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PREFACE.

In preparing the Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts preserved in the Cambridge University Library, we have more than once had occasion to take somewhat full notes of Manuscripts borrowed from other libraries for the purpose of illustrating our own work. In order that the labour thus gone through may not be lost, it has seemed advisable to issue occasionally such notices as may appear worth preserving.

Through the kindness of the Curators of the University of Leyden, and especially of Dr M. J. de Goeje, the 'Interpres Legati Warnoriani,' we have been able to examine at leisure the priceless MS. of the Palestinian Talmud, which forms one of the chief glories of their Library. The least return we can make for their act of generosity is to put on record such points of interest as a careful study of the MS. has enabled us to bring out. We have drawn up this Notice precisely in the form adopted in the Cambridge Catalogue; and it is hoped that the technicalities of the description will not detract from its interest.

The MS. is No. 3 among the 'Manuscripti Hebraici quaes Bibliothecae legavit Illustrissimus Josephus Scaliger,' in the Leyden Catalogue published in 1716; and it is still recognised under the same number. In that Catalogue it is entered thus: 'Talmud Hierosolymitanum. 2 ingentibus vol. In membrana. 3.'
PREFACE.

Steinschneider, in making his special Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts at Leyden, gives the scribe's name, and one of the subscriptions; but, having been necessarily limited to a small compass, he has not given in this case (probably from thinking the book too well known to require a minute description or special research) all those points of detail which have made his Catalogue, when concerned with later Hebrew literature, such a store-house of valuable information.

S.S.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LEYDEN MS.

OF THE

PALESTINIAN TALMUD.

Parchment, volume I. 15 in. x about 12½ in., vol. II. 15½ in. x about 12½ in.; 674 leaves, 5-sheet quires, 33 lines; Rabbinic character, fine Italian Ashkenazi handwriting; dated 25 Adar Rishon 5049.

The Palestinian Talmud; incomplete.

Leaf 1, originally blank (see below); 2, I. Zera'im: Berakhoth; 33, Pesah; 49, Demai; 62, Kilayim; 76, Shebath; 95, Terumoth; 113, Meteiroth; 122, Meazer Sheni; 133, Challah; 142, 'Orlah; 149, Bikkurim; 156, II. Mo'ezin: Shabbath; 183, 'Eruvin; 214, Pesachim; 242, Yoma; 262, Shabat; 273, Sukkah; 297, Rodh Hachanah; 297, Botzah; 309, Talmud Rabbath; 334, Megilloth; 334, Changog; 352, Mokhan (Mied Qamn); 363, III. Nashim: Yevamoth; 383, Sotah; 421, Kolhoth; 552, Nedarim; 469, Gittin; 490, Nazir (509, 510, blank); 510, Qiddushin; 534, subscription by the scribe; 534, IV. Yeshi'oth (Nashim): Baba Qamma; 549, Baba Metziah (Melizah); 564, Baba Bathra; 578, Synhedrin; 613, Makkoth; 618, Shabbath; 636, 'Abodah Zarah; 654, Horayoth; 663, subscription by the scribe; 664, VI. Tosep'toth: Niddah; 670—672, blank.

1 The last quire contains six sheets.
2 We are at a loss to know what Steinschneider means by calling the handwriting of the MS. Spanish.
3 According to Jahn's Tables 23 Adar Rishon 5049 corresponds to Thursday, 17 February 1299.
The several Sederim and Masekhtoth begin and end without anything worthy of remark in the headings and conclusions by the scribe except in the following cases:

S. Zera'im, M. Berakhat, begins (leaf 27) :
כברך והמתנה והגנה
...משנתיו חורשים את יציבת בדיק

M. Berakhot ends (leaf 35b):
 trope שולמה בпродаж
...שלחתי תכנתו מברכים

M. Shebith ends (leaf 39b):
...ונמה זר וניה למליצת הורר
פלך פרוקא
อลכיאק ולפי מסכתה ודאויתת
ב╝רץ ידיא

S. Mo'ed, M. Shabbath, begins (leaf 156b):
...בנועית וחדים ומעד
האולימדק שב بتاريخ מדר
 מסכת שבית
...יצאתי וקהבלת שים

M. Shabbath ends (leaf 193b):
...שלכובסי לא יגנה...
...זרר López על ארבעה אימא תולק
...לא מחביאי מלוך וידברוב ידוסי

M. Mechikin (Mo'ed Qatan) begins (leaf 392b):
...מקבת מיכא
...משניא כתנה ומכלה במכה

1 In the Venice, Crmow and Krookshin editions the Yeramalim Mishnah of the last four Peraqim of Shabbath follows here. It is introduced thus:
מכהא אבראיבהו פ בפייסבוק ולפי דרתם באבראיבא עראיבא עראיבא שרי
...לפיודי

The Zitomair edition omits these four Peraqim of the Mishnah, and has instead of the above preamble the following questioning rhymes:
...ברברת אבראיבא אבראיבא עראיבא עראיבא שרי...
...ኤיל
...ארח לברברא עראיבא שרי...

This otherwise magnificent edition has also tampered with the position and arrangement of the Mishnah and has omitted several single Halakoth.

M. Makkoth ends (leaf 618):
...תליאי ידוארה...
...
...מלוך פרוקא

The Zitomair edition has the bare Mishnah of this Peraq.

...שלכיבא ולפי מסכתה ומכלה במכה
...שמיא

1 The Zitomair edition has the bare Mishnah of this Peraq.
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M. Horayoth, and with it S. Yeshu’oth, ends (leaf 663):

This is immediately followed by the subscription (leaf 663):

The scribe is the well-known writer on ethics R. Yechezkel b. Yequthiel.

b. Binyamin Harophe b. Yechezkel b. Abraham Harophe of the family סַעֲרָבָם, which numbered among its members men distinguished not less for learning than for piety. To this family belonged, undoubtedly, the celebrated R. Nathan b. Yechezkel, the author of the ‘Arubaḥ, R. Yehudah b. Binyamin Harophe (תלמי), R. Tadghyiyan b. Abraham Harophe, R. Binyamin b. Yoab the pointer, &c. Because (in accordance with Abodh 1. 18, iv. 7, &c.) they would not degrade their theological knowledge by making it a means of gaining a livelihood, some of them became physicians, whilst others adopted the profession of scribes. To these latter belonged our R. Yechezkel. If his talent as a poet was only just above mediocrity, his talmudic knowledge apparently never went beyond it. His honesty and conscientiousness as a scribe however leave nothing to be desired, and are every way worthy of the author of the Maḥoṭeh Hummidoth.

