

BIBLICAL CITATIONS IN THE MISHNAH: A CHARACTERIZATION OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT WITNESSES IN MEDIEVAL BYZANTIUM

YEHUDIT HENSHKE*

A. The Biblical Traditions Preserved in Mishnaic Manuscripts

Tannaitic literature can be broadly divided into two genres: halakhic midrash and the autonomous collections of topically arranged laws represented by the Mishnah and the Tosefta. Unlike the midrashic genre, which follows the order of the biblical text and aims at its exegesis, the second genre does not systematically rely on the biblical sources. Nonetheless, citations from all the biblical books are present in the six orders of the Mishnah,¹ where they serve as a basis for exegesis, as prooftexts,² and even as literary devices.³ These citations range from

* Department of Hebrew Language, Haifa University.

** I wish to thank Jordan S. Penkower for reading an earlier draft of the article and for his insightful, invaluable comments and patience in answering my questions. I must also express my appreciation to Benjamin Richler for his unstinting assistance in locating the sources of various manuscripts. Many thanks to Marc Brettler for reading this version of the article and especially for his instructive comments. Gaia Lembi, the Judaica librarian at the National Library, tendered assistance with the Greek and Latin Bible translations. Finally, I express my sincere appreciation to Dena Ordan for her editorial suggestions.

¹ See Chanoch Albeck, *Mavo la-mishnah* (Jerusalem, 1959), 3-39; Ezra Z. Melammed, *Pirke mavo le-sifrut ha-talmud* (Jerusalem, 1973), 25-31. The biblical citations are not scattered evenly throughout the mishnaic orders. Some have no citations; others have many. According to my count, tractate Sotah has the greatest concentration of biblical verses. On the uniqueness of this tractate with its many embedded halakhic midrashim, see Ezra Z. Melammed, *Ha-yahas she-ben midreshe ha-halakhah la-mishnah ve-la tosefta* (Jerusalem, 1967), 188-89.

² Albeck, *Mavo la-mishnah*, 40-62.

³ Such as ending mishnaic tractates with biblical verses. See n. 15 below.

some brief, one- or two-word citations, to lengthier ones, comprised at times of entire verses, or even more than one verse, even if this is not exegetically required.

For the most part, these citations are identifiable by the introductory formulas that precede and distinguish them from the mishnaic discussion. Three roots feature in these introductory formulas: אמ"ר, כת"ב, and דר"ש. Of these, the most frequent is אמ"ר,⁴ as found in the recurring expression שנאמר,⁵ its related expressions,⁶ and in the different forms of אמר,⁷ אומר,⁸ and תלמוד לומר.⁹ Also found in these formulas is the root כת"ב,¹⁰ and mixed expressions with אמ"ר and כת"ב.¹¹ Where accompanied by exegesis, the root דר"ש usually appears alongside the name of the tanna who explicates the verses.¹² Two additional singular introductory formulas are found in the Mishnah: the root פר"ש in the passive participle מפורש (found twice; Sheqal 1.5; Tamid 3.7), and the expression משום, found twice in Mak 1.3. Occasionally, indirect introductory formulas,¹³ or biblical citations with no introduction, are embedded in the running tannaitic discussion.¹⁴ Intriguingly, a greater number of biblical citations

⁴ See Wilhelm Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (Leipzig, 1905), 5-6.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ שנאמר בו, שנאמר כאן, כמו שנאמר, אף על פי שנאמר, (אלא) משום שנאמר, (ו)נאמר, למה נאמר, (ו)על זה נאמר, לא נאמר אלא, ונאמר להלן, (והלוא) כבר נאמר.

⁷ אמרה תורה, אמר

⁸ הוא אומר להלן, מה הוא אומר, והרי הוא אומר, וכן הוא אומר, עליהם הוא אומר, (ו)להלן הוא אומר, כשהוא אומר, אינו אומר... אלא

⁹ See, e.g., Sotah 5.4-5; Mak 1.7-8.

¹⁰ הכתוב שבתורה, ככתוב בתורת משה עבדך

¹¹ הכתוב אומר, (ו)כתוב אחד אומר, עליו הכתוב אומר

¹² See, e.g., a collection of homilies in the name of Rabbi Akiba in Sotah 5.2-4. But in Sheqal 1.4 we find: הכהנים דורשים מקרא זה לעצמן.

¹³ Such as אמר על פי שאין ראיה לדבר, וזכר לדבר (Shab 8.7, 9.4; Sanh 8.2), following which the verse is cited without any other introductory formulas according to the best witnesses; in secondary witnesses שנאמר was added. The addition of אמר and similar formulas is not unique. See Menahem Kahana, "Aqdamot le-hoza'ah ḥadashah shel sifre be-midbar" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1982), 150-51 and the following note.

¹⁴ For varied examples, see Pe'ah 7.7; Sotah 8.5-6, 9.5; B. Kam 9.7 (secondary witnesses add שנאמר; see David Henshke, *Mishnah rishonah be-talmudam shel tanna'im aḥaronim* [Ramat Gan, 1997], 34 n. 136); Sanh 10.5-6; Mak 1.7; Neg

are concentrated at the end of the tractates,¹⁵ not necessarily for direct exegesis but rather as a literary device of conclusion.¹⁶

The verses embedded in the Mishnah are not always identical to the Masoretic text.¹⁷ This is not surprising: witnesses to the biblical text and rabbinic sources themselves provide both direct and indirect attestation to variants in the biblical text.¹⁸ This question of the variants found in rabbinic sources citing biblical texts was already addressed by the Babylonian geonim, followed by early and late talmudic authorities,¹⁹ and the approaches taken to this issue evidence disagreements between Oriental and Ashkenazic authorities.²⁰ Moreover, as attested in various sources ranging from biblical manuscripts to indirect testimony by

12.7. On the embedding of halakhic midrashim in the Mishnah, see Melammed, *Ha-yahas she-ben midreshe ha-halakhah la-mishnah ve-la tosefta*, 182-89, esp. 188-89.

¹⁵ Tractates *Berakhot*, *Pe'ah*, *Yoma*, *Mo'ed Katan*, *Gittin*, *Kiddushin*, *Makkot*, *Menahot*, *Hullin*, *'Arakhin*, *Keritot*, *Tamid*, *Kinnim*, and *Yadayim*. The concluding verses found at the end of *'Uksin* in MSS Kaufmann and Parma A are missing in MS Cambridge.

¹⁶ See Yonah Fraenkel, *Midreshe aggadah* (Ramat Aviv, 1993), 1.200-201.

¹⁷ For a comprehensive study, see Victor Aptowitzer, *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur* (Vienna, 1906-15).

¹⁸ This phenomenon was already noted by medieval authorities. For a comprehensive discussion, see David Rosenthal, "The Sages' Methodical Approach to Textual Variants within the Hebrew Bible" in *Sefer Yizhaq Aryeh Seeligmann*, ed. A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch (Jerusalem, 1983), 2.395-417. See also Eduard Y. Kutscher, *Ha-lashon ve-ha-reqa' ha-leshoni shel megillat Yesha'yahu ha-shelemah mi-megillot yam ha-melaḥ* (Jerusalem, 1959), 57-65; Menahem I. Kahana, "Nusah ha-miqra ha-mishtaqqef bi-khtav yad romi 32 le-sifre be-midbar u-dvarim," *Mehqere talmud* (1990): 1; among others.

¹⁹ For a compilation of this material, see Menachem Cohen, "Some Basic Features of the Consonantal Text in Medieval Manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible," *Iyyune miqra u-farshanut*, ed. U. Simon and M. Goshen-Gottstein (Ramat Gan, 1980), 1.123-82; Jordan S. Penkower, "The Text of the Bible Used by Rashi as Reflected in His Biblical Commentaries," in *Rashi: Demuto vi-zirato*, ed. A. Grossman and S. Japhet (Jerusalem, 2008), 1.99-105; among others.

²⁰ Rosenthal, "Textual Variants," 401-2.

biblical exegetes and halakhists,²¹ these divergent textual traditions remained current for centuries among medieval Jewish communities.²² These disparate traditions were even characteristic of the different academies; after all, the knowledge of the MT differed in Sepharad and in Ashkenaz,²³ and medieval Ashkenazic biblical manuscripts vary in many details from contemporary Sephardic ones.²⁴ The Italian manuscripts display great affinity to the Ashkenazic ones.²⁵ These distinctions make the biblical traditions represented in mishnaic manuscripts a reliable tool—alongside other criteria—for determining the origins of a manuscript and its scribe's tradition.

This article neither attempts to evaluate the different medieval biblical manuscripts, nor to reconstruct the original biblical text. Indeed, like other studies, the present study demonstrates the influence of the processes of harmonization and attraction on these manuscripts. My aim is rather to situate MS Cambridge and other manuscripts of the Mishnah within the different families of medieval biblical texts.²⁶

²¹ See, e.g., Cohen, "Consonantal Text"; Menachem Cohen, ed., "Introduction to *Miqra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*, in *Joshua-Judges: A Revised and Augmented Scientific Edition of 'Miqra'ot Gedolot' Based on the Aleppo Codex and Early Medieval MSS* (Ramat-Gan, 1992), *4-*6; Penkower, "Text of the Bible Used by Rashi."

²² Cohen, "Consonantal Text," 146-81.

²³ See *ibid.*

²⁴ On the pentateuchal text in Ashkenaz, see the comprehensive doctoral dissertation of Joseph Peretz, "Ha-Torah bi-khtav yad, be-tikkune soferim u-v-sifre torah ashkenaziyyim bi-tqufat yeme ha-benayim: Nusah, parashiyot petuhot u-stumot ve-zurat ha-shirot" (Ph.D. diss., Bar-Ilan University, 2008); *idem*, "Nusah ha-otiyot be-sifre torah ashkenaziyyim mi-me ha-benayim," in *Minhat Sappir: Asuppat ma'amarim: Minhut yedidut ve-hoqarah li-khvod Yizhak Sappir*, ed. I. Rozenzon and Y. Spanier (Elkana-Rehovot, 2013).

²⁵ See Cohen, "Consonantal Text," 108, 154; Penkower, "Text of the Bible Used by Rashi," 108. On the Spanish manuscripts, see Cohen, "Introduction," *4-*5; Cohen, "Consonantal Text," 137-82. On the Italian manuscripts, see Orlit Kolodni, "Ha-torah be-mazhafim u-v-tiqqune soferim italqiyyim bi-tqufat yeme ha-benayim: Nusah, parashiyot petuhot u-stumot ve-zurat ha-shirot" (M.A. thesis, Bar-Ilan University, 2008).

²⁶ On medieval biblical manuscripts, see Cohen, "Consonantal Text," 123-82; Menachem Cohen, "The 'Masoretic Text' and the Extent of Its Influence on the Transmission of the Biblical Text in the Middle Ages," *Iyyune miqra u-farshanut* 2 (1986): 242-54. See the reservations expressed by Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein,

B. The Biblical Text in MS Cambridge of the Mishnah: Methods and Aims

The biblical traditions in MS Cambridge of the Mishnah (also known as the Lowe edition), the nature of whose mishnaic tradition remains somewhat obscure,²⁷ are here subjected to examination for this purpose. Dated by a watermark to the mid-fifteenth century,²⁸ this manuscript, whose origins lie in the Aegean basin, is, with MSS Kaufmann and Parma A, one of three complete witnesses to the text of the Mishnah without the talmudic text. Its Byzantine origins and our limited knowledge of this tradition's characteristically mixed nature raise the following question:²⁹ does the manuscript reflect a Sephardic tradition current in Byzantium in the fifteenth century, or a local Romaniot one?

