

## **From Rabbis and Millenarians to High Church Orthodoxy: Edward Bernard (1638-1697) Reads the 1646 Amsterdam Vocalized Mishnah**

Thomas Roebuck

University of East Anglia

Norwich, England

The publication in 1646 of a vocalized edition of the Mishnah in Amsterdam has long fascinated scholars of Judaeo-Christian relations in the early modern Anglo-Dutch world. The Mishnah, the compilation of Jewish law which is now commonly accepted to have been produced in or around the early third century CE, had been published many times in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, from various sites in northern Italy to Prague and Constantinople. It was often accompanied by the key commentaries of Maimonides (1138–1204), Obadiah Yare of Bertinoro (ca. 1445–ca. 1515, known simply as Bartenora), or the more recent work of Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller (ca. 1579–1654).<sup>1</sup> Another vocalized edition had even been published shortly before the Amsterdam edition, in Constantinople in 1643.<sup>2</sup> As an edition of the Mishnah, then, the vocalized 1646 Mishnah was not unique. It is the book's origins that makes it remarkable: its emergence at the confluence of multiple interrelated projects and aspirations of Christians and Jews which had developed from at least the early 1640s. This story has been brilliantly reconstructed by a series of scholars, beginning in the 1980s with the work of Richard Popkin and Ernestine van der Wall.<sup>3</sup> The bulk of the work of actually vocalizing the Mishnah, as Yosef Kaplan has argued, was carried out by Rabbi Jacob Judah Leon (1603-after 1675), the man who became famous for building a scale model of Solomon's Temple, which was a popular visitor

attraction in Amsterdam.<sup>4</sup> He was encouraged and supported financially by a Christian: the Nonconformist Dutch theologian, early Collegiant, and Hebraist Adam Boreel (1602-1665), recently the object of a compelling book-length study by Francesco Quatrini.<sup>5</sup> 'Boreel's interest in Jewish texts was motivated by a desire to convert the Jews to Christianity, and this drew him to the attention of the circle in England of the intelligencer Samuel Hartlib (1600–1662). As Yosef Kaplan has shown, Hartlib and members of his circle shared a millenarian vision (given greater urgency by Britain's civil wars) to convert the Jews and thus usher in the second coming of Christ.<sup>6</sup> To these Christians, a vocalized edition of the Mishnah – ideally with accompanying Latin translation – would spur the conversion of the Jews, as it would serve to reveal beliefs held in common by Christians and Jews, and also the origins of the separation between Judaism and Christianity. Their vision was the production of a series of editions of the Mishnah, including one in Spanish aimed at members of the Jewish community in Amsterdam whose ability to read Hebrew was limited.

In the end, it was only the 1646 vocalized Mishnah – without Latin translation – that was published.<sup>7</sup> The multicultural city of Amsterdam was the obvious site for such a publication, the city which had emerged by the mid-seventeenth century as not only the "Bookshop of the World", but also as "the Jewish bookshop of the world."<sup>8</sup> Menasseh ben Israel had already published an unvocalized edition of the Mishnah in 1632. After his son, Joseph ben Israel, had taken over the publishing house, they published a second edition of the Mishnah in 1644, also unvocalized, this time in a small format (sixteenmo as opposed to octavo).<sup>9</sup> The vocalized Mishnah was, therefore, not only a product of Christian millenarian enthusiasm, but also a book aimed firmly at Jewish communities in Amsterdam and (perhaps) across

Europe. This is why Boreel's name appears nowhere in the edition: if it had, the book would have lost credibility with Jewish audiences.<sup>10</sup> The prefaces to the 1646 vocalized Mishnah, by Menasseh ben Israel and Jacob Judah Leon, present the work as a pedagogical tool for Jews to aid in the understanding their own traditions. "It is known throughout the world that the Mishnaioth are the crown and splendour of the Jews wherever they be scattered," Menasseh begins, "for they are concise regulations incorporating the most select interpretations of all the commandments of our law received on Sinai, more precious than gold." However, he goes on to say, "I saw many of the most wise and learned of my people stuttering over the pronunciation of many words instead of being precise." This sentiment is echoed by Judah Leon in his preface. "Sitting then peacefully together as brothers in deep communion," when he was teaching the Mishnah in Hamburg, Judah Leon writes, "innumerable times we came upon difficult and obscure passages which we could not understand because of the lack of vocalization, and only with great difficulty could we follow and grasp their meaning."<sup>11</sup> The Mishnah edition, therefore, was a means to help initiate conversos who were returning to Judaism into the practice of reading and studying the Mishnah. From the perspective of the Jews involved in the edition, rather than a tool of conversion, the book was a means of immersing Jewish readers within their own traditions. The book's address to Jewish audiences and to the Amsterdam community in particular has recently been reemphasised and reassessed by David Sclar.<sup>12</sup>

The present essay aims to revisit one crucial element of this story: its ending. Although the edition seems to have been printed in an astonishing four thousand copies and despite a campaign to disseminate the book in England and on the Continent, it has generally been agreed that the edition was a flop among Christian

readers.<sup>13</sup> Writing to John Worthington in 1660, Samuel Hartlib noted that “I hear nothing more from Mr. Boreel, but that last week we sent back 2 or 3 hundred copies of the Misnaioth in Hebrew, not having sold one of them. He will try how I may put them off in the Low Countries.” Worthington felt that a parallel Latin text was needed: “it would help off his Hebrew edition of the Mishnah, which did not sell.”<sup>14</sup> This has led historians to argue that English scholars at the time were simply not capable of engaging with this edition of the Mishnah. As Kaplan concludes, Hartlib’s inability to sell the 1646 Mishnah in England “supports our estimation of the dismal state of Hebrew studies at that time”<sup>15</sup> Popkin concluded his 1988 discussion of the vocalized Mishnah by saying that “there is no evidence anybody read it or used it,” a conclusion he revisited for a lecture at the Marsh Library in Dublin, which has two copies of the book, one which belonged to the leading defender of orthodoxy, Edward Stillingfleet (1635-1699), bishop of Worcester, and the other to Narcissus Marsh (1638-1713) himself. “The failure of the project needs more explanation,” he argued. “The Jews might not have trusted the text because of rumors of Christian involvement in the edition. But why were there no Christian purchasers except for Stillingfleet and Marsh?”<sup>16</sup>

Sclar, however, has recently argued that, since Popkin wrote, “many copies have been discovered that indicate readers’ active engagement with the text,” perhaps most notably by Nina Cohen in an important MA thesis at the University of Pennsylvania.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, evidence of seventeenth-century Christian scholars’ engagements with the book’s margins often remain fragmentary and frustrating: Sclar, for instance, points to Richard Allestree’s copy, where annotations peter out after the beginning of the first tractate. My purpose, then, is to introduce a remarkable copy of this book, now in the Bodleian Library, the annotator of which I

have identified. This single copy, I wish to suggest, is a linchpin in the history of seventeenth-century Mishnaic studies. It shows that the didactic aims of Amsterdam rabbis helped to enable the flurry of Mishnaic scholarship at the end of the seventeenth century, which culminated in the complete Latin edition of the Mishnah produced by Gulielmus Surenhusius (c.1664-1729) at the turn of the eighteenth century.<sup>18</sup> The book's journey from the excitable (and exciting) world of millenarian Christians in the Civil War to the study of one high church orthodox (and ostensibly less exciting) scholar has much to teach us about how Jewish texts were read and valued in late seventeenth-century England, and the crucial part their study played in constructing an erudite British Protestant identity in the confessionalized late seventeenth-century world.

### **Edward Bernard's Annotated 1646 Vocalized Mishnah**

There are now three copies of the 1646 Mishnah preserved in the Bodleian Library. One was part of David Oppenheim's collection and is in a distinctive seventeenth-century clasped binding, probably from Eastern Europe (immediately hinting at the range of this book's travels).<sup>19</sup> Another copy now also has an Oppenheim shelfmark but originally had a "Selden" shelfmark, which is inscribed on the title page and partly stamped on the binding: Seld. ⊕ 128.<sup>20</sup> This book may, therefore, have been part of the collection of the antiquary and Hebraist John Selden (1584-1654), which came to the Bodleian after his death. However, it lacks any confirmatory marks such as his motto or signature; it may simply be that this copy of the book was shelved at the "Selden" end of the Bodleian. Neither this copy nor the one in Oppenheim's collection bears any significant annotation. The third copy, however, which on the

outside is bound simply in calf leather with a double fillet border (almost certainly an English binding), is truly remarkable: it is annotated heavily in Latin throughout most of the tractates of the Mishnah's first five orders (sedarim) in the hand of a Christian scholar.<sup>21</sup> This was, without question, an English scholar, as quotations from the Bible in English appear in the book's margins.<sup>22</sup> Even without other contextual evidence, the characteristics of the handwriting alone leave scarcely any room for doubt that the hitherto unidentified owner and annotator of this book was Oxford's Savilian Professor of Astronomy, fellow of St John's College, Oxford, and assiduous student of Middle Eastern languages, Edward Bernard (1638-1697).<sup>23</sup> Bernard's handwriting was considered idiosyncratic and challenging to read even by his contemporaries: his greatest friend and posthumous biographer, the Nonjuror scholar Thomas Smith (1638-1710), who took possession of many of Bernard's personal papers after his death, talked of his struggles to decipher his deceased friend's "abbreviations and scrawlings."<sup>24</sup> Comparison of the hand of the annotator in the 1646 Mishnah (see figure 1) with Bernard's in his letters, personal papers, and other annotated books shows close similarities: both feature Bernard's striking ampersand, his tendency to place otiose flourishes on individual letters (especially terminal letters), a highly distinctive "per" abbreviation, and his distinctive majuscule epsilon "E" graph, to name just a few.

