

A SPANISH RECENSION OF RASHI'S COMMENTARY TO TRACTATE BERAKHOT IN A FRAGMENT FROM A GIRONA HISTORICAL ARCHIVE BINDING

Original handwritten copies of the commentary to the Babylonian *Talmud* composed by Rashi, Šelomo bar Isaac (1040-1105), are not extant. The only textual witnesses extant are a few copies produced by later scribes, mostly dating to the 14th and 15th centuries, and early printed editions from the end of the 15th century and beginning of the 16th century.¹ Characterization of the various extant manuscripts of a given tractate is a central focus of preliminary research in the process of preparation of a critical edition of that tractate's commentary. Recently, several studies have been dedicated to this subject. This article is devoted to several textual witnesses to the commentary to tractate *Berakhot*.

Introduction

The commentary of Rashi to tractate *Berakhot* has been preserved in its entirety in two manuscripts: Parma Palatina 2589 and London, British Museum, Or. 5975; in the printed Soncino edition of 1484; and portions of the commentary are preserved in various manuscripts and early editions of the *Talmud*. In addition, *En Ya'aqov*, a compendium of Aggadah, legends of the *Talmud*, contains a version of Rashi's *Talmud* commentary to these sections. The *Halakhot* of Isaac Alfasi (mostly abbreviated from

the *Talmud*) is also commonly accompanied by an adaptation of Rashi's commentary. The legal works of various other medieval sages on tractate *Berakhot* commonly cite or paraphrase Rashi. These sections cited usually discuss legal sections of the *Talmud* as the medieval sages tended to skip over the aggadic sections and focused on the legal sections. An updated list of textual witnesses to the commentary follows this article in the form of an appendix.

Y. Malhi authored a series of studies on the textual witnesses of the commentary of Rashi to tractate *Berakhot*, covering most of the manuscript sources which were then available.² His conclusions regarding the relationship between the main textual witnesses will now be summarized briefly.

According to Malhi, the commentary is witnessed by two branches of families:

A. The Soncino edition of the *Talmud*. Manuscript F2 (described in Appendix A) resembles this text closely. This branch represents the French-Ashkenazi textual tradition. The texts of the commentary cited in the *Tosafot* of Judah Messer Leon and in the legal compendium *Or Zarua'* belong to this branch.³

B. The Parma and London manuscripts. The texts of these manuscripts are closely rela-

¹Not including early printed editions, the average number of complete manuscripts of Rashi's commentary to a tractate is about 2.5.

²Malhi's series of publications began with his dissertation: Y. MALHI, פירוש רש"י למסכת ברכות: הנוסח שבידינו ונוסחאות אחרות [Rashi's Commentary to tractate *Berakhot*], Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, 1983 (henceforth: MALHI, Commentary). He then published a book: רש"י - הפירוש לתלמוד [Rashi - the Commentary to the *Talmud*], Jerusalem, 2010

(henceforth: MALHI, Rashi). Among the manuscripts listed in Appendix A below, Malhi did not examine the following: C, D2, D3, F1, F3, G, H, J, L, M. He studied the version of the commentary of Rashi appended to printed editions of Alfasi, but not manuscripts of this version.

³Regarding the text of the commentary in the Soncino edition see: MALHI, *Commentary*, p. 93; MALHI, *Rashi*, pp. 54-55, 66-68, 101-119, 133-141. Regarding manuscript F2 see: MALHI, *Commenta-*

ted, containing common errors which resulted from being copied from the same source or one from the other. The London manuscript contains fewer errors than the Parma manuscript.⁴ The versions of the commentary found in *Šeride Bavli* and *‘En Ya‘aqov* constitute a derivative of this family. This branch represents the Italian or Italian-Spanish textual tradition. The texts of the commentary cited by Isaiah of Trani in *Pisqe ha-Rid* are similar to those found in the Parma and London manuscripts. The versions found in Zechariah Aghmati’s *Sefer ha-ner* at times resemble those found in the Parma and London manuscripts and at other times resemble those found in *Šeride Bavli* and *‘En Ya‘aqov*.⁵ Malhi referred to this branch as “Italian-Spanish” primarily due to the fact that the text of the Spanish *Šeride Bavli* resembles the texts of the Parma and London manuscripts more closely than the text of branch A. Also, the texts of this branch are close to those found in *Sefer ha-ner*, whose Moroccan author liberally cites the sages of Spain and the Islamic world.⁶

Due to the small number of textual witnesses to the commentary of Rashi to tractate *Berakhot*, as with most tractates, each additional witness of the commentary utilized sharpens our impression of the original “Urtext” of the commentary or, at the very least, casts light on the subsequent evolution of the text. A new textual witness to the commentary on tractate *Berakhot* has just been discovered which has not yet been the subject of scholarly analysis of any sort.

The Girona manuscript of the commentary of Rashi to tractate Berakhot

Rashi composed his Talmudic commentary in Northern France in the middle of the 11th century. The commentary slowly but steadily spread to other *Torah* centers. Spanish sages do not mention the commentary until the middle of the 12th century, which, therefore, is when it arrived there. From the beginning of the 13th century the commentary became a central element of discussion among the Spanish sages.⁷ For some tractates, manuscripts are extant which were copied by Spanish scribes during the 14th and 15th centuries.

In the late 1980s, various Hebrew manuscripts were discovered in the Arxiu Historic of Girona, located in the province of Catalonia in northeast Spain. These manuscripts were preserved in the bindings of Notary books. Due to the cost of paper and parchment, pages were glued together to serve as bindings for other books. This process began around 1330 and continued until the Spanish expulsion.⁸ Fragments of Rashi’s commentary to several tractates are found among the manuscripts of the archive. These manuscripts preserve text versions which circulated in Catalonia in the 14th century. Sadly, the examples for most tractates are extremely fragmentary in nature.⁹

The fragments which survive from the commentary to tractate *Berakhot* are especially important, for they are numerous and preser-

ry, pp. 57-62. On Judah Messer Leon see: MALHI, *Rashi*, pp. 101-112. Regarding *Or Zaru’a* see there, pp. 112-119.

⁴Regarding the text of the Parma and London manuscripts see: MALHI, *Rashi*, pp. 53-54, 63-66.

⁵On the text of *Šeride Bavli* see: MALHI, *Rashi*, pp. 68-71, 122-123. For *‘En Ya‘aqov* see there, pp. 88-98, 123-127. On *Pisqe ha-Rid* see there: pp. 112-119. For *Sefer ha-ner* see there: pp. 127-132, 180-192.

⁶MALHI, *Commentary*, pp. 38-39; MALHI, *Rashi*, pp. 53, 127-128. Regarding the Spanish provenance of *Šeride Bavli* see below, near note 75.

⁷Manuscripts of the commentary of Rashi were also in the possession of laymen. The Arxiu Historic of Girona holds a booklist from the year 1389 of

Abraham Samuel, a resident of Peralada, a village north of Girona. The list includes the commentaries of Rashi to tractates *Roš ha-Šannah*, *Sukkah*, *Pesah Rišon* (chapters 1-4, 10), and Bava Batra. See the anonymous article: *Notes Bibliographiques*, «Tamid» 2 (1998-1999), pp. 242, 245, 252.

⁸Regarding this collection and studies on it, see: M. PERANI, *The “Gerona Genizah”: An Overview and a Rediscovered Ketubba of 1377*, «Hispania Judaica Bulletin» 7 (2010), pp. 137-173.

⁹Gi 1, 114 (1, 2, 3, 4) contains the commentary of Rashi to tractate Šabbat 2b-5b, 13b-16b; Gi 5, 205 (1) covers Šabbat 20b-22a; Gi 1, 90 (4) covers *Pesahim* 3a-4a, 8b-9a. Gi 1, 260 (15) covers *Yevamot* 2a; Gi 1, 237 (1) covers *Yevamot* 75a-77b. Gi 1, 130 (1) covers *Giṭṭin* 2a-3a. Gi 10, 26 (5) covers *Soṭah*

ve a significant portion of a genuine Spanish manuscript version of the commentary. Parts of the manuscript were preserved in two different notary books housed in the archive. The vast majority of the fragments were extracted from a volume labeled Gi 2, 81, pp. 6, 7, 9, 11-15, and 21, extracted from that binding. Eight of these nine pages comprise complete bifolios; page 13 consists of half of a bifolio. All together these comprise 34 sides. Each page contains 30 lines written in clear, legible script. On all pages the majority of the text is legible, but some is corrupted due to torn pages or blurred ink. The binding of an additional volume, Gi s. XIV, pp. 10, 13, 15, 20, 22, 23, 26, and 27, contain 15 small fragments which were frayed from 12 faces of the pages in the first volume.

The surviving portion of the manuscript preserved in the two volumes covers about 24 pages of printed editions, mostly contiguous, spread across the second half of tractate *Be-rakhot*. This covers over a third of the text of the commentary to the tractate, including the following pages of the standard editions:¹⁰ 29b-36b, 39b-43b, 46b-50a, and 52b-61a.

The protocols found in the first notary book are from the years 1400-1401. The manuscripts in the binding are almost certainly older than the protocols of the notary book,¹¹ so 1400 may be considered an absolute terminus ad quem for the composition of the manuscript. However, in 1391, great disasters and upheavals struck the Jewish communities, so it stands to reason that the manuscript was written before that date.

The Girona manuscript and other textual witnesses to the commentary of Rashi to tractate Berakhot

Previously it was mentioned that Malhi studied the relationships between the textual witnesses to Rashi's commentary to tractate *Be-*

rakhot. Now, the topic can be revisited in the light of the Girona manuscript and a comparison of it with other textual witnesses from the Spanish peninsula, such as the Parma and London manuscripts, the Soncino edition, *Śeride Bavli*, and *‘En Ya‘aqov*. In most instances, the text of the Girona manuscript is similar to that found in other textual witnesses to the commentary. There are occasional scribal errors and omissions, especially homeoteleuton. Over the length of commentary, there are significant differences between the text found in the Girona manuscript and other texts, especially additions and omissions to points of reference to the text of the *Talmud*. We prepared a sample comparison between the aforementioned textual witnesses for 27 loci in which there is a disagreement with the existing complete textual witnesses. Of these, the Girona manuscript corresponds to the Soncino edition in 16 cases, to the Parma and London manuscripts in 7 cases, and the Soncino edition corresponds to the Parma and London manuscripts in 4 cases. Only portions of the commentary are preserved in *Śeride Bavli* and *‘En Ya‘aqov*, but it is enough to determine a close correlation between these two witnesses and the Girona manuscript.

