	15		איסרסי"ר בלע"ז
17	15		איסרמא"ש בלע"ז
17	11	קונסרידש בלע"ז <u>contrees</u>	
17	18	ארוד לוי בלע"ז — זאף בלשון אשכנז קורין רוריין שעוקרין שורשי האילנות לחץ.	

French erod lui

German - roden -- to
uproot

page 53, notes 5 & 6 (77)

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
18	5	"יעמוד" - בלע"ו אשטייט <u>German -- esteit, steht</u>	
19	12		"כסלות חבור" - פלוק"ש בלע"ו
22	11	"גלילות" - ריביר"ש בלע"ו <u>French -- revier</u>	
23	13	"ולשום" - בלע"ו ווריינ"ם <u>German --- variant ---</u> <u>hin-und-hergehend</u>	

The Hebrew word "G'liloth" is translated by ^{Rashi} ~~KARA~~ in Chapter XIII, verse 2, and by Kara in Chapter XXII, verse 11; their French translations are not the same.

Rashi uses only French laazim in his commentary; in Kara, German laazim also occur. Whether these were used by Kara himself or inserted by later German exegetes cannot be definitely stated; in one instance, Eppenstein thinks that the German laaz was inserted by a later commentator (78).

Both Rashi and Kara quoted many words and phrases from the Targum, which might be treated here as a foreign language. These will be found in Chart "B".

Chart "D"

Grammatical Erudition

Chap.	Verse	Kara	Rashi
8	20	והעם הנס המדבר נהפך אל הרורף	"והעם הנס המדבר" - ישראל שנס אל המדבר כמו שאמר למעלה נהפך להלחם אל הרורף
9	4	<p>"וילכו ויצטירו" - נעשו צירים שלוחים לאנשי מקום כמו שמפרש בעיניין ויאמרו אלינו זקינינו קחו בידכם צידה לדרך ולכו ויש ספרים שכת' בהן ויצטיירו עשו כל לחם צידה יבש היה ניקודים כאילו מארץ רחוקה מאוד באו, אילו ואילו מביאין ראיה לדבריהם ולא הכריעו אלו את אלו, גם בדבר הזה אין לברר הנכוחה זולת אלהינו, אבל לבי נוסה אחר הספרים שכת' בהם ויצטיירו מדבר הלמד מעיניינו שלמד כעיניין זה</p> <p>מכאן בכמה מקומות מה ראו על ככה לעשות צידה זו כדי שיחקבלו דבריהם שיראו האנשים צידה שלהם וברבר זה יהיו ניכרים כי רחוקים מהם מהם הה"ד ויקחו האנשים מצידם ומפרש עוד בעיניין זה לחמנו חם הצטיידנו אותו מבתינו ביום צאחנו ועתה הנח יבש, על כל דיבור ודיבור חוזר על הצדה.</p>	<p>"ויצטירו" - עשו עצמם כהולכים בשליחות לשון וציר בגויס שולף, וכל חיבה שתחלת יסודה צד"י כשהיא מתפעלת בל" מתפעל או נתפעל באה ס"ח בחוכה וחולקת את אוהיות שרשי התיבה כמו מה נצטדק מנורת צדק שאומר נצטדק.....</p>
9	12		הצטיידנו - לשון צרה כשהוצאנוהו לצרה לדרך
9	14	<p>ויקחו האנשים מצידם - ויאמינו האנשים לדבריהם, ומה ראו שהאמינו בהם, מלחם שבידם שראו שהיה יבש ומועלים בלוח ומוסולאוח שברגליהם ומשמלות בלוח שעליהם היו מבורים שקדבריהם כן הוא, אמרו צידם מוכיה עליהם שבודאי מארץ רחוקה באו וחרגומו מוכיה על הפתרון שהוא וקבילו נבריא לפתגמיהו.</p>	<p>ויקחו האנשים מצידם - קבלו דבריהם שצדום בפייהם לשון ואמר לא צרה</p> <p>4218 מכאן</p>

Symbolical
and
allegorical

Chapter	Verse	Kara	Rashi
10	18		גלו אבנים גדולות - גלגלו אבנים אל פי המערה:
10	21	לא חרץ לבני ישראל לאיש את לשונן - ולא חרץ כלב אח לשונן כמו ולכל בני ישראל לא יחרץ כלב לשונן, ויש מקומות הרבה שקיצרו הכתובים את לשונם ולא ביחנו את דבריהם באר היסיב וסמכו על אנשי לבב הקוראים בהם שיבינו בדבר, כמו אל תשלחנה בחילו ביום אידו ... שפתרונו אל תשלחנה ידיך בחילו, וכן פירש יונתן בחרנומו, וכמו ויקחו האנשים מצידם שפתרונו ויקחו האנשים את דבריהם מלחם צידם שראו אותו יבש, ובמקצה שפירשתי ישמע חכם ויוסיף לקח.	לא חרץ לבני ישראל - חרי זה מקרא קצר לא חרץ החורץ לאיש מבני ישראל אח לשונן, חרץ לשון דבור הלשוון וכן לא יחרץ כלב לשונן, אז תחרץ דוד, חקרא חצקע קול חשוואת המלחמה.
13	22	הרגו אל חלליהם - כמו עם חלליהם	אשר נהלו אותם - אשר הנחילו אותם
14	1		
15	3		צוה - לצו, וכל חיבה שצריכה למד בתחלתה הסל לה ה"א בסופה
15	19	נתתני - חיבה זו מחלוקת לשנים ומשחמש במקום נתת לי ורבים כמוה במקרא כמו בשלם הבשר שפתרונו בשל להם הבשרובמקצה שפירשתי חבין את רובם	נתתני - נתת לי כמו דברו שלום דבר אליו, בני יצאוני יצאו ממני, ובשלם בשל להם
18	5	יעמד - לשון הווה הוא ואין משמעו כאן להבא	
18	12		מדברה בית און - למדבר של בית און
19	13		קדמה מזרחה נתת חפר - מזרחה לנת החפר
19	13		המתואר הנעה - המוסב אל נעה כלומר משם תאר הגבול לנעהוכן חרגם יונתן ונסיק לרסון וסמחן מסחחר לנעה
19	51		אשר נהלו - הנחילו
22	19		ואותנו אל תמרודו - כמו ובנו אל תמרודו

Chapter	Verse	Kara	Rashi
22	34	וּיִקְרָאוּ בְּנֵי רֵאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי גַד לְמוֹזֶבֶת - הָרִי זֶה מִן הַמִּקְרָאוֹת הַקְּצֵרִים וְצִרִין לְהוֹסִיף בּוֹ חֵיבָה אַחַת וּיִקְרָאוּ בְּנֵי רֵאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי גַד לְמוֹזֶבֶת עַד;	וּיִקְרָאוּ בְּנֵי רֵאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי גַד לְמוֹזֶבֶת כִּי עַד הוּא - הָרִי זֶה מִן הַמִּקְרָאוֹת הַקְּצֵרִים וְצִרִין לְהוֹסִיף בּוֹ חֵיבָה אַחַת וּיִקְרָאוּ בְּנֵי רֵאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי גַד לְמוֹזֶבֶת עַד
24	5	כֹּאשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי בְּקִרְבּוֹ - כֹּאשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי אֲחוּחֹתַי בְּקִרְבּוֹ	
24	19	כִּי אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים הוּא - כָּל אֱלֹהִים חֲמֻצָה בְּלִשׁוֹן רַבִּים כִּמוֹ אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים הַמְכִּיחַ אֶת מִצְרַיִם, וְכֵן רַבִּים	אֱלֹהִים קְדוֹשִׁים - בְּרֹב מִקְּדוּשָׁתוֹ וְקָרָא כָּל לִשׁוֹן רַבִּנוֹת לִשׁוֹן רַבִּים, כִּמוֹ אֲדוֹנֵי הָאֶרֶץ אֲדוֹנֵי יוֹסֵף אִם בְּעִלְיוֹ עָמָד אֲשֶׁר הִלְכוּ אֱלֹהִים לַפְּרוֹת לִפְי שֶׁהֵם הָיָה שֶׁם שָׂרָה הוּא;