Examination of the textual versions of the biblical verses in MS Cambridge not only contributes to identification of the biblical tradition to which it bears the closest affinity, but also impacts on the characterization of the Byzantine tradition in general and the sources of its inspiration. Although we might assume that a mid-fifteenth-century manuscript would reflect exposure to mixed traditions, nonetheless, this consideration showed MS Cambridge to possess defined characteristics, outstanding among which was a close affinity to Ashkenazic rather than Sephardic biblical manuscripts. This manuscript represents a historical juncture preceding the overwhelming influence of the Sephardic influx

"Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), 73-75 and elsewhere in the article; and the survey of approaches in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis, 2012), 38-39.

²⁷ See Yehudit Henshke, "Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge (Lowe Edition) of the Mishna," *Leshonenu* 72 (2010): 421, 434-48, 440-41; idem, "Gutturals in MS Cambridge of the Mishnah: A Historical-Linguistic Study of Rabbinic Hebrew Traditions," *Hebrew Studies* 52 (2011): 183-85.

²⁸ See Henshke, "Gutturals," 172.

²⁹ See Henshke, "Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge," 434-38.

on Byzantium and accordingly represents the local Romaniot traditions which were grounded in Ashkenazi ones. These affinities will be highlighted throughout.

Moreover, as opposed to the characteristic harmonization of traditions in fifteenth-century biblical manuscripts,³⁰ the secondary, covert nature of the biblical citations embedded in the Mishnah may have preserved early variants and kept them from mixing with other traditions. This is evident in the printed editions of the Mishnah, where, centuries after the invention of printing and unification of the text, we still find differences between the MT as represented in Bibles and the verses cited in the prevalent editions of the Mishnah.³¹ Accordingly, despite its relatively late date, as a secondary witness to biblical verses MS Cambridge may not only provide reliable data on the Byzantine tradition but also serve scholars of the biblical text.

For the purposes of this paper, I compared all the biblical citations in MS Cambridge to the MT and to the versions found in other manuscripts of the Mishnah: Kaufmann, Parma A, Parma B, and Antonin. The results were as expected: most of the biblical citations in MS Cambridge are identical to the MT, textually and orthographically. Moreover, as reflected in the scribe of MS Cambridge's penning of defective and plene spellings, the citations are largely accurate and tend to preserve the defective spelling of the MT version.³²

³⁰ Evidence of the difference between primary and secondary sources comes from the scope of the influence of the accepted version on manuscripts of the Prophets and the Writings, which preserved local traditions, as opposed to the synagogue Torah scrolls, which were closer to the MT. See Joseph Peretz, "Simane zehut tekstu'alim shel 'askolot mesirah be-khitve yad miqra'iyim shel yeme ha-benayim, midat ha-hat'ama benehem u-mashma'am le-toledot ha-mesirah shel ha-nusah" (Hebrew; M.A. thesis, Bar-Ilan University, 1986), 176.

³¹ E.g., in the printed editions of Pe'ah 5.6, Prv 22.28 is cited as אל תסג גבול עולם as opposed to the usual עולמים. In the same mishnah, the first verb in the verse כי תבצר (Dt 24.21) is written plene as opposed to the MT. The same is true of the verse בהריש ובקציר תשבת (Ex 34.21) in Sheb 1.4. Ezr 4.3, לא לכם ולנו לבנות בית ה', differs in the citation in Shekal 1.8, אלהינו, and אלהינו, appears in other printed editions, among other examples. Note that the Kehati edition of the Mishnah takes greater care to harmonize the citations with the MT.

³² This does not mean that MS Cambridge does not contain plene spellings as compared to the MT, but that they are relatively few in number. This contrasts with the plene spellings characteristic of the biblical verses cited in MS Kaufmann.

Thus, in penning the verse **וַאֲהַבְתָּ אֶת ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל לִבְבְּךָ וּבְכָל נַפְשְׁךָ וּבְכָל מְאֹדְךָ** (Dt 6.5), which appears in Berakhot three times (9.5 [7]), the scribe of MS Cambridge adhered to the defective spelling **מְאֹדְךָ** found in the MT, whereas in MS Kaufmann the scribe wrote the plene **מְאֹדֶיךָ** for these occurrences,³³ and in Parma A the defective spelling appears only once.³⁴ This is also the case for **וְכִי תִבְצֹר כְּרֶמֶךְ לֹא תַעֲוֹלֵל** (Dt 24.21) cited in Pe'ah 5.6: MS Cambridge has the defective spelling twice as in the MT, whereas in MSS Kaufmann and Parma the spelling is plene: **תִּבְצֹר**. This is exemplified in Bik 1.2 as well: the verse **רֵאשִׁית בְּכוּרֵי אֲדָמָתְךָ** (Ex 23.19) is (twice) written defectively in MSS Cambridge and Parma, whereas in MS Kaufmann it is spelled plene—**בִּיכּוּרֵי**—on both occasions. In the continuation of this chapter (1.9 [10]) MS Cambridge preserves the MT's defective spelling of this word, whereas MSS Kaufmann and Parma A use the plene spelling.

This brief sample by no means fully reflects the relationship between the manuscripts of the Mishnah regarding the complex issue of defective vs. plene spelling, but it does confirm the trustworthiness of the biblical citations in MS Cambridge.³⁵ Even though the mishnaic manuscripts generally use plene spelling, in the case of biblical citations, their scribes, the scribe of MS Cambridge especially, may diverge from this practice and retain the version found in the biblical text in their possession.³⁶ It appears likely that some of these scribes also penned biblical manuscripts; this perhaps impacted on their citation of the biblical quotations embedded in the Mishnah. This suggests in turn that MS Cambridge is a faithful witness to the version of the biblical text with which its scribe was familiar. In those instances in which the biblical verse presents a variant from the MT, this should not be immediately identified as a scribal error, a slip of the pen, or carelessness (although

³³ The scribe of MS Kaufmann tends to the plene in many instances. See Ariel Gabbai, "The Language of Biblical Quotations in Ms. Kaufmann of the Mishna," *Mehqarim be-lashon* 13 (2011): 67-74.

³⁴ In the last two occurrences, the word is abbreviated: **מֵא**.

³⁵ Although I did not subject the orthography of the biblical verses in MS Parma to examination, my impression is that it too tends to be in line with the MT.

³⁶ Nonetheless, MS Kaufmann has many examples of plene spellings. See Gabbai, "Biblical Quotations in Ms. Kaufmann," 69-78, 94-95.

this cannot be ruled out). We must rather seek its sources: Ashkenaz or Sepharad.

Indeed, there are a significant number of variants from the MT in this manuscript. As an initial step, I located parallels of the non-MT variants in MS Cambridge, using the variants listed in the Kennicott Bible (2003). This edition of the Bible is based on 680 manuscripts and other witnesses to the biblical text.³⁷ After locating and sorting these manuscripts, I turned to identification of their origins. This examination of the variants led to an intriguing picture. Most of the non-MT variants found in MS Cambridge are supported by medieval Ashkenazic and Italian manuscripts, but are largely unknown in Sephardic biblical manuscripts. Note that the Ashkenazic biblical tradition has early roots and differs from the Sephardic tradition.³⁸ This finding attests to clear links between the Ashkenazic biblical tradition and the tradition that underlies MS Cambridge; namely, this is a local Romaniot manuscript and not a Sephardic one.³⁹

This article seeks to take an overall look at these data in MS Cambridge. In the course of the discussion I will try, as noted, to reach conclusions regarding the origins of this manuscript and also shed light

³⁷ Benjamin Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus*, 2d ed. (Hildesheim, 2003). The Kennicott Bible served only as a source for comparing the biblical text in the various medieval manuscripts. On the Kennicott Bible, see Tov, *Textual Criticism*; Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 49-52. Henceforth references to this Bible are in abbreviated form: the letter K and the manuscript number. I did not include the printed editions on which Kennicott relied. In order to limit the influence of the printed versions and the mixing of traditions, I only checked manuscripts up to the fifteenth century.

³⁸ See Jordan S. Penkower, "A Tenth-century Pentateuchal MS from Jerusalem (MS C3), Corrected by Mishael ben Uzziel," *Tarbits* 58 (1988-89): 49-74; idem, "The Text of the Pentateuch in the Masoretic Codices Written by Early Ashkenazi Sages in the 10th – 12th Centuries," *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 17 (2007): 279-308; Peretz, "Simane zehut tektstu'alim"; Kolodni, "Ha-torah be-mazhafim u-v-tiqqune soferim italqiyyim."

³⁹ This conclusion is supported by the manuscript's language and orthography. See Yehudit Henshke, "Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge"; idem, "Gutturals"; idem, "The Vocalization of MS Cambridge of the Mishnah: Between Ashkenaz and Italy," *Leshonenu* 74 (2012): 143-63; idem, "The Orthography of MS Cambridge of the Mishnah: The *i* Vowel," in *Nit'e Ilan: Meḥqarim ba-lashon ha-ivrit ve-ahyoteha muggashim le-Ilan Eldar* (Jerusalem, 2014).

on the Byzantine biblical tradition. These conclusions will also assist in uncovering the features and roots of the Byzantine Jewish community, which remain shrouded. The discussion also reveals the shared base of the biblical variants reflected in the three main manuscripts of the Mishnah.

The variants from the MT in MS Cambridge can be divided into three categories: the first and largest includes variants with parallels in Ashkenazic (and Italian) biblical manuscripts; the second, variants supported in manuscripts of mishnaic Hebrew and its sources for which I found no supporting evidence in biblical manuscripts; and third, the smallest group (three examples), variants unique to MS Cambridge, some of which have late, indirect parallels.⁴⁰ The differences between the biblical citations in MS Cambridge of the Mishnah and the MT are identifiable in various spheres: defective and plene spelling;⁴¹ addition or deletion of vav conjunctive and determination; exchanges of letters, consonants, and prepositions; and actual textual variants.

1. The Biblical Tradition in MS Cambridge and Ashkenazic Biblical MSS

a. Orthography

As noted, despite the general tendency toward plene in mishnaic Hebrew, MS Cambridge tends to retain the biblical orthography. Accordingly, attestations to defective spellings as compared to plene spelling of the MT are surprising and testify to a unique tradition. Thus we find in ודור רביעי ישובו הנה (Gn 15.16; 'Ed 2.9[10]) that MS Cambridge has a variant with defective spelling in the verb: ישוב, whereas MSS Kaufmann and

⁴⁰ Although the focus of this study is on the medieval witnesses to the biblical text, each variant was also compared to the ancient witnesses: the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Talmuds, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the LXX, and the Vulgate. Note that for almost all the variants treated in this article the text of the DSS is identical to the MT.

⁴¹ This article will relate to defective spelling in biblical verses in MS Cambridge as compared to the MT but not to plene spellings of these verses.

