

## The Two Lists of Addenda to Nahmanides' Torah Commentary: Who Wrote Them?

YOSEF OFER

### *Introduction\**

Nahmanides' Torah commentary is a masterpiece of Torah literature. Nahmanides, who came from Spain shortly before his demise to live in the Land of Israel, constantly engaged in improving this work of his, even in the final stage of his life, and added to it scores of new passages to broaden and deepen his discussion.<sup>1</sup> The passages added to his commentary were collected in special lists, and most of them have been included in the contemporary printed editions of his work.

Five manuscripts contain lists of the addenda to his commentary. The existence of most of the lists was already known in the second half of the nineteenth century, in catalogs compiled by Steinschneider, Neubauer and Margoliouth.<sup>2</sup> Yet, nevertheless, the subject has not enjoyed the attention it deserves.<sup>3</sup>

\* I would like to thank all libraries that own the manuscripts mentioned in this article and the Institute for microfiled Hebrew manuscripts in the National Library in Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> From a quantitative standpoint, the documented addenda make up 4.5% of the Torah commentary. This calculation is based on the Chavel (Hebrew) edition of the work. The entire commentary comprises some 25,000 lines, and the 134 additions make up 1120 lines.

<sup>2</sup> Steinschneider identified Nahmanides' addenda in both ms *M2* and ms *P*. This was done already in 1864 in "*Hamazkir* – Hebräische Bibliographie Blätter", no. 41, annum 7:119. The independent addenda list (ms *S*) was identified in Neubauer's catalog in 1886 (A. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* [Oxford 1886]:783 – ms 2253,12: fol. 268). Neubauer notes that the list of Nahmanides' addenda to his commentary on the Pentateuch was sent from Acre and ends with the portion of Pinhas (Num 26:42). The list in ms *H* was identified by Margoliouth in 1899 (G. Margoliouth, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum* [London 1965, vol. I, reprint of 1899 edition]:157, ms no. 208), and he refers there to Neubauer as well. The addenda list of ms *A* was first identified by Kahana in his article. Pietro Perreau noted in his catalog of Parma manuscripts (from 1878–1904) that Nahmanides' arrival in Acre is mentioned in ms *A*, but he did not explain expli-

The first comprehensive discussion of the subject was published in 1969. Rabbi Kalman Kahana described four manuscripts of Nahmanides' commentary that also contained a list of addenda, naming them *P*, *H*, *M* and *A*. Kahana listed precisely the 134 additions mentioned in these lists, and systematically examined whether these addenda were to be found in the Torah commentary of these manuscripts and of an additional manuscript he marked *D*.<sup>4</sup> It turned out that, in the main, the addenda lists were supported by this examination, because some of the manuscripts do not include the added passages (and so they represent the first edition of the commentary), while others do – either in the body of the commentary itself or in the margins (and so they represent the last edition).

In recent years, Mordechai Sabato has devoted much time to this subject. In his lectures and articles, he has mapped out a way to study and identify the reasons for every added passage, Nahmanides' understanding in the early edition of his commentary as well as the changes that took place in his later versions.<sup>5</sup> In his comprehensive article in *Megadim* 42, Sabato expounds on the subject at length and shows that scores of additional addenda, besides those documented in the lists, can be located by means of comparing the manuscripts of the commentary. Sabato indicates the criteria by means of which it is possible to distinguish between an addendum added by Nahmanides and a copyist's omission.

It should be stressed that in the common editions of Nahmanides' commentary, almost all of the addenda have been integrated into the body of the commentary and are an inseparable part of it. In other words, the common editions represent the final edition of the commentary, as intended by Nahmanides when he completed his work, rather than any of the earlier stages. The examination of the list of addenda

citly that this manuscript contains a list of passages added to Nahmanides' commentary (see: P. Perreau, *Catalogo dei Codici Ebraici della Biblioteca di Parma*: 111; and see *ibid.*:155, about ms *P*).

<sup>3</sup> Menahem Zvi Eisenstadt took a significant step in making use of these lists when he published an edition of Nahmanides' commentary to the Book of Genesis, and included in it the addenda according to ms *H* (M. Z. Eisenstadt [ed.], *Nahmanides' Commentary on the Pentateuch*, published according to ancient manuscripts and early printed versions, with index and notes, New York 1958–1961). Some thirty additions – which make up about half the additions to Genesis listed in ms *H* – appear there.

<sup>4</sup> See the details of the mss at the end of this article. As a matter of fact, Ms *M* is composed of two different manuscripts: *M1*, that contains Nahmanides' commentary to Genesis and Exodus, and *M2*, that contains the commentary to Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. This fact will be discussed *infra*.

<sup>5</sup> See especially: M. Sabato, "Notes on the text of Ramban's commentary to the Torah", *Megadim* 23 (1995):72–74 (in Hebrew).

and the comparison of the manuscripts are aimed at uncovering the stages of compilation of the commentary, its earliest editions, and the method adopted by Nahmanides in writing and improving his commentary.

I myself have recently examined the lists of the addenda to Nahmanides' commentary, and I have come to a number of new conclusions that I wish to propose in the present article.

### *Two Lists of Addenda*

An examination of the five manuscripts containing the addenda lists shows that they reflect two lists of addenda: the one appears in mss *P* and *H*, while the other occurs in mss *M2* and *A* and in an independent list of the addenda – not mentioned by Kahana – to be marked *S*.

The first list contains 89 additions, most of which – 60 additions – relate to his commentary to the Book of Genesis. The second list, appearing in its entirety only in ms *M2*, contains 70 additions, none of which relate to the Book of Genesis; they relate to the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy only. This list appears partially in mss *S* and *A*.<sup>6</sup>

The relationship between the two lists will be clarified if we divide the Pentateuch into three sections: the Book of Genesis; from the beginning of Exodus to Numbers 13:3; and thence to the end of the Pentateuch. The data are presented in the following table:

	Genesis	From Exodus to Num 13:3	From Num 13:3 to the End	Total
Only H, P	60	3	1	64
H, P and M2	0	24	1	25
Only M2	0	5	40	45
Total	60	32	42	134

It can be seen that the first list ends at Numbers 13:3, and only two additions in it appear later in the Pentateuch. In contrast, the second

<sup>6</sup> Ms *S* is unclear and the end of the list (from Nu 26:42 on) is missing. Ms *A* contains the title of the list and the part relating to the Book of Exodus only; the compiler announces that the additions from the Book of Leviticus onward are integrated into the body of the manuscript, so there is no need to repeat them again in the list.

list is lacking at its beginning: as noted above, it starts with the Book of Exodus. As regards the middle section, dealt with by both lists, only 75% of the cases appear in each of the lists, while 25% of the cases appear only in one of them.

### *The Difference in Descriptions*

Another perusal of the lists reveals that there exists a fundamental difference between them with regard to the technique employed to describe the additions. Each of the lists strives to demonstrate to the writer what the addition is and where precisely it is to be integrated into the commentary. We shall render the differences more meaningful by means of an example:<sup>7</sup>

The first list:

[0] סדר וישמע יתרו [1] בפסוק לא תרצח [2] כצרכו וטובתו [3] וכל העם רואים [4] והנה הזכיר בקצת הדברות למולם (!) ... והמשכיל יבין [5] וכל העם רואים

The second list:

[0] בסדר וישמע יתרו [2] ונשארו חמשה לאדם כצרכו וטובתו [4] והנה הזכיר בקצת הדברות גמולם... והמשכיל יבין. [5] וכל העם רואים את הקולות וכו'

The numbers in brackets (which of course do not appear in the original) are intended to clarify the structure. This is the descriptive method adopted by the first list: [0] in the Weekly Portion *wa-yishma' yithro* (וישמע יתרו: Exodus 18–20), [1] in the verse (or the passage beginning with) *lo thirtsah* (לא תרצח: *ibid.*, 20:11), [2] between the words *ke-tsorko we-tovatho* (כצרכו וטובתו) “according to his need and for his benefit”) and the words [3] *we-khol ha-‘am ro'im* (וכל העם רואים) “and all the people see”) the following addition is to be inserted [4]: *we-hinne' hizkir ... we-hamaskil yavin* (והנה הזכיר... והמשכיל יבין) “and here he has mentioned ... and the knowledgeable will understand”). And after this addition continue with the words [5] *we-khol ha-‘am ro'im* (וכל העם רואים).

As a formula: the Portion [0], the verse [1], insert between [2] and [3] the new passage [4] and when finished continue with [5] (identical with [3]).

<sup>7</sup> The passages included in the two lists can be found in Kahana's article. I intend to publish them in the future as part of a book that deals with Nahmanides' additions. In the quotations from the list in this article, the 'body' of the addition (passage [4]) is not quoted in full: only the first and the last words are quoted, and three dots are marked between them.

The repetition of the consecutive words in section [3] and in section [5] makes it possible for the reader of the list of addenda to identify the precise limits of the addition. The moment he locates these repeated words, he will know that the passage included between them is the addition.

