IIMM's very title — ... Medieval Manuscripts in Latin Script — excludes Hebrew manuscripts, but that does not mean necessarily that it may not be of some value to the study of books written in Hebrew script as well.\(^{11}\) Especially when having to deal with a large number of manuscripts within a limited period of time most of IIMM's principles may prove to be quite useful to Hebrew codicologists. What should be kept in mind, however, is that Hebrew codicologists have at their permanent disposal the catalogue of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, which includes the majority of existing Hebrew manuscripts. This catalogue provides not only elementary descriptions of the listed manuscripts, but, in most cases, it also gives access to a microfilm of a particular manuscript. Furthermore, there is the SFAR-DATA database of the Hebrew Palaeography Project. Therefore IIMM may not be very useful for future Hebrew codicology, but in certain special cases some of its basic principles need to be considered.

As has been stressed already the very fact that material is being listed and thus made accessible is more important than the actual model of description adopted. This is best illustrated in the recent five-volume listing of the Hebrew manuscripts of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York.\(^\text{13}\) Its compiler, Jay Rosner, formulates the following goal:\(^\text{13}\)

> [The Guide] has been compiled in order to provide, in brief format, the following basic data about its Hebrew manuscripts: author, title or description of contents, date, script type, place, and foliation. [...] The quantity of manuscripts and the shortness of the time period made it impossible to undertake an original and thorough catalogue of the Collection.

The result is a modest listing, uncritical and with minimal descriptions of the manuscripts:\(^\text{14}\)

\[4460.\] Siddur (France). Sidur Tsharaf, ve-cod. 1294 France 289 l.

It must be admitted that, in certain cases, the descriptions in the Guide seem to be really too minimal and too uncritical. In such cases a comparison with the information included in J.P. Gumberg's IIMM descriptions, which, on the one hand, require a certain experience with the description of manuscripts, and, on the other hand, do not make much more time than the Guide's descriptions, may serve to prove the usefulness of some of IIMM's principles for Hebrew manuscript research. Most important, however, is the fact that the Guide happens to be the first comprehensive Hebrew manuscript listing ever, of the largest Jewish library (over 10,000 manuscript items) in the world.

\(^{11}\) It should be noted that the words 'in Latin script' were added only during the author's stay in Jerusalem in 1991, which resulted in the fourth elementary precursor, and are not to be found in earlier versions of IIMM.

\(^{12}\) See: ROYNER, Guide to the Hebrew Manuscript Collection.

\(^{13}\) ROYNER, Guide to the Hebrew Manuscript Collection 1, p. vii-viii.


\(^{15}\) It was decided therefore to refrain from direct references to this model in the discussion of the model of description presented here. Its basic principles are explained by M. BUT-ARID in his 'Premiers ristelhans' and are discussed in Chapter 2.

\(^{16}\) An overview of models from the non-Hebrew world may be found in PETRUSO, Discrizione. The most important Hebrew models have been discussed in Chapter 2. A discussion of the problems involved in cataloguing manuscripts with the help of a computer can be found in GRUIN, 'Plan for computer assisted codicography'.

\(^{17}\) Particularly in auction catalogues: Fine Judaica, lot 128; Judaica [1990], lots 458, 459 & 470, Judaica [1991], lot 478; also see: SCHÖNWER, 'Some Light Sheds.'
a more specific model of description. It was decided here, however, to adhere to the general outline under all circumstances.

- Data not incorporated into the descriptions are either non-existent or without any descriptive importance (according to the catalogue). The model offers the opportunity for an ideal description but should never become imperative.

- During the preparation of the catalogue considerable effort has been put into an attempt to formulate various levels of restrictiveness. It turned out to be practically (although not theoretically) impossible to define groups of manuscripts for which a certain characteristic should be recorded and groups for which it should not. The idea was therefore abandoned and the present arbitrary, but pragmatic, liberty came into its stead. In the descriptions proper any information inferred from the catalogue is given between square brackets.

- The technical parts of the description should be written as objectively as possible. Interpretation must wait until the evaluation, after all relevant information has been gathered.

- In most cases miscellany volumes, containing more than a single book, are described according to their so-called codicological units. Thus one volume may contain many separate manuscripts. Again, however, a certain liberty seems appropriate, especially in the case of relatively late miscellanies of limited importance.

A special problem related to the description of miscellany volumes is the question of where to include the descriptions of features shared by the different codicological units, such as the binding and possible users' annotations. It was decided to include these in the description of the first unit in the volume.

- Hebrew script is only included in the case of direct quotations from the manuscript described; in all other cases romanization is used. Texts are transcribed according to the rules of the Hebrew Palaeography Project.

**Heading**

The heading, meant for quick reference only, should contain:

- The present shelf-mark (and, if appropriate, codicological unit).

---

18 One could think for example of the outline of a description of a *kemakh* provided by Shalom Sabar in his *Kemakh*, p. 33-34.

19 This is in accordance with Otto Asal's notion that 'it goes without saying that the manner of description should vary according to the age and importance of the manuscripts; it does not however seem justified to postulate priorities or preferences categorically or a priori', asal, *Keeper of Manuscripts*, p. 9.

20 As in many ways very interesting attempts to define, what is called, 'the horizon of the codex', may be found in: S. Stekel, 'The Interpreted Text', he tentatively distinguishes between (1) the codex containing one work, (2) the homogeneous codex containing several works, (3) the composite codex containing several works and (4) the codex defining one work, i.e. combining pre-existing literary units into a new unique literary and bibliographical unit. Without detracting from the great importance of Sanché's classification (and he is, as far as I know, the first to attempt that), it may well be that further research will indicate that his categories are not all-inclusive. What to do for example with the admittedly rare case of a manuscript combining fragments from different manuscripts into one new codicological unit?

---

**Contents**

This section provides a formalized table of contents, from the first to the last page of the book block (i.e. the pages of the actual book, without later additions that do not form an integral part of the original, such as the flyleaves), without irrelevant additions and including possible blanks. Titlepages and colophons that do not contain much text may be included; longer texts are transcribed in the section 'History of the manuscript'. This inconsistency is necessary to ensure legibility of the table of contents. When a Hebrew title is mentioned in the manuscript it is provided in Hebrew script; otherwise either a romanized Hebrew title or an English description of the contents is given. In many cases the registration of *incipit* and *explicit* may also prove useful.

This table of contents of Hs. Ros. 657 may serve as an example:

Fol. 1r: Titlepage:

Fol. 1v: *incipit*: דודו רוחא ע"ש ע' ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי ה"ש דודו רוחא ע"ש ידוהי

Fol. 2r: congratulatory introduction by the author/scribe.

Fol. 2v: blank

Fols. 3r-14r: text

Fol. 14v: blank

---

22 Kis, Catalogue, p. xx.
CHAPTER 3

Codicology

This section, printed in smaller type, provides a codicological description of the manuscript, i.e. a description of the physical characteristics of a handwritten book. It is divided into three parts, 'book block', 'script', and 'binding', separated by a blank line for quick reference.

Book block

NUMBER OF LEAVES—The actual number of leaves should always be recorded, regardless of the presence of foliations and/or paginations. It is library policy to foliate unnumbered manuscripts, as a result of which all manuscripts have a numbering, but mention should also be made of other system(s) employed. Chronology is indicated according to the following scheme: original—contemporary—old—modern.

MATERIAL—A distinction should be made between parchment manuscripts, paper manuscripts and manuscripts that combine both materials. In the case of parchment manuscripts at least a distinction between hair and flesh side, an arrangement according to Gregory’s rule and the color and the thickness of the material are to be recorded, if possible. In the case of handmade paper the main watermark(s) can and, in the case of substantial books, should be mentioned, while occasionally a more detailed analysis of the paper should be carried out (as an identified watermark may provide a terminus post quem). The description of the condition of the writing-material usually will be limited to a few words only, although, especially for medieval manuscripts, a more detailed description of, for example a staining pattern, may prove to be useful.

INK—The basic color and the various shades of the ink used in the manuscript will be described according to the following range: black—greyish—dark brown—brown—light brown. Different colors (usually red) will, of course, be recorded as well.

MEASUREMENTS—Measurements are given in millimeters and are presented as follows, provided the detail suggested is in any manner in accordance with the nature and relative importance of the manuscript. In the case that it is not, only the height and width of the page are provided.

height x width: top margin x bottom margin x inner margin x outer margin. number of columns x number of lines (10 lines = XN lines (if appropriate)

(New line) number of characters in 5 lines of text (if appropriate)

A MODEL OF DESCRIPTION FOR HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS

In the case of varying and/or more complicated layouts, for example in certain medieval manuscripts, it may be necessary to provide these data for more than one page.

A practical problem is measurement. The following drawings illustrate the method followed here. The drawing on the left illustrates the regular situation, where measurements are taken along the inner and lower margins of the text area; the drawing on the right describes a more complex situation in which a certain page is not rectangular. In such a case the most extreme height and/or width is provided (given that, in view of the appearance of the manuscript, that makes sense). All drawings describe recto pages.

The following drawings illustrate the measuring of the text area and the margins, in the cases of one and three column texts.

---

23 This section has benefited greatly from J.P. Gumbert’s unpublished draft of an introduction to codicology, which he generously put at my disposal. Of course it has benefited perhaps even more from Malachi Beit-Arié’s Hebrew Codicology Collette Stair’s very informative recent publication on the letter א in אאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאאם

24 This system is a slight variation on the one proposed by J.P. Gumbert in his aforementioned unpublished introduction to codicology, which in turn is a variation on an unpublished system by D. Muruzel (to find an emendation of L. Gilissen’s formula). Square brackets indicate (cropped) page borders.
The foregoing will suffice for parchment manuscripts. For paper manuscripts measurements in millimeters are given as well: when handmade paper was used the bibliographical format is also provided. At the same time it was decided not to include folding formats of parchment manuscripts, as this catalogue is not the appropriate place, and the corpus of manuscripts to describe is unsuitable for pioneering research on such a technical detail.

Text is measured from the first ruled line to the last in the case of the presence of an extra ruled line below the text, or from the ‘x-height’ of the letter to the base of the last line of text if such an extra line is absent. The ten lines of text are always measured from ruled line (or from the ‘x-height’ of the letter) to (assumed) ruled line (i.e. the eleventh).

COLLATION – The best way to describe the structure of a quire is a drawing. As fortunately quite a few manuscripts have a regular quire structure and as drawings usually take up too much space, a descriptive formula is to be preferred. From the many alternatives the one designed by Neil R. Ker was chosen, because of its wide acceptance, and due to its readability without lengthy explanation. This formula is based largely on those used in the analytical bibliography of printed books. Each quire is assigned a running number, followed by a superscript number indicating the number of leaves in the quire: 1q, i.e. the first quire of eight leaves (four bifolia). Sequences of identical quires may be put together (provided there is no textual or other caesura between two quires): 1-155, i.e. the first 15 quires of eight leaves (four bifolia) each. Irregular quires are considered as diverging from the natural situation. Thus an original fifth quire of eight leaves of which the last leaf is now missing, will be described as: 5q wants 8, while an original fourth quire of seven leaves with the single leaf added in the second half of the quire after the second bifolium, will be described as: 4q + 1 leaf after 5. Another possible quire could be: 4q + 1 leaf inserted after 5, which indicates that the inserted leaf is not original.

In case an instructive drawing may prove to be necessary the following basic presentation of the quire is to be preferred:

![Quire Diagram]

25 The state of research on the topic is reflected in Chapter 4: ‘Le pliage comme mode de construction du cahier’, of Limarre, Introduction, p. 69-94.
26 See the recent discussion of the different methods in: Bichotte, ‘Methoden der Lagenbeschreibung.’
27 Ker, Catalogue p. xxi, where more examples of irregular quire structure are provided.

A MODEL OF DESCRIPTION FOR HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS

CATCHWORDS AND SIGNATURES – Of the various ways of preserving the correct order of the quires, sheets and leaves, catchwords, usually written somewhere on the last page of a quire and consisting of the first word(s) of the next quire, are the most commonly used in Hebrew manuscripts of both the medieval and the post-medieval period. Another way to preserve the right order of quires is the assignment of a running number to each quire, usually called a signature. The use of these is less common than the use of catchwords. Catchwords, signatures and other ways to preserve the right order of quires are recorded according to the rules formulated by the Hebrew Palaeography Project. 28 It should be mentioned that the use of catchwords and signatures depends on the nature of the manuscript. A medieval or post-medieval luxury manuscript is more likely to have them than a fourteenth-century autograph, while in many post-medieval manuscripts, especially those titled ‘br-ne-zayt amstelnd’, scribes have treated catchwords so carelessly that one is led to believe that therein they serve an esthetic rather than a practical purpose.

