

▶ Having font/display problems? [Click here](#)

[About](#) • [Home](#) • [Mailing Lists](#) • [Help](#)

BROWSE

SEARCH

A - B - C - D - E - F - G - H - I - J - K - L - M - N
O - P - Q - R - S - T - U - V - W - X - Y - Z

[power search](#)

IN All Current Article
Article Titles Image Captions

TALMUD (print this article)

By : Wilhelm Bacher

ARTICLE HEADINGS:

- [The Name.](#)
- [Relation to Midrash.](#)
- [The Three Subjects of Study.](#)
- [The Gemara.](#)
- [Relation to Mishnah.](#)
- [The Palestinian Talmud.](#)
- [The Style of the Yerushalmi.](#)
- [Examples.](#)
- [Further Examples.](#)
- [Passages Repeated.](#)
- [The Haggadot of the Yerushalmi.](#)
- [Editions of the Babli.](#)
- [Missing Gemaras.](#)
- [Earliest Manuscript of the Babli.](#)
- [Examples from the Babli.](#)
- [Further Examples.](#)
- [Legal Example.](#)
- [Framework of Commentary.](#)
- [Haggadah of the Babli.](#)
- [Style and Language.](#)
- [The Halakah in Babli.](#)
- [The Framework Anonymous.](#)
- [Redaction.](#)
- [Technical Terms for Tradition.](#)
- [Date of Redaction.](#)
- [Activity of Jonah and Jose.](#)

Original Pages



Images



Discussion Forum

● This article has (1) message posts. [click here to view.](#)

[add](#)

[Activity of Raba.](#)

[Committed to Writing.](#)

[No Formal Ratification.](#)

[Influence of the Talmud.](#)

[Edict of Justinian.](#)

[Attacks on the Talmud.](#)

[Early Editions.](#)

["Variæ Lectiones" and Translations.](#)

[Function in Judaism.](#)

[Its Authority.](#)

Name of two works which have been preserved to posterity as the product of the Palestinian and Babylonian schools during the amoraic period, which extended from the third to the fifth century C.E. One of these compilations is entitled "Talmud Yerushalmi" (Jerusalem **Talmud**) and the other "Talmud Babli" (Babylonian **Talmud**). Used alone, the word "Talmud" generally denotes "Talmud Babli," but it frequently serves as a generic designation for an entire body of literature, since the **Talmud** marks the culmination of the writings of Jewish tradition, of which it is, from a historical point of view, the most important production.

The Name.

"Talmud" is an old scholastic term of the Tannaim, and is a noun formed from the verb "limmed" = "to teach." It therefore means primarily "teaching," although it denotes also "learning"; it is employed in this latter sense with special reference to the Torah, the terms "talmud" and "Torah" being usually combined to indicate the study of the Law both in its wider and in its more restricted sense, as in Pe'ah i. 1, where the term "talmud Torah" is applied to study as a religious duty. On the other hand, the learning acquired by study is also called "talmud," so that Akiba's pupil Judah ben Ilai could say: "He from whom one derives the greater part of his knowledge ["talmudo"] must be regarded as the teacher" (Tosef., B. M. ii., end; Yer. B. M. 8d; B. M. 33a has "okmah" instead of "talmud"). To designate the study of religion, the word "talmud" is used in contrast with "ma'aseh," which connotes the practise of religion. Akiba's view that on this account the "talmud" ranked

above the "ma'aseh" was adopted as a resolution by a famous conference at Lydda during the Hadrianic persecution (see Sifre, Deut. 41; id. 40b; Yer. Pes. 30b; Cant. R. ii. 14). The two terms are contrasted differently, however, in the tannaitic saying (B. B. 130b), "The Halakah [the principles guiding decisions in religious law] may not be drawn from a teaching of the master ["talmud"] nor be based upon an act of his ["ma'aseh"], unless the master expressly declare that the teaching or act under consideration is the one which is applicable to the practise."

In the second place, the word "talmud"—generally in the phrase "talmud lomar"—is frequently used in tannaitic terminology in order to denote instruction by means of the text of the Bible and of the exegetic deductions therefrom. In the third place, the noun "talmud" has the meaning which alone can be genetically connected with the name "Talmud"; in tannaitic phraseology the verb "limmed" denotes the exegetic deduction of a halakic principle from the Biblical text (for examples see R. H. ii. 9; Sifre, Num. 118); and in harmony with this meaning of the word "talmud" denotes that exposition of a halakic saying which receives an exegetic confirmation from the Biblical text. Of the terms, therefore, denoting the three branches into which the study of the traditional exegesis of the Bible was from earliest times divided by the Tannaim (see Jew. Encyc. iii. 163, s.v. [Bible Exegesis](#)), "midrash" was the one identical in content with "talmud" in its original sense, except that the Midrash, which includes any kind of Biblical hermeneutics, but more especially the halakic, deals with the Bible text itself, while the **Talmud** is based on the Halakah. The Midrash is devoted to Biblical exposition, the result being the Halakah (comp. the phrase "mi-kan ameru" [= "beginning here the sages have said"], which occurs frequently in the tannaitic Midrash and which serves to introduce halakic deductions from the exegesis). In the **Talmud**, on the other hand, the halakic passage is the subject of an exegesis based on the Biblical text.

Relation to Midrash.

In consequence of the original identity of "Talmud" and "Midrash," noted above, the former term is sometimes used instead of the latter in tannaitic sentences which enumerate the three branches of traditional science, Midrash, Halakah, and Haggadah (see Ber. 22a [comp. M. . 15a and Yer. Ber. 6c, 39]; id. 30a; Suk. 28a; B. B. 134a; Ab. R. N. xiv. [comp. Masseket Soferim, xvi. 8]; Yer. B. . 4b, 31 [comp. Sifre, Deut. 33]; Tosef., So ah, vii. 20 [comp. Yer. So ah 44a]), while sometimes both "Talmud" and "Midrash" are used (M. . 21a; Ta'an. 30a); it must be noted, however, that in the editions of the Babli, "Gemara" is usually substituted for "Talmud," even in the passages here cited. The word "Talmud" in all these places did not denote the study subsequently pursued by the Amoraim, but was used instead of the word "Midrash," although this did not preclude the later introduction of the term "Talmud" into tannaitic sayings, where it either entirely displaced "Midrash" or was used side by side with it.

After the term "Talmud" had come to denote the exegetic confirmation of the Halakah, it was applied also to the explanation and exposition of halakic passages in general. As early as the end of the tannaitic period, when the halakot were finally redacted by the patriarch Judah I. and were designated as "Mishnah," a term originally applied to the entire system of traditional learning, the **Talmud** was developed as a new division of this same science; and it was destined to absorb all others. In a baraita dating, according to the amora Johanan, from the days of Judah I. (B. M. 33a; comp. Yer. Shab. 15c, 22 et seq.), the Mishnah and the **Talmud** are defined as subjects of study side by side with the "Mi ra" (Bible), the study of the **Talmud** being mentioned first. To this baraita there is an addition, however, to the effect that more attention should be given to the Mishnah than to the **Talmud**. Johanan explains this passage by the fact that the members of Judah's academy, in their eagerness to investigate the **Talmud**, neglected the Mishnah; hence the patriarch laid stress upon the duty of studying the Mishnah primarily. In these passages the word "Talmud" is used not in its more restricted sense of the establishment of halakot by Biblical exegesis, but in its wider signification, in which it designates study for the purpose of elucidating the Mishnah in general, as

pursued after Judah's death in the academies of Palestine and Babylon. This baraita is, furthermore, an authentic document on the origin of the **Talmud**.

Three classes of members of the academy are mentioned in an anecdote referring to Judah I. (B. B. 8a): (1) those who devoted themselves chiefly to the Bible ("ba'ale Mi ra"); (2) those whose principal study was the Mishnah ("ba'ale Mishnah"); and (3) those whose main interest lay in the **Talmud** ("ba'ale **Talmud**"). This is the original reading of the passage, although the editions mention also the "ba'ale Halakah" and the "ba'ale Haggadah" (see below). These three branches of knowledge are, therefore, the same as those enumerated in B. M. 33a. Tan um b. anilai, a Palestinian amora of the third century, declared, with reference to this threefold investigation ('Ab. Zarah 19b): "Let the time given to study be divided into three parts: one-third for the Bible, one-third for the Mishnah, and one-third for the **Talmud**." In id. 33a this saying is quoted in the name of the tanna Joshua b. Hananiah, although this is probably a corruption of the name of Jose b. anina (amora). Yudan, a Palestinian amora of the fourth century, found in Eccl. xi. 9 an allusion to the pleasure taken in the three branches of study, Mi ra, Mishnah, and **Talmud**.

