

*Did ArtScroll Censor Rashi?**

By: YISRAEL ISSER ZVI HERCZEG

Bereishis 18:22 speaks of the departure of the angels who were sent to Avraham to inform him and Sarah of the impending birth of Yitzchak. The verse reads:

וַיִּפְּנוּ מִשָּׁם הָאֲנָשִׁים וַיֵּלְכוּ סְדוֹמָה וְאַמּוֹרָהּם עוֹדְנֵי עִמְדָּה לְפָנָיו ה'.

The men turned away from there and went to Sodom, but Avraham was yet standing before Hashem.

The version of Rashi's comment to the verse that appears in all ArtScroll *Chumashim* with *Rashi* reads:

ואברהם עוֹדְנֵי עִמְדָּה לְפָנָיו ה'. והלא לא הלך לעמוד לפניו אלא הקב"ה בא אצלו ואמר לו זעקת סדום ועמורה כי רבה והיה לו לכתוב וה' עוֹדְנֵי עִמְדָּה לְפָנָיו אברהם אלא תיקון סופרים הוא זה.

But Avraham was yet standing before Hashem. But is it not true that he did not go to stand before Him; rather, the Holy One, Blessed is He, came to [Avraham] and said to him, "Because the cry of Sodom and Amorah is great."¹ It should have written, "And Hashem was yet standing before Avraham"! But this is a correction of scribes, i.e., authors and editors.²

A more popular alternative version of the text reads:

ואברהם עוֹדְנֵי עִמְדָּה לְפָנָיו ה'. והלא לא הלך לעמוד לפניו אלא הקב"ה בא אצלו ואמר לו זעקת סדום ועמורה כי רבה והיה לו לכתוב וה' עוֹדְנֵי עִמְדָּה לְפָנָיו אברהם אלא תיקון סופרים הוא זה אשר הפכוהו ז"ל לכתוב כן.

But Avraham was yet standing before Hashem. But is it not true that he did not go to stand before Him; rather, the Holy One, Blessed is He, came to [Avraham] and said to him, "Because the

* I thank Rav Reuven Butler, Rav Moishe Kimelman, and Rav Aryeh Sklar for reading earlier drafts of this essay and for their valuable comments.

¹ *Bereishis* 18:20.

² This version of the text is not exclusive to ArtScroll. I have before me a standard single-volume *Chumash* with *Rashi*, *Targum Onkelos*, *Toldos Aharon*, *Baal Ha-Turim*, and *Ikkar Sifsei Chachamim*. The only publication information it has is "New York, 5740 [1980]." It has the same version of the text as ArtScroll's. So does Koren's edition of *Chumash Bereishis* with *Targum Onkelos* and *Rashi* (Jerusalem, 2014).

Yisrael Isser Zvi Herczeg is the translator of the ArtScroll *Rashi*.

cry of Sodom and Amorah is great.” It should have written, “And Hashem was yet standing before Avraham”! But this is a correction of scribes, i.e., authors and editors, in which those of blessed memory inverted the verse this way.

This version of Rashi’s text appears, for instance, in the early editions of the Malbim’s commentary to *Chumash*, the *Torah Temimah*, and many more.

The idea of *tikkun soferim*, “correction of scribes,” as applied to Biblical verses does not originate with Rashi. *Midrash Rabbah*, *Midrash Tan-chuma*, and *Midrash Tebillim* all use this expression in interpreting this verse as Rashi does, and various Midrashim apply it to other verses, as well.

If taken literally, these Midrashim contradict Rambam (*Hilchos Teshuvah* 3:8):

האומר שאין התורה מעם ה' אפילו פסוק אחד אפילו תיבה אחת אם אמר משה
אמרו מפי עצמו הרי זה כופר בתורה.

One who says that the Torah did not come from G-d, even a single verse, even a single word—if he says that Moshe said it on his own, this person is a denier of the Torah.

According to the Rambam, the text of the Torah is sacrosanct. Even Moshe Rabbeinu himself could not have had a hand in its composition. How could “scribes” have corrected it?

