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I

Codex Neofiti I (= N) of the Vatican Library sprang into the full light of serious academic interest in 1957 when Professor A. Diez Macho of Barcelona announced his discovery of its identity as a copy of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch.¹ The present study is concerned with the palaeographical character of the Codex. A brief summary of what can be established concerning the previous history of MS N is necessary here.²

The manuscript belongs to the Neofiti Collection which is found today in the Vatican Library. The name Neofiti derives ultimately from an institute at Rome. The latter owed its beginning to the zeal of Ignatius Loyola and the energy of Paul III. This Pope in his Bull Cupientes (21st March, 1542) had drawn up a series of instructions to govern the treatment of Neophytes.³ Shortly after this, at the suggestion of Ignatius, the parish priest of S. Giovanni di Mercato⁴, a man called Don Giovanni di Torano made a petition to Paul III: he asked that he be allowed to erect “unum monasterium pro puellis⁵ et unum Hospitale pro viris Judaeis”⁶. By his Bull Illius Qui (19th February, 1543), Paul III granted the necessary permission. In spite of different appellations applied to the institute at this stage of its career⁷, the official name was “Hospitale”. The Bull provided for the establishment of a community, and Don

---

² My thanks are due to the authorities of the Vatican Library for the facilities afforded me during my examination of Neofiti I.
⁴ Or Mercatello, as some documents called it. The Bull of 1543 calls it: Parochialis Ecclesiae S. Joannes de Mercato Regionis Campuselli de Urbe. It was situated at the foot of the Capitol in the Piazza d’Aracoeli.
⁵ Known in documents as Casa di Putti. Cf. Vat. no. 6792, I, p. 95a.
⁷ E.g. Antonio Possevino speaks of it as Seminarium Catechumenorum in his Bibliotheca Selecta, (Cologne 1605), ch. VI.
Giovanni di Torano was appointed Rector for his own life's span; after his death, the Bull further provided, the priests and clerics themselves of the community would regularly choose one from among their own number to be Praepositus and to govern for three years at a time.8 Cardinal Marcello Crescenzi was the first Cardinal-Protector of the Hospitale.9 Don Giovanni di Torano was definitively set aside in 1553 and sent into perpetual exile.10 By his Bull Vices Elus (1st September, 1577), Gregory XIII remodelled the nature of the Hospitale, conferring on it a new name: Collegium Ecclesiasticum Adolescentium Neophytorum.11 Henceforth it would house not only Jewish and Mahomedan converts, but members from the dissident oriental Churches. In 1580, the Collegium was transferred to its present site beside the Church of Madonna dei Monti.12 It was suppressed in 1798, but started its activity once more in the 19th century.13 Today, the official name of the house is Ospizio Pontificio dei Catechumeni e Neofiti.14

From the earliest foundation at S. Giovanni di Mercato, a library was provided. We know from a letter of Cardinal Amulio, Vatican Librarian in his time, that the latter asked that the transfer of Hebrew manuscripts and fragments be effected through a certain Giovanni Paolo Eustachio.15 Yet it was certainly during the second phase of its existence as the Collegium Ecclesiasticum that the library obtained the vast bulk of its Hebrew manuscripts. Bartolocci, his pupil Imbonatus, and many others visited it and consulted its contents. We do not know much else about the Hebrew MSS of the Neofiti library at this stage. In 1891, 39 of them, together with two Christian Arabic library MSS and a

8 No members of Religious Orders and no prelates could belong to the community. Cf. K. Hoffmann, Ursprung und Anfängstätigkeit des ersten päpstlichen Missionsinstituts, Münster 1923, pp. 9–18, 180–192.
10 In 1552 he had been sentenced to life imprisonment after a year's litigation on various charges. Cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., pp. 33–37. At this time, the Institute had a new Cardinal-Protector, Innocenzo del Monte.
13 In 1847, the house itself was still closed, as testified by Moroni in his Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica, Veneci 1847, vol. XLVII, p. 275a, but the work of the house continued. It is impossible for the moment to consult the archives preserved today in the Ospizio.
14 Cf. Annuar. Rom., 1962, p. 1032. The official stamp of the Collegium in 1891 (the year in which the Hebrew MSS were transferred to the Vatican Library) calls it "Pia Domus Neophytorum", Cf. infra concerning this stamp and the older stamp on f. 3a of Neofiti I.
15 Cf. Vat. MS 6792 I, p. 183a. This was in 1572.
Roman Missal written in Dalmatian, were transferred to the Vatican Library where they now constitute the Neofiti Collection. It is very hard to determine the provenance of these 39 Hebrew MSS. The autographs of Dominic Gerosolimitano and Andrea Del Monte, both erstwhile teachers at the Collegium, are found amongst the Neofiti Collection. The former became a Christian in 1593 and remained in Rome until 1620 at least. Andrea Del Monte was converted in 1552, was maestro di casa at Madonna dei Monti and preacher in the city. It is therefore probable that these men gave their own manuscripts to the library. No. 39 in the Neofiti Collection has annotations and observations in the hand of Robert Bellarmin, who was at one stage Cardinal-Protector of the Collegium. This manuscript is possibly a gift of the Cardinal's. In addition, Imbonatus mentions this no. 39 in his Bibliotheca Latino-Hebraea of 1694.

However, we must guard against any presumption that the Neofiti Collection of Hebrew MSS has remained the same up to our day as it was in, say, the 17th century. Bartolucci mentions a commentary of Rabbi Aba on Genesis and Exodus as belonging to the Neofiti Collection. Yet none of the present-day MSS fit his description. This MS has therefore disappeared from the Collection. Doubtless, it underwent many changes, modifications and additions throughout the centuries.

II

Today, N is wonderfully preserved. The text is written on vellum folios bound together and cased in hard vellum covers. Due to the age of the binding, it is impossible to tell how many signatures were used by the binder. The outer edges of the folios were originally gilt; even today this gilt is clear and glossy at certain places. On the back we find written by a relatively modern hand in capi

17 Sometimes called Andrea di Monte. Domenico Gerosolimitano was constituted censor of Hebrew books in 1595 by the Bishop of Mantua.
18 Nos. 32–34 belong to Domenico Gerosolimitano. Nos. 37–38 belong to Andrea del Monte. The vexed question of no. 35 (cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 209, n. 57) has not yet been settled.
22 He describes it as "in 4. papyr."
23 Cf. infra, p. 8 concerning one series of numbers which may indicate the original amount of signatures.
the name of Monsignor Ludwig Schüller, Rector of the Ospizio at the time of the transfer of the Hebrew MSS to the Vatican. The inscription on f. 3a: Collegium Neophytorum. Rom, was most certainly made after 1577 (date of Gregory XIII's Bull). Yet, palaeographically, the hand is of the sixteenth century. We have, therefore, a provisional terminus a quo for the acquisition of N by the Collegium, the year 1577.

On the other hand, the reference to Bartolocci, which is written in a different and later hand from that of the Latin inscription on f. 3a just mentioned and is found on a paper folio after folio 447, provides us with another but not definitive indication. Bartolocci published his first volume in 1675. N was certainly in possession of the Neofiti Library sometime around this date. But I have searched in vain through Bartolocci’s four volumes and Imbonatus’ single volume for any reference to N. The most we find is a reference to the Library of the Collegium. Bernheimer gives a text of a censor’s note which mentions Neofiti but gives no reference to his source. Until new evidence comes to light, we shall have to be content with these general dates for the acquisition of N by the Collegium.

Before dealing with the colophon of N, it is necessary to describe briefly the pagination of the manuscript and one or two other details. At the beginning of the MS, two folio paper leaves were sewn with the vellum folios, the recto of the first leaf being glued to the inside of the hard cover. Neither the verso of the first paper folio nor the recto nor verso of the second attached paper folio has any inscription, sign or marking. At the end of the MS, the situation is somewhat different. We find that two paper leaves have been sewn in similar fashion on to the vellum folios; the first folio (recto and verso) and the recto of the second folio in paper have no sign or mark; the verso of the second folio has been glued to the hard cover.

The interesting element here is that a third paper folio has been glued on the verso of the last vellum folio — along the inner edge of the verso. This paper folio has two important characteristics: it is older, as paper, than that of the

24 F. 2a: “Ludovicus Cancus Schuller Rector”, together with the stamp of the Collegium.
25 The Enc. Catt. Ital., sub voce, gives 1675–83 as the dates. This is incorrect. According to the title pages of Bartolocci’s volumes and of the 5th one edited by his pupil Imbonatus the dates are for all five: 1675, 1678, 1683, 1693, 1694, respectively.
26 Cf. infra, p. 5 when discussing the inscription at the end of N. From his remarks cited in this part, it is clear that Bartolocci never saw N; or if he saw it that he did not realize its nature.
28 Thus: “Il fra(nces) co Antonio de medecis ho revisto il detto libro p. (ordine’) del... rev. padre in(quis) tore dei Neofiti di... a d 10 (167) gennaio 1622 (?); Alex[andro] de cavi revedetor a d 20 lullo 1599”. 
double paper folio sewn at the front and at the back of the MS, and, secondly, it carries a notice which we must describe here briefly. In effect, we find that the present clear Latin notice has been written over another Latin notice which has been all but erased. The present visible words are, in certain cases, written over those of the earlier notice. Even the three numbers visible in the upper right-hand corner are written over an earlier set of numbers. In giving here the present Latin words and endeavouring to convey also what is legible of the earlier notice, I have placed words and numbers in brackets which belong to the earlier one. The position of the words is approximately the present one: the words in square brackets lie under the present notice; those in round brackets stand in the free spaces.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A ??????]</th>
<th>[436]</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onkelos</td>
<td>095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eliam L ?????)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Pent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Targum Caldaicum in Pentateucum)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ?)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coment. in Pentateu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum Caldaicum</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartolocci t. l. fol 405. et</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequent.</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seu Paraphrasis Caldaica</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seu Translatio Caldaica Penta</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teuchi</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be noted that there are very faint traces where I have indicated line 4. However, after hours of use of a Wood’s lamp on this page, I was not able to elucidate more than I have indicated. The original notice does not seem to have extended beyond my line 4.30 Concerning the present visible letters, the following must be noted: the one letter of the word which present ‘Onkelos’

---

29 The numbering of the lines (at the right-hand side) is my own. The words in italics have been crossed out in the text. Cf. fig. 1.
30 It is to be hoped that in the authoritative edition now being prepared, the authorities will publish an infra-red photograph of at least this page of N and of the present title-page. It must not be thought that the erasures are due to censorship on the part of Church authorities. The MS was prepared for Aegidius of Viterbo and, furthermore, it was annotated by him. It is hardly likely that it passed through the hands of censors even after his death, unless it had lost its identity as having belonged to the illustrious cardinal. In such a case, one could justifiably suppose censorship. But the erasures themselves are not proof of censorship.
replaces is a capital A. Now, the colour of the ink used is a rich brown colour corresponding in detail to the ink used in the chapter-headings to be found at certain places in N\textsuperscript{31}, and which are certainly from the hand of Aegidius of Viterbo. In addition, the style of this capital A and of “Elias” are so clearly in the hand of Aegidius that there remains no doubt in one’s mind but that the original notice carried the name of Aegidius and of Elias Levita.\textsuperscript{32} We shall see later on that Elias was responsible for the transcription of the Codex but in an indirect way.

