secolo si è rivelato infatti il paese-guida in quanto a innovazioni, seguita, a
distanza di qualche decennio, dalla Francia.
Per citare infine un solo esempio riguardante l'Italia, ricordiamo che
dall'analisi della produzione manoscritta è scaturita qualche informazione in più
sulla nascita e l'affermazione del quinione, un tipo di fascicolo da sempre
associtato alla produzione italiana del periodo umanistico, ma che fa la sua
comparsa ben prima di quest'epoca.

Paola BUSONERO
Università di Cassino

EARLY BABYLONIAN HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS

This article summarizes a lecture given in June 1995 at the Ben Zvi Institute in
Jerusalem. A detailed study of this topic will appear in a forthcoming volume of Sefinot. The
terms "Orient" and "Oriental" used in reference to Hebrew manuscripts here refer to the Near
East. The name "Babylonia" (present-day Iraq) remained in use in Jewish history and culture
throughout the Middle Ages, the period to which this article refers. My thanks to Peretz
Rodman for his translation of this article from the original Hebrew.

Medieval Hebrew manuscripts from every region follow Gregory's rule,
discovered by G. R. Gregory in 1885. Accordind to this Rule, as is widely
known, manuscripts written on parchment in Greek and Latin worlds were
arranged in quires in such a way that at each opening the two facing sides of
parchment would be matched: a flesh side facing a flesh side and a hair side
facing a hair side, producing a uniform appearance between ofthe openings.
The successive rectos are thus hair, flesh, hair, flesh, etc. The reasons for this
arrangement are apparently aesthetic considerations and ease of reading.

Nonetheless, two Hebrew manuscripts not arranged according to
Gregory's Rule have been known to us. Their quires begin with a hair side,
and the rectos quire are arranged thus: hair, hair, hair... in the first half of the
quire, and consequently flesh, flesh flesh... in the second half. In this way,
each opening consists of a flesh side facing a hair side, and vice versa (with the
exception of the central opening of each quire, where flesh has to face flesh).
These two manuscripts are: MS Vatican Ebr. 66 ofTorat Kohanim [= Sifra]
1981], p. 41, n. 66); and a manuscript of Halakhot Pesuqot formerly part of
the Sassoon collection and now in the Friedberg collection, Toronto (cf.
M. Glatzer, "The Aleppo Codex: codicological and Palaeographical aspects"
[Hebrew], Sefinot, 19, 1989, p. 167-276: p. 198, n. 1). The first one was
copied in the Orient with early simple Babylonian vocalization (cf. I. Yeivin,
The Hebrew language tradition as reflected in the Babylonian vocalization
[Hebrew], Jerusalem 1985, p. 203 ff.); the contents and the language of the
latter are Babylonian, its vocalization is middle simple Babylonian, and the
orthography too may attest to its Babylonian provenance, as Yeivin notes
(ibid., p. 200). On an earlier occasion, I posed the question whether we can
deduce from this arrangement of the quires that the manuscript was copied in an
early period or whether it was copied in Babylonia (ibid.). In other words, is
the variation from Gregory's Rule a Babylonian characteristic or is it indicative
of an early date, before the practice describes by Gregory's Rule became widespread.

This question has been of concern to me since that publication, and I undertook a search for other manuscripts that follow the same system. First, I investigated biblical manuscripts with Babylonian vocalization — which is recognizable by its superlinear placement —, and in fact I found manuscripts at variance with Gregory's rule written in Oriental script and vocalized according the ancient Babylonian system. I am most grateful to Prof. I. Yeivin and to his patient and thorough work on Babylonian vocalization, gathering, annotating, and analyzing far-flung materials which otherwise would have remained inaccessible. Most manuscripts with Babylonian vocalization are indeed mere segments and fragments of a few folios from the Geniza, and they are scattered in many libraries around the world. Nonetheless I have examined the relevant original manuscripts in most of the places where they are to be found: Cambridge, Oxford, Manchester, New York, and St. Petersburg. It need hardly be noted that I chose only those sections in which there is continuous text and in which, therefore, one may determine whether the appearance of each opening is uniform or not.

First among these is Alef Gimel 1 (using the sigla assigned by Yeivin, op. cit.) : Hagioography. This is a well-known manuscript most of which is in Berlin, with a smaller portion in New York. Its vocalization is early simple Babylonian, and it serves as one of the prime exemplars of the tradition in Babylonian vocalization, as Yeivin notes. It is our good fortune that an unusually large number of folios (101) are extant, among which many are consecutive.

