

*The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Proverbs: A Case of Mistaken Attribution*¹

NAOMI GRUNHAUS

Stern College for Women, New York

In his book *The Commentaries on Proverbs of the Kimhi Family* (Hebrew), F. Talmage attributes the commentary on Proverbs contained in MS Vatican Ebr. 89 to Rabbi David Kimhi (Radak).² The manuscript itself ascribes authorship to Joseph Kimhi, Radak's father, although the elder Kimhi was not its author, as the commentary is different from the known commentary on Proverbs of Joseph Kimhi.³ An annotated full version of the text is presented in Talmage's book, alongside the commentaries of Joseph and Moses Kimhi, with the supposition that it is in fact Radak's commentary.⁴

Attribution of the commentary to Radak is based on U. Cassuto's remarks in his description of the manuscript.⁵ Talmage offers further evidence from the text of the commentary to corroborate Cassuto's attribution of the text to Radak. This paper challenges the assignment of the commentary to Radak.⁶

¹ It is my pleasure to acknowledge the support of a faculty research incentive grant for this paper from Stern College for Women, made possible through the generosity of Ms E. Billi Ivry. I would also like to thank Yisrael Dubitsky of the Jewish Theological Seminary library in New York for his gracious assistance in locating and using some of the primary sources examined in this article, for some important methodological insights related to those sources and for reading and commenting on the entire article.

² The manuscript is of the fourteenth century in Sefardic script.

³ The manuscript asserts on its front cover that it contains Joseph Kimhi's commentary to Proverbs, and the commentary begins **אמר יוסף קמחי הספרדי** 'Joseph Kimhi the Sefardi said'. Apparently there was some confusion between the various Kimhi commentaries even in the medieval period. In his fourteenth-century commentary on Proverbs, Joseph Ibn Nahmias refers to commentaries of the Kimhi family by name a number of times. See **פירוש על משלי לר' יוסף** **אבן נחמיה** (Meqise Nirdamim, Berlin, 1911), pp. xii–xiv. In two cases, his comments on Prov. 3:30 and 6:19, Ibn Nahmias quotes a comment in the name of Radak and the comment is not actually found in any of Radak's works, but *is* found in his father's commentary on Proverbs. In two other cases, Prov. 12:27 and 26:9, Ibn Nahmias quotes a comment in the name of Joseph Kimhi. The comment in 12:27 is found in Joseph Kimhi's commentary, but the one in 26:9 is not. Joseph Kimhi's commentary is also known by the name **ספר חוקה**.

⁴ The text of the commentary is found in F. Talmage, ed., **פירושים למשלי לבית קמחי** (Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1990), pp. 328–427. Talmage's analysis of its authorship is found on pp. 328–330 of his lengthy introduction to the book and a description of the commentary is found on pp. 330–331. Also see his *David Kimhi: The Man and the Commentaries* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1975), pp. 59–60. The annotated version of the text that is presented is based on the single manuscript, which contains a commentary through Prov. 21:14. Talmage's edition of the commentary is laid out carefully and easy to read. The 1990 Hebrew book was published posthumously, but consists of work done by Professor Talmage himself.

⁵ Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Codices Vaticani Hebraici* (Bybliotheca Vaticana, Città del Vaticano, 1956), pp. 129–130. Only the attribution of the commentary to Joseph Kimhi's son is disputed. Cassuto's assertion that the commentary is not Joseph Kimhi's is confirmed by the many copies of Joseph Kimhi's actual commentary, which are distinct from it.

⁶ It was common for the works of lesser scholars to be mistakenly attributed to prominent figures of their time. Moses Kimhi's commentary on Proverbs was mistakenly attributed to Abra-

Talmage hints in his introduction at some reservations concerning the nature of his proofs and expresses surprise at some of the stylistic discrepancies between Radak's commentaries elsewhere and the Proverbs commentary (henceforth *'the commentary'*), but his assumption throughout the book is that Radak had in fact authored *the commentary*.⁷ The publication of *the commentary* in a volume alongside Radak's father and brother's commentaries reinforces this belief.⁸

A. Examination of proofs marshalled by Cassuto and Talmage

Cassuto offers two proofs for Radak's authorship of *the commentary*.⁹ One is the use of the term *רבי אחי*, 'my teacher my brother', on folio 61a of the manuscript (comments on Prov. 20:25), which Cassuto understands as a reference to Moses Kimhi. The other is an inserted note in the margin at the end of *the commentary* on folio 62a, which states: *עד כאן פירוש ר' יוסף*, 'until here is the commentary of Rabbi Joseph', in which the name Joseph was erased and amended to David. The identity of the corrector of the note is unknown.

Concerning the first proof, Talmage asserts:

The strongest evidence is of course the quotation of a definition from 'my teacher my brother' in the comments on Prov. 20:25, a definition that is not found in the commentary of Moses Kimhi, but is also found in [Radak's] *Shorashim*, root *loa* in the name of 'my teacher my brother', a reference that

ham Ibn Ezra (Talmage, *פירושים* as in n. 4, pp. טז–יח). Y. N. Epstein discusses the authorship of pseudo-Rashi to Chronicles in *מחקרים בספרות התלמוד ובלשונות שמיות* (Jerusalem, 1984), vol. 1, pp. 278–285. For a discussion of the mistaken attribution of Rashi's biblical commentaries to Rabbi Joseph Kara see M. L. Katzenellenbogen, *יהושע שופטים עם פירוש רש"י* (Mosad ha-Rav Kook, Jerusalem, 1987), pp. [1], nn. 2–3. E. Kanarfogel cites numerous examples of the phenomenon of mistaken attribution of the works of lesser scholars to greater ones in his *Peering through the Lattices: Mysical, Magical and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period* (Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 2000), p. 185, n. 118.

⁷ No hesitation is expressed in the 1975 English book, but on page יט of the introduction to the 1990 Hebrew book Talmage states: *שכן עולמות, שכן עולמות, שכן עולמות*, 'It is not advisable to build worlds on stylistic proofs, as these worlds are easily destroyed.' Talmage puzzles over several dissimilarities between Radak's commentaries and *the commentary* in his introduction (pp. לו–מב), and credits these discrepancies primarily to Radak's negative reaction to the length and complexity of his brother's commentary. He also mentions the statement in the introduction to *the commentary* that it was written specifically for *המון העם*, 'the masses of people'. Talmage reasons that due to the unsophisticated audience for which the commentary was intended, Radak curtailed some aspects of his usual method. Talmage also downplays the significance of contradictions between Radak's works and *the commentary* by showing other examples of inconsistencies in Radak's interpretation of verses in his biblical commentaries.

⁸ In the Encyclopedia Judaica (1971–72) entry for David Kimhi, Talmage wrote: 'There are several medieval testimonies to commentaries on the remaining four books of the Pentateuch and on Proverbs but these, like the Job commentary in Y. Schwartz's *Tiqwat Enosh* (Berlin, 1868), may have been culled from his philological writings.' Therefore, Talmage's discovery of Cassuto's comment concerning the authorship of *the commentary* must have been made between the writing of the entry in the encyclopedia and the publication of his English book in 1975.

