

# The Latin Talmud Translation: The Hebrew Sources\*

Annabel González Flores  
(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

## Abstract

The Latin work *Extractiones de Talmud* is the translation of the Hebrew text of the Talmud *Babli*. It emerges from an attentive analysis and comparison of the texts, which highlights the presence of Hebraisms as well as the fidelity to the original text. Notwithstanding, until today there is still no study that attempts to reconstruct the plausible Talmudic sources for the Medieval Latin translation of the text. In order to find the Hebrew manuscript tradition which underlies the translation, I identified passages in the Latin text that differ from the edition of the Hebrew-Aramaic canonical text of the Vilna Talmud and then looked for a similar text in the medieval Hebrew manuscripts. The aim of this paper is to provide a brief characterization of the transmission of the Hebrew Talmud manuscripts preserved in Europe, in order to reconstruct, if possible, the sources of the Latin text of the *Extractiones*.

## 1. Introduction

During the eleventh century, the Talmud<sup>1</sup> became a study book for young Jews and the most important part of their religious education.<sup>2</sup> In Sepharad the written text of

\* 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. The structure and content of the Talmud consists of two corpora of different origin and period: the legal compendium of the Mishna, written in Hebrew; and the Gemara, which is an extensive, but partial, commentary on the Mishna, written in Aramaic. A distinction should be made between the Talmud of the Land of Israel (commonly known as *Yerushalmi*) and the Babylonian Talmud (*Babli*), depending on the geographical/linguistic origin of the Gemara. The latter was the most authoritative and the best-known in medieval Europe. On the different strata of the Talmud, with its different origins and stages – and therefore different languages – see Moulie VIDAS, *Tradition and the Formation of the Talmud*, Princeton, 2014 (esp. pp. 1-19 and 45-80); David BRODSKY, “Lo que nos enseña Kalá Rabati sobre la redacción del Talmud”, in: *Miscelanea de estudios árabes y hebraicos* 65 (2016), pp. 33-58. In contrast, Neusner considers the Talmud as a document whose writing and formation are unified. See: Jacob NEUSNER, *The Reader’s Guide To the Talmud*, Leiden/Boston/Köln, 2001.
2. With regard to the different ways of studying the Talmud in Sepharad and Ashkenaz see David WEISS, “The Study of the Talmud in the Thirteenth Century”, in: *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 1/4 (1889), pp. 289-313; Avraham (Rami) REINER, “De la France à la Provence: L’assimilation des innovations des tossalistes dans la tradition talmudique de Provence”, in: Danièle Iancu-Agou (Ed.), *Philippe le Bel et les Juifs du royaume de France (1306)*, Paris, 2012, pp. 57-66.

the Talmud was copied accurately and with all the respect owed to a fixed and immutable sacred text. However, in the Ashkenazi area,<sup>3</sup> the oral traditions were alive: the written text was considered as an open document, and therefore the rabbis took the liberty of correcting the text when they deemed necessary.<sup>4</sup>

The Latin version, *Extractiones de Talmud*, translates the text of the Babylonian Talmud as it emerges from a careful analysis and comparison of the texts, which highlights the presence of Hebraisms and remains faithful to the original onomastics. Although the Latin translation was elaborated with clear polemical theological aims, it is a literal and methodical translation from the original text. Its prologue offers a brief phonetic treatise to justify the criteria of the transcription of certain Hebrew words into Latin. It also includes a lexicon of technical words from the Talmudic tradition that are used in the Latin translation.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, until today there is still no study that attempts to reconstruct a plausible Talmudic textual tradition behind the Medieval Latin translation of the text.

To find the Hebrew manuscript tradition, I identified passages in the Latin text that differ from the edition of the Hebrew-Aramaic canonical text of the Vilna Talmud.<sup>6</sup> I also sought in the medieval Hebrew manuscripts the source that was used

3. According to Malachi Beit-Arié, the geocultural area of Hebrew book of Sepharad includes the Iberian Peninsula, Provence, the Bas Languedoc, the Maghreb and Sicily: areas with different Iberian Jewish communities during the Late Middle Ages. Ashkenazi regions were France, England and the Rhine zone. See Malachi BEIT-ARIÉ, "Commissioned and Owner-Produced Manuscripts in the Sephardi Zone and Italy in the Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries", in: Javier del Barco (Ed.), *The Late Medieval Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean. Hebrew Manuscripts and Incunabula in Context*, Leiden/Boston, 2015, pp. 15-27, at p. 15.
4. While the Jewish sages of Sepharad were open to the profane sciences, in Ashkenaz, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the sciences that had arrived in Europe through Arabic intermediation were almost entirely disregarded. The only texts studied were of religious character, in Hebrew and Aramaic. There was an almost exclusively religious culture where three currents of thought coexisted: a) the traditionalist trend; b) a new conception of the Talmud; c) a mystical movement of the Ashkenazi pietists. On this theme see Colette SIRAT *et al.* (Eds.), *La conception du livre chez le piétistes ashkenazes au Moyen Âge* (École Pratique des Hautes Études. Sciences historiques et philologiques 6), Geneva, 1996, pp. 8-30. We can observe in the Ashkenazi books, both in their exterior appearance as well as in their Hebrew writing, the mark of the Christian culture. On this subject see Colette SIRAT, "Looking at Latin Books, Understanding Latin Texts. Different Attitudes in Different Jewish Communities", in: Giulio Busi (Ed.), *Hebrew to Latin, Latin to Hebrew. The Mirroring of Two Cultures in the Age of Humanism*, Colloquium Held at the Warburg Institute, London, October 18-19, 2004, vol. 1, Milan, 2006, pp. 9-24 (esp. on pp. 10-11 and notes 6 to 8).
5. See Ulisse CECINI/Óscar DE LA CRUZ/Eulàlia VERNET, "Observacions sobre la traducció llatina del Talmud (París, mitjan segle XIII)", in: *Tamid* 11 (2015), pp. 73-97 (esp. pp. 79-80); Eulàlia VERNET, "On the Latin Transcription of Hebrew and Aramaic Proper Names in the Latin Talmud (Tractate Sanhedrin). Phonetic Features of the Translation", in: *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 2/2 (2015), pp. 197-219 (esp. pp. 201-202).
6. This edition was the most reproduced edition of the Babylonian Talmud from the late nineteenth century onwards. It was printed in the Lithuanian capital by the Romm brothers. This canonical edition publishes the Mishna and the Gemara in the central column, while in the margins are the posterior rabbinical comments, the most notable of which are the Rashi (1040-1105) commentaries whose glosses are also present in the Latin version of the Talmud. It was Daniel Bomberg (c. 1483-1549), who made the first complete

