Sefarad, vol. 77:1, enero-junio 2017, págs. 91-115
issn: 0037-0894, doi: 10.3989/sefarad.017.004

The *Extractiones de Talmud* and Their Relationship to the Hebrew Talmud Manuscripts of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence (MS Magl. coll. II.I.7, 8 and 9)[*]

Ulisse Cecini[**]
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
ORCID 0000-0002-9397-3180

Las *Extractiones de Talmud* y su relación con las manuscritos hebreos del Talmud de la Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale de Florencia (MS Magl. coll. II.I.7, 8 y 9).– Los manuscritos talmúdicos Magl. coll. II.I.8 y 9 de la Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale de Florencia contienen traducciones latinas marginales del Talmud que corresponden a la traducción del siglo xiii conocida como *Extractiones de Talmud*. En este trabajo se describen los dos manuscritos y su evidencia textual es comparada tanto con la tradición manuscrita de las *Extractiones* como con el texto talmúdico hebreo/arameo que contienen, tratando de responder la pregunta de si los manuscritos de Florencia constituyen, o no, la *Vorlage* de la traducción latina del Talmud. La cuestión se presenta compleja: las sorprendentes analogías parecen sugerir una respuesta afirmativa a la pregunta en cuestión; sin embargo, también pueden encontrarse evidencias que apoyan una conclusión contraria. Aun así, los manuscritos florentinos ciertamente pertenecen a una tradición hebreo-aramea que está muy cercana a la *Vorlage* de las *Extractiones*. Además, el texto latino que ofrecen en sus márgenes refleja un estadio de trabajo anterior en la producción de las *Extractiones*, conteniendo variantes y pasajes únicos que se corrigen u omiten en el resto de la tradición latina manuscrita.

Palabras clave: Traducción del Talmud; latín; hebreo; paleografía; Edad Media; relaciones entre cristianos y judíos.

[*] This article was prepared within the framework of the research project "The Latin Talmud and its Influence on Christian-Jewish Polemic," funded by the European Research Council of the European Union (FP7 / 2007-2013 / ERC Grant Agreement n. 613 694 [http://pagines.uab.cat/lattal]).

[**] ulisse.cecini@uab.cat

The Talmud manuscripts Magl. coll. II.I.8 and 9 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence contain marginal Talmud-translations in Latin which correspond to the 13th-century translation *Extractiones de Talmud.* The two manuscripts are described and their textual evidence is compared both with the Latin manuscript tradition of the *Extractiones* and with the Hebrew/Aramaic Talmudic text which they contain, trying to answer the question of whether the Florence manuscripts are the *Vorlage* of the Latin translation of the Talmud. The matter reveals itself as complex: striking analogies seem to suggest an affirmative answer to the question at stake; however, evidence can also be found which rather supports the opposite conclusion. Nevertheless, the Florence manuscripts certainly belong to a Hebrew/Aramaic tradition which is very close to the *Vorlage* of the *Extractiones.* Moreover, the Latin text they offer in their magins reflects a prior stage of work in the production of the *Extractiones*, featuring unique variants and passages, which are corrected or omitted in the rest of the Latin manuscript tradition.

Keywords: Talmud Translation; Latin; Hebrew; Paleography; Middle Ages; Christian-Jewish Relationships.

The corpus known as *Extractiones de Talmud* is a large collection of Latin translations of almost two thousand passages extracted from the Babylonian Talmud around 1244-45. It was commissioned by the bishop of Tusculum and legate of the Apostolic See in France Odo of Châteauroux at the request of Pope Innocent IV. Already in 1238-39 the Jewish convert Nicholas Donin had brought to Innocent's predecessor Gregory IX some Talmudic passages translated into Latin and organized in thirty-five articles of accusation against the Talmud and its supposed blasphemy against Christianity. This led to a trial and a public disputation between Christian theologians and Jewish Rabbis, held in Paris in 1240 and concluded by the condemnation and public burning of the Talmud in 1241-42 at the Place de la Grève in Paris.[1] When Innocent IV succeeded Gregory IX as Pope, exponents of the French Jewish community approached him, claiming that it was not possible to interpret correctly the Bible and live a ritually cor-

[1] Not all scholars agree on the assumption that the Talmud-investigation had the character of a trial and a public disputation. Rather they interpret the events, in the words of Harvey Hames, as an "inquisitorial-like procedure before a specially appointed commission made up of senior clergymen [...] during which Rabbi Yeḥiel [of Paris] and another rabbi, Judah ben Davin of Melun, were asked a series of questions" based on Donin's thirty-five articles of accusation, to which "they responded with short, succint replies" (see Harvey J. Hames, "Reconstructing Thirteenth-Century Jewish-Christian Polemic. From Paris 1240 to Barcelona 1263 and Back Again," in *Medieval Exegesis and Religious Difference. Commentary, Conflict and Community in the Premodern Mediterranean*, ed. Ryan Szpiech (New York 2015) pp. 115-127 (notes on pp. 241-246), esp. pp. 115-116.

rect life according to Judaism without the Talmud, and hence asked for a revision of the sentence.[2] Thus, the translation contained in the *Extractiones de Talmud* was supposed to offer a new, more systematic and more comprehensive material, allowing a thorough examination of the Talmudic text which would eventually lead to a second, definitive sentence. This was issued in 1248, confirming the condemnation of the Talmud of 1241-42.[3]

This paper will focus on a particular manuscript witness of the *Extractiones*, which differs from the rest of the tradition in the way it presents the textual evidence. Its analysis will allow us to gain further knowledge about the "making-of" of this translation and in particular about its *Vorlage*.

[2] About this, see a letter from Innocent IV to Louis IX dated August 12, 1247: "Sane magistris Iudaeorum regni tui proponentibus nuper coram nobis et fratribus nostris quod sine illo libro, qui hebraice Talmud dicitur, bibliam et alia statuta suae legis secundum fidem ipsorum intelligere nequeunt" (Quoted after: Chenmelech MERCHAVIA, *The Church versus Talmudic and Midrashic literature (500–1248)* (Jerusalem 1970 [in Hebrew]) p. 449 (with some orthographic normalization on my part). The text of this letter is also published in Solomon GRAYZEL, *The Church and the Jews in the XIII^th^ Century. Vol. I: A Study of Their Relations During the Years 1198-1254, Based on the Papal Letters and the Conciliar Decrees of the Period* (2nd. ed. New York 1966 [Philadelphia 1933]) pp. 274-281: 276 and 278; see also an undated letter by Odo of Châteauroux to Innocent IV: "Unde manifestum est magistros Iudaeorum regni Franciae nuper falsitatem Sanctitati Vestrae, et venerabilibus patribus dominis cardinalibus suggessisse, dicentes quod sine illis libris, qui hebraice Talmud dicuntur, Bibliam et alia instituta suae legis secundum fidem ipsorum intelligere nequeunt" (MERCHAVIA, *The Church*, p. 450 [with some orthographic normalization on my part]; GRAYZEL, *The Church and the Jews*, I, pp. 275-279, n. 3 here esp. 276).

[3] This was in fact the result sought for by Odo of Châteauroux. About the biased attitude of the commissioner and the polemical nature of the *Extractiones*, despite their apparent fidelity to the original, see: Ulisse CECINI, "Looking for Polemical Argument: A Closer Look into the Latin Translation of the Talmud, *Extractiones de Talmud* (ca. 1244-45)," in *Studies on the Latin Talmud*, eds. Ulisse CECINI and Eulàlia VERNET (Bellaterra [forthcoming 2017]). The polemical purpose of the translation is highlighted by the fact that the passages from the *Extractiones*, which in a first version follow the sequential order in which they appear in the Hebrew Talmud, were mixed with the previously translated material (*e.g.* Donin's article) and rearranged according to polemical topics (*e.g.* passages against Christians, passages about magic, passages with sexual, silly or erroneous content, tales and legends etc.) in a second step, which results in the thematic version of the *Extractiones*. For a general assessment of the Talmud controversy in the 1240s and further bibliography on the subject, see in the same volume Alexander FIDORA, "The Latin Talmud and its Place in Medieval Anti-Jewish Polemic." About the sequential and thematic version of the *Extractiones* and the relation of the latter with the 35 Articles see Alexander FIDORA, "Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions. The two Versions of the Latin Talmud," *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 2:1 (2015) pp. 63-78. The version we deal with in the present article is the sequential one.

