

The Torah Comments of Yeḥiel of Paris: Mediating between *Peshat* and *Derash*

Ephraim Kanarfogel

More than a century ago, Samuel Poznanski charted in great detail the decided turn in northern France to *peshuto shel miqra* (the plain meaning of scripture) that was embraced by Rashi (d. 1105) and several of his students and Tosafist successors during the twelfth-century, including Joseph Qara, Rashbam and Joseph Bekhor Shor of Orleans (d. c. 1190). However, Poznanski and others maintain that this quest for *peshat* (*sensus literalis*) interpretation in northern France largely came to an end during the thirteenth-century with the appearance of the so-called Tosafist Torah compilations. These heavily focused on midrashic interpretation (Poznanski 1913: viii-cxxv; Grossman 1995: 462-77; Touitou, 2003: 11-47; Japhet 2004: 413-18).

On the basis of extensive manuscript research and a concomitant re-reading of the extant Tosafist Torah commentaries, I have identified several additional Tosafists in northern France who produced *peshat* interpretations during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Among them are two contemporaries of Bekhor Shor, Yom Tov b. Isaac of Joigny and Jacob b. Solomon of Orleans, as well as Moses b. Jacob of Coucy (d. c. 1250), who offered interpretations designated as *peshatei ha-Rav Mosheh mi-Coucy*. Indeed, there is even some evidence for interest in *peshat* among German rabbinic figures in the early thirteenth-century (Kanarfogel 2016). In this context, the present study will consider the largely overlooked Torah interpretations offered by Moses of Coucy's contemporary northern French

Tosafist colleague, Yehiel of Paris. The varied interpretations put forward by R. Yehiel serve as a bridge between those Tosafist exegetes who were drawn to the plain meaning of scripture, and those who preferred to read rabbinic or midrashic interpretations into biblical verses, as many Tosafists and other medieval rabbinic figures did.

Yehiel of Paris has recently been shown to be a more multifaceted Tosafist and rabbinic figure than heretofore thought. Known for his *halakhic* (legal) rulings, in addition to his participation in the Trial of the Talmud in 1240, R. Yehiel also composed talmudic *tosafot* that are still extant, and others that are not (Kupfer 1973: 325-26; Urbach 1984, 448-61; Ta-Shma 2001a: 110-12; Emanuel 2006: 187-98; Emanuel 2009: 86-89; see also also Asher ben Yehiel 1997: 25-28, 834, 843, 922, 976; ms. Bodl. Qu. 635, fols. 17r-v). He produced commentaries to several liturgical poems, some of which reflect familiarity with mystical teachings (Kanarfogel 2013: 435, 478-80; see also ms. Paris 312, fols. 235v-236v), and there are records of other polemical encounters and exchanges in which he participated (Poznanski 1913: xci; Galinsky 2001; Galinsky 2012).¹ Yehiel of Paris died sometime before 1265. He set out for the land of Israel but did not reach it, having been forced to return to France due to his failing health (Emanuel 2006: 185-86; Emanuel 2009: 89-99).

One version of a series of comments to the Torah (Pentateuchal) portion *Mishpatim* found in a Tosafist Torah commentary in a Florence manuscript, concludes with the phrase, “these is the compendium to [the portion of] *Mishpatim* assembled by Yehiel of Paris, who went to Israel”.² Much of the material in this section of commentary is legal, as reflected by its title, and could easily have been discussed in the context of talmudic study or during a review of the weekly Torah reading. It also remains unclear as to whether R. Yehiel was solely responsible for compiling this section. One of the first comments in this

section, for example, is attributed to Rabbenu Perez b. Elijah of Corbeil, who studied with R. Yeḥiel and died in 1297.³

A number of northern French Tosafist scholars who preceded Yeḥiel of Paris are also cited within this unit. Rashba is an acronym that denotes either Samson b. Abraham of Sens (d. 1214), or his brother, Solomon b. Abraham of Troyes. Rashba discusses the exclusion of women from serving as judges (*dayyanim*), as implied by the phrase in Exodus 21:1: *asher tasim lifneihem (which you shall put before them)*, which serves to exclude both non-Jews (since the verse is dealing with Israelites) and women (since the grammatical form of *them* is masculine). He also discusses the distinction between a Jewish slave sold by the court (who must be freed after a six-year term) and a Jewish slave who sold himself, whose enslavement is not limited to any term. Solomon of Dreux, who like Samson of Sens was a student of Ri of Dampierre, is also mentioned several times (Kanarfogel 2013: 278-79), as are Ri himself and his student Ritsba (the older brother of Samson of Sens), in addition to a R. Barukh (which most likely refers to the author of *Sefer ha-Terumah*, Barukh b. Isaac, yet another student of Ri), and Moses and Samuel b. Shneur of Evreux, who were Tosafist colleagues of Yeḥiel of Paris (Kanarfogel 2013: 268 n. 192, 352 n. 170).

Yeḥiel of Paris is cited in the body of this exegetical section in connection with Rashi's comment to Exodus 21:6. Rashi writes that the slave's right ear is pierced if he wishes to stay with his master beyond his initial term of servitude, based on a linkage with the leper. Just as the leper's right ear receives the blood used in his purification process, so too the right ear is the one that is pierced in the case of slavery. R. Yeḥiel asks why this is not derived from the dedication ceremony of the Tabernacle, in which the right ear of the priest receives the blood of consecration (Leviticus 8:24). He suggests that it would be inappropriate to learn non-Temple practices from the procedures that were in

effect in the Temple or the Tabernacle. A certain R. Nathan questioned whether there is any association between slavery and leprosy that would justify the linkage of these procedures. Nathan's son (who is also named Yehiel) answers that since leprosy is caused by slanderous speech, and the slave's perpetual state of slavery is also occasioned by his speech – since he had declared: *I love my master, my wife and my children, and I do not wish to go free* (Exodus 21:25) – this is a most appropriate linkage. Others explain (*ve-yesh mefarshim*) the connection on the basis of the similarity of letters and the implied relationship between the Hebrew word for awl (מרצע), and the word for leper (מצ[ו]רע).⁴

At the same time, this section of Torah commentary associated with Yehiel of Paris reproduces a *peshat*-like interpretation by Yom Tov of Joigny concerning the rationale for the commandment that the ear of the slave is pierced, and this is performed at the doorpost. Simply put, this procedure makes it impossible for the slave to later claim that his piercing was self-inflicted. At the same time, no other owner can claim that he had done the piercing of this slave's ear, since the door frame of the genuine owner precisely fits and reflects the piercing of this particular slave's ear.⁵ An unattributed *peshat* is presented here as well, as to why a female servant may not serve her master past her initial term, in addition to an analysis by Solomon the Holy One of Dreux of the talmudic dictum (*B.T. Qiddushin* 21b) that sharp utensils other than an awl may also be used for piercing the slave's ear.⁶

An anonymous interpretation labeled as *lefi ha-peshat* (in accordance with the literal or simple interpretation) accounts for the internal order of Exodus 21:14-17 and its significance. This sequence of verses begins with the crime of intentional murder, moves to the less heinous crime of kidnapping and then to cursing one's parents, which is (merely) an act of speech. Nonetheless, the punishment of death in all three of these cases is the same.⁷

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

Also *lefi ha-peshat*, there is no punishment for one who kills a criminal who tunnels into his house (Exodus 22:1), and there is no obligation incumbent upon him to try to stop the thief in less harmful ways when the break-in occurs at night. If the thief came to steal by day, however, when other means to dispatch him are available, the one who kills him is culpable.⁸ A polemical comment by one of the members of the Official family (who were well known in mid-thirteenth century France for their political and polemical activities) is also included (ms. Florence, fol. 201v; *Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne* 1970: 49-50; Berger 1979: 66, 255). In sum, while the bulk of the comments in the portion of *Mishpatim* within the section assigned to Yehiel of Paris are focused, as expected, on the laws and legal specifications found in this portion, there is an attempt at *peshat* interpretation as well, although only Yom Tov of Joigny is mentioned by name in this regard.⁹

In terms of the exegetical method employed by Yehiel of Paris, it is instructive to turn to a comment found earlier in this manuscript, to Genesis 38:26 (ms. Florence II. 20, fol. 168v). Rashi interprets the phrase in this verse in which Judah acknowledges that Tamar was correct (*zadqah mimeni*) to mean that according to Judah, Tamar is vindicated because she was pregnant with his child. However, a passage in the Florence manuscript, which is quite similar to a comment on this verse found in a manuscript version of the Tosafist Torah compilation *Hadar Zeqenim*, presents a different explanation. Judah maintained that Tamar should not be punished because she was righteous (*zadqah*), since their tryst had been consummated through marriage (*qiddushin*) (*Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985: 87 sec. 22). Sexual relations between them were thereby permitted according to Jewish law (*be-heter 'astah*), and she had not acted promiscuously (*derekh zenut*). At the same time, however, an otherwise unidentified R. Moses (perhaps Moses of Paris) notes that according to the *Hadar Zeqenim* passage, there cannot be marriage with one's daughter-

in-law in any case. Therefore, Judah's statement should be understood to mean that since her child is from him and not from a non-Jew, she does not deserve the punishment of burning that had first been proposed. Yet another possibility is also suggested. Since 'Er and Onan never had marital relations with Tamar, she retained her status as a single (non-married) woman.