The descriptive method adopted by the second list is shorter and simpler. It, too, mentions the Weekly Portion [0], but omits the verse. It adduces the sequence of words preceding the addition [2], the addition itself [4], and the words following it [5], closing with the symbol 'וכו' "etc.". If the reader has before him a copy of Nahmanides' commentary which does not include the addenda, he can locate with its help the limits of each addition. If he has a copy that includes the addenda, he may have difficulty identifying the exact limits of the addition. He has to rely either on his powers of comprehension or on the punctuation and the spaces left in the list, and to deduce accordingly what the addition is.

This descriptive method is maintained consistently throughout each of the lists (only rarely was one of the component parts omitted). This fact makes it difficult to assume that Nahmanides himself edited these two lists and sent them to the Diaspora one after the other: why should he have repeated the middle part of the Pentateuch in both lists? And why should he have altered his descriptive method, even for the very same addition he had previously described?

### *The List Titles and their being Ascribed to Nahmanides*

We shall now examine the titles of each of the two lists:

#### *The First List:*

Ms H: These are the additions the late Rabbi added to this commentary while he was in Acre.

Ms P: These are the additions the late Rabbi added to his commentary on the five sections [of the Pentateuch] in this commentary while he was in Acre, and I have seen fit to bring them up here again, “adding one thing to another, to find out the account” (based on Eccl 7:27).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> אלו ההוספות שהוסיף הרב ז"ל [בפירוש החמשה חומשים שלו] בפרוש זה בהיותו בעכו [וראיתי להעלותם עוד פה אחד לאחד למצוא חשבון].

*The Second List:*

Ms *M2* (and similar in mss *S* and *A*): After the great Rabbi R. Moshe son of R. Nahman, of blessed memory, traveled to Acre, he sent from there that which he had added to these commentaries of his, so as to write each and every item in its place, and he also sent this missive.<sup>9</sup>

The second list thus explicitly attributes the creation of the list to Nahmanides. According to the title heading the list, Nahmanides added various passages to his commentary and probably listed them in the margins of a manuscript of the commentary he had in his possession. Then Nahmanides prepared a list of the addenda and sent it abroad (apparently to Spain), so that whoever had a manuscript copy of the first edition of the commentary would be able to update and complete it. There is no reason to doubt this testimony – that Nahmanides himself prepared the list. There is, additionally, circumstantial evidence supporting this claim. The title of the list indicates that together with the list there was an additional comment made by Nahmanides concerning an ancient silver coin he had found in the possession of the elders of the Land when he arrived in Acre.<sup>10</sup> This comment, as well as the prayer Nahmanides recited in Jerusalem, appear in mss *M2*, *A* – alongside the list of addenda.<sup>11</sup> There is no doubt about the authenticity of these two passages, and their proximity to the addenda list reinforces the testimony of the list to the effect that Nahmanides was the person who compiled it.

It is reasonable to assume that Nahmanides attached to the list of additions a letter explaining the nature of the list and showing how to make use of it. It is possible that this letter – which has not survived – also explained the unusual fact that the list begins with the Book of Exodus, rather than with the beginning of the Pentateuch. The letter has not reached us, and all that remains is the general instruction “to write each and every item in its place”.

We shall now consider the first list. Its title states merely that the list contains the addenda added by Nahmanides when he was in Acre; it does not claim that Nahmanides himself edited the list or dispatched

אחר שהלך הרב הגדול ר' משה ב"ר נחמן ז"ל לעכו שלח משם מה שהוסיף על פירושו ואלו לכתוב כל דבר ודבר על מקומו ושלה גם כן כתב זה

<sup>9</sup> The comment about the coin was printed by C. B. Chavel at the end of Nahmanides' Commentary on the Pentateuch (Hebrew Edition, Vol II:507–508).

<sup>11</sup> In ms *M2* the comment on the coin appears, followed by Nahmanides' addenda and the prayer recited in Jerusalem. In ms *A* the addenda list comes first and is followed by the comment on the coin and the Jerusalem prayer.

it.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, a careful examination of the list of addenda demonstrates clearly that someone, other than Nahmanides, edited the list.

I wish to make it clear that there is no justification for doubting the authenticity of the addenda list, nor is there any doubt that the passages adduced in it were not in Nahmanides' commentary when this was first written.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, there is no doubt that Nahmanides himself added these passages to his commentary while he sojourned in the Land of Israel. I claim only that the first addenda list was not prepared by Nahmanides himself, but by another person.

The following are the indications that this is the case:

- A. Some addendum fragments have been inserted in the wrong place.
- B. No instruction is found to erase a passage that was nullified.
- C. Imagined addenda.
- D. The limits of the addendum are unclear.
- E. Imprecise notation of the verse that contains the addendum.
- F. Additions closely related to other additions are not included in the list.

Some of these indications are extremely convincing (especially numbers A, B). The others tend to support the conclusion to which the first two undoubtedly lead.

Following are the details of these proofs (the numbers of the addendum fragments have been adduced from Kahana's article).

A. Addendum fragments inserted in the wrong place

The first list of additions (Addendum No. 42):

[1] בפסוק ויאהב גם את רחל [2] וזה טעם גם [3] כי שנואה לאה [4] גם ביעקב כי אם נאמר שנהגה כבודו עד שראה אותה בכקר ולכן שנאה יעקב [5] כי שנואה לאה

Commentary to Gen 29:30:<sup>14</sup>

*And he loved Rachel (ויאהב גם את רחל) more than Leah* – The reason why Scripture mentions that he also loved Rachel more than Leah is that it is

<sup>12</sup> The scribe who wrote ms *P* added another sentence (which does not appear in ms *H*): “and I have seen fit to bring them up here again, 'adding one thing to another, to find out the account' (based on Eccl 7:27)”. These words may indicate that he is apologizing, as it were, for writing down the list, despite the fact that the body of his manuscript was already updated and contained the addenda.

<sup>13</sup> Except for five “additions”, with which I will deal *infra*.

<sup>14</sup> The passages quoted from Nahmanides' commentary here and below are adduced from Chavel's translation (*Ramban [Nachmanides] – Commentary of the Torah* [5 vols.], translated and annotated by Rabbi Dr. Charles B. Chavel, New York 1971–1976).

natural for a man to have more love for the woman with whom he first had relations, just as the Sages have mentioned with reference to women: "And she makes a firm commitment only to the man who married her first" (Sanhedrin 22b). Thus, Jacob's loving Rachel more than Leah was unnatural. This is the significance of the word *gam* (גם וזה טעם גם).

Commentary to Gen 29:31, mss *A, D* (=first edition of the commentary):

[*And the Eternal saw*] that Leah was hated (כי שנואה לאה) – for from the time she deceived her sister, Jacob hated her (שנאה יעקב).

Commentary to Gen 29:31, in common editions (=second edition of the commentary):

[*And the Eternal saw*] that Leah was hated (כי שנואה לאה) – Now Leah had deceived her sister and also Jacob. For even if we were to say that she showed respect to her father, who took her and brought her in to him and she was not rebellious against him, she should have by word or sign indicated that she was Leah. All the more is this so since she feigned herself all night to be another, which was the reason why Jacob did not recognize her until he saw her in the morning. It was for that reason that Jacob hated her (ולכן שנאה יעקב).

In his opening sentence Nahmanides resolves the difficulty in the expression *and he loved Rachel more than Leah*, which means that the verse differentiates between Rachel and Leah and states that his love for Rachel was greater than his love for Leah, and so the word *גם*, "also", which serves to compare the two, presents difficulties. Nahmanides' answer is that the word *גם* appears here in the sense of "nevertheless, however". The first part of the verse notes that Jacob went in unto Rachel, after Leah, and its second part states that nevertheless, Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah.

In his second sentence, Nahmanides comes to explain why Jacob hated Leah. In the first edition of his commentary, he explained that this was Jacob's reaction to the deceitful act Leah performed vis-à-vis her sister Rachel. In the later edition, Nahmanides added that Leah had sinned not only with regard to her sister, but also directly against Jacob, and that this was the reason why he disliked her. Nahmanides adds that Leah had not acted under duress, for she could have communicated with Jacob either when Laban handed her over or later on that night. The long sentence added here caused Nahmanides to change the basic sentence, for it was impossible to include the entire discussion of Jacob in a parenthetical sentence such as "for from the time she deceived her sister and also Jacob <for even if we were to say ... in the morning> Jacob hated her". Nahmanides thus replaced the basic sentence with two: "[a]

Now Rachel had been deceived by her sister, and also Jacob <for even if we were to say... in the morning> [b] and therefore Jacob disliked her".

Thus the correct instruction to insert the fragment should have been as follows:

[2] כי שנואה לאה [3] שנאה יעקב<sup>15</sup> [4] הנה לאה רמתה באחותה... ולכן [5] שנאה יעקב.

