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The medieval Church’s position on the Jews is summed up in the document *Sicut Judeis*. Repeatedly issued and re-issued by popes from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, and included in the Corpus of Canon Law, it also incorporated earlier material going back to Pope St. Gregory the Great (reigned 590–604).

[Although [the Jews] prefer to persist in their obstinacy rather than acknowledge the words of the prophets and the eternal secrets of their own scriptures, thus arriving at an understanding of Christianity and salvation, nevertheless, in view of the fact that they have begged for our protection and our aid, and in accordance with the clemency which Christian piety imposes, we, following in the footsteps of our predecessors of happy memory..., grant their petition and offer them the shield of our protection....]

The pope's benevolent protection was at best a mixed (if not a missed) blessing. *Sicut Judeis* affirmed the right of Jews to practice their religion, and it probably did restrain some forced baptisms, libelous accusations, malicious prosecutions, acts of extortion, and general harassment. But it explicitly excepted Jews who were accused of plotting against the Church, creating a massive loophole for any Christian who was willing to make such an accusation, however unfounded. Moreover, by endorsing the Christian perception of Jews as people who obstinately refused to admit the true message of their own scriptures, the popes contributed much to an environment in which helping Jews discover the truth of Christianity was perceived, not as a kind of religious persecution, but as an ethical and even charitable act of Christian love and piety. Even preachers who brazenly walked into synagogues on Saturday mornings to deliver their message had the support of both church and state.

Of course, arguments about biblical interpretation had been going on since Christianity first emerged from within Judaism. For almost that long, Christian writers had been collecting controverted or compelling biblical proof-texts for use in such disputes, in anthologies or florilegia that often had the title *Adversus Judaeos*, "Against the Jews." It is hardly surprising, then, that medieval Jews, given the centrality of biblical interpretation in their own religion, began compiling a literature of their own, to collect rebuttals of Christian exegesis and approved Jewish interpretations of the contested passages.

One of the oldest such collections is the *Nizzahon Yashan* or "Old Polemic" (hereafter *NY*), a large compendium in Hebrew of Christian proof-texts and Jewish refutations. Evidently compiled in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, in a place where the vernacular was German, it was first published by a Christian Hebraist in 1681, then in a critical edition with English translation by David Berger in 1979. Most of the collection is devoted to passages from the Old and New Testaments, which Christians cited from the Latin Vulgate to support their claims. Usually these are quoted in somewhat garbled Latin, followed by a Jewish disproof of the Christian interpretation. But toward the end is a section dealing with proof texts taken from another source. These are not from the Bible, but from the medieval Catholic liturgy, primarily the Mass and the rite of Baptism. The sources of most of these liturgical quotations have not been identified accurately until now, partly because most of them have become very corrupt.
Textual corruption, of course, is a fascinating topic in itself. Textual critics have long recognized that it arises from a variety of causes, each of which can give us fascinating insights into the processes by which the textual data were received, handled, and passed on within the community where the texts were used. Scribal inability to read antiquated scripts, and changes in the way letters are pronounced—both can tell us about the historical development of written and spoken language. Unintentional omissions, additions, or transpositions, and errors "induced by the context" can reveal much about the mental processes of individual scribes, as can such things as "mistakes that betray the influence of Christian thought" on pre-Christian classical writings. Deliberate alterations and corrections, of course, can be even more illuminating.

In the case of NY, however, the processes of textual corruption worked somewhat differently. Comparison of the original Latin liturgical text with its NY quotation offers a fascinating look at what can happen when texts are transmitted by people who neither understand nor value them, who are motivated instead by the needs of self-defense. In turn, the apparent transmission history of these quotations implies much about the processes by which NY itself was formed. Following the many clues and hints can, in the end, give us a sense of what medieval Christian worship looked like to Jews, though the result is not an extensive critique based on first-hand experience, but rather a reaction to what Christian preachers told Jews about it.

The form that the Latin liturgical quotations exhibit in the extant state of the text suggests that their incorporation into the NY occurred in five "stages." It should be stressed, however, that these are logical stages, which need not necessarily correspond with distinct chronological stages. What actually happened historically may have been much more complicated; or it may have been simpler, with two or more logical "stages" effectively occurring at the same time.

