

**Reconstructing Rashi's Commentary on
Genesis from Citations in the Torah
Commentaries of the Tosafot**

**Deborah Abecassis
Department of Jewish Studies
McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
March 1999**

**A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

© Deborah Abecassis 1999



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-50099-3

Canada

Abstract

Rashi, an eleventh century Bible commentator who lived in France, is the most influential Jewish exegete of all time. The popularity of his Pentateuch commentary has resulted in many extant manuscripts and printed editions, and the effect of scribal activity involved in the work's large circulation has led to extensive textual variants. Moreover, the earliest extant dated manuscript of the commentary was copied 130 years after Rashi's death. This extended length of time facilitated the introduction of countless changes into the work that, over time, have become virtually undetectable.

One key to uncovering the most authentic version of Rashi's commentary is to examine texts written as close to his lifetime as possible. Since neither Rashi's own copy of his commentary nor any reasonable alternative has been discovered, the Pentateuch commentaries of his immediate successors, the Franco-German writers known as the Tosafot, provide the closest possible substitute. For the most part, the writings of these twelfth- and thirteenth-century relatives and students of Rashi consisted of glosses, explanations and criticisms of his work.

This study compares citations of Rashi in over fifty manuscripts of Tosafot commentaries with texts of Rashi published in both early and modern printings and in over thirty manuscripts of his commentary. It suggests that the text of Rashi utilized by the Tosafot was significantly different from the printed versions. Examples show that portions of the printed interpretations attributed to Rashi are actually explanations and criticisms offered by the Tosafot that, through various processes, were attributed to the master himself. Awareness of this helps establish a reliable witness to the text of Rashi's Pentateuch commentary, and it suggests that the Tosafot must be an important component of any future efforts to establish a scientific edition of it.

Résumé

Rashi, un commentateur biblique de la France du onzième siècle, est sans exception l'exégète juif le plus influent. La popularité de son commentaire de la Pentateuque a abouti à plusieurs manuscrits existants et beaucoup d'éditions imprimées. Et l'effet de l'activité des scribes a large contribué à la circulation de l'ouvrage et à l'introduction des variations de texte étendues. De plus, le manuscrit existant le plus ancien, ayant une date précise, a été copié 130 années après le mort de Rashi. Cette longue période de temps a facilité l'introduction des changements innombrables dans l'ouvrage, qui pendant ce temps, sont devenus presque introuvable.

Pour découvrir la version la plus authentique du commentaire de Rashi, on doit examiner les textes qui ont été écrits tout près de la période où il était vivant. Puisque la copie originale ou toute autre copie semblable de Rashi n'ont pas été trouvées, les commentaires des successeurs immédiats de la Pentateuque, les écrivains français-allemands (appelés les Tosafot), fournissent la substitution la plus proche que possible. Pour la plupart, les écrits de ces parents et étudiants de Rashi, du douzième et du treizième siècle, se composaient en des gloses, des explications et des critiques de son ouvrage.

Cette dissertation compare les citations de Rashi en plus de cinquante manuscrits avec les commentaires des Tosafot avec des textes de Rashi dans les imprimés anciens et modernes ainsi que plus de trente manuscrits de son commentaire. Elle propose que le texte de Rashi, qui a été utilisé par les Tosafot, était bien différent des versions imprimées. Les exemples montrent que des parties des interprétations imprimées qui sont attribuées à Rashi, sont, en fait, les explications et les critiques offertes par les Tosafot. Grâce à divers procédés, ces explications et critiques ont été attribuées au maître lui-même. La reconnaissance de ce phénomène permet d'établir un témoin crédible au texte du commentaire de Rashi sur la Pentateuque. Elle suggère que les Tosafot doivent dorénavant être une partie importante de tous efforts futurs afin d'établir une édition scientifique de Rashi.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation could not have been achieved without the help of distinguished institutions and the extraordinary support of unique individuals.

The following libraries and collections graciously granted me permission to use and reproduce their manuscripts from the microfilms at the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in Jerusalem's Jewish National and University Library:

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican
Biblioteca Palatina, Parma
Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden
Bibliothèque nationale, Paris
Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire, Strasbourg (France)
Bodleian Library, Oxford
British Library, London
Jewish Historical Institute, Warsaw
Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem
Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest
Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York
Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
Russian State Library, Moscow
Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden
Saltykov -Shchedrin Public Library, St. Petersburg
Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin
Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg
Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt on Main
Topkapu Serai, Istanbul
Universitätsbibliothek, Leipzig
University Library, Cambridge
Uppsala University Library, Sweden
Victor Klagsbald

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada provided me with generous funding for four years of study, and McGill University's Principal's Dissertation Fellowship supported the final year. Without this income I would not have been able to devote myself to my research as consistently as I managed, and completion of this dissertation would have been delayed.

Yael Okun of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts was indispensable in organizing the permission to use and reproduce the manuscripts. Her assistance in all matters related to this aspect of my research, including guiding me through the process of locating and requesting manuscripts for review, informing me of additional manuscripts as the library received them and responding promptly to my queries once I was back in Canada was greatly appreciated. The staff of the IMHM in general was always helpful and accommodating in the brief time I spent in Jerusalem.

Cheryl Jaffe, curator of the Jacob Lowy Collection at the National Library of Canada, has been a graduate student's dream. The time she took to find and organize the sources I required made the day I spent in Ottawa so much more productive. Her eagerness to avail her resources to me in any way that she could, including fax and e-mail, precipitated the completion of the footnotes. Her interest and enthusiasm in my research were sincerely felt.

Joshua Share, Prina Klinger, and Hartley Lachter checked references for me in libraries in Israel and New York. I thank them both for their legwork and for their friendship.

The professors and lecturers of McGill's Jewish Studies Department, especially its present and past chairpersons Professor Gershon Hundert and Professor Eugene Orenstein, have been enormously supportive. In the years I have been in the department, as undergraduate, graduate student and staff, I have benefited greatly from their knowledge and experience. Their willingness to accept me as a colleague offered me unique teaching opportunities at an early stage in my training and instilled me with self-confidence. My gratitude is immeasurable.

Professor B. Barry Levy, my thesis supervisor, teacher, and mentor, has been a constant source of support and encouragement. His enthusiasm for my research and his confidence in my abilities have challenged me to strive only for excellence; his talents as an educator and his patience have convinced me that I am capable. In the years that I have studied with him, he has shared with me some of his vast erudition, referred me for important professional opportunities, and shown a sincere interest in my well-being as well as in my professional

development. The time he has taken from his busy schedule to accommodate my deadlines and to discuss my work (and anything else on my mind) has been well beyond his job description and much appreciated.

The most significant contribution Professor Levy has made to my education has been to teach me how to think. I have learned from him that I have opinions, and that they are worth hearing (and reading), and I have acquired from him the skills needed to read critically, formulate analyses and most importantly, trust in my findings. The benefits from these lessons are endless and will serve me always, both personally and professionally. I remain indebted to him, and thankful for the chance to have studied with him for so long.

Liz Freedman has been, and is, the personification of the term "best friend." She has been a constant voice of calm, reassurance and motivation. She knew when to encourage me to take a break and when to nudge me back to work, and she always had the right answer when, in my most hopeless moments, I asked, "Why am I doing this?" Her displays of interest in my research, her enthusiasm for my small accomplishments, and her unfailing confidence that I would actually finish this dissertation boosted my spirit endlessly. Our shared laughs (and cries), often on a daily basis, offered welcome breaks in a lonely day with the computer. I only hope I have been as good a friend to her as she has been to me.

My husband Paul Warshawsky has helped me grow into the person I want to be. The time I have spent devoted to my work has been met with unwavering support and encouragement, and the pride he takes in my successes, the time he spends listening to and reading parts of my writing, and the efforts he makes for my happiness have furnished me with security and love that are unparalleled. And to think, our lives are only just beginning.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Résumé	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	vi
Introduction: The Text of Rashi's Torah Commentary	1
A. The Text of the Commentary	3
1. The Manuscripts	3
2. The Contribution of Printing	9
B. Review of Previous Research	15
1. Hizkuni	16
2. The Early Printers	18
3. Samuel Almosnino	18
4. Avraham Baqrat and Eliyahi Mizrahi	19
5. Rabbi Yosef ben Yisakhar Baer: יוסף דעת	21
6. Amsterdam: 1667	22
7. Abraham Berliner	23
8. Rabbi Ephraim Zalman Margoliot: ספר שם אפרים	23
9. Isaiah Sonne	24
10. M. Lehmann and E. Hurvitz	26
11. Elazar Touitou	27
12. Rabbi Menahem Mendel Brachfeld: ספר יוסף הלל	29
13. Gilead Gavrayahu	31
14. A. Grossman and E. Touitou	32
15. E. Touitou and A. Van der Heide	35
16. Yitshaq Fenkober	38
17. Hananel Mak	39
18. Conclusion	41
C. Citations of Rashi in Tosafot Torah Commentaries	42
1. The Tosafot	42
2. The Citations	45
D. Methodology	48
Chapter One: The Printed Texts	53
A. The Standard Printed Text	53
B. The Textual Pattern	55
1. Numbers, Letters, Abbreviations	55
2. Syntax	61
3. Examples and Proof texts	66
4. Missing or Added Comments and Phrases	71
5. Differing Explanations	80
C. The Corrupt Editions - The Standard for Comparison	83

Chapter Two: Conformity	85
A. The Nature of Citations	85
B. Identical Comments	87
1. Consistent Conforming Citations	88
2. Limited Textual Evidence of Citations	107
3. Identical Printed Comments Never Cited	113
4. Conclusion	115
C. Conforming Citations	116
1. Genesis 6:13	117
2. Genesis 6:19	137
3. Conclusion	141
Chapter Three: Partial Citations	143
1. Genesis 9:23	144
2. Genesis 12:6	159
3. Conclusion	175
Chapter Four: Partial Citations and the Printed Text	177
A. Tosafist Exegesis in the Printed Text of Rashi	177
1. Genesis 8:10	178
2. Genesis 12:5	182
B. The Contribution of the Rashi Manuscripts	194
1. Genesis 8:2	195
2. Genesis 9:5	202
C. Conclusion	209
Chapter Five: Conclusion	211
Appendix A	217
1. Genesis 6:9	217
2. Genesis 9:24	219
3. Genesis 8:11	221
4. Genesis 9:20	222
5. Genesis 8:12	223
6. Genesis 11:3	224
7. Genesis 12:16	224
8. Genesis 8:6	226
Appendix B	228
1. Genesis 16:5	228
2. Genesis 9:21	240
Appendix C: The Manuscripts	245

A. Manuscript Catalogues	245
B. Manuscripts	247
1. Tosafot Super-Commentaries on Rashi	247
2. Anonymous Tosafot Torah Commentaries	247
3. Individual Tosafist Commentaries	249
4. מנחת יחודה	250
5. פענח רזא	250
6. Rashi's Commentary	251
Bibliography	254
A. Primary Sources	254
1. Printed Editions of Rashi's Commentary and Translations	254
2. Super-Commentaries on Rashi	254
3. Rabbinic Texts	255
4. Miscellaneous	256
B. Secondary Sources	257
1. Rashi - General	257
2. Analyses of Rashi's Exegesis	259
3. The Text of Rashi's Commentaries	261
4. Tosafot and their Times	263
5. Books and Manuscripts	266
6. Miscellaneous	267

Introduction: The Text of Rashi's Torah Commentary

Rashi's Torah commentary is textually problematic. The many manuscripts and printed editions contain extensive variants, and a critical analysis of the work has yet to be prepared. The goal of this thesis is to demonstrate the value of the citations of Rashi's commentary in the writings of the twelfth and thirteenth century Franco-German exegetes, the Tosafot, in uncovering the most authentic version of Rashi's Torah commentary.

An eleventh century¹ French exegete, Rashi is perhaps the most influential Jewish writer of all time.² His Pentateuch commentary, the first Hebrew book to be printed,³ had a profound impact on Jews young and old⁴ and even on many Christian Bible scholars.⁵ His appeal to all levels and origins of scholarship is

1. From written documentation, Rashi is known to have died in 1105; the date of his birth is less certain. The accepted tradition is that Rashi was 65 years old when he died, suggesting that he was born in 1040. For more details relating his birth to the death of Rabbenu Gershom and whether Rashi could have written all that is attributed to him in only 65 years, see the following: Ezra Shereshevsky, *Rashi: The Man and his World*, (New York: Sepher-Hermon Press, 1982) 19-21; Avraham Grossman, *חכמי צרפת הראשונים*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1996) 122-123; L. Zunz, *תולדות רש"י*, trans. Shimshon Bloch Ha-Levi (Warsaw: Alexander Ginz, 1862), 8; Y. Avinery, *היכל רש"י*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1979) 16.
2. See E. Urbach, "יבמה זכה רש"י לתואר 'פרשנותאי'", *Ephraim E. Urbach Studies in Judaica*, eds. M. Herr and J. Fraenkel, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1998) 15-22; and E. Urbach, "ירש"י (למלאת 900 לחולדתו)", *Ephraim E. Urbach Studies in Judaica*, eds. M. Herr and J. Fraenkel, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1998) 23-26.
3. Grossman, p. 213; Moses Marx, "On the Date of Appearance of the first Printed Hebrew Books," *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950) 484; A. K. Offenberg, "The Earliest Printed Editions of Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch," *Rashi 1040-1105, Hommage à Ephraim E. Urbach*, ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris: Éditions du Cerfs, 1993) 493; M. Ahrend, "פרוש רש"י לתורה," *1 מחניים על פרשנות התורה* (1993): 94.
4. Grossman 212-213.
5. See: Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed. (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978) xvi, 190-191, 351-353; Aryeh Grabois, "The *Hebraica Veritas* and Jewish-Christian Relations in the Twelfth Century," *Speculum* 50.4 (1975): 613-634; Herman Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963).

attributed to his brief and clear style and his unique mixture of traditional rabbinic homiletics and literal interpretations.⁶

Rashi's popularity has resulted in the production and preservation of hundreds of manuscripts of his Torah commentary and in an equal number of supercommentaries and scholarly analyses of his writings.⁷ Thousands of pages have been devoted to explaining Rashi's statement in his commentary to Gen. 3:8⁸ - ואני לא באתי אלא לפשוטו של מקרא ולאגדה המישבת דברי המקרא דבר דבור על אפניו - and to correlating its meaning with the realities of the commentary.⁹ Despite a supposed intention to focus his interpretations on the *peshat*¹⁰ meaning of the text, Rashi's commentary is filled with *midrashim*. The concern of this work is not the methodology of Rashi's exegesis or whether the inclusion of the homiletical passages follows a pattern that corresponds to דבור המקרא דברי המקרא דבר דבור

6. Grossman 214.

7. A. Van der Heide, "Rashi's Biblical Exegesis. Recent Research and Developments," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 41 (1984): 292-318; B. Barry Levy, "Rashi's Commentary on the Torah: A Survey of Recent Publications," *Tradition* 23.4 (1988): 102-116.

8. This version of Rashi's statement is from A. Berliner, *רש"י על התורה*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1905) 8. For other variants of the statement, in the early printed editions of the commentary, see *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Ariel United Israel Institutes, 1986) 318. The translation of this statement varies from one translator or scholar to another because of the ambiguous way Rashi himself understood פשוטו של מקרא and the even more enigmatic ...אגדה המישבת דברי המקרא. The translation in A. Silbermann, *Chumash with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers Ltd., 1985) 14 offers: "I, however, am only concerned with the plain sense of Scripture and with such Agadoth that explain the words of Scripture in a manner that fits in with them."

9. B. Gellis, *Peshat and Derash in the Exegesis of Rashi* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981); Sarah Kamin, *רש"י פשוטו של מקרא ומדרשו של מקרא* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986); Yosefa Rahman, "עיבוד מדרשים בפירושו של רש"י," *תעודה - קובץ מחקרים של ביח"ס למדעי היהדות ע"ש חיים רוזנברג לתורה"*, vol. 3, eds. M. Friedman, A. Tan, G. Brin (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1983) 261-268; Pinhas Doron, "Methodology of Rashi in his Commentary on the Torah," *Estudios Biblicos* 45.1-2 (1987): 93-104; Ahrend 99-108; M. Troper, *שמעתין* 69 (1982): 8-14; M. Troper, "לדרכו של רש"י במדרשים," *שמעתין* 72 (1983): 17-22; A. Berliner, *רש"י על התורה* (Berlin: Sumptibus Editoris, 1886) viii.

10. What exactly Rashi meant by the term פשוטו של מקרא has been explored in the sources above. For a discussion of the terms *peshat* and *derash*, not necessarily related to Rashi, see: U. Simon, "The Religious Significance of the Peshat," *Tradition* 23.2 (1988): 41-63.

על אפניו. Rather, the focus of this thesis is the text from which these analyses and explanations have been drawn.

A. The Text of the Commentary

The variations between the hundreds of manuscripts and early printed editions of Rashi's Torah commentary are innumerable. Differences in wording, vocabulary, sentence structure, order, and even content are rampant; entire passages appear in some editions but not in others. No consistent use of conjunctions or of *plene* and defective spellings is evident. Numbers are alternatively written out in words or represented in their letter symbols, often with both forms appearing in the same comment. No discernable patterns in the variants among the editions and manuscripts are evident.¹¹

1. The Manuscripts

The text of the commentary has evolved into this chaotic state for a variety of reasons. Rashi's popularity as a commentator and his general appeal to so many groups of people caused the manuscripts of his writings to be in high demand, and they circulated quickly and widely.¹² This circulation was effected by the scribal vocation of hand-copying one manuscript from another. Scribes are

11. For a visual representation of these variants, see the parallel columns of the three earliest printings of the commentary at the back of *Rashi HaShalem*, 310-377. For acknowledgement of the existence of these textual variations, see: A. Berliner (1905), vii-xxi; A. Berliner, "לתולדות פרושי", כתבים נבחרים רש"י" vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1969) 179-226; Y. Avinery 62-101; I. Sonne, על פירוש רש"י על "התורה", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 15 (1940): 37-56; E. Touitou, על "על", *Tarbiz* 56 (1987): 211-242; A. Van der Heide, "The Longer Variants in Rashi's Commentary on the Torah," *Rashi (1040-1990), Hommage à Ephraim E. Urbach*, 419-426; E. Touitou, "Quelques Critères Pouvant Aider à Établir la Version Originale du Commentaire de Rashi sur le Pentateuque," *Rashi (1040-1990), Hommage à Ephraim E. Urbach*, 399-409.

12. Berliner (1905), ix; Grossman, 43-44; 212-214; I. Agus, "Rashi and his School," *The World History of the Jewish People*, 2nd ser., vol. 2, ed. Cecil Roth (Ramat Gan: Jewish History Publications Ltd., Rutgers University Press, 1966) 233.

human and made errors. Haplography and dittography,¹³ common scribal errors, are fairly easily detectable when comparing different manuscripts and printed versions of the same text, and detection of such blunders can help to identify passages that have been added or omitted in alternate editions. Because these types of errors can be observed easily and regularly by the trained reader, they are not causing the chaos, although their presence certainly magnifies its complexity.

Writing and copying were important components of learning in the Middle Ages.¹⁴ Many students copied Rashi's commentary, not only to have a copy of their own, but also as part of the process of learning and studying it. The goal of this exercise was pedagogic, not necessarily the accurate transmission of the text.

Students regularly wrote personal notes consisting of additional observations, alternate explanations, relevant rabbinic comments, and literal interpretations in the margins of the text.¹⁵

The more the commentary was copied and passed from one student or scribe to the next, the more complex this process became. Scribes also contributed to the text they were copying by correcting errors they themselves made while copying or that previous copyists had made, or by correcting errors they believed the author of the text had made in his original writing.¹⁶ These notes were also written on the same page of the text being copied.

Each scribe or student may have had his own approach to distinguishing between these types of corrections and additions to the text. For example, some scribes made copying corrections above the very line in which the correction was to be made and content corrections in the margin.¹⁷ Many additional passages originally had some form of identifying notation, be it a letter or a symbol, to alert the reader and the subsequent scribe to the inserted passage. Over time, and

13. For more information on these types of scribal errors, and others, see the web site, *Interpreting Ancient Manuscripts Web*, designed by Timothy Seid, (Brown University, 1995), [May 8, 1998], <http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/mss/haplography.html>.

14. Yakov Spiegel, *עמדים במולדות הספר העברי* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1996) 18; Agus 231.

15. Agus 237; Spiegel 143-145; 186-187; 201; Berliner (1866) ix.

16. Spiegel 40.

17. *Ibid.* 73, n. 170.

with each additional copying, these distinguishing marks became less distinct.¹⁸ The ink colour or the thickness of the quill or the quality of the scribe's handwriting contributed to this same problem.

As increasing numbers of fallible students and scribes of varying intellectual capabilities interacted with a given manuscript, additional comments and explanations were often blindly incorporated into the body of the text. Since marginal notes were sometimes corrections intended to be implemented in the next copy, and markings indicating otherwise often faded, all writing outside the body of the text frequently was assumed to be glosses and corrections of the previous scribe and inserted, sometimes incorrectly, sometimes randomly into the text.¹⁹

The impact of copying and correcting on manuscripts was not unknown to the scholars learning from the handwritten texts.²⁰ A *taqanah* made by Rabbenu

18. Touitou (1987) 214; Touitou (1993) 399-400; Berliner (1866) ix; Berliner (1905) xii; Spiegel 62-71; 148-152. Spiegel describes a variety of indicators by which manuscripts were corrected or augmented. Some scribes or students actually erased the text they deemed faulty. Others put dots above the letters or words requesting they be erased in the next copying. The dots, however, were not unambiguous, since they were also used for emphasis, abbreviations, and to instruct that the dotted letters or words be reversed in order. Horn symbols at the beginning and end of a phrase indicated the need for some type of change, or that change had occurred. Like the dots, the intention in the use of the horns could be unclear. Interlinear or marginal writing also was used for the purposes of correction, but the scribe could not always know where the correction was meant to be inserted. Some scribes did actually cross out their mistakes with ink. Regarding additions to the text, terms such as פירוש, תוספת, or הגהה/הנהגה, or the name of the author of the addition sometimes would be inserted to alert the reader or scribe to the non-original material.

19. Grossman 184; Touitou (1987) 214.

20. For example, phrases like שתלח ענמו באיך גדול are common in Responsa literature and reflect the candour with which textual irregularities and peculiar comments were attributed to the routine errors of scribes and students. In addition, in his ספר הישר Rabbenu Tam often referred to טעות סופר or other such copying errors that result in the corruption of the text. See E. E. Urbach, בעלי התוספות, 5th ed., vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1986) 71-84 for a discussion of Rabbenu Tam's correspondence with Rabbi Meshullam regarding a textual emendation.

Gershom (950-1028)²¹ forbade the correction of manuscripts, and to varying degrees, scholars subsequent to Rabbenu Gershom were aware of the *taqanah* and abided by it.²² According to Spiegel, the people of Ashkenaz took great liberties with the texts they were copying,²³ including the Talmud, and the possibility of losing the original texts of these works was a genuine fear.²⁴

Rashi mentions the corrections to the text of the Talmud he himself made, based on the readings of his teachers. Rabbenu Tam,²⁵ Rashi's grandson, discusses at length the types of corrections that were permitted and that were not. He reports of students actually erasing the dominant text and replacing it with their corrections, not just correcting the text in the margins or above the line.²⁶

In addition to the changes brought to the text by the scribes and students interacting with the manuscripts, modifications the author himself made to his work further complicated the transmission process. The author would often go back and make changes to his text after the work had already begun to circulate, essentially creating multiple authentic, although variant, original editions.²⁷ Moreover, the author often made adjustments to his work through his students and scribes, instructing them to correct the text while copying it.²⁸ The possible errors that arose in such communications cannot be disregarded; the potential for inconsistencies is clear.

21. Rabbenu Gershom, named "the Light of the Exile," is one of the better known Ashkenazi scholars prior to Rashi. For more on his life and works, and the many *takanot* attributed to him, see: A. Grossman, *חכמי אשכנז, תראשונים*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988) 106-174.

22. Spiegel 101-115.

23. *Ibid.* 108-109.

24. *Ibid.* 114-118.

25. Rabbi Yakov ben Meir, the full name of Rabbenu Tam, is the best known of the Tosafot, and probably one of the most influential. He was born around 1100. See Urbach (1986) vol. 1, 113.

26. Spiegel 119-127; 135.

27. *Ibid.* 52.

28. *Ibid.* 51; Grossman (1996) 191-193.

The issue of "author-originated" changes to a text is not foreign to the transmission of Rashi's Torah commentary.²⁹ Rashi's grandson, the Rashbam,³⁰ said in his commentary to Genesis 37:2 that Rashi had admitted to him that "had he had more time, he would have written other comments more in line with the *peshat* exegeses being generated every day."³¹ This mention of a desire by Rashi to rewrite some of his commentaries suggests that Rashi may have in fact begun to correct some of his comments after his commentary had been in circulation for some time.³²

Furthermore, the manuscript Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1)³³ discussed by A. Grossman and E. Touitou in *Tarbiz*,³⁴ as well as by A. Berliner decades earlier,³⁵

29. Grossman (1996) 210-212.

30. Rashbam is the acronym for Rabbi Samuel ben Meir. He was the son of Rashi's daughter, Yokheved, and his son-in-law, Meir. His birth is calculated to be around 1080-1085, considering his testimony to having studied with his grandfather. His death is believed to be after 1158. The following provide more details about the Rashbam's life and works: Sarah Japhet, Robert Salters, *The Commentary of R. Samuel ben Meir Rashbam on Qoheleth* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985) 11-18; Urbach (1986) vol. 1, 45-59.

31. This is my translation from the Hebrew: שאילו היה לו פנאי היה צריך לעשות פרושים אחרים לפי הפשטות המתחדשים בכל יום. The source for the Hebrew is: פרוש הרשב"ם השלם על התורה, ed. David Rosin (Breslau: R. Solomon Stotlander, 1882) 49.

32. Grossman (1996) 212.

33. Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1) [IMHM 30142]. All manuscripts are described in full, with appropriate catalogue references, in Appendix C at the end of this work.

34. A. Grossman, "תגנות ר' שמעיה ונסח פירוש רש"י לתורה," *Tarbiz* 60.1 (1990): 67-98; E. Touitou, "האמנם משקף את הנוסח המקורי של פירוש רש"י לתורה?" *Tarbiz* 61.1 (1991): 85-115; A. Grossman, "כתב-יד לייפציג" *Tarbiz* 61.2 (1992): 305-315; E. Touitou, "לשחזור הנוסח המקורי, לתורה (תגובה למאמר של "אלעזר טויטו) תרומתו האפשרית של כ"י לייפציג 1," *Tarbiz* 62.2 (1993a): 299-303; Grossman (1996) 187-193. The details of the debate in these articles will be explored more fully below, in the section on Literature Review. In short, Grossman and Touitou argue whether removing all the comments identified as belonging to Rabbi Shemaya and those inserted by the scribe (also labelled) from Leipzig 1 (B. H. fol. 1) would result in an authentic version of Rashi's Torah commentary. Touitou submits that the reader cannot rely on the consistency with which additions and corrections were marked and the date of the manuscript is unknown. These two factors present the possibility that many levels of textual alteration may be undetectable to the reader, and possibly even to the scribe who copied this very text.

35. Berliner (1969) 196.

presents evidence that R. Shemaya,³⁶ Rashi's student, scribe and personal assistant, made many modifications to the commentary on the instructions of his master.³⁷ To what degree R. Shemaya took liberties with these corrections is impossible to assess,³⁸ but the problems they introduce to the already complex issue of the transmission of Rashi's commentary are appreciable. In addition to sorting out the corrections and comments inserted by the students and scribes as a process of learning and copying the commentary, one must consider those modifications made either by Rashi himself or under his direction.

Because corrections were so rampant among Ashkenazi scholars, any individual reading a manuscript could change the version without verifying the witnesses to this version or consulting other authorities. Since correcting became part of the process of learning and copying, the control over who was adequately qualified to correct manuscripts was lost.³⁹ Spiegel believes Rabbenu Gershom's *taqanah* anticipated this chaos and attempted to prevent it.⁴⁰

The process of transmitting and circulating any given manuscript held considerable potential for altering the original version. The changes and problems that developed in the text of Rashi's commentary were not unique, but the degree to which they emerge in Rashi is extreme. His appeal and accessibility to all levels of the community, and to all communities, were the main contributors to this extraordinary result. His style of exegesis incorporated a mixture of different sources and varying interpretive methodologies and thus inherently encouraged others to append additional opinions, sources, comments, and corrections. Centuries of copying facilitated the introduction of countless changes to the text, which over time have become virtually undetectable.⁴¹

36. Very little is known of Rabbi Shemaya's life or family. He lived at the end of the eleventh century and was one of Rashi's closest and greatest students. He also lived very much in the shadow of his teacher. Despite being a prolific scholar, much of what he wrote has been attributed to others, and in particular, to Rashi. Grossman (1990) 67; Grossman (1996) 347-426.

37. Berliner (1905) x-xi; Berliner (1969) 197-202; Grossman (1990) 67-98; Grossman (1996) 359.

38. Touitou (1993a) 302; Grossman (1996) 405-406.

39. Spiegel 142; Berliner (1905) xii.

40. Spiegel 108-109.

41. *Ibid.* 54.

2. *The Contribution of Printing*

With the invention of the Hebrew printing press in the second half of the fifteenth century,⁴² the problems with the transmission of a text changed, but did not disappear. The printer's role in publishing a text was to prepare the manuscript for printing, which entailed verifying its clarity and legibility and correcting the errors, as well as supervising the printing.⁴³ Often, the printing house hired two separate individuals for these distinct tasks. A scholar familiar with the text would correct and edit the manuscript, and a skilled printer would typeset it.⁴⁴ Many of the textual difficulties of the printed editions arose in the course of this process.⁴⁵

What constituted an error in the manuscript, what criteria and resources were used to correct these errors, and where the errors existed previously were not recorded by the correctors; the printers, not being educated in the subject matter of the texts they printed, often did not understand the notations and corrections made by the scholar. Like the centuries of scribes and students that preceded them, the printers continued to alter and corrupt the texts in much the same way as the "manual" transmitters. They made corrections and additions to the text without advising the reader to the changes or preserving the "uncorrected" version.⁴⁶

Rashi's commentary was first printed in Rome in 1470,⁴⁷ more than three and one half centuries after he died. Considering the extent to which the commentary circulated and changed while the exegete was still living,⁴⁸ an explanation of methodology and concrete evidence towards proving the authenticity and reliability of the manuscripts utilized by the printer would have greatly supported the credibility of a given edition.

42. See Marx, 483, and Offenberg 493-495 regarding the exact dating of the first Hebrew printed book.

43. Spiegel 206.

44. *Ibid.*

45. *Ibid.* 220-224.

46. *Ibid.* 207-208.

47. See Marx, 481-501; Offenberg, 494-505; *Rashi Hashalem*, vol. 1, 308-309.

48. Grossman (1996) 184.

Some of the early printers, still working in the tradition of manuscript transmission, included a colophon in their editions, in which they praised God for His help in producing the work and attested to the authenticity of their versions.⁴⁹ In the 1476 edition of Rashi's commentary, published in Guadalajara, Rabbi Moshe Alkabetz wrote in his colophon כי הגהתי מסברא⁵⁰ expressing that he had difficulties with the text of Rashi's commentary from which he was printing and that he used "logical reasoning" to eliminate the errors. He knew the text was problematic, but he did not reveal where he made his corrections or why.⁵¹ The lack of documentation for this process of correcting manuscripts contributed further to the chaotic state of the text of Rashi's Torah commentary, as did the changes introduced by scribes and students.

In the 1482 edition of Rashi's commentary, printed in Bologna, Rabbi Yosef Hayyim son of Rabbi Aaron Strassbourg, the Frenchman, wrote in his colophon:

I was careful to correct the commentary of Rashi, to restore it to its pristine glory, as much as possible. And this was my duty. For I knew the students would find in it rest for their souls, where the tired can find rest. Because the words which were obscured in their minds from so many errors, will now be for them as a light, and they will be sweet for them in their mouths.⁵²

Sonne explains that Rabbi Yosef's self-identification as a Frenchman may be intended to lend additional credibility to his edition of the commentary, since Rashi too was a "Frenchman," and therefore, Rabbi Yosef must have a greater ability to determine the most authentic text. However, how Rabbi Yosef corrected and restored the commentary and how he knew its former "pristine glory" remains unexplained.⁵³

49. Spiegel 201.

50. צור תעודה חתום תורה ברוך אשר עזרני כי הגהתי מסברא עם הספר שהנחני וזאת "is the pertinent part of the Hebrew colophon. Varying amounts of the passage are cited in Sonne 38; Ch. B. Friedberg, *History of Hebrew Typography in Italy, Spain-Portugal, and Turkey* (Tel Aviv: M. A. Bar-Juda, 1956) 92; Spiegel 202. I have not seen the original.

51. Sonne 38; Spiegel 202.

52. The Hebrew is: "ונתתי את לבי להגיה הפירוש מרשיי לחזויר העטרה ליושנה כפי האפשר, וזאת היתה משמרת, ידעתי ימצאו בו התלמידים מרגוע לגשותם שמה ינחו יגיעי כח. כי הדברים אשר היו חשוכים בהבנתם מרוב הטעויות יהיה להם לאורה וימתקו להם בפייהם." Sonne 38-39; Spiegel 205.

53. Sonne 39.

Individual copies of printed texts reached far larger audiences than hand-copied manuscripts, and their impact on the community was significant. A student learning from a handwritten manuscript knew the physical text he was using was imperfect; he could see all the corrections made in the margins and between the lines, and he himself, contributed to the process by making notes and changes on the same document, as he studied.

The invention of printing did not stop the corrections and annotations from being written,⁵⁴ but the printers did not leave sufficient room in the margins for these to be included on the printed page. Independent editions of corrections lingered, although the influence they had on the general reader's attitude towards textual transmission was far less substantial.⁵⁵

Moreover, multiple copies of an identical text lent an authority to the printed version that would never have been expected, let alone assumed, of the manuscripts. Therefore, the textual problems propagated by the printers had much more serious consequences for the readership of their texts.

Subsequent printings of a given work were usually based on the first edition,⁵⁶ since editing and correcting manuscripts was timely and costly. Just as the errors made in manuscript copying were carried and compounded from one text to the next, so too were errors manifested and sustained in the printed editions. The authority ascribed to the printed editions in their inherent commonality and large circulation mitigated the desire and the need to correct the texts. Over time, the candour towards textual inconsistencies that characterized the era of the manuscripts diminished, even though many inconsistencies remained. This meant that the appearance of a uniform and thus seemingly correct text grew, even as ideological preferences for the belief in a perfect text

54. In Yehudah Aryeh de Modena's 1617 edition of the Rabbinic Bible, he writes that in the first volume of his publication he corrected more than three hundred errors that he found in the the commentaries. His words are בכל כחי וכונתי התאמצתי לעיין אות באות תיבה בתיבה כתב ונקוד טעם תג וקוץ בפסוק הן בתרגום הן במסורת הן במפרשים חדק היטב היטב חדק מפני שהכל יפה יהיה ומדויק ביותר. ולא לבד יעלה ויבא כחשתקות אשר לפנינו כי גם שלמים מהם וחלק אי שנדפס עד הנה הנחתי ותקנתי יותר משלש מאות סעיות עצמיים נפלו בראשונים מפני סופרים. *חמשה תומשי תורה ומצי ספרים*. (Venice: 1617).

55. *Ibid.* 267-268.

56. *Ibid.* 208-209.

spread. In fact, globally, the text may have become more readable, but that in itself does not confirm its accuracy.

A variety of sources bear witness to the fact that Rashi included maps and diagrams in his Bible commentary.⁵⁷ His grandson Rashbam said in his commentary to Numbers 34:2, "Our teacher, my grandfather, explained and drew borders."⁵⁸ The number of printed editions in which these diagrams can be found, however, is limited.⁵⁹ The absence of the maps and drawings illustrates clearly some of the issues of textual transmission through manuscript copying and printing explained above.

In a series of articles on the subject of Rashi's diagrams,⁶⁰ Mayer Gruber discusses the process by which they were omitted, as well as the determinants of their authenticity. He rejects the assumption that the printers did not have the technical ability to reproduce Rashi's line drawings, since they managed to print his Talmud commentary with the diagrams he had included there. Rather, the omission of the drawings from the early printed editions of his Bible commentary reflects the state of the manuscripts utilized by the printer.⁶¹ The process thus began with the scribes.

Initially, a scribe had in his possession an autographed copy of Rashi's commentary that included the diagrams.⁶² Gruber enumerates seven witnesses

57. M. Gruber, "What Happened to Rashi's Pictures?" *The Bodleian Library Record* 15.2 (1992): 112; Levy 109.

58. The Hebrew in Rosin 196 is "רבינו זקני פירש וצייר תחומין." The translation is mine.

59. Catherine Delano Smith, Mayer I. Gruber, "Rashi's Legacy: Maps of the Holy Land," *The Map Collector* 59 (1992): 30.

60. *Ibid.* 30-35; Gruber (1992) 111-124; M. Gruber, "Light on Rashi's Diagrams from the Asher Library of Spertus College of Judaica," *The Solomon Goldman Lectures*, vol. 6, ed. M. Gruber (Chicago: The Spertus College of Judaica Press, 1993) 73-85; M. Gruber, "Notes on the Diagrams in Rashi's Commentary to the Book of Kings," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 19 (1994): 29-41.

61. Gruber (1992) 112-114. Alternatively, one might understand the omission to reflect a lack of interest in these maps or the realization that contemporary explorations had improved on Rashi's geographic informations. A similar fate befell the astronomical sketches in Maimonides' *Hilkhot Qiddush HaHodesh*. (See B. Barry Levy, *Planets, Potions and Parchments*, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990) 99.)

62. *Ibid.* 121.

to the authenticity of these drawings. They include a statement by Rashi himself, in a letter, indicating his tendency to explicate certain points graphically; the presence of drawings in his Talmud commentary; and testimonies from Rashbam, Tosafot, and the fourteenth-century Christian exegete, Nicholas de Lyra. Furthermore, the presence of identical drawings in manuscripts from a variety of countries suggests their source was the author, and not some addition of a scribe that would have circulated only in limited areas.⁶³

In numerous extant manuscripts, the scribe copied a term, such as כזה, that introduced the diagram, and he left a blank space for an artist to fill in the drawing. The artist never did his job, and to this day, the blank spaces remain.⁶⁴ For Gruber, these blank spaces are also proof that the illustrations originated with Rashi. He writes,

While a map or other diagram added in the margin of a manuscript may raise doubts as to whether such a map or diagram is an integral part of the commentary, it should be obvious that no later hand added a blank space!⁶⁵

The manuscripts with the blank spaces were eventually used as base texts for the next scribes who would copy the introductory formula but eliminate the spaces. In the final stage of this copying process, the scribe would ultimately eliminate the introductory term as well, since it no longer made any sense. The printed texts appear to be based on manuscripts of this final stage.⁶⁶

Elucidated in this manner, the reliability of the texts of the printed editions becomes even more questionable. If the manuscripts that were used as the basis for printing already lacked any reference to the existence of these drawings, the number of other undetectable errors and alterations unknown to the printer, is unimaginable. Moreover, besides these imperceptible modifications, by their own admission the printers made additional changes to the text, further compounding the problem. The modern reader has no information as to how many manuscripts

63. Gruber (1993) 74-76.

64. Gruber (1992) 121.

65. Gruber (1993) 76.

66. Gruber, (1992) 121.

were consulted in the printing process, on what basis manuscripts were deemed reliable, or what determined tenable evidence to justify changes.

In 1866, Abraham Berliner published an edition of Rashi's Torah commentary based on ten manuscripts.⁶⁷ In 1905, he improved upon this effort, consulting in approximately one hundred manuscripts, from which he decided, based on his extensive experience and instinctive knowledge,⁶⁸ what constituted the most authentic commentary of Rashi. In both editions, Berliner remarked on having seen drawings in some manuscripts.⁶⁹ In the first edition, he listed the three manuscripts containing diagrams,⁷⁰ but by the second, they had appeared in too many manuscripts to list all of them. He did not include the diagrams in either edition.

According to Gruber, despite the fact that the evidence prevented Berliner from attributing the drawings to the addition of scribes, he could not believe that they really originated with Rashi. At this point, the omission of the diagrams from the printed text, is no longer accidental.⁷¹ Unlike the printers before him, Berliner informs his readers of the resources he consulted in order to publish Rashi's commentary. However, his unscientific methodologies resemble the "logical reasoning" of his predecessors. He does not provide an adequate critical apparatus with alternate options to the readings he has chosen, nor does he explain the rationale for his choice. The fact that Berliner did not include the diagrams in his printed edition, despite the overwhelming supportive evidence, suggests that his "experience and instinctive knowledge" were clouded by subjective feeling towards the text with which he was familiar. As well, since, by his own admission, students of Rashi and scribes made additions to the commentary,⁷² one would assume Berliner's work would have attempted to sift out

67. Berliner (1866) xi-xiii.

68. Berliner (1905) xv. The Hebrew is: סגלתי לי את היכלת לדעת מה לרחק ומה לקרב, ובעסקי שנים רבות בדברי רש"י ולהבחין בין הנוסח הנכון והעקרי ובין המוטעה והמשובש, ובעסקי שנים רבות בדברי רש"י ז"ל ובפרושי בכבוד ראש ובעיון, למדתי את חכי לשעור את טעם אמרותיו הסהרות, אשר על כן הרחבתי עז בנפשי לסמוך על דעתי ולהשען אל ביתי...."

69. *Ibid.* 348-349; Berliner (1866) 300.

70. Berliner (1866) 300, n. 4. The three manuscripts were: Leiden, Munich 5, and from the collection of Rabbi L. Sorval.

71. Gruber (1992) 114-115.

72. Berliner (1866) ix-x; Berliner (1905) x-xii.

some of these added passages. Rather, he seems more comfortable claiming the most familiar text is the most authentic.

Without the possibility of viewing alternate readings or the discarded evidence from the numerous manuscripts Berliner consulted, the public has received Berliner's text of Rashi, but not necessarily, Rashi's text. Despite this, Berliner's edition has been widely accepted and considered to be authentic Rashi.⁷³

When a self-proclaimed expert on Rashi claims to have consulted hundreds of manuscripts and produces a text that does not differ considerably from the text familiar to his readers, the incentive to improve the text of Rashi's commentary is mitigated further. From the time when no text except that signed by the author was believed to be unblemished, to the invention of printing and the circulation of multiple identical copies and into the twentieth century, the recognition and acceptance of textual problems decreased despite the fact that errors were not only sustained but generated anew.

B. Review of Previous Research

Rashi's Torah commentary best exemplifies the impact printing had on attitudes towards textual discrepancies. Despite its tenacious popularity, few of the commentary's readers are aware of the questionable nature of the text, nor have they made a serious effort to correct or restore its original version. Even the modern printed editions that minimally provide alternate versions in the notes⁷⁴ do not express to the reader the true degree of uncertainty and unreliability in the text. Most students of the printed commentary had and have no concept of how a text evolved through its transmission, unlike the students who learned from the manuscripts and partook in the ongoing change and development.

73. Sonne 37.

74. Both H. Chavel, *פירוט רש"י לתורה*, 7th ed. (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1992) and Y. Herczeg, *Rashi, The Sapirstein Edition* (New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1995) include alternate readings of the commentary in the critical apparatus. Chavel utilized Reggio 1475, a manuscript from the Oxford library (2440), and Berliner's edition. Herczeg consulted *ספר יוסף חלל* (see below) and *Rashi HaShalem*.

This section will review those writers through the centuries who were or are aware of the problems with Rashi's text and how they have attempted to improve upon the situation.

1. *Hizkuni*

London 173.2 (Add. 11, 566), a fourteenth century manuscript of a super-commentary on Rashi, cites Hizkuni's⁷⁵ comment on Rashi's interpretation for Gen. 8:22.⁷⁶ In the citation, Hizkuni suggested that the scribes had erred in their transmission of Rashi. The passage is as follows:⁷⁷

עוד כל ימי הארץ פרש חצי כסלו טבת וחצי שבט קור והקשה חזקוני הא
אמרי למסכת בבא מציעא פרק המקבל חצי תשרי מרחשון וחצי כסלו
זרע חצי כסלו טבת וחצי שבט חורף חצי שבט אדר וחצי ניסן קור חצי ניסן
אייר וחצי סיון קציר חצי סיון תמוז וחצי אב קיץ חצי אב אלול וחצי תשרי
חום והוא תירץ שהסופרים טעו כי ראו בפירושם כתוב חצי כסלו טבת
וחצי שבט חורף ונקודה אחת על הריש כדי להשלים התיבה להיותה חורף
והיו סבירים שהוא קור וכתבו מהיום ההוא והלאה חצי כסלו וכו' קור
כמו שטעו כמה סופרים בפרשי' ואלה הדברים גבי ואשימם בראשיכם ושם
אפרש כנר' את הצורך...

75. Hizkiah bar Manoah, whose interpretive work is known as *ספר חזקוני*, is a 13th century French exegete who refers to Rashi often in his writings. See: Moshe Greenberg (ed.), *Jewish Bible Exegesis An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: "Graf-Hen" Ltd., 1992) 85; S. Japhet, "Hizkuni's Commentary on the Pentateuch - Its Genre and Purposes," *Rabbi Mordechai Breuer Festschrift*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Academ Press, 1992) 91-111.

76. In this verse, God is promising Noah that he will not destroy the living creatures of the earth again. He promises זרע וקציר וקר וחם וקץ וחורף ויום ולילה לא ישבתו. Rashi's comment for the first lemma of this verse consists of identifying which months of the year form part of which of each of the six seasons named in the verse.

77. London 173.2 (Add. 11, 566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 10b. IMHM refers to the call number used at the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem.

According to Hizkuni,⁷⁸ his text of Rashi⁷⁹ identified the months חצי כסלו טבת וחצי שבט as the season קור , but the rabbinic source for this comment, Bava Metzia 106b, calls these same months חורף. He suggested that the scribes must have misread an abbreviation of חורי as קור, and the error was transmitted from manuscript to manuscript.

This recognition of the scribal impact on the transmission of the text of Rashi's commentary is one of the earliest sources demonstrating that scholars and students of Rashi were aware of problems in the manuscripts. Errors such as misreading words or abbreviations were common among scribes, and Hizkuni understood the consequences of even these small oversights. No mistake is insignificant when a faded apostrophe or letter fragment can change the very words or meaning of the comment.

78. Two printed texts of Hizkuni consulted present conflicting texts. The edition of Hizkuni included in *תורת חיים חמשה חומשי תורה*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1986), is the edition of H. D. Chavel which is based on the manuscript Oxford-Bodleian, Mikhal 568. Moshe Menahem Aaron's edition, *חוקוני* (Jerusalem: כנסת שרמא, 1992) utilizes the manuscript Vilna 640 (p. 4). This version cites Rashi as identifying the months חצי כסלו טבת וחצי שבט as the season חורף and then presents the source from the Talmud. In a footnote, Aaron explains that the manuscript has an addition in which Hizkuni explains the scribal error. The language of this addition is parallel to the passage above from London 173.2. (Aaron, p. 61, note 36). Chavel's edition (Jerusalem: 1986) cites Rashi (in Hizkuni) identifying the months חצי כסלו טבת וחצי שבט as the season קור. The inclusion here of the Talmudic source makes more sense since it differs from the text of Rashi presented. Also in a footnote, Chavel includes a marginal note from the manuscript that discusses the issue of the scribal error again in language that is parallel to the text from London 173.2 (add. 11, 566) (*תורת חיים*, vol. 1, p. 120). While the reliability of Hizkuni as the source for the suggestion that the scribes made a mistake in copying Rashi's text is debatable, the issue at hand is the recognition that the errors of the scribes changed the text of Rashi and the attempt by later readers of the commentary to restore it.

79. The printed texts of Rashi available in *Rashi HaShalem* (Rome 1470, Reggio 1475, Guadajara 1476, Venice 1524) as well as Berliner (1866) and Berliner (1905) all identify the seasons חצי כסלו טבת וחצי שבט as קור. Berliner, however, in his notes in the first edition (p. 15, n. 9), mentions that Hizkuni and others, including the Tosefta on Tractate Ta'anit, and Radaq have the season חורף for those months. In the 1905 edition (p. 18, n. 9), Berliner only mentions the Tosefta and Radaq.

2. *The Early Printers*

The first printers of Hebrew books, who worked in the fifteenth century, also were aware of the difficulties with the text of Rashi. Their attestations of errors in the manuscripts, which they corrected prior to printing the commentary, suggested not only that they were aware of the problems, but that the public knew the text was troublesome and would benefit from a corrected edition. The printers would have had no reason to admit to the errors in Rashi and the improvements they made, if this had not been a marketing advantage.

As mentioned above, the corrections made by the printers were not validated in any concrete way. The printers did not inform the readers how they identified the errors, where the errors were found, and what the text contained before it was corrected. The reading public embraced the cheaper, more accessible, and "corrected" printed alternative to the expensive manuscripts, forgoing both the hassle of acquiring trustworthy texts and an appreciation for the tenuous conditions of textual transmission.

3. *Samuel Almosnino*

Rabbi Samuel Almosnino's super-commentary on Rashi is credited with being the first work, excluding the Tosafot, to include a systematic interpretation of Rashi on the Torah.⁸⁰ Very little is known of Almosnino's life, including his dates and home, although he is believed to have died by the second half of the fifteenth century. His commentary on Rashi was published in Constantinople in 1525.⁸¹

The primary goal of Almosnino's work on Rashi was the explanation and interpretation of the commentary. However occasionally, he referred to textual inconsistencies between variant renditions of the work, and he would instruct his reader on the correct reading and on the presence of errors.⁸² Almosnino's approach to the textual matters affecting Rashi's commentary was not systematic,

80. Almosnino, S. פירוש לפירוש רש"י מהרב הגדול רבי שמואל אלמושנינו, ed. M. Philip (Petah Tiqva: M. Philip, 1998) 5.

81. *Ibid.* 6.

82. *Ibid.* 11.

and the methods by which he determined the correct readings or identified errors are not explained.

As with the early printers, the readers have only Almosnino's word that the choices he made in correcting the text are valid. Nonetheless, the very presence of comments related to the state of the text of Rashi's commentary demonstrates that the need to establish a correct text of the commentary in order to explicate it was recognized and that textual corruption was acknowledged as a possible explanation for a difficult passage. Unfortunately, the corrections that were made to the commentary without any documented basis except the statements of the exegete himself compounded the corruption.

4. *Avraham Baqrat and Eliyahi Mizrahi*

Two sixteenth century super-commentators on Rashi were concerned with the text of his commentary⁸³ in their own works, and they tried to correct the text by comparing it to other manuscripts and early printed editions they had acquired. Avraham Baqrat, the first of them, lived at the very beginning of the sixteenth century.⁸⁴ His primary goal was to restore an accurate text of the commentary from the many manuscripts he had from different eras, as well as from the early printings.⁸⁵ Throughout his work, Baqrat referred to what he had or had not found in other versions of the commentary. However, he did not

83. Other sixteenth century super-commentators may have made occasional textual comments in their works, but the following two, Baqrat and Mizrahi, focus much of their respective commentaries on textual inconsistencies. One other exegete worth mentioning is the Maharal of Prague, Rabbi Yehudah Loew son of Betsalel (1525-1609) whose commentary on Rashi, *גור אריה*, is based heavily on Mizrahi's comments. The work was first published in Prague in 1578. See HaMaharal of Prague, *חומש גור אריה*, *השלב*, vol. 1, ed. Yehoshua Hartman, (Jerusalem: Makhon Yerushalayim, 1989) 20; "Judah Loew ben Bezalel," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 10, (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Jerusalem Ltd., 1972) 374-379.

84. The date of Baqrat's birth is unknown, although he is certain to have lived in Spain prior to the expulsion and eventually to have arrived in Tunis. See A. Baqrat, *ספר זכרון על פרוש רש"י לחומש*, ed. M. Philip (Petah Tikvah: M. Philip, 1985) 60-63.

85. *Ibid.* 7-8.

clearly lay out his methodology in approaching the variants and in deciding the preferred reading.⁸⁶

The need to confront the diverse versions of Rashi's commentary is blatant from the consistent references to them in Baqrat's writings. The data culled from his research and observations are invaluable, despite the lack of systematic examination and organization of the varying texts. He had access to manuscripts that may no longer be extant, although the reader is not told what manuscripts he consulted, how many he had, or how he determined their accuracy and reliability.⁸⁷

Similarly, Eliyahu Mizrahi (1450-1526),⁸⁸ the best known super-commentator on Rashi,⁸⁹ considered the textual variants in the commentary. Utilizing Baqrat as one of his sources and following his example, Mizrahi attempted to correct the Rashi commentary by extensive examination and comparison of manuscripts. For the most part, his comments and decisions related to the text agree with Baqrat's.⁹⁰ Unfortunately, like his predecessor, Mizrahi was not systematic in his presentation of the alternate readings.⁹¹

Both exegetes demonstrate a keen awareness of the difficulties with the text, and their attempt at fixing the commentary provides essential data regarding its state. Neither of them, however, offer irrefutable evidence, a coherent

86. *Ibid.* 8; 69-70.

87. The editor, M. Philip, in his introduction to Baqrat's commentary, provided references to Baqrat's comments regarding his choices of textual reading. Most of these choices were made on the basis of evidence from more than one manuscript. However, Baqrat did not offer any proof as to the accuracy or reliability of the texts he consulted or to the objectivity of his analyses. See *Ibid.* 8 (and notes).

88. Mizrahi was born in Constantinople, and was recognized as the leading rabbinic authority in the entire Ottoman Empire. See "Mizrahi, Elijah," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 12, 182-184; E. Mizrahi, *תומש חרא"ם*, ed. M. Philip (Petah Tikvah: M. Philip, 1994) 8-9.

89. Mizrahi, 5; EJ, vol. 12, 183; see also, Jean-Christophe Attias, "Eliahu Mizrahi, Sur-Commentateur de Rashi," *Rashi 1040-1990 Hommage à Ephraim E. Urbach*, 475-481.

90. Mizrahi, pp. 6-7.

91. *Ibid.* 7. Mizrahi's references are very vague. "ויש" and "ברוב ספרים כתוב" "ספרים שכתוב בהם" are just a few examples of the types of comments he makes in order to justify his choices. The reliability of these sources was not established.

methodology or documented sources that suggest their decisions accurately reflect the authentic version of Rashi's commentary.

5. *Rabbi Yosef ben Yisakhar Baer: יוסף דעת*

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Rabbi Yosef ben Yisakhar Baer of Prague published a collection of variant readings of Rashi's Torah Commentary entitled *יוסף דעת*. He had in his possession an old parchment manuscript of the commentary, which he claimed was copied over three hundred years earlier. He compared this manuscript with two early printed editions of the Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, from Lublin and Prague, and found many discrepancies. At the urging of friends, he published his findings.⁹²

יוסף דעת is organized according to the lemmata in Rashi's commentary. In addition to the variants found in the manuscript and the two printed editions, Rabbi Yosef consulted the versions of the commentary used by previous scholars such as his teacher, the Maharal of Prague,⁹³ and Mizrahi.⁹⁴ He refers as well to "other texts," though he does not specify their origin or identify them.⁹⁵

A unique and valuable quality of *יוסף דעת* is the lack of interpretation of the findings. Rabbi Yosef simply recorded the variants he observed.⁹⁶ At times, he noted whether the variant was found in the margins or above the line of the text, and if he did provide an opinion, he included the source for this explanation or interpretation in the margins of his own work.⁹⁷ Furthermore, he reproduced illustrations that he found in the texts he consulted.⁹⁸ Rather than determining for himself which readings were errors and which were authentic, Rabbi Yosef's unassuming work allows the reader to view all the data independently. Variants

92. Yosef ben Yisakhar Baer, *ספר יוסף דעת* (Prague: 1609) (Tel-Aviv: אחים גיטלר, n.d.) fol. 2b; Spiegel 306.

93. See above, note 83.

94. See note 88.

95. Baer, fol. 6b.

96. Spiegel 307.

97. Baer, fol. 6b. A review of Rabbi Yosef's key of acronyms utilized in the commentary demonstrates the extent to which he described the position and location of a given variant in the texts he consulted.

98. *Ibid.* fols. 57b, 58b, 61-64, 73b, 87a, 109a, 109b, 128a, 133a, 134a, 142a.

from texts perhaps no longer extant have not been corrupted or corrected but preserved for further comparison with other versions as they come to light.

One copy from the original 1609 printing of Rabbi Yosef's work is housed in the National Library of Canada, in Ottawa, as part of the Jacob M. Lowy collection.⁹⁹ The work is extant also in a facsimile edition assembled from three copies of the original printing, from which the publishers chose the most legible pages.¹⁰⁰ The book, however, remains difficult to read, and its availability is limited. Because Rashi was so popular and his Torah commentary was commonly read and studied, *יוסף דעת* was preserved until modern times, but so far the lack of interest in textual inconsistencies has prevented this valuable work from being reset and reprinted more clearly.

6. Amsterdam: 1667

Joshua DaSilva published an edition of Rashi's commentary in Amsterdam, in 1667.¹⁰¹ Like his predecessors in Italy in the fifteenth century, DaSilva acknowledged the large degree of corruption that had befallen the text, "in both the new and old printings,"¹⁰² and also, like the printers before him, he attempted to correct the errors. Unique to DaSilva's edition, though, was his inclusion of two possible readings, when he could not decide which version was better. He wrote:

"Whenever I found two readings that were equally good, I included both of them in the text, and I marked the second one on both sides, and I called it 'another text.'"¹⁰³

This acknowledgement of the possibility that two versions of the commentary could be "equally good" recognized both the extent and the depth of the

99. Brad Sabin Hill, *Incunabula, Hebraica and Judaica*, Catalogue of The Jacob M. Lowy Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, National Library of Canada (Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1981) 29.

100. *Ibid.* 2 of editor's introduction (not numbered).

101. Sonne 41-42.

102. *Ibid.* 42. Da Silva wrote, *אשר נפלו בכל הדפוסים חדשים גם...*
"ישנים..."

103. *Ibid.* The Hebrew text reads: *וּבְכָל מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר מִצָּאתִי שְׁתֵּי נִסְחָאוֹת*
מְשׁוּנוֹת... שְׁתֵּיחוֹץ שׁוֹת לטובה... העליתי את שתיהן על ספר והשנייה עשיתי לה סימניות
מכאן ומכאן ובשם ספר אחר אכנת."

problems in the text as well as the limits of one individual, with an eclectic assortment of editions, to make sense of the chaos.

7. *Abraham Berliner*

Abraham Berliner, in 1866, was the next scholar to confront the problems in the text of Rashi. Consulting ten manuscripts for the first edition and over a hundred for the 1905 edition, he worked to restore the original Rashi. His introductions in both editions demonstrate an astute understanding of the transmission process for manuscripts and of the practices of student and scribal activity that led to the textual problems in Rashi's commentary.¹⁰⁴ However, as mentioned earlier in the discussions of the absence of Rashi's pictures from his editions, Berliner's failure to include a critical apparatus that lists alternatives to the readings he had chosen or a verifiable methodology justifying them has created a new edition of the commentary, but not necessarily the original. The reader has only Berliner's word that he discarded the extraneous material correctly.

8. *Rabbi Ephraim Zalman Margoliot: ספר שם אפרים*

In 1911, Rabbi Ephraim Zalman Margoliot published a super-commentary on Rashi.¹⁰⁵ The purpose of the work was to clarify the content of the commentary.¹⁰⁶ An approbation by Rabbi Isaiah Silberstein at the beginning of the book stated that Rabbi Margoliot proved "the truth" regarding certain matters in Rashi's commentary that previously were unclear.¹⁰⁷ In the process of accomplishing this goal, Rabbi Margoliot included numerous comments regarding the problematic text of the commentary, explanations as to how these errors occurred, as well as corrections and preferred readings.

Rabbi Margoliot did not set out to establish a corrected text of the commentary, although almost every page of his work contains comments related

104. Berliner (1866) vii-xvii; Berliner (1905) vii-xix.

105. Ephraim Zalman Margoliot, *ספר שם אפרים* (Vacz: 1911).

106. *Ibid.*, p. 5 of introduction. [The introduction does not have page numbers. The paragraph referred to begins וואמנס היינו.]

107. Rabbi Silberstein wrote: "כי בכמה ענינים אשר לא מצאנו דינו ורגליו בפירש"י והמאן זליל העמידנו על האמת" *Ibid.*, p. 1 of introduction.

to the textual issues. Many of his textual comparisons were made with the version of the text preferred by Mizrahi and the Maharal of Prague, as well as with parallel citations and comments in rabbinic literature. He also utilized a variety of old manuscripts and a collection of early printings of various works. Many of his textual comments were based on differing editions and visible scribal errors.¹⁰⁸

Rabbi Margoliot did not claim to have rare and reliable manuscripts, nor did he provide methodological justification for the textual choices he made. ספר שם אפרים is not devoted solely to the text of Rashi's commentary. The comments regarding variant readings were simply necessary for a clearer understanding of Rashi's interpretations. Annotations of Rabbi Margoliot's work, included at the bottom of each page and entitled יד ושם, attempted to clarify and expand upon ספר שם אפרים. The notes often included additional sources and readings, explanations, and references for Margoliot's choices.

Only one decade after the publication of Berliner's second edition of Rashi's commentary, ספר שם אפרים emerged, dealing with the same larger issue of Rashi's text, but with less consistency and less systemization, and without mention of the earlier work. Rabbi Margoliot's textual explorations were veiled behind a candid interest in the content of the commentary, and while the textual questions were recognized, their impact was limited to the extent to which they did not defame the integrity of the commentary as a whole.¹⁰⁹

9. Isaiah Sonne

Berliner's edition of Rashi was accepted as the true text of the commentary and remained virtually without rejoinder for four decades. In the early 1940s, Isaiah Sonne wrote that what Berliner did for the textual study of Rashi's commentary was an important step, but certainly not the final word.¹¹⁰ He suggested that Berliner could have improved greatly on his work by organizing his one hundred manuscripts into the groups or families in which they were copied. A family of manuscripts would be the series of texts that were sequentially copied one from

108. *Ibid.*, p. 3 of introduction. [The paragraph begins היות דרכו]

109. To the best of my knowledge, the contribution of ספר שם אפרים has been recognized only in Levy (1988) 108.

110. Sonne 37.

the other. This organization would have better allowed Berliner to record variants and alternative readings in a more useful critical apparatus.¹¹¹

Sonne organized early printed texts into two families to demonstrate the possibility of two distinct traditions of Rashi's commentary: an Ashkenazi or Franco-German version and a Sephardi or Spanish version.¹¹² He suggested that the commentary evolved to meet the needs of each community. For example, the medieval Sephardi community is known for its wealth of literalist exegetes; therefore, the commentary in the editions of this family of texts tended to have more rabbinic homiletics to meet this lack in their learning environment. On the other hand, the Ashkenazi students were surrounded by traditional, rabbinic oriented learning, and hence, they had little need to add them to the commentary. Instead, Sonne found more literal interpretations in those editions.¹¹³

Similar textual work has been conducted on Rashi's Talmud commentary for Tractate Berakhot in which the standard version of the commentary was compared with manuscripts, early printings, and citations of Rashi. From them the author, J. Malchi, concluded that as early as the thirteenth or fourteenth century, two main versions of the commentary existed: the Franco-German version and the Italo-Spanish version.¹¹⁴ This work on the Talmud traced the incorporation of variants and demonstrated the process through which variant renditions emerged. Sonne's examination of only printed editions of the Torah commentary does not clarify whether Rashi himself wrote two versions of his work or how close to his own lifetime this distinction between them becomes apparent. One would assume that each community would continue to reprint the version of the text with which the people were familiar.