The *Extractiones* and other documents related to the Talmud controversy of the 1240s are transmitted by eight Latin manuscripts:[4]

- P: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 16558 (13th c.), 238ff.
- Z: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, lat. 1115 (end 17th c.), 433ff.
- C: Carpentras, Bibliothèque Inguimbertine, lat. 153 (14th c.), 142ff.
- G: Girona, Arxiu Capitular, ms. 19b (14th c.), 81ff.[5]
- B: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. theol. lat. fol. 306 (15th c.), 209ff.
- S: Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibliothek, ms. Min. 71 (13th-14th c.), ff. 60-153.
- W: Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, ms. I.Q.134a (mid. 13th c.), 2ff.[6]
- M: Stuttgart, Hauptstaatarchiv, SSG Maulbronner Fragment, f. 1r/v (13th-14th c.).[7]

These are all Latin manuscripts; in the section which contains the *Extractiones*, the translated Talmudic passages appear one after another without contextualization.

[4] About the manuscripts see Óscar DE LA CRUZ PALMA, "El estadio textual de las *Extractiones de Talmud* en el BnF ms. lat 16558," in *Studies on the Latin Talmud*, eds. Ulisse CECINI and Eulàlia VERNET (Bellaterra [forthcoming 2017]); Ulisse CECINI, Óscar DE LA CRUZ and Eulàlia VERNET, "Observacions sobre la traducció llatina del Talmud (París, mitjan segle XIII)," *Tamid* 11 (2015) pp. 73-97.

[5] On this manuscript see: José M.ª MILLÁS VALLICROSA, "Extractos del Talmud y alusiones polémicas en un manuscrito de la Biblioteca de la Catedral de Gerona," *Sefarad* 20 (1960) pp. 17-49, and recently Alexander FIDORA, "Die Handschrift 19b des Arxiu Capitular de Girona: Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des lateinischen Talmud," in *Zwischen Rom und Santiago. Festschrift für Klaus Hebers zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Hans-Christian LEHNER et al. (Bochum 2016) pp. 49-56.

[6] Edited in Joseph KLAPPER, "Ein Florilegium Talmudicum des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* 1 (1926) pp. 3-23 (in the critical apparatus of the following editions: *Klap.*).

[7] Edited in GÖRGE K. HASSELHOFF/ÓSCAR DE LA CRUZ PALMA "Ein Maulbronner Fragment der lateinischen Talmudübertragung des 13. Jahrhunderts (mit Edition)," *Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 74 (2015) pp. 331-344

The text of the *Extractiones*, however, is transmitted by one further document, in three volumes, the last two of which contain the text of the Latin translation. It is a Hebrew/Aramaic manuscript containing the original text of the Talmud, which is now in Florence at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, in the Magliabechi Collection, under the shelfmark Magl. coll. II.I. 7, 8 and 9. Henceforth we will call it F, when referring to the whole work, or F_7, F_8 or F_9, when referring to a single volume of the manuscript. In volumes F_8 and F_9, the margins contain Latin translations of the Hebrew text which is right next to them or –mostly– at least on the same page. These translations correspond to the *Extractiones de Talmud*. These Latin passages can be analyzed in a productive way from two different perspectives. On the one hand, the Latin text can be compared with the rest of the manuscript tradition, in the process of collation for the critical edition. On the other hand the Latin text can be compared with the Hebrew text of F to examine its relationship with it. The extraordinary nature of this manuscript in comparison with the rest of the tradition raises a lot of intriguing questions: What was its genesis? How was it used? What relation does it have to the rest of the manuscript tradition? Was it the manuscript from which the translation was first made? In other words: is it the *Vorlage* of the translation?

In this first approach to this very complex manuscript, I will give some examples that will help to reconstruct what happens in this manuscript and will answer some of the aforementioned questions Yet, before getting into textual details, I would like to present some general information about the manuscripts:[8]

[8] The most relevant bibliography on this manuscript is: CECINI, DE LA CRUZ PALMA and VERNET I PONS, "Observacions;" David ROSENTHAL, *Babylonian Talmud. Codex Florence. Florence National Library II.I.7-9* (Jerusalem 1972 [Introduction, English and Hebrew]). This work offers a photographical reproduction of the manuscript); Chen MERCHAVIA, *The Church versus Talmudic and Midrashic Literature (500-1248)* (Jerusalem 1970 [in Hebrew]), and "Latin translations in the margins of the Talmud manuscript Florence and the manuscript Paris 16558" [in Hebrew], *Qiryat Sefer* 41 (1965-66) pp. 545-556; Colette SIRAT, "Les manuscrits du Talmud en France du Nord au XIIIe siècle," in *Le brûlement du Talmud à Paris 1242-1244*, eds. Gilbert DAHAN and Élie NICOLAS (Paris 1999) pp. 121-139; Malachi BEIT-ARIÉ, Colette SIRAT and Mordechai GLATZER, "Florence, Bibliothèque nationale II-I-7," in *Codices Hebraicis litteris exarati quo tempore scripti fuerint exhibentes* (Turnhout 2006 [in French and Hebrew]) vol. IV, pp. 46-61; Raphael Nathan RABINOWITZ, *Sefer Diqdûqê Sofᵉrîm*, part IX (Mainz 1878 [in Hebrew]) pp. 4-5; Moritz STEINSCHNEIDER, "Handschriften des Talmud's mit Rücksicht auf Lebrecht's Abhandl. von M. St. (und nach Mitth. v. Prof. Lasinio)," in *Hebraeische Bibliographie. Blätter für neuere und ältere Literatur des Judenthums* VI (1863) pp. 39-42: 41-42.

The first volume, F_7, has to be considered apart from the other two. It has a colophon, which dates it very precisely to 1177, at least in its second codicological unit, from page 127 onwards.[9] This part contains tractates from the fifth Mishnaic Order, *Qôdašîn* (Sacred things), although in a different order from that found in printed editions.[10] Before this codicological unit another one was bound, containing an incomplete version of the tractate *Bᵉraḵôṯ* (Blessings. In the reference edition of Vilna, it pertains to the Order *Zᵉra'îm*: Seeds). Although this is another codicological unit, it is close in date and style to the subsequent one.[11]

Volumes F_8 and F_9 contain five tractates of the fourth Order, *Nᵉzîqîn* (Damages), and are independent from the previous volume. F_8, contains the first two tractates of *Nᵉzîqîn*, *Baḇâ qammâ* (First door) and *Baḇâ Mᵉṣi'â* (Middle door); F_9 contains the tractates *Baḇâ Batrâ* (last door), *Sanhedrîn* and *Šᵉḇu'ôṯ* (Oaths). Tractate five, *Makkôṯ* (Strikes), which should be contained between *Sanhedrîn* and *Ševu'ôṯ*, is missing (in the *Extractiones* there are passages from *Makkôṯ*).

To sum up, this is the content of the three volumes in a schematic form:

---

[9] The colophon (F_7, p. 334: there is a continuous numeration in Roman numbers on every page of the manuscript) is published in Beit-Arié, Sirat and Glatzer, *Codices Hebraicis*, pp. 46-47.

[10] In modern editions the Order *Qôdašîn* is composed of the following tractates: *Zᵉḇaḥîn*, *Mᵉnaḥôṯ*, *Ḥûllîn*, *Bᵉḵôrôṯ*, *'Araḵîn*, *Tᵉmûrâ*, *Kᵉrîtôṯ*, *Mᵉ'îlâ*, *Tamîd*, *Mîddôṯ*, *Qînnîn*. In F_7 the Order, which is incomplete, begins with *Bᵉḵôrôṯ* 12a. After *Bᵉḵôrôṯ* (pp. 127-194) we have *Tᵉmûrâ* (pp. 194-243), *Kᵉrîtôṯ* (pp. 243-299), *Tamîd* (pp. 299-309), *Mîddôṯ* (pp. 309-315), *Mᵉ'îlâ* (pp. 315-332) and *Qînnîn* (pp. 332-333).

[11] The most recent and thorough description of this volume (with a very short description of the other two) is contained in Beit-Arié, Sirat and Glatzer, *Codices Hebraicis*.

[12] The last page is numbered 333, however the page numeration 108 is repeated three times.

