

THE EUROPEAN GENIZAH: ITS CHARACTER AND THE HISTORY OF ITS STUDY*

A. *Reuse of Manuscripts on the European Continent*

Recycling – the reuse of materials no longer needed for their initial function but still usable for other purposes – is not a modern innovation. It was once a widespread phenomenon, albeit under another name, and the European Genizah is an integral part of it. The term “European Genizah” refers to thousands of individual pages that were torn out of Hebrew manuscripts centuries ago, and then used to bind books and cover archival files. Sometimes these pages were discovered by chance, and sometimes as a result

of a systematic search. They were discovered mainly in Central Europe, in dozens of libraries, archives, and monasteries, and even among private possessions.¹

The European Genizah is not limited to Hebrew manuscripts. Tens of thousands of manuscripts in Latin, Greek, and other local languages were discarded as worthless throughout Europe, mainly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also during the medieval era. They were then used by bookbinders and notaries in bindings, to cover files, and occasionally for other uses as well.² An unwanted manuscript – whether because the ideas and opinions they

* The present publication (which was written within the framework of the Ludwig Jesselson chair of Codicology and Paleography at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem) is an expanded and updated version of S. EMANUEL, *The “European Genizah” and its Contribution to Jewish Studies*, «Henoch» 19 (1997), pp. 313-340. A Hebrew version appears in Id., *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 17-63. I am grateful to Elli Fischer for the present translation.

Bibliographical Abbreviations: *Books within Books* = A. LEHNARDT - J. OLZOWY-SCHLANGER (eds.), *Books within Books. New Discoveries in Old Book Bindings*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2014; EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures* = S. EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures from Europe*, vol. 1, Mekize Nirdamim, Jerusalem 2015 (Hebr.); *Genizat Germania* = A. LEHNARDT (ed.), *Genizat Germania. Hebrew and Aramaic Binding Fragments from Germany in Context*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2010; LEHNARDT, *Bibliography* = A. LEHNARDT, *Bibliography of the “European Genizah”*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 335-363; SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus* = Y. SUSSMANN - Y. ROSENTHAL - A. CHOU-EKA, *Thesaurus of Talmudic Manuscripts*, 3 voll., Friedberg Genizah Project - Ben Zvi Institute, Jerusalem 2012 (Hebr.).

¹ Among the first scholars to study the European Genizah, the following deserve special mention: M. STEINSCHNEIDER, *Vorlesungen über die Kunde hebräischer Handschriften*, Otto Harassowitz, Leip-

zig 1897, p. 8; S. ASSAF, *Be-oholei Ya’aqov*, Mosad ha-Rav Kook, Jerusalem 1943, pp. 21-23 (Hebr.). In recent years, the number of studies relating to the European Genizah has increased, and it now is in the hundreds; see LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*. I will mention two comprehensive studies in particular: B. RICHLER, *The Contribution of the Italian Parchment Fragments to the History of Medieval Rabbinic Literature and Booklore*, in G. TAMANI - A. VIVIAN (eds.), *Manoscritti, frammenti e libri ebraici nell’Italia dei secoli XV-XVI*, Carucci, Roma 1991, pp. 41-50; M. PERANI, “The Italian Genizah”: *Hebrew Manuscript Fragments in Italian Archives and Libraries*, «Jewish Studies» 34 (1994), pp. 39-54. There are also several collections of essays on the European Genizah: E. FREGNI - M. PERANI (eds.), *Vita e cultura ebraica nello stato estense*, Comune di Nonantola, Nonantola - S. Giovanni in Persiceto (Bologna) 1993; A. DAVID - J. TABORY (eds.), *The Italian Genizah*, Orhot Press, Jerusalem 1998; M. PERANI - C. RUINI (eds.), “*Fragmenta ne pereant*”: *Recupero e studio dei frammenti di manoscritti medievali e rinascimentali ritutilizzati in legature*, Longo, Ravenna 2002; CH. GLASSNER - J.M. OESCH (eds.), *Fragmenta Hebraica Austriaca*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2009; *Genizat Germania*; *Books within Books*.

² Thus, for example, the manuscripts in the magnificent library of the Monte Cassino abbey in Italy

contained had been invalidated, because better versions of the works had been published, or because newer and more beautiful manuscripts (or printed books) had been obtained – was removed from the shelves and sold to bookbinders. It goes without saying that ordinary folks had no interest in preserving manuscripts for which they no longer had any use, but even esteemed university libraries did not hesitate to discard thousands of manuscripts for which they no longer had use.³ Some of those manuscripts were purchased by craftsmen, who used the parchment in bindings and to cover archival files. Parchment is a valuable material, easy to cut but hard to tear, and light (especially in comparison to the heavy wooden bindings that were common then). Therefore, bookbinders found much use for passé manuscripts that no one wished to read any longer. A handful of scholars understood by the middle of the sixteenth century that bookbinders were in possession of ancient manuscripts that should be rescued from their blades,⁴ but the phenomenon continued unabated for a long time and throughout Europe. Tens of thousands of such pages have been discovered recently in various countries, some in old bindings, and some in the covers of archival documents.⁵

were excised by the resident monastics during the fourteenth century so they could use the parchment in amulets; see: J.E. SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1908, p. 13; below, section D.

³ A somewhat similar phenomenon is found as recent as the late twentieth century, when esteemed national libraries (the British Library in London, the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, and others) discarded thousands of newspapers once they had been microfilmed. See: N. BAKER, *Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper*, Random House, New York 2001.

⁴ C.E. WRIGHT, *The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the Beginnings of Anglo-Saxon Studies: Matthew Parker and his Circle: A Preliminary Study*, «Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society» 1 (1949-1953), pp. 211-212; below, at n. 92.

⁵ For a detailed description and a long list of studies and catalogues dealing with this topic, see: E. PELLEGRIN, *Fragments et Membra Disiecta*, in A. GRUYS - J.P. GUMBERT (eds.), *Codicologica 3: Essais Typologiques*, Brill, Leiden 1980, pp. 70-95 (= ID., *Bibliothèques Retrouvées: Manuscrits, Bi-*

I will not presently address non-Hebrew manuscripts that have been discovered in book bindings, but I nevertheless note that even these contain, albeit infrequently, information of importance for Jewish history or the history of the Hebrew book. I cite three examples: The first is the remnant of a very old Hebrew manuscript that was discovered by chance within a Latin fragment used in a binding.⁶ The second is from a Marseille notary who bound his archival files in the early 1320s with a Latin document that he had written himself a short time before. By then, he no longer needed that document, so he excised and repurposed the parchment. The document contains the account of an investigation conducted by the Inquisition in Toulon, a city near Marseille, against a Jew suspected of helping an apostate Jew return to his original faith. It provides important information about the history of the Jews of that community during this period.⁷ The third consists of strips of outdated bills in Latin, which were used in England to bind newer bills. These strips contain information on loans made by English Jews to their Christian neighbors in the thirteenth century.⁸

bibliothèques et Bibliophiles du Moyen Age et de la Renaissance, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris 1988, pp. 343-364); R. WATSON, *Medieval Manuscript Fragments*, «Archives. The Journal of the British Records Association» 13 (1977), pp. 61-73; N. PICKWOOD, *The Use of Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts in the Construction and Covering of Bindings on Printed Books*, in L.L. BROWNRIGG - M.M. SMITH (eds.), *Interpreting and Collecting Fragments of Medieval Books*, Anderson-Lovelace, Los Altos Hills (CA) 2000, pp. 1-20.

⁶ M. BEIT-ARIÉ, *The Munich Palimpsest: A Hebrew Scroll Written Before the Eighth Century*, «Kiryat Sefer» 43 (1967-1968), pp. 411-428 (Hebr.).

⁷ J. SHATZMILLER, *Converts and Judaizers in the Early Fourteenth Century*, «Harvard Theological Review» 74 (1981), pp. 67-77.

⁸ Z.E. ROKEACH, *A Bill Fragment on a Strip of Parchment*, «Ṭarbiz» 40 (1971), pp. 515-516 (Hebr.). For another example of a non-Hebrew fragment containing important historical information, see: H. GERBER, *A Turkish Document on Abraham di Castro, a Sixteenth Century Jewish Leader in Egypt*, «Zion» 45 (1980), pp. 158-163 (Hebr.).

B. Cultural and Historical Background

Reuse of old manuscripts is well attested in the scholarly literature thanks to palimpsests: ancient manuscripts, from the early medieval period, onto which new texts have been copied after the original text faded or was erased.⁹ The use of manuscripts in book bindings is a later phenomenon; it began in the medieval era, but it spread and became firmly established only in the early modern era.

The first evidence of this phenomenon is already found in Hebrew sources from the early thirteenth century. R. Yehuda He-Ḥasid attests that it was customary among some Jews of Germany to use Latin manuscripts in their book bindings, and he objected strongly:

One should not cover his book with parchment upon which romances are written. It once happened that someone covered his Bible with leather, upon which was written foreign (= non-Hebrew) nonsense – an account of the wars of gentile kings. A righteous man came and tore it off and removed it.¹⁰

⁹ B. BISCHOFF, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. by D.O. Croinin - D. Ganz, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990, pp. 11-12. See also above, at n. 6, about a Hebrew palimpsest found in a Latin fragment used in the binding of a book.

¹⁰ *Sefer Ḥasidim*, Abraham ben Moses Hakohen, Bologna 1538, §142 (in later editions, §141). The same passage is found in *Sefer Ḥasidim*, ms. Oxford, Bodleian Opp. 340 (Neubauer 875), p. 150a (there the word *qelafim*, “parchments”, is missing). See also *Sefer Ḥasidim*, ed. J. WISTINETZKI, Mekiẓe Nidramim, Berlin 1891, p. 332, middle of §1348: «Boards from unfit books should not be used to bind Jewish books». Ms. Oxford was written in 1299, and so the suggestion that this passage is a sixteenth century addition must be rejected. See: M. SCHÜLER, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der alten jüdisch-deutschen Profanliteratur*, in M. LANGE et al., *Festschrift zum 75. Jährigen Bestehen der Realschule mit Lyzeum der Isr. Religionsgesellschaft Frankfurt am Main*, Hermon, Frankfurt am Main 1928, p. 84. On the familiarity of *Sefer Ḥasidim* with “romances”, see: J. SHATZMILLER, *Fromme Juden und christlich-höfische Ideale im Mittelalter*, Trier 2008, pp. 16 ff. For an example of a Hebrew manuscript (an Ashkenazi *maḥzor* copied at the end of the thirteenth century) that was bound in an Old French romance, see: N. HOWELL, *Reflecting (on) the Other: Jewish-Chri-*

Elsewhere, R. Yehuda He-Ḥasid attests to a much broader range of real possibilities in his day. Jews occasionally bound their manuscripts with parchment excised from manuscripts of neighboring Christians,¹¹ while the Christians bound their manuscripts with parchment excised from Hebrew manuscripts:

Two *ḥasidim* had books that they needed to bind, and there was a priest in town who was more adept at bookbinding than the Jews. One of the *ḥasidim* would give his books to a Jew who was not as adept as the priest, for he said [...] that if the gentile would do the binding, he would demean the books, and perhaps he would cut up the remnants and use them to repair his invalid books. His fellow said [...] that it is not forbidden to give them other books [= not Torah scrolls] to bind with the boards that they study. He would stand over [the gentile bookbinder] so that he would not use the remnants for his invalid books.¹²

Another Ashkenazic sage, from the end of the sixteenth century, also protested the use of

stian Relations in Cligès and MS Michael 569()*, «*Speculum*» 91 (2016), pp. 374-421 (I am grateful to Dr. Pinchas Roth for this reference).

¹¹ This occasionally happened in later eras as well; for example, a sixteenth century Yiddish version of *Sefer Minhagim* was covered in a sheet of parchment from a thirteenth century Latin manuscript. See: Y. AVIVI, *Rabbinic Manuscripts: Mendel Gottesman Library, Yeshiva University, Yeshiva University Libraries*, New York 1988, p. 5, n. 12. Another example is found in the library of the late Prof. Meir Benayahu: *Sefer Aderet Eliyahu* (Venice 1622) is covered with a Latin manuscript (I thank Hanan Benayahu for showing me this book). Dr. Pinchas Roth commented to me that the famous manuscript of the *Mishnah* (Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Kaufmann Collection A50) was bound in front by a page from a Latin manuscript, as can easily be seen in facsimile editions of this important manuscript. See also: M. SAELEMAEKERS, *Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana HS. Ros. 72*, «*Studia Rosenthaliana*» 38-39 (2006), pp. 158-159.

¹² *Sefer Ḥasidim*, J. WISTINETZKI (ed.), p. 179, §682. Also see the statement of R. Isaac of Acre, who lived about a century later, in *Me'irat Einayim*: «I heard about a German *ḥasid* in Germany who was not wise, but who was simple and upright, who erased a prayer book to use the parchment, and there were mentions [of God's name] therein [...]» – but

Hebrew manuscripts to bind books. Apparently, he was referring to Jews who did so:

I have often seen it practiced, due to our manifold sins, that books are bound with the most sacred of sacred books, which are filled with God's glory. They become blurred, and [God's] holy and blessed name is erased [...] It is proper to raise a cry like a ram's horn and preach publicly to remove this stumbling block from our midst.¹³

Nevertheless, it is clear that the most common phenomenon in the late medieval and early modern eras was that gentiles would bind their books with pages they excised from Hebrew manuscripts. The seventeenth-century German rabbi, Rabbi Joseph Yuspa Hahn Nordlingen, reports at length about this practice:

It is strictly forbidden to bind books with pages taken from parchments of sacred books. If a gentile bookbinder erroneously bound a Jew's book with parchments taken from sacred works, the book's owner must remove the binding. He should not be concerned about the cost of the binding, which was for naught, for it is better for him to lose his money and not treat sacred works disgracefully, constantly, without interruption. Even though I have heard that there are some people who are lenient in a case where the book had already been bound, their reasoning being that it is commendable that the manuscript page remain in the binding, for in that way it will continue to be treated with sanctity along with the book in which it is bound, and if, on the contrary, he removes the manuscript page, since it is small, it might become lost, for it is only a single

it is difficult to determine whether that German pietists erased the prayer book in order to bind other manuscripts with them, or to write on the parchment anew (see A. GOLDREICH, *Sefer Me'irat Einayim by R. Isaac of Acre, a Critical Edition*, PhD Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1981, p. 248 [Hebr.]).

¹³ R. JECHIEL B. JEDIDJA [MICHAEL MORAVSKÝ], *Seder Berakhot*, Krakow 1582, p. 9c (= p. 40 in the E.L. Prins edition, Frankfurt am Main 1910).

¹⁴ *Mishnah Giṭṭin* 4,6: «Captives should not be ransomed at more than their value [...] Sacred scrolls, *tefilin*, and *mezuzot* should not be purchased from gentiles at more than their market value, so as to improve the world order».

¹⁵ *Yosef Ometz*, Hermon, Frankfurt am Main 1928, pp. 275-276.

fragment [...] The wise man should have the foresight, when he gives his books to a bookbinder, to stipulate that he not bind the books with parchment from manuscripts of sacred works. Even though people think that a person acts commendably when he has his books bound with manuscript pages taken from sacred works, for if they remain in the hands of the non-Jew, he will use them in the bindings of other books, and so the pages will certainly suffer much greater disgrace – in my opinion, this argument should be rejected [...] Should someone argue that this being the case, when a person knows that a bookbinder has a manuscript page from a sacred work, he must buy it from him in order to rescue it from disgrace – it seems to me that there is no such obligation, for our Sages said that sacred books should not be ransomed at more than their value,¹⁴ and parchment for binding is far more expensive than a study book, in particular today when printing is so common [...]¹⁵

Today we are in possession of quite a few Hebrew books that were bound with pages removed from Hebrew manuscripts, thus reflecting both of the aforementioned phenomena: of Jews who willingly bound their books with Hebrew manuscripts, and of Christians who bound Hebrew books without the owners' prior knowledge. I will mention but three examples. The first is the *pinqas* of the Modena community from 1659-1749, which was bound in a leaf that had been torn from a manuscript Pentateuch (not a Torah scroll);¹⁶ the second is an Ashkenazic *mahzor* (festival prayer book) bound on both sides by a sheet of parchment taken from the Scroll of Esther;¹⁷ the third example is a prin-

¹⁶ The *pinqas* is at the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem, whereas the leaf has been removed and given to the Manuscripts Department of the National Library of Israel in Jerusalem, where its call number is 4°7533/1.

¹⁷ Ms. Toronto, University Library, Friedberg 5-016. I thank Dr. Dov Walfish for calling my attention to this. The blank side of the scroll faces outward, and the written side faces down, but whoever possessed this *mahzor* certainly knew the nature of its binding, especially due to the back cover of the book, where the names of the ten sons of Haman, in large lettering, can be discerned. Photographs of the entire manuscript and its binding are available at: <http://search.library.utoronto.ca/details?2726363>

ted book – *Beit Ya'akov* (better known as *Ein Ya'akov*), Venice 1547 – which is likewise bound in a sheet of parchment excised from the Scroll of Esther.¹⁸

How did hundreds and thousands of Hebrew manuscripts come into the possession of Christian bookbinders? The aforementioned R. Joseph Yuspa Hahn Nordlingen continues: «most of the parchment books common nowadays came into Christian hands during persecutions». Indeed, the period was marked by pogroms and the confiscation of books. R. Joseph's detailed description also teaches that the problem facing communal leaders was limited to the question of how to deal with the Hebrew manuscript pages from the time that they entered the possession of gentile bookbinders. It was not in their power to prevent the bookbinders from obtaining those pages.

An even more explicit account is found in *Megillat Winz*, in a description of the pogrom against the Jews of Frankfurt in the year 1614. The author, an eyewitness to the pogrom, reports acts of plunder and clearly distinguishes between the fate of printed books – which were sentenced to destruction – and that of parchment manuscripts which were sold to the bookbinders:

The important sacred books [...] all printed and beautifully written, many of which were priceless [...], were scattered by the wicked on the road

[...]. They lit a fire to do evil, and they burned the venerated books [...]. They divided the parchment books, new and old alike, among themselves. They were worth several thousand, more precious than jewels, but they sold them to a craftsman, to bind other books with them.¹⁹

This writer's words are corroborated in full by non-Jewish sources, and documentation from Frankfurt in those years record, in detail, that many Hebrew manuscripts were stolen from the city's Jews during the pogrom and sold to bookbinders.²⁰ Another example comes from the Western Hungarian city of Sopron. The city's Jews were expelled in 1526, and in a petition submitted in 1528, the expellees complained that the townspeople demolished the synagogue and plundered their Hebrew books.²¹ Indeed, an examination of Hebrew and Latin fragments from book bindings demonstrates that from 1528 to 1548, local bookbinders used mainly fragments from Hebrew manuscripts, whereas in other years they used fragments of Latin manuscripts.²²

Similar findings emerge from a statistical analysis of hundreds of fragments from several Italian archives. These fragments cover archival files, so it is possible to date precisely when they were reused. Mauro Perani found, for example, that even though notaries in Bologna used manuscript pages throughout the sixteenth century, there was a dramatic rise, by hundreds of percentage points, in the use of Hebrew manuscripts in the immediate aftermath of the 1593 expulsion of the Jews from Bologna. In nearby

¹⁸ This book was in the collection of the late Prof. Meir Benayahu. A photograph of it appears in: I. FISHOF, *From the Secular to the Sacred: Everyday Objects in Jewish Ritual Use*, Jerusalem 1985 (Israel Museum, Jerusalem, catalogue n. 261), pp. 92-93, n. 56.

¹⁹ R. ULMER, *Turmoil, Trauma and Triumph: The Fettmilch Uprising in Frankfurt am Main (1612-1616) According to Megillas Vintz: A Critical Edition of the Yiddish and Hebrew Text Including an English Translation*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 2001, pp. 127-129.

²⁰ A. LEHNARDT, *Hebräische Einbandfragmente in Frankfurt am Main: Mittelalterliche jüdische Handschriftenreste in ihrem geschichtlichen Kontext*, Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 2011, pp.

39-46. For additional testimonies to similar events in other German cities, see: Id., *Newly Discovered Hebrew Fragments in the State Archive of Amberg (Bavaria). Some Suggestions on Their Historical Background*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 272-273; S. DÖNITZ, *Puzzling the Past: Reconstructing a Mahzor from Receipt Wrappings*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 34-38.

²¹ B. MANDL, *Magyar-Zsidó Oklevéltár (Monumenta Hungariae Judaica)*, vol. 2: 1540-1710, Wodianer F. És Fiai Bizománya, Budapest 1937, p. 547.

²² K. SZENDE - E. MADAS, *Einleitung*, in E. MADAS (Hrsg.), *Mittelalterliche Lateinische Handschriftenfragmente in Sopron*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 2006, p. 10.

Nonantola (c. 35 km northwest of Bologna and 10km east of Modena), usage of Hebrew manuscripts increased significantly around 1630-1635 – years during which the Christian censor confiscated the books of Modena's Jews.²³ These data clearly demonstrate that Hebrew manuscripts came into the possession of bookbinders and notaries by means of force.

