

RECENSIONES

Abraham Ibn 'Ezra', Sefer Moznayim, Introducción (en castellano e inglés). Edición crítica del texto hebreo y versión castellana de LORENZO JIMÉNEZ PATÓN, Revisada, completada y reelaborada por ÁNGEL SÁENZ-BADILLOS, Córdoba (El Almendro) 2002, 223 +132* págs. ISBN 84-8005-054-3.

The composition

R. Abraham Ibn Ezra who lived and was active from 1089 until 1164, was born in Tudela, Spain. Himself a wonderfully talented poet, he was a contemporary and friend of the famous R. Yehuda Halevi. A polyfacetic intellectual, he was an artist of the Hebrew language, all of whose opus was written in Hebrew. He wrote commentaries to the Bible, studies on grammar, mathematics and philosophy as well as riddles. He caused a great intellectual stir among the Jews in Spain and later in other countries in Europe as well. Wherever he went he left an immense impression and a clear stamp. Until today he is considered one of the finest Hebrew authors of all times.

In the field of scientific description of the Biblical language he had several predecessors such as R. Yehuda b. David Ḥayyūj, R. Yonah ibn Janaḥ, R. Moses ibn Gikatilla and R. Yehuda ibn Bal'am, who had already laid well based, extensive scientific fundamentals of the Hebrew grammar which they presented systematically. Ibn Gikatilla, Ibn Bal'am and others had written treatises on various grammatical themes, in the footsteps of the works of Ibn Janaḥ. Thus, Ibn Ezra did not have to create an entirely new system of Hebrew grammar, but rather to study the previous works, re-organize and edit them and follow them up with monographs of his own expounding on these previous compositions. Therefore it is not surprising that his grammatical studies do not run smoothly in a well ordered fashion, but are compiled round diverse points of reference. (He himself hints at that at the end of *Moznayim*, p. 118*).

Ibn Ezra composed his *Sefer Moznayim* in the first year after his arrival in Rome, in 1140, having already written his commentary to the book of Ecclesiastes, (to which he refers in *Sefer Moznayim* in the lemma העבדים p. 32* and in lemma השרשים, p. 34*; A page number, in

parenthesis, without any specification refers in this article to the Patón-Badillos edition described here. When followed by an asterisk, it refers to the Hebrew part, at the right-hand part of the book, and probably his commentary to the book of Job as well. *Sefer Moznayim* or *Sefer Moznei Lehson Haqqodesh* is his first study on grammar, constructed as a sort of grammatical lexicon. It is not a gradually developing systematic instruction in the Biblical language, and thus not meant for the beginner, it rather aims at those who have learned before and endeavor at expanding their knowledge. In the book Ibn Ezra deals with 58 basic terms, which he clarifies, defines and illustrates by means of examples; he does so following studies of his predecessors with whom he argues and who he, at times, criticizes. These entries are not random technical terms, but rather deal with phrases designating prominent phenomena, chosen for their singular significance in the biblical language, even if they are not exhaustive. The entries are not set in alphabetical order, but are arranged by thematical-logic: first the vowels are dealt with, then the various letters/characters according to phonetic groups or their morphological use, to be followed by morphological syntactical terms (p. 55).

The heading of each lemma comes in the defined plural form, such as המתחלפים, המלכים, הנחים, הנעים, העבדים, המשרתים, המתחלפים. This, basically, is a simple technical way to rhyme the various entries and strengthen their mutual correlation, though in most cases the thematical relation is minimal, and many of the entries stand in their own right, not necessarily connected to those preceding or following them as is the common way in lexicons. In certain cases no more than a single example is adduced, yet the entry is still brought in the plural such as האחדים (lemma number 10), in which he deals with the *qeri* and *ketib* of Deuteronomy 32, 6 [תגמלו זאת] הלה which could have been part of the entry זרים, seeing that he himself says that it is an irregular word (מילה זרה); it may well be that the reason for the word forming a separate entity is out of reverence for the Lord.