Sonne did not confront the issues of when and how these variants were entered into the text or what clues they provide for determining the original. He did,

111. *Ibid.* 42-43.

112. *Ibid.* 45.

113. *Ibid.* 47-48.

114. J. Malchi, "Rashi's Commentary to Tractate "Berachot" A Comparison of the Standard Version with the other Versions," (Diss. Bar Ilan University, 1982) i-iv. A second thesis written at Bar Ilan examines the textual variants in Rashi's commentary on Tractate Megillah leading towards the preparation of a critical edition of the work: A. Ahrend, "פירושי רש"י למסכת מגילה - נסחו ותכונתו בצירוף מחזורי מדגמית" (Diss. Bar Ilan University, 1995).

however, proceed one more step in sorting through the transmission of the text of Rashi's commentary and the problems which developed thereupon, and a response to his work has yet to be forthcoming.

10. M. Lehmann and E. Hurvitz

In 1981, M. Lehmann published a critical edition of Rashi based on a 1440 Yemenite manuscript, and "medieval fragments from Germany, Spain, Provence and Italy."¹¹⁵ He compared these texts with the printed edition from Reggio de Calabria 1475, Berliner's edition, and the readings provided by Baqrat in *Sefer Ha-Zikkaron*.

In E. Hurvitz's introduction to the work, he briefly reviewed the history of the study of the text of Rashi, with much focus on and acclaim for Berliner's work.¹¹⁶ He described the types of additions and variants found between the Yemenite text and the printed editions, including additions made by students or other exegetes, marginal notes that were incorporated into the body of the commentary, different ordering of the verses, and a lack of the foreign, Old French words commonly known to be part of Rashi's printed work.¹¹⁷ Hurvitz also described in detail the qualities and characteristics of the manuscript.¹¹⁸

The manuscript is missing large sections of text from the beginning, middle, and end¹¹⁹ and therefore cannot provide an accurate comparison for the entire commentary. The intention of the publication was not to suggest that the manuscript was close to the original. Rather, Lehmann, a businessman by trade, found the variants in the manuscript to be intriguing and, with Hurvitz's help, he published the text with a critical apparatus for others to share the manuscript he had acquired.¹²⁰ Hurvitz himself stated that this edition was meant to complement Berliner's work and to advance it, rather than replace it.¹²¹

115. M. Lehmann, *The Commentary of Rashi on the Pentateuch*, (New York: Manfred and Anne Lehmann Foundation, 1981) vi.

116. *Ibid.* 17-23.

117. *Ibid.* 25-34.

118. *Ibid.* 35-38.

119. *Ibid.* 35.

120. *Ibid.* vi-vii.

121. *Ibid.* 38.

Obviously a more extensive examination of this manuscript in light of other important Rashi manuscripts would be worthwhile. In the meantime, the publication serves only as an additional version of the work that contains variants deserving of further exploration. Its contribution to an understanding of the issues and processes involved in the transmission of the text and its evolution to and from the resulting Yemenite manuscript is limited.

11. *Elazar Touitou*

The issues regarding the text of Rashi's commentary and a concrete approach to its corruption were presented in 1986. In his article על גלגולי הנוסח של פירוש רש"י לתורה, Elazar Touitou suggested that the smallest element common to all manuscripts was the original Rashi.¹²² He explained that professional scribes would not have dared to knowingly change the texts they were copying, and their careless and negligent errors can be detected from the syntactic, stylistic and logical traces they leave. These same scribes are also known for their tendency to have incorporated marginal and superlinear notes into the body of the text. They only knowingly omitted notation marks or made other small changes that carried no meaning. For this reason, the evolution of the text is believed by Touitou to have developed from the shortest version to the longest.¹²³

Touitou suggested that a comparison of as many manuscripts of Rashi's commentary as possible would uncover the numerous additions included by the scribes and isolate the smallest common element, the original commentary.¹²⁴ He explained that the manuscripts and early printed editions displayed many traces to the additions and changes made to the commentary.¹²⁵ He further opined that the earliest manuscripts are not necessarily the most reliable ones. Additions and modifications to the commentary were made from the very beginning of its transmission, and, with each recopying, they became more embedded in the body of the text.¹²⁶

122. Touitou (1986) 215.

123. *Ibid.* 214.

124. *Ibid.* 215-216.

125. *Ibid.* 214-215.

126. *Ibid.* 216.

The oldest extant manuscript of Rashi is dated 1233, and most of the surviving manuscripts are from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The manuscripts one would prefer to have for establishing an authentic text of the commentary would be closer to Rashi's actual lifetime, and that of his direct descendants and students. Unfortunately, manuscripts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries were most likely burned with the Talmud, in Paris, in the year 1242.¹²⁷

The one hundred and thirty years from the time of Rashi's death to the date of the earliest extant manuscript witnessed countless copyings with even more additions incorporated into the text. Over time, these changes to the commentary lost their distinctive marks and traces and became unrecognizable. The valuable manuscripts are those that consistently noted the additions and changes, allowing for an unambiguous designation of the original element of the commentary.¹²⁸

For his research for this article, Touitou examined forty manuscripts.¹²⁹ In numerous examples, he demonstrated the process through which the commentary developed and expanded. He explained the presence and absence of notation marks and symbols denoting additional passages and the inclusion of words and phrases like *ומצאתי* and *ואומר אני*, which suggest the contribution of a student during his study of the commentary.¹³⁰ The transmission process, illustrated by Touitou with acute clarity, proposes that the original commentary of Rashi was significantly shorter and profoundly different in its exegetical character from the printed editions studied today.¹³¹

By Touitou's own admission, some additions and changes to the commentary may be unrecoverable. Moreover, occasionally Rashi himself may have used the phrases like *ואומר אני*, and thus one should be cautious in suspecting all such phrases. Nonetheless, Touitou opened an area of scholarship long dormant but much deserving of attention. His consistent, organized and well documented approach to correcting the commentary does not solve all its difficulties, but the recognition and understanding of the problem and the serious

127. *Ibid.*

128. *Ibid.*

129. *Ibid.* 212.

130. *Ibid.* 241-242.

131. *Ibid.* 242.

proposals for solving it contributed greatly to a renewed interest in the text of Rashi's commentary and in fresh and original efforts towards its restoration.

12. *Rabbi Menaḥem Mendel Brachfeld: ספר יוסף הלל*

In 1987, the sons of Rabbi Menaḥem Mendel Brachfeld published a work of their deceased father on the text of Rashi's commentary.¹³² In the introduction to *ספר יוסף הלל*, the sons explained that Rabbi Brachfeld believed one of the obstacles to understanding Rashi's commentary is the textual corruption caused by the generations of printers and correctors.¹³³ He compared the texts of a number of early printings¹³⁴ with "a parchment manuscript," and from these versions he determined the correct reading. His commentaries reflect the consultation of Ibn Ezra, Mizraḥi and the Maharal for comparison.¹³⁵ Unlike the seventeenth century work, *יוסף דעת*, this commentary decided which was the preferred reading.¹³⁶ It did, however, include a selection of the readings in the other texts.¹³⁷ Moreover, the sons appended notes of additional sources for further differentiation.¹³⁸

ספר יוסף הלל is prefaced with an affirmation from Rabbi Shlomo Halbershtam to the importance of the work and to his role in encouraging Rabbi Brachfeld to see to its completion.¹³⁹ In the introduction, Brachfeld's sons explained briefly the types of additions and corrections that led to the text's corruption, and they included references to specific comments of their father who corrected the passages with these particular errors.¹⁴⁰ The introduction also described the different sources utilized by Rabbi Brachfeld in his work.¹⁴¹

132. Menaḥem Mendel Brachfeld, *ספר יוסף הלל*, ed. Yermie Brachfeld (New York: Shaul Hotterer, 1987).

133. *Ibid.* 8.

134. M. Brachfeld himself compared the manuscript with the printings of Reggio, Alkabetz, and Rome. His son added Zamura, Soncina, and an "old manuscript." *Ibid.* 11.

135. See for example, *Ibid.* 40 [9:9]; 41 [9:10] 47 [12:8]; 57 [16:1].

136. *Ibid.* 10.

137. *Ibid.* 10-11.

138. *Ibid.* 11.

139. *Ibid.* 3.

140. *Ibid.* 8-9.

141. *Ibid.* 11-13.

The primary focus of Brachfeld's work was on the printed editions; manuscripts that were consulted were assumed to possess reliability and authenticity that remain unvalidated. Moreover, the reader was not told on what basis Brachfeld determined the correct readings. Even so, the work compiles important information regarding the text of the commentary, and the inclusion of readings from "incorrect" texts allows for additional comparison beyond the opinions of the author.

One interesting quality of *ספר יוסף הלל* is the environment from which it emerged. Rabbi Brachfeld was born near Krakow in 1918 and, after the Holocaust, he founded a Yeshiva and taught classes in Austria. In 1947, he immigrated to New York and continued to teach. As a follower of the Bobov Hasidic dynasty, he was also asked by his Rebbe to copy and edit works of the Rebbe's father.¹⁴²

הלל יוסף, like the works of Mizrahi, Rabbi Yosef of Prague, and Rabbi Margoliot, embodies the style of traditional, classical learning, and at the same time, is pertinent to the concerns of the scholarly enterprise undertaken by Berliner, Sonne and Touitou. Both groups of learned men examined similar texts and employed comparable methodologies; however, they rarely focused on the same issues. The textual problems of Rashi's commentary have been recognized, to some extent, throughout the centuries of the text's transmission, but *ספר יוסף הלל* marks the first time since the seventeenth century that a super-commentary acknowledged that the textual questions in the commentary systematically hindered one's understanding of Rashi's interpretations, and lemma by lemma, attempted to establish a correct reading.¹⁴³ This publication legitimized a place for the study of textual issues in classical learning without discrediting or dishonouring the tradition of Rashi.

142. *Ibid.* 7-8.

143. *ספר שם אפרים* examined only selected lemmata in each *parshah*, based specifically on difficulties understanding the content.

13. *Gilead Gavrayahu*

In 1988, Gilead Gavrayahu explored the influence of the censor on the text of Rashi's commentary on Psalms.¹⁴⁴ The book of Psalms was the book of the Hebrew Bible cited most frequently by the Church Fathers, and Rashi appeared to have been responding to their interpretations and beliefs in his own work.¹⁴⁵ For this reason, his commentary on Psalms, in particular, was subjected to the textual corruption of the censor.

Gavrayahu explained three different ways in which the censor affected the transmission of the text. First, the copyists or printers, from fear of censorship, would alter, adjust or adapt passages they anticipated as problematic by replacing the original text with words that sound similar, or that carry double meanings, or that hint at the real meaning of the interpretation. Second, the censors would black out problematic words, phrases or paragraphs. Third, in addition to erasing the original text, the censors would add words in an attempt to change the original meaning of the comment and reflect a more Christological or Islamic sense.¹⁴⁶

Gavrayahu also illustrated the corruption effected by the censor in two examples in which he traced the transmission of the text in a variety of manuscripts and printed editions.¹⁴⁷ Furthermore, he presented the types of words and phrases that tended to be problematic. These consisted mostly of terms referring to non-Jews.¹⁴⁸

The influence of the censor on textual transmission is an important component of determining the original text of Rashi's commentary, or indeed of any controversial work. However, the impact of the censor on Rashi's Torah commentary is probably much less significant than that on the book of Psalms, because it is not as focused on the beliefs and interpretations of the Christians. Moreover, the intervention of the censor was most strongly discerned in the printed

144. G. Gavrayahu, "נטחאות רש"י לתהלים והצנזורה", ספר פרופ' חמ"י גבריאלו "נטחאות רש"י לתהלים והצנזורה", ed. B. Luria (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer Ltd., 1988) 248-261.

145. *Ibid.* 250.

146. *Ibid.* 249-250.

147. *Ibid.* 252-256.

148. *Ibid.* 257-259.

editions of the commentary,¹⁴⁹ when much textual corruption was already embedded into the work.

14. A. Grossman and E. Touitou

In the early 1990s, in a series of articles in *Tarbiz*,¹⁵⁰ Avraham Grossman and Elazar Touitou entered into a debate regarding the potential of one particular manuscript to reveal the authentic text of Rashi's commentary. The manuscript, known as Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1),¹⁵¹ is comprised of the Pentateuch, the Haftarat, Targum Onkelos, sections from Targum Yerushalmi, marginal notes on the text of the Torah and the Targum from a comparison with other manuscripts (by the scribe, Rabbi Makhir), Rashi's commentary on the Torah, Rashi's commentary on the Haftarat, Rabbi Shemaya's marginal notes on Rashi's Torah commentary, a few marginal notes of Rabbi Makhir on Rashi's Torah commentary, and the five megillot with Rashi's commentary.¹⁵²

For Grossman the importance of this manuscript lies in Rabbi Makhir's claim to have copied Rashi's commentary from the manuscript belonging to Rabbi Shemaya himself.¹⁵³ According to Grossman, since Rabbi Shemaya lived, worked and studied with Rashi, his copy of the commentary should be as close to the original as possible.¹⁵⁴ The advantage of this manuscript is the varying types of notes Rabbi Shemaya made on the text and the differentiations among them in the glosses. Rabbi Shemaya interacted with the commentary in three different ways. (1) He made corrections and additions as instructed by Rashi, which he marked with a phrase or acronym like צוני רי להגיהה. (2) He wrote his own notes to the commentary which in this manuscript are appended with various abbreviations of his name ranging from רי שמעיה to ריש. (3) He also collected large sections of midrash and other lengthy discussions which he inserted in the

149. *Ibid.* 251-252.

150. Grossman (1990) 67-98; Touitou (1991) 85-115; Grossman (1992) 305-315; Touitou (1993a) 297-303.

151. Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1) [IMHM 30142].

152. Grossman (1990) 70.

153. Grossman (1990) 79; Touitou (1991) 86.

154. Grossman (1990) 79, 88; Grossman (1992) 305.

manuscript.¹⁵⁵ Grossman's suggestion was that removing all of Rabbi Shemaya's and Rabbi Makhir's comments would result in the text closest to Rashi's authentic work.¹⁵⁶

Touitou's problem with this approach was one of consistency and one of dating. The manuscript contains within it numerous levels of commentary, much of the annotation is written in acronyms, and by Grossman's own admission, the text is often illegible.¹⁵⁷ Touitou questioned to what extent Rabbi Shemaya felt bound to the text of Rashi and what degree of freedom he took in entering changes. He wondered how one can be certain Rabbi Shemaya always marked what Rashi instructed him to change in contrast to what he commented on his own. The same questions can be asked of the scribe. His claim of consistent annotation must be explored beyond his own statements.¹⁵⁸

The legibility of the manuscript is also important in qualifying the text based on its supposed accurate annotation. Touitou pointed out that a smudged ת (for תוספת) can easily be read as a ך and thus interpreted as a comment authorized by Rashi, rather than an addition made anonymously at some time in the manuscript's transmission. Since many of the annotations are in fact abbreviations, the potential for deciphering them incorrectly is great.¹⁵⁹

The issue of the date of the manuscript contributes further to these uncertainties. Grossman argued for the thirteenth century. He suggested two possible identifications of Rabbi Makhir based on mention of his father, Rabbi Karsavia. The first possibility is that Rabbi Makhir's father is the same Rabbi Karsavia who refused to obey the ordinance of Rabbenu Tam to return the dowry to the bride who was widowed in the first year of marriage without having born any sons. This would place Rabbi Makhir in the first half of the thirteenth century. The second possibility is that he is the son of Rabbi Karsavia, the expert scribe who worked in Paris and Rouen in the first half of the thirteenth century. This would place Rabbi Makhir in the second half of that century. In either case, Rabbai Karsavia was a distinguished scholar and an important man who may have

155. Grossman (1990) 70-73.

156. *Ibid.* 97-98; Grossman (1992) 305.

157. Grossman (1990) 69-72.

158. Touitou (1991) 86-87.

159. *Ibid.* 87.

possessed a valuable scroll such as one belonging to Rabbi Shemaya. In addition, Grossman validated his dating of the manuscript with codicological analyses.¹⁶⁰

Touitou preferred the fourteenth century. He presented seven examples from the manuscript in which comments appearing to be Rashi's can be proven from other manuscripts and commentaries not to be his. Comments appeared in the manuscript that were not in other early texts, and at the same time, were attributed to Hizkuni in other sources, thus confirming they did not originate with Rashi. Since Hizkuni himself lived in the thirteenth century, the comment needed time to be transmitted from text to text to eventually be embedded in the commentary of Rashi and attributed to him. Regarding the codicological analyses, Touitou responded that codicology was not an objective science, that codicologists and paleographers acknowledge the lack of certainty that accompanies each hypothesis, and that one should be cautious regarding definitive statements and hypotheses.¹⁶¹

Both the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries are significantly later than the lifetime of Rabbi Shemaya, and one cannot be certain that Rabbi Makhir really was copying from Rabbi Shemaya's personal copy of the commentary or that the statements attesting to the manuscript's importance were not also copied by the scribes in each subsequent text.¹⁶² Such attestations would lend great authority, reliability and value (both academic and financial) to any manuscript, and hence this prestigious reputation would be carried along with each copying.

An attestation of authenticity, however, does not preclude the incorporation of extraneous material that did not originate with Rashi into his commentary. Touitou, in fact, cited a number of examples in his rejoinders to Grossman, which demonstrated that not every addition made in Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1) is accounted for by the annotations of either Rabbi Shemaya or Rabbi Makhir.¹⁶³ This supports the conception that the many years separating Rabbi Shemaya and Rabbi Makhir may have witnessed numerous changes to the commentary no longer detectable by deciphering this manuscript alone.

160. Grossman (1990) 88-93; Grossman (1992) 314.

161. Touitou (1990) 109; Touitou (1993a) 302.

162. Touitou (1990) 87, 114; Touitou (1993a) 298-299.

163. Touitou (1990) 91-109.

The issues debated by these two scholars clearly describe the problems in finding the original text of Rashi's commentary. The analyses of the transmission processes are complex; the evidence culled from the manuscripts is intricate and enigmatic; and the original text of Rashi's commentary is deeply hidden behind countless layers of additions, annotations and corrections. The extensive examinations and elucidations of the intricacies of Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1) that have been exposed by both Grossman and Touitou are invaluable; their articles are dense with information and rich in examples. The essence of their combined work reflects back to Sonne, i. e., that the answer to recovering the original Rashi commentary lies not with one individual, nor in this case, with one manuscript. The complexities inherent in its compilation based on generations of contributors preclude an obvious and straightforward solution. Leipzig 1 (B.H. fol. 1) is certainly an important component to the study of the text of Rashi, but not the only one; a focus on this manuscript to the exclusion of others would only obscure further the original text.

15. *E. Touitou and A. Van der Heide*

In 1993, Touitou and Van der Heide each contributed an article on the subject of the text of Rashi's Torah commentary to *Rashi 1040-1990, Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach*, edited by Gabrielle Sed-Rajna. In "Quelques Critères Pouvant Aider à Établir la Version Originale du Commentaire de Rashi sur le Pentateuque,"¹⁶⁴ Touitou analyzed four examples of Rashi's commentary to which he applied a combination of methodologies. He began with a critical analysis of the printed text, noting contradictions or ambiguities within the interpretation, as well as oddities such as an abundance of homiletical passages.¹⁶⁵ He then compared a selection of manuscripts, looking for that kernel of the interpretation common to all texts.¹⁶⁶

Finally, Touitou explored the issue of Rashi's goal in writing his interpretation. This content-based analysis considered the general trends in the

164. Touitou (1993b) 399-409.

165. *Ibid.* 400.

166. *Ibid.* 401.

text of Rashi and also the influences on Rashi's intentions that are attributable to the historical context, from the local exegetical schools, community interests and needs, and relationships with Christian neighbours in general, and Christian Bible scholars, in particular.¹⁶⁷

This non-textual approach suggests that finding the original commentary requires more than a comparison of variant versions; indeed, an insight into the mind of an eleventh century French exegete. While an appreciation and understanding of the content of the commentary is crucial to an analysis of its authenticity, one should be wary of drawing conclusions as to the goals and intentions of the commentator based on a corrupt text, the intricacies of which scholars are only beginning to understand.

In "The Longer Variants in Rashi's Commentary on the Torah,"¹⁶⁸ Van der Heide explored the issue of establishing criteria through which to analyze the longer midrashic passages that appear in some manuscripts and printed editions, but not in others. He opposed the idea that all the variant passages were additions to the commentary as "too easy" a solution.¹⁶⁹ He suggested that knowing the purpose of midrashim in Rashi's commentary would help in judging the variant passages.¹⁷⁰ While Van der Heide acknowledged the existence of conflicting opinions as to Rashi's purpose in using midrashim, he seemed to propose that the possible inaccuracy of the text did not preclude an analysis of the exegetical methodology of the commentator.¹⁷¹

Van der Heide suggested focusing on only two groups of midrashim found in the commentary in order to assess their authenticity. The first are those that present an interpretation of the biblical text "completely at variance with its natural meaning;"¹⁷² the second are those that have been adapted or rephrased, rather than quoted literally, and thus can be judged based on style and function. He admitted the inherent difficulty in identifying Rashi's style from an uncertain text, yet

167. *Ibid.* 401-402.

168. Van der Heide (1993) 419-426.

169. *Ibid.* 422.

170. *Ibid.* 422-424.

171. *Ibid.* 424.

172. *Ibid.* 425.

he maintained that the division of midrashic passages into variant types presented an opening into judging their authenticity.¹⁷³

Van der Heide did not present any concrete answers in his article, nor did he actually examine individual examples. His conclusion was that in order to determine the validity of these longer passages in the commentary, one first must examine its use of midrashim in general. He wrote that at the same time, "it may be profitable to concentrate renewed study of the textual evidence."¹⁷⁴ His preference was obviously for the precedence of exegetical methodology, while still considering the problematic nature of the text.

The issue of textual reliability and exegetical methodology is complex. Van der Heide's repeated warning of the "lure of the circular argument" is justified.¹⁷⁵ But the task of determining Rashi's use of midrashim in general in order to resolve the validity of these longer variant passages is arduous and uncertain, when the text required for such an analysis remains in doubt. Classifying the different types of passages found in the commentary helps to confront the chaos in the state of the text, but one cannot compare one category of passages to the others without first ascertaining the reliability of the other passages. The process becomes circular and non-productive. After much scholarly focus on Rashi's exegetical methodologies based on a faulty text, precedence should be given to establishing a reliable text on which to confirm or redefine these methodologies.

173. *Ibid.*

174. *Ibid.* 426.

175. *Ibid.* 424, 426.

16. *Yitsḥaq Penkober*

In 1994, Y. Penkober examined the text of Rashi's comment on Ezekiel 27:17.¹⁷⁶ In his article, "על גלגולי נוסח פירוש רש"י ליחזקאל כז, יז," he explained the convoluted and contradictory nature of the printed text and then proceeded to illustrate the process by which the comment evolved to this state.¹⁷⁷ Through an analysis of seventeen manuscripts, in addition to evidence from two manuscripts he himself did not see, Penkober established four stages in the printed text's development. These included Rashi's initial comment, a revision of that comment by Rashi at a later stage, a remark by Rabbi Shemaya as to a variant reading of Targum Yonatan cited by Rashi in his initial comment, and another addition from an anonymous hand.¹⁷⁸

The manuscripts Penkober consulted could be divided into families representing each of the different stages in the comment's development.¹⁷⁹ Although Penkober's work is not concerned with Rashi's Torah commentary, and his study is limited to one comment, the principles of his work are significant and valid. Through a comparison of fewer than twenty manuscripts and by analyzing the content of the printed interpretation, he was able to confirm his suspicions of textual corruption and demonstrate the process of textual transmission.

176. Rashi's comment for this verse, from the Venice 1524 printing of the Rabbinic Bible in *מקראות גדולות*, vol. 9 (New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1951), fol. 42a, is the following: בחטי מנית - שם מקום שחיטיה יפות: כמו עד בואך מנית (שופטים יח) ומדרש אגדה חטין יפין וגסין הנמכרים במניין ויונתן תרגם בחטי ריחוש לשון קבוצת מניינים הרבה טרוקא"ס בלע"ז ותבירו בפסיקתא מה הדם רחוש בעלין אף לאה רחושה בבנים ולא ידעתי מהו מפי רבי שמעון מצאתי שמצא במקרא תרגום ירושלמי בחיטי מנית ופגג דחושלא וקלמא שערי דחושלא שבגמרא אנו שונים שעורים קלופים ואומר אני מנית לשון מנות מאכל מזומן ואף לפי נקוד דגש דרכו של יונתן לתרגם התיבה פעם משמעה פעם מדרשה כן תרגם וגם שם העיר המונה אנו נוקדים שם והמונה לא מפיך ה"א ותרגם אף לתמן יתרמון קטולי קרתא דסגיאן איתרגושתתא: ופגג - ראיתי בספר יוסף הכהן עץ אפרסמון הוא פגג והיו מצויין ביריחו ועל שם ריח הטוב נקראת יריחו באלסמ"א בלע"ז:

177. Y. Penkober, "על גלגולי נוסח פירוש רש"י ליחזקאל כז, יז," *Tarbiz* 63.2 (1994): 219-233.

178. *Ibid.* 230-233.

179. *Ibid.* 232-233.

17. *Hananel Mak*

Most recently, H. Mak explored the attribution to Rashi of a well-known homiletical passage. In his 1996 article,¹⁸⁰ "יעם לבן גרתי ותרי"ג מצוות שמרתי - דרכה של הדרשה מספרו של ר' משה הדרשן אל פירוש רש"י לתורה" Mak claimed that, prior to the first quarter of the sixteenth century, the midrash that follows the words **דבר אחר** at the end of Rashi's comment for Genesis 32:5¹⁸¹ was not part of the original commentary. In order to demonstrate this, Mak traced the appearance of the comment in the exegetical literature before and after Rashi, the presence and absence of the midrash in six important manuscripts of Rashi's commentary, and the mention of Rashi's use of this passage by commentators on his work.

180. H. Mak, "יעם לבן גרתי ותרי"ג מצוות שמרתי - דרכה של הדרשה מספרו של ר' משה הדרשן אל פירוש רש"י לתורה" *Tarbiz* 65.2 (1996): 251-261.

181. The comment in the Venice 1524 printing of the Rabbinic Bible in *מקראות גדולות*, vol. 1, (New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1951), is the following: גרתי - לא נעשית ישר וחשוב אלא גר, אינך כדאי לשנא אותי על: **דבר אחר ברכות אביך שברכני (לעיל כז כט) הוה גביר לאחך, שחרי לא נתקיימה בי. דבר אחר גרתי בגימטריא תרי"ג, כלומר עם לבן הרשע גרתי ותרי"ג מצוות שמרתי ולא למדתי ממעשיו הרעים:** The phrase in bold is the midrash discussed in the article.

According to Mak, the midrash appears in three separate eleventh or twelfth century works:¹⁸² *Lekah Tov*,¹⁸³ *Bereshit Rabati*¹⁸⁴ and *Midrash Aggadah*.¹⁸⁵ In addition, it is mentioned in works by both Ashkenazi and Sephardi writers.¹⁸⁶ Not one of them claimed to have read the passage in Rashi's commentary. Furthermore, the passage is absent from five of the six manuscripts Mak consulted and which he considered to be the most representative of the original commentary, as well as most of the earliest printings.¹⁸⁷

Most of the pre-sixteenth-century commentators who usually cite Rashi by name in their writings do not mention this midrash at all, and those who mention the passage do not attribute it to Rashi. However, beginning in the sixteenth century, Rashi's commentators clearly attribute the midrash to him.¹⁸⁸ Moreover, Mak consulted nine sixteenth-century printed editions of Rashi's

182. Mak 252-253.

183. *Lekah Tov* was written by Tuviah ben Eliezer at the end of the eleventh century, or the beginning of the twelfth. It comments upon the Torah and the Megillot, and its sources include the Babylonian Talmud and many midrashim. See: H. Strack, G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. Markus Bockmuehl, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992) 389-390; E. Touitou, של "עקבות של פירוש רש"י לתורה לקח טוב בנטח", 15 (1988-89): 38; "Midrash Lekah Tov," *EJ*, vol. 11, 1516-1517.

184. *Bereshit Rabati* is believed by some to be an abridged version of another of Rabbi Moshe Ha-Darshan's works. It is a midrashic text on the book of Genesis that utilizes sources from the entire corpus of rabbinic literature especially, *Genesis Rabbah*. Rabbi Moshe ha-Darshan lived in Narbonne in the first half of the eleventh century. He wrote commentaries on the Bible and he is frequently quoted in the writings of Rashi and Rabbenu Tam. See Strack and Stemberger 388-389; Mak 253; "Genesis Rabbati," *EJ*, vol. 7, 401-402; "Moses Ha-Darshan," *EJ*, vol. 12, 429.

185. According to Mak, *Midrash Aggadah* was compiled sometime around the twelfth century, and a connection appears to exist between this work and the midrash of Rabbi Moshe Ha-Darshan. The work is an exegetical midrash on the Torah and consists of many passages that are parallel to *Bereshit Rabati* and the citations of Rabbi Moshe Ha-Darshan in Rashi. The title of the work was coined by S. Buber in 1894. See Mak 253; Strack and Stemberger 289; "Midrash," *EJ*, vol. 11, 1511-1512; "Midrashim, Smaller," *EJ*, vol. 16, 1517-1518.

186. Mak 253-258.

187. *Ibid.* 258.

188. *Ibid.* 251.

commentary, of which six contained the midrash as a nondescript part of the text.¹⁸⁹

Mak concluded that the midrashic passage, known from the time of Rabbi Moshe HaDarshan, was recognized in many different places. Over time, however, the source of the passage was almost forgotten, and an anonymous compiler or copyist molded the midrash to the style of Rashi's commentary. Once incorporated in the *Miqra'ot Gedolot* editions of the sixteenth century, the passage was indistinct from the rest of the commentary.¹⁹⁰

Like Penkober, Mak was concerned with only one small part of Rashi's commentary, and his purpose was not to generalize to the larger textual issues. Nonetheless, his methodological foci regarding the citations of Rashi, or lack thereof, as a means of determining the authenticity of a given passage have significant implications for the study of Rashi's text as a whole.

Mak has demonstrated that evidence of the presence or absence of citations of Rashi's comments in works centred on the commentary can introduce an opening into determining the authenticity of certain passages. His ability to support the preliminary suspicions with evidence from the manuscripts and printed texts strengthened the validity of this approach.

18. Conclusion

Despite the consistent popularity of Rashi's commentary over the centuries, the issue of the problematic nature of his text has been the focus of serious exploration only in the last century, and with the exception of Sonne, really only in the last two decades. Variant texts, scribal and printing errors and the value of citations of the text in other works on Rashi have been recognized, in varying degrees, by many scholars. Perhaps the availability and accessibility of diverse resources in modern times has permitted a better appreciation of the textual problems while more advanced technologies help collect and synthesize the enigmatic data.

189. *Ibid.* 258.

190. *Ibid.* 260.

The articles, books and commentaries reviewed here utilized different texts and methodologies, and their authors approached their task with different goals and intentions. Each work has its strengths and weaknesses. If a reliable and useful critical edition of Rashi is ever to emerge, approaches that benefit from each study would need to be considered and incorporated.

The sections below describe a different component of this quest for the authentic Rashi, one that makes a significant contribution to determining what originated in his Torah commentary and what are additions and corrections made by later scribes and students. This component is the citations of Rashi in the Torah commentaries of the Tosafot and the treatments of it there.

C. Citations of Rashi in Tosafot Torah Commentaries

One key to uncovering the most authentic version of Rashi's commentary is to examine texts written as close as possible to his lifetime. Until Rashi's own copy of his commentary or any reasonable alternative is discovered, the Torah commentaries of the Tosafot provide the closest possible substitute. The Tosafot included relatives, students, and colleagues of Rashi who focused their work around his.¹⁹¹ For the most part, their writings were additions to his, and took the form of glosses, explanations and criticisms.¹⁹² The citations of Rashi in the works of the Tosafot should theoretically reflect a Rashi text close to the original, and their comments should help clarify which parts of the present printed version were his and which were not.

1. The Tosafot

The Tosafot were twelfth- and thirteenth-century Jewish scholars, who were descendants and students of Rashi and his school. They were recognized

191. J. Gellis, ספר תוספות השלם, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: "Mifal Tosafot HaShalem" Publishing, 1982) 7; Urbach 21.

192. Gellis 7; Urbach 21-22.

specifically for their innovative methodology in studying Talmud.¹⁹³ Their dialectical method consisted of comparing distant Talmudic passages containing any common expression or phrase, accompanied by an acute, critical reading of the text.¹⁹⁴ Their fundamental priority was to resolve the contradictions and dilemmas present in the Talmud.¹⁹⁵

The very name of this distinguished group of scholars alludes to a second important component of their work. The word *tosafot* means "additions," and indeed, the Tosafot saw much of their work as only modest expansions upon or explanations of Rashi, an icon of learning they would never surpass.¹⁹⁶ Tosafot commentaries on both the Talmud and the Torah often begin with a citation of Rashi's comment followed by the explanation, addition or criticism of the Tosafist exegetes.¹⁹⁷

For the most part, the Tosafot worked and wrote anonymously. The commentary that appears on the outside margin of a standard page of the Babylonian Talmud often attributed a comment to a specific Tosafist, but more frequently the comments were stated without notice of authorship.¹⁹⁸ The same is true of the Tosafist Torah commentaries.¹⁹⁹ While individual Tosafot did write

-
193. In recent years, A. Grossman has suggested that the dialectical method of study associated with the Tosafot and originating with them after the death of Rashi may actually have begun a generation or two earlier, in the study houses of Worms. The Tosafot's disregard for any earlier Franco-German literature except Rashi may have contributed largely to the disappearance of many eleventh century works; but, the extant remnants suggest that this critical method of study associated with the Tosafot did not originate with them. Nonetheless, for the purposes of this study, the Tosafot connection with Rashi is the primary focus, and therefore, whether the exegetical methodology emerged in the twelfth century or the eleventh century is of no fundamental consequence. I. Ta-Shma, "The Library of the French Sages," *Rashi 1040-1990 Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach*, 536; A. Grossman, "התוספות של רש"י ענינים במערכת הראשית של," ed. Zvi Arie Steinfeld (Jerusalem: "Daf-Noy" Press Ltd., 1993) 57-68; Grossman (1996) 439-456.
194. E. Kanarfogel, *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992) 69.
195. *Ibid.* 67.
196. Gellis 7.
197. Kanarfogel 74.
198. Urbach 21-31.
199. Poznanski xcii-xciii.

commentaries on the books of the Bible, they are few in number²⁰⁰ and consist mostly of the well know circle of *peshat*-oriented writers, such as Rashbam, Yosef Kara,²⁰¹ Bekhor Shor²⁰² and Eliezer of Beaugency.²⁰³

The majority of Tosafot Torah commentaries are anonymous compilations in which the author or copyist would periodically reference a comment to "my teacher" or to a particular exegete.²⁰⁴ Urbach suggested that the earlier generations of Tosafot may have attempted to record the names of the writers with each of their statements, but that essentially the Tosafot saw their work as part of their teacher's scholarship and therefore were at liberty to add, change, and comment as they saw fit, without bothering to leave a note or a signature.²⁰⁵

The method of Tosafist exegesis of the Torah paralleled their work on the Talmud. The dialectical analyses applied to the Talmud were exercised regarding both the biblical text and Rashi's commentary of it, and resolving perceived contradictions in Rashi's interpretations was a common concern.²⁰⁶

200. Kanarfogel 82.

201. Yosef Kara was a student and colleague of Rashi. He was born around 1060-1070 and died between the years 1120-1130. He lived mostly in Troyes, although he spent a significant amount of time in the study houses of Worms, and he is known for his commentaries on piyyutim, his polemic discussions with Christians, and his Bible commentaries, in which much is related to Rashi. See Grossman (1996) 254-346; Greenberg 75-77; Poznanski xxiii-xxxix; "Kara, Joseph," EJ, vol. 10, 759-760; G. Brin, *מחקרים בפירושו של ר' יוסף קרא* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies University Publishing Projects, 1989); and M. Ahrend, *פירוש רבי יוסף קרא לספר איוב* (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1988) 11-22.

202. Rabbi Yosef Bekhor Shor was a twelfth century French exegete and Talmudist. He was born around 1140, and was a student of Rabbenu Tam and Rashbam. He wrote a commentary on the Torah and on Psalms, and he is mentioned by name a number of times in the Tosafot literature. See Poznanski iv-lxxv; Greenberg 79-82; Y. Navo, *פירושי רבי יוסף בכור שור על התורה* (Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1994) 1-17.

203. Very little is known of Rabbi Eliezer of Beaugency. He was a twelfth century French exegete of the same generation of Bekhor Shor. Hints throughout his extant writings suggest that he wrote commentaries for all the biblical books, but only his works on Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets are available. See, Poznanski cxv-cxvi; Greenberg 82-83.

204. Kanarfogel 81-82.

205. Urbach 24.

206. Kanarfogel 81.

The integral link between the commentaries of the Tosafot and Rashi is undeniable. The Tosafists' loyalty and affiliation with the master of exegesis is tangible in almost every comment, and whether they agreed with his interpretations or not, they demonstrated an intense desire to be connected to the genre and quality of exegesis they associated with Rashi.²⁰⁷ These intense associations and powerful links are the reason the Tosafot are an important component in recovering the original commentary of Rashi.

2. *The Citations*

The Tosafot lived close to Rashi, in geographic and chronological proximity, as well as in a common intellectual milieu. Many of the Tosafot studied with Rashi or were students of his family members. All of them considered Rashi to be the erudite master they would never surpass, but to whom they could contribute modest additions for the purpose of partaking in a greater exegetical enterprise. Rashi's passive participation in the writings of the Tosafot was consistent and systematic.²⁰⁸

These very concrete characteristics of the Tosafot intimate that the commentary of Rashi they cite in their own writings should be the best witness to the original version. Theoretically, one should be able to collect and organize the citations of Rashi from the numerous manuscripts and printed compilations of Tosafot commentaries and produce the text closest to Rashi's own lifetime and the best alternative to his own copy.

The issues involved in implementing this theory are complex. First, the fact that several readings of the same comment may have originated with the exegete himself complicates the recovery of the best possible version. For the purposes of this study, a text reconstructed as close as possible to the original presumes that the work preserved by his students and relatives at the time of his death includes what Rashi himself wrote, what he taught, and what he instructed his students and scribes to write, to copy and to correct on his behalf. In the subsequent analysis of

207. K. Stow, *Alienated Minority* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996) 140-141.

208. Malchi 234.

Tosafot citations, references to the authentic Rashi or the original text imagine a critical edition with multifarious apparati of which the Tosafot are one element. Changes instituted by Rashi after his work had already begun to circulate are a significant, yet separate, area of concern.

Second, the reliability of the text of the Tosafot commentaries is debatable, and the accuracy of the citation itself always can be questioned. Scribes may have "corrected" the Rashi citation in the Tosafot comment to make it conform to the version of Rashi with which they were familiar.

Furthermore, the unintentional scribal corruption that one encounters with the Rashi manuscripts must also exist for the Tosafot texts. The prevalence is greater among Rashi manuscripts because of his popularity and the extent to which his commentaries circulated, but one can assume with a fair amount of certainty that the manuscripts of the Tosafot writings also contain mistakes, additions, and traces of the ravages of time that render any text suspect.

Third, the nature of a citation is problematic. Essentially it consists of a portion of another author's text included for the purposes of support or disagreement. The extent to which the Tosafot felt bound to the exact words of the text from which they were citing and the degree to which they took liberties with the comments and paraphrased the general sense of the content is an important consideration. Citations that are not direct quotations but reflect evidence of paraphrasing suggest that certain forms of textual variants may reveal not a different text, but the influence of the Tosafot themselves.²⁰⁹

In addition, the anonymous quality of the Tosafist's own writings,²¹⁰ as well as the conviction that their work was only an affiliated extension of the primary commentary, may have affected the consistency with which they credited the author of their sources, including Rashi. For this reason, the comments in Tosafot that are similar to the printed Rashi but are not attributed to him, are suspect. On the one hand, they may have originated with Rashi and were commonly known to be associated with him, and hence appropriate credit was not necessary. On the other, Rashi may not have made these particular comments, but they were attributed to him at some point in the commentary's complex, enigmatic

209. *Ibid.* 234-235.

210. *Stow* 148-149.

transmission process.²¹¹ The fact that these anonymous comments are not credited to Rashi by the Tosafot may indicate that Rashi was not their original source.

Finally, the issue of content and the concerns and interests of the Tosafot is crucial. The premise of this examination is that the Tosafot would represent in their citations of Rashi the version of the commentary they had before them, and when these citations differ from the printed versions available today, the Tosafot rendition would be considered closer to the original, and the variants would be explored further. However, when, relative to the printed texts or the manuscripts, the Tosafot appear to omit a comment of Rashi, or when they only cite a portion of what appears in standard Rashi editions, the question arises as to whether this comment was not part of the commentary utilized by the Tosafot, and hence, not part of the original Rashi, or whether the content of this particular interpretation was of no interest to the Tosafot or of no relevance to the lessons they wished to generate from a given interpretation. Determining general trends of interest in Tosafot writings would sharpen the evaluation of the citations. Despite the methodological issues that require serious consideration in the examination of citations of Rashi in the Tosafot, this suggested approach to the text of Rashi's commentary constitutes significant and legitimate analyses. No one manuscript is free from all forms of corruption, nor is any extant manuscript close enough to Rashi's own lifetime to be a reliable representation of the original text.

Previous research has demonstrated that plodding through hundreds of manuscripts and sifting out all the marginal notes and other additional comments clearly marked as such in the body of the commentary would not be sufficient.²¹² Over time, scribal errors, insertions by students and other textual alterations have become so embedded in the manuscripts to be virtually undetectable. The Tosafot offer a resource in which the very style of the work is defined by the distinction between the citations of Rashi's interpretations and the comments, additions and explanations that follow. While the presence of textual corruption in these works can be presumed, the allegiance and connection

211. Grossman (1996) 124.

212. Touitou (1986), (1991), (1993a).

the Tosafot held for Rashi's commentary should have a preserved a version of the text in accord with the author's own interpretations.

D. Methodology

In order to research the value of citations in the Tosafot Torah commentaries, a number of methodological steps were employed. The first step involved a thorough examination of the early printed editions of Rashi's commentary on Genesis published at the back of *Rashi HaShalem* (Rome 1470, Reggio di Calabria 1475, and Guadelajara 1476),²¹³ as well as the main text of *Rashi HaShalem* (i.e., Venice 1524), and Berliner's 1905 edition.²¹⁴ The three earliest printings were chosen based on their relative chronological proximity to the manuscript traditions and their availability, and Venice and Berliner were chosen because of their popular acceptance.

This initial investigation illustrated the types of variants that exist between the different editions and the extent to which no acronym, phrase or paragraph escaped corruption. In addition, it served to highlight individual comments that varied significantly from one edition to another, such as lacking large passages or key phrases to the interpretation.

The second step explored the printed comments of the Tosafot on Genesis, and specifically their citations of Rashi. J. Gellis' *תוספת השלם* served as the resource for the Tosafot comments because of the anthological selection it provided from both manuscripts and printed editions.²¹⁵ Gellis' work is not a textually accurate representation of the original comments, and his concern was not the textual discrepancies between the sources he employed. One passage often has many sources attributed to it, suggesting that the exact comment can be found in each of these manuscripts and publications. However, upon further investigation of the original documents, the content can be demonstrated to be similar, but the texts are not identical. In fact, two medieval manuscripts of the same document are rarely completely identical. This organization of similar

213. *Rashi HaShalem*, vols. 1-3, (1986-1990).

214. Berliner (1905).

215. Gellis, vols. 1-5, (1982-1986).

passages with numerous sources listed below them seriously misleads the reader in his or her understanding of the nature of these medieval texts. Consistency and conformity were not the norm; rather, the lack thereof is what characterizes these texts. The uninitiated reader of Gellis cannot appreciate this quality of the Tosafot literature. Furthermore, his subtle editing of the passages to achieve conformity contributes to the same kind of textual corruption being struggled with in the Rashi manuscripts.

Nonetheless, the purpose of utilizing Gellis at this stage was to gain an initial sense of the role of the citations of Rashi in the Tosafot literature, and their relationship to the printed editions of the commentary, as well as an appreciation for the style and content of Tosafot interpretations. The concern was focused more on what the Tosafot cited from Rashi's comments and what they did not, rather than the exact words and phrases of both the citations and the comments.

The impression drawn from this starting analysis was that an average of half of Rashi's printed comments were not cited in the Tosafot commentaries, and many of the comments that were cited were not complete representations of the printed version. The portions of the commentary missing from the Tosafot appeared to be no more or less relevant to their exegesis than what was cited.

The idea that Rashi's comment was not going to be recovered down to every letter and acronym also became apparent. The scribes and printers themselves were not meticulous about such details, and the variants among the editions and the citations could simply drive one who attempts such restoration mad.

The third step sought to confirm the data extracted from Gellis in the manuscripts of the Tosafot Torah commentaries. Due to the sheer length of Rashi's work on Genesis, the scope of the research was limited to the commentary on chapters 6 through 17, or *Parshioth Noah* and *Lekh Lekha*. The exploration did not commence with *Parshath Breishith* because of the tendency for many manuscripts to lack the beginning pages, which were more subject to damage and loss. The potential for examining consistently ten complete chapters in all manuscripts increased when launched part way into the commentary.

Approximately fifty manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries were examined. These included super-commentaries on Rashi, anonymous collections of Tosafot commentaries, exegetical works by individuals, and multiple copies of *פננת רזא* and *מנחת יהודה*.²¹⁶ They ranged in date from the thirteenth century to the seventeenth century. The manuscripts were chosen primarily based on the list of sources utilized by Gellis,²¹⁷ since the comprehensive nature of his work suggested he would have explored a large selection of the more important manuscripts. In addition, the catalogue of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM) at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem was consulted for twelfth-to fifteenth-century manuscripts not mentioned by Gellis. Manuscripts copied after the fifteenth century and after the advent of printing would not be as reliable as those copied closer to the actual period of the Tosafot, and those cited by Gellis in his list provided a sufficient sample of later texts.

The citations of Rashi were extracted from a careful reading of each of the fifty manuscripts, and the Tosafot discussion surrounding the citation was analyzed for its relationship to the text of Rashi. Specifically, the analysis compared the citations of Rashi to the printed texts of the commentary, and it searched the comments of the Tosafot for explanations of the variations and for traces of the present Rashi and its origins.

The final step involved an examination of over thirty manuscripts of Rashi's commentary. These texts were chosen mostly from the sources utilized by Touitou in his work,²¹⁸ and they were supplemented by other pre-fifteenth-century manuscripts found in the catalogue at the IMHM.

From these two resources, the manuscripts were selected based on legibility, dating, and the number of marginal notes and corrections present in the text. A greater number of visible additions to the commentary, and the facility with which to read them, increased the possibility of deciphering earlier layers of the

216. *פננת רזא* is a thirteenth century collection of comments on the Torah gathered from earlier works on abbreviations (נטריקון) and Gematria. The work was compiled by Rabbi Yitzḥaq ben Rabbi Yehudah ha-Levi. *מנחת יהודה* is a super-commentary on Rashi written in 1313, in Troyes, by Rabbi Yehudah ben Eliezer. See: Gellis, vol. 1, 15-16.

217. *Ibid.* vol. 1, 21-38.

218. Touitou (1986) 212.

original text. Manuscripts dated closer to the period of the Tosafot were preferred over those copied after the beginning of printing.

The purpose of exploring the Rashi manuscripts was two-fold. First, the large differences between printed editions of the commentary suggested that a perusal of older versions of the work would elucidate additional aspects of the text and its transmission. Moreover, a true cognizance of the state of the text of Rashi can only be discerned through an examination of the manuscripts.

Second, the manuscripts of Rashi's commentary held the tenuous potential to confirm the texts extracted from the Tosafot manuscripts. In other words, if the Tosafot cite only half of a given comment of Rashi (compared to the present printings), then a Rashi manuscript that contains only that same half, or has the omitted half marked as an addition, would authenticate the citation as the original text.

This potential of the Rashi manuscripts is tenuous because, as already discussed, even the earliest of these texts cannot be deemed reliable. Many additions and changes have lost distinguishing marks and notations and no longer can be differentiated from the body of the commentary. The lack of profuse corroboration in the Rashi texts does not weaken the value of the citations for this very reason.

The manuscripts of Rashi's commentary may substantiate the version of the text cited in the Tosafot occasionally, but consistent corroboration would suggest that the Rashi manuscripts were reliable, and the reconstruction from the citations unnecessary. Since the questionable nature of the manuscripts has been demonstrated by a number of previous researchers,²¹⁹ the lack of findings in the manuscripts supports the value of the citations and their contribution to recovering the original commentary.

The subsequent chapters will reveal the various types of citations that were extracted from the Tosafot manuscripts; they will demonstrate the processes of analysis that were undertaken in order to substantiate the relationship of the citations to the original text; finally, they will prove that the citations are an essential

219. See in particular: Touitou (1986); (1991); (1993).

component to recovering the commentary that Rabbi Shlomo ben Isaac wrote in the eleventh century.

Chapter One: The Printed Texts

A. The Standard Printed Text

A standard printed text of Rashi's commentary is an oxymoron. The adjective *standard* is defined as "having recognized and permanent value, authoritative;" the noun means "an object or quality or measure serving as basis or example or principle to which others should conform or by which others are judged."¹ The text of Rashi's commentary has no standard. The manuscripts and printed editions vary tremendously, and while popular editions like Venice 1524 and Berliner 1905 have value, they have been falsely deemed authoritative and should not serve as an example to which other editions should conform.

The text of Rashi's commentary contains many layers of additions and corrections made by both scribes and students, and the printers of the work compounded the problem by attempting to remedy the state of corruption. Their lack of explanation and annotation regarding their own corrections only served to add more strata to an already complex excavation.

The Venice 1524 edition of Rashi is that text included in the second publication of the Rabbinic Bible.² The consistent reprinting of the same text of Rashi in other compendia of medieval exegesis *standardized* that version of the commentary. The public's general lack of appreciation for textual difficulties precluded a demand for alternate readings or details of corrections, modifications and editing, and the extensive circulation of the Rabbinic Bibles and partial copies, which insured the relatively universal accessibility of this version of the text, attributed an authority not earned by scientific means of accreditation or by any documented methods of verifiable textual reliability.

The objective of the Berliner edition was to fix the corrupted text and to establish the true text of Rashi, but while it became a *standard* version of the commentary, it does not represent the text of the original commentary and

-
1. *The Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, ed. R. E. Allen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987) 733.
 2. David Amram, *The Makers of Hebrew Books in Italy* (London: Holland Press, Ltd., 1988) 172.

therefore should not be the measure by which other texts are judged. Berliner's lack of proof for his textual choices, as well as the lack of alternate readings and objective methodology, only adds his version to the number of textual layers that need to be stripped away before the original commentary can be revealed.

Rashi HaShalem is the first edition of the commentary to acknowledge that a *standard* text does not yet exist. It does so by including in the volume four versions of the commentary. Venice 1524 is placed as the main text under the Torah, and the early printed editions of Rome 1470, Reggio di Calabria 1475 and Guadelajara 1476 are included in parallel columns at the back.

The introduction to *Rashi HaShalem* explains that Venice 1524 was chosen because of its clarity as a text as well as the fact that it constitutes a prototype of the printed editions that have circulated and that are extant.³ The three editions at the back are intended for the benefit of the reader, to better grasp Rashi's true meaning in his exegesis.⁴ This statement of purpose makes abundantly clear that one text of Rashi is not sufficient to standardize the text of the commentary; even four fall short of attaining this goal.

Nonetheless, certain editions of Rashi have become familiar to the general public and accepted as a standard. No text other than *Rashi HaShalem* exists to serve as this standard; any initial study of the text of Rashi requires an examination of the more customary editions of Venice 1524 and Berliner 1905. The easy availability of the earliest printings allows for a more extensive exploration into the state of the text of Rashi and is an obvious starting point towards grasping the depth of the problem and the manners in which it manifests.

This chapter will explore the types of textual difficulties evident in the printed editions. The examples will demonstrate the tenuous nature of the texts accepted as standard and utilized as the basis for many of the exegetical analyses of Rashi. In addition, this chapter will justify employing these corrupt editions as the measure by which to judge the citations extracted from the Tosafot commentaries, while refraining from using them as the example to which the citations should conform.

3. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 27.

4. *Ibid.*

B. The Textual Pattern

Patterns in the variants of the printed texts of Rashi's commentary do not exist. Missing or additional letters, words, phrases, paragraphs, or entire comments can be discerned in all editions, and while some variants are obviously more significant than others, they all contribute to the complexity of the text, and they are consistent only in their lack of consistency.

The examples that follow demonstrate this lack of consistency and differentiate between those variants that convey significant textual evidence and those that are characteristic of scribal copying, bear no relevance to the interpretation, and essentially, are irreparable. The accompanying analysis will explore possible reasons for the variants and the processes through which they occurred; it will also demonstrate the perspective offered by citations regarding the resolution of the textual difficulties.

1. Numbers, Letters, Abbreviations

Approximately three hundred and eighty-three lemmata are commented upon in *parshiyot Noaḥ* and *Lekh Lekha*. This number is only approximate, because the counting surveys five printings of the commentary, and not all lemmata appear in all editions. However, of these 383 lemmata found among the five editions, only nine comments are exactly identical in all five printings.⁵ While some of the comments may vary as insignificantly as an absent *yod* or *vav*, many more contain complex differences, and the fact that only 2% are without any variants further elucidates the degree to which the texts are corrupt.

Regardless of the extent to which comments can differ with respect to additional phrases or entirely unique interpretations, all the comments in the remaining 98% of the lemmata contain the basic variants of missing or added

5. The following are the chapter:verse references for the lemmata that are identical. The letters a, b, etc., indicate which lemma in the verse is identical in corresponding editions, since many verse have comments for more than one lemma: 7:5; 10:2; 11:10; 12:13; 14:2c; 16:4a; 17:10a; 17:12b; 17:23b.

letters, as well as numbers and abbreviations that may differ in their representation, from edition to edition.

(1) Gen. 10:13 lists the offspring of *Mitzrayim* who was the son of Ham and the grandson of Noah. The name of one of Mitzrayim's progeny was להבים. Rashi's comment is identical in meaning in all five editions. He explains that this descendent was called להבים because the faces of those in this genealogical line resembled a flame (להב). The Venice and Berliner texts read שפניהם דומים ללהב. The Reggio (1475) reads שפניהם דומין ללהב.⁶ Guadelajara (1476) has שפניהן דומין ללהב; and Rome (1470) mixes both *mem* and *nun* endings with שפניהם דומים ללהב.⁷

The significance in this variant to the meaning of the exegesis is nil. The sense of the word does not change at all whether it ends with a *mem* or a *nun*. The pluralization of להב in the Reggio edition may have been an attempt to fix the comment to the same number or to render the connection between להב and להבים unmistakable. This type of variant is rampant throughout the commentary, without pattern. In this example, three editions preferred the *mem* ending, one preferred the *nun*, and one used both. The editions are not consistent in their preferences.⁸

The question of whether Rashi preferred *mem* or *nun* endings is unanswerable from the commentary. Scribes were consistent only in their tendency to interchange these endings without concern. Similar situations exist with *plene* and defective spellings and the random appearances of *yod* and *vav*. In a simple comment such as 10:13, the variants can be overlooked in the face of the clear interpretation that emerges from the comment. In more intricate explanations, these insignificant variants add to the confusion and to the complexity of sorting through the layers of corruption.

The citations of Rashi in the Tosafot will not enable us to decide whether the words in the comment on 10:13 should end with a *mem* or a *nun*, or a combination of both. The scribes of these manuscripts were no more concerned

6. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 107; Berliner (1905) 20.

7. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 335.

8. See for example, 6:12 where Venice and Berliner now prefer the *nun* ending and 6:20 where all editions contain a combination of the endings.

with this type of minutiae than were the copyists of Rashi's manuscripts.

(2) Gen. 8:4 is an example of the representation of numbers and abbreviations in variant forms among the editions. As in the preceding example, the meaning of the comment is not affected by the variants, but the complexity of the textual analysis in the larger context is increased.

The biblical verse describes how the ark has come to rest on Mount Ararat on the seventeenth day of the seventh month. The comment explains how this date allows us to learn that the ark was, on that day, submerged in eleven cubits of water. The versions of the comment contain numerous variants besides the differing representations of numbers and abbreviations, and the texts will be compared, line by line, in order to fully appreciate their intricacies.

Berliner's text begins: מכאן אתה למד שהיתה התיבה משוקעת במים י"א אמה.⁹ The Venice edition spells התבה without the *yod*;¹⁰ Guadelajara does not include the word התיבה at all; and Reggio spells מיכאן with a *yod*. Rome's first line is identical to Berliner's.¹¹

Did Rashi include the word תיבה in his comment, and a scribe or the printers of the Guadelajara edition omitted it, or was the word added in to the tradition of the text to better clarify the sense of the comment? Touitou would argue for the latter scenario. According to him, scribes rarely omitted words in their copying but were more likely to insert comments or clarifications; hence words that are not common to all editions are not authentic.¹² While the Guadelajara version of the comment is certainly clear in the context of the verse, the word התיבה is not superfluous in the other editions, and either alternative offers a reasonable version.

The text of the comment continues with its explanation of how this verse

9. Berliner (1905) 16. For purposes of comparative analysis, the texts of the editions are often presented in orders different from the chronology in which they were printed. This in no way suggests that one edition was aware of the text of another, or utilized another edition in its own preparation. Despite the great extent to which Berliner's edition resembles the Venice printing, nowhere in either of Berliner's editions does he mention the use of Venice 1524 as one of his sources. See Berliner (1866) xi-xiii and Berliner (1905) xiv-xv.

10. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 88-89.

11. *Ibid.* 330.

12. Touitou (1986) 214; Touitou (1993b) 401.

suggests the ark was submerged eleven cubits. Berliner reads: שהרי כתיב בעשירי: 13 Part of verse 8:5 is quoted stating that on the first day of the tenth month, the tops of the mountains could be seen. The comment explains that this tenth month is the month of Av, which is ten months after Marḥeshvan, when the rain began. Berliner is not clear in his introduction as to the significance of words that appear in parentheses,¹⁴ but they seem to be parts of the commentary he was unsure about including in his text. In fact, while Guadelajara and Venice both contain the word, Rome and Reggio do not.¹⁵

Rome and Reggio also differ from the other versions in their expression **והוא אב**, rather than **זה אב**, and their abbreviations of the word **כתיב** (כתיב) **וגוי**.¹⁶ None of these variants changes the meaning of the comment. The way different students and scribes understood the explanation, the minor adjustments they noted to themselves to ensure a clear comprehension, and different styles of speech and writing probably account for most of these types of variants.

The core of the interpretation follows. Berliner's text reads:¹⁷

והן היו גבוהים על ההרים חמש עשרה אמה וחסרו מיום אחד בסיון עד אחד באב חמש עשרה אמה לששים יום הרי אמה לדי ימים נמצא שבי"ו בסיון לא חסרו אלא ד' אמות ונחה התיבה ליום המחרת למדת שהיתה משוקעת י"א אמה במים שעל ראשי ההרים.

The comment explains that the rain water (והן) was higher than the mountains by fifteen cubits,¹⁸ and since by the first of Av the tops of the mountains were visible,¹⁹ then, in sixty days, from the first of Sivan until the first of Av, the water subsided fifteen cubits. This amounts to one cubit every four days. On the sixteenth day of Sivan, the water would have subsided only four cubits, so when the ark came to rest on Mount Ararat, on the seventeenth day of Sivan, the seventh

13. Berliner (1905) 16.

14. Berliner (1905) xv.

15. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 89, 330.

16. *Ibid.* 330.

17. Berliner (1905) 16.

18. As it says in Gen. 7:20: חמש עשרה אמה מלמעלה גברו המים ויכסו ההרים.

19. As it says in 8:5: בעשירי באחד לחדש נראו ראשי ההרים.

month since the flood began in Marḥeshvan, it would have still been submerged eleven cubits, in water that covered the mountain tops.

The variants of this explanation, in each edition, should not change the meaning. In Berliner's text, all the numbers, except for the י"י indicating the sixteenth of Sivan and the ל"ד, for the four days, are written out in words.²⁰ The Venice text is the reverse. The number four is represented by the ד' as in Berliner, but both חמש עשרה אמה are written as ט"ו אמה, and the phrase לששים יום is presented as לסי יום. Despite this edition's apparent preference for letter representations of the numbers, the phrase שבששה עשר של סיון is written out in words.²¹

Guadelajara consistently represents all numbers in their letter symbols, but the phrase indicating the sixteenth of Sivan, שבי"ו בסיון in Berliner, was transmitted as שבוי בסיון in this edition.²² The date of the sixteenth of Sivan was changed to the sixth day of that month, rendering the entire explanation incomprehensible. The scribal or type-setting error that occurred in this case is easy to imagine. The distinctive length differences in the letters *vav* and *yod* are not usually clearly apparent in manuscripts, and some sort of quotation marks or supralinear notations abbreviating the letters, and maybe a few smudges of the ink, could easily lead one to mistake sixteen (י"ו) for six (ו').