D. Grammatical Erudition

As mentioned above, neither Kara nor Rashi were acquainted with the more important grammatical works of the Spanish School, as they were written in Arabic, a language which was not understood by the Jews of Northern France. But they did make extensive use of the Hebrew-written works of Menachem ben Saruq and Dunash ibn Labrat. They also knew the Massora and the works of Saadia. What is more important, however, is that they were masters of the Hebrew language and understood its spirit to perfection; they had the "Sprachgefuehl" of the Hebrew tongue. "Like the Spaniards, he (referring to Rashi, and this may also refer to Kara) had that very fine understanding for the genius of the language which arises from persevering study, from constant occupation with its literature" (79). This enabled them to fathom the correct interpretation of passages which would have otherwise remained obscure.

Littmann gives a complete list of Kara's grammatical knowledge and teachings (80). Chart "D" is a comparative study of Kara's and Rashi's grammatical comments as found in their respective commentaries on "Joshua". In analyzing them, we find the following:

1. In Chapter VIII, verse 20 --- both agree that instead of הסדבר we should have אל הסדבר; Rashi makes this explicit --- he quotes the section of the verse upon which he comments, adds his emendation, and then explains it. Kara, on the other hand, just puts the preposition אל into the verse without any further comment whatsoever. If one were to read Kara cursorily, he might be led to infer that the אל belonged there and was an integral part of the Bible text. Kara seems to have taken the idea that the אל was necessary from Rashi.

2. In Chapter IX, verse 4 --- Rashi enunciates an important grammatical rule, in dealing with the word וַיִּצְטִיר. He says that whenever a verb root begins with a צ, a ס takes the place of the ח, in the התפעל, and changes places with the צ of the root. Thus in the case of the verb צִרַּךְ, it should be וַיִּצְטִיר in the התפעל, but becomes instead וַיִּצְטִיר. Kara makes no mention of this rule.

3. A very involved discussion takes place in connection with the words וַיִּצְטִיר, וַיִּצְטִיר, and צִרַּךְ --- in Chapter IX, verses 4, 12, and 14.

a.) In verse 4, Rashi takes the word וַיִּצְטִיר to be derived from צִיר, "a messenger". Kara (following Rashi) at first also takes this word to be derived from צִיר, "a messenger". He cites verse 11, which tells that these men are delegated as messengers to the Israelites, as his authority for this. He then admits that there are other codices that give different readings. Instead of וַיִּצְטִיר, some read וַיִּצְטִיר --- "they took food or game for themselves" (Kittel says that there are ten (10) manuscripts reading וַיִּצְטִיר) being derived from צִיר. (This is an interesting point, because it shows that even so late as the time of

to connect מצרים with צרה, and thus create a little midrash of his own; instead, he says that "they (the Israelites) took some of their food (Gibeonites') מצרים", as evidence of their long trip, as common sense and the sequence of the narrative would lead us to infer. He cites the Targum as evidence that this translation is correct:

וּקְבִילוּ וּבְרִיא לַחֲמוּסֵיהֶן, "The people accepted their statements".

In the last analysis, Rashi and Kara accept the same interpretation:

קָבְלוּ דְבָרֵיהֶם, but Rashi loses himself in an unproductive and contradictory grammatical discussion, whereas Kara maintains his

Peshatic equilibrium. (I do not agree with Eppenstein that רַע"י פִּירַשׁ

בִּירָךְ אַחֵר (82), for Rashi's "קָבְלוּ דְבָרֵיהֶם" is the same as Kara's quotation from the Targum "וּקְבִילוּ וּבְרִיא לַחֲמוּסֵיהֶן".

4. In trying to interpret וָלוּ, Rashi says "וָלוּלוּ אֲבוֹנִים". The root of וָלוּ is וָלַל (Brown-Driver-Briggs); Rashi may not have known this, so that the only way in which he could interpret וָלוּ was by improvising a verb from the noun וָלוּל - "a wheel" --- namely: in a rolling motion. *no! (ל' is also found in same to roll" with ל' of פ' 5²)*

5. In Chapter X, verse 21, XXII 34 and XXIV 5, both agree that the verses are elliptical. Elliptical verses will be treated later under another heading --- Kara's "Exegetical Rules".

6. In two places --- XIV 1 and XIX 51 --- Rashi interprets the Piel as a Hiphil.

7. The ל of location is treated three times by Rashi --- in XV 3, XVIII 12 and XIX 13. In XV 3, Rashi enunciates the general principle in regard to this. *what is found in the Talmud Sh. 13b*

8. In VIII 20 and XIX 13b we have the word אל missing, according to the commentators. הַמְדַּבֵּר should be אל הַמְדַּבֵּר and חֲנוּעָה should אל נִעָה.

9. According to Kara, the word אל means sometimes "with" --- by --- as in Chapter XIII verse 22.

10. They agree that two words can be combined into one as in Chapter XV, verse 19. ^{Rashi} ~~_____~~ cites many examples to prove this point. Kara says that many examples could be cited, but mentions only one. It seems to me that this was taken bodily from Rashi, as Kara adds nothing to Rashi's comment.

24:19 11. The rule that אלהים takes a plural form, לשון רבים, according to Kara, does not hold, for it says in this verse, Chapter XXIV, verse 19, כי אלהים קדשים הוא, and, according to this rule, it ought to be הם. Kara says כל אלהים and then gives only one example to prove his rule. Rashi enunciates a better principle, and, because of his many examples to prove it, is also more convincing. Furthermore, in some manuscripts it says אלה אלהים הסכה את מצרים, which contradicts Kara altogether (83).

12. Kara, in Chapter XVIII, verse 51, posits a rule that the imperfect tense need not always express futurity, but may very often express "present time" (84).

To sum up --- we find that within so brief a book as Joshua and within the compass of but nineteen verses, twelve separate grammatical rules are noted by both Kara and Rashi. To evaluate either one of these men as a grammarian is beyond the ability of a novice like the present writer. Suffice it to say that each, in his way, shows a great deal of perspicuity and ²deep insight into the intricacies of the Hebrew language, and that each makes, in his own way, and despite the handicaps with which he was confronted, a worthy contribution to the basic tool by means of which the Bible can be comprehended. Judging from their grammatical work on the Book of Joshua only, we might venture the opinion, however, that Rashi seems to be the greater grammarian of the two, ²as he laid the basis and paved the way for Kara, and because, in many instances, it seems that Kara merely elaborated on Rashi's work. In several instances, Rashi is clearly superior.

