

Israel ben Abraham: An Ashkenazic Translator of Aquinas?*

Milan Žonca

Introduction and the Summary of the Translation¹

This article presents an edition of a set of Hebrew philosophical notes discussing the human faculty of understanding.² Preserved in a 15th-century Ashkenazic manuscript now in Oxford, the notes are attributed to an author named Israel ben Abraham, but in fact draw substantially from the commentary on Aristotle's *De anima* by Thomas Aquinas (*Sentencia libri De anima*, written 1267–1268), without acknowledging this dependence.³ At first sight, the text appears as a rather disorganized collection of excerpts from an unspecified commentary on book 3 of *De anima*, in particular on its famously arcane fifth chapter describing the active intellect. The exposition does not follow the book's structure and the excerpts were clearly rearranged to reflect the compiler's own interests. The text first considers the difference between understanding material and immaterial things (fols 59r–v); then it proceeds to discuss the analogy between the operation of the intellect and sense perception (fols 59v–60v) and

p. 104

*This is a post-print version of an article published in: *Zutot* 19 (2022): 103–120, doi:10.1163/18750214-bja10023. The published version also contains an edition, which is not included here. An alternative edition can be found [here](#).

¹This article was completed thanks to a postdoctoral research fellowship at the Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences.

²Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Mich. Add. 25 (IMHM F 20970), fols 59r–63v. For a description of the manuscript, see A. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford 1886) col. 792 (no. 2278).

³R.-A. Gauthier, ed., *Sentencia libri De anima* (Rome 1984), henceforth *SLDA*. Available online: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k94964> [Note: Unfortunately, the online version is now only accessible on the premises of the BnF. (M.Ž., May 2026)].

argues that intelligibles are stored in the passive intellect (fols 60v–61v). Several paragraphs are dedicated to a discussion of mistaken views of the active intellect, namely that the active intellect is not a separated substance (fols 61v–62r) or identical to the dispositional knowledge of first principles (fols 62r–v). Finally, the excerpts consider the role of common sense and its relation to other senses (fols 62v–64v). Aquinas’s name is nowhere mentioned; the only authorities named besides Aristotle are Avicenna, Maimonides, and Themistius.⁴ The scholastic background of the text is only hinted at by the presence of several foreign terms transcribed into Hebrew (*principium formale*, *res intellecte*, *habitus*, *phantasmata*) and by the references to the ‘language of impurity’ and ‘the language of the Christians’.⁵

The covert nature of the text’s indebtedness to Aquinas does not make it any less substantial. As the list of parallels appended to this article shows, nearly every paragraph contains material that can be traced back to Aquinas’s commentary. Even direct quotations from Aristotle are based on William of Moerbeke’s Latin translation used by Aquinas, rather than on the available Hebrew translation by Zerahyah ben Shealti’el Hen.⁶ At the same time, passages borrowed from Aquinas have been incorporated into the text in diverse ways and various degrees of faithfulness to the original. Parts of the text were translated almost literally, such as the passage on fols 59r–v (l. 8–15). Other excerpts reproduce the contents of Aquinas’s commentary more freely. Sometimes, the structure of Aquinas’s exposition is altered, as in the passage on fol. 62r–v (l. 103–115), where the arguments adduced by Aquinas are recapitulated in a different order. Occasionally, Aquinas’s arguments are paraphrased or summarized in a more concise fashion and passages located in different parts of the commentary are combined to enhance the explanation of the topic under discussion. Both techniques are employed in the paragraph dealing with the actualization of the passive intellect on fols 60v–61v (l. 46–74). Finally, some passages seem to have been distorted by scribal errors in the course of their transmission.⁷ p. 105

⁴See fol. 60r (l. 36) (Maimonides); 60v (l. 46), 61v (l. 74) (Avicenna); 63v (l. 140) (Themistius).

⁵See fol. 59r: רש אנטלקטי (l. 7), פנטשמטא (l. 12), פרינסיפיאום פורמלא (l. 15); fol. 62v: אביטוש (l. 105–109).

⁶G. Bos, ed., *Aristotle’s ‘De Anima’ Translated into Hebrew by Zerahyah ben Isaac ben Shealtiel Hen* (Leiden 1994).