On line 1, nothing else but this capital A is visible. On line 2, “Elias” followed by a capital L is clearly legible. The words on line 3 are clear enough today. On line 4, the words are lost. The original number in the upper right-hand corner was 436. The lack of \textit{ductus} in this number, plus the fact that it has the same coloured ink as the underlying words of the notice, suggest that it comes from the same pen. At hand, we have only one indication as to the distance of time separating the present notice from the original one. It is to be found in the left vertical of the letter “n” in the half-written word “Pent” on line 2; this vertical is not on this \textit{verso} of the paper folio but on the \textit{verso} of folio 447, the reason being that a small round hole such as is found in several places on these paper folios and is due certainly to the activity of some form of book-worm, stands just here; the pen of the writer drew the vertical through this hole and on to the \textit{verso} of folio 447. But there are no statistical calculations available for the boring frequency or intensity of book-worms! Hence all we can say is that a certain amount of time must have elapsed.

On the other hand, the reference to Bartolocci’s Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, vol. I, which was published in 1675, gives us some clue. This second notice was written after that date. The earlier notice, if it contains a reference to Aegidius of Viterbo and the execution of the manuscript for him through the good offices of Elias Levita and if it is from the hand of Aegidius himself — I sustain both suggestions on very strong evidence — could be placed at any time within 1515 and 1532.\textsuperscript{33} In the present state of this paper folio, I can do no more than institute comparisons between the remains of the earlier notice and the known samples of Aegidius’ signature and his writing of Elias’ name.\textsuperscript{34}

The reference to Bartolocci’s work and the description of the Targum as being a Targum Caldaiicum of Onkelos and a \textit{Commentarium} of Onkelos on

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. p. 9 ff.
\textsuperscript{32} Cf. figs. 2 and 23.
\textsuperscript{33} Elias probably met Aegidius in 1515. There is a dispute among historical experts on this point, and the matter is not quite clear. Aegidius died in 1532.
\textsuperscript{34} Both stand at the end of Cod. 74, 2 of the Staatsbibliothek of Munich, folio 596b. Cf. fig. 23.
the Pentateuch arouses a point of interest. Actually, Bartolocci devotes 10 double-column pages to the subject under the name Onkelos.35 Here he also discusses Targum Jonathan.36 Bartolocci, in sum, seems to ignore completely the version of the Targums contained in Neofiti 1. He does mention the type of Targum text wherein the Aramaic version of each verse follows its Hebrew original; and such is N.37 He also describes two other types of Targum arrangement.38 But he cites the normal beginning of Targum Onkelos as we know it.39 Elsewhere Bartolocci touches on the Targum.40 Nowhere do we find that he makes any distinction between Targum Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi, nor does he mention the latter. This is significant in many ways. First of all, it explains the source of the notice on the verso of the inserted paper folio at the end of N.41 Bartolocci uses, actually, the words paraphrasis and translatio, and the author of this notice (the later version) probably drew his comments from Bartolocci. Secondly, it throws light on the subsequent changes in the title-page of the MS.42 For, as will be pointed out shortly, the present description רından חומש ירושלמי is not original. Thirdly, it inclines one to conclude that Bartolocci never saw N in the Collegium Neophytorum of his time.43 For otherwise he would have mentioned its textual differences from Onkelos. It is, however, possible, as we suggest later44, that the original title of N referred it to Onkelos. In this case, Bartolocci could have seen it and not noticed its peculiarities, although such a suggestion does not seem likely.

35 Cf. his Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, Tomus I, Rome 1675. Actually Bartolocci calls each of his volumes Pars, not Tomus, but authors always refer to them as Tomus, etc. Cf. pp. 405–15.
37 Cf. ibid, p. 407: "ut unus versiculus Bibliorum Hebraic scribereetur, postea Chaldaece, et sic totam Sacram Scripturam". He cites as an example of this type of text MS no. 1 of the Vatican Library Hebrew codices.
38 Cf. ibid, p. 414, where he says that the Targum is placed either "ad calcem Sacri Textus" as in "Biblis Regii", or it is placed "ad laevam Hebraei textus in altera columna" as in Biblis Hebraicis Venetis, Basileensibus, Hanouianis, Parisiensibus, Anglicanis," or it is placed "seorsim in columna et regione Sacrae Scripturae una cum Postilla R. Salomonis infere apposita" as in "alii Bibliis minoribus".
39 Bartolocci's technical knowledge was very limited.
40 Cf. op. cit. T. III, pp. 696, 815.
41 Cf. supra p. 9.
42 On the verso of the second vellum folio of the MS. Cf. infra p. 10.
43 He mentions the Collegium in T. I, p. 1 of op. cit., where he mentions another MS of the Collection (cf. supra, p. 3) and also in T. III, p. 758 where he gives a thumbnail historical sketch of the Collegium up to his day. But he never mentions a codex of the Targum.
44 Cf. infra p. 11 f.
III

As regards the foliation\(^{45}\) of the MS, we must note the following. Fs. 1a and 2a have got Roman numerals \(I\) and \(II\), respectively, at the lower left-hand corner. The \textit{verso} in each case has no foliation number. Regular foliation begins at f. 3a with the beginning of the text of Genesis. We have to distinguish here between three elements. In the entire MS as it is today there are 449 vellum folios. Secondly, one foliation series was inserted throughout, at the upper left-hand corner in each case, by an early hand which began at the 3rd vellum folio (because the text only begins there). Thirdly, another foliation series was inserted throughout, at the lower left-hand corner in each case, by some mechanical means (a stamp of some kind or other). Since most publications concerning N have used the last foliation series for reference, and since it is the only correct one as far as it goes, I shall use it henceforward. But, in actual fact, two folios precede the folio on which the text begins. The early foliation series is hopelessly wrong.\(^{46}\) The second foliation series only goes as far as f. 447b. The text stops on f. 446b.\(^{47}\)

In this context of foliation, we must mention another series of numbers which runs from f. 1a to f. 446a. This is a series of Arabic numerals placed, in each case, at the lower left-hand corner of the \textit{recto}. Between fs. 1–101 inclusive, they stand on every tenth folio, starting with f. 1.\(^{48}\) The next number (12) stands on f. 109, and from this onward the numbers stand on every tenth folio\(^{49}\) up to f. 199. The next number (22) stands on f. 211, and from this onward the numbers follow on every tenth folio\(^{50}\) up to f. 251. F. 258 is marked 27, and from this onwards the numbers follow on every tenth folio up to f. 446 inclusively.\(^{51}\) Thus the folios of N are divided off into 46 groups. Each group

\(^{45}\) I use \(a\) and \(b\) instead of speaking of \textit{recto} and \textit{verso}.

\(^{46}\) The two series coincide up to f. 54. Then the upper series numbers f. 55 as 54. This difference of one persists until f. 80 when the upper series again repeats the number (78), thus falling behind by 2. The same mistake occurs at f. 82 (3 behind), f. 245 (four behind), f. 296 (5 behind), f. 316 (6 behind), f. 346 (7 behind), f. 350 (8 behind), f. 356 (9 behind), f. 397 (10 behind); here the upper series omits all pagination), f. 411 (11 behind), f. 414 (12 behind). A still later hand has written in \textit{bis} after each case of repeated pagination. The upper series goes as far as f. 435a (= 447a of lower series).

\(^{47}\) Similar double foliation and even triple foliation problems are to be found elsewhere in MSS of this period. Cf., e.g., Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199, which has one pagination series in the middle of the upper margin, and at least another in the corners of the pages. The former foliation is from Aegidius of Viterbo. Cf. infra p. 10.

\(^{48}\) Thus: 1 (1), 11 (2), 21 (3), 31 (4), 41 (5), 51 (6), 61 (7), 71 (8), 81 (9), 91 (10), 101 (11).

\(^{49}\) Thus: 119 (13), 129 (14), \textit{etc.} F. 199 is marked 21.

\(^{50}\) Thus: 221 (23), 231 (24), \textit{etc.} F. 251 is marked 26.