E. Principle Characteristics of Interpretation

Both Kara and Rashi belong to the School of Peshatists, Rashi being its founder and Kara one of Rashi's disciples. As was mentioned previously, Rashi was the one who blazed the new trails but was afraid to stray too far from the beaten path. We therefore find in his commentaries a mixture of Peshat and Derash --- the Derash introduced only when the Peshat seems inadequate. "It is interesting to note how Rashi, in accordance with the tendencies of his age, seeks to emancipate himself from the older exegesis, still under the sway of the Talmud, and how he strives for the Peshat, i.e., for a sober, natural, and rational interpretation of the Bible. As he tells us at the beginning of the work, by way of preface (Rashi on Genesis III, 8), ^{for reference to the me of the work} his standpoint is entirely that of the Peshat, the Derash being resorted to only when it can be harmonized with the text. It is true that he often breaks this rule, falling unconsciously into the Derash, even where it cannot be reconciled with the plain text. On the other hand, he emphatically repudiates the Midrashic explanation in other innumerable cases It is, however, just this discrimination between the traditional Midrashic interpretations, on the basis of their exegetical value, that makes Rashi the pioneer of the Peshat. ⁵⁻¹²⁻¹¹

"..... On the whole, however, Rashi sought to arrive at the meaning of Scripture independently, always guided by the frequently emphasized Talmudic principle that no Bible-verse should be divested of its simple sense" (85). Kara, on the other hand, starts out with the purpose of being thoroughly Peshatic in his interpretations, and seeks to reject the Midrash entirely. As an excellent example of his Peshatism, we note his remarkable discussion regarding Joshua's powers over the laws of nature. Kara denies that Joshua had such powers. "..... er will Josua keinerlei Macht ueber Sonne und Mond einräumen und nur die Kraft des Gebetes hervortreten lassen. Aber, so weit es

in den Rahmen sich einfuegt, will er alles natuerlich erkl hoeren
 ..." (86). In this long discussion (on Joshua X, verses 10-15), Kara
 is very logical and scientific, whereas Rashi seems to evade all the
 vital problems that are involved in this passage. In interpreting the
 word עָרַב, Rashi starts out with a Midrash and ends with a Peshat,
 neither of which solves a pressing problem.

Notwithstanding Kara's noble intentions of adhering strictly to
 the Peshat, it does not take him long to succumb to the Derash. Not
 only does he often quote a Midrash (as in Joshua XIV, 15 he quotes
 Genesis Rabbah), but, despite his aversion to the Midrashic method,
 he also says אין משיבין על דברי אורח (87) thereby signifying that
 he is desisting from the battle which he himself started. Often, too,
 he creates a "midrash" of his own, as in Joshua XV verse 18. In this
 case, he is no different from Rashi, who creates a similar "midrash"
 in Chapter XV, verse 19, in which he puns on the word עָרַב, and says
 that it means בית מנוח כלל פני אדם, שאין בו אלא חורח.

To sum up --- while both Kara and Rashi are Peshatists, they
 both make extensive use of the Midrash. The only difference between
 them seems to be that Rashi is more consistent than Kara, in that
 Rashi admits that he is going to use it when necessary, and later even
 expresses the hope that he could revise his work and render it more
 peshatic, whereas Kara starts out to be a crusader against the Derash
 and then succumbs to its lure and weakens in the heat of battle.

P. Kara's "Exegetical Rules"

One of Kara's greatest contributions to Biblical exegesis is his "exegetical rules", or, as he calls them, "נחיצות הקרייה" (88). He fumes and rages and battles repeatedly against those exegetes who adhere to the Agadic-Midrashic method of interpretation, and who can not or will not see how the method they pursue is in contradiction to the נחיצות הקרייה, by means of which alone the true and correct meaning of a verse can be ascertained (89).

Littmann gives us a complete list of these נחיצות הקרייה, describes them, and cites examples of each (90). We shall discuss here only those "rules" which occur in the Commentary of the Book of Joshua.

1. Kara's rule דבר הסתום במקום אחד וסתורש במקום אחר finds an example in Chapter X, verse 10. According to this rule, whenever a term is left unexplained anywhere in the Bible, but happens to be explained in only one place, we are to use that explanation as the correct one for all the other instances. In Chapter X, verse 10, the word ויהוסם is mentioned, but we are not told what it means. We learn, however, from I Samuel VII 10, that it means "to be confused through the agency of a קול גדול". This explanation, then, is to be applied to ויהוסם wherever it may occur in the Bible.

Talmudic rule 2. His rule דבר הלאמר ססופו, or, as Kara often calls it דבר הלאמר מענייניו, finds examples in Joshua IX 4 and in X 12.

According to this rule, statements that at their beginning are either obscure or subject to the wrong interpretation are elucidated and given their correct meaning at the end of the passage. From Chapter X verse 12 we might be led to infer that it was Joshua who caused the sun and moon to stop in their courses, but in reading verse 14 we learn that it was God Who did it and not Joshua.

which he intends to comment, and then adds his remarks. When there is occasion to do so, he quotes the comments of other exegetes or of his numerous sources, then gives his own opinion as to which is correct, and usually prefaces his opinion with some such remark as ואני אומר, ואמר אני יוסף בר' שמעון, ולבי יוסף.

2. A pronounced characteristic of Kara is his verbosity, as contrasted with Rashi's brevity. Rashi is brief, concise, terse --- Kara is long-winded and expansive in his explanations. A good example of this contrast between the two commentators is Chapter IX, verse 4, in which Kara takes almost a whole page for his comment, whereas Rashi is satisfied with but a few lines. Kara takes a verse, divides it into small sections, inserts his own comments as well as numerous Biblical quotations, which he uses as authorities to substantiate his points or as convenient means of expression, between these sections, and welds them together into a clear, coherent, running thought, so that, if the reader were unacquainted with the Bible, and if there were no reference notes, he would be unable to distinguish between the component parts of a comment on a verse, and would be led to infer that the entire comment was in Kara's own words. This Kara does with great skill and artistry. Examples of this can be seen in IX 6 - 8; XIV 4 - 10.

3. Kara quotes copiously and at length; in fact, the quotations are so long that very often the greater part of a comment consists of nothing but quotations. He often tries to harmonize verses taken from different places in the Bible, as in XIV 4 - 10. He often, too often, minimizes the intelligence of his readers, and goes into unnecessarily detailed explanations. This might be one of the reasons why Eppenstein believes that Kara was a Bible Teacher (page 8) as he would then be justified in explaining matters in detail

to his pupils. He often conducts a running commentary which explains, not a verse or a section of a verse, but a group of consecutive verses, all at one time. An example of this is XVII 15 ff. This is in strange contrast to Rashi's brief and concise explanations of particular points. Kara propounds questions and then proceeds to answer them, in good pedagogical style, just as teachers do in order to stimulate the thinking of their students. He uses such expressions as לכך ואמר: ומהפסוק שאמר אחא לומר : ואם תאמר :

לכך ואמר: ומהפסוק שאמר אחא לומר : ואם תאמר . He thus anticipates and answers the questions that might arise in the minds of his pupils.

All in all, Kara's is a good commentary, simply worded, composed in a running narrative or discursive style, good for students or for plain, hard-working, moderately-educated Jews, who want to get the most Torah with a minimum amount of effort and thinking on their part.

4. Unfortunately, Kara makes many errors when quoting.

While we may make allowances for many of these errors and say that they are due to the carelessness of later copyists, we cannot help but say that many of them are Kara's own. Eppenstein notes many of these errors in editing the Book of Joshua. The following is a list of the more flagrant ones:

In Chap. VIII verse 33 -- Kara says: ר' יוס' אמר Eppenstein notes that בנמצא שם איתא; ר' יאשיה אמר .

X 12 Eppenstein says לא ידעתי אל איזה מאמר כוון המחבר .

XI 21 --- Eppenstein: לא ידעתי אל איזה מאמר כוון המחבר .

XV 8 --- Kara says: חלקו של בנימין , Eppenstein says: שבט יהודה .

XV 12 --- Kara says: אמר ר' יהודה אמר רב , Eppenstein says: ר' יוס' אמר ר' יהודה אמר רב .

בר' חזינה אמר .

XV 17 --- Kara quotes from כתובות ; Eppenstein says: פנהרין .

