The "Lemma Complement"
in Hebrew Commentaries from Byzantium
and Its Diffusion to Northern France and Germany[1]

RICHARD C. STEINER

לידידי היקר, פרופ׳ דוד ברגר עמו״ש

The publication of a corpus of Byzantine Jewish texts from the Cairo Genizah by Nicholas de Lange[2] has provided important new data for reconstructing the history of Jewish biblical exegesis in the Middle Ages. De Lange was able to find fragments of four or five early Hebrew Bible commentaries containing Greek glosses. Three of these commentaries are sufficiently well preserved to be useful: a commentary on Ezekiel and Minor Prophets by an exegete named Reuel (around 1445 preserved lines), a commentary on Genesis and Exodus (around 230 preserved lines), and a commentary on Kings (around 300 preserved lines). The first two commentaries are Rabbanite, while the third appears to have been composed by the well-known Karaite translator, Tobias b. Moses.[3]

The two Rabbanite commentaries are in some ways very different, but they have several things in common beyond Greek glosses and an early date. The most striking shared feature is a rudimentary theory of biblical redaction rooted in Palestinian sources. There is even a distinctive formula associated with this theory that they both cite: "the editor/Ezra

[2] N. de Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996), henceforth *GJT.* For corrections to the edition, see R. C. Steiner, "Textual and Exegetical Notes to Nicholas de Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah,*" *JQR* 89 (1998) 155–69.

[3] R. C. Steiner, "The Byzantine Biblical Commentaries from the Genizah: Rabbanite vs. Karaite," in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language,* eds. M. Bar-Asher, et al. (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007) *243–*262.

found X books (= manuscripts)." The formula was previously known only from medieval commentaries on Chronicles.[4]

Another thing that the two commentaries seem to have in common is a critical lack of linguistic terminology. Reuel has only a handful of terms at his disposal – most of them attested already in antiquity: לשון זכר ("masculine") and לשון נקבה ("feminine") (Ezek 10:14, Hos 5:9), חסרים ("defective [in spelling]") and שלמים ("plene") (Ezek 13:18, 39:26),[5] בתימה ("in astonishment"),[6] מליצה ("interpretation [of figurative language]"),[7] יצא מלשון ("derives from, is related to"),[8] טעם ("sense"), and משמשין ("are used interchangeably").[9] The commentary

---

[4] R. C. Steiner, "Beḥinot lashon ba-perush li-Yḥezqel we-li-Tre-ʿAsar she-ba-megillot ha-ʿivriyyot mi-Bizanṭion," *Leshonenu* 59 (1995–96) 51–54; idem, "A Jewish Theory of Biblical Redaction from Byzantium: Its Rabbinic Roots, Its Diffusion and Its Encounter with the Muslim Doctrine of Falsification," *JSIJ* 2 (2003) 123–167. For additional literature, see G. Brin, "Li-sh'elat ʿarikhat ketuvim miqra'iyyim we-ʿod she'elot govelot bi-tfisatam shel parshane ha-qovets ha-bizanṭi," *Beth Mikra* 54 (2009) 108–20.

[5] The use of שלם instead of מלא to refer to plene spelling is found in early (Talmudic, midrashic, and Masoretic) sources, e. g., PT Ketub III ix 27d: נער חסר כתיב בפרשה ... נערה אחת שלימה כתיב בפרשה ("'Girl' has defective spelling in this *parashah* ... One 'girl' has plene spelling in this *parashah*"). Cf. I. Yeivin, *Ha-Masorah la-miqra'* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2003) 95.

[6] R. C. Steiner, "Textual and Exegetical Notes," 164; cf. the superscription of a Masoretic list cited in W. Bacher, *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1895) 17: א"ב מן חד חד ה' בריש תיבותא בתמיה ("an alphabetical list of words, each with a word-initial interrogative *h*-"); C. del Valle Rodríguez, *Die grammatikalische Terminologie der fruehen hebraeischen Grammatikern* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1982) 294 s. v. The literal meaning of this term, "in astonishment," suggests that it was originally restricted to rhetorical questions, and that is how Reuel uses it. He makes this clear in several places (Ezek 14:3, 7; 38:19; *GJT*, 193 lines 251, 260; 233 line 110) by writing ...בתמה / בתימה כלומ' ("in astonishment, i. e., ..."), followed by an assertion that reverses the polarity of the question (negative for positive, positive for negative); cf. בתימ' כלומ' לא ישב ("in astonishment, i. e., He will *not* dwell") in the commentary on 1 Kings (8:27 "Will God really dwell?" *GJT*, 141, 5 verso line 6). Rashi too usually uses it for rhetorical questions; see, for example, his comment to Amos 2:11: בתמיה כלומ' כלום אתם יכולים להכחיש את זאת ("in astonishment, i. e., can you in any way deny this?"). However, his comment to Ezek 14:3, הרבה תמיהות מתקיימות, seems to mean "many interrogatives are non-rhetorical (lit., confirmed)." Our text preserves not only the original meaning but also the original plene orthography – with *yod* preceding *mem* – of the segolate noun *těmah* (on the pattern of *těqaʿ* in Ps 150:3).

