THE EDWARD ULLENDORFF LECTURES IN SEMITIC PHILOLOGY

THIRD LECTURE

THE LANGUAGE OF THE MISHNA: FROM LATE MANUSCRIPTS TO THE PRINTED EDITIONS

BY

MICHAEL RYZHIK
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF ASIAN AND MIDDLE EASTERN STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
2016
The passage from manuscript to print was important in the history of many ancient and modern texts. This passage is described and analyzed in many cultures, but it seems to be somewhat neglected in the field of the history of the Mishnaic language. In the works of Yechezkel Kutscher, particularly his fundamental article “The Language of the Mishnah,” the study of Mishnaic Hebrew is generally limited to manuscripts and ancient oral traditions. But early (and sometimes not-so-early) printed editions are also of considerable interest for at least three reasons: (1) it was the language of the printed editions, which was known to the people, rather than that of manuscript Kaufmann, that influenced Modern Hebrew; (2) there are many details and features in the printed editions that can help to explain the phenomena that we see in the ancient traditions; and (3) there are many facts and traits that are simply interesting from purely linguistic and socio-linguistic points of view.

Three main factors are decisive in defining the Mishna language
traditions as they appear in the early printed editions and as they develop from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries: the medieval manuscript traditions; the unifying and normativizing tendencies of print; inner reorganization due to multiple analogies and local influences. The category of “medieval manuscript traditions” includes ancient ones such as those of MS Kaufmann, but mostly those of later manuscripts, such as MS Paris. For the most part, we will see the “tendencies of development” from the ancient manuscript traditions to print via the late medieval manuscripts.

Four complete manuscripts of the Mishna have survived, three of them copied in Italy, and one somewhere in the Byzantine Empire (perhaps also in Italy): Budapest, Kaufmann A50 (11th century, Italy); Parma, De Rossi 138 (12th century, Southern Italy, = Parma A); Cambridge, Add. 470 (14th century, Byzantine zone); Paris, Heb. 328-329 (1399, Cesena, Italy). It is generally accepted that the oldest of these manuscripts, Kaufmann, conserves the language of the Mishna in its most authentic form.

The first printed edition of the Mishna was produced in Naples in 1492. It was un-vocalized, and therefore many morphological traits cannot be studied on its basis. The first vocalized edition was printed in Constantinople in 1644, but more important from different points of view was the second vocalized edition, printed in Amsterdam in 1646. This latter influenced very considerably all the editions that followed, especially those of Livorno. It is also more closely related to the earlier Italian traditions, and its vocalization is moreover much clearer than that of the Constantinople edition, and seems to be much more reliable. This is true also from a technical standpoint—for example, in the Constantinople edition dagesh appears in almost every lamed, especially in certain tractates.

The unifying tendencies of print are well documented in the second vocalized edition, Amsterdam 1646. They became decisive in the edition produced in Venice in 1737, which constitutes the basis for the “Livorno (i.e., Leghorn) edition,” in whose development they may be traced up to the latest printing, Livorno 1866. Inner reorganization (which may be the most interesting from a purely linguistic point of view) is, in turn, defined by the phonological
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4. For further reading, see Bar-Asher 2015.
5. For this manuscript, see especially Bar-Asher 1980.
peculiarities of the real oral tradition (e.g., the absence or presence of double consonants, or the shortening or lengthening of vowels in some positions) and the subsequent possibilities of morphological analogies in the verbal and nominal fields.

The following are the vocalized Mishna editions which were printed up to the second half of the 19th century: Constantinople 1644; Amsterdam 1646; Venice 1704; Venice 1737; Mantua 1777; Leghorn (Livorno) 1791; Pisa 1797; Leghorn 1800, 1810, 1823, 1842, 1845, 1857, 1866. All these editions are genetically related, with three important passages from the one stage to another. The most important is of course the first—from manuscripts to vocalized printed editions. As we shall see, the vocalized Mishna editions are probably not based on the un-vocalized printed editions, but directly on manuscripts or the oral tradition related to them. The first two printed editions, Constantinople 1644 and Amsterdam 1646 are clearly closely related along general lines, though distinct in many particularities, thereby demonstrating both the existence of a general Mishnaic Hebrew tradition underlying the first printed editions (of the 17th century) as well as diversity within this tradition. As mentioned above, the later printed editions are generally more influenced by the Amsterdam edition than by that of Constantinople. This may perhaps be due to the fact that they were all printed in Italy, whose Jewry was closely related to that of Amsterdam. Thus, Venice 1704 is based mostly on the Amsterdam edition, but is not identical to it, as we shall see.

The second great passage was between Amsterdam 1646 and Venice 1737. The Venice 1737 edition was produced by R. David Altaras, whose work changed and shaped Mishnaic Hebrew. Ultimately, it is to him that we owe many of our notions regarding the vocalization of the Mishna as found in the printed editions. The third passage was from Venice 1737 to the “Livorno edition” that is based on it.

Let us first see an example of a change associated with the passage from manuscript to print, and even from the older manuscripts to the younger, which latter mostly influenced the language of the printed editions. As is well known, the period of intense interest in the Hebrew language began in the Late Middle Ages, when the Biblical Hebrew was conceived as an ideal standard. Consequently, Mishnaic language was corrected or corrupted, depending on one’s point of view, in an effort to bring it in line with
Biblical Hebrew. Such corrections have been most thoroughly studied for the 12th to the 14th centuries, but it seems that the definitive period in this regard was the passage from manuscript to print. We will take one case.