In contrast to these testimonies, which are certainly accurate with regard to the location of the writers, Colette Sirat has advanced another explanation for the existence of the European Genizah. According to her, it is possible that the Jews themselves sold the manuscripts in their possession to bookbinders.²⁴ It was mentioned earlier that in Christian society from the sixteenth century on, thousands of manuscripts were

discarded as useless and worthless, and that bookbinders and notaries were just about the only people who exhibited any interest in them.²⁵

In Jewish society as well, starting in the sixteenth century, printed editions began to replace manuscripts on bookshelves, and manuscripts whose time had come were pushed to the margins.²⁶ It is therefore possible that due to the major decline in the value of manuscripts, some members of the Jewish community voluntarily sold the valuable parchment pages of their manuscripts to bookbinders of their own free will, as was the custom among their Christian neighbors. A striking example is *Sefer Ha-Ittur*, published in Venice in 1608 from a manuscript. As soon as the printing was completed, the publishers took the manuscript, which ostensibly had already

²³ M. PERANI - E. MONGARDI - E. CHWAT, 385 *Printed Books of the Fifteenth to Eighteenth Centuries, Bound with Medieval Hebrew Manuscripts in the Estense Library in Modena*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 222-224. For a more detailed analysis of the data in these two archives, see: M. PERANI - S. CAMPANINI, *I frammenti ebraici di Bologna. Archivio di Stato e collezioni minori*, Giuntina, Firenze 1997, pp. 22-30; M. PERANI, *Frammenti di manoscritti e libri ebraici a Nonantola*, Comune di Nonantola - Aldo Ausilio Editore - Bottega d'Erasmus, Nonantola - Padova 1992, pp. 32-43.

²⁴ C. SIRAT, *Il reimpiego dei materiali dei libri ebraici*, in *Vita e cultura* (above, n. 1), pp. 37-47. A much milder formulation appears in her book, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, pp. 238 ff. I will not address at present one of Sirat's claims (pp. 45-46), namely, that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many Jews sold the manuscripts in their possession to Christians, which in turn led to the fact that Christian bookbinders used Hebrew manuscripts in their craft. This issue demands its own discussion, and at present I note only that Sirat relies primarily on the way that the Hebrew manuscript collection of the Bibliotheque Nationale de France in Paris was established, namely, that the manuscripts were mainly purchased from Jews of eastern countries. However, Joseph Hacker demonstrated that the eastern Jews sold their manuscripts to the library's agents very selectively, and only works from specific genres. They did not sell halakhic or liturgical manuscripts – whereas the European Genizah is replete with manuscripts of precisely those disciplines (see J. HACKER, *Jean Baptiste Colbert's Hebrew Manu-*

script Collection and the Culture of Ottoman Jewry, «Zion» 62 [1997], pp. 327-368, esp. 344-352 [Hebr.]). A fascinating attestation to the Jewish perspective on the efforts of Christian scholars to acquire Hebrew manuscripts is a query sent to R. Abraham Amigo in the seventeenth century from an unnamed community in the east: «Question: A certain gentile, a Christian of importance to the rulers, purchases sacred books, soliciting them without exception (that is: the Pentateuch, Prophets, Writings, Mishnah, Talmud, Midrashic collections, and commentaries; in general, he solicits every type of Jewish religious book. Although this is not stated in the query, it was explained to me thus orally). He then hires a Jew to study with him. It is not known whether he is for us or against us, whether he has good intentions to convert or inclines toward heresy. May this Jew transact with him to study? And is it permitted to sell him books *ab initio*?» (R. ABRAHAM AMIGO, *The Law of Studying Torah with a Gentile*, «Qovetz Kerem Shlomo» 10,1 [1987], 10,2 [1992], p. 8 [Hebr.]. Regarding the respondent, see M. BENAYAHU, *Three Jerusalem Sages*, «Sinai» 17 [1945], pp. 309-313 [Hebr.]). Regarding fifteenth-century Italy, I cite Nurit Pasternak, who wrote: «It is clear that the presence of Hebrew manuscripts in the libraries of Christian patrons – princely as well as scholarly – was sparse» (N. PASTERNAK, *Together and Apart: Hebrew Manuscripts as Testimonies to Encounters of Jews and Christians in Fifteenth-Century Florence. The Makers, the Clients, Censorship*, PhD Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem 2009, p. 118 [Hebr.]).

²⁵ See above, at nn. 2-5.

²⁶ On the decline in the prestige of manuscripts in Central Europe at this time, see: S. EMANUEL,

served its purpose, tore out its pages, and used them in the bindings of the copies of the *Ittur*, which were then rolling off the press.²⁷

It is worth noting another matter, which may support Sirat's hypothesis: In parallel to the European Genizah, which was most common in the countries of Central Europe (as well as Spain), we find a similar phenomenon in some places in the Balkans and the East. Printing houses accumulated considerable quantities of unneeded and surplus printed pages, and bookbinders bought those pages on the cheap to use in their bindings. A detailed description of this practice in the sixteenth century is given by Rabbi Samuel de Medina:

The practice here in Salonika among the bookbinders is to make boards from the leftover pages and leaves from the printing presses, whether they contain commentaries and homilies or they contain part of the Torah, the Prophets, or the Writings. They do as follows: they paste leaves together [...] until they resemble a thick board. Then they use this board to protect the bound books [...] Moreover, they cut the boards into smaller pieces to protect smaller books, and they discard the small slices that they made while fitting the boards to the books.²⁸

There are numerous other attestations to this practice from the East,²⁹ and it was generally accepted among Jewish bookbinders, who permitted themselves to reuse pages that they no longer needed.³⁰ This permissive practice occasionally

Fragments of the Tablets: Lost Works of the Tosafists, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 2006, pp. 324-330 (Hebr.). Explicit evidence of the drastic reduction in the price of manuscripts upon the invention of the printing press can be found in the words of an Italian sage from the end of the fifteenth century: «This [= Jewish trade in idolatrous paraphernalia] was one of the reasons that those who lent to gentiles with interest lost their money. The proof is that the beginning of their downfall was that books began to be printed, reducing the cost of books to the point that none would buy theirs. In one place, usurers lost more than a thousand ducats on books alone, *quid pro quo*» (ms. New York, the Jewish Theological Seminary, Rab. 1087, p. 358b; printed by A. MARMORSTEIN, *An Italian Sage and Halakhist*, «Dvir» 2 [1924], p. 218 [Hebr.]. There, he mistakenly replaces “usurer” [*ba'al ribit*] with “landowner” [*ba'al bayit*]). On the identity of the writer and his times, see: Y. YUDELOV, “Who is the Italian Sage and Halakhist?” *On the History of a Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century French-Italian Rabbinic Family*, «Italia» 10 (1993), pp. 9-16 (Hebr.).

²⁷ B.M. LEWIN, *Metivot*, Jerusalem 1933, Introduction, p. 2, n. 2 (Hebr.). Additional pages from this manuscript were used in the bindings of other books. See: M. GLATZER, *Ittur Soferim (Sefer ha-Ittur) of R. Isaac b. Abba Mari*, PhD Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983, vol. 1, pp. 23-24 (Hebr.). This case provides a partial answer to a vexing question. Hundreds of books were published from manuscript between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries, but in only rare instances were the manuscripts used by the publishers preserved. The case of the *Sefer ha-Ittur* is perhaps extreme, but it stands to reason that it sheds light on a more com-

mon phenomenon: Once a manuscript was brought to print, it no longer had any value; in the best of cases, it was cast into a genizah, but often it suffered a much worse fate.

²⁸ *Responsa Maharshdam*, Salonika 1594-1598, *Yoreh De'ah*, §184. I will not address remnants that originated in Yemen, where it was common practice to bind books in the pages of old books and worn manuscripts. Many manuscript pages have been discovered in the bindings of Yemenite books and manuscripts. See, for example, what Rabbi Yihiyah Qafih wrote in a 1927 letter: «I tell you that in my youth, just as I was beginning my studies, I went, for some purpose, to the home of Yihiyah Najjar. I found that he had a cubit-and-a-half tall [stack] of notebooks and pages from ancient books. And he was gluing them [...] to make them into bindings for books that were brought to him to bind» (Y. YESHAYAHU - A. ZADOK [eds.], *Shevut Teiman*, Tel Aviv 1945, pp. 228-229 [Hebr.]). See also: Y.L. NAHUM, *Exposure of Yemen's Treasures*, Holon 1971, pp. 70 ff. (Hebr.); J. TOBI, *The Jewish Community of Rada'a, Yemen in the Eighteenth Century*, Jerusalem 1992, pp. 14-15 (Hebr.). See also below, n. 146.

²⁹ See ASSAF, *Be-oholei Ya'aqov* (above, n. 1); I.Z. KAHANA, *Studies in the Responsa Literature*, Mosad ha-Rav Kook, Jerusalem 1973, pp. 281-282 (Hebr.).

³⁰ See, for example, RABBI MOSHE IBN ḤABIB, *Responsa Qol Gadol*, Jerusalem 1907, §55 (Hebr.): «Query: Must one be concerned about the common practice of making boards from printed pages of the Gemara and other [sacred] books [...] and using the boards to protect books, thus destroying [the pages] in the process? Or perhaps it is not forbidden, for it is no worse than burying the pages and letting them disintegrate under the ground?». After deliberation,

reached Central Europe. For instance, R. Jacob Emden (d. 1776) reports that he did so himself when he published his books.³¹ If this is how Jews treated the scraps of printed books, is it possible that they treated their manuscripts similarly?

Perhaps there is some truth to Sirat's explanation, but it is certainly not sufficient on its own.³² As will be shown below, many fragments discovered in the European Genizah are from works that were never printed, and whose owners therefore had no reason to sell them voluntarily to bookbinders. It is hard to imagine that people were so eager to dispose of their manuscripts that they did not even note which of the works in their possession had already been printed and which had not. Moreover, the European Genizah also includes fragments of Torah scrolls;³³ it is hard to believe that simple folk sold their Torah scrolls to bookbinders for profit.

the respondent invalidates this practice.

³¹ *Mor U-gezi'a*, Altona 1761-1768, 1, §154, p. 63b (= p. 178 in the Bombach edition, Jerusalem 1996; see n. 5 *ad loc.*). The bindings of a considerable number of books contain the proof pages of other books, which can be used to trace the changes and corrections made to the latter book; see, for example: R. PLESSER (ed.), *Revealed Treasures: From the Ezra P. Gorodesky Collection in the Jewish National and University Library*, The Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem 1989, p. 9, n. 20; A. ELBAUM, *The "Mermaid" Bindings*, in B. YANIV (ed.), *Wise-hearted Woman: In Memoriam of Dr. Sara Fraenkel*, Art Plus, Jerusalem 2011, p. 101 (Hebr.).

³² Perani notes that the Nonantola archive's intensive use of Hebrew manuscript fragments toward the middle of the seventeenth century – long after the invention of the printing press but soon after the Church confiscated such books (see above, at n. 23) – clearly demonstrates that it was the confiscation that brought the Hebrew manuscripts into the possession of the notaries; see Perani, *Nonantola* (above, n. 23), p. 33.

³³ See, for example, F.D. HUBMANN - J.M. OESCH, *Verborgene Schätze der hebräischen Bibel in Österreich*, «Biblos. Beiträge zu Buch, Bibliothek und Schrift» 52 (2003), pp. 75-86; J.M. OESCH, *Kodikologisches zu den Sifre Tora: Zwei unveröffentlichte Torarollenfragmente aus Innsbruck*, «Protokolle zur Bibel» 14 (2005), pp. 3-16; F.D. HUBMANN, *Beobachtungen und offene Fragen zu einigen Besonderheiten der Torarollenfragmente*, in *Fragmenta Hebraica Austriaca* (above, n. 1), pp. 61-88; J.M.

It stands to reason that the historical truth lies somewhere between these two explanations. It seems that the Jews did not sell their manuscripts to bookbinders voluntarily; rather, the latter obtained them through force. Nevertheless, even within Jewish society – not only in the Christian society in which they lived – the status of manuscripts diminished noticeably during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Jews did not expend too much effort in this period to redeem Hebrew manuscripts from ruffians, who, for their part, understood that the Jews no longer considered these books to be so valuable and stopped trying to sell to them (unlike in prior centuries).³⁴ The only people who still had interest in stolen manuscripts were bookbinders, who bought them for next to nothing.

OESCH - F.D. HUBMANN, *Torarollenfragmente in österreichischen Stifts- und Klosterbibliotheken*, «Codices Manuscripti» supplement 2 (2010), pp. 168-193; PERANI, *Estense Library* (above, n. 23), p. 229; E. ABATE, *Bindings and Covers: Fragments of Books and Notebooks from the Angelica Library (Biblioteca Angelica, Rome)*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 243-244; T. VISI - M. JÁNOŠÍKOVÁ, *A Regional Perspective on Hebrew Fragments: The Case of Moravia*, cit., pp. 205-207. See also below, n. 54; J.S. PENKOWER, *Fragments of Six Early Torah Scrolls: Open and Closed Sections, the Layout of Ha'azinu and of the End of Deuteronomy*, in N. DE LANGE - J. OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER (eds.), *Manuscrits hébreux et arabes: Mélanges en l'honneur de Colette Sirat*, Brepols, Turnhout 2014, p. 55.

³⁴ See, for example: *Sefer Ra'avayah*, ed. D. DEVELAYTZKI, Bnei Brak 2005, §1006 (vol. 3, p. 365; and see V. APTOWITZER, *Mavo Le-sefer Ra'avayah*, Mekize Nirdamim, Jerusalem 1938, pp. 426-428 [Hebr.]); A.M. HABERMANN, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz Ve-Tzarfat*, Tarshish Books, Jerusalem 1946, p. 127 (Hebr.); W.J. FISCHEL, *The Jews of India: Their Contribution to the Economic and Political Life*, Ben Zvi Institute, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 29-30 (Hebr.) (manuscripts had been confiscated from Portuguese Jews in 1497 and sent to distant Cochin, India for sale to local Jews). On the "redemption of books" in countries of the East, see H. BEN-SHAMMAL, *Notes on the Peregrinations of the Aleppo Codex*, in Y. HAREL et al. (eds.), *Aleppo Studies. The Jews of Aleppo: Their History and Culture*, vol. 1, Ben Zvi Institute, Jerusalem 2009, pp. 139-147 (Hebr.), where further literature is cited.

C. Central Features of the European Genizah

As noted, using Hebrew manuscripts to bind books and cover archival documents was a widespread practice during the late medieval and early modern periods, until the seventeenth century, and primarily in countries with thriving Jewish communities: Italy, Germany, and

Austria in Central Europe, and Spain in Western Europe.³⁵ Additional fragments have been discovered in regions bordering these countries: Alsace,³⁶ Western Hungary,³⁷ Southern Poland,³⁸ and the Czech lands.³⁹ Relatively few fragments have been discovered in a long list of other European countries, like Slovenia,⁴⁰ Switzerland,⁴¹ France,⁴² England,⁴³ the Nether-

³⁵ In recent years, hundreds of pages have been discovered in archives in Spain, primarily in Gerona. In many respects, the findings in Spain are similar to those of Central Europe (the emphasis of the present discussion), but they also differ in many significant ways. For a survey of the findings in the Gerona archives, see: M. PERANI, *The "Gerona Genizah": An Overview and a Rediscovered Ketubah of 1377*, «Hispania Judaica Bulletin» 7 (2010), pp. 137-173 (and the works it cites). See also: LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, pp. 360-362.

³⁶ See J. KOGEL, *The Reconstruction of a Sefer Haftarat from the Rhine Valley: Towards a Typology of Ashkenazi Pentateuch Manuscripts*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 43-68; ID., *Les fragments du Talmud de Babylone conservés à la Bibliothèque municipale de Colmar*, in DE LANGE - OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, *Manuscrits hébreux et arabes* (above, n. 33), pp. 115-126; EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 371-377; TOVIA (below, n. 122); and below, n. 87.

³⁷ See LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, pp. 348-349; E. RÓTH, *A Soproni Állami Levéltár héber kéziratáról*, «Soproni Szemle» 10 (1956), pp. 319-334.

³⁸ See LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, pp. 359-360; E. KUPFER, *On "One of the Greatest of the Generation" in the First Half of the Thirteenth Century in Poland and Germany*, «Kiryat Sefer» 59 (1984), pp. 959-960 (Hebr.); Z.Y. LEITNER, *Remnants of R. Azriel's Commentary on Bavli Nazir*, in Y. BUXBAUM (ed.), *Sefer Zikaron Le-khvido shel Rabbi Shmuel Barukh Werner*, Jerusalem 1996, pp. 156-162 (Hebr.); J. OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, *Binding Accounts: A Ledger (!) of a Jewish Pawn Broker from 14th Century Southern France (MS Krakow, BJ Przyb/163/92)*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 97-147 (and see below, n. 47); EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 208-209.

³⁹ See LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, p. 348; Y.A. SHOSHANA, *Tosafot of R. Isaac b. Asher on Bavli Shabbat, Chapter "Ba-meh Tomnin"*, «Yeshurun» 13 (2003), pp. 21-36 (Hebr.); D. POLAKOVIČ, *Hebrew Manuscript Fragments in the Czech Republic: A Preliminary Report*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 329-332; VISI - JÁNOŠÍKOVÁ (above, n. 33), pp. 185-236. On Hebrew fragments in Slovakia, see: S. KRAUSS, *Pressburger Synagogen*, in H. GOLD (Hrsg.), *Die*

Juden und die Judengemeinde Bratislava in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart: Ein Sammelwerk, Jüdischer Buchverlag, Brünn 1932, pp. 91-92, 98 n. 2; E. KATZ, *Jalkut Schimoni Poseniensis*, in S. SEGERT (ed.), *Studia Semitica philologica necnon philosophica Ioanni Bakos Dicata*, Vydavatel'stvo Slovenskej akademie vied, Bratislava 1965, pp. 131-137; ID., *Mittelalterliche hebräische Handschriftenfragmente aus Bratislava*, «Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden» 3 (1966), pp. 17-30, 63-77.

⁴⁰ A. VIVIAN, *Iscrizioni e manoscritti ebraici di Ljubljana*, «Egitto e Vicino Oriente» 5 (1982), pp. 93-113; ID., *I manoscritti ebraici dell'Archivio Vescovile (Skofjski Arhiv) di Maribor*, «Egitto e Vicino Oriente» 6 (1983), pp. 133-208.

⁴¹ See: LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, p. 362; G. JOBIN - P. PÉGEOT, *Documents hébraïques médiévaux à Porrentruy*, «Actes» (1988), pp. 143-171; M. BANNITT, *Deux fragments homilétiques de l'Abbaye d'Engelberg*, «REJ» 152 (1993), pp. 177-191; J. ISERLES, *Medieval Hebrew Manuscript Fragments in Switzerland: Some Highlights of the Discoveries*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 255-269.

⁴² See: LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, p. 348; S. SCHWARTZFUCHS, *An Enactment from 1313*, «Bar Ilan» 4-5 (1967), pp. 209-210 (Hebr.) (see also n. 141 below).

⁴³ See at n. 167 below; LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, pp. 362-363; W.H. LOWE, *The Fragment of Talmud Babli Pesachim of the Ninth or Tenth Century, in the University Library, Cambridge*, Cambridge 1879 (and see: SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 1, p. 167, n. 1528; S.C. REIF, *Hebrew Manuscripts at Cambridge University Library*, Bell & Co., Deighton 1997, pp. 124-125, n. 173); EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 183-203; P.E. PORMANN, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Oxford*, D.S. Brewer, Oxford 2015, pp. 109-114, ms. 469. A preliminary (and very incomplete) attempt to study binding fragments on English soil was undertaken by Herbert Loewe. See: H. LOEWE, *The Heythrop College Maimonides Fragment*, «Journal of Theological Studies» 38 (1937), pp. 252-258 (and see also ID., *A Hebrew Antidotary. Queens' College, Or. 5*, «Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine» 31 [1938], pp. 647-649).

lands,⁴⁴ and Denmark.⁴⁵ Some have even been found on other continents.⁴⁶

Some of the fragments found in these other countries are the remnants of Hebrew manuscripts that were in those places, and from which they were taken to bind books.⁴⁷ Other fragments reached those countries incidentally, as the Latin (and Hebrew) books in which they were bound wandered from place to place⁴⁸ (a few fragments even crossed the ocean and reached the United States via book dealers).⁴⁹ An example is one of the first European Genizah fragments to be published – a will from Italy published by Abraham

⁴⁴ See LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, p. 359; S. SEE-LIGMANN, *Ein portugiesischer Talmuddruck*, «ZfHB» 12 (1908), pp. 16-19 (and see below, n. 150); EMANUEL, *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), p. 276, n. 247.

⁴⁵ EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 105-106.

⁴⁶ On fragments in Armenia, see: M. KAHANA, *Midrashic Fragments in the Libraries of Leningrad and Moscow*, «Assufot» 6 (1992), p. 42, n. 2 (Hebr.).

⁴⁷ See, for example, M. ABRAHAMS, *Leaf from an English Siddur of the Twelfth Century*, in I. HARRIS et al., *Jews' College Jubilee Volume*, Luzac & Co., London 1906, pp. 109-113. On this fragment, see: M. BEIT-ARIÉ, *The Makings of the Medieval Hebrew Book: Studies in Palaeography and Codicology*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1993, p. 129 and p. 136 n. 68; J. OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, *Les manuscrits hébreux dans l'Angleterre médiévale: étude historique et paléographique*, Peeters, Paris - Louvain 2003, pp. 262-265.