Parma A retain the biblical plene spelling. Witnesses to this defective spelling come from three biblical manuscripts, all Ashkenazic.⁴²

With regard to the verse **והאם רבצת על האפרחים או על הביצים** (Dt 22.6; Hul 12.3[5]) MS Cambridge, like MSS Kaufmann and Parma A, has the defective spelling **בצים**.⁴³ This defective spelling is attested in two Ashkenazic manuscripts,⁴⁴ and one eastern one.⁴⁵

Preservation of historical spelling, on the other hand, is found in the verse **ויקבר אותו בגי** (Dt 34.6; Sotah 1.9). MS Cambridge, and also MSS Kaufmann and Parma A, surprisingly attest to the spelling with *alep*: **בגיא**.⁴⁶ This spelling is found in eleven Ashkenazic and Italian manuscripts, and in one Sephardic one.⁴⁷

b. Consonantal Exchanges

1. ט – צ

Exchange	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
צ – ט	הושיעה ה' כי גמר חסיד כי פסו אמונים מבני אדם (Ps 12.2)	Sotah 9.12[18]		
		Cambridge ⁴⁸	Kaufmann	Parma A
		פצו	פסו	phrase not cited

A *tsadi-samekh* exchange is found in MS Cambridge for the third verb in the verse, **פסו**, whereas MS Cambridge reads **פצו**.⁴⁹ For this surprising

⁴² K 9, 18, 615.

⁴³ On the defective spelling **בצים** in mishnaic manuscripts, see J.N. Epstein, *Mavo le-nusah ha-mishnah*, 3rd ed. (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2000), 2:1240-41.

⁴⁴ K 69, 80.

⁴⁵ K 69, 80.

⁴⁶ Note that the defective spelling **גי** is not unusual in the Bible, though the spelling **גיא** is more common in the Pentateuch, with the exception of the verse in question. See *Minhat Shay* on Dt 34.6.

⁴⁷ For the Ashkenazic manuscripts, see K 1, 4, 80, 107, 150, 196, 260, 674; for the Italian ones, see K 94, 678; for the single Sephardic manuscript, see K 3.

⁴⁸ On *tsadi-samekh* exchanges in MS Cambridge, see Henshke, "Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge," 422-29.

⁴⁹ *Tsadi-samekh* exchanges appear not just in the biblical citations in MS Cambridge but in the text of the Mishnah itself. This can of course be attributed to

variant I found parallels in only two biblical manuscripts, both from Ashkenaz.⁵⁰

2. ה – א

Exchange	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
ה – א	והאראל שתיים עשרה ארך בשתיים עשרה רחב רבוע (Ez 43.16)	Mid 3.1 [3]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		וההריאל	והאריאל	והאריאל

Alep-heh exchanges are attested in the first word of the verse וְהָאֲרִיאֵל. The MT has a *kere-ketiv* here: the *ketiv* is וְהָאֲרִיאֵל and the *kere* is וְהָאֲרִיאֵל. MSS Kaufmann and Parma A cite the *kere* version, but MS Cambridge attests to a third variant: וְהָהָרִיאֵל.⁵¹ This variant is also found in Genizah fragments with Palestinian vocalization.⁵² Examination of the variants in the Kennicott Bible did not find exactly the same variant as the MS Cambridge one, but versions that exchange *alep* for *heh* are attested in Ashkenazi manuscripts starting in the twelfth century,⁵³ and in a fourteenth-century Italian-Ashkenazi manuscript.⁵⁴ This exchange is found in only one Sephardic manuscript, which is later than the Ashkenazic and the Italian ones.⁵⁵

scribal correction. See Henshke, “Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge,” 427. However, the parallel to Ashkenazic biblical manuscripts tips the balance in favor of an early Ashkenazic tradition. In MS Parma A the citation ends earlier.

⁵⁰ K 37, 156.

⁵¹ On this exchange, see Henshke, “Gutturals,” 278.

⁵² Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein and Shmaryahu Talmon, eds., *The Book of Ezekiel* (Hebrew and English; Jerusalem, 2004), 203.

⁵³ וְהָהָרִיאֵל: K 96; וְהָהָרִיאֵל: K 109; וְהָרִיאֵל: K 80.

⁵⁴ וְהָרִיאֵל: K 1.

⁵⁵ וְהָהָרִיאֵל: K 171. The manuscript contains a deed gifting the manuscript to Joseph ben Judah ben Hanin of Tunis, 1492.

3. ז – ס

Exchange	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
ז – ס	ואסיר גבולות עמים ועתודותיהם שושתי (Is 10.13)	Yad 4.4 [12]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann ²	Parma A and B
		שוסתי	שוסתי	שוסתי

A *sin-samekh* exchange is attested for the second verb in the verse, **שושתי**. The MT has a *sin* in the verb,⁵⁶ but MSS Cambridge, Kaufmann², Parma A and B have **שוסתי**, with *samekh*.⁵⁷ Similar attestation comes from Genizah fragments with Palestinian vocalization.⁵⁸ This reflects the known exchange in mishnaic Hebrew between *sin* and *samekh*. The version with *samekh* is found in varied biblical manuscripts, seven Ashkenazic and one Italian,⁵⁹ but only in two Sephardic ones.⁶⁰ In effect, this exchange attests to a widespread tradition of *sin-samekh* exchanges, to which the manuscripts of the Mishnah can be added.⁶¹

c. Vav Conjunctive

The addition or deletion of vav conjunctive from the biblical citations in the Mishnah can also serve as a criterion for determining the nature of the biblical text version.⁶²

⁵⁶ *Minhat Shay* (ad loc.) attests to two *sinin*.

⁵⁷ MSS Parma A and B have plene spelling: **שוסיטי**; Kaufmann has the abbreviated form **שוס**.

⁵⁸ Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, ed., *Sefer Yesha'yahu* (Jerusalem, 1995), 40.

⁵⁹ The Ashkenazic manuscripts include: K 4, 93, 96, 153, 160, 168, 584. The Italian manuscript is: K 613.

⁶⁰ K 477, 570.

⁶¹ MS Kaufmann has four *sin-samekh* exchanges. See Gabbai, "Biblical Quotations in Ms. Kaufmann," 13. MS Parma has only two such exchanges, one in our citation and one in Shab 8.7. There the verse **ולא ימצא במכתו חרש** (Is 30.24) appears with *samekh*: **חרס**. MSS Cambridge and Kaufmann preserve the MT spelling.

⁶² See Penkower, "Text of the Bible Used by Rashi," 116-17, 122, and passim.

1. Added Vav Conjunctive

MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
מאן יבמי להקים לאחיו שם בישראל לא אבה יבמי (Dt 25.7)	Yebam 12.6 [7]		
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
	ולא אבה יבמי	phrase not cited	phrase not cited

MS Cambridge inserts a *vav* in the middle of the verse and reads **ולא** אבה יבמי.⁶³ *Minḥat Shay* (ad loc.) provides evidence from the BT for this reading (bYebam 106b). This version is also found in three thirteenth-to-fourteenth-century Ashkenazic manuscripts.⁶⁴

2. Deleted Vav Conjunctive

In MS Cambridge the dropping of *vav* conjunctive is more frequent than its addition. Note, however, that alongside the omission of *vav* conjunctive in biblical verses, MS Cambridge in many cases preserves the *vav* conjunctive, even at the beginning of citations.⁶⁵ Therefore, it is difficult to treat the phenomenon of the deletion of *vav* conjunctive as arbitrary; it appears to depend on a tradition. Moreover, the versions with deletions have parallels in Ashkenazic biblical manuscripts and in mishnaic manuscripts. This suggests that the deletion of *vav* conjunctive in the biblical citations embedded in the Mishnah reflects a text tradition that differed from the MT. The examples are summarized in the table below:

⁶³ These words are missing from MSS Kaufmann and Parma A.

⁶⁴ K 17, 80, 150.

⁶⁵ E.g., ונתן לכהן (Tem 1.1 [2]); והיה הוא ותמורתו יהיה קדש (Pe'ah 8.9); ודורש רעה תבואנו (twice; Ter 6.6 [7]); ולחשוף מים מגבא (Shab 8.7), among many others.

MT	MSS of the Mishnah			Additional Evidence
ואם לא תפדה וערפתו (Ex 13.13)	Bek 1.7 [9]			Parallel from 13 th -century Ashkenaz ⁶⁶
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	אם לא תפדה וערפתו	אם לא תפדה וערפתו	ואם לא תפדה וערפתו (MT)	
ואם לא יגאל ונמכר בערכך (Lv 27.27)	Bek 1.7 [9]			15 th -century Ashkenazic ms ⁶⁷
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	אם לא יגאל ונמכר בערכך	אם לא יגאל ונמכר בערכך	ואם לא יגאל ונמכר בערכך (MT)	
ובשכבך ובקומך (Dt 6.7; Dt 11.20)	Ber 1.3 [5]			Two Ashkenazic Bible mss ⁶⁸
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	בשכבך ובקומך	בשכבך ובקומך	ובשכבך ובקומך (MT)	
ולא תחבל בגד אלמנה (Dt 24.17)	B. Metsi'a 9.13 [16]			13 th -century Ashkenazic ms ⁶⁹
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	לא תחבל	לא תחבל	ולא תחבול	
ולא ימצא במכתתו חרש לחתות אש מיקוד	Shab 8.7			Ashkenazic Bible mss ⁷⁰
	Cambridge ⁷¹	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	לא ימצא	לא ימצא ⁷²	לא ימצא	

⁶⁶ K 84.

⁶⁷ K 104.

⁶⁸ K 75, 232.

⁶⁹ K 69. Note that in this manuscript the negative particle is attached to the verb: לתחבל.

⁷⁰ K 96, 150, 246, 249, 256.

⁷¹ A version without *vav* is attested in the BT and the PT. See Goshen-Gottstein, *Yesha'yahu*, 123.

(Is 30.14)				
------------	--	--	--	--

Only in one instance do we find no preference for the Ashkenazic tradition and equal Sephardic and Ashkenazic evidence.

ומדי שבת בשבתו (Is 66.23)	‘Ed 2.10 [11]			Two biblical mss: one Ashkenazic ⁷³ and one Sephardic ⁷⁴
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	מדי שבת בשבתו	ומדי שבת בשבתו (MT)	מדי שבת בשבתו	

Once again, this examination of the addition or deletion of *vav* conjunctive attests to the links between MS Cambridge and the Ashkenazic tradition.

d. Definite article (heh)

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
פנים – הפנים	ונתת על השלחן לחם פנים לפני תמיד (Ex 25.30)	Menah 11.4		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		הפנים	הפנים	פנים

I identified a slight change in the noun: **פנים**. Parma A retains the MT version, whereas MSS Cambridge and Kaufmann have the determined

⁷² The *vav* has been added in a different hand.

⁷³ K 223.

⁷⁴ K 82.

form **לחם הפנים**.⁷⁵ This determined form appears only in Ashkenazic manuscripts.⁷⁶

e. Prepositional Exchanges

*1. כ – ב*⁷⁷

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
ב – כ	ושבה אל בית אביה כנעוריה מלחם אביה ⁷⁸ תאכל (Lv 22.13)	Yebam 9.6 [9]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		כנעוריה	כנעוריה (MT)	כנעוריה (MT)

Bet-kap exchanges are attested twice in MS Cambridge.⁷⁹ The first instance is found in the inflected noun **כנעוריה**. MSS Kaufmann and Parma A agree with the MT, but MS Cambridge reads **כנעוריה**.⁸⁰ Here too the manuscripts that support this version have Ashkenazic origins.⁸¹ This

⁷⁵ MS Kaufmann has **ונתת** with plene spelling: **ונתתה**. Parma A has **לפני** in plene spelling: **לפניי**.