The error demonstrates the unconvincing reliability of the printers' corrections. Even if this error existed previously in the manuscripts, the printers were supposed to have corrected and improved the text of the commentary. Since the sixteenth of Sivan fits more logically with the soundness of the interpretation, and since manuscripts must have existed in which the word sixteen was spelled out, as opposed to symbols, the fact that this error exists in an early printing questions the undescribed methodologies of the printers and confirms the corruption that continued to manifest beyond the scribal influence.

The Reggio edition presents the numbers fifteen and four in symbol form, but the numbers sixty and sixteen are written out in words; the Rome edition

20. *Ibid.*

21. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 89. Berliner's text also has בסיון rather than על סיון.

22. *Ibid.* 330.

presents all the numbers in their letter symbols.²³ In addition, the phrase in Berliner והן היו גבוהים also varies from edition to edition with the same lack of consistent *mem* and *nun* endings. Guadelajara has והם היו גבוהים; Reggio reads והן היו גבוהין; and Rome has the exact opposite of Berliner with והם היו גבוהין. The Venice text is identical to Berliner.²⁴

Numerous scenarios can be developed to explain the variant ways the same explanation is presented in each of these editions. The most compelling is the error that emerges in the Guadelajara text, which does not change the meaning of the interpretation, but rather, renders the interpretation meaningless. Perhaps conscientious scribes noticed a development of problems in the transmission of numbers in their letter symbols as they were more easily misread and misinterpreted, and hence they began writing out key numbers in their full and unmistakable words. Perhaps the choice of how to represent numbers was as random as the mood of the scribe at the time of writing or the amount of room he had left on the line.

In general, variants of letters, number representations and abbreviations do not affect the meaning of the word or the interpretation; however, this assumes that the abbreviations have been correctly interpreted in their transmission. In some cases, even these minor textual "adjustments" can alter the sense of the comment.²⁵

The prevalence of these types of variants throughout the printed editions of the commentary, the fact that only two percent of the commentary attributed to Rashi are identical in early and popular printed editions, and the randomness with which these types of variants are manifested confirm extraordinary corruption and suggest that a comparison of a selection of texts of the commentary would not be sufficient to resolve these variants.

The citations of the commentary in Tosafot, by the very tenuous nature of quoting another's work, are removed from the intricacies of textual minutiae. Once they determine which lemmata were part of the original commentary and which

23. *Ibid.*

24. *Ibid.* 330, 89.

25. In Gen. 11:1, Rome, Venice and Berliner record the number 656 in the letters תרנ"ו and Guadelajara has תרס"ה or 665. Reggio omits the number completely.

were not, the exegetical methodologies can be analyzed, and perhaps at that point, Rashi's style of presentation, his preference for *plene* or defective spelling, for *mem* or *nun* endings, or for writing numbers out in words or symbols, or even, whether any of these details concerned him and with which he was meticulous will be more accurately evident.

2. Syntax

In some comments, the words of the interpretation are more or less the same, and the sense of the content is maintained from edition to edition, but the order of the words or phrases varies. This phenomenon might suggest that parts of the comment originated as marginal notes that were incorporated into the commentary by different scribes and in different ways. The lack of consistent order intimates that the copyists or printers were unsure as to where certain words or phrases belonged. One could also argue that the marginal note was not an addition, but a correction by the scribe who had omitted the dubious phrase intended to be reinserted in the subsequent copying. Unfortunately, the next copiers were unsure where it should be inserted.

Comments that appear convoluted when compared with other versions express textual difficulty. Whether the word or phrase that is presented in varying positions in the comment was an added remark or explanation or whether it originated in Rashi's commentary and was misplaced because of human error and the obscurity of textual transmission, the comment exhibits signs of corruption.

(1) In Genesis 6:9, Rashi's comment addresses four lemmata. Let us look at the second lemma, בדרתיו. This verse is the first of *Parashat Noah*, and, although Noah himself is mentioned in the previous verse, this one introduces the story of him and his family.

אלה תולדת נח נח איש צדיק תמים היה בדרתיו את הא-להים התהלך נח.

Rashi's comment deals with the idea of Noah being blameless in his generations (בדרתיו). According to the interpretation, this phrase can be understood either in a

positive sense, which praises Noah's character, or in a negative sense, which does not. The positive attitude would imply that even if Noah lived in a generation of righteous people, he would still be considered a righteous person, indeed a greater moral character. The negative view insinuates that, compared to his own generation, Noah was considered righteous but, had he lived in the time of Abraham, he would not have been considered exceptional.

Berliner, Venice, Guadelajara, and Reggio all present the same basic text. The following is Berliner's version,²⁶ and the minor variants from the other versions are presented below in the notes:²⁷

יש מרבתינו דורשים אותו לשבח כל שכן אלו היה בדור צדיקים היה צדיק
יותר ויש דורשים אותו לגנאי לפי דורו היה צדיק ואלו היה בדורו של
אברהם לא היה נחשב לכולם.

This comment identifies the praise (שבח) that can be associated with the qualification of בדרתי and explains its implication; it then presents the alternate interpretation of disgrace or shame (גנאי) and explains the sense that way. This syntax is what differentiates the Rome text from the other editions.

The following is the version of the comment in Rome:²⁸

יש מרבתי דורשים אותו לשבח ויש דורשים אותו לגנאי הדורשין אותו
לשבח אומרים אם בדורותיו היה צדיק כל שכן אם היה בדור צדיקים
שהיה צדיק יותר הדורשין אותו לגנאי אומרין לפי דורו היה צדיק ואלו
היה בדורו של אברהם לא היה נחשב לכולם.

Here, the reader is first told of the varying ways one could understand the qualification of בדרתי: in the sense of praise or in the sense of disgrace. The

26. Berliner (1905) 13.

27. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 72-73, 126-127. Venice differs from Berliner only in the *plene* spelling of both occurrences of אילו. Guadelajara does not attribute the comment to the rabbis directly. This text reads: יש שדרשמו: לשבח and then afterwards, ויש דורשין אותו לגנאי. Here דורשין has the *nun* ending rather than the *mem* in Berliner and Venice. This edition also reads אבל אלו היה בדורו rather than בדורו של צדיקים as well as אבל אלו היה בדורו as opposed to ואלו. In Reggio, both occurrences of אילו are written *plene*, and דורשין always has the *nun* ending. The word מרבתינו is abbreviated to מרבתי and the second occurrence of אילו does not have the preceding *vav* as it does in Berliner and Venice, or the word אבל as in Guadelajara.

28. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 126-127.

comment then goes on to explain the nuance of each approach. The meaning is maintained in both syntactic arrangements, and the common source from which the differences developed is obvious.

The basis for this comment stems from a variety of similar remarks in the midrashic literature. The varying syntactic arrangements may reflect the way the different texts expressed this idea in their original location. *Midrash Tanhuma*²⁹ (Warsaw) contains the following passage:³⁰

בדורותיו ולא בדורות אחרים, רבי יהודה ורבי נחמיה חד אמר תמים היה
 בדור המבול ובדור הפלגה, שאלו היה בדורו של אברהם אבינו לא מצא
 ידיו ורגליו, משל לחבית של אפרסמון שהיתה מונחת במקום המטונף
 במקומה ריחה נודף, שלא במקומה אין ריחה נודף, וחד אמר תמים היה
 בדורותיו כ"ש בדורות אחרים, משל לצלוחית של פליטון שהיתה מונחת
 במקום הטנופת כ"ש אם היתה מונחת במקום הבושם.

The midrash is clear that בדרתיו distinguishes Noah's generation from the other generations. Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Nehemiah differ on the intended meaning of this qualification. One says that Noah was blameless or righteous when compared to the flood generation or the generation of the Tower of Babel; had he lived in Abraham's generation, he would not merit this designation. This understanding of בדרתיו is compared to a barrel of persimmons placed in a dirty location. In that spot, the scent of persimmons carries, and hence, is distinguishable; however, when the barrel is removed from the filth, its scent no longer stands out.

The other rabbi claims that, as Noah was righteous in his generation, so too would he be in others. The parable here compares Noah to a flask of spikenard oil (which is an aromatic ointment made from this sweet smelling plant). Whether this flask is placed in a dirty spot or among pleasant scents, it would retain the same fragrance.

29. *Midrash Tanhuma* is a homiletical midrash on the Torah. It exists in two editions, with very different texts for Genesis and Exodus, but compatible texts for Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. The Ordinary edition was first printed in Constantinople, in 1520, and the Buber edition, based on seven manuscripts, was published in Vilna, 1885. See: Strack and Stemberger 329-333.

30. *Midrash Tanhuma*, vol. 1 (Warsaw: Lewin Epstein, n.d.), *Parshat Noah* n, fol. 13a.

The syntax of this passage is similar to Rashi's comments in Berliner, Venice, Guadelajara and Reggio. Were this one of Rashi's sources, the present printed text could be regarded as a loose and simplified paraphrase of the main idea expressed in the midrash.

Midrash Tanhuma (Buber) offers a different passage, although with the same basic interpretation.³¹ It reads:

אלה תולדות [נח נח איש צדיק תמים היה בדורותיו]. מהו בדורותיו, יש דורשין לשבח, ויש דורשין לגנאי, צדיק בדורותיו ולא בדורות אחרים, משל למה הדבר דומה, אם יתן אדם סלע של כסף בתוך [מאה] סלעים של נחשת, אותה של כסף נראית נאה, כך היה נח נראה צדיק בדור המבול, יש דורשין אותו לשבח כיצד, לנערה שהיתה שרויה בשוק של זונות והיתה כשרה, אלו היתה בשוק הכשרות על אחת כמה וכמה, משל לחבית של אפרסמון שהיתה נתונה בקבר והייתה ריחה טוב, אילו היתה בבית על אחת כמה וכמה.

The syntactic arrangement of this interpretation is parallel to that of the Rome edition of Rashi. First, the midrash presents the two possible nuances that can be understood from the qualification *בדרתיו*, and then each nuance is expounded. As with the Rome version, *Tanhuma* (Buber) states that *בדרתיו* can have the sense of praising Noah or shaming him. An understanding of shame would intimate that Noah was righteous in his generation, but not in any others; a parable comparing him to a silver coin among one hundred copper coins illustrates his distinction only among the flood generation, as the silver coin appears beautiful among the copper.

Regarding an understanding of *בדרתיו* as praise, the midrashic passage provides two parables. The first compares Noah to a young girl who lived among harlots, but was noble; had she lived among noble women, she would have been even more noble. The second compares him to a barrel of persimmons that emits a pleasant smell, even though placed in a grave. If the barrel was in the house, rather than the grave, it would smell even better. Although the midrash does not describe the analogy to Noah directly, like the comments in the Rashi editions it suggests that Noah was righteous among the flood generation; had he lived among righteous people, he would have been even more righteous.

31. *Midrash Tanhuma*, ed. S. Buber (Vilna: 1914) (Jerusalem: Ortsel, 1964), *Parshat Noah*, fols. 16a-16b, (pp. 31-32).

The comments in the varying editions of Rashi do not contain parables, but the interpretation is the same. The differences that one finds in the syntactic arrangement might be accounted for in the discrepancies of the midrashic texts.³² Perhaps a scribe or student attempted to "correct" the comment in Rashi in order to align it better with the midrashic source with which he was familiar. He may not have considered the idea that Rashi may have been employing a different source or intentionally altering it.

The passages in both *Tanḥuma* (Warsaw) and *Tanḥuma* (Buber) present the negative interpretation of בדרתיו before the positive. In all the editions of Rashi, including Rome, the positive is expounded before the negative. A vague paraphrase of a known interpretation of בדרתיו would probably have encouraged many a scribe or student to expound the comment with more details from the midrashic source. Perhaps, the random *mem* and *nun* endings may be visible seams of an attempt to sew pieces of text together, while still maintaining the very basic structure of the interpretation. Rashi may have presented the positive view of Noah before the negative, and this was not "corrected," but additional words and phrases were included so that the passage was more similar to its assumed midrashic origin.

Inconsistencies in syntax are a clue to textual difficulties.³³ Variant midrashic traditions provide possible sources for the problems. The citations of Rashi in the Tosafot will elucidate the text that was familiar to the exegete's descendents and students. They can shed light on those comments in which the syntactic arrangement asserts corruption, and they can contribute data to the larger picture of the text's transmission.

If citations in Tosafot consistently follow the syntax of the Berliner, Venice, Guadelajara and Reggio editions, then one could conclude that the variant order in the Rome edition emerged as a result of later interference. The midrashic evidence supports this claim. If the reverse situation is the case, that

32. Other variations of this comment are in Sanhedrin 108a and Bereshit Rabba 30:9, *Midrash Bereshit Raba*, eds. J. Theodor and C. Albeck, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1965) 275-276.

33. For a more complex example of this phenomenon, see Gen. 15:6 in all five editions, as well as *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 144-145, notes 13 and 14, regarding the midrashic sources.

the citations parallel the comment in Rome, the midrashic evidence can support this too, but one would want to inquire why this version is not manifested in the so-called standard editions. In such an analysis, the citations work together with the printed editions not only to determine the original text, but to elucidate the process by which the corruption developed.³⁴

3. *Examples and Prooftexts*

A common variant among the printed texts arises in the examples and prooftexts provided in a given comment. Often biblical verses cited to support an explanation or to elucidate an interpretation differ either in the verse utilized as proof or in the amount of the verse included in the exegetical text. Some citations end with an abbreviated וְגוֹי, indicating that the entire verse has not been quoted; others cite only the few relevant words and do not indicate whether the text includes the full biblical source. Occasionally, one edition will have an additional example or prooftext that is not present in the others.

(1) In Gen. 9:24, Noah awakes from his drunken sleep and realizes what Ham has done to him. The biblical text reads:

וַיִּקַּץ נֹחַ מֵיֵינוֹ וַיֵּדַע אֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לוֹ בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן.

Rashi's comment focuses on the meaning of בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן. In all editions, the explanation suggests that קָטָן does not refer to age or size, as in the younger or smaller son, but to character, as in the son who was unfit and despicable. This comment is supported with another biblical verse in which קָטָן clearly does not refer to age or physical size. The comment in Berliner's edition is as follows:³⁵

הַפְּסוּל וְהַבְּזוּי כְּמוֹ הַנָּה קָטָן נִתְּתִךְ בְּגוֹיִם בְּזוּי בְּאָדָם.

The supporting verse in this edition is Jer. 49:15, and the entire verse is cited. The synonymous parallel structure of the verse confirms the meaning of קָטָן proposed

34. After the complete analysis of the methodology comprising the use of Tosafot citations for reconstructing Rashi, Appendix A reviews the examples of this chapter and explores their representation in the Tosafot manuscripts.

35. Berliner (1905) 19.

by the Rashi comment. God states he has made Israel "small among the nations" and "despised among man," and the sense of small is despised or unworthy.

The Venice and Guadelajara editions do not disagree with Berliner's text, but they do not cite the whole verse. Venice reads: הפסול והבוזי כמו הנה קטן, נתתיך בגוים בזוי, ³⁶ and Guadelajara has: הפסול הבוזי כמו הנה קטן נתתיך בגוים, ³⁷. In the latter case, the abbreviated וגוי shows that the biblical verse does not end with the cited phrase. The inclusion of the word בזוי as the last word of the citation ensures that the meaning derived from the parallel structure of the cited verse is clear. The omission of the word באדם might suggest the word was unnecessary to the intended message of the prooftext; the omission of וגוי suggests either that the scribe was unaware the verse continued or that he or the author assumed the reader would be familiar with the biblical source.

The Rome edition of the comment cites even less of the prooftext than Venice and Guadelajara: הפסול והבוזי כמו קטן נתתיך. ³⁸ The first word of the verse (הנה) and the key part of the parallelism (בזוי) are missing. With only the data from these four editions, one would be required to ask how much of the verse was cited in the original commentary. Rashi could have cited the entire verse, but lack of space on the line, error, or an illegible or corrupt text from which the subsequent one was copied may have led to omitting the end of the verse. The more likely scenario is that Rashi cited only a few words of the verse and, at various points in the text's transmission, the rest of the verse or the important aspects of the defining parallelism were added. The Reggio version of the text supports this assumption.

Rashi's comment in the Reggio edition does not provide the same prooftext as the Berliner edition, and the verse it does use calls into question the source for the citations in Rome, Guadelajara, and Venice. The text is the following: הפסול והבוזי כמו הנה קטן נתתיך בגוים בזוי אתה מאד. ³⁹ While almost identical to the verse in Jeremiah presented in Berliner's text, this verse is Obad. 1:2. The

36. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 103.

37. *Ibid.* 334. Guadelajara does not have the vav on בזוי as do Venice and Berliner.

38. *Ibid.*

39. *Ibid.*

meaning and the synonymous parallelism are the same. The word בזוי is parallel in meaning to the word קטן, as God states "Behold, I have made you small among the nations; you are greatly despised."

Rashi's original comment probably cited only a few words to remind the reader of the use of קטן in the Bible in the sense of despised. Since the cited words could apply to one or both of these very similar verses, different textual recensions developed. Berliner's use of the whole Jeremiah verse disregards the textual evidence in Reggio, as well as the fact that the incomplete citations do not refer necessarily to Jeremiah. The same criticism can be made of the printer of the Reggio edition, who has decided the verse cited in the comment is from Obadiah.

In most examples of this type of variant,⁴⁰ the resulting textual corruption is not as intriguing. As with *plene* and defective spelling, where one might want to know whether Rashi had a preferred way of spelling, the differing amounts of a verse included as a proof-text encourage us to ask whether Rashi tended to include more or less of a verse to support his interpretation. In this example, the verse itself is dubious. Perhaps Rashi only included a small part of the verse so that it could apply to either source, and the meaning and proof would be clear.

The citations of Rashi in Tosafot Torah commentaries can help to resolve these types of examples as well. Scribes and students copying and studying the text made numerous changes and additions. Often they added parallel examples, or they completed cited verses and midrashic passages in the margins of text for their own learning or mnemonic purposes. Since many of the Tosafot studied from Rashi directly, or from his students, the Tosafot texts have the potential to demonstrate how much of the verse was cited in the original commentary, which verse Rashi was considering when it was included in the interpretation, or whether the proof-text ever formed part of the original interpretation.

(2) In Gen. 8:11, the dove returns to the ark with an olive branch in its mouth, and Noah knows that the floodwaters are subsiding. The verse reads:

ותבא אליו היונה לעת ערב והנה עלה זית טרף במיה וידע נח כי קלו המים
מעל הארץ.

40. See also 17:9 for comparison.

Two lemmata are explained in Rashi's commentary, and the first, טרף בניה, is the comment to be analyzed. In this explanation, Rashi sees a contradiction between the male form of טרף and the female form of ביה. He explains that the dove is male, but in Scripture, its grammatical form is feminine, and therefore the dove is sometimes described with feminine forms and sometimes with masculine ones. The comment also includes a number of examples from other biblical verses in which the grammatical form of יונה is feminine.

Berliner's text is the following:⁴¹

אומר אני שזכר היה לכן קוראו פעמים לשון זכר ופעמים לשון נקבה לפי שכל יונה שבמקרא לשון נקבה כמו (כיונים על אפיקי מים רוחצות) כיוני הגאיות כלם הומות וכמו כיונה פתה.

The three prooftexts utilized in Berliner's edition are רוחצות מים רוחצות from Song of Songs 5:12, כיוני הגאיות כלם הומות from Ezek. 7:16, and כיונה פתה from Hos. 7:11. In each example, the noun dove is followed by a feminine verb or adjective. In Song of Songs, the lover's eyes are compared to doves by streams of water, bathed (רוחצות) in milk. In Ezekiel, those that escape God's punishments through the sword, pestilence and famine, are compared to doves of the valleys, all of them moaning (הומות), and in Hosea, Ephraim is compared to a silly dove (פתה). None of the verses is cited in full in Rashi; only the relevant grammatical association is provided. As mentioned earlier, Berliner's use of parentheses suggests he was unsure about the inclusion of this example in the comment.⁴²

The Venice edition has the same text as Berliner without the parentheses around the Song of Songs citation;⁴³ however, neither Guadalajara, nor Reggio, nor Rome include this example. Guadalajara reads:⁴⁴

אומר אני שזכר היה לכך הוא קוראו פעמים לשון זכר ופעמים לשון נקבה לפי שכל יונה שבמקרא בלשון נקבה היא כיוני הגאיות כלם הומות וכן יונה פתה.

41. Berliner (1905) 17.

42. *Ibid.* xv.

43. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 91. Venice has קוראו instead of קוראו in Berliner.

44. *Ibid.* 331.

Reggio's text is very similar:⁴⁵

אומר אני שזכר היה לכך הוא קורא אותו פעמים לשון זכר ופעמים לשון
נקבה לפי שכל יונה שבמקרא לשון נקבה היא כמו כיוני הגאיות כלם
הומות יונה פותה.

Finally, the Rome edition includes more of the verse from Hosea but is still
analogous to Reggio and Guadelajara:⁴⁶

אומר אני שזכר הוא לפי קורחו פעמים לשון זכר פעמים לשון נקבה לפי
שכל יונה שבמקרא לשון נקבה כיוני הגאיות כולם הומות כיונה פותה אין
לב.

Besides example missing from the early editions, the renditions of the comment
vary in their introductions of the examples. Berliner has the word כמו before the
first example and its parenthesis and before the last example; Venice is the same
as Berliner. Guadelajara has the word וכן before its last example (from Hosea)
and nothing before the citation from Ezekiel. The Reggio text introduces the verse
from Ezekiel with the word כמו, but has nothing before the Hosea verse, and the
Rome edition introduces neither verse.

The discrepancies in the examples and in their introductions, as well as the
other small variants,⁴⁷ render suspect all the citations included in the printed
comment. Comparable examples written in the margins were often incorporated
into the text of the commentary, and later scribes would add words like כמו or וכן
to eliminate the seams of merging texts. While the verse from Song of Songs is
obviously a questionable part of the commentary, because it appears only in later
printed editions and in parentheses, the other proof texts could have been
appended to the comment as well. The lack of introductions to the examples
supports this suspicion.

Touitou stated in his work that phrases such as ואומר אני were indications
of additional material in the commentary.⁴⁸ This would render suspect the entire
comment for this lemma and not just the examples used to support the gender

45. *Ibid.*

46. *Ibid.*

47. For example, Berliner and Venice have היה לך where Guadelajara and
Reggio have הוא לכך הוא and Rome has לפי.

48. Touitou (1986) 214.

representation of dove. The text of Rashi's commentary needs to be determined before one can decide whether Rashi ever used terms such as **אומר אני** in his work. Since one would assume he is stating all or most of his explanations, one might wonder why this comment requires a special assertion of authorship.⁴⁹

The citations of Rashi in Tosafot can address both the question of the examples used in the comment and the comment as a whole. As with the comments expounded above, the textual variants in the printed editions insinuate the presence of textual corruption and the need for analysis and restoration. The true depth of the corruption is obscured by layers of additions, errors and editing. The citations represent a text that preceded many of these layers, and their representation of Rashi's commentary will help sort through the textual complexities of comments such as this one.⁵⁰

4. Missing or Added Comments and Phrases

In general, the variants explored in the previous examples did not alter the meaning of the interpretation, and while the authenticity of the comment as a whole could be questioned, the differences in letters, syntax and even prooftexts were significant only in their contribution to the complexity of the textual minutiae.

In the subsequent examples, the textual evidence will demonstrate that even independent comments and phrases do not appear consistent in all printed editions. These erratic components of the printed commentary include distinct explanations that have no necessary connection to the interpretation common to

49. Interestingly, in a responsum by the Radbaz addressing, in part, gender inconsistency in the Bible, he claims to cite Rashi on *Parashat Nega'im* (Leviticus 13): **ורשי"י ז"ל דחק לתרץ בפרשת נגעים מפני שהם באדם שיש בו רוח חיים וגם הנגעים בעצמם יש בהם חיות אבל בדבר שאין בו רוח חיים ליכא קפידא**. No such passage can be found in any of Rashi's commentaries, thus providing another good example of the difficulties with Rashi's text, but also demonstrating a problem with the perception of Rashi's opinion regarding masculine and feminine words in the Bible. Together with the textual inconsistencies in the printed editions for Rashi's comment for 8:11, as well as the use of **אומר אני**, this attribution to Rashi of a no longer extant passage on a similar subject in the Radbaz magnifies the complexities involved in resolving the text of Rashi's commentary and understanding his exegetical methodologies. *שאלות ותשובות רדב"ז*, vol. 1, #336, responsum 31.

50. See also 7:16 for a comparable example.

all editions as well as explanatory phrases that clarify the idea expressed in the "regular" comment. The overall sense of the interpretation is usually enhanced rather than changed by these additional comments.

(1) The third lemma of Rashi's commentary for Gen. 9:20 is a straightforward example of this phenomenon. The biblical verse reports that Noah, the farmer, planted a vineyard after he and his family left the ark: ויחל נח איש כרם. The comment for the lemma ויטע כרם responds to the idea of how Noah could have planted a vineyard if all had been destroyed in the flood. The texts in Berliner, Venice, Reggio and Rome are basically identical. The following is Berliner's version:⁵¹

כשנכנס לתיבה הכניס עמו זמורות וייחורי תאנים.

The Venice text has the word לתבה without the *yod*,⁵² and Rome spells וייחורי with only one *yod*,⁵³ otherwise the editions are the same. They all explain that when Noah entered the ark, he brought with him vine-branches (זמורות) and shoots from fig trees (ייחורי תאנים).

The Guadelajara edition of the comment has an extra phrase, clarifying the meaning of וייחורי תאנים. The text is the following:⁵⁴

כשנכנס לתיבה הכניס עמו זמורות וייחורי תאנים כפי גזעי תאנה.

After the interpretation common to all editions, this text has a brief phrase that explains the term וייחורי תאנים as the stems from a fig tree. The likelihood that this comment was added on to the original interpretation is high, given the gloss-like character of the phrase. It explains an element of the explanation, rather than the biblical text, and therefore, seems more characteristic of a student learning the commentary, as opposed to the author writing it.

The abbreviated כפי is not uncommon in exegetical works explaining Rashi's interpretations,⁵⁵ and the Tosafot Torah commentaries might provide the

51. Berliner (1905) 19.

52. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 102.

53. *Ibid.* 334.

54. *Ibid.*

55. See, for example, Gellis, vol. 1, 199, par. 34; 201, par. 50; 228, par. 4; 234, par. 1/א.

original context in which this comment may have been appended to Rashi's text. In other words, Tosafot Torah commentaries cite their version of Rashi's commentary and then comment upon it, and their interaction with it as super-commentary has the potential to reveal the source for the explanatory comments that do not appear consistently in all editions.

The fact that the printer at Guadalajara included this phrase in his version of the commentary exposes the tenuity of his textual choices and the need for methodological justification for establishing textual reliability. The presence of this obvious addition in an edited and "corrected" printing of the commentary confirms the visible level of corruption and magnifies the extent of its subtlety.⁵⁶

(2) In Gen. 8:12, Noah waits an additional seven days after the dove returned with an olive branch and then sends forth the dove again, which no longer returns to him. The verse reads: **וייחל עוד שבעת ימים אחרים וישלח את היונה ולא יספה שוב אליו עוד ויִיחַל**, and the explanation, in all the editions, explores the sense of the verb in its grammatical construction.

The texts in the Berliner and Venice edition are identical, and read as follows:⁵⁷

הוא לשון ויחל אלא שזה לשון ויפעל וזה לשון ויתפעל ויחל וימתן ויחל
ויתמתן.

The comment explains that the word **וִיִּחַל** has the same meaning as **וִיחַל** in verse ten, where Noah waited another seven days before sending the dove out a second time. The difference is that **וִיחַל** in verse ten is conjugated in the simple form of the Hebrew verb (בנין פעל/קל) and **וִיִּחַל** is conjugated in the reflexive form (בנין התפעל). The word **וִיחַל** is the equivalent of **וַיִּמְתֵּן**, "and he waited," and **וִיִּחַל** is equivalent to **וַיִּתְמַתֵּן**, or "and he made himself wait."⁵⁸

The Rome text differs only very slightly from this version. Instead of **הוא**

56. See Rashi's comment for the first lemma of 6:13, and 11:2, where the Rome edition has an added phrase that does not appear in any other of the printed versions of the commentary analysed here.

57. Berliner (1905) 17; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 91.

58. The dagesh in the second *yod* marks the assimilation of the *ת* of the *תפעל* conjugation.

לשון ויחל, this edition begins with כמו ויחל. In addition, the phrases לשון ויפעל and בלשון ויתפעל are prefixed with a ב and are read בלשון ויפעל and בלשון ויתפעל. Finally, the meaning of the word ויחל is presented as וימתין, with an additional *yod*, as compared to וימתין in the other editions.⁵⁹

The comment in the Reggio edition is not as extensive in its elucidation of the grammatical contrasts between the two verbs. The text is the following:⁶⁰

היא לשון ויחל אלא שזה לשון ויפעל ויחל וימתין וייחל ויתמתן.

Missing from this edition is the direct connection of ויחל to the reflexive form of conjugation: וזה לשון ויתפעל.

The text in the Guadelajara printing reads only: ויתמתן.⁶¹ The entire explanation of each verb's meaning and their separate forms of conjugation is absent from this version, and a cognizance of the grammatical nuances is assumed of the reader.

The variants between Berliner, Venice and Rome and the Reggio edition, as well as between the three parallel examples and Guadelajara can be explained as haplography. With the Reggio text, the similar endings of ויפעל and ויתפעל might have caused the scribe inadvertently to skip the intervening words. A similar error may have occurred in the Guadelajara edition, since the word that precedes ויתמתן in the other versions, is the lemma ויחל.

However, because the Guadelajara text is so different from the other editions, and the Reggio version lacks the phrase that balances the explanation, one must consider the possibility that the original Rashi commentary was the single word in Guadelajara. The auxiliary phrases in the other editions elucidate and facilitate the explanation, but the fundamental element of the comment is the one-word definition in its reflexive form.

Like the preceding example, the explanatory phrases that appear here in the majority of editions can be regarded as explanations of the comment, as opposed to interpretations of the biblical text. A student learning the comment may have noted to himself the grammatical clarification, and over time this gloss was

59. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 331.

60. *Ibid.*

61. *Ibid.*

included as part of the main exegetical work.

The variants in this comment demonstrate the importance of establishing the text of Rashi's commentary before analyzing his exegetical methodology.⁶² The issue of whether Rashi would have provided only one nuanced word as the explanation or whether he tended to be more comprehensive in his grammatical descriptions begs an extensive examination of his commentary to determine patterns and tendencies. Such an analysis, however, is futile, until a reliable text is published.

The citations of Rashi in Tosafot can contribute to the resolution of an example like this by clarifying the amount of the comment known to the Tosafot. Like the example of the added phrase above, the additional phrases not included in the Guadelajara edition might have originated as part of the Tosafot super-commentary on Rashi. As well, the possibility remains that the citation in Tosafot could reflect the longer comment from the printed texts, which would mean that the version in Guadelajara is, in fact, the result of scribal error. The generations of sustained corruption in the printed texts and in the manuscripts precludes an accurate analysis of only these witnesses; their potential for accurate testimony is buried behind the layers of textual corruption. The Tosafot offer a resource outside the complexities of the extant texts.

(3) The last example for this section consists of a comment that does not appear in all editions and that could exist independently of the explanation common to all texts.⁶³ In Gen. 11:3, the men of the generation of the Tower of Babel are planning the construction materials with which to build the tower. The verse reads:

ויאמרו איש אל רעהו חבה נלבנה לבנים ונשרפה לשרפה ותחי להם חלבנה
לאבן והחמר היה להם לחמר.

Rashi's comment discusses five lemmata; the second, חבה, is the subject of the following analysis.

The Venice and Berliner editions have the same explanation for the

62. See also 9:3 and 11:8 as additional examples.

63. The following verses in *Noah* and *Lekh Lekha* are examples of comments that contain lemmata not addressed in all editions: 6:19, 6:22, 9:10, 12:17, 13:16, 13:18, 14:1.

הזמין עצמכם לשון הזמנה הוא המכיל את המילה "הבה" בלשון הזמנה.
הבה הוא המכיל את המילה "הבה" בלשון הזמנה.

The comment explains that the word הבה addresses the audience to prepare themselves, and that every use of הבה has the sense of preparation, that they should ready themselves and unite for some work or plan or undertaking. The last phrase of the comment translates the original definition of הבה, והזמין, into the Old French equivalent, *apareiller*.⁶⁵

The version of the comment in the Regio edition is essentially the same.⁶⁶ The phrase in the later editions, ומכיל את המילה "הבה" בלשון הזמנה, has consistent *nun* endings in this text: ומכיל את המילה "הבה" בלשון הזמנה, the words in אשר are in square brackets, suggesting the editor's uncertainty with the reliability of these words. The *la'az* comment appears as *בלשון הזמנה*.

The *la'az* translations in Berliner and Venice and Regio, while slightly different, are obviously related. The variant of a ב and a ר can be explained through scribal error - the smudged letter could appear as either of the two - or due to the transmission of unfamiliar words. Italian scribes or printers would not necessarily have understood the translation into French, which could result in miscopyings.

The Guadelaajara text differs a little more dramatically from the Regio edition, and its *la'az* translation is presented as its own separate lemma.⁶⁷ The comment reads:

הבה הוא המכיל את המילה "הבה" בלשון הזמנה.
הבה הוא המכיל את המילה "הבה" בלשון הזמנה.

The phrase *הבה* appears in place of *לשון הזמנה* in Regio, and, when considered with the reversal of the terms *הבה* and *לשון הזמנה* in Regio, determines the

64. Berliner (1905), 21; *Rashi Hashalem*, vol. 1, 112.
65. See A. Silberman, vol. 1, 44.
66. *Rashi Hashalem*, vol. 1, 336.
67. *Ibid*.

authenticity of both phrases. Furthermore, the presentation of the *la'az* translation as its own lemma intimates its existence as a comment independent of Rashi's work. The appearance of a self-sufficient comment in different places within the commentary hints at an origin extraneous to the body of the work, like a marginal note, inserted erroneously into the text in varying loci.

In the Rome edition, the *la'az* translation is missing completely.⁶⁸ The text reads:

הזמינו עצמכם כל הבה לשון הזמנה הוא שמכינין את עצמם ומתחברין
למלאכה או לעצה או למשא.

Excluding the insignificant additional words הוא and את, this text differs only in the absence of the French translation. The presentation of the *la'az* as its own separate comment in Guadelajara strengthens the argument that the foreign translation may have originated as a marginal note, later incorporated into the body of the commentary.

In general, the actual *la'az* words in Rashi's commentary vary greatly between the different editions, probably because of the scribes' ignorance of French. However, scribes were paid to copy, not to think or understand, and the likelihood that they would decide to omit a *la'az* because of their lack of comprehension, or even the lack of relevancy for the commissioner of the manuscript, is slim. Moreover, the possibility that *la'azim* were added into the commentary by students and colleagues of Rashi is certainly conceivable.

Menahem Banitt has referred to a French translation of the Bible that was accessible in an oral form to scholars of Rashi's time, if not before.⁶⁹ This would suggest that students of the eleventh century and later first learned the Bible in French, their mother-tongue, before progressing to higher levels of learning involving the Hebrew text and commentaries. In such a setting, one can imagine

68. *Ibid.*

69. M. Banitt, "פרוש רש"י למקרא ולנו העולם," *Benjamin De Vries Memorial Volume*, ed. E. Z. Melamed (Jerusalem: Tel Aviv University Research Authority and Stichting Fronika Sanders Fonds, 1968) 252-253; M. Banitt, "Les Poterim," *Revue des Études Juives* 125 (1966): 21-24; M. Banitt, "La Langue Vernaculaire dans les Commentaires de Raschi," *Rashi 1040-1990 Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach*, 412; M. Banitt, "Le Français chez Rachi," *Rachi: ouvrage collectif* (Paris: Service technique pour l'éducation, 1974) 123-130.

easily the French speaking student having the need to jot down here or there the French translation of certain words, be they of the Bible text itself or of a word in Rashi's commentary. Some of these *la'azim* may have originated from Rashi, instigated by a student's query or the result of Rashi's later editing; many may have originated from scholars, students, and scribes, even generations after Rashi, who were teaching, studying or copying the text, and who wished to clarify words or ideas for themselves or others.

The resources for French equivalents of difficult Hebrew words were certainly available, be they in the French translation of the Bible, in the French glosses that emerged in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, or in the work of the *Poterim*, like Menahem Bar Helbo, of the tenth century.⁷⁰ The question is whether Rashi's commentaries were a resource for French translations of Hebrew words or a repository for definitions assembled from elsewhere. The evidence from the early printed editions suggests that the answer is far from clear.

Of seventy-two *la'azim* counted in the printed texts of Rashi's commentary on all of Genesis,⁷¹ only nine appear in all five of the early editions examined,⁷² and M. Alberts mentions two that do not appear in any of them.⁷³ Twenty-six *la'azim* do not appear in any of the three early printed editions, Rome,

70. *Ibid.*

71. The process by which the *la'azim* were gathered is as follows. The words לעז, לעיז, לעיז, בלעז, and בלעיז were searched in the Bar Ilan database (*Bar Ilan's Judaic Library* CD-ROM (Spring Valley, N. Y.: Torah Education Software, 1994) to attain an initial list. This provided 61 sources. A. Darmesteter's work, "Les gloses françaises de Raschi dans la Bible," *Revue des Études Juives*, 53-56 (1907-1908) and מעם לעז by Moshe Alberts, vol. 1 (New York: s.n., 1917-25), both systematic examinations of every *la'az* in Rashi's Bible commentary, were then consulted. Many of those words missed by the computer were not identified as *la'azim* in the text. The only way to have found them would have been to have known the exact word, or at least the comment in which it appears. Other *la'azim* that were not found with the computer do not appear in the better known editions of Rashi's commentary, and therefore, were not in the text of the database. Some of these were located in the various editions consulted for analysis and some were not. An additional eleven *la'azim* were identified from these sources.

72. The verses in Genesis in which the *la'azim* are found in Rashi's corresponding commentary are: 1:27, 3:24, 4:18, 4:23, 11:3, 14:14, 30:37 (מקל לבנח), 30:37 (וערמוך), 43:11.

73. 25:25, 32:33. Alberts, vol. 1, 94, 111-112.

Reggio, and Guadelajara,⁷⁴ and thirty-four do not appear in some combination of these three editions.⁷⁵ In other words, sixty *la'azim* are missing from one or more of the three early printings, but appear consistently in Venice and Berliner. The remaining two *la'azim* appear only in Reggio and Guadelajara,⁷⁶ respectively, but not in any of the other editions, including Venice and Berliner.

The significance of this data is puzzling. The *la'azim* are considered to be a characteristic part of Rashi's commentary, and yet over 85% of them are missing from the early printed editions. In this example, the missing *la'az* from the Rome edition is only the tip of the iceberg. While, historically, the idea that Rashi may have included French in his Hebrew commentaries to help explain certain concepts to his non-Hebrew speaking readers certainly makes sense, textually, such a characterization of Rashi's exegetical methodologies is based on uncertain data.

Since the texts of the printed editions and the manuscripts are corrupt and their obscurity among centuries of non-French speaking scribes and students increased the probability that the foreign words in particular would be subjected to error, the Tosafot's citations of Rashi's use of *la'azim* would help to resolve this question. Geographically and intellectually close to Rashi, the Tosafot included French translations in their own commentaries. This fact precludes the argument that a lack of citations of Rashi's use of French reflects a Tosafot lack of interest in such exegesis. Rather, a significant lack of citations of Rashi's French definitions could signify an inauthentic component of the commentary.

Independent phrases or self-sufficient comments that do not appear consistently in all printed editions indicate some type of textual corruption. Utilizing

74. The verse that contain *la'azim* that do not appear in Rome, Reggio, or Alkabetz are the following: 19:19, 22:3, 24:17, 25:21, 29:17, 29:27, 30:32, 31:34, 33:10, 38:16, 40:1, 40:10 (שריגים), 40:10 (כפרחת), 41:2, 41:3, 41:5, 41:6, 41:15, 41:19, 45:2, 48:7, 49:6, 49:11, 49:13, 49:19, 49:26.

75. Verses in which *la'azim* are missing from Rome and Reggio: 19:17, 19:28, 23:16, 24:14, 30:20, 33:13, 41:5, 44:2. Missing from Rome and Alkabetz: 1:2 (תחו ובחו), 41:7. Missing from Reggio and Alkabetz: 4:18, 23:13, 25:25 (שער), 26:14, 26:21, 31:10, 31:37, 37:2, 40:16, 41:40, 47:7. Missing from Rome: 1:11, 11:3 (תבה), 41:6; Missing from Reggio: 15:2, 20:16, 30:32, 30:37 (ולדו), 33:11, 37:25, 41:14, 43:16. Missing from Alkabetz: 1:2 (מרחפת), 1:24.

76. Genesis 7:22 in Reggio and Genesis 14:14 (וירק) in Alkabetz.

the texts themselves to resolve the corruption runs the risk of developing circular arguments. The data on the *la'azim* emphasize this concern. Rashi may not have included French translations consistently and deliberately in his commentary. His exegetical methodologies cannot be analyzed or even defined until the issues of text have been resolved. Employing the evidence of corruption from the printed editions, the citations in Tosafot can substantiate textual inconsistencies and propose authenticity, or lack thereof.

5. Differing Explanations

At times, the variants between the printed editions of Rashi's commentary are more substantial than alternative spellings, word order, or prooftexts. The actual interpretation differs from edition to edition. Excluding the lemma itself, a common core is non-existent. Choosing one comment over the other as the authentic Rashi implies that in the process of textual transmission, the original comment was omitted and replaced by a new one. The admission of such a possibility widens the depth and breadth of corruption considerably.

(1) In Gen. 12:16, upon arrival in Egypt, where Sarah's beauty is praised and she is taken to Pharaoh, Abraham is given sheep and cattle, male and female servants, male and female donkeys, and camels. The lemma to be discussed states: ולאברם היטיב בעבורה, "and he did well to Abraham, for her sake." As a unit, the five printed editions answer the questions who did well to Abraham and how did he do so; however, no edition addresses both issues.

Berliner's text has the following comment:⁷⁷

ולאברם היטיב פרעה בעבורה [נתן לו מתנות].

Since the subject for the verb היטיב is not obvious from the verse, and the subject in the previous verse is the plural שרי פרעה, this comment clarifies that Pharaoh did well to Abraham for her sake. The words in brackets tell the reader that he did so by giving Abraham gifts. According to Berliner's introduction, he included in square brackets an alternate version of the comment that differed from the

⁷⁷. Berliner (1905) 23. The lemma is presented in *italics*.

"standard" printed editions, and that in his opinion, was usually the better text.⁷⁸ (Once again, Berliner demonstrates how he favoured the familiar text over the reading he felt to be textually more accurate.) The phrase נתן לו מתנות is not meant to supplement the first part of the comment but to replace it.

The Venice, Guadelajara, and Reggio editions do not respond to the question of how Pharaoh did well to Abraham. The comments in these texts are variants of only the first half of Berliner's version. The Venice edition has ולאברם; ⁷⁹ Guadelajara reads ולאברם היטיב בעבורה כלומר היטיב פרעה בעבורה; ⁸⁰ and Reggio includes only the one relevant word ולאברם היטיב פרעה.⁸¹ In contrast, the Rome edition reflects the bracketed part of Berliner's text. It states: ולאברם היטיב בעבורה נתנו לו מתנות.⁸²

Two distinct explanations of the lemma are revealed in the printed editions, each responding to a different aspect of exegesis. The majority of texts responds to the ambiguous subject of the verb היטיב. In other words, they clarify that *Pharaoh* did well to Abraham for Sarah's sake. The Rome edition explores the meaning of בעבורה and explains how Pharaoh did well to Abraham for Sarah's sake, i. e. by giving him gifts. Either comment is a legitimate query about the verse, and Berliner lets the reader decide the preferred version. The question as to which explanation, if any, Rashi wrote, remains.

One can resolve this textual difficulty and others like it in a variety of ways. In separate contexts, Rashi may have offered different explanations for the same word or verse, perhaps like in a classroom setting, where students recorded incomplete notes. He may have changed his interpretation in a later editing, and the alteration only affected manuscripts not yet in circulation. Different traditions of the commentary may have circulated,⁸³ neither based, necessarily, on an original recension. As well, either comment or both could have originated as a marginal note, embodied into the commentary at different points in its transmission.

78. *Ibid.* xv.

79. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 130.

80. *Ibid.* 340.

81. *Ibid.*

82. *Ibid.* The plural נתנו might be intended to reflect the plural subject of the previous verse.

83. See: Sonne (1940); Malchi (1982).

Additional manuscripts and early printings will only provide more texts with one or the other, or maybe both, explanations. None of the versions can really be deemed more reliable than these early printings, because even texts that appear to be reliable are generations later than the original writing of the commentary and may include corruptions no longer detectable. The Tosafot, however, would know the comment Rashi offered for this lemma. Their citations of his work can help to authenticate one, both or neither of the comments offered for this verse.

(b) In a similar example, contrasting explanations appear in the printed editions for the lemma **מקץ ארבעים יום**, in verse 8:6,⁸⁴ where, at the end of forty days, Noah opened the window of the ark. In Berliner,⁸⁵ Venice,⁸⁶ and Rome,⁸⁷ the comment explains that "the end of forty days" refers to the appearance of the tops of the mountains: **משנראו ראשי ההרים**. The previous verse had stated that, on the first day of the tenth month, the mountain tops were visible, and then this verse began, "at the end of forty days," and the comment linked the two clauses.

The text in the Reggio edition identifies the end of forty days as referring to **עד שחרבו פני האדמה** - "until the face of the earth had dried up."⁸⁸ According to the chronology of the biblical text, this occurred on the first day of the first month of the year six hundred and one (8:13), after Noah had sent out both the raven and the dove. The Guadelajara edition includes both comments. It states: **מקץ ארבעים יום משנראו ראשי ההרים עד שחרבו פני האדמה**.⁸⁹ The inclusion of both options could be regarded as complementary or contradictory. Either the comment means to say that the end of forty days is referring to the time between the visibility

84. The verse in Hebrew is: **ויחי מקץ ארבעים יום ויפתח נח את-חלון התבה אשר עשה**

85. Berliner (1905) 17.

86. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 90.

87. *Ibid.* 331.

88. *Ibid.* The Reggio text actually includes a number of lines that, in most editions, appear in the previous comment, and it repeats both the lemma **מקץ ארבעים יום** and the comment **עד שחרבו פני האדמה** at the beginning and end. The entire passage reads: **מקץ מי יום עד שחרבו פני האדמה (ואם תאמר: אלו נראו ראשי חחרים נמצא שחרבו במרחשון והוא קורא אותו ראשון ואין זה אלא תשרי שהוא ראשון לבריאת העולם ולרי יחושע הוא ניסן. מקץ מי יום עד שחרבו פני האדמה).** Because this example is concerned with the explanation, the textual focus was on the meaning given for the lemma. The parentheses inserted by the editor of *Rashi HaShalem* indicate that the text is erroneously placed and should be removed (p. 308). For these reasons, the analysis above does not concern itself with this additional passage.

89. *Ibid.*

of the mountain tops and the drying up of the earth, or each comment stands on its own and was erroneously appended to the other. The latter seems more likely.

In the lengthy comment on the previous verse, the reliability of which is, of course, debateable, Rashi clearly refers to the idea that the end of the forty days is noted by the visibility of the mountain tops. In addition, the comment counts *sixty* days משנראו ראשי ההרים עד שחרבו בני האדמה. The confusion in verse 8:6 could be accounted for by the similarity of the מ and the ס in representing forty and sixty, respectively. As well, the scenarios suggested for the example above persist as possibilities.

Both 12:16 and 8:6 are examples of comments that differ among the editions,⁹⁰ obviously demonstrating the corrupt state of the text. The processes involved in resolving these textual inconsistencies must include the literature of the scholars who best knew Rashi and the commentary he wrote. The Tosafist's representation of Rashi's commentary through citations has the potential to offer this resource.

C. The Corrupt Editions - The Standard for Comparison

The textual difficulties in the printed editions, including both the early versions and the more popular later texts, are severe. Comparisons of comment after comment demonstrate the unreliable textual choices made by the printers as well as the complex and intricate levels of corruption. Despite this poor standard of textual quality, these editions are utilized routinely as the basis for exegetical analyses of Rashi's commentary. Textual ambiguities are commonly ignored in favour of the more familiar reading, a practice in which Berliner himself engaged.

The search for an accurate text is frustrated by the fact that these texts represent the extant commentary, and while the two hundred or so manuscripts of the work may offer compelling alternatives, no criteria have yet been developed by which to measure the value, reliability, or authenticity of the older, and less legible, remnants. Until a mechanism by which to judge the texts of the commentary is in place, the standard printed editions are the only texts to function in such a capacity, although with restrictions and qualifications.

90. See also 13:6.

The acknowledgement that the printed commentaries are textually problematic precludes utilizing them as the example to which other texts and citations should conform. Obviously, the goal is not to reconstruct the corrupt edition. Nonetheless, an example is needed with which to compare the citations and by which to explore the processes of textual transmission and corruption. The imperfect texts must serve as this qualified standard. However, employing the printed editions as the standard for comparison in no way attributes to them textual authority, and the comments in them should not be considered more accurate than, for instance, the versions extracted from the Tosafot citations of the work.

The variety of categories of variants above elucidates the contributions of the Tosafot to the resolution of the textual difficulties. The assumption, from the beginning, is that the citations of Rashi in the writings of his students and relatives will reflect more accurately the original rendition. However, the Tosafot literature is extensive, scribal influence had an impact on its transmission as well, and at times the citation of a given comment may differ slightly from one Tosafot text to another.

For this reason, the assorted versions of the commentary must not be discarded completely in favour of only the citations. Rather, the texts of the citations must be analyzed in conjunction with the extant, but admittedly corrupt, editions and manuscripts to ensure a comprehensive appreciation for the intricacies of the text's transmission and to more accurately reconstruct a text closest to the original.

Chapter Two: Conformity

A. The Nature of Citations

The previous chapter demonstrated the extensive problems with the printed texts of Rashi's commentary and suggested that, since the citations of the commentary in Tosafot have the potential to represent a text closest to the exegete's own writing of it, exploring this resource can help to resolve some of these textual difficulties and contribute to the reconstruction of the original version. But citations by their nature are not uniform. Depending on the writer's objective for including a portion of another's work in his own, the amount that is cited, the degree to which the "citer" reproduces the passage accurately, and the way in which the citation is referenced can alter its representation and reliability. The context in which a citation is included in a Tosafist manuscript is also integral to its analysis. Whether a given Tosafist work is an anonymous compilation of a variety of comments on the Torah, or a super-commentary specifically on Rashi, or the work of one identified Tosafist can affect the way the citation is used in the work, the amount of the comment cited, as well as which comments were of interest to the Tosafot.

The variety of Tosafot commentaries explored for this research offered a selection of the styles of the Tosafot in their inclusion of citations and in the nature of their works in general. In addition, the topics of exegesis that concerned the Tosafot more regularly became evident. In the fifty Tosafot manuscripts examined, numerous comments were cited multiple times, and in varying ways, and many comments were never cited at all.¹

The issue of whether a citation of Rashi in Tosafot that represents less than the comment in the printed editions implies that the Tosafot had a briefer comment, and hence the original commentary was shorter, or whether they cited only a small portion of a longer text is essential. However, the problematic printed texts have been shown to fail as an authoritative standard, and the ambiguous

1. A total of 147 lemmata from the printed texts of Rashi's commentary on נב and ךז כז are never cited in the Tosafot manuscripts verified.

nature of a citation precludes a straightforward collection of all Tosafot citations of Rashi and a conclusion that this collection constitutes the original commentary. For this reason, until a more accurate text is found to serve as a standard for comparison, the printed editions and the citations must help each other to eliminate the errors of textual transmission and the subjectivity of textual citations.

Initially the complex and intertwined contextual factors contributing to a citation's framework can be facilitated by a bipartite search for conformity. If the textual difficulties in the printed editions signify corruption, and the Tosafot theoretically offer the means to resolve the problematic passages, then those comments that conform from edition to edition also could be substantiated in the texts of the Tosafot. Comments that do not display variants among the printed editions and that are cited consistently and identically in the Tosafot manuscripts can be deemed authentic.

Similarly, citations of Rashi's commentary that appear regularly and consistently in the Tosafot manuscripts can be verified against the evidence from the printed texts for substantiation. Citations that represent the entire printed comment can help resolve minor variants, and citations that consistently bring only half of a particular comment, suggesting that only half is authentic, can be considered in light of the kinds of variants that appear among the printed versions of the text.

Akin to the search for conformity in both the printed commentaries and the Tosafot citations is an appreciation for conformity in content. In other words, those comments that are consistently not cited in the Tosafot manuscripts also hold information regarding both the interests and goals of the Tosafot as well as the authentic Rashi commentary. The question of whether the absent comments were of no relevance to the Tosafot or not present in their version of the commentary is a salient and intricate issue. Exploring the nature of those comments that are never cited will help to strengthen the arguments supporting the reliability of the Tosafot citations of Rashi and their insight into the original work.

This chapter will explore conformity between comments in the printed texts that are identical and the citations in the Tosafot manuscripts that consistently represent the entire content of the printed version. In addition, variants

of the printed comments that are not exactly identical will be examined in light of the citations in Tosafot that reflect them unabridged and invariably in their own works. The subsequent chapter will discuss the printed comments that, on a regular basis, are cited only partially.

B. Identical Comments

In five printed editions, from 383 lemmata with comments attributed to Rashi, only nine were identified as being exactly identical.² "Exactly identical" means that neither a *vav* nor a *yod* was different, nor was any word abbreviated in some editions and not in others, nor was any other form of insignificant error excused or overlooked. In a text where so much variance exists from edition to edition, the most objective line of distinction was considered to be one that, at least initially, regarded all variants as equal, and therefore excepted none.

Of these nine comments, four are not cited by the Tosafot in any of the manuscripts verified,³ two are cited in only one manuscript,⁴ one is cited in only two manuscripts,⁵ and the remaining two comments are cited consistently in numerous manuscripts.⁶

The issues that emerge from this division are intriguing. First, the authenticity of the two comments cited consistently in numerous manuscripts can be strongly considered. Second, the specific manuscripts that cite the comments not appearing in any of the other manuscripts examined should be assessed for style, date, clarity and relative value and reliability. This evaluation will help determine the significance of the citations in these manuscripts and their ability to offer a text of Rashi close to the original.

Finally, the contents of all these comments, as well as the Tosafot interest in those that are cited, should be explored in terms of why the majority of these identical comments is not cited by Tosafot at all, and whether they

2. Gen. 7:5; 10:2; 11:10; 12:13;14:2c; 16:4a; 17:10a; 17:12b; 17:23b.

3. Gen. 7:5; 17:10a; 17:12b; 17:23b.

4. Gen. 10:2; 11:10.

5. Gen. 14:2c.

6. Gen. 12:13 and 16:4a.

were excluded because of lack of relevance and interest or because they did not actually exist in their version of the commentary.

1. *Consistent Conforming Citations*

(1) Rashi's comment for Gen. 12:13 almost certainly formed part of the original commentary. The lemma for this comment is למען ייטב לי בעבורך, where Abraham asks Sarah, on their way to Egypt, to pretend to be his sister, "so that it will go well for me, for your sake," and that he will live because of her.⁷ The explanation in all five printed editions elucidates the sense of ייטב לי and states יתנו לי מתנות.⁸ In other words, if Sarah pretends to be Abraham's sister, "it will go well for me" in that Abraham will receive gifts from the Egyptians. The comment is brief and simple and focuses on the meaning of one word from the verse in the context in which it appears.

This comment is cited in eighteen Tosafot manuscripts of assorted styles and from varying centuries. A review of each citation will help to explore the criteria through which the comment's authenticity is assessed.

(a) Warsaw 204/27 is a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century manuscript of a Torah commentary. The manuscript is fairly easy to read, but although each lemma is identified by dots over the words, the comments within each *parashah* do not follow a sequential order. The marginal notes consist of both scribal corrections and additions to the main text, and they all appear to be written in the same handwriting as the main text.

To some extent, the various types of marginal notes are differentiated by scribal symbols. The majority of glosses is marked by a symbol like o- corresponding to the equivalent -o in the body of the text and signifying that the marginal note is meant to be inserted at that point. Occasionally, one or more words in the margin are marked by dots above them. Sometimes, corresponding dots are present in the text to indicate the point for insertion; at other times, the word is meant to be part of the lemma, already marked by dots in the main text. A

7. The verse in its entirety is אמרי נא אחתי את למען ייטב לי בעבורך וחיתה נפשי בגלך.

8. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1 340, 129; Berliner (1905) 23.

number of lengthy passages are unmarked in the margins of the manuscript and appear to be late additions. Finally, illustrations such as a hand with a pointed index finger appear in the margins on some pages; they appear repeatedly throughout the document and seem to be motioning from a marginal note towards the main text.

The citation of 12:13 and the accompanying remark appear as follows:⁹

למען יטב לי פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתו שונא מתנות יחיה היינו
במתנות ישראל...

In the manuscript, the lemma and the subsequent abbreviation פרשי have dots above the words. The phrase שונא מתנות יחיה is from Prov. 15:27.¹⁰ The essential problem with Rashi's comment for this verse is the suggestion that Abraham was greedy and in search of gifts. The explanation in this text claims that the dictum שונא מתנות יחיה relates specifically to gifts from other Israelites, and therefore, since Abraham was hoping to receive gifts from the Egyptians, he is not acting in defiance of the aphorism. Rashi is clearly associated with the comment יתנו לי מתנות, and the comment itself appears exactly as it does in the printed editions.

(b) A second citation of the comment appears in Oxford - Bodleian 271/2 (Opp. 31), a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript of a Torah commentary. This text is written very small and is more difficult to read than the previous one. In addition, the format of the pages of this manuscript is unique. Each page consists of a rectangle of text; within that rectangle is the main text and independent paragraphs separated by space all around. Each independent paragraph is a self-contained comment, many of which contain a citation of Rashi. This phenomenon does not preclude the appearance of citations of Rashi in the main text of the commentary as well. The manuscript does not contain any marking indicating that these independent paragraphs are intended to be part of the main commentary. Marginal notes are seldom present outside the rectangle of text. The reason these passages are singled out from the rest of the text is unclear.

9. Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fol. 222b.

10. The entire verse reads עכר בידו ברצע ברצע ושונא מתנת יחיה.

The citation of Rashi for 12:13 in this manuscript appears in such an independent paragraph.¹¹ The passage reads as follows:

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי תנו לי מתנות והכת ושונא מתנות יחיה וגומר
למלך סדום אי אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל וייל לפי שסדום תרי עין לפיכך
לא קבל מהם דבר כגון שאומי הפסוק אל תלחם את לחם רע עין אבל
המצריים לא היו תרי עין לכך קיבל מהם.

This comment is responding to the same issue as the previous manuscript. After the lemma from 12:13 and a citation of Rashi's commentary, the verse from Proverbs is contrasted to the idea that Abraham was seeking gifts, suggesting a flaw in his character. The passage then contrasts Abraham's actions in this incident in Egypt with his refusal to take even a thread or shoelace from the king of Sodom (14:23).¹² The commentator explains that the king of Sodom was two-faced or crafty (תרי עין), and so Abraham would not take anything from him, as it says in Prov. 23:6: "Do not eat the bread of one who has an evil eye."¹³ The Egyptians, on the other hand, were not two-faced, and so Abraham accepted gifts from them.

The missing *yod* from the word תנו in this manuscript's citation can be regarded as a simple scribal error or an unclear text. The previous word פרשי ends with a *yod* and might account for the lack of one in the following word. In any case, this representation of Rashi's comment still conforms with the version in the printed editions as well as with the previous citation.

(c) London 173,2 (Add. 11, 566) is a fourteenth-century manuscript, catalogued as a super-commentary on Rashi.¹⁴ Each page of the manuscript

-
11. Oxford-Bodleian 271/2 (Opp.31) [IMHM 16739]. The folio numbers are illegible. This passage appears on the eighth side, from the beginning of פרשת בראשית. It is the second side from the beginning of לך כן.
 12. After Abraham saved Sodom from the kings of Elam, Goyim, Shinar and Elasar, the king of Sodom offered Abraham the loot in exchange for the return of his people, to which Abraham replied in 14:23: אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל ואם אקח מכל אשר לך ולא תאמר אני העשרתי את אברם.
 13. The verse in its entirety is אל תלחם את לחם רע עין ואל תתאו למטעמיו.
 14. The Margoliouth catalogue, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum* (see Appendix C), describes the manuscript as a "super-commentary in the style of the Tosafists" and in fact does not call it a super-commentary on Rashi as is stated in the title on the IMHM catalogue card.

places the entire Rashi commentary in the centre with a secondary or "super" commentary around it. The assumption that the text surrounding the Rashi commentary is intended to relate directly to it should preclude the need to associate Rashi by name with every comment. In reality, the secondary text appears to be a Tosafot commentary that often refers to Rashi but is not necessarily meant to accompany it. For this reason, Rashi's comments are identified as such, other unaffiliated comments are included as well, and citations of Rashi and the response to him often do not appear on the same page as the text of the commentary itself. The script is fairly clear and legible, and marginal notes are minimal.

The citation of and response to Rashi's comment for 12:13¹⁵ is brief and of the same concern as the previous examples:

למען ייטב לי פירש יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתו ושונא מתנות יחיה במתנות
של ארץ ישראל.

Once again, the comment explains the contradiction between Abraham's desire for gifts (according to Rashi) and the adage from Proverbs. The citation conforms with the previous examples as well as the printed versions, and the resolution of Abraham's character flaw continues to lie in the specification of gifts from Israel.

(d) Parma 837 (2058) is a fourteenth-century manuscript of a super-commentary on Rashi. Parts of this text are smudged and unclear, but otherwise it is fairly legible, with a style that is easy to follow. After each lemma, Rashi's comment is cited with the introduction פרשי (which has an arrow ← above it), and most of the explanations that succeed the citation begin with the term והטעם, clearly distinguishing between Rashi's comment and the super-comment. Marginal notes are infrequent.

The citation in this text is as follows:¹⁶

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי יתנו לי מתנות והטעם כי אמר אח"כ וחיתה
נפשי בגללך ועו דכתי ולאברם הטיב בעבורה ויהי לו צאן ובקר וגו'.

15. London 173, 2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 12b.

16. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135]. The folio numbers are illegible. The cited passage appears on the second side of פרשת לך לך.

The explanation provided here for Rashi's comment that Abraham was expecting gifts from the Egyptians lies in the second phrase of 12:13, "that my soul may live because of you." Since Abraham's life and well-being is to be dependent on Sarah, and since in 12:16, the verse then reports that Pharaoh treated Abraham well for Sarah's sake and gave him sheep and cattle and donkeys and camels and slaves,¹⁷ the two concepts of well-being and the gifts later given by Pharaoh must be related.

