

The References to the Talmud in Andrew of St. Victor's Biblical Commentaries

Montse Leyra Curiá
(Universidad San Dámaso, Madrid)

Abstract

In his commentaries to the Pentateuch and to the Former and Latter Prophets, Andrew of St. Victor (died 1175) often refer to Jewish religious practices and traditions that have parallels in either the Talmud of Babylonia or the Palestinian one. From the date of its manuscripts (middle thirteenth century) it appears that the Latin version of the Talmud was written several decades after Andrew's death and thus could not have been his source. On the other hand, the Victorine transmits interpretations of Biblical texts similar or identical to those written by Jewish medieval authors contemporary with him. In this paper I propose to ascertain the origin of Andrew's references to Jewish traditions found in the Talmud, whether they were derived from earlier Latin sources or from Jewish authors earlier to or contemporary with him. I also try to work out whether or not the Victorine employs specific formulas or expressions to refer to the Talmud and whether he distinguishes between it and other interpretations by Jewish authors earlier to or contemporary with him (especially Rashi and R. Joseph Kara) or does not display any awareness of the difference between the various sources.

Introduction

In his Biblical commentaries, Andrew of St. Victor (died 1175) often refers to Jewish religious practices and traditions. A group of these references have identical or similar parallels in either the Talmud of Babylonia or the Palestinian one. The Latin version of the Talmud was written in the middle thirteen century and therefore could not have been Andrew's source.¹ On the other hand, Andrew also transmits interpretations of Biblical texts similar or identical to those found in the commentaries of Jewish authors belonging to the twelfth-century Northern-French school of literal exegesis or other Jewish medieval authors.²

1. The *Extractiones de Talmud* from 1244/1245 are preserved in eight manuscripts (in particular: Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 16558): see Alexander FIDORA, "The Latin Talmud and Its Influence on Christian-Jewish Polemic", in: *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 1/2 (2014), pp. 337-342, at p. 338.
2. Beryl SMALLEY, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1952, pp. 103-105, 154-156. For the Jewish movement towards literal exegesis in northern France, see Avraham GROSSMAN, "The School of Literal Jewish Exegesis in Northern France", in: Magne Sæbø (Ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, vol. 1, part 2, Göttingen, 2000, pp. 321-371; Avraham GROSSMAN, *The Early Sages of France: Their Lives*,

In this paper, I propose to search for the sources of these parallels to the Talmud in some of Andrew's commentaries, to ascertain their origin and to work out whether or not Andrew employs certain formulas or expressions to refer to the Talmud and whether he distinguishes between it and other interpretations by Jewish authors earlier or contemporary with him (especially Rashi and R. Joseph Qara) or does not display any awareness of the difference between the various sources.

I shall restrict my analysis to those interpretations which feature explicit ascriptions to the Jews/Hebrews or to Jewish traditions (*in hebraeo*, *secundum hebraeos*) and to those interpretations which feature these ascriptions together with a verb of speech, thought, or writing, that is, where Hugh or Andrew assert that either the Jews say or hold a certain interpretation.³ I will not consider those interpretations according to the Hebrews which refer to features of the Hebrew language (Andrew, *In Gen.* 1, 29) or to the differences pointed by Andrew between his Latin version and the *in hebraeo* text. I have focused on references to Jewish traditions in Genesis, Exodus, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Prophets.

I. Jerome

The works of Jerome constitute the main source for all the material related to the Hebrew text, the Hebrew language, and Jewish exegesis found in Latin Christian writings from the late antique and the medieval period. Therefore, many of the interpretations that Andrew ascribes to the Hebrews or to Jewish traditions in their commentaries on Genesis and some *in hebraeo* interpretations in their commentaries on other Biblical books are ultimately traceable to Jerome's *Hebraicae Quaestiones in Genesim* (HQQ), to some of his letters, or to one of his Biblical commentaries. A number of references to the Jews or to a Jewish tradition in Andrew's commentaries with parallels in the Talmud are found as well with identical or very similar wording in one of Jerome's works or in one of the later Latin sources that transmit them.⁴ For example, in his comment on Obadiah 1, 1, Andrew writes:

Leadership and Works, Jerusalem, ³2001 [Hebrew], especially chaps. 1 and 8; ELIEZER DE BEAUGENCY, *Commentary on Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets of Eliezer of Beaugency*. Ed. Samuel A. Poznanski, Warsaw, 1913 [Hebrew], pp. ix–ccxxx, especially xiv and n. 1.

3. Both Hugh and Andrew employ the expressions *hebraeus*, *hebraei*, *apud hebraeos* and *iudaei* to refer to both Biblical Hebrews and their Jewish contemporaries. I have respected the differences between the Latin expressions by using the English translations, 'the Hebrew/Hebrews', 'according to the Hebrews', and 'the Jews', respectively.
4. On Jerome's Hebrew knowledge and on Jewish traditions transmitted by Jerome, see for instance: Görg K. HASSELHOFF, "Revising the Vulgate: Jerome and his Jewish Interlocutors", in: *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 64/3 (2012), pp. 209–221; Adam KAMESAR, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the "Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim"*, Oxford, ²2002 [¹1993]; Benjamin KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, *The Vulgate as Translation: Some Semantic and Syntactical Aspects of Jerome's Version of the Hebrew Bible*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1968; *Id.*, "Jewish Traditions in the Writings of Jerome", in: Derek R. G. Beattie/Martin J. Mc Namara (Eds.),

Andrew	
<i>Visio Abdie.</i> Abdiam aiunt esse Hebrei qui sub Achab paut centum prophetas in specubus qui non curuauerunt genu Baal et de VII milibus erant quos Helias arguitur ignorasse. ⁵	<i>The vision of Abdias.</i> The Hebrews say that Obadiah is the one who under Ahab supplied with food in caves a hundred prophets, who did not bend their knees before Baal and were among the seven thousand whom Elijah is shown not to have known. ⁶

In I Kings 18, 4, a person named Obadiah, the governor of Ahab's household, is reported to have hidden a hundred prophets in caves and provided them with food. The identification of this person with the prophet Obadiah appears only in TB, San 39b:

Sanhedrin 39b	
TB Vilna: אמר רבי יצחק מפני מה זכה עובדיהו לנביאות מפני שהחביא מאה נביאים במערה שנאמר מלכים א' י"ח ויהי בהכרית איזבל את נביאי ה' ויקח עובדיהו מאה נביאים ויחביאם חמשים איש במערה	R. Isaac said: Why did Obadiah attain the gift of prophecy? – Because he hid a hundred prophets in caves, as it is written, <i>For it was so when Jezebel cut off the prophets of the Lord that Obadiah took a hundred prophets and hid them, fifty in a cave.</i> ⁷

