**Rashi’s Commentary to Tractate Sukka:
An Examination of the Textual Transmissions**

**Abstract**

Rashi’s commentary to the Babylonian Talmud has attracted the attention of a host of scholarly studies. Over the past generation, scholars have begun to produce in-depth studies of the textual witnesses to Rashi’s commentary to a few tractates, aiming principally to pursue its original text and determine the appropriate weight to assign each textual witness in the preparation of a scientific edition. Our research will be devoted to the study of Rashi’s commentary to tractate Sukka. We shall examine the relationships between the textual witnesses to the commentary while offering a few examples to illustrate and explain the conclusions reached. Having done so, we shall seek to demonstrate the scholarly importance of the manuscripts and finally present a list and brief descriptions of the textual witnesses.

The commentary of eleventh-century scholar Rashi (Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac) to the Babylonian Talmud is by far the most influential companion to that corpus.[[1]](#footnote-1) His work has attracted the attention of a host of scholarly studies, which have analyzed his exegetical style, the halakhic decisions included, the text of the Talmud as it lay before him, the influence exerted by his work on textual witnesses to the Talmud, the world of experiences reflected by its content, and so forth. Yet despite the attention to Rashi’s talmudic commentary, virtually no scholarly attention has been dedicated to one of its most salient aspects: the history of the commentary’s text. Rashi died in 1105. A few of the surviving direct textual witnesses to his commentary are manuscripts produced by twelfth- and thirteenth-century copyists, while most manuscripts date to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the earliest editions to the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth century. In other words, a space of hundreds of years separates the composition of the commentary from the production of most surviving witnesses. As the commentary was copied time and again, its text became corrupted by insertions, omissions, and copyists’ errors, resulting in discrepancies between textual witnesses.

Over the past generation, scholars have begun to produce in-depth studies of the textual witnesses to Rashi’s commentary to a few tractates, aiming principally to pursue its original text and determine the appropriate weight to assign each textual witness in the preparation of a scientific edition. The effort has included the collection of all textual witnesses to the commentary to each given tractate, which then are sorted and furnished with precise descriptions, and finally analyzed to identify the relationships and ties that bind them to one another.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The relationships between different textual witnesses are evaluated using the genealogical (or stemmatic) method, in which textual branches, each consisting of a group of textual witnesses that are dependent on a single common hyparchetype, are identified on the basis of shared text. Links between textual witnesses are found based on sections of the commentary whose text has been preserved in several witnesses, in which variant readings shared by specific witnesses can be identified. Shared errors are of especial importance, because multiple copyists are unlikely to have made precisely the same mistakes. The relationships between textual witnesses are central to the pursuit, because the presence of a given sentence in many witnesses from different branches lends credence to the presumption that the sentence appeared in the original. Conversely, if all of the textual witnesses that contain a sentence belong to a single branch and can be traced to a single hyparchetype, then they are to be viewed not as multiple witnesses to that part of the text, but as a single one.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The isolation of branches in the genealogical method is premised on the assumption that each textual witness was copied from a single exemplar. However, this assumption does not always hold true. Some copyists had occasion to copy a work using two exemplars, or else used a single exemplar while integrating marginal emendations in the body of the new version. It is not uncommon to encounter a version whose text is thus contaminated, and because of such cross-contamination of different versions, comparison of textual witnesses may fail to yield clear answers about their relationship.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Following the established model, we shall examine Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka and attempt to draw conclusions regarding the various witnesses to the work while offering a few examples to illustrate and explain the conclusions reached.[[5]](#footnote-5) Having done so, we shall seek to demonstrate the scholarly importance of the manuscripts.

**The diminution of the textual witnesses of Rashi's commentary on the Talmud.**

Rashi's commentaries on the Bible survived in dozens of manuscripts. For example the commentary on the Torah has more than 200 manuscripts; the commentary on Joshua has 46 manuscripts, and the commentary on Ezekiel has 61. In contrast, Rashi's commentary on the Talmud have been preserved only in a few manuscripts. On average, about two-and-a-half complete or almost complete manuscripts of the tractate were preserved. In order to understand the paucity of the manuscripts of the Talmudic commentary, one must consider the state of the manuscripts of the Talmud itself. A very small amount of manuscripts of the Talmud have been preserved, mainly from Ashkenaz, France and Italy. The main reason for the small number of manuscripts of the Talmud is that the Christian Church decreed the fires of the Talmud in several cities in Europe, such as in Paris in 1242 and later in other places. The scarcity of copies of the Talmud was one of the factors behind the transition from the study of the Talmud itself to the study of Hilchot HaRif. Like the fate of the Talmud, is the fate of Rashi's commentary on the Talmud. However many manuscripts of the Bible and Rashi's commentary on the Bible have survived because they were not condemned to fire.

**Textual Witnesses of Rashi’s Commentary on Tractate Sukkah**

Following is a brief description of all the textual witnesses to Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka. The order of the list was determined as follows: The large manuscripts, the partial manuscripts, the printed textual witnesses and a short and torn Genizah section.

Source **A**: New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Rab. 832, folios 33b–103a. The commentary covers the entire tractate except for folio 52a, s.v. *naqdim* through 54b, s.v. *ella arba’ah*. Byzantine manuscript with an Italian touch from the fifteenth century.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Source **B**: Munich, Bavarian State Library 216, folios 161a–187a. The commentary runs from the beginning of the tractate through folio 55a, s.v. *talmud lomar*. Semi-cursive Italian manuscript from the middle of the thirteenth century.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Source **C**: Escorial, G II 4, folios 75a–120a. The commentary is from the beginning of the second chapter (20b) until the end of the tractate. Semi-cursive Spanish manuscript from the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth century.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Source **D**: Torino, National Library, A II 9, folios 32a–89b, 179. 181, 189 (our numbering). The manuscript was damaged in a fire that broke out in Torino in 1904. The fragments remaining from the commentary are on folios 2a–23a, 24a–34a, 35a–44a, 46b–49b, 50b–53a, 54a–56b. The surviving pages are partial and the words are sometimes blurred and unreadable. Semi-cursive Italian manuscript from the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth century.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Source **E**: Nonantola, city archives, 319b and 320b, and Modena, the main archive (Archivio Capitolare), 1a, 21, and 2a, 21. Eight pages with commentary on the following sections: 2b s.v. *nema* – 3b s.v. *lema*; 4b s.v. *d’khi emtsa* – 6b s.v. *kol ve-gazru*; 7b s.v. *ba-amta* – 8b s.v. *ha-penimit*; 13b s.v. *mesakhekhin bahen* – 14a s.v. *ma’aseh mevatel*; 16a s.v. *aval im yesh* – 16b s.v. *u-muki lah be-fahot*; 22a s.v. *tumah tahat ahat* – 22b, s.v. *be-rosh ha-ilan*; 25b s.v. *mi-de’amar le* – 26b s.v. *she-regilin*. Semi-cursive Italian manuscript, approximately from the second half of the fourteenth century.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Source **F**: Sopron, Hungarian National Archives 19. Two attached pages with commentary on folios 4b s.v. *be-tarte* – 8a s.v. *be-shivsar*. Each page is written on both sides, on each page two columns. The left edge of page 1 is not preserved. Proto-semi-cursive Ashkenazi manuscript, from the second half of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth century. [[11]](#footnote-11)

Source **G**: Vienna Tab. 3866, without pagination. One page with commentary on folio 13a s.v. *ve-lo pasul* – 13b s.v. *le-Rabbi Abba*. Proto-semi-cursive Ashkenazi manuscript, approximately from the thirteenth century.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Source **H**: Berlin, Academy of Sciences 481.186a. A remnant from a page with commentary from folio 15b s.v. *Rava amar* – 16a s.v. *ben tokh ogno*. In each line only few words survived. Spanish manuscript, approximately from the fourteenth century.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Source **I**: Pesaro, city archives 20, pp. 84, 85, 86, 86a, 99, 119. Six double pages with commentary on the following pages: 29a s.v. *ve-al qotsetse* – 33a s.v. *lo amrinan*; 33b s.v. *huttar igdo* – 35a *le-fi she-en ba din mamon*; 36a s.v. *simane* – s.v. *Rabbi Aqiva*; 36b s.v. *da’avida* – s.v. *bemino*; 36b s.v. *amru lo* - 38a s.v. *velo milleta*; 38a s.v. *onah* – 38b s.v. *hu* *omer halelu*; 39b s.v. *ptorin* – 40b s.v. *keman*; 40b s.v. *vesamikh* – s.v. *shemma yegadel*; 41a s.v. *hare perot* – s.v. *de’ibbene emat*; 42b s.v. *al gag ha’itsteva* – 47a s.v. *neqot*. Semi-cursive Italian manuscript, approximately from the first half of the fourteenth century.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Source **J**: Nonantola, city archives, 312b and 313b. Two pairs of pages with commentary on folios 34b s.v. *vahalo* – 35a s.v. *uman deva’e*; 38b s.v. *hu omer barukh* – 39a s.v. *yehu mehulalin*; 48b s.v. *kesheravta ba-mizrah* – 49a s.v. *ma’aseh*; 53b s.v. *qema demidle* – s.v. *shalosh le-gabbe mizbeah*. Semi-cursive Spanish manuscript from the end of the thirteenth century or the first half of the fourteenth century.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Source **K**: Paris, The National Library, Héb. 1066, folios 114a – 115b. Includes the commentary on folios 38b s.v. *hu omer anna Hashem* – 40b s.v. *derabbi Yossi bar Hanina*. Semi-cursive Spanish manuscript from the first half of the fourteenth century.

