

## The Latin Talmud Translation: The Epitome \*

Isaac Lampurlanés  
(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

### Abstract

This chapter briefly introduces and describes the work known as *Excerptum de Talmud*, starting with a description of the two extant manuscripts. It continues by focussing on the contents of the work, showing its relation to the *Extractiones de Talmud* and giving some remarks about ways in which it differs from the latter. Finally, it deals with how the *Excerptum* relates to the Sequential and Thematic translations of the *Extractiones* and their traditions, trying to demonstrate which version the *Excerptum* uses.

The *Extractiones de Talmud* were the first extensive and methodical translation of numerous Talmudic passages into Latin. The passages first translated in the *Extractiones* follow the order of the Talmudic tractates (hence, I will refer to it as the “Sequential translation”). The first translation was subsequently rearranged into thematic sections focussing on different polemical topics. The second rearrangement (referred to as the “Thematic translation”) contains additional materials not found in the Sequential translation and taken from Nicholas Donin’s thirty-five articles against the Talmud, which were presented to Gregory IX in 1238-39, an additional anthology of translated Talmudic passages and Rashi’s glosses, among others. All these can be found, together with the *Extractiones*, in the Paris manuscript, BnF, lat. 16558, from the thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> This thematic arrangement of the Talmudic materials was clearly more useful and an excellent source for later polemical works against the Jews. However, the material seems to have been almost totally ignored, and was not used in later polemical literature. Subsequent polemicists, like Jerónimo de Santa Fe in his *De iudaicis Erroribus ex Talmud* (1412), or Alonso de Espina, in his encyclopedic *Fortalitium fidei* (1458-85), went back to the Jewish sources themselves<sup>2</sup> or to other Latin sources, disregarding the extensive Latin translation of the *Extractiones*. However, we find two works that seem to be an exception to this rule and that seem to have used the *Extractiones*.

\* 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. 613694).

1. See in this volume the chapter by Óscar de la CRUZ about the description of the Paris *dossier*, BnF, Ms. lat. 16558.
2. This is the case for Jerónimo de Santa Fe. See: HIERONYMUS DE SANCTA FIDEI, *De Iudaicis Erroribus ex Talmud. Tratado apologetico de Jerónimo de Santa Fe*. Ed. Moisés Orfali, Madrid, 1983, p. 65.

The first of these is the *Errores iudaeorum* by the Dominican Thibaud de Sézanne,<sup>3</sup> who for a long time has been thought to have been one of the translators of the *Extractiones* due to the textual similarities between the works.<sup>4</sup> However, a more in-depth reading raises doubts about whether he really knew the material from the Sequential translation. This is because the correspondences between the *Errores* and the *Extractiones*, which can be found in the Thematic translation, appear to go back to Donin's articles rather than to the material from the Sequential translation.<sup>5</sup>

The second source which seemingly used the *Extractiones* is by an anonymous author and is called *Excerptum de Talmud*. As will be shown in what follows, it contains passages from the *Extractiones de Talmud* and is, in essence, a summarized version of the *Extractiones*, hence we refer to it as an "Epitome". It represents a further selection of the passages of the *Extractiones* which sometimes incorporate additions and variations that intentionally radicalize their polemical purpose.<sup>6</sup> I will now focus on this work, its manuscript tradition, its content and its relation with the *Extractiones* in both their Sequential and Thematic version.

## Manuscripts

Two manuscripts containing this work are conserved:

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cIm 21259 (henceforth *Y*).  
London, British Library, Add. 19952 (henceforth *L*).

*Y* is a manuscript containing four originally separated parts dated from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century. It is made of parchment and measures 35 x 22 cm, with 278 folios. The first part of the manuscript, where we find the *Excerptum*, has the following works: *Notitia de Machometo* by William of Tripolis (fols. 1r-12v); *Itinerarium* by Odoricus de Pordenone (fols. 13r-27va); a different version of the Pseudo-Beda's *De miraculis septem mundi*; and finally the *Excerptum de Talmud*

3. On the *Errores*, its manuscripts and Thibaud de Sézanne, see: Heinz PFLAUM, *Die religiöse Disputation*, Geneva, 1935, p. 79, n. 2; Thomas KAEPPELI/Emilio PANELLA, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi. Vol. 4 T-Z*, Rome, 1993, pp. 292-295; Moisés ORFALI, "El 'Dialogus pro ecclesia contra synagogam': Un tratado anónimo de polémica antijudía", in: *Hispania* 54/2 (1994), pp. 679-732; Carmen CARDELLE, "Drei Schriften mit dem Titel *Pharetra fidei*", in: *Aschkenas* 11 (2001), pp. 327-349; *Ead.*, "El *Dialogus pro ecclesia contra synagogam* impreso por Pablo Hurus: autoría, fecha y transmisión manuscrita", in: *Séfarad* 62 (2002), pp. 3-19.
4. Gilbert DAHAN, "Les traductions latines de Thibaud de Sézanne", in: Gilbert Dahan/Élie Nicolas (Eds.), *Le brûlement du Talmud à Paris 1242-1244*, Paris, 1999, pp. 95-120 (esp. pp. 100-101).
5. Alexander FIDORA, "The Latin Talmud and its Translators. Thibaud de Sézanne vs. Nicholas Donin?", in: *Henoah* 37/1 (2015), pp. 17-28 (esp. p. 23).
6. Within the project "The Latin Talmud and its Influence on Christian-Jewish Polemic" I have been carrying out an edition and a preliminary study of the work *Excerptum de Talmud* since 1st October 2015.

(fols. 28v-39va). It is written in black lettering using two columns and can be dated to the middle of the fourteenth century.<sup>7</sup>

The other manuscript, *L*, belonged to the library of Nicholas of Cusa and is dated in the middle of the 15th century. It is made of paper, with a size of 21 x 15 cm and contains 113 folios.<sup>8</sup> We can divide it into two parts according to the hands that wrote its content. A first part (fols. 1r-84v) contains the *De condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum*, translation of Franciscus Pipinus of Bologna from Marco Polo's original. At the end of this part we find a subscription that gives us the date *anno 1445*, although the catalogue of the library has it (wrongly) as 1472.<sup>9</sup> The second part, written by another hand, has the works *Notitia de Machometo et de libro legis Sarracenorum* by William of Tripolis (fols. 85r-98v) and the anonymous author's *Excerptum de Talmud* (fols. 99r-111r). It can be said that Nicholas of Cusa knew and read this second part because there are glosses and markers of his hand in the *Notitia*,<sup>10</sup> although there is no gloss in the *Excerptum*.<sup>11</sup> In addition, according to Peter Engels, the second part of the manuscript *L* is a copy of the *Notitia de Machometo* and *Excerptum de Talmud* extant in *Y*.<sup>12</sup>

Both witnesses of the *Excerptum* are, unfortunately, bad copies. The manuscripts show that neither the copyists nor the epitomist himself knew Hebrew, since we find strange spellings of Hebrew words. That is what we can see in the following passages, where the misspellings appear when compared with the *Extractiones* versions:<sup>13</sup>

