

On the Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz

Ephraim Kanarfogel

In one of his last published articles, Frank Talmage undertook to assess the extent of independent Bible study in the medieval Jewish world.¹ His approach was to compare and contrast biblical studies in the Ashkenazic and Sefardic orbits, while raising questions about some fundamental assumptions of earlier research. In his memory, I should like to further clarify the status of the study of Scripture in medieval Ashkenaz.²

Tosafists noted that the widespread practice in their era, of rabbinic scholars spending virtually all of their study time on Talmud, conflicted with the dictum of R. Joshua b. Hanina that one ought to devote equal time to each of the three disciplines of *miqra* (Scripture), *mishnah*, and *gemara*. Rabbeinu Tam defended the contemporary practice by claiming that “through our [study of] Talmud, we exempt ourselves.”³ Since the talmudic corpus contained material from the Bible and the Mishnah, focusing on the Talmud exclusively would allow the scholar to be exposed to those texts while remaining firmly rooted in talmudic study.

Rabbeinu Tam’s formulation is open to diverse interpretations. Was Rabbeinu Tam making an ideological statement about the relative unimportance of biblical studies? Or, was he simply trying to justify the reality that less time was being spent in Ashkenaz on the study of Scripture and Mishnah than talmudic law appeared to mandate?⁴ Rabbeinu Tam’s own writings in the areas of biblical commentary and grammar can be used to support either view. His commentary on Job and his work in defense of Menahem ben Saruq suggest that Rabbeinu Tam was committed to the study of Bible as a distinct entity.⁵ And yet, his relatively meager output in the realm of biblical commentary, rendered even less significant when compared to the massive contributions of his grandfather Rashi and his brother Rashbam to the systematic interpretation of Scripture,⁶ fosters the impression that Rabbeinu Tam did not devote much time to the study of Scripture. The assessment of his Spanish/Provençal critic, R. Joseph Qimhi, that Rabbeinu Tam “did not make an effort at grammar...and did not occupy himself with Scripture (*higgayon*) because it is a virtue and not a virtue (B.T. Bava Mešia‘ 33b),” may have been an accurate, unbiased evaluation.⁷

Whatever the motivation behind Rabbeinu Tam's statement, the Tosafot texts that cite it confirm that most encounters with the biblical corpus in the Tosafist academies took place during talmudic study.⁸ These texts do not, however, imply that Ashkenazic talmudists were unfamiliar with the Bible. Indeed, several Ashkenazic sources demonstrate that the biblical text served as a primer for young boys who were learning the rudiments of Hebrew reading and comprehension. Elementary level tutors also taught the weekly portion as well as selected biblical books.⁹

The involvement of adult non-Tosafists in Bible study is more difficult to ascertain. Not every talmudist in medieval Ashkenaz studied with a bona fide Tosafist. Indeed, it appears that most did not. Nonetheless, the Tosafists were the intellectual models for all rabbinic scholars and students in this region. Their *batei midrash* set the tone and the methodology, as well as the curriculum, for the others.¹⁰ The similar inclination of non-Tosafists to stress the study of Talmud at the expense of Bible study is perhaps reflected by an ordinance promulgated by the Qehillot-Shum (Speyer, Worms, Mainz) in the 1220s, that recommended the study of Scripture only for one who was unable to study Talmud:

Every man shall set aside a definite time for study; if he is unable to study Talmud, he shall read Scriptures, the weekly portion, or midrash, according to his ability. He who does much and he who does little are alike, provided that their intentions are directed toward Heaven...¹¹

The place of Bible study in the Tosafist milieu can be evaluated more precisely by taking a brief look at the role of biblical studies in pre-Crusade Ashkenaz. Avraham Grossman has argued that virtually all of the leading pre-Crusade scholars were involved with biblical studies. Some taught Scripture to their students within the academies.¹² Others made extensive use of biblical texts in their talmudic commentaries.¹³ A thorough familiarity with the Bible was a prerequisite for the writing of *piyyuṭim*, an important aspect of pre-Crusade rabbinic culture.¹⁴ Some scholars, most notably Rabbeinu Gershom, issued halakhic rulings that were based principally on biblical verses.¹⁵ While no full-fledged biblical commentaries were produced on an entire biblical book or section, the relatively large number of comments on biblical verses, the interest in biblical *masorah* and *nosah*, as well as the use of Scripture in letters and other documents issued by pre-Crusade scholars, further attest to the prominent role that biblical studies apparently played in the curriculum of pre-Crusade Ashkenaz.¹⁶

Many of the extant biblical comments were made on verses outside of the Pentateuch or verses that were never cited or discussed by the talmudic text. This supports the notion that comments on verses were not made merely in the course of talmudic lectures, when a particular verse was cited by the talmudic text, but that there were separate lectures devoted to the biblical text itself.¹⁷ Indeed, R.

Jacob b. Yaqar was referred to as a “teacher of Talmud and Scripture.” The comments on the biblical text made by pre-Crusade scholars were often devoted to the explication of difficult words and phrases within the verse, adumbrating the methodologies of Rashi, R. Joseph Kara, and Rashbam.¹⁸

Two types of biblical commentaries were produced in Ashkenaz during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The first consisted of the so-called Tosafist commentaries to the Torah (*peirushej Ba^calei ha-Tosafot ^cal ha-Torah*). These commentaries contain biblical interpretations that were attributed in many instances to leading Tosafists. The largely anonymous authors or copyists often indicated that they heard an explanation from “my teacher” or from a particular scholar, implying some sort of classroom setting.¹⁹

Tosafist commentaries to the Torah took different forms. There were collections that simply reformulated or copied suggested scriptural interpretations on verses that were cited in the talmudic text, many of which are to be found in Tosafot to the Talmud, and organized them according to the order of the Pentateuch.²⁰ Another style of Tosafist commentary consisted of dialectical or critical analyses of Rashi’s commentary to the Pentateuch and, by extension, dialectical analysis of the biblical text itself. These analyses were essentially applications of Tosafist talmudic methodology to biblical or Rashi texts.²¹ The standard literary styles used by the talmudic Tosafot to introduce a question (e.g., *im tomar, teimah*) and answer it (*yesh lomar, nir^oeh lomar, yesh omerim*) are found frequently in the Tosafist biblical commentaries. It is likely that many of these verses, together with Rashi’s commentary, were discussed in the course of talmudic study. On the other hand, Tosafist commentaries also offered interpretations of verses in the Pentateuch that are not cited within talmudic literature.²² Moreover, many of the works commented on almost every verse in a number of portions of the Pentateuch. This format indicates that the biblical text itself was the object of study. It appears that the Tosafists and their students, perhaps following the recommendation of the *amora* Rav Yosef, reviewed or discussed, formally or informally, the weekly Torah portion.²³ R. Meshullam of Melun wrote to Rabbeinu Tam concerning a contradiction between verses raised by a student “when we were studying the portion [of Mešora].”²⁴

It is tempting to point to the form of Tosafist commentaries on the Torah just described as evidence that Tosafists also lectured on and interpreted biblical texts within their *batei midrash*, thus continuing the activities of their pre-Crusade predecessors. Such an assessment, however, would be misleading. Study of the weekly Torah portion, even if it took the form of a distinct lecture or academic session, employed the same dialectical method and conventions used for talmudic studies. These discussions or lectures did not include comprehensive, intricate methods of literary or grammatical analysis. Biblical interpretation was not considered to be independent from talmudic interpretation. When the contradiction, referred to above, was raised in R. Meshullam’s study hall, the

resolution was offered on the basis of a talmudic passage. Since the solution had possible halakhic implications, R. Meshullam hastened to add that “this is what we answered amongst ourselves (*bein yeshivoteinu*) but we did not intend with this to offer a practical legal suggestion.”

