The Two Lists of Addenda to Nahmanides’ Torah Commentary: Who Wrote Them?
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Introduction

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

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

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

1 From a quantitative standpoint, the documented addenda make up 4.5% of the Torah commentary. This calculation is based on the Chavel (Hebrew) edition of the work. The entire commentary comprises some 25,000 lines, and the 134 additions make up 1126 lines.

2 Steinschneider identified Nahmanides’ addenda in both ms M2 and ms P. This was done already in 1864 in “Hamazkir – Hebräische Bibliographie Blätter”, no. 41, annum 7:119. The independent addenda list (ms S) was identified in Neubauer’s catalog in 1886 (A. Neubauer, Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library (Oxford 1886), 783 – ms 2253,12: fol. 268). Neubauer notes that the list of Nahmanides’ addenda to his commentary on the Pentateuch was sent from Acre and ends with the portion of Pinchas (Num 26:42). The list in ms H was identified by Margoliouth in 1889 (G. Margoliouth, Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum (London 1965, vol. I, reprint of 1899 edition), 157, ms no. 208), and he refers there to Neubauer as well. The addenda list of ms A was first identified by Kahana in his article. Pietro Perreau noted in his catalog of Parma manuscripts (from 1878–1904) that Nahmanides’ arrival in Acre is mentioned in ms A, but he did not explain expli-
The first comprehensive discussion of the subject was published in 1969. Rabbi Kalman Kahana described four manuscripts of Nahmanides' commentary that also contained a list of addenda, naming them \( P, H, M \) and \( A \). Kahana listed precisely the 134 additions mentioned in these lists, and systematically examined whether these addenda were to be found in the Torah commentary of these manuscripts and of an additional manuscript he marked \( D \). It turned out that, in the main, the addenda lists were supported by this examination, because some of the manuscripts do not include the added passages (and so they represent the first edition of the commentary), while others do — either in the body of the commentary itself or in the margins (and so they represent the last edition).

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

It should be stressed that in the common editions of Nahmanides' commentary, almost all of the addenda have been integrated into the body of the commentary and are an inseparable part of it. In other words, the common editions represent the final edition of the commentary, as intended by Nahmanides when he completed his work, rather than any of the earlier stages. The examination of the list of addenda explicitly that this manuscript contains a list of passages added to Nahmanides' commentary (see: P. Perreau, *Catalogo dei Codici Ebraici della Biblioteca di Parma*: 111; and see ibid.:155, about ms \( P \)).

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

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


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

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

**Two Lists of Addenda**

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

The first list contains 89 additions, most of which — 60 additions — relate to his commentary to the Book of Genesis. The second list, appearing in its entirety only in ms \( M2 \), contains 70 additions, none of which relate to the Book of Genesis; they relate to the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy only. This list appears partially in mss \( S \) and \( A \).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>From Exodus to Num 13:3</th>
<th>From Num 13:3 to the End</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only H, P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H, P and M2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only M2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the first list ends at Numbers 13:3, and only two additions in it appear later in the Pentateuch. In contrast, the second list only appears in ms \( M2 \), which contains the commentary to Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. This fact will be discussed *infra*.

* Ms \( S \) is unclear and the end of the list (from Nu 26:42 on) is missing. Ms \( A \) contains the title of the list and the part relating to the Book of Exodus only; the compiler announces that the additions from the Book of Leviticus onward are integrated into the body of the manuscript, so there is no need to repeat them again in the list.
list is lacking at its beginning; as noted above, it starts with the Book of Exodus. As regards the middle section, dealt with by both lists, only 75% of the cases appear in each of the lists, while 25% of the cases appear only in one of them.

The Difference in Descriptions

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

The first list:

[0] המ числе וממספר...
[5] המ числе רכיב

The second list:

[0] המ числе וממספר...
[5] המ числе רכיב כהן...