\(^{51}\) F. 446 is marked 46. For examples of this numbering, cf. figs. 8–10.
does not contain the same number of folios; the group starting with f. 10 and marked 11 only contains 8 folios, the group starting with f. 199 and marked 21 contains 12 folios, the group starting with f. 251 and marked 26 contains only 7 folios. All the others of the 46 groups of folios contain 10 folios each.\footnote{52} One possible explanation is that these spaced numbers had some function in the binding of the MS: each of these 46 groups of folios may correspond to the binders’ “signatures” and the usual preliminary measure taken prior to the binding of all the folios in one and the final casing of the volume. An extension of this explanation lies in a consideration of the chapter-headings found here and there in the MS. We must now examine these. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Chapter-heading, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110b</td>
<td>ex: 1. a. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111b</td>
<td>ex: β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112b</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113a</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113b</td>
<td>ex: ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114b</td>
<td>exo: ɔ c. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115a</td>
<td>ɔ F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115b</td>
<td>ex: ɔ a: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118b</td>
<td>ex: η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119a</td>
<td>ex: η, χ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119b</td>
<td>ex: ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120a</td>
<td>ɔ B. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120b</td>
<td>ex: ɔ D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121a</td>
<td>ex: τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121b</td>
<td>ex: τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122a</td>
<td>B (opposite line 1, in left-hand margin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122b</td>
<td>τ D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123a</td>
<td>ex: ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124b</td>
<td>ex: ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125b</td>
<td>ex: ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126b</td>
<td>ex: ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127b</td>
<td>ex: ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128a</td>
<td>ex: ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129b</td>
<td>ex: ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130b</td>
<td>ex: η ν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{52} The difference is not explained by the 2 excised folios between present fs. 199 and 200, because this would increase the number from 12 to 14, or by the one excised folio between fs. 257 and 258.
131a  ex. י
131b  ex י
132b  ex י. a.
133b  ex י. E.
134a  ex י. F.
134b  ex: י
135b  ex: י
180b  32
181a  33
181b  ex. 33
182b  ex.
33
183a  34

These indications are only found over the Targum text of Exodus. The Greek letters used here correspond in each case to the chapters of Exodus, but the number 1 is used over f. 110b in place of Alpha. The enumeration series in Hebrew letters breaks off at chapter xiii (בי) and takes up again — this time in Arabic numerals at chapter xxxii (f. 180b) and continues only as far as chapter xxxiv (f. 183a). Evidently, chapters i–xiii and chapters xxxii–xxxiv had some special interest for the author of this enumeration. The other ciphers used are hard to explain and probably represent some system of chapter division. In fact, we find Arabic capital letters used in the margin at two places. In one place we find a Hebrew Daleth in the right-hand margin opposite line 1 and followed by an abbreviation (in cursive) of כ and by a bracket which delimits lines 1–2 of f. 115b, (= Ex. iv, 1).

If now we compare both the colour of the ink and the style of numbering in this "chapter-heading" series with the numbering which we discussed previously, we find a definite similarity in the style and formation, the colour of the ink used in both places being the same light-brown colour. The change from Hebrew numeral letters to Arabic numerals together with the use of Greek letters as numbers suggests a Christian author rather than a Jewish one for this chapter enumeration. I have compared the lettering of these chapter-headings of N with known examples of Aegidius' hand in Br. Mus.

53 I have given these as they stand in the MS, putting points only where they exist here (irregularly), and etc. For examples, cf. figs. 4–7.
54 a. 6 (cf. f. 110b, 115b), B. C (cf. f. 120a), D (cf. f. 120b), etc.
55 On f. 115b in the right-hand margin opposite line 12 and line 13. On f. 122a in the left-hand margin opposite line 1.
56 Cf. f. 115b. The bracket is composed of a vertical line with a horizontal upper tip.
57 Cf. p. 8 supra.
Add. 27, 19958, and there can be no substantial doubt that they are identical. Furthermore, the Arabic numerals contained in these chapter-headings are identical in form with those placed on every 10th folio of N in the lower left-hand corner and with the central foliation numbers of Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199. Both the chapter-headings and the lower recurrent numbering of N must be the work of Aegidius.59 Coming back to the idea suggested previously that the latter numbering represents a list of binders’ “signatures”, we can now suggest that possibly Aegidius thus prepared the folios for binding. It is difficult to imagine any other function for this series of numbers.

We must next discuss the state of the first vellum folio of N. The first and second folio stand outside the foliation series which starts on the third folio. On the recto of the first folio we find the remains of Hebrew letters adorned with decorative effects, but it is difficult to make out with the naked eye what they were. Below these remains and to the right stand the four letters Pent [????]. Already we know from the researches of Professor A. Diez Macho and others that N represents the Targum Yerushalmi. And this provides us with possible answers to two questions which arise at this point: did the original title standing on this page contain that name? Why was the original erased? Special photography of this folio may reveal the answer to the first question. In the meantime, it is good to recollect the words of Elias Levi in the preface to his Meturgeman60 when he was discussing the Targum in general. Levi says here61: “actually we do not know who was the Targumist of the Ketuvim, which is the Targum Yerushalmi. Nor do we know the identity of the Targumist of <the Targu[m]62> the Torah in the Targum Yerushalmi. And perhaps a different man was responsible for both of them...”63 It would seem from this that Levi knew of a Targum Yerushalmi of the Torah which

58 Cf. figs. 2, 3–6, 28.
59 This also demonstrates that the central pagination of Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199 is from Aegidius. Neither chapter-headings nor the series of numbers at the lower left-hand corner of the folios comes from Levi. I have compared his numerals in the Meturgeman MS of the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome, and there is no doubt on this point. In Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199, Paris nos. 134 and 135 and Munich 74, 1 and 2, certain numerals are from Levi.
60 Now as MS A. 6, 6 of the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. Cf. infra p. 29 ff, The preface stands on f. 2 ff. The work was started in Rome and finished in Venice in 1531. Fagius published it at Isny in 1541.
61 Ibid., f. 2a, 11. 21–23.
62 The Hebrew here is crossed out by Levi and put in brackets. Five diacritic points or strokes were placed over the annulled letters.
63 חותן לא ודא לה מוי הווא חוהים והים ירנום
(21) ירושלם. בהם שליה וודא מוי הווא חוהים (היחורים) והוהיר
(22) והוהיר ירושלם והויאוי יאש אואר חורמ הולות
(23) הוהיר ירושלם...
he refused to ascribe to Onkelos or Jonathan. It is possible, therefore, that the
original title of N announced it as Targum Yerushalmi. The erasing of this
title and the inscribing of Targum Onkelos and the reference to Bartolocci
(who betrays no knowledge of Targum Yerushalmi) would be self-explanatory
in that case. Because executed for Aegidius, the MS would carry on its title-
page the title of the MS both in Hebrew and in Latin.

The verso of this folio has been ruled with 18 horizontal lines and two
vertical margins, both the latter reaching to the upper and lower edges of the
page. There was some writing above the first horizontal line but all that can
be seen clearly now is the Arabic م. The beginning of the original was in
the upper righthand corner; the ink-dots of the original can be seen still in
the upper lefthand corner of the recto of the 2nd folio. In the margin opposite the
Arabic letters noted above stand the remains of a capital N.65

IV

On the recto of the 2nd folio we find the same arrangement of horizontal and
vertical lines as on the verso of the first folio. Distributed on these lines we
find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Roman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>פсалמי ירושלם</td>
<td>(1. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יאשם חסידא קומר</td>
<td>(1. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שלוח תבניbaneהכלי ישראל ז&quot;כ</td>
<td>(1. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנה קומתא</td>
<td>(1. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לודוויקוס קאנוס שולץ</td>
<td>(1. 14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erasures took place on line 2 of original words, on line 5 under the last three
letters at least, and along the entire length of line 7. Other erasures took
place in the upper left-hand corner. Down under line 18 we find the two words
הא שמא, and still further down towards the left we can see the letters ר. In
the upper lefthand corner stand the three letters שמא. It is difficult to recon-
struct what has happened here. The original title stood on lines 2, 5 and 7. The
present Samek and Pe of מ in line 7 stand over an erased Lamed. The
material for present lines 11 and 12 comes from the prayer inscribed by Hand
A on the first page of the text of the Targum. All of lines 8, 11, and 12 come
from one hand which is found nowhere else in the MS. The מ and the ר under line
18 and the ר still further down are identical with the hand which wrote the

64 Cf. supra, p. 5 ff.
65 The first letter of the name Neophitorum?
66 The original words ran out beyond the left-hand vertical margin.
67 Cf. infra p. pp. 16, 26 concerning this hand.
first two words on line 5. A still different hand wrote כְּרָד in the upper right-hand corner, but fortunately this hand appears again in the MS. Beyond this we cannot say much. As a hypothetical reconstruction on the basis of these facts, I suggest that the original title carried the name of Onkelos on line 7 (cf. the original Lamed under the present Samek and Pe of mas on that line), that the word יְרִשְׁלָם replaced some other term, that originally the present contents of line 7 stood below line 18. So far, therefore, in our enquiry, we have found that both here on the original title-page and at the back where a notice stood modifications were introduced by a later hand. We have also found some evidence connecting the MS with Aegidius of Viterbo and with Elias Levita indirectly. We must now go on to examine the colophon of the MS.

V

The colophon stands on f. 446b. It runs as follows:

(1) נָשִּׁלְּךָ על דִּי גַּזְוָרְךָ מַמְחָטָם מָצָה בַּכָּרְרָה מַרְמֵר רֹזְפָּהָ זִיבָּה (נָשִּׁלְּךָ בַּכָּרְרָה מַרְמֵר רֹזְפָּהָ זִיבָּה) (sic)
(2) הָאוּרָתָם וֹלֶת (וֹלֶת הָאוּרָתָם) (כְּכָנָר מַמְחָטָם מַרְמֵר רֹזְפָּהָ זִיבָּה (כְּכָנָר מַמְחָטָם מַרְמֵר רֹזְפָּהָ זִיבָּה) (sic)
(3) מִשְׁפָּרָה אֱיְדִירַיָּ (מִשְׁפָּרָה אֱיְדִירַיָּ) (רַיָּה מִשְׁפָּרָה אֱיְדִירַיָּ) (sic)
(4) לְדוֹתָא רָאִיִּה גֹּבְרָה אֱלֶה אָשָׂרָה לְדוֹתָא רָאִיִּה גֹּבְרָה אֱלֶה אָשָׂרָה (לְדוֹתָא רָאִיִּה גֹּבְרָה אֱלֶה אָשָׂרָה)
(5) וֹתָק מַמְמָס לְלוֹכָבָס הָלֵמוֹרִילַי לְלוֹכָבָס הָלֵמוֹרִילַי (וֹתָק מַמְמָס לְלוֹכָבָס הָלֵמוֹרִילַי)

This may be translated as follows:

(1) It was finished by the junior of the scribes Menahem, the son of the honourable Mordecai the doctor, may his creator preserve him and keep him in life, the son of the honourable Moses
(2) the doctor, may his memory be blessed, the son of the most highly honoured Menahem the outstanding doctor, chief of the doctors. And I wrote it for the wise and the mighty
(3) Master Aegidio, may his glory be extolled, here at Rome
(4) in the glorious month of Adar, I shall sing the greatness of God
(5) Strengthen your heart’s courage, all you who fear God.

