

Be'er HaGolah (באר הגולה) — Editorial footnotes (draft)

Judah Loew ben Bezalel (יהודה בן בצלאל), the Maharal of Prague, c. 1520–1609.

Drafted editorial footnotes for review before publication. Each note is keyed to its anchor in the **manuscript-grade complete edition** — the collated output that retains the per-batch/page scaffolding the anchors reference (produced by *ms*). The reading in the main text is **preserved as printed/transcribed** and is not altered by these notes. The note text below is a **draft** — review and edit before publication.

The notes are classified as follows:

- **Category B — source compositor error.** A printing, compositor, or scribal error in the source itself (a wrong letter or digit, a dropped or doubled word, a non-resolving citation). The likely intended reading is noted, but the main text preserves exactly what is printed.
- **Category C — author/source anomaly.** An anomaly originating with the author or the source rather than the typesetting (a factual or geographic slip, a misattribution, an internal inconsistency, or a deliberate but unusual feature). Recorded as written.
- **Missing-source lacuna.** A point where source text is missing, damaged, or illegible. The note states what should stand at the gap and points to an alternate witness where one is known.

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
1	Introduction §1–§16	C	Tradent named R. Eliezer ben Shamua in one clause, R. Elazar in the parallels
2	Introduction §1–§16	C	The closing <i>li-Yhudah</i> of §16 is a double sense English cannot carry
3	Well 1 §3–§4	B	Berachos 20b quoted without the Rav Ami half of the received pair
4	Well 1 §5–§6	C	The element air is named <i>avir</i> and then <i>ruach</i> within one argument

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
5	Well 1 §7	B	Makkos 22b quoted as "the reasoning of the tanna kamma" for "of the Rabbanan"
6	Well 2 §1	C	Eruvin 21b attributed to Rava bar Ulla; received text has Rav Acha bar Ulla
7	Well 2 §3	C	Sanhedrin 34a reported in the reverse of its usual summary
8	Well 2 §4	C	The <i>Shakai</i> / <i>shoded</i> wordplay survives only in part in English
9	Well 2 §5	B	Yoma 23a baraisa quoted with "your axe" for "your sickle" and "your garment"
10	Well 2 §8	B	Devarim 26:11 quoted with the wording of Devarim 14:26 attached
11	Well 2 §9	B	Eichah 1:8 quoted with the opening of 1:3 spliced onto it
12	Well 2 §9	B	Niddah 13a cited as "sheds a soul" for the received "sheds blood"
13	Well 2 §9	C	The <i>ben Noach</i> paragraph closes by restating the dissent it argued against
14	Well 3 §2	B	The segment ends with two clauses repeating the two before them
15	Well 3 §3	B	Avos 2:10 paraphrased with serpent and <i>saraf</i> for scorpion and fox
16	Well 3 §4	B	"One verse divides into several senses" assigned to the first chapter of Sanhedrin
17	Well 4 §1	C	Well 4 opens with no "Fourth Complaint" rubric, unlike Wells 2 and 3

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
1 8	Well 4 §1	C	The Well 4 prologue is an acrostic on the author's name, unreproducible in English
1 9	Well 4 §2	C	Maharal glosses "their house of prayer," the phrase the derashah rejects
2 0	Well 4 §4	C	Divine speech shifts from first to third person and back in one clause
2 1	Well 4 §5	B	"Such is the reading of —, of blessed memory": the name is missing
2 2	Well 4 §7	B	Yechezkel 21:22 quoted with an ending drawn from Yechezkel 5:13
2 3	Well 4 §8	B	Mishlei 9:1 quoted with the opening of Mishlei 14:1 attached
2 4	Well 4 §9	B	Avodah Zarah 3b cited as "R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav"
2 5	Well 4 §11–§12	C	A section-closing doxology stands at §12, though Well 4 runs to §18
2 6	Well 4 §13	C	Ta'anis 31a cited as R. Chelbo in the name of R. Eliezer, with a shortened chain
2 7	Well 4 §14	C	The <i>zakein</i> pun — "beard" and "elder" — cannot be carried in English
2 8	Well 4 §14	B	"Idolaters were accustomed" printed with a preposition the syntax cannot bear
2 9	Well 4 §16	B	The Bereishis Rabbah dictum cited as "creating" and then as "building" worlds
3 0	Well 4 §17	B	A third Creation-days formula, "the six days of nature," where