to prepare the Latin translation. I looked for differences in a number of areas, and mainly in onomastic, loan words, textual variants, and the order and composition of treatises. It is also important to find manuscripts containing Rashi's commentaries as well as the manuscripts which include the Minor Treatises. These latter are not incorporated into the canon of Vilna, but in medieval times they often circulated along with the Talmud. The glosses of Rashi were occasionally included, either after the Mishna and the Gemara, or, usually, in a separate booklet called *peruš ha-quntres* – lit. 'commentary of the booklet' – since it was not until the sixteenth century that the page composition was established.

When analysing the differences between the Latin and the original text, I realised that there is a manuscript tradition which matches the Latin text very well: namely, the tradition which left traces in the Florence and Munich *Talmudim*.

## 2. Reconstructing the Hebrew Sources: The Florence and Munich Manuscripts

Before delving into textual details, here are some general data about the manuscripts:

### 2.1. *The Florence Manuscript*<sup>7</sup>

The Florence manuscript is a partial Talmud *Babli* in 3 volumes. Although the three volumes have been catalogued under a single shelfmark, the date of composition of the first volume – Firenze, Magl. Coll. II.I.7 (henceforth *F*<sub>7</sub>) –, namely 1177, is not the same as the other two volumes – Firenze, Magl. Coll. II.I.8 and II.I.9 (henceforth *F*<sub>8</sub> and *F*<sub>9</sub>) – which came later (13th century). Being more or less contemporary to

---

edition of the Babylonian Talmud and who set its characteristic *mise en page*. On this subject see Yaakov ELMAN, "The Babylonian Talmud in its Historical Context", in: Sharon Liberman Mintz/Gabriel Goldstein (Eds.), *Printing the Talmud: From Bomberg to Schottenstein*, New York, 2005, pp. 19-27; Marvin J. HELLER, "Designing the Talmud: The Origins of the Printed Talmudic Page", in: *Tradition* 29/3 (1995), pp. 40-51; Mordechai GLATZER, "Early Hebrew Printing", in: Leonard Singer Gold (Ed.), *A Sign and a Witness. 2000 Years of Hebrew Books and Illuminated Manuscripts*, New York/Oxford, 1988, pp. 80-91; Colette SIRAT, "Le livre hébreu en France au Moyen Âge", in: *Michael: On the History of the Jews in the Diaspora* 12 (1991), pp. 299-335.

7. Found in Florence at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, in the Magliabechi Collection, under the shelfmark Magl. Coll. II.I.7, 8 and 9. This manuscript is reproduced entirely in *Babylonian Talmud, Codex Florence: Florence National Library II.I.7-9: the Earliest Dated Talmud Manuscript*. Ed. David Rosenthal, Jerusalem, 1972 [Introduction: English and Hebrew]. For general information and the most relevant bibliography concerning the Florence manuscript see: CECINI *et al.*, "Observacions sobre la traducció" (as in note 5), esp. pp. 88-94; Ulisse CECINI, "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)", in: *Sefarad* 77/1 (2017), pp. 91-115; Colette SIRAT, "Les manuscrits du Talmud en France du Nord au XIIIe siècle", in: Gilbert Dahan/Élie Nicolas (Eds.), *Le brûlement du Talmud à Paris 1242-1244*, Paris, 1999, pp. 121-139.

the Latin Talmud, this manuscript is interesting because it is very close to the *Vorlage* of the Latin translations and also contains Latin translations from the *Extractiones*, written as *glossae marginales*.

## 2.2. The Munich Manuscript<sup>8</sup>

This manuscript is undoubtedly the most important Talmud manuscript<sup>9</sup> because it is the only one that contains the entire Talmud and also includes the Minor Treatises and other rabbinical works.<sup>10</sup> An addition, particular feature is its placing of the Mishna in the centre of the bifolio, in square, angular letters, while the Gemara around it occupies most of the page and is written in a smaller rabbinical script.<sup>11</sup>

In order to bring the text of the Mishna and the Gemara together, the scribe “aired” the text by leaving blank spaces and often extended the last letters of the lines of the Gemara so that the folios are pleasant to read, despite the density of the text (only 30mm in height for ten lines).