Moreover, Ibn Ezra's love for rhetoric did, occasionally, have the upper hand in deciding on certain entries. Thus for example, המתחלפים (p. 40*, line 1) and המתהפכים (p. 42*), do not establish a differentiation of categories, seeing that both cases deal with the interchange of the letters *waw* and *yod*. Another example: the reverse of זכרים is נקבות (this opposition is already used in the general language in biblical Hebrew, as e.g. in זכר ונקבה ברא אותם (Gen. 1, 27); yet the lemma after entry 33,

הזכרים, is הנשים (entry 34) and not הנקבות, the reason being that if he had used the common term he would have disrupted the flow of rhyme ending in ים. In a number of cases the lemma does not deal with the plain meaning of the word but with its opposite meaning, as for example in השלמים (entry 39) dealing with irregular verbs, which we have to compare to the sound verbs to be able to understand their formation.

These lemmata are first listed consecutively, then with short definitions, finally to be dealt with at length. This is not the most economical way of treating grammatical problems, seeing that certain matters are repeated in different entries. For example the fact that the *he* at the end of a word is pronounced as a *ne'lam* is mentioned under נעלמים (p. 36*), though it had been dealt with previously under קמץ גדול (p. 28*). The short form can not accommodate lengthy discussion or criticism, thus the long version should be read in order not to miss important information. In lemma 55 Ibn Ezra brings the form למשופטי, which in the short version (pp. 12*-13*) is, without any hesitancy or criticism, described as a *po'al* conjugation, whereas in the comprehensive version (p. 108*) this premise is rejected, as it is not considered necessary to constitute a specific conjugation for three words only. According to Ibn Ezra, a conjugation is only set when hundreds and thousands forms are inflected in its pattern. (ומה פירוש בנין רק שימצאו למאות ולא לפים על בנינו). Therefore he now suggests a different explanation, including reading משופטי as an adjective.

Even though Ibn Ezra edited his list three times, he did not mention the number of 58 [entries], and never explained why this was the number he chose. Though it is not a typological number, its numerology is ח"ן, which may well be a hint at his hope that the book may find favor (ימצא חן) in the eyes of his readers, or that it is meant for those who are initiated into the subject (יודעי חן). Be that as it may, if he had wanted to add entries there would have been no difficulty. From the material he integrated into certain entries he could have made separate, independent ones if he had been so inclined. Thus he could have made an entry such as הנוספים in which he could have included forms like מקללני (Jer 16, 10) and המגביהי (Psalms 113, 5), which have an additional *waw* and *yod*, instead of bringing these forms in the entry המתהלפים (p. 40*), where they are not quite in place, (as if the *waw* in מקללני were replacing zero as the form stands instead of מקללני, and so in the case of the final *yod* in המגביהי,

which replaces (המגביה). He himself says about these words that the *waw* and the *yod* in them are redundant.

In addition to the 58 lemmata, the introduction to Ibn Ezra's work holds a historical survey of the transmission of the Hebrew language from its beginning, and material about Hebrew grammar and grammarians. (An alternative Karaite version to this list of philologists was published by M. N. Zislin in his article "A Karaite Version of the Introduction of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra to his *Sefer Moznayim* (Firk. II ebr, 456/1)", *Meḥqarim be-Lashon [Languages Studies]* 8 (2001), pp. 283-288). This survey is of great importance, not only because it offers a chronology which enables us to place the authors at their accurate point in time, but mainly as it preserves names of grammarians and compositions which have been lost over the ages. In the book itself Ibn Ezra also cites entries from works which are no longer extant, among others by Yonah ben Ḥisday (p. 68*), or from the work of R. Samuel Hannagid (p. 70*). These quotations are often the only reference left from the lost writings.

However, the novelty is not only in the original method of arrangement of the composition; in his work Ibn Ezra innovates on a great many general issues as well as in details, such as explaining the technical form of the vowels. He explained the *qibbutz* as an intermediate vowel standing between the *ḥolem* and the *ḥireq*, since according to his explanation the *qibbutz* is composed of an upper dot taken from the *ḥolem*, and a lower one from the *ḥireq*, whereas the middle one refers to both its origins (p. 20*).