⁴⁸ See, for example: OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, *Binding Accounts* (above, n. 38; fragments from Southern France that were found in the binding of a book that reached Krakow by way of Leipzig; see p. 102); L. BLAU, *Leaves of Unknown Tosafot on Bavli Ketubot*, in D. BARON et al. (Hrsg.), *Festschrift zu Ehren des Dr. A. Harkavy aus Anlass seines 70. Lebensjahres*, Markon, St. Petersburg 1908, pp. 357-364 (Hebr.) (a book from Palestine that was brought to Hungary. The pages in the binding have since returned from Hungary to Palestine, and they are presently in the National Library of Israel in Jerusalem; see: B. RICHLER, *Manuscripts of the Tosafists on the Talmud*, in A. REINER et al. [eds.], *Ta Shma: Studies in Judaica in Memory of Israel M. Ta-Shma*, Tevunot Press, Alon Shevut 2011, p. 805, n. 119 [Hebr.]. On the contents of this fragment, which, contrary to the editor's opinion, contain the Tosafot of R. Asher, see also: J. FAUR, *Tosafot Ha-Rosh le-Pereq Ha-Maddir*, «Sinai» 57 [1965], pp. 20-21 [Hebr.].

Berliner in 1882. Berliner wrote that he found the document in the binding of the first printing of the Passover Haggadah that is preserved at the British Museum in London.⁵⁰ However, he did not note that he himself sold the book, which he had found several years earlier while traveling in Italy, to the British Museum.⁵¹ This fragment is instructive about another facet of the European Genizah – the document has disappeared in the vast repositories of the British Library (the successor of the British Museum), and it cannot be located today.⁵²

⁴⁹ See, for example, above, n. 11; below, at n. 88 and nn. 177, 183; LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, p. 363; U. CASSUTO, *Gli ebrei a Firenze nell'età del Rinascimento*, Olschki, Firenze 1918, p. 160, n. 1; I. SONNE, *Critical Annotations to Solomon bar Simson's Record of the Edicts of 1096, Including a Fragment of this Text in Judeo-German*, in *The Abraham Weiss Jubilee Volume*, Yeshiva University, New York 1964, pp. 385-386 (Hebr.); S. EMANUEL, *Fragments of "Se-der Binyan Bayit Sheni" of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yoel Halevi*, «Ha-ma'ayan» 34,4 (1994), pp. 11-17 (Hebr.) (and below, n. 183); ID., *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 327-366. On the tortuous path that a Talmud fragment took from the library of the Lambach Abbey in Austria to the Yale University Library in the United States, see: R.G. BABCOCK, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library: Fragments from Lambach*, Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, New Haven 1993, pp. 13, 25, 116 (for a description of the fragment, see Sussmann, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 543, n. 5933).

⁵⁰ A. BERLINER, *Devarim Atikim*, «Ha-medaber Le-Yisrael» 1 (1882), pp. 47-48 (Hebr.) (and again in «Qobetz Al Yad» 10 [1903], pp. 27-28). Berliner conjectures that the book was printed in Rimini, but today we know that this Haggadah was printed in Soncino in 1486 and is not the first printing of the Haggadah, but the third; see P. TISHBY, *Hebrew Incunabula (E) - Italy: Soncino (3)*, «Kiryat Sefer» 64 (1992), pp. 694-698 (Hebr.); Y. YUDELOV, *Otzar Ha-haggadot: A Bibliography of Passover Haggadot from the Beginning of Printing until 1960*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1997, p. 1, n. 3 (Hebr.).

⁵¹ See: I. BENJACOB, *Ozar ha-Sefarim Thesaurus Librorum Hebraeorum tam impressorum quam manusciporum*, Vilna 1880, p. 124, n. 9 (Hebr.).

⁵² Reported to me in 2010 by ms. Ilana Tahan, Curator of the Hebrew Collection of the British Library. I am grateful to her for her efforts to locate the fragment. Unfortunately, such cases of European Genizah fragments that go missing over time are

The pages discovered in the European Genizah reach us in a variety of different ways. Some libraries possess hundreds of fragments, and other have one or two. Sometimes bookbinders used whole pages for their needs, and at other times they cut the pages, horizontally or vertically, to render them suitable for their new function. Occasionally, a single page has been cut into dozens of thin strips, which were then used to reinforce book bindings; each strip contains no more than one or two lines of written text.⁵³ Sometimes both sides of a page have been preserved and can be read easily, but often the bookbinders erased everything written on one side of the parchment, leaving only the second side legible⁵⁴ (this phenomenon was especially prevalent in and around Modena, where the sheets used for binding were completely erased on one side).⁵⁵ Sometimes there is only one page in a binding, and sometimes there are several, even from different manuscripts.⁵⁶ Sometimes dozens of pages from a single document have been preserved,⁵⁷ but usually no more than one or two pages from any one book have reached us. Sometimes a complete manuscript was sold to a single bookbinder, and many remnants of that manuscript can now be

found in books bound by that particular craftsman. However, sometimes the manuscripts were sold piecemeal, with one part going to one bookbinder and another to a different bookbinder, so that the remnants of a single manuscript are now scattered across multiple locations.⁵⁸

The easiest manuscripts for bookbinders and notaries to use were written on parchment and in a relatively large format,⁵⁹ a fact with far-reaching significance. Manuscripts of this sort generally contain classic works that are expected to remain on the bookshelf for a long time: Scripture and its commentaries, prayer books, the Talmud and its commentaries, and familiar halakhic works. Other works, which are generally rarer and thus more interesting, were usually not written in such magnificent manuscripts, and so they are not adequately represented in the European Genizah. Certainly, then, the Genizah does not contain drafts of works, letters and responsa in their authors' handwriting, historical documents, or other informal writings that so abound in the Cairo Genizah.⁶⁰ Ultimately, the European Genizah is not as fascinating and exciting as its Cairene counterpart, and the vast majority of it consists of works that have

not rare; see, for example, below, nn. 97, 153, 166; EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, p. 114, n. 2.

⁵³ See, for example, Y. SUSSMANN, *Yerushalmi Fragments. An Ashkenazi Manuscript: Notes toward a Solution to the Riddle of Sefer Yerushalmi*, «Qobetz Al Yad» 12 (1994), the image before p. 23; *ivi*, p. 6 and p. 8 n. 34 (Hebr.).

⁵⁴ It is worth noting that many bookbinders were not meticulous about this, as is clearly demonstrated in the case of sheets of Torah scrolls that were used for binding books (see above, n. 33): in some cases, they were glued with the writing facing out and the blank side of the sheet stuck to the book. Aesthetically, it would have been better to do the reverse so that the blank side of the sheet faces out. This seems to indicate that some bookbinders and book owners did not consider visible Hebrew writing on their books to be an aesthetic blemish.

⁵⁵ See PERANI, *Estense Library* (above, n. 23), pp. 224-225; EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 426-427.

⁵⁶ *Ivi*, p. 67 n. 3, and pp. 208-209; *Responsa of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg and his Colleagues*, ed. Id., The World Union of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 2012, vol. 1, pp. 165-166 (Hebr.).

⁵⁷ See, for example, below, at nn. 157-159, 162;

below, n. 202; OLZSOWY-SCHLANGER, *Binding Accounts* (above, n. 38); PORMANN (above, n. 43); A. LEHNARDT, *Die Einbandfragmente des Sefer Teruma des Baruch bar Isaak aus der Bibliothek des ehemaligen Augustiner-Chorherren-Klosters in Eberhardsklausen bei Trier*, in A. RAPP - M. EMBACH (eds.), *Zur Erforschung mittelalterlicher Bibliotheken: Chancen, Entwicklungen, Perspektiven*, Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 2009, pp. 245-273.

⁵⁸ See, for example, LEHNARDT, *Frankfurt* (above, n. 20), p. 44. This is also true of non-Hebrew manuscripts used in bindings; see: N.R. KER, *Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts Used as Pastedowns in Oxford Bindings, with a Survey of Oxford Binding c. 1515-1620*, Oxford Bibliographic Society Publications, Oxford 1954, p. 224.

⁵⁹ The same applies to Latin manuscripts used in book bindings; see PELLEGRIN (above, n. 5), pp. 73, 75.

⁶⁰ For a few examples of historical documents preserved in the European Genizah, see below, at nn. 140-147. And see EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 291-326, on an Ashkenazic work by one of the Tosafists, of which an autograph has been preserved in the European Genizah.

long been familiar to us; nevertheless, its significance is far from negligible.

The notaries' raw material of choice – large-format parchment manuscripts – can seemingly explain something else as well. Sixteenth-century Italy was famously a meeting point of migrants from Iberia and Ashkenaz and natives of Italy; it could therefore be expected that the fragments found in Italian archives would reflect this situation. In fact, however, there are a disproportionate number of manuscripts in Ashkenazic scripts. The first (partial) summaries show that almost half of the fragments discovered in Italy are Ashkenazic, much higher than the ratio of Ashkenazic Jews among the Jews of Italy.⁶¹ As noted, this can be explained by the notaries' preferences. Malachi Beit-Arié, who examined, at my request, the SfarData database of the Hebrew Paleography Project, found that the larger the manuscript format, the greater the likelihood that it is Ashkenazic.⁶² His examination incorporated all dated manuscripts written in Italian, Iberian, or Ashkenazic scripts throughout the Jewish world. These are the findings: among manuscripts with very small formats (101-200 mm long), about one-sixth are Ashkenazic; among manuscripts

with medium-sized formats (201-300mm), about a third are Ashkenazic; among large-format manuscripts (301-400mm), about one half are Ashkenazic; and among very large format manuscripts (>401 mm long), about three quarters are Ashkenazic. The data show that an Italian notary seeking a large-format parchment Hebrew manuscript would find mainly Ashkenazic manuscripts. Thus, Genizah fragments discovered in Italy primarily represent the Ashkenazic library.⁶³

D. Other Usages of Hebrew Manuscripts

According to the present state of our knowledge, it is apparent that Hebrew manuscripts were used in Central Europe to bind books specifically, whereas in Italy they were utilized mainly to cover files of archival documents, and, only to a lesser extent, to bind books. Much rarer still was the use of manuscripts for other, occasionally bizarre, purposes. There is also evidence of such usage of non-Hebrew manuscripts. For example, an English scholar wrote in 1536 of Latin manuscripts that were taken from English monasteries and used to polish

⁶¹ RICHLER, *The Contribution* (above, n. 1), pp. 49-50. See also: M. PERANI - E. SAGRADINI, *Frammenti ebraici negli archivi di Cesena, Faenza, Forlì, Imola, Rimini e Spoleto*, Giuntina, Firenze 2012, pp. 14-17. Richler examined other manuscript collections that were assembled in Italy around that period and found that Ashkenazic manuscripts fluctuate between just 20% and 25% of the total, while Italian manuscripts comprised 40-50% of the total.

⁶² The following chart shows the distribution of Hebrew manuscripts, written on parchment, in Iberian, Ashkenazic, and Italian script, according to page size, and throughout the Jewish world. (The entries in the Hebrew Paleography Project lack data on the size of some manuscripts, and so there is a disparity between the sum entered in the last row and the sum of the four preceding rows):

Format	Spain	Ashkenaz	Italy	Total
101-200 mm.	47 (20%)	39 (16.6%)	149 (63.4%)	235 (100%)
201-300 mm.	107 (18.9%)	168 (29.6%)	292 (51.5%)	567 (100%)
301-400 mm.	51 (20.3%)	123 (49%)	77 (30.7%)	251 (100%)
>401 mm.	5 (7%)	55 (77.5%)	11 (15.5%)	71 (100%)
All sizes	255 (15.5%)	644 (39.3%)	739 (45.1%)	1638 (100%)

⁶³ As noted, the data show the distribution of Ashkenazic, Iberian, and Italian manuscripts throughout the world. Ashkenazic manuscripts comprise

c. 40% of these manuscripts. Since the distribution in Italy was slightly different (see above, n. 61), the findings should be adjusted accordingly.

boots and candlesticks, sold in grocery stores, etc.⁶⁴ Another scholar, from Denmark, wrote in 1701 about the systematic collection of “unnecessary” Latin manuscripts from cathedrals, for use as fuses to light fireworks at a royal wedding that took place in Copenhagen in 1634;⁶⁵ about a Danish peasant who ripped out eleven illuminated pages of a manuscript to decorate his kitchen;⁶⁶ of ancient manuscripts used by schoolchildren as notebooks, by tailors in their craft, and in other various and bizarre ways.⁶⁷

There is similar evidence – some from first-person accounts and some from stories whose reliability I do not know how to assess – about Latin manuscripts in other countries. Thus, for example, we hear of magnificent twelfth-century manuscripts being used by a French tailor at the beginning of the seventeenth century;⁶⁸ of the writings of the first-century Roman historian Livy used in the manufacture of tennis rackets, also in seventeenth-century France;⁶⁹ of a French shopkeeper during the Revolution using ancient manuscripts to wrap

groceries;⁷⁰ and of the librarian of a monastery library in Northern France who, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, tore thousands of pages out of manuscripts entrusted to him and sold them to shopkeepers.⁷¹ Another aspect of this phenomenon is the clipping of illustrations from ancient manuscripts in order to sell them, give them as gifts, display them in one’s home, or even paste them inside or on the binding of another manuscript. This was done as late as the early twentieth century, by reputable publishing houses who took pride in the fact that their printed books were bound in ancient parchment.⁷²

We likewise have evidence of the use of Hebrew manuscripts for other purposes, some of which is much earlier than the evidence about Latin manuscripts that I noted above. I will list four such uses here, but I emphasize that these are exceptions that do not even constitute one per mil of European Genizah fragments.

⁶⁴ J. BALE, *The Laboryouse Journey & Serche of John Leylande for Englandes Antiquitees [...]*, ed. W.A. Copinger, The Priory Press, Manchester 1895, pp. 18-19.

⁶⁵ Compare this to the statements by R. Nathan Nata Hannover cited below, at n. 76.

⁶⁶ Only one of the ten pages is extant. See: E. PETERSEN, *Illuminatio. Texts and Illustrations of the Bible in Medieval Manuscripts in the Royal Library, Copenhagen*, in P.A. CHRISTIANSEN (ed.), *Transactions of the International Association of Bibliophiles, XVth Congress 1987*, Danish National Library of Science and Medicine, Copenhagen 1992, pp. 91-96.

⁶⁷ THOMAS BRODER BIRCHEROD, *Dissertatio epistolaris de causis deperditarum apud Septentrionales & praesertim apud Danos Antiquitatum*, in *Dänische Bibliothec: oder Sammlung von alten und neuen gelehrten Sachen aus Dännemarck*, vol. 4, Gottmann Friderich Kifel, Copenhagen - Leipzig 1743, pp. 366-422. An English translation of the relevant passages appears in: CH.G. TORTZEN, *Medieval Manuscript Fragments in Denmark*, in E. PETERSEN (ed.), *Living Words & Luminous Pictures: Medieval book culture in Denmark. Essays*, Moesgård Museum - Det Kongelige Bibliotek, Højbjerg - Copenhagen 1999, pp. 170-171.

⁶⁸ «Mercure de France» (1725), p. 1164. Another story, about an important manuscript of the Magna

Carta utilized by a tailor in the seventeenth century, has long been refuted. It exemplifies the caution with which such stories – some of which are pure fiction – must be assessed. See: W.SH. McKECHNIE, *Magna Carta: A Commentary on the Great Charter of King John, with an Historical Introduction*, J. Maclehose & Sons, Glasgow 1914, pp. 166-167.

⁶⁹ B.L. ULLMAN, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma 1973, p. 67.

⁷⁰ E.A. BÉGIN, *Histoire des Juifs dans le nord-est de la France*, «Mémoires de l’Académie royale de Metz» 24 (1842-1843), p. 157.

⁷¹ PH. GRIERSON, *La bibliothèque de Saint-Vaast d’Arras au XIIIe siècle*, «Revue Bénédictine» 52 (1940), pp. 120-121. See also: EMANUEL, *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), p. 14, n. 41.

⁷² CH. DE HAMEL, *Cutting up Manuscripts for Pleasure and Profit*, Book Art Press, Charlottesville 1996 (Sol. M. Malkin Lecture in Bibliography, 11); ID., *Medieval Manuscript Leaves as Publishers’ Wrappers in the 1920s*, in D. PEARSON (ed.), *For the Love of the Binding: Studies in Bookbinding History Presented to Mirjam Foot*, British Library - Oak Knoll Press, London - New Castle (DE) 2000, pp. 9-11; R.S. WIECK, *Folia Fugitiva: The Pursuit of the Illuminated Manuscript Leaf*, «The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery» 54 (1996), pp. 233-254.

1. *The manufacture of shoes*

In an elegy (*qinah*) composed in the aftermath of the First Crusade, the poet (who may have been R. Eliezer b. Joel ha-Levi – Ra’avyah) writes of Torah scrolls that were desecrated by the marauders (“lepers”), who made them into tents and boot shafts.⁷³

Additional evidence of this, is recorded in a much later (c. sixteenth century) manuscript. The writer recounts:

Every Jew is obligated to redeem a book, *tefilin*, a *mezuzah*, or even one letter from a gentile, even if it costs several dinars, and even if he must be sold into slavery for the gentile to be paid, for this is a great mitzva [...] I have been tested on this matter. I was an itinerant silk salesman to gentile tailors, and one day I found a single leaf from the Book of Kings. I offered thirty dinars to redeem it from him, but he did not give it to me, so I left. From that day on, I did not see any sign of blessing, because I did not redeem it from the gentile. Several years later, I was walking on the road, and I encountered a gentile shoemaker who had a book that he would slice and make into glue⁷⁴ for shoes. When I saw it, I went, dejected and bitter, to my father, and told him what the shoemakers was doing to this book. I went with my father, and we redeemed the book from the

⁷³ The elegy, “Hereg Rav Ve-yom Tevo’ah, Be-4856 Nigzerah Gezerah”, published by S. BERNFELD (ed.), *The Book of Tears: The Occurrences of Decrees, Persecutions and Destructions*, Eshkol, Berlin 1924, vol. 1, p. 209 (Hebr.). On the identity of the poet, see APTOWITZER (above, n. 34), p. 134.

⁷⁴ The word *batzamaq* is vocalized in the manuscript. The scribe added, between the lines, «this is from the Ishmaelite (= Arabic) language». It apparently refers to glue (in Medieval Hebrew: *tzemeg*) produced from parchment. See: C. SIRAT - M. BEIT-ARIÉ, *Manuscrits médiévaux en caractères hébraïques portant des indications de date jusqu’à 1540*, vol. 3: *Notices*, Acad. Nation. des Sciences et des Lettres d’Israël, Paris - Jerusalem 1986, no. 23, n. 3.

⁷⁵ Ms. Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, héb. 309, p. 199a. The manuscript is from 1481 and written in Byzantine script; this entry was written later on a page in the manuscript that had remained blank.

⁷⁶ *Yeven Metzulah*, Venice 1653, p. 4a. English translation: N. HANOVER, *Abyss of Despair*, tr. A.J. Mesch, Bloch Pub. Co., New York 1950, p. 44.

⁷⁷ As a matter of curiosity, I also mention the warning, publicized by the Chief Rabbinate of Pa-

gentile for fifteen dinars. From that day on, our labors are successful and profitable; we have seen a sign of blessing, and God has increased our quality a hundredfold.⁷⁵

R. Nathan Nata Hannover writes similarly in his description of the Khmelnytsky Massacres: «Scrolls of the Law were torn to pieces, and turned into boots and shoes for their feet [...]. Other sacred books served to pave the streets. Some were used for kindling purposes, and others to stuff the barrels of their guns». ⁷⁶

All of these attestations are literary, and I do not know of any such shoes that have survived to the present day. Consequently, I am unable to evaluate the scope of the use of Hebrew manuscripts in the footwear industry (and similar uses).⁷⁷

2. *Musical instruments*

R. Meir of Rothenburg penned an elegy about the pogroms against German Jewry in the early thirteenth century. He writes as follows:

I will cry out bitterly, weeping and groaning over the holy writings that were not spared from the

lestine at the beginning of World War II, against using the parchment of sacred writ as wrapping or for other mundane uses (*Haaretz*, 21 November 1941, p. 4 [Hebr.]; a more detailed explanation for the Rabbinate’s decision appears in the same date’s edition of *Hatzofeh*, p. 4 [Hebr.]: «Recently there has been an increase in the use of printed and used paper in the manufacture of sacks and wallets. In Tel Aviv, peddlers go from house to house buying used paper and old newspapers»), as well as the furious response of J.N. Epstein to the Rabbinate’s warning, published shortly thereafter: «I must say that this “warning” rocked me to my core, no less than the shocking actions themselves. Have we come to this? Do we have no answer to such actions other than the “power” of “warnings”? A “warning” is not the proper response to these Jewish hooligans; war is. War by virtue of the law!» (*Haaretz*, November 25, 1940, p. 3 [Hebr.]). See also: *Haḥlatot Va’adat Haqira*, «Ha-hed» 16,1-2 (1941), p. 16; RB [= RABBI BINYAMIN, the *nom de plume* of Yehoshua Radler-Feldman], *Yeri’ot Magdiel*, «Ha-hed», 16,3-4 (1941), pp. 3-12, 16 (Hebr.).

flames [...]. The rite of Your Torah and scrolls was consumed, desecrated for drums, dancing, and the smithy through to the end of the scroll.⁷⁸

Material reinforcement of R. Meir's words has recently been discovered, albeit from a later period: in the library of the Mainz Landmuseum, there is a single sheet from a book of *haftarot*, containing the passages from the Prophets read publicly after the weekly Torah portions of Pinhas through Ekev (the end of Numbers and the beginning of Deuteronomy, read during the summer months). The sheet is written as a scroll, with script on only one side – exactly as R. Meir of Rothenburg describes! – and four columns have been preserved. The sheet has been trimmed on all four sides to an almost circular shape; only the bottom edge is the sheet was cut straight. It is readily apparent that this sheet was used in a drum – the blank side of the sheet faced outward, and the marks of the percussionists' blows are easily visible on this side. The written side faced inward. Three small squares of parchment have been excised from it, certainly so that the drum's hoops could be passed through.⁷⁹

3. Sculptures

This is attested in two sculptures that have been preserved to this day. The first, a statue of Mary and Jesus from c. 1350, is in a church

in the south of Germany. Jesus's two legs were wrapped in parchment from a Hebrew book, but at some point the parchment was removed, leaving only residual ink. Today, the Hebrew text that was written on the parchment can be read by means of a mirror, but it is too difficult to identify it from photographs, as the curvature of the leg skews the image. A thorough examination conducted by Ms. Margaretha Boockmann showed that the text on the right leg is the Psalms, and it stands to reason that the text on the left leg is from the same book.⁸⁰ A similar discovery was made about another sculpture in Germany, also from the fourteenth century. This sculpture was also wrapped in parchment with Hebrew writing, in this case, from the *siddur*.⁸¹

4. Paintings

The only attestation I have to the use of Hebrew manuscripts for paintings – and for this purpose, specifically Torah scrolls, whose backs are blank, were used – is from the twentieth century. In 2011, painted portraits of the prior owners – a Nazi officer and his wife – were found in a condominium in Tübingen, Germany. The portraits had been painted on sheets that had been excised from a Torah scroll, which had certainly been looted from a European Jewish community. The portraits, which were given to a museum in Stuttgart, were loaned to the Galicia Jewish Museum in Krakow, where they are exhibited.⁸²

⁷⁸ H. SHIRMAN, *Qinot al Ha-gezerot Be-Eretz Yisrael, Africa, Sepharad, Ashkenaz, Ve-Tzarfat*, «Qobetz Al Yad» 3,1 (1940), pp. 48-49; *Gezerot Ashkenaz Ve-Tzarfat* (above, n. 34), p. 181.