⁷⁶ K 69, 153, 686.

⁷⁷ *Bet-kap* exchanges occur elsewhere in the Bible. See, e.g., Penkower, “Text of the Bible Used by Rashi,” 122.

⁷⁸ The version in MS Cambridge reads **אביך**. See n. 118 below.

⁷⁹ A second exchange of this type appears in the verse: **והיה כקרבנכם אל המלחמה**. In the MT and mishnaic manuscripts the infinitive is prefixed by *kap*, whereas in MS Cambridge it is prefixed by *bet*: **בקרבנכם**. I found attestation to this version in two Sephardic manuscripts, from the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries respectively (K 19, 99), and in *Minḥat Shay*.

⁸⁰ Graphic exchanges between *bet* and *kap* are relatively frequent in MS Cambridge. Although they may simply be graphic exchanges, the parallels to Ashkenazic manuscripts tip the scales in favor of the assumption that MS Cambridge here represents a unique version.

⁸¹ K 80, 155.

version also appears in the Soncino Bible, of clear Ashkenazic provenance.⁸²

2. אל – על⁸³

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
אל – על	בנות ישראל אל שאל בכינה המלך שכם ⁸⁴ שני עם עדנים המעלה עדי זהב על לבושכן (2 Sm 1.24)	Ned 9.12 [11]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		על	על	על

The verse above, as found in MS Cambridge, has the preposition על, as do most of the witnesses to the Mishnah.⁸⁵ This version of the verse, with על instead of אל, is found in biblical manuscripts, all Ashkenazi,⁸⁶ with one exception: a late Sephardic manuscript.⁸⁷ The variant על (*super*) is reflected in the Vulgate as well.

⁸² K 260. On the Ashkenazic origins of this Bible, see Menachem Cohen, “The Consonantal Character of the First Biblical Printings: The *Editio Princeps* of the Entire Bible Soncino 1488,” *Bar-Ilan* 18-19 (1981): 55-67.

⁸³ Prepositional exchanges are attested elsewhere in the Bible. See e.g. Penkower, “Text of the Bible Used by Rashi,” 108, 121.

⁸⁴ The MT has the second person masculine plural pronoun: המלך שכם. MS Cambridge has a variant that is directed to second person plural feminine: המלבישכן. See below.

⁸⁵ For two exceptional witnesses, which read אל as in the MT, see *Masekhet Nedarim* ‘im shinnuye nusha’ot [*Diqduqe soferim ha-shalem*] (Jerusalem, 2001), 2.168 and n. 96.

⁸⁶ K 130, 154, 198, 201. The latter manuscript dates to the twelfth century and its handwriting is described in George Margoliouth, *Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1899), 82 as Ashkenazi-Greek, which naturally attests to the presence of early Ashkenazic traditions in Greece.

⁸⁷ K 89. This manuscript is dated to the fourteenth century.

3. את – אל

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
את – אל	היוצר יחד לבם המבין אל כל מעשיהם (Ps 33.15)	Rosh ha-Sh 1.2 [3]		
		Cambridge ⁸⁸	Kaufmann	Parma
		את	אל (MT)	אל (MT)

Exchanges between the prepositions **את** and **אל** are found for the verse above. With the exception of MS Cambridge, which attests to the variant **את**, all other mishnaic manuscripts cite a version identical to the MT. I found attestation to this variant in two biblical manuscripts from the early thirteenth century in Ashenazic or Italian hands.⁸⁹ This version appears twice in late Sephardic manuscripts from the fourteenth-to-fifteenth centuries.⁹⁰

4. אלי – אליו

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
אלי – אליו	וידבר אלי זה השלחן אשר לפני ה' (Ez 41.22)	Abot 3.3		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		וידבר אליו	וידבר אלי (MT)	וידבר אלי (MT)

⁸⁸ Another **אל**-**את** exchange is found once in the verse: אז נדברו יראי ה' איש **אל** רעהו: (Mal 3.16). Cited twice in the Mishnah (Abot 3.2, 6), in its second occurrence in our manuscript it reads **את** רעהו. I found no other witnesses to this version.

⁸⁹ K 80, 129.

⁹⁰ K 128, 176.

In this verse from Ezekiel, MS Cambridge has **אֱלִי** instead of **אֱלִי**. Only for this variant in MS Cambridge did I find evidence from Sephardic sources: the first hand in a manuscript from Spain dated to 1301.⁹¹

f. Word Exchanges

1. Nouns

a. תחנונו – תפלתו

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
תחנונו – תפלתו	ויתפלל אליו ויעתר לו וישמע תחנונו וישיבהו ירושלם למלכותו (2 Chr 33.13)	Sanh 10.2		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		תפלתו	תפלתו	תפלתו

One striking textual variant relates to 2 Chr 33.13. As the table shows, where the MT reads תחנונו, MSS Cambridge, Kaufmann, and Parma A read תפלתו. Attestation to this variant comes from an Italian manuscript of the Bible.⁹² In general, as reflected in biblical manuscripts, there are affinities between the Italian and Ashkenazi traditions.⁹³

b. מורה – יורה

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
יורה- מורה	ויורד לכם מורה ומלקוש בראשון (Jl 2.23)	Ta'an 1.3		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		יורה	יורה	יורה

⁹¹ K 178. See Katrin Kogman-Appel, 'Omanut yehudit ben Islam le-nazrut: 'Ittur sifre tanakh 'ivriyyim bi-Sfarad (Bnei Brak, 2001), 120-25.

⁹² K 225 (Benjamin Richler, *Guide to Hebrew Manuscript Collections*, 2d ed. [Jerusalem, 2014], p. 270). The Vulgate translates *orationem*, which is closer in meaning to לתפלתו found in the mishnaic manuscripts.

⁹³ See above.

The combination **יורה ומלקוש** appears twice in the MT (Dt 11.14; Jer 5.24 [as the *kere*]), alongside its parallel combination **מורה ומלקוש** (Jl 2.23). In Ta'an 1.3 the latter phrase **מורה ומלקוש** is cited. But as opposed to the MT version, MS Cambridge (along with MSS Kaufmann and Parma A) reads **יורה ומלקוש**. Namely, for these manuscripts **יורה ומלקוש** is the sole phrase found in the Bible. Supported by Ashkenazic and Italian manuscripts,⁹⁴ this version of the verse in Joel is not attested in Sephardic manuscripts.

c. **פקחים – חכמים**

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
פקחים – חכמים	ושחד לא תקח כי השחד יעור פקחים (Ex 33.8)	Pe'ah 8.9		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		ושחד לא תקח כי השחד יעור עיני ח/חכמים	verse not cited	ושחד לא תקח כי השחד יעור פקחים (MT)

This verse, which warns against taking bribes, appears in a different version from the MT in MS Cambridge.⁹⁵ MS Parma A, on the other hand, contains the MT version, including its defective spelling. The textual variant found in MS Cambridge was apparently the result of the conflation of two parallel verses, one from Exodus and the other from Deuteronomy, both of which treat the prohibition against taking bribes. Both MSS Cambridge and Parma A start with the verse from Exodus, **ושחד לא תקח**, but whereas Parma continues the verse correctly according to the MT, MS Cambridge completes it with the parallel from Dt 16.19: **ולא תקח שחד כי השחד יעור עיני חכמים**. This conflation is not simply a slip of the pen by the scribe of MS Cambridge; it is also found in early-

⁹⁴ For the Ashkenazic manuscripts, see K 23, 93, 95, 111, 136, 150, 151, 196, 223, 245, 681. For the Italian manuscript, see K 180.

⁹⁵ The word **חכמים** occurs at the end of the line and again at the beginning of the next one.

thirteenth-century Ashkenazi and Italian manuscripts of the Bible.⁹⁶ I found no evidence of this mixing in Sephardic manuscripts.

d. שני – שנים

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishna		
שני – שנים	על פי שני עדים או על פי שלשה עדים יקום דבר (Dt 19.15)	Sotah 6.4		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		על פי שנים עדים או שלשה עדים יקום דבר	על פי שנים עדים או שלשה עדים יקום דבר	על פי שנים עדים או שלשה עדים יקום דבר

The conflation of verses is found in the citation of Dt 19.15 in Sotah 6.4. MS Cambridge, alongside MSS Kaufmann and Parma A, reads **על פי שנים** עדים או שלשה עדים יקום דבר. The biblical text in these manuscripts reflects the conflation of the original verse with a similarly worded one: **על פי שנים** (Dt 17.6); namely, the manuscript version united the beginning of the verse in Dt 17.6 with the ending of the verse in Dt 19.15. Witnesses to this mixed version are found not only in mishnaic manuscripts, but also appear in Ashkenazic and Italian biblical manuscripts.⁹⁷ No attestation is found in Sephardic biblical manuscripts.

2. Singular-Plural

a. עטרת – עטרות

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
עטרת – עטרות	והעטרת תהיה לחלם (Zec 6.14)	Mid 3.8 [13]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		והעטרות תהיינה לחלם	והעטרות תהיינה לחלם	והעטרות תהיינה לחלם

⁹⁶ K 109, 129, 153.

⁹⁷ For the Ashkenazic manuscripts, see K 1, 18, 69, 109, 111, 129, 153. For the Italian manuscripts, see K 129.

This verse evidences an exchange between *kere* and *ktiv* and singular and plural. As cited in MS Cambridge (and Kaufmann and Parma A), the *kere* is written plene: **והעטרות** and this spelling is found in many biblical manuscripts.⁹⁸ On the other hand, for the continuous verb **תהיינה** as found in MS Cambridge, which creates harmony between the plural subject and its verb, I found only one parallel, in an Ashkenazic manuscript of the Bible.⁹⁹ This syntax is also reflected in the Vulgate.

b. מקדשכם – מקדשיכם

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
מקדשיכם – מקדשכם	והשמותי את מקדשיכם (Lv 26.31)	Meg 3.3[4]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		מקדשכם (sing.)	מקדשיכם (plural)	מקדשיכם (plural)

An opposite exchange—from plural to singular—underlies this example. MSS Kaufmann and Parma A preserve the plural form of the MT, whereas MS Cambridge has the singular. There are fifteen witnesses to this version in Ashkenazi and Italian manuscripts of the Bible,¹⁰⁰ and only three attestations to this form in Sephardic manuscripts.¹⁰¹ This version is also found in the Samaritan Pentateuch. I note that the rabbis and biblical commentators found the appearance of the plural form **מקדשיכם** in the MT version difficult and offered various explanations for its appearance.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ See Kennicott, ad loc.

⁹⁹ K 30. Note that the plural verb **תהיינה** is written defectively here.

¹⁰⁰ The Ashkenazi manuscripts include: K 18, 69, 80, 104, 181, 196, 199. See also K 107, 109, 132, 157. The Italian manuscripts include: K 1, 129, 225, 227. For K 81, 152, I found no data.

¹⁰¹ K 173, 185, 252.

¹⁰² See, for example, Rashi ad loc.

