

PERSECUTION AND THE ART OF PRINTING



Hebrew Books in Italy in the 1550s

Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

IN his seminal *Early Modern Jewry*, David Ruderman surveys the role of the printed book in shaping early modern Jewish culture.¹ He begins with the publication of the *Shulḥan 'arukh*, suggesting that its writing, publication, and later expurgation represent an outstanding manifestation of print consciousness, and accordingly, marks a crucial moment in the Jewish transition to modernity. In this essay I would like to follow Ruderman's cue and expand on my own previous work on this topic,² to propose that the two decades before the publication of the *Shulḥan 'arukh* in 1565 represent a fundamental period in the history of Hebrew print and Hebrew culture.

About twenty years before the publication of the *Shulḥan 'arukh* in Venice, the Mishnah was published in 1546, also in Venice. By 1553, with the burning of the Talmud, the Venetian Hebrew printing industry was shut down, only to resume in 1565, the year of the publication of the *Shulḥan 'arukh*. When the Venetian firms were shuttered, Hebrew printing had to find other locations. As a result, many of the books to be discussed here were printed in shops established in other places, like Sabbioneta, Ferrara, Mantua, Cremona, and Riva di Trento.

In 1559, the same year in which the last burning of the Talmud took place in Cremona, two editions of the Mishnah were printed in different locations, the first in Riva di Trento, sponsored by Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, the Prince-Bishop of nearby Trent, where a few years later the third session of the Council of Trent

(1562–63) dedicated a formative discussion to the methods of control over the print industry. The second began in Sabbioneta in the print shop of Tuvia (Tobias) Foa. The publication of this edition was completed four years later in Mantua. Different in form and size, these two editions are nearly identical in terms of text and content. Both include the commentaries of Maimonides and R. Obadia of Bertinoro, the latter published for the first time a decade earlier and from then on included in most editions of the Mishnah. Another edition of the Mishnah was printed in 1560, also in Riva di Trento.

The brief span separating the burning of the Talmud with the printings of the Mishnah tells us that the Church distinguished clearly between the two works. To my knowledge, there is no extant Catholic statement of explicit recognition or toleration of the Mishnah. Still, its licit publication in a time of heightened Christian awareness of Jewish religious books is telling. Despite the fact that in burning a Talmud, the Mishnah is consumed as well, the Mishnah was evidently tolerated as an independent text. The act of burning might be viewed as one of purification, whereby the “authentic” was distinguished from the “demonic” and “blasphemous.” In precisely this same period the Mishnah attained a new and revolutionary status in the Jewish world, playing a crucial role in the cultural revival that took place in Safed and elsewhere in the mid-sixteenth century. Though this process happened independently, the publication of the Mishnah as a separate text, not embedded in the Talmud, marks a critical moment in the history of Jewish culture and religion and Jewish modernity. To date, historians who analyze the condemnation and burning of the Talmud, or those who deal with the history of the Hebrew book, have not paid attention to the concurrence of these events.³

The Mishnah was not the only major composition published between 1553 and 1559. The period is significant in the history of Hebrew printing, and witnesses the printing of several canonical Jewish books, some of them for the first time. Among them were the kabbalistic *Zohar*, the *Bet Yosef* by R. Yosef Karo that anticipates the soon-to-come *Shulḥan ‘arukh*, and editions of the midrashic anthology *‘En Ya‘akov*. Thus during the very years surrounding the burning of the Talmud, nearly the entire Hebrew canon (in form and content) was printed, including much “talmudic” literature extracted from the Talmud or built on it, constituting what could be considered the cornerstones of “the Jewish library” as we know it today.

By viewing the 1550s and early 1560s as a prism through which to examine the interrelations between printing, burnings, censorship, and cultural developments, I am not suggesting any simple causal links between these dimensions, such as, for example, that the printing of the *Zohar* or *Shulḥan ‘arukh* was directly caused by the Talmud burnings, or framing specific cultural developments as the immediate result of the printing of this or that text. Such linear analyses must remain tenuous at best. The historical dynamics at play are more complicated, and only by looking at a range of aspects together can we understand printing in its larger context. What I argue is that both the burnings and the publications mark, in two diametrically

opposite ways, the rise of a new awareness of the opportunities and implications embedded in the invention of print.