⁹ Cassuto mentions that these two proofs are 'inter alia', but does not allude to the nature of other proofs.

supports Cassuto's identification.¹⁰

The rationale is that since the same definition of a word appears in the name of Radak's brother in the two works, one of which Radak unquestionably authored, the other work must of necessity be ascribed to Radak. In reality, though, the actual text of Radak's *Shorashim* does not credit the stated definition to 'my teacher my brother,' but rather presents it as Radak's own, which weakens rather than strengthens Cassuto's claim.¹¹

While Radak refers to his brother in his commentaries and *Shorashim*,¹² he always refers to him by name, most often as **רבי משה [זכרנו לברכה]**, 'my teacher my brother, Rabbi Moses [of blessed memory]', and not simply as 'my teacher my brother'.¹³ Indeed, the fact that an interpretation known to have been said by Radak is referred to as having been said by **רבי אחי** in the *commentary* suggests that the author of the *commentary* was not Radak, but was rather referring to Radak's interpretation in the *Shorashim*.¹⁴

Talmage offers his own proofs of Radak's authorship of the *commentary* in addition to Cassuto's.¹⁵ One is that the writer of the *commentary* frequently uses the expression **כפל הענין במלות שונות**, 'repetition of an idea in different words', as Radak does.¹⁶

Another is that when commenting on the word **ילכדונו** in the comments on Prov. 5:22, the *commentary* states: **ודקדוקו מבואר בחלק הדקדוק**, 'Its grammar is explained in the grammar part [presumably of the *Mikhlol*].' An explanation of the word **ילכדונו** is found in Radak's *Mikhlol*,¹⁷ but again the use of terminology in the *commentary* differs from Radak's.¹⁸ Radak al-

¹⁰ Talmage, **פירושים** (as in n. 4), p. ט"ז. The translation of the passage is my own.

¹¹ Talmage indicates that he used the printed edition of the *Sefer ha-Shorashim* (Jo. H. R. Biesenthal and F. Lebrecht, ed., 1847, reprinted Jerusalem, 1967). His mistake appears to have arisen from a confusion of the entry **שנה** in the *Shorashim*, in which Radak mentions a rabbinic interpretation in the name of his brother but this interpretation is not used in the *commentary*, and the entry **לוע**, in which Moses Kimhi is not mentioned at all. Talmage's use of the entry **שנה** is discussed below.

¹² A list of thirteen references to Moses Kimhi in Radak's commentaries is found in E. Z. Melamed, **מפרשי המקרא** (Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1978), p. 749, n. 87 and a list of ten cases in the *Shorashim* is found in D. Kimhi, *Sefer ha-Shorashim* (as in n. 11), p. ixxxx.

¹³ The term **זכרנו לברכה** is used in more than half of Radak's references to his brother. In two references in the commentaries, his comments on Isa. 19:6 and Ezek. 21:20, Radak shortened his standard formula **משה רבי אחי** to **אחי רבי משה (ז"ל)**.

¹⁴ It seems doubtful that Cassuto's intention was as Talmage understood it. Rather, Cassuto simply meant that the expression 'my teacher my brother' is used by Radak in other cases in which he refers to Moses Kimhi and therefore the use of the term in the *commentary* suggests that that too might have been written by Radak. In addition, the fact that the interpretation that is quoted in the *commentary* in the name of **רבי אחי** is also found in Radak's *Shorashim*, albeit not in the name of Moses Kimhi, means that Radak was aware of that interpretation.

¹⁵ See Talmage, **פירושים** (as in n. 4), p. יט.

¹⁶ In the *commentary*, the term **כפל הענין** is often the only comment to a verse, which is not the case in Radak's works. The *commentary* also uses the expression **כפל לשון**, 'double language' (e.g., its comments on Prov. 4:5 and 4:15), which is much less common in Radak's works than the expression **כפל הענין במלים שונות**. Talmage alludes to additional unspecified stylistic similarities between the *commentary* and Radak's works.

¹⁷ David Kimhi, **ספר מכלול**, ed. I. Rittenberg (1864; reprinted Jerusalem, 1966), p. 35b.

¹⁸ The *Mikhlol* was originally written as a two-part work, one part grammatical and the other

ways refers to his *Mikhloḥ* in the first person stating: / בארתי / כמו שהבאתי / כתבתי בספר מכלול. In addition, while the term חלק הדקדוק describes the grammatical section of Radak's *Mikhloḥ*, it is always adjoined to the name of the full book as בספר מכלול בחלק הדקדוק, 'in the *Mikhloḥ* in the grammatical section'.¹⁹

That the author of the commentary refers to the *Mikhloḥ* without claiming it as his own work and without the usual name ספר מכלול suggests that it was *not* Radak who wrote it, but rather someone else. The author of the commentary was indeed familiar with the *Mikhloḥ*, as he was shown above to have been familiar with the *Shorashim*, but he was not the author of those works.

Talmage mentions the likeness of *Shorashim*, root שגה, to the comments on Prov. 5:19 as an additional proof.²⁰ While the same opinion of Rabbi Jonah is considered similarly in both places, this only proves that the author of the commentary had seen the entry in the *Shorashim*, not that he had written it himself.

Talmage refers to comments of three fifteenth- and sixteenth-century writers to corroborate the existence of a commentary on Proverbs written by Radak.

1. *Mikhloḥ Yofi*

In describing the availability of Radak's works in the epilogue to *Mikhloḥ Yofi*,²¹ Solomon Ibn Melekh (1480–1530) admits to having had only Radak's popular works that are extant today,²² but states:

האמת, כי בארבעה ספרי התורה וכן בחמש מגילות וכן בספר
משלי, ואיוב, ודניאל ועזרא לא מצאתי פירוש הרד"ק . . .
וכל שכן שכבר שמעתי באי זה מקום אמצא פירוש הספרים ההם
להרד"ק . . .

The truth, that in the four books of the Pentateuch [excluding Genesis] and in the five scrolls and in the book of Proverbs, and Job, and Daniel and Ezra I have not found commentaries of Radak . . . and even more so since I have already heard that in some place I will find commentaries to these books of Radak . . .

lexical, but it was subsequently published as two separate works. The grammatical portion of the work is commonly referred to simply as *Mikhloḥ*, while the lexical portion is referred to as the *Shorashim*.

¹⁹ There appears to be only one case in his commentaries, his comments on 1 Chron. 1:7, in which Radak refers to the *Mikhloḥ* as ספר הדקדוק, rather than ספר מכלול בחלק הדקדוק. Some manuscripts and the printed edition record a variant for that comment, in which חלק הדקדוק is substituted for ספר הדקדוק.

²⁰ Talmage, *David Kimhi* (as in n. 4), p. 209, n. 56.