Rashba deals with this problem in response to Christian claims that the Rabbis tampered with the text of the Torah. He writes:

When the Sages refer to Rabbinic correction of the Biblical text, it does not, Heaven forbid, mean that they appended even a single letter to it. Rather, it means that the Scribes examined the text with care, and found, based on the content and context of each of those verses [that they are described as correcting], that the immediate sense of the words is not their essential meaning. Something different is meant—it is written the way it looks only for euphemistic reasons. These are called “scribal corrections” only because it was the Scribes who examined the texts with care and explained that they are euphemisms.³

³ Translation of *Teshuvos HaRashba*, Prof. Chaim Zalman Dimitrovsky ed., *Mosad HaRav Kook*, vol. 1, no. 19. *Tosafos Rid* to *Nedarim* 37a also says *tikkun soferim* means that the “scribes” determined how to understand the words of Scripture, not that they altered the text. He says that the Gemara there that says that *ittur soferim* (“the adornment of the scribes”) is *halachah leMoshe miSinai* refers to *tikkun soferim*. (My thanks to Rav Aryeh Sklar for drawing this to my attention.) Here we have the idea stated explicitly by a student of the yeshivos of Ashkenaz in the century after Rashi.

To the Rashba, then, “correction of the scribes” is a figure of speech. The Sages did not actually edit the Scriptural text. They taught us to interpret the text euphemistically, as if it were edited.

While we have no proof that Rashi understood the Midrashic term *tikkun soferim* as the Rashba did, there is likewise no evidence that he didn't. Thus, there is nothing that forces us to conclude that Rashi was of the opinion that the Sages actually emended the text of the Torah.⁴

This is true of both versions of Rashi quoted above. The concluding words of the lengthier and more popular version are אשר הפכוהו ז"ל לכתוב כן, “in which those of blessed memory inverted the verse this way.” This can be taken to mean that the Sages of blessed memory taught us to understand that out of respect for G-d, the verse was written in an inverted way so as to avoid stating outright that Hashem was yet standing before Avraham.⁵ From the point of view of conforming to

⁴ *Mizrahi, Gur Aryeh* and some other supercommentaries to this comment of Rashi understand him as agreeing with the Rashba.

⁵ Likewise, Rashi's comment to *Iyov* 32:3, זה אחד מן המקומות שתקנו סופרים את לשון הכתוב, “This is one of the places in which the Scribes corrected the language of the verse,” can be taken as meaning that the Scribes corrected our understanding of the language of the verse. The words שתקנו סופרים are no more problematic than the term *tikkun soferim*. If that can be taken as a matter of interpretation rather than emendation, so can שתקנו סופרים.

Rashi's comment to *Malachi* 1:13 is more problematic. He writes והפחתם אותו. זו אחת מי"ח תיבות של תיקון סופרים הפחתם אותו וכתבו אותו. “*You have grieved it*. This is one of the eighteen words of correction of the Scribes. *You have grieved it*. It was written [‘you have grieved] Me’ (referring to G-d). But the verse used euphemism, and they wrote ‘it.’”

“And *they* wrote ‘it’” clearly seems to refer to the Scribes and says that they changed the word that was written. However, the sentence in which this appears is grammatically incorrect. “But the verse used euphemism” implies that “the verse” rather than the Scribes is doing the composing. The sentence should have ended “and *it* wrote ‘it.’”

This problem does not arise in the version of the text that appears in the Berlin 1221 manuscript. It reads without any grammatical error, as we would expect it to: והפחתם אותו. תיבה זו אחת מי"ח תיבות של תיקון סופרים הפחתם אותי וכתבו אותו. “*You have grieved it*. This word is one of the eighteen words of correction of the Scribes. *You have grieved it*. It was written [‘you have grieved] Me.’ But the verse used euphemism, and it wrote ‘it.’”

An image of the manuscript can be viewed at:

https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN666097542&PHYSID=PHYS_0385&DMDID=DMDLOG_0001

conventional religious beliefs, then, the latter version of the text of Rashi is no more problematic than the former.

