

The *Extractiones de Talmud* from the Tractate bSanhedrin 96a-97a

Enric Cortès
Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya

1. On the Composition of the Talmud Bavli

There have been different ways in attempting to explain how the text of the Talmud has arisen, has grown and, finally, has been edited. There is no consensus on these subjects.¹ The “editors” of the Talmud in the fifth century, R. Ashi and Rabina (who are called ‘the end of the Mishnah’ and ‘the end of the teaching’ in bBM 86a) had the *Saboraim* as their successors/disciples who introduced many passages in the Gemara after Ashi’s death in their “reedition” of the Talmud up to the middle of the sixth (or seventh) century.²

This has been, more or less, a commonly accepted view. But especially the studies of Shamma Friedman and David Weiss Halivni, Jacob Neusner and Jeffrey L. Rubenstein have challenged this opinion.³ They believe that the successors of the Amoraim were not simply editors but authors indeed. They examined carefully the huge amount of anonymous sayings and aggadot of the Gemara, the so-called “stam material” (the texts initiated by *stam*...). The authors of all this material wanted to correct the errors in the oral transmission of the Amoraim’s dicta, or to adapt them to the new circumstances, to solve the lack of consistency in the way of conveying the halakhah and even to take delight in showing how a halakhah is obtained (even when it has been refused previously) through the Talmudic dialectic; and so they took the principle of “Torah for its own sake” to new levels; they worked hard in trying to avoid all kinds of contradictions in the Gemara transferring motifs from disparate Talmudic passages etc. All this impressive work cannot be done by some “editors” (= the *Saboraim* in the commonly accepted view). So the afore-mentioned scholars prefer to talk of real authors: these were the ones who introduced the *stam* (tannaitic) material, i. e. the *Stammaim*, who are everywhere in the Talmud. They worked from the fifth to the seventh centuries.

1. See Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*.
2. Cf. Berkovits already in the EJ ‘Talmud, Babylonian’, col. 761. Basically A. Hanok would say the same: the editors after R. Ashi-Rabina do not add anything new to the Talmud, although the process of editing goes on for many years. The work edited by Jacob Neusner (*The Formation of the Babylonian Talmud*) offers a good summary, especially of the options of Albeck Hanok, Abraham Weiss and David Weiss Halivni. Though Halivni’s work has developed over the next twenty-six years in *Meqorot umesorot*.
3. The last studies were critically summarized by Rubenstein, *Talmudic Stories*, pp. 15-33.

2. The Expansion of the Talmud Through Its Codifiers

One cannot understand Jewish life without taking into account the importance of the Talmud. But no Jew, even a learned one or what has been called a Talmudic scholar, could find easily his norms of conduct in the Gemara. The number of *halakhot stam* (theoretic legal conclusions) and *halakhot lma'ašeh* (laws to be observed) is too large and, at the same time, prescriptions are introduced where one would not expect them. The *aggadot* of the Talmud (though they often intend to prepare or to explain the moral point of the halakhah) do not always help the reader. So from the very end of the Talmud Bavli (eighth century) the need for a guide was felt, and therefore we find the first halakhic codes already in the Geonic days with a special interest in the mishnaic Order of *Neziqin* (*Sanhedrin* being one of its main Tractates). The first codifier among the Geonim seems to be Yehudai, eighth century (*Halakhot Pesuqot* and *Halakhot Gedolot*, though the last book seems to be written by Simeon Qayyara who flourished in the middle of the ninth century). The books of Hai (*Mišpete Šebu'ot* and *Sefer Miqqaḥ u-Mimkar*) were particularly important in the field of codification. *Bašar'al gabbe geḥalim*, though most of it has been lost, is already quoted by the Sages of Ashkenaz in the eleventh century. One has to remember also several codifiers from the beginning of the millennium in northern Africa. Amongst them, Alfasi's *Halakhot* deserve particular attention.⁴ Isaac b. Judah Ibn Ghayyat and Maimonides are the great codifiers of the Spanish school. We find also excellent codifiers in the Languedoc, northern France and Germany. In northern France, the home of the Tosafists (that is, the scholars who *add* explanations to the Talmud), the need of a guide for practical purposes was often felt. In fact, this guiding function of the codes has been the principal aim of all the codifiers before:

The (French) Tosafists, however, did not consider the study of the Talmud merely as a means to the end of regulating religious life; for them it was an end in itself; and the explanation and exposition of the Talmud were of primary importance, while the reduction of the halakhah to norms was merely secondary.⁵

This seems to be a kind of revival of the tannaitic topic of the priority of study *vis-à-vis* practice.⁶ Rashi and the northern France Tosafists, in turn, had a great influence on the German Tosafist school. But at the beginning of the thirteenth century, Isaac b. Moses' book, '*Or Zarua*', marks a change: the book is both a commentary

4. His commentaries on the Talmud were particularly appreciated by the Jewish scholars of the Talmud. Several of his commentaries, copied or reworked in Girona, present his ideas; some of these are discussed in Cortès, 'Fragments de manuscrits hebreus i arameus', pp. 43-44.
5. Ginzberg, *On Jewish Law and Lore*, p. 172. For our comments on Talmudic codifiers in general see pp. 153-184.
6. When R. Yoḥanan b. Zakkay deals with the basics of Judaism, study precedes the practice of halakhah, see Cortès, 'Els fonaments del Judaisme postbiblic', pp. 61-67.

and a code. 'Or Zarua' will become a decisive factor in the religious practice among the German-Polish Jews.

In the Languedoc, in the Catalan-Aragonese Crown, Solomon Abraham Ibn Adret (c. 1235-c. 1310), Nahmanides' famous disciple, wrote a codex which is unique: *Torat ha-Bayit*. The codex has seven divisions (בתים, houses) which are again subdivided into several שערים, gates.⁷ We find the same systematization in another of his codifying works, *Abodat ha-Kodesh* on the laws of festivals and on the halakhot of Shabbat. From the same Nahmanic/Asheric school comes the great and most important of all codifiers, Jacob ben Asher (c. 1269-1343) or the *Tur*, as he is briefly called after his codex. The two centuries coming afterwards produced little of value in the field of codification. Joseph ben Ephraim Caro (1488-1575) was the author of the last great codification of Jewish law, the *Shulḥan 'Aruk*. Although during a century it was met with some serious opposition, at the end it became what it is now: the codex *par excellence* of rabbinic Judaism. 'Nevertheless', says Louis Ginzberg,

it must always be borne in mind that the really decisive authority is the Talmud [...] and a reference to a codex as authoritative is equivalent to saying that its exposition of the Talmud is regarded as the correct one.⁸

Because of its authority the Talmud Bavli has been studied and even scrutinized by Jewish scholars throughout history. When the Geonic period finished (eleventh century), the centre of Talmudic studies shifted to Sepharad: Barcelona, Girona, Toledo, and so on. The *scriptoria* of these Jewish communities issued good copies and original works on the Talmud that were highly appreciated in Ashkenaz, Italy and everywhere, because they contained few copyist's errors. Nevertheless, the *lectiones variantes* were numerous. Some of them are not to be considered additions because they simply reflect another textual tradition. But mostly they were added to render the wording clearer, to update the Talmudic halakhah or to explain the many commentaries that had been attached to the Talmud copies by the 'first' expounders (הראשונים, up to the fifteenth century) and by the 'last' ones (האחרונים, from the sixteenth century on). In fact, their aim was both to be respectful towards the authority of the Talmud and to translate the Talmudic words in such a way as to be spiritually fruitful in a geographical setting and in the midst of a culture that was very different from the environment of the Geonic, Saboraim or Stammam centuries.