Andrew's comment, however, is identical to Jerome's comment on the beginning of the Book of the prophet Obadiah:

The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context, Sheffield, 1994, pp. 420-430; Moritz RAHMER, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus: durch eine Vergleichung mit den jüdischen Quellen kritisch beleuchtet*, vol. 1, Breslau, 1861. For studies on the Biblical canon at the beginning of Christianity and at the time when Jerome translated the Hebrew Bible into Latin, see: Agustín GIMÉNEZ GONZÁLEZ, "Si el justo es hijo de Dios, le socorrerá" (*Sab* 2, 18): *Acercamiento canónico a la filiación divina del justo perseguido en Sab* 1-6, Asociación Bíblica Española 48, Estella, 2009, pp. 73-79; Julio TREBOLLE BARRERA, *La Biblia judía y la Biblia cristiana*, Madrid, 1998 [1993], pp. 256-259 and the bibliography cited in pp. 283-284.

- ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Opera VIII: Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas: Super Abdiam*. Ed. Frans A. van Liere/Mark Zier, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 53G, Turnhout, 2007, p. 161, ll. 2-4.
- I have followed the 'Douay-Rheims-Challoner' Bible translation of the Vulgate for the Biblical lemmata introducing the commentaries of the Latin authors treated in this article.
- The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nezikin: Sanhedrin*. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices by Jacob J. Schacter (chapters 1-6) and Harry Freedman (chapter 7); under the editorship of Isidore Epstein, London, 1959, p. 253.

Jerome	
<i>Visio Abdiae.</i> Hunc aiunt esse Hebraei qui sub rege Samariae Achab, et impiissima Iezabel paut centum prophetas in specubus, qui non curuauerunt genu Baal, et de septem milibus erant, quos Helias arguitur ignorasse. ⁸	<i>The vision of Abdias.</i> The Hebrews say that Abdias is the one who under Ahab, King of Samaria and the impious Jezebel supplied with food in caves a hundred prophets, who did not bend their knees before Baal and were among the the seven thousand whom Elijah is shown not to have known.

In addition, whereas Sanhedrin mentions only that Obadiah hid the prophets, both Andrew and Jerome claim in addition that the prophet provided them with food.

Other references of Andrew to Jewish traditions with Talmudic parallels are identical or very similar to Jerome's parallel comments and can be traced back to him. These include: 1) Andrew's prologue to his commentary on the prophet Malachi, addressing the identification of the prophet Malachi with Ezra the priest, contained in TB, Meg 15a;⁹ 2) his comment on Jonah 1, dealing with the identification of Jonah with the widow's son whom Elijah raised from the dead, which is found in the TJ, Suk 5, 1;¹⁰ 3) his comment on Obadiah 1, identical in content to a parallel in the TJ, Tan 1, 1;¹¹ 4) his interpretation of Gn 49, 27, with a parallel in TB, Zeb 54a-b, explaining that the altar of the sacrifices was built in the territory corresponding to the tribe of Benjamin;¹² 5) his comment on Os 11, 12, with a parallel in both TB, Sot 37a and the Midrash on Ps 76, 1 on the reason why Judah merited the kingship over all the other tribes;¹³ 6) his comment on Mal 3, 1, with a parallel in TB, Sab 118a.¹⁴

8. HIERONYMUS, *Opera Exegetica 6, Commentarii in Prophetas Minores. In Abdiam I.* Ed. Marc Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 76, Turnhout, 1969, p. 352, ll. 1-4.
9. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Super Malachiam*, 2007 (as in note 5), p. 328, ll. 2-3; HIERONYMUS, *Opera Exegetica 6: Commentarii in Prophetas Minores. In Malachiam Prophetam*, Prol., Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 76A, Turnhout, 1970, p. 901, ll. 15-19.
10. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Super Ionam*, 2007 (as in note 5), p. 168, ll. 2-3; HIERONYMUS, *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores. In Ionam*, 1969 (as in note 8), Prol., p. 378, ll. 35-37.
11. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Super Abdiam*, 2007 (as in note 5), p. 162, ll. 28-32; HIERONYMUS, *In Abdiam I*, 1969 (as in note 8), p. 355, ll. 120-125.
12. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Opera I. Expositio super Heptateuchum. In Genesim*. Ed. Charles Lohr/ Rainer Berndt, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 53, Turnhout, 1986, p. 94, ll. 3081-3090; HIERONYMUS, *Opera Exegetica 1: Hebraicae Quaestiones in libro Geneseos*. Ed. Paul de Lagarde, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 72, Turnhout, 1959, p. 56, ll. 20-29; Rainer BERNDT, "Les interprétations juives dans le *Commentaire de l'Heptateuque* d'André de Saint-Victor", in: *Recherches Augustiniennes* 24 (1989), pp. 199-240, at p. 218, n. 94.
13. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Osee III*, 2007 (as in note 5), p. 70, ll. 1934-1939; HIERONYMUS, *In Osee III*, xi: 12, 1969 (as in note 8), pp. 129-130, ll. 379-385; *The Midrash on Psalms*, II. Translated by William G. Braude (Yale Judaica Series 13), New Haven, 1959, pp. 13-14.
14. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Super Malachiam III*, 1, 2007 (as in note 5), p. 338, ll. 292-296; HIERONYMUS, *In Malachiam Prophetam*, III, 1, 1970 (as in note 9), pp. 928-929, ll. 57-63.