The Girona manuscript was copied in Spain. *Śeride Bavli* editions were printed in Spain and nearby Portugal so the similarity can be explained by geographic proximity. This also explains the similarity with the text of *‘En Ya‘aqov*, which was transmitted via the Spanish-Portuguese exiles.¹² These three witnesses represent the Spanish branch of the text of Rashi's commentary to tractate *Be-rakhot* from the 14th and 15th centuries. *Śeride Bavli* and *‘En Ya‘aqov* should not be grouped together with the Parma and London manuscripts, as Malhi proposed, but rather, as part of this Spanish branch. The similarity between the Parma and London manuscripts, which was correctly noted by Malhi, consists of a separate branch which should not be described as "Italian-Spanish".¹³ This would

32a-32b. Gi 1, 90 (1) covers *Hullin* 21a-21b, 33a-34a, 44b-45a. I thank Leor Jacobi for alerting me to the collection of the Archive of Girona.

¹⁰ A detailed description of the contents of each fragment can be found below in Appendix B.

¹¹ See PERANI (above, note 8), p. 148.

¹² Regarding the sources of *Śeride Bavli* and *‘En Ya‘aqov* see the descriptions in Appendix A.

¹³ Malhi's opinion near Note 6, above, regarding the relationship between the Parma and London

more fittingly be referred to as an “Italian-Byzantine” branch due to its similarity to the text cited by Isaiah di Trani in *Pisq̄ ha-Rid*.¹⁴

The text of the Soncino edition forms a third branch. It at times preserves a text distinct from the other two branches by way of additions, omissions, and discrepancies in word order and points of reference. In cases in which there is a discrepancy between the text of the Girona manuscript and the Parma and London manuscripts, the Soncino edition more often resembles the Girona manuscript. It appears that the Soncino edition and the related manuscript F2 preserve a branch which was circulated in Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries, not a French-Ashkenazi branch.¹⁵

Textual additions in the Girona manuscript

As previously stated, the Girona manuscript contains comments which are not found in several or all of the other textual witnesses. These textual supplements come in various forms. The following discussion will focus on selected locations of interest over the length of the commentary, organized according to type. We will then analyze the version of Rashi’s commentary to tractate *Berakhot* which circulated in Spain. Quotations from the *Talmud* are from the Soncino edition unless otherwise stated.

The following notation will be employed:
 <..> = part of word missing, <...> = entire word missing, [] = text hypothetically reconstructed.

manuscripts and *Sefer ha-ner*, is difficult to accept, but will be discussed elsewhere.

¹⁴ MALHI, *Commentary*, p. 80; MALHI, *Rashi*, p. 114, noted that in 33 cases in which there is a discrepancy between the texts of the to the commentary of Rashi to tractate *Berakhot* in the Parma and London manuscripts and in the first edition, the text of RID follows the manuscripts 31 times and only twice follows the printed edition.

¹⁵ Malhi determined that this is a French/Ashkenazi branch due to the resemblance between the texts of the printed edition and those found in the Tosafot of Judah Messer Leon and *Or Zaru’a*. See: MALHI, *Commentary*, pp. 77-81, 239-280; MALHI, *Rashi*, pp. 73-76, 101-115. However, this matter is

A. Additional commentary cited under the heading: “yeš omerim”

On occasion, Rashi cites additional commentaries to the ones he often adds under the heading: “yeš omerim”. In the printed editions of the commentary this occurs only twice in the entire tractate.¹⁶ In the Girona manuscript, of which was noted that only a portion is extant, four “yeš omerim” appear. In three of them, the “yeš omerim” appears as part of the point of reference to the *Talmud*, and in the other one (#4) the Talmudic citation immediately follows the “yeš omerim” heading.

1. Page 43b of tractate *Berakhot* states:

האי נרקום דגנוניתא מברכין עליה בורא עצי בשמים

The Commentary of the Girona manuscript:

נרקום: בריזיל בלעז ויש אומי חבצלת >השרון
 ב<הלכות גדולות

Other textual witnesses cite only the second interpretation, as follows:

Parma: חבצלת השרון בהלכות גדולות

London: חבצלת השרון בהלכות גדולות

First Edition: חבצלת השרון בהלכות גדולות

The three witnesses contain identical interpretations but the target text of the *Talmud* varies. נרקין is a corruption of נרקום. נרקום is cited by many of the early Sages.¹⁷ This spelling is similar to נרקיס, found in early sources and several textual witnesses of the *Talmud*.¹⁸ The spelling found in the Girona manuscript,

not clear, even according to the data presented by Malhi himself.

¹⁶ Rashi, 28a loc. שפחמי 57b loc. דמסרג.

¹⁷ The text נרקום is found in the Soncino edition, *Halakhot Alfasi, Or Zaru’a* (*Hilkhot se’uda* 179), *Rašba* (43a), Aaron ha-Levy, *Talmid Yonah, Riṭva, Berakhot Maharam* (Jerusalem 1988, ch. 21). In the Munich 95 manuscript of the *Talmud*: נרכום.

¹⁸ Such as: הלכות גדולות [*Sefer Halakhot Gedolot*], Ed. E. HILDESHEIMER, Vol. 1, Jerusalem 1972, p. 137; תשובות רב נטרונאי גאון [*Tešuvot Rav Natrunai bar Hilai Gaon*], Ed. R. BRODY, Jerusalem 1994, #438; and ערוך השלם [*Aruch Completum*], Ed. A. KOHUT, Venice 1890, loc. נרקיס. This spelling is also found in the Paris 671 manuscript of tractate

כרקום, is cited by several early sages.¹⁹ The comment: בריזיל בלעז ויש אומרים is not found in other witnesses, including the version of Rashi surrounding *Alfasi*,²⁰ and in *Sefer ha-pardes* (Ch. 7), *Šiboley ha-leqet* (154), and *Rašbaš*.²¹ However, an alternate vernacular tradition is attributed to Rashi by the sages of Provence. In the 13th century Rabbenu Manoah of Narbonne states in his *Sefer ha-menuḥa*:²²

In our Books of the *Talmud* we find נרקום and Rashi's commentary states that it is called גראויל... However, according to the *Talmud*, which refers to it as נרקום, it appears to be חבצלת, for חבצלת השרון is translated as מתילא לנרקום רטוב דמן גנתא דערון.

A similar interpretation appears in *Sefer ha-battim*, composed by David HaKokhavy of Etoile in the 14th century:²³

נרגיס... Rashi interpreted this as גרביויל but there is an [alternate] opinion that it is חבצלת השרון which is referred to as אילויל.²⁴

Both of these sages attribute the vernacular interpretation to Rashi: גראויל, Catalan: *grèvol*, Holly. From the text of *Sefer ha-menuḥa* it is unclear whether the second commentary, חבצלת השרון, is also part of the citation from Rashi's commentary, but according to the text of *Sefer ha-battim* it appears that this interpretation is not Rashi's.

The Girona manuscript cites a vernacular interpretation and then an alternate one, attributed to *yeš omerim*: חבצלת השרון. However, the vernacular is different and the interpretation

חבצלת השרון is attributed to *Sefer Halakhot Gedolot*, as in the other witnesses to the commentary. Neither the version of the Talmudic text nor the vernacular בריזיל are found in the other manuscripts. It appears that this vernacular refers to the French *brésil* (Catalan: *brasil*), a tree which produces red dye. This word is appropriate to translate the textual variant כרקום>כרכום, which is identified as a tree that produces yellowish/orange dye. If the other textual witnesses are accurate, it appears that a later scribe added the vernacular and shifted the original interpretation to appear as *yeš omerim*. He could have been motivated by the unique variant: כרקום, which fits neither the vernacular גראויל nor Rashi's חבצלת השרון.

2. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 47a states:

א"ל שמואל אילו מיתו לי ארדיליא וגוזליא לאבא מי לא אכילין

The Girona manuscript's commentary:

אילו מיתו ארדיליא וגוזליא לאבא: לשמואל היו חביבין עליו ארדיליא בקינוח סעודה והן כמהין ופטריות ויש אומרים מין ולרב היו חביבין גוזלות ושמואל היה קורא לו [אב]א לכבודו

The commentary offers two interpretations of ארדיליא: A) Truffles and mushrooms; B) According to *yeš omerim*: "מין". Clearly the commentary has been truncated and is missing words. *Talmid Yonah* states:²⁵

There are those who interpret ארדיליא as truffles and there are those who interpret it as type of herb, for Samuel was a doctor and would consume various herbs after dining.

Berakhot. The Florence manuscript reads: נרקים. Oxford: נרגיס. A similar version, נרגיס, is found in *Sefer ha-ner*, *Mišnah Torah* (Berakhot 9, 6), *Bet ha-behira* (attributed to: (יש גורסים), *Sefer ha-battim* and *Nimuqe Yosef*, *Rašbaš*: נרגס. *Sefer ha-šorašim* of Yonah ibn Janaḥ (Berlin 1896, p. 176) reads: פירש רב האיי בנרקיס דגנוניתא נרגיס ואמר הוא חבצלת השרון.

¹⁹ *Sefer ha-menuḥa* of Rabbenu Manoah of Narbonne (Ed. E. HURWITZ, Jerusalem 1970, p. 331) and Meiri transmit the text of *Rambam* as כרכום. *Sefer ha-pardes* of Ašer bar Ḥayyim Nevyo (Ša'ar 7) also quotes this version. See the next footnote.