Quite different was the process of appropriation and interpretation of the Talmud that took place in the thirteenth century, when Christian scholars prepared the first Latin translation of large portions from this book. In what follows, I will offer a close reading of this translation of bSanhedrin 96a.

7. Curiously, the same kind of divisions and subdivisions has been found in a fragmentary MS from Girona (Girona Diocesan Archive).

8. Ginzberg, *On Jewish Law and Lore*, p. 182.

3. The Order of *Neziquin* (Damages) and Its Tractate *Sanhedrin*

The fourth Order of the Mishnah expounded by the Gemara of the Talmud is *Neziquin* (Damages), and its general aim is to settle Israel's social order. The different Tractates of *Neziquin* deal with the origins of the damages, how an acquisition should be made, the criminal laws, how to bear witness for the prosecution and for the defence, the different kinds of penalties, and so on. The fourth Tractate of *Neziquin*, that is, *Sanhedrin*, deals with the civil/religious laws to keep or to establish peace and equity between the people through the institutions of the Jewish government (Great Sanhedrin/Small Sanhedrin).

Some medieval Christian scholars were interested in the Tractate *Sanhedrin*. In the eyes of some learned Christians, it might help to understand Jesus' last trial. For a Jewish scholar, the whole Order *Neziquin* had a special fascination,

partly on account of the fundamental importance of the legal principles with which it deals, and partly on account of the wide range of its digressions and the exceptionally high quality of its aggadic material.⁹

Hence their great interest in the entire *Neziquin Order*. All its tractates were often copied and studied, but it seems that when Johannes Reuchlin (1455-1521), a distinguished Christian scholar interested in Jewish literature, searched all over Europe to find a copy of the Talmud, the only treatise he could find was *Sanhedrin*.

Sanhedrin has a lot of aggadot. bSanhedrin chapter XI¹⁰ is almost entirely aggadic. The eleventh chapter, after expounding the mishnaic principle of every Jew having a portion in the world to come, mentions Bar Gebiha ben Pasisa's story (he supposedly made halakhic expositions before Alexander of Macedonia), a certain "Rabbi's" dissertation before Antoninus (on the so-called innocence of the body or of the soul: the cripple and the blind man that are both necessary to steal the figs from the orchard), the stories of Bar Coziba, Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem and Nebuchadnezzar's siege and conquest of the holy City. The chapter ends expounding the different rabbinic dicta about the times preceding the coming of the Messiah. Both topics, the Sennacherib/Nebuchadnezzar stories and the messianic days, have been selected and translated into Latin, among other materials, by the authors of the *Extractiones de Talmud*.

4. The *Extractiones de Talmud*

In 1238/39 the convert Nicholas Donin formulated 35 accusations against the Talmud and submitted them to pope Gregory IX. Though we do not know who is (or who

9. Jacob Schachter and H. Freedman at p. XII of their 'Introduction' to *Neziquin*.

10. In the Jerusalem Talmud and in the Mishnah this is the tenth chapter.

are) the author(s) of the Latin translation of the Talmud, that is, the *Extractiones de Talmud*, we have to bear in mind what has been said recently by Alexander Fidora:

Both the sequential Talmud translation and its subsequent thematic rearrangement display additions and modification which go back to Nicholas's list, or at least clear reminiscences thereof; this was done in a more cursory manner already for the sequential translation, and in a very systematic one, either by the same person or by someone else, for the thematic translation, which incorporates material not only from Nicholas's list but also from the section of Rashi's quotations from the second part of the Paris manuscript.¹¹

So it seems that Donin's list is at least a direct source for the final redaction of the *Extractiones de Talmud*.¹²

According to the prologue of MS Paris, BnF lat. 16558, f. 211rb,¹³ which contains the Latin Talmud with other material, Nicholas Donin addressed the Pope Gregory IX in the twelfth year of his pontificate (1238/39); the author of the prologue further states that Donin's articles were translated some five or six years before another translator prepared the *Extractiones de Talmud*. This means that the second translator finished his work at 1244 or 1245, after the Talmud trial and its burning in 1241/42. (The identity of the second translator still has to be determined). But the burning of the Talmud in Paris was not the end of the matter. Afterwards some learned and influential Jews approached pope Innocent IV asking him to revoke the condemnation of the Talmud and to obtain the return of the Talmudic literature still in possession of Christian authorities, though in the end they did not succeed. The *Extractiones*, we are going to comment upon, belong to the days of pope Innocent IV.

5. The *Extractiones* from bSanhedrin

5.1. *The Case of an Angel Named 'Nox'*

Gn 14:1-15 tells the story of Abram fighting against Chedorlaomer and his allies: Abram armed his trained servants and went in pursuit of them as far as Dan (v. 14).

11. Fidora, 'The Latin Talmud and its Translators', p. 25.

12. See the arguments adduced by Fidora, 'Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions': the passage of the thematic *Extractiones* taken from bAZ 3b, which Fidora analyses, depends on the article XXII of Nicholas' list; also further material that has been included in the thematic *Extractiones* is taken from Nicholas' list; as e.g. the section 'De sapientibus and magistris' (Tractates bYevamot, bSukkah, bRosh ha-Shana, bMakkot). The same is true for the claim that rabbinic teachings can abolish the biblical halakhot (bYev 89b-90b [bSuk 29a]).

13. See the text in Fidora, 'The Latin Talmud and its Translators', pp. 26-27. This manuscript consists of 238 folios.

‘He divided his forces against them by night (לילה), he and his servants, and smote them, and pursued them unto Hobah’ (v. 15). The Gemara, as it has been translated by the *Extractiones*, comments on the passage in the following way (San 96a [2]):

‘Divisis sociis, inruit super eos nocte’ (Gen. 14, 15). Dicit rby Iohannen: Angelus qui missus est Abrahæ vocatus est Nox. Rby Isaac dicit: Factum fuit Abrahæ opus noctis, sicut scriptum est: ‘de coelo dimicatum est contra eos, stellæ manentes in cursu et in ordine suo contra Sisaram pugnaverunt’ (Iud. 5, 20) – glossa: sicut stellæ pugnaverunt pro Barac, ita pro Abraham contra reges –.¹⁴

Who is the subject of R. Yiṣḥaq’s statement (the real one, not the grammatical)? Probably the same angel adduced by R. Yoḥanan. R. Yiṣḥaq wants to explain how the angel helped Abram: by doing the ‘opus noctis’: the acts by night were performed for Abram. This is how he argues that the angel is called ‘night’ (לילה). His name means and is what he does – *opus noctis* – (as happens very often in the popular etymologies of biblical and Talmudic names). This is stressed at the very beginning of the passage of the *Extractiones*, ‘factum fuit Abrahæ (?) opus noctis’. Possibly ‘Abrahæ’ is understood in the Latin text as a dative case, for Abram.

Another possible meaning, if the text is understood as a passivum theologicum: the marvellous acts by night were done, ‘factum est’ (by God himself) on behalf of Abram. But this seems to me against the context; the *Extractiones*, on the other hand, ignore or do not follow Rashi’s interpretation here.

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

The *Extractiones* obviate the decision of the Gemara (that is, R. Yiṣḥaq’s exegesis is better than R. Yoḥanan’s interpretation), and the biblical quotation of the book of Job. Both were unnecessary for their purpose. But this has nothing to do with the aims of the *Extractiones*. If the translators wanted to underline the difficulties of the Talmudic exegesis, why do they omit R. Yoḥanan’s farfetched exegesis of Job 3:3? Why do they not mention it? Perhaps the *Extractiones* wanted to point to the absurdity of understanding the ‘lailah’ (the night) as someone, as an angel. Or they wanted to stress the absurdity of an astrology which is fighting against Sisera, Judges 5:20: ‘They fought from heaven against them, the stars from their courses and orders fought against Sisera’. But, if they wanted to underline the absurdity of the stars fighting, this is precisely what the biblical text says! At any rate, the MSS *P* and *Z* of the *Extractiones* point to such an *absurdity*, adding ‘stultitia’ in the margins.