II. Later Latin sources

Another group of Andrew's interpretations, some of which are also found in Jerome, appear to have been transmitted to Andrew *via* Latin sources later than Jerome. For example, in his comment on Gn 4, 26, Andrew writes:

Andrew: <i>In Gen.</i> , ll. 1333-1336	
<i>Iste coepit inuocare nomen Domini. [...] Arbitrantur Hebraei, quod iste primus in nomine Domini ad repraesentandum ipsum sub oculis, ut deuotius coleretur, imagines quasdam adinuenerit.</i> ¹⁵	<i>This one began to call upon the name of the Lord. [...] The Hebrews think that this was the first that on the name of the Lord devised certain statues to represent Him visually so that He could be worshipped more devotedly.</i>

Rainer Berndt points to two possible sources for Andrew's interpretation of Gn 4, 26: Jerome's *Hebraicae Quaestiones* and the Babylonian Talmud, Sab 118b.¹⁶ Jerome and the TB, Sab render:

<i>Quaestiones Hebraicae</i> (Lag. 10. 5-7)	TB, Sab 118b
[...] <i>tunc initium fuit inuocandi nomen domini: licet plerique Hebraeorum aliud arbitrentur quod tunc primum in nomine Domini et in similitudine eius fabricata sint idola.</i> ¹⁷	אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן: כל המשמר שבת כהלכתו, אפילו עובד עבודה זרה [כדור] אנוש-מוחלין לו, שנאמר אשרי אנוש יעשה זאת וגו' מחללו, אל תקרי מחללו אלא מחול לו. ¹⁸
<i>Then there was a beginning of calling on the Name of the Lord; although the majority of the Hebrews think something else, that then, for the first time, idols were constructed in the Name of the Lord and His likeness.</i>	R. Ḥiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: He who observes the Sabbath according to its laws, even if he practises idolatry like the generation of Enosh, ¹⁹ is forgiven, for it is said: <i>Blessed is Enosh that does this ...</i> [that keeps the Sabbath <i>meḥallelo</i> from profaning it] ²⁰ read not <i>meḥalelo</i> but <i>maḥul lo</i> [he is forgiven].

15. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *In Genesim*, 1986 (as in note 12), p. 44, ll. 1333-1336.

16. BERNDT, "Les interprétations juives" (as in note 12), p. 207, n. 22.

17. HIERONYMUS, *Hebraicae Quaestiones* (as in note 12), p. 8, ll. 5-7; I follow the English translation of Hebrew Questions Jerome's *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, a translation with an introduction and commentary by Charles T. R. HAYWARD, Oxford, 1995, p. 35.

18. Source: *Responsa Project* - Version 23. Bar-Ilan University.

19. According to tradition, idolatry commenced in his days.

20. Is 56, 2.

However, Hugh comments on this text:

Hugh on Gn 4, 26	
<i>Iste cepit inuocare Dominum. Nouum cultum uel nouas orationes inueniens ad inuocandum Dominum specialiter uel imagines ad Dominum representandum et magis diligendum.</i> ²¹	<i>This one began to call upon the Lord. Devising a new form of worship or new prayers to call upon the name of the Lord in particular, or devising statues to represent the Lord and love Him more.</i>

However, the Babylonian Talmud could hardly have been the source of the Victorines, since the idea of idolatry is absent from Hugh and Andrew. On the other hand, I do think that the interpretation of the Victorines is ultimately traceable to *HQG*. Indeed, they must have employed as one of their sources either *HQG* or one of the other sources that render Jerome's work verbatim, namely Hrabanus and Angelom. Andrew could also have used the *Glossa Ordinaria*. It is evident, however, that Andrew did not rely exclusively on any one of the mentioned sources, but that he also drew on Hugh. For he notably modified Jerome's interpretation in *Hebraicae Quaestiones* on the basis of Hugh's comment on the same Biblical text. The Victorines omitted the idea of Enoch's fabrication of idols, which is present in the Talmud, *HQG*, and the sources dependent on the latter, and they write instead of Enoch's creation of statues or images representing God to help people worship Him with devotion.

The *Glossa Ordinaria* (interlinear) appears to have been Andrew's source for two interpretations that have parallels in the Talmud, to wit his comment on Gn 6, 16 (2), not found in Jerome's *HQG* but with a parallel in both TB, San 108b and TJ, Pes 1, 1,²² and his interpretation of Gn 22, 21, which is also found in Jerome's *HQG* with a parallel in the Palestinian Talmud Sot 5, 5.²³

21. HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Notae in Pentateuchum*, Paris, BnF, lat. 2092 (the third quarter of the twelfth century), fol. 87v. I have employed the Latin word *notae* as a title of Hugh's comments on the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, since the word *notae* is found as a part of the *incipit* and *explicit* of Hugh's comments on each Biblical book in at least nine of the manuscripts. For instance, in Cambridge, Trinity College Library, Ms. 23 (B. 01.05), fol. 48r, one reads: "Expliciunt note super Genesim ad litteram. Incipiunt note de Exodo". Other examples may be found in Trinity College Library, Ms. 23 (B. 01.05), fols. 53r, 57r; Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 7531, fol. 268v; Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 14507, fol. 150v, 182r; Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 15695, fol. 79r; Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 15315, fol. 182r; Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 13422, fol. 32v; Douai, Bibliothèque, Ms. 362, fols. 133r, 139v; Douai, Bibliothèque, Ms. 365, fols. 97r, 103v.
22. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *In Genesim*, 1986 (as in note 12), p. 47, ll. 1430-1432. I have consulted the Interlinear Gloss in: *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria: facsimile reprint of the editio princeps Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81*. Ed. Karlfried Froehlich/Margaret Gibson, vol. 1, Turnhout, 1992: *Genesis*, p. 36, and the manuscripts Paris, BnF, lat. 14399, fol. 39v, and Paris, Bibl. Maz., 131 (int.), fol. 32r; see Montse LEYRA CURIÁ, *The Victorine Exegesis on the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets: The Sources of the In Hebreo Interpretations in the Light of Its Parallels With the Peshat School of Northern France and Other Jewish Sources*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2012, pp. 81-82; BERNDT, "Les interprétations juives" (as in note 12), p. 208, n. 31, points to Remigius of Auxerre, TB, San 108b, and Rashi as possible Jewish sources for Andrew.
23. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *In Genesim*, 1986 (as in note 12), p. 71, ll. 2311-2313; HIERONYMUS, *Hebra-*

III. Jewish contemporary sources

Finally, a group of Andrew's references to Jewish traditions contained in the Talmud are not found in Jerome or other Latin sources. However, similar parallels to these references of Andrew are also found in the Midrashim and/or in interpretations of one or several Jewish exegetes contemporary with him, such as Rashi, Joseph Qara, Rashbam, Ibn Ezra, Bekhor Shor, or in Radak, who lived several decades later than Andrew, but who wrote interpretations which probably were known among the Jews contemporary with him.²⁴ For some interpretations, Andrew shares more elements with the Midrash or with Rashi or the Jewish contemporary exegete than with the Talmudic text.

