



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.

ReDaK

AS EXEGETE AND GRAMMARIAN WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

HIS COMMENTARY ON HOSEA

by

ARTHUR B. LEBOWITZ

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of Rabbi

Hebrew Union College,
Cincinnati, Ohio
1932

mic. 11/78

To

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner

in gratitude

March 10, 1932

CONTENTS

	Page
Bibliography	iii
Chapter One -- Life of Redak	1
Chapter Two -- Character of His Writings	3
I Traditionalism	6
II Influence on Christian Writers	7
Chapter Three -- Works	9
Chapter Four -- Relation to His Sources	11
I Targum Jonathan	11
II Ibn Ezra	14
III Rashi	16
IV Saadya	17
V Joseph Kimhi	19
VI Ibn Janah	21
VII Aruk	22
VIII Targum Jerushalmi	23
IX Targum Onkelos	23
Chapter Five -- Exegesis	24
I Figurative Interpretation	31
II Knowledge of History	32
III Knowledge of Arabic	33
IV Loazim	34
Chapter Six -- Knowledge of Grammar	35
I Grammar	37

	Page
II Verb Syntax	39
III Sentence Syntax	40
IV Spelling	41
V Etymology	43
VI Massorah	44
VII Accents	45
VIII Lexicography	46
Notes	49

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackermann, A., Das hermeneutische Element der biblischen Accentuation,
Berlin, 1893.
- Cohen, Harry, The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Hosea. N. Y., 1929.
- Geiger, Abraham, Ozar Nechmad, Vol. 11, Wien, 1856.
- Gesenius, H. F. W., Hebrew Grammar, N. Y., 1875.
- Graetz, H., History of the Jews, Vol. 111.
- Hirsch, D. A., A Book of Essays - Johann Reuchlin, London, 1905.
- Hirschfeld, Hartwig, Literary History of Hebrew Grammarians and Lex-
icographers, London, 1926.
- Kimhi, David, Miklol, Lyck, 1862.
- Kimhi, David, Et Sopher, Lyck, 1864.
- Levy, Antoine, Die Exegese bei den Franzosischen Israeliten von 10. bis
14. Jahr undert, Leipzig, 1873.
- Levias, Caspar, David Kimhi, Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VII.
- Lewis, H. S., Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 8, 15, 1889.
- Margolis, Max L., The Story of Bible Translations, Philadelphia, 1917.
- Newman, Louis, Israel, Jewish Influence On Christian Reform Movements,
N. Y., 1925.
- Rosenau, William, Jewish Biblical Commentators, Baltimore, 1906.
- Tauber, Jacob, Standpunkt Und Leistung Des R. David Kimchi Als
Grammatiker, Breslau, 1867.
- Turner, S. H. On Jewish Rabbis, N. Y., 1847.
- Winter, J. and Wunsche, A., Die Judische Litteratur, Vol. 11, Trier, 1894.

REDAK AS EXEGETE AND GRAMMARIAN

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

HIS COMMENTARY ON

HOSEA

..

CHAPTER ONE -- LIFE OF REDAK.

We are unaware of the exact date of Redak's birth. We find
however, that in 1232 he was already an old man. His father died when¹⁾
he was ten years of age. From the fact that he never quotes his father
as (my teacher) but rather (my master my father) we may therefore con-
clude that he did not study under him. He did, however, apply the term
'לל to his brother Moses, from whom it appears that he received most
of his education. "Yet it must be remembered that Redak learned more from²⁾
books than from writers". "Unlike most Jewish learned men the best part
of whose knowledge comes from oral teaching, he owed much of his attain-
ments to his own reading, which was of a very wide nature and which em-³⁾
braced a large proportion of Hebrew literature up to the twelfth century."
He studied all the grammars and commentaries which were available to him.
From these sources he drew much material which was later to serve him as
intellectual sustenance. "They (the Kimhis) were not mere transcribers
or compilers, but natural interpreters and expositors, teachers by nature

as well as by profession. Especially is this true of Redak in whom the⁴⁾ didactic talents of the family reached their highest." He gathered and in a systematic manner arranged all that he clearly understood. He was no original writer. In the introduction to his Miklol hé regards himself as a מלקט שבלים אחרי הקוצר ("A gleaner of the ears of corn that fall from the reaper's sickle"). He scaled the heights of grammar, philology and exegesis and was, therefore, honored with the saying from Pirke Aboth אם אין קמח אין תורה.

In Arabic speaking circles this name was pronounced "Kamhi". (From the word Kemah - "corn ground small"). From this is to be explained the French surname "Maistre Petit" - (small master).

CHAPTER TWO -- CHARACTER OF HIS WRITINGS.

Redak, like the Kimhis, did not draw from his own intellectual reservoir, nor did he enter into the depths of philosophy nor did he hurry to set up rules to suit his own reasoning, but rather learned very much from his predecessors and adopted the method of pursuing the proper method of investigating the smallest detail and then applied the simple rules which had the support of many noteworthy examples. "Kimhi did not possess the strong originality, the deep perception nor the sharpness of Ibn Ezra, yet he possessed other important qualities. He is free from the philosophical prejudices of Ibn Ezra".⁵⁾

By omitting Ibn Ezra, we may readily say that Kimhi among all the commentators serves as the best example of correct exegesis. He shows more firmness than the latter representatives of the school of Rashi, when he disregards the homiletical interpretation, for to him the natural interpretation alone is the true method.⁶⁾ What Maimonides was in the field of philosophy, Kimhi was in the study of the Hebrew Language.⁷⁾ He created nothing new, neither did he discover rules hitherto unknown but delve deeply into the foundation of the language nor did he speak of the spirit of the Jew hovering over the language; he merely spoke concerning all that he found through the aid of his simple reasoning, in the earlier books. His method was like that of the grammarians of the Middle Ages, empirical or inductive. His grammar is not presented and described scientifically but he rather presents a description of the language forms and offers a proper explanation of the true process of the language. "A method of reducing

language to the fundamental rules and principles, and whose process is bound up with philosophical criticism of grammar and raised to the status of a science was yet far from him and his time." ⁸⁾ He became the representative of the then known grammatical "science" both because of his great knowledge and because of the fact that he was well equipped with biblical knowledge. He was well versed in the Targumim, rabbinic and midrashic writings, and the writings of his predecessors. He brought order out of chaos, by bringing their work together into a clear and methodic presentations. He sought out the individual language appearances and showed how they may be elucidated and supplemented. "He often resorted to the utilization of the dialect which often served to shed much light upon the Hebrew in the Bible, in the language of the Mishna, both the Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi, later Hebrew and on the development of the payitanim found until the 13th century. These works, because of their many idioms, are indeed a veritable storehouse of words and language explanations. Also through them whether they directly contain an explanation of the words and forms or indirectly through free interpretations, they nevertheless hint in a very fine way to grammatical observations." ⁹⁾ "His fine critical instinct and thorough sympathy with the Hebrew language usually led him to adopt the best of the views put forward by previous writers" ¹⁰⁾ "That which makes him especially outstanding and valuable is the complete method of his presentation and also the many good definitions he offers." ¹¹⁾ He greatly utilizes rare Hebrew words and forms for his explanations. He also uses the Aramaic and Arabic, *(but not Hebrew)*

*did he know Aramaic
in the original?*

although he considers the Hebrew language as the original and complete. In his explanations and comments he greatly relies on the Peshat and often cites the targumim. "He also made a study of the various customs and rituals which he had before him. He also made a thorough study of the Targum of the Prophets, yet seldomly used the targum of the Heg-¹²⁾ iography." He expresses the opinion of the Talmud and Midrashim merely for the sake of those lovers of drash yet he never hesitates from adding his comment that this drash is far fetched or that the author of the drash erred in the verse and failed to notice etc. He is at times diffuse and repeats himself in different words. This is due to the fact that he thinks he did not make himself clear. We can easily overlook this fault as he readily redeems himself through his beautiful style. "He (Redak) arranged and prepared a table for us filled with the finest food, and all who came after him ate of his bread and drank of his wine and crowned him king over all the scholars¹³⁾ of language."