In a passage found in a Bodleian manuscript, Yehiel of Paris raises a similar issue. The validity of Judah's argument according to Rashi's interpretation, that "since the child is from me, she is now free from punishment," is at best unclear, since their relationship was nonetheless illicit if not promiscuous. R. Yehiel explains, however, that since Judah believed that his sons had consummated their marriages with Tamar, she had been legally married to them. Accordingly, even in the pre-Sinaitic period, Tamar was now eligible for levirate marriage (*yibbum*) and, as such, she was prohibited to marry or to have relations with any other man until after the family member obliged to marry her (*yavam*, known also as the redeemer, *go'el*) had released her. Indeed, this was the same situation in which Ruth and Boaz found themselves. What Judah did not know, however, until Tamar proved that she had relations with him, was that his sons had in fact not had marital relations with her, and were therefore not formally married to her (and as such, levirate marriage was not required). This passage concludes by noting that although levirate marriage does not appear to have been formally commanded, and therefore Tamar should not have been punished in any event, a passage found in the *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana* 12.1 suggests that this precept was given to Judah even before the Torah was given, just as Abraham and Isaac were instructed to be circumcised, and Jacob did not eat from the sciatic nerve, and so on.¹⁰

Joseph Bekhor Shor, a literal exegete or *pashtan* in the mold of Rashi and a Tosafist predecessor to Yehiel of Paris, had also interpreted the correctness of Tamar's actions vis-à-vis Judah on

the basis of the notion of pre-Sinaitic levirate marriage. In this its pre-Sinaitic version, levirate marriage could also be done by the father of the deceased man. Hence, Judah himself should have performed it if he did not want to give Tamar to Shelah, his third son. Both Bekhor Shor and Yeḥiel of Paris employ this rabbinic approach and analysis as a kind of *halakhah ha-meyashevet divrei miqra* (a law that harmonizes the words of Scripture), a Jewish legal construct that effectively addresses the various contextual and linguistic challenges that this biblical episode presents (Kanarfogel 2013: 152-53 n. 117, 160). Indeed, it is likely that Bekhor Shor's interpretation, or perhaps that of Yeḥiel of Paris, influenced Nahmanides' exegetical approach to this section, in which levirate marriage plays a significant role in both its esoteric and exoteric dimensions (Kanarfogel 1996-97: 171).¹¹

There is also evidence for Yeḥiel of Paris's interest in even more pointed forms of *peshat* interpretation. A Paris manuscript contains a treatise named *Te'amim shel Ḥumash* (ms. Paris BN 353, fols. 68v-81v), which was composed by a student or follower of Samuel the Ḥasid and his sons, Abraham (who was also known as Eshel) and Judah the Ḥasid. Although there has been some scholarly debate regarding the authorship and dating of this treatise, Israel Ta-Shma suggested that the author of this treatise – and of several sections that follow, dealing mostly with Divine names as well as a few difficult passages in Ibn Ezra's Torah commentary – is Solomon b. Samuel the Tsarefati, father of the Tosafist, Samuel of Falaise. R. Solomon made his way to Germany to study with German Pietists, especially Eleazar of Worms. The commentary contains quite a bit of *gematria*, in addition to esoteric (*sod*) and exoteric materials, similar to other Torah commentaries associated with *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*, and it cites both Samuel the Ḥasid and Judah the Ḥasid by name (Grossman 1981: 86-87; Ta-Shma 1994; Kanarfogel 2000: 94-102; Ta-Shma 2001b: 273-81).

R. Solomon reports the contact that he had with Yehiel of Paris concerning a *peshat* interpretation suggested by Ibn Ezra: “R. Yehiel b. Joseph told me in the name of Abraham ibn Ezra about an interpretative solution (*pittaron*) for these two verses [Leviticus 24:15-16], *lefi ha-peshat* (in accordance with the literal meaning).” The first verse appears to suggest that one who blasphemes the name of God known as *E-lohim* (*ish ish ki yeqallel E-lohav*) is not subject to punishment by an earthly court (*ve-nasa het’o*). The following verse, on the other hand, which also refers to one who blasphemes the divine name (*ve-noqev shem ha-Shem*), mandates the punishment of stoning, as administered by an earthly rabbinic tribunal. The interpretation of Ibn Ezra reported by Yehiel to Solomon b. Samuel, which appears in the commentary of Ibn Ezra to Leviticus 24:15, is that in the first verse, the blasphemer is left to be punished by Heaven, where his intent can be known with certitude. An earthly court cannot be absolutely certain if his intent was to blaspheme God or only to revile a judge, since judges are also referred to by the Torah as *elohim*. In the second verse, however, where the blasphemer invokes an unequivocal divine name, the punishment of stoning can be prescribed and carried out by the earthly court.¹²

R. Solomon (or the copyist) notes, however, that the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 56a) does not seem to understand these verses in this manner. Rather, while the second verse refers to one who blasphemes the Tetragrammaton (*ha-Shem ha-Meyuḥad*) after having been properly warned not to do so, the first verse, as Rashi also interprets, refers to a case where there was no warning. Since the rabbinic court cannot act, the heavenly punishment of being “cut off” or *karet* (*ve-nasa ‘avono*) is the only one that can be imposed. The willingness of Yehiel of Paris in this instance to embrace a distinctive literal interpretation following Ibn Ezra, in light of a readily available rabbinic interpretation that goes in a rather different direction, is striking.¹³

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

Two manuscripts contain Torah commentaries compiled by rabbinic scholars who are identified as students or colleagues of Yehiel of Paris, which can also shed light on his own exegetical activities, as well as the model that he set for his students. The first of these is a brief treatise called *Peshatim la-Torah*, found at the beginning of a Bodleian manuscript (ms. Bodl. 2343, fols. 1r-16v; see Poznanski 2013: xciv; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1982: 24), whose compiler, Isaac b. Ḥayyim, is described as a student of both (his uncle) Moses of Coucy and Yehiel of Paris (ms. Bodl. 2343, fols. 16r-v). These *peshatim* (literal interpretations) contain comments from the beginning of the Torah through the portion *Beshalah*, although not surprisingly, these *peshatim* sometimes borrow from rabbinic literature.

Rashi interprets God's statement to the snake (Gen. 3:14), "You are more cursed than any domestic animal [*mi-kol ha-behemah*] and from any beast of the wild [*umi-kol ḥayyat ha-sadeh*]," to mean that if the snake is more cursed than any domestic animal, he would certainly (*lo kol she-ken*) be lower than the (non-domesticated) beasts of the wild. Rashi cites the talmudic discussion in tractate *Bekhorot*, that the gestation period for a snake lasts for seven years. The first edition of Rashi adds here, "seven times longer than that of a horse, and many more times longer than a *ḥayah*, many of which give birth in a period of fifty days," as emblematic of this curse, which makes the snake significantly worse off than all other animals. The compiler of *Peshatim la-Torah* seeks to pinpoint the precise meaning and implication of the phrase *lo kol she-ken* in Rashi's comment. He cites what he heard from Moses of Evreux, a contemporary of Yehiel of Paris (Urbach 1984: 461, 465, 479-80, 485; Emanuel 2006: 191-98), that if the snake is to be more cursed than the domestic animals, which are completely under man's dominion and control and can be used by man for hard labor, ipso facto the

snake is to be even more cursed than the non-domesticated animals, which are typically free from man's domination.¹⁴

Peshatim la-Torah cites three interpretations in the name of Rashbam (Rabbenu Shmuel) that reflect his method of pursuing a deep level of *peshat* ('*omeq peshuto shel miqra*). The first, to *Genesis* 12:3: *all of the families of the earth will be blessed through you* (*ve-nivrekhu vekha kol mishpehot ha-adamah*), is that the meaning of the word *ve-nivrekhu* does not reflect a form of blessing but rather connotes intermingling, similar to the phrase in rabbinic Hebrew, *mavrikh u-markiv*. Rashbam bases his interpretation on the grammatical structure of this word. He therefore understands the verse, unlike the approach taken by Rashi, to mean that Abraham's family will mix with the families of the earth.¹⁵ Rashbam understands *Genesis* 23:20: *And the field and the cave in it were established for Abraham* (*va-yaqam ha-sadeh veha-me'arah*) as a burial plot from the sons of *Ḥet* (*la-ahuzat qever me'et bnei Ḥet*), to mean that while the land belonged to Abraham immediately after he paid the purchase price, it was not deeded to him by the sons of *Ḥet* as a burial plot until he actually buried Sarah there.¹⁶

Isaac b. Hayyim also cites a literal interpretation from Rashbam which maintains (*lefi ha-peshat*) that Eliezer, the servant of Abraham, recounts his encounter with Rebecca as it unfolded. For Rashbam, the seeming discrepancy between the actual sequence of their meeting and the way that Eliezer reports it does not present a problem. The Torah records in *Genesis* 24:22 that once Rebecca had completed watering the camels, Eliezer took the nose ring and bracelets in hand (*va-yiqah ha-ish*) in order to have them ready, since he intuited that his mission was succeeding. Although he only placed them on Rebecca once he had asked her who her parents were (*Genesis* 24:23), it was unnecessary for the Torah to now confirm this action. Hence, Eliezer's report (*Genesis* 24:47) that he placed the nose ring and

the bracelets on Rebecca (*va-asim*) after he ascertained who her parents were, is not an indication (as Rashi had suggested on the verse) that Eliezer changed the order of events in his report to avoid being questioned by Rebecca's family as to why he gave her the jewelry before he knew who she and her family were. Rather, this was how the events themselves actually unfolded.¹⁷

