



*ENGLISH ABSTRACTS*

**The Unique Place of Codex Munich 95 in the Version Tradition of  
Tractate Sukka**

*Rabin Shushtri*

No manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud is better known than the Munich Codex (Cod. Heb. 95). This manuscript is the only one containing the complete Talmud and Mishna. In addition, this manuscript had most of its tractates copied by R. Rabinowitz in his book *Dikdukei Sofrim*.

This article deals with the tradition of version of the Munich Codex for Tractate Sukka in the Babylonian Talmud. A methodical analysis of the manuscript's version for the tractate and its comparison to the other text witnesses of the tractate – both direct and indirect – reveals a complex yet interesting pattern regarding this manuscript. Although the chief version of this manuscript follows the Ashkenazi tradition, there were many versions found within that can be traced back to the early Eastern tradition. In many of the cases one can conclude with sufficient certainty that the specific version is the original and was revised already in the East. Another finding is of the many fused versions that exist in the manuscript.

These data teach us that the author of the Munich Codex (or one of his predecessors) had before him various codices of different origins and traditions. These conclusions are critical for the evaluation of the versions presented in the Munich Codex for Tractate Sukka. Much weight should be given to the versions of this manuscript and to the option that they may reflect an early, original Eastern tradition.

Abstracts

**‘This Fourth Part has been neither Copied nor Printed’:  
On the Identification of the Last Part of *Sha’are Qedusha***

*Avishai Bar-Asher*

*Sefer Sha’are Qedusha*, traditionally attributed to R. Hayyim Vital, has been transmitted, since its first edition, with a great deal of uncertainty as to the origination of its fourth and final section. Unlike the broad circulation of the central part of the composition, textual evidence of the final section was largely lost. It is generally assumed that this was due to a decision on the part of the editors of the composition: either that of the first editor, or even earlier by Vital’s manuscript copyist in Egypt.

Previous attempts to identify the lost fragment have involved copying and ascribing chapters from other minor texts as the fourth chapter of this significant work. In light of the contentious nature of this section, a critical analysis of this crucial fragment has to date not been attempted.

Through a close study of those remaining manuscripts, and the attention they have been afforded by other scholars, I reconstruct the textual and intellectual history of this mysterious abstract. I suggest that only the first chapter (Hebrew: *Sha’ar*) of the missing section has somehow survived. However, the remainder, if any of the attributions were authentic, has been lost. Furthermore, the other texts in the manuscripts attributed to *Sha’are Qedusha* were altogether unconnected to the original composition.

This study thus contributes to the publishing activity of Kabbalistic texts in this generation in general and to the investigation of this cryptic text in particular. Through a thorough study of the various editions of this text published in the last decades, I present what I term ‘the invention’ of a new composition, in which misattributions of the codex of manuscripts abound. In light of this I seek to reconfigure the fourth section through a study of the lost fragments of the fourth section.

## Abstracts

### **R. Isaac Aderbi's *Divrei Shalom*: Between Venice and Warsaw Editions**

*Shaul Regev*

R. Isaac Aderbi (Salonika, 16th century), a disciple of R. Joseph Taitazak, was known for two books that he wrote: *Divrei Rivot*, which was responsa, and *Divrei Shalom*, a book of sermons. *Divrei Shalom* was printed in three editions during the 16th century, the first edition in Salonika and the other two in Venice. In the 19th century, it was printed again in Warsaw. A comparison between the Warsaw edition and the other three show some significant changes made by the publisher in form and content, as a result of an arbitrary decision. The major changes are: (1) Interchanging between the first and second part of the book; (2) Transferring sermons or parts of sermons from the first part to the second part; (3) Omitting the third sermon of the first part for no obvious reason. As a result of this, there were corrections to be made in the cross references which the publisher ignored. (4) Disregarding information and notes written by the author or the proofreader of the previous editions. The publishers of the Warsaw edition did not leave any documentation to explain or justify their actions, or even to mention the changes that were made.

### ***Sefer HaZiquq* as a Source for Hebrew Bibliography**

*Gila Prebor*

One of the challenges of the field of Hebrew bibliography is the attempt to “reconstruct” Hebrew books that were printed but have become lost for various reasons. One of the sources from which we can learn about these lost books is *Sefer HaZiquq* by Domenico Yerushalmi. This article discusses the bibliographic structure of *Sefer HaZiquq* in comparison with the extant works known from the period and from lists of books. It also presents and analyzes the bibliographic details that come to light in *Sefer HaZiquq*.

## Abstracts

### **The Scandiano Synagogue Customs According to R. Joshua Segre**

*Shlomo E. Glicksberg*

The manuscript of prayer customs that this article presents was written by R. Joshua Segre in the 18th century (1740). It reflects the practices of prayer and Torah reading in the synagogue of the Almansi brothers in the city of Scandiano of those days. In his introduction, Segre emphasizes that he documents earlier practices and that he used earlier, similar compositions in his possession. In further writings of his, Segre presents a list of modifications to those original practices that he established during the years he spent serving the Scandiano community.