The presence of Rashi’s commentary in these discussions did not alter their basic nature. A talmudist, with little interest in *peshaṭ* exegesis, could feel quite comfortable using Rashi’s commentary. There is no doubt that the students of Rashi and their students made use of Rashi’s commentary to the Torah even before it was ruled to be an acceptable substitute for the Aramaic Targum in reviewing the weekly portion.²⁵ While Rashi’s commentary served as an important reference point for students of *peshaṭ* in northern France, it was at the same time an excellent compendium of rabbinic and midrashic material.²⁶

The other type of biblical commentary produced in northern France during the Tosafist period consisted of the works of the *pashtanim* of northern France such as Kara, Rashbam, Bekhor Shor and Eliezer of Beauvoisin. These scholars commented extensively on biblical books that were not part of the Pentateuch, including books which had little talmudic or halakhic relevance.²⁷ Included in this enterprise too were an intensive study of biblical grammar and syntax, the identification of literary devices found in Scripture, an understanding of biblical forms and style based on natural phenomena, an appreciation of the authors of various biblical books and their aims in writing them and an effort to establish the correct text.

There are, however, several factors which suggest that this circle had little impact upon the curricula of Tosafist *battei midrash* or academies. The number of *peshaṭ* exegetes known to us is tiny and almost all of them stemmed from two families. The lifetime of this circle was less than one hundred years, and its presence was limited to northern France. The first generation of northern French *pashtanim* had studied in pre-Crusade Germany. In the pre-Crusade period, as has been noted, scholars wished to understand difficult words in the biblical text as well as the “simple” meaning of biblical verses. Straightforward, non-midrashic interpretations of verses are to be found even in comments of thirteenth-century Tosafists. Yet, the search for *peshaṭ* was undertaken systematically only by a handful of scholars in twelfth-century northern France.

Menaḥem Banitt has maintained that thirteenth-century Old French glosses to the biblical text and vernacular glosses to Rashi’s commentary are evidence for the existence of a continuous vernacular translation of Scripture in both France and Germany. The groups of teachers that used these translations to teach the weekly *Torah* and *haftarah* portions in a rudimentary fashion to non-scholars were called *poterim*. An individual who taught Scripture at this basic level was called a *qara* or a *naqdan*.²⁸

Elazar Touitou, building on the conclusion of Moshe Ahrend that *qara* (in the case of R. Joseph Kara) was a title akin to “professor of Bible,”²⁹ and on the suggestions of Banitt, has claimed that there was a cadre of Bible teachers in Ashkenaz who taught *peshat* interpretation of Scripture on an advanced level.³⁰ Touitou’s textual proofs for the existence of these “*ba‘alei Miqra*” are a passage from Rashi’s biblical commentary,³¹ which Touitou himself noted is nothing more than a paraphrase of a talmudic formulation, and an exegetical passage from R. Avraham b. ‘Azriel’s *‘Arugat ha-bosem*.³² R. Avraham b. Azriel was a dedicated student of R. Eleazar (Roqeah) ben Judah of Worms and the German Pietists who, as we shall see, were more interested in biblical studies than Ashkenazic society as a whole.

The weakness of these proofs aside, teachers of *peshat* did undoubtedly teach and discuss their interpretations and methodologies with groups of students.³³ There is no evidence, however, that these lectures were connected in any way to the Tosafist academies. At most, some of those present may have been Tosafists. Indeed, among the known *pashṭanim*, only Rashbam and Bekhor Shor were important Talmudists.³⁴ R. Joseph Kara studied in Worms, as well as in Mainz, and later in Troyes. He was involved in the transmission of talmudic interpretations from Germany to France.³⁵ But it appears that he was preoccupied in both regions with the study of Scripture, as his title implies.

The biblical commentaries of the circle of *pashṭanim* certainly do not reflect the normal give and take of the Tosafist academies. They are referred to and structured as the products of individual authors. Even the addenda or responses of R. Joseph Kara and Rashbam to the comments of Rashi are essentially literary and do not necessarily reflect classroom discussion.³⁶

The strong disclaimers that Rashbam made in regard to the relationship between his own *peshat* commentary to the Pentateuch and the methods of scriptural interpretation employed by the Oral Law highlight the difficulties that a talmudist would encounter if he became involved in *peshat* exegesis. Indeed, Rashbam noted that most rabbinic scholars did not deal systematically with *Miqra* because of talmudic dicta such as, “*ha-oseq ba-Miqra middah ve-‘einah middah*.”³⁷ R. Joseph Kara called attention to the fact that *ba‘alei ḥaggadah* and *ba‘alei Talmud* would not suffer (his) interpretations that ran counter to rabbinic exegesis.³⁸

The commentaries of R. Joseph Bekhor Shor were cited with great frequency by Tosafist commentaries, especially *Sefer ha-Gan*. Bekhor Shor’s commentaries, however, are replete with midrashic and talmudic interpretations and analyses. They contain passages introduced by *‘im-toṣartfesh lomar*, in the style of the Tosafist commentaries, as well as interpretations using *gematria*.³⁹ R. Joseph’s works convey the impression that he was keenly interested in various aspects of rabbinic biblical interpretation and not only in *peshat*. Generally, the *pashṭanim*

who are cited in the so-called Tosafist commentaries appear as additional resources, not as methodological models.⁴⁰

Recent research has examined the possible role that Christian polemics, as well as contemporary Christian biblical exegesis, had in the development of *peshat* exegesis.⁴¹ Tosafist masters produced hardly any polemical literature.⁴² In addition to the issues outlined above, the cautious stance toward polemics taken by the Tosafists may partially explain the lack of significant interest on their part in developing and employing *peshat* methodology.⁴³

Ephraim Urbach has noted the existence of biblical comments by more than twenty Tosafists. Most of these comments were related to legal issues and were probably made in the course of talmudic lectures. Almost all were comments on the Pentateuch.⁴⁴ R. Isaac b. Asher (Riba), who commented on a verse in Ezekiel, studied in the pre-Crusade period.⁴⁵ R. Samuel he-Hasid, who commented extensively on the Book of Chronicles, was part of the exceptional German Pietists whose unusual approach to biblical studies will be discussed shortly.⁴⁶ Comments that revolved around grammatical issues were invariably the product of early Tosafists who studied in pre-Crusade Germany.⁴⁷ There is also a significant correlation between French Tosafists who commented on or wrote *piyyuṭim* and those who authored *peshat* commentaries. The disappearance of *piyyuṭ* composition and commentary in northern France coincides with the last of the *pashṭanim*.⁴⁸

The comments of R. Eliezer b. Joel ha-Levi (Rabiah) that have survived consist entirely of *gematria* methodology or analyses of Rashi's commentary.⁴⁹ R. Moses of Coucy appears to have commented extensively on the Pentateuch itself. His affinity to the German Pietists and his role as a *darshan* may explain his unique contribution.⁵⁰

On the whole, the Tosafists believed that there was no room for distinct sessions devoted to Bible study within the academy curriculum. Those verses that were cited by talmudic *sugyot*, or that were contained in the weekly portion, were subject to Tosafist analysis. Even the analysis of verses in the latter category, however, was related to talmudic studies. The involvement of the Tosafists in independent Bible study was far more limited than that of their predecessors in the pre-Crusade period. Only the small circle of *pashṭanim* inherited the earlier tendencies with regard to biblical studies and elaborated upon them. Profiat Duran (d. ca. 1414) wrote:

In this period, I note that Jewish scholars, even the greatest among them, show great disdain for biblical studies. It is enough for them to read the weekly portion *shenayim miqra ve-ehad targum* and still it is possible that if you ask them about a particular verse, they will not know where it is. They consider one who spends time doing biblical studies a fool because the Talmud is our mainstay. This disease is as rampant in France and Germany in our generation as it was in

the preceding period. But in earlier generations it was not so. We see the glory of the Talmudists uplifted by...the great Rashi who delved into the meaning of Scripture (*he'emiq ba-havanat ha-Miqra*) and wrote beautiful commentaries on it, including wonderful formulations about grammar and syntax.⁵¹

Duran may have been exhibiting a degree of Sefardic bias in failing to mention any of the commentaries of the northern French *pashṭanim*. Perhaps the small number and scope of these commentaries did not impress Duran. As their commentaries and halakhic works indicate, Tosafists did know the content of the Bible, its talmudic interpretation, and the commentaries of Rashi quite well. But the claim of Duran, that Ashkenazic scholars (from the twelfth century onward) subscribed to the notion that “*ha-Talmud hu ha-ṣiqqar*” and did not systematically study the Bible, other than in their review of the portion of the week, was essentially accurate.⁵²

There was one other small group within medieval Ashkenaz, the German Pietists, who recognized the importance of independent Bible study. They too were inspired by the values and teachers of the pre-Crusade period. At the same time, their writings show conclusively that Ashkenazic society in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries generally followed the Tosafist model with regard to the study of Scripture.

The German Pietists' sharp critique of the impact that Tosafist dialectic was having on talmudic studies in Ashkenaz has been thoroughly documented and analyzed.⁵³ The Pietists were also deeply concerned about the place of Bible study in Ashkenaz and here too they wished to correct prevailing practices. Their critique in this area was multi-faceted. First, they insisted that biblical studies must be given a much higher priority by accomplished scholars in Ashkenaz. A striking version of this critique is found in a comment of R. Eleazar of Worms on the pietistic leitmotif, *Torat ha-Shem temimah* (Ps 19:8).

R. Eleazar wrote that a penetrating scholar (*navon ha-maskil*) must be familiar with the entire biblical corpus for several reasons. Numerous commandments were derived from or explained in the prophetic works. Moreover, knowledge of Scripture (and the Aramaic Targum) would allow the scholar to unlock “the secret of the Hebrew language...which in turn would yield the essence of life and the secret of the Torah.” A scholar must have at least a passing familiarity with Scripture. If he does not, he will not know where verses which the Talmud cites come from and whether the Talmud is interpreting them simply or in midrashic fashion. Is the verse being used as a source of law or merely as secondary verification? “Thus the Torah is faithful to the Talmud; it makes the fool wise.”⁵⁴ Several other pietistic texts also proclaimed the importance of being able to demonstrate “how the Talmud (= Oral Law) is derived from the Torah.”⁵⁵

This aspect of the Pietists' critique in regard to biblical studies was undoubtedly motivated by one of the major concerns that fueled their critique of talmudic

dialectics. The Pietists advocated a return to the pre-Crusade method of talmudic study. That study stressed the importance of replicating substantive halakhic traditions in straightforward fashion, without recourse to the expanded conclusions that dialectic might yield. Similarly, they stressed the importance of Bible study as a critical link in the halakhic process, as it had been viewed in the pre-Crusade period.⁵⁶

Of course, as the comment of R. Eleazar of Worms to Ps 19:8 suggests, biblical studies also had a significant role to play in the transmission of esoteric teachings. Use of the Bible as a source for both the ethical and esoteric teachings of the German Pietists is commonplace throughout *Sefer Ḥasidim* and the entire corpus of pietistic literature.⁵⁷ Numerous passages within the so-called *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al ha-Torah* commentaries, as well as the biblical commentaries attributed to Eleazar of Worms, contain mystical, midrashic, and even *sensus litteralis* interpretations produced by the German Pietists.⁵⁸

As part of their larger concern for the spiritual well-being and development of the non-scholar, *Sefer Ḥasidim* and *Sefer Roqeah* also recommended the study of Bible as an appropriate pursuit for older youths and adults who could not master the study of the Talmud.⁵⁹ Moreover, *Sefer Ḥasidim* suggested that the earliest stages of the educational process in Ashkenaz, the elementary study of Scripture and even the teaching of reading, should also be viewed as opportunities for moral instruction and for encouraging religious piety, not only in potential pietists, but in the average Jewish child as well.⁶⁰

It is difficult to gauge whether the demands of the German Pietists concerning Bible study had an impact on contemporary Ashkenazic society. As with the *pashanim*, the small number of Pietists and the absence of any fundamental change in the nature of biblical study in thirteenth-century Ashkenaz suggest that the impact was slight.⁶¹ Independent Bible study was advocated in medieval Ashkenaz only by small, unrelated groups of scholars and religious leaders who took their cue from rabbinic scholarship of the pre-Crusade period. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century Ashkenazic Jewry as a whole, however, apparently followed the lead of the Tosafists for whom the Talmud constituted the basis of all their intellectual endeavors.

NOTES

1. Frank Talmage, "Keep Your Sons from Scripture: The Bible in Medieval Jewish Scholarship and Spirituality," in *Understanding Scripture: Explorations of Jewish and Christian Traditions of Interpretation*, ed. Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod (New York, 1989), 81-101.
2. As Talmage noted, a similar study entitled "'Min'u beneikhem min ha-higgayon'" was published by Mordechai Breuer in *Mikhtam le-David: Sefer zikhron ha-Rav David 'Oqs [Ochs]*, ed. Yitschak Gilat and Eliezer Stern (Ramat Gan, 1978), 242-64.