Study of the book's provenance and journey to the Bodleian offers confirmation that this book indeed belonged to Bernard. The earliest of the Bodleian's three copies to be acquired was the one which was given a "Selden" shelfmark. This book and its shelfmark appears in the 1674 catalogue of the Bodleian's printed books prepared under the direction of the librarian (and scholar of Middle Eastern languages), Thomas Hyde (1636-1708). It was indexed under

“Mishnaioth” and recorded as “Mishnaioth cum Punctis vocalibus per Menasse ben Israël. Amst. 1646.”<sup>25</sup> It is recorded alongside four other copies of the Mishnah that the Bodleian owned by that date: the 1606 Venice edition with the commentaries of Maimonides and Bartenora, the 1614-17 Prague edition with the commentaries of Bartenora and Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller, and the 1631 octavo edition “sine Punctis vocalibus” which had earlier been published by Menasseh ben Israel.<sup>26</sup> When Bernard died in January 1697, the university set about acquiring a substantial part of his collection of manuscripts and printed books. His was a major collection, enriched by Bernard’s attendance at the sale of important Dutch scholarly libraries, including that of Nicholas Heinsius (1620-1681) in 1683.<sup>27</sup> The young and aspiring Anglo-Saxon scholar and palaeographer, Humphrey Wanley (1672-1726), was appointed to make a list of the books in Bernard’s collection of which the Bodleian had no copy. This list, in Wanley’s autograph, survives among the Bodleian’s series of Library Records, and is titled “Catalogus Librorum (è Bibliotheca D. Ed. Bernardi) in Bodleiana desideratorum” [i.e. a catalogue of the books lacking in the Bodleian].<sup>28</sup> In another document, the original of which I have been unable to locate, but which was published in part by Philip Bliss in his edition of Anthony Wood’s Athenae Oxonienses in the nineteenth century, Wanley lays out the story more fully.<sup>29</sup> After Bernard’s death, he explains, he was ordered to make “a catalogue of those books in the said Dr. Bernard’s study (being not manuscripts nor collated with manuscripts) which were either wholly wanting in the publick library, or else were of different editions.” Wanley subsequently had to whittle the list down, as it was longer and therefore more expensive than the university officials were happy to pay. “I was afterwards required to extract from it a new list of the chiefest books,” Bernard

explains, which involved (among other omissions) “leaving out most of the rabbinical authors, because such are, at present, but little used.”<sup>30</sup>

Nevertheless, the 1646 Mishnah was chosen for the Bodleian. On Wanley’s first handwritten list, it is recorded as number 969 among the “Libri in Octavo” and given the title “Liber Mishnaioth cum punctis, per Men. ben Israel. Amst. 1646.”<sup>31</sup> Wanley has added an asterisk and a cross beside the book: these signs seem likely to indicate books that were selected for purchase. Why was this volume selected when a copy was in fact already in the library? It would be pleasing to think that Wanley was attracted to this volume because of Bernard’s annotations and as such he saw some special significance in it. Bernard’s annotated books were valued at his death, but primarily for their marginal collations of manuscripts.<sup>32</sup> The reality is more prosaic: the book was acquired by mistake. It apparently was catalogued not as a copy of the Mishnah, but as a book by Menasseh ben Israel. This is exactly how the Nonjuring antiquary, Thomas Hearne (1678-1735) recorded the book in the 1700s (when he was library assistant to John Hudson [1662-1719], Bodleian librarian) in his interleaved copy of the 1674 catalogue, where he heavily revised the entry for Menasseh ben Israel, adding “Liber Mishnayoith, cum punctis. Amst. 1646. 8°. S. 104. Th.”<sup>33</sup> Hearne’s work formed the basis of the revised 1738 catalogue of the printed books. While that catalogue’s entry for “Mishnaioth” recorded the same volumes as the 1674 catalogue, the entry for Menasseh ben Israel is revised according to Hearne’s notes, and here the 1646 Mishnah appears, albeit with a slightly inaccurate shelfmark.<sup>34</sup> For our purposes, what is most important is that the story of this book’s provenance points to Bernard’s ownership.

As we shall see, Bernard played a key role as one of the encouragers and galvanizers of Mishnaic study in late seventeenth-century Oxford. To an extent that



was unusual even in that late humanist polyglot world, Bernard worked across disciplines, languages, and traditions. He was a passionate student of Middle Eastern languages, and in the 1690s considered putting himself forward for the university's professorship of Hebrew.<sup>35</sup> It was as the Savilian Professor of Astronomy that he spent much of his career, and he was equally engaged with the history of mathematics, planning an enormously ambitious edition of Euclid's Elements in Greek, Arabic, and Latin.<sup>36</sup> His interests ranged beyond the borders of the world of the Abrahamic religions, too, as he studied John Selden's map of China.<sup>37</sup> His intellectual center of gravity, however, was the study of the ancient world from Europe to North Africa and the Middle East, which bore fruit, for instance, in his book reconstructing ancient weights and measures across those traditions.<sup>38</sup> Unusually among his projects, this one was actually published, but most of his works were only partially finished. He spent much of his life working on an edition of Josephus for Oxford University Press, a project supported initially by John Fell (1625-1686), bishop of Oxford, which would have been part of Fell's wider publication of editions of texts (especially patristic texts) from the first centuries after Christ.<sup>39</sup> However, only fragments of Bernard's edition would ever be published.<sup>40</sup> That edition did offer an entrée into the international world of the learned correspondence in the republic of letters, within which he was unusually widely and well connected for an English scholar at the end of the seventeenth century. The fragments of Josephus's Antiquities of the Jews that were published show Bernard's tendency toward colossal annotations, and indeed the act of annotation itself – with all its inevitable tendency toward copiousness and incompleteness – lay at the heart of Bernard's life's work. Annotation was his natural scholarly mode.

Bernard's religious sympathies were thoroughly with the high church, among the learned circles of which he moved for his whole life. Many would have expected him to side with the Nonjurors at the Glorious Revolution, and his behavior around 1689 signaled as much. He published a devotional handbook which was presented to the archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft (1617-1693), who apparently greeted it "very kindly," as well as an appendix on British etymology to the Old English grammar of his friend George Hickes (1642-1715), the man who would go on to become the leader of the Nonjuring church.<sup>41</sup> Sancroft, of course, refused to swear the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary, and along with Hickes became one of the leading figures in the Nonjuring church. Eventually, though, Bernard himself did take the oaths to William and Mary, and in 1691 became rector of Brightwell near Oxford. Nevertheless, he continued his lifelong correspondence with his friend, the Nonjuror Thomas Smith, and expressed sympathy for their mutual friend, the Anglo-Irish patristic scholar, Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), when he was ejected from the Camden Professorship of History due to his own refusal to swear the oaths.<sup>42</sup> After Bernard took the oaths, he continued working on the devotional handbook which had won him Sancroft's admiration. A manuscript of a vastly expanded second edition of this work survives in the Bodleian (MS Bodl. 896), replete with huge arrays of patristic and Talmudic sources; the whole work hints at the continuities between orthodoxy, devotion, and erudition for Bernard.

The study of the Mishnah inevitably cut across several of Bernard's scholarly preoccupations. In the fragments of his edition of Josephus's Antiquities of the Jews that reached print, for instance, Bernard carefully compares Moses's speech to the Israelites before his death to the arguments found in the Mishnah and the Talmud.<sup>43</sup> I have argued elsewhere that these completed sections of his edition of Josephus's

Antiquities, published in 1700, likely date from the early 1680s, by which time he was clearly deeply engaged with the Mishnah.<sup>44</sup> However, the work with which Bernard's marginal notes correlate most precisely is another project which came to fruition in the 1680s. This was Bernard's account of weights and measures in the ancient world. That work was originally published in 1685 as an appendix to the commentary on Hosea published by Oxford's Professor of Hebrew (and leading Arabic scholar), Edward Pococke (1604-1691), and then expanded as a separate book in 1688, where references to the Mishnah are particularly frequent. In a prefatory letter (in English) addressed to Pococke in the first version of this work, Bernard announced his wide-ranging ambition of "recovering the just Weights and Measures of antiquity," including, "the Eggs of the Rabines."<sup>45</sup> Discussion of the "ovum Rabinorum"—the use of the size of an egg as a standard of measurement in Rabbinic terminology—is developed in the standalone version of Bernard's book. Here, he notes that "if less than the weight an egg is consumed it does not cause uncleanness, according to the opinion of Shammai," and he cites as evidence two passages from the first order of the Mishnah, Zeraim: Terumot ("Heave-Offerings") 5:1-2 and Orlah ("The Fruit of Young Trees") 2:5.<sup>46</sup> Both these passages are marked in Bernard's Mishnah, the first simply with the word "ovum", and the second (and more significant reference, in that it attributes this rabbinic view to Shammai the Elder) with the comment that "the quantity of an egg is required for uncleanness."<sup>47</sup> This is one of many details of Jewish measures and coinage that Bernard picks out in his book's margins (and a correspondence which adds further confirmation that Bernard is the author of the annotations).