7. Manuscript description in: Karl HALM/Georg von LAUBMANN/Wilhelm MEYER, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis*, Munich, 1878, p. 303; GUILIELMUS TRIPOLITANUS, *Notitia de Machometo. De statu Sarracenorum*. Edited and translated by Peter Engels, Würzburg-Altenberge, 1992, pp. 113-114.
8. Manuscript description in: GUILIELMUS TRIPOLITANUS, *Notitia*, 1992 (as in note 7), pp. 118-119; Herrad SPILLING, "Cod. Harl. 3934, 3992 und Cod. Add. 19952", in: *Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanus-Gesellschaft* 12 (1977), pp. 59-71 (esp. pp. 62-63).
9. Berthold L. ULLMAN, "Manuscripts of Nicholas of Cues", in: *Speculum* 13/2 (1938), pp. 194-197 (esp. pp. 195-196).
10. James E. BIEHLER, "Three Manuscripts on Islam from the Library of Nicholas of Cusa", in: *Manuscripta* 27/2 (1983), pp. 91-100 (esp. pp. 98-99).
11. Although Nicholas of Cusa mentioned some Jewish sages, he never referred to the Talmud: see Görg K. HASSELHOFF, "The Image of Judaism in Nicholas of Cusa's Writings", in: *Medievalia & Humanistica* 40 (2014), pp. 25-36.
12. GUILIELMUS TRIPOLITANUS, *Notitia*, 1992 (as in note 7), p. 123.
13. Italics are mine. The given text of the *Extractiones* comes from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 16558, henceforth *P*.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractions</i>	<i>Sequential Extractions</i>
[Y fol. 32va-vb; L fol. 103v] [Az 20b] Item: Dicunt magistri: <i>Malachi nau</i> –id est angelus mortis– plenus est oculis et in hora qua infirmus decedit, stat ad caput eius et evaginatus gladius in manu eius et gutta amaritudinis dependit in illo quam cito infirmus videt illam contremiscit et aperit os eius et ille proicit eam in os eius et per illam moritur, per illam fetet, per illam viridescit facies eius.	[P fol. 29ra] [Az 20b] Dicunt magistri: <i>Malaach Mavet</i> –angelus mortis– plenus est oculis et in hora qua infirmus decedit stat ad caput eius et evaginatus gladius in manu ipsius et gutta amaritudinis dependet in illo quam cito infirmus videt illam contremiscit et aperit os et ille proicit eam in os eius. Per illam moritur, per illam fetet, per illam viridescit facies eius.	[P fol. 190rb] [Az 20b] Dicunt magistri <i>Malaach Mavez</i> –angelus mortis– plenus est oculis et in hora qua infirmus decedit, stat ad caput eius et evaginatus gladius quem manu ipsius et gutta amaritudinis dependet in illo quam cito infirmus videt illam contremiscit et aperit os et ille proicit eam in os ipsius. Per illam moritur, per illam fetet, per illam virescit facies illius.
[Y fol. 39rb, L fol. 110v] [Bek 57b] Item: Quadam vice cecidit ovum <i>barvica</i> et submersit sexaginta castra et contrivit trecentas quercus.	[P fol. 92rb] [Bek 57b] Quadam die cecidit ovum <i>bariucaneri</i> – <u>volantis</u> – et submersit sexaginta castra et contrivit trecentas quercus.	[P fol. 203vb] [Bek 57b] Quadam vice cecidit ovum <i>bariucanen</i> et submersit sexaginta castra et contrivit trecentas quercus.

In the first example, in the text from the Epitome we see the word *Malachi nau* which clearly corresponds to the *Malaach Mavet*<sup>14</sup> of the texts from the *Extractiones*. In the other case we find the enormous bird *Bar Yochani* whose name in the *Excerptum* is reduced and is erroneously cut.<sup>15</sup>

Similarly, we also find corruptions in the rabbis' proper names:

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractions</i>	<i>Sequential Extractions</i>
[Y fol. 31rb, L fol. 102r] [Bq 113b] Item: Dicit <i>rabi Levi</i> : Si <i>Goy</i> –id est Christianus– traditus est in manu tua –id est potestate illius–, rapina eius, etiam admissio, concessa sunt tibi –hoc est, potes ei auferre sua et res inventas retinere–.	[P fol. 19ra] [Bq 113b] Dicit <i>rab Bivi</i> : Si <i>Goy</i> traditus est in manu tua – <u>id est in potestate</u> –, rapina eius et admissio concessae sunt tibi – <u>hoc est potes ei auferre et inventa retinere</u> –.	[P fol. 133vb] [Bq 113b] Dicit <i>rab Bivi</i> : Si <i>Goy</i> traditus est in manu tua – <u>si praesis illi</u> –, rapina illius et admissio concessa est tibi – <u>id est potes ei auferre et amissa retinere</u> –.

14. מלאך המוות 'the angel of death'.

15. Heb. בר יוכני.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractiones</i>	<i>Sequential Extractiones</i>
[Y fol. 29va, L fol. 100r] [Ber 44a] Item: Rabi Avehu tantum comedebat, quod muscae cadebant de fronte ipsius prae pinguedine. <i>Rabi Ate et rabi Ame</i> similiter comedebant, quod capilli cadebant eis et Relakos tantum, quod fere sensum admiserat –ex dictis talium sanctorum compositus est Talmud–.	[P fol. 9va] [Ber 44a] Rabi Avehu tantum comedebat, quod muscae cadebant de fronte ipsius prae pinguedine. <i>Rab Ace et rab Amme</i> tantum similiter comedebant, quod capilli cadebant eis et Relakos tantum, quod fere admittebat sensum – <u>ex dictis talium sanctorum compositus est Talmud</u> –.	[P fol. 112va] [Ber 44a] Rby Abhu tantum comedebat, quod muscae cadebant de fronte eius prae pinguedine. <i>Rab Ace et rab Amme</i> tantum similiter comedebant, quod capilli cadebant eis et Relakys tantum, quod fere admittebat sensum.

In these examples, for instance, we see in Bq 113b how the epitomist misunderstood the name of the rabbi, *Bivi*, and wrote *Levi*, which might have been a Jewish name more familiar for Christians. Moreover, the epitomist, disregarding the distinct meanings of the Hebrew words, homogenized the terms *rab* and *rby*, both extant in the *Extractiones*, and wrote always *rabi*.<sup>16</sup>

## Content

As mentioned previously, the *Excerptum de Talmud* is a summary of the *Extractiones de Talmud*. Therefore, apart from being a selection of passages from the *Extractiones*, the content of the passages is also reduced. We can notice that the epitomist skips circumstantial or uninteresting parts of the text in order to focus on the most polemical. In the following examples we can see that the text in italics from the *Extractiones* is missing in the *Excerptum*.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractiones</i>	<i>Sequential Extractiones</i>
[Y fol. 39ra, L fol. 110v] [Nid 61a] Item: Og, propter suam longitudinem, evasit diluvium. Noe enim quando aperuit arcam, ipse inmisit caput suum.	[P fol. 89va] [Nid 61a] “ <i>et ecce unus qui evaserat</i> ” [Gn 14, 13] <i>et cetera. Dicit rby Iohan</i> : Iste fuit Og qui evasit de diluvio. – <u>Glossa</u> : quia Noe aperuit fenestram arcae et Og inmisit caput suum–. <u>Quaeritur in libro Kadassym</u> .	[P fol. 194vb] [Nid 61a] “ <i>et ecce unus qui evaserat nuntiavit Abram</i> ” [Gn 14, 13] <i>dicit rby Iohan</i> : Iste fuit Og, rex Basan, qui evaserat de diluvio – <u>Glossa</u> : quia Noe aperuit fenestram arcae et Og inmisit caput suum et sic evasit– <u>Quaeritur in libro Kadassym</u> .