⁷⁹ A. LEHNARDT, *Hebräische und aramäische Handschriftenfragmente in Mainzer Bibliotheken*, «Mainzer Zeitschrift» 103 (2008), pp. 26-27. Several years ago, pages of a Latin manuscript were discovered in a pipe organ, having been used in its initial manufacture. The organ was in a church in Frederiksborg (c. 25 miles northwest of Copenhagen), but it had been made in Braunschweig, Germany, in 1610, which is when the Latin manuscript was repurposed. See: J. RAASTED - G. TORTZEN, *Psalterium Compenianum*, in S. GIVERSEN - I. GIVERSEN (eds.), *Kunsten og Kaldet: Festskrift til biskop Johannes Johansen 4. marts 1990*, Poul Kristensen, Herning 1990, pp. 165-183.

⁸⁰ F. HOFMANN, *Ein Vesperbild des 14. Jahrhunderts in Watterdingen*, «Hegau» 53 (1996), pp. 91-112; M. BOOCKMANN, *Ein Psalm an ungewöhnlichem Ort: Hebräische Schriftzeichen an der Christusfigur des gotischen Vesperbilds in Watterdingen*, «Hegau» 64 (2007) [Jüdische Kultur im Hegau und am See], pp. 37-38. Hofmann discusses the Hebrew text on pp. 104-108. I am grateful to Prof. Andreas Lehnardt for notifying me of this finding, and to Ms. Boockmann for sharing her conclusions with me.

⁸¹ H. WESTHOFF, *Die Wiederentdeckung der Originalfassung zweier Skulpturen des 14. Jahrhunderts*, «Maltechnik - Restauro: Internationale Zeitschrift für Farb- und Maltechniken, Restaurierung und Museumsfragen» 87,3 (1981), pp. 143-153.

⁸² See: <http://blogs.timesofisrael.com/the-other-side-of-the-torah> and <http://jasonfrancisco.net/on-the-other-side-of-the-torah>. I am grateful to Prof.

E. Differences between the European Genizah and the Cairo Genizah

There are certain similarities between the European Genizah and the Cairo Genizah, but there are more differences than commonalities. First of all, there is a terminological difference: the Cairo Genizah is indeed a genizah in the original sense, that is, the worn remnants of manuscripts that had been buried by their owners in order to protect their sanctity. With respect to the European Genizah, “genizah” is merely a borrowed term.

The difference between the two Genizot is much more fundamental, though. The Cairo Genizah disclosed a world that had gone all but extinct, for the libraries of Jewish communities from Egypt nearby countries – which contained prayer books, Talmud commentaries, halakhic works, thousands of letters and formal documents, and the list goes on – were almost all lost. Only a few complete manuscripts have reached us. For this reason, the Cairo Genizah sparked a bona fide revolution in certain disciplines within Jewish studies.

The European Genizah is entirely different. For the most part, its contents reflect the hundreds of manuscripts that have been preserved from that era. It therefore contains relatively few innovations. The European Genizah

does, however, have a certain advantage. While the Cairo Genizah preserves the books that had reached a single city, the European Genizah contains the remnants of libraries from dozens of Jewish communities throughout Central Europe, and thus offers a comprehensive snapshot of the culture of Central European Jewry during the late medieval and early modern eras.

Both Genizot contain fragmentary and scattered manuscript remnants, so there has been a tendency among scholars to combine the remnants from both Genizot in one discussion. The confusion between the Cairo Genizah and the European Genizah causes various problems. Some refer to European Genizah fragments as though they are from the Cairo Genizah⁸³ (and, much less frequently, Cairo Genizah fragments are cited as having been discovered in book bindings);⁸⁴ some editors of critical editions are well aware of the difference between the two Genizot, yet they cite fragments of both Genizot with the same signs;⁸⁵ some editors were careful to state that they are publishing fragments found in book bindings in the European Genizah, but habit has lulled scholars into erroneously thinking that they were working with Cairo Genizah fragments.⁸⁶ An even more severe problem prevails in libraries that hold fragments from both the Cairo Genizah and the European Genizah, occasionally in the same file, which then contains

Andreas Lehnardt for bringing this to my attention.

⁸³ For example, the Ashkenazic fragment from Klosterneuberg, Austria, which was included in *Seridei Vayiqra Rabbah mi-Genizat Mitzrayim* [“Vayiqra Rabbah Remnants from the Egyptian Genizah”] (*Midrash Vayiqra Rabbah*, ed. M. MARGULIES, Jerusalem 1953-1960, vol. 5, p. 4 (document 4), 16-17, 23-26, 45-47. In some of the copies of the book, the appendix is introduced with the words “Seridei Vayiqra Rabbah” [“Vayiqra Rabbah Remnants”], with no further specification); likewise, an Ashkenazic fragment of the scholium of *Megillat Ta’anit* is erroneously described as a Cairo Genizah fragment (see, in this regard: Y. SUSSMANN, *Talmudic Remnants in the “European Genizah”*, in DAVID TABORY [above, n. 1], p. 24 [Hebr.] [= ID., *Thesaurus*, Index and Introductory Volume, p. 24]. On this fragment, see below, at n. 167).

⁸⁴ See the comment of Y. SUSSMANN, *Talmud Remnants in the Genizah*, «Teudah» 1 (1980), p. 30, n. 42 (Hebr.) (= ID., *Thesaurus*, Index and Introductory

Volume, p. 21, n. 42); M.B. LERNER, *The Genizah Fragments in the Munich Library*, «Aleï Sefer» 20 (2009), pp. 118-119 (Hebr.).

⁸⁵ Like λ^1 and λ^2 , the convention of the *Complete Talmud Bavli with Diquduqei Soferim*, M. HERSCHLER et al. (eds.), Jerusalem 1972- (Hebr.); see SUSSMANN, *Talmud*, cit., p. 27, n. 34 (= ID., *Thesaurus*, Index and Introductory Volume, p. 19, n. 34). Since the initial publication of this article (see the introductory footnote above), the editors of *The Complete Diquduqei Soferim* have been meticulous about using a different symbol for each of the Genizot: Cairo Genizah fragments are signified with a λ (= Genizah), and European Genizah fragments are marked with a \beth (= *Kerikhot*, bindings); see: *The Complete Diquduqei Soferim*, Gittin, vol. 1, p. 40, and *ivi*, pp. 25-26, 29-30, 55-63.

⁸⁶ See the comment of Y.D. WILHELM, *Qeta'im mi-Midrash Tanhuma Le-sefer Shemot U-miMidrash Yelamdenu le-Sefer Devarim*, «Qobetz Al Yad» 6,1 (1966), p. 61 (Hebr.).

Cairo Genizah Fragments and European Genizah fragments side by side.⁸⁷ This is very misleading, and extreme caution is therefore in order: the Cairo Genizah and the European Genizah must be treated as two distinct phenomena.

Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out the unusual case of a Cairo Genizah fragment that found its way into the European Genizah. I am referring to ms. New York, JTS Mic. 10719, which contains a fragment of the Babylonian Talmud (*Rosh Hashanah* 2a-b) in the familiar handwriting of R. Joseph Rosh Haseder,⁸⁸ which is known from dozens of Cairo Genizah fragments. There is no doubt that this fragment originated in the Cairo Genizah, but amazingly, it was removed from the binding of a printed book – tractate *Shabbat* of the Constantinople (1583-1595) edition of the Babylonian Talmud.⁸⁹ Apparently the book was bound in Egypt,⁹⁰ and the bookbinder took a single page from the Cairo Genizah for his craft. Thus, this one page has the distinction of being part of both the Cairo Genizah and the European Genizah.

⁸⁷ I will note, as an example, the National and University Library in Strasbourg, which has a substantial collection of Cairo Genizah fragments as well as a considerable number of European Genizah fragments (at least some of which were found in the bindings of incunabula donated to the library in Strasbourg by the town of Colmar in the late nineteenth century; see KOEGL, *Sefer Haftarat* [above, n. 36], pp. 43-44). Thus, for instance, Volume 4109 in this library contains four fragments that definitely originated in the Cairo Genizah, but also one fragment (4109/3, containing Rashi's commentary on the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Sanhedrin*) whose form attests clearly that it is from the European Genizah. All of the fragments in Strasbourg, including the European Genizah fragments, have been included in the "Friedberg Genizah Project".

⁸⁸ SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 570, n. 6152.

⁸⁹ On this edition, see: A. YAARY, *Hebrew Printing at Constantinople*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1967, p. 133, n. 207 (Hebr.); J. HACKER, *Constantinople Editions in the 16th Century*, «Areschet» 5 (1972), pp. 491-492, nn. 206-220 (Hebr.).

⁹⁰ Many printing houses would sell their books without binding, leaving the task of binding to the buyer. This was certainly the practice of the printers of this Constantinople edition of the Talmud, for in the first

F. A History of Scholarship on the European Genizah

Already in the mid-fifteenth century, a handful of individual Christian scholars recognized the importance of the Hebrew manuscript fragments in book bindings,⁹¹ and the unsystematic study of these fragments began already in the last third of the eighteenth century, not long after bookbinders and notaries discontinued their brutal mutilation of manuscripts. Christian Hebraists were the first to recognize the significance of the fragments they discovered in the bindings of books in various libraries in Germany, and they devoted special studies to the Scriptural variants found in them.⁹²

Scholarly interest in fragments found in the bindings of books continued through the nineteenth century. The compilers of catalogues of the manuscript collections of various German libraries included a few Hebrew fragments that originated in the bindings of books, and they described them as best they could.⁹³ The attention given to Hebrew fragments that were not Scrip-

volume they wrote explicitly that buyers would receive the book one notebook at a time (see YAARY, cit., p. 131, n. 205; I am grateful to Prof. Joseph Hacker for his assistance in clarifying this point).

⁹¹ S. CAMPANINI, *Carta pecudina literis hebraicis scripta: The Awareness of the Binding Hebrew Fragments in History. An Overview and a Plaidoyer*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 13-22.

⁹² See, for example: J.D. MICHAELIS, *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek*, Johann Gottlieb Garbe, Frankfurt am Main 1771-1789: vol. 2, pp. 196-209; vol. 4, pp. 239-257; vol. 6, pp. 244-247; vol. 8, pp. 167-178; vol. 12, pp. 101-111; vol. 13, pp. 205-217. A bibliography of the earliest publications in the eighteenth century can be found in: H.F. KÖCHER, *Nova Bibliotheca Hebraica secundum ordinem Bibliothecae Hebraicae Io. Christoph. Wolfii disposita, analecta literaria huius operis sistens*, vol. 2, Impensis Haeredum C.H. Curnonis, Ienae 1784, pp. 35-36. And see: CAMPANINI, *Carta pecudina*, cit., pp. 22-25.

⁹³ For example: J. GILDEMEISTER, *Catalogus librorum manu scriptorum orientalium in bibliotheca academica Bonnensi servatorum*, C. Georgius, Bonnae 1864-1876, p. 106. Gildemeister also found, in a bookbinding, a fragment of a commentary to the book of Job, and he published it in a special

tural fragments occasionally led to egregious errors, which apparently prompted Jewish scholars to take interest in these fragments.⁹⁴

About a hundred years elapsed from the beginning of academic interest in the Scriptural fragments in book bindings until Jewish scholars began to publish fragments from the European Genizah. The first publication of which I am aware was in 1863, when six pages from a manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud were found in the Vienna Municipal Archives.⁹⁵ Shortly thereafter, H. Jolowicz of Königsberg produced a critical edition of a fragment of Rashi's commen-

tary on Daniel and Ezra, which he had found in the binding of a book, and published it in a special volume in honor of Zunz's seventieth birthday in 1864.⁹⁶ Two years later, Jolowicz published another article containing variant readings of the Babylonian Talmud (tractates *Makkot* and *Shevu'ot*) from a fragment found in a book binding.⁹⁷

In the following years, the number of scholars who dealt with book binding fragments increased. Some dealt with fragments that came into their hands by chance,⁹⁸ while others found fragments of works while preparing critical editions

pamphlet: *Bruchstücke eines rabbinischen Hiob-Commentars*, C. Georgius, Bonn 1874. In another article, Gildemeister described several Talmudic fragments that he found in bindings. See: «Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums» 9 (1882), pp. 175-176 (and see: SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 833, nn. 8756-8757).

⁹⁴ H. EWALD, *Über ein Bruchstück Hebräischer Handschrift in Wolfenbüttel*, «Nachrichten von der G.A. Universität und der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen» 21 (1860), pp. 209-223 (and now compare to a correct description of the fragment, in: H. STRIEDL (Hrsg.), *Hebräische Handschriften*, vol. 2, Steiner, Wiesbaden 1965 (*Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, vol. 2,2, pp. 410-411, n. 656). The responses to Ewald's article and the errors contained therein were not long in coming. See: A. GEIGER, *Das Studium der nachbiblischen Literatur unter den Christen*, vol. 2, «Hebräische Bibliographie» 3 (1860), pp. 77-79; J. CARO, «Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums» 24 (1860), pp. 588-590; *ivi*, pp. 648-649. And see Zunz's letters on this matter in: N.N. GLATZER, *Leopold Zunz: Jude, Deutscher, Europäer: ein jüdisches Gelehrschicksal des 19. Jahrhunderts in Briefen an Freunde*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 1964, pp. 407, 410.

⁹⁵ G. WOLF, *Ein archäologischer Fund*, «MGWJ» 12 (1863), pp. 72-75 (these fragments are now in the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, Cod. hebr. 184-185 [Schwartz 47-48]; and see SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 1, p. 6, nn. 41-42). Several fragments of the Babylonian Talmud, discovered in book bindings, had been mentioned several years earlier, but those fragments were not published. See: *Babylonischer Talmud Traktat Berachoth mit deutscher Uebersetzung*, E.M. PINNER (Hrsg.), Berlin 1842, Foreword, p. 10, in note (Hebr.) (a fragment from Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Zevaḥim*, in the University Libra-

ry in Breslau; see SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 756, n. 8017); E.M. PINNER, *Prospectus der Odesaer Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthüme gehörenden ältesten hebräischen und rabbinischen Manuscripte*, Braun, Odessa 1845 (the manuscripts and fragments listed there are now in the National Library in St. Petersburg, collection Yevr. I C; see SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 806, n. 8522). Additional Babylonian Talmud fragments are mentioned by Lebrecht, also in the name of Pinner. See: F. LEBRECHT, *Handschriften und erste Ausgaben des Babylonischen Talmud*, in *Wissenschaftliche Blätter aus der Veitel Heine Ephraim'schen Lehranstalt (Beth ha-Midrash) in Berlin*, A. Asher - Rosenthal, Berlin 1862, pp. 82, 87. Other fragments that had been in Pinner's hands are now preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. See STRIEDL and ROTH (above, n. 94), p. 287.

⁹⁶ H. JOLOWICZ, *She'orit Rashi*, Königsberg 1864; and see the critique of J. KOBAK, «Jeschurun» 5 (1865), pp. 107-110 (Hebr.).

⁹⁷ H. JOLOWICZ, *Bruchstücke aus dem babyl. Talmud, aufgefunden in der königlichen Bibliothek zu Königsberg in Preussen*, «Forschungen des wissenschaftlich-talmudischen Vereins» 9-10 (1867), pp. 143-145, 163-164 («Beilagen zu Ben Chananja» 9 [1866], n. 43 and 10 [1867], n. 1). The fate of this fragment is unknown. See SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 832, n. 8750.

⁹⁸ For example, BERLINER (above, n. 50). See also the fragments from the Babylonian Talmud which were found in Kremsmünster (Austria) and which were published by S. HAMMERSCHLAG, *Nuṣḥa'ot al-pi Seridei Kitvei-Yad mitokh Gemarot Ketuvot Kodem Shenat 1440*, «Beit Talmud» 1 (1881), pp. 185-187, 222-224, 280-282 (Hebr.) (and see: SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 1, p. 25, nn. 211-214. Additional fragments from one of the manuscripts described there can be found in other Austrian libraries; see *loc. cit.*, n. 214).

based on complete manuscripts.⁹⁹ Other scholars, who during those years were diligently preparing catalogues of manuscript collections, incorporated manuscript fragments found in book bindings, devoting considerable attention to them.¹⁰⁰

The first fruits of the European Genizah were not plentiful, and the initial findings did not fire the imagination of scholars. Ultimately, during the years when the first fragments in book bindings were discovered, there were still thousands of complete manuscripts in Europe that had not been examined or catalogued. The scholars who devoted their efforts and energies to the study of manuscripts gave their attention, and rightfully so, to complete manuscripts, not to tiny fragments found in book bindings. It is no wonder, then, that even first-rate scholars did not take special interest in the shredded pages of the European Genizah. Even the discovery, at the end of the nineteenth century, of about three hundred fragments, including important remnants of several rare works,¹⁰¹ in Trier, Ger-

many, did not generate the momentum befitting of the study of the European Genizah. It was during those very years that the Cairo Genizah with all of its vast treasures was discovered. The Cairo Genizah attracted the attention of scholars of Judaism, overshadowing the European Genizah and once again delaying its comprehensive study.

It was only many years later, in 1912, that the first comprehensive attempt was made to reveal all of the fragments hidden in the bindings of books found in a single library, and to describe them systematically. This project was undertaken at the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna at the initiative of J.N. Epstein and A.Z. Schwarz, and its impressive results – hundreds of fragments – were listed in an appendix to the catalogue of Hebrew manuscripts in that library.¹⁰² Another fifty years passed until additional catalogues were published, in the 1960s and 1970s, listing a considerable portion of the fragments found in the libraries of Germany¹⁰³ and Hungary,¹⁰⁴ and

⁹⁹ For example, a fragment from the *Tosefta* which was found by M.S. ZUCKERMANDEL while preparing his edition of the *Tosefta*; see ZUCKERMANDEL, *Erhaltene Trümmer eines dritten Toseftacodex*, in «Das Jüdische Literaturblatt (Beilage zur Israelitischen Wochenschrift)» 7 (1878), pp. 78, 82. Zuckerman del brought variant readings from this fragment in his edition of the *Tosefta* (Pasewalk 1881); see his remark at the beginning of the order *Neziqin*. The fragment under discussion is now at the Schocken Library in Jerusalem (see: SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 739, n. 7874), and an image of it is reproduced at the beginning of *Tosefta: Neziqin*, ed. S. LIEBERMAN, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1988.

¹⁰⁰ For example, S. KOHN, *Die hebräischen Handschriften des ungarischen Nationalmuseums zu Budapest*, «Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums» 4 (1877), pp. 98-100; M. STEINSCHNEIDER, *Verzeichnis der hebraeischen Handschriften*, vol. 1, Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften (G. Vogt), Berlin 1878-1897, I, pp. 13-15, n. 34 (on the fragment of Biblical exegesis which is described there at length, see: EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 114-182).

¹⁰¹ J. BASSFREUND, *Über ein Midrasch-Fragment in der Stadt-Bibliothek zu Trier*, «MGWJ» 38 (1894), pp. 167-176, 214-219; Id., *Hebräische Handschriften-Fragmente in der Stadtbibliothek zu Trier*, «MGWJ» 39 (1895), pp. 263-271, 295-302, 343-350, 391-398, 492-506. On the significance of

the Trier fragments, see also SUSSMANN, *Yerushalmi Fragments* (above, n. 53); E. HOLLENDER, *Reconstructing Manuscripts: The Liturgical Fragments from Trier*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 61-90.

