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The Preservation of Hebrew Books by Christians in the Pre-Reformation German Milieu

Abstract: The main aim of this article is to provide an overview of how German humanists and Hebraists formed their Hebraica collections around 1500, ranging from less than a dozen Hebrew codices to several hundred volumes in mid-16th-century humanist libraries. The period in question is actually one of the earliest encounters that Christians had with a great number of Jewish books, and reflects earlier Christian conceptions of Jewish literature as well as predetermining those to come. First, the article analyses the modes and channels for the acquisition of Hebraica by Christians and the difficulties involved in such a task, which had serious implications for the scope and character of Christian Hebraica collections. It then traces the dissemination of Jewish texts among Christians according to the texts’ genres and discusses their Christian uses. Christian additions to and modifications of Hebrew texts reflected polemics, appreciation and appropriation, and as a whole effected the transition of the Hebrew book from a Jewish to a Christian object.

A Hebrew book of any religious content was a sacred object in Jewish life and yet a controversial object in the eyes of a Christian owner. For the latter, it was a desired artefact that had to be preserved on the grounds of its great value for humanist and Hebraist studies, but at the same time it was also a repository of false beliefs and blasphemy that needed to be polemicised and even destroyed. These two seemingly conflicting qualities of Jewish religious and cultural traditions were reflected in the ways in which Christians collected and treated Hebrew books.

The period in question represents one of the most formative stages in the history of Christian collecting of Hebraica, from less than a dozen Hebrew codices in the 15th-century German collections to several hundred volumes in mid-16th-century humanist libraries. The rise of early Hebraica collections was intimately related to 15th-century persecutions and expulsions of Jews from many German cities. As a result of the expulsions, Christians realised that Hebrew books, which were necessary for their own scholarly studies, would become scarce and soon vanish altogether. On the other hand, paradoxically, it was precisely the expulsions and confiscations of Jewish property that opened a channel for the acquisition of Hebrew manuscripts by Christians. Prior to these campaigns, Jews had...
rarely co-operated with non-Jews when it came to Hebrew books, but after the expulsions, many Hebrew codices were left behind by them and became available to Christian book collectors. In this situation, two main factors that were decisive for forming early Christian Hebraica collections were brought together: the necessity to preserve Hebrew books for Hebraist scholarship and the relative availability of such works in a Christian environment.

In what follows, I would like to present some considerations regarding the modes of transition and dissemination of Hebrew books among Christians in the period of diminishing Jewish urban presence in the German milieu. Drawing on analyses of the original Hebrew codices which were found in Christian libraries at that time, I will examine the implications of such transition and dissemination modes for the character of early Hebraica collections and for Christian conceptions of Jewish literature in general.

An indicative example of the post-expulsion provenance of Hebrew manuscripts in Christian libraries is given by a collection of eight biblical and liturgical Hebrew codices (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek [BSB], Chm 14, 16, 21, 69, 88, 90, 298 and 410) from the library of the Nuremberg physician and humanist Hartmann Schedel (1440–1514), who was well known in his time, being the compiler of the Nuremberg *Liber chronicarum* (*The Book of Chronicles*).¹ One of his codices, a tiny, mutilated *siddur* on parchment produced in Franconia c. 1300 (BSB, Chm 410), bears an inscription which directly links it to the expulsion. The *siddur* was inscribed by Schedel on its second back flyleaf (foliated as fol. 262v):

Iste liber hebraicus post expulsionem hebreorum ex Babenberga in sinagoga eorum (que postea consecrata fuit in pulchram capellam) repertus est. Hunc librum fratre ordinis praedicatorum mihi hartmanno Schedel doctori dono dederunt anno domini etc. 1502 die 27. Novembris Babenberge. Quem laceratum decorari feci ad laudem excelsi.

This Hebrew book was discovered after the expulsion of the Jews from Bamberg in their synagogue (which was sanctified afterwards as a beautiful chapel). Brothers of the preaching order [Dominicans] gave this book to me, Doctor Hartmann Schedel, as a gift in 1502 CE, on 27 November in Bamberg. I have had this torn book restored in praise of the Sublime One.

The words ‘Iste liber hebraicus...’ indicate that due to Schedel’s lack of command of the Hebrew language, he most likely had no idea that this was a prayer book, otherwise he would have recorded its title, as he usually did with his non-Hebrew books.² Yet as a historian and book collector, it was important for Schedel to

¹ Walde 1916, 186–90.
² As for Schedel’s command of Hebrew, see Stauber 1908, 50; Walde 1916, 186.
document the circumstances in which he had received the book. Thus he recorded the precise details, including the book’s source, the expulsion of the Jews from Bamberg and the transformation of their synagogue. On the other hand, his note does not appear to be dry documentation for its own sake; rather, by recording this particular information, Schedel eventually created a conceptual chain of events in which appropriation of Hebrew books and conversion of synagogues into churches formed an integral part of the expulsions.3

The synagogue in Bamberg that he referred to had been erected in the mid-13th century. It was apparently confiscated by the authorities in 1422 and rebuilt as the Marienkapelle (Chapel of the Virgin Mary), which was documented as ‘Unsere Lieben Frau Kapellen’ for the first time in 1428. It was rebuilt again in 1470 as a larger structure, namely Marienkirche.4 Therefore, the expulsion of Jews from Bamberg mentioned by Schedel might be the event that occurred in 1422. It is not clear to what extent the authorities implemented the expulsion order, however, since it was followed by other expulsions as well, the latest one being in 1478.5

The battered condition of the siddur, as well as of Schedel’s other Hebrew manuscripts, suggests that the manuscripts came from synagogue genizot appropriated by Christians after the expulsions. The siddur was most probably found by the Dominicans in the geniza of Bamberg’s synagogue. This hypothesis is supported by Schedel’s statement that the manuscript had been found in a torn condition and he had then restored it. My examination of the manuscript revealed that the beginning, end and certain other quires were missing and that the margins of some of the leaves were torn, as in fols 259–260. A strip of different parchment pasted into the margin in order to fill in a gap was apparently added by Schedel as part of the manuscript’s restoration. The fact that Schedel personally attended to the material condition of his Hebrew codices reflects his approach towards Hebrew books, treating them as precious artefacts whose importance went well beyond the texts they contained. By restoring the manuscripts in his possession, Schedel demonstrated that cultural objects of this kind needed to be nurtured and preserved carefully in their entirety.

