

03
1235
K63H6

A
A
0
0
0
3
7
7
6
5
1
5



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

Hirschfeld

Qirqisani Studies



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Dec. 647918.



PUBLICATION No. 6

Qirqisāni Studies

BY

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD, Ph.D.

LECTURER IN SEMITIC LANGUAGES AT JEWS' COLLEGE, LONDON

LONDON

1918



PUBLICATION No. 6

Qirqisāni Studies

BY

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD, Ph.D.

LECTURER IN SEMITIC LANGUAGES AT JEWS' COLLEGE, LONDON

LONDON

1918

PRINTED AT OXFORD, ENGLAND

BY FREDERICK HALL

PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

B.5.
1235
K.3.H.6

PREFACE

THE following essay is based on a MS. which is not only incomplete, but of which only one copy was available. Of another copy, presumably existing in St. Petersburg. I have been unable to obtain any information. I have published the Arabic text in Arabic characters, because the MS. from which it is borrowed is so written. To all appearance the author wrote his work in Hebrew script. This point, which is not without importance, is dealt with in the essay.

My thanks are due to the authorities of the British Museum for the loan of the manuscripts and books necessary for the work.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

May, 1914



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

QIRQISĀNI STUDIES

A THOUSAND years ago intellectual life in the domains of the Caliphs of Baghdād manifested itself in an intense and many-sided activity. Every branch of human knowledge sent forth representatives proficient in a high degree. Indirectly, all these studies, except theology which was its direct outcome, were connected with the interpretation of the religious law. The doctrines laid down in the Qorān left much room for theological discussion. The metaphysical side of the Moslim faith especially favoured the development of a speculative theology known by the name of Kalām.¹ Later on, the Arabs became acquainted with the writings of Greek philosophers, notably Plato and Aristotle. Through this influence the Kalām was widened to such an extent that the tenets of the original creed were almost overgrown with a kind of philosophic criticism which produced what is termed the Mu'tazilite Kalām.² Side by side

¹ See Al Shahrastani (translated by Haarbrücker), I, p. 26; Schreiner, *Der Kalām in der jüdischen Literatur*; Goldziher, *Die islamische und jüdische Philosophie (Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, 2nd ed.)*, p. 302 sqq.

² Schreiner, *Studien über Jeshu'a b. Jehuda* (Berlin, 1900), pp. 50 sqq., endeavours to prove that Mu'tazilitism owes its origin to the dictates of Jewish teachings in Moslim tradition. This may be true in a small degree. In the main, Mu'tazilitism seems to be the natural reaction against the degeneration of Moslim theology which set in in the second century of Islām. It may be ascribed in the first instance to a more critical study of the Qorān, in which the grosser forms of anthropomorphisms are carefully avoided (see my *New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Qorān*, p. 89). There is even in it no lack of passages in which human free will is allowed. There are many views which Mu'tazilites had in common with Muhammed himself in the earlier stages of his career. The advancement of education, and especially the

with this the Moslim church was torn by the rivalry of sects of widely differing beliefs whose followers combated one another in bloody encounters. The consequence was an unrest both spiritual and political.

All this deeply influenced the numerous Jewish subjects of the Caliphs. They were irresistibly drawn into the medley of different convictions. They, too, were divided into the two camps of Rabbanites and Qaraites, who fought one another with great bitterness, though they spilled nothing but ink in their battles. It is, however, interesting to observe that in two important matters both sects sunk their differences. The first is that from the political struggle of the Moslim sects they drew a common messianic hope, secretly siding with the Shiite rebels who, in the event of a successful issue, were bound to abolish the Caliphate, with its harsh laws concerning non-Moslims.¹ The second was the adoption by both sects of the Mu'tazilite Kalām for purposes of theological speculation, but with a dissimilarity which brings out in the most marked manner the fundamental difference between their respective tenets. Whilst the Rabbanites were careful to apply the Kalām only to the metaphysical side of religion, the Qaraites insisted in subjecting the whole religious law to philosophical speculation.

In the earlier half of the tenth century each of the two sects was represented by a leader remarkable for ability, learning, and zeal for his cause. The champion of the Rabbanites was the Gaon Sa'adyāh who, as defender of his creed, interpreter of the law in its various aspects, Bible exegete and philosopher, has few equals among his brethren. The vindicator of the Qaraites was Ya'kub al Qirqisāni,² a man not less valiant than Sa'adyāh,

acquaintance with Greek philosophy, had a powerful influence. We thus see that various influences were at work to produce the movement.

¹ See my *Jephet's Commentary on Nahum*, p. 9.

² The name is given in the form of Ya'kub b. Isaac by Trigland, *Notitia*

and endowed with great intellect and learning. A clear indication of his fame is given by Abraham b. Daud, who mentions Anan and Al Qirqisāni as 'the heads of the sectarians'.¹

Little is known of the life of this man. His name is derived from the town of Qirqisān,² which is said to be the ancient Circesium (Karkemish) on the Euphrates. The date of his birth is unknown. His education embraced the study of the Bible and the writings of the older Qaraite teachers, besides which his works reveal acquaintance with the Mishnāh, the Talmud, and the Rabbanite prayer-book. He was versed in the Kalām, and took part in discussions with professors of this school of thought. He had also read the Qorān, although he must have had difficulties to overcome in procuring a copy of this book. He had read works on Moslim tradition, and was familiar with the tenets of the Moslim faith. He was also instructed in Aristotelian philosophy, probably from the books of his older contemporary

Karaeorum, p. 115. According to him Al Qirqisāni, Solomon b. Jerōham, and Joseph b. Noah were disciples of David Al Moqammaš. The last named is eulogistically mentioned by our author. Al Hīti (ed. Margoliouth), p. 9, has the same name, which is also repeatedly given in various colophons in cod. Brit. Mus. Or. 2492, foll. 54 v^o and 55 r^o, viz. Abū Yūsuf Ya'kub b. Ishāq b. Sam'awaih. The absence of the *kunya* Abū Yūsuf in my *Arabic Chrestomathy*, p. 116, caused an unnecessary flutter in the criticism of this book by the late Prof. Bacher in *RÉJ.* XXV, p. 155 (but modified in *JQR.*, VII, p. 689), and by Dr. Poznański in *Semite Studies in memory of Dr. A. Kohut*, p. 436, who overlooked the identity of the names Ya'kub and Abū Yūsuf. Even his patronymic Ibn Ishāq is uncertain. We find exactly the same names with Al Kindī, 'the Philosopher of the Arabs', viz. Abū Yūsuf Ja'kub b. Ishāq. Another instance is Abū Yūsuf Ja'kub b. Ishāq Al Sikkīt (died 858). A flagrant example of the free play made with Biblical names even in ancient Arab sources is given in Qor. XIX. 29 where Mary, whose Arabic name is Maryam, is called 'sister of Aaron'. Our author's *kunya* Abu Yūsuf is evidently fictitious; see also Steinschneider, *JQR.*, X, 620 sq.

¹ הקבלה 'ס, see Neubauer, *Mediaeval Chronicles*, I, p. 51.

² Yāqūt writes Qarqasān, see also Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XXXVI, p. 183.

Al Farābi.¹ He had also studied the works of Arab grammarians. He was conversant with the doctrines of the Samaritans and Christians, as well as with other forms of belief, such as the Manichaeans and followers of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. The fruits of his labours he laid down in a number of works, the majority of which are unfortunately either lost or have come down to posterity in fragmentary condition. They are, however, sufficient to secure him our respect, and to justify the expenditure of time and trouble in the study of the remains of his writings

His principal work bears the somewhat fantastic title 'Book of Lights and Lighthouses'.² It is of encyclopaedic character, consisting of thirteen sections with nearly five hundred chapters. The subjects dealt with are in turn historical, philosophical, polemical, exegetical, ritual, and legal, and contain much important information about the older Qaraite sects. Apart from this work he wrote commentaries on various books of the Bible,³ and a treatise on the Unity of God.⁴ On various occasions he mentions an essay on 'Translation',⁵ but does not enable the reader to learn whether this embodied a translation of the Pentateuch or a criticism of translations known to him, or observations on the art of translating. His commentary on the Pentateuch, of which we only possess a small portion, is not accompanied by a coherent translation. This commentary is headed by an Introduction which forms the subject of this essay.

¹ See further on, p. 21.

² The first two chapters giving a survey of the Qaraite sects were published with an instructive introduction by A. Harkawy in the Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, 1894 (in Russian); the chapter on the 'Transmigration of Souls' has been edited by Dr. Poznański (see p. 22); the 'Refutation of Christianity' is printed in my *Arabic Chrestomathy*, pp. 116 sqq.; see also rem. 5.

³ See below, p. 10, and Harkawy, l. c., p. 250. This work is not mentioned by Steinschneider.

⁴ See Steinschneider, *Die arabische Literatur der Juden*, p. 79 sq.

⁵ See p. 18, rem. 2, and the last passages of propositions 20 and 21.

Although Al Qirqisāni was a contemporary of Sa'adyāh, he displayed his principal literary activity after the latter had laid his pen aside. This we gather from internal evidence rather than from historical sources, which are neither full nor very reliable. From Al Hīti's 'Chronicle'¹ we gain, not without a certain amount of manipulation, the year 937 as the date of the compilation of the 'Book of Lights'. This was four years after Sa'adyāh had written his philosophical work which is the last of his writings. Al Qirqisāni's 'Introduction' could not, therefore, have been written much before 940. This explains why we learn nothing about him from Sa'adyāh's writings, whilst, on the other hand, the works of the latter were known to the former. In his 'Introduction' Al Qirqisāni mentions 'a fine commentary on Genesis' by David b. Marwān Al Moqammaṣ. He criticises this work for being too brief in parts, whilst in others it is irrelevant and verbose, 'but one of my contemporaries, he adds, composed another fine book similar to that of David, and we intend using what is best in both and showing where they differ.'² This can only refer to Sa'adyāh, and the admission is remarkable in a Qaraite. It is, indeed, quite noticeable that Al Qirqisāni was not so bitter an opponent of Sa'adyāh and the Rabbanites as other Qaraite teachers, notably Jepheth b. Ali, who did not hesitate occasionally to indulge in abusive terms. It also seems that Al Qirqisāni had read Sa'adyāh's 'Book of Beliefs',³ which must have impressed him deeply, as he found in it theories which Qaraites freely endorsed, and which in many respects harmonized with his own arguments.

¹ I. e., p. 5. Margoliouth, *ibid.*, p. 10, rem. 1, discusses the discrepancy between the two dates given by Al Hīti, viz. *A. Sel.* 1278 and *A. H.* 315, which he ascribes to a blunder by the writer. If we read 325 we get the right date 936/7. We gain the same date by reading *A. Sel.* 1248 instead of 1278.

² This passage is also given by Harkawy, *l. c.*, p. 261.

³ See further on, pp. 13, 15, &c.

It is rather strange that Al Qirqisāni did not receive the attention he deserved at the hand of historians. His name is not mentioned either by Graetz or by the author of the article on the Qaraites in Winter und Wünsche's *Jüdische Literatur*. Fürst makes but one passing reference to him, and even Pinsker has very little to say about him. The reason of this is undoubtedly to be sought in the fragmentary character of his writings, and this circumstance renders it difficult to assign him his right place, not only among his co-sectarians, but also in Jewish literature in general.

As far as is known at present, fragments of his writings are extant in the British Museum and in St. Petersburg. A survey of those kept in the former place has been given by Dr. S. Poznański, but it is curious that he completely overlooked the volume which contains his 'Introduction'. From a reference contained therein to his 'Book of Lights' and his Commentary on the Pentateuch we gather that this was a later work. Although of small extent it is better for gauging his abilities and learning than his legal and polemical writings. He reveals himself as a ripe scholar, philosopher, exegete, and linguist, so that the loss of so many of his writings is sincerely to be deplored.

Al Qirqisāni's legal code takes the form of a commentary on the laws of the Pentateuch. This work he professes to have supplemented by a commentary on the non-legislative portions of the Tōrah under the title *Book of Lawns and Gardens*, which, as stated before, has not been preserved. We possess, however, a fragment of an abridged form of this work in MS. Or. 2492 of the British Museum. It was penned later than the *Introduction*, to which it contains the following reference in the preface: 'I shall mention only part of it (the commentary) in this compendium, and shall also omit the thirty-seven propositions¹ which I framed to elicit the interpretation

¹ See further on, p. 13.

of the Book.'¹ The fragment hereinafter published forms the first part of B. M. MS. Or. 2557, and contains the Introduction to the original commentary. That these two fragments belong together is further illustrated by the following prefatory remark in the latter: 'We intend to undertake the explanation of the Book of our Lord which He revealed through Moses, I mean the Tōrah, with the explanation of its contents as far as they are non-legislative, since we have already dealt with the laws; to which we devoted a special volume.'²

The external dissimilarity of these two fragments is accounted for by the fact that the former fragment is of more recent date, and is written in Hebrew characters, whilst the latter is considerably older, and is in Arabic writing. It seems to me, however, that the 'Introduction' was originally also written in Hebrew characters, and that our fragment is but a transcription. I have, on an earlier occasion,³ suggested that Qaraite copyists adopted this means in order to rule out the Rabbanite reader who, on the whole, was not very familiar with Arabic script. I must uphold this view in spite of Dr. Poznański's diversity of opinion.⁴ The fragment in question not only contains many orthographic characteristics of Arabic in Hebrew square, but also numerous Hebrew passages. The copyist was, in many cases, oblivious of his self-imposed task of transcription, and allowed Hebrew script to stand for Arabic words. These words are distinguished by overlines in the following reproduction of the Arabic text. It is not superfluous to add here that this game

¹ Pol. I 1^o: פאני אדכר פי הדיא אלאכתנאר בעצהא דן אלכל וכדלך
אינא אהדף דכר אלכבע ותלאתין מקדמה אלתי נעלתהא אצולה לאסתכרא
בעאני אלכתאב.

² See the Arabic text, p. 39.

³ *ZDMG.*, XLV, p. 332.

⁴ *Semitic Studies*, p. 439. It is to be noted that the passage from the *Introduction*, quoted by Harkawy, is given in square characters, which leads to assuming that it is taken from a MS. written in the same style.

of hide-and-seek is confined to older MSS., and is therefore helpful in ascertaining the approximate age of the same. In many of these MSS. the copyists even went so far as to transcribe Hebrew passages in Arabic characters. This not only gives them a strange appearance, but also interferes with the orthography to such an extent that they cannot be read without close examination. This peculiar practice ceased in later MSS., probably because the faculty of reading Arabic script gradually waned among Karaites.

The British Museum fragment has been fully described in the new Catalogue.¹ There are, however, a few details to be added. On the *recto* of fol. 1 we find the title תפסיר בראשית ללקרקסאני רצי אללה ענה 'Commentary on Genesis by Al Qirqisāni, may God be pleased with him'. We gather from these words that the copy was made after the death of the author. The name of the scribe is not given. The volume was owned in the first instance by Abūl Majd b. (name of father illegible), and later on by Aaron b. Moses Feirūz.²

The MS. is of considerable age, although no date is mentioned. The frequently faded writing and the absence of a large number of diacritical points render the reading difficult. Many places are worm-eaten, and corners have broken away, to the detriment of the text. Wherever it was possible to restore missing passages they are enclosed in square brackets.

I. AL QIRQISĀNI AS PHILOSOPHER.

As far as we can gather from the existing fragments of the works of our author, he has given expression to his philosophic views in three different places. He states that the *seventh* chapter of the *second* section of his

¹ G. Margoliouth, vol. I, p. 189. For facsimile see plate IX.

² See Poznański, *Die karäische Familie Feirūz*, p. 16; but 250 is a misprint for 2557; Pinsker, *Liqqūtè qadm.*, p. 169.

'Book of Lights' contains a systematic discussion of his metaphysics, but this chapter is unfortunately lost. His *second*, and fullest, opportunity he takes in his commentary on the Book of Genesis, each word of the opening verses forming a nucleus of philosophic research. A few extracts from his reasonings will be given in the following pages.