In addition to presenting two other unnamed interpretations to Genesis 37 that are termed *lefi ha-peshat* (in accordance with the literal meaning),¹⁸ the *Peshatim la-Torah* treatise also cites comments from Moses Ha-Kohen ibn Chiqatilia and from Joseph Kimḥi, who is cited occasionally in other Tosafist Torah commentaries on the books of Genesis and Exodus. Since the comment by Moses ha-Kohen comes from the commentary of Ibn Ezra, its presence here, in a commentary from the circle of Yeḥiel of Paris, is not surprising.¹⁹

Isaac b. Ḥayyim identifies his teachers by name in several comments found toward the end of his treatise. "According to my teacher and uncle R. Moses of Coucy, the Torah wrote: *and [the tefillin shel rosh] shall be for a remembrance between your eyes* (Exodus 13:9) to teach that the less devoted (*ha-qalim*), who typically need to be reminded more, should be especially careful in observing this precept. Similarly, the *tefillin* (phylacteries) are referred to as *totafot* [in Exodus 13:16], which in rabbinic Hebrew connotes seeing."²⁰

The first comment cited by Isaac in the name of his teacher, Yeḥiel of Paris, is a polemical one, made in connection with Exodus 14:7: *and [Pharaoh] took six hundred of his chosen chariots*. Following the *Mekhilta*, Rashi explains that horses were still available for these chariots because those Egyptians who feared God (during the plagues of pestilence and hail) brought their animals inside where they were able to survive. As Rashi further notes, the *tanna* R. Simeon derives from here that even the good among the nations should be eliminated, because those

Egyptians who were God-fearing had no difficulty in using their horses to chase after the Jews at the Red Sea. A question is raised, however, since according to a talmudic discussion in tractate *'Avodah Zarah*, non-Jews may not be killed by Jews without reason. And if the allowance is being made here since it was considered to be a time of war, the fact is that anyone fighting against a Jew can be killed during wartime (including another Jew), because of the principle: "when one comes to kill you, rise up and kill him first."²¹ Isaac notes that, "this question was put to my teacher R. Yehiel by a heretic." Yehiel of Paris responds that this episode is the source for the aphorism *tov sheba-goyim harog*; it reflects what the other nations would like to do to the Jewish people (namely, kill them). The proper legal procedure for Jews to follow, which does not include the wanton killing of Gentiles, is formulated according to the discussion in tractate *'Avodah Zarah*.²²

A further comment that Isaac attributes to his teacher Yehiel of Paris addresses a more typical exegetical problem in Exodus 15:26: *for I am the God that heals you*. Since God had said earlier in this verse: *I will not place upon you the sicknesses that you suffered in Egypt*, there should be no need then for God to heal them from any illness. Rashi, in the second of his approaches to this verse, which is labeled *lefi peshuto* (in accordance with its literal meaning), understands this to mean that the Almighty, by providing the Torah and the commandments through which man can be saved from punishment, is akin to a doctor who cautions his patient against eating certain foods, lest he fall ill. According to R. Isaac, Yehiel of Paris, without mentioning Rashi, extends this approach in a more naturalistic vein: "My teacher R. Yehiel told me that the divine healing here refers to maintaining a salutary diet, through which healthy people conduct themselves in such a way that they do not become sick."²³

Ms. Parma (De Rossi) 541 contains another collection of biblical interpretations compiled by a student of Yehiel of Paris.

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

This collection consists of individual comments, both *peshat* and *derash*, as well as lengthy midrashic citations. Virtually all the rabbinic scholars cited by name in this compilation are from northern France. The few exceptions are several comments that are cited from the Torah commentary of Judah the Ḥasid, a lone legal comment found in the name of R. Judah (b. Qalonymus; Rivaq) of Speyer (d. 1199), and two references to rabbinic scholars from Rome. On the basis of two passages in this manuscript, Solomon Schechter suggested that its compiler was a R. Netanel, who refers to Yehiel of Paris as his teacher (Schechter 1897). Yehiel of Paris sent responsa to R. Netanel of Chinon, who is mentioned a number of times in *Tosafot*. They were consulted jointly in the case of an individual who refused to perform *ḥalitsah* (a ceremony performed by the brother-in-law that enables his barren widowed sister-in-law to marry someone else); and they were both consulted by Moses of Evreux (Urbach 1984: 458-59, 480-81; Emanuel 2006, 191).

A closer examination of the rabbinic figures cited by this commentary also provides a better sense of the place of Yehiel of Paris within it. Early on, a comment is cited from Isaac b. Abraham (Ritsba) of Dampierre, the Tosafist teacher of Yehiel of Paris's main teacher, Judah b. Isaac Sirleon. Judah Sirleon's presence in Tosafist Torah commentaries is fairly rare, especially in non-legal contexts (Kanarfogel 2013: 275-77). Noah is characterized as pure, *tamim* (in Genesis 6:9), and a passage in *Bereshit Rabbah* posits that all those referred to by the epithet *tamim* lived to ages divisible by the number seven. This is true for Abraham, for Jacob, and ostensibly for Job. But as Ritsba notes, Noah's lifespan was not divisible by seven. Judah Sirleon's suggestion is that the years that Noah lived before the flood do not figure into this calculation, since the world was to be destroyed.²⁴

A comment by Joseph of Paris, ostensibly the eldest son of Yehiel of Paris, who carried his grandfather's name (Urbach

1984: 456-57; Emanuel 2006:186; Kanarfogel 2013: 435), is presented on Genesis 13:7, which juxtaposes two seemingly unrelated facts: *And there was a conflict between the shepherds of Abraham and those of Lot, and the Canaanites and the Perizites were then in the land.* R. Joseph writes that, *lefi ha-peshat*, the Torah means to indicate that the conflict at this time was pointless and ill-advised, since Abraham and Lot were then living in the land among the Canaanites and the Perizites, both of whom were well-fortified. On the other hand, according to Rashi's interpretation that the conflict broke out because the shepherds of Lot were accustomed to shepherding by means of thievery, the intention of the Torah is to indicate here that Abraham had not yet merited possessing the land completely, and that is why the Canaanites and Perizites still lived there. Although the land had already been given to Shem and it is not possible to steal land in the absolute sense, it is possible to conquer and hold land by means of warfare. R. Joseph is thus comparing and contrasting the approach of Rashi with a deeper *peshat* approach (ms. Parma 541, fol. 20v; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 28 sec. 6. Cf. Bekhor Shor, Ibn Ezra, and Ḥizzequni, ad loc). A comment attributed to Joseph of Paris by a different manuscript collection also contains a *peshat* dimension (*Da'at Zeqenim* to Exodus, fol. 41a; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1993: 125 sec. 5, 38 sec. 12).

A lengthy passage in ms. Parma 541 on Abraham's age at the time of the *berit bein ha-betarim* (the covenant between the parts, Genesis 17) is presented in the name of Yeḥiel of Paris. The suggestion that Abraham was seventy years old (as per Rashi on Exodus 12:40) is not in accord with a number of other verses and rabbinic sources. Especially problematic is the time interval between this event and Abraham's war with the five kings, as well as with the verse which notes that Abraham left Ḥaran at age seventy-five. The compiler then indicates that he saw a comment by Rashbam (*bi-yesod de-Rabbenu Shmuel*) which also maintains

that Abraham was seventy years old at the time of the covenant, and proof for this approach can be found in the *Seder 'Olam* and other rabbinic texts. Nonetheless, the difficulty surrounding Abraham's age when he left Ḥaran remains. Therefore, the compiler concludes, "my teacher R. Yeḥiel of Paris explained" that Abraham left Ḥaran a total of three times: once when he was seventy (although he later returned); once when he was seventy-four (he conquered the kings that year and then immediately returned to Ḥaran); and finally, when he left Ḥaran for good at the age of seventy-five, as indicated in the verse. Yeḥiel of Paris's approach resolves a variety of scriptural questions, along with the meaning of the *Seder 'Olam* text. In the final analysis, however, R. Yeḥiel addresses a *peshat* problem that began with Rashi's interpretation (ms. Parma 541, fols. 11v-12v; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 55 sec. 8; cf. *Tosafot Berakhot* 7b, s.v. *lo*).