In all his undertakings he was dominated and governed by two principles --- dissemination and unification. "So successful was he, that while he popularized and made current the views of his predecessors",¹⁴⁾ "he at the same time made their works superfluous and helped to sink them in an oblivion from which they were not rescued until the nineteenth century."¹⁵⁾

TRADITIONALISM

Redak is governed by the spirit of Traditionalism. If we consider the time and place of Redak, we will then understand the reason for his being a traditionalist. The Jews of France during that period looked with askance toward every science, and therefore the study of grammar was no exception. He who dared to treat any work critically, was running the risk of being excommunicated or being denounced as a heretic. Therefore, to expect such martyrdom from the strict believer Kimhi would be expecting too much. The nature of the man may also have a great deal to do with this method. Redak was a timid man. "He does not mention (in his writings) the Karaite books so that no difficulty or misunderstanding may enter his books." I see no reason for not mentioning these books. It is his duty to accept or reject, to praise or condemn these books, but let them be mentioned and be made known. The following comments of his, which I carefully selected from his commentary, will furnish us with many statements pertaining to his traditionalism.

1;7 He believes that an angel of God smote the army of Assyria and saved Judah from the hands of Sennacherib.

5:5 Commenting upon אלך אשובה אל מקומו
 _____, he says it means, I shall remove My divine presence from them and shall return to the heaven which is my place of glory. Such a comment betrays the theology of Redak, i.e. he believed

the heaven to be the divine resting place.

7:2 He makes the comment that all is known to God and when the people receive their punishment they will recognize the fact that I (God) know everything and that I reward them accordingly. Redak, we here see, believes that God keeps a strict account of our deeds, and rewards or punishes us accordingly. Joseph Karo and Ibn Ezra offer the same interpretation.

7:6 He errs in believing that the heart is the organ of thought.

He says: הלב הוא כלי המחשבה והכח הפועל בו. He also believed that mental activity does not cause one to become fatigued

לפי שאין במחשבה יגיעת הגוף.

8:6 Redak follows the traditional interpretation as explained in I Kings 12:28, that Israel did not learn how to make the calf from the notions as they had learned the other forms of idolatry but it was rather of their own handiwork, a product of the wilderness.

10:12 He quotes his father who believed in a material reward and punishment; Redak, evidently had the same belief. In his Miklol P.73a,

he ascribes Mosaic origin אשר נתנו למשה מסיני to the vowels.

II

INFLUENCE ON CHRISTIAN WRITERS.

The tremendous influence of Redak was not only felt on

Jewish scholars but also on Christian. His works became a veritable fountain source of Christian information. Scholars during the thirteenth century did not profit by the Sepher Miklol, but in the sixteenth century it influenced Reuchlin and his contemporaries profoundly. (17) Luther's knowledge of Hebrew was studied from Reuchlin's grammar which was based almost entirely upon Radak's Sepher Miklol. The Latin Bibles of Pragninus (1528) and Munster (1534-35) were influenced by his exegesis and these in return were indirectly instrumental in influencing the earlier English versions.

The translations of the Authorized Version --- the King James' Bible of 1611 -- were directly influenced by him. Special attention was paid by them to the Hebrew text of those passages which contain the comments of Radak. "In 1506 the humanist Reuchlin wrote the first Hebrew grammar and dictionary produced by a Christian scholar, and his teachers were Jacob Jehiel Loans and Obadiah Sforno. Sebastian Munster and Paul Fagius were the pupils of Elias Levita (1469-1548), a versatile man (18) (19) who became the link between Kimhi and the Christian Hebraists." Radak's influence may be traced in every line of the Anglican translation. (1611).

Marginalia:
 18) (19)
 Munster
 Fagius
 1611

CHAPTER THREE -- WORKS

His first contribution, which is his magnum opus is the Miklol, "Book of Completing" or "Summing Up" which is a combination of a grammar and a dictionary of the Bible. He refers to his Miklol in his commentary to Hosea three times (4:13, 6:1, 8:2). There are no references to his dictionary. Later this work was divided into two distinct parts; the first under the title "The Book of Roots".

"The title "Book of Roots was probably modelled on, if not borrowed
19) from Ibn Janah." The title Miklol was retained only for the first or grammatical part. In this monumental work he "summarized the previous centuries of scientific study and research into Hebrew grammar and philology. In Biblical exegesis he performed the same feat." The
20) second part of the Miklol deals with the Hebrew vocabulary, and its value is as significant as the first. Redak's philological endeavors did not meet with as much success as one would hope, especially so since he does not compare kindred roots in the various Semitic dialects according to the work of a modern lexicographer.

Kimhi's aim was to shorten and render complete the labours of R. Judah Hayyuj and Jonah ibn Janah (Abulwalid). Kimhi claims with reason that he not only simplified and condensed grammatical principles, but that he has for the first time enabled students to dispense with the use of books written in Arabic, and translated with more or less accuracy and elegance from that language
21) to Hebrew.

Redak first wrote on the Hagiographa, then on the prophets and finally on the Pentateuch. This procedure was due to his custom of rising according to the degree of holiness. Of the Pentateuch, we possess only the part which embraces the Book of Genesis.

He also wrote a small work, entitled Et Sopher. It is a book that includes the rules pertaining to the writing of a scroll by a scribe. Et Sopher על סופר divided into three parts השער הראשון בכתיבה השער השני בנקוד השער השלישי במעמים. "Although most of this material was already explained in his Miklol, yet there is no doubt that there is an additional value in this book over the Miklol for Redak wrote this after having written the Miklol." ²²⁾

He wrote a commentary on the Psalms and then wrote commentaries on all the early prophets and later prophets. We are at loss to say definitely when Redak's works were written, however, we are certain of the fact that his commentaries to the Prophets and Genesis were written after the year 1205 for it is the year when Samuel ibn Tibbon translated Maimonides' Moreh. By this translation the book became known throughout the cities of the Provencè. It was then (after translation) that Redak also first learned of its existence, for he (Redak) mentions this book in his commentaries.

CHAPTER FOUR -- RELATION TO HIS SOURCES.

I

TARGUM JONATHAN

"Redak quotes the Targum more copiously than any other
23) Biblical commentator." The Targum is cited in almost three fifths of the verses in Hosea. After making a careful study of the text, he then resorts with an equal amount of care to the study of the Targum. Despite his great reliance upon it, we may freely say that he accepts the Targum in a most critical and independent manner

The numerous citations of Targum Jonathan by Redak may be characterized as follows: Redak accepts Targum Jonathan, disagrees with Targum Jonathan, merely cites Targum Jonathan, relies on him, follows his interpretation, accepts only part of Targum Jonathan, quotes and comments on Targum Jonathan, differs with Targum Jonathan, relies upon Targum Jonathan by quoting his interpretations and in one place Redak adds (8:11) למה עירוש.

1:2 Quotes T. J. and agrees with him.

1:3 Quotes Targum Jonathan at the end of the verse and comments upon his interpretation of וַיֵּקֶם אֶת גִּמְרָא בֵּת דְּבִלִים and says (Redak) that he (Targum Jonathan) by the word גִּמְרָא means end, finish, and the meaning of the word בֵּת דְּבִלִים is derived from the word דְּבִלַת תַּאֲנִים (role of figs).

1:4 Quotes Targum Jonathan and relies upon his interpretation

of the words וְחִשְׁבוּ לָהֶם שֹׁשֶׁר לָדָם וְנִי for Targum
Jonathan says: זֶם זָרָא.

In the following verse (1:8), I offer my own criticism of Redak.

1:8 Redak cites Targum Jonathan at the end of the verse after he cites Ibn Ezra (Abraham). It is Redak's method to cite Targum Jonathan at end, yet he should have quoted Targum Jonathan before Ibn Ezra, for by so doing there would have been no break in the comment, for Targum Jonathan's has nothing to do with Ibn Ezra's, for Targum Jonathan says they continued to sin. *Criticism not justified for Redak means only by citing T after Ibn Ezra. T. is correct. In passage figuratively means portion ref. to T. is correct.*

2:1 Cites Targum Jonathan who makes a literal translation.