16. For the difference between the terms *rab* and *rabi*, where the former especially designates the sages from Babylon, see the prologue of the *Extractiones* (P fol. 97va): “*rab* seu *rby* interpretatur ‘magister’; sed *rab* de illis specialiter dicitur qui in Chaldea docuerunt”.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractiones</i>	<i>Sequential Extractiones</i>
[Y fol. 39rb, L fol. 110v] [Bb 74a] Item: Dicit rabi Iohan: Vidi piscem qui extraxit caput suum de aqua et duo oculi sui erant sicut duae lunae. Emittebatque aquam de duabus naribus suis sicut duo flumina.	[P fol. 77vb] [Bb 74a] Dicit rby Iohan: <i>Quadam vice navigabamus et</i> vidi piscem qui extraxit caput suum de aqua et duo oculi ipsius sicut duae lunae. Emittebatque aqua de duabus naribus suis sicut duo flumina <i>de Coza</i> .	[P fol. 142va] [Bb 74a] Dicit rby Iohan: <i>Quadam vice navigabamus et</i> vidi piscem qui extraxit caput suum de aqua et duo oculi illius sicut duae lunae. Emittebatque aqua de duabus naribus suis sicut duo fluvii <i>de Coza</i> .
[Y fol. 39rb, L fol. 110v] [Bb 74a] Item: Dicit Rava: Vidi in monte Syna bufones ita magnos sicut albi muli.	[P fol. 16ra; fol. 77va] [Bb 74a] Dixit Rava <i>filius</i> <i>filiu Ana: Dixit mihi quidam</i> <i>mercator: veni, ostendam tibi</i> montem Syna. Et vidi <i>quod</i> <i>circundabant</i> eum bufones ita magni sicut albi muli.	[P fol. 142ra] [Bb 74a] Dicit Rava: <i>Dixit mihi</i> <i>mercator: veni, ostendam tibi</i> montem Synai. Et vidi <i>quod in</i> <i>circuitu eius erant</i> bufones ita magni sicut albi asini.

Rashi's glosses seem to have been a particular focal point for the epitomist. If in the Paris dossier Rashi's glosses to the Bible – contained in the part named *De glossis Salomonis* – and the glosses to the Talmud extant in the *Extractiones* were assumed to be as authoritative as the Talmud itself,<sup>17</sup> in the *Excerptum* we can see that the gloss is even more important<sup>18</sup> than the passage itself. This is why sometimes the *Excerptum* only reports Rashi's gloss, leaving out the passage it refers to, as in the case of the following examples:

- Gilbert DAHAN, "Rashi, sujet de la controverse de 1240. Edition partielle du ms. Paris, BN lat. 16558", in: *Archives Juives* 14 (1978), pp. 43-54; See also: Herman HAILPERIN, *Rashi and the Christian scholars*, Pittsburgh, 1963, pp. 115-129; Gilbert DAHAN, "Un dossier latin de textes de Rashi autour de la controverse de 1240", in: *Revue des études juives* 151 (1992), pp. 321-336; Görg K. HASSELHOFF, "The Parisian Talmud Trials and the Translation of Rashi's Bible Commentaries", in: *Henoch* 37 (2015), pp. 29-42; *Id.*, "Rashi for Latin Readers: The Translations of Paris, 1240. With an Edition of the Excerpts from Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy", in: Görg K. Hasselhoff/Knut Martin Stünkel (Eds.), *Transcending Words: The Language of Religious Contact Between Buddhists, Christians, Jews, and Muslims in Premodern Times*, Bochum, 2015, pp. 103-110.
- Piero CAPELLI, "Rashi nella controversia parigina sul Talmud del 1240", in: Marcello Milani/Marco Zappella (Eds.), *Ricerzare la sapienza di tutti gli antichi (Sir 39, 1). Miscellanea in onore di Gian Luigi Prato*, Bologna, 2013, pp. 441-448 (esp. p. 444). Besides, in Ramon Martí's *Pugio fidei* Rashi's glosses are weightier and numerous than are the Talmudic texts themselves; see: Görg K. HASSELHOFF, "Rashi and the Dominican Friars", in: Charles Burnett/Pedro Mantas-España (Eds.), 'Ex Oriente Lux'. *Translating Words, Scripts and Styles in Medieval Mediterranean Society*, Cordova/London, 2016, pp. 201-215, at p. 210.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<b>Thematic Extractions</b>	<b>Sequential Extractions</b>
<p>[Y fol. 28vb, L 99r]</p> <p>[Ber 28b] Glossa Salomonis: Non assuefaciatis filios vestros in <i>Mikara</i> -id est Biblia-, quia nimis abstrahit ad aliam doctrinam, et facite eos sedere inter genua sapientum qui docent Talmud.</p>	<p>[P fol. 5rb]</p> <p>[Ber 28b] Quando rbi Eliezer –<u>seu Eleazar</u>– infirmabatur intraverunt discipuli eius ad ipsum visitandum et dixerunt ei: Magister, doce nos vias vitae, verbum in quo lucremur vias futuri saeculi. Dixit eis: Estote veloces in honorem sociorum vestrorum et prohibete filios vestros et avertite a studio legis –Glossa Salomonis: Non assuefaciatis eos <i>Mykara</i> –<u>Biblia</u>–, quia nimis abstrahit ad aliam doctrinam –<u>infidelitatem</u>–, et facite eos sedere inter genua sapientum –<u>qui docent Talmud</u>– et per hoc lucrabimur vitam futuri saeculi-.</p>	<p>[P fol. 109vb]</p> <p>[Ber 28b] Discipuli rby Eleazar venerunt ad eum et dixerunt: Rby, doce nos consuetudinem vitae postquam veniamus ad futurum saeculum –<u>vitam aeternam</u>–. Qui dixit eis: Honorate socios vestros et avertite filios vestros a studio legis, quia abstrahit cor ad infidelitatem.</p>
<p>[Y fol. 29vb, L fol. 100r]</p> <p>[San 17a] Item: Glossa Salomonis: Magistri sortilegiorum ad cogendum sortilegos qui inducunt et impingunt homines in sortilegia sicut Iesus Nazarenus.</p>	<p>[P fol. 12vb]</p> <p>[San 17a] Dicit rbi Iohan: Non statuebantur <i>Cenhezerim</i> –<u>septuaginta iudices</u>– nisi essent domini scientiae, et nisi scirent septuaginta <i>lingatgia</i> et nisi essent magistri sortilegiorum. –Glossa Salomonis: Magistri sortilegiorum ad detegendum sortilegos qui inducunt et impingunt homines in sortilegia sua sicut Iesus Nazarenus–. <u>Idem est in libro Kazassym</u>.</p>	<p>[P fol. 147ra]</p> <p>[San 17a] Dicit rby Iohan: Non statuebantur <i>Cenhezerim</i> –<u>id est septuaginta iudices</u>– nisi essent domini scientiae et magna proceritatis staturae, et decori aspectus, et senes, et nisi scirent septuaginta <i>lingatgia</i>, et nisi essent magistri sortilegiorum. –Glossa Salomonis: Magistri sortilegiorum ad detegendum sortilegos quasi incitant et impingunt homines in sortilegia sua, sicut Iesus Nocerī–<u>Nazarenus</u>–.</p>
<p>[Y fol. 30va, L fol. 101r]</p> <p>[San 38a] Item: Glossa Salomonis: Angeli de caelo absolvunt Deum a iuramento.</p>	<p>[P fol. 16ra]</p> <p>[San 38a] Salatiel quare sic vocatus est? Aliqui dicunt Salatiel idem est quod solum Deo. Deus enim fecit solvi iuramentum suum. Iuraverat enim quod Iechonias non haberet ultra filios –Glossa Salomonis: Angeli de caelo absolverunt Deum a iuramento illo, sicut legitur in <i>Agaza de Vagikara Raba</i> super illud verbum: “scribe virum istum sterilem” [Ier 22, 30]–.</p>	<p>[P fol. 152rb]</p> <p>[San 38a] Salatyel –<u>frutex Dei</u>– quare sic vocatus est? Quia Deus fecit matrem ei ipsum concipere tali modo quo mulier concipere non potest. Tenemus eum pro vero, quod nulla mulier concipit stando et ista stando concepit. Locus enim carceris ita strictus erat quod non poterat decumbere. Aliqui dicunt aliter: Salatiel, id est quod solum Deo, quia Deus fecit solui iuramentum suum. Iuraverat enim quod Iechonias non haberet filios. –<u>Dicit Glossa Salomonis: Quod angeli de caelo absolvunt Deum a iuramento illo, sicut legitur in Agaza de Vagicia Raba super illud verbum: “scribe virum istum sterilem”</u> [Ier 22, 30]–.</p>