The Three Subjects of Study.

The old trichotomy of traditional literature was changed, however, by the acceptance of the Mishnah of Judah I., and by the new study of the **Talmud** designed to interpret it. The division termed "Halakot" (singular, "Halakah") in the old classification was then called "Mishnah," although in Palestine the Mishnah continued to be designated as "Halakot." The Midrash became a component part of the **Talmud**; and a considerable portion of the halakic Bible hermeneutics of the Tannaim, which had been preserved in various special works, was incorporated in the Babylonian **Talmud**. The Haggadah (plural, "Haggadot") lost its importance as an individual branch of study in the academies, although it naturally continued to be a subject of investigation, and a portion of it also was included in the **Talmud**. Occasionally the Haggadah is even designated as a special branch, being added as a fourth division to the

three already mentioned. Anina ben Pappa, an amora of the early part of the fourth century, in characterizing these four branches says: "The countenance should be serious and earnest in teaching the Scriptures, mild and calm for the Mishnah, bright and lively for the **Talmud**, and merry and smiling for the Haggadah" (Pesi . 110a; Pes. R. 101b; Tan., Yitro, ed. Buber, p. 17; Massek. Soferim, xvi. 2). As early as the third century Joshua ben Levi interpreted Deut. ix. 10 to mean that the entire Law, including Mi ra, Mishnah, **Talmud**, and Haggadah, had been revealed to Moses on Sinai (Yer. Pes. 17a, line 59; Meg. 74d, 25), while in Gen. R. lxvi. 3 the blessings invoked in Gen. xxvii. 28 are explained as "Mi ra, Mishnah, **Talmud**, and Haggadah." The Palestinian haggadist Isaac divided these four branches into two groups: (1) the Mi ra and the Haggadah, dealing with subjects of general interest; and (2) the Mishnah and the **Talmud**, "which can not hold the attention of those who hear them" (Pesi . 101b; see Bacher, "Ag. Pal. Amor." ii. 211).

According to a note of Tan uma ben Abba (of the latter part of the 4th cent.) on Cant. v. 14 (Cant. R. ad loc.), a student must be familiar with all four branches of knowledge, Mi ra, Mishnah, Halakah (the last-named term used here instead of "Tatmud"), and Haggadah; while Samuel b. Judah b. Abun, a Palestinian amora of the same century, interpreted Prov. xxviii. 11 as an allusion to the halakist ("man of the **Talmud**") and to the haggadist ("man of the Haggadah"; Yer. Hor. 48c; see also Pesi . 176a; Lev. R. xxi., **Talmud** and Haggadah). Here may be mentioned also the concluding passage of the mishnaic treatise Abot (v., end): "At the age of five to the Bible; at the age of ten to the Mishnah; at the age of fifteen to the **Talmud**." This is ascribed by many to the ancient tanna Samuel ha- a on (see Bacher, "Ag. Tan." i. 378), although the sequence of study which it mentions is evidently that which was customary during the amoraic period (comp. also the saying of Abaye in Ket. 50a).

The following passages from the Babylonian **Talmud** may likewise serve to illustrate the special usage which finally made the word "Talmud" current as the name of the work. Samuel, one of the earliest Babylonian amoraim, interpreted the words of Zech. viii. 10,

"neither was there any peace to him that went out or came in," as applying to the restlessness of one who turns from the **Talmud** and confines himself to the study of the Mishnah (ag. 10a). Johanan, the younger Palestinian contemporary of Samuel, extends the allusion to "him also who turns from one **Talmud** to study another," referring here to Babli and to Yerushalmi. It is very possible that he had noticed that in the case of his numerous Babylonian pupils the transition from the mishnaic exegesis which they had acquired at home to that of the Palestinian schools was not made without disturbing their peace of mind. Allusions to the "Talmud of Babylon" by two prominent Babylonians who settled in Palestine (Ze'era and Jeremiah) have likewise been pre-served (B. M. 85c; Sanh. 24a); and they confirm Johanan's conception of the meaning of the term.

The Gemara.

In Babylonia the Aramaic noun "gemar" (emphatic state, "gemara") was formed from the verb נָטַר (which does not occur in Palestinian texts), having the meaning of "learn." This substantive accordingly designates that which has been learned, and the learning transmitted to scholars by tradition, although it is used also in a more restricted sense to connote the traditional exposition of the Mishnah; and it therefore gained currency as a designation of the **Talmud**. In the modern editions of the Babylonian **Talmud** the term "Gemara" occurs very frequently in this sense; but in nearly every case it was substituted at a later time for the objectionable word "Talmud," which was interdicted by the censor. The only passage in which "Gemara" occurs with the meaning of "Talmud" in the strict sense of that term and from which it was not removed by the censor is 'Er. 32b, where it is used by Na man bar Jacob, a Babylonian amora of the second half of the third century. For further details see Bacher, "Gemara," in "Hebrew Union College Annual," pp. 26-36, Cincinnati, 1904, where the word is shown to have been used for "Talmud" from the geonic period (see also idem, "Die Terminologie der Amoräer," pp. 31 et seq., Leipsic, 1905). The later editions of the **Talmud** frequently substitute for the word "Gemara" the abbreviation ש"ס (Aramaic, שְׁתַּא סְדְרֵי = "the six orders of

the Mishnah"), which has come to be, with the pronunciation "Shas," a popular designation for the Babylonian **Talmud**.

Here may be mentioned the term "Shem'ata" (שְׁמַעְתָּא), which was used in Babylonia to designate the halakic portion of the **Talmud**, and which was thus contrasted with "Haggadah" (see *ag.* 26a; *So ah* 20a; *Sanh.* 38b; comp. also *M.* . 23a, where "Shemu'ah," the Hebrew form, occurs in a baraita). In the tenth century this word was used in Mohammedan circles to designate Jewish tradition as well as its chief source, the **Talmud**; so that Mas'udi refers to Saadia Gaon as an "ashma'ti" (i.e., a believer in the tradition), using this term in contrast to "Karaites" (see Pinsker, "Li u e admoniyyot," i. 5). A "Kitab al-Ashma'ah" (i.e., "Talmud") is also mentioned ("Z. D. M. G." lviii. 659).

The theorem that the **Talmud** was the latest development of traditional science has been demonstrated by this discussion of the meaning and the use of the word itself. The **Talmud** accordingly dates from the time following the final redaction of the Mishnah; and it was taught in the academy of Judah I. as the commentary on the tannaitic Halakah. The editorial activity which, from the mass of halakic material that had accumulated since Akiba's Mishnah, crystallized the **Talmud** in accordance with the systematic order introduced by that teacher, implied the interpretation and critical examination of the Halakah, and was, therefore, analogous to **Talmudic** methodology.

There were, likewise, many elements of tannaitic tradition, especially the midrashic exegesis of the Bible, as well as numerous halakic interpretations, lexicographical and material, which were ready for incorporation into the **Talmud** in its more restricted meaning of the interpretation of the Mishnah of Judah I. When this Mishnah became the standard halakic work, both as a source for decisions of questions of religious law, and, even more especially, as a subject of study in the academies, the **Talmud** interpretation of the mishnaic text, both in theory and in practise, naturally became the most important branch of study, and included the other branches of traditional science,

being derived from the Halakah and the Midrash (halakic exegesis), and also including haggadic material, though to a minor degree. The **Talmud**, however, was not an independent work; and it was this characteristic which constituted the chief difference between it and the earlier subjects of study of the tannaitic period. It had no form of its own, since it served as a running commentary on the mishnaic text; and this fact determined the character which the work ultimately assumed.

Relation to Mishnah.

The **Talmud** is practically a mere amplification of the Mishnah by manifold comments and additions; so that even those portions of the Mishnah which have no **Talmud** are regarded as component parts of it and are accordingly included in the editions of Babli. The history of the origin of the **Talmud** is the same as that of the Mishnah—a tradition, transmitted orally for centuries, was finally cast into definite literary form, although from the moment in which the **Talmud** became the chief subject of study in the academies it had a double existence, and was accordingly, in its final stage, redacted in two different forms. The Mishnah of Judah I. was adopted simultaneously in Babylon and Palestine as the halakic collection par excellence; and at the same time the development of the **Talmud** was begun both at Sepphoris, where the Mishnah was redacted, and at Nehardea and Sura, where Judah's pupils Samuel and Rab engaged in their epoch-making work. The academies of Babylon and of Palestine alike regarded the study of the Mishnah and its interpretation as their chief task. The Amoraim, as the directors and members of these academies were called ([see Amora](#)), became the originators of the **Talmud**; and its final redaction marked the end of the amoraic times in the same way that the period of the Tannaim was concluded by the compilation of the Mishnah of Judah I. Like the Mishnah, the **Talmud** was not the work of one author or of several authors, but was the result of the collective labors of many successive generations, whose toil finally resulted in a book unique in its mode of development.