2:2 Cites Targum Jonathan and follows his interpretation when Redak says, they will go up from the land of exile to their own land.

2:2 Cites Targum Jonathan who like Redak says, after many days, he will assemble them אֵרִי רַב יָם כִּנְשִׁירוֹן.

2:3 Quotes Targum Jonathan although he contributes nothing.

2:4 Quotes Targum Jonathan from whom we can clearly see that his (Redak) interpretation, pertaining to Israel's indifference to God's ways, was taken.

2:11 Quotes Targum Jonathan-- yet unlike other places where Redak merely quotes him and lets it go at that, here he comments upon Targum Jonathan's interpretation and also interprets the meaning of

לְיָסָר as meaning removal (Gen. 31:16).

- 2:25 Quotes Targum Jonathan and differs with him. Redak's comment on באנץ ^{is, they will be as numerous as the seed of} the land and they will once again be a nation. Targum Jonathan says, I (God) shall establish in the land for them a Holy House. *Handwritten notes: I am here, while Redak means to indicate a replacement, which is not what the verse is diff. with. But Redak again is again into the mystery to explain the Targum Jonathan's way of comment of interpretation to say diff. about it.*
- 3:2 Quotes Targum Jonathan who translates the word חמשה עשר in the usual way and does not relate it with the words חמשה עשר (fifteen) *Handwritten notes: Targum Jonathan's way of comment of interpretation to say diff. about it.*
- 3:4 Quotes Targum Jonathan and utilizes his interpretation.
- 3:5 Accepts Targum Jonathan's interpretation of טוב as meaning goodness וסגי כעברה ד"ת לרזק. *Handwritten notes: Here again Redak's interpretation is not the same as Targum Jonathan's. (The Targum Jonathan's interpretation is available to the reader.)*
- 4:2 Quotes Targum Jonathan twice although his interpretation differs from his own.
- 4:12 Follows Targum Jonathan who differs with the text's translation and interprets the words עמי דבצלם אציה שאר "my people who consult an image of wood."
- 4:15 Commenting on "neither go ye up to Beth Aven," Redak relies upon Targum Jonathan to substantiate his interpretation that Beth Aven is really Beth el, for Targum Jonathan says, and go not up to Beth El.
- 5:1 Here also Redak is influenced by Targum Jonathan. Redak comments on reason for Mizpah and Tabor because they are lofty mountains. Targum Jonathan says, טור דם.
- 5:15 Redak offers same interpretation as Targum Jonathan עד דייקן דרבו.
- 8:11 Redak praises Targum Jonathan for his interpretation and adds לפה פירש.
- 8:14 Follows Targum Jonathan verbatim.

9:6 Cites Targum Jonathan who differs with him on meaning of קמח וחרה. Targum Jonathan says, it means beasts, while Redak says they are thorns.

10:7 Here also Targum Jonathan differs with Redak. Targum Jonathan says, קצף has the meaning of רפחה (foam) and Redak says it means bark (קליפת העץ).

10:9 Redak disagrees with Targum Jonathan's interpretation to the extent of saying ואינו מושב הפסוק על פירושו.

10:7 It is interesting to notice that regarding the interpretation of the word תשובה Redak does not follow Targum Jonathan as he usually does, for Rashi follows Targum Jonathan and interprets the word to mean repentance (תשובה). *with this meaning to account for previous statement*

"His critical use of the Targum can be seen by his frequent comments on it, but especially by his making the important observation that the translator appeared to have had a different reading from that of the Masoretic text." (24) "He calls attention to paraphrases of the Targum as not being in accordance with the accepted vocalization." (25)

a better arrangement would have been to have classified those that are in accordance with the accepted arrangement

II

IBN EZRA

Of the Spanish school, Ibn Ezra is the only author that Redak mentioned by name. R. was influenced by Ibn Ezra more than by

any other author. We find him quoted by name eleven times. The following are the references: 1:8, 2:17, 4:13, 5:10, 6:2, 6:3, 7:9, 10:12, 11:7, 11:9, 11:10, "and is mentioned five times anonymously; as וַיִּשְׁמַע (2:2), rejecting his interpretation; וַיִּשְׁמַע (6:11), as a possible explanation; וַיִּשְׁמַע (5:1, 13:14) and וַיִּשְׁמַע (10:2) as additional comments. Ibn Ezra, however, is utilized without being named very frequently, and he is the source of Kimhi in at least 26) forty-nine other instances."

We find Redak quoting Ibn Ezra in the very beginning of the first chapter (1:8). Commenting upon וַיִּשְׁמַע Ibn Ezra says that after the ten tribes were exiled, the tribes in exile bore children who remained there and did not return to their land, therefore he called them וַיִּשְׁמַע. We see that Palestine played a large role according to the opinion of Ibn Ezra, despite the peace and security of the Spanish "golden" era. This likewise must have been the view of Redak.

1:9 Redak makes no comment whatsoever and merely says, וַיִּשְׁמַע already explained, meaning Ibn Ezra's. Redak seldom does pass up verse without commenting upon it. This, therefore, sheds much light upon the complete dependence and faith Redak had in Ibn Ezra. 6:3 Redak out of sheer respect to his father quotes him first and then quotes Ibn Ezra whose view was a part of his own philosophy of life, i.e. striving after knowledge. Commenting on the words

this does not follow, as frequently he uses this explanation in commentaries. I.E. is commenting on 4. number was available to every reader. Redak's view was a phrase was in meaning as reference to a comment made by I.E.

וְהָיָה נִדְבָרָה, Ibn Ezra says, that only through a gradual increase of knowledge can one reach God, the ultimate knowledge. This great emphasis upon the acquisition of knowledge is characteristic of Ibn Ezra.

12:4-7 It is clearly to be seen from these verses that Redak followed Ibn Ezra.

III

RASHI

Although Redak in no way relies upon Rashi as he does upon Targum Jonathan and Ibn Ezra, yet we find him to quote ^{in Redak 27)} Rashi five times in Hosea. He also cites him anonymously. Throughout the section devoted to his exegesis, I have shown how Rashi has been utilized without being cited.

I here quote a few of Rashi's comments, which are characteristic of his exegesis: (*whose exegesis?*)

4:12 Redak says, ש' מַלְאָכָיו (Cohen says it is Rashi) "some say" that לְצִו וּמַלְכוֹ his counsel and staff refer to an idol which is of wood.

8:13 Redak quotes the entire comment of Rashi on זִבְחֵי הַבְּהֵמָה בָּשָׂר. It refers to "those sacrifices that they roast (לְעִמְהָרְבֵּי) before Me on the altar,

what do I need them, let them slaughter them and eat them for I do not wish them." Redak agrees that Rashi's interpretation would have been good would it have read with a Sheva וְאֵכְלֻם but it is written with a patah. He rejects it because it requires a different vocalization.

11:7 He quotes Rashi and rejects his interpretation. Rashi interprets the meaning of לְמַשׁוּבָתִי to come from תְּשׁוּבָה (repentance). Redak says, that in no place do we find the word תְּשׁוּבָה to have any other than a derogatory meaning. Ibn Ezra has the same interpretation as Redak "and was taken from him" (Cohen).

IV

SAADYA

28)

We find Redak quoting Saadya fourteen times. Of this number, only in three places does he accept his interpretation outright, and in the other places they are merely cited. It is to be noted that on none of these does he make any comment.

2:3 Saadya and Targum Jonathan quoted.

2:13 Saadya alone quoted.

2:17 Saadya, Rashi and Targum Jonathan quoted.

2:19 Saadya and others quoted, anonymously יְעֹזֵר כִּי רָשָׁע הוּא.

3:2 Saadya, Rashi and Targum Jonathan quoted.

