

In honour of Prof. J. L. Seeligmann.

This article is an effort to solve three problems connected with Psalm 80 — (a) the problem of the chapter's construction, (b) the textual problem at the end of the psalm and (c) the date of its composition.

1. As to its construction the psalm is composed of four stanzas differing in their length: (I) vv. 2-3; (II) vv. 5-7; (III) vv. 9-14; (IV) vv. 15b-19. The verse "ה' צְבָאוֹת הִשְׁיבֵנו הָאֵל קִיָּד וְנִשְׁדָּ" (vv. 4, 8, 15a, 20). The above cited was the original form changed and corrupted mostly as a result of the "elohistic" redaction which elaborated the group of psalms xliii-lxxxiv. The verse 15a "אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת שׁוּב נָא" is to be considered an abbreviation which was later misunderstood. In support of this supposition, attention is called to the address that follows: "הִבֵּט מִשָּׁמַיִם וּרְאֵה" ("Look from heaven and behold") which appears to be a typical opening to a new section in biblical elegies (Is. lxiii, 15; Lam. v, 1).

Every stanza deals with a different subject. In the first one — an address to God to lead his people in the war; second comes the description of the grief and humiliation of defeat; the third follows with a historical survey of the people's fate, using the allegory of a vine; the fourth stanza closes with a prayer of redemption.

2. The textual difficulties of the fourth stanza can be solved with the aid of the fact, long ago recognized by some scholars, that the stylistic influence of Ps. lxxx is perceptible in Ps. lxxxix. The comparison of lxxx, 13 with lxxxix, 42-43 is striking. It is obvious that the author of Ps. lxxxix quotes Ps. lxxx adapting to it a new interpretation to fit his own protagonist. It seems to the present writer that an analogous phenomenon occurs elsewhere in these chapters and he compares three verses:

lxxx, 16: וְכִנָּה אֲשֶׁר נִטְעָה יְמִינֶךָ וַעֲלֵ בֶן אֲמֻצָּתָה לֶךָ
lxxx, 18: תְּהִי יָדְךָ עַל אִישׁ יְמִינֶךָ עַל בֶּן אֲדָם אֲמֻצָּתָה לֶךָ
lxxxix, 22: אֲשֶׁר יָרִי תִבּוֹן עִמּוֹ אֶף זְרוּעֵי תִאֲמָצְנוּ

Probably the author of lxxxix had before him instead of vv. lxxx, 16/18 only one single original verse. The writer tries to reconstruct it taking into account the following factors:

a) expressions common to the three verses cited above (וְכִנָּה) is to be understood as in the Septuagint translation and R. Judah Hallewi's interpretation as imperative of Pi'el (כִּנּוּ).

b) the use of synonyms in the biblical poetic style, together with

c) the principle of *parallelismus membrorum*.

Consequently the following version results:

("And enforce the man of Thy right hand וְכִנָּה אִישׁ יְמִינֶךָ וּבֶן יָדְךָ אֲמֻצָּתוֹ לֶךָ and strengthen Thy hand's son for Thy sake").

This version which seemed obscure because of its particular expressions, was misinterpreted and therefore corrected. Two corrected editions survived and we find them in the masoretic vv. 16-18. Verse 18 in its actual form bears the signs of Ezekiel's phraseology.

First Editor: the late Prof. J. N. Epstein
Editor: J. Schirmann; Editorial Secretary: I. Yeivin
Annual subscription rates: IL. 8.— in Israel; \$ 6 abroad. Single copies: IL. 2.— in Israel; \$ 1.50 abroad. Contributors of articles to TARBIZ receive a copy of the issue in which their articles appear, plus 50 off-prints. Additional off-prints may be ordered at individual expense. Request for such should be made before publication of the article. Manuscripts should be sent to Professor J. Schirmann, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Authors are requested to use one side of the paper only, and to leave considerable space between lines (typewritten manuscripts are preferred). Communications concerning subscriptions, purchase of single copies, and requests for off-prints should be addressed to The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The editor assumes no responsibility for the opinions of individual contributors.

CONTENTS

Alexander Roifer	The End of Psalm 80	113
Schirmann	Some Additional Leaves from Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew	125
Ilom Albeck	Negligence and Remoteness of Damage in the Talmud (End)	135
Israel Levin	A Study of Samuel Hannagid's <i>Ben Mishle</i>	146
H. Levine	Mahzor Commentary Ascribed to Rabbi 'Eli'ezer Bar Nathan of Mainz	162
Kestenberg-Gladstein	The House as Feature of Feudal-Estate Character of Pre-Emancipation Jewry	176
Leibel	<i>Baqe'a</i> Name of a Bird	191
Sarfatti	Supplement to "Notes on the Genesis Apocryphon"	192
Zemah	Note to the Article "Resurrection of a Poet"	193
Schirmann	Ibn Alwarraq and Ibn Almirra Two Members of Judah Hallewi's Circle	193
Review		
'Ankori	Daniel al-Qumissi's Commentary on the Twelve Prophets	195
Jewish Summaries		I-VIII

In verse 17 the vocalization must be changed, because the subject is not Israel but Israel's enemies. The verse should then be placed after verse 15b. Requests of redemption in the imperative mood distinguish the last stanza, and it runs as follows:

Look from heaven and behold

and be mindful of this vine

Its burners with fire, its cutters

let them perish at the rebuke of Thy countenance

And enforce the man of Thy right hand

and strengthen the son of Thy hand for Thy sake

So shall we not turn back from Thee

quicken Thou us and we will call upon Thy name.