The other manuscripts, in which the number of consecutive folios is smaller, are as follows:

Alef Alef 12 : Pentateuch with Targum Onqelos after each verse. This is one of the most important manuscripts, as Yeivin observes, representing an early stage in the development of early simple Babylonian vocalization.

Alef Bet 10 : Prophets. Yeivin sees this as one of the early sources for the early simple Babylonian vocalization. It was written by the same scribe as Alef Alef 12.

Alef Bet 4 : Early Prophets with Targum Jonathan after each verse. Its vocalization is early simple Babylonian, with vowels signs indicated by points alone. This is apparently the oldest representative of that tradition.

The following fragments also display early simple Babylonian vocalization: Alef Bet 5, Early Prophets; Alef Bet 7, Early Prophets; Alef Bet 16, Later Prophets with Targum Jonathan after each verse; Alef Bet 59, Joshua; Alef Gimel 4, Job and Chronicles. Joining these nine Bible manuscripts is Mem Samekh 1, an early Babylonian Masorah, some of the leaves of which are consecutive.

Sor far then, there are twelve manuscripts altogether whose connection to Babylonia is unequivocal; in none of them is there a matching of facing sides of parchment. This would tend to support the view that we have before us a Babylonian codicological phenomenon. Support for this assumption can be found in Dr. Sh. Naeh's study of the aforementioned Sifra manuscript (The Tannaitic Hebrew in the Sifra according to Codex Vatican 66 [Hebrew], Ph. D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1989). In his view, not only does the vocalization belong to the Babylonian tradition, but the orthography also displays the influence of Babylonian pronunciation and tradition. Further, in his opinion both the scribe and the naqdan (vocalizer) were Babylonians of the 10th century. Additional support for this view is found in the study on the same codex by the late Dr. O. Haneman ("On the linguistic tradition of the written text in the Sifra MS", Henoch Yalon Memorial Volume, Ramat Gan, 1974, p. 84-98).

In fact, lack of coordination between parchment sides was, of necessity, present until a later period than has been imagined. This we learn — with certainty and not as an hypothesis — from two additional manuscripts which Prof. H. Ben-Shammai kindly brought to my attention:

1) St. Petersburg, EBP AP. I 127 : Sa'adia Ga'on's Book of beliefs and opinions (Arabic in Hebrew letters). It is written in an Oriental square script and contains 132 folios. Every quire is without coordination of parchment sides, except for the first quire, which is written in a different hand and serves as a replacement for the original quire that was lost. There is no indication that this copy was written or corrected by the author himself, who died in 942 (aggeret [Epistle of] Rav Sherira Ga'on, ed. B. M. Lewin, Haifa, 1921, p. 118). Thus the earliest date that may be assigned to this manuscript is the second half of the 10th century.

2) St. Petersburg, EBP AP. I 4132 : Sa'adia Ga'on's Commentary to the Pentateuch, Exodus, Part I (Arabic in Hebrew letters). It includes 73 folios, of which three quires are nearly complete, and here too there is no coordination of parchment sides. (The remaining folios are separate and damaged.)

The upper limit so far, then, for this codicological phenomenon is the end of the 10th century or even the beginning of the 11th century. It should be kept in mind that the vocalization of Halaqot Pesuqot is middle simple, and it is therefore later than the texts bearing early simple vocalization (cf. Yeivin, op. cit., p. 27 : "It appears that one may make inferences from the date of one source about the date of another source of the same type"). For example, I
examined another Bible manuscript with middle simple vocalization, and it too
does not display coordination of parchment sides: Yeivin Alef Bet 22,
Prophets and Targum Jonathan after each verse, the largest biblical manuscript
and the most characteristic of middle Babylonian vocalization. It includes
38 folios; among them, the consecutive pages in approximately five different
quires are not in accordance with Gregory's Rule.