At first glance, this community seems to follow Italian customs. However, a deeper reading leads us to believe that this is a subset of Italian customs, including many differences to the standard practice as seen in the Italian prayer book. Many of these differences originate from the sefardic or ashkenazic customs. Others seem to be influenced by kabalistic writings. This research also compares the practices of the Scandiano congregation with those of Venice, Milan and Viadana, which was Segre's previous location. In addition, unique customs are pointed out.

### **The Genizah: Antonin's and Wertheimer's Collections**

*Meir Bar-Ilan*

This article aims to shed light on the early years of the Genizah manuscripts' publications by looking at the source of the manuscripts, some known to be from the Genizah while others came from an unknown source.

First, Archimandrite Antonin's (1817-1894) collection is discussed and later Rabbi S. Wertheimer's collection, showing similarities and differences between these collections. Their sources, as well as their middlemen, are discussed.

It is already known that R. Wertheimer published manuscripts from the Genizah before S. Schechter (1846-1915) did, but which was the first Ms.

[X]

*Alei Sefer 23, August 2013*



## Abstracts

from the Genizah to be published is not clear. It is suggested that the first scholar who published Mss. from the Genizah, without telling his source, was S. Pinsker (1801-1864), whose Mss. were given by his friend: A. Firkowiz (1787-1874). Pinsker books were published in 1860 and 1864 and it is assumed that his books are based on Mss. that came to Firkowiz from the Genizah.

### **The Habad Literary Corpus**

*Ariel Roth*

During the years of existence of Habad hassidism, extensive literature was created by scholars following the philosophy of RaSHaZ. The collective Habad literature has expanded so that today, the number of primary sources that can be associated to Habad hassidism exceeds three thousand titles. Furthermore, in our time, we address not only written literature but also information stored in other media.

The purpose of this research is to try and sift the extensive information. To examine criteria pursuant to which it will be possible to establish what is the Habad literary corpus, i.e., what is the literature that should be considered Habad literature, and who is the person whose products shall be identified as Habad philosophy. Within the framework of this question we shall try and offer several criteria which will allow identification of a written product or an oral statement as part of the Habad literary corpus. We shall suggest that this corpus alone serves as a source for Habad knowledge. This question is fundamental to the base of bibliographic, historic, contemplative or social research focusing upon the Habad hassidism.

Abstracts

**The Commentary on Proverbs by Joseph Caspi, its Edition by Isaac Last and Manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Hébreu 184**

Arlette Lipszyc-Attali

Isaac ben Joseph Last is known as the editor of a great number of works authored by the 14th century provincial philosopher Joseph Ibn Caspi. At the beginning of the 20th century, Last copied in European libraries and, almost single-handedly, published many of his commentaries. In consequence, Caspi became one of the few philosophers of his time known to students of Jewish studies.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Hébreu 184 is the only known copy of a commentary on Proverbs by Caspi and it was published by Last in Presbourg, 1903, pp. 7-80. In his introduction, the editor affirms that “he copied the manuscript as it is”.

When I described the manuscript for the New Catalogue, I compared the text with the edition and discovered that the two texts were not identical: the edition introduced divisions, the end of biblical verses and many other small differences.

There are other intriguing differences. The pagination, as well as the description of the manuscript, written about 1860 (thus well before the copy by Last), by Salomon Munk fit the manuscript as it is now. I discovered that two folios are lacking between ff. 142 and 143, corresponding to a lacuna extending from Prov. 13, 1 to 14, 3. The loss cannot have occurred after Last copied the manuscript. However, the edition gives, on pp. 46 to 48, a text which does not exist in the manuscript. No explanation is given by Last. Did Isaac Last forge these pages?

Abstracts

**A Review of the New Edition of the Book: *Tanya Rabbati***

*Gavriel Yitshak Ravenna*

A new edition of the book of *Halakhah* known as *Tanya Rabbati* was recently published by Mosad ha-Rav Kook. Although this edition includes an introduction, it does not provide all the relevant information, offers some inaccurate details, has incomplete bibliographic references and requires language editing. Facts are missing in regard to the various manuscripts and there is no discussion of the connections between them. Despite the preferential treatment given to one particular manuscript, this edition carries an eclectic signature. Certain erroneous 'corrections' were made to this version of the text, while, on several occasions, other relevant, attested versions are ignored; valuable source editions are not properly taken into account, negatively influencing the quality of the work. Many of the accompanying footnotes are too brief and lack the necessary information. Though this new edition is valuable as a useful edition, a better, corrected edition is still needed.