This interpretation of Parma 837 (2058) is not concerned with the character of Abraham or the idea that he is seeking gifts. Rather, its purpose is simply to explain the rationale behind Rashi's comment and the process from which it emerged. This approach is dealing directly with the text of Rashi's commentary and less with its own interpretation of the biblical verse. Despite the difference in explanation, the citation of the comment is the same, and its association with Rashi remains uncontested.

(e) The fifth citation of Rashi's comment on 12:13 is found in a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century manuscript of another super-commentary on Rashi. The text of Moscow-Guenzburg 317 is clear, with few marginal notes, but the handwriting is often difficult to decipher. The beginning of each new comment is identified with a supra-linear squiggle resembling the letter *L*. Some comments begin with a lemma from the biblical verse followed by a citation of Rashi identified as פֶּרְשֵׁי; others begin with the citation and its designation פֶּרְשֵׁי; and still others begin with only a citation from Rashi, but without the preceding source reference. The reader is expected to recognize the origin of the quoted phrase.

The varying styles of presentation suggest an anthological nature to the work. Comments on Rashi's exegesis of Genesis were collected from various Tosafot sources and incorporated in a new edition, without eliminating the distinguishing characteristics of each source.

The citation of Rashi for 12:13 in Moscow-Guenzburg 317 conforms to its representation in the other manuscripts.¹⁸ The comment that follows also

17. The text at 12:16 is: וְאֶבְרָם הָיָה בְּעִבְרָה וַיְחִי-לוֹ צֶן-וּבִקָר וְחִמְרִים וְעִבְדִים וְשִׁפְחוֹת וְאֵתְנֵת וְגַמְלִים.

18. Moscow-Guenzburg 317, fol. 14a.

assertion, the biblical text does not seem to suggest that Abraham refused Avimelekh's gifts. In verses 14 through 16 in chapter 20, Avimelekh gives Abraham sheep, cattle and servants. He offers him settlement in his land, and he tells Sarah that he gave "her brother" a thousand pieces of silver. The text states neither that Abraham accepted nor that he refused these gifts.

The difficulties with this passage may be due to its later dating, the sources from which it was copied, or even the competence of this particular scribe. Nonetheless, the text of the citation is certain and the issue from Rashi's comment that concerned the Tosafot is consistent with the previous examples.

(f) In Paris héb. 167/3, a fifteenth-century manuscript of a Torah commentary by **דוסא היוני ב"ר משה זצ"ל מעיר בידיני**,²⁰ the contrast of Rashi's suggestion that Abraham expects gifts in Egypt with his refusal to accept anything from the king of Sodom persists. This manuscript is written in Eastern or Byzantine script and is very clear and legible. With the exclusion of omitted words or letters included at the end of or above the line, marginal notes seldom appear in this document. The commentary incorporates interpretations from numerous sources and citations from Rashi are identified as **פרשי**. Often, lemmata from the biblical text are not provided.

The passage is as follows:²¹

פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ותימי והלא אברהם אמי אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל
משמע שהיה אברהם שונא מתנות כמי שכתוי ושונא מתנות יהיה וי"ל
בשביל שלא יכירו אותו שהוא בעלה לכן אמי לקבל מתנות שלא יהרגוהו
אומי בשביל שהיה רעב והיו עמן נפשות רבות כמי שאומי ואת הנפש אשר
ע"ב לכך קיבל המתנות כדי לפרנסם אבל אחר מיכן שנתעשר ולא היה
ג"כ רעב אם מחוט ועד שרוך.

Rashi is cited in conformity with the printed editions and the other citations examined so far. The comment of **דוסא היוני** begins with the assumption and proof from 14:23 that Abraham did not seek out gifts but in fact refused them. Two reasons are supplied here to explain his deviance in behaviour. First, since the Egyptians did not know that Abraham was Sarah's

20. Dosa ha-Yevani was a student of Rabbi Shalom Ashkenazi of Neustadt. He lived in Bulgaria and wrote his super-commentary on Rashi in 1430. See. "Bulgaria," *EJ*, vol. 4, 1482, and "Vidin," *EJ*, vol. 16, 121.

21. Paris héb. 167/3, fol. 108a.

husband, he did not want to offend them by refusing the gifts and risk being killed. Second, he was responsible for a large entourage during the time of a famine, and therefore he accepted the gifts in order to provide for them. When Abraham became wealthy and he was not subject to a famine, he refused to accept gifts, as one can see from his response to the king of Sodom.

(g) The citation of Rashi in Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) is the first that does not conform exactly to the previous examples. In addition, the comment on Rashi refrains from excusing Abraham's behaviour. This sixteenth-century manuscript is a Torah commentary comprised of comments drawn from various sources. The primary text is written in tiny handwriting which is fairly clear, although difficult to decipher because of the size. Surrounding the main text, on almost every page, are numerous marginal passages. These glosses contain no marking to indicate intended insertion into the main commentary. They are written in a larger script and most appear to be in a different handwriting. They also are occasionally written at right angles to the text at the bottom or top of the page.

The citation and comment read the following:²²

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי מתנות והא כתי' שונא מתנוי יחיה וייל
דמיירא בוש' אבל לא ה' מותר.

The citation in this manuscript consists of only the word מתנות, still conveying the idea that in requesting Sarah to pretend to be his sister, Abraham would receive gifts. The absence of the words לי יתנו might be due to the brevity of this text in general; it can also call into question the authenticity of these words.

The response to the citation of Rashi's comment contrasts the idea of gifts to the adage from Proverbs and suggests that perhaps Abraham feared being shamed or discovered in his cover-up, if he refused the gifts; therefore, he accepted them. Regardless of his fear, according to this text, he was not permitted to have accepted them.

General conformity persists even with this citation. The idea that Rashi commented on this lemma with regard to Abraham seeking gifts has not altered with the absence of two words. Furthermore, the difficulty justifying this behaviour with the verse in Proverbs endures, despite a negative interpretation of Abraham's

²². Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fol. 10a.

actions. The disorderly presentation of the manuscript, the frequent abbreviations, and the numerous passages in the margins added by different hands, could contribute to the discounting of these textual variants in the citation, especially if the remainder of the manuscripts cite the comment in conformity with the previous examples. If other texts reflect this shorter comment, then more serious consideration must be given to the possibility that the authentic commentary consisted of only the word מתנות.

(h) The next citation was extracted from Hamburg 46 (Cod. hebr. 108), a manuscript of a Torah commentary dated 1628. The text is clear and legible with an inordinate amount of blank space between the lines, and very few marginal notes or intralinear corrections. The passage is the following:²³

למען ייטב לי בעבור פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ותימה והא כתיי ושונא מתנות
 יחיה וגם למלך סדום אמר אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל וגוי וייל לפי
 שהסדומיים הם צרי עין לפיכך לא קבל מהן דבהון נאמר לא תלחם את
 לחם רע עין.

Similar to the comment in Oxford - Bodleian 271/2 (Opp. 31), this text compares Abraham's behaviour with the king of Sodom (where he refuses to accept gifts) with his behaviour in Egypt, in light of the adage from Proverbs. It resolves the difficulty with the suggestion that the Sodomites were shrewd and deceptive, and therefore Abraham did not accept from them gifts, in accordance with Prov. 23:6: "Do not eat the bread of one who has an evil eye." The citation is consistent with the other examples and with the texts of the printed editions, and the issue that concerns the Tosafot exegete persists as well.

(i) Munich 50.1 is an undated manuscript of פענח רזא.²⁴ The text is written very clearly, with few marginal glosses. Rashi's comment is again cited in conformity with the previous documents.²⁵

23. Hamburg 46 (Cod. hebr. 108) [IMHM 942], fol. 1b.

24. See Gellis, vol. 1, 16 for a description of פענח רזא, a collection of brief comments on the Torah by ר' יצחק ב"ר יהודה הלוי who lived at the end of the thirteenth century.

25. Munich 50,1 [IMHM 1692], fol. 28b.

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פי רשי יתנו לי מתנות וקשי היאך היה אברהם
אוהב מתנות והא כתיב שונא מתנות יחיה ונראה דולק ממונו של ישראל
לפי שמחסר ממונו אבל שרי.

The issue that concerns this Tosafist, like those presented above, is the suggestion that Abraham was seeking gifts despite the proverb שונא מתנות יחיה. The resolution to this problem translates as "and it appears he pursues Israel's money because he lacks his own money, but he is permitted [to do so]." The explanation intimates not only that Abraham was seeking gifts, but that he was doing so from Israel; however, because he himself did not have any money, he was permitted to do so.

The next nine citations of Rashi for 12:13 are all from variant manuscripts of the thirteenth-century work מנחת יהודה, written by Rabbi Yehudah ben Eliezer.²⁶ The citation in all these documents is identical to its representation in the examples above and in the printed texts. In addition, the comment that accompanies the citation briefly contrasts the sense of Rashi's comment to the phrase from Proverbs and then stipulates that שונא מתנות יחיה refers specifically to gifts of Israel.

(j) Vat. Ebr. 506, dated 1414, contains extensive marginal notes on every page, but remains quite legible. Its text reads:²⁷

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתוי ושונא מתנות יחיה
היינו במתנות יש.

(k) Parma 537 (2541) is dated 1466 and contains occasional lengthy notes in the margins in a different handwriting from the main text. The lemmata are written larger than the rest of the commentary, with additional blank space surrounding the word or words. The passage in this document is:²⁸

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתוי ושונא מתנות יחיה
במתנות של ארץ ישראל.

26. Gellis, vol. 1, 15.

27. Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fol. 12a.

28. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 13b.

(l) Budapest-Kaufmann A31 is a fifteenth-or sixteenth-century manuscript with few marginal notes. The comment here is:²⁹

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פי הרשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתוי שונא מתנות
יחיה היינו במתנות ישראל.

(m) Paris héb. 168, also a fifteenth-or sixteenth-century manuscript, is identical to the example from the Budapest manuscript:³⁰

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פי הרש יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתו שונא מתנות יחיה
היינו במתנות ישראל.

(n) New York - JTS L790 is a fifteenth-century manuscript. The writing of this document is extremely small, with parts faded beyond legibility; it contains no marginal glosses. Its text is also identical to the previous examples:³¹

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתוי שונא מתנות יחיה
היינו מתנות של ישראל.

(o) New York - JTS L787 is a sixteenth-century manuscript written in tiny script. It too is free of marginal notes. This text lacks the attribution of the comment to Rashi as well as the word בעבורך. The word לי in the lemma has become לך. These variants appear to be due more to sloppy copying than to a different original source that should alter the picture of conformity demonstrated in the above citations.³²

למען ייטב לך יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתוב ושונא מתנות יחיה במתנות של
ארץ ישראל.

(p) New York - JTS L789, also a sixteenth-century manuscript written in tiny script, contains the same variants as above, except in this text the citation is attributed to its author.³³

29. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 27a.

30. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 14b.

31. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 15a.

32. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fol. 9b.

33. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 10b.

למען ייטב לך פי רשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתוב ושונא מתנות יחיה
במתנות של ארץ ישראל.

(q) Vat. Ebr. 53, dated 1459, is clearly written, with much space between the lines and no marginal notes. Its text reads:³⁴

למען ייטב לי בעבורך פרשי יתנו לי מתנות ומה דא' שונא מתנות לא יחיה
היינו במתנות א"י.

The insertion of the word לא in the citation of the verse from Proverbs drastically changes the sense of the comment. Since it obviously does not reflect accurately the biblical source, it can safely be deemed a copying error.

(r) Finally, Parma 527 (2368) is dated 1412 and is written in clear, deliberate script. Some pages have faded and are illegible, and some marginal notes appear throughout the document. Its comment is no different from the examples already presented.³⁵

יטב לי בעבורך פרש יתנו לי מתנות ומה שכתו שונא מתנות יחיה היינו
במתנות ישראל.

Seventeen of eighteen citations of Rashi's comment for 12:13 are identical. In addition, the citations conform with the identical texts presented in the printed editions. The citations appear in different styles of text, from various centuries, and in manuscripts of varying qualities. The eighteenth citation³⁶ maintains the basic idea expressed in the other representations and could be a deliberate abbreviation of the source. The lack of variants in the printed texts, together with the conformity among the citations in the Tosafot manuscripts, strongly supports the authentic nature of the comment.

(2) The second comment that appears identically in all five printed editions and is cited consistently in the Tosafot literature is the explanation for the lemma ויבא אל הגר ותהר in 16:4. In this verse, Abraham has relations with Hagar and

34. Vat. Ebr. 53, fol. 15b.

35. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233]. The folio numbers for this document are illegible. This passage appears on the 19th side, or the third page of פרשת לך לך.

36. Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fol. 10a.

she conceives.³⁷ In the printed editions, Rashi's comment is מביאה ראשונה. The remark responds to the apparent redundancy of the word ויבא, since if Hagar conceived, Abraham obviously had relations with her. The superfluous ויבא is in the text to imply that Hagar conceived from their first encounter. Similar to the previous example, this comment is short in length and simple in meaning. Its source is *Bereshit Rabba* 45:4.³⁸

The comment for this lemma is cited in thirteen Tosafot manuscripts. Ten of these citations are in manuscripts of מנחת יהודה. With slight variations, these passages all question the possibility of whether a women in fact can conceive in the first occurrence of relations. They refer to the comment in BR 45:4, which presents two opposing opinions in this matter, and they conclude that Rashi was following the opinion of Rabbi Levi, who argued that a women could conceive מביאה ראשונה.

(a) The passages in the מנחת יהודה manuscripts are the following. In Vat. Ebr. 506, dated 1414, the texts reads:³⁹

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרשי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה וקשה דאמרי אין אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה וייל דדבר זה מחלוקת תנאים היא בביר דקאמריי התם דאמרי לוי הגר מביאה ראשונה נתעברה אמרי אלעזר לעולם אין אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה ורשיי זל פי ברי לוי.

(b) In Parma 537 (2541), the difficulty with Rashi's comment is attributed to Rabbi Elyakim:⁴⁰

ותבא אל הגר ותלד ותהר פרש נתעברה מביאה ראשונה ותימי ר' אליקים דבדבר זה יש תנאים בברי דקאמי אמי ר' לוי בר חיפא מביאה ראשונה נתעברה אמי ר' אלעזר לעולם אין אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה עכל ורשיי זל פרש ברי לוי ברי חיפה.

37. The entire verse is *ויבא אל הגר ותהר ותרא כי הרתה ותקל גברתה בעיניה*.

38. The printed texts of Rashi include only one of the opinions expressed in the midrashic passage. See *Midrash Bereshit Rabba*, eds. J. Theodor and C. Albeck, 449-450; and *Midrash Rabbah*, ed. M. Mirkin, 4th ed. vol. 2 (Tel Aviv: Yavne Publishing, 1986-1987) 157-158.

39. Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fol. 13b.

40. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 15b.

(c) Budapest-Kaufmann A31, from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, has a similar text:⁴¹

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פי הרשי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה וקשי דאין אשה
מתעברת מביאה ראשונה ותי הרי אליקיי דבדבר זה יש תנאים בברי רבה
דאמי רי לוי ברי אבא הגר מביאה ראשונה נתעברה אמי רי אלעזר אין
אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה והרשי פי ברי לוי.

(d) Paris héb. 168, also from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, is almost identical:⁴²

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פי הרש נתעברה מביאה ראשונה וקש דאין אשה
מתעברת מביאה ראשונה ותי הרי אליקים דבדבר זה יש תנאים בברא
רבה דאמי רי לוי ברי חלבתא הגר מביאה ראשונה נתעברה אמ רי אלעזר
אין אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה והרש פי ברי לוי.

(e) In New York - JTS L790, Rabbi Elazar's opinion is excluded, despite the reference to its source in BR 45:4. In addition, Rabbi Elyakim is designated the teacher of the author or scribe of this text, a relationship not mentioned in the previous examples.⁴³

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרשי זל נתעברה מביאה ראשונה וקשיא דהא אמרינן
אין אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה אמי מורי הר"ר אליקים דבדבר זה יש
תנאים בברי רבא דקא אמרי אמי רי לוי הגר מביאה ראשונה נתעברה
עכיל ורשי פי ברי לוי.

(f) New York - JTS L788 is a sixteenth-century manuscript of the work, and its representation of the citation and the comment also conform with the rest.⁴⁴

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פי רשי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה וקשה דאמרו אין
אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה ותירץ הרי רי אליקים ובדבר זה יש תנאים
דקאמרי אמ רי לוי הגר מביאה ראשונה נתעברה אמי רי אלעזר לעולם אין
האשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה והרשי פי ברי לוי.

41. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 31a.

42. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 17a.

43. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 16a.

44. New York - JTS L788 [IMHM 24018], fol. 6a.

(g) In New York - JTS L787, Rabbi Eliezer's opinion that a woman cannot conceive the first time she has intercourse is extended to suggest that she can conceive during the second encounter.⁴⁵

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרשי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה ואמי רבינו אליקים
ובדבר זה יש תנאים בביר דקאמי ר' לוי בר אבא הגר מביאה ראשונה
נתעברה אמי ר' אליעזר לעולם אין אשה מתעברת אלא מביאה שניה עכיל
ורשמי ברי לוי בר אבא.

(h) Except for the different name of Rabbi Levi's father, the passage in New York - JTS L789 is essentially identical to L787.⁴⁶

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פי רשי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה ואמי רבינו אליקים
ובדבר הזה יש תנאים בבר דקאי ר' לוי בר חיפא הגר מביאה ראשונה
נתעברה אמר ר' אליעזר לעולם אין אשה מתעברת אלא מביאה שניה
עכיל ורשי פי ברי לוי בר חפא.

(i) In Vat. Ebr. 53, the issue that arises from Rashi's comment is mentioned anonymously and not attributed to Rabbi Elyakim. In addition, the citation of Rashi itself begins שנתעברה instead of נתעברה. Such a variant does not alter the pattern of conformity demonstrated in all these examples, since the letter ש may be linking the source of the comment to the actual words, without implying direct speech and open quotations.⁴⁷

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרשי שנתעברה מביאה ראשונה וקשי דאמי אין אשה
מתעברת מביאה ראשונה ויל דיש תנאי בבר איר לוי הגר מביאה ראשונה
נתעברה ר' אליעזר אוי אין האשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה ופר"ש ברי
לוי.

(j) Finally, Parma 527 (2368) resembles numerous examples presented above.⁴⁸

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרש נתעברה מביאה ראשונה ותירץ הרי אליקים כתוב
בדבר זה יש תנאים בבר רבי דקאמי אמי ר' לוי בן חיפא הגר מביאה

45. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fol. 11a.

46. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 11b.

47. Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fol. 16a.

48. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233]. The folio numbers in this document are illegible. This passage appears on the twentieth side of the manuscript or the fourth page of פרשת לך לך.

ראשונה נתעברה אמי ר' אליעזר אין האשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה
עכ"ל ורש פי ברי לוי בן חיפא.

The citation of Rashi, while the same in all these manuscripts, differs, in fact, from the version in the printed editions. With the inclusion of the word נתעברה, the Tosafot citations of Rashi follow the midrashic source for the comment more closely than the printed texts of Rashi's commentary, which read only מביאה ראשונה. The sense of the comment remains intact with either version, and the Tosafist concern with this explanation would apply with either rendition. Of course, the question arises as to whether Rashi's original comment included the word, based on its source in BR, and then through the process of transmission it was omitted, or whether, as they examined the source of the exegesis for further clarification, the Tosafot studying the comment added the word נתעברה.

The significance in the resolution of this question is minimal. Because the source from which the word appears in the comment is obvious, and the meaning of the comment is maintained in either version, determining whether Rashi actually wrote the word נתעברה in his commentary adds very little to the larger picture of textual corruption. In a comment as simple and brief as this one, ascertaining the authenticity of this particular comment as a whole is more important than the minutiae. The citations can confirm that Rashi did write a brief comment on the lemma ויבא אל הגר ותהר, and that his explanation was based on a midrashic source.

The conformity among the Tosafot discussions of Rashi's comment in these examples is expected since all the above texts are from manuscripts of the same work. As with the previous Rashi comment explored through citations, the passages from the numerous manuscripts of מנחת יהודה are better explored as a unit, rather than ten single citations emerging from manuscripts of different works. The conformity among these texts, while supportive of the potential authenticity of this comment, can be negated easily by the argument that they all emerge from one original source, and hence reflect only one representation of the citation and the accompanying issue that concerned the Tosafot. Had the citations in these texts differed significantly, the variants might have suggested corruption in the transmission of this comment.

At the same time, however, the conformity in the citations in מנחת יהודה are not sufficient to confirm its authenticity.

Rashi's comment for 16:4 is cited in three other Tosafot manuscripts. An examination of these passages in conjunction with the information from the מנחת יהודה manuscripts will illustrate more clearly the text accepted by the Tosafot to have been written by Rashi.

(k) In Warsaw 204/27, the citation conforms with its presentation in מנחת יהודה. The comment explicating Rashi refers to the content of the passage in BR, but without the detail provided in the examples above, and it points out a contradiction in Rashi between this interpretation and his comment for 19:36. The text reads:⁴⁹

הגר פרשי כי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה יש תנאי אומי כי תוכל להתעבר
ויש אומי כי לא תוכל וממי קי לרשי שאמי כי נתעברה מביאה ראשונה
ואמי בבנות לוט כי אין האשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה.

At the base of this comment is the question of whether a woman can conceive the first time she has relations. The exegete addresses the issue by confirming that both opinions are expressed among the Tannaim. The persistent problem for him is that, in different places, Rashi himself expresses contradictory opinions. In this verse, Rashi appears to support the possibility of a woman's ability to conceive her first time. However, in 19:36,⁵⁰ where Lot's daughters conceived from their father, Rashi comments the following for the lemma ותהרין:⁵¹

אע"פ שאין האשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה אלו שלטו בעצמן והוציאו
ערוותן לחוץ ונתעברו מביאה ראשונה.

In this instance, Rashi states that although a woman does not conceive from the first time she has relations, these particular women were able to take control of themselves and conceive the first time.

49. Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fol. 222a.

50. The verse itself is: ותהרין שתי בנות-לוט מאביהן

51. The rendition cited here is from Berliner (1905) 39. Minor variants can be found among the other printed editions. For example, neither the Rome, Reggio or Guadelajara editions include the word לחוץ and the Guadelajara edition alone has the phrase כמביאה שניה at the end of the comment. For further comparison, see *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 226, 362.

Unlike the comments in the **מנחת יהודה** manuscripts, this text does not explain Rashi's comment. It acknowledges the existence of the variance in opinion related to conception and indicates that Rashi himself accepts both opinions. Whereas in **מנחת יהודה** the justification for Rashi's explanation lies in BR, in the statement of Rabbi Levi, this comment does not rationalize the contradiction it presents. Nonetheless, Rashi's affiliation with the comment for 16:4 is certain, and the citation is consistent with the above examples.

(I) in Parma 837 (2058), the Tosafist comment attempts to explain how, despite the opinion of the rabbis, that a woman could not conceive her first time, Hagar was successful in such a feat.⁵²

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרשי מביאה ראשונה ואעפי שאמרו חזל אין אשה מתעברת מביאה ראשונה איפשר דשאני אברהם שהיה כחו גדול או איפשר שבעל בהטייה או איפשר שמעכה עצמה להתעבר מיד פן יחזרו בהם אברהם ושרה ויפרישוה ממנו.

The citation of Rashi in this manuscript conforms with the comment's presentation in the printed editions; the word **נתעברה** is not included. The reaction to Rashi's comment in this passage is a justification of Rashi's position despite the contradictory opinions expressed by **חז"ל**. Hagar may have been able to conceive her first time having relations because of Abraham's extraordinary strength, or because he was able to have relations with her without causing her to bleed, or because Hagar herself destroyed her own virginity in order that she would conceive right away, lest Abraham and Sarah changed their minds and separated her from him.

The explanations provided to rationalize Rashi's comment express the same basic difficulty with it as do the previous passages. The accepted idea was that a woman could not conceive the first time she had relations. In all cases, though, Rashi's association with comment, be it of three words or two,⁵³ is undeniable and consistent.

52. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135]. The folio numbers in this manuscript are illegible. This passage appears on the the twenty-third side, or the eighth page of **פרשת לך לך**.

53. In other words: **נתעברה מביאה ראשונה** or just **מביאה ראשונה**.

(m) Finally, Rashi's comment for 16:4 is cited in the fourteenth-century manuscript London 173.2 (Add. 11,566). This passage is the same in content and regarding the citation as the passages from the מנחת יהודה manuscripts.⁵⁴

ויבא אל הגר ותהר פרש נתעברה מביאה ראשונה ואומי הרב ר' אליקים
 דבדבר זה יש תנאים בבר דקאמי ר' לוי ברי חיפא הגר מביאה ראשון
 נתעברה אמי ר' אלעזר לעולם אין אשה מתעברת אלא מביאה שניה עכל
 ורשפ ברי לוי בר חיפא.

Similar to the examples above, this comment justifies Rashi's explanation as following the opinion of Rabbi Levi expressed in BR 45:4, in contrast to the opposing position presented by Rabbi Elazar. The citation of Rashi conforms with the other manuscripts and the association of this comment with Rashi, despite its very slight variation among some texts, is inarguable.

Through the use of citations of Rashi in the Tosafot manuscripts, as well as the identical representations of the comment in the printed editions, two comments, so far, can be deemed original to the commentary written by the exegete himself. The citations of the comments conform from text to text, and the discussion of Rashi's comment clearly associates the remark with him.

The variety of documents from which the passages were extracted further supports the claim for authenticity. Generations of Tosafot studied not only Rashi, but the works of their predecessors, as well. Their tendency to address similar issues, in similar ways, should be expected. The fact that Rashi's comments are cited invariably in general exegetical works, in super-commentaries specifically on Rashi, and in commentaries by identified individuals, as well as in manuscripts demonstrating different qualities of scribal transmission, legibility, and marginal notes, weakens the argument that the conformity is due to Tosafist mimicry. Rather, these factors suggest the accuracy and consistency with which Tosafot cited Rashi in their works, as well as the central place Rashi held in their exegesis.

These examples demonstrate that textual evidence extracted from the Tosafist citations of Rashi can help to determine the authenticity of the commentary.

54. London 173.2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 14a.

2. Limited Textual Evidence of Citations

Three of the nine identical comments in the printed texts of Rashi are cited in only one or two of the Tosafot manuscripts verified. The comments for 10:2, 11:10 and 14:2 are all cited in Moscow-Guenzburg 317; in addition, 14:2 is also cited in New York - JTS L819a/1. The nature and quality of these manuscripts, the subject matter of the Rashi comment, and the Tosafot concern with it must be explored in order to determine the reliability of the citation.

Moscow-Guenzburg 317 is a fifteenth-or sixteenth-century super-commentary on Rashi.⁵⁵ By definition, its style examines more comments by Rashi, in a more systematic manner, than a Tosafot commentary that refers to Rashi frequently, but not systematically. Furthermore, the varying ways in which the citation of Rashi is introduced, sometimes with an introductory פרשי and sometimes without, was suggested above to indicate a compilation of comments by and about Rashi drawn from a variety of sources. This anthological process may have had as its objective the inclusion of a comment on Rashi for every lemma. Finally, the late date of the manuscript, after the beginning of printing, might lessen the reliability of the citation, especially when the comment is not cited elsewhere.

(1a) Gen. 10:2 lists the sons of Japheth: Gomer and Magog and Madai and Yavan and Tuval and Meshekh and Tiras.⁵⁶ The only lemma for this verse in Rashi's commentary is the word ותירס, and the comment in the printed editions reads: פרס.⁵⁷ The citation and comment in Moscow-Guenzburg 317 is the following:⁵⁸

תירס זה פרס וא"ת למה מפרש רשי יותר מה היה תירס ממה שמפרש
באחרים וי"ל לפי מפי לעיל אעפי שיפת אלוהים ליפת שבנה כורש שהיה
מבני יפת כו' שאל תקשו מנלן דפרס היה דילמא מבני יפת היה לכך מפרש
תירס זה פרס א"מ דפרס היו מבני יפת וכורש היה מלך פרסיים וגם הוא
היה פסי ועי"ל משום שכתוי מדי כאן ובכל מה ותקרא מדי ופרס יחד

55. See Appendix C.

56. The Hebrew text of the verse is: ותירס ומשך ותירס: בני יפת גמר ומגוג ומדי ויון ותבל ומשך ותירס:

57. Berliner (1905) 20. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 105, 335.

58. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 11b.

שעל תקשו למה נאמר כאן מדי ולא נאמר פרס לכך נראה פי תירס זה
פרס...

The citation of Rashi in this manuscript differs from the printed editions only in the word זה instead of זו. The idea that Rashi is associated with the identification of תירס as פרס is certain from this passage. The concern in this comment is the reason why Rashi chose to single out תירס for identification but did not comment on the names of the other sons of Japheth.

The explanation suggested by the exegete refers to Rashi's comment on the lemma וישכן באהלי שם, in which he refers to a midrash that claims Cyrus, King of Persia, was a descendent of Japheth.⁵⁹ In order to support the familial affiliation between Persia and Japheth, Rashi takes the opportunity in 10:2 to substantiate the relationship. By identifying תירס as Persia, he is able to demonstrate that Persia is a son of Japheth. Since Cyrus was king of Persia and a Persian himself, he too was a descendent of Japheth.

The exegete also offers a second interpretation for Rashi's comment. He suggests that since 10:2 mentions the son מדי, and in most places פרס and מדי are mentioned together, Rashi aims to indicate to the reader who among Japheth's sons represents פרס.

The fact that the identification of תירס as פרס appears in a variety of earlier sources,⁶⁰ yet is only affiliated with Rashi in this one manuscript, and that in relation to the emergence of the printed editions, the manuscript is a late text of a super-commentary minimizes the reliability of this one citation and renders its ability to authenticate the comment inconclusive.

59. The lemma commented upon is in Gen. 9:27. The verse is: וַיַּתְּ אֱלֹהִים לִיֶּפֶת וַיִּשְׁכֶּן בְּאֹהֲלֵי שָׁם וַיְהִי כְנָעַן עֶבֶד לְמוֹ וַיִּשְׁכֹּן בְּאֹהֲלֵי שָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׂכִינְתּוֹ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִדְרַשׁ חַכְמִים אָף עַל פִּי שִׁיפַת אֱלֹהִים לִיֶּפֶת שְׁבִנָּה כּוֹרֵשׁ שֶׁהָיָה מְבִנֵי יֶפֶת בֵּית שֵׁן לֹא שְׂרֵתָה בּוֹ שְׂכִינָה וְהִיכָן שְׂרֵתָה בְּמִקְדָּשׁ רֵאשׁוֹן שְׁבִנָּה שְׁלֵמָה (שְׁחִיָּה). Berliner (1905) 20. For textual variants, compare with *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 104-105, 335. Rabbinic sources are Tractate Yoma 9b-10a, in which תירס is associated with פרס and BR 36:8 (Theodor and Albeck, vol. 2, 342-343; Mirkin, vol. 2, 70-71) in which כרש is identified as a descendent of יפת. See also *מדרש פסיקתא רבתי*, ed. M. Friedmann (Vienna: 1880; Tel Aviv: s.n., 1963) פליה, fol. 160a, in which מלך פרס is identified as a descendent of יפת.

60. B. Yoma 10a, BR 37a, P. Megillah, פי"א ח"ט.

The presence of the comment in the Talmud and Midrash, although not uncommon sources for Rashi, intimates the ease with which scribes and students had access to this comment and could have incorporated it onto and eventually, into their own texts. At the same time, the anthological nature of Moscow-Guenzburg 317 implies that this comment and its association with Rashi were drawn from earlier sources. Its citation only in this one manuscript may be accounted for by the inclusive quality of this text, and perhaps, not being a comment that concerned the Tosafot regularly, it is not mentioned in other works.

Unlike 12:13, where Abraham's character was at issue, or 16:4, where the troublesome suggestion that a woman could conceive with her first sexual encounter was made, the reaction to Rashi's comment in this passage does not have a greater moral or edifying concern. The explanation relates directly to Rashi's exegetical motive and hence may not have been a question for regular consideration.

(2a) In 11:10, the verse relates that Shem was one hundred years old and he begot Arpakhshad two years after the flood.⁶¹ Rashi's comment for the lemma שם בן מאה שנה clarifies simply: כשהוליד את ארפכשד שנתיים אחר המבול.⁶² The passage in Moscow-Guenzburg 317 cites the comment in conformity with the printed editions and explains the following:⁶³

שם בן מאה שנה כשהוליד ארפכשד שנתיים אחר המבול ר"ל דמה שכתוב
אחר המבול קאי אי מוליד את ארפכשד וגם קאי אי שם בן מאה שנה...

In this example, Rashi's name does not precede the citation of his comment, a phenomenon not uncommon in this text. The passage explains that the phrase "two years after the flood" refers to both the age of Shem and the fact that he had a son. In other words, *when* Shem was one hundred years old, he had a son, and this, the birth of his son and his hundredth birthday, occurred two years after the flood.

Rashi's explanation simplifies the sense of the biblical text by utilizing the words of the verse and adding one letter, ש. The passage in the manuscript

61. The verse in the Hebrew is אלה תולדת שם שם בן מאה שנה וילד את ארפכשד שנתיים אחר המבול.

62. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 117, 336; Berliner (1905) 21.

63. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 12b.

clarifies the problem anticipated by Rashi, as well as the solution he offered. Without the understanding that both the birth of Arpakhshad and Shem's one hundredth birthday occurred two years after the flood, the latter statement of Shem's birthday would suggest uselessly that Shem turned one hundred years old at some point in his life.

As in the previous example, the ability of the Tosafot citation to authenticate Rashi's comment is inconclusive. The exegesis could have originated with Rashi as easily as it could have been a clarifying marginal note. The sole occurrence of a citation in the manuscripts verified could be due to the later dating of the manuscript or the lack of an engaging issue in either the biblical text or Rashi's comment and not to a consistent concern of Tosafot exegesis.

(3) Finally, in 14:2, Rashi's comment on the lemma בלע is cited in two manuscripts. The biblical verse lists the kings upon whom war is being made.⁶⁴ The final king mentioned is מלך בלע היא צער. Rashi's comment in the printed editions states that בלע is העיר.⁶⁵ The explanation responds to the feminine pronoun היא, which should be masculine if referring to the name of the king.⁶⁶ Rashi clarifies that בלע refers to the name of the city, which according to the verse, is also known as צער.

(a) The passage in Moscow-Guenzburg 317 reads as follows:⁶⁷

בלע מרשי שם העיר ר"ל דרשי דייק מדכתיי בלע היא צוער דאם הוא שם
 אדם לא שייך לאומר היא צוער [וויאכל] קשה למה לא הזכיר ג"כ המלך
 כמו באחרים ד"ל דאיפשר דשם של אותו מלך לא היה על שם רשעתו
 כמו
 שמאבי ושנאב כדפרישות והא כתיי לא בדבר שמותם אלא להודעין
 רשעתם.

64. Verse 14:2 is עשו מלחמה את ברע מלך סדם ואת ברשע מלך עמרה שנאב מלך אדמה
 ושמאבר מלך צביים (צבויים) ומלך בלע היא-צער.

65. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 138, 342; Berliner (1905), 25. (The Rome edition actually reads שם עיר instead of העיר.)

66. In other words, if the phrase is meant to read "and the king of Bela was Tsoar," than the היא should be הוא. However, cities are feminine, and therefore, the feminine pronoun must be referring to the name of the city - "And the king of [the city of] Bela [which] is [also known as] Tsoar."

67. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 15a. The word in square brackets is as it appears in the manuscript. However, it appears to be an error because its meaning is unclear.

The comment addresses two issues: the question behind Rashi's comment, and the variant style in the introduction of this king in the biblical text. The exegete explains that Rashi specifies that בלע is the name of the city because, if it referred to the name of a man, it would not read היא but הוא. The problem that remains is why the text does not mention the name of the king of בלע, as it does with all the other kings. The suggestion is made that perhaps the name of the king of בלע did not express the wickedness of the king as did the names of the other kings, and that in fact the names of the kings are not in the text in order for the reader to know the kings' names but that he/she should perceive the evil within them.

(b) The second citation for Rashi's comment in 14:2 is in New York - JTS L819a/1, a sixteenth-century manuscript of a super-commentary on Rashi. This text is faded and difficult to read, and the comments do not follow the sequential order of the verses within each *parashah*. Each comment and super-comment is an independent paragraph that begins with a citation of Rashi. The passage for this lemma reads:⁶⁸

בלע שם העיר זהו סיוע לדרש שדרש שמות שאר מלכים על שם רשעים וזה
לפי שלא נתמלא סאתם עדין לכך שנתרסה שמן דאלייכ למה לא הזכיר
בשם כמו השאר ולכך נוצלה עמו עיי לוט כמו שמפרש שם.

The exegete in this text is more concerned with the *derash* related to Rashi's comment than with Rashi's explanation itself.⁶⁹ He expounds that Rashi's identification of בלע as the name of a city suggests that the lack of a *derash* on the king's name and his wickedness is due to the idea that "their measure was not yet full," and therefore his name is not specified like the others.

In both these texts, the citation of Rashi conforms to its identical representation in the printed editions. The comments refer to the exception that exists with the mention of בלע in relation to the other kings in the verse, as well as to the midrashic texts that explain the names of the kings in light of their wickedness. The idea that the omission of the king's name is a statement on the king's wickedness, or lack thereof, is easily assumed.

68. New York - JTS L819a/1 [IMHM 24053], fol. 3a.

69. Tanḥuma נ לך and BR 42:5 (Theodor-Albeck, vol. 1, 409-410; Mirkin, vol. 2, 124) both explore the meaning in the various kings' names. Neither passage mentions בלע.

Similar to the comments for 10:2 and 11:10, these Tosafot passages relate more to Rashi's exegetical motives and the difficulties in the biblical verse than to an edifying difficulty with the suggestions made in Rashi's commentary. This difference may account for the fewer number of citations of this comment in the Tosafot manuscripts. The style of Moscow-Guenzburg 317 and the late date of both manuscripts may also render suspect the reliability of the citations of this comment in them. The appearance of this Rashi comment in these particular manuscripts is no more valuable than its conforming presentation in the printed editions, most of which pre-date these two texts.

The inconclusive nature of these lemmata that are cited only minimally is, nonetheless, supportive of the value of Tosafot citations in reconstructing the original Rashi, as well as of the importance of conformity to this process. The examples presented above from 10:2, 11:10 and 14:2 are not cited sufficiently in the manuscripts examined to be deemed unquestionably authentic or inauthentic. The comments are brief and directly related to the verse, with two of them having a source in rabbinic texts. All of these factors can be associated with Rashi's exegetical methods, as well as with the nature of scribal interference.

The comments, however, are similar in style and length to one another, and the Tosafot exegeses related to them also conform to each other in terms of their concerns and interests. In addition, these uniquely cited comments appear in the same manuscript, and both manuscripts are dated quite late. Had a uniquely cited comment appeared in an early manuscript or had each uniquely cited comment appeared in a different manuscript, or had each been of a different exegetical character, the lack of conformity would weaken considerably the ability of the Tosafot citations to reflect an accurate text of Rashi.

By examining the manuscripts and the nature of the Tosafot concerns, in the comments that appeared identically in the printed texts, the conformity among the manuscripts in which the uniquely cited comments appear and in the nature of the exegeses related to them allows for a stronger analysis of the citations, as well as of those comments that are not cited at all. In general, the Tosafot tended to be more concerned with those comments of Rashi that raised a moral issue or challenged an edifying concern. The simple, *peshat*-like comments of Rashi are

often shorter in length and therefore are more likely to appear identically in all printed editions; at the same time, they are less likely to be of concern to the Tosafot.

The next section will explore briefly the remaining four lemmata in which Rashi's comments are presented identically in the printed editions of the commentary but are not cited in any of the Tosafot manuscripts examined. The patterns of conformity established among those comments that are cited either in full according to the printed editions or not cited at all will help in the analysis of those comments that are only cited partially, either consistently or inconsistently, based on the example of the printed editions.

3. Identical Printed Comments Never Cited

Four comments appear identically in all printed editions but are not cited by the Tosafot in any of the manuscripts verified. An examination of the exegetical nature of these comments will help to support the argument that comments not cited by Tosafot may have existed in the original commentary. The interests of the Tosafot may not have revolved around Rashi's simpler comments. Rather, those comments that did not carry greater moral lessons (or in some other way stimulate or participate in controversy) may not have been discussed and interpreted by the Tosafot to the same extent as others that challenged or questioned accepted practices and beliefs. Distinguishing between comments that addressed issues that could have interested the Tosafists and those that, according to previously established patterns of conformity, might not have done so, will help defend the authenticity of those comments never cited.

(1) Gen. 7:5 states that Noah did all that God had commanded him: ויעש נח זה ביאתו לתיבה.⁷⁰ ככל אשר צוהו ה' God commanded Noah to do a number of things related to the ark, and here and in verse 6:22, the text relates that Noah did as God commanded. Rashi's comment, based on a midrashic source,⁷¹ identifies exactly which command is being followed for each statement of ויעש. This verse refers to Noah's coming to the ark

70. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 81, 328; Berliner (1905) 15.

71. BR 32:5 (Theodor-Albeck, vol. 1, 293; Mirkin, vol. 2, 30).

after its building but before boarding. Since the biblical text essentially declares the same point twice - that Noah did all that God commanded - the midrash is inclined to understand a distinct meaning in each declaration. Despite its midrashic quality, this comment is simple and related to the words of the verse and the context of the narrative.

(2) In verse 17:10, God establishes through circumcision the covenant between Himself and Abraham and future generations. The text reads: **ואת בריתי אשר תשמרו ביני וביניכם ובין זרעך אחריו המול לכם כל זכר**. Rashi's comment for the lemma **ביני וביניכם** is **אותם של עכשיו**.⁷² The plural **וביניכם** suggests that God is making a covenant with Abraham and his descendants. But this assumption renders the subsequent phrase in the verse, **ובין זרעך אחריו**, redundant. Rashi clarifies that **וביניכם** refers to those descendants that already exist, suggesting that the subsequent phrase refers to those generations not yet born.

The concern of this comment with the specific meaning of each phrase of the text follows the midrashic attribution of purpose and meaning to every word and letter included in the Torah. The explanation does not take the narrative beyond its basic context, and is not unlike the comment at 7:5.

(3) Gen. 17:12 specifies the age at which males are to be circumcised, as well as the application of the covenant to both sired and adopted children. The verse reads: **ובן שמת ימים ימול לכם כל זכר לדרתכם יליד בית ומקנת כסף מכל בן**. Rashi's comment for the lemma **ומקנת כסף** is **שקנאו**.⁷³ It explains that someone bought after his birth must also be circumcised. The simple clarification defines a term perhaps unfamiliar in the context of babies and changes nothing from the meaning or implication of the biblical text.

(4) Finally, in 17:23, where Abraham circumcises his son Ishmael and all the males born to his household, as well as those purchased after they were born, Rashi's comment for the verb **וימל** is identical in all printed editions. The verse reads: **ויקה אברהם את ישמעאל בנו ואת כל ילידי ביתו ואת כל מקנת כסף כל זכר באנשי בית אברהם וימל את בשר ערלתם בעצם היום הזה כאשר דבר אתו א-להים**.

72. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 172, 351; Berliner (1905) 30.

73. *Ibid.*

Rashi's comment for the lemma **וימל** is **לשון ויפעל**.⁷⁴ It explains that the verb **וימל**, and he circumcised, is in the simple, active stem conjugation of the verb (**בנין קל**). The reason for this grammatical comment might be the irregular conjugation of the root **מול** or the desire to differentiate between other uses of the root in this section of the narrative.⁷⁵ As with the examples above, the exegetical nature of the comment does not lend itself to profundities.

The four comments of Rashi that are identical in the printed texts not cited in the Tosafot manuscripts are similar in style and exegetical character. None of them addresses an issue of moral character, life lessons, or controversial beliefs or practices. Rather, each comment focuses on a simple textual clarification within the context of the narrative.

4. Conclusion

The examples presented in the above three sections demonstrate two kinds of conformity that both substantiate the ability of the Tosafot citations of Rashi to offer an accurate text of the original commentary. First, the conformity in the citations of two identical printed comments among numerous manuscripts of various styles and qualities demonstrates that the Tosafot did cite Rashi's comments regularly and consistently. Secondly, the conformity in the exegetical character of those comments not cited at all, as well as those cited only minimally, elucidate the types of issues that concerned the Tosafot more regularly and those to which they rarely had anything to add or need to explain or explore. Moreover, the conformity in the manuscript that contained uniquely cited comments⁷⁶ exhibits the ability of the manuscripts themselves to manifest their own reliability, quality and value in their presentation of Rashi's commentary.

The second half of this chapter will examine those comments that are cited fully and consistently in the Tosafot manuscripts but are not exactly identical in the printed editions of the commentary. This conformity among the citations will further substantiate the ability of the Tosafot to determine the original text.

74. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 178, 352; Berliner (1905) 32.

75. For example, **וימל** or **וימל** in **vv. 17:10; 17:12; 17:13; 17:14** and **וימל** in **17:11**.

76. *Moscow-Guenzburg* 317 [IMHM 47585].

C. Conforming Citations

Certain comments among the lemmata of Rashi's work cannot be identified as identical because of minor inconsistencies that do not alter the essential meaning of the interpretation but nonetheless are present. The variants in spelling, abbreviations, and conjunctions that separate the textual version of each edition are the sort of inconsequential variants routinely overlooked when analyzing citations. A degree of scribal corruption is accepted in every text, and even greater textual liberties are expected in the copying of someone else's representation of the original writing.

Once these minor variants can be tentatively overlooked, the analysis of the Tosafot citations of Rashi's commentary on Genesis sheds light on significant patterns of conformity. Comments that are cited in many different manuscripts of varying quality demonstrate which issues are of interest to the Tosafot. More importantly, the numerous, consistent citations extracted from these manuscripts support a textual authenticity to the comments, despite the presence of variants in the printed editions. In fact, when patterns of conformity among certain citations were noticed and the comments then verified in the printed texts, the textual variants in them were minor and insignificant to the meaning of the interpretation.

Since the printed texts have been shown to harbour much textual corruption, and their ability to serve as a standard by which to measure the contribution of the citations is tenuous at best, alternating the sources from which patterns of conformity are analyzed helps to overcome the weaknesses in the texts' ability to serve as standards for comparison. In addition, issues of content, Tosafist concerns, and manuscript reliability can be minimized by approaching the citations both from the perspective of the problematic printed text and the unpredictable citations.

The examples in the first half of this chapter have explored comments that are exactly identical in the printed editions. The citations in the Tosafot manuscripts confirmed the conformity of the printed text through numerous, consistent representations of the comment in a variety of exegetical manuscripts. In addition, those identical comments that were not cited conformed in terms of the

nature of the interpretation, suggesting that their absence from the Tosafot manuscripts may be due to a lack of interest on the part of the Tosafot, rather than a lack of authenticity.

The subsequent section will examine comments that are cited completely according to the printed text and consistently in many kinds of manuscripts. With minimal and insignificant variants in the printed versions of these comments, the recurring citations in Tosafot will be able to corroborate their authenticity.

1. *Genesis 6:13*

In Rashi's comment on Gen. 6:13, three lemmata are explained.⁷⁷ The first two are cited consistently and frequently in the Tosafot manuscripts, usually within a single discussion. The biblical verse reports God's statement to Noah that the end of all flesh has come before Him because the earth is filled with violence and so God will destroy it. The Hebrew text is the following:

ויאמר אלהים לנח קץ כל בשר בא לפני כי מלאה הארץ חמס מפניהם
והנני משחיתם את הארץ.

Rashi's comments on קץ כל בשר (6:13a) and כי מלאה הארץ חמס (6:13b) explain why *all* flesh was to be destroyed. They also clarify the purpose for the phrase כי מלאה הארץ חמס, since verse 11 has already reported that the earth had become filled with violence.⁷⁸ The source for both his interpretations is found in numerous midrashim.⁷⁹

In essence, the comment for 6:13a explains that wherever one finds lewdness (זנות), indiscriminate punishment (אנדרולומוסיה)⁸⁰ befalls the world and kills both good and evil. In other words, "*all* flesh was to be destroyed" because of the presence of lewdness. The comment for 6:13b clarifies that the goal of the

77. The lemmata are: את הארץ and כי מלאה הארץ חמס, קץ כל בשר.

78. Verse 11 states ותמלא הארץ חמס.

79. The following texts all discuss the indiscriminate punishment (אנדרולומוסיה) that will befall both good and evil because of lewdness. BR 26:5 (Theodor and Albeck, vol. 2, 248-249; Mirkin, vol. 1, 195); LevitR. 23:9 (Mirkin, vol. 8, 49); NumR. 9:33 (Mirkin, vol. 9, 211); Tanhuma. בראשית 12 (*Midrash Tanhuma* (Warsaw), fol. 8b); BT San. 108a; PT Sot. פ"א ח"ה.

80. See M. Jastrow, *ספר מליס*, vol. 1 (New York: 1989) 81.

seemingly repetitive statement regarding the presence of violence is to specify that their fate was sealed only on account of the robbery they committed.⁸¹

Excluding מנחת יהודה for the moment, both lemmata are cited in fifteen Tosafot manuscripts; קץ כל בשר alone and כי מלאה הארץ חמס alone are each cited in one document. From the twelve manuscripts of מנחת יהודה examined, both lemmata are cited in ten manuscripts; קץ כל בשר appears alone in one. The fact that both lemmata are cited in a particular manuscript does not suggest necessarily that both comments form part of one Tosafot discussion. In some instances, each comment is cited at the beginning of its own explanatory passage.

Since the focus of this section is the consistency among the citations, only the actual citations of the comments are presented for analysis. The discussions and concerns of the Tosafot regarding these comments are summarized in the analyses, as required.

(a) Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) cites 6:13a as part of its own discussion and then paraphrases the same comment in a subsequent section that contrasts 6:13a with a citation of 6:13b. The texts read:⁸²

קץ כל בשר בא לפני פ"ה כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיא בא
לעולם והורג טובים ורעים...

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פ"ה לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל לפי דיהשא
קשה למיד פיר דמשום זנות אנדרומוסיא בא לעולם אלא דנתחתם גזר
דינם על הזנות ואחר כך דלא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל דווקא...

The citation of 6:13b in the first line sets up the problem addressed in many Tosafot manuscripts. Rashi's comment on 6:13a suggests that the reason for the destruction of all flesh is the presence of lewdness, yet the comment for 6:13b claims that the fate of the flood generation was sealed specifically because of the robbery they committed. The resolution of this seeming contradiction in the two comments varies from text to text.⁸³

81. According to Jastrow 478, חמס has the meaning of violence or extortion.

82. Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738], fol. 3a.

83. See Gellis, vol. 1, 204-207 for a selection of Tosafot comments on this problem.

The citations of 6:13a and 6:13b reflect accurately the ideas expressed in the printed versions of Rashi's work. In order to demonstrate the discernable pattern of conformity in the citations of this comment, the presentation of the actual texts of the printed editions will succeed the texts of the citations. The purpose of this organization is to impress upon the reader the compelling evidence of the citations which then can be substantiated by the printed comments.

(b) Parma 837 (2058) cites the following:⁸⁴

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרשי לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקש על
פירו הא פיר כבר על קץ כל בשר כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיא
בא לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

Like the second passage of Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604), the comments of 6:13a and 6:13b in this manuscript are contrasted; however, in this text, the comment for 6:13a is clearly intended to be an actual citation as opposed to the paraphrase presented in the previous manuscript. The phrase **הא פיר כבר על קץ כל בשר** with its inclusion of the lemma introduces the quotation; in Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604), the words **למיד פיר** submit only what is learned from the comment, namely that lewdness leads to indiscriminate punishment. The only textual difference between the citations in each manuscript is the word **הורג** in the first passage in Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) and **הורגת** in Parma 837 (2058). Obviously, the presence or absence of the **ת** does not alter the meaning of the interpretation.

(c) New York - JTS L792/1 includes citations of both comments, each at the beginning of its own passage. The citation for 6:13a is:⁸⁵

קץ כל בשר בא לפני פ"ה כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרלומוסיא באה
לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

The feminine **באה**, which is **בא** in the previous citations, agrees better with the feminine **הורגת**, and both **אנדרלומוסיא** and **אנדרומוסיא** are defined in Jastrow's **ספר מלים** as indiscriminate punishment.⁸⁶ This suggests that the variant

84. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], second and third fols. of פרשת נח.

85. New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022], fol. 6a.

86. Jastrow 81. The actual words of the definition are: "punishment of men regardless of guilt or innocence."

representations in the citations may reflect different traditions regarding the spelling or pronunciation of this term in its earlier sources and that it is not necessarily a scribal error or textual inconsistency that arose in the transmission of Rashi's comment. In any case, neither of these variants affects the meaning of the comment, nor do they alter the basic conformity between the citations.

The citation for 6:13b is identical to the previous examples:⁸⁷

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פ"ה לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל...

(d) Sassoon 409/1 discusses both comments in one passage and the comment for 6:13b alone in a second passage. The two texts are as follows:⁸⁸

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרש מכאן משמי שלא נגזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשי שהרי ר"ש בעצמו אמי שבכל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולומוסי באה לעולם פי זנות הורגת רעים וטובים אלמא דגזר דינם היה על הזנות....

כי מלאה הארץ חמס רש אומי שלא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל היה לו לומי לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על החמס...

The first passage presents the comments in a looser, paraphrastic style as opposed to a verbatim quotation, although the essence of both comments is maintained. The words מכאן משמי intimate an explanation of the comment for 6:13b as opposed to a simple copying of the words. The citation for 6:13a begins as a verbatim quotation, prefaced by the words ר"ש בעצמו אמי. The exegete interrupts the citation with the explanatory clause פי זנות, to ensure that the reader understands the contradiction between these two comments.

The second passage cites Rashi's comment in conformity with the previous examples and supports the notion that the reference to the comment for 6:13b in the first passage was intended as an explanatory paraphrase. Textual variants between these examples and the previous citations continue to be at the level of missing or added letters, abbreviations, and, in the first passage, the reversal of the order of the words רעים וטובים. The sense of the interpretation is

87. New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022], fol. 6a.

88. Sassoon 409/1 IMHM 9353], p. 6. [Page numbers are marked on the bottom of each page].

not altered nor do any of these variants call into question all or part of the comments' authenticity.

(e) London 173.2 (Add. 11,566) cites the comments for both lemmata in a single, lengthy discussion. The citations themselves appear as follows:⁸⁹

קץ כל בשר פרשי אנדרלמוסיה באה לעולם וכי... כי מלאה הארץ חמס
פרש לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא הגזל וקשיא שאמי ... לעיל פרש עצמו כל
מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרלמוסיה באה לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

The presence of **וכי** in the first citation of 6:13a could theoretically raise the question as to how much of the comment known to modern readers was known to the scribe and intended as part of the "*et cetera*." The complete citation further on in the comment confirms this text's conformity with the earlier examples. The citation of 6:13b is consistent as well; the absence of the word **על** can be attributed easily to scribal error and does not challenge the validity of the text.

(f) Moscow-Guenzburg 317 includes partial citations of both comments:⁹⁰

לא נתחתם גזר דינם וכי וא"ת והא לעיל פי כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות
כי משמע משום זנות...

The use of **וכי** precludes the comparison of the details of this scribe's rendition of the comment; however, the juxtaposition of the two comments conforms with their presentation in the other manuscripts and suggests that the actual texts of the interpretation conformed as well. The inclusion of **וכי** implies that more text existed but was not cited, rather than that the abbreviated comments were the original versions.

(g) The issue of abbreviated citations is more complex in Cambridge 1215,5 (Add. 1215,5), where a partial citation of 6:13a, without **וכי**, begins two separate discussions, and complete citations of both 6:13a and 6:13b appear in a third passage. The texts follow:⁹¹

89. London 173.2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fols. 7b-8a.

90. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 8b.

91. Cambridge 1215,5 (Add. 1215,5) [IMHM 17078]. fol. 12a.

(h) New York - JTS L791 presents this same juxtaposition in its citations of 6:13a and 6:13b. The text in this manuscript reads:⁹²

פ"יה לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקי' שהרי לעיל פי' כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרלמוסיה באה לעולם והורגת טובי' ורעים...

This passage is the same as most of the citations presented above, and the textual variants between them are virtually non-existent.

(i) Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) cites each comment as part of its own separate discussion. The texts are the following:⁹³

קץ כל בשר פרשי כל מקו' שיש בו זנו' אנדרומוי באה לעלם והורגי רעי' וטובים...

חמס פרשי לא נחתי גזר דיני' אלא על הגזל...

Besides the frequent use of abbreviations in these citations, the one significant textual difference here is the phrase *שיש בו זנות*, which is cited as *שאתה מוצא זנות* in the other renditions. The sense of the comment is not changed by this variant, which suggests perhaps that the author was citing Rashi's comment from memory. One could also argue that the very existence of this variant intimates a lack of authenticity to the comment; however, the manifest conformity among the texts of the other manuscripts and in the meaning of the interpretation weakens this perspective.

(j) Jerusalem 8°5138 (B200) cites both comments in abbreviated form. The inclusion of *וכו'* in each citation indicates that the scribe was aware of more text than was being presented in this document. Like Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52), 6:13a and 6:13b are cited at the beginning of separate discussions. The texts are the following:⁹⁴

קץ כל בשר פרשי כל מקום שאתה וכו' טובים ורעים...

92. New York - JTS L791 [IMHM 24021], fol. 7b.

93. Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fol. 6a.

94. Jerusalem 8°5138 (B200), fols. 2a, 3a.

חמס פרשי לא נתחתם גזר דינם וכוי...

The presence of **וכוי** in the middle of the citation of 6:13a, with the words **טובים** included at the end, confirms the existence of the rest of the comment. One could argue that the **וכוי** at the end of the citation for 6:13b was added to the text by a later scribe who was familiar with a longer comment, but that the original author only possessed these first four words. Even so, the frequent discussions of whether **זנות** or **גזל** was the cause of the flood generation's downfall, as well as the particular comment that follows in this manuscript, which refers to the sin of **גזל**, affirm Tosafist knowledge of a comment longer than the citation above as well as an association of the comment with Rashi.

(k) The citations of 6:13a and 6:13b in Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 appear in the same discussion in which the concept of **זנות** and **גזל** are contrasted. The text reads:⁹⁵

כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות וכוי לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הזנות
ואחר כך נאמי לא נחתם אלא על הגזל...

Identifying which aspects of this passage are intended as direct quotations of Rashi's comment and which are paraphrases of the ideas can prove difficult. One could question legitimately whether Rashi said the words **לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא** **לא נחתם אלא על הזנות** in addition to the words **לא נחתם אלא על הגזל**.

Since the issue being addressed in this passage conforms with the cited passages in previous examples, the sense of this text becomes clearer: the idea that in 6:13a Rashi suggests that **זנות** is the reason for the flood seems to contradict his comment in 6:13b, where he states that the fate of the flood generation was sealed only on account of their sin of robbery. For this reason, 6:13a is only cited up until the most relevant word, **זנות**. The **וכוי** indicates that more comment exists but is not included.

The remaining part of the citation is essentially a paraphrase of the contradiction of 6:13a and 6:13b. Using the words of 6:13b, the exegete expresses the difficulty that from the cited phrase of 6:13a, the fate of the flood

95. Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 [IMHM 15890], first folio of פרשת נח, ninth folio from the beginning of the ms.

generation appears to have been sealed on account of זנות, but afterwards the comment at 6:13b states that גזל was the sole cause of their fate.

In this passage, the citations of 6:13a and 6:13b are not complete. In fact, the comment for 6:13b is not really cited verbatim, at all. However, the information provided in this citation regarding these two comments does not contradict or supplant the conformity established in previous examples. Rather, the issue being addressed in this text corroborates this citation's conformity with the above citations and supports the interpretations' presence in the original commentary.

(l) Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) cites 6:13a in one discussion and then both 6:13a and 6:13b together in another. The citations are:⁹⁶

קץ כל בשר טובי ורעי קי והלא כלם...

כי מלאה הארץ מכאן שלא נגזר גזר דיני אלי על הגזל וקי שהרי פי מיד
כל מקוי שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומסיה בא לעולם והורגי טובי ורעי...

The first passage in this Tosafot manuscript discusses whether good people existed at this time, because verse 6:12 states על דרכו כל בשר את דרכו, כי השחית כל בשר את דרכו על הארץ, that *all* flesh had corrupted its way on the earth. For this reason, only the relevant words from 6:13a, regarding the good and evil people (טובים ורעים), are cited. The explanation for the incomplete citation is justified by the longer and complete citation which appears in the second passage.

The citation for 6:13b differs from other renditions of this comment in the word נגזר; other texts cite the word נתחם (or נתחם). The root חתם in its נפעל form means to be sealed, and גזר in its נפעל form means to be decreed.⁹⁷ The sense of either word in the context of the comment does not alter the interpretation.

The scribe or student in this text may have been citing the comment from memory, and the word נתחם was accidentally changed to נגזר. The predominance of נתחם (or נתחם) in most of the cited passages establishes the preference for this word's legitimacy as opposed to that of נגזר.

96. Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], first fol. of פרשת נח.

97. Jastrow 514, 231.

(m) Warsaw 204/27 cites comments for 6:13a and 6:13b in the same passage. The text reads:⁹⁸

פרשי לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל ק' לעיל אמ' אנדרלמוסיא באה
 כו' אם כן נגזרה גזרה בשביל הזנות פהררא לא נתחתם גזר דינם של רשעי
 אלא על הגזל ומשום הזנות נהרגו גם הטובים ולפי לשון רש"י משמע הכי
 דכתב גבי הזנות והורגת טובי' ורעים...

The citation of 6:13b is identical to the majority of representations in the other examples. The comment for 6:13a is not cited in full anywhere in this text, but its content is paraphrased throughout. The phrase לעיל אמ' אנדרלמוסיא באה כו' refers briefly to the words of Rashi's comment, while it explains the main agenda for its inclusion in this discussion, that in 6:13a זנות appears to be the reason for the flood, whereas in 6:13b the impetus is גזל. The words ולפי לשון רש"י משמע הכי דכתב גבי הזנות והורגת טובי' ורעים confirm that the scribe had more of Rashi's comment for 6:13a but did not see a need to cite it completely.

The full citation of 6:13b presented in juxtaposition to fragmentary representations of 6:13a continues to manifest the conformity found in the Tosafot manuscripts among the citations of these comments. The lack of a complete citation for 6:13a in this passage does not undermine this conformity, because the context in which the partial citations and paraphrases are presented follows the pattern witnessed in other documents. Moreover, no element of the brief references to this comment in any way contradicts or invalidates the full citations in the other texts.