There is also a passage in ms. Parma 541 in the name of "*mori* (my teacher) *ha-rav R"Y*," which may refer to Yeḥiel of Paris. This comment concerns his response to a masoretic tradition based on a midrashic passage, which nonetheless has a basis in a *peshat* distinction between the prophecies of Moses and Bil'am.²⁵ Another student of Yeḥiel of Paris, Solomon of Château-Landon (which is located to the west of Sens, about fifty miles south of Paris) issued legal rulings (Urbach 1984: 1:456 [n. 32]; Emanuel 2006: 31, 198), and was also involved in interpreting the Torah, although he does not cite any interpretations from Yeḥiel of Paris by name as far as I can tell. Indeed, most of the comments associated with R. Solomon are talmudic or midrashic in nature, although he works with comments by Rashi and those of Jacob of Orleans as well, especially as reflected in Isaac ha-Levi's *Pa'aneah Raza*. Solomon of Château-Landon and Ḥayyim Paltiel were also the teachers of the anonymous figure who assembled the voluminous Tosafist Torah compilation published by Y. S. Lange under the title

of *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Hayyim Palti'el*, although R. Solomon is mentioned only three times by name in that collection while Ḥayyim Paltiel is mentioned more than a hundred times (1980: 144-46; Ḥayyim Palti'el 1981: 9-10).²⁶

Interpretations in the name of Yeḥiel of Paris are scattered within several published collections of Tosafist Torah compilations as well. In Exodus 10:14, the locusts in Egypt are described as *after them there will never be anything like it*. Several exegetes compare the locusts in Egypt to those described in the Book of Joel (2:2), there they are characterized as completely unprecedented (*kamohu lo niyah me-'olam*). The Tosafist Torah compilation *Moshav Zeqenim* notes Yeḥiel of Paris identified a unique aspect of each occurrence, suggesting that those in the days of Moses arrived in smaller, separate groups (species by species), while those in Joel's day came in one very large, mixed swarm. However, the total number from each separate species in Moses' day was larger than the number of each species in Joel's day.²⁷

Several compilations contain a *peshat* comment from Yeḥiel of Paris about the naming of Moses's sons, Gershom and Eliezer (Exodus 18:3-4), in conjunction with Moses's writing of the Torah. Jethro brings Zipporah to Moses, together with their two sons. The first is named Gershom, *because he [Moses] said (ki amar) I was a stranger (ger hayiti) in a foreign land*. The name given to the other son was Eliezer, *because the God of my father helped me, and saved me from the sword of Pharaoh*. Yeḥiel of Paris notes that when Moses's second son Eliezer was named, the phrase *ki amar* (because he said) is not included, as it was at the naming of Gershom. He explains that, "since Moses wrote his own book and he often said that 'the God of my father helps me,' had he written *ki amar* here, the implication would be that he expressed such an idea only at this time (*lefi sha'ah*)." Although the phrase *Moshe katav sifro* is found in the Talmud (in *Bava*

Batra 14b), Yehiel of Paris is apparently comfortable with the notion of Moses as the *kotev ha-Torah*, a concept espoused by several earlier northern French Tosafist exegetes including Rashbam, Joseph Bekhor Shor, Yom Tov of Joigny, and Moses of Coucy.²⁸ A passage in the *Da'at Zeqenim* collection to Exodus 27:4, on the nettings and rings used for carrying the altar, records a question raised by Yehiel of Paris in an effort to get the text of the verse to concur with its talmudic analysis (*Da'at Zeqenim* to Exodus, fol. 41a; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1993: 125 sec. 5, 38 sec. 12).

The fourteenth-century Tosafist Torah compilation known as *Imrei No'am* (compiled by Jacob d'Illescas) on Genesis 11:11 attributes to Yehiel of Paris an exegetical resolution to the problem of why the deaths of those who lived before the flood are explicitly mentioned by the Torah, while those who lived after the flood are noted in terms of the children they had but their deaths are not mentioned. The same resolution is also attributed by Judah the Ḥasid's son, R. Zal(t)man, and by several Tosafist compilations, to Judah the Ḥasid. Although it is possible that the initials for Judah the Ḥasid (יה"ח) came to be mistakenly identified with Yehiel of Paris (יה"ר), it is also possible that these two rabbinic figures actually offered a similar solution.²⁹ Ms. Munich 50 has a question of *halakhic* (legal) detail from Yehiel of Paris that also appears in one of the main manuscripts which contains Judah the Ḥasid's Torah commentary (ms. Moscow Guenzberg 82), as to why the Torah ties the fate of the betrothed woman who has been raped in an inhabited area to whether or not she calls out (Deuteronomy 32:24), as opposed to making her status dependent on whether she had been properly warned about the punishment for her willful participation. In this instance, however, the comment is never actually attributed to Judah the Ḥasid, but it immediately precedes a comment by him to Deuteronomy 23:2.³⁰

Imrei No'am also records a rabbinic interpretation by Yehiel of Paris (attached to Rashi's comment) concerning the

juxtaposition of the Sabbath and the Tabernacle in the Torah portion *Va-Yaqhel* that is not attributed to any other northern European rabbinic figure.³¹ So does ms. Moscow 82 regarding the two offerings brought by a woman who has given birth (Leviticus 12:8, *eḥad le-‘olah ve-eḥad le-ḥatat*). Rashi, based on a talmudic passage in the name of Rava (*Zevaḥim* 90a), explains that the order indicated here (the *‘olah* offering is mentioned first and the *ḥatat* second) is *li-miqra’ah*, (apparently meaning, for the purpose of designating by name [the offerings in order of their respective sanctity]), and not the order of sacrificing, for the *ḥatat* must certainly be offered before the *‘olah*. Yeḥiel of Paris understands Rashi’s comment to mean that the order of the offerings found in the Torah reflects the fact that they proceed according to the happenstance of those bringing them (and the term *li-miqra’ah* used by Rashi thus connotes *leshon miqreh* or a term indicative of chance). In this section of the Torah (Leviticus 12:6-8), a woman of means brings a year-old lamb for an *‘olah* and either a dove or a pigeon for the *ḥatat*, while a poor woman brings either two doves or two pigeons for both the *‘olah* and the *ḥatat* based on what is available to her. Since the details of the bird sacrifices vary according to the circumstances of those involved, they are listed only after the *‘olah* lamb brought by a woman of means. Yeḥiel of Paris’s appreciation of the larger scriptural context plays a significant role in his interpretation of the talmudic passage.³²

Several manuscripts record the following question by Yeḥiel of Paris: How could Aaron wear his priestly garments when he ascended Mount Hor prior to his death (Numbers 20:27), since wearing these garments out of the precincts of the Tabernacle is prohibited? R. Yeḥiel responds that this prohibition applies only when the priest is still involved in performing the service in the Tabernacle, but not if the service is no longer taking place. His second suggestion is that this was a *sui generis* situation (*hora’at*

sha'ah) which overrides the service regulations concerning these garments.³³

In the realm of midrashic interpretation, the Tosafist compilation *Da'at Zeqenim me-Rabbotenu Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* notes Rashi's comment to Numbers 21:34, that Moses was told not to fear doing battle with 'Og, despite the merit that 'Og earned by informing Abraham that his nephew Lot had been captured (Genesis 14:13, according to the midrashic interpretation that 'Og was the survivor who informed Abraham about Lot). On the other hand, 'Og's brother Siḥon had no such merit, and therefore Israel fought against him without any sense of trepidation (Numbers 21:23). However, a different midrashic approach suggests that 'Og is referred to as the survivor because he lived through the flood, and this was the sign of his merit. While Rashi (Genesis 7:23) provides a substantive hint (*remez*) to indicate that 'Og survived the flood, it must be assumed that his brother Siḥon survived as well, and should therefore have also been an object of Israel's fear. *Da'at Zeqenim* resolves this difficulty by citing the view of Yeḥiel of Paris, that while 'Og was born prior to the flood (and survived it on his own merits), his mother was pregnant with Siḥon just prior to the period of the flood. She then married one of the sons of Noah, giving birth to Siḥon while aboard the ark.³⁴

The comment here by Yeḥiel of Paris is intended as much to correlate the various midrashic traditions and formulations regarding 'Og and Siḥon as it was to support Rashi's interpretation. Indeed, R. Yeḥiel was apparently quite involved with the study of midrash as well. An unidentified German rabbinic student records his efforts at verifying a passage in *Bereshit Rabbah* that had been cited by Rashi in his Torah commentary but which did not appear in full in the student's copy of *Bereshit Rabbah*. The student thought that his copy was perhaps defective. When he reached France, however, he checked the *Bereshit Rabbah* texts that belonged to his Tosafist teachers,

Yeḥiel of Paris and Tuvyah of Vienne, and found them both to be the same as his. The student then offered his own suggestion to fill in the lacuna.³⁵

In summary, Yeḥiel of Paris put forward a number of *peshat* (literal or simple) interpretations, including several that follow approaches taken by the commentaries of Rashbam, Ibn Ezra, and Judah the Ḥasid. He does quite a bit of analysis of Rashi with regard to both *peshat* and rabbinic interpretations, although he had an abiding interest in midrashic interpretation as well. Indeed, the individual comments of Yeḥiel of Paris appear to be somewhat parallel to the slightly earlier Tosafist Torah compilation *Sefer ha-Gan*, even as his comments are not as systematic.³⁶

Like *Sefer ha-Gan* (Aaron ben Yose, 2009: 19-21, 42-48), the Torah comments produced by Yeḥiel of Paris served to link the work of the Tosafist *pashtanim* (literal exegetes) with later Tosafist Torah compilations. These compilations, which were composed from the mid-thirteenth through the early fourteenth-centuries, include a greater number of midrashic interpretations, and generally preserved an array of interpretational strategies and styles. The purpose of these compilatory works was to expose their readership, which may well have consisted largely of the secondary elite, to Tosafist teachings and approaches of different types. Although it appears that the Torah comments by Yeḥiel of Paris were directed mainly to his Tosafist peers, his experiences during the Trial of the Talmud and at other points in his career may well have led him to present a more balanced exegetical program, which would perhaps be attractive to a wider range of readers as well (Kanarfogel 2013).³⁷