Michael Signer points to two interpretations in Andrew's commentary on Ezekiel that have parallels in two Talmudic texts as well as in Rashi and Joseph Qara: Ez 10, 2 and Ez 10, 14.²⁵ Signer also refers to the formulas that Andrew employs in his comments to refer to Jewish traditions: *Hebrei uero ex suorum traditione preceptorum huiuscemodi* ("the Hebrews, however, out of the following tradition of their teachers"), which appears in Andrew's comment on Ez 10, 14; and *Hebreorum traditio* ("a tradition of the Hebrews"), which appears in Andrew's interpretation of Ez 10, 2. In addition, Signer explains that Andrew's exposition of Ez 10, 14 can be found in the Babylonian Talmud, Hag 13b, but also appears in R. Joseph Qara's comment on the text.²⁶ While Signer gives a detailed analysis of Andrew's comment on Ez 10, 14, he refers only briefly to Andrew's comment on Ez 10, 2 and makes no reference whatsoever to the midrashim that also contain that interpretation. Thus, I turn to an analysis of the latter's comment in the next paragraph.

Andrew's interpretation of Ez 10, 2 is very similar to TB, Yom 77a. Andrew writes:

icae Quaestiones (as in note 12), p. 27, ll. 10-16; see: LEYRA CURIÀ, *The Victorine Exegesis* (as in note 20), p. 67; BERNDT, "Les interprétations juives" (as in note 12), p. 213, n. 58, points to Jerome's *Hebrew Questions* and to the TJ, Sot 5, 5 as two possible sources for this interpretation of Andrew.

24. See Signer's Introduction in ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Opera VI. Expositio in Ezechielem*. Ed. Michael A. Signer, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 53E, Turnhout, 1991, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

25. See Signer's Introduction in *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), pp. xxviii-xxix.

26. For Andrew's comment on Ez 10, 14, see: ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), pp. 54-55, ll. 62-93. Ez 10, 14 addresses why the ox face in Ez 1, 10 is changed into a cherub's face in Ez 10, 14. Signer does not mention that one element of Andrew's interpretation is also transmitted by Rashi's parallel interpretation of the Biblical text.

Andrew	
<p><i>Et dixit ad uirum qui indutus erat lineis et ait. [...]. Cum premissum sit, et dixit, quare statim adiunxit, et ait, cum hoc idem sit si utrumque ad eadem refertur personam? [...]; primum Hebrei ad dominum, secundum ad uirum lineis indutum Gabrielem referunt. Gabrieli dixit dominus ut ingrederetur in medio rotarum que erant subtus cherubin et impleret manus suas prunis qui erant inter cherubin et effunderet super ciuitatem. Gabriel uero ait ad cherubin ut illi carbones, unde manus suas implere iussus est, porrigeret. [...] Iccirco dicunt Gabrielem potius de manu cherub quam de medio rotarum ignitos carbones accipere uoluisse, quia caloris eorum aliquid diminuerentur dum de medio rotarum ubi ardebant tollerentur et in manus eius darentur. Hos Gabrielem carbones a quinto die sexti mensis anni sexti transmigrationis Iechonie usque ad finem anni undecimi Sedechie in manu sua portasse et ex eis super ciuitatem effusis cum uastaretur ipsam incendisse hebreorum habet traditio.²⁷</i></p>	<p><i>And he spoke to the man, that was clothed with linen, and said: [...]. Having previously written ‘and he spoke’, why did he [the writer] immediately after add ‘and he said’, given that this means the same thing if both [words] refer to the same person? [...]; the Hebrews refer the first to the Lord; the second, to the man clothed in linen, Gabriel. The Lord commanded Gabriel to enter in between the wheelwork even under the cherub, to fill both his hands with burning coals from between the cherubim and to scatter them over the city. Gabriel, however, asked the cherub to reach out to him the coals with which he had been commanded to fill his own hands. [...] Therefore, Gabriel is said to have wanted to receive the glowing coals from the cherub’s hand rather than from the middle of the wheels so that something of their heat should be diminished while they were lifted up off the wheels where they were burning and handed over into his hands. A tradition of the Hebrews has it that Gabriel carried these coals in his hand from the fifth day of the sixth month of the sixth year of Jeconiah’s transmigration until the end of Zedekiah’s eleventh year, and, having been scattered over the city, when the latter was devastated, He burnt it.</i></p>

In his comment, Andrew brings two elements which are present in TB, Yom 77a: a) the man clothed in linen is identified with Gabriel, and b) the coals become cold in the process of being passed from the cherub into the hands of Gabriel.

TB, Yom 77a	
<p>וישלח הכרוב את ידו מבינות לכרובים אל האש אשר בינות הכרבים וישא ויתן אל חפני לבש הבדים ויקח ויצא. אמר רב חנא בר ביזנא אמר רבי שמעון חסידא: אילמלא לא נצטננו גחלים מידו של כרוב לידו של גבריאל לא נשתיירו משנאיהן של ישראל שריד ופליט. וכתב והנה האיש לבוש הבדים אשר הקסת במתניו משיב דבר לאמר עשיתי כאשר צויתני.²⁸</p>	<p><i>And the cherub stretched forth his hand between the cherubim unto the fire that was between the cherubim, and took thereof and put it into the hands of him that was clothed in linen, who took it and went out (Ez 10, 7). R. Hana b. Bizna said in the name of R. Simeon the Pious: Were it not for the fact that the coals of the hand of the cherub became cold [in the process of coming] into the hands of Gabriel, there would not have been left over from the ‘enemies of Israel’ one to remain or one to scape, for it is written: <i>And behold the man clothed in linen, who had the inkhorn on his side, reported, saying: “I have done according to all that Thou hast commanded me”</i> (Ez 9, 11).²⁹</i></p>

27. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), pp. 52-53, ll. 8-30.

28. Source: *Responsa Project* - Version 23. Bar-Ilan University.

29. *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Mo'ed: Yom'a*. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices by Leo Jung; under the editorship of Isidore Epstein, London, 1959, p. 374.

These two elements are also found in both Midrashim *Leviticus Rabbah* 26, 8 and *Lamentations Rabbah* 41. In addition, these Midrashim share another two elements with Andrew's interpretation not found in the Talmudic text: c) that the repetition of the phrase 'he said' indicates that two dialogues happened instead of just one: the first dialogue describes the Lord speaking to the angel, and the second, the angel speaking to the cherub; and d) that Gabriel carried off the coals in his hands for six years.

