

NEW CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TALMUDIC TEXTUAL TRADITION IN A CENSORED PASSAGE ABOUT JESUS IN THE LATIN TRANSLATION OF THE TALMUD (13TH CENTURY)

ULISSE CECINI, *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*

1. Introduction

The *Extractiones de Talmud*, written in 1245, are a collection of passages from the Babylonian Talmud translated into Latin with the purpose of providing first-hand material for the refutation of the Talmud¹. They were commissioned by Odo of Châteauroux after Pope Innocent IV's request to carry out an investigation on the Talmud. This investigation ended with a condemnation in 1248. The Talmud had already been condemned and publicly burnt in Paris in 1241-2, after the Jewish convert Nicholas Donin had presented in 1239 his 35 articles of accusation against it to Pope Gregory IX. The second investigation was probably triggered by the protests of the Jewish community, which addressed to Gregory IX's successor the complaint that without the Talmud they could not correctly understand the Bible and the prescriptions they were bound to in order to practice their religion, whose practice was to be tolerated and allowed by the Christians.² Both

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

¹ For a general assessment of the subject and further bibliography see U. Cecini - E. Vernet i Pons (eds.), *Studies on the Latin Talmud* (Bellaterra: Servei de publicacions UAB, 2017). See also: A. Fidora, "Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions: The Two Versions of the Latin Talmud", *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 2/1 (2015), pp. 63-78; Id., "The Latin Talmud and its Translators: Thibaud de Sézanne vs. Nicholas Donin?", *Henoah. Historical and Textual Studies in Ancient and Medieval Judaism and Christianity* 37/1 (2015), pp. 17-28.

² For this, see the letter of Innocent IV to the King of France, dated August 12th, 1247, in S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1933), pp. 276-280: "Sane magistris Iudaeorum regni tui nuper proponentibus coram nobis et fratribus nostris quod sine illo libro qui hebraice Talmud dicitur, bibliae et alia statuta suae legis secundum fidem ipsorum intelligere nequeunt, nos qui iuxta mandatum divinum in eadem lege ipsos tolerare tenemur, dignum eis duximus respondendum quod sicut eos ipsa lege sic per consequens suis libris nolumus iniuste privare. Unde venerabili fratri nostro episcopo Tusculano, Apostolicae Sedis legato [sc. Odoni], direximus scripta nostra ut tam ipsum Talemum quam alios sibi faciendi exhiberi libros, ac eos inspicere et inspiciens diligenter eosdem toleret in his in quibus secundum Deum sine fidei Christianae iniuria viderit tolerandos, et magistris restituat supradictis, contradictores per censuram ecclesiasticam appellatione postposita compescendo."

investigations revolved around the question of whether the contents of the Talmud could be allowed or should be prohibited and destroyed. The latter option is what the 1922 passages from the Babylonian Talmud chosen and translated for the *Extractiones de Talmud* should prove. One of the criteria for selecting the passages belonging to the *Extractiones* was anti-Christian content. However, this is not the only criterion: we also find passages that are considered meaningless legends from a Christian point of view or that speak of magic and sorcery, passages that seem to contradict the Bible and to give the Talmud a higher authority, or passages that appear from the perspective of their opponents just illogical, misleading or silly. Some of the passages that discredit the Christian religion and particularly Jesus have an additional relevance: either they have disappeared from printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud, from early-modern to modern times, or their open anti-Christian content has been replaced by a more neutral formulation.³ So even in times when the Talmud was allowed to be printed, these passages remained censored. The original version of these passages remained therefore often hidden and concealed.

This has been known for a long time. As a matter of fact, numerous studies – the most popular of which is Peter Schäfer's *Jesus in the Talmud*⁴ – have picked up and analyzed these passages from the very few surviving manuscripts that date from before the censorship. Now the *Extractiones de Talmud* not only paradoxically provide an additional testimony of such passages that they sought to conceal and eradicate, but through them we also get informa-

English translation *ibid.*: “When, therefore, the Jewish masters of your Kingdom recently asserted before us and our brothers, that without that book which in Hebrew is called ‘Talmut’, they cannot understand the Bible and their other statutes and laws in accordance with their faith, we then, bound as we are by the divine command to tolerate them in their Law, thought fit to have the answer given them that we do not want to deprive them of their books if as a result we should be depriving them of their Law. Whereupon we directed our letters to our venerable brother, the Bishop of Tusculum, Legate of the Apostolic Throne [*sc.* Odo], ordering him to cause the Talmud as well as other books to be shown to him, and to have them carefully inspected; of these he should tolerate such as he will find may be tolerated, in accordance with divine command, without injury to the Christian Faith, and he shall restore them to the Jewish masters, doing so by quieting their opponents by means of ecclesiastical censure without appeal.”