Interesting is his conception of the hollow verbs and of the *naḥ ne'lam*, which probably is no more than a continuation of R. Samuel Hannagid's assumptions. (See G. Goldenberg, על השוכן החלק והשורש העברי, *Leshonenu* 44 (1980), pp. 281-292.). He explains the *naḥ ne'lam* not as a specified letter, but as an abstract concept which materializes at times in one and at times in another letter; Ibn Ezra adds elaborations of his own (see what he says on the matter on pp. 24*-25*, more specifically in lemma 45 השניים).

Though Ibn Ezra's teaching is based on that of his forerunners, he does not hesitate to criticize them. So, for example on page 32* he disapproves of Ibn Janah's syntactical analysis of a rare biblical construction.

Not in every case does he specifically state his disagreement with his predecessors, often we just infer it from the explanation he offers. For example in the entry השרשים (p. 34*) he comments that in ללת (I Sam 4, 19) a *daleth* is missing, that the form should have been ללת. Already Ibn Janaḥ in his first book, *Kitab al-Mustalḥaq* (root ל"ה, Dérenbourg's edition, *Opuscules et traités d'Aboul Walid Merwan ibn Djanah*, Paris 1880, p. 154), devotes a long discourse to the matter. Ibn Janaḥ did not accept this simple solution, which had been previously suggested by David b. Abraham Alfāsi in his dictionary *Jāmi' al-Alfāz*, (Skoss Solomon Leon, *The Hebrew-Arabic Dictionary of the Bible Known as Kitāb Jāmi' al-Alfāz, Agrun of David ben Abraham al-Fāsi the Karaite*, I-II, New Haven 1936-1945) and suggested three new explanations. However, Ibn Ezra does not go into Ibn Janaḥ's elucidations, nor does he refer to them.

In other instances he criticizes R. Moses Ha-Kohen ibn Gikatilla, who says that זהב וברזל ('gold and iron') etc. (the names of the metals) "will always be in the singular" (p. 44*); Ibn Ezra also contests his assumption that the root of הסיו is הס"י (p. 88*). Ibn Ezra claims the root to be הס"ה, and therefore not belonging to the IIIy verbs but to the IIIh. Neither did Ibn Ezra accept Gikatilla's opinion regarding לקה being the passive voice of the *Qal* conjugation. As we know now, with time it was precisely Ibn Gikatilla's opinion on these two matters which was accredited.

On p. 89*, lemma יכרסמנה, Ibn Ezra adduced the etymology כרס, but then rebuts it; unlike Menaḥem ben Saruq who suggests it without any criticism. (Cf. A. Sáenz -Badillos (ed.), *Menaḥem Ben Saruq, Maḥberet*, Granada 1986, p. 223*; A. Maman, "Menaḥem ben Saruq's *Maḥberet* – The First Hebrew-Hebrew Dictionary", *Kernerman Dictionary News* 13 (2005), pp. 7-8.)

In *Sefer Moznayim*, as in his other works, Ibn Ezra commented on many principles in various fields of linguistics: phonology (as in entry 42), morphology and semantics (in lemmata 46, 48), syntax (in 44) and linguistic uses (in 43). To a great extent Ibn Ezra crystallized the scientific terminology of Hebrew grammar, which in part is still used today, though this is not the place to go into these matters.

The importance of *Sefer Moznayim* is also in the fact that it serves as a milestone in the history of the development of Hebrew grammar and of the diffusion of the Spanish grammarians' teaching world over, mainly outside the Arabic speaking countries such as Provence, France, Italy,

Germany and England where until then Jews had not been exposed to the teaching of the early Spanish scholars in its Arabic original.

