

Raphael da Prato's manuscripts kept in Moscow

Elodie Attia

► **To cite this version:**

Elodie Attia. Raphael da Prato's manuscripts kept in Moscow . *Materia Giudaica*, Associazione Italiana per lo Studio del Giudaismo/Giuntina, 2009, XIV (1-2), pp.411-417. hal-01405037

HAL Id: hal-01405037

<https://hal-amu.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01405037>

Submitted on 13 Jan 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



RAPHAEL DA PRATO'S MANUSCRIPTS KEPT IN MOSCOW

Raphael Salomon (or Salomon Raphael) ben Jacob ha-Kohen da Prato was one of the Italian scholars and rabbis in activity in the first half the 16th century. Although he is almost unknown, he is of special interest for Hebrew Palaeographical Studies because he copied twenty-three manuscripts, containing more than 3,000 folios, sometime between 1518 and 1541. Given that a half of his manuscripts are not explicitly dated or localized, these dates are approximate and any precisions are only hypotheses¹.

According to his name, the scribe was a member of the Da Prato family, established in banking activities in Northern Italy (especially in Prato, Pisa, Florence) at the beginning of the 15th century. The leader of this family was known as «Salomon da Prato», connected to the Da Pisa family in Florence during the same century².

In a manuscript of the founding consti-

tution of a *gemilut ḥasadim* society in Ferrara dated from 1515, a member called «Šelomo Rafa'el Kohen mi-Prato» appears as one of the signatories³. He can be identified with our scribe who calls himself «Šelomo Rafa'el ha-Kohen» in various colophons and manuscripts he copied⁴. Other colophons indicate that Raphael was also in activity in the city of Ferrara near 1530⁵.

According to the diary of David Reuveni, Raphael da Prato could probably be the private teacher met in 1524-1525⁶ at the house of Yehiel Nissim da Pisa (1497?-1571), leader of one of the most famous Jewish banking families in Northern Italy⁷. A Hebrew manuscript confirms Raphael's link to Yehiel at this period: the MS Florence, *Marciana Laurenziana*, Plut. 88, 51 has been copied for Yehiel Nissim da Pisa in 1525. Raphael called him clearly in the colophon «my master» (גבירי)⁸.

¹This paper has been presented at the VIIIth EAJS Congress, Moscow, 23rd-27th July 2006. The whole of these manuscripts have been studied in a PhD, prepared under supervision of Prof. Judith Olszowy-Schlanger and defended in April 2008 at EPHE - Paris, 4th section. See E. Attia, *Les manuscrits de Raphaël de Prato. Une bibliothèque privée juive italienne du XVI^e siècle*, Berlin-Torino, (forthcoming 2010).

²See, U. CASSUTO, *Gli ebrei a Firenze*, Firenze 1918, p. 125. Other documents on Da Prato family should be studied soon, see E. ATTIA, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

³See, D. RUDERMAN, *The founding of a Gemilut ḥasadim in Ferrara in 1515*, «AJS Review» 1 (1976), pp. 233-267, and especially p. 266.

⁴See for example, in MS Paris, BNF, Hébr. 369, colophon fol. 111v, line 21: נאום הצעיר והקטן שבעדת: «Discourse of the insignificant member of Israel's community, who has the name of the Aaron's family, the one who is called Salomon Raphael».

⁵For example, in MS Cambridge, CUL, Add. 506-4, fol. 134r; see S. Reif, *Hebrew Manuscripts at Cambridge University Library*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 205-206.