In many ways, this period represents a third formative period in the history of Hebrew printing, following the activities of the Soncino printers in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and the unique project of Daniel Bomberg, who established his print shop in Venice in 1516 and over four decades printed approximately two hundred compositions in Hebrew. In Bomberg's wake in Venice and the smaller cities where Hebrew printing reemerged in the 1550s, we see a series of entrepreneurs, printers, and editors whose explicit intention was to preserve the standards and layouts of his editions. Among them were editors previously employed by Bomberg. Indeed, as Isaiah Sonne and Meir Benayahu have pointed out, most of the products of the Conti press in Cremona were reproductions of the Venetian editions.⁴ Nevertheless, innovations do emerge in this period; during the period of the burnings, professionalization of the editing process evolved, new tools such as indices and references were integrated into printed editions, and official external surveillance and the practice of "expurgation" were first introduced. The printing professionals were well aware of their innovative role. This is clear from the title and colophon of R. Isaac of Corbeil's *Amude golah* (Pillars of exile), printed in Cremona in 1556:

The holy new work was undertaken in order to be of aid to the public. In comparison with the earlier edition, our edition is renovated and supplemented by recent and earlier notes as well as by references to biblical verses and talmudic passages, indicating in what chapter and in what leaf the latter are to be found.⁵

As Sonne commented, "the striking feature of this title is the special emphasis laid upon the innovations and supplements introduced by the editor. . . . Moreover, the editor paid special attention to the establishment of a correct text, using, as he states, seven manuscripts, so that to a certain extent the edition can be considered as a critical one." Sonne directs us to recognize the novel self-awareness of the editors that became part of the process of publication.⁶

The productions emerging from the Conti press in Cremona in particular evidence this new stage in the history of Hebrew printing. Working under the threat of the burning and within an atmosphere of increasing pressure, the press internalized the restrictions of the Church, and for the first time initiated a prepublication censorship. Books that were published there from 1557 carried the official permission of the censors.⁷ Sonne observed that editions that were more carefully censored were also more professionally and carefully edited.⁸

THE BURNING OF THE TALMUD

None of the above is meant to downplay the implications of the burnings and the continuous prohibitions on the publishing of the Talmud—each event remains crucial in the development of Jewish publishing for generations to come.⁹ Indeed,

looking backward, the prohibition, condemnation, and burning of the Talmud in the sixteenth century can be seen as a chain in a series of burnings that began in thirteenth-century Paris.¹⁰ But we should also notice the significant difference determined by the sixteenth century context. Kenneth Stow, who provided an illuminating analysis of papal anti-Jewish policy, argued that the measures taken by the Church against the Jews and their books expressed a shift from its traditional policy, and should be understood within the framework of Paul IV's messianic desire to bring about the conversion of the Jews.¹¹ Christians remained ambivalent about the project of converting the Jews, but following Stow we should recognize the new dimension implied by the burnings of the sixteenth century. It is important to note that the Talmud that was burnt was itself a new object; most of the copies that were set to fire were printed volumes. The content was ancient, but the product itself, the printed Talmud, and mainly the full Talmud, was new. The first stage in designing the printed page of the Talmud was presented in the tractates issued by Gershom Soncino, who inserted the major talmudic commentaries (Rashi and the Tosafot) on the pages of the Talmud itself.¹² But it was Bomberg who began the most important stage by publishing the entire Talmud and determining the talmudic page layout and its pagination. As was argued by Elchanan Reiner, the publication of the *full Talmud* produced a new kind of composition. Until then the focus of learning was the singular *sugya* (passage), but the publication of the entire Talmud immediately generated new ways of learning that focused on the Talmud as a text.¹³