He tells us plainly that, having had before him a copy full of mistakes, he corrected them (not by comparison with other copies, but) by mere conjectures of his own. Now, although he does not tell us that the Mishnah (probably because better known to him than the Gemara) had experienced most of

1 That there were four copies in existence at that time (besides a copy of the Mishnah of the last four Perekim of M. Shabbath) we learn from the following words which occur in the postscript to the first edition:

A further reference to these four copies will be found quoted above, p. 6, note 1.

These allusions to the other (now apparently lost) copies seem to have escaped Steinschneider’s notice. It is very desirable, however, to draw attention to the fact of their having existed; because it seems less likely that they have been destroyed during the interval, than that they have been lying buried in some unexplored library; and a notice of their disappearance is the most hopeful means of leading to their re-discovery.

2 See the Cambridge MSS. Add. 11. 25 and Add. 549.

3 Dr. Maimi, or de Prazzili; comp. Zeux, Literaturgeschichte der Synag. Poesie, p. 352.

4 See the Cambridge MSS. Add. 376, 1; Add. 408, 2; Add. 472, 2 and Add. 473.

5 That is, מִשְׁנָה (פִּלְפִילוֹת) יֵשָׁבוּ בּוֹ (Psal. 118; comp. Job i. 2). See our communication in Geiger’s Jbr. Zeitschr. yr. v. p. 238 and the Cambridge MS. Add. 574.

6 See the Cambridge MS. Add. 638.

7 See the Bible at Emmanuel College, MS. 1. 1. 5 (Kennicott 94).

8 See the Cambridge MS. Add. 173.

9 See the Cambridge MS. Add. 10. 11. 2, &c.
his conjectural corrections, we can scarcely doubt the fact. And we can the less doubt it, when we see the number of variants which are to be found between the text of the Mishnah which precedes the Gemara of each Perek, and the reference or catch-words which occur in the Gemara, at the beginning of each small subdivision. We have the whole Palestinian Mishnah in the Cambridge MS. Add. 476. 1 (Catalogue, No. 73), and this agrees mostly with the catch-words in the Leyden MS. From which it is evident, that the many emendations which are to be found in the Mishnah of the Leyden MS, must be attributed to the scribe. Further, a difference is visible in his treatment of the Mishnah and of the Gemara, for we frequently meet in the margin, on occasion of his emending the Gemara-text, the words ש"מע, whilst such is never the case concerning the Mishnah-text, which he emends without any further remark.

This MS, does not afford us many instances of the custom, which we have noticed so frequently elsewhere, of the scribe showing traces of his name in the vacant spaces at the end of a line. Our scribe generally manages to fill out the line by a dilated letter, or by part of the first letter of the first word on the next line. Nevertheless we may notice the existence of the 58 (of אול我々) on leaves 133b, 229b, 577 and elsewhere. Another point of interest may be mentioned, which is however not absolutely a peculiarity of our scribe; that is, the practice of writing ש"מע never by itself, but always in connexion with the substantive following it, the genitive of which it denotes (as for instance, שבתת שבתת, קסוע, קסוע, and not קסוע שבתת, קסוע קסוע). This is important from a grammatical point of view.

The scribe originally intended the whole work to form one volume, as appears from the continuous enumeration of the quires (ן–ף) and the uninterrupted way in which the various Sedarim succeed one another. Having almost finished his labours (at the end of the fourth Sederin), he found that the book was too bulky and must be divided into two volumes. He placed therefore on leaf 1f (which he had originally left blank) the title of the first volume, running thus:

Now, this first volume (quires ן–ף), containing these first two Sedarim, contained also, because the division was only an afterthought, a portion of the third Seder, and would thus admit of no regular subscription. For this

1 We have also observed the same usage in the fragment of the Mishnah ( FindObjectOfType Zarah) according to the recension of the Palestinian Talmud (see No. 74 in our Catalogue), and in MSS. Oo. 6, 67, L. Oo. 5, 67, 2. Add. 486, &c.

2 Those nine words are written in bold Ashkenazi square character. In the א of ובו are the letters טב, forming together the word ובו, and in the א of ובו is the כ, forming together the word יבכ.
This subscription has been printed both by Steinschneider and by Frankel, but with some slight inaccuracies. The single marks over הנריע in the date were intended by the scribe to show that he meant the word to be cancelled.

Of owners we find thirteen. Some of these are not only mentioned by name, but are distinctly announced as owners, whilst others can only be inferred to have been such.

(1) The first owner is, of course, the R. Menachem b. Binyamin. Menachem mentioned in the scribe's two chief subscriptions. Although not designated by the scribe as his relative, or even as a member of the family of the 'Amarnam, this owner was probably both. The names Menachem and Binyamin occur very often in the family of the 'Amarnam, which, to say the least, is an indicative evidence for the probability of our conjecture (Comp., our Catalogue, p. 161, Note 2, and Additions, p. 245).

(2) An anonymous owner, of about the xivth century, has left his mark on this MS, by writing many catchwords from leaf to leaf. The writing is in a bold Sephardic hand and in Rabbinic character. Some of the running titles are also due to this owner.

(3) Another anonymous owner has written in a neat mixed (French and Italian) Rabbinic hand a few notes on the margins. This owner apparently belongs to the latter part of the xivth century. He can be best identified on leaf 471r.

(4) Again, an anonymous owner has left his mark by writing numerous emendations and supplements, partly between the lines and partly on the margins. This hand is German Ashkenazic and the character is mixed (mostly Rabbinic and current). He belongs to the xiv—xvth century.

(5) A fourth anonymous owner, also of the xiv—xvth century (but somewhat later than the foregoing) wrote numerous marginal notes, chiefly supplements of omissions. They are in a bold Ashkenazic mixed hand (German and Italian) and in mixed character (Rabbinic and current). This annotator is perhaps the father of the next owner.

(6) One R. Zimlin Segal, i.e. Shime'on, Shemuel, or Meshullam, Haller, of Ashkenazic origin, although he may have been an Italian by birth. This owner, who must have belonged to the latter half of the xivth century, left apparently no mark of ownership himself. He is, however, known to us by the record of ownership to be found in connexion with his successor.

(7) On leaf 1r we read in a bold Ashkenazic mixed hand (German and Italian) and mixed character (Rabbinic and current) of the latter part of the xvth century, the following:

Although not speaking of the owner as his wife, it is not improbably the husband of Elkele, who is the writer of these lines. This omission has nothing extraordinary in it, as the writer's chief aim was simply to establish the immediate owner's right. This mode is frequently used in modern times also. Be this, however, as it may, Elkele was the wife of a Rabbi. The next question is of more importance: was Elkele's husband a Rabbi in Italy? was he also of German extraction? was his name R. Moshe? Did his parents come originally from Altona? and is he identical with the R. Moshe, mentioned by Ya'acov Ibn Adoniyyahu (see the next two paragraphs), or is he identical with the equivalent of Altona?

