Unexplored glosses in the Yerushalmi manuscript of Leiden
by Hans-Jürgen Becker

The hitherto unknown glosses of the famous Leiden manuscript Or. 4720 (= Scal. 3), edited and evaluated in the following, have been erased so thoroughly either by their producer or by a later reviser that they are almost completely invisible to the naked eye. Only with an ultra-violet reader do they appear somewhat clearer and can they be partly deciphered.

The glosses are of particular importance in connection with the question of the origin of the textus receptus of the Talmud Yerushalmi. They offer further information concerning the problem of identification of the text-witnesses on which the revision of the Leiden manuscript was based and thereby prepared for the print of the editio princeps. Venice 1523.

The Status of Research. MS Leiden and the Venice Edition

Moritz Steinschneider was the first to become convinced, by means of a text comparison, that the first edition of the Yerushalmi was undertaken 'sine dubio ex ipse cod. nostro', MS Leiden. The observations of S.M. Schiller-Szinessy in the year 1878, twenty years later, can be taken as evidence that MS Leiden indeed played an important role in the printing of the editio princeps. Schiller-Szinessy identified the signature of Ya’aqov b. Haym b. Yitzhaq ibn Adoniyahu, one of the closest co-workers of Daniel Bomberg in Venice, in the manuscript (Vol. II, fol. 268a), and pointed out the buyer’s entry 'Ex Bibliotheca Jo. Huralti Boistallerii. Emi a bombergo Coronatis xij' (Vol. I, fol. 371b). Furthermore, he was the first to observe that even instructions for the establishment of the columns, as they are actually to be found in the editio princeps, have been laid out in the manuscript — most of them probably by Ibn Adoniyahu.

Schiller-Szinessy had already discovered numerous smudges of printer’s ink; in 1973 distinct marks of faded print were discovered during the restoration of the manuscript. Such a spot has now been identified as a copy in mirror image of an apparently wet printed folio of the editio princeps.

In order to work out precisely which role MS Leiden played in Bomberg’s workshop, we must take into consideration the colophon, which was added to the Venice edition of the Yerushalmi on the last page at the end of treatise Nidda. There we read:

Van der Heide and van Koningsveld, in agreement with the opinion of preceding scholars, have interpreted this phrase in the light of the above-mentioned facts, expressly in respect to MS Leiden — and correctly so. If the printed text came into being based upon a basic manuscript which beforehand had been corrected on the basis of three other copies, then this basic manuscript must without doubt have been MS Leiden. Various marginal glosses in this manuscript, which have been incorporated into the printed text, can then be traced back to the three additional text-witnesses mentioned in the colophon of the Venice edition.

If so, these glosses naturally acquire considerable significance for the textual history of the Talmud Yerushalmi. In particular, the following two questions require an answer:

1. Which glosses in MS Leiden offer a text which is taken from the three other text-witnesses mentioned in the colophon of the Venice edition?
2. From which text-witnesses have these glosses been taken?

The Glossators of MS Leiden

As far as the revisers of the Yerushalmi manuscript of Leiden are concerned, the description of the manuscript by Schiller-Szinessy has caused some confusion. In the first place, he refers to his own system of pagination, which cannot be found in the manuscript itself and which therefore makes the locating of glosses mentioned by him extraordinarily difficult. Furthermore, through his overly speculative distinction between thirteen owners, eight of whom are supposed to have revised the manuscript, Schiller-Szinessy conveys a false impression about the way in which the manu-
greater number of additions and changes in the text than that of glossator 2. Nevertheless, a change.

Sines. No. 8

Glossator 3: Epstein and Melammed = Schiller-Szinessy. The description of Schiller-Szinessy already suggested, only some of the catchwords, running titles and technical signs for the editor of the editio princeps stem from Ibn Adoniyyahu, but not glosses of his own.

Therefore, it should suffice to distinguish between the three revisers of MS Leiden, from whom nearly all the changes in the text originate, and sum up the few marks of revisers other than these three under one single, extra category.

