

On One Masorah in Rashi's Biblical Commentary*

Lea HIMMELFARB **
Bar-Ilan University

The most famous and illustrious of all Biblical commentators, Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac, 1040-1105),¹ incorporated Masorah material in his writings. It is quite surprising, then, that there are so few studies of his use of the Masorah. Zunz in 1838 was the first to supply references to Rashi's citations from the *Masorah Magna*,² and he was followed by Ehrentreu in 1925, who counted 16 references for the term «Masorah» in different forms.³ Ehrentreu's

* The present article is an expansion of a paper read on August 6, 2001, at the Fifteenth Congress of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies (IOMS) held in Basel.

** leahimm@hotmail.com

¹ For the main bibliography of studies of Rashi's biblical exegesis, see A. GROSSMAN, *The Early Sages of France* (Jerusalem 1995) pp. 121-215 (Hebrew); D. ZAFRANI, «On 'Repeated Commentaries' in Rashi's Exegesis of the Bible,» *Beit Mikra* 162 (2000) pp. 224-245, nn. 1-8 (Hebrew).

² ZUNZIO (= Zunz), «Additamenta,» in *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca senatoria civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur...*, eds. H. O. FLEISCHER and F. DELITZSCH (Grimae 1838) pp. 314-315; Y. T. L. ZUNZ, *Toldoth Raschi*, translation with remarks by S. BLOCH (Jerusalem 1971 [photocopy: Warsaw 1862]) p. 12, mentions only a few references.

³ E. EHRENTREU, *Untersuchungen über die Massora* (Hannover 1925); see especially: pp. 118-142, 155-160.

attempt to classify them into five groups drew the criticism of Blau⁴ four years later as well as that of Díaz-Esteban in *Ochla we-Ochla* in 1975.⁵ Penkower recently summarized all these studies in a footnote to a paper published in 1997.⁶

All the papers reviewed above refer only to *Ochla we-Ochla*⁷ as the source of Rashi's citations of the Masorah notes.⁸ In my current work, I shall concentrate upon one instance that was not mentioned in the works of those scholars, and I shall present the results of my research in identifying the sources of the Masorah that Rashi used in his commentary on Ezek. 47:19: "לית... ומסורת עליו" "ראיתי נחלה מצרים" i.e., «and I saw נחלה מצרים (Num. 34:5)... the Masoretic note *ad loc.* is לית בטעמא unique with this accentuation.»

Penkower refers in *Haketer*⁹ to Rashi's words by citing «Ginsburg, Masorah, Letter נ 180.» However, in that source¹⁰ the Masoretic note comments that the word נחלה occurs «twice penulti-

⁴ L. BLAU, «Zur Massora,» *Studies in Jewish Bibliography... in Memory of A. S. Freidus* (New York 1929 [photocopy: Farnborough 1969]) pp. 431-462, esp. pp. 451-457.

⁵ F. DÍAZ-ESTEBAN, *Sefer 'Oklah we-Oklah'* (Madrid 1975) p. LIX.

⁶ J. S. PENKOWER, «The Tosaphist R. Menahem of Joigny and the Masoretic Work 'Okhlah ve-Okhlah,' the Halle Manuscript Recension,» in *Studies in Bible and Exegesis - M. Goshen-Gottstein in Memoriam*, eds. M. BAR-ASHER *et al.* (Ramat Gan 1993) pp. 287-315, see esp. n. 3.

⁷ Published twice: S. FRENSDORFF, *Das Buch Ochla W'ochlah (Massora)* (Hannover 1864; repr. New York 1972); F. DÍAZ-ESTEBAN, *Sefer 'Oklah we-Oklah'*.

⁸ I have dealt with a number of the examples in my articles: «The Masoretic Notes in the Commentary by Rashi on the Bible and Their Relation to His Commentary», in *Studies in Bible and Exegesis Presented to Menahem Cohen*, eds. S. VARGON *et al.* (Ramat Gan 2004) pp. 41-60; «On Rashi's Use of the Masorah Notes in His Commentary on the Bible», in *Shnaton – An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies*, ed. S. JAPHAT (Jerusalem, forthcoming).

⁹ *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer' Ezekiel*, ed. M. COHEN (Ramat Gan 2000).

¹⁰ C. D. GINSBURG, *The Massorah Compiled from Manuscripts*, II (London 1880-1905; repr. New York 1975), with a Prolegomenon... Table of Contents by A. DOTAN, Letter נן, n. 180.

mately,» whereas Rashi observes that this accentuation is unique. In this paper I hope to resolve this seeming contradiction.¹¹

Ezek. 47:19 describes the southern border as follows:¹²

וּפְאַת נֹגֵב תִּימְנָה מִתְּמַר עַד-מֵי מְרִיבוֹת קָדְשׁ נַחֲלָה אֶל-הַיָּם הַגָּדוֹל וְאֶת
פְּאַת-תִּימְנָה נֹגֵבָה

On the south side, it shall run from Tamar as far as the waters of Meriboth-kadesh, thence along the Brook of Egypt to the Great Sea. This shall be the south side.