14. The Latin texts of the *Extractiones* (bSanhedrin), which I quote here and in what follows, are taken from the edition: *Extractiones de Talmud per ordinem sequentialem*, prepared by Ulisse Cecini and Óscar de la Cruz; for the reader’s convenience, the text is given in the Appendix.

5.2. *The Pursuit As Far As Dan*

Concerning the war against Chedorlaomer, the king of Elam, the *Extractiones* give a fairly good translation of the Talmudic aggada on the tribe of Dan. According to the aggada Abram could not go further as Dan because of the future idolatry of this tribe, and Sennacherib, on the contrary and for the same reason, could only be powerful when he arrived in Dan (bSan 96a [3]):

‘Persecutus est eos usque Dan’ (Gen. 14, 14). Dicit rby Iohannen: Quando Abraham venit ad Dan, debilitata fuit virtus eius. Vidit enim quod filii filiorum suorum servituri erant in Dan idolatriae, unde scriptum est: ‘posuit unum in Dan et alium in Bethel’ (III Reg. 12, 29 – s. hebr. –). Similiter ille impius – Sennacherib – non habuit vires donec venit in Dan, sicut scriptum est: ‘a Dan auditus est fremitus equorum eius’ (Ier. 8, 16).

Which are the *Extractiones’* aims?

On the whole this is a good translation. But the Latin text adds ‘Abraham’ (unnecessarily?) and omits ‘šadiq’, righteous. The last omission (if the word was in the Gemara) is difficult to explain, because of the Christian/Jewish respect for Abram. The addition of ‘Abraham’ could be, once more, pedagogic. And so perhaps the authors of the *Extractiones* intended to say: see how the Talmud treated Abram, as a frightened man!

The last statement on ‘horses’ snorting being heard from Dan’ could be taken as a Jewish ‘stultitia’. But it is just what the biblical text says!

5.3. *The Honour Due to the Elders and to the Unlearned People*

At bSanhedrin 96a (4) R. Juda quotes the second part of Lv 19:32 on the honour which one owes to the elders. But in fact the rabbi restricted the general biblical pronouncement to the elder people that forgot their learning of the Torah:

Rby Iuda mandavit discipulis suis: Sitis muniti de honorando sene [cf. Lev. 19, 32] qui oblitus est Talmud vi senii.

The *Extractiones* explain the Talmudic מהמת אונסו (that possibly has to be translated as ‘involuntarily, through no fault of his [has forgotten]’)¹⁵ adducing the usual involuntary cause to forget the Torah, that is, the old age: ‘qui oblitus est Talmud vi senii’.

The Latin text goes on with a statement which seems a bit clumsy:

15. Cf. Jastrow, *A Dictionary*, s.v.

et de filiis idiotarum – illiteratorum [gloss] –, quia forsitan de ipsis exhibunt aliqui qui fient magistri.

The correct wording might be understood as ‘et de (honorando) filiis idiotarum –illiteratorum...’.

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

The text wants to be clear, it is brief and pedagogic and quotes only what seems meaningful. It is very difficult to see how any learned Jew (or Christian theologian) could ever blame Judaism because of this Gemara fragment. Do they want to tell the audience of the future trials (not the readers of the text) that the Talmudic doctrine comes sometimes from unlearned people, quoting this *as a kind of* proof? It seems clever to read the Latin fragment as a result of the ‘more lenient climate in the mid 1240s under Innocent IV’.¹⁶

5.4. A Clock that Loses and Gains Depending on the Moral Standards of the People

Hezekiah, the king of Jerusalem, became mortally ill (bSan 96a [5]). But he obtained his health anew through a prayer. The Lord promises him to add fifteen years to his life (Is 38:1ff). In turn, the day his father, the wicked Ahaz, died, had only two hours, as is stated in the aggada:

Dies in quo mortuus est Ahaz non habuit nisi duas horas; et, quando Ezechias fuit curatus ab infirmitate sua, Sanctus, benedictus sit ipse, restituit illas decem horas, sicut scriptum est: ‘reversus est sol decem lineis per gradus per quos descenderat in horologio Ahaz’ (Is. 38, 8).

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

It should be observed that the Talmudic Gemara has the wording in the first person: ...המעלות את צל המעלות, and so has it the biblical text (‘Behold, I will cause the shadow on the stairway, which has gone down with the sun on the stairway of Ahaz, to go back ten steps ...’, v. 8a). In both (*Extractiones* and Gemara), these are God’s words and it is also God’s action. The Latin translation mentions only v. 8b (and not v. 8a, i.e. the divine authorship) to show clearly that the whole case is nonsense or a ‘fabula’, as one can read at the top of the page in MS F₉.¹⁷ So the Latin translation seems to pursue a negative intention.

16. The statement goes back to Alexander Fidora (though he applies it to the sequential *Extractiones* in general, not to our fragment which is extant in MSS *P, Z, W, G, C* and *B*). Cf. Fidora, ‘Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions’, p. 67.

17. MS F₉: p. 248. On the top of the page: ‘Totum hoc est de fabulis et esset scribendum’. At the beginning of the first column, next to a text relating to the Latin, but which is not in the translation: ‘totum hoc esset scribendum’.

5.5. *Israel Killed the Prophet Zechariah*

The Talmudic aggada at bSanhedrin 96b (1) expounds on Zechariah who suffered death at the hands of the Judean people at king's Yoash command (2 Ch 24:21-22).¹⁸ As the prophet and priest Zechariah was dying, he said: 'May the Lord take notice and seek vengeance!'. The *sugya* that contains this aggada clearly wants to underline that the wicked may repent. In fact, says the Gemara, 'Nebuzaradan was a righteous proselyte'. And so says the ending of our fragment. But surely this is not at all what the *Extractiones* aim at. They are only interested in underlying that the Jews killed a prophet, even more, that the Jews of all times kill the prophets. Whence the malicious changes they added to the Gemara:

5.5.1 'Dixit magistris'. The Gemara has only 'said to them (the priests)'. The Jewish Talmud law *teachers* were the only ones known in the days of the *Extractiones* and not the priests. The Latin translation maliciously wants to accuse the whole Jewish learned people of every time.

5.5.2 'Sanguinis sacrificii', which is a more *ad rem* translation than that of the Gemara (*blood of the sacrifices*). The translators into Latin more clearly underline the crime.

5.5.3 'Pontifex et propheta fuit'. The term 'pontifex', and not 'priest' (כֹּהֵן, Gemara), has been chosen so as to magnify the monstrosity of the crime.

5.5.4 'Qui arguebat nos', instead of 'prophesied to Israel about the destruction of Jerusalem' (Gemara), makes more evident the prophetic arguments against the Jewish people of then and now (the days of the *Extractiones*).

5.5.5 'And they killed him' (Gemara). To inculpate the Jews of their own time the *Extractiones* translate 'we killed him'.

5.5.6 'Israhel, qui non perdidit nisi unam animam [...]'. 'Israhel' comes from a mean-spirited Latin translation. The Gemara speaks only about those who killed Zechariah.

5.6. *May the Wicked Be under God's Protection?*

De filiis filiorum Nahaman, Nabuzardani, Sisarae, Sennacherib et Aman fuerunt magistri – Talmud –. Et etiam de filiis filiorum illius impii – Nabuchodonosor – voluit Deus facere intrare sub alas suas. Dixerunt angeli ministerii coram Sancto,

18. See the Appendix below.

benedictus sit ipse: Domine saeculi, illius qui destruxit domum tuam et combussit palatium tuum vis filios ponere sub alis tuis? Hoc est quod scriptum est: ‘curavimus Babylonem et non est curata’ (Jer. 51, 9). Hula dicit: Hoc fuit Nabuchodonosor. Rby Samuhel dicit quod fuerunt flumina Babylonis – cantantia destructionem Hierusalem – [bSan 96b (2)].