The numbers in brackets (which of course do not appear in the original) are intended to clarify the structure. This is the descriptive method adopted by the first list: [0] in the Weekly Portion wa-yishma’ yithiro (Exodus 18–20), [1] in the verse (or the passage beginning with) le thirtsah (התרצה: ibid., 20:11), [2] between the words ke-tzorko we-tovatho (“according to his need and for his benefit”) and the words [3] we-khol ha’am ro’m (וכל מספר אומות “and all the people see”) the following addition is to be inserted: [4]: we-hinneh hizkir ... we-hamaskil yavin (יחיון אתочки ... והמשכיל יבין “and here he has mentioned ... and the knowledgeable will understand”). And after this addition continue with the words [5] we-khol ha’am ro’m (וכל מספר אומות).

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

The List Titles and their being Ascribed to Nahmanides

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

The First List:

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

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

---

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

8 אל החסמות שלפיו שםtrand(nd) מצורף המספר ומספרים שלם| מצורף זה מביאו בכמה exhilarating lists of words.

[إنجليزية للفلبينية: وفقًا لهذا الكتاب، يمكنني أن أقول إنني أضيفت شيءًا إلى شيء آخر، لرؤية الحساب” (ب thresh 7:27).]
The Second List:

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

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

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

We shall now consider the first list. Its title states merely that the list contains the addenda added by Nahmanides when he was in Acre; it does not claim that Nahmanides himself edited the list or dispatched it.12 Indeed, a careful examination of the list of addenda demonstrates clearly that someone, other than Nahmanides, edited the list.

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

The following are the indications that this is the case:

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

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

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

A. Addendum fragments inserted in the wrong place

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

Commentary to Gen 29:30:14

Ana he loved Rachel (רחל) more than Leah – The reason why Scripture mentions that he also loved Rachel more than Leah is that it is

---

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

10 Except for five “additions”, with which I will deal infra.

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

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

[And the Eternal saw] that Leah was hated (ךָּפָתָה לֹא הָאָלֶה) – for from the time she deceived her sister, Jacob hated her (לֹא-שֶׁחָפָה).

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

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

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

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

"And thou mayest dwell in the land of thy forefathers, and of the land in which thou wast a stranger, and I will do mine image towards thee, in the land of Egypt, in the midst of their gods."

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

In the manuscripts, this addition is inserted at the end of the commentary to verse 5, while the list of addenda contains an instruction to insert it at the end of the commentary to verse 6. Regarding its meaning, the insertion of the addition at the end of verse 6 is not completely impossible, or this verse, too, deals with Jacob’s efforts to appease Esau. However, the wording of the addition we-da’ ki ha-kavod ha-zeh she-
B. The absence of an instruction to erase a passage that was nullified