Source **L**: Frosinone, National Archives, ebr. 3. Two remains of the commentary: the first contains the commentary on folio 39a s.v. *haloqeah* – s.v. *en mosrin* and the second contains the commentary on folio 39b s.v. *ve-niqqahin* – s.v. *i hakhi*. Semi-cursive Ashkenazi manuscript, approximately from the fourteenth century.

Source **M**: Pesaro edition, approx. 1515. Tractate *Sukkah* with the commentaries of Rashi and Tosafot. The oldest complete printing of Tractate *Sukkah*.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Source **N**: *En Ya’aqov*, Salonika, 1516. The book was authored by R. Jacob ibn Habib, a deportee from Spain who came to Salonika. It is a collection of aggadic material compiled from the Babylonian Talmud, with some additions from the Jerusalem Talmud to which the author attached Rashi’s commentary together with those of other sages.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Source **O**: Cambridge, T-S NS 34.114. A page written on both sides with commentary on folios 4a s.v. *vehaqaq bah* – 4b s.v. *hakha*; 4b s.v. *gud assik* – s.v. *aval be’emtsa hagag*. The page is partly torn. Semi-cursive Ashkenazi manuscript, from the end of the fourteenth century or the beginning of the fifteenth century.[[18]](#footnote-18)

**Rashi’s Commentary to b. Sukka**

The only complete surviving textual witness to Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka is the first edition (*M*). It is joined by two nearly complete manuscripts (*AB*), and two extensive manuscripts: *C*, which includes the commentary from the beginning of the second chapter until the end of the tractate, and *D*, whose surviving fragments of commentary together refer to nearly every folio. Also still extant are nine partial manuscripts scattered among the libraries of Europe. Fragments of significance are to be found in *EFIJ*, while there are somewhat or much briefer fragments in *GHKLO*. *N* is limited, by design, to Rashi’s commentary to aggadic sections of the tractate.

To assess links between textual witnesses, we conducted a comparison that focused on omission and insertions of at least two words, transpositions within sentences, and shared errors in the witnesses.[[19]](#footnote-19)The comparison was based on a broad sample of the text of the commentary at points where the text had survived in the various witnesses.[[20]](#footnote-20) During the comparison between the text's witnesses, we also had the complete manuscripts and the first edition of Rashi’s commentary accompanying the halakhot of al-Fasi,[[21]](#footnote-21) as well as quotations from Rashi's commentary in books of Rishonim.[[22]](#footnote-22)

It must be said that although discrepancies occur in a minority of cases, the vast majority of Rashi’s commentary to Sukka appears similarly in the various textual witnesses. Among the discrepancies are scribal errors, abbreviations paralleled by equivalent full forms, alternate terms synonymous in meaning, and the occasional disparity of substance. For the most part, the textual transmissions of the commentary to b. Sukka are quite well preserved and remained largely the same despite emendations rendered over the centuries.[[23]](#footnote-23)

We will now present a division into two branches that reflects the general relationships between the more complete witnesses. Later we shall examine the fragmentary witnesses and consider what degree of resemblance they bear to these branches, and finally we shall evaluate *M*.

**Branch *BD* and Branch *AC***

Comparison of the more complete textual witnesses makes clear that no particular resemblance links any two of them, unlike those preserving many other parts of Rashi’s talmudic commentary.[[24]](#footnote-24) However, two principal branches can be distinguished, one including extensive witnesses *BD*, and the other extensive witnesses *AC*.[[25]](#footnote-25) Also to be included in the first branch (*BD*) are limited witnesses *FI* and apparently *L*, and in the second branch (*AC*), *E* and apparently *JKN*.[[26]](#footnote-26)*BD*, on one hand, and *AC*, on the other, contain similar errors that are difficult to explain other than by positing that all of the witnesses within each branch have their origins—and the origins of these errors—in a single ancestor that contained these corruptions. The members of each branch also share a general resemblance characterized by such elements as insertions and omissions that are not necessarily errors per se. Let us begin our discussion with examples that illustrate the errors common to *BD*.[[27]](#footnote-27)

1. An added passage at 29a, after s.v. *ṣibhutaʾ*, appears thus in the witnesses:[[28]](#footnote-28)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *AC* | *B* | *DM*[[29]](#footnote-29) |
| רב יוסף מאניני הדעת היה כדתניא בזבחים[[30]](#footnote-30) שלשה חייהם אינן חיים הרחמנים והרתחנים[[31]](#footnote-31) ואניני הדעת.ואמ' רב יוסף[[32]](#footnote-32) כולהו איתנהו ביאניני הדעת שאינן יכולין לסבול שום דבר מיאוס.[[33]](#footnote-33) | רב יוסף מאניני הדעת היה דתניא בפסחים ג' חייהם אינן חיים הרחמנין והרתחנין ואניני הדעת. שאינן יכולין לסבול שום מיאוס. | רב יוסף מאניני הדעת הוה דתניא בזבחים ג' חייהן אינן חיים הרחמנין והרתחנין ואניני הדעת. שאינן יכולין לסבול שום דבר מיאוס.ואמר רב יוסף כולהו איתנהו בי. |

All of the witnesses give very much the same text at the start of the passage, but differences then appear. According to *AC*, which appear to preserve the original text, Rashi quoted a remark attributed to Rabh Yoseph in Pesaḥim to explain the comment made here by the same scholar that אנינא דעתאי, and then proceeded to explain those words by quoting from a baraita. *BDM* omit the words ואמר רב יוסף כולהו איתנהו בי אניני הדעת, which doubtless appeared in the original. In *DM*, the words ואמר רב יוסף כולהו איתנהו בי are inserted out of place.

2. At 32b, *AC* contain the text:

דרכי נועם: והאי מברז בריז את הידים.

*BDIM* omit the quoted words דרכי נועם,[[34]](#footnote-34) leaving the ensuing words והאי מברז בריז with no quotation to which to refer.

The affinity between *AC* is less evident than that between the witnesses of branch *BDFIL*.[[35]](#footnote-35) A more or less corrupt text is given in each of *AC*, and particularly in the latter, which more than any other witness to the commentary on b. Sukka is plagued by scribal errors, insertions, and omissions.[[36]](#footnote-36) The numerous defects in *C* largely obscure its relationship to *A*, and the errors and modifications that found their way into *A* and particularly *C* distanced them not only from the original text of Raśi’s commentary, but also from the text of the hyparchetype from which both appear to have descended. Following is an example of a corrupt reading in branch *AC*.[[37]](#footnote-37)

3. At 32a, s.v. *qawwuṣ*, the readings found in the witnesses are as follows:

*BDIM*: קווץ שיוצאין בשדרה שלו עוקצים כמין קוצים.

*A*: קווץ שהוצין שלו עוקצים כמין [נ"א] שיוצאין בשדה שלו קוצין.

*C*: הוצין שיוצאין בשדרה שלו כמין קוצים.

The reading in *BDIM* appears to be original and is identical or nearly identical to that found in the works of many medieval rabbinic scholars.[[38]](#footnote-38) *AC* here contain corrupted versions that are linked by the fact that both corruptions concern the word הוצין (“leaves”; see Rashi to 37b, s.v. *de-mištayyerey*). Possibly there were two versions, the original, שיוצאין בשדרה שלו עוקצים כמין קוצים, and a shorter one that was added later, שהוצין שלו עוקצים. In *C*, the quoted word קווץ is absent, the word הוצין is all that remains of the shorter version, and the longer, original version is provided with the omission of the word עוקצים. In *A*, the shorter form is followed by a corrupted version of the original reading.