Endnotes

- 1 See also ms. Bodl. 271/1, fol. 27v: תשובת ר' יחיאל אל מין ומשומד; *Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne* 1970: 53, 67 (גלה אחד אמר לרבינו יחיאל מפריס); and ms. Vatican 324, fol. 278r (תשובת הר"ר יחיאל מפריס לפול המין), which begins a somewhat different, truncated version of the trial of the Talmud than the one that has been published as *Vikkuaḥ R. Yehiel mi-Paris*. The “ten questions asked by R. Eliezer with regard to resurrection” that appear in ms. Vatican 324 just before the version of R. Yehiel’s disputation found there have nothing to do with R. Yehiel.
- 2 See ms. Florence/Laurenziana Plut. II.20, fol. 208r (זה סדור משפטים שסדר) (הר"ר יחיאל אשר הלך לארץ הצבי Emanuel 2006: 187 (n. 9); and Urbach 1984: 1:458-60. Poznanski appears to have been unaware of this manuscript.
- 3 See ms. Florence II.20, fols. 192r-v. Rabbenu Perez discusses Rashi’s opening remark to this portion, that *ve-’eleh ha-mishpatim* “adds to what came before it.” It is possible that Yehiel of Paris shared this collection of interpretations with his students, who then included additional material. The closest variant to this comment, recorded in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 139, does not mention Rabbenu Perez’s name.
- 4 Ms. Florence II.20, fol. 195v. The identities of R. Nathan and his son Yehiel are unclear, and there is no mention of these names in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 168-69 (sec. 16 presents the comment about the similar Hebrew letters in the words *awl* and *leper* from the commentary of Ephraim b. Samson, an associate of Eleazar of Worms and *Hasidei Ashkenaz*, whose Torah commentary contains quite a bit of letter manipulation and other forms of *remazim*). In *Moshav Zeqenim* 1959: 191 (to Exodus 21:29 = *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 236 sec. 12), R. Yehiel is cited as questioning Rashi’s halakhic analysis of the text of this verse, based on a talmudic passage in tractate *Bava Qamma*, although no answer is provided.
- 5 See ms. Florence II.20, fol. 195v: [פרש"י] אוזן ששמעה לא תגנוב. וי"מ דמ"מ: בן נח מוזהר על לא תגנוב וכו'. וי"ל כי אוזן ששמעה לא תגנוב מפי משה רבי' שא"ל הקב"ה בסניני. וה"ר יום טוב מפרש לפי הפשט אוזן דנקט לפי שאם היה רוצעו במקום אחר יוכל לומר העבד צפתי עצמי או חתרתי עצמי. אבל באוזן אין זה מקום שיוכל לו' העבד דבר אז הוא עבד לעבד. ובוה מפרש לפי הפשט אל הדלת לפי שאם היה רוצעו ממקום

אחר יכול אדם לערער עליו לו' שלי הוא ואני רצעתיו. אבל עתה ייאמר האדון שלי הוא ולפי הפשט בתחלה כתי' וכי יזיד איש איירי . *Hizzequni* notes, without attribution, that piercing the ear will prevent the possibility of self-infliction, while Ibn Ezra, in his short commentary on Exodus, suggests that this procedure marks the door of the actual owner, preventing any confusion with regard to ownership (as does *Hadar Zeqenim*, also without attribution; see *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990:166 sec. 5). See also Bekhor Shor 1994: 138, who suggests that the use of the doorway serves to publicize the matter.

- 6 See fol. 196r-v. The talmudic analysis found in *Minḥat Yehudah* in the name of *ha-Qadosh mi-Dreux* to Exodus 21:12 (מכה איש ומת), cited in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 193 sec. 6, is not found in this manuscript.
- 7 See ms. Florence II.20, fol. 198v: ולפי הפשט בתחלה כתי' וכי יזיד איש איירי . ברצח ואח"כ בגונב שהוא קל ממנה ואח"כ במקלל אביו שאינו אלא דיבור בעלמא.
- 8 See ms. Florence II.20, fol. 204r: לפי הפשט ר"ל לילה לכך נכנס אם במחתרת. בכותלו [ביום] ולא הצילו באחד מאיבריו או לתפסו חי אז יש לו דמים אם בא This comment is made by Rashbam and Bekhor Shor (and Ibn Ezra as well) against the *Mekhilta*, which does not accept the literal distinction between day and night as the key factor for punishment. See *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 255 sec. 4; and Lockshin 1997: 249-50.
- 9 Following these comments on *Mishpatim* in the Florence manuscript, a second very brief commentary of similar nature appears. This is then followed by a third set of comments to *Mishpatim* (beginning on fol. 210r), which consist mainly of *gematria* interpretations, including some that are associated explicitly with the German Pietists.
- 10 See ms. Bodl. 274, as cited in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985: 87 sec. 20. A brief version of the first part of this passage, without R. Yehiel's name, is found in *Pa'aneah Raza*, 174; other Tosafist Torah commentaries in manuscript take up aspects of this issue and offer similar solutions. See *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985: 84-86, and see also ms. Gaster 9931, fol. 18r, in the name of R. Samuel Bamberg. Cf. ms. Bodl. 271/2 (cited in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985: 87 sec. 18): "in those days, another family member could perform *yibbum*," although there is no reference to Boaz and Ruth as there is in the passage associated with R. Yehiel. The question posed by R. Yehiel had been raised by Judah the Hasid, although his answer is rather different. See Judah the Hasid 1975: 53-54; and see also ms. Parma 541, fol. 31r: הק' ר' יהודה החסיד מהו צדקה ממני, וכי בשביל שזינתה ממנו לא תשרף . Since this Parma compilation appears to have been composed by a student of Yehiel of Paris (as will be seen below), he was perhaps aware of this issue from two different sources.

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

- 11 Nahmanides notes the expanded scope of *yibbum* at this time, and includes the case of Ruth and Boaz. He explains Tamar's "correctness" in the way that these Tosafist exegetes do. Although Nahmanides does not cite R. Yehiel in his talmudic commentaries, which were completed at a relatively early point in his career (see Ta-Shma 2001a: 29-45; Chwat 1993: 32-37), it is possible that he was influenced in his Torah commentary by R. Yehiel as well. For Nahmanides' awareness of and contact with Yehiel of Paris (and with Yehiels's northern French Tosafist contemporaries, Moses and Samuel of Evreux) via his relative, Yonah of Gerona, see, Nahmanides' sermon for Rosh ha-Shanah (Nahmanides 1968: 1:228, *ודבר זה חדשתי אותו בילדותי והרציתי הדבר לפני רבני צרפת אל ה"ר הרב ר' משה ב"ר שניאור ואל אחיו ר' שמואל ואל הרב ר' יחיאל בפריש על ידי קרובי הרב ר' יונה שלמד שם*). Cf. Yahalom 2008: 100-125.
- 12 Ms. Paris 353, fol. 77r: *ר' יחיאל ב"ר יוסף אמר לי משמו של ר' אברהם אבן עזרא* פתרון לאלו שני מקראות [ויקרא כד: טו-טז] לפי הפשט כנגד איש איש כי יקלל א-להיו ונשא חטאו אדם המוציא מפיו א-להים ומברך אין לנו להרגו על זה, כי אין לברר מחשבתו וכונתו זולתי הבורא. כי אין אנו יודעים אם כוונתו היתה כלפי יוצרו או על דינין לכן ישא חטאו וגביית חובותיה ביד שמים הוא. אבל ונוקב שם ה', המבטא בשפתיו שם הקודש ומברך, על זה אין לגמגם לפיכך מות יומת כי מחשבתו גלויה לכל. לפיכ' רגום ירגמיהו כל. On the influence of Ibn Ezra in Ashkenaz during the thirteenth-century, see Ta-Shma 2001b: 1:277-79; Abramson 1982: 244-49; Lifshitz 1968: 202-21. Cf. Golb 1997: 252-308; Simon 2009: 181-89; Mondschein 2009: 309-11.
- 13 See ms. Paris 353, fol. 77r. Rashbam similarly distinguishes (*left peshuto*) between the blaspheming of a lesser form of the Divine name, and the blaspheming of an explicit Name (סתם בכני בלא פירוש שם מובהק), while Hizzequni adopts the approach of Ibn Ezra. Indeed, the approach of Ibn Ezra was adumbrated by Yom Tov of Joigny; see Kanarfogel 2012: 193 n. 228. Bekhor Shor suggests another approach that *ve-nasa het'o* in the first verse refers to the lesser punishment of lashes, which is fitting for one who curses a judge, *elohim*, although he also notes, without attribution, the interpretation followed by both Rashi and the Talmud, that this verse refers to one who was not properly warned (*be-lo 'edim ve-hatra'ah*). On R. Yehiel's use of the term *pashteh di-qera* in a talmudic formulation, see Urbach 1984: 1:460.
- 14 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 3r: [פרש"י] ארור אתה מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה. יש לשאול מהו לא כל שכן. ושמעתי בשם הרב ר' משה דאיברא אם מבהמה שאיננה חפשית מן האדם שהיא ברשות ידו לכל עבודת פרך.