In the first example from Ber 28b in the *Excerptum* we only find the gloss of Rashi, which the sequential *Extractiones* do not have. In addition, we see that the thematic version and the sequential one are textually different. That shows that in this case, the thematic text does not come from the sequential *Extractiones* but from the article of Donin containing this passage.<sup>19</sup> In the other examples, relating to San 17a and San 38a, the epitomist only selected the glosses, which are seemingly more interesting for him and the polemist than the Talmudic passages.

In some cases in the Epitome we find Rashi's glosses without the common heading *Glossa* or *Glossa Salomonis*, as is usually given in the *Extractiones*:

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<b>Thematic <i>Extractiones</i></b>
[Y fol. 31va; L fol. 102r-102v] [Krubot, P 210va] Item: <i>Goyim</i> –id est christiani– credunt in Iesu Nazareno qui est corpus abhominatum.	[P fol. 22rb] [Krubot, P 210va] <i>Goyim</i> corpus abhominatum acceleratio sceleris eorum – <i>Glossa</i> : credunt in Iesu Nazareno qui est corpus abhominatum et proiectum de fovea sua–.
[Y fol. L fol. 104v] [Ber 51b] Item: Qui bibit bis postquam surrexerit de mensa, daemones habent potestatem nocendi ei.	[P fol. 34rb] Non benedices super scyphum infortunii. Quid est scyphus infortunii? Hic est secundus scyphus. – <i>Glossa Salomonis</i> : Qui enim bibit bis postquam surrexit de mensa, daemones habent potestatem nocendi ei–.

When it comes to the relation between the Epitome and each version of the *Extractiones*, the *Excerptum* is apparently closer to the thematic version than to the sequential, since all the material of the *Excerptum* can be found in it. This is significant because the Thematic *Extractiones* have material not included in the Sequential version: there are passages from Donin's thirty-five articles, a further anthology of Talmudic passages and Rashi's commentaries to the Bible. This is the case for the following examples; they are both in the *Excerptum* and in the thematic *Extractiones* but not in the sequential one, since they come from Donin's articles:

19. Isidore LOEB, "La controverse de 1240 sur le Talmud", in: *Revue des études juives* 2 (1881), pp. 248-270 (esp. pp. 262-263): VIII<sup>us</sup>. QUI PROHIBENT NE INFANTES BIBLIA UTANTUR, QUIA NON EST MODUS, UT DICUNT, DISCENDUM EA, SED DOCTRINAM TALMUD PREFERENTES, QUEDAM EDIDERUNT PRO SUA VOLUNTATE MANDATA. Hoc legitur in macecta *Brakot*, in perec *Thephilat hasahar* (quod est oratio matutina), ubi dicitur: "Quum Rby Elyezer fuit infirmus, discipuli eius intraverunt ad ipsum visitandum et dixerunt ei: Magister, doce nos vias vite, verbum in quo luemur vias futuri seculi. Dixit eis: Estote veloces in honorem sociorum vestrorum et prohibete filios vestros a studio legis". –*Glossa Salomonis*: Non assuefaciatis eos in mykara (Biblia), quia nimis abstrahit ad aliam doctrinam (infidelitatem). –Et iterum ait: "Facite filios vestros sedere inter genua sapientium discipulorum et per hoc lucrabimini vitam alterius seculi".



<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractiones</i>	<b>Donin's articles</b>
<p>[Y fol. 28vb, L fol. 99r]</p> <p>[Meg 25b; cf. Nid 73a] Item: Qui studet in <i>Halakot</i> –id est in sententiis Talmud– adsecuratum est ei, quod erit filius futuri saeculi.</p>	<p>[P fol. 5vb]</p> <p>[Meg 25b; cf. Nid 73a] Dictum est de domo Heliae: Omnis qui studet in <i>Halakot</i> –<u>sententiis Talmud</u>– adsecuratum est ei, quod erit filius futuri saeculi. <u>Eadem verba sunt in libro Nassym in macecta Nyda.</u></p>	<p>[P fol. 217va]</p> <p>[Meg 25b; cf. Nid 73a] XXXII<sup>us</sup>. AC SECURUS EST IN FUTURO QUI IN DOCTRINA PREFATA STUDUERIT IN PRESENTI. Hoc legitur in libro <i>Mohed</i>. in macecta <i>Meguilla</i>, in perec <i>Bene hair</i>: Dictum est in domo Helye: Omnis qui studet in <i>Halakod</i> –verbis Talmut–, assecuratum est ei, quod erit filius futuri seculi. Eadem verba sunt in libro <i>Nassim</i>, in macecta <i>Nydda</i>, in fine.<sup>20</sup></p>
<p>[Y fol. 29va, L fol. 100r]</p> <p>[Er 21b] Item: Omnis qui deridet verba sapientum punitur in stercore bulliente.</p>	<p>[P fol. 12rb]</p> <p>[Er 21b] Dicit rab Papa: Docet quod omnis qui irridet verba sapientum punitur in stercore bulliente.</p>	<p>[P fol. 213rb]</p> <p>[Er 21b] Dicit Rab Papa: Docens quod omnis qui irridet verba sapiencium punitur in stercore bullienti.<sup>21</sup></p>
<p>[Y fol. 29va, L fol. 100r]</p> <p>[Rh 17a] <i>Hasana</i> primo capitulo dicitur: <i>Mynim</i> sunt discipuli Iesu Nazareni qui subvertunt verba Dei vivi in malum.</p>	<p>[P fol. 12vb]</p> <p>[Rh 17a] <u>In <i>Ros Hasana</i> in primo capitulo dicitur: <i>Mynim</i> sunt discipuli Iesu Nazareni qui subverterunt verba Dei vivi in malum.</u></p>	<p>[P fol. 217ra]</p> <p>[Rh 17a] In libro enim <i>Mohed</i>, in macecta <i>Roshasana</i> –id est caput anni–, in primo perec dicitur: <i>Mynim</i> sunt discipuli Ihesu noceri qui subverterunt verba Dei vivi in malum. Eadem verba sunt in eodem libro in macecta <i>Brakot</i>.<sup>22</sup></p>