¹⁰² A.Z. SCHWARZ, *Die hebräischen Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, Ed. Strache, Wien - Prag - Leipzig 1925, pp. 240-248, and see *ivi*, Introduction, p. XVI, and Addenda, p. XX. New examinations recently conducted in the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna yielded a considerable number of additional fragments. Epstein himself published, from the fragments he found in Vienna, important remnants of the Geonic literature; see below, n. 169. Epstein continued searching in book bindings even after he moved to Jerusalem; see M. EPSTEIN, *Professor Jacob Nahum Epstein, of Blessed Memory: A Biography*, matriculation project, Kibbutz Yavneh High School, 1984, p. 58 (Hebr.). See also *ivi*, p. 18, on Epstein's copying of fragments from *Sefer Ra'avyah* while in Vienna. See also above, n. 77.

¹⁰³ STRIEDL - ROTH (above, n. 94). A significant portion of the fragments in Germany had been listed already in N. ALLONY and D.S. LOEWINGER, *List of Photocopies in the Institute*, vol. 1, Ministry of Education and Culture. State of Israel, Jerusalem 1957 (Hebr.).

¹⁰⁴ A. SCHEIBER, *Hebräische Kodexüberreste in Ungarländischen Einbandstafeln*, Magyar Izraeliták Országos Képviselete, Budapest 1969 (with facsimiles). For a review of this book, see D.S. LOEWIN-

in other libraries of Austria.¹⁰⁵ With those catalogues, the systematic description of known (at the time) manuscript fragments in those three countries was almost completed.

A new chapter in the history of the European Genizah began a few decades ago, with the joint project of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts at the Jewish National and University Library (now: The National Library of Israel) in Jerusalem and the Mishnah Project at the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. This project began with the photographing and cataloguing of all known fragments in Germany and Austria, and it quickly morphed into a systematic search for additional fragments in dozens of libraries, monasteries, and archives throughout Central Europe.

These searches were unlike the searches undertaken twenty years earlier, by the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, to locate all Hebrew manuscripts scattered in hundreds of libraries around the world. This time, libraries and archives – most of which do not hold any complete Hebrew manuscripts – were asked to open the bindings of books and the covers of notarial documents in order to examine whether they contain fragments of Hebrew manuscripts,

a process which could cause damage to the treasures in their care. Despite the difficulties, these searches yielded surprising results.

The greatest surprise came from Italy, where only a few fragments had come to light by then.¹⁰⁶ In the 1970s and 1980s, several Italian and Israeli scholars, headed by the late Prof. Giuseppe (Joseph) Baruch Sermoneta, undertook a systematic examination of Italy's archives. Upon Sermoneta's passing, Prof. Mauro Perani continued the task vigorously. The findings in Italy exceeded all expectations. To date, over 6,000 fragments have been found in Italy, several times the number of fragments found in all of the other Central European countries, and the work is not yet completed.¹⁰⁷ Only a small portion of the fragments found in Italy were used in bookbindings (the common practice in Germany, Austria, and Hungary), and most were used to cover archival files. The extensive survey of Italian archives in recent years has been described by Mauro Perani, who presented the achievements of the project as well as the difficulties it encountered.¹⁰⁸

The fragments found in several Italian archives, primarily those in which relatively few fragments were discovered, were described in a

GER, «Kiryat Sefer» 45 (1970), pp. 49-51 (Hebr.). SCHEIBER had already described twenty of the fragments in an earlier article: *Medieval Hebrew Manuscripts as Binding Boards in the Libraries and Archives of Hungary*, in A. BERGER - L. MARWICK - I.S. MEYER (eds.), *The Joshua Bloch Memorial Volume*, New York Public Library, New York 1960, pp. 19-28. Twenty additional fragments, which had not been included in that book, were described by Scheiber in another article: *Weitere hebräische Handschriftenfragmente in Ungarländischen Einbandstafeln*, in G. NAHON - C. TOUATI (eds.), *Hommage à Georges Vajda, Études d'histoire et de pensée juives*, Peeters, Louvain 1980, pp. 569-577.

¹⁰⁵ A.Z. SCHWARZ - D.S. LOEWINGER - E. ROTH, *Die hebräischen Handschriften in Österreich außerhalb der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, vol. 2, Hiersemann - American Acad. for Jewish Research, New York 1973, pp. 80-109 (167 fragments. See *ivi*, p. 111 on c. forty additional fragments scattered among various libraries in Austria that were not included in this volume). Most of the fragments in Austria had also already been listed in brief by ALLONY - LOEWINGER (above, n. 103).

¹⁰⁶ See, for example: U. CASSUTO, *Frammenti ebraici in archivi notarili*, «Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana» 27 (1915), pp. 147-157 (fragments of Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Yevamot*). On these fragments, see also: CASSUTO [above, n. 49], p. 94, n. 2; SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 1, p. 60, n. 463); A.H. FREIMANN, *A Fragment of Jerushalmi Bava Kamma*, «Tarbiz» 6 (1935), pp. 56-63 (Hebr.) (see below, n. 206). Other fragments found in Italy until the mid-1970s are not of significance, and it is no wonder that they did not generate interest; see: G. SABATINI, *Frammenti di antichi codici ebraici in pergamena esistenti in Pescocostanzo*, «Rassegna di Storia ed Arte d'Abruzzo e Molise» 3 (1927), pp. 94-113 (see below, n. 197); A. TOAFF, *A proposito di una pergamena ebraica recentemente ritrovata ad Assisi*, «La Rassegna Mensile di Israel» 42 (1976), pp. 144-148.

¹⁰⁷ See PERANI, *Estense Library* (above, n. 23), pp. 218-219; PERANI - SAGRADINI, *Cesena* (above, n. 61), p. 8.

¹⁰⁸ PERANI, *The Italian Genizah* (above, n. 1). For a detailed list of Italian archives in which Hebrew manuscript fragments were found and the number of fragments found in each of those archives, see: ID., *I frammenti ebraici scoperti in Italia:*

lengthy series of articles by the scholars who had been involved in their discovery.¹⁰⁹ In recent years, there has been an attempt to describe the many fragments that have been found in archives with a richer yield of Hebrew manuscript fragments. The first fruits of these efforts – detailed catalogues of the hundreds of fragments found in several important archives – have been published in recent years.¹¹⁰ Additional catalogues are currently in various stages of preparation, and hopefully they will be published in the near future.

In the wake of the extraordinarily successful search from fragments in Italy, a similar project was initiated in Austria in the early 1990s. The goal of this project, which began as a joint effort between Prof. Ferdinand Dexinger of Vienna and Prof. Yaakov Sussmann of Jerusalem, is to prepare a complete list of binding fragments, photograph them, and catalogue them. In context of this project, presently headed by Prof. Martha Keil, more than 1,300 fragments have been documented (in addition to the hundreds of fragments preserved at the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna), and a sophisticated

website, containing descriptions and images of the fragments, has been launched.¹¹¹

In recent years, Prof. Andreas Lehnardt of Mainz has toiled to find and catalogue Hebrew fragments on German soil, and through his strenuous efforts, he has found about a thousand fragments all over Germany. Lehnardt is working on cataloguing and describing the fragments, and he has already published numerous studies of them.¹¹²

As a result of successful efforts in these three countries – Italy, Austria, and Germany – in recent years, many other scholars have joined the search for Hebrew fragments in a series of European countries. They, too, have discovered and catalogued many fragments. Images of the vast majority of fragments discovered in Europe have been brought together at the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts of the National Library of Israel in Jerusalem. Its staff even participates in the identification and cataloguing of those fragments.¹¹³ Thousands of fragments from all over Europe, including hundreds that have not yet been described in any of the

censimento degli archivi e bibliografia aggiornati al 1998, in Id. (ed.), *La Genizah italiana*, Bologna 1999, pp. 285-293.

¹⁰⁹ For a detailed list of the articles dealing with the Italian Genizah from the beginning of the twentieth century, see: LEHNARDT, *Bibliography*, pp. 349-359. For a detailed list of most catalogues of the Italian Genizah, see: B. RICHLER, *Guide to Hebrew Manuscript Collections*², The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jerusalem 2014, pp. 99-101 (A. LUZZATTO, *Le pergamene ebraiche dell'Archivio di Stato di Viterbo*, «Italia» 4,2 [1985], pp. 109-128 should be added to that list).

¹¹⁰ PERANI, *Nonantola* (above, n. 23); P.F. FUMAGALLI - B. RICHLER, *Manoscritti e frammenti ebraici nell'Archivio di Stato di Cremona*, Roma 1995; PERANI - CAMPANINI, *Bologna* (above, n. 23); M. PERANI - S. CAMPANINI, *I frammenti ebraici di Modena: Archivio Storico Comunale*, Olschki, Firenze 1997; M. PERANI - S. CAMPANINI, *I frammenti ebraici di Modena, Archivio Capitolare. Archivio della Curia, e di Correggio, Archivio Storico Comunale*, Firenze 1999 (for a review of this catalogue, see S. EMANUEL, *The Libraries of Modena's Jews in the Seventeenth Century*, «Pe'amim» 86 [2001], pp. 327-330 [Hebr.]); H.M. SERMONETA - P.F. FUMAGALLI, *Manoscritti ebraici nell'Archivio di Stato di Pesaro: Catalogo con riproduzione del Mahazor francese di Pesaro*,

Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali, Roma 2002; PERANI - SAGRADINI, *Cesena* (above, n. 61); M. PERANI - L. BARALDI, *Frammenti ebraici dell'Archivio di Stato di Modena*, vol. 1, Olschki, Firenze 2012.

¹¹¹ The web address is: <http://hebraica.at>. On this project, see: J.M. OESCH - A. HAIDINGER, *Genizat Austria: Zwischenbericht zum Projekt "Hebräische Handschriften und Fragmente in österreichischen Bibliotheken"*, in *Fragmenta Hebraica Austriaca* (above, n. 1), pp. 11-31 (or its abbreviated English version: J. OESCH, *Genizat Austria: The "Hebrew Manuscripts and Fragments in Austrian Libraries" Project*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 317-328).

¹¹² For a list of Lehnardt's publications in this field, see: A. LEHNARDT - J. OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, *Introduction: "Books within Books" - The State of Research and New Perspectives*, in *Books within Books*, p. 2, n. 3. A. LEHNARDT - A. OTTERMANN, *Fragmente jüdischer Kultur in der Stadtbibliothek Mainz: Entdeckungen und Deutungen*, Veröffentlichungen der Bibliothek der Stadt Mainz, Mainz 2015, should now be added to the list.

¹¹³ For an up-to-date summary of the state of research in Austria, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, the UK, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Russia, Spain, and Switzerland, see LEHNARDT - OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, cit.

printed catalogues, are now catalogued in the Institute's computerized catalogue.¹¹⁴

G. *The Novelty of the European Genizah and its Contribution to Scholarship*

I mentioned above that most fragments discovered in the European Genizah come from works that were very prevalent in Central Europe at the end of the Middle Ages: Scripture and its commentaries, prayer books, the Talmud and its traditional commentaries, and familiar halakhic works.¹¹⁵ Most of these works were already available to us both in printed editions and in dozens of complete manuscripts. Thus, the European Genizah has not yielded much new material. Nevertheless, the Genizah makes novel contributions to a variety of disciplines.

1. *Lost Works*

The European Genizah has preserved remnants of a considerable number of works that had been entirely lost, and which are not extant in a complete manuscript. Some of these works were already known to us from citations by medieval sages, and other works were altogether unknown before they were discovered in the European Genizah. I will note several examples of such works.

a) Rabbinic literature: Lost works from the classical rabbis (like *Mekhilta of Rabbi Shimon b. Yochai* and *Sifrei Zuta*) were not found in the European Genizah,¹¹⁶ but another, pseudo-rabbinic, work was first discovered in this Genizah: the work that V. Aptowitzer dubbed *Sefer Yerushalmi*.¹¹⁷ The Ashkenazic sages of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries cite passages in the name of the Palestinian Talmud which are not found in the extant version of that Talmud. Thus, they must have had a version of the Palestinian Talmud that included small and large additions as well as deliberate changes. This *Sefer Yerushalmi* had never been found, and only recently, Yaakov Sussmann found several pages from that work – all from the same copy – scattered in various libraries in Germany.¹¹⁸

b) Scriptural exegesis: The field of Scriptural exegesis has also benefited from the European Genizah. Several of new remnants from the Bible commentaries of French exegetes have been found in the European Genizah,¹¹⁹ but undoubtedly the most significant discovery thus far has been R. Joseph Qara's Torah commentary. All scholars who dealt with the works of R. Joseph Qara concluded that his Bible commentary included the books of the Prophets and Writings, but not the Torah (aside from his well-known glosses to Rashi's commentary). Recently, however, several pages of a Torah commentary have been found in several archives in Italy and identified as passages from a heretofore unknown

¹¹⁴ The final chapter (thus far) of the history of this scholarship appears below, at the end of the article.

¹¹⁵ See above, at n. 59.

¹¹⁶ See below, at n. 154.

¹¹⁷ APTOWITZER (above, n. 34), pp. 275-277.

¹¹⁸ SUSSMANN, *Yerushalmi Fragments* (above, n. 53); ID., *An Ashkenazic Manuscript of the Yerushalmi and Sefer Yerushalmi*, «*Ṭarbiz*» 65 (1996), pp. 37-63 (Hebr.). And see: M. ASSIS, *On Yerushalmi Fragments of Ashkenazic Origin*, «*Alei Sefer*» 19 (2001), pp. 19-34 (Hebr.). A number of fragments from the "regular" Yerushalmi (= the Palestinian Talmud) have also been found in the European Genizah; see, for example, below, nn. 205-206; M. PERANI - G. STEMBERGER, *The Yerushalmi Fragments Discovered in the Diocesan Library of Savona*, «*Henoch*» 23 (2001), pp. 267-303; D. ROSENTHAL, *Yerushalmi Neziqin in the Italian Genizah: Bologna Fragments, Savona Fragments*, in E.S. ROSENTHAL

- S. LIEBERMAN - D. ROSENTHAL (eds.), *Yerushalmi Neziqin*, The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jerusalem 2008, pp. 225-273 (Hebr.).

¹¹⁹ GILDEMEISTER (above, n. 93); B. RICHLER, *Rabbeinu Tam's "Lost" Commentary on Job*, in B. WALFISH (ed.), *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, vol. 1, Haifa University Press, Haifa 1993, pp. 193-194, 197 (and see: *The Book of Job with the Commentaries of Rashi, Rabbenu Jacob b. Meir Tam, and a Disciple of Rashi*, A. SHOSHANA [ed.], Ofeq Institute, Jerusalem 2000, Introduction, pp. 79-82 [Hebr.]); M. PERANI, *Frammenti di un commento medievale sconosciuto a Proverbi e Giobbe rinvenuti nell'Archivio di Stato di Imola*, «*Henoch*» 15 (1993), pp. 47-64; E. HOLLENDER - A. LEHNARDT, *Ein unbekannter hebräischer Esther-Kommentar aus einem Einbandfragment*, «*Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge*» 33 (2006), pp. 35-67.

commentary by R. Joseph Qara. His commentary to Psalms, also heretofore unknown, has apparently been discovered in the Archivio di Stato in Imola, Italy.¹²⁰

Remnants of several other Bible commentaries were recently published in the first volume of my *Hidden Treasures*. These commentaries include: a commentary on the Book of Judges that is either the first version of R. Joseph Qara's commentary or the commentary of an anonymous sage who used R. Joseph Qara's commentary; a commentary of one of Rashi's grandsons to the Book of Ecclesiastes; the commentary of R. Menaḥem b. Shlomo (author of *Sekhel Tov*) on four of the scrolls – Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther; and a commentary of R. Elazar of Worms (author of *Roqeaḥ*) to Psalms.¹²¹

c) Commentaries on halakhic midrashim: Four pages of an early Ashkenazic commentary to *Sifrei Numbers* were found in the binding of a book in Selestat, Alsace. This commentary may

have been composed at the end of the eleventh century, and it is the earliest extant commentary on the halakhic midrashim.¹²²

d) Talmud commentary: The works of the Tosafists are well-represented in the European Genizah, which also contains remnants of a number of new works, which had not survived in any manuscript.¹²³ Among the works that have already been identified from Genizah fragments are the *Tosafot* of R. Samson b. Abraham of Sens to Tractate *Bava Batra*, which was found in the binding of a book in Jerusalem;¹²⁴ an abridged version of the commentary of R. Samson of Sens to the Mishnaic order of Taharot (or perhaps another version of that commentary written by R. Samson himself), found in the Archivio di Stato of Bologna;¹²⁵ the *Tosafot* of R. Meir of Rothenburg to Tractate *Pesaḥim*, found in Klosterneuburg (Austria);¹²⁶ and others.¹²⁷

In my *Hidden Treasures*, remnants of additional Talmud commentaries appear: fragments of *Sefer Hefetz* on Tractates *Bava Kam-*

¹²⁰ On the Torah commentary: A. GROSSMAN, *From the Genizah in Italy: Remnants of R. Joseph Qara's Torah Commentary*, «Pe'amim» 52 (1992), pp. 16-36 (Hebr.); Id., *Genuzei Italia U-feirushav shel R. Yosef Qara Le-miqra*, in S. JAPHET (ed.), *The Bible in Light of its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1994, pp. 335-340 (Hebr.); Id., *The Early Sages of France: Their Lives, Leadership and Works*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1995, pp. 290-305 (Hebr.). On the Psalms commentary: cit., pp. 305-307; M. PERANI, *Yosef ben Simon Kara's Lost Commentary on the Psalms: The Imola Fragment from the "Italian Genizah"*, Id. (ed.), «The Words of a Wise Man's Mouth are Gracious» (Qoh 10,12): *Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, De Gruyter, Berlin 2005, pp. 395-428. On these fragments of R. Joseph Qara's commentaries, see also: A. GROSSMAN, *The Importance of the Italian Genizah for Research on Joseph Qara's Bible Commentaries*, in *David and Tabory* (above, n. 1), pp. 39-51 (Hebr.).

¹²¹ EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 67-103, 114-203. See also EMANUEL, *New Fragments of Unknown Biblical Commentaries from the "European Genizah"*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 207-215.

¹²² EMANUEL, *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), p. 59; E. TOVIA, *An Anonymous Commentary on Sifrei from the European Genizah*, «Qobetz Al

Yad» 24 (2016), pp. 123-149 (Hebr.).

¹²³ Ephraim Elimelech Urbach was apparently the first to attempt to comprehensively examine the *Tosafot* fragments in the European Genizah; see: E.E. URBACH, *The Tosaphists: Their History, Writings and Methods*, Bialik Inst., Jerusalem 1980⁴, p. 29, n. 72*; p. 254, n. 9; p. 269, n. 40; p. 660, n. 69 (Hebr.). An almost full list of fragments of Tosafist Talmud commentaries in the European Genizah appears in Richler, *Manuscripts* (above, n. 48). Some of the fragments listed by Richler contain unknown versions of the *Tosafot*; see, for example, pp. 784-785, nn. 35 and 40 (*Tosafot* on Tractate *Eruvin*); p. 789, n. 57 (*Tosafot* on Tractate *Pesaḥim*); etc.

¹²⁴ Y. LIFSHITZ, *The Tosafot of R. Samson on Tractate Bava Batra*, «Moriah» 9, 11-12 (1980), pp. 5-14; 10,9-10 (1981), pp. 2-8; 10,11-12, pp. 2-7 (Hebr.).

¹²⁵ EMANUEL, *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), pp. 45-48.

¹²⁶ *Ivi*, pp. 41-43. In the meantime, the fragment has been published: R. Meir b. Barukh of Rothenburg: *Tosafot on Pesaḥim, Chapters Elu Devarim and Keitzad Tzolin*, «Me'asef Torani Mi-Shulḥan Melakhim: Pesaḥ - Mukdash Le-zikhro shel Rabbi Eliezer Palchinsky» 1 (2008), pp. 42-49 (Hebr.).

¹²⁷ For example: *Shoshana, Tosafot* of R. ISAAC B. ASHER (above, n. 39); LEITNER, *Remnants* (above, n. 38); A. AHREND, *Remnants of an Ashkenazic*

ma and *Bava Metzi'a*; an Ashkenazic commentary to Tractate *Bava Batra* that systematically copies vast portions of R. Ḥananel's commentary on that tractate; a commentary on Tractate *Berakhot* from a member of the Qalonymus family – apparently R. David b. Qalonymus of Münzenberg, who was active at the beginning of the thirteenth century – in the handwriting of the author himself; the commentary of R. Barukh b. Samuel of Mainz on Tractate *Megilla*; the *Tosafot* of R. Samson of Sens on Tractate *Eruvin*; and another version of the *Tosafot* of R. Isaiah di Trani on several tractates.¹²⁸

e) Philology. Sefer Ha-Shorashim of Jonah ibn Janah has reached us by way of the translation of Judah ibn Tibbon, who mentions that two other translations of the work exist. Fragments of a fourth, heretofore unknown, translation of the book were found in the European Genizah,

Commentary to Tractate Rosh Hashanah, «Qobetz Al Yad» 17 (2003), pp. 137-151 (Hebr.); Y. LIFSHITZ, *Tosafot u-Ferishat Rabbi Hizkiyah b. Ya'akov mi-Magdeburg Mahari'ah*, in ID., *Qimḥa de-Piṣḥa*, Jerusalem 1986, pp. 109-127, and Introduction, pp. 21-25 (Hebr.).

¹²⁸ EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 207-461.