It seems very likely, then, that Bernard owned his 1646 vocalized Mishnah in the mid-to-late 1680s, and that he was using it as a kind of working copy to draw

material for his revision and expansion of his initial appendix to Pococke's book. It is worth noting that Bernard did own at least one other copy of the Mishnah, which is recorded in the auction catalogue of Bernard's books which were not bought by the Bodleian. This was a 1606 Venice edition of the Mishnah with the commentaries of Maimonides and Bartenora (a copy of which the Bodleian already owned).<sup>48</sup> He may well have been using this edition of the Mishnah in parallel to the 1646 vocalized edition, and given that the Venice edition contained the most prized commentaries on the Mishnah (which Bernard drew upon in his notes on Josephus), they may have served different purposes. Is there evidence, however, that Bernard acquired the 1646 vocalized Mishnah any earlier than the 1680s? Thomas Smith recorded in his biography of Bernard that his great friend was "well versed in classical authors and not unlearned in Hebrew" by 1655, when he was elected fellow of St John's College, Oxford.<sup>49</sup> This suggests his studies would not yet have advanced beyond biblical Hebrew. Moreover, the surviving evidence – scattered and fragmentary as it is – does not suggest that he owned the vocalized Mishnah in the 1650s or 60s. Bernard made two catalogues of his own books, one that is dated to 1658 and another which is undated, but was probably made around 1670 (to judge by the books' dates of publication). Neither of these catalogues feature the 1646 Mishnah. They do, however, show that Bernard was likely engaged in reading Mishnaic tractates in translation from an early date. The notebook in which Bernard made a record of his library in 1658 begins with Bernard's notes on the bookseller Octavian Pulleyn's printed catalogue of 1657 – presumably titles that Bernard was interested to acquire. One of them is "per Empereur Codex Middoth, seu de mensuris templi."<sup>50</sup> Constantijn l'Empereur's edition and translation of Middoth was one of the most widely read Latin translations of a Mishnah tractate in Europe.<sup>51</sup> The 1658 catalogue,

however, shows that he did already own by this point another key work of Mishnaic studies: Johannes Cocceius's edition and translation of tractates Maccoth and Sanhedrin, which Bernard calls "Cocceius in tit. Talm."<sup>52</sup> In the ca. 1670 catalogue, Bernard records that he owned a copy of Samuel Clarke's translation of tractate Berakhot.<sup>53</sup> By this point he already had a not insignificant (albeit perhaps miscellaneous) collection of Hebrew books, including Shulchan Aruch, Sepher Kerithoth, and Simon ben Zemah Duran's Oheb Mishpat. However, no copy of the whole Mishnah is listed. This pattern of ownership does suggest a conclusion: in the 1650s and 60s, Bernard began to own and study the Latin translations of the Mishnah, rather than the Mishnah itself. His 1646 vocalized Mishnah was therefore likely acquired some time after 1670, but before this work he was making use of his marginal notes on ancient weights and measures in the mid-1680s.

The pattern of annotations, too, would also support this conclusion. Perhaps most important here is what is not annotated. We have already noted that Bernard does not annotate the entire Mishnah: he breaks off at the end of tractate Tamid, and then makes scarcely any annotations to the whole of Seder Tahorot (Purity). Perhaps he simply eventually ran out of energy before quite reaching the end of the whole Mishnah. However, earlier in the Mishnah there are several tractates that are not annotated. It is striking that many of the tractates which were completely unannotated had Latin translations by 1670, including Shabbat, Eruvin, Middoth, Bava Kamma, and Maccoth. This includes tractates with which we know Bernard was deeply engaged, such as Yoma, from the vocalized text of which he recorded some notes on vestments of the high priest in one of his notebooks.<sup>54</sup> In other words, lack of annotation certainly did not indicate disinterest in a tractate, nor even necessarily that Bernard did not read the vocalized text. It suggests that Bernard had

other resources for making notes elsewhere, and that the margins of the texts with Latin translations, for instance, may have been more conducive to recording his thoughts on those tractates. An exception is tractate Berakhot, the translation of which by Samuel Clarke we already noted Bernard owned; however, perhaps this was simply due to this tractate's exceptional importance as the start of the Mishnah. A limit case is tractate Sotah, of which the German Hebraist, Johann Christoph Wagenseil (1633-1705) would publish a translation in 1674. Bernard has made only one annotation on this tractate: perhaps this then suggests that he found little of immediate use for his purposes in this tractate rather than that he relied on Wagenseil's translation. Shekalim was translated by Johann Wülfer (1651-1724) in 1676, and as Joanna Weinberg has discovered Wülfer presented a copy of his edition of the tractate to Bernard with a handwritten manuscript dedication in English.<sup>55</sup> This tractate was underlined and annotated by Bernard. In other words, the pattern suggests that Bernard may have been working intensively with this book in perhaps the early 1670s in order to read the greater part of the Mishnah which had not yet been translated into Latin.

In this context, it is also important to note that the book contains two relatively distinct "layers" of annotation. The notes of the first layer are relatively simple in their approach to the Mishnah, in that they only keep track of the Tannaitic authorities whose arguments are cited; in the second layer, however, the notes are more discursive and sophisticated in their analysis. The first layer of annotations is uncharacteristically neat for Bernard, and there is a possibility that this is the work of another annotator, perhaps an earlier owner of the book. However, despite their neatness, close examination of these notes show that they also contain some of the characteristic features of Bernard's hand, including otiose flourishes over individual

letters. The same can be said of the relatively neat notes which are found in the front and back pastedowns. The front pastedown lists the opening of each of the Mishnah's tractates, while at the back certain Hebrew words are indexed. My view, overall, is that all the notes in the margins of the book are in Bernard's hand. The character of the annotations suggest two phases of reading: an earlier, where Bernard was still simply focussing on following the complicated arguments, and a later, in Bernard's unmistakable scrawl, where he is evincing his own interpretations of the Mishnah. Perhaps the first layer of notes might constitute an initial foray beyond the known limits of the Latinized Mishnah, and the second layer a deeper analysis reflecting his mature Mishnaic studies in the later 1670s and 80s. I will return in the conclusion to reflect on the significance of Bernard's potential use of the vocalized Mishnah as an educative entry-point into this hugely complex text, but for now I want to unpick the most substantive of the marginalia (all of which is certainly in Bernard's hand). What did Bernard value in this ancient Jewish text and how did he interpret it?

### **Bernard's Mishnah, the Study of the New Testament, and the Restoration Church**

The 1646 Mishnah contains little by way of paratextual materials. There are two Hebrew prefaces and a lexicon at the end of the book, neither of which Bernard annotates.<sup>56</sup> In his book on weights and measures and in his annotations on Josephus, Bernard frequently interprets the Mishnah in the light of the later Jewish commentary tradition, whether that is the Talmud or the commentaries on the Mishnah. However, in his notes on the 1646 Mishnah, Bernard, as it were, takes his

cue from the fact that the book lacks this kind of commentary in its margins to interpret the work largely outside that context. It should be acknowledged that occasionally, Bernard does make links between the Mishnah and the Jewish commentaries upon it. The mishnah at the end of tractate Hagigah (“Festival Offerings”), for instance, discusses the fact that the altar of gold and the altar of bronze in the Temple were “not susceptible to uncleanness.”<sup>57</sup> Rabbi Eliezer claims this is because they were “reckoned as like to the ground,” whereas other sages say that it is because “they were plated [with metal].”<sup>58</sup> Bernard’s note on this passage refers to the Babylonian Talmud’s treatment of this mishnah, where much greater discussion can be found of whether the altar was more or less likely to be impure having been coated in metal.<sup>59</sup> This topic may somehow have been connected to his interest in weights and measures. One invitation to consult Maimonides’s commentary on the Mishnah (to “see Maimonides on this”) does come in tractate Maaser Sheni (“Second Tithe”), beside a mishnah discussing the value of various coins, which again may have been connected to Bernard’s interest in ancient weights and measures, of which coinage was an aspect.<sup>60</sup> There are also links made to Maimonides’s Mishneh Torah, but they are more sporadic than might be expected given many Christian scholars’ reliance on this text as a means to navigate and simplify Rabbinic argument. The nakedness of the 1646 Mishnah’s margins leaves Bernard able to work with the Mishnah in a way that is discernibly different from the practice of the Cambridge Hebraist, Robert Sheringham (1602-1678), whose commentary on Yoma takes care to interpret the tractate according to Jewish traditions.<sup>61</sup> The 1606 Venice edition of the Mishnah with the commentaries of Maimonides and Bartenora, that Bernard owned, may have served a purpose that



was complementary to but distinct from the 1646 Mishnah: to read the Mishnah in the context of those key Jewish commentaries.