This, however, is not the opinion of Prof. Marc Shapiro. Prof. Shapiro wrote an essay that appeared in *The Seforim Blog* on June 8, 2015, in which he criticizes ArtScroll's version of the text of Rashbam's commentary to *Chumash*. In the course of this essay he refers to Munich MS 5:

This manuscript of Rashbam is bound together with another manuscript from 1233 that contains the earliest example we have of Rashi's commentary on the Torah. It is also the first illuminated Ashkenazic manuscript (with the illumination by a non-Jewish artist). The copyist of the Rashi manuscript was not some anonymous person, but R. Solomon ben Samuel of Würzburg. R. Solomon was an outstanding student of R. Samuel he-Hasid and a colleague of R. Judah he-Hasid. He was also a student of R. Yehiel of Paris, and R. Solomon's son was one of the participants in the 1240 Paris Disputation together with R. Yehiel. R. Solomon wrote Torah works of his own and he may be identical with R. Solomon ben Samuel, the author of the *piyyut* שמיענו סלחתי that is recited in Yom Kippur Neilah. ArtScroll, in its Yom Kippur Machzor, p. 746, tells us that שמיענו סלחתי was written by "R' Shlomo ben Shmuel of the thirteenth-century."

It is significant that in this early copy of Rashi's commentary, whose copyist was himself a Torah great, Rashi's comment to Genesis 18:22 appears in its entirety. In this comment, Rashi refers to one of the *tikun soferim* and states that the Sages "reversed" the passage. What this means is that Rashi understood *tikun soferim* literally. Some have claimed that Rashi could never have said this, and it must be a heretical insertion. (There is always someone who says this about texts that depart from the conventional view.) In line with this approach, ArtScroll deleted this comment of Rashi. As we have seen with the passages of Rashbam that were censored, in this case as well ArtScroll would also no doubt claim that it accepts the view of those who do not regard the deleted comment as authentic. Yet how can such a claim be taken seriously when the earliest manuscript of Rashi's commentary, dating from the early

The text that appears in MS. Bodley Or. 326 likewise has וכתב אותו, "and *it* wrote 'it,'" in the singular.

An image of that manuscript can be viewed at <https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/inquire/Discover/Search/#/?p=c+0,t+,rsrs+0,rsps+10,fa+,so+ox%3Asort%5Easc,scids+,pid+22002600-ff96-4292-86a7-0d7f9c1141a2,vi+64bc0b5e-bf78-468a-a23f-b00e50abaf92..>

thirteenth century and copied by R. Solomon ben Samuel, contains the passage?

Prof. Shapiro here makes a number of claims with which I take issue. Before I go any further, I wish to make it clear that I consider him a formidable scholar who is both fair and honest. If I am correct regarding the points about which I disagree with him, his errors are honest errors.

Regarding Rashi's interpretation of the verse as being a *tikkun soferim*, Prof. Shapiro writes, "In this comment, Rashi refers to one of the *tikkun soferim* and states that the Sages 'reversed' the passage. What this means is that Rashi understood *tikkun soferim* literally." No. It doesn't mean that. As mentioned above, if *tikkun soferim* is taken as interpreting the verse euphemistically as the Rashba understands it, "reversing" the passage means interpreting the passage in a reversed sense, i.e., when the verse says that Avraham was yet before Hashem, it means that Hashem was yet before Avraham. There is no indication that this is not Rashi's intent.

Prof. Shapiro goes on to say, "Some have claimed that Rashi could never have said this, and it must be a heretical insertion.⁶ (There is always someone who says this about texts that depart from the conventional view.)"

It took me a while to realize why anyone would consider the concluding words of the longer version of Rashi, אשר הפכוהו ז"ל לכתוב כן, any more problematic than the term *tikkun soferim*, "correction of the scribes." If people can accept that "correction of the scribes" can be taken as a figure of speech, why is it any more difficult to take "inverting" the verse as interpreting it in a reversed sense? It occurred to me that the problem could arise from a misreading of Rashi.

The concluding words of the long version of Rashi are אשר הפכוהו ז"ל לכתוב כן, which I have translated as "in which those of blessed memory have inverted the verse this way." This presumes that the last two words, לכתוב כן, are pronounced *lakasuv kein*, "the verse this way." But if we vowelize לכתוב כן differently, it could be pronounced *lichtov kein*, "to write this way." Rashi would then be saying, "Which those of blessed memory inverted to write this way." Accordingly, Rashi would unmistakably be saying that the Scribes' inversion of the verse involved writing, not interpreting.

⁶ *Sefer Zikaron* and *Mizrahi* find the additional words problematic, but do not go so far as to question the authenticity of the manuscripts that have them. *Tzaidah LaDerech* (Rav Yissachar Ber Eilenberg) says the words must have been inserted into the text by someone other than Rashi.