Rashi comments on נחלה אל הים הגדול:¹³

נחלה אל הים הגדול - ומשם הולך הגבול עד נחל מצרים, הנופל בים הגדול

¹¹ An examination of other interpretations of Rashi's commentary reveals that he has not been understood accurately. E.g., the translation of A.J. ROSENBERG, *A New English Translation of Text, Rashi and Commentary* (New York 1991) *Ezekiel*, p. 422, indicates that the Masoretic note refers to Ezekiel, even though Rashi stated that he found it on נחלה מצרים in Numbers (which is not mentioned in the English translation). Also, S. POZNAŃSKI, *Kommentar zu Ezechiel und den XII kleinen Propheten von Eliezer aus Beaugency, und mit einer Abhandlung über die nordfranzösischen Bibelexegeten eingeleitet* (Warsaw 1913 [photocopy: Jerusalem 1965]) p. XXIV, n. 2, quotes Rashi «קראים טועים» and comments «but his meaning is not entirely clear.» A. LEVY, *Rashi's Commentary on Ezekiel 40-48* (Philadelphia 1931), writes in his introduction: «Rashi often found it necessary to take account of the interpretations of the Darshanim (preachers) and Karaim (elementary school teachers) and accordingly revised his own comments» (p. 4). Levy bases his statement on our verse, but apparently did not understand its full meaning. E. TOUITOU, «J. Florsheim, Rashi on the Bible in his Commentary on the Talmud,» *Tarbiz* 52 (1982-1983) pp. 360-367, concluded that the Qara sometimes erred, as we can learn from Rashi's commentary ולא-תרגמו יונתן כן, כי אם קראים «[it] was not rendered in this manner by Jonathan but rather by erring readers» (p. 365); however, Rashi points out that were it not for the Masorah that he had before him «I would say... we have before us an error of the readers; that is, we could think so, but in fact this is not the case.» (And yet, we could say that Rashi knows of cases where readers erred, but in this specific instance he rules out such error.)

¹² All the Bible quotations are according to the translation of the *Revised Standard Version* (New York 1952).

¹³ According to 'Haketer' *Ezekiel*, cf. A. LEVY, *Rashi's Commentary*, p. 110; *Biblia Rabbinica*, reprint of the 1525 Venice Edition edited by Jacob Ibn Adoniya (Jerusalem 1972); *Mikra'ot Gedolot*, Pardess edition.

במקצוע דרומית מערבית. ואף משה¹⁴ כך נתן גבול נגב: "ממדבר צין¹⁵ על ידי אדום" (במ' לד 3) ומנה והלך¹⁶ עד "מעצמון נחלה¹⁷ מצרים והיו תוצאותיו הימה" (במ' לד 5). ו"נחלה" האמור כאן - כמו: לנחל.¹⁸ ומצאתי מתורגם 'אחסנא'. ואם לא שהטעם למטה וראיתי "נחלה מצרים" (במ' לד 5) שהטעם למעלה¹⁹ ומסורת עליו 'לית בטעמא', הייתי אומר: שיבוש הוא, ולא תירגמו יונתן כן כי אם קראים²⁰ טועים.

Thence along the Brook of Egypt to the Great Sea – And from there the border proceeds until the Brook of Egypt, which falls into the Great Sea in the southwestern corner. Moses, too, delineated the southern boundary in this way: «from the wilderness of Zin along the side of Edom» (Num. 34:3) and continues until «from Azmon to the Brook of Egypt, and its termination shall be at the sea» (Num. 34:5). נחלה stated here is like לְנַחַל «to the brook» and I found it rendered by *the Targum* as אֲחִסְנָא «an inheritance.» Were it not for the fact that the accent is on the last syllable and I saw that נחלה מצרים (Num. 34:5) has the accent on the first syllable and the Masoretic note ad loc is בטעמא (unique with this accentuation), I would be inclined to say that it is an error and was not rendered in this manner by Jonathan [ben Uzziel] but rather by erring readers.

In the beginning of his commentary, Rashi describes the southern border as being similar, in his view, to the one set down by Moses in Num. 34: beginning with ... ממדבר צין... (v. 3) until ... נחלה מצרים... (v. 5). As is characteristic of Rashi, he goes straight to the solution of the problem by explaining that נחלה here is like לנחל – to the brook; but he does not define what is the actual difficulty, namely, what is the meaning of נחלה in the verse?

In order to understand Rashi's explanation, I shall need to examine from the grammatical aspect the 46 occurrences of the

¹⁴ A. LEVY, *Rashi's Commentary*, adds רבינו.

¹⁵ In our version: צין.

¹⁶ *Biblia Rabbinica*, Pardess, and A. LEVY, *Rashi's Commentary*: ומונה והולך.

¹⁷ Pardess: נחל.

¹⁸ Pardess and A. LEVY: לנחלה.

¹⁹ A. LEVY: לעיל.

²⁰ *Biblia Rabbinica*: קוראים, Pardess and A. LEVY: קוראים. See n. 29.

word נחלה in the Bible (in 44 verses) that appear, as Ibn Ezra put it: «in three ways and each different.»²¹