Instead of serving to interpret the Mishnah in the context of the Jewish commentaries, Bernard's notes point up connections between the Mishnah and the New Testament, especially the writings of St. Paul. It should be stressed that there was nothing unorthodox about this approach of Bernard's – quite the opposite, in fact. The notion that New Testament Greek embodied Semitic languages, phrases and ideas was widely accepted in English Protestant scholarship in the second half of the seventeenth century.<sup>62</sup> To read Bernard's Mishnah annotations is to watch this approach to the New Testament in action. Pesahim ("The Feast of Passover") is one of the tractates that Bernard annotated most heavily and to which he gave the Latin title "De Paschalibus." The first mishnah of chapter 4 explores the question of what a person should do who travels from a place where it is customary not to work on the day before Passover to a place where people do work. What rules ought to apply to him? Should he work? Here is the mishnah:

Where the custom is to do work until midday on the day before Passover they may do so; where the custom is not to do work, they may not work. If a man went from a place where they do so to a place where they do not, or from a place where they do not to a place where they do, to him is applied the more stringent use of the place which he has left and the more stringent use of the place to which he has gone; but let no man behave differently [from local use] lest it lead to conflict.

Bernard underlines the ending of this mishnah and makes the following marginal comment: “thus St Paul was all in all [πᾶς ἐν πᾶσι].”<sup>63</sup> He is linking this passage of the Mishnah to 1 Corinthians, chapter 9 (KJV), where Paul explains that he has “made [himself] servant unto all, that I might gain the more.” “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. ... To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men [τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα], that I might by all means save some” (1 Cor. 9:19-20, 22). Here, Bernard is pointing not to a verbal link between the Mishnah and Paul’s epistles, but to a cultural one. Both texts – Mishnah and New Testament – emerge from the same cultural milieu and thus embody some of the same values. The Mishnah ultimately advises its Jewish readers to adopt local custom in order to avoid conflict. Bernard’s note suggests that Paul’s cultural adaptability – his ability to be “all things to all men” in order to spread Christianity – is a product of this norm, absorbed as part of his Jewish cultural background.

Another aspect of commonality that Bernard finds between the Mishnah and St. Paul is in their use and treatment of passages of the Old Testament. A striking instance is to be found in a note Bernard makes on the final mishnah of tractate Moed Katan (“Mid-Festival Days”), which deals with the question of mourning rituals at festivals. This mishnah – and indeed the whole tractate – concludes by turning to the future, “a time that is to come.” The last words are a quotation from Isaiah 25:8: “He will swallow up death for ever, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.” Here, again, Bernard perceives connections to the thought of St Paul, and he notes in the margin: “Behold the agreement of the ancient Doctors [i.e., the Tannaim of the Mishnah] and St. Paul in their commentary's exposition of that wonderful

passage.”<sup>64</sup> The moment in St. Paul’s writings that Bernard must be thinking of is in 1 Corinthians 15, where Paul quotes Isaiah as the culmination of his own meditation on the mystery of the Resurrection and Last Judgment. “Behold, I shew you a mystery,” Paul says, in one of the New Testament’s most famous passages (15:51). “So when this corruption shall have put on incorruption,” he argues, “and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory” (15:54), the passage of Isaiah that is also quoted at the end of “Moed Katan.” Bernard’s comment is strongly worded here: he sees “agreement” [assensum] between the Mishnah and St Paul in their interpretations of this passage. Bernard here points to deep commonalities of understanding across Jewish and Christian traditions.

Not only does Bernard find underpinning cultural and spiritual connections between the Semitic world of the Mishnah and the New Testament, he also reads the Mishnah itself in symbolic and Christological terms, finding prophetic significance in ancient Jewish prescriptions. In another example from tractate Pesahim, the Mishnah specifies that during Passover, “[t]he [freewill] festal-offering may be taken from the sheep or from the oxen, from the lambs or from the goats, from the males or from the females, and consumed during two days and one night” (6:4). Bernard notes: “Thus was Jesus Christ in the tomb for three days.” Here he draws out the typological, Christological significance of the festal offering.<sup>65</sup> Another comparable instance can be found in Bernard’s notes on tractate Rosh ha-Shanah (“Feast of the New Year”). The tractate explains that in ancient times, the Jews used to kindle flares to signal that the new moon had been spotted. “And from what place did they kindle the flares?,” the Mishnah asks. “From the mount of Olives [they signalled] to Sarteba, and from Sarteba to Agrippina, and from Agrippina to Hauran, and from

Hauran to Beth Baltin.” Bernard notes: “the mount of Olives (from where the Lord, the light of the World, rises),” as though the flares rising from the Mount of Olives to signal the new moon were a sign to be fulfilled by the ascent of Christ, the Light of the World.<sup>66</sup>

It would have been commonplace for commentaries on Leviticus to allot Christological significance to the Passover offerings. In the second instance, Bernard translates the methodologies of typological reading that would be applied to the Old Testament and uses them to interpret the Mishnah. Even though this was a text compiled after the coming of Christ, to Bernard it seems to have embodied within it many of the same prophetic qualities of the Old Testament. Given that the Mishnah was often understood by Christian scholars as a written record of the Oral Law handed down by God to Moses on Mount Sinai, it is not surprising he should read the Mishnah in this way.<sup>67</sup> Indeed, to Bernard the Mishnah is clearly valued not only as a cultural and linguistic key to the New Testament, but as a theological commentary on the Old. One of the most remarkable instances of Bernard’s use of the Mishnah in this way brings together the margins of his annotated copy with his editorial work on Josephus. This comes in his notes on the latter mishnayot of tractate Maaser Sheni (“Second Tithe”), 5:10-13, which explicate and expand upon Deuteronomy 26.13-15, the avowal to be pronounced after a particular tithe-offering. The final mishnah exclaims rhapsodically to God about the rewards that might issue to the Israelites from their following these commandments: “Look down from thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless thy people Israel, and the land which thou hast given us, as thou swarest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey.” In his copy, Bernard notes in the margin “Deut. 26.13,” and places an “NB” beside the whole passage (a sign he uses frequently throughout the Mishnah).<sup>68</sup> He goes on

to make use of this passage directly in the notes to Josephus as part of his vast discussion of the beliefs and practices surrounding “first fruits”; this single note stretches over four folio pages of dense text. As part of his discussion of Deuteronomy 26, he translates Maaser Sheni 5:13, an expansion and clarification of the invocation to God which concludes this section of Deuteronomy. “Thus reads the Commentary of the Pharisees on Deuteronomy c. 26. 13, 14, 15,” he concludes, giving the reference to this passage of the Mishnah, “gleaming with piety, as I think, and with good learning.”<sup>69</sup> The value of the Mishnah for Bernard, then, lay not just as a kind of cultural companion to the world of the New Testament, but as a guide to the meaning of the Old — one “gleaming with piety and good learning,” suggesting the almost reverential attitude with which Bernard read at least parts of the Mishnah.

Perhaps most striking in a modern scholarly context are the connections Bernard draws between the Mishnah and Christian ecclesiastical and liturgical practice. Polly Ha has traced the ways in which Jewish texts were used, on the one hand, by Nonconformists to separate the ceremonies of the Jewish church from contemporary ecclesiology (showing they are time and context dependent), and, on the other hand, by the ecclesiastical establishment to draw continuities between divinely appointed Jewish ritual and the church of the present moment. Ha points to the importance of Richard Hooker in this latter tradition, and Bernard’s reading of the Mishnah certainly has something in common with this approach.<sup>70</sup> In chapter 5 of Pesahim, the Mishnah describes the ritual slaughtering of the Passover offering, during which the Temple servants would sing the Hallel (Psalms 113-118). “If they finished it,” Pesahim 5:7 explains, “they sang it anew, and if they finished it a second time they sang it a third time, although it never happened that they thrice completed it.” Beside this description of ritualized, repetitive singing, Bernard makes the

following note: “from hence, the repetitions in Christian prayers.”<sup>71</sup> Here Christian liturgy is seen as continuous with Jewish worship. Bernard notices a similar example of continuities between Jewish and Christian festivals when in tractate Hullin (“Animals Killed for Food”) his eye is drawn to discussions of fasting. “If a man vowed to abstain from flesh,” one mishnah argues, “he is permitted the flesh of fish and locusts.” Bernard comments, “this is the case among fasting Christians.”<sup>72</sup> In the same tractate, another of Bernard’s notes draws out the Mishnah’s implications about Judaism’s institutional structure after the Second Temple period. Chapter 10 of Hullin begins with a discussion of “The law of the shoulder and the two cheeks and the maw”: that when someone kills an ox or sheep, he must give these parts to the priests (Deuteronomy 18:2). This law, the mishnah states, “is binding both in the Land [of Israel] and outside the Land, both during the time of the Temple and after the time of the Temple.” The Mishnah discusses hypothetical objections to this prescription, but concludes that the “Scriptures says, And I have given them unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons as a due for ever” (Leviticus 7:34). Bernard’s marginal conclusion is telling: “Therefore there were priests among the Jews in the time of Juda ha-Nasi,” the compiler of the Mishnah.<sup>73</sup> For Bernard, the passage’s key implication is that although there was no longer a high priest after the Second Temple – and in that sense no “sons” of Aaron – the offering was still due, and thus there must have been a priesthood to which it could be due. This kind of continuity points to the enduring institutional structure of the priesthood: it was not historically bound and contingent to the Old Testament period. Jewish and Christian ritual blur into one another.