[13] The tractate *Bᵉraḵôṯ* has a total of 64 folios. The last lines of F_7, p. 126, which are evidently on the last folio of the quire (as shown by the first words of the next page, now missing, on the lower left corner of the page), are: שנים עשר שבטים עתידים לצאת מיעקב ששה יצאו ממני וארבעה משתי שפחות (Twelve tribes are destined to issue from Jacob. Six have issued from me and four from the two handmaids), which are found in Ber 60a (lines 24-25 of the Vilna Edition). The next page belongs to the other codicological unit with the order *Qôdašîn*, and begins with the text from Bᵉḵôrôṯ 12a: מאי כיון דאסור בהנאה אין איסור חל על איסור או דילמא כיון (What is [the ruling]? Since it [i.e. the firstborn donkey]

F_7, 335pp.[11]	pp. 1-126 *Beraḵôṯ* (2a-60a)[12] [Order *Qôdašîn*] pp. 127-194: *Beḵôrôṯ* (from 12a) pp. 194-243: *Temûrâ* pp. 243-299: *Kerîṯôṯ* pp. 299-309: *Tamîd*[13] pp. 309-315:*Mîddôṯ*[14] pp. 315-332: *Me'îlâ* pp. 332-333: *Qînnîn*
F_8, 314pp.	[Order *Nezîqîn*] pp.1-146 *Baḇâ qammâ* (from 4a)[15] pp. 147-314 *Baḇâ Me'ṣi'â*
F_9, 359pp.[16]	pp. 1-102 *Baḇâ Batrâ* (2a-73a;140b-)[17] pp. 103-286 *Sanhedrîn* (2a-71a; 75a-77b; 82a-)[18] pp. 287-349 *Šeḇu'ôṯ*

is prohibited for benefit, [its] prohibition cannot take effect on [the other] prohibition; or perhaps, since...; Vilna Edition line 47ff.)

[14] The tractate goes from its beginning to Tam 32b (F_9, p. 306), thus leaving out the chapters 5 to 7 of the Mishna (Tam32b-33b). Then the Mishna is repeated: of chapter 1 and 2 are repeated only the first words (בשלשה מקומות וכו ; ראוהו אחיו וכו; In three places etc. / His fellow saw him etc.). Then, starting from chapter 3, the text is extensively copied until the end (F_9, p. 309).

[15] The last sentence of the Vilna edition (line 24ff, וכך היו אומרים...; and thus they would say: ...) is missing. The text ends with ויום טוב היו עושין שלא נמצא פסול בזרעו של אהרן (And they would make a day of celebration, that no disqualification was found in the descendants of Aaron; Vilna edition, lines 23-24).

[16] The first quire of the manuscript is apparently missing. The text begins with, Bq 4a: את הכופר ולא ראי אדם שחייב בארבעה דברים כראי השור (...[pays] kôfer (atonement), and the attribute of man, who is liable to four things is not similar to the attribute of the ox; Vilna edition lines 29-30).

[17] The last page is numbered 349. However after page 67, the numeration starts again from 58 and then continues until 349. (The page numbers 58-67 are repeated twice, which gives a total number of pages increased by ten compared to the numeration of the last page).

[18] Between p. 70 and 71 a huge part of the text of *Babâ Batrâ* is missing. A librarian noted this at the beginning of the codex ("desunt circiter pagg. 50 inter paginam 70 et 71"). Page 70 ends with the words of Bb 73a: אמר רבה לדידי [לי חזי לי הורמין בר לילית (Rabbah said: I myself [saw Hûrmîn the son of Lîlît]; Vilna edition, line 28) and page 71

The paleographical and codicological description made by Beit-Airié, Sirat and Glatzer states about F_8 and F_9 the following: "The codicological characteristics evoke the Ashkenaz of the beginning of the 14th cen-

---

begins with Bb 140b: האחין בנבסים מועטין [כבת אצל] like the daughter in relation to] the brothers in meager property; Vilna edition, lines 6-7).

[19] F_9 p. 214, San 71a: תנו רבנן אכל כל מאכל ולא אכל בשר שתה כל משקה ולא שתה יין אינו נעשה בן סורר ומורה [עד שיאכל בשר וישתה יין](The rabbis taught: He ate any food, but he did not eat meat; he drank any beverage, but he did not drink wine: he does not become "a wayward and rebellious son" [until he eats meat and drinks wine]); Vilna edition, lines 1-4); p. 215 begins with the closing words of the chapter: הדרן עלך בן סורר ומרה (We shall return to you, [End of the chapter named] "Wayward and rebellious son") and the beginning of the next chapter, chapter 9, San 75a: אילו הן הנשרפין (And these are the ones who are burned, Vilna edition, line 20); The text continues until p. 218, San 77b: ואמר רבה זרק בו חץ וסימנין בידו ובא אחר ופיזרן פטור (And Rabbah (scil. רבא, Rava) said: One shot an arrow at someone and there were medicines in his [scil. the victim's] hand, but someone else came and scattered them: he is not liable; Vilna edition, lines 9-11); p. 219 begins with San 82a: [וכן צוה...] אביה אל תשמעי אלא לגדול שבהם ([And so] her father [ordered]: Do not submit except to the greatest of them; Vilna edition line 49). From there the text goes on until the end. For the missing parts we obviously do not have the Florence version of the text of the Extractiones. Interestingly enough, however, on the lower margin of p. 219 the Latin translation of the passage from San 82a which contains the aformentioned sentence [וכן צוה...] אביה אל תשמעי אלא לגדול שבהם begins from an earlier point of the text, which is absent from the Florence manuscript. The passage begins in fact as follows: "Dixitque Moyses ad iudices Israhel. Occidat unusquisque proximum suum etc. Tunc ivit tribus Symeon post Zambri et dixerunt ei: Iudicant iudicia mortis et tu sedes et taces? Quid fecit? Surrexit et congregavit viginti quattuor milia hominum de Israhel et intravit ad Cozbi filiam Thur. Et dixit ei: Fac pro me. Quae respondit: Filia regis sum et [Hebrew of F_9 begins here] pater meus praecepit quod non faciam nisi pro maiore vestrum" and so on (*cf.* Vilna ed., San 82a, lines 46-49, the underlined text is the point where F_9 begins: ויאמר משה אל שפטי ישראל וגו׳ הלך שבטו של שמעון אצל זמרי בן סלוא, אמרו לו: הן דנין דיני נפשות, ואתה יושב ושותק? מה עשה - עמד וקיבץ עשרים וארבעה אלף מישראל, והלך אצל כזבי, אמר לה: השמיעי לי! - אמרה לו: בת מלך אני, וכן צוה לי אבי: לא תשמעי אלא לגדול שבהם). The presence of the translation of a text missing from F_9 suggests (together with the variant reading אביה instead of Vilna/Latin אבי / pater meus) that, at least for this passage, the translator did not translate from F_9. We must exclude the possibility that the translation was made before the page containing the original text was lost, because, in that case, the translation would have been written on the page where the passage began and would have been lost with it. The fact that it was transcribed where we find it, means that the page containing the beginning of the passage was already missing from the manuscript F_9 at the time of the transcription.

tury."[20] However, they explain this conclusion by saying that around 1300 the quality of the parchment changes and one does not distinguish between flesh and hairside and the ruling is made using leadpoint. So, as in this parchment one distinguishes well flesh and hairside and the ruling is made with hardpoint, all we can really say is that the manuscripts are to be dated *before* 1300, and not at the beginning of the 14th century. This would allow the possibility to place them closer to the time of the Talmud trial.

The Latin writing appears to me to be from the second half of the 13th century and a North-European (probably North-French) hand. So both the Hebrew Ashkenazi script and the Latin indicate that the manuscript was produced in northern Europe, which would include Paris, before going to Italy.

After this very brief description of some key-elements of the manuscripts, I will pass to considering the textual evidence.

First of all I will consider the Latin text contained in F and compare it with the rest of the manuscript tradition. I should mention that the Florence manuscripts contain more passages than the other "purely Latin" manuscripts. This could indicate that the other manuscripts are the result of a selection and that the Florence manuscripts portray an earlier stage before the said selection was made.

In addition, we encounter differences at the textual level, which clearly are not the result of the work of a misguided scribe, but also point to the fact that F and the rest of the tradition portray two different versions of the text. The following examples may serve to illustrate this point.

San 11a:

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סנהדרין דף יא עמוד א

תנו רבנן: משמתו נביאים האחרונים חגי זכריה ומלאכי - נסתלקה רוח הקודש מישראל

The Rabbis taught: When the latter prophets Aggeus, Zechariah and Malachi died, Divine Spirit was withdrawn from Israel.[21]

[20] BEIT-ARIÉ, SIRAT and GLATZER, *Codices Hebraicis*, p. 49: "Les caractères codicologiques évoquent l'Ashkénaz du début du XIV^e^ siècle. Vers 1300, la qualité du parchemin change: on ne distingue plus la fleur de la chair, et les piqûres dans les marges extérieures et intérieures (qu'on voit déjà dans un manuscrit daté de 1232/33) sont associées à la réglure à la mine de plomb."

[21] Here and henceforth, the text of the Talmud is quoted from the Schottenstein Edition (R. Hersh GOLDWURM [Gen. Ed.], *Talmud Bavli. The Schottenstein Edition*.