Leviticus Rabbah 26, 8	Midrash Lamentations Rabbah 1, 41
<p>ויאמר אל האיש לבוש הבדים ויאמר הקדוש ברוך הוא אמר למלאך והמלאך לכרוב אמר לו גזר עלי הקדוש ברוך הוא ואני אין לי רשות ליכנס למחיצתך אלא עשה עמי צדקה ותן לי שני גחלים משלך שלא אכזה מיד וישא ויתן אל האיש לבוש הבדי', ר' פנחס אמר הפשירן ונתנן לו אר"י דסכנין בשם ר' לוי ו' שנים היו אותן גחלים עמומות בידו של גבריאל סבור שישאל עושין תשובה כיון שלא עשו בקש לזרקן ולקעקע ביצתן אמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא גבריאל גבריאל.³⁰</p>	<p>א"ר יוחנן בשם ר' ש"ב בן יוחאי כל מקום שנאמר ויאמר ויאמר לא נאמר אלא להדרש הה"ד (יחזקאל י') ויאמר אל האיש לבוש הבדים ויאמר בא אל בינות לגלגל וגו' מהו ויאמר ויאמר שתי פעמים אלא הקדוש ברוך הוא אמר למלאך ומלאך אמר לכרוב אף על פי שגזר עלי הקדוש ברוך הוא ליקח הגחלים איני יכול ליכנס לפניו ממחיצתך, אלא עשה עמי צדקה ותן לי שתי גחלים משלך שלא אכזה, הה"ד (שם יחזקאל י') וישא ויתן אל חפני לבוש הבדים, מהו וישא ויתן, אמר ר' יצחק הפשירן ונתנן בכפו, ר' יהושע דסכנין בשם ר' לוי שש שנים היו הגחלים עמומות בידו של גבריאל, סבור שישאל עושין תשובה, וכיון שלא עשו תשובה בקש לזרקן עליהם בחימה, קרא לו הקדוש ברוך הוא ואמר לו גבריאל גבריאל.³¹</p>
<p><i>And He spoke to the man clothed in linen, and said</i> (Ez 10, 2), which implies that the Holy One, blessed be He, spoke to the angel and the angel told it to the cherub. The angel said to the cherub: "The Holy One, blessed be He, has decreed that I should do it, but I have no right to enter your division; do it then for me as an act of charity and give me two live coals of yours, so that I be not scorched". Forthwith he <i>Took thereof, and put it into the hands of him that was clothed in linen</i> (ib. 7). R. Phinheas explained that he cooled them and gave them to him. R. Joshua of Siknin observed in the name of R. Levi: For six years those coals lay dead in the hand of Gabriel, who thought that Israel would repent. When they neglected to do so he sought to hurl them down and exterminate them. Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him: "Gabriel, Gabriel! [...]"³²</p>	<p>R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai: Wherever 'He said' occurs twice in a passage, the purpose is to convey some inner meaning. For instance, <i>And He said unto the man clothed in linen, and He said: Go in between the wheelwork, even under the cherub, and fill both thy hands with coals of fire</i> (Ez 10, 2). Why is 'He said' repeated? It signifies that the Holy One, blessed be He, spoke to the angel and the angel said to the cherub, "Although the Holy One, blessed be He, decreed that I should take the coals of fire, I am unable to enter within your domain; so perform an act of righteousness with me, and give me two burning coals of yours in order that I may not be scorched". Hence it is stated, <i>And [the cherub] took thereof, and put it into the hands of him that was clothed in linen, who took it and went out</i> (ibid. 7). What means <i>And took thereof and put it</i>? R. Isaac said: The cherub cooled them and placed them in his hand. R. Joshua of Siknin said in the name of R. Levi: For six years the coals were kept dimly glowing in the hands of Gabriel, who thought that Israel would repent. When they failed to repent he wanted to cast them upon the people in his wrath. The Holy One, blessed be He, called to him, saying, "Gabriel, Gabriel! [...]"³³</p>

30. Source: *Responsa Project* - Version 23. Bar-Ilan University.

31. Source: *Responsa Project* - Version 23. Bar-Ilan University.

32. *Midrash Rabbah: Leviticus*. Ed. Harry Freedman/Maurice Simon; chaps. 20-37, translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices by Judah J. Slotki, London/New York, 1983, p. 337.

33. *Midrash Rabbah: Lamentations*. Ed. Harry Freedman/Maurice Simon, translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices by Abraham Cohen, London-New York, 1983, pp. 118-119.

Rashi shares with Andrew's interpretation the same elements as the Midrashim *Leviticus* and *Lamentations Rabbah* do, but he also chronologically situates the date of the period during which Gabriel kept the coals in his hands: from the sixth year of Jeconiah's transmigration until the end of the eleventh year of Zedekiah, in which the city was destroyed.³⁴ In his interpretation of the passage, Joseph Qara includes the same elements that Rashi does except the explanation for the addition of meaning when *he said* is repeated.³⁵

Rashi	Joseph Qara
... (ויאמר ... ויאמר) - כל מקום שנאמר 'ויאמר' ... 'ויאמר' אינו אלא לידרש: הקדוש ברוך הוא אמר לגבריאל, והוא בקש מן הכרוב לתתם לו, כדי שיצטננו גחלים ותקל הגזירה; וכן הוא מפורש בעניין 'וישא ויתן אל חפני לבוש הבדים'. וזרוק אל העיר - לא זרקם מיד, שש שנים עשו הגחלים עוממות בידו, שהרי נבואה זו נאמרה בשנה השישית, והעיר חרבה בשנה אחת עשרה.	... וישא ויתן אל חפני לבוש הבדים - הפשירן ונתן לו, שעד שנשא ונתן אל חפני לבוש הבדים, נצטננו הגחלים. הוא שאמרו רבותינו ז"ל: שש שנים עשו גחלים עוממות בידו של גבריאל; שהרי נבואה זו נאמרה בשנה ששית לגלות יהויכין, ובשש שנים אחרי כן נשרף הבית כדכתיב.
[<i>Wa-yomer ... wa-yomer</i>] – Wherever it says <i>Wa-yomer</i> [...] <i>wa-yomer</i> is meant to be expounded midrashically. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Gabriel, and he [Gabriel] asked the cherub to give them to him, so that the coals might be cooled and the decree [of punishment] be lightened (<i>Lam. Rab.</i> 1, 41) and this is stated explicitly when the matter is recounted (lit. 'in the matter' = <i>bainyan</i>): "and he took some and put it into the hands of the one clothed in linen" (Ez 10, 7). <i>And scatter them over the city</i> – He did not scatter them immediately. The coals were becoming dim in his hand for six years, for this prophecy was uttered in the sixth year (Ez 8, 1) and the city was destroyed in the eleventh year (BH II Rg 25, 2-9).	<i>And he took some and put it into the hands of the one clothed in linen. He tempered them and gave [them] to him, for by the time he had taken some and put it into the hands of the one clothed in linen, the coals had cooled. This is what our rabbis their memory be blessed said (Lev. Rab. 26, 8): "For six years, the coals were becoming dim in Gabriel's hand; for this prophecy was said in the sixth year of Yehoyakim's exile (Ez 8, 1) and six years afterwards the temple was burnt, as it is written" (BH II Rg 25, 2-9).</i>