For the moment, we will defer further discussion of the identity of Menahem

68 Cf. infra, ibid. concerning mh 9.
69 Words given here in brackets are interlinear. The numbering of the lines is mine. Lines 4 and 5 are further in from the right-hand margin than I indicate here. Saderdote’s transcription (op. cit. p. 159) omits line 5. He also transcribes wrongly אַרְיוֹדִי of line 3. On line 1, there are no abbreviation signs over the second case of בָּכָר or over בָּרָא. On line 2 there are also lacking abbreviation signs over לָ. The abbreviation signs over the other words are in compact groups of 3. The abbreviation signs over קִנֶּמֶנֶּשׁ in line 3 must be an error.
ben Mordekai ben Moshe ben Menahem, the scribe who wrote this colophon. The name Master Aegidio and the indications of date chiefly interest us here. Menahem tells us in the first three words of line 4 that he finished the manuscript in the month of Adar. He adds the words נָאוֹרֹת אֶזְכָּרָה. There is a single dot placed over the second Waw of the first word in this phrase. It is also striking that he does not give the year either according to the Jewish or Christian calendars or according to both.\(^70\) A numerical use of the Hebrew letters in line 4 seems to offer a reasonable solution. In Hebrew MSS the commonest system of dating is from the Creation of the world.\(^71\) Up to the 10th century C.E., the Jews also used the Seleucid era,\(^72\) but this is found rarely in European MSS after that time. Dating from the destruction of the Second Temple\(^73\) is found sporadically both before and after the 10th century, and usually it is accompanied by the date according to the Creation. In the colophon of N, the numerical value of the words הנואר נבורה אִזְכָּרָה would be 1206 (= 264 + 617 + 1 + 324). If this date is calculated from the destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.), we must first add 70 and then 240 in order to arrive at the corresponding date in the Christian era. This would give us the year 1516 C.E. The year would be suitable from other points of view, as we shall see.

The mention of Master Aegidio on line 3 starts us off on another line of reasoning. We have no solid reason for doubting that by this appellation is meant Aegidius of Viterbo,\(^74\) the maecenas and protector and pupil of Elias Levita. Aegidius was appointed General of his Order in 1507. He was made Cardinal by Leo X at the consistory of the 1st of July 1517. Hence, if the assumption that Master Aegidio refers to Aegidius is correct, then this colophon would have been written before 1517. The spelling of Aegidius' name here differs from that in the colophon of Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199 where Elias Levita speaks of ר(styles)

\(^{70}\) As is done, for instance, in Cod. 74, 2 of Munich.

\(^{71}\) מֶלֶם רַשָּׁת לִשְׁכַּבָּן חֵינָה. Dating from the Exodus or according to Christian or Mohammedan eras are sometimes found. In spite of Mishnaic prohibitions, the Seleucid era was used commonly in the first 10 centuries.


\(^{73}\) לַמָּסְרָת נַבָּרָה אִזְכָּרָה. Cf. f. 601b, line 11 of colophon (which begins at the bottom of f. 601a. The use of Zayin
is referred to as חָשֶׁם יִרְקָר וַתְּנַעְשֶׁה. The latter MS was finished in 1521\textsuperscript{77}, that is to say some years after Aegidius had been made Cardinal. The former is dated to 1516 and therefore predates the time of his elevation to the cardinalate.\textsuperscript{78} We can confidently place the execution of N between 1506 (or 1507)\textsuperscript{79} and July 1517, merely on this basis.

A further precision of this date would seem to be ruled out\textsuperscript{80} unless, as had been suggested by some scholars, N was executed for Aegidius by the instrumentality of Elias Levita.\textsuperscript{81} In that case, we could narrow the date down to a period of time less than two years in extent: Elias Levita came to Rome in 1515\textsuperscript{82} and he lived there with Aegidius until 1527 when the civil disturbances caused him to flee. Thus the date of N would be between 1515 and July 1517. The numerical indications of line 4 of the colophon would fit in with this arrangement. It is at this point that we are led to consider the palaeographical character of N, in an effort to determine whether directly or indirectly the palaeographical evidence would tilt the scales in favour of a connection with Elias Levita and thus help to date the execution of N.

VI

In the following analysis of N we must distinguish between the main text and the marginal notes, additions, etc. When referring to the text hands I will use the cipher \textit{th}; when referring to the \textit{marginalia} I will use the cipher \textit{mh}. The link-words, the \textit{parashoth} indications and other elements will be treated after the text and the \textit{marginalia}. The main text of N was transcribed by three hands, which I distinguish as \textit{th A}, \textit{th B}, \textit{th C}. The distribution of the latter is as follows:

would reflect the Italian pronunciation, the use of \textit{Gimel} would give the Germanic pronunciation of the Cardinal's name.

\textsuperscript{76} Cf. f. 596b, line 2 of colophon.

\textsuperscript{77} The scribe gives as Christian date 1520, which, as Weil justly points out in his article \textit{L'Archétype du Massoret ha-Massoret d'Elie Lévita (Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil.Relig. no. 2, 1961, p. 148, n. 5), must be corrected to 1521.}

\textsuperscript{78} In MS. A. 6, 6 of the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome, Levita refers to him as חָשֶׁם יִרְקָר וַתְּנַעְשֶׁה. Cf. \textit{ibid} f. 2a, line 4.

\textsuperscript{79} In 1506 Aegidius was made Vicar Apostolic of his Order by Julius II; in 1507 he became General.

\textsuperscript{80} Omitting for the moment any argument based on the numerical value of the letters in the colophon of N. Cf. supra on page 14.

\textsuperscript{81} The use of חָשֶׁם יִרְקָר in line 3 of the colophon indicates a living person. Cf. J. Buxtorfius. \textit{De Abbreviatis Hebraicis}, Herbornae Nassaviæ 1707, p. 108.

\textsuperscript{82} With Weil (in \textit{art. cit. 77}) and against Rödiger and de Rossi who choose 1512 and Ginsburg who chooses 1509 as the date of Elias’ arrival in Rome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Bible text</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a—30b</td>
<td>Gen. i, 1—xviii, 18</td>
<td>th A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a—110a</td>
<td>Gen. xiii, 18—126</td>
<td>th B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110a—200a</td>
<td>Exodus(^{83})</td>
<td>th B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200b</td>
<td>(blank)(^{84})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201a—240b</td>
<td>Lev. i, 1—xxii, 2</td>
<td>th A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241a—241b</td>
<td>Lev. xxii, 2—18</td>
<td>th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242a—245a</td>
<td>Lev. xxii, 18—xxiii, 28</td>
<td>th B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245b—257b</td>
<td>Lev. xxiii, 28—xxvii, 34(^{85})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258a—355b</td>
<td>Numbers(^{86})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356a—446b</td>
<td>Deuteronomy(^{87})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus th A is responsible for 70 folios, th B for 173 folios, and th C for 202 folios, making up in all 445 written folios.\(^{88}\) The third text hand obviously did the bulk of the work. There is no readily apparent reason for the interruption of th C's work after one folio\(^{89}\) by the intercalation of 3 folios by th B, all the more so since th C\(^{90}\) executes the remainder of the MS.\(^{91}\) This th C is also responsible for the writing of the colophon, and there he gives his name as Menahem ben Mordecai ben Moshe ben Menahem.\(^{92}\)

We must now deal with the *marginalia*. Here the situation is less simple and more complicated to explain. These marginalia are written for the most part in a rabbinic script.\(^{93}\) We have two main problems: the number of marginal hands and the identity of these hands (whether all or some are identical or not with certain text hands). As to the number of marginal hands, an examination of the MS reveals an interesting situation. Ten different hands are detect-

---

\(^{83}\) Between the text of Genesis and Exodus only a blank line intervenes.

\(^{84}\) Between the text of Exodus and Leviticus.

\(^{85}\) The text of Leviticus ends at the foot of the page. A blank folio followed here originally but it was cut out, leaving only a narrow edge of surface.

\(^{86}\) The text of Numbers ends on the last line of the page because the scribe spaced out Nu. xviii, 13 with that purpose in mind.

\(^{87}\) The text ends in the first third of the page; then comes the colophon.

\(^{88}\) F. 200b is blank. The last folio is not quite full, but it is reckoned here as used.

\(^{89}\) Viz. f. 241a and b.

\(^{90}\) F. 245b.

\(^{91}\) To judge by the pious invocation placed before the first verse of Genesis (cf. f. la) th A intended at least to finish the entire MS.

\(^{92}\) Cf. supra p. 11. I give examples of these three text hands on fig. 11 (= th A), figs. 12–19 (= th B), fig. 20 (= th C).

\(^{93}\) Cf. *infra* for the distinctions (*semi-rabbinic, semi-cursive*, etc.), p. 23 ff.
able in these *marginalia*. The distribution and order of these marginal hands is as follows:\(^94\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mh</th>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1a—30b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31a—32b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33a—40b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41a—45a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45b—50b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51a—60b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61a—61b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>62a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62b—70b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>71a—74b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>75a—80b</td>
<td>no <em>marginalia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>81a—83b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>84a—90b</td>
<td>no <em>marginalia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>91a—94a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>94b—95a</td>
<td>to line 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>95a—99b</td>
<td>to line 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>99b—100b</td>
<td>from line 9 of 99b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>101a—108b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>109a—111a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>111b—113a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>113b—118b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>119a—124a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>124b—135a</td>
<td>to line 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>135a—168b</td>
<td>from line 13 of 135a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>169a—200a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200b</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>201a—240b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>241a—407b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^94\) I have numbered these hands from 1 upwards according as they appeared in any bulk in the MS. Certain *marginalia* of the later hands (according to my numbering) appear sporadically in the earlier parts. The details of the work done by each hand is given *infra* p. 26ff. In the above schematization, the attribution of folios to a marginal hand means that the bulk of the *marginalia* on the folios in question come from that hand. Details and distinctions are given later. For samples of these marginal hands, cf. fig. 11 (= *mh* 1), fig. 12 (= *mh* 2), fig. 13 (= *mh* 3), fig. 14 (= *mh* 4), fig. 15 (= *mh* 5), fig. 16 (= *mh* 6), fig. 17 (= *mh* 7), fig. 18 (= *mh* 8), fig. 19 (= *mh* 9), fig. 20 (= *mh* 10).
The most striking fact about the distribution of these marginal hands is that from f. 31a (Gen. xviii, 18) to f. 168b inclusive (Ex. xxviii, 6) no less than nine different hands appear in the marginalia. At this point 2 hands (mh 1 and mh 10) share the remainder of the work. In all, mh 1 annotated 70 folios, mh 10 annotated 238 folios. As in the case of the text hands, we can find abrupt changes either from folio to folio95, or from page to page96, or within one page of a folio.97 We must suppose, however, that the marginalia in their entirety were done over a certain period of time which is difficult to calculate. The possible identification of these marginal hands is linked to the description of link-words, parashoth indications, colour of inks, and the work of the three text hands. We will now discuss these latter elements.