⁷On fol. 62r (l. 103), לו is written down as לא, thus distorting the meaning of the sentence. Similarly, on fol. 59v (l. 14), the translation fails to convey the sense intended by Aquinas because of a missing negative particle לא.

The Character of the Translation

The text clearly does not depend on any other known Hebrew rendering of Aquinas's commentary. Judah Romano, perhaps the most prolific popularizer of Latin philosophy in Hebrew, produced several translations of scholastic works focusing on Aristotelian psychology, including commentaries on *De anima* by Albert the Great and Giles of Rome, but he did not translate *Sentencia libri De anima* in its entirety.⁸ He incorporated two short quotations from it into his other writings, however, neither of these passages is reproduced in the excerpts attributed to Israel ben Abraham.⁹ The whole *Sentencia* p. 106 was translated into Hebrew by an anonymous translator at some point during the fourteenth century under the title *Be'ur Sefer ha-nefesh*.¹⁰ Both Romano's translation and *Be'ur Sefer ha-nefesh* differ substantially from the excerpts attributed to Israel ben Abraham. Romano's philosophical terminology has been described as 'rigid but exact'¹¹ and the same literal approach is characteristic of *Be'ur Sefer ha-nefesh*.¹² In contrast, Israel ben Abraham's excerpts vary in their faithfulness to the Latin original and their philosophical terminology is closer to the one employed by Samuel ibn Tibbon and his followers. To take a prominent example, Romano consistently translates the term *intellectus possibilis* as *sekhel efshari*, while Israel ben Abraham renders it as *sekhel hiyulani*. Similarly,

⁸G. Sermoneta, 'Jehudah ben Mošeh ben Dani'el Romano, traducteur de Saint Thomas', in G. Nahon and Ch. Touati, eds., *Hommage à Georges Vajda: Etudes d'histoire et de pensée juives* (Leuven 1980) 231–262; C. Rigo, 'Yehudah B. Mosheh Romano, traduttore di Alberto Magno: Commento al "De Anima" III, II, 16', *Henoch* 15 (1993) 65–91; C. Rigo, 'Yehudah Ben Mosheh Romano traduttore degli Scolastici latini', *Henoch* 17 (1995) 141–170; C. Wilke, 'Albert the Naturalist in Judah Romano's Hebrew Translations', in R. Fontaine and G. Freudenthal, eds., *Latin-into-Hebrew: Texts and Studies, Volume One: Studies* (Leiden 2013) 245–273; J.-P. Rothschild, 'Quelques philosophes juifs du Moyen Age tardif, traducteurs ou lecteurs de saint Thomas d'Aquin', in E. H. Füllenbach and G. Miletto, eds., *Dominikaner und Juden: Personen, Konflikte und Perspektiven im 13. bis 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 2015) 25–63.

⁹Aquinas's discussion of the nature of light (*SLDA*, II:14, pp. 126–129) appears in Romano's commentary on the Biblical story of creation *Be'ur ma'ase bereshit*. A brief statement concerning the intellect's proper object (*SLDA*, III:2 [III:8], pp. 212–213) appears in Romano's translation of the *Commentary on De anima* by Giles of Rome. See Sermoneta, 'Jehudah ben Mošeh ben Dani'el Romano, traducteur de Saint Thomas', pp. 256–257.

¹⁰M. Zonta, *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico: le traduzioni ebraiche medievali dei testi filosofici antichi* (Brescia 1996) 233. The translation survives in four manuscripts. I have consulted MS Oxford, Christ Church, MS 190 [IMHM F 32854].

¹¹Wilke, 'Albert the Naturalist in Judah Romano's Hebrew Translations', p. 254.

¹²René-A. Gauthier described the translation as '[e]xtremement littérale, [...] un véritable décalque du texte latin.' *SLDA*, p. 41*.

the term *species intelligibilis* is mostly translated by Israel ben Abraham as *tzura muskelet* (perhaps under the influence of a term used by Ibn Tibbon in the *Guide of the Perplexed*, I:68) or simply as *muskal*, while Romano rendered it more accurately as *min muskal*.¹³ Both Romano and the anonymous translator also employed Hebrew equivalents for terms such as *mathematica* (*limudiyim*) or *habitus* (*kinyan*) which have been left untranslated by Israel ben Abraham.