Now let us proceed to examples that illustrate the similarity of the textual witnesses within each individual branch of the stemma (Even though it is not necessarily a similarity that is a distortion).

4. 26a, s.v. *karyaʾ de-peyrey*:

שהוא תמיד לפניו ויכול לשומרן

The words מתוך סוכתו are added after the word לשומרן in *AC* but absent in *BDEM*.

5. 28b, s.v. *Rabhaʾ amar iṣṭerikh*:

רבא אמר איצטריך מה התם נשים חייבות

The words רבא אמר איצטריך are present in *BDM* but absent in *AC*.

6. 30b, s.v. *hilkakh ligzu*:

הלכך ליגזו: הן מן המחובר ויתנוה לכם שיהיו הן הגזלנין.

The words מן המחובר ויתנוה לכם exist in *BDIM* but not *AC*.

A comparison of the translations in the textual witnesses also sheds light on the relationships between the documents.[[39]](#footnote-39) The entirety of *B* contains a total of forty-six translations into European languages,[[40]](#footnote-40) *D* contains forty-two,[[41]](#footnote-41) and *M* ninety-one, so that *BD* contain only about half the number of translations as *M*.[[42]](#footnote-42) The affinity of *BD* is demonstrated by the fact that the vast majority of translations missing in *B* are absent in *D* as well,[[43]](#footnote-43) as well as by the similarity (often the identity) of these renderings in *BD* relative to other witnesses.[[44]](#footnote-44) As for the translations in *AC*, in the commentary to the second chapter through the fifth, the material that remains extant in *C*, there are fifty-one translations in *A* and forty-two in *C*,[[45]](#footnote-45) or a total of fifty-five instances in which one or both of *AC* provide a translation. A certain affinity exists between the two witnesses at these points, but not one as strong as that between *BD*. In most cases, the translations in the two witnesses are similar, with only scant variations.[[46]](#footnote-46)

**Fragmentary Sources of Branch *BD***

*BD* share their branch of the stemma with two fragmentary witnesses (*FI*). Due to the lack of any overlap between the texts of *FI*, it is impossible to identify the relationship between them, but links between each of them and *BD* are in evidence.

***F***

*F* agrees with *BD* in many instances, such as corruptions, insertions, and omissions.[[47]](#footnote-47) Let us consider an example of a shared error.

7. 7a, s.v. *dophen sukka ke-dophen šabbat*:[[48]](#footnote-48)

מחיצה של שתי… שפיר דמי דאמרינן לבוד והוה ליה כולו עומד.

After the above, *BDF* append בקולחות או[[49]](#footnote-49) באוכפות של בהמה, which is out of place[[50]](#footnote-50) and does not appear in *AM*.

However, there are not a few points where it is *B* that *F* closely resembles, as in the following examples:[[51]](#footnote-51)

8. 5a, s.v. *taphasta merubbe* (toward the end of the comment):

ואתה ריבית לתפוס חסרו לך ממה שבידך והיינו לא תפשת אבל כשתתפוש המועט אם יוסיפו יוסיפו ואם לאו מה שתפשת תפסת ונמשל הוא.

The entirety of this reading appears in *ADEM* but is absent in *BF*, possibly due to deliberate abbreviation.

9. At 7a, s.v. *dophen sukka ke-dophen šabbat*, *BF* quote the Talmud as stating that דופן עקומה סוכה כדופן שבת, where the word עקומה, which lacks meaning in the context, is a clear error. It is absent in *ADM*, and in *F* it is marked for deletion.

We thus see that corrupt readings are a matter of course in *BF*. In the following examples, though, these sources may have preserved the correct version:

10. At 6b, s.v. *štayim he-hilkhatan*, the different witnesses give Rashi’s explanation as follows:

*A*: מזרחית צפונית כמין גומא או דרומית ומערבית

*M*: מזרחית וצפונית כמין גאם או דרומית ומערבית

*D*: מזרחית צפונית כמין גמא או מזרחית דרומית

*B*: מזרחית צפונית כמין גמא או מזרחית מערבית

*F*: מזרחית צפונית כמן גמא כזה[[52]](#footnote-52) או מזרחית ומערבית

The versions given in *AM* and in *D* present a problem, because there is no clear reason for differentiating between northeast and southwest, or else southeast: one way or the other, the two panels in question meet. Possibly the correct version of these words is that preserved in *BF*, in which the second scenario is that of panels at east and west, such that they do not meet, but run parallel to each other, as in the alley-like *sukka* described by Rabh Yehuda at 7a. Such an explanation also explains why the words כמין גאם appear not at the end of the comment, but in the middle.[[53]](#footnote-53)

We thus see that *F* is related to branch *BD*. There are no shared readings that clearly set *DF* apart from *B* (or other witnesses). The shared readings in *BF* generally take the form of similar errors, indicating that these two witnesses represent a sub-branch of branch *BD*.

***I***

An examination of the text of *I* demonstrates that it too generally agrees with branch *BD*,[[54]](#footnote-54) as in the following examples:[[55]](#footnote-55)

11. At 29b, s.v. *limḥot*, *ACMN* read:

למחות: ביד עוברי עבירות שבדורם שדבריהם נשמעים.

*BDI*, instead of שבדורם שדבריהם נשמעים, have שבדור שהרי נשמעין דבריהם.

12. At 31b, s.v. *kaphuph*, the witnesses diverge as follows:

*AM*: כפוף: ראשו כפוף כאגמון דומה לאיש גבן וזקן שראשיהן שחין וכפופין למטה.

*BDI*: כפוף: ראשו כפוף כאגמון כפוף דומה לאיש גבן.

*C*: כפוף: ראש כאגמון.

The version found in *AM* very well may be preferable to the others: To illustrate a bent palm frond, Rashi first appealed to a scriptural verse (הלכוף כאגמון ראשו; “Is it bowing the head like a bulrush”; NJPS, Isa. 58:5), then offered a simple analogy. *BDI* truncated the second of his illustrations, and *C* omitted it entirely. However, the version given by *Macḥzor Vitry* (p. 833) and Abraham of Montpellier is:

כפוף: ראשו כפוף כאגמון

and all manuscripts of Rashi’s commentary included with the *halakhot* of al-Fasi similarly read:

כפוף: שנכפף ראש כאגמון.

If the briefer version is the original, then *C* preserves something close to it, *BDI* add the lengthier illustration, and *AM* give the second illustration at length.

The evident affinity between *I* and branch *BD* is corroborated by the European translations they contain. Those in *I* strongly resembling their counterparts in *BD*,[[56]](#footnote-56) and wherever no such translation is given in *I*, *BD* as well contain none.[[57]](#footnote-57)

However, in some cases *BI* contain a common corrupted reading that is exclusive to them but *D* is consistent with the other witnesses. For example:

13. At 29b, s.v. *we-šel ʿir ha-niddaḥat*, *BI* erroneously omit the beginning of the comment:

ושל עיר הנדחת: משום דלשריפה קאי דכתיב ואת כל שללה.

*D*, however, gives the reading found in *ACM* in its entirety.[[58]](#footnote-58)

14. Ibid., s.v. *ke-dey lenaʿneaʿ bo* (toward the end of the comment), the witnesses diverge after דבעינן נענוע כדלקמן מוליך ומביא מעלה ומוריד. In *A*, the comment ends after those words. The other textual witnesses continue as follows:

*DM*: מוליך ומביא לעצור רוחות רעות מעלה ומוריד לעצור טללים רעים.

*C*: לעצור רוחות רעות וטללים רעים.

*BI*: מעלה ומוריד לעצור רוחות רעות וטללים רעים.

The reading found in *A* may be the original. Regardless, it is clear that the text of *BI* is corrupt, because the expression they seek to reproduce here is מוליך ומביא כדי לעצור רוחות רעות מעלה ומוריד כדי לעצור טללים רעים (37b),[[59]](#footnote-59) where the action taken to preclude harmful winds is not raising and lowering, but moving forward and backward.