The *third* place devoted to philosophical speculations is to be found in the 'Introduction'. It consists of a preamble and *thirty-seven* propositions dealing with the various aspects of Bible interpretation. It is in the preamble that the author lays down his philosophic views, linking them to the opening words of the Bible. These words, he says, contain abstruse questions which demand logical thinking, especially on the part of those persons who endeavour to proceed on the way of rationalism and philosophy. Many who desire to establish harmony between the teachings of the opening passage and their powers of thought are troubled by the apparent incompatibility of the former with the phenomena of nature. This, however, is not so. Whoever strives after truth will find that the two supplement one another. The Bible is in reality the fountain-head of philosophy, only the student must not be swayed by inclination and bias.

These remarks show the above-mentioned unity in the application both by Rabbanites and Qaraites of the Mu'tazilite Kalām to matters metaphysical. It is only necessary to peruse a few pages of Sa'adyah's 'Book of Beliefs' to observe this. Although the latter, as a rule, demonstrates his axioms first and merely supports them by quotations from the Bible, he deduces the first axiom of monotheistic belief direct from the Bible in the words: Our Lord has taught us that all things are created and that He created them from nought as stated in Gen. i. 1.¹

¹ Amānāt, ed. Landauer, p. 32.

Al Qirqisāni's comment on the same verse runs as follows: 'In the beginning' means that this is a beginning which was preceded by (the existence of) the Creator only, that He began and created: the world from naught and from no-time. For had He created it in a (definite) period, time must have preceded Him. Time, however, was created together with heaven and earth, and the proof of its having been thus created lies in the fact that we witness the termination of one (span of) time and the appearance of another. If one period was created, all must be created.—While thus combating the Aristotelian conception of the eternity of time,¹ he adopts his definition of time in the words: 'Time is the measure which is cut and numbered by movements. Time is a notion in itself, and is not identical with movement, but movement counts and comprehends it.' In this definition Al Qirqisāni differs from Sa'adyāh, whose conception of time is that of Plato.² At all events we see that he must have studied the writings of the Stagirite philosopher.

Now Sa'adyāh, as well as Al Qirqisāni, indulged in philosophic speculations not without misgivings, being aware that they were contrary to the Jewish spirit. Al Qirqisāni, though not bound by any tradition, alludes to the warnings of the Rabbis against metaphysical speculations by saying that many of 'our people', i. e. Jews in general, consider philosophical research either superfluous or forbidden. Whilst Sa'adyāh allays his scruples with the plea that honest philosophic reasoning is a duty, Al Qirqisāni describes reluctance to pursue it as foolishness and lack of understanding. 'If', he says, 'the fountains of their minds were opened they would become aware that these things are but the implements of the Bible, the ladders and bridges leading to the

¹ See Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. II (3rd ed.), p. 399.

² See Guttman, *Die Religionsphilosophie des Saadia*, p. 80.

knowledge of truth.' The verity of the Bible, he thinks, can only be arrived at by applying the mind to it. These words sound like a direct protest against the well-known sentence of the Mishnah (Hāgīgāh, II. 1).

Philosophic axioms, our author continues, are based on logical arguments which, in their turn, rest on the perception of tangible things and its corollaries. Whoever denies the dictates of reason and philosophy denies the comprehension of every perception. 'The learned of the people' (i.e. not only Qaraites) find it expressed in the Biblical description of Solomon that he was the wisest of men, that is to say, that he discoursed on every kind of plant, from the greatest to the smallest, and every kind of animal, their nature, good and evil effects. From him philosophy was handed down to the Greek philosophers in whose writings it was laid down, and the Bible makes a similar statement concerning Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah (Dan. i. 20). It should be noted that the King of Babel, when inquiring of them about various learned matters, found that they eclipsed all his other counsellors. This is the strongest proof that they excelled the magicians in every branch of philosophy, and establishes the fact that philosophy was the property of the people of Israel.¹ The importance of applying the mind [in the recognition of the creative power of God] is taught in Isa. xli. 20, because this furnishes the most convincing proof that action presupposes an agent. Further evidence of this is given in Isa. xlv. 6, which at the same time demonstrates the Unity of God. The passages Isa. xlvi. 6, 7 show that things are, of necessity, created and are not without a beginning, which is corroborated in xlvi. 9.² From Ps. c. 3 we infer that things could not have created themselves.³ Eccles. vii. 27 lays down that things are so created as to depend one upon another, which leads to the recognition of a Prime

¹ See further on, p. 19 sq.

² Amānāt, p. 38.

³ Ibid.

Cause.¹ Job xii. 11, 12² alludes to understanding by means of inference, whilst the words *now men see not light* (Job xxxvii. 21) mean that he who denies the existence of God is like him who denies the existence of light. The mind proves its existence by arguing, just as light is known by perception. This is also expressed in Isa. xlv. 11 and xlv. 8, which illustrates the movement arising from the region of the ether, or rather from the sphere of fire which gives forth vapour, as alluded to in Gen. ii. 6. The passage Isa. xlv. 8 also points to the sphere of water which surrounds the earth. The words *let the earth open* (Isa. *ibid.*) point to tellurian activity to produce

¹ In his comment on *elōhīm* (Gen. i. 1) the author says, Or. 2492, fol. 3 v^o: וממא ידל עלי אלצאנע גל דכרה הו אנא וגדנא טבאע מכתלפא מתצארה מן שאנה אלחעאדי ואלנפור בעצה מן בעין כאלחרארה אלתי תצאר אלברודה ותנפר מנהא ואלרטובה אלתי תצאר אליבוסה וגדנאהא מע הוה אלחצאד ואלחבאין ואלחנאפר קד אגתמעט ואמתונת ואתלפת כאנת אלאשיא ען אגתמאעהא ואמתואגהא פעלמנא מן דלך אן אמתואגהא ואגתמאעה לם יכן אלא מן גאמע גמעהא וקאהר קהרהא אד כאן אלאמתואג ואלאגתמאע בצד מא פי טבעהא מן אלחנאפר ואלחבאין ואן אלדי מונהא וגמעהא כאלקהא אלפהא מן כל גהה והו אלכאלק גל ותעאלי וקד צדח סלימאן
אלחכים בהוה אלדליל ודלך אן קולה ראה זה מצאתי אכרה קהלת (קה' ו"ב) יעני אני וגדת אלאשיא מתקבלה ואחד באדא ואחד ודלך ליצאחב אלפכר ואלחסאב יעני אנה אד אפכרה אלמפכר כי דלך ותאמלה ערף ווקף מנה עלי באריהא ומדברהא ובהוה אלדליל יתבת אנהא לם תכן תם כאנת
'A proof of the existence of the Maker is that we find varied and opposite characteristics, one being opposed to and removed from the other, as heat which is opposed to cold and removed from it, moisture being opposed to dryness. Yet we find that things come into being from the combination and commixture of these contrasts. From this we learn that this combination can only be caused by one who forced them to combine, since this combination is contrary to their nature. He who united them is their Creator, viz. God. It is this what Solomon makes clear, viz. "I find matters being ranged one opposite the other, so that when a thoughtful person ponders over it he will derive therefrom the existence of their Creator and Governor." This further establishes the fact that things were not, but arose.'

² The same quotation is given by Sa'adyāh, p. 65, in refutation of the Aristotelian doctrine of the eternity of the universe.

vegetation. This is how the doctors of the Kalām prove the creation of the world to be the result of the united efforts of the sphere and the elements¹ as well as the work of a wise Creator. This, the author here inserts, is explained in connexion with the third word, viz. Elōhim,² and is further illustrated by the passage: I, the Lord created it (Isa. *ibid.*), viz. that He placed in these things the proof of His existence. These are constructive proofs built upon perfect knowledge. On these grounds David describes the Tōrah as being linked to reason and beauty in the words of Ps. xix. 8, meaning the *nous* which no harm can touch. The words *gladden the heart* convey that the heart is at rest on account of the perfect condition both of premisses and corollaries. The words *enlightening the eyes* (*ibid.*) allude to the light emanating from the word (*kalām*) and the removal of ambiguity therefrom. The phrase *enduring for ever* (*ibid.*) expresses the firmness of the word in the face of attacks; and to complete these five fountain-heads David adds: 'They are true and righteous altogether' (*ibid.* v. 10).

In the passage Prov. xviii. 4 Solomon teaches that God has enabled the learned to elicit the meaning of words and to render them intelligible to mankind, to put them together and to organize them, just as He endowed their *minds* with the power to draw water from the earth. Whoever denies the exercise of judgement

¹ Sa'adyāh, *ibid.*, p. 55, 'the sixth view', which is a compromise between the theory of Aristotle (see Zeller, l. c.) and monotheistic theology.

² Concerning this the author says in his comment on Gen. i. 1: אלהים ודלך אהבאת אלכאלק גל ועז פנדל מן עלי דלך מן אלמעקול פנקול אן אלדלאיל אלתי תדל עלי חדת אלשיא ואנהא מכתרעה לם תכן תם באנת כאנהא יחבת אלבראי גל ותקדם אד כאן אלחדת יקתצי מחדת כאלצנאעה תקתצי צאנע 'Elohim entails the establishment of [the existence of] the Creator. We prove this logically by saying that the arguments which demonstrate the creation of things from nought also establish the existence and eternity of the Creator, since a thing created must have a creator as the work a worker'.

and its power to draw conclusions by means of argument and analogy is guilty of audacity and ignorance untold.¹ Do men rival one another in aught but the mind? Did not the mind, and the understanding resulting from it with its power of removing ignorance and disclosing latent goodness by means of proof, exist, how could man excel over animals as stated in Job xxxv. 11? Although animals such as the bee, the ant, and the spider (which weaves its nest to catch the fly for food) are possessed of some wisdom, this is implanted in them. Man, however, is superior to them by the power of free choice, as illustrated by his ability to draw water from the depth of the earth. For this see Ps. viii. 9. The passage: *Who hast set thy glory above the heavens* (ibid. v. 1) means: Thou hast put it in the heavens and hast created it as a proof of thy glory and greatness. This is also expressed in Ps. xix. 1, and is further alluded to in the discussion of 'heaven' in Gen. i. 1.² The word *strength* (Ps. viii. 3) teaches that the divine power and justice are so conspicuous in the creation that even infants are able to comprehend it. If a person set a boy a task which he is unable to discharge, this boy may confess his inability to do so, but if the man wax angry and punish him for it, he may, no doubt, accomplish it. The knowledge of the justice and power of the Creator grows firm in the mind of every individual, child as well as adult.

The Psalmist, then, returns to the description of the firmament and what is therein, deriving from it evidence of the existence of the maker (ver. 4). He, then, speaks of man and his high station above the whole creation, and concludes with an allusion to *whatsoever passeth*

¹ This vigorous remark refers, of course, to the Rabbanites.

² Or. 2492, fol. 7 v^o, בה ירד להם קולה השמים לך ירד בה, פנקול אלן עלי אלסמא קולה השמים לך ירד בה, סמא ואחדה בל סמואת עראד ודלך אן הרה אלכלמה אנמא תרל עלי גמע לא עלי פראד אד כאן מצאפהא סמי וקר שרחנא דלך פי אלקול עלי אלתרנסה.

through the paths of the seas (ver. 8),¹ which means that man has been taught by God to plough the waters with skilful steering.

All these quotations (thus the author concludes his observations confirm the theory of the effect of logical deductions, and many more are to be found in Scripture.

The foregoing sketch contains, though in disconnected form, the principal doctrines which one would seek in a treatise on Jewish philosophy of religion, viz. the existence of God, His Unity and Eternity, the refutation of the eternity of time and matter, and the divine attributes of the Creator of the world and His omnipotence. The biblical anthropomorphisms are discussed by the author in Mu'tazilite style later on in one of the canons of exegesis.² Human free-will is alluded to in a passing remark. Although all this is gained from direct deductions from Biblical passages, the author shows himself a true follower of the Muta'zilite Kalām, in which the doctrine of human free-will occupies a prominent position. His whole attitude in regarding reason as the mainspring of metaphysical as well as physical knowledge is Mu'tazilite. In his doctrine of human free-will he is entirely in accord with Sa'adyāh, and even uses the same term to express it.³

Nevertheless, the author cannot escape the soft impeachment of a little self-deception. He operates with notions gained in the course of his training from the writings of metaphysicians, but overlooks that only with their assistance was he able to formulate those arguments which he took as mere deductions from the Bible. He seems to have had some consciousness of inconsistency, and finds solace in the assertion, mentioned before, that the Greeks derived their philosophy from Solomon.

¹ A similar exposition of Ps. viii is given by Sa'adyāh, p. 116.

² See p. 25 (proposition 4).

³ Viz. אֱלֹהֵי אֱמָנָה; Amānāt, p. 152. l. 1

This view, however, was not an invention of our author, but was of older date, and widely spread among Jews.¹

One of the leading doctrines of the Mu'tazilite school was that of the creation of the Qorān. This was a protest against a theory of the old orthodox school that the Qorān was one of the attributes of God, and therefore eternal. One of Al Qirqisāni's contemporaries, Abul Hasan Al Ash'ari, who had been a Mu'tazilite, suddenly recanted, and returned to the orthodox view. The matter caused great sensation, and may perhaps also have impressed Jews. At any rate, it was probably a Mu'tazilite tendency that caused Jewish authors to lay stress on the compilation of the Tōrāh by Moses. In a fragment, probably belonging to Joseph al Baṣīr's 'Book of Laws', we find the following passage²: I must now describe how these things were handed down from records of the Messenger. We say that these matters with their nature, quantities, and qualities were witnessed by the people through the doings of the Messenger before he wrote the Tōrāh down in the fortieth year. For Scripture lays down that the Tōrāh was not written till the fortieth year, thus: God said to His Messenger, write *b'rīshīth bārā elōhīm*. He dictated to him word for word and he wrote from *b'rīshīth* to *w'shāmmāh lū ta'bōr* (sic) (Deut. xxxiv. 4).³

As can be seen, here the author follows the Talmudic

¹ See Targum II to Esther i. 2. This view is much older than the author. Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, II, 4, alludes to the great learning among Jews. See also Judah Hallevi, *Kitāb Al Khazari*, I, 463 (my *Translation*, p. 53), and Malter in *J. Q. R.*, N. S., I, pp. 166 sq.

² B. M. Or. 2580, fol. 44 r^o. This passage is a quotation from a hitherto unknown work by Sa'adyāh, being a refutation of the speculative method of the Qaraites. It was probably entitled אבטאל אלקיאספי אל'טראיע אלסמעיה (see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, p. 600).

³ On the question of the rejection of the doctrine of the eternity of Tōrāh by Jews, see Schreiner, l. c., p. 3, and *Studien über Jeshu'a b. Jehuda*, p. 15. See also further on p. 23.

Agādā (Bābhā bathrā, fol. 15 v^o.) which states that the last eight verses were written by Joshua.

There is one subject in which Al Qirqisāni is so entirely in harmony with Sa'adyāh, that he simply seems to have followed in his wake. That is his psychology. It is probably more correct to say that they are both dependent on Al Farābi's treatise on the 'Quiddity of the soul'.¹ It is particularly noteworthy that in his exposition of the nature of the soul he does not follow Anan,² the nominal founder of his sect, but the most powerful antagonist of the same. His affinity to Sa'adyāh's opinions is visible from the outset in his translation of *the breath of life* (Gen. ii. 7) by the same term as that used by Sa'adyāh, viz. *the rational soul*.³ He describes the soul as a simple substance, but not as an accident, since its definition is identical with that of substance. A substance allows contrasts in its essence, and, consequently, the human soul is open to intelligence and folly, good and evil, joy and sadness.⁴ The soul was created simultaneously with the body and did not exist prior to it.⁵ The body is nothing but the

¹ See Edelmanu גנוזה חמרה, pp. 45 sq. See also Al Farābi's treatise on 'the Beginnings of being' in the Hebrew version by Moses b. Tibbon, ed. Filipowski in ס' האסיף, p. 3; Munk, *Mélanges*, p. 344.

² See Guttman, l. c., p. 198.