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
			the argument wants "of Bereishis"
3 1	Well 4 §18	B	Moreh Nevuchim cited as II:2; the passage discussed stands at II:26
3 2	Well 4 §18	B	Dittography: the preposition <i>shetachas</i> printed twice in the Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer quotation
3 3	Well 4 §18	C	Shemos Rabbah 13:1 quoted first with "pebbles," then twice restated with "clods"
3 4	Well 5 §1	C	Aristotle cited only as <i>Shamayim ve'Olam</i> , with no book or chapter and no Greek behind it
3 5	Well 5 §2	B	The elements acronym printed both ם"שׂא and ש"מא, matching neither Sefer Yetzirah nor the stated order
3 6	Well 5 §3	C	The Bava Basra 73b lemma quoted thigh-then-wing, then twice reversed, against his own next sentence
3 7	Well 5 §4–§5	C	R. Yochanan placed "at the end of the Tannaim" and, a few lines later, treated as an Amora
3 8	Well 5 §6	C	The derash on "a woman who bore six hundred thousand" is quoted with no source
3 9	Well 5 §7	C	Bava Kamma 60b quoted with <i>tzo'akim/sochakim</i> against the received <i>bochim/mesachakim</i>
4 0	Well 5 §10	C	Shabbos 56a quoted first as "the Shechinah was with him," then as "Hashem was with him"
4 1	Well 5 §10	C	Bas Sheva called "at the very least a doubtful <i>eishes ish</i> ," then "there

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
			was no <i>eishes ish</i> here"
4 2	Well 5 §11	B	Dittography: "what they hinted to us in this incident" printed twice
4 3	Well 5 §11	C	Two scriptural quotations at the close of Well 5 carry no reference in the source
4 4	Well 5 §12	C	Well 5 closes at §11; §12 opens fresh material after the well has already been sealed
4 5	Well 5 §12	C	The "behind and before" derashah given wholly in Reish Lakish's name against Bereishis Rabbah 8:1
4 6	Well 6 §1	C	The argument turns on deriving <i>achos</i> from <i>ichui</i> , a wordplay English cannot carry
4 7	Well 6 §2	C	Sukkah 29a quoted with <i>kamayim</i> for <i>ke'echad</i> , and <i>eidei sheker</i> for <i>eidus sheker</i>
4 8	Well 6 §3	B	Agalah and Akrav printed with their directions reversed; corrected by the editor
4 9	Well 6 §5	B	Rava's proof printed as "one fifth" where the argument requires "one sixth"; editor's emendation
5 0	Well 6 §5	C	The two versions of the proof use different daily distances but the arithmetic is never reconciled
5 1	Well 6 §6	C	Yoma 20b quoted as "the fourth kingdom" where the received baraisa reads "Rome"
5 2	Well 6 §7	C	The Zevachim maxim quoted with a doubled limb against the received "we did not see is no proof"

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
5 3	Well 6 §8	C	The pillar-attributions of Chagigah 12b swap between the first and second expositions
5 4	Well 6 §8	B	"The mountains of God" cited to Tehillim 36:6; the verse is 36:7 in the Masoretic numbering
5 5	Well 6 §9	lacuna	A diagram is lost in the digitization; only its labels survive, flattened into the prose
5 6	Well 6 §10	C	The unnamed opponent is Azariah dei Rossi; <i>Imrei Binah</i> is part three of <i>Me'or Einayim</i>
5 7	Well 6 §12	B	Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer cited to the end of ch. 5; the passage stands in ch. 6 in current editions
5 8	Well 6 §13	B	Yirmiyahu 23:7 cited for "from the land of the north," which is 23:8
5 9	Well 6 §13	B	Witness reads "the sphere of the earth" where the argument requires "the sphere of the heavens"
6 0	Well 6 §14	B	One Roman general's name printed three ways: Archinus, Trachinus, Trajan
6 1	Well 6 §15	C	<i>Ulpian</i> glossed as learning "from a verse," against its ordinary sense
6 2	Well 6 §16	B	<i>Bas sheva</i> printed twice within one clause; probably a copy-text doubling
6 3	Well 6 §17	B	The opponent's objection misquotes "a two-year-old fledgling" for the baraisa's "year-old fledgling"
6	Well 6 §17	C	The chapters of the opponent's

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
4			book are cited out of sequence: 11, 12, 15, 17, then 16
6 5	Well 6 §18	C	<i>Yemos Olam</i> is not a second book but the chronological part of the same work
6 6	Well 7 §3	C	Kesubos 111b quoted as "a remedy from another place" against the received "a takanah from the Torah"
6 7	Well 7 §4–§5	C	The goring-ox argument turns on the <i>nochri/re'ehu</i> contrast, which English cannot carry
6 8	Well 7 §4–§5	C	Maharal's restatement substitutes <i>kofrim</i> for the baraisa's informers
6 9	Well 7 §4–§5	B	<i>Ein Ma'amidin</i> cited as Avodah Zarah 26a for a statement that stands on 26b
7 0	Well 7 §6	B	The blessing said to have twenty-nine <i>letters</i> ; the count holds only for its words

1. Introduction §1–§16 — Category C — author/source anomaly

In the *ikka de'amri* clause of Introduction §2 the copy-text names the tradent R. Eliezer ben Shamua, whereas the opening clause of the same passage and both mentions at §9 read R. Elazar ben Shamua; the received text of Eruvin 53a has Elazar in every position. Each occurrence has been translated as it stands rather than normalized to a single form, so the divergence remains visible to the reader.