In the first stage, Christian polemicists extracted these quotations from their original contexts, and quoted them in oral or perhaps written presentations aimed at Jewish audiences. The oral presentations could have included sermons and disputations, as well as perhaps informal conversations and arguments. In the second stage, these quotations were collected by Jews, along with the much larger number of quotations from the Latin Bible. Somehow they were compiled so that they could be studied by Jews preparing to defend themselves against Christian proselytizers. In the third stage, which may have begun to happen simultaneously with the second or compiling stage, the Latin passages became corrupted as they were written down in Hebrew letters, then reread and reinterpreted by Jewish readers. Even under the best of circumstances the passage from an Indo-European alphabet to a Semitic one can be brutal, as it was for the many Greek ecclesiastical terms that have been incorporated into Christian Arabic, Syriac, and Ethiopic. But these circumstances were hardly the most favorable, for the Jewish compilers and copyists of the NY clearly had limited knowledge of both Latin and Christianity. In the fourth stage, the degraded Latin transliterations were translated into Hebrew and sometimes also German, often incorrectly. Explanations and refutations were added to show why the meaning of each Latin passage, or the Christian argument based on it, should be unconvincing to Jews. Sometimes these refutations were based on misunderstandings of what the Latin had originally meant before it was corrupted. In the fifth stage, the collection was edited into the NY as we know it. Attempts were made to correct and improve the text, though this often succeeded only in aggravating the damage.
The Liturgical Texts

The liturgical section of the NY begins, fittingly enough, with what Catholics considered the single most important sentence of the Mass, Jesus' words of institution, which effected the transubstantiation of the eucharistic bread into the body of Christ.⁷

When they defile the abominable bread and make it impure, they say the following: *Hoc est enim corpus meum.* Translated, this means: "I alone am the body and blood."

No doubt Christian polemicists referred to this sentence frequently, which is why it is mentioned first in the liturgical portion of the NY. A testimony to the familiarity of this sentence in the Middle Ages, even among Jews, may be the fact that this is almost the only quotation of a Latin liturgical text in NY that has not been significantly corrupted. Nevertheless it has been translated incorrectly; a better translation would say "for this is my body." The inaccuracy seems to have arisen by reading כ, the Hebrew transliteration of the Latin word *enim* (meaning "indeed, for"), as a transliteration of the Latin word *unum* (meaning "one"), and thus translating it into Hebrew as לבריה ("only" or "alone").⁸ The error suggests that the Hebrew transliteration may have been in circulation for a while before the translation was added. If so, then the third logical stage of compilation, the transliteration of Latin into Hebrew, would have been distinct from the fourth stage, when the Hebrew transliteration was misread to produce a faulty Hebrew translation.

The NY moves immediately to a central line of the baptismal ritual, one that, again, is likely to have come up frequently in Christian anti-Jewish sermons.

Moreover, when they baptize their children in the impure waters, they say: *Offerentia Satane;*⁹ i.e., let this be an offering to Satan.

Here there is unquestionably a corruption of some sort. It is incredible that any medieval baptismal ritual would have included such a line as "Let this be an offering to Satan," particularly as the word *offerentia* was relatively rare in liturgical Latin.¹⁰ Undoubtedly *Offerentia Satane,* translated in NY as מנהיה ירי לשתט, is a misreading of the Hebrew transliteration of the Latin question that was asked of each candidate before baptism: *Abrenuntias Satane?* or "Do you renounce Satan?"¹¹ What probably happened was this: the Latin question was first transliterated into Hebrew as (Aprenuntsiyah Sataney), with the b rendered as an unvoiced p (reflecting German pronunciation of Latin) and the final s of *Abrenuntias* assimilated into the initial one of *Satane.*

Subsequently the first word underwent a series of corruptions, which led to its being re-read as *Offerentia:* Since the first letter, Hebrew *aleph,* represents an undifferentiated vowel, it could easily be read as a or o. The second Hebrew letter, intended to represent the labial plosive p, was read as a fricative f, a common shift in Hebrew. The transliteration was then corrupted further by haplography, dropping one of the two ns (i.e., the Hebrew letter nun), and shortening the waw between them to a yod, resulting in the
actual manuscript reading (Afrenitsiyah). This was close enough to Offerentia to justify translation into Hebrew as מנהה, a sacrifice or offering. The phrase "offering to Satan" obviously lends itself to anti-Christian interpretation much better than the original question, "Do you renounce Satan?"