³ An example of the latter case is the substitution of the word *goy* (non-Jewish) – which in medieval and early-modern Europe may have been interpreted as a synonym of Christian – through the expression ‘*obed kokaḥim*’ (worshipper of the stars), which refers more openly to a pagan cult and cannot be interpreted as meaning Christian. For this, see e.g. San 38b: the Schottenstein Edition of the Vilna Talmud (H. Goldwurm et al. [eds.], *Talmud Bavli. The Schottenstein Edition* [Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, 1990-]) has לא שנו אלא אפיקורוס, whereas in the 14th century Talmud manuscript Munich, BSB, Cod. hebr. 95, we read לא שנו אל' אפיקורוי גוי (source: Database of the Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research, Version 5 [Jerusalem: Bar-Ilan University, 2002]). In the *Extractiones* we read: *Verum est de ephycoroz goy – christiano* – (Ed. Cecini - De la Cruz, *cf. infra* n. 13, p. 261). Apart from the gloss, which explains the word *goy* as Christian, it is affirmed in the prologue to the *Extractiones* that the expression *goy* was commonly understood as Christian: *Goy idem est quod 'gens' et goym quod 'gentes'; sed ad christianos usu restringitur* (Ed. Cecini - De la Cruz, *cf. infra* n. 13, p. 6).

⁴ P. Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

tion that has not been handed down in the preserved Talmud manuscripts. Thus, the intended purpose of the *Extractiones* has had the opposite effect, for they have preserved for us texts and ideas for which they were meant to show the necessity of disappearing forever.

2. The Censored Passage of Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya and his Disciple Yešu the Nazarene in the Jewish Sources (San 107b)

What follows is a particularly striking example of this phenomenon. It is a passage from the order Neziqin, tractate Sanhedrin, page 107b, of which there is a slightly modified version also in the order Našim, tractate Soṭah, page 47a. The passage was dealt with by Peter Schäfer in his study about Jesus in the Talmud.⁵ Here, Schäfer translates and comments the text from Sanhedrin, while showing the textual differences between the 19th-century Vilna edition (reference text for the modern editions), the 15th-century Barco (Soncino) print, and the five Talmud manuscripts which transmit the passage.

The passage in question, in its most recent version, from the database Responsa Project of Bar-Ilan University, begins as follows:⁶

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סנהדרין דף קז עמוד ב

תנו רבנן: לעולם תהא שמאל דוחה וימין מקרבת. לא כאלישע שדחפו לגחזי בשתי ידים, +ולא כיהושע בן פרחיא שדחפו לישו הנוצרי בשתי ידיו / המשפט האחרון השלמה של השמטת הצנזורה/+

Our masters taught: Always let the left [hand] push away, but the right [hand] bring near. Not like Eliša‘, who pushed Geḥazi away with both hands, + and not like Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya, who pushed Yešu the Nazarene away with both hands. +

The Responsa project edition adds the following note to the part between the crosses:⁷

The last sentence completes what was erased by censorship [i. e. it is a restored censored passage].

If one consults the Vilna Edition, one does indeed not find the passage in the main text, although it is noted on the margin that it still existed in the 16th century Venice print.

If we turn now to the content of the passage, the audience is presented with one, or, actually, two examples of masters who “pushed away with both

⁵ Schäfer, *Jesus*, pp. 34-40.

⁶ Responsa Project, Version 24.

⁷ It is the Hebrew text between the two slashes (“/”).

hands”, i. e. who have firmly and irrevocably rejected their disciples without leaving them the chance – as good masters should – to repent and correct their mistakes.