Another manuscript without coordination of parchment sides is the
St. Petersburg manuscript, MS Antonin 262: Mishna Tohorot (from Negaim
to Zabim), which comprises 38 folios. There are places where the text bears
sublinear vocalization, but that vocalization is in a different color ink from the
text itself. Prof. M. Bar-Asher has established, on the basis of work done by
E. Netanel, that this manuscript belongs to the "Eastern Type" of Mishnaic
Hebrew ("The different traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew" [Hebrew], Tarbis, 53,
1984, p. 187-220). Bar-Asher coined this phrase in light of the linguistic
differences he has found between the "Western" manuscripts of the Mishna,
copied in Europe or Byzantium (MSS Kaufmann, Parma, Lowe and others),
and the following manuscripts: MS Parma B, the aforementioned MS Antonin
262, and Mishna fragments with Babylonian vocalization.

In addition to the codicological support for Bar-Asher's findings, it may be
possible to find support for the contention that MS Antonin 262 is of
Babylonian origin in a section added therein at the end of Chapter 5 of the
tractate Nidda. This addition is closer to the tradition of the Babylonian Talmud
than to that of the baraita recorded in Tosefta. (Additional discussion of this
codex will be found in the more detailed article on this subject.)

The assumption that lack of matching of parchment sides is
characteristically Babylonian is still in need of additional corroboration, since
Babylonian pronunciation and vocalization were also used outside Babylonia
from the 9th century to the 15th century. How, then, can we be certain that the
manuscripts in question are indeed Babylonian? In contrast to the afore-
mentioned Babylonian manuscripts, however, the date-bearing manuscripts
written from the beginning of the 10th century and the early 11th century in the
Orient, and particularly in Palestine and Egypt, all display coordination of the
parchment sides, and the contents of every manuscript in which there is not
such coordination bears clear indications of Babylonian origin. What is more,
in examining several fragments of liturgical poetry with superlinear Palestinian
vocalization — considered quite ancient — in which there are consecutive folios
(and to which I was directed by Prof. Y. Yahalom), I found that there is
coordination of parchment sides. It appears, then, that we are indeed dealing
with a Babylonian phenomenon.

The paucity of comparative codicology in general, and on this point in
particular, makes it more difficult to state unequivocally that variance from
Gregory's Rule in Hebrew manuscripts is a local phenomenon peculiar to
Babylonia. Among Latin codices, we know of exceptions to Gregory's Rule
(cf. J. Vezin, "La réalisation matérielle des manuscrits latins pendant le haut
Moyen Age", Codicologia, II, Leiden, 1978, p. 26), mostly among manu-
scripts written in the British Isles up to the 11th century, or in Continental
scripitoria influenced by the Insular school. Most Latin manuscripts, it appears,
do follow Gregory's Rule. It is tempting to say that in the distant Orient and the
farthest western reaches of the European world, as distinct from the vast
middle, parchment coordination was not practiced. The Greek manuscripts are,
of course, significant for our topic because they are closer to the region of
Oriental Hebrew manuscripts. E. G. Turner, in his book on the Typology of
the early codex from the 2nd and 3rd centuries on (Philadelphia, 1977), makes
no mention of departures from Gregory's Rule among Greek manuscripts on
parchment. On the contrary, only among papyrus manuscripts is there a period
during which there is either coordination or non-coordination between layers of
papyrus in each opening; no such phenomenon exists in parchment
manuscripts. From the 6th century onwards, there is consistent coordination of
papyrus as well.

It need not be stated that the early Syriac, Persian, and Arabic manuscripts
must be examined as well, not to mention Samaritan and Palestinian Christian
Aramaic manuscripts. In a Syriac manuscript of Pesähita that was donated
recently to the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem (MS
Or. 63, ascribed to the 9th century), there is indeed no parchment
coordination; on the other hand, W. H. Paine Hatch, An Album of dated
Syriac manuscripts (Boston, 1946), does not deal with Gregory's Rule. The
rarity of Arabic manuscripts on parchment, even manuscripts of the Qur'an,
also makes such an examination difficult. As is well known, the transition to
codices written on paper occurred in the Middle East long before the West.
However, I was pleased to discover in B. Layton's excellent catalogue of
Coptic manuscripts in the British Library (London, 1987) that all the parchment
manuscripts from the 9th century to the 12th are in accordance with Gregory's
Rule — with the only exception of MS 159, from the year 987; but the size of
its folios is also not consistent. (From the 13th century, all manuscripts in this
collection are on paper.)