The *Extractiones* skip between ‘Nahaman’ and ‘illius impii’ the different kinds of conversion (גר תושב and גר צדק), the places where the offspring of Naaman, Nabuzardan etc. have learned or taught the Torah¹⁹ and the great names of Sennacherib’s descendants, Shemayah and Avtalyon. On the other hand, the *Extractiones* specify who is ‘that wicked man’ (Gemara), namely Sennacherib. This they clearly do in order to obtain a more simple and understandable story, a more pedagogic one. The same conclusion applies to the changes that occur between ‘under the wings of the Divine Presence, שכינה’ (Gemara) and ‘sub alis tuis’. The ‘rivers (*flumina Babylonis*)’ ‘as referring to the Babylonian palms’ (Gemara) are also deleted in the *Extractiones*. As it stands now, R. Samuel’s remarks have to be understood in the same basic way as the statement of R. Hula: Babylon ‘non est curata’. Then the meaning of the *Extractiones* may be summarized as follows: ‘Hoc est quod scriptum est: “curavimus Babylonem et non est curata” (Jr 51:9). Hula dicit: Hoc fuit Nabuchodonosor’. (The text runs as in the Gemara). Hula’s probable meaning being: in spite of the precedent Gemara, Nabuchodonosor was not completely cured. R. Samuel applies the same biblical text not to Nabuchodonosor but to the rivers of Babylon that behaved very badly when Jerusalem was conquered. The advantage of the latter pronouncement is that it is not in direct contradiction with what is said in the precedent Gemara.²⁰ In fact, Rashi’s commentary *ad locum* expands also on the Babylonian rivers and palm-trees’ bitterness or fruitlessness. R. Samuel does not speak of Nabuchodonosor but underlines the moral misconduct of the Babylonians (= the rivers) in the Jewish exile: in spite of tokens of solidarity they were jumping for joy, ‘flumina Babylonis cantantia destructionem Hierusalem’, a clear reference to Ps 137.

Which are the aims of the *Extractiones*?

The *Extractiones* do not seem to underline that the great masters of the Talmud are the descendants of the worst people. Or is this precisely their aim? At least this is not clearly stated. So it seems difficult to see in the Latin text any malicious reference to the Jewish people or to the Talmudic masters. Perhaps the present text of San 96b (2) belongs to the ‘more lenient climate in the mid 1240s under Innocent IV’.

19. Jerome Schottenstein (*Sanhedrin*) translates: ‘the descendants of Sisera taught Torah’, but vocalizes *lamdu*=learned.

20. According to some modern Talmud experts, one of the main aims of the Stammaim was to avoid the contradictions of a *sugya*.

5.7. *Ammon and Moab, the Evil Neighbours of Jerusalem*

Ammon and Moab, the wicked neighbours of the holy city, sent seven letters to king Nabuchodonosor asking him to come and conquer Jerusalem (bSan 96b [3]).²¹ In the fourth request they want to assure the king that the Lord will not come back soon, because He has taken on his travel enough money for a long absence: “saccum pecuniae secum tulit” [Pr 7:20] et iusti sunt argentum’. Rashi *ad locum* applies the phrase to the righteous who have died. And so probably does the Latin translation. The biblical proof for ‘iusti sunt argentum’ is taken from the metaphor of Hosea 3:2 (‘et fodi eam mihi quindecim argenteis’) as a reference to the deliverance of Israel (the unfaithful wife) from Egypt through the merits of the righteous ones (among the Jews) who are described as *silver* (Schottenstein’s note). ‘Quindecim argenteis’ is seen as an allusion to the acquisition of her – the wife, Israel – on the fifteenth of Nissan.²² The authors of the *Extractiones* do not develop such a high and complicated theology. They seem here also more pedagogic, even if they retain the idea of acquisition of the unfaithful wife by God through the merits of the righteous: ‘et fodi eam mihi quindecim argenteis’ (Hos 3:2).

In their fifth request, Ammon and Moab want to guarantee that He will only come back at the appointed time: ‘Posuit eis terminum, sicut scriptum est: “in die plenae lunae reversurus”’, Pr 7:20. The Latin translation deletes בְּיָתוֹ (ל) = ‘to his house’ (Gemara) as unnecessary. But it is more difficult to explain why it keeps the next biblical phrase (‘bucinate in neomenia tuba in insigni die sollemnitatis vestrae’, Ps 80:4, which does not offer anything new (not so in the Gemara where the quotation proves the meaning of כֶּסֶף, *plenae lunae*, which appears in Pr and Ps 80 (81), *neomenia*).

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

As before, the authors of the *Extractiones* are more pedagogic in their translation than the original Gemara. But their real aim is difficult to understand. Perhaps they want to say that there were only (!) fifteen Jewish righteous who merited the main salvation act of God, the Exodus. Be that as it may, it is not made clear in the *Extractiones*. In fact, MSS *P* and *Z* of the *Extractiones* in a marginal note see the whole text as a ‘fabula’, i.e. something which is difficult to believe: seven (!) letters to the great king Nabuchodonosor.

21. See again the Appendix.

22. Cf. Hul 92a.

5.8. *The Messiah Is Named bar Nafli, i.e. the Son of the Fallen Kingdom of David*

The main subject of all Jewish-Christian controversies is the Messiah. Has the Messiah already come? When will he come? In San 96b (4) – 97a (1), we find a dialogue between R. Nahman and R. Yiṣḥaq on the coming of the Messiah. The pivotal question is the meaning of the expression ‘filius cadens’ which is the name supposedly given to the Messiah in Am 9:11: ‘in die illo suscitabo tabernaculum David *quod cecidit*’. According to R. Nahman, the prophecy refers to the fallen dynastic kingdom of David. R. Yiṣḥaq, who seems to be reporting the words of R. Yoḥanan, interprets metaphorically the biblical quotation as impoverishment of the Talmudic training in the midst of all kinds of calamities:

minorabuntur sapientes magistri et remanentium finient oculi in tristitia et suspirio et angustiae magnae et mala fata renovabuntur: antequam prima finiantur alia festinabunt venire.

The Gemara adds to the decrease of scholars: ‘And for the rest of the people [...] harsh decrees will be constantly appearing anew, גזרות קשות מתחדשות’. The *Extractiones* skip (as unnecessary) ‘for the rest of the people’ and translate גזרות קשות מתחדשות as ‘mala fata renovabuntur’. Perhaps the Latin translators did not want to refer to the persecutions by Christian kingdoms so common in their days.

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

Possibly the Latin translators wanted to show that the Messiah had already come because all these troubles are part of the everyday experience of the contemporary Jews. Of course, this could really be upheld in the controversies. Though the same events could be taken as meaning quite the opposite: all these calamities are not yet totally present, the *heble ha-mašiah* (the messianic sufferings preceding the son of David and announcing the end of the world) are still only a hope, and so is the Messiah. If our literary analysis is not wrong, we might have here another sample of the ‘more lenient climate in the mid 1240s under Innocent IV’, as in our reading of bSanhedrin 96a (4) and 96b (2).