For Bernard, the Mishnah does not only point toward the general form of Christianity. It is even reminiscent of the specific form of Christianity in Bernard’s

England. The very last mishnah of tractate Megillah (“The Scroll of Esther”) specifies passages of the Bible which ought not to be read aloud or interpreted in the synagogue, and among those are the stories of David and Bathsheba and of David’s son Amnon’s love for his sister Tamar. Bernard underlines this and comments: “The Christian Church should not read these things because of the great danger of unchastity.” “Thus rightly,” Bernard’s note continues, “the Book of Revelation is omitted from our lectionary, with the exception of a few chapters.”<sup>74</sup> “Our lectionary” is the Book of Common Prayer (1662), which prescribes that the “New Testament shall be read over every year thrice ... except the Apocalyps, out of which there are only certain proper Lessons appointed upon other Feasts.”<sup>75</sup> In this remarkable annotation, Bernard hints both at parallels between Mishnaic prescripts and contemporary liturgy, and at the possibility of taking inspiration from the Mishnah for the liturgy’s future reformation to ensure it meets appropriately high moral standards. In this annotation, he moves seamlessly from the Mishnah to the key document of Restoration English orthodoxy, the Book of Common Prayer.

### **The Significance of Edward Bernard’s Copy of the 1646 Vocalized Mishnah**

The 1646 Mishnah has long been understood to be a project in which the demands, needs, and aspirations of Christians and Jews collided to create a single book: on the one hand, the world of Amsterdam Jewry and Jewish publishing; on the other, the enthusiasms of millenarian Christians, for whom the study of Jewish texts was a means to encourage conversion and, in turn, the second coming of Christ. Edward Bernard’s interventions in the text – the richness of which, the above discussion has only begun to bring to light – constitutes a next chapter in that story. His copy of the

book itself constitutes a palimpsest of intellectual traditions, where Amsterdam Jewry, Millenarian Protestants, and now, with Bernard's interventions, English high church scholarship, meet on the same page. How far did Bernard's use of the book represent a departure from the intentions of the Jews and Christians who created it? And are there any continuities to be found? The departures are obvious: Bernard has brought the 1646 vocalized Mishnah into a very different religious context from the one in which it had been envisaged. For one thing, Bernard's interest in the Mishnah had nothing whatsoever to do with converting real life Jews to Christianity, and thus was divorced from the millenarianism of Hartlib and some of his correspondents. More significantly, his annotations effectively draw the book away from the Nonconformists of the revolutionary era and into the world of orthodox, high church, biblical, patristic and Middle Eastern scholarship in late seventeenth century Oxford, of which Bernard was a leading representative.

Bernard's use of the Mishnah as a key to the language and culture of the New Testament was a continuation of some of the work that John Pearson (1613-1686), bishop of Chester, had gathered at the Restoration in the massive volumes of biblical commentary, the Critici Sacri. More immediately, Bernard's intense study of the Mishnah in the 1670s and 80s was likely inextricably linked not only to his work on Josephus and ancient weights and measures for the University Press, but also more broadly to the patronage of John Fell, who played a decisive role in encouraging the study of Middle Eastern texts in Oxford in this period.<sup>76</sup> Bernard brought the millenarian 1646 vocalized Mishnah into the world of high church Oxford scholarship, where it was, in a sense, already quite at home. Nevertheless, Bernard was working at a moment when the value of the Mishnah was far from uncontested, both abroad and even at home. In 1669, the theologian and scholar of Middle Eastern languages



Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672), expressed his concerns in a letter to John Lightfoot about the latest (posthumous) edition of the French Oratorian Jean Morin's (1591-1659) Exercitations on the Authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the bible. As part of a much wider attempt to discredit the Hebraica veritas and thus cast the emphasis on the role of the Catholic Church as the Bible's custodian and guarantor, Morin argued that the Mishnah was a far later production than was generally agreed. Pointing to the silence of fathers such as Jerome and Origen about the Mishnah, he claimed this was a work not of the third but of the mid-sixth century CE, a translation into Hebrew of earlier Greek works in response to the emperor Justinian's decree forbidding the public reading of deuterosis in synagogues.<sup>77</sup> Even Thorndike had to admit that Morin's "arguments seem to conclude that [the Mishnah] could not be in published authority so soon," but, significantly, he insisted that of all Jewish writings, "the Misna must needs be as anciently written as is pretended, by the very stile of it, being so roundly and elegantly couched."<sup>78</sup>

These arguments were adopted at the end of the 1670s by a Protestant scholar whom Bernard enormously admired, Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), as part of his own defence of the authority of the Septuagint over that of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>79</sup> Bernard was deeply concerned by Vossius' arguments, as appears from a letter he wrote to the French Huguenot scholar, Henri Justel, soon after Vossius's book was published. "What truly does Richard Simon, what do others think about the recent little book of Isaac Vossius?," he asks. "Judaic literature perishes, the studies of the Buxtorfs, Lightfoot, and others perish, unless someone will respond to Vossius and wipe away the infamy of rabbinism."<sup>80</sup> The terms in which Bernard thinks here are revealing. His concern is not for what is built upon Hebraic foundations – for the church practices that derive authority from Jewish sources. His concern is for the

Jewish texts themselves, and the traditions of (not coincidentally Protestant) learning they have inspired, traditions which he so admired and which the desire to emulate (so Smith claims in his biography) drove Bernard to want to become a scholar in the first place.<sup>81</sup> Bernard's Jewish studies, in other words, do not seem motivated by only by a desire to develop arguments that can be used to defend Protestantism or the English church. For Bernard, it is also the other way round: the correspondences between the Mishnah's teachings and the New Testament or church practice are what confirm the Mishnah's value and authority, or even, at times, its sacredness. Viewed in this context, of course, that is not to say that such an approach was completely disinterested or detached from the confessionalized world of early modern erudition. It was that world which meant there was a need to defend a text such as the Mishnah.

In contrast, then, to the many differences between Bernard's religious position and that of the group who encouraged the 1646 Mishnah, are there also continuities between Bernard's use of the book and the aims of its creators? I noted at the outset that Menasseh ben Israel and Jacob Judah Leon conceived the vocalized Mishnah as a pedagogical tool: to help Jews who were not familiar with the text, or perhaps not even very familiar with Hebrew, to begin to study the Mishnah. The dating of Bernard's annotations perhaps to the early 1670s suggests he was also using the book propaedeutically: to enable him to embark on the vast sea of untranslated Mishnah. It would seem highly plausible that the first layer of (unusually) neatly written notes – which primarily simply record the names of the rabbis in the Mishnah – represented an early stage of grappling with the difficulties of the text. The 1670s was clearly a crucial phase in Bernard's Mishnaic studies. In 1669, Bernard embarked on a journey to Holland, and he wrote to his fellow scholar of Middle

Eastern culture Samuel Clarke about the many scholarly projects he hoped to encounter there. The Dutch theologian, Johannes Leusden (1624-1699), he noted, “promises to sett out [th]e Misna in Hebr. & Lat with Notes.”<sup>82</sup> He was therefore already well aware of the need for an edition of the whole Mishnah with Latin translation. In the 1670s, as is well known, Bernard was in contact with the Jewish scholar, Isaac Abendana (ca. 1640-1699), who was engaged in translating the entire Mishnah into Latin in Cambridge.<sup>83</sup> There are hints that by the end of the 1670s (by which time Abendana had finished translating the Mishnah and was no longer receiving payment in Cambridge) Bernard was in regular touch with him. The Ely clergyman and scholar Thomas Broughton (d.1709), writing in 1679, asked Bernard to convey “my service to the Dr Abendana & tell him I haue not heard from him a long time.”<sup>84</sup> Abendana was frequently dismissed by Bernard’s fellow scholars: his friend Thomas Smith claimed that “suppressing his translation [of the Mishnah] for ever” would be the only way to “secure the favourable opinion, which you & others have of him.”<sup>85</sup> Bernard, on the other hand, refers to him as “my master Abendana,” hinting that he may have studied with him, perhaps even studied the Mishnah, just as the German scholar Theodor Dassow did.<sup>86</sup> If so, these studies would likely have been in the 1670s, when he seems to have been most in touch with Abendana. A last hint that the vocalized Mishnah represents an earlier stage of Bernard’s Mishnah studies is another absence: of any reference to Judaeo-Arabic scholars. Marcello Cattaneo has recently drawn attention to Bernard’s discussion of the Mishnah not long before his death in his letter to the clergyman and Hebraist Patrick Gordon, who himself intended to translate the Mishnah. Here Bernard notes that “a Christian having by him a learned Jew, especially one whose natural tongue is Arabe, might turne the whole to better advantage then hath yet been done.” As Cattaneo explains,

the inspiration for this approach was the work of Edward Pococke on Maimonides's Judaeo-Arabic commentary on the Mishnah. If by the 1690s, however, Bernard was convinced that the Mishnah needed to be understood within "a tradition of interpretation which had partially taken place in Arabic centuries after its original composition," the margins of his copy do not show his adoption of this approach.<sup>87</sup> This stands in contrast to Bernard's notebooks, where he does quote from the thirteenth-century scholar Tanḥum ha-Yerushalmi (1220-1291), who wrote a commentary on the Mishnah in Judaeo-Arabic, which Pococke had been instrumental in promoting.<sup>88</sup>

If Bernard were using the vocalized Mishnah as a relatively propaedeutic tool to grapple with the syntactic and grammatical challenges of untranslated Mishnah, he would not have been out of step with his contemporaries. The young Narcissus Marsh recorded the date of purchase of his own copy of the vocalized Mishnah on its title page: 1658.<sup>89</sup> This was the year in which Marsh became a fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, having matriculated at Magdalen Hall in 1656 at the age of eighteen and taken his BA in February 1658. Presumably Marsh bought the book in Oxford.<sup>90</sup> Marsh was only a few months younger than his friend Bernard, and their studies seem to have taken a similar trajectory. In 1667, the follower of Pococke, Middle Eastern scholar and architypographer of Oxford University Press Samuel Clarke (bap.1624, d.1669) also seems to have been putting the vocalized Mishnah to pedagogic use for students. In that year, he printed his parallel Latin-Hebrew text of tractate Berakhot, presented on the title page as "for the use of students in Talmudic letters in Christ Church."<sup>91</sup> What has not before been noted is that the vocalized text he prints is almost identical to that of the 1646 Mishnah, with the exception of only very minor differences. By contrast, the other vocalized text of the Mishnah, which

had been printed in 1643 in Constantinople, omits whole words printed in Clarke's edition. The most likely scenario is that Clarke used the 1646 vocalized Mishnah as his copytext. In advertising the edition as a pedagogic text aimed at those learning to study the Mishnah Clarke worked in parallel to Menasseh ben Israel and Jacob Judah Leon. In adding a Latin translation, he worked in parallel to Boreel and the Hartlib circle. Bernard, as we have noted, owned Clarke's translation: it may even have been his first encounter with the vocalized text of the Mishnah.