LAYOUT: PRECKING AND RULING – In the field of description of page layout and of ruling patterns there are major differences between Hebrew and non-Hebrew manuscript research. The only study of ruling patterns in Hebrew manuscripts is Michæl Dukans La régular des manuscrits hébreux au Moyen Âge, published in Paris in 1988. The work is based entirely on the manuscripts described in the CMDHeb. Its main goal is the classification of ruling patterns, based on ‘la forme de la surface écrite’, conceived of as the written space without the letters. 29 The actual ruling technique and the use of prickings were studied only in light of their ‘rôle dans la forme visuelle du schéma de régule’. 30 This may seem justified when taking into consideration the fact that the different ruling techniques already have been described adequately by Malachi Beit-Arié in his Hebrew Codicology, 31 but an important drawback of this highly ‘graphic’ approach (which is also evidenced by the overwhelming number of drawings) is that it provides no guideline whatsoever for the description of individual ruling-patterns, other than a space-consuming drawing.

In non-Hebrew manuscript research much effort has been put into the creation of a descriptive formula of the page. 32 There appear to be two different approaches. The first concentrates on measuring the distances between consecutive vertical and horizontal ruled lines, 33 thus presenting a formula for the ‘mise en page’; the second focuses on the mere presence of ruled lines on the page and their relative lengths, 34 thus offering a description of the ruling pattern proper. Apparently only a combination of both formulas can lead to a satisfactory description of the page.

The remarks already made with regard to the folding format of parchments – that this catalogue is not the place, and the corpus of manuscripts to describe is unsuitable for pioneering research on such a technical detail – may be repeated here. It was therefore
decided not to provide formulas but rather, for the present, to remain with the practice of the Hebrew Paleography Project, and to describe the ruling in prose. 35 In certain isolated cases, especially in the case of medieval manuscripts, a drawing may also be included.

Script

In the case of manuscripts written by more than one hand the descriptive data discussed hereafter should be provided separately for the different hands. It should be realized that Hebrew script is characterized by a strong tendency toward stereotyped forms, which diminishes the importance of script typology and underlines the importance of the study of para-scriptural elements such as line-filling techniques and the dilatation and shortening of words and letters. 36

Modes of Script – This section provides a description of the various modes of script used in the original manuscript. 37 Later additions should be described in the section dealing with the history of the manuscript. The description of the modes of script should be arranged according to the frequency of their occurrence and should also take into account possible hierarchical structures indicated by a change of script. Decorated initials or initial words should be described in the section on decoration, although a distinction between certain large display scripts and (minimally) decorated initial letters at times is hard to make.

Margins – Hebrew scribes took great pains to create relatively straight left-and marginal bounding lines. They achieved these marginal lines either by filling out a short line, by preventing the margin from being exceeded or by writing protruding words or letters in such a manner that the line would still be kept. 38 Descriptions of these practices, in both medieval and post-medieval manuscripts, follow the guidelines of the Hebrew Paleography Project.

Graphic Symbols – Graphic symbols used by the original scribe, such as stress marks, cantillation signs, abbreviation signs, the tetragram and correction marks, are described according to the guidelines of the Hebrew Paleography Project. In certain instances detailed photographs may prove useful. 39

Vocalization – When a text has been vocalized, it should be noted, as should the vocalization system used. Remarks concerning the linguistic character of this vocalization should be made only in the case of unusual phenomena; in most instances a linguistic analysis of the vocalization is beyond the limits of a manuscript catalogue.

Binding

Original bindings, especially of medieval and earlier post-medieval manuscripts, should be described in some detail; this detail will vary according to the importance attached to the binding and to the cataloguer's knowledge of bindings. In all cases, both for original and later bindings, mention should be made of at least the materials used and the presence and nature of decorative elements, pastedowns, flyleaves and binders' signatures. Datings are provided only with great caution, according to the following scheme: original = contemporary; old = modern.

Decoration

In most cases a listing and short, accurate description of the decoration will be sufficient. Only in isolated cases will there be reason to compare the decoration to that of other (categories of) manuscripts. Descriptions should always take into account a hierarchical structure that decorative elements might indicate; a full-page miniature is usually more important and is added for different reasons than, for example, decorated initial letters. 40

Text(s)

This section should contain a short discussion of the contents of the text(s) included in the manuscript. Possible comments concern the role of the manuscript described in the transmission of a text, the existence of printed editions of the text and their relation to the manuscript (was the text simply copied from a printed text?), or, in the case of liturgical manuscripts, the identification or problems concerning the identification of a rite. In certain cases it may be wise to provide incipits and explicits of texts in this section, rather than in the table of contents, as, in this section, ample reference can be made to, for example, repertoires of texts or modern critical editions.

History of the manuscript

This section should provide a chronological (if at all possible) and preferably schematic description of the vicissitudes of the manuscript since its completion, such as later additions to the text, marginal notes, ownership marks, old shelfmarks and censorship. In the case of lengthy titlepages and colophons these texts may be printed in this section rather than in the table of contents.

---

35 I am convinced that an experiment with both types of formulas mentioned here will prove their great usefulness for Hebrew manuscript research. I am, it may be repeated, also convinced that such an experiment should be based on a well-defined corpus of (medieval or post-medieval) Hebrew manuscripts, and not on an incidental collection of woefully disparate material.

36 For a detailed discussion of the difficulties one is likely to encounter when trying to distinguish between different hands in a Hebrew manuscript, see Btr-Ant, 'Stéhscopé.'

37 The paleographical nomenclature used is explained in Chapter 1.

38 Btr-Ant, Hebrew Codology, p. 87.

39 An example of this may be found in: Chapter 5, No. 10, p. 74-75. A drawback of the presentation there is that the photographs are not shown at full size. Ideally they should have been; practically it was impossible.

40 Although little research has been done on the hierarchical structures of decorated Hebrew manuscripts, most existing descriptions of decorated manuscripts do distinguish between various levels of decoration in one way or the other.
CHAPTER 3

Evaluation

The most important element (though not necessarily the longest) of the model of description presented here is the evaluation. As has already been indicated, the technical parts of the description should be written as objectively as reasonably possible. After all, relevant information has been gathered, the evaluation should point out what a potential researcher might expect when investigating the original. It is self-evident, however, that even the evaluation can only provide indications. Such is the nature of a manuscript catalogue.

Bibliography

The bibliography provides only references that are of primary importance to the manuscript, such as earlier descriptions and (partial) printed editions of its text. Secondary references are provided in footnotes.

Photograph(s)

In his IIMM Principles J.P. Gumbert wrote41:

Of every MS there should be given, not only a description [...], but also a PHOTOGRAPH – in actual size, of course. A photograph, even a small one, can say much about a MS; it is the only practical way of giving information about its script and decoration; and it affords some means to check the date and localization proposed by the cataloguer. Photograph and description form an inseparable unit. Photographic and reproductive techniques being what they are today, I feel it ought to be a matter of course for every catalogue to give a picture of every MS.

If this is true already for a short listing like IIMM, then it is certainly true for a model of description that claims to provide at least some completeness. All descriptions in this catalogue are therefore accompanied by at least one full-scale photograph, even if that means that the complete page cannot be shown. In such cases there will also be another (reduced) photograph, indicating the percentage of reduction.

41 GUMBERT, IIMM: Rules - Instructions, p. 4.

4 The Hebrew Manuscript Collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana*

L. Rosenthal in Hannover (gest. 7. Aug. 1868) hinterliess eine, jetzt der Amsterdamer Stadt gehörige Sammlung, deren Katalog von M. Roest 1875 in 2 Bdn. herausgegeben ist; die Drucke sind nach dem Muster Zedners verzeichnet (HB. XV, 105); daneben sind nur 32 MS., worunter kaum ein bedeutsames.3

Moritz Steinschneider's judgment of Leeser Rosenthal's collection of Hebrew manuscripts was based on his own rather biased experience with the major collections in Europe, such as those of the Bodleian Library in Oxford and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. For a private collector who was sustained financially by his in-laws, and who could not travel to the Middle East, which was the best place to buy an important Hebrew manuscript during the nineteenth century, it was impossible to even think of competing with these collections, which were built over a period of centuries and were often based on important legacies of great sixteenth- and seventeenth-century collectors. It is therefore no coincidence that the two nineteenth- and early twentieth-century private collectors who were able to build collections of a quality comparable to that of the great institutionalized libraries, Abraham Firkowitz (1786-1874) and David Solomon Sassoon (1880-1942), were people who were able to travel and who could afford to invest considerable amounts of money in their passion.

When in 1880 the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana became part of the Amsterdam University Library, the decision was made to concentrate first and foremost on those manuscripts that were of importance for the history of the Jews in the Netherlands, rather than to catch up with the larger collections in the world. This strategy has prevailed now in the Rosenthaliana for more than a century and has had a strong influence on the general nature of the collection of manuscripts. It did not, however, entail a narrow-minded one-sidedness. On the contrary, even today every opportunity to add an important item to the collection is welcomed warmheartedly, an attitude that has, in the course of the decades, led to a second objective: the collecting of representative manuscript items from as many different places and times and of as varying a character as possible. The following is an

* There are only two accounts of the history of the manuscript collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana: FUNS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts 1, p. ixxi and FUNS, 'Handschriftenverzameling'; occasional repetition of information provided there could not be avoided completely. It should be stressed here that this chapter deals with the Hebrew manuscripts of the Rosenthaliana only, and not with the often very important non-Hebrew ones; inevitably certain statements in this chapter are biased, therefore.

3 STEINSCHNEIDER, Verkäufe, p. 59-60.
attempt to evaluate the nature and importance of the Hebrew manuscript collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana.

For practical reasons the subject division of the 1973 catalogue by L. Fuks and R.G. Fuks-Manfeld of the complete manuscript collection, Hebrew and non-Hebrew, is followed. It consists of twenty-one different categories, most of which will be dealt with here. Not unexpectedly the first category is Biblical literature. It has to be admitted that, especially textually, the Rosenthaliana’s collection of Biblical manuscripts is not particularly impressive. Of the nineteen listed items only one dates from the medieval period; closer inspection reveals it to be a collection of just seven fragments from medieval Bibles (Hs. Ros. 101). Most of the remaining Biblical manuscripts are either single sheets with Biblical texts, produced mainly for decorative reasons in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and Esther scrolls. From the viewpoint of decoration, the Biblical manuscripts are of some importance, however. Among the Esther scrolls there are some very attractive samples (Hs. Ros. 356 for example), while a 1721 Book of Psalms by Jacob ben Judah Leib Shamas, who was active in Hamburg, is a fine example of skilled eighteenth-century penwork and calligraphy (Hs. Ros. 533). Equally attractive is a large parchment sheet with the text of the Ten Commandments, written by Jekutiel ben Isaac Sofer in 1768 and beautifully decorated (Hs. Ros. Plano A-33). An interesting manuscript of an apocryphal text is Hs. Ros. 543, a Hebrew translation of the commentary on the Wisdom of Solomon by the enlightened Naphthali Herz Wessely (1725-1805), beautifully copied by the renowned Copenhagen scribe Uri Faviush ben Isaac Segal in 1757; Wessely spent part of his youth in Copenhagen. The first printed edition of this important text was not published before the year 1780; it is interesting to realize that the translation and commentary existed already in 1757, almost two decades before Wessely began to play an important role in the Berlin Haskalah (Enlightenment). Mention also should be made here of the many smaller commentaries and novellae on biblical passages by numerous, mainly eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Ashkenazic scholars.

The next two sections in the 1973 catalogue are the homiletic manuscripts and the talmudic ones, including many talmudic novellae and commentaries by scholars of all regions. A very special talmudic manuscript was copied by Mordecai ben Samson Altschuler of Cologne between 1715 and 1721 (Hs. Ros. 323). It is a complete copy of a printed edition, consisting of 13 volumes and over 3,000 leaves, and as such a very impressive example of scribal dedication.

Halakhic manuscripts make up a very strong part of the Rosenthaliana’s collection of Hebrew manuscripts. To begin with there is what may without reservation be called the most important book in the entire collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana. It is an impressive medieval codex in two heavy volumes of 303 and 260 leaves respectively of the Sefer Or Zaruah, by Isaac ben Moses of Vienna (c. 1180-c. 1250; Hs. Ros. 3). The Or Zaruah owes its title to the words of Psalms 97:11: ‘Light is shown (or zaruah) for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart.’ The last letters of the six Hebrew words of which the verse consists form the name R. Akiva; this is the reason why Isaac ben Moses liked the verse so much, as he states explicitly in the introduction to his work. The Or Zaruah is formally a halakhic compendium but, in fact, it is much more than that. Isaac ben Moses traveled extensively and was thus well informed about the different Northern French and Southern German communities of his age. Furthermore, his work contains many of his comments on medieval Ashkenazic everyday life and on actual historical incidents, besides many Responsa. The work is therefore a major source of information on the history of medieval Ashkenazic Jewry, dealing with, among much else, charity and marriage, clothing and hunting, education and ritual slaughtering and criminal law and superstition.