3. Verbs

a. והשמתי-והשמת

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
והשמתי – והשמת	והשמתי את מקדשיכם (Lv 26.31)	Meg 3.3[4]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		והשמת	והשימתי	והשמתי

The archaic *hif'il* form appears in MS Cambridge and even Parma A. The scribe of MS Kaufmann has the variant והשימתי. The parallel form והשמתי is attested in twenty Ashkenazic and Italian manuscripts, and in only four Sephardic ones.¹⁰³

b. ובכשלו-ובהכשלו

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah	
ובכשלו – ובהכשלו	בנפל אויבך אל תשמה ובכשלו אל יגל לבך (Prv 24.17)	Abot 4.17	
		Cambridge	Kaufmann
		בהכשלו	בהכשלו

The infinitive construct with a pronominal suffix ובכשלו attests to the dropping of the *heh* in the MT. A version that preserves the prefix *heh* is attested in MSS Cambridge and Kaufmann, and in four Ashkenazic and Italian manuscripts.¹⁰⁴ This variant is also supported by two Sephardic manuscripts.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ For the Ashkenazic manuscripts, see K 4, 7, 9, 17, 69, 75, 104, 109, 107, 111, 136, 150, 158, 168, 170, 181, 237. For the Italian manuscripts, see K 94, 97, 108, 129; for the Sephardic manuscripts, see K 2, 14, 171, 178.

¹⁰⁴ For the Ashkenazic manuscripts, see K 1, 30; for the Italian manuscripts, see K 227, 240.

¹⁰⁵ See K 119, 210.

4. Pronominal suffixes

a. המלבישכם- המלבישכן

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah Ned 9.12 [11]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
המלבישכם – המלבישכן	בנות ישראל אל שאוּל בכינה המלבישכם שני עם עדנים המעלה עדי זהב על לבושכן (2 Sm 1.24)	המלבישכן	phrase not cited	phrase not cited

In the MT **המלבישכם** is not in agreement with the vocative—בנות ישראל—but returns to the feminine form at the end of the verse. MS Cambridge has the variant **המלבישכן**, the plural feminine form. The variant found in MS Cambridge is attested in three Ashkenazic, and one Italian, manuscripts.¹⁰⁶ I suggest that this variant attests not to a *mem-nun* exchange at the end of a word, but rather to a morphological conception that distinguishes between the masculine and feminine plural.

2. Variants Attested in Manuscripts of Mishnaic and Rabbinic Language

All the variants in this section are attested in witnesses to mishnaic and rabbinic Hebrew but not in biblical manuscripts.

a. Consonantal Exchanges

1. Final ך – ן

MS Cambridge has two occurrences of this exchange, both in a pronominal suffix. The example of **המלבישכן** discussed above is apparently not fueled phonologically, but this is not the case for the following example. For the verse **ומת אחד מהם ובן אין לו יבמה יבוא עליה** (Dt 25.5; Yebam 3.9 [11], both MSS Kaufmann and Cambridge have **מהן** with a final *nun*.¹⁰⁷ MS Parma A retains the traditional standard

¹⁰⁶ For the Ashkenazic manuscripts, see K 93, 153, 182; for the Italian manuscript, see K 94.

¹⁰⁷ The **מהן>מהם** exchange is found in MS Kaufmann in another biblical verse cited in Ned 3.11 [15].

orthography. I found no reference to this exchange in Kennicott.¹⁰⁸ Note that the paraphrase of this verse in the opening of the Mishnah (Yebam 2.2) שני אחים ומת אחד מהן may have influenced the citation.

The issue of *mem-nun* exchanges at the end of words, an outstanding feature of mishnaic Hebrew, provides further insight into the attitude of the scribes of the mishnaic manuscripts to biblical citations. My examination of the mishnaic manuscripts showed that in most cases, they preserve the traditional biblical spelling and do not exchange final *mem* for final *nun*. Note, however, that MS Kaufmann differs from the other manuscripts: it has nine examples of final *mem-nun* exchanges in biblical citations.¹⁰⁹ Eight of the occurrences are found in pronominal suffixes: seven are prepositions (מהן, בהן, אותן, עליהן) and one is a noun with an attached possessive pronoun: אלהיהן. Only one example attests to a switch in the plural suffix: שבעין. I found no examples of final *mem-nun* exchanges in Parma A,¹¹⁰ but Parma B has one such example, in the possessive pronoun.¹¹¹ As noted above, MS Cambridge attests to an exchange in a declined preposition, which is consistent with the findings in MS Kaufmann.

The data surveyed above indicate that in the mishnaic manuscripts, *mem-nun* exchanges in biblical citations are restricted to a single category: pronominal suffixes.¹¹² This is an intriguing finding because many *mem-nun* exchanges in mishnaic Hebrew appear in the plural suffix, yet this exchange is almost unattested in the biblical citations.

¹⁰⁸ Exchanges of final *mem* and *nun* are attested in biblical manuscripts. See Penkower, "Text of the Bible Used by Rashi," 121.

¹⁰⁹ Gabbai, "Biblical Quotations in Ms. Kaufmann," 4.

¹¹⁰ In Tem 6.3 we read: שנאמר שני [thus in MSS Kaufmann, Parma A, and the Lowe edition; most of the printed editions read שנים] ולא ולדותיהן – וה' – שנאמר 'ה' – ולא ארבעה... שני. Parma A switches הם for הן, but this is a unique occurrence: the verse undergoing exegesis does not contain שני or הן but שניהם (Dt 23.19) and the midrash breaks the single word into two: שני and הן (cf. bYebam 59b and the variants). Since the form הם does not appear in the verse, the witnesses to the Mishnah used the form הן, which was prevalent in mishnaic Hebrew (and like the nearby word ולדותיהן) whereas Parma A retained the MT version.

¹¹¹ ועתודותיהן > ועתודותיהם (Yad 4.4 [12]).

¹¹² With the exception of one occurrence of the plural suffix in MS Kaufmann.

Note, that pronominal *mem-nun* exchanges are already found in Scripture.¹¹³ This makes it difficult to decide whether these *mem-nun* exchanges in the mishnaic manuscripts are the result of the influence of mishnaic Hebrew or perhaps represent a variant biblical tradition.

b. Vav Conjunctive

1. Added Vav Conjunctive

a.

MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
————— (See Nm 3.12 and Ex 13.2)	Bek 8.1 [3]		
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
	ופטר רחם בישראל	ופטר רחם מישראל	פטר רחם בישראל

Bek 8.1 [3] in MS Cambridge reads: ר' יוסי הגלילי אומ' בכור לנחלה ולכהן שנ' 'ופטר רחם בישראל עד שיפטרו רחם מישראל'. As cited in MS Cambridge, there is no such verse in the Bible, but there are two similar ones: מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Nm 3.12) and רָחֵם בְּבִנְיָ יִשְׂרָאֵל פֶּטֶר כָּל (Ex 13.2),¹¹⁴ neither of which opens with vav conjunctive. The citation also opens with vav conjunctive in MS Kaufmann: ופטר רחם מישראל, whereas Parma A has the same version as in MS Cambridge but without the added vav conjunctive. Note that here all three manuscripts of the Mishnah consistently cite a variant that differs from the MT.

b.

MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
ויוציאני אל החצר החיצונה וגו' בארבעת מקצעת החצר חצרות קטרות (Ez 46.21-22)	Mid 2.5 [6]		
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
	ובארבעת	ובארבעת	ובארבעת

¹¹³ Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome, 2006), 516.

¹¹⁴ See below: *Word Exchanges*.

This is another example where we find vav conjunctive added in the middle of the verse. MSS Cambridge, Kaufmann, and Parma A all have the variant **ובארבעת**.

2. Deleted Vav Conjunctive

Additional deletions of vav conjunctive are found in MS Cambridge. Although often attested in other manuscripts of the Mishnah, I found no parallels in the biblical manuscripts.

MT	MSS of the Mishnah			Additional Evidence
ולא היה בו שער צהב (Lv 1.13)	Neg 10.2			Not listed in Kennicott
	Cambridge	Kaufmann, Parma B, Antonin	Parma A	
	לא היה בו שער צהב	לא היה בו שער צהב	ולא היה בו שער צהב (MT) ¹¹⁵	
ואם כבש יביא קרבנו לחטאת (Lv 4.32)	Ker 6.9 [12]			Not listed in Kennicott
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	
	אם כבש יביא קרבנו לחטאת	אם כבש יביא קרבנו לחטאת	אם כבש יביא קרבנו לחטאת	
וכי יתן מים על זרע (Lv 11.38)	Maksh 1.3			Not listed in Kennicott
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A, Parma B, Antonin ¹¹⁶	

¹¹⁵ MSS Cambridge, Kaufmann, and Parma A have the plene spelling **צהוב**. Parma B and Antonin have defective spelling as in the MT.

¹¹⁶ In this Mishnah the phrase **וכי יתן** marks a citation (like **שנאמר**) and the mishnaic manuscripts follow the biblical form. But the phrase **כי יתן** was divorced from citations and became a common expression in mMakshirin, where it took on a *bet* and lost the *vav*: **בכי יתן** (but with defective spelling according to most of the

	וכי יתן מים על זרע	וכי יתן מים על זרע (MT)	וכי יתן מים על זרע (MT)	
ומי האיש אשר נטע כרם נטע כרם ולא חללו (Dt 20.6)	Sotah 8.2 [5]			
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	Not listed in Kennicott
	מי האיש אשר נטע כרם נטע כרם ולא חללו	מי האיש אשר נטע כרם נטע כרם ולא חללו	ומי האיש אשר נטע כרם נטע כרם ולא חללו (MT)	
ומי האיש אשר ארש אשה ולא לקחה (Dt 20.7)	Sotah 8.2 [6]			
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	Not listed in Kennicott
	מי האיש אשר ארש אשה ולא לקחה	מי האיש אשר ארש אשה ולא לקחה	ומי האיש אשר ארש אשה ולא לקחה (MT)	
ושתיים דלתות לדלתות שתיים מוסבות (Ez 41.24)	Mid 4.1 [2]			
	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A	Not listed in Kennicott
	שתיים דלתות לדלתות שתיים מוסבות	ושתיים דלתות לדלתות שתיים מוסבות (MT)	שתיים דלתות לדלתות שתיים מוסבות	

Once again, this examination of the addition or deletion of vav conjunctive attests to the links between MS Cambridge and the Ashkenazic tradition. It also attests to features shared by the manuscripts

witnesses). In MS Parma B this divorcing of the expression from its biblical origins takes on another form: it vocalizes יתן (instead of יתן).

of the Mishnah that are not supported by the biblical manuscript witnesses.

c. Word Exchanges

1. עולם – עולים.

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
עולם – עולים	אל תסג גבול עולם (Prv 22.28)	Pe'ah 5.6, 7.3		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		גבול עולם גבול עולים	גבול עולים (twice)	גבול עולים (twice)

An intriguing exchange is found in the word **עולם** which is cited twice in Pe'ah. MSS Kaufmann and Parma A read **עולים** in both occurrences.¹¹⁷ But in MS Cambridge, this exchange between two different nouns, one singular and the other plural, is found only in the second occurrence (7.3) and the first occurrence preserves the MT version, **עולם**. The variant **עולים** was already supplied and expounded by the amoraim.¹¹⁸ Maimonides both copied it and provided an explanation for its appearance in his commentary on the Mishnah.¹¹⁹ This variant is also found in the printed editions of the Mishnah, in some witnesses to *Sifra*,¹²⁰ and elsewhere.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ These manuscripts read תשג with *sin*. For other witnesses to the variant **עולים**, see N. Sacks, *Mishnah Zera'im 'im shinuye nusha'ot* (Jerusalem, 1981), 1.132 and n. 40; 148 and n. 32.