The verbal root עבר in the general sense of “to pass over, cross, traverse,” and the metaphorical sense of “to transgress a command” is attested (quite commonly) in Biblical Hebrew only in the Qal stem: e.g., והימים אשר הלכנו מקדש ברneasעָבַרְנוּ הנחל זרד שלשים ושמנה.

“And the days that we traveled from Kadesh-Barnea until we crossed the wadi Zered, was thirty-eight years” (Deut. 2:14). There is no Piel conjugation in this sense in the Bible. On the other hand, according to the best Mishna manuscripts—Kaufmann and Parma A—the root עבר is attested in the sense of “to pass over” almost exclusively in the Piel (עִיבֵּר). Below are a number of examples:

a. So, too, if a man had gone forth from Jerusalem and remembered that he still had with him flesh that was hallowed, if he had already passed Zofim he may burn it there and then” (Pes. 3:8, according to mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

b. If a man caused fire to break out and it consumed wood or stones or dust, he is culpable, for it is written, If fire break out and catch in thorns [Ex 22:6]. If it passed over a fence four cubits high, or over a public way or a river, he that caused it is not culpable” (B. Qam. 6:4, ms. Kaufmann).

c. So long as it is permitted to eat of the hametz a man may give it as fodder to cattle, wide animals, and birds, or sell it to a gentle; and it is permitted to derive benefit from it. But when the time is past it is forbidden to derive benefit from it” (Pes. 2:1, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

d. “If a hireling [claimed his wages] within the set time he may take an oath and receive his wages; but if the set time had passed he may not take an oath and receive his wages” (B. Meṣ. 9:12, mss Kaufmann and Parma.

7. The translations of the Mishnah are given, with minor changes, according to Herbert Danby, The Mishnah Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933.
e. “If they were turtle-doves whose time was not yet come, or young pigeons whose time has passed” (Zeb. 7:5, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

f. “If a man offered outside turtle-doves whose time was not yet come or young pigeons whose time has passed, he is not culpable. R. Simeon says, Young pigeons whose time has passed, he is not culpable” (Zeb. 14:2, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

g. “So, too, in what concerns [the sin-offerings] whose owner has already made atonement, or [a Sin-offering] that has passed the age of the year, the rule applies to the offerings of the individual but not to the offerings of the congregation” (Tem. 2:2, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

h. “The young of a Sin-offering, the Substitute for a Sin-offering, and the Sin-offering whose owner has died must be left to die. If it passed the age of a year or was lost and found blemished” (Tem. 4:1, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

i. “The young of a Sin-offering, the Substitute for a Sin-offering, and the Sin-offering whose owner has died must be left to die. If it passed the age of a year, or was lost and found blemished” (Me'il 3:1, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

j. “No use may be made of turtle-doves that are not yet of prescribed age or of pigeons that are past the prescribed age, but the law of Sacrilege does not apply to them. R. Simeon says: The law of Sacrilege applies to turtle-doves that are not yet of prescribed age; and no use may be made of young pigeons that are past the prescribed age, but the law of Sacrilege does not apply to them” (Me'il 3:4, mss Kaufmann and Parma A).

But even in these superior manuscripts, the Biblical Qal form is attested once, in the description of the crossing of the Jordan under Joshua: 구성 עיריהם את הירדן באלה הלך גורידי לahoma עיבל בשמשם וברד עיבר לשעבר אזל צריך-מורדו. שנ’ הלך הוא לבנר הירדן’ נגמי. הלך הוא אמר.’יועבר אבש ברך לע ממקו שכם עד אלוה-מורדו.’ (מ”אלאל-מורדו” האומר הלך שכם אכפ
“When Israel crossed the Jordan and came unto mount Gerizim and unto mount Ebal in Samaria, nearby Shechem, beside the oaks of Moreh, as it is written, Are not they beyond Jordan (Deut. 11:30). There it is written, And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Shechem unto the oak of Moreh (Gen. 12:6). As there the oak of Moreh that is spoken of is [at] Shechem, so here the oak of Moreh that is spoken is [at] Shechem” (Sot. 7:5, mss Kaufmann and Parma A). The Qal appears here under the influence of the biblical story about the crossing of the Jordan, as well as under the influence of another biblical quotation, Gen. 12:6, the story of Abraham passing through the Land of Canaan. This is an example of a very important phenomenon: the strong influence of Biblical Hebrew on Mishnaic Hebrew already in the very ancient period.

Now let us see what happened with the Piel conjugation עיבר in the course of history. Already in ms. Parma A, second in quality after ms. Kaufmann, we see the Qal employed instead of the Piel in the case cited as example 1b above. The use of the Qal is much more common in the late ms. Paris (copied in 1399), where it appears instead of the Piel in the passages cited as examples c, e, f [2x], and j [2x] above.

Methodologically important is the case of the passage cited as example 1a above, where mss Kaufmann and Parma A read עיבר, while ms. Paris reads the participle עובר. The latter reading is out of place here according to the syntactic rules of Mishnaic Hebrew, and it may be explained as a compromise between the Mishnaic Piel conjugation and the Biblical Qal. The change from עיבר עובר is relatively simple, as we may see from the following example:

Mss Kaufmann and Parma A: עיבר (Piel preterit)
Ms. Paris: עובר (Qal participle)
Printed editions: עבר (Qal preterit)

The only change that must be made is the elongation of yod to waw, yielding the syntactically inappropriate Qal participle, which is then replaced in the printed editions by the appropriate preterit.

In other cases, ms. Paris conserves the Piel. But in all printed editions, beginning with the editio princeps, Naples 1492, there are no traces of the Piel—only the Qal form עבר is attested. So in this case, which involves many occurrences in different places in the
Mishna, the grammatical change, driven by Biblical Hebrew, occurs precisely in the passage from the manuscripts to the printed edition.