However, the list of addenda, strangely enough, says that the addition is to be inserted adjacent to verse 30, and not verse 31! It appears that Nahmanides emended the first four words (*hinne Leah rimeta ba-ahota*, "Now Leah had deceived her sister") in the body of his manuscript, and wrote the rest of his addition in the margin: *gam be-Ya'akov... ve-lakhen sene'ah Ya'akov* "And also Jacob. [...] It was for that reason that Jacob hated her". Someone else saw the addition beginning with the word *gam* ("also"), thought that this word was to be identified with the word *gam* at the end of the commentary to verse 30, and so wrote an instruction in the addenda list to insert the addition there.<sup>16</sup>

The first list of additions (Addendum No. 62):

[0] סדר בא אל פרעה<sup>71</sup> [2] אעשה בשמים ובארץ [3] וטעם התעללתי [4] ולמען תספר באזני בנך הודיעו הקב"ה למשה מכה יביא עליהם וכת' אותה משה ברמז [5] וטעם התעללתי

Ex 10:1: [*And the Eternal said unto Moses: Go in unto Pharaoh*] for I have hardened his heart – The Holy One, blessed be He, informed Moses that He Who has hardened their hearts [...] I am the Eternal, and whatsoever I please, I do in Heaven and in Earth (אעשה בשמים ובארץ).

Ex 10:2: And the meaning of *hit'alalti* ('I have mocked him'; התעללתי) – for it is I Who hardened his heart and exacted punishments of him [...] the Holy One, blessed be He, now informed Moses of the plague of locusts [although this is not stated here in Scripture], and that he should tell it to Pharaoh, for what sense was there that he be commanded, Go in to Pharaoh, and not say something to him?! The plague is mentioned only in the words of Moses to Pharaoh, as Scripture spoke succinctly of this [...] In Eileh Shemoth Rabbah I have seen it stated: "<And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son – The Holy One, blessed be He, informed Moses what

<sup>15</sup> The list of addenda may give instructions to erase a short sentence and insert the addition in its place, by denoting the words preceding the passage to be erased in section [2] and the words following it in section [3]. This will be discussed *infra*.

<sup>16</sup> Rabbi Kahana adduces all the textual material in his article, yet he thought, oddly, that it was the list of addenda that was correct, rather than the text of the manuscripts. As far as its contents are concerned, the wording of the addition is completely meaningless.

<sup>17</sup> The mark of the verse (paragraph [1]) is missing here, apparently because the addendum appears in the very first verse of the portion.

plague He is about to bring upon them and Moses wrote it down with a hint: ולמען תספר באזני בנך – הודיעו הקב"ה למשה מכה יביא עליהם וכתב) > *And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son and of thy son's son*, which is an allusion to the plague of locusts, just as it is said [of the locusts in the days of the prophet Joel], *Tell ye your children of it, and let your children tell their children, etc.*" (Joel 1:3)

Nahmanides claims in the second passage that Moses was ordered here to appear before Pharaoh and to inform him of the plague of locusts, and that this was the main purpose of his appearance before Pharaoh. The Biblical text does not mention explicitly the order given to Moses to announce the coming plague of locusts, for the Biblical text tends to abbreviate. At the end of Nahmanides' words, he brings a *midrash* that resolves the problem in a somewhat different fashion: according to the *midrash*, the plague of locusts is actually referred to in the Biblical text, not explicitly but implicitly.

The "addition" with which we are dealing is actually only an imaginary addition. It seems that a sentence quoting the *midrash* was omitted sometime during the copying and recopying of Nahmanides' commentary, because of the resemblance of its opening words to the very same phrase appearing later (the copyist skipped from *ul-ma'an tesapper* to *ul-ma'an tesapper*). This sentence was then written down in the margin, and the addenda list tells the copyist to insert it into the commentary. However, the writer of this instruction did not identify the exact place of the insertion. He thought that the sentence of the insertion was an independent commentary by Nahmanides, and therefore wrote that it was to be inserted at the beginning of the commentary to verse 2, for the words *ul-ma'an tesapper be-oznei binkha* precede the word *hith'allalti* in the verse!<sup>18</sup>

It can hardly be imagined that Nahmanides, the compiler of the commentary, misunderstood the meaning of the sentence and thus ordered that it be inserted in the wrong place.<sup>19</sup> It is important to note that this "addition" is not included in the second list of addenda, which is attributed to Nahmanides himself.

<sup>18</sup> It should be noted as well that in ms *MI* the sentence does not appear in the original text, but in the margin at the beginning of verse 2, just as the first list of the addenda prescribes. In ms *H*, the sentence is written in its proper place in the body of the manuscript, and is rewritten in the margin at the beginning of verse 2, in accordance with the instruction in the addenda list. In ms *A*, the sentence appears in the margin in its proper place.

<sup>19</sup> Kahana considers this example, and notes that it is a case of an omission because of similarity, that was inserted in an improper place because it was misunderstood to be an independent commentary. Nevertheless, for some reason he does not draw the self-evident conclusion that this list of addenda was not compiled by Nahmanides.

The first list of additions (Addendum No. 43):

[0] סדר וישלח יעקב [1] בפסוק ואשלחה להגיד לאדני [2] למצא חן בעיני אדני [3] ויירא יעקב [4] ודע כי כל הכבוד הזה... להוציא המשטמה מלבו [5] ויירא יעקב

Gen 32:5: *Thus shall ye say unto my lord Esau: Thus saith thy servant Jacob* – He commanded them that they should say "to my lord Esau we belong" or "we were sent to him", and to say to him, *Thus saith thy servant Jacob*: I have sojourned with Laban. A similar example in this section is the verse: *When Esau my brother meeteth thee, and asketh thee, saying, Whose art thou?* It may be that in their presence Jacob called Esau "my lord Esau" in order to caution them only to mention Esau respectfully even when not in his presence, just as their lord calls him "my lord".

*The addition*: Know that this respect (ודע כי כל הכבוד הזה) that Jacob showed for his brother by fearfully saying "my lord" and "thy servant" was due to it being the custom of the younger brother to give recognition and respect to the firstborn, as if he were his father, just as the Torah also hints to us on this matter: "This includes your oldest brother." Now Jacob had taken his birthright and his blessing, for which Esau hated him, and now he is acting towards Esau as if the effect of that sale was nil as far as he was concerned, and he is conducting himself towards him as to a firstborn and father in order to remove the hatred from his heart (ואשלחה להגיד לאדני).

Gen 32:6: *And I have sent to tell my lord (ואשלחה להגיד לאדני)* – i. e., "to announce that I am coming to you. *That I may find favour in thy sight* for I am at peace with you and seek your friendship." These are Rashi's words. Rashi's intent is that the verse "I have sent to tell my lord" does not refer to the previous verse, "I have sojourned with Laban, etc." but, instead, it says, "And I have sent to tell my lord that I have come to find favour in thy sight and to do whatsoever my lord will command." But it is more correct to say that it refers to the verse above: "And I have sent to tell my lord that I have wealth, belongings, and precious things, to do with them according to your desire and will." He thus hinted to him that he would send him a present from them, or that Esau may take from him whatever he desires. And so, when Esau asked Jacob, *What meanest thou by all this camp which I met?* And he [Jacob] said: *To find favour in the sight of my lord (למצא חן בעיני אדני)*; Gen 33:8).

In the manuscripts, this addition is inserted at the end of the commentary to verse 5, while the list of addenda contains an instruction to insert it at the end of the commentary to verse 6.<sup>20</sup> Regarding its meaning, the insertion of the addition at the end of verse 6 is not completely impossible, for this verse, too, deals with Jacob's efforts to appease Esau. However, the wording of the addition *we-da' ki ha-kavod ha-zeh she-*

<sup>20</sup> In the mss of the first edition (*A, D*), there is no commentary at all to verse 7, and the commentary to verse 6 is followed by the commentary to verse 8 (*wa-yira Ya'akov*

*haya Ya'akov oseh le-ahiv be-fahdato lemor adoni we-avdekha* "Know that this respect that Jacob showed for his brother by fearfully saying 'my lord' and 'thy servant'" is suitable for the discussion on verse 5. If its place had been in verse 6, Nahmanides would have had to mention, too, the gift discussed in verse 6.

#### B. The absence of an instruction to erase a passage that was nullified

In the vast majority of addenda, Nahmanides does not alter what he had written before, but merely adds to it. He appears to have done so consciously, in order not to confuse students or copyists who may not be able to identify what he wrote first and what he wrote later. In a number of cases, however, Nahmanides had no choice but to make some emendation in the original wording – a necessary result of the addition.

In a few cases the required emendation is not long, and the passage that has to be omitted and then replaced by an added passage consists of only a few words. The addenda list makes it possible to deal with these cases without giving a direct order to erase any words, both in the system adopted by the first list and in that adopted by the second list. The way to do this was to adduce in paragraph [2] the words preceding the addition and in paragraph [5] (and also in paragraph [3] of the first list) the words following the addition – and merely to drop words to be omitted between [2] and [5].

Here is an example (Gen 27:4):

39. [1] בפסוק בעבור תברכך נפשי [2] את פי יי' והיא לא תצלה [3] כי אמרה באהבתו [4] והנה מתחילה לא הגידה לו בדרך מוסר וצניעות... רק הוגד לי מאת השם טרם לדתי [5] כי אמרה באהבתו.