The fact that the Or Zaruah is a massive text is certainly one reason why it was never copied on a large scale. Today there exist only two medieval manuscripts of the text, and later some fragments. Neither of the two codices contain the whole text, but each is at least more or less complementary. The first manuscript is that in the Rosenthaliana; the other is now in the British Library in London (Ms. Oriental 2859, 2860). A thorough codicological analysis of the two manuscripts has shown that both were produced shortly after the author’s death, that is some time between 1260 and 1300. The most probable place of production for the Rosenthaliana manuscript is Southern Germany, while the London manuscript appears to have been produced in Northern France. The beautiful story of the shipwreck of the Rosenthaliana Or Zaruah should be enjoyed as fiction rather than fact. Careful study of all available sources has shown that much can be assumed, but that very little can be proven. One of the few certainties is that the manuscript has been wet.

The next important manuscript is one of the few surviving medieval Hebrew manuscripts copied by a female scribe. It contains the text of the Sefer Mizzowei Qatan, a halakhic code by Isaac ben Joseph of Corbel, and has a colophon in which Hannah bat Menahem Zion mentions the fact that she finished the work on 11 Tanuz 5146 (10 June 1386; Hs. Ros. 558). On fol. 122r, the manuscript contains a sample text of the get, the deed of divorce; this is a very useful tool for localizing the manuscript, as this text usually contains a place name, which, in many manuscripts, is also the scribe’s place of residence.

---

2 Fuks, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts 1. In 1986 inventories of undescrbed Hebrew and Spanish and Portuguese manuscript material were published (Schrijver, 'Inventary' and Miranda-de Boer, 'Inventary'), while in Chapter 5 of this dissertation several additional manuscripts were added. In sum, the manuscript collection of the Rosenthaliana, starting with the 32 from the original collection, and having grown to some 300 items until 1940, nowadays adds up to approximately 1,000 items.

6 Chapter 5, No. 27: Schrijver, 'Catalogue', p. 50, no. 16 and II. 64 (in color).

8 Fuks, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts 1, p. 3, No. 3; also see: Fishoff, 'Yaleh Sefer mi Berlin'; Schrijver, 'Be-onsiyot Amsterdam'; Schrijver, 'Catalogue' and No. 14 in Chapter 5 in this work.

10 Fuks, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts 1, p. 10-13, Nos. 26-33.

12 For more information on this culturally and historically highly interesting phenomenon, see: Shalt, 'Remarks juives'.

14 Fuks, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts 1, p. 47, No. 94 and Ill. 1, opposite p. 32.
The ger in the Rosenthaliana manuscript mentions Cologne, an ascription that is sustained by the codicology. Mention also should be made here of a largely uncatalogued manuscript in the collection, containing the third and first Tur of Jacob ben Asher’s Arba’ah Turim (Hs. Ros. 55). The manuscript, which bears no place and date of production, was copied by the well-known Italian scribe Levi ben Aaron Halkan, who is responsible for at least seven more manuscripts, five of which are dated explicitly, ranging from 1459 to 1489. Halakhic manuscripts survive also from the post-medieval period. Especially important in this respect are the autograph manuscripts of many great leaders, among whom is Zevi Hirsh Ashkenazi (1660-1718), the Hakham Zevi (especially Hs. Ros. 576 and 578). In addition, no less than eleven manuscripts concentrate on the laws of ritual slaughter.  

No matter how impressive the collection of halakhic manuscripts may be, more attention has been paid in the course of the decades to liturgical texts. First and foremost is the Eshel MeAsser, copied by the scribe Kalonymos ben Judah in Eshelgen in North Württemberg and finished by him on 28 Tevet 5050 (12 January 1290). The Eshel MeAsser is the earliest Ashkenazic codex from Germany, in which both time and place of productio are indicated explicitly. It is the second volume of a winter MeAsser; the first volume is housed in The Library of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York. The Amsterdam volume is described in detail in Chapter 5 of this work, where all the relevant literature is provided.

Most liturgical manuscripts in the Rosenthaliana’s collection were produced in eighteenth-century Europe and represent the second blooming of decorated Hebrew manuscript production. There are eight Hagadot, amongst which are some famous examples. To begin with there is the Rosenthaliana Leipnik Haggadah (Hs. Ros. 382), reproduced in facsimile in 1987 and extensively studied and used for many different purposes. It was copied, and probably decorated, by the Moravian artist Joseph ben David of Leipnik in Altona, near Hamburg, in 1738; it is a striking example of how eighteenth-century artists, on the one hand, depended on their Amsterdam printed models, while and foremost the 1695 and 1712 Hagadot, and how, on the other hand, at least some of them added their own baroque and rococo artistry. Two Hagadot were produced by Jacob ben Judah Leib Shamas of Hamburg, one of the most productive eighteenth-century scribes, who were copied in 1728 (Hs. Ros. 383) and 1741 (Hs. Ros. 573) respectively. Especially the 1728 Haggadah is important, as it is an almost perfect page for page copy of the 1695 printed Amsterdam Haggadah. A fine example of the Bohemian group of decorated manuscripts is the 1751 Haggadah, produced by Aaron Schreiber Herlingen of Gwitsch.

who worked in Vienna (Hs. Ros. 463). It is completely different in approach from the Northern German examples, both palaeographically and artistically. An Amsterdam 1794 Haggadah, executed by Meir ben Moses Kornik (Hs. Ros. 491), is especially interesting as it contains musical notations for the Passover hymns.

Other liturgical manuscripts of importance include works by most of the renowned eighteenth-century artists, such as Nathan ben Simon of Meistereth (Hs. Ros. 683), Samuel ben Zevi of Dreenz (Hs. Ros. 692 and Zevi ben Abraham Bumtlai (Hs. Ros. 322), besides many nineteenth-century collections of prayers and benedictions from all regions of the Jewish diaspora. Special mention should be made here of what has, until now, been called unjustifiably the ‘Binger Sidur’; this is, in fact, a prayerbook for the Sabbath, executed in Amsterdam in 1820 by Hayim Binger and his two sons (Hs. Ros. 681). It contains lavish illustrations and is among the most attractive of Hebrew manuscripts produced in the nineteenth century.

The majority of mystical manuscripts in the Rosenthaliana’s collection were produced in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Ashkenaz. They include well-known mystical works like the Etz Hayim by Hayim Vital (Hs. Ros. 559, 327, 544), the Toldot Adam by the Elijah Baal Shem (Hs. Ros. 4230) and the Rebish Hokhmah by Elijah ben Moses de Vidas (Hs. Ros. 526, 673). Among the uncatalogued manuscripts a large parchment scroll of 147.8 x 54.7 centimeters is especially important. It contains a kabbalistic tree, and is in fact the summary of an individual scholar’s mystical insights. Only a few of these scrolls survive. This one was probably made in Eastern Europe at the end of the eighteenth or at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Mention also should be made of the many amulets in the collection, which are often touching examples of Jewish folk belief.

Of the twenty Hebrew manuscripts of ethical, philosophical and theological content separate attention has been paid recently to an early nineteenth-century copy in Ashkenazic cursive script of the Megilah Hamegaleh, by the twelfth-century scholar Abraham bar Hiya (Hs. Ros. 29). It is an eschatological work, dealing with the coming of the Messiah; the exact time of his arrival is computed in many different ways, on the basis of historical events from the history of Israel. Interesting among the polemical manuscripts are the so-called Toldot Yeshua texts, which describe the life of Jesus, from the

23 PUKS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts, 3, 1, p. 66, No. 132.
24 PUKS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts, 1, p. 66-67, No. 133 and ill. 6, between p. 32 and 33; SCHREIVER, "Catalogue", p. 67, No. 73 and p. 66, Ill. 67.
25 Chapter 5, No. 20.
26 Chapter 5, No. 21.
27 PUKS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts, 1, p. 83, No. 172; SCHREIVER, "Catalogue", p. 69, No. 80, Ill. 62.
28 Chapter 5, No. 18.
29 PUKS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts, 1, p. 97, 100-101, Nos. 207, 212, 213.
30 PUKS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts, 1, p. 97-98, No. 208.
32 I was informed of this by my good friend William L. Gross of Tel Aviv, Israel.
34 FONTAINES, "Treize der geschickten,".
35 PUKS, Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts, 1, p. 126, No. 273.
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Jewish point of view. The Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana holds 12 manuscripts, containing different versions of this fascinating text.36 Quantitatively, belles-lettres manuscripts make up the majority of Hebrew manuscripts in the collection, but it must be realized that many of these are very small and contain specimens of occasional poetry only. Many riddles and other literary experiments form part of the collection as well.37 A separate section worthy of attention is that of the stage-plays, among which the Ashkenazic Purim-shpiln are the best known.38 Mention of course should be made also of the Yiddish Melokhim-Bukh (Hs. Ros. 17639), a Biblical epos in what is probably a sixteenth-century Italian copy, which was published by L. Fuks in 1965.40 Among the philological, mathematical, astronomical and medical manuscripts, which are few in number, only one manuscript deserves special mention. It contains the Hebrew translation of two astronomical works by Aristotile with the commentary of Averroes and was copied in Mantua on 18 September 1446 by Mordecai Finzi.41

The last great section of the collection is that of the historical manuscripts. Of the many interesting Hebrew sources here only a few will be mentioned, as it is impossible to discuss all of them within the limited framework of this chapter. The first interesting manuscript is Hs. Ros. 23, a Yiddish travelogue of a journey made by a Abraham Levi ben Menahem Tal through several Germanic lands and Italy, between 1719 and 1724.42 This manuscript, in fact the only known description of a Jewish grand tour, was copied by a professional scribe in Amsterdam, some thirty years after Abraham Tal made his journey. It contains not only the text of the travelogue, but also all of the maps and etchings used by the traveler during his journey. In the historical collection, there are two Yiddish chronicles of great importance, both of which were written in Amsterdam. The first, copied by Abraham Hayim Braaard, describes the period from 1740 to 1752 (Hs. Ros. 486).43 The second, of which the Rosenthaliana also holds a second copy, was written by Benj ben Ayziq Wing (or B.L. Benjamin); it describes the period from 1795, the year of the French invasion in the Netherlands, until 1812 (Hs. Ros. 534 and Hs. Ros. 74).44 Finally mention should be made here of the collection of Jewish marriage contracts, eight of which were described in the 1973 catalogue and seven of which, all decorated examples from nineteenth-century Italy, were acquired later.45

From the remaining sections of the collection an interesting family history of the Swedish Graaboom family has received ample scholarly attention (Hs. Ros. 523).46 In the summary of his 1967 article on this manuscript L. Fuks wrote:47

A Hebrew manuscript in the collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana gives us a fascinating story of a Swedish family which came to Amsterdam about 1750 to escape Judaism. The old pater familias, Jacob, after his circumcision Abraham Granhoon, had been kohenegde, a kind of bailiff, in Lindoping. He retired in 1745 and went to Amsterdam with his wife and two young children. According to the manuscripts several other members of the family followed in the course of the century.

A last group of manuscripts close the circle of the history of the Hebrew manuscript collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana. It is composed of nine handwritten lists of books owned by Leeser Rosenthal, which were not listed by Roest in his 1875 catalogue.48 They show how diligently the original collector kept his collection. Some of these (for example Hs. Ros. 273) also contain Leeser Rosenthal’s annotations on remarkable books from his collection.

Separate attention should be paid here to the correspondence of the so-called ‘Pekidim and Amaarcam’ of Amsterdam, a considerable part of which is housed in the Rosenthaliana; it is formally part of the archival rather than the manuscript collection. In the year 1809 the well-known Amsterdam banker Hirschle Leheren, Rabbi Abraham Prins and Salomo Rubens founded an organization on behalf of the Jews of the Land of Israel, called the ‘Pekidim and Amaarcam’ (officers and treasurers); abbreviated חספּ, ‘Piqam’, in Hebrew. In order to deal with the heavy expenses (salary, traveling, etc.) of the emissaries of the Jewish community in Palestine, and to overcome difficulties relating to the distribution of money collected by these emissaries between the rival groups there (the haluqaḥ49), the organization aimed to concentrate the collection of moneys throughout Western Europe in this one organization. In 1824 the actual leader of the Piqam, the aforementioned Hirschle Leheren, succeeded in convincing all parties involved of the necessity of such a concentration, and later that year the new organization was recognized by the rabbis of Jerusalem as the exclusive agency for collecting moneys on behalf of the Holy Land. In all major Jewish communities in Western Europe the Piqam appointed so-called gabbaim, collectors of money. These collectors, who were supposed to pay the collected money to the central organization, had their contacts with private individuals and institutions and organized special money raising activities for the benefit of poor Jews in Palestine.

