

THE HEYTHROP COLLEGE MAIMONIDES FRAGMENT

THE purpose of this note is to reiterate the need, of which most librarians are fully aware, of scrutinizing the bindings of sixteenth or seventeenth-century volumes for manuscripts—especially for Hebrew manuscripts—that may have been utilized to form outer covers or inner boards. From these sources, interesting material is constantly being recovered, but a systematic investigation would very probably reveal more, especially in libraries where the majority of the books and the interests of the readers are far remote from Hebrew studies. The introduction of printing led to the supersession of hand-written books, which were too often regarded as worthless and which were, in consequence, cut up for bindings. The persecution of the Jews and the seizure of their writings is a further cause of the destruction of Hebrew MSS for this object. Sometimes vellum leaves served as the outer covers of new books, sometimes these leaves were packed inside, as substitutes for boards. For the latter purpose, *incunabula* or early-printed proof-sheets were employed, and these are sometimes more interesting than manuscript.

The writer has recently recovered, in this way, the following fragments:—

(1) In a private copy of Hutter's Hamburg Bible (1587) the end-papers included two beautiful folio leaves of an illuminated missal (xiiith cent.).

(2) In the binding of a Constantinople book at Queens' College, Cambridge, there were two halves which, when joined, formed a complete leaf of a Hebrew antidotary, probably the oldest medical MS in Cambridge (xiiiith cent.).

(3) In an xviiiith-century volume of sermons at Montefiore College, Ramsgate, there were 80 half-leaves which formed 40 leaves of an exceedingly rare Italian printed Hebrew Bible (xvth cent.).

The example which is the subject of this note comes from Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon., and I am indebted to Father C. Lattey, S.J., for the opportunity of examining the manuscript and for the notes on its provenance which he has kindly furnished. He says:—

'This piece of vellum came from the English headquarters of the Jesuit order (Farm Street, W. 1.) in 1936. It had been serving to contain and protect Toletus's commentary on Luke in the library of Mount St Mary's College, near Chesterfield (a Jesuit boarding-school), and it had probably come thither, together with the volume it contained,

from some former Jesuit station in England when the latter was closed. The number of such small stations was at one time fairly large, but with more systematic organization of the Catholic Church in this country and the development of large institutions some have been closed down, and their books sent to the larger institutions. This would probably have happened to the vellum and its contents in the latter half of the nineteenth century; but it does not seem possible to trace either vellum or book farther back.

'As has been indicated, the vellum does not seem to have been used as actual binding; so I have been told, and its appearance seems to confirm this.

'Franciscus Toletus (Francisco de Toledo in Spanish) was born at Cordova in 1532, and died at Rome in 1596. He was created cardinal in 1593. Even before this he had severed his connexion with the Society of Jesus (the Jesuit order) which he had originally entered. He wrote on philosophy, dogmatic theology, and Holy Scripture, and was engaged in diplomatic work, but was chiefly famous as a moral theologian. His work on Luke, which this vellum contained, was a commentary on Luke i-xii only, the title being: "In prima XII capita Sacrosancti Jesu Christi Domini Nostri Evangelii secundum Lucam". It was published in Rome in 1600. In this vellum fragment the writing was found on the inside only; on the outside along the back runs the title in large letters: *Toleti in Lucam*. There is nothing else on the outside besides this title, nor anything else on the vellum fragment belonging to this later use of it.'

Coming now to the binding, we note the following details. The fragment consists of a single sheet, at present measuring 16 inches in width and $10\frac{3}{4}$ inches in height. The edges are not even and in utilizing the sheet as a cover, the centre has been somewhat contracted: the original dimensions, certainly the width, must have been slightly longer.

The sheet forms two leaves and the size of the written area of each is $7\frac{1}{8}$ inches (height) by $4\frac{5}{8}$ inches (width). There are 26 lines of script on each page. Two pages, which formed the outside of the cover, are now illegible to the naked eye and it is not, in consequence, possible to know which way the sheet was folded in the original manuscript. An examination in ultra-violet light revealed nothing: therefore, the use of the terms *recto* and *verso* is merely for convenience in description and it must not be taken to imply any decision as to the order of the pages.