In ms *D*, which represents the first edition, the words *אולי עשתה כך* appear between [2] and [3], so the addenda list gives the implicit instruction to omit these words. A similar case where a few words are omitted exists with other additions as well (such as nos. 33, 36, 771, 82 in Kahan's list).

However, in two cases Nahmanides changes his opinion in a way that makes it necessary to omit a rather lengthy section of his commentary. In these cases, the editor of the addenda list has no choice but to include

me'od "And Jacob feared greatly"). This is the situation reflected in the addenda list as well, though it does not adduce the commentary to verse 7 at all. The commentary to verse 7 was adduced by Sabato as an addition (no. 15), and he derived it from the texts of *A, D*.

in his list an explicit instruction to omit the relevant passage and replace it with another. If he does not do this, his readers will be unable to know just what the final text of this part of Nahmanides' commentary actually is. In the first case, Nahmanides deals with Joseph's dreams:

Commentary to Gen 42:9, mss *A, D* (= first edition):

*And Joseph remembered the dreams (ויזכר יוסף את החלומות) that he dreamed of them* – [That is, he remembered the dreams that he dreamed] concerning them, and knew that they had been fulfilled, for they had bowed down to him. This is the language of Rashi. And what is right in my eyes is that Scripture states that when Joseph saw his brothers bowing down to him, he remembered all the dreams which he had dreamed concerning them (כל (ואמר בלבו: עתה) הם (החלומות אשר חלם להם) they will all be fulfilled," for he thought that this trick would cause them to bring Benjamin, his brother, to him in order to fulfill the second dream as well where he said, "...and eleven stars bowed down to me (Gen 37:9)". This is the meaning of "And Joseph's ten brethren went down" (Gen 42:3), for the first dream related to the ten, and it was referring to them when the text read: *and he told it to his brethren, and they hated him yet the more* (Gen 37:5). And it was to them that he said: *for, behold, we were binding sheaves (ibid., 7)*, but Benjamin was not of that number, and so the first dream was fulfilled by them bowing down to him, but the second dream could not come true until Benjamin came down, together with his father.

According to the explanation proposed by Nahmanides in this text, the first dream – that of the sheaves – was fulfilled immediately upon the arrival of the ten brothers to Egypt. Nahmanides goes out of his way to explain that the dream was intended for the ten brothers before whom it was told and had never included Benjamin. The trick Joseph planned was aimed to bring about the fulfilling of the second dream, that of the sun and moon and eleven stars, and for this purpose it was vital to have Benjamin and Jacob come down to Egypt.

Afterwards, however, Nahmanides had second thoughts and proposed a far more complex trick as an explanation for Joseph's actions: according to the second edition (that appears in the usual printed editions, and is not adduced here because of its considerable length), neither of the dreams was fulfilled with the arrival of the brothers, for the first dream involved eleven brothers and not ten. Joseph's trick was comprised of two stages. At first he planned to bring Benjamin alone and in this way the first dream would be fulfilled, and only later would he reveal himself to his brothers, thus fulfilling the second dream as well.

Nahmanides' changed understanding made him erase a number of lines of his earlier commentary, from the words *ואמר בלבו עתה יתקיימו כלם* on. Indeed, in the text that appears in the usual printed editions

(and also, for example, in ms *MI*), these lines have been omitted. However, here is the text of the first addenda list:

52. [1] בפסוק ויזכור יוסף את החלומות [2] כל החלומות אשר חלם להם [3] ואמ' בלבו עתה [4] וידע שלא נתקיים... ויתקיימו כל חלומותיו [5] ואמר בלבו עתה.

There is no instruction to omit anything. On the contrary, the list instructs the reader to insert the long addendum [4] between the words "all the dreams he dreamt about them" ([2]) and the words "and he said to himself, now..." ([5]) – i.e., not to omit anything!<sup>21</sup> Nahmanides could evidently never have written such an instruction. It could only have originated with someone who saw a manuscript of Nahmanides' commentary with a long addition in the margin, and overlooked the fact that in the body of the manuscript itself, a number of lines were marked for omission.

For the Book of Genesis, it will be recalled, we only have the first list of addenda. For the Book of Exodus, however, where the second case of interchanged passages occurs, both lists appear in parallel and a comparison of them is interesting:

In his commentary on Chapter 24 of the Book of Exodus, Nahmanides deals with the order of the preparatory steps taken in anticipation of the revelation at Mount Sinai, the revelation itself and the Ten Commandments (described in chapters 19–20), and the covenant of the blood-basin (described in Chapter 24). Contrary to the opinion of Rashi, who considered the covenant of the basins to have preceded the giving of the Ten Commandments, Nahmanides believes that all these narratives appear in the order in which they were written down. Thus, the episode described in Chapter 24 occurred after the giving of the Torah and after Moses was given all the statutes of the Portion of Mishpatim (Ex 21–23). Nahmanides describes the order of events as he perceives it, relating in his commentary also to the events described in the Book of Deuteronomy. According to the description there, after the Ten Commandments, the people approached Moses, expressed their fear that if they continued to hear the voice of God directly they would perish, and asked that Moses alone hear the word of God and relay it to the people. God agreed to the people's request and said to Moses:

Go say to them: Return ye to your tents. But as for thee, stand thou here by Me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments, and the statutes, and the ordinances, which thou shalt teach them (Deut 5:26–27).

<sup>21</sup> Indeed, this is the text actually found in mss *H, P* as Kahana noted.

Nahmanides attempts to integrate the facts narrated in Deuteronomy with those related in Chapter 24 of the Book of Exodus. In the first edition of his commentary, he was of the opinion that the commandment given to the people, "Return ye to your tents", was given just before Moses' ascent to the mountain. Nahmanides says in his commentary on verse 3:<sup>22</sup>

Then Moses came together with them (=the heads of the tribes and the elders) to the place where the people were standing and told all of them all the words of God ('וסיפר לכולם את כל דברי יי') and they said, "we shall do (והם אמרו: נעשה) all that He had commanded us in the ten Commandments, and we will hearken to your voice in everything that you have commanded, or will command in His name, exalted be He".

When Moses went back afterwards to the edge of the mountain with the elders, as God had commanded him, God said to him again, *Come up to Me into the mountain, and be there* (Ex 24:12). It was at that time that He informed him, *I have heard the voice of the words of the people, which they had spoken unto thee: they have well said all that they have spoken* (Deut 5:25), and He commanded him: *Go say to them: Return ye to your tents. But as for thee, stand thou here by Me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandment and the statutes, and the ordinances, which thou shalt teach them* (*ibid.*: 27–28). It is with reference to this that He said here, *And I will give thee the Tablets of stone, and the law and the commandment* (Ex 24:12), meaning, that to you alone I will give the law and the commandments which you will teach them, and they will keep them as they have undertaken to do.

However, according to this suggestion, there was a time interval between the people's reaction to the Ten Commandments as described in Deuteronomy and their proposal to Moses, "Go thou near, and hear ...", and God's response to all this. The covenant of the basins described at the onset of Chapter 24 intervenes between the people's request and God's response. Moreover, the preparations for this covenant and its execution took at least two days, for the Biblical text tells us there: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord; and rose up early in the morning and built an altar under the hill ..." (verse 4).

This interval between the people's request and God's response bothered Nahmanides, and in the later edition of his commentary he proposed another way of integrating the episode as related in Deuteronomy with the description in Exodus. According to his new proposal, the commandment "Return ye to your tents" refers to a single night, the night between Moses' announcing to the people God's laws and statutes and the ceremony of the basin covenant.

<sup>22</sup> Nahmanides' commentary in the printed editions is in accordance with the first edition here. The version of the second edition can be found in mss *MI, H*.



In his second edition, Nahmanides explains the sequence of events of that night in his commentary to verse 1:<sup>23</sup> The commandment “return ye to your tents” is a command for only a single night, for on the following day the people returned and took up their positions for the ceremony of the Covenant of Basins. Nahmanides proposes two explanations for the dispersal of the people that day and its reconvening on the following day. The first is an *a posteriori* explanation: the many preparations needed for the Covenant of the Basins – the erecting of the altar and the monuments and the offering up of the sacrifices – could not have been accomplished the very same day the commandments were related to the people. The second explanation is an *a priori* one: the people needed a day to contemplate and internalize what they had heard (לתת להם עצה ומתון בדבר). Furthermore: the people utilized their return to the tents to celebrate the receiving of the Torah.