- ואם ממנה נתקלל, מחיה שהיא הפשית מן אדם לא כל שכן (= *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1982: 134 sec. 9).
- 15 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 5r; cf. Kislev, 2008: 191-92. Rashbam also interprets this phrase in this way in Gen. 28:14. Rashbam's comment here comes from a lost section of his full Torah commentary; see Lockshin 1989: 165-66. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 8 sec. 15. As Gellis, the editor of *Tosafot ha-Shalem*, notes there, this comment also appears in ms. Parma 541, which was compiled by another student of R. Yehiel, as we shall see shortly. Bekhor Shor follows Rashi's interpretational approach: see Bekhor Shor 1994: 25.
- 16 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 7r. Cf. the comments of Judah the Ḥasid, and ms. Bodl. 271/2, in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 244. See also Bekhor Shor 1994: 40.
- 17 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 7v; and *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 274 sec. 3. In the standard edition of Rashbam, this comment appears at the earlier verse (Gen. 24:22), on the word *va-yiqah*. In this version, Rashbam notes that the correct order of the story is the one told by Eliezer (in Gen. 24:47). Not wanting to interrupt his words and Rivka's answers, the Torah changes the order a bit at that point. See Lockshin 1989: 116. As Lockshin notes, Rashbam's approach (against that of Rashi) is favored exegetically by Bekhor Shor (who defines *va-yiqah* as *hizmin latet*, precisely as Rashbam does according to ms. Bodl. 2343; see Bekhor Shor 1994: 41); by *Tosafot* (and *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to) *Hullin* 95b, s.v. *ke-Eli'ezer* (which explain the problem away as a case of *ein muqdam u-me'uḥar ba-Torah*); and by Naḥmanides. In ms. Munich 62, this interpretation, as against that of Rashi, is attributed simply to *mori* (= Ḥayyim Paltiel). See *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 274 sec. 5; and Ḥayyim Paltiel 1983: 63.
- 18 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 11v. The first of these interpretations, to Gen. 37:14 (cited also in *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 28 sec. 12), leads to a rabbinic aphorism and word play: וישלחהו מעמק חברון. לפי הפשט הלך עמו עד העמק ומשם שלחו ואמר לו לך לשלום. מכאן אמרו רבותינו אלמלא לא ליוה יעקב ליוסף היה בניזוק. וכך דרשו כי יעקב בחר לו י-ה אותיות ליוה וכסינו את דמו. The second, to Genesis 37:26 (cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985: 42 sec. 7), is rather original: הפשט וכסינו לשון כיס, שנשים בכיסו את דמי המכר.
- 19 For Joseph Kimḥi, see fol. 15r. Cf., e.g., *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1982: 96 sec. 4, 101 sec. 8, 110 sec. 7, 147 sec. 1, 154 sec. 2, 187 sec. 1; and Japhet 1991: 101-02. Moses ha-Kohen is mentioned on fol. 16r, with respect to the *ḥataf qamaṣ* in the phrase עזי וזמרה (Ex. 15:2); Ibn Ezra brings the

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

- approach of R. Moses in his short commentary to that verse. Ms. Bodl. 2343 presents the balanced rabbinic interpretation put forward by R. Elhanan (son of Ri) to address the different approaches taken by Joseph and Levi with respect to having children during the time of famine in Egypt, albeit without attribution; see Kanarfogel 2012: 272-73 n. 205.
- 20 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 16r; and *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1988: 150 sec. 6: ולזכרון בין עיניך. כתב מורי דודי הרב ר' משה מקוצי כי לכך כתי' ולזכרון לוי' כי במצות תפילין יזהרו הקלים, אותם הצריכים יותר זכרון. ולטוטפות לשון ראייה בלשון חכמים וכי' וראו כל עמי הארץ כי שם ה' נקרא עליך ויראו ממך וכי' This comment is likely a reflection of Moses of Coucy's avowed commitment to ensure that the precept of *tefillin* (among others) should be observed regularly and punctiliously, especially by those Jews who were typically less observant; see Kanarfogel 1992: 9-10, 23-25 n. 62. Indeed, the interpretation presented here in R. Moses's name appears to be a paraphrase of one of his *derashot* (sermons) which he recorded in his *Sefer Mizvot Gadol* (Venice, 1547), *mizvat 'aseh* 3 (fol. 96d): עוד זאת דרשתי להם כי יותר חפץ הקדוש ברוך הוא באדם רשע שיניח תפילין מאדם צדיק. ועיקר תפילין נצטוו להיות זכרון לרשעים ולישרם דרך טובה ויותר הם צריכים זכר והזיוק מאותם שגדלו כל ימיהם ביראת שמים...וכתוב בה ולזכרון ללמד שעיקר חיוב תפילין לאותם שצריכים יותר זכר.
- 21 This question is recorded in Isaiah di Trani 1972: 42, and in ms. Hamburg 45 (in the so-called *Peshatim le-R. Avigdor b. Elijah Katz*), fol. 42v.
- 22 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fol. 16r: ויקח שש מאות רכב בחור. פר"ש מאין היה להם: מהירא את דבר ה'. מכאן אמרו טוב [שבגוים] הרוג. שאל [מין] למורי ה"ר יחיאל מתוך פי' רש"י דמכס מותר לגוי כבר כת' הבא להרגך השכם להרגו וכאן כת' טוב שבגוים הרוג. השיב אין הפי' כך אלא מכאן יש ללמוד טוב [שבגוים] הרוג את ישראל, כשר שבנחשים רצוץ את מוהו של אדם. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1988:184-85 sec. 1.
- 23 See ms. Bodl. 2343, fols. 16r-v (= *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1988: 253 sec. 11): ואמר לי מורי הר"ר יחיאל רופאיך אדיאטירי, שמור הבריאים להתנהג בדרך שלא יחלו. Couched in these terms, R. Yehiel's interpretation perhaps anticipates Nahmanides' question against Rashi's *left peshuto* approach.
- 24 See ms. Parma 541, fol. 6v. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1982: 198 sec. 30. Schechter does not make note of this comment, but does record (on p. 487) a subsequent passage in the portion *Bo*, in which ריב"א (Riba, an acronym that can refer to R. Isaac b. Abraham of Dampierre [Ritsba], and is understood as such by Schechter) interprets the significance of the (mnemonic) *simanim* given for the ten plagues by the *tanna* R. Judah. However, fuller versions of this passage contain not only the name of Raban of Mainz but also those of Judah the Ḥasid and Raban's grandson

- Rabiah, strongly suggesting that Riba in this instance refers to the early German Tosafist R. Isaac b. Asher the Levi, rather than to the French Tosafist Ritsba. See *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1989: 99 sec. 5.
- 25 See Ms. Parma 541, fol. 70v: והוא או' מורי ה"ר ר"י במסורת א' דויקרא קטנה. לולי שהיו אומרים שאני חולק על המסורה, הייתי כותבה גדולה שבגדולות לפי שבמדרש מחלק בין נביאי ישראל לבין נביאי אומות העולם. וממקרא זה ילפי' דנביאי אומות העולם קורא בהם בלשון גנאי כמו ויקרא א-להים אל בלעם כמו מקרה לילה. ובנביאי ישראל בלשון טהרה בלשון שמלאכי השרת משתמשין בו וקרא זה אל זה אף כאן ויקרא Cf. *Moshav Zeqenim* 1959: 228, for an interpretation by R. Eleazar of Worms which suggests (based on a passage in *Midrash Tanhuma*) that ויקרא is also an indication of full (Jewish) prophecy. At the same time, however, *Moshav Zeqenim*: 229, also presents an interpretation by Yosef Bekhor Shor that is quite similar to what is found here in ms. Parma, in its comparison between the prophecies of Moses and Bil'am (and in the linguistic forms that characterized them), although this passage is not found in the key manuscript of Bekhor Shor's commentary (ms. Munich 52). See also the interpretation of Nathan b. Yosef Official preserved in *Sefer ha-Gan* (Aaron ben Yose 2009: 268). On R. Yeḥiel's use of midrash, see also below.
- 26 See also Ḥayyim Paltiel 1983: 180 (Ex. 3:12), 222 (Ex. 12:29 = *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1988: 119 sec. 8); 496 (Nu. 11:22); 498 (Nu. 11:31); and *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1983: 97 sec. 1; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985: 121-22; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 173 sec. 11, 189 sec. 11.
- 27 See *Moshav Zeqenim* 1959: 122 (ה"ר יחיאל תי' של משה רבינו לא באו יחד) בערבוביא אלא כל מין אחד לבדו. ואותו מין אחד שבא במצרים היה מרובה יותר ממין אחד של יואל = *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1988: 17 sec. 6). Similar answers and approaches are found in the *peshatim* contained in the Ashkenazic compilation found in ms. Hamburg 45, fol. 39v; see *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1988: 18-19. Two *pesaqim* (legal decisions) of R. Yeḥiel are found in the ms. British Museum 243 on fol. 108r (which is parallel to the *perushim u-pesaqim* found in ms. Hamburg 45; see Kanarfogel 2012: 360 n. 193), regarding the taking of *ḥalah* from non-leavened batters, and on fol. 200r, regarding the power of a single witness to testify in matters of *issur veheter* (forbidden and permitted). In addition, B.M. 243, fol. 137r, contains a response that R. Yeḥiel gave to a heretic concerning the expiation associated with the appearance of the new moon. For these and other citations from R. Yeḥiel, see Avigdor b. Elijah 1996: 68, 243 292, 390, 42.
- 28 See *Ḥaẓi Menasheh* 1901: 42 (Ex. 10:14) = *Minḥat Yehudah* (Exodus), fol. 22a: כי א-להי אבי בעוזרי. לא [נ]אמר כי אמר וכו' כמו כי אמר גר הייתי בארץ: כי