In their work, Epstein and Melammed have referred to the three main revisers of the Leiden manuscript with the following abbreviations: ע"ע, which stands for לְפַדַּר יַבְנֵי יַקְרִיתֶל הָאָדַת (Oznati) ע"ע, and ע"ע (Sallam). This does not correctly reproduce the chronology of the revisions, however (though this was also not intended by the authors). Various places in which ע"ע has revised additions and deletions of ע"ע prove that the latter is prior to the former 9. Nevertheless, it is preferable to maintain the numeration introduced by Epstein and Melammed, since it has become common use. Thus we distinguish the following:

Glossator 1 = Epstein and Melammed ע"ע

This glossator is the writer of the manuscript itself, Yehiel b. Y'quti'el b. Binyamin ha-Rofe. Sh. Lieberman has provided detailed information about this kind of marginal glosses 10.

Glossator 2 = Epstein and Melammed ע"ע = Schiller-Szinessy No. 7

By far the greatest share of all the revisions in the text of MS Leiden, including most of the marginal glosses, was made by this reviser. In the beginning of fol. la in Vol. I he left behind the following note 11:

הָלַחַם הַרְבּוּתָה מִי אַלִּקָּלֵם שְׁוֵי מְרֹצָה אֶחָד מַהְרָר

Glossator 2 has often taken into consideration the works of his predecessors 1 and 3 — either by distinction, e.g., through additional filling signs with which he coordinates the available glosses more clearly with the corpus of the text, or by means of elimination or change.

Glossator 3 = Epstein and Melammed ע"ע = Schiller-Szinessy No. 8

This glossator's revision of the manuscript is less intensive than that of glossator 2. Nevertheless, a greater number of additions and changes in the text can be traced to glossator 3. On the whole, his work makes a more diligent impression than that of his successor. Characteristic are the gloss-custodes, which in turn revert to the text of the manuscript.

In the beginning of fol. la in Vol. I we find the following note from his hand (under that of glossator 2) 12:

It is glossator 2 who, as final reviser before the editing of the manuscript, made a revision which thoroughly changed the text, and who thus produced the draft copy for the editio princeps. Although it seems quite likely that glossator 3, too, had at least one other manuscript at his disposal during his revision of MS Leiden, we should therefore concentrate upon glossator 2 when dealing with the 'three other copies' of the Yerushalmi mentioned in the colophon of the Venice edition. The question thus raised is: Which three copies other than MS Leiden could glossator 2 have called upon to produce the draft copy for the editio princeps Venice of the Yerushalmi, and how did he work with them?

The three other copies of the Yerushalmi used for the glossing of MS Leiden

Without consistently viewing glossators 2 and 3 as distinct from each other, Sh. Lieberman and E.Z. Melammed have, on the basis of detailed text comparisons, issued clear statements concerning the question which text-witnesses were used for the glosses of MS Leiden. The analyses of both authors rely mainly on the revisions made by glossator 2, who revised the manuscript for print on the basis of three other copies'. If their theses are correct and many details in their investigations suggest that they are — then two of the three text-witnesses used have already been identified.


Bomberg's edition of the Talmud Bavli was already completed when the editing of the Yerushalmi began. The editio princeps of the Bavli contains in addition to Bavli Horayot a Yerushalmi version of the treatise instead of the Tosafot missing here. Lieberman has pointed out the existence of a large number of glosses in MS Leiden which share the text of this version of the treatise, and concludes from this that it served as the textual basis for the respective glosses. Considering the manner in which the glossator treated his copy (known to us), we can learn a great deal about his working methods. According to Lieberman, he worked unsystematically and superficially, as he often did not transmit even excellent versions into the margins of the Leiden manuscript. Gaps in the text of MS Leiden,
which do not facilitate an understanding of the text, were not filled in by him, even in those places where it would have been possible with the help of the text-witness available to him. Subsequently, he corrected his copy only indistinctly in the glosses and undertook haphazard changes where he thought it to be sensible.

MS Vatican Ebr. 133, Yerushalmi Soṭa and Zera'im (without Bikkurim).

On the basis of a great number of partly literal equivalents of even corrupt paragraphs of MS Vatican with glosses in MS Leiden, which mostly cover gaps stemming from homoioteleuton, Melammed deduces a direct dependence of appropriate glosses on MS Vatican. Indeed, the glossator did not always copy accurately from his additional text-witness, but with certain regularity changed e.g. plene spelling into defective spelling, ąc to ą and a final ń to ń.