Amsterdam became the organization’s center and the money was sent out to Palestine on a regular basis. The fact that the Jerusalem rabbinate recognized the Piqam as the sole

36 Also see: Chapter 5, No. 3.
37 For extensive information on Hebrew riddles, see: PAKKE, Secret Sealed.
38 They are discussed at length in: BIRD, ‘Jiddisch theater’; also see: Chapter 5, No. 13, and the literature mentioned there.
39 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 176-177, No. 399.
40 FUKS, Abjadische Epis.
41 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 208-209, No. 472.
42 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 261-262, No. 594; the Yiddish text was published in: ROESS, Verhoud van jooden.
43 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 217-218, No. 489; the text was published by: FUKS, Joodsche Provocatie; on the Yiddish language in this manuscript, see: ZWIESENS, ‘Jiddisch in Amsterdam’., p. 153-154.
44 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 218-219, Nos. 491 and 490; part of the text was published by: ROESS, ‘Losse bijdragen’; also see: ZWIESENS, ‘Jiddisch in Amsterdam’., p. 154.
45 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 254-257, Nos. 576, 578-584; also see: Chapter 5, Nos. 28 and 29.
46 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 275-276, No. 626; the text was published by: FUKS, ‘Zweede familie Granhoon.’
48 FUKS, Hebrew and Judaica Manuscripts 1, p. 209-273, No. 607 (Hs. Ros. 169), No. 609 (Hs. Ros. 254), No. 610 (Hs. Ros. 112), No. 611 (Hs. Ros. 594), No. 612 (Hs. Ros. 405), No. 613 (Hs. Ros. 273), No. 614 (Hs. Ros. 404), No. 615 (Hs. Ros. 180), No. 619 (Hs. Ros. 26).
49 Also see: HEBROOSEN, ‘Graphik der Chaldeken’.
organization authorized to collect money for the Palestinian communities and to distribute it amongst these so-called kovlim, resulted in a position of power within Palestine itself. This gave rise to continuous friction, which is reflected in the letters to Amsterdam. Hirschel Lehren made actual use of his power. He, an ultra-orthodox Jew, considered the Palestinian communities to be the last bulwark against the Reform and the ideas of the Enlightenment: the greatest threats to Judaism according to his opinion. In the course of the nineteenth century the Palestinian communities grew considerably and the portion of the money collected that was allotted to each poor family fluctuated.

Only part of the correspondence of the Piquam has been preserved. Fifteen copybooks, containing copies of the outgoing letters written between 1826 and 1870, are now preserved in the archives of the Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi at Jerusalem. This collection of 6700 pages consists of thousands of letters written over a period of 44 years. Until now three volumes, covering the years 1826-1829, were edited and published.30 Of the incoming correspondence only a part is in the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana; another part (of the some 4,000 to 5,000 letters still extant) gradually is being sold by the present board of the 'Pekdim and Amarcim'. The Rosenthaliana’s collection consists of some 4700 incoming letters, dating roughly from 1880 until 1903.31 Above, Morgenstern once gave the following qualification of the Piquam correspondence52:

A careful and intelligent use of [...] the PAA correspondence is thus a conditio sine qua non for a critical historiography and interpretation of the yishuv during the 19th century.

**Some statistics**

The following chart visualizes the nature of the Hebrew manuscript collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana. It is based on the printed information on the manuscript collection and excludes hitherto undescribed material. Of the 721 manuscripts listed in the 1973 Fuks catalogue, 591 can be considered as Hebrew manuscripts. Of the 91 manuscripts listed in the 1986 inventories by Schrijver and Miranda-de Boer, 35 are Hebrew manuscripts according to the standards adopted in this dissertation. In the Specimen catalogue in the next chapter 11 additional Hebrew manuscripts are listed. This means that of the 823 manuscripts of the collection on which printed information is available, 637 are in Hebrew script; that is 77.4%. The subject classification on which the chart is based is that of the 1973 Fuks catalogue. It includes the following 21 subjects (the absolute figures are provided between brackets; no separate indication refers to the 1973 Fuks catalogue, 1 = the 1986 inventory, S = the specimen published in the next chapter).

---

51 Smeyt van Gelder-Fontaine, *Brieven uit Palestina*.
52 Morgenstern, *Correspondence*, p. 463.
53 As already indicated, it should be realized that the majority of manuscripts in this section are single leaves (71 + 1 L, that is 51%).
54 These are not Hebrew manuscripts in the strict sense of the word, but rather Hebrew texts transcribed into Latin, which is a common practice in Jewish musical manuscripts.
5 A Specimen of a Supplementary Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana

Beim der Handschriftenkunde kommt Verschiedenes in Betracht: Inhalts, Entstehung, Verbreitung, Schicksale, Sammlung und Beschreibung, also bieten sie Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte. Der Weg der Erkenntnis ist häufig der des Entstehens eines Dinges entgegengesetzt; man kann also eine Erörterung bei verschiedenen Stellen beginnen. Wir nehmen in diesem Kapitel die Beschaffenheit der Quellen zum Wegweiser. 1

The following thirty descriptions of previously undescribed manuscripts from the collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana intend to be an illustration of the practicality of the model of description presented in Chapter 3. The library holds a total of some eighty undescribed Hebrew manuscripts, which will all be described in the near future. The manuscripts described here were selected mainly to represent the different types that may be encountered in the Rosenthaliana’s collection. Thus there are, for example, two medieval manuscripts (Nos. 5 and 30), the nineteenth-century will of the chief-rabbi of the town of Zwolle (No. 3), a seventeenth-century Esther scroll with engraved borders (No. 26), two nineteenth-century Italian decorated marriage contracts (Nos. 28 and 29), several decorated eighteenth-century manuscripts (Nos. 14, 20, 21 and 24), a nineteenth-century lamentation on the death of Tsar Alexander I (No. 16), and so forth. It is clear that many other selections from the collection could have been made, but I believe that the present one, arbitrary as it may be, is a faithful reflection of the general nature of the collection.

1

Hs. Ros. 295

Snoorobkh.  
Book used to register the payment for mitzvos during the Sabbath and high holidays.  
[The Netherlands, 18-19th century].  
58 fols.

Codicology

* 58 unnumbered fols. Modern pencil numbering of the quires (the book was held upside down).  
* Very thick and stiff parchment, rather soiled, frayed edges, partly due to hungry mice.  
* Brown ink throughout.

1 STEINSCHNEIDER, Verleugnen, p. 57.
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Hs. Ros. 346

Will of the chief-rabbi of Zwolle, David Jacob Stibbe (1717-1806).4
Zwolle, Wednesday 7 Shevat 5561 (21 January 1801).
2 fol.

Contents
Fol. 1r: text of the testament, dated by David Stibbe: י"ש דא ויבש יקימ התמ
Fols. 1v-2v: blank

Codicology
• 2 fol.
• Paper, recently restored, rather soiled.
• Brown ink.
• 27; 326 x 203 mm.
• 1 bifolium.
• Ashkenazic cursive script.
• In a modern paper wrapper, with a pamphlet-stitch.

Text
The text contains six stipulations, dictated by David Stibbe. According to a statement, which precedes his signature, the text was copied because of the 'weakness of his body' (שמדיר).

History of the manuscript

Bibliography
Schröver, 'Inventory', p. 167, No. 6.

Photographs
• Fol. 1r (70 %)
• Fol. 1r (detail; full size)

3

Hs. Ros. 373

Yiddish description of the life of Jesus, in the tradition of the Toledot Yeishu.
[Western Ashkenaz, late 18th – early 19th century].
10 fol.

CHAPTER 5

Contents
Fol. 1r-10v: text

Codicology
• 10 fols. Modern pencil foliation.
• Paper, rather soiled, frayed edges.
• Brown ink throughout.
• 4°: 220 x 182 mm. 23-29 lines per page.
• 18 loose leaves, loosely sewn together.
• Single catchwords in the left hand bottom corner of each page.
• Single lines ruled in pencil on 1r-6r.

• Ashkenazic square and cursive scripts.
• Certain Biblical Hebrew phrases have an infra-linear vocalization.
• In a poorly preserved paper cover, practically falling apart.

Text
This is one of the Yiddish versions of the originally Hebrew so-called Toledot Yeshu texts. These texts contain a pseudo-history of the life of Jesus, accepting his extraordinary powers, but stripping them of their holiness. The Yiddish version preserved in this manuscript was copied from an older manuscript, as indicated by the copyist on fol. 10v: בך נראיתי יומם סופי (In my final day I saw).

History of the manuscript
Olive Br. Hs. Port. 4° B 1

Evaluation
The dating of the manuscript is based on the script only, and is rather tentative. The Bibliotheca Rosenhalmiana holds 11 more manuscripts in the Toledot Yeshu tradition, in Hebrew and Yiddish and of varying importance, besides the printed editions.

Bibliography

Photograph
• Fol. 1r

5 Extensive information on the Toledot Yeshu can be found in, El 15, cols. 1208-1209; ELTHOV, Jewish View of Jesus; KRAUS, Leben Jesu; SELIGMANN, Judisches Leben Jesu; SCHONFELD, According to the Hebrews.

Codicology
• 158 fols. Modern pencil foliation. There is an original running Hebrew title indicating chapters.
• Paper, with some minor staining. In the paper a running foolscap watermark occurs, which were especially popular during the second half of the seventeenth century.8
• Throughout the manuscript a brown ink was used.
• Fols. 71r: 201 x 155 mm; 6c x 179h x 16v x 9c x 21h (77r) x 27v x 12l (1 column x 21 lines)9 (10 lines = 88 mm).
• Fols. 26, 32, 38.
• Single catchwords occur, written within the vertical and horizontal boundary lines, in the left hand bottom corners of fols. 1-38 (i.e. the first five quires) only.
• The text areas, already described in the statement on the dimensions of the page, are ruled in pencil, often somewhat carelessly. Horizontal lines are often ruled by hand paint, but occasionally the horizontal chain lines of the paper (the book is in quarto) are also used. Both Hebrew and Latin scripts stand on the line.
• The Hebrew text is written in a non-Jewish square hand, the Latin text in an Italian hand.
• To fill the line, larger catchwords were used, to prevent the margin from being exceeded the last words in the line were usually compressed.
• The Biblical text appears fully vocalized and accented.
• Bound in contemporary re-used yellowish parchment, without boards, badly scuffed and torn. There is a paper pastedown at beginning and end, with an additional paper flyleaf at the end, practically loose hinges.

Text
Santes Pagnini’s translation was one of the most popular Latin Bible translations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and was often printed in so-called ‘interlinear editions’ (the first Latin edition appeared in Lyons in 1528; the first interlinear edition in Antwerp in 1570). The text of the Book of Genesis that was copied in the manuscript, was undoubtedly taken from one of these printed editions, seven of which are in the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana. The layout of the pages was conceived of as consisting of three columns, the inner one holding elementary grammatical comments, the middle one containing the Hebrew and Latin texts, and the outer one containing exegetical remarks. While the inner and middle columns were indeed used, the outer columns were left empty with the exception of fol. 2r (while on fol. 2v the outer column was erroneously used for the grammatical comments).

History of the manuscript
• Fol. 1r: ‘Joann Frans Dialet’ [1], in a contemporary hand.

Evaluation
The manuscript is a typical private working copy of a Christian Hebraist. On the basis of the watermark present in the paper, it should be dated to the second half of the seventeenth century, a dating that is not contradicted by the other characteristics of the manuscript. Its localization remains problematic.

History of the manuscript
• Fol. 1r: dedication.

by the words: מודל negó. Above the crown there is a decorative banner, executed in blue watercolors, holding a chronogram: מֶשֶׁת שֵׁמוֹ יִבְנֵלָהּ יִשְׁמַר בְּאֶדְוָיָלָהּ. מֵלָכָה. סָמָא הַבְּרֵכָה תַּחֲנָה.

History of the manuscript
• Fol. 1r: dedication.

The heart on the left with the bride’s name holds the following text:

בְּדַלֵּהַ דֶּרֶךְ בְּרֵכָה | יִשְׁמַר בְּאֶדְוָיָלָה | מַקְוֵה נְתָנֶה | יִשְׁמַר בְּאֶדְוָיָלָה | מֵלָכָה.

Donated to the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana by Prof. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg.

Evaluation
Apart from the very attractive decoration of this list, its main importance lies in the listing of 117 mainly Rotterdam relatives and friends of the newly-weds. In the chronogram, in the dedication the [נ] in [ברכה], which the scribe forgot to write as it is indeed part of the formula, should be added to result in the year [5]566.

Bibliography

Photographs
• Fol. 1r (58 %)
• Fol. 1r (detail; full size)

5 Hs. Ros. 600

H. Ros. 600

בְּדַלֵּהַ דֶּרֶךְ בְּרֵכָה | יִשְׁמַר בְּאֶדְוָיָלָה | מַקְוֵה נְתָנֶה | יִשְׁמַר בְּאֶדְוָיָלָה | מֵלָכָה.