On the basis of this siddur and other Hebrew manuscripts from Schedel’s library, which were not discussed here, the timing of Schedel’s collection of his Hebrew codices (1500–1504) after the Jewish expulsions from Bamberg and his hometown, Nuremberg, in 1499 appears to be crucial.6 The expulsions not only
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3 For further discussion on this point, see Steimann 2014, 146–150.
5 Schmidt 1989, 137ff; Eberhardt/Hamm/Kraus 2007, 73.
6 See Steimann 2014, 40–47 regarding the dating of Schedel’s acquisitions.
provided the actual channel for this collecting, but its specific reason, a fact that left a certain imprint on its character and nature. The expulsion was one of the most important events in the German milieu at the end of the 15th century, and it obviously attracted heightened attention to the Jews and their books. Despite the fact that practical use of Jewish books for any kind of interaction with the Jews was no longer relevant after this momentous event, Christians were aware of the importance of Hebrew codices for Christian Hebrew scholarship. At the same time, they re-evaluated the potential of the original Jewish sources in understanding the hidden sides of Jewish life allegedly related to secret ritual practices – the aspects which often served as the reason for expulsions, strengthening the conceptual linkage between the expulsions and Christian collections of Hebraica.

In the case of collectors like Schedel, who did not understand any Hebrew or look for any particular books, but were interested in Jewish literature in general, the Hebrew codices incorporated in their libraries were acquired from whatever was available in their immediate environment. These acquisitions, although reflecting efforts at finding Hebrew books, were therefore rather occasional in nature and do not indicate any particular priorities with regard to the books’ content on the part of the collectors. The most widespread works were Pentateuchs (Toras) and prayer books due to their wide use in Jewish communities. Thanks to their high demand among Jews, the production of such texts in mediaeval Ashkenaz was proportionally much higher than that of any other Jewish texts, leading to their high representation in Christian libraries after the expulsions.

The confiscations for their part constituted another channel for the acquisition of Hebrew books by Christians in the mediaeval and early-modern periods. As early as the 13th century, the authorities confiscated Hebrew books in order to examine them as part of a process of condemning post-biblical Jewish literature.7 Around 1500, the confiscations of Hebrew books widely implemented by the authorities were motivated by their ‘anti-Christian’ content, such as curses and terms of mockery used against Christians that were supposedly found in post-biblical Jewish literature.8 These indictments focused on the Talmud as the chief cause of the Jews’ obstinacy in their perfidy. In 1509, for example, Johann Pfefferkorn, a convert from Judaism (c. 1469–1521) strongly supported by the Dominican order, persuaded Emperor Maximilian I to issue a decree ordering the confiscation of all Jewish books except the Hebrew Bible. The aim of this action was to put

7 Cohen 1984, 56–60; Chazan 1989, 23.
8 Deutsch 2010, 42–43.
an end to the practice of Judaism. Pfefferkorn claimed that the post-biblical literature of the Jews, especially the Talmud, contained blasphemous and heretical material and represented the main obstacle to Jewish conversion to Christianity. In his view, this was why all Jewish books should be confiscated, examined and destroyed if necessary.

Pfefferkorn’s battle against Jewish literature proceeded in several stages and involved a good number of prominent people, including the Emperor, the Archbishop of Mainz, the papal inquisitor Jakob von Hoogstraeten, theologians from several German universities and individual experts, among whom was Pfefferkorn’s main opponent, Johann Reuchlin, the famous German jurist, scholar and Hebraist (1455–1522). In Reuchlin’s Gutachten (‘expert opinion’), which served as the basis of his book Augenspiegel (Eye Glasses), published in 1511, the scholar formulated a legal and theological defence of Jewish writings. He argued that Jewish books posed no threat to Christianity, and emphasised their benefits for Christian scholarship. This was the first in a line of publications stemming from the particular question of the Jews’ right to keep their own books, which grew into a humanist/scholastic confrontation and eventually caused Reuchlin to face a trial on the grounds of ‘heresy’ (1514). Another effect of this famous book controversy, as noted by Jerome Friedman, was to bring the question of Hebrew books to the forefront of humanist attention and thereby to promote the study and publication of Hebraica by Christians. While the Reuchlin affair stimulated an increase in the production of Christian Hebraica, it nonetheless appears that the affair itself only happened because of the pre-existing Christian fascination with Hebrew books.

As for the actual fate of Jewish books, Pfefferkorn succeeded in confiscating around 1,500 volumes from synagogues and private holdings in Frankfurt am Main, Worms and smaller Jewish communities in the Rhineland area before his campaign came to an end. The confiscation was supposed to be carried out in accordance with a list of wanted books compiled by Pfefferkorn, but in reality he also seized books that were not on his list at all. The list included prayer books (siddurim, mahzorim and selihot), two polemical anti-Christian works, Sefer Niṣṣaḥon (The Book of Victory) and Toledot Yeshu (The History of Jesus), of which he found no copies, Talmudic tractates and commentaries, works of bib-
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10 O’Callaghan 2012, 105–197.
13 Shamir 2011, 111.
lical exegesis, *minhagim* and halakhic literature.15 Pfefferkorn’s list of wanted books has not survived, unfortunately, but a similar list was published by him in a tract called *Zu lob und ere*... [Pfefferkorn 1510, fol. A viii].16 Some central works of Jewish literature were omitted, however – of the thirty-seven tractates of the Babylonian Talmud, for instance, he only included thirteen in his list, which were found to contain blasphemous sections mentioned by earlier Christian authors. Hence, their selection by Pfefferkorn depended on his knowledge of Christian anti-Talmudic literature rather than of Jewish tradition.17 Ultimately, after several waves of confiscations, the books were returned to their Jewish owners (in less than a month, in fact). However, one may presume that some volumes remained in Christian hands, thus opening or maintaining a channel for the preservation of Hebrew books by Christians.