This process reached its culmination only a few years before the burning. Between 1548 and 1551 Marco Antonio Giustinian published what has become the standard of all further editions. In this edition we can clearly see a growing awareness of print and editorial innovation that emerges in publications of this period. Though based on Bomberg's previous editions, the editor Yehoshua Boaz added crucial tools, such as *Masoret ha-talmud* (for talmudic and tosfist sources), *En mishpat* and *Ner mitsva* (for literature of codification), and *Torah or* (for biblical quotes). By making these additions he showcases the advantages of the printing press over the manuscript.¹⁴ Reiner showed that these improvements came as a response to the needs of the diverse students and readers who emerged after the appearance of Bomberg's full editions.¹⁵ Thus, we should remember that the standard Talmud was created only six years before its consignment to the flames.

No less important is the number of copies that were burnt. For comparison, no conclusive estimate for the number of manuscripts burnt in Paris is available, though Salo Baron suggests 12,000.¹⁶ Yet even the number of 1,200, mentioned by R. Hillel of Verona a few decades after the burning, seems very large, considering the number of manuscripts of the Talmud at that period. The burnings of the sixteenth century came after the publication of five editions of the full Talmud, preceded by a significant number of individual tractates. Although we cannot know the exact number of copies of each edition—with many assuming around 1500—or exactly how many remained in Italian cities rather than being distributed to other places, we can as-

sume that thousands of copies of Talmud tractates were extant in Italy by 1550. The quantity of books is important to appreciate the significance of the events, and the anxiety of the church created by the large distribution of the Talmud. The burnings that took place in central places in the Italian cities must have been spectacular events.

Nonetheless, the burning did not prevent the Talmud from remaining a main source of authority for the Jews. Moreover, as Reiner argues, the time of the Italian conflagrations is the same time that the Talmud reached its place as the core of study in Poland. Giustiniani's edition was even designed according to the needs of the Polish yeshivot.¹⁷

PRINTING THE MISHNAH

The Mishnah was not published for the first time in 1559–60, but its publication in such striking proximity to the burnings of the Talmud is significant. The Mishnah, together with a Hebrew translation of Maimonides' commentary, was first printed in 1492 in Naples, followed by a probably limited edition in 1515 in Pesaro. An important stage in the shaping of the standard version and form of the Mishnah took place in Venice in the 1540s, when two editions were printed. The first, based on the text of the Naples edition but with many corrections of errors of the earlier printing, was published by Giustiniani (1546–47), during the preparation for the later publication of the Babylonian Talmud.¹⁸ A year later (1548–49) the Mishnah was published by Meir Parenzo in the Venetian printing press of Antonio Querini, which included for the first time the commentary of R. Obadiah of Bertinoro. This would become standard in most later editions. Hence, this Venetian edition should be seen as the model of all future editions of the Mishnah. Accordingly, the 1559 editions themselves should be seen as a confirmation and hence canonization of the previous Venetian editions.

These two publications demonstrate simultaneously a new stage in the history of printing, and the dramatic shift in the reception of the Mishnah as an independent composition. As Yaakov Sussman proved in a seminal essay, the Mishnah as a distinctive composition had hardly any existence in most of the Jewish world, particularly in the Ashkenazi domain, from at least the end of the geonic period.¹⁹ Full mishnaic manuscripts numbered only three, all from medieval Italy, and may say something about the persistence of a Byzantine tradition. Moreover, aside from Maimonides' commentary of the Mishnah, the only other pre-fifteenth-century commentary is that of R. Samson of Sens who covered only those tractates to which there was no *Bavli*.²⁰ Several references, mainly from the fifteenth century, to the study of the Mishnah as a separate text exist in Spanish circles. Indeed, as Saul Lieberman demonstrated, "the Mishna was not published in writing" but was known through oral transmission from the *Tanna* (repeater, reciter) to his disciples, a fact worthy of consideration when dealing with the absence of manuscripts.²¹ Nonetheless, it seems that the Mishnah had hardly any independent status during the Middle Ages, a far

cry from its role in Jewish culture in the sixteenth century.²² The very publication of five editions of the composition in little over a decade demonstrates the growing popularity of the Mishnah.