⁶We follow A.Z. Aescoly, 1940 [1993], p. 240 (in

hebrew) who corrected partly Kaufmann assumption (see cit., 1893, p. 89 et p. 92). See details in E. ATTIA, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

⁷See D. KAUFMANN, *La famille de Yehiel de Pise*, «Revue des Etudes Juives (REJ)» 26 (1893), pp. 83-110; *Notes sur l'histoire de la famille De Pise*, «REJ» 29, 1894, pp. 142-147; *La famille De Pise*, «REJ» 30, 1895, pp. 220-239; *La famille De Pise*, «REJ» 31, 1895, pp. 62-73; *Abraham ben Isaac de Pise*, «REJ» 32, 1896, pp. 130-134; 34, 1897, pp. 309-311. See also U. CASSUTO, *Gli ebrei a Firenze nell'età del Rinascimento*, Firenze 1918, pp. 340-346. U. CASSUTO, *La famiglia da Pisa et ancora sulla famiglia da Pisa*, «Rivista Israelitica» 5-6 (1908), pp. 227-238; 4-5 (1909), pp. 160-170; 6 (1909), pp. 223-232; 1 (1910), 9-19; 2-3 (1910), pp. 72-86 et 146-150; 10 (1913), pp. 48-59; M. LUZZATI, *La casa dell'ebreo*, Pisa 1985, *passim*. For the thought of Yehiel da Pisa, see R. BONFIL, *Rabbis and Jewish Communities in Renaissance Italy*, Oxford 1990, p. 285 ff. See also A. GUETTA, *Religious Life and the Jewish Erudition in Pisa: Yechiel Nissim Da Pisa and the Crisis of Aristotelism*, «Journal des Etudes de la Cabale» 2, Paris 1999, pp. 1-20.

⁸See MS Florence, *Bibl. Marciana Laurenziana*, Plut. 88, 51, fol. 79v:

In any cases, Raphael da Prato was a rabbi and a Jewish scholar in one of the highest intellectual milieu of that time⁹.

As we said, Da Prato copied no less than twenty-three manuscripts. Credit should go to C. Sirat and M. Beit-Arié who first listed them in the *Manuscrits Datés*¹⁰. Four of these manuscripts are now preserved in the Russian National Library – the former Lenin Library, and all of them are part of the Günzburg collection (no. 72, 41, 280 and 508). These manuscripts shed new light on the nature of Jewish private libraries during the Renaissance. A number of important studies have been carried out on the lists of manuscripts drawn up for various purposes (for selling, for inheritance, for the Inquisition in the second half of the sixteenth century in Mantova)¹¹. In his important article «Les listes de livres, reflet de la culture des juifs d'Italie du nord au XV^e et XVI^e siècle ?», J.-P. Rothschild reviewed the sources and these studies and proposed new directions for the reconstruction of the average Jewish library in the Late Middle Ages¹². He concluded that a broadening of the documentation is necessary, including the chronology. He also observed, following Bonfil's sug-

gestion, that works on library lists should complement the historian's approach, paying more attention to citations, allusions, influences, and on the reading interests of the authors of that time. This paper will be limited to only one Da Prato's manuscript, taking to account these considerations.

The majority of Da Prato's manuscripts are collections of texts. These manuscripts have not yet received all the attention they merit, and had never been treated as potential new sources for the historical investigation¹³. In this paper, I will focus on the manuscripts Oxford, *Bodleian Library*, Mich. 500 (further Mich. 500) and the Moscow, *Russian State Library*, Günzburg 41 (further Günz. 41). First of all, I will show that these two manuscripts originally constituted one single volume. Then, I will stress the new important insights such collection of texts can reveal.

The reconstructed original volume: A peculiar collection of heterogeneous texts

The original manuscript is preserved in two separate parts: one part is in Oxford (*Bodleian Library*, Mich. 500; fols. 89r-151v)¹⁴ and the other

אני הצעיר רפאל שלמה הכהן יצ"ו בכמ"ר יעקוב הכהן זלה"ה \ מפראטו כתבתי הלוחות האלה עם פירושם לגביירי הנעלה \ כמר יחיאל נסים זי"א בן החסיד העניו כמה ר שמואל זצ"ל \ מפיסא ה' יזכהו להגות בס הוא וכול זרעו אחריו וחפץ היי \ בידו יצלח אכ"ה

«I, the insignificant Raphael Salomon Ha-Kohen, son of R. Jacob Ha-Kohen da Prato, wrote these Tables with their commentaries for my master, the great and honorable R. Yehiel Nissim, son of the pious Samuel, da Pisa. Let God him study them, him and all his descendants after him. The will of God shall prosper in his hand <Is. LIII, 10>. Amen.»