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

- נכריה לפי שמששה כתב את ספרו והיה אומר כל שעה א-להי אבי בעזרי [ואלון] (ולא) כתב אמר משה [משמע ש]אמר לפי שעה. בשם ה"ר יחיאל. See also ms. Parma 541, fol. 55v, and *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1990: 11 sec. 9. In section 10 a different answer to this question is recorded in the name of Judah the Ḥasid (which is also found in ms. Hamburg 45). See also Judah the Ḥasid 1975: 91; and *Moshav Zeqenim* 1959, 152, in the name of Jacob of Orleans. On the issue of Mosaic authorship in northern France, see Kanarfogel 2012: 147 n. 102, 187 n. 208, 313 n. 60.
- 29 See *Imre No'am* 1970: 6; *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1982: 293-94 sec. 1; and Judah the Ḥasid 1975: 16 (which cites both the Moscow and Cambridge manuscripts that contain R. Judah's commentary, as well as *Pa'aneah Raza* and *Moshav Zeqenim*); and ms. St. Petersburg, EVR I 22, fol. 7r. See also Aaron ben Yose 2009: 145, who presents a solution to this problem (צריך ליתן טעם לפי הפשט) in the name of *ha-Rav Rabbenu Yosef Bekhor Shor* (which does not appear, however, in the commentary of Bekhor Shor found in ms. Munich 52; see Bekhor Shor 1994: 24, and the editor's notes there. The muddling of R. Judah's and R. Yehiel's initials may also have occurred with regard to certain esoteric teachings, although as some other passages indicate, R. Yehiel himself was involved in this area of endeavor as well. See Kanarfogel 2012: 479.
- 30 See ms. Munich 50, fol. 305v, and ms. British Museum 9931, fol. 166r-v: צעקה הנערה המאורשה. הקשה הרב רבינו יחיאל מפריזא אם קבלה עליה התראה אפילו בשדה תהרג. ואם לא התרו בה, אפילו בעיר תפטר. ותירץ שבאו עדים בסוף ביאה והתרו בה וקבלה התראה וכו'. ומיירי בעדים חלשים או בקיימי בתרי עברי דנהרא דאל"כ, היה להם להצילה בנפשו של בועל. [לא יבוא פצוע דכא וגו'] וקשה למה אסרתו תורה הואיל ואין מולידין ואשה אינה מצווה על פו"ר מדרבנן. חסיד Judah the Ḥasid 1975: 206-07 (based on ms. Moscow 82) records the first passage as a question put forward by an otherwise unknown R. Yehiel b. Moses to R. Yehiel (of Paris), and the second question without any specific attribution to R. Judah.
- 31 See *Imre No'am* 1970: 74. See also *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1995: 168 sec. 4: ויקהל. פרש"י למה נסמכה פרשת שבת למשכן לומר לך שאינו דוחה שבת. והקשה ר' יחיאל דאמאי צריך סמיכה והלא בנין המשכן הוי עשה ושבת הוי עשה ולא תעשה ואין עשה דומה לא תעשה ועשה. ות"י דאצטריך סמיכה דאי לאו הכי הוי יליף מק"ו וכו'.
- 32 See ms. Moscow 82, fol. 30v: פרש"י למקראה הקדימה אחד לעולה ואחד לחטאת. הכתוב פי' לקריאה קודם לחטאת היינו קריאת שם. אבל להקרבה חטאת קודם. לכן גבי ע"ז כתוב שם שבכל מקום שתמצא העולה אותו החטאת בלא אלף לפי שהוא חלוק וכן אחרים. וה"ר יחיאל מפריש פי' לשון מקראה לפי שעשירה מבאיה כבש בן שנתו לעולה ושלה מקרה היא אם יש לה ב' תורים או ב' בני יונה. See also Rashi to *Zevahim*

90a, s.v. *le-miqra'ah*; *Hadar Zeqenim*, fol. 48b; and *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 2009: 192 sec. 3. *Minḥat Yehudah*, Leviticus 11a, cites its compiler, Judah b. Eleazar (ריב"א), who also understands מקראה as מקרה, but with a different application. If it happened that the 'olah was offered before the ḥatat (בדיעבד), these sacrifices are nonetheless accepted. Cf. *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 2009: 192 sec 4.

- 33 See ms. Bodl. 270, fol. 75v: הקשה מורנו ה"ר יחיאל מפריש היאך היה פ' חקת. אהרן לובש בגדים בהר ההר, הא אין יוצאים בהם חוץ לעזרה כלל. ויל' דהא שהם מקדשים דוקא בשעת עבודה אבל שלא בשעת עבודה אין חומרא בבגדים מצאתם חוץ. This passage appears in ms. Vatican 45, fol. 55r, with the additional answer: וכן אמר' בבני אהרן שכת' בבגדיהם כל' בגדיהם עליהם כהונתם עליהם אין בגדיהם עליהם אין כהונתם עליהם וכו'. א"נ י"ל הוראת שעה היתה. כל זה מפ' ר' יחיאל מפריש. See also ms. Jerusalem Karlin 688 to the Torah portion *Ḥuqqat*, and cf. *Yoma* 69a, on the meeting of the High Priest (while wearing his priestly garments) with Alexander the Great (outside of Jerusalem). A similar kind of question, regarding the reward given to Pinḥas (in Nu. 25:11), is also resolved by R. Yeḥiel (as recorded in *Moshav Zeqenim* 1959: 480): (שמות) ואת והלא כבר נתנה כהונה לזרעו שנ' [שמות] כט:כט] ובגדי הקדש אשר לאהרן יהיו לבניו אחריו וכו'. וי"ל לפי שהרג זמרי סבור היה שלא יקריב עוד קרבן כדתנן [סנהדרין דף לה ע"ב] כהן שהרג את הנפש לא ישא את כפיו. ולכן הוצרך לשנותו ולומר לו הנני נותן לו את בריתי שלום שלא יערער אדם על כהונתו. ור' יחיאל מפריש אומ' דגברא קטילא קטל ולא היתה רציחה דהבא על ארמית קנאין פוגעין בו וזש"ה תחת אשר קנא לא-להיו.
- 34 See *Da 'at Zeqenim – Rabbotenu Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* to Numbers, fol. 18a: ויאמר ה' אל תירא אותו. פרש"י לכך הוצרך לו' אל תירא אותו מה שאין הוצרך לו' מסיחון לפי שהיה ירא פן יעמוד לו זכות שהגיד [עוג] לאברהם אבינו שנשבה לוט [כדכת' ויבא הפליט וכו']...ומיהו תימ' למ"ד דעוג נקרא פליט על שנפל מן המבול דבמס' נדה מסיק דעוג וסיחון אחי הוו. וא"כ סיחון פלט מן המבול [גם כן] דבשלמא עוג מצינו סמך ורמז כדאיתא בפר' נח דפי' רש"י [בר' ז:כג] וישאר אך נח שעולה בגימ' עוג. אבל לסיחון לא מצינו סמך ורמז. ואו' ה"ר יחיאל בן יוסף שעוג נולד קודם המבול ואמו היתה מעוברת מסיחון בשעת המבול והלכה ונשאת לאחד מבני נח וכבר היתה מעוברת מאותן בני האלהים אשר לקחו מבנות האדם ונולד סיחון בתיבה Cf. Aaron ben Yose 2009: 311-12. Interestingly, *Da 'at Zeqenim* to Genesis 7:23, fol. 7a, cites the *gematria* that links 'Og to Noah in the name of Judah the Ḥasid (rather than in Rashi's name). The attribution to Judah the Ḥasid appears to be correct (and this *gematria* does not appear at all in extant texts of Rashi). See Judah the Ḥasid 1975: 12; and Ḥayyim Paltiel 1983: 19. In one of his interpretations to Genesis 14:13 (*va-yavo ha-palit*), Rashi mentions the rabbinic view (which he cites from *Midrash Rabbah*), that 'Og came to

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

be known as the *palit* since he had “escaped from the generation of the flood” and survived, but he does not provide any additional support for it. The resolution attributed here to R. Yehiel is found without attribution in the Torah commentary attributed to Rosh, fol. 4b.