Having studied the Amsterdam vocalized Mishnah, Bernard was poised to make his most significant and lasting contribution to seventeenth-century Mishnaic studies. This was his edition and preface of William Guise's (1653-1683) edition and translation of the first order of the Mishnah, Zeraim, which emerged from Oxford University Press in 1690.<sup>92</sup> Guise was a prodigiously gifted scholar of Middle Eastern languages, who was inspired by the example of Edward Pococke to plunge into the study of both the Mishnah and Judaeo-Arabic commentators and philologists, whose work he uses to shed light on Zeraim.<sup>93</sup> Guise's research was encouraged by Bernard – or perhaps it was the other way around – before Guise passed away in 1683, at the age of only thirty.<sup>94</sup> The volume was eventually ready to appear from Oxford University Press in early 1690. "I have been prevail'd with to give a short account of [th]e Excellent Mr. Guise," wrote Bernard to Smith in March 1690, "that his Fragment on [th]e Misna may come abroad."<sup>95</sup> This dedicatory preface, a paean to Guise's linguistic talents, is addressed (appropriately) to Narcissus Marsh. Bernard also reaffirms the value of Mishnaic study itself. Guise, Bernard explains, understood that the Mishnah is essential for the understanding of the "speech, rites, customs, and precepts" of "both Testaments," something he had learned and "seen demonstrated with the greatest praise by Lightfoot's commentaries on the

Evangelists.”<sup>96</sup> Bernard also takes the opportunity to reject the Catholic/Vossian critique of the Mishnah’s lack of antiquity. Whereas they had argued that Jerome’s ignorance of the Mishnah showed that it was a later compilation, Bernard claimed specifically that Jerome did know the Mishnah. “The rector of Bethlehem,” as Bernard calls Jerome, “had indeed at one time seen this work the Mishnah, a volume he thought little less or even equal to the Testament of our own faith.” He only “held off from translating it because of the difficulty of the argument.”<sup>97</sup> This is a claim that Bernard also advanced in his notebooks: “The Tiberian Jews (among whom this book was established a little while before by Judah the Prince) presented the Mishnah to St Jerome.”<sup>98</sup> The Mishnah’s antiquity, then, was very real, and it was held in the highest esteem by St Jerome, one of the authorizing figures of Renaissance Hebrew studies. “I should be glad,” wrote Bernard to Smith, reflecting on the edition at the start of April 1690, “if the Remaynes of Mr Guise occasion the publication of the entier Misna in Latine. For the Hebrew copyes, you knowe, are frequent enough. We want that incentive to [th]e study of the Orientall learning.”<sup>99</sup> Despite this pessimism about the state of Hebrew studies, Bernard’s wish would be fulfilled sooner than he might ever have imagined with the publication of Gulielmus Surenhusius’s six volume Amsterdam edition of the Mishnah, which began to emerge in 1698, the year after Bernard’s death. Surenhusius’s edition was the summa of seventeenth-century Mishnaic studies, drawing together Christian scholarship on the text from across Europe. He reprinted not only Guise’s notes on Zeraim, but also Bernard’s preface, which effectively becomes one of the prefaces to the entire Mishnah and a justification of its study. Scholars have already begun to show that the 1646 Mishnah was indeed read. Bernard’s copy, however, allows us to go considerably further. Instead of a book largely neglected by learned England, the

1646 vocalized Mishnah emerges as a vital node in a network of Mishnaic studies that spanned the second half of the seventeenth century, crossing the boundaries between England and the Dutch Republic, Jews and Christians, millenarian radicalism and high church orthodoxy.

---

This article emerges from research conducted during a Polonsky Visiting Fellowship at the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, as part of a 2019 Oxford Seminar in Advanced Jewish Studies project entitled “The Mishnah between Christians and Jews,” which was convened by Joanna Weinberg and Piet van Boxel. I am very grateful to the convenors and to all participants on the project for their constructive comments, inspiration, and unfailing support. The present article is intended partly as a companion to the essays published in a volume which has resulted from this project, The Mishnaic Moment: Jewish Law among Jews and Christians in Early Modern Europe, ed. Piet van Boxel, Kirsten Macfarlane, and Joanna Weinberg (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022). I am extremely grateful for the comments I received at the Renaissance Society of America Conference (2021), where an early version of this paper was presented, and to John-Mark Philo, Deborah Stephan, Michael Cornett, Polly Ha, and two anonymous peer reviewers for their invaluable feedback.

<sup>1</sup> On the publication history of the Mishnah, see Piet van Boxel, Kirsten Macfarlane, and Joanna Weinberg, eds., “Introduction: The Mishnah between Jews and Christians in Early Modern Europe,” in The Mishnaic Moment: Jewish Law among Jews and Christians in Early Modern Europe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 3-43, at 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> Mishnayot im nekudot ve-im perush Kaf Nahat (Constantinople, 1643).

<sup>3</sup> R.H. Popkin, “Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges in Holland and England, 1640-1700,” in Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century: Studies and Documents, ed. J. van den Berg and E. G. E. van der Wall (Dordrecht, Neth.: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988), 3-32; R.H. Popkin and Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, “Samuel Hartlib, John Worthington, and John Durie on Adam Boreel’s Latin Translation of the Mishna (1659-1661),” in Jewish-Christian Relations, ed. van den Berg and van der Wall, 155-160; Ernestine van der Wall, “The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel and the Mishnah Project: Six Unpublished Letters,” Lias: Journal of Early Modern Intellectual Culture and Its Sources 16, no. 2 (1989): 239-263.

---

<sup>4</sup> Yosef Kaplan, "Jews and Judaism in the Hartlib Circle," Studia Rosenthaliana 38/39 (2005/2006): 186-215, at 198-99; A. K. Offenber, "Jacob Jehuda Leon (1602-1675) and His Model of the Temple," in Jewish-Christian Relations, ed. van den Berg and van der Wall, 95-115.

<sup>5</sup> Francesco Quatrini, Adam Boreel (1602-1665): A Collegiant's Attempt to Reform Christianity (Leiden: Brill, 2020), esp. 61-78 on his work on the vocalized Mishnah and interest in Judaism.

<sup>6</sup> Kaplan, "Jews and Judaism in the Hartlib Circle." Although he shared Hartlib's interest in conversion of the Jews, Quatrini has questioned how far Boreel ought to be described as a millenarian (see Adam Boreel, 383).

<sup>7</sup> Mishnayot : helel ro'shon zera'im zemanim nashim (Amsterdam, 1646). Citations of this edition are abbreviated as M (1646), followed by signature references.

<sup>8</sup> Theodor Dunkelgrün, introduction to the special issue, "The Jewish Bookshop of the World. Aspects of Print and Manuscript Culture in Early Modern Amsterdam," Studia Rosenthaliana 46, no. 1-2 (2020): 7-28, at 14.

<sup>9</sup> Marvin Heller, Printing the Talmud: A History of the Earliest Printed Editions of the Talmud (Brooklyn, NY: Im Hasefer, c. 1992), 31.

<sup>10</sup> Kaplan, "Jews and Judaism in the Hartlib Circle," 197-198.

<sup>11</sup> Richard H. Popkin and David S. Katz, "The Prefaces by Menasseh ben Israel and Jacob Judah Leon Templo to the Vocalized Mishnah (1646)," in Jewish-Christian Relations, ed. van den Berg and van der Wall, 151-153.

<sup>12</sup> David Sclar, "Cultivating Education and Piety: Menasseh ben Israel, Lay Readership, and the Printing of the Mishnah in the Seventeenth Century," in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 278-298.

<sup>13</sup> For the story of a copy's fascinating journey through Jewish communities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries see Martina Mampieri, "From Menasseh ben Israel to Solomon Proops: Amsterdam Jewish Druckwesen in the Library of Isaiah Sonne," Studia Rosenthaliana 46, no.1-2 (2020): 97-116, at 103-104.

<sup>14</sup> James Crossley, ed., The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, vol. 1 (Manchester, for the Chetham Society, 1847), 199, 319.

<sup>15</sup> Kaplan, "Jews and Judaism in the Hartlib Circle," 200.