²¹ Solomon Ibn Melekh, ספר מכלול יופי (Makor, Jerusalem, 1969), p. 219d. On Ibn Melekh, see E. Schlossberg, 'מכלול יופי' לר' שלמה אבן מלך — מאסף לפרשנות המקרא הפילולוגית, *Megadim* 5 (1988), pp. 45–57.

²² Ibn Melekh differentiates between the commentaries to the former and latter Prophets and the book of Psalms, which were readily available to him, and the commentaries to the books of Genesis and Chronicles, which he acquired at a later date.

2. *Qav we-Naqi*

3. *Shalshelet ha-Kabbalah*

[illegible]

In addition to the three writers discussed above, commentators who wrote on the book of Proverbs in the century following Radak, such as Rabbi Menaḥem ha-Meiri and Joseph Ibn Naḥmias, refer only to Radak's comments in his *Shorashim* and never to an actual commentary. This casts doubt on the existence of any commentary on Proverbs written by Radak.

It is necessary to carefully examine *the commentary* itself and all of the evidence surrounding it to determine if there is conclusive evidence to support Cassuto's identification. While some additional similarities to Radak's works can be mustered, the indications against Radak's authorship of *the commentary* are formidable and conclusive.

B. Further links to Radak's work

Following are a number of additional similarities between Radak's works and *the commentary*. Certain biblical stylistics that are used by Radak are used in *the commentary*.²⁹ For example, the notion of a mismatch between plural and singular is found in the comments on Prov. 14:1, 14:9 and 16:2 and a missing letter *aleph* is mentioned in the comments on Prov. 1:10.

Certain expressions, such as *מבואר הוא*, 'it is understood', *כלומר*, 'that is to say', and *דבק למעלה*, 'adjoined to the above', are reminiscent of Radak's terminology. The author of *the commentary* felt obliged to comment on each and every biblical verse, as Radak does.

M. Cohen claims that Radak is unique in his use of the construct 'just as *x* so is *y*' for metaphors, and that construct *is* found in *the commentary*, 1:9.³⁰ The use of the term *דרך משל*, 'by way of parable', is common to both *the commentary* and Radak's commentaries.

C. Evidence against Radak's authorship of the commentary

The evidence against Radak's authorship of *the commentary* overshadows the similarities to Radak's works that have been catalogued up to this point. Firstly, certain hallmarks of Radak's commentaries are missing. There is comparatively little use of biblical grammar and stylistics and when biblical stylistics are used, Radak's standard citation of other examples of the same biblical stylistic is completely absent. *קרי וכתוב*, 'words that are read differently from the way they are written', is not mentioned at all in *the commentary*, although it is almost never overlooked by Radak in his commentaries.³¹

²⁹ See Talmage, *David Kimhi* (as in n. 4), pp. 102–108 for a discussion of Radak's use of biblical stylistics.

³⁰ M. Cohen, *Three Approaches to Biblical Metaphor: Radak and his Predecessors, Abraham Ibn Ezra and Maimonides* (E. J. Brill, Leiden, 2003). Examples of the same construct of 'just as *x* so is *y*' are found in Joseph Kimhi's commentary on Proverbs, 20:30 and 21:1. Perhaps Radak learned the use of this construct from his father.

³¹ I thank Yitzhak Berger for bringing this to my attention. Because he thought that the *קרי* and *כתוב* were equally likely, Radak's method throughout his works is consistently to attempt to explain both. An explanation of the origin of the phenomenon of *קרי וכתוב* and a delineation of his strategy for commenting on it are found at the end of Radak's introduction to the commentary.

The commentary does not mention the commentaries of Joseph or Moses Kimhi at all, even though their commentaries on Proverbs are mentioned in Radak's *Shorashim* and should have figured prominently in Radak's writing of a commentary on Proverbs.³² Since the writing of Radak's commentaries is assumed to have followed the writing of his grammatical works,³³ the elder Kimhi commentaries to Proverbs must be believed to have been in place by the time Radak would have written his own commentary on Proverbs.

Given his great dependence on his father and, to a lesser degree, on his brother, it is improbable that Radak would have written a commentary on Proverbs and not have mentioned either of them by name even once. Reference to his father's interpretations is one of the characteristic signs of Radak's authorship. For example, to prove that the commentary to Genesis is Radak's, A. Geiger states: 'והדבר ברור כי הוא לרד"ק והביא את מכלולו ואת אביו ר' יוסף, כדרכו', 'The matter is clear that it [the Genesis commentary] was written by Radak and he mentions his *Mikhlol* and his father Joseph, as is his usual method.'³⁴

The author of *the commentary* justifies his work with the introduction that he wrote his commentary because he did not find any other commentaries that explain the text verse-by-verse, but only allegorically.³⁵ Had Radak written *the commentary*, one would have expected him to reflect on his father's and brother's commentaries in the context of this introduction.

The style of *the commentary* is simplistic and the tone is homiletical and flat—not rich, crisp and analytical, as Radak's commentaries are. The author uses the book of Proverbs as a tool to urge his readers to live an upright, God-fearing life. He persistently reiterates themes of the struggle between good and evil, reward and punishment, and the world to come and reflects on the

on the book of Joshua. *The commentary* interprets both the **קרי** and **כתיב** in its comment on Prov. 17:27, but does not point out that the alternative readings are due to **קרי וכתיב**.

³² Joseph Kimhi died when his son David was very young (Talmage, *David Kimhi*, p. 7) and Moses Kimhi died before Radak wrote the *Shorashim*, as Radak refers to him in that book as **עליו השלום**, 'may he rest in peace' (e.g., root **תעה**). Therefore, both commentaries to Proverbs were written before Radak might have written one. Radak mentions his father's interpretation of verses from Proverbs directly in the *Shorashim*, e.g. roots **גהה** and **לבט**. His brother's commentary on Proverbs is quoted in *Shorashim*, root **שנה**, in which Radak states: **ורבי אחי רבי משה פירשו: בפירוש משלי**, 'and my teacher my brother Rabbi Moses explained in his commentary to the book of Proverbs'. This latter quotation is further proof that Moses Kimhi's commentary on Proverbs was in place when Radak wrote the *Shorashim*.

³³ Geiger, 'תולדות הרד"ק' (as in n. 23), p. 162.

³⁴ Geiger, 'תולדות הרד"ק', p. 163. Many of the anonymous references to explanations of others introduced as **יש מפרשים** 'there are those who explain' in *the commentary* are close to interpretations of Joseph and Moses Kimhi, which accentuates the question of the lack of mention of them by name. Geiger employs an argument regarding the absence of a commentary written by Radak on the final four books of the Pentateuch that applies to *the commentary* as well. He maintains (p. 164) that, given Radak's popularity, if he had really written a commentary to the latter four books of the Pentateuch, the public would have copied them enthusiastically. The fact that they were not copied implies that they did not exist.