About two decades earlier, a group of forty-three Hebrew manuscripts had been confiscated in Regensburg. This confiscation was possibly related to the accusation that local Jews had conspired with those of Trent to perform the ritual murder of a child called Simon (1475), as a result of which a number of Regensburg Jews were imprisoned. However, no direct links between the imprisonment and this particular confiscation are found in the sources;18 some books were mentioned among the confiscated property of the imprisoned Jews of Regensburg, albeit without their titles.19

Under these circumstances, the confiscation focused mainly on Jewish liturgy, the Talmud and Talmudic commentaries. The confiscated group of texts represents a thematic collection from different sources (some texts appearing more than once) rather than the library of any one person: it included three copies of the *Berakhot* tractate from *Seder Zera’im* (Seeds), the *Shabbat*, *Eruvin*, *Pesaḥim* tractates, two copies of *Rosh ha-Shana* tractate and the *Sukka* and *Megilla* tractates from *Seder Mo’ed* (Festival) as well as some associated commentaries, *Seder Nashim* (Women) and its tractates *Ketubot*, *Giṭṭin* and *Qiddushin* along with commentaries on them, *Baba Meṣia*, *Sanhedrin*, *Makkot*, *Shevu’ot* and *Horayot* from *Seder Neziqin* (Damages), some of which were only represented by their commentaries, *Seder Qodashim* (Holy Things) and its tractate *Ḥulin*, three copies of the *Nidda* tractate from *Seder Ṭohorot* (Purities), a *maḥzor* for Rosh ha-Shana, Yom

16 For more details about the list of confiscated books, see Kracauer 1900, 320–332, 423–430 and 455–460; Shamir 2011, 109–111.
17 Shamir 2011, 46–47.
18 Ocker 2006, 48–49.
19 See Volkert 1982, 115–141.
Kippur and Sukkot, a siddur, a register to supplement the Pentateuch, and an unspecified miscellany.\textsuperscript{20} It is worth noting that nine of the thirteen Talmudic tractates named in Pfefferkorn’s list of wanted books appear here. This suggests that the confiscation was guided by principles similar to Pfefferkorn’s and that these principles were certainly not his own invention.\textsuperscript{21}

After this confiscation was carried out, the manuscripts that had been taken passed into the hands of Duke Albrecht of Bavaria-Munich. Through the intermediacy of a Dominican monk called Peter Schwarz, alias Petrus Nigri (c. 1435–83), who preached in Regensburg in this very period (1474/5),\textsuperscript{22} they were donated to the Dominican Abbey in Regensburg in 1476 where Petrus’s brother Johannes Nigri was serving as prior.\textsuperscript{23} The manuscripts were donated to the Abbey on condition they would not be sold, but only exchanged for other valuable Jewish writings if need be. Two Hebrew manuscripts – a lexicon on the Talmud based on the Arukh by Natan ben Yeḥiʾel and commentaries on the Prophets (BSB, Chm 390 and 391 respectively), which derive from the Regensburg Dominican Abbey, but do not appear in Nigri’s list – might be a result of such an exchange carried out by the monks after 1476.\textsuperscript{24} The role of Petrus Nigri in this affair was not limited to intermediacy alone, however; he also acted as an adviser in all matters connected with Hebrew manuscripts. Thanks to his mastery of the Hebrew language, Nigri was initially called upon by the duke to assist in the manuscripts’ valuation. Nigri, in turn, was assisted by an otherwise unknown Jew by the name of David of Eichstätt, who estimated the price of the manuscripts at thirty guldens, a sum that hardly anyone would have been able to pay.\textsuperscript{25} As in the case of the acquisition of Hebrew books by Christians, Jewish assistance and expertise were also necessary here, even if the Christian purchaser/intermediary was familiar with the Hebrew language.\textsuperscript{26} Although it is unlikely, some scholars even presume that David of Eichstätt was the original owner of the confiscated collection.\textsuperscript{27}

As was mentioned previously, most of the manuscripts in the donated group contained tractates from the Talmud, which according to Nigri was a cursed book and should be burnt (Nigri 1477, fol. [309r]). In reality, however, as follows from this episode, they were considered to be extremely valuable and of great import-
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ance in anti-Jewish polemics, hence they had to be preserved by Christians. If expulsions provided Christian libraries with a range of Hebrew biblical and liturgical books, in the case of confiscations specifically focused on allegedly blasphemous literature, the texts that passed into Christian hands were mainly of this sort (although not exclusively). Different ways of obtaining Hebrew books led to different results, and the means of the Hebrew books’ acquisition consequently had direct implications for the scope and character of Christian Hebrew book collections. It appears, then, that around 1500, Hebrew books often were not obtained directly from Jews, but from other Christians who were not always knowledgeable in Hebrew, but had nonetheless received them as a result of the confiscations and expulsions. Once Hebrew books passed into Christian hands, they were re-used, depending on their condition, or else re-sold, exchanged or given to other Christians as gifts. Such books were rarely returned to Jews later. Many of these Christian acquisitions were rather occasional and depended greatly on books’ availability in the collectors’ immediate environments, which increased with confiscations and expulsions, creating an important channel for the preservation of Hebrew books in Christian libraries.

Unlike the Jewish books that ended up in Christian hands as a result of persecutions, in the case of Hebraist scholars who could read Hebrew, had contact with converts from Judaism and knew Jews ready to co-operate with Christians, the acquisitions were by no means haphazard. These men looked out for specific titles known to them from earlier Christian and Jewish sources and were able to acquire them with the help of Jewish intermediaries. Even so, such collections north of the Alps were not particularly rich in their choice of texts and were extremely limited in number. One of the largest private Hebraica collections around 1500, which was rather exceptional for the period, was kept in Johann Reuchlin’s library. It contained around fifty volumes of manuscripts and printed books of nearly all genres of Jewish literature. One of Reuchlin’s first Hebrew codices was a lexicon based on the *Maḥberet* of Menahem ben Saruq (BSB, Chm 425, fols 136r–167v) copied for him in 1486 by an otherwise unknown but apparently learned German Jew named Calman, with whom Reuchlin began to learn Hebrew in the 1480s. In the following years, Reuchlin continued his Hebrew studies under the guidance of two Jewish scholars of Italian origin, Yaʿaqov Loans (Jacob ben Jechiel), son of Yeḥiʾel Loans (died c. 1506), the private physician of Emperor Friedrich III, and the biblical commentator ‘Ovadya (Ovadia), son of Yaʿaqov Sforno (c. 1475–1550). Apparently, both men also served as mediators,
acquiring books for his library of Hebraica. Many of Reuchlin’s Hebrew books were therefore obtained in Italy. South of the Alps, ‘semi-neutral’ encounters between Jews and Christians could take place due to scholarly Jewish humanists such as Ya’aqov Loans, ‘Ovadya Sforno and others who were trained in Western philosophy and sciences, giving them a common basis for contact with Christian humanists.