¹²⁹ B. RICHLER, *Another Translation of Sefer ha-Shorashim by R. Jonah Ibn Janah*, «Kiryat Sefer» 63 (1990), pp. 993-995; ID., *Additional Fragments from Manuscripts of the Unknown Translation of R. Jonah Ibn Janah's Sefer ha-Shorashim*, «Kiryat Sefer» 63 (1990-1991), pp. 1327-1328 (Hebr.) (an updated version of the articles appears in A. DAVID [ed.], *From the Collections of the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts*, Jerusalem 1996, pp. 31-33, 61-62 [Hebr.]); M. PERANI, *I manoscritti ebraici della "Genizâ italiana" - Frammenti di una traduzione sconosciuta del Sefer ha-Sorasim di Yônâ ibn Ganah*, «Sefarad» 53 (1993), pp. 103-142.

¹³⁰ For example: (1) a Yiddish medical book, with the colophon: «In the year 157 [1397] I finished this work on the effects of bloodletting and veins as described by the doctors». See: L. DÜNNER, *Das hebräischen Handschrift-Fragmente im Archiv der Stadt Cöln*, «ZfHB» 8 (1904), pp. 113-114 (where the date was interpreted incorrectly); J.C. FRAKES (ed.), *Early Yiddish Texts 1100-1750*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004, pp. 52-61. (2) POLAKOVI (above, n. 39), p. 331. (3) A page from a book of medical prescriptions; see: LOEWE, *A Hebrew Antidotary* (above, n. 43).

¹³¹ SH. SELA - R. SMITHUIS, *Two Hebrew Frag-*

and they are scattered through various archives in Northern Italy.¹²⁹

f) Books from other fields of study. Remnants of books from many other fields of study have been discovered in the European Genizah, including: unknown medical works;¹³⁰ the Hebrew original of two astrological works by Abraham ibn Ezra, which had been known only in their Latin translation;¹³¹ unknown philosophical works;¹³² early (and late – from the seventeenth century) *piyyutim* (liturgical poems) that are not known from other sources;¹³³ belles-lettres, such as a Hebrew translation of a French version of *The Romance of Alexander* (a translation that, according to Eli Yassif, «necessitates a new mapping of *The History of Alexander the Great* in Medieval Hebrew literature»)¹³⁴ and other works in this vein;¹³⁵ illuminated manuscripts;¹³⁶ Hebrew-French glossaries

ments from Unknown Redactions of Abraham Ibn Ezra's Sefer ha-Mivharim and Sefer ha-Še'elot, «Aleph» 9 (2009), pp. 225-240.

¹³² M. ZONTA, *I frammenti filosofici di Nonantola, in Vita e cultura* (above, n. 1), pp. 123-147.

¹³³ E. FLEISCHER, *Azharot Le-R. Binyamin (ben Shmuel) Paytan*, «Qobetz Al Yad» 11,1 (1985), p. 18, end of n. 62 (Hebr.) (cf. LUZZATTO [above, n. 109], pp. 125-126, n. 57); HOLLENDER (above, n. 101), pp. 78-90; A.M. PIATTELLI, *Frammenti e manoscritti ebraici negli Archivi di Stato di Bassano e Verona*, «Italia» 11 (1994), pp. 90-102.

¹³⁴ E. YASSIF, *The Hebrew Traditions of Alexander the Great: Narrative Models and their Meaning in the Middle Ages*, «Ṭarbiz» 75 (2006), pp. 401-407 (Hebr.).

¹³⁵ A. LEHNARDT, *Meshal Qadmonim: A Newly Discovered Ashkenazic Binding Fragment of an Unknown Maqama from the Cathedral Library of Freising, Germany*, in R.S. BOUSTAN *et al.* (eds.), *Envisioning Judaism: Studies in Honor of Peter Schäfer on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 2013, vol. 2, pp. 1139-1164.

¹³⁶ See, for example: L. PASQUINI, *L'incipit miniato del Levitico (sec. XIV) nel frammento ebraico 640 dell'Archivio di Stato di Bologna*, «Materia giudaica» 8,1 (2003), pp. 145-153; A. LEHNARDT, *Ein Haman-Baum in einem illuminierten Machsor-Fragment aus dem Hauptstaatsarchiv Weimar*, «Judaica: Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums» 68 (2012), pp. 61-69; R. FRONDA, *Lions of Judah. Identifying an Italian Genizah Fragment in Bologna State Archive*, «Materia Giudaica» 19 (2014), pp. 471-480.

of difficult words in Scripture;¹³⁷ *piyyutim* with Old French translations;¹³⁸ a Yiddish translation of one of the chronicles of the First Crusade;¹³⁹ and so forth.

g) Historical documents. I have noted above that, in contrast to the Cairo Genizah, there are very few historical documents in the European Genizah. Nevertheless, occasionally such documents are indeed found in the European Genizah. The earliest is a marriage contract (*ketubah*) from Sicily, apparently from the early eleventh century.¹⁴⁰ A number of other historical documents have been found, including: Provençal communal enactments (*taqqanot*) from 1313;¹⁴¹ ledgers of traders, bankers,

and usurers;¹⁴² bills of sale of houses;¹⁴³ wills;¹⁴⁴ letters (including fragment of a letter sent to R. Isaac Luria – the Ari – while he was in Egypt);¹⁴⁵ and more. Historical information can also be gleaned from the colophons that, on rare occasions, are found in the European Genizah (the earliest, it seems, is the one that appears at the end of Rashi's commentary to Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Yevamot*, written in Straubing, c. 45km southeast of Regensburg, in 1336),¹⁴⁶ from owners' inscriptions that appear in the first pages of manuscripts (if they happen to have been preserved),¹⁴⁷ and, occasionally, from the content of the fragments themselves.¹⁴⁸

h) Lost printed books. Pages of rare print-

¹³⁷ See, for example: VISI - JÁNOŠÍKOVÁ (above, n. 33), pp. 205, 219; A. LEHNARDT, *Ein hebräisch-altfranzösisches Glossar-Fragment zum Buch Ezechiel aus der Stadtbibliothek Reutlingen*, «Judaica: Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums» 66 (2010), pp. 332-347; M. KEIL, *Fragments as Objects: Medieval Austrian Fragments in the Jewish Museum of Vienna*, in *Books within Books*, p. 322.

¹³⁸ H. PERI (PFLAUM), *Old French Poems from the Mahazor*, «Tarbiz» 25 (1957), pp. 154-182 (Hebr.).

¹³⁹ SONNE (above, n. 49); Id., *Nouvel examen des trois Relations hébraïques sur les persécutions de 1096*, «REJ» 96 (1933), pp. 137-152.

¹⁴⁰ D. BURGARETTA, *La Ketubbah del fondo ss. Salvatore della biblioteca regionale di Messina*, «Materia giudaica» 12 (2007), pp. 257-264. For additional *ketubot* in the European Genizah, see, for instance, A.Z. SCHWARZ, *Eine illuminierte Kremser Kethubah aus dem Jahre 1392*, «Archiv für jüdische Familienforschung, Kunstgeschichte und Museumswesen» 1,4-6 (1913), pp. 23-25; PERANI, *The Gerona Genizah* (above, n. 35), pp. 160-165; Id., *Una ketubbah cremonese del 1591 dalla "Genizah italiana"*, «Materia giudaica» 8,1 (2003), pp. 209-212.

¹⁴¹ SCHWARTZFUCHS (above, n. 42); and see J. SHATZMILLER, *Provençal Enactments from 1313*, «Kiryat Sefer» 50 (1975), pp. 663-667 (Hebr.).

¹⁴² See CASSUTO (above, n. 49); SCHWARZ - LOEWINGER - ROTH (above, n. 105), p. 90, n. 63; M. PERANI, *La "Genizah italiana": Caratteri generali e rapporto su quindici anni di scoperte*, «Rivista Biblica» 45 (1997), pp. 61-64; Id., *The Gerona Genizah* (above, n. 35), pp. 155-159; OLSOWY-SCHLANGER, *Binding Accounts* (above, n. 38); PORMANN (above, n. 43).

¹⁴³ See: *A Bill of Sale from Austria*, «Dine Yisrael» 1 (1970), pp. 95-97 (Hebr.) (unsigned article; the bill is apparently from the second half of the fourteenth century); V. KURREIN, *Neue Fragmentfunde in der Linzer Studienbibliothek*, «Jüdisches Archiv» 1 (1927-1928), N.F. 5/6, pp. 5-7 (a bill from 1495, from the city of Judenburg [?] or Odenburg [?]); see also the description of this fragment in SCHWARZ - LOEWINGER - ROTH (above, n. 105), p. 92, n. 71.

¹⁴⁴ See BERLINER (above, n. 50).

¹⁴⁵ *Revealed Treasures* (above, n. 31), p. 15, n. 95.

¹⁴⁶ Klosterneuburg, Augustiner-Chorherrenstift, Fragm. 344; see SCHWARZ - LOEWINGER - ROTH (above, n. 105), p. 87, n. 43. For other colophons, see, for example, above, n. 130; SCHWARZ, *Wien* (above, n. 102), p. 248, n. 80; PERANI - CAMPANINI, *Modena, Archivio Capitolare* (above, n. 110), p. 63, fragment D.IV.12; *ivi*, pp. 73-74, fragment H.XIII; SIRAT - BEIT-ARIE (above, n. 74), vol. 3: Descriptions, n. 115* (a Yemenite manuscript from 1476).

¹⁴⁷ See, for instance: SCHWARZ, *Wien* (above, n. 102), p. 242, n. 55; PERANI - BARALDI (above, n. 110), pp. 67-69; PERANI - SACRADINI, *Cesena* (above, n. 61), pp. 77-87.

¹⁴⁸ For example, in Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Fragm. hebr. A 58, p. 2b (an anonymous Ashkenazic commentary to the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Yevamot*; see SCHWARZ, *Wien* [above, n. 102], p. 242), the commentator writes: «"They seat her on a throne" (*Yevamot* 110a) – that is, they seat her under the wedding canopy (*huppah*) in a manner similar to what we do on the Saturday night after the *huppah*, when we seat the bride and groom on two cathedral chairs». This informs us about Jewish custom in medieval Ashkenaz; cf. *Mahzor Vitry*, S. HOROWITZ² (ed.), Bulka, Nürnberg 1923, p. 602, end of §496; *Sefer Ra'avan Even Ha-ezer*, D. DEVELAY-TZKI (ed.), Bnei Brak 2008-2012, *Ketubot* 16b (vol. 3, p. 529); *Tashbetz*, Cremona 1557, §467; *Pisqei Tosafot* (in the Vilna edition of the Babylonian Tal-

ed books have also been found in book bindings,¹⁴⁹ including fragments of a long list of print editions that have been lost and heretofore unknown. For example: pages of a Babylonian Talmud printed in Faro (Portugal) in 1497 (with the printer's colophon that appears at the end of the tractate);¹⁵⁰ pages of Targum Onqelos on the Torah, apparently also printed in Faro;¹⁵¹ the title page (only) of the sole copy of *Baraita De-Rabbi Eliezer*, printed in Safed in 1587;¹⁵² and still other books.¹⁵³ Thus, the European Genizah contributes to the history of Hebrew printing.

Additional unknown works are hidden amongst the torn pages of the Genizah, but experience has shown that great caution must be exercised before the finding of a new work can be announced. The fragmentary nature of the findings makes it very difficult to identify them, and it is easy to erroneously think that a particular fragment is the remnant of a heretofore

unknown work, whereas it is in fact a fragment from a well-known work. This is what happened to a fragment that was supposedly the most important work discovered in the European Genizah: one page in the Berlin State Library that was identified as a new work on the laws of *Miqva'ot*, from the Tannaitic Era (!). The page was published in a special booklet in 1931, but several weeks later, the editor realized that he had erred; the new text was nothing but the last page of *Sefer Mitzvot Qatan*, one of the most common Tosafist halakhic works. There was nothing new about it. The editor quickly buried the booklet and even made a public announcement.¹⁵⁴

2. New Versions of Known Works

Certain works have multiple versions, and the European Genizah has disclosed additional,

mud), *Sanhedrin*, §97.

¹⁴⁹ In the municipal archive in Modena, for example, bookbinders used mainly manuscripts in their work, but they also used pages from three incunabula of the Pentateuch. Two of the books had been printed in Italy, as expected, but the third had been printed in Spain and brought to Italy by expellees, apparently. See PERANI - CAMPANINI, *Modena: Archivio Storico Comunale* (above, n. 110), pp. 58-59, and images 98-100 at the end of the volume.

¹⁵⁰ See: SEELIGMANN (above, n. 44. see also: E. SLJPER, *Eine portugiesische Talmud-Ausgabe vor 1500*, «Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde» 12 [1908], pp. 207-209; on the significance of this finding, see: H. DIMITROVSKY, *S'ridei Bavli: Fragments from Spanish and Portuguese Incunabula and Sixteenth Century Printings of the Babylonian Talmud and Alfasi*, vol. 1, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1979, Historical-bibliographic introduction, pp. 19-20 [Hebr.]). For remnants of other editions of the Talmud that have been found in book bindings, see: A. BERLINER, «ZfHB» 3 (1899), p. 61.

¹⁵¹ J.L. TEICHER, *Fragments of Unknown Hebrew Incunables*, «Journal of Jewish Studies» 1 (1948-1949), p. 108. For a remnant of a different edition of Targum Onqelos, see: J. SCHISCHA, *A Remnant of an Incunabulum of Targum Onqelos to Parashat Miqetz*, «Moriah» 12,7-9 (1984), pp. 23-25 (Hebr.).

¹⁵² M. GASTER, *Der Midrasch Agur des Menachem di Lonzano*, «ZfHB» 10 (1906), pp. 92-94 (= ID., *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediaeval Romance and Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan*

Archaeology, Maggs Bros, London 1925-1928, vol. 2, p. 730; vol. 3, pp. 244-245). And see: S. LIEBERMAN, *Midrash Lamed-Bet Middot - Midrash Agur*, «Ginze Qedem» 5 (1934), p. 186ff (= ID., *Studies in Palestinian Talmudic Literature*, D. ROSENTHAL [ed.], Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1991, p. 157ff) (Hebr.).

¹⁵³ See, for example: S. ROSANES, *History of the Jews in Turkey*, vol. 1, Dvir, Tel Aviv 1930², p. 320 (Hebr.) («I have acquired individual pages of the Book of Job, with no commentary, which I found in the binding of the book *Tefillah Le-Moshe*, by R. Moses Almosnino, from 1564»); I. SONNE, *Siddur Tefillah im Dinim Be-la'az Sepharadi, Saloniki [5]329 (=1569), Qiryat Sefer*, 11 (1934), p. 134 (Hebr.); A.M. HABERMANN, *Sefer "Mikhtav Me-Eliyahu": Mahadura Bilti Noda'at shel Sefer "Hanoten Imrei Shefer" Le-Maharanah (= R. Elijah ibn Haim)*, in U. CASSUTO - J. CLAUSNER - J. GUTMANN (eds.), *Sefer Assaf: Festschrift in Honor of Rabbi Professor Simcha Assaf*, Mosad ha-Rav Kook, Jerusalem 1953, pp. 221-222 (Hebr.) (on the significance of this fragment, which has since been lost, see M. BENAYAHU, *Turkish Imprints Actually Printed in Italy*, «Sinai» 72 [1973], pp. 180-181 [Hebr.]); E. HURVITZ, *Mishneh Torah of Maimonides: Remnants of an Unknown Edition Printed in Spain before the Exile, Found in the Cairo Genizah and in Book Bindings*, New York 1985 (Hebr.).

¹⁵⁴ A. SPANIER, *Das Berliner Baraita-Fragment*, M. Poppelauer, Berlin 1931; ID., *Zur Frage des literarischen Verhältnisses zwischen Mischna und Tosefta*, Self-published, Berlin 1931, p. 16. For a

unfamiliar versions of those works. I will present four examples.¹⁵⁵

a) Fragments of *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelamdenu* were first discovered in the European Genizah in the nineteenth century, and additional fragments have continued to come to light, even in recent years. Some fragments include midrashic variants that are not found in any of the extant complete manuscripts of the work.¹⁵⁶

b) The manuscripts of *siddurim* and *mahzorim* differ one from the other, some more and some less, with respect to the text of the prayers and the *piyyutim* recited. Thus, each additional textual witness is of significance. The European Genizah abounds with hundreds of pages from *siddurim* and *mahzorim* (sometimes even dozens of pages from the same copy),¹⁵⁷ but the vast majority have not yet been studied.

similar example, see below, n. 179.

¹⁵⁵ I also note the various versions of R. Joseph Qara's commentary on the Prophets and Writings that have been discovered in the European Genizah; see, for example, EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 67-79. On the importance of these versions, see: GROSSMAN, *The Early Sages of France* (above, n. 120), pp. 311-315; ID., *The Importance of the Genizah* (above, n. 120), pp. 43-47, 49-50.

¹⁵⁶ See: J. BASSFREUND, *Über ein Midrasch-Fragment* (above, n. 101) [these fragments were edited again by A. LEHNARDT, *The Binding Fragments of Midrash Tanhuma (Buber) from the Municipal Library of Trier*, in I. KALIMI (ed.), *Bridging between Sister Religions: Studies of Jewish and Christian Scriptures Offered in Honor of Prof. John T. Townsend*, Brill, Leiden 2016, pp. 217-238]; K. WILHELM, *Ein Jelamdenu-Fragment*, «MGWJ» 75 (1931), pp. 135-143; E.E. URBACH, *Seridei Tanhuma-Yelamdenu*, «Qobez Al Yad» 6,1 (1966), pp. 7, 48-54 (= ID., *Collected Writings in Jewish Studies*, M.D. HERR - J. FRAENKEL [eds.], vol. 2, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1998, pp. 578, 619-625 [Hebr.]). The three fragments have been described in M. BREGMAN, *The Tanhuma-Yelamdenu Literature. Studies in the Evolution of the Versions*, Gorgias Press, New Jersey 2003, pp. 69-70, n. 17; p. 70-71, n. 2; pp. 87-88, n. 1; see also p. 43, n. 1.1 (Hebr.). For additional publications of *Midrash Tanhuma* fragments, see: M. PERANI - G. STEMBERGER, *A New Early Tanhuma Manuscript from the Italian Genizah: The Fragments of Ravenna and their Textual Tradition*, «Materia giudaica» 10,2 (2005), pp. 241-266; A. LEHNARDT, *Ein neues Einbandfragment des Midrasch Tanchuma in der Stadtbibliothek*

To date, it seems that the most important findings in this area are the various copies of the *mahzor* according to the French rite. By the end of the nineteenth century, dozens of pages from different copies of the French-rite *mahzor* had been discovered in Trier, Germany, and they were the subject of a reasonably comprehensive study.¹⁵⁸ Fifty sheets (100 pages) of a single copy of a French *mahzor* were found in the municipal archives of Pesaro. A brief description of this copy, accompanied by an introduction and facsimiles of each page, appear in the archive's catalog.¹⁵⁹

c) Another genre that is well-represented in the European Genizah is commentary on *piyyutim*. Commentators on *piyyutim*,¹⁶⁰ as well as copyists and compilers, would always revise and update the commentaries of earlier scholars, such that almost all manuscripts differ from

Mainz, «Judaica: Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums» 63 (2007), pp. 344-356; ID., *A New Fragment of Midrash Tanhuma from Cologne University Library*, «Zutot» 7 (2011), pp. 1-16; A. LISITSINA, *A Newly-Discovered Fragment from Midrash Tanhuma in the Collection of Western European Manuscripts in the Russian State Library (Moscow)*, in *Books within Books*, pp. 69-82.

¹⁵⁷ See, for example: S. DÖNITZ, *Ein Hildesheimer Machsor. Fragmente eines mittelalterlichen hebräischen Gebetbuches: Pergamentmakulaturen aus dem 15. Jahrhundert im Stadtarchiv Hildesheim*, «Hildesheimer Jahrbuch für Stadt und Stift Hildesheim» 72-73 (2000-2001), pp. 189-203.

¹⁵⁸ BASSFREUND, *Hebräische Handschriften-Fragmente* (above, n. 101); HOLLENDER (above, n. 101). The fragment of a *siddur* from English Jews, discovered in a book binding at Cambridge, was published by ABRAHAMS (above, n. 47).

¹⁵⁹ See SERMONETA - FUMAGALLI (above, n. 110), pp. 60-78, n. P.II, pp. 85-106, and the images at the end of the book. See also Y. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Mahzor Pesah: According to All Branches of the Ashkenazic Rite*, Koren, Jerusalem 1993, p. 408 (Hebr.).

¹⁶⁰ Thus far, only a few of the fragments of commentaries on *piyyutim* found in the European Genizah have been published. In addition to the publications listed in the following notes, I will also mention the fragment, found in the Graz Universitätsbibliothek, published in C. SCHEDL, *Tešûbâh und mēlīs: Über die wahre Busse und den Fürsprecher. Hebräisches Fragment aus der Handschriftensammlung der Universität Graz. Hs 1703/195*, «Biblica» 43 (1962), pp. 152-171. The fragment was

one another. The abundance of fragments of *piyyut* commentaries that have been discovered in the European Genizah are likely to increase the number of variants known to us from complete manuscripts.¹⁶¹

The most notable remnant – 32 pages, mostly consecutive – was found in the municipal library of Alessandria, in Northern Italy. This remnant contains a commentary on several Rosh Ha-shanah *piyyutim* but mostly consists of a commentary on the Shavu'ot *Azharot* “Emet Yehgeh Hiki” and “Azharat Reishit”.¹⁶²

It seems, however, that the current state of the research in this field makes it necessary to put these fragments on hold for the time being. There are hundreds of complete manuscripts of commentaries on *piyyutim* that have not yet been properly studied,¹⁶³ so that at this time there is almost no reason to examine the fragments found in the European Genizah. Only after the complete manuscripts are studied and analyzed

published in transliteration, with a facsimile of the original added.