³ Or. 2492, fol. 360: נשמת חיים יעני בנסמה אלחיאה אלוה אלנאטקה Sa'adyāh; נסמה אלחיאה פצאר אדם נפסא נאטקה.

⁴ Ibid., fol. 38 v^o: וזן אלרליל עלי אלנפס גוהר לא ערין לאנהא מחדורה בחד אלגוהר ודלך אן אלגוהר יקבל אלמתצאראת פי דאתה וכו' אלנפס תקבל פי דאתה אלעקל ואלנהל ואלביר ואלשר ואלפרח ואלחון ונמיע אבלאקה אלמתצארה. See also Amānāt, pp. 116, 194; Guttman, p. 200.

⁵ Ibid., fol. 36 v^o: וזן סאל סאל פקאל פאנה יקול נשמת חיים ולם יבלק אלוה וכאן הוא יוהם אן אלנפס כאנת מוגורה פי וקת בלק אלנפס פמתי בלקת נקול קד כנא דכרנא פי תפסיר ורוח אלוהים קול מן זעם אן בלק רוח אלנפסאן קד דבל פי קד ורוח אלוהים. ופי דלך קול אבר והו אנה

tool and instrument of the soul. The words *and man became a living soul* allude to this; the soul is the life and the real man even apart from the body. Man is not what appears to the eye, but is the internal force which moves and guides him, and this is the soul. The creation of the soul is an additional proof of the creation of the world from nought.¹ Its seat is in the heart,² and it endures after the decay of the body.

In his 'Book of Lights' the author devotes one chapter to the belief in the transmigration of the soul, refuting it even in greater detail than did Sa'adyāh.³

II. AL QIRQISĀNI AS BIBLE EXEGETE.

No attention whatsoever has as yet been paid to our author as interpreter of the Bible. The obvious reason is that he was overshadowed by Sa'adyāh who also eclipsed him as philosopher. Possibly his peculiar method of treating the legislative and non-legislative portions of the Pentateuch in separate volumes contributed to the neglect of exegetical labours as being of minor importance for his Qaraite brethren. As an introduction to

ואן כאן לם יכבר ההנא בכלקהא באלחצריה פיגוד אן יכון פי קול ויפח ונ'
אכבאר באנה כלקהא מע אלנסם.

This is also alluded to in בקרבו (Isa. lxiii. 11), and in li. 13; Jer. xxxviii. 16; cf. Guttman, p. 204.

¹ Ibid., fol. 37 v^o: פאמא בעין אלמפסרין פועם אנה אענא בקו ויהי האדם לנפש חיה אראר אן נסם אלאנסאן אדאה ואלה לנפסה אלתי הי אלחיה ואן אלנפס הי אלאנסאן באלחקיקה דון אלנסם ונריד אלען נדל עלי וגוד אלנפס ומאהיתהא פמן אלדליל עלי וגודהא ואן אלאנסאן לים הו הדא אלמראי פקט בל ביה מעני אכר יחלכה וידברה והו אלנפס.

The interpreter alluded to in this passage seems to be no other than Sa'adyāh.

² Ibid., וקר קלנא אן מוהלהא פי אלקלב, see Amānāt, p. 196; Guttman, p. 201.

³ See above, p. 8, rem. 2.

his commentary, he lays down *thirty-seven* propositions of interpretation, partly of theological, partly of philological character. It is particularly the latter which secure him a place not only amongst the oldest Jewish Bible interpreters, but also grammarians.

(1) The first of these propositions, leading from meta-physical to purely religious doctrines, deduces from Deut. xxxi. 9 that Moses was Israel's prophet and master. It was he who 'compiled' the Tōrāh from *b'rēshith* to the end, and recorded the historical events from the creation of the world down to his own death. For this reason is the Tōrāh coupled with his own name as stated by Mal. iii. 22, and this is one of the fundamental articles of belief.¹

(2) The intrinsically Qaraite way of literal conception of the holy text is discussed in the *second* proposition, with the modification that absolute literalness in every case lays the Bible word open to misconception. There are many passages in which literal conception is made impossible by the context. Free interpretation must, however, be controlled, as it might result in garbling the narratives, commands, and prohibitions of the Bible. Mu'tazilite influence cannot here be mistaken. Possibly this also means a side glance at the allegorical explanation of the Bible in which some Qaraite authors indulged, perhaps also at Philo, whose writings were known to Oriental Jews; and very probably at the very free interpretation of the Qorān by the Shiites, for whom the author as a Qaraite entertained secret sympathy. Literal conception is, however, impossible in Exod. xxiv. 10, since no human eye can see God, and in Deut. xvi. 2, because this verse refers to peace-offerings, inclusive of the pascal lamb. In other passages both conceptions are allowed, as in Gen. xlv. 26. The allegorical interpretation of this verse (which is supported by Num. xi. 17), betrays the influence of the Rabbinic

¹ See above, p. 20, rem. 2.

Agādā. Onkelos paraphrases the passage by translating 'the holy Spirit rested on Jacob, their father', and it is alleged by Jewish interpreters (Rashi) that the holy Spirit kept aloof from Jacob during the time of his mourning for Joseph.¹ Another instance is Deut. xxxiii. 14 which either refers literally to the annual produce regulated by the seasons, or allegorically to the bounties of this world and the effects of the yearly and monthly revolutions of sun and moon upon the harvests.

(3) Theological rather than philological is the next proposition, which endeavours to establish the fact that Hebrew is the oldest language, and the speech in which God spoke to Adam. This idea is not the author's own, being borrowed from the Rabbanite camp, and based on Midrāsh rabbāh on Gen. ii. 23.² He rejects the opinion of those who claim for Aramaic the honour of being the oldest language. The evidence for the priority of Hebrew is to be found in alphabetical psalms as well as in the final chapter of the Book of Proverbs and in the Book of Lamentations. All these chapters would, if translated into any other language, lose their alphabetical arrangement. This is absolutely certain, and checks the audacity of the opponents. Further evidence is to be found in Gen. ii. 7 (אָדָם and אִרְמָה) and ver. 23 (אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה). A similar proceeding is impossible in Aramaic, because the words for man and woman are taken from different roots. This is irrefutable. The name of Cain is derived from *qanīthī*³ (Gen. iv. 1), but the Arabic form, Qābil, is not formed from (the Arabic) *iqtanaitu*. Another instance is *Seth* from *shāth*, whilst the Arabic form *Shīth* has no connexion with 'appointing'. Similar are the cases of Peleg, Jacob, Israel, Reuben, Simon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Gad, Naphtali, Asser, Zebulun, Dan, Joseph, Moses, Menasseh, Ephraim, Gershōm, Eliezer, Peres,

¹ See also Onkelos.

² See Kitab al Khazari, II, 68.

³ Ibid.

for which names the Aramaic and Arabic languages retained the same or very similar forms. No one dare contradict the statement of Gen. xi. 1, which shows that there was no other language side by side with Hebrew. With the dispersion of the people the language was split up, but according to Zephaniah iii. 9-10 will ultimately be re-united, and all other ways of invoking God will disappear.

(4) In the next proposition the author seems intentionally to lay stress on the fact that in matters non-legislative he shares an important Rabbinic rule of Bible explanation. The Tōrāh, he says, speaks to human beings in their own fashion, or, as the Rabbis have it, the Tōrāh speaks according to the speech of mankind.¹ This means that when the Creator desired to describe himself as seeing everything, He assumed the attribute of the eye; not that He was really visible. In man's mind, contemplation depended on what he knew and was familiar with and judged by outward appearance. Likewise, when God wished to convey to him that no sound could escape Him, whilst the human conception of sound is bound up with real hearing, He represents himself as being possessed of an ear, &c.

The Mu'tazilite influence, which is visible here side by side with the older Jewish custom of transcribing Biblical anthropomorphisms, is given in the form of an inquiry, put to a Doctor, as to how God could speak to man, whilst His speech is of a kind too exalted above him. The answer was that, when God created man, and desired to communicate to him His commands, promises, and rebukes, He employed a speech resembling man's own, and adapted to his understanding. Man proceeds in a similar way when speaking to animals which do not understand human speech, but are directed by gestures and vociferations, differing according to the nature of

¹ Berachoth, fol. 31 v°.

the animal.¹ This describes how we should interpret God's speech to man, and is also expressed in Exod. xix. 19.

(5) In the *fifth* proposition the author demonstrates that the Bible never makes an untrue statement, unless it is to show this statement to be false, or to make its author responsible for it. Were it possible that the Tōrah gave utterance to a falsehood without stigmatizing it as such or ascribing it to an author, it would proffer an untruth in the guise of truth. True statements would be indistinguishable from untrue ones, but God is exalted above such description. All such passages in the Bible are given in the name of their authors as Exod. v. 2; Ps. xciv. 7; 2 Sam. i. 10; 2 Kings v. 25; Gen. xviii. 15. This also refutes the charge that Balaam's she-ass did not speak and that the story about her is false.

(6) The next feature of the Bible is the manner in which it reproduces words spoken by gentiles either in the original or in translation. Some people are of opinion that whenever the Bible reports such words as part of the revealed text, they are in Hebrew, unless the other language is mentioned. This is illustrated by the examples of the two different names given to the cairn built by Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 47), and Dan. ii. 4; Jer. x. 11; Ezra iv. 7, whilst all preceding and following is in Hebrew. It is, however, argued that this rule has exceptions as in Exod. v. 2; 1 Kings x. 9; v. 23, x. 6; Num. xxiv. 11; 1 Kings xx. 18, 31; 2 Kings v. 18; Ezra i. 2; Neh. ii. 2; and also in the colloquy between David and Goliath. Is it likely that all these people spoke their respective languages, but used Hebrew in these instances? The only established fact is that, whatever they spoke, was rendered in the language of the Bible. Now, as Hebrew was shown to be the oldest

¹ The author mentions *جر* for the ass, *كش* and *اخ* for birds, and *احش* for the dog; see also *ZDMG.*, LXVI, 735 sqq. and LXVIII, 273.

language, it is possible that kings, nobles, and learned men acquired its knowledge, as we see in the instance of Rabsakeh (Isa. xxxvi. 11-13), and Ahasuerus (Esther i. 22; viii. 9). Against this it is argued that professional scribes and interpreters were sufficient for the official intercourse of various nations, a view which the author supports by the usage of his own time. In the case of Hezekiah, it is quite clear that only his nobles, and not the people, understood Aramaic. From Gen. xlii. 21-23 we gather that Joseph's brothers did not credit him with the knowledge of Hebrew, which shows that each party used its own language. The Bible, however, renders the incident in Hebrew. Thus, although the Book of Esther is written in Hebrew, the king and other persons mentioned therein spoke their own language and were addressed in the same by the queen.

(7) When recording a narrative, the Bible does not always exhaust all incidents, but makes up for omissions in another place. Thus Jacob's words to his wives (Gen. xxxi. 7, 41) fill a gap left in the preceding narrative itself. The story of Joseph contains nothing about a humble entreaty by him to his brothers not to cast him into the pit or to sell him, but the Bible mentions it in Gen. xlii. 21. When, subsequently, his brethren came before him, nothing is said about his question to them whether they had a father or a brother, whilst Gen. xliv. 19 says the opposite. They could not have reminded him of words which he never had spoken. Further instances are Gen. xxxi. 11; Deut. i. 22; Num. xiii. 2; Exod. xii. 22, the bunch of hyssop not being mentioned in the previous paragraph (ver. 7). Similar instances are Deut. v. 21, 28; Num. xi. 12; Gen. i. 16; Exod. xiv. 12; Ps. lxxviii. 19; Num. xxxi. 16.

The chief purpose of these observations seems to have been to meet the charges of a would-be (or real) critic who thought he detected discrepancies and omissions in the Biblical narratives and laws. Charges of falsifying

the Tōrāh by the Rabbis were made by Mohammed, and later theologians who were better acquainted with the Bible may have laid their finger on passages such as those mentioned above. Strange to say we have no record that Rabbanite Jews ever attempted to refute these charges, but we are in possession of at least one instance where this was done by a Qaraite.¹ No doubt their strict adherence to the word rendered the retort of the latter more cogent. Be that as it may, the author must have felt the necessity of defending the holy book against defamation. Less severe but apparently well-founded are the strictures refuted in the next proposition.

(8) Many passages in the Bible are prolix and broad, whilst others are terse and succinct.² Instances of the former class are to be found in Gen. i. 29, 30; Lev. viii. 17; xiv. 45; Num. xix. 13; Lev. xxv. 8; Num. vii. An instance of terseness is given in Num. xxviii. 24 in connexion with the sacrifices of the days of Passover forming a contrast to the sacrificial laws enacted for the Feast of Tabernacles. Other instances are Num. xv. 11; Lev. xii. 2; v. 10, &c.

Now several of these instances (as Lev. xiv. 45 and Num. xix. 13) bear in reality a grammatical complexion, and belong to the chapter of syntax. They represent examples of *permutation* which is a subdivision of apposition. We shall have an opportunity of seeing that our author was a keen observer of the peculiarities of the Hebrew style, although he was unable to formulate rules by way of induction.

(9) Rabbinic interpretation frequently makes use of the maxim laid down in the Talmud that certain statements in the Bible occupy an earlier, or later, place than they should occupy in their chronological arrangement.³

¹ See my article: 'Ein Karäer über den von Muhammed gemachten Vorwurf jüdischer Torafälschung,' *Zeitschr. Assyr.*, XXVI, p. 111, and *New Researches*, p. 107.

² Cp. Ibn Janāh's *Kitāb al luma'* (Rīqmāh), ed. Goldberg, ch. xxvi.

³ *Pesāhim*, fol. 6 v^o.

This was also recognized by Qaraites, and here again our author is the first to employ it exegetically. Scripture, he says, gives priority to incidents which should have been told later, and defers others that actually took place at an earlier date. Thus the death of Adam is related prior to the birth of Ænos; likewise that of Sēth before the birth of Cainan. The same is the case with Sem, Arphaxad, and Salah. The next instance is Gen. xxix. 30, where the fact that Jacob *served with him yet seven other years* is placed before the reference to the birth of his sons. Yet several of them must have been born before the seven years were terminated. Num. i. 1 refers to an incident later than that told in ch. ix. 1.¹ The command related in Deut. x. 1 is inverted in ver. 3. Similar instances are to be found (but no passages are quoted) in the books of Psalms and Jeremiah. Gen. xxiv. 29-30² should have been told in inverted order, and Zach. iv. 4 precedes ver. 5, but should, in reality, follow it. Ps. xxxiv. 18 should precede ver. 17, and finally Gen. xxxvii. 28 does not state whether the Midianites or the brethren lifted Joseph out of the pit.³

(11) Something akin to historical criticism is visible in the author's review of geographical names. Since he lived in the country of the early history of mankind, the subject of the change of biblical names, into others such as were employed in his time, was possessed of a certain amount of actuality. He therefore considers it a special feature of the Bible that it mentions names of places which were not known at the time when the events recorded took place. The first case is Gen. ii. 11-14. Neither *Kūsh* nor *Assur* were known at the time of creation. At the time of Moses, however, these names were *Habesh* and *Mosul*. Another instance is Gen. xiii. 10, whereof the names are not those known to

¹ See also Rashi on Num. ix. 1, who adds למרת שאין מוקדם בתורה.

² Rashi tries to justify the arrangement in the Bible.

³ As to propositions 10, 12, 13, see further on.

Lot, but to Moses. The next cases are Gen. xiv. 7; xix. 37, 38; xiv. 14; xxi. 14; xxxiii. 16; xxxv. 6 (*Lāz*, i. e. *Beth El*); Exod. xv. 23; Num. xiii. 23, after which (ver. 24) the reason of naming the place *Eshcol* is given. The author, then, mentions Judges ii. 1, the cause of giving the place the name of *Bochim* being given in ver. 5. These instances, he says, can be multiplied.