Nahmanides’ new explanation appears in his commentary on verse 1 of Chapter 24; this is addition no. 68 in Kahana’s list. The earlier explanation written in the commentary for verse 3 in the first edition is to be erased. Nahmanides thus rewrites his commentary there:

Then Moses came together with them to the place where the people were standing and told all of them all the words of God (וסיפר לכולם את כל דברי') (כי רצון הקב"ה כך הוא), that the desire of the Creator was that it be so

<sup>23</sup> The section mentions that Moses did according to the command of God, and came to the camp and told the people all the words of the Eternal as He had commanded him, *Thus shall you tell the children of Israel: Ye yourselves have seen* etc. (Ex 20:19); and all the ordinances as He had commanded him. *Now these are the ordinances which thou shalt set before them* (Ex 21:1). The people receive everything with joy and say, *All that the Eternal hath spoken will we do*, meaning that all these things that God had told you we will do, for we believe in your words; just as he narrated in the Book of Deuteronomy [that the people said to him], *and thou shalt speak unto us that which the Eternal our God may speak unto thee; and we will hear it, and do it* (Deut 5:24). And then God told Moses: *I have heard the voice of the words of this people, which they have spoken*, that they have received everything with joy, *Go say to them: Return ye to your tents*. And behold, they returned to their tents; and celebrated with a festive meal on the day they received the Torah. And Moses wrote down that day in the Book of the Covenant all that he had been commanded, laws and statutes and teachings, and took the Book so that it would be with him until the morrow, for there was no time that day to build the altar and the twelve monuments and to prepare the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings and to do all those many things (see *infra*, 4–8). Furthermore: it is also best for them to wait until the following day for the Covenant, to give them advice and counseling, so as to ensure that they desire to do this with all their hearts and all their souls. Moses rose early the following morning to perform for them the Covenant regarding everything (see there), and all the people of Israel rose early in his wake and returned to the places they had occupied when they received the Ten Commandments, and there he built the altar and offered the sacrifices, and put half of the blood upon the altar of God, and half of it he put in basins (Ex 24:4–6).

that they should learn the rest of the Torah from Moses. And they rejoiced and accepted this: all the words spoken by God we shall do, and we shall listen to you regarding His commandments (see Ex 24:7); then he gave them permission: *return ye to your tents* (Deut 5:25), as I have explained *supra* (v. 1).<sup>24</sup>

The change in verse 3 is worded as follows in both addenda lists:

The first list:

69. [1] בפסוק ויבא משה ויספר לעם [2] וספר לכולם את דברי יי' [3] והם אמרו נעשה [4] כי רצון הקב"ה כך הוא... או הגבה למעלה [5] והם אמרו נעשה.

The second list:

69. [0] בסדר ואלה המשפטים [2] ומשה בא עמהם אל מקום העם וספר לכולם את כל דברי יי' [4] כי רצון הקב"ה כך הוא... או הגבה למעלה. ונמחק מוהם אמרו נעשה כל דברי יי' עד נערי בני ישראל

(= and from יי' נערי בני ישראל until והם אמרו נעשה כל דברי יי' is erased. [These words are marked with erasure marks]).

The second list thus instructs the reader to omit a passage from the commentary—the passage belonging to the first edition. The erasure begins with the words והם אמרו נעשה until the end of the section (the words נערי בני ישראל are the beginning of the next section in Nahmanides’ commentary).

The first list, however, does not include an instruction to omit anything. Moreover, it does instruct the reader to go back to the words והם אמרו נעשה and to continue from there, so clearly they were not to be omitted. This evidently created a fragmented text, faulty and replete with contradictions. It is difficult to imagine that the writer of the text could have confused the wording of such an instruction.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Nahmanides adds here: “in the opinion of our Sages (see Shabbat 88a), who praise them: they said ‘we shall do’ before ‘we shall listen’ (*infra*, 7), for this means that they said: from here on we undertake to do and to perform whatever He commands us, whatever He desires and whatever He decrees, for we shall do it all immediately upon hearing Him, whether directly from Him or from your own mouth; we accept it all, whether it is trivial or serious, whether it is profound or exalted (או הגבה) – based on Isaiah 7:11”.

<sup>25</sup> The instruction to omit a passage was itself omitted from ms A (that represents the second list), and it seems as if the copyist of this manuscript did not understand its meaning. However, unlike the first list, there is no continuation here at all.

## C. Imagined addenda

The first addenda list includes five additions which are apparently not true additions made by Nahmanides. In other words: to the best of our judgment, the passages marked in them already appeared in the first edition of Nahmanides' commentary. There are three criteria for identifying an imagined addition: an analysis of the content of the added passage; its appearance in those mss that reflect the 'first edition' of Nahmanides' commentary; and its absence from the other addenda list. The coalescence of two or more of these criteria naturally strengthens the identification of the addendum as an imagined addition.

Two of the additions in Genesis contain passages which, if omitted from the commentary, will leave the text fragmented and unreadable. These are additions nos. 1 (Gen 1:8) and 5 (Gen 6:4), which have already been pointed out by Sabato.<sup>26</sup> Sabato has also shown that these two addenda are to be found in the text of the two mss representing the first edition of Nahmanides' commentary and are (nearly) free of added passages (ms *A* and ms *D*).<sup>27</sup> Sabato wonders why these two passages are included in the addenda list, and suggests that Nahmanides may have seen a copy of the commentary from which these passages were mistakenly omitted, and thus may have wanted to make sure that they were actually included in all copies of his commentary, and so copied them over into the list of additions.

Our conclusion that the list of additions to the Book of Genesis was not prepared by Nahmanides reduces Sabato's aforesaid wondering. It would appear that the copy before the compiler of the list contained these passages in the margin for some reason or other, a feature often found in manuscripts (and not always resulting from omissions made because of similar wording). We shall suggest hereunder that the compiler of the list actually did so in accordance with the marginal passages inscribed in the copy he had before him, and so came to include in his list both of these passages.

A third addition that is also an imagined addition is addendum no. 62 (to Ex 10:2), one we have already considered amongst the additions inserted erroneously. We suggested there, that the addenda passage found its way to the margin with a section missing because of similar wording. The other two criteria are fully met here: the addition has been

<sup>26</sup> For a discussion of these two passages see Sabato: 64–65.

<sup>27</sup> The second addendum list does not include the Book of Genesis, and so the third criterion of those I have defined cannot be met in this case.

inserted in its proper place in the body of ms *D*, and is not included in the second addenda list.<sup>28</sup>

Let us deal now with addendum no. 20 (Gen 13:12): this section of commentary stands here on its own two feet, and from this point of view it may well be a later addition. However, the passage appears in mss *A* and *D*, which represent the first edition of the commentary. Only one of the three criteria is applicable here, and so it may be suggested, hesitantly, that this passage too was already part of the first edition.<sup>29</sup>

Addition no. 89 (Deut 21:18) is an independent passage, but there are many indications that it is an imagined addendum: (a) it is to be found in ms *D*, that represents an almost pure first edition; (b) it is to be found in ms *M2*, which represents a pure first edition; (c) it is not to be found in the second addenda list (in ms *M2*); (d) it is one of the only two additions in the first addenda list, relating to Num 13 ff.

The first addenda list thus includes *five* imagined additions. In contrast, I have not located any imagined additions in the second addenda list.

## D. The limits of the addendum are unclear

In one of the additions there is a gap concerning the limits of the addition between what is stated in the addenda list and what is found by a comparison of the manuscripts:

Gen 49:10: In Tractate Horayoth of the Jerusalem Talmud (3:2), I have seen the following text: "We did not anoint priests as kings. Rabbi Yehudah Anturya said that this is an account of the verse, *The scepter shall not depart from Judah*. Rabbi Chiya, the son of Rabbi Abba, said [that the Scripture states concerning the king], *To the end, that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he and his children, in the midst of Israel* (Deut 17:20). Now what is written afterwards? *The priests the Levites... shall have no portion* (*ibid.*, 18:1)". Thus the Sages have taught here that kings are not to be anointed from among the priests, the sons of Aaron. Now at first the above text explains that this is out of respect for the tribe of Judah since sovereignty is not to depart from that tribe (שאינן השררה טרה מן השבט ההוא). <Therefore, even if Israel, out of temporary necessity, raises a king over itself from the other tribes, he is not to be anointed so that the glory of royalty should not be upon him. Instead, such kings are to be merely as judges or officers. The reason for mentioning 'priests' [when the same stricture applies to all

<sup>28</sup> It is indeed missing from the body of ms *A*, but appears in the margin (in its proper place).

<sup>29</sup> See Sabato: 65.

tribes other than Judah] is that even though the priests as such are suited for anointment, we are not to anoint them as kings, and all the more so the rest of the tribes. It is as the Rabbis said in the *Gemara* (*Horayot* 11b): we are to anoint only the kings of the house of David. And Rabbi Chiya, the son of Rabbi Abba, explained that anointing priests as kings is forbidden by a law of the Torah, which says that *the priests, the Levites, even all the tribe of Levi, shall have no portion nor inheritance in royalty*. This comment is a matter that is fitting and proper (והוא דבר ראוי והגון).