3. See Tosafot to B.T. Sanhedrin 24a, s.v. "belulah;" Qiddushin 30a, s.v. "la serikha;" Avodah Zarah 19b, s.v. "yeshallesh;" Elhanan ben Isaac, of Dampierre, *Tosafot al Massekhet Avodah Zarah* (Husiatyn, 1901), ad loc.; and Moses of Coucy, *Sefer Mišvot gadol* (Venice, 1547), c^aseh 12 (fol. 97b).
4. See Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2d ed., vol. 5 (Philadelphia, 1957), 34, 336 (n. 37).
5. See Samuel Poznanski, "Mavo al ha-khmei Šarefat mefarshei ha-Miqra," in Eliezer of Beaugency, *Peirush al Yehezkel u-Terei asar* (Warsaw, 1913), 53-54; Ephraim E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 4th ed., 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1980), 1:107-110; and cf. below, n. 27.
6. See, e.g., Poznanski, "Mavo," 13-21, 39-49; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:48; and *Enšiqlopedyah Miqra'it*, s.v. "Tanakh. Parshanut. Parshanei Šarefat;" 8:690-96 (by Moshe Greenberg; repr. in *Parshanut ha-Miqra ha-Yehudit: pirqei mavo*, ed. Moshe Greenberg [Jérusalem, 1983], 68-77). Rabbeinu Tam's younger brother, Solomon, who was known as "the doyen of grammarians (*avi ha-daiqanim*)," apparently directed most of his efforts toward the study of biblical grammar. See Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:59. R. Hayyim Yosef David Azulai [Hida], *Shem ha-gedolim* (Warsaw, 1876), 116, attributed this statement to Rabbeinu Tam: "I will engage in interpretation of the Talmud, as my revered grandfather did. But I will not undertake biblical interpretation for I do not have the capacity to pursue it."
7. Joseph Qimhi, *Sefer ha-Galui*, ed. H. J. Mathews (Berlin, 1887; repr. Jerusalem, 1966/67.), 2.
8. Tosafot Qiddushin/Avodah Zarah (above, n. 3) cited approvingly the accommodation of R. Amram Gaon [which was in vogue in Spain; see *Ošar ha-Ge'onim, Qiddushin (Teshuvot)*, 82] that one's obligation to study Scripture, Mishnah, and Talmud each day could be discharged by reciting passages from each of these disciplines as part of the morning prayer service. Rabbeinu Tam's assertion that the study of the Babylonian Talmud subsumed the necessary study of Scripture had already been expressed by R. Natronai Gaon. See *Teshuvot ha-Ge'onim*, ed. Jacob Mussafia (Lyck, 1864), #9; *Teshuvot ha-Ge'onim-Sha'arei teshuvah*, ed. Zvi Leiter (New York, 1946), #55; Simhah ben Samuel, *Maḥazor Viṭri*, ed. S. Hurwitz, 2d ed. (Nürnberg, 1923), 26, and Zedekiah ben Abraham Anav, *Shibbolei ha-leqet*, ed. Salomon Buber (Vilna, 1887), sec. 44. R. Natronai's formulation, however, attributed the need for a streamlined program of study to economic and other exigencies, factors mentioned neither by Rabbeinu Tam nor by the supporting Tosafot formulations. Cf. *Hiddushei Talmidei Rabbeinu Xonah al Massekhet Avodah Zarah*, ed. H. Zarkowski (New York, 1955), 25, and R. Hayyim b. Bezalel, *Eš ha-hayyim* (below, n. 61). Some contemporary Spanish and Provençal halakhists also sought to limit the amount of time that a mature scholar spent on formal Bible study. See the view of R. Meir ha-Levi Abulafia (Ramah) cited in R. Yeruham b. Meshullam, *Toledot Adam ve-Havvah* (Venice, 1553), 16b. According to Ramah, the increasingly limited intellectual capacity of scholars dictated that biblical studies should be undertaken only in one's youth. The major preoccupation of one's subsequent academic career, however, must be the study of Talmud. (Bernard Septimus, *Hispano-Jewish Culture in Transition* [Cambridge, Mass., 1982], 127, n. 106, raises the possibility that this formulation belongs to (the Tosafist) R. Meir of Rothenburg rather than to Ramah.) See also R. Meir b. Shim'on ha-Me'išli, of Narbonne, *Sefer ha-Me'qror. (Massekhet Berakhot)*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1966), 94. Yom Tov ben Abraham al-Ishbili, *Hiddushei ha-Riṭba al Massekhet Avodah Zarah*, 19b, citing one of his teachers, also maintained that biblical studies should be undertaken thoroughly only at the beginning of one's career. This formulation, however, bears some resemblance to a passage in Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, *Hilkhot Talmud Torah*, 1.12, which was directed toward

the scholar who has fully mastered biblical literature and had no need for constant review.

9. See Shlomo Eidelberg, ed., *Teshuvot Rabbeinu Gershom Me'or ha-Golah* (New York, 1955), #71, p. 166; the responsum of Ri, cited in Isaac ben Moses of Vienna, *Sefer 'Or zarua'* (Zhitomir, 1862), Pišqei Bava Mešia', sec. 242 (= *Teshuvot Maharam mi-Roženburg [Prague]*, ed. M. A. Block [Budapest, 1895], #477); Isaac ben Moses, *'Or zarua'*, vol. 1, Hilkhot Qeriat Shema', sec. 12; and Menahem Banitt, "L'étude des glossaires bibliques des Juifs en France au moyen âge: Méthode et application," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2(1967): 195. R. Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, *Sefer Roqeaḥ* (Jerusalem, 1970), 11, traced the stages of the educational process: "First the child should be taught to recognize the letters, then to form words with them, then the verse, then the *parashah*, then Mishnah, then Talmud." This appears to be a depiction of the common practice, to which R. Eleazar then appended a warning that each child should be educated according to his own proclivities. See below, n. 60. See also the discussion regarding *Sefer Huqqei ha-Torah* in my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1992), 101-05. Cf. Breuer, "'Min'u beneikhem min ha-higgayon,'" 249-50. No conclusions with regard to elementary education can be drawn from the formulation of Rabbeinu Tam. As a passage in the ethical will of R. Judah b. ha-Rosh (see *Beit ha-Talmud* 4[1885]: 344) indicates, the younger students in Ashkenaz who were taught the biblical text were not exposed to grammatical or exegetical analysis. Cf. the critiques of Profiat Duran and Abraham Ibn Ezra, below, nn. 51, 54.
10. Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in the Sefer Ḥasidim," *AJS Review* 1(1976): 347.
11. See Louis Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1964), 231. The ordinance was attributed incorrectly to R. Tam by Simḥah Assaf, in his *Meqorot le-toledot ha-hinnukh be-Yisra'el*, 4 vols. (Tel Aviv, 1925-42), 1:4.
12. Abraham Grossman, *Ḥakhmei 'Ashkenaz ha-rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1981), 419-20. See also Israel Ta-Shma, "Halakhah, minhag, u-masoret be-Yahadut 'Ashkenaz ba-me'ot ha-11-12," *Sidra* 3(1987): 122.
13. Grossman, *Ḥakhmei 'Ashkenaz*, 64-66, 74, 226, 250, 353.
14. *Ibid.*, 96. Familiarity with midrashic literature was also required. See Abraham b. Azriel, *'Arugat ha-bosem*, ed. Ephraim Urbach, vol. 4 (Jerusalem, 1963), 167-76.
15. Grossman, *Ḥakhmei 'Ashkenaz*, 154-57, 187, 430-32. Cf. pp. 342, 396. See also A. Grossman, "Haggirat Yehudim 'el Gernanyah ve-hityashvutam bah ba-me'ot 9-11," in *Haggirah ve-hityashvut be-Yisra'el u-va-'ammim*, ed. Avigdor Shinan (Jerusalem, 1982), 112, n. 9. This type of usage was curtailed by the mid-eleventh century.
16. Grossman, *Ḥakhmei 'Ashkenaz*, 62-63, 158-61, 419.
17. Grossman, *Ḥakhmei 'Ashkenaz*, 289, 226, 240, 249-50, 412. Cf. David Berger's review in *Tarbiḥ* 53(1983-84): 484, n. 7.
18. See Grossman, "Ha-Polmos ha-Yehudi/Nošeri ve-ha-parshanut ha-Yehudit la-Miqra be-Šarefat ba-me'ah ha-12," *Zion* 51(1986): 60. According to Grossman (*Ḥakhmei 'Ashkenaz*, 420), the *peshaḥ* methodology of Rashi was not his creation but rather the development of an approach that he learned from his teacher R. Jacob b. Yaqar.
19. For a description of the so-called Tosafist commentaries to the Torah, see Poznanski, "Mavo," 92-119. A comprehensive listing of published sources as well as manuscripts was compiled by Jacob Gellis in *Tosafot ha-shalem*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1982), 11-38. I. S. Lange, "Peirush Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al ha-Torah—MS. Paris 48," *'Aleī sefer* 5(1978): 73-74, has noted that a comprehensive study of the content, style and historical and cultural development of the Tosafist commentaries is still a desideratum.
20. An example of this type is the commentary published by Shraga Abramson under the title *Ba'alei Tosafot 'al ha-Torah* (Jerusalem, 1974). See also Abramson's introduction, pp. 7-11.