We have seen above the influence of Biblical Hebrew on the most authentic manuscript of Mishnaic Hebrew, as well as the gradual correction from Mishnaic to Biblical grammar. We have also seen how these corrections may happen in several stages. The examples given above represent a small but detailed illustration of the first great passage, from manuscripts to the printed editions.

As noted above, the second passage is from Amsterdam 1644 to Venice 1737, the printing of R. David Altaras. As a small example, let us take the vocalization of declined forms of יָכוּל in the two editions. In Amsterdam (as also in Venice 1704) the ancient Mishnaic form יַכוּל is attested throughout. However, in Venice 1737 we find the new form יָכוּל, known to us from the printed editions.

Now let us turn to the third passage, from the Venice 1737 to the “Livorno edition.” I have indicated above that all printed editions that follow Venice 1737 up to the second half of the 19th century are based on it. All are preceded by the same introduction by R. David Altaras. Aside from two editions, those of Pisa and Mantua, all were printed in Leghorn (Livorno) and as a consequence are known in the Jewish world as the “Livorno edition” (דפוס ליוונו). Officially, all of them are reprints of Venice 1737. In reality, however, one may observe in them a slow drift towards a more and more “corrected” Hebrew. The third passage, from Venice 1737 to the final form of the “Livorno edition,” is therefore gradual, but the final results are occasionally quite substantial. For example, in Suk. 5:4 Venice 1737 gives the old vocalization וְתֻשְבָחוֹת, while in the “Livorno edition” the form is וְתִשְבָחוֹת, as in the modern printed editions.

Let us now return to the passage from manuscripts to prints, especially to the vocalized prints. As mentioned above, the first vocalized printed editions may have been based on the manuscripts, rather than on earlier un-vocalized prints. In any case, their text sometimes differs from that of the un-vocalized editions whereas it is identical to that of the manuscripts. Let us take one example, from Ned. 5:6. The un-vocalized editio princeps, Naples 1492, reads כל מנה שאם הדרשה אנה מדרשה. In the facsimile edition (i.e., the copy

10. The phenomenon is admittedly rare, on account of the temporal gap between the manuscripts and the prints in question.
reproduced by Sifrut Meqorot, Jerusalem 1970), this is corrected by hand to כל מתנה שאינך הקדיש והא מקודשת והא מקודשת. The vocalized editions (Constantinople 1644, Amsterdam 1646, Venice 1704, 1737, Livorno) read כל מתנה שאינך הקדיש והא מקודשת והא מקודשת (thus also in mss Kaufmann, Parma A and Paris). On the other hand, the un-vocalized editions (Venice 1506, 1508; Prague 1809, Berlin 1823, Amsterdam 1803, Warsaw 1915) read כל מתנה שאינך הקדיש והא מקודשת והא מקודשת.11 The Mishna has two different versions here: כל מתנה שאינך הקדיש והא מקודשת והא מקודשת, and also כל מתנה שאינך הקדיש והא מקודשת והא מקודשת. The first one, with the word והא, is found in three manuscripts, Kaufmann, Parma A and Paris, and in all vocalized editions, from Constantinople and Amsterdam up to the last Livorno printings. The second version, with the word והא, is found in all the un-vocalized printed editions, from Naples 1492, through the 16th-century Venetian editions, and up to the modern vocalized printed editions such Albeck-Yalon and Kehati (see note 11).

Turning now to the normativizing tendencies of print, we note that the most salient is that of orthographical standardization. This may be seen clearly already in the vocalized siddur editions that were printed as early as the second half of the 15th and the first half of the 16th century. Thus, we see that between the Soncino edition of 1485 and Bologna 1540 spelling becomes more defective:12

Soncino 1485, f. 20a: אֶחָד מְבוּשַל וְאֶחָד שֶׁאֵּינוּ מְבוּשֶׁל; Bologna 1540: מְבֻשַל (2x)
Soncino 1485, f. 107a: וַלַּא הַמֶּדְרַש הוא הָעִיקַר; Bologna 1540: עִיקַר
Soncino 1485, f. 11b: יְכִּי לִישוּעָתְ קִיוִּינ; Bologna 1540: וּקִוִּינ
Soncino 1485, f. 110a: כָּכִי לִישוּעָתְ קִיוִּינ; Bologna 1540: וּקִוִּינ
Soncino 1485, f. 110a, 113a: עֲבֵּירָה; Bologna 1540: עֲבֵּרָה
Soncino 1485, f. 106b: אל תַעַש עַצמָך כְעוֹרְכֵּי הַדַיָינִין; Bologna: הַדַיָנִין

It is clear therefore that this tendency is strong in both the use of the matres lectionis as well as the use of a doubled letter to signify a consonantal value in the case of the glides (for waw see below).

The same processes may be observed two hundred years later in
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11. Thus also in the modern printed editions, which are based on the un-vocalized editions and have been vocalized ex novo: Newark 1980, Albeck-Yalon (Jerusalem-Tel Aviv 1951-1957) and the modern editions of the Mishna with the commentary of P. Kehati (first edition: Jerusalem 1955-1964).
the vocalized editions of the Mishna, and it therefore seems that the process of standardization took place independently in different texts as these passed from manuscript to print.