15. At 32a, s.v. *amar Rabh Pappaʾ*, In *BI*, whose text appears to have suffered when a copyist skipped a line, an entire comment contained in *ACDM* is omitted:

אמר רב פפא: הא דקתני סדוק פסול לאו שנסדקו ראשי עלין או שדרה.

16. 33b, s.v. *Rabbi Yehuda hiʾ*:

כורך עליו פונדיון או פסיקא ובלבד שלא יענבנו.

The words עליו and ובלבד appear in *ACDM* but are erroneously omitted in *BI* (although they appear in the marginalia of both the latter).

In contrast to the significant agreements between *BI*, readings characteristic of both *DI* are unusual,[[60]](#footnote-60) again suggesting that *BI* represent a unique sub-branch.

***L***

Only a few lines of text survive in *L*. At one point it contains a corruption shared by *B*, and it agrees in several cases with branch *BD*,[[61]](#footnote-61) indicating that *L* too belongs to that textual branch.

**Fragmentary Sources of Branch *AC***

***E***

*E* appears to belong to branch *AC*, with which it shares a common reading in a few cases.[[62]](#footnote-62) Meanwhile, there is a clear affinity between *E* and *A*,[[63]](#footnote-63) often in conflict with *C*.[[64]](#footnote-64) Let us consider a few compelling examples of the relationship between *AE*.

17. At 3a, s.v. *we-eyn meʿarebhin bo* (toward the beginning of the comment), the various witnesses read as follows:[[65]](#footnote-65)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *BM* | *A* | *E* |
| דרך בתיהם פתוחין לחצרוהרבה בתים פתוחין לחצר אחת והן יוצאיןדרך חצר לרשות הרבים. | דרך בתיהן להיות פתוחין לחצרוהרבה בתים לחצר אחת והן יוצאיןויוצאין דרך חצר לרשות הרבים. | דרך בתיהן להיות פתוחין לחצרויוצאין דרך חצר לרשות הרבים. |

The words והרבה בתים פתוחין לחצר אחת are absent in *E*. *A* appears not to be lacking any words, but the seeming dittography והן יוצאין ויוצאין is suspicious and may be evidence of an emendation. The basic text of *A*—להיות פתוחין לחצר ויוצאין—apparently was identical to the reading in *E*, while the words והרבה בתים לחצר אחת והן יוצאין, which clarify that the courtyard is common to multiple homes, was added to the text preserved in *A* based on the version in *BM*.

18. At 22a, s.v. *ba-me debharim amurim*, the witnesses preserve the following versions:

*BDM*: במה דברים אמורים דכולה מתניתין בשיש בהן טפח.

*C*: במה דברים אמורים דכולה מתניתין בשיש

*A*: במה דברים אמורים דכולה מתניתין אמוריו ביש בהן טפח.

*E*: במה דברים אמורים בשיש בהם טפח דכולה מתני' אמורי' בשיש בהן טפח.

The version preserved in *BCDM* evidently is the original, and it is this version that appears in the commentary of Abraham of Montpellier as well.[[66]](#footnote-66) The wording דכולה מתניתין אמורין, found in *AE* (*A*: אמוריו, mistakenly), does not conform to the remainder of the sentence in either witness. Apparently their basic text was במה דברים אמורים בשיש בהן טפח, which was joined by the marginal emendation דכולה מתניתין אמורין. The emender’s intention was that the words דכולה מתניתין were to be inserted between במה דברים and אמורים, with אמורין indicating the appropriate point of insertion (a standard practice of emenders) and not intended to be incorporated in the main text. However, it is unlikely that the text before Rashi read, במה דברים דכולה מתניתין אמורים. Most probable is that the emender gave an incorrect insertion point and should have written, דכולה מתניתין בשיש. It is this erroneous emendation that informed the work of *AE*. *A* copied it in the correct location, i.e., after אמורים, but its text is corrupt because the location reference אמוריו also was copied, and *E* erred not only by copying the entire text of the emendation, but also by improperly inserting it after בשיש בהם טפח. Having done so, *E* realized that the emendation should have come before בשיש בהן טפח and therefore rewrote those words.

The above examples demonstrate that neither *A* nor *E* is dependent on the other, but they can be traced back to a common hyparchetype.[[67]](#footnote-67) Each reflects a different transcription (with different errors) of a single lost exemplar containing periodic corruptions, omissions, and minor additions.

***J***

*J*, which is related to *C*,[[68]](#footnote-68) may belong to branch *AC*, although there are no significant agreements among *ACJ*. *CJ* agree on several minutiae,[[69]](#footnote-69) as well as on a number of extensive insertions. Following are examples:

19. At 48b, the comment headed “maškhaʾ de-ha-huʾ gabhraʾ” appears in *CJM* but is absent in *AB*. At its conclusion, the comment in *M* is followed in *J* by וכגון גיד בכיסיו, and similarly in *C*, כגון נאד. Both versions are corrupt and seek to refer to the words גוד בכיסנא (b. Šabbat 138b).

20. At 49a, s.v. *ḥammuqey* (toward the end of the comment), where *M* reads:

חמוקי ירכיך: לשון ירך המזבח.

*ABD* contain no parallel text. *CJN* also lack such a sentence, but in its place they contain another sentence and two additional comments. The reading found in *J* is:

אף כאן חמוקי ירכיך סתרי יריכיך שמסותרין בירך המזבח. כמו חלאים: דבר חלול. מעשה ידי אמן: הקב"ה שהוא אומן לבריאת עולם.

*J* also contains peculiar additions absent from the more complete witnesses. A few appear in *K*, as will be discussed presently.

***K***

What remains of *K* is brief, and it is difficult to identify a resemblance between it and any other witness with confidence. It contains occasional readings that are unattested in the other sources. Although the remaining part of *K* that coincides with *J* covers only just more than a page of the talmudic text, there is some degree of affinity, as evidenced by additions common to the two.[[70]](#footnote-70) Most feasibly, an ancestor of *K* contained additions comparable to those found in *J*. There is a relationship, if slight, between *CK* as well,[[71]](#footnote-71) and thus it is possible that *K* belongs to branch *AC*.

***M***

*M* postdates the other more complete textual witnesses. It is not related strictly to one branch or another, but shares a certain affinity with each, although it is more closely related to branch *AC*.[[72]](#footnote-72) We previously (examples 1-6) observed an affinity between *M* and *BD*, but there also are alterations, corruptions, and insertions in *BD* that *M* lacks, thus conforming more to branch *AC*. Two examples follow:[[73]](#footnote-73)

21. 4a, s.v. *abhal hakhaʾ*:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *AM* | *BD* |
| אבל הכא דלא חזי לדופןועקימותו משום דליתחזי למיהוי דופן[[74]](#footnote-74) הוא לא אמרי[[75]](#footnote-75) קא משמע לן. | אבל הכא גבי האצטבה דלא חזי לדופןמשום שגבוהה מעשריםועקמימותו משום דלא חזי למיהוי דופן הוא לא אמרינן קא משמע לןאפי' גבי אצטבה נמי אמרי' דופן עקומה. |

The version משום דלא חזי, in *BD*, is erroneous, and the additional phrases in these sources likely are additions to the original text.

22. At 22a, s.v. *beyneyhem*, *ACEM* read, בין התחתונות לעליונות כשהן מכוונות טהור, while after מכוונות, *BD* extraneously add על גבה, apparently under the influence of the ensuing words: והוא הדין בשאין מכוונות שעל גבה טהור.

In other cases, *M* preserves a corrupt reading shared by *AC*. For example:[[76]](#footnote-76)

23. At 55a, s.v. *atqen ameymar*, *ACM* contain the reading ובחמישי לחול המועד שהוא הושענא רבה, and it is this version that appears in Sefer Mitzvot Gadol (Positive Commandments, 19), while *D*, like the version preserved in the work of a number of medieval scholars,[[77]](#footnote-77) has יום ערבה instead of הושענא רבה, reflecting the ancient name of that day. The use here of הושענא רבה apparently results from an emendation reflecting the term’s currency in later generations as the day’s name.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Translations to European languages found in *M* also tend toward branch *AC* more than branch *BD*, as demonstrated by the earlier discussion of the few such translations in *BD*.[[79]](#footnote-79) The fact that *M* betrays the influence of two branches is unsurprising. The edition was produced at a late date, and it is entirely possible that the individuals who printed it, or else a previous source, took advantage of multiple versions.[[80]](#footnote-80) Contamination, a common occurrence in textual witnesses of old works as noted at the beginning of this essay, appears to have made its mark on *M*.[[81]](#footnote-81)

***N***

*N* is only a brief document, because it contains only the commentary to aggadic passages. A number of its turns of phrase are unique, some no doubt the work of editor Yaʿaqob Ibn Ḥabib,[[82]](#footnote-82) and it is difficult to identify a particular affinity between it and any of the other witnesses, although a certain degree of textual similarity to *C* suggests that it may belong to branch *AC*. Following is one example:[[83]](#footnote-83)

24. At 55a, s.v. *hasiroti* (at the end of the comment), *ADM* quote

 ומצור[[84]](#footnote-84) דבש אשביעהו (תה' פא, יז)

preserving a shared misquote of the verse, whose final word in fact is not אשביעהו, but אשביעך.