The edition

Until the year 2002 *Sefer Moznayim* had been published in no fewer than eight editions: Augsburg 1521, Venice 1546, (edited by R. Eliyahu Bahur Levita), Amsterdam 1657, Altona 1770 (edited by R. Benjamin of Hebron), Offenbach 1791 (edited by W. Heidenheim), Bialystock 1804, Vilna 1809, and Kale 1890 (Patón-Badillos, p. 74), and according to Patón-Badillos (*ibid*) M. Wilensky started preparing a new edition, though it is not clear what became of it. The numerous editions clearly testify to the great popularity *Sefer Moznayim* enjoyed over the centuries. It seems that today the edition most widely circulating in the libraries is that of Heidenheim, in any case this was the only one I could consult as comparison when studying the new edition. It easily transpires that the Heidenheim edition is outdated and does not pass the test of present-day demands. The edition adduces in the text itself (though in brackets) not only the chapter and verse of the biblical references, but also Heidenheim's short annotations. His longer comments he collected in a separate apparatus. The edition brims with imprecision and inaccuracies in references to biblical quotes such as in אירש and יכרסמנו (p. 2c) instead of אורש and יכרסמנה (which in the Patón-Badillos edition p. 10* appear correctly). *Sefer Ha-Roqḥa* (p. 1b) has been corrected in Patón-Badillos's edition into *Sefer Ha-Qorḥa* (p. 5*), which better fits the original title *Kitāb al-Nutaf*, the fourth book of Ḥayyūj (Nasir Basal, ' כתאב אלנתף לר', יהודה חיוג', Tel Aviv 2001).

The hebrew edition

The new edition has been prepared according to the rules of modern editing. It is based on twenty four manuscripts. The editors decided to publish an eclectic rather than a diplomatic edition, seeing that even MS Madrid, National Library 5460/4, a thirteenth century manuscript, the earliest in existence, does not hold the *verbatim* original version of *Sefer Moznayim*. Out of the twenty four MSS, six belong to the Firkowitch collection of St. Petersburg, though it is not clear whether they derive from the Geniza. In any case, had the editors waited for the exhausting research of the Geniza fragments mapping they would not have been able to complete their work. I will here mention one fragment from the Geniza,

which I located in the JTSAL, New York, reference number ENA NS 13.28-31.

The foundation for the present edition was laid by the late Dr. Lorenzo Jiménez Patón as his PhD thesis, which he wrote under the supervision of Professor Angel Sáenz-Badillos at the Universidad Complutense, Madrid, in the year 1995; unfortunately Dr. Patón unexpectedly passed away shortly afterwards and was not granted to see his work completed. His thesis advisor took it upon himself to update the thesis and to publish it. There is no difficulty in pinpointing the additions Sáenz-Badillos made, by the quoted material post-dating 1995, and the annotations included therein. It goes without saying that Sáenz-Badillos's merits as thesis advisor and the name he has made for himself as a researcher and editor of ancient texts in the field of medieval linguistics are beyond dispute, and they come to light yet again in the excellent edition in front of us.

From the typographical point of view as well the edition is a pleasure to the beholder, since it is fashioned in the best of tastes. The division into paragraphs and the numbering of the lemmata in the translation are helpful indeed.

The textual apparatus, as would be expected, lists text variants collated from all manuscripts; yet the editors did not deem it necessary, and rightly so, to cite variants from the printed editions; they remarked on this fact in their introduction (p. 75).

In the Hebrew edition those quotes on which the *ketib* and *qeri* differ, have been cited in a form combining both versions such as יִדְעָתָהּ שָׁחַר (Job 38, 12; p. 93*); שָׁבִית (Job 42, 10; p. 93*); in the translation, however, only the *ketib* version was cited. Yet on p. 218, in the translation, we find אָנִי אֱהִי אֱהִי (Proverbs 8, 17; p. 112*) in the *qeri* transliteration.

The translation

This is not a side by side edition, the translation is printed as a running text. Though in order for the reader to find his way in the text, and locate parallels in the original and its translation, the editors have introduced into the translation, in square brackets and well highlighted, the numbers of the pages in the Hebrew original.