The first addenda list:

60. [1] באותו פסוק עצמו [2] שאין השררה סרה מן השבט [3] ולו יקחת עמים [4] לפיכך אע"פ שישראל מקיימים עליהם מלך משאר השבטים... והוא דבר ראוי והגון [5] ולו יקחת עמים

Nahmanides deals at length with Jacob's words מיהודה לא יסור שבט "The scepter shall not depart from Judah". In his opinion, this statement embodies a permanent prohibition against appointing kings that are not of the tribe of Judah. In the passage adduced here, Nahmanides brings the words of the Talmud Yerushalmi in Tractate *Horayot* and explains them. He says that the two Amoraim disagreed over the reason for the prohibition against anointing priests to serve as kings. According to R. Yehuda this prohibition is part of the general prohibition against appointing kings that are not of the tribe of Judah, and the priests are mentioned here in order to indicate that though they are worthy of being anointed as priests, it is forbidden to anoint them as kings. In contrast, R. Chiya believes that there exists a specific prohibition against priests being appointed as kings, and that this prohibition derives from the verse: חלק ונחלה לא יהיה לכהנים... (The priests... shall have no portion nor inheritance – Deut 18:1).

In both manuscripts representing the first edition, *A* and *D*, the entire passage does not appear in the body of the manuscript.<sup>30</sup> In contrast, the addenda list notes only the passage included between angular brackets. From a logical standpoint, the situation in the manuscript is understandable: Nahmanides encountered the discussion in the Talmud Yerushalmi only after he had finished writing his commentary to the verse, and when he found it, he adduced its words and explained them. In contrast, if we omit from the text only the passage defined in the addenda list, the discussion is fragmentary and almost incoherent. The possibility that Nahmanides added the passage in two stages seems unlikely. It is more reasonable to assume that he wrote the first sentences in the available space at the bottom of the page, and when there was no

<sup>30</sup> In ms *D* it appears in the margin. The data concerning the two mss were adduced by Kahana: 34. See Sabato: 65, n. 23.

more room, he wrote the rest in the margin. The editor of the addenda list thought that only what was written in the margin was Nahmanides' addition.

#### E. Imprecise notation of the verse that contains the addendum

We shall now examine the notation of the verse in the first addenda list (marked with the numeral [1]). It is to be noted at the onset that the list is arranged in a technical manner, and the verse annotation comes to note the precise point where the addendum is to be inserted. Whenever the addendum is an independent commentary on a new verse, it is attributed in the list to the *previous* verse discussed by Nahmanides. For example:

21. [1] בפסוק ויהי בימי אמרפל (Gen 14:1) [2] ולא שם לו על פני חוץ (the end of the commentary on verses 1–2) [3] אל עין משפט (vs. 7) [4] איל פארן (vs. 6) כתרגו'... אבל תירוש אמללה גפן [5] אל עין משפט (vs. 7)

The addition belongs to verse 6, and deals with the meaning of the name איל פארן, but the verse mentioned in the list as a place reference is verse 1. This is because the person holding the first edition was required to insert the new passage at the end of the commentary on verse 1 (and before the commentary on verse 7).<sup>31</sup>

However, in a number of places the verse reference is imprecise, and should rather have indicated a later verse. For example:

17. [1] בפסוק ויהי רעב בארץ (12:10 << 12:11–13) [2] בהתיאשם ממנה [3] ויראה מפשט הכתובים [4] כתב רש"י הנה נא... וכולם ככה. [5] ויראה מפשט הכתובים.

The added passage here defined appears in the middle of the commentary to vss 11–13 (headed by the words הנה נא ידעתי "Behold now, I know" etc. אמרי נא אחותי את "Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister"). Noting the previous verse, vs. 10, is a case of imprecision. It appears that

<sup>31</sup> The commentary on verse 1 is followed by a short note referring to verse 2, beginning מלך בלע וטעם. This note was marked as a commentary to verse 2 in the Chavel edition and in the *Miqra'ot Gedolot Ha-Keter*, just like many scores of commentary passages opening with the word וטעם. However, the compiler of the first addenda list does not regard such a commentary as an independent one, and always indicates commentaries opening with a citation of the words from the text without the word וטעם.

<sup>32</sup> The first reference is the aforementioned verse, while the second reference is the verse to which the addition relates. This double arrow notes that it would have been better had a verse been mentioned closer to the passage being explained.

the compiler of the list did not read Nahmanides' words accurately, but rather looked at the text of the commentary with the addition written down in its margins, and sought out the beginning of the paragraph marked by a space before it or by prominent lettering.

Here are further cases of similar imprecision:

20. [1] ובאותו פסוק עצמו תמצא (13:12 << 13:7) [2] מפני מכר המקנה [3] וטעם ואנשי סדום [4] וזה טעם ויבחר לו לוט... שלא יבוא בכל הככר. [5] וטעם ואנשי סדום.

28. [1] בפסוק ויפצר במ מאד (19:3 << 19:5) [2] לא היה בכל הגוים כסדום לאכזריות [3] אוציאה נא אתהן [4] ודע כי משפט סדום היה... אם יחיני הממית והמחיה [5] אוציאה נא אתהן אליכם

30. [1] בפסוק ויי' המטיר (19:24 << 19:32 + 20:2) [2] וכן תירג' אנק' רבתא [3] וישלח אבימלך מלך פלשתים [4] וטעם ונחיה מאבינו זרע... מגנים את לוט מאד. ויאמר אברהם אל שרה... והיה אומר לכל אחתי היא [5] וישלח אבימלך מלך פלשתים

#### F. Omission of addenda closely related with other additions

It can often be shown that there are close ties between an added passage mentioned in the first list and another addition that is not mentioned in it, but has been revealed as a result of comparing the manuscripts. Sabato refers to a number of examples of this kind. For example, in addendum no. 16 Nahmanides explains at length the distinction between אֱלוֹנֵי מוֹרָה and אֱלוֹנֵי מַמְרָא (or אֱלוֹנֵי מוֹרָה). This addition is closely related to the fact that in the first edition of the commentary, Nahmanides erroneously identified these two places. On the verse describing Abraham setting out in pursuit of the kings, מִמְרָא הָאֱמֹרִי, והוא שוכן באלוני ממרא האמורי, (14:13), Nahmanides notes: "The distance between *Elonei Mamre* – which is located at the beginning of the Land of Israel on the other side of the Jordan, near Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Eival – and Damascus is known to be great". In the later edition the text has been corrected and reads as follows: "from Elonei Mamre which is in Hebron, in the land of Judah"<sup>33</sup>. This emendation, however, is not included in the addenda list. There are additional examples of this kind.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> See Sabato: 76–77.

<sup>34</sup> See the discussion in Sabato: 107–111, regarding addendum no. 59 and the three short additional passages connected to it, which were not included in the addenda list.

#### *On what basis was the first addendum list compiled?*

The series of proofs I have adduced suffices, in my opinion, to demonstrate without a doubt that it was not Nahmanides who compiled the first addenda list. This conclusion raises the question, how was this addenda list prepared? What were the methods employed by the compiler and just how could he identify the additions to the original commentary?

What appears to me to be the most likely hypothesis is that the compiler of the addenda list had before him the original text in the margins of which Nahmanides had written down the additions to his commentary.<sup>35</sup> That anonymous compiler examined this text, and prepared a list of the addenda he found in its margins. Such an explanation provides well for his failures as noted above: he may have misunderstood just where the addition was to be inserted, or may have overlooked erasure marks in the body of the manuscript, or may have reported that some words were written in the margins while they were actually from Nahmanides' original text and not a later addition.

There is another possibility as well: the compiler of the list may have discovered Nahmanides' additions as the result of comparing two manuscripts of the commentary, one representing the first edition and the other representing a later one. However, in this case, it will be difficult to explain the instances where the addition was not inserted in its precise place.

#### *The second addenda list and its relationship to Nahmanides*

We have already seen that the second addenda list is attributed explicitly to Nahmanides. This list appears in the manuscripts together with Nahmanides' letter concerning the *shekel* he found upon his arrival in Acre, and this fact strengthens the attribution of the list to Nahmanides. In contrast to the first list, I found in the second list no signs that cast doubt upon the authorship of Nahmanides: it contains no cases of incorrectly positioned insertions or of imagined additions, and wherever necessary there appears an instruction to erase a passage no longer va-

<sup>35</sup> Or perhaps another copy that represented the first edition and had been consistently updated from Nahmanides' original text. It should further be noted that Nahmanides died in or about the year 1270, and the unknown compiler of the first addenda list prepared it at the very latest in the year 1458 (the year of origin of ms *P*), and perhaps much earlier. It is thus reasonable to assume that he saw Nahmanides' original manuscript.

lid.<sup>36</sup> So there is no reason to doubt the attribution of the second list to Nahmanides.

Nonetheless, I do not claim that the second list exhausts all the addenda from the Book of Exodus on. On the contrary: one can point out many passages that were not included in the first edition and yet are not included in the addenda list. A comprehensive study of this subject is a matter itself worthy of independent consideration. It shall suffice here to discuss two additions that appear in the first list, and yet do not appear in the second one.<sup>37</sup> The first case relates to the discussion of the purpose for sending out the spies to the Land of Israel and deals with the command *והתחזקתם ולקחתם מפרי הארץ* “And be ye of good courage, and bring of the fruit of the land” (Addendum 88; Nu 13:2):

[Furthermore] it is possible that it was because Moses knew that it is a fertile and good land – as he was told, *unto a good Land and a large one, unto a Land flowing with milk and honey* (Ex 3:8) – that he told them to set their minds ascertaining this [fact], so that [upon their return] they would tell the people about it, and they would rejoice and gain renewed strength to go up there in joy. Therefore he told them, *And be ye of good courage, and bring of the fruit of the Land* (Nu 13:20), so that they [the people] would see with their own eyes the goodness of the Land.