Hebrew text of the book of Genesis, with interlinear Latin translation by Santes Pagnini (1470-1536) and explanatory notes.

[Northern Europe, 2nd half of the 17th century].

158 fols.
CHAPTER 5

Bibliography
SCHNEIDER, 'Inventory', p. 169, No. 17.

Photograph
* Fol. 2r
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Hs. Ros. 601

Passover Haggadah according to the Yemenite rite, with explanations in Judeo-Arabic.
[Yemen, probably first half of the 19th century].
16 fol.

Contents
Fol. 1r: blank
Fols. 1v-3r: intro memra
Fols. 3r-16r: text Haggadah inscribed [...] and memra

Codicology
* 16 fol. Modern pencil foliation. On most pages there is an original running title, with (later) minimal decoration. The original paper wrappers are pasted onto the blank first and last pages of the manuscript.
* Recently restored occidental paper, rather soiled. Traces of the watermark (e.g., a crescent moon) are too rudimentary to identify the paper.
* For the main text and the vocalization (different) black inks were used; headings were decorated rather minimally with a brownish red ink, that was also used for a few (later) text additions.
* 8½ x 150 x 110 mm. 17 to 26 lines per page, largely depending on the presence of Arabic, which was usually written in smaller script.
* The original book most probably consisted of 1 quire of 8 bifolia, for which most probably 2 sheets of paper of different thicknesses were used. The paper was cut into pieces before writing the text, after which the bifolia were assembled in random order to form a quire of 8 bifolia (as may be deduced from the varying thickness of the paper).
* Single catchwords on all verso, usually written directly below the text on the lefthand side.
* There are no signs of pricking and/or ruling of the pages, which explains why the lines of text are never straight.
  *(Semi-uncial Yemenite script with square headings.*

Text
The text is the standard Yemenite Haggadah as it is known from many other manuscripts and printed editions. Of the two versions of the last paragraph of the Haggadah that are mentioned by Y. Qafih in his edition of the Yemenite Haggadah, this manuscript has the older, at least eighteenth-century tradition.11

Evaluation
On the basis of the script and the general, highly inexperienced outlook of the manuscript, it is certain that this manuscript is the product of a toiling amateur individual. It is even not improbable that the manuscript represents a phenomenon described by Y. Qafih, being that in Yemen, due to the scarcity of paper, pupils who were learning to write were given useful texts (like prayerbooks) to copy, so that no expensive paper would be wasted.12 Although the text seems to represent a relatively old tradition, the manuscript can hardly be dated any earlier than the first half of the nineteenth century.

Bibliography
SCHNEIDER, 'Inventory', p. 169, No. 18.

Photograph
* Fol. 2r

7

Hs. Ros. 604

Prayerbook for the afternoon prayer and various occasional prayers.
Copied by Meijer Mijers. Hoorn (the Netherlands), 1852.
30 fol.

Contents
P. 81: titlepage:

P. 82: colophon:

P. 1-16: text Haggadah

P. 16-36: text Haggadah

P. 36-53: text Haggadah

P. 53-58: text Haggadah

Codicology
* Relatively thick parchment, clear distinction between hair and flesh sides of the parchment, arrangement according to Gregory's rule, quires starting with the hair side, rather thumbed.

11 QAFIH, loc. cit., p. 133.
12 QAFIH, loc. cit., p. 155.
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* Dark brown ink for the text, purplish ink for certain initial words.
  * 103 x 78 mm. Usually 15 lines per page. Only the titlepage is written within a grey washed-ink frame, outlined in the brownish text ink.
  * 1-30v. Judging from the thickness of the separate parchment leaves, it has to be admitted that it is not clear whether the original was divided into five bifolia or not. They were cut into loose leaves once and now occur as reconstructed bifolia (conjugated in the back). Gregory’s rule is still valid.
  * Two vertical boundary lines ruled in pencil and usually 15 blind horizontal lines on both rectos and versos.
  * Square Ashkenazic script in different sizes.
  * To fill the line the scribe used diluted letters, or, when the line happened to end, he left an open space before the ‘colon’, which he uses at the end of a line. To prevent the margin from being exceeded he regularly compressed the last word(s) or letters in the line.
  * Intralinear vocalization throughout.
  * Bound in later quarter leather over cardboard. Five paper flyleaves and a paper pastedown at beginning and end.

History of the manuscript


Evaluation

Meijer (Meir ben Mordechai) Mijers is known as the copyist of at least seven other manuscripts in the collection of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana.13 He worked as a teacher at the Jewish school in Kampen, presumably until the mid-thirties, when he left for Hoorn, perhaps to become a head-teacher there.14

Bibliography

SCHINZER, ‘Inventory’, p. 169, No. 20

Photographs

* Fol. πιγ
  * π. 1
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20 fols.


14 In 1835 a new Jewish school was opened in Den Helder; see: MICHANEN, Piska, p. 435. In 1859 Mijers was apparently working ‘at the Latin school’ (op de Luitjensche school; Hs. Ros 186).
CHAPTER 5

History of the manuscript
• On the recto of the front flyleaf there is owner’s inscription: ‘This book is written by hand of the son of the High Priest of the Samaritans in Samaria. They are very few & dying out & very poor. (about 160 all told)’ The actual note reads: ‘Eschem. (Nablus) Samaria. November 15, 1910. Dear Teddy bought me this book this afternoon when we went to visit the old synagogue of the sect of the Samaritans here. There are only 160 of them left. After a part of the population was carried off by the Assyrians (B.C. 722) their place was taken by pagan colonists (2 Kings xvii.24) & from their union with those of the Israelites who had been left behind sprang the mixed people of the Samaritans, towards whom the Jews after their return from exile behaved with most jealous reserve excluding them [verso] from all share in the religious rites of Jerusalem. Their Pentateuch differs somewhat from ours, & their oldest chronicles date from the 12th century. The oldest of the Samaritan manuscripts is believed to be as old as the Christian era, and is conceded to be the oldest manuscript of the Bible in the world. The 5 books of Moses are written on the hair skin sides of skins of lambs offered in sacrifice, the entire roll is 60 or more ft in length – no one knows for certain how long it is, but probably is of about 52 skins. Constance Boyle. [signature].’

Evaluation
Apart from the touching letter and the interesting assumed provenance, the historical importance of this crudely written manuscript seems rather limited.

Bibliography

Photograph
• Fols. 1v-2r
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Leviticus 1:1–9:21 in its Samaritan version.
[Nablus, appr. 1900].
30 fols.

Contents
Fol. 1r: blank
Fols. 1v-28v: Leviticus 1:1–9:21
incipit: יקוק קא לחשש
Fols. 29r-30v: blank

Codicology
• 30 fols. Modern pencil foliation.
• Paper, slightly sized.
• Black ink throughout.
• 12 x 92 mm. Varying number of lines per page, usually 18 or 19.
• 1 x 38.
• Most pages have a very crudely drawn frame in pencil around the text area.

• Crude Samaritan script.
• To fill the line the copyist left an open space before the last letter of the last word in the line. He did not always manage to prevent the line from being exceeded, at times in spite of compressing the last word(s) in the line.
• Bound in contemporary paper over cardboard, with linen spine. There is a single paper pastedown at both ends.

10

Hs. Ros. 609

The Eslingen Mahzor.16 Second volume of a festival prayerbook according to the Ashkenazic rite, containing part of the liturgy for the Day of Atonement and the complete liturgy for the Feast of Tabernacles. Copied by Kalonymos ben Judah. Esslingen, 28 Tever 5050 (12 January 1290). 127 fols.

16 Large parts of the description provided here inevitably repeat descriptions published earlier, especially: COHEN, ‘Eslingen Mahzor’. Full references can be found in the section ‘Bibliography.’
CHAPTER 5

Contents
Fols. 1r-37v: Mas'uf for Yom Kippur (continuation)

incipit: בֶּשָׁנָה שָׁפָר הַיֶּלֶד הַכָּלָּה בְּעָלָה אֶל הַכֹּבֶּץ אֵלֶּה

Fols. 37v-56r: Minhah for Yom Kippur
Fols. 56r-71v: Ne'ilah for Yom Kippur (fols. 68v-71v: final prayers for Mozza's Yom Kippur)
Fols. 71v-73v: Ma'ariv for Sukot
Fols. 74r-82v: Shaharit for Sukot
Fols. 85r-85r: Ma'ariv for the second night of Sukot
Fols. 85v-92v: Shaharit for the intermediate days of Sukot
Fols. 92v-93v: Ma'ariv for the eighth day of Sukot
Fols. 96r-100v: Shaharit for Shemini Atzeret and Simhat Torah
Fols. 100v-110v: Mas'uf for Shemini Atzeret and Simhat Torah
Fols. 110v-119v: Shaharit for Simhat Torah
Fols. 120r-120v: Hoshanot for Hoshana Rabah, followed by the Qaddish


A SPECIMEN OF A SUPPLEMENTARY CATALOGUE

goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 380 x 250 mm. Fol. 6r: an original leaf, cut out elsewhere in the manuscript, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 458 x 327 mm. Fol. 9r: somewhat glossy calf-parchment, pasted onto the original surface, text written by the original scribe; ruling by lead pencil; HF unknown; 100 x 313 mm. Fol. 33v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 145 x 231 mm. Between fols. 41 and 42: an original leaf (the third leaf in the original quire), conjugate with fol. 44; cut out and fol. 41v and 42r were subsequently stuck together and later torn apart. Fol. 51v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 127 x 247 mm. Fol. 62v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 237 x 298 mm. Fol. 63: a separate leaf; calf-parchment; HF unknown; quality similar to the MS; on the verso-side 7 large initial words or parts thereof, taken from removed pages of the original manuscript, have been pasted onto the writing surface; 468 x 350 mm; Fol. 64: a separate leaf; somewhat glossy calf-parchment; HF unknown; on the recto-side 3 large initial words or parts thereof, taken from removed pages of the original manuscript, have been pasted onto the writing surface, with an additional catchword: 462 x 350 mm. Fol. 65: a separate leaf, pasted together out of three separate pieces; glossy goat and calf-parchment (0); HF uncertain; with an additional catchword: 461 x 348 mm. On quite a few of the additional pieces of goat-parchment the black ink has come off the writing surface partially.

* The original text was written in black and very dark brown ink, which is only occasionally somewhat aggressive, the vocalization in light brown ink. In quite a few instances red ink has been used to decorate letters or to indicate accents and the like. For a discussion of the decoration, see below.

* Fols. 1r, 5v, 459 x 350: [52v=337=70] x 622x255=68 (1 column x 20 lines=10 lines = 126 mm)
Fols. 62r, 660 x 337: [52v=337=71] x 632x221=66
Fols. 62v, 663 x 352: [50v=324=90] x 612x226=65
Fols. 62v, 663 x 352: 1 column x 21 lines=10 lines = 127 mm
291 characters in 5 lines of text (fol. 101v, l. 1-5).

* 1h (4 replaced), 2v (1 removed), 3v-5v, 6v (5 removed), 7v-8, 9 (1 replaced, 1a and 1b added), 10-14v, 15v
1 after 8, 16v (bound with quire 15, 8 removed).

23 The last addition is left out of account here.
24 The layout is irregular as there are 7 lines of larger script.
25Irregular number of lines; later additions, e.g. below the last horizontal ruling line, are left out of account here.
26 This collation formula differs from the one published in: COHEN, ‘Earliest Mahzor’, p. 63 and is more accurate.