Israel ben Abraham's notes share some common traits with a set of 78 Hebrew excerpts from Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* (and one passage from *Summa contra gentiles*) preserved under the title *Sefer Hokhmat ha-elohut* in three manuscripts.¹⁴ The compilation represents a heterogeneous selection of well-known passages from the *Summa* (such as the famous five ways to prove the existence of God) as well as some less prominent specimens of Aquinas's thought. Like the passages translated by Israel ben Abraham, the excerpts collected in *Sefer Hokhmat ha-elohut* do not follow the order in which they appear in the *Summa*. Furthermore, the compiler clearly attempted to conceal the fact that the text was produced by a Christian scholar and he left out parts deemed unsuitable or irrelevant from a Jewish point of view. The translator of *Sefer Hokhmat ha-elohut* employed the terminology of the Tibbonid school. However, the text contains no vernacular glosses or references to Latin terminology. While Tamás Visi has suggested that the translation originated in Spain or Italy, remarkably, all three manuscripts preserving it were copied by Ashkenazic scribes and marginal notes added by later hands in one of the manuscripts suggest that the excerpts were studied in Germany.

Context

It is important to note, however, that Israel ben Abraham did not merely summarize and rearrange the content of Aquinas's commentary, but also interacted with it. He interwove the text with interpolations expressing agreement (fol. 63v), marking a subject for further inquiry (fol. 60r), or inserting additional commentary (fol. 61r). The different layers present in the translation can be illustrated by examining the excerpt on fol. 60r (l. 33–39). In this pas-

p. 107

¹³Compare C. Wilke, 'Judah Romano's Hebrew Translation from Albert, De Anima III', in A. Fidora, H.J. Hames, and Y. Schwartz, eds, *Latin-into-Hebrew: Texts and Studies, Volume Two: Texts in Contexts* (Leiden 2013) 369–436 (p. 396 l. 10–11, p. 418 l. 12).

¹⁴T. Visi, 'Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae* in Hebrew: A New Finding', in R. Fontaine and G. Freudenthal, eds, *Latin-into-Hebrew: Texts and Studies, Volume One: Studies* (Leiden 2013) 275–293.

sage, Aquinas's explanation of Aristotle's statement regarding the unity of sense object and sensory capacity in act is related to the analogous claim regarding human intellect. The analogy is buttressed by a reference to the *Guide of the Perplexed* by Maimonides and several questions are raised concerning the exact nature of human intellect.

The formulation of the central issue – how can the capacities to sense or to intellect be united with the objects being sensed or intellected while retaining their own identity – also reveals the limits of the translation used in the text. Aristotle's statement that 'the actuality of sense object and the sensory capacity is one, but their being is different' (*unus quidem est actus sensibilis et sensitui, esse autem alterum est* in William of Moerbeke's translation) is taken by Aquinas to mean that they 'are one in subject, although they differ conceptually', that is, they are distinct to human thought (*actus sensibilis et sensitui est unum subiecto, set differunt ratione*).¹⁵ The author of the Hebrew translation employed the word 'atzmut to render the Latin terms *esse* ('in being') and *ratione* ('in thought', 'conceptually'), thus distorting both the original passage and Aquinas's explanation of it.¹⁶ At the same time, the mistranslation aligned the excerpt more closely with the debate in the *Guide of the Perplexed*. In chapter I:68, Maimonides emphasizes that in God the subject and object of understanding are always united, because God's essence is to be constantly in act, while both separated intellects and the human intellect pass from potentiality to actuality only from time to time. It is to this difference between the First Intellect and other types of intellect that the excerpt alludes. Thus, Israel ben Abraham seems to have read Aquinas through the lens of the discussions familiar to him from his study of Maimonides.

Manuscript

While a more thorough analysis is necessary to establish the precise contours of Israel ben Abraham's approach to Aquinas's commentary, it seems that the excerpts should be examined primarily within the framework of his study of Jewish philosophical texts. This suggestion is further corroborated by the codicological context of Israel ben Abraham's notes. The manuscript was copied

p. 108

¹⁵I have used the translation by R. Pasnau, *A Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima* (New Haven 1999) 307.