**Rashi’s Commentary: The Function of Manuscripts**

The preceding examination of relationships between the witnesses to Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka forms part of the ongoing groundwork for the publication of a critical edition of the commentary, and brings us to the importance of reference to the manuscripts of the work.

Students of Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka today study reproductions of the Vilna edition, a version based on the first edition (*M*) with emendations and corrections that crept in over the course of the generations. The printed text has its virtues, and it must be recognized that the early printers worked hard to produce a clean, precise text. Still, some of Rashi’s comments are corrupt in the editions, even to the point of being unintelligible without the aid of manuscripts. Let us illustrate this point with three selections from *M* containing errors that have survived into modern editions and make the original text impossible to divine without recourse to the manuscripts. The first example is one of omission; the two others concern additions.

25. At 27a, the Talmud states that one is required to eat *maṣṣa* on the first night of Passover, and cite a verse to prove that this is so:

בערב תאכלו מצות (שמ' יב, יח) הכתוב קבעו חובה.

*M* offers no clarification. Yet all of the manuscripts (*ABCD*) bring here a quotation and an explanation which are not included in the print version to this day:

בערב תאכלו מצות: שנה[[85]](#footnote-85) עליו הכתוב לקובעו[[86]](#footnote-86) חובה.

Rashi’s intention was to note that the instruction to consume *maṣṣa* appears twice and the repetition indicates that doing so is mandatory on the first night.[[87]](#footnote-87) This is the explanation that appears in all textual witnesses of Rashi’s commentary accompanying the *halakhot* of al-Fasi and in *Maḥzor Vitry* (p. 807), and it was omitted from *M* because the previous comment also ends in the word חובה, which resulted in a haplography.

26. שושי ושווצרי appear in the talmudic text at 12b and are thus interpreted by *M*:

שושי: פלייא בלעז. שווצרי: ארניזא בלעז שושי ושווצרי מיני ירקות, ורבי מכיר פירש שווצרי ארבא פלקירא והוא שעליו רחבין וגדל ביערים.

First, שושי is translated as פלייא, or *falje*, i.e., fern.[[88]](#footnote-88) The term שווצרי then is translated as ארניזא, or *arneize*, i.e., a plant of the genus Artemisia, especially wormwood. Next, the two are together defined as מיני ירקות, and finally Rabbi Makhir is cited as offering the translation ארבא פלקירא, *erbe polikeire*, referring to the genus Pulicaria or specifically to common fleabane, and the commentary goes on to state that this plant has broad leaves and grows in forests. The source of the final translation is Makhir ben Yehuda, a brother of Gerešom of Mainz and the author of a dictionary-like compendium of challenging words in Scripture and Talmud that Rashi cites on rare occasion.[[89]](#footnote-89) The repetition of the elements comprising the comment is difficult to justify: first each Judaeo-Aramaic word is given in a European language, and then the original words (שושי ושווצרי) reappear and are followed again by a general description. Surely enough, the initial part of the comment (שושי: פלייא בלעז. שווצרי: ארניזא בלעז) appears in *M*, but is absent in all of the manuscripts (*ABD*),[[90]](#footnote-90) all textual witnesses to the text of the commentary printed with al-Fasi’s *halakhot*, *Maḥzor Wiṭri* (p. 799), *Or Zaruaʿ* (§ 289), and the commentary of Abraham of Montpellier. This state of affairs clearly demonstrates that the words were added to Rashi’s commentary by a later hand and that Rashi originally declined to give his own translations but simply described the flora as מיני ירקות and appealed to the authority of Makhir.

27. The expression מגדלי הושענא, used by the Talmud at 37a, is thus explained in *M*:

**מגדלי הושענא**: אוגדי הלולבין לשון גדילין (דב' כב, יב), ולשון תלמוד לומר לכל אומן בדבר לשון זה כגון הך דמסכת משקין (יא ע"א) למגדלי אהלי[[91]](#footnote-91) ולמגדלי תנורא בחולו של פסח (צ"ל: מועד) הא למדת שפירש לשון זה לשון עשויה (צ"ל: עשייה) ותקון.

This version is problematic. First it explains the word מגדלי as from the same root as גדילין, i.e., denoting the action of intertwining or forming a bundle, but afterward, with the words

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *AC* | *B* | *D* | *I* |
| מגדלי הושענא:אוגדי הלולביןלשון גדילים | מגדלי הושענא:אוגדין הלולבין[עם ערבה והדס]לש' גדילין[תרגו' מעשה עבות (שמ' כח, יד) עובד גדילו] | דגדלי הושענא:אוגדין הלולבלש' גודלין | מגדלי הושענא: נ"א דגדלי הושענאאוגדי הלולבעם ערבה והדסלשון גדיליםתרגום עבות (שמ' כח, יד) עובד גדילו |

The reading preserved in *ABCD* is identical or similar to the first explanation given in *M*. *I* contains the same interpretation, but there it is followed by three short additions,[[92]](#footnote-92) two of which appear in emendations in *B* as well. In any event, all of the manuscripts contain the first explanation but not the second, and the same is true of the witnesses to Rashi’s commentary accompanying the *halakhot* of al-Fasi and excerpts preserved by Jonathan ben David ha-Kohen of Lunel and by Abraham of Montpellier. It thus becomes clear that the second explanation in *M* was inserted at a late date. Further evidence of the inauthenticity of the second explanation is that Rashi and other rabbinic scholars in France and Germany referred to the tractate in question as Moʿed Qaṭan, rather than Mašqin, an appellation that suggests the author of these words may have hailed from Italy, where the name Mašqin was that in use.[[93]](#footnote-93)

The examples above indicate that **M** contains errors, despite the great efforts of his copyists to present an exact version based on the textual witnesses that stood before them. Rashi's commentary is the most important interpretation of the Talmud, and it is therefore appropriate to publish a precise edition of it. In the edition of the commentary to Tractate Succah it is appropriate to determine source **M** as the internal version, but to correct the faults found therein and the changes made due to the censor. In the edition will be a text changes section, so that all the ancient versions of the surviving textual witnesses will be presented before the learner. The edition will also be accompanied by a commentary section, which will discuss the nature of the various textual witnesses and explain the difficult segments of Rashi's commentary.

**Conclusion**

Generally speaking, the textual witnesses to Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka offer a uniform, cohesive, and stable text, and the great majority of variant readings reflect straightforward copying errors or minor differences of language or style. These are accompanied, however, by occasional conflicts of greater significance: emendations and alterations that change the substance of the commentary, explanatory or supplementary comments, and even a few insertions of entire sentences or interpretive passages.

A survey of the witnesses points toward a bifurcate stemma one of whose branches is represented by the relatively complete witnesses *BD*, fragmentary witnesses *FI*, and seemingly *L*, and the other branch by *AC*, fragment *E*, and possibly *JKN*.

Extensive witness *BD* and fragmentary witnesses *FI* (and possibly *L*) share common errors. Fragmentary witnesses *FI*, whose remaining text does not overlap, exhibit a clear affinity to *B* but not to *D*, indicating that *FI*, along with *B*, belong to one or more separate sub-branches. Manuscripts *BDI* are written in Italian hand and in one instance contain a translation to Greek,[[94]](#footnote-94) and quotations of Rashi in *Tosephot Rid*, by the Byzantine rabbinic scholar Yešaʿya di Trani the Elder, resemble the text of *BD*, so that one might presume that *BDI* reflect the text of Rashi’s commentary to b. Sukka that pervaded in Italy and Greece during the thirteen and fourteenth centuries. It must be noted, however, that brief witnesses *FL* are written in Ashkenazic hand, perhaps evidence that branch *BDFIL* originated in Ashkenaz.