21. See Poznanski, "Mavo," 92-93; Greenberg, "Parshanei Šarefat," 702 [repr. (above, n. 6), 78-79]; and cf. Elazar Touitou, "Al gilgulei ha-nosaḥ shel Peirush Rashi la-Torah," *Tarbiz* 56(1986-87): 238-41. When *pashṭanim* were cited in the Tosafist commentaries, they were simply incorporated into the flow of the text. See below, n. 40.
22. The verses in the early part of Genesis, many of which are not analyzed in talmudic literature, are particularly fruitful for the exegete interested in *remez* and *gematria*. These methodologies are often associated with the German Pietists. Many of their comments appear in Tosafist commentaries; indeed, some are occasionally attributed to Tosafists. See Joseph Dan, *Torat ha-sod shel Ḥasidut ṽAshkenaz* (Jerusalem, 1968), 65-70, 220-21; J. N. Epstein, "L'auteur du commentaire des Chroniques," *Revue des études juives* 58 (1909): 196-97; and Urbach in Abraham b. Azriel, *Arugat ha-bosem*, 4:110, 152-54; and below, n. 58.
23. See Tosafot Berakhot 8b, s.v. "R. Yosef;" *Tosfat Rabbenu Yehudah Sirle'on*, ed. Nisan Zaqš (Jerusalem, 1969), 90 s.v. "yashlim;" Isaac ben Moses, *Or zarua* 1:12 (p. 22); "Haggahot Maimoniyot," to Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, Hilkhot Tefillah, 13:25 [300]; and *Shibbolei ha-leqef*, [above, n. 8], sec. 75.
24. *Sefer ha-Yashar le-Rabbenu Tam* (Responsa), ed. Sheraga Rosenthal (Berlin, 1898), #47:1. (On the implications of this source for the larger conflict between R. Tam and R. Meshullam, see Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:71-82.) R. Eleazar of Worms may also have referred to this type of weekly lecture; see A. M. Habermann, ed., *Gezeirot ṽAshkenaz ve-Šarefat* (Jerusalem, 1945), 164. See also *Peirushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid*, ed. I. Š. Lange (Jerusalem, 1975), and Solomon Schechter, "Notes on a Hebrew Commentary to the Pentateuch in a Parisian Manuscript," in *Semitic Studies in Memory of Alexander Kohut*, ed. George Alexander Kohut (Berlin, 1897), 486.
25. See *Sefer Mišvot gadol*, [above, n. 3], fol. 103b, c.aseh 19 (end), and cf. *Peirush R. Ašer b. Yeḥi'el al Mašṣekhet Berakhot*, 1:8.
26. See, e.g., Nehama Leibowitz, *Iyyunim ḥadashim be-Sefer Shemot* (Jerusalem, 1970), 497-524; Sarah Kamin, *Rašhi-Pešuṭo shel Miqra u-midrasho shel Miqra* (Jerusalem, 1986), 263-72; and Moshe Ahrend, "Peirush Rašbam le-Iyyov?" *Alei sefer* 5(1978): 46-47. There is a degree of correlation and consistency between Rashi's biblical and talmudic commentaries. See Elazar Touitou, "Al heqer parshanuto shel Rashi la-Miqra," *Tarbiz* 52(1982-83): 360-63, which is a review of Yoel Florsheim, *Rashi la-Miqra be-feirusho la-Talmud*.
27. The Book of Job, for example, merited half a dozen commentaries by northern French *pashṭanim*. See Moshe Sokolow, "Ahrend's Yoseph Qara on Job," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 72(1981): 153-55. On northern French commentaries to Proverbs, see Frank Talmage, "Mi-kitvei R. ṽAvigdor Qara ve-R. Meṇaḥem Šalem," in *Hagut u-ma'aseh: Sefer zikkaron le-Shim'on Ravidovič [Ravidowicz] bi-melot esrim va-ḥamesh shanim le-moto*, ed. Avraham Greṅṅbaum, Alfred Ivry (Tel-Aviv, 1983), 50, n. 12. On the works of Meṇaḥem bar Ḥelbo, see Poznanski, "Pitronei R. Meṇaḥem bar Ḥelbo le-Khitvei ha-Qodesh," in *Sefer ha-yovel li-khvod Naḥum Soqolov* (Warsaw, 1904), 389-439. On Joseph Kara's works, see Moshe Ahrend, *Le-Commentaire sur Job de R. Yoseph Qara* (Hildesheim, 1978), 180-84. Rašbam authored commentaries on a number of biblical books outside the Pentateuch, although the attribution to him of certain French commentaries is questionable. See Šarquel ben Meir, *The Commentary of Samuel ben Meir Rašbam on Qoheleth*, ed. and trans. Sara Japhet and R. B. Salters (Jerusalem, 1985), 14-31.
28. See Banitt, "L'étude des glossaires bibliques," 188-210, and Banitt, "Les Poterim," *Revue des études juives* 125(1966): 21-33.
29. Ahrend, *Le Commentaire sur Job de R. Yoseph Qara*, 2-3.
30. Elazar Touitou, "Šiṭato ha-parshanit shel Rašbam al roqac ha-meši'ut ha-historit shel