Both authors are so convinced of their respective theses that possible counter-arguments are sometimes ignored. But can it be 'positively certain' — as Lieberman states (p. 287) — that the glosses are based upon the first edition of the Bavli? Could they not just as well be based upon the handwritten copy of the editor — perhaps not only of treatise Horayot, but also of other treatises? Certain 'changes' would then not be attributable to our glossator, but possibly to an earlier reviser of this — by now — lost manuscript.

The same is true for MS Vatican, which was also copied from at least one manuscript. Although Melammed does mention that the text of some glosses is not found in MS Vatican, he does not remark upon the fact that glossator 2 carries out corrections opposed to the text of MS Vatican in many cases where it agrees with that of MS Leiden.

Despite these objections, the great number of proofs collected by Lieberman and Melammed attest to the fact that glossator 2 revised the text of MS Leiden by relying on the copies named by the authors or at least on copies which were textually very close to them. A certain amount of caution nevertheless is appropriate when defining probable characteristics of glossator 2, as the kind of changes noted by Lieberman and Melammed, compared to the respectively corresponding draft copy, do not converge significantly. On the other hand, the textual basis does not allow for cogent conclusions, for the glosses in Yerushalmi Horayot do not offer enough material for a conclusive comparison.

THE ERASED GLOSSES IN MS LEIDEN

No. 1: MS Leiden, fol. 32b, lines 28-29.

Text of the Gemara:

ר' בר קה ה פ ל י י ל א נ י מ ע ת ה א נ י מ
ה פ ל י י ל א נ י מ ע ת ה א נ י מ ר א נ ה פ ל י י ל א
ה פ ל י י ל א נ י מ ע ת ה א נ י מ

Text of the erased gloss in the outer margin.

פ' ר ב

Corresponding text in Shimshon’s commentary, according to the editio princeps of the Bavli, Venice 1520-23, fol. 2a, lines 33-43:

The undiscovered glosses on MS Leiden. Treatise Pe'ah

The above-mentioned authors had to rely solely on text comparisons to find out which text-witnesses were the basis for the glosses in MS Leiden. Five previously unnoticed, erased glosses in treatise Pe'ah now enable at least the identification of one text-witness which definitely was at the disposal of the reviser named glossator 2. These glosses, written by glossator 2, all prove to be extracts from the Mishna commentary of R. Shimshon of Sens on the order Zera'im, which is rich in Yerushalmi citations and explanations. Three of the glosses can be clearly identified by comparison with the first edition of this commentary in the editio princeps of the Bavli, whereas the other two reveal their origin only by means of their heading ש"ר רמב"ם שמשון (She'ar Rambam Shemshon). In the following edition Shimshon’s commentary-text, based upon the text of the first edition, is coordinated with the glosses in such a way that the identification can be verified easily.

THE UNDISCOVERED GLOSSES IN MS LEIDEN, TREATISE PE'AH

The above-mentioned authors had to rely solely on text comparisons to find out which text-witnesses were the basis for the glosses in MS Leiden. Five previously unnoticed, erased glosses in treatise Pe'ah now enable at least the identification of one text-
No. 2: MS Leiden, fol. 32b, line 34.

Text of the Gemara:

Erased gloss in the inner margin, to Dlb) 'DN. It consists of probably ten very short lines. Only the beginning of the first line can be deciphered: I "D. Shimshon's commentary on this passage covers the following text (fol. 2a, lines 47-50):

No. 3: MS Leiden, fol. 33a, line 7.

Text of the Gemara, with addendum:

The gloss placed in brackets (in the inner margin) completes the text of the Gemara in partial agreement with Shimshon's citation of this passage, fol. 2a, lines 11-21 (see below). At the end of the quoted line a filling sign can be found, and in the outer margin a voluminous, erased gloss of probably twenty lines. Next to several single, uncoordinable letters, again only the beginning of the line can be deciphered: I "D. Once again Shimshon's commentary on the corresponding passage is probably indicated by this (fol. 2a, lines 21-31).