Table 1: Occurrences of נחלה in the Bible

Word	.1 נחלה	.2 נחלה	.3 נחלה
punctuation	<i>het</i> with <i>hataf-patah</i>	<i>het</i> with <i>sheva</i>	<i>het</i> with <i>sheva</i>
stress	ultimate	ultimate	penultimate
meaning	inheritance	illness	stream
occurrences	40	4	2
examples	אֲשֶׁר ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ בְּנַחֲלָה (Deut.19:10)	נַחֲלָה מִכְתִּי (Jer. 10:19); מִכָּה נַחֲלָה מֵאִד (Jer. 14:17) נַחֲלָה מִכְתֶּךָ (Jer. 30:12); נַחֲלָה מִכְתֶּךָ (Nah. 3:19)	נַחֲלָה מִצְרַיִם (Num. 34:5); נַחֲלָה עָבַר עַל-נַפְשֵׁנוּ (Ps. 124:4)
exceptions	גַּד קָצִיר בְּיָוִם נַחֲלָה (Isa. 17:11); נַחֲלָה אֶל-תִּים הַגְּדוֹל (Ezek. 47:19); נַחֲלָה עַל-תִּים הַגְּדוֹל (Ezek. 48:28)		נַחֲלָה עָבַר עַל-נַפְשֵׁנוּ (Ps. 124:4)

There are 40 such instances, occurring in 37 verses, of the first form: נחלה with ultimate stress, *het* with *hataf-patah* and the *he* as a sign of the feminine, with the meaning of 'inheritance'. For example: אשר ה' אלקיך נתן לך נחלה: «which the Lord your God gives you for an inheritance» (Deut. 19:10).

²¹ Commentary on Ps 124:4 in *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*, Psalms, II, ed. M. COHEN (Ramat Gan 2003).

The second form: נַחֲלָה, also with ultimate stress, but the *het* is with *sheva* alone, as a verb in the past *Nif'al* conjugation, with the meaning of 'illness.' This occurs 4 times: נַחֲלָה מִכְתִּי «my wound is grievous» (Jer. 10:19), מַכָּה נַחֲלָה מְאֹד «a very grievous blow» (Jer. 14:17), נַחֲלָה מִכְתֶּךָ «your wound is grievous» (occurs twice – Jer. 30:12 and Nah. 3:19).

The third form: נַחֲלָה with the stress on the first syllable, the *het* is with *sheva*, and the additional *he* is as in *laila*, now assuming the meaning of a brook, a 'stream of water'. This form occurs twice: וְנָסַב הַגְּבוּל מֵעֲצָמוֹן נַחֲלָה מִצְרַיִם «And the boundary shall turn from Azmon to the Brook of Egypt...» (Num. 34:5) and אִזֵּי הַמַּיִם שִׁטְפוּנוּ «Then the flood would have swept us away, the torrent would have gone over us» (Ps. 124:4).

After surveying the regular cases, I shall now turn to the irregular ones. Table 1 shows that there is no agreement between the grammatical and semantic aspects of the next 4 verses:

There are three exceptions in the first group (that has the meaning of 'inheritance'). Most of the commentators interpreted נַחֲלָה in Isa. 17:11: נִד קִצִּיר בַּיּוֹם נַחֲלָה וְכָאֵב אֲנוּשׁ «yet the harvest will flee away in the day of sickness and incurable pain» as a derivative of *holi* 'illness' and as being parallel to «and incurable pain,» as can be inferred from Rashi's comment «that harvest arrived on the day of pain,» and similarly Ibn Ezra, R. Eliezer of Beaugency, R. David Qimḥi and Isaiah di Trani²². Other scholars regard נַחֲלָה as a stream of water, as the interpretation of *Ha-Korem*, cited by Samuel David Luzzatto²³ and by Amos Hakham²⁴.

The two other exceptional cases in the first group are from Ezekiel: נַחֲלָה אֶל-הַיָּם הַגְּדוֹל, נַחֲלָה עַל-הַיָּם הַגְּדוֹל «...the Brook of Egypt to the Great Sea» (47:19; 48:28), and belong to the first

²² *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*, Isaiah, ed. M. COHEN (Ramat Gan 1996).

²³ As S. D. LUZZATTO wrote in the *Commentary on Isaiah* (Padua 1845-1897; Tel Aviv 1970): «...that the word נַחֲלָה is connected to נָחַל, and when the stream increases and overflows into the fields it is called נַחֲלָה» (17:11). And perhaps, because of his second part of his explanation it is possible to assign it to the first group.

²⁴ A. HAKHAM, *The Book of Isaiah with «Da'at Miqra» Commentary* (Jerusalem 1984) (Hebrew).

group only grammatically, on the basis of their punctuation, that is, *het* with a *hataf-patah*, and their ultimate stress. When, however, נחלה is interpreted as 'inheritance,' as it is in the other instances in the first group, the verses in Ezekiel are no longer clear. Only with the meaning of נחל, that is, as a 'stream of water', does the word נחלה fit well within the context; and that, indeed, is how both Rashi and Qimḥi understood it. Therefore, semantically, the נחלה in Ezekiel is unsuitable for the first group and, rather, is compatible with the examples in the third group.

The fourth exception belongs to the third group. One could explain נחלה in the expression נַחֲלָה עָבַר עַל-נַפְשֵׁנוּ as «the torrent would have gone over us» in the sense of a stream of water, as do Ibn Ezra and Qimḥi,²⁵ and as it appears in Table 1. There is, however, the alternative approach of Aramaic Targum, who renders it as *mar'ita* 'illness', as does Rashi *ad loc*: לשון חולי 'derived from illness.' Semantically, this means that it is possible to assign the נחלה in Psalms to the second group.