After the story of Eliša[‘] and Geḥazi has been told, it is the turn of the censored story of Yehošua[‘] ben Peraḥya and his disciple Yešū the Nazarene, which is preserved only in three manuscripts⁸ and two printed editions, i.e. Barco and Venice, but has disappeared from the Vilna edition:

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סנהדרין דף קז עמוד ב

+יהושע בן פרחיה מאי היא? כדקטלינהו ינאי מלכא לרבנן אזל יהושע בן פרחיה וישו לאלכסנדריא של מצרים. כי הוה שלמא שלח ליה שמעון בן שטח: מיני ירושלים עיר הקדש ליכי אלכסנדריה של מצרים: אחותי, בעלי שרוי בתוכך ואנכי יושבת שוממה.

קם אתא ואתרמי ליה ההוא אושפיזא, עבדו ליה יקרא טובא. אמר: כמה יפה אכסניא זו. אמר ליה: רבי, עיניה טרוטות. אמר ליה: רשע! בכך אתה עוסק? אפיק ארבע מאה שיפורי ושמתיה.

אתא לקמיה כמה זימנין, אמר ליה: קבלן! – לא הוי קא משגח ביה. יומא חד הוה קא קרי קריאת שמע, אתא לקמיה. סבר לקבולי, אחוי ליה בידיה. הוא סבר: מידהא דחי לי. אזל זקף לבינתא והשתחוה לה. אמר ליה: הדר בך! – אמר ליה: כך מקובלני ממך: כל החוטא ומחטיא את הרבים אין מספיקין בידו לעשות תשובה. ואמר מר: ישו כישף והסית והדיח את ישראל /מתחלת הקטע עד כאן, השלמה של השמטת הצנזורה/⁹

Yehošua[‘] ben Peraḥya, what [is there to say about] him? When King Yannai killed the rabbis, Yehošua[‘] ben Peraḥya and Yešū fled to Alexandria in Egypt. When there was peace, Šim[‘]on ben Šetaḥ sent [them the following message]: “From Jerusalem, the Holy City, to you, Alexandria in Egypt. Sister of mine, my husband is in your midst, and I am sitting here abandoned!”

He [Yehošua[‘] ben Peraḥya] got up, went and it happened to him to find himself in a certain inn. There he was treated with great honor. He said: “How beautiful is this [female] innkeeper! He [the person who was with him, i.e. Yešū] said: “Rabbi, her eyes are bleared (or: half-closed; or: round).” He [Yehošua[‘] ben Peraḥya] replied [to him]: “Wicked man! With such things do you occupy yourself?!” He produced four hundred hornblasts and excommunicated him.

⁸ Mss. Jerusalem, Yad ha-Rav Herzog, 1; Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magl. Coll. II.I.9; Munich, BSB, Cod. hebr. 95.

⁹ Source: Responsa Project, Version 24.

He [Yešū] came to him [Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya] several times (and) said to him, “receive me!”, but he did not pay attention to him. One day while he [Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya] was reciting the *šema*’, he [Yešū] came [again] to him. [This time] he [Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya] wanted to receive him [and] made a sign to him with his hand. But he [Yešū] thought: “He definitely rejects me!” He [Yešū] walked away, set up a brick and worshipped it. He [Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya] said to him: “Repent!”, but he replied: “Thus I have learned from you: Anyone who sins and induces many to sin is not provided with the possibility of repenting.”

The master said: “Yešū practiced magic and enticed and led Israel astray.”

In this case, too, there is an editorial note at the end:

From the beginning of the section to here: integration of what was erased by censorship.

Before showing the Latin translation of the passage, I would like to provide a couple of coordinates for understanding its context. As Peter Schäfer explains,¹⁰ the narrated facts are to be situated during the reign of the Hasmonean king Alexander Yannai, who reigned from 103 to 76 BC. It happened that King Yannai was accused by a member of the Pharisees, as it is reported in the Talmud, order Našim, tractate Qiddušin, page 66a. When the accusation turned out to be false, the king took revenge by putting to death all his opponents among the Pharisees. It is clear that there is a chronological problem in putting a story about Jesus of Nazareth into this time. We must hypothesize different stages of redaction: a first one, in which appears Yešū, the disciple of Yehošua‘ ben Peraḥya, and a second one when the former is identified with Jesus of Nazareth. The chronological incongruence is not really relevant, as Peter Schäfer says: “The fact that Jesus penetrated into the story at a later stage does not mean that the story does not contain any reliable information about *the Bavli*’s¹¹ perception of Jesus.”¹² Moreover, the fact that the passage has been censored proves that Christians, despite the chronological inconsistency, referred it to Jesus Christ, even though it may refer to another figure of the same name who lived in the time of King Yannai.