³⁵ A similar complaint is used by Radak to justify his writing of a commentary to Chronicles, which is assumed to be his first. In the introduction to the commentary to Chronicles, Radak claims to want to write a *peshat* commentary, as opposed to all the commentaries written before his that were 'by way of *derash*'.

prerequisites for the proper functioning of the different castes of society.

While Radak addresses many of these themes in his Bible commentaries, they are incidental and used merely to explicate the biblical text. In *the commentary*, though, the encouragement of moral rectitude is the dominant goal and the explication of the verses is incidental.³⁶ The correlation of the words in the Bible to the ideas that they convey is limited and artless.

1. *Quotation of rabbinic literature*

None of the distinguishing features of Radak's use of rabbinic material are present in *the commentary*. The most common format for quotation of rabbinic passages by Radak is the *perush kaful*, 'dual interpretation', in which two interpretations that address the same question are presented with one identified as using the *peshat* method and the other identified as using the midrashic method. This construct is completely absent in *the commentary*.³⁷ Cases in which a rabbinic statement is quoted before a supposed *peshat*, such as the comments on Prov. 9:1 and 18:21, do not function like comments of the same structure in Radak's known commentaries.

The commentary shows a lesser sophistication in the use of rabbinic material than Radak does in his commentaries, leading to the conclusion that the works are not of the same author.³⁸ In addition, different criteria were used when choosing rabbinic passages for quotation in *the commentary* than in Radak's biblical commentaries.

Remarkably, almost every quotation of rabbinic literature in *the commentary* is copied from Rashi, while the use of Rashi as a source for rabbinic traditions in Radak's commentaries is occasional.³⁹ More importantly, though, the widespread imitation of Rashi's quotation of talmudic and midrashic traditions means that the only original quotations of rabbinic literature in *the commentary* are basic rabbinic notions that would be known to anyone with a

³⁶ This is true even when one considers the difference between the content of the book of Proverbs and the other books on which Radak wrote commentaries. The biblical book on which Radak commented whose content is closest to the book of Proverbs is the book of Psalms. Yet Radak's commentary on Psalms exhibits the usual characteristics of his other commentaries, while *the commentary* does not.

³⁷ While some comments include identification of a rabbinic comment as such (e.g., the comments on Prov. 5:9, 5:18 and 8:30), the *peshat* is never contrasted with a rabbinic interpretation, as it is in Radak's works. An exhaustive study of Radak's use of rabbinic literature is undertaken in my 'The Interplay of *Peshat* and Rabbinic Traditions in the Exegetical Works of Rabbi David Kimhi', PhD dissertation (New York University, May 2003).

³⁸ Following is a list of verses for which the author quotes rabbinic material in *the commentary*: Prov. 2:6, 3:6, 3:16, 3:26, 4:14, 4:23, 4:26, 5:9, 5:18, 6:33, 8:17, 8:30–31, 9:1, 12:13, 12:16, 14:9, 14:10, 15:6, 15:30, 15:31, 18:1, 18:21, 19:2, 20:21. Talmage discusses these quotations briefly in *פירושים*, p. 17.

³⁹ Most of the quotations that were copied are found in Rashi's commentary *ad loc.*, but the quotation in the comments on Prov. 3:6 is found in Rashi's commentary to Prov. 16:9 and the quotation in the comments on Prov. 19:2 is found in Rashi's commentary to Prov. 19:7. Radak's use of Rashi as a source for rabbinic traditions is analysed in my 'The Dependence of Rabbi David Kimhi (Radak) on Rashi in his Quotation of Midrashic Traditions', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 93:3–4 (Summer 2003), pp. 415–430.

rudimentary Jewish education.⁴⁰ This demonstrates that the author probably had no primary knowledge of the types of talmudic and midrashic original texts that are quoted so frequently in Radak's commentaries.

The author's lack of primary knowledge of rabbinic literature argues strongly against Radak's authorship of *the commentary*. It is clear from Radak's commentaries that he had first-hand mastery and first-rate erudition in all aspects of rabbinic literature, which is not true of the author of *the commentary*.⁴¹

The content of most of the talmudic and midrashic statements mentioned in *the commentary* supports its preaching goal rather than exegetical purposes, which is not the case in Radak's works. For example, in the comments on Prov. 6:33 the rabbinic statement that wounds are meted out to the adulterer reinforces a less specific statement in the verse. The goal of many of the rabbinic traditions that the author quotes is to strengthen his own statements in *the commentary*.

2. Use of the term 'peshat'

In addition to the fact that the quotation of rabbinic traditions differs from Radak's, *the commentary's* notion of *peshat* is different from Radak's.⁴² In his introduction, the author of *the commentary* defines *peshat* as the verse-by-verse explication of the non-figurative meaning of the verse, as opposed to the figurative meaning. This characterisation is quite far from Radak's complex tradition of the meaning of the term *peshat* as drawing on grammar, philology, lexicography, biblical stylistics, and comparison to other biblical texts.⁴³

Other peculiarities are found in the use of the term *peshat* in *the commentary*. *The commentary's* definition of *peshat* is employed in a straightforward

⁴⁰ Following is an analysis of the rabbinic statements in *the commentary* not copied from Rashi. The only rabbinic notion mentioned twice in *the commentary* (comments on Prov. 2:6 and 8:17) is the celebrated notion of *יָנַעַת מַצָּאת*, 'you have toiled and you have found', which would have been familiar to many, especially to those with an inclination towards preaching about repentance. The statement *כָּל הַפּוֹסֵל, בְּמוֹמוֹ פּוֹסֵל*, 'anyone who disqualifies, disqualifies his own flaw' (comments on Prov. 14:9), and the notion of caution in teaching taken from *Pirke Avot* (comments on Prov. 18:21), would also have been generally known. The only complicated rabbinic notions in *the commentary* that are not found in Rashi's commentary first are found in other sources. The rabbinic statement in the comments on Prov. 18:1 is quoted in the name of 'others'. In the comments on Prov. 15:31, *the commentary* quotes a rabbinic statement that is also quoted by Jonah Gerondi in his commentary on Proverbs and in his *Sha'are Teshuva*.

⁴¹ If any proof that Radak looked at original rabbinic texts is necessary, it can be found in the frequent combination of passages from different rabbinic sources (e.g., his comments on 1 Sam. 16:2) and verbatim quotation of aggadic traditions (e.g., introduction to his commentary to Hosea). See also Radak's summation to *Shorashim*, in which he admits to having been mostly involved in teaching Talmud to youngsters while he was writing his grammatical works. Radak's prominent participation in the defense of Maimonides at the end of his life suggests that he had some rabbinic stature within the Jewish community, which would never have been accorded someone with no competence in rabbinic sources.

⁴² In addition to the introduction, the author of *the commentary* uses the term *peshat* in his comments on Prov. 5:3, 11:22, 12:11, 15:30 and 18:21.