The Palestinian **Talmud**.

Before entering into any discussion of the origin and peculiar form of the **Talmud**, the two recensions of the work itself may be briefly described. The general designation of the Palestinian **Talmud** as "Talmud Yerushalmi," or simply as "Yerushalmi," is precisely analogous to that of the Palestinian Targum. The term originated in the geonic period, when, however, the work received also the more precise designations of "Talmud of Palestine," "Talmud of the Land of Israel," "Talmud of the West," and "Talmud of the Western Lands." Yerushalmi has not been preserved in its entirety; large portions of it were entirely lost at an early date, while other parts exist only in fragments. The editio princeps (ed. Bomberg, Venice, 1523 et seq.), on which all later editions are based, terminates with the following remark: "Thus far we have found what is contained in this **Talmud**; and we have endeavored in vain to obtain the missing portions." Of the four manuscripts used for this first edition (comp. the note at the conclusion of Shab. xx. 17d and the passage just cited), only one is now in existence; it is preserved in the library of the University of Leyden (see below). Of the six orders of the Mishnah, the fifth, *odashim*, is missing entirely from the Palestinian **Talmud**, while of the sixth, *ohorot*, it contains only the first three chapters of the treatise Niddah (iv. 48d-51b). The treatises of the orders of the Mishnah are arranged in the following sequence in this **Talmud**; the pagination also is given here, in parentheses, to indicate the length of the several treatises:

I. Zera'im:

Berakot (2a-14d);

Pe'ah (15a-21b);

Demai (21c-26c);

Ki'layim (26d-32d);

Shebi'it (33a-39d);

Terumot (40a-48b);

Ma'aserot (48c-52a);

Ma'aser Sheni (52b-58d);

allah (57a-60b);

'Orlah (60c-63b);

Bikkurim (63c-65d).

II. Mo'ed:

Shabbat (2a-18a);

'Erubin (18a-26d);

Pesa'im (27a-37d);

Yoma (38a-45c);

She'alim (45c-51b);

Sukkah (51c-55d);

Rosh ha-Shanah (56a-59d);

Be'ah (59d-63b), Ta'anit (63c-69c);

Megillah (69d-75d);

agigah (75d-79d);

Mo'ed a'an (80a-83d).

III. Nashim:

Yebamot (2a-15a);

So'ah (15a-24c);

Ketubot (24c-36b);

Nedarim (36c-42d);

Gi'in (43a-50d);

Nazir (51a-58a);

iddushin (58a-66d).

IV. Nezi'in:

Baba'mamma (2a-7c);

Baba Me'i'a (7c-12c);

Baba Batra (12d-17d);

Sanhedrin (17d-30c);

Makkot (30d-32b);

Shebu'ot (32c-38d);

'Abodah Zarah (39a-45b);

Horayot (45c-48c).

VI. 'Ehorot:

Niddah (48d-51b).

In order ii. the last four chapters of Shabbat are missing from the Palestinian **Talmud**, while the treatise She'alim has been incorporated into the editions of the Babylonian **Talmud** from Yerushalmi, and is found also in a Munich manuscript of Babli. In order iv. the treatises Abot and 'Eduyot are missing in both **Talmudim**, and the concluding chapter of Makkot is wanting in Yerushalmi. In order vi. the treatise Niddah ends abruptly after the first lines of ch. iv.

Maimonides expressly states in the introduction to his commentary on the Mishnah that in his time Yerushalmi was extant for the entire first five orders (comp.

Abraham ibn Daud, ed. Neubauer, "M. J. C." i. 57); therefore he must have seen the Yerushalmi of the order *odashim*, although he himself does not quote it in his commentary on this order (see Frankel, "Mebo," p. 45b). Except for the treatise *Niddah*, on the other hand, there was, according to Maimonides (l.c.), no Yerushalmi for the sixth order. A South-Arabian work of the fifteenth century, however, quotes the Gemara "on 'U' in the Gemara of the people of Jerusalem," which is said to contain a passage on the zodiac (see Steinschneider, "Catalog der Hebräischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin," p. 65, Berlin, 1878). The author of this quotation, therefore, knew Yerushalmi for the last treatise of the sixth order, although it is possible that the passage quoted may have been in the lost portion of the treatise *Niddah*, and that the name "'U' in" may have been used instead of " *ohorot*." For further details on the missing sections of Yerushalmi see Frankel, l.c. pp. 45a et seq.; Weiss, "Dor," iii. 232; Buber, in Berliner's "Magazin," v. 100-105; and Strack, "Einleitung in den **Talmud**," pp. 63-65. The mishnaic text on which the Palestinian **Talmud** is based has been preserved in its entirety in a manuscript belonging to the library of the University of Cambridge, and has been edited by W. H. Lowe ("The Mishnah on Which the Palestinian **Talmud** Rests," Cambridge, 1883).

([see image](#)) Pages from a Manuscript of the Jerusalem **Talmud**.

(From the Cairo Genizah.)

The Palestinian **Talmud** is so arranged in the editions that each chapter is preceded by its entire mishnaic text with the paragraphs numbered, this being followed by the **Talmud** on the several paragraphs. In the first seven chapters of *Berakot* the paragraphs are designated as "First Mishnah" (*כַּתְּנִי א*), "Second Mishnah," etc.; while in the remaining chapters and all the other treatises the paragraphs are termed "halakot" (*הַלְכָה א*). In the early chapters the mishnaic text of each paragraph is repeated entire in the **Talmud** at the beginning of the paragraph; but later only the first words are prefaced to the **Talmudic** text. Even in cases where there is no **Talmud** the designation of the paragraph and the beginning of the mishnaic text are given. The editio princeps seems to have borrowed this arrangement from the manuscripts, although the

system is much more simple in the fragment of Yerushalmi edited by Paul von Kokowzoff in the "Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de St. Petersbourg" (xi. 195-205), which contains some paragraphs of the sixth and eighth chapters of Baba amma. This fragment begins with the concluding lines of the **Talmudic** text of ch. v.; but between them and the beginning of ch. vi. the Mishnah is lacking, so that the superscription, "Chapter vi.," is followed immediately by the **Talmudic** text. There is no reference to the beginning of the paragraph, either in the first or in the succeeding paragraphs; nor is there any explanation of the fact that paragraphs 4 and 7 of ch. viii. have no **Talmud**. It is clear, therefore, that the manuscript to which this fragment belonged contained only the **Talmudic** text, thus presupposing the use of a special copy of the Mishnah. It is likewise noteworthy that in the first two chapters of Berakot the sections of the **Talmudic** text on some of the paragraphs are designated in the editions by the word "pis a" (section), a term found occasionally also in other portions of the text of Yerushalmi.

The Style of the Yerushalmi.

The style of Yerushalmi may be indicated by a brief analysis of a few sections, such as Ber. i. 1; R. H. i. 1, 2; Gi . ii. 1; and B. B. i. 6.

Ber. i. 1: The text of this paragraph, which begins the Mishnah, is as follows:

"During what time in the evening is the reading of the 'Shema' begun? From the time when the priests go in to eat their leaven [see Lev. xxii. 7] until the end of the first watch of the night, such being the words of R. Eliezer. The sages, however, say until midnight, though R. Gamaliel says until the coming of the dawn."

Examples.