⁹On relationship between Da Prato, Yehiel da Pisa and Moses Basola, see E. ATTIA, *La bibliothèque du cabaliste italien Mordekhay Dato: nouvelles preuves*, «REJ» 168 /3-4 (juillet-décembre 2009).

¹⁰See C. SIRAT, M. BEIT-ARIE, M. GLATZER, *Manuscrits médiévaux en caractères hébraïques portant des indications de date jusqu'à 1540. Bibliothèques de France et d'Israël*, Paris - Jerusalem 1986, tome III, notice 91, MS Paris, BNF, hébr. 369.

¹¹See for example R. BONFIL, *Le biblioteche degli ebrei d'Italia nell'epoca del Rinascimento*, in G. TAMANI - A. VIVIAN (cur.), *Manoscritti, Frammenti e libri ebraici nell'Italia dei Secoli XV-XVI, Atti del Congresso internazionale dell'AISG S. Miniato 7-8-*

9 novembre 1988, Rome 1991, pp. 137-150. Also Z. BARUCHSON, *Books and Readers. The Reading Interests of Italian Jews at the Close of the Renaissance*, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan 1993 (in Hebrew). Also: *La culture livresque des Juifs d'Italie à la fin de la Renaissance*, CNRS Ed., Paris 2001.

¹²See J.-P. ROTHSCHILD, *Les listes de livres, reflet de la culture des juifs d'Italie du nord au XV^e et XVI^e siècle ?*, in G. TAMANI, A. VIVIAN (cur.), *Manoscritti, Frammenti e libri ebraici nell'Italia dei Secoli XV-XVI, Atti del Congresso internazionale dell'AISG S. Miniato 7-8-9 novembre 1988*, Rome 1991, pp. 163-193.

¹³See C. SIRAT, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages*, edited and translated by Nicholas de Lange, Cambridge 2002, Introduction, part VI.

¹⁴See A. NEUBAUER, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 1886-1906, n. 2192, col. 756-757. M. BEIT-ARIE, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Supplement of Addenda and Corrigenda to Vol. I*, Oxford 1986, n. 2192, col. 409. The folios from 1 to 89 corresponds to two others palaeographical unities from the 18th century (1750 and 1774). The three were bound together as a whole in the Bodleian Library.

part is in Moscow (*Russian State Library*, Coll. Günzburg 41, fols. 2r-162v). B. Richler has already noticed that there is a relationship between the two separate parts¹⁵. This relationship has been confirmed by the palaeographical analysis carried out by myself, which ascertained that both were written by the same hand. Surprisingly enough, the analysis of the text shows that Günz. 41 is a copy of a book printed in Constantinople in 1515. The copy of the printed colophon begins on the last folio of Günz. 41 (fol. 161v) and continues clearly in Mich. 500, (fol. 132r). The catchword of fol. 161v corresponds to the beginning of Mich. 500. Most of all, after my examination of the quires and their watermarks, it appears that the manuscript was separated in the middle of a septenion (i.e. fourteen folios). In other words, the repartition of these fourteen folios is now eight folios in Günz. 41¹⁶ and six folios in Mich. 500¹⁷. There is uncertainty about the date of the separation. We have some evidence that the manuscript might have been divided at an early stage: Günz. 41 bears the marks of censorship by Isaac of Arles, who was an internal censor of the Jewish community of Ferrara in 1575-1579, while the Mich. 500 was censured only in 1600 by Luigi da Bologna. Therefore, it seems that Günz. 41 was already an independent volume by the seventies of the sixteenth century.

As for the composition of the volume, it is complex since it contains a large number of texts copied at different times. I found three indications of date, written by Da Prato himself, in fols. 102r, 127v and 132r. These dates appear on Mich. 500. But as we said, the fol. 132r belonged to the same quires and the same text as the fol. 161v, and so the date on Mich. 500, fol. 132r must be considered as the date of Günz. 41.