We can see a parallel development of this process in texts that are common to the siddur and to Mishna, as in the pericope Ba-me madliqin, taken from tractate Shabbat, chapter 2. Thus, in the siddur:

Soncino 1485: בְשֶֽׁמֶׁן שְרֵּֽיפָה... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... בְכוּלָן... הַוַּדַּאי
Bologna 1540: בְשֶֽׁמֶׁן שְרֵּֽיפָה... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... בְכֻלָּן... הַוַּדַּאי

And similarly in the Mishna:

Amsterdam 1646: בְשֶֽׁמֶׁן שְרֵּיפָה... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... בְכֻלָּן... הַוַּדַּאי
Venice 1737: בְשֶֽׁמֶׁן שְרֵּיפָה... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... מְבוּשַל... בְכֻלָּן... הַוַּדַּאי

The same development may be observed in the parts of the Mishna that do not appear in the siddur, as in the case of התשבחות (cf. also above):

Soncino 1485: התשבחות; Bologna 1540: התשבחות (in the morning benedictions)
Amsterdam 1646: וְתוּשְׁבָחוֹת; Venice 1737: וְתוּשְׁבָחוֹת (Suk. 5:4)

Other remnants of manuscript features may be seen in Amsterdam 1646. For example, *dagesh* is sometimes written in the second of two *yod* used to signify a consonantal value, a feature that is characteristic of the manuscripts of the Mishna: חַיָיִב, Venice 1737: חַיָּיב (Ma’as. 3:3).

On the basis of the examples given here, it is evident that the normative orthographic usages that emerged during the period in question have survived in general outline to the present day. It must also be stressed that alongside the normative rules there remained exceptions, e.g., the defective spelling of the word כַהַנִים. As is well known, this word is written defectively (as a result of the influence of the Bible) in spite of the general rule according to which the *holam* of the Qal active participle is written *plene*. The words כַהַנִים and כַהַנִים are written defectively in all known sources, including medieval manuscripts with heavily pronounced tendencies towards *plene* writing. There was only one attempt to bring this spelling in line with the general rule, in the siddur printed in Fano in 1506, but this
attempt failed and in the following printed edition כהן is again written defectively. Thus (in quotations from Berakhot 1:1 and Avot 3:2): Soncino 1486: כֹהֲנִים; Fano 1506: כֹהֲנִים; Bologna 1540, Mantua 1517: כֹהֲנִים. It is therefore evident that the force of tradition may overcome the tendency towards normativization, itself becoming part of the norm.

Naturally, the process of normativization also affected vocalization. For example, the word אֲפּוֹטְרוֹפִּיסִין is written with hataf-pataḥ before dagesh ḥazaq in Amsterdam 1646, but with pataḥ in Venice 1737:

Amsterdam 1646: אֲפּוֹטוֹרְפִּיסִין (Pes. 8:1), הָאֲפּוֹטוֹרְפוֹס (Bik. 1:5)
Venice 1737: אַפּוֹטְרוֹפִּים (Pes. 8:1), הָאַפּוֹטוֹרְפוֹס (Bik. 1:5)

Sometimes, alternative methods of normativization are employed in different editions. For example, in a case similar to the preceding one, whereas Venice 1737 replaces hataf-pataḥ with pataḥ before dagesh, the “Livorno edition” retains the hataf-pataḥ, eliminating the dagesh instead: Amsterdam 1646: אֲפּוֹטְרוֹפִּים, Venice 1737: אַפּוֹטְרוֹפִּים; Livorno: אֲפּוֹטְרוֹפִּים (Rosh Hash. 2:1). Occasionally, the tendency to normativize vocalization may influence the morphology, as in the following example:

Amsterdam 1646, Constantinople 1644, Venice 1704, Venice 1737, Livorno: תְּкла (Ber. 4:2; Sanh. 7:4, Par. 9:5)
Amsterdam 1646, Constantinople 1644, Venice 1704, Venice 1737, Livorno: תְּкла (Rosh Hash. 1:3, 4)
Amsterdam 1646, Constantinople 1644, Venice 1704: סְכָנָה (Yom. 2:2; Meg. 4:8; Suk. 4:4), סְכָנָה (Ter. 8:6)
Venice 1737, Livorno: סְכָנָה (Yom. 2:2; Meg. 4:8; Suk. 4:4), סְכָנָה (Ter. 8:6)

In late medieval traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew nouns may be attested in the pattern קְטָלָה instead of קַטָלָה. Such is the case with תְּקנה, which became תְּקלָה, and סְכָנָה, which became סְכָנָה.13 The forms תְּקנה, קָלָה, and סְכָנָה, with shewa in the first syllable, are the only ones attested in Amsterdam 1646 and in Constantinople 1644. The first two persisted in all the following editions, up to Livorno 1866, while

the third is corrected to סכנה in Venice 1737. The reason for this correction seems to lay in the perceived impossibility of a form in which shewa mobile in the first syllable appears before dagesh. Thus, which do not infringe this constraint, were allowed to persist, while סכנה was corrected by R. David Altaras to the alternative סכנה. In this example, we have seen inner morphological reorganization, one of the characteristic features of the tradition of the printed editions. Let us see another example, in this case two phonologically similar nouns belonging to the pattern קט that were assimilated to the pattern קטל:

Ms. Paris (1399): הָגַיָּיס (Pes. 3:7), הָפַיָּיס (Rosh Hash. 2:5), הביןיסות (Yeb. 16:7)
Constantinople 1644: הָגַיָּיס, הביןיסות
Amsterdam 1646, Venice 1704: הָגַיָּיס (Pes. 3:7; Rosh Hash. 2:5), הביןיסות (Yeb. 16:7)
Venice 1737, Livorno: הָגַיָּיס, הביןיסות