But this is a misreading of Rashi. As Prof. Shapiro notes, the earliest source for this version of Rashi is the Munich MS. The text there varies slightly from that found in the later popular editions. It reads:

ואברהם עודנו עומד לפני ה'. והלא לא הלך לעמוד לפניו אלא הקב"ה בא
 אצלו ואמר לו זעקת סדום ועמורה כי רבה והיה לו לכתוב וה' עודנו עומד על
 אברהם אלא תיקון סופרים הוא זה אשר הפכוהו רבותינו לכתוב כאן.⁷
 But Avraham was yet standing before Hashem. But is it not true
 that he did not go to stand before Him; rather, the Holy One,
 Blessed is He, came to [Avraham] and said to him, "Because the
 cry of Sodom and Amorah is great." It should have written, "And
 Hashem was yet standing before Avraham"! But this is a correction
 of scribes, i.e., authors and editors, in which our Rabbis inverted
 the verse here.

The concluding words of this version are *לכתוב כאן* rather than the later variation, *לכתוב כן*. If we read them as *lichtov kan*, Rashi's concluding words mean, "In which our Rabbis inverted it to write here." This is as incoherent in the original Hebrew as it is in English. It is clear that the last words are read *lakasuv kan*. Rashi says, "In which our Rabbis inverted the verse here." As we mentioned above, these words are no more problematic than the term *tikkun soferim* itself.⁸

Prof. Shapiro goes on to say, "In line with this approach, ArtScroll deleted this comment of Rashi. As we have seen with the passages of Rashbam that were censored, in this case as well ArtScroll would also no doubt claim that it accepts the view of those who do not regard the deleted comment as authentic. Yet how can such a claim be taken seriously when the earliest manuscript of Rashi's commentary, dating from the early thirteenth century and copied by R. Solomon ben Samuel, contains the passage?"

⁷ An image of the Munich MS can be viewed here:

<http://daten.digitalde.de/daten/digitalde-desammlungen/~db/0003/bsb00036327/images/index.html?id=00036327&nativeno=15>.

⁸ In an essay on Rashi's understanding of *tikkun soferim* that appears in *Netivot LeDavid: Jubilee Volume for David Weiss Halivni* (Orhot Press, Jerusalem, 2004), Yeshayah Maori discusses whether Rashi takes *tikkun soferim* in its most literal sense. He starts his argument by erroneously claiming that the text of the Munich MS has the words *לכתוב כן*, and builds on that to conclude that Rashi indeed held that the Scribes emended the Biblical text. Had he realized that the correct version of the manuscript's text is *לכתוב כאן*, he may have arrived at a different conclusion.

ArtScroll is portrayed here as ignoring the empirical evidence of the authentic text of Rashi, and no doubt accepting the view of those who delete the comment in question because they must be a heretical insertion. The motive attributed here to ArtScroll⁹ is the result of conjecture. But we should not resort to conjecture until we have examined the existing evidence.

On page xiii of the Publisher's Preface to the volume on *Bereishis* of ArtScroll's Sapirstein Edition of *Rashi*, the publisher writes:

Variant readings [of the text of Rashi] are either enclosed in braces or appear in the footnotes, along with the sources from which Rashi drew his commentary. Among the earliest printed editions (incunabula) from which the variant readings are taken are the editions printed in: Rome (undated, possibly 1470), Reggio di Calabria, Italy (also called *defus rishon*, "first printed edition"; 1475); Guadalajara, Spain (Alkabetz edition, 1476); Soncino, Italy (1487); Zamora, Spain (1487). The Venice (Bomberg) edition of 1517-18 was the first edition of *Mikraos Gedolos* with Scripture, *Targum*, *Rashi* and all the standard commentaries. In the course of researching the variant readings of Rashi, we found valuable resources in the recently published *Yosef Hallel* (Rabbi Menachem Mendel Brachfeld; Brooklyn; 5747/1987); and, for the *Bereishis* volume, the ongoing *Chumash Chumshei Torah – Ariel/Rashi HaShalem* (Jerusalem, vol. 1 – 1986, vol. 2 – 1988, vol. 3 – 1990).

This passage refers to the text of Rashi's commentary that ArtScroll had prepared for the Stone Edition of the *Chumash*, without translation or elucidation. It was also this text that I was given to work from for the Sapirstein Edition.¹⁰

So we don't have to guess about the sources ArtScroll used in preparing the text of Rashi. They came right out and told us. Of the six early editions mentioned by name,¹¹ the Reggio di Calabria, Soncino, and Zamora editions include the words that do not appear in ArtScroll's text. The Rome, Alkabetz, and Venice editions do not.