(8) On the same page, just below the foregoing record, we read in a bold Italian hand and in Rabbinic character of the early part of the xvth century:

These last five words refer perhaps to a waste leaf once at the beginning of what is now volume 2, but which has disappeared in the re-binding. We might otherwise have learnt who this R. Moshe was. Perhaps, it was R. Moshe יְבִירוּס, and, perhaps, this R. Moshe יְבִירוּס was a Rabbi.

(9) The chief interest, however, centres upon the ninth owner, who is no less a personage than the most learned Masorete of his time, the famous Ya'acov b. Chayim b. Yitzhak Ibn Adoniyyahu. His signature (יטרְנִין יְבִירוּס) in Sephardic mixed (Rabbinic and current) character is to be found on the upper margin of leaf 829r. It has luckily just escaped being cut away by the binder (see the photograph accompanying this description). To this owner some of the catchwords and running titles are due. He was, no doubt, chiefly instrumental in preparing the Yerushalmi, of which fact however no bibliographer seems ever to have had a suspicion¹.

¹ This is the German Elkele. Zunz, Gesammelte Schriften, v. (Berlin, 1876, 8vo.) p. 65, knows only the holy name (יהי כל) Shime'on; see, however, רָבָא בר סה, v. (2nd ed. Wien, 1877, folio), Hepp, 21, 22.

² Certainly in title-loving Germany and elsewhere people would scarcely speak of a Rabbi as ר"ה; but in Italy (as in Spain and Portugal and other countries) there was greater simplicity in such matters at that period.

³ It is, no doubt, this owner, who, probably buying this copy from the heirs of R. Moshe (ג'וּרְשָא), used it himself for some time and then sold it to Bomberg the printer (see next paragraph). It is, also, no doubt, this owner, who largely assisted in, if not altogether supervised, the editio princeps of the
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(10) The next owner was Daniel, son of Bomberg (Rabbi Shmuel) of Antwerp, or simply of Flanders, who had a Hebrew press at Venice for more than thirty years, and who, though a Christian, has immortalized himself in the hearts of all Jews by what he did for them and their literature. The book came into Bomberg's possession, no doubt, shortly before the date of his edition (1523-4). Everything shows that the MS. was actually used in the printing office. There are numerous smudges of printer's ink throughout the book, and the pages and columns of the printed book are laid out in the MS. partly in the handwriting of the preceding owner (Ya'akov Iban Adoniyyahu) and partly in an Ashkenazic mixed (Germann and Italian) hand, which, if not that of Yisrael (Cornello) Adelkind, is in all probability that of R. David ben Yisrael, both of whom we know to have been employed by Bomberg as two of the correctors for, and of, his press. The phrase יִהְיֶהוּ בְּרָעָה יִישָׂרָאֵל, which occurs in Bomberg's (or rather Iban Adoniyyahu's) postscript to his edition of the Yerushalmi (v, leaf 61, column 2), seems to us to apply not only to the Midrash Torah, to which it has generally been given exclusive reference, but also to the Yerushalmi itself. It is the same hand which has made many corrections probably from the three other MSS. which we know were in the editor's hands in preparing Bomberg's edition. Another handwriting of this period occurs in two or three places (e.g. leaf 392), which but for the 3 we should almost identify as that of Eliezer Levita. It may however be that of R. Chiyum Meir, who also was one of the correctors for Bomberg's press.

Yerushalmi. And it is, no doubt, finally this owner who composed the titles, etc., in Aramaic, which are to be found in that edition, as will be seen from the wording of his postscript to the Tosefta Tiberiaca, with the commentary of Rabbenu Shimonon on it. By the apparently mere scribbling which is to be found on what is now the last page of the first volume and which we readily identify as this owner's, we are enabled to throw some light on this distinguished Rabbis's condition and state of mind in or about 1533-4. His money affairs must have been in a deplorable condition, and the vexations he suffered at the hands of some people (a man, to whom the expression מִנְיָא לְשׁוֹנָא יִשָׂרָאֵל התַּכִּיר points!) were very great indeed. It is perhaps to free himself from these that he became a Christian. This we may, no doubt, be brought into connexion also with Pelliccio da Prato (Paolo Pratesi, the editor of the Rabbis Bibles of 1517-18). Ya'akov b Chiyum Iban Adoniyyahu, it ought to be remarked, is not merely the first editor of the המרא, as it is, on the whole, known as yet, but was also an eminent Talmudist, as may be seen from the edition of the before-mentioned Tosefta Tiberiaca with the commentary of Rabbi Shimonon, which he revised.

Fralhali at one time disputed Steinschneider's statement to this effect; but after he had seen the MS. himself, he silently changed his opinion. The facts that the pages and columns of the printed book are all marked out in the MS., and that there are numerous smudges of printer's ink throughout, had, however, not been mentioned by Steinschneider.

OF THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD.

(11, 12) The next trace of ownership to be found in the MS. is contained in the following entry, on what is now the blank last page of the first volume, in a hand of the xvi century: Ex Bibliotheca Jo. Harrati Beisalarius. Emi a bomburai Coronatis xii.

It is impossible to say positively whether this Bomberg is Daniel the father, or Daniel the son. The father printed at Venice from 1516 to 1548 (see Steinschneider, Cataz Biblioth. Bodl., p. 297); but the latter year the name disappears, and his press passed into other hands. The son is mentioned in 1571 by Benedictus Arias Montanus in his preface to the Antwerp Polyglot, as having assisted him in the work. He is, no doubt, also the Bomberg by whose desire the Pentateuch and Haphtarot were printed at Antwerp by Plautin in 1566. Steinschneider mentions this edition, but seems not to have been aware of the passage in the preface to the Polyglot, or he would not have expressed his doubts as to whom Plautin meant. From the date and place of the purchase it is highly probable that the book was sold by the younger Bomberg before his return to the Netherlands.

Jean Hurault de Boisbailli was a member of the Boisbailli branch of the house of Hurault, Counts of Chiverny. Thanks to the care with which Steinschneider has given the details of the ownership of the Leyden MSS. (see his Index possessionum, we learn without difficulty not only that several of the Scaliger MSS. came from this owner, but also that they were bought by him at Venice while French Ambassador there in the years 1561-1563, either from Bomberg, or from the heirs of a certain R. Zalman (R. Zalman S'21). As Jean Hurault de Boisbailli died in 1582 on his way to England as Ambassador, ten years before Scaliger went to Leyden and while he was still living in France with his friend the Seigneur de la Rochebossy, it is easy to see how the Boisbailli MSS. have found their way into Scaliger's possession.