XVII 15 --- Kara misquotes from Ezekiel XXIII 47 אחא should be אחאן .

X 8 --- Misquotes from Deut. VII 23 לפניכם should be לפניך .

- XI 8 --- Kara misquotes Targum: חריצי מיא should be חריצי יאא.
 XV 7 --- Kara misquotes Targum עין קצריא should be עין קצרא.
 XV 17 --- וכלב בן חצרון should be וכלב בן יפוא.

5. Both Kara and Rashi have a fine, keen sense of definition as well as excellent discriminative insight into the diverse shadings in the meanings of words. Occasionally they agree in their definitions; usually they differ widely. The following --- Chart "E" --- is a comparative list of their definitions:

Chart "E"

Both Define Words.

<u>Chap.</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
8	20		ידים + כח
9	4	מצררים - מלאים קשרים מרב יושן	מצררים - מבוקעים
		<u>tied together; full of knots</u>	<u>cracked, split</u>
<u>Each defines the same word in a different manner</u>			
10	40	והאשדות - הם יושבי סלע שררים במקום שמים נובעים מן ההר	והאשדות - מקום שמי הנובעות שופכים
13	25		והחי ארץ בני עמון - חצי מה שכבוש מארץ בני עמון
		<u>Not half of the whole land, but only half of what</u>	
		<u>they had conquered. A very fine distinction.</u>	
<u>Shows perspicuity on the part of Rashi</u>			
13	27		הירדן וגבול - הערים על שפתו
13	28		ערים - מוקפות חומה חצריהם - ערי הפרוי בלא חומה
<u>A very fine distinction</u>			
14	8	מלאותי - אדם שעושה רצון רבו במקצה ובמשל במקצה אין זה מלא	

<u>Chap.</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
		רצון רבו, אבל כשאנו מפיל דבר מכל אשר מצאה עליו הרי זה נקרא ממלא רצון רבו	
17	2	<u>A very good definition</u>	
15	3	<u>Kara tries to differentiate between the terms used:</u> ועלה and ועבר	ועלה - כל מה שהוא עולה מן המזרח לצד ירושלים הוא עולה, ומירושלים והלאה הוא יורד, כאן למדנו שירושלים נבזה מכל ארץ ישראל
15	9	ותאר - כל מקום נבזה כחייב בו ועלה שנבול, וכל מקום נמוך כחייב בו יורד, אבל מקום שזה שאין בו לא עלייה ולא ירידה כחייב בו ותאר <u>A very good definition</u>	ותאר - לשון ונסב בעונל כמו ובמחוגה יתארהו, וי"ת אח כלם ויסחר
15	13		אל פי ה' ליהושע - כמה שאמר הקב"ה ליהושע
15	18	בבואה - בשלוח אותה אביה החוצה לבית בעלה <u>He then elucidates and enlarges on the thought. unnecessarily, it seems to me.</u>	
15	19	ברכה - ארץ מבורכת במים הנוב - ארץ צמאה למים וכן כל דבר ננוב פחרונו יבש גלות - עינות מים עליות - תחתיות : עינות מים יוצאים בבקעה ובהר	ברכה - פרוסה ארץ הנוב - חרבה גלות - מעינות
17	12		ויואל - ויאבה
17	14		וידבר בני יוסף - שבט מנשה
17	15	ובראת - פחרונו ותכרוח את העצים שביער	ובראת - לשון כריתה
17	16		אל תחמה אם קראו לפרינו ורפאים כנעני כי כלם בני כנען היו
18	1		מתרפים - מתרשלין

Chap.	Verse	Kara	Rashi
18	6		ויריתי - וחשכתי כמו ירה בים
19	9		רב מהם - מן הראוי להם
19	12		מסלות תבור - לשון כסלים, לא בנובהו ולא בשיפולו אלא בשיפולו
19	13		עתה קצין - שם העיר עתה קצין
19	29	צר - כמו צור	צר - לשון צור
22	23		הוא יבקש - יפרע ממנו
22	24		כל דאגה שבמקרא לשון יראה הוא
23	13	צנינים - קוצים, ואין לך דומה אלא לפי העניין ולשונם - ישונם לבוז ולשולל מביבותיכם ולצנינם - לשון סתונה	ולשונם בצידיכם - ישונם לבוז ולשולל מביבותיכם ולצנינם - לשון סתונה
24	2	ישבו אבותיכם מעולם - כלומר, כבר עברו ימים רבים	

6. While it is not unusual for both Kara and Rashi to attend to individual words and to define them with precision and conciseness, it occurs more frequently that, while Rashi renders the definition of the single word, Kara translates, defines or paraphrases the entire thought, verse, or string of verses. Many instances of this occur in his commentary on "Joshua"; we shall list some of the more important ones.

VIII 21 Kara paraphrases the words of the text.

VIII 22 Rashi merely tells us who the ואלה refers to: המורב
שנצית את העיר; Kara agrees with Rashi, but he is
verbose and renders a paraphrase of the text.

VIII 33 Rashi explains the word בראשונה as meaning להקדים,
Kara explains the whole verse.

- IX 5 Rashi gives a brief definition of בִּרְתִּי; Kara goes into a long and detailed explanation on how to make biscuits.
- IX 27 Kara tries to harmonize verses 23 and 27. His explanation becomes confused and repetitive, as if he were trying desperately to convince the reader of something of which he himself may have been in doubt or which he thought the reader would not easily believe.
- X 14-16 Here Kara seems to feel that there is no transitional phrase between the verses that would show their necessary sequence. He therefore proceeds to supply a phrase in each place, thus making his statement verbose and clumsy.
- XIII 6 Rashi gives a brief, sensible explanation; he does not make a hill out of a mere heap of earth. Kara is unnecessarily verbose; makes remarks about the conquest of the land, for which he gives no authorities; gives a fantastic explanation as to how the אֲרָיִם וְחַמִּים and the לָרִי functioned.
- XIII 7 - 8, XV 19, XVII 15 - 16 are excellent examples of Kara's long-winded explanations of thoughts as against Rashi's brief and succinct definitions of words.

7. Kara takes great pains to render detailed, penetrating explanations. I cannot agree with the writer who says that Kara "shows more common sense than depth" (92), for at times he shows great insight into the meaning of a passage. It is true that his verbosity often confuses the reader and makes him feel that Kara is superficial, but this is due to his verbosity and not to his lack of depth and power of penetration. Eppenstein has a more correct estimate of Kara when he says: "Im Commentar zu Josua finder wir, dass er ganz bedeutend ausfuehrlicher ist, als der von Raschi, und besonders die Teilung des Landes viel eingehender behandelt" (93); again: "Auf den vorliegenden Josuacommentar nummehr eingehend, finden wir bei Kara ein bemerkenswert tieferes Eingehen auf die scheinbar wenig interessanten Berichte von der Einteilung des Landes und der Grenzen der einzelnen Stammesgebiete, --- ein Thema, das bei Raschi keineswegs in diesem Masse behandelt ist. Karas Werke wollten eben gewissermassen Lehrbuecher sein, aus denen man umfassendere Aufschluesse entnehmen konnte, waehrend Raschis Erklaerungen vielleicht der raschen Orientierung moeglichst breiter Massen dienen sollten" (94). Perhaps it is because Kara was a Bible Teacher (if Eppenstein's theory is correct) and his commentary was designed to be "Lehrbuecher", that he enters into many detailed explanations. This is particularly true as regards those sections of the Book of Joshua which deal with the Division of the Land: Kara takes pains to trace the boundaries of each tribe, to locate correctly each place mentioned in the Text, to prove that a border town belonged to one tribe and not to its neighboring tribe. Rashí, on the other hand, contents himself with defining terms and elucidating particular points; rarely does he enter into a discussion such as Kara enters into, and, when he does, it is not with that zest and spirit that Kara manifests, a spirit that is often almost combative in its tone.