The **Talmud** on this paragraph (2a, line 34-3a, line 3) contains three sections, which correspond to the three opinions and the contents of which are as follows:

(1)

A citation, from a baraita, of another tannaitic regulation defining the Mishnah that governs the reading of the "Shema" in the evening; two sayings of Jose (a Palestinian amora of the 4th cent.), serving to elucidate the baraita (2a, 34-45). Remarks on the position of one who is in doubt whether he has read the "Shema," with analogous cases, according to Jeremiah, whose views were transmitted by Ze'era II. (4th cent.), the first case being decided according to the baraita already mentioned (2a, 45-2b, 4). Another passage from the baraita, designating the appearance of the stars as an indication of the time in question; explanation of this baraita by Abba bar Pappai (transmitter, Phinehas; both of the 4th cent.); other passages on the appearance of the stars as bearing on the ritual, together with a dialectic explanation by Jose b. Abin (second half of the 4th cent.) and a saying by Judah b. Pazzi (2b, 5-31). A baraita on the division between day and night, and other passages bearing on the same subject (ib. lines 31-41). The meaning of "ben ha-shemashot" (twilight), and an answer by Tanuma b. Abba (latter part of the 4th cent.), together with another solution given by a baraita (ib. lines 41-46). Discussion of this baraita by Abba and Jose (4th cent.); reference by Mani to a question dealing with this subject which he addressed to Hezekiah of Caesarea (4th cent.) from Mishnah Zab. i. 6, and the answer of the latter (2b, 46-2c, 9). Amoraic sayings and a baraita on the beginning of the day (ib. lines 9-20). A sentence of tannaitic origin in no way related to the preceding matters: "One who prays standing must hold his feet straight," and the controversy on this subject between Levi and Simon (3d cent.), the one adding, "like the angels," and the other, "like the priests"; comments on these two comparisons (2c, 20-31). Further discussion regarding the beginning of the day, introduced by a saying of R. Anina's (3d cent.); haggadic statements concerning the dawn; a conversation between R. Hiyya the Elder and Simeon b. Lafta (latter part of the tannaitic period); cosmological comments: dimensions of the firmament, and the cosmic distances expressed in units of 50 and 500 years, together with similar haggadic material, chiefly tannaitic in origin; Haggadic sayings on Gen. i. 6, introduced by a saying of Abin's (4th cent.), and

including sayings by Rab, Judah b. Pazzi, and Anina; Haggadic material on Isa. xl. 22, introduced by a controversy between Johanan and Simeon b. Laish (3d cent.), and on Gen. ii. 4 (2c, 31-2d, 11). On the second part of the first mishnaic sentence; the views of Judah I. and Nathan on the number of the night-watches, and an exegetic discussion of them, with an allusion to Ps. cxix. 62 ("at midnight"), as well as haggadic material concerning David and his harp, with especial reference to Ps. lvii. 9 (2d, 11-44).

(2)

Assi in the name of Johanan: "The ruling of the sages ["until midnight"] is the valid one, and forms the basis for the counsel given by Jose [4th cent.] to the members of the academy" (ib. lines 45-48). Baraita on the reading of the "Shema" in the synagogue; a question bearing on this matter, and Huna's answer in the name of the Babylonian amora Joseph (ib. lines 48-52), an illustration being given in an anecdote regarding Samuel b. Naḥman, together with a haggadic saying by him (ib. lines 52-58). A contradictory view by Joshua b. Levi, together with pertinent haggadic sayings to the effect that the "Shemoneh 'Esreh" must follow immediately the after-benediction of the "Shema" (ib. lines 59-73).

(3)

R. Gamaliel's view compared with an analogous opinion of Simeon b. Yoḥai, together with a question which remains unanswered (2d, 74-3a, 3).

R. H. i. 1, 2: These two paragraphs, which are combined into one in Babli, deal with the commencement of the four seasons (new years): Nisan 1, Elul 1, Tishri 1, and Shebat 1 (or 15). The Talmud on par. 1 is found in 56a, 44-56d, 52, and that on par. 2 in 56d, 52-57a, 30.

Talmud on par. 1:

(a)

The "new year of the kings." Exegetic deductions and

elucidations, beginning with the interpretation of Ex. xii. 1; Johanan's explanation of II Chron. iii. 2; a controversy between Hananiah and Mani regarding the same verse; an explanation by Aḥa of Ex. xii. 1; a baraita by Samuel on the same verse; and similar material (56a, 44-56b, 10). Anina's saying that even the years of Gentile kings were dated from Nisan, and the confirmation thereof by Biblical passages from Haggai and Zechariah, together with the contradictory view of the Babylonian amora 'Efa or Efa; remarks and objections by Jonah and Isaac (56b, 10-29). Jonah on the practical importance of the new year for dating business documents (ib. lines 29-33). On the new year in the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah, together with an interpretation of I Kings ii. 11, and several haggadic passages referring to David (ib. lines 33-52).

(b)

The "new year of the feasts." Statement that according to Simeon b. Yoḥai Nisan 1 marks the beginning of the year for the sequence of the feasts; a tannaitic midrash of considerable length on Lev. xxiii. 38, and a reply by Ela (4th cent.) to a question bearing on this matter; additional, remarks and objections by amoraim of the fourth century, together with the citation of a saying by the scholars "of that place" (i.e., Babylonia; 56b, 52-56c, 15); various discussions on kindred subjects, especially those whose content involved halakic exegesis (56c, 15-56d, 14).

(c)

The "new year for tithes of cattle," declared by Meïr to be Elul 1. Proof by the Babylonian amora Huna, who deduced an opposing view from Ps. lxxv. 14; the relation between Ben 'Azzai, who is mentioned in a baraita belonging to this passage, and Akiba (ib. lines 14-33); interpretation of Mishnah Bek. vii. 7 as being analogous in content; a citation by Mani of a halakic exegesis by his father, Jonah (ib. lines 33-52).

Talmud on par. 2: (a) Tishri 1, the "new year for the counting of the years." Deductions from Biblical passages; discussion on the subject between Jonah

and the members of the college; Jonah's quotation of anina's saying on the names of the months, and a saying of Simeon b. La'ish on the names of the angels (56d, 52-77). (b) The "new year for the Sabbatical years and the years of jubilee." Biblical inference (56d, 77-57a, 2). (c) The "new year for the planting of trees." Explanation and exegetical deduction (ib. lines 3-14). (d) The "new year for vegetables." Elucidation and discussion (ib. lines 14-23). (e) The "new year for trees," this section being supplemented by an example from a tannaitic account of Akiba's practise, with explanations (ib. lines 23-30).

Further Examples.

Gi . ii. 1: Inadequate attestation of the preparation of a bill of divorce. The **Talmud** on the passage (44a, 34-71); a special case in the Mishnah shown to contain the opinion of Judah b. Ilai (ib. lines 34-40); two casuistic questions by Jose and the Babylonian amora' isda, and the answers furnished by the Mishnah (ib. lines 40-50); a more detailed discussion of another question of similar content, with reference to a controversy between Johanan and Simeon b. La'ish, together with notes thereon by Ammi and Ze'era, and a discussion concluding with a comment by Mani (ib. lines 50-71).

B. B. i. 6: (a) A short exegetic proof by Ela, based on Prov. xviii. 11 (12d, 71 et seq.). (b) A baraita dealing with analogous matter, together with a remark by Jose b. Abin (ib. lines 72-75).

Although this analysis of the contents of four parts of Yerushalmi gives no adequate idea of the structure of the entire work, it will serve to show the difference between its several parts in regard both to their length and to their amplifications of the simple explanations of the Mishnah. A comparison of the portions of the Palestinian **Talmud** here summarized with the corresponding sections of Babli, as given below, is especially instructive.

Passages Repeated.

Yerushalmi, when regarded as a work of literature, is

noteworthy for a textual peculiarity which is characteristic of it, though found also in Babli, namely, the large number of literal repetitions. Entire passages, sometimes whole columns, of the **Talmud** are found in two, occasionally in three, separate treatises, in which they differ from each other by mere variants, most of them due to corruptions of the text. These repetitions throw some light on the redaction of the **Talmudic** text, since they prove that before the editing of the treatises was undertaken a uniform mass of material was already at hand in a definitely revised form; they likewise show that in the compilation of the **Talmud** one portion was explained by another, as was natural in view of the character of the contents. The opportunity was gladly seized, moreover, to repeat didactic material in passages where it did not strictly belong. These repetitions are obviously of great value in the textual criticism of the **Talmud**. Since sufficient attention has never yet been paid to this phenomenon of Yerushalmi, a list is here given of those passages of the first order, Zera'im, which are repeated in other orders. It must be noted, however, that this list includes neither citations based on passages of another treatise nor parallel passages consisting of a single sentence.

(a)

Passages from the order i. repeated in the order ii.:

Ber. 3b, lines 10-55 = Shab. 3a, 69-3b, 20.

Ber. 4a, 30-56 = She . 47a, 13-59 = M. . 83c, 40-83d, 8.

Ber. 5a, 33-62 = M. . 82b, 14-47.

Ber. 5d, 14-20 = Shab. 3a, 55-61.

Ber. 5d, 65-6a, 9 = M. . 83a, 5-27.

Ber. 6c, 4-17 = Yoma 44d, 58-68.

Ber. 6d, 60-67 = Meg. 73d, 15-22.

Ber. 7b, 70-7d, 25 = Ta'an. 67c, 12-67d, 47.

Ber. 7d, 75-8a, 59 = Ta'an. 65c, 2-69.

Ber. 8c, 60-69 = R. H. 59d, 16-25.

Ber. 9a, 70-9b, 47 = Ta'an. 63c, 66-63d, 44.

Ber. 9c, 20-31 = Meg. 75c, 8-19.

Ber. 9c, 49-54 = Meg. 75b, 31-36.