On fol. 102r, in the text itself, line 14:

אני המעתק שמעתי את זה מפי מאור הגולה אברהם הכהן
 יצ"ו בשנת רע"ח לפ"ק פשט הגאון [...]»
 «I, the scribe, heard this from the Light of the Exile,
 Abraham Ha-Kohen, may his Rock and his Saviour

protect him, in the year 278 [1518]. Commentary of the Gaon [...]»

Then, the text follows with a literal commentary (*pešaṭ*) of Abraham Ha-Kohen. According to this note, the scribe was listening to a new oral interpretation (a supercommentary) on Rashi's Commentary on the Bible by Abraham Ha-Kohen of Bologna, in the year 1518, and included it in his copy, made probably around 1532 as quoted on f. 123r.

The title of fol. 126v indicates an extract of a public sermon delivered by the same Abraham Ha-Kohen at the synagogue of Ferrara, on the first day of *Šavu'ot* 1534. The change of ink colour suggests that the copy of the sermon is a later addition¹⁸.

קצת חדושי הדרשה שדרש המאור הגדול כמהר"ר אברהם
 הכהן יצ"ו ב"ט ראשון דעצרת רצ"ד פה פירא' [רה]
 «Extracts of *hiddusim* of the sermon pronounced by
 our Master the very great R. Abraham Ha-Kohen,
 the first day of the festival of *Šavu'ot* [6 *Šivan*] 294
 [the 20th of May 1534] here in Ferrara»

The folios 128r-131v let us see various extracts without any titles . [After them, previously began the text of ms. Günz. 41, a copy of a printed edition of *Kad ha-Qemaḥ*]. On the folio 132r, Raphael's personal colophon begins after the end of the colophon copied from the Constantinople edition, and mentions the year 1532. Colophon, fol. 132r, lines 5-20 :

5- ואני הצעיר רפאל שלמה הכהן יצ"ו המתאוה לשמוע דבר
 יי דורש ומבקש ממנו להאיר במאור 6- תורתו [...] 20-
 תם ונשלם בליל מוצאי שבת קדש בחדש הראשון הוא חדש
 ניסן 21- בארבעה לחדש שנת ופר"ו ורבו בפרשת ריח ניחח
 אזכרתה ליי[...]»
 «5- I, the insignificant Raphael Salomon Ha-Kohen,
 who longs to follow the words of the Lord, seeks and
 desires of Him to enlighten with the lighth of 6- His
 Torah [...] 20- I finished by night, at the end of the
 Holy Shabbat, in the first month that is Nissan 21-
 the 4th of this month, in the year *Be fruitful* [292]¹⁹

¹⁵ See B. RICHLER, «Assufot» 1 (1987), n. 54, p. 130.

¹⁶ From fol. 155 to 162.

¹⁷ From fol. 132 to 137. It appears that the last folios of Günzburg 41 were bound disorderedly. The correct order is explicit by the catchwords.

¹⁸ This sermon is quite uncomplete comparing to

the same text copied in MS Parma, 3540, f. 1r-v (second foliotation). See ATTIA, *op. cit.*, notice n. 22. Note that f. 127r-v is missing in Mich. 500.

¹⁹ The addition of the letters ופר"ו *waw peh resh waw* gives the year [5]292.

and multiply [Saturday night, March, the 10th, 1532]²⁰, at the parashah *An aroma pleasing to God* <parashah *Ṣaw* [*Leviticus*, VI, 8]>, [...]»

What we see here clearly reveals that the scribe did not plan his manuscript as a single entity. He rather copied different texts on separate quires at different moments of his life. A lot of folios remained blank and Da Prato could have completed them on other occasions like the Ferra-

ra sermon of 1534²¹. The question of who decided to bind them together is a difficult one: it is not clear (though highly probable) that the decision to bind these heterogeneous texts together was taken by the scribe. In any case, it is certain that it was made by the same person. Indeed, this personal collection of texts reveals a coherent structure. It can be described as a piece of a library, which allows us to study its evolution through the lifetime of the scribe, from 1518 to 1534.