Extractiones de Talmud (P:146vb [50]; F_9: 115 *infra* ; C: 38rb; B:106ra-b Z: 283r [147]):[22]

Dicunt magistri: Ex quo primi prophetae mortui fuerunt, scilicet Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, ablata est prophetia [*B* 106rb] ab Israhel.	1
1 magistri] rabanan *et add. s.l.* magistri F_9 | primi] prime *C add.* postremi *mg. Z* | fuerunt] sunt F_9 **1-2** Aggeus ... Malachias] angelus et amalech *C* Malachias *om. B*	

Where the rest of the manuscripts begin with "Dicunt magistri," F_9 has "Dicunt Rabanan" (reflection of the original text: *tānû rabbānān*) and a correction, or a gloss, over the line which says "magistri." This could be an example of an earlier stage of the translation more predisposed to leaving Hebrew terms untranslated and a later correction more inclined to offer the Latin translation of such words.

Some of the alternative readings in F are also shared by the Berlin manuscript, which, though being late, seems to portray this earlier stage.

An example is given by a passage from **San 35 a**:

> כדרבי אלעזר אמר רבי יצחק: כל תענית שמלינין בו את הצדקה - כאילו שופך דמים, שנאמר מלאתי משפט צדק וגו'. והני מילי - בריפתא ותמרי, אבל בזוזי חיטי ושערי - לית לן בה.
>
> For R' Elazar said in the name of R' Yitzkhaq: on any fast day that day delay [giving] charity until morning, [they are considered] as if they shed blood; for it is stated: It was full of judgement; righteousness etc. [lodged in it]. This statement applies [only] to [a place in which it is customary to distribute at the conclusion of a fast] bread or dates, but [a place in which it is customary to distribute donations of] money, raw wheat or raw barley, there is no [objection to waiting until the next day].

Extractiones de Talmud (P: 151rb [55]; F_9: 156a; G: 11ra [54]; C: 40va; B: 111va; Z: 290v [162])

Vols. 47-49: Tractate Sanhedrin. Vols. 1-3 [New York 1993-1995]). The English translation is also based on the Schottenstein edition, with some adjustment to render it more literal.

[22] The text I give here and in the following examples is a critical edition, based on all extant manuscripts, of the final stage of the *Extractiones*. The variant readings of F_9 can be found in the critical apparatus. In this way the reader can follow the whole process and observe how the text came to be what it is.

Dicit rby Eleazar: Ieiunium cum quo non fit elemosyna, quasi effunderetur sanguis, et hoc est quod scriptum est: «Iustitia habitavit in ea –glossa Salomonis: quia post ieiunium dabant elemosynas pauperibus–, nunc autem homicidae –glossa: quia pauperes spem habent in eis et ipsi dimittunt eos mori fame–» [Is 1, 21]. Verum est –dicit Talmud–, sed hoc erat quando dabantur panis et dactili, sed ubi non dabantur dactili non erat curandum.	1 5
1 *add.* error *mg. PZ* | rby] raby *G* rabi *C* rbi F_9B | Eleazar] Eleasar *B* | Ieiunium] quod ieiunio F_9 | elemosyna] iustitia id est elemosina F_9 | quasi *praem.* est F_9 **2** habitavit] habitabit *B* **3** glossa] *add. et del. textum quem legi non potest* F_9 | Salomonis *om.* F_9 | elemosynas pauperibus] pauperibus elemosynas F_9 | nunc] non *B* **4** glossa *add.* Salomonis F_9 **5** dabantur] dabatur F_9GC **6** et *om. GC* | dactili[1]] dactyli *Z add.* non erat *C* | sed *om. Z* | non[1] *om.* F_9B | dactili[2]] denarii	

If we compare the Latin of F with the Latin of the rest of the manuscripts we notice two things: First that F translates the Hebrew *ṣᵉdāqâ* more etymologically, with "iustitia," and then adds a gloss explaining the meaning as "charity" in this context. The rest of the tradition filters this, leaving only the gloss. Second, that the last sentence in F, and in Berlin, is again a translation more similar to the Hebrew than the rest of the Latin tradition. We can see that this says: "This is true, but this happened when bread and dates were given. However, in a place in which dates were not given this [prescription] was not to be considered." F and Berlin, very much like the Vilna Talmud say: "This is true, but this happened when bread and dates were given. However, in a place in which money was given this [prescription] was not to be considered." The end of the sentence reflects the Hebrew "[*bᵉ*]*zûzê* [...] *lêt lān bâ*."

We shall now move forward to the second perspective under which the Latin passages in the Florence manuscripts can be examined: the comparison between the Latin and the Hebrew text contained in it.

Let us consider again the passage from **San 35a** (F_9: 156a):[23]

כדרבי אלעזר אמר רבי אלעזר[24] : כל תענית שמלינין בו צדק[25] - כאילו שופך

[23] I underlined the differences with the Vilna edition.

[24] Vilna: אמר רבי יצחק.

[25] Vilna: את הצדקה.

דמים, שנאמר מלאתי משפט צדק ילין בה ועתה מרצחים[26] . והני מילי - בריפתא ותמרי, אבל זוזי[27] חיטי ושערי - לית לן בה.

It shows how F_9 has *ṣedeq*, that is 'justice,' instead of *ṣᵉdāqâ* 'charity,' which would explain why the first translation into Latin with *iustitia*. Moreover we can see that in F_9 the Biblical quotation appears in full, as in the Latin, while the Vilna edition only has the first part.[28] In the mentions of the Rabbis at the beginning, Rabbi Yiṣḥāq is absent in F_9, as in the Latin.

If we continue comparing the Latin text and the Hebrew/Aramaic text of F, we can find other remarkable similarities which they share against the modern Vilna reference edition.

The very passage from **San 11a**, which we looked at before, contains this sentence:

Extractiones de Talmud (P:146vb [50]; F_9: 115 *infra* ; C: 38rb; B:106rb Z: 283v [148])

Inter vos est homo qui dignus est ut poneret Deus spiritus suum super eum, sed generatio sua non est digna.

poneret Deus] Deus poneret B | spiritus *add. et del.* sanctum C

The Vilna text reads:

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סנהדרין דף יא עמוד א

יֵשׁ כַּאן אֶחָד שֶׁרָאוּי שֶׁתִּשְׁרֶה עָלָיו שְׁכִינָה (כְּמשֶׁה רַבֵּינוּ), אֲלָא שֶׁאֵין דּוֹרוֹ זַכַּאי לְכַךְ

There is one here who deserves to have [God's] divine presence rest upon him as [it rested upon Moses, our teacher, but his generation does not merit this.

The Florence text reads (F_9: 115a):

יש כאן אדם אחד שתשרה שכינה עליו אלא שאין דורו ראוי לכך

[26] Vilna: *om.* ילין בה ועתה מרצחים.

[27] Vilna: בזוזי.

[28] This can be seen also in the passage from San82a quoted above, note 18.

If we compare the Latin with Vilna and F, we notice that, on the one hand, F has the word *ādām*, which corresponds to the Latin *homo*, and that the sentence "like Moses our teacher" (כְּמֹשֶׁה רַבֵּינוּ) is absent both from the Latin and from F.[29] On the other hand, in F *še-rāʾûi* ('who deserves') is missing, which is present in Vilna and in the Latin.

At the point where the Latin translation has a passage from **San 32a,** we find an interesting analogy between the translation and the Talmudic text contained in F. Folio 32a of Sanhedrin begins with the Mishna, precisely with section IV,1. In this section we encounter a list of ten aspects according to which the judgment in monetary matters (דיני ממונות / *dînê mamônôt*) differs from the capital judgement (דיני נפשות / *dînê nᵉfašôt*). One of the passages of the Latin translation reads as follows:

> *Extractiones de Talmud* (P: 150vb [54]; F_9: 150b *infra*; G: 11ra [54]; C: 40va; B: 111ra; Z: 289v [160])
>
> IN IUDICIO CENSUS ABSOLVITUR REUS SI UNUS SOLUS SIT IUDEX –PLUS EX UNA PARTE QUAM EX ALIA–, SED AD CONDEMNANDUM EXIGUNTUR DUO.
>
> **1** In *praem.* vel *GC* | sit iudex] iudex sit F_9GC **1-2** ex una] in illa F_9 **2** alia] illa *G* | exiguntur]exigunt *G*
>
> In the judgement regarding monetary cases the accused is acquitted if there is only one more judge (on a side than on the other), however to convict him two [judges] are required.