[7] See Steiner, "Beḥinot lashon," 43–47. An additional occurrence of the term is found in the work that de Lange calls "Glosses on 1 Kings" at 1 Kgs 7:33 (*GJT*, 161, 2 recto line 10).

[8] See Steiner, "Beḥinot lashon," 51.

[9] In Reuel's commentary and a later Byzantine source, the term is predicated of Hebrew letters that are (allegedly) used interchangeably; see Steiner, "Textual and Exegetical Notes," 161, and idem, "Jewish Theory," 126 n. 6. This technical usage is the result of a long semantic development. An earlier stage is reflected in Masoretic trea-

on Genesis and Exodus is similar. The author uses terms like לשון זכר ("masculine") and לשון נקבה ("feminine") (Gen 32:9),[10] לשעבר ("past"), and לעתיד ("future") (Exod 15:1),[11] but seems to lack more sophisticated terminology.

This lack of terminology cannot be attributed solely to the early date of the two Rabbanite authors. One has only to leaf through the 18–page index of grammatical and Masoretic terms that Skoss prepared for David Al-Fasi's biblical dictionary to see what was possible already in the tenth century.[12] The Byzantine commentary on Kings is another good control. That commentary uses the term שם מקרה ("abstract noun") – a term which, like Arabic ʿaraḍ and English *accident*, is a conventional equivalent of the Aristotelian term *symbebēkos*.[13] The use of this sophisticated term is the exception that proves the rule, for it has nothing to do with traditional, indigenous Byzantine exegesis. There are striking parallels between the use of מקרה in the Kings commentary and the use of the corresponding Arabic term ʿaraḍ in the *Diqduq* of Yusuf ibn Nuḥ,[14] and the similarity is too great to be a coincidence. In other words, the immediate source of the loan translation מקרה is Arabic, not Greek. How ironic it is that the presence of an Aristotelian term in the commentary on Kings has nothing to do with the knowledge of Greek exhibited there! One gets the impression that, even for Greek-speaking Jews, philosophy and linguistics were accessible only via Arabic media-

---

tises, where the term refers to any use of letters, not specifically their *interchangeable* use; see del Valle Rodríguez, *Die grammatikalische Terminologie*, 279. Originally, שמש meant "serve," and it was used of people rather than letters of the alphabet. It is well known that Hebrew borrowed this verb from Aramaic; see Dan 7:10 and M. Moreshet, *Leqsiqon ha-poʿal she-nithaddash bi-lshon ha-tannaʾim* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1980) 372–73 n. 29**. However, its ultimate origin is not well known to Semitists; see, for example, M. Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009) 1576 s. v. שמש: "etym. unkn." Egyptologists, on the other hand, have long known that Aramaic שמש is a borrowing of Egyptian *šmš* ("follow, serve"), attested in the latter language since the Pyramid Texts; see A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1926–1963) 4.482 s. v. In Coptic the word appears as *šmše* with the meaning "serve, worship"; see W. E. Crum, *Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939) 567 s. v. The semantic equivalence between the Coptic and Aramaic verbs is confirmed by the fact that they are indirect translation equivalents in Bible versions, appearing in correspondences like Coptic *šmše* = Greek *leitourgein* = Hebrew שרת = Aramaic שמש. Surprisingly, this borrowing is not mentioned in Y. Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).

[10] *GJT,* 93, 3 recto lines 5–6.

[11] *GJT,* 105, 6 recto line 1.

[12] David Al-Fasi, *Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-Alfāz of David ben Abraham al-Fāsī,* ed. S. L. Skoss (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936–45) 2: xci–cix.

[13] Steiner, "Byzantine Biblical Commentaries," 253* n. 40.

[14] Steiner, "Byzantine Biblical Commentaries," 253*–254*.

tion. Jews like Reuel who knew no Arabic manifested little knowledge of grammar.