Not only in the matter of the Division of the Land, but in dealing with other matters, too, Kara strives to dig into the heart of a question. Many examples present themselves, of which we shall mention but a few here:

X 12 - 13 The question as to whether God or Joshua ordered the sun and moon to stop in their courses is dealt with in a very penetrating, logical and scientific manner. Kara discusses very clearly and convincingly a problem which, because of its supernatural, miraculous tang, has been a forceful weapon in the hands of anti-religionists. Kara brings proof direct from the words of Scripture that Joshua did not stop the sun and moon in their movements. However, he is naive enough to believe that they did stop, that God could and would stop them at Joshua's request. He tries to harmonize the seeming discrepancy between Joshua X 14 and Isaiah XXXVIII 8.

X 21 Kara finds a discrepancy in the story told in X 15 - 21. The question is: When did the five kings flee, before or after the Israelites had returned to Gilgal from the battle? According to him, they fled during the battle, when they realized that the Israelites were winning, and were immediately discovered and shut up in the cave where they had sought refuge for safe-keeping until after the battle; that is, they fled before the Israelites had returned to Gilgal. For had they fled after the battle, what need was there to shut them up in the cave? they could have been executed immediately! Kara however, does not explain the need for verse 15, for, according to this answer, verse 15 is superfluous. Neither does he explain Gilgal in verse 15 and Makeda in verse 21. Redak seems to treat the matter in better fashion. This does not detract Kara's effort, however, for it may be due to Kara that Redak gave thought to the problem; at any rate, Kara looked into this problem whereas Rashi passed it by entirely.

Other verses where Kara is more penetrating in his explanations than Rashi and more meticulous as to details are XIV 4; XV 2-3; XVII 5, 15-16, 17-18; XXII 22; XXIV 19.

8. There are times, however, when Kara is superficial and when he gives a great deal of attention to points that are obvious. As examples of this characteristic we can cite IX 1. 3 in which he merely repeats the text in paraphrase; IX 16, 23, 27; X 8, 10 on which Rashi sees no need for comment, as they are obvious; XIV 11, the thought being understood from the following verse; XI 15, 20; XVIII 7, the comment on which is merely repetition of what he already told us in other chapters; XX 4, 39, 42; XXII 1, 4, 7; XXII 10, the comment on which is nothing more than the contents of XXII 28 ff.; XXII 23. X 18 --- Kara's comment does not help, and is unnecessary. The verse is perfectly clear. וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב מִבְּנֵי חַוִּיל is a tautology and adds nothing.

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב מִבְּנֵי חַוִּיל is just as good and understandable. X 20 --- Kara repeats the entire verse verbatim. The final comment וְלֹא יָכֹל is not convincing; it may have been that they did not want to. Kara is very pedantic here. X 24 --- on the text וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב מִבְּנֵי חַוִּיל

Kara makes the asininē remark לְקִיָּים כֹּחַ שְׁוֹאֵר וְאֵתָּה עַל בְּמִוְחָסוֹ חֲרִיר (Deut. XXXIII 29) as if the word בֶּמֶךְ means "neck" or "throat". It appears from his comment on this verse that, in order to be able to say something, he must pervert the meaning of a word.

X 42 --- וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב מִבְּנֵי חַוִּיל in this verse Kara interprets as meaning בְּרִשָּׁתָּהּ Not only does he not add to the clearness of this verse, but he confuses, as one may not know what פֶּרֶק means in this connection.

XV 18 --- Much of his comment here is unnecessary; it is obvious that the object of וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב מִבְּנֵי חַוִּיל is עַתִּיכָּה and that עַתִּיכָּה is the subject, without Kara's telling us so.

9. Kara is bombastic in his expressions and argues in dogmatic fashion, except when he is unable to explain a verse and leaves it up to God for a decision. Even then he seems to say: "If I cannot explain this verse, no other human being can do it, we must therefore leave it up to God". Rashi, on the other hand, is quiet and modest in his expressions, humble and self-effacing in his demeanor. Numerous examples present themselves:

IX 4 אבל יש עליו תשובה שיחתה את בעצמך את דברך, לכן פול לך
וכן תפרש גם בדבר הזה אין לברר הוכחות וזוהי אלהינו, very dogmatic.

IX 27 הרע שכן הוא, very dogmatic

X 12 ולא יעלה בדעתך שתאמר שאם כדברך אלא על כורחך

X 21a אל יעלה על דעתך אם אחת אומר כן נוקטת באשרי פירך ... אלא על כורחך

X 21b Both Rashi and Kara explain the term לא חרץ לבני ישראל in the same manner; Rashi does it quietly and humbly, whereas Kara holds forth in a long harangue and ends with ובמקצת שפירשתי ישמע
חכם ויוסף לקח.

XV 3,5,6, Kara says dogmatically כך פתרנו or פתרנו, as if *Rashi also uses this expression elsewhere*
 his say-so was the last word in the matter. He uses the term מכלל in a similar manner, it seems to me. He shows no humility.

XV 19 ובמקצת שפירשתי תבין את ריבם Why does he say this, particularly the word שפירשתי, when Rashi explained this verse in this manner long before Kara, and cites three examples to his one?

XVII 5 ואשר דברו אחת ישים מחשך לאור ומעקשים למישור

XVIII 15 ויצא הגבול ימה - אל ים אחר, ולא ידעתי איזה ים הוא

Kara is not as modest as Rashi is in the above statement; he tries to find a sea, and even says ודע שכן הוא.

XVIII 19 הרי פירשתי לך -- very bombastic

XX 18 והרע שכן הוא.

10. There are many instances in Kara's commentary on the Book of Joshua where he not only uses Rashi's interpretation or agrees with him in preference to some other opinion, but where he also uses Rashi's actual words and quotes his sources. There are instances where Kara uses Rashi's exact words without adding one word of his own or making the least change, and without giving credit to Rashi.

- X 12 Both agree that the word דום means חמתן, "wait"; they both give the same references to substantiate their definition.
- X 21b Both agree in the interpretation of לא חרץ לבני ישראל; one reference is the same.
- X 40 They agree on the meaning of והחשדות, but say it in different words.
- XI 8 Kara gives Rashi's interpretation of משרפות חים, cites another, and then says that Rashi's is better: ומחרון ראשון עיקר.
- XIII 3 They agree that there is a discrepancy between the number of kings the text intends to enumerate (5) and the number mentioned (6). Both quote the same source (Chulin 60b).
- XIII 7-8 Both agree, except that Rashi is brief and Kara is verbose.
- XIV 10 Both have the same thought as found in Erechin 13a. Kara refers to it explicitly --- Rashi uses it without giving the reference.
- XIV 15 Both agree in all but one of the interpretations.
- XV 1 Both agree -- Kara is verbose
- XV 5 Both have similar, almost verbatim, expression for the same idea.
- XV 17 They agree: ומצא עתניאל אחי כלב מן האם (Kara), אחי כלב - מאמו (Rashi)
- XV 19 They agree on the meaning of והחזי.