I shall now return to Rashi's comment: - לנחל ו"נחלה" האמור כאן - כמו. Rashi explains the word נחלה with another word: לנחל, in the sense of a stream of water, with an additional *he locale*²⁶. Rashi's explanation differs from the meaning offered by Targum Jonathan: «I found it rendered by the *Targum* as 'an inheritance.'» Targum Jonathan seemingly relates to this word solely as a translator and not as a commentator. His version ignores the context of a stream of water, and he translates the word according to the grammatical form as it appears before him, similar to the examples we have seen in the first group with identical punctuation and accentuation. This version also appears in the critical editions of the *Targum*, for example, in Sperber's edition;²⁷ and the New English Bible assigns

²⁵ See *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*, Psalms II.

²⁶ For the *he locale*, see N. ELKAYAM, «The He Locale in Rashi's Biblical Exegesis,» *Bisde Hemed* 40 (1997) pp. 13-24 (Hebrew).

²⁷ *The Bible in Aramaic*, ed. A. SPERBER, III (Leiden 1962); with variants, of אַחַסְנָת, אַחַסְנָתָא: אַחַסְנָתָא

it the same meaning:²⁸ «...the region assigned to you reaches the Great Sea.»

Rashi enlists support from the placement of the accent and from the Masorah in order to prove that Jonathan did, indeed, have the ultimate stress נחלה שהטעם למטה, which he therefore translated literally as אחסנא: אחרונה ומעלה (במ' לד 5) שהטעם למעלה ומסורה: אחסנא. עליו 'לית בטעמא'.

Rashi attests that he saw the word נחלה in מצרים in Numbers as being penultimately accented. This grammatical form, as I presented it in the third group, has the meaning of 'brook.' The Masorah on נחלה, according to Rashi, has the note לית בטעמא «unique with this accentuation», namely, the Masorete signifies that the word נחלה in Numbers is unique in that the stress is penultimate, whereas in the other Biblical occurrences, the stress is on the final syllable as we, indeed, found it to be in the first two columns of Table 1. Rashi, therefore, deduces that נחלה in Ezekiel cannot have penultimate, but rather ultimate accentuation, with the meaning 'inheritance' as in the first column. I may therefore conclude that the rendering of אחסנא was based on a version owned by Targum Jonathan, and is not the result of an errant reading with ultimate stress by Bible-teachers.²⁹

²⁸ *The New English Bible* (London 1970).

²⁹ Following M. COHEN, *Haketer*, who vocalizes קראים with a *holem* although there is a version קראים; see above n. 20. S. POZNAŃSKI, *Kommentar zu Ezechiel*, uses קראים and notes that, «in the latest printout, they had gotten themselves into difficulties trying to correct erring readers» (p. XXIV, n. 2). The reading קראים also accords well with E. TOUITOU, «J. Florsheim, Rashi on the Bible...»: «The קראים (Bible-teachers) based themselves primarily on Aramaic translations and then on early commentators» (p. 365); and he adds on our verse: «In different manuscripts the reading is קוראים [...], it seems to me that this is late and its purpose is to make a distinction between the קראים the 'Bible-teachers' and the seceding members of the sect» (n. 23). For the title «Qara» see also A. M. LIPSCHITZ, *Rashi* (Jerusalem 1967) pp. 156-160 (Hebrew); A. LOEWENSTAMN, «On the Derivation and Vocalization of the Name קראים», *Lesonenu* 38 (1974) pp. 181-182 (Hebrew); *Lesonenu* 40 (1976) pp. 296-297; M. M. AHREND, *Rabbi Joseph Kara's Commentary on Job* (Jerusalem 1988) p. 26, n. 25 (Hebrew).

Rashi's conclusion that נחלה in Ezekiel has ultimate stress is compatible with the version we have,³⁰ whereas Rashi's testimony: «And I saw that נחלה מצרים [in Numbers] [...] and the Masoretic note *ad loc.* is לית בטעמא» is not. As I have demonstrated in the third column of Table 1, נחלה has penultimate stress not only in Numbers, but also in Ps. 124:4 על-נפשו and, therefore, the Masorah should have been written בטעם ב since there are two instances where נחלה has penultimate stress.

How can we explain the difference in counting? It could be that in Rashi's text of Psalms, the stress was ultimate and, therefore, there is no disagreement with the Masoretic note in Numbers that, according to Rashi, states that נחלה with penultimate stress is a unique occurrence. Indeed, according to Ginsburg,³¹ there are ten manuscripts in which נחלה is accented with a *revi 'a mugrash* and ultimate accentuation, with the *revi 'a* on the *lamed* and the *geresh* on the initial *nun*. Thus, when נחלה has ultimate accentuation and the *het* is vocalized with a *sheva*, it belongs to the second group. In their commentaries to נחלה על נפשו in Psalms, both Rashi and Targum Jonathan derive it from חולי, as I indicated regarding the exceptional cases in the third group and similar to the occurrences in the second group.

This may possibly be an example of a phenomenon known to occur in manuscripts in there is a lack of congruence between the Masoretic note and the version.³² Hence, despite the note לית בטעמא in

³⁰ Thus in the Aleppo Codex. I did not find any evidence of different versions in C. D. GINSBURG, *The Later Prophets; Diligently Revised according to the Massorah and the Early Editions ...* (London 1926).

³¹ C. D. GINSBURG, *The Writings; Diligently Revised according to the Massorah and the Early Editions ...* (London 1926).