¹⁰ Schäfer, *Jesus*, pp. 35-36.

¹¹ i.e. the Babylonian Talmud.

¹² Schäfer, *Jesus*, p. 37.

3. The Latin Translation

Extractiones de Talmud, n. 1442, Sanhedrin 107b¹³

Blasphemia Dicunt magistri: Semper debet homo sinistra inpellere – illum qui peccavit – et dextera adtrahere. Non sicut Heliseus, qui inpulit Giezi duabus manibus, neque sicut Iosua filius Perahya, qui inpulit Iesum duabus manibus. De Iosua filio Perahya quid fuit? Quando Iannay rex occidit magistros – sicut legitur in *Nassym* in *macecta Ievamot* sponsaliorum –, rby Iosua filius Perahya ivit in Alexandriam Aegypti – propter turbationem quae erat in Hierusalem –, Quando autem facta fuit pax, scripsit Symeon filius Sathay: “Ex parte Hierusalem, civitatis sanctuarii, tibi, Alexandria de Aegypto. Dominus meus manet in te et ego sedeo vastata”. Quando rby Iosua redibat, hospitatus est cum quadam hospitissa, feceruntque ei bonum vultum, qui ait: Quam decens est ista hospitissa! Respondit ei – Iesus scilicet –: Oculos habet varios. Dixitque rby Iosua: Impie, intromittis te de talibus? Fecit adferri quadringentas bucinas – gallice *cors* – et excommunicavit illum. Venit Iesus bis coram illo et ait illi: Recipe me – ad paenitentiam –. Ille vero non curavit de eo. Quadam die dicebat rby Iosua *parassa* de *smay* – lectionem scilicet “Audi Israhel” –, venit iterum Iesus coram ipso et ait: Rby, recipe me. Et innuit illi de manu, cogitavitque illum recipere. Ipse autem credidit quod repelleret eum. Abiit igitur Iesus et erexit laterem et adoravit eum. Dixit ei rby Iosua: Revertere in te. Respondit Iesus: Teneo a te, quod ille qui peccat et facit peccare plures non adducitur ad veram paenitentiam.

Nota Et hoc dicit dominus meus – Talmud scilicet –: Iesus *Noceri* sortilegiavit et incitavit et inpegit Israhel – Istud est etiam in *Nassym* –.

Blasphemy The masters taught: one should always push away – the one who sinned – with the left [hand] and draw him near with the right one. Not like Heliseus [lat. for Eliša⁴], who pushed away Giezi with both his hands, and not like Iosua, son of Perahya, who pushed Jesus away with both his hands. What happened to Iosua, son of Perahya? When King Yannai killed the masters – as one reads in *Našim*, in the *massekta* [scil. treatise] *Yevamot*, i. e. ‘Marriages’ –, Iosua, son

¹³ In the critical edition of the *Extractiones de Talmud* every passage has been numbered. Cfr. U. Cecini - Ó. De la Cruz (eds., with E. Vernet i Pons and F. Dal Bo), *Extractiones de Talmud. Per ordinem sequentialem* (CCCM 291; Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), pp. 392-393.

of Perahya, went to Alexandria in Egypt – because of the turmoil in Jerusalem –. When peace was concluded, Simeon, son of Sathay, wrote: “From Jerusalem, the city of the sanctuary, to you, Alexandria in Egypt. My Lord dwells in you, and I am sitting here destroyed! “When R. Iosua was on his way back, he was lodged with an inn-keeper. He was shown a friendly face [i.e. he was honored] and he said. “How beautiful is this inn-keeper! He – i.e. Jesus – answered him: “Her eyes are variegated (or: deceiving).” Iosua said: “You wicked one! Do you meddle in such things?!” He let four hundred trumpets – French: *cors* [scil. Horns] – come and excommunicated him. Jesus came to him twice and said to him, “receive me – so that I can repent –!” But he did not pay him any attention. One day, while R. Iosua was praying the pericope of the *šema* – namely, the passage “Hear, o Israel” – Jesus came to him again and said: “Rabbi, receive me.” And he [the rabbi] made him a sign with his hand, and thought to receive him. But he [Jesus] believed that he [the rabbi] was rejecting him. So Jesus went away, set up a brick and worshipped him. R. Iosua said to him: “Go back to yourself!” Jesus replied: “I learned from you that anyone who sins and make many others sin will not be led to true repentance.”