In both texts, the titles, the first words and the colophon of each treatise are written in square script. When at the bottom of the page a word of evil omen such as

8. Nowadays this manuscript is in Munich at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, under shelfmark BSB Cod. hebr. 95. The manuscript is reproduced entirely in: *Babylonian Talmud, Codex Munich 95: The Only Manuscript in Existence Containing the Complete Text of the Talmud*. 3 vols., Facsimile Edition, Jerusalem, 1971 (repr. of *Talmud Babylonicum Codicis Hebraici Monacensis 95. Der Babylonische Talmud nach der Münchener Handschrift Cod. Hebr. 95*. Ed. Hermann L. Strack, Facsimile. Leiden, 1912). The manuscript was studied and described by Moritz STEINSCHNEIDER, *Die hebräischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München*, vol. 1, Munich, 1895, p. 60; Moritz ALTSCHÜLER (Ed.), *Cod. Hebr. Monac. 95. Die Pfersee-Handschrift*. Heft 1, Leipzig/Vienna, 1908; SIRAT, *Les manuscrits du Talmud en France du Nord au XIIIe siècle* (as in note 7); Colette SIRAT, “Le Talmud: le texte et les livres”, in: Frédéric Barbier et al. (Eds.), *Le livre et L’Histoire. Etudes offertes en l’honneur du Professeur Henri-Jean Martin*, Paris, 1997, pp. 47-67.
9. This manuscript is based on a textual witness from the middle of the ninth century, Wilhelm BACHER, “Talmud”, in: *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 12, 1906, pp. 1-27, on p. 11. Also quoted in Israel LEWY, *Jahres-Bericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars*, Breslau, 1905, pp. 3-52, on p. 28.
10. Of the 584 folios that constitute the Codex only 480 contain the Talmud. The codicological description of this manuscript has been made based on the following articles: SIRAT, “Les manuscrits du Talmud en France” (as in note 7), pp. 121-139; *Ead.*, “Le livre hébreu en France au Moyen Âge” (as in note 6); BACHER, *Talmud* (as in note 9), on pp. 4-6.
11. The Munich manuscript measures 280mm in height by 215mm in width. The written space is 260mm by 160mm. The 577 folios are of very fine parchment, and the total thickness of the codex is 92mm. We can distinguish the hair and the flesh side, since it is folded in *quaternions* (with some *terniones* or *quiniones* at the end of the treatises) that begin on the flesh side. The prickings have been made in the outer margins and these have been doubled by the particularly long lines that frame the text. The ruling was made on both sides of each bifolium with a brown or grey lead stylus and the arrangement of the lines is different on each page. The text of the Mishna, written in square script, occupies two columns, varying in width and in height, arranged in the centre of the bifolio; there are between 28 to 48 lines per page. Around it, the Gemara appears in a minuscule rabbinical script, with 80 lines per page.

‘death’, ‘sin’, ‘punishment’ is written, the scribe includes at the bottom of the page a pious formula or auspicious verse.<sup>12</sup>

The copyist has carefully corrected his own copy, and other hands have added glosses and comments. However, the beautiful handwriting notwithstanding, the manuscript is full of slips of the pen and omissions.

The manuscript’s date of composition as indicated on one of the pages (f. 501r) is *Kislev* 12th 5103 (corresponding to 12 November 1342), while on another page (f. 563v) I read *Tebet* 17th 5103 (corresponding to 15 December 1342). The person for whom the manuscript was written was Jeḥosphia Benjamin, though Mattatiah ben Joseph is the name substituted on folios 501a and 563b, where Jeḥosphia’s name was erased. The copyist up to f. 575r was Salomon ben Samson.

Jeḥosphia names some prominent Talmudists and liturgical poets among his ancestors (f. 576r), such as Benjamin ben Samuel of Coutances in Normandy, and his brother Joseph Ṭob ʿElem (Bonfils) of Limoges, who lived in the middle of the eleventh century.<sup>13</sup>

Despite typical French paleographic features and the model of divorce (f. 573r-575v), dated in Paris in 1308, the copyist never lived in France, and it is probable that Salomon ben Samson was born in Germany into one of the families of Jews expelled from France in 1306.<sup>14</sup>

The content of the Munich Manuscript:<sup>15</sup>

fol. 1v *Baraita deMelekheth ha-Mishkan*: is a *baraita* on the erection of the tabernacle.

fol. 2v An alphabetical poem from the pen of Jeḥosphia Benjamin.

fol. 4r *Seder Olam Rabbah*, the Great Order of the World. It gives a chronology detailing the dates of Biblical events from the Creation to Alexander the Great’s conquest of Persia.

fols. 8r-501v Talmud.<sup>16</sup>

12. For instance, in the folio 348r, the word *magefa* (‘epidemic’, ‘plague’) concludes the page, and the scribe has added at the bottom of the page: “We have applied ourselves to Your law, to Your commandments [which protect us from troubles]”. SIRAT, “Le livre hébreu en France au Moyen Âge” (as in note 6), on p. 321.