Contents as testimony of a personal choice of texts

The analysis of contents offers an interesting personal collection of texts: it shows an accumulation of fragments of different lengths and on different subjects. Here is a detailed list of the texts and their lengths²²:

[In Mich. 500]

(fols. 89r-108v) a supercommentary on Rashi by Abraham ben Moshe ha-Kohen of Bologna, around 1518 (20 fols), with an intermediary commentary of Moshe Basola (2 folios)

(fols 108v-109v) a zoharic extract on Jonas (1 folio)

(fols 110r-123v) an uncomplete *commentary on the Haggadah* by Joseph Gikatilla (13 fols)

(fols 123v-127v) an anonymous haggadic treatise on the Ten *Ma'amarot* (4 fols)

(fols 127v-129v) an incomplete homily of Abraham ha-Kohen for *Ṣavu'ot*, in 1534 (2 fols)

(fol. 129v) a short note of Yohanan of Treviso (10 lines)

(fol. 129v-130r) short notes on the Zohar (1 folio)

(fol. 130v) two *Piyyuṭim* according to *Alphabeta de-Ben Sira* (1 page)

[In Günz. 41]

(f. 3r-v) short notes on the Zohar (2 pages)

(ff. 5r-162v) the *Kad ha-Qemaḥ* of Baḥya ben Asher ben Ḥalawa from a printed edition (the bulk of Günz. 41, 160 folios)

[In Mich. 500 again]

(Fol.132r) the end of the copy of printed colophon of *Kad ha-Qemaḥ* (1 fol.)

(ff. 132v-136v) the *Qabbalah on the Hebrew Alphabet* [זה השער בפ"י האותיות] by Judah Salomon Ha-Kohen ibn Matkah from the *Midrash ha-Ḥokhmah* (4 fols).

Other fragments and notes of one folio or less in:

Fol. 137r: בספר ילקוט / Extracts from *Sefer ha-Yalqut* (2 pages). [ff. 139-140 are blank]

Fol. 138r: Short extracts from *Sefer Abudraḥam* are copied also from a printed book (20 lines). [fols 139-140 are blank]

Fols 141r-142v: a *Commentary on Isaiah LII,13 to 54* by Solomon b. Astruc of Barcelona / באור פרשת הנה ישכיל עבדי אל הקדוש אנשלמה אסטרוק

Fols 142v-144r: The same extract on Isaiah commented by Nahmanides /הנה מפרשת הנה פרוש אחר מפרשת הנה /ישכיל עבדי לרב הגדול הרמב"ן ז"ל

Fols 144r-145v: *Commentary on Psalm 119* by Solomon b. Astruc de Barcelone. (3 pages) /פרוש מזור קל"ט אל הקדוש אנשלמה אסטרוק מברצלונה ז"ל

Fol. 145v: *ḥidduṣim* on Ḥumaš and Targum, from the printed edition of Bomberg Venice edition 1527 according to Beit-Arié²³. (4 pages)

Fol. 148v: *Fragments from the Zohar* (2 pages)

Fol. 149v: a fragment by Moshe of Leon about a mystical explanation of the separation of the soul from the body, and extract of *Ṣa'are ha-'Orah* of Joseph Gikatilla (4 pages).

²⁰ According to the Julian Calendar.

²¹ See above.

²² For other details, see ATTIA, *op. cit.*, notices n.

9 [for Ms. Günz. 41] and 14 [for Ms. Mich. 500].

²³ According to BEIT-ARIE, *op. cit.*, col. 409.

As for the length, we can observe that the type and length of texts vary considerably: from 160 folios (for the *Kad ha-Qemaḥ* in Günz. 41) to 10 lines (the short note of Yohanan of Treviso in Mich. 500, f. 129v). The source of the copy is also variable. For example, it can be a printed book (as in the case of the *Kad ha-Qemaḥ*), or an oral commentary listened by the scribe himself (for example the note of John of Treviso, fol. 129v)

Concerning the contents, we find classical Rashi's supercommentaries by two rabbis of that time (Abraham Ha-Kohen of Bologna and Moshe Basola) whom the scribe knew personally; pietistic and ethical discourses on the tenets of Judaism (*Kad ha-Qemaḥ*, 13th century); Kabbalah is well represented by many fragments (fragments of the Zohar, texts by Moshe of Leon, or Gikatilla, but also a kabbalistic discussion on the letters by Judah ben Salomon Ha-Kohen); Yom Kippur liturgical short poems. To conclude, it appears that the collection was mainly composed of commentaries of the Bible and on the Kabbalah.