No. 4: MS Leiden, fol. 36a, lines 7-8.

Text of the Gemara:

Corresponding text in Shimshon’s commentary, fol. 2b, lines 50-53:

No. 5: MS Leiden, fol. 36a, lines 28-29.

Text of the Gemara:

Corresponding text in Shimshon’s commentary, fol. 3a, lines 4-16:

Text of the erased gloss in the outer margin, to Dlb) 'DN:

Corresponding text in Shimshon’s commentary, fol. 3a, lines 4-16:
CONCLUSIONS FROM THE EDITION

1. The existence of the glosses proves that the Mishna commentary of Shimshon of Sens was, at least partially, at the disposal of glossator 2 of the Leiden manuscript and that he used it for glossing. Whether this commentary was available to him in the first edition of the Bavli or in a manuscript must remain undecided.

2. The glosses contain Shimshon’s commentary on five passages in the first chapter of treatise Pe’ah, naturally in the sequence in which these passages appear in the Yerushalmi text. This sequence does not quite correspond with that in which the commentaries appear in Shimshon’s work. There the sequence of the text covered by the glosses is: Nos. 3:1;2;4;5, whereby Nos. 3;1;2 follow upon each other almost immediately, interrupted only by the appropriate Yerushalmi text cited before each commentary. In Shimshon’s work, which commences only with the treatise Pe’ah, No. 3 is the very first commentary on a Yerushalmi paragraph.

After comparison with the Shimshon-version in the first edition of the Bavli, one notes that the glossator has skipped several chances to cite this commentary on the text of MS Leiden after the first three marginal glosses. This could mean, but it is not conclusive, that there was another draft copy which had a gap in this place (perhaps a missing page). At any rate, in MS Leiden the next two glosses with Shimshon’s commentary can be found only on fol. 36a.

How should these observations be interpreted?

I personally favour the solution that at the beginning of his revision glossator 2 intended to include an authoritative commentary — like that of Rashi in the Bavli’s first edition — in the printed edition of the Yerushalmi. As a Yerushalmi commentary on Z’ra’im it had not yet been written, the next best thing was to extract passages from the Mishna commentary of Shimshon of Sens. The authority of the Tosafot of Sens doubtlessly played a part in this.

The glossator quickly abandoned his plan, however, either due to lack of time or because of other difficulties.

3. Preceding every commentary from Shimshon’s work that is quoted by glossator 2, we find detailed citations from the commented Yerushalmi text. Altogether Shimshon’s commentary contains, in addition to a great number of hints and short quotations, several hundred extensive Yerushalmi citations from the order Z’ra’im. The assumption suggests itself that the glossator used these citations for the correction of the Yerushalmi text in MS Leiden.

In order to verify this assumption, I shall in the following pars pro toto quote and concisely analyse the passages in treatise Pe’ah which glossator 2 has added to the text of MS Leiden, and of which (at the same time) a citation exists in the Mishna commentary of Shimshon of Sens. This commentary is taken from its first edition in the editio princeps of the Bavli and, where extant, from the only (almost) complete manuscript of this work, MS Paris Hebr. 362.

CORRESPONDENCE OF ADDITIONS OF GLOSSATOR 2

IN MS LEIDEN WITH THE TEXT OF YERUSHALMI CITATIONS

IN THE MISHNA COMMENTARY OF R. SHIMSHON OF SENS

(Abbreviations: yLei+ = Yerushalmi MS Leiden Or. 4720, glossator 2; yVat — Yerushalmi MS Vatican Ebr. 133; sVen — Shimshon’s commentary to Mishna Z’ra’im in the editio princeps of the Bavli, Venice 1520-23; sPar — Shimshon’s commentary, MS Paris Hebr. 362)

MS Leiden, fol. 32b.33 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 15a.41

Likewise sVen fol. 2a.45; missing in MS Vatican.

Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon.

Evaluation: Important for context.

MS Leiden, fol. 33a.7 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 15a.52-55.

How should these observations be interpreted?