Reuel's commentary and the commentary on Genesis and Exodus show us what medieval biblical exegesis might have looked like had the Jews remained oblivious to the work of the Arab grammarians. They help us to appreciate the magnitude of the revolution brought about by the decision of Saadia Gaon and his Andalusian successors to embrace the systematic study of language.[15] The backwardness of Byzantine Rabbanite exegesis in the area of linguistics contrasts with its relative sophistication in the area of text criticism. Both of these features may be attributed to its isolation from Islamic civilization.[16]

A third feature shared by Byzantine commentaries (including that of Isaiah of Trani) is stylistic. The feature, which I will call the "lemma complement," is a quotation from the verse that continues – following the comment – from the point where the lemma left off, a quotation with no subsequent comment. It can be seen in the following examples:

a. Reuel

Ezek 13:9:   וְהָיְתָה יָדִי אֶל־הַנְּבִיאִים הַחֹזִים שָׁוְא וְהַקֹּסְמִים כָּזָב

והיתה ידי. מכתי. **אל הנביאים החז[ים] שוא והקוסמ[ים] כזב**.[17]
My hand, my affliction, **shall be against the prophets who utter vain visions and false divinations**.

Ezek 33:15:   בְּחֻקּוֹת הַחַיִּים הָלַךְ

ובחק[ות] החיים שלתורה אשר יעשה אותם האדם וחי בהם. **הלך**.[18]
And **the laws of life**, of the Torah, through the pursuit of which a man shall live, **he follows**.

Ezek 34:4: אֶת־הַנַּחְלוֹת לֹא חִזַּקְתֶּם וְאֶת־הַחוֹלָה לֹא־רִפֵּאתֶם וְלַנִּשְׁבֶּרֶת לֹא חֲבַשְׁתֶּם
וְאֶת־הַנִּדַּחַת לֹא הֲשֵׁבֹתֶם וְאֶת־הָאֹבֶדֶת לֹא בִקַּשְׁתֶּם

הנחלות שהיו בחולי **לא חזק[תם]** אותם שיהי[ו] הולכות בנחת. **לא חבשתם**. אימ[פ]לשטרושישטי. שתשימו. תעלה ויבריא **ואת הנד[חת]** אשר נפרדה מן הצאן מקום מעט והלכה **לא הש[בתם]** אל הצאן. **ואת האובד[ת]** אשר אבדה ולא נראתה לעו[לם]/לעי[ן] **לא בקשתם**.[19]

---

[15] Cf. the discussion of Moses Ibn Ezra cited by M. Z. Cohen, "A Poet's Biblical Exegesis," *JQR* 93 (2003) 540–41.
[16] See Steiner, "Jewish Theory," for the claim that the Muslim doctrine of falsification forced Jews in Muslim lands to forgo discussion of biblical redaction.
[17] *GJT*, 187, lines 190–91. In texts from *GJT*, I have followed de Lange in reproducing the original punctuation (to the extent that it is still visible), and I have used parentheses to complete words abbreviated by the scribes/exegetes.
[18] *GJT*, 223 line 28; Steiner, "Textual and Exegetical Notes," 162.
[19] *GJT*, 225 lines 42–45; Steiner, "Textual and Exegetical Notes," 162.

The sickly ones, which were in a state of illness, **you have not strengthened** them that they might walk in tranquility. **You have not bandaged**, plastered, applying a cure that it might heal. **And the strayed**, which became separated a little way from the flock and went away, **you have not returned** to the flock. **And the lost**, which became lost and was not seen ever again / visible to the eye, **you have not searched for**.

וְנָשׂוּ אֶת־כְּלִמָּתָם   Ezek 39:26:

ונשו ונשאו **את כלמ[תם]**. חסר א' ויפתר כשלם כי הרבה תמצא שהם חסרים ויפותרו כשלמים.[20]

They shall endur (sic), they shall endure, **their shame**. It is missing an *aleph* but is interpreted as though it were plene. You will find many that are defective but are interpreted as though they were plene.

וַתַּשְׁלִיכֵנִי מְצוּלָה בִּלְבַב יַמִּים וְנָהָר יְסֹבְבֵנִי כָּל־מִשְׁבָּרֶיךָ וְגַלֶּיךָ עָלַי עָבָרוּ   Jon 2:4:

ותשל[יכני] מצ[ולה] בשעה שהיו משליכים [אותי ה]ספנים בים **ונהר** שלים היה מסובב אותי **וכל משב[ריך] וגל[יך]** שלים **עלי** [על ר]אשי **עב[רו]**.[21]

You threw me into the deep at the time when the sailors threw me into the sea, **and the current** of the sea **surround**ed me, and **all of your breakers and waves** of the sea **over me**, over my head, **they passed**.

b. Byzantine Commentary on Genesis and Exodus

וּשְׁלֹשׁ־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה מָרָדוּ: וּבְאַרְבַּע עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה בָּא כְדָרְלָעֹמֶר   Gen 14:4–5:

[...] **מרדו ובש**נת **יד שנה בא כדר[לעמר]**[22]

… **they rebelled, and in** the year of (= the final year of a period of)[23] **fourteen years Chedorlaomer came**.