⁴³ The chapter entitled 'The Way of *Peshat*' in Talmage's 1975 monograph on Radak (Talmage, *David Kimhi*, pp. 54–134) is itself eighty pages long. On p. 84 in his book, Talmage demonstrates the relationship between grammar and the term *peshat* in Radak's thought.

manner in Prov. 5:3, 11:22 and 18:21, in which the non-figurative (*peshat*) meaning of the verse is contrasted with the figurative meaning. In the comments on Prov. 12:11, though, the non-figurative meaning of the verse is mentioned alone and identified as a *peshat*.⁴⁴ It is unclear why *the commentary* would single out this interpretation for identification as non-figurative when the premise of the whole commentary is to provide such non-figurative interpretations.

Of the straightforward examples, in the comments on Prov. 11:22 the non-figurative meaning of the verse is placed before the figurative meaning. But in the comments on 18:21, the order is reversed, with two figurative meanings occupying the initial positions in the comment and the *peshat* only mentioned at the end. This confusion does not correspond with Radak's careful attention to the ordering of interpretations.⁴⁵

One of the evaluations of a comment as fitting the *peshat* is peculiar and foreign to Radak's refined understanding of the difference between *peshat* and homiletical interpretation. In his comments on Prov. 15:30 the author of *the commentary* offers an interpretation followed by a rabbinic interpretation, which is labelled as such. He then evaluates the two, stating **והראשון לפי פשוטו**, 'and the first interpretation is correct according to its *peshat*'. If the first interpretation is *peshat*, then it is visibly correct according to the *peshat* method. Radak would never make such a plain observation regarding an interpretation.

3. Use of earlier sources

Another patent area of incongruity between Radak's commentaries and *the commentary* is in the restatement of earlier interpretations, for which Radak is legendary. Radak often mentions the names of commentators when he paraphrases their interpretations, while the author of *the commentary* does not.⁴⁶ The only prior commentator mentioned by name in *the commentary* is Rashi. The Targum is also used with some frequency and will be discussed separately below.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ The anomalous expression **פירושו כפשוטו**, 'its interpretation is as its *peshat*', is used in the comments on Prov. 12:11.

⁴⁵ The term *peshat* is also formulated oddly in the comments on Prov. 18:21 as **פשוטו** and not Radak's usual **פשוטו**. Another case in which the order of interpretations proceeds incongruously from more to less complex is the comments on Prov. 20:4, in which a broad figurative theme is developed before a restricted one.

⁴⁶ While Radak does include anonymous references to the interpretations of others, one of the standard features of his writing is the quotation of the works of others by name. For a discussion of Radak's use of earlier sources see H. Cohen, ed., *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Hosea* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1929), pp. xvi–xli and Melamed, **מפרשי המקרא** (as in n. 12), pp. 775–778.

⁴⁷ In his comments on Prov. 5:19–20, the author mentions Rabbi Moshe Ha-Darshan and Rabbi Jonah Ibn Janah, but these references appear to have been copied from Rashi's commentary and the *Shorashim* respectively. The comment on Prov. 5:19 is one of two comments in which Rashi mentions Rabbi Moshe ha-Darshan in his commentary to Proverbs. The other is his comment on Prov. 26:10, which is after *the commentary* ends. See A. Epstein, **רבי משה הדרשן** 'מנרבונו' (1890/91; reprint, A. M. Haberman, **כתבים מאת אברהם אפשטיין**, Mossad ha-Rav Kook: Jerusalem, 1949/50), 1: ל"ז, item 37.

Another obvious divergence in the use of earlier sources is in the manner of their quotation. *The commentary* simply states the explanations of others, while Radak often reflects on the interpretations of others and places them into an exegetical context, classifying them based on their approach to a particular textual question.⁴⁸

A distinct difference between Radak and the author of *the commentary* exists in the use of the term **יש מי שפרש**, ‘and there is one who explained [as follows]’, which is found quite often in *the commentary*. This term seems to appear only once in Radak’s commentaries.⁴⁹ The more typical phrase **יש מפרשים**, ‘there are those who explain [thus]’, is used in both *the commentary* and Radak’s works.

In one case, the comments on Prov. 13:7, *the commentary* announces that the commentators have explained this verse in two different ways and proceeds to state the two interpretations, introducing each with **יש מי שפרש**. Both interpretations appear to derive from Rashi, though. Radak would most likely have acknowledged that the two interpretations came from one and the same source.

The commentary quotes unusual sagacious sources, which is inconsistent with Radak’s method. For example, in the comments on Prov. 14:9 a wise statement is quoted in the name of **אמר במוסר**, ‘said in the moral works’.⁵⁰ In the comments on Prov. 15:17⁵¹ and 13:12⁵² judicious statements are quoted in the name of **החכם**, ‘the wise one’.⁵³ This demonstrates further the difference

⁴⁸ In a number of cases, such as the comments on Prov. 2:17, 14:30 and 15:25, **יש מפרשים**, ‘there are those who explain’ is followed by another **יש מפרשים**, a construct that does not appear often in Radak’s works.

⁴⁹ That one case is Radak’s comments on Josh. 3:11, in which he refers to an explanation given by Maimonides in *Guide to the Perplexed* 2:30. Perhaps Radak avoided mentioning the exact source because of the esoteric content of that passage.

⁵⁰ Talmage comments that the idea quoted in this case is found with slight variations in Bahya Ibn Paqudah’s eleventh-century work *Sefer Hovot ha-Levavot*, ‘Sha’ar ha-Keni’ah’, ch. 6. Radak mentions Ibn Paqudah’s work once in his commentaries, in his comments on Ps. 35:10, but the content in Psalms differs from the content in Proverbs. In Psalms Radak alludes to a philosophical explanation, while the quotation in *the commentary* is of a homiletical nature.

⁵¹ Talmage notes that the same statement is quoted in Yeda’ah ha-Penini (ca. 1270–1340), *Sefer Mivhar ha-Peninim* (Wagschall, Jerusalem, 1994/5), p. 121 (‘Sha’ar ha-Kevedut’). *Sefer Mivhar ha-Peninim* is considered by some to have been written by Solomon Ibn Gabirol (eleventh century). Ibn Gabirol’s *Tikun Midot ha-Nefesh* is quoted a number of times in Radak’s commentary to Psalms, mostly when the former had explained the verse from Psalms on which Radak was commenting. A complete list of the sources quoted by Radak in his commentaries is found in Cohen, *The Commentary* (as in n. 46), pp. xx–xxvi and Melamed, **מפרשי המקרא** (as in n. 12), pp. 738–778.

⁵² Talmage notes that a similar statement is quoted in the name of Pythagoras in Judah al-Ḥarizi, *Sefer Musre ha-Filosofim* (in Solomon Ibn Gabirol, *Tikun Midot ha-Nefesh*, Library for Jewish Thought, Jerusalem, 1966), ch. 1:5.