The manuscript contains portions of Part III of the *Yadh ha-Hazaqah* or *Mishneh Torah* of Maimonides, the only one of his major works which he wrote in Hebrew. It may be assumed that the sheet once formed part of a text of the whole work. The surviving portions are

from Book VI (*Sefer Hafta'ah*), second division (*Hilkhoth Nedharim*, the 'Laws of Vows'). The MS. has been compared with the great Amsterdam edition (Joseph Athias) of 5480 A.M. (= 1720 C.E.): this is cited as P.T. (printed text).

F. 1 b begins with שמגביה (*Pereq* VI, sec. 9), line 2 from the foot of f. 22 b of P.T. : it ends with להשאל (sec. 16), line 4 from top of f. 23 b.

F. 2 a begins with בניכם (*Pereq* VIII, sec. 6), *lin. ult.* of f. 25 b and ends with ואם אין line 5 from foot of f. 26 a.

The hand is Spanish or slightly Spanish-North African (Maghrebine): the character is Rabbinic and the date might be tentatively given as late thirteenth century. Maimonides died in 1204: the *Mishneh Torah* was completed in 1180. The date of publication of the book to which this fragment served as a cover was 1600 and it was bound presumably at that time.

The collation of the manuscript gives the following variants, which are not very important. They shew that although the scribe had a fine handwriting, he was careless (or he copied a faulty archetype), since in the short space of one leaf he twice was guilty of *homoeoteleuton* (May we be forgiven! See Ps. xix 13):—

VARIANTS

Ms. f. 1 b. = P.T. f. 23 a.

P.T. line 2.	אחת	MS. omits
" "	5	After אכל MS. omits שמעון
" "	7	MS. שיהוירנה
" "	9	MS. omits וינתנה
" "	16	MS. שאין הניה בזה
" "	22	MS. הפיסת יד בהן
" "	כגון	MS. omits
" "	33	MS. נשבע
" "	שנדר	MS. נדר
" "	34	MS. יצא
" "	35	MS. בארנו
	אם לפני שביעית נאסרה	MS. אם נאסרה לפני שביעית
F. 23 b. line 2		after יורד ו(אוכל) MS. omits מפירותיו שאין

Ms. 2 a = P.T. f. 25 b, last line.

P.T. F. 26 a line 3.	האומר	MS. הנודר
" " " 4		after לבני מעים, MS. omits, by <i>homoeoteleuton</i> , the following words:—

			ואמרו לו הרי המיושן יפה לבני מעים
			The ending, after הייתי יודע, which differs from P.T., is:—
			הייתי אומר כל היינות אמורין לי [?] חוץ
			מהמיושן הרי זה מותר במיושן בלבד
			וכל כיוצא בזה
P.T. F. 26a line 24	after	בו תהנה	MS. omits, by <i>homoeoteleuton</i> :—
		לעולם	ובן המגרש את אשתו ונשבע או נדר
			שלא תהנה בו לעולם
"	"	" 30	MS. omits
		וישחה	MS. omits
		זו	MS. omits
"	"	" 32	MS. omits
		קונם	MS. omits
"	"	" 34	MS. לבית
		לביחו	MS. שהוא
		שהן	MS. omits
		אבל	MS. omits
"	"	" 36	MS. omits
		קונם	MS. omits
		שרי	MS. שרה
		לחרוש בידו הוא אסור	Ms. לחרוש הוא בידו והוא אסור
"	"	" 37	Ms. לה
		לו	

PS.—Since writing the note above, I have received a further letter from Father Lattey in which he states that St Mary's College was built on the site of an old Jesuit station and that the MS probably came there somewhere in the early eighteenth century.

H. LOEWE.

LOOFS' THEORY OF THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH AS A SOURCE OF IRENAEUS

II

Phrases peculiar to Irenaeus.

THIS is yet another test which can be profitably applied to the twenty-nine passages, and to other passages claimed for IQT by Loofs. There are first of all the genitive absolute and the figure chiasmus. Irenaeus has often strings of the former in passages Loofs allows are his or passes over, e.g. iii 17. 4 † 'spiritu descendente, veniente plenitudine temporis, Filio . . . incarnato, . . . implente, existente': i. 2. 6 * (supra) *συννευδοκουίντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς συνεπισφραγισμένου*; v 3. 3, * *παρέχοντος (θεοῦ), θεοῦ δυνατοῦ ὄντος . . . τῆς σαρκὸς δυναμένης*. Also note v 28. 2 † 'illo (diabolo) veniente, apostasiam recapitulante . . . operante . . . sedente,