(14) The Bible avoids the use of objectionable terms by circumscribing them in order to preserve the hearer from unpleasant expressions, as in 1 Sam. iii. 13 (where the word לָהֶם is used reflexively whilst in reality referring to other persons). 'This is as if a person who is the subject of another person's imputations would say that this individual accuses, abuses, and curses himself. By this means he rids himself of the idea that he is accused or abused or cursed.' Similar instances are 2 Sam. xii. 14; Ps. lxxx. 7, and xliv. 11¹ (in both of which the author probably understands לָנוּ for לָנוּ); Ezek. viii. 17²; 1 Sam. xxix. 4³; Num. xvi. 14 for 'our eyes'; Neh. vi. 13, לָהֶם standing for לִי; 1 Sam. xxi. 5. Some commentators explain the passage *he shall stand at the latter (day?) upon earth*, Job xix. 25, in the same way, viz. the last shall be so and so. Finally 1 Sam. xxv. 27 mentions the servants by way of respect.⁴

(15) If a person witness some prohibited deed which he does not prevent he would be held responsible for it. Instances of this kind are given, Joshua xxii. 20; 1 Sam. iii. 13; Joshua xxii. 18; 1 Kings xxi. 19. In the last named instance Ahab is made responsible for the murder which he was able to prevent. The foundation of this is in Lev. xix. 17. Know therefore that if thou see a person committing a sin without rebuking him, thou bearest the sin to which thou givest countenance. This is also intimated in Num. xxv. 13; Ezek. iii. 17; xviii. 30, which means *return and turn others, for if you do not*

¹ Ibn Ezra כִּמּוֹ לָהֶם.

³ See Kimḥi.

² See Rashi and Kimḥi.

⁴ See Kimḥi.

do so it will be unto you for the stumbling-block of iniquity. This is also the meaning of Eccles. x. 4, and the guilt of Sodom as described by Ezek. xvi. 49.

III. AL QIRQISĀNI AS GRAMMARIAN.

As in philosophy and biblical exegesis, Sa'adyāh is also regarded as the earliest pioneer in the scientific treatment of the Hebrew language. His claim to this title is directly and indirectly derived from the grammatical observations dispersed over various of his works which reveal a goodly amount of fairly accurate knowledge. This being so, we must assume that at that time investigations on the Hebrew language had already run through the initial stages, though the names of the fathers of this movement are not at present known to posterity. However that may be, we know of two of Sa'adyāh's contemporaries who rank with him in the front row of Hebrew linguists. The one is the Masorete Aaron b. Moses b. Asher, the other Judah b. Qoreish of Tahort (North-west Africa) who even went so far as to pay attention to comparative studies.

A vague notion is current that the awakening of the study of Hebrew grammar is due to Qaraites. There exists no evidence either to confirm or to reject this notion, but we may, *a priori*, conjecture that the Qaraites were, for reasons of religious practice, compelled to find means for an accurate understanding of the holy text. This was in a lesser degree the case with the Rabbanites whose ritual was regulated according to the Talmud. The late Prof. Bacher, in his well nigh exhaustive essay on the beginnings of Hebrew Grammar,¹ says that hitherto no proof has been adduced that any Qaraite teacher had, under the influence of Arab linguists, arrived at similar beginnings of Hebrew Grammar prior to Sa'adyāh. We are now in possession of a grammatical

¹ ZDMG., vol. XLIX, p. 2.

note by a Qaraite who wrote a hundred years before Sa'adyāh. We also see that Al Qirqisāni is the third to whom a place is due side by side with Sa'adyāh as one of the early Jewish grammarians.

Both Sa'adyāh and Al Qirqisāni lived in a country where the study of grammar had been developed to the highest degree of perfection. They had almost in their immediate neighbourhood, in Kūfa and Baghdād, two great centres in which the study of the Arabic language, which was their own, flourished. It is undoubtedly due to this environment, and books produced by Arab grammarians, that they were prompted to pursue similar studies in Hebrew, and learnt the way how to do so.

We are not, unfortunately, in a position to do full justice to Al Qirqisāni's achievements as a grammarian. As about half the propositions devoted to grammatical research are lost, we can only judge him by the scant material saved. This is, however, sufficient to reveal not only his close familiarity with the Bible and its language, but also his ability to deduce rules from instances which present common features. This is a sure sign of a scientific training. Particularly interesting is it to compare his method to that of the man who, a hundred years later, compiled the first real Hebrew grammar, viz. Ibn Janāh. The latter probably was not acquainted with Al Qirqisāni's writings. Leaving aside the greater fulness in Ibn Janāh's work, the similarity of method visible between them can, therefore, only be explained by the circumstance that both drew inspiration from Arab models. In many instances they use the same quotation for the same rule. Occasional grammatical notes also appear in other places of Al Qirqisāni's writings. I quote here one which shows his bent for comparative study. In his comment on Gen. i. 1, discussing the use of the particle אה, he says¹:

¹ Or. 2492 fol. 10 vo.: אה ולו קאל ברא השמים לבאן פי דלך מקנע אלקואב אן הודא בלמיה מסתעמלה פי לנה אלעבראני מענאהא איה

‘Had this word been omitted, it would not have mattered, but it is employed in Hebrew as *iyḡā* (in Arabic). Hebrew has it frequently after a (transitive) verbal form. In Arabic *iyḡā* is used less often, and would be entirely missing in a sentence like Jer. xxiii. 14.’

This statement is not, of course, exhaustive, but is not without a certain amount of critical tact, since the relationship between נא and *iyḡā* is an established fact. There is at present no older authority known to have ventured the above remark. It is, however, curious that Al Qirqisāni does not offer his grammatical notes as such, but simply as keys for exegetical difficulties. They are nevertheless original, often suggestive, and deserving of attention.

(10) The first class of these notes outwardly forms an annex to that which deals with the question of chronological arrangement of dates, but differs from it, as it merely treats on the logical structure of sentences, and therefore belongs to the chapter of Syntax. The first instance is Lev. xiv. 44, which should run *the leper has been healed from the plague of leprosy*.¹ In Exod. xiv. 21, *the waters were divided* should stand before *He made the sea dry land*.² In Exod. xvi. 20, *it stank* should precede *and it bred worms*.³ In Exod. xxvi. 20, *the second side of the tabernacle* is meant. Gen. x. 21 does not convey that Japhet was the eldest, but *the elder* refers to *brother*, just as the instance prior to it does not speak of a second tabernacle but of the other side of the latter. In 1 Kings vi. 24 *the other* refers to *wing*, but not to the cherub, since the *second cherub* is mentioned in the next verse. Num. xi. 28 (the passage is defective in the MS.).

ואלעבראני יסתעמלהא כתרֵא פי כל מא וקע עליה אלפעל וקר יסתעמלהא
אלערבי פי בעין אלמואצע לא פי כתרֵא אלעבראני מתל מא יקול אלעבראני
הלא את היטמים וליס יקול פי אלערבי אני מלא איא אלסמוואת.

¹ See Riqmāh, pp. 210-12.

² See Septuagint.

³ Riqmāh, *ibid*.

IL Ps. xxii. 30, and *shall worship* should stand after *all they that be fat*. In Ps. xlv. 6, the words *the people fall under thee* form the end of the verse. Prov. xxvi. 16 means that the fool is wise in his own eyes. 1 Sam. iii. 3 does not mean that Samuel was asleep in the Temple, but *before the lamp went out in the temple*.¹

(12) The Bible often treats singular nouns as collective ones and vice versa, e. g. Deut. vi. 4 *Hear (thou) O Israel*. Num. xiii. 22 *they ascended by the south and he came unto Hebron*, the meaning being that *he* came. Joshua ii. 4 and *hid him* stands for *hid them*.² In 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 and *he bid* means *they bid*, viz. his companions. *Israel* is treated as a singular in Exod. iv. 22 and Ps. lxxxii. 9; the same is the case in Deut. xxxii. 7. Isa. xxxvii. 14 has *the letter*, but says afterwards *he read it . . . and spread it*.³ Sometimes dual forms are treated like singular nouns, as in Gen. iv. 24; 2 Sam. xii. 6; Eccles. x. 18 . . . Exod. i. 16; Deut. xxiv. 6.

Instances of plural forms treated as singulars are Gen. i. 26⁴; xi. 7; xlv. 15 although he only had one daughter; *ibid.* ver. 23; Num. xxvi. 8; 1 Sam. iv. 8, *elōhim* always being a plural form, but see Joshua xxiv. 19. מים is always plural, its construct form being מי, it having no singular. The same is the case with פנים. Other plural forms are בתולים and שמים without a singular in Hebrew. To the same class belong נעורים, שמורים, זקונים, מאזני. There are also dual forms actually used as plurals, e. g. מאזני, because in construct state it is מאזני; likewise כנפים Isa. vi. 2, and רגלים in Lev. xi. 23; שנים Prov. x. 26; רחים Jer. xxv. 10; קרנין Dan. vii. 7.

(13) There are in the Bible passages which begin with a negative, and are followed by an apparent affirmative which in reality is also a negative, because the negative particle refers to the second part of the passage also, e. g. Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. ii. 3; Isa. xxviii. 27⁵;

¹ Riqmāh, p. 214.

² *Ibid.*, p. 195.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

⁵ So also Sa'adyāh's translation.

Ps. i. 5; Isa. xlii. 8; Ps. ix. 19; xlv. 19; lxxv. 6; xxxv. 19; xxxviii. 2; cxl. 9; Prov. xxx. 3; Ps. cxxi. 6; Lam. iii. 33; Jer. v. 28; Isa. xxxviii. 18¹; Job xxxii. 9. There are also instances without a negative in which the verb of the first part also refers to the second, e. g. Prov. xxi. 14; Ps. cxxxvii. 3.

(16) Some people are of opinion that interrogative sentences always begin with the interrogative particle η , as in Gen. iii. 11; Num. xi. 23; *ibid.* ver. 22; Gen. xxvii. 21; and if this particle be missing, there is no interrogation. There are, however, many sentences of this kind without the particle in question, as Gen. xxvii. 24²; Num. xvi. 22; xxiii. 19; Exod. viii. 22; Judges xiv. 16; 1 Sam. xi. 12; 2 Sam. xii. 21; Jer. xlix. 12; xxv. 29; xxiii. 24; Ezek. xviii. 13; Jer. ii. 30; Ezek. xx. 31; Jonah iv. 10, 11; Isaiah xxvii. 4; Job ii. 10; Ezek. xxviii. 4³; xxix. 7, the meaning of this verse is: when they seize thee with the hand, thou shalt be broken, but is it possible that they are supported by and lean upon thee, so that their bodies are supported? and when they are at a stand this is impossible. The next instance is Ezek. xxviii. 3; Job xxxvii. 18, i. e. Is there impunity for such deed?⁴ Job xv. 2,⁵ and many other instances.

In many instances, however, the interrogative η is followed by *Dagesh forte*, e. g. Num. xiii. 20; Lev. x. 19; in others the interrogative particle in reality expresses a firm decision, as 1 Sam. ii. 27; Num. xx. 10; Ezek. xxiii. 36; xxii. 2.

(17) If verbal forms in the past tense be augmented (by a prefixed \imath) they are converted into the future. This is very frequent, though in some instances the past tense remains. It is future in Gen. xxviii. 21; Num. xi. 20;

¹ See Sa'adyāh's translation.

² Riqmāh., p. 220.

³ See Septuagint.

⁴ See Sa'adyāh's translation, ed. John Cohn, p. 81.

⁵ See Sa'adyāh's commentary, where Ezek. xviii. 23 is quoted as a parallel.

Deut. xxxi. 4; Num. v. 23. This is so frequent as to require no further explanation. Instances of unchanged past tense are Gen. xxxviii. 9; 1 Sam. i. 12; xvii. 35; 1 Sam. xxiv. 11; xxv. 20; 2 Sam. vi. 16; xii. 16; 2 Kings xviii. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 4; Job i. 1; Jer. xxv. 4; Judges xvi. 18; Jer. xx. 9; Neh. ix. 7, 8.

(18) In many passages the future tense is used, but the past is meant, e.g. Hab. iii. 3, where the literal translation would be *shall come*, though it is only a statement of what happened in the days of Moses; further, 2 Kings viii. 29. In 2 Sam. i. 10, literally *I shall kill him*, really means *I killed him*¹; Ps. lxxxvii. 40; lxxxviii. 49, 50; lxxx. 9, 12; cvi. 17; ciii. 7; Judges ii. 1, in which passage הָיָה must be taken as past tense.

(19) There are other passages with a verb in the past tense, the future being really meant, e.g. Deut. xxviii. 47, *ibid.* 45; xxxii. 13, 15, 19; xxxiv. 10 means 'shall not arise'; 2 Chron. xv. 4; Ps. lxxxv. 2; cix. 18; cxxxvii. 1 sqq., and many others.

(20) There are passages in Scripture which require strengthening for the purpose of emphasis and structure, either by a clause, or a word, or a letter. To the first class belongs [the so-called objective complement] e.g. Exod. xxiii. 5, and the meaning is *thou shalt abandon the enmity which fills thy heart*.² In Eccles. iv. 8 supply *he shall not think and say*: for whom do I labour and am miserable; Num. xii. 14 add *as it were*; xxii. 33 means *unless she had turned from before me*; Joshua xxiv. 19 add *while inclining towards other gods*; 1 Chron. iv. 17 add *his wife*; Hos. x. 5 *that upon they rejoice*; 1 Chron. xvii. 5 add *and from one tabernacle to another*; 1 Kings xviii. 37 means *thou hast turned their heart which was 'aback'*; Exod. v. 23 (?) . . . ; . . . 1 Sam. xvi. 7 insert *for what the Lord seeth*.

As regards the insertion of a single word, this is

¹ Riqmāh, p. 118, i. Derenbourg, *Opuscules d'Ibn Janah*, p. 342.

² Not in Riqmāh.

the negative particle לֹא as in Gen. xxvi. 29¹ *nothing but*; 1. 15 *would that Joseph hate us not*; Exod. ix. 30 *not yet*, as a person is told: 'thou art not the first who does this'. The word אִשֶׁר is to be inserted in Isa. xlii. 5²; Ps. lxxi. 18; Exod. i. 5; 2 Chron. xv. 11; xvi. 9. In Exod. x. 5 insert *one*; 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 insert *my eye*; 2 Sam. xiii. 39 add *the soul*; xv. 12 should be *Absalom took Ahithophel*.³ In Judges xvi. 2 add *it was told*; Isa. li. 1 insert מָמַנּוּ⁴; 2 Sam. xiv. 14 read פָּנֵי נִפְשׁ; xx. 11 add *go*; Isa. lxiv. 10 requires בּוּ after הִלְלוּךָ; Ps. lxxiv. 9 read *how long this*. 'This was dealt with in the book in which we spoke about the translation.'

(21) In many sentences there occurs a word which is a mere *lapsus*, not being required at all, e.g. מָמַנּוּ Gen. ii. 17; אָהוּ Isa. viii. 13; וַיֵּאמֶר⁵ Esther vii. 5; הִלְבֵנוּ 1 Sam. xvii. 14; Lev. xxvii. 3 contain repetitions which might have been omitted. A redundant אֵה occurs in 1 Sam. xvii. 34 &c.

(22) As to words to which ׀ has been added or omitted, the first instance is Gen. i. 30. Other instances are Gen. xxiii. 15; Num. iv. 19; vii. 13; Judges iv. 8; xiii. 4 (וְעַל); xix. 19; 1 Sam. xiv. 4 (וַיִּשֶׁב); xvii. 20; xxv. 6; 2 Sam. xiv. 21; xx. 12; xiii. 20; xv. 34; Gen. xiv. 23; Exod. xl. 37; Ezek. xxiv. 16; Neh. iv. 15.

(23) In contrast to these instances are others from which a ׀ is missing, e.g. Lev. viii. 30; Hab. iii. 11; Num. xvi. 27⁶; 1 Chron. xxviii. 19; Joel ii. 25; 1 Sam. xv. 22; Ps. cxxxviii. 2 (?); Lev. viii. 30; Isa. xxxviii. 14⁷; Jer. viii. 7; Isa. lxiv. 3; Ps. lxxiv. 8; 1 Chron. v. 16; Hos. viii. 10; Lev. xxiii. 40 means וַיִּכְפֹּה; and others without number.