The ‘high’ number of Hebrew books in Reuchlin’s library was, then, a result of his direct contacts with Jews, converts and other Hebraists in Italian- and German-speaking areas connections that other humanists could not always boast of having. The situation was quite different in the German-speaking lands. Judging by what has been preserved or mentioned in related sources, German private collections of Hebraica only included a small number of Hebrew codices. Due to the fragmentary character of such collections from the pre-Reformation German milieu, it is hardly possible to spot any clear patterns of Hebrew book collecting at that time. Some particular features and fields of interest can be highlighted, however. In the period in question, Hebrew texts were not being printed north of the Alps yet. In Italy, by contrast, editions printed by Jews for Jewish use already existed, and some of these made their way north to German-speaking areas. As Reuchlin asserted in the introduction to his Hebrew grammar *Rudimenta linguae hebraicae* (*Rudiments of the Hebrew Language*) published in 1506, one could easily purchase Hebrew Bibles printed in Italy at low cost (Reuchlin 1506, 1). The only Hebrew printed edition in Schedel’s collection was also of Italian provenance: the Hebrew Bible published by Gershom Soncino in Brescia in 1494 (BSB, Inc.c.a. 181; GW 4200). Following Soncino’s first edition of 1488, it was one of the earliest editions of the complete Hebrew Bible in octavo, printed in one column with no Targum or commentaries. Schedel acquired it around 1501. One of Soncino’s editions was also purchased by the Swiss Hebraist Conrad Pellican (Konrad Pellikan; 1478–1556) in Tübingen in 1500, a scholar who in turn described his endeavours to obtain Hebrew books in his *Chronikon*, and by Martin Luther in 1515. Around this time (1515), the number of Hebrew printed books that Christians could purchase increased considerably thanks to the enormous amplitude of Venetian printing presses (especially Daniel
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Bomberg’s); the production of works printed in Hebrew then began to spread in the
German-speaking milieu as well. One of such editions, a Hebrew Pentateuch with
a Targum and Rashi’s commentaries, for instance, was given to Pellican in Nurem-
berg in 1515 by the abbottess of St Clara, Charitas Pirckheimer.

Before printed editions of the Hebrew Bible appeared on the European
market, biblical texts, which were in high demand in humanist circles, circulated
among Christians in manuscript versions. The famous library of the cardinal
and philosopher Nicholas of Kues (1401–1464), for example, contained a Hebrew
biblical codex. The Dominican Sifrid Piscatoris (d. in 1473) was in possession
of a Hebrew manuscript of the Prophets (Mainz SB, Hs I 378), while the scholar
and artist Winand von Steeg (1371–1453) owned four copies of the Old Testament
and five Pentateuchs (Trithemius 1495, fol. 42v). The Bishop of Brandenburg,
Stephan Bodecker (1384–1459), possessed an Ashkenazic Hebrew Bible in three
volumes and a manuscript of the Prophets and Hagiographa (SBB, Ms. or. fols 5–7
and 123 respectively). Three biblical manuscripts were included in the afore-
mentioned collection belonging to Hartmann Schedel (BSB, Chm 14, 16 and 298).
Reuchlin, for his part, owned a number of biblical manuscripts, among which
was a luxurious Ashkenazic Bible with a Targum and masora given to him as a gift
in 1492 by Emperor Friedrich III.

Important evidence of the preservation and careful treatment of Hebrew bib-
lical texts by Christians has survived in two Hebrew manuscripts copied, proof-
read and annotated between c. 1495 and 1520 by a monk known as Johannes of
Grafing from the St Sebastian Benedictine monastery in Ebersberg (d. after 1519)
(BSB, Chm 400 and 401). On the first folio of BSB, Chm 401, Johannes identified
himself as ‘Yoḥanan bar Shimʿon ha-Moshiaḥ [the anointed]’. His Hebrew name
and his indication of himself as being ‘anointed’, apparently during the baptis-
mal ceremony, suggest that Johannes was a convert from Judaism. His impressive
fluency in Hebrew and his familiarity with Jewish scribal practices are not sur-
prising, given his Jewish origin. Unlike other parts of these two manuscripts, the
first codicological unit of BSB, Chm 401 containing the Psalter (fols 1r–111r) was
not copied by Johannes, but by a Jewish scribe called Yedaʿya Shniʾor, as can be
gathered from his script, which differs from Johannes’s own hand, and from the

38 See also Burnett 2012b, 63–84.
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41 Walde 1916, 64–69.
42 Walde 1916, 33–35.
44 Campanini 1999, 77–79.
colophon at the end of it (fol. 111r). The Psalter was originally copied by a Jew for Jewish use, but was incorporated into Johannes’s compilation later. Although Johannes indicated the date of the Psalter’s completion as 1463 (fol. 111r), suggesting that he was informed about its original production, he did not receive this Psalter from its original scribe; the Psalter passed into Johannes’s hands from another Hebraist after the latter had annotated it in Latin in the margins, mostly in vermillion ink. Johannes added his own Latin annotations to this along with the psalm’s interlinear Latin translation in brown ink around 1513 (this date appears on fol. 111r).