VII

Link-words are usually two in number (rarely three) placed under the last line on the verso of certain folios. The words represent the beginning of the text on the recto of the following folio. The distribution of these link-words is irregular, and the script is usually in square, although rabbinic and cursive forms appear now and again. The latter cases are of importance for identifying certain marginal hands. The distribution of these link-words and the kind of hand (square or rabbinic) and its identity are presented here schematically. Link-words appear only on the verso of folios98:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—4; 10—14;</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
<td>55:</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20—24; 30:</td>
<td>th A</td>
<td>56:</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31; 33—34;</td>
<td>th B</td>
<td>58; 60:</td>
<td>th B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40—41; 43—44;</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
<td>62; 64; 65:</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45—46; 50—51.</td>
<td>th B</td>
<td>71:</td>
<td>th B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72—74:</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81—82:</td>
<td>mh 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 E.g. from f. 32 to f. 33; from f. 61 to f. 62.
96 E.g. from f. 62a to f. 62b.
97 E.g. on f. 95a, f. 99b, f. 135a.
98 Except on f. 59a (= th B).
In certain parts of the MS, it is clear that the link-words are placed regularly. In the first section executed by th A\textsuperscript{99}, we find the link-words in his script and placed on the first 4 of every 10 folios.\textsuperscript{100} In the second part of his work\textsuperscript{101}, the same arrangement holds. In the large section of the text executed by th C\textsuperscript{102}, we find link-words in his script, the first placed on f. 251, the second on f. 267, and thereafter on every tenth folio up to f. 297. He starts again on f. 315 and places them regularly every 10 folios until f. 445.\textsuperscript{103} Here a certain amount of regularity is noticeable. In th B’s work, regularity is all but wanting: some regularity exists in his early work\textsuperscript{104}, but thereafter I can detect no guiding principle in the placing of the link-words. It is possible that he was forgetful! The regular spacing of the link-words in the work of th A and th C may have depended on the number of folios bound together initially. But no apparent concordance can be discovered between the placing of the link-words and the numbering placed at the lower left-hand corner of every 10 folios which we have already mentioned and ascribed to Aegidius of Viterbo with, perhaps, the binding of the folios in mind.\textsuperscript{105}

Of greater interest in this matter of the link-words is the presence of rabbinitic script in certain of them: it helps us to identify certain of the marginal hands. As can be seen from the above schematic analysis, th B can be identified with mh 9. This follows from the non-square forms found as link-words on fs. 129, 131, 143, 165, to quote only a few. The link-word on f. 194 is really conclusive on this point as here we have the first three letters of the word נוֹדָד in th B’s

\textsuperscript{99} Cf. supra p. 13 (= fs. 1-30b).
\textsuperscript{100} And on f. 30b.
\textsuperscript{101} Fs. 201a–240b.
\textsuperscript{102} Fs. 245b–446b.
\textsuperscript{103} The penultimate folio of the written MS.
\textsuperscript{104} Fs. 33–51.
\textsuperscript{105} Cf. supra p. 8 ff.
script, and the last two letters are in mh 9's script. This conclusion on palaeographical grounds coheres with the fact that the link-words of mh 9 are found with the text which is due to th B. We would expect the text hand to be the author of the link-words. An indirect confirmation of this is seen between fs. 201–445. Th A is responsible for the text of fs. 201a–240b, and all the link-words are in his script. Fs. 242a–245 are due to th B, and the link-words are in his script. Fs. 251–445 are due to th C, and all the link-words are in his script.

One point must be noted as regards th C. On fs. 251, 267, 385, and 405, we find that the final Nun in each case is fitted with some purely decorative lines. On f. 287, the final Lamed of the link-word is also decorated in a similar way. Now on the first unwritten folio of the MS we find traces of a similar decorative effect. I suggested before that the original title of the MS stood on this folio. Actually the decorative elements on the folios just mentioned look like capital letters T and P of our alphabet, but so do the decorative lines attached to folio la. In all probability they were the decorated letters of a Hebrew title the translation of which was placed beneath and of which only Pent [????] remains visible to the naked eye today. Th C would be the hand responsible for the writing of this title page.

VIII

The colour of ink is another element which must be remarked upon in this context. Generally speaking, the colour of the ink used by the marginal hands runs from a deep black to a greyish-black and to a deep brown colour. These colours together with the palaeographical characteristics help to separate and distinguish the marginal hands. Throughout N, however, we find a certain use of violet ink, but this use raises several problems for which no ready answer can be found. We find that the marginalia on the following folios are in this violet coloured ink. I also indicate the marginal hand responsible for these marginalia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51a—53a</td>
<td>mh 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71a—72a</td>
<td>mh 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298a—315b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106 Cf. supra p. 18 and compare with p. 16.
107 Cf. supra p. 11.
108 Cf. ibid.
109 I. e. fs. 251, 267, 287, 385, 405.
The marginal hands which use violet coloured ink are mh 6 and mh 10. On folio 298a we find an interlinear intervention (lines 8–9) by th C of one word. This latter is in violet ink. As the surrounding *marginalia* are all in violet and are from mh 10, it is reasonable to see in this an indication of the equivalence of th C to mh 10. The use of violet ink does not seem to have any particularly important significance: *de facto*, mh 6 continues past f. 53a — but in black ink — up to f. 60b. *Mh* 10 began with black ink on f. 169a, and with a short intervention of mh 110b continues on in black until f. 298a. After f. 315b, two and a half folios110 of black coloured ink follow, then he takes up again in violet until f. 320a. He then uses black ink until f. 356a when violet ink intervenes until f. 405b inclusively. After one folio111, he again takes up the use of violet for one folio, and then from f. 408a to the end he uses black ink. Another complicating factor is that mh 1 in one intervention on f. 378b112 used a violet ink but obviously with a slight admixture of black.113

There are three other marginal interventions in violet ink. One is on f. 6b: here we find the first nine lines delimited by a vertical line placed in the right-hand margin. This line has little horizontal tips at both ends. Beside it in the margin is written *Adm ne ejiciams*114 (= Adamum nunc ejiciamus) which seems to be a translation of three words of the Targum text.115 The Latin does not correspond either to the Vulgate or the Septuagint translation of this place. On f. 10b we find another species of marginal bracket in violet ink on the right-hand margin which delimits lines 8–10 or v. 24 of the Targum in which the

109a Between f. 301 and 315b there are 5 interventions of mh 1 in black ink. Cf. *infra* p. 28.  
109b On fs. 201a–240b.  
110 Fs. 316a and b, 317a and b, 318a.  
111 F. 406.  
112 In th C’s section. The *marginale* is opposite lines 1 and 2 in the right-hand margin.  
113 The reason is probably quite banal: in preceding and following folios mh 1 has made various marginal interventions and all in black ink. The pen he was using had probably been just used in black ink and was not properly cleaned. This is the impression one gets from the blackish tint in his violet ink.  
114 The contraction sign for the omitted *u* and the final *s* are merged into one line. Cf. fig. 3.  
115 Cf. f. 6b, lines 5–6;
disappearance of Henoch is mentioned.\textsuperscript{116} On f. 24b a single vertical line in violet runs down the right-hand margin delimiting lines 2–13. The delimited part only represents part of the entire Targumic explanation of Gen. xv, 1. I have compared the handwriting of this Latin annotation (on f. 6b) with a known specimen of Aegidius' hand\textsuperscript{117}, and I have concluded that the annotation is from him. The use of violet ink here would invite us to look for a rabbinic hand of the same scholar in either \textit{mh} 6 or \textit{mh} 10 (both used violet ink). But \textit{mh} 10 is ruled out since, as we shall finally confirm, it is the rabbinic script of \textit{th} C\textsuperscript{118}, and we know the identity of \textit{th} C (Menahem the scribe who wrote the colophon). \textit{Mh} 6 therefore is the likeliest candidate for the \textit{rabbinic} script of Aegidius.\textsuperscript{119}

IX

Lastly, we must treat of the \textit{parashoth} indications in N. These are only found sporadically in the MS. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliol</th>
<th>Parashah\textsuperscript{120}</th>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–11:</td>
<td>רָבוֹשָׁה</td>
<td>rabb.</td>
<td>\textit{mh} 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b:</td>
<td>תּוֹרָת מְגַּוֶּל הַמּוֹרָשְׁתָה (לְלֹל)</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>\textit{th} A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–19:</td>
<td>ב</td>
<td>rabb.</td>
<td>\textit{mh} 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:</td>
<td>מָלַכָּה מְגַּוֶּל</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>\textit{th} A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b:</td>
<td>שְׁמוֹת מְגַּוֶּל (לְלֹל)</td>
<td>rabb.</td>
<td>\textit{mh} 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61b, 62a, 62b, 63a:</td>
<td>שְׁמוֹת מְגַּוֶּל (לְלֹל)</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>\textit{th} A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{116} "And Henoch worshipped before God in truth, and it is not known whither he went in the \textit{Memar} from God".

\textsuperscript{117} I choose an autograph of Aegidius now preserved as Cod. 315 Arch. Com. di Viterbo B. n. 1. A sample of this was published by G. Signorelli in his \textit{Il Cardinale Egidio da Viterbo, Agostiniano umanista e riformatore, 1469–1532}, Firenze 1929, facing p. 80. I hereby thank Professor F. X. Martin O.S.A. of University College Dublin, for the aid and facilities extended to me. Cf. fig. 2.