As for the order and the logical relationship between the different texts, there is sometimes a clear link between two extracts copied one after another. There are for instance «twin» commentaries on Isaiah: one by Salomon Astruc of Barcelone and one by Nahmanides (fols. 141r-144r). The letters of the alphabets are used for kabbalistic purposes by Judah Salomon ha-Kohen but they are also used in the piyyuṭ, and perhaps in the *Kad ha-Qemaḥ* which is organised in alphabetical order. But other times, the collection appears as less coherent and it seems just to «jump» from one subject to another, lacking a clear connection. For instance, the *Commentary on Psalm* is followed by *ḥidduṣim* on Ḥumash and Targum. The case of the insertion of Basola's sermon inside the supercommentary on Rashi by Abraham ha-Kohen of Bologna is of a particular interest²⁴. At the end of folio 102r, Da Prato clearly states that the *exemplar* (העתק) of the supercommentary he was

copying was lacunary between *Exodus* VI,2 to *Exodus* XXX, 11. He thus decides to complete it by using another text: Basola's discourse concerning the commentary of Rashi on parashah *Mišpaṭim* (*Exodus* XXI,1 to XXIV,18), as he writes in fol. 102v:

טרם אכתוב יתר החידושים אשר אתי מפרשת כי תשא אל אלה מסעי בחרתי לכתוב הנה דרשה יפה \ וחמורה אשר שמעתי מפי החכם הנעלה \ כמהח"ר משה באזולה יצ"ו. בשבת משפטים.

«Before, I write more *ḥidduṣim* that I have from parashah *Ki-tisa*' <Ex, XXX,11> to the parashah '*Eleh mase'e*' <Num, XXXIII,1>, I have chosen to write here a beautiful and important interpretation that I heard from the mouth of the great Moshe Basola. At Shabbat, parashah *Mišpaṭim* [Here is quoted verses of Ex XXI, 7-11]»

At the end of Basola's sermon, fol. 104r, Raphael da Prato stressed clearly that he here is returning to copy Ha-Cohen's commentary, by adding:

נחזור לעניננו ולהעתקתנו \ פרשת כי תשא
«Let's return to our subjects and to our copy / Parashah *Ki-tisa*' <Ex, XXX,11>»

Indeed, this Basola's sermon remains in a close relationship to the supercommentary of Abraham ha-Kohen of Bologna. Basola's sermon is a part of parashah *Mišpaṭim* (precisely *Ex*, XXI, 7-11) that is effectively missing in Abraham's supercommentary. It also shows how Raphael da Prato felt free to place the discourse of Basola inside the supercommentary of Abraham Ha-Kohen, because he found the commentary beautiful and interesting. It allows us to prove an intellectual relationship and affinity between Da Prato and contemporary Italian rabbis like Moshe Basola and Abraham ha-Kohen. Da Prato considered both of them as great scholars of his time. The way he presents the lacunary source of Abraham of Bologna reveals also both a medieval attitude and a Renaissance attitude, as we are going to focus on now.

Medieval and Renaissance intellectual approaches to the texts

Make visible the lacunary sources

As we have seen, Raphael da Prato completed a lacunary supercommentary by Abraham ha-Kohen (in fol. 102r) and made an appropriate

²⁴ This sermon is edited by R. LAMDAN, «Michael» 9 (1985), pp. 186-193.

note to this effect at the beginning of the sermon of Basola (see above). In fact, Raphael da Prato made a note each time a piece of text was lacking, not only in fol. 102r but also in fols. 104v, 105r, and 106r, as well as three times in 106v, 107r and 108r. I mention here two examples:

Fol. 105r, after the end of the parashah *Wa-Yqra'*:

בפרשת צו לא מצאתי מאומה בהעתק
«In the parashah *Şaw*, I have found nothing in the *exemplar*.»