Not only did Johannes elucidate the Psalter’s contents in Latin, but he collated and then corrected the text of his Psalter in accordance with another Hebrew Psalter, Ms. Georg. 192, now kept at the University and State Library of Saxony-Anhalt in Dessau (ULB). Strong evidence of Johannes’s use of the Dessau Psalter is found on its first folio (fol. 1r), which contains ownership notes, a list of psalms for each day of the week and a Midrashic fragment. He copied the names of the Dessau Psalter’s owners, ‘Shimʿon bar Yuda’ and ‘Yaʿaqov bar Shimʿon’, at the top of the first folio of his Psalter, after which he wrote his own name as well as the aforementioned textual fragments. The name of the vocaliser of the Dessau Psalter, Yaʿaqov ha-Levi of Mainz (fol. 121r), was also added by Johannes in the outer margin at the end of his Psalter together with his own name, ‘Johannes son of R. Shimʿon of Grafing’ (fol. 111r). By copying the names of the owners and the vocaliser and by recording his own name and the dates, Johannes thus preserved the pieces of information which did not pertain to the text itself, but indicated its particular copy. Such scrupulous treatment of the Hebrew text indicates Johannes’s critical approach to his textual models and the editorial nature of copying, which reflect the direction taken by the humanist biblical scholarship of his time. The re-examination of biblical sources in their original language, which was one of the main reasons for humanist interest in the Hebrew language and Hebrew books, involved new methods of textual criticism leading to the search for a more accurate copy of the Hebrew Bible.

This kind of interactive approach to Hebrew texts was not reserved for the field of biblical studies alone; Hebrew grammar and lexicography, which were similarly popular among humanists and Hebraists as these subjects constituted the basis of any examination of Hebrew sources, were treated in a similar manner. Among all the works on Hebrew grammar by Jewish authors, it was the treatises by the 12th-century Provençal biblical commentators and grammarians David and Moshe Qimḥi that gained the widest popularity in Hebraist circles.45 Johannes Reuchlin,
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for instance, apparently owned a handwritten exemplar of Moshe Qimḥi’s grammatical work *Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat* (*The Journey on the Paths of Knowledge*) as early as the end of the 15th century and used it in his *Rudimenta* (1506).\(^{46}\) This exemplar was supposedly borrowed by Pellican, who copied it and then returned it to Reuchlin in 1500. In his account of this episode, Pellican reported that the manuscript served as a basis for a German translation of the work, which was carried out by a Jew (Reuchlin’s Hebrew tutor Calman, perhaps?), who also translated some texts for Johann Böhm, the priest and cantor from Ulm (1485–1533/5).\(^{47}\) Böhm also possessed some other grammatical and lexical works in Hebrew (e.g. BSB, Chm 204),\(^{48}\) which were used by Pellican when he visited Böhm in Ulm in 1500.\(^{49}\) It is also possible that once Pellican returned the manuscript to Reuchlin, the latter sent it along with its German translation to a frater called Crismann in 1501 to assist him in his own Hebrew studies.\(^{50}\) Another copy of the same work in Reuchlin’s possession was a printed edition of it, probably originating from Soncino’s press (1508). It was referred to in the earlier catalogues of Reuchlin’s *Hebraica*,\(^{51}\) but was lost during the Second World War (formerly BLB Bc 69).\(^{52}\)

Thanks to Reuchlin, *Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat* was highly esteemed by Christians who wished to learn biblical Hebrew and was widely disseminated in Reuchlin’s scholarly environment. Around the same time as Pellican copied Reuchlin’s copy of Qimḥi’s work, Johannes of Grafing included it in his composite manuscript (BSB, Chm 401, fols 227r–244r). The dates of 1501 (*Apollonaris*) and 1509 (*Misericordia Domini*) concluding the treatise (fol. 244r) possibly denote the beginning and end of the copying.\(^{53}\) In this case, *Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat* was written in two columns, the Hebrew text in the right-hand column and its German translation in the left-hand one. This fact may indicate that Johannes of Grafing’s copy reflects – albeit only indirectly – Reuchlin’s handwritten exemplar of the same work, which, as mentioned above, was translated into German around the

\(^{46}\) Von Abel/Leicht 2005, 53–54.

\(^{47}\) Riggenbach 1877, 22; von Abel/Leicht 2005, 53.

\(^{48}\) See Walde 1916, 190–194.
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\(^{51}\) Christ 1924, 41–42.

\(^{52}\) See von Abel/Leicht 2005, 53–55 and 232–234; see also the contribution by Reimund Leicht in this volume.

\(^{53}\) Walde 1916, 195–196.
same time.\textsuperscript{54} Such a transmission of Reuchlin’s version of Qimḥi’s work is highly likely due to Johannes’s personal connection to Reuchlin.\textsuperscript{55}

On the other hand, another German translation that differs from the one done by Johannes of Grafing accompanies the exemplar of \textit{Mahalakh Shevile ha-Da’at} copied by the Hebraist Kilian Leib (1471–1553) (SBB Or. oct. 148, fols 25r–120v).\textsuperscript{56} Its Hebrew version requires further collation with Johannes’s copy. As in the case of Johannes’s manuscript, the Hebrew and German texts appear side by side in two columns in Leib’s codex. In its colophon, which lacks a date, unfortunately (fol. 120v), Leib stated that he was ‘brother Kilian Leib’, suggesting that the manuscript was copied by him sometime before 1499 when he was appointed prior of Rebdorf Monastery.\textsuperscript{57} Translating Qimḥi’s Hebrew text into German seems to have been an integral part of its Christian production. Since grammatical treatises of this kind played a practical role, their translation into the language spoken by their non-Jewish users was necessary, especially in the case of Christians who did not have any previous knowledge of Hebrew.