Among the main arguments for this link between the Epitome and the thematic version, in the *Excerptum* we find chapters dealing with polemical topics, whose titles are strikingly similar to those found in the thematic *Extractiones*:<sup>23</sup>

20. Isidore LOEB, “La controverse de 1240 sur le Talmud”, in: *Revue des études juives* 3 (1881), pp. 39-57, at p. 53.

21. LOEB, “La controverse” (as in note 19), p. 262.

22. LOEB, “La controverse” (as in note 20), p. 51.

23. Alexander FIDORA, “Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions. The Two Versions of the Latin Talmud”, in: *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 2/1 (2015), pp. 63-78, at p. 68; Judah M. ROSENTHAL, “The Talmud on Trial: The Disputation at Paris in the Year 1240”, in: *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 47/1 (1956), pp. 58-76 (esp. pp. 75-76).

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<b>Thematic Extractions (in P)</b>
No name <sup>18</sup>	De auctoritate Talmud
De magistris Talmud	De sapientibus et magistris
Blasphemiae contra Christum	De blasphemiis contra Christum et beatam virginem
Blasphemiae contra Deum, creatorem omnium	De blasphemiis contra Deum
Contra Christianos et ecclesiam Dei sunt ista quae sequuntur	De malis quae dicunt de <i>goyim</i> , id est christianis
Oratio contra Christianos	De erroribus
De stultitiis et execratione iudaeorum	De sortilegiis
De sortilegiis iudaeorum et de infidelitate ipsorum	De somniis
Fictio iudaeorum de futuro saeculo	De futuro saeculo
De adventu Messiae	De Messia
De stultitiis iudaeorum	De stultitiis
De immunditiis iudaeorum	De turpitudinibus et immunditiis
De somnis seu visionibus nocturnis iudaeorum	De fabulis
De fabulis iudaeorum	

Nonetheless, despite these apparent similarities, in the *Excerptum* we find changes and innovations on the titles: The *Excerptum* adds the chapter *Oratio contra Christianos*, whereas the thematic version lacks it;<sup>25</sup> the chapters of the *De somniis* and the *De stultitiis* are displaced in the Epitome and they also appear with a different title, and the same is true of *De futuro saeculo*, which is *Fictio iudaeorum de futuro saeculo* in the *Excerptum*. This shows us that the *Excerptum* is meant to be a new work, independent from its source, and not just a selection of passages.

In order to show more resemblances with the thematic version, we may also underline close connections between textual and lexical elements.

24. The first part of the *Excerptum* lacks a title in the manuscripts. However, this part clearly relates to the passages that deal with the Talmud and its authority in Judaism. This explains why Herrad Spilling only mentioned twelve issues of anti-Jewish polemic instead of thirteen when describing the manuscript Add. 19952: SPILLING, "Cod. Harl. 3934" (as in note 8), p. 66.
25. Even if it does not exist as a chapter title, the content of this chapter of the *Excerptum* does appear, with additions, in the chapter *Contra christianos* of the thematic version (*P* fols. 21va-22va) and in the section of the dossier *De libro Krubot* (*P* fols. 206vb-207rb; 210va-210vb).

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractions</i>	<i>Sequential Extractions</i>
[Y fol. 39ra, L fol. 110v] [San 95b] Item: Legimus quod longitudo exercitus Sennacherib erat quadringentorum leucarum et <i>longitudo</i> colli equorum quadraginta leucarum.	[P fol. 83vb] [San 95b] Legimus quod longitudo exercitus Sennacherib erat quadringentorum leucarum et <i>longitudo</i> colli equorum quadraginta leucarum.	[P fol. 170va-170vb] [San 95b] Legimus quod longitudo exercitus Sennacherib erat quadringentorum leucarum et <i>latitudo</i> colli equorum quadraginta leucarum.
[Y fol. 32ra, L fol. 103r] [San 91b] Item: Dicit rabi Cenlay: Qualiter est puer in utero matris... –et infra– candela accensa est super caput eius et intuetur ab uno capite mundi usque ad aliud et docet eum tota lex. Quando vero <i>egreditur</i> de utero, angelus percutit eum super <i>buccam</i> et faciet eum oblivisci totius legis, ut scriptum est: “statim in foribus peccatum aderit” [Gn 4, 7]; nec egredietur donec iuraverit quod fiat probus homo, unde scriptum est: “mihi curvabitur omne genu et confitebitur omnis lingua” [Is 45, 23].	[P fol. 29rb-29va] [San 91b] Dicit rbi Cenlay: Qualiter est puer in utero matris... –et infra– candela accensa est super caput illius et intuetur ab uno capite mundi usque ad aliud, sicut scriptum est: “quando lucebat lucerna eius super caput meum” [Iob 29, 3] nec super hoc mireris. Homo enim dormit et per somnium videt in Hispania... –et infra– et docetur eum tota lex. Quando vero <i>egreditur</i> ex utero, angelus percutit eum super <i>buccam</i> et facit eum oblivisci totius legis, sicut scriptum est: “statim in foribus peccatum aderit” [Gn 4, 7]; nec egreditur donec iuraverit <u>quod erit probus homo</u> , unde scriptum est: “mihi curvabitur omne genu et confitebitur omnis lingua” [Is 45, 23].	[P fol. 195ra] [Nid 30b] <sup>26</sup> Puer in utero matris habet candelam super caput et videt ab uno capite mundi usque ad aliud et docetur eum totam legem. Quando vero <i>exit</i> , angelus percutit eum super <i>os</i> et facit oblivisci et faciunt eum iurare quod erit iustus et non impius. – <u>Alibi etiam est hoc plenius infra</u> –.

In the examples we can see that the text of the *Excerptum* closely corresponds to the thematic version both textually and lexically. Thus, in the samples from San 91b and Nid 30b there are texts and passages that the sequential version lacks. In the example from San 95b one finds the word *longitudo*, shared between *Excerptum* and the thematic version, whereas *latitudo* is used in the Sequential.

Also, the Epitome provides new readings and variations that enhance the polemical potential and thus make the text more acrimonious or let the Talmud appear more ridiculous.