Fol. 108r, at the end of the parashah *'Eleh mase'e*:

בהעתק לא מצאתי יותר תם תל"ח
«In the *exemplar*, I have found nothing else. Here, finished.»

Through these mentions, the scribe lets us know that he had an incomplete version of the Supercommentary. This can be interpreted as an evidence of a Renaissance attitude towards the text. During the Middle Ages, mention of a missing text was rarely noted: Scribes often felt free to complement the text they copied and rarely used to mention their sources. The importance of the quality of the sources appears only in the Renaissance connected to the printing industry. As it was sought to establish a single corrected version of Hebrew classical texts, printers used different manuscripts and versions of these texts, like Jacob ben Adonyah did for Daniel Bomberg's edition of *Biblia Rabbinica*. The aim was to create what is called today a critical edition, i.e. a corrected text and, in accordance to the sources, the only «true» one. On the one hand, in his examination of the supercommentary of Abraham Ha-Kohen, Da Prato shows himself as a medieval man, the one who completes the lacunary commentary of Abraham of Bologna with another one by Basola. On the other hand, however, he appears as a Renaissance

man, quoting the exact part he has copied and the name of the authors, rather more an editor than a scribe.

Copying texts from printed books

Searching «good editions» can be related to the fact that he copied some texts or fragments from printed editions. To sum up, he copied in this collection:

The *Kad ha-Qemaḥ* edition of Constantinople (1515).

Extracts from *Sefer ha-Yalqut* (edited according to Beit-Arié's catalogue²⁵).

Extracts from *Sefer Abudraḥam* edition of Fez (1517), according to terms I found in the manuscript and only in the Fez edition²⁶.

Extracts of *ḥidduṣim* on the *Ḥumash* and Targum from the printed edition of Bomberg edition (Venice, 1527), according to Beit-Arié.

It seems that a printed book was for Da Prato a valid source for copying texts: in short fragments (20 lines from *Sefer Abudraḥam*) or a whole text (like the *Kad ha-Qemaḥ* from Günz 41). I must stress that this attitude is not an isolated case: I found many copies of printed books in other manuscripts of Da Prato²⁷. Comparing the printed original edition with manuscript Günz. 41, it becomes clear how the printed book influenced even the disposition of the copy. The scribe respects the titles and subtitles in square script, makes space so that the copying is clear and easy to read, and does it with care. The number of copies of printed books and the care the scribe takes for it reveal an obvious value of printed texts in the eyes of the scribe. I think that, in his mind, the printed editions represented a higher level of quality, a refined text, in a more complete and perfect form, while the handwritten texts that he also used to read were probably often lacunary and imperfect. According to Ziporah Baruchson, the Constantinople editions were sold in Italy and were bought only

²⁵ See M. BEIT-ARIE, *cit.*, col. 409, 9a.

²⁶ I compared the Fez Edition of *Sefer Abudraḥam* (1517) and the Constantinople Edition (1513). See Microfilms at JNUL, Jerusalem: FI 10062

(Fez, 1517) and F594 (Constantinople, 1513). The copy concerns a short fragment of the section on prayers.

²⁷ See ATTIA, *op. cit.*, Chapter II.

by scholars, who had a high level of education and a vast intellectual approach to the texts²⁸.

A Humanist habit of marginalia

The reading activity of Raphael da Prato appears clearly in the various annotations he put in the margins. In MS Günz. 41, the scribe read again the text, completing very carefully the missing terms for making the reading easier. For example, in Günz. 41, fol. 138v, he is writing all the terms of the abbreviations in the margins²⁹. On other occasions, he quotes in the margin the entire biblical verse that was abbreviated in the printed source³⁰. In MS Mich. 500, I listed fifty-six corrections in the margins (generally marked with a reference sign). Most of the corrections are insertion of lacking terms³¹. Sometimes, variant opinions are introduced by the abbreviation נ"ל (נראה לי) that means «it seems to me»³². In another manuscript in Günzburg collection, I found an allusion to other contemporary rabbis and their exegesis of the text³³.