<Now it is well-known that Egypt is not very far from Hebron – approximately a distance of a seven-day journey – and the border of the land of Canaan comes close to Egypt, and it is therefore impossible for people living in Egypt not to know about the land of Canaan whether it is good or bad. And indeed Moses’ intention was to find out the way in which he should go up, and the cities which he was to capture first, as I have explained. However, since the Israelites in Egypt were slaves doing the most rigorous work, *they did not know neither did they understand* (based on Ps 82:5) [the nature of the Land], therefore Moses wanted the spies to tell them all the particulars of the Land in order to cause them to rejoice in its qualities, since he [himself] knew of them.>

The second passage adduced *supra* is the added passage. In this passage, Nahmanides presents a disguised difficulty relating to his interpretation in the first passage. At first, he had explained that Moses was familiar with the nature of the Land of Canaan as a result of what he was told prophetically, and that the purpose of sending out the spies was to inform the people, as well, of the nature of the Land. In the second pas-

<sup>36</sup> This list does not include notations of the verse containing the addendum (i. e., the passages which we marked by “[1]”). As a result, it contains no cases of imprecise notations.

<sup>37</sup> Regarding two other cases (no. 62 and no. 89), we have already shown that they are imagined additions, and so it is not difficult to understand why they do not appear in the second list.

sage, however, Nahmanides argues that Egypt was not far from Hebron and that it was not possible for one living in Egypt not to be aware of the nature of Hebron. It is easy to appreciate that the latter passage was written after Nahmanides had arrived in the Land of Israel and had visited Hebron. At this point, he was even able to note the time it would take to make the trip from Hebron to Egypt.<sup>38</sup> As a result, Nahmanides replaced the explanation he had offered at first (though he refrained from erasing his first explanation): Moses was certainly aware of the nature of the Land and had no need of prophecy for this purpose; the people, however, were not aware of it as they had been engaged in hard labor that dulled their thinking and resulted in their not knowing that which any ordinary human being would.

Besides the matter of content, there is strong evidence that this is an added passage: the first addenda list indicates this explicitly, and the passage does not appear in either of the two manuscripts representing the earlier edition: ms *D* and ms *M2*. The fact that this passage does not appear in the second addenda list (in ms *M2* and ms *S*) is thus surprising.<sup>39</sup>

Far more surprising is the absence of addition 68 that deals with the order of events following the giving of the Torah – and has already been discussed *supra* (together with addition no. 69).<sup>40</sup> These two addenda are closely related to one another, for addition no. 68 includes a passage that replaces the passage Nahmanides decided to erase at the end of addition no. 69. Addition 68 does not appear in any of the three manuscripts of the second addenda list (*M2*, *A*, *S*), and I believe that it can only be assumed that it was omitted from the list at an early stage, as a result of a copyist’s error.

It is to be stressed that these difficulties are not sufficient to rule out the attribution of the second addenda list to Nahmanides. First of all, a number of passages may have been omitted from the original list as the result of copyists’ errors. And even if we assume that Nahmanides overlooked a number of passages, a mistake of this kind could indeed have befallen the compiler of the commentary. There is no comparison what-

<sup>38</sup> A similar sentence appears in addition no. 52, which deals with Joseph’s dreams (mentioned *supra*): “[...] how was it possible that he (= Joseph) did not send a single letter to his father to inform him of his whereabouts and comfort him, *as Egypt is only a six-day journey from Hebron?*”

<sup>39</sup> In ms *A*, the passage has been inserted in its proper place in the body of the manuscript. This manuscript represents the last edition of Nahmanides’ commentary to the books of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

<sup>40</sup> In the section “The absence of an instruction to erase a passage that was nullified” pp. 334–337.

ever between the seriousness of this mistake and that of the problems that beset the first list.

*Why is the Book of Genesis not represented in the second list?*

If only the second addenda list was compiled by Nahmanides – as I argued *supra* – the question then arises: why does this list begin with the Book of Exodus and does not include the Book of Genesis? This appears to be the most difficult and important question arising from the discussion of the Nahmanides addenda. A list truncated at its end is easy to explain: something occurred that prevented the compiler from completing the task he had undertaken. But why did Nahmanides see fit to omit the Book of Genesis and begin his addenda list with the Book of Exodus?

I have no clear-cut answer to this question. I shall thus present the various logical possibilities and indicate the one that seems to me to be the most appropriate.

In fact, there exist only two possibilities: the first is that Nahmanides compiled a list of addenda to his commentary on Genesis, but this list has not survived. The other possibility is that Nahmanides never compiled an addenda list relating to Genesis. All we can do is theorize as to how the Genesis addenda list was lost or why it was never actually compiled.

If we adopt the first possibility, we will thus wonder why Nahmanides' list did not survive. It may have been merely a matter of chance: perhaps the addenda manuscript was damaged, and its first few pages lost. On the other hand, it is to be noted that the three manuscripts of the second list open in identical fashion—they all begin with the additions relating to the Book of Exodus, and the first addendum is identical in all three: addition no. 63 in the portion of *Bo el Par'o* "Come before Pharaoh". It would thus seem that Nahmanides had no additions relating to the Book of Exodus that would have preceded this addendum.<sup>41</sup> This argument is of course not decisive, for the three manuscripts may all have derived from a single source after the loss of the additions to Genesis.

Another hypothesis can be formulated: Nahmanides may have sent the addenda list pertaining to the Book of Genesis as one of two sepa-

<sup>41</sup> There is no addition between the opening of the Book of Exodus and addition no. 63 in the first addenda list either, except for addition no. 62 which, as we have already noted, is actually an imagined addition. I have personally examined the marginal annotations in ms *A* from the beginning of the Book of Exodus until addition no. 63, but found not the slightest indication of a later addition of a commentary passage.

rate lists, the other one being the list of all the other additions. The first list was lost, while the second one survived. From a quantitative point-of-view, the number of additions in the Book of Genesis (60) almost equals the number of additions in all the other books of the Torah combined (74).

The direction that appeals to me, however, is the very opposite: Nahmanides seems to me to have deliberately chosen not to compile an addenda list for the Book of Genesis. The reason for this that seems logical to me is the following: Nahmanides' commentary on Genesis contains nearly a hundred additions: sixty of these are documented in the first list; Sabato points out another 36; the addition referring to the tomb of Rachel (Gen 35:16) is not included in these. The relative number of addenda in comparison with the entire commentary on the Book of Genesis is large, more than twice as large as the relative number of annotations in the other four books of the Pentateuch.<sup>42</sup> Nahmanides may well have felt that the large number of changes relating to the Book of Genesis did not justify or made it impossible to update the commentary merely by means of inserting addenda that have been handed down in a list, and may have preferred that potential students of his updated commentary on Genesis request an updated copy and then copy from it. In this context, one should indeed emphasize the difficulty encountered by a scribe who tries to copy the commentary from a book that does not include the addenda and uses such an addenda list to copy from the new passages and insert them in their precise places in the new copy that he is making. Errors and confusion might well result from the incautious use of the addenda list. In particular, additions might be inserted in the wrong place and mixtures of the initial and final versions of the commentary might be created. An examination of the manuscripts of Nahmanides' commentary shows that such fears were indeed well grounded.

*The addenda lists and the undocumented additions*

As already noted, Sabato has pointed out thirty-six undocumented addendum passages relating to the Book of Genesis, revealed by comparing Nahmanides' manuscripts. There undoubtedly exist many more ad-

<sup>42</sup> The Chavel edition of Nahmanides' commentary on Genesis contains 277 pages and includes 60 documented additions, i. e., one addition per an average of 4.5 pages; Nahmanides' commentary on the other four books of the Pentateuch contains 763 pages and includes 74 documented additions, i. e., one addition per an average of 10.3 pages. It is to be noted that of the other four books, the Book of Numbers is the most replete with annotations (147 pages that contain 27 additions; i. e., one annotation per 5.4 pages).

dendum passages, especially relating to the other four books of the Pentateuch, and I intend to discuss them elsewhere.

Why were some of the additional passages not included in the lists? Sabato asked this question and expressed his opinion that there were several "waves" of additions and that some of these were written out while Nahmanides was still in Spain, prior to his move to the Land of Israel. As supporting evidence, Sabato indicated a passage in which there are noticeable signs of two stages of additions to Nahmanides' commentary and where only the second of these stages was included in an addenda list.<sup>43</sup>

It is indeed possible that some of the additional passages were not included in the lists because they had been added to the commentary at an early stage. Moreover, the opposite situation is also a possibility: perhaps Nahmanides added new passages to his commentary in his last years, after he had compiled the addenda list.