13. See *Talmud Babylonicum* (as in note 8), p. IV. Strack also mentions that Zunz doubts that Benjamin ben Samuel and Joseph Ṭob were really brothers. See Leopold ZUNZ, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, Berlin, 1865, p. 138.

14. Colette SIRAT, “Les manuscrits du Talmud en France” (as in note 7), on p. 139.

15. The parts of the Munich manuscript, except the Talmud and the Mishna, are transcribed in the work of Taussig, see Shelomoh Zalman TAUSSIG, *Melech Schlome: Enthält verschiedene Talmudische Abhandlungen und Traktat Schekalim*, Krotoschin, 1876 [Hebrew].

16. In folio 157v the copyist copied magical recipes dealing with water and the creation of living beings. Concerning this subject see Giuseppe VELTRI, “‘Watermarks’ in the MS Munich, Hebr. 95: Magical Recipes in Historical Context”, in: Shaul Shaked (Ed.), *Officina Magica: Essays on the Practice of Magic in Antiquity*, Leiden, 2005, pp. 255-268.

fols. 502v-563r Mishna.

fols. 565b-571a *Masekhtot Qetanot*: Minor Treatises:<sup>17</sup>

*Abot de-Rabbi Natan*, a chapter of the fathers according to Rabbi Natan.<sup>18</sup>  
*Dereq Erets*, literally means “the way of the world”, which in this context refers to deportment, manners and behavior.

*Pirquei Ben Azzai*

*Kallah*, ‘bride’. A treatise on engagement, marriage and co-habitation.

*Sopherim*, ‘scribes’.

*Gerim*, ‘conversion to Judaism’.

fols. 571r-572r *Seder Tannaim we-Amoraim*, a list of the teachers whose names are found in Mishna and Talmud.

fols. 573r-575v *Ṭofsei shetirot*, a divorce dated 1308 in Paris.

fols. 575v-576r *Tequnot*, ordinances of Rabbenu Gershom and Rabbenu Jacob Tam.

fols. 576r A genealogy of the owner.

fols. 576v Document on the purchase of the manuscript.

fols. 577v List of owners.

### 3. Examples of the possible Hebrew sources

In what follows, I will give some examples of the differences between the Latin text and the Hebrew canonical text which can be explained by the Florence manuscript or by the textual tradition of the manuscript of Munich.

17. The Minor Tractates are normally printed at the end of *Seder Neziqin* in the Talmud. In addition to the treatises that appear in the Talmud of Munich, they include: *Ebel Rabbati*, a preparation in Mourning. This treatise deals with laws and customs relating to death and mourning, and is sometimes euphemistically called *Semakhot* ‘joys’; *Kallah Rabbati*, that is an elaboration of the treatise *Kallah*; *Dereq Erets Zuta*, aimed at scholars, is a collection of maxims that exhort self-examination and modesty; *Pereq ha-Shalom*, a chapter that deals with the peace; *Sefer Torah*, which explains the regulations for writing scrolls of *Torah*; *Mezuzah*, a piece of parchment contained in a case attached to the doorpost; *Tefilin*, a treatise concerning the phylacteries; *Tsitsit*, fringes; *Abadim*, a chapter regarding the slaves; *Kutim*, a section relating to the Samaritans. There was also a lost treatise called *Erets Israel* about laws concerning the Land of Israel. Three of these tractates were also printed in the first edition of Venice (1520-1523). In the third edition (1550) three new tractates were added. The other treatises were joined to the Talmud Romm-Vilna edition (1883). For a brief description of these tractates see Günter STEMBERGER/H. L. STRACK, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated from German and edited by Markus Bockmuehl, Minneapolis, <sup>2</sup>1996 [<sup>1</sup>1992]; for an English translation of the minor treatises see Aaron COHEN (Ed.), *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud: Massekhtot Ketannah*. Translated into English, with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of Aaron Cohen, 2 vols., London, 1971.

18. Even though *Abot de-Rabbi Natan* is the first and longest of the minor tractates, it probably does not chronologically pertain to that collection, having more the character of a late *Midrash*.

### 3.1. *Differences in the order of treatises*

I can explain two important differences that I find between the Latin and the Hebrew text of the Vilna using the manuscript tradition of Munich. These formal differences are:

Firstly, in the Latin Talmud, the tractate *Niddah* ‘menstrual impurities’ is inside the order of *Nashim* ‘women’, instead of in the order of *Tohorot* ‘pure things’. This is also the case in the Munich manuscript.

Secondly, there is the internal reference in the *Extractiones* to some minor treatises, such as *Kallah* ‘bride’, and *Sopherim* ‘scribes’. These treatises were independent of the canonical Talmudic units – it seems that the *Gaonic* circles would not accept them and therefore they were not included in the Talmud –; nevertheless, later, the rabbinical authorities used them to make decisions concerning halakhic questions. It is for this reason that these minor tractates were copied together with the Talmud in medieval times. I can explain also this difference between the Latin text and the canonical text of Vilna Talmud through a close reading of the text of the Munich manuscript.