אָבִינוּ זָקֵן וְאִישׁ אֵין בָּאָרֶץ לָבוֹא עָלֵינוּ כְּדֶרֶךְ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ: לְכָה   Gen 19:31–32: נַשְׁקֶה אֶת־אָבִינוּ יַיִן וְנִשְׁכְּבָה עִמּוֹ וּנְחַיֶּה מֵאָבִינוּ זָרַע

אבינו זקן ואינו יכול לבוא עלינו **ואיש אין באר ץ** אחר **אין באר ץ לבוא עלינו. נשקה אבינו יין** אולי יתגבר עמו **ונחיה מאבינו זרע**.[24]

Our father is old and is not able to have relations with us, **and there is no** other **man on earth to have relations with us. Let us make our father drink wine**, perhaps he will summon up the strength with it, **that we may bring to life offspring from our father**.

---

[20] *GJT*, 235 lines 139–40.

[21] *GJT*, 265–67, fragment iv, verso lines 15–17. I have filled in the lacunae in the edition.

[22] *GJT*, 89, 1 verso line 10.

[23] Biblical Hebrew has several syntactic constructions for converting cardinal numbers above ten to ordinal numbers. The short one found in Gen 14:5 is ambiguous; the exegete has expanded it to the long, unambiguous one used in שנת החמשים שנה ("the fiftieth year") (Lev 25:10) and ביום שנים עשר יום ("the twelfth day") (Num 7:78).

[24] *GJT*, 89, 2 recto lines 5–6.

Exod 4:23: וָאֹמַר אֵלֶיךָ שַׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנִי וְיַעַבְדֵנִי וַתְּמָאֵן לְשַׁלְּחוֹ הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי הֹרֵג אֶת־בִּנְךָ בְּכֹרֶךָ

ואמר אליך. משה לך. **שלח את בני ויעבדני. ותמאן לשלחו הנה אנכי הרג את בנך בכרך.**[25]

And I said to you, Moses, "go[26] release my son that he may worship me," but you have refused to release him, so now I am going to kill your first-born son.

Exod 10:17: וְעַתָּה שָׂא נָא חַטָּאתִי אַךְ הַפַּעַם

ועתה שא נא ייי **חטאתי. אך הפעם.**[27]

And now pray forgive, Lord, my sin just this (one) time.

Exod 14:20: וַיָּבֹא בֵּין מַחֲנֵה מִצְרַיִם וּבֵין מַחֲנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי הֶעָנָן וְהַחֹשֶׁךְ וַיָּאֶר אֶת־הַלָּיְלָה וְלֹא־קָרַב זֶה אֶל־זֶה כָּל־הַלָּיְלָה

ויבא הענן **בין מחנה מצ(רים) ובין מח(נה) יש(ראל). ויהי הענן והחשך** כשאמרנו למעלה. **ויאר** האש **את הלילה ול(א) ק(רב) ז(ה) א(ל) ז(ה) כ(ל) ה(לילה).**[28]

And it, the cloud, came between the army of Egypt and the army of Israel, and so there was the cloud and the darkness, as discussed above, and it, the fire, lit up the night, and they did not come near each other all night.

Exod 17:16: וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי־יָד עַל־כֵּס יָהּ מִלְחָמָה לַה' בַּעֲמָלֵק מִדֹּר דֹּר

ויאמ(ר) כי יד שליש(ראל) יהיה **על כסה יה מלחמה לייי בעמ(לק) מדור דור.**[29]

He said, "The hand of Israel will be upon the throne of the Lord. The Lord will be at war with Amalek throughout the ages."

Exod 19:1: בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה בָּאוּ מִדְבַּר סִינָי

ביום הזה. בראש חודש סיון. **באו מדבר סיני.**[30]

On that day, on the first of the month of Sivan, they came to the wilderness of Sinai.

Cf. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: **ביומא הדין** בחד לירחא **אתו למדברא דסיני**
On that day, on the first of the month, they came to the wilderness of Sinai.

---

[25] *GJT*, 101, 5 recto lines 4–5 (with de Lange's משה corrected to משה).

[26] De Lange renders "Moses, to you" instead of "Moses, go," but if לך glosses אליך it should come before משה. Either way, the gloss reflects an interpretation rejected by Ibn Ezra: וחסרי דעת חשבו כי עם משה ידבר וזה שגעון ועוד כי אלעזר אינו בכור משה ("and ignoramuses have thought that He was addressing Moses, but this is lunacy; and, furthermore, Eleazar is not Moses' firstborn").

[27] *GJT*, 103 5 verso line 4.

[28] *GJT*, 105, 5 verso lines 12–14.

[29] *GJT*, 107, 6 recto lines 12–13.