3:5 Rabbis, Targum Jonathan and Saadya quoted. (It is interesting to note that in this case Redak differs from his usual procedure by quoting Targum Jonathan last.).

4:2 Saadya and Targum Jonathan quoted/

4:10 Saadya alone quoted.

5:10 Rashi, Saadya, Joseph Kimhi and Abraham Ibn Ezra quoted.

6:9 Targum Jonathan, Saadya and Joseph Kimhi quoted. (See my comment on 3:5).

8:9 Saadya and Targum Jonathan quoted.

10:6 Saadya and Targum Jonathan quoted.

11:9 Saadya, Targum Jonathan and Abraham Ibn Ezra quoted.

12:5 Joseph Kimhi, Saadya and Rabbis quoted.

In the light of the previous observations, we may be justified in saying that wherever Saadya is quoted, Redak found it very little need for quoting many other commentators. In a few of these verses the name of Saadya alone stands, and in a few that of Targum Jonathan with it (for his reliance upon Targum Jonathan was great) and in the others are also to be found Rashi, Abr. Ibn Ezra, Joseph Kimhi and the Rabbis.

30)

Of the fourteen times that Redak quotes Saadya, nine
31) 32)

are on exegesis, three are on the meaning of a word, one is a

33)
Gimatriya and one deals with accentuation (verse divisions). This therefore, sheds much light upon the nature of Redak's reliance upon Saadya.

*See this is not
correct for
only 5 cases
where Saadya
alone (with Targum
+ Rashi) is quoted
in the commentary*

JOSEPH KIMHI

Indirectly, Joseph commanded a great influence upon his son, David. David learned very little from his father for the latter died when David was about ten years old. The son learned much from his father's books. We are indebted to R. Joseph for introducing the system of long and short vowels which are still followed by modern Hebrew grammarians. He was the first to compile a complete Hebrew grammar. He made a careful study of the European languages and his attempt to present our vowel system as equal to that of the Latin alphabet was crowned with success. In each case he claimed that there were five primary sounds, viz.. a, e, i, o, u, and these with the corresponding short sounds form the whole vowel system. "This system may not be completely satisfactory in its application to a Semitic language, but it is undoubtedly superior to the confusing system of earlier grammarians, such as Ibn Ezra, who are misled by the analogy of Arabic and recognize in Hebrew only three primary vowel sounds." ²⁴⁾

It may be said of him (Joseph) that he was "the first successful transplanter of Judeo Arabic science to the soil of Christian Europe." ³⁵⁾ His father's books supplied him (David) with abundant grammatical information. It must also be said, that the method of arranging nouns, which Redak so well does, was learned from him. (Joseph).

R. Joseph is quoted by name, in Hosea by Redak, twenty-five times though he seldomly agrees with him. "The attitude of R. David toward his father, however, may be described as being similar to his relation to the Rabbis, an attitude of respect and reverence, and therefore frequent quotation, but little actual dependence and utilization of the source of his interpretations." ³⁶⁾

2:2 From this verse, we see that Redak most likely received his interpretation from R. Joseph. Commenting on כי גזל ים ירעל R. Joseph says, they (Israel) were scattered among the nations for a long time and now I shall re-assemble them; he therefore, called Israel Jezreel (ירעל) because the Lord planted them among the nations.

2:7 Although disagreeing with his father, yet he quotes him. Commenting upon אחרי מאהבי, R. Joseph says it does not refer to the nations (Assyria and Egypt) with whom Israel had signed a covenant, but rather to the planets which supplied them with food.

2:8 The same applies to this verse. Redak has a specific purpose in quoting his father since he (Redak) wished to accredit his father with the fact that he does not always accept the literal meaning of a word. R. Joseph says, that the word "thorn" should not be taken literally but rather figuratively. This he does by introducing the word כאכל.

2:12 In this verse he quotes his father and accredits him with

his interpretation of the word מַלְאָכִים to refer to the sun.

4:12 Here Redak quotes a lengthy comment of his father on

עַתָּה בִּיטְלָהּ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְחָקְלָהּ יָדָא לָהּ. "My people ask counsel at their stock, and their staff declareth unto them etc." He (R. Joseph) says, they are comparable to the blind whose staff shows him the way, and his cane which are his false prophets.

4:14 Although differing with his father, yet he quotes him.

R. Joseph says, that the word פִּרְדָּן is derived from the word פִּרְדָּן (mule), i.e., the people are comparable to mules. After having quoted his father, he then quotes others וְשֵׁנִי פִרְדָּן.

6:3 R. Joseph's comment on נִיבָה concerning the achievement of knowledge can in no way compare to the brilliant statement in this verse by Ibn Ezra. Redak, if wishing to show his respect for his father's exegesis by quoting him, should have without question limited these quotations by his father to merely a few statements and certainly not as many as the number twenty-five. Also, the error committed by him in quoting his father in the same verse with the brilliant exegete, Ibn Ezra, is almost inexcusable.

VI

IBN JANAHA

Of the authors of the Spanish school none, except Ibn

Ezra, are mentioned. We find Ibn Janah and Hayyuj mentioned anonymously. Ibn Janah twice 8:3, 10:12 and Hayyuj once 14:8. Despite the failure on the part of Redak to mention these masters of his, yet it is well known that they occupy a significant place as "one of the main sources of his exegesis." Of these two scholars, we ^{may} say that Ibn Janah especially influenced him greatly either directly or indirectly through Ibn Ezra whose comments can readily be traced to Ibn Janah as their source. Redak was greatly indebted to the celebrated Ibn Janah (Abuwalid) whom he follows almost blindly. Redak considers him to be the most eminent of all grammarians. He learned from Ibn Janah through the translations of Judah ibn Tibbon.

8:13 Redak quotes Ibn Janah anonymously by merely saying ש"י מפרש"ר (Cohen, H. on page xxxviii says it is Ibn Janah).

10:12 Quotes Ibn Janah anonymously.

VII

ARUK

Redak quotes the author of the Aruk only once (7:11). He (Redak) not only quotes him there, but offers his complete explanation. Commenting upon the word עֲרִיחָה of the Targum Jonathan, he says that its meaning is that of a woman who weeps and is in mourning.

He compared the word with the Arabic which utilizes the word שררה to describe a woman who weeps and cuts (lacerates) her face.

VIII

TARGUM JERUSHALMI

We find the Targum Jerushalmi quoted only once in the entire book. This citation shows that Redak completely relies upon this citation to bear out his own explanation of the word קטק to mean "cut down". He cites the Targum Jerushalmi למקטב for the words לחטב.³⁸⁾

IX

TARGUM ONKELOS

Targum Onkelos is cited only once in the entire book.³⁹⁾ Redak could easily have dispensed with this citation, inasmuch as this statement is duplicated in Targum Jonathan.

CHAPTER FIVE -- EXEGESIS

The exegesis of Redak may be characterized as being literal, rational and based upon an exact and grammatical construction of the text. His clear exposition, derived from a keen insight of the Hebrew language, is based upon his knowledge of philology. Being equipped with a sense of critical observation, he often notices a word, or even a letter, which warrants comment, and thereby serves as a source for his exegesis.

As one reads the text, there is much that appears to the reader to be clear and self-evident and therefore any explanation would seem superfluous and would involve the risk of only confusing matters, yet Redak in a method which is so characteristic of him, comments upon them and adds lustre and color to the text, thereby, making it all the more rich and appealing.

Though largely independent in his exegesis, yet, there are many passages where the influence of other exegetes, especially Ibn Ezra and Rashi are to be noticed as the sources of his interpretations.

The reader of Redak will also notice the presence of Midrashic interpretations and gimatriyos. We can hardly give our consent to the fact that they form an integral part of his exegesis, for this may be explained in the light of the great emphasis he placed upon rational and literal interpretations. To advance the

contrary would label him as being inconsistent in his style.

Midrash and gimatriyos were then highly in vogue and Redak either unconsciously resorted to them or understood~~x~~ their value to the people and therefore included them in his exegesis in order to make his writings appealing to many of his day.