In the following verses, Kara uses verbatim or almost verbatim citations from Rashi: XVIII 19, 20, 13, 29, 41, 47; XX 8,9; XXI 5; 9, 11, 18; XXII 22, 34; XXIII 13; XXIV 11, 25, 26, 27; 32, 33

Chart "F"

Historical Perspective

<u>Chap.</u>	<u>Verse</u>	<u>Kara</u>	<u>Rashi</u>
11	18	ימים רבים עשה יהושע את כל המלכים האלה מלחמה: כלומר אעפ"י שכתובות אילו המלחמות זו כעד זו לא היו כפרק אחד.	ימים רבים עשה יהושע: כננוחו ספר הכתוב שהיה פתוח לידו את כבוש הארץ כדי להאריך ימים לפי שנאמר ואחרי חתילנה אותם כסדרש נחומא.
12	8	בהר וכשפלה ובערבה ובאשדות ובמדבר ובנוב, כך הוא ספרך את שתי מקראות הללו, כעיניין הזה נחנה יהושע ירושה במחלקותם שלא היה אחד מישראל שלא היה לו בהר וכשפלו של הר למטעה כרמים בהר וכשפלו וכן בערבה לזרע השדה, וכן באשדות מספך סים היוצאים כנקעה ובהר להשקות את השדות וכן במדבר למרעה בהמה נסה וכן בארץ הנגב למרעה בהמה דקה. החת' והאמור', כך חילק להם כל ארץ שנת עסמים הללו.	
14	10	(עריבין י"נ ע"א)	(עריבין י"נ ע"א)
15	2-3	<u>Each tries to make a map, as it were, of the boundaries of Palestine. They go into geographical details as to rivers, lakes, cities and tribal territories.</u>	
15	14		וידע משם כלב: לאחר מיתה יהושע כי עדיין בימי יהושע לא נלכדה חברון כמה שנאמר בספר שופטים ולא נכתבה כאן אלא ספרי החלוקה. <u>This took place after the death of Joshua, not while he was living.</u>
15	63	ואת היבוסים יושבי ירושלים לא יכלו בני יהודה להורישם: שנינו בספרי רבי יהושע בן קרחה אומר יכולין היו אלא שלא	

Chap.	Verse	Kara	Rashi
		<p>עד שבא דוד והורישו דכה ויאמר דוד כיום חתוא כל סכה יכוסו ונו" (שמואל ב"ה" ח"</p>	<p>היו רשאים סתם השבועה שנשבע אברהם לאביסלך. ויכוסו זה לא על שם האזסה היה אלא סודל דוד שהיה בירושלים ושמו יכוס ובני אוחז סחז מפלשתים היו וכשכבשו בני יהודה את ירושלים לא הורישו את בני אוחז סחז.</p>

11. Both Kara and Rashi try to exercise historical perspective, with more or less success. Sometimes Kara seems to have better historical insight than Rashi, at other times it is Rashi who surpasses Kara.

- XI 18 --- Here Rashi becomes Midrashic, borrowing from the Midrash Tanchuma, and his comment appears childish. Kara, on the other hand, is clear, rational, and historical: "This verse comes to tell us that, although all the battles in which Joshua engaged are described in close sequence, actually they were not fought one immediately after the other, but over a period of many years".
- XII 8 --- Rashi makes no comment on this verse, and thus seems to be wiser than Kara. This must be merely conjecture on the part of Kara; I cannot see how the land could have been divided in accordance with Kara's outline. If the portion that was given to each Israelite extended from the mountainous region in the north of Palestine to the "Negeb" or southernmost region --- then I cannot see, first, how any person could tend to so long and narrow a strip of land, and, second, how there was sufficient land for all the nine and one-half tribes.

- XIV 10 --- Kara and Rashi agree here, but neither contributes anything of his own. They both draw from the same Talmudic source.
- XV 2f --- Each tries to reconstruct Palestine as it looked after it had been divided. As mentioned above, Kara is more detailed and penetrating than Rashi. It is beyond the province of this paper to determine which is nearer the truth, although it would make an interesting study.
- XV 14 --- In this verse, Rashi is after historical accuracy, which he fails, however, to attain. He says that Caleb's conquest of Hebron, which is mentioned here, did not take place until later, after the death of Joshua, as told in Judges I 10, but that it is mentioned here in order that it may be possible to give a complete survey of the division of the land. It does not seem, however, that the event of Caleb's conquest of Hebron, as recorded in Judges I 10, took place after the death of Joshua, for Judges II 6 still speaks of Joshua as living and active, and his death is then recorded in Judges II 8.
- XV 63 --- This verse presents a number of difficulties. Rashi contradicts the statement made by this verse that "the Children of Judah were unable to conquer the Jebusites". He prefers to agree with the statement in the Sifre that they were able to do it had they been permitted, but that they were restrained by Abraham's oath to Abimelech, as told in Genesis XXI 22 - 34. From this it would appear that the Jebusites were never conquered by the tribe of Judah, because of the everlasting character of Abraham's oath, but that the two peoples dwelt together. Kara says, however, that Judah was unable to conquer the Jebusites until the time of David, from which we may infer that Judah was physically unable to do so, but needed the strength of the United Kingdom to help them. Kara cites

II Samuel V 8 as evidence of this. But while II Samuel V 8 tells us that David wanted to strike at the Jebusites, it does not tell us that he accomplished his purpose. First, then, how can Kara accept a mere attempt as an accomplishment? Second, if we accept the statements of the Sifre and Rashi as correct, how did David dare to attempt an attack against the Jebusites, since it was a violation of the oath given to Abimelech by Abraham? And, finally, in view of the fact that both Kara and Rashi try desperately, each in his own way, to explain away or to rationalize the statement: "And the children of Judah were unable to conquer the Jebusite", why do they not make a similar attempt to explain away or to rationalize the similarly derogatory statement: "And the children of Manasseh were unable to conquer those cities, and the Canaanite was satisfied to dwell in this territory", (Joshua XVII, 12 - 13)?

To sum up --- both Kara and Rashi feel that there are certain historical inconsistencies in the Book of Joshua. Whether their explanations are good or bad makes no difference. They did not have the science of Biblical Criticism and its revelations or the historical approach to guide them. They did the best they could for their time and training. Suffice it to say that they sensed some of these historical difficulties and attempted to explain them, thus paving the way for further study of the subject.

General Summary

In their commentaries on the Book of Joshua, Kara and Rashi attend to almost the same number of verses. This does not allow us, however, to draw any conclusions as to the relative lengths of the two commentators: first, because this may not be true in their works on other Biblical books, and second, because Rashi's comments are brief, whereas Kara's are long.

Both Kara and Rashi make frequent use of the various branches of Rabbinic literature, with which they were thoroughly familiar. In their commentaries on the Book of Joshua, they quote mostly from the Targum and the Babylonian Talmud.

Both Kara and Rashi use "laazim" in their commentaries to facilitate translation or explanation and to avoid circumlocution. Rashi uses only French laazim; in Kara, both French and German laazim occur, the latter may have been inserted by later German exegetes.

Both Kara and Rashi show deep insight into the intricacies of the Hebrew language and exercise remarkable perspicuity in deriving correct grammatical principles. Judging from their works on the Book of Joshua only, Rashi seems to be the greater grammarian of the two and in a number of instances is clearly superior to Kara.

While both Kara and Rashi are Peshatists, they make extensive use of the Midrash. Rashi is more consistent than Kara, however, in that he admits that he is going to use it when necessary, whereas Kara starts out to be a crusader against the Derash and then succumbs to its lure and desists from the battle.

Kara's language is similar to Rashi's --- medieval Hebrew mixed with Biblical and Rabbinical phrases. He quotes copiously and uses many laazim. The "lay-out" of his commentary is similar to that of Rashi. Kara is long-winded and verbose; Rashi is brief, concise, terse.