[30] *GJT*, 107, 6 verso line 5.

c. R. Isaiah of Trani[31]

Ezek 17:17:   בִּשְׁפֹּךְ סֹלְלָה וּבִבְנוֹת דָּיֵק לְהַכְרִית נְפָשׁוֹת רַבּוֹת

בשפך נבוכדנצר **סללה** אל העיר **להכרית נפשות רבות**

upon the construction by Nebuchadnezzar **of a ramp** to the city **for cutting off
many lives**

Ezek 23:24:   וְנָתַתִּי לִפְנֵיהֶם מִשְׁפָּט וּשְׁפָטוּךְ בְּמִשְׁפְּטֵיהֶם

ונתתי לפניהם המשפט שלי **ושפטוך במשפטיהם**

I will give over to them my **punishing, and they will punish you by their laws**.

Ezek 33:33:   וּבְבֹאָהּ הִנֵּה בָאָה וְיָדְעוּ כִּי נָבִיא הָיָה בְתוֹכָם

ובבאה הרעה לבני יהודה שהיו בירושלם **הנה** יראו כי **באה** וזה **ידעו כי נביא** אמת
היה בתוכם.

And when it comes, the misfortune, to the people of Judah in Jerusalem,
behold they will see that **it is coming, and** this **they shall know: that a** true
prophet has been among them.

Hos 7:16:   יָשׁוּבוּ לֹא עַל הָיוּ כְּקֶשֶׁת רְמִיָּה יִפְּלוּ בַחֶרֶב שָׂרֵיהֶם מִזַּעַם לְשׁוֹנָם זוֹ
לַעְגָּם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם

ישובו לא על. בדבר שאין בו תועלת שהולכים אחרי הבעל. **היו כקשת רמיה**.
כשדורכין אותה לירות כנגד האויב היא נהפכת כנגדו. **יפלו בחרב שריהם מזעם
לשונם**. שהיו זועמים על הנביאים. **זו לעגם בארץ מצרים**.

They repent without profit, in that which has no benefit, for they follow Baal.
They are like a treacherous bow, when they draw it to shoot at the enemy, it
turns back on them. **Their ministers shall fall by the sword on account of the
rage of their tongues**, because they would rage against the prophets. **Such
shall be (the result of) their babbling in the land of Egypt**.

Hos 11:11:   יֶחֶרְדוּ כְצִפּוֹר מִמִּצְרַיִם וּכְיוֹנָה מֵאֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר

יחרדו וימהרו לבוא **כצפור ממצרים וכיונה מארץ אשור**.

They shall hurry[32] and hasten to come **like a bird from Egypt, like a dove
from the land of Assyria**.

The same stylistic feature can occasionally be found outside of Byzantium:

---

[31] Unless otherwise indicated, all of the examples below are drawn from *Miqra'ot
Gedolot ha-Keter*, ed. M. Cohen (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1992–), supplemented by *Yehoshua´•Shofeṭim ´im perush Rashi*, ed. M. L. Katzenellenbogen (Jerusalem:
Mossad Harav Kook, 1987) and *Perush Nevi'im u-Khtuvim le-Rabbenu Yesha´ya ha-
rishon mi-Ṭrani*, ed. A. I. Werthaimer (Jerusalem: Ketav wa-Sefer, 1965).

[32] For this rendering, see the exegete's comment on Hos 11:10.

d. Rashi

Josh 4:9:   וּשְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה אֲבָנִים הֵקִים יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּתוֹךְ הַיַּרְדֵּן

ושתים עשרה אבנים אחרות **הקים יהושע בתוך הירדן**.

And twelve other **stones Joshua set up in the middle of the Jordan**.

Josh 10:18:   גֹּלּוּ אֲבָנִים גְּדֹלוֹת אֶל־פִּי הַמְּעָרָה

גולו גלגלו **אבנים אל פי המערה**.

Rol *(sic)* roll **stones to the mouth of the cave**.

Josh 17:6:   וְאֶרֶץ הַגִּלְעָד הָיְתָה לִבְנֵי־מְנַשֶּׁה הַנּוֹתָרִים

וארץ הגלעד שבעבר הירדן **היתה לבני מנשה הנותרים**.

And the land of Gilead across the Jordan **was assigned to the rest of Manasseh's descendants**.

e. Commentary Ascribed to R. Eleazar b. Judah of Worms

Gen 37:28:   וַיַּעַבְרוּ אֲנָשִׁים מִדְיָנִים סֹחֲרִים וַיִּמְשְׁכוּ וַיַּעֲלוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף מִן־הַבּוֹר
                         וַיִּמְכְּרוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף לַיִּשְׁמְעֵאלִים

וימשכו המדינים **ויעלו** [את] **יוסף מן הבור וימכרו את יוסף לישמעאלים**.[33]

And they, the Midianites, **pulled Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit, and they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites**.

Gen 50:18:   וַיֵּלְכוּ גַּם־אֶחָיו וַיִּפְּלוּ לְפָנָיו

וילכו גם אחיו אחר השליח **ויפלו לפניו**.[34]

His brothers also went after the emissary **and fell down before him**.