2. Introduction §1–§16 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The introduction closes on *li-Yhudah* (Introduction §16), which carries two senses at once: the allotment of Be'er Sheva to the tribe of Yehudah, and the author's own given name, Judah (Yehudah) Loew. The rhymed peroration turns on that coincidence, which no English rendering can carry; the translation keeps the gloss minimal in the body.

3. Well 1 §3–§4 — Category B — source compositor error

The copy-text quotes Berachos 20b as "sometimes he said it in the name of Rav Asi," where the received Talmudic text has the pair "sometimes in the name of Rav Ami, and sometimes in the name of Rav Asi." The sentence is otherwise well formed, so this reads as the author's own compression in citing rather than a defect of the digitization. Preserved as printed, without harmonization.

4. Well 1 §5–§6 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Within a single chain of argument in Well 1 §5 the elements are named *yesod ha-mayim* and *yesod ha-avir*, and a few lines later the element predominant in a tree is called *yesod ha-ruach*. Both *ruach* and *avir* denote the element air here, and both are rendered "air" so that the argument tracks; the shift is the author's own and is recorded rather than corrected.

5. Well 1 §7 — Category B — source compositor error

Maharal quotes the sugya at Makkos 22b as *mai ta'ama de-tanna kamma* ("what is the reasoning of the *tanna kamma*"), where the received text frames the question as *mai ta'ama de-rabbanan*. The substance of the derivation is unaffected. This appears to be the author's own paraphrase rather than a copy-text defect, and it is translated as he gives it.

6. Well 2 §1 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The quotation of Eruvin 21b reads "in the name of Rava bar Ulla," where the received text of that sugya has Rav Acha bar Ulla. Maharal's following sentence — that Rava disagreed with Rav Papa only about the interpretation of the verse — shows that he takes the respondent there to be Rava, whom the received text leaves unnamed. The attribution is translated exactly as the copy-text gives it.

7. Well 2 §3 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal reports Sanhedrin 34a as holding that the bar on reversing a verdict toward conviction applies during deliberation but is lifted at the time of the final verdict — the reverse of the way the sugya is ordinarily summarized. The explanation he then develops is fully consistent with the form he gives, so this reads as his own construal of the passage rather than a textual defect. Translated as written, without harmonization.

8. Well 2 §4 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's argument in Well 2 §4 turns on hearing the Divine Name *Shakai* against *shoded*, "He who plunders the arrays of the upper hosts." The Name is rendered by the reverent transliteration *Shakai* and the pun carried in a

parenthetical gloss, but a reader who does not know the Hebrew will see it only partially; the play cannot be reproduced in English.

9. Well 2 §5 — Category B — source compositor error

The baraisa on *nekimah* and *netirah* is quoted with *kardumcha* ("your axe") in both requests of the *nekimah* case and again in the *netirah* case, where the received text of Yoma 23a has "your sickle" (*maglach*) and "your garment" (*chalukcha*). The substitution is internally consistent across both halves of the baraisa and reads as the author's (or his witness's) loose citation. Preserved as printed.

10. Well 2 §8 — Category B — source compositor error

The verse quoted as "and you shall rejoice in all the good, you and your household" blends two passages: "you shall rejoice in all the good" is Devarim 26:11, while "you and your household" is the wording of Devarim 14:26. The copy-text supplies no reference at this point. This reads as the author quoting from memory; the quotation is preserved as given and cited as Devarim 26:11, cf. 14:26.

11. Well 2 §9 — Category B — source compositor error

The segment opens with "all who pursue her have despised her... for they have seen her nakedness," which splices the opening of Eichah 1:3 onto Eichah 1:8 ("all who honored her have despised her"). The substitution is almost certainly the author's own and is pointed: it turns the verse's "those who honored her" into the critics who pursue her, and the "nakedness" puns on the subject matter of the complaint. Preserved as printed, cited to Eichah 1:8.

12. Well 2 §9 — Category B — source compositor error

Maharal cites Niddah 13a as saying that one who destroys seed is "as though he sheds a soul," where the received wording is "as though he sheds blood"; the reason clause is likewise given from his own wording rather than the printed Gemara's. The change suits the argument he has just made, that a power of soul is bound up in the seed, and he returns to the same phrasing a few lines later. Rendered as printed.

13. Well 2 §9 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Having explained at length why intercourse not in the usual manner is forbidden to a *ben Noach*, Maharal closes the paragraph with "and since it is permitted to Israel, it is permitted to *bnei Noach* as well" — a restatement of Rava's dissenting

position, named at the head of the same paragraph. The Hebrew marks no change of voice, so read continuously the paragraph contradicts itself. The compression is the author's own and is preserved.