¹¹⁸ YPe'ah 5.6, 19a: רב ירמיה ורב יוסף, חד אמר: אילו עולי מצרים, וחרנה אמר: אילו שירדו מנכסיהן, לסמיא צווחין סגיא נהוריא.

¹¹⁹ Maimonides, *Perush ha-mishnah la-Rambam: Makor ve-targum* (Jerusalem, 1963-68), Pe'ah 5.6: "And the fact that they said **עולים** where the verse reads **עולם** is not difficult, because this is exegetical in nature and one of the rules of Hebrew language is that the *matres lectionis* can be exchanged or are omitted in careless writing."

¹²⁰ *Kedoshim*, chap. 3.2, printed edition; MS New York; and MS Parma. The other manuscripts read **עולם** as in the Bible.

¹²¹ See n. 117 above.

2. דמעך – דמענתך

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah	
דמעך – דמענתך	מלאתך ודמעך לא תאחר (Ex 22.28)	Ter 3.6	
		Cambridge	All other MSS
		דמענתך	ודמעך (MT)

In the verse above MS Cambridge has the feminine form ודמענתך instead of ודמעך. I found no source for this variant in either biblical or mishnaic manuscripts, all of which read דמעך. It appears in MS Leiden of the Jerusalem Talmud,¹²² and in other rabbinic sources.¹²³ This variant is apparently the result of attraction. In the wake of the first, second-person feminine pronoun, מלאתך, the second noun, also in the second person, was changed into the feminine form.

3. איש – אשר

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
לאיש – לאשר	לאיש אשר מכר לו (Lv 25.27)	‘Arak 9.2 (twice)		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		לאשר מכר לו	לאשר מכר לו	לאיש אשר מכר לו (MT)

A striking variant is found for this verse: לאיש אשר/לאשר. The text of Parma A agrees with the MT, but MSS Cambridge and Kaufmann omit the antecedent (איש) and join the prepositional *lamed* to אשר, making it a nominal relative pronoun that stands for לאיש אשר. I found no parallels in any sources.

¹²² YTer 3.6, 42b (*Talmud Yerushalmi: According to Ms. Or. 4720 (Sca.3) of Leiden University Library with Restorations and Corrections* [Jerusalem, 2001], 229).

¹²³ See the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project.

4. זרועיה – זרעה

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
זרועיה – זרעה	כִּי כָאֲרֵץ תּוֹצִיא צִמָּחָהּ, וְכִגְנָה זִרְעֶיהָ תִּצְמִיחַ (Is 61.11)	Shab 9.2		
		Cambridge (and Parma A, second hand)	Kaufmann	Parma A (first hand)
		וכגנה זרעה הצמיח (1st citation)	זירועיה (both citations)	זירועיה (both citations)

Shab 9.2 reads as follows:

מנין לערוגה שהיא ששה על ששה טפחים שזורעין
בתוכה חמשה זרעונין, ארבעה בארבע
רוחות הערוגה ואחד באמצע? שנאמר 'כי כארץ
תוציא צמחה וכגנה זירועיה תצמיח' (ישעיהו סא, יא)
– לא נאמר כן אלא 'זירועיה תצמיח'.

This is the version of the Mishnah in MS Kaufmann and in the first hand of Parma A; what we find here is the expansion of the biblical orthography (זִרְעֶיהָ). However, in MS Cambridge, the second hand of Parma A,¹²⁴ Genizah fragments of the Mishnah,¹²⁵ and in Maimonides' commentary on the Mishnah,¹²⁶ we find the following for the first

¹²⁴ In MS Parma, the first version זִרְעֶיהָ was unvocalized (unlike the other words there), and crossed out, with the vocalized form זרעה written next to it.

¹²⁵ Cambridge, T-S E1.43; T-S E1.47 with Babylonian vocalization (Israel Yeivin, *'Osef qit'e ha-genizah shel ha-mishnah be-niqqud bavli* [Jerusalem, 1974], 95). See also Abraham Goldberg, *Perush la-mishnah: Masekhet Shabbat* (Jerusalem, 1976), 181.

¹²⁶ Maimonides, *Perush ha-mishnah la-Rambam*, ad loc.

citation of the verse: וכגנה זרעה תצמיח.¹²⁷ For the second citation, all have the variant זירועיה.

5. חרבותם – חרבותיהם

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
חרבותם – חרבותיהם	וכתו חרבותם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות (Is 2.4)	Shab 6.4		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		חרבותיהם	חרבותיהם	חרבותיהם

Variants are found in this verse for the third-person masculine plural pronoun חרבות. MSS Cambridge, Kaufmann, and Parma A all read חרבותיהם, the usual nominal form for third-person plural pronouns.¹²⁸ This variant can be explained not just as a grammatical correction but also as the result of attraction, the influence of חניתותיהם in the continuation of the verse.¹²⁹

6. בית לאלהינו – בית ה' אלהינו

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
בית לאלהינו – בית ה' אלהינו	לא לכם ולנו לבנות בית לאלהינו (Ezr 4.3)	Sheqal 1.5		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		בית ה' אלהינו	בית לאלהינו (MT)	בית לאלהינו (MT)

¹²⁷ This was Rabbi Joseph Ashkenazi's emendation. See Shlomo Adani, *Melekheth Shelomoh* on the Mishnah (Vilna, 1887), ad loc.

¹²⁸ See Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 263-64. There are, however, many biblical examples of the preservation of the possessive pronoun ׁ, found in plural nouns such as אבותם, מסגרותם, among others. See *ibid.*, 264-65.

¹²⁹ This variant appears in *Yalqut Shim'oni* (Salonika, 1527), Isaiah, § 293; Micah, § 551. It is also found in the usual editions of Radak on Is 51.4, but in the *Haketer* edition it is like the MT. Many biblical manuscripts read חרבתם, with defective spelling.

Another addition is found in the combination **בית לאלהינו**. The MT, found in MSS Kaufmann and Parma A of the Mishnah, attests to the attributive combination **בית לאלוהינו** (with a prepositional *lamed*), whereas MS Cambridge has the construct state: **בית ה' אלהינו**. The editio princeps of the printed Mishnah (Naples, 1492) has another variant: **בית אלקינו**. In the Venice edition of the Talmud (1521), the Mishnah reads **את בית אלהינו**.

ה' – פי ה' 7.

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
ה' – פי ה'	בלע המות לנצח ומחה ה' אלהים דמעה מעל כל פנים וחרפת עמו יסיר מעל כל הארץ כי ה' דבר (Is 25.8)	Mo'ed Qat 3.9		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		כי פי ה' דבר	verse not cited	כי ה' דבר (MT)

The phrase **כי ה' דבר** appears in the MT version in Parma A, but in MS Cambridge there is an addition: **כי פי ה' דבר**. I found parallels for this variant in talmudic manuscripts and in *Yalkut ha-mekhiri* on Isaiah, which is a definitively Ashkenazic work,¹³⁰ and in Nahmanides' *Torat ha-Adam*.¹³¹

¹³⁰ For the variants, see Goshen-Gottstein, *Yesha'yahu*, 94.

¹³¹ Nahmanides, *Torat ha-'adam. sefer hiddushe ha-Ramban*, ed. I. Meltzer (Zichron Ya'akov, 1994), end of introduction. It is possible that the variants in the different sources were perhaps a slip of the pen as the usual expression in Isaiah is **כי פי ה' דבר** (1.20, 40.5, 58.14).

8. פטר רחם מבני ישראל – פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל – פטר רחם בישראל.

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
פטר רחם מבני ישראל – פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל – ופטר רחם בישראל	פטר רחם מבני ישראל (Nm 3.12) פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל (Ex 13.2)	Bek 8.1 [3]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		ופטר רחם בישראל	ופטר רחם מישראל	פטר רחם בישראל

This is a case where the variants attested in the mishnaic manuscripts are not actually found as such in the Bible.¹³² As seen from the table, the term *בישראל* appears in MSS Cambridge and Parma A;¹³³ MS Kaufmann has a similar version but with a different preposition: *ופטר רחם מישראל*.¹³⁴ All three manuscripts of the Mishnah cite a version that differs from the MT. The version found in MSS Cambridge and Parma is also cited by Maimonides in his commentary on the Mishnah,¹³⁵ in the printed editions of the Mishnah (starting with the editio princeps), and in many other sources.¹³⁶

3. Variants Unattested in Early Sources

a. Consonantal Exchanges

¹³² Two verses could have served as its source: Ex 13.2 or Nm 3.12. See above: *Vav Consecutive*.

¹³³ In MS Parma A, the verse does not open with vav consecutive.

¹³⁴ A parallel to the version in MS Kaufmann is found in K 168.

¹³⁵ Maimonides, *Perush ha-mishnah la-Rambam*, ad loc.

¹³⁶ See the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project.

Only three variant readings of verses in MS Cambridge are unknown from any other early sources: manuscripts of mishnaic Hebrew and biblical manuscripts. They may represent a unique tradition.¹³⁷

1. ט – ש

Exchange	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
ט – ש	אשר תשטה אשה תחת אישה (Nm 5.29)	Soṭah 4.1		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		תסטה	תשטה (MT)	תשטה (MT)

A *sin-samekh* exchange is attested for the verb: **תשטה**. MS Cambridge has a variant with *samekh*: **תסטה**. But MSS Kaufmann and Parma A maintain the distinction between biblical and mishnaic Hebrew and preserve the MT's orthography.

2. ק – כ

Exchange	MT	MSS of the Mishnah
כי – קיא	כי כל שלחנות	Abot 3.3

¹³⁷ Graphic exchanges and omissions are found in the following verses: For Lv 22.13 **ואכל תאכל**, cited in Yebam 6.6 [9], MS Cambridge reads **אביך**. I found no evidence for this exchange in any sources; it is apparently a mistaken expansion of the abbreviation **אבי**. For Nm 19.3, **והוציא אתה**, cited in Par 3.7 [8], MS Cambridge reads **והוציא אחת** (all the other manuscripts have the MT version). I found no parallels for this version and it is apparently the copyist's mistake. For Dt 25.7 **לא תפצתי לקחתה** cited in Yebam 12.6 [7] the mishnaic and biblical manuscripts have the verb with the third-person feminine pronominal object, whereas MS Cambridge attests to **לקחת**. This is simply the omission of the apostrophe from the abbreviated form **לקחתה**. For Ex 21.22 **ענוש יענוש** cited in Ketub 3.2 [3], MSS Kaufmann and Parma A retain the MT version, but MS Cambridge deletes the infinitive and reads **יענוש**. I found no source for this version and it may simply be the result of skipping over a similar word.