³² As noted by M. BREUER, *The Aleppo Codex and the Accepted Text of the Bible* (Jerusalem 1976) (Hebrew): «The duty of the Masorete is to faithfully copy the Masorah but it is not his task to examine the Masorah itself» (p. 251). And as has been proved by M. COHEN, «Some Basic Features of the Consonantal Text in Medieval Manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible,» in *Studies in Bible and Exegesis: A. Toeg in Memoriam*, eds. U. SIMON and M. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN (Ramat Gan 1986) pp. 123-182 (Hebrew); see esp. pp. 150-151, 176-182. The majority of Masorettes do not attempt to exhaustively examine the general import of annotations of the Mp and Mm which they copy, and, at times, restrict themselves to correcting texts which do not correspond closely with the Masorah at hand. If there was no

Numbers that asserts the unique penultimate stress of נחלה, the fact is that it does recur in Ps. 124:4.

There may be still another manner in which לית בטעמא could be understood. I tried to find the source of the note לית בטעמא that Rashi claims to have seen on Num. 34:5. We do not know which Biblical manuscript Rashi had before him and whether it contained the Masoretic notes. Therefore, I first examined the *Masorah Parva* (Mp) and the *Masorah Magna* (Mm) for the appearances of the word נחלה in Num. 34:5 and Ps. 124:4 that are found in 42 medieval Biblical manuscripts from all geographical regions.³³

conspicuous discrepancy between the Masorah and the text and its components (punctuation and accentuation), they were able to coexist in Ashkenaz for hundreds of years until the onset of printing. For the lack of correlation between the text/accompanying signs and Masoretic notes see J. PERETS, «Signs of Textual Identity for Schools of Transmission in Biblical Manuscripts of the Middle Ages, The Degree of Correlation between Them and Their Relevance in Understanding the Transmission History of the Biblical Text,» Master's thesis, Bar-Ilan University (Ramat Gan 1986) pp. 70, 138 (Hebrew); L. HIMMELFARB (Widawski), «The Paseq in the Hebrew Bible – Occurrences in Medieval Manuscripts, Characteristics and Relation to the Accentuation System,» Ph. D. diss., Bar-Ilan University (Ramat Gan 1990) pp. 140-142, 146-148 (Hebrew). For contradictory Masoretic notes due to errors by Masoretes and different methods of counting, see M. BREUER, *The Aleppo Codex*, pp. 193-283; M. COHEN, «The 'Masoretic Text' and the Extent of Its Influence on the Transmission of the Biblical Text in the Middle Ages,» in *Studies in Bible and Exegesis – Presented to Yehuda Elitzur*, II, ed. U. SIMON (Ramat-Gan 1986) pp. 229-256 (Hebrew); see esp. p. 237, nn. 22-23; pp. 240-241; Y. TOREN, «The Massora Parva to the Book of Isaiah in Manuscript Paris 1-3: Characteristics, Origins and Prevalence,» Master's thesis, Bar-Ilan University (Ramat Gan 1986) pp. 96-145 (Hebrew).

³³ More than twenty Ashkenazi manuscripts were chosen because it may be assumed that Rashi owned mainly Ashkenazi manuscripts. I also cited manuscripts from other geographical regions, to indicate that the Masorah note is not limited to a specific region.

In ten manuscripts there were no Masoretic notes concerning the discussed verses: eight Ashkenazi manuscripts (Codex Parma 668; Codex Paris, National Library 5-6; Codex Paris, National Library 44; Codex Paris, National Library 48-49; British Museum Add. 9400; British Museum Add. 9403; British Museum Or. 2091; Codex Roma 1); one Italian manuscript (Vatican, Codex 'Urbanity 2); one Sephardic manuscript (Codex Paris, National Library 24).

I am indebted to the members of the Institute for Research of Biblical Manuscripts at Bar-Ilan University and its head, Professor Menahem Cohen.

Table 2. A List of Manuscripts

A. Eight Palestinian/Eastern manuscripts

Manuscript	Sigla	Dated
Leningrad Codex, second Firkovitch collection, 17	LF17	930 C.E.
Leningrad Codex, second Firkovitch collection, 10	LF10	946 C.E.
Aleppo Codex ³⁴	A	10th century
Sassoon Codex 507 ³⁵	S507	10th century
(Or. 4445) Codex London, British Library	L45	10th century
Leningrad Codex B19a ³⁶	L	1009
Leningrad Codex, second Firkovitch collection, 59	LF59	11th century
Codex Vatican 448 ³⁷	Vt 448	11th-12th centuries

B. Twenty one medieval manuscripts of the two large and important transmissions of the Masorah

1. Thirteen Ashkenazi manuscripts of the Franco-German area

Manuscript	Sigla	Dated
(Or. Fol. 1213) Codex Berlin 127* ³⁸	B127	11th-12th centuries

³⁴ *The Aleppo Codex - Provided with Masoretic Notes and Pointed by Aaron Ben Asher*, edited with a Prolegomenon by M. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN (Jerusalem 1976).

³⁵ *Early Hebrew Manuscripts in Facsimile: The Damascus Pentateuch* (Copenhagen, I - 1978, II - 1982).

³⁶ *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition*, general editor D. N. FREEDMAN (Leiden - New York - Cologne 1998).

³⁷ *The Pentateuch Manuscript Vat. Heb. 448...*, Introductory remarks by A. DÍEZ MACHO (Jerusalem 1977).

³⁸ I indicated manuscripts with a Non-Conventional Tiberian system with a circle.