14. Well 3 §2 — Category B — source compositor error

The final two clauses of Well 3 §2 repeat the two that precede them almost verbatim, with only one word dropped and "of every man" altered to "of a wise man," after which the segment breaks off mid-thought. This reads as a dittography in the copy-text — a line repeated in the witness or in its digitization — rather than an authorial refrain. Both occurrences are preserved as printed rather than collapsed.

15. Well 3 §3 — Category B — source compositor error

Maharal's paraphrase of the mishnaic warning to be wary of the Sages' coal gives the sting of a serpent and a *saraf*, where the received text of Avos 2:10 has the sting of a scorpion and the hiss of a fox. He supplies no citation, and none has been added. Preserved as printed, without harmonization to the mishnah.

16. Well 3 §4 — Category B — source compositor error

Maharal attributes the dictum "one verse divides into several senses" to *perek kamma* — the first chapter — of Sanhedrin. The dictum stands at Sanhedrin 34a, which falls in the fourth chapter, *Echad dinei mamonos*. The chapter designation is preserved as printed and the standard folio reference supplied; the slip appears to be the author's own, or a loose use of *perek kamma*, rather than a defect of the copy-text.

17. Well 4 §1 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Wells 2 and 3 each open with the well's prologue followed immediately by a rubric announcing the complaint. Well 4 has no counterpart heading: the complaint is stated instead within the rhymed prose that follows the prologue. The rhymed passage is metrically continuous with the prologue and states the charge in full, so the arrangement appears to be the author's own rather than a loss in transmission.

18. Well 4 §1 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The twelve clauses of the prologue to Well 4 open with letters spelling יהודה בן בצלאל — Yehudah ben Bezalel, the author's own name. The device is structural in the Hebrew and cannot be carried on English initials; the passage is therefore set as prose, and the acrostic recorded rather than imitated.

19. Well 4 §2 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The Gemara's proof at Berachos 7a turns on the verse saying "My house of prayer" and not "their house of prayer." A few lines later Maharal himself glosses "their house of prayer" as the Beis HaMikdash and builds on it. This is his own descriptive use of the rejected phrase rather than a claim about the verse's wording, but a reader may trip on it. Translated exactly as it stands.

20. Well 4 §4 — Category C — author/source anomaly

In the exposition of "My sons have defeated Me" the divine speech moves within a single clause from the first person ("they are My sons") to the third ("they are His own") and back again. The shift is the author's own and is preserved rather than harmonized, since it carries his point that what proceeds from the side of the receiver is nonetheless the Giver's own will.

21. Well 4 §5 — Category B — source compositor error

The copy-text reads "such is the reading of —, of blessed memory, in the chapter *HaMadir* in Kesubos," the honorific standing with no name before it. Given the appeal to Rabbeinu Tam a few lines later, and the fact that the Tosafos on this sugya stand in *HaMadir*, the missing name is most likely Rabbeinu Tam or Tosafos, but the identification is not certain and nothing has been supplied. The defect appears to lie in the copy-text or in the author's own draft.

22. Well 4 §7 — Category B — source compositor error

Rav Katina's proof-text is printed as "I too will strike My hand against My hand, and I shall be comforted for you," whereas Yechezkel 21:22 reads "and I will satisfy My fury." The ending appears to be contaminated by the *ve-hinachamti* of Yechezkel 5:13, quoted two clauses later as R. Natan's proof-text. The edition itself marks the citation as approximate, so the looseness is likely the author's or his witness's; since it cannot be settled which ending was intended, the reading is preserved as printed.

23. Well 4 §8 — Category B — source compositor error

The verse cited as Mishlei 9:1 is printed as "the wisdom of women has built her house, she has hewn out her seven pillars," merging Mishlei 14:1 ("the wisdom of women") with Mishlei 9:1 ("Wisdom has built her house... her seven pillars"). The seven pillars, which the derashah at Sanhedrin 38a requires, come from 9:1 and are present. This reads as citation from memory; the quotation and its printed reference are preserved as they stand.

24. Well 4 §9 — *Category B — source compositor error*

The quotation formula at the head of the segment reads "R. Yehudah said in the name of Rav," where the received text of Avodah Zarah 3b has Rav Yehudah, the Amora, in the name of Rav. The citation formula requires the Amoraic form, so this is most likely a slip in the copy-text rather than the author's own. Rendered as printed.

25. Well 4 §11–§12 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

Well 4 §12 closes with "may He deliver us and enlighten our eyes; Amen, so may it be His will" — a formula of the kind that elsewhere seals a section, although Well 4 continues to §18. Nothing has been added or removed; the placement is recorded for the reader, since it may mark an earlier stage in the composition of the well.