- zemanano," in 'lyuntim be-sifrut Hatzal, ha-Miqra u-ve-toledot Yisra'el miqdash le-Prof. Ezra Stryon Me'annned, ed. Y. D. Gilat, Ch. Levin, Z. M. Rabinovitz (Ramat Gan, 1982), 60; idem, "Al gillig'el ha-nosah shel Petrush Rashi," [above, n. 21], 216. See also Moshe Ahrend's introduction to *Petrush R. Yosef Qara le-Iyyov* (Jerusalem, 1988), 26-27, n. 25.
31. Rashi to Sgs 7:13, s.v. "nir'eh'im parnah ha-gefen (= Judah Rosenthal, ed., "Petrush Rashi 'al Shir ha-Shirim," in *Samuel K. Mirsky Jubilee Volume*, ed. Simon Bernstein and Gershon A. Churgin [New York, 1958], 182).
32. Abraham b. Azriel, *Arugat ha-bosem*, ed. Urbach, 3:289, and n. 17; Cf. E. Touitou, "Al ha-gefen parshanuto, shel Rashi la-Miqra," 367; idem, "Al ha-gefen parshanuto, shel Rashi la-Miqra (a review of Ahrend's *Le Commentaire sur Job de R. Yosef Qara*), and Banitt, "The Lazim of Rashi and of the French Biblical Glossaries," in *The Dark Ages: Jews in Christian Europe*, 711-1096, ed. Cecil Roth, World History of the Jewish People, series 2, vol. 2 (Tel-Aviv, 1966), 291-96. See also I. A. Agus, "The Languages Spoken by Ashkenazic Jews in the High Middle Ages," in *Josua Finkel Festschrift*, ed. Sidney Hoenig and Leon Stitskin (New York, 1974), 19-28.
33. See Rashbam's commentary to Genesis 37:2, and Sarah Kamlin, *Rashi*, 267-72. Rashbam twice referred to questions of exegesis that he received. See his commentary to Numbers 11:35 [note that the question here was in regard to a *derasha* interpretation], and 30:2, and Touitou, "Shit'ato ha-parshanut shel Rashbam," 54, n. 30. Cf. Rashi, *Teshuvot Rashi*, ed. Israel Eifenbein, 1:1-6, and esp. sec. 10 [= Abraham Geiger, *Melo hofnayim*, 36] and see now Abraham Grossman, "Haggahot R. Shema'yah ve-nosah Petrush Rashi 'al ha-Torah," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 67-79. Moshe Ahrend, *Le Commentaire sur Job de R. Yosef Qara*, 19, claimed that Kara's commentary to Job was the result of an oral presentation while Michael Signer, "Exegese et enseignement: les commentaires de Joseph b. Simeon Kara," *Archives juives* 18 (1982): 60-68, has argued that Kara's exegetical writings reflect his activity as a teacher of Scripture. Their documentation, however, is sketchy. See also Ahrend, "Petrush Rashbam le-Iyyov?" 46-47, and Touitou, "Al ha-gefen parshanuto, shel Rashi la-Miqra ha-Yehudit-Sarfatit," 525-27. Cf. Jonah Frankel, *Darkei shel Rashi be-fetrucho la-Talmud ha-Bavli* (Jerusalem, 1980), 284-96.
34. The identification of Bekhor Shor as the Tosafist Joseph of Orleans is beyond question. See Urbach, *Bavlei ha-Tosafot*, 1:134.
35. See Ahrend, *Le Commentaire sur Job de R. Yosef Qara*, 13-23; Grossman, "Ha-Polinos ha-Yehudim/Noseri," 31-32; Urbach in Abraham ben Azriel, *Arugat ha-bosem*, 4:13-15; and Urbach, *Bavlei ha-Tosafot*, 1:43.
36. See Abraham Berliner, ed., *Rashi 'al ha-Torah* (Frankfurt a.M., 1905), introduction, 10; Poznanski, "Mavo," 54-57; Ahrend, *Le Commentaire sur Job de R. Yosef Qara*, 2-3; Poznanski, "Shit'ato ha-parshanut shel Rashbam," 61, n. 76; Morris Berger, "The Torah Commentary of R. Samuel b. Meir" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1982), 195-205; Moshe Sokolow, "Hapeshatot ha-mithaddeshim - Qetanim hadashim mi-petrush ha-Torah la-Rashbam," *Alai sefer* 11 (1984): 73-80; Japhet and Saliers, *The Commentary of Samuel ben Meir Rashbam on Qohel'et*, 14-35. David Rosin, in his introduction to *Rashbam, Perush ha-Torah* (Breslau, 1882), 30, noted that Rashbam and Joseph Kara refer to each other on occasions in their commentaries. See also Rosin, R. Shit'ato ha-parshanut shel R. Yosef Qara li-Nevi'im Rishonim" (M.A. thesis, Bar Ilan University, 1983), 80-81. See also Poznanski, "Mavo," 22-23.
37. See Rashbam's commentary (ed. D. Rosin) to Genesis 1:1, 37:2, and the preamble to Exodus 21. See Elazar Touitou, "Darkei shel Rashbam be-fetrucho la-jeleg ha-halakh shel ha-Torah," *Miller* 2 (1985): 275-88.
38. See R. Joseph Kara's commentary to 1 Sm 1:20. Kara noted that while those who follow

- rabbinic interpretation will reject his exegesis, the *maskilim*, who are faithful to the text, will accept it. On *maskilim* as those who study and interpret Scripture in its own light, see the critique of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra, below, n. 54. Rashbam, in the sources cited in the above note, also referred to those who prefer *peshaṭ* interpretation as *maskilim*. Cf. Touitou, "Shiṭato ha-parshanit shel Rashbam," 66, n. 122.
39. See Poznanski, "Mavo," 55-75; Yehoshafat Nevo, "Yaḥasam shel parshanei ha-Torah Ba'alei ha-Tosafot le-R. Yosef Bekhor Shor," *Sinai* 92(1983): 97-108; and J. M. Orllan, "Sefer Ha-Gan – Text and Analysis" (Ph.D. diss., Yeshiva University, 1973), 54-61.
 40. Compared to Rashbam, Bekhor Shor has fewer comments that disagree with halakhic interpretations of the Sages; see Y. Nevo, "R. Yosef Bekhor Shor parshan ha-peshaṭ," *Sinai* 95(1984): 271-77, and Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:134-36.
 41. See Avraham Grossman, "Ha-Polmos ha-Yehudi/Noṣeri," 57-60; E. Touitou, "Shiṭato ha-parshanit shel Rashbam," 48-74; idem, "Al ḥoqer parshanut ha-Miqra ha-Yehudit-Ṣarfait," 524-26. Cf. Yitzhak Baer, "Rashi ve-ha-meṣiṭut ha-historit shel zemanno," in *Sefer Rashi*, ed. Y. L. Maimon (Jerusalem, 1956), 489-502; Judah Rosenthal, "Ha-Polmos ha-panti-Noṣeri be-Rashi 'al ha-Tanakh," in his *Mehqarim u-meqorot*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1967), 1:101-16; E. I. J. Rosenthal, "Anti-Christian Polemic in Medieval Bible Commentaries," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 11(1960): 115-35; Ephraim Kanarfogel, "Trinitarian and Multiplicity Polemics in the Biblical Commentaries of Rashi, Rashbam and Bekhor Shor," *Gesher* 7(1979): 15-37; Sarah Kamin, "Peirush Rashi 'al Shir ha-Shirim ve-ha-ikkuaḥ ha-Yehudi-Noṣeri," *Shenaton la-Miqra u-le-ḥequer ha-Mizrah ha-Qadum*, 7-8(1983-84): 244-48; Morris Berger, "The Torah Commentary of R. Samuel b. Meir," 321-29.
 42. See Haym Soloveitchik, "Pawnbroking: A Study of Ribbit and of the Halakhah in Exile," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 38-39(1972): 242, n. 63; David Berger, "Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Polemical Literature of the High Middle Ages," *American Historical Review* 91(1986): 589, n. 66; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, index, s.v. "vikkuah 'im Noṣerim." The production of polemical literature in this period was the province of the *pashtanim* and specialists such as the members of the Official family. See Joseph ben Nathan Official, *Sefer Yosef ha-meqanne*, ed. Judah Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1970), introduction, 21-28.
 43. Cf. E. Touitou, "Darko shel Rashbam be-feirusho la-ḥeleq ha-halakhic shel ha-Torah" (above, n. 37); Sarah Kamin, "Ha-Polmos neged ha-allegoryah be-feirusho shel R. Yosef Bekhor Shor," *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Maḥashevet Yisra'el* 3(1983/84): 367-92; Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:226, 2:745; Martin Lockshin, ed. and trans., *R. Samuel b. Meir's Commentary on Genesis* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1989), 13-20. [A form of the word *pitron* is used to introduce *peshaṭ* interpretations (especially by R. Joseph Kara) as well as polemical interpretations (see, e.g., *Sefer Yosef ha-meqanne*, passim). The origin of the meaning and precise use of these terms requires further study.] On possible contacts between Tosafists and masters of cathedral schools, see my *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*, 69-73. On other external influences that led to the development of *peshaṭ* exegesis in northern France, and may in fact have outweighed the role of polemics, see, e.g., W. C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1989), 14-16, and Avraham Grossman, "Bein Sefarad le-Ṣarfait," in *Galut ḏaḥar Golah (Mehqarim be-toledot Yisra'el nuggashim le-Prof. Ḥayyim Beinart)*, ed. Aaron Mirsky, Avraham Grossman, Yosef Kaplan (Jerusalem, 1988), 87-88.
 44. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:146, 149, 263, 333-34, 460; 2:585. See also Norman Golb, *Toledot ha-Yehudim ba-'ir Ru'an bi-yemei ha-beinayim* (Tel Aviv, 1976), 116-18, 190-92.
 45. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 1:173.
 46. *Ibid.*, 195. See also the comment of R. Barukh, *ibid.*, 361, and Abraham b. Azriel,