Note And this is what my lord – i.e. the Talmud – says: “Jesus the Nazarene practiced magic and incited and thrusted Israel [scil. to magic or sin] – this is also found in *Našim* –.”

If we compare the Latin translation with the Hebrew text, we can see that, apart from different nuances in the rendering of some words, the translation is very literal: a feature that can be described as being characteristic of the whole *Extractiones*.¹⁴ An illustrative example of the effort for literality is the translation as “revertere in te!” of the expression !הָרָר בְּךָ (*Hedar be-ka!*), which we have translated as “repent!”, but which literally means “return to you”, as in Latin. This patent effort for literality has the consequence that when one finds variants or differences while comparing source and translation, one should take them seriously and consider the possibility that such a variant was in the *Vorlage* of the translation. After having established the literality of the translation, we can now start looking for the differences between the original version we have and the medieval Latin translation and what additional information these differences offer.

¹⁴ However, on how the literal translation of the *Extractiones* can be deceiving and serve the polemical purpose of the work, see U. Cecini, “Looking for Polemical Argument: A Closer Look into the Latin Translation of the Talmud, *Extractiones de Talmud* (c. 1244-45),” in U. Cecini - E. Vernet i Pons (eds.), *Studies on the Latin Talmud* (Bellaterra: Servei de publicacions UAB, 2017), pp. 43-55.

3.1. *Hitherto Unknown Exegetical Material in the Extractions*

The most evident difference between the Hebrew and Latin texts is the presence of glosses, which give additional information to the text and that, in the edition, appear in a smaller font size and between dashes. The presence of such glosses is a typical feature of the *Extractiones de Talmud*. The translator frequently inserts glosses into the text, which usually go back to the famous Jewish commentator of the 11th century R. Šelomoh Yišḥaḳi of Troyes, usually known as Rashi. Often, the translator explicitly identifies Rashi as the source of a gloss by placing the expression “Glossa Salomonis” at its beginning. This is however not a consequent effort. Even when the introducing statement “Glossa Salomonis” is missing, one can often trace the gloss back to Rashi. Moreover, the translator gives also his own explanations, which are normally easy to recognize and represent only a small percentage when compared to the Rashi-glosses.¹⁵ While the simple presence of glosses in our passage may come as no surprise, it is their content that makes them particularly relevant for the present study. The glosses give us in fact information that is not included in the preserved Rashi glosses and that presents the Talmudic text in a different redactional state than the one we know from the printed Talmud editions and surviving manuscripts. The Latin text, with the purpose of censorship, has preserved information that would have been lost without it.

If we look at the glosses in the above Latin text one by one, we see that none of them is marked as “Glossa Salomonis”, however, as we have said, we can often find the corresponding text in Rashi, even if the gloss is not marked as such in the translation. As this is not the case here, one may refrain from attributing them to Rashi. At several instances, it seems indeed impossible to decide whether the glosses go back to the translator or belong to Rashi. Thus, in the case of explanatory additions coming from the context such as “illum qui peccavit”, “propter turbationem quae erat in Hierusalem”, “ad paenitentiam”, “Iesus scilicet” both hypotheses seem equally acceptable. Yet, with regard to *le’azim*, i.e. the translations of a Hebrew word into French, I would rather tend to attribute them to Rashi – even if there is no material evidence –, as this is a typical feature which Rashi uses to make the explanation clearer to his French audience.¹⁶ An example of this in our fragment is the gloss to the Latin word “bucinas” (‘horns’), where the medieval French word for horns (“cors”) is given next to the Latin. For the explanation of the expres-

¹⁵ In the critical edition one also finds an Appendix by Federico Dal Bo, in which every gloss of the *Extractiones* is classified according to its provenance and especially whether it is a gloss that goes back to Rashi or to the translator himself.