²⁰ The commentary of Rashi surrounding *Alfasi* has an abbreviated text: חבצלת השרון (Manuscripts read: כרקום).

²¹ *Nimuqe Yosef*: נרגיס: חבצלת השרון ויש אומ' שהיא ררשה בלעז.

²² p. 331.

²³ ספר הבתים [*Sefer ha-battim* of Dawid Kokhavy], Ed. M.I. HA-KOHEH BLAU, NY 1978, *Ša'arey Berakhot*, 11,4.

²⁴ The vernacular אילו appears to be the product of a scribal error. See *Sefer ha-menuḥa*, p. 330, note 39.

²⁵ A similar version is found in *Šiṭa Mequbešet*.

We find a similar passage in *Ritva*, who was greatly influenced by *Talmide Yonah*:²⁶

There are those who interpret ארדיא as a type of meat and there are those who interpret it as a type of herb, for Samuel was a doctor and would consume herbs after dining.

These sources suggest that the text of the Girona manuscript should be restored to:

ויש אומרין מין עשב.²⁷

In the other textual witnesses the second interpretation is not found: The Parma manuscript and the first edition give only the first interpretation while the London manuscript contains neither. Was the second interpretation really authored by Rashi himself? The phrase מין עשב is used by Rashi several times at other loci of his commentary to the *Talmud*.²⁸ However, as previously stated, it is rare for Rashi to include a second commentary as *yeš omerim*. Furthermore, this interpretation is not found in the other witnesses, the version of Rashi on *Alfasi*,²⁹ *Sefer ha-ner, Or Zarua'* (*Hilkhot se'uda*, 194), *Rivevan*, *Rašbaš*, and *Nimuqe Yosef*.³⁰ Thus, it appears that Rashi authored the first interpretation and the second one, מין (או מיני), עשבים, is most likely a later scribal addition. Possibly this interpretation was copied into the Girona manuscript (or its source) from the commentary of *Talmid Yonah*.

3. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 56a states:

אמר ליה חזית דמשחרי לך פרסאי וגרבי לך ורעיי בך
שקצי בחוטרא דדהבא

The Girona manuscript:

[מ]שחרי לך פרסאי: [עושים] >ב< עבודת המלך כמו
לא חמ[רא דחד מנהון שחרית] ולשון [חכמים] הדבק

לשחזור וישתחוו [לך] ויש אומ' לא חמור אחד מה[ם]
נשאתי

In the printed edition, and similarly in the Parma and London manuscripts and *'En Ya'aqov*:

משחרי לך פרסאי: עושים בך עבודת המלך כמו לא
חמרא דחד מנהון שחרית ולשון חכמים הדבק לשחזור
וישתחוו לך

These textual witnesses are lacking the concluding *yeš omerim*. They quote the text לא חמור אחד of the verse (Numbers 16:15) for which *Targum Onqelos* was previously cited: לא חמרא דחד מנהון שחרית. The purpose of the addition of the verse here is unclear. One might suppose that the original verse was added later in order to aid a student unfamiliar with the *Targum*. Rashi usually cites a verse before its *Targum*. The scribe who copied it after the *Targum* erroneously understood it as an alternate interpretation and so labeled it: *yeš omerim*.

4. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 59b states:

רב יוסף אמר מאיה דקירא ולעיל

The Girona manuscript:

איה דקירא: שם מחוז היא על פרת. ויש אומ' מאיה:
מאותה. דקירא: שפ>וע ה<נהר. ע"א דקירא: פורט
בלעז וכן פירש המורה [בפרק] לא יחפור

In *Seride Bavli* the page containing this commentary is not extant but at the top of the following page the word יחפור is written, which clearly indicates the final word of this commentary. So at least this part of the commentary of the Girona manuscript is also in *Seride Bavli*. On the other hand, the other textual witnesses contain a much shorter version. In the first edition:

איה דקירי: שם מחוז שהוא על פרת

ding to which also the ארדליא was desired by Rav. In any case we find only the first interpretation of ארדליא there.

³⁰ In *Sefer ha-'Arukh* (loc. ארד), *Sefer ha-ner*, and *Rivevan*, only an abbreviated form of the first interpretation is found: כמהין, without פטריות. *Sefer ha-mikhtam* reads: כלומ' מיני כמהין. The first interpretation is found in most textual witnesses of Rashi and the second one is only found here in *Sefer ha-mikhtam*.

²⁶ See: I.M. TA-SHMA, חלק, הספרות הפרשנית לתלמוד, 1400-1200: שני, [Talmudic Commentary in Europe and North Africa: Literary History, Part Two: 1200-1400], Jerusalem 2000, p. 77.

²⁷ Perhaps the rest of the sentence is missing as well: ששמואל היה רופא והיה אוכל מיני עשבים אחר אכילתו.

²⁸ Even in Rashi's commentary to tractate *Berakhot*, see 43b loc. סמלק.

²⁹ An unusual explanation is found there, accor-

In the Parma manuscript and similarly in the London manuscript:

איהי דקירא: שם מחוז הוא של פרת

The Girona manuscript contains three interpretations. The first interpretation is: שם מחוז היא על פרת. It is also found in the commentary of Rashi to Kiddušin 72a and Bava Batra 24a. *Yeš omerim* offer a second interpretation: מאיהי: שפוע הנהר דקירא. מאותה. According to this interpretation מאיהי is understood as from it and דקירא is *the slope of the river*. Perhaps דקירא is translated: *of the wall*. In other words, a place where the river slopes from a wall alongside the river.³¹ A third interpretation follows: ענין אחר: פורט בלעז דקירא. The vernacular פורט is used elsewhere by Rashi to translate נמל.³²

However, here it translates קירא and so too in *Megillah* 6a: מקום מעבר הנהר ובלעז: אקרא: פורט. The label: *inyan aher* is found quite rarely in Rashi's commentary and is more commonly found in the commentaries attributed to Rashi.

After the third interpretation of the Girona manuscript we find: וכן פירש המורה [בפרק] לא יחפור. If this teacher referred to is Rashi, then clearly this was written by a student. In Chapter *Low Yahpor* of Bava Batra Rashi's interpretation follows the first interpretation here but it is quite forced to explain that this addition to the third interpretation is actually referring back to the first interpretation. It is possible that Rashi authored the first interpretation which a student was referring to and subsequently a later scribe erroneously moved the note to the end of the third interpretation instead of the first one. Another more remote possibility is that the teacher referred to is Rashi, but the intended reference was to *Megillah* and Bava Batra containing the same phrase was erroneously cited. A third possibility is that the teacher referred to is not Rashi but another Ashkenazi sage who

commented on Bava Batra like the third commentary here. For the expression: המורה, *the teacher*, was used often in Mainz and it is commonly found in Rashi's commentary.

It appears that only the first commentary actually emanates from Rashi. The second to interpretations are not found in most textual witnesses and conflict with Rashi's commentary to Kiddušin and Bava Batra. They were probably added later, possibly by students.

Four examples have been studied in which the Girona manuscript cites interpretations under the heading: *yeš omerim*. In examples 2, 3, and 4, the interpretation appears to stem from a later source than Rashi. However, in example 1 it seems that Rashi's commentary was cited as: *yeš omerim*, and the interpretation which is not Rashi's was added before the *yeš omerim*.

B. Additional interpretation labeled *lišna ahrina*

In Rashi's commentary to the *Talmud* we come across the phrase: *lišna ahrina*. In some of those instances this phrase labels an alternate text of the *Talmud*.³³ However, in most instances it introduces an alternate interpretation to the same Talmudic text. The phrase is more commonly found in the commentaries to tractates where the attribution to Rashi is doubtful than in the commentaries where the attribution is accepted. Since it is found in the standard commentaries these commentaries should not automatically be considered later additions but must be examined individually on their merits.³⁴ We will now examine one instance of *lišna ahrina* in the Girona manuscript which does not appear in the printed edition.³⁵

³¹ Compare the Commentary of Rashi, *Kiddušin* 73b loc. פירש. An explanation similar to the second interpretation is found in *Sefer ha-Arukh* (loc. דקר: קריאה של נהר: *a gushing river*. See *Arukh ha-šalem*.

³² See, for example, Rashi, *Eruvin* 41b loc. לנמל, *Yoma* 38a loc. לנמלה, *Avodah Zarah* 34b loc. נמילא דעכו.

³³ In such cases, the word גרסין is usually appended, such as Rashi, *Eruvin* 11b loc. אבי; *Eruvin* 81a loc. לאפוקי.

³⁴ In the printed editions of the commentary we find fourteen instances of לישנא אחרת (or לשון אחר), at times repeating the quotation and at times foregoing it.

³⁵ See below, example 8.

5. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 48a contains a phrase appearing in the textual witnesses in alternate versions:

Soncino Edition:	מקטפי ידיע	בוצין בוצין
Florence:	מקיניה ידיע	בוצין
Oxford:	מקטפיה ידיע	בוצין
Munich 95:	מקיטפיה ידיע	בוצינא
Paris 671:	מפיניה ידיע	בוצינא

In most witnesses we find מקטפיה, but in the Florence manuscript: מקיניה.³⁶ The version in the Paris manuscript, מפניה, appears to be a corruption of מקיניה. This passage is explained in the Girona manuscript as follows:

מקיניה: מקן שלו מקטנותו. בוצין: דלעת. ואית דגרסי מקטפיה וקטף הוא שרף האילן כלומר משעה שהוא חונט ויוצא מתוך השרף הוא ניכר אם יהיה טוב. לישנא אחרינא בוצין: קרא קטנה כדאמרין בוצינא טב מקרא (כתובות פג ע"ב). מקיניה ידיע: כלומר כשהיא קטנה ניכרת אם נגדלת לשבח. מקיניה: כמו קן צפור

The first section, from מקיניה until יהיה טוב, is found in all the textual witnesses to the commentary: Parma, London, the Print, *Šeride Bavli*, and *‘En Ya‘aqov*. The *lišna aḥrina* which follows in the Girona manuscript is not found in the Parma and London manuscripts or in the first edition. However, it is found in *Šeride Bavli* without the heading: *lišna aḥrina*,³⁷ apparently omitted erroneously. In *‘En Ya‘aqov* the comment appears in a slightly different form, also missing the heading: *lišna aḥrina* and without the phrase: מקרא... כדאמרין.