A case in point was what transpired in Safed. Founded on the memory of the tannaim, and the link to the Mishnah and the *Zohar* (to be discussed below), Safed witnessed traditions of learning and ritualistic reciting of the Mishnah that had a fundamental role in the shaping of the self-perception of many of its prominent figures—R. Yosef Karo, R. Moshe ben Makhir and others.²³ The Mishnah was revealed to R. Yosef Karo during his work on his comprehensive legal projects. R. Yosef Ashkenazi (Ha-Tana, of Safed) renewed rituals of reciting and chanting individual mishnayot, and revised the text of the Mishnah (perhaps one of the Venetian editions), according to ancient manuscripts. This reached its most elaborate form with the arrival of R. Yitzhak Luria Ashkenazi (Ha-Ari) and the emergence of Lurianic Kabbalah. The importance of the Mishnah was also emphasized by a contemporary, R. Judah Loew ben Bezalel (Maharal of Prague), who ruled that a serious learning of the Mishnah as a separate book was to precede the study of the Talmud.

The commentary of R. Obadia of Bertinoro (1440–ca. 1530), who immigrated to Jerusalem in the early decades of the sixteenth century, is perhaps an early manifestation of this new mishnaic consciousness. His commentary was written after the advent of the printing press, and maybe with the intention that it would be printed. Following the publications of the Mishnah several commentaries appeared, e.g., that of Yitshak Gabbai and Yom Tov Lipmann Heller, later included in most editions. Yet, it was not printing itself that generated the new status of the Mishnah; rather, printing responded to an existing need and provided the tools for the Mishnah's future role in Jewish culture, its dispersion, and its new role in learning and ritual. In these rituals and practices, we see interestingly, that printing facilitated a renewal of the orality of tannaitic culture.²⁴

THE MISHNAH AND THE *ZOHAR*

In the same years, 1558–60, the *Zohar* (and previously other sections of zoharic literature) was published for the first time, and also in two editions, Mantua (three volumes, 1558–60) and Cremona (one volume, 1559). Unlike the printing of the Mishnah, the publication of the *Zohar* has received significant scholarly attention. So while the publication of the *Zohar* generated an intense debate, that of the Mishnah was accepted as natural although in fact it was no less revolutionary.

There are obvious differences between the two compositions. Unlike the case of the Mishnah, the two editions of the *Zohar* were not identical. In spite of differences between several textual traditions of the Mishnah, the compilation of the mishnaic text was ancient. On the other hand, as Daniel Abrams has shown and Boaz Huss has conclusively proven, the *Zohar* only became a “book” through its publication.²⁵ The very idea of the “Book of Zohar” did not exist previously. Print was crucial for its canonization and formation as an integral entity. As Huss showed, the printings

of the *Zohar* can be seen as a crucial stage in the gradual creation of a relatively standard edition.

Notwithstanding these differences, we should remember that the *Zohar* was, like the Mishnah, considered a tannaitic composition. Therefore, it is from some angles misleading to separate the discussion of these two compositions. The publication of the *Zohar* was not only permitted, but encouraged by Christian scholars. To a certain extent, it could be seen as a common project of Jews and Christians, the latter who considered it as an authoritative manifestation of Divine revelation and a crucial source of knowledge for the understanding of Christianity.²⁶ Such enthusiasm did not accompany the publication of the Mishnah, although this project was also a product of collaboration.

One of the enthusiastic supporters of the publication of the *Zohar* was the biblical scholar and Hebraist Sisto of Siena. Sisto, who was also the major figure in the campaign against the Talmud in Cremona, proudly claimed to have rescued 2000 copies of the *Zohar*.²⁷ Shifra Baruchson has challenged this number, but the important fact is Sisto's proud claim, which shows his sense of the stark distinction between the *Zohar* and the Talmud.²⁸ He may or may not have also encouraged the publication of the Mishnah, but it is improbable that he had no knowledge of it. In both cases his intention was to advance the conversion of the Jews, but in his attitude to these seminal Jewish texts, he demonstrated two seemingly contradictory aspects of the Christian Hebraist discourse: recognition (and even embrace) and condemnation.