Oh Lord of Hosts, restore us

cause Thy face to shine and we shall be saved.

3. As to the date of composition of the psalm, the writer found his opinion identical (with some reservation) with that already expressed by H. Heinemann in *JQR*, 40 (1950), p. 297 ff. —

a) the historical survey of the happenings which preceded the defeat conveys no information of events in the period after the settlement in the Land.

b) There is no consciousness of sin in the psalm, neither in connection with cult nor with morality.

c) From the Psalm's expressions we deduce that in its time the Ark went out to the battlefield. The style resembles very much that of the Hymn of the Ark in Nu. x, 35-36.

d) The mention of the three tribes Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh in verse 3, indicates a period before the division of monarchy, but a hegemony of Judah is also out of question; verse 18 in its masoretic form and even more when reconstructed, alludes clearly enough to a principal role exercised by the tribe of Benjamin, or, still better, by some personality belonging to it.

It is not farfetched, therefore, to suppose that King Saul was intended; the king who "began to save Israel" (I Sam. ix, 16). The desolate atmosphere of the Psalm and the mentioning of only three tribes direct us to the very beginning of his reign.

SOME ADDITIONAL LEAVES FROM ECCLESIASTICUS IN HEBREW

by J. SCHIRMANN (pp. 125-134)

The article contains, in its first part, some brief information regarding the origin and character of the "New Series" of the collection of Geniza fragments at Cambridge. From a manuscript that belongs to this series, a new leaf from the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus was published in *Tarbiz*, a year and a half ago (Vol. xxvii, pp. 440-443). Three additional leaves of this work are now printed here. They, too, were all of them discovered amongst the MSS of the "New Series". The first forms part of the MS known to scholars by the name of MS B, as was the other leaf already reproduced in *Tarbiz*. The new leaf listed in library T-S, NS, Box 193,

הַבֵּט מַשְׁמַיִם וְרֵאָה

וּפְקֹד גִּזְוֹן זֹאת :

טַרְסִיף בָּאֵשׁ כִּסְרִיף

מִגְצָרֹת פְּרִיף יֵאבְדוּ :

וְכַף אִישׁ מִיְמֶנְךָ

וְכֹן יְדֶךָ אֲמַצְהוּ לְךָ :

וְלֹא נִסּוּג מִפֶּנֶךָ

תִּחְיֶנּוּ וּבִשְׁמֶךָ נִקְרָא :

ה' עֲבֹאוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם

הָאֵר פְּרִיף וְנִשְׁעָ :

no. 107 contains vv. 10, 19-11, 10 of Ecclesiasticus. The two remaining leaves li T-S, NS, Box 194, no. 114 belong to the copy called MS C. Sixty years ago Schechter published two other leaves of the same copy (*JQR*, xii, 1900), and it is interesting that one of these leaves follows on exactly from where the first leaf in edition further on leaves off, whilst the second leaf of the new source follows from where the second leaf of Schechter leaves off. The new leaves contain vv. 14-18, 21, 22; 40: 16; 4: 21; 20: 22-23; 4: 22-23a; 26: 2b, 3, 13, 15-17; 36: 27-28. As in the other leaves of C known to us, here too, the leaves of the book were not copied down in their proper order, but constitute a selection of verses taken from various places. The text of the new fragments is given further in photos and copy, each line facing a line of the original. In my comments to the edition I have noted the variant readings to this text, those found in other copies of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus as well as those emerging from the ancient translations in Syriac and Greek. In the new texts there are a large number of variants of all kinds, and even some completions to verses that were incomplete in other sources. They contain also a number of verses hitherto not extant in the Hebrew text. These leaves constitute a mine of important material for research into the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus and its relation to the ancient translations.

NEGLIGENCE AND REMOTENESS OF DAMAGE IN THE TALMUD (End)

by SHALOM ALBECK (pp. 135-145)

The English Summary of the article appeared in *Tarbiz*, vol. xxviii, No. 3-4.

A STUDY OF SAMUEL HANNAGID'S *BEN MISHLE* by ISRAEL LEVIN (pp. 146-161)

Since the publication of Sassoon's edition of Samuel Hannagid's *Ben Mishle* it has attracted the attention of scholars as one of the most important and richest creations in Hebrew proverb literature, in Spanish poetry belonging to the category of the Arabic 'Adab literature. Inter alia, two problems have received attention and solutions have been looked for: (1) The numerous internal contradictions in *Ben Mishle* — in many cases, and in many themes there are proverbs expressing contradictory ideas, sometimes emphatically so, when one immediately follows the other. Various and contradictory moral attitudes towards central features of human existence are prominent too. (2) The non-Jewish character of a considerable portion of his themes and views in the field of Jewish tradition uttered by a writer regarded as the religious and national leader of his people.

In later research which revealed the strong influence of the Arab 'Adab literature on *Ben Mishle* there emerged two viewpoints: (1) The contradictions in the book can be traced to the different sources of his proverbs. The author himself testified to the multiplicity of his sources in one of the proverbs in his work, and his son 'Elyasaf, the editor, in the introduction. (2) The idea expressed in the proverb is conditioned by the style of the period and the conventions of the 'Adab literature. It forms part of a common heritage and reflects no personal experience of the poet.

The present article endeavours to prove that these two viewpoints are too extreme.