26. The passage from San 91b, extant in the Thematic version and in the epitome, is not in the Sequential *Extractions*. The only passage from the Sequential version related to it by content is this from Nid 30b, which remarks at the end that the same content reoccurs more extensively in another place. Indeed, the passage from San 91b is found in the anthology of further Talmudic material (in the *dossier P* fol. 224rb-224va); the Thematic version must have taken the passage from this anthology.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractions</i>	<i>Sequential Extractions</i>
[Y fol. 33va, L fol. 104v] [Bb 58a] Rabi Bannaa: Inveni Eliezer, servum Abraham, stantem in porta et dixi ei: Quid facit Abraham, pater noster? Respondit Eliezer: Dormit in gremio Sarae et ipsa quaerit ei <i>pediculos</i> in capite.	[P fol. 42va] [Bb 58a] Rbi Bena signabat sepulcrorum speluncas. Quando venit ad speluncam Abraham, patris nostri, invenit Elyezer, servuum Abraham, stantem in porta et ait illi: Quid facit Abraham, pater noster? Respondit Elyezer: Dormit in gremio Sarae et ipsa quaerit ei in capite.	[P fol. 140va] [Bb 58a] Rby Bena signabat sepultorum speluncas. Quando venit ad speluncam Abraham, patris nostri, invenit Eliezer, servum Abraham, stantem in porta et ait illi: Quid facit Abraham, pater noster? Respondit Eliezer: Dormit in gremio Sarae et ipsa quaerit ei in capite.
[Y fol. 33vb, L fol. 104v] [San 92a] Item: Dicit rabi Yessa: Quicumque docet legem in hoc saeculo docebit etiam eam in <i>inferno</i> .	[P fol. 43va-43vb] [San 92a] Dicit rab Sesa: Quicumque docet legem in hoc saeculo docebit eam in futuro.	[P fol. 166va] [San 92a] Dicit rab Sesa: Quicumque docet legem in hoc saeculo docebit eam in futuro.
[Y fol. 31ra, L fol. 101v] [Ber 57b] Item: Dicit rabi Symeon: Omnes gentes convertendae sunt ad <i>Messiam</i> .	[P fol. 18va] [Ber 57b] Qui videt locum a quo <i>avoza zara</i> eradicata est debet dicere: Benedictus Deus, qui eradicavit <i>avoza zara</i> de terris nostris et sicut inde eradicata est, sic eradicetur de omnibus locis Israhel et convertantur corda eorum qui ei serviunt ad serviendum tibi, Domine. Extra terram Israhel non oportet hoc modo dicere. Et rbi Symeon dicit quod immo, quia omnes gentes convertendae sunt ad iudaismum sicut scriptum est: “reddam populis labium electum ut invocent omnes in nomine Domini et serviant ei umero uno” [So 3, 9].	[P fol. 120ra] [Ber 57b] Qui videt locum a quo <i>avoza zara</i> eradicata est – <u>id est</u> <u>servitium peregrinum</u> – debet dicere: Benedictus, qui eradicavit <i>avoza zara</i> de terris nostris et sicut inde eradicatum est, sic eradicetur de omnibus locis Israhel et convertantur corda eorum qui ei serviunt ad serviendum tibi, Domine. Extra terram Israhel non oportet sic dicere. Et rby Symeon dicit quod immo, quia omnes gentes convertendae sunt ad iudaismum sicut scriptum est: “reddam populis labium electum ut invocent ei umero uno” [So 3, 9].

In the first example of Bb 58a we observe that the epitomist added *pediculos* to the Latin text, making the tale from the Talmud ridiculous, since lice are not mentioned in the original text. In the second sample, there is a manipulation of the original *in futuro* (the world to come) in order to condemn the Jews to go to Hell. Finally, in the passage of Ber 57b, the epitomist entirely changes the meaning of the Talmudic passage by Christianising the text with the addition of *Messiam* – laden with a clear Christian connotation<sup>27</sup> – instead of the word *iudaismum* as found in the *Extractions*.

27. Also, Ramon Martí in his *Pugio fidei* tried to prove the coming of the Messiah through Jewish sources including the Talmud. See Jeremy COHEN, *The Friars and the Jews. The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism*, Ithaca/London, 1982, pp. 132-133.

Furthermore, being a revision of the *Extractiones* and a new text, the *Excerptum* yields lexical variations that do not match any *Extractiones* version, leading us to consider that they might be incorporated by the very epitomist. In the following example we can find an extra sentence in the *Excerptum* which is non-extant in the other versions and summarises the precedent content.

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<i>Thematic Extractions</i>	<i>Sequential Extractions</i>
<p>[Y fol. 38rb-38va, L fol. 109v-110r]</p> <p>[Bb 74b] Item: Dicit rabi Iuda: Quicquid Deus creavit in saeculo, masculum et feminam creavit. Leviathan ergo masculum et feminam creavit. Si autem masculus cum femina coirent, totus mundus periret. Et quid fecit Deus? Castravit masculum et occidit feminam et sallitam servavit eam pro iustis in futuro saeculo, secundum quod scriptum est: “et occidet cetum qui in mari est” [Is 27, 1]. Similiter bovem, qui singulis diebus depascit mille montes, masculum et feminam creavit, secundum quod scriptum: “meae sunt omnes bestiae silvarum” [Ps 49, 10]. Isti duo, si coirent, destruerent totum mundum. Ideo, castravit Deus masculum et infrigidavit feminam, unde scriptum est: “Fortitudo eius in lumbis eius et virtus eius in umbilico ventris eius” [Iob 40, 11]. Fortitudo eius: hoc est masculi; et virtus eius: hoc est feminae. De piscibus autem quare occidit feminam et non infrigidavit potius? Quia pisces nimis fructificant, nec prodesset infrigidatio. Et quare tunc non potius interfecit masculum? Quia scriptum est: “draco iste quem formasti ad includendum ei” [Ps 103, 26]. Non enim esset decens quod luderet cum femina vel diceret quod femina sallita melior est quam masculus. Feminam vero bovis quare infrigidavit potius quam occidit? Quia piscis sallitus bonus est, carnes vero sallitae non valent. <i>Ut ergo daret nobis carnes recentes et pisces sallitos, feminam bovis infrigidavit et non occidit et feminam piscis occidit et sallitam servavit.</i></p>	<p>[P fol. 78rb-78va]</p> <p>[Bb 74b] Dicit rab Iuda: Rab dicit: Quicquid Deus creavit in saeculo suo, masculus et feminam creavit eum. Et Leviathan, masculum et feminam creavit eum. Et si coirent simul destruerent totum mundum. Et quid fecit Deus? Castravit masculum et occidit feminam et sallit eam pro iustis in futuro saeculo, secundum quod scriptum est: “et occidet cetum qui in mari est” [Is 27, 1]. Similiter bovem, qui singulis diebus depascit mille montes, masculum et feminam creavit, de quo scriptum est: “meae sunt omnes ferae silvarum Beemoth in montibus milium” [Ps 49, 10]. Et, si coirent simul, destruerent totum mundum. Ideo, castravit Deus masculum et infrigidavit feminam, unde scriptum est: “fortitudo eius in lumbis eius et virtus eius in umbilico ventris eius” [Iob 40, 11]. Fortitudo eius: hoc est masculi; et virtus eius hoc est feminae. De piscibus, quare occidit feminam et non potius infrigidavit eam? Pisces enim nimis fructificant, nec <u>prodesset infrigidatio</u>. Et quare non interfecit masculum et feminam reservavit? Quoniam scriptum est: “draco iste quem formasti ad ludendum in eo” [Ps 103, 26], nec esset decens quod luderet cum femina vel dic, si vis, quod femina sallita melior est quam masculus. Et feminam bovis quare infrigidavit et quare non occidit illam ut reservaret eam iustis in futuro saeculo? Quare piscis sallitus bonus est, sed carnes sallitae non valent.</p>	<p>[P fol. 143ra-143rb]</p> <p>[Bb 74b] Dicit rab Iuda: Quicquid Deus creavit in saeculo suo, masculum et feminam creavit. Et Leviathan, masculum et feminam creavit eum. Et si coirent simul destruerent totum mundum. Et quid fecit Sanctus, benedictus sit ipse? Castravit masculum et occidit feminam et sallit eam pro iustis in futuro saeculo, sicut scriptum est: “et occidet cetum qui in mari est” [Is 27, 1]. Similiter bovem, qui depascit mille montes singulis diebus, masculum et feminam creavit, de quo: “iumenta in montibus millenariis <u>-ubi habemus ‘iumenta in montibus et boves’-</u>” [Ps 49, 10]. Et, si coirent masculus cum femina sua, destruerent totum mundum. Et quid fecit sanctus, benedictus sit ipse? Castravit masculum et infrigidavit feminam, sicut scriptum est: “fortitudo eius <u>-id est masculi-</u> in lumbis eius et virtus eius <u>-id est feminae-</u> in ventris umbilico eius” [Iob 40, 11]. De piscibus, quare occidit feminam et non potius infrigidavit eam? Pisces enim nimis fructificant, non prodest infrigidatio. Et quare non dimisit feminam Leviathan et occidit masculum? Propter hoc quod scriptum est: “draco quem formasti ad ludendum in eo” [Ps 103, 26], nec esset decens quod Deus luderet cum femina. Et feminam bovis quare infrigidavit? Quare non occidit, ut reservaret illam iustis in futuro saeculo, sicut fecit de femina Leviathan? Quia pisces salsi boni sunt, carnes autem salsae non tantum valent.</p>