Gen 50:22:   וַיֵּשֶׁב יוֹסֵף בְּמִצְרַיִם הוּא וּבֵית אָבִיו

וישב יוסף במצרים נתחזק בישוב הערים **הוא ובית אביו**.[35]

So Joseph dwelt in Egypt, he became established by settling the cities, **he and his father's house**.

Exod 2:6:   וְהִנֵּה־נַעַר בֹּכֶה וַתַּחְמֹל עָלָיו

והנה נער בכה אחר יניקה **ותחמל עליו**.[36]

Behold it was a boy crying after nursing, **and she took pity on it**.

---

[33] Eleazar ben Judah, *Perush ha-Roqeaḥ ʿal ha-Torah,* ed. Chaim Kanievsky (New York: Julius Klugmann and Sons, 1980) 1.261.

[34] *Perush ha-Roqeaḥ ʿal ha-Torah,* 1.323.

[35] *Perush ha-Roqeaḥ ʿal ha-Torah,* 1.323.

[36] *Perush ha-Roqeaḥ ʿal ha-Torah,* 2.8.

הֲלֹא אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ הַלֵּוִי יָדַעְתִּי כִּי־דַבֵּר יְדַבֵּר הוּא וְגַם הִנֵּה־הוּא יֹצֵא :Exod 4:14
לִקְרָאתֶךָ וְרָאֲךָ וְשָׂמַח בְּלִבּוֹ

הלא אהרן אחיך הלוי איש משבט לוי **ידעתי כי דבר** עתה **ידבר הוא** כל עת
וגם הנה הוא יוצא ממקומו לילך **לקראתך** כי ישמע שתבא שם **וראך** מיד **ושמח
בלבו.**[37]

Behold Aaron, your brother, the Levite, a man from the tribe of Levi – **I know
that he speaks** now **and will speak** always,[38] **and also behold he is coming out**
from his place to go **to meet you** because he hears that you will come there,
and he will see you right away **and be glad in his heart**.

These examples illustrate one style of what students of early commentaries have dubbed "morselization," "atomization," "lemmatization," or "segmentation."[39] In this style, the comment is flanked by two pieces of the explicated text: the lemma and the lemma complement. Some instances of the lemma complement seem motivated, but others seem quite gratuitous – a waste of valuable parchment and ink, not to mention time. Those are the ones that are most significant for our purposes.

The unmotivated lemma complement is first attested for Hebrew in Reuel's commentary, which has come down to us in scroll fragments from ca. 1000 CE. How did it arise? One possibility is suggested by the treatment of Exod 4:23 in the Byzantine Commentary on Genesis and Exodus. Following a lemma consisting of the first two words of the verse, the exegete provides a short comment, משה לך ("Moses, go"), but then he returns to the verse at the point where the lemma ends, appending the last twelve words of the verse with no additional comment.[40] Thus, all fourteen words of the verse are found in the commentary, divided between the lemma and the lemma complement. The intervening comment has the appearance of a short interlinear gloss that has been inserted into the verse by a later copyist. This is not to say that the Byzantine Commentary on Genesis and Exodus was itself originally a collection of interlinear glosses. It is possible, however, that the lemma complement is a vestige of an earlier practice of copying interlinear glosses into biblical verses. Such a practice has been posited by

---

[37] *Perush ha-Roqeaḥ ʿal ha-Torah,* 2.16–17.

[38] This exegete rejects the idea that infinitive absolutes merely emphasize (the truth of) their finite verbs.

[39] These terms refer to the manner in which the commentator breaks up the explicated text into bite-sized pieces; see R. K. Gibson and C. Shuttleworth Kraus, eds., *The Classical Commentary: History, Practices, Theory* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 7, 153, 297, 364–65; and J. E. Wansbrough and A. Rippin, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Amherst, N. Y.: Prometheus, 2004) 131.

[40] One could argue that the beginning of this lemma complement is motivated, but hardly all of it.

S. Japhet, based on a possibly related stylistic feature found in many medieval Hebrew commentaries.[41] The example discussed above illustrates the fact that the insertion of a comment into a biblical verse automatically divides it into a lemma and a lemma complement.