Ber. 10a, 32-43 = Pes. 29c, 16-27.

Ber. 11c, 14-21 = Pes. 37c, 54-71.

Ber. 12c, 16-25 = 'Er. 22b, 29-37.

Ber. 12c, 44-62 = Suk. 24a, 6-21 = Meg. 72a, 15-31.

Ber. 13d, 72-14a, 30 = Ta'an. 64a, 75-64b, 35.

Pe'ah 15a, 67-15b, 21 = ag. 76b, 24-53.

Pe'ah 17a, 39-72 = ag. 76b, 13-47.

Pe'ah 18d, 16-33 = She . 46a, 48-67.

Pe'ah 18d, 66-19a, 5 = She . 48c, 75-48d, 13.

Pe'ah 21a, 25-29 = She . 48d, 55-58.

Dem. 22a, 31-40 = She . 48d, 40-49.

Kil. 29b, 27-61 = 'Er. 19c, 15-49 = Suk. 52a, 40-73.

Kil. 29b, 62-76 = Suk. 52a, 73-52b, 11.

Sheb. 34c, 27-49 = M. . 80b, 26-52.

Sheb. 38a, 50-60 = Shab. 3c, 55-65.

Ter. 44a, 32-38 = Shab. 44d, 4-10.

Ter. 45d, 42-51 = Shab. 3d, 2-15 (comp. 'Ab. Zarah 41d, 13-28).

Ter. 46a, 41-46b, 35 = Pes. 28a, 34-28b, 37.

Ma'as. 49a, 22-28 = Suk. 53d, 43-53.

Ma'as. 49b, 14-32 = Shab. 6b, 17-36.

Ma'as. 49b, 39-48 = Be'ah 62b, 72-62c, 6.

Ma'as. Sh. 53b, 6-44 = Yoma 45c, 2-36 (comp. Shebu. 32b. 56-34c, 3).

Ma'as. Sh. 54b, 48-58 = She' . 51b, 15-25.

Ma'as. Sh. 55a, 23-55 = 'Er. 24c, 33-66.

Ma'as. Sh. 55d, 62-67 = M. . 80b, 72-80c, 10.

al. 57c, 16-20 = R. H. 57b, 60-63.

(b)

Passages from the order i. repeated in the order iii.:

Ber. 6a, 35-6b, 17 = Naz. 56a, 12-68.

Ber. 6b, 51-56 = id. 61c, 11-17.

Ber. 9d, 3-19 = Gi' . 47b, 49-63.

Ber. 11b, 42-68 = Naz. 54b, 2-27.

Ber. 14b, 45-70 = So'ah 20c, 40-64.

Pe'ah 15b, 41-47 = Ket. 32c, 10-16.

Pe'ah 15c, 7-16 = id. 61a, 75-61c, 10.

Dem. 25b, 60-45c, 7 = id. 63a, 75-63b, 21.

Kil. 32a, 64-32d, 7 = Ket. 34d, 74-35b, 56.

Sheb. 36b, 25-68 = id. 61c, 56-61d, 17.

Ter. 40c, 42-40d, 6 = Yeb. 13c, 70-13d, 32.

Ter. 42b, 44-53 = Naz. 53d, 16-27.

Ter. 44c, 9-44d, 44 = Ket. 27b, 5-27c, 39.

Ma'as. Sh. 55a, 69-55b, 13 = Gi . 47d, 55-70.

'Orlah 61b, 8-33 = Naz. 55c, 32-63.

Bik. 64a. 32-44 = Yeb. 9b, 71-9c, 8.

(c)

Passages from the order i. repeated in the order iv.:

Ber. 3a, 52-69 = Sanh. 30a, 65-30b, 8 = 'Ab. Zarah 41c, 46-63.

Ber. 6b, 20-41 = Sanh. 20a, 43-60.

Pe'ah 16b, 22-25, 43-60 = Sanh. 27c, 38-60.

Sheb. 35b, 26-40 = 'Ab. Zarah 44b, 27-41.

Sheb. 39b, 14-38 = Mak. 31a, 33-50.

Ter. 45c, 24-45d, 11 = 'Ab. Zarah 41a, 18-41b, 3.

Ter. 47c, 66-47d, 4 = 'Ab. Zarah 41c, 13-23.

Ma'as. Sh. 54d, 71-55a, 8 = Sanh. 19a, 63-76.

Ma'as. Sh. 56c, 9-18 = Sanh. 18d, 13-22.

'Orlah 62b, 49-62c, 10 = 'Ab. Zarah 45a, 32-45b, 10.

The following parallel passages from the second and fourth orders may also be mentioned on account of their length: Shab. 9c, 62-9d, 59 = Sanh. 24c, 19-24d, 14; Shab. 14d, 10-15a, 1 = 'Ab. Zarah 40d, 12-41a, 4.

Despite these parallel passages in the four orders of Yerushalmi, which might be regarded as a proof of the uniform redaction of the entire work, there is proof to the contrary, which shows that the first two orders differ in origin from the third and fourth. While the first and second contain a large number of baraitot with the introductory formula "Samuel transmits [תני שמואל]," there is not a single baraita by Samuel in the third and fourth orders. These latter two include, on the other hand, many controversies between Mani and Abin, two amoraim of the second half of the fourth century, while Zera'im and Mo'ed contain very few (see Bacher, "Ag. Pal. Amor." iii. 398). The redaction of Yerushalmi is discussed in further detail below.

The Haggadot of the Yerushalmi.

The haggadic portions of Yerushalmi are also characteristic of its style. As in Babli, they frequently have only a slight bearing, sometimes none at all, on the subject of the mishnaic section and its **Talmudic** interpretation, being added to the passages in which they are found either because they were mentioned in the academy on account of some subject under discussion, or because, in the process of the redaction of the treatise, this haggadic material, which was valued for some special reason, seemed to fit into the **Talmudic** text at the passage in question. Many haggadic portions of Yerushalmi are likewise found almost word for word in the earlier works of Palestinian midrashic literature, especially in Genesis Rabbah, Leviticus Rabbah, Pesita di-Rab Kahana, Ekaḥ (Lamentations) Rabbati, and Midrash Shemuel. These parallel passages do not always prove actual borrowing; for the same earlier source may have been used in the redaction both of Yerushalmi and of the midrashic works. The haggadot of the Palestinian **Talmud** were collected and annotated by Samuel ben Isaac Jaffe Ashkenazi in his "Yefeh Mar'eh" (Venice, 1589), and they were translated into German by Wünsche ("Der Jerusalemische **Talmud** in Seinen Haggadischen Bestandtheilen," Zurich, 1880).

Linguistically, the Palestinian **Talmud** is Aramaic, in so far as its framework (like the elucidations of the

mishnaic text by the members of the academies and the amoraic discussions connected with them) is redacted in that language; the greater portion of the terminology is in like manner Aramaic. The same dialect is employed in general for the narrative sections, including both the haggadot and the accounts of the lives of the sages and their pupils. The Aramaic portion consequently comprises all that is popular in origin or content. The Hebrew sections, on the other hand, include the halakic sayings of the Tannaim, the citations from the collections of baraitot, and many of the amoraic discussions based on the tannaitic tradition, together with other sayings of the Amoraim. This linguistic usage is due to the fact that both in Palestine and in Babylon the Halakah was for the most part elucidated and expanded by the Amoraim themselves in the language in which it had been transmitted by the Tannaim. In the academy the Hebrew of the Mishnah held its place side by side with the Aramaic, thus giving to the latter a certain coloring, especially from a lexicographic point of view. Hebrew was retained in great measure also in the amoraic Haggadah. The Aramaic, which assumed a fixed literary form in Yerushalmi, is almost the same as that of the earlier Palestinian midrashic works, differing from them only in a few peculiarities, mostly orthographic. This idiom, together with that of the Palestinian Targum on the Pentateuch, has been analyzed in G. Dalman's "Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch" (Leipscic, 1894; 2 ed. 1905).

Editions of the Babli.

The first complete edition of the Babylonian **Talmud** (תלמוד בבלי) was printed at Venice, 1520-23, by Daniel Bomberg, and has become the basis, down to the present day, of a very large number of editions, including that of Basel, 1578-81, which, with the changes and omissions made by the censor, exerted a powerful influence on later texts until the edition of Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1720-22, with its additions, became the model of all subsequent editions of the **Talmud** (see below). The external form of Babli was determined by the editio princeps. While the first edition of Yerushalmi, in its two columns on each folio page, contains only the text, the editio princeps of Babli adds

the commentary of Rashi on one margin and the tosafot on the other, together with kindred matter. Especially noteworthy is the fact that the first edition of Babli has a pagination which has been retained in all subsequent editions, thus rendering it possible to quote passages with exactness, and to find citations readily. The mishnaic treatises which have no Babylonian **Talmud** are included in the editions of the **Talmud**, together with commentaries, and these same tractates are likewise found in the only complete manuscript of Babli (that at Munich), where they form an appendix, although they precede the post-Talmudic treatises, which are likewise contained in the editions. It has been noted above that the editions of Babli contain the Yerushalmi for the treatise She alim; and this is also the case in the Munich manuscript.