(Add. 15451) Codex London, British Library 55* ³⁹	L451	13th century
Codex Paris, National Library 1-3*	P1-3	1286
Vatikan, Codex Urbanity 1	Vr1	1294
Codex Paris, National Library 8-10	P8-10	1304
Codex Paris, National Library 19-20	P19	13th century
(Or. 4227) Codex London, British Museum 58 ⁴⁰	L4227	13th-14th centuries
Codex Reuchlin 1	R1	13th-14th centuries
(Or. Fol. 1-4) Codex Berlin 1-4 ⁴¹	B1-4	14th century
Codex Paris, National Library 34	P34	14th century
Codex Paris, National Library 40	P40	14th century
(Or. Fol. 5-7) Codex Berlin 2	B5-7	14th century
(Add. 9398) Codex London, British Museum 119	L9398	14th century

2. Eight Sephardic manuscripts

Manuscript	Sigla	Dated
Codex Hillely ⁴²	Hillely	1197
Codex Paris, National Library 25*	P25	1232
(Or. 2201) Codex London, British Museum 52	L2201	1246
Codex Sassonn 368 ⁴³	S368	1325
Codex Modena Estensa1 (Or.28)	ME1	13th-14th centuries
Codex Paris, National Library 23	P23	13th-14th centuries
Codex Sassoon 16	S16	1383
(Or. 2626-2628) Codex London, British Museum 62	L2628	1483

³⁹ See its description in C. D. GINSBURG, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (New York 1966) p. 605.

⁴⁰ See its description in C. D. GINSBURG, *Introduction*, p. 721.

⁴¹ See its description in M. COHEN, «Some Basic Features...» p. 154, n. 96.

⁴² *The Pentateuch, Codex Hillely*, Introductory remarks by N. M. SARNA (Jerusalem 1974).

⁴³ See its description in M. COHEN, «Some Basic Features...» p. 155 n. 97.

C. Two Italian manuscripts

Manuscript	Sigla	Dated
(Har. 5710-11) Codex London, British Library	L54	13th century
54*		
Codex Paris, National Library 17-18	P17	14th century

D. One manuscript from southern France

Manuscript	Sigla	Dated
Codex Vatican 468	Vt 468	1215

Table 3: Masorah Parva and Masorah Magna on the word נחלה in Num. 34: 5 and Ps. 124:4

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ב	ב' בטעי'	ב מלעיל	ב בטעי' מלעיל	ב' בטעי' בנון	ב' בטע' בנון מלעיל	ב' בתר' לישנ'	ב' בטעי' ובתר' לישי'	ב' בת' לישי' ומלעי'
						A:Ps Mp*		
	L:Ps Mp			L:Ps Mm*		L:Num Mp Mm*		
		LF10: Num Mp	LF10: Num Mm*	LF17: Num Mp Mm*				
	L45: Num Mp Mm	S507: Num Mp	S507: Num Mm*	Vt448: Num Mp ⁴⁴				
		L451: Num Mp, Ps Mp	L4227: Num Mp*	LF59: Num Mp Mm*				

⁴⁴ ב. בנון בטעי'.

		B1-4: Num Mp	P1-3: Num Mp* Mm*					
	L54: Num Mp	P23: Num Mp	P23: Ps Mp*	P25: Num Mp, Ps Mp*				
		R1: Ps Mp	R1: Num Mp	Hillely: Num Mm*			Hillely: Num Mp	
		P8-10: Num Mp*, Ps Mp*	S368: Ps Mp	S368: Num Mp Mm*				
		S16: Ps Mp	S16: Num Mp					
B127: Num Mp* ⁴⁵	Vt468: Num Mp	ME1: Num Mp Mm*	Vt468: Ps Mm					ME1: Ps Mp
		P17: Num Mp			P17: Num Mm ⁴⁶			
P40: Num Mp		B5-7: Num Mp	B5-7: Ps Mp					
L2201: Num Ps Mp		P19: Ps Mp	P19: Num Mp					
	Vr1: Num Mp	Vr1: Ps Mp						

⁴⁵ חד מן ב'.

⁴⁶ ב' בטע בנון מלעיל... ושאר טעמא בלמד.

		L9398: Ps Mp						
		P34: Num Mp*						
	L2628: Ps Mp	L2628: Num Mp Mm*						

* = detailed Masoretic notes

As can be seen from this table, I found a common basis for all the Masoretic notes in all the manuscripts I examined: ם appeared in each of them.⁴⁷ In the first column, I recorded ם with no additional information in order to illustrate two occurrences of נחלה in the Bible. In the other columns, I demonstrated one of three types of notes: the first note refers to where the stress is placed (2-6), followed by an exegetical one (7), and, finally, by one combining the two types together (8-9). More specifically: columns 1-6 show that the Masoretes left their personal imprint in the wording of their notes, and so we have six different descriptions of the exceptional accentuation of נחלה with penultimate stress, such as ם בטעי, ם מלעיל, ם בטעי בןון מלעיל, ם בטעי בןון, ם בטעי בןון מלעיל, ם בטעי מלעיל, ם בטעי בןון, ם בטעי בןון מלעיל, in contrast with the stress on the final syllable in the other occurrences. In column 7, I recorded the exegetical note ם בתרי לשני meaning «a unique pair of words, with identical pronunciation but different interpretation,» which I found in Mp and Mm of two manuscripts –the Aleppo Codex (Psalms) and, similarly, the Leningrad Codex B19a (Numbers).⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Y. OFER, *The Babylonian Masorah of the Pentateuch: Its Principles and Methods* (Jerusalem 2001) p. 518 (Hebrew), mentions a Babylonian Masorah reading בניגרא i.e., twice with penultimate accent.