Interlinear glosses are found in Christian biblical commentaries from the late eighth or early ninth century.[42] One could therefore argue that the Byzantine Jews borrowed this style from their Christian neighbors. Unfortunately, such a borrowing seems to be excluded by the fact that "the Byzantines never inserted interlinear glosses" in their Bibles;[43] this was a Carolingian practice,[44] thought to be imported from Ireland.[45]

Another possible non-Jewish model is the "continuous lemmata" style. In this style, the lemmas of the commentary cover the entire explicated text, obviating the need for a separate copy of that text. This style is found in some of the ancient commentaries on classical works.[46] It is also found in one of the earliest extant commentaries on the Quran, that of Muhammad Kalbi (d. 763). However, in the examples of this style provided by Wansbrough and Rippin (Quran 12:6, 56–57), there are no lemma complements; the final lemmas of all three verses are provided with glosses.[47]

A third possible model is Jewish: Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. The Aramaic renderings in this late targum frequently contain explanatory interpolations ("expansions"). Indeed, the comment on Exod 19:1 in the Byzantine Commentary on Genesis and Exodus is quite similar to Pseudo-Jonathan's Aramaic rendering (see above). In Pseudo-Jonathan, the inserted comment is naturally flanked by literal Aramaic renderings of two verse segments identical to the ones that function as lemma and lemma complement in the Byzantine commentary; in a translation, of course, an explanatory interpolation does not make the following verse

---

[41] S. Japhet and R. B. Salters, eds., *The Commentary of R. Samuel ben Meir* Rashbam *on Qoheleth* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985) 57: "The origin of this technique seems to have been in the practice of glosses, where the interpretive words were affixed to the text itself."

[42] G. Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: Les gloses de la Bible" in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, eds. P. Riché and G. Lobrichon (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984) 98–99; Gilbertus Universalis, *Glossa Ordinaria in Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete*, ed. A. Andrée (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 2005) 28; L. Smith, *The* Glossa Ordinaria*: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 91.

[43] Lobrichon, "Les gloses de la Bible," 98.

[44] Smith, Glossa Ordinaria, 91–92.

[45] Lobrichon, "Les gloses de la Bible," 98–99.

[46] M. del Fabbro, "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea," *Studia Papyrologica* 18 (1979) 69–132 (esp. 70–78).

[47] Wansbrough and Rippin, *Quranic Studies,* 131–32, 283–84.

segment superfluous. But why would an exegete writing in Hebrew imitate the style of an Aramaic translation? Is it possible that the influence of targumic style on the Byzantine exegetes was only indirect? Was there an early Byzantine *peshat* commentary that was nothing more than a Hebrew translation of an expansive targum, one that served as a model for later commentaries? These questions cannot be answered at the moment.

In any event, it appears that this style spread quickly from Byzantium to western Europe. Can we explain its appearance in Rashi's commentaries?[48] We do not know if Rashi had access to Byzantine commentaries, but we do know that his pupil and amanuensis, R. Shemaiah, had some knowledge of Greek and was familiar with Byzantine coins and the customs of Byzantine Jewry; it has therefore been suggested that he came from southern Italy.[49] Moreover, a glance at R. Shemaiah's own commentary on tractate *Middot* of the Mishnah reveals that he too made use of the lemma complement:

f. R. Shemaiah

mMid 1:3: חמשה שערים היו להר הבית. שני שערי חולדה מן הדרום משמשין כניסה ויציאה. קיפונוס מן המערב משמש כניסה ויציאה. טדי מן הצפון לא היה משמש כלום. שער המזרחי עליו שושן הבירה צורה, שבו כהן גדול השורף את הפרה ופרה וכל מסעדיה יוצאים להר המשחה.

שער המזרחי. שבחומת עזרת נשים שהכל נכנסין דרך שם לכל העזרות **ועל** אותו השער **שושן הבירה צורה**.[50]

The eastern gate in the wall of the women's courtyard, through which everyone entered all of the courtyards, **and on** that gate **the fortress Shushan was depicted**.[51]

---

[48] For a discussion of the relationship between lemma and comment in Rashi's commentaries, see Y. Avineri, *Hekhal Rashi* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1985) 20–22. No mention is made there of the lemma complement.

[49] See A. Grossman, "R. Shemaʿyah ha-Shoshani u-ferusho le-Shir-ha-Shirim," in *Sefer ha-yovel la-rav Mordekhai Breuer*, ed. M. Bar-Asher (Jerusalem, 1992) 1.37, and the other literature cited in Steiner, "Jewish Theory," 145, n. 73. For a weaker version of this suggestion (Italy instead of southern Italy), see A. Grossman, *Ḥakhme Tsarefat ha-rishonim* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995) 350–52.

[50] Middot 34a in the standard Vilna editions of the Talmud. For ועל instead of על, see Codex Parma De Rossi 138 (*Mishna Codex Parma* [Jerusalem: Kedem, 1970]) 289 col. b, line 10.

[51] For the passive participle צורה ("depicted"), see R. C. Steiner, "Poetic Forms in the Masoretic Vocalization and Three Difficult Phrases in Jacob's Blessing: יֶתֶר שְׂאֵת (Gen 49:3), יְצוּעִי עָלָה (Gen 49:4) and יָבֹא שִׁילֹה (Gen 49:10)," *JBL* 129 (2010) 216 n. 39.