⁹ And apparently to Koren and the anonymous publisher of the *Chumash* mentioned in note 2, as well.

¹⁰ Had I been aware of the alternative text when working on it, I would have discussed it in a footnote.

¹¹ "Among the earliest printed editions (incunabula) from which the variant readings are taken" implies that other incunabula may have been consulted, as well. I do not know which ones they are or how often they were consulted.

So on that basis it's a tossup. ArtScroll could have included the additional words in brackets but chose to leave them out.

But why didn't ArtScroll use the Munich MS? If it is the most authoritative version of the text, shouldn't it have been consulted?

The text of Rashi that appears in the ArtScroll *Chumashim* had been completed by 1990 when I started working on the Sapirstein Edition. The internet was then in its infancy. The Munich MS could not have been online then. Even if it was, ArtScroll had no responsibility to be aware of it. ArtScroll aims to publish high-quality editions of Torah classics for a popular market. It does not publish scholarly critical editions of the kind that Machon Yerushalayim, Mossad HaRav Kook, and Machon Ariel do. When they were engaged in publishing the Stone Edition of the *Chumash*, I assume they wanted to produce a more accurate version of the text of Rashi than that in the popular editions then available, so they used some valuable resources that were readily accessible. In my opinion they did this responsibly. They had no obligation to search for manuscripts that at the time were available only in university libraries. That just wasn't the kind of thing they were doing. It would come as no surprise if they weren't even aware that there was such a thing as the Munich MS.

So now let's go back and ask our original question again, along with another. First, did ArtScroll censor Rashi? Prof. Shapiro leaves the impression that ArtScroll rejected the empirical evidence—the Munich MS—in favor of a text they favored for ideological reasons. This points to intellectual dishonesty on ArtScroll's part.¹² But after seeing what ArtScroll tells us about what they actually did, a different picture emerges. We are left with a number of possibilities.

ArtScroll may have found the evidence on one side more compelling than that on the other because of historical considerations regarding the early printings.

Due to sincerely held religious beliefs, they may have tipped the scales in favor of the shorter version of the text because they thought it unlikely that Rashi wrote the longer version.

In these cases, ArtScroll would not have been acting dishonestly. However, there could be room to criticize them for poor judgment, ei-

¹² If someone believes that it is literally impossible for Rashi to have written the words in question, it is not dishonest to delete them. An argument can be made for not even putting them in brackets. Doing so could be interpreted as investing the bracketed words with some authority.

ther for not mentioning a popular alternative text with considerable objective support, or for the way they evaluated the data.

Then there is the possibility that ArtScroll left out the alternative longer version for some self-serving reason. That would be intellectual dishonesty, although of a lesser order than that of which Prof. Shapiro accuses them. There is a difference between choosing a clearly incorrect version of the text over a clearly correct one, and choosing to use one version of the text which does have objective support and leaving out another of comparable claim to validity.

Now the second question—all considerations about ArtScroll aside, what is the accurate text of Rashi? Prof. Shapiro leaves us with the impression that the Munich MS is the last word; the evidence leads us to conclude that Rashi's comment ends with the words **אשר הפכוהו רבותינו לכתוב כאן**. But there is more to it than that.

The two fundamental texts on the history and development of Torah study among early Ashkenazic Jewry, *Chachmei Ashkenaz HaRishonim* ("The Early Sages of Ashkenaz") and *Chachmei Tzarfat HaRishonim* ("The Early Sages of France") are both by Prof. Avraham Grossman. He and Prof. Haym Soloveitchik are the preeminent experts in the field. Much of the second volume is devoted to Rashi. Prof. Grossman deals with the issue of determining the original text of Rashi's commentary. In the course of his discussion he writes the following:

An important tool in determining the original text of Rashi's commentary to the Torah is Leipzig MS 1. Rashi's commentary to the Torah in this manuscript is apparently the closest which we currently possess to the original that Rashi wrote, although it, too, has later additions and copyist's errors. Many valuable notes of Rashi's disciple Rabbeinu Shemayah are recorded in the margin of Rashi's commentary to the Torah in this manuscript. We will discuss them in detail in a survey of Rabbeinu Shemayah's work. (p. 187)¹³