⁵³ Radak mentions **החכם** three times in the commentaries (Cohen, *The Commentary* [as in n. 46], pp. xxvi). In Radak’s comments on Gen. 3:22, **החכם** probably refers to Ibn Ezra; on Jer. 2:35, the wise statement deals with an aspect of sin, as opposed to the wise statements that are quoted in *the commentary* on Prov. 13:12 and 15:17, which concern human psychology. Only the quotation in Radak’s comments on Gen 16:6 is similar to the quotations of **החכם** in *the commentary*.

between the basic knowledge of the author of *the commentary* and that of Radak.⁵⁴

4. *Use of Rashi*

In addition to their use as a source for rabbinic traditions, Rashi's explanations are referred to comparatively often in *the commentary*.⁵⁵ One might argue that few commentaries to Proverbs were available at the time and therefore the author of *the commentary* made heavier use of Rashi's commentary. On the other hand, from the numerous instances of *יש מפרשים* 'there are those who explain' for which Talmage is unable to find an extant source, it is clear that the author of *the commentary* knew other commentaries to the book, which are unavailable today.

A discrepancy is found in the constant references in *the commentary* to Rashi as *ר"ש*, 'Rabbi Solomon', whereas in Radak's commentaries Rashi is most commonly referred to by his acronym, *רש"י*, 'Rashi'.⁵⁶ In Radak's commentaries, the expression 'of blessed memory' is appended to Rashi's name in all but a few cases, but that expression is never used in *the commentary*.

In one case, the comments on Prov. 12:16, there seems to be no essential difference between *the commentary*'s explanation of the verse and the quoted interpretation of Rashi. This differs from Radak's method of reference to earlier sources, as Radak would mention Rashi and other earlier sources in cases in which they differed from his own and added new ideas to the exegesis of the verse. The reason for referring to Rashi in the comments on Prov. 12:16 appears to have been the desire to repeat the rabbinic statement that he quoted, which confirms the importance of Rashi as a source for rabbinic material.

An interesting result of the conclusion that *the commentary* was not written by Radak relates to the view of Rashi as a repository for rabbinic traditions. Many of the rabbinic passages that Rashi quoted without stating their rabbinic character are identified by *the commentary* as deriving from the rabbinic corpus.⁵⁷ Radak also often categorises a comment copied from Rashi as deriving from the rabbinic corpus, even though Rashi did not identify the rabbinic

⁵⁴ In his comments on Prov. 4:14, the author of *the commentary* summarises a statement quoted by the rabbis (BT Bava Kamma 92b) in the name of Ben Sira. The lack of primary knowledge of rabbinic texts coupled with the author's apparent acquaintance with other marginal sources may imply that the original source for this comment was the writings of Ben Sira or some other secondary source, but not the Talmud.

⁵⁵ Radak refers to Rashi by name relatively few times in his commentaries, although he also alludes to Rashi's interpretations without identifying their source. The quotation of Rashi's explanations by name is uneven across Radak's commentaries and most common in the later chapters of Ezekiel, in Hosea and in Amos. A complete list of the acknowledged quotations of Rashi's interpretations by Radak is found in Cohen, *The Commentary* (as in n. 46), p. xxv, n. 1. The issue of the extent of Radak's use of Rashi's commentaries is discussed at length in my 'The Dependence' (as in n. 39). As in Radak's works, Rashi's interpretations are mentioned both by name and in many unacknowledged references in *the commentary*.

⁵⁶ Every reference to Rashi in *the commentary* is to *ר"ש*. Following is a list of the acknowledged references to Rashi in *the commentary*: comments on Prov. 4:23, 4:24, 5:6, 11:18, 11:21, 12:16, 13:8, 20:6. In Radak's commentaries, thirty-one of the acknowledged references to Rashi are to *רש"י* as opposed to eight references to *רבינו שלמה*.

⁵⁷ E.g., the comments on Prov. 5:8, 5:19 and 14:10.

character of the comment.⁵⁸

The existence of this phenomenon in Radak's work can be attributed to his own thorough knowledge of the midrashic and talmudic literature. However, the same is not true of the author of *the commentary*, who does not display any primary knowledge of rabbinic literature. Therefore, the lack of sophistication on the part of the author of *the commentary* illustrates that the *prevalent* view, even among more innocent readers of Rashi's commentary than Radak, was that many of Rashi's statements originated in the rabbinic literature. Alternatively, the author might have absorbed this view of Rashi, along with the other limited Kimhian elements, from Radak himself or from his works.

5. *Use of the Targum*

The commentary utilises mostly Onkelos' Targum on the Pentateuch, while Radak relies heavily on Jonathan's Targum to the Prophets. Whereas Radak does not quote Targum Onkelos on the Pentateuch frequently in his commentaries to the Prophets and Hagiographa, *the commentary* quotes Targum Onkelos twenty-four times in the single book of Proverbs.⁵⁹ In contrast, the references to Jonathan's Targum in Radak's works are too numerous to list⁶⁰ but *the commentary* mentions Jonathan's Targum only seven times. This inversion of Radak's usual ratio of quotations of Targum Onkelos to Jonathan's Targum corroborates the claim that the author's knowledge base and method were different from Radak's.

The commentary also repeats a number of quotations from the Targum, which does not seem to be the case with Radak. For example, the same Aramaic translation of Deut. 32:2 is quoted in the comments on Prov. 1:3, 4:2 and 11:30, and the Aramaic translation of Exod. 32:25 is quoted in the comments on Prov. 1:25 and 15:32 to explain almost the identical word.

6. *Discrepancies in Style*

The existence of similarities to Radak's terminology in his exegetical works was used as proof of Radak's authorship of *the commentary*. While these similarities are present, so are numerous discrepancies. The nature of many of the discrepancies is quite fundamental.

Certain grammatical constructs are referred to atypically in *the commentary* relative to Radak. In the introduction to *the commentary*, the anomalous expression מלה אחת מדברת על עצמה ובשרה ומושכת אחרת עמה, 'one word speaks about its inherent own self and draws another with it', is used.⁶¹ Radak

⁵⁸ See my 'The Dependence' (as in n. 39).

⁵⁹ A list of Radak's quotations of the Targum is found in Cohen, *The Commentary*, p. xxiv, n. 5, p. xxvi n. 11, and L. Finkelstein, ed., *The Commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1926), pp. xxviii–xxix. Radak quotes Targum Onkelos on the Pentateuch only thirty-three times in all of his commentaries to the Prophets and Hagiographa.

⁶⁰ Cohen, *The Commentary*, p. xxvi, n. 11.