(n) Vat. Ebr. 48/1 includes complete citations for both comments, one following the other. It then goes on to discuss the contradiction between them. The citations read as follows:⁹⁹

קץ כל בשר בא לפני פ"ה כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרלמוסלא בא
 לעולם והורגת הטובים עם הרעים כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרשי לא נתחתם
 גזר דינם אלא על הגזל...

98. Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fols. 220a-220b.

99. Vat. Ebr. 48/1 [IMHM 165], fol. 3b.

Two minor textual variants appear in this citation. The first is אנדרומוסלא, which is close enough to the other renditions of this word to be a simple copying error. The second is the phrase הטובים עם הרעים, which appears in other citations as (רעים וטובים) or טובים ורעים. The essential meaning of the phrase, that both the good and evil will be killed on account of the lewdness, is not altered with the version in this manuscript. The variant perhaps stresses that, while the evil obviously would be killed, in this particular case the good are killed with them. The difference in nuance is miniscule in significance and, as a whole, the citations of 6:13a and 6:13b in this text conform with their citations in the previous examples.

(o) Akin to Vat. Ebr. 48/1, Leiden 27 (Warn. 27; Cod. Or. 4765) also cites the comments for 6:13a and 6:13b one after the other.¹⁰⁰

קץ כל בשר בא לפני פרשי כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיה באה
לעולם והורג הטובים עם הרעים כי מלאה הארץ חמס לא נחתם גזר דינם
אלא על הגזל עייכ פרשי...

This passage conforms almost identically to the majority of representations of this comment in the preceding documents. The textual variant of the phrase הטובים עם הרעים appears in Vat. Ebr. 48/1 and can be explained in the same way. The words פרשי עייכ indicate clearly to the reader the end of the citation and the beginning of a discussion on it, and this confirms the limits inadvertently set in the citations above.

(p) Similarly, Paris héb. 260 has one passage that cites both comments:¹⁰¹

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרשי מכאן משמי שלא נגזר גזר דינם אלא על הגזל
וקי שהרי אומי רשי עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולומוסיה באה
לעולם והורגת טובים ורעי אינו אלא בשביל זנות אלא דגזר דינם היה על
הזנות ולא על הגזל...

The passage is reminiscent of several texts. The phrase שלא נגזר appears in most renditions as (נחתם) or שלא נחתם but is not unique to this manuscript.¹⁰² The sense of the comment is not altered by the change in words, and the variant

100. Leiden 27 (Warn. 27; Cod. Or. 4765) [IMHM 17371], fols. 5b-6a.

101. Paris héb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fol. 19a.

102. See above, the citations from Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739].

may represent a paraphrase that was transmitted erroneously as a verbatim quote.

(q) Vat. Ebr. 45/1 cites only the comment for 6:13a:¹⁰³

קץ כל בשר פרש אנדרומוסיא בא לעולם פיי דבר גדול בא לעולם.

The purpose of this brief, incomplete citation is the definition of the word אנדרומוסיא, and therefore the rest of the comment is not relevant to the exegete. While one certainly could argue that this citation is evidence of an original, shorter comment, or at least a sign of the longer version's questionable authenticity, the conformity among all the previous citations would have to be rejected as meaningless. Since the comment that accompanies the citation pertains directly to the cited part of the Rashi, the lack of וכי or the remainder of the comment does not undermine the conformity found among the majority of citations or invalidate the authenticity of the comment.

Also, the lack of a citation for 6:13b needs not question the legitimacy of this comment to the original work. Since even those comments that are included are cited only for their relevance to the discussion that follows, the idea that some comments were of no interest to a particular exegete and therefore not mentioned at all need not be of any consequence to their authenticity.

(r) Similarly, Oxford - Bodleian 271/2 (Opp. 31) only cites the comment for 6:13b:¹⁰⁴

חמס פרשי לא נחתם גזר דיניי אלא על הגזל...

This text presents the comment in conformity with the majority of examples above.

The lack of a citation for 6:13a can say more about the interests of the Tosafot in this exegetical work than about whether the comment was part of the original work of Rashi. Since both 6:13a and 6:13b are cited regularly in many manuscripts, their absence in any one particular document does not discard the arguments for their authenticity.

103. Vat. Ebr. 45/1 [IMHM 162], fol. 2b.

104. Oxford - Bodleian 271/2 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], second fol. of פרשת נח.

Rashi's comments for 6:13a and 6:13b are also cited in the exegetical work *מנחת יהודה*. Most of the manuscripts of this work cite and discuss 6:13a and then present both comments in juxtaposition to each other in a discussion of the contradiction between them. The passages extracted from these manuscripts are essentially the same in terms of content, structure, and style.

However, considering that these are all copies of the same work, the variants that do appear between them can prove very interesting.

(s) Parma 537 (2541) cites the following:¹⁰⁵

קץ כל בשר פירש אנדרולומסיה באה לעולם [צי"מ די"ע הער"ו]

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרש לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשיא שהרי לעיל פרש עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולומסיה באה לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

As discussed in the examples above, the brief citation of 6:13a in the first passage is redeemed by a fuller citation in the second passage.

(t) Budapest-Kaufmann A31 has a similar text:¹⁰⁶

קץ כל בשר פי רשי אנדרומסיה בא לעולי וכו' פי דבר כבוד בא לעולם כך מצאתי בער"ו.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פי רשי לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקי שהרי לעיי פי רשי עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומסיה בא לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

The comment that follows the citation in the first passage demonstrates that the focus for this author was the definition of the word *אנדרומסיה*.¹⁰⁷ This specific topic of exegesis could explain the abridged citation, which is subsequently presented in full in the next passage.

105. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 8a.

106. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 15a.

107. The author of this comment learned the definition of the word *אנדרומסיה* from *הערך*, which is an Aramaic lexicon compiled by Rabbi Natan ben Jehiel of Rome (1035-1110) in the twelfth century. See Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome, *ספר ערוך השלם מאת רבנו נתן בן רבנו יהואל*, eds. Alexander Kohut and Samuel Krauss, vol. 1 (Tel-Aviv: 1969-1970) 143 - *פי אנדרומסיה דבר כמו דרמסיות שבעי דלית* - For more on Rabbi Natan see "Nathan ben Jehiel," *EJ*, vol. 8, 859-860.

(u) Munich 62,1 also discusses 6:13a in one comment and then both 6:13a and 6:13b in a second passage, but the citations in this text are less complete, and the first comment contains significant variants.¹⁰⁸

קץ כל בשר פרשי כל מקום שיש בהן זנות רוח רעה באה לעולם והורגת
טובים ורעים ותימי והלא אותם שלא נכנסו...

חמס פרשי לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל והקי מדי והא עיקר עבודה
היה ערוה כדפי לעיל כל מקום שני זנות אנדרומוסיי באה לעולם כו'...

In the first passage, the phrase **קץ כל בשר פרשי** appears instead of the standard **שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיי**. However, in the second passage 6:13a is cited in conformity with other renditions, although in an abbreviated form. The fact that **מנחת יהודה** is a recognized, exegetical work and not an anthology of interpretations indicates that the lack of textual consistency from paragraph to paragraph is suggestive of a large degree of scribal corruption. Otherwise, one could propose that each passage originated from an independent source and was included in this one work of exegesis. While this may be the case, the idea that random comments were inserted under the guise of **מנחת יהודה** elucidates further the extent to which the copying process had the potential to alter an author's work.

(v) The citations in Paris héb. 168 are almost identical to that of Budapest Kaufmann A31:¹⁰⁹

קץ כל בשר פרשי אנדרולומסיי בא לעולם וכו' פי' דבר כבד בא לעולם כד
מצאתי בערך.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרשי לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשה
שהרי לעיל פרשי עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיי בא
לעולם והורגת רעים וטובים...

While the textual variants in these citations are essentially insignificant, since they do represent extracts of the same exegetical work, they are noteworthy, nonetheless. The word **אנדרולומסיי** in the first citation appears as **אנדרומוסיי** in the second passage, and the phrase **רעים וטובים** is reversed in the

108. Munich 62,1 [IMHM 23118], fol. 6b.

109. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 7b.

Budapest-Kaufmann A31 rendition. Many of these variants were exhibited in the non-יהודה-מנחת manuscripts, but the textual inconsistency among renditions of the same text and even within the same manuscript manifests clearly the degree of corruption.

(w) New York - JTS L790 also has a similar text:¹¹⁰

קץ כל בשר פרשי זל אנדרולמוסיא באה לעולם וכי פי דבר בא לעולם כד מצאתי בערוך.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרשי זל לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשיא דהא לעיל פי הוא בעצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולמוסיא באה לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

(x) New York - JTS L788 cites more of 6:13a in its first passage than do the previous examples, but it does not include the definition of the word אנדרולמוסיא. The second passage also compares 6:13a and 6:13b, but it differs sharply from the preceding texts:¹¹¹

קץ כל בשר פירשי כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולמוסיא באה לעולם כד מצאתי בערוך.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פי רשי כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולמוסיא באה לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...דהכי פירש לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא רשעים על הגזל ומשום זנות הורגת טובים ורעים...

The citation of 6:13b in the second passage is presented as part of the discussion and explanation of the contradiction between Rashi's two comments. The insertion of the word רשעים serves as a clarification that the evil people would be killed because of the גזל, but that, because of the זנות, both good and evil were to be killed. While the passage discusses the same main issue as the equivalent sections in the other יהודה-מנחת manuscripts, its presentations vary explicitly.

(y) New York - JTS L787 follows the pattern of Budapest Kaufmann A31 and New York - JTS L790:¹¹²

110. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 9a.

111. New York - JTS L788 [IMHM 24018], fol. 2b.

112. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fol. 4b.

קץ כל בשר פרשי אנדרומוסיא באה לעולם וכוי פיי דבר בא לעולם כך פי
בהערוך.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרשי לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשיא שהרי
לעיל פרשי עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיא באה לעולם
והורגת טובים ורעים...

פירש (z) New York - JTS L789 differs only in its presentation of the phrase

רשי.¹¹³

קץ כל בשר פיי רשי אנדרומוסיא באה לעולם פי דבר באה לעולם כך פי
בערוך.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פיי רשי לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשיא
שהרי לעיל פי רשי עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיא באה
לעולם והורגת טובים ורעים...

(aa) In Vat. Ebr. 53, the discussion in the first passage extends beyond the
definition of אנדרומוסיא, while the contrast of 6:13a and 6:13b remains the same
in the second passage:¹¹⁴

פרשי אנדרומוסיא באה לעולם פיי דבר יש שואלין על פי רשי כל מקום
שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיא באה לעולם היכן מצינו במקום אחר כמו
זה וייל...

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פי לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקי שהרי לעיל
פרשי כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרומוסיי באה לעולם והורגת טובים
...ורעים

The remarks that follow the citation of 6:13a include a second citation of the same
comment. This repetition intimates strongly a second exegetical passage
appended to the citation and subsequent definition of אנדרומוסיא that is common
to most of the מנחת יהודה manuscripts already examined. While the citations of
the Rashi comments continue to manifest conformity from one manuscript to the
next, the texts of the exegeses that follow demonstrate distinct variants. In this
context of explicit textual corruption, the minor textual variants within the citations

113. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fols. 5a-5b.

114. Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fol. 9a.

themselves are evidently insignificant, and their consistent conformity among the explicit corruption strengthens the argument for their authenticity.

(bb) Finally, the citations in Parma 527 (2368) are more similar to the earlier examples:¹¹⁵

קץ כל בשר פרש אנדרולומוסיה בא לעולם פי דבר כנד בא לעלם כד
מפרש בערוך

כי מלאה הארץ חמס פרש לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל וקשיא שהרי
לעיל פרשי עצמו כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות וכו'...

The abbreviated citation of 6:13a in the second passage is accompanied by וכו' and, as well, it cites a different part of the comment than is presented in the first passage. Moreover, since the content of the exegesis in the second discussion conforms with the previous examples, one can assume that the author of this manuscript knew of a longer text of Rashi's comment and chose to include it in an abridged form. The possibility also remains that the original version of מנחת יהודה abbreviated Rashi's comments, and later renditions of the work completed the citation. In either case, the citation of Rashi presented in these two passages does not challenge the conformity established among the other renditions of the work.

Despite the extensive corruption of the text and content of the מנחת יהודה super-commentary on Rashi, the citations of Rashi themselves do not contain significant variants, either in terms of text or content. In fact, the conformity manifested among the citations from the manuscripts of מנחת יהודה is substantiated further by their conformity with the citations extracted from the first set of Tosafot manuscripts of varying quality, date, and exegetical nature.

The examination of the manuscripts of Tosafot exegesis, including the מנחת יהודה texts and the extraction of conforming citations of the comments for 6:13a and 6:13b advocate for the authenticity of these comments to the original version of Rashi's commentary without requiring the faulty printed editions to serve as the standard for comparison. The citations on their own demonstrate an ability to present consistent evidence of Rashi's work.

115. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], fols. 6b-7a.

When the texts of the citations are verified against the printed editions, the tenuous nature of the printed editions is reinforced, and the reliability of the Tosafot citations is enhanced. The Venice and Guadalajara editions of the commentary present the comments most in conformity with the standard extracted from the citations.

The Venice edition reads the following:¹¹⁶

קץ כל בשר כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולומוסיה באה לעולם
והורגת טובים ורעים.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל.

The text of the Guadalajara edition is:¹¹⁷

קץ כל בשר כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרולומוסיה באה לעולם
והורגת טובים ורעים.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס לא נתחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל.

The only difference between these two versions is the spelling of אנדרולומוסיה, which does not have the *vav* after the *mem* in the Guadalajara edition, and the words נחתם and נתחתם. Both these variants, meaningless to the sense of the interpretation, are evident among the different Tosafist citations.

The Reggio printed edition has one significant variant that did not appear among any of the citations:¹¹⁸

קץ כל בשר כל מקום שאתה מוצא זאת אנדרולומוסיה באה לעולם
והורגת טובים ורעים.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס לא נתחת(ת)ם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל.

The spelling of אנדרולומוסיה differs yet again, and this edition prefers the word נחתם. The most interesting variant, however, is the word זאת instead of זנות. Obviously a scribal error misreading the word זנות, this variant renders Rashi's

116. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 74.

117. *Ibid.* 327.

118. *Ibid.*

comment meaningless. Rather than explaining that lewdness is the cause of indiscriminate death among both good and evil people, and thus God tells Noah that "the end of all flesh has come," the rendition of the Reggio text states that "this" is the cause of indiscriminate punishment, although the subject of the relative pronoun remains obscure and unintelligible.

Considering the prominence of זנות among the Tosafot discussions of Rashi's comment, this error reinforces both the lack of leamedness among those editing the printed editions and the gravity of the textual corruption. Despite its recognition as דפוס ראשון or the "First Edition,"¹¹⁹ the text of Reggio contains more significant errors than the variant minutiae found among the citations.

The Rome printing of the commentary contains an additional phrase at the end of 6:13a, which, without having consulted the Tosafot manuscripts, would have been considered a serious variant among the printed texts. This version reads:¹²⁰

קץ כל בשר כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות אנדרלמוסיה באה לעולם
והורגת טובים ורעים אנדרלמוסיה פי' דבר.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הנזל.

The phrase at the end of 6:13a is the definition of אנדרלמוסיה, which appears primarily in the מנחת יהודה manuscripts. The exploration of the citations in Tosafot exegetical works helps to eliminate phrases and comments that have become appended to Rashi's work but that did not originate there. The definition of אנדרלמוסיה obviously formed part of the super-comment, but without the resource of the Tosafot citations, the variant becomes part of an extensive assortment of phrases and words that may have been either added to or omitted from one edition or another. An analysis of Tosafot exegeses and their relationship to Rashi's commentary helps to resolve some of these anomalies.

The repeated presence of this phrase in the Tosafot literature again calls into question the competency of the editors of the printed editions, and it also

119. Offenberg 493; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 309.

120. *Rashi Ha-Shalem*, vol. 1, 327.

elucidates the inadequacy of these works to serve as standard versions of the commentary.

Finally, Berliner's edition contains only one minor variant. The text is as follows:¹²¹

קץ כל בשר כל מקום שאתה מוצא זנות (ועי"ז) אנדרלומוסיא באה לעולם
והורגת טובים ורעים.

כי מלאה הארץ חמס לא נחתם גזר דינם אלא על הגזל.

The additional acronym ועי"ז is in parentheses, presumably because Berliner was unclear as to whether it formed part of the original commentary. He probably found the abbreviation in a minority of the manuscripts he consulted, and hence he included it in parentheses. Its appearance in the comment suggests that both lewdness *and* idolatry lead to indiscriminate punishment.¹²²

Almost every Tosafot comment consulted contrasted זנות with גזל, with no mention of idolatry, and none of the other printed editions included the acronym (or the words) in its rendition. Berliner's inclusion of the term, even in parentheses, demonstrates his tendency to be inclusive in his choices rather than exclusive. His acknowledgement of students' comments and scribal additions appended to the body of the commentary¹²³ does not translate into a critical apparatus elucidating these layers, and the conformity both among the citations of Rashi in the Tosafot as well as in their discussions of the comments suggests that Berliner's inclusion of the acronym was unjustified. As with the other printed texts, the problematic nature of Berliner's edition is reinforced through the analysis of the Tosafot texts and their citations of Rashi.

121. Berliner (1905) 14.

122. Worth mentioning is the presence of the phrase in Rashi's comment for 6:11, for the lemma ותשתת. The comment begins לשון ערה ועי"ז. See *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 73, 327; Berliner (1905) 13. The rabbinic source for this comment is BT San. 56b-57a, in which the prooftexts indicating that the sons of Noah were commanded against idolatry (עי"ז) and גלוי עריית (of which זנות is assumed to be a form) are discussed. The linking of sexual improprieties with idolatry may have led to the inclusion of ועי"ז in Rashi's comment for 6:13a. (See *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 73, fn 28, for other sources).

123. Berliner (1905) viii-ix.

Rashi's comments for 6:13a and 6:13b were established through the citations of these interpretations in manuscripts of Tosafot works of exegesis. From manuscript to manuscript, the conformity in the citations substantiated the authenticity of these remarks. It also served as a standard for verifying the variants in the printed editions. Since neither the printed editions nor any one Tosafot manuscript represents a reliable version of the original Rashi commentary, patterns of conformity in both resources must be established, elucidated, and analyzed in order for the comments to be validated.

In this example, the extraction of the citations from the Tosafot manuscripts, with the evaluation of the significance of the textual variants, (or the lack thereof), established the pattern for a conforming text. The subsequent verification of the printed editions corroborated the evidence while supporting the notions both that the citations have much to contribute to a textual analysis of Rashi's commentary and that the printed editions lack the textual reliability popularly attributed to them.

2. Genesis 6:19

Rashi's comment for this verse consists of two lemmata. The first lemma, מכל החי, will be the subject of the subsequent discussion.¹²⁴ In the verse itself, God tells Noah that he should bring to the ark two of "every living thing of all flesh." The Hebrew text is:

ומכל החי מכל בשר שנים מכל תביא אל התבה להחית אתך זכר ונקבה
יהיו.

The comment addresses the apparent redundancy of the phrases מכל החי and מכל בשר, since one clause could have been sufficient to convey the types of beings to be invited on the ark. Rashi's source in *Bereshit Rabba* (31:13)

124. מכל החי is the second lemma in Rashi's comment for this verse.

suggests that each phrase alludes to a specific category of creature; specifically that demons who are living but not made of flesh were to be included on the ark.¹²⁵

The citation of Rashi's comment for this lemma appears in sixteen Tosafot manuscripts. Fourteen of them present Rashi's comment as אפילו שדים.¹²⁶

Textual variants among these fourteen manuscripts include the conjunction ו preceding the word אפילו,¹²⁷ an additional *yod* after the ש in שידים,¹²⁸ and the definite article on the word השידים.¹²⁹ Two renditions do not abbreviate אפילו.¹³⁰ None of these variants alters the meaning of the interpretation nor requires profound analyses.

The Tosafot discussions regarding this citation either explain the difficult issue addressed in Rashi's interpretation¹³¹ or include a passage from מדרש מדרש that expounds a conversation between Noah and a demon named תהלים

-
125. BR 31:13, Theodor-Albeck, vol. 1, 287; Mirkin, vol. 2, 24-25. Most texts of BR read אפילו רוחות. The Theodor-Albeck edition has ושדים in the notes to be appended to the phrase אפילו רוחות as a variant reading. Both Ms. Vat. Ebr. 60 and Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30 of BR read אפילו רוחות only. *Midrash Bereshit Rabba, Codex Vatican 60* (Ms. Vat. Ebr. 60) (Jerusalem: Makor, 1972) 105, and *Midrash Bereshit Rabba* (Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30) (Jerusalem: Makor, 1971) fol. 29b. Cf. also *Midrash Bereshit Rabati*, 61 (6:19), 66 (7:16).
126. Oxford-Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738], fol. 3b; Oxford-Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], first fol. of פרשת נח; Oxford-Bodleian 284 (Marsh. 225) [IMHM 16752], second fol. of פרשת נח; Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], third fol. of פרשת נח; New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022], fol. 6a; Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 9b; New York - JTS L793 [IMHM 24023], fol. 5a; Cambridge 1215, 5 [IMHM 17078], fol. 13a; Paris héb. 167/3 [IMHM 4154], fol. 106a; Vat. Ebr. 45/1 [IMHM 162], fol. 3a; Vat. Ebr. 48/1 [IMHM 165], fol. 4a; Munich 62, 1 [IMHM 23118], fol. 6b; New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 13b; Leiden 27 (Wam. 27; Cod. Or. 4765) [IMHM 17371], fol. 6a.
127. Oxford-Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738]; New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022]; New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020].
128. Vat. Ebr. 45/1 [IMHM 162].
129. Leiden 27 (Wam. 27; Cod. Or. 4765) [IMHM 17371].
130. Oxford 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738] and Moscow-Guenzburg 317.
131. Namely, the redundancy of the two phrases מכל בשר and מכל חיי.

שיקרא.¹³² The conformity among both the citations and the Tosafist super-comments establishes the text of Rashi's comment for 6:19a, and supports its authenticity.¹³³

Two manuscripts from the sixteen present citations of Rashi that differ from the conforming renditions in the other documents. Oxford - Bodleian 283 (Hunt. 569) cites the following:¹³⁴

ומכל החי לרבות את השדים...

The sense of the interpretation is maintained in this variant citation, which explains that the phrase מכל החי is different from מכל בשר because it *includes* the demons.

The discussion that follows presents the conversation between Noah and the demon.¹³⁵ The textual variant could suggest a paraphrase of the idea expressed in Rashi's commentary and hence was not intended as a verbatim quotation. Since almost all the citations are relatively identical, minimal importance can be placed on one text that does not alter the meaning of the comment in any way.

The text of the citation in Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) differs more significantly. It reads:¹³⁶

פרשי מכל החי אפני צמדי...

צמד is a yoke or a pair of working animals tied to a yoke.¹³⁷ The reason these animals would be singled out in the phrase מכל החי or מכל בשר is unclear, as is any potential relationship to demons. The subject of the discussion surrounding this citation is a comparison of Rashi's understanding of the phrase מכל החי with

132. S. Buber (ed.), *מדרש תחלים חמכנה שוחר טוב* (New York: Om Publishing, 1947), מזמור ז, יא, fol. 35a (p. 69). Essentially, the demon שיקרא requested permission to board the ark, and Noah told him he first had to find a mate. שיקרא proposed marriage to פתחא the demon responsible for causing men to lose their money. In exchange, he promised to give to פתחא everything he earned, and so they entered the ark.

133. See Gellis, vol. 1, 214-215, for a selection of Tosafot comments that accompany Rashi 6:19.

134. Oxford-Bodleian 283 (Hunt. 569) [IMHM 16751], fol. 3a.

135. See note 165.

136. Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fol. 6b.

137. Jastrow 1287.

that of the *Gemara*¹³⁸ and the issue of whether the animals were taken onto the ark in pairs, the number of which was not limited, or whether only two of every animal was permitted to board. In this context, the concept of צמדים is not entirely foreign, although the significance of this particular category of animal is dubious.

After explaining that the animals boarded the ark in pairs, and that seven pairs of the ritually pure animals was required, the passage concludes with the thought that the explanation אפילו שדים refers to the extra *vav* on the beginning of the phrase ומכל החי.¹³⁹ Since אפילו שדים had yet to be mentioned in this passage, the reference to it at the end is curious. Moreover, Rashi's source for this comment in BR employs the words אפילו רוחות שדים, with שדים added to the phrase only in some renditions;¹⁴⁰ the mention of this unreferenced *derash* in the Tosafot passage is illogical, and its connection to the exegesis that precedes it is dubious.

Munich 62.1 contains a comparable discussion as in Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52), except that the citation of Rashi reads שדים instead of צמדי.¹⁴¹ In this version, the reference to the phrase אפילו שדים at the end of the passage is more logical. Since Rashi had first been associated with the phrase earlier in this discussion, the second citation and subsequent explanation are not out of place. Rather the passage closes an explanation that began with a presentation of Rashi's comment for ומכל החי in contrast to the *Gemara's* understanding of the same lemma.

The combined evidence of the analogous discussion in Munich 62.1 and the reference to אפילו שדים at the end of both passages suggest that the attribution of צמדים to Rashi is a scribal error.¹⁴² An illegible word and a scribe's attempt to

138. BT AZ 51a.

139. In other words, we know demons were included on the ark from the conjunction *vav* at the beginning of 6:19, on the first clause - ומכל החי.

140. See note 125.

141. Munich 62.1 [IMHM 23118], fol. 6b.

142. In Gellis, vol. 1, 214-215, both manuscripts are presented as reading אפילו שדים for the citation of Rashi, despite the variant in the Hamburg document. On one hand, this attests to the inaccuracy with which Gellis transcribed the textual evidence; on the other hand, the unreferenced omission of צמדים supports the consideration of error in scribal transmission.

decipher it in the context of the text's discussion could have resulted in the variant citation. The lack of consistency in Hamburg 40's presentation of אפילו צמדים in the middle of the passage and אפילו שדים at the end attests to the reality of carelessness with which texts were often copied.

The conformity among the majority of citations of Rashi's comment for 6:19a and the suggestive evidence of scribal corruption in the one citation that does not conform validate the authenticity of this comment. In a variety of exegetical works, the Tosafot consistently attributed that same comment to Rashi. When the text of the citations is compared with the renditions of the printed editions, the comment's validity is confirmed further.

The variants that exist among the printed texts are of the same insignificant nature as those found among the citations. All five printed texts examined present Rashi's comment as אפילו שדים.¹⁴³ Both the Reggio and Guadalajara editions abbreviate the word אפילו (אפי'), and the Rome version reads ואפילו שדים.¹⁴⁴ Like the previous example, conformity among the citations of the comment helped to establish a text with which to evaluate the printed editions. At the same time, the trivial variants of the printed editions corroborated the version of the comment extracted from the citations.

3. Conclusion

In this chapter, five comments have been authenticated through the extraction of citations from Tosafot manuscripts. From 383 lemmata, the number is surely not extraordinary, and the preponderous of intangibles in each example is obvious. The analysis of various Tosafist exegetical texts copied in different centuries by varying scribes with different intentions and a range of abilities complicates the process of reconstructing the original text of Rashi; the lack of a standard text with which to compare the citations renders their evaluation more complex still.

Patterns of conformity explored both from the perspective of the printed editions and from the findings in the texts of the citations simplify these

143. Bertiner (1905) 14; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 78, 328.

144. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 328.

complexities. The examples analyzed above have demonstrated that the citations in the Tosafot manuscripts can confirm the renditions of the unreliable printed texts as well as offer explanations for some variants. At the same time, the authenticity of Rashi's comments that appear consistently in the Tosafot manuscripts can be substantiated by the types of variants that appear in the versions of the printed editions. This bipartite search for conformity facilitates the comparative analysis that lacks a standard for comparison.

These patterns of conformity elucidate the ability of the Tosafot manuscripts to help recover the authentic Rashi and to both correct and explain the errors of the printed editions. However, until now, the examples explored all addressed the citations of comments that were, according to the texts of the printed editions, cited in full. The more common phenomenon in the Tosafot manuscripts is the appearance of comments that are cited consistently and that continue to manifest clear patterns of conformity but that, according to the texts of the printed editions, are not complete citations. Patterns of conformity among partial citations of numerous printed comments could alter significantly the popular perception of what constitutes Rashi's original work.

The need to establish the ability of the Tosafot manuscripts and their citations of Rashi to indirectly, yet critically, assess the printed texts of Rashi and to validate comments original to the work, was essential to the process of legitimizing the methodology. In the subsequent chapters, the analysis of the partial citations will follow the same bipartite approach to conformity. Rather than confirming and correcting the versions of the printed editions, these examples will demonstrate the ability of the Tosafot to offer innovative and intriguing resources for reconstructing the original commentary.

Chapter Three: Partial Citations

A citation of another's work in one's own implies a selected phrase or paragraph included for a specific purpose. The author chooses to cite only the passages most pertinent to his or her own arguments and obviously does not recopy the entire work when the issues relevant to his/her own agenda comprise only a few words.

When compared with the printed texts of the commentary, many citations of Rashi extracted from the Tosafot manuscripts are partial or incomplete. Occasionally, they seem to be abbreviated because of the exegete's particular concerns for a given comment. The content of the explanatory remark, the disagreement or the criticism of the Tosafist focuses on a very specific part of Rashi's comment, and a citation of the entire interpretation is therefore unnecessary. However, when numerous manuscripts of varying style, date, and quality consistently cite only part of a comment, the authenticity of the uncited portion of the comment must be considered. Multiple citations that, with consistent conformity, represent only part of Rashi's printed comment suggest that the text utilized by the Tosafot may have been shorter in length than the texts available today and that centuries of textual transmission have resulted in countless additions to the original work that are no longer detectable from an examination of the Rashi editions themselves.

This chapter will examine two comments cited by Tosafot consistently and similarly in numerous manuscripts, but that, according to the example set by the printed editions, are considered incomplete citations. The conformity among the partial citations intimates that the abbreviated citation represents the true, complete text of Rashi, and that the lengthier comment now present in the printed editions is not authentic to the original work. The process of analysis is similar to that developed in the previous chapter. The variants in the printed editions will be examined and considered in the light of potential corruption introduced through scribal transmission of the texts. The citations will be evaluated on the basis of their conformity with the other manuscripts, since consistent citing of Rashi in Tosafot manuscripts has been shown to offer a reliable resource for determining

the text of Rashi's commentary and for assessing critically and deciphering the multitude of additional layers embodied in the printed versions.

1. Genesis 9:23

Shem and Japhet, upon hearing from their brother Ham of their father's drunken and naked state, covered Noah with a garment and exited the tent without viewing his nakedness. The verse reads:

ויקח שם ויפת את השמלה וישימו על שכם שניהם וילכו אחרנית ויכסו את ערות אביהם ופניהם אחרנית וערות אביהם לא ראו.

As found in the printed editions, Rashi's comment addresses the lemma **ויקח שם** **ויפת** **את השמלה** **וישימו על שכם שניהם** **וילכו אחרנית** **ויכסו את ערות אביהם** **ופניהם אחרנית** **וערות אביהם לא ראו**. Rather than what might be expected to accompany the plural subject. Since both Shem and Japhet covered Noah, the verb should have read **ויקחו**. Based on midrashic sources,¹ the comment explains that the singular form **ויקח** teaches that Shem was more devoted to the effort to fulfill the commandment of safeguarding their father's honour than was Japhet. For this reason, his descendants were privileged to assume the commandment of wearing **ציצית**, and Japhet earned the privilege of burial for his progeny. A prooftext from Ezekiel 39:11 is included to justify the connection between Japhet and the privilege of burial,² and then Isaiah 20:4 is cited as testimony to the fate of Ham's descendants because of the disgrace he caused Noah.³

The variants among the printed editions are minimal in terms of their significance to the meaning of the comment; however, numerous phrases and words differ from edition to edition, both in their presence or absence and in the syntax or order in which they appear in the comment. Berliner's edition has the

1. BR 36:6 (Theodor, Albeck, vol. 1, 339-340); Tanhuma (Buber) נח, נח, 48-49 (fols. 24b-25a); Tanhuma (Warsaw) נח, טו, fol. 16b.
2. The text at Ezek. 39:11 reads: **והיה ביום ההוא אמן לנג מקום שם קבר בישראל גי העברים קדמת הים וחסתת היא את העברים וקברו שם את נוג ואת כל המונה וקראו גיא חמון נוג**.
3. Isaiah 20:4 is: **כן ינהג מלך אשור את שבי מצרים ואת גלות כוש נערים וקנים ערום ויחף וחשוכי שת ערות מצרים**.

following text:⁴

אין כתיב כאן ויקחו אלא ויקח למד על שם שנתאמץ במצוה יותר מיפת
לכך זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית ויפת זכו בניו לקבורה שנאמר אתן לגוג
מקום שם קבר וחם שבזה את אביו נאמר בזרעו כן ינהג מלך אשור את
שבי מצרים ואת גלות כוש נערים וזקנים ערום ויחף וחשופי שת וגוי.

The text in the Venice edition contains only a few differences:⁵

אין כתוב ויקחו אלא ויקח לימד על שם שנתאמץ במצוה יותר מיפת לכך
זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית ויפת זכה לקבורה לבניו שנאמר אתן לגוג מקום
שם קבר וחם שבזה את אביו נאמר בזרעו כן ינהג מלך אשור את שבי
מצרים ואת גלות כוש נערים וזקנים ערום ויחף וחשופי שת וגוי.

This version of the comment has כתוב instead of כתיב and לימד instead of למד. In addition, the word כאן is absent, and rather than the phrase לקבורה זכו בניו, this edition reads זכה לקבורה לבניו.

The variants in the Guadelajara edition consist more of plusses and minuses than simple letter changes.⁶

ויקחו אין כתיב למד שנתאמץ שם במצוה יותר מיפת לכך זכו בניו לטלית
של ציצית ובני יפת זכו לקבורה בארץ ישראל שנאמר אתן לגוג שם קבר
וחם שבזה את אביו נאמר בזרעו כן ינהג מלך אשור את שבי מצרים ואת
גלות כוש ערום ויחף וחשופי שת.

In this rendition, the phrase ויקח אלא is absent and the comment itself begins with ויקחו אין כתיב rather than ויקחו (כאן) אין כתיב. The words על שם are also absent; instead, the proper noun שם follows the verb שנתאמץ. In place of the phrase זכו בניו יפת זכו לקבורה (or the equivalent variant in Venice), this text reads זכו לקבורה ובני יפת זכו לקבורה, differing both in the placement of the reference to Japhet's progeny and in the addition of the phrase בארץ ישראל. In the proof-text from Ezekiel 39:11, the word מקום is not included in the Guadelajara edition, and in the citation from Isaiah 20:4, the phrase נערים וזקנים and the abbreviation וגוי are missing.

The Reggio edition contains variants in many of the same troubled words

4. Bertiner (1905) 19.

5. *Rashi HaShalem* vol. 1, 103.

6. *Ibid.* 334.

and phrases of the other editions.⁷

אין כתי ויקחו אלא ויקח מלמד על שם שנתאמץ במצוה יותר מיפת לכך
זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית ויפת זכה לינתן לקבורה לבניו שנא' אתן לגוג
מקום שם קבורה וחם שביזה את אביו נאמי בזרעו כן ינהג מלך אשור את
יושבי מצרים ואת גלות כוש נערים וזקנים ערום ויחף וחשופי שת.

This text abbreviates numerous words written out in full in the other editions, such as **אין כתי** and **נאמי**, while **וגוי** is absent from the end of the comment. The phrase **זכו בניו לקבורה** appears as **זכה לינתן לקבורה לבניו**, with a different placement for the reference to Japhet's descendants as well as the added word **לינתן**. The word **למד** (or **לימד**) is **מלמד** in this version, the word **קבר** from the verse in Ezekiel is cited as **קבורה**, and the phrase **שבי מצרים** from the verse in Isaiah is cited as **יושבי מצרים**. The latter two variants clearly demonstrate the scribe's lack of familiarity with the biblical sources.

Finally, the Rome edition is most similar to the Venice text, but is not without its own variants.⁸

אין כתי ויקחו אלא ויקח למד על שם שנתאמץ במצוה יותר מיפת לכך
זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית ויפת זכה בניו לקבורה שני אתן לגוג מקום שם
קבר וחם שבזה את אביו נאמי בזרעו כן ינהג מלך אשור את שבי מצרים
ואת גלות כוש נערים וזקנים ערום ויחף וחשופי שת ערות מצרים.

The problematic phrase **זכו בניו לקבורה** appears as the grammatically inconsistent **זכה בניו לקבורה** in this edition. Both applications of **נאמר** as well as the word **כתוב** are abbreviated as **שני**, **נאמי** and **כתי** respectively. Finally, the citation of Isaiah 20:4 includes the entire verse, ending with the words **ערות מצרים**, rather than with **וגוי**.

None of the variants displayed above alters the sense of the interpretation in any significant way. They do indicate, however, a problem in the transmission of the phrases relating the initial problem with the verse and regarding Japhet's reward, as well as in the citation of the verses included for prooftexts. Let us now examine the treatment of this comment in the Tosafot manuscripts.

Rashi's comment on Genesis 9:23 is cited in twenty-four Tosafot

7. *Ibid.*

8. *Ibid.*

manuscripts, ten of which are manuscripts of מנחת יהודה. Most of the discussions regarding the citation of Rashi revolve around an apparent contradiction between Rashi's attribution of the privilege of ציצית to Shem's good deed with the attribution of the privilege to Abraham in his statement אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל, which is based on earlier rabbinic sources.⁹ The contradiction is resolved with two explanations. The first is that in his comment on 9:23, Rashi was not referring to the *commandment* of ציצית, but that the descendants of Shem earned the privilege of wearing a beautiful garment made of ציצית, or in other words, of a fine thread. The second explanation is that *one* of Shem's descendants earned the privilege of fulfilling the commandment of ציצית, but exactly which son would assume this reward was not clear. When Abraham refused the loot offered by the king of Sodom with the phrase אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל, his descendants earned the privilege more than any other of Shem's progeny.¹⁰

The citations of the comment in the Tosafot manuscripts consistently mention only Shem's reward of טלית של ציצית because of his effort to protect his father's honour. Those citations that do not follow this pattern or that include other elements of the printed comment do not attribute the comment to Rashi at all. The texts of the citations appear below. A few words that follow the citation are included as well to demonstrate clearly that the exegete has proceeded to his comment on the Rashi.

(a) In Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add. 4°103) the citation reads:¹¹

ויקח שם ויפת פרש בזכות שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
ותימי והא אמי לקמן כדכתי' מחוט ועד שרוך נעל...

(b) The citation in Sassoon 409/1 varies only in the word בנו after שם, in למצוה instead of במצוה, and in an obvious scribal error reading נתאמץ as נתאמר:¹²

ויקח שם ויפת פרש בזכות שנתאמר שם בנו למצוה זכו בניו לטלית של

9. See for example, Gellis, vol. 1, 273, par. 1.

10. *Ibid.*

11. Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add. 4°103) [IMHM 21408], fol. 19b.

12. Sassoon 409/1 [IMHM 9353], fol. 9.

... יצאית ויתר אקראי, אכן ...

(c) Cambridge 1215,5 includes the word לַי instead of תַּי, but

otherwise, the citation in this text is identical to that in Oxford - Bodleian 2344

(Opp. Add. 4°103):¹³

יקרא שם פרט לפרט שנתאמר במאמר כי לוי לטלית לוי יצאית

... וקרא לרית דאמר במסכת סוטה...

(d) The citation in London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) is identical to that of

Cambridge 1215,5, except for the absence of the word ו. The comment that

follows also has minor variants:¹⁴

נאמר שם פרט לפרט שנתאמר במאמר כי לוי לטלית לוי יצאית וקרא

... וקרא לרית דאמר במסכת סוטה...

(e) New York - JTS L819a/1 does not deviate from the pattern in the

previous citations, although the words יצאית לוי¹⁵ are not included there:¹⁶

יקרא שם פרט לפרט שנתאמר במאמר כי לוי לטלית לוי יצאית וקרא

... אכן, אקרא

(f) The citation in Paris heb. 260 is not distinct in any way:¹⁷

יקרא שם פרט לפרט שנתאמר במאמר כי לוי לטלית לוי יצאית וקרא

... וקרא לרית דאמר במאמר כי לוי לטלית לוי יצאית וקרא

(g) Jerusalem 8°2240 differs from Paris heb. 260 only in the absence of the

word ו. The citation is identical to that in Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add.

13. Cambridge 1215,5 [IMHM 17078], fol. 20b.

14. London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 11a.

15. In Mishnaic Hebrew, לוי actually means a piece of cloth (Jastrow 537).

The addition of לוי clarifies that this refers to the commandment to

add tassels to the four corners. The analogy that Shem and Japhet

covered their father with a piece of clothing and in return they merited a

piece of clothing stands linguistically, but the sense of the comment is the

origin of the way they fulfilled the commandment in the line of Shem, and

so the absence of the words לוי should in no way suggest that this

passage understood Shem's reward differently.

16. New York - JTS L819a/1 [IMHM 24053], fol. 70a.

17. Paris heb. 260 [IMHM 27838], fol. 27a.

4°103):¹⁸

ויקח שם ויפת פרשי בזכות שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
ותי והלא אומר לקמן בזכות מחוט ועד שרוך נעל...

(h) The citation of Rashi in Moscow-Guenzburg 82 is an abbreviated version of even the citations in the previous manuscripts.¹⁹

ויקח שם ויפת את השמלה פרשי מכאן זכו לטלית ואינו מבין אם לציצית
הלא בשכר אם מחוט ועד שרוך נעל...

The comment that follows the citation of Rashi is an abridged discussion of the same issue that concerns the Tosafot above, namely the attribution of ציצית to both Shem and Abraham. The citation, therefore, is most likely a paraphrase of Rashi directing the reader immediately to the difficulty; the issue itself is then explored briefly. The inclusion of the concept of ציצית only in the Tosafot discussion (ואינו מבין אם לציצית) supports further the notion of a paraphrase. Since the exegete's problem considers whether Shem or Abraham was awarded the privilege of ציצית, one can assume the qualification was in the original text to which he was responding.

The conformity among citations persists with this manuscript, since it too manifests only one idea expressed in the printed editions. Neither Japhet's reward nor the accompanying verses is mentioned, but the comment related to the privilege of ציצית clearly is associated with Rashi.

(i) The passage in New York - JTS L791 that includes the citation of Rashi for this comment explains, prior to the citation, the difficulty with the verse and its singular conjugation of לקח:²⁰

ויקח שם ויפת ויקחו לא נאמי שעיקר המצוה עיי שם לפי נתברך יותר
מיפת פרשי לפי שנתאמץ במצוה זכו בניו לטלית ציצית וקי שאמי...

The phrase that precedes the citation of Rashi is reminiscent of the troubled beginning of the printed editions which questioned the use of ויקח instead of ויקחו.

The presence of this concern outside the parameters of the citation of Rashi and

18. Jerusalem 8°2240 (B432), fol. 8b.

19. Moscow-Guenzburg 82 [IMHM 07247], fols. 64a-64b.

20. New York - JTS L791 [IMHM 24021], fol. 10a.

its exclusion from this citation and the previous examples suggest that its origin is the Tosafot exegesis and not Rashi's commentary. The explication of the problem addressed by Rashi appears to have been articulated by the Tosafot commenting on his work, which through transmission, was then joined to the commentary of Rashi and incorporated into the body of his text. The textual difficulties in the printed editions regarding this phrase in particular would have resulted from the process of copying and recopying a marginal note, inserting it into the main text, and then altering it slowly and slightly to adjust it to the style and manner of the work.

The remaining five manuscripts cite different or added elements of Rashi's printed comment for 9:23, but they do not attribute the remarks to Rashi. The question arises then as to whether the author of the passage assumed his readers would be able to identify the comment as originating with Rashi, or whether the exegete learned of the comment from elsewhere. Since most of the Tosafist exegeses incorporate and respond to material from other sources besides Rashi, and since most of Rashi's comment for this verse originates in rabbinic texts, the lack of attribution to Rashi may suggest, in fact, a lack of authenticity to the printed comment.

(j) Parma 837 (2058) is a fourteenth-century manuscript of a commentary on Rashi's Torah commentary. After each lemma, this manuscript consistently introduces the citation of Rashi as פְּרָשִׁי. The Tosafot comment that follows the citation is usually prefaced with the word והטעם. The passage concerning Gen. 9:23 deviates from this pattern as well as from the conformity displayed among the citations in the examples above.²¹

ויקח שם ויפת פירו ששם נתאמץ יותר מיפת ולכך זכו בניו לטלית של
 ציצית ויפת זכה לינתן קבורה לבניו וכו' ואין להקשו דהא נתן שכר ליפת
 כמו לשם אעפי שלא נתאמץ במצוה כמו שם וא"כ מה ייפה כחו של שם
 שנתאמץ במצוה דהא ייפה כחו דנתן לו מצוה והיינו מה שאמרו חז"ל שכר
 מצוה מצוה.

The difficulty addressed by the Tosafot in this passage is the suggestion that although Japhet did not exert himself as much as Shem to protect their father's

21. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], seventh folio from beginning of פרשת נח.

honour, he still received a reward. The exegete explains that what empowered Shem to exert himself in fulfilling the commandment was the very fact that he had a commandment to fulfill. The explanation is supported by a rabbinic saying in *Avot* that the reward for a commandment (a "*mitzvah*") is the fulfillment of the commandment itself.²²

The citation included at the beginning of the passage is not attributed to Rashi, but the content certainly corresponds to the text of the printed editions. The phrase *זכה לינתן קבורה לבניו* appears identically in the Reggio edition. Moreover, the citation in the manuscript ends with *וכו'*, intimating that more text of the comment was available to the exegete and agreeing with the model in the printed versions.

The variant style with which the passage is cited in this manuscript and the additional phrase about Japhet's reward relative to the other conforming citations permit one to debate whether the author of this passage actually consulted Rashi or whether the vague attribution of *פירו'* suggests that the author referred to Rashi's primary sources, such as *Tanḥuma* (Buber)²³ or *Bereshit Rabba*.²⁴ The text in *Tanḥuma* (Buber) is very similar to both the citation in Parma 837 (2058) and to elements of the printed comment:

ויקח שם ויפת ויקחו לא נאמר אלא ויקח, מלמד ששם נתחזק תחלה
במצות, וילכו אחורנית שהיו מהלכין לאחוריהו, ויכסו את ערות אביהם
שהיה ביאתו כדרך הליכתו, מה פרע להם הקב"ה לשם פרע לו שכרו מצות
תכלת תפילין שהיה מכסה בה, וליפת נתן לו קבורה בארץ ישראל.

The first phrase of the passage, seen above as part of the Tosafot introduction to the citation of Rashi and manifesting textual variants in the printed editions, originates in the midrashic source and may have been included in the Rashi by readers who were familiar with the midrashic passage and who deemed its inclusion essential to comprehending the issue at hand. Similarly, the juxtaposition of Japhet's reward to Shem's may have been added to Rashi's comment to complete the midrashic thought alluded to in Rashi's mention of Shem and his *טלית של צניצית*.

22. *Avot* 4:2.

23. *Tanḥuma* (Buber) נח, כא 48-49 (fols. 24b-25a).

24. BR 36:6 (Theodor, Albeck, vol. 1, 339-340).

The textual proximity of Rashi's comment to that of his midrashic sources is evident and expected, and the degree to which scribes and students "filled in" the midrashim paraphrased and abbreviated by Rashi is unclear. The persistent question regarding this particular manuscript is whether the exegete believes he is citing Rashi or the midrash. Both the lack of conformity between this citation and those clearly attributed to Rashi as well as the lack of consistency between this example and the majority of citations in the manuscript inspire doubt and dilemma.

The subsequent examples, however, will demonstrate that the passages that correspond most closely to the text of the printed editions are never attributed to Rashi. When compared with the consistent and conforming partial citations presented above, the lack of attribution to Rashi could indicate strongly that the longer passages refer to the midrashic source and not to Rashi's original commentary.

(k) New York - JTS L792/1 is a sixteenth-century manuscript entitled **חדושי צרפת** and consists of a collection of Tosafot comments that cite Rashi frequently but not as regularly as a work dedicated to the systematic interpretation of his commentary. The majority of citations of Rashi are introduced with the acronym **פ"י**. The following passage does not include an attribution to Rashi, but the content of the comment is almost identical to the versions of the printed editions.²⁵

ויקח שם ויפת את השמלה ויכסו את ערות אביהם ומשום הכי זכו בניו של
שם למצות ציצית ובניו של יפת לקבורה משום שכסה אביו כדכתיב אתן
גוג שם מקום קבר ובניו של חם גלו למצרים ערומים ויחפים דכתיב כן נהג
מלך אשור את שבי מצרים ואת גלות כוש ערום ויחף וחשופי שת לפי
שראה חם אביהם ערות נח אביו.

The question of the plural or singular inflection of the verb **ויקח** is not an issue in this text. The exegete explains that, because Shem and Japhet covered their father's nakedness, the progeny of Shem merited the commandment of **ציצית**, and those of Japhet merited burial. Ezekiel 39:11 is cited as proof that Japhet's descendants did receive burial, and Isaiah 20:4 is cited as evidence of Ham's fate to be exiled naked and bare to Egypt. All the elements of Rashi's printed comment are included in this Tosafot passage, but the text itself does not attribute

²⁵ New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022], fol. 7a.

the interpretation to Rashi, and the style of the comment does not suggest a quotation from extraneous sources. Both verses, however, are cited in the same context in *Bereshit Rabba*²⁶ and thus are not unique to Rashi's printed comment.

Considering 1) the number of manuscripts that consistently do attribute part of the comment to Rashi, 2) the frequency with which this particular manuscript credits Rashi when including citations, and 3) the accessibility of the indisputable sources from which the original comment was developed, the style of this passage, the lack of a clear differentiation between a citation and a super-comment and the use of paraphrastic words such as משום and הכי, which are not present in the printed renditions of the comment, challenge the authenticity of the lengthier printed comment in favour of the comment cited most consistently in other manuscripts and limited to the reward of Shem.

(I) Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) is a thirteenth- or fourteenth-century manuscript also entitled חדושי צרפת. Like New York - JTS L792/1, this text cites Rashi frequently but not regularly, and the citations tend to be introduced by the acronym פי"ה. The idea that this manuscript is actually an earlier copying of the same work seems highly plausible. The passage related to Gen. 9:23 differs from the above example only minimally, and the variants are insignificant to the meaning of the comment.²⁷

ויקח שם ויפת את השמלה ויכסו את ערות אביהם ומשום הכי זכו בניו של
שם למינות ציצית ובניו של יפת לקבורה משום שכסה אביו כדכת אתן גוג
שם מקום קבר ובניו של חם גלו למצרים ערומים ויחפים דכתו כן ינהג
מלך אשור את שני מלכי מצרים ואת גלות כוש ערום ויחף וחשופי שת לפי
שראה חם אביהם ערות נח אביו.

Despite the passage's obviously close relationship to the content of Rashi's printed comment, like New York - JTS 792/1 this manuscript does not attribute the comment to him. The only differences between this extract and the one above is the extra *yod* in the words למינות and ינהג (instead of נתג). The *yod* in ינהג is actually the correct reading of the verse. However, the phrase שני מלכי מצרים in this version varies from the preceding text and does not reflect accurately the biblical verse; both read את שני מלכי מצרים.

26. BR 36:6, (Theodor, Albeck, vol. 1, 339-340).

27. Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738], fol. 4a.

The presence of these variants is insignificant to the issue of the relationship of this passage to Rashi's printed comment and ultimately to the original work. This lengthy passage, unattributed to Rashi, does not appear to be a super-comment on someone else's exegesis, or a citation, but a comment unto itself. Its source may have been the same rabbinic texts familiar to Rashi, which would explain why analogous concepts are explored. The consistent attribution to Rashi of the first part of the comment testifies to the Tosafist's cognizance of Rashi's connection with this verse. The consistent lack of attribution in these lengthier passages intimates the distinct possibility that the elements of the comment subsequent to the reward of Shem are additions to the text originating from the midrashic sources.

(m) Leiden 27 (Cod. Or. 4765) is dated in 1400 and entitled *חדושי התורה* ליוסף בכור שור. It too cites Rashi frequently, and these citations are prefaced by such abbreviations as *פ"י* and *פ"ר*. Once again, the passage for Gen. 9:23 is similar to the preceding extracts and is not attributed to Rashi.²⁸

ויקח שם ויפת את השמלה ויכסו את ערות אביהם ומשום הכי זכו בניו של
שם למצות ציצית ובניו של יפת לקבורה לפי שכסה אביו כדכי אתן גוג שם
מקום קבר ובני חם גלו למצרים ערומים ויחפים כדכתיב כן ינהג מלך
אשור את שבי מצרים ואת גולת כוש ערום ויחף חשוף שת לפי שראה
ערות נח אביו.

The textual variants are minimal. This version reads *לפי שכסה* instead of *משום*, *ובניו של חם* instead of *ובני חם*, and *גולת כוש* in place of *כוש ערום*. In addition, it lacks a *vav* word (*וחשוף*); the words *חם אביהם*, which follow *שראה* in the other versions, are missing.

The issue of the author's source for this comment persists. Citations clearly attributed to Rashi are not foreign to any of these manuscripts, and Rashi's association with the part of the comment related to Shem was acknowledged in numerous Tosafot manuscripts of varying style and date. The only reason one would link these last three examples with Rashi is because of the version in the printed editions. However, the printed editions have been shown repeatedly to be corrupt and unreliable standards for comparison. Since the

28. Leiden 27 (Cod. Or. 4765) [IMHM 17371], fol. 8a.

exegetical material in this extract is not unique to Rashi's printed comment, but is found in the midrashic literature (sources known and available to the scribes and students of these works), one need not assume the passage's authenticity. Rather, the conformity among the attributed citations and the non-attributed comments as well as the refutable reliability of the printed comments nullify such an assumption.

(n) The final example to be treated before the מנחת יהודה manuscripts, is complex. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 is a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century manuscript of a super-commentary on Rashi. It consistently and regularly cites Rashi, although the likely anthological nature of this manuscript has resulted in differing presentations of the citations. Aside from the standard form of the lemma followed by the acronym פְּרָשִׁי to introduce the citation, the text frequently proceeds without introduction of either the lemma or an attribution to Rashi. Rather, a few random words from anywhere in the comment are cited and then are followed by a response. The extract from this text related to Gen. 9:23 cites two words from the very end of Rashi's comment which originate in the prooftext from Isaiah 20:4.²⁹

וְחֹשֶׁפִי שֶׁתְּ חֹשֶׁפִי לְשׁוֹן גִּלּוּי שֶׁתְּ לְשׁוֹן עֲרוּהָ כְּלוֹמֵר כְּגִלּוּי עֲרוּהָ שֶׁהִיוּ
עֲרוּמִים וְלֹא יִתְכַסּוּ עֲרוּתָן אִשָּׁם שֶׁלֹּא כִּיסָה עֲרוּת אֲבִיו אֲבֵל יִפֶּת שְׂכֵסָה
זָכָה גִּיּוֹכָה דֵּהֵינּוּ קְבוּרָה וְשֵׁם שְׁנִתְאַמַּץ בְּמִצְוֵה יוֹתֵר לְכֵסֶה בְּשִׂמְלָה זָכָה
לְטָלִית שֶׁל צִיצִית.

The passage explains the meaning of the words וְחֹשֶׁפִי שֶׁתְּ and how they relate to Ḥam's behaviour and thus to his fate in contrast to the merit awarded his brothers.

True to the manuscript's style, the text assumes the reader will recognize the brief citation from Rashi's comment, and without attribution, undertakes its explication.

This example stands out among the rest, for it clearly attributes to Rashi a portion of the printed comment not cited in any other attributed citations and suggests that Rashi's original comment may have consisted of all the elements contained in the printed comment. However, before this conclusion is drawn, the nature of the Moscow-Guenzburg 317 manuscript must be considered.

Analyses in earlier chapters have demonstrated that comments not cited in any of the Tosafot manuscripts examined tend to be cited in this document. While

29. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 11b.

the super-commentary style of the text supposes a more consistent and systematic citing of Rashi's comments, the late date of the manuscript - after the earliest printings of the commentary - presumes a document subjected to many centuries of evolution and one inclined to resemble the printed editions. These characteristics of Moscow-Guenzburg 317 weaken the evidence culled from only this text in contrast to the numerous conforming citations extracted from diverse documents of varying date and exegetical style.

The unattributed citation of a latter portion of Rashi's printed comment, while not a unique phenomenon in this manuscript, may represent the perpetuation of a textual error and one of the steps towards the incorporation of the prooftexts into Rashi's commentary. If the author of this text truly amassed comments on Rashi from a variety of sources, the attribution of this comment to him may not have been intended in the original source, and thus no direct, introductory term of attribution was included. In short, one citation of two words in a manuscript of questionable reliability complicates the analysis, but it does not seriously contradict the conformity established in the preceding and succeeding examples.

Rashi's comment for Gen. 9:23 is also cited in ten manuscripts of מנחת יהודה. All of these manuscripts address the issue of whether the commandment of ציצית was introduced through the acts of Shem or the words of Abraham. The citations of Rashi in these texts are essentially identical and manifest the same conformity found in the earlier examples. The fact that these citations are extracted from numerous versions of the same work renders their identical nature very unremarkable. However, some variants do exist; in fact, the wording and syntax of the comment that follows the citation differ considerably from manuscript to manuscript. The conformity among the citations despite the variations in the super-comment further supports the accuracy with which Rashi's comments were preserved in the citations. The extracts that follow focus primarily on these citations but include a few words of the Tosafot comment to demonstrate the degree to which it differed from text to text.

(o) The text in Vat. Ebr. 506 is the following:³⁰

30. Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fol. 9b.

ויקח שם ויפת פרשי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
וקשה שהרי במסי סוטה אמי בזכות שאמי אברה'...

The citation is clearly attributed to Rashi and is limited to the first element of Rashi's printed comment, namely Shem's reward of ציצית. The comment that follows the citation addresses the attribution of ציצית to Abraham in BT Sotah.

(p) In New York - JTS L789 the citation of Rashi is identical and the comment that follows is attributed to Rabbeinu Tam:³¹

ויקח שם ויפת פי רשי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
וקשיא לר"ת דהא אמרין במסכי סוטה...

(q) Vat. Ebr. 53 is missing the words של טלית, and similar to the previous example, the subsequent comment is attributed to Rabbeinu Tam:³²

ויקח שם ויפת פרשי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לציצית וקי לר"ת
דאמי במסי סוטה בזכות שאמי אברהם...

(r) In Parma 537 (2541), Rabbeinu Tam's city is included after his name. The citation of Rashi is missing the word לפי:³³

ויקח שם ויפת פרש שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית וקשיא
לר"ת מאורליינש דהא אמרי...

(s) Paris héb. 168 spells out Rabbeinu Tam's name (as opposed to the earlier examples' use of acronyms). The citation of Rashi is unexceptional.³⁴

ויקח שם ויפת פי הרשי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
וקשה לרבי תם מאורליינץ...

(t) In Parma 527 (2368) the abbreviation וכו' is included in the middle of the citation, although the citation is not missing any word or phrase. The word מצוה is also missing the prefix ב that is present in the other examples:³⁵

ויקח שם ויפת פרש לפי שנתאמץ שם מצוה וכו' זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית

31. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 8b.

32. Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fol. 13a.

33. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fols. 11a-11b.

34. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 12b.

35. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], eighth folio of פרשת נח.

וקשיא לר"ת...

(u) Budapest-Kaufmann A31 is essentially identical to the extract from New York - JTS L789.³⁶

ויקח שם ויפת פי רשיי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
וקי לר"ת דהא...

(v) In Munich 62,1 Shem's name follows the word במצוה rather than precedes it, and Rabbeinu Tam's given name, Jacob, is used in presenting his difficulty with Rashi's comment.³⁷

ויקח שם ויפת פרשי שלפי שנתאמץ במצוה שם זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
הקי הרי יעקב מאורלייני הא אמרינן...

(w) New York - JTS L790 is in conformity with the standard mode of presentation among these passages.³⁸

ויקח שם ויפת פי רשי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
וקשיא לרבי תם...

(x) Finally, New York - JTS L787 is also unexceptional in both the citation and the subsequent comment.³⁹

ויקח שם ויפת פרשי לפי שנתאמץ שם במצוה זכו בניו לטלית של ציצית
וקשיא לר"ת דהא...

The conformity among the citations of Rashi in the מנחת יהודה manuscripts is undeniable, and the analogy between these extracts and those from the variety of Tosafot manuscripts presented above is obvious. The examples that do present a more complete expression of all the elements in Rashi's printed comment consistently do not attribute the comment to him. These passages appear to be independent comments and not super-comments linked to citations. The expression of similar exegetical concepts in the midrashic literature provides an alternate source for the Tosafot text. The one exception to

36. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 23a.

37. Munich 62,1 [IMHM 23118], fols. 9a-9b.

38. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fols. 11b-12a.

39. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fols. 7b-8a.

these two groups of passages is an unattributed citation of Rashi in a manuscript copied after the beginning of printing and likely to have incorporated many of the same corruptions as in the printed editions.

Conformity among the citations of Rashi in the Tosafot manuscripts has been shown to substantiate the authenticity of some printed comments to the original work. Conformity can also raise questions regarding this authenticity. The analysis of Gen. 9:23 suggests that Rashi's original comment may have been limited to the reward of Shem. This was the comment undeniably attributed to him in the Tosafot literature and cited consistently from text to text, even when the exegetical remarks that followed the citation contained many textual variants. Furthermore, the sources for the additional elements of Rashi's comment are clearly apparent and were readily available to the students of his work. The unattributed comments are in texts that usually do identify Rashi when citing him, although these documents do not appear to associate Rashi with the longer passages.

The process of textual transmission and the degree to which scribes could alter a text has been demonstrated, and the manner in which the original comment of Rashi could have been doubled in length and altered in content during the process of transmission is quite believable. When the printed texts are no longer considered standards by which to measure or judge other renditions, the text of Rashi presented in the Tosafot literature cannot be dismissed merely because it differs from the familiar. Rather, the search for the original commentary must entertain the possibility that the commentary that Rashi wrote differed greatly from the editions we have today and that, in fact, parts of it are preserved in the comments of the Tosafot.