THE REVELATION OF THE MISHNAH AND THE CODIFICATION OF THE LAW—R. YOSEF KARO

Unlike the Mishnah and the *Zohar*, the compositions of R. Yosef Karo were composed during this period. So while his efforts are the conclusion of a long process, the origins of which go back to the twelfth century with the appearance of Maimonides' codification, the *Mishneh torah*, from the start, Karo possessed a deep awareness of the implications and advantages of print. According to Karo's mystical diary (*Magid mesharim*), the Mishnah was revealed to him and directed him in his studies as he composed the *Bet Yosef* and the *Shulḥan 'arukh*.²⁹ Karo's project is therefore another example, or manifestation, of what we may call a "Mishnah consciousness." His commitment to the Mishnah did not come to replace the Talmud, but acted as a guide in reading the entire Jewish tradition, from the Talmud to the later halakhic literature.

The burning of the Talmud extended the *Bet Yosef's* role, as it contained a substantive number of quotations from the banned composition, and was thus perceived as an invaluable source of talmudic knowledge. Evidently, this was not the intention of the author and not the reason for its immediate reception as an ultimate authority. In fact, Karo began writing this work already in 1522, when he resided in Adrianople,³⁰ and the first two volumes printed in Venice and Sabbioneta in the years 1551 and 1553, respectively, precede the burnings. After the decree against the Talmud, its

publication was interrupted, only to be completed several years later; the last two volumes were published in Sabbioneta and Cremona in 1558 and 1559 respectively.

The *Shulḥan 'arukh* was composed in Safed over a period of four years (1555–59), and while far away from the Italian cities in which the Talmud was burnt, its composition was certainly impacted by the violent measures and new restrictions. Unlike the *Bet Yosef*, it does not include the entire halakhic apparatus, but brings the conclusions and exact decisions concerning each of the commandments. The *Shulḥan 'arukh* instantly became a best seller, and since its first publication it has been recognized as the authoritative presentation of Jewish law.³¹

The *Shulḥan 'arukh* embodies many aspects associated with the advent of print, such as unification, distribution, the rise of new codes, new communities of readers, and the standardization of textual traditions and praxis. Karo was an obvious, albeit exceptional example, of “a new author,” who was well aware of the advantages and restrictions of print. The explicit purpose of the book was popularization—namely to make the law available to both scholars and lay people—and the author was well aware that it would be quickly disseminated throughout the Jewish world, and hoped that it would bring unification and consensus.

The first edition of the *Shulḥan 'arukh* appeared in 1565, a year after the publication of the *Index of Trent* (1564), which significantly reduced the number of prohibited books and also introduced a system of permanent surveillance based on the principle of expurgation, the removal or revision of certain paragraphs as a condition for a book's publication. The *Shulḥan 'arukh* was therefore one of the first Hebrew books to be revised *before* publication. The work that reflected the reshaping of Jewish tradition appeared at the same time and in the same context in which Catholic boundaries and ecclesiastical institutions were also being shaped.

The concurrence of the arrival of the *Shulḥan 'arukh* manuscript to the Venetian printing press (Di Gara) and the introduction of censorship should not be seen as merely coincidental: both were part and parcel of the same process associated with the professionalization of publication. Moreover, the publication of the *Shulḥan* was delayed for several years. It was compiled in four years (1555–59; in each of which Karo completed one volume), but was published only several years later.³² We have no evidence concerning the reason for this delay, but one conjecture is that the temporary closure of the Venetian Hebrew printing houses was partially responsible. We may assume that Karo believed that explicit permission from the Catholic authorities would prevent any further objection.