---

<sup>16</sup> Richard H. Popkin, "Two Treasures of Marsh's Library," in Judaeo-Christian Intellectual Culture in the Seventeenth Century: A Celebration of the Library of Narcissus Marsh (1638-1713), ed. Allison P. Coudert, Sarah Hutton, Richard H. Popkin, and Gordon M. Weiner (Dordrecht, Neth.: Springer, 1999), 1-8, at 8. A far fuller continuation of Popkin's story is to be found in David B. Ruderman, "The Study of the *Mishnah* and the Quest for Christian Identity in Early Eighteenth-Century England: Completing a Narrative Initiated by Richard Popkin," in The Legacies of Richard Popkin, ed. Jeremy D. Popkin (New York: Springer, 2008), 123-142.

<sup>17</sup> Sclar, "Cultivating Education and Piety," in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 293, where he cites Nina Cohen, "Imaginary Jews for Imaginary Audiences: Jewish and Christian Appropriations of the 1646 Vocalized Mishnah" (M.A. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2012).

<sup>18</sup> Willhelm Surenhuys, Mischna sive Totius Hebraeorum juris, rituum, antiquitatum, ac legum oralium systema, 6 vols. (Amsterdam, 1698-1703). The importance of this edition has been explored in David B. Ruderman, Connecting the Covenants: Judaism and the Search for Christian Identity in Eighteenth-Century England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 75-76 and now in essays by Joanna Weinberg, Richard Cohen, Dirk van Miert, and Kirsten Macfarlane in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg.

<sup>19</sup> Oxford, Bodleian Library (hereafter Bodl.), Opp. 8°. 131. On Oppenheim's collection see Joshua Teplitsky, Prince of the Press: How One Collector Built History's Most Enduring and Remarkable Jewish Library (New Haven, Conn.: Yale UP, 2019).

<sup>20</sup> Bodl. Opp. Add. 4° IV. 605. The title page bears a note "Seld. ⊕ 128," and 128 is stamped on the spine.

<sup>21</sup> Bodl. 8° S. 104 Th.

<sup>22</sup> Shebuoth 4:13 in M (1646), sig. 18, 8<sup>v</sup>: marginalia: "blesse & curse not", "y<sup>e</sup> Ld smite thee, you whited wall".

<sup>23</sup> On Bernard's life, see Hugh de Quehen, "Edward Bernard (1638-1697), mathematician and Arabist," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography online, Oxford University Press, May, 29, 2022, doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/2240. An important assessment of his scholarship remains G.J. Toomer, Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 299-305.

- 
- <sup>24</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 127, p. 129: Smith to Hearne, Aug. 3, 1706.
- <sup>25</sup> Thomas Hyde, Catalogus impressorum librorum bibliothecae Bodleianae in Academia Oxoniensi (Oxford, 1674), pt. 1, 459.
- <sup>26</sup> Bodl. Th. 1. 8. Art. Seld.; 4<sup>o</sup>. B. 49, 50, Th. Seld. (incomplete); and 8<sup>o</sup>. Z. 8. Th. Seld. (pt.1).
- <sup>27</sup> See de Quehen, “Edward Bernard”, ODNB.
- <sup>28</sup> Bodl. Library Records MS c. 1816.
- <sup>29</sup> Anthony Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, ed. Philip Bliss, 4 vols. (London, 1813-20), vol. 4, cols. 707-710.
- <sup>30</sup> Wood, vol. 4, col. 707.
- <sup>31</sup> Bodl. Library Records MS c. 1816, p. 31. Here and elsewhere I have silently expanded common abbreviations in manuscripts and printed books.
- <sup>32</sup> See the catalogue of Bernard’s books “collated with manuscripts” [collat. cum MSS], in London, British Library, Sloane MS 825.
- <sup>33</sup> Bodl. Library Records MS c. 1081: Hearne’s annotated copy of Hyde’s 1674 catalogue, interleaved I-Z.
- <sup>34</sup> Catalogus impressorum librorum bibliothecae Bodleianae in Academia Oxoniensi, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1738), 2: 169, where the shelfmark is given as 8<sup>o</sup> G. 104. Th.
- <sup>35</sup> In a letter to Thomas Smith, July 24, 1691, Bernard discloses “my small ambition for the Hebrew chair” (Bodl. MS Smith 47, fol. 90’).
- <sup>36</sup> Benjamin Wardhaugh, Encounters with Euclid: How an Ancient Greek Geometry Text Shaped the World (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 2021), 81-89.
- <sup>37</sup> William Poole, “Edward Bernard’s Chinese Map”, The Seventeenth Century 35, no.3 (2020): 363-388.
- <sup>38</sup> Edward Bernard, De mensuris et ponderibus antiquis libri tres (Oxford, 1688).
- <sup>39</sup> Jean-Louis Quantin, “Erudition and Orthodoxy: John Fell and Patristic Scholarship in Restoration Oxford,” Erudition and the Republic of Letters 1, no. 1 (2016): 43-78.
- <sup>40</sup> Edward Bernard, ed., Flavii Josephi antiquitatum Judaicarum libri quatuor priores (Oxford, 1700). For more on Bernard’s project to edit Josephus see, Thomas Roebuck, “‘Great Expectation among the Learned’: Edward Bernard’s Josephus in Restoration Oxford,” International Journal of the Classical Tradition 23, no. 3 (2016): 307-325.

- 
- <sup>41</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 57, p. 109, letter of Smith to Bernard, Oct. 17, 1689. Bernard's "Etymologicon Britannicum" appeared as an appendix to George Hicckes, Institutiones grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae et Moeso-Gothicae (Oxford, 1689).
- <sup>42</sup> See Bodl. MS Smith 47, fol. 93r, where Bernard describes Dodwell (in a letter to Smith) as "our good & deprived freind Mr. Dodwell".
- <sup>43</sup> Bernard, ed., Flavii Josephi ... libri quatuor, 282-323.
- <sup>44</sup> Roebuck, "Great Expectation among the Learned," 320-321.
- <sup>45</sup> "A Letter of Dr. Edward Bernard Professor of Astronomy in Oxford to Dr. Edward Pocock Regius Professor of the Hebrew Tongue in the same University," in Edward Pockocke, A Commentary on the Prophecy of Hosea (Oxford, 1685), sig. a1<sup>r</sup>.
- <sup>46</sup> Bernard, De mensuris ... libri tres, 11: "Ovo minus [corrected from miuus] neminem polluit, si comedatur, dogma Samaeum Trumot c.5.1,2. & Orla c.2.5."
- <sup>47</sup> Orlah 2:5 in M (1646), sig. 4, 7<sup>v</sup>, Bernard's note: "quantitas ovi ad immunditiem requiretur."
- <sup>48</sup> Edward Millington, Bibliotheca Bernardina (London, 1697), 6: "Libri orientales ... in Folio", item 11: "Sepher Misnaiot, sive Deuterotion Codex cum Comment. Majemonides, &c. Vet. 1606."
- <sup>49</sup> Thomas Smith, Vita clarissimi et doctissimi viri, Edwardi Bernardi (London, 1704), 4: "in Classicis Authoribus versatissimus, nec erat Ebraicè ineruditus" (quoted in de Quehen, "Edward Bernard", ODNB).
- <sup>50</sup> Bodl. MS Lat. misc. f. 11, fol. 6<sup>r</sup>. The book appears in Catalogus librorum in omni genere insignium, quorum copia suppetit Octaviano Pulleyn (London, 1657), 90.
- <sup>51</sup> Constantijn L'Empereur, Talmudis Babylonici Codex Middoth sive de mensuris Templi (Leiden, 1630).
- <sup>52</sup> Bodl. MS Lat. misc. f. 11, fol. 12<sup>v</sup>; Johannes Cocceius, Duo tituli Thalmudici Sanhedrin et Maccoth (Amsterdam, 1629).
- <sup>53</sup> Bodl. MS Lat. misc. f. 7, fol. 33<sup>r</sup>: "Massecheth beracoth. Hebr. & Lat."
- <sup>54</sup> See Bodl. MS Lat. misc. e. 7, fol. 5<sup>r</sup>, where Bernard quotes the vocalized text of Yoma 7:5 under the heading "On the High Priest's Eight Golden Vestments" [De octo Vestibus Aureis P.M.].
- <sup>55</sup> Joanna Weinberg, "The Role of Jewish Commentaries in Christian Interpretation of the Mishnah in Seventeenth-Century Northern Europe," in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 301-319, at 312.

---

<sup>56</sup> There is a note on one of the pages of the lexicon, but it appears to be incidental rather than a commentary on that page.

<sup>57</sup> The word 'mishnah' (with a lower-case 'm') is used to designate an individual paragraph of the Mishnah, as opposed to the Mishnah as a whole, which begins with an upper-case 'M'.

<sup>58</sup> Hagigah, 3:8. Translations of the Mishnah are those of Herbert Danby, trans., The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes (Oxford: OUP, 1933; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2016).

<sup>59</sup> Hagigah 3:8 in M (1646), sig. 7, 5<sup>v</sup>, Bernard's note: "Talm. bab. f. 27. Chagiga".

<sup>60</sup> Maaser Sheni 2:9 in M (1646), sig. 4, 2<sup>v</sup>, Bernard's note: "v. Maim. ad hunc loc."