2. *Genesis 12:6*

Upon receiving the command from God to depart from H₁aran, Abraham gathered up his family and his possessions and set out for the land of Canaan. In this verse, Abraham passed through the land until Shechem, until the terebinth of Moreh; the reader is then told that the Canaanite was then in the land. The verse

reads:

ויעבר אברם בארץ עד מקום שכס עד אלון מורה והכנעני אז בארץ.

Rashi's printed comment for the lemma בארץ אז והכנעני is lengthy and complex. It centres on the assumption that Noah divided the world among his sons and allocated to Shem the land of Israel. The problem emanates from the presence of "the Canaanite" - according to Genesis a son of Ham - in the land that was given to Shem and his descendants. Berliner's 1905 edition of the commentary presents the following text:⁴⁰

היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם שבחלקו של שם נפלה
כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו שנאמר ומלכי צדק מלך שלם לפיכך ויאמר ה'
אל אברם לזרעך אתן את הארץ הזאת עתיד אני להחזירה לבניך שהם
מזרעו של שם.

Rashi explains that the Canaanite was gradually capturing the land of Israel from the progeny of Shem, to whom Noah had given it. Rashi's prooftext for Shem's acquiring the land is Gen. 14:18, in which Melchizedek, the king of Shalem, brings bread and wine and blesses Abraham for having defeated their enemies.⁴¹ Onkelos translates Shalem as Jerusalem,⁴² and numerous midrashic sources identify מלכי צדק as Shem.⁴³ Together, these elements suggest that Shem was allocated the land of Israel.

The second half of the comment addresses the reason why the reader is informed of the Canaanite presence in the land of Israel and its relevance to the narrative of Abraham. According to Rashi, if the land belonged to Shem and the Canaanite was now in the process of conquering it, then God's promise in the

40. Berliner (1905) 23.

41. The entire verse of Gen. 14:18 is ומלכי צדק שלם הוציא לחם ויין וחמא כחך ואל עליון.

42. See *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 147, T. Onk. ומלכי צדק מלכא דירושלם. A. Sperber. *The Bible in Aramaic*. vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959) 20.

43. In all the following sources, the connection between Shem and Melchizedek is made through Gen. 14:18: *Midrash Tehillim* 76:3 (Buber, 1947: 341-342); *Nedarim* 32b; *Avot de Rabbi Natan*, ב (S. Schechter, *Avot de Rabbi Natan*, New York: Feldheim Publishers, 1967, 12); BR 56:14 (Theodor, Albeck, vol. 2, 607-608); NumR. 4:8 (Mirkin, vol. 9, 71-72); *Pirquei de Rabbi Eliezer* 27 (Warsaw: 1852; New York: Om Publishing, 1946, fol. 63a).

giving the land or returning it are irrelevant issues. However, if God made his promise to Abraham in response to his apprehension at encountering the Canaanite upon arriving in the land to which God had led him, then, to the contrary, Rashi's very comment suggests a hesitation on Abraham's part rather than an unshakable faith. This last passage of the Guadelajara text does not correspond conceptually to the preceding elements of the comment, which are themselves conceptually difficult. The reader is left with an obscure understanding of the intending meaning and purpose for the information of the Canaanite presence.

With only the texts of the printed editions, one struggles to comprehend the significance of this comment and its explication of the verse. Although not troubling at the level of the text, the interpretation's illogical development in content intimates the existence of a problem in its transmission. Since the lack of reliability in the text of Rashi's commentary has been established and acknowledged, rationalizing, justifying and explaining the problematic comment is futile, until the correct text has been ascertained. The citations of Rashi in the Tosafot Torah commentaries suggest that Rashi's original comment for this lemma was not as convoluted or enigmatic, or as long, as it appears now.

Rashi's comment for 12:6 is cited in 24 manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries, ten of which are manuscripts of מנחת יהודה. In all of these texts, the concern of the Tosafot is Rashi's assumption that the land of Israel was allocated to Shem and the Canaanites were in the process of capturing it. The Tosafot contrast Rashi's comment with the numerous rabbinic sources that assume the land belonged to the descendants of Ham.⁴⁹ For example, both BT Ketubot 112a and Sotah 34b address Num. 13:22, which states that Hebron in Canaan was built seven years before Zoan (Tanis) in Egypt.⁵⁰ Canaan and Egypt are listed as sons of Ham in the genealogical lists of Gen. 10. Egypt precedes Canaan and is thus considered to be the elder.⁵¹ The Talmudic passages raise the question of whether a man would build his younger son a home before his elder son. The underlying assumption in this discussion is that the land belonged

49. See Gellis, vol. 2, 12-14.

50. Num. 13:22 is: ויעלו בגב ויבאו עד חברון ושם אחימן ששי ותלמי ילדי הענק וחברון שבע שנים נבנתה לפני צען מצרים.

51. Gen. 10:6 lists the sons of Ham in the following order: ובני חם כוש ומצרים ופוט וכנען.

to Ham, who built in it the city Hebron for his son Canaan, and not that Shem was given the land by Noah.

Similarly, Gen. 10:19 identifies the northern border of Canaan as Sidon, the son of Canaan and another of Ham's descendants.⁵² According to the Tosafist discussions of Rashi, the extension of the border to the northern extreme implies that in its entirety the land belonged to Canaan and not Shem.⁵³

Occasional attempts are made at understanding Rashi's divergence from the accepted rabbinic assumptions regarding the ownership of the land. One opinion suggests Rashi is only referring to a small portion of the land of Israel, specifically the narrow part of the north east in which Jerusalem is located, whereas Ham possessed the southern area which included Hebron.⁵⁴ Another proposes that the land did belong to Canaan, but that Shem acquired it legally because Canaan was his servant,⁵⁵ as it states in Gen. 9:26, "and may Canaan be a servant to them."⁵⁶

The citations of Rashi in the Tosafot manuscripts invariably consist only of the first part of Rashi's comment, that the Canaanites were now in the process of capturing the land originally allocated to Shem by Noah. The discussions that accompany the citations remain focused on the difficulties with Rashi's comment rather than the meaning of the biblical text. They consider how the land could have been in Shem's possession, as Rashi assumed, and they demonstrate how this assumption is problematic and in contradiction to numerous other sources, including statements by Rashi himself. Without the presumption that the land belonged to Shem, Rashi's explanation for the Canaanite presence has no foundation. The Tosafot do not offer an alternate interpretation of the biblical lemma; their comments are restricted to the analysis of Rashi and the relationship of his comment to the traditional sources.

The citations are as follows:

(a) In Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52), Rashi's comment is cited in two

52. Gen. 10:19: ויהי גבול חכנעני מצידן באכה גררה עד עזה באכה סדמה ועמרה ואדמה: וצבים עד לשע.

53. Gellis, vol. 2, 12-14. See for example, par. 9.

54. *Ibid.* 13, par. 10.

55. *Ibid.* 12, par. 9.

56. Gen. 9:26: ויאמר ברוך ה' אלהי שם ויהי כנען עבד למו.

separate marginal notes.⁵⁷

והכנעני אז בארץ פרשי שהיה הולך וכובש הארץ מזרעו של שם וקי
דאדרבי בכתובי...

ורשיי כתי למעלי והכנעני אז בארץ שהיה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישרי
מזרעו של שם שלזרעו של שם נחלה כשחלק נח לבניו את הארץ שני ומלכי
צדק מלך שם ואין זה נכון כי גבול...

The first citation is almost identical to the first clause of the printed comments. The remainder of the comment is not cited at all. In the second passage, the entire first section of Rashi's comment is cited, including the proof-text from Gen. 14:18. The phrase שבחלקו של שם נפלה appears as שם נחלה in the printed editions, but the sense of the two phrases is the same.

(b) In Paris héb. 260, Rashi's comment is cited in two parts:⁵⁸

והכנעני אז בארץ פרשי הולך וכובש בזרעו של שם ומקי הא אמי במסכי
כתובי... ואי נראי מפרשי שפי לשם נפלה כשחלק נח את הארץ...

The passage begins with a citation of only the first clause of the printed texts, that the Canaanite was gradually conquering the land from Shem. After a discussion of the difficulty this comment presents - unpacked in the light of the Talmudic discussions of Num. 13:22, in which the land is assumed to belong to Ham and his progeny - the subsequent phrase of Rashi's comment, that Shem acquired the land when Noah apportioned the world among his sons, is cited and refuted. The proof-text of Gen. 14:18 is not included, and the later discussions of whether God is giving Abraham the land or returning it to him and the passage from the Guadajajara edition about Abraham's merit are also not cited.

(c) The citation in Leiden 27 (Cod. Or. 4765) consists of only the first clause of Rashi's printed comment:⁵⁹

ורשיי פי והכנעני אז בארץ שהכנעני היה הולך וכובש הארץ שנפלה
בחלקו של שם בתחלה שני ומלכי צדק מלך שלם וקשה שהרי ארץ ישראל
היה לכנען...

57. Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fols. 9b and 10b.

58. Paris héb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fols. 9a-9b.

59. Leiden 27 (Cod. Or. 4765) [IMHM 17371], fols. 8b-9a.

When compared with the printed renditions of Rashi's comment, this citation seems to be a briefer paraphrase. The printed text specifies that the land was being conquered by the Canaanite **שם מורעו של שם**, and the word **נפלה** follows the phrase **שם של שם**. The citation also does not indicate that Shem acquired the land **כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו**, but rather **בתחלה**. These textual differences, however, do not alter the meaning of the interpretation and accurately represent the first part of Rashi's printed comment. Like the previous citations, the latter parts of the printed comment are not cited or discussed by the Tosafot.

(d) Moscow-Guenzburg 317 is a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century manuscript of a super-commentary on Rashi. As explained in earlier chapters and examples, this text presents the citation of Rashi in a variety of styles, including citing a few words from the comment without clear attribution. For Rashi's comment on 12:6, two elements of the interpretation are cited, both from within the first part of the comment.⁶⁰

היה הולך ותופש וכובש וכוי וקי לרשי...

שני ומלכי צדק וכוי...

The printed editions varied in the first phrase of the comment in whether they read **הולך ותופש** or **הולך וכובש**; this text includes all three verbs. The later date of the manuscript suggests that the scribe or student may be accounting for the variant traditions of this phrase, rather than that the printed renditions lost one of the verbs in the course of transmission.

The abbreviated **וכוי** intimates that the scribe realized that the comment continued beyond the citation, although to what extent it conformed to the entire comment in the printed editions is unknowable. The only reason to assume the author was familiar with the printed version of Rashi's comment is the reader's awareness of a longer rendition. Since the printed versions are acknowledged to be corrupt, the basis for this assumption is weak. Neither the citations nor the comments that follow indicate any awareness of Rashi's note on God's promise in 12:7. The **וכוי** after **ומלכי צדק** most likely refers only to the continuation of the

60. Moscow-Guenzburg 317 [IMHM 47585], fol. 13b.

biblical citation of Gen. 14:18, מלך שלם. Despite the incompleteness of the citations, the texts conform to the citations from the previous examples in lacking the latter elements of the printed comment.

(e) London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) persists in this conformity. Like Paris (héb.) 260, the citation of Rashi's comment for this lemma is divided into two parts, separated by a discussion of each element.⁶¹

והכנעני אז בארץ פרי"ש היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם...
עוד פרי"ש בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו וקשי'...

The prooftext is the only aspect of the first part of Rashi's printed comment not included in the citation. Consistent with the other citations, the existence of more text to Rashi's comment is not indicated.

(f) In Sassoon 409/1, only the first clause of Rashi's printed comment is cited:⁶²

והכנעני אז בארץ פרש הולך וכובש מזרעו של שם ומקשי' הא בסו'...

(g) The citation of Rashi in New York - JTS L819a/1 differs from Sassoon 409/1 only in the inclusion of the words היה and את ארץ ישראל, absent in the example above.⁶³

והכנעני אז בארץ היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם...

(h) The citation in Vat. Ebr. 48/1 is the following:⁶⁴

והכנעני אז בארץ פ"ה שהכנען הולך וכובש הארץ שנפלי בחלקו של שם
מתחילה שני מלכי צדק מלך שלם וקשי' שהרי'...

Like Leiden 27 (Cod. Or. 4765), this text cites the entire first part of Rashi's printed comment, although with minor textual variants. In conformity with all the citations, the latter elements of Rashi's comment are not cited, nor do the exegetes indicate they were aware that the interpretation continued.

(i) The citation in New York - JTS L792/1 is very similar to Vat. Ebr. 48/1:⁶⁵

61. London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fols. 18b-19a.

62. Sassoon 409/1 [IMHM 9353], fol. 11.

63. New York - JTS L819a/1 [IMHM 24053], fol. 2b.

64. Vat. Ebr. 48/1 [IMHM 165], fols. 6a-6b.

65. New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022], fol. 7b.

והכנעני אז בארץ פה הולך וכובש הארץ שנפלה בחלקו של שם בתחלה
שנא ומלכי צדק מלך שלם וקשה שהרי...

This version is missing the word כנעני and has בתחלה instead of מתחילה. The vav on ומלכי is not present in the previous text.

(j) New York - JTS L791 divides its citation of Rashi into two parts.⁶⁶

והכנעני אז בארץ פי הולך וכובש ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם לפי שחם...
עוד פרש"י בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח הארץ לבניו וק'...

The prooftext is not included in this citation, as it is absent from a number of other citations. However, the Tosafot's awareness of Rashi's comment regarding Shem's original ownership of the land is certain, and the lack of reference to any remainder elements of the comment persists.

(k) Jerusalem 8*2240 has a complete citation of the first part of Rashi's printed comment:⁶⁷

והכנעני אז בארץ היה כובש את ארץ ישראל כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו
נפלה בחלקו של שם שנא ומלכי צדק מלך שלם...

The order of the clauses varies slightly between this rendition and that of the printed editions, and the phrase מזרעו של שם is absent from this citation. The word שכם instead of שם is obviously an error. The affiliation between this citation and the first part of Rashi's printed comment for 12:6 is undeniable. The conforming absence of the latter parts of the comment challenges its authenticity to the original work.

(l) The citation in Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) maintains the conformity established in the preceding examples:⁶⁸

והכנעני אז בארץ פייה שהכנעני הולך וכובש הארץ שנפלה בחלקו של שם
בתחלה שני ומלכי צדק מלך שלם וקשה שהרי...

(m) Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) cites the first part of Rashi's printed comment with only a few textual variants from Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or.

66. New York - JTS L791 [IMHM 24021], fol. 11b.

67. Jerusalem 8*2240 (B432), fol. 9b-10a.

68. Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738], fol. 5b.

604):⁶⁹

והכנעני אז בארץ היה הולך וכובש ארץ ישרי מזרעו של שם שבחלקו של
שם נפלי כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו שני ומלכי צדק מלך שלם...

(n) Finally, Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 offers a puzzling deviation from the conformity presented in the above citations.⁷⁰

והכנעני אז בארץ פי שהיה הולך וכובש את הארץ מזרעו של שם וכן גבי
לזרעך אתן את הארץ פרשי שמן הדין אתננה לכם שהרי הארץ עלתה
בגורלו של שם והם יצאו מזרעו ותי'...

The first clause of Rashi's printed comment is cited as in earlier examples, although the remainder of the first part of the comment is not. What follows the citation is essentially a paraphrase of the second part of Rashi's comment, not yet represented in any of the Tosafot texts. The text of the manuscript explains that according to Rashi's comment regarding לזרעך אתן את הארץ, God will give Abraham and his descendants the land legally, because it formed part of the portion allocated to Shem from whom the progeny of Abraham descends.

This version of the comment varies from the rendition in the printed texts in the absence of the notion of return. In other words, where the printed texts suggested that God was not giving Abraham the land, but rather returning to him what he rightfully inherited, thus diminishing the greatness of God's gift, this text explains that God was giving Abraham the land, but in doing so, He was not stealing it from anyone else, since legally it belonged to the progeny of Abraham.

The words used to express the second half of Rashi's printed comment are very different from what actually appears in the commentary itself and the variant nuance in meaning intimates that the author's source may not have been Rashi's comment on 12:6.

Rashi does not offer a comment for this particular lemma, לזרעך אתן, in 12:7, but the comment for Gen. 23:4 is similar in language and meaning. Abraham is negotiating with the sons of Heth for a burial place for Sarah and he introduces himself as גר ותושב אנכי עמכם, "I am a resident alien among you." Rashi's

69. Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], fourth folio of פרשת לך לך.

70. Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 [IMHM 15890], second folio of פרשת לך לך.

comment for this lemma is the following:⁷¹

גר מארץ אחרת ונתישבתי עמכם. ומדרש אגדה אם תרצו הריני גר ואם לאו אהיה תושב ואטלנה מן הדין שאמר לי הקב"ה לזרעך אתן את הארץ.

The comment offers two explanations for the oxymoron "resident alien."

The first states that Abraham was a stranger in that he originated in another land, but he settled among the sons of Heth and therefore lived among them. The second part of the comment, labelled *midrash aggadah*, expounds the double meaning intended in Abraham's introduction. If the sons of Heth are willing to sell him the land, he will regard himself as a stranger and purchase it in order to own it.

However, if the sons of Heth are not willing to sell him the land, Abraham will regard himself as a settler and will claim the land on legal grounds, since God said He would give him the land.⁷²

The association of the words מן הדין with the lemma אתן את הארץ is reminiscent of the Tosafot citation of Rashi. In both, Abraham has a legal right to the land because of God's promise in 12:7. However, the connection of this legal right to the inheritance of the progeny of Shem is made only in Rashi's printed comment for 12:6 and in this one Tosafot passage.

If the exegete in Cambridge 669,2 is thinking about the second half of Rashi's printed comment, then his representation must be considered a broad paraphrase, and his omission of the notion of God returning to Abraham the land he owned is dubious. On the other hand, the intention of the exegete might be to attribute to Rashi only the words שמן הדין אתננה לכם and the phrase beginning שהרי is the exegete's clarification of Rashi's use of מן הדין. This would be an allusion to the idea expressed in Rashi's comment for 23:4 related to Abraham's legal right to the land.

The conformity among the partial citations presented in 13 of the 14 examples and the lack of a clear and certain association between the second half of Rashi's comment for 12:6 and the citation or paraphrase in Cambridge 669,2 sustains the challenge to the authenticity of the printed comment that states that

71. This version is the Venice edition in *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 261-262.

Variants to this renditions are insignificant to the meaning of the comment, but can be found in *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 371, and Berliner (1905) 45.

72. See BR 58:4 (Theodor, Albeck, vol. 2, 624).

God returned the land to Abraham's progeny rather than gave it to them. Since the Tosafot consistently question and contest Rashi's claim that the land was originally allocated to Shem, their lack of attention to the remainder of Rashi's comment, which is founded on this assumption and which involves a reinterpretation of God's promise to Abraham, is suspicious. The one reference to this aspect of the comment is not a straightforward citation or association; perhaps, it represents the source from which the comment entered into the printed editions.

The ten manuscripts of מנחת יהודה maintain the conformity established in the previous examples. Only the first part of Rashi's printed comment is cited, and the Tosafot do not insinuate in any way that the text before them continued beyond what was cited. The texts are as follows:

(o) Budapest Kaufmann A31 discusses the citation in two parts:⁷³

והכנעני אז בארץ פי רש"י היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של
שם
פי חזקוני... עוד פי הרש"י בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח הארץ לבניו
והק'...

(p) Verona 4 lacks the word וכובש, and ארץ ישראל is abbreviated. In addition, נופלה has a *vav* not present in other renditions, and הארץ does not follow נח. Aside from these few minor variants, the citation represents the same portion of Rashi's printed comment as earlier examples:⁷⁴

והכנעני אז בארץ פי רשי היה הולך א"י מזרעו של שם פי חזקוני... עוי
פי רשי בחלקו של שם נופלה כשחלק נח לבני וק'...

(q) Paris héb. 168 does not differ significantly:⁷⁵

והכנעני אז בארץ פי הרש היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם
פי חזקוני... עוד פי הרש בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח הארץ לבניו
והקשה...

(r) Parma 537 (2541) varies only in the way it presents its attribution to

73. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 25a.

74. Verona 4 [IMHM 768], fol. 11b.

75. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 13b.

Rashi and in the addition of the particle את before הארץ:⁷⁶

והכנעני אז בארץ פרש היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם
פרש חזקוני... עוד פרש בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו
וקשיא...

(s) New York - JTS L790 includes the abbreviation ז"ל after the attribution to Rashi:⁷⁷

והכנעני אז בארץ פרשי זל היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם
פ"י חזקוני... עוד פ"י ז"ל בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח את הארץ
לבניו וקשיא...

(t) The conformity persists in the citation in New York - JTS L789:⁷⁸

והכנעני אז בארץ פ"י רשי היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם
פ"י חזקוני... עוד פ"י רשי בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו
וקשיא...

(u) The text of New York - JTS L787 presents no significant differences:⁷⁹

והכנעני אז בארץ פרשי היה הולך וכובש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם פ"י
חזקוני... עוד פירש רשיי בחלקו של שם נפלה כשחלק נח את הארץ לבניו
וקשיא...

(v) The citation in Parma 527 (2368) cites the word ותופש instead of וכובש.

This manuscript is dated in 1402 and thus presents an association of this textual rendition with Rashi prior to the beginning of printing. Since both words express the same idea of the Canaanite appropriating the land from Shem, determining for certain which word was utilized by Rashi is unnecessary at this point. One can certainly envision a scribal error arising from an illegible copying of either word, but the association of Rashi with the concept expressed in the comment is undeniable and therefore, the recovery of the exact word awaits Rashi's own manuscript, or at best, the criteria with which to evaluate the reliability of the extant ones.⁸⁰

והכנעני אז בארץ פרש היה הולך ותופש את ארץ ישראל מזרעו של שם פ"י

76. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fols. 12a-12b.

77. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 14b.

78. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 9b.

79. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fols. 8b.

80. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], first folio of פרשת לך לך.

תקנתו... על שרש בתלמוד בבלי נאמר כי לא היה שם אלא שרש בלבד...
...תקנתו

(w) Munich 62, 1 only cites the first clause of Rashi's printed comment, and

the discussion that follows from the queries posed by Hizkuni in the other manuscripts. The affiliation of Rashi to the idea that the Canaanite was conquering the land from its rightful owner Shem is sustained.⁸¹

תקנתו... על שרש בתלמוד בבלי נאמר כי לא היה שם אלא שרש בלבד...
...תקנתו

(x) Finally, Vat. Ebr. 53 cites both clauses of the first part of Rashi's printed

comment.⁸²

תקנתו... על שרש בתלמוד בבלי נאמר כי לא היה שם אלא שרש בלבד...
...תקנתו

All ten manuscripts present the same text of Rashi, and these

citations conform with the first set of examples extracted from manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries of varying style, date and quality. Rashi's

explanation for the Canaanite presence in the land of Israel when Abraham arrived - that they were in the process of capturing it from the progeny of Shem, who were allocated the land by Noah - is undeniably associated with him. The authenticity of the remainder of the printed comment is less certain.

The integrity of the additional passage at the end of the Guadelajara edition

is suspicious because of its conceptual inconsistency with the remainder of the

comment. The lack of citations of this passage in any of the Tosafot extracts

upholds its dubious nature and sustains a significant challenge to its authenticity.

Similarly, the reinterpretation of God's promise in 12:7, from giving Abraham

the land to restoring his inheritance, is not cited in any of the manuscripts. The

one text that suggests a reference to this second part of Rashi's comment does

not manifest the same linguistic formulations as the citations of the first part of the

comment, and the exact nuance in meaning in the printed rendition is not

expressed accurately in this one Tosafot passage. Thus, the authenticity of this

81. Munich 62, 1 [MHM 23118], fols. 11a, 82. Vat. Ebr. 53 [MHM 170], fol. 13b-14a.

problematic nature of the assumption that the land was apportioned originally to Shem, the prooftext and its legitimacy were irrelevant. For this reason, the lack of conformity regarding the citation of the prooftext does not lead necessarily to a conclusion of inauthenticity.

The same argument of irrelevance cannot be made regarding the second half of Rashi's printed text on this verse, because the comment extends beyond the assumption of Shem's inheritance of the land and involves a reinterpretation of the subsequent verse. The nature of God's promise to Abraham regarding the land persists, regardless of who originally possessed it. The difficulties with the logical progression in the printed comment as a whole have already been expressed and need not be repeated; however, these very conceptual difficulties beg for clarification; had they formed part of the Tosafot version of the commentary, one would have expected them to be considered.

Rashi's printed comment for Gen. 12:6 does not manifest blatant textual inconsistencies, but the development of ideas throughout the interpretation is problematic. Twenty-four manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries consistently cite only the first half of Rashi's printed comment. This conformity together with the difficult nature of the printed comment suggest that Rashi's interpretation of the lemma **והכנעני אז בארץ** originally ended with the idea that the Canaanites were capturing the land from Shem who had been apportioned it by Noah. The subsequent elements in the printed texts do not appear to be authentic to the original work.

3. Conclusion

Conformity among citations of Rashi from the Tosafot Torah commentaries has been shown to confirm the authenticity of certain comments as they are presented in the printed editions. This same conformity can challenge the authenticity of uncited elements of the printed texts. The intention is not to eliminate half of Rashi's printed comment simply because the Tosafot do not cite it, but if twenty-five manuscripts of Tosafot commentaries cite a comment of Rashi in conformity with the version in the printed editions, the authenticity of this

comment would not be challenged. When this same conformity among the manuscripts manifests only half of the familiar comment, and texts of the printed comment display inconsistencies, or the content of the printed comment is awkward and unclear and the Tosafot address the contents of the comment directly, then the Tosafot reading of the comment must also be considered authentic.

An argument from silence is not easy to make, and the reasons for which the Tosafot addressed some issues and not others could be ascertained only by asking the very men who wrote the commentaries, and even this would qualify as *post facto* testimony and not fact. The printed editions, however, cannot be the standard by which to ascertain the authenticity of Rashi's comments. The manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries present the text of Rashi with which the people closest to him were familiar, and hence a text as close to Rashi's own version as is available. When only half of a printed comment, which in its extant form is problematic, is cited consistently, the citations should not be dismissed as incomplete simply because they do not manifest the familiar text. The familiar text is not necessarily the authentic one. Rather these "incomplete" citations may represent the original kernel of Rashi's commentary, to which subsequent layers were added. The analyses of Rashi's comments on Gen. 9:23 and 12:6, as cited in the manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries, suggest that the original rendition of the work may have been considerably shorter than what is now found in the printed editions.

In the next chapter, the notion that uncited elements of Rashi's printed comment are the result of additions to the work, incorporated in the body of the commentary during the process of its transmission, will be demonstrated through examples in which aspects of Rashi's printed comment originated as part of the Tosafot discussions.

Chapter Four: Partial Citations and the Printed Text - The Tosafist Proof of Added Material

A. Tosafist Exegesis in the Printed Text of Rashi

Comments from the printed text of Rashi's work that are represented only partially in the citations of Rashi in the Tosafot manifest a complex dilemma. The issue of whether the parts of Rashi's printed comments that are not cited by the Tosafot were unknown to the exegetes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and therefore are not authentic to Rashi's original commentary, or whether they were not of interest to the Tosafot and therefore not addressed in their writings is essential. The previous chapters have suggested that consistent citations of only half of the printed renditions of the commentary challenge the authenticity of the uncited portions in the same way that consistent citations of the entire printed comment confirm its authenticity. The processes through which the original comments were expanded to include the added parts now found in the printed version and the reasons for the Tosafot concern for one issue over another are contingent upon speculative analyses only.

This chapter will demonstrate that the Tosafot citations and discussions of Rashi offer not only a text close to the original, but that they can also present the source from which a specific part of a comment now part of Rashi was expanded. The examples explored below suggest that the original text of Rashi's comment on these verses was shorter, and that the elements of the comment not cited by Tosafot originated in their discussions of the Rashi comment.

The complexity of extracting a citation of Rashi from the Tosafot manuscripts without the benefits of modern punctuation is integral to this discussion. The temptation to search the Tosafot text for the familiar words of Rashi's printed comment and to assume all comparable linguistic formulation is a reference to the work of Rashi is both misleading and unscientific. Any assumptions made on the basis of the printed texts defeat the goal of

reconstruction, since the extensive circulation and transmission process and the late date of the manuscripts relative to Rashi's own lifetime prove that the printed editions have been corrupted.

For this analysis, the Tosafot manuscripts were read as works unto themselves and the citations were extracted based on the scribal patterns established in each of them. The signals within each manuscript as to what constituted a citation and what was the discussion of that citation included the type of attribution to Rashi, the terminology that began the super-comment, and notation marks such as supra-linear dots. Familiarity with each Tosafot manuscript facilitated the analysis of elements of Rashi's printed comment that did not appear to form part of the actual citation of Rashi. Akin to earlier analyses, variants in the early printed editions were also considered to support the challenge to the authenticity of each reading.

While each previous chapter aims to emphasize the essential contribution of the Tosafot to the reconstruction of the original text of Rashi's commentary, this one will stress the importance of disregarding and abandoning preconceived notions of what Rashi's commentary should say. The familiar text of Rashi's commentary often is not authentic, and the Tosafot can offer us a text that is closer to Rashi's own. The variant readings they present must not be rejected simply because they do not conform to the corrupt versions with which readers are familiar.

1. *Genesis 8:10*

Not having found a place to rest, the dove has returned to the ark, and in Gen. 8:10, Noah waits another seven days and then sends the dove from the ark again. The verse reads:

ויחל עוד שבעת ימים אחרים ויסף שלח את היונה מן התבה.

Rashi's comment for the lemma ויחל is the same in all editions except Reggio. The text of Berliner, Verice, Guadelajara and Rome reads:¹

1. Berliner (1905) 17; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 91, 331.

ויחל לשון המתנה וכן לי שמעו ויחלו והרבה יש במקרא.

The comment defines the word ויחל in the sense of waiting and offers a comparable use of the word in Job 29:21.² It concludes that the word is used similarly in many examples in Scripture. The comment in Reggio varies minimally from the rendition in the other editions:³

ויחל לשון המתנה כמו לי שמעו ויחלו והרבה לשון יש במקרא.

This version introduces the example with כמו instead of וכן, and the word לשון appears in the middle of the phrase והרבה יש במקרא. The meaning of the phrase והרבה יש במקרא is difficult to translate. The sense may be either the same as in the other editions, that many such uses of ויחל as "waiting" are evident in Scripture, or that ויחל has many meanings in Scripture. The ambiguity does not alter the essential definition provided in the Rashi comment, but it does signal a potential problem in the text's transmission.

This comment is cited in only one Tosafot Torah commentary: New York - JTS L793, a fifteenth-century manuscript of a super-commentary on Rashi.⁴ The style of this text is the following: The lemma from the verse is presented with three dots above the word and is followed by an unattributed comment of Rashi. Since the title of the work is פרוש על פרוש רש"י לתורה, an identification for each citation is unnecessary. The super-comment on the citation is usually introduced with the abbreviation פ"י, clearly signalling the end of each citation. Should Rashi's comment be referred to further on in the discussion, an attribution is appended to the citation.⁵

The Gen. 8:10 passage in this manuscript cites only the first two words of Rashi's printed comment, the basic definition of the word ויחל, but the comment

2. The whole verse reads: לי שמעו ויחלו וידמו למו ענתי. Job is lamenting his plight and recalls that "Men listened to him and waited for his advice."

3. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 331.

4. New York - JTS L793 [IMHM 24023].

5. For example, fol. 6a.

from Job 29:21 and the phrase **והרבה יש במקרא** are not authentic to the original Rashi.

Rashi's original comment defined **ויחל** as **לשון המתנה**. The Tosafot clarified the need for such a definition by demonstrating where the same exact word carries a different meaning and provided examples to support Rashi's definition of the word in this context. One might speculate that some or all of these examples were included in the margins of Rashi's commentary by students studying and copying the work. The variant of **וכן** in most of the printed editions and **כמו** in the Reggio text might be the visible seam indicating the insertion of extraneous material into the body of the commentary.

The phrase **והרבה יש במקרא** corresponds accurately with the text of the Tosafot comment, where a number of other examples are presented. If the citation of Job 29:21 in the Tosafot extract were intended to refer back to the comment of Rashi, its presence in the middle of the two other citations is troublesome. Job 29:21 precedes chronologically the first biblical citation in the Tosafot passage (Job 29:23), and had it formed part of Rashi's original comment, one would expect it to be listed first, followed by the examples added by the Tosafist.

The tone of the comment and the pattern of its style within this particular document suggest that the citation of Job 29:21 was one of three examples supplied by the Tosafist in his commentary on Rashi, and that Rashi's original comment ended with the text suggested by the citation in New York - JTS L793: **לשון המתנה**. The fact that these words are identical in all printed editions and that the remainder half of the comment contains minor differences is not insignificant.

A comparison of only the printed editions would not have suggested profound textual difficulties with Rashi's comment for Gen. 8:10. The Tosafot comment indicates however that the original comment was shorter than the printed versions. It also demonstrates the source for the added material. Without consultation of the Tosafot commentaries, the exact nature of the textual difficulties would have remained unknown.

In addition to establishing the value of the Tosafot commentaries for the reconstruction of the original Rashi, this example has demonstrated the

importance of reading the Tosafot text for what it presents of the Rashi and of itself and not for what the reader expects it to cite. The Tosafot passage for Rashi's comment on Gen. 8:10 does not affiliate the citation of Job 29:21 with Rashi in any way. Only the reader's comparison with a text not worthy of being used as a standard for comparison would lead to this association. Otherwise the citation of Job 29:21 clearly forms part of the Tosafot comment on Rashi, and consultation of the passage as a whole helps to correct and restore the original version of Rashi's text.

2. Genesis 12:5

In this verse, as God has commanded him, Abraham leaves Haran and takes all his possessions and his family with him.

ויקח אברם את שרי אשתו ואת לוט בן אחיו ואת כל רכושם אשר רכשו
ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן ויצאו ללכת ארצה כנען ויבאו ארצה כנען.

One of the things Abraham takes with him is "the souls that they made in Haran," and Rashi's comment addresses the meaning of "to make a soul." The printed texts offer two explanations for the lemma *ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן* and the Berliner and Venice editions have the identical comment. Their text reads as follows:⁹

שהכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה אברהם מגייר את האנשים ושרה מגיירת
הנשים ומעלה עליהם הכתוב כאלו עשאוּם ופשוטו של מקרא עבדים
ושפחות שקנו להם כמו עשה את כל הכבוד הזה וישראל עושה חיל לשון
קונה וכונס.

The first part of the comment explains that "to make a soul" means that Abraham entered the people under the wings of the Divine Presence. The plural of *עשו* (they made) signifies that Abraham converted the men and Sarah converted the women. Because of this act of conversion, Scripture attributes to Abraham and Sarah the "making" of these people.

In the second half of the comment, Rashi offers an explanation according to *פשוטו של מקרא*, the literal or simple meaning of "the souls that they made in Haran." According to this section of the comment, "the souls they made" refers to

9. Berliner (1905) 22; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1 124.

the male and female servants that Abraham and Sarah acquired prior to leaving Haran. Two prooftexts then demonstrate other verses in Scripture where the verb עשה "to make" can mean קנה "to acquire."¹⁰ The comment ends with a phrase defining the sense carried by the use of the verb עשה in these examples, that of acquiring and amassing.

The textual variants in the other printed editions do not alter the sense of the comment. The Rome edition reads:¹¹

שהכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה הוא גייר האנשים ושרה גיירה את הנשים ומעלה עליהם הכתוב כאלו עשאוּם ופשוטו של מקרא עבדים ושפחות שקנו להם כמו עשה את כל הכבוד הזה וכמו עושה חיל לשון קונה וכונס.

This text has ושרה גיירה and אברהם מגייר את האנשים instead of הוא גייר האנשים instead of ושרה מגיירת את הנשים. The only other variant is with the second prooftext. In the Rome edition, the phrase עושה חיל is preceded by an introductory וכמו, whereas the Berliner and Venice editions append the second example to the first without clearly separating them. They also include the word עושה חיל before וישראל.

The Reggio edition is very similar to the Berliner and Venice texts:¹²

שהכניסום תחת כנפי השכינה אברה' מגייר את האנשי ושרה מגיירת הנשים ומעלה עליהם הכתוב כאילו עשאוּם ופשוטו של מקרא עבדים ושפחות שקנו להם כמו עשה את כל הכבוד הזה וכמי וישראל עושה חיל לשוי קונה וכונס.

This version abbreviates numerous words written out in full in the other editions, like לשוי, וכמי, הכתוב, האנשי, אברה', and וישראל. The second prooftext includes the word

10. The first example is Gen. 31:1 - וישמע את דברי בני לבן לאמר לקח יעקב את כל - אשר לאביו ומאשר לאביו עשה את כל הכבוד הזה. The sons of Laban are complaining that Jacob has taken all that belongs to their father, and from that which was their father's, he has "amassed all this wealth." Rashi's comment for 31:1 defines עשה as כנס - to gather. See *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 2, 115-116. The second prooftext is Num. 24:18 - ויהי אדום ויהי - ירעה שיעיר איביו וישראל עשה חיל. Balaam relays God's words that Edom and Seir (enemies of Israel) will be an inheritance for their enemies and Israel will acquire strength or success. The printed texts of Rashi contain no comment on עשה חיל for this verse.

11. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, p. 339.

12. *Ibid.*

וישראל, but it is also preceded by an introductory וכמי. The first word of the comment שהכניסון is שהכניסן in the other editions.

Finally, the Guadelajara edition differs more significantly in terms of its text, although the content of the comment remains the same.¹³

אברהם מגייר האנשים ושרה מגיירת הנשים ומעלה עליהם כאלו עשאו
לכך כתיי עשו ופשוטו של מקרא עבדי ושפחות שקנו להם כמו עשה את
כל הכבוד הזה לשון קנין.

This edition is missing the first phrase that Abraham brought the people under the wings of the שכינה, the particle את before the word האנשים, and the word הכתוב after עליהם ומעלה עליהם. It does contain the additional phrase לכך כתיי עשו. The word עבדי is abbreviated, the second proof-text is missing entirely, and the final phrase of the comment reads לשון קונה וכונס instead of לשון קנין. The types of variants displayed in this text intimate difficulties in the text's transmission.

The absence of the second proof-text and the varying ways in which it is appended to the comment in the other editions suggest it may not be authentic to the commentary. The phrase לשון קנין is very similar to its alternate in the other texts, לשון קונה וכונס, but the textual variants call into question the reliability of the word וכונס, if not the entire phrase. The absence of the beginning clause is also suspicious, since the association of Abraham with bringing people under the wings of the שכינה is explicit in numerous rabbinic sources.¹⁴

Despite the numerous textual uncertainties, the comment itself is the same in all editions. The texts all present two explanations: the first one is firmly rooted in rabbinic midrashim,¹⁵ and the second one is clearly distinguished as פשוטו של מקרא. Since many articles and books have analyzed the ways Rashi

13. *Ibid.*

14. For example, *Sifrei Devarim*, פיסקא עב, ed. L. Finkelstein (Berlin:1939; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969) 54; *Avot de Rabbi Natan*, נטתא א', יב, (Schechter 1967) fol. 27a, p. 53; and *Shir HaShirim Rabbah* 1:3.

15. San. 99b, Esther Rabbah 6:2, *Sifrei Devarim*, פיסקא עב (Finkelstein 1969) 54; *Avot de Rabbi Natan*, נטתא א', יב, (Schechter 1967), fol. 27a, p. 53; and *Shir HaShirim Rabbah* 1:3.

blends *peshat* and *derash* in his commentary,¹⁶ and this aspect of the comment is consistent in each edition, Rashi's inclusion of two explanations does not raise any suspicions. The citations in Tosafot suggest otherwise.

Rashi's comment for Gen. 12:5 is cited in seven Tosafot manuscripts. The concern in all these texts is how Abraham could have converted other people when he himself had not been converted or commanded yet to perform circumcision, one of the essential rituals for conversion. Despite the Tosafot difficulty with the first part of Rashi's comment, none of the passages then turns to Rashi's second comment as the preferred explanation, nor do they speculate as to why Rashi offered two explanations. All of the Tosafot citations of Rashi present only the first half of Rashi's printed comment, and none of the subsequent discussions suggests in any way that these students of Rashi were aware of an alternative interpretation.

(a) Verona 4 contains the following passage:¹⁷

ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן פרשי אברם מגייר אנשים ושרה מגיירת הנשי
ותימי והלא עדיין לא נצטוו על המילה וייל שלמדן ז' מצות שנצטוו לבני
נח.

This text does not cite the phrase about the wings of the שכינה nor the explanatory remark that, because of the conversion, מעלה עליהם הכתוב כאלו עשאוּם. Most significantly, it is missing the entire comment according to פשוטו של מקרא. This exegete finds Rashi's comment about the conversion surprising, because Abraham was not yet commanded to perform circumcision. He suggests that Abraham simply instructed them in the seven laws commanded to the sons of Noah. One would expect that if the Tosafist had Rashi's second interpretation, he might have expressed his preference for it or demonstrated why it was a superior or inferior alternative.

16. For example, Gelles; Kamin (1986); Y. Kuperman, "עיון בפירוש רש"י על", *תורה* 26.1 (1986): 28-42; Troper (1983); Rahman (1983); Doron; Menahem Banitt, "עד על כפל לשון בפירוש רש"י על המקרא", *The Bible in the Light of its Interpreters, Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume*, ed. Sarah Japhet, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1994) 262-286; Amnon Shapira, "פירוש הכפל", *ibid.*, 287-311.

17. Verona 4 [IMHM 768], fol. 10b.

(b) In the margins of Jerusalem 8°5138 (B200), the citation of Rashi includes the phrase about the wings of the שכינה, but the *peshat* comment is not offered:¹⁸

את הנפש אשר עשו בחרן פרשי שהכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה שאברהם
מגייר את האנשי ותימי לדבריו והלא הוא עצמו לא גייר.

Although the passage does not cite that Sarah converted the women, the issue of conversion is clearly associated with Rashi and troublesome for the Tosafot. Without prior knowledge of the corrupt printed editions, the reader has no reason to assume the Tosafot had other elements of Rashi's comment to consider.

(c) Paris héb. 260 is similar to Verona 4:¹⁹

ואת הנפש פרש אברהם מגייר את האנשי ושרה מגיירת הנשי ותימי והלא
עדיין לא נצטוו אברהם אבי על המילה ובמה היה מגיירם וייל לא היה
מל אותם אלא למדם זי מצוות וזה היה הגירות.

Citing Rashi's comment of the people's conversion by Abraham and Sarah, the Tosafot suggest that since Abraham had not yet been commanded to perform circumcision, one could say that the conversion consisted only of teaching them the seven commandments given to Noah.

(d) The passage in Warsaw 204/27 also corresponds to the same issue:²⁰

פרשי שאברהם היה מגיר האנשים קי והלא לא נצטוו עדיין על המלה
והיאך היה מגירם י"ל שהיה מלמדם זי מצות בני נח.

The textual variants between the printed editions and the citations do not alter the fact that the Tosafot's text of Rashi offered the interpretation that Abraham converted the people with him. The absence of any reference to the *peshat* comment presented in the printed editions is also consistent from manuscript to manuscript.

(e) In Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 part of the Tosafot discussion of the Rashi incorporates comparable linguistic formulations to one phrase of the printed editions not cited in the previous examples:²¹

18. Jerusalem 8°5138 (B200), fol. 3b.

19. Paris héb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fol. 29a.

20. Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fol. 223a.

21. Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 [IMHM 15890], first fol. of פרשת לך לך.

אשר עשו בחרן פי רשי אברהם גייר האנשים שרה מגיירת הנשים וא"ת
הלא לא נצטווה לאברהם עדיין מצות מילה וי"ל אין מוקדם ומאוחר
ועי"ל שהתורה אז היתה מתחילה ועי"ל הדריכין בדרך ישרה ומעלה
עליהם הכתוי כאילו עשאום ומלו אותם.

After citing Rashi's comment about the conversion, the Tosafist exegete presents the problem that Abraham was not yet commanded to perform circumcision, and he offers three resolutions to the issue. The first is that the Torah does not maintain chronological order,²² so, in other words, just because in the narrative Abraham circumcises himself in a later chapter, one need not assume that this event did not occur prior to the issue addressed in this particular verse. The second suggested solution to this problem is that the laws of the Torah were observed from the beginning, even though they had not yet been given on Sinai,²³ and so Abraham might have performed circumcision. The final solution is that the conversion did not necessarily include circumcision, but rather Abraham led the people to the way of God (to the straight path), and Scripture accounts to Abraham and Sarah as if they had converted these people and circumcised them.

The phrase in the last suggestion of the Tosafist, ומעלה עליהם הכתוי כאילו עשאום, appears in the printed versions of the commentary. Once again, the only reason to assume that this phrase is a reference to Rashi's commentary is the reader's knowledge of the corrupt texts. The passage on its own clearly includes this phrase as part of the Tosafot super-commentary on the citation and in no way affiliates it with Rashi. The locution of the phrase מעלה עליהם...כאילו is common in rabbinic sources and thus not unique to Rashi. In fact, in Song of Songs Rabbah 1:3, the phrase מעלין עליו כאלו הוא בראו is used in a discussion of the meaning of the lemma אשר עשו בחרן, which, like the

22. See Pes. 6b and (ספרי על ספר במדבר וספר זוטא) ed. H. Horowitz (Leipzig: 1918; Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1966) 60-61.

23. See *Va-Yikra Rabbah* 2:10 (Mirkin, vol. 7, 30), where Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah and Joseph are believed to have fulfilled the commandments of the Torah.

printed comment of Rashi, understands the verse as referring to the conversions performed by Abraham and Sarah.²⁴

The identical formulation of the phrase in the printed editions and in the Tosafot passage, not as part of the citation of Rashi but as part of the Tosafot exegesis, challenges the authenticity of this phrase. It suggests that the lack of attribution to Rashi and its absence from the distinctive citations are indicative of both the addition of material to the familiar texts of Rashi and the source from which these additions were made. The commonality of the phrase's style and syntax in sources familiar to both Rashi and his students further supports the consideration that this part of the comment did not originate with him.

The explanation according to פשוטו של מקרא is also not cited in Cambridge (Add.) 669,2. This conformity with the other Tosafot extracts proposes that the second half of Rashi's printed comment is not original. The argument that perhaps the Tosafot were not interested in Rashi's *peshat* comment is valid; however, all the citations of Rashi for this lemma cite only the first part of the comment, and they all deal with a similar disagreement with it. If the Tosafot's text of Rashi had offered another interpretation, one might have expected the exegetes to address the legitimacy of the alternative.

(f) The final two citations of Rashi are consistent with the examples presented above. The discussions of Rashi, however, offer the source from which the *peshat* comment may have entered into Rashi's commentary in the complexity of its transmission. Like the previous passages, the concern in Munich 50,1 is the ability of Abraham to convert others:²⁵

ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן פי רשיי שהכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה אברהם
מגייר האנשים ושרה מגיירת את הנשים תימי והלא עצמו עדיין לא נתגייר
כי לא נקרא גר עד שימול ויטבול לכך לפי פשוטה של דבר ואת הנפש אשר
עשו בחרן עבדים ושפחות שקנו בחרן כמו עשה את כל הכבוד הזה אליבי
למ"ד אברהם קיים כל התורה כדאמי בפרשי תולדות יצחק עקב אשר
שמע אברהם בקולי למה לא מל את עצמו מיד וייל לפי שאברהם נביא

24. See *ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן והלא אם שיר השייכים רבה*, פרשה א', ד"ה גר יוחן שגיר
מתכנשים כל העולם לבראת יתוש אחד אין יכולים לבראתו, אלא אלו הגרים שגיר
אברהם ושרה, לכך נאמר ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן, אמר רבי חנינא אברהם היה מגייר
אנשים ושרה הנשים, ופה ת"ל אשר עשו בחרן, מלמד שהיה אברהם אבינו מכניסן לביתו
ומאכילן ומשקן ומאחיבן ומקרבן ומגיירן ומכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה, הא למדת שכל
המכניס בריה אחת לתוך כנפי השכינה מעלין עליו כאלו הוא בראו ויצרו וריקמו.

25. Munich 50, 1 [IMHM 1692], fol. 27b.

היה ויודע שעתיד הקבי"ה לצות לו על המילה לכך המתין כדאמי גדול
המצוה ועושה למי שאינו מצוה ועושה.

The citation of Rashi conforms with the earlier examples. Rashi is unequivocally linked with the idea that Abraham and Sarah converted people. The expression *שהכניסן תחת כנפי השכינה* is included in this citation, but it does not appear in all manuscripts. This may be due to a degree of paraphrasing in the citation inducing the exegete to cite only the essential idea of the comment. It may also indicate that the phrase's close association with the parallel discussion in the rabbinic sources precipitated its attachment to Rashi's comment.

The Tosafot's problem with Rashi is by now familiar, although this passage elucidates the issue more clearly. Abraham could not have converted others since he himself was not yet converted. The exegete specifies that a convert is so called once he has been circumcised and ritually immersed.²⁶ According to the chronology of the narrative, Abraham himself has not partaken in either ritual.

The most significant phrase for this discussion follows. After presenting the difficulty with Rashi's comment, the Tosafot remark, "Therefore, according to the simple meaning (לכך לפי פשוטה של דבר), the lemma 'and the souls that they made in Haran,' means the male and female servants that they acquired in Haran, as in Gen. 31:1, 'and he acquired all this wealth.'" The Tosafot does not attribute this comment to Rashi. Its affinity with the printed editions might prompt the reader to assume the Tosafot has now returned to Rashi's second explanation, but the passage itself gives no such indication.

The remainder of the passage returns to the discussion of Abraham performing circumcisions. The exegete presents hypothetical arguments of one who supports the idea that Abraham conducted conversions with this ritual. Gen. 26:5 is cited as proof that Abraham fulfilled the commandments of the Torah even before it was given,²⁷ and the rabbinic dictum, גדול מצווה ועושה יותר

26. Yeb. 46a delineates that a man has not been properly converted unless he has been circumcised and ritually immersed.

27. Gen. 26:5 reads: עקב אשר שמע אברהם בקלי וישמר משמרתו מצותי חקותי ותורתו. From here the rabbis understood that Abraham fulfilled all the commandments of the Torah. *Va-Yikra Rabbah* 2:10 (Mirkin, vol. 7, 30).

ממי שאינו מצווה ועושה²⁸ is proposed as the reason for which Abraham waited so long before circumcising himself. Since the patriarch had prophetic abilities, he knew God was going to command him to perform circumcision, and so he waited until he received the command in order to receive the greater reward of having fulfilled a good deed which God had commanded him.

The extract as a whole substantiates the claim that Rashi's original comment for this verse consisted of only the first half of the printed versions. In conformity with the earlier examples, it attributes to Rashi only the first element of the printed comment. It further provides the source for both the *peshat* explanation of the lemma found in the printed versions and the first proof-text used to support the definition of עשה as acquire. The absence of the second proof-text corroborates the suspicions raised from the textual variants in the printed texts described above.

If Rashi's original comment consisted of the first half of what now appears in the printed editions, then this passage from the Tosafot manuscript highlights the processes through which the comment developed into its present form. The *peshat* comment was originally part of the Tosafot's disagreement with Rashi's explanation of conversion. Perhaps once the Tosafot comment had been appended to Rashi's, which at that point contained only one proof-text, a subsequent scribe or student added a second example that then was incorporated into some versions of the commentary in different forms; it never was added to Guadelajara.

(g) A second very similar passage in Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) presents the same evidence, namely that half of Rashi's printed comment is actually the Tosafot super-commentary for a troublesome interpretation.²⁹

ואת הנפש אשר עשו בחרן פרשי שהכניסו תחת כנפי השכיני שאברהם
מגייר האנשי ושרה מגיירי הנשי ותימי לדבריו והלא עצמו לא גייר ועוד
גרסיי גר לא נקרא עד שימול ויטבול לכך נר' כפי פשוטו של דבר ואת
הנפש אשר עשו בחרן עבדי ושפחיו שקנו כמי עשה לי את כל הכבוד הזה

28. Kidd. 31a, BK 38a and AZ 3a are sources for the rabbinic adage that the greater reward goes to the one who does good deeds, having been commanded to do so, than to the one who has not been commanded, but does good deeds anyhow.

29. Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], third folio of פרשת לך לך.

commentary. This work offers interpretations of the biblical verses, and many of them, although not all, begin with a citation of Rashi. Those comments that do cite him, systematically refer to him by name. For Gen. 12:5, the text in this manuscript reads:³⁰

את הנפש אשר עשו בחרן לפי הפשט עבדים ושפחות.

In a text known to attribute comments to Rashi, the only reason to assume this comment was recognized by the Tosafot exegetes as belonging to Rashi is the corrupt printed editions. In the context of the Tosafot commentary, the comment is not affiliated with Rashi and may have been intended as a response to the known *derash* interpretations in rabbinic texts. Ultimately, the Tosafot offer no reason for the reader to assume the familiar printed text of Rashi is its source.

Three elements of the Tosafot Torah commentaries contribute to the serious challenge of the authenticity of the second half of Rashi's comment for 12:5. The first is the consistent, conforming citations of only the explanation of conversion. As demonstrated in previous chapters, this conformity has the potential to both confirm familiar readings and to propose a much shorter original rendition. None of the extracts from the Tosafot manuscripts indicates in any fashion that the text with which Rashi's students were familiar continued beyond the first (or in their case, the only) explanation. The second factor to this challenge is the appearance of the uncited portion of the printed comment in the Tosafot discussion of the Rashi. The idea that the unbiased reader, unfamiliar with the corrupt printed versions of Rashi, would not assume a textual connection between the attributed citation and the phrase resembling the printed *peshat* comment is integral to an objective reconstruction of the original work. The Tosafot passage itself clearly associates Rashi with the comment on conversion, but it does not relate the *peshat* comment to him. The assumption that the linguistic formulation common to the printed editions reflects the original Rashi perpetuates the sort of textual problems effected by the early printers and by Berliner in their subjective attempts to correct the work.

30. Oxford - Bodleian 284 (Marsh. 225) [IMHM 16752], fol. 11a.

The presence of the *peshat* explanation with its proof-text in the Tosafot exegesis of Rashi substantiates the challenge to its authenticity by manifesting a likely source from which the remark became embedded in Rashi's work. Evidence of only conforming citations requires speculating as to the Tosafot's interests and concerns and whether they should or should not have addressed issues related to the uncited portions of the printed comment. The Tosafot comments for this lemma account for the two explanations that appear in the printed editions and confirm the challenge proposed by the conforming but abbreviated citations.

The third element is the unattributed *peshat* comment in a work that cites Rashi frequently. The discussion of the conversion issues in rabbinic sources³¹ and the lack of an explanatory remark to the *peshat* comment suggest that the exegete in this document did not intend to be citing Rashi. A clear identification of Rashi followed by a super-comment would have conformed more accurately to the patterns of Tosafot exegesis of Rashi, and the availability of texts external to Rashi that address identical concerns might be the sources to which this exegete is responding with the words לפי הפשט.

The presentation of two explanations in Rashi's printed comment did not arouse suspicions because of the consistency with which both interpretations appeared in all printed versions and because many of the exegetical analyses conducted on Rashi's commentary have explored the methodologies of his employment of *peshat* and *derash*. The texts of the Tosafot concretize both the printed text's lack of reliability and the flawed results of analyses based on corrupt editions.

The Tosafot exegeses for Gen. 12:5 have demonstrated that half of Rashi's comment originated in the super-comment, and thus is not authentic to Rashi's own work. Since the printed versions of the commentary no longer manifest such traces of textual additions, analyses of his exegetical methods must be preceded by ascertaining a reliable text. Patterns in Rashi's use of *peshat* and *derash* interpretations - when he includes both forms of exegesis, or when he cites only one, and why one precedes the other - cannot be determined

31. See notes 14 and 15.

from the printed editions, because, as these Tosafot texts demonstrate, half the comment may not have been included by the exegete himself.

The printed texts of Rashi on 8:10 and 12:5 do not present drastic textual variants that render the integrity of the comments suspect. They underscore the potential of the Tosafot commentaries to sift out many of the undetectable layers, to demonstrate that even textual conformity can be misleading, and thereby to confirm the extent to which the printed versions are unreliable measures from which to establish the original work. These examples elucidate the reality of scribal transmission whence comments on Rashi have become indistinct from what Rashi himself wrote. Consideration to the style of the Tosafot manuscripts and the constant suppression of the reader's bias towards the familiar printed editions ultimately will allow for a more objective and more accurate correcting and reconstructing of the original Rashi.

B. The Contribution of the Rashi Manuscripts

As explained above in the Introduction, the contribution of the Rashi manuscripts to the process of reconstructing the original Rashi from citations of the commentary in the Tosafot texts is a tenuous one. Ideally, one would hope to confirm all the Tosafot versions of Rashi with evidence from the Rashi manuscripts themselves. This would substantiate the ability of the citations in Tosafot to provide the text closest to Rashi's own. However, this would also render futile the analyses of the Tosafot manuscripts. If the manuscripts of Rashi were sufficiently reliable as to consistently display the comments devoid of the centuries of transmission layers, the search for the original Rashi would not need to extend beyond the extant manuscripts of his work.

The reality is that the manuscripts of Rashi's Torah commentary, at least those presently under scholarly scrutiny, are far too removed from the copy Rashi wrote himself to provide reliable witnesses to the original text. The citations in the Tosafot manuscripts have proved effective at manifesting the commentary of Rashi familiar to his students and descendants. The examples above demonstrate further the ability of the Tosafot passages to exhibit the sources from

withhold (יכלה) one from him.³⁴ Despite the fact that word is spelled alternatively with an א or a ה, it appears to carry the same meaning.

The Venice and Guadelajara versions of the comment are identical to each other and very similar to Berliner's text.³⁵

ויכלה וימנע כמו לא תכלה רחמך לא יכלה ממך.

They vary only in the spelling of the word ויכלה in the second example, which has a ה in the biblical source and in Berliner. The presence of an א may have been an attempt by the scribe to correct what he believed to be an error and to render the analogous words uniform.

The Reggio edition includes the word ממני in the first proof-text, and like Venice and Guadelajara, it spells יכלה with an א.³⁶

ויכלה וימנע כמו לא תכלה רחמך ממני לא יכלה ממך.

The comment in the Rome edition differs more significantly. All the analogous words in this version, including the lemma, are spelled with a ה, and the order of the two proof-texts is reversed. The word ממני is also included in the example from Psalms.³⁷

ויכלה וימנע כמו לא יכלה ממך לא תכלה רחמך ממני.

Again the erroneous uniformity among the words being compared may have been a scribe's attempt at correction or clarification. The reverse order of the examples intimates perhaps that one or both of the proof-texts may not be authentic to the original commentary. Rather they were inserted into the body of the work from the margins and hence appear in differing positions within the comment.

Rashi's comment for this lemma is cited in only one Tosafot manuscript. New York - JTS L793 is the fifteenth-century manuscript of a super-commentary

34. This verse reads: שמעו אדני נשיא אלהים אתה ברוכנו במבחר קברינו קבר את מתך שמשו אדני נשיא אלהים אתה ברוכנו במבחר קברינו קבר את מתך. Rashi's comment for this verse and the variations among the editions are explored further on.

35. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1 88, 330.

36. *Ibid.* 330.

37. *Ibid.*

on Rashi that clearly delineates between the citation and the super-comment with the abbreviation כ"י. Akin to the citation of 8:10 above, this extract only attributes to Rashi the one word definition of the lemma. The proof-text appears to form part of the Tosafot discussion that follows. Most significantly, only one of the proof-texts from the printed editions appears in the passage. The text is the following:³⁸

ויכלא וימנע פי כי ויכלא באלף הוא כמו לא יכלה ממך שהוא בהא.

Being a super-commentary on Rashi, the manuscript does not need to attribute each comment to him prior to the citation. The style of the document clearly considers the word וימנע as constituting the commentary of Rashi. The Tosafist clarifies that even though this use of the word ויכלא employs an א, it nonetheless has the same meaning as יכלה with a ה in Gen. 23:6. The proof-text from Psalms 40:12 does not appear in either the citation or the super-comment.

The primary question to be addressed is whether the citation of Gen. 23:6 is a reference to what the Tosafot had in their version of Rashi or whether it originated in the Tosafot clarification of Rashi. As with the earlier examples, the only reason to assume the Tosafot are introducing a latter element of authentic Rashi is the reader's familiarity with the printed editions. However, would the Tosafist concern with identical meanings being attributed to words that carry different endings have arisen had Rashi not included this proof-text in his original work? The definition of וימנע may not have required further explanation and association with Gen. 23:6, unless the word with a ה ending was known to carry this same definition and the Tosafist felt obliged to ensure his reader that Rashi had not erred, but rather that the word meant the same whether it ended with a ה or an א.

The printed texts for Rashi's comment on Gen. 23:6 present similar dilemmas. The Berliner and Venice editions have the following comment:³⁹

38. New York - JTS L793 [IMHM 24023], fol. 8a.

39. Berliner (1905) 45; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 262.

לא יכלה לא ימנע כמו לא תכלה רחמך וכמו ויכלה הגשם.

The lemma with a ה is defined as ימנע, and Psalms 40:12 and Gen. 8:2 are provided as prooftexts. The Reggio edition has the same text, but the location of its comment does not follow the logical sequence of the verses; rather it appears before Rashi's comment on Gen. 23:4. The lack of sequential order suggests textual corruption and intimates that the comment may have been inserted erroneously from a marginal note.

The Rome edition includes both prooftexts, as do the previous examples, but the citation from Psalms 40:12 spells תכלה with a ה and includes more words from each verse:⁴⁰

לא יכלה לא ימנע כמו לא תכלה רחמך ממני וכמו ויכלה הגשם מן השמים.

The text of the Guadelajara edition cites both biblical verses with a ה on the analogous words. It adds further to the complexity by omitting the essential definition וימנע:⁴¹

לא יכלה ממך לשון לא תכלה רחמך ממני ויכלה הגשם.

As with Rashi's comment for 8:2, the variants in these comments raise similar issues regarding the integrity of the text. The interchange of ה and א endings for the lemmata and for the prooftexts suggests an awareness of and even a difficulty with the same definition for words that appear different. Erroneous attempts at correcting the prooftexts and rendering their correlation uniform underscore the scribe's lack of familiarity with the biblical sources. The inconsistent order in Reggio and the definition missing from Guadelajara contribute further to the dubious nature of the text.

The citation of this comment in New York - JTS L793 sheds some light on the textual mess.⁴²

40. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 371-372.