The act of unification in the codification, was, however, also an act of division, as shortly after its appearance R. Moshe Isserles (the ReMa) published the *Mapa* (Table Cloth) to the *Shulḥan 'arukh* (Set Table). An interpretation and supplement to the *Shulḥan*, the *Mapa* also challenged Karo's claim to universal authority by introducing Ashkenazi traditions and customs that differed from the *Shulḥan's* Sephardic tradition. But, as Reiner demonstrated, it was Isserles who established the status of the *Shulḥan 'arukh* as the authoritative text. In most editions since 1574, the *Shulḥan* has

been printed with the *Mapa*, thus creating an interesting tension that was realized on the printed page.³³

To complete this short survey, mention should be made of the republication of Ibn Habib's *'En Ya'akov* as another venue for making talmudic material available in the aftermath of the burnings. The collection of talmudic aggadot was compiled by Ibn Habib following the Spanish expulsion, and was first published in Salonica in 1516. He presented this project as a completion to the literature of codification and stated that "Alfasi and later codifiers took upon themselves the task of assembling and conveying in clear and understandable manner all the halakhot. It is also important to gather the aggadot in which the profound thoughts of our sages are concealed."³⁴ It was published again in Venice in 1546, and then condemned and burned together with the Talmud. But later its publication was permitted, and it was republished in 1566, under the title *'En Yisrael*. The imposed title change can be read as a new status of the Jews: not the Chosen People (Jacob), but an ethnic group with its special code, Israel.

CONCLUSION

Needless to say this presentation is partial, as it could only concentrate on a few of the dozens of works printed during this period in Venice and then elsewhere. Yet, the outline may contribute to our understanding of the cultural meaning to be found in the selection of titles and their editions during the period surrounding the burning of the printed Talmud. The main titles, perceived as representative of the traditional Jewish canon, were published for the first time in this period, and thus should be seen tied to the beginning of Modernity. The publication of the Mishnah during the time of the burnings of the Talmud is a critical case in point that may enrich our understanding of the cultural development of the period. Moreover, we have alluded to the growing distinction made by Christians between the Mishnah and the Talmud, which later became crucial in reshaping Jewish discourse. On many occasions this distinction served attempts to refute the authority of the Talmud, and among extreme secularist approaches, which did not make such a distinction, to undermine talmudic literature altogether.³⁵

Notes

1. David B. Ruderman, *Early Modern Jewry: A New Cultural History* (Princeton, N.J., 2010).
2. Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, "Legislation, Messianism, and Censorship: Printing the Shulkhan Aruch as the Beginning of Modernity," in *Tov Elem: Memory, Community, and Gender in Jewish Communities in the Middle Ages and in the Beginning of the New Age: Articles in Honor of Reuven Bonfil*, ed. E. Baumgarten, R. Weinstein, and A. Raz-Krakotzkin (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 2011), 306–35. An earlier, English version was printed as "From Safed to Venice: The Shulhan Arukh and the Censor," in *Tradition, Heterodoxy and Religious Culture: Judaism and Christianity in the Early Modern Period*, ed. C. Goodblatt and H. Kreisel (Beer Sheva, 2007), 91–115. See also Yaacob Dweck, "What is a Jewish Book?" *AJS Review* 34.2 (2010): 367–75.

3. Judith Thomanek's analysis of the postpublication censorship of a copy of Riva di Trento's edition (1558–59), helped to highlight this disjunctive moment. Judith Thomanek, "Dies ist die *Mishna* des Giuseppe Salvador Ottolenghi: Zu Druck, Besitzer, Zensor und Zensur eines hebräischen Buches aus dem 16. Jahrhundert," in *Zwischen Zensur und Selbstbesinnung: Christliche Rezeptionen des Judentums*, ed. C. Böttrich, J. Thomanek and T. Willi (Frankfurt aM, 2009), 93–123. Some of the ideas elaborated here were first presented as a lecture in Greifswald, later published as "Printing, Burning and Censorship: Hebrew Books in Italy in the 1550s," *Judaica: Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums* 66.1 (2010): 1–13. I would like to thank Dr. Thomanek and Prof. Thomas Willi for the opportunity to discuss these issues.

4. Isaiah Sonne, "Expurgation of Hebrew Books: The Work of Jewish Scholars," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 46 (1942): 993–96; Meir Benayahu, *Hebrew Printing in Cremona: Its History and Bibliography* (Hebrew, Jerusalem, 1971).