Though I do not consider myself an expert in Spanish, I believe this is an excellent translation. Translating an ancient Hebrew text into any modern language is no easy feat to undertake. The present translation

clearly evinces to a thorough understanding of the original text. This is evident in particular in the translation of the Arabised expressions of Ibn Ezra, in words such as זר (p. 31*) translated into 'anómalo' (p. 137), and לכן, very common in this work to the idiom of Ibn Ezra, meaning 'but', as influenced by the Arabic, phonetically similar word לאכן (e.g. p. 31*), unlike its biblical use, which has been translated into 'pero' (p. 137), and rightly so! The Arabised הצטרף, with the Arabic meaning of צרף (inflection), has correctly been construed into 'conjugar' (see for example the opening of entry 50). The word יתחבר (*ibid*), also influenced by the Arabic יג'תמע (= is inflected in plural) has been translated as 'tiene plural' (p. 195). By the same token the word אופנים (p. 41* line 14), was successfully rendered into 'casos de formas' (p. 146). These translations at sensitive points in their context witness to a thorough understanding of the original.

The commentary apparatus

The editors have placed the commentary apparatus in the margin; in it they have commented on anything needing clarification, such as the terms and linguistic usages employed by Ibn Ezra (for example the definition of the *pataḥ qatan* as a *segol* and the *qamatz qatan* as a *šere* in note 40); supplemented further inter-textual references to other studies by Ibn Ezra (as in note 56); referred to additional compositions and contemporary authors (such as Ibn Janah and Rashi in note 134, and to Ibn Gikatilla in 137, and to Radaq's *Sefer Mikhlol* in note 151); they also called attention to modern research, dealing with both Ibn Ezra's teaching as well as the grammar of biblical Hebrew (in notes 140-152). They have supplied detailed specification in those instances where Ibn Ezra only made a general mention. By way of example: when Ibn Ezra deals with the הרה ללה (I Sam 4, 19; p. 34*) cited above, he says he had dealt with the matter in his commentary on the Ecclesiastes, but does not state the details, the present editors (p. 139, note 120) made a point of finding and quoting the exact chapter and verse (Ecc 7, 27). Modern monographs are referred to (e.g. Poznanski 1895, p. 98). Needless to say they have filled in historical facts regarding personalities Ibn Ezra mentions in passing (as in note 19).

The indexes, of Biblical references and that of the grammarians mentioned in Ibn Ezra's *Sefer Moznayim*, are of great importance to the scholar using the study, specially when he wants to locate a certain matter

in the present text and compare it to other texts, whether by Ibn Ezra or by different authors.

Miscellaneous remarks

The expression פעמים הליום (p. 17*) ought to have been supported by reference material from the Sages: Tosefta tractate Terumot (Lieberman), chapter 1 *halakha* 3; Pal. Talmud, Terumot, chapter 1, p. 42b, and. Gittin, chapter 7, p. 48c.

Pp. 35* and 37*, in which Ibn Ezra referred to Ḥayyūj, should be added to the list of grammarians mentioned in the *Sefer moznayim*. Even though Ibn Ezra does not mention him by name, he calls him “the greatest among the grammarians” and “the preeminent of grammar”, there can be no doubt that Ḥayyūj is alluded to. The mention made of R. Yonah, should include p. 82*, even if he is not explicitly named there, yet Ibn Ezra deals with a matter which clearly evinces that he opposes R. Yonah, who consented to the use of עבור instead of בעבור where the poet is constrained. (Esther Goldenberg, דוהק השיר בתורת הלשון העברית בימי הביניים, *Meḥqerei Lashon Muggashim li-Zeev Ben-Hayim* (eds. M. Bar-Asher et al.), Jerusalem 1983, pp. 117-141)

The translation on the whole is extremely good. The examples of the Hebrew words appear in Latin transliteration. However, the editors transliterated מעמד (Ps 69, 3), החליתי (I Kings 22, 34), תארו (I Sam 28, 12), אהלה (Gen 9, 21) and others (in lemma 22 and elsewhere) according to the Ashkenazi pronunciation or following diachronic grammatical arguments: ‘mo‘omad’, ‘hoholeti’, ‘to‘oro’, ‘oholoh’ (p. 163-1640). These should have been transliterated following the Sephardic pronunciation: ‘ma‘omad’, ‘haholeti’, ‘ta‘oro’, ‘’aholo’, which was the pronunciation Ibn Ezra used according to his admission in the very same lemma. Precisely that is the meaning of הנרחבים which is the heading of this entry; that is to say: although these words are vocalized as *hof‘al* with a *qametz qatan* (which parallels the *qubbutz*), and though the nouns from which the derived forms תארו and אָהלו open in a *holem* (תואר, אולה), this *holem* is broadened in the pronunciation, i.e., it is uttered as a *pataḥ* (not a *qamatz*), due to the guttural consonant.