<sup>61</sup> Thomas Roebuck, "'Ancient Rabbis Inspired by God': Robert Sheringham's Surprising Edition of Mishnah Tractate Yoma (1648)," in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 193-214. Bernard's annotations to Josephus point his readers to the edition of Yoma "with the notes of the most learned Sheringham" [cum notis doctissimi Sheringami]. See Bernard, ed. Josephi ... libri quatuor priores, 215.

<sup>62</sup> On the origins of the study of the "lingua Hellenistica" among the students of Joseph Scaliger, see Dirk van Miert, The Emancipation of Biblical Philology in the Dutch Republic, 1590-1670 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), especially 103-132. On the absorption of this kind of work into orthodox English scholarship, see Dmitri Levitin, Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), chap. 1.3, "English Intellectual Culture, c. 1640-1700," 13-21.

<sup>63</sup> Pesahim 4:1 in M (1646), sig. 6, 3<sup>v</sup>, Bernard's note: "ita S. Paulus erat πᾶς ἐν πᾶσι".

<sup>64</sup> Moed Katan 3:9 in M (1646), sig. 8, 1<sup>r</sup>, Bernard's note: "Ecce veterum Doctorum & B. Pauli assensum in praeclari istius commentationis expositione."

<sup>65</sup> Pesahim 6:4 in M (1646), sig. 7, 2<sup>r</sup>, Bernard's note: "Ita J.X. erat tribus diebus in sepulchro".

<sup>66</sup> Rosh Hashanah 2:4 in M (1646), sig. 8, 1<sup>v</sup>, Bernard's note: "mons oliveti (unde Dominus ascendit lux mundi)".

<sup>67</sup> See Roebuck, "Sheringham's Edition of Yoma", in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 196-197.

<sup>68</sup> Maaser Sheni 5:10-13 in M (1646), sig. 4, 4<sup>v</sup>.

---

<sup>69</sup> Bernard, ed., Josephi ... libri quatuor priores, 300: “Sic erat Pharisaeorum Commentatio ad Deut. c. 26. 13, 14, 15. pietate, quod sentio, & bona eruditione praeclara, Maaser Seni c. ult. §. 10. &c.”

<sup>70</sup> See Polly Ha, “Who Owns the Hebrew Doctors? Oriental Scholarship, Historical Proportionality, and the Puritan ‘Invention’ of Avant-Garde Conformity,” Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 2023: XXXX.

<sup>71</sup> Pesahim 5:7 in M (1646), sig. 7, 1<sup>v</sup>, Bernard’s note: “inde repetitiones in precibus Xtianis”.

<sup>72</sup> Hullin 8:1 in M (1646), sig. 23, 4<sup>v</sup>, Bernard’s note: “ita in jejuniis Xtianis obtinet”.

<sup>73</sup> Hullin 10:1 in M (1646), sig. 23, 5<sup>r</sup>, Bernard’s note: “Ergo erant sacerdotes tempore Judae hannasi inter Judaeos”.

<sup>74</sup> Megillah 4:10 in M (1646), sig. 10, 2<sup>r</sup>, Bernard’s note: “Recte sic, in lectionaris nostris omittitur Apocalypsis Johannis, quid enim nil aliud praeter paucula capita”.

<sup>75</sup> Brian Cummings, ed., The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662 (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 217.

<sup>76</sup> See Alastair Hamilton, “The Learned Press: Oriental Languages,” in The History of Oxford University Press, Volume 1: Beginnings to 1780, ed. Ian Gadd (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 399-417, at 406.

<sup>77</sup> Jean Morin, Exercitationum biblicarum, de Hebraei Graecique textus sinceritate libri duo (Paris, 1669), pars posterior, Exercitationes 6, chap. 2, 294-297.

<sup>78</sup> John Rogers Pitman, ed., The Whole Works of Rev. John Lightfoot, D.D. Master of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, 13 vols. (London, 1834), 13: 443-444, letter of Herbert Thorndike to Lightfoot, May 18, 1669.

<sup>79</sup> Isaac Vossius, “De Judaeorum Grammatica, & de Judaeis Hellenistis,” in Isaaci Vossii de sibyllinis aliisque quae Christi natalem praecessere oraculis (Oxford, 1679), 89. See Scott Mandelbrote, “Isaac Vossius and the Septuagint,” in Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), between Science and Scholarship, ed. Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 85-117, at 100-101, on the connections (and distinctions) between Vossius’s work and “mainstream post-Tridentine, Catholic scholarship.”

<sup>80</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 16, p. 115, letter of Bernard to Henri Justel, Feb. 13, 1679/80: “Quid verò P. Simonius, quid alij sentiant de nupero libello Is. Vossii? perit literatura Judaica, pereunt studia Buxtorfiorum, Lightfoti, et similium, ni aliquis responderit Vossio, et infamiam Rabbanismi absterserit.”

<sup>81</sup> See Smith, Vita ... Bernardi, 7.

---

<sup>82</sup> British Library Add. MS 4275, fol. 40r, letter of Bernard to Samuel Clarke, 1669.

<sup>83</sup> On Abendana, now see Theodor Dunkelgrün, “The First Complete Latin Translation of the Mishnah (1663-1676): Isaac Abendana and Rabbinic Erudition in Restoration England,” in Mishnaic Moment, 89-113, esp. 105 for Abendana’s letter to Bernard.

<sup>84</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 45, p. 175: letter of Thomas Broughton to Bernard, Oct. 19, 1679.

<sup>85</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 57, p.129: letter of Smith to Bernard, April 5, 1690.

<sup>86</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 47, fol. 92r: letter of Bernard to Smith, n.d., printed in Toomer, Eastern Wisdom, 296. I am grateful to Theodor Dunkelgrün for sharing his thoughts on the meaning of Bernard’s honorific here. For Dassow’s studies with Abendana, see Guido Bartolucci, “Translating the Mishnah and the Conversion of the Jews: The Case of Isaac Abendana’s student Theodor Dassow,” in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 114-131.

<sup>87</sup> Marcello Cattaneo, “Between Law and Antiquarianism: The Christian Study of Maimonides’s Mishneh Torah in Late Seventeenth-Century Europe,” in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 237-254, at 242-3.

<sup>88</sup> Bodl. MS Lat. misc. e. 7, fol.11v.

<sup>89</sup> The inscription reads, “Liber N: Marsh. Exon Coll: Socij 1658. pr. x[s].” See the entry for Mishnayot: ḥeleḳ rishon zera ‘im zemanim nashim, entered and revised by Javier del Barco, May 30, 2020, at Footprints: Jewish Books through Time and Place, ed. Michelle Chesner et al., [footprints.ctl.columbia.edu/footprint/5256/](http://footprints.ctl.columbia.edu/footprint/5256/). I am grateful to Marcello Cattaneo for sharing his notes on this volume with me.

<sup>90</sup> On Marsh’s Hebrew books see Bradford A. Anderson and Jason McElligott, “Jewish and Hebrew Books in Marsh’s Library: Materiality and Intercultural Engagement in Early Modern Ireland,” Religions 11, 597 (2020): 1-41, [doi.org/10.3390/rel11110597](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11110597).

<sup>91</sup> Samuel Clarke, ed. Masseceh Beracoth. Titulus Talmudicus. In quo agitur de benedictionibus, precibus & gratiarum actionibus. Adjecta versione Latina. In usum studiosorum literarum Talmudicarum in Aede Christi (Oxford, 1667).

<sup>92</sup> William Guise, Misnae pars: ordinis primi Zeraim tituli septem, ed. Edward Bernard (Oxford, 1690).

<sup>93</sup> See Alastair Hamilton, “William Guise: The Application of Arabic to the Interpretation of Mishnah Zera‘im,” in Mishnaic Moment, ed. van Boxel, Macfarlane, and Weinberg, 177-192.

---

<sup>94</sup> For their relationship, see, e.g., Guise's letter to Bernard (Bodl. MS Smith 45, fol. 121r) on the Armenian translation of the word for cinnamon in Proverbs 7:17.

<sup>95</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 47, fol. 62r, Bernard letter to Smith, March 22, 1689/90.

<sup>96</sup> Guise, Misnae pars, sigs. \*2<sup>v</sup>-\*3<sup>r</sup>: "Noverat autem vir sapiens & Divinae scientiae studiosissimus ad S. Biblia utriusque Testamenti, ut dictio, ritus, mores, & praecepta eorum recte intelligantur, valde multum conferre Juris Pharisaei corpus, quod Misna sive Deuterosis vocatur. Id etiam à Lightfoto ad S. Evangelia magna cum laude demonstratum viderat."

<sup>97</sup> Guise, sig. \*3<sup>r</sup>-<sup>v</sup>: "Viderat equidem aliquando opus illud Misnicum rector Bethleemiticus, volumen paulo minus, ita putabat aequus, quam fidei nostrae Testamentum: verum difficultate argumenti ab omni translatione abstinuit."

<sup>98</sup> Bodl. MS Lat. misc. f. 2, fol.132<sup>r</sup>: "Librum Misnaioth Judaei Tiberienses (apud quos, dudum conditus erat à Juda Praefecto) obtulére B. Hieronymo." On Jerome's presentation of his Jewish teachers, see Megan Williams, The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 221-231.

<sup>99</sup> Bodl. MS Smith 47, fol. 63<sup>r</sup>: letter of Bernard to Smith, April 1, 1690.