Rashi shares five elements with Andrew. He or Joseph Qara, who shares four of the five elements included in Rashi, may have been the source that transmitted these Jewish traditions to Andrew. Andrew, therefore, had access to the interpretation that he ascribes to the tradition of the Jewish teachers both in early Jewish works, such as the Talmud and Midrashim, and in Jewish scholars contemporary to him. Since Andrew did not master the Hebrew language, he probably took this information from one of the latter.

Andrew's interpretation of Ezekiel 9, 6 is similar to its parallel in TB, Sab 55a and to Rashi's comment on that text of Ezekiel in some respects, but it differs from them in others.³⁶ Andrew's comment on Ez 24, 7, on the identification of the blood

34. *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer': A Revised and Augmented Scientific Edition of 'Mikra'ot Gedolot' Based on the Aleppo Codex and Early Medieval MSS: Ezekiel*. Ed. Menahem Cohen, Ramat-Gan, 2004 [Hebrew], p. 48.

35. *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer': Ezekiel*, 2004 (as in note 34), p. 49.

36. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), pp. 49-50, ll. 119-138; *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer': Ezekiel*, 2004 (as in note 34), p. 46.

poured out upon the bare rock in Ez 24, 7 with the blood of Zachariah, the son of Jehoiada the priest,³⁷ is similar to its parallel in TB, Git 57b, but shares more elements with the Midrash *Lamentations Rabbah* (proems) and Rashi's and Radak's comments on Ez 24, 7.³⁸ Andrew's interpretation of Ez 24, 17, which deals with prescriptions and prohibitions when mourning for one's own relatives, presents some elements that are also found in TB, Mq 15a-b, Rashi, and Joseph Qara on Ez 24, 17, while other elements appear in TB, Mq 27a-b, Rashi, and Joseph Qara.³⁹ However, Andrew also expounds details that do not appear in Mq 15b or 27a-b but only in Rashi, whereas on the other hand, he does not include all of the elements that are present in these two talmudic passages.

Andrew's interpretation of Hab 3, 3, which is not found in Jerome, presents similarities with its Talmudic parallel TB, Az 2b but is closer to Rashi's and Joseph Qara's respective comments on this passage.⁴⁰ Andrew's interpretation of Joel 1, 4, also not found in Jerome, contains a few elements present in TJ, Tan 3, 6, but shares more content with Rashi's comment on the same Biblical text.⁴¹

One of Hugh's interpretations in his comment on Ex 1, 11 (adopted by Andrew), involving the explanation of the Hebrew word *miskenôt* מַסְכְּנוֹת as 'of the poor ones', is found in the Babylonian Talmud Sot 11a as well as in *Ex. Rab.* I, 10.⁴² However, Hugh and Andrew's comments include an alternative interpretation that is also present in the comments of *Ex. Rab.* I, 10, the Targum Onkelos, Rashi, Rashbam, and Bekhor Shor on the text.⁴³ On the other hand, Hugh's explanation of the two interpretations of the Hebrew word is based on supposed differences in its orthography. However, the orthographic differences pertain to the supposed underlying word *miškenôt* מִשְׁכְּנוֹת with *šin* (as underlies the Vulgate's translation) rather than the actual underlying Hebrew (*miskenôt*) מַסְכְּנוֹת with *samek*. This complex error shows that Hugh has not read the He-

37. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), p. 108, ll. 11-15; see Signer's Introduction there, p. xxix.

38. *Midrash Rabbah: Lamentations*, 1983 (as in note 33), pp. 32-34; *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer': Ezekiel*, 2004 (as in note 34), p. 162.

39. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), p. 109, ll. 19-25; *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer': Ezekiel*, 2004 (as in note 34), pp. 166-167; see Signer's Introduction in *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), pp. xxx-xxxi.

40. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Super Abacuch*, 2007 (as in note 5), pp. 243-244, ll. 506-510; *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*; online: www.mgketer.org/mikra [22.12.2016].

41. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Duodecim Prophetas. Super Iohel*, 2007 (as in note 5), p. 88, ll. 38-44; *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'* online: as in note 40 [22.12.2016].

42. Marianne AWERBUCH, *Christlich-jüdische Begegnung im Zeitalter der Frühscholastik* (Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog, 8. Ed. Helmut Gollwitzer), Munich, 1980, p. 226; Gilbert DAHAN, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge*, Paris, 1999, p. 282; HUGO DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Pent.*, Paris, BnF. Ms. lat. 2092 (as in note 21), fol. 100r-v.

43. RASHI, *Rashi: the Commentary of Solomon b. Isaac on the Pentateuch*. Ed. Avraham Berliner, ²1905 [¹1866] [Hebrew], p. 102; RASHBAM, *The Torah Commentary of Rashbam*. Ed. David Rosin, Breslau, 1881 [Hebrew], p. 79; BEKHOR SHOR, R. Joseph, *The Commentaries of Rabbi Joseph Bekhor Shor on the Torah*. Ed. Yehoshafat Nevo, Jerusalem, 1994 [Hebrew], p. 97; DAHAN, *Les intellectuelles* (as in note 42), p. 282; AWERBUCH, *Christlich-jüdische Begegnung* (as in note 42), p. 226.

brew but heard his information from a contemporary informant: he is putting into written form interpretations transmitted orally, and perhaps not fully understood. Though Andrew knew some Hebrew he did not master the language.⁴⁴ Probably, he drew the Talmudic and Midrashic interpretations from one of his contemporary sources.