It is also the case that the epitomist follows his particular criterion when changing some words from the source text, thus correcting and improving the text of the *Extractiones*:

<i>Excerptum de Talmud</i>	<b>thematic <i>Extractiones</i></b>	<b>sequential <i>Extractiones</i></b>
[Y fol. 38va, L fol. 110r] [San 59b] Item: Dicit rabi Iuda: Adam comedebat in horto Paradisi et angeli ministri assabant ei carnes et <i>refrigerabant</i> ei vinum. Serpens vero hoc vidit et invidit.	[P fol. 81ra] [San 59b] Dicit rby Iuda: Adam primus comedebat in horto Paradisi et angeli ministerii assabant ei carnes et <i>refrigidabant</i> vinum. Serpens vidit et invidit. Ergo Adam comedit carnes, verum est, sed fuerunt carnes quae descenderunt de caelo – <u>quasi diceret: has potuit comedere, non alias</u> –.	[P fol. 159rb] [San 59b] Dicit rab Iuda: Adam primus comedebat in horto Paradisi et angeli ministerii assabant ei carnes et <i>refrigidabant</i> ei vinum. Serpens vidit et invidit. Ergo Adam comedit carnes, verum est, sed fuerunt carnes quae descenderunt de caelo – <u>quasi diceret: has potuit comedere, sed non alias</u> –.
[Y fol. 36ra, L fol. 107r] [Ber 3a] Item: Tres custodiae nocte sunt et in qualibet Deus sedet et clamat ut leo, sicut scriptum est: “Deus de excelso rugiet” [Ier 25, 30]. In prima custodia rudit asinus, in secunda latrant canes, in tertia <i>sugit</i> infans ubera matris suae et mulier loquitur cum viro suo.	[P fol. 46rb] [Ber 3a] Tres custodiae sunt in nocte et in qualibet Deus sedet et clamat ut leo, sicut scriptum est: “Dominus de excelso rugiet” [Ier 25, 30]. In prima custodia rudit asinus, in secunda latrant canes, in tertia <i>lactet</i> infans ubera matris suae et mulier loquitur cum viro suo.	[P fol. 99rb] [Ber 3a] Tres custodiae sunt in nocte et in qualibet Deus sedet et clamat ut leo, sicut scriptum est –Iere. xxv. f–: “Dominus de excelso rugiet” [Ier 25, 30] et cetera. In prima custodia rudit asinus, in secunda latrant canes, in tertia <i>lactet</i> infans ubera matris suae et mulier loquitur cum viro suo.

In San 59b we see that the epitomist prefers the term *refrigerare* instead of the *refrigidare* used in the *Extractiones*. In the example of Ber 3a we rather notice that the epitomist changes words with the same meaning (*sugit/lactet*).

In order to finish this presentation of the *Excerptum*, we will see a piece of the prologue to the *Excerptum* that also heads, more extensively, the *Extractiones* (being placed both before the thematic and the sequential version).

<i>Excerptum</i>	<i>Prologus in P</i> <sup>28</sup>
[Y fol. 28va, L fol. 99r] Iudaei duas leges dicunt Dominum Moysi tradidisse, scilicet: legem scriptam et legem super os vel in ore. <i>Haec lex dici solum poterat et eam scribere non licebat.</i> Hanc legem dicunt iudaei Talmud –id est documentum vel doctrinam– antonomasice.	[P fol. 1rb; fol. 97ra-97rb] Ut autem quae translata sunt melius intelligi possint, sciendum quod iudaei dicunt duas leges in monte Synai Dominum Moysi tradidisse: una est lex in scripto et alia est lex super os vel in ore, sicut patebit inferius. Porro legem in ore Talmud –id est documentum seu doctrinam– antonomasice vocant.

We can observe that in the *Excerptum* there is a sentence that both *Prologi* of *P* do not have. This might be considered as an addition by the epitomist; however, we find the same sentence in the prologue of the thematic *Extractiones* in the manuscript Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibliothek, Ms. Min. 71 (13th/14th century),<sup>29</sup> in the folio 60r. Apart from this added sentence, in the prologue we also see other textual similarities with the thematic *S*.

<i>Excerptum</i>	<i>Prologus in P</i>	<i>Prologus in S</i>
[Y fol. 28va, L fol. 99r] Haec lex continet sex libros, scilicet: <i>Gerasim</i> –id est <i>semina</i> –, et <i>Tearoht</i> –id est <i>munditia</i> –, <i>Mohet</i> –id est terminus–, <i>Iessuhot</i> –id est salvationes–, <i>Nassim</i> –id est mulieres–, <i>Kadassyim</i> –id est sanctuaria–.	[P fol. 1rb; fol. 97rb] Continet autem sex libros quorum duo non habentur a multis. Unus dicitur <i>Zeraym</i> –id est <i>seminum</i> –, alius <i>Tearod</i> –id est <i>munditiarum</i> –, unus quattuor aliorum appellatur <i>Mohed</i> –id est terminus–, alius <i>Iessuhoz</i> –id est salvationes–, tertius est <i>Nassim</i> –id est mulieres– et quartus <i>Cazassim</i> –id est sanctuaria–.	[S fol. 60r] Continet autem sex libros quorum duo non habentur in usu, videlicet: <i>Zeraym</i> –id est <i>semina</i> –, et <i>Tearot</i> –id est <i>munditia</i> –. Aliorum quattuor nomen sunt ista: <i>Motheo</i> –id est terminus–, <i>Iessuhod</i> –id est salvationes–, <i>Nassym</i> –id est mulieres–, <i>Kadassym</i> –id est sanctuaria–.