Here again, as in the previous case, we can distinguish between the third stage, when the Latin question was simply transliterated into Hebrew, and the fourth, in which the transliteration, no longer understood, was accidentally modified into something that made sense to the readers of NY, even though it betrayed the meaning of the original. But the present passage also tells us something else about the reactive nature of the NY in the first and second stages of its compilation. If we try to imagine a Jewish writer searching Catholic liturgical texts for polemical ammunition, it is of course possible that he might have focused on the question "Do you renounce Satan?" But it is much easier to imagine that a Christian polemicist would have referred to the renunciation of Satan in an anti-Jewish sermon—hoping, as he saw it, to persuade Jews to make this very renunciation. This in turn would have created an obvious need for Jews to counter-interpret and refute the passage. In other words, this section of the NY gives the impression that it was not based on a first-hand knowledge of the Catholic liturgy, but on quotations that became known to Jews only through being cited by Christian apologists.

This section also provides possible evidence of the organizing and rewriting that may have taken place at the notional fifth stage. In two manuscripts of NY the implausible Offerentia Satane has been replaced by the words for making the Sign of the Cross, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, Amen." Apparently this was confused with the very similar formula that the priest spoke as he poured the water over the head of the person being baptized. Yet this Trinitarian formula, which in principle would have been a good target for Jewish refutation, is not discussed as such, but simply and wrongly given the same translation as before, "let this be an offering to Satan." In short, this is a kind of hypercorrection, an attempt to replace the troublesome Offerentia Satane with wording the baptismal service actually contains, though not quite successfully, and without altering the Hebrew mistranslation. A corruption of this sort surely arose after the original NY had been completed, and its manuscript diffusion had already begun.

The next section of the text quotes another part of the baptismal service, giving the first half of the so-called Apostles’ Creed in both Latin and German:

The following is called the Credo in their language: *Credo in Deum patrem omnipotentem creatorem celi et terrae et>in Jesum Christum filium eius (some say at this point: unicum dominum nostrum qui conceptus est de spiritu sancto natus ex Maria virgine—this is as far as the additional passage extends) passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, descendit ad infera, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, aedit a caelum, sedet a dexteram Dei patris omnipotentis. This means the following: I believe in God the ruling father, creator of heaven and earth, and also in his son Jesus who suffered agonies at the hand of the procurator Pilate.
He suffered, and he was killed and buried, and on the third day he rose from the dead—he who sits at the right hand of God the ruling father. The German [Ashkenaz] translation is: *Ich gleybe an Gott Vater gewiltig Schöpfer Himm un' Erde un' an seinen Sohn Jesu der hat gelitten von dem Fürsten Pilatus den Marter. Er ist gepeinig un' getödet un' begraben. Am dritten Tag stund er oyer von seinem Tode, der sitzt zu der Rechten Seiten Gottes Vater gewiltig.* Now, one may ask that since they say they believe in God and Jesus, it follows that Jesus is not God. Moreover, they say that he sits at the right hand of God; this indicates that he himself is not God. Otherwise they would have said, "He who sits on a lofty and exalted throne" [Isaiah 6:1]; only that would indicate that he himself is divine.

As the brackets show, the Latin text is considerably more corrupt than the German, possibly because German was better known to Jews of the period. Some of the corrupt Latin spellings, such as *santo, crucifisus,* and *asendit* may be due to the way Latin was pronounced in the place where NY was compiled, compounded by the vagaries of Hebrew transliteration. Further corruption is evident in the fact that the line *unicum dominum nostrum qui conceptus est de spiritu sancto natus ex Maria virgine* was evidently dropped in transmission, and thus omitted from the Hebrew and German translations. It was subsequently restored to the Latin text, but with the (incorrect) "explanation" that it was an "additional statement," only said by some people. In fact it was an essential and inseparable part of the text, found even in the earliest witnesses. ¹³

However, shortened forms of the creed do turn up elsewhere in the Jewish anti-Christian polemical literature;¹⁴ they may have been used deliberately by Christian polemicists in order to simplify their message. Since the missing section of the creed in NY mentions the Virgin Birth, it is possible that some Christian apologist deliberately omitted it to avoid getting sidetracked into discussion of a doctrine particularly disliked by Jews. If so, then once again it would be evident that the NY text of the Creed became known to its Jewish compilers through citations in Christian polemic, not through direct knowledge of Christian worship. At a later stage, as NY grew closer to its extant form, the omission was re-supplied editorially, with the disclaimer that not everyone said it—a disclaimer that could only be believed by people who were themselves unfamiliar with Christian practices.