[29] For the sake of completeness we give also the reading of the ms. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, hebr. 95 (14th. c.): יש כאן אדם אח' ביניכ' שראוי שתשר' עליו שכיני אל' שאין דורו זכיי לכך; source: The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, The Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank (Version 5, Bar-Ilan University 2002). As has been shown in CECINI, DE LA CRUZ PALMA and VERNET I PONS, "Observacions," particularly about a passage from Ber 33b, this manuscript portrays unique readings close to the *Extractiones*. As a matter of fact, also in this case we find such readings, which, unique in Munich, are close to the *Extractiones*: the ביניכם (*Extr.* inter vos) and the שראוי, which is missing in Vilna and F. The sentence "like Moses our teacher" (כְּמֹשֶׁה רַבֵּינוּ) is absent from Munich as well. Further investigations on the manuscripts of Florence and Munich, as well as their relationship to the *Extractiones* are currently carried out by Annabel González in her doctoral thesis. For a description of the manuscript see, *e.g.*: Moritz STEINSCHNEIDER, *Die Hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München* (2nd ed., vol. I, München 1895) p. 60; SIRAT, "Les manuscrits du Talmud," p. 139.

If we translate the text more loosely, it means that in monetary cases there is a difference, if an accused has to be set free or convicted. In the first case, a majority of one is needed and in the second case a majority of two. It is important to note that in this sentence the difference that is dealt with *regards only* the one type of procedure concerning monetary matters.

Now, if we have a look at the Vilna Text we find this:

> תלמוד בבלי מסכת סנהדרין דף לב עמוד א
>
> דִּינֵי מָמוֹנוֹת - מַטִּין עַל פִּי אֶחָד בֵּין לִזְכוּת בֵּין לְחוֹבָה, וְדִינֵי נְפָשׁוֹת - מַטִּין עַל פִּי אֶחָד לִזְכוּת, וְעַל פִּי שְׁנַיִם לְחוֹבָה.
>
> Monetary cases are decided on the basis of a majority of one, whether for non-liability (לִזְכוּת) or liability (לְחוֹבָה); whereas capital cases are decided on the basis of a majority of one for acquittal (לִזְכוּת), but only on the basis of a majority of two for conviction (לְחוֹבָה).

Hence the passage relates to one of the differences between the *dînê mamônôt* and the *dînê nᵉfašôt*, namely that in the *dînê mamônôt* a majority of one is sufficient in either case, whereas in a capital case a different majority is required depending on if the verdict is of acquittal or conviction.

F (F_9: 150) reads as follows:

> דיני ממונות מטין על פי אחד לזכות על פי שנים לחובה
>
> Monetary cases are decided on the basis of a majority of one for acquittal, but on the basis of a majority of two for conviction.

This variant, which could have originated from a *saut du même au même* between the two לזכות (although the *waw* before the second על is also missing in the Florence ms.), seems to be the source of the Latin translation, which translates it almost literally (I think that the part PLUS EX UNA PARTE QUAM EX ALIA was not in the original Talmudic source text, but was added by the translator to make the text more intelligible).

Another clue example is the alternation of Mishna and Gemara, as shown in the following explanation. After the passage from Mishna, San. IV, 1, the Latin Talmud continues with a text (TERRENDI SUNT TESTES IN

CAUSA SANGUINIS, ET DICENDUM EST EIS...)[30] which turns out to be the abridged translation of Mishna, San IV, 5. This text, however, in the modern Vilna edition of the Talmud, is found on folio 37a. At first it seems that the Latin translator made a huge leap forwards, skipping the whole discussion in the Gemara about San. IV,1. Maybe he was just interested in the Mishna, as, at the end of the tranlsation of IV,1 there is a polemical note: "When the Jews crucified Jesus on Easter Eve, they did that against the Talmudic prescription not to condemn anyone on the Eve of a Holiday."[31] So one could imagine that the translator was not interested in the following Gemara and just continued with the next Mishnaic text that interested him, namely Mish., San IV, 5. However, if we read the sections after the Mishnaic text, we find Gemara texts about Mish., San. IV, 1, which in the Vilna edition of Sanhedrin are found on folios 33-35. Why did the translator apparently jump ahead and then go back? The reason is provided by the textual evidence of F. F_9, at folios 150-151, contains the whole Mishnaic Text of San. IV and, only after the whole chapter is finished, the text of the Gemara starts.[32] In the lower margin of the two folios of F, we find the corresponding Latin translations, so to speak, one after the other.

In sum, all the above seems to be evidence that the Florence manuscripts were in fact the *Vorlage* of the translation. However, I will now show a couple of examples that do not support this theory.

The following passage gives indeed contradictory signals about its relationship with the text of F_9. It has both elements that follow F against

[30] P: 151ra (55); F9: 151a *infra*; G: 11ra (54); C: 40va; B: 111ra-b; Z: 290r (161)

[31] P: 151ra (55); F9: 151a *infra*; G: 11ra (54); C: 40va; B: 111ra; Z: 290r (161): "Nota: quod fecerunt contra Talmud, quando in vigilia Paschae Iesum crucifixerunt." Actually, the Talmud says not to *start* a capital trial the day before a holiday, because, as the verdict will fall the next day and in case of condamnation the death penalty should be carried out on the same day of the sentence (custom not to let wait the condemned), this would be impossible on a Shabbath or on a holiday.

[32] This structure of the Florence manuscript is also described by Colette Sirat, "Les manuscrits du Talmud," as in note 7. See esp. p. 122 (it refers to the first volume of the Florence manuscript. Second and third volume have however the same structure): "Dans ces premiers manuscrits, on trouve la mise en page en deux colonnes qui sera celle de presque tous les Talmud copiés en zone ashkénaze. [...] Le chapitre de la *mishna* est copié tout entier en tête du chapitre de la *gemara*, les premiers mots de la *mishna* introduisant ensuite le commentaire qui les concerne."

Vilna, but also elements that follow Vilna against F, as appears in the following synoptic table.

San 94a[33]

	Extractiones de Talmud	Vilna	English transl. of Vilna	Florence (F_9, 242)
1	«Multiplicabitur eius imperium	למרבה המשרה	"To him who increases	למרבה המשרה
	etc. –In hebraeo *lemarbe*, id est	ולשלום אין קץ	[God's] authority; and	ולשלום אין קץ
	ad multiplicandum–» [Is 9,7].	וגו׳ אמר רבי	for [him there shall be]	על כסא דוד ועל
	Dicit Rby Tanhu: Quare omnis	תנחום, דרש בר	peace without end etc."	ממלכתו להכין
5	*mem* – m – in medio dictionis	קפרא בציפורי:	[Is 9,6] R' Tanchum said:	אותה ולסעדה
	aperta est et ista est clausa –de	מפני מה כל	In Tzippori, Bar Kappara	במשפט ובצדקה
	lemarbe–? Quia Sanctus,	מ״ם שבאמצע	expounded: Why is every	מעתה ועד
	benedictus sit ipse, voluit	תיבה פתוח, וזה	letter *mem* that appears	עולם קנאת ״י
	facere de Ezechia Messiam et	סתום? ביקש	in the middle of a word	צבאות תעשה
10	de Sennacherib Gog et Magog.	הקדוש ברוך	open, but this [letter	זאת אמ׳ ר׳
	Dixit autem mensura iustitiae	הוא לעשות	mem that appears in the	תנחום דרש בר
	coram Deo: Domine saeculi, et	חזקיהו משיח,	word lemarbeh is closed?	קפרא בציפורי
	quid? David, qui coram te fecit	וסנחריב גוג	The Holy One, Blessed	מפני מה כל מם
	tot cantica et tot laudes, non	ומגוג. אמרה	is He, sought to make	שבאמצע תיבה
15	fecisti Messiam de eo.	מדת הדין לפני	Chizkiah the Messiah -	פתוח וזה סתום
	Ezechias, pro quo fecisti tot	הקדוש ברוך	and Sancheiriv, Gog and	ביקש הקבה
	miracula, et non dixit coram te	הוא: רבונו	Magog. The Attribute of	לעשות חזקיה
	canticum, nonne iustum est	של עולם!	Justice exclaimed before	משיח וסנחריב
	quod non facias de eo	ומה דוד מלך	the Holy One, Blessed	גוג ומגוג אמרה
20	Messiam? Statim fuit clausa	ישראל שאמר	is He: "Master of the	מידת הדין לפני
	mem –.m. Glossa Salomonis:	כמה שירות	Universe! If David, King	הקבה רבונו
	ad ostendendum quod verba	ותשבחות לפניך	of Israel, who recited	של עולם דוד
	quae Deus cogitaverat non	- לא עשיתו	multitudes of songs and	שאמ׳ לפניך
	fuerunt facta–. Incontinenti	משיח, חזקיה	praises before You, You	כמה שירות
25	aperuit terra os suum et dixit:	שעשית לו כל	did not make the Messiah,	ותושבחות לא
	Domine saeculi, ego dicam	הנסים הללו	then Chizkiah, for whom	עשיתו משיח
	cantum pro isto iusto: fac eum	ולא אמר שירה	You performed all these	חזקיה שעשית
	Messiam. Tunc aperuit os	לפניך - תעשהו	miracles and yet he did	לו כל הניסים
	suum et dixit canticum, sicut	משיח? לכך	*not* sing songs before you	הללו ולא אמ׳
30	scriptum [*B* 133ra] est: «A	נסתתם. מיד	- - will You make *him* the	שירה לפניך
	finibus terrae laudes	פתחה הארץ	Messiah? [This would be	תעשהו משיח
	audivimus: gloriam iusti –in	ואמרה לפניו:	an injustice!" Thereupon,	לך נסתם מיד
	hebraeo: iusto–» [Is 24,16]. [*Z*	רבונו של עולם,	God relented and did not	פתחה הארץ
	321r (223)] Dixit princeps	אני אומרת	bring about the Messianic	ואמרה שירה
35	saeculi coram Deo: Domine	לפניך שירה	Era,] and because of this	ריבונו של עולם
	saeculi, fac voluntatem illius	תחת צדיק זה,	[the letter *mem*] wa closed.	אני אומ׳ שירה
	iusti. Exivit filia vocis et dixit:	ועשהו משיח.	At that point, the earth	בשביל צדיק זה
	«Secretum meum mihi;	פתחה ואמרה	interjected and said	ועשהו משיח