(24) Other instances of the addition or omission of a letter at the beginning of a word, e.g. Exod. x. 7;

¹ For similar instances see Riqmāh, p. 164.

² So also Sa'adyāh.

³ Riqmāh, p. 150.

⁴ So also Sa'adyāh.

⁵ Riqmāh, p. 168.

⁶ See Targum.

⁷ See Rashi and Kimḥi; Sa'adyāh, *or*.

xx. 20, for בעבור ; Judges xiv. 11 ; ¹תמול stands for תמול ; קקלו (Hab. ii. 16) for קלון.

A letter added at the end in ננבתי Gen. xxxi. 39 ; Num. viii. 16, פטרת, which the author seems to consider to be used for פטר. A letter is missing in Neh. ix. 32, where the text has וחסר for והחסר² ; לנחותם Exod. xiii. 21 for להנחותם ; נחנו Gen. xlii. 11 for אנחנו ; סותה Gen. xlix. 11 for כסותה ; 1 Sam. xiv. 33 חטים should be חוטאים ; Ps. xcix. 6 (קורים) ; Jer. viii. 11 for וירפאו ; 1 Sam. xvi. 14 for ביעתתהו ; Cant. i. 6 ; בלבת for בלהבת Exod. iii. 2 ; בשורי Ps. xcii. 12 for בשוררי ; ותחצב Exod. ii. 4 for ותחצב.

¹ So also Ibn Janāh, Kitāb al uṣūl.

² Probably error in the author's copy.

תפסיר בראשית

ללקרקסאני רז"י אללה ענה

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

ان التسمية الله اولى ما ابتدئ عند الدخول في كل امر وذلك كما قال
 דוד עליה אללה ברוך הבא בשם יי וְיָقוּבַע וְיָסֵעַ וְיָשָׁר וְיָשׁוּעַ וְיָשׁוּעַ וְיָשׁוּעַ
 الرب تع جدّه مثل البرج العزيز الحصين الذي يجرى فيه البرّ العادل فينصر ويتلو
 الابتدا باسم الخالق تقدّست اسماءه حمداً والشنا عليه فالحمد لله الواحد
 الفرد الذي لم يزل ولا شئ سواه وليس له صفة تنال ولا حدّ يضرب له فيه
 الأمثال ولا نعت موجود ولا اجل محدود ولا أوّل مبتدا ولا غاية منتهى
 حدّ الاشياء عند خلقها فهي دالة عليه وعلى وحدانيته وانه اخبر عما لا من
 شئ سبحانه وتعالى جدّه اما بعد فيأتا نريد نكلّف تفسير كتاب ربنا جلّ
 ثناؤه الذي انزله على يدى موسى عليه السأم اعنى التوراة وشرح معانيها التي
 هي غير الفرائض والوصايا اذ كتنا قد تكلمنا على الفرائض وافردنا لها كتابا
 مجرّدا ونذكر المسائل التي في الكلام المتشابه والكلام الذي يوهم تناقض
 التي يتعلّق بها المخالفون والمحدون مثل المنانمة وغيرهم وقد عزمّت ان
 لا اداء . . . شيأ بما دقّ وجلّ من المسائل التي تسأل الناس عنها الا ذكر . . .
 الجواب عنه وذلك أتى ارى قوما من اصحابنا من اهل النظر والعلم يتهاونون
 بما صغر من المسائل والمعاني ولا يتكلّمون الا فيما دقّ منها وهم في هذا
 الامر متخلفين عن الواجب من جهتين احديهما ان الذي يجب ان يبتدأ به
 من العلم والكلام (?) ما جل يرقا من ذلك الى ما دقّ وصعب ولجهة الثانية
 أنه رّما انتدب للعالم والمتكلم الحادق الرجل الجذب والعامى فيمسّله عن
 المسألة التي يتهاونون بها العالم لصغرها عنده فيقف في جوابه ويحجّله اذا لم
 يكن عنده لها جواب فلذلك لا يجب التخلف عما هذا سبيله بل يبتدأ به

قبل غيره وليبتدئ من ذلك بشرح معانى **בראשית** اذ كان هو أول التوراة وفيه معانى غامضة ومسائل غلقة تحتاج الى نطق ونظر شاف و خاصة لمن يتعاطا اخرج ذلك على المعانى العقلية الفلسفية وذلك ان قوما ممن راموا ذلك ولم يكن لهم حداقة بالامرین جميعا اعنى الكتاب والمعقول توهموا ان ما فى الكتاب من ذكر الخليقة وترتيبها يناقض للتوابعين الفلسفية والطبيعية وليس *fol. 2 ro.* الامر على ما ظنوا [1] بل من وقف على الامرین جميعا وقوا صحيحا علم ان كل واحد منها مؤيد للآخر بل الكتاب اصل من اصول الفلسفة وهذا يكون اذا طرح الناظر عن نفسه الهوى والميل وسنبيين من ذلك بحسب الطاقة وبالله التوفيق

وقد بين داود بن مروان الرقى المعروف بالمقماص فى تفسير **בראשית** كتابا حسنا نقله من تفسير السريانيين غير انه لم يستوفى فى مواضع منه جميع ما يحتاج اليه مما قصد القول عليه وايضا فاته أكثر الهدر والإطناب فى مواضع منه أكثر مما لم يكن به حاجة اليه ودون غيره ايضا من اهل هذا العصر فى ذلك كتابا حسنا سلك فيه شبيها بما سلكه داود ونحن نأخذ من كلامهما أحسنه ونصف الى ذلك من القول ما نرى أنهما تخلفا عن ذكره وقصدا فيه وقبل نبتدى بذلك فاتا نحتاج نُصَحِّحُ امر المعقول والاضاع الفلسفية من الكتاب بذكر بعض ما نطق به الكتاب مما تأول الى ذلك ويدل عليه وانما نعقل ذلك لان قوما من اصحابنا اذا سمعوا تفسيراً ومازجه كلام المعقول فى (!) الفلسفة نفروا منه وكان ذلك عندهم فضلا لا يحتاج اليه بل بعضهم يرى ان ذلك منكراً وحراماً وهذا من جهلهم وقلة معرفتهم ولو كانت عيون عقولهم مفتوحة لعلوم ان هذه الامور انما هى آلات الكتاب وسلايم ومعاير الى معرفة الحقائق اذ كان صحة الكتاب والدين انما علم بالعقل واذا كانت الازواح الفلسفية ايضا انما هى مبنية على المقاييس العقلية التى اصولها مبنية على علوم الحواس والضرورات فمن انكر الاقويل العقلية والفلسفية فقد انكر كل معلوم وكل محسوس وقد ذكرنا فى الكتاب السابع من المقالة الثانية من الكتاب الذى تكلمنا فيه على الفرائض من ذلك طرفاً ونحن نذكر من ذلك هاهنا ايضا جزوا يسيراً وذلك حاجتنا اليه فى التفسير وخاصة فى تفسير **בראשית** انما ذكرنا هناك مما يشبت النظر فى المعقول والعلوم الفلسفية وإن العلماء من الأمة قد كانوا يستعملون ذلك وينظرون فيه ما وُصف به سليمان

fol. 2 vo. الذي اخبر الكتاب انه كان احكم ولد آدم من انه تكلم على جميع اصناف
 النبات من اعظمه الذي هو الارز حتى اصغره الذي هو الازاب وعلى جميع
 اصناف الحيوان من البهائم والطيور والسماك والذبيب افترى ما الذي تكلم
 على هذه الاشياء غير الاخبار بطبائعها وعللها والنافع منها والضرر وما أشبه
 ذلك وذلك هو ما يقبله الفلاسفة عنه من اليونانيين وغيرهم وهو الآن موجود
 في كتبهم ونظر ذلك ايضا ما اخبر به الكتاب عن دنيال حنניה موشال
 ועזריה اذ يقول وكل دבר חכמה ובינה וג' فأعلم بذلك ان الملك سألتهم عن
 ضروب من الحكمة وانه كان عليهم فوق علم اصحابه وفلاسفته بعشرة طبقات
 فهذا من أدل دليل على أنهم كانوا علماء حذائق بجميع فنون الفلسفة اذ
 كانوا أعلم من الملوك بعشرة اضعاف ولولم يكن لنا دليل على وجود
 الفلسفة في آل اسرائيل غير ما ذكرناه لقد كان في غاية التاكيد كيف وقد
 يكتب الكتاب من ذلك اشياء في مواضع عدة قد ذكرناه بعضها هناك
 وسنذكر منها جملا فيما يستأنف مما يقع في التفسير ومما ذكره الكتاب
 ايضا مما يؤكد امر المعقول واستعماله قوله למען יראו וידעו וישימו וג' وهذا
 في الدلالة من المعقول على ان الصنعة يدل على الصانع وقوله ايضا למען
 ידעו מזמרה שמים וג' وهذا ايضا دليل على الوجدانية من المعقول وقوله
 ايضا שמעת חזה וג' וקולה עתה נבראו ולא מאז וג' هذا في الدلالة على
 حدث الجسم من انه لا يحلو من المحدثات التي هي الاعراض وقوله וזכרו
 ראשונות מעולם וג' هي الدلالة على انه لا يجوز ان يكون شئ قبل شئ بلا
 غاية وقوله דעו כי יוי הוא האלהים הוא עישנו الى الدلالة على انه لا يجوز ان
 يكون الاشياء صنعت نفسها وقوله ראה זה מצאתי אמרה קהלת וג' ای אטי
 وجدت الاشياء محتاج كل واحدا الى الاخر لتجد ذلك الفكر وهذا في الدلالة
 على العلة والمعقول نفاقة(?) كل موجود بعض الى بعض وفي قوله הלא און מלון
 תבחן ביישישים חכמה לאמר المعقول ومثله قوله עתה לא ראו אור ای
 ان من جحد اللثة كمن جحد النور اذ كان العقل قد شاهده بالدليل كما
 يشاهد النور بالحس وقال ايضا וחרשים המה מאדם יתקבצו כלם יעמדו وقال
 بعده הרעיון שמים ממעל אומא بذلك الى الحركة التي تأتي من جهة الاثير
 اعني كرة النار تنشر البخار الذي قال فيه الكتاب ואד יעלה מן הארץ وقوله
 fol. 3 ro. ושחקים יזלו צדק ישיר בה الى احوار ما استحال منه الى المائية على الارض

ومطله وقوله הפתח ארץ ויפרו ייטל ירید בה תלתי الأرض وقواها لذلك فمن
 الجميع يكن سبب النبات لقوله וצדקה תלמייה وهذا هو دليل المتكلمين من
 تساعد الفلك والطباع على حدث العالم وأن ذلك من صانع حكيم وسنذكر
 هذا الدليل الذي ذكروه من تساعد الفلك والطبائع في القول في اثبات
 الباري جل وعزّ وذلك في تفسير الكلمة الثالثة التي هي אלהים فلذلك قال
 אני יי בראתינו اعنا آتة هو جعل في هذه الاشياء دلالة عليه وتلك هي
 الدلائل العقلية المبنية على علوم الحسن ولذلك قال داود عليه السلام في نعتة
 للمتوراة واخباره بأنّها متصلة بالعقل والحسن جميعا תורת ה' תמומה וז' اعنا
 ان ذلك مما تتصل به العقول السليمة من الآفات وقوله מיטמחי לב ארד ما
 يسكن الية القلب من صحّة المقدمات والنتائج وقوله מאירת עינים ארד
 ضيا الكلام ونوره بارتفاع الشبه عنه وزوالها وقوله עומדת לעד ארד ثبات
 القول عند ورود المطاعن عليه والمعارضات ولا يتنقض فيتبين الحق حينئذ
 بتأليف هذه الخمس اصول واجتماعها بقول צדקו יהוה وقال سليمان عليه
 السلم מים לעמוקים דברי פי איש וז' فاخبر ان الله قد جعل في طاقة العلماء
 استخراج المعاني وتقريبها الى افهام الناس بالجمع والتقسيم والترتيب والنظام
 كما جعل في افكارهم الخيلة حتى يرقون الماء من قعر الأرض فمن جحد
 المعقول وما يوجبه من الاستخراج بالدلائل والمقاييس هل تعافى القحة غاية
 مع افراط الجهل منه وهل تفاضل الناس بعضهم الى بعض الا بالعقل وما
 يوجبه المعقول بل لولا العقل وما يوجبه المعقول من استخراج المجهول ومعرفة
 ما غاب عن الحسن بالدلائل المشاهد هل كان يكون للانسان على البهيمية
 فضّل ولذلك قال الكتاب מלפני מבהמות ארץ וז' اعنى ان البهائم
 والطيران كان قد يوجد لها حكمة ما مثل النحل الذي يعمل الكوارات
 والنمل الذي يعدّ لنفسه الطعام في الصيف للشتا كما قال לך אל נמלה
 לאל וז' תכין בקיין לחמה וז' والعنكبوت الذي يعمل وينسج شبكة ليصيد
 بها الذباب لطمعة وغير ذلك من فنون ما يشاهد من حكمة البهائم
 والطير فان تلك الحكمة انها هي طباء وتركيب * فأما الانسان فانه فضل
 على جميعها بحكمة الاختيار الذي هو الاستنباط والاستخراج وذلك مثل ما
 ذكرناه من احتياله للماء حتى يرقيه من قعر الأرض وكذلك ايضا قال داود
 عليه السلم ה' אדנינו מה אדיר עמוך וז' فقوله جعلت بهاءك على السماء

اعنا أنك جعلت في السماء وخلقته دلالة على بهأك وعظمتك وذلك على ما قيل في قوله השמים מספרים כבוד אל וג' وسنشرح ذلك في الكلام على السماء ثم قال מפני עוללים ויונקים וגו' اى بعد ان جعلت ذلك في السما فانك آتيت معرفة عزك وعدلك في الفطر حتى ان الاطفال يعلمون ذلك وذلك ان انساناً لو كلّف صبيّاً فعل شيء لا يطيقه لقال له الصبي ائني لا اقدر فان هو غضبه او عاقبه على تكلفه كان عنده جائزاً عليه لا محالة فمعرفة عدل البارى جل ثناؤه وعزه ثابت عند كل واحد حتى الاطفال ثم رجع الى ذكر السماء وما فيها من الدلالة على الصانع وقال כי אראה שמיד וג' הם اخذ في ذكر الانسان وما فضل به على جميع الخليقة وختم ذلك بقوله לומר ארחות ימים اى انك معما جعلته مستولى على جميع الحيوان فانك اقدرته وعلمته ان يقطع البحار ويسلك في لججها بالتدبير والحيلة وتلك على ما تقدم من القول وجميع هذه الاقاويل تؤكدنا من المعقول والاستنباط والاستخراج وكذلك نظائر كثير في الكتاب فاذا بيّنا المعقول وما يوجبه الدلائل العقلية والسياسية والاوزاع الفلسفية التي هي مبنية على علم القياس فلنقدم قبل ان نبتدى التفسير ذكر اشياء مما يحتاج الى تقديمها في شرح معاني الكتاب والتاويل على مشابهة ليكون ذلك كالاساس الموضوع ليُبنا عليه اذ كنا نخر تمامة جملة الكتاب في الكلام والخطاب والاخبار والسوال من الحقيقه والمجاز والاطلاق والتقديم والتاخير والابجاز والاطناب والقطع والوصل وغير ذلك من فنون استعمالته وهي سبعة وثلاثين باباً فان في تقديمنا لذلك تسهيل لما قصدنا له وبالله التوفيق

اول ذلك انه يجب ان نعلم ان نبيّنا وسيّدنا موسى عليه السلام هو الذى دون هذه التوراة من راس براشيت الى اخرها وهو الذى رفع اليها جميع ما فيها من الاخبار منذ خلق الله العالم الى وقت وفاته اذ يقول ויכתב משה את התורה הזאת וג' ولهذا العلة اسميت به في غير موضع وانها توراته اذ يقول פי ככתוב בספר תורת משה وايضا قول الله جلّ وتعالى זכרו תורת משה لعبدى فهذا احد الاصول