Amsterdam 1646, Venice 1704: הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס (Yom. 2:2), הָפַיָּיס (Yom. 2:3), הָפַיָּיס (Yom. 2:4), הָפַיָּיס (Yom. 2:2)
Venice 1737, Livorno: הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס
Constantinople 1644: הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס, הָפַיָּיס

In Amsterdam, Constantinople, Venice and Livorno we find the singular forms גייס and פיס. Two facts must be stressed. First, we see the beginning of the process already in ms. Paris, where only גייס is attested, whereas פיס is found in accordance with the original pattern. Second, the plural forms develop differently in Amsterdam and the subsequent Venice and Livorno editions, on the one hand, and in Constantinople, on the other. In Amsterdam and Livorno the plural form גייסות is retained, whereas the word appears as גייסות in Constantinople. Conversely, in Amsterdam and Livorno we find פיסות, whereas the form פיסות is retained in Constantinople. Here, we see two characteristics of the printed editions: 1) in the tradition of the early printed editions, as attested in Constantinople 1644 and Amsterdam 1646, there exist common general tendencies as well as differences in particular details of development; and 2) the Venice

and Livorno editions for the most part continue the Amsterdam print tradition.

Parallel developments that depend on the same morphophonological principles may also be seen in other nominal patterns. Thus, in the case of the words זֵמֶן and קַטֵּן:

Amsterdam 1646, Venice 1704: הָזְמֶן (Rosh Hash. 2:7 [3x], 8; Meg. 1:3), קַנְטֶן (Meg. 3:6), בַּקְנֶן (Rosh Hash. 2:7 [3x], 8)
Constantinople 1644: בַּקָּטָנָה (Meg. 1:3), בַּקָּטָנָה (Rosh Hash. 2:7 [3x], 8), בַּקָּטָנָה (Meg. 3:6), בַּקָּטָנָה (Rosh Hash. 2:7 [3x])
Venice 1737, Livorno: בַּקָּטָנָה (Meg. 1:3), בַּקָּטָנָה (Meg. 3:6), בַּקָּטָנָה (Suk. 5:7, 8)
Ms. Kaufmann: בַּקָּטָנָה בַּקָּטָנָה (Zeb. 2:4), בַּקָּטָנָה בַּקָּטָנָה (Suk. 5:7)

Amsterdam 1646, Venice 1704: קַנְטָנָה (Meg. 3:1), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 3:2; 7:6), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 7:3), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 4:8)
Constantinople 1644: קַנְטָנָה (Suk. 1:11; Meg. 1:10; 3:1), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 7:5), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 4:8), קַנְטָנָה (Ma’as. 1:4), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 7:3)
Venice 1737, Livorno: קַנְטָנָה, קַנְטָנָה, קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 7:3), קַנְטָנָה, קַנְטָנָה (c. 30x), קַנְטָנָה (Ter. 7:3), קַנְטָנָה, קַנְטָנָה (Yeb. 13:8), קַנְטָנָה (Kelim 24:17)

The declensional forms of the noun זֵמֶן are without dagesh in the nun and with qamas under the mem in Amsterdam 1646. Such forms are found also in Constantinople 1644 (for lack of a dagesh sign, they can be discerned only due to the presence of patah), but here they are in the minority. In Venice 1737 all forms show duplication of the nun. But forms with one nun and with qamas under the mem are also attested in the two cases in ms Kaufmann that are given above.

The declension of the noun קַטֵּן presents a similar case, though here the situation is more complicated. In Amsterdam 1646 we find the form קַטָּנָה, whereas the plural is always קַטָּנִים. In Constantinople 1644 the tendency is the same, but with the opposite result: קַטָּנִים, but קַטָּנָה (with a “virtual” dagesh—see above). In this case, as in the case of זֵמֶן above, the forms are corrected in Venice 1737 to קַטָּנָה, etc.

15. Forms of קַנְטָנָה are also attested (Meg. 1:10; Suk 1:11), but they constitute a clear minority.
Also in this case, the forms without the *dagesh* are attested three times in ms. Kaufmann—once קטנים, as in Constantinople 1644, and twice קטנה, as in Amsterdam 1646.

In the above examples, we have noted an affinity between the tradition of the printed editions and traditions attested in manuscripts copied in Italy, Kaufmann and Paris. Let us now see two further examples of this affinity, on the basis of the following data:

(A) is mentioned in Mishna *Terumot* 10:12, which—depending on the textual variant—was either cooked or mixed/spiced with תבלין. The reading of the Babylonian vocalization tradition is ניתבה, a *Nitpaal* of the verb תבל. This suits the context well, and the *Piel* verb in question is common in Mishnaic Hebrew. Ms. Kaufmann, on the other hand, reads ניתשתל vå, a *Nitpaal* of ובשתל, which is also appropriate to the context. The reading in the latter has been corrected in the margins by another hand to ניתבה, which may be interpreted as a *Nifal* of a verb *תбаל*. This is problematic, however, as such a verb is not attested in Mishnaic Hebrew, in either *Qal* or *Nifal*. Understanding the marginal form as a *Nitpaal* of *תבהל* with *dagesh* omitted (as happens often in the marginal corrections of this manuscript) is problematic for the same reason. The reading in ms. Parma A, אתשתביה, which must be understood as a *Nitpaal* of *תבהל*, is very similar to the marginal reading of ms. Kaufmann. Haneman rejects this vocalization and accepts Babylonian אתשתביה as being correct.18

Haneman’s judgment seems sound, and it is therefore all the more significant that this mistake returns in Constantinople 1644 and in Amsterdam 1646—even if in origin the form is a mistake, it became part of tradition. Here we see also the rare case of a distinction between Amsterdam 1646 and Venice 1704, which reads נִתְבַלָה, as in the original reading of ms. Kaufmann. In Venice 1737, R. David Altaras reads נִתְבַלָת, deciding as Haneman did 243 years later.