5.9. *The Seven-Year Cycle Preceding the Messiah’s Arrival*

The *Extractiones* (bSan 97a [2]) describe what will happen to the world in a cycle of six thousand years. In the first year and in the second there will be famine in some areas (and so also in the fourth year). In the third year ‘morientur viri et mulieres et iusti et homines operum – virtutum –’. ‘Justi’ is not the translation of טף (children). Probably, the translators had another Gemara that did not contain טף, and so ‘justi’ has to be taken as a correct translation of הטידים (Gemara). Next, אנשי מעשה is translated as ‘homines operum’, a Semitism which is difficult to understand in Latin,

whence the gloss ‘virtutum’. In the fifth year ‘saturitas magna et lex revertetur ad discentes’. After ‘saturitas magna’ the Gemara adds: ‘and (people) will eat and drink and rejoice’. This was considered unnecessary by the Latin translators. So the Latin scene becomes more sorrowful. In the sixth year ‘exibunt voces – glossa Salomonis: quia dicetur: Filius David venit, filius David venit –’. This is a literal translation of the Gemara. The gloss adds Rashi’s exegesis: ‘there will be voices that the son of David comes’. The gloss wants to make the text clearer. In the seventh year ‘proelia – glossa Salomonis: inter Israhel et gentes saeculi –’. In fact, Rashi says: ‘between idolatrous nations and Israel’. The *Extractiones* changed ‘idolatrous nations’ into ‘gentes saeculi’, which sounds much better to Christian ears. The fragment ends by announcing when the Messiah will come: ‘In the aftermath of the seventh (year) the son of David will come’.

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

Again, the translators want to offer a clearer text, which is more pedagogic. The gloss takes the idea (not the wording) from Rashi. He in fact explains ‘proelia’ (*milhamot*) as wars ‘between the idolatrous nations and Israel’. The gloss of the *Extractiones* seems to soften Rashi’s wording: ‘[proelia] inter Israhel et gentes saeculi’. If the translators had kept ‘[wars] between the idolatrous nations and the Jews’, they could have argued: see how the Talmud mocks the Christian nations: ‘idolatrous nations’. It is true that we are talking only of a gloss, but one may ask why the translators did not take advantage of Rashi’s pronouncement (as they did in other fragments). Perhaps we have here another sample of a ‘more lenient climate’ of the sequential *Extractiones* (similarly in bSan 96b [4] – 97a [1] and elsewhere).

5.10. *When the Synagogue or the bet midrash Is Used for Licentiousness*

The fragment (bSan 97a [3]) is a *baraita*, an old tannaitic piece transmitted orally that was eventually put into writing by the Amoraim or the Stammaim. The *baraitot* often contain biblical exegesis, in our case we have only Is 59:15, understood as a messianic statement. In fact, any of the following verses (vv. 16-20) could be taken as messianic, especially v. 20: וּבֵא לִצִּיּוֹן גּוֹאֵל, ‘and a redeemer will come to Zion’. Yet, the tannaitic tradition chose v. 15, probably because of the general messianic context of the chapter. The Latin translators took the wording of the quotation from the Vulgata, ‘facta est veritas in oblivionem et qui recessit a malo praedae patuit’, but understood the terms as they sound in the Gemara/Hebrew biblical text: וּסְרַ מֵרַע מִשְׁתּוּלֵל, ‘hoc est quicumque recedet a malo deridebitur a creaturis’. The quotation fits very well the *baraita* which has at its very beginning: ‘in tempore quo filius David veniet erunt domus placitorum meretricum²³ – glossa: ubi docebatur lex erunt meretrices’, i.e. the place where the Talmudic truth is to be taught has become a house of licen-

23. MS Z offers ‘meretricium’.

tiousness. ‘Placitorum’ comes from ‘placitum’ and is understood as: there ‘will be houses of (carnal) pleasures, of prostitutes’. However, the translation does not run fluidly, whence the appearance of the gloss ‘ubi docebatur lex erunt meretrices’. The Gemara reads: בית הוועד יהיה לזנות, ‘the meeting place (the *bet ha-midrash* or the synagogue) will be used for licentiousness’. Then the righteous will have to wander from one place to another: ‘iusti ibunt de villa in villam nec aliquis miserabitur illorum’. In the Gemara the subject of the sentence is ‘and the men of the frontier will wander [...]’ The Latin ‘iusti’ probably goes back to Rashi. The picture of the persecuted righteous grows somber in ‘sanguis scribarum fetebit’. The Gemara says: ‘The wisdom of scholars will decay, תסרה (or putrify or become vapid)’. It is difficult to see why the Latin translators have chosen ‘the scholars’ blood’ instead of ‘the wisdom of scholars’. Probably this is a misreading or the translators wanted to dramatize the story.

After the description of the persecuted Jews, appears the pursuers’ identity card: ‘et facies generationis illius quasi facies canum’ (mSot 9:15). The translators speak in general terms, the reference being purposely to the whole ‘generation’, not directly to Christian pursuers. The ‘faces of dogs’ have been differently interpreted in the Jewish Talmudic tradition: to act like a dog, with no shame or to act brazenly.²⁴

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

Probably behind this Latin translation one might see the Jewish circumstances in the exile, although a bit dramatized. And so our fragment is probably another sample of the more lenient ambience of the sequential *Extractiones* (cf. our analysis on bSan 96a [4]; bSan 96b [2]; bSan 96b [4] – 97a [1]; bSan 97a [2]).

5.11. *Living in a City Named Kushta, ‘Truth’*

The parable (bSan 97a[4]) tells a story about men who spoke only the truth in a city called ‘truth’, קושטא. So the Gemara digresses in order to report an aggada which apparently has nothing to do with the messianic hopes we were talking about. Yet, it has to be observed that the absence of ‘the truth’, האמת, was one of the main signs of the coming of the Messiah in the last fragment. However, in our previous fragment the truth was God’s revelation, while at present the matter is simply not to change the truth in the speech, not to lie. This is what R. Tivioni promises: he would never lie (‘even if they would give him all the riches in the world’)²⁵ because of what happened to him: ‘Once he visited a certain town named Kushta (Truth) whose inhabitants would not tell a lie’. In such a case the people merit to retain all

24. Schottenstein in his note ad loc. quotes in this sense bBes 25b, though there Simeon b. Lakish is talking about the strength of Israel among the nations and about the dog’s strength: שלוש עוין הוּן (כלב בחיית).

25. ‘Si daretur ei tota concavitas mundi, non mutaret se a verbo suo’ is a literal translation of הוּן יְהִי לִיהּ כֹּל חַלְלֵי דְעֻלְמָא כל חללי דעלמא.

the years that have been predetermined for them, at birth, by God. They kept their word. So God kept His own:²⁶ no one died before his day in Kushta. R. Tivioni took a woman from that city as his wife and had two sons from her. One day, while his wife was shampooing her hair, her neighbour came and knocked on the door. The rabbi who thought that it would be improper to say what his wife was doing told the neighbour that she was not there. ‘And immediately his two sons died’. The people of the place came and asked what was going on. R. Tivioni told them what happened. Then the inhabitants of the city urged R. Tivioni’s family to leave the city and go away.

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

The aim may be to show the cruelty of the punishment: the ‘lie’ being simply because of the embarrassment (when it is correct to lie), the story could be taken as a cruelty not warranted. The story could be seen by the Latin translators also as a ‘fabula’, as is stated in the margins of MSS *P* and *Z*.

5.12. *When the Messiah Will Come, the World Will Be Purified*

R. Nehoray interprets mSota 9:15 (bSan 97a [5]) on the absence of respect towards the elders of the family as a sign of the messianic times. Curiously, at the end of the quotation we read: ‘a son is not ashamed before his father’ (Mishnah and Gemara), but the *Extractiones* seem to read in their Talmudic copy ‘nec filius erubescet matrem’. Then comes another expounding of the messianic times which in the original is attributed to R. Nehemiah: the messianic days will be of increasing presumption and dearth; the whole world ‘will turn to be unbelieving’ (‘convertetur ad infidelitatem de Talmud’), while the Gemara has ‘the entire Kingdom²⁷ will turn to heresy, *minut*’, which could be understood as a direct reference to the Christian kingdom, because often (though not always) *minim/minut* means Christian heresy in the old Jewish writings. Probably the translators want to avoid a direct confrontation with the Christian faith.