Another of Andrew's interpretations having a close parallel in the Talmud but also in the Jewish Northern French exegetes is his comment on Ex 23, 19. Andrew writes:

	Andrew
<p><i>Non coques haedum in lacte matris suae</i>, siue agnum. Verbum hebraicum, pro quo nos 'haedum' siue 'agnum' habemus, magis 'separatum' significat. Et est sensus: Nihil quod separatum est a carne, id est quod per generationem carnalem conceptum et editum est, quod propter aues determinandum Iudaei putant; nihil, inquam, tale <i>in lacte coques</i>.</p> <p>Observant usque hodie Iudaei, ut nullius gressibilis animalis carnes – in lacte uel cum aliquo eorum, quae de lacte fiunt, ut caseo uel butyro et huiusmodi, coctas – comedant. Non ideo putant <i>in lacte matris suae</i>, agni scilicet uel haedi uel separati, dictum fuisse, quod si in alterius pecoris lacte coquatur transgressio non sit; sed quia hoc lac paratius et magis praesto quam aliud forsitan inueniri posset. Nec ideo de agno uel haedo hoc prohibitum, quod de aliis animantibus hoc fieri liceat. Sed quod de hoc animali praecipitur, de omnibus potius uult –exceptis auibus, quae non de carne sed de ouis separantur debere intelligi.</p> <p>Sunt tamen, qui non de quolibet agno uel haedo hoc dictum putant, sed de his tantum quae Domino offeruntur. De quibus Dominus in lege praecipit, dicens: "Bos, ouis, et capra, cum generata fuerint, septem diebus erunt sub ubere matris suae. Die autem octauo et deinceps offerri poterunt Domino". Hi hoc modo litteram exponunt. <i>Non coques haedum</i>, id est: Non offeres ad occidendum et coquendum, dum est <i>in lacte matris suae</i>, id est dum recenter natus non herba pascitur, sed solo lacte matris suae alitur.⁴⁵</p>	<p><i>Thou shalt not boil a kid in the milk of his dam</i>, or a sheep's lamb. The Hebrew word for which we have "the young of a goat or of a sheep" means rather 'separated'. And the sense of the text is the following: you should cook in milk nothing such that has been separated from the flesh, i.e., conceived or brought forth <i>via</i> fleshly generation, which according to the Jews must be specified because of the birds.</p> <p>The Jews take care to the present day not to eat the flesh of any walking animal when it has been cooked either in milk or in any product made from milk, such as cheese or butter. They do not think that it has been said <i>in the milk of his dam</i>, that is, of the sheep or goat or separated, such that if it were cooked in the milk of any other animal, it would not be a transgression, but perhaps because this milk could be found more readily and at hand than any other. And it is not forbidden to do with respect to the sheep or goat what is permitted with respect to other animals, but what it is taught to do with respect to this animal should be understood preferably with respect to every animal, except birds, which are not brought forth <i>via</i> the flesh but through eggs.</p> <p>However, there are those who think that this was said not about all sheep or goats but only about those that are offered to the Lord. About them, the Lord in the Law commands saying: "When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the udder of its dam; but on the eighth day, and thenceforth, it may be offered to the Lord". These [commentators] explain the letter in the following way: <i>Thou shalt not boil a goat's kid</i>, i.e. you shall not offer it to be killed or cooked while it is <i>in the milk of his dam</i>, that is, while having been recently born, it does not yet feed on grass but only on its mother's milk.</p>

44. See Signer's Introduction in ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio in Ezechielem*, 1991 (as in note 24), pp. xxi-xxv; LEYRA CURIÁ, *The Victorine Exegesis* (as in note 22), pp. 198-203.

45. ANDREAS DE SANCTO VICTORE, *Expositio super Heptateuchum: In Exodum*, 1986 (as in note 12), pp. 137-138, ll. 1506-1530.

R. Berndt refers to this comment of Andrew and points to the Babylonian Talmud, to the *Mekhilta de R. Yishmael*, and to Bekhor Shor's parallel interpretation as its possible sources.⁴⁶ However, I have found no similarity between Bekhor Shor's interpretation and the ones contained in Andrew's comment. On the other hand, I do think we should distinguish between three different interpretations within Andrew's comment, each of which may traced to different Jewish sources. Andrew's explanation that what is forbidden with respect to sheep or goats should be understood with respect to every animal, except birds, is found in both TB, Hul 113a-b and in Rashi's interpretation of the Biblical verse. For Rashi, the word גדי *gedi* means the 'young' of any animal and not just a young goat.

Ḥullin 113b	Rashi
<p>שנאמר לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו ג' פעמים, פרט לחיה ולעוף ובהמה טמאה [...].</p> <p>גמ'. מנא הני מילי? א"ר אלעזר, אמר קרא: וישלח קיג ע' [ב'יהודה את גדי] כאן - גדי עזים, הא כל מקום שנאמר גדי סתם - אפילו פרה ורחל במשמע; ויליף מיניה! כתיב קרא אחרינא: ואת עורות גדיי העזים, כאן גדיי העזים, הא כל מקום שנאמר גדי סתם - אפילו פרה ורחל במשמע:⁴⁷</p>	<p>לא תבשל גדי.</p> <p>אף עגל וכבש בכלל גדי אין גדי אלא לשון וולד רך ממה שאתה מוצא בכמה מקומות בתורה שכתוב גדי והוצרך לפרש אחריו עזים כגון אנכי אשלח גדי עזים, את גדי העזים, שני גדיי עזים, ללמדך שכל מקום שנאמר גדי סתם אף עגל וכבש משמע.</p>
<p>FOR IT IS WRITTEN THRICE, THOU SHALT NOT SEETHE A KID IN ITS MOTHER'S MILK, TO EXCLUDE WILD ANIMALS, FOWLS, AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS [...].</p> <p>Gemara: Whence do we know this? R. Eleazar said, Because the verse says: <i>And Judah sent the kid of the goats</i>; [113b] here it was a 'kid of the goats', but elsewhere, wherever 'kid' is stated, it includes [the young of] the cow and the ewe. And might we not derive the rule from that? There is another verse, which says, <i>The skins of the kids of the goats</i>; here it was 'kids of the goats', but elsewhere, wherever 'kid' is stated, it includes [the young of] the cow and the ewe.⁴⁸</p>	<p>לא תבשל גדי.</p> <p>THOU SHALT NOT SEETHE A KID – A calf and a lamb also are comprehended under the term גדי, for גדי means nothing more than a young tender animal, as you may gather from the fact that you will find in several passages in the Torah that the term גדי is used and that the writer felt it necessary specially to explain it by adding after it the word עזים, as, e.g., (Gn 38, 17) "I will send forth a גדי of the goats" (<i>ibid.</i> vs. 20); "the גדי of the goats" (<i>ibid.</i> 27, 9); "two kids of the goats (גדיי עזים)". This fact serves to show you that wherever גדי is mentioned without further description the term implies also a calf and a lamb.⁴⁹</p>

46. BERNDT, "Les interprétations juives" (as in note 12), p. 227, num. 150.

47. Source: *Responsa Project* - Version 23. Bar-Ilan University.

48. *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Kodashim: Hullin*. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices by Eli Cashdan; under the editorship of Isidore Epstein, London, 1959, pp. 621-622.