Codicology

* 127 fols. There is a modern pencil foliation in the left hand upper corner of the recto of each leaf. No older foliations occur.
* Written on calf-parchment of varying thickness. It is usually very difficult, but not always impossible, to distinguish between hair and flesh side of the parchment. Traces of the shaving of the hides occurs frequently. Stitches occur on fols. 8, 13, 14, 16, 25, 57, 60, 82, 87, 113, 120, along the edges of these stitches occasionally the grain can be seen (enabling a distinction between hair and flesh side of the parchment). Holes occur in fols. 10, 15, 24, 33, 36, 37, 40, 43, 57, 60 (due to an erasure on the verso page). Fol. 75, 81, 82, 90, 92, 101, 102, 111 (due to an erasure on the recto page), 114, 118 to end (mainly worming). 127 (the colophon page, once pasted onto an earlier wooden board), detached later, resulting in considerable damage, without, however, significantly affecting the text. Tears are present in fols. 100, 106, 116, 122. Mice have eaten at the corners of the leaves. A strip of approximately 40 mm has been cut off the outer margin of fol. 41. Most leaves are soiled, while candle-wax has dripped on many pages as well. Fols. 41v and 42v were once stuck together and later torn apart, with considerable loss of individual letters.
* In the course of its history several parchment leaves have been added to the manuscript, pieces of parchment were pasted onto the original text, and occasionally original leaves were cut out and pasted onto others. Unless otherwise stated, those leaves have a blind ruling: fol. 1r: calf-parchment, pasted onto the original surface, now detached; HF unknown; 182 x 265 mm. Fol. 4: a separate leaf; glossy goat-parchment, pasted together out of three separate pieces; flesh-side on recto, 462 x 340 mm. Fol. 5v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 380 x 250 mm. Fol. 6r: an original leaf, cut out elsewhere in the manuscript, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 458 x 327 mm. Fol. 9r: somewhat glossy calf-parchment, pasted onto the original surface, text written by the original scribe; ruling by lead pencil; HF unknown; 100 x 313 mm. Fol. 33v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 145 x 231 mm. Between fols. 41 and 42: an original leaf (the third leaf in the original quire), conjugate with fol. 44; cut out and fol. 41v and 42r were subsequently stuck together and later torn apart. Fol. 51v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 127 x 247 mm. Fol. 62v: glossy goat-parchment, pasted onto the original surface; HF unknown; 237 x 298 mm. Fol. 63: a separate leaf; calf-parchment; HF unknown; quality similar to the MS; on the verso-side 7 large initial words or parts thereof, taken from removed pages of the original manuscript, have been pasted onto the writing surface; 468 x 350 mm; Fol. 64: a separate leaf; somewhat glossy calf-parchment; HF unknown; on the recto-side 3 large initial words or parts thereof, taken from removed pages of the original manuscript, have been pasted onto the writing surface, with an additional catchword: 462 x 350 mm. Fol. 65: a separate leaf, pasted together out of three separate pieces; glossy goat and calf-parchment (0); HF uncertain; with an additional catchword: 461 x 348 mm. On quite a few of the additional pieces of goat-parchment the black ink has come off the writing surface partially.

* The original text was written in black and very dark brown ink, which is only occasionally somewhat aggressive, the vocalization in light brown ink. In quite a few instances red ink has been used to decorate letters or to indicate accents and the like. For a discussion of the decoration, see below.

* Fols. 1-5, 459 x 350: [52v=337=70] x 622x255=68 (1 column x 20 lines=10 lines = 126 mm)
Fols. 62-660 x 337: [52v=337=71] x 632x221=66
Fols. 62v, 663 x 352: [50v=324=90] x 612x226=65
Fols. 62v, 663 x 352: 1 column x 21 lines=10 lines = 127 mm
291 characters in 5 lines of text (fol. 101v, l. 1-5).

* 1h (4 replaced), 2v (1 removed), 3v-5v, 6v (5 removed), 7v-8, 9 (1 replaced, 1a and 1b added), 10-14v, 15v
1 after 8, 16v (bound with quire 15, 8 removed).

23 The last addition is left out of account here.
24 The layout is irregular as there are 7 lines of larger script.
25 Irregular number of lines; later additions, e.g. below the last horizontal ruling line, are left out of account here.
26 This collation formula differs from the one published in: COHEN, ‘Earliest Mahzor’, p. 63 and is more accurate.
While being bound at some point in time the book was trimmed considerably (see below). This resulted, among other things, in the loss of most of the original, often decorated, single catchwords; these were placed horizontally in the left-hand part of the bottom margin of the last page of the quire, but not in a fixed place; they are usually of the same size as the text letter. On fols. 54v (66 mm from the last ruled line: no decoration), 104v (42 mm from the last ruled line: no decoration), 120v (66 mm from the last ruled line, with decoration) entire catchwords have been preserved; parts of decorated catchwords have been preserved on fols. 72v (74 mm from the last ruled line) and 96v (66 mm from the last ruled line), while on fol. 23v only traces of the decoration of the original catchwords have been preserved. The decoration is minimal, consisting of small dashes above the letters only.

The book was pricked in both inner and outer and upper and lower margins of the folded quire, starting from the beginning of the quire. The pricks are wedge-shaped. Usually there are single pricks in the upper and lower margins for vertical ruling lines, but these have been cut away in quite a few instances, and 27 pricks in the inner and outer margins for horizontal ruling lines, those in the outer margins being cut away quite often. The text is written hanging from the ruled line, without any space between the line and the letter, and within the last ruling line, resulting in 26 lines of text. There is a regular distance of 12-13 mm between the ruling lines. The lines have been drawn on both recto and verso using a lead pencil. At times the scribe draws the first, second and/or third and the ultimate, penultimate and/or ante-penultimate horizontal ruling line somewhat longer. This calls to mind an Ashkenazic practice, described in more detail by Malachi Beit-Arie, in which, however, double pricks were used for those so-called through-lines.27 Those double pricks were never used by the scribe of the Eslingen Mahzor; furthermore the scribe is inconsistent in his ruling of these elongated ruling lines. In general, the findings concerning pricking and ruling illustrate the shift of techniques encountered in Ashkenazic manuscripts after the introduction of parchment prepared in such a way as to make a distinction between hair and flesh side practically impossible.28

The scribe has been inventive in creating original layouts. Especially in his copying of the piyutim a wealth of often decorated large display scripts, acrostics and multi-column layouts may be found, together with a skilled use of the blank spaces on the page. It is beyond the limits of this description to discuss the structures of all layouts separately, presupposing that such a thing would be possible in light of the fact that the margins of the manuscript have been cropped considerably. It is sufficient to mention the fact that the scribe added additional vertical ruling lines in his more creative layouts, according to his needs.

Throughout the manuscript the scribe wrote in Ashkenazic square script, in various heights, with the sole exception of a number of liturgical instructions, for which he used an Ashkenazic semi-cursive. He made regular use of the alef-lamed ligature.

The scribe often decorated individual letters of large initial words: red and black circles; fol. 42v: red circles; fol. 13v: black circles; fols. 2v, 3v, 35r, 16v, 17r, 18v, 19r, 21v, 22v, 23v, 24v, 25v, 26r, 27v, 29v, 36v, 40v, 41v, 42v, 43v, 45v, 46v, 47v, 48v, 59v (modified) 60v, 61v, 63v (later), 64v, 66v, 68v, 74v, 76v, 88v, 93v, 94v, 95v. For more elaborate forms of decoration of individual letters, see 'Decoration.'

Although the scribe apparently did not consider an even left-hand margin of utmost importance, most of the common devices for maintaining that even margin were used. To fill the line he elongated letters toward the end of the line, apparently with a preference for letters with clear horizontal strokes. At times he simply elongated such a horizontal line, and not the whole letter. He further used graphic symbols to fill the line, all variants of a well-known archetypic. At times he left an open space before the last word of the line or before the graphic filler. Further he often wrote the beginning of the next word up to the marginal line, only to repeat it in full on the following line. These anticipated letters are usually marked with a simple dash above them, and at times also with a small dash inside, to indicate that they should not be read. Of the so-called 'broken letters', which often appear in Ashkenazic manuscripts as last letters of an anticipated word, shin (fol. 121v, 13128, for example) and alef (fol. 118v, 13, 18, for example) are encountered in the Mahzor; the shape of the letter mem also differs from the usual, but not decisively enough to call it a 'broken mem'.

To prevent the margin from being exceeded the scribe usually compressed the last words or letters in a line of text. He also very often abbreviated the last word in a line, with a dash put above the abbreviated word. It should be noted, however, that he frequently allowed himself to protrude into the left-hand margin, horizontally without extra space, usually by a single letter, but at times by more than one and even by a whole word (fol. 121v, 11, 18, for example).

Scribal practices and graphic symbols are shown in a composition photograph (III. 10: 900). Photographs are not shown at full size.29

**Script**

a. A **mem** with an elongated horizontal line to fill the line.

b. A typical graphic filler.

c. Broken shin at the end of a line.

d. Broken alef at the end of a line.

e. Liturgical instructions in Ashkenazic semi-cursive script.

**Punctuation**

a. Short interval.

b. Long interval, indication of rhyme, hemistichs/stanzas and/or end of paragraph.

c. *Idem* (less common).

d. End of section (usually not indicated).

**Special words and phrases**

- kp. *pi* is uncommon.
- q.t. Acrostics (also alphabetical).

**Other**

a. **Stress**

b. **v.w.** Abbreviations.

c. Different forms of the tetragram.

d. Insertion of words.

---


28 Beit-Arie, Hebrew Codicology, esp. p. 25.

29 The composition photograph was taken from COHEN, 'Eslingen Mahzor', p. 66-67; photographs were taken both from the present manuscript and from the first volume, preserved in The Library of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York. Composition of a new photograph was considered unnecessary, as it would not be more instructive than the present one.
program was restricted to designs executed in red or black ink, and was limited generally to floral and dragon-like motifs.

- Fol. 1v: The initial word יָשָׁ֑נָה is embellished with rosettes. This is the only decoration that may be interpreted as an actual text illustration. Although the rosette motif occurs frequently throughout the manuscript in a merely ornamental manner, its inclusion at this point is deliberate, as the text refers to a flower. Floral motifs adorn this initial word in many manuscripts; they are found for example in panels decorating סַּנְּהָּ in the Worms Mahzor II, fol. 119v, and later in the Mahzor in the New York Public Library (Jewish Division, **P, fol. 420v), and without a frame in the Leipzig Mahzor (Leipzig, Karl-Marx Universitätbibliothek, Ms. V. 1102/I-11; II, fol. 129v), and the Hambourg Mahzor (Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, Cod. Or. 13, fol. 261r). In a contemporary Mahzor in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest (A 388II, fol. 113r) there are flowers with stems and little leaves on either side of the initial word. Especially noteworthy is the סַנְּהָּ in the Worcev volume of the Double Mahzor (fol. 148v) which is very similar to that in the Eslingen Mahzor, but of a more elaborate nature. Rosettes even appear in minimally decorated manuscripts, such as the Bamberg Mahzor (New York, JTSI, Mich. 4843) fol. 43r, where they are placed in the corners of the page to illustrate the pait יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל.

- Fols. 12v, 13r: Dragon-like forms, which adorn the ascenders but were cut off in part at a later date when the manuscript was rebound. These forms are perhaps the most striking ornamental elements in the Mahzor and are especially frequent in the New York volume.

- Fol. 42v: Alph-lamed ligatures, decorated with winged dragon-headed motifs from whose mouths other dragon-headed figures emerge and spread into the space between the words and up into the top border. These zoomorphic forms, and those in the New York volume, are strikingly similar to, although not identical with, those found in the Double Mahzor.

Most of the remaining ornamentation embellishes the letters themselves. They are: red and black rosettes: fols. 1v, 12v, 13v, 14r, 40v, 60r; black rosettes: fols. 74v, 85v, 96v, 101r, 102r, 104r, 105r, 111r, 116v, 117v, 118r, 120r; red lobes: fols. 6v, 7v, 8v, 9v, 11rv, 12v, 55v, 56v, 57r, 61r; red and black lobes: fols. 55v, 56v, 57r, 61r; black lobes: fols. 75v, 76v, 77v, 83v, 87v, 88v, 92v, 94sv, 98r, 101r.

- There are some areas of decorative pen flourishes executed in red and/or black ink. They are either feather-like in shape: fols. 1v, 2rv and 3v; or symmetrical foliate forms: fols. 7v, 42v, 43v; or angled foliate forms: fol. 78v.

- On fol. 6v the scribe has decorated the repeated word יָשָׁ֑נָה with triangular forms, built up of lozenges and executed in black ink. The uppermost was filled in with red foliate forms.

30 See Cohn, 'Eslingen Mahzor', p. 70-72.
31 Apparently the edges of fols. 116-127 have not been trimmed, as they are rather soiled.
32 All major repertories in the collections of the Amsterdam University Library and the Royal Library in The Hague have been checked, together with unpublished sources, held in the Royal Library. Thanks are due to H. Porck of the Royal Library for his information. It should be noted, by the way, that Brombach's assumption that the watermark derived from the Amsterdam Van der Ley company is unreliable. It is based on a mere similarity between the watermarks in the fly-leaves and those found in some of this firm's papers. Watermarks can, however, only serve as a means of identification in case of a full correspondence between certain marks. Besides, the monogram makes her assumption impossible; Brombach, 'Eslingen Mahzor', p. 107, n. 5.
33 The binding of the first part of the Mahzor, kept in The Library of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York (see 'Evaluation') was in even poorer condition. It therefore was restored and rebound recently.
34 The greater part of the description of the decoration was done by Evelyn M. Cohen (New York), as part of our joint article on the Eslingen Mahzor. Some alterations and the different presentation here are entirely my own responsibility; see: Cohen, 'Eslingen Mahzor', p. 73-81.
CHAPTER 5

The following later additions occur:
1. Fol. 16r: A stag, similar to the one on fol. 63r of the New York first volume, drawn in brown ink at the bottom of the page.
2. Fol. 127v: A labyrinth, formed by twelve concentric circles, with one axis and three half-axes, and with a diameter of 238 mm.