There are several differences between the versions: A. In the first interpretation מקיניה is explained before בוצין. In the second version the order is reversed and corresponds to the order of the *Talmud*. B. In the first version, בוצין is explained as דלעת. In the second version it is explained as קרא קטנה and is followed by a proof text. (דלעת is basically synonymous with קרא). C.

The first version explains the word מקיניה. The second version first explains the phrase מקיניה ידיע and then explains the word מקיניה. D. The first version explains two variants: מקיניה and מקטפיה. The second version only explains the variant: מקיניה.

It appears that the second version is not Rashi's. The interpretation of בוצין as קרא קטנה is not characteristic of Rashi, who generally distinguishes between בוצינא and קרא by explaining בוצינא as דלעת קטנה and קרא as דלעת גדולה.³⁸

According to Rashi, the interpretation קרא קטנה is impossible, because he explains it generally as being דלעת גדולה. Furthermore, the word נגדלת does not appear anywhere in Rashi's commentaries and is not in his linguistic style.

Apparently, the scribe copying the commentary had an additional commentary which he occasionally drew from and supplemented with under the heading: *lišna aḥrina*.³⁹

C. Identical points of reference with different commentaries

Rashi differentiates between alternate interpretations with labels such as לישנא אחרינא, אי נמי, פירוש אחר, ורבותי פירשו.

In the Girona manuscript we often find a style not frequently encountered in the other textual witnesses: the text of the *Talmud* is cited twice, each with an alternate interpretation with no label or indicator at all dividing the two Talmudic citations.⁴⁰ This phenomenon could be explained by the omission of the indicator by the scribe of the Girona manuscript; alternatively, he could have selected from other commentaries and supplemented them to Rashi's commentary without labeling the additions or without realizing his repetition. We will now examine three such cases in the Girona manuscript.

בוציני. commentary to *Megillah* 12b loc.

³⁹ See also the results in example 8, below.

⁴⁰ See: A. AHREND, מפירוש אשכנזי על מסכת [Remnants of an Ashkenazi Commentary to tractate *Roš ha-Šannah*], «Kobez al Yad» 17 (2003), pp. 142-143.

³⁶ The variant מקיניה is found in *Sefer ha-Arukh* (loc. בוצין א). The variant מקטפיה is found in *Riṭva* here and in *Tosafot Sukkah* 56b loc. בוצינא.

³⁷ Another variant in *Šeride Bavli* is ידיע instead of ידיע.

³⁸ See Rashi, *Sukkah* 56b loc. בוצינא; *Ketubbot* 83b loc. בוצינא; *Temurah* 8b loc. דמסיק. See also his

6. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 57a:

המתפלל בחלום סימן יפה לו והני מילי דלא סיים

The Girona manuscript and *Seride Bavli* read:

דלא סיים: נראה שמראין לו שלא סיים מעשיו ויחיה
דלא סיים: שנעור משנתו קודם שנסתלק סימן שסמוך
אצל הקב"ה

דלא The citation of the point of reference appears twice without any division between the two comments. The first comment explains that the prayer not having been completed in the dream indicates that the dreamer will live on actively. The second comment interprets the end of the prayer as when three steps back are taken in withdrawal from the divine presence, and explains that his awakening before the withdrawal represents a closeness to the divinity. The Parma and London manuscripts and the first edition contain only the second interpretation. This second interpretation appears to be original, as the word סימן is commonly used by Rashi in his commentary to the Talmudic passages concerning dreams in the ninth chapter of the tractate, *ha-ro'eh*. On the other hand, the word מראין used in the first interpretation is not found there.⁴¹ The fact that the second interpretation is the one found in the other textual witnesses supports this conclusion.

7. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 57b:

שלשה נכנסין לגוף ואין הגוף נהנה מהן גוגדניות וכו'

The Girona manuscript states:

גוגדניות: איילנו... <...> עתי. גוגדניות: עץ הוא
שקורין ציריריש בלעז

The reference word גוגדניות appears twice without any dividing phrase between them. In other textual witnesses we do not find this repetition. The Parma and London manuscripts read: גוגדניות: אלנידרי, *ailendre* in Old French,

referring to coriander.⁴² Rashi often uses this word to explain גוגדניות.⁴³

However, the printed edition reads: גוגדניות: ציריריש. The Girona manuscript contains both vernacular interpretations. The second vernacular term is: ציריריש, *cireres* in Catalan, cherries. In the printed edition this vernacular was erroneously copied as ציריריש.⁴⁴ It appears that the first interpretation appearing in the Girona manuscript can be reconstructed as: גוגדניות: איילנו [דורי] <...> [שמ] עתי. The missing word in the middle may be [כך] or possibly [ואני]. In the second case ואני שמעתי introduces the second interpretation: גוגדניות עץ וכו'. This is followed by explaining that a tree is being referred to and the vernacular which is found in the first edition is cited. It appears that the first interpretation is original, as it is frequently used by Rashi. The second interpretation is probably not Rashi's for in his commentary to *Gittin* 71a (ad. Loc. בפירי) he uses the vernacular ציריש shortly after explaining on page 70a that גוגדניות refers to איילנדרא, strongly implying that ציריש is not the interpretation of גוגדניות.

8. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 59b:

מאי חדקל אמר רבא שמימי חדין וקלין

The Girona manuscript:

חדין: דרדיפי מיא. וקלין: לשקול במאזנים
וטובים לשותות שאין מכבידין. חדין: שהוא נהר שוטף
שמהלכין [מי] מיו בזריות. וקלין: שחמין⁴⁵ מימיו
בהליכתן ונותנין קול גדול קלין קול <נ>ין

In this case two sequential points of reference are repeated without any indicator separating them: חדין and קלין. A similar version is found in *Seride Bavli*, as follows:

חדין: חריפי⁴⁶ מיא. וקלין: לשקול במאזנים
וטובים לשות' שאין מכבידין את הגוף. לישנא אחרינא
חדין: שהוא נהר שוטף שמהלכין מימיו במהירות.

⁴¹ In addition to this case, on page 57 of tractate *Berakhot* Rashi uses the word סימן another 12 times. He never used the term מראין.

⁴² According to: A. DARMESTETER & D.S. BLONDHEIM, *Les Gloses Françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi*, I. Paris 1929, No. 19.

⁴³ See the commentary of Rashi to Exodus 16:31 and Numbers 11:7; his commentary to *Eruvin* 28a loc. גוגדניות, *Yoma* 75a loc. כגידא, and *Gittin* 70a

loc. גוגדניות. Rashi also uses the vernacular איילנדר to translate כוסבר, see his commentary to *Šabbat* 109a loc. כוסברתא and *Sukkah* 39b loc. והכוסבר.

⁴⁴ In Old and Modern French: cerises. See DARMESTETER & BLONDHEIM (note 42 above), No. 177. See also: *Berakhot Maharam*, p. 6.

⁴⁵ Should read: שהומין.

⁴⁶ This appears to be a scribal error and should read: דרדיפי.

וקלין: שהומין [מי] מזו בהליכתן ונותנין קול גדול קלין קולנין

Śeride Bavli discerns between the two interpretations with the signifier: *lišna aḥrina*. It is possible that this heading was added subsequently to a version such as that found in the Girona manuscript, or possibly it was erroneously deleted from the Girona manuscript. In the Parma and London manuscripts and in the first edition the second interpretations are not present.

We will now examine the relationship between the two interpretations. The word חדין is interpreted as דרדיפי מ״א according to the first interpretation.⁴⁷ This refers to rushing waters in a flowing river.⁴⁸ The second interpretation is very similar to the first one. קלין is explained in the first interpretation as the Hebrew קלות, *levity*. In the second interpretation is understood as the Hebrew קול, *voice*. It appears that the first interpretation is Rashi's.⁴⁹ The second interpretation's connection between קל and קול is not found elsewhere in Rashi's commentary and so doesn't appear to emanate from him. The fact that this interpretation is absent in the other textual witnesses supports this conclusion.

The examples were analyzed in which points of reference in the commentary of the Girona manuscript were repeated. In the first example, the second interpretation appears to be Rashi's, whereas in the other two examples it is the first interpretation that we would attribute to Rashi.

D. Additional point of reference

Sometimes we find a point of reference cited in one textual witness of Rashi's commentary which is absent in the others. Usually this occurs with a short point of reference. We will

now present three examples of additional points of reference in the Girona manuscript which do not appear in all of most other witnesses.

9. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 32a:

אמרי דבי ינאי אין ארי נוהם מתוך קופה של תבן
אלא מתוך קופה של בשר

The Girona manuscript:

אין ארי נוהם מתוך [קופה] של תבן: קופה גורביילא
בלעז שמח ומשתגע ומזיק

The Harvard, Cambridge, manuscript reads:

אין ארי נוהם [מתוך קופה של תבן: קופה] גורביילא
בלעז שמח ומשתגע ומזיק

En Ya'aqov preserves the following text:

אין ארי נוהם מתוך קופה של תבן: שמח ומשתגע ומזיק

In other witnesses the text is shorter. The Parma and London manuscripts read:

אין ארי נוהם אלא מתוך: שמחה ומזיק

The Oxford manuscript and first edition:

אין ארי נוהם: שמח ומשתגע (בדפוס: ומשתגע) ומזיק

The Girona manuscript contains the vernacular גורביילא which explains the word קופה, and it seems that the Harvard, Cambridge, manuscript contains the same text. The word is not found in the other witnesses or elsewhere in Rashi's writings. It appears that the commentary is referring to the Catalan *garbella*, a vessel for holding meat after its removal from the oven.⁵⁰ Perhaps it is the Old French *corbeille*, meaning *basket*.⁵¹ The text is rather unusual: first the word קופה is translated to the vernacular and then the word נוהם is defined, which precedes it. Furthermore, the word קופה is often found in the *Talmud* and Rashi always ignores it and never explains it in his commentaries. The fact that the vernacular does not appear in Rashi's cor-

⁴⁷ See *Yoma* 77b, *Sukkah* 18a, *Avodah Zarah* 39a.