⁶¹ This means that a word (or letter) can be used twice in the verse, even though it is only written once. In addition to the irregular wording, *the commentary* offers a rudimentary explanation of the construct, which does not mirror Radak's sophistication in the use of biblical stylistics.

generally uses the expression **עומד במקום שנים**, 'stands in place of two', for this phenomenon. Some exegetes, such as Ibn Ezra and Moses Kimhi in his commentary on Proverbs, use wording closer to *the commentary's*, but theirs is the crisper **מושך עצמו ואחר עמו**, 'it pulls itself and another with it', and not the ornate phraseology used in the introduction to *the commentary*.⁶²

Similarly, the expression **נכתב בחסרון**, 'it is written with a deficiency', is used in *the commentary*, 19:16, while Radak's usual term for the phenomenon is **דרך קצרה**. The expression **סמך על המבין**, '[the Bible] relied on the reader's understanding', in the same comment is used differently from the way it is used in Radak's commentaries. In almost every case in which Radak uses the term **סמך על המבין** in the commentaries, he explains why it is reasonable to rely on the reader, while no explanation is given in the comments on Prov. 19:16.⁶³

Certain oddities exist in the presentation of explanations in *the commentary*. Simple words that Radak assumed would be familiar to his audience in his commentaries are explicated in *the commentary*, while apparently difficult words are left unexplained. For example, the word **בר**, 'wheat', is not explained by Radak when it is used in Jer. 23:28, and is even used by Radak in his comments to 2 Sam. 24:14 as if it were a simple Hebrew word. Nevertheless, the straightforward comment **בר: תבואה**, 'Bar: wheat', is found in *the commentary*, 11:26.⁶⁴ On the other hand, *the commentary* does not explain the difficult, irregular word **בוטה** in Prov. 12:18.

The writing style of the author of *the commentary* is conversational and loose, not crisp and analytical as in Radak's commentaries. For example, in the comments on Prov. 19:17, *the commentary* explains why the Lord considers a benevolent act towards humans to be equivalent to benevolence towards Himself. The appreciation of poor people for the benevolence of a kind-hearted donor is described: **לפי, כשימצא חנינה בעיני אדם הוא אומר "ברוך" ה' אשר חנני ונתן בלב האיש הזה לחון אלי . . .** 'Because, when he [the poor man] finds pity in the eyes of people he says "Blessed be the Lord who pitied me and placed in the heart of this man to pity me . . ."' This verbosity and informal style is the antithesis of Radak's investigative approach.⁶⁵

The commentary has a personal quality to it, as opposed to Radak's objective, detached analysis. For example, to encourage diligence in the comments on Prov. 6:6 the author states: **שכל . . . כל שכן אני, שחנני הקל שכל, שאני צריך להשתדל יותר בעניני ותאמר בלבך "כיון שזאת היא בריה שאין לה כבד פירשתי אותו"**

⁶² Radak's commentaries have been characterised by M. H. Segal as consisting of a synthesis of a number of methods. See his **פרשנות המקרא** (Qiryat Sefer, Jerusalem, 1971), pp. 76–77, 86–87. No such synthesis exists in *the commentary*. There are also none of Radak's characteristic philosophical musings or lengthy digressions.

⁶³ Another example of a discrepancy in phraseology is found in the comments on Prov. 16:25, in which *the commentary* states **כבר פירשתי אותו**, 'I have already explained it', while Radak regularly uses the smoother **כבר פירשתי**.

⁶⁴ The explanation of the word **אבוס** in the comment on Prov. 14:4 is another example.

⁶⁵ Additional examples of *the commentary's* loose, conversational style are the comments on Prov. 18:13 and 21:14. Even when such a style is used by Joseph Kimhi, as in his comments on Prov. 3:5, Kimhi's wording is more compact and to the point than the language in *the commentary*.

”ממנה, ‘You should say in your heart “Since this is a creature [an ant] that has no intellect . . . how much more so I, to whom God endowed an intellect, that I must try harder in my affairs than it does.”’⁶⁶

There is very little comparison to other verses in the Bible in *the commentary*. Radak’s commentaries are replete with references to biblical verses, as are his father and brother’s commentaries on Proverbs. The lack of quotation of biblical verses for comparison is indicative of a different approach from the one that Radak would take to the same material.⁶⁷

7. Comparison to the *Shorashim*

Cases in *the commentary* in which the author ignores an explanation stated in the *Shorashim* are common.⁶⁸ These cases are not decisive, though, because Radak’s commentaries do not always mirror the *Shorashim*.⁶⁹ For example, in Prov. 21:18 *the commentary* deviates from an explanation in the *Shorashim*. While the *Shorashim* interprets **הפכפך דרך איש זור**, ‘dishonest is the way of [a wicked] man and foreign’, as a description of impious behavior, *the commentary* explains it as a punishment on the part of the Lord, who will corrupt and overturn the path of the wicked.⁷⁰ Similarly, while the *Shorashim* views the one who is **בשפתיו פותה**, ‘persuasive with his lips (words)’, in the comments on Prov. 20:19 as one who acts like a friend but is not, *the commentary* perceives of him as an inciter to sin.⁷¹

In one case, though, *the commentary* seems to be oblivious to the importance of an explanation given in the *Shorashim*. In *Shorashim*, root **גהה**,

⁶⁶ Other direct addresses to the reader are found in the comments on Prov. 7:6 (**אני מזהירך**, ‘I warn you’), 15:3 (**השמר**, ‘beware’), and 19:12 and 19:18 (**הזהר**, ‘be careful’). Addressing the reader directly supports the author’s goal of arousing the reader to repentance.

⁶⁷ See Talmage’s lists in **פירושים**, pp. 454–472. Moses Kimhi quotes biblical verses 948 times in his commentary on Proverbs as compared to Joseph Kimhi’s 337 and *the commentary*’s 147. Especially noticeable is the trivial number of times *the commentary* quotes other verses from Proverbs, as compared to the number of times that Joseph and Moses Kimhi quote them. The lack of quotation of biblical verses most likely results from a lack of erudition on the part of the author.

⁶⁸ Melamed, **מפרשי המקרא** (as in n. 12), p. 787, lists interpretations of verses from Proverbs in the *Shorashim*. Melamed’s list appears to be limited to fairly complicated entries in the *Shorashim*. For example, he does not include *Shorashim*, root **פשע**, which explains **אח נפשע** in Prov. 18:19.

⁶⁹ No general study of the relationship between Radak’s commentaries and his *Shorashim* has been done to date, but a number of examples will illustrate that Radak’s commentaries do not always mirror the *Shorashim*. For example, the translation of the word **סריס** in the Bible that was discussed in chapter four is treated differently in the *Shorashim* than in the commentaries. In *Shorashim*, root **סריס**, Radak prefers the translation of ‘eunuch’ for the word **סריס**, but in the commentary he prefers the translation of ‘officer’. Similarly, Radak’s comments to 1 Sam. 15:4 differ in a number of ways from his entry in the *Shorashim*, root **טלא**.

⁷⁰ Similarly, in *Shorashim*, root **חטב**, Radak paraphrases Jonah Ibn Janah’s approach to the word **חטובות** but rejects it and defends his own interpretation of the word. Yet in the comments on Prov. 7:16, s.v. **חטובות**, *the commentary* mirrors Ibn Janah’s interpretation, rather than the one that Radak insisted was correct in the *Shorashim*.