والثانى ان الكتاب باسره على ظاهرة الى ما لحق ظاهره فسادا وابهام مناقضة فاذا كان ذلك او غيره مما يوجب له ان يخرج الظاهر وذلك مثل ان يتقدمه كلام او يكون بعده كلام يوجب له ذلك احتيج حينئذ الى اخراجه

عن الظاهر وذلك انه لو جاز ان يجئ الى بعض ما في الكتاب فنخرجه عن
 ظاهرة من غير سبب يدعونا الى ذلك لجاز ان نفعل ذلك في جميعه فيبطل
 جميع الاخبار التي فيه والامر والنهي وغير ذلك وهذا غاية الفساد وانها
 احتجنا ان نقول ان *ויראו את אלהי ישראל* ون' ليس على ظاهرة وان هذا
 ليس هو نظرا بالعين لما فسد في العقل ان يكون الخالق مما يدركه الخواص
 وكذلك كلما كان من هذا الجنس وكذلك لما قال *וזבחتم פסח ליי אלהיך* ون'
 احتجنا ان نقول انه لم يريد بهذا الفسخ الذي *בין הערבים* وانما اراد به
אלה למוים التي هي لعيد الفسخ اذ كان الفسخ نفسه الذي نذبح *בין*
הערבים انما يجب من الغنم فقط وقد يكون في الكتاب ما يحتمل الظاهر
 والباطن جميعا وذلك مثل *וחחי רוח ילאקב אביהם* فانه قد يجوز ان يكون
 اراد الظاهر الذي هو انه لما سمع ذلك *לחבר* عاشت روجه اى *قَوِيَتْ* وستر
 بذلك وذلك مما يستعمله الناس في كلامهم وقد يجوز فيه التاويل وهو انه
 اراد ان النبوة رجعت اليه اذ كانت النبوة اسميت روح لقوله *ואצלתי מן*
הרוח אשר עליו ون' يدل على ذلك ان منذ غاب عنه يوسف لم يذكر
 الكتاب ان الله خاطبه وانه عند رحيله ليمضى الى مصر وقع به الخطاب ومثل
 ذلك قوله *ומזמנד חבואות שמי* ون' الذي يجوز ان يكون اعنا الظاهر
 الذي هو الفاكهة التي تاتي من سنة الى سنة لانها تنعقد بحركة الشمس
 وتأثيرها وقوله *נדת ירחים* يريد به الفاكهة التي يوتر فيها الشهر
 البطييس والقشا والخيار التي بحركة القمر وتأثيره فيها على ما هو ظاهر. fol. 4 vo.

للحس ويجوز فيه الباطن وهو انه يريد بقوله *חבואות שמי* نعيم هذه الدنيا
 وحرثها التي تاتي بها الغلات من سنة الى سنة التي هي مقدار قطع الشمس
 للفلك دورة واحدة وقوله *נדת ירחים* يريد به نعيم ايام المسح الذي ياتي
 والشمار من شهر الى شهر الذي هو مقدار قطع القمر للفلك دورة لقوله
לחדשו יבכר ונו'

الثالث في ان اللغة العبرانية هي اللغة القديمة وبها خاطب الله آدم. fol. 4 vo.
 وغيره من جميع الانبياء وقد ادعا قوم ان اللغة القديمة هي اللغة السريانية
 فما يدل على بطلان ما ادعوه وان اللغة القديمة هي لغة العبراني دون
 غيرها ما تجد في الكتاب من المزامير وغيرها التي هي مبنية على حروف
 آب وذلك مثل *אשרי חמימי דרך* ون' وغيرها من المزامير ومثل *אשת חיל*

ومثل איכה فان هذه المواضع وهذه الاقاول اذا جُمِعات بلغة اخرى زالت عن هذا الترتيب وهذا وكيد جدا وفيه بطلان لما يدعون وسكبت لفتحهم ومما يدل على ذلك ايضا ما وجدناه من اشتقاق الاسماء فأول ذلك قوله ويצר آلهים את האדם וגו' فاشتق له الاسم الذي هو آدم من الادمة¹ التي خلقه منها ومثل ذلك قوله لأزات יקרא אשה וגו' فاشتق لها اسماً من اسمه اذ كانت منه ماخوذة وليس تجرى على هذا في لغة السرياني لان איש بالسرانية נברא ואישה אחתא وليس אחתא مشتقاً من נברא وهذا ما لا يقدر ينفك منه مَنْ خَالَف قولنا ومن ذلك قوله ותלד קיזן מן קניתי איש والعربي يسميه قابيل وليس ذلك مشتقاً من اقتصيتم ولم يقل ذلك لأن احداً ادعا قدم لغة العربي ولكن لتزليل الشبهة שת כי שת לי والعربي يقول شيث وليس ذلك مشتقاً من جعل لي الله فلان من نفلנה יעקב من בעקב עשו ישראל כי שרית וגו' ראובן מן כי ראה שמעון כי שמע לווי ילוה אישי والسرانية تسميه هم ايضاً לווי وليس مشتقاً من ينعطف יהודה מן אודה יששכר מן قوله נתן אלהים שכרי גד מן בא גד נפתלי מן נפתולי אישר מן באשרי זبولן מן זובلני דן מן דנני יוסף מן יוסף משה מן מושיחיהו تفسيره נשלתה وليس يسميه السرياني والعربي ناشل واتما يسميه العربي موسى والسراني מושה מושה כי נשני אפרים כי הפרני גרשם גר הייתי . אליעזר מן בעזרי . פריץ מן פרצת . עמק עכור מן מה עברתי יעכרך . בעל פרצים מן פריץ וגו' . אבן העזר מן עזרנו . כי שלמה יהיה שמו ושלוש ושקט وليس يقدر احد يدعى انه كان اذ ذاك مع لغة العبراني لغة اخرى اذ يقول الكتاب وיהي כל הארץ שפה אחת الى ان جرى من القوم ما جرى فتشتتوا في اللغات وتفرقوا كما قال כי ישם בבל וקד وعد الله جل ثناؤه برّد ذلك اللغة الواحدة الى ما كانت عليه وان لا تستعمل لغة غيرها وذلك عند مجي الفاروق اذا يقول כי אז אהפוך אל עמים שפה ברורה וגו' وايضا ביום ההוא . وذلك ان كل أمة الآن تسميه بلغتها ففي ذلك الوقت تبطل جميع تلك الاسماء وتقول الخلق بأسرهم "

الرابع في ان الكتاب خاطب الناس من حيث تبلغه معرفتهم وما قد جرت به عاداتهم فيما بينهم وهذا هو معنى قول الرابانيين דברה תורה לשון בני

¹ אל אדמה Probably

٥٦٨ معنى ذلك ان الخالق تعالى جدّه لَمَّا اراد يصف لنا نفسه ان المناظر لا تخفى عليه وكان النظر عند الناس على ما عرفوا وجرت به عادتهم اذّما يكون بخارجة العين وَصَفَ نفسه بالعين لا لانه ذو خارجه وكذلك لما اراد يعرفهم ان الاصوات غير محتجبه عنه وكانت الاصوات عند الناس انما يدرك بحاسّة السمع وصف نفسه بالاذن وكذلك كلما كان من هذا الجنس وهذا نظير لقول بعض الحكماء اذ سئل فقيل كيف يجوز ان البارى جلّ ثناؤه ان يخاطب الناس وليس كلامه من جنس كلامهم اذ كان اعلا وأشرف فأجاب فى ذلك بأن قال ان الله سبحانه لما خلق خلقه واراد يخاطبهم بالأمر والنهى والوعد والوعيد والخبر وكان طبعهم لا تحمل سماع كلامه لشرف ذلك وعلوّه ولانه غير مجانس لكلامهم جعل لهم كلاما من جنس كلامهم يقرب من أفهامهم وتقبله أذهانهم وتحمله طبائعهم وذلك كالذى نفعله نحن فى البهائم وما شبهها فأنها لما كان خلقها مابينا خلقتنا واحتجنا الى سياستها وتدبيرها وتعريفها مما زيدة منها وكانت غير عارفة بكلامنا ولم تكن اصواتنا ونطقنا مجانسة لاصواتها احتلنا لها من الأيمى والأشارة والتصويت ما يفهم به مرادنا وذلك مثل الصقير والنعيق وحركات الأهوات بضروب من الاصوات كما تقول للحمار جرّ اذا اردنا يمشى ونقول له شيا اخر اذا اردنا يقف وكذلك نقول لبعض الطير كرش اذا اردنا طرده ونقول لبعضه اخ ونقول للكلب اخش ونصفر لبعض الحيوان ونستعمل ضروبا آخر من الاصوات لضروب من الحيوان وهذا كلام جليل المقدار وهو نظير لقولنا ان الله يخاطب الناس من حيث يعقلون ومن حيث تبلغه معارفهم ولمثل هذه العلة او قريب منها استغنوا بنى اسرائيل عن سماع خطاب البارى جلّ ثناؤه اذ قالوا لموسى أَلْ يَدَّبَّرُونِ

الخامس فى ان الكتاب لا يحكى قولاً عن كذاب بكلام مطلق إلا بأن يخبر بان ذلك القول كذب او ينسبه الى قائله فكون ناصاً فيه قد انبا عن كذبه وذلك انه لو جاز ان يحكى الكتاب خبرا باطلا من غير ان يعرفنا انه كذب او من غير ان ينسبه الى قائله لكان قد اتا بالباطل فى صورة الحقيّ وكنا لا نعرف من الاخبار المحقّقة والأخبار الباطلة والبارى الحكيم جلّ وتعالى يتنزّه عن هذه الصفة وكذا رأيناه فى كل موضع من الكتاب فانه ينسب القول الذى هو خبر وكذب الى قائله وذلك مثل قوله وَيَا مَرْيَمُ اقْنُتِي لِقَوْلِكِ رَبِّكِ وقوله لَمَّا يَرَاهُ وكذلك المبشر بموت سَالُود اذ يقول وَالْعَمُودُ لَعَلَّوْ وَأَمُوتَ تَحْتَهُ أَخْبِر

בכזבה אז נסבה אליה ומשל ذلك قول גחזי לא הלך עבדך אנה ואנה ומשל
 ذلك اخبر في سרה بأثها فحكمت و جمדת لعلة الخوف في هذا رد لقول fol. 6 ro.
 من زعم ان اتون بلاليم لم تنطق وانما ذلك حكاية عن محكي كذاب

السادس فيما يحكيه الكتاب من الاخبار عن سائر اهل الملل الذين هم
 غير آل اسرائل هل حكاها باللغة التي قيل بها ام قد يجوز ان يكون قيل
 بلغة اخرى وحكاها الكتاب بلغته على جهة الترجمة زعم قوم أن كلما حكاها
 الكتاب من كلام قوم وخطابهم بقول مُرْسَلٍ فانما حكاها على ما قيل باللغة
 العبرانية الا ان يبين ان ذلك كان بلغة اخرى واستدلوا على ذلك بقصة
 االذلي الذي عمله يعقوب واخبره بان يعقوب اسماء دل وان لدن أسماء
 يجر שהדוחא فاما ما اسماء كل واحد منهما باللغة التي اسماء بها ومثل
 ذلك قوله ويדברו למלך ארמיית ما حكي ما قالوه بلغتهم فقال מלכא
 לעלמיון חיי ומשל ذلك كتب ירמיה אלוי اهل الجالية وهم بالعراق بان
 قال لهم خاطبوا النبط بلغتهم وقولوا لهم אלהיא די שמיא וארקא לא
 עבדו וגו' وكذلك ما ذكره في עזרא من قوله ובתב הנשתון כתוב ארמיית
 וגו' فحكي الكتاب كيف كان باللغة التي كتب بها רחום בעל טעם وسائر
 القول وكذلك لما اخبر بما كتب به ארתחשסתא מלך מלכיא וגו' وكان الكلام
 المتقدم عبراني فلما فرغ من حكاية نسخة المنشور رجع الى الكلام العبراني
 فقال ברוך יי אלהי אבותינו וגו' وقال من يخالف هذا القول هذا وان كان
 قد يقع في بعض المواضع فليس هذا سبيله في كل موضع بل قد يجوز ان
 يحكي الكتاب شيئا بلغته ويكون قد قيل بلغة اخرى من غير ان يبين
 ذلك وذلك انا نراه يحكي كلاما كثيرا عن قوم من الامم بلغة الكتاب ونحن
 نعلم انهم تكلموا به بلغتهم وذلك مثل حكايته عن פרעה قوله מוי יי אשר
 אישמע בקולו ומשל قول חירם في كتابه الي שלמה באהבת יי את ישראל
 وقوله עבדי יורידו מן הלבנון ימה וגו' وقوله מלכת שבא אמת היה הדבר אשר
 וגו' وباقي الكلام الذي تكلمت به وقول בלק לבלעם אמרתי כבוד אכבדך
 وجميع ما جرى بهم من الخطاب وقول בן הדד ויאמר אם לשלום יצאו
 חפזים חיים والرسائل التي رسلها الي אחاب وقول اصحابه הנה נא שמענו
 כי מלכי בית ישראל ושائر القصة وقول נעמן לדבר הזה יסלח יי לעבדך וגו'
 وقول כורש כל ממלכות הארץ נתן לי יי אלהי היט' وقول ארתחשסתא

لنحتموه מדוע פניך רעים ואוּד מן ذلك مخاطبة دוד וגלית كل واحد
 منهما لصاحبه وليس بينهما احد اخر غيرهما فهل يجوز ان يكونوا هاوּלי
 بأسرهم على اخلاف اجناسهم ولغاتهم ان يكونوا كلهم تكلموا بجميع هذا
 الكلام بلغة العبرانى هذا ما تمكّن انما كان كل واحد منهم تكلم بلغته
 وحكيّت بلغة الكتاب قال الاولون ما الذى يمنع من ذلك اذ كانت لغة
 العبرانى هى اللغة القديمة على ما قدّمنا من الشرح فيجوز ان يكون ملوك
 تلك الاعصار وحواشيهم وطلّاب العلم منهم كانوا يطلبونها ويعلمونها والدليل
 على ذلك قول اصحاب حזקיהو لרבشקה دבר נא לעבדיך ארמיות ונ' وجوابه
 بان قال ويקרא בקול גדול יהודית فعلمنا من ذلك ان لغة العبرانى قد كان
 يعرفها الملوك وحواشيهم قالوا ويؤكد ما قلناه قوله فى قصة אחשורש
 מדינה ומדינה ככתבה ונ' وقوله להיות כל איש שורר בביתו ונ' ويقول
 ליהודים ככתבם ובלשונם פصح מן ذلك انهم كانوا عالمين بكتابة اليهود
 وبلغتهم اذ كتبوا لهم بذلك قال خصمؤهم هذا ايضا كالأول وهو انه يجوز ان
 يكون قد كان فى القوم من يطلب لغة العبرانى وليس يجب من ذلك ان
 الملك وجميع حاشيته كانوا يعلمون ذلك بل كان فيهم من يعلم ذلك ليكون
 ترجمان بين الملك وبين من يقصده من رسل سائر الملوك كما قد نشاهد
 ذلك الآن قال ملوك العرب قوم يترجمون بينهم وبين رسل ملوك الروم
 وكذلك ملوك الروم مثل ذلك ويدلّ على ذلك ايضا ما احضرتوه من قصة
 יחזקיה וقول اصحابه לרבשקה דבר נא אל עבדיך ארמיות ונ' فاحبر انهم
 كانوا عارفين بلغة الارماني وان سائر الناس من العوام لم يكونوا يفهموا ذلك
 قال الاولون هذا الدليل لنا وهو يؤكّد ما قلناه من ان الملوك وحواشيهم
 كانوا يطلبون ويتعلمون لغات غيرهم لان اصحاب יחזקיהو لم يكونوا واحد و??
 بل كانوا جماعة وكلهم قالوا לה גלמנא באלרמאניّة פאנא נפهم פעלמנא מן ذلك ان الملوك
 مع جماعة كثيرة من حواشيهم كانوا يعرفون لغات مَن يُقارِبُهُم ويراسلهم من الامم
 وقول هولى الى هذا الموضوع كآته ابين غير ان هاهنا اشيا تدفّعه من ذلك قول
 אחוה יוסף אבל אשמים אנחנו על אחינו ונ' وقوله והם לא ידעו כי
 שומעו יוסף ונ' فاحبر انهم تكلموا بكلام فيما يفهم وكان ذلك بالعبرانية
 لا محالة وانهم لم يعلموا ان يوسف يسمع ذلك معنى ذلك انهم لم يعلموا
 انه يفهم كلام العبرانى اذ كان انما يخاطبهم ويكلّمهم ويكلّمونه بترجمان فعلمنا