(13) The next owner was the famous linguist and scholar Joseph Justinus Scaliger, the son of the not less celebrated Julius Caesar Scaliger. He was honorary Professor at the University of Leyden; and bequeathed at his death, which took place in 1609, this and other valuable MSS. to that University. Each of the two volumes of this MS. bears on a printed label the words: 'Ex lepote illustris viri Josephi Scaligeris.'

3 His word's are: Daniel Bombergis pius et doctus vir, et paterni tum nominis, tum ingenii lucernae, Novi Testamenti antiquissimae exemplars Syriacam Coloniam Agrippinam ad nos attestat. quod quidem magno nobis facil iusi venit eum modo.' Comp. also the preface of Girolamo Floridus (Vol. V. of the Polyglot) whose words are: 'Habet autem vetustissimam exemplar aliam quam ex Oriente a Postello, sampulit, vt ipsam seriat, viri optimi et doctissimi Danieli Bombergi, ex Antvrgpia criminat, cui Hellenicet Chaldaic linguae promotionem accepta foro deservit; nos autem commune est beneficio Danielli Bombergi, qui vt nominis umquam virtutis lucernae ad rerum literarum pronemendum studiosissimae meritum.'

9 On the last page of Vol. I. and on the first page of Vol. II.
As regards the present state of the MS, the book is misbound, and the various pagination, both old and new, Hebrew and Arabic, are all incorrect. The proper order can, however, easily be ascertained by aid of the quires, which are doubly marked by the original quire on the recto-page of the first leaf in the right corner of the upper margin and on the verso-page of the last leaf in the left corner of the lower margin. The transpositions are the following. The three inner sheets of the 21st quire and the three inner sheets of the 68th quire are misplaced by the binder. Those belonging to the 69th quire have been inserted after the 7th leaf of the 1st quire; so that the leaves run thus: 1, 1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 4, 1, 5, 1, 6, 1, 7, 66, 3, 66, 4, 66, 5, 66, 6, 66, 7, 66, 8, 1, 9, 1, 10. Those belonging to the 21st quire have been inserted in the 69th quire, so that the leaves run thus: 66, 1, 21, 8, 66, 2, 21, 4, 21, 5, 21, 6, 21, 7, 66, 9, 21, 8, 66, 10. As all the quires except the last (67th) run in tens, it will be seen at once, that what we call in our description leaf 429 is the last leaf of the 42nd quire, leaf 527 will be the 7th leaf of the 59th quire, and so on. As the sheet forming the outside of the 37th quire is only an afterthought, we call the two leaves of which it consists, 381 and 370, that the numeration is not complicated by this addition. The material condition of the MS is excellent.

Besides the use made of this MS, for the editto principis, it was again collated for a new edition of the Yerushalmi with a commentary, &c. by the late Dr Z. Frankel. Unfortunately only the first three Massikhtot of the first Seder have appeared of this excellent work.

** particulière,**

1 This scholar was formerly Local Rabbi of Teplice and District Rabbi of Leitmeritz in Bohemia. He was afterwards Chief Rabbi of Dresden, whence he was called in 1864 to the Directorship of the Rabbinical Seminary of Breslau, where he died on Sabbath, 8 Mir 5655 (13 February 1875), deeply respected not only by his immediate disciples, but by all honest students of science of which he was so bright an exponent.

2 This expression occurs frequently as a concluding formula in books written in the far East (Yemen, Southern India, &c.), in place of the Hebrew יrazione רודס, which is found so constantly in books written and printed in the West. As this latter is commonly written וודס רודס, so the former is almost invariably written וודס יراحة, so the difference is only in the accents which, with other grammatical matters, stands at the head of an early paper copy of the Pentateuch, brought from Yemen and now to be found among the rich stores of Mr Bernard Quaritch, who rarely allows any literary treasures to pass him by.

THE PALESTINIAN RECEPTION OF THE TALMUD.

Or the two Talmudim, which had for centuries to fight for their existence, the Palestinian recension, commonly, but by mistake, called "Yerushalmi," had to contend with by far the more powerful enemies of the two. The Babylonian recension, or "Babli," as it is correctly called, had certainly raised the ire, not merely of the rulers of the Church, but also of the civil Governments. Informed by renegades of its pretendedly dangerous doctrines and tendencies against Church and State, Popes and Kings several times proscribed it, and condemned not merely the innocuous book to the flames but its votaries also to the extreme penalty of the law. In vain! According to the law of nature, pressure begets counter-pressure, and the Babli thus not merely survived the machinations of its enemies, but, like the people with whose life it had in the course of ages become interwoven and identified, it flourished. The more they afflicted it, the more it grew and spread. Not so the "Yerushalmi." This recension was considered among non-Jews to be comparatively innocuous—a glorious, indeed, that whenever a Jew or a Christian (like Reuchlin; see Rabbinische, Fariasi Lestiones, viii., in the account of Codex xxv., note) wished to avert from himself the suspicion of having in his house a volume of the Babli, he wrote on its outside יר귤ל מירא, or Talmud Hierosolymitanum. Who, then, were the Yerushalmi's deadly foes? Long neglect of it, and consequent ignorance, on the one hand, and the high authority of the Babli, on the other. Although the "Yerushalmi" is (except in size and correctness of text) every way superior to the Babli—indeed, in conciseness, and lucidity of style, in the value of its contents, &c.—yet the persecution to which the Babli was exposed increased the veneration for it day by day, in addition to the fact that most of the Jews had received it from the Geonim (Heads of the Babylonian Academies). These Geonim very naturally preferred the Babli, partly because they considered it their own, and partly, to do them justice, because they thought it more correct and trustworthy, it being the work of teachers living at a later period (הומ), who thoroughly know, had carefully examined, and only after mature consideration had rejected, sayings and decisions of the teachers of an earlier age (הומ). Haskalah matters, if found in the Babli, were therefore always decided from the standpoint of the Babli; and only when not to be found there was recourse had to the "Yerushalmi." Now, the longer this was the case, the more the want of knowledge as regards the "Yerushalmi"
increased. The ignorance respecting it may be better imagined, when the fact is stated, that Rab Soladyah (the Gauin par excellence), a man of not merely vast philosophical, but Talmudical learning also, had actually to learn a portion of its contents from anti-Rabbinic Jews (יַעָבִיד). A book so neglected, it will surprise no one to learn, lost by degrees not only its correctness, but also portions of its contents. The "Yerushalmi," which no doubt at one time extended over all the six Sederim of the Mishnah, consists now of less than two-thirds of its original extent. True, some scholars, who we feel sure have not deeply studied the book, maintain that it never contained more. They have, however, given no proof, and can give none, for this extraordinary statement. It will cost us, on the other hand, very little trouble to prove the contrary, partly by mere reasonable assumptions, but partly also by incontrovertible facts.