Did the German text, too, ultimately come from Christian missionaries, or was it made by the Jewish compilers of NY? The fact that the language is called "Ashkenaz" implies that it is meant to be Yiddish, and the presence of some Yiddish traits (e. g. "oyf," "un") may suggest a Jewish writer.

The most extreme case of corruption occurs in the next passage:

They say the following daily in their *Prima* prayers: *Christe fili Dei vivi, mi<s>erere nobis. <Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris,> miserere nobis.¹⁵ Offerimus tibi Domine calicem salutaris<secundum ordinem Melchisedek et secundum ordinem Moysi et Aaron <in> sacerdotibus eius et Samuel inter eos qui invocant*
nomen Domini. That is what they call *Stimmesse*; they teach it only to those who are ordained as priests, and those priests whisper it silently in their house of prayer. The following is its German [Ashkenaz] translation: *Christus des lebenden Gottes Sohn, erbarm dich über uns, der sitzt zu der rechten Seiten seines Vaters, erbarm dich über uns. Wir offeren dem Herrn dankenlich der salbet Acharon in ihr Priesterschaft un' Samuel der Ruf in Namen Gottes.* Now, how can you say that this is God when the priest himself says that it is just an offering and when you yourself made the wine and baked the bread? How can you say that this made you, established you, formed you, and created you?

Here a number of unrelated passages have been run together to look like a single prayer, though they really are not. From a Christian viewpoint they do not even make sense together, for a prayer addressed to "Christ the Son of the living God" could not continue with "we offer you, O Lord, the cup of salvation," words that could only be addressed to the Father.16 Thus we need to separate out the individual units within the series.

The first unit extends from *Christe fili Dei vivi* through the second *miserere nobis*. The words *qui sedes ad dexteram patris* have dropped out, though the equivalent phrase is still present in the German translation. Thus the original Latin text was:

> *Christe fili Dei vivi, miserere nobis. Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris, miserere nobis.*

It means

> *Christ, Son of the living God, have mercy on us. [You] who sit at the right of the Father, have mercy on us.*

This is a short responsory from the Gregorian chant of the Divine Office, the cycle of prayers for the hours said or sung by all priests and other clergy, contained in the liturgical book known as the breviary. Though there was much variety among medieval breviaries, this text was normally said or sung at *Prima* or *Prime* on Sundays, the first of the four "minor hours" of the Office for that day.17 The NY concurs in attributing this text to "the *Prima* prayers," but seems to err in stating that this particular text was recited every day. Unlike the quotations cited previously, which come from important points of the Mass and Baptism ritual, *Christe fili Dei vivi* is a relatively obscure text that would not have been known to a Christian layman or a casual non-Christian observer. It is unlikely that a Jewish writer bent on refuting Christianity could have found this text on his own. On the other hand, the responsory *Christe fili Dei* would have been quite familiar to any Christian cleric who recited the breviary regularly. Thus it is easy to imagine a Christian proselytizer quoting it to support an argument that Christ is the Son of God who sits at the right hand of the Father.

The next unit, *Offerimus tibi calicem salutaris*, is also an obscure text like *Christe fili Dei*. It means "We offer to you the cup of salvation." Obviously it comes not from the breviary, but from the Mass, where it was part of a prayer the priest said quietly while offering the chalice filled with wine.18 Thus it would have been known to every priest, but not heard by the laity attending the Mass. The NY recognizes this by attributing the prayer to *Stimmesse*, the "low
Mass" said privately by a priest without music, and often without even a congregation. As the NY says, "they teach it only to those who are ordained as priests, and those priests whisper it silently in their house of prayer." Again, this text must have entered Christian-Jewish polemic from the Christian side.