Kara's commentary is simply worded and composed in a running narrative or discursive style, which makes it easy and attractive for students and moderately-educated persons to read. There are many errors in the Kara text, due either to Kara's carelessness in quoting or to the carelessness of later copyists. Both Kara and Rashi manifest a fine, keen sense of definition as well as excellent discriminative insight into the diverse shadings in the meanings of words. At times both Kara and Rashi attend to individual words and define them with precision; more frequently, however, Rashi renders the definition of the single word whereas Kara translates, defines or paraphrases the entire thought, verse, or string of verses. Kara takes great pains to render detailed, penetrating explanations and to dig, as it were, into the heart of a question. He often anticipates questions and seeks to answer them as well as he can. However, there are times when he becomes superficial and when he seems to give a great deal of attention to points that are obvious. He is often bombastic in his expressions and argues in dogmatic fashion, except when he is unable to explain a verse and leaves it up to God for a decision. There are instances where Kara uses Rashi's exact words and sources, with ^{OUT} adding one word of his own or making the least change, without giving credit to Rashi or to his sources. Both Kara and Rashi recognized the existence of certain historical inconsistencies in the Book of Joshua and sought to explain them thus paving the way for later scholars.

IV

In the footnotes to his critical edition of Kara's commentary on the Book of Joshua, Eppenstein gives us thirteen important references to Rashi's commentary (VIII 13, 30; X 12; XI 8, 25; XIX 13; XX 9; XXI 18; XXII 34; XXIII 13; XXIV 25, 26, 32), seven to Redak (VIII 13, 29; IX 1, 27; XIV 4; XXII 20; XXIV 11) and one to Rabbag (XXII 19). We have already mentioned the fact (page 12) that Rashi was being influenced by Kara even while he was exerting his own influence over him (95). Redak, Rabbag, Rashbam and perhaps many other exegetes owe much to Kara, although, for the most part, they make no direct mention of it and do not cite him explicitly. (Rashbam is an exception, for he refers to Kara repeatedly in terms of friendship and endearment). "Unser Autor wird in der spaeteren Literatur verhaeltnismaessig sehr wenig zitiert. Doch ist sein Einfluss gleichwohl wahrzunehmen. Denn, wie die Noten zu unserer Edition des Commentars zum Richterbuch (and to the Book of Joshua) erweisen, hat besonders David Kimchi seine Commentare benutzt, Auch Levi ben Gerson aus Bagnols (Rabbag) verraet in seinen Commentarien eine Bekanntschaft mit Karas Schriften" (96). This is perhaps due to the fact that in those days the works of prominent authors became the common property of the group to which they belonged and could be utilized by everybody, and perhaps also because scholars knew their sources so well that the mere mention of a thought or quotation would suffice to locate its source and author without recourse to reference notes.

Great as was Kara's influence over later exegetes in the interpretation of various words, verses or passages, his influence in guiding them in their general approach and methodology was even greater. His example encouraged them to make bolder strides in the direction of the Peshat, to seek the natural, unadulterated meaning of Scripture. Until comparatively recent times Kara was thought to be of little

consequence in the field of exegesis, and that most of his works were "ganz von Raschi abhaengig" (97). Modern scholars are agreed, however, that Kara manifests a great deal of independence of Rashi, and is entitled to glory on his own account. "Immer aber sind seine Arbeiten selbststaendig genug, um neben denen Raschis gelesen und geschaetzt zu werden" (98). Eppenstein considers Kara's work to be even greater than Rashi's: "Joseph Karas Leistungen sind, meines Erachtens, inbezug auf die sinnghemaesse Erklarung hoeher einzuschaetzen als die Raschis" (99).

Kara further influenced other exegetes through his so-called "Exegetical Rules", by means of which he put the methodology of interpretation into systematized principles. "Kara hat das grosse Verdienst die exegetischen Regeln systematisch in Anwendung zu bringen, wodurch er auch auf Samuel b. Meir vorbildlich gewirkt haben duerfte" (100).

The commentaries of Kara and Raschi, when used together, make a very good combination, for they seem to complement and supplement each other (101). Kara's verbosity and Rashi's brevity, Kara's treatment of passages in a comprehensive manner and Rashi's minute interpretations of individual verses and words, and other divergent characteristics, when applied together, seem to enhance each other and to render the Scriptural text more understandable. It would make a very interesting study to determine to what extent, if at all, later exegetes combined both of these methods, Kara's and Rashi's, in the writing of their own commentaries.

V

Owing to the fact that until comparatively recent times Kara was not so well known, his place in Medieval Jewish Biblical Exegesis, or even in later exegesis, Jewish and Christian, can hardly be compared with that of Rashi. As noted above, Kara influenced many exegetes, but these were his contemporaries or immediate followers. But his sphere of influence was limited, and with the passing of time his manuscripts were lost and his work forgotten. One cannot say of Kara that which Schloessinger says of Rashi: "Rashi became and remained throughout all the Middle Ages the 'Expounder of the Law', the 'Parshandatha'..... He introduced the lad to the Bible and afforded also the ripper man, even to the scholar, the opportunity for thought and research..... Rashi was a book for young and old. In the fourteenth century, a man was considered to possess but the most elementary education, if his knowledge was confined to Rashi's Bible commentary; while, on the other hand, the most respected and celebrated rabbi would regard it as a compliment, if it was said of him that he was familiar with this commentary" (102).

Kara did not exert any influence upon Christian exegesis, as Rashi did. Christian exegetes, or at least, most of them, used Rashi rather extensively, both in the original and in translation. Nicholas de Lyra plagiarized Rashi to so great an extent that he was termed "the Ape of Rashi" (103). Christians quoted from Rashi's commentaries without giving him credit (104). This cannot be said about Kara's works.

Neither did Kara found a great school, nor did his commentaries inspire an immense literary activity and research in philosophy and religion, as did Rashi's commentaries (105). Even to this day, Rashi is studied in every Cheder, Talmud Torah and Yeshiva, whereas Kara is known only to the few who have made the field of exegesis their special study. Let us hope that further research will shed more light on the man and his accomplishments.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. Graetz: "History of the Jews", vols. III, IV
2. Jewish Encyclopoedia: vol. III art. "Bible Exegesis"
vol. VII art. "Kara"
vol. X art. "Rashi"
and other related articles
3. Poznanski: "Introduction" to his edition of the "Commentary of Eliezer of Beaugency on Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets", Warsaw, 1909 - 1914.
4. Geiger: "Parshandatha", 1855, Hebrew and German sections
5. Geiger: "Nite Na-amonim", Hebrew and German sections.
6. "Monatschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums", 1881.
7. Berliner: "Pletath Soferim", Hebrew section, pp. 12 - 25,
German section, pp. 19 - 25.
8. Berliner: "Zur Charakteristik Raschis", in "Gedänkbuch fuer David Kaufmann".
9. Eliezer Meir Lipschuetz: "R. Sh'lomo Izchaki", Warsaw, 1912.
10. Max Schloessinger: "Rashi --- His Life and His Work", in C. C. A. R. Yearbook, 1905
11. Maurice Liber: "Rashi" --- translated from the French by Adele Szold, 1906
12. Zunz: "Salomon ben Isaac, genannt Raschi", in "Die Zeitschrift fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthums", erster Band, zweites Heft, pp. 277 ff., Berlin, 1822.
13. Samson Bloch: "Toldoth Rashi", Lemberg, 1840, being a translation from the German by Zunz.

- 14 Martin Littmann: "Josef ben Simeon Kara als Schrifterklaerer",
1886 - 1887.
- 15 S. Eppenstein: "Studien ueber Joseph ben Simeon Kara
als Exeget nebst einer Veroeffentlichung
seines Commentars zum Buche der Richter",
in "Das Jahrbuch der Juedisch-Literarischen
Gesellschaft", vol. IV, 1906, pp. 238 ff.
- 16: S.Eppenstein: "Joseph Karas Commentar zum Buche Josua
und Nachtraege zum Commentar ueber
das Buch der Richter", in "Das Jahrbuch
der Juedisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft",
vol. V, 1907, pp. 335- 340.