בני אִסְרָאֵל לְמוֹסֵי הַלֵּא זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרַנּוּ וְגו' וּמִשְׁלֵה קוּלוֹ אִמְרוּ הַיּוֹבֵל
אֵל וְגו' וְקוּלוֹ הֵן הֵנָּה הָיוּ לְבִנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּדִבְרֵי בַלְעָם

השָׁמֵן פִּי אִן הַכְּתָב קִד יִסְתַּעַל פִּי מִוֹאֲעֵ הַהֲזֵר וְהַאֲטָנָב וּפִי מִוֹאֲעֵ
הַאֲחִטָּר וְהַאֲיִגָּז פִּי מִוֹאֲעֵ הַאֲטָנָב וְכִשְׂרֵה הַכְּלָמ פִּי מִשְׁלֵה קוּלוֹ הֵנָּה נַחֲתִי
לְכֵם אִחַ כָּל עֵשֶׁב וְגו' נִם אֵעָד זֶלֶק בְּקוּלוֹ אִחַ כָּל יִדֵק עֵשֶׁב לְהַאֲבִלָּה וּמִשְׁלֵ
זֶלֶק קוּלוֹ וְאִחַ הַפֶּר וְאִחַ עוֹרוֹ וְגו' וְהַלְגָּד וְהַלְחֵם וְהַפֶּרֶת לִישׁ הִי גִיר הַשּׁוֹר
וּמִשְׁלֵ זֶלֶק קוּלוֹ וְנַחֲתִן אִחַ הַבֵּית אִחַ אֲבִנְיוֹ וְגו' וּמִשְׁלֵ קוּלוֹ וְכָל הַנִּנְעֵ בַמַּח
בַּנֶּפֶשׁ וְגו' וְקוּלוֹ וְהָיוּ לָךְ יָמֵי שֶׁבַע שַׁבְּתוֹת הַשָּׁנִים וְגו' וּמִשְׁלֵ קֶסֶה רֵאשִׁי
הַמַּטּוֹת וְהַטָּבָה פִּי בָּב בָּב מִנְּהָ וּמִשְׁלֵ זֶכֶרֶה לְקִרְבֵן נִשְׂיָאִים וְקוּלוֹ פִּי כָל
וְאִחַד קִרְבָּנוֹ קִעֶרֶת כֶּסֶף וְגו' שְׁעִיר עֹזִים אִחַד וְגו' וְלִזְבַּח הַשְּׁלָמִים וְאֵעָדֵתֵ
לְלִקּוֹל יִקּוֹל זֶה קִרְבֵן פְּלָן וּמִשְׁלֵ זֶלֶק כְּשִׁיר פִּי מִוֹאֲעֵ הַאֲחִטָּר
וְקֵאֵה הַכְּלָמ מִשְׁלֵ קוּלוֹ פִּי קִרְאִיִּין אֵיָּמ הַפֶּסַח כֵּאֵלָה תַעֲשֶׂה לְיוֹם שַׁבְּעַת
יָמִים וְגו' וְזֶלֶק בְּחֵלָפֵ מִאֲעֵל פִּי קִרְאִיִּין אֲלֶסְכָּה וּמִשְׁלֵ קוּלוֹ כִכָּה יַעֲשֶׂה
לְשׁוֹר הָאִחַד וּמִשְׁלֵ קוּלוֹ כִימֵי נִדַת דּוֹתָה תַמְנָא וּמִשְׁלֵ קוּלוֹ וְאִחַ הַשָּׁנִי יַעֲשֶׂה
עֵלָה כְּמִשְׁפַּט וּמִשְׁלֵ זֶלֶק אֵיכָּשֶׁר

הַתַּסְּעֵ פִּי אִן הַכְּתָב קִד יִקְדָּם פִּי הַתְּלָאוֹת וְהַתְּדוּיִין מִאֲ הוּ מִתְאַחֵר
וּבְיוֹחֵר מִאֲ הוּ מִתְקַדָּם וְזֶלֶלָּ מִשְׁלֵ מִאֲ קִדָּם זֶכֶר מוֹת אִדָּם עַלִּי זֶכֶר וְלָדָה אִנוּשׁ
וּמוֹת שִׁמִּית עַלִּי וְלָדָה קִינֵן וְכִמִּיעַ מִאֲ בַעַד זֶלֶק וְכִזֶּלֶק יִשֵּׁם וְאִרְפַּכְשֵׁד
וְשִׁלַּח וְקוּלוֹ פִּי יַעֲקֹב וַיִּבֵּא גַם אֵל רַחֵל וַיִּקּוֹל וַיַּעֲבֵד עִמּוֹ עוֹד שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים אַחַ
נִם יִזְכֵּר בַּעַד זֶלֶק וְלָדָה אִוְלָדֵה פִּזְאֵהֵר הַתְּלָאוֹת יוּעַם אִן הַאִוְלָד כָּאִנוּא בַּעַד חֲדָמֵ
הַשִּׁבְעֵ שְׁנֵיִן הַאֲחִירֵה וְלִישׁ כִּזֶּלֶק בֵּל קִד וְלִד רֵאוּבֵן וְשִׁמְעוֹן וְגִירֵהֵמָּה קִבֵּל
אִנְקִצִּי הַשִּׁבְעֵ שְׁנֵיִן וַיִּקּוֹל וַיִּדְבֵּר יי אֵל מוֹשֶׁה בַּמִּדְבָּר סִינֵי בֵּאֵהֵל מוֹעֵד וְגו'
וַיִּקּוֹל בַּעַד זֶלֶק יִשְׁחַטֵּב טוּוִיל וַיִּדְבֵּר יי אֵל מוֹשֶׁה בַּמִּדְבָּר סִינֵי בִּשְׁנֵה
הַשָּׁנִית לְעָאֲחַם מִאוּיִן מוֹצ' בַּחֲדָשׁ הַרֵאשׁוֹן לְאִמְרֵ פִּי קִדָּם פִּי הַתְּדוּיִין מִאֲ כָּאִן
פִּי הַשְּׁהֵר הַשָּׁנִי עַלִּי מִאֲ כָּאִן פִּי הַשְּׁהֵר הָאוּל וַיִּקּוֹל פִּי אִמְרֵ הַבָּרִי לְמוֹסֵי עֲלִיֵה
הַשִּׁלֵּם פֶּסֶל לָךְ שְׁנֵי לִוְחוֹת אֲבִיָּים נִם יִקּוֹל וְעֵשִׂית לָךְ אֲרוֹן עֹזִן וּפִי זֶכֶרֶה
לְהַפֶּעַל קָאֵל וְאֵעֵשׂ אֲרוֹן וְאִפְסֵל וְכִזֶּלֶק נִזְאָרִים כְּשִׁירֵה פִי תַהֲלוֹת וַיִּרְמִיָּהוּ וְגִיר
זֶלֶק וְקִד יִקְעֵ זֶלֶק פִּי מוֹשֶׁה וְהוּ אִן יִזְכֵּר פֶּסוּקִין מִתְּשָׁלִּיִּין פִּי כִּיכּוֹן
הַמְּוֹחֵר פִּי הַתְּלָאוֹת הוּ הַמִּתְקַדָּם פִּי הַמַּעֲנֵי וְכִזֶּלֶק מִשְׁלֵ וַיְהִי כִרְאוּת אִחַ הַנּוֹם וְגו'

يجب ان يكون متقدم لقوله ويرين لبني آل هاريس ود' ومثل ذلك وراعن واما
 آل המלאך הרבר בי מה אלה ארני מתקדם قبل ויען המלאך הרבר בי ויאמר
 אלי הלא ידעת מה המה אלה وهو فی الحقیقة موخر بعده فهذا فی جملة
 القصص وال اخبار والفواسیق ومثل ذلك قاله עיני " אל צדיקים ובעדה
 פני " בעיני רע ובעד ذلك צעקו ויי שמעו فقوله צעקו מתקדם لقوله "
 لانه قصد الصديقين الذي قال فيهم واوנוي אל שועתם ב מן ذلك
 ونظيره قوله ויעברו אנשים מדינים סהרים ود' وليس يعنى ان المدنیين
 اصعدوه من الجب بل اخوته الذين تقدم ذكرهم قبل ذلك

العاشري في انه قد يقع في الكلم مثل ذلك ايضا وهو انه تقدم كلمة في
 القول وفي الحقيقة ان المتقدمة هو المؤخرة في المعنى وذلك مثل قوله והנה
 נרפא נגע הצרעת מן הצרוע معناه נרפא הצרוע מן נגע הצרעת . וישם
 את הים לחרבה ויבקעו המים وقوله ויבקעו המים מתקדם لقوله וישם את הים
 לחרבה . וירם תולעים ויבאש فقوله ויבאש מתקדם לוירם תולעים וيقول
 ולצלע המישכן השנית معناه צלע השנית פי המשכן : אחי יפת הגדול
 לביס יריד ان יפת هو الكبير واتما قوله הגדול רاجע אלי אחי . ולצלע
 המישכן השנית לביס هو המשכן الثاني واتما هو الضاع الثاني من المسכן .
 חמיש אמות כנף הכרוב האחד וחמיש אמות כנף הכרוב השנית יריד الجناح
 الواحد والجناح الثاني ولم يقصد הכרוב الواحد والكروب الثاني لانه يقول
 بعد ذلك ועטר באמה הכרוב השני . ויען יהושע בן נון משרת משה ל . . .

. יהושע אלד . تقدم ذكره كان حادم موسى . اكلو
 וישתחוו [כל דשני ארין] אכלו כל דשני ארין וישתחוו . חציר שנונים יריד
 בלב אובי המלך ثم بعده עמים תחתך יפלו : חכם עצל בעיניו معناه ان
 fol. 8 vo. الكسلان حكيم عند نفسه وقد قيل ان قوله ونر אלהים טרם יכבה وقوله
 וישמואל יוכב בהיכל " לם יריד بذلك ان ישמואל كان قائم في الهيكل
 واتما قوله בהיכל " واجع الى قوله ونر אלהים טרם יכבה בהיכל "
 الحادي عشر في ان الكتاب يذكر الاشياء بالاسماء التي قد عرفت بها

وتشهرت في وقت ذكره لها ذلك مثل قوله הוא הסובב את כל ארין כויש
 את כל ארין החוילה הוא ההולך קדמת אשור وفي وقت الخليفة لم يكن كويش
 ولا اشور ولكن لما كان الولي اعنى موسى عليه السلام هو النبي دون التوراة

עלֵי מַא קְדַמְנָא בַּי הַכְּתָב הַאֲוֹל וְכָאן בַּי וְקַת תְּדוּבִינֵהּ לָהּ קַד עֲרַפְתְּ תַלְכַּ
 הָאֲרֻץ בַּחֲבִישָׁה וּמְוַסַּל וְגַבְרִי דְכֵר תַלְכַּ הָאֲנְהָר וְאִשָּׁר אֵיבָהּ בַּמְעָנִי הַמְּוַדָּה
 בַּי עֶסְרָה וּמִשָּׁל דְכֵר וְיִשָּׂא לֹט אַת עֵינֵי וִירָא וְג' לְפָנֵי שַׁחַת יי וְג'
 כֵּהֵנָּה הַקּוּל לֵיִשׁ הוּא קוּל לֹוֹט וְאִנְהָּ הוּא קוּל מוֹסֵי עֲלֵיֶּהּ הַרְחֵמָה עֲלֵי מַא בֵּינָּה
 הַדֵּי הוּא הַמְּדוּן לְדֵלְכַּ אֲחִירָאן לֹוֹט כָּאן מִנֵּה הַזֶּה הָאֲמַר קִבֵּל פְּסָד סְדוּם תִּם
 אֲחִירָא בַּעַד דְכֵר בְּחֻבְבַּת כְּתִיר כִּיפַּת כָּאן פְּסָד סְדוּם וּמִשָּׁל דְכֵר וְיִכּוּ אַת
 כָּל שַׁרְהָ הַע' וְג' וְקוּלֵהּ הוּא אֲבִי מוּאֵב . הוּא אֲבִי בְנֵי עַמּוֹן . וִירְדָּף עַד דָּן .
 בְּמַדְבַּר בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע . וְיַעֲקֹב נִסַּע סַכְתָּה . וַיִּבְאֵ אַת יַעֲקֹב לְזוּהָ וַיִּקּוּל הִיא בֵּית אֵל .
 וַיִּבְאוּ מִרְתָּה . וַיִּבְאוּ עַד נַחַל אֵיִשְׁכָּל תִּם אֲחִירָא בַּעַד דְכֵר בַּלְעֵלָה הַתִּי מִן
 אֲגַלְהָ אִסְיָ נַחַל אֵיִשְׁכָּל וְכִדְכֵל מַא תִּקְדָּם מִן הַקּוּל וַיַּעַל מִלְּאֲךָ יי מִן הַנְּלָל
 אֵל הַבָּכִים תִּם אֲחִירָא לִיִּם סְוֵי בָכִים וְגַבְרִי דְכֵר

הַשֵּׁנִי עֶשְׂרִי אִן הַכְּתָב קַד יִחְרַג לְחָאֲסַּת מַחְרַג הָעֻמּוּם וְהָעָאֵם מַחְרַג
 חֲסוּס פִּאֲמָא תְּחִימָה לְעֻמּוּם כִּמְשָׁל קוּלֵהּ שִׁמְעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל . וַיַּעַלּוּ בְּנֵי וַיִּבְאֵ עַד
 חֲבָרוֹן מְעָנָה וַיִּבְאוּ . וְתַקַּח הָאִשָּׁה אַת שְׁנֵי הָאֲנִשִּׁים וְתַלְפַּנּוּ מְעָנָה וְתַלְפַּנּוּ .
 וְאִמְרָ לְהַרְנַךְ מְעָנָה וְאִמְרוּ עֲבָדֵי וּמִשָּׁל בְנֵי בְּכוֹרֵי יִשׂ . וְאִעִידָהּ בְּךָ . עַם
 נַבֵּל . [בֵּינוּ שְׁנוֹת דוֹר] שְׂאֵל אֲבִיךָ וַיַּגִּד . וַיִּקַּח יַחֲזַקִּיהוּ אַת הַסְּפָרִים וַיִּקּוּל
 [וַיִּקְרָאָהּ וַיַּעַל בֵּית יי . וַיִּפְרִיִּתָּ] הוּא מִנֵּה מַא יוֹהֵם תְּשִׁינָה וְהוּא פְּרָאֵד וְדֵלְכַ מִּשָּׁל כִּי
 שְׁבַעֲתִים [יָקָם קִין וְאִת הַב] בִּישָׁה יִשְׂלָם אַרְבַּעֲתִים . בַּעֲצָלְתִים יִמַּךְ
 הַמְּקַרָּה שֶׁהָ . וְרִאִיתָן עַל חֲאֲבָנִים . לֹא יַחֲבֵל רַחִים וְג' פִּאֲמָא
 עֻמּוּמָה לְלְחָאֲסַּת כִּמְשָׁל נַעֲשִׂיהָ אַרְם . הַבָּה נִרְדָּה . כָּל נַפְשׁ בְּנֵי וּבְנִתָּיו וְג' וְאִנְהָ
 כָּאן הֵנָּה אִבְנֵהּ וְאִבְנֵהּ וּבְנֵי דָן חֲשִׁים . וּבְנֵי פְּלוּאֵ אֵלִיאֵב . אֵלֵהּ הֵם
 הָאֵלֵהִים הַמְּכִים אַת מַצְרַיִם עֲלֵי אִן אֵלֵהִים בַּי כָּל מוֹזַע אִנְהָ יַקַּע עֲלֵי
 כָּמִיַּע לֹאן מַצָּפָה אֵלֵהֵי . כִּי אֵלֵהִים קְדוּשִׁים הוּא וְכִדְכֵל מִים אִבְדָּה אִנְהָ יַדֵּל
 עֲלֵי כְּתוּבָה לֹאן מַצָּפָה מִי וְלֵיִשׁ לֵה פְּרָאֵד מִיַּהּ וּמִשָּׁל לֵה פְּרָאֵד וּמִשָּׁל
 דְכֵר בְּתוּלִים בְּתוּלֵי וְכִדְכֵל שְׁמַיִם שְׁמַיִם לֵיִשׁ לְלוּאֲחַד מִנְּהָ אִסְם בַּלְעִבְרָאִי
 וְאִשְׁתַּ נַעֲוִרִים . כִּן בְּנֵי הַנַּעֲוִרִים . כִּי בֶן זְקוּנִים הוּא . לֵיל שְׁמֹרִים הוּא וְקַד
 יִחְרַג אִשִּׁיָּה מַחְרַג תְּשִׁינָה וְהִיא בַּחֲקִיָּקָה כָּמִיַּע מִשָּׁל מַאֲזִינִים מְעָנָה מוֹאֲזֵן לֹאֵן
 מַצָּפָה מַאֲזִי . שֵׁשׁ כְּנָפִים מְעָנָה אֲשֶׁר לוֹ אַרְבַּע רַגְלִים מְעָנָה אֲרַגְלָה
 כְּחַמִּין לְשָׁנִים לְלַסְטָאן קוּל רַחִים אֲרַחָּ וְקַרְנֵין עֲשֶׂר וְקַרְנֵין אִתְּמָא דְכֵרְתָּ הַזֶּה