26. Well 4 §13 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

Maharal cites the Ta'anis passage as "R. Chelbo said in the name of R. Eliezer," where the received text at Ta'anis 31a reads "R. Chelbo said in the name of Ulla Bira'ah in the name of R. Elazar" — R. Elazar rather than R. Eliezer, and with an intermediate tradent. The shortened chain is a common citation habit, and the argument does not turn on the attribution; the printed form has been followed exactly, and this translation elsewhere keeps R. Eliezer and R. Elazar distinct.

27. Well 4 §14 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

The exposition of Yeshayahu 7:20 turns on a single Hebrew word bearing both senses: *zakan*, the "beard" the verse speaks of shaving, and *zakein*, the "old man" of the aggadah, whom Kiddushin 32b glosses as one who has acquired wisdom. It is that pun which lets Maharal fold the old man of the story into the beard of the verse. English must render the two senses by different words, and the link is lost.

28. Well 4 §14 — *Category B — source compositor error*

The clause about the practice of offering one's sons is printed with a prefixed *lamed* on "idolaters" that the syntax does not support; the sense required is "idolaters were accustomed." The passage has been rendered for that sense, and no emended reading is asserted, the correction being probable rather than certain. The irregularity most likely belongs to the author or his witness.

29. Well 4 §16 — *Category B — source compositor error*

R. Abahu's dictum is quoted first as "He was creating worlds and destroying them" and, from the paragraph on Shabbos 89b onward, as "building worlds and destroying them," with a further variant in between. Both verbs are used of the same statement, and both forms circulate for this midrash. The variation appears to be the author's own loose re-citation; each occurrence is rendered as printed rather than normalized.

30. Well 4 §17 — Category B — source compositor error

In the paragraph beginning "Now know further," the source reads *besheshes yemei hateva*, "in the six days of nature," in a sentence that also carries *sheshes yemei hama'aseh*, "the six days of Creation," while the surrounding paragraph uses *sheshes yemei Bereishis* throughout. The parallel appears to require the creative period — nature is precisely what Maharal has just said was not yet operative — so the phrase reads as a slip for *sheshes yemei Bereishis*, though the sense is not impossible as printed, since nature was itself being created in those days. Whether the variation is Maharal's own loose usage or a defect in the witness cannot be settled from the digitized copy-text; the reading is preserved as printed.

31. Well 4 §18 — Category B — source compositor error

The copy-text cites the Rambam's criticism of *Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer* to "chapter 2 of the second part" of the *Moreh Nevuchim*; in the standard editions that discussion stands at *Moreh Nevuchim* II:26. Since Maharal quotes the passage itself accurately, the reference is most likely a transmission or digitization slip (*pereq kaf-vav* reduced to *pereq beis*) rather than his own error. The citation is preserved as printed.

32. Well 4 §18 — Category B — source compositor error

The quotation from *Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer* chapter 3 reads *veha'aretz mishaleg shetachas shetachas kisei hakavod*, repeating the preposition. The doubling is a copy-text defect rather than an authorial repetition; the phrase is translated once, and the repetition is recorded here rather than emended in the text.

33. Well 4 §18 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal first quotes the midrash as "the *pebbles* (*tzeroros*) that were in the dust became mountains and hills," then twice restates it, still citing Shemos Rabbah 13:1, with "*clods*" (*regavim*). *Clods* is the word of the proof-verse, Iyov 38:38, and his exposition of matter turns on it. The shift appears to be his own assimilation

of the midrash to the verse it expounds rather than a defect in the copy-text; both forms are preserved as printed.

34. Well 5 §1 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's appeal to "the Philosopher" on the duty to set out an opponent's arguments in full names only *Sefer Shamayim ve'Olam (De Caelo et Mundo)*, with no book or chapter number; the passage corresponds in substance to the methodological preface of *De Caelo* II. No reference has been supplied, since none stands in the Hebrew. He is quoting a Hebrew rendering, in all likelihood through the Averroist tradition, and the wording should not be collated against the Greek.

35. Well 5 §2 — Category B — source compositor error

The copy-text prints the acronym for the elements as א"ש twice — at the citation of *Sefer Yetzirah* 3:3 and again at "the order of א"ש" — but as א"מ once, in the sentence that spells the elements out as air, water, fire. *Sefer Yetzirah* 3:3 reads א"מ, and the order the passage actually narrates, and states in plain words two sentences later, is water, fire, air, which matches neither form as printed. This looks like a transposition defect in the transmission rather than a step in the argument, since Maharal himself supplies the intended order in words. All three occurrences are preserved as printed.

36. Well 5 §3 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal quotes the Gemara's phrase three times as thigh-then-wing, matching Bava Basra 73b, and then twice in the reverse order, immediately after which he writes, "He also began first with the thigh." The reversal appears deliberate — it aligns the pair with Tehillim 16:11, where *ne'imus* precedes *netzach*, which is how he keys the two in his closing lines — but the following sentence reads against it. Both orders are preserved exactly as printed.