41. *Ibid.*

42. New York - JTS L793 [IMHM 24023], fol. 31b.

לא יכלה לא ימנע פי שאינו מלשו כלו כמו כלה זעם וכמו ויכל אלהים
 וזולתם רבים כי לפי הענין לא יהיה נכון זה הפי אבל טעמו לא ימנע כמו
 לא תכלא רחמך ואם הוא באלף ולא יכלה הוא בהא.

As with the citation of 8:2, the Tosafist attributes to Rashi the comment of לא ימנע.

He then clarifies that Rashi provides this definition to differentiate between the sense of the similar word that appears in verses like Dan. 11:36⁴³ and Gen. 2:2⁴⁴ and that means "to finish" or "to complete" and the verb here in Gen. 23:6.

According to the exegete, the biblical context of this verse does not support a definition of "complete" or "finish." Rather, the explanation of "withhold" is akin to פתח Psalms 40:12, even though the lemma has a ה, and the prooftext is spelled with an א.

In this passage, the prooftext clearly forms part of the Tosafot exegesis not Rashi's; the distinction between א and ה appears to be the Tosafist's own support for his clarification of Rashi. Both extracts lack one of the prooftexts used in the printed editions. The missing prooftext from 8:2 appears in the discussion of Rashi's citation for 23:6; the missing example from 23:6 is the lemma of Rashi's comment on 8:2. The overlap between these exegetical passages suggests that the students and scribes were aware of parallel comments in Rashi and attempted to make the commentary uniform. The complex evidence of corruption can be explained.

Since the distinction between citation and super-comment is clear in the Tosafot passage for Gen. 23:6, the authentic Rashi can be identified as the brief definition that begins the comment; one prooftext (Psalms 40:12) originated in the exegesis of the Tosafot. The citation of Gen. 8:2 in the printed comments of 23:6 would seem to be part of a different amalgamation.

Rashi's comment for 8:2 also originated with the basic definition of וימנע. The word ויכלא is not uncommon in Scripture, and its meaning is not necessarily

43. Dan. 11:36 - ועשה כרצונו המלך ויתרומם ויתגדל על כל אל ועל אלים ידבר נפלאות - וחצליה עד כלה זעם כי נחרצה נעשתה והצליה עד Rashi's comment for the lemma - עד שוב אף הקבי"ה מישאל is כלה זעם - the oppressing king will rule and succeed until God's wrath against Israel is finished.

44. Gen. 2:2 - ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי מלאכתו אשר עשה וישבת ביום השביעי מכל - מלאכתו אשר עשה. Rashi does not define the meaning of the word ויכל in his comment for this verse.

ambiguous. The Tosafot may have felt obliged to explain Rashi's need to clarify the word in the first place, namely to demonstrate that, despite the different spellings, the words have the same meaning. Analogous interpretations in different locations in the commentary perhaps invited studious and conscientious students to reference comparable examples each place the comment appears. This would explain further why only one proof-text from the printed editions can be accounted for in the Tosafot passage.

The analyses of these examples have explored two components. The first is the evidence set out by the variants in the printed editions and the resulting suspicion regarding the authenticity of the proof-texts. The second component is the extracts from the Tosafot manuscripts. These passages have demonstrated that the Tosafot can help to recover the original kernel of Rashi's commentary along with the source from which the additional elements were taken, and they helped to account for the presence of one proof-text in each of the printed comments.

A third component to this analysis is the contribution of the Rashi manuscripts to corroborating the texts reconstructed from the Tosafot. Of the thirty-eight Rashi manuscripts examined,⁴⁵ not one presented Rashi's comment for Gen. 8:2 as only the definition וימנע, but two manuscripts did offer a version of the comment with only one proof-text. Both record Rashi's comment with the citation from Psalms 40:12 but lack the proof-text from Gen. 23:6.

Oxford - Bodleian 192 (Can. Or. 35) is a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript of the commentary and has the following Rashi comment for Gen. 8:2:⁴⁶

ויכלא וימנע כגון לא תכלא רחמך.

Paris héb. 48 is a fourteenth-century manuscript and also includes only one example:⁴⁷

45. There are over 200 extant manuscripts of Rashi's commentary. As explained in the Introduction, those used for this study were chosen mostly from the sources used by Touitou in his work [Touitou (1986) 212], in addition to other pre-fifteenth-century manuscripts found in the catalogue at the IMHM.

46. Oxford - Bodleian 192 (Can. Or. 35) [IMHM 16256], fol. 9b.

47. Paris héb. 48 [IMHM 3102], fol. 35b.

ויכלא כמו וימנע כמי לא תכלא רחמיק.

The variant terms used to introduce each proof-text (כמו or כגון) may signal further the corruption still evident in even these earlier stages of the comment.⁴⁸

The findings support the notion that the version of Rashi to be extracted from the Tosafot manuscripts precedes the text available in the extant manuscripts of the commentary. The Tosafot citations of Rashi and their discussions of his comments also help to establish criteria through which to analyze these documents. Without the texts recovered from the Tosafot, readers partial to the familiar printed edition might assume the abbreviated version of Rashi in Oxford 192 (Can. Or. 35) and Paris héb. 48 is the result of scribal errors and omissions. As Berliner did with the evidence supporting the authenticity of the drawings, they would refrain from both correcting the text and facing the implications of actually altering drastically the familiar version of Rashi.

The examination of the relationship of the Tosafot to Rashi as well as their citations and discussions of him helps to correct individual comments of the commentary and thus, to recover a version as close to the original as possible. These reconstructed texts can then be used as a measure against the extant manuscripts of the commentary to establish the reliability of the more than two hundred manuscripts of Rashi's commentary and to consider objectively the myriads of compelling textual alternatives offered in these documents.

The contribution of the Rashi manuscripts to the process of recovering the original text of Rashi is therefore, uncharacteristically, secondary. Because of the state of the text and the depth of the corruption, the manuscripts can be used only to build upon the evidence extracted from the citations of Rashi's students. The Tosafot knew Rashi's commentary better than the scribe copying it at least 130 years later, and therefore the examination of the citations must precede the analysis of the manuscripts themselves. The citations in Tosafot offer

48. Both these manuscripts present Rashi's comment for Gen. 23:6 as it appears in the printed editions. Paris (héb.) 48 has on fol. 92b: לא יכלא לא ימנע כמו לא תכלא רחמיק ויכלא הגש' . Oxford - Bodleian 192 (Can. Or. 35) has on fol. 27a: לא יכלא לא ימנע כמו לא תכלא רחמיק ויכלא הגשם.

the means by which to sort through the chaos that is the extant text of Rashi's commentary.

2. Genesis 9:5

This verse is part of God's instructions to Noah and his family upon their exit from the ark. God warns Noah that He will require an accounting for "the blood of every soul," for the life of every animal and every human. The text itself is:

וּאֵךְ אֶת דַּמְכֶם לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם אֲדַרְשׁ מִיֵּד כֹּל חַיָּה אֲדַרְשֶׁנּוּ וּמִיֵּד הָאָדָם מִיֵּד
אִישׁ אַחִיו אֲדַרְשׁ אֶת נַפְשׁ הָאָדָם.

Rashi's printed comment for the lemma לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם explains that even though the focus in the verse is on blood (דַּמְכֶם לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם), God still requires an accounting from one who strangles himself, even though this form of death does not produce blood. The textual variants among the printed editions are minimal. The Berliner and Venice texts have this comment:⁴⁹

לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם אִךְ הַחֹנוֹק עֲצָמוֹ אֵפ"פ שֶׁלֹּא יֵצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ דָם.

In the Rome, Reggio and Guadelajara editions, the comment appears at the end of the explanation for the previous lemma וּאֵךְ אֶת דַּמְכֶם. This comment clarifies the sense of the word אֵךְ that even though God gave people permission to kill animals, the one who spills the blood of an animal is still accountable to God. In the Rome edition, the lemma לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם is separated from the comment that explains it by a number of words related to this previous explanation. The text of the comment that relates to the editions of Berliner and Venice is:⁵⁰

[אֶת דַּמְכֶם] לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם [אֲדַרְשׁ מִיֵּד שׁוֹפְכוֹ אֲדַרְשׁ] אִךְ הַחֹנוֹק עֲצָמוֹ
אֵפ"פ שֶׁלֹּא יֵצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ דָם.

49. Berliner (1905) 18; *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 96.

50. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 333. The square brackets indicate elements of the comment for the previous lemma that are mixed in with the comment for לַנְּפֹשׁוֹתֵיכֶם.

In the Reggio version, the comment in question is also attached to the previous explanation, but except for a missing ל on the lemma, the text is identical to the other editions:⁵¹

[את דמכם אדרוש שופך דם] נפשותיכם אף החונק עצמו אעפ"י שלא יצא ממנו דם.

The Guadelajara edition differs only in its order of the final two words of the comment, דם ממנו and דם.⁵²

[דמכם אדרוש השופך דם] לנפשותיכם אף החונק עצמו אעפ"י שלא יצא דם ממנו.

The fact that this comment is preserved distinct as its own discreet entity in the Venice and Berliner editions and that it is lacking from the earlier renditions suggests an intriguing component to the text's corruption. Aside from the integrity of the textual details, the comment's very existence as an independent explanation of a specific concept is questionable.

The source for Rashi's comment for the lemma לנפשותיכם appears to be BR 34:13, which reads:⁵³

ואך את דמכם לנפשותיכם - להביא את החונק עצמו; יכול כשאול תלמוד לומר אך; יכול כחנניה מישאל ועזריה תלמוד לומר אך.

According to the midrash, the purpose of the word אך is to include people who strangle themselves among those from whom God requires an accounting. The references to Saul who falls upon his sword (lest the Philistines defile him)⁵⁴ and to Hananiah, Mesha'el and Azariah (who are thrown into fiery furnace for refusing to commit idolatry)⁵⁵ suggest that החונק עצמו may be an archetype for suicide in general. The examples imply that any type of self-inflicted death - be it suicide as in the case of Saul or martyrdom as in that of Hananiah, Mesha'el and Azariah - is accountable to God. This differs from the printed comments of Rashi,

51. *Ibid.*

52. *Ibid.*

53. Mirkin, vol. 2, 56; Theodor and Albeck, vol. 1, 324.

54. I Sam. 31:4.

55. Dan. 3:13-33.

where the focus is on death that does not involve blood, but nonetheless requires an accounting.

Rashi's comment for **לנפשותיכם** is cited in eight Tosafot manuscripts. These extracts suggest that Rashi's original explanation may have emulated the focus in the midrashic text more similarly than is evident from the printed versions.

(a) Two of the passages cite Rashi exactly as the comment appears in the printed editions. The following is from Munich 50,1:⁵⁶

לנפשותיכם פי רש"י אף החונק את עצמו אע"פ שלא יצא ממנו דם.

This citation of Rashi constitutes the entire Tosafot comment for this lemma. In other words, based on the printed version of Rashi's commentary, the Tosafot have not supplemented the citation with a remark or clarification of any sort. This phenomenon is odd, because the intention of the Tosafot was to build upon the exegesis of their teacher. If they had nothing to add, correct, criticize, teach or edify, they would not have cited the comment in the first place. The only textual variant between this text and that of the printed versions is the presence of the particle **את**.

(b) Vat. Ebr. 53 contains a similar curiosity:⁵⁷

לנפשותיכם פרשי אף החונק את עצמו אעפ שלא יצא דם.

This passage lacks the word **ממנו**, which is not surprising considering its inconsistent placing in the printed editions; it also includes the particle **את**, absent from the later printings. Again, the Tosafot do not appear to comment on their citation of Rashi.

(c) Vat. Ebr. 506 varies from the previous citations with the inclusion of one word. This small difference suggests that what the reader of the printed texts views as a complete citation of Rashi may in fact encompass both the citation and the super-comment:⁵⁸

56. Munich 50,1 [IMHM 1692], fol. 25a.

57. Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fol. 12b.

58. Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fols. 9a-9b.

לנפשותיכם פרשי אף החונק עצמו כלומי אע"פ שלא יצא דם.

The comment is missing both ממנו and את, but the presence of the word כלומר is very significant. The insertion of כלומר before the abbreviated אף על פי renders the second clause of the comment an explanation of the first. In other words, "even if he strangles himself" implies "even though no blood went forth." The corrupt versions of the comment lead the reader, partial to the printed texts, to assume that the Tosafot interpretation of Rashi consisted only of the addition of the word כלומר. The placement of the word between the two clauses of the comment clarifies for the reader the link between them and hence the essence of the interpretation. Further evidence from other Tosafot manuscripts demonstrates that even this analysis is too devoted to the extant comment.

(d) The next four citations of Rashi's explanation for לנפשותיכם differ only in their presentations of the introductory attribution to Rashi and in other degrees of abbreviation for certain words. They also include an acronym at the end of the passage missing from the previous manuscript extracts and from the printed comments. Cambridge 1215,5 has the following passage:⁵⁹

לנפשותיכם פרשי אף החונק את עצמו כלומי אע"פ שלא יצא דם כפ"ח.

The acronym represents the words כד פירש חזקוני, crediting to Hizkuni the explanation of the first clause by the second. The Tosafot passage presents Rashi's original comment as "even the one who strangles himself," and Hizkuni (thirteenth century, France)⁶⁰ explains in the second clause that strangling produces death without blood, but that according to Rashi, even though the verse mentions blood and this death does not produce any, God would still require an accounting.

(e) The passage in Budapest Kaufmann A31 is almost identical:⁶¹

59. Cambridge 1215,5 [IMHM 17078], fol. 20a.

60. Greenberg 85.

61. Budapest Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 23a.

לנפשותיכם פ"י רשי אף החונק את עצמו כלומ' אעפ שלא יצא דם כפ"ח.

Since these texts do not offer any Tosafist comment external to what is found in the printed editions of the commentary, it is more difficult than in the earlier examples to view the second clause of the comment as having originated in Tosafot exegesis and then, through the process of transmission, having migrated indistinguishably into the body of the work. The reason however is one of partiality and connectedness to the familiar text. The passages in Munich 50,1 and Vat. Ebr. 53 that did not include attributions to Hizkuni may have been regarded by earlier students as incorporating both the comment and the super-comment.

(f) Parma 527 (2368) offers no significant variants:⁶²

לנפשותיכם פרש אף החונק את עצמו כלו אעפ שלא יצא דם כפח.

(g) New York - JTS L790 persists in the conforming way Rashi's comment for 9:5 is presented in Tosafot:⁶³

לנפשותיכם פרשי אף החונק את עצמו כלומ' אעפי שלא יצא דם כפ"ח.

(h) Finally, Paris héb. 168 allows no room for an ambiguous reading of the acronym כפ"ח. This passage spells out according to whom the super-comment was made.⁶⁴

לנפשותיכם פרשי אף החונק את עצמו כלומ' אעפי שלא יצא דם כך פיר' חזקוני.

The deduction that half of Rashi's printed comment originated in the exegesis of Hizkuni and thus is not authentic to the original work offers a renewed comparison of Rashi's comment with the midrashic source. Both texts now consist only of the phrase specifying one who strangles himself. With the elimination of the focus on blood from Hizkuni's interpretation, the reader might consider that Rashi's explanation did not differ so greatly from the midrash, but that he also intended to teach that all forms of suicide, of which strangling is just one, are accountable to God.

62. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], seventh folio of פרשת נח.

63. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 11b.

64. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 12a.

The closer affiliation between the original sense of Rashi's comment and that conveyed in the midrashic passage supports the reconstruction of Rashi's original comment as only **אף החונק את עצמו**. An examination of Hizkuni's printed comment for this verse offers further corroboration. Within Hizkuni's own commentary on the Torah, his explanation for the lemma **לנפשותיכם** begins with a citation of Rashi, which he explains, and it includes a reason for why Rashi offered this explanation. The text of the comment is the following:⁶⁵

לנפשותיכם פרשי אף החונק עצמו כלומר אף על פי שלא יצא ממנו דם
תשובה לאומרים אין גיהנם ואין גן עדן כלומר אף להורג את עצמו הקבה
דורש דמו ממנו ואימת אם לא לאחר מיתה.

The citation of Rashi in this passage can be interpreted differently depending on the reader's willingness to forgo his/her reliance on the printed text. After the section of passage analogous to what comprises the comment and super-comment in the Tosafot manuscripts, Hizkuni explains that the purpose of Rashi's remark is a response to those who do not believe in heaven or hell. Using the word **כלומר** again, he clarifies that God requires an accounting of blood from even one who kills himself, and this accounting will occur only after death.

In this comment, the employment of **כלומר** to explain a preceding statement appears to be part of Hizkuni's style of writing⁶⁶ and thus substantiates the claim that his explanation of Rashi consisted of the entire second clause of the printed text for 9:5. Just as **אף להורג את עצמו הקבה כלומר אף** תשובה לאומרים אין גיהנם ואין גן עדן elucidates **דורש דמו ממנו** פרשי אף החונק עצמו על פי שלא יצא ממנו דם.

The lack of an obvious super-comment in some citations of Rashi and the attribution of part of the printed Rashi to Hizkuni in others offer a serious challenge

65. **חוקוני** (Chavel 1986) 123; (Aaron 1992) 63. The comment continues with a reference to the midrashic passage: **בביר דריש יכול כשאל תייל אך יכול כחנניה מישראל ועזריה תייל ואך חמבין יבין**.

66. The word **כלומר** is used in other comments in Hizkuni's work (see for example Gen. 8:3, 12:6, 16:5). A more extensive study is required to ascertain its exact exegetical purpose. The possible link between Hizkuni's comments introduced by **כלומר** and Rashi's printed texts is also worthy of further exploration.

to the extant version of the comment.⁶⁷ The difference between this example and the previous ones is the lack of an obviously abbreviated citation completed in the Tosafot exegesis. Nonetheless, in the printed editions, Rashi's explanation for 9:5 does include the Tosafot super-comment appended to it without any distinguishing markings, and the texts of the Tosafot offer the evidence required to detach and isolate the authentic Rashi from the explications of him. The style of Hizkuni's exegesis in his own commentary and a recovered correlation with the midrashic source help to overcome the reader's hesitations towards abandoning the printed version.

The manuscripts of Rashi's own commentary offer the deciding proof. In fourteen manuscripts of Rashi's Torah commentary, his comment for 9:5 consists of only the first clause of the printed editions.⁶⁸ A fifteenth manuscript has the second clause above the line.⁶⁹ For this example, these manuscripts have corroborated the text of Rashi extracted from the Tosafot works. Previous scholars analyzing the Rashi manuscripts might have assumed that those texts lacking the second clause had been subjected to scribal error and that the phrase was omitted accidentally. This type of analysis stems from what the text is expected to say, determined from our extant printed editions, and from critical determination of what it did say. Because the Rashi manuscripts are so removed from the original text and because they are so varied, they cannot offer convincing criteria through which compelling alternate readings can be measured and evaluated.

67. For a reference to the idea that Hizkuni's writings preceded Tosafot works like *מנחת יחודה* and *דעת זקנים*, and that over time attributions to Hizkuni have disappeared, see Aaron's introduction, p. 8.

68. Parma 181/1 (3204) [IMHM 13919], fifth folio of *פרשת נח*, right column. Munich (Cod. Hebr.) 5 [IMHM 2525], fifth folio of *פרשת נח*, right column. Paris héb. 155 [IMHM 4142], fol. 7a. Vat. Ebr. 94 [IMHM 253], third folio of *פרשת נח*, middle column; Oxford - Bodleian 188 (Opp. 34) [IMHM 16250], fol. 7b. Parma 682 (3256) [IMHM 13943], eighth folio of *פרשת נח*, right column. Paris héb. 48 [IMHM 3102], fol. 39a. Uppsala (O. Cod. Hebr.) 1 [IMHM 18009], fol. 15a; Paris héb. 159 [IMHM 4146], fol. 13b. Vienna 24 (Hebr. 3) [IMHM 1295], fol. 7b. Oxford - Bodleian 188 (Opp. 35) [IMHM 16252], fourth folio of *פרשת נח*, right column. Berlin 14 (Ms. Or. Fol. 121) [IMHM 1788], fol. 8b. Berlin 141 (Ms. Or. Fol. 1222) [IMHM 10036], fol. 8b. Istanbul - Topkapu Serai G.I.61 [IMHM 70616], fol. 15a.

69. Paris héb. 156 [IMHM 4143], fol. 7a.

The Tosafot citations of Rashi and their discussions of these comments do reveal the layers within the commentary that are no longer detectable. In turn, they offer the criteria on which to evaluate the variants within the Rashi manuscripts. An analysis of the citations of Rashi's comment for Gen. 9:5 demonstrates conclusively that the short texts of Rashi's comment are not abbreviated or corrupt. In fact, they contain the true original text of the comment.

C. Conclusion

"Unlearning" information is not an activity one initiates happily or easily; striving to forget what one knows is disarming and difficult. However, achieving a proper perspective of objectivity on the evidence regarding the text of Rashi's Torah commentary might be best undertaken by someone who has never read a printed commentary of Rashi. This is, in fact, the most effective way to examine the Tosafot citations of him and their discussions of the issues he raised. The acknowledgement that the familiar text of Rashi's commentary is unreliable relieves the reader from having to establish conformity between it and the texts extracted from the Tosafot. The goal is to recover the original text of Rashi, or at least a version as close to Rashi's own as possible, and a comparison of extant versions of the work suggests that the authentic Rashi will differ greatly from the familiar one.

The examples in this chapter have proved that the Tosafot do reveal a text of the commentary that often differs quite drastically from the printed editions. However, conforming examples, midrashic corroboration, evidence for the sources of added material, and limited substantiation in the Rashi manuscripts themselves submit that the contribution of the Tosafot to the reconstruction of Rashi is both essential and unavoidable. Their ability to help isolate the complex, undetectable layers of corruption and to account for uncited portions of the printed work is integral to the process of recovery. Rashi's original commentary can be established only after the depth of corruption in the extant texts is revealed, and only after criteria are developed with which to evaluate the infinite number of variants. The Tosafot offer one important resource with which to

accomplish this, and therefore, they are essential to the reconstruction of the authentic Rashi text.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

The printed editions of Rashi's Torah commentary, the versions of the work with which readers are most familiar, are textually inaccurate. Centuries of scribal activity and numerous attempts by both medieval and modern printers to correct and restore the commentary without accounting for their methodologies or the reasons for their preferred readings have altered the text drastically. Yet, these are also the very editions utilized routinely as the basis for exegetical analyses of Rashi's commentary. Rashi's preferences for certain methods of interpretation over others cannot be learned, nor can his general tendencies in exegesis be established from the analysis of passages that embody undetectable layers of textual corruption.

The problems with the text of Rashi's commentary have not been unknown, and printers, super-commentators and scholars alike have endeavoured to rectify the situation. Their comparisons of varying quantities and qualities of manuscripts and early printed editions have produced compelling alternate readings, interesting textual corrections, comprehensive summaries of the difficulties inherent in textual transmission, and innovative methodologies for the recovery of the original work.

An examination of only five printed editions has demonstrated the variety of textual problems that exist, the intricacies involved in their resolution, and the inability of any one version to be deemed a standard with which other editions can be compared and measured. And this constitutes only the visible corruption. The imperceptible layers within the printed texts of Rashi's commentary are deep and complex. The older and less legible manuscripts utilized in previous attempts to correct the text are too distant from Rashi's own lifetime to have remained an accurate representation of the original version. They too embody many emendations and changes.

Despite the acknowledgement that the text of Rashi's commentary is unreliable and despite the varying attempts at its recovery, no criteria have been established with which to judge the value, reliability or authenticity of the extant texts of the commentary or to evaluate the countless variants evident in them. Rashi's popularity as an exegete and the extensive circulation of his work are the

reasons for the chaotic state of the text. Each recopying of the commentary fostered new interactions with it and more opportunities for error and corruption to transmute it. This same popularity, however, has resulted in the appearance of citations of the commentary in numerous exegetical texts, both among Jews and Christians.¹ These citations offer an unexplored resource for recovering early textual evidence of Rashi's commentary.

The previous chapters have demonstrated that citations of Rashi in the Torah commentaries of the Tosafot are integral to the recovery of a text close to the original. Their intellectual, geographical and chronological affinity and proximity to Rashi are unequalled. Rashi's own students, relatives, and colleagues are the obvious place to begin the process of restoration, by studying their citations of the commentary. Their version of his work precedes, in some cases, the known representations of it in even the oldest extant manuscripts.

Evidence of conformity among the versions of the printed texts and consistent citations of the complete printed comment in the manuscripts of the Tosafot often confirm the ability of Rashi's students to authenticate the text of a given comment. Conforming citations extracted from manuscripts of varying quality, date and style further corroborate the reliability of these passages. Moreover, despite the extent of variation in the new exegesis of these citations in numerous manuscripts of the same work (like מנחת יהודה), the citation of Rashi itself remains consistent from text to text. This bears witness to the reverence attached to Rashi's writings, the care with which they were copied, and the value

1. Among Christian scholars, Hugo and Andrew of St. Victor of the twelfth century and Nicholas de Lyra of the fourteenth century refer to Rashi, if not by name, then by pseudonym, often translating his commentary verbatim into Latin. See Smalley 190-191, 351-353; Hailperin 103-114; 137-246. Ibn Ezra's commentary on Exodus 16:15 demonstrates the interesting textual findings to be explored in citations of Rashi in other exegetical works. In this comment, Ibn Ezra attributes to Rashi the explanation that מִן פֶּן is the Arabic equivalent of מִן מֶן . According to Ibn Ezra this interpretation is incorrect; he understands the lemma in the sense of food provisions and preparation as in Dan. 1:10. The printed editions of Rashi present Rashi's comment in accordance with Ibn Ezra's preferred interpretation and not in accordance with what is attributed to him by Ibn Ezra. These types of inconsistencies in the citations of Rashi contribute intriguing data to the recovery of the writings of the exegete who was studied by so many, and whose writings, in different stages of completion, travelled far and wide.

of these citations for restoring the text.

A comparison of the textual variants of the printed editions with the conforming citations extracted from the manuscripts of the Tosafot Torah commentaries demonstrates our ability to use the Tosafot texts to resolve inconsistencies and eliminate some of the layers of corruption in Rashi. Together the printed editions and the citations of Rashi in Tosafot help us reconstruct a text as close to the original as possible, without the benefit and advantage of a standard for comparison.

The same conformity that authenticates consistent citations of complete printed comments challenges the authenticity of seemingly partial citations of Rashi's comment and suggests that uncited elements of the printed passage did not form part of the original work. The temptation to dismiss "partial" citations as incomplete or abbreviated is countered with the analysis of the content of Tosafot exegeses and the state of the printed versions of these comments, as well as an argument against the reader's bias for the familiar.

When the cited comments are consistently "abbreviated," when the printed versions manifest textual and conceptual difficulties, and when the Tosafot cite and discuss only half of this comment and do not appear aware of any other issues arising from it, the conformity in the partial citations should be as compelling negative data as the conformity among the complete citations is positive. The reader's bias towards the familiar printed text is not an adequate reason to measure the citations extracted from Tosafot against a corrupt standard.

Finally, the Tosafot Torah commentaries also help us reveal the otherwise undetectable layers within the printed Rashi commentary. Analyses of the Tosafot passages as a whole, including both the citations and the exegeses upon them, expose the comment close to the one Rashi wrote himself, as well as the sources from which added material was appended to the work. An appreciation of the complexities of textual transmission facilitates the acknowledgement that over time elements of Tosafot super-comments on Rashi were affixed to Rashi's own work and eventually became indistinguishable from what Rashi wrote himself. The exploration of the citations of Rashi in the works of his students is essential in eliminating these layers of extraneous material.

Sensitivity towards the reader's bias for the familiar printed version of the commentary is perpetually a concern. Reading Rashi's commentary as presented by the Tosafot requires uncustomary objectivity, but is integral to the recovery of the original work. The tendency of the reader to identify all familiar linguistic formulations within the Tosafot extract as a reference to Rashi must be replaced with an assessment of the passage on its own and an attempt to understand the text as if the version in the printed editions were unknown.

The realization that elements of Rashi's printed comment originated in the Tosafot super-comments confirms the integral contribution of the Tosafot to the reconstruction of Rashi's original work. Without the elucidation of the citation and the exegesis upon it, these additional layers could not be revealed and the best text of Rashi could not be recovered.

Despite the fact that the extant text of Rashi's commentary is uncertain and that serious explorations of the citations in Tosafot reveals significant alternate readings and compelling textual corrections, the nature of Tosafot literature precludes establishing a critical edition of Rashi based solely on it. The manuscripts of the Tosafot Torah commentaries are not exempt from some degree of scribal corruption, although not to the same extent as Rashi's texts, and the quality and integrity of a citation is often ambiguous. A scribe may have emended a citation of Rashi in order to make it conform to the version with which he was familiar, and the Tosafot may have taken liberties with their representation of the comment or paraphrased its main ideas; these forms of textual interference cannot be recovered with absolute certainty without a standard version of the work for comparison.

Any study conducted on the state of the text of Rashi's commentary requires an examination of the many extant manuscripts of the work. The exploration of any significant number of these documents underscores the extent of textual variance and the need for a mechanism by which to evaluate and identify preferred readings; the relatively late date of the earliest extant manuscript precludes its use as an accurate representation of the original version.

The next step in the recovery of a version of Rashi as close to the original as possible is to endeavour to corroborate the readings of the Rashi manuscripts with

the texts extracted from Tosafot.

The fact that some of the texts reconstructed by Tosafot in their citations of Rashi can be substantiated in the manuscripts of the commentary itself establishes the Tosafot as the means by which to judge the texts of the commentary and to identify reliable readings. The identification of specific comments, reconstructed according to the evidence of the Tosafot citations of Rashi, can be used as criteria with which to examine all the extant manuscripts of Rashi and to isolate those texts that present the comments in conformity with the text in the Tosafot. These manuscripts should then serve as a guide in establishing the preferred base of any critical edition of Rashi and help lead towards resolving the text closest to Rashi's own original production.

This study of פרשת נח and לך לך, Gen. 6-17 (almost twelve chapters), has revealed more than a dozen examples of significant textual differences. If Tosafot offer sufficient evidence to reconstruct only one or two such comments per chapter, extrapolating to the rest of the Torah suggests that Rashi's entire commentary could contain over two hundred passages for which the Tosafot provide the correct text, without all the layers of corruption that have become untraceable in the printed editions. Should one manuscript exist in which all these Tosafot reconstructed readings are extant, then this text would be the version of Rashi as close to the original as possible, and it should serve as the base text for a scientific edition of the work.

Until such a manuscript is discovered, a critical edition of Rashi must contain a critical apparatus that does not challenge the integrity of any given text. The versions of Rashi as preserved in the most reliable manuscripts of the commentary (which would be determined by the Tosafot citations), the material extracted from the Tosafot literature that is no longer evident in any of the extant texts of the work, remnants of corrections and emendations instructed upon the students and scribes by Rashi himself and citations of the interpreter in other exegetical sources (aside from the Tosafot) should all be considered and recorded in separate apparati.

Rashi, the eleventh century French exegete, will remain an enigma until the text of his commentary is restored to a version as close as possible to the one he

wrote. The extant editions of the work presently constitute the ultimate Jewish commentary, as it is comprised of centuries of contributions by scribes and students who have inserted their own interpretive preferences into Rashi's exegesis.

Since the problems of textual corruption that have plagued his work from its first inception began with the interactions of his students with the manuscripts they copied and studied, the writings of these same students should offer the best resource for reconstructing the original version. The ability of the Tosafot to correct textual inconsistencies evident in the printed editions, to identify layers of corruption no longer detectable to the untutored reader, and ultimately, to offer the means by which to evaluate the extant manuscripts of the commentary has been demonstrated beyond doubt. The analysis of citations of Rashi in the Torah commentaries of the Tosafot is essential to the reconstruction of Rashi's commentary and to the restoration of the original work of the most popular medieval Jewish exegete of the Torah.

Appendix A

This appendix will complete the analysis of the examples presented in Chapter One, an examination of the different categories of variants evident in the printed editions. The chapter alluded to the potential contribution of the Tosafot to the resolution of some types of textual variants. Now that the methodologies manifesting the importance of the Tosafot to the reconstruction of Rashi's commentary have been established, the issues integral to each example will be reviewed briefly, and the evidence extracted from the manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries will be presented. The page numbers refer back to the original discussion in Chapter One.

1. *Genesis 6:9 (p. 61)*

The printed comments for the lemma בדרתי offer two different ways of understanding this qualification attached to the introduction of Noah in the biblical verse: either positively, in the sense of praise, or negatively, in the sense of shame or disgrace. All the editions also expand upon the implication in each nuance. If the qualification is meant to suggest praise, then even if Noah lived in a generation of righteous people, he would have been a greater moral being still. However, if בדרתי implies shame, then among people of his own generation Noah was considered righteous, but had he lived in the generation of Abraham, he would not have been exceptionally virtuous.

The primary textual difficulty among these editions is the varying syntactic order in which the comment is organized. The Berliner, Venice, Guadelajara, and Reggio editions all explain the nuance of each qualification immediately following its identification. In the Rome edition, both possibilities in meaning are first identified and then the implications of each interpretation are explored. The earlier analysis demonstrated that midrashic sources supported both syntactic arrangements.¹

The comment for this lemma of Gen. 6:9 is cited in only four Tosafot

1. *Midrash Tanhuma* (Warsaw), vol. 1, פרשת נח, ה, fol. 13a; *Midrash Tanhuma* (Buber), פרשת נח, ו, fols. 16a-16b, (31-32).

manuscripts, and the citations manifest no notable conformity to each other or to the printed renditions. For the most part, the citations are incomplete and are recognized as such by the Tosafot exegetes. All elements of the printed comment are represented in the variety of citations, but the order in which the interpretations appeared in the Tosafot rendition of the commentary is not apparent. The citations are as follows:

(a) Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 cites both possible understandings of the lemma.²

בדורותיו יש דורשין לשבח ויש דורשין לגנאי וא"ת...

This manuscript is a copy of a Torah commentary by זלמן בן ר' יהודה החסיד. Since citations of Rashi are usually attributed to the exegete with an appropriate identification, this reference may relate directly to its midrashic source. The lack of an abbreviated וכו' does not indicate that more of the comment followed. The presence of comparable markings would have suggested a syntactic order in accordance with the text of the Rome edition.

(b) Two citations related to Rashi's comment for בדרתיו in Paris héb. 260 corroborate the syntax of Berliner, Venice, Reggio, and Guadelajara:³

בדורותיו פרשי יש דורשיי אותו לשבח וכו' והרמבין פ"י לפי הפשט שבחו לבדו... בדורותיו פרשי יש מרבתי שדורשי אותו לגנאי שאילו היה בדורו של אברהם לא היה נחשב לכלום והקי הרי ישעיה...

In this text, the implication of each interpretation of the lemma appears to follow directly after its identification, as is demonstrated in the second citation. Moreover, the first citation includes the abbreviated וכו', indicating that the comment continued beyond what was cited.

(c) In Parma 837 (2058) the citation is brief and inconclusive:⁴

בדורותיו פרשי ויש דורשין אותו לגנאי וכו' ולפי זה הפירוש קצת קשה...

The text indicates clearly that Rashi's comment extended beyond the citation, but the syntactic order to which it conformed cannot be determined from this one

2. Cambridge (Add.) 669,2 [IMHM 15890], first folio of פרשת נח.

3. Paris héb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fols. 18a-18b.

4. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], first and second fols. of פרשת נח.

phrase.

(d) Similarly, Hamburg 46 (Cod. hebr. 108) cites only one clause from what appears to have been a lengthier comment to the Tosafot exegete:⁵

בדורותינו פרשי שאילו היה בדורות אחרים וכי פירש אם היה דר זמן...

The citation of this phrase does not provide the reader with any indication as to the syntactic order of the passage familiar to the Tosafot.

The common association of the content of Rashi's comment with the rabbinic sources from which it emanated may have curbed the Tosafot need to cite the complete interpretation. A single phrase or brief reference would have been sufficient to remind the reader of the comment and to focus him or her on the exact element of Rashi to be discussed. Likewise, Rashi himself may not have restated as much of the rabbinic comment as appears in the printed editions of his work. A concise allusion to the two midrashic interpretations of the lemma would have encouraged students to expand upon the rabbinic sources in the margins of the commentary.

The close affinity between the printed comment and the midrashic texts, the representation of both syntactic organizations of the interpretations in early rabbinic sources, and the lack of conformity among the Tosafot citations precludes a definitive decision about the formulation of the original comment. The familiarity of Rashi's students with his primary sources suggests that the inconsistencies in the printed editions may be the result of continuous emendations and expansions in an attempt to conform Rashi's comment with its midrashic origins.

2. *Genesis 9:24* (p. 66)

Rashi's printed comment for the lemma קטן cites a biblical proof-text to support his definition of the word as despised and unworthy rather than small in physical size or younger in age. The difficulty among the editions is that Berliner viewed Rashi's biblical source as Jer. 49:15, while the Reggio text presented the proof-text as Obad. 1:2. The other editions cited the example only within the common elements of both verses.

5. Hamburg 46 (Cod. hebr. 108) [IMHM 942], first folio of פרשת נח.

The essential question is whether Rashi's original comment cited an entire verse as his proof-text, and then of course which one, or whether he cited only enough of the verse to substantiate his definition, and then over the course of the work's transmission students and scribes filled in differing recensions. While neither Berliner nor the editor(s) of the Reggio edition appears aware of the likeness of Jer. 49:15 and Obad. 1:2, Rashi may have deliberately included the abbreviated citation in order to allude to the two verses that both support his understanding of the word קטן.

The citations of Rashi's comment for this lemma in the Tosafot manuscripts support the hypothesis that the original passage did not include any verse in its entirety. The texts are as follows:

(a) Munich 50,1 includes the first half of the proof-text that is common to both the verses in Jer. and Obad.⁶

אשר עשה לו בנו הקטן פי' רש"י הקטן הבזוי כמו קטן נתתיך בגויים...

(b) In Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52), the citation consists of only two words:⁷

...ופרשי הבזוי כמו קטן נתתיך ודוחק הוא...

(c) Finally, the citation in Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add. 4'103) includes an abbreviated וכו' ⁸.

וכן פרשי קטן לאמי ביזוי כמו הכתי קטן נתתיך בגויים בזוי וכו' וזה דוחק גדול...

Rashi's comment for Gen. 9:24 as viewed by the Tosafot was not associated with one verse or the other. The citations support the notion that the abbreviated proof-text was expanded by scribes and printers to ameliorate and complete the text of the commentary, and the differing recensions reflect the lack of care with which this was done. Neither the extant texts nor the Tosafot citations of Rashi suggests the priority of either verse. Rather Rashi's original explanation allowed the reader to utilize either or both verses as justification for the

6. Munich 50,1 [IMHM 1692], fol. 21b.

7. Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fol. 8b.

8. Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add. 4'103) [IMHM 21408], fol. 19b.

definition of **קטן** as **בווי**.

3. *Genesis 8:11* (p. 68)

Akin to the previous example, the difficulty with Rashi's printed comment for the lemma **טרף בפיה** is the inconsistency in the prooftexts that are used in the each edition. The Berliner and Venice editions present three prooftexts⁹ to support Rashi's explanation that the word **ינה** is feminine, but because this particular dove sent out in search of dry land was a male, it is referred to sometimes in the feminine and sometimes in the masculine. The Reggio, Rome and Guadelajara editions lack the prooftext from Song of Songs. In addition, the terms used to introduce the prooftexts vary from text to text and suggest that perhaps the authenticity of all the examples should be considered seriously.

A further intriguing peculiarity is the comment's introductory phrase **ואומר אני**. According to Touitou such personalized clauses are indicative of extraneous material and should be regarded with suspicion.¹⁰ For this reason, the reliability of the comment as a whole appears tenuous.

The manuscripts of the Tosafot Torah commentaries revealed two citations of Rashi for his comment on this lemma.

(a) Parma 837 (2058) demonstrates that the Tosafot did associate the phrase **ואומר אני** with Rashi's comments:¹¹

טרף בפיה פרשי אומר אני שזכר היה וכו' והטעם...

The citation represents only the first phrase of the printed comment. The abbreviation **וכו'** indicates that the exegete possessed more to Rashi's comment for this lemma than he cited; however, the nature of the prooftexts in that version of Rashi and whether only some or any of the prooftexts were even included cannot be determined from the brief citation. The linking of the introduction of **ואומר אני** with Rashi in the writings of his students suggests that these types of phrases need not render suspicious all such comments, but rather

9. Song of Songs 5:12, Ezekiel 7:16 and Hosea 7:11.

10. Touitou (1986) 214.

11. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], seventh folio of פרשת נח.

their authenticity should be investigated with the same care as other textual irregularities.

(b) Paris héb. 260 presents a slightly longer citation of Rashi's comment, but also does not include the prooftexts:¹²

טרף בפיה פרשי שהיה זכר לכך קורהו פעם לשוי זכר ופעם לשוי נקבה
ודוחק לומר כן...

This citation of Rashi does not suggest that the Tosafot's version of Rashi extended beyond what is included in this passage. The lack of prooftexts together with the textual discrepancies in the printed editions establishes a significant challenge to the authenticity of these examples to the original work. However, the infrequent citations of this comment in the Tosafot literature precludes any definitive conclusions. Conformity among the Tosafot manuscripts cannot be manifested among only two citations and the inconsistent use of *זכר* leaves the exact parameters of the Tosafot's version of Rashi's comment for 8:11 ambiguous.

4. *Genesis 9:20* (p. 72)

In the printed comments for the lemma *ויטע כרם*, Rashi addresses the issue of how Noah could have planted a vineyard if every living thing had been destroyed in the flood. All the editions explain that upon entering the ark, Noah brought with him vine-branches (*זמורות*) and shoots from fig trees (*יחורי תאנים*). The irregularity among the editions lies in an added phrase appended to the comment in the Guadelajara text, which clarifies the meaning of the term *יחורי תאנים*. The gloss-like character of the phrase *פיי גזעי תאנה* suggests it may be an addition of a student noting to himself the meaning of unfamiliar words.

12. Paris héb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fol. 27a.

Rashi's comment on 9:20 is cited in sixteen Tosafot manuscripts.¹³ The citations are quoted consistently and in conformity with the texts of the printed editions, and not one Tosafot text includes the additional phrase of the Guadelajara edition. Unfortunately, none of the Tosafot discussions of Rashi's comment for this lemma offers the source for the additional phrase. Its attachment to the body of Rashi's commentary originated among the countless other student and scribal interactions with the work. Nonetheless, the conforming citations substantiate the authenticity of the comment as a whole and they confirm the suspicions raised by the unique appearance of a definition-type phrase that begins with the abbreviation פ"י and bears the style of a gloss.

5. *Genesis 8:12* (p. 73)

The difficulty among the printed comments of 8:12 is the varying amounts of clarification included in the explanation of the lemma וייהל. The Berliner, Venice and Rome editions compare this lemma, conjugated in the reflexive (התפעל) form, to the analogous simple (פעל/קל) conjugation in 8:10. Synonyms defining each word in its respective conjugations are included at the end. The Reggio edition lacks the description of the lemma as being in the reflexive conjugation, and the Guadelajara text consists only of the synonym defining the lemma in its התפעל form.

Rashi's printed comment for this lemma is not cited in any of the Tosafot manuscripts examined. The reasons for this may range from the text's lack of trustworthiness to the Tosafot's lack of interest in a comment that consisted of only a grammatical definition. While the possibility certainly exists that this

13. Munich 50,1 [IMHM 1692], fol. 25a; Cambridge 1215,5 [IMHM 17078] fol. 20b; Paris heb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fol. 27a; Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fol. 22a; Hamburg (Cod. hebr. 52) [IMHM 901], fol. 7b; Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], seventh folio of פ"י; London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 11a; New York - JTS L791 [IMHM 24021], fol. 10a; Oxford - Bodleian 2343/1 (Opp. Add. 4'127) [IMHM 21407], fol. 4b; Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fol. 9b; Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 11a; Budapest Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 23; Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], seventh folio of פ"י; Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fols. 12b-13a; New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fol. 7b; New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 8b; New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 11b.

comment did not form part of the Tosafot's version of Rashi's commentary, the nature of the explanation does not address issues of morality, impart instruction, or in some way arouse controversy, and therefore, the Tosafot may not have had anything relevant to add to the simple textual definition.

6. *Genesis 11:3 (p. 75)*

Rashi's comment for the lemma הבה explains the meaning of the word in the sense of preparation. All the editions except Rome include a translation of the difficult term into Old French; the Guadelajara edition presents the *la'az* as its own separate lemma rather than appended to the end of the comment on הבה, as in Berliner, Venice and Reggio. The different presentations of the *la'az* within the commentary and the inconsistency with which it appears in all the editions question the reliability of the comment's text.

As with Rashi's comment for 8:12, the Tosafot manuscripts do not contain citations of this passage. The resemblance of this explanation of הבה to Rashi's comments for Gen. 38:16, Ex. 1:10 and Josh. 4:18¹⁴ suggests that these passages may have arisen from a later attempt by students to reference all analogous definitions and therefore that they may not have formed part of the original work. Similarly, the frequency with which the word is defined in Rashi's commentary and the uncomplicated nature of the comment might not have stirred profound critical issues among the Tosafot, and therefore it was not cited or discussed.

7. *Genesis 12:16 (p. 80)*

The biblical lemma ולאברם היטיב בעבורה does not specify who did well to Abraham for the sake of Sarah, nor what manner of "good" was done. The printed editions of Rashi vary the question they address. Berliner's edition responds to both issues, clarifying that Pharaoh did well to Abraham by giving him gifts. The

14. In all three of these comments, Rashi expresses the "exegetical policy" that every use of the word הבה has the sense of preparation - לשון הכנה - וחזמנה.

Venice, Reggio and Guadalajara texts specify only that Pharaoh did well to Abraham, but not how; the Rome edition explains that "good" was done for Abraham through the giving of gifts, but not by whom. The differing exegeses of the lemma signal a problem with the text of this comment and suggest that Rashi's explanation was not a fixed and recognized element in all versions of the work.

The manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries manifest one citation of Rashi for this comment. Parma 837 (2058) has the following passage:¹⁵

ולאברם הטיב בעבורה פרשי פרעה והטעם שאמי ותקח האשה בית פרעה
וסמך ליה ולאברם היטיב בעבורה.

According to this citation, the version of Rashi known to the Tosafot identified who did well to Abraham (Pharaoh), but not in what manner. The super-comment explains that Rashi's reasoning is based on the verse just before this lemma, which describes Sarah being taken to Pharaoh's house. The proximity of the name Pharaoh to the "subject-less" lemma supposes that Pharaoh was the one who did well to Abraham.

The issue of the manner in which good was done for Abraham was already explained by Rashi in his comment to 12:13, למען ייטב לי בעבורך. Identically in all five printed editions, and consistently in numerous Tosafot manuscripts,¹⁶ Rashi comments that Abraham asked Sarah to pretend to be his sister so that the Egyptians would furnish him with gifts (יתנו לי מתנות). The similar terminology between the biblical phrases ולאברם הטיב בעבורה and למען ייטב לי בעבורך suggests that the inclusion of the explanation of gifts at 12:16 may be once again the result of additional notes and references on the part of the students learning the commentary.

The simple nature of the comment for 12:16, identifying the subject of the verb הטיב (which is unstated but obvious from the context), explains the lack of extensive evidence among the Tosafot manuscripts. Nonetheless, although Rashi is cited in only one manuscript, the tenuous state of the printed texts - and the appearance of the comment that is not cited in Rashi's interpretation of another

15. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], second folio of פרשת לך לך.

16. See pp. 90-105.

verse - supports the version presented in Tosafot and substantiates the authenticity of one of the comments offered in the printed editions.

8. *Genesis 8:6 (p. 82)*

The printed texts of Rashi's comment for the lemma **מקץ ארבעים יום** explain what milestone had been achieved "at the end of forty days." The editions of the commentary present contrasting opinions. The Berliner, Venice and Rome versions explain that "the end of forty days" refers to the appearance of the tops of the mountains (**משנראו ראשי ההרים**); the text in the Reggio edition claims the reference is to when the face of the earth had dried up (**עד שחרבו פני האדמה**); and the Guadelajara edition includes both options.

The Tosafot decide the matter unequivocally. In twenty-seven manuscripts of Tosafot Torah commentaries, the students of Rashi attribute to him the comment of **משנראו ראשי ההרים**.¹⁷ This type of conformity supports the authenticity of one of the comments in the printed editions and helps to correct the text of the commentary.

An analysis of the extant manuscripts of Rashi's commentary would increase the variety of compelling alternatives to the versions in the printed editions, but the Tosafot present the version known to the students who lived closest to Rashi himself. Their consistent citation of one option supplies the

17. Cambridge 1215,5 [IMHM 17078], fols. 16a-17a; Paris héb. 260 [IMHM 27839], fols. 23b-24a; Jerusalem 8*5138 [B200], fol. 3a; Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], third folio of **פרשת נח**; Oxford - Bodleian 271/1 (Opp. 31) [IMHM 16739], fol. 4b; Moscow-Guenzburg 82 [IMHM 07247], fol. 63b; Jerusalem 8*2240 [B432], fol. 7b; Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add. 4*103) [IMHM 21408], fols. 18a-18b; London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fols. 8b-9a; New York - JTS L793 [IMHM 24023], fol. 8b; Paris héb. 167/2 [IMHM 4154], fol. 52b; Dresden EB399 [IMHM 20767], fol. 2a; Leiden 27 (Cod. Or. 4765) [IMHM 17371], fol. 7a; Vienna 20,4.16 (Hebr. 12a) [IMHM 1298], fol. 8b; New York - JTS L792/1 [IMHM 24022], fols. 6b-7a; Sassoon 409/1 [IMHM 9353], fol. 5b; Oxford - Bodleian 2343/1 (Opp. Add. 4*127) [IMHM 21407], fol. 4a; Oxford - Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604) [IMHM 16738], fol. 3b; Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 9b; Budapest Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 20; Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 10b; Munich 62,1 [IMHM 23118], fol. 8b; Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], fifth folio of **פרשת נח**; Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fol. 11b; New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fol. 8b; New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 7b; New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 10b.

criterion with which to assess the reliability of the Rashi manuscripts. Those texts that do not present Rashi's comment for 8:6 as משנראו ראשי ההרים could be deemed less reliable and its textual alternatives would not be judged equal to readings from manuscripts more in accordance with the citations from Tosafot.

Appendix B

The following pages present two additional examples of intriguing findings from the Tosafot citations of Rashi's commentary. The printed editions demonstrate little variation among the texts, but the Tosafot passages suggest that the text and content of these comments are not as clear as they appear.

1. Genesis 16:5

When Hagar becomes pregnant, her mistress, Sarah, is diminished in her eyes. Sarah blames Abraham for this wrong done to her, for she herself gave her maidservant to Abraham, and now that Hagar is pregnant, Sarah is diminished in the eyes of her maid. She entreats God to decide between them, ביני וביניך, ("between me and you"). The verse reads as follows:

ותאמר שרי אל אברם חמסי עליך אנכי נתתי שפחתי בחיקך ותרא כי הרתה ואקל בעינייה ישפט ה' ביני וביניך.

Rashi's comment for the lemma ביני וביניך explains that every Scriptural use of the word ביניך (between you [masculine form]) is spelled defective (חסר), but this word is spelled *plene* (מלא). The presence of this extra *yod* between the *nun* and the *kaf* signifies to Rashi that it should be read in the feminine form - וביניך, even though the context of the verse clearly implies that Sarah is addressing Abraham. The feminine "you" implies that Sarah cast an evil eye on Hagar's fetus and caused her to miscarry. Support for this interpretation is found in the angel's announcement to Hagar that she was pregnant, in Gen. 16:11.¹ Since Hagar already knew she was pregnant in 16:4,² the angel's announcement informs the reader that Hagar miscarried her first pregnancy and now is pregnant

1. In 16:11, the angel announces to Hagar that she will bear a son whom she will name Ishmael. The verse reads: ויאמר לה מלאך ה' הנך חרה וילדת בן וקראת: שמו ישמעאל כי שמע ה' אל עניך.
2. The verse reports that Abraham cohabited with Hagar and she conceived, and when she saw that she was pregnant, her mistress was diminished in her eyes: ויבא אל הגר ותהר ותרא כי הרתה ותקל גברתה בעיניה.

a second time. Venice and Berliner's edition have the following text:³

כל ביניך [וביניך] שבמקרא חסר וזה מלא קרי ביה ובניך שהכניסה עין הרע
בעיבורה של הגר והפילה עוברתה הוא שהמלאך אומר להגר הנך הרה והלא
כבר הרתה והוא מבשר לה שתהר אלא מלמד שהפילה הריון הראשון.

The comment in the Guadelajara edition contains a few insignificant variants:⁴

כל ביניך שבמקרא חסר וזה מלא קרי ביה ובניך מלמד שהכניסה עין הרע
בעבורה והפילה הוא שאמר לה המלאך הנך הרה היא מעוברת והוא מבשר
לה שתהר אלא מלמד שהפילה הריון הראשון.

In this text, after the phrase קרי ביה ובניך is written as ביניך. The word מלמד precedes שהכניסה, and של הגר and עוברתה are missing; בעבורה is spelled without a yod after the 'ayin. The phrase שאמר לה המלאך replaces להגר אומר להגר, and מעוברתה היא replaces הרתה. None of these differences alters the sense of the passage.

The Reggio text also differs only minimally:⁵

כל ביני ובניך שבמקרא חסרין וזה מלא קרי ביה ובניך מלמד שהכניסה
עין רעה בעבורה של הגר והפילה הוא שהמלאך אמי לה הנך הרה היא
מעוברת והוא מבשר לה שתהר אלא מלמד שהפילה הריון הראשון.

This version includes ביני in the introductory phrase שבמקרא and כל ביני ובניך. חסרין is in the plural, חסר. As in Guadelajara, מלמד precedes שהכניסה, and עוברתה is spelled without a yod after the 'ayin, and עוברתה is lacking. The phrase שאמר לה המלאך replaces להגר אומר להגר, and עין רעה replaces עין רעה. This text also has מעוברתה היא in place of הרתה.

The Rome edition reads:⁶

כל ובניך שבמקרא חסרין וזה מלא קרי ביה ובניך הכניסה עין הרע
בעבורה והפילה הגר הוא שהמלאך אומי להגר הנך הרה כבר הרתה
והוא מבשר לה שתהר אלא מלמד שהפילי הריון ראשון.

3. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 164-165; Berliner (1905) 29. Only Berliner's edition has the alternate reading of ובניך in brackets in its text.

4. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 349.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*

Although the introductory clause contains only **וביניך** (instead of **ביני וביניך**), **חסר** is in the plural, **חסרין**. This version does not include **מלמד**, nor does **הכניסה** have a prefixed **ש**. The phrase **בעבורה של הגר והפילה** is replaced with **בעבורה והפילה הגר**, and **והלא כבר הרתה** or **היא מעוברת** is in place of **כבר הרתה**. Both **אומי** and **שהפילי** are abbreviated, and **ראשון** lacks the definite article.

Numerous phrases and words of this comment differ slightly from edition to edition, but none of them changes the meaning of the interpretation or the nature of the exegesis. The idea that Sarah cast an evil eye on Hagar and caused her to miscarry stems from BR 45:5,⁷ and some of the textual variants in the printed editions may have arisen from attempts to make Rashi's comment conform to its rabbinic source.

The Tosafot manuscripts offer seventeen citations of Rashi's comment for 16:5; eleven are from **מנחת יהודה** manuscripts. The text attributed to Rashi in the passages below manifests an intricate relationship to the comment of the printed editions as well as to an apparent super-comment of Hizkuri. The lack of consistent conformity among the citations, however, complicates the recovery of a version of the comment as close to the original as possible.

(a) The citation in Munich 50,1 attributes to Rashi an explanation that does not appear in the printed versions and, at the same time, does not account for all that is interpreted in the familiar editions:⁸

ביני וביניך פי רשי כל ביניך שבמקרא חסירים יוד בין הנון ובין הכף וזה
מלא וביניך לשון נקיבה וי"א היא מדברת עם הגר.

This text does not distinguish clearly between the citation of Rashi and the subsequent exegesis. Moreover, the specification of where exactly **ביניך** is usually defective (between the *nun* and the *kaḥ*) is not mentioned in the printed editions, nor is the clarification that **וביניך** should have the sense of the feminine form (**לשון נקיבה**). The remark that "some say" (**י"א**) Sarah was speaking to Hagar explains the idea that **וביניך** should be understood as addressing another female. This might be considered an allusion to the comment about Sarah's evil eye and Hagar's subsequent miscarriage, either from Rashi or BR, but the reference is far

7. Mirkin, vol. 2, 180; Theodor and Albeck, vol. 1, 453.

8. Munich 50, 1 [IMHM 1692], fol. 32a.

from obvious. The extract also does not account for the proof that Hagar miscarried, which is derived from the angel's announcement of her pregnancy in 16:11.

This text raises several important questions. Did Rashi specify the nature of the defective word, or did the phrase originate from a Tosafist paraphrase of his comment? What elements of the passage did the exegete attribute to Rashi, and what is his clarification? Did the Tosafist's version of Rashi include the interpretation of the evil eye and the miscarriage?

(b) Warsaw 204/27 offers some clarification of the previous example, but does not explain completely the phenomenon of the extant printed comment:⁹

ביני וביניך פרשי כל וביניך שבמקרא חסרין יוד בין הנון ובין הכף וזה מלא
כפ"יח וי"מ קרי ביה וביניך לשון נקבה דמשמע שהיתה שרה מדברת עם
הגר ואומרת ישפט ה' ביני וביניך.

Hizkuni is credited with a limited explanation of Rashi in this passage, but what exactly constitutes his super-comment is unclear. The words *וזה מלא* directly precede the acronym *כפ"יח* and are the most obvious choice. Their appearance in Rashi's printed comment certainly does not preclude this possibility. Hizkuni's purpose may have been simply to underscore the difference between the lemma and most spellings of the word, an elemental clarification perhaps not original to Rashi's text.

The phrase *קרי ביה וביניך* is also found in the printed comments. Here it is attributed to the anonymous *יש מפרשים* who explain that the *plene* form of the word should be read *וביניך* in the sense of the feminine, which means that when Sarah spoke the words *ישפט ה' ביני וביניך*, she was speaking to Hagar.

The Tosafot passages seem to indicate that Rashi's comment for this verse only consisted of the statement that most spellings of the lemma, when used in an address to a male, do not include a *yod* between the *nun* and the *kaf*. The designation of this lemma as *plene* and the specification of the manner in which the word should be read, despite the appearance of both these elements in the printed editions, did not originate with Rashi. Neither passage includes a *וכי* or any other notation suggesting that the Tosafot's text of Rashi extended beyond

9. Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fol. 222a.

what is cited.

(c) London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) is very similar:¹⁰

ישפט הי ביני וביניך כל ביניך שבמקרא חסר יוד בין נון ובין כף וזה מלא
כפי"ח וז"ל קרי ביה וביניך שהיא לשון נקבה דמשמי שהיתה שרה מדברת
להגר ואומרת לה ישפט השם ביני וביניך.

The subtle variant of the acronym וז"ל (in place of וי"מ) alters the reader's interpretation of the passage. This text now suggests that כפי"ח introduces the super-comment on Rashi that follows and that the words וזה מלא form part of the Tosafist's citation. The phrase קרי ביה וביניך still seems to be part of Hizkuni's comment, not Rashi's.

The content and logic of the Tosafot presentation of the citation of Rashi and the of super-comment itself are also difficult. If as suggested by the Tosafot, the text of Rashi consisted of only the statement that the usual spelling of the lemma was defective but that in this verse it is *plene*, the idea that the lemma should be read in the feminine form and the notion that Sarah addressed Hagar when she said קרי ביה וביניך were introduced by the Tosafist; they do not necessarily clarify the meaning or purpose of Rashi. Moreover, the significance of Rashi's observation is unclear.

(d) The extract in New York - JTS L793 also attributes to Rashi the specification of where the extra *yod* is included but, unlike the previous examples, it cites as well the midrash about Sarah's evil eye and Hagar's subsequent miscarriage:¹¹

כל ביני וביניך שבמקרא חסר יוד בין הנון והכף וזה מלא בין הנון והכף
כאלו אומי ובניך מלמד שהכניסה עין הרע בעיבורה של הגר והפילה
והרדק הקשה על זה המדרש באומר...

The phrase קרי ביה וביניך, which in other extracts is credited to Hizkuni, appears here as כאלו אומי ובניך; seemingly it is part of the citation of Rashi. This observation further complicates the picture of the original Rashi with the question of whether the Tosafist is paraphrasing קרי ביה וביניך, which in his text belonged

10. London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 14a.

11. New York - JTS L793 [IMHM 24023], fol. 17b.

to Rashi, whether **קרי ביה וביניך** is the wording of the original comment, or whether it is not intended here as part of the citation of Rashi.

The specification of how **קרי ביה וביניך** is *plene* (וזה מלא בין הנון והכף) does not appear in the citations of the previous examples; on the one hand, it supports a link to Rashi of the statement of *plene* (וזה מלא), but on the other hand, it suggests the passage as a whole may suffer from extensive paraphrasing. While the lack of conformity among the examples frustrates efforts at reconstruction, it demonstrates the variety of traditions associated with Rashi for this comment and the untrustworthiness of the version in the printed editions.

(e) In New York - JTS 791, the passage is less convoluted than the preceding ones, but the issue concerning the parameters of Rashi's citation persists.¹²

ישמט ה' ביני וביניך פ"ה ביניך שבמקרא חסר וזה מלא קרי ביה וביניך
ובמלאות ר"ל בין נון והכף חז'.

This text suggests that the clarification of the exact nature of this *plene* spelling, which was of concern to Rashi, is undertaken by Hizkuni. He specifies that the *plene* refers to the *yod* between the *nun* and the *kaf*. The curiosity of his explanation is the conjunction **ובמלאות**; it intimates, perhaps, the second of two comments. In other words, the question of whether the phrase **קרי ביה וביניך** is part of the citation of Rashi or part of Hizkuni's super-comment remains unclear. The inability of the printed texts to serve as a reliable standard and the confusing evidence from previous Tosafot extracts does not convince the reader either way.

(f) Parma 837 (2058) cites the midrashic element of Rashi's printed text and lacks the complexity of the first part of the comment:¹³

ביני וביניך פרשי הכניסה עין הרע בעיברה של הגר והפילה והטעי כי לפי
היו"ד שהיא אחר הנו"ן מורה שהחזירה פניה אל הגר כאילו אמרה ביני
וביניך.