The text of branch *AC* is less constant and consistent than that of branch *BD* and its appendages and was less well preserved, apparently due to the alterations and corruptions that entered the text of *A* and especially *C* as successive copies were transcribed. *E* bears an especial affinity to *A*, and a comparison of *ACE* in many instances is illustrative of secondary developments within the branch. *J* is related to *C*, *K* has some affinity to *CJ*, and *N* bears some level of relation to *C*. *A* is a Byzantine-Italian source, *E* from Italy, and *CJK* Sephardic. *N*, though printed in Salonika, may be considered Sephardic because its editor was among the Jews expelled from Spain. It thus appears that texts of this branch were present in two centers of rabbinic learning, viz., Spain and Byzantine-Italian.

No textual branch preserves a clearly superior version of the commentary. Each branch and each witness contains corruptions and alterations, including adaptations and additions to the main body of the text, and in some instances a witness from one branch was emended on the basis of a text from the other, or else a given insertion made its way into two witnesses representing both branches. The most recent witness (*M*) appears to have been influenced by both branches, but is more closely related to branch *AC*. Against this chaotic backdrop, it is possible to identify a given text as preferable and to draw closer to the original text of the commentary only by including in the analysis a critical eye for text and careful consideration of content.

Below is a stemma illustrating the relationships between most witnesses to the commentary according to the conclusions and observations described above. *JKLN* each are connected to the rest of the stemma by a broken line because their correct positions are not fully clear. *GHO* are not included in the graph because the text that they preserve is insufficient to permit identification of relationships with other surviving witnesses.
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12. See short description at A. Z. Schwarz, *Die Hebraischen Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, Leipzig 1925, p. 246. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See E. Chwat, 'The Dome of the Treasure: Recent findings in the Damascus Genizah', *Giluy Milta B'alma*, 30.6.13. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. See short description at H. M. Sermoneta & P. F. Fumagalli, Manoscritti ebraici nell'Archivio di Stato di Pesaro, Roma 2002, pp. 80-81. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. See short description at M. Perani, "*Frammenti di manoscritti e libri ebraici a Nonantola*, Nonantola", pp. 180-181. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See R. Rabbinovicz, "History of the printing of the Talmud". (Ed. A. M. Habermann, Jerusalem 1952); H. Z. Dimitrovsky, Seride Bavli, New York 1979, pp, 113, 116-117. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. See Ahrend, *Rashi’s Commentary on Tractate Rosh Hashana*, p. 32. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The passage is written at R. Brody, A hand-list of Rabbinic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections, Cambridge 1998, p. 9, *Vol. 1: Taylor-Schechter New Series*. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. In comparing the textual witnesses, we did not include omissions or insertions of a single word or letter, or omissions due to homoeoteleuton. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. The sample included the commentary to folios 5-7, 21-33, and 38-40, as well as several additional selections representative of the shorter witnesses. The discussion that follows will express the relationship between witnesses in percentages. A high rate of agreement is indicative of a relationship between the given witnesses. It is clear that for the fragmentary witnesses - where the examination was based on a smaller sample - the evidence for the rates of agreement was weaker. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. These are the manuscripts of Rashi’s commentary accompanying the halakhot of al-Fasi: 1. Oxford, Bodleiana 545, pp. 19a-24b. 2. Berlin, State Library 6, pp. 305b-309b. 3. London, British Library addition. 17049, pp. 73b-83a. 4. Paris, National Library Héb 311, pp. 183a-187b. 5. Parma, platinum 3273, pp. 117b-124a. 6. Frankfurt am Main Heb. Fol. 10 (Merzbacher 8), pp. 117a-129a. All these manuscripts are Ashkenazi, from the fourteenth century. In addition, we used the first edition of Hilchot HaRif, Venice 1521. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. These are the Rishonim that we used to examine the text of the commentary: Machzor Vitry, Jonathan ben David ha-Kohen of Lunel, Ra'avyah, Tosafot, Tosafot ha-Rid, Or Zarua, Shibbole ha-Leḳeṭ, Rabbi Yehuda Almadari, Abraham of Montpellier, Beit HaBechirah, Sefer Ha'Batim. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. The same has been found true of the textual witnesses to certain other tractates, e.g., Berakhot, Megilla, and Roš ha-Šana. In the commentary to Babhaʾ Qammaʾ, however, the witnesses contain more consequential disparities. See S. Efrati, “Nusaḥ peruš Raši le-pereq keiṣad ha-regel” [The Text of Rashi’s Commentary to the 2nd Chapter of Tractate Baba Qama], final thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2013, p. 15-16. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. In the case of his commentary to b. Berakhot, for instance, there is a great similarity between London, British Library MS Or. 5975, and Parma Palatina MS 2589. See Y. Malchi, *Raši—Ha-peruš la-Talmud* [Rashi—The Talmudic Commentary], Jerusalem, 2009, pp. 63-66. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. On comparison of the witnesses to the commentary to folios 21-23, 25-33, 38-40, the rate of agreement of *AC* was found to be 12%, as opposed to: *AB* 5.3%, *AM* 2.4%, *BC* 2.9%, *BM* 2.9%, *CM* 3.4%. *AC* thus bear a relatively meager resemblance to other witnesses and a relatively great resemblance to each other. *D* is not included in the above calculations because it is lacking in many places. On comparison of the parts of the commentary to these folios preserved in *D*, the rate of agreement of *BD* was found to be 24.3%, as opposed to: *AB* 0.5%, *AC* 6.8%, *AD* 4.2%, *AM* 1%, *BC* 0.5%, *BM* 0%, *CD* 1.5%, *CM* 2.1%, *DM* 0.5%. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The amount of comparable data provided by the shorter witnesses was limited. *M* will be discussed below, following the discussion of the manuscripts. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. See also examples 21, 22 below. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. In this essay, any quotation for which no witness is named is from the first edition (*M*). ‹..›: illegible letters within a word. ‹…›: illegible word. ‹… …›: illegible words. [ ]: insertion in the main text. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. The quoted text is according to *M*. The extant fragments of *D* indicate that its reading here resembled that of *M*. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. *C*: דתניא בפסחים; see Pesaḥim 113b. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. *C*: הרצחנין. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. *C*: אמ' רב. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. *C* has באניני rather than בי אניני, and מאוס rather than מיאוס. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Concerning the authenticity of the version that includes the quotation, see Ahrend, “Rashi’s Commentary on Tractate Megilla,” p. 83-85. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. See n. 25 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. The rates of irregularities (insertions, reductions, and significant transpositions) for the respective extensive witnesses relative to the others at folios 21-33, 38-40 where *D* was preserved were: *C* 33.8%, *A* 7.9%, *B* 3.1%, *D* 5.8%, *M* 4.7%. Many of the irregularities are errors. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. A few further examples: 1. At 25b, s.v. *mi-šum yiḥud*, *BM* read, ושמא ירד החתן לעשות צרכיו ויתייחד אחר עם הכלה, while *AC* erroneously have ותתייחד instead of ויתייחד. 2. At 42a, s.v. *be-šabbat ḥayyabh ḥaṭṭaʾt*, *BD* contain the text ואינה דוחה את השבת (*D* has שאינה instead of ואינה), whereas *ACM*, apparently in error, omit the words את השבת. 3. At 43a, s.v. *we-yaʿabhirennu*, *BM* has the reading אם לא עמד לפוש בינתים, but *AC* incorrectly substitute בבתים for בינתים. 4. At 48a, s.v. *mi-peney kebhod yom ṭobh*, *BDM* read שמראה כמכין עצמו לקראתו (*D* reads שנראה rather than שמראה), while *AC* erroneously omit שמראה. See also n. 62, example 3, below. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. See A. Goldschmidt (ed.), *Maḥzor Viṭri*, Jerusalem, 2009, p. 833; Tosaphot; Rashi’s commentary accompanying the halakhot of al-Fasi; Abraham of Montpellier (ed. M. Y. Blau, New York, 1978), Beit HaBechirah (A. Liss addition, Jerusalem 1971). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. However, see n. 5 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. At three points where other witnesses contain a translation, the text of *B* has been lost. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. European translations in lost sections of *D* were preserved by Darmesteter and Blondheim, *Les gloses françaises*. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. At least some of the missing translations were omitted by scribes who did not find them helpful. R. Rabbinovicz, *Diqduqey Sopherim:* *Beyṣa*, Munich, 1869, introduction, p. 11, opined that the copyist who produced *B* had omitted the translations “because to him they were a thing of no use” (“ki hayu eṣlo ke-dabhar še-eyn ḥepheṣ bo”). Yehuda al-Madari, whose commentary to the part of al-Fasi’s *Sefer Halakhot* paralleling b. Sukka quotes Rashi extensively, omitted the translations. Concerning the omission of translations, see Ahrend, “Rashi’s Commentary on Tractate Rosh Hashana,” p. 98. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Forty translations are absent in both *BD*. Three appear only in *B*, and nine only in *D*. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. For example: 1. At 9b, the rendering אדרייא appears in *A*, while *BD* have אינרא and *M* reads אידרא. 2. At 22a, *A* contains the translation שליבש, *C* has שולבט, *M* שוליבא, and *BD* שולביש. 3. At 31a, s.v. *pariš*, the word פריש is interpreted in *A* as קודוניץ, in *M* as קודוניא, and in *C* as קודונץ. *BD* contain no European translation, but offer the Hebrew term חבושין, while in *I* we find ‹…› [חבושין]. See also n. 56, 57 below. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. The text of *A* is lacking in one case, and that of *C* in two. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. See also n. 56, 57 below. However, there are ten instances where A gives translations that do not appear in C, and four where C gives a translation absent in A. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. On comparison of the witnesses to the commentary to folio 5a, the beginning of 5b, a short passage of 6a, and 7a, the rate of agreement of *F* and *BD* was found to be 25%, and that of *FB* 25%, contrasting with *AF* 6.2%, *DF* 0%, and *FM* 6.2%. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. In a further example under the same heading of the commentary, *AM* read, שלא יהא בין קנה לחבירו, while *BDF* substitute לקנה for לחבירו. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. *BF* omit או. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. In his initial comments, Rashi referred to a mishnah in b. ʿErubhin 16b: מקיפה בקנים ובלבד שלא יהא בין קנה לחבירו שלשה טפחים. The individual responsible for the insertion may have intended to quote from a preceding baraita ibid., 15b: שיירא שחנתה בבקעה והקיפוה בגמלין באוכפות בעביטין בשליפין בקנים בקולחות מטלטלין בתוכה…. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. In a further example, at 5a, s.v. *middat qomatah loʾ natena*, *ADEM* read, שהיא היתה לארון ככסוי תיבה, but *BF* erroneously substitute אמה for היתה. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. The margin of *F* contains a capital gamma-like illustration of a right angle. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. *ADM* do not contain this version, potentially having rejected it because the panels described are not considered to form an acceptable sukka. They instead emended מזרחית מערבית by substituting דרומית for the former word (*AM*) or the latter (*D*). [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Rates of agreement on examination of folio 29b, 30a, the beginning of 30b, 31a, a short passage from the beginning of 31b, most of 32a, most of 32b, the beginning of 33a, 38a, the first half of 38b, most of 39b, 40a, and most of 40b are as follows: *BI* 15.2%, *BDI* 12.5%, *AI* 2.7%, *CI* 1.3%, *DI* 1.3%, *IM* 0%. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. See also examples 2, 3, 6 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. For example: 1. At 29b, *ACM* give the translation אשקובא, while *BI* read אשקופא and *D* has סקופא. 2. At 34a, in defining the word מסר, *ACM* state, היא מגירה שקורין שיגה (*A* gives the final word as סירה; *C*: שירא), while instead of שירא, *BDI* define the term as פריאוני לשון יון, referring to the Greek word for sword, πριόνι (*prioni*). See also n. 44, example 3, above. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. 1. At 32a, s.v. tartey, *A* gives the translation טרונקא, *C* has צרוקא, and *M*טרוקא. 2. At 34b, s.v. *karatey*, *A* reads פוריש, *CJ* read פורש, and *M* hasפורי. *BDI* contain no foreign translation in either case. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. *C* omits the words [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. *B* indeed includes an emendation that inserts [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Notwithstanding, at 37a, s.v. *megaddeley hošaʿnaʾ*, *I* reads מגדלי הושענא נ"א דגדלי הושענא, and the latter version of these two: דגדלי הושענא appears in *D*. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. The corruption appears at 39b, s.v. *le-pi še-eyn* (at the end of the comment), where the printed text reads, דהא וניקחין קתני משמע אפילו טובא. After וניקחין, *BL* insert טובא, apparently without cause; the offending word is marked for erasure in *B*. In the first agreement, ibid., s.v. *le-pi še-en ka-yoṣeʾ ba-hen nišmar*, *BDL* read, ולא חיישינן ליה שיצניעם, while *ACIKM* have חשדינן rather than חיישינן. In the second case of agreement, ibid., s.v. *wayman*, *BDL* read, לצרכי סעודה משתעי קרא, while *ACKM* have בצרכי rather than לצרכי. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Following are a number of such cases. 1. At 22b, s.v. *štey qorot ha-matʾimot*, *ACE* read, ואם לא היתה קורה רחבה טפח, while *BM* contain the additional word לא (*B*: לו) after היתה. 2. At 25b, s.v. *ṣaʿar ḥatan*, *ACE* read, ובוש לצחק עם כלתו, while *BDM* have לשחק instead of לצחק. 3. Ibid., s.v. *we-ḥayyabhin bi-qeriʾat šemaʿ*, *ACE* have the apparently corrupt text ליישב דעתם שעה קטנה כדי לפסוק ראשון, while all of the other witnesses vary in their parallels to לפסוק. *B*: לקרוא לפסוק; *D*: [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. The following rates of agreement were found on comparison of the witnesses to the commentary to folio 5, most of 6a, a brief section of 7b, a passage in the second half of 22a, a brief section of 22b, part of the middle of 25b, and most of 26a: *AE* 42.3%, *DE* 11.5%, *BE* 3.8%, *EM* 0%. *C*, which contains only a small part of the commentary to these passages, was not included in this comparison. A comparison of those sections of these passages for which *C* is preserved again indicated an especial affinity between *AE*, while the rate of agreement for *CE* was 0%. Following are illustrations of the affinity of *AE*: 1. At 3a, s.v. *we-eyn mištattephin bo*, where the edition reads, ואין בית אחר פתוח לה, *AE* adds גדול ממנו after אחר. 2. At 5b, s.v. *u-mi-maʾy de-ḥalal ʿaśara*, *AE* add the words של סוכה after דחלל. 3. At 8a, s.v. *abhal be-ribbuaʿ*, *BM* and an emendation in *F* have the reading וצריך אתה לעשות על כרחך, a version that seems to have existed in *D* as well. *AE* read, ועל כרחך אתה צריך לעשות. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. As illustrated by the following examples: 1. At 22a, s.v. *ba-me debharim amurim bi-zeman še-yeš*, *BM* read, ולא גרסינן אין בהן טפח והכי פירושא (*B* has ופירושא instead of והכי פירושא), *C* preserves the version ולא גרסינן אבל אין בהן טפח. and *ADE* contain no such passage. 2. At 26a, s.v. *holekhey be-derekh miṣwa*, *BCM* read, דטריד ודואגים; *AE* omit the latter word. 3. Ibid., s.v. *Rabhaʾ amar*, *BCDM* have the version וסוכה היינו טעמא דאסור שינת עראי. while *AE* omit טעמא. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Of the text of *D* here, all that remains is ‹… …› חצר לרשות הרבים. Given the apparent original length of the line, it appears to have contained a shorter reading than *BM*, possibly skipping from the first to the second instance of פתוחין לחצר. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. The end of the passage in *C* bears the mark of a haplography resulting from the final part of the text: [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. The translations to European languages in *E* are indicative of an affinity with *M*, rather than *A*. 1. At 13b, *E* reads, יונקיש, while *M* has יונקש; *ABD* here give no translation. 2. At 13b, *A* gives the version טנביש, *EM* have טינבש, and *BD* preserve no translation. 3. At 26a, *A* translates as אלכצי, *B* as צינגלש, *C* as שיונצלש, *D* as צינבלש, and *EM* as צינצלש. 4. Ibid., *M* reads, מורשיילש, *B* מורשלייש, and *E* ‹..