The codex in languages other than Hebrew began to appear, according to the
commonly accepted date, as early as the 3rd or even the 2nd century. It may
well be that the difference I have suggested between the Babylonian Hebrew
codex and Hebrew codex outside Babylonia has its basis in hypothesized
differences between the codex in the area of the Roman (and later, the
Byzantine Empire and the codex in the area of the Sassanian Empire — both of which were later imitated by the Jews during the Arab period. During that period, the codex appeared within the Jewish cultural orbit. The earliest literary evidence for this dates from the 8th century, during the time of Ray Yehuda Ga'on (Glatzer, op. cit., p. 260-263). This difference between Babylonian and non-Babylonian codices will be seen to resemble the clear and distinct differences in the construction of Hebrew codices in a later period, according to the geopolitical alignment of each region: see M. Beit-Arié, *Hebrew manuscripts of East and West*, London, 1993.

It is possible that I have overstated the case, but if indeed the codicological criterion suggested here is more forcefully demonstrated and finds support from manuscripts in other languages as well, we shall be able to distinguish between Hebrew manuscripts from Babylonia and those from elsewhere. We shall, moreover, have a criterion for distinguishing between manuscripts that are Babylonian in their content, language, or vocalization written in the Babylonian diaspora and those from Babylonia itself. Further research may in fact uncover additional distinctions of time and place among manuscripts bearing the various types of Babylonian vocalization. I fervently hope that this notice will encourage others to examine manuscripts written in scripts other than Hebrew with regard to their adherence to Gregory's Rule. In any case, the sixteen Hebrew manuscripts that are at variance with Gregory's Rule deserve exposure even at this stage.

Mordechai GLATZER
School of Library Science
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

L’ARCHITETTURA DELLA PAGINA GLOSSATA
LA "MISE EN PAGE" DEL CODEX DI GIUSTINIANO

L’interesse rivolto al libro giuridico trova una sua motivazione di fondo nella pluralità e nella complessità degli aspetti che lo caratterizzano e che ne fanno un oggetto di studio stimolante e ricco di spunti. Ogni libro di diritto di epoca medievale è essenzialmente un prodotto della cultura universitaria del XII-XIV secolo, in quanto ne riflette sia i principi di elaborazione scientifica e i criteri entro i quali nuove norme vengono ad organizzarsi e a definirsi, sia i meccanismi di riproduzione e di diffusione promossi e gestiti dai grandi Studia. Dalla commistione di interessi di natura scientifica, ideologica ed economica dell’istituzione universitaria nasce un modello di codice frutto di specifiche modalità di progettazione e di esecuzione funzionali per uso e destinazione all’ambiente che lo ha prodotto e nel quale sopravvive sino a tutto il Quattrocento.

Questo studio, frutto di una tesi di specializzazione dell’Università degli Studi di Cassino, si è focalizzato sull’analisi della struttura della pagina del libro giuridico, sui criteri che presiedono all’organizzazione e all’articolazione di tutte le sue componenti, scritte e non scritte, nonché sulle modalità di sfruttamento e di utilizzazione dello spazio destinato ad accogliere il testo. Dal momento che non è possibile esporre in questa sede tutte le fasi del lavoro, ci si limita a considerare alcune problematiche fondamentali e ad esporre alcuni dei risultati conseguiti, rimandando ad un contesto più ampio e dettagliato l’illustrazione complessiva della ricerca.

L’interesse rivolto all’architettura della pagina e alla sistemazione degli elementi che ne determinano il disegno trovano una sua motivazione nella sostanziale omogeneità e uniformità che caratterizza, sotto questo aspetto, un codice di diritto. Il testo e il commento vengono disposti secondo modalità che risultano pressoché identiche nei vari centri di produzione, nel periodo compreso tra il XIII e il XV secolo, e questo sia per il materiale manoscritto che per quello a stampa. Tale continuità, all’interno di una radicale trasformazione delle tecniche di produzione del libro, è piuttosto evidente: in effetti, a prima vista, esiste una grande uniformità tra le pagine di un incunabolo giuridico e quelle di un manoscritto contenente la medesima opera e delle quali si imitano la struttura, il formato, l’impaginazione, l’organizzazione del testo, il sistema dei rinvii, la scrittura e la gerarchia dell’ornamentazione. La ragione probabilmente risiede nella forza e nel prestigio di un modello di libro, ritenuto ancora funzionale nell’impianto e nella struttura, che una tradizione di secoli aveva