The following list gives the names of the treatises of Babli which have been preserved, together with the sequence generally followed in the editions, and the number of folios in each tractate, the pagination always beginning with fol. 2. Of the 570 leaves of the Munich codex, containing about eighty lines to a page, 490 belong to Babli; this gives an approximate idea of the size of this **Talmud**. The amount of text on each page of the editions, however, varies greatly on account of the varying length of the commentary of Rashi and the tosafot which accompany it; but the number of leaves shows the comparative lengths of the several treatises.

I. Zera'im:

Berakot (64).

II. Mo'ed:

Shabbat (157);

'Erubin (105);

Pesa'im (121);

Be'ah (40);

agigah (27);

Mo'ed a an (29);

Rosh ha-Shanah (35);

Yoma (88);

Sukkah (56);

Ta'anit (31);

Megillah (32).

III. Nashim:

Yebamot (122);

Ketubot (112);

iddushin (82);

Gi in (90);

Nedarim (91);

Nazir (66);

So ah (49).

IV. Nezi in:

Baba amma (119);

Baba Me i'a (119);

Baba Batra (176);

'Abodah Zarah (76);

Sanhedrin (113);

Shebu'ot (49);

Makkot (24);

Horayot (14).

V. odashim:

Zeba'im (120);

Mena'ot (110);

Bekorot (161);

Ullin (142);

'Arakin (34);

Temurah (34);

Keritot (28);

Me'ilah (22);

Tamid (9).

VI. ohorot: Niddah (73).

Missing Gemaras.

Babli thus contains but one treatise each of the first and sixth orders; of the second, She'alim (see above) is lacking; and there is no **Talmud** on 'Eduyot or Abot either in Babli or Yerushalmi. The fifth order of Babli contains neither Middot nor innim, nor the third, fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Tamid. It is incorrect, however, to speak of missing portions of the Babylonian **Talmud**, since in all probability the sections which it omits were entirely disregarded in the final redaction of the work, and were consequently never committed to writing (for a divergent opinion see Weiss, "Dor," iii. 271). It will be shown further on that the mishnaic treatises lacking in Babli were subjects of study in the Babylonian academies.

Earliest Manuscript of the Babli.

In the editions the Babylonian **Talmud** is so arranged that each paragraph of the Mishnah is followed by the portion of the **Talmud** which forms the commentary on it; the portions are frequently divided into sections, rubricked by the successive sentences of the mishnaic paragraph on which they are based, although an entire paragraph occasionally serves as a single text. Thus Babli on Ket. ii. 1 (16a-18b) is divided into six sections; but there is no division into sections for ii. 2 (18b-20b), ii. 3 (20b-22a), ii. 5 (23b), and ii. 9 (27b-28a). There are three sections for ii. 4 (23a); two for ii. 6 (23b-26a), ii. 7 (26b-27a), and ii. 8 (27a, b); and eight for ii. 10 (28a, b). In the Munich codex, which is based on a manuscript of the middle of the ninth century (see Lewy in "Breslauer Jahresbericht," 1905, p. 28), the text of the entire chapter of the Mishnah is written in large characters on the inner portion of the page, separated from the **Talmudic** text, which is in a different script. In the fragments in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, written in 1123 and containing a portion of the treatise Keritot (see "J. Q. R." ix. 145), each chapter is headed by the entire mishnaic text on which it is based. Then follow the sections of the **Talmud**, each beginning with the word **כַּתְּנִי** and the first part of the mishnaic paragraph in question, although some sections are marked by the superscription **פִּי'ס** (= **פִּי'סְקָא**). The superscription **נְטוּרָא**, which in the editions marks the beginning of the **Talmud** on each paragraph of the Mishnah, is found neither in the Munich codex nor in the Bodleian fragments. Most of the manuscripts containing one or more treatises of Babli, and described by R. N. Rabinovicz in the introductions to vols. i., iv., viii., ix., and xi. of his "Di du e Soferim," are so arranged that the entire mishnaic text is placed at the beginning of the chapter; and this is also occasionally the case in the editions, as in the first chapter of the treatise Sanhedrin. In a St. Petersburg manuscript said to date from 1112 the paragraphs are repeated in their proper places (ib. viii. 3). A number of codices in the Vatican Library are arranged partly in the one way and partly in the other (xi. 13, 15, 17, 18), while the system adopted in the printed texts occurs in manuscripts also (see ib. iv. 6, 8; xi. 20). It may be mentioned as a curious circumstance that in one manuscript of the Vatican (ib. xi. 19), containing the treatise Pesa'im, many passages are

vocalized and accented, as is also the case in a Bodleian fragment of Yerushalmi on Berakot ("J. Q. R." ix. 150). A fragment of considerable length in the Cambridge Library, and possibly the earliest extant manuscript of Babli, also contains the treatise Pesa'im; it has been edited by Lowe ("The Fragment of Talmud Babli of the Ninth or Tenth Century," Cambridge, 1879); and in its four folios it includes the text of fols. 7a, below -9a, middle, and 13a, below -16a, above, of the editions. The pages are divided into two columns; and the entire mishnaic text precedes the chapter; the several sections, even those beginning with a new paragraph of the Mishnah, have an introduction only in the case of the first word of the mishnaic passage in question, with the word **מתני'** as superscription.

The character of Babli and its divergencies from Yerushalmi may best be illustrated by a citation of its commentary on the same passages of the Mishnah as those contained in the sections of the Palestinian Talmud already analyzed.

(see image) Page from the Munich Manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud. Ber. i. 1 (divided in Yerushalmi into four paragraphs, but in Babli forms one only, the explanations of which are given in 2a-9a; for the purposes of the present comparison, only those discussions in Babli which refer to that part of the Mishnah which in Yerushalmi forms the first paragraph are here summarized):

(a)

The initial question of the Mishnah and its basis; two divergent answers, together with an objection and its refutation (2a; all anonymous). The initial statement of the Mishnah, and an interpretation of Lev. xxii. 7 based on a baraita on this verse and concluding with a note of Rabbah b. Shela (2b), and the method of teaching this interpretation in Palestine. The contradictions between the statement of the Mishnah and three baraitot which are successively stated and dialectically refuted (all anonymous). A discussion of the third baraita (3a). The opinion of R. Eliezer ("until the end of the first watch of the night"), and the problem whether three or four night-watches were implied; a haggadic baraita with a saying of R. Eliezer on the three watches of the night, together

with a discussion of it. A haggadic excursus of some length, beginning with Rab's saying regarding the three watches of the night, and containing a baraita (a poem by Jose b. alaftha) and a disquisition on it (3b). Further details of the night-watches, beginning with a controversy between Judah I. and Nathan (in a baraita); a haggadic saying of Joshua b. Levi transmitted by Zeri a and Ammi, this section concluding with a saying of Ashi. Another saying of Joshua b. Levi, transmitted in like manner, together with two versions of a comment by Abba b. Kahana. Discussion of the first saying of Joshua b. Levi, beginning with the rising of David "at midnight" (Ps. cxix. 62), and devoted in the main to the connotation of the word "neshef" (ib. cxix. 147), together with sayings of Babylonian amoraim. The way in which David knew when midnight had arrived, and concerning his harp, (4a). Further details regarding David, Ps. lvii. 9, and Ex. xi. 4, with an exegesis by Ashi, which concludes the entire discussion. Additional haggadic material concerning David, and a controversy between the Palestinian haggadists Levi and Isaac on Ps. lxxxvi. 2 with reference to Ps. cxix. 62, together with comments and citations of a kindred nature.

Examples from the Babli.