The labyrinth in the Eisingen Mahzor is of the so-called 'Chartres-type', named after Chartres cathedral: twelve circles, and an 'axis' with three 'half-axes'. This is the classical church-labyrinth found in the floors of many Northern-European churches. The precise meaning of these church-labyrinths is uncertain. Certain traditions consider the labyrinth to be a symbolic image of the earthly world and its many possible digressions. Other traditions, however, surmise that the maze might symbolize the way out of the labyrinth of earthly life that the Christian belief claimed to offer. One of the most likely explanations is that our church-labyrinths were designed in medieval Christian manuscripts, especially in so-called 'Compassus-manuscripts'. These manuscripts contain tables with that helped determine the exact date for the Easter festival and the festivals having dates related to Easter; the maze became a symbol of this astronomical computation of the festival. The fact that these manuscripts often contain labyrinths may prove that the makers considered the labyrinth to be a symbol of the hope for resurrection. The maker of the maze in the Eisingen Mahzor apparently based it on either a church- or a compassus-labyrinth: its exact meaning, however, if in fact one was intended, remains uncertain. The design may have been, but is not necessarily, part of the original decorative program. No other Hebrew manuscripts containing labyrinths seem to be related in any manner to that described here.

Text

For the sake of brevity the following list of piyutim includes references to Goldschmidt's critical editions of the Ashkenazi Mahzor only. References to Davidson's Thesaurus may be found there. Reference to Davidson is made here only in cases in which a certain

37 An impressive work on the history of labyrinths is: KERN, Labyrinthe, esp. Ch. viii: Labyrinthe in Handschriften (p. 139-205). Particularly important with regard to the occurrence of labyrinths in medieval manuscripts is BASCHELEIT-MASSINI, 'Labyrinthezeichnungen,' in BASCHELEIT-MASSINI, Labyrinthezeichnungen (p. 59).
38 BASCHELEIT-MASSINI, 'Labyrinthzeichnungen,' p. 60.
39 It should be noted that the very occurrence of a labyrinth in a medieval Jewish manuscript is not unprecedented. These labyrinths, however, are all so-called Jericho-labyrinths, with only seven circles, representing Jericho's seven walls, and with one axis. A possible connection between the labyrinth in the Eisingen Mahzor and the Jericho-labyrinths is therefore rather unlikely. For a discussion of five such Jericho-labyrinths in Jewish manuscripts see: KERN, Labyrinthe, p. 182-198, esp. ill. 221, 222-
226; also see: SCHULLER, 'Labyrinthe.'
40 There is yet another possible connection with the so-called 'labyrinth' that King Solomon built: in certain Latin medieval manuscripts a maze similar to the one in the Eisingen Mahzor is believed to have been conceived by King Solomon, but the exact background and meaning of this belief are unclear; for a discussion see: BASCHELEIT-MASSINI, 'Labyrinthzeichnungen,' p. 34-43 and KERN, Labyrinthe, p. 178-181. It is noteworthy that none of the labyrinths in Kern's encyclopedic work and in Bascheleit-Massini's article is identical with the one in the Mahzor.
41 See: GOLDSCHEIDT, יָּדֵּשׁ הַלְּעֹּר וּרְאֵשָׁה and GOLDSCHEIDT, יְשֵׁשָׁה וּרְאֵשָׁה.
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CHAPTER 5

History of the manuscript

- Fol. 127r: Scribe's colophon: 43
  "I am a student of the house of Yosef Zuriel. May it be for the good of the house of Yosef, as it is written in the Torah. In the year 5699, the 14th day of Nisan, the 1st of the month, I, Yosef, have completed this manuscript. May it be for the good of the house of Yosef, as it is written in the Torah."
  "[...] Amen, so that the word is written in the Torah."

- Fol. 127r: A deed of sale, written in an old Ashkenazi cursive hand: 44
  "An agreement between..." (text continues in Hebrew)

There are many later additions:

- Fol. 79v: A list of names.
- Fol. 127r: Right below the colophon, on the lefthand side, two lines written in a variant of the so-called 'Freemasons' cipher. 47 This cryptographic alphabet makes use of a sort of noughts and crosses diagram, in which according to a system of monalphabetic substitution, every letter has its own graphic representation (the photograph is at full size). 48

---

43 The original text has been vocalized. For technical reasons this vocalization is not given here. The colophon is discussed at length in SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 187-189, while a photograph occurs on p. 186; also see MALACHI BEIT-ARIEL's substantial corrections and additions to this discussion: BEIT-ARIEL, 'Ashkenazi Mitzvot'.

44 For an explanation of the reading of the vocalizer's name as 'Yosef', see: SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 188, n. 6.

45 SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 190-192; some transcription errors have been corrected here.

46 In 1987 I transcribed this word as 'Avraham', which led to a rather awkward translation: SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 190-191. After a correspondence I had on the exact meaning of the words 'Yosef Zuriel', she asked the expert opinion of Binyamin Richter of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in Jerusalem, who, on the basis of a photostat, established the unambiguously correct reading presented here. I am very grateful to Ya'el Zuriel and Binyamin Richter for their efforts in this respect.

47 SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 192-193, where Moses ben Naftali Heret is identified. A bulk of information on cryptography can be found in: RASN, Codexbrekers, where the Freemasons' cipher is discussed on p. 772; further see: CRYPTOLOGY; VISIT, Traité d'CRYPTOGRAPHIE, 80-84; Lange, De la Cryptographie, p. 21-22; Lange, Traité de Cryptographie, p. 60-61; Smith, Cryptography, p. 18-19; WALT, Sewer writing, p. 49.

48 A similar cipher is described in: ROTHS, 'Hebräische Handschriften', No. 42, p. 62-63, describing Ms. hebr. 42 of the Staatliche und Universitätsbibliothek in Frankfurt am Main, a work on the book of Job, reportedly in a 'Spanische Masurgeschritt (semi-cursive) des 17. Jh.'.

---

After cryptanalyzing the inscription the following Hebrew plaintext can be read:

משה בן אברם רבי מאיר ז'רניאל יֵזֶרֶנְיָל וּמְקוֹם כְּדוּשׁ מֵאָד


- Fol. 127r: [Ms] [Ms] | this Azi el also wrote his name on fol. 79v. The inscriptions should, on the basis of the script, be dated sometime in the eighteenth or nineteenth century.

- Fol. 127r: A more substantive, and more important, Hebrew inscription, in an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century Ashkenazi cursive hand, which might be identical with the one of the two previous descriptions 50, was written next to the abbreviation be-gematriya in

---

49 SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 195-196. 'Ma' cannot be explained and is probably a writing error; the word 'yu' has been struck out: 'chezef dan' = ["jul dan"].

50 In 1987 I proposed another (too early) dating: SCHOCH, 'Colophon Page', p. 196.
the last line of the colophon. It reads: מֹמֵק מִדֵּין הַתּוֹלֶדֶת וַעֲשֵׂי בְּרִי יִבְּשֵׂשׁ וְלֹא מִדְנָשׁ וּלְאֵ֫יֵּהוּלָהוּ שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה. 51

51 See Cohen, ‘Eislingen Mahzor’, p. 69, ill. 5 (see col. 14), where the two hands are shown.

52 Ibid., ‘Eislingen Mahzor’, p. 45: ‘The text of the original Mahzor, as well as its later alterations, particularly those achieved by elaborated erasing, cutting, covering, pasting and rewriting by two different hands which seem to date not much later than the original copy and which endeavored to imitate the graphic practices of the original scribal-drawer research’.

53 See: Lifschitz, ‘Prayer and Piyut’, p. 36: ‘The mahzorim, which contain the holiday prayers constitute a different type. These are designed to complement the siddurim, and generally contain only what is added to the regular prayers on the holidays, primarily the piyyutim. Codices of this type are often divided into two parts: one contains the liturgical material for the winter season, including the High Holy Days and Sukkot, while the other is for use in the summer period, reaching from Pashuk Shemini until after the Ninth of Av.’

54 And not 01720, as written on the last page of the manuscript. The two volumes were described together in: Cohen, ‘Eislingen Mahzor’, an article that celebrated the reunification of the two volumes; the ‘Evaluation’ especially relies heavily on the conclusion of this article.

55 See: Rabin, Mahzor enclavista, p. 15-16, 67-68.

56 See: Rabin, Mahzor enclavista, p. 51, n. 10.

57 Cohen, ‘Eislingen Mahzor’, p. 57-60; in fact, the related Wroclaw part of the Double Mahzor begins with the text found on fol. 1v of the New York volume: בשן ושם הילאיה.

published in 1987, the exact wording of the deed is somewhat problematic and its translation is therefore not undisputed. 58 Pursuing the concept of the existence of a full Mahzor the words: יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמְזוֹנָה חַיָּה́ שֶם מַעֲשֵׂי עֲשֵׂי בְּרִי יִבְּשֵׂשְׁשָׂהוּ שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֵׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁنֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה שֶׁנֶּאֶשְׁמָרְנָה Sh"einer, ‘Colophon Page’, p. 190-192.

P. 117-137: blank
P. 138: blank
P. 139-141: prayers for the night following the Sabbath
P. 142: blank
P. 143-178: blank
P. 179-180: blank
P. 181-196: blank
P. 197-202: blank
P. 203-211: blank
P. 211-222: additional hymns and havdalah
P. 223-228: blank
P. 229: blank
P. 230: blank
P. 231-234: blank
P. 235-247: blank
P. 248-262: blank
P. 263-281: blank
P. 282-291: additional piyyutim, apparently by Moroccan poets
P. 292-294: blank
P. 295-296: prayer for the repose of the dead
P. 297-299: list of deceased men
P. 300: list of deceased women
P. 301-302: blank
P. 303-309: Grace after meals
P. 310: blank
P. 311-313: table of contents
P. 314: blank

Codicology
• There are various erroneous old paginations, besides a modern pagination that is not completely correct either p. 1-3 5-7 107-114 114-15 159-159 159-159-151.
• Machine-made paper, partly pre-ruled (printed).
• Darkbrown ink throughout.
• 206 x 129 mm. Usually 24 lines per page.
• As numerous pages were cut out and pasted in, a collation formula, which in this particular case is of no descriptive importance anyhow, is not provided.
• Most pages have single catchwords on the lefthand side of the page in the bottom margin.
• Those pages that do not have a pre-printed ruling were ruled neatly in pencil with both horizontal and two vertical boundary lines.
• Extremely naive Sephardic square script, due to the fact that the copyist copied the book lefthandedly. Occasionally a rather skilled Sephardic cursive hand occurs.
• All texts have a full infra-linear vocalization. The former owner Alfonso Cassuto wrote on the verso of the front flyleaf: 'Die Vokalisierung ist ertüchtlich fehlerhaft.' That is true.

61 The Shabbat for the sabbath is apparently missing.
CHAPTER 5

• Bound in contemporary linen over cardboard, heavily scuffed. There is one marbled flyleaf which makes up a bifolium with the pastedown, at both ends. On the front cover is a label with the following inscription:

Decoration

Throughout the manuscript paper cutouts of all sorts (gold-embossed floral designs, colored floral designs, dozens of drawn hands on loose pieces of paper) were pasted in. Together with the peculiar script they give the manuscript its special naïve attractiveness.

Text

Most of the prayers, the orthography of which is incredibly erroneous, are well-known constituents of the Sephardic (i.e. North African) ritual. Some of the copyist’s personal additions, however, like a personal note in the benediction on physical health on p. 100, deserve special attention.

History of the manuscript

• Olime Cassuto 1360; from a note on the verso of the front flyleaf it is learnt that Alfonso Cassuto bought the manuscript from a Lisbon bookseller.

Evaluation

In The Sephardic Journey Shalom Sabar wrote: 'Large numbers of Moroccan Sephardim settled in Portugal and its islands in the late 19th century. Names of important Moroccan rabbinic scholars appear in this manuscript. In the colophon, the scribe explains that he wrote this manuscript with his left hand because he was ill; apparently his right side was paralyzed. The use of pasted cutouts as decoration was common in many Sephardic communities, particularly in Turkey.' To this information may be added that there are four manuscripts by the same copyist in the Gross Family Collection in Tel Aviv, Israel. Only one of these has the same touching left-hand script found here. On the basis of the colophon of this manuscript the others may therefore be assumed to have been written before the year 1872, as the copyist mentions the fact that he fell ill three years earlier. Another of the Gross manuscripts consists mainly of printed fragments, with some substantial manuscript additions.

Bibliography

SCHREIBER, 'Inventory', p. 170, No. 26; Sephardic Journey, p. 341, No. 577.