- ‘*Arugat ha-bosem*, 1:167, n. 1. Cf. Breuer, “Min^cu beneikhem,” 251. The passage in the article of H. H. Ben-Sasson, to which Breuer referred (n. 43) as proof that many Ashkenazic scholars were masters of the biblical text and actively involved in its interpretation, concerned the German Pietists who were not representative. See below.
47. Urbach, *Ba^calei ha-Tosafot*, 1:40, 44, 59, 110.
 48. See Urbach, 1:146, 151, 263, 270, 460,^c and A. Grossman, “Peirus^t ha-Piyyu^tim le-R. Ḥaharon be-R. Ḥayyim ha-Kohen,” in *Be-ḥorah madda^c: meḥqarim...muggashim le-Ḥaharon Mir^sqi [Mirsky]*, ed. Zvi Malachi (Lod, 1986), 451-68. On R. Joseph Kara’s piyyu^t commentaries, see Urbach, in ‘*Arugat ha-bosem*, 4:3-23, and A. Grossman, “Polmos’ anti-Noḥeri be-feirushav shel R. Yosef Qara la-Miqra ve-la-Piyyu^t,” *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, Aug. 4-12, 1985: Division B: History of the Jewish People (From the Second Temple until the Middle Ages)*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1986), 75-77. Commentaries to piyyu^t were also authored by twelfth-century German scholars who were directly linked with the pre-Crusade period, and by the German Pietists who were attempting to rekindle interest in piyyu^t. See Urbach, in Abraham ben Azriel, ‘*Arugat ha-bosem*, vol. 4, chaps. 2, 3.
 49. Urbach, *Ba^calei ha-Tosafot*, 1:387. Urbach doubts whether in fact this is Rabbiah’s commentary. See Victor Aptowitzer, *Mavo le-Sefer Ravyah* (Jerusalem, 1938), 184-85.
 50. Urbach, *Ba^calei ha-Tosafot*, 1:465^c-78; Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (New York, 1961), 102-05. Cf. Jacob Elbaum, “Shalosh derashot ḥAshkenazyot mi-ketav yad Beit ha-sefarim,” *Qiryat sefer* 48(1972-73):340-47, and MS, Bodleian Library (Oxford) Laud. 115 (Uri 126) (Neubauer 340), fols. 143-61. The *Derashot* of R. Ḥayyim ḥOr Zaruac (cited, e.g., by Jacob Mœllin, *Teshuvot Maharil, Minhagei Maharil*, and Israel ben Pethahiah Isserlein, *Terumat ha-deshen*) were halakhic, with homiletical introductions. See N. Goldstein, “R. Ḥayyim Eliezer b. Isaac ḥOr Zaruac—his Life and Works” (D.H.I., diss., Yeshiva University, 1959), 36-37; I. S. Lange, ed., *Derashot R. Ḥayyim ḥOr Zaruac* (Jerusalem, 1975); and *Tosafot ha-shalem*, ed. Jacob Gellis, vol. 5 (Va-yehi) (Jerusalem, 1986), 105, 198, 227. The commentary on most of the books in *Nevi^ḥim* and *Ketuvim* attributed to the Italian Tosafist R. Isaiah di Trani was probably the work of his grandson, R. Isaiah the Younger. This commentary makes use of the commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Radaq and contains Italian glosses. In any event, R. Isaiah the Elder’s provenance and background make him an exception within the Tosafist orbit. See Israel Ta-Shema in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Isaiah ben Elijah di Trani,” (vol. 9, cols. 73-74); E. Z. Melammed, “Le-feirush Nakh shel R. Yesha^cyah mi-Trani,” in *Meḥqarim ba-Miqra u-va-Mizrah ha-Qadmon muggashim li-Shemu^cel ḥA. Livenshtam [Loewenstamm] bi-melot lo shiv^cim shanah*, ed. Yitschak Avishur and Joshua Blau (Jerusalem, 1978), 279-301; S. Z. Leiman, “Ḥaharonei ha-parshanim bi-Sefarad u-Provans u-farshanei ḥItalyah,” *ḤEnsiqlopedyah Miqra^cit*, 8:708 [repr. (above, n. 6), 91-92]; and Urbach, *Ba^calei ha-Tosafot*, 1:413, 435.
 51. Profiat Duran, *Ma^caseh ḥefod* (Vienna, 1865), 41. See also his introduction, 13-14, and Dov Rappel, “Haqdamat Sefer ‘Ma^caseh ḥefod’ li-Profiat Duran,” *Sinai* 100 [*Sefer Yovel*] (1987): 755-56.
 52. Talmage, “Keep Your Sons from Scripture,” 86-87, held that Duran’s critique concerning the absence of biblical studies in Ashkenaz was restricted to the fourteenth century. It appears from Duran’s formulation, however, that the downward spiral began more immediately after Rashi.
 53. See Haym Soloveitchik, “Three Themes,” 339-54, and Israel Ta-Shema, “Miḥvat Talmud Torah ki-ve^cayah ḥevratit-datit be-‘Sefer Hasidim,’” *Bar Ilan* 14-15(1977): 98-113. Cf. Ivan Marcus, *Piety and Society* (Leiden, 1981), 102-06. Marcus views the Pietist critique differently.
 54. MS. Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) héb. 772, fol. 21r, cited by E. E. Urbach in his