[33] P: 169ra (73) F9: 242a *infra*; W:1vb; G: 17rb (60); C: 48va; B: 132vb; Z: 320v (222)-321r (223).

	secretum meum mihi" [Is	שירה לפניו	before [God]: "Master of	שני מכנף הארץ
40	24,16] –Glossa Salomonis:	שנאמר מכנף	the Universe! *I* will recite	זמירות שמענו
	quasi diceret: Scio quare	הארץ זמרת	a song of praise to You	צבי לצדיק
	dimitto–. Tunc ait propheta:	שמענו צבי	in this righteous man's	ואומ' רזי לי
	«Vae mihi!» [Is 24,16] –	לצדיק וגו'.	[Chizkiah's] stead, only	רזי לי בוגדים
	Glossa Salomonis: Usquequo	אמר שר העולם	make him the Messiah!	בגו ובגד בוגדי'
45	morabitur Messias?– Exivit	לפניו: רבונו של	[The earth] began and	בגדו אמ' שר
	filia vocis et dixit:	עולם, צביונו	recited a song to [God]	העולם לפני
	«Praevaricatores praevaricati	עשה לצדיק	- as it is written: «From	הקבה רבונו של
	sunt et praevaricatione	זה! - יצאה בת	the edge of the earth we	עולם עשה צבי
	praevaricatorum praevaricati	קול ואמרה:	have heard songs [saying]	לצדיק יצתה בת
50	sunt» [Is 24,16]. Dicit rby Aba:	רזי לי רזי לי.	"Do the wish (*tzvi*) of	קול ואמרה רזי
	Donec veniant praedatores et	אמר נביא: אוי	the righteous" etc. »[Is	לי רזי לי אמ'
	praedatores praedatorum – qui	לי, אוי לי, עד	24, 16] The Minister of	ליה נביא אוי לי
	praedabuntur [*P* 169rb (73)]	מתיי יצאה בת	the World said to [God]:	עד מתי יצתה
55	Israhel multis vicibus.Et tunc	קול ואמרה:	"Master of the Universe!	בת קול ואמרה
	veniet Messias.	בגדים בגדו	Fulfill the wishes (*tzvi*)	בוגדים בגדו
		ובגד בוגדים	of this righteous man! A	ובגד בוגדים
	1 *add.* Nota *mg. F*$_9$*W* Messias	בגדו. ואמר רבא	heavenly voice (*Bat qol*)	בגדו אמ' ר'
	mg. Z **2** etc. *om. B* | In hebraeo]	ואיתימא רבי	rang out and proclaimed:	אבא ואיתימ' ר'
	hebraeus *W* lemarbe] lemmarbe	יצחק: עד דאתו	«It is my secret; It is	יצחק עד דאתי
	F$_9$*WB* **3** ad multiplicandum]	בזוזי ובזוזי	My secret!» [Ibid]. The	בזוזי דבזוזי
	multiplicatum *F*$_9$*WB* **4** Tanhu]	דבזוזי.	prophet exclaimed: «Woe	ובזוזי דבזוזי
	Thanhu *P* | Quare] [quare]		is to me!» [Ibid.] Woe	
	<quia> *corr s.l. Z* | omnis *add.*		is to me; until when? A	
	littera *GCB* **4-6** omnis mem...		heavenly voice (*Bat qol*)	
	aperta est] aperta est in medio		rang out and proclaimed:	
	dictionis omnis .m. *W* **5** mem]		«Treacherous dealers	
	men *GC om. F*$_9$*B* | in *om. CB* **6**		have dealt treacherously;	
	est[2]] *om. B* | est clausa] clausa est		They have indeed dealt	
	W **6-7** de lemarbe] de lemmarbe		very treacherously»	
	PG de lemmabre *W* de [lemanar]		[Ibid.] Rava said, or some	
	lemmarbe *corr. C om. F*$_9$ **7** *add.*		say R' Yitzkhaq: Until	
	Deus voluit facere de Ezechia		plunderers and plunderers	
	Messiam *mg.* G[2] | Quia] propter		of plunderers.	
	hoc quod *F*$_9$ **9** Ezechia] Ezech			
	P Ezechya *W* | Messiam]			
	messyam *PW* **10** Sennacherib]			
	Sennacheriph *F*$_9$ Santacheryph			
	W sennach rby *G* Sennach Raby			
	C Semiacherip *B* Scintacheryph			
	Klap. | Gog et Magog] goch et			
	magoch *F*$_9$*B* **11** Dixit] Dicit *W*			
	| autem *om. F*$_9$ **12** Deo] domino			
	*Klap.***13** fecit] facit *P mg. F*$_9$ **14**			
	cantica] cantus *W* | non *praem.*			
	sed *F*$_9$ **15** Messiam] messyam *PG*			

	| Messiam de eo] de eo messyam *W* **16** Ezechias] Ezechyas *W* **18** canticum] cantum F_9W | nonne] imme *sic Klap.* **20** Messiam] messyam *PWG* **20-21** clausa mem .m.] clausa[m m] <mem *s.l.*> *corr. B* **21** mem] men *GC om.* F_9W | m *om. C* **21-24** Glossa Salomonis... facta *om. W* **22-23** verba quae] sermones quos F_9B **24** facta] facti F_9 sancti *B* | Incontinenti] in continenti *PGCZ* statim F_9 **25** terra os suum] os suum terra *W* **25-29** et dixit... suum *om. B* **27** cantum] tantum *et corr. mg.* cantum G^2 tantum *C* | isto] illo F_9 | iusto *add.* ezechia F_9 **28** Messiam] messyam *PWG* **28-29** os suum *om.* F_9 **29** canticum] cantum F_9WG quintum *C* | sicut] ut F_9 **31** laudes] laudem *GC* **32-33** iusti in hebraeo iusto] iusto .hebraeus. *W* | in hebraeo] hebraeus F_9 **35** saeculi *om. GC* | Deo] sancto benedictus sit F_9 domino *Klap.* **36** illius] istius *B* **39** secretum meum mihi *om. GC* **40-41** Salomonis...diceret *om. W* **41** diceret] dicat *C add* mea consilia mea sunt et F_9 | quare] quia *CKlap.* **42** dimitto *add. et del.* secretum *C* | Tunc *praem. et del.* et *P praem.* et *Z* | ait] dicit *W* **45** Messias] messyas *PG* **48-50** et prevaricatione... sunt] etc. *W* **50** Aba] aha *PZ* **51** praedatores] praed[ic] atores *corr.* G^2 praedicatores *C* **51-52** et praedatores *om. GC* **52** praedatorum] praedicatorum *GC* **55** et tunc] non *W* **56** Messias] messyas *P om. B*		

According to Vilna (passages with simple underlining), we have the *et quid* (*Extr.*, 12-13), corresponding to ומה / *û-mâ* (Vilna, 19), which is absent from F (Fl., 23). Later, the sentence "Tunc aperuit os suum et dixit canticum" (*Extr.*, 28-29), according to Vilna's פתחה ואמרה שירה / *Pāt*^{e} *â v*^{e}*-ʾāmrâ šîrâ* (Vilna, 38-39), which is missing in F (Fl., 39). It is worth noting that, if we look at the critical apparatus of the *Extractiones*, we see that in the Latin text of F "os suum" is missing, closer to the original.[34] This is again a sign that the rest of the tradition portrays a later modification, in this case an addition to render the text more clear. Moreover, in line 25 of the *Extractiones*, we read "et dixit," without any object, where F (l. 34) reads ואמרה שירה / *v*^{e}*- āmrâ šîrâ* / (and 'said' a song). Also, when the *princeps saeculi* is speaking (*Extr.*, 34ff.), he says "fac voluntatem ILLIUS iusti," emphasis on *illius*, 'fulfill the will of THIS righteous man,' according to Vilna's (ll., 46-48) צביונו עשה לצדיק זה / *ṣb*$\underline{i}$*yônô* ^{a}*sē l*^{e}*- ṣaddîq ZE*, against F (ll. 49-50), which has עשה צבי לצדיק / $^{'a}$*sē ṣb*$\underline{i}$ *l*^{e}*-ṣaddîq*, 'fulfill the will of the righteous man,' without "This" (זה / *ze*). The biblical quotation of Is 24, 16 is interrupted in Latin (l. 32) at the same point as in Vilna (l. 43), while in F we read the whole verse (l. 39-45).