Photograph

• P. 19

A SPECIMEN OF A SUPPLEMENTARY CATALOGUE
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Hs. Ros. 658

יאיר ישראエルמשך פן יאני

Yiddish story on the double standards of morals among eighteenth-century Amsterdam Jews.

Amsterdam, [S]506 / 1746.

28 fols.

Contents

Fol. 1r: blank
Fol. 1v: engraving
Fol. 2r: engraving
Fol. 2v: title:

אינון | ישראエルמשך פן יאני | יואל ראו לוטון צערר | מהלולה ראו תכשיר | citt למלט המלך נורש
וא䰀יו | ישראエルמשך פן יאני | יואל ראו לוטון צערר | מהלולה ראו תכשיר | citt למלט המלך נורש
וא | ישראエルמשך פן יאני | יואל ראו לוטון צערר | מהלולה ראו תכשיר | citt למלט המלך נורש

Fol. 3r-27v: text
Fol. 28r: blank with added engraving on verso.

Codicology

• 28 fols. There is an original foliation using either Hebrew lettering, or Arabic or Roman numerals, which disagrees inserted engravings. The book was re-foliated in pencil recently; this foliation is used here.

• Somewhat soiled paper, frayed edges.

• Brown ink throughout.

• 198 x 154 mm.62

• Ashkenazic square and cursive scripts.

• Bound in contemporary brown leather, rather scuffed, loose hinges, poorly preserved, with paper pastedowns at both ends.

Decoration

The text is full of engravings taken from different sources, illustrating different moments in the story. Often these engravings have been colored and/or have been embellished with additional decorative elements, which are pasted onto the engravings, such as little flying birds. They occur on fols. 1v, 2r, 3r, 4r, 5v, 6v, 7v, 8rv, 9v, 10rv, 11r, 18v, 19rv, 20r, 21r, 22v, 24r, 25v, 26v and 27rv.

Text

The story, written in a rather cynical style, recounts how a certain Abraham ben Rafael Wing managed to unmask the thief Moshe Chosid, by giving him the opportunity to steal

62 As a result of cutting and pasting it was practically impossible, and typologically irrelevant, to establish the original quire structure.
a book and seeing what would happen. In spite of his denying this crime, as well as several earlier crimes, Moshe Choisd was found guilty and had to leave the city of Amsterdam. Only after a wandering unhappy life did he return secretly to his native town.

History of the manuscript
- Donated by Dr. L. Fuks, who apparently found the manuscript shortly after the war.
- Olím: Fuks, Ms. 6.

Evaluation
As L. Fuks already stressed in his two articles on this attractive manuscript, the anonymous author’s main interest seems to lie in criticizing the so-called piety of those who considered themselves to be the religious establishment.

Bibliography
FUKS, יד הנсим ואין ישן; FUKS, 'Spain nie majel'; SCHRIEVER, 'Inventory', p. 171, No. 29

Photographs
- Fol. 2v (66 %)
- Fol. 3r
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Hs. Ros. 660
[‘Az der sof iz gut iz alles gut.’]
Purim-shpil, the unmasking of swindlers.
[Amsterdam, late 18th century].
17 fols.

Contents
Fols. 1r-17v: text

Codicology
- 17 fols. Modern pencil foliation.
- Greyish paper, spotted and xerographed.
- Brown ink in different shades.
- 4; 196 x 153 mm.
- The book is bound too tightly to establish the quire structure.
- Ashkenasian cursive script (one hand).
- Modern quarter-parchment binding, with one paper pastedown and three paper flyleaves at both ends.

Text
In 1992 Hetty Berg wrote: 'In terms of subject matter, form and structure this play is related closely to seventeenth-century Western European comedies. The theme of deceit being brought to light was very popular in the comedies and often rather rude farces of those days. The comedy is full of figures who earn a living by swindling. At the end of the comedy the swindle is brought to light and all promise to better their lives. In this drama, just as in Western European comedies and farces, the language of the figures is used to achieve a comic effect. The play is subdivided into three acts (‘אברך’) and 12 scenes (‘סיפורים’). Apparently the beginning and end of the text are missing.

History of the manuscript
- Two versions of the saving of the manuscript exist. In 1951 L. Fuks wrote about ‘a bag of damaged Hebrew books, ready to be buried at the Muiderberg cemetery’ (p. 6), while in 1992 Rena Fuks-Mansfield described ‘a box with books that were entrusted to someone else’s keeping, shortly before the Jewish owner was sent to the concentration camps’ (p. 91).
- Olím: L. Fuks, Ms. 32.

Evaluation
This manuscript, published in a modernized version by L. Fuks in 1955, has received much scholarly attention. Recently both Hetty Berg and Rena Fuks-Mansfield have dealt with it, both underlining the fact that, although, as can be learnt from the manuscript, it was performed undoubtedly at the house of the Amsterdam chief-rabbi (since 1793) Jacob Moses Loewenstamm during the Purim festival – according to Rena Fuks most probably during the Purim of 1794, one year before the French invaded the Republic – it is not a classical Purim-shpil, as it does not deal with the Esther story or any other Biblical story. Rena Fuks-Mansfield’s article also provides interesting examples of the anonymous author’s skilled use of different Yiddish dialects.

Bibliography

Photograph
- Fol. 1r

14

Hs. Ros. 661
ירדש תקוני ובש תושך
although Moses is represented here in a typically Christian manner, with horns, and instead of the Hebrew opening words of the Ten Commandments, there are ten Roman numerals.

- Fol. 1v: family at the Sabbath table.
- Fol. 2v: family at the Sabbath table.
- Fol. 4r: havelalah scene. There is no doubt that the three text illustrations are derived from illustrated Haggadah booklets.
- Fol. 2r and 4r: decorated opening words, executed in copper varnish, inside a baroque shield held by angels.

**Text**

Isaac Luria’s Tiqune Shabat consists of traditional and newly composed piyutim, Biblical sections (such as the Song of Songs) and traditional and newly composed prayers. The texts are full of acrostics, indicating the names of the patriarchs and of Isaac Luria, and the secret divine names. In Eastern Europe this mystically inspired, originally Sephardic prayerbook eventually substituted the Ashkenazic ritual completely. It has to be assumed that a printed version of the Tiqune shabat, which could not be identified, served as model for Jacob Leib. As is usually the case with decorated eighteenth-century manuscripts, the text does not seem to be of any special text-critical interest.

**History of the manuscript**

- The manuscript was bought by the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana in 1977.

**Evaluation**

Jacob ben Judah Leib Shamas was an important representative of the group of eighteenth-century artists who produced decorated manuscripts with Amsterdam letters. He was active between 1718 and 1741. He was most probably born around the year 1700 and married around 1720. From 1730 onward he served not only as scribe of the Hamburg community, but also of the closely related community of Altona. He died between 1741 and 1744. Both in his artistic style and his calligraphic abilities Jacob Leib developed in the course of his career; his later calligraphic work especially is among the best produced during the eighteenth century.65

**Bibliography**


**Photographs**

- Fol. 1r
- Fol. 47v

---

64 See: LEIBERMAN, '-payyim ve-yiyyun,' pp.
65 SCHRIEVER, Judeische Buchkunst 2, p. 117-119.
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Hs. Ros. 662

Text
- The Seder Abot Qastal66 is a hymn for Rosh Hashanah, composed by the thirteenth-century Southern-French poet Abraham Hazan Gerondi. It is especially popular in the Sephardic ritual and is sung before the evening prayer on Rosh Hashanah.
- The Hashanot hymns are sung while walking around the bimah seven times during Hashanot Rabah, at the end of the Musaf service.
- The anonymous hymn Sixa wqathle67, itself the opening of the piyut Ahale Elohay weemehah be68, is sung after the evening prayer during Simhat Torah.
- The Seder hatarat nedarim is said directly before the final meal before the fast of Yom Kippur.

History of the manuscript
- The manuscript was bought by the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana in 1976.

Evaluation
This is a typical private prayerbook of a religious individual. Its main importance may be that it can give some insight into everyday religious life in Algeria in the second half of the nineteenth century. It has to be admitted, however, that manuscripts like these are not particularly rare.

Bibliography
SCHREINER, 'Inventory', p. 171, No. 35.

Photographs
- Fol. 1r
- Fol. 1r
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Hs. Ros. 674

קִסֵּם הַגָּדוֹל

30 lamentations, on the death of Tsar Alexander I (1777-1825), collected on 1 December 1825 by Moses Laski of Leczyca.
Copied by Issachar Moses Schwartz. Zgiez (Central Poland), 1875.
18 fols.

Contents
Fol. 1r: titlepage:

Decoration
- Fol. 1r: Architectural titlepage, naively executed in green, red, blue and yellow watercolors.

66 DAVIDSON, The chain, p. 2451.
67 DAVIDSON, The chain, p. 11281.
68 DAVIDSON, The chain, p. 1453.
History of the manuscript
• Issachar Moses Schwarz copied the manuscript for his own use: on the front cover he wrote: ספר ישע | חלבי ושך | פ"ד ור' תקצ י"ש | משט תשלוט appended: ינויי ישע | ספר ישע | חלבי ושך | פ"ד ור' תקצ י"ש. He further inscribed his name on the front cover and on the titlepage in different cursive styles and is probably also responsible for some other scribbles occurring in the manuscript. On fol. 4v he began to write the first two verses of a poem that is not found in the present text, but happens to begin with the same words as the poem on fol. 5r: ישע | ישע | ישע | ישע.70
• The manuscript was bought in Portugal by the former owner, Alfonso Cassuto, from Issachar Schwarz’s son, Samuel Schwarz, discoverer in 1917 of the so-called ‘twentieth-century Marranos’ of Belmonte.70

Olive Castulo 1619.

Evaluation
Issachar copied the poems in Zgierza, Central Poland, but his strange nickname ‘Black Sea’ may be an indication of his origin. It is noteworthy in this respect that Moses Laski is said (on fol. 10) to have written his poetry in Taganrog, near the Black Sea, while he is called ‘of Lezycza’, which is also in Central Poland. This geographical relationship between the poet and the copyist of this manuscript might offer a tentative explanation for the fact that no printed editions seem to exist; perhaps Issachar could simply copied from another manuscript version.

Bibliography

Photographs
• Fol. 1r
• Fol. 18r
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Hs. Ros. 680

Collection of prayers and benedictions.

Contents
Fol. 1r: titlepage:

A SPECIMEN OF A SUPPLEMENTARY CATALOGUE

CHAPTER 5

Fols. 2r: 18 laments

Fols. 3r-18r: 30 laments

Fols. 18r: colophon:

All texts were written on recto pages only

Codicology
• 18 fols. Original foliation in black ink partly trimmed; contemporary foliation in brown ink in the left-hand upper corner of the rectos.
• Rather thick, machine-made brownish paper, some water-stains, frayed corners and edges, trimmed.
• Black ink throughout for the text; the vocalization up as fol. 14, l. 13-14 is in the same ink; from there on the same brown ink as used for the foliation is found.
• (169-172) x (169-175) mm. Varying disposition, usually 14 lines of text per page.
• 118, 22.
• Blind ruling, no signs of prickling. Horizontal ruling lines at a distance of 10-13 mm according to the scribe’s needs; two vertical ruling lines at a distance of 19-24 mm for the right-hand margin and the indented third and sixth stichs of the poems.
• All poems consist of 6 stichs. Although some attention has been paid to the layout of the pages (for example the aforementioned indented third and sixth stichs) the general impression remains somewhat disordered.
• Neat Ashkenazic square script in different heights, with vocalization. Some letters have asign (no system discernible).
• In order to visualize the rhyme, the scribe tried to copy rhyming stichs at equal lengths. To achieve this he occasionally compressed his writing or elongated certain letters of the last word(s) in a stich.
• Full intra-line vocalization; additional use of amah to indicate pausal forms.
• Bound in a contemporary (original?) lilac paper cover, soiled and brittle.

Text
In spite of the fact that especially at the end of his reign Tsar Nicholas, who ruled from 1801 until his death in 1825, acted rather unfavorably toward the Jews, the traditional loyal Jewish attitude toward the sovereign is clearly demonstrated in this manuscript. A printed edition of the poems of Moses ben Meir Laski presented in this manuscript could not be identified. Laski, known as the author of a few other poetic works (ישע ישע, Warsaw 1825; דוד ישע, Warsaw 1833; ערא ישע, Warsaw 1840 and Lvov 1860?), wrote his laments in the year 1825 in Taganrog, on the Sea of Azov (connected with the Black Sea). As already indicated the poems consist of six stichs each, with a rather simple rhyming scheme: aabcc. They constitute an ongoing ‘conversation’ between a mourner, the community, the king, and are, from a literary point of view, rather stereotyped.

69 ROBERT, Catalog. p. 661, FRISERING, Besamim, 32, 591 and w 750.

94