The Tosafist explains that the *yod* after the *nun* teaches that Sarah turned her face to Hagar while she was speaking to Abraham, as if the phrase "between me

12. New York - JTS 791 [IMHM 24021], fol. 12b.

13. Parma 837 (2058) [IMHM 13135], eighth folio of **פרשת לך לך**.

and you" implied between Sarah and Hagar, and not Abraham. This clarifies the link between the lemma בני וביניך and Rashi's comment that Sarah cast an evil eye on Hagar and caused the subsequent miscarriage.

The linguistic formulation expressing the *plene* spelling of the word בני וביניך and the confusion regarding which elements of that part of the comment belonged to Rashi and which to Hizkuni are not concerns in this passage. The association of Rashi with a comment that reflects closely the interpretation in the rabbinic source (BR 45:5) is intriguing. The simplicity and clarity of the text in this manuscript, as well as the corroboration with BR, support the reliability of this version of Rashi, and suggest that the specifications regarding the spelling of the lemma may have resulted from the contributions of Hizkuni and others.

(g) The passages in the מנחת יהודה manuscripts are very similar and consistently reflect analogous versions of Rashi. However, in many, this conformity is manifested among the less clear style of extracts where the parameters for the citation of Rashi's comment and the exegesis of Hizkuni are not explicitly fixed. The text of Vat. Ebr. 506 does not include recognition of Hizkuni's contribution.¹⁴

ישפט הי בני וביניך פרשי וביניך חסר יוד שהוא לשוי נקבה דמשמע שהיתה שרה מדברת להגר ואמי לה ישפט הי בני וביניך.

The comment attributed to Rashi in this manuscript expresses the idea that the *plene* spelling of the lemma in this verse implies a feminine form, which the Tosafist understands to mean that Sarah uttered the words "between you and me" to Hagar. While similar in content to other passages, this one is much more brief and succinct. Specifically, it lacks the details of the spelling and its pronunciation. The possibility of paraphrasing, however, must be considered cautiously, because it attributes an authority to the lengthier citations not yet established as authentic. The relationship of Vat. Ebr. 506 to the printed editions is significantly distant. The reference to Hagar's miscarriage is not mentioned at all, and the ideas of the first half of the printed comment are expressed in very different words and phrases.

(h) Vat. Ebr. 53 reflects some of the linguistic formulations of the printed

14. Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fol. 13b.

editions but does not help to resolve the confusion:¹⁵

ישפטי ה' בניי ובניי פריי ברקיי ויהוה שפטי דמבא נקנון לשוי דמבא נקנון לשוי
ישפטי ה' בניי ובניי פריי ברקיי ויהוה שפטי דמבא נקנון לשוי דמבא נקנון לשוי

The phrase פריי ברקיי ויהוה שפטי דמבא נקנון לשוי is found in the printed comment, although in some Tosafot manuscripts it is attributed to Hizkuni. The clause נקנון לשוי is not in the familiar version of Rashi; in the Tosafot texts, sometimes it forms part of the citation of Rashi and sometimes part of the super-comment. The explanation that the feminine form of the lemma directs Sarah's speech to Hagar appears often in the above passages and always seems to constitute the Tosafot exegesis on the Rashi.

(i) The citation in Parma 537 (2541) reflects scribal error in the specification of the defective spelling of פריי ברקיי, and an ambiguity exists in terms of what constitutes Hizkuni's comment:¹⁶

ישפטי ה' בניי ובניי פריי ברקיי ויהוה שפטי דמבא נקנון לשוי דמבא נקנון לשוי
ישפטי ה' בניי ובניי פריי ברקיי ויהוה שפטי דמבא נקנון לשוי דמבא נקנון לשוי

This text is very similar to the passages in Warsaw 204.27 and London 173.2. In the Warsaw manuscript, פריי ברקיי replaces פריי ברקיי, and either option suggests that Hizkuni's exegesis of Rashi either precedes the acronym of accreditation and then the passage is supplemented by an anonymous Tosafot opinion, or that Hizkuni's comment is introduced with the abbreviation פריי ברקיי and begins with the vague expression "and some say" or "and some interpret."

The London manuscript has פריי ברקיי, which suggests that the explanation beginning with the phrase פריי ברקיי constitutes Hizkuni's understanding (and that, despite its presence in the printed comments, it is not authentic to Rashi). The specification of the defective spelling and the absence of the midrashic reference are still not clearly understood in their relationship to Rashi's original work. (i) Verona 4 includes the abbreviation פריי ברקיי after the attribution to Hizkuni.

Otherwise it is very similar to the previous passage:¹⁷

15. Vat. Ebr. 53 [IMHM 170], fol. 16b.
16. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 15b.
17. Verona 4 [IMHM 766], fols. 18b-19a.

ישפוט הי ביני וביניך כל ביניך שבתורה חסירי יוד בין הנון ובין הכי וזה מלא כחזקי וזל קרי ביה וביניך שהוא לשוי נקבה דמשמי שהיתה שרה מדברת להגר ואומרת לה ישפוט הי ביני וביניך.

(k) New York - JTS L787 is almost identical:¹⁸

ישפוט הי ביני וביניך כל ביניך שבמקרא חסירין יוד בין נון ובין כף וזה מלא כפייח וזל קרי ביה וביניך שהוא לשון נקבה דמשמע שהיתה שרה מדברת להגר ואומרת לה ישפוט השם ביני וביניך.

(l) The text of New York - JTS L789 contains no significant differences:¹⁹

ישפוט הי ביני וביניך כל בניך שבמקרא חסרין יוד בין נון ובין כף וזה מלא כפייח וזל קרי בזה וביניך שהוא לשון נקבה דמשמע שהיתה שרה מדברת להגר ואומרת לה ישפוט הי ביני וביניך.

(m) Parma 527 (2368), a manuscript of מנחת יהודה just like the previous six examples, differs from the above in only three words. This additional phrase serves to clarify the relationship of the Tosafot passage to the printed text.²⁰

ישפוט הי ביני וביניך פרש כל וביניך שבמקרא חסרין יוד בין הנון ובין הכי וזה מלא כפייח עוד פרש על זה וזל קרי ביה וביניך שהוא לשון נקבה דמשמע שהיתה שרה מדברת להגר ואומרת לה ישפוט הי ביני וביניך.

Like Vat. Ebr. 53, קרי ביה ובניך is clearly attributed to Rashi and is not part of Hizkuni's super-comment. The insertion of עוד פרש על זה וזל changes drastically the parameters of the citation and the Tosafot exegesis, and it elucidates the contrasting evidence extracted from other documents. The consistent attribution to Rashi of the exact composition of the *plene* form seems to support its authenticity despite its absence from the printed editions. The nature of Hizkuni's exegesis of Rashi and its relationship to the text of the printed editions, however, is not yet apparent.

(n) Budapest-Kaufmann A31 corroborates the version of Parma 527 (2368), as well as provides additional elucidation. It attributes the specification of the *plene* comment to the Tosafot exegesis as distinct from the citation of Rashi.²¹

18. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fols. 11a-11b.

19. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 11b.

20. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], fourth folio of פרשת לך לך.

21. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 31a.

ישפט הי בניי וביניך פי הרשי כל ביניך שבמקרא חסרין וזה מלא פי
 חסרין יוד בין נון וכף וזה מלא עוי פי רשי קרי בי וביניך שהוא לשון נקבה
 משמע שכשרה הייתה מדברת עם אברהם הפכה פניה כנגד הגר כשאמרה
 ישפט הי בניי וביניך.

The first line of the passage is a citation of Rashi that agrees with the version in the printed texts. The description of the placement of the letters constitutes the clarification of Rashi's comment. This explains the difficulty in earlier examples of distinguishing between Rashi's comment and Hizkuni's super-comment. Both the citation and the exegesis of it end with the phrase וזה מלא. A brief review of examples i, j, k and l reveals the absence of an abbreviated attribution to Rashi prior to the first line and suggests that these מנחת יהודה extracts were not citing Rashi but presenting a combination of Rashi and the interpretation of him.

The final lines of the passage describe in great detail the scene implied by reading וביניך in the feminine. Although Sarah is clearly speaking to Abraham, she turns and faces Hagar as she says, "Let God decide between you and me." Despite the absence of the clause from the printed texts, the author of the phrase שהוא לשון נקבה appears to be Rashi; the word משמע seems to introduce the clarification of the citation. The authenticity of the passage from BR now found in the printed editions remains uncertain.

(o) Paris héb. 168 offers a very similar text:²²

ישפט הי בניי וביניך פי הרש כל ביניך שבמקרא חסרין וזה מלא פי חסרין
 יוד בין נון וכף וזה מלא עוד פי הרש קרי בי וביניך שהוא לשון נקבה משמע
 שכשרה היתה מדבר עם אברהם הפכה פניה כלפי הגר כשאמרה ישפט
 הי בניי וביניך.

(p) New York - JTS L788 distinguishes clearly between the citation of Rashi's comment and Hizkuni's super-comment, further elucidating the contributions of both Rashi and Hizkuni to the unattributed passages of מנחת יהודה.²³

ישפט הי בניי וביניך פי רשי כל ביניך שבמקרא חסר וזה מלא קרי וביניך

22. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 17a.

23. New York - JTS L788 [IMHM 24018], fol. 6a.

כלומי כל ובינד חסר יוד בין הנון ובין הכף וזה מלא כד פיי חזקוי.

The use of the word כלומר introduces Hizkuni's exegesis, just as it did for the citation and discussion of Rashi's comment for Gen. 9:5 (analyzed in Chapter Four),²⁴ and the content of the super-comment conforms with what is introduced as פי in the previous two manuscripts. The passage identifies the source for the detailed description of the intended meaning of *plene* and defective and corroborates the authenticity of part of the printed comment. The absence of the phrase לשון נקבה שהוא from this extract suggests that, in Budapest- Kaufmann A31 and in Paris héb. 168, it was intended as part of the super-comment and not the citation of Rashi.

In addition, most manuscripts lack any reference to the printed comment's remarks regarding Hagar's miscarriage as well as any indication that the Tosafot were aware the comment continued beyond what they cited. This conformity questions the reliability of that section of the printed comment to the original work.

(q) The final extract from the Tosafot manuscripts appears to be the most complete and hence, the most clear. It accounts for most elements of the printed comment and attributes the super-comments to their respective authors with clarity. New York - JTS L790 has the following passage:²⁵

ישפט הי ביני ובינד פרשי זל כל בינד שבמקרא חסרים וזה מלא קרי ביה
ובינד כלומר כל ובינד חסר יוד בין הנון ובין הכף וזה מלא כפח עוד פרש
זל על זה וזה לשונו קרי ביה ובינד הכניסה עין הרע בעבורה של הגר
והפילה עכל והכי רל תי קרי ביה ובינד שהיא לשון נקבה דמשמע שהיתה
שרה מדברת להגר ואומרת לה ישפט הי ביני ובינד.

The only aspect of Rashi's printed comment not mentioned in this manuscript or any other is the proof that Hagar must have miscarried, deduced from the angel's announcement of her presumably second pregnancy several verses later. The authenticity of this section remains questionable, and its appearance in BR 45:5 supports the possibility that it was appended later. The employment of phrases like לשונו וזה and עכל identifies the citation of Rashi clearly and marks the phrase לשון נקבה שהוא as part of the super-comment; the use of כלומר and כפח

24. See pages 205-209.

25. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 16a.

distinguishes Hizkuni's remarks. The midrashic reference within the parameters of the citation of Rashi link it underiably with Rashi and not with the primary source. The care with which this passage is annotated and the logical organization of the interpretations and clarifications supports its reliability and authenticity over the previous examples.

The presentation of this comment in the Tosafot citations of Rashi demonstrates the complexity of this analysis. The variety of textual renditions manifested in the *מנחת יהודה* manuscripts alone demands an examination of numerous documents and cautions against relying on just one version.

The lack of conformity among the citations complicates the search for a text of Rashi as close to the original as possible and renders suspect all extant passages. At the same time, the reader must be careful not to dismiss the evidence from the Tosafot versions in favour of the familiar printed texts, even if the data is contradictory. The original text of Rashi's comment on 16:5 was probably not all that different from the printed editions, with the exception of the angel's announcement, but the potential for corruption in the printed texts and in the citations cannot be better elucidated.

One manuscript of Rashi's commentary reflects a version of the comment with remnants of Hizkuni's super-comment. The text in Paris héb. 55 is as follows:²⁶

ביני וביניך כל וביניך שבמקרא חסרין יוד וזה מלא ב' יודין קרי ביה וביניך
הכניסה עין הרע בעיבורה של הגר והפלה עוברה הוא שהמלאך אמי להגר
הנך הרה הרי כבר הרתה והוא מבשר לה שתהרה אלא מלמד שהפילה
הריון הראשון.

The specification of the *plene* and defective spellings originates with Hizkuni, but if only a limited analysis of the Tosafot manuscripts had been conducted, this version of Rashi may have been considered corroboration for the correct reading. The texts of this example demonstrate the need for the Tosafot citations to work together with the unreliable printed editions in order to manifest the most authentic version of the commentary. The similarity between this comment's relationship to Hizkuni and that of Gen. 9:5 - specifically, the incorporation of what follows *כלומר*

26. Paris héb. 55 [IMHM 3107], fols. 20a-20b.

in Rashi's work in the Tosafot for 16:5 and in the printed editions for 9:5 - suggests that only chance prevented Hizkuni's super-comment on 16:5 from being embedded undetectably in the printed texts of Rashi.²⁷

The Tosafot display the intricate and enigmatic process of scribal transmission and the corruption that ensues. Their manuscripts are also not free from error; but the alternative readings they present are not as copious as with the Rashi manuscripts and a comparison of a sufficient number of them, in the end, reveals the layers of interactions. The caution and objectivity with which one must evaluate the texts and the recognition of the extent to which copying the manuscripts had the potential to change them cannot be more striking.

2. Genesis 9:21

Noah drank the wine he made from his vineyard and became drunk, and he uncovered himself inside his tent. The text reads:

וישת מן היין וישכר ויתגל בתוך אהלה.

In all the printed editions except Berliner, Rashi's comment for the lemma אהלה precedes his comment for ויתגל, despite the reverse order of the words in the biblical verse. The texts of the comments are fairly consistent from edition to edition. The word אהלה is spelled with a *hey* but pronounced "aholo," as if it ended with a *vav*, and Rashi explains that the *hey* ending is an allusion to the ten tribes of Israel who are referred to as Samaria (שומרון) and which, in turn, is called אהלה (pronounced "aholah").²⁸ The allusion to the ten tribes is made because they were exiled over matters of wine. Amos 6:6 is included as a proof-text because it states that "those who drink wine in bowls and who anoint themselves with the best oils, but are not concerned with the ruin of Joseph, shall go into exile

27. Hizkuni's printed comment for this verse supports the relationship between Hizkuni and Rashi established from the manuscripts. The text reads: וביניך נקוד פרשי כל וביניך שבמקרא חסר וזה מלא קרי ביה ובניך כלומר כל וביניך חסרים יידיך בין הנניץ ובין הכיין וזה מלא. See Aaron 87; Chavel 189.

28. The connection between Samaria and אהלה is made in a parable in Ezek. 23:4 in which the acts of two whores are compared to Jerusalem and Samaria. The verse reads: ושמותן אהלה הגדולה ואהליבה אחותה ותהיינה לי ותלדנה בנים ובנות ושמותן שמרון אהלה וירושלם אהליבה.

first,"²⁹ thus supporting the connection between drinking wine and exile.³⁰

The texts in the Venice and Guadalajara editions read:³¹

אהלו אהלה כתיב רמו לעשרת שבטים שנקראו על שם שומרון שנקראת
אהלה שגלו על עסקי יין שנאמר השותים במזרקי יין.

In all the printed editions, Rashi's comment for the second lemma, ויתגל, is simply לשון התפעל. The statement informs the reader that the verb is in the reflexive conjugation and suggests that Noah uncovered *himself*. Despite the the lack of textual problems among the printed editions, Rashi's objective in indicating this particular detail is unclear.

The Tosafot citations of Rashi for ויתגל present a different text with a different interpretation. The analysis of the citations will demonstrate the degree of interpretation that is sometimes required in assessing the evidence extracted from the Tosafot manuscripts. From eleven citations, three attribute to Rashi the comment לשון גלות.

(a) Warsaw 204/27 has the following text:³²

ויתגל בתוך אהלה לפרשי צריך לפרש לשון גלות.

The brief extract does not include a super-comment on Rashi's interpretation, but the subtle paraphrase presents how Rashi understood the lemma, not a direct citation of his comment. The meaning of this explanation is that Rashi defined ויתגל in the sense that Noah exiled himself in his tent, instead of "uncovered himself," as the printed editions imply.

(b) Vat. Ebr. 506 has a similar passage:³³

ויתגל בתוך אהלה לפי פי רשיי צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות.

29. Amos 6:6 in its entirety reads: חשתים במזרקי יין וראשית שמנים ימשחו ולא נחלו: על שבר יסף.

30. The same analogy between the spelling of אהלה and the exile of the ten tribes because of wine is made in Tanhuma, נח, כ, כא, נח.

31. *Rashi HaShalem*, vol. 1, 102, 334. The Rome, Reggio and Berliner editions differ only in the word לעשרת שבטים instead of לעשרת, and Berliner differs in the order of the comments for this verse. See *Rash HaShalem*, vol. 1, 334; Berliner (1905) 19.

32. Warsaw 204/27 [IMHM 10112], fol. 220b.

33. Vat. Ebr. 506 [IMHM 542], fol. 9b.

(c) The citation in Vat. Ebr. 53 also attributes to Rashi the same comment regarding the sense of exile:³⁴

ויתגל בתוך אהלה לפרשי צריך לפי ויתגל לשון גלות.

The remaining eight citations of Rashi attribute to Hizkuni the remark that "according to Rashi" the lemma ויתגל should be understood in the sense of exile. The texts of each manuscript differ only in the manner in which they abbreviate words or spell them out in full.

(d) London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) has the following:³⁵

ויתגל בתוך אהלו פירש חזקוני לפי פרש צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות עכ"ל.

(e) Parma 537 (2541) is almost identical:³⁶

ויתגל בתוך אהלה פי חזקוני לפי פרש צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות עכ"ל.

(f) Budapest-Kaufmann A31 reads:³⁷

ויתגל בתוך אהלה פי חזקוני שלפי פי הרשי צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות.

(g) Paris héb. 168 offers no significant differences:³⁸

ויתגל בתוך אהלה פי חזקוני שלפי פי הרשי צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות.

(h) In Parma 527 (2368), the attribution to Hizkuni is abbreviated:³⁹

ויתגל בתוך אהלו פח לפרשי צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות עכל.

(i) New York - JTS L787 refers to the lemma as ויתגלו, but otherwise the passage conforms to the previous examples:⁴⁰

ויתגל בתוך אהלו פירש חזקוני לפי פרשי צריך לפרש ויתגלו לשון גלות.

34. Vat. Ebr. 53, fol. 13a.

35. London 173,2 (Add. 11,566) [IMHM 4921], fol. 11a.

36. Parma 537 (2541) [IMHM 13503], fol. 11a.

37. Budapest-Kaufmann A31 [IMHM 2833], fol. 23a.

38. Paris héb. 168 [IMHM 4155], fol. 12b.

39. Parma 527 (2368) [IMHM 13233], eighth folio of פרשת נח.

40. New York - JTS L787 [IMHM 24017], fol. 7b.

(j) The same variant of the lemma appears in New York - JTS L789:⁴¹

ויתגל בתוך אהלו פי חזקוני לפי פי רשי צריך לפר' ויתגלו לשון גלות.

(k) Finally, New York - JTS L790 reads:⁴²

ויתגל בתוך אהלה פי חזקוני לפי פרשי צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות עכ"ל.

The conformity among these citations, which attribute to Rashi the interpretation of ויתגל as exile, presents a very different comment than appears in the printed editions. The variation questions the authenticity of the vague and unclear comment לשון התפעל and intimates that, once again, Hizkuni has directed the reader to the more correct Rashi.

The relationship between Hizkuni's version of Rashi and Rashi's printed comment for אהלה should not be ignored. The explanation for אהלה is an allusion to the exile of the ten tribes through the common theme of wine. The nature of Hizkuni's paraphrase of Rashi's understanding of ויתגל may be a reference to Rashi's comment for אהלה. In other words, since Rashi sees an allusion to exile in the word for tent, and the root of ויתגל is גלה, which can mean to be exiled or to uncover, Hizkuni's comment might reflect a need to respond to the implication of Rashi's first comment about the meaning of ויתגל; thus, he may have assumed that Rashi understood the lemma in the sense that Noah exiled himself into his tent.⁴³

The issue of the authenticity of Rashi's printed comment of לשון התפעל remains unresolved. If Hizkuni is reacting to the implication for the meaning of ויתגל from Rashi's comment for אהלה, this does not preclude the existence of a comment for the lemma itself. However, one might have expected the consistent references to Rashi's intention regarding this particular lemma to have been linked to what he actually wrote in his work. The absence of any discussion of the printed comment despite the direct attention paid to Rashi's understanding of the

41. New York - JTS L789 [IMHM 24019], fol. 8b.

42. New York - JTS L790 [IMHM 24020], fol. 11b.

43. Once again Hizkuni's printed commentary reflects the same comment extracted from the Tosafot manuscripts: Both the edition of Aaron 64 and of Chavel 129 have the following: ויתגל בתוך אהלה לפי פרשי צריך לפרש ויתגל לשון גלות.

lemma in consistent extracts from the Tosafot, the reverse order of Rashi's comments compared with the appearance of the lemmata in the verse, and the puzzling significance of the printed comment challenge the authenticity of לשון התפעל.

These passages demonstrate the influence and impact Tosafot paraphrasing can have on the text of Rashi. Without the analogous theme of exile in the comment of אהלה, the reader would have been justified in concluding that Rashi's original comment for ויתגל consisted of the words לשון גלות. Despite their corrupt nature, the potential contribution of the printed editions must not be dismissed or discounted. Only constant comparisons of both text and content, in all extant versions of Rashi in all early citations and interpretations, will help to assess the citations of Rashi in Tosafot and thus, correct and restore the text as close as possible to the authentic work.

Appendix C: The Manuscripts

A. Manuscript Catalogues

Allony, N. and D. Loewinger. רשימת תצלומי כתבי היד העבריים במכון. Vol. 3. כתבי יד שבספריית הוואטיקן. Jerusalem: Reuven Mass, 1968.

Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manuscriptorum Catalogus, Recensuerunt Steph. Evodius Assemani et Jos. Sim. Assemani. Vol. 1. Codices Ebraicos et Samaritanos. Rome: 1756; Paris: Maisonneuve frères, 1926.

Cassuto, U. *Bybliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codices Manuscripti Recensiti, Codices Vaticani Hebraici.* Vatican: 1956.

Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Gaster Collection, The British Library, London. London: Oriental and India Office Collections, 1996.

Catalogue des manuscrits hébreux et samaritains de la Bibliothèque Impériale. ed. H. Zotenberg. Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1866.

Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca senatoria civitatis lipsiensis asservantur. ed. Robert Naumann. Leipzig: Grimae, J. M. Gebhardt, 1838.

De Rossi, I. B. *Manuscripti Codices Hebraici Biblioth. I. B. de-Rossi accurate ab eodem descripti et illustrati.* Parma: 1803.

Fleischer, Henricus Orthobius. *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Orientalium, Bibliothecae Regiae Dresdensis.* Lipsiae: Fridenci Adolphi Eberti, 1831.

Margoliouth, G. *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum.* Vol. 1. London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1965.

Neubauer, Adolf. *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library.* Vols. 1-2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886-1906.

Rovner, Jay. *A Guide to the Hebrew Manuscript Collection of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.* New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1991.

- Roth, Ernst and Leo Prijs. *Hebräische Handschriften Teil 1a*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1982.
- Roth, Ernst and Leo Prijs. *Hebräische Handschriften Teil 1B*. Frankfurt Am Main: Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, 1990.
- Sachs, S. *Catalogue of the Guenzberg Collection*. Moscow: Lenin State Library, 1980.
- Sassoon, David Solomon. *תולדות ספרים* *Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the Sassoon Library, London*. Vols. 1-2. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1932.
- Schwarz, Arthur Zacharias. *Die Hebräischen Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*. Leipzig: Verlag Karl W. Hieseman, 1925.
- Sotheby's Catalogue. *Catalogue of Thirty-Eight Highly Important Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts from the Collection formed by the Late David Solomon Sassoon*. Zurich: Nov. 5, 1975.
- Sotheby's Catalogue. *A Further Ninety-Seven Highly Important Hebrew Manuscripts from the Collection formed by the Late David Solomon Sassoon*. New York: Decentury. 4, 1984.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. *Catalog der hebräischen Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg*. Hamburg: Georg Olms Verlag Hildesheim, 1969.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. *Catalogus Codicum Hebraeorum Bibliothecae Academiae Lugduno - Batavae*. Leyden: 1858, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1977.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Berlin: Buchdruckerei der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1878.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Berlin: A. Asher and Co., 1897.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. *Die Hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in Muenchen*. Munich: 1895.
- Tentative handlist of the Baron Guenzburg collection of manuscripts in the Russian State Library in Moscow, 1995.
- Van der Heide, Albert. *Hebrew Manuscripts of Leiden University Library*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1977.

Weisz, Miksa. *Katalog der hebräischen Handschriften und Bücher in der Bibliothek des Professors Dr. David Kaufmann*. Budapest: Nvomatott Alkalav Adolf és Fiánál Pozsonyban, 1906.

B. Manuscripts

1. *Tosafot Super-Commentaries on Rashi*

London 173,2 (Add. 11,566), IMHM 4921. פרוש על פרושו של שלמה בן יצחק (בראשית א-מח) לתורה. 14th century. Margoliouth 132.

Moscow-Guenzburg 317, IMHM 47585. פרוש על פרוש רש"י לתורה. 15-16th century. fols. 1a-207b. Sachs; handlist.

New York - JTS L793, IMHM 24023. פרוש על פירוש רש"י לתורה. 15th century. Rovner 18.

New York - JTS I819a/1, IMHM 24053. פרוש על פרוש רש"י לתורה. 16th century. fols. 1a-64b. Rovner 18.

Parma 837 (2058), IMHM 13135. פרוש על פרוש התורה של רש"י. 14th century. De Rossi vol. 2, 188.

2. *Anonymous Tosafot Torah Commentaries*

Cambridge 669,1, IMHM 15873. "באורים". 15th century.

Cambridge (Add.) 1215,5, IMHM 17078. פרוש התורה. 1532.

Dresden EB 399, IMHM 20767. חדושים על התורה. 1344. Fleischer 67.

Frankfort Am Main 8°133/5, IMHM 25932. פרוש התורה. fols. 154a-206b. 15th century. Roth and Prijs (1982) 188-192.

Frankfort Am Main (hebr.) 8°174, IMHM 22028. הדר זקנים. 15th century. Roth and Prijs (1990) 36-37.

Hamburg 40 (Cod. hebr. 52), IMHM 901. פרוש התורה. 16th century. Steinschneider (1969) 10-12.

- Hamburg 46 (Cod. hebr. 108), IMHM 942. פרוש תורה. 1628. Steinschneider (1969) 17-18.
- Jerusalem 8°5138 (B200). פרוש על התורה. 1547.
- Leiden 27 (Wam. 27, Cod. Or. 4765), IMHM 17371. חדושי התורה ליוסף בכור. 1400. Steinschneider (1977) 113-144; Van der Heide 31.
- London (Or.) 9932/1, IMHM 6980. "תוספת תורה". 15th century. Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Gaster Collection.
- Moscow-Guenzburg 82, IMHM 07247. פרוש התורה, fols. 1a-48b; פרוש מאיר בן יהודה חסיד פרוש התורה, fols. 62a-97b; ברוך מרוטנבורג מסורת פרוש על פרוש רש"י לתורה, fols. 102a-114b; fols. 115a-124b. 14th century. Sachs; handlist.
- New York - JTS 791, IMHM 24021. פרוש התורה. 16-17th century. Rovner 17.
- New York - JTS 792/1, IMHM 24022. חדושי צרפת. 16th century. fols. 1a-79b. Rovner 18.
- New York - JTS L794, IMHM 24024. פרוש התורה. 15th century. Rovner 18.
- Oxford-Bodleian 270 (Bodl. Or. 604), IMHM 16738. חדושי צרפת. 13-14th century. Neubauer 53.
- Oxford - Bodleian 271/1 (Opp. 31), IMHM 16739. חדושים על התורה מחכמי צרפת. fols. 1a-36b. 14th century. Neubauer 53-54.
- Oxford - Bodleian 271/2 (Opp. 31), IMHM 16739. פרוש התורה. fols. 37a-78b. 14-15th century. Neubauer 53-54.
- Oxford - Bodleian 271/8 (Opp. 31), IMHM 16739. פרוש התורה (בראשית). fols. 120a-131b. 14-15th century. Neubauer 53-54.
- Oxford - Bodleian 274 (Marsh. 423), IMHM 16742. פרוש התורה. 15th century. Neubauer 55.
- Oxford - Bodleian 283 (Hunt. 569), IMHM 16751. "פרוש תורה". 17th century. Neubauer 56.
- Paris héb. 260, IMHM 27839. פרוש התורה. 15th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 33-34.
- Parma 541/1 (2342), IMHM 13218. נימוקי חומש. 13-14th century. De Rossi 77-79.

Sassoon 409/1, IMHM 9353. סי מושב זקנים. 1474. Sassoon vol. 1, 75-81; Sotheby's (1975) 119.

Vat. Ebr. 45/1, IMHM 162. פרוש התורה. 14th century. *Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ* 34-35; Cassuto 64-66.

Warsaw 204/27, IMHM 10112. פרוש התורה. 15-16th century. fols. 219-232.

3. Individual Tosafist Commentaries

Cambridge (Add.) 377.3/1, IMHM 15872. ספר השגות, אברם בן דוד. 15th century.

Cambridge (Add.) 669,2, IMHM 15890. פרוש התורה מאת "זלטמן" בן ר' יהודה החסיד. 14th century.

Jerusalem 8°105 (B23). חדושי הרא"ש על התורה. 16th century. fols. 1a-38a.

Munich 28.2, IMHM 1614. פשטים ופרושים על חז"ת יעקב מוינה. 16th century. Steinschneider (1895) 13-15.

Munich 52/1, IMHM 2852. בכור שור. n.d. Steinschneider (1895) 35.

Oxford - Bodleian 284 (Marsh. 225), IMHM 16752. פרוש התורה, נתנאל בן נחמיה כספי. 16th century. Neubauer 56.

Oxford - Bodleian 2343/1 (Opp. Add. 4°127), IMHM 21407. "פשטים מפרשת בראשית... ר' יצחק בן חיים". 14th century. fols. 1a-18a. Neubauer 817-818.

Paris héb. 167/2, IMHM 4154. פרוש התורה מאת שלמה הכהן בי"ר יעקב הכהן. 1443. fols. 51b-103b. Bibliothèque Impériale 18.

Paris héb. 167/3, IMHM 4154. פרוש התורה מאת דוסא היוני בי"ר משה מעיר. 15th century. fols. 104a-125b. Bibliothèque Impériale 18.

Paris héb. 167/4, IMHM 4154. יעקב בן שבתאי. פרוש על פרוש רש"י לתורה. 1443. fols. 126a-226b. Bibliothèque Impériale 18.

4. מנחת יהודה

Budapest-Kaufmann A31, IMHM 2833. מנחת יהודה. 15-16th century. Weisz 8-10.

Munich 62,1, IMHM 23118. מנחת יהודה. 16th century. Steinschneider (1895) 41.

New York - JTS L787, IMHM 24017. מנחת יהודה. 16th century. Rovner 17.

New York - JTS L788, IMHM 24018. מנחת יהודה. 16th century. Rovner 17.

New York - JTS L789, IMHM 24018. מנחת יהודה. 16th century. Rovner 17.

New York - JTS L790, IMHM 24020. מנחת יהודה. 15th century. Rovner 17.

Paris héb. 168, IMHM 4155. מנחת יהודה. 15-16th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 18.

Parma 527 (2368), IMHM 13233. מנחת יהודה. 1402. De Rossi vol. 2, 71-72.

Parma 537 (2541) IMHM 13503. מנחת יהודה. 1466. De Rossi vol. 2, 75.

Vat. Ebr. 53, IMHM 170. מנחת יהודה. 1458. *Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ* 41-42.

Vat. Ebr. 506, IMHM 542. פרוש התורה. 1414. Allony and Loewinger 68.

Verona 4, IMHM 768. מנחת יהודה. 15-16th century.

5. פענח רזא

Jerusalem 8^o2240 (B432). פענח רזא. 16th century.

Munich 50,1, IMHM 1692. פענח רזא. n.d. Steinschneider (1895) 34-35.

Oxford - Bodleian 2344 (Opp. Add. 4^o103), IMHM 21408. פענח רזא. 16th century. Neubauer 818.

Parma 1050 (2057), IMHM 13134. פענח רזא. 15th century. De Rossi vol. 3, 46.

Vat. Ebr. 48/1, IMHM 165. פענח רזא. 14th century. *Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ* 37-38; Cassuto 69.

Vienna 20,4.16 (Hebr. 12a), IMHM 1298. פענח רזא. 14-15th century. Schwarz 27.

6. *Rashi's Commentary*

Berlin 14 (Ms. Or. Fol. 121), IMHM 1788. פרוש התני"ך. n.d. Steinschneider (1878) 5.

Berlin 141 (Ms. Or. Fol. 1222), IMHM 10036. פרוש התני"ך. n.d. Steinschneider (1897) 4-5.

Istanbul - Topkapu Serai G. I. 61, IMHM 70616. פרוש התורה לרש"י. 14-15th century.

Leipzig (B.H. fol.) 1, IMHM 30142. תורה הפטרות והי מגלות. 13-14th century. Naumann 273-274.

London 168,1 (Add. 26,917), IMHM 5452. פרוש התורה, שלמה בן יצחק. 1273. Margoliouth 130.

Munich (Cod. Hebr.) 5, IMHM 2525. פרוש רש"י. 1233. Steinschneider (1895) 2.

New York - JTS L747, IMHM 23979. רש"י פרוש התורה. 14th century. Rovner 16.

New York - JTS L749, IMHM 23981. פרוש התורה. 15th century. Rovner 16.

Oxford - Bodleian 186 (Opp. 34), IMHM 16250. פרוש תורה, נביאים, וכתובים. 13th century. Neubauer 31.

Oxford - Bodleian 187 (Mich. 384), IMHM 16251. פרוש התורה. 1399. Neubauer 31-32.

Oxford - Bodleian 188 (Opp. 35), IMHM 16252. פרוש התורה. 1409. Neubauer 32.

Oxford - Bodleian 189 (Can. 81), IMHM 16253. פרוש התורה. 1396. Neubauer 32.

- Oxford - Bodleian 192 (Can. Or. 35), IMHM 16256. פרוש התורה. 14-15th century. Neubauer 33.
- Oxford - Bodleian 196 (Opp. Add. Qu. 78), IMHM 16260. פרוש התורה לרש"י. 14-15th century. Neubauer 33-34..
- Oxford - Bodleian 2440 (Corpus Christi Coll. 165), IMHM 20753. פרוש תנייך. n.d. Neubauer 862.
- Oxford - Bodleian 2546 (Opp. Add. fol. 69), IMHM 22250. פרוש התורה. 15th century. Neubauer 1114.
- Paris héb. 37, IMHM 3102. תורה הי מגלות והפטרות. 14th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 4.
- Paris héb. 42/1, IMHM 2923. תורה. 1472. Bibliothèque Impériale 5.
- Paris héb. 48, IMHM 3102. תורה הפטרות וחמש מגלות. 14th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 6.
- Paris héb. 55, IMHM 3107. תורה והפטרות. 15-16th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 6.
- Paris héb. 68, IMHM 3109. תורה. 14-15th century.. Bibliothèque Impériale 7.
- Paris héb. 155, IMHM 4142. פרוש התורה, אסתר, שה"ש ואיכה מאת רש"י. 13th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 16.
- Paris héb. 156, IMHM 4143. פרוש התורהמאת רש"י. 13-14th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 16.
- Paris héb. 157, IMHM 4144. פרוש התורה מאת רש"י. 13-14th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 16.
- Paris héb. 158/1, IMHM 4145. פרוש התורה מאת רש"י. 14-15th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 17.
- Paris héb. 159, IMHM 4146. פרוש התורה מאת רש"י. 14-15th century. Bibliothèque Impériale 17.
- Parma 175 (3115), IMHM 13859. פרוש התורה לרש"י. 1305. De Rossi vol. 1, 116.
- Parma 181/1 (3204), IMHM 13919. רש"י פרוש התורה. 12-13th century. De Rossi vol. 1. 119.

- Parma 459 (2706), IMHM 13581. פרוש התורה לרשי"י. 14th century. De Rossi vol. 2, 64.
- Parma 682 (3256), IMHM 13943. פרוש התורה לרשי"י. 1312. De Rossi vol. 2, 156.
- Parma 1082 (2986), IMHM 13715. פרוש התורה לרשי"י. 1370. De Rossi vol. 3, 52.
- St. Petersburg - Russian State Library Evr. I. 1, IMHM 46097. פרוש התורה לרשי"י. 13-14th century.
- St. Petersburg - Russian State Library Evr. II A 1181, IMHM 64137. פרוש התורה לרשי"י. 15-16th century.
- Uppsala (O. Cod. Hebr.) 1, IMHM 18009. תורה, הי מגלות הפטרות. 14th century.
- Vat. Ebr. 94, IMHM 253. שלמה בן יצחק פרוש התנ"ך. 13th century.
- Vienna 19.4 (Hebr. 28), IMHM 1306. פרוש התורה, הנביאים וכתובים. 14th century. Schwarz 20.
- Vienna 23 (Hebr. 220), IMHM 1299 (10151). פרוש התנ"ך. שלמה בן יצחק. 13-14th century. Schwarz 29.
- Vienna 24 (Hebr. 3), IMHM 1295 (10152). פרוש התנ"ך רשי"י. 14-15th century. Schwarz 29.

Bibliography

A. Primary Sources

1. Printed Editions of Rashi's Commentary and Translations

Ben Isaiah, Abraham and Benjamin Sharfman. *The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary*. 2nd. ed. Vols. 1-5. Brooklyn: S. S. & R. Publishing Company Inc., 1976.

Berliner, A. *רשיי על התורה*. Berlin: Sumptibus Editorus, 1866.

Berliner, A. *רשיי על התורה*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt: J. Kauffmann, 1905.

Chavel, H. *פירושי רשיי על התורה*. 7th ed. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1992.

Herczeg, Yisrael. *Rashi, The Sapirstein Edition*. Vols. 1-5. New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1995-1997.

Lehmann, M. *The Commentary of Rashi on the Pentateuch*. New York: Manfred and Anne Lehmann Foundation, 1981.

Rashi HaShalem. Vols. 1-3. Jerusalem: Ariel United Israel Institutes, 1986-1990.

Silbermann, A. *Chumash with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary*. Vols. 1-5. Jerusalem: Feldheim Publishers Ltd., 1985.

2. Super-Commentaries on Rashi

Almosnino, S. *ספר רבי שמואל אלמושנינו על פירוש רשיי*. Ed. M. Philip. Petah Tiqva: M. Philip, 1998.

Baer, Yosef ben Yisakhar. *יוסף דעת*. Prague: 1609. Tel Aviv: אחים גיטלר, n.d.

Baqrat, Avraham ben Shlomo. *ספר זכרון*. Ed. M. Philip. Petah Tiqva: M. Philip, 1985.

- Ben Shmuel HaLevy, David. *ספר דברי דוד - טורי זהב*. Ed. H. Chavel. 4th ed. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1993.
- Brachfeld, Menahem Mendel. *ספר יוסף הלל*. Brooklyn: Shaul Hotterer, 1987.
- Calez, Yehudah ben Shlomo. *ספר משיח אלמים על פירוש רש"י לחומש*. Jerusalem: Meir Albaz, 1986.
- HaMaharal of Prague, Rabbi Yehudah Loew ben Betsalel. *חומש גור אריה השלם*. Ed. Yehoshua Hartman. Vols. 1-2. Jerusalem: Makhon Yerushalayim, 1989.
- Margoliot, Ephraim Zalman. *ספר שם אפרים*. Vacz: n.p. 1911.
- Mizrahi, Eliyahu. *חומש הרא"ם*. Ed. M. Philip. Vols. 1-2. Petah Tiqva: M. Philip, 1994.
- Otsar Mefarshei Rashi 'al HaTorah*. Vols. 1-2. Jerusalem: H. Wagshal Inc., n.d.
- Pardo, David. *ספר משכיל לדוד*. Jerusalem: Makhon Even Yisrael, 1986.
- Sellenik, Ya'akov ben Binyamin Aharon. *ספר נחלת יעקב*. Ed. M. Kuperman. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: Irving Cymberknopf Publication Foundation, 1993.
- Ushenberg, Simeon ben Isaac. *ספר דבק טוב*. Tel Aviv: D. Melamed, 1947.

3. Rabbinic Texts

- Avot de Rabbi Nathan*. Ed. S. Schechter. New York: Feldheim Publishers, 1967.
- Bar Ilan's Judaic Library*. CD-ROM. Springfield, N. Y.: Torah Education Software, 1994.
- Midrash Bereshit Rabba*, Eds. J. Theodor and C. Albeck, Vols. 1-3. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1965.
- Midrash Bereshit Rabbah, Vat. Ebr. 30*. Jerusalem: Makor, 1971.
- Midrash Bereshit Rabbah, Vat. Ebr. 60*. Jerusalem: Makor, 1972.
- Midrash Pesikta Rabati*. eds. M. Friedmann and M. Gudemann. Vienna: 1881. Tel Aviv: s.n., 1962-1963.

- Midrash Rabbah*. Ed. Moshe Aaron Mirkin. Vols. 1-11. 4th ed. Tel Aviv: Yavne Publishing, 1986-1987.
- Midrash Tanḥuma*. Vols. 1-2. Warsaw: Lewin Epstein, n.d.
- Midrash Tanḥuma*. Ed. S. Buber. Vilna: 1885. Jerusalem: Ortsel, 1964.
- Midrash Tehillim*. Ed. S. Buber. New York: Om Publishing, 1947.
- Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome. *Sefer 'Arukh HaShalem*. eds. Alexander Kohut, Samuel Krauss. Tel Aviv: n.p., 1969-1970.
- Pirquei de Rabbi Eliezer*. Warsaw: 1852. New York: Om Publishing, 1946.
- Sifrei devai Rav*, ספרי על ספר במדבר וספר זוטא. Ed. H. Horowitz. Leipzig: Gustav Fock, G. m. b. h., 1918. Jerusalem: Wahmann Books, 1966.
- Sifrei Devarim*. Ed. Louis Finkelstein. Berlin: Judischer Kulturbund in Deutschland E.V., 1939. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969.

4. Miscellaneous

- Gellis, J. *Sefer Tosafot HaShalem*. Vols. 1-5. Jerusalem: "Mifal Tosafot HaShalem" Publishing, 1982-1986.
- Hizkuni*, פרוש על התורה לרבינו חזקיה ב"ר מנחם. Ed. Moshe Menahem Aaron. Vols. 1-2. Jerusalem: כנסת שרגא, 1992.
- Ibn Seruk, Menahem. *מחברת מנחם*. Ed. Yehezkel Filipowski. London: The Hebrew Antiquarian Society, 1854.
- Midrash Bereshit Rabati*. Ed. C. Albeck. Jerusalem: Mikitse Nirdamim, Mossad HaRav Kook, 1966-1967.
- Mikraot Gedolot*. New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1951.
- Perush HaTorah: Rashbam*. Ed. David Rosin. Breslau: R. Solomon Stotlander, 1882.
- Perush Rabbi Yosef Kara le-Sefer Iyov*. Ed. Moshe Ahrend. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1988.

Perushei Rabbi Yosef Bekhor Shor 'al HaTorah. Ed. Yehoshaphat Navo. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1994.

Tanakh - The Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1988.

Torat Hayim Hamisha Humshei Torah. Ed. Mordehai Leib Katznelbogen. Vols. 1-5. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1986-1993.

B. Secondary Sources

1. Rashi - General

Alberts, M. *מעם לועז*. New York: s. n., 1917-1925.

Agus, I. "Rashi and his School." *The World History of the Jewish People*. 2nd ser. Vol. 2. Ed. Cecil Roth. Ramat Gan: Jewish History Publications Ltd., Rutgers University Press, 1966: 210-248, 423-428.

Ahrend, M. "1 מחניים על פרשנות התורה." *פרוש רש"י לתורה* (1993): 93-108.

Avinery, Y. *מלון פרושי רש"י*. Tel Aviv: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1949.

Avinery, Y. *היכל רש"י*. Vols. 1-2. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1979-1985.

Ben Shem, Meir David. *מוסף רש"י*. Jerusalem: Sifriyat Yosef Davar Publishing, 1984.

Blumenfield, Samuel. *Master of Troyes*. New York: Behrmann House, Publishers, 1946.

Dahan, Gilbert. "Présence de Rashi dans l'Exégèse Chrétienne du Moyen Âge." *Sens* 8/9 (1991): 291-299.

Delmaire, Jean-Marie. "A Travers les Responsa de Rachi..." *Sens* 8/9 (1991): 300-312.

Gross, Avraham. "פרלמוס על שיטת הישמירה: לתולדות לימוד פירוש רש"י על התורה בדור גירוש ספרד." *AJS Review* 18.1 (1993): א-כ.

Hailperin, Herman, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars*, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963.

Katan, Moshe. תורת הלכה - דברי חיים. תל אביב: תל אביב, 1988.

Katan, Moshe. תורת הלכה - דברי חיים. תל אביב: תל אביב, 1990.

Katan, Moshe. "משנת רמב"ם בתורת הלכה." *תורת הלכה* 27: 15-9, 1981.

Kleiman, Saul. *Anthology of Rashi*. St. Louis, MO: Quality Printing and Publishing, 1942.

Levy, B. Barry. "Rashi's Commentary on the Torah: A Survey of Recent Publications." *Tradition* 23.4 (1988): 102-116.

Liber, M. Rashi. Trans. Adele Szold. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1926.

Pearl, Chaim. *Rashi*. New York: Grove Press, 1988.

Rachi: *ouvrage collectif*. Paris: Service technique pour l'éducation, 1974.

Rashi 1040-1105 *Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach*. Ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna. Paris: Editions de Cerfs, 1993.

Rashi Anniversary Volume, *Texts and Studies*, Vol. 1, New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1941.

Rashi Studies. Ed. Zvi Aré Steinfeld. Jerusalem: "Daf-Noy" Press Ltd., 1993.

Rosenthal, Erwin I. J. "Rashi and the English Bible." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 24 (1940): 138-167.

Sefer *Dikdukei Rashi*. Bnai Brak: Heikhal HaSefer, n.d.

Sefer *Rashi*. Ed. Y. L. Hakohen Maimon. Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1956.

Shereshvsky, Esra. *Rashi: The Man and his World*. New York: Sepher - Hermon Press, Inc., 1982.

Shereshvsky, Esra. "The Significance of Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 54 (1963-64): 58-79.

Van der Heide, A. "Rashi's Biblical Exegesis. Recent Research and Developments." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 41 (1984): 292-318.

Zunz, L. *תולדות רש"י*. Trans. Shimshon Bloch Ha-Levi. Warsaw: Alexander Ginz, 1862.

2. Analyses of Rashi's Exegesis

Ahrend, Moshe. "פירוש רש"י למקרא לאור המחקר המדעי." *Sinai* 112 (1993): 182-188.

Banitt, Menahem. "The *La'azim* of Rashi and of the French Biblical Glosses." *The World History of the Jewish People*. 2nd ser. Vol. 2. Ed. Cecil Roth. Ramat Gan: Jewish History Publications Ltd., Rutgers University Press, 1966: 291-296, 463.

Banitt, Menahem. "הלעזים בפירוש-רש"י ובספר הפתרונוֹת." *תעודה - קובץ מחקרים של ביה"ס למדעי היהדות ע"ש חיים רוזנר*. Vol. 4. Eds. Mordechai Akiva Friedman, Moshe Gil. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1986: 143-168.

Banitt, Menahem. "פירוש רש"י למקרא ולעז-עולם." *Benjamin De Vries Memorial Volume*. Ed. E. Z. Melamed. Jerusalem: Tel Aviv University Research Authority and Stichting Fronika Sanders Fonds, 1968: 242-267.

Blidstein, Ya'akov. "עיונים בפירושי רש"י: ענייני הנהגה ושלטון." *Eshel Beer-Sheva Essays in Jewish Studies in memory of Professor Nehemiah Allony*. Vol. 3. Eds. Gerald Blidstein, Yosef Salmon, Eli Yassif. Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University, 1986: 137-148.

Darmesteter, A. "Les gloses français de Raschi dans la Bible." *Revue des Études Juives* 53-56 (1907-1908).

Doron, Pinhas. "Methodology of Rashi in his Commentary on the Torah." *Estudios Biblicos* 45 (1987): 93-104.

Elyakim, Nissim. "7 מורשת יעקב." *מקרא קצרי כמידה פרשנית בפרשנות רש"י* (1993): 24-39.

Florsheim, Yoel. *Rashi on the Bible in his Commentary on the Talmud*. 2nd. ed. Vols. 1-2. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass Ltd., 1989.

Gelles, B. *Peshat and Derash in the Exegesis of Rashi*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.

Glantser, Avraham. "לעזי רש"י ומשמעותם." *צמנת* 3 (1989): 75-79.

- Glantser, Avraham. "לעזי רשיי ומשמעותם (ב)." *צמנת* 5 (1990): 76-82.
- Glantser, Avraham. "לעזי רשיי ומשמעותם (ג)." *צמנת* 8 (1990): 78-81.
- Glantser, Avraham. "לעזי רשיי ומשמעותם (ד)." *צמנת* 15 (1992): 70-80.
- Greenstein, Edward. "Sensitivity to Language in Rashi's Commentary on the Torah." *The Solomon Goldman Lectures*. Vol. 6. Ed. Mayer I. Gruber. Chicago: Spertus College of Judaica Press, 1993: 51-71.
- Gruber, Mayer. "פירוש רשיי לתורה כמקור לשיבוש באגדה תלמודית." *Sinai* 106 (1990): 225-228.
- Kamin, Sarah. *רשיי פשוטו של מקרא ומדרשו של מקרא*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986.
- Kuperman, Yehuda. "עיון בפירוש רשיי על התורה." *המעין* 21.3 (1986): 28-42.
- Landau, Louis. "סיפורי רשיי הנדפס בתלמוד הבבלי." *Eshel Beer-Sheva Essays in Jewish Studies in memory of Professor Nehemiah Allony*. Vol. 3. Eds. Gerald Blidstein, Yosef Salmon, Eli Yassif. Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University, 1986: 101-117.
- Leibowitz, Nechama and Moshe Ahrend. *Rashi's Commentary on the Torah Studies in his Methodology*. Vols. 1-2. Tel Aviv: Open University of Israel, 1990.
- Mirski, Aharon. "רשיי ומחברת מנחם." *Sinai* 100 (1987): 579-586.
- Opher, Y. "שינויים וחזרות של רשיי בפירושו לתורה." *מגדים* 20 (1993): 83-89.
- Rahman, Yosefa. "רשיי: מלאכת אירגון הפירוש." *דברי הקונגרס העולמי העשירי למדעי היהדות, ירושלים 1989*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: האיגוד העולמי למדעי היהדות, 1990: 73-77.
- Rahman, Yosefa. "תעודה - קובץ עיבוד מדרשים בפירושו של רשיי לתורה." *מחקרים של ביחייס למדעי היהדות ע"ש חיים רוזנר*. Vol. 3. Eds. Mordechai Akiva Friedman, Avraham Tan, Gershon Brin. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1986: 261-268.
- Touitou, E. "גישות שונות בחקר פרשנות המקרא של רשיי." *Tarbiz* 56.3 (1984): 439-447.
- Touitou, E. "כוננו=כמונו - חידוש לשוני של רשיי." *Leshonenu* 54.4 (1992): 317-318.

- Touitou, E. "עקבות של לקח טוב בנוסח פירוש רש"י." *15 עלי ספר* (1988-89): 37-44.
- Troper, M. "לדרכו של רש"י בפרוש ידבר אחריו." *69 שמעתין* (1982): 8-14.
- Troper, M. "לדרכו של רש"י במדרשים שבפרושי יהפשוט והדרשי שלו לתורה." *72 שמעתין* (1983): 17-22.
- Weiser, Jonathan M. "Translation as Interpretation: Rashi's Use of French in his Commentary to the Torah." *Tradition* 29.4 (1995): 30-42.
- Zohari, Menahem. *דברי משה הדרשן ופיוטי אלעזר הקלירי בפירושי רש"י*. Jerusalem: Carmel Publishing, 1995.
- Zohari Menahem. *מדקדקים וחיבוריהם בפירושי רש"י*. Jerusalem: Carmel Publishing, 1994.

3. *The Text of Rashi's Commentaries*

- Ahrend, A. "פירוש רש"י למסכת מגילה - נוסחו ותכונתו בצירוף מהדורה" *Diss. Bar Ilan University*, 1995.
- Ahrend, Moshe. "Rabbi Joseph Kara and His Notes on Rashi's Torah Commentary." *L'Eylah* 24 (1987): 30-33.
- Ahrend, Moshe. "יחס פירושו של ר' יוסף קרא לספר איוב אל פירושו של רש"י." *עיוני מקרא ופרשנות מנחות זיכרון לאריה טווינג*. Eds. U. Simon, M. Goshen-Gottstein. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1980: 183-206.
- Dahan, Gilbert. "Un Dossier Latin de Textes de Rashi autour de la Controverse de 1240." *Revue des Études Juives* 151.3-4 (1992): 321-336.
- Delano Smith, Catherine and Mayer Gruber. "Rashi's Legacy: Maps of the Holy Land." *The Map Collector* 59 (1992): 30-35.
- Fenkober, Y. "על גלגולי נוסח פירוש רש"י ליחזקאל כז, יז." *Tarbiz* 63.2 (1994): 219-233.
- Gavrayahu, G. "נוסחאות רש"י לתהלים והצנזורה." *ספר פרופ' חמ"י גבריהו*. Ed. B. Luria. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer Ltd., 1988: 248-261.

- Greenberg, Moshe. "היחס בין פירוש רש"י לפירוש רשב"ם לתורה." *ספר יצחק*. Vol. 2. Eds. Y. Zekovitz, A. Rofeh. Jerusalem: Elhanan Rubenstein, 1983: 559-567.
- Grossman, Avraham. "הגהות ר' שמעיה ונוסח פירוש רש"י לתורה." *Tarbiz* 60.1 (1990): 67-98.
- Grossman, Avraham. "כתב-יד לייפציג 1 ופירושו של רש"י לתורה (תגובה)" *Tarbiz* 61.2 (1992): 305-315. למאמרו של אלעזר טויטו.
- Gruber, Mayer. "Light on Rashi's Diagrams from the Asher Library of Spertus College of Judaica." *The Solomon Goldman Lectures*. Vol. 6. Ed. Mayer Gruber. Chicago: The Spertus College of Judaica Press, 1993: 73-85.
- Gruber, Mayer. "Notes on the Diagrams in Rashi's Commentary to the Book of Kings." *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 19 (1994): 29-41.
- Gruber, Mayer. "What Happened to Rashi's Pictures?" *The Bodleian Library Record* 15.2 (1992): 111-124.
- Mak, H. "קטעים חדשים מפירוש ר' יוסף קרא לתורה מתוך כתי"י 118.1 שבאוסף." *Tarbiz* 63.4 (1994): 533-553. השני של פירקוביץ שבספריית בנקט-פטרבורג (לנינגרד).
- Mak, H. "עם לבן גרתי ותרי"ג מצוות שמרת"י - דרכה של הדרשה מספרו של ר"י." *Tarbiz* 65.2 (1996): 251-261. משה הדרשן אל פירוש רש"י לתורה.
- Malchi, Jermiah. "Rashi's Commentary to Tractate 'Berakhot' A Comparison of the Standard Versions with Other Versions." Diss. Bar Ilan University, 1982.
- Narkiss, B. "רש"י ומפתיו." *Sefer Zev Vilnay*. Ed. E. Shiller. Jerusalem: Ariel Books, 1984: 435-439.
- Navo, Y. "יחס פירושו של ר' יוסף בכור שור לתורה אל פירוש רש"י." *Sinai* 93.5-6 (1983): 246-252.
- Sonne, Isaiah. "לביקורת הטכסט של פירוש רש"י על התורה." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 15 (1940): 37-56.
- Touitou, E. "על גלגולי הנוסח של פירוש רש"י לתורה." *Tarbiz* 56 (1987): 211-242.

- Japhet, Sara. "The Nature and Distribution of Medieval Compilatory Commentaries in the Light of Rabbi Joseph Kara's Commentary on the Book of Job." Trans. Jeffrey Green. *The Midrashic Imagination Jewish Exegesis, Thought and History*. Ed. Michael Fishbane. Albany: State University of New York, 1993: 98-130.
- Japhet, S. and Robert Salters. *The Commentary of R. Samuel ben Meir Rashbam on Qoheleth*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985.
- Kamin, S. *Jews and Christians Interpret the Bible*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991.
- Kamin, S. and Avrom Saltman. *Secundum Salomonem A 13th Century Latin Commentary on the Song of Songs*. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1989.
- Kanarfogel, Ephraim. *Jewish Education and Society in the High Middle Ages*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Kanarfogel, Ephraim. "On the Role of Bible Study in Medieval Ashkenaz." *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*. Ed. Barry Walfish. Vol. 1. Haifa: Haifa University Press; Hanover, N. H.: University Press of New England in association with Brandeis University, 1992-1993: 151-166.
- Navo, Y. "דרכי פרשנות של ימושב זקנים לתורה." *Sinai* 100 (1987): 587-592.
- Navo, Y. "ר' יוסף בכור שור פרשן הפשט." *Sinai* 95.5-6 (1984): 268-277.
- Navo, Y. "1 מתניים על פרשנות התורה." *ר' יוסף בכור שור פרשן התורה* (1993): 138-153.
- Poznanski, Samuel Avraham. *מבוא על חכמי צרפת מפרשי המקרא*. Warsaw: חברת מקיצי נרדמים, 1913. Jerusalem: n.p., 1965.
- Rahman, Yosefa. "לדמותו של ר' יוסף קרא." *בית מקרא* 35.3 (1990): 272-277.
- Sabato, Mordechai. "פירוש רשב"ם לתורה." *1 מתניים על פרשנות התורה* (1993): 110-125.
- Salters, Robert. "Possible Variant Readings in a Mediaeval Hebrew Commentary." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30 (1979): 85-90.
- Shaviv, Yehuda. "הפירוש הארוך של בעל הטורים לתורה." *1 התורה* (1993): 170-179.

- Shulvass, Moses. "Medieval Ashkenazic Jewry's Knowledge of History and Historical Literature." *The Solomon Goldman Lectures*. Vol. 4. Ed. Nathaniel Stampfer. Chicago: The Spertus College of Judaica Press, 1985: 1-27.
- Signer, Michael A. "Peshat, Sensus Litteralis, and Sequential Narrative: Jewish Exegesis and the School of St. Victor in the Twelfth Century." *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*. Ed. Barry Walfish. Vol. 1. Haifa: Haifa University Press; Hanover, N. H.: University Press of New England in association with Brandeis University, 1992-1993: 203-216.
- Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. 3rd ed. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978.
- Stow, Kenneth. *Alienated Minority*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Talmage, Frank. "Keep Your Sons from Scripture: The Bible in Medieval Jewish Scholarship and Spirituality." *Understanding Scripture Explorations of Jewish and Christian Traditions of Interpretation*. Eds. Clemens Thoma, Michael Wyschograd. New York: Paulist Press, 1987: 81-101.
- Ta-Shma, I. "קוים לאופיה של ספרות ההלכה באשכנז במאות הייג-י"ד." *עלי* 4 (1977): 20-41.
- Ta-Shma, I. "ספרייתם של חכמי אשכנז בני המאה הי"א-הי"ב." *Kiryat Sefer* 60.1-2 (1984-1985): 298-309.
- Ta-Shma, I. "נוספות למאמרי 'ספרייתם חכמי אשכנז בני המאה הי"א-הי"ב'." *Kiryat Sefer* 61.3 (1986-1987): 581-582.
- Touitou, E. "על שיטתו רשב"ם בפירושו לתורה." *Tarbiz* 48.3-4 (1979): 248-268.
- Touitou, E. "פשט ואפולוגטיקה בפירוש הרשב"ם לסיפורי משה שבתורה." *Tarbiz* 51.2 (1982): 227-238.
- Touitou, E. "שיטתו הפרשנית של רשב"ם על רקע המציאות ההיסטורית של עיונים בספרות חז"ל במקרא ובתלדות ישראל מוקדש לפרופ' זמנו." *עזרא ציון מלמד*. Eds. Y. Gilat, C. Levine, Z. Rabinowitz. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1982: 48-74.

Touitou, E. "דרכו של רשב"ם בפירושו לחלק ההלכתי של התורה." *Milet Everyman's University Studies in Jewish History and Culture*. Vol. 2. Eds. Shmuel Ettinger, Yitshak Gilat, Shmuel Safrai. Tel Aviv: Everyman's University, 1985: 275-288.

Touitou, E. "Quelques aspects de l'exégèse biblique juive en France médiévale." *Archives Juives* 21 (1985): 35-39.

Touitou, E. "Courants et contre-courants dans l'Exégèse Biblique Juive en France au Moyen Âge." *Creative Biblical Exegesis*. Ed. Benjamin Uffenheimer, Henning Graf Reventlow. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series*. Vol. 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1988: 131-147.

Touitou, E. "Rashi's Commentary on Genesis 1-6 in the Context of Judeo-Christian Controversy." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 61 (1990): 159-183.

Touitou, E. "Rashi and his School." *Bar Ilan Studies in History IV Medieval Studies in honour of Avrom Saltman*. Eds. Bat Sheva Albert, Yvonne Friedman, Simon Schwarzfuchs. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1995: 231-251.

Urbach, Ephraim E. *בעלי התוספת*. Vols. 1-2. 5th ed. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1986.

Yuval, Isaac Jacob. *חכמים בדורים*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989.

Zinn, Grover. "History and Interpretation: 'Hebrew Truth,' Judaism, and the Victorine Exegetical Tradition." *Jews and Christians: Exploring the Past, Present and Future*. Ed. James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroads, 1990: 100-135.

5. Books and Manuscripts

Amram, David. *The Makers of Hebrew Books in Italy*. London: Holland Press Ltd., 1963.

Baruchson, Shifra. *Books and Readers*. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1993.

Beit-Arié, Malachi. *The Makings of the Medieval Hebrew Book*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993.