Following this are two quotations that seem to come from the Bible rather than the liturgy: secundum ordinem Melchisedek (Psalm 110:4), and secundum ordinem Moysi et Aaron in sacerdotibus eius et Samuel inter eos qui invocant nomen Domini (cf. Psalm 99:6). Though the Canon of the Mass does refer to the sacrifice of Melchisedek, along with those of Abel and Abraham, it does not quote the words of this psalm, nor does it mention Moses, Aaron, or Samuel at all. It is easy to imagine, however, that these psalm verses would have become known to the compilers of NY by having been cited in some sermon on the priesthood of Christ, an idea with which Psalm 110 was especially associated. Such a context would explain the close juxtaposition with a prayer from the Mass, and the responsory that refers to Christ sitting at the right hand of the Father. It is also possible, though, that these texts were only aggregated during the second stage of Jewish transmission, when Christian proof texts were being assembled, but translations and refutations had not yet been added. The assimilation of these quotations into a single pseudo-prayer could have happened during the third stage, when the quotations were being transliterated and written down in Hebrew letters. In any case it had already been accomplished by the fourth stage, when the German translator treated them all as a single continuous text.

This translator worked at a time before the words qui sedes ad dexteram Patris had fallen out of the Latin text, because der sitzt zu der rechten Seiten seines Vaters occurs in the translation. But several other problems suggest that he was not a Christian. The Latin says

We offer to you, Lord, the cup of salvation, according to the order of Melchisedek and according to the order of Moses and Aaron among his priests and Samuel among those who invoke the name of the Lord.

But the German says

We offer thankfully to the Lord who anoints Aaron in their priesthood and Samuel, the one who calls on the name of God.

Thus the translation omits the second person pronoun in "We offer to you, Lord," as if to smooth over the inconsistency with the responsory addressed to Christ that begins this textual cento. The German also omits the cup of salvation, Melchisedek, and Moses. The words for the order of" in the Latin original have been replaced by "who anoints" in the German, which then mentions only the two figures who in the Bible were actually associated with anointing: Aaron who was anointed priest (Exodus 28:41, 29:7), and Samuel who anointed King Saul (1 Samuel 9:16, 10:1, 15:1, 17) and King David (1 Samuel 16:3, 12–13). However, the wording "Aaron in their priesthood" rather than "in his priesthood" indicates that the name of Moses was originally included in the translation but subsequently dropped out. The overall impression, then, is of someone trying to make sense of something that isn't really a prayer, and doing so on the basis of Old Testament assumptions.

The cup of salvation, though omitted from the German, provides the link to the final liturgical
During the swallowing of the bread he says, "I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord" [Psalm 116:13]. The Latin is: *Calicem salutari<sa> accipiam et nomen Domini invocabo.* At that point he drinks the wine which he had smelled when it was in the chalice.

This passage is quoted and explained correctly, for before drinking from the chalice (according to *NY*, "during the swallowing of the bread") the priest recited a prayer consisting of Psalms 116:12–13 and 18:4. It is the only Latin liturgical quotation, apart from *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, that has not been corrupted in some way. There is also no explicit Jewish refutation. Of course the Jewish compilers doubted that the priest drank anything more than ordinary wine; the priest should have been able to draw this conclusion himself since, as the *NY* says, "he had smelled [it] when it was in the chalice."

**Summary**

Having surveyed the entire section on the liturgy, we can now summarize what this section tells us about the compilation of *NY*. First, Christian preachers quoted these Latin texts from the liturgy in order to make points about Christian belief. These texts were remembered by the compilers of *NY*, though only because of their interest in refuting them. As the Latin texts were handed down among Jews, whether orally or in writing, phrases dropped out, and unrelated quotations were run together into what looked like continuous texts. As these came to be written down, the transliterations of the Latin into Hebrew letters gave rise to further misunderstandings, some of which were incorporated into the Hebrew explanations and refutations that were the main purpose of *NY*. The German translations witness to an intermediate state of transmission, for they incorporate some of the corruptions of the Hebrew but not others. With the possible exception of the Apostles' Creed, therefore, the translations appear to be of Jewish origin and not, like the Latin, taken from Christian sermons or other sources. The German texts therefore confirm the impression that the *NY* was entirely a defensive document, drawn up by people who knew Christianity only second hand.