An interlinear translation of \textit{Mahalakh Shevile ha-Da’at}, this time into Latin, also appears in a manuscript from the collection belonging to Caspar Amman (c. 1450–1524), prior of the Augustinian hermit monastery in Lauingen (BSB, Chm 426, fols 1r–36v). This translation and the copying of the original Hebrew text in this codex were apparently carried out by Amman himself around 1511–1513 in connection with his own Hebrew studies, which he began c. 1505.\textsuperscript{58} In addition to Qimḥi’s work, the manuscript includes other grammatical treatises and excerpts by Jewish and Christian authors copied by Amman.\textsuperscript{59}

This codex belongs to a group of nine Hebrew manuscripts from Amman’s library dedicated mainly to Hebrew grammar and lexicography (Bern Burg., A 198; BSB, Chm 424 [in BSB, Clm 28233] – Chm 427; Gottweig SB, 10–11; UB, 4\textsuperscript{0} Cod. ms. 757 and 759). One of the lexicological works on Hebrew that Amman possessed is the aforementioned lexicon based on the \textit{Maḥberet} by Menahem ben Saruq, which was copied for Reuchlin by his Hebrew tutor, Calman, in 1486 and ended up being bound into Amman’s Hebrew volume (BSB, Chm 425, fols 136r–167v).\textsuperscript{60} Another codex in this group was copied for Amman by Johannes Böschenstein
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\bibitem{60} Von Abel/Leicht 2005, 177–182.
\end{thebibliography}
Ilona Steimann

(BSB Chm 72 and 427, fols 132v–134v), who was employed as Amman’s Hebrew tutor.⁶¹

In 1521, Böschenstein provided similar guidance in the Hebrew language through another exemplar of Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat copied by the theologian Johann Eck (1486–1543) (BSB, Clm 11602, fols 2r–36r [135v–169v]; evidence of Eck’s Hebrew studies is also preserved in UB, 4⁰ Cod. mss. 800 and 827). This copy of Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat was included in the volume containing an index for Reuchlin’s Rudimenta, which Eck compiled in the monastery of Polling where he fled from the plague raging in Ingolstadt.⁶² In addition to Eck’s interlinear translation of Qimḥi’s work into Latin, Böschenstein wrote down his own translation on the last few leaves of the treatise and signed his name at the end of it (fol. 36r). Böschenstein’s additions to Eck’s codex suggest that he possibly interpreted Qimḥi’s work for Eck after the latter produced his own copy of it. A year earlier, in 1520, Böschenstein had printed his own version of Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat (in Augsburg), but a comparison has shown that this did not serve as a direct model for Eck’s manuscript. In the same year, Qimḥi’s work was also published by Gilles de Gourmont in Paris and by Thomas Anshelm in Hagenau in 1519. The latter edition served as a basis for Eck’s extracts on Hebrew grammar found in the same codex (BSB, Clm 11602; see Eck’s Latin note on fol. 170r). As a result of these publications, Mahalakh Shevile ha-Daʿat came to occupy a firm place in the Christian tradition of writing Hebrew grammars.

Although it is not yet possible to establish the precise interrelations between different copies of Qimḥi’s grammatical text in Christian book collections at this stage of my research, what is obvious is that the aforementioned circle of German civic and monastic humanists and Hebraists such as Böschenstein, Amman, Johannes of Grafing, Eck, Leib, Pellican, Böhm and Schedel all shared a common interest in the Hebrew language and Jewish literature and created a scholarly network. They were connected to each other via private contacts and correspondence, sent their literary works to each other and lent books to one another. Hebrew books circulating in these circles led, in turn, to the creation of a kind of a ‘canon’ of Hebrew and Hebrew-related texts and authors used by Christians, which eventually shaped Christian conceptions of Jewish literature. Due to their innate mastery of Hebrew, it was natural for converts from Judaism to play the main role as transmitters of knowledge during this process. The figure of Johannes Reuchlin, whose Hebraica collection was widely used by other Heb-

⁶¹ Wagner 1895, 47–48.
⁶² See Eck’s note on fol. 46r; Perles 1884, 212.
raists, was behind all these attempts to produce ‘Christian’ Hebrew codices – he acted as a kind of ultimate referee in such matters.

Thanks to Reuchlin, German Hebraists not only took an interest in the Hebrew Bible and works on Hebrew grammar and lexicography, but in works on Jewish mysticism, philosophy and other subjects as well. These were subsequently included in numerous Christian libraries. This was especially true with regard to the Kabbala, which was considered a source of esoteric knowledge universal to Judaism and Christianity and was believed to prove basic Christian doctrines.

Although he hardly had any command of the Hebrew language, another scholar from Reuchlin’s circles, Johann von Dalberg, the Bishop of Worms (1455–1503) was highly interested in Jewish literature and mysticism, for instance. His Hebrew books have now been lost, but we still know about them from his correspondence with Reuchlin.63 Dalberg gave some of the manuscripts from his library to Reuchlin, including the polemical anti-Christian work *Sefer Niṣḥahon*.64 In 1495, Reuchlin received another 15th-century Ashkenazic manuscript from Dalberg called *Ginnat Egoz* (*The Nut Orchard*), a Kabbalistic work by Joseph Gikatilla (BL, Ms. Add. 11416 = or. 740).65 Upon acquiring it, Reuchlin inscribed it with an ownership note of his own, stating that Dalberg had obtained the codex with the greatest effort (*summa conatu*) from a rabbi from Worms (fol. 206r). Although it is uncertain whether Dalberg himself was actively involved in Kabbalistic studies, he obviously supported Reuchlin in the latter’s devotion to Hebrew and the Kabbala.66

In his search for Kabbalistic works, Reuchlin also sought assistance from Jews. In response to his request for books on the Kabbala, the Rabbi of Regensburg, Yaʿaqov Margolioth, wrote to Reuchlin c. 1493–1496, saying that such books were not available for purchase in his city.67 Keeping in mind that Kabbalistic treatises existed in Ashkenaz in that period,68 it is not clear whether this answer reflected the actual situation in Regensburg or if Margolioth was just showing circumspection; in the case of Kabbalistic literature, such caution would have been more than appropriate as it was strictly forbidden for Jewish mystical tradition to be passed on to non-Jews.69

Due to the obvious reluctance on the part of Ashkenazic Jews to share secret Jewish knowledge with non-Jews, the scope of Kabbalistic texts to which Chris-
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63 Walde 1916, 184.
65 Von Abel/Leicht 2005, 147.
66 Walter 2005, 112.
68 Yuval 1988, 302ff.
69 Cf. Kaufmann 1897, 500–508.
tians were exposed was apparently limited at that time. The same titles of Kab-
balistic works circulated among Hebraists, setting out their priorities with regard
to book acquisitions. Following Reuchlin’s example, for instance, the Hebraists
in his circle took a great interest in Ginnat Egoz. Its contents were considered to
be extremely valuable by Caspar Amman, who therefore wished to examine it, as
expressed by R. Rafaʾel of Hagenau in the recommendation he sent to the Jewish
scholar and cantor R. Naftali Hir ṣ Treves [of Worms] on Amman’s behalf (BSB,
Chm 426, fol. 190v)⁷⁰. This letter was written on an uncertain date, but shortly
afterwards, apparently, Amman established his personal connections with Naftali
Hir ṣ. In a letter that the latter sent to Amman, Hir ṣ mentioned that he had pro-
vided Amman with some books, but these did not include any Kabbalistic works
(BSB, Chm 426, fols 196v–197r [another copy is in UB, 4⁰ Cod. ms. 827, fol. 48r])⁷¹.