Up to this point I have listed the readings concording to Vilna against F. However, as was said before, we have also elements which follow F against Vilna (passages above with double underlining). Where David is mentioned, in F (Fl., 22) the qualification "mele$\underline{k}$ Isrāʾēl / מלך יש֯ראל," "King of Israel," is missing, as it is in the Latin. In the *Extractiones* we read "qui coram te fecit tot cantica et tot laudes," with *coram te* ('before you;' heb. לפניך / *l*^{e}*-p*$\underline{ā}$*nê*$\underline{k}$*a*) right at the beginning of the sentence, exactly like F (l. 23-24: שאמר לפניך כמה שרות / *še-āmar l*^{e}*-p*$\underline{ā}$*nê*$\underline{k}$*a kammâ šîrô*$\underline{t}$, while in Vilna (l.22) the לפניך / *l*^{e}*-p*$\underline{ā}$*nê*$\underline{k}$*a* comes at the end of the sentence: שאמר כמה שירות ותשבחות לפניך / *še-āmar kammâ šîrô*$\underline{t}$ *ve-t*$\underline{i}$*šbāḥô*$\underline{t}$ *l*^{e}*-p*$\underline{ā}$*nê*$\underline{k}$*a*. Equally, we do not find neither "coram eum" nor "coram te," when the Earth is speaking (*Extr.*, 25ff., Vilna, 32ff.), like in F (ll. 34ff.), where Vilna's לפניו / *l*^{e}*-p*$\underline{ā}$*nāv* and לפניך / *l*^{e}*-p*$\underline{ā}$*nê*$\underline{k}$*a* (ll. 32;35) are both missing. Similarly, the translation "PRO isto iusto" (*Extr.*, l. 27) is more likely to translate בשביל צדיק זה / *bi-švîl ṣaddîq ze*

[34] However this Latin text of Florence does not entirely reflect the Hebrew of Florence, as in the Hebrew the whole sentence is missing.

of F (l. 37) than תחת צדיק זה / *taḥaṯ ṣaddîq ze* of Vilna (l. 36). Moreover when the *princeps saeculi* is speaking, we have in Vilna (l. 45) לפניו / *l^e-p̲ānāv* ('before him') and in F (ll. 47-48) לפני הקב״ה / *li-p̲nê ha-qāḏ̲ôš bārûḵ hû'* ('before the Holy One, may He be blessed'). In Latin (l. 35) we have "coram Deo," but, if we look at the critical apparatus, F has "coram sancto benedictus sit," again a first version more respectful of the Hebrew text than in the rest of the Latin manuscript tradition, and not in line with the Hebrew text of Vilna, but rather with the one of F. Finally, we read in the Latin (l. 50) "dicit Raby Aba," like in F (l. 58-59: אמר רבי אבא / *āmar rabbî 'Aḇ̲a*), while in Vilna (l. 58) we read אמר רבא / *āmar Rāḇ̲â*.

If this passage from San 94a yields contradictory evidence both pro and against F, there are, however, other passages which are definitely not from F:

San 105b[35]

	Extractiones de Talmud[35]	Vilna	Engl. transl of Vilna	Florence (F_9, 269)
1	Fuit quidam *myn* in vicinia rby Iossua, qui multum adversabatur ei. Accepit itaque rby Iossua gallum in manu sua, dicens intra se: Quando illa hora veniet maledicam ei. Quando vero hora venit dormitavit. Tunc dixit: Modo scio quod hoc non est bonum, quia scriptum est: «et miserationes eius super omnia opera eius» [Ps 144, 9]. **1** myn *add.* haereticus in talmud F_9 **2-3** multum adversabatur ei] adversabatur ei quam plurimum F_9 **3-4** itaque...Iossua *om.* F_9 **4** sua *om.* F_9 **5** illa hora] hora illa F_9 **8** Modo] nunc F_9 | quod om. GC	ההוא מינא דהוה בשיבבותיה דרבי יהושע בן לוי דהוה קא מצער ליה. יומא חד נקט תרנגולתא, ואסר ליה בכרעיה, ואותיב. אמר: כי מטא ההוא שעתא - אילטייה. כי מטא ההוא שעתא - נמנם. אמר: שמע מינה לאו אורח ארעא, דכתיב גם ענוש לצדיק	There was a certain heretic who was in the neighborhood of R' Yehoshua ben Levi, who used to harrass [R' Yehoshua]. One day, [R'Yehoshua] took a rooster, tied it by its foot, sat it up, and stared intently at it. He said: When that moment comes [that the rooster's comb pales], I will curse [the heretic]. When that moment came, however, [R' Yehoshua] dozed off. [R'Yehoshua] said: One may deduce from this that it is not proper [to have another punished on one's account] as it is written:	ההוא מינא דהוה בשיבבותיה דר׳ יהוש׳ בן לוי דהוה קא מצער ליה יומא חד נקט תרנגולתא ויתי סבר כי מטיא ההיא שעתא אלטיה אדהכי מיתנמנם וחליף ההיא ש(ל)[ע]ת׳׳ אמ׳ ש״מ לאו אורח ארעא למיעבד הכי דכת׳ גם ענוש לצדיק (כי) [לא] טוב

[35] P: 179va (83); F_9: 269b; G: 14rb (57) C: 53va; Z: 339r (259).

		לא טוב, אפילו במיני לא איבעי ליה למימר הכי.	«It is also not good for a righteous person to punish» [Prv 17,26], which implies that one should not pronounce [curses] even against heretics. [R'Yehoshua] said: One may deduce from this that it is not proper [to have another punished on one's account] as it is written: «It is also not good for a righteous person to punish» [Prv 17,26], which implies that one should not pronounce [curses] even against heretics.	

If we look at the Latin, we see that it is very similar to the Vilna version, but the scriptural passage quoted is not, as in Vilna, from Prv 17, 26 (which, according to the Vulgate version, should be: "non est bonum damnum inferre iusto"), but from Psalm 144, 9.[36] The text in F does not contain this source, but the source from Proverbs, as Vilna does. F can therefore not be the source of the Latin translation. To this a further remark should be added. The same story is also found in *B^{e}ra$\underline{k}$ô$\underline{t}$* 7a and *ʿA$\underline{b}$ôdâ Zarâ* 4b, which are also translated into Latin. In the passage of *B^{e}ra$\underline{k}$ô$\underline{t}$*, both scriptural passages are quoted, Ps 144, 9 and Prv 17, 26:

Ber 7a[37]

Fuit quidam *myn* –haereticus [*P* 103ra (7)] seu infidelis– in vicinia rby Iossua, qui adversabatur ei quam plurimum. Accepit rby Iossua gallum in manu sua dicens in corde suo: [*B* 52ra] Quando illa hora veniet, maledicam ei. Quando venit hora, dormitavit. Tunc dixit: Nunc scio quod hoc non est bonum, quia scriptum est: «miserationes eius super omnia opera eius» [Ps 144, 9]. Et iterum: [*Z* 218v (18)] «non est bonum damnum inferre iustum» [Prv 17, 26].

[36] Ps. 144 (heb. 145), 9: טוֹב־יְקֹוָק לַכֹּל וְרַחֲמָיו עַל־כָּל־מַעֲשָׂיו.

[37] P: 102vb (6)-103ra (7); C: 15va; B: 51vb-52ra; Z: 218r-v (18-19).

1 haereticus seu *om. C* | haereticus seu infidelis] [inimicus]<haereticus *s.l. B*^{2}> in thalmud *B* **2** rby Iossua *om. B* | sua *om. B* **4** Nunc scio] N[e]<unc *suprascrip.*>scio *P* [ne]<nunc *s.l.*>scio *Z* | miserationes *praem.* et *CB* **5** opera *om. C* | iterum] [irasci]<iterum *s.l.*> *Z* **5-6** Et iterum... iustum *om. CB*

The passage from *'Abôdâ Zarâ* has only the Psalm:

Az 4b[38]

Fuit quidam *myn* in vicinia rby Iossua, qui multum adversabatur ei. Accepit itaque rby Iossua gallum cogitans quod illa hora veniet, maledicam ei. Quando diei hora venit, dormitavit. Tunc dixit: Modo scio quod hoc non est bonum, quia scriptum est: «et miseratio super omnia opera eius» [Ps 144, 9]. Quando sol oritur omnes reges orientis ponunt coronas in capitibus suis et inclinant ei, statim irascitur Deus.