I personally favour the solution that at the beginning of his revision glossator 2 intended to include an authoritative commentary — like that of Rashi in the Bavli’s first edition — in the printed edition of the Yerushalmi. As a Yerushalmi commentary on Z’ra’im it had not yet been written, the next best thing was to extract passages from the Mishna commentary of Shimshon of Sens. The authority of the Tosafot of Sens doubtlessly played a part in this.

The glossator quickly abandoned his plan, however, either due to lack of time or because of other difficulties.

Preceding every commentary from Shimshon’s work that is quoted by glossator 2, we find detailed citations from the commented Yerushalmi text. Altogether Shimshon’s commentary contains, in addition to a great number of hints and short quotations, several hundred extensive Yerushalmi citations from the order Z’ra’im. The assumption suggests itself that the glossator used these citations for the correction of the Yerushalmi text in MS Leiden.

In order to verify this assumption, I shall in the following pars pro toto quote and concisely analyse the passages in treatise Pe’ah which glossator 2 has added to the text of MS Leiden, and of which (at the same time) a citation exists in the Mishna commentary of Shimshon of Sens. This commentary is taken from its first edition in the editio princeps of the Bavli and, where extant, from the only (almost) complete manuscript of this work, MS Paris Hebr. 362.
Likewise sVen fol. 2b,41; missing in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Important for context.
Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon.

MS Leiden, fol. 36b,25 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 16c,46

Likewise sVen fol. 3b,20; missing in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Rather unimportant for context.
Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon.

MS Leiden, fol. 36b,26 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 16c,47

sVen fol. 4a,4, sPar fol. 1a,2.

Evaluation: Closing up of a gap which is due to haplography. The paragraph is indispensable for the context.

Analysis: The origin of the singular נטאו is unexplainable in the gloss of MS Leiden. It could — like ידוע — originate from a different version of Shimshon’s commentary.

Origin: The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden — possibly Shimshon or yVat.

MS Leiden, fol. 36b,28 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 16c,51

Likewise sVen fol. 4a,9, sPar fol. 1a,11; also in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Indispensable in context.
Origin: Probably conjecture. But origin from an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat, cannot be excluded.

MS Leiden, fol. 37a,31 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 16d,49

Likewise sVen fol. 4a,28, sPar fol. 1b,5; missing in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Disparate textual tradition.

Analysis: The gloss offers the lectio facilior.

Origin: Probably added from the Mishna by glossator 3 of the Leiden text, who noted the glossword in the outer margin of the manuscript.

MS Leiden, fol. 39a,6 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 17c,33

Likewise sVen fol. 5a,45, sPar fol. 4a,19; also in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Gloss in a Mishna quotation, there indispensable.

Origin: Probably added from the Mishna by glossator 2, but that it originated from an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat, cannot be excluded.

MS Leiden, fol. 40a,27 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 18a,41

Likewise sVen fol. 6a,33, sPar fol. 7a,8; missing in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: The gloss has an explanatory function in context, but is not indispensable.

Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon.

MS Leiden, fol. 40a,32 = Ed. Princ. Venice, fol. 18a,48f.

Likewise sVen fol. 6b,44, sPar fol. 7a,15-16; missing in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Closing up of a gap which is due to haplography.

Analysis: Closeness to the text of the Shimshon-citation, but no complete agreement with sVen or sPar.

Origin: The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden — possibly Shimshon.

MS Leiden, fol. 40b,20 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 18b,23

Likewise sVen fol. 6a,61, sPar fol. 8a,7-8 (interrupted by commentary text); also in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Closing up of a gap which is due to haplography.

Origin: The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden — possibly Shimshon.

MS Leiden, 41a,37 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 18c,33

Likewise sVen fol. 7a,3, sPar fol. 9b,16; also in MS Vatican.

Evaluation: Correction of an obvious oversight in MS Leiden.

Origin: Probably conjecture; perhaps use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat.

MS Leiden, fol. 42a,28 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19a,1

Likewise sVen fol. 7b,9, sPar fol. 11b,16.

Evaluation: Disparate textual tradition.

Analysis: The glossator does not offer the difficult reading of Shimshon, but the lectio facilior, which is also found in MS Vatican.
Origin: The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden, possibly yVat, but probably not Shimshon.