NOTES

1. J.E., III, p. 165
2. J.E., III, p. 166
3. *ibid*
4. *ibid*, Bacher quotes *ibn Janah*; Littmann, p. 3; Liber, p. 109
5. Eppenstein (J.J.L.G. 1906), p. 238; Liber, pp. 25, 127; J.E., III, p. 168
6. Liber, p. 25
7. Liber, p. 109
8. J.E., III, p. 168
9. *op. cit.*; Poznanski calls him the greatest, but not the founder, p. xiii.
10. Liber, pp. 111-112, 114, 119-120, 124; Lipschuetz, p. 185; Poznanski, pp. xiv - xvi.
11. Liber, p. 121-122, 125-126, 196-197
12. Liber, p. 197
13. *ibid*
14. Littmann, pp. 26-32
15. Eppenstein (J.J.L. G., 1907), German section, pp. 335-337, Hebrew section, pp. 39-60;
16. Eppenstein (J.J.L.G., 1906), German section, pp. 238 ff., Hebrew section. pp. 1-28. (J.J.L.G., 1907) German section, pp. 337-340.
17. Geiger, *Parshandatha* -- p. 23; Berliner, *Plethath Soferim*, German section, p. 22
18. *op. cit.*
19. "Orient", 1847, p. 344, referred to by Littmann, p. 4 and notes 14, :
20. Geiger, "Parshandatha", German section, p. 20
21. J.E., VII, p. 437, art. "Kara"
22. *Commentarien zu Esther, Ruth, etc.*, p. vi, Leipzig, 1855, quotation from Schloessinger in J.E., VII, p. 437, art. "Kara".
23. Littmann, p. #, and notes 11 and 12
24. *ibid*
25. *ibid*
26. J.E., III, p. 168, art. "Bible Exegesis".

- 27 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 243, German section and note 4, also 1907, pp. 335, 336.
- 28 Poznanski, p. xxiv and note 2
- 29 Littmann, p. 3; see also Poznanski, p. xxiv
- 30 Liber, p. 31
- 31 Zunz (in Z. fur W. des J. -- 1822) p. 279; Lipschuetz, p. 16; Liber, p. 37
- 32 Liber, p. 72; Lipschuetz, p. 195
- 33 Littmann, p. 4
- 34 Eppenstein, J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 242; Poznanski, p. xxiv; also J.E. VII, p. 436
- 35 Poznanski, p. xxiv
- 36 J.E., VII, p. 436
- 37 Liber, p. 37; Lipschuetz, p. 16; Zunz in op.cit., p. 281; Bloch, "Toldoth Rashi", p. 1
- 38 In his commentary to I Kings VIII 2 and other places; see Littmann, p. 3 and note 4; Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 265, note 2, p. 267, note 2; Parshandatha, Hebrew section, p. 21; Poznanski, p. xxiii
- 39 Graetz, III, pp. 345ff. *English transl. J. P. S. A.; see Zunz 2.G.v. L. p. 6*
- 40 Littmann, p. 3
- 41 Liber, p. 124 and p. 251 note 89; Eppenstein in J.J.L.G., 1906, p. 242, 243 and note 1; Poznanski, p. xxiv
- 42 Liber, pp. 46, 53; Lipschuetz, p. 19
- 43 For details see Zunz in op. cit., pp. 282-283; Liber, pp. 61-62, 186-199; appendix I, p. 227; Lipschuetz, pp. 21-22; Graetz on the history of that period. *indefinite ref. and place*
- 44 Poznanski, p. xxiv; Berliner's "Pletath Soferim", German section, p. 27; Hebrew section, p. 28; Monatschrift - 1881, p. 22
- 45 Liber, p. 56
- 46 Liber, p. 197; Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 242 and note 5 (only a possibility); J.E., VII, pp. 436-437
- 47 Liber, p. 61; Lipschuetz, p. 43
- 48 Berliner, "Pletath Soferim", p. 21, Hebrew section; Littmann, p. 3 and note 9
- 49 Schloessinger, p. 228 in C.C.A. R. 1905
- 50 J.E., VII, pp. 436-437; Littmann p. 4 and note 1; Zunz in Z.W.J., 1822, p. 318

- 51 Littmann, p. 9
- 52 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, German section, p. 245; J.E. X, p. 326
- 53 *ibid.*, p. 253, see also p. 261
- 54 J.E. VII, p. 437
- 55 Poznanski, p. xii
- 56 On Menachem bar Chelbo see J.E. VII pp. 436-437; Littmann pp. 4,11; Poznanski pp. xi-xiii, xxiii-xxiv; Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, pp. 240, 243, 245, 256, 257; Liber, p. 197; Geiger "Nite Naamanim" pp. 17 - 18.
- 57 On Samuel ben Meir see J.E. VII, pp. 436-437; J.E. III, p. 168; Littmann pp. 4, 12; Poznanski xxxix - L; Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, pp. 242, 261; Liber p. 197.
- 58 Littmann pp. 4, 12
- 59 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, pp. 261-262
- 60 J.E. III, p. 168
- 61 J.E. VII, p. 437; Littmann p. 4 and notes 8,9,10; Liber, p. 187
- 62 Poznanski, p. x
- 63 Littmann, pp. 12-13
- 64 Littmann, pp. 5-9 and notes; Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, pp. 244-245 and notes; Poznanski, pp. xxv-xxxi;
- 65 Littmann, p. 5
- 66 Poznanski, p. xxxi
- 67 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1907, p. 335
- 68 *ibid.*, Hebrew section, p. 50 and note 1, German section, p. 337
- 69 *ibid.*, Hebrew section, p. 43 and note 1
- 70 *ibid.*, Hebrew section, p. 43 and note 3
- 71 *ibid.*, p. 48 and note 2
- 72 *ibid.*, p. 49 and note 3
- 73 *ibid.*, p. 49 and note 4
- 74 *ibid.*, p. 57 and note 6
- 75 Liber, pp. 98-99
- 76 Liber, p. 101

- 77 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1907, Hebrew section, p. 53 notes 4,5,6.
78 ibid, note 5.
79 Liber, p. 128
80 Littmann, pp. 20 - 26
81 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 266 and note 4
82 " " " 1907, Hebrew section p. 41 and note 6
83 " " " " " " p. 59 note 4.
84 See also Littmann, p. 23, rule 13
85 Schloessinger, pp. 237-238, see also J.E. III 168, Littmann p. 14
86 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1907, p. 336; Littmann p. 18
87 Littmann p. 14 and notes, especially note 10, p. 15
88 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 243
89 " " " " , pp. 245 and note 5; 246. and notes 1, 2;
Littmann, pp. 13 - 14; Geiger "Parshandatha", pp. 26ff.
90 Littmann, pp. 13 - 19
91 Littmann, p. 20
92 J.E. VII, p. 437
93 Eppenstein, in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 252
94 " " " 1907, p. 336
95 " " " 1906, p. 261
96 " " " " p. 267
97 Littmann, p. 10; also Poznanski, p. xxxiii
98 Littmann, p. 10
99 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, p. 261; 1907 -- p. 366; also
Poznanski, p. xxxiii
100 Eppenstein in J.J.L.G. 1906, pp. 261-262
101 " " " 1907, pp. 335-336; Littmann, p. 10
102 Schloessinger, p. 239 [quoted from Guedemann)
103 ibid; Liber, pp. 200-201, 217
104 Schloessinger, (quoted from Zunz)
105 Schloessinger, p. 239.