ומקום היה שם אמה על אמה וטבלא של שיש וטבעת היתה קבועה 1:9 mMid
בה ושלשלת שהמפתחות היו תלויות בה. הגיע זמן הנעילה, הגביה את הטבלא
בטבעת, ונטל את המפתחות מן השלשלת, ונעל הכהן מבפנים ובן לוי ישן לו
מבחוץ. גמר מלנעול, החזיר את המפתחות לשלשלת ואת הטבלא למקומה, נתן
כסותו עליה, ישן לו.

גמר. הכהן **מלנעול והחזיר המפתחות לשלשלת** והחזיר **הטבלא למקומה ונתן**[52]
בן לוי **כסותו**[53] **עליה** חזר **וישן לו.**[54]

When he, the priest, **finished locking up,** and **he returned the keys to the chain,**
and he returned **the slab to its place, and he,** the Levite, **put his mattress**[55] **on**
it, he went back **to sleep.**

כל הנכנסין להר הבית נכנסין דרך ימין ומקיפין, ויוצאין דרך 2:2 mMid
שמאל, חוץ ממי שאירעו דבר שהוא מקיף לשמאל. מה לך מקיף לשמאל? שאני
אבל. השוכן בבית הזה ינחמך! שאני מנודה. השוכן בבית הזה יתן בלבם ויקרבוך!

מה לך מקיף לשמאל. שואלין לו וזה משיב **שאני אבל** והם עונין **השוכן** וכן
שאני מנודה.[56]

"**What's the matter with you that you are going to the left,**" they ask him, and
he replies, "**I am a mourner,**" and they answer, "**May He that dwells …!**"; and
so too for "**I am excommunicated.**"

Was R. Shemaiah the conduit through which the lemma complement
reached Rashi? In recent years it has become increasingly clear that R.
Shemaiah played an important role in revising Rashi's Bible commen-
taries, over and above his role in copying them. Much of the new
research, conducted by A. Grossman and J. S. Penkower, concerns mar-
ginal notes written by R. Shemaiah, sometimes at Rashi's request and
sometimes on his own initiative, that were inserted into the body of the
commentaries by later copyists. Examples of this phenomenon have
been cited from the commentaries on the Pentateuch, Joshua, Kings,
Isaiah, Ezekiel, etc.[57] These revisions were substantive. Did R. Shemaiah

---

[52] Our printed editions and Codex Parma (290 col. a, line 10) read נתן, but Codex
Kaufmann (http://kaufmann.mtak.hu/en/ms50/ms50–215r.htm col. a, line 2) reads ונתן,
agreeing with the text of the commentary.

[53] This is the reading in the standard edition of the commentary, here and at the end
of 1:8, but R. Shemaiah's gloss in 1:8 suggests that his reading in both places was
כ(י)סתו, as in Codex Parma, 290 col. a, lines 3 and 10.

[54] Middot 34a.

[55] For this rendering, see n. 53 above and R. Shemaiah's comment at the end of 1:8.

[56] Middot 34b.

[57] For Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch, see A. Grossman, "Haggahot R.
Shemaʿyah we-nosaḥ perush Rashi la-Torah," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991) 67–98; J. S. Penkower,
"Haggahot Rashi le-ferusho la-Torah," *JSIJ* 6 (2007) 141–88; and idem, "Haggahot
nosafot shel Rashi le-ferusho ʿal ha-Torah," in *Or le-Mayer: Studies in Bible, Semitic
Languages, Rabbinic Literature, and Ancient Civilizations Presented to Mayer Gruber on
the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday,* ed. S. Yona (Beersheba: Ben-Gurion Univer-

also make occasional stylistic changes while copying the commentaries? If so, were they unconscious, or were they made deliberately, with Rashi's permission? And if the latter, why did R. Shemaiah fail to mention them in marginal notes, as he did with substantive changes? Did he, like the later copyists who altered Rashi's lemmas,[58] consider them too trivial to mention? Further research will be needed to answer these questions.

---

sity of the Negev, 2010) 363–409. For Rashi's commentary on the Prophets, see J. S. Penkower, "Haggahot Rashi, haggahot talmidaw, we-haggahot ʾanonimiyyot, be-ferush Rashi le-sefer Yehoshuaʿ," *Shenaton le-ḥeqer ha-Miqraʾ we-ha-mizraḥ ha-qadum* 16 (2006) 205–29 and the literature cited there in n. 1.

[58] Cf. *Rashi's Commentary on Psalms,* ed. M. I. Gruber (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2007) 148: "It should also be observed that one of the most variable elements from ms. to ms. of Rashi's Commentary on the Book of Psalms is the length of the lemma, i. e., how much of the verse is quoted before each comment."