I shall resort to the same procedure, in dealing with his exegesis as I have done in discussing the other characteristics of his writings, i.e. to mention some of his comments, the purpose of which is to enable us to comprehend the exact nature of his exegesis.

1:6 Commenting upon the word כָּהֵם of בִּי נִשְׂאָ אֲשָׁא לָהֶם he says this means, I shall bring the enemy upon them who will exile them and destroy their land; or the word כָּהֵם has the same connotation as אֹתָם⁴⁰⁾ and is similar to הִרְגוּ לֵאבֹנֵר, that is, I shall carry them away to the land of their enemies.

Redak seldom compares one word to another without citing the verse.

2:2 Commenting upon בְּרִי אֵל חַי he says, now they are making Gods which are not living, and even the living among them, the planets, are living only through the cause of the One who makes them alive, but He is alive without any cause. Though the meaning of the words commented upon are quite evident, yet his philosophical insight concerning the Prime Cause and his comment upon it makes his exegesis more appealing.

2:21 Redak here resorts to a midrashic interpretation. He comments on the fact that the word "betrothed" is written three times. Each refers to one of the three exiles of Israel--- Egypt, Babylon and the present exile. Every time they emerged from an exile, it was as though God betrothed them. The first betrothal, when he took them forth from Egypt, was not a permanent one, for they were later exiled. In contrast to it, he therefore said, "I will betroth thee unto me forever, etc, etc."

2:23 Commenting upon אָעֲנֶה אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם he says that God will respond to the heavens and it will be as though the heavens ask whether rain shall be given as it is their custom, and I (God) shall answer them and be willing that they be given rain as it is the custom i. e. rains of blessing, and that is what he means by אָעֲנֶה, my wish shall be given them.

3:1 Redak says, after prophet completed comfort, he then resorted to rebuke----- it seems that he errs here. Is it not usually rebuke and then comfort?

3:2 Here we have a typical example of a gimatriya. It may also be noted that he fails to mention the names of the other commentators who offered a different interpretation. Although failing to mention the name of Targum Jonathan, yet he utilizes Targum Jonathan's explanation to comment upon the words בְּחִמְשָׁה עָשָׂר כֶּסֶף. The reason for fifteen is, because God will redeem her (Israel) on

the fifteenth of Nisan. He also adds another comment, anonymously, by saying ע"י אברהם, יצחק, ויעקב "through the merit of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the twelve tribes" which account for the number fifteen.

3:2 The following is another gimatriyo, which is a bit more involved than the preceding. Utilizing Targum Jonathan's statement that the fifteen refers to the fifteenth of Nisan when the children of Israel were redeemed from Egypt, Redak adds his own comment by saying that חומר ולת refer to the number of days it took them since they left Egypt until they came to the wilderness of Sinai and there received the Torah, for חומר is equal to thirty תק"ס (Seah) and ל is equal to fifteen, together they amount to forty-five; the fifteen days remaining in Nisan and thirty in Iyar which together amount to forty-five days.

3:2 The following is a fine example how a lengthy and interesting comment can be made by Redak upon a single word. Commenting on the word נִרְיָא, he says that it refers to feed for beasts, for most of the people who left Egypt were comparable to beasts, until they received the Torah. They were like horses and mules devoid of understanding and engaged in all sorts of work, but after they received the Torah, their eyes were opened and the spirit of intelligence rested upon them.

3:4 Redak's independence in exegesis extends even to the freedom of dividing sentences thereby dividing its meaning. Commenting

upon לְאֵן זָבַח וְאֵין מִלֵּזֶה, the word מִלֵּזֶה applies to God and מִלֵּזֶה applies to the worship of Idolatry.

4:2 Rashi, Joseph Karo, Abraham Ibn Ezra and others offer the same comment as Redak yet he fails to acknowledge this fact.

4:4 Redak's great knowledge of the Bible enabled him to divorce words from their setting and transfer them to an entirely different setting thereby giving them an altogether new meaning. He says it is possible that כַּמְדֵּי כֹהֵן refers to the company of Korah ⁴⁵⁾ עֵדֶת קֹרַח who disputed and protested against the priesthood.

4:10 Redak, here, entirely ignores the verse division and joins verse ten with verse eleven.

5:7 Commenting upon word חֹדֶשׁ he says, it refers to the month of Tamuz when the city was entered and the month Ab when it was destroyed.

6:3 Redak differs with the general interpretation of the word יָרַה, as meaning "to water" but rather considers it to be a noun. He adds a vay and writes it thus --- כַּמֶּלְקוֹשׁ וְיֹרֶה and יָרַה means early rain.

8:9 Here Redak enlightens us with the full meaning of the word עָלוּ of כִּי הָמָּה עָלוּ אֲשׁוּר. If we say that Assyria is, geographically speaking, on a lower level than Palestine, then we must interpret the word עָלוּ to mean departing as וְעָלָה מִן הָאָרֶץ ⁴⁶⁾ and if you wish to interpret the words וְעָלָה מִן הָאָרֶץ as a ctually going up to Palestine then we have the meaning of סִדּוּק

and לפניו and he cites, Gen. 49:4, Job, 5:26, Ps. 102:25.

9:1 Here, we again have a case where Redak's comment is similar to that of Rashi and Ibn Ezra. "It is possible that he⁴⁷⁾ borrowed it from them."

9:5 The following is a rare interpretation and Redak is almost alone in this comment. He takes the word ליום to mean the day of destruction. Jacob b Reuben, as Cohen points out, offers this interpretation. "The designation of ליום as referring to the day of destruction is found neither in the Talmud nor Midrashim."⁴⁸⁾

10:9 Commenting upon ליום Redak adds ליום כי שם. "Ibn Ezra offers same interpretation and it was from him that this⁴⁹⁾ was taken."

10:11 Once again Redak calls our attention to the difference in meaning of apparent similar words. Commenting upon the words ויר and ויר he says, during threshing, (ויר) the animal has the freedom to eat, not so while ploughing.

10:14 He calls our attention to defective spelling of the word למנו (written with a yod which stands for the plural i, e. the tribes).

12:4 He comments upon the following words למנו את את and informs us of the physiological difficulty involved in these words. It was a great wonder, he says, for while the embryo (child) is in the womb, it lacks the necessary strength to grasp with one of

its limbs, and therefore for an embryo to grasp the heel of another child is considered to be a great wonder.

General Criticism: It would have been better to more completely have classified the character of this comment, as that of giving comment in the order of narrative text.

I

FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATION

There are places in the book of Hosea where Redak definitely calls our attention to the fact that certain words should not be taken literally but rather figuratively. I make mention of a few of these, although not abundantly to be found, in order to illustrate my previous statement.

1:5 The word קוֹחַ he takes to denote strength and power. This he deduces from Targum Jonathan וְאֵתְּרִי יֵת תְּקוּף.

1:6 The word בֵּת in וְתִהְיֶה צוּר וְתִלְדָּ בֵּת, he says refers to Zekariah and Shalom who were as weak as females.

1:8 The words וְהִגְמַל אֶת לֹא רִחְמָהּ are taken figuratively and mean, a period of weakness, during the days of Zekariah and Shalom also during the reign of Menahem ben Gedi who ruled for ten years, for it was during his reign that Pul, king of Assyria, invaded the country, and also in the days of Pikhaya, his son, who ruled for two years until Pekah b. Remalya arose and ruled firmly for twenty years, and arose against Judah and killed 120,000 in one day, (these numbers are undoubtedly hyperbolic); he also laid seige to Jerusalem together

with Rezin king of Aram. It is concerning him that he utilizes the proverb לְתַהַרְוֹתָּךְ וְתִלְדָּ בֵּת, and concerning his generation it is said לְעֵינֵי אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה רָעָה, for concerning him it is said, he did evil in the eyes of God, he did not turn from the sin of Jeroboam.

II

KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORY

Of the very few references to history found in the commentary, the following may well serve as a good example of Redak's reliance upon his knowledge of history in aiding hām in his exegesis.