¹⁶¹ In other instances, the European Genizah fragments can serve as additional textual witnesses to commentaries that have survived in complete manuscripts. One example is the commentary of R. Samuel b. Solomon of Falaise to the *piyyut* “El Elohei Ha-ruhot”, a fragment of which is found in Wien, Schottenstift, Fragm. hebr. 22A (Cod. 346). The editor of this commentary indeed used this fragment (*Otzar Pisqei Ha-rishonim al Hilkhot Pesah*, G. ZINNER [ed.], New York 1985, p. 32). Another example is *Arugat Ha-bosem*, which contains the commentaries of R. Abraham b. Azriel on *piyyutim*. In his edition, Urbach used a fragment of this work found in the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna (*Arugat Ha-bosem*, E.E. URBACH [ed.], Mekize Nirdamim, Jerusalem 1939-1963, vol. 4, p. 128, n. 1). We now know of additional fragments of this work that are found in the European Genizah: one fragment, Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Fragm. hebr. C 6, is among the fragments found recently in this library (see above, n. 102); a second fragment, with two consecutive pages, corresponds to the printed edition, part 1, pp. 72 (end)-75 and 47-54, but the order of *piyyutim* is different (Wien, Erzbischofliches Diözesanarchiv, Kirnberger Bibliothek der Wiener Dompropstei, C-8; for an imprecise description of the fragment, see: F. LACKNER, *Katalog der Streubestände in Wien und Niederösterreich*, vol. 1, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften,

will the time come to examine the partial fragments; the future still holds much promise.

d) Several pages of the work *Even Ha-ezer* of R. Eliezer b. Nathan of Mainz (Ra'avan) were found in archives in and near Modena,¹⁶⁴ and these pages represent a different version of the work. For the most part, this version is identical with the printed version, but there are occasionally substantive differences, both structurally and in the interpretation of Talmudic passages.¹⁶⁵

3. New Textual Witnesses of Rare Works

Many works have reached us from only one or two textual witnesses, so we are unable to emend the mistakes and lacunae in those witnesses. Here, too, the European Genizah, in its modest way, helps us ascertain the correct or complete texts. There are editors of critical editions who searched for fragments in the Eu-

Wien 2000, pp. 478-479, n. 109); a third fragment is found in the Nürnberg Stadtbibliothek, Fragmente hebr., Aus Amb. 173, 2°. The fragment contains one leaf that was cut lengthwise, leaving only the first and fourth columns. It corresponds to vol. 1, pp. 160-162, 166-168 in the printed edition.

¹⁶² S. CAMPANINI, *Commentaries on the Azharot and other Liturgical Poems found in the Bibliotheca Civica of Alessandria*, in *Genizat Germania*, pp. 277-295. On the identity of the commentator, see also EMANUEL, *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), p. 298, n. 351.

¹⁶³ See: E. HOLLENDER, *Clavis Commentariorum of Hebrew Liturgical Poetry in Manuscript*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2005, pp. 21-47.

¹⁶⁴ See: PERANI, *Nonantola* (above, n. 23), pp. 149-150, n. H.XI; ID. - CAMPANINI, *Modena: Archivio Storico Comunale* (above, n. 110), pp. 52-53, n. H.V.

¹⁶⁵ See: *Ra'avan* (above, n. 148), vol. 1, Introduction, pp. 17-18. Pages from an additional copy of *Sefer Ra'avan* have been found in the European Genizah (see below, n. 204), and they are completely identical to the printed version. Additional pages, also from the European Genizah, are at the Bodleian Library in Oxford, ms. Hebr. c. 66.36-37 (page 37 contains parts of §§597-599 [vol. 3, pp. 773-778], and page 36 contains parts of §613 [3:815-817]) and at Schwabach, Kirchen Bibliothek (near Nürnberg). It contains one page, which is damaged – one side is completely obscured and cannot be read, and even the exposed side is partially obscured by an adhesion. It contains §43 [1:137-138]).

ropean Genizah that would help them in their work, and they used these fragments in the editions they published.¹⁶⁶ Other fragments were published separately, as supplements to works that had already been printed, occasionally before the existence of a manuscript of the work became known. We shall cite several examples.

a) Several years ago, Vered Noam demonstrated that the Hebrew explanation of *Megillat Ta'anit* – the “Scholion” – was preserved in two distinct versions as well as a hybrid third version that was created when the two earlier versions were combined. The earliest manuscript of the hybrid version (ms. Oxford, Bodleian Opp. Add. Fol. 55 [Neubauer 2421,10]) is from the European Genizah and was used for bookbinding during the years 1603-1605.¹⁶⁷ Yoav Rosenthal found another fragment of the Scholion in the binding of a book in the library of St. Paul's Abbey, a Benedictine monastery in Austria; it is the earliest manuscript of one of the other versions.¹⁶⁸

b) Fragments from a single copy of *Halakhot Pesuqot* – the sole surviving Ashkenazic

copy of the work – were found in several libraries in Austria. These fragments include contents that are missing from the printed version.¹⁶⁹

c) Fragments of the work *Ve-hizhir* were discovered in the Hungarian National Archives in Sopron, and these fragments supplement slightly the printed edition, which is based on the sole – and incomplete – manuscript.¹⁷⁰

d) R. Hai Gaon's *Sefer Ha-meqah Ve-hamimkar*, which was composed in Arabic, was translated into Hebrew three times in the medieval era. One of the translations survives in a single manuscript (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Or. Qu. 685 [Steinschneider 160]), and the fragment of another copy is found in Vienna, Dominikanerkonvent, Cod. 149/119.¹⁷¹

e) Several fragments (from different copies) of R. Hananel b. Hushiel's commentary to the Babylonian Talmud have been discovered in Italian archives,¹⁷² including commentaries on tractates for which there is otherwise no complete manuscript. In the municipal archive in Pergola, I found a complete page from R. Hana-

¹⁶⁶ For example, Zuckerman in his edition of the Tosefta (see above, n. 99); *Sifre Deuteronomy*, L. FINKELSTEIN (ed.), Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1969 [1939] (a fragment that had been in the Ladenberg municipal archive, see the list of abbreviations at the beginning of the work. See also ID., *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Sifre on Deuteronomy*, «PAAJR» 3 [1931-1932], p. 7. This fragment is apparently lost. See: A. LEHNARDT, *Introduction*, in *Genizat Germania*, p. 16, n. 62).

¹⁶⁷ V. NOAM, *The Scholion to Megillat Ta'anit: Towards an Understanding of its Stemma*, «Tarbiz» 62 (1993), pp. 95-99 (Hebr.). On the nature of ms. Oxford, see *ivi*, p. 61. And see above, n. 83.

¹⁶⁸ Y. ROSENTHAL, *A New Fragment of Megillat Ta'anit*, in *Fragmenta Hebraica Austriaca* (above, n. 1), pp. 49-59; ID., *A Newly Discovered Leaf of Megillat Ta'anit and its Scholion*, «Tarbiz» 77 (2008), pp. 357-410 (Hebr.). Tiny fragments of another copy of this version were preserved in the Cairo Genizah; see NOAM, *In the Wake of a New Leaf of Megillat Ta'anit and its Scholion*, *cit.*, p. 411, n. 4 (Hebr.).

¹⁶⁹ The first fragment, from the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, was published by J.N. Epstein even before *Sefer Halakhot Pesuqot* was published; see: J.N. EPSTEIN, *Two Gaonic Fragments*, «JQR» 4 (1914), pp. 422-442. Additional pages from this copy were identified in Graz, Austria; see: N. DANZIG, *In-*

roduction to Halakhot Pesuqot, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York - Jerusalem 1993², pp. 633-635 (variant texts from these are cited on pp. 503 ff.; see also pp. 102-104 [Hebr.]).

¹⁷⁰ E. ROTH, *A Fragment of Midrash Vehizhir*, «Talpiyot» 7,1 (1957), pp. 89-98 (Hebr.). On the second fragment Roth mentions, which includes *Baraita de-Melekhet ha-Mishkan*, see: R. KIRSCHNER (ed.), *Baraita de-Melekhet ha-Mishkan*, Hebrew Union College Press, Cincinnati 1992, pp. 107-108.

¹⁷¹ On the translation in ms. Berlin, see S. ABRAMSON, *Five Sections of Rabbi Hai Gaon's Sefer Hamekach*, in S. YISRAELI *et al.* (eds.), *Jubilee Volume in Honor of Moreinu Hagaon Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik*, vol. 2, Mosad ha-Rav Kook - Yeshiva University Press, Jerusalem - New York 1984, pp. 1312-1379 (Hebr.). The fragment preserved in Vienna contains two pages, but one side of each page has been erased and is all but impossible to read. One page is bound at the end of the manuscript, and its legible side contains the translation of sections 11 and 12 (corresponding to pp. 1355-1365 in Abramson's publication). The second page is bound at the beginning of the manuscript, and its legible side contains the translation of part of section 13.

¹⁷² See also: SERMONETA - FUMAGALLI (above, n. 110), p. 79, n. T.II, and the partial facsimile at the end of the volume, n. CXIII.

nel's commentary to Tractate *Qiddushin*, which parallels another copy of the commentary, found in the Cairo Genizah.¹⁷³ In the same archive, I found another fragment, of two consecutive pages (both pages were cut lengthwise, and less than one quarter of the text remains on each line of the first page), containing a commentary on Tractate *Gittin* 34a (end)-39b (beginning). The handwriting of these pages is different from that of the commentary on Tractate *Qiddushin*, but they are from R. Ḥananel's commentary on Tractate *Gittin*, which has not yet been published.¹⁷⁴

f) Fragments of *Sefer Ma'aseh Ha-Ge'onim* were found in the Leipzig University Library, and they fill in a passage that is missing from the printed edition.¹⁷⁵

g) As is known, the commentary attributed to Rashi on the Babylonian Talmud, Trac-

tate *Mo'ed Qatan*, is not his, and Rashi's "real" commentary on *Mo'ed Qatan* was published by Ephraim Kupfer based on ms. Escorial.¹⁷⁶ Remnants of three additional copies of the commentary are scattered around the world: one is in Cremona, Italy, another is in Brno, Czech Republic, and a third is in Los Angeles, US.¹⁷⁷

h) The commentary of R. Solomon b. Hayatom to Bavli *Mo'ed Qatan* was published from a single manuscript, and now fragments of an additional copy have been found in the environs of Modena.¹⁷⁸

i) I have found four pages of "Another Version" (*Shittah Aheret*) of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra's commentary to the Twelve Minor Prophets in the Archivio di Stato di Modena.¹⁷⁹ The pages include marginalia signed by "Z.E.V.", and which incorporate passages from commen-

¹⁷³ Pergola, Archivio Storico Comunale 3. The page contains R. Ḥananel's commentary to Bavli *Qiddushin* 33a-35b, and it corresponds to: A. EISENBACH - A.Y. SHULEVITZ, *Ḥiddushei Rabbeinu Hananel (mi-ketav yad) al Masekhet Qiddushin*, in H. MAN (ed.), *Ohel Ḥiya: Qiddushin - Yotze Le-or Le-zikhro shel [...] Rabbi Haim Elazar Tzvebner*, Bnei Brak 2006, p. 31, s.v. "yakhhol" - p. 34 n. 171. And see cit., Introduction, p. 3. The editors used the Pergola fragment (see p. 33, n. 164), but only its verso side; the recto side had not yet been detached at that time.

¹⁷⁴ Pergola, Archivio Storico Comunale 4. The beginning (1a, at the top of the page) and end (2b, at the bottom) parallel another copy of the commentary, from the Cairo Genizah; compare: *Otzar ha-Ge'onim*, B.M. Lewin edition, Haifa - Jerusalem 1928-1943, *Gittin*, Collected Commentaries of Rabbeinu Ḥananel, pp. 25 (beginning)-26 (corresponding to p. 1a); Y. HUTNER, *Sheloshah Qetaḥim Mi-peirush Rabbeinu Hananel Le-Qiddushin Ve-Gittin*, in Y. BUXBAUM (ed.), *Sefer Ha-zikaron Le-maran Ba'al Ha-Pahad Yitzḥaq [...] Rabbi Yitzhak Hutner*, Gur Aryeh Institute for Advanced Jewish Scholarship - Mekhon Jerusalem, Brooklin (NY) - Jerusalem 1984, pp. 397-399 (corresponding to p. 2b).

¹⁷⁵ Ms. Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek 1103. See: LIFSHITZ, *Qimḥa de-Pisha* (above, n. 127), pp. 6-13, and introductory pp. 13-15.

¹⁷⁶ *Perush Rashi Le-masekhet Mo'ed Qatan*, E. KUPFER (ed.), Mekize Nirdamim, Jerusalem 1961. And see: A. SCHREMER, *Concerning the Commentaries on Mo'ed Qatan Attributed to Rashi*, in D. BOYARIN et al. (eds.), *Atara L'Haim: Studies in the*

Talmud and Medieval Rabbinic Literature in Honor of Professor Haim Zalman Dimitrovsky, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 2000, pp. 534-554 (Hebr.); Y. FUCHS, *Rashi's Commentary to Tractate Moed Katan: Determining Authorship and Methods of Transmission and Formation*, PhD Thesis, Bar-Ilan University, 2008 (Hebr.).

¹⁷⁷ Thus far, only the first two fragments have been mentioned in the scholarly literature; see: FUCHS, *Rashi's Commentary*, cit., pp. 2 and 229 (the Cremona fragment); VISI - JÁNOŠÍKOVÁ (above, n. 33), p. 216 (the Brno, cit., fragment). The third fragment is: Los Angeles, University of California, the Charles E. Young Research Library, ms. 170/594 (the Hebrew fragment is in the binding of a Latin manuscript that was copied in c. fifteenth-century Germany).

¹⁷⁸ See: PERANI, *Nonantola* (above, n. 23), pp. 182-184, n. T.VII; PERANI - CAMPANINI, *Modena, Archivio Capitolare* (above, n. 110), pp. 98-99, n. T.X. The commentary was published from ms. New York, the Jewish Theological Seminary, Rab. 840, by H.P. CHAJES, *Salomo ben Ha-jatom's Kommentar zu Mashiḥin*, Berlin 1910.

¹⁷⁹ Modena, Archivio di Stato 692; see: PERANI - BARALDI (above, n. 110), p. 43, n. C.I. Regarding the *Shittah Aheret* to the Twelve Minor Prophets, see: *Ibn Ezra's Two Commentaries on the Minor Prophets*, ed. U. SIMON, vol. 1, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 1989, p. 11 (Hebr.). Another fragment in the Italian Genizah, which initially seemed to contain the lost commentary of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, is in fact the commentary of R. Menahem b. Simon of Posquieres; see: M.

taries by Jonah ibn Janah, Judah ibn Balam, and other exegetes.¹⁸⁰

j) R. Eliezer of Metz's *Sefer Yere'im* was published from a single manuscript, and now I have found, in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, a single page from another copy, which differs somewhat from the printed version,¹⁸¹ and a fragment from yet another copy of the work at the Innsbruck University Library.¹⁸²

k) Fragments of R. Eliezer b. Joel Halevi's *Avi Ha-ezri (Sefer Ra'avayah)* have been found in several libraries and contain long passages that were omitted from the printed book.¹⁸³

l) There is one extant manuscript of the work *Sinai*, which contains responsa of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg edited by his brother Abraham. I have found four large pages from a second copy of the work in the Archivio di Stato in Bologna, and it seems that the complete manuscript was copied from this copy.¹⁸⁴

PERANI, *Frammenti del commento perduto a Geremia ed Ezechiele di Abraham ibn Ezra o di un suo discepolo dalla "genizah" di Bologna*, «Henoch» 18 (1996), pp. 283-325; U. SIMON, *A Disappointing Discovery: The "Italian Genizah" Fragments of the Commentary of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are not by Ibn Ezra but by Menachem ben Simon*, «Tarbiz» 67 (1998), pp. 563-572 (Hebr.) (the full commentary on these two books has been published only recently in *Miqra'ot Gedolot "Haketer": A Revised and Augmented Scientific Edition of "Miqra'ot Gedolot" Based on the Aleppo Codex and Early Medieval mss*, M. COHEN (ed.), 16 vols., Ramat Gan 1992-).

¹⁸⁰ Z.E.V.'s comments on the Twelve Minor Prophets and other Biblical books appear in the margins of other manuscripts (as well as other fragments from the archives of Modena and its environs; see PERANI - CAMPANINI, *Modena, Archivio Capitolare* [above, n. 110], pp. 58-59, n. C.X). Some of the comments on the Twelve Minor Prophets have been published, but the Modena fragments contain more than what has appeared in print; see: H.J. MATHEWS, *Notes on the Minor Prophets*, «Israelitische Letterbode» 7 (1881-1882), pp. 32-37, 70-75 (additional comments by Z.E.V. to other Biblical books were published by Mathews in another article, *Binjamin Ze'ev Yitraf*, «Israelitische Letterbode» 4 [1878-1879], pp. 1-43, and also by S.J. HALBERSTAM, *Peirushim Shonim al Sefer Yeshayah*, «Israelitische Letterbode» 7 [1881-1882], pp. 133-161).

¹⁸¹ München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 153, III (STRIEDL - ROTH [above, n. 94], p. 262,

4. Additional Textual Witnesses for Critical Editions

The European Genizah has preserved dozens of copies (if only fragmentary) of several common works, and those fragments can be used in the preparation of critical editions. However, since there are many complete manuscripts of those same works, most editors of such editions did not find it necessary to examine European Genizah fragments specifically. As noted above, some eighteenth-century Bible scholars examined the Scriptural fragments found in the bindings of books in Germany and used them in their research.¹⁸⁵ Since then, however, excellent and complete Bible manuscripts have been discovered, and so the Scriptural fragments in the European Genizah have justifiably been superseded.

It would seem that the only individuals who examine each fragment discovered in the

n. 379, first page, where the fragment is described as "midrash"!). This page includes §§304-306 in the printed edition (*Sefer Yere'im*, A.A. Schiff edition, Vilna 1892-1902, vol. 2, pp. 170a-171b. §306 of the printed edition is labeled §290 in the Munich fragment).

¹⁸² Innsbruck, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol, Druck 27686, Einband. In the binding of this book, three consecutive fragments from a single page were found (the page was written in three columns per side; two of the columns have been preserved in full, but only the right-hand side of the third column remains). The page contains §401 of the printed edition, pp. 220a-221a.

¹⁸³ See APTOWITZER (above, n. 34), pp. 107-8; D. DEVELAYTZKI, *He'arot ve-Tiqqunim le-Sefer "Mavo le-Sefer Ra'avayah"*, «Moriah» 17,11-12 (1991), pp. 101-102 (Hebr.); EMANUEL, *Fragments* (above, n. 49); ID., *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), pp. 101-103 (to the list of fragments that appears in n. 229, five additional damaged pages should be added: New York, Columbia University X893.15 E 14, which includes parts of §§957[a]-958, 972-976).

¹⁸⁴ See: *Responsa of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg* (above, n. 56), vol. 1, pp. 26-29. On a fragment from another copy of *Responsa* of R. Meir, preserved in Braunschweig, Stadtarchiv und Stadtbibliothek, which contains, *inter alia*, a responsum that is not known from other sources, see *ivi*, pp. 165-166; vol. 2, pp. 927-928, 1085.

¹⁸⁵ See above, at nn. 92 ff.

European Genizah are scholars of rabbinic literature. Each textual witness of the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the halakhic and haggadic midrashim, the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds has great significance, and so these scholars are very interested in each old or new fragment.¹⁸⁶ It is not coincidental that the first comprehensive catalog of Italian Genizah fragments pertaining to a particular discipline was devoted to rabbinic literature – Mauro Perani and Enrica Sagradini published a detailed catalog of 474 fragments (!) found in Italy, which they managed to combine into 150 total copies, of the Mishnah, Tosefta, Talmuds, Alfasi, and haggadic midrashim (and more fragments have been discovered since then).¹⁸⁷

The first publications of rabbinic texts found in the European Genizah were done haphazardly, based on whichever fragments happened to be available to scholars at the time.¹⁸⁸ In recent years, on account of the increase in material found in the European Genizah, we have witnessed the adoption of a more methodical and critical approach; scholars are now focusing on the earliest and most important fragments discovered in the Genizah. Thus, for example, pages from an Italian-Byzantine Mi-

shnah manuscript found in Italy have been published. This copy, which included all six orders of the Mishnah, is quite early – the equal of the Kaufmann manuscript of the Mishnah (!).¹⁸⁹ Similarly, fragments from two early copies of the Babylonian Talmud, which had been scattered in various libraries throughout Europe, have recently been addressed.¹⁹⁰

5. *The Jewish Bookshelf*

The examples cited above illustrate the importance of just a small portion of the fragments discovered in the European Genizah. But even those fragments which in and of themselves seem to contain nothing new contribute greatly to the study of Jewish history and culture. The European Genizah offers an original and heretofore unknown perspective on the book culture of the Jewish communities in Central Europe during the late medieval and early modern periods. The fragments can teach us, for example, which books the average community possessed; where scholars studied Talmud and Halakha, and where they studied grammar and the sciences. It is also possible to learn about Jewish set-

¹⁸⁶ See: SUSSMANN, *Talmudic Remnants* (above, n. 83) = ID., *Thesaurus*, Index and Introductory Volume, pp. 23-28.