37. Well 5 §4–§5 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal first places R. Yochanan at "the end of the Tannaim" and then, within a few lines, reasons from the fact that "R. Yochanan is an Amora, a level below this." The two statements are reconcilable — R. Yochanan stands at the close of the tannaitic era and at the opening of the amoraic one — and the descending-measure argument requires both, so neither has been harmonized to the other.

38. Well 5 §6 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The homiletical remark that Moshe's mother was "a woman who gave birth to six hundred thousand in one womb" is introduced as a preacher's *derash* but carries

no source reference in the copy-text, and none has been supplied here. It does not correspond to a passage identifiable in the standard midrashic collections; the reader should treat it as an unlocated citation.

39. Well 5 §7 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's citation of Bava Kamma 60b reads "dogs *crying*" (*tzo'akim*) where the received Gemara has *bochim*, and *sochakim* where ours has *mesachakim*; he likewise has "Eliyahu" where ours reads "Eliyahu the prophet." The divergence is load-bearing rather than incidental: his entire explanation is built on *tze'akah viylalah*, crying and howling, which his printed reading supplies directly. This appears to be the text of the Talmud before him rather than a defect in transmission, and it is preserved as printed.

40. Well 5 §10 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal cites the Gemara's rhetorical question with "and the Shechinah was with him" and re-quotes it a few lines later as "and Hashem was with him," assimilating it to the verse. The second form is the one his argument requires, since he reasons directly from "and Hashem was with him" at Shmuel I 18:14. Both are preserved as printed and neither has been harmonized.

41. Well 5 §10 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Within one section Maharal argues that David was not scrupulous about the soldiers' bill of divorce and that Bas Sheva was "at the very least a doubtful *eishes ish*," and then concludes that "you are forced to say that there was no *eishes ish* here." The two are reconcilable — the first describes David's subjective position, the second the objective halachah — but the text nowhere says so, and nothing has been supplied to bridge them.

42. Well 5 §11 — Category B — source compositor error

The closing lines of the section read, "for to grasp the depth of this matter, what they hinted to us in this incident — it is impossible to explain what they hinted to us in this incident," repeating the phrase verbatim. Both occurrences are preserved and their order kept; the repetition looks like a doubling in the transmission of Maharal's text rather than a rhetorical restatement.

43. Well 5 §11 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Two verses are quoted verbatim at the close of the section with no citation in the copy-text: "the righteous walk in them, while transgressors stumble over them" (the closing half of Hoshea 14:10) and "make the sweet bitter and the light

darkness" (after Yeshayahu 5:20). No references have been supplied in the text, per the policy of not inventing citations the author did not give; they are identified here.

44. Well 5 §12 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The peroration of the fifth well — "may Hashem illumine our eyes ... Amen, and may it be His will" — stands at the end of §11. Section 12 then opens entirely fresh material on Bereishis Rabbah 8:1 and runs to its own end with no closing formula, no summary of the fifth complaint, and none of the "with this we conclude our words in removing the complaint" pattern found elsewhere. Nothing is missing from the segment, which is complete and coherent in itself; it reads as a discussion appended after the well was closed, and the same absence of a closing formula recurs at the end of Well 6.

45. Well 5 §12 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal gives "behind — to the work of the last day; before — to the works of the first day" in Reish Lakish's name and then continues, "this accords with Reish Lakish's own view." In the received text of Bereishis Rabbah 8:1 the first statement belongs to Rav Shmuel bar Nachman and only the second to Reish Lakish, which is what makes "this accords with his view" an argument at all. The attribution appears to be Maharal's own citation from memory; it is preserved as printed and unharmonized.

46. Well 6 §1 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's reading of Shabbos 145b on "Say to wisdom, you are my sister" (Mishlei 7:4) derives *achos*, sister, from *ichui*, joining, and treats "brother" and "sister" as morphologically one word — the point being that brother and sister are equals, unlike father and offspring, who are distinguished. The inference exists only in the Hebrew consonants; no English rendering carries it, and the Hebrew forms are therefore quoted in the body. The reading is presented as Maharal holds it.

47. Well 6 §2 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The baraisa of Sukkah 29a is quoted twice with divergences from the received text. The opening list reads "two brothers whose blood was shed as one" (*ke'echad*), while the later restatement reads "whose blood was spilled like water" (*kamayim*) before returning to "as one" in the same sentence; the received text has *ke'echad* throughout, and the variant looks like loose re-citation. Both occurrences of the second list read *me'idei eidei sheker*, "those who have false witnesses testify," where the received text reads *me'idei eidus sheker*, "those who

give false testimony" — a reading Maharal's own gloss requires, since he explains it as "one testifies about a thing that does not exist at all." All are preserved as printed.