⁴⁸ Compare *Yoma* 77b: שאני נחל דרדיפי מ״א, and Rashi's commentary: היוצא מבית קדש. שאני נחל: הקדשים שהיו מימיו רודפים הולכים מהר ושוטפים רדיפי. Also see Rashi's commentary to *Sukkah* 18a loc. and *Avodah Zarah* 39a loc. דרדיפי.

⁴⁹ Regarding water not adding weight, also see

Rashi's commentary to *Bava Mešia* 81b: שׁל סדינא: פשתן ואין מים מכבידין אותו כל כך.

⁵⁰ However, the vernacular term is referring here to a container of straw whereas a container of meat is mentioned later instead.

⁵¹ See: M. KATAN, *על תנ״ך ועל השׁס*, Jerusalem 2006, *Sanhedrin* 39a, #1696.

pus is a further cause of suspicion. Thus, we can conclude that the entire comment: קופה: גורביילא בלעז, was inserted into the commentary of Rashi by a later scribe and preserved in two textual witnesses.

10. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 46b:

תנו רבנן אין מכבדין לא בדרכים ולא בגשרים

The Girona manuscript reads:

לא בדרכים: כגון שמהלכין בדרך למקום חוץ לעיר
לומר לגדול לפני תלך. ולא בגשרים: אפילו בעיר

In other witnesses we find a shorter text:

לא בדרכים: לאמר לגדול ממנו לך לפני: Parma
לא בדרכים: לומ' לך לפני: London
לא בדרכים: הולכי דרכים לומר: Printed Edition
לגדול הימנו לך לפני

Other witnesses do not mention a context of Rashi, "outside the city limits". They also do not contain any comment to בגשרים, "not on bridges". The commentary of Rashi appended to *Alfasi* and in the commentary of Yehonatan of Lunel. *Rasba* and *Nimuqe Yosef* also do not include the additional text found in the Girona manuscript.⁵² *Sefer ha-menuḥah* explains as follows:

ולא בדרכים ולא בגשרים: פרש"י אפילו בעיר
ואין צריך לומר חוץ לעיר כי כל הדרכים בחזקת סכנה
וכל שכן הגשרים ומשום הכי אין מכבדין

Sefer ha-menuḥah does in fact attribute to Rashi a comment which relates to road's location and the bridges. However, he explains that not giving precedence to others on the roads applies within the cities and certainly on bridges, whereas according to the Girona manuscript giving precedence is only done outside of city limits. Menaḥem ha-Meiri wrote in his *Bet ha-behirah*:

וגדולי הרבנים פרשוהו בהולכי דרכים בעיר מכבדין

Gedole ha-Rabanim is Meiri's standard nickname for Rashi, which means that his copy of the commentary of Rashi, according to which

precedence not being given on the roads refers to locations outside of the city limits, was similar to the version found in the Girona manuscript.

Talmid Yonah commented:

לא בדרכים: יש מפרשים שבדרכים שבעיר קאמר...
ויש מפרשים שלא נאמר אלא על ההולכין מעיר לעיר...

Talmid Yonah was familiar with two interpretations. According to the first, precedence is not given on the road even within the city, as per *Sefer ha-menuḥah*, and according to the second, this applies even outside the city limits, as per the Girona manuscript.

Thus we find that in Provence and in Girona a unique version of the commentary of Rashi to this passage was in circulation, which does not resemble other textual witnesses or citations of other early sages.

11. Babylonian *Talmud* 48a:

אמר לה קא חזית דלא מקבלי מרות

The Girona manuscript contains the following two comments to this passage:

אמר ליה:⁵³ ינאי למלכתא. חזית דלא מקבלי: שאין
מכירין רבנן שום טובה שאדם עושה להם

The texts of *Seride Bavli* and *'En Ya'aqov* are similar to the Girona manuscript:

Seride B.:

ואמ' לה: למלכת'. חזית דלא מקבל מרותא: שאין
מכירין רבנן שום טובה שאדם עושה להם

'En Y.:

א"ל: למלכת'. חזי דלא מקבלי מרותא: שאין מכירין
רבנן שום טובה שאדם עושה להם

In contrast, neither the Parma and London manuscripts nor the first edition contain these comments. A certain gap in Rashi's commentary is filled by these comments. It is not clear whether these are original comments of Rashi which were omitted in certain manuscripts or whether they are later additions not composed by Rashi.

⁵² *Rasba* reads like most textual witnesses of Rashi's commentary: לאמר לגדול ממנו לך. He then cites loc. ולא בגשרים, but not following the text of the Girona manuscript. In *Nimuqe Yosef*

we find: הולכי דרכים. לא בגשרים: שהוא מקום סכנה.

⁵³ Should read: לה.

We have seen three examples of additional comments found in the Girona manuscript. The first two appear to be later additions to the text. The third is inconclusive: it may be either a later addition or an original interpretation of Rashi.

E. Expansion of an existing comment

A common occurrence in textual witnesses of the commentary of Rashi is that one witness expands on a particular comment over and beyond the others. Below we will examine several locations at which the Girona manuscript expands on the text found in the other witnesses.⁵⁴

12. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 42a:

אמר רב הרגיל בשמן שמן מעכו

The Girona manuscript explains:

הרגיל בשמן: למשוח ידיו אחר האכילה להעביר הזוהמא

The Parma, London, and Cambridge manuscripts, as well as the first edition, do not contain the final words: להעביר את הזוהמא, which explain the reason for anointing the hands. Also, *Or Zarua'* (1, 177), *Pisqe ha-Rid*, and *Nimuqe Yosef*, who all copied from the commentary of Rashi, do not include this text. *Ritva* explains:

הרגיל בשמן: כלומר לסוך ידיו בשמן אחר אכילה כדי להעביר זוהמת האוכלין

Ritva's wording is similar to that of Rashi's comment and so it appears likely that his copy of Rashi contained the additional words להעביר הזוהמא. It seems like these words are a later addition to the commentary.

13. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 42a:

ברך על היין שלפני המזון פטר את היין שלאחר המזון

According to the Girona manuscript:

בירך על היין וכו': ... ואוכלין פרפראות כגון כסני דמעלו לליבא ולחמניות קשטילש ואובלירש והן יין ופרפרת שלאחר המזון

This comment is found in the other textual witnesses,⁵⁵ but they vary regarding the word קשטילש and the vernacular ולחמניות. The word ולחמניות is found in the Parma manuscript and in the first edition but not in the London manuscript. The vernacular is only found in the Girona manuscript. As far as the early sages go: Yehonatan of Lunel and *Sefer ha-battim* contain neither לחמניות nor vernacular. *Šīṭat Rivav* and *Nimuqe Yosef* include לחמניות but not the vernacular. *Rašbaš* includes both לחמניות and the second vernacular as follows: פת הבאה בכיסנין ולחמניות שקורין אובלירש. It is possible that ולחמניות is a part of Rashi's original commentary.

The vernacular appear together in the literature of Rashi of the 12th century: *Mahzor Vitry*, *Siddur Rashi*, and *Sefer ha-pardes*.⁵⁶ קשטילש are to be identified as Old French *chantels*, pieces of bread.⁵⁷ אובלירש are clearly אובלירש, Old French *oblede*s, biscuits, crackers, cookies.⁵⁸ This vernacular was already cited twice previously in the commentary, a few rows above this comment and on page 41b explaining: פת שנלושה עם תבלין. It is extremely rare for Rashi to utilize the same vernacular even twice in proximity, so the possibility that this comment is original to Rashi's commentary is even more remote. These vernaculars should not be considered part of Rashi's original commentary, but rather, were added to Rashi's literature by an early scribe. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the vernaculars appear neither in the other textual witnesses nor in the citations of the aforementioned early sages. *Rašbaš*, in which the second vernacular is found, is a relatively late work which was apparently influenced by the Girona manuscript or a similar version.

⁵⁴ See above as well, Example 10. For an exceptional case in which the expansion is also found in the text of the printed edition see Example 16.

⁵⁵ The first edition reads והוא instead of והן, a scribal or printing error.

⁵⁶ [Mahzor Vitry of Šimḥa of Vitry], Ed. A. GOLDSCHMIDT, Vol. 1, Jerusalem 2009, p. 92; [Siddur Rashi], Ed. S. BUBER and J. FREIMANN, Jerusalem 1963, p. 60;

[Sefer ha-pardes], Ed. H.I. EHRENREICH, Budapest 1924, p. 183.

⁵⁷ See: G. SCHLESSINGER, *Die altfranzösischen Wörter im Machsor Vitry*, Mainz 1899, Reg. 66; and the introduction to Rashi's prayerbook (Note 56 above), p. LXII.

⁵⁸ See the introduction to Rashi's prayerbook (previous two notes); DARMESTETER & BLONDHEIM (note 42 above), No. 745.

14. Babylonian *Talmud* 46b:

תנו רבנן אין מכבדין לא בדרכים ולא בגשרים ולא בידים מזוהמות

The Girona manuscript comments:

ולא בידים מזוהמות: בנטילת מים אחרונים שאפילו הקטן שבכולן הרשות בידו ליטול תחלה

In the Parma and London manuscripts and the first edition, the final part of the commentary, *is not found*. It is absent in the version of Rashi on Alfasi, Yehonatan of Lunel, *Nimuqe Yosef*, and *Rašbaš*. In contrast, this passage is found in *Sefer ha-ner* and *Šiṭat Rivav*. It may be part of Rashi's original commentary or it may have been appended to the Girona manuscript under the influence of *Šiṭat Rivav*.

15. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 47a tells a story:

רבין ואבין הוו קא אזלי בארחא, קדמיה חמריה דרבין לדאבין ולא אמר ליה ניזיל מר. אמר מדסליק האי מרבנן ממערבא גס ליה דעתיה. כי מטא לפתחא דבי כנישתא אמר ליה ניזיל מר. אמר ליה ועד השתא לאו מר אנא. אמר ליה הכי אמר ר' יוחנן אין מכבדין אלא בפתח שיש בה מזוה. דאית בה מזוה אין דלית בה מזוה לא, אלא מעתה בית הכנסת ובית המדרש דלית בהו מזוה הכי נמי דאין מכבדין. אלא אימא בפתח הראוי למזוה

The commentary in the Girona manuscript states:

[בפתח הראוי למזוה]: כלומר בכניסת כל פתחים למעוטי דרכים ופירצות ופתח דאין ראוי למזוה כגון בית התבן ובית הבקר ובית העצים ובית האוצר בית המרחץ ובית הכסא ובית הבורסקי

In the first edition, Rashi on Alfasi, and *Nimuqe Yosef* we find:

בפתח הראוי למזוה: כלומר בכניסת כל פתחים למעוטי דרכים ופירצות

The Parma and London manuscripts contain an even shorter version:

בפתח הראוי למזוה: כלומר בכניסת כל פתחים

The beginning of the commentary of the Girona manuscript, until *ופירצות*, is identical to the printed edition. This version is clearer than the abbreviated version of the Parma and London manuscripts and so appears to be original. The continuation: *ולמעוטי פתח... הבורסקי*, based on a passage in Yoma 11a, is somewhat perple-

xing. The first explanation offered is that *פתח* excludes roads and open areas, but not synagogues and houses of study which are discussed here in the *Talmud*. If so, for what reason is *ולמעוטי פתח דאין ראוי למזוה* added in the Girona manuscript? Furthermore, the phrase *כניסת כל פתחים*, all entrances, appears to contradict *ולמעוטי פתח דאין ראוי למזוה* and it seems that two separate commentaries have been conflated here: A. *כניסת כל פתחים למעוטי דרכים*. B. *ולמעוטי פתח דאין ראוי למזוה*. In order to understand the context of the second commentary, let us now examine *Šiṭat Rivav*, who only cites this second version:

שראוי למזוה: למעוטי פתח שאינו ראוי למזוה כגון בית התבן ובית הבקר ובית העצים ובית האוצר ובית המרחץ ובית הכסא ובית הבורסקי

Clearly the Girona manuscript contains Rashi's commentary followed by the commentary of *Rivav*, even though it is redundant after the first comment and the scribe added a connecting *vav* to join the two commentaries into one. The commentary of *Rivav* works smoothly on its own without difficulty in its original context as a commentary to Alfasi, which does not include the story Rashi is commenting on, but just the *barayta*:

אין מכבדין לא בדרכים ולא בגשרים ולא בידים מזוהמות אלא בפתח שראוי למזוה

Rivav's comment is indeed appropriate to the text of Alfasi he is commenting upon.⁵⁹

16. Babylonian *Talmud Berakhot* 47a:

תנו רבנן אין עונין לא אמן חטופה ולא אמן קטופה ולא אמן יתומה

The commentary of the Girona manuscript comments:

יתומה: שלא שמע ברכה אלא שמע שע[ונין] אמן והא[דאמרין] בהחליל (סוכה נא ע"ב) באבדיו לפוס של (אלס) אלכסנדיא של מצרים שהיו [מניפים בסודרים] כשמגיע עת לענות אמן אלמא לא שמעי וקא ענו אמן הנהו מידע ידעי [שהם] עונין אחר ברכה ועל איזו ברכה אלא שלא היו שומעין את הקול

A similar version is found in the printed edition: יתומה: שלא שמע הברכה אלא ששמע שעונין אמן והא דאמרין בהחליל שבאלכסנדריה של מצרים

which may be influenced by the Girona manuscript.

⁵⁹ *Rašbaš* also includes an expanded version

היו מניפים בסודרים כשהגיע עת לענות אמן אלמא לא שמעי וקא ענו הנהו מידע ידי שיהם עונים אחר ברכה ועל איזו ברכה הם עונים אלא שלא היו שומעים את הקול

In contrast, in the Parma and London manuscripts, as well as the commentary of Rashi appended to Alfasi, both the difficulty raised based on the *Talmud* in *Pereq ha-ḥalil* and the resolution, *והא... את הקול* are absent. In the literature of the early sages: *Sefer ha-ner* does not include the difficulty and resolution. Some early sages cite the difficulty along with a different resolution which is attributed to Rabbi Nissim Ga'on⁶⁰ (*Or Zarua'* [*Hilkhot se'uda* 193], *Riv'van*) or attributed to the *Ge'onim* (*Pisqe Ri'az*). Clearly the versions of Rashi's commentary at the disposal of these sages did not contain this section. However, Yehonatan of Lunel cites the section in a similar manner as the Girona manuscript and the printed edition, after other commentaries he copied from Rashi, and followed by the alternate resolution of Rabbi Nissim Ga'on.⁶¹ *Tosafot* Judah Messer Leon raises the difficulty and offers the resolution found in the Girona manuscript and the printed edition, but with a different wording and the comment is signed: *Rabbenu Šemu'el*, possibly referring to Šemu'el ben Meyir, *Rašbam*. *Sefer ha-mikhtam*, and in a similar fashion *Nimuqe Yosef* and *Rašbaš*, cite the section and attribute it to Rashi, with a similar wording as the Girona manuscript and the printed edition.

It appears that the original commentary of Rashi probably did not relate to this difficulty, like the version found in the Parma and London manuscripts. The early sages who cited the resolution of Rabbi Nissim Ga'on had this version of Rashi's commentary. *Rabbenu Šemu'el* (*Rašbam*?) raised the difficulty of Nissim Ga'on independently and offered his own resolution, perhaps even copying it into the margins of his copy of Rashi's commentary. At a later stage, this comment was copied into the commentary itself, as we find in the Girona manuscript and

the printed edition. Such an expanded version of Rashi's commentary was apparently employed by Yonatan of Lunel, and was certainly consulted by *Mikhtam*, *Rašbaš*, and *Nimuqe Yosef*.

We have surveyed several types of scribal additions to the Girona manuscript. In general, the additions are found in the appropriate locations, but at times they have been inserted in the middle of Rashi's comments (Ex. 9) or added as an alternate interpretation without any such label (Ex. 6-8). The additions are supposed to aid the student by providing novel interpretations but they can also be confusing because it is difficult to distinguish between Rashi's interpretation and the alternative to it.

Utilizing the previous study of the additions to the commentary of Rashi we can tease out how the Girona version probably developed. The first stage begins with a manuscript of the original commentary of Rashi. During a second stage additional notes were added to the margin of one of the manuscripts.⁶² In the third stage the commentary is copied with the notes in the main body of the commentary. The Girona manuscript was copied by a Spanish scribe in the 14th century as the third stage of the process or a copy of an earlier third-stage manuscript.

What is the source of the additions to the Girona manuscript? The previous analysis shows that they are do not stem from Rashi himself.⁶³ One addition cites *המורה*, *the teacher*, which appears to have been written by a student of Rashi (Ex. 4). Half of the additions are also found in the commentaries of early sages copying Rashi's commentary or paraphrasing it.⁶⁴ One addition is cited by an early sage and signed *Rabbenu Šemu'el*, possibly *Rašbam* (Ex. 16). Another addition appears to have been copied from the Rashi literature (Ex. 13). The additions to examples 4, 13, and 16 are early, apparently authored around the 12th century. The authors of the other additions are not identified.

⁶⁰ According to Rabbi Nissim Ga'on there is a distinction between obligatory blessings and optional ones. See also: *Sefer ha-'Arukh* (ערך 'אמן).

⁶¹ *Tosafot Sukkah* 52a loc. *וכין* lists the resolution of Rabbi Nissim Ga'on followed by that of *Rašbam*.

⁶² Early French manuscripts generally copied these comments in the margins. These or a similar source served as a basis for the Parma and London manuscripts and the Soncino edition.

⁶³ Except possibly Example 11.

⁶⁴ The additions to Examples 1, 2, 10, 12, 13,

We find labels such as *yeš omerim* (Ex. 1-4) and *it degarsi* (Ex. 5). Possibly these additions were supplemented by an Ashkenazi/French contemporary of Rashi around the 12th century, for during this period other local commentaries to the *Talmud* were authored which are similar stylistically to Rashi's commentary. Another possibility is that these are additions of a later Spanish or Provençal sage.⁶⁵ Some of the additions may have been authored by one sage and others by a second sage. Some of the additions contain vernacular, mostly Old French, but also Catalan.⁶⁶ Some of the additions are also copied by early sages of the 13th and 14th centuries: *Šitat Rivav* (Ex. 14,⁶⁷ 15), *Talmid Yonah* (Ex. 2, 10), *Rivva* (Ex. 2, 12), and *Meiri* (Ex. 10). *Rivav* and *Talmid Yonah Girondi* were active in Girona,⁶⁸ so it is natural to find additions of the Girona manuscript in their own works. In conclusion, we can conclude that some of the additions were authored in France around the 12th century and at least some of them as based upon the comments of the early sages to tractate *Berakhot* from the 13th and 14th centuries in the Girona area (Catalonia) and perhaps also Provence.