\textsuperscript{118} Cf. infra.

\textsuperscript{119} I have not been able to find a sure sample of rabbinic script by Aegidius.

\textsuperscript{120} These indications always stand on the \textit{recto} page unless otherwise stated.

\textsuperscript{121} The \textit{לְלֹל} of this \textit{parashah} was erased later. It is erroneous, this being \textit{נָל}.

\textsuperscript{122} The form of \textit{Samek} in \textit{th} A's \textit{parashoth} is always \textit{rabbinic}.

\textsuperscript{123} This is partly in \textit{square}, partly in \textit{rabbinic}.

\textsuperscript{124} The indications on fs. 61b–63a stand in the centre of the page above the first line. The previous ones stand at the upper left-hand corner of the page in question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Parashah</th>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>ירקא</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>th A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229b</td>
<td>תוספת פרשת أشهر כ עירוניי</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>th A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235125</td>
<td>תוספת פרשת חוריי</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>th A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>תוספת פרשת קדישים</td>
<td>square</td>
<td>th A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parashoth indications are only found in the text transcribed by th A\(^{126}\) and th B. In addition, on f. 29b the last two words of the parashah are in the square script of th A while the first two words are in the rabbinic script of mh 1. This appears to clinch the argument for identifying th A and mh 1. Besides, anywhere in the MS where the first text hand has transcribed the main text, this mh 1 appears as the predominant marginal hand. A similar argument would lead us to identify th C with mh 10. For the latter occurs chiefly between fs. 241a — 446b which were transcribed by th C. Mh 10 is also found on some folios transcribed by th B\(^{127}\), but even here we find that th C has inserted square forms into the margins of th B’s work.\(^{128}\) This proves that th C revised th B’s work. In fact, mh 9 which we have identified with th B\(^{129}\) does not appear in these folios under discussion. Mh 10 (= th C) seems to have performed this work.

X

This is the place to summarize the characteristics and the work of each of the marginal hands, so that we may get a vue d’ensemble of the entire palaeography of N. In discussing the palaeographical character of each hand, I shall use the time-honoured distinction of square, rabbinic and cursive, but a word of explanation must be prefixed here to our general remarks. The square in N is of a most pure strain, without any admixture of rabbinic or cursive forms.\(^{130}\) In the marginata, the style is mainly rabbinic, but there is in certain hands a strong admixture of cursive forms. The definition of rabbinic and cursive is one which has never been quite effected with due clarity. Bernheimer attempted the only definition possible — an experimental one based on the examination

---

\(^{125}\) There are erasures before the first word and under the last word.

\(^{126}\) Fs. 1a–30b, 201a–240b.

\(^{127}\) Fs. 169a, 186b, 187b, 189a, 194b, 195a.

\(^{128}\) Cf. f. 200a.

\(^{129}\) Cf. supra p. 19.

\(^{130}\) Except, as we have noted, in the link-words and in later additions to the text, (cf. e.g. mh 10’s addition at the end of Leviticus on f. 257b.) The square style is found occasionally in the marginata. Cf. immediately our observations.
of MSS\textsuperscript{131}, yet when one examines his triple tables, one finds that the same forms appear as rabbinic and cursive in several cases. His general "types" are, however, of great value.\textsuperscript{132} Birnbaum in his first volume of The Hebrew Scripts\textsuperscript{133} distinguishes between square, cursive and mashait. A comparison between his samples of cursive shows that what Bernheimer calls rabbinic would sometimes be classified by Birnbaum as cursive or as mashait. On the other hand, the Jewish Encyclopedia speaks of square, square rabbinic or semi-rabbinic, rabbinic and cursive, writing.\textsuperscript{134} Bernheimer inveighs against the term square rabbinic and semi-rabbinic, declaring that neither term corresponds to any palaeographical reality in Hebrew writing.\textsuperscript{135} Actually, the article of the Jewish Encyclopedia just mentioned does not give any essential description of what it means by these terms, but neither does Bernheimer. The latter does go a step further and adduces types; yet, as I have remarked, his types are sometimes inadequate and — on his own showing — interchangeable. In reality, no thoroughgoing treatment of this problem exists as yet.\textsuperscript{136}

In spite of his deficiencies in essential definition, Bernheimer’s division seems more or less to correspond to the reality. And the underlying principles of his analysis seem to have been as follows. The square script preserves the full form of the letter in its “square” form; the latter term does not need further definition. He defines the other two forms by their departures from this fundamental form: the rabbinic script preserves a very clear image of the essential characteristics of the square, while it introduces new elements or diminishes other elements or emphasizes still other elements. The cursive arrives at forms which are sometimes unrecognizable as such when compared merely with their square counterparts. In actual fact, it is very hard to find a purely cursive or a purely rabbinic document on the basis of these criteria. And when the prin-

\textsuperscript{132} He based them on MSS of the Bodleian Library, the Livorno Library of Talmud and Torah, and the British Museum.
\textsuperscript{134} Vol. VIII, p. 307 ff.
\textsuperscript{135} Cf. op. cit. p. 27, no. 9.
\textsuperscript{136} A letter of Elias Levita exists in the library of the Alliance Israélite at Paris, numbered 2H83, sheets 49–55, in which Levita describes amongst other things three kinds of writing. The letter is to Sebastian Munster and is dated Venice 5291 (= 1531). The three are: מוצלע (Münster had called it — erroneously according to Levita — מַשְׂקָט, מַשְׂקָה, and מַשְׂקָב). The latter is clear from his remarks on Sheet 52. The מַשְׂקָט, he says, comes from the Arabs and consists of the writing of half the letters (Sheet 51). The מַשְׂקָב is also derived from the Arabs, according to Levita (ibid). Both the latter and the former terms are Arabic ones, he says. They were both widespread in Spain and France.
ciples are applied to the marginal hands of N, one is forced to say that very few of the latter are purely rabbinic. All are basically this; yet the cursive elements in each one are quite remarkable. In the following analysis, therefore, I will content myself with describing the scripts as rabbinic and giving in each case the most frequently recurring cursive forms.

mh 1: a rabbinic hand. Predominantly cursive forms are those of Zain, final Nun, Samek, Sade and Shin. Besides his marginal work on fs. 1a–30b, 201a–240, this hand is responsible for marginal interventions in the following places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Margin(^{138})</th>
<th>Lines(^{139})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>17–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>10–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{137}\) The letter of Elias Leiva mentioned above in footnote 136 is a prime example of admixture in this matter. It is a private letter, of course. E.g. the letter-title (Sheet 49) contains cursive Alephs but rabbinic Qophs. Most of the Shins throughout are cursive, yet rabbinic forms occur here and there, (cf., e.g., line 5 and 12 of Sheet 54). The same remarks hold for Pe (rabbinic on line 4 of Sheet 49, cursive in second last line of the letter on Sheet 55), for Sade, Zayin, and for Lamed.

\(^{138}\) The capital letter R stands for right-hand, capital letter L for left-hand, margin.

\(^{139}\) In the following analysis of all marginal hands, I thus indicate the place in the margin where the marginal hand has intervened. It is to be understood that the intervention takes place opposite the lines indicated and in the margin, unless otherwise stated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these marginal interventions\(^{140}\) of mh 1 (= th A) take place over the text written by C and beside the marginalia belonging to the same hand (= mh 10). This mh 1, which we have identified with th A, is responsible for a large portion of the main text, as we have pointed out.

\(^{141}\) mh 2: a rabbinitic script. Predominantly cursive forms are those of šade, qoph and shin. The hand does not appear elsewhere in N. Responsible for fs. 31a–32b.

mh 3: a rabbinitic script. Predominantly cursive forms are mem, samek, qoph, shin, taw. This hand does not appear again. Responsible for 33a–40b.

mh 4: very pure rabbinitic script. Aleph is square with few exceptions. Lamed occurs in a cursive form. This hand does not appear again. Responsible for fs. 41–45a.


mh 6: very pure rabbinitic script. Sporadic cursive forms of aleph, shin are found, as well as of samek, pe, šade. Responsible for fs. 51a–60b.

mh 7: a rabbinitic script. Cursive aleph and mem nearly always. Sporadic forms of cursive lamed and pe occur. Responsible for fs. 61a–61b, 62b–70b, 94b–95a (up to line 1, in left-hand margin), 99b (from line 9)–100b, 111b–113a, 119a–124a. This hand has also inserted all the marginalia on f. 408a.

mh 8: a rabbinitic script. Lamed and qoph are sporadically cursive, aleph rarely so. šade, pe and shin are nearly always cursive. Otherwise the script is rabbinitic with occasional square forms. Responsible for fs. 62a, 71a–74b, 95a–

---

140 Excepting those on f. 56a.
141 For mh 2–6, which only appear once in N, cf. supra p. 17.
99b (to line 10), 109a–111a, 113b–118b, 124b–135a (line 11). This hand has inserted marginalia on fs. 408b\(^{142}\) and 409b.\(^{143}\)

**mh 9:** a rabbinc script. Aleph is normally square, Mem is normally cursive, Lamed is sporadically cursive but mainly rabbinic. Responsible for fs. 81a–83b, 91a–94a, 101a–108b, 135a (from line 13) —168b. Also responsible for the marginalia on f. 1a in left-hand margin, opposite line 1, on f. 1b in right-hand margin, opposite line 18, for the parashoth indications on fs. 1–11, 12–19, 61b–63a. This is the rabbinic script of th B.\(^{144}\)

**mh 10:** a very pure rabbinic script, and the most elegant of all 10 marginal hands. Responsible for fs. 169a–200a, 241a–407b, 409a–446. This is the rabbinic script of th C. The latter is responsible for a number of marginalia in square script in the following places:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Lines(^{145})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170b(^{146})</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187b</td>
<td>R &amp; L</td>
<td>7–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>15–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243a</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{142}\) In the right-hand margin opposite lines 2, 7, 9, and in the left-hand margin opposite line 4.

\(^{143}\) In the right-hand margin opposite line 4, and in the left-hand margin opposite lines 2, 4, 12.