الاشياء بالتثنية لان من شانها في الطبع ان تكون ازواجا وذلك ان الميزان
سبيلها ان تكون بكفتين وكذلك سبيل الطائر ان يكون له جناحين وسبيل
الحيوان ان يكون له رجلين وهي القرون قرنين والرحا قطعتين

الثالث عشر في ان في الكتاب فواسيق تذكر في اول الفسوق معنى على
جهة السلب ثم يتبعه معنى يوجب وهو على الحقيقة سلب اي انه راجع
على الاول وحاكم له وذلك مثل قوله لأ ايش آل ويكوب و' معناه ولأ بن
ادم فوله لأ في الاول راجع على الثاني ايضا أل תרבו תדברו נבהה נבהה
ונ' معناه ולأ יצא עתק . כי לأ בחרוין יודיש קצה ואופן ענ' מענה ולأ אופן
ענלה . על כן לأ יקומו רשעים במשפט ולأ חטאים בעדת צדיקים . וכבודי
לאחר לأ אתן ולأ תהלתי לכסילים . כי לأ לנצה ישכח אביון ולأ תקות ענת
לעד . ולأ נסוג אחור לבנו ולأ ותט אישורנו . אל תרימו למרום קר ואל
תדברו בצ' עתק . אל ישמחו אויבי שקר ולأ שנאי חמס יק' עין .
'' אל בקצף תוכיחני ולأ בחמותך תיסרני . וזמו אל תפק ולأ ידומו סלה .
ולأ למדתי חכמה ולأ דעת קרושים אדע [יומם השמש] לأ יכבה ולأ
ירח בלילה . כי לأ ענה מלבו וינה [בני איש] . דין לأ דנו ולأ דין יתום
יצליחו . כי לأ שאול תו[דרך מות יהללך] . לأ רבים יחכמו ולأ זקנים fol. 9 vo.

יבינו משפט . מצות שפתיו ולأ אמיש ולأ מוחקי צפנתי אמרי פיו . وقد
يقع ذلك ايضا في غير السلب وذلك نظير قوله מתן בסתר יכפה אף שחד
בחק חמה עוה . מענה יכפה חמה עוה נאב الباب الأول عن الثاني כי יש
שאלונו שבינו דברי שיר ותוללינו שמחה מענה ותוללינו שאלונו שמחה
الرابع عشر في ان الكتاب قد يستعمل في الكلام الردى والقبیح الاكنا
وصيانة السامع عن سماع انكروه وذلك مثل قوله כי מקללים להם בניו ذلك
كما يقول القائل فمن يفترى عليه ان فلان لم يزل يفترى على نفسه ويشتم
نفسه ويلعن نفسه يريد بذلك يرفع نفسه وينزهها من ان يقول يفترى على
او يشتمنى او يلعنى ومثله افس כי נאין נאצת את איבי '' وقوله ואויבינו ילענו
למו . ומישנאנו שסו למו . وفولهم והנם ישלחים את הזמרה אל אפם . ובמה
יתרצה זה אל אדניו הלא בראשי האנשים ההם ولم يقولوا ברؤسنا وذلك
ايضا نظير العيني האנשים ההם תנקר לأ נעלה ולם יקולו ولو قلتم اعيفنا
وقوله והיה להם לשם רע למען יחרפוני اراد يقول והיה לי לשם רע فاكنا

מצרים לעיניהם וג' הנה לאבי ולאמי לא הנדתי ולך אניד . מי האמר
 שאול ימלך עלינו יעניי الذين يقولون ذلك على جهة التعجب والتنكير كما يقول
 الانسان مثل فلان يكون ملكا בעבור הילד חי צמת ותבך אי לנן הולד כן
 חי צמת ודלכ איצא תעבב ונכיר הנה אשר אין משפטם לשתות הכוס שתו
 ישתו ואתה הוא נקה תנקה לא וג' . כי הנה בעיר אשר נקרא שמי עליה
 אנבי מוחל הרע ואתם הנקה ת[נקו לא תנקו] אם יסתר איש
 במסתרים ואני לא אראנו נאם יי [ה לא את השמים מלא السما
 fol. 10 vo. والارض בנישך נתן ותרבית לקח וחי לא יח' . לישוא הכיתי את בניכם לא בל
 لأنهم لم تقبلوا الأدب אתם נטמאים לכל גלוליםם ואני אדרש לכם מאל
 אתה חסת על הקיקיון ואני לא אחוס על נינוה . חמה אין לי בלי גם
 את הטוב נקבל ואת הרע לא נקבל . בחכמתך ובתבונתך עשית לך חיל .
 והעמדת להם כל מתנים אי אדא כאנו אדא צמטוק בליד תרצצ פהל
 يجوز ان يعتمدوا عليك ويتكرون حتى تسند متونهم وبوقفها هذا محال
 הנה חכם אתה מדיניאל . תרקיע עמו לשתקים אי هل هدر على ذلك
 החכם יענה דעת רוח ומשל דלכ כשיר גדא ואמא מא זכרוה מן التشديد فان
 الكتاب قد يستعمل التشديد ايضا في الاستفهام وذلك مثل قوله ومما הארץ
 השמנה היא אם רזה ומשל ואכלתי חטאת היום הייטב מעני דלכ אסמינה
 هي ام رزّة معنى ذلك ائحسن ذلك عند سيدي وقد يكون ما ظاهره ظاهر
 استفهام وهو في الحقيقة حزم وانجاب وذلك مثل הנגלה נגליתי לבית אביך
 ظاهره ظاهر الاستفهام وهو قطع وحزم ומשל דלכ קולה המן הסלע הזה
 נוציא לכם מים . התשפט את אהלה . התשפט את עיר הדמים

السابع عشر ان الأفعال الماضية اذا زيد فيها صارت مستقبلية وهذا على
 الأمر الأغلب في استعمال الكتاب واللغة غير ان ذلك قد يتغير في مواضع
 وهو بان يزيد فيها فتكون هم ماضية ايضا فاما التي تصير مستقبلية فمثل
 היה كان והיה לי לאלהים ويكون והיה לכם לזרוא ويكون עשה عمل
 ועשה יי להם ويعمل مוחה מחא ומחה אל מי המרים וימחה وهو أكثر من
 ان يحتاج الى بيان فاما الذي يبقى على الاستئناف فمثل והיה אם בא
 אל אשת אחיו وكان ان جاء الى امرأة اخيه והיה כי הרבתה להתפלל
 وكان اذا أكثرت وبأ הארי ואת הדב وجاء الاسد وكذلك بعده من ויצאתי

ואת שמי אי גילת אמרָתֶּה וולדת מרים ושמי: ובמריו עליו יגילו יעני
 الذي كانوا עליו יגילו. ואהיה מאהל אל אהל וממשֵׁת מענא וממ[יטכן
 fol. 11 vo. אל מיטכן]. הסבת את לבם التي كانت אחרנית. והצל
 . . לבסת את עד כי לא אישר יראה האדם יִחְתָּאֵךְ כי אישר יראה ה' וּמֵא
 ما يحتاج الى كلمة واحدة فانه ما يوهם اثبات وانجاب وهو سلب فكأنه يحتاج
 الى زيادة لا في الكلام وذلك مثل וכאשר עשינו עמך רק טוב מענא וכאשר
 לא עשינו או כמא למ נעמל מעל האל לחייר والا كان القول متناقضا לו ישתמנו ויוסף
 מענא לית לא יִחְתָּד עלינא ויזמר לנו ידעתי כי טרם תיראון מענא כי לא טרם
 תיראון כמא יקאל للانسان ليس انت اول من يفعل كذا وكذا وفيه ما يحتاج
 الى אשר وذلك مثل נתן נטמה לעם עליה מענא אשר עליה. לכל יבא
 נבורתך מענא לכל אשר יבא وهذا ايضا كثير ויוסף היה במצרים מענא
 אשר היה. ויזבחו לה' ביום ההוא מן הטלל הביאו מענא אשר הביאו.
 להתחזק עם לבכם שלם מענא עם אשר לבכם שלם وغير זהו ממשל וכסח
 את עין הארץ ולא יוכל לראות את הארץ מענא לא יקדר احد לו انسان ינטר
 الى الأرض ואמר להרנג ותחס עליך מענא ותחס עיני עליך. ותכל דוד המלך
 מענא נפש דוד וישלח אבישלום את אחיתפל הגלוני. מענא ויקח את
 אחיתפל הז. לעזותים לאמר בא שמשון הנה מענא ויגד לעזותים. הביטו
 אל צור הצבתם מענא ממנו הצבתם. ולא ישא אלהים מענא פני נפש.
 ומי אשר לדוד אחרי יואב יִחְתָּאֵךְ יִכּוֹן ילך אחרי יואב. אשר הללוך
 אבותינו יעני الذي حمدوك فيه يحتاج בו. ולא אתנו יודע עד מה יעני
 حتى متي هذا وقد ذكرنا في الكتاب تكلمنا فيه على الترجمة من هذا
 الباب طرفاً

לחאדי ועשרין פי אנד קד יקע פי הכתב מעני תכונ פי המעני קלמֶה
 שאקטֶה לא יִחְתָּאֵךְ אליה וּזְכָר מִשְׁל וּמְעִין הדעת טוב ורע לא פקולֶה ממנו שאקטֶה
 לֵאנֶה אִדָּא קָאֵל וּמִן שְׁגֵרֶה קִזִּי לא תאכל למ יִחְתָּאֵךְ אִן יקול מִנֶּה וּמִשְׁלֶה את ה'
 נבאות אתו תקדישו וקולֶה אתו שאקטֶה וּמִשְׁלֶה [ויאמר] המלך אחשורש ויאמר
 לאסתר הזו פקולֶה נִאִיִּתִּי ויאמר לא יִחְתָּאֵךְ אליה [ודוד הוא הקטן ושְׁלִישֶׁה] הגדלים
 הלכו אחרי ישאול פקולֶה הלכו שאקטֶה [מ]בן עשרים שנה
 ועד בן ישישים שנה והיה [ואין אני] ואחי ונערי ואנשי המשמר

fol. 12 ro.

אשר אחרו אין אנחנו פשטים وهذه الاعادات كلها اقل ما تكون بعد
 كلمتين بفضل من القولين وقد يقع في مواضع كثيرة את يكون ساقطة وذلك
 مثل ובא הארי ואת הרב מענה והרב פאלאָת שاقطة وقد ذكرنا في الباب
 الثاني من القول على الترجمة معنى طرفا صالحا

الثاني والعشرين فيما هو سمي [ل] ما تقدم وهي الكالم التي يقع فيها زيادة
 حرف ونقصان حرف هذا ايضا قد ذكرناه في القول على الترجمة في عدّة
 ابواب ونحتاج نختصّ منه ههنا طرفا يسيرا من ذلك الواوات التي تقع زيادة
 في اول الكلمة مثل ואת כל ירק עשב מענה את כל ירק. ואת מתך קבור
 מענה את מתך. ואת עשו להם וחיו. וקרבונו קערת כסף. אם תלכי
 עמי והלכתי. ועתה השמרי נא ואל תשתי מִיַד אֵל תשתי. וגם תבן גם
 מספוא יִישׁ לחמורינו. ושם האחד בוצין. והרעו במלחמה. ואתה שלום
 וביתך. ולך השב את הנער את אביש. כאשר ראה כל הבא עליו ועמד
 מענה עמד. והשב תמר ושוממה. עבר אביך ואני מאז ועתה ואני עברך.
 אם מחוט ועד ש' נעל ואם אקח. ואם לא יעלה הענן ולא יסעו. ולא
 תספור ולא תבכה. חצים מחזיקים ופ'

الثالث والعشرين في ضد ذلك وهو في الناقص واو اى اول
 על בגדיו יִגֵב אֵן יִכּוֹן ועל בגדיו. שמיט ירח עמד. ויאמר
 שלום בא ונ'. בכתב מיד יי עלי. מעל משכן קרח דתן ואבירם. הילק
 החסיל והגזם. להקשיב מחלב אלים יִגֵב אֵן יִכּוֹן ולהקשיב. כי הגדלת על
 כל שמך אמרתך מענה אמרתך. ויקדיש את אהרן את בגדיו. כסוס
 עגור. [ותור וסוס] ועגור. ומעלם לא ש'מעו לא האוינו] אמרו בלבם נינם.
 معنى ונינם. וישבו בגלעד בבשן ויחלו מעט מומשא [מלך]
 שרים יעני ושרים. פדי עין הדר כפות מענה וכפות ומثل ذلك
 كثيرة لا يحصا

الرابع العشرين في ضروب آخر كثيرة من زيادة الحروف ونقصانها في اول
 الكلمة הטרים تدע. כי לבעבור נסות את מענה בעבור. שלשים מרעים
 מענה [רעים]. אתמול מענה תמול. וקיקלון מענה קלון. כי למבוא ישי מענה
 כפי ויכּוֹן في אחריו בנימין

fol. 12 vo.

.....

..... قد ذكرناه

..... ננובתי יום פטרת

בעור ומנה בי . . צפו לנו לנוז مع سائر
 شرحناه هناك فإما الذي ينقص من أول الكلمة حرف مثل שומר הברית
 וחסד מענה והחסד . לנחותם בדרך מענה להנחותם . בני איש אחד נחנו
 מענה אנחנו . וברם ענבים סותה מענה כסותו . ואם الذي ينقص من الوسط
 فإنة مثل חוטאים . ליי לאכול על הדם מענה חוטאים . קורים (so) אל יי והוא
 יענם . וירפו [את שבר מענה וירפאו . כיעתתו רוח מענה כיעתתהו . עין
 שזפתו . בלבת איש בלהבת איש . ותבט [עיני בשורי] מענה בשוררי .
 ותתצב ירד ותתיצב אחותו

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

LD
URL

MAY 21 1968

REC'D
URL-LD

MAY 24 1968

REC'D LD-URL

JUN 14 1977

Form L9-40m-7,'56 (C790s4)444

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Gaylord
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.



AA 000 377 651 5

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

4 5 6 7 8 9 0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59
FORM L 30202

CALL NUMBER

PS1235, K63H6

SER VOL PT COP

AUTHOR