¹⁶The Latin term *esse* is translated as *metzi'ut* on fol. 59r (twice) and most probably also on fol. 63r, where the same passage from *De anima* is quoted again (the reading of the manuscript is corrupted).

by an Ashkenazic scribe called Me'ir who was active around the mid-15th century in Italy.¹⁷ The first 58 folios contain a collection of extracts taken mostly from the *Guide of the Perplexed* and from the commentary of Moses Narboni.¹⁸ The quotations are not arranged according to the order of chapters in the *Guide*, but rather grouped into clusters of related excerpts addressing various issues, such as the nature of human intellect and its divine and celestial counterparts, prophecy, divine providence, as well as the significance of biblical sacrifices. The compiler marked many paragraphs for further inquiry or added questions concerning their subject matter.¹⁹ In addition to Maimonides and Narboni, the selection also contains numerous quotations from Abraham ibn Ezra's *Commentary on the Torah*, two longer quotations from Gersonides's *Wars of the Lord* (*Milhamot ha-Shem*),²⁰ a quotation from Narboni's commentary on al-Ghazzali's *Intentions of the Philosophers*²¹ and a brief quotation from Judah Romano's preface to his translation of Pseudo-Aristotle's *Liber de causis*.²²

Perhaps most significantly, included in the collection are also three glosses written by Menahem ben Jacob Shalem, an Ashkenazic student of philosophy who lived in Prague at the turn of the 15th century and was perhaps the most important student of Maimonides and Narboni in this area.²³ At least two

p. 109

¹⁷See fol. 64v. Other manuscripts copied by Me'ir are Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Cod. Parm. 3261 (IMHM F 13948); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS héb. 1223, fols 40r–124r (IMHM F 23087, F 15604); Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, A III 13 (IMHM F 34312); formerly London, Montefiore Library, MS 123 (IMHM F 4635).

¹⁸On the commentary, see G. Holzman, 'R. Moshe Narboni's Commentary to Maimonides's "Guide of the Perplexed"' (in Hebrew), *Daat: A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah* 74–75 (2013) 197–236. For a printed edition, see Moshe Narboni, *Be'ur le-sefer More nevukhim*, ed. Jacob Goldenthal (Wien 1852).

¹⁹The examples of such glosses include: ואני לא הבנתי זה הדרך (fol. 40r), צריך לחקור מה הוא (fol. 46r), דעת וידל (fol. 46r), וצ"ע כל אותו הפרק (fol. 57r).

²⁰A quotation from *Milhamot ha-Shem*, I:11 is on fol. 51r, from II:2 on fol. 47v and again 50v. *Milhamot ha-Shem* is cited again more extensively on fols 85r–87r (I:12), 87r–88v (I:13), 88v–91v (I:11), 91v–92v (III:6).

²¹See fol. 58r.

²²See fol. 53r.

²³See fol. 16r (on *Guide of the Perplexed* III:11), 19v (on III:17) and 20v (III:19). On Shalem, see E. Kupfer, 'Concerning the Cultural Image of Ashkenazic Jewry and Its Sages in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries' (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 42 (1973) 113–147; T. Visi, 'The Emergence of Philosophy in Ashkenazic Contexts: The Case of Czech Lands in the Early Fifteenth Century', *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 8 (2009) 213–243; M. Žonca, 'Menahem ben Jacob Shalem and the Study of Philosophy in Late Medieval Prague', in O. Pavlíček, ed., *Studying the Arts in Late Medieval Bohemia: Production, Reception and Transmission of Knowledge* (Turn-

manuscripts containing Shalem's glosses on Narboni's commentary on the *Guide* survive, as well as a manuscript containing his other philosophical writings, including glosses on Narboni's commentary on al-Ghazzali's *Intentions of the Philosophers*, a text which, as we have seen, is also quoted in this compilation.²⁴ The link between Menahem Shalem and the material contained in the Oxford manuscript is further underlined by the fact that it contains an anonymous treatise, written in a form of a letter, explaining in detail Maimonides's interpretation of biblical sacrifices and defending it against the theories proposed by the adherents of Sephirotic Kabbalah.²⁵ Parts of this treatise incorporate Shalem's glosses on Narboni's commentary on the *Guide* criticising kabbalistic beliefs and it is likely that the treatise was written either by Menahem ben Jacob Shalem himself or by one of his students.²⁶