¹⁸⁷ M. PERANI - E. SAGRADINI, *Talmudic and Midrashic Fragments from the "Italian Genizah": Reunification of the Manuscripts and Catalogue*, Giuntina, Firenze 2004. And see Yaakov Sussmann's review of this catalog: Y. SUSSMANN, «Materia giudaica», 10,1 (2005), pp. 176-180. A few fragments that were found in book bindings in Hungary are listed in E. ROTH, *Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud in Hungary*, «Qiryat Sefer» 31 (1956), pp. 472-482 (Hebr.). Regarding the dearth of haggadic midrashim in the European Genizah, see: SUSSMANN, *Talmudic Remnants* (above, n. 83), pp. 58-59 (= ID., *Thesaurus*, Index and Introductory Volume, p. 26). Additional fragments of haggadic midrashim are described in: PERANI - SAGRADINI, *Talmudic and Midrashic Fragments*, pp. 147-150, 154-157.

¹⁸⁸ For example, LOEWE, WOLF, JOLOWICZ, HAMMERSCHLAG and CASSUTO (above, nn. 43, 95, 97, 98, 106); Dünner (above, n. 130), pp. 84-90; D. HERZOG, *Zwei hebräische Handschriftenfragmente aus der*

Steiermark, «Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse» 166,7 (1911) (and see SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 1, p. 2, n. 11).

¹⁸⁹ G. ZARFATI, *Alcuni frammenti un codice della Mishnah provenienti dalla "Genizah Italiana"*, «Italia» 9 (1990), pp. 7-36 (Hebr.); ID., *Addenda to a Mishna Manuscript from Italy*, «Italia» 11 (1995), pp. 9-38 (Hebr.). In recent years, additional pages of this copy have been discovered, but have not yet been published; for a list of all pages and additional bibliography, see: PERANI - SAGRADINI, *Talmudic and Midrashic Fragments* (above, n. 187), pp. 24-28, n. T.V; SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 1, p. 50, n. 407 and p. 55, n. 438.

¹⁹⁰ See: SH. FRIEDMAN, *Early Manuscripts to Tractate Bava Metzia*, «Aleí Sefer» 9 (1981), pp. 37-47, 51-52 (Hebr.); ID., *Talmud Arukh BT Bava Metzi'a VI: Critical Edition with Comprehensive Commentary*, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York - Jerusalem 1996, pp. 59-63 (Hebr.); E.S. ROSENTHAL, *Li-leshonoteha shel Massekhet Temurah*, «Tarbiz» 58 (1989), pp. 327 ff. (Hebr.).

tlement in the period under discussion:¹⁹¹ where there were communities that originated in Iberia, and where expatriates of Ashkenaz settled; where prayers were conducted according to the French rite, and where they were conducted according to the Ashkenazic rite;¹⁹² when books were confiscated; and so forth.¹⁹³ It is nevertheless necessary to qualify such statements and acknowledge that page fragments cannot, in general, answer other important questions relevant to book culture, like: when and where was the book written? For whom? How many scribes collaborated to copy it? How extensive was the manuscript? Which works were contained therein? And additional questions like this.

A remarkable example of the possibilities inherent in the manuscript fragments used in bookbindings is offered by the catalogue of Latin manuscript fragments discovered in the Oxford Libraries.¹⁹⁴ More than 2,000 (!) fragments that had been reused by that city's bookbinders were found in those libraries, and through them it is possible to paint a clear picture of the intellectual life of sixteenth and seventeenth century Oxford. Thus, for example, it is possible to discern that manuscript fragments of works of canon law were found in the bindings of books published in very specific years – right after those works had themselves been printed, rendering the manuscripts useless. Manuscript fragments of early translations of Aristotle's works were

found in the bindings made in a later period, indicating that in those years new translations replaced the old ones (and the latter, which were no longer of any use, were sent to the bookbinders); and so forth.

Research of this sort is only possible under certain conditions. It can only be undertaken if there is a significant number of fragments from a particular place, and only if care was taken when the bindings were opened to meticulously record the book or archival file in which each of the fragments was found. A hasty removal of fragments from book bindings, without recording the volume in which each fragment was found, is liable to render such research impossible.¹⁹⁵

The conditions for such socio-cultural research are best met with respect to the pages discovered in Italian archives. Generally speaking, a substantial number of fragments are discovered in each of these archives, and it is easy to determine the exact year that the Hebrew manuscripts were used, based on the dates in the documents that the manuscripts were used to cover. A comprehensive study of the libraries of Mantuan Jewry was published several years ago. The study was based on other sources – the lists of books that the Jews of Mantua submitted to the censors for examination at the end of the sixteenth century.¹⁹⁶ It would be instructive to compare the findings reached through the study of those book lists and the findings that would

¹⁹¹ See, for instance, SUSSMANN, *Yerushalmi Fragments* (above, n. 53), pp. 17-18, on the Jewish settlement of Heidelberg.

¹⁹² See: HOLLENDER (above, n. 101), pp. 61-78.

¹⁹³ Thus far, very few attempts have been made in this direction. See, for example: B. WEINRYB, *Hebrew Mss. Fragments of Silesian Jews Toward the End of the Middle Ages*, «Qiryat Sefer» 14 (1937), pp. 112-117 (Hebr.); G. SERMONETA, *I frammenti ebraici di Nonantola come fonte per la storia degli ebrei nella regione*, in *Vita e cultura* (above, n. 1), pp. 87-93.

¹⁹⁴ See: KER (above, n. 58); D. PEARSON, *Oxford Bookbinding 1500-1640, Including a Supplement to Neil Ker's Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts Used as Pastedowns in Oxford Bindings*, Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, Oxford 2000.

¹⁹⁵ Thus, for example, Leopold Zunz managed to determine the year that *Pesiqta Rabbati* was printed in Prague, based on the printed pages he

found in the book's binding. Had those pages been separated from the book, it would have been impossible to determine when the *Pesiqta Rabbati* had been published (L. ZUNZ, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden: historisch entwickelt*, A. Asher, Frankfurt am Main 1892, pp. 250-251, n. d; see also: M. SANDERS, *The First Print of Pesiqta Rabbathi*, «Areshet» 3 [1961], pp. 99-101 [Hebr.]). For an illustrative description of the sort of detective work necessary to reconstruct the source of fragments that have been separated, see: BABCOCK (above, n. 49), pp. 13-34 (the discussion there is mainly of Latin fragments, but he also addresses a single Hebrew fragment, which found its way from Austria to the United States; see above, n. 49).

¹⁹⁶ S. BARUCHSON, *Books and Readers: The Reading Interests of Italian Jews at the Close of the Renaissance*, Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat-Gan 1993 (Hebr.).

be obtained by analyzing the fragments found in the archives of Northern Italy.

H. *Plans for the Future*

The study of the European Genizah is still in its infancy. Thousands of documents have already been discovered, but we are still far from exhausting its rich stores. Three main tasks, it seems, devolve upon its researchers:

1. *The Systematic Disclosure of All Fragments*

Many pages, whose number cannot even be guessed, remain hidden in the covers of archival documents and the bindings of Hebrew and non-Hebrew books and manuscripts. Hundreds of archives all across Europe must still be systematically examined, lest they contain more fragments, whose number is likely to reach well into the thousands. The ancient bindings of countless books must also be checked, for perhaps they, too, hide pages of Hebrew manuscripts. In other words, in order to exhaust the European Genizah's potential, it is necessary to systematically check every archive in Europe and the binding of every book bound in Europe

from the fifteenth century through the seventeenth century.¹⁹⁷

Such a search, whose magnitude seem almost impossible, can sometimes be conducted in collaboration with local scholars who are also systematically searching for non-Hebrew fragments hidden in the bindings of books and archival documents, thereby somewhat easing the burden placed on scholars of Hebrew culture.¹⁹⁸

The European Genizah is indeed an endless sea, and we will never be able to say that we have reached all of the Hebrew fragments hidden in book bindings.¹⁹⁹ It will always be possible to find yet another fragment in some remote archive, or another page or two in some book binding. Additional fragments will undoubtedly continue to be discovered for decades, if not centuries, but although it is not our task to complete, neither are we free to desist from it.

Another task that must be undertaken is the separation of the fragments from the bindings. A sizeable portion of the fragments which have been found are presently legible only from one side, while the other side, glued to the binding, cannot even be seen. The ungluing process is expensive and often encounters the opposition of those in charge of the libraries and archives. Efforts are currently being made to separate the more important fragments from the bindings,

¹⁹⁷ A significant number of fragments are found in the bindings of books held in private collections around the world, and from time to time they are discovered by scholars, some of whom do not recognize Hebrew letters. Information on such fragments is published in obscure places, beyond the reach of scholars of Jewish studies, and over time it becomes difficult to trace the path of those fragments. See, for example, SABATINI (above, n. 106. Three fragments: the author, who did not know how to read Hebrew, was aided by several Jewish scholars and identified the first two fragments: Scripture with Targum Onqelos and Masoretic notes, and Rashi's commentary to *Deuteronomy*. The third fragment contains *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol*, Positive Commandment 27); L. FORSTER, *From the Schwabenspiegel to Pfefferkorn: A study in Makulatur*, in *Mediaeval German Studies Presented to Frederick Norman Professor of German in the University of London by his Students, Colleagues and Friends on the Occasion of his Retirement*, Publications of the Institute of Ger-

manic Studies (University of London), London 1965, pp. 282-295 (two fragments: Scripture with Targum Onqelos and Masoretic notes, and Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Eruvin*).

¹⁹⁸ An example of such praiseworthy cooperation between researchers of Hebrew and non-Hebrew book binding fragments can be seen in the fragment catalog of a small library in Germany, which was recently published: K. WIEDEMANN - B. WISCHHÖFER, *Einbandfragmente in kirchlichen Archiven aus Kurhessen-Waldeck*, Landeskirchliches Archiv Kassel, Kassel 2007. The vast majority of fragments in the library are Latin, and only a small number (pp. 170-180) are Hebrew.

¹⁹⁹ See, for example, what I wrote above (n. 102) about the additional fragments that were recently discovered at the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, even though J.N. EPSTEIN - A.Z. SCHWARZ had already conducted a thorough search of the bindings of its books.

whereas the fragments that do not appear to contain anything new remain attached to the bindings.²⁰⁰

2. Cataloguing

It is vital to prepare comprehensive catalogues of all European Genizah fragments. As is well known, the Cairo Genizah has also not yet been catalogued in a complete and orderly manner, but here the European Genizah must receive precedence over its Cairene counterpart. The distinct nature of the European Genizah generally enables a fast and efficient cataloguing process, and so it is not necessary to wait a hundred years or more, as happened with the Cairo Genizah. The range of the works found in the European Genizah is relatively limited; it includes, as noted, mainly well-known and classic works. A sizeable portion of the works in the European Genizah can now be found in computerized databases, making it relatively easy to identify most of the fragments and establish their contents with precision. Even tiny fragments, which contain only two or three words, and pages that are almost entirely blurred or erased, so that only a word or two can be made out, can be identified today, at least in some cases, by means of the sophisticated technology at our disposal.

²⁰⁰ See PERANI, *The Italian Genizah* (above, n. 1), pp. 44-45.

²⁰¹ See, mainly, above, nn. 102-105, 109-110, 187.

²⁰² For example, the sixty fragments of the Babylonian Talmud which were found in the Stadtbibliothek in Trier, and which Dr. J. Wolf successfully reassembled into two manuscripts. See: SUSSMANN *Yerushalmi Fragments* (above, n. 53), p. 4, n. 10; ID., *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, pp. 661-664. See also above, at nn. 157-159.

²⁰³ See, for example, SUSSMANN, RICHLER, DANZIG and ZARFATI (above, nn. 53, 129, 169, 189); GROSSMAN (in the studies listed above, n. 120); EMANUEL, *Hidden Treasures*, pp. 104-106, 114-115, 207-210, 291-292, 426-428.

²⁰⁴ This happened, for example, to a manuscript of *Sefer Ra'avan*, whose pages I found in four different libraries in Austria: in Vienna, Salzburg, and Admont (Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Fragm. hebr.

Some of the cataloguing has already been done, and above I mentioned a number of catalogues – whether large and comprehensive or small²⁰¹ – but there is still a great deal of work to be done in this area.

3. Piecing Together Individual Pages and Attempting Reconstructions

As mentioned, bookbinders and archivists took apart the manuscripts at their disposal, and so today, the pages of a single manuscript may be scattered in the bindings of numerous books. Occasionally, pages and fragments from a single manuscript are found in the bindings of books or the covers of archival files that have all been preserved in the same place,²⁰² but often pages from the same manuscript ended up in different cities,²⁰³ and sometimes pieces of the same page appear in different libraries, hundreds of miles away from one another.²⁰⁴

This phenomenon is reminiscent of what happened to the Cairo Genizah, albeit for different reasons. The dispersal and fragmentation of the Cairo Genizah at the end of the nineteenth century was the result of the work of scholars and dealers, who collected whatever they could lay hands on and sent the fragments to various locations.²⁰⁵ But the scattering of the pages of the European Genizah took place centuries ago,

A 64; Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Fragm. M II 293; Salzburg, Erzabtei St. Peter, Benediktinerstift, Ink. 97 and Ink. 893; Admont, Benediktinerstift, Fragm. B 21). All of the pages come from the sections dealing with Bavli Tractates *Niddah* and *Shabbat*, albeit not consecutively. This is the order of the pages: Page 1 (the bottom half of the page) in Vienna; page 2, part in Vienna (the bottom half of columns 1 and 4) and part in the Salzburg Universitätsbibliothek (columns 2 and 3, in their entirety); page 3 (the entire page) in the Salzburg Universitätsbibliothek; page 4 (columns 2 and 3) in Vienna; page 5 (the top half of columns 1 and 4) in Admont; pages 6 and 7 (columns 2 and 3 of one page and columns 1 and 4 of another page), at the abbey's library in Salzburg. On other fragments of *Sefer Ra'avan* in the European Genizah, see above, at nn. 164-165.

²⁰⁵ Fragments from the European Genizah sometimes suffered a similar fate, when the books in

for the most part. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century traders occasionally sold manuscripts to bookbinders and notaries piecemeal; one section of a manuscript was sold to one bookbinder and a second section to another bookbinder, and so the remnants of a single manuscript were dispersed across many places already centuries ago. Sometimes a single bookbinding served the needs of an entire region, so that fragments of a single copy ended up in several nearby locales. Wandering monastics took their books along with them,²⁰⁶ and when monasteries were closed down, their books were divvied up among a number of other monasteries. Thus, fragments of the same copy ended up in places far away from one another other.²⁰⁷

In light of this, it falls upon scholars investigating the European Genizah to piece together the scattered pages of each copy and reconstruct, to the best of their ability, its original form. Piecing together all of the fragments found in a single library requires a great deal of patience and hard work, and searching for fragments of a single copy that are scattered in different libraries

which they were hidden were taken to distant places. Thus, pages from an early manuscript of *Avi Ha-ezri* ended up in six different libraries in four countries: Israel, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Argentina. See: EMANUEL, *Fragments* (above, n. 49), p. 12, and n. 7 *ad loc.*; ID., *Fragments of the Tablets* (above, n. 26), p. 101, n. 226. Another example is a copy of the Palestinian Talmud, several pages of which were found in a book binding in Jerusalem, and several pages of which reached the Sassoon Collection; see: M. ASSIS, *A Fragment of Yerushalmi Sanhedrin*, «Tarbiz» 46 (1977), pp. 29-90 (Hebr.) (and p. 30, n. 10); B. ELIZUR, *Toward a New Edition of Seridei Ha-Yerushalmi*, «Leshonenu» 72 (2010), pp. 270-271 (Hebr.); SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 740, n. 7885.

²⁰⁶ See, for instance: FREIMANN (above, n. 106). The fragment in question was bound in Provence – where this phenomenon was uncommon – and ended up in Italy, at the Vatican library (and see SUSSMANN, *Thesaurus*, vol. 2, p. 697, n. 7433. On the nature of this Palestinian Talmud fragment, see *Yerushalmi Neziqin* [above, n. 118], Introduction, pp. 13-16; Y. SUSSMANN, *Once Again on Yerushalmi Neziqin*, in Y. SUSSMANN - D. ROSENTHAL [eds.], *Talmudic Studies*, vol. 1, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1990, p. 117 [Hebr.]).

and archives demands wide-ranging knowledge of the history of the libraries and archives, the direct and indirect connections between the various libraries in past centuries, and the bookbinders who worked in different locales.²⁰⁸ Valuable information on such matters can be found in historical studies of the libraries and monasteries, in the catalogues of non-Hebrew manuscripts found in those libraries, and especially in the catalogues of non-Hebrew fragments found in those libraries. Such information, along with direct collaboration with local scholars specializing in such matters, can teach us a great deal about the Hebrew fragments discovered in the various libraries. In this way, it will sometimes be possible to trace the origins of the fragments, to ascertain when and where they came into the possession of bookbinders, to disclose the connection between the different pages of a single copy that ended up in different places, and even to find additional pages of the same copy.²⁰⁹ This work, difficult as it is, will be even more burdensome in regions where the political boundaries of the late medieval and early modern periods

²⁰⁷ For example, a fragment of *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol* has been found in the binding of a book in Olomouc, Czech Republic, while other pages from this copy reached Rome; see: ABATE (above, n. 33), pp. 240-243. See also: PERANI - SAGRADINI, *Cesena* (above, n. 61), pp. 10-11. On the fragments given by the Academy of Sciences and Literature in Mainz to the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, see: A. LEHNARDT, “*Siddur Rashi*” und die *Halacha-Kompendien aus der Schule Raschis*, in D. KROCHMALNIK - H. LISS - R. REICHMAN (Hrsg.), *Raschi und sein Erbe. Internationale Tagung der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien mit der Stadt Worms*, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg 2007, pp. 85-99.

²⁰⁸ In recent years, staff at the Friedberg Genizah Project developed sophisticated software whose purpose is to aid in piecing together different fragments from the Cairo Genizah. Hopefully it will be possible to use this software to piece together European Genizah fragments. See: L. WOLF - N. DER-SHOWITZ - L. POTIKHA - T. GERMAN - R. SHWEKA - Y. CHOUKEKA, *Automatic Palaeographic Exploration of Genizah Manuscripts*, in F. FISCHER *et al.* (eds.), *Codicology and Palaeography in the Digital Age 2*, BoD, Norderstedt 2010, pp. 157-179.

²⁰⁹ See, for example: SUSSMANN, *Yerushalmi Fragments* (above, n. 53), pp. 17-18, 21.

differ from those of today. Sometimes pages of a single copy ended up in cities that are presently in two different states.²¹⁰ Thus, it is necessary to ignore present-day international boundaries and initiate cooperation based on cultural and commercial ties that prevailed in centuries past.

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that only once the fragments are properly identified and catalogued will it be possible to attempt to piece different pages of a single work together into one copy. However, piecing together the scattered fragments will quickly render the catalogues outdated and obsolete; it will be necessary to prepare new and more comprehensive catalogues, which will bring all the remaining pages of each and every copy into one place.

I originally wrote this section about plans for the future twenty years ago, and in conclusion I wrote that the massive scope of the project and its diffusion among many states make it necessary to establish a central body to direct and coordinate the individuals and institutions involved in the project. At the time, this seemed like a pipe dream, but to my pleasant surprise, the dream has been fleshed out and is becoming a reality. Scholars from many European countries have joined the exhausting search for Hebrew fragments all over Europe, and I have already mentioned the vigorous efforts being made today in Italy (by Prof. Mauro Perani), Germany (by Prof. Andreas Lehnardt), Austria (by Prof. Martha Keil), and other states.²¹¹

In 2007, Prof. Judith Olzowy-Schlanger joined this group and initiated the establishment of a single body to centralize all such efforts

undertaken on European soil. This body, called “Books within Books: Hebrew Fragments in European Libraries” has already brought about fruitful collaboration among all who work on the European Genizah, by creating uniform standards, to the extent possible, for cataloguing fragments, holding conferences, publishing, and more. The crown jewel of this body is the development of a central website (www.hebrewmanuscript.com), that will host high-quality images and descriptions of each of the tens of thousands of European Genizah fragments, scattered across hundreds of libraries, archives, and monasteries throughout Europe. The site is still in its trial phase, but already now it hosts images and descriptions of thousands of fragments from many different states.

The study of the European Genizah has taken giant steps forward in the past half century. In the mid-1900s, a few hundred Hebrew fragments, scattered all over Europe, were known. Blurry images of them could be found only at the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in Jerusalem. It is no surprise that only a few scholars studied these fragments, and consequently, only a small number of studies were devoted to them. We are now in a new era, and we can expect that within a few years, anyone in the world will be able to study tens of thousands of fragments, compare them to one another, piece together individual fragments and pages, and reveal the treasures concealed in the European Genizah.

Simcha Emanuel
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
e-mail: simcha.emmanuel@mail.huji.ac.il

²¹⁰ For example, the fragments belonging to a single manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud ended up in various libraries in Austria and Hungary. See:

FRIEDMAN, *Early Manuscripts* (above, n. 190), pp. 45-47, 51-52.

²¹¹ See above, at nn. 107, 111-113.

SUMMARY

In the late medieval and early modern eras, thousands of pages of Hebrew manuscripts were reused to bind books and folders of archival documents. These pages are now scattered in hundreds of libraries and archives throughout Europe and even beyond. This article tries to comprehensively review this phenomenon, from the first pieces of information we already had in the high Middle Ages, to the ambitious projects of the present century, for full disclosure of these pages.

KEYWORDS: European Genizah; Books within Books; Hebrew manuscripts.