	מלאו קיא צואה בלי מקום (Is 28.8)	Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		כי/קיא	קיא	קיא

Another interesting internal exchange is found in the noun קיא. MS Cambridge has a variant כי, which is corrected to קיא. I found no other witnesses to this exchange,¹³⁸ and its origins probably lie in the scribe's linguistic background.¹³⁹

b. Word Exchanges

1. העיר – כל העיר

Variant	MT	MSS of the Mishnah		
העיר – כל העיר	ושרפת באש את העיר ואת כל שללה (Dt 13.17)	Sanh 10.6 [9]		
		Cambridge	Kaufmann	Parma A
		ושרפת באש את כל העיר ואת כל שללה	ושרפת באש את העיר ואת כל שללה (MT)	ושרפת באש את העיר ואת כל שללה (MT)

The phenomenon of attraction explains the change found in MS Cambridge: the addition of the word כל. I found no other attestation to this variant except for a single occurrence in the printed editions of Maimonides' *Code*.¹⁴⁰ This appears to be backwards attraction from the second half of the verse which reads כל שללה.

¹³⁸ 1QIsa^a 22:9 reads קיה. See Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (Leiden-Boston, 2010), 381.

¹³⁹ See Henshke, "Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge," 432, 434-38.

¹⁴⁰ Maimonides 1962, "Laws Relating to Idol Worship," 4.6. See *Yalqut shinnuye nusha'ot ba-Rambam*: Appendix to Shabse Frankel, ed., *Mishne torah by Moses Maimonides* (Jerusalem, 1973-2007), ad loc., where the manuscripts and early printed versions have the MT.

The examination thus far provides a faithful picture of the status of MS Cambridge of the Mishnah. On the one hand, the phenomena detailed in the first and second categories demonstrate that this manuscript has preserved early variants of biblical verses as verified by various manuscripts of the Bible and sources of rabbinic Hebrew. On the other hand, there are several occurrences of versions with no parallels or that have parallels only in late, post-rabbinic sources.

The data also show that the biblical tradition of MS Cambridge has close affinities to that of MS Kaufmann especially, with respect to some 55 percent of the variants, and to MS Parma A, for some 30 percent of the variants,¹⁴¹ which may testify to a shared biblical tradition that differed from the MT. But MS Cambridge differs from the other two traditions in some 40 percent of the variants.¹⁴² Here MSS Kaufmann and Parma A attest to the MT version, whereas MS Cambridge has a different alternative.

Of greatest interest was the finding regarding the origins of the biblical manuscripts consulted. Most of the variants were attested primarily in Ashkenazic and not Sephardic manuscripts,¹⁴³ again placing the origins of the biblical tradition of the medieval Byzantine community squarely in the Ashkenazic tradition. Another interesting finding relates to the typology of the version found in MS Cambridge, which greatly reinforces my identification of this manuscript's Ashkenazic orientation. The variants shared by MS Cambridge of the Mishnah and biblical manuscripts are concentrated in Ashkenazic manuscripts (and several Italian ones). These variants generally do not appear in Sephardic manuscripts, and when they do appear there, we find no more than one variant per manuscript. We can then state that the biblical tradition reflected by MS Cambridge is close in nature to the Ashkenazic biblical manuscripts but is found only sporadically in Sephardic ones. The table below summarizes the findings from Kennicott.

¹⁴¹ See appendix 3.

¹⁴² See appendix 3.

¹⁴³ As for Italian manuscripts, research of the biblical text has shown that the biblical manuscripts from Italy exhibit close affinity to the Ashkenazi ones. See Cohen, "Consonantal Text," 154; Penkower, "Text of the Bible Used by Rashi," 108.

Kennicott number	Number of variants shared with MS Cambridge
K 80	7
K 69, 129	6
K 1, 109, 153	5
K 4, 18, 107, 168	4
K 17, 150, 181	3
K 9, 75, 93, 94, 108, 111, 155, 196, 225	2

I observe that a similar typology has been noted in other studies of the Ashkenazic traditions. For example, the early-second-millennium variations from the MT version from Ashkenaz are found in a significant number of the manuscripts cited here.¹⁴⁴

C. Conclusion

This study suggests another means of ascertaining the origins of manuscripts of mishnaic Hebrew, one that has not been utilized to date: examination of the biblical traditions of the verses cited therein. After all, biblical manuscripts can be grouped as Ashkenazic or Sephardic according to defined characteristics. Therefore, manuscripts of rabbinic literature can be tested in line with the affinity of their biblical traditions to these traditions and assigned to the above-mentioned categories.

This methodology was here applied to MS Cambridge of the Mishnah. This article examined the versions of the biblical verses cited in MS Cambridge, comparing them to the varied biblical text witnesses. I was specifically interested in the range of textual variants from the MT, from words, to grammatical changes, to consonantal exchanges.

That rabbinic literature as a whole contains variants from the MT is well known. But what emerged from this study was that the manuscripts of the Mishnah—Cambridge, Kaufmann, and Parma A—exhibit a basic, shared biblical tradition. Nonetheless, a systematic examination of MS Cambridge revealed its tradition to differ in many details from the other mishnaic manuscripts. The conclusion reached from MS Cambridge's

¹⁴⁴ See Penkower, "Masoretic Codices," 279-308, esp. 289-92.

unique features as detailed in all the sections of this article was instructive: the scribe of this manuscript followed an Ashkenazic tradition.

Because MS Cambridge is a fifteenth-century Byzantine manuscript—which represents a point in time that predates the sweeping changes in the tradition of Byzantine Jews effected by the arrival of Spanish exiles—this study is able to illuminate the obscure nature of the local Byzantine tradition. Despite Byzantium's links to southern Italy, the study of the Byzantine tradition is still not complete, but it is already obvious that there were clear-cut affinities between Ashkenaz and Byzantium.¹⁴⁵ This study now affirms this connection from another direction and is consistent with the findings from my other studies of MS Cambridge.¹⁴⁶ Thus, it is now necessary to make a clear distinction between the mishnaic tradition reflected by MSS Kaufmann and Parma A and the Byzantine one. This distinction has broad implications for scholarly research of the Mishnah and of the history of its study and transmission.

¹⁴⁵ See, for example, Israel Ta-Shma, *Keneset mehqarim: 'Iyyunim ba-sifrut ha-rabbanit bi-me ha-benayim*, vol. 3: *Italya u-Bizantyon* (Jerusalem, 2005).

¹⁴⁶ See Henshke, "Emphatic Consonants in MS Cambridge"; idem, "Gutturals"; Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 42-89.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Biblical Manuscripts Cited in the Kennicott Bible (Referred to in This Article)

Kennicott number	Origin	MS: Identifying Siglum
1	Ashkenaz-Italy	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby Or. 32-33
2	Sepharad	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Arch. Seld. A. 47
3	Sepharad	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Poc. 347-348
4	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hunt 11-12
6	East	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Poc. 395-396
9	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Marsh 635
14	Sepharad	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hunt. 235
15	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Marshall Or. 51
17	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodl. Or. 802-804
18	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Marsh Or. 1
19	Sepharad	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Poc. 30
23	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Marshall Or. 3
29	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Hunt. 604
30	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 173
37	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. Or. 174
69	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Corpus Christi Coll. 5-12
75	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Jesus College, 95-97
80	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Oriel Coll. 73
82	Sepharad	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Kenn. 2
84	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Kenn. 10
89	Sepharad	Cambridge, University Library, Mm. 5.27
93	Ashkenaz	Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College Library 404/625
94	Italy	Cambridge, Emmanuel College I.I. 5-7/1
95	Ashkenaz	Cambridge - St. John's College A 1
96	Ashkenaz	Cambridge, St. John's College, A 2
97	Italy	Cambridge, Trinity College, R 8 6

99	Sepharad	London, British Library, Kings 1
104	Ashkenaz	London, British Library, Harley 5772
107	Ashkenaz	London, British Library, Harley 5706
108	Italy	London, British Library, Harley 7621
109	Ashkenaz	London, British Library, Harley 5709
111	Ashkenaz	London, British Library, Harley 1861
119	Sepharad	London, - British Library, Harley 5774-5775
128	Sepharad	London, British Library, Loan 1
129	Italy	London, British Library, Ar. Or. 2
130	Ashkenaz	London, British Library, Ar.s Or. 16
132	Ashkenaz	London, Westminster Abbey
136	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Kenn. 3
150	Ashkenaz	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz), Or. fol. 1-4
151	Ashkenaz	St. Paul im Lavanttal, Benediktinerinnenstift 84. 1
153	Ashkenaz	Rostock, Universitätsbibliothek, Or. 32
154	Ashkenaz	Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Reuchlin 3
155	Ashkenaz	Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Reuchlin 1
156	Ashkenaz	Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Reuchlin 10
157	Ashkenaz	Kassel, Landesbibliothek fol. Ms. theol. 3
158	Ashkenaz	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale heb. 1-3
160	Ashkenaz	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz), Or. fol. 1210-1211
167	Italy	Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. III.4
168	Ashkenaz	Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. I.30
170	Ashkenaz	Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ricc. 1
171	Sepharad	Copenhagen, Royal Library, Cod. Hebr. 7-9
173	Sepharad	Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibl., Cod. Hebr. 1
176	Sepharad	Copenhagen, Royal Library, Cod. Hebr. 6
178	Sepharad	Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibl., Cod. Hebr. 2
180	Italy	Hamburg - Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek

		Cod. hebr. 27-28
181	Ashkenaz	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 3
182	Ashkenaz	Jena, Universitaetsbibliothek El. fol. 6
185	Sepharad	Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Cod. B. 35 Inf
196	Ashkenaz	Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, E 52 Inf
198	Ashkenaz	Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Solg. MS. 1-7. fol
199	Ashkenaz	Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek Cent. V. App. 1-2
201	Ashkenaz	London, British Library Add. 21161
210	Sepharad	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale heb. 32
223	Ashkenaz	Princeton, University Scheide Library, MS 136
225	Italy	Vatican, Urbinati. ebr. 2
227	Italy	Vatican, ebr. 9
232	Ashkenaz	Vatican, ebr. 20
237	Ashkenaz	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica ebr. 439-440
240	Italy	Roma, Biblioteca Angelica Or. 72
245	Ashkenaz	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (Preussischer Kulturbesitz) Ham. 80
246	Ashkenaz	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale A.I.1
249	Ashkenaz	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, A.IV.20
252	Sepharad	Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, Or. 152
256	Ashkenaz	Bologna, printed edition, 1482
260	Ashkenaz	Soncino Bible 1488
477	Sepharad	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, ebr. 8
570	Sepharad	Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Cod. Parm. 1833
584	Ashkenaz	Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Cod. Parm. 3294
613	Italy	Hamburg, Staats- und Universitaetsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 45
615	Ashkenaz	Hamburg, Staats- und Universitaetsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 1
647	Ashkenaz	Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden Or. 4737
678	Italy	Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hunt 484
681	Ashkenaz	Oxford, Corpus Christi Coll. 133
686	Ashkenaz	Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, O. Cod. Hebr. 1