(b)

Dialectic exposition of the relation of the view of the scholars to the opinions of R. Eliezer and R. Gamaliel, together with the citation of a baraita (4b). A controversy between Johanan and Joshua b. Levi on the sequence of the "Shema" and prayer, based on a sentence in this baraita ("the 'Shema' is read: prayer is offered"), together with a discussion devoted chiefly to exegetic inferences. An objection alleged by Mar b. Rabina and based on a passage in the Mishnah, and a haggadic saying of Eleazar b. Abina to the effect that he who recites Ps. cxlv. thrice daily is assuredly a son of the world to come, the citation being made in this place on account of an aphorism of similar content given by Johanan in the course of the same debate. A discussion of these matters, and a saying of Johanan on Ps. cxlv., together with another haggadic aphorism by Eleazar b. Abina on the angels Michael and Raphael, and its elucidation. The view of Joshua b. Levi

on the evening "Shema'," which should be recited in bed (5a), and amoraic sayings on the same subject, together with a confirmation, by a citation of Ps. iv. 6, of the ruling of Joshua b. Levi; a haggadic saying of Simeon b. La-ish transmitted by Levi b. La-ma, as well as another aphorism of this scholar transmitted by the same authority. A haggadic saying by Isaac on reading the "Shema" in bed, and a comment by Ashi, followed by another haggadic aphorism by Isaac based on Job v. 7; interpretation of this verse as denoting afflictions sent by God ("yissurim"), against which the study of the Torah gives protection; haggadic sentences on the Law. A long series of haggadic sayings by Palestinian and Babylonian amoraim, and especially by Johanan, regarding affliction (5b), with anecdotes from Palestine and Babylon. A baraita with a saying of Abba Benjamin regarding prayer before retiring, and its elucidation, together with three other baraitot and haggadic sayings of Abba Benjamin regarding prayer (6a), regarding demons (with various sayings of Babylonian authors), and praying in the synagogue. A haggadic saying by Isaac on the last subject transmitted by Rabin b. Adda, together with a saying of Ashi and additional elucidations, followed by another aphorism transmitted by Rabin in the name of Isaac regarding the "phylacteries of God," and by a discussion of the subject by Babylonian amoraim, the view of Ashi standing last. A third haggadic saying of Isaac, of similar transmission, concerning prayer in the synagogue (6b), and a series of aphorisms of a like nature, the first being by Johanan, and the second by Huna transmitted by elbo. These, interspersed with other sayings, are followed by five more aphorisms transmitted by elbo in the name of Huna and regarding departure from the synagogue, the Min-ah prayer, participation in marriage festivities, the fear of God, and the refusal to return a salutation. A series (7a) of five haggadic sayings transmitted by Johanan in the name of Jose ben alafta: the prayer offered by God, pacification of an angry neighbor, discipline of one's own conscience, three requests of Moses, and the teaching that a threat or promise by God is not recalled, even though given only conditionally, and that neither, therefore, is ever unfulfilled. After a number of sayings, partly tannaitic and partly amoraic in origin, come six haggadic aphorisms (7b) transmitted by Johanan in the

name of the tanna Simeon ben Yo ai, the second treating of the same subject as the corresponding one in the previous series. To these sayings are appended various aphorisms and elucidations, followed by a conversation between Na man b. Jacob and Isaac, in which the latter cites a sixth saying, concerning prayer in the synagogue, transmitted by Johanan in the name of Simeon ben Yo ai. Additional haggadic aphorisms (8a) on this subject as well as on the importance of the synagogue, followed by three sayings of 'Ulla transmitted by iyya b. Ammi, and by various aphorisms on the reading of the Torah in the synagogue (8b) and other kindred matters. This portion is concluded by the instructions which Joshua b. Levi gave to his sons, and by the analogous instructions which Raba gave to his children, as well as by elucidations of details of these teachings and by sayings of a similar import.

(c)

In the name of Samuel, Judah declares that the opinion of R. Gamaliel is authoritative. A baraita giving a similar view by Simeon ben Yo ai, followed by an interpretation of it with a final decision by Joshua ben Levi, and by another version of the relation to it of the ruling of Joshua ben Levi. The section (9a) terminates with an opinion on this baraita by a scholar who had come from Palestine to Babylon.

Further Examples.

R. H. i. 1 (§§ 1-2 in Yerushalmi; the **Talmud** on these sections is contained in 2a-15b):

(a)

isda's answer to the question as to the practical importance of the "new year of the kings," with a citation of the mishnaic passage (Sheb. x. 5) regarding antedated and postdated promissory notes. A baraita on the reckoning of regnal years, and its elucidation (2b), together with hermeneutic deductions from the Bible regarding Nisan as the beginning of the regnal year, introduced by an inference of Johanan based on I Kings vi. 1 as compared with Num. xxxiii. 38, Deut. i. 3,

4, Num. xxi. 1 (3a), and similar passages, preference being finally given to Eleazar's deduction founded on II Chron. iii. 2. A baraita giving the deduction of Johanan. The assertion of *isda* that the regnal years of non-Israelitish kings were reckoned from Tishri, together with Biblical passages in confirmation of this view, beginning with Neh. i. 1 and its hermeneutic exposition (3b), the conclusion being formed by a variety of haggadic material on the Persian kings mentioned in the Bible (4a).

(b)

isda's answer to the query why Nisan 15, the first day of the Feast of Passover, was not made the "new year of the feasts," while a baraita shows that this view was promulgated by Simeon ben Yo^{ai} himself. Another baraita (4b) on the ritual order of the festivals, together with exegetic deductions from the views contained therein and additional discussions, concluding with an elucidation (5a) of other halakic and exegetic sayings on festivals and sacrifices. Baraita (5b) on Deut. xxiii. 22 et seq., and a detailed discussion, followed by a similar section (6a, b) on Deut. xxiii. 24. Baraita (7a) on Nisan 1 and its four meanings, the first being deduced from Ex. xii. 2 and Deut. xvi. 1, although an objection caused Lev. xxiii. 39 to be regarded by *isda* as the basic passage, while Zech. i. 7 was cited to refute an allegation made by Rabina, additional Biblical passages being quoted by the Babylonian amoraim 'Ulla, Kahana, and Ashi; the section is concluded by a deduction of the three other meanings of Nisan 1 (7b) mentioned in the baraita.

(c)

The signification of Elul 1 as the "new year for tithes of cattle," as taught by R. Me^{ir}. The various origins of the sentences collected in R. H. i. 1, together with a saying by Joseph, followed by a series of aphorisms of later Babylonian amoraim, and one by Ashi (8a). Johanan's deduction, from Ps. lxxv. 14, of the double view concerning the new year for tithes of cattle, and its dialectic elucidation.

Second half of the mishnaic paragraph:

(a)

The question regarding the practical utility of the new year for the counting of the years, answered by Pappa in exactly the same way as *isda* had solved the question concerning the new year of the kings; solution of the discrepancy and further elucidations of the principle that Tishri 1 was the new year for the counting of the years. Two baraitot on Ps. lxxxi. 4 et seq. (8b).

(b)

An inference regarding the year of jubilee, based on Lev. xxv. 4; and the obviation of the difficulty presented by Lev. xxv. 9 (with reference to the Sabbatical year) by means of a baraita on the following verse, together with two other baraitot on the same subject (9a) and an elucidation of Tishri 10, concluded by a baraita on Lev. xxv. 11 and its interpretation (9b).

(c)

Biblical deduction regarding the planting of trees and a baraita thereon, with an inference drawn from the Bible by Johanan (10a), and an elucidation of another baraita cited in explanation of the first, Johanan's deduction from Gen. viii. 13 regarding the opposing views of R. Meïr and R. Eleazar (10b) as to whether a day may be reckoned like a year, thus introducing a baraita containing the controversy between R. Eliezer and R. Joshua on the month of Creation, the former arguing for Tishri and the latter for Nisan; exegetic haggadot of considerable length (11a-12a) on this section.

(d)

A baraita stating that "tithes" and "vows" as well as "vegetables" belong to Tishri 1, together with interpretations by hermeneutics and other methods (12b), and with discussions of the subject by the Palestinian and Babylonian schools, and halakic exegeses (13a-14a).

(e)

An argument by Hoshaiah transmitted by Eleazar (14a), and a baraita recording the practise of R. Akiba (14b-15b), as well as elucidations of it. Another baraita on Sheba 15, with a controversy between Johanan and Simeon ben La'ish, and a discussion of it.

Gi . ii. 1 (the **Talmud** on this section is contained in 15a-17a):

(a)

The purpose of the entire paragraph, although its content is immediately apparent from the opening sentence of the mishnaic treatise.

(b)

The problem of the connotation of "the half of the bill of divorce, and Ashi's answer.

(c)

The law regarding a case in which only "the half" of a bill of divorce is signed by witness in the presence of the bearer; the more rigorous interpretation of it by isda and subsequent modifications by Raba and (15b) Ashi, as well as a dialectic discussion of these three sayings. Analogous cases from other branches of the Halakah and casuistic questions bearing on them (16a), concluding with one by Pappa which remains unanswered.