From the point of view of the text critic, this part of the *NY* is of great interest as exhibiting an unusual kind of textual transmission. It shows us what can happen when texts are preserved and handed down among people who do not know the language well, are not familiar with the original context, do not agree or sympathize with what the texts mean, and indeed hold them in low esteem, for the only interest that the compilers of *NY* had in these texts was as self-defense against religious persecution.

But a more fully humane view allows us to see much more: what some of the central and most respected rituals of one religious culture looked like to the minority in its midst—a community actively resisting intense and relentless pressure to dissolve into the mainstream society. To the Christian reader, or to one for whom the Latin Christian culture defines the normative Middle Ages, this section of the *NY* looks like no more than a motley collection of stray excerpts from the medieval Christian liturgy, corrupt and misunderstood. But seen from its own internal perspective, *NY* makes a consistent and intelligible statement. Under pressure to recognize themselves in the incomplete, distorted, and degraded depictions of Jews that the
Christian society accepted and promoted, the compilers of the Old Polemic sought to turn the mirror around. What their text offers is not a weak protest—"We don't understand Latin very well, your liturgy makes no sense to us"—but rather a strong affirmation—"It is your worship, not ours, that is abominable and impure, corrupt, and even Satanic. It is we, not you, who are faithful to the revelation and commandments of God."

ENDNOTES

I am grateful to the late Paul Oskar Kristeller for some helpful advice.


5. Paragraph 231 of the Berger ed., Hebrew text pp. 155–6, English translation pp. 219–21, commentary pp. 335–8. In presenting the quotations that follow, I have largely preserved Berger's English translations from the Hebrew, but have revised the Latin and German passages to show more clearly how the Hebrew text attempts to transliterate the medieval Latin and German spellings. Thus the present article incorporates a number of improvements over an earlier one that I published prematurely: "Lateinische liturgische Zitate im 'Nizahon Yasan': Eine jüdische Kritik aus dem Mittelalter an der katholischen Liturgie," Judaica: Beiträge zum Verständnis des jüdischen Schicksals in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart 41 (1985), 108–14.


9. Berger transcribes the dative of Satanas with the modern classicizing spelling Satanae, but I have reverted to the medieval spelling which is, of course, what the Hebrew transliteration attempted to render.


11. For the rite of the German-speaking diocese of Constance, which would no doubt have been similar to the rite used in the place where the *NY* was compiled, see Alban Dold, ed., *Die Konstanzer Ritualientexte in ihrer Entwicklung von 1482-1721*, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen 5–6 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1923), 37.

12. The correct baptismal formula was *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*, meaning "I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," without "Amen." A lost Strasbourg MS, the basis for the printed edition of 1681, apparently contained "In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, Amen." An extant Munich MS appears to combine both readings in an extremely corrupt form: אימונין שם טראו ויד אפרים צייחא שטניא. This could be read *Imonine shem trao es afrenitsat sataney*. The word *shem* (Hebrew for "name") would have originated as a gloss on *In nomine*, while *trao es* would be the remnants of *Patris et*. See the remarks in Berger’s commentary, 336.


15. Berger’s edition mistransliterates *Christi fili Dei, vae vae, miserere nobis, miserere nobis*. The correctness of my own transliteration is confirmed by the German translation.

16. The belief that the wine of the Mass was offered to the Father is expressed in the prayer
Unde et memores in the Canon Missae. See Jungmann, Mass, 2: 218–26; Lippe, Missale romanum, 1: 207–8; Botte-Mohrmann, L’Ordinaire, 80–2.


19. The psalms are here cited according to their Hebrew numbers, the numbers used in most modern English translations of the Bible. The Vulgate numbers are Psalm 109:4; 98:6.

20. Lippe, Missale Romanum, 1: 208; Botte-Mohrmann, L’Ordinaire, 82.


22. Perhaps the Jewish translator was unable to understand the Hebrew transliteration at this point. The word salbet, occurring just before the omission of Melchisedek and Moses, may represent his attempt to render \( "סְלָבָטָר" \) (=Latin salutaris) with a similar-sounding German word, though one quite different in meaning.


24. Lippe, Missale Romanum 211; Botte-Mohrmann 90; Jungmann 2:353.
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