¹³ The translations here are my own. The quotations in the original Hebrew are:

עמ' 187: כלי עזר חשוב לברור הנוסח המקורי של פירוש רש"י לתורה הוא כתב-יד לייפציג 1. פירוש רש"י לתורה שבכתב-יד זה הוא ככל הנראה הנוסח הקרוב ביותר על המקור שכתב רש"י, המצוי כיום בידונו, אף שגם בו יש השלמות מאוחרות ושיבוש העתקה. בשולי פירוש רש"י לתורה שבכתב-יד זה נרשמו הגהות רבות ערך של תלמידו ר' שמעיה, ונידון בהן בפירוט בסקירת מפעלו של ר' שמעיה.
עמ' 188: ר' מכיר העיד פעמים הרבה שהחזיק בידיו את כתב היד של פירוש רש"י לתורה שבו כתב ר' שמעיה בעצמו את הגהותיו.
עמ' 191: מדבריו של ר' שמעיה עולה כי לא זו בלבד שרש"י בעצמו הכניס תקונים לפירושו והגיהם, אלא שביקש גם ממנו לעשות כן.

Rabbi Machir [the scribe who copied the manuscript] attested several times that he had in his possession the manuscript of Rashi's commentary in which Rabbeinu Shemayah himself wrote his notes. (p. 188)

Rabbeinu Shemayah's words imply that not only did Rashi himself insert corrections into his commentaries and emend them, but that he asked him [Rabbeinu Shemayah] to do so, as well. (p. 191)

Elsewhere, Prof. Grossman writes:

In my opinion, [Leipzig MS 1] ought to be considered *the most important source* [emphasis in the original] we presently have and the main tool for any inquiry into the question of the text of Rashi's commentary on the Torah.¹⁴

Here we have a version of Rashi's text that the expert in the field considers the closest to the original. Prof. Shapiro says that the Munich MS of 1233 is the earliest text of Rashi we have. I don't know how long it took to copy Rashi's commentary by hand, but I would venture that it was less than five years. If so, given that Rashi died in 1105, the Munich MS could conceivably be twenty-five generations of manuscripts away from an original. Most likely, it is far closer to an original, but even if we take the high figure, it is still a very important resource.

Prof. Grossman says that the Leipzig MS is also from the 13th century, but does not give a precise date. It could have been written as much as sixty-seven years after the Munich MS. But what gives a manuscript of this sort its authority is not its age. It is how close it is to an original. Rabbi Machir copied from a manuscript that was not only read and commented on by Rashi's own disciple. As Prof. Grossman says in the third quotation above, it was copied from a manuscript that was read and commented on by Rashi's *editor*. The Leipzig MS is then a single generation removed from a virtual original. As Prof. Grossman concludes, you can't do much better than that.¹⁵

¹⁴ "לדעתי ראוי [כ"י ל1] להיחשב כמקור החשוב ביותר המצוי כיום בידינו וככלי העזר העיקרי לכל חקירה בשאלת הנוסח של פירוש רש"י לתורה". – "הגהות רבינו שמעיה ונוסח פירוש רש"י לתורה", תרביץ ס, (תשנ"א)

¹⁵ Prof. Elazar Tuito claims that Rabbi Machir was mistaken in his belief that the manuscript from which he copied actually had notes written by Rabbeinu Shemayah in "האמנם משקף כתב-יד לייפציג 1 את הנוסח המקורי של פירוש רש"י לתורה (בעקבות מחקרו של אברהם גרוסמן)", תרביץ ס"א (תשנ"ב). Prof. Grossman rebuts Prof. Tuito's arguments in "עוד לטיבו של כתב-יד לייפציג 1 (תגובה למאמרו של אלעזר טויטו)", תרביץ, ס"ב (תשנ"ג)

The Leipzig MS does not have the words in question.¹⁶

In conclusion, the jury is still out on what the authentic text of Rashi is, but there is strong evidence in favor of the version without the extra words. The two versions do not differ substantially in meaning. And omission of the additional words is not *prima facie* evidence of censorship. ❧

¹⁶ The text of the Leipzig MS can be viewed at:
http://alhatorah.org/Commentators:Rashi_Leipzig_1/Bereshit_18