Next we find R. Isaac’s dictum which gives the same meaning to the quotation of the Mishnah. The biblical proof which follows in the original Gemara comes from the mouth of Rabba – and not from R. Isaac as in the *Extractiones* –: ‘teneri lepra mundissima iudicabit eo quod omnis in candorem versa sit’ (Lev 13:13). We do not know where the Latin translators took their text from. But the meaning of the biblical/Talmudic quotation is clear enough: ‘it is all turned white, he is clean’. When all have turned heretics, it is a sign that the world is about to be purified by the coming of the Messiah.²⁸

26. Schottenstein’s note.

27. The Mishnah (Sot 9:15) has: ...המלכות.

28. So in the English translation of the *Babylonian Talmud* by Jacob Neusner.

Which are the *Extractiones*' aims?

The *Extractiones* do not want to issue a harsh pronouncement against the Christian kingdom, if our reading of the text is correct. They speak only against heresy in general. Probably this has again to do with the 'more lenient climate' of the sequential *Extractiones* we have found before.²⁹

5.13. *The Desperation of Salvation Is the Grave Sin of the Jews*

The *Extractiones* (bSan 97a [6]) begin with a biblical quotation ('iudicabit Dominus populum suum et in servis suis consolabitur videbitque infirmata sit manus etc.' Dt 32:36)', which does not seem to be taken from the Vulgata.³⁰ The Gemara, as usual, gives only the beginning of the verse, כִּי יִדִין ה' עִמּוֹ. For pedagogic reasons the authors of the *Extractiones* write out the whole biblical text that suits them. But they do not translate directly from the Hebrew, otherwise they would not have avoided the biblical כִּי (*because*): the Messiah will come when (or *because*) – כִּי – the Almighty God will see that the hand is going (or 'the hands [of the people] will go [empty]', Rashi).³¹ If we compare the Gemara text with the wording of the *Extractiones*, we realize that they differ considerably. The Gemara says: 'the son of David will not come until the informers have become numerous', which is left out by the *Extractiones*. The Schottenstein edition in note 44 speaks of a common Jewish interpretation of the biblical אֲזֵלָה יָד as 'the power is going up' (i.e. it is growing) and it refers to those who inform against the Jews to foreign authorities. When these informers become too successful, God will bring the redemption (Rashi). But the *Extractiones* do not seem to me to be using at all אֲזֵלָה יָד, 'infirmata sit manus'. Also, the *Extractiones* add to the Gemara: 'et *myinin* – increduli in Talmud – multiplicabuntur'.³² Here again they interpret *minim* as a general term, at least so does the gloss ('increduli in Talmud').

The *Extractiones* end by quoting R. Zera's dictum: 'quando inveniebat magistros qui orabant pro Messia, dicebat eis: Rogo vos quod non adfligatis vos'. 'Qui orabant pro messia', instead of 'dealing with it, דַּמְעָסְקֵי בֵיה, (the messianic timing)', is also a pedagogic addition. 'Quod non adfligatis vos' stands for 'not to delay (the coming of the Messiah)' (Gemara).

Which are the *Extractiones*' aims?

'Et desperabunt de redemptione [...] istud est contra Deum'. The last statement is

29. bSan 96a (4); 96b (2); 96b (4); 97a (1); 97a (3).

30. The MSS *F9*, *G*, *C* and *Z* offer 'videbit quod', more correct.

31. Note 46 of the ed. of the Talmud Bavli by Schottenstein.

32. 'Et pictavina deficiet'. The rendering of the lowest Talmudic denomination for money, a coin, *prutah*, by 'pictavina' (a small coin: *parva pictavina* already used in Poitiers in the tenth century) is a pedagogic adaptation of the translators to their own times.

found only in the Latin translation. The *Extractiones* render literally the preceding pronouncement of the Gemara, ‘et desperabunt de redemptione (איתיישו מן הגאולה)’: the desperation of salvation is a grave sin against the Almighty God. So they can blame Talmudic Judaism, ‘istud est contra Deum’. They do not want to pay attention to the plain context of the Gemara: the Messiah will come when the Jews will lose their confidence in the (imminent) messianic redemption (גאולה).

5.14. Dating the End of the World

The *Extractiones* (bSan 97a [7]) begin by quoting Is 2:11. The biblical context of Is 2:11 suits perfectly the matter that has been treated till now in the Gemara: the entire world will turn to heresy. Is 2:8s says that the world turned to idolatry. In Is 2:11 we see that then ‘exaltabitur Dominus solus in die illa’. The Gemara (and *Extractiones*) tries to propose a date for this day: ‘For six thousand years the world will exist’ and then “‘exaltabitur Dominus solus in die illa’ [Is 2,11] – hoc est in septimo millenario nullus erit nisi Deus –’. The Latin seems to translate the Isaian text from the Gemara (or from the Hebrew biblical text). The glosses are meant to explain the text: but the second one seems to go even a bit further: it *will exist only Almighty God*, which is not necessarily what the Gemara wants to convey (with the Hebrew Bible). Both could be understood perfectly as: *God alone will be exalted on that day*.

Which are the *Extractiones*’ aims?

The *Extractiones* do not seem to be interested in the distinction between the different verbs conveyed by the Gemara (to be destroyed and to cease): ‘the world will be destroyed – הרוב – for one thousand years’. Another opinion: ‘[...] will be destroyed – הרוב – for two thousand years’ (R. Katina and R. Abaye). And in the *baraita* we read that one year out of seven years the world will cease of any activity, ‘requiescet’, משמט, as it suits a ‘sabbatical year’ (‘sabbatical millennium that causes cessation), משמטת. The ‘proof’ is taken from Is 2:11, ‘et exaltabitur Dominus solus in die illa’, because *dies illa* is ‘dies sabbati’ (Ps 91:1 = 92:1 of the Hebrew Bible): ‘Hoc est in die quae tota est sabbatum – id est in septimo millenario –’. The *Extractiones* (and the Gemara) want to finish with the quotation of Ps 89:4 (90:4): ‘because in your eyes a thousand years are like yesterday’; i.e. *that* day means a thousand years. Curiously, the Latin translators kept the intricate rabbinic argument.

Thus, the end of the world is understood in two different ways in the *Extractiones* and in the Gemara: as a destroyed or as a desolate world. In any case, this does not help us to understand the actual aims of the *Extractiones*. Perhaps its authors wanted to earmark the whole fragment as a ‘stultitia’, as it is written in the margin of MS Z. How then should we understand the *Extractiones*’ ‘stultitia’? Is our fragment of the *Extractiones* so labeled because of their disdain for any kind of speculation about the end of the world? Is the marginal note pointing to Joachim of Fiore’s eschatological prophecies?

6. Conclusion

In the literary analysis of the sequential *Extractiones* from bSanhedrin one can also observe many small differences between the Latin translation and the extant editions of the Vulgata, like the addition of ‘enim’ or ‘contra’ instead of ‘adversum’ (e.g. at bSan 97a [5]) and so on. However, they do not seem to be meaningful for our purpose. Likewise, our analysis has not paid attention to the names of the rabbis who handed down the oral tannaitic traditions (the *Extractiones* themselves avoided them several times). They do not seem to me to be meaningful at all.