While Kabbalistic texts were adapted by humanists to support their own
beliefs, Christian interest in Hebrew liturgical manuscripts took another turn
around 1500. Referring to the former status of Jewish literature on liturgy, rites
and customs among Christians, Reuchlin stated in his Gutachten (1511):⁷²

> Weiter von iren predig büchern unnd disputations auch brevir, gesanng büchern ordnung
> irer cerimonien, sitten und andacht. Was sollich reden annders dann die loblichen keyser
> unnd geistlichen bapste dar von geredt unnd gesetzt haben, das mann sie inn iren Syn-
> agogen, cerimonien, ritus, gewonhaitten, sitten und an dachten rüwigklichen soll belei-
> ben lassen, besunder wan sie uns nit wider recht thůndt, unnd unsere cristenlich kirchen
> offenlich nitt verachten. Dann die cristenlich kirch hat sunst nichtz mit inen zů schaffen,
> ausserhalb der neun sticken so die glos anzaigt.

Furthermore, what shall I say to their books on preaching and disputations, to their brevi-
aries and songbooks, to their books on liturgy, on their customs and devotions, other than
repeat what has already been said and decreed by the praiseworthy emperors and their holi-
nesses, the popes, namely: That nobody shall interfere with their synagogues, ceremonies,
rites, habits, customs, and devotions, particularly when they do not transgress our laws nor
publicly deride our Christian Church. Other than this the Christian Church has no truck with
them, except for the nine parts listed in the glosses.⁷³

Although the conditional phrase ‘when they do not transgress... nor deride...’
renders the meaning of Reuchlin’s formulation somewhat evasive by suggesting
that Jews do transgress or deride in certain cases, the general tenor of his conclu-
sion regarding Jewish liturgy and rites is to regard them as internal Jewish affairs
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⁷⁰ Zimmer 1980, 84–85.
⁷¹ Zimmer 1980, 85–86.
⁷² Reuchlin 1511, fol. XIIIr.
⁷³ Translated in O’Callaghan 2012, 176.
in which Christians do not need to interfere. On the other hand, written in response to Pfefferkorn’s accusations of the blasphemous nature of Jewish liturgical texts, Reuchlin’s Gutachten pursued the goal of protecting Hebrew books from destruction and therefore can hardly be taken as reflecting any actual Christian conceptions of Jewish liturgy around 1500.

In contrast to Reuchlin’s opinion, one of the earliest of Pfefferkorn’s tracts on Jewish slurs against Christianity, Ich bin ain buchlein. der Juden veindt ist mein namen (‘I am a Booklet. The Jews’ Enemy is my Name’) published by him in 1509 before the actual controversy over Jewish books broke out, considers Jewish liturgy no less harmful and offensive than the Talmud.74 He wrote, for instance, that the words ‘Zú den getauften ist kain hoffnung und alle unglauhigen sollen schnelliglich vergon und alle die find deines volckes Israhel untertruckt und verdilgt werden das geschech bald’ (‘There is no hope for the baptised, and all infidels will soon be gone and all the enemies of your people Israel will be suppressed and destroyed. This will happen soon’) from a Jewish prayer recited three times a day (the ‘Amida’) designated the baptised as infidels and expressed the hope that the Christian Church and the Holy Roman Empire would collapse.75 These and similar references by Pfefferkorn to Jewish prayer and rites, intended to ridicule them and stress their anti-Christian elements, depicted Jewish liturgy as being deliberately hostile to Christianity.

Converts from Judaism were not the only vehicles of transmission in this process of Christian insight into Jewish liturgy and ceremonies, however – Hebrew books also played an important role in it. For example, the Hebrew book emerges from the protocols of the aforementioned trial on the ritual murder of the child called Simon in Trent (1475) as a full ‘participant’ in the murder and a significant ‘witness’ of it. In several instances, the podestà demanded imprisoned Jews to indicate words and expressions of malediction in Hebrew as well as those related to blood in the Passover Haggada. An interrogated Jewish woman named Anna was asked to identify the curses uttered against Egyptians in the Haggada, which were immediately copied down in Hebrew in the record of the trial and then translated into Latin.76 It is interesting to note that in a folk poem from 1475 that was dedicated to Simon, the author stated that the Jews read from a book from the Talmud called ‘Agoyin’, after the boy’s murder.77 In these and other
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75 Pfefferkorn 1509, fol. [127r]; trans. in Rummel 2002, 55. See also Carlebach 2001, 26–28.
76 Esposito/Quaglioni 1990, 51.
77 Liliencron 1866, 16. Although such a tractate does not actually exist in the Talmud and he probably meant the word ‘ha-goyim’, i.e. the Gentiles, which is also not the name of a Talmudic
instances of using the original Hebrew text of the Haggada, the actual manuscript of the Haggada was probably confiscated from Jews by the magistrates.\textsuperscript{78}

Use of the Haggada as the primary source of information on Jewish liturgy and rites leads us to another example closely related to the Trent trial. This concerns an illuminated Haggada manuscript copied in the Passau area in the third quarter of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century by Yosef son of Efrayim (BSB, Chm 200). The manuscript came into the possession of Paulus Wann of Kemnath, a preacher at the Cathedral of Passau, probably after the Jews were expelled from Passau in 1478 as a result of an accusation of host desecration. In 1489, Wann donated the manuscript to the Benedictine monastery in Tegernsee together with some non-Hebrew books.\textsuperscript{79} A few years later, the librarian of the monastery library, Ambrosius Schwerzenbeck, sent the Haggada to Erhard of Pappenheim (d. 1497), a Dominican monk from Altenhohenau, along with a request to describe its contents.\textsuperscript{80} Erhard, in turn, added annotations in the Haggada itself, mainly translating the first lines of its passages. He also wrote an introductory text, bound into a composite manuscript of religious tractates in Tegernsee (BSB, Clm 18526b, fols 190v–200r) and copied in 1493 by Schwerzenbeck in a quire added to the beginning of the Haggada (the first quire in BSB, Chm 200, fols 1–6, but to be read as ‘6–1’). As can be gathered from Schwerzenbeck’s note added to the quire of the composite manuscript (BSB, Clm 18526b, fol. 190r), he received Erhard’s text in 1492.\textsuperscript{81}