48. Well 6 §3 — Category B — source compositor error

In the sentence "always Agalah in the north and Akrav in the south," the copy-text has the two directions reversed, contradicting the baraisa Maharal quotes three lines above; the editor of the critical edition deletes both and supplies the opposite readings. The emendation is required by the argument, and the error appears to lie in the transmission of Maharal's own text rather than in the digitization. The editor's readings stand in square brackets, and the witness readings are recorded here.

49. Well 6 §5 — Category B — source compositor error

At the hinge of Rava's proof the witness reads "one fifth" (*michamishah*), which the editor of the critical edition deletes in favor of "one sixth" (*mishishah*). The emendation is plainly right — Maharal's whole exposition rests on the rakia being a sixth of six thousand *parsah*, matching the six sides of a body and the six days of Creation — and it is rendered here in square brackets, with the witness reading preserved here.

50. Well 6 §5 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Rava's proof allows an average man ten *parsaos* a day and five *mil* from dawn to sunrise, and concludes that the rakia is one sixth; R. Yehudah's version, cited a few lines later, gives the same ten *parsaos* but four *mil*, and concludes one tenth. Maharal does not remark on the discrepancy, taking each figure directly to its symbolic ground — the six sides of a body, the ten utterances of Creation. A related looseness follows shortly after, where "a tenth part of the day" answers to "the tenth part of the world." All figures are preserved as printed; the procedure appears to be the author's own rather than a defect in the text.

51. Well 6 §6 — Category C — author/source anomaly

The opening quotation of Yoma 20b reads "the sound of the multitude of the fourth kingdom," where the received text of that baraisa reads "the sound of the multitude of Rome"; Maharal himself quotes the line a second time later in the same section with "Rome." The substitution is not neutral: his entire reading depends on the referent being the fourth kingdom's *preparedness*, present since the world was created, rather than the historical nation — the very

misunderstanding he goes on to warn against. Both forms are preserved as printed.

52. Well 6 §7 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

The maxim ascribed to Zevachim 103b is printed as "'I did not hear' and 'I did not see' is no proof," where the received formula is "'We did not see' is no proof." The doubled limb suits Maharal's argument, which concerns what the astronomers have failed to observe, and the divergence is most likely his own paraphrase. It is preserved as printed and not harmonized.

53. Well 6 §8 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

In the baraisa as Maharal quotes it, and in the first exposition that follows, the Sages say twelve pillars, "some say" seven, and R. Elazar ben Shamua says one. In the second exposition the seven are assigned to R. Elazar ben Shamua and the one to "some say," the twelve remaining with the Sages. The received text of Chagigah 12b agrees with the baraisa as quoted, so this appears to be a slip — the author's own or the copy-text's — rather than a variant he is following; nothing in the second exposition turns on which name carries which number, and both forms are preserved as printed.

54. Well 6 §8 — *Category B — source compositor error*

The phrase "the mountains of God" is cited in the source as Tehillim 36:6; in the Masoretic numbering the verse is Tehillim 36:7. The reference is transcribed as printed, in keeping with the policy of not silently correcting a numeral.

55. Well 6 §9 — *Missing-source lacuna*

At this point in the argument about the east–west span against the earth–rakia distance, Maharal refers the reader to a figure. The digitized copy-text preserves no figure, only its labels, flattened into a single run of running text after "as follows": "heavens / the end of the heavens [west] / the end of the heavens [east] / west / east / beginning / beginning / west / earth / east," with the editor's bracketed supplements marking which end is which. The labels are rendered here in their printed order; nothing has been supplied and no figure has been reconstructed. The printed Machon Yerushalayim edition should carry the diagram itself, and it is worth consulting for this passage.

56. Well 6 §10 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

The book attacked here and through the remainder of Well 6 is identified in the source only as "a book composed by one of the sons of our people" and, by title, as

Imrei Binah. It is Azariah dei Rossi's *Me'or Einayim* (Mantua, 1573–75), of which *Imrei Binah* is the third and largest part. Maharal never names the author, and the attribution has deliberately not been supplied in the body of the translation; the chapter numbers he gives are the reader's only handle on the work.

57. Well 6 §12 — Category B — source compositor error

The passage on the sun riding in a chariot is cited to the end of chapter 5 of *Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer*; in the printed editions in general use it stands in chapter 6, the chapter on the sun, the moon and the planets. Chapter division in *Pirkei deRabbi Eliezer* varies between editions, so this most likely reflects the witness before Maharal rather than a defect in transmission. The reference is preserved as printed.

58. Well 6 §13 — Category B — source compositor error

The verse cited as Yirmiyahu 23:7 is quoted as "As Hashem lives, who brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north." The received text of 23:7 reads "from the land of Mitzrayim"; it is 23:8 that has "from the land of the north." The two verses form a fixed pair, and the argument here requires the northern one, since Maharal has just used Mitzrayim for the south and needs a second direction. The compression of the pair under the first verse-number appears to be his own; the citation is preserved as printed.