What can be said about the main issue of our study, the aims of the *Extractiones*? First, not all the fragments are hostile. They are not hostile at least in bSanhedrin 96a (4), 96b (2), 96b (4) – 97a (1), 97a (2), 97a (3), 97a (5). The only ones which can definitely be called unfriendly are: bSanhedrin 96a (5) and 96b (1), the last one being particularly opposed and most malicious. The following fragments seem doubtful: bSanhedrin 96a (2), 96a (3), 96b (2), 96b (3), 97a (4), 97a (7). So it has to be underlined that almost half of the fragments (six of fourteen) are not hostile. Both the unfriendly ones and those which I call doubtful, suit perfectly the years after the death of Gregory IX (1241), when pope Innocent IV showed in his letters more understanding for the Jews in spite of his condemnation of the Talmud (May 1244). In any case, the fragments our *Extractiones* do not seem to be written uniformly with the same intention behind every extract.

Appendix: The Latin Text of bSanhedrin 96a-97a³³

San 96a (1) Commuta te in quo adfer forcipes et tonde te. Ubi accipiam? Dixit ei Deus: Intra in domum illam et adfer. Ivit et invenit angelos ministerii et visi sunt ei quasi homines qui molebant nucleos et ait illis: Tradite mihi forcipes. Qui dixerunt ei: Mole nobis sextarium istorum nucleorum et quaeremus tibi. Interim, dum moratus est, venit nox. Et ait illis: Date mihi ignem. Abiit unus et adtulit. Dum sufflavit posuit angelus ignem in barba ipsius. Tunc totondit ei caput et hoc est quod scriptum est: ‘et barbam universam’ (Is. 7, 20). Dicit rab Papa: Hoc est quod homines dicunt: Frica goy et placet ei; pone ignem in barba eius, nondum saturatus eris derisione illius. Abiit ergo Sennacherib et invenit asserem de archa Noe et ait: Hic est magnus Deus qui evadere fecit Noe de diluvio. Dixitque Sennacherib: Si prosperatus fuero quo ego vado, offeram coram te duos filios meos. Audierunt hoc filii sui et interfecerunt eum et hoc quod scriptum est: ‘Adramelech et Sarasar filii sui occiderunt eum’ (IV Reg. 19, 37).

33. For the full text with all its variant readings, see the edition *Extractiones de Talmud per ordinem sequentialem*, pp. 350-356. I thank the editors for having shared their text with me.

San 96a (2) ‘Divisis sociis, inruit super eos nocte’ (Gen. 14, 15). Dicit rby Iohannen: Angelus qui missus est Abrahae vocatus est Nox. Rby Isaac dicit: Factum fuit Abrahae opus noctis, sicut scriptum est: ‘de caelo dimicatum est contra eos, stellae manentes in cursu et in ordine suo contra Sisaram pugnaverunt’ (Iud. 5, 20) – glossa: sicut stellae pugnaverunt pro Barac, ita pro Abraham contra reges –.

San 96a (3) ‘Persecutus est eos usque Dan’ (Gen. 14, 14). Dicit rby Iohannen: Quando Abraham venit ad Dan, debilitata fuit virtus eius. Vidit enim quod filii filiorum suorum servituri erant in Dan idolatriae, unde scriptum est: ‘posuit unum in Dan et alium in Bethel’ (III Reg. 12, 29 – s. hebr. –). Similiter ille impius – Sennacherib – non habuit vires donec venit in Dan, sicut scriptum est: ‘a Dan auditus est fremitus equorum eius’ (Ier. 8, 16).

San 96a (4) Rby Iuda mandavit discipulis suis: Sitis muniti de honorando sene qui oblitus est Talmud vi senii et de filiis idiotarum – inlitteratorum –, quia forsitan de ipsis exhibunt aliqui qui fient magistri.

San 96a (5) Dies in qua mortuus est Ahaz non habuit nisi duas horas, et, quando Ezechias fuit curatus ab infirmitate sua, Sanctus, benedictus sit ipse, restituit illas decem horas, sicut scriptum est: ‘reversus est sol decem lineis per gradus per quos descenderat’ (Is. 38, 8) in horologio Ahaz.

San 96b (1) Quando Nabuzardan combussit templum et vidit sanguinem Zachariae qui bulliebat dixit magistris: Quid est hoc? Responderunt: Hic est sanguis sacrificii qui effusus est. Et ait illis: Dicite verum, si non, pectinabo carnes vestras pectine ferreo! Et dixerunt: Pontifex et propheta fuit, qui arguebat nos et occidimus eum et ab illa hora non requievit. Dixitque eis: Pacificabo illum. Fecit itaque adduci magistros et occidit omnes, nec propter hoc quievit sanguis. Dixit eis iterum: Ego pacificabo eum. Et fecit venire de pueris scholarum magistrorum et occidit de illis nonagesies et quater decem milia. Nec propter hoc quievit. Tunc appropriavit ad ipsum et ait illi: Zaccharia, Zaccharia, meliores de eis occidi. Vis quod interficiam omnes? Continuo quievit. In illa hora cogitavit paenitentiam in corde suo et dixit: Quid? Israhel, qui non perdidit nisi unam animam – ita punitur, supple –. Iste homo, qui omnes hos, quid erit de ipso? Fugit et scripsit cartam et posuit in domo sua factusque est iudaeus.

San 96b (2) De filiis filiorum Nahaman, Nabuzardani, Sisarae, Sennacherib et Aman fuerunt magistri – Talmud –. Et etiam de filiis filiorum illius impii – Nabuchodonosor – voluit Deus facere intrare sub alas suas. Dixerunt angeli ministerii coram Sancto, benedictus sit ipse: Domine saeculi, illius qui destruxit domum tuam et combussit palatium tuum vis filios ponere sub alis tuis? Hoc est quod scriptum est: ‘curavimus Babylonem et non est curata’ (Ier. 51, 9). Hula dicit: Hoc fuit Nabuchodonosor. Rby Samuhel dicit quod fuerunt flumina Babylonis – cantantia destructionem Hierusalem –.

San 96b (3) Dicit Hula: Amon et Moab mali vicini fuerunt Hierusalem. Quando audierunt prophetas prophetantes destructionem Hierusalem, mandaverunt Nabuchodonosor: Exi et veni. Mandavitque eis: Timeo ne faciant mihi sicut primis – Sennacherib et aliis –. Et responderunt: ‘non est vir in domo sua’ (Prov. 7, 19): et Deus dicitur ‘vir’, quia scriptum est: ‘Dominus quasi vir pugnator’ (Ex. 15, 3). Et rescripsit: Prope est et redibit. Responderunt: ‘abiit via longissima’ (Prov. 7, 19). Et iterum rescripsit: Sunt ibi iusti qui rogabunt et facient eum venire. Remandaverunt: ‘sacculum pecuniae secum tulit’ (Prov. 7, 20); et iusti sunt argentum, sicut scriptum est: ‘et fodi eam mihi quindecim argenteis’ (Os. 3, 2). Et iterum rescripsit: Paenitebunt et adducent eum. Et remandaverunt: Posuit eis terminum, sicut scriptum est: ‘in die plenae lunae reversurus’ (Prov. 7, 20). Et iterum: ‘bucinate in neomenia tuba in insigni die sollemnitatis vestrae’ (Ps. 80, 4). Et mandavit eis: Hiems est, nec possum venire propter nivem et pluviam. Rescripserunt: Veni per rupes montium, quia scriptum est: ‘emitte agnum, Domine, dominatorem terrae de Petra deserti ad montem filiae Sion’ (Is. 16, 1). Et remandavit: Si venirem, non est ibi locus in quo possem habitare. Et mandaverunt ei: Melius valent sepulchra eorum quam aulae tuae, sicut scriptum est: ‘in tempore illo ait Dominus: eicient ossa regum’ – etc. usque ibi: – ‘super faciem terrae erunt’ (Ier. 8, 1-2). – Tunc venit Nabuchodonosor super Hierusalem –.