8:9 After commenting upon the word לְבָנָיִם and attempting to clarify its meaning in the light of the fact that Palestine is geographically higher than Assyria, he then resorts to the facts of history as an explanation of the term לְבָנָיִם and that is, the incident of Menahem offering Pul, king of Assyria a thousand pieces of silver and Menahem went up (in Palestine) to the place where Pul was encamped, for in Palestine proper he says we know there are marked topographical differences.

III

KNOWLEDGE OF ARABIC

Different views are held as to whether Redak knew Arabic.

"Geiger, Tauber and Schiller-Szinessy are of the opinion that he was
50)
unacquainted with this language." "Poznanski and Eppenstein say that
51)
he was well versed in the language." Doctor Israel Friedlaender said,
that Kimhi knew Arabic but his acquaintance with the language was
limited to mere expressions and words, yet did not know its grammar
and read it with difficulty. The works of the Arabic grammarians
(David Hayyuj, the "first grammarian" and Jonah Ibn Janah the
"greatest of Medieval Hebraists") were made known to him through
translations or from the mouths of others. Quite a number of
derivations from the Arabic are to be found in his works which offer
rich material for the Hebrew lexicographer. He compares the Arabic
to the Hebrew form and when dissatisfied with the Hebrew he then
resorts to the aramaic idiom.

4:13 He quotes the Arabic word בָּלֵם for the word בָּלֵם.

"Quotes Arabic in four places: three from Ibn Janah, one directly
(4:13), and two (4:14), (13:15) through his father, the fourth,
52)
(7:11) is from the Aruk."

13:5 Quotes Arabic through his father whom he says drew from
Ibn Janah. "My father brought proof for this word from the Arabic

which for the word יָבֵשׁ is יָבֵשׁ i.e. dry." Ibn Janah says
that the root is יָבֵשׁ.

IV

^a
LOAZIM

53) ^a
Redak cites only three Loazim in Hosea. Evidently he
places little importance upon the citation of foreign words in aiding
him to explain his interpretations. Two of these Loazim are not his own
54)
but Rashi's, the third, is his own. He makes no acknowledgement
of the fact that he takes them from Rashi.

CHAPTER SIX -- KNOWLEDGE OF GRAMMAR

"Redak possessed an all embracing and fundamental grammatical knowledge, which enabled him to bring together the often unsystematic and disorganized results of his predecessors into a systematic whole. His works are looked upon as the development of the Hebrew grammar of the tenth to the thirteenth century.⁵⁵⁾"

"The period of Kimhi's life and activity falls at the close of the "golden" age of Hebrew literature, an age especially noteworthy for the study of the Hebrew grammar and Biblical exegesis. Nearly three centuries had passed since the scientific study of Hebrew, begun by R. Saadya Gaon, and brought to its fruition by the great researches of R. Judah Hayyuj and R. Jonah ibn Janah, an age which had produced a number of new Biblical commentaries and grammatical works. But all this literary development, with few exceptions, was in Arabic, and was therefore, confined to countries where that language was spoken.^{56)"}

Of the scholars who preceded Redak, R. Judah Hayyuj and R. Jonah ibn Janah played the greatest role in influencing his works. Although he does not mention the names of Hayyuj and ibn Janah and are only cited anonymously, R. Jonah ibn Janah in 8:3 and 10:12, and R. Judah Hayyuj in 14:8, yet Redak greatly

57)
 acknowledges their importance in his Miklol. On the same page, he defines his purpose for writing his Miklol. He says, if one wishes to learn the science of grammar, he will become weary studying the numerous books written by the many scholars and will therefore find it necessary to study them all his life. Since one must know when letters are extraneous and when they are missing, he should be very careful in the matter pertaining to his explanations, his letters and poetry. Our rabbis, he says, commanded that one must always teach his pupil by means of a short and precise method. The books which should be studied are those of R. Judah and R. Jonah, although their books are quite far from the status of being perfect. Redak named this book Sepher Miklol for it was his wish to include in it the grammar of the language and everything pertaining to it, in a brief manner, in order that it be easy for the pupils to study and understand the method of grammar and find in it everything to be known concerning this knowledge.

In the entire ground work of his grammatical works, Kimhi presents himself in the light of a compiler, "yet he is far removed from committing plagiarism, for he expressly mentions in his introduction that he had compiled the scattered statements of the
 58)
 early grammarians and wished to correct the errors." "Despite his honesty, yet at times he had concealed the sources whence he drew. This shows that he had imbibed much of the works of others into his

grammatical conscience or else was informed by others and therefore⁵⁹⁾ did not believe it necessary to make the name of the author known."

Despite the above mentioned reasons of Tauber, I hardly believe them acceptable for I cannot see how he failed to mention his sources when the works of the other ~~of the other~~ commentators were before him and which he could have consulted for references. In discussing the grammatical standpoint of Redak, I shall point out places where not only the influence of other writers are felt, but even to the extent of including words, expressions and comments which are the products of their pens. Redak often has the tendency to fail to acknowledge the contributions of other scholars. If this tendency is purposive, then he may be accused of lacking a certain amount of scholarly integrity.

I

GRAMMAR

§11 Commenting upon אֲשִׁישׁ יָבִיחַ, he says it is derived from the root שׁשׁ. This is not original with Redak. R. Jonah and Abraham ibn Ezra also say it is derived from this root.

3:5 Commenting on word וּפָנֶה, Redak says it is similar to וּפָנֶה in the future tense, for as it stands, one would take it to be in the imperative.

4:10 Commenting upon יָנִיחַ Redak says it is an intransitive verb and thereby disagrees with Ibn Ezra. Though Redak's reliance upon Ibn Ezra is very evident, yet the former's independence and reliance upon his own judgement is often noticed.

4:13 Commenting upon word יָנִיחַ he calls our attention to dagash in the beth and says it is similar to the word יָנִיחַ in II Chronicle, 33:22. Here, also, he disagrees with Ibn Ezra who says it has the force of causation (Hiphil), but rather has the force of intensity, both here as well as other places as mentioned in his Miklol.⁶⁰⁾

4:18 Here again Redak shows his independence of judgement. He differs with Rashi and Joseph Karo who say יָנִיחַ means הִזְמִינָה, to invite, and with R. Jonah who says it comes from the root אָהַב and the meaning of יָנִיחַ is יָנִיחַ (they liked) and with ibn Parhon⁶¹⁾ who says it comes from the root יָנִיחַ but Redak in his Miklol says it is from the root יָנִיחַ.

5:15 Redak often comments upon an apparent strange construction of a verb. Being a careful observer and critical student, he therefore felt that the reader should be enlightened with regard to any unusual spelling. Commenting upon the word יָנִיחַ he says that the first nun is similar to the nun of יָנִיחַ which is often added in the future in the case of plurals.

6:1 Commenting on construction of the verb יָנִיחַ which has a double kamatz, although it is in the perfect tense, Redak says that there are many verbs which take a double kamatz and he refers to his

62) Miklol. There, he says, that where words are derived from the root form שׁוּג with a patah it returns to a kamatz at an ethnah or at the end of a sentence. I am at loss in understanding how Redak can offer such an explanation when the word שׁוּג in the text is neither at an ethnah nor at the end of a sentence. However, he may have had a different text.

6:1 Redak's independence of opinion in matters pertaining to verb tenses is here revealed. Commenting on word יָ, he says it is an apocopated form of יָכָה and is in the future tense. Ibn Ezra and Rashi say it is in the present tense and Joseph Karo says it is in the past tense.

8:5 The word יָנַח he says is an intransitive verb and has the same meaning as יָנַח and he cites the passage וַתֵּלֶךְ מִשְׁלֹם 63) וַיֵּשֶׁב. He has a supporter in the scholar of R. Jonah his illustrious predecessor, but had his opponents in the scholars of Rashi, Joseph Karo, Im Ezra and Jacob b. Reuben who considered it to be a transitive verb.