Therefore the translation “Por eso no se debe decir *zohare hamah*, sino *zohore hamah*” should be “Por eso no se debe decir *zohore hammah* sino *zahore hammah*” (על כן אין ראוי לומר זוהרי חמה כי אם זוהרי חמה).

The transliteration of the word חסיו (Deut 32, 37) as 'hasaw' (p. 193, line 6) should in fact read 'ḥasayu'.

In the entry הרביעים (number 47), when discussing the word אהשרפנים which Ibn Ezra believes to be a Persian word, and פרשגן ופתשגן which he states 'are not words in the holy language', he says: "the months of Nissan, Adar, Elul and Kislev are mentioned in the book of Ezra, in the book of Esther and in the prophecies of Zechariah, they are in Chaldean, and therefore they do not appear in book one". (חדש ניסן ואדר ואלול וכסליו). הנמצאים בעזרא, ובמגילה ובדברי זכריה, הם לשון כשדים על כן לא תמצאם בספר אחד (p. 89* line 7). According to the translation 'el primer libro' (p. 194) and a note *ad loc* (n. 274), 'book one' refers to the book of Genesis, the first book of the Bible; this shows that the editors had 'one', which they construed as 'first'. However, this is a forced explanation, seeing that these Chaldean names of the months are absent not only from the book of Genesis, but from the other books of the Bible as well, except for those which Ibn Ezra himself refers to. It is therefore simpler to read ספר אחר - any other book. (Due to the bad typography of Heidenheim's edition, it is hard to decide whether the first or the second reading are meant at this point)

Regarding the form הֶהְדַּלְתִּי (Jud 9, 9) Ibn Ezra remarks "that it should have been vocalized by a *qamatz* זהרי חמה כי אם זהרי חמה על כן אין ראוי לומר זוהרי חמה כי אם זהרי חמה *ḥataf* under the letter *he* and the '*ayin* unvocalized". If we are to understand this sentence according to its plain meaning, we should assume הֶהְדַּלְתִּי in the morphological pattern of החליתי in I Kings 22, 34; however, there is no reason to assume that this is what Ibn Ezra alluded to. It seems that a mistake has crept in at the placing of the *shewa*, and it should not be construed as נוה העי"ן but נוה הפ"א. The conjectured form will thus be הֶהְדַּלְתִּי, as is to be expected in inflecting the sound verb in the *hof'al* conjugation. This indeed is the way Heidenheim corrected it (page 51a, note 389). In the apparatus of the text in the Patón-Badillos' edition there are no variant-readings, neither is there any annotation by the editors regarding the original nor as to the translation, but they translated (p. 210) the ונוה העי"ן 'y con la tercera radical quiescente', as if they emended into ונוה הלמ"ד. This correction, however, is of no great avail and Heidenheim's emendation should be preferred.

In the translation of entry 53 (p. 204 line 11) the examples אשלה and נשלח have been omitted, though this does not impair the meaning.

On page 200 line 5 instead of ‘sujeto transitivo’, ‘verbo transitivo’ would be a better translation.

From the translation ‘la acción del verbo’ (p. 196, line 15), it transpires that they read פועל הפועל as the original, though actually פועל הפועל should be read, to be translated as ‘la acción del sujeto’, or the like. In most instances הלא תראה has been translated according to its plain meaning, as a rhetorical question, ‘No ves que’, ending on a question mark (as in the beginning of entry 51; p. 92* line 8; p. 105*, line 13), yet it seems preferable to translate it as ‘la prueba es’, according to its usage, seeing that it no longer is a question.