Here is the case of the month name אדר:
Constantinople 1644, Amsterdam 1646: אָדָר הָרִאשוֹן (Meg. 1:4), אָדָר (Meg. 3:4), בֵּאָדָר (Meg. 1:4), בֶּאָדָר (Meg. 1:4) (Meg. 1:4)
Venice 1737, Livorno: בֶּאָדָר

In another important Italian source, the metrical poetry of Emmanuel ha-Romi, we find the vocalization with two full vowels: בְֵאָדָר אֶהְיֶּה יוֹשֵּּב וְדוֹרֵּש / וְאַזְכִיר חַסְדֵּי הָמָן וְזֶּׁש (Mahberet 9).Before us is another case of affinity between early printed editions and Italy—the form אדר is the only one attested in both Constantinople 1644 and Amsterdam 1646, and as we see here, it is found in metrical poetry based on the Italian tradition.

Occasionally, the Amsterdam 1646 edition can tell us something new about the manuscript traditions. Thus, for example:

Constantinople 1644, Venice 1737, Livorno: הַיְעֵּלִים, יְעֵּלִים, יָעֵּל
Amsterdam 1646:_handle (Kil. 1:6), יַעֲלִים (Rosh Hash. 3:5), יַעַל (Rosh Hash. 3:3)
Ms. Paris: יַעֲלִים (Kil. 1:6), בְּשֶׁלְיָעֲלִים (Rosh Hash. 3:5), שליעל (Rosh Hash. 3:3)

The plural of יָעֵּל is attested twice in the Mishna: Kil. 1:6 and Rosh Hash. 3:5. In ms. Paris the vocalization in the former place is the normative יָעֲלִים, whereas in the latter the form is abnormally יַעֲלִים. The singular form, which is uniquely attested in Rosh Hash. 3:3, is left un-vocalized, indicating that the scribe was not sure regarding the tradition. As in the case of נִתְבַלָה in Parma A (see above), the vocalization יָעֲלִים in ms. Paris in Rosh Hash. 3:5 may be mistaken.

19. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Uri Melammed, who showed me this quotation.
20. On such cases see Bar-Asher 1980, pp. 53–54.
However, it recurs in the same place in Amsterdam 1646, in a slightly different but principally identical form: יַעֲלִים.21 The distribution of forms in Amsterdam 1646 also matches that of ms. Paris—in Kil. 1:6 we find the normative יַעֲלִים. Amsterdam 1646 goes one step further, giving the singular form יַעַל which corresponds to the plural יַעֲלִים,

Naturally, there are also some vocalizations that seem to represent traditions found (almost) exclusively in Amsterdam 1646. Here is one:

Meg. 4:10:

מטַרְגֵּם, מִתַרְגָּם,
Ms. Kaufmann:
Ms. Paris: מִתַרְגֵּם, מִתַרְגָּם
Amsterdam 1646: מִתַרְגָּם (2x), מִתַרְגָּמִין
Venice 1737, Livorno: מִתַרְגָּם, מִתַרְגָּמִין
Constantinople 1644: מִתַרְגָּם... וּמִתַרְגָּמִין... מִתַרְגָּם... מִתַרְגָּמִין

The verb מִתַרְגֵּם, Niphal of תִרְגֵּם, is vocalized מִתַרְגָּמִין in Amsterdam 1646, perhaps by some analogy to the structure of Nifal. The vocalizer of ms. Paris also had difficulties with this verb and gave it as a Piel. We also find Piel in Constantinople 1644 in the last two instances, the last one being in conflict with the consonantal text, a phenomenon that is quite rare in the printed editions.

Now let us see some illustrations of the expansion of the new tendencies. Interchanges between different verbal stems, especially Qal and Piel are frequent. They also seem to obey some rules and sometimes to be rooted in ancient traditions. One interchange of this type, a return to the Biblical norm, has been illustrated above, in the case of עָבַר versus עִבֵּר. Another variant of this type is constituted by Piel verbs with /r/ in second root position. When conjugated in the preterit and bearing an objective suffix, such verbs tend to shift to Qal, apparently due to syllabic reconstructions around /r/. Let us

22. On such plural forms of the segolate nouns, see Bar-Asher 1980, pp. 86–87.
   Regarding the possible role of the consonants /l/, /m/, /n/, /r/ in this phenomenon (as in the present case), see Ryzhik 2008a, pp. 146–147.
now see two examples of this tendency, the first rooted in the ancient tradition, at least according to mss Kaufmann and Paris, and the second developing in the print editions. The first, the verb מֵרַח, is documented only in tractate Kelim:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaufm.</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Const.</th>
<th>Amst.</th>
<th>V. 1737</th>
<th>Leg. 1704</th>
<th>Ven. 1737</th>
<th>Leg. 1791</th>
<th>Leghorn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelim 5:8</td>
<td>מֵּירְחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מֶרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelim 5:9</td>
<td>מֵּירְחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מֶרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelim 5:11</td>
<td>מֵּירְחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מֶרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶちょ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחום</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelim 6:3</td>
<td>מֵּירְחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מֶרֶショー</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶחוֹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelim 7:1</td>
<td>מֵּירְחוֹ</td>
<td>מְרֶショー</td>
<td>מֶרֶショー</td>
<td>מְרֶショー</td>
<td>מְרֶショー</td>
<td>מְרֶショー</td>
<td>מְרֶショー</td>
<td>מְרֶショー</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that the Qal form מֵּירְחוֹ is documented already in ms. Kaufmann. The Qal becomes the most common form in ms. Paris, remains so (with slightly different distributions) in the early vocalized printed editions, and comes to be the sole form in the “Livorno edition.” The form מֵּירְחוֹ with pataḥ rather than šere, attested in ms. Paris Kel. 7:1, may represent a transitional variant. It is important to note that Constantinople 1644, with Qal throughout, is different from the other printed editions, as also from the manuscripts copied in Italy, alluding thereby to its special place with regard to this tradition (or these traditions).