II

VERB SYNTAX

Being a keen student of the Hebrew language and a fine

stylist, proper syntax was therefore of utmost importance to him.

A typical example of Redak's comments on syntax may be seen in the following sentence.

14:3 כל תשא עון should read כל עון תשא

or מקום קבר שם should read מקום קבר שם. He

cites over two pages of similar examples in his Miklol. However,

it is interesting to read the following words on page 89 b of his

Miklol. ולכן לא הקפידו העברים בסדור התיבות

זו לפני זו והכניסו את השמוש או מלת ענין זו בזו

אעפ שהמלה הראשונה או את השמוש ענינה

הזתה באחרונה וזה עשו בדבר שאין לטעות

בו ולומר הפוך הסברא הנכונה.

III

SENTENCE SYNTAX

8:10 Redak comments upon the apparent syntactical difficulty

of the sentence. The vay of שורים of מלך שורים is missing.

It is as though it were written מלך ושורים. He deals with this

(64)

matter in his Miklol. There He merely cites additional examples, but

makes no attempt to shed some light upon the question as to why the

vay is missing.

13:9 He comments upon the double beth of the verse כִּי בִעֲדָךְ and says that although one beth would have been sufficient, yet it is the custom of the language to so speak.

IV

SPELLING & *Farus*

6:9 Commenting upon word וַיִּחַסֵּר he says that the yod takes the place of a heh of חָסַר which is the infinitive. He calls our attention to the fact that the yod and heh are interchangeable but offers no explanation of this fact. This is cited in his Miklol.⁶⁵⁾

וְחָסִי יֵאֵשׁ גְּדוּדִים. הַיּוֹד תּוֹמַרֵת הָא."

9:12 He calls our attention to the spelling of the word בְּעוֹרֵי and says it should be written בִּסּוּרֵי with a samah.

9:15 Here, as in the previous comment, (9:12), he merely calls our attention to the vocalization of the word אֵסֵף with a zereh.

10:4 The word שָׁעִי he says is like שָׁעוֹת. Joseph Karo makes the same comment. It is interesting to note that in 12:12 Redak says, שָׁעִים.

10:6 Commenting upon the spelling of the word בְּשֹׁנֶה he says it is like בְּשֹׁנָה, and the nun is added.

10:10 Here, Redak not only comments upon the spelling of a word but also adds a grammatical point of explanation. The root of the word וְאֶסֶר is סָר and is in the kal. The dagash in the samah

takes the place of the missing yod of the peh aleph. This is similar to כִּי אֶצֶק מִים עַל זֶמֶא⁶⁶⁾.

10:12 The word עִיר is a hiphil imperative and should be written with a heh (הִעִיר). The heh is dropped as is the custom in the imperative of נָחִי הִעִיר, and is similar to שִׁמּוּ, שִׁמּוּ.

11:7 Commenting upon the word תְּלוֹאִים he says that the chirik under the aleph takes the place of the heh of תְּלֹה, i.e. ⁶⁷⁾ ⁶⁸⁾ the third radical, and he quotes Deuteronomy and II Samuel. It is indeed both unfortunate and surprising that the only comment he makes ⁶⁹⁾ on this word in his Miklol, is the fact that the root תְּלֹה is here mentioned as though it belonged to a לֹא⁷⁰⁾. I feel that additional information should have been given, such as the fact that, "the original yod or vav in all forms which end with the third radical gives place to heh as a vowel letter, which represents the closing vowel."

13:3 He calls our attention to the spelling of the word סֶעֶר⁷¹⁾ and says that it is as though it were written with a patah under the ayin. In his Miklol he says, כִּי הָיָה בּוֹ בְּמִקְוֵם הַפֶּתַח וּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ יִסְוֶר בְּפֶתַח. Here again it was his duty to explain why the ayin takes a zereh.

⁷²⁾
13:13 Commenting on word מְשֻׁבֵּר in his Miklol he says it is a מְפֻעֵל form and the mem is written either with a patah or chirik, such as מִקְהֵל, מִחְצֵב, מִשְׁעָן etc. And with a chirik it is מִסְכָּן, מִזְבָּח and in the construct state it is

written with a patah and the mem with a chirik, like מִזְבַּח אֶדְמָה etc.

14:1 Although here Redak says that the aleph is written with a sheva alone, however, in his Miklol, he says ⁷³⁾ תֵּאשֵׁם בְּהִנָּקֶת הָאֵלֶף
בְּשׂוּא וּסְגוּל, אִין בְּשׂוּא לְבָדוֹ תֵּאשֵׁם שְׁמִדוֹן.

14:8 Redak often notices the omission of certain letters, that is, words that are spelled defectively, Commenting upon the word דָּגַל
 he says the kaf preceding the word is missing. He cites ⁷⁴⁾ חֲמִיאַת קֶסֶם
 (כַּחֲמִיאַת קֶסֶם). לֵב שֹׁמֵם "מִבְּגֵהָ" (כַּגֵּהָ) ⁷⁵⁾ לֵב שֹׁמֵם "מִבְּגֵהָ" (כַּגֵּהָ) ⁷⁶⁾ לֵב שֹׁמֵם "מִבְּגֵהָ" (כַּגֵּהָ). He cites many more examples in his Miklol to substantiate his statement.

V

ETYMOLOGY + lexical matter

7:12 Redak is independent in his opinion as to the etymology of the word אֲסִירִם. Whereas, he says, it comes from אָסַר (to bind), Rashi, Joseph Karo, Ibn Ezra and others consider it to come from יָסַר (chastisement). The same comment reappears in verse 15 of this chapter. I see no need for repeating this explanation, except for the fact that in verse 15, he is more clear.

9:4 Commenting upon the word אֲוִירִים he says it is an adjective, while Ibn Ezra says it is a noun.

9:7 חֲתוּל פָּגוּל he says is a noun like חֲתוּל פָּגוּל.

*But does this
independently or
from the same
source as the
other words?*

77)
In his Miklol, he places these nouns together with many more, under the heading פיעול. He also accounts for the variation in vocalization in certain words, although they come under the פיעול form, such as the words זרע זרוע⁷⁸⁾ and זרעה תצמיח⁷⁹⁾. The zereh replaces the chirik because of the resh.

12:7 Commenting upon the letter beth of the word באהיר he says that it serves in place of a lamed, and the word רעוב will imply תשובה (repentance). He cites examples to substantiate his first statement, ושלח את השעיר במדבר⁸⁰⁾ instead of למדבר, רנו צדיקים בה⁸¹⁾ instead of לה. He presents this entire matter in a very detailed manner in his Miklol. There he points out the various meanings which the beth assumes such as a mem, רעובר (for sake of), עד (unto) etc.

VI

MASSORAH

Being a traditionalist, we can readily understand why he does not deviate from the Massoretic's text. This applied not only to the letters and words, but also to the vowels to which in his Miklol p. 73a, he ascribes Mosaic origin אשר נתנו למשה מסי. In connection with his grammatical system, he gathered with great knowledge the Massoretic texts. He compared many rare codices of

whose origin and existence very little is known. In this manner they were preserved and often consulted.

VII

ACCENTS

Redak does not consider accents to be binding on Biblical Exegesis. "For him (Redak) accents had only a grammatical significance, in order to establish the tone of the dagash, for he neglects the nature of the accent in his scientific investigations. ⁸³⁾ In Hosea 12:12, he lays down the rule אין כל נוסחי הפירושים הולכים אחרי נוסחי הנקוד. "Interpretations of Bible passages do not always follow the accents." We may clearly see from his remarks on page 54b and page 55a of his Miklol about the מתקני הנקוד on the former page and מתקני הנוסחים on the latter page, that he considers the accents and punctuation to be of a later development. By ignoring the verse-division, which he does by following Saadya, who holds that there are ten verse-pairs in the Bible which belong together, he shows his independence of the accents. ⁸⁴⁾ ⁸⁵⁾ Of the ten, two are found in Hosea. Kimhi refers to only one. ⁸⁶⁾ The ten verses are as follows : II Chronicles 30:18, Jeremiah 17:11, Hosea 12:11, Jeremiah 10:18, Hosea 4:10, Deuteronomy 4:9, Numbers 35:14, Ezekiel 41:21, Haggai, 2:5, Job 17:5.