49. RASHI, *Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch*, ²1905 (as in note 43), p. 164; RASHI, *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary: Exodus*. Translated into English and Annotated by Morris Rosenbaum/Abraham M. Silberman in coll. with Aaron Blashki and Louis Joseph, New York, n. d.

The second interpretation in Andrew's comment – that the verse *Thou shalt not boil a goat's kid in the milk of his dam* wishes to outlaw the boiling of the young of any mammal in its mother's milk, but that the text specifies 'goat' because this milk could be found more readily to hand than any other – is close to that in the *Mekhilta de R. Yishmael* and in Rashbam's comment on this Biblical text. For Rashbam, גדי means a young goat, but the rule applies to all animals since the Bible follows the principle of the most likely occurrence.

R. Yishmael: Kaspā, ch. 5, 14	Rashbam
<p>מפני מה דיבר הכתוב בגדי, מפני שהחלב מרובה באמו.⁵⁰</p>	<p>לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו. דרך העזים ללדת שני גדיים יחד, ורגילים היו לשחות אחד מהם, ומתוך שרוב חלב בעזים כדכתיב 'ודי חלב עזים ללחמך וגו', היו רגילים לבשלו בחלב האם, ולפי ההווה דבר הכתוב. וגני הוא הדבר ובליעה ורעבתנות לאכול חלב האם עם הבנים. ודוגמא זו באותו ואת בנו ושילוח הקן. וללמדך דרך תרבות ציווה הכתוב. ולפי שברגל היו אוכלין בהמות הרבה, הוהיר בפרשת הרגלים שלא לבשל ולא לאכול גדי בחלב אמו והוא הדין לכל בשר בחלב כמו שפירשו רבותינו בשחיטת חולין.</p>
<p>Then why does Scripture speak of a kid? Because its mother produces a lot of milk.⁵¹</p>	<p>לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו. <i>You shall not boil a kid in its mother's milk:</i> Goats generally give birth to two kids at the same time. It was customary, then, to slaughter one of the two. And since goats produce much milk, as it says (Prv 27, 27), <i>Goats' milk will suffice for your food [and the food of your household]</i>, it was common custom to boil the kid in its mother's milk. The text describes the most likely occurrence. It is disgraceful and voracious and gluttonous to consume the mother's milk together with its young.⁵²</p>

Andrew adduces a third interpretation: the view of those who think that the precept *Thou shalt not boil a goat's kid in the milk of his dam* refers only to animals offered to the Lord. Andrew probably associates Ex 23, 19 with Lv 22, 27: "When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; but from the eighth day and thenceforth it may be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the LORD". Andrew explains that, according to these people, "Not seethe a kid" means: you shall not offer it to be killed or cooked while it is "in the milk of his dam".

50. *Mekhilta de Rabbi Yišmael, 'im hilufeī girsabt we-he 'arot*. Ed. H. Saul Horowitz/Israel Abraham Rabin, Frankfurt am Main, 1931 [Hebrew], www.daat.ac.il/sefaria/virtu%27al%27it [24.12.2016].

51. Jacob NEUSNER, *Mekhilta According to R. Ishmael: An Analytical Translation*, vol. 2: *Kaspā*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1988, p. 249.

52. RASHBAM, *The Torah Commentary of Rashbam*, 1881 (as in note 43), p. 121; Martin I. LOCKSHIN, *Rashbam's commentary on Exodus: An Annotated Translation* (Brown Judaic Studies 310), Atlanta, Georgia, 1997, p. 287.

This interpretation is partially represented in Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*.⁵³ Maimonides writes that the reason for the prohibition to seethe a kid in its mother's milk (a prohibition that he takes literally) is that this was a practice of idol worshippers in their cultic practices, and therefore the Torah prohibits this practice during the Pilgrimage festivals.⁵⁴ So for Maimonides, the origin of this prohibition was with respect to animals consecrated to the Lord. Andrew expounds three interpretations, the first two of which are found in early Jewish sources (the Babylonian Talmud Hul 113a-b and the *Mekhilta de Rab. Yishmael*, respectively) as well as in Jewish exegetes from the twelfth-century Northern-French school (Rashi and Rashbam, respectively). The third is similar, but not identical to Maimonides' interpretation in *The Guide for the Perplexed*. Since Andrew did not master the Hebrew language, it is not likely that he read the *Mekhilta* or the Babylonian Talmud by himself. In addition, Andrew refers to the Jewish customs of not eating milk or milk products, which he probably learned from the Jews who lived in France in his own time. It is likely that he drew this interpretation from one of the Northern-French Jewish exegetes, such as Rashbam, and that Rashbam or another exegete does not reflect in his commentary everything that he transmitted to Andrew.

To summarise, Andrew's references to Jewish traditions found in the Talmud are, on a good number of occasions, actually derived from Jerome. For a number of interpretations found in the Talmud, Andrew drew on other Latin sources such as the *Glossa Ordinaria*, or on both Jerome and a later Latin source, such as Hugh of St. Victor. A third group of Andrew's interpretations show that Andrew also borrowed the Talmudic material from Jewish authors contemporary with him. It appears that Andrew interacted with contemporary Jewish exegetes, and that he heard from them Talmudic interpretations orally. He might have had a rudimentary knowledge of Hebrew, but this was not enough to enable him to read the Hebrew text of the Talmud by himself. There are several expressions that Andrew employs to refer to Jewish traditions found in the Talmud: *Hebreorum traditio*, *arbitrantur Hebrei*, *tradunt iudaei*. Out of all those, however, the expression that most clearly reveals that he is pointing to the Talmud is that which he employs in his comment on Ez 10, 14: *Hebrei uero ex suorum traditione preceptorum huiuscemodi* ("out of the following tradition of their teachers").

53. Moses MAIMONIDES, *Guía de Perplejos*. Ed. David Gonzalo Maeso, Madrid, 1983, section III, chap. 48, p. 532. I thank Mordechai Cohen for having drawn my attention to this source.

54. Also Ibn Ezra in the Shorter Commentary on Ex 23, 19, *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*: *Exodus*, 2007 (as in note 34), p. 50.