Erhard’s introduction to the Tegernsee Haggada was primarily based on his knowledge of the Hebrew text of the Haggada, its included rituals and even their extended version in Yiddish (BSB, Chm 200, fol. 6v.)\textsuperscript{82}. However, he did not rely on Jewish sources alone; on fol. 6r he stated that he had translated the Latin record of the Trent trial into German, and some of this material was included in his introduction as well.\textsuperscript{83} For example, his references to use of the blood of Christian babies for making the principal cakes of unleavened bread (maṣot miṣva), to mixing such blood into the first cup of wine of the seder (Passover Eve ceremony) and to sprinkling the blood mixed into wine on the contents of the table whilst reciting the ten plagues inflicted on the Egyptians were obviously based

\textsuperscript{78} Hsia 1992, 63, n. 5.
\textsuperscript{79} Aretin 1803, 64.
\textsuperscript{81} For more details, see Shalev-Eyni 2014, 18–19.
\textsuperscript{82} For a detailed discussion on its contents, see Stern 2014, 73–89.
\textsuperscript{83} Stern 2014, 261, n. 51.
on the Trent protocols (BSB, Chm 200, fols 6r, 5v and 5r respectively). According to Erhard, the ritual performance of the seder was closely connected to its verbal aspects, thus emphasising a strict correspondence between certain actions and corresponding passages of the Haggada.

A reference to the process against the Jews of Trent, written in a similar spirit to that of Erhard, accompanies the Passover Haggada in Johannes of Grafing’s aforementioned Hebrew codex (BSB, Chm 401, fol. 184r). Around 1519, when Johannes wrote his annotations to this unit of BSB, Chm 401, details of the Trent process were widely known due to a number of printed editions which described Simon’s alleged ritual murder. But this particular reference to the confessions of the Jews of Trent was rather inspired by his acquaintance with Erhard’s work. An actual relation between these two monks can be established through Johannes’s Greek manuscripts. Erhard was not only a confessor at the nearby Dominican nunnery of Altenhochenau, but also participated in the copying of Johannes’s Greek compilation, BSB, Cgrm 323 (fols 2r–20v, 97r–107r, 167r–268r passim). 84

Thus, if Christian preoccupation with the Hebrew Bible had a longstanding tradition before the rise of 15th-century Hebraism, Christian interest in Jewish liturgy and religious customs was a new phenomenon in this period. According to Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, this new interest departed from the narrow context of ritual murder accusations, especially that of Trent in 1475, and engendered the emergence of a new literary genre describing Jewish rites, customs and lifestyles for their own sake. 85 This is not the place to discuss Hsia’s conclusions and their validity for general Christian attitude towards Jewish rites, but the trial in Trent undoubtedly had a great impact on Christian views of Jewish Passover customs and Jewish liturgical practices in general. As a result, Jewish books on liturgical contents were not perceived by Christians as neutral works or as internal Jewish affairs, but as being imbued with a definite anti-Christian aura. Christian interest in this sort of Jewish literature combined curiosity with regard to Jewish matters with anti-Jewish tendencies nourished by blood libels and other Jewish ‘crimes’ against Christianity.

If this is correct, then the very fact of the preservation of these ‘blasphemous’ books in Christian libraries requires further consideration. Hebraists and humanists – even those who did not have any command of the Hebrew language – shared an idea of preserving Hebrew books for the sake of humanist scholarship. The attitudes of the religious circles towards Jewish literature, on the other hand, were less homogenous. At one extreme were men like Pfefferkorn who stood
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84 Sicherl 1994, 75 and 77.
for the destruction of Hebrew books, while at the other, there were humanist-oriented ecclesiastic and monastic representatives (such as Johann von Dalberg) who, being interested in Jewish biblical scholarship and Jewish mysticism, made an effort to collect Hebrew books for their own monasteries. They were in favour, rather, of taking Hebrew books away from the Jews, but not destroying the works altogether. Even Petrus Nigri, whose negative evaluation of Hebrew books and their harmfulness is undoubted, was careful to preserve Hebrew manuscripts in the Dominican Abbey in Regensburg, being motivated by their potential value to anti-Jewish polemics.

Christians in this period attempted to physically disassociate Hebrew books from their Jewish owners and make these books serve their own needs, namely to foster anti-Jewish polemics and scholarship – the latter via Christian interpretation of Hebrew texts. The general tendency towards conceptual and practical disassociation of Jewish texts from the Jews was accompanied by a transition in the backgrounds of Hebrew tutors (as Jews were replaced by converts and Christians) and with the beginning of independent Christian production of Hebrew texts. Both these developments minimised the necessity for Jewish co-operation and inaugurated a new era in the history of Hebrew books, breaking up the Jewish monopoly on Hebrew book production. Those works produced by Christians for Christians no longer belonged to ‘Jewish literature’ and were finally separated from the actual fate of the Jews. At this stage of the process of Christian appropriation of Jewish texts around 1500, Hebrew books still remained ambivalent objects, desired and yet dangerous at the same time.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bern Burg.</td>
<td>Burgerbibliothek of Berne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>London, British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLB</td>
<td>Badische Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSB</td>
<td>Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessau ULB</td>
<td>Anhaltische Landesbücherei Dessau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottweig SB</td>
<td>Gottweig, Stiftsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke. 1925–2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic edition</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/">http://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz SB</td>
<td>Mainz, Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBB</td>
<td>Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Universitätsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

86 See also Carlebach 2001, 161; Burnett 2012a, 90–207.
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