1. This peculiar recension was composed, as its name, even in its mistaken form, correctly indicates, in Palestine. Now, in Palestine many laws only applicable in the Holy Land (נֵבְעָדָה לָשׁוֹן הָעָרֶבֶּתָה) were practised for hundreds of years after the destruction of the Temple; while in Babylon they of course never had been practised. We find, therefore, that while the Seder Zara'it (with the exception of the first treatise Berakhot, which is applicable everywhere) indeed Gemara to all but this one treatise, the Palestinian recension has, to this day, Gemara to all eleven Masachoth of the Seder. Again, the hopes of a speedy restoration were naturally, at the sight of the Holy Places, greater among the Jews of Palestine than among those of Babylon. We find, therefore, that while the Babli has no Gemara of its own on Masachoth Sheqalim, the "Yerushalmi" has (that of the Babli being notoriously Palestinian). Is it now, on the other hand, likely that the Babli should have Gemara on Zohakhim, Menachoth, etc., Masachoth, which contain only נָבְעָדָה לָשׁוֹן הָעָרֶבֶּתָה (i.e., matters applicable again in Messianic times), and the "Yerushalmi" should never have had them?

2. It can have escaped few real Talmudic and Midrashic scholars that a goodly portion of the so-called Midrash Rabba, and other Midrashim, can be literally traced to the "Yerushalmi" as it now exists; while other passages, though absolutely identical in subject and language, cannot. Is it not a reasonable assumption that the passages now not traceable were also taken from the "Yerushalmi," only from the portions now missing? Should the "Yerushalmi" ever be found in its entirety (and we have, after the discovery of the lost Mishnah of that recension, not given up the hope of its re-discovery), the whole Midrash will, we doubt not, be traced to it as its original source.

3. Is it possible, is it conceivable, that a treatise like Chullin, which not merely treats of matters of everyday life, and which matters were, according to the testimony of the Babli itself (T. B. Chullin, 110 b), better studied and known in Palestine than in Babylon, although applicable everywhere—is it conceivable, we say, that such a Masachoth should never have had a Palestinian Gemara?

4. Moreover, Maimonides (twelfth to thirteenth century) states distinctly (in the Introduction to his Mishnah-commentary) that he had the Talmud "Yerushalmi" on the first five Sederim complete, while of the sixth Seder there was only Gemara on one treatise (Niddah). Now, people may try to weaken the force of his declaration, to explain it away; in vain! Is the explanation that he had a leaf or two of the fifth Seder a satisfactory one? How many leaves had he, and of what treatise of the Seder Qidushin, to justify him in his expression that that Seder was perfect? Where were the treatises of "Eduyyoth and Aboth of the fourth Seder? Is an exact scholar like Maimonides likely to have used such an expression without proper warrant for it?

5. But we have a better proof still of the gradual loss of portions of the "Yerushalmi," from another side. The Tosaphists (Rabbis of Northern France, of England, and of Southern Germany, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries) unquestionably yet held that Talmud on the whole of Masachoth Niddah (that on the seventh Peser is actually referred to, T. B. Niddah, 66 a, 72 a 218), the first); although now, as everyone knows, it reaches only to within a few lines of the fourth Peser. We thus see, that between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries (when the "Yerushalmi" was first printed) more than three entire Peserim of a most important Masachoth were lost.

Judging, then, from the known to the unknown, and combining reasonable assumptions with historical facts, there can scarcely be a doubt as to the existence, at one time, of a Yerushalmi Talmud on all the six Sederim.

There is, however, at the present moment, a matter of even greater importance before us than the discussion on the existence of a Yerushalmi Talmud on the whole Mishnah; it is the peculiar recension of the Mishnah itself on which this Talmud rests. Many may know that this peculiar Mishnah deviates somewhat from the two other recensions—i.e., the one on which Babli rests, and the other which constitutes the Mishnikoth as a separate work. Few know that the Yerushalmi Mishnah, even in its present corrupt state, is greatly superior to the two before-named recensions. Fewer still know that this corruption is traceable to two causes, one a natural one (mistakes made by successive copyists down to 1280), and the other an artificial one (confessed tampering by the copyist of the MS. on which principally the editions are based). But very few indeed are aware of the following facts:—1. The catch-words of the Mishnah in this Gemara, which differ considerably from the Mishnah as it stands at the head of the Peser, are remnants of the genuine recension.

* We hope one day to discuss this matter more fully in a more suitable place—i.e., in the Introduction to a critical edition of the "Yerushalmi," for which we are now collecting materials, and which we shall take in hand as soon as our critical edition of Qimachi's Entire Commentary on the Psalms, now in the press, is finished.
2. In the fourteenth century (early) the whole of the six Sederim of the Mishnah of this peculiar recension existed, and was known, in Spain (see our *Catalogue*, ii. p. 2, Note 2). 3. Within the first quarter of the sixteenth century there were known only four more Peraqim of this Mishnah than the four copies contained, which were under the editor's eye (see our *Occasional Notices*, &c., No. 1; Cambridge, 1878, svo. p. 6, Note). 4. For the last nine years a copy of the whole Mishnah has been preserved in the University Library at Cambridge (MS. Add. 479. 1). This copy, whatever its drawbacks may be, proves on examination to be the long-lost recension on which the "Yerushalmi" rests, and to contain the uncorrupted and pristine text thereof.

*Extract from Exercus III* (Talmud) to the *Catalogue* of Hebrew Manuscripts preserved in the University Library, Cambridge; by Dr S. M. Schiller-Szinessy.
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**CATALOGUE**

or

**HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS.**

---

**TALMUDIC LITERATURE.**

---

**Halakhah.**

Text.

No. 73.

Paper, in folio, 11½ in. x 8½ in.; 250 leaves, mostly 6-sheet quires, 30 lines; Rabbinic character; Greek Sephardic handwriting of the xivth century.

The whole Mishnah according to the recension of the Palestinian Talmud.¹

Leaf 1: I. Zera'IM: Berakhot; 2, Peah; 3, Demai; 4, Kilayim; 5, Sheq'ith; 6, Terumoth; 7, Ma'aser Shenai; 8, Ma'aser Rishon; 9, Ma'aser Specimenes.