**MS Leiden, fol. 42b.5 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19a.21.**

Analysis: MS Vatican and Shimshon agree partly with each other in contrast to MS Leiden.

**Origin:** The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden. Possibly not Shimshon nor yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 44a.10 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19c.57-58.**

Evaluation: Closing up of a gap which is due to haplography.

Analysis: MS Vatican and Shimshon agree essentially with each other in contrast to the text of the gloss.

**Origin:** The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden. Probably not Shimshon nor yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 44a.25 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19d.14**

Evaluation: Important for context.

Analysis: In contrast to Shimshon the glossator offers the lectio difficilior.

**Origin:** Another text-witness additional to MS Leiden; most probably not Shimshon nor yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 45a.13 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 20a.43**

Evaluation: Important for context.

Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 45b.34 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 20b.58.**

Evaluation: Indispensable in context.

Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 47a.6 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 20d.49.**

Evaluation: Important; the gloss changes the meaning of the text.

Origin: Adaption on the basis of an additional text-witness; not yVat and probably not Shimshon.

Origin: The glossator used another text-witness in addition to MS Leiden, possibly yVat, but probably not Shimshon.

**MS Leiden, fol. 42b.10.11 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19b.53.**

Evaluation: Two obvious corrections in concordance with the meaning of the context.

Origin: Use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat, or conjectures.

**MS Leiden, fol. 43a.35 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19b.53.**

Evaluation: Correction of an oversight, clear from the context.

Origin: Probably conjecture; perhaps adopted from an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 43b.1 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 19b, 58f.**

Evaluation: Indispensable in context.

Origin: Conjecture or use of an additional text-witness, possibly Shimshon or yVat.

**MS Leiden, fol. 45b,25 = Ed. princ. Venice, fol. 61c.3-6.**

Evaluation: The sugya would be unintelligible without the gloss. No homoioteleuton. Disparate textual tradition.
EVALUATION OF THE TEXT-COMPARISONS

To begin with, we must stress that within the examined treatise *Pe'ah* the use of Yerushalmi citations of Shimshon of Sens by glossator 2 of MS Leiden cannot be fully proven at any place. The mere correspondence of certain versions is not relevant as proof, since they could also have been adapted from other text-witnesses — unless we are dealing with corresponding mistakes or a common corrupt text. This, of course, is very rare in Shimshon’s commentary, and in any case, we have not found any example of this in the analyses of the previous section. Therefore, during the following evaluation of correspondences, only a weighing of probabilities is offered.

Of the twenty-two examined cases, which cover the complete treatise *Pe'ah*, the probable origin of the glosses, as I see it, can be divided in the following way:

Conjecture or origin from MS Vatican or from Shimshon’s commentary: 6 cases.
Conjecture or origin from Shimshon’s commentary: 5 cases.
Origin from another additional text-witness, but not from MS Vatican or Shimshon’s commentary: 3 cases.
Origin probably from MS Vatican: 1 case.
Origin probably from Shimshon’s commentary: 1 case.
Adaptation from previous glossator 3: 1 case.

This statement considers only the positive evidence, that is, the glosses which overlap the Shimshon-citations of the Yerushalmi. It neither takes into account the respectable number of citations present which did not induce the glossator to alter the text of MS Leiden, nor does it refer to existing glosses with no corresponding Yerushalmi citations in Shimshon’s commentary. The examined correspondences lead to the following conclusions:

1. Assuming that both the Shimshon-commentary on treatise *Pe'ah* and MS Vatican were available to glossator 2 of the Leiden manuscript, it can be concluded on the basis of the five cases which were probably neither taken from these two text-witnesses nor conjected, that the glossator used an additional, third text-witness of Yerushalmi *Pe'ah* for glossing MS Leiden, which has yet to be identified. If we take into consideration the fact that the colophon of the first edition of the Yerushalmi mentions only three additional copies (other than the basic manuscript, MS Leiden), among which probably MS Vatican to Z'a'im (Melammed) and the ‘Bavli’ version of Yerushalmi Horayot, it seems rather doubtful that with the third copy Shimshon’s commentary is meant; it is more likely that there was a conjoining Yerushalmi manuscript, which at least covered treatise *Pe'ah*.