5. As quoted in Sonne, "Expurgation," 999.

6. See Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Stanford, Calif., 1994).

7. Chartier, *The Order of Books*, 74–86; Sonne, "Expurgation," 994–95.

8. Sonne, "Expurgation," 994–95.

9. Fernando Bravo López, "Continuity and Change in Anti-Jewish Prejudice: The Transmission of the Anti-Talmudic Texts of Sixtus of Siena," *Patterns of Prejudice* 45.3 (2011): 225–40.

10. See Solomon Grayzel, "The Talmud and the Medieval Papacy," in *Essays in Honor of Solomon B. Freehof*, ed. W. Jacob et al. (Pittsburgh, 1964), 20–45; Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982); Robert Chazan, "The Condemnation of the Talmud Reconsidered (1239–1248)," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 55 (1988): 11–30. On the exact date of the burning, see recently Paul Lawrence Rose, "When was the Talmud Burnt at Paris? A Critical Examination of the Christian and Jewish Sources and a New Dating: June 1241," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 62.2 (2011): 324–37.

11. Kenneth R. Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy, 1555–1593* (New York, 1977).

12. Marvin J. Heller, *Printing the Talmud: A History of the Earliest Printed Editions of the Talmud* (Brooklyn, 1992); Raphael Nathan Neta Rabinowitz, *An Essay on the Printing of the Talmud* (Hebrew; Munich, 1877), 9–32; Elisheva Carlebach, "The Status of the Talmud in Early Modern Europe," in *Printing the Talmud: From Bomberg to Schottenstein*, ed. S. Liberman Mintz and G. M. Goldstein (New York, 2005), 81.

13. Elchanan Reiner, "The Printed Talmud: A Project of Modern Jewish Culture," unpublished lecture.

14. Edward Fram, "In the Margins of the Text: Changes in the Page of the Talmud," Mintz and Goldstein, *Printing the Talmud*, 91–96.

15. Reiner, "The Printed Talmud."

16. Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (New York, 1970), 9:270, n. 10. Baron based his conclusion on the descriptions of twenty-four wagonloads of books. See Cohen, *The Friars*, 64, n. 23.

17. Elchanan Reiner, "Transformations in the Polish and Ashkenazi *Yeshivot* during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Dispute over *Pilpul*," in *Ke-Minbag Ashkenaz u-Polin: Sefer Yovel le-Khane Shmeruk*, ed. I. Bartal, C. Turniansky, and E. Mendelsohn (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1993), 9–80.

18. The printers of Naples were aware of the errors, occasioned by the use of a manuscript of Maimonides' commentary, where at times the mishnaic text was replaced by the Hebrew translation of Maimonides' Arabic formulations. In these cases Parenzi in Venice used the mishnaic text that existed in the Bavli. See Jacob N. Epstein, *Introduction to the Mishnaic Text* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 2000 [1948]), 2:1275–80.