¹ The Talmud-text and its commentaries are included under the head of Halakhah, because of the prevalence of Halakhic matter in them. On the terms Halakhah and Agadah see Exercus III.

² The first quire has 5 sheets only.

³ On the age of the Mishnah, its mode of originating, its various recensions and their relation to one another, the order and number of the Sederim and Maschaboth, Peraqim and Halakhah, &c., see Exercus III.

⁴ The order of the Mishnah will be discussed in Exercus III. But we wish only to show here, how cautious one must be not to pronounce as mistakes things that appear somewhat strange. The anomaly of Ma'aser Shenai standing before Ma'aser Rishon has not been noticed, as far as we are aware. And yet
M. Berakhoth ends (leaf 32) :

M. Peah ends (leaf 6) :

M. Kilayim begins (leaf 9) :

M. Kilayim ends (leaf 15) :

M. Shabbath concludes (leaf 17) :

M. Bikkurim, and with it S. Zera'im, ends (leaf 32) :

Compare groups Berakhoth vs. M. Bikkurim.
CATALOGUE OF HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS. [No. 73]

S. Mo'ed, M. Shabbath, begins (leaf 32):

M. Sukkah begins (leaf 56):

M. Betzah begins (leaf 59):

M. Ta'anityoth begins (leaf 62):

M. Megillah begins (leaf 66):

M. Nasi'iqin (commonly called Mo'ed Qatan), and with it S. Mo'ed, ends (leaf 69):

M. Sota, and with it S. Nasi'iqin, ends (leaf 106):

1. Pereq xxt. of M. Shabbath begins (leaf 389) thus:

2. Compare C. Taylor, Sayings, &c. p. 56. This passage, which occurs in M. Betzah in no printed edition, is to be found in the ordinary editions in M. Edryo'ut vs. 3, but not in our MS. there. The remark of R. Yomtah Lopaman Beller there, that this passage must be altogether spurious, or the Gemara in Betzah would have referred to it, cannot, in the face of numerous similar examples, stand the test of criticism.
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Baba Tiniyana begins (leaf 119):

M. Sheebitath Chullin begins (leaf 163):

M. Chullin ends (leaf 168):

M. Bekhoroth ends (leaf 173):

M. 'Amahin begins (leaf 178):

M. 'Amahin ends (leaf 182):

M. Nezizin (Baba Bathra) begins (leaf 193):

M. Edryoth ends (leaf 194):

M. Horayoth, with it S. Nezizin, begins (leaf 194):

S. Qodashin, M. Zebachin, begins (leaf 194):

M. Memuchoth ends (leaf 163):

M. Qinnin begins (leaf 192):

Comp. C. Taylor, Sayings, loc. p. 56, and T. B. Rosh Hanishamah, 31;
S. Taboroth, M. Kolim, begins (leaf 192):

M. Oholotet ends (leaf 214):

M. Negaim ends (leaf 221):

M. Parah begins (leaf 221):

M. Makkshirin begins (leaf 240):

M. Yadnahm ends (leaf 249):

From the transliteration of Alexandria, it is clear that either our scribal or the scribal of some previous copy of the work, was an Aramaic-speaking Jew.

Pereq pr. 9 runs thus:

Pereq pr. 6, 7, 8, 9 (all four comody written together as 9) runs thus:

Pereq pr. 6, 7, 8, 9 (all four comody written together as 5) runs thus:

The matter which is found after this in the ordinary editions, and which is given there in the names of R. Yehoshua b. Levi and R. Shime'on b. ha-Koton, is most assuredly a later addition.

The Mishnah is, of course, of all-absorbing importance to the Rabbinic Jew only. In his eyes it contains, as far as its Halakhic matter is concerned (and Halakhah forms the overwhelming part of the Mishnah), practically speaking, the only true interpretation, even as it contains the never-ceasing and ever-living continuation, of the Pentateuch (see Exodus III). Of great im-

As this passage is one of some moment for the Canon of the Hebrew Scrip-
sions, however, that Mishnah on which the Talmud Yerushalmi is founded, particularly and justly claims our attention, containing as it does, even in its present imperfect or corrupt state, readings superior not only to those of the Mishnah on which the Rashi rests, but also to those of the Mishnah itself. As a distinct work. To this ought to be added, (1) that the printed editions of the Yerushalmi embrace scarcely two-thirds of the whole, (2) that of the four MSS. from which the first edition was originally made, only one is now known to exist, and (3) that one, however valuable for this very reason and other reasons, was, particularly as regards the Mishnah, by no means the most genuine, or even the most correct one. Now the MS. before us contains the whole Mishnah, and represents mostly, both by what it has and by what it omits, the genuine pristine text on which the Yerushalmi rests. Many of its readings, now for the first time actually found and evidently correct, spread over all branches of literature, such as lexicography, grammar, history, geography, &c.

The scribe's name seems to have been וֶּלֶדֶי, לוֹדֶי, or some other commencing with ל, as the lines are frequently filled up with that letter (see Buxtorf I). The hand is a very distinct one and full of character. To judge from the nature of some of the mistakes to be met with here, the scribe seems to have been a faithful copyist, albeit not a very intelligent one. He apparently copied right and wrong with equal zeal; and in the pointed words, which frequently occur in this Mishnah, he has occasionally imposed importance, however, it must also be to the Christian divine, whom it materially helps, by the kindred matter it contains, in the understanding of his Scriptures. But the general scholar also is considerably aided in his pursuits by the study of it, since it contains vast treasures of linguistic, historical, geographical, grammatical, ethnographical, mythological information, &c., quite indispensable to him.

1 Of the six Sedarim into which the Mishnah is divided, only the first three are complete in the printed editions of the Yerushalmi. Of the fourth Seder there are fragments in the Rabh, Babli, and Ashoth are wanting. The fifth and sixth Sedarim (except the first three Pesaqin and a small part of the fourth Peseq of Kiddish, which belongs to the last Seder) are entirely missing.

2 Having been allowed the unrestricted use of this noble MS. for many months by the kind offices of Prof. M. J. de Goeje, the "Interpreter Legalis Warminsteri" in the University of Leyden, we have given the results of our examination in No. 1 of our "(25522 יְסִירָה, יְסִירָה of Hebrew Manuscripts." (Cambridge, 1878, 2d.)

3 Many readings established partly by the deep research and partly by the critical acumen of two great Rabbis, separated by centuries and countries, but united by love and zeal for the Yerushalmi (Shelah and Yehoshua b. Joshua b. Zakkariya b. Ya'akov Frankel), are here to be met with as plain and ordinary text. See Talmud Jerusalem, ordo Servium, Meguntius, 1675, folio; and Talmud Jerusalemmum. I. Windthorst, 1675, 4to; II. Frutcherius, 1675, 4to, passim.