### 3.2. *Some examples of textual differences*

That the manuscripts of Florence and Munich can be considered very close to the Talmud manuscript used for the Latin translation is clearly seen in the passage from Bm 58b:



	<i>Extractiones</i> <sup>19</sup>	Vilna <sup>20</sup>	Engl. Transl. of Vilna	Munich <sup>21</sup>	Florence
1	Dicit rby Iohannen: Omnes descendunt in infernum [cf. Ps 113, 25 –iuxta LXX–]	דאמר רבי חנינא הכל יורדין לגיהנם חוץ משלשה [...] כל היורדין לגיהנם	For R' Ḥannina said: All descend to Gehinnom <sup>6</sup> except for three.	דא"ר חנינא הכל יורדין לגיהנא ועולי' חוץ משלש' שיורדין ואי' עולין [...] כל היורדין עולין חוץ משלש' שיורדי' ו <sup>1</sup> אי' עולין המכנ' שם לחבירו ו <sup>2</sup> המלבין פני חבי' ברבים <sup>3</sup> והבא על אש' איש היינו.	דאמ' ר' יוח' הכל יורדין לגיהנם חוץ משלשה חוץ משלש' [...] כל היורדין לגיהנם עולין חוץ משלש' שיורדין ואינן עולין ו <sup>1</sup> אילו הו המכנה שם חבירו (והמכנה) <sup>2</sup> והמלבין פני חבירו ברבים (והוע) <sup>3</sup> והבועל אשת איש הינו.
5	praeter tres. Quid est "praeter tres"? Sed sic dices: "omnes qui descendunt in infernum reascendunt praeter tres", qui descendunt, sed non reascendunt: <sup>1</sup> ille qui imponit cognomen proximo suo; <sup>2</sup> et qui facit albescere faciem proximi sui <sup>3</sup> et qui iacet cum coniugata.	עולים חוץ משלשה שיורדין ואין עולין ואלו הן <sup>3</sup> הבא על אשת איש <sup>2</sup> והמלבין פני חבירו ברבים <sup>1</sup> והמכנה שם רע לחבירו.	[...] All those who descend to Gehinnom <sup>22</sup> ascend except three, who descent but not ascend.		
10	And these are: someone who cohabits with another man's wife, someone who makes friend's face turn white in public, and who calls his friend an embarrassing nickname.				
15	1 Dicit <i>praem.</i> quia <i>BF<sub>8</sub></i>   Iohannen] Iohan <i>PGCZ</i> Ioh. <i>B F<sub>8</sub></i> 5-9 praeter tres. Quid est... infernum <i>om. B 9</i> infernum] inferno <i>GC 13</i> cognomen <i>add. non GC</i>				

19. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 16558 (*P*): fol. 135ra; Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magl. Coll. II.I.8 (*F<sub>8</sub>*): fol. 229b; Girona, Arxiu Capítular, Ms. 19b (*G*): fol. 52va; Carpentras, Bibliothèque Inguibertine, Ms. 153 (*C*): fol. 32ra; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. Theol. lat. fol. 306 (*B*): fol. 90rb; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 1115 (*Z*): fol. 225v [I underlined the differences between manuscripts. The numbers <sup>1</sup>, <sup>2</sup>, <sup>3</sup> mark off the order for the men that are descending]. For these manuscripts containing the Latin Talmud see 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 (esp. p. 66); CECINI *et al.*, "Observacions sobre la traducció" (as in note 5); Óscar DE LA CRUZ, "El estadio textual de las *Extractiones de Talmud* en el BnF ms. lat 16558" and Alexander FIDORA, "The Latin Talmud and its Place in Medieval Anti-Jewish Polemic" in this volume.
20. Here and from now on, the text of the Talmud is quoted from the Schottenstein Edition, *Talmud Bavli. The Schottenstein Edition*. Ed. Hersh Goldwurm, New York, 1990-. The English translation is also based on the Schottenstein edition, with some modifications regarding the transcription of Hebrew words.
21. The source for the Florence and Munich text is: The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, *The Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank*, Version 5, Bar-Ilan University, 2002.
22. The place where children were sacrificed to the god Moloch was originally in the Valley of Ben-Hinnom בְּנֵי הַיָּהוּנָם. For this the valley was deemed to be accursed, and 'Gehinnom' (גיהנם) therefore soon became a figurative equivalent for 'hell'. See Kaufmann KOHLER/Ludwig BLAU, "Gehenna", in: Isidore Singer (Ed.), *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, New York/London, 1903, pp. 582-584.



I can see that the order for men descending to hell in the text *Extractiones de Talmud* is the same as that in the manuscripts of Florence and Munich. This can be seen below:

1. *Ille qui imponit cognomen proximo suo* correspond to the Hebrew אילו הן המכנה שם חבירו,<sup>23</sup> the translation for both the Latin and the Hebrew text is: “someone who gives his friend a nickname”.
2. *Et qui facit albescere faciem proximi sui* matches with the Hebrew והמלבין פני חבירו ברבים, the translation for both the Latin and the Hebrew text being: “someone who makes his friend’s face turn white in public”.<sup>24</sup>
3. *Et qui iacet cum coniugata* corresponds to the Hebrew הבא על אשת איש<sup>25</sup>. The meaning of the Latin and Hebrew text is: “someone who lies with another man’s wife”.

However, the name of the Rabbi in the *Extractiones* and in the Florence manuscript is *Iohannen* while in Munich (and in Vilna edition) it is Rabbi Ḥannina. In this case, the Latin text follows the tradition of the Florence Manuscript.