⁷¹ Another example is the comments on Prov. 17:14. The author of *the commentary* interprets the word **התגלע** in the second half of the verse as ‘it will be revealed’, while Radak interprets it in the *Shorashim* as ‘it will be joined’. *The commentary*’s explanation of the first part of that verse is also not the same as Radak’s in *Shorashim*, root **פטר**.

Radak explains Prov. 17:22, **לב שמח ייטיב גהה**, 'a happy heart improves medicine', as missing **כ' הדמיון**, 'the *kof* of comparison', and contrasts that interpretation with his father's, which did not require addition of the **כ' הדמיון**. Radak mentions his interpretation of the word **גהה** numerous times in his commentaries.⁷² Yet in *the commentary*, 15:13, the suggestion of addition of a **כ' הדמיון** to the word **גהה** is quoted as a secondary explanation of the verse in the name of **יש מפרשים** 'there are those who explain', and in the doublet of the same verse, 17:22, no mention at all is made of the addition of a *kof*.

In this case, Radak had favoured his own interpretation over another in the *Shorashim* and used that interpretation many times in the commentaries. The apparent ignorance of the centrality and consistency of Radak's approach to the verse implies that Radak did not write the comment on Prov. 17:22 in *the commentary*.

Another case in which an explanation from the *Shorashim* is introduced as **יש מי שפרש** 'there is one who explained' is found in the second part of the comments on Prov. 20:25. The expression **אחר נדרים לבקר** is explained in *the commentary* with almost the exact definition as is used for the phrase in the *Shorashim*. Yet *the commentary* introduces the interpretation as **יש מי שפרש**, which suggests that Radak did not write that entry in *the commentary*.

D. Conclusions

In sum, the evidence against Radak's authorship of *the commentary* is more convincing than the similarities to his other works that were used to prove his authorship of it. Overemphasis of the facts supporting Radak's relationship to *the commentary* have caused substantial proofs against his authorship to be ignored.

If Radak had in fact written *the commentary*, he would have had to have written it after the grammatical works because of the mention of **חלק הדקדוק** in the comment on Prov. 5:22. On the other hand, the commentary's primitive, rudimentary nature relative to Radak's works and lack of reference to those works implies that if he had written it at all, he would have had to have done it *before* the grammatical works, which leaves the example of the comment on Prov. 5:22 without explanation.⁷³ On balance, then, the most logical conclusion is that Radak did not write *the commentary*.

The following considerations may help identify the true author of *the commentary*. Firstly, he was greatly influenced by Rashi's commentary, as has been demonstrated above. The use of the term **דרך דוגמא**, 'by way of example', in

⁷² Radak's comments on Isa. 9:17, s.v. **גאות עשן**, and Ezek. 4:12, s.v. **רענות**, are examples. In his comments on Judg. 5:26, s.v. **ידה ליתד**, Radak states that he learned this explanation from his brother.

⁷³ Radak is assumed to have written all of his works after 1205, as he refers to Ibn Tibbon's translation of Maimonides' *Guide to the Perplexed*, which appeared in that year. See Finkelstein, *The Commentary* (as in n. 59), p. xviii, n. 1. Another proof that the grammatical works were not written early in his life is that Radak refers to his brother as **ז"ל**, 'may his memory be blessed', in many entries in the *Shorashim*. Moses Kimhi died around 1190 (Talmage, **פירושים**, p. יד). Since Radak was born in 1160, the grammatical works were not in place before Radak was thirty years old.

the comments to Prov. 8:30–31 is also typical of Rashi.⁷⁴ The author was aware of Maimonidean ideas, as he mentions Maimonides' notion of extraneous details that were inserted only for the purposes of beautifying a parable in the comment on Prov. 5:3.⁷⁵

As the author knew some Kimhian methods and interpretations, either through personal knowledge of the Kimhis and/or through Radak's written works and/or the works of Joseph and Moses Kimhi, he included these in his commentary.⁷⁶ Consistency in the style of most of *the commentary* argues against a compilatory commentary.⁷⁷

The author's fondness for Radak and/or his works led to his reference to Radak as his brother in his comment on Prov. 20:25. The reference to Radak as a family member is not unique. Abraham Ibn Hasdai applies the term **אבי**, 'my father', to Radak in his introduction to his translation of **ספר היסודות**.⁷⁸ The attraction of the author to Radak's works explains those stylistic similarities to Radak's works that were uncovered.⁷⁹

The Kimhian elements can easily be isolated from the rest of *the commentary* and are only a small portion of it. Perhaps further research can prove the existence of some rudimentary notes on the book of Proverbs written by Radak or an outline of a Kimhian commentary to Proverbs around which the author shaped his own work.⁸⁰ Even so, the limited application of certain Kimhian methodologies does not obscure the true mission of the author—namely, the preaching of moral rectitude and the promotion of religiously upright behavior. Neither can it obscure his lesser significance as an exegete as compared to Radak.

⁷⁴ For an analysis of Rashi's use of the term **דוגמא** see S. Kamin, "בפירוש רש"י, **דוגמא**" in **בין יהודים לנוצרים בפרשנות המקרא** (Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1991), pp. 13–29. The term does not appear to be used in Radak's extant commentaries.

⁷⁵ Maimonides, *Guide to the Perplexed*, introduction.

⁷⁶ Perhaps these Kimhian elements led to the mistaken attribution of *the commentary* to Joseph Kimhi in the first place.

⁷⁷ See S. Japhet, 'Hizquni's Commentary on the Pentateuch—Its Genre and Purpose' (Hebrew) in *Rabbi Mordechai Breuer Festschrift: Collected Papers in Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1992), pp. 91–111 and idem, 'The Nature and Distribution of Medieval Compilatory Commentaries in the Light of Rabbi Joseph Kara's Commentary on the Book of Job', in *The Midrashic Imagination*, ed. M. Fishbane (State University of New York Press, Albany, 1993), pp. 98–130, for a description of the nature of compilations.

⁷⁸ **ספר היסודות** לר' יצחק הישראלי אבן חסדאי (העתיק אותו אל לשון הקודש ר' אברהם בר שמואל הלוי חסדאי) (original printing: תרס, זופניק, א.ה. דפוס א.ה. דראהאביטש; reprinted Jerusalem, (תשכח), p. ב'. Radak also refers to Samuel Ibn Tibbon as 'our brother' in his second letter to Yehuda al-Fakar ('Three Letters of Radak to Judah Al-Fakar', in *תשובות קובץ* ו**אגרותיו**, ed. A. Lichtenberg, H. L. Shinuis, Leipzig, 1859, 3: 4a).

⁷⁹ Alternatively, the author might have incorporated Kimhian methods because they would lend his own work a measure of respectability or because they were standard in his environment.

⁸⁰ I thank Dr E. Kanarfogel for this suggestion and for his constant encouragement.