Marginalia of a scribe are an obvious sign of the need to stress something that was missing. We can therefore consider Da Prato's process of copying and reading in a more precise way. It enables us to know what was exactly unclear for him, what was interesting for him, and how he read texts. Like all the other

scholars of the Renaissance, Da Prato used to read texts *la plume à la main*, to use Anthony Grafton's expression³⁴. We should also ask ourselves if this collection could not have been a pedagogical anthology that he used for teaching his pupils. Da Prato was probably a preceptor at Da Pisa family home, so it is possible that he could have done such collection for this purpose.

In conclusion, the study of the Da Prato's collection can bring about important codicological and palaeographical aspects, especially in the field of the archaeology of the book, the ways of their making in connection with printed book. Obviously, all these observations need to be connected to the whole corpus of Da Prato's manuscripts and afterwards to other composite volumes from the sixteenth century. Here, MSS Mich. 500 - Günz. 41 reveal a complex structure as well as chronological evidences of the constitution of a library during the lifetime of a scribe. No doubt the study of these collections provides original insights into mentality of Jewish scholars in northern Italy at the first half of the 16th century.

Elodie Attia
Research Associate (EPHE)
e-mail: attia.elodie@gmail.com

²⁸ See Z. BARUCHSON, *News about the bookmarket between Italy and the Ottoman Empire in the 16th century (in Heb.)*, «Mi-Mizrah u-mi-ma'arav» 5 (1986), pp. 53-77, especially pp. 70-71.

²⁹ The symbol *[...] indicates the reference sign and the marginal annotation in the manuscript.

MS Günz. 41, fol. 138v:

ואעפ"י שאי אתה עומד לפניו כי אי אפשר לו * [למלך בשר ודם] להמצא בכל המקומות

Kad ha-Qemah (ed. 1515), p. 85v, part on Week / שבועה, line 12:

ואעפ"י שאי אתה עומד לפניו כי אי אפשר לו למלך ב"ו להמצא בכל המקומות

³⁰ MS Günz. 41, fol. 144r:

2- ומזה דרשו רז"ל 3- כל מעשה בראשית לדעתם נבראו בצביון נבראו שני * [ויכלו השמים והארץ וכל צבאם וכל צבאם אל תקרי צבאם אלא צביונם].. ודבר ידוע כי שמים [...]

Kad ha-Qemah (ed. 1515), p. 88v, part on Peace / שלום, line 6:

5-ומזה דרשו רז"ל כל מעשה בראשית לדעתן נבראו לצב-ביונם \ 6- נבראו שני וכל צבאם. ודבר ידוע כי שמים [...]

³¹ See an example in Mich. 500, fol. 137v.

³² See MS Mich. 500, fols 111r, 124v, 132v, 133r, 137r.

³³ See MS Moscow, *RSL*, Günzburg 72, fol. 134v. The scribe observed that for explaining the text in this folio, Yohanan of Treviso used to quote the *Targum Yerushalmi*.

³⁴ See A. GRAFTON, *Le lecteur humaniste*, in G. CAVALLO R. CHARTIER (cur.), *Histoire de la lecture dans le monde occidental*, Paris 1997, pp. 209-248, esp. pp. 243-245.

Elodie Attia

SUMMARY

The study of Da Prato's private manuscripts, (MSS Oxford, *Bodleian Library*, Mich. 500, and Ms Moscow, *Russian State Library*, Günzburg 41) provide original insights to the mentality of Jewish scholars towards books in northern Italy, at the first half of the 16th century. The study of these two manuscripts reveals the complexity in manuscript's structure: they are both part a former original volume, some of their contents are annotated or copied from printed books. Some chronological evidences indicate the constitution of a private library during the lifetime of a scholar scribe.

KEYWORDS : Raphaël Salomon ben Jacob ha-Kohen da Prato; Manuscripts; Jewish private library; Sixteenth Century; Italy.