The following example, San 11a,<sup>26</sup> although showing that the Florence manuscript is very close to the source of the Latin translation of the Talmud, also demonstrates that it does not coincide exactly. Fortunately, these small differences can be explained by the tradition of the Munich manuscript.

23. The copyist of the Munich manuscript often used abbreviations For instance, ‘ואילו for אילו; חבי for חבירו, among others.

24. “In public” is only present in Hebrew.

25. The Florence manuscript has הבעל אשת איש דינו, “someone who has a sexual intercourse with another man’s wife”.

26. For the passages from Sanhedrin I thank Ulisse Cecini. See his publication CECINI, “The *Extractiones de Talmud* and Their Relationship” (as in note 7).

	<i>Extractiones</i> <sup>27</sup>	Vilna	Engl. Transl. of Vilna.	Munich	Florence
1 5 10	Unde accidit quod magistri comedebant in solarío Bezgoria <sup>28</sup> in Hiericho descenditque super eos filia vocis et dixit: <u>Inter vos est homo qui dignus est ut poneret Deus spiritum suum super eum, sed generatio sua non est digna.</u>  1 unde] sicut F 3 solarío] salario C   bezgoria] hezgazya P hetgazya F bezgazia C bezgazia Z 4 Hiericho] jericho PZ ierico CF iericho B 5 descenditque] et descendit F descendit C 9 poneret deus] deus poneret B 10 spiritum add. [sanctum] C	פעם אחת היו מסובין בעליית בית גוריה ביריחו ונתנה עליהם בת קול מן השמים יש כאן אחד שראוי שתשרה עליו שכינה (כמשה רבינו) אלא שאין דורו זכאי לכך.	One time [the sages] were reclining in the attic of Guryah's house in Jericho and an echo of a voice came to them from the heaven, saying: There is one here who deserves to have God's divine presence rest upon him as it Moses, our teacher, but this generation does not merit this.	פע' אח' היו מסובין בעלוי בי' גוריה ביריחו ונתנ' עליה בת קו' מן השמי' יש כאן אדם אח' ביניכ' שראוי שתשר' עליו שכינ' אל' שאין דורו זכאי לכך.	פעם אחת היו מסובין בעלייה בית גריא ביריחו וניתנה עליו בת קול משמים יש כאן אדם אחד שתשרה שכינה עליו אלא שאין דורו ראוי לכך.

In the Latin text we can observe *inter vos est homo qui dignus est*, that is: “among you there is one man here who is worthy”, while in the Vilna Edition it is written “יש כאן אחד שראוי”, “there is one here who is worthy”. If we look at the manuscript of Florence we find reflected “יש כאן אדם אחד” of the Latin text. However, the words “among you” and “worthy” are missing. To find an exact concordance between the Latin and the Hebrew text we must see the text of the Munich manuscript: *inter vos* corresponding to “ביניכ” “among you”, *est homo*, corresponding to “יש כאן אדם אה” “there is one man here” and *qui dignus est*, corresponding to “who is worthy”.

In the following example, San 105b, we can see that the Latin translation is very close to the textual tradition of Munich manuscript:

27. P146vb (50); F<sub>9</sub> 115a infra; C 38rb; B106rb; Z: 283v (148); G *abest*.

28. For the different manners to transcribe in the Latin Talmud the term *Bezgoria* see, VERNET, “On the Latin Transcription of Hebrew” (as in note 5), on p. 213.

	<i>Extractiones</i> <sup>29</sup>	Vilna	Engl. Transl. of Vilna	Munich	Florence
1	Fuit quidam <i>myn</i> in vicinia rby Iossua, qui multum	ההוא מינא דהוה בשיבכותיה דרבי יהושע בן לוי דהוה קא מצער ליה יומא חד נקט תרנגולתא ואסר ליה בכרעיה	There was a certain heretic who was in the neighborhood of R' Yehoshua ben Levi, who used to harrass [R' Yehoshua].	ההו' מי' דהוה בשיבכותי' דר' יהוש' בן לוי דהוה קמצע' לי' יומ' חד נקט תרנגולת' ואסר לי' בכרעי' [דפוריא] ואותיב א' כי מט' ההי' שעת' אילטייה	ההוא מינא דהוה בשיבכותיה דר' יהוש' בן לוי דהוה קא מצער ליה יומא חד נקט תרנגולתאויתי סבר כי מטיא ההיא שעתא אלטיה אדהכי מיתנמם וחליף ההיא ש(ל)[ע]ת? אמ' ש"מ לאו ארעה למיעבד הכי דכת' גם ענוש לצדיק (כי) [לא] טוב.
5	adversabatur ei. Accepit itaque rby Iossua gallum in manu sua, dicens intra se: Quando illa hora veniet maledicam ei.	והוה שעתא אילטייה כי מטא ההוא שעתא נמנם אמר שמע מינה לאו ארעה דכתיב משלי י"ז גם ענוש לצדיק לא טוב אפילו במיני לא איבעי ליה למימר הכי.	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].	כי מט' א' כי מט' ההי' שעת' אילטייה כי מט' א' ש"מ לאו ארעה דכ' גם ענוש לצדי' לא טוב אפי' במיני לא איבעי לי' למימ' הכי [דכתי' ורחמיו על כל מעשיו].	
10	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].		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: "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.		
15					
20	2 <i>myn add.</i> haereticus in talmud <i>F</i> <sub>9</sub> 4-5 multum adversabatur ei] adversabatur ei quam plurimum <i>F</i> <sub>9</sub> 6-7 itaque...Iossua <i>om. F</i> <sub>9</sub> 8 sua <i>om. F</i> <sub>9</sub> 10 hora illa <i>transp. F</i> <sub>9</sub> 14 Modo] nunc <i>F</i> <sub>9</sub> 15 quod <i>om. GC</i> .				