- introduction to *Arugat ha-bosem*, 4:111. In this passage, R. Eleazar of Worms used the term *miqra* to refer to biblical books other than the Pentateuch. On the use of the term *miqra* in this manner, see *Sifrei*, ed. Louis Finkelstein (Berlin, 1940), Ha'azinu, section 317 (p. 359, line 14): "...zo Torah...zeh Miqra...zo Mishnah..." See also the elegy "Mi yitten roshi mayim," of R. Qalonymous b. Judah ha-Ba'ur, a Qalonymide ancestor of Eleazar of Worms in Habermann, *Gezeirot Ashkenaz ve-Şarefat*, 67. R. Qalonymus mourned the loss of the great German scholars during the First Crusade who were thoroughly versed in "Torah, Miqra, Mishnah, 'aggadah." Eleazar also used *miqra* in this way in his introduction to *Sefer Roqeah*, 14: "If one cannot study Talmud, he should study *midrashim*, or *miqra* or *humash*..." The absence of the study of these sections of Scripture was particularly acute in Ashkenaz, as we have noted. Cf. Epstein, "L'auteur du commentaire des Chroniques," 189-99. Talmage, "Keep Your Sons from Scripture," 86, has noted the striking similarities, in both style and content, between R. Eleazar's remarks and a passage in Abraham Ibn Ezra's *Yesod mora*, and has cogently suggested that the Ibn Ezra text was a source for Eleazar's formulation. On the relationship of the German Pietists to Ibn Ezra, and their use specifically of *Yesod mora*, see Dan, *Torah ha-Sod shel Hasidut Ashkenaz*, 29-30, 51. Indeed, since *Yesod mora* was written in London in 1158, Talmage felt that it too may have been referring to Ashkenazic scholars. Cf. Uriel Simon, "R. Avraham Ibn Ezra - bein ha-mefaresh le-qor'av," in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Panel Sessions, Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* (Jerusalem, 1985), 40-42.
55. See Epstein, "L'auteur," 198-99, n. 2, and Joseph Dan, "'Sefer ha-hokhmah' le-R. El'azar mi-Vorms u-mashma'uto le-toledot toratah ve-sifrutah shel Hasidut Ashkenaz," *Zion* 29(1964): 170-71.
 56. The German Pietists sought to rehabilitate or preserve virtually all the disciplines that comprised the pre-Crusade curriculum. See Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 345-46.
 57. See, e.g., Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 312-20. *Sefer Hasidim* makes extensive use of the entire biblical corpus. One section of the Parma manuscript (ed. Jehuda Wistinetzki and Jakob Freiman [Frankfurt a. M., 1924; henceforth *SHP*]) (paragraphs 1792-1874) entitled *Sefer ha-Hasidim be-Mishlei Shelomoh* is devoted to pietistic interpretation of verses in the Book of Proverbs. Cf. *SHP* 666. R. Eleazar of Worms commented extensively on all of the *megillot* and on the *haftarot*. See his *Qiryat sefer* (Lemberg, 1905), and the next note.
 58. For the biblical commentaries of the German Pietists, and the Tosafist biblical commentaries in which German Pietists were cited, see the following entries in the introduction of Jacob Gellis to his edition of Tosafist commentaries, *Tosafot ha-shalem*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1982): *Da'at Zeqanim* (p. 12); *Perush ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Hasid* (16) [add R. Yehudah's *Ta'amei masoret ha-Miqra*, ed. I. S. Lange (Jerusalem, 1985); cf. R. Meir of Rothenburg's *Ta'amei masoret ha-Miqra* (13); and *Perush Ba'al ha-Turim 'al ha-Torah* (16); and Bodleian Library [henceforth BL] (Oxford) Opp.31 (Ol.260) (Neubauer 271/5, 6) (22)]; *Perush ha-Roqeah 'al ha-Torah* (18); and R. Elezer [sic] mi-Germaizah (20) [add the so-called commentary of R. Eleazar Roqeah to the Pentateuch and the Megillot published in three volumes by S. Konyevsky (Benei Beraq, 1979-81). The author utilizes the methodology of the Pietists but is not R. Eleazar; see Joseph Dan in *Qiryat sefer* 59(1984): 644]; *Pesha'im u-ferushim* (19); BL (Oxford) Opp.31 (Ol. 260) (Neubauer 271/22); Opp.202 (Ol.263) (Neubauer 945); Opp.225 (Ol.285) (Neubauer 970/4-6); Opp.506 (Ol.1017) (Neubauer 1812/6) (22-24); Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana ebr. 45/1 (26); Jewish National and University Library (Jerusalem) Heb. 8° 5138 (27); British Library (London) Or.10855/1 (Gaster 748) (29); Bibliothek Rijksuniversiteit (Leiden) Cod. Or. 4765 (Warn. 27) (29); Russian State Library (Moscow) Ginzburg 82/1, 322/22 (29-30); J TSA 793, 899/1, 1062, 1065/3 (32-33); Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire (Strasbourg) 44/3 (38). See also the texts

- published by Joseph Dan "Sefer Mal'akhim' le-R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid," *Da'ar* 2(1978): 99-120; Mosheh Hershler, "Midrash Shemoneh 'Esreh le-Rabeinu 'El'azar mi-Vormaiza ba'al ha-Roqeah," *Sinai* 74(1974): 193-200; and Manfred Lehmann, "Peirush 'al P. Bo mi-Rabeinu 'Efrayim ben Rabbeinu Shimshon ve-R. 'El'azar mi-Germaiza," *Sinai* 71(1972): 1-20 and his edition of the commentary of 'Eleazar to Esther published under the title *Sha'arei binah* (New York, 1980). On the methodology of the biblical interpretations of the German Pietists, see Epstein, "L'auteur du commentaire des Chroniques," 193-94; Gershon Brin, "Qavvim le-feirush ha-Torah shel R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid," in *Mehqarim be-sifrut ha-Talmud, bi-leshon Hazal u-ve-farshanut ha-Miqra*, ed. M. A. Friedman, Avraham Tal, Gershon Brin (Tel-Aviv, 1983), 215-220; Dan, (above, n. 55), 177-81; and Ivan Marcus, "Exegesis for the Few and for the Many: Judah he-Ḥasid's Biblical Commentaries," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 8(1989), 1*-24*. See also the anonymous work *Te'amim shel Humash*, originally attributed by Israel Levi to R. Leontin, the teacher of R. Gershon, and published in *Revue des études juives* 49(1904): 234-38. (Levi, in *REJ* 53 [1907]: 153-54, accepted the claim of Abraham Epstein, "Leontin und andere Namen in dem Ta'amim shel Humash," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 49[1905]: 557-70, that this was a twelfth century text.) On its affinity to the work of the German Pietists, see Epstein, "L'auteur du commentaire des Chroniques," 196-97. Study of *midrash* was also extremely important to the German Pietists. See Dan, *Torat ha-söd shel Ḥasidut 'Ashkenaz*, 10-12, 20-22, 'Arugat ha-bosem, 4:155-76; and Soloveitchik, "Three Themes," 322-23.
59. *SHP* 748, 824-825, 796, 765, 745, 751; *Sefer Roqeah*, above, n. 54, and Ta-Shema, "Mišvat Talmud Torah," 99-101.
 60. *SHP* 820. The importance of studying texts in a manner which will inculcate fear of heaven extends to older students as well. See *SHP* 752. On the concern shown by *Sefer Ḥasidim* for the educational development of the average child, see Ta-Shema, "Mišvat Talmud Torah," 107-111, and my *Jewish Education and Society*, 40-41.
 61. Despite the fact that R. Eleazar of Worms was among the many signators, it is unlikely that the *Taqqanot Shum* (above, n. 11), which attest to the one-sided curriculum of study in Ashkenaz, were promulgated directly in response to the critique of the German Pietists. The claim of R. Ḥayyim b. Bezalel in his 'Eš ha-ḥayyim (cited by Assaf, *Megorot le-toledot ha-ḥinnukh be-Yisra'el*, 1:43-44), that his sainted predecessors, in particular the "Ḥasidei 'Ashkenaz," were forced to teach their children Talmud exclusively (due to temporal pressures which rendered the teaching of other disciplines impossible for all but a handful of "yeḥidei segulah") was made in the course of a diatribe against those in his own day who did not study Hebrew grammar and syntax. He made no such charge regarding biblical studies. Cf. Talmage, "Keep Your Sons from Scripture," 87. It should also be noted that contemporaries of R. Ḥayyim used the term Ḥasidei 'Ashkenaz to refer to their pious Ashkenazic ancestors from the High Middle Ages generally, and not specifically to the German Pietists. See H. H. Ben-Sasson, *Hagut ve-hanhagah* (Jerusalem, 1959), 12, 15, 59. R. Ḥayyim himself later repeated that grammatical studies had been neglected, especially in "medinat 'Ashkenaz." See now Ilan Eldar, "Sifrut ha-diḡduq shel Yahadut 'Ashkenaz bimei ha-beinayim," *Masorot* 5-6 (1991): 1-32.

**THE
FRANK TALMAGE
MEMORIAL
VOLUME**

I

**Edited by
BARRY WALFISH**



HAIFA UNIVERSITY PRESS

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF NEW ENGLAND in association with BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY PRESS