›ל‹..›; *A* contains no translation. 5. At 26b, *C* contains the translation אלישנא, *E* has אלינירש, and *M* אלצש; *ABD* contain none. Although one should be careful not to draw conclusions based on the comparison of the foreign translation, because many copyists did not understand the translation and thus disrupted them. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. The following rates of agreement were found on comparison of the witnesses to the commentary to folio 38b, 39a, and the middle of 48b to the beginning of 49a: *CJ* 18.7%, *CJM* 3.1%, *AJ* 0%, *BJ* 0%. *D* is only partially preserved in these sections and was not included in the comparison. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. For example: 1. At 39a, s.v. *wayyaʿabhor et ha-kuši*, *CJ* are the only witnesses in which the word כמו precedes ויעבור. 2. At 48b, s.v. *di-ketibh śimḥa we-śaśon*, the word קרא of the phrase אקדים קרא is absent in *CJ*. 3. At 49a, s.v. *Rabbi Yosey*, where *ABDM* read, בזבחים בפרק קדשי קדשים, *CJ* have בפרק קדשי הקדשים במסכת זבחים. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. An additional passage of commentary found in *J* at 39a, following s.v. *noten lo etrog be-mattana*, is largely paralleled in *K* and in an emendation to *K*. Ibid., s.v. *we-littebh leh demey etrog be-hedyaʾ*, *K* contains the additional text לשם אתרוג ואמאי תנן במתניתין אינו רשאי לקנות והאי לאו סחורה דהדר אכיל ליה, while *J* contains a similar addition. *JK* contain similar additions ibid., s.v. *eyn moserin*, as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. The following rates of agreement were found on comparison of the witnesses to the commentary to folio 38b (the end of the folio), 39-40: *CK* 5.3%, *AK* 1.7%, *BK* 0%, *DK* 1.7%, *KM* 0%. To assess the relationship between *JK*, a comparison was conducted of witnesses to the commentary to the first half of folio 39a; the rate of agreement was 33.3% for *JK*, 8.3% for *CJ*, and 0% for each of *AK*, *BK*, *DK*, and *KM*. Illustrative of the affinity between *CK*, at 40b, s.v. *de-Rabbi Yosey be-Rabbi Ḥaninaʾ*, *DM* read, במסכת ערכין; *A* reads, משנה במסכת ערכין; *B* reads, משנה היא במסכת ערכין; and the version found in *CK* is, במסכת ערכין היא משנה (with *C* substituting הא for היא). Later in the same sentence, *ABDM* preserve the version ארוכה היא מאוד, the final word of which is absent in *CK*. See also n. 61 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. The following rates of agreement were found on comparison of the witnesses to the commentary to folios 29-33, 38-40: *MAC* 11.1%, *MA* 6.7%, *MC* 8.2%, *MB* 1.4%, *MD* 1.4%, *MBD* 5.7%, *MAB* 7.2%, *MBC* 5.3%, *MAD* 0.9%, *MCD* 0.9%. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. A few additional examples: 1. At 28b, s.v. *lerabbot et ha-gerim*, *AC* contain no comment, while *BDM* read: לרבות את הגרים: שחייבים בסוכה. Also included in *BD* is the following exegesis: סלקא דעתך אמינא אזרח אשה ולא גרים קמ"ל האזרח לרבות את הגרים. 2. At 33a, s.v. *lulabh eyn ṣarikh eged* (in the middle of the comment), *ACM* read, דהא בדידיה לא כתיב תעשה, to which *BD* add—extraneously, it would seem—ולא מן העשוי. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. In *A*, the words ועקימותו משום דליתחזי למיהוי דופן are omitted due to haplography. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. *A* has לאמרינן instead of לא אמרי. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Other examples include the following: 1. At 29a, s.v. *tartey*, *ACM* superfluously insert הן, absent in *BD*, after the word דברים of שני דברים אלו. 2. At 32a, s.v. *de-ʿabhed ki himnaq*, *BI* read, כמין שתי שדראות, while *ACM* erroneously omit the word שתי. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. Ṣidqiyya ʿAnaw (the Physician), *Šibboley ha-Leqeṭ*, ed. S. Buber, Vilna, 1886, § 371; David d’Estella, *Sefer ha-Battim*, vol. 3, ed. M. Hershler, Jerusalem, 1982, p. 234. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. See Y. Y. Stal, “‘Yom ṭobh šel ʿarabha’: Šemo šel ha-yom ha-šebhiʿi šel Sukkot” [“The Festival of the Willow”: The Name of the Seventh Day of Sukkot], *Yerushaseinu* 9 (2015-2016), pp. 172-174. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. See also n. 56, 57 above. See also Darmesteter, Blondheim, *Les gloses françaises*, p. 24. They determined that *M* was the finest witness to the commentary to b. Sukka, but did so on the sole basis of translations to European languages. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. S. Friedman, “Rabbi Dawid ben Elʿazar S.L. u-massekhtot ha-Talmud še-nidpesu bi-dephus Soncino” [David b. Elazar Sal and the Soncino Talmud Prints], *Asufot* 7 (1992-1993), p. 22, states that the individual who proofread the draft of b. Nidda for the Soncino edition had several manuscripts of Rashi’s commentary, and the same may have been true of the first edition of the commentary to b. Sukka. For another example of the tendency among early printers to use multiple manuscripts, see Milikowsky, *Seder Olam*, pp. 176-177. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. The same is true of the first edition of Rashi’s commentary to b. Roš ha-Šana and b. Babhaʾ Qammaʾ. See Ahrend, *Rashi’s Commentary on Tractate Rosh Hashana*, p. 41; Efrati, “Nusaḥ peruš Raši,” p. 34. There are occasional instances of contamination between other witnesses to the commentary to b. Sukka despite the absence of any particular affinity between the documents, namely, between *A* and *I* and between *D* and either *AH* or *H*. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. For examples of conspicuous additions, see *N* at 45b, s.v. *liphṭor* and s.v. *Yotam ben ʿUzziyyahu*, and cf. *ABCM*. See also Ahrend, *Rashi’s Commentary on Tractate Rosh Hashana*, p. 40. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. Following are several additional examples: 1. At 28a, s.v. *mišna*, *A* reads, כגון משנה וברייתא של ששה סדרים ספרא וספרי, while *CN* and an emendation to *A* substitute ותורת כהנים for ספרא, and *B* reads, וששה סדרים, while *M* has neither ספרא וספרי nor any parallel. 2. Ibid., at s.v. *diqduqey tora*, *BM* preserve the text ריבויי אותיות שבאין לדקדק בהן, while *ACN* contain the additional word ולדרוש (*C*: לידרש; *N*: לדרוש) after לדקדק. 3. Ibid., s.v. *diqduqey sopherim*, *BM* read ודכוותה גר הבא, while *ACN* add בבכורות after דכוותה. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. *C*: ומצוף. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. *C*: שינה. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. *D*: ולקובעו. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. It seems that this refers to the verse that said 'שבעת ימים מצות תאכלו' (Shemot, 12:15), and later'בערב תאכלו מצות' (there, 12:18). See Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Horowitz-Rabin addition, Jerusalem 1960, p. 27. See also D. Henshke, 'Mah Nishtannah': The Passover Night in the Sages' Discourse, Jerusalem 2016, pp. 186-187. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. The translations of *M* are rendered in Latin characters and translated to English in this essay according to M. Catane, *Recueil des gloses*, Part II (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 2006, No. 764, 765, 766. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. Regarding Makhir, see A. Grossman, *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz: Their Lives, Leadership and Works, 900-1096* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 2001, pp. 102-105. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. *D* has not been preserved at this point, but Darmesteter and Blondheim, *Les gloses françaises*, § 67, 465, attest that it lacked these two translations. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. Most textual witnesses to b. Moʿed Qaṭan read אהרי rather than אהלי. Just in MS Oxford 23, the reading is אוהלי. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. The first addition is נ"א דגדלי הושענא. The version דגדלי appears in *D* as well and may be original, as suggested by its correspondence to the first explanation: לשון גדילין. The version מגדלי appears to suit the second explanation, which as noted above was not penned by Rashi. דגדלי is the version found in a number of talmudic manuscripts, the version of Rashi’s commentary accompanying the *halakhot* of al-Fasi, and the work of several other medieval scholars. גדלי is found in MS New York 108 and in *Sefer Abhi ha-ʿEzri* of Eliʿezer ben Yoʾel ha-Lewi of Bonn (§ 680). דמגדלי appears in MS London and in MS Munich 95. מגדלי is found in the editions and in the work of Yonatan of Lunel. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. See Y. S. Spiegel, *Chapters in the History of the Jewish Book: Writing and Transmission*, Jerusalem, 2005, pp. 349, 354-355. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. See n. 56 above. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)