\(^{144}\) To judge only by the colour of the ink used for the pointing of f. 83b (the only substantially pointed portion of N), I would say that this mh 9 is responsible for it. Certainly the light-brown colour of the pointing is the same as that of mh 9’s script, and it is different from nearby marginal hands. The vowel pointing is rather thorough. Dagesh tenu is omitted a few times, (line 2, last word; line 3, penultimate word; line 5, fifth word; line 12, last word). Dagesh forte is omitted on line 13, penultimate word. Sin never has a point except on line 10 (second word). On line 8, we find Shin, but it should be Sin. The point over Shin in this page is both correctly and incorrectly placed. The vowel-point of Holam is correctly placed. Raphe is extensively used, (except in the final Pe of line 2; line 5, fifth word; line 7, second word).梅iot never appears. Qames is correctly formed (a line with a dot beneath it).

\(^{145}\) Understood and used as explained in note 139.

\(^{146}\) But notice that the words תואר יריבית ת are from th B which is the text hand on this and surrounding folios.
I can find only one possible intervention of mh 10 in the earlier part of the MS; it is on f. 32a in the left-hand margin opposite line 10. Here and there in the MS there are a few insertions which find their place here for mention. On f. 74b, in the right-hand margin and opposite lines 1–3 we find a marginale of four Hebrew words in square script which cannot be identified with any of the three main text hands.\footnote{Perhaps: \textit{מִסְכָּנָה}.} It partially covers a marginale of mh 6. At the lower right-hand corner of f. 91a the Hebrew letters \textit{יִזְרִיאֲלָה} stand in square script.

The hand could be that of \textit{th} C but this is not sure. It certainly is not \textit{th} A or \textit{th} B. On f. 190a, two words stand in a rabbinc hand which is not identifiable with any of the marginal hands of the MS hitherto identified. The words are very obscure.\footnote{כָּל אֵלֶּה בְּאֵדֹת קְרָא.} At the bottom of f. 255b there appear faint traces of some cursive, but special photographs will be necessary in order to read the words involved.

XI

In order to bring out the work of the various hands and to show the mutual relationship, it will be useful if we summarize what they did. In the following summary, I use an arrow to indicate the work of one hand (of any kind) in another hand’s section of the MS.

\[
\begin{align*}
th A (= mh 1) \rightarrow & \begin{cases} th B \\ th C \end{cases} mh 2 \\ mh 3 \rightarrow & th B \\
ths B (= mh 9) \rightarrow & th A \\
ths C (= mh 10) \rightarrow & th B \begin{cases} mh 7 \rightarrow & th B \\ th C \end{cases} mh 8 \rightarrow \\
ths C \end{align*}
\]
It is clear, on the one hand, that the marginal work of the three main text hands must have been done within a reasonably small distance of time: th A annotated th C’s text, and th B annotated th A’s text. On the other hand, we have no positive reason for saying that the marginal activity of marginal hands 2–8 took place either soon or much later after the text was completed by th C.

XII

With this evidence in hand, we must now return to our main problem: the connection of N with Elias Levita. A strictly palaeographical connection is the first possibility to be explored. I have chosen for comparison in this matter 5 MSS of Levita: nos. 74, 1 and 74, 2 of the Staatsbibliothek of Munich149, nos. 134 and 135 of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris150, MS A. 6, 6 of the Biblioteca Angelica of Rome151, no. 2H83 of the Bibliothèque de l’Alliance Israëlite at Paris152, and Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199.153 Since we are dealing with both square and rabbinic and cursive scripts in N, and any one of these may a priori belong to Levita, we have to have samples of his hand in all three styles.

Let us first discuss the rabbinic script of Levita in relation to the marginal hands of N. The surest and best examples of this script are to be found on f. 601b of Br. Mus. Add. 17, 199, on f. 596b of Munich 74, 2, on MS. A. 6, 6

149 Concerning this MS, cf. M. Steinschneider, Die Hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München, München 1875, and the article of G. Weil quoted note 77. Steinschneider’s judgement is that this MS is “wahrscheinlich autograph.” This must be emended and stated in certain terms. The two MSS preserved under the same number (74) contain three works of Levita. There is a colophon by Levita followed by a Latin notice in the hand of Aegidius of Viterbo and signed by the latter. Weil’s transcription of the Latin notice has to be corrected on a few points: there is an a at the end of the second word on the second line of the notice, and it should be read as “Lecta”. Aegidius has a very peculiar way of forming his a. Both Weil and Steinschneider take the sign in front of Aegidius’s signature as an f (= frater). Professor Wirszubsinki of the Hebrew University, whom I consulted on the point and whom I have to thank, thinks that the sign is a cross. The point is doubtful. There are only two stops in the notice: after Lecta and cocordantias.

150 Levita has a special dedicatory notice prefixed to this work in which he dedicates the work contained in nos. 134 and 135 to Georges de Selve, who as ambassador from Francis I to the Venetian Republic became Levita’s patron and pupil. This notice is written in rabbinic hand and is signed by Levita. There is no colophon to this MS.

151 The MS of Levita’s Meturgeman. I hereby thank the authorities and Custodian of the Biblioteca Angelica for their kindness.

152 We find in this collection of papers a letter of Levita to Sebastian Munster, dated Venice 1531. It occupies Sheets 49–55. It is a signed autograph of Elia.

153 The MS is dated to 1516. It is a signed autograph of Levita. Cf. the colophon on f. 600b; the letters (used as numerals) ינו were added in red ink in the margin.
of the Biblioteca Angelica, and on f. 2a and 2b of Paris no. 134.\textsuperscript{154} Both the Paris and the British Museum MSS bear Elias Levi's signature, which corresponds to his signature on MS. A. 6, 6 of the Biblioteca Angelica. The rabbinic style of the script is very pure, and, in spite of the lapse of years between the execution of each of these MSS\textsuperscript{155}, the unity of authorship and identical personality of style is quite noticeable between all four.\textsuperscript{156} Even between the \textit{recto} and \textit{verso} of Br. Mus. Add. 27, 199 where Levi slips from a small format of letter to a large one, the same unity is quite obvious.

On the other hand, it is clear that only one of the marginal hands of N is possibly identical with this script of Levi's: this is \textit{mh} 5 found on fs. 45b–50b of N.\textsuperscript{157} A comparison of the photographs of these four places with those of the other marginal hands of N\textsuperscript{158} suffices to demonstrate the truth of this. Even if we examine a sample of Levi's \textit{cursive}, we will find no parallel to any other one of our marginal hands.\textsuperscript{159}

This conclusion would seem to exclude any further research throughout Levi's MSS in connection with the marginal hands of N. Yet a careful perusal of Paris nos. 134 and 135 opens up a new possibility. First of all, it is clear that Elias Levi wrote the dedicatory notice on folio 2 of this MS. Yet it is also clear that he is not the main scribe of this MS.\textsuperscript{160} This is of capital importance in many ways. We find Levi's hand has intervened in many places to supplement the written text\textsuperscript{161}, and his script here is quite recognizable in relation to the dedicatory notice. The main text hand of nos. 134 and 135 can be justly described as \textit{rabbinic} with a certain admixture of cursive forms. Yet, the two scripts (that of Levi and the main text hand of nos. 134 and 135) cannot be confounded.\textsuperscript{162}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[154] Cf. figs. 21–23, 27–29.
\item[156] I have not thought it necessary to draw up an alphabet of Levi's \textit{rabbinic} script.
\item[157] Cf. fig. 15.
\item[158] Cf. figs. 11–14, 16–20.
\item[159] Cf. figs. 30–31.
\item[160] Cf. figs. 25–26 and compare with samples of Levi's \textit{rabbinic} script given on figs. 21–24, 27–29.
\item[161] Cf. fig. 26, in the first column.
\item[162] Levi did transcribe some complete folios in no. 134. The bulk of the work is from another hand. This is not unusual in Levi's MSS. In MS. 6, 6 of the Angelica (= MS. 84 in the new system now in use there as opposed to the old destination-number Ms. 52 given by di Capua in the 'Catalogo dei codici ebraici della Biblioteca Angelica' of his \textit{Cataloghi dei codici orientali di alcune biblioteche d'Italia, Firenze 1878, pp. 101–2}, we find that Elia only transcribed fs. 2a–103a, 120a–133a, 166a–171b, 292a–323a, 333a–425b. Another hand transcribed fs. 104a–119b, 134a–165b, 172a–291b, 325a–332b. The
\end{footnotes}
On the other hand, there is such a resemblance between the main text hand (rabbinic) of nos. 134 and 135 and mh 1 of N, both palaeographically and in personality of style, that one cannot but conclude that mh 1 of the Neofiti MS comes from the same scribal author of the main text of nos. 134 and 135. I have already given photographs of mh 1 and of the main text hand of Paris nos. 134 and 135.\textsuperscript{163} Here and there throughout the Paris MSS, Levita’s hand appears at greater length, yet the bulk of the MSS is not from him.

The identification of mh 1 of N with Levita’s scribe, employed by him to transcribe the greater portion of nos. 134 and 135, forges yet another link between Levita and N. The square script appears in the Paris MSS only in the key-words of the alphabetic order in which Levita arranged his material. The situation is complicated. In no. 134, we find no real consistency in the use of square script for the key-words until f. 250 (up to the end of “Daleth”). We find genuine square script of key-words on fs. 6a—14b, 29a, 56b—71b, 119a—121a. Elsewhere the key-words are written in the type we have called semi-square.\textsuperscript{164} No. 135 begins with a folio\textsuperscript{165} whose key-words are in pure square. The key-words throughout are predominantly\textsuperscript{166} in this square script. After f. 281a there come two and half blank folios.\textsuperscript{167} Then on f. 289a, the square script takes up again and continues on until the last written folio (303a). The interesting character of the square script in all these key-words is that on practically all points it resembles the square script of th A of N. In only one form (the final form of šade) can I find a definite difference,\textsuperscript{168} and even this is not a constant difference. Comparison of texts is the only and ultimate means of judging here.\textsuperscript{169}

Consequent on this evidence, I conclude that th A of N (= mh 1) is due to the same scribe who transcribed the vastly major portion of nos. 134 and 135 of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. We do not know the identity of this scribe. What seems certain is that he was with Elias Levita in Rome between 1515 and 1517 and again with Levita in Venice around 1531—1536. The import-

destination—number A. 6, 6 was the oldest and first which the volume received in the Library.