It is possible that in the passage of Sanhedrin the translator, if he had the Florence manuscript in front of him, integrated the missing quotation from what he knew was present in *B^{e}rakôt*. However, why integrate the quotation from Psalms, which is not there, and then leave out the quotation from Proverbs which is? It is far more likely that a translator had before his eyes a text with the quotation of Psalms, which is not in F.

Another passage, from **San 98a,** offers a difference between the Latin and the Talmudic text of F.[39]

Extractiones de Talmud	Vilna	Engl. transl. of Vilna	Florence (F_9 252)
Rby Iossua filius Levi invenit Heliam prophetam et rby Symeon stantes ante ostium paradisi... **1** filius *iter. Z*	רבי יהושע בן לוי אשכח לאליהו, דהוי קיימי אפיתחא דמ"ע ערתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי	R' Yehoshua ben Levi met Elijah, who was standing at the entrance of the cave of R'Shimon ben Yochai.	ר' יהוש' אשכחיה לאליהו דיתיב אמערתא דר' שמע' בן יוחי

[38] P: 186va (90); G: 24ra (67); C: 56va; Z: 350v (282).

[39] P: 173va-b (77); F_9: 253a supra; G: 19ra (62); C: 50vb; Z 328v (238)-329r (239).

According to the the Vilna edition, the beginning of the passage says: R' Yᵉhôšuaʿ ben Lēvi met ʾĒliyāhû, who was standing at the entrance of the cave of R' Šimʿôn ben Yôḥai. The reading of F is, with some textual variants, similar. However, the Latin is clearly different: R' Yᵉhôšuaʿ met the prophet ʾĒliyāhû and Rabbi Šimʿôn who stood in front of the door of Paradise. R' Yᵉhôšuaʿ meets two people instead of one and the place where he meets them is not the entrance to the cave of R' Šimʿôn, but the entrance to Paradise. This is another example in which the Latin cannot be a translation of the Talmudic text that we have in F.[40]

An even clearer example is given by a passage from San92a:[41]

San 92a[42]

Qui dat panem suum illi qui non habet scientiam –legis scilicet–, dolor veniet super eum, sicut scriptum est: «panis tuus dolor est subtus te, non est prudentia in eo» [Abd 1, 7 s. heb.].

1 *add.* error. Nota *mg. PZ* | legis scilicet] glossa legis F_9 *om. W* **2** dolor est] dolorem *WGCB* | subtus] subit *C* subter *BZ* | panis...te] panem tuum dolorem subter te F_9

This Latin text, which is found on the left margin of F, misses its original text in the Hebrew/Aramaic corpus of the text. The Talmudic text of Florence skips this passage as one can see from the following table which compares Florence and Vilna concerning this passage and the ones immediately before and after it:

[40] Here the text given by the Hebrew ms. 95 from the Staatsbibliothek in Munich, which reflects the version of the Latin translation as it says that R Yᵉhôšuaʿ met ʾĒliyāhû and Rabbi Šimʿôn and that they were standing, literally, at the entrance of the Garden of Eden, i.e. of Paradise: ר׳ יהוש׳ בן לוי אשכחינהו לאליהו ולר׳ שמע׳ בן יוחי דהוו קיימי אפי׳ תח׳ דגן עדן . For further observations on the Munich manuscript, *cf.* Annabel Gonzalez, "The Latin Talmud Translation: The Hebrew Sources," in *Studies on the Latin Talmud*, eds. Ulisse Cecini and Eulàlia Vernet (Bellaterra [forthcoming 2017]).

[41] My attention to this passage was raised by Eulàlia Vernet and her article: "Hebrew *Hapax Legomena* from the Bible in the Latin Talmud: Some Comments Regarding Their Textual Transmission and Their Latin Translation," in *Studies on the Latin Talmud*, eds. Ulisse Cecini and Eulàlia Vernet (Bellaterra [forthcoming 2017]).

[42] P: 166va (70); F_9: 237b; W: 1rb; G: 16rb (59); C: 47va; B: 129vb; Z: 316v (214).

Vilna (San 92a)	Engl. Transl. of Vilna	F_9 fol. 237b (San92a)
ואמר רבי אלעזר כל אדם שאין בו דעה אסור לרחם עליו שנאמר כי לא עם בינות הוא על כן לא ירחמנו עושהו ויוצרו לא יחוננו	And R' Elazar said: If a person does not have understanding, it is forbidden to have mercy on him. For it is stated: "For it is not a people of understanding; therefore its Maker shall not have compassion on it, and He who formed it shall not grant it favor" [Is 27, 11]	אמ׳ ר׳ אלעז׳ כל אדם שאין בו דעה אסור לרחם עליו שנ׳ כי לא עם בינות הוא על כן לא ירחמנו עושהו וי[ו]צ(ו)רו לא יחוננו
ואמר רבי אלעזר כל הנותן פיתו למי שאין בו דעה יסורין באין עליו שנאמר לחמך ישימו מזור תחתיך אין תבונה בו ואין מזור אלא יסורין שנאמר וירא אפרים את חליו ויהודה את מזורו	And R' Elazar said: If one gives his bread to someone who does not have understanding, suffering comes upon him. For it is stated: [Because of] your bread, they will lay "mazor" under you; there is no discernment in him. [Abd 1, 7]. And "mazor" means nothing other than "suffering," as it is stated: "And Ephraim saw his sickness, and Yehudah his suffering ("mezoro")" [Os 5, 13]	
ואמר רבי אלעזר כל אדם שאין בו דעה לסוף גולה שנאמר לכן גלה עמי מבלי דעת	And R' Elazar said: Any person who does not have understanding eventually oes into exile. For it is stated: "Therefore, My people has gone into exile from lack of understanding" [Is 5, 13]	ואמ׳ ר׳ אלעז׳ כל אדם שאין בו דיעה לסוף גולה שנ׳ לכן גלה עמי מבלי הדעת

The text of F goes directly from ויוצרו לא יחוננו ('he who formed it shall not grant it favor') to ואמ׳ ר׳ אלעז׳ כל אדם ('And R' ʾElʿāzār said: Any person...'), without our passage between them. As a consequence, the Latin text which is in the margin of the folio cannot be a direct translation of the text of the manuscript right next to it, because precisely this text is missing.[43] The Latin text must be a copy of an already existing translation.

Conclusion

Given the negative arguments above, we must conclude that F was not the *Vorlage* of the translation. Moreover a paleographical evaluation of the Latin writing seems to hint at a dating in the second half of the 13th

[43] In Munich, we find the text: וא״ר אלע׳ הנותן פתו למי שאין בו דיע׳ ייסורין באין עליו שנ׳ לחמך ישימו מזור תחתיך אין מזור אל׳ ייסורין שנ׳ וירא אפרי׳ את חוליו ויהוד׳ את מזורו; source: The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, The Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank (Version 5, Bar-Ilan University 2002).

century which of course postdates the events in Paris. The passages we read in F seem rather to be copies from an already existing translation. Nonetheless, other textual similarities allow us to surmise that F belongs to a tradition very close to the *Vorlage*.[44] Its content reflects a prior stage to the one contained in the Paris manuscript of the *Extractiones*, in which a further selection took place, as we encounter Latin passages in F which are omitted in Paris and in the rest of the manuscript witnesses.[45] The provenance of the Florence manuscript seems to be northern Europe, given the shape both of the Hebrew and the Latin writing. This and the fact that it reflects an earlier stage of the process leads us to think that it was copied by someone close to the entourage responsible for the translation. As a consequence, it is a witness of foremost importance for the transmission of the *Extractiones de Talmud* and for our understanding of their redaction process.

Recibido: 27/01/2017
Aceptado: 03/04/2017

[44] Another explanation for the presence in the Latin translation of both similarities and differences with regard to F could be the simultaneous use of two (or more) manuscripts as *Vorlage*. This could explain the existence of Latin translations for passages missing in F. However, this would not explain the missing or different translations of a text which *is present* in F, such as the examples we have seen from San 105b (missing quotation from Prv) and San 98a. In this latter case, even if we find a correspondence in the Munich manuscript, it is not clear why the translator should suddenly use another manuscript for a text which does not pose any problem in F.

[45] See DE LA CRUZ PALMA, "El estadio textual," as well as the concordance at the end of MERCHAVIA, *The Church*, pp. 364-420.