In the Latin text appears the Biblical verse Ps 144, 9 *et miserationes eius super omnia opera eius*, "compassionate toward all your works". In contrast, in the Vilna edition and the Florence manuscript the Biblical quotation that appears is Prv 17,

29. P 179va (83); *F*<sub>9</sub> 269b; *G* 14rb (57) C 53va; Z 339r (259).

26: “it is also not good to fine the righteous”. However, in the manuscript of Munich the two Biblical quotations appear: Prv 17, 26 in the body of the text and Ps 144, 9 in the interlinear space.

As in the previous example here, Az 2b, we find a correspondence between the Latin text of the *Extractiones* and that of the Munich Manuscript.<sup>30</sup>

	<i>Extractiones</i> <sup>31</sup>	Vilna	Engl. Transl. of Vilna	Munich Manuscript
1	Dicet eis Dominus: <u>De quo intromisistis vos in hoc saeculo?</u>	אמר להם הקב"ה במאי עסקתם אומרים לפניו רבש"ע הרבה שווקים תקנינו הרבה מרחצאות עשינו הרבה כסף וזהב הרבינו וכולם לא עשינו אלא בשביל ישראל כדי שיתעסקו בתורה.	The Holy One, Blessed is He, says to [the Romans]: With what did you involve yourselves? They respond before Him: Master of the Universe, we established many marketplaces, constructed many bathhouses, and amassed much silver and gold. And all of these we did only for the sake of the Jews so that they should be able to involve themselves in Torah study.	א' להן הקב"ה כמה עסקתם בעול' הזה אמ' לפניו רבו' ש"ע הרב' שווקי' תקננו הרב' מרחצאו' עשינו הרב' כסף וזהב הרבינו וכלן לא עשינו אל' בשביל ישר' שיעסקו בתור'.
5	Respondebunt coram ipso: Domine saeculi, multa fora fecimus, plura balnea fecimus, aurum et argentum multiplicavimus; et			
10	hoc totum fecimus pro Israhel ut studerent in lege.			
	II studerent sic codd			

In the Latin text we can observe *De quo intromisistis vos in hoc saeculo*. The words *hoc saeculo* – ‘this world’ – are missing in the Vilna edition. Notwithstanding, in the margins, written by a different hand, in the Munich manuscripts we can read *הזה* ‘this world’.

The following example, San 35a,<sup>32</sup> clearly demonstrates that the Florence manuscript is a witness of textual revisions applied to the Latin translation of the Talmud.

30. Unfortunately, the treatise *Aḥoda Zara* is missing from the Florence manuscript.

31. P 185 ra (89); G 66rb (23); C 55vb; Z 348r (277).

32. This example is quoted in CECINI *et al.*, “Observacions sobre la traducció” (as in note 5), on p. 15, also, is quoted in CECINI, “The *Extractiones de Talmud* and Their Relationship” (as in note 7).

	<i>Extractiones</i> <sup>33</sup>	Vilna	Engl. Transl. of Vilna	Munich	Florence
1	Dicit rby Eleazar: Ieiunium cum quo non fit elemosyna, quasi effunderetur sanguis, et	אמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי יצחק כל תענית שמלינין בו את הצדקה	For R' Eleazar said in the name of R' Yitzkhaq: on any fast day that	דא"ר אלעז' כל תעני' שמלינין בה צדק' כאילו שופך דמי' שנ' צדק ילין בה ועת' מרצחים.	דאמ' ר' אלעז' כל תענית שמלינין בו צדק כאילו שופך דמים שנ' מלאו משפט צדק ילין בה ועתה מר(ח) צחין.
5	hoc est quod scriptum est: "Iustitia habitavit in ea -glossa Salomonis: quia post ieiunium dabant elemosynas pauperibus-,	כאילו שופך דמים שנאמר מלאתי משפט צדק וגו' והני מילי בריפתא ותמרי אבל בזווי חיטי ושערי לית לן בה.	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].		
10	nunc autem homicidae -glossa: quia pauperes spem habent in eis et ipsi dimitunt eos mori fame-"		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].		
15	[Is. 1, 21] <sup>34</sup> . Verum est -dicit Talmud-, sed hoc erat quando dabantur panis et dactili, sed ubi non dabantur dactili non erat curandum.  <b>1</b> <i>add. error mg. PZ   rby  raby G rabi C rbi F<sub>9</sub>B   Eleazar Eleasar B 2 Ieiunium] quod ieiunio F<sub>9</sub> 3 elemosyna] iustitia id est elemosina F<sub>9</sub>   quasi praem. est F<sub>9</sub> 6 habitavit] habitabit B 7 glossa] <i>add. et del. textum quem legi non potest F<sub>9</sub>   Salomonis om. F<sub>9</sub> 9 elemosynas pauperibus] pauperibus elemosynas F<sub>9</sub> 10 nunc] non B 11 glossa <i>add. Salomonis F<sub>9</sub> 12 ipsi om. F<sub>9</sub> 16 dabantur] dabatur F<sub>9</sub>GC 17 et om. GC 17 dactili] dactyli Z <i>add. non erat C   sed om. Z 17-18 sed ubi...dactili mg. G 18 non om. F<sub>9</sub>B   dactili] denarii BF<sub>9</sub> dactyli Z</i></i></i></i>				