On the Spanish versions of Rashi's commentary to the Talmud

Recently several Spanish textual witnesses to Rashi's commentary to the *Talmud* have been studied, and scholars have distinguished between them and versions from other regions.⁶⁹ How

does the Girona manuscript inform us regarding the Spanish recension? We have found that several of the additions are found in the works of the early sages but none of the early sages seems to regularly cite these additions. On the contrary, in many cases these early sages also cite Rashi without these additions.⁷⁰ This phenomenon is observed in works contemporaneous to the Girona manuscript and in the same region: Spain of the 14th century: *Sefer ha-pardes*, *Rašbaš*, and *Nimuqe Yosef*.⁷¹ This means that another version of Rashi's commentary was circulating in Spain in the 14th century and there is no single "Spanish version." This conclusion is based on the words of the early Spanish sages themselves, who write at times about textual variants they found in "some versions of the commentary of Rashi." Clearly they had more than one version at their disposal.⁷² It stands to reason that the situation was similar in the 15th century although we have no proof of it. Apparently we could learn this from the fact that the version of the commentary in *Šeride Bavli*, printed in Portugal and the Spanish or Portuguese commentary in *En Ya'aqov* preserve a textual variant influenced by the Girona manuscript version. On the other hand, the London manuscript was copied by a Spanish hand and preserves a tradition unlike that of the Girona manuscript. However, as previously stated, the text of the London manuscript resembles that of the Italian Parma manuscript, so it is possible that the London manuscript does not preserve a Spanish version, but is the product of a Spanish scribe who immi-

14, 15, 16.

⁶⁵ From the 12th century the legal literatures of Provence and Catalonia are increasingly associated, as parts of Provence were subsumed under the Province of Catalonia.

⁶⁶ See Examples 1, 4, 7, 9, 13. The second vernacular of Example 7 is Catalan. Also see our explanation of Example 9.

⁶⁷ Example 14 is also found in *Sefer ha-ner*.

⁶⁸ Since Rivav was a native of Girona, it stands to reason that his father, Berekhya, the brother of Zerahya ha-Levy, also lived in Girona. Also, his brother, Isaac bar Berekhya, was a sage of Girona.

⁶⁹ See: Y. FUCHS, פירוש רש"י למסכת מועד קטן [Rashi's Commentary to tractate *Moed Katan*], Dissertation, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 2007, pp. 144-150, 199-208; B. DEBLITZKI, פירוש

רש"י להוריות על פי כתב יד פארמא [The Commentary of Rashi to tractate *Horayot*, according to the Parma Manuscript], in *מסכת הוריות*, Jerusalem 2005, pp.13-14. Malhi's explanation concerning tractate *Berakhot* was discussed above.

⁷⁰ *Sefer ha-ner* (Ex. 2), Yehonatan of Lunel (Ex. 13, 14), *Or Zaru'a* (Ex. 2, 12), *Rivav* (Ex. 13), *Riv'van* (Ex. 2), *Sefer ha-battim* (Ex. 13), *Sefer ha-pardes* (Ex. 1), *Rašbaš* (Ex. 1, 2, 10, 14), *Nimuqe Yosef* (all examples). The version of Rashi appended to *Alfasi* does not contain the additions (Ex. 1, 2, 10, 14, 15, 16).

⁷¹ *Sefer ha-pardes* of Asher ben Ḥayyim Navio of Aragon, *Rašbaš* composed his work on tractate *Berakhot* in Majorca, R.Y. Ḥaviva, author of *Nimuqe Yosef* was a resident of Barcelona.

⁷² See Rašba's commentary to *Megillah* 23a loc.

grated to Italy.⁷³ No legal works of Spanish sages of the 15th century have been preserved which could inform us regarding the text of the commentary of Rashi then in circulation.

Conclusion

In the bindings of books preserved in the Arxiu Historic of Girona, approximately one third of a 14th century manuscript was preserved containing the commentary of Rashi to tractate *Berakhot*. It covers about 24 pages of the second half of the tractate. The text was thoroughly examined in comparison with the other textual witnesses and testimonia of the early sages. Conclusions based on the analysis are:

A. A uniquely Spanish recension of Rashi's commentary to tractate *Berakhot* was in existence, as represented by the Girona manuscript, as well as *Šeride Bavli* and *‘En Ya‘aqov*. Only portions of the commentary of this branch are extant. Another branch of the commentary which circulated in Italy/Byzantium was preserved in the Parma and London manuscripts. The Soncino edition represents a third branch and circulated in Italy. This third branch resembles the first Spanish branch more closely than the second branch does.

B. The Girona manuscript contains various types of later scribal additions to the text of Rashi's commentary. Some of the additions were supplemented in France around the 12th century, some of them are based on the early sages of the 13th and 14th centuries in the Girona area (Catalonia) and possibly Provence.

C. During the 14th century, and apparently the 15th century as well, there were at least two distinct versions of the commentary of Rashi circulating throughout the Spanish peninsula.

למאי, *Hullin* 43a loc. אמר עולא, *Giṭṭin* 50b loc. חמשה, *Ke-tubbot* 29b loc. אלא; *Nimuqe Yosef on Bava Mešia* 10a loc. הרוחוק.

⁷³ The phenomenon of Italian manuscripts written in Spanish script is partially a product of the disasters which perpetrated on Jewish communities in 1391 re-

APPENDIX A

*Textual Witnesses of the commentary of Rashi to tractate Berakhot*⁷⁴

Manuscripts

A. Parma Palatina 2589, f. 1r-61v. Commentary of Rashi to the entire tractate. Italian, 14th century.

B. London, British Library Or. 5975, f. 1r-35v. Commentary of Rashi to the entire tractate. Spanish, 15th century.

C. Holon 259/39, f. 29, Commentary of Rashi to 4a loc. ידי – loc. ובשפיר. Eastern, 14th-15th century.

D. Fragments of a manuscript of the Commentary of Rashi, dispersed among three libraries:

1. New York, JTS Rab. 844, Commentary from 5b loc. ורדפה to 7a loc. ורדפה.

2. New York, JTS ENA 3007, f. 9-12, Commentary from 5b loc. ובנים to loc. ביר, 7a loc. ותמונה – loc. תחת.

3. London, British Lib. Or. 5558 0/22, f. 30r-33v, Commentary from 8a loc. מהדר to 9a loc. הכי. Manuscript partially torn and missing. Spanish cursive, 15th-16th century.

E. Vatican 229/5, f. 285a-293b, Commentary from 15b loc. בריתה בד"א דקטן to 19b loc. ולאו חותו, and from 20a loc. קטנים to 22b loc. ור' יהודה. Byzantine, 14th century.

F. Fragments of a manuscript of the Commentary of Rashi dispersed among three libraries:

1. Jerusalem, NLI Heb. 4⁰577.4.71, one folio containing commentary from 23a loc.

sulting in a wave of migration from Spain to Italy. See: M. BEIT-ARIE, הכתב העברי בספרד: התפתחותו, שלוחותיו, וגלגוליו [Hebrew Script in Spain: Development, Offshoots and Vicissitudes], in *Morešet Sepharad* [Heb.], Ed. H. BEINART, Jerusalem 1992, p. 232.

⁷⁴ A list of the fragments of the Girona manuscript is found in Appendix B.

דמר to 23b loc. אורחא.

2. Oxford, Bod. Heb. d. 34, f. 17-26, ten folio of commentary from 23b loc. תיובתא to 34b loc. שהוא.

3. Cambridge University Library T-S NS 311.117, one folio containing commentary from 34b loc. שהוא to 36a loc. החושש. Ibid. T-S F3 161, two folios of commentary from 41a loc. כשברכותיהן to 43a loc. מתיבין. Byzantine, 14th century.

G. Cambridge University Library T-S 18 F1, one folio containing *Talmud* and Rashi's commentary from 24a loc. ונתעטש to 24b loc. אפשר, and from 24b loc. בחבלי to 25a loc. הטמא. Page ripped and missing at end. Spanish, 13th-14th century.

H. Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University 29/3, four folios containing commentary:

1. 27b loc. התורגמן – 28a loc. אפר.
2. 28a loc. ואח"כ – 28b loc. עד כאן.
3. 31a loc. הלכה – loc. זמנין.
4. 31b loc. בדקי – 32a loc. מכאן. Pages 3 and 4 are ripped on the side. Byzantine, 14th-15th century.

I. New York, JTS Rab. 846, f. 4-5. Folio 4 includes the commentary from 28b loc. באסדא to 29a loc. בנאות and from 29a loc. שבע to 29b loc. עשה. The page is torn away at the bottom and missing text. Folio 5 contains the commentary from 30a loc. לישתף to loc. רב אשי and from 30a loc. לא חזינן to 30b loc. שוהין. The page is ripped at the bottom and on the side. Spanish, 16th century.

J. Hamburg, Levy 176, four pages including the following sections of the commentary:

1. 29b loc. אבל – loc. אפי' בשעה.
2. 30a loc. לישתף – loc. קורא.
3. 44b loc. כל נפש – loc. מבלי עצים.

4. 45a loc. לזמן – loc. שאני התם. Byzantine, 14th-15th century.

K. Melk, Benediktinerstiftsbibliothek 6, commentary from 33b loc. הכל to 36b loc. קפרס, and from 51a loc. אין מפסיקין to 52b loc. דברא. Ashkenazi, 14th century.

L. Cambridge University Library Or. 1080.11.5, one folio with commentary from 35a loc. חוץ to loc. אלא. Spanish, 14th-15th century.

M. London, British Library Or. 6712/1, f. 1a, commentary from 64a loc. אומנא to loc. אין להם. Italian, year 1288.

Printed Editions

A. Soncino Edition, 1484, tractate *Berakhot* with commentary of Rashi and *Tosafot*.

B. *Seride Bavli* consists of a collection of surviving pages of the Babylonian *Talmud* to tractate *Berakhot* with the commentary of Rashi, printed in the Spanish peninsula at the end of the 15th century. Pages which include Rashi's commentary just on the left side of the page were printed in Guadalajara, Spain, just before the expulsion of Spanish Jewry in 1492. Most pages contain Rashi's commentary on the left of the recto side of each page and on the right of the verso side of each page. These were printed in Faro, Portugal, just after the expulsion from Spain.⁷⁵ The following sections of the commentary of Rashi are preserved in the Spanish/Portuguese editions:

- 8a loc. עת –
- loc. הא דכייף,
- 10a loc. חמשה – loc. מקובלני,
- 10b loc. סתם – loc. התולה,
- 18a loc. חוששין –
- 18b loc. חלל, loc. יורה – loc. דלמא,
- 19b loc. כל מילי –

⁷⁵ See: H.Z. DIMITROVSKY, שרידי בבלי [*Seride Bavli*], NY 1979, pp. 22, 71, 73, 111. Another distinction between the two editions is in the font of Rashi's commentary: in the Guadalajara edition it

is printed with Spanish script ("Rashi" script) whereas the Faro edition the text of the commentary is in square Hebrew script.