¹⁶ About the *le’azim*, see A. Darmesteter - D.S. Blondheim, *Les Glosses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Rashi. Tome premier: Texte des glosses* (Paris: H. Champion, 1929); D.S. Blondheim, *Les Glosses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Rashi. Tome deux: Études lexicographiques* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1937); A. Grossman, *Rashi* (Oxford/Portland, Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2012), esp. p. 112, n. 4, with further bibliography.

sion “my lord” as “the Talmud” (“dominus meus – Talmud scilicet –”) there is no material evidence in Rashi either. Yet, while for the glosses “illum qui peccavit”, “propter turbationem quae erat in Hierusalem”, “ad paenitentiam”, “Iesus scilicet” one may think that they are the translator’s own explanations, which he drew from the surrounding context, in the case of “dominus meus – Talmud scilicet –” one should be open to another possibility as well.¹⁷ The explanation does not seem to have any connection with the surrounding context and it is not what one would intuitively expect when reading the expression “my lord”. This gloss is different from the gloss “lectio ‘Audi Israel’” which can be attributed with certainty to the translator, as it is meant for Christian readers who do not understand Hebrew. The latter expression explains the phrase “parassa de Samay”, i.e. Hebr. *parašah* of the *šema* ‘[*Yišra’el*], which Rashi did not need to explain for his Jewish audience. In contrast, to state that where the text has “my lord” this means “the Talmud”, could reflect Jewish exegetical material – Rashi or another commentator – that has been lost and that only the *Extractiones* have preserved for us, as this gloss cannot be deduced from the context. Such exegetical material, certainly decontextualized by the translator, can be used by him for the anti-Talmudic purpose of the *Extractiones*, in support of one of the leading accusations of the Talmud trials of the 1240s, namely that the Jews gave the Talmud more authority than the Bible: here the rendition of the Latin translation gives the impression that the Jews call the Talmud their “dominus”, as if it could be compared to God himself. If the Christian translator feels confident to introduce this interpretation, without giving more explanations, he is probably relying on what he considers a valid source, and one cannot exclude that it is a Jewish one, although such a source has not been identified until now.

3.2. *A Hitherto Unknown Talmudic Textual Tradition*

The two remaining glosses belong to a special kind of gloss, which occurs now and then in the *Extractiones*. The translator uses his overview of the whole Talmud to draw the reader’s attention to parallel passages. So he notes at the end of the story: “this is also found in Našim”. This is true: this story is also found in Sotah 47a. The tractate Sotah is included in the order Našim. Similarly, the other gloss tells us that one can find the story of King Yannai and his confrontation with the rabbis also in Našim, namely in the tractate Yevamot. If we review the preserved manuscripts and prints of the Talmud, we find this story indeed in the order Našim, but in the treatise Qiddušin, page 66a, and not in Yevamot. It may, of course, be a mistake of the

¹⁷ Given the lack of material evidence Federico Dal Bo attributes this gloss, like all the others mentioned in this study, except for one, which concerns Yevamot (see below 3.2.), to the translator. Even if his criterion of classification is certainly the most prudent, I try to leave room for a further interpretation, which seems plausible to me too, without, however, ruling out the conclusions at which he arrives.

translator, but considering that it is a concern of the translator to be faithful to his *Vorlage*, and that these cross-references in the *Extractiones* are usually correct, one cannot rule out the possibility that this gloss be a witness to a different redaction of the Talmud in which a parallel passage of this story was found also in the treatise Yevamot. It can thus be seen that the relevance of the Latin translation of the Talmud *Extractiones de Talmud* goes far beyond its unquestionable value for the study of Christian anti-Jewish polemics. It not only preserves censored passages about Jesus in a reliable way – whose existence has already been shown by studies on manuscripts and some early-modern prints. This translation also offers new, useful material for tracing the history of the redaction of the Talmud. Moreover, it preserves hitherto unknown textual and exegetical material, paradoxically saved in the censoring intent of the translation.

ABSTRACT

After a brief presentation of the Latin translation of the Talmud called Extractiones de Talmud (1245), this study deals with a passage about Jesus which is missing from the modern Talmud editions as a result of censorship, but which is extant in the Latin translation. Comparing the Latin translation with the original version of the passage transmitted by manuscripts pre-dating the censorship, new material comes to light thanks to the Latin version, such as hitherto unknown glosses to the Talmud and traces of a stage of redaction of the Talmud different from the one we are acquainted with.