⁴⁸ I did not find the paired נחלה in the lists of תרין בתרין לשנין – that is, pairs of homonyms in the Bible – that are to be found in S. FRENSDORFF, *Das Buch Ochla W'ochlah*, list 59; F. DÍAZ-ESTEBAN, *Sefer 'Oklah we-Oklah'*, list 60. However, I do find them in Codex S368, mentioned in R. I. ZAR, «Masorah and Commentary,»

This Masoretic note *ב' בתרי לשני* means that the word *נחלה* is found only twice in the Bible in this form, with a different meaning in each of these two occurrences.⁴⁹ I contend that even though the note is exegetical and teaches that *נַחֲלָה* in Psalms (from *חולי* 'illness') is different from the instance *נַחֲלָה* in Numbers (meaning 'brook'), it serves its purpose in preserving the text. Indeed, the note does not specify the unique penultimate accentuation of *נחלה* in its two occurrences, but it does emphasize that these are a unique pair of words that are identical in their pronunciation. This description fits only the penultimately accented *נחלה*, since it would not be appropriate for the many occurrences of *נחלה* with an ultimate accent. It goes without saying that great proficiency is required of the scribe and the reader to apply this scanty information.

The notes in the last two columns of Table 3 are of two different kinds: they specifically mention the unusual case when the stress is penultimate and when the Masoretic note has an exegetical sense, such as *ב' בת' ליש' ומלע' / ב' בטע' ובתר' ליש'*.

I should add that Mm, and even Mp, of many manuscripts contain an allusion to the location of the other verse.⁵⁰ It can be concluded, then, that despite their unusual wording, all the notes surveyed above enable us to preserve the penultimate reading of *נחלה* twice in the Scriptures. But how can we regard them as the source of the Masoretic note which proclaims another count (*לית*), only one occurrence, as Rashi reports?

Master's thesis, Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1999) p. 53 (Hebrew). See A. DOTAN's article on our subject: «Homonymous Hapax Doublets in the Masorah,» *Textus* 14 (1988) pp. 131-145.

⁴⁹ In contrast with the Masoretic note quoted by C. D. GINSBURG, *Massorah*, Letter Nun, n. 180: *נַחֲלָה בַּעֲנִין נָהַר וְנַחֲלָה בַּמַּלְעִיל וּבַחֲטָף לְבַד* (with the connotation of river and stream; occurs twice with penultimate stress and *ḥataf*); i.e., the two exceptional occurrences with penultimate stress have a single meaning.

⁵⁰ E.g., in MS. Vat 448 I found that the Mp to Numbers has, in addition to the note *נחלה עבר על נפשנו*, a reference to the second occurrence: *ב' בנן בטע*.

Only one manuscript, Parma di Rossi 2 (PR2)⁵¹ from Ashkenaz, employing the Non-Conventional Tiberian system, contains an Mp note on Numbers with wording radically different from the approximately 50 notes of both Masorah collections: *ל פס דס וחד נחלה עבר על נפשנו*. That is, that the occurrence (in Numbers) of the word-pair⁵² *נחלה מצרים* is unique in the Bible, while in the other instances – 5 in number – I found a different word-pair: *נחל מצרים*, in Jos. 15:4; 47; I Kings 8:65; Isa. 27:12; 2 Chr. 7:8. At the end of the Masoretic note of PR2, I find a reference to *נחלה* occurring once *עבר על נפשנו*, in Ps. 124:4.

It would appear that the Mp of PR2 contradicts the note *ב* that I found in the vast majority of notes, and seems closer to Rashi's observation of *לית בטעמא*. This, however, is not the case: my assumption is that the note in manuscript PR2 not only does not contradict the Masorah notes which declare *ב* but, on the contrary, it relies on that source, from which most of the notes that mention *ב* are derived. It seems that the Masorete of PR2 used his own methodology to rework the significance of two unique occurrences of *נחלה* with penultimate stress in contrast to the majority of the occurrences of *נחלה* with ultimate stress. He divided the two occurrences of *נחלה* into two references (which he could take the liberty to do because each occurrence has a different meaning), and created a linkage between the two verses: in the first part of his note, *ל פס דס*, he alludes to the *נחלה* in Numbers, while in the second part he alludes to the verse in Psalms by citing *נחלה עבר על נפשנו*. In this manner, the Masorah alludes to the two instances sharing a common element but does so without expressly delineating this shared characteristic, namely, the penultimate stress.

I presume that the note in PR2 can be considered an intermediate stage between the first notes I examined above (and marked *ב*) and the note in Rashi's commentary.

⁵¹ *Codices Palatini: The Parma Bible (Manuscript Parma No. 2808... de Rossi No. 2)*, ed. A. SPERBER (Copenhagen 1959); dated: 13th century.

⁵² Although the location of the Masorah Parva Circle is a distinctive Masoretic mark indicating that the note is concerned with a word-pair item, we know that the Non-Conventional Tiberian system manuscripts (with Tiberian-Palestinian punctuation) customarily use *דסמיכי* in cases of word-pairs as, e.g., in MS. P1-3, and similarly the Masorete of PR2. See Y. TOREN, «The Massora Parva,» pp. 36-37.