59. Well 6 §13 — Category B — source compositor error

In the geometrical objection about the point beneath the crossing of the meridian and the equinoctial, the witness reads "the sphere of the earth" (*kadur ha'aretz*), which the editor of the critical edition deletes in favor of "the sphere of the heavens." The editor's reading is required by the argument and is rendered here in square brackets; the witness reading is recorded here.

60. Well 6 §14 — Category B — source compositor error

The general who destroyed the Jews of Alexandria on the Yerushalmi's account is named three different ways in the copy-text: *Archinus* at the first citation of the Yerushalmi, *Trachinus* at all four later mentions, and *Trajan* as the witness reading the editor removes near the end. The variation appears to be the state of the copy-text rather than the author's own inconsistency — Maharal's argument depends on the Yerushalmi naming one man where the Bavli names another, and he treats every later mention as a single name. All three forms are preserved as printed.

61. Well 6 §15 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal glosses the midrash's *ulpan* as learning "from a verse," where the term ordinarily denotes received instruction as distinct from Scripture. The gloss is load-bearing for the conclusion he draws about the standing of aggadah, and it is rendered exactly as he writes it, without correction.

62. Well 6 §16 — Category B — source compositor error

The clause *d'vas sheva haysah molidah bas sheva* repeats *bas sheva* within a single clause. The construal adopted takes it as the age of bearing, seven, paired with Betzalel's eight in the parallel member — but that parallel member (*uVetzalel ben ches*) carries no such doubling, which suggests a defect in the copy-text rather than Maharal's own phrasing. The reading is preserved as printed; it is worth checking against the printed Machon Yerushalayim edition.

63. Well 6 §17 — Category B — source compositor error

The quoted objection asks how the skull could contain "a two-year-old fledgling," where the baraisa it has just quoted (Gittin 56b) reads "a year-old fledgling." The slip appears to belong to the book under attack — possibly a conflation with the two *litrin* of weight mentioned in the same passage — rather than to the transmission of Maharal's text; he does not remark on it. The reading is preserved as printed.

64. Well 6 §17 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's references to the unnamed book run 11, 12 and 15 in the preceding sections, then 17, and now 16, so that the ascending sequence breaks here. The ordering appears to be his own — he gathers the opponent's statements by topic rather than by chapter — and the numbers are rendered as printed, without renumbering. Since the work is never named, these chapter numbers are the reader's only means of locating the passages under attack.

65. Well 6 §18 — Category C — author/source anomaly

At the close of Well 6 the reference to the opponent's work shifts from numbered chapters of *Imrei Binah* to a title, *Yemos Olam*. This is not a different author or a second book but the chronological section of the same work — Azariah dei Rossi's *Me'or Einayim* — which treats the era of Creation, the years of the two Temples, and the succession of the Persian and Greek kingdoms, the very matters disputed here. The usage is Maharal's own and is preserved as printed.

66. Well 7 §3 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's quotation of Kesubos 111b reads "I have found them a remedy from another place," where the received text reads "I have found them a *takanah* from the Torah." His later restatement of the passage repeats the same wording, which suggests his own paraphrase rather than a defect in the copy-text. The quotation is preserved as printed and unharmonized.

67. Well 7 §4–§5 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal explicitly identifies *goy* and *nochri* as one category — "the *nochri* spoken of there is the third division" — and both are therefore rendered "gentile" throughout, since two English words would manufacture a distinction he denies. What English cannot carry is the contrast on which the goring-ox argument actually rests: *nochri*, the estranged one who has taken himself to another side, set against *re'ehu*, one's fellow, from which he derives *re'us*, fellowship, as the ground of liability for one's animal. The argument is an inference from that pair of Hebrew words, and no single English pair reproduces it.

68. Well 7 §4–§5 — Category C — author/source anomaly

Maharal's restatement of who is lowered into a pit — "the *minim*, the *meshumadim*, and the *kofrim*" — does not match the baraisa he has just quoted, which reads "the *minim*, the informers, and the *meshumadim*." He substitutes *kofrim* for the informers and never discusses informers at all. This appears to be his own reframing toward the theological triad his explanation actually treats rather than a defect in the copy-text; the passage is preserved as printed.

69. Well 7 §4–§5 — Category B — source compositor error

The chapter *Ein Ma'amidin* is cited as Avodah Zarah 26a at the head of the section and as 26b twice later, for one and the same statement; 26b is where the statement stands. The first reference is probably the author's own slip. Both are preserved as printed.

70. Well 7 §6 — Category B — source compositor error

Maharal writes that the *birkas ha-minim* has twenty-nine *letters* (*kaf-tes osiyos*), set against the twenty-seven letters of the Torah together with the Written and the Oral Torah. The count works for the *words* of the blessing in the standard *nusach*, not for its letters, of which there are far more. This appears to be the author's own usage, or a slip in the text before him, rather than a defect in the digitization; nothing has been harmonized and the reading is preserved as printed.