19. Yaakov Sussman, "Manuscripts and Text Traditions of the Mishnah" (Hebrew), *World Congress of Jewish Studies 7 (Studies in the Talmud, Halacha and Midrash)* (1981): 215–50.
20. Paradoxically, this tendency grew in the first stages of print. While in most manuscripts, the entire chapter of the Mishnah was placed at the head of the chapter in the Talmud, Soncino placed the text of the Mishnah before each talmudic chapter. See Carlebach, "The Status of the Talmud," 81.
21. Saul Lieberman, "The Publication of the Mishna," in Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1962), 83–99.
22. On the revolution in the status and significance of the Mishnah, see Aaron Ahrend, "Mishna Study and Study Groups in Modern Times" (Hebrew), *Jewish Studies, An Internet Journal* 3 (2004): 19–53.
23. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo. Lawyer and Mystic* (London, 1962); Ronit Meroz, "The Circle of R. Moshe ben Makhir and Its Regulations" (Hebrew), *Pe'amim* 31 (1987): 40–71.
24. See Haviva Pedaya, *Nachmanides: Cyclical Time and Holy Text* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 2003).
25. Boaz Huss, *The Radiance of the Sky: Chapters in the Reception History of the Zohar and the Construction of Its Symbolic Value* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 2008). See also Huss, "Sefer ha-Zohar as a Canonical, Sacred and Holy Text: Changing Perspectives on the Book of Splendor between the Thirteenth and the Eighteenth Centuries," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 7 (1998): 257–307. See also Daniel Abrams, "The Invention of the Zohar as a Book: On the Assumptions and the Expectations of the Kabbalists and Modern Scholars," *Kabbalah: Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 19 (2004): 7–142.
26. Huss, *The Radiance*, 236–41. François Secret, *Les Kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1964).
27. On Sisto da Siena, see Fausto Parente, "Alcune osservazioni preliminari per una biografia di Sisto Senese: Fu realmente Sisto un Ebreo convertito?," in *Gli ebrei in Italia tra Rinascimento e Età barocca* (Rome, 1986), 211–31; Parente, "Quelques contributions à propos de la biographie de Sixte de Sienna et de sa (prétendue) culture juive," in *Les Églises et le Talmud. Ce que les Chrétiens savaient du judaïsme (XVIIe-XIXe siècles)*, ed. D. Tollet (Paris, 2006), 57–94. Parente proved unequivocally that the claim that Sisto was a convert was unfounded.
28. Benayahu, *Hebrew Printing*, 201. Shifra Baruchson-Arbib, *Books and Readers: The Reading Interests of Italian Jews at the Close of the Renaissance* (Hebrew; Ramat Gan, 1993), 41.
29. Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo*. For an analysis of Karo's messianic approach and its expression in his legal project see Rachel Elijor, "R. Joseph Karo and R. Israel Ba'al Shem Tov: Mystical Metamorphosis, Kabbalistic Inspiration and Spiritual Internalization" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 65 (1996): 671–709, Mor Altshuler, "Prophecy and Maggidism in the Life and Writing of R. Joseph Karo," *Frankfurter judaistische Beiträge* 33 (2006): 81–110.
30. According to his testimony at the end of the last volume, *hoshen mishpat* (Sabbioneta, 1558).
31. For a more detailed discussion see Raz-Krakotzkin, "Legislation."
32. Reuven Margalio, "The First Prints of the *Shulchan Aruch*," in *Rabbi Yosef Karo: Insights and Studies in the Mishnah of the Maran of the Shulchan Aruch*, ed. Y. Raphael (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1969), 89–100; Meir Benayahu, *R. Yosef Behiri* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1991).
33. Elchanan Reiner, "The Ashkenazi Élite at the Beginning of the Modern Era: Manuscript versus Printed Book," *Polin* 10 (1997): 85–98.
34. Quoted in Marvin J. Heller, *The Sixteenth Century Hebrew Book: An Abridged Thesaurus* (Leiden, 2004), 93. On Ibn Ḥabīb's work and its reception, see Marjorie Lehman, *The En Yaaqov: Jacob Ibn Ḥabīb's Search for Faith in the Talmudic Corpus* (Detroit, 2012).
35. One area not covered directly in this essay is the important relationship between print and the place of the Mishnah in Christian Hebraism. The frequent citation of the Mishnah by

these Hebraists, who, to my knowledge, did not distinguish from the Talmud, leads me to think that they may have been working from printed Mishnayot, not the entire Talmud. For related discussions, compare: my “Legislation;” other important studies which bear on this discussion are Theodor Dunkelgrün, “The Multiplicity of Scripture: The Confluence of Textual Traditions in the Making of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible” (Ph.D. diss.; University of Chicago, 2012), 147, n. 55; A. Kuyt and E. G. L. Schrijver, “Translating the Mishnah in the Northern Netherlands: A Tentative Bibliographie Raisonnée,” in *History and Form: Dutch Studies in the Mishnah*, ed. A. Kuyt and N. A. Van Uchelen (Amsterdam, 1988), 1–42; Chanan Gafni, *The Mishnah’s Plain Sense: A Study of Modern Talmudic Scholarship* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 2011).