De Messia

San 96b (4) Dixit rab Nahaman ad rby Isaac: Audisti quando filius cadens veniet? Et respondit: Quis est filius cadens? Qui ait: Messias. Messiam vocas filium cadentem? Ait illi: Etiam vere, sicut scriptum est: ‘in die illo suscitabo

San 97a (1) tabernaculum David quod cecidit’ (Am. 9, 11). Et dixit ei: Ita dicit rby Iohannen: In tempore in quo veniet Messias minorabuntur sapientes magistri et remanentium finient oculi in tristitia et suspirio et angustiae magnae et mala fata renovabuntur: antequam prima finiantur alia festinabunt venire

San 97a (2) Dicunt magistri: In primo anno hebdomadae in qua filius David veniet – Messias – verificabitur illa auctoritas: ‘pluam super unam civitatem et super alteram non pluam’ (Am. 4, 7 – s. hebr. –). In secundo anno mittentur sagittae famis. In tertio fames magna et morientur viri et mulieres et iusti et homines operum – virtutum – et lex tradetur oblivioni. In quarto saturitas et non saturitas. In quinto saturitas magna et lex revertetur ad discentes. In sexto exhibunt voces – glossa Salomonis: quia dicetur: Filius David venit, filius David venit –. In septimo proelia – glossa Salomonis: inter Israhel et gentes saeculi –. In exitu septimi veniet filius David.

San 97a (3) In tempore quo filius David veniet erunt domus placitorum meretricum – glossa: ubi docebatur lex erunt meretrices –. Iusti ibunt de villa in villam nec aliquis miserabitur illorum. Sanguis scribarum fetebit. Timentes peccatum abhorrebuntur et facies generationis illius quasi facies canum et veritas deficiet, sicut

scriptum est: ‘facta est veritas in oblivionem et qui recessit a malo praedae patuit’ (Is. 59, 15). Hoc est quicumque recedet a malo deridebitur a creaturis.

San 97a (4) Dicit Ravena: Ante dicebam quod non erat veritas in saeculo. Dixit mihi unus magistrorum qui vocabatur rab Tivioni quod, si daretur ei tota concavitas mundi, non mutaret se a verbo suo, retulitque mihi: Quidam vice hospitatus sum in quodam loco qui vocabatur ‘veritas’ et non mutabant ibi verba sua nec moriebatur ibi aliquis nisi in termino suo; et accepi uxorem ex eis fueruntque mihi duo filii ex illa. Una die sedit illa et lavabat caput suum, venit vicina eius et pulsavit ad ostium et ego dixi: Non est hic. Et statim mortui sunt duo filii mei. Venerunt homines istius loci coram me et dixerunt mihi: Quid est hoc? Respondi: Ita accidit. Et dixerunt mihi: Precibus rogamus te, exi de loco nostro ne mors impugnet nos sicut istos.

San 97a (5) Dicit rby Nahoray: Tempore quo filius David veniet, pueri facient verecundiam senibus et senes adsurgent pueris et filia consurget adversus matrem suam et nurus contra socrum suam et facies illius generationis sicut facies canis nec filius erubescet matrem. Nequitia crescet et simplicitas corruet. Vineam dabit fructum et vinum carum erit et totus mundus convertetur ad infidelitatem de Talmud – quia non credetur Talmud –. Et similiter dicit rby Isaac quod Messias non veniet, donec totus mundus conversus sit ad infidelitatem, sicut scriptum est: ‘teneri lepra mundissima iudicabit eo quod omnis in candorem versa sit’ (Lev. 13, 13) – hoc est: quando nullus credet in Talmud, tunc mundabuntur per Messiam –.

San 97a (6) Dicunt magistri: Scriptum est: ‘iudicabit Dominus populum suum et in servis suis consolabitur videbit quod infirmata sit manus’ etc. (Deut. 32, 36). Hoc est quia magistri Talmud minuentur et mynin – increduli in Talmud – multiplicabuntur et pictavina deficiet et desperabunt de redemptione et deficient domini et auxiliarii. Istud est contra Deum. Non habebit Israhel adiuvantem aut fulcientem. Sed rby Zera, quando inveniebat magistros qui orabant pro Messia, dicebat eis: Rogo vos quod non adfligatis vos. Legimus enim quod tria ventura sunt in hoc saeculo ex improvise, et ista sunt: Messias, inventio et morsus serpentis.

San 97a (7) Dicit rab Katina: Sex milibus annorum durabit mundus et unus – scilicet septimus millenarius – destruetur, sicut scriptum est: ‘et exaltabitur Dominus solus in die illa’ (Is. 2, 11) – hoc est: in septimo millenario nullus erit nisi Deus –. Dicit Abaie quod duplex millenarius destruetur, sicut scriptum est: ‘vivificabit nos post duos dies et die tertia suscitabit nos et vivemus in conspectu eius’ (Os. 6, 3). Legimus quod sicut requiescit unus annus de septem, ita mundus requiescet in septimo millenario, sicut scriptum est: ‘et exaltabitur Dominus solus in die illa’ (Is. 2, 11); et iterum: ‘psalmus cantici in die sabbati’ (Ps. 91, 1), hoc est, in die quae tota est sabbatum – id est in septimo millenario –, et hoc est quod scriptum est: ‘mille anni ante oculos tuos tamquam dies hesternae quae praeteriit’ (Ps. 89, 4).

San 97a (8) Discimus a domo Heliae prophetae quod sex milibus annorum du-

rabit mundus: duobus milibus in vanitate – sine lege –, duobus milibus sub lege et duobus milibus in diebus Messiae.

Bibliography

Sources

- Extractiones de Talmud per ordinem sequentialem*, ed. by Ulisse Cecini and Óscar de la Cruz, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 291 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018).
- Nezikin (The Babylonian Talmud)*, vol. 3 (London: Soncino Press, 1935).
- Sanhedrin (Talmud Bavli)*, ed. Jerome Schottenstein, 3 vols (Brooklyn, New York: Mesorah Publications, 1993-1995).
- The Babylonian Talmud. A Translation and Commentary*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, CD edition (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007).

Studies

- BERKOVITS, Eliezer, ‘Talmud, Babylonian’, in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 16 vols (New York: Macmillan, 1971-1972), vol. 15, pp. 755-768.
- CORTÈS, Enric, ‘Fragments de manuscrits hebreus i arameus descoberts de nou a l’Arxiu Diocesà de Girona. III’, *Revista catalana de teologia*, 10/1(1985), 31-52.
- , ‘Els fonaments del Judaisme postbiblic’, *Qüestions de vida cristiana*, 93 (1999) = *El Món Jueu*, 56-67.
- FIDORA, Alexander, ‘The Latin Talmud and its Translators: Thibaud de Sézanne vs. Nicholas Donin?’, *Henoch*, 37/1(2015), 17-28.
- , ‘Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions. The Two Versions of the Latin Talmud’, *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies*, 2/1 (2015), 63-78.
- GINZBERG, Louis, *On Jewish Law and Lore* (Canada/New York: Atheneum, 1977).
- HALIVNI, David Weiss, *Meqorot umesorot*, 5 vols (Tel-Aviv: Devir and Jerusalem. Jewish Theological Seminary, 1968-1994).
- JASTROW, Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1903).
- NEUSNER, Jacob, *The Formation of the Babylonian Talmud* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).
- RUBENSTEIN, Jeffrey L., *Talmudic Stories. Narrative Art, Composition, and Culture* (Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
- STEMBERGER, Günter, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, ninth, completely revised edition (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2011).