\textsuperscript{163} Cf. supra p. 30; figs. 11, 25–26.
\textsuperscript{164} Much the same as is found throughout Cod. 74, 1 and 2 of Munich.
\textsuperscript{165} This folio is marked with three pagination series: 1 (of no. 135), 261 (with reference to the preceding no. 134), and CCLXI (= the preceding in Roman numerals). “Heb. 480” stands in the right-hand corner.
\textsuperscript{166} On fs. 1–2a, 188b–208b, 209b–254a, 255a–258b, 259a, 261b–280b.
\textsuperscript{167} Fs. 286b, 287a and b, 288a and b.
\textsuperscript{168} In th A, the little tip surmounting the upper right-hand arm is usually turned inwards towards the other arm. In the square of no. 135 it is usually turned outwards.
\textsuperscript{169} Cf. fig. 26
ance of this identity of th A lies, however, in the fact that it establishes a very
direct link with Elias Levita. For, if part of N (the text and annotations of th A)
was transcribed by a scribe in the employ of Levita and the scribe revised the
other two portions of the text (those of th B and th C), we can then say that
N was transcribed on Levita’s orders by his scribes for Aegidius of Viterbo.
Furthermore, Levita intervened in one place to annotate the manuscript, and
Aegidius of Viterbo himself added more annotations. Who inserted the re-
mainng maginalia or when they were inserted, are questions for which there
seems no immediate answer.

On the other hand, it is necessary to correct Reger’s statement\textsuperscript{170} to the effect
that Menahem wrote Neofti I for Aegidius. Reger quotes Sacedote as his
source here, and Sacedote’s source was the colophon of N. We know that
Menahem only wrote part of N. Sacedote merely consulted the colophon where
verbotoeus Menahem states that he wrote it for Aegidius. In actual fact, N
was written for Aegidius by three people employed by Elias Levita, and it can
therefore be justly described as a MS prepared by Levita for Aegidius.\textsuperscript{171}

XIII

The above findings concerning N, and its attribution to a scribe in the employ
of Elias Levita who was acting under orders from Aegidius of Viterbo, cohere
well with what we know about the latter. The Augustinian was at once humanist,
Hebraist, Churchman, and statesman. His first steps in Hebrew studies were
probably taken during his stay at Florence in 1497, where he would certainly
have undergone the influence of the recently dead Pico della Mirandola who
had left a living heritage with the Florentine Platonists.\textsuperscript{172} The Florentine his-
torian Piero Parenti described Aegidius as skilled in Hebrew as early as 1502,
but this cannot be taken too seriously. There is no solid evidence that he had
become a proficient Hebrew scholar before 1507 at the very earliest. In 1499
he was living in semi-seclusion at San Giovanni in Carbonara at Naples and
his main proficiency at this time seems to have been confined to Greek and

\textsuperscript{170} P. Reger, \textit{Geschichte der Juden in Rom} (1420–1870), zweiter Band, Berlin 1895. The
first volume was published a year later in collaboration with Hermann Vogelstein.

\textsuperscript{171} My thanks are due to the authorities of the Bibliothèque de l’Alliance Israélite Uni-
verselle, Paris, for photographs received and for the authorization granted to use them
in this publication. Similar thanks are due to the authorities of the Bibliothèque Na-
ionale de Paris, the British Museum of London, the Staatsbibliothek of Munich, the
Biblioteca Angelica of Rome.

\textsuperscript{172} Aegidius in his Hebrew grammar, now Vat., Lat. Ms 5080, 2r, acknowledged his debt
to Pico; Cf. quotation in E. Wind, \textit{Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance}, London 1958,
p. 26, n. 3.
Latin. Greek learning is also stressed in the dedicatory letter by Aldo Manuzio to Aegidius in the 1503 edition of the *Homiliae* of Origen. We know of one Greek text used by Aegidius at Florence in 1497. The Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, has copies of Aegidius's Homer's *Iliad*, his Valla's translation, and his Bessarion's *In Calumniatorem Platonis*. A note on the last folio of his *Iliad* shows that Aegidius had used it in 1504.

It is probably with his meeting in Rome with Elias Levi that we must identify the beginning of a real deepening of Aegidius's knowledge of Hebrew. Whether Elias came to Rome immediately after the sack of Padua in 1509 by the imperial forces, or whether he only arrived in 1515, does not really matter in this particular context. Thereafter, the Augustinian gave himself seriously to Hebraic studies. Since his purpose was to penetrate more deeply the meaning of the Scriptures, he was more than ordinarily attracted to the Kabbala. With the publication of Reuchlin's *Augenstieg*, a controversy arose on both sides of the Alps, and Aegidius declared himself a firm advocate of the German scholar. He wrote again and again to his Venetian friend, the Augustinian Della Volta, asking him to obtain Greek and Hebrew works. He wrote to the German Hebraist, Kaspar Amman, for various Targums and for a copy of Reuchlin's library. He sought a copy of the *Zohar* from Damascus. He studied Arabic and embarked on a study of Persian and Turkish. He employed the services of several Jewish scribes and, above all, he maintained Elias

175 The MS is a copy of Rufin's translation of Origen's *Peri Archon*. Cf. Ang. MS 1244, 151r. The note was averted to by Pélissier in *Rev. Bibl.*, II (1892) p. 233, and more recently by E. Wind in *Studies in Art and Literature for Bella da Costa Greene*, Princeton 1954, p. 418.
Levita in his own household, thus enabling the Jewish scholar to continue his life of productivity.

Of more direct interest to us is Aegidius's interest in the Targums. We have mentioned his request to Kaspar Amman. He himself tells us about a copy of the Targum as having been given to him by Leo X and which came from the library of a very learned man. Both his request to Amman and the gift from the Pope seem to have been made before 1516. It is always possible that N was a copy of the Targum sent him from Germany by Kaspar Amman.

Of his library only four printed works are now identifiable. His MSS were preserved in much greater quantity because of their rarity. The majority are scriptural and cabbalistic. Some idea of this section of his personal library can be formed from the catalogue of it which went into the royal collection of Paris at the end of the sixteenth century. Sixty-three works are listed, of which thirty-one are rabbinical, cabbalistic and talmudic. Seven are textual and philosophical concerning the Old Testament. Five are Arabic. Five deal with the classics. There are four polemical works on theology. Three MSS contain sermons. Two are commentaries on passages from the New Testament. There are three philosophical works and two of a historical nature. It is clear that his bias lay towards Hebraic and Talmudic and Kabbalistic studies. We must presume that N figured in his library between 1516 and 1527.

The fate of his library has been a matter of some confusion and uncertainty. Aegidius, seemingly, had one library in Rome and one in Venice. The library at Rome was pillaged by the imperial troops in 1527, but some authors think that not all his books perished. At any rate, by 1530 Aegidius had...


184 Valla's translation of Homer's Iliad, in Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, as Incunabulum 1261a. Aegidius's signature appears on Sig. Ar. and Sig. 0–6r. His marginalia run throughout the work. The second work is Bessarion's In Calumniatorum Platonis which is bound in with the preceding work. Aegidius's signature appears on the table of contents and his marginalia run throughout. The third is his copy of Lexicon Rabbinicum vocatum Haeret, now in the Biblioteca Angelica as Aut. 7. 2. Aegidius's signature and notes are to be found in it. The fourth is a work Opus adversus nova quaedam et a christianae religione prorsus aliena dogmata Martini Lutheri (Rome 1522), which is also in the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome.

185 Filalteo to Contarini, Pavia 8 August 1527, tells of the loss of Aegidius's library at Rome, in Filalteo libri tres epistolæarum (Pavia 1564, 41r–42v). Cf. also Filalteo to Aegidius, 5 April 1530, which confirms the loss (ibid., 92r). Filalteo to Contarini (same letter as above) mentions that various friends including Bembo intend to try and replace the pillaged MSS (ibid., 41v).

already established another library at Rome, as Widmanstetter tells us.\textsuperscript{187} His library at Venice remained untouched, and from it a collection of sixty-four MSS was acquired by Cardinal Ridolfi, Aegidius's successor as bishop of Viterbo. This collection eventually became part of the Royal Library of Paris. A section of the library remained with Seripando, as we know from Widmanstetter, and it was bequeathed by him to the monastery of San Giovanni in Carbonara.\textsuperscript{188} Several of these MSS are to be found in the Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples. Other books and MSS from Aegidius's library have found their way to the Biblioteca Angelica, to the Vatican Library, to the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome, to the British Museum Library, and to the Staatsbibliothek, Munich.

Concerning N, much remains doubtful. Aegidius died in 1532, and therefore he himself could not have donated the MS to the \textit{Hospitale} since the latter was only founded in 1543. It is always possible that, having escaped destruction in 1527, it passed into the hands of Seripando and that the latter bequeathed it to the monastery of San Giovanni in Carbonara from which it eventually made its way to the \textit{Collegium}. But hitherto we have no cogent proof that N ever belonged to the \textit{Hospitale} either at San Giovanni di Mercato or at Madonna dei Monti. Perhaps a subsequent study of the archives of the present \textit{Ospizio} will throw light on this and other tantalizing aspects of N. In the meantime, it is interesting to note that Widmanstetter states quite clearly that “Seripandi benefici singulares omnem eius (\textit{i.e.} Aegidii) bibliothecam et maxime secretos commentarios manu ipsius notisque perplexis de rebus variis scriptos evolvere concessum fuit.” Perhaps, after all, N was amongst these “commentarii” which Widmanstetter mentions.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{187} Cf. Widmanstetter in the preface to his \textit{Novum Testamentum lingua et characteribus Syriacis}, Vienna 1555.


\textsuperscript{189} Cf. the preface to his \textit{Novum Testamentum} mentioned above. My sincere thanks are due to Professor F. X. Martin of University College, Dublin, for his aid and help in studying Aegidius of Viterbo, and for the generous loan of his personal notes and files.