4 See the specimen-pages in C. Taylor's Sayings; &c. p. 34, line 29, and p. 35, line 24.

5 See the specimen-pages in C. Taylor's Sayings; &c. p. 34, line 29, and p. 35, line 24.

6 The scribe's name seems to have been וֶּלֶדֶי, לוֹדֶי, or some other commencing with ל, as the lines are frequently filled up with that letter (see Buxtorf I). The hand is a very distinct one and full of character. To judge from the nature of some of the mistakes to be met with here, the scribe seems to have been a faithful copyist, albeit not a very intelligent one. He apparently copied right and wrong with equal zeal; and in the pointed words, which frequently occur in this Mishnah, he has occasionally imposed importance, however, it must also be to the Christian divine, whom it materially helps, by the kindred matter it contains, in the understanding of his Scriptures. But the general scholar also is considerably aided in his pursuits by the study of it, since it contains vast treasures of linguistic, historical, geographical, grammatical, ethnographical, mythological information, &c., quite indispensable to him.

1 Of the six Sedarim into which the Mishnah is divided, only the first three are complete in the printed editions of the Yerushalmi. Of the fourth Seder there are fragments in the Rabh, Babli, and Ashoth are wanting. The fifth and sixth Sedarim (except the first three Pesaqin and a small part of the fourth Peseq of Kiddish, which belongs to the last Seder) are entirely missing.

2 Having been allowed the unrestricted use of this noble MS. for many months by the kind offices of Prof. M. J. de Goeje, the "Interpreter Legalis Warminsteri" in the University of Leyden, we have given the results of our examination in No. 1 of our "(25522 יְסִירָה, יְסִירָה of Hebrew Manuscripts." (Cambridge, 1878, 2d.)

3 Many readings established partly by the deep research and partly by the critical acumen of two great Rabbis, separated by centuries and countries, but united by love and zeal for the Yerushalmi (Shelah and Yehoshua b. Joshua b. Zakkariya b. Ya'akov Frankel), are here to be met with as plain and ordinary text. See Talmud Jerusalem, ordo Servium, Meguntius, 1675, folio; and Talmud Jerusalemmum. I. Windthorst, 1675, 4to; II. Frutcherius, 1675, 4to, passim.

4 See the specimen-pages in C. Taylor's Sayings; &c. p. 34, line 29, and p. 35, line 24.

6 The scribe's name seems to have been וֶּלֶדֶי, לוֹדֶי, or some other commencing with ל, as the lines are frequently filled up with that letter (see Buxtorf I). The hand is a very distinct one and full of character. To judge from the nature of some of the mistakes to be met with here, the scribe seems to have been a faithful copyist, albeit not a very intelligent one. He apparently copied right and wrong with equal zeal; and in the pointed words, which frequently occur in this Mishnah, he has occasionally imposed importance, however, it must also be to the Christian divine, whom it materially helps, by the kindred matter it contains, in the understanding of his Scriptures. But the general scholar also is considerably aided in his pursuits by the study of it, since it contains vast treasures of linguistic, historical, geographical, grammatical, ethnographical, mythological information, &c., quite indispensable to him.

1 Of the six Sedarim into which the Mishnah is divided, only the first three are complete in the printed editions of the Yerushalmi. Of the fourth Seder there are fragments in the Rabh, Babli, and Ashoth are wanting. The fifth and sixth Sedarim (except the first three Pesaqin and a small part of the fourth Peseq of Kiddish, which belongs to the last Seder) are entirely missing.

2 Having been allowed the unrestricted use of this noble MS. for many months by the kind offices of Prof. M. J. de Goeje, the "Interpreter Legalis Warminsteri" in the University of Leyden, we have given the results of our examination in No. 1 of our "(25522 יְסִירָה, יְסִירָה of Hebrew Manuscripts." (Cambridge, 1878, 2d.)

3 Many readings established partly by the deep research and partly by the critical acumen of two great Rabbis, separated by centuries and countries, but united by love and zeal for the Yerushalmi (Shelah and Yehoshua b. Joshua b. Zakkariya b. Ya'akov Frankel), are here to be met with as plain and ordinary text. See Talmud Jerusalem, ordo Servium, Meguntius, 1675, folio; and Talmud Jerusalemmum. I. Windthorst, 1675, 4to; II. Frutcherius, 1675, 4to, passim.

4 See the specimen-pages in C. Taylor's Sayings; &c. p. 34, line 29, and p. 35, line 24.
The fragment is so small, that it is dangerous to draw any large conclusions from it. It may, of course, be a portion of a Talmud MS., in which the whole Peroch of the Mishnah stood at the head of the Gemara belonging to it; as in the ordinary copies of the Yerushalmi and the old fragments of the Babil Pesachim and Yoma described below, and as in other MSS. elsewhere. It is again barely possible, that the other side of the leaf, which now appears blank, has at one time contained writing which is now completely obliterated. If this be so, any inference from this Massikhta being separately copied, of course, fails to the ground.

(2) In this fragment are preserved the few readings which are generally recognised as distinguishing the Mishnah of the first Peroch of this Massikhta from the Mishnah as found in the corresponding places in the Talmud Babbli and in the Mishnayoth.

(3) It agrees, on the whole, with MS. Add. 470.1, described in the immediately preceding article. A comparison with the Leyden MS. (Sed. Heb. 3) shows an entire correspondence with the catch-words of the Mishnah as found in the Gemara; though it differs from the Mishnah-text preceding the Gemara, which, however, is known to have been tampered with and emended by the scribe of that MS. (See our account of that MS. in nos. 12771 and 12772, or Occasional Notices, &c. No. I., Cambridge, 1875, Svo.) The printed editions stand in such close relation to the Leyden MS., that what is said of the one applies equally to the other.

The state of this fragment is bad; the writing can only be deciphered with difficulty. The preservation is, indeed, only due to its having been used to line the binding of a ninth century MS., written apparently in Morocco (Add. 1297.1).

[Library-mark, Add. 1297.1; bought in 1875 from Fischl Hirsch.]

No. 75.

Paper, in folio, 10½ in. x 7½ in.; 716 leaves, 6-sheet quires, 2 columns, 34 lines; the text in square character and the commentary in Rabbinic, African handwriting of the eighteenth century, dated in the first decade of Tamuz 5522.