The identity of the compiler of the excerpts on fols 1r–58v is not specified, however, I believe that they were assembled by Israel ben Abraham himself or they were at least produced in his milieu. Two glosses on fol. 3v relating to Narboni's comments on the *Guide of the Perplexed* II:30 are signed [אל] ישר'. In one of them, Israel cites a passage from Narboni's allegorical interpretation of the story of Eden and connects it with a quotation from *De anima*. In his commentary, Narboni claims that the vegetative part of the soul, represented in the biblical story by the serpent, has the potential to annihilate the divine faculty of intellection in man. Israel added the following explanation: 'It seems to me that he has in mind what Aristotle said in part 2 [sic] of *De anima*: To say that men understand after death is like saying that the soul weaves.'²⁷ This

p. 110

hout 2021) 27–47.

²⁴Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 573 (IMHM F 22078), fols 12v–227v; St Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, MS C 47 (IMHM F 69303), fols 4v–245v; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 585 (IMHM F 17390), fols 20r–58r. The gloss on fol. 16r can be also found in MS C 47, fol. 176v; the gloss on fol. 19v in MS C 47, fol. 190r and MS Opp. 573, fol. 181v; the gloss on fol. 20v in MS C 47, fol. 195r; MS Opp. 573, fol. 192v.

²⁵See fols 65r–85r.

²⁶M. Žonca, 'Difference and Intellectual Diversity in Late-Medieval Ashkenaz, 1350–1500' (PhD diss., Queen Mary University of London 2014) 110–126.

²⁷בפ' ח"ב אמ' וידל זה לשוננו גם הכח השכלי אם יזהר בתכלית האזהרה הנה ישובנו בסוף וישיב הכח האלהי דוממי עכ"ל ונראה לי שכוונתו בזה הוא מה שאמ' ארסטו בספר הנפש בח"ב זה לשוננו האומר שנפש האדם תשכיל אחר המות כאלו יאמר שהיא אורגת. ישר'. Compare Narboni, *Be'ur le-sefer More nevukhim*, ed. Goldenthal, fol. 41a.

is an inaccurate quotation of a passage from *De anima* I.4, where Aristotle asks whether the soul can be moved by its own affects.²⁸ Israel employed the analogy of a weaving soul to examine the soul's operation after death. This approach is paralleled by Aquinas in his *Quaestiones De anima*, where he used the same quotation in the discussion whether the actions of human composite can be attributed to the soul itself, hence whether it is capable of intellection after death.²⁹ The scholastic background of this gloss makes it likely that it was indeed written by our Israel ben Abraham. The reference to Narboni's commentary would also establish 1362, the date of its completion, as the terminus post quem for Israel's activity.³⁰

Translator

At this stage of research, it is difficult to say more about the background of Israel ben Abraham. Does his connection to Menahem Shalem, a little known Ashkenazic author active in Prague, and the fact that his translation is preserved in a manuscript copied by an Ashkenazic scribe (albeit one active in northern Italy) suggest that we are dealing with an Ashkenazic Jew who was able to simultaneously study Jewish philosophical texts and Latin scholastic commentaries? An intriguing proposal was brought forward by Malachi Beit-Arié, who noticed the presence of Menahem Shalem's glosses in MS Mich. Add. 25.³¹ He suggested that Israel ben Abraham could be identical with a scholar mentioned in another late 15th-century volume containing Narboni's commentary on the *Guide of the Perplexed* along with numerous marginal glosses. Many of these glosses are signed by Menahem Shalem; two glosses appended to Narboni's discussion of chapters I:72 and I:73 of the *Guide*, however, are signed by a certain 'rabbi Israel the Proselyte' (g[er] tz[edeq]).³² Unfortunately,

p. 111

²⁸[S]aying that it is the soul that gets angry will be rather like saying that the soul weaves or builds a house.' Aristotle, *De Anima (On the Soul)*, transl. Hugh Lawson-Tancred (London 1986) 146 (I.4, 408b11–13).