- 35 See ms. Paris 260 (a variant of *Moshav Zeqenim*), fol. 92r, to Gen. 44:8 (“the money that we found in our sacks we brought to you from the land of Canaan in order to return it, and so why would we then steal silver and gold from the master’s home?”). Rashi comments that this is one of ten *kal va-homer* (inference from minor to major) formulations found in the Torah, which are all included in *Bereshit Rabbah* (*ve-hem mefursahim bi-Bereshit Rabbah*). On fol. 92v, the student reports that only nine are to be found in his copy: והנה לפי המנין שמונה בב"ר אין בהם כי אם ט' ק"ו. ואמרתי: שמא חסר בב"ר שלי. וכשבאתי לצרפת ראיתי בב"ר של מורי ה"ר יחיאל וגם בב"ר של מורי ה"ר טוביה והיה כתוב כמו בשלי. ונ"ל דזה ק"ו חסר בספרי' והנה שני מלאכים לא עמדו לפנינו וכי'. In the published edition of *Moshav Zeqenim* 1975: 87 (= *Tosafot ha-Shalem* 1985:186-87), this passage is found without the names of R. Yehiel and R. Tuvyah (וכשבאתי לצרפת ראיתי באחרים והיה כתוב (כשלי), although it does contain the name of the student narrator’s uncle (והגדתי לדודי ה"ר יצחק והיה לו קשה כמו כן). On the relationship between R. Yehiel and R. Tuvyah (and perhaps the identity of their student as well), see Urbach 1984: 1:486-87, and also Emanuel 2009: 94-98.
- 36 The treatise found in ms. Paris 1408, fols. 159-168r, which concludes with the phrase, עד כאן מפרישות ה"ר יחיאל, refers to a collection of *Tosafot* from R. Yehiel to tractate *Mo'ed Qatan*, rather than to biblical interpretations.
- 37 See Kanarfogel (2013): 328-48, for an earlier discussion of the Torah comments of Yehiel of Paris. R. Yehiel’s integrated exegetical program has been recast here, and a number of additional examples have been provided.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Aaron Ben Yose. 2009. *Sefer ha-Gan*. Ed. Yeḥiel M. Orlian. Jerusalem: Mossad Ha-Rav Kuk.
- Asher ben Yeḥiel. 1997. *Tosafot ha-Rosh 'al Massekhet Pesahim*. Ed. Abraham Shoshana. Jerusalem: Makhon Ofeq.
- Avigdor ben Elijah Zarfati. 1996. *Perushim u-Pesaqim le-Rabbenu Avigdor*. Jerusalem: Makhon Harerei Qedem.
- Bekhor Shor, Yosef. 1994. *Bekhor Shor: Perush la -Torah*. Ed. Yehoshafat Nevo. Jerusalem: Mossad Ha-Rav Kuk.
- Ḥayyim Paltiel. 1983. *Perushei R. Ḥayyim Palti'el 'al ha-Torah*. Ed. Y. S. Lange. Jerusalem.
- Ḥaẓi Menasheh*. 1901. Ed. Menashe Grossberg. London.
- Imrei No'am*. 1970. Ed. Mordechai Harris. Jerusalem: Hominer.
- Isaiah of Trani. 1972. *Nimmugei Ḥumash*. Ed. C. B. Chavel. Jerusalem: Mossad Ha-Rav Kuk.
- Judah the Ḥasid. 1975. *Perushei ha-Torah le-R. Yehudah he-Ḥasid*. Ed. Y. S. Lange. Jerusalem.
- Moshav Zeqenim 'al ha-Torah*. 1959. Ed. Solomon D. Sassoon. Jerusalem.
- Nahmanides. 1968. *Kitvei ha-Ramban*. Ed. C. B. Chavel. Jerusalem: Mossad Ha-Rav Kuk.
- Sefer Yosef ha-Meqanne*. 1970. Ed. Judah Rosenthal. Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim.
- Tosafot ha-Shalem*. 1982-2009. Volumes 1-12. Ed. Yaacov Gellis. Jerusalem.

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

Secondary Sources

- Abramson, Shraga. 1982. "Iggeret ha-Qodesh ha-Meyuḥeset la-Ramban," *Sinai* 90: 244-49.
- Berger, David. 1979. *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: JPS.
- Chwat, Ezra. 1993. *Hiddushei ha-Ramban le-Massekhet Ketubot*. Jerusalem.
- Emanuel, Simcha. 2006. *Shivrei Luhot*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Emanuel, Simcha. 2009. "R. Yehiel mi-Paris: Toledotav ve-Ziqato le-Erets Yisra'el," *Shalem* 8: 86-99.
- Galinsky, Judah. 2012. "The Different Hebrew Versions of the Talmud Trial of 1240 in Paris." In *New Perspectives on Jewish-Christian Relations*. Ed. Elisheva Carlebach and Jacob J. Schacter. 109-40. Leiden: Brill.
- Galinsky, Yehudah. 2001. "The Trial of the Talmud in Paris in 1240." [Hebrew] *Shenaton ha-Mishpat ha-'Ivri* 22: 45-69.
- Golb, Norman. 1997. *The Jews in Medieval Normandy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Grossman, Avraham. 1981. *Hakhmei Ashkenaz ha-Rishonim*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Grossman, Avraham. 1995. *Hakhmei Tsarefat ha-Rishonim*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Japhet, Sara. 1991. "Ḥizkuni's Commentary on the Pentateuch" [Hebrew]. In *Mordekhai Breuer Jubilee Volume*. Ed. Moshe Bar-Asher. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Japhet, Sara. 2004. "The Tension Between Rabbinic Legal Midrash and the Plain Meaning (Peshat) of the Biblical Text: An Unresolved Problem?" In *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe*

Ephraim Kanarfogel

Weinfeld Jubilee Volume. Ed. C. Cohen et al. 413-18, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Kanarfogel, Ephraim. 1992. "Rabbinic Attitudes toward Nonobservance in the Medieval Period." In *Jewish Tradition and the Nontraditional Jew*, Ed. Jacob J. Schacter. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Kanarfogel, Ephraim. 2000. *Peering through the Lattices*. Detroit: Wayne State University.

Kanarfogel, Ephraim. 2012. *The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz*. Detroit: Wayne State University.

Kanarfogel, Ephraim, 2013. "Midrashic Texts and Methods in Tosafist Torah Commentaries." In *Midrash Unbound*. Ed. M. Fishbane and J. Weinberg. 267-319. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Kanarfogel, Ephraim. 2016. "Ba'alei ha-Tosafot ke-Parshanei ha-Peshat: Me'ah Shanah le-Mavo'o shel S. A. Poznanski." *Mikhlol — Pardes* 1: 147-60.

Kislev, Itamar. 2008. "Perush ha-Ḥizzequni ke-'Ed Nosaḥ le-Perush Rashbam la-Torah." In *Shai le-Sarah Yefet*. Ed. Moshe Bar-Asher et al. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik.

Kupfer, Ephraim. 1973. *Teshuvot u-Pesaqim*. Jerusalem: Mekitse Nidrdamim.

Lange, Y. S. 1980. "On the Identity of R. Ḥayyim Palti'el," [Hebrew], *'Aleī Sefer* 4 (1980), 140-41.

Lifshitz, Abraham. 1968. "R. Avraham Ibn Ezra be-Perushei Ba'alei ha-Tosafot 'al ha-Torah," *Hadarom* 28: 202-21.

Lockshin, Martin L. 1989. *Rashbam's Commentary on Genesis*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen.

The Torah Comments of Yehiel of Paris

- Lockshin, Martin L. 1997. *Rashbam's Commentary on Exodus*. Atlanta: Brown University.
- Mondschein, Aaron. 2009. "The Massorettes Fabricated Explanations for Full and Defective Spellings: On Abraham Ibn Ezra's Struggles against the (Ab)use of Biblical Spelling as an Exegetical Tool" [Hebrew], *Shenaton le-Heqer ha-Miqra veba-Mizrah ha-Qadum* 19: 309-11.
- Poznanski, Samuel. 1913. *Mavo 'al Hakhmei Zarefat Mefarshei ha-Miqra*. Warsaw: Mekitse Nirdamim.
- Schechter, Solomon. 1897. "Notes on a Hebrew Commentary to the Pentateuch in a Parma Manuscript." In *Semitic Studies in Memory of Alexander Kohut*. Ed. G. A. Kohut. 485-94. Berlin: S. Calvary.
- Simon, Uriel. 2009. "Transplanting the Wisdom of Spain to Christian Lands: The Failed Efforts of Ibn Ezra," *Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook* 8: 181-89.
- Ta-Shma, Israel. 1994. "Mashehu 'al Biqqoret ha-Miqra be-Ashkenaz Bimei ha-Benayim." In *Ha-Miqra bi-Re'i Mefarshav*. Ed. Sara Japhet. 453-59. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Ta-Shma, Israel. 2001a. *Ha-Sifrut ha-Parshanit la-Talmud*. Volume Two. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Ta-Shma, Israel. 2001b. *Knesset Mehqarim*. Volume One. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.
- Touitou, Elazar. 2002. *Exegesis in Perpetual Motion* [Hebrew]. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University
- Urbach, Ephraim. 1984. *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.
- Yahalom, Shalem. 2008. "Ha-Ramban u-Ba'alei ha-Tosafot be-Akko: Ha-Narativ ha-Histori bi-Drashat ha-Ramban le-Rosh ha-Shanah," *Shalem* 8: 100-125.

Reading the Bible in the
Pre-Modern World:
Interpretation, Performance and Image

edited by

Chanita Goodblatt and Howard Kreisel



Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press