We may observe that the Latin translator added Rashi's Glosses explaining why the Biblical verse is related to what R. Eleazar says: "the Bible says about Jerusalem: "where justice lived", because alms were given to the poor; "now, on the other hand, murderers", because the poor trust those who have to give them alms, but when the latter fail to do so they let the poor die of hunger".

33. P 151rb (55); F<sub>9</sub> 156a; G 11ra (54); C 40va; B 111va; Z 290v (162).

34. Is 1, 21: איבה היתה לזונה קרהה נאמנה מלאתי משפט צדק ילין בה ועתה מרצחים: א

It is also interesting to note that the Latin translation of the Florence Manuscript is more accurate because it translates the Hebrew Talmudic text literally: it is written *cum quo non fit iustitia* and explains that in this context, *iustitia* means *elemosyna*. The word ‘justice’, *iustitia* (Hebrew root צדק), is precisely the one that connects the sentence of Rabbi ‘El‘azar to the Biblical verses. The last stage of the Latin Text in the *Extractiones* does not show any connection to the Biblical quotations because it replaces the word *iustitia* with *elemosyna*.

In the examples above we have seen that the textual variations between the Latin translation and the canonical edition of the Vilna Talmud could be explained by the Florence or Munich manuscript. However, in the following example, Tam 27b, it does not seem to be the case, as the name *Hennina* does not appear in any manuscript.<sup>35</sup>

	<i>Extractiones</i> <sup>36</sup>	Vilna	Engl. Transl. of Vilna	Munich	Florence <sup>37</sup>
1	Dicit rby Hennina: Nullus debet bibere aquam et dare	לחייא בריה וכן א"ל רב הונא [...] לא ישתה אדם	Rav said to his son Chiya, and similarly Rav Huna said to his son,	לר' חייא בריה וכן א"ל רב הונא [...] לא ישתה אדם	רב הונא לרבה בריה [...] לא ישתה אדם מים
5	discipulo suo nisi prius effuderit de illa. Accidit enim de quodam qui dedit discipulo	מים ויתן לתלמידו אלא אם כן שפך מהן ומעשה באחד ששתה מים ולא שפך מהן ונתן לתלמידו ואיתו	should not drink water and then give to his disciple to drink unless he pours from [the water]. And there was	מים ויתן לתלמידו אלא אם כן שפך מהן ומעשה באחד ששת' מים ולא שפך מ?ה?ם ונתן לתלמידו ואסטנס	ויתן לתלמידו אלא אם כן שפך מהן ומעשה באחד ששתה מים ולא שפך מהן ונתן לתלמידו ואיסטנס
10	suo et non effudit prius et ille postea mortuus est. In illa hora staturerunt quod nullus biberet et daret discipulo suo nisi prius effunderetur de ea.	תלמיד איסטניס היה ולא רצה לשותות ומת בצמא באותה שעה אמרו לא ישתה אדם	an incident involving one, who drank water and did not pour from [the water] and he gave it to his disciple. That	היה ומת בצמא באותה שעה אמרו אל ישתה אדם מים ויתן לתלמידו אלא א"כ שפך מהם.	היה ומת בצמא באותה שעה אמרו לא ישתה אדם מים ויתן לתלמידו אלא אם כן שפך מהן.
15	18 effunderetur] effunderet GC	מים ויתן לתלמידו אא"כ שפך מהן.	disciple was squeamish and did not want to drink –from de cup- and he died of thirst. At that time they said: a person should not drink water and give to his disciple to drink unless he pours some of it –over the edge of the cup.		

35. Nonetheless, a confusion between the name חנינא (Hannina) and the name הונא (Huna) can be supposed to explain this incongruence.

36. P 205ra (109); G 71rb (28); C 65ra; Z 381r (343).

37. The treatise Tamid is in the codex *F<sub>2</sub>* of the Florence manuscript. As I have said before, this manuscript should be considered apart from the other two. Even if it is close in date and style to the subsequent one, it is another codicological unit and it does not contain the Latin translations in its margins.

#### 4. Conclusions

After the Babylonian Talmud reached Ashkenazi Christian Europe around the eleventh century, it became the core of Medieval Jewish Studies and the different Talmudic schools copied the manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud.

Christians tried to prove that the Jews were wrong in their way of interpreting Scripture, and the translation of several passages of the Talmud in Latin became a new method of refuting Judaism. However, even today there is still no study that attempts to reconstruct plausible Hebrew Talmudic manuscript sources for this translation.

My opinion concerning the Hebrew sources behind the Latin translation of the Talmud is that the textual tradition is portrayed by the manuscripts of Florence – which contain the *Extractiones* as marginal glosses– and by the Munich Talmud both of which elaborate the Latin text of the *Extractiones*.