According to John's Tables, the first ten days of Tamuz, 5522, correspond to June 4—13, 1562.
The Mishnah with the commentary of R. Meshoch b. Maimon (Rambam, Maimonides) on the whole of it translated by various scholars, with anonymous unknown Haggahoth; and with the commentary of R. Shelomo b. Yitzchahq of Troyes (Rashi, Isacides) on part of it; defective.

Leaf 1, Ibn Chazri's preface: 1, Maimonides' general introduction; 10, 1. Zeraim: Berakoth; 23, Pesah; 32, Demah; 41, Kiluyoth; 54, Shabbath; 66, Terumoth; 79, Moaszer Rishon; 84, Moaszer Sheni; 92, Chaloth; 99, Derishoth ha-Perah; 102, Bikkurim; 108, enumeration of the Maschithoth of this Seder and their Peraquern; Maimonides rhyme for the whole Seder; and the scribe's subscription; 109, blank; Leaf 109, H. Mo'ed: Shabbath; 182, Evrinah; 149, Pesahim; 161, Shagalah; 170, Yoma; 178, Succoth; 184, Yomim (Batzot); 189, Rosh Hashanah; 194, Tovaniythoth; 197, Megillah; 202, Moad Qatan; 205, Chagigah; 209, Enumeration of the Maschithoth of this Seder and their Peraquern; Postscript and rhymes by Meshoch b. Maimonides; 219, probably blank, wanting. Leaf 219.

11. Nasim: Introduction to this Seder by Ibn Nasiyyah; 214, Yeabnoth.

1 This introduction to the whole work, because it stands at the head of Zeraim, which is the first Seder, is ordinarily, but by mistake, called *שהה ידכ שמי התשא ידכ שמי התשא* instead of *שהה ידכ שמי התשא ידכ שמי התשא*

2 The prefatory remarks by the translator, ordinarily to be found in the editions, are not in this MS.

3 The spurious Peraquern is also found here, and is duly superscribed *נין* in the margin. It is, however, not merely not committed on, but is not even counted either in the special summing up of the Peraquern at the end of the Maschithoth, or in the general summing up of them at the end of the Seder.

4 The prefatory rhymes and remarks of the translator (given according to the 26* and in the 32 words*), which are ordinarily to be found in the editions, are not in this MS.

5 In the enumeration of the Maschithoth of the Seder, &c this Maschith is simply called *נין* (comp. MS. Add. 1470, 1, described in No. 78 above).

6 This more common name is given in the enumeration of the Maschithoth of the Seder.

7 This postscript and these rhymes are not to be found in the ordinary editions. The *editio princeps* (Noyes, 1495, folio), however, has them on leaf 108.
Rabinovics, by copying them into his work, Varias Lectiones in Mekhaneh et in Talnum Babyloniacum . . . (Moschelli, 1687, 8vo.) p. 75, has the merit of having made them accessible to the general reader.

8 Though we have here the translator's preface, we do not find the postscript, and his letter to R. Shelomo b. Nasiyyah concerning this translation and the latter's answer to it. All these are found together in the ordinary editions before the commentary to Maschithoth Yebamuth, whilst the first edition has, with more propriety, the preface, which ought to come first, before the commentary (leaf 169), and the postscript and letters, which ought to come last, after the commentary (leaf 121).
The commentary by Maimonides, which extends over the whole Mishnah, was written originally (like several other works by the same author) in Arabic. It was afterwards translated into Rabbinic by various scholars, at various places and various times; the whole, however, being finished before the close of the thirteenth century. Thus:

I. The Seder Zera'os was translated by the celebrated poet R. Yehudah b. Shelomoh Ibn Charizi at Marseilles during the author's life-time.1 This translation unquestionably extended over at least the whole of this Seder2. Towards the close of the thirteenth century, however, the translator of the Seder Moed, being unable to find more than the first five Massikhtoth, of Ibn Charizi's translation, himself translated afer the last six Massikhtoth of the first Seder after having accomplished the task specially allotted to him. It is this second translation that is now commonly known, and which is found in this MS. as elsewhere.

II. The Seder Moed was finished by R. Yoseph b. Yitzchak Ibn Habib, at Husca, in the summer of 1297.

III. The Seder Nashim was translated by R. Yehudah b. Mosheh Ibn Aqeel, surnamed וirical, with the assistance of R. Chayyim b. Shelomoh the Physician, surnamed Ibn Sassan; and finished also at Husca in 1298.

1 This may be seen from the expression וב שם הכות (printed editions וב שם הכות). i.e. according to, in Ibn Charizi's preface.
2 There results a good deal of confusion on this subject, both concerning the extent of this translation, the persons for whom, and the place where, it was made. We believe we have found the way to remove the apparent contradiction, into which Ibn Charizi is supposed to have fallen. In his preface he says that the learned, pious, and noble Jews of Marseilles requested him to translate for them the Mishnah-commentary (עなかなか וארינ באל תדעיה), of which he must have finished for them, at least, the first Seder, which he afterwards merely copied (בשא הריבע באל תדעיה; see later) for R. Yonathan Hazzaken of Loael and his household or college. It must be borne in mind, that, although Ibn Charizi himself used the term עなかなか, in the sense of translation, it is more frequently used for a mere copy. As the text of the poem and its superscription, bearing on this point, deviate somewhat and for the better, in our MS. of the Mishnah (MS. Add. 1319, leaf 141) from those communicated by Delitzsch, in the Literaturblatt des Orients (vtt. No. 30), we supply both:

We see here distinctly, that all the eleven Massikhtoth must have then already existed in a translation by Ibn Charizi. This is also borne out to some extent by the wording of אקרד (Preface to Terumoth) who says... zend am... . . . , אקרד (and not אקרד את תודע) אל מעתה להרוא את תודע אל מעתה אל מעָתי, etc., דועה.

4 Catholics under the Sign of The Cross,
לא הוכן読ם.
למען לשלוח:
1. בודגום.
2. בודגום.
3. בודגום.
4. בודגום.
5. בודגום.
6. בודגום.
7. בודגום.
8. בודגום.
9. בודגום.
10. בודגום.
11. בודגום.
12. בודגום.
13. בודגום.
14. בודגום.
15. בודגום.
16. בודגום.
17. בודגום.
18. בודגום.
19. בודגום.
20. בודגום.
21. בודגום.
22. בודגום.
23. בודגום.
24. בודגום.
25. בודגום.
26. בודגום.
27. בודגום.
28. בודגום.
29. בודגום.
30. בודגום.
31. בודגום.
32. בודגום.
33. בודגום.
34. בודגום.
35. בודגום.
36. בודגום.
37. בודגום.
38. בודגום.
39. בודגום.
40. בודגום.
41. בודגום.
42. בודגום.
43. בודגום.
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