It should be mentioned that I did not find in any of the more than 40 manuscripts I examined the note which Rashi claimed that he had seen: לית בטעמא. If we understand the words לית בטעמא literally, the Mp specifies only one occurrence with penultimate stress. This, however, does not agree with our text, because it ignores the other occurrence of בחלה with penultimate stress, namely, the verse in Psalms. I assume that the yet unknown Masorete formulated an independent type of wording which is an extension of the exegetical note ב' בתרי לישני found in the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices.

The Masorete who reworked the wording of ב' בתרי לישני and shortened it to לית בטעמא clearly intended to say that every occurrence of נחלה is unique in its meaning, to be understood just one time with the meaning of 'brook' (as in Numbers, with penultimate stress), and just one time with the meaning of 'illness' (as in Psalms, with penultimate stress). By doing so, the Masorah highlights the common characteristic shared by the two occurrences of the word נחלה – penultimate stress – but without expressly stating this.

Finally, another possible explanation for the source of Rashi's Masorah: the anonymous Masorete might have erred in deciphering the Masoretic note that he had before him and as, for example, in the Mm of manuscript P17⁵³ נחלה ב' בטע בנון מלעיל... ושאר טעמא בלמד, mistakenly changed ל' בטעמא to ל' טעמא בל' 'stress on the letter ל' to 'unique.'

To sum up, I can indicate three stages in the development of the Masorah on נחלה in Numbers: initially, the Masorah of Aleppo Codex and of Leningrad Codex taught ב' בתרי לישני. This wording provides a wealth of information: it obviously refers to the total number of the occurrences of נחלה (twice); to the meaning, which is different in each occurrence; and even alludes to a special stress, i.e., on the first syllable. In the second stage, the Masorete of PR2 divided the two occurrences of נחלה into two references: ...חד and ...ל. He only hinted at any special accentuation, and made no reference whatsoever to its meaning. Rashi's citation: לית בטעמא

⁵³ I found the same Masoretic note in *Minhat Shai* on Ps. 124:4 in Pardess.

belongs to the third phase. The mention of the sum: 5 in addition to the reference בטעם to the stress combine to provide an obvious allusion to the meaning of the occurrence in Numbers, and can shed light on the meaning of its occurrence in Psalms.

CONCLUSION

The incorporation of Masorah notes in Rashi's writings teaches of the importance that he ascribed to the Masorah. He was convinced that if the Masoretic note לית is appended to the penultimately stressed word נחלה in Numbers, then it is not feasible that there is another Biblical occurrence of this word with the same accentuation. Even though Rashi did not explicitly speak on this subject, he valued the work of the Masoretes and credited the Masorah with the ability to preserve the Biblical text in an impeccable manner.

Let us end with a prayer: May it be the will of the Lord that he send נחלה – ('a stream of water') to the נחלה ('inheritance') and remove all נחלה ('illness').

RESUMEN

El propósito de nuestra investigación ha sido dilucidar cuáles fueron las fuentes masoréticas que Rashi empleó en su comentario a la palabra נחלה en Ezek. 47:19. Rashi sostiene haber visto que el acento va en la penúltima sílaba en נחלה מצרים (Num. 34:5), y que la Masora *ad loc* es לית בטעמא (única por tener dicha acentuación).

Por nuestra parte, hemos examinado numerosos manuscritos originarios de todas las regiones conocidas, pero no hemos encontrado ni una sola anotación masorética formulada de este modo. Además, todos ellos utilizan en sus masoras el ב (dos casos) en diferentes ocasiones, pero sin usar לית del modo que lo hace Rashi. Sólo en un manuscrito, Parma di Rossi 2, pudimos encontrar la anotación ל פס דס וחד נחלה עבר על נפשנו (la pareja מצרים נחלה es única en la Biblia, al igual que נחלה עבר על נפשנו). Sugerimos, a la vista de esta anotación y de la otra citada por Rashi, que לית בטעמא es otra forma con que los masoretas expresaron la anotación equivalente encontrada en los manuscritos de Alepo y Leningrado: ב בתרי לישני (una pareja única de palabras, idéntica en su pronunciación pero de diferente significado).

PALABRAS CLAVE: Rashi, Ezek 47:19, Masora, manuscritos bíblicos, acentuación hebrea, comentario bíblico.

SUMMARY

The aim of our research was to clarify the Masoretic sources which Rashi used in his commentary on the word נחלה in Ezek. 47:19. Rashi claims that he has seen that the stress is penultimate for נחלה מצרים (Num. 34:5) and that the Masorah *ad loc* is לית בטעמא (= unique with this accentuation).

I examined scores of medieval Biblical manuscripts that originated from all known regions but did not find a single Masoretic note formulated in this way. Moreover, they all apply the ב (= two occurrences) in different wording, without the use of לית as Rashi does. In only one manuscript, Parma di Rossi 2, did I find the note ל פס דס וחד נחלה עבר על נפשנו (the word-pair מצרים נחלה is unique in the Bible as is נחלה עבר על נפשנו). I suggest viewing this note and the other one quoted by Rashi לית בטעמא as a rewording by the Masorettes of the equivalent note found in the Aleppo and Leningrad Manuscripts: ב בתרי לישני (= a unique pair of words identical in pronunciation but different in meaning).

KEYWORDS: Rashi, Ezek. 47:19, Masorah, Biblical manuscripts, Hebrew accents, Biblical commentary.