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

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

Here is an example (Gen 27:4):

```

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

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

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

...and eleven stars bowed down to me (Gen 37:9)”. This is the meaning of “And Joseph’s ten brethren went down” (Gen 42:3), for the first dream related to the ten, and it was referring to them when the text read: and he told it to his brethren, and they hated him yet the more (Gen 37:5). And it was to them that he said: for behold, we were binding sheaves (ibid., 7), but Benjamin was not of that number, and so the first dream was fulfilled by them bowing down to him, but the second dream could not come true until Benjamin came down, together with his father.

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

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

Nahmanides’ changed understanding made him erase a number of lines of his earlier commentary, from the words בכם עולה החנית וקנרים выпуск on. Indeed, in the text that appears in the usual printed editions
Nahmanides attempts to integrate the facts narrated in Deuteronomy with those related in Chapter 24 of the Book of Exodus. In the first edition of his commentary, he was of the opinion that the commandment given to the people, “Return ye to your tents,” was given just before Moses’ ascent to the mountain. Nahmanides says in his commentary on verse 3:22

Then Moses came together with them (=the heads of the tribes and the elders) to the place where the people were standing and told all of them all the words of God (יִהְיֶהוּ הָלוֹךְ אֶל בּוֹרִי; אֲנָהָא) and they said, “we shall do all that He had commanded us in the ten Commandments, and we will hearken to your voice in everything that you have commanded, or will command in His name, exalted be He”.

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

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

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

---

22 Nahmanides’ commentary in the printed editions is in accordance with the first edition here. The version of the second edition can be found in ms M1, H.
In his second edition, Nahmanides explains the sequence of events of that night in his commentary to verse 1.23 The commandment "return ye to your tents" is a command for only a single night, for on the following day the people returned and took up their positions for the ceremony of the Covenant of Basins. Nahmanides proposes two explanations for the dispersal of the people that day and its reconvening on the following day. The first is an a posteriori explanation: the many preparations needed for the Covenant of the Basins—the erecting of the altar and the monuments and the offering up of the sacrifices—could not have been accomplished the very same day the commandments were related to the people. The second explanation is an a priori one: the people needed a day to contemplate and internalize what they had heard (לתל התל.use המות המברד). Furthermore, the people utilized their return to the tents to celebrate the receiving of the Torah.

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

Then Moses came together with them to the place where they were standing and told all of them all the words of God ("יסırlוכאלכםכלדרה"), that the desire of the Creator was that it be so (כיزانףכףכך).  

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

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

The first list:

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

The second list:

The words marked with erasure marks.

The second list thus instructs the reader to omit a passage from the commentary—the passage belonging to the first edition. The erasure begins with the words 'ות概述 את דברי' until the end of the section (the words 'ות概述 את דברי' are the beginning of the next section in Nahmanides' commentary).

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

23 Nahmanides adds here: "in the opinion of our Sages (see Shabbat SSa), who praise them: they said 'we shall do' before 'we shall listen' (infra, 7), for this means that they said: from here on we undertake to do and to perform whatever He commands as, whatever He desires and whatever He decrees, for we shall do it immediately upon hearing Him, whether directly from Him or from your own mouth; we accept it all, whether it is trivial or serious, whether it is profound or exalted (אתם יראין יראין - based on Isaiah 7:11)."

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

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

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

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

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

26 For a discussion of these two passages see Sabato: 64-65.
27 The second addendum list does not include the Book of Genesis, and so the third criterion of those I have defined cannot be met in this case.

28 It is indeed missing from the body of ms A, but appears in the margin (in its proper place).
more room, he wrote the rest in the margin. The editor of the addenda list thought that only what was written in the margin was Nahmanides' addition.

E. Imprecise notation of the verse that contains the addendum

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

the priest shall not depart from Judah. In his opinion, this statement embodies a permanent prohibition against appointing kings that are not of the tribe of Judah. In the passage adduced here, Nahmanides brings the words of the Talmud Yerushalmi in Tractate Horayot and explains them. He says that the two Amoraim disagreed over the reason for the prohibition against appointing priests to serve as kings. According to R. Yehuda, this prohibition is part of the general prohibition against appointing kings that are not of the tribe of Judah, and the priests are mentioned here in order to indicate that though they are worthy of being appointed as priests, it is forbidden to appoint them as kings. In contrast, R. Chiya believes that there exists a specific prohibition against priests being appointed as kings, and that this prohibition derives from the verse: (The priests...shall have no portion nor inheritance—Deut 18:1).