The second case is that of the verb גֵּרַש. Here, the change is documented only in the printed editions; in the manuscripts—Kaufmann and Paris—the Piel is retained in all occurrences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Const.</th>
<th>Amst.</th>
<th>V. 1737</th>
<th>Mantua</th>
<th>Pisa 1797</th>
<th>Leghorn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeb. 3:7, Git. 9:9</td>
<td>יֶגֶרֶשׁ, יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יֶגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יֶגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יֶגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יֶגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mak. 1:1</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. 8:1</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeb. 3:13</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeb. 6:6</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ket. 4:2</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeb. 13:5</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ket. 8:8</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Git. 4:7</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
<td>יָגֶרֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of important facts, some of which we have already noted above, are clearly illustrated here. Most importantly, the shift from Piel to Qal occurs only in the forms with object suffixes, the free forms (see the two upper rows of the table) remaining unchanged. We see therefore that the reason for the change seems to lay in the shift of accent. Thus, in the form וּגְרַשְתִיהָ, where the accent is shifted far forward, the shewa under the gimel is documented in all sources, even Constantinople 1644. Generally, however, the Piel is retained in Constantinople 1644. The number of occurrences of the Piel grows slowly from Amsterdam 1646 to the “Livorno edition.” The transitional form הּɡוֹרָשָ, with şere under the gimel and qamas under the resh, appears in the Pisa 1797 edition and later becomes the main form in the “Livorno edition,” one of the many signs that the various iterations of the latter have complicated connections with different prints originally derived from the Venice 1737 edition of R. David Altaras.

Before concluding, I would like to mention two different methodological problems. The first is the search for additional sources. As we have seen, there is a gap of almost 250 years between the last manuscript, Paris, copied in 1399, and the first vocalized printed editions, Constantinople 1644 and Amsterdam 1646. In these printed editions, the vocalization is different in many details from that of ms. Paris, and we are unable to pinpoint the time of a given change. However, there are vocalized sources which can help us: siddurim and editions of the Passover Haggada. For example, let us trace the development of the vocalization of the word רבי, one of the most common in the Mishna. In ms. Paris, as in many occurrences in ms. Kaufmann, the resh is vocalized with the shewa, while in Amsterdam 1646 it is vocalized with hiriq, the latter form being known in modern times as the Italian tradition:

Ms. Paris: רְבִי
Amsterdam 1646, Venice 1704, 1737, Livorno: רִבִי

The vocalization with hiriq is well known from Sephardic sources, but when did it arrive and spread in Italy? This question may be answered on the basis of its vocalization in the siddur. Thus, in the
15th–16th centuries, we find the form with shewa: רְבי נָתן, רְבִי אֱלִיעֶָּזֶּר, וְרְבִי אלעזר בן עזריה וְרְבִי עקיבא (Soncino 1486, Fano 1504). The vocalization with hiriq first appears, albeit very rarely, in the siddur printed in Mantua in 1557: דִּבְרֵּּי רִבִי אֱלִיעֶָּזֶּר (Ber. 1:1; this is the only occurrence). The Haggada printed in Mantua in 1560 already shows the form with hiriq exclusively, e.g., מַעֲשֵּּה בְּרִבִי אֱלִיעֶָּזֶּר וְרִבִי יְהוֹשֻעַ וְרִבִי עֲקִיבָה, and thus also in all subsequent editions of the siddur and the Haggada (Venice 1608, 1628). We therefore see that the change from the medieval Italian tradition to the modern one happens in the sixth decade of the 16th century. This is logical from several different points of view, for example the growing influence of Spanish Jewry, expelled from Spain (the famous Ladino Ferrara Bible was printed at this time) and the normativizing linguistic tendencies, which became very strong in Tridentine and Post-Tridentine Italy.

This period seems to be crucial in many other cases, for example, the vocalization of רבון. The ancient pronunciation of this word is rabbon, as is proved by the title rabbuni given to Jesus by his disciples. Thus also in all the medieval sources, which are very rich in this case, as the word is common in the prayers. The modern vocalization is רבון.23 Here, the switch occurs at the same time as in the case of the former: רבון כָּל הָעוֹלָמִים (Soncino 1486, Fano 1504, Bologna 1540), versus רִבֹּון כָּל הָעוֹלָמִים (Mantua 1557), followed by all subsequent editions.

Lastly I would like to make some remarks about the socio-linguistic influence of print. This is a very fruitful area of research, and by way of example I would like to mention the case of the influence of censorship. One of the direct effects of the Counter-Reformation censorship of Hebrew texts was suppression of the use of certain words that were conceived to be anti-Christian. The Canon purificatiois (Hebrew ספר הזקוק), which was written and published in 1590's, contains a list of such words, the most strictly forbidden among them being the word מין, as may be seen from a comparison between different methods of censoring the terms בָּרָה וּבָּרָה אָבַת בֵּית תַאֲרוֹן and מין.24 Thus, in the case of the former: כָּל מַלַּת אֵין אָשָּר לְאֵין יָרָךְ נְעֵה, יֵהָב בִּכְלָה שְׁכִּוָּא עִמָּם שֵׁרִי צַעְרִי inicio כְּלָי.23 The word is famous among scholars of Mishnaic Hebrew, as it is discussed by Kutscher in his fundamental article The Language of the Mishnah, mentioned above—see note 2.