In his introduction Ibn Ezra says (p. 2*) that the shortest word in the Bible holds two characters; the longest has eleven characters. In note 12 of the translation (p. 104), we read that on the subject of the minimal number of letters this opinion of Ibn Ezra’s contradicts that of Alfāsi and Menaḥem b. Saruq, who believed that certain roots were of no more than one letter. Yet, it should be noted that Ibn Ezra here does not refer to a *root* but to a *word*, and neither Menaḥem nor Alfāsi were of the opinion that there are words of less than two characters.

Ḥayyūj did not borrow the concept *sākin layyin* (p.51) from the Arab grammarians, but coined it himself. (See Goldenberg, above). More than that: Ḥayyūj’s rule of the triliterality applies only to the verb, not to the noun, as is rightly maintained close to note 87, and not as said ten lines earlier.

The concept איות המשיך (p. 58, which translates איות המשיך) should be translated as “lengthening letters” and not as “continuation letters”, which may reflect the reading איות המשיך.

The orthography of ‘Hayyuŷ’ and ‘Ibn Yanāh’ (p. 59) follow the common Spanish spelling, and are thus in place in the Spanish version of the introduction, but are out of place in the English translation, where the *jim* should be transliterated by /j/ or by /ǰ/.

In p. 60, lines 20-21 should read: Ibn ‘Ezra’ mentionsMosheh ha-Kohen on the text of Nu 28, 4.

Printing errata

The Hebrew version has been well edited and is almost free of errors. I found only few: היות (p. 74*, line 17) should be היות; תצטרף (p. 88* line 9) should be תצטרך (and that indeed is the way Heidenheim has it in his

edition p. 42a, line 4); הַטָּף (p. 104*, line 15) should be הַטָּף; and הַצְטָרְפוּ (p. 117* line 4) should be הַצְטָרְפוּ.

Some additional corrections: instead of 969 in note 28 it should be 939. On p. 29 and p. 64, וְלֹאִין אֹנִיִּים should be וְלֹאִין אֹנִיִּים. On the whole the introduction of Hebrew characters into the text has on occasion failed as for example (ibid.) in the description of MS 7; on p. 31 and on p. 65 we should read : סֵפֶר הַהִשׁוּאָה... בֶּר יוֹסֵף ז"ל בֶּן אִיֹּב... חֲמִשָּׁת אֲלֵפִים... נִשְׁלַם סֵפֶר : הַמְאֻזְנִים... The Hebrew is faulty also on p. 63, line 18; on p. 65, lines 5-8; on p. 49 note 80 instead of 'of', 'de' must be read.

In the English version of the Introduction a line has been doubled at the top of p. 60; this should be erased.

Summary

To sum up, what we have here is an excellent scientific edition of *Sefer Moznayim* of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra. This is based on reliable transmissions of a great number of manuscripts, and accompanied by an apparatus of text variants, and by an exact translation into Spanish with clear explanatory annotations introduced by comprehensive introductions in both English and Spanish.

The sound foundations of the edition which Patón contrived to prepare before his untimely death, within the framework of his Doctoral thesis, witness to the fact that he was a scholar evincing of great potential, and the loss can only be bitterly regretted. There is not the slightest doubt that the research of medieval linguistics has lost an excellent scholar. Our gratitude and congratulations go to his mentor Professor Sáenz-Badillos who took the pains to complete the work and present us with this edition to study and enjoy.

(I am grateful to Ms. Judith H. Seeligman for having translated this review from the original Hebrew version)

AHARON MAMAN

DE LUCA, ERRI *La urgencia de la libertad. El jubileo y los años sacros en su origen según el libro del Vaikrà /Levítico*, trad. Juan Barja, serie: Historia de la religión, Madrid (Abada editores) 2005. 62 págs. ISBN: 84-96258-51-3

El libro de De Luca aborda una de las normas más interesantes de la legislación judía recogida en la Torá, como es la cuestión del sabático y el jubileo. Esta norma, con un claro matiz socializante, representa toda una cosmovisión de un mundo basado en la igualdad y la ausencia del derecho