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

---

38 In ms D it appears in the margin. The data concerning the two ms were added by Kahana: 34. See Sabato: 65, n. 23.
the compiler of the list did not read Nahmanides' words accurately, but rather looked at the text of the commentary with the addition written down in its margins, and sought out the beginning of the paragraph marked by a space before it or by prominent lettering.

Here are further cases of similar imprecision:

On what basis was the first addendum list compiled?

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

What appears to me to be the most likely hypothesis is that the compiler of the addenda list had before him the original text in the margins of which Nahmanides had written down the additions to his commentary.33 That anonymous compiler examined this text, and prepared a list of the addenda he found in its margins. Such an explanation provides well for his failures as noted above: he may have misunderstood just where the addition was to be inserted, or may have overlooked erasure marks in the body of the manuscript, or may have reported that some words were written in the margins while they were actually from Nahmanides' original text and not a later addition.

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

The second addenda list and its relationship to Nahmanides

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

---

33 See Sabato: 76–77.
34 See the discussion in Sabato: 107–111, regarding addendum no. 59 and the three short additional passages connected to it, which were not included in the addenda list.
So there is no reason to doubt the attribution of the second list to Nahmanides.

Nonetheless, I do not claim that the second list exhausts all the addenda from the Book of Exodus on. On the contrary: one can point out many passages that were not included in the first edition and yet are not included in the addenda list. A comprehensive study of this subject is a matter itself worthy of independent consideration. It shall suffice here to discuss two additions that appear in the first list, and yet do not appear in the second one. The first case relates to the discussion of the purpose for sending out the spies to the Land of Israel and deals with the command חלום ומיוב ופשתן מביר אסייר (Addenda 88; Nu 13:2):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Far more surprising is the absence of addition 68 that deals with the order of events following the giving of the Torah – and has already been discussed supra (together with addition no. 69).39 These two addenda are closely related to one another, for addition no. 68 includes a passage that replaces the passage Nahmanides decided to erase at the end of addition no. 66. Addition 68 does not appear in any of the three manuscripts of the second addenda list (M2, A, S), and I believe that it can only be assumed that it was omitted from the list at an early stage, as a result of a copyist’s error.

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

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

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

In the section “The absence of an instruction to erase a passage that was nullified” pp. 334-337.
ever between the seriousness of this mistake and that of the problems that beset the first list.

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

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

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

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

If we adopt the first possibility, we will thus wonder why Nahmanides’ list did not survive. It may have been merely a matter of chance: perhaps the addenda manuscript was damaged, and its first few pages lost. On the other hand, it is to be noted that the three manuscripts of the second list open in identical fashion—they all begin with the additions relating to the Book of Exodus, and the first addendum is identical in all three: addition no. 63 in the portion of Bo el Paro’ “Come before Pharaoh”. It would thus seem that Nahmanides had no additions relating to the Book of Exodus that would have preceded this addendum.  

This argument is of course not decisive, for the three manuscripts may all have derived from a single source after the loss of the additions to Genesis.

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

---

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

---

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

The direction that appeals to me, however, is the very opposite: Nahmanides seems to me to have deliberately chosen not to compile an addenda list for the Book of Genesis. The reason for this that seems logical to me is the following: Nahmanides’ commentary on Genesis contains nearly a hundred additions: sixty of these are documented in the first list; Sabato points out another 36; the addition referring to the tomb of Rachel (Gen 35:16) is not included in these. The relative number of addenda in comparison with the entire commentary on the Book of Genesis is large, more than twice as large as the relative number of annotations in the other four books of the Pentateuch.  

Nahmanides may well have felt that the large number of changes relating to the Book of Genesis did not justify or made it impossible to update the commentary merely by means of inserting addenda that have been handed down in a list, and may have preferred that potential students of his updated commentary on Genesis request an updated copy and then copy from it. In this context, one should indeed emphasize the difficulty encountered by a scribe who tries to copy the commentary from a book that does not include the addenda and uses such an addenda list to copy from the new passages and insert them in their precise places in the new copy that he is making. Errors and confusion might well result from the incautious use of the addenda list. In particular, additions might be inserted in the wrong place and mixtures of the initial and final versions of the commentary might be created. An examination of the manuscripts of Nahmanides’ commentary shows that such fears were indeed well grounded.