*Redak's system
of verse-division
is based on
accents.*

VIII

LEXICOGRAPHY

Redak's commentary on Hosea contains a wealth of Lexicographical material. In detecting the finest distinctions and similarities between words exhibiting a superficial similarity, he reveals a profound mastery of the Hebrew tongue. Being completely at home in the entire bible, he finds it quite easy to draw analogies from any biblical book in order to substantiate his statements.

Even though one must be superlative in his praise of Redak's lexicography, it must nevertheless be said that it is not free from definite blemishes.

1:2 The letter ב of the word בהושע is similar to word אל. He cites passages where the same word occurs.

היה אף במשה דבר ה' (87) רוח דבר ב' (88)
פ' אל פ' אדר ב' (89)

2:1 Commenting on לא ימדולא יספר he says, if they cannot be measured than surely they cannot be counted and similarly

אין אמת ואין חסד. The term מדידה (measure) and מספר (number) apply to sand and the term מספר (counting) can

only apply to stars.

2:1 The following words of his occur in this verse, מבלי

עילת. There is no necessity for adding the word סבה ועילת

*so that of the
 this is a regular
 with lexicography*

since סב and עילה have the same meaning.

4:14 The word ילבט has the same meaning as יכשל. He then cites the verse ואניל שפתיים ילבט ⁽⁹⁰⁾, "and a prating

fool shall fall." It is to be noted that he seldom fails to quote the verse whence the word יכשל appears. It is interesting to note that Redak fails to mention the fact that his brother Moses (his teacher) made the same comment in Proverbs on word ילבט.

However, the source for both of these comments is Janah's "Book of Roots," root לבט ⁽⁹¹⁾.

4:16 כבש though in the singular yet refers to the collective, to many sheep and he quotes יהי לי שור וחמור ⁽⁹²⁾. Redak completely overlooks the fact that Rashi there makes the identical comment, yet he gives his father credit for this explanation. I hardly believe such bias to be excusable.

5:4 לא יתנו מעלליהם he says is similar to ולא נתן סיחון ⁽⁹³⁾ and its meaning is עזיבה וחנחה (permission).

9:4 צמקים Redak says means dry (יבשים).

10:9 Commenting upon עלורה he says it is similar to עולה and similarly זונה, לעורה and כבש, לשד etc.

10:12 חטט means more than צדקה.

11:1.0 לחרדו. Redak says it means to move or shake without fear. He quotes I Samuel 16:4, to bear him out.

12:15 תמוררים he says is a noun. He discusses its form

94)
 in his Miklol in section שער דקדוק לשמות under nouns
 which add a letter at their beginning מהשמות אשר נוספה
ברם זאת בראש. He calls this word a תפסול form.

NOTES

- 1). Geiger, Abraham, Ozar Nehmad, Vol. II, p. 157.
- 2). Ibid
- 3). Lewis, H. S., Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 8, 1889.
- 4). Cohen, H. ., The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Hosea, p. xiii.
- 5). Levy, Antoine, Die Exegese bei den franz. Israeliten vom 10 bis 14 Jahrhundert, p. 29.
- 6). Ibid, pp. 29-30
- 7). Tauber, Jacob, Standpunkt und Leistung des R. David (Breslau, 1867).
- 8). Ibid, p. 6.
- 9). Lewis, Harry, S., Op. cit.
- 10). Tauber, Jacob, Op. cit. p. 10.
- 11). Ibid.
- 12). Geiger, Abraham, Op. cit.
- 13). Ibid.
- 14). Cohen, Harry, Op. cit., p. xiv.
- 15). J. E., vii, p. 494.
- 16). Geiger, Abraham, Op. cit.
- 17). Hirsch, S. A., "Johann Reuchlin" in A Book of Essays, 1905, p. 137 ff.
- 18). Margolis, Max L., The Story of Bible Translations, p. 61.
- 19). Hirschfeld, Hartwig, Literary History of Hebrew Grammarians and Lexicographers p. 85.
- 20). Geiger, Abraham, Op. cit.
- 21). Lewis, H. S., Op. cit., Feb. 8, 1889.
- 22). Goldb rg, B., In introduction to the Et Sopher, Lyck, 1864.

- 23). Cohen, Harry, Op. cit., p. xxx.
- 24). Ibid, p. xxx.
- 25). Ibid, p. xxix, ~~xxx~~ lines 1-4
- 26). Ibid, p. xxxvi -- xxxvii.
- 27). Hosea, 2:17, 3:2, 5:10, 8:13, 11:7,
- 28). Hosea, 2:3, 2:13, 2:17, 2:19, 3:2, 3:5, 4:2, 4:10, 5:10, 6:9, 8:9,
10:6, 11:9, 12:5.
- 29). Hosea, 2:3, 3:5, 11:9.
- 30). Hosea, 2:3, 2:13, 2:17, 4:2, 5:10, 6:9, 10:6, 11:9.
- 31). Hosea, 3:5, 8:9, 12:5.
- 32). Hosea, 3:2
- 33). Hosea, 4:10
- 34). Lewis, H. S. Op. cit.
- 35). Graetz, H., History of the Jews, Vol. III, p. 404.
- 36). Cohen, H., Op. cit., p. xxxvii.
- 37). Hosea, 13:14
- 38). Deuteronomy 19:15.
- 39). Hosea, 11:8
- 40). II Samuel, 3:30
- 41). Genesis, 1:14
- 42). Genesis, 18:14
- 43). II Samuel 20:5, Redak erred in this citation, it should read _____.
- 44). Hosea, 2:14.
- 45). Numbers, 16.
- 46). Exodus, 1:10

- 47). See H. Cohen's note to 9:1.
- 48). See H. Cohen's note to 9:5.
- 49). See H. Cohen's note to 10:9.
- 50). Cohen, H., Op. Cit., p. xviii.
- 51). Ibid.
- 52). Cohen, H., Op. cit., p. xxviii.
- 53). Hosea 4:13, 4:13, 10:7.
- 54). Hosea 10:7.
- 55). Tauber, Jacob, Op. cit. p. 25.
- 56). Cohen, H., Op. cit., p. xii - xiii.
- 57). Miklol, p. 1.
- 58). Tauber Jacob, Op. cit. P.11.
- 59). Ibid.
- 60). Miklol, 20b, 6a, 8b.
- 61). Ibid, 91b.
- 62). Ibid, 4a.
- 63). Lamentations, 3:17.
- 64). Miklol, p. 50b.
- 65). Ibid. p. 117a.
- 66). Isaiah, 44:2.
- 67). Deuteronomy, 28:66.
- 68). II Samuel, 21:22.
- 69). Miklol, 127a.
- 70). Gesenius, Heb. Grammar translated by Conant, T. J., 1875, p. 133
- 71). Miklol, p. 164b.

- 72). Miklol, p. 85b.
- 73). Ibid, p. 85b.
- 74). I Samuel 15:23.
- 75). Proverbs, 17:22.
- 76). Miklol, p. 50b.
- 77). Ibid, p. 155a.
- 78). Leviticus, 11.
- 79). Isaiah, 51.
- 80). Leviticus, 16:22.
- 81). Psalms, 33:1
- 82). Miklol, 46a,b.
- 83). Ackermann, A., Das hermeneutische Element der biblischen Accentuation, p. 64.
- 84). Ibid, pp. 36-37.
- 85). Hosea, 4:10, 10:12.
- 86). Hosea, 4:10.
- 87). Numbers, 12:2.
- 88). II Samuel, 23:2/
- 89). Numbers, 12:8.
- 90). Proverbs, 10:8.
- 91). Cohen, H., Op. cit. note to line six on p. 40 of text.
- 92). Genesis, 32:6.
- 93)L Numbers, 21:23.
- 94). Miklol, P. 166b.