However, Sabato has indicated a number of examples in which strong ties exist between documented additional passages and undocumented ones, whether they appear adjacent to one another or not.<sup>44</sup> In light of what we have seen about the nature of the lists, and in light of the argument that it was not Nahmanides who compiled the first addenda list, it appears to me that most of the undocumented additional passages are neither earlier nor later than the documented ones. The difference between the two types of addenda is linked to the compilation of the addenda lists and to the operation of the list compiler.

In the case of the first addenda list, the choice of additions might well have been by chance. Certain glosses in the manuscript margins may have seemed to the compiler of the list to be localized emendations of copyists' errors rather than additions. Furthermore, it appears that the compiler of the list preferred to include in it larger passages and omitted shorter ones. Further evidence of this is found in a statistical examination of the addenda. While the average length of the documented additions is 8.5 lines in the Chavel edition, the average length of the undocumented additions listed by Sabato is only 2.5 lines.<sup>45</sup>

In the case of the second addenda list, compiled by Nahmanides himself, the criteria governing the inclusion or non-inclusion of passages were perhaps those of an author conscious of the content of the pas-

<sup>43</sup> See Sabato's summation on pp. 120–124 and his discussion of example 15 on pp. 90–95.

<sup>44</sup> See Sabato, examples 4, 28.

<sup>45</sup> The length of 23 of the 36 additions found by Sabato (64%) is less than 2.5 lines, while only ten of the 134 documented additions are of that length (7.5%).

sages, yet aware of the problematic side of the use of lists as a means of updating the commentary. Nahmanides may well have determined deliberately to omit from his lists certain changes he had made in his commentary. It is also not impossible that he erroneously overlooked a few additions he had made.<sup>46</sup>

#### *The classification of the manuscripts of the commentary according to editions*

The main way to identify addenda passages, to understand their significance, to date them and to determine which of the various hypotheses presented *supra* to prefer – is to carry out a broad and systematic examination of the manuscripts. Over fifty manuscripts of Nahmanides' commentary are listed in the computerized catalog of the Institute for the Photographing of Hebrew Manuscripts, of which only a few have been examined in the context of the addenda question. For our purposes it is especially important to locate mss that reflect both extremes: mss reflecting a "first edition," 'free' of addenda, and mss reflecting "the last word", that include as many addenda passages as possible.

From the articles by Kahana and Sabato, we learn that two mss reflect the "first edition": ms *A* (for Genesis and Exodus) and ms *D*. These two mss are extremely important, but it should be recalled that neither of them is entirely 'clean' of additions: ms *A* includes (in the body of the manuscript) the well-known addition concerning Rachel's tomb (Gen 35:16), and the addenda from the Book of Leviticus onward, while ms *D* includes thirteen of the documented additions.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Sabato wonders (on p. 111) whether Nahmanides deliberately refrained from including in the addenda list he sent to the diaspora all those emendations stemming from the additions and included only the additions themselves. He may have done so to avoid causing confusion in the existing copies of the commentary. Sabato makes this point in connection with the Book of Genesis, but from what we have learned, the Genesis addenda list was not compiled by Nahmanides. However, the criterion considered by Sabato could have been a valid criterion for some other compiler, and also with regard to additions Nahmanides himself wrote out (and which appear in the second list).

<sup>47</sup> Five additions to the Book of Genesis have been inserted into the body of the manuscript (nos. 1, 5, 20, 26 and 41), but three of these are actually "imagined additions" (see Sabato: 65–66). Seven additions have been added in the Book of Exodus (nos. 62, 68–73), while one addition (which may be an "imagined addition") relating to the Book of Deuteronomy has been inserted (no. 89). To these we must add eight undocumented addendum passages noted by Sabato (nos. 29–31, which are virtually certain, and nos. 32–36, which are doubtful), which are not to be found in ms *A* but do appear in ms *D*.

A “final edition” is reflected by many mss and especially the printed versions.<sup>48</sup> However, addenda passages not found in the printed versions can be found in the manuscripts. Even those mss that do reflect, in the main, the “final edition” do not include all the additions.

### ‘Ms Munich’

One of the important mss of Nahmanides’ commentary is ms Munich, which divides up into two manuscripts: ms Munich 138 contains the commentary on the Books of Genesis and Exodus, and ms Munich 137(!) includes the commentary on the Books of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. Those studying the commentaries of Nahmanides have referred to the two parts as if they were a single manuscript: Steinschneider described the two parts as a single item in the catalog he compiled,<sup>49</sup> while Kahana and Sabato have discussed this addenda list and its reflection in the mss, but have not distinguished between its two sections. The *Miqra’ot Gedolot Ha-Keter* project examined the Nahmanides mss and chose ms Munich as the basic text of Nahmanides’ commentary on the Pentateuch.

Yet an examination reveals that as far as the addenda are concerned there is a substantive difference between the two mss. Ms *M1* (Munich 138 – to Genesis and Exodus) contains almost all the documented addenda,<sup>50</sup> while ms *M2* represents a pure ‘first edition’ without any addition in the body of the ms.<sup>51</sup> The addenda list is to be found, as already noted, at the end of this manuscript.

These two manuscripts differ from each other in the number of lines on every page and in the design of the “opening words”. Moreover, at the end of ms *M2*, there appears an inscribed bill of sale dated the 27<sup>th</sup> of Tammuz 5172 (1412),<sup>52</sup> which reads as follows:

<sup>48</sup> For example, the Chavel edition reflects all the documented addenda (except for nos. 68–69, which we have discussed *supra*, in the body of the article).

<sup>49</sup> Moritz Steinschneider, *Die Hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof und Staatsbibliothek in München* (1895): 85.

<sup>50</sup> In ms *M1* only additions 2, 3, 4 and 6 are missing. Sabato shows that additions 1 and 5 are imagined additions, and thus the first part of the manuscript (until chapter 8 or 9 of Genesis) contains no additions.

<sup>51</sup> Kahana erred in saying (on p. 35) that addition 742 at the beginning of the Book of Leviticus appears in ms *M*. As far as addition 75 is concerned, he noted in his list that it is found in ms *M* and also that it does not appear in it. In the wake of Kahana’s error, Sabato too made a mistake in describing the additions of ms *M* in Leviticus and Numbers (p. 63).

<sup>52</sup> The bill of sale was copied over partially in Steinschneider’s catalog, p. 81.

Before us, we the undersigned, testify that Avraham Yamin (?), an emissary, admitted that he had received from Don Vidal bar Shelomo (of blessed memory), son of Alrabbi, four and a half ‘flowers’ of gold from Aragon, that are beautiful and of full weight, and sold him in return this book which is a commentary on the books of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, three books of the Pentateuch, as interpreted by Nahmanides z”l. [...]

Ms *M2* is thus a pure manuscript representing the ‘first edition’, and it is very significant for purposes of clarifying the text of the commentary. Ms *M1* is not a part of it, though it is indeed possible that after Don Vidal bar Shelomo acquired the ms, he wanted to complete the commentary of Nahmanides to Genesis and Exodus, and so he initiated the writing of ms *M1*.

### Conclusion

The additions composed by Nahmanides to his commentary on the Pentateuch must be examined and studied in light of the two addenda lists and in light of all extant mss of the commentary. In general, most of the addenda mentioned in the lists find support in a comparison of the manuscripts, while on the other hand there exist other addenda that are not documented in lists, but may be identified by comparing the mss.

Nahmanides seems to have compiled the second addenda list himself, from the Book of Exodus on, and he may have deliberately dropped the idea of treating the Book of Genesis in the same manner because of the large number of changes he had made to his original commentary. The first addenda list was compiled by someone else, as indicated by certain faults in the manner of description that the author would probably not make.

### The Manuscripts

*A* = Ms Parma Platina 3258 (de Rossi 1378); F 13945 (in the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in the National Library in Jerusalem) – Nahmanides’ Commentary to the Pentateuch and a list of addenda.

*D* = Ms Fulda Qu. A.2; F 2141 – Nahmanides’ Commentary to the Pentateuch.

*H* = Ms The British Museum, Harley 5703 (Margaliouth 208); F 4871 – Nahmanides’ Commentary to the Pentateuch and a list of addenda.

*M* = Ms. Munich 138–137 (See *M1* and *M2*).

*M1* = Ms. Munich 138; F 1188 – Nahmanides’ Commentary to Genesis and Exodus.



*M2* = Ms Munich 137; F 1187 – Nahmanides' Commentary to Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy and a list of addenda.

*S* = Ms Oxford 2253/12; F 20536 – a list of addenda.

*P* = Ms Parma Platina 3535; F 14042 – Nahmanides' Commentary to the Pentateuch and a list of addenda.

### *Bibliographical Abbreviations*

Kahana = Kalman Kahana, "Nahmanides' Additions to his Commentary on the Pentateuch", *HaMa'ayan* 9:1 (1969): 25–47 (in Hebrew).

Sabato = Mordechai Sabato, "Nahmanides' Additions to his Commentary on the Pentateuch", *Megadim* 42 (2005): 61–124 (in Hebrew).