**The addenda lists and the undocumented additions**

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

42 The Chovel edition of Nahmanides’ commentary on Genesis contains 277 pages and includes 60 documented additions, i.e., one addition per an average of 4.5 pages; Nahmanides’ commentary on the other four books of the Pentateuch contains 763 pages and includes 74 documented additions, i.e., one addition per an average of 10.3 pages. It is to be noted that of the other four books, the Book of Numbers is the most replete with annotations (147 pages that contain 27 additions; i.e., one annotation per 5.4 pages).
dendum passages, especially relating to the other four books of the Pentateuch, and I intend to discuss them elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The classification of the manuscripts of the commentary according to editions

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

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

43 See Sabato's summation on pp. 120–124 and his discussion of example 15 on pp. 90–95.
44 See Sabato, examples 4, 28.
45 The length of 23 of the 36 additions found by Sabato (64%) is less than 2.5 lines, while only ten of the 134 documented additions are of that length (7.5%).
46 Sabato wonders (on p. 111) whether Nahmanides deliberately refrained from including in the addenda list he sent to the diaspora all those emendations stemming from the additions and included only the additions themselves. He may have done so to avoid causing confusion in the existing copies of the commentary. Sabato makes this point in connection with the Book of Genesis, but from what we have learned, the Genesis addenda list was not compiled by Nahmanides. However, the criterion considered by Sabato could have been a valid criterion for some other compiler, and also with regard to additions Nahmanides himself wrote out and (which appear in the second list).
47 Five additions to the Book of Genesis have been inserted into the body of the manuscript (nos. 1, 5, 20, 26 and 41), but three of these are actually "imagined additions" (see Sabato: 65–66). Seven additions have been added in the Book of Exodus (nos. 62, 68–73), while one addition (which may be an "imagined addition") relating to the Book of Deuteronomy has been inserted (no. 89). To these we must add eight undocumented addendum passages noted by Sabato (nos. 29–31, which are virtually certain, and nos. 32–36, which are doubtful), which are not to be found in ms A but do appear in ms D.
A “final edition” is reflected by many mss and especially the printed versions.48 However, addenda passages not found in the printed versions can be found in the manuscripts. Even those mss that do reflect, in the main, the “final edition” do not include all the additions.

‘Ms Munich’

One of the important mss of Nahmanides’ commentary is ms Munich, which divides up into two manuscripts: ms Munich 138 contains the commentary on the Books of Genesis and Exodus, and ms Munich 137(1) includes the commentary on the Books of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. Those studying the commentaries of Nahmanides have referred to the two parts as if they were a single manuscript: Steinschneider described the two parts as a single item in the catalog he compiled,49 while Kahana and Sabato have discussed this addenda list and its reflection in the mss, but have not distinguished between its two sections. The Migra’ot Gedolot Ha-Keter project examined the Nahmanides mss and chose ms Munich as the basic text of Nahmanides’ commentary on the Pentateuch.

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

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

(2008) *The Two Lists of Addenda to Nahmanides’ Torah Commentary* 351

Before us, the undersigned, testify that Avraham Yamin (7), an emissary, admitted that he had received from Don Vidal bar Shelomo (of blessed memory), son of Alrabbi, four and a half ‘flowers’ of gold from Aragon, that are beautiful and of full weight, and sold him in return this book which is a commentary on the books of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, three books of the Pentateuch, as interpreted by Nahmanides z”l. […]

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

**Conclusion**

The additions composed by Nahmanides to his commentary on the Pentateuch must be examined and studied in light of the two addenda lists and in light of all extant mss of the commentary. In general, most of the addenda mentioned in the lists find support in a comparison of the manuscripts, while on the other hand there exist other addenda that are not documented in lists, but may be identified by comparing the mss. Nahmanides seems to have compiled the second addenda list himself, from the Book of Exodus on, and he may have deliberately dropped the idea of treating the Book of Genesis in the same manner because of the large number of changes he had made to his original commentary. The first addenda list was compiled by someone else, as indicated by certain faults in the manner of description that the author would probably not make.

**The Manuscripts**

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

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

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

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

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

---

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


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

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

52 The bill of sale was copied over partially in Steinschneider’s catalog, p. 81.
\textit{M2} = Ms Munich 137; F 1187 – Nahmanides’ Commentary to Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy and a list of addenda.
\textit{S} = Ms Oxford 2253/12; F 20536 – a list of addenda.
\textit{P} = Ms Parma Platina 3535; F 14042 – Nahmanides’ Commentary to the Pentateuch and a list of addenda.
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