Therefore, the *Excerptum* seems to follow the tradition of the text of *S*. In addition, we find some other close textual coincidences between *S* and the *Excerptum* that differ from the readings of thematic *P*.

28. In *P* we find two prologues that were meant to introduce the *Extractiones*: one heading the thematic *Extractiones* (fols. 1ra-4va) and the other heading the sequential *Extractiones* (fols. 97ra-99rb). However, that which heads the thematic *Extractiones* is the same prologue that is meant to introduce the sequential: we find some excerpts of the Berakhot which correspond to the beginning of the sequential version at the end of this prologue.

29. Henceforth *S*.



<i>Excerptum</i>	<i>Thematic P</i>	<i>Thematic S</i>
[Y fol. 34rb, L fol. 105r] [San 98a] Item: Dicit rabi <i>Allacocudre</i> : Si reges ex toto corde convertantur, Messias veniet cum nubibus. Sin autem ascendet super asinam.	[P fol. 45rb] [San 98a] Dicit rbi <i>Alaccendre</i> : Scriptum est: “ecce cum nubibus quasi filius hominis veniebat” [Dn 7, 13]. Et iterum scriptum est: “ecce rex tuus veniet tibi iustus et salvator ipse pauper et ascendens super asinam” [Za 9, 9]. Si reges ex toto corde convertantur, veniet cum nubibus. Sin autem ascendet super asinam.	[S fol. 108v] [San 98a] Dicit rbi <i>Allacocudre</i> : Scriptum est: “ecce cum nubibus caeli quasi filius hominis veniebat” [Dn 7, 13]. Et iterum scriptum est: “ecce rex tuus veniet tibi iustus et salvator ipse pauper et ascendens super asinam” [Za 9, 9]. Si reges ex toto corde convertantur, veni et cum nubibus. Sin autem ascendet super asinam.
[Y fol. 31vb, L fol. 102v] [Ber 34b] Item: Dicit rabi Asse: Non sunt in oratione <i>denudanda</i> peccata, quia scriptum est: “Beati quorum remissa sunt peccata” [Ps 31, 1] et cetera.	[P fol. 25ra] [Ber 34b] Dicit rab Asse: Non sunt in oratione <i>demandata</i> peccata, quia scriptum est: “Beati quorum remissa sunt iniquitates et quorum tecta” [Ps 31, 1] et cetera.	[S fol. 83v] [Ber 34b] Dicit rab Asse: Non sunt in oratione <i>denudanda</i> peccata, quia scriptum est: “Beati quorum remissa sunt iniquitates et quorum tecta sunt peccata” [Ps 31, 1].

Nonetheless, sometimes readings of the *Excerptum* seem to follow the thematic from *P* rather than that from *S*. However, one should consider that the copy of *S* is very corrupted.

<i>Excerptum</i>	<i>Thematic P</i>	<i>Thematic S</i>
[Y fol. 28vb, L fol. 99r] [San 91b-92a] Dicit rabi Symeon: Quicumque impedit <i>Halaka</i> ab ore sapientis magistri <i>etiam</i> pueri in uteris matrum maledicunt <i>ei</i> , sicut scriptum est “qui abscondit frumenta [San 92a] maledicetur in populis” [Prv 11, 26].	[P fol. 6va] [San 91b-92a] Dicit rbi Symeon: Quicumque impedit <i>Halaka</i> ab ore sapientis magistri <i>etiam</i> pueri in uteris matrum maledicunt <i>ei</i> , sicut scriptum est: “qui abscondit frumenta [San 92a] maledicetur in populis” [Prv 11, 26].	[S fol. 63r-63v] [San 91b-92a] Dicit rbi Symeon: Quicumque impedit <i>Halaka</i> ab ore sapientis magistri <i>cum</i> pueri in uteris matrum maledicunt <i>eis</i> , sicut scriptum est: “qui abscondit frumenta [San 92a] maledicetur in populis” [Prv 11, 26].
[Y fol. 28vb, L fol. 99r-99v] [Az 35a] Quid est “meliora sunt ubera tua vino” [Ct 1, 1]? Dicit rabi Dymi: Hoc modo dixit synagoga coram Deo: Domine saeculi, dulciora sunt mihi ubera amicorum tuorum –magistorum in Talmud– quam fundamenta legis <i>scriptae</i> .	[P fol. 7rb] [Az 35a] Quid est “meliora sunt ubera tua vino” [Ct 1, 1]? Dicit rbi Dymi: Hoc modo dixit synagoga coram Deo: Domine saeculi, dulciora sunt mihi verba amicorum tuorum – <u>magistorum in Talmud</u> – quam fundamenta legis <i>scriptae</i> .	[S fol. 64r] [Az 35a] Quid est “meliora sunt ubera tua vino” [Ct 1, 1]? Dicit rab Dymi: Hoc modo dixit synagoga coram Deo: Domine saeculi, dulciora sunt mihi verba amicorum tuorum –magistorum in Talmud– quam fundamenta legis <i>scripturae</i> .

## Conclusion

The Disputation of Paris in 1240 provided the background for what was then the largest translation of the Talmud, known as *Extractiones de Talmud*. This enormous corpus, even though it could have provided useful controversial material for polemicists, nevertheless had few repercussions after the Disputation except for the *Excerptum de Talmud*.

Throughout this study, we have been able to show how the *Excerptum* was created from the thematic version of the *Extractiones*. It is not a mere rewriting of the *Extractiones* in a shorter form; on the contrary, the writer took part in the rearrangement and completion of this work according to their own criteria. Therefore, the epitomist remade the structure of the chapters of the thematic *Extractiones*, displacing the extant topics and even creating the chapter *Oratio contra Christianos*. The epitomist was also responsible for removing sections of text from the selected passages in order to focus more on their most polemical parts, such as Rashi's glosses. Moreover, the epitomist did not only focus on structural matters, but also changed some words and expressions for stylistic reasons, as well as adding new information in order to enhance certain polemical points or to clarify unintelligible or overly-long passages.

Within the thematic tradition portrayed by the manuscripts *P* and *S*, the *Excerptum* represents a separate branch. This makes the *Excerptum* an important witness when studying the thematic *Extractiones*, since it gives us additional information about them. For instance, the witness of the *Excerptum* confirms that there were two traditions, spreading independently of each other, with their own, specific prologue: the tradition of the sequential *Extractiones* with the prologue which we find in *P*; and the tradition of the thematic version with its own prologue that we have in *S*. Hence we can infer that the *Excerptum* cannot come from manuscript *P* because this manuscript lacks the thematic prologue. On the other hand, the manuscript *S* cannot be the source of the *Excerptum* either, because in some cases the *Excerptum* gives the same readings that *P* has.

Ultimately, we conclude that the *Excerptum* bears witness to a tradition of the thematic *Extractiones* that circulated with its own prologue independently, as the manuscript *S* portrays. However, we do not have the manuscript source (i.e. original textual tradition) from which *Excerptum* takes its text.<sup>30</sup> The *Excerptum* contains the textual variations of this lost manuscript in addition to its own variants, the latter having been inserted by the epitomist.

30. On the manuscripts containing the *Extractiones* see the article by Alexander FIDORA in this volume.