(d)

Case in which one of the bearers of a bill of divorce witnesses the engrossing of the document and the other the signature; exact definition given by Johanan and transmitted by Samuel b. Judah (16b); the answer of the latter to the objection of Abaye, although another version of the entire affair makes Ashi the author of the objection; controversy on the subject between Hoshaiah and 'Ulla. Anecdote of a visit made by Judah b. Ezekiel to Rabbah bar bar ana during an illness of the latter, and their conversation on a problem connected with Gi . i. 1.

(e)

The case in which the engrossing of a bill of divorce is witnessed by one and the signature by two persons (17a), and the exact definition of such an event, given by Johanan and transmitted by Ammi, the section being concluded by a discussion between Ammi and Assi.

Legal Example.

B. B. i. 6 (the **Talmud** on this section is contained in 7b-11a):

(a)

"One who is part owner of a courtyard is obliged to contribute to the cost of the gateway as well as of the door itself"; -the citation of a legend concerning Elijah to prove that a gateway is not necessarily a subject for praise, concluded by a casuistic definition of the case presupposed by the Mishnah.

(b)

According to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, "Every courtyard is not adapted to a gateway"; a baraita containing the complete version of this saying.

(c)

According to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, "One who dwells in a city is obliged to contribute toward the building of the walls and the doors," etc.; a baraita containing the complete version of this saying. Johanan's answer to the query advanced by Eleazar concerning the method of levying contributions, followed by a second version of the same account. The patriarch Judah II. and the scholars contributed toward building the wall, although the legality of this action was questioned by Simeon b. Laish on the basis of a haggadic deduction from Ps. cxxxix. 18, while Johanan proposed another verse, Cant. viii, 10, to aid in the solution of the problem (8a); Rabbah's interpretation of this passage of Canticles. An instance of contributions on the part of the scholars of Babylonia, and the proof of their illegality furnished by the exegesis of three Biblical passages, taken

respectively from the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. Pappa's proof that a certain tax was imposed on orphans, and a discussion of it, followed by a tannaitic account (half Aramaic) by Judah I. of the support of scholars during a time of famine.

(d)

"How long must one dwell in a city to have equal rights with its citizens? Twelve months"; a conflicting baraita which speaks of thirty days; Rabbah's solution of this contradiction, while Johanan reconciles the discrepancy between the period of twelve months and that given in another baraita. The saying of Johanan as to the liability of scholars to taxation, and various statements regarding the practise of the Babylonian sages. The way in which Joseph (4th cent.) expended a sum of money sent him by the mother of King Sapor, together (8b) with an interpretation of Jer. xv. 2. Baraita on the mode of levying taxes for the poor, and the right of assessment of municipal taxes. The rule of the Mishnah (She . v. 2) that the smallest number of persons who may be entrusted with raising taxes is two, and its Biblical basis according to Na man b. Jacob, together with sayings and examples bearing on this matter. An interpretation of Dan. xii. 3 as referring to the collectors and trustees of the tax for the poor, followed by two baraitot on these collectors and Abaye's statements regarding the practise of Rabbah b. Na mani, as well as (9a) by a note of Ashi and an opinion of Rabbah. Baraita on the auditing of the accounts of the trustees of the tax for the poor, and elucidations of it. Notes and anecdotes illustrating Mishnah Pe'ah viii. 7 (on the amount to be given to the poor), followed by haggadic passages on the importance of almsgiving, among these aphorisms being one cited by Rabbah as transmitted to Eleazar by a certain 'Ulla with a curious surname, which forms the basis of an anecdote. Further haggadic passages on the charity of Eleazar, Isaac, and others. A baraita giving R. Meïr's answer (10a) to the question why God Himself does not nurture the poor, followed by an account of the conversation on this subject between R. Akiba and Tineius Rufus. Sermon by Judah b. Shalom (Palestinian amora of the 4th cent.) on Jer. lvii. 17, and anecdotes from the lives of Johanan b. Zakkai and Pappa. Haggadic sayings by

tannaim and amoraim on alms. The vision of Joseph b. Joshua b. Levi (10b) of the future life, together with baraitot on the interpretation of Prov. xiv. 34 by Johanan b. Zakkai and his scholars as well as by Gamaliel II. and the other sages of Jabneh. The charity of the mother of Sapor, and two baraitot: one (11a) the story of the beneficence of Benjamin ha-addi ; the other an account of the generosity of King Monobaz.

(e)

"If one obtains a dwelling-place in the city, he immediately receives equal rights with the citizens"; an opposing view by Simeon b. Gamaliel transmitted in two versions.

Framework of Commentary.

This analysis of four different passages of the Babylonian **Talmud** shows, in the first place, that the framework, as in the Palestinian **Talmud**, is formed by a running interpretation of the Mishnah, despite the heterogeneity of the material which is interwoven with it. The **Talmud**, however, is not a mere commentary on the Mishnah, since, in addition to its haggadic portions, it contains a varied mass of halakic material, connected only loosely, if at all, with the contents of the mishnaic paragraphs in question; and while the **Talmud** sometimes adheres closely to the text of such a paragraph, its commentary on a single section of the Mishnah is often expanded into the compass of a small book. In this respect Babli is much more free than Yerushalmi, which is more concise in other regards as well; the wider interests of the former and its greater variety and length are due at least in large part to the fact that the Babylonian academies enjoyed a longer existence and hence its redaction extended over a more protracted period.

Haggadah of the Babli.

([see image](#)) Page from an Unknown Edition of Tractate Baba Me i'a of the Babylonian **Talmud**, Printed Probably by Soncino Before 1500. (By courtesy of Prof. Solomon Schechter.) The fact that the Haggadah is much more prominent in Babli, of which it forms, according to Weiss ("Dor," iii. 19), more than one-third, while it constitutes only one-sixth of Yerushalmi,

was due, in a sense, to the course of the development of Hebrew literature. No independent mass of haggadot developed in Babylon, as was the case in Palestine; and the haggadic writings were accordingly collected in the **Talmud**. The most curious example of this is a midrash on the Book of Esther, found at the end of the first chapter of the treatise Megillah (pp. 10b-17a). Except for the fact that the text of this section naturally alludes to the Book of Esther, the midrash has no connecting-link with the preceding portion of the **Talmud**. It is a true midrashic compilation in the style of the Palestinian midrashim, introduced by sixteen proems (mostly by Palestinian authors), and followed by exegeses and comments on individual verses of Esther in the order of the text, each preceded by a catch word (for further details on this midrash see Bacher, "Ag. Bab. Amor." p. 119). A fragment of a similar compilation on Lamentations, treating of a few verses of the first two chapters, is found in the last chapter of Sanhedrin (104, 4 et seq.), this fragment being inserted there on account of the preceding casual allusion to the Babylonian exile (ib. p. 120). The treatise Giṭin (55a-58a) contains a haggadic compilation on the destruction of Jerusalem, its elements being found partly in the Palestinian literature, partly in *Ekah Rabbati*, and partly in the treatise *Ta'anit* of the Jerusalem **Talmud**. This haggadah, which begins with a saying by Johanan, is appended to the brief halakic elucidation of the first sentence of the mishnaic paragraph on the law of the Sicarii (Giṭ. v. 6), mentioning those who fell in the war against the Romans. In Babli such haggadic interpolations, often of considerable length, are extremely frequent, while the very content of the mishnaic paragraphs often affords a basis for lengthy haggadic excursions. Thus the last (in Yerushalmi, next to the last) chapter of Sanhedrin is made the foundation for a mass of haggadic comments, most of them only loosely connected by an association of ideas with the text of the passages of the Mishnah to which they are assigned. In this exceptionally long chapter of Babli (pp. 90a-113b) only that portion (111b-112b) which refers to the Law in Deut. xiii. 12 et seq. is halakic in nature. The haggadic conclusion of the first chapter of *Soṭah* furnishes the basis for further **Talmudic** comments in the style of the Haggadah (8b, 14a); so that, for example, the interpretation of Ex. ii. 4,

cited in the Mishnah (11a), is followed (11a-13b) by an independent section which forms a running midrash on Ex. i. 8-ii. 4. Additional examples may be found in nearly every treatise of the Babylonian **Talmud**. The haggadic sections of this **Talmud**, which form an important part of the entire work, have been collected in the very popular "En Ya'a ob" of Jacob ibn abib (1st ed. 1516), as well as in the rarer "Haggadot ha-Talmud" (Constantinople, 1511; comp. Rabbinovicz, "Di du e Soferim," viii. 131); and they have been translated into German by A. Wünsche ("Der Babylonische **Talmud** in Seinen Haggadischen Bestandtheilen," 3 vols., Leipsic, 1886-89).

An important factor in the composition of the **Talmud**, and consequently one it is necessary to consider in a discussion of its literary form, is the frequent juxtaposition