²⁹[N]ulla enim operatio conjuncti manet in anima separata. Sed intelligere est operatio conjuncti. Dicit enim philosophus in primo de anima quod dicere animam intelligere idem est ac si dicat eam quis texere vel aedificare. Ergo intelligere non manet in anima a corpore separata.' Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones De Anima*, ed. J.H. Robb (Toronto 1968), qu. 15 (p. 206).

³⁰Holzman, 'R. Moshe Narboni's Commentary,' 200.

³¹M. Beit-Arié, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library: Supplement of Addenda and Corrigenda to Vol. 1 (A. Neubauer's Catalogue)* (Oxford 1994) col. 436 (no. 2278).

³²See Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 573, fol. 62v: עד תנוח לכל איכו מתדמה ר"ל שווי עד and fol. 67v: הנה מפליא זה החכ לבאר עניין הזמן כי הוא מגלה ד' שיעמדו יחד בנמוג' מה"ר ישראל ג"ץ

they are too short to reveal much of their author's intellectual profile; however, they attest to his focus on Narboni's commentary as well as his awareness of basic Aristotelian terminology. As we have seen, Israel ben Abraham also wrote glosses on Narboni's commentary and these glosses are found in a similar codicological context, alongside glosses of Menahem Shalem.

Is it really possible that these glosses, as well as the Hebrew excerpts from Aquinas's commentary on *De anima*, were written by a Christian convert to Judaism, perhaps a member of a study circle associated with Menahem Shalem in Prague or elsewhere? While admittedly less sophisticated than the Hebrew of Judah Romano's translations, the language used by Israel ben Abraham seems too fluent for someone who would have acquired it later in his life. As we have seen, Israel ben Abraham's excerpts and the glosses are not primarily interested in Aquinas's position as such, rather, Aquinas's commentary is used to elucidate problematic points in Maimonides and Narboni and the Hebrew translation is distinctly influenced by this focus. All this makes the identification of Israel ben Abraham as a Christian convert less likely. It is also conceivable, however, that the translator worked with a native Jewish collaborator and provided material in oral discussion that was then updated to better suit the concerns of Jewish readers and put down in writing. Surprisingly, another piece of the puzzle is found in the work of the infamous Jewish convert to Christianity, Johannes Pfefferkorn (1469–1523). In his pamphlet *The Magnifying Glass (Handt Spiegel)*, Pfefferkorn related a story about a young Franciscan preacher from Erfurt who converted to Judaism because he desired to marry the daughter of a local rabbi. The rabbi dispatched the friar and his bride-to-be to a town called Hrubieszów 'in Russia', where the convert was later killed by local Jews who feared that he might revert.³³ While the story is full of literary *topoi* and cannot be taken at face value because of the anti-Jewish agenda of its author, one piece of information is strikingly specific, namely the convert's new place of residence. Hrubieszów, a small town in Lesser Poland where Jews were first attested only in mid-15th century, could hardly have served as an archetypical Jewish settlement in the east easily identifiable by Christian readers. Moreover, by the time Pfefferkorn recounted his story, it lay in ruins after Tatar attacks in 1498–1500.³⁴ However, it was precisely in Hrubieszów p. 112

סבותיו חמרו צורתו פועלו ותכליתו מה"ר ישראל ג"ץ. Compare Moses Narboni, *Be'ur le-sefer More nevu'chim*, ed. J. Goldenthal (Wien 1852) fol. 16a, 17b.

³³J. Pfefferkorn, *Handt Spiegel* ([Mainz 1511]), fols. c3v–d4v.

³⁴A. Wein et al., eds., *Pinkas ha-kehilot: Polin* (Jerusalem 1976–2005), vol. 7 (1999) 147–152.

where the part of the manuscript containing glosses signed by ‘rabbi Israel the Proselyte’ was copied in 1489.³⁵ Is it possible that Pfefferkorn heard a story about a learned convert to Judaism during his stay in Prague at the turn of the 16th century, or that he came across some manuscripts produced in Hrubieszów that mentioned him? The coincidence is suggestive, but the evidence ultimately remains inconclusive. Further analysis of philosophical manuscripts copied by Ashkenazic scribes and glosses contained in them can hopefully shed more light on this question, as well as deepen our understanding of the various modes of reception of scholastic philosophy in late medieval Jewish society.

³⁵Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 573, fol. 159v.