Appendix 2: The Biblical Text in MS Cambridge as Compared to Biblical MSS

Variants Shared by MS Cambridge and Ashkenazic (Italian) MSS			
Kennicott number	MS Cambridge	MT	
9, 18, 615	ישבו	ודור רביעי ישבו הנה (Gn 15.16)	1
84	אם	ואם לא תפדה (Ex 13.13)	2
69, 153, 686	לחם הפנים	ונתת על השלחן לחם פנים לפני תמיד (Ex 25.30)	3
109, 129, 153	עיני חכמים	שחד לא תקח כי השחד יעור פקחים (Ex 33.8)	4
80, 155, 260	בנעוריה	ושבה אל בית אביה בנעוריה (Lv 22.13)	5
104	אם	ואם לא יגאל (Lv 27.27)	6
75, 232	בשכבך	בשכבך ובקומך (Dt 6.7)	7
1, 18, 69, 109, 111, 129, 153	על פי שנים עדים או שלשה עדים	על פי שני עדים או על פי שלשה עדים יקום דבר (Dt 19 15)	8
69	לא תחבל	ולא תחבל בגד אלמנה (Dt 24.17)	9
17, 80, 150	ולא אבה יבמי	לא אבה יבמי (Dt 25.7)	10
4, 17, 18, 107, 108, 155, 167, 168, 181	מכותך	והפלא ה' את מכותך (Dt 28 59)	11
69, 80	הבצים	והאם רבצת על האפרחים או על הביצים (Dt 26.2)	12
93, 94, 153, 182	המלבישכן	בנות ישראל אל שאול בכינה המלבישכם שני עם עדנים (2 Sm 1.24)	13
96, 150, 246, 249, 256	לא ימצא במכתו	ולא ימצא במכתו חרש לחתות אש מיקוד (Is 30.14)	14
23, 93, 95, 111, 136, 150, 151, 196, 223, 245, 681, 180	יורה ומלקוש	מורה ומלקוש (Jl 2.23)	15
30	והעשרות תהיינה לחלם	והעשרת תהיה לחלם (Zec 6.14)	16
37, 156	פצו	הושיעה ה' כי גמר חסיד כי פסו אמונים מבני אדם (Ps 12.2)	17
225	תפילתו	ויתפלל אליו ויעתר לו וישמע תחנונו	18

		וישיבהו ירושלם למלכותו (2 Chr 33.13)		
Variants Shared by MS Cambridge and Ashkenazic MSS, Alongside Some Witnesses from Sephardic MSS				
Sephardic MSS	Ashkenazic (and Italian) MSS	MS Cambridge		
4 MSS 2, 14, 171, 178	20 MSS 4, 7, 9, 17, 69, 75, 94, 97, 104, 107, 108, 109, 111, 129, 136, 150, 158, 168, 170, 181, 237	והשמתי	והשמותי את מקדשיכם (Lv 26.31)	1
3 MSS 173, 185, 252	15 MSS 1, 18, 69, 80, 104, 107, 109, 125, 129, 132, 157, 181, 196, 199, 227	מקדשכם	והשמותי את מקדשיכם (Lv 26.31)	2
1 MS 3	11 MSS 1, 4, 80, 94, 107, 150, 196, 260, 674, 678	בגיא	ויקבר אותו בגי (Dt 34.6)	3
1 late MS 89	4 MSS 130, 154, 198, 201	על שאול	בנות ישראל אל שאול בכינה (2 Sm 1.24)	4
2 MSS 477, 570	8 MSS 4, 93, 96, 153, 160, 168, 584, 613	שוסתי	ואסיר גבולות עמים ועתודותיהם שושתי (Is 10.13)	5
1 MS 82	1 MS 223	מדי שבת	ומדי שבת בשבתו (Is 66.23)	6
2 MSS 119, 210	4 MSS 1, 30, 227, 240	ובהכשלו	בנפל אויבך אל תשמח ובהכשלו אל יגל לבך (Prv 24.17)	7
1 late MS 171	4 MSS 1, 80, 96, 109	וההריאל	והאראל שתים עשרה ארץ בשתים עשרה רחב רבוע (Ez 43.16)	8

2 late MSS 128, 176	2 MSS 80, 129	את כל מעשיהם	היוצר יחד לבם המבין אל כל מעשיהם (Ps 33.15)	9
-------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------	---	---

Variants Shared by MS Cambridge and Sephardic MSS			
Kennicott MSS	MS Cambridge	MT	
19, 99	בקרבתכם	והיה כקרבתכם אל המלחמה (Dt 20 2)	1
178	וידבר אליו	וידבר אלי זה השלחן אשר לפני ה' (Ez 41.22)	2

Variants in MS Cambridge, Unsupported by Known Biblical MSS			
MS Cambridge	MT		
ופטר רחם בישראל	פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל (Ex 13.2) פטר רחם מבני ישראל (Nm 3.12)		1
ופטר רחם בישראל	פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל (Ex 13.2) פטר רחם מבני ישראל (Nm 3.12)		2
ודמעתך	מלאתך ודמעך לא תאחר (Ex 22.28)		3
תסטה	אשר תשטה אשה תחת אישה (Nm 5.29)		4
לא	ולא היה בו שער צהב (Lv 1 13)		5
אם כבש	ואם כבש יביא קרבנו לחטאת (Lv 4.32)		6
כי יתן	וכי יתן מים על זרע (Lv 11.38)		7
לאשר מכר לו	לאיש אשר מכר לו (Lv 25.27)		8
כל העיר	ושרפת באש את העיר ואת כל שללה (Dt 13.17)		9
מי האיש אשר נטע	ומי האיש אשר נטע כרם נטע כרם ולא חללו (Dt 20.6)		10
מי האיש אשר ארש	ומי האיש אשר ארש אשה ולא לקחה (Dt 20.7)		11
מהן	ומת אחד מהם ובן אין לו יבמה יבוא עליה (Dt 25.5)		12
חרבותיהם	וכתתו חרבותם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות (Is 2.4)		13
כי פי ה זבר	כי ה זבר (Is 25.8)		14
כי	כי כל שלחנות מלאו קיא צואה בלי מקום (Is 28.8)		15
זרעה תצמיח	כי כארץ תוציא צמחה וכגנה זרועיה תצמיח (Is 61.11)		16
שתיים דלתות	ושתיים דלתות לדלתות שתיים מוסבות (Ez 41.24)		17

18	בארבעת מקצעת החצר הצרות קטרות (Ez 46.21-22)	ובארבעת
19	אל תסג גבול עולם (Prv 22.28)	עולים
20	לא לכם ולנו לבנות בית לאלהינו (Ezr 4.3)	בית ה אלהינו

Appendix 3: The Text of the Biblical Verses in MS Cambridge: A Comparison to Other MSS of the Mishnah

Variants Unique to MS Cambridge and Unattested in Other Mishnaic MSS		
MS Cambridge	MT	
ישבו	ודור רביעי ישובו הנה (Gn 15.16)	1
את כל מעשיהם	היוצר יחד לבם המבין אל כל מעשיהם (Ps 33.15)	2
ודמעך	מלאךך ודמעך לא תאחר (Ex 22.28)	3
עיני חכמים	שחד לא תקח כי השחד יעור פקחים (Ex 33.8)	4
כי יתן	וכי יתן מים על זרע (Lv 11.38)	5
בנעוריה	ושבה אל בית אביה כנעוריה (Lv 22.13)	6
מקדשכם	והשמותי את מקדשיכם (Lv 26.31)	7
תסטה	אשר תשטה אשה תחת אישה (Nm 5.29)	8
כל העיר	ושרפת באש את העיר ואת כל שללה (Dt 13.17)	9
בקרבתכם	והיה כקרבתכם אל המלחמה (Dt 20.2)	10
ולא אבה יבמי	לא אבה יבמי (Dt 25.7)	11
המלבישכן	בנות ישראל אל שאול בכינה המלבישכם שני עם עדנים (2 Sm 1.24)	12
כי פי ה דבר	כי ה דבר (Is 25.8)	13
כי	כי כל שלחנות מלאו קיא צואה בלי מקום (Is 28.8)	14
וידבר אליו	וידבר אלי זה השלחן אשר לפני ה (Ez 41.22)	15
וההריאל	וההריאל שתיים עשרה ארך בשתיים עשרה רחב רבוע (Ez 43.16)	16
תהיינה	והעטרת תהיה לחלם (Zec 6.14)	17
פצו	הושיעה ה כי גמר חסיד כי פסו אמונים מבני אדם (Ps 12.2)	18
בית ה אלהינו	לא לכם ולנו לבנות בית לאלהינו (Ezr 4.3)	19
Variants Shared by MSS Cambridge and Kaufmann		
אם לא תפדה	ואם לא תפדה (Ex 13.13)	1
לחם הפנים	ונתת על השלחן לחם פנים לפני תמיד (Ex 25.30)	2

3	לאיש אשר מכר לו (Lv 25.27)	לאשר מכר לו
4	והשמותי את מקדשיכם (Lv 26.31)	והשמותי
5	ואם לא יגאל (Lv 27.27)	אם לא יגאל
6	ובשכבך ובקומך (Dt 6.7)	בשכבך ובקומך
7	ומי האיש אשר נטע כרם ונטע חללו (Dt 20.6)	מי האיש אשר נטע
8	ומי האיש אשר ארש אשה ולא לקחה (Dt 20.7)	מי האיש אשר ארש
9	ולא תחבל בגד אלמנה (Dt 24.17)	לא תחבל
10	ומת אחד מהם ובן אין לו יבמה יבוא עליה (Dt 24.17)	מהן
11	בנפל אויבך אל תשמה ובכשלו אל יגל לבך (Prv 24.17)	ובהכשלו
Variants Shared by MSS Cambridge and Parma A		
1	והפלאה את מכתך (Dt 28.59)	מכותך
2	כי כארץ תוציא צמחה וכגנה זרועיה תצמיח (Is 61.11)	זרעה תצמיח
3	ומדי שבת בשבתו (Is 66.23)	מדי שבת
4	ושמים דלתות לדלתות שמים מוסבות (Ez 41.24)	שמים דלתות
Variants Shared by MSS Cambridge, Kaufmann, and Parma A		
1	פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל (Ex 13.2) פטר רחם מבני ישראל (Nm 3.12)	ופטר רחם בישראל
2	פטר כל רחם בבני ישראל (Ex 13.2) פטר רחם מבני ישראל (Nm 3.12)	ופטר רחם בישראל
3	ולא היה בו שער צהב (Lv 1.13)	לא היה בו
4	ואם כבש יביא קרבנו לחטאת (Lv 4.32)	אם כבש
5	על פי שני עדים או על פי שלשה עדים יקום דבר (Dt 19.15)	שנים עדים
6	והאם רבצת על האפרחים או על הביצים (Dt 26.2)	הביצים
7	ויקבר אותו בגי (Dt 34.6)	בגיא
8	בנות ישראל אל שאול בכינה המלכשכם שני עם עדנים (2 Sm 1.24)	על שאול
9	וכתתו חרבותם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות (Is 2.4)	חרבותיהם
10	ואסיר גבולות עמים ועתודותיהם שושתי (Is 10.13)	שושתי
11	ולא ימצא במכתו חרש לחתות אש מיקוד (Is 30.14)	לא ימצא במכתו
12	בארבעת מקצעת החצר חצרות קטרות (Ez 46.21-22)	ובארבעת
13	מורה ומלקוש (Jl 2.23)	יורה ומלקוש
14	והעטרת תהיה לחלם (Zec 6.14)	והעטרות

עולים	אל תסג גבול עולם (Prv 22.28)	15
תפילתו	ויתפלל אליו ויעתר לו וישמע תחנו וישיבהו ירושלם למלכותו (2 Chr 33.13)	16