2. Independent of this, the answer to the question to what degree glossator 2 used the Yerushalmi citations in Shimshon’s commentary for glossing MS Leiden, will be influenced by how far we are inclined to ascribe conjectures and the use of MS Vatican to this glossator.

If all possible conjectures in fact are conjectures and if, in case of doubt, the possible adaptations from MS Vatican or Shimshon in fact originate from MS Vatican, then only one single case is left which seems to trace back to Shimshon. This case could, of course, also have been taken from the third text-witness unknown to us. So one could argue that the glossator did not use the Shimshon-citations at all. If, on the contrary, all or most of the possible adaptations from Shimshon’s commentary should, in fact, be looked upon as such, then the glossator would have conjected less and evaluated MS Vatican less intensively. In that case one can argue that up to 16 of the 22 evaluated correspondences can be seen as corrections on the basis of Shimshon-citations.

In my opinion, the truth lies somewhere in between. It seems improbable to me that the reviser of the Leiden manuscript intended to add the comments of Shimshon of Sens to the first edition of the Yerushalmi, while at the same time ignoring his Yerushalmi versions completely. On the other hand, Lieberman’s examination of Yerushalmi Horayot already offers the conclusion that the glossator did not work thoroughly and systematically. Our result confirms this with regard to his use of Shimshon’s citations. Only where he felt the text of MS Leiden to be spoilt — and these are by far not all cases — did glossator 2 seek advice from the remaining text-witnesses. Perhaps he also preferred solutions which were offered by them in complete agreement with one another (nine cases in our survey offer yLei + = yVat = Shimshon).

THE COMMENTARY OF SHIMSHON OF SENS ON MISHNA ZERA’IM AS A TEXT-WITNESS OF THE TALMUD YERUSHALMI

Not only in view of the small number of text-witnesses of the Talmud Yerushalmi must Shimshon of Sens be looked upon as one of the most important tradents of parts of the Yerushalmi text. His Mishna commentary was quoted by many Yerushalmi commentators, among them Shlomo Sirillo and Y’hoshua Beneviste, who in many cases integrated Shimshon’s versions into their Yerushalmi text. The fact that these versions also played a role in producing the text of the *editio princeps* and with it our *textus receptus* is new. However, the erased glosses in MS Leiden, together with our text comparisons of treatise *Pe'ah*, seem to point exactly to this fact.

The systematic exploration of the history of the text and reception of the Talmud Yerushalmi is still in its infancy. Next to the synoptic edition of the most important manuscripts and editions of the Yerushalmi begun this year, a — forthcoming — examination of
its use in the Mishna commentary of Shimshon, combined with the edition of all Yerushalmi citations present in it, is one of its urgent desiderata.

NOTES

1 This article came about in connection with the project of a synoptic edition of the Talmud Yerushalmi, supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, at the Institut für Judaistik of the Freie Universität Berlin. I am obliged to Dr. J.J. Witkam, curator of the Oriental collections in Leiden, who not only assisted me while working in the Leiden library, but also enabled the complicated development of excellent ultra-violet photographs, which greatly helped in the decipherment of the glosses. A sample of these photographs, namely, the one of fol. 36a, accompanies this article.

2 Catalogus Codicum Hebraeorum Bibliothecae Academae Lugduno-Batavae, Leiden 1858, p. 343. I.


8 op. cit., p. 13.

9 Some instances, limited to treatise Pe'ah, are fols. 41b,31; 42a,29 (deletion of I - gloss-words through glossator 2); 37a,31 (see below); 38a,8 and 28 (elucidation of 1 -additions through glossator 2); 42a,34; 44b,30; 45b,38 (elucidation of I - deletions through glossator 2). These places also argue against the chronology No. 7 — No. 8 of Schiller-Szinessy.


12 Schiller-Szinessy, op. cit., p. 13. His spelling of the last two words, יכزو לְוִאָנֵי. I cannot follow even with the ultra-violet reader.


15 Schiller-Szinessy, op. cit., p. 13. His spelling of the last two words, יכזו לְוִאָנֵי. I cannot follow even with the ultra-violet reader.