- 20a loc. כרבלתא,
 22b loc. לא יפסיק –
 23b loc. הרי אלו,
 47a loc. הא לא –
 50a loc. אלא לאו,
 50a loc. ומטובו –
 50b loc. אבל,
 53a loc. מה – loc. אין,
 53b loc. היכי –
 54a loc. לפרקים,
 54a loc. וצחא – loc. התקינו – loc. ועל הטובה,
 54b loc. קמצי,
 54b loc. כיון –
 55a loc. בדיחותיה,
 56a loc. נסי – loc. וי"ו – loc. מריר – loc. בדינא –
 56b loc. ובכל –
 57a loc. בארץ,
 57a loc. אגם –
 57b loc. גזור – loc. קול – loc. קפופא,
 58a loc. כל –
 59a loc. כטרפא,
 59b loc. אגשרא –
 61a loc. יביע,
 63a loc. כל – loc. דעהו,
 63a loc. שגרו –
 63b loc. ומיץ – loc. לא גרסינן – loc. בכעס – loc. ינגן,
 63b loc. ושמונה – loc. אף.⁷⁶

Some of these fragments contain only a few lines or sections of lines of Rashi's commentary.

Compendia

A. *En Ya'aqov*, Salonika 1516. This work was authored by Ya'aqov ben Ḥaviv, who was born in Castile, Spain, in the middle of the 15th century, expelled from Spain, arriving first in

Portugal, and then to Greece, where he died in 1517. The author compiled an anthology of legends, collected primarily from the Babylonian *Talmud*. Commentaries of Rashi and others to the relevant Talmudic passages are appended. Ya'aqov ben Ḥaviv composed this work in Salonika and in his introduction he stated that he used a *Talmud* with the commentary of Rashi which he received from Don Judah Beḥ Ben Venest. Don Judah also fled to Portugal during the Spanish expulsion and eventually made his way to Salonika.⁷⁷ The version of the commentary of Rashi in *En Ya'aqov* is therefore based on a version which Jews fleeing Spain or Portugal brought to Salonika at the end of the 15th century.⁷⁸

B. *Sefer Halakhhot Alfasi*. A version of Rashi's commentary to the legal sections of the tractate appearing in *Alfasi* is copied in the margin. The commentary is preserved in numerous textual witnesses of *Alfasi*. Two of them are: 1. Jerusalem, NLI Heb. 4^o621, f. 264v-294b, Ashkenazi, mid-14th century. 2. First edition, Venice 1521.⁷⁹

APPENDIX B

Fragments of Rashi's commentary to tractate Berakhot in the Arxiu Historic of Girona

34 fragments were found in the binding of book Gi 2.81, page numbers are cited in brackets []. 15 short fragments which join to and restore sections of 12 of the 34 fragments were found in the binding of book Gi. s. XIV (henceforth: Folder B), page numbers are cited in rounded brackets { }. Texts within comments referred to where the commentary begins or ends abruptly appear in parenthesis ().

1. [12b] 29b loc. (לשון) שועת –

⁷⁶ The commentary is extant for the following pages of the Guadalajara edition: 10a-b, 18a-b, 19b, 20a, 53a-b, 56b-57a, 58a-59a, and 63a-b. In the Faro edition: 8a, 22b-23b, 47a-50b, 53b-55a, 56a-b, 57b, and 59a-61a.

⁷⁷ See: M. BENAYAHU, רבי דוד בן באן בנשת משאלוניקי, ואגרתו לרבי אברהם אבן יעיש בברוסה [Rabbi David Ben Ban Venest of Saloniki and his letter to Abraham Ibn Yaiš in Brusa], «Sefunot» 11 (1971-1978),

p. 269.

⁷⁸ Thus, it is not surprising to find Spanish and Catalan vernacular used in these editions. Catalan may be found in the Commentary of Rashi to page 18b loc. גזיז, discussed by DARMESTETER & BLONDHEIM (note 42 above), No. 543. Spanish in Rashi's commentary to 28b loc. פטיש is discussed in DARMESTETER & BLONDHEIM, No. 802.

⁷⁹ As mentioned previously, citations of this ver-

- 30a loc. (מסמך ג'אולה) – ולעבד
2. [12a] 30b loc. – בצבור (דאין) –
31a loc. (הצריכה שבעה נקיים) – יושבת
3. [15b] 31a loc. – (ואין) – יושבת
31b loc.⁸⁰ (שנדברין) – ולא חכם
4. [15a] 31b loc. – (עין הרע) – ולא חכם
32b loc. (אלהיך) – גם אלה
5. [6b] 32b loc. – (ואנכי) – והא פליג
33b loc. (ברכה) – והא פליג
6. [6a] 33b loc. – (ל'עצמה) – והא פליג
34a loc.⁸¹ (מת') – מרזפתא
7. [21b] + {15a}: 34a loc. – (כדאמר) – מפני הטרורף
35a loc. (היין) – חוץ
8. [21a] + {15b}: 35a loc. – (וכן הפת) – חוץ
35b loc. (הא) – ואמר רב הונא
9. [7b] 35b loc. – (דקתני) – ואמר רב הונא
36a loc. (כעין) – קפריסין
10. [7a] 36a loc. – (קליפה) – קפריסין
36b loc. (בוטיתא) – בוטיתא
11. [9a] + {20a, 26a}: 39b loc. – (אלא אמר) – אלא אמר (הברכה)
40a loc. (פירי) – מפיך
12. [9b] + {20b, 26b}: 40a loc. – (עשו להם חגורות אין התינוק)
41a loc. (בלהקדים) – אמר ר' ירמיה
13. [11a] 41a loc. – (בש'ברכותיהן) – אמר ר' ירמיה
41b loc. (אכילה) – פת
14. [11b] 41b loc. – (וברכת המזון) – פת
42a loc. (כיצד) – ברך על היין
15. [14a] 42a loc. – (סדר) – ברך
43a loc. (שלפני) – אע"פ
16. [14b] + {27}: 43a loc. – (המזון שאינו) – אע"פ
43b loc. (כשלשה) – וירח. The left side is missing here and some of it can be found in item 30 [15b] on the margins with the text reversed due to bleeding of ink onto the opposite page.
17. [14b] + {22a}: 46b loc. – (חוטם) – ויש מהן
47a loc. (הראוי) – אלא אימא בפתח הראוי
18. [14a] 47a loc. – (כלומי) – אלא אימא
47b loc. (רשות) – (השני) – האי אידגן
19. [11b] + {13b, 25b}: 47b loc. – (לא קבע) – לא
48a loc. (ולא) – היכי
20. [11a] + {25a}: 48a loc. – (אומי) – היכי
49a loc. (בברוך) – ומאן דאמר
21. [9b] + {10a} 49a loc. – (לפי) – ומאן דאמר
49b loc. (כמו) – לפי שרוב
22. [9a] + {10b} 49b loc. – (בין עשרה למאה) – לפי שרוב
50a loc. (כדי זימון) – ששה
23. [7a] 52b loc. – (דרבנן) – תוכו
53a loc. (נהורא) – כפי
24. [7b] 53a loc. – (בריא) – כפי
53b loc. (קס"ד) – היכי
25. [21a] 53b loc. – (מתני' באחד) – היכי
54a loc. (בשם) – שיהא
26. [21b] 54a loc. – (הקב"ה) – שיהא
55a loc. (תוחלת) – תוחלת
27. [6a] 55a loc. – (בוטח) – מזכירין
55b loc. (מאן) – האי
28. [6b] 55b loc. – (דחליש) – האי
56a loc. טורזינא. The text on the upper left is missing. Part of the missing text is found at the top of item 6 [6a].
29. [15a] 56b loc. – (דאיצטליק) – דאיצטליק
57a loc. (ישיבה) – אגם
30. [15b] 57a loc. – (שהגדולים) – אגם
58a loc.⁸² (עשיר היה והכל) – כל אומות
31. [12a] + {23a}: 58a loc. – (שאם יזכה) – שאם
58b loc. (כמאה) – כמאה
32. [12b] + {23b}: 58b loc. – (של כימה) – כמאה
59a loc. (עולם כרוך) – כרוך
33. [13b] 59a loc. – (שתי) – כרוך
60a loc. (הונא) – ואיכא
34. [13a] 60a loc. – (צריך לברך אלא) – ואיכא
61a loc. (צרתני) – אחר. The text on the upper left is missing. Part of the text can be found in item 3 [15b] with the text flipped.

Aaron Ahrend
Bar-Ilan University
e-mail: ayahrend@walla.com

sion of Rashi without specifying the source indicates that the same text is found in both of these witnesses.

⁸⁰ See the description of item 34 below.

⁸¹ See the description of item 28 below.

⁸² See the description of item 16 above.

SUMMARY

This article presents a new study in Rashi's commentary on tractate *Berakhot*. We examine fragments of a fourteenth century manuscript that was preserved in the bindings of two notary books in the Historical Archive of Girona. A close analysis of the manuscript led to the conclusion that it represents a Spanish branch of Rashi's commentary. A second branch existed in Italy-Byzantium, and was preserved in mss Parma Palatina 2589 and London Or. 5975. The first printing, Soncino 1484, represents a third branch. Girona manuscript contains some additions to Rashi, some of them were written by scholars of Girona in the 13th-14th centuries. It becomes apparent that at the end of the *Rišonim* period there were different versions of Rashi's commentary throughout Spain.

KEYWORDS: Rashi; "Girona Geniza"; Book-bindings; Tractate *Berakhot*.