24. For further details see Ryzhik 2003.
In the second category, we read: כל שם אומת ואומות יכתב בצדוعقום.

In the case of מין, the ban is absolute, as the term was generally believed to specifically refer to Christians: כל שם מין מינים ימחק לגמרי.

As a consequence, in the Mishna editions printed in Catholic Italy in the 17th century this word is replaced by אפיקורוס, as may be seen in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>MS Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>MS Parma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>MS Parma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Parma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Parma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Kaufmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber. 9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San 4:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull 2:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paia 3:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Kaufmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Kaufmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Kaufmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Greek:

- Αἰκίδιοι
- Μινών
- Αἰκίδιοι
- Μινών
- Αἰκίδιοι
- Μινών
- (μήνα)

- Μινών
- (μήνα)
- Μινών
- (μήνα)

- Αἰκίδιοι
- Μινών
- Αἰκίδιοι
- Μινών
- Αἰκίδιοι
- Μινών
- (μήνα)
- (μήνα)
These data make plain that the substitution of מין by אפירוקוס מין occurred in the early 1590’s, precisely after the appearance of the *Canon purificationis*. Substitution was the usual result of censorship, but in the case of מין a new Hebrew word was created (perhaps on the basis of an existing but very limited usage—see below) in order to protect the Mishna (as the presence of the word מין could serve as a pretext for a complete ban on the text in which it appeared).

Following the ban, this word is documented only once in the printed editions of the Mishna—Venice 1606, in the somewhat corrupted form מיאנים. But it is very widespread in the *ma’amadot*, a compilation of sacred texts for different days of the week. Two Mishna passages and one from the Talmud containing the word מין are included in these compilations, and here is what happened to this word:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ber. 9:5</th>
<th>Sanh. 4:5</th>
<th>bT Sanh. 38a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1564</td>
<td>מיאין</td>
<td>מיאים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1571</td>
<td>מיאין</td>
<td>vacat</td>
<td>vacat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1574</td>
<td>מיאין</td>
<td>הלצים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1587</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td>הלצים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1591</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td>הלצים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1598</td>
<td>מיאין</td>
<td>vacat</td>
<td>vacat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1606,’17,</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua 1612</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td>המאאני</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1648, 1718,’21</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td>קפתעי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven.1731, ’54, ’80, Pisa 1775, Liv. 1887</td>
<td>מיאין</td>
<td>המיאין</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that after the first tentative attempts—leaving a *vacat*, or using the word לצים [Venice 1574] or מתעים [Venice 1587]—the new word מיאנים is introduced and employed until the end of Counter-Reformation censorship at the beginning of the 18th century. The same word is used also in the *ma’amadot* printed in Amsterdam, which are closely related to the Italian Jewish tradition:
The word מאנין, which so successfully served as a substitute for מין from its birth at the end of the 16th century until its death in the middle of the 18th, is absent from the dictionaries. It could be interpreted in different ways, for example “refusers,” which would be an appropriate term for heretics. In reality, however, the meaning of מאנין is very clear—Manicheans. Let us see for example how Eliahu Bahur, the famous Italian Hebrew grammarian of the first half of the 16th century, defines the word מין in his dictionary Ha-Tishbi:

> וכתב הרמב"ם ז"ל כי זה השם אינו נופל רק על צדוקי או ביתוסי. וتمعיה אני כי נמצא בספרי היונים שהיה אדם אח ד שמו מַאנִי ולא היה בעל דת אעל שמו נקראים כל הנמשכים אחריו מִינִין. כמו מִן אפיקורוס נקראו אפיקורסים.

It seems that Eliahu Bahur has taken this definition from the Sefer Ha-Iqqarim of R. Yosef Albo (1380-1444), a fundamental work on the principles of Judaism (editio princeps Soncino 1487): ...

There are many other 17th-century texts that cite this meaning of the word מאנין, and there are many in the 16th–18th centuries that explicitly use מאנין rather than מינים, e.g., when the definition by Eliahu Bahur is cited by R. Avraham Sarval:

> הכתובermal התשב... אדם אחד שהיה שמו מאנ"י... ועל שמו נקראים הנמשכים אחריו מאנין.

So in the replacement of מינים by מאנין was an attempt to rehabilitate the word and the Mishna passages in which it appears, by proving that it does not refer to Christians, but rather to the greatest official enemies of orthodox Christianity, the Manicheans. Along the way a new Hebrew word was coined, and it persisted for two hundred years and then disappeared.

On the basis of the examples provided above, we have examined the three factors mentioned at the beginning: normativization and its

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ber:9:5</th>
<th>Sanh:4:5</th>
<th>bT Sanh. 38a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1635, 1713, '17</td>
<td>מאנין</td>
<td>מאנין</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718, '40</td>
<td>מינין</td>
<td>מינין</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704, '11, '34, '48, '53</td>
<td>המינים</td>
<td>המינים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. In his comment to the Sefer Ma'amadot printed in Venice in 1606 (שס"ו).
influence, inner reorganization with its general tendencies and particular differences, and affinity between the traditions of the earlier printed editions and those found in Italy. We have also seen a small example of the impact that socio-linguistic aspects of print may have had on the printed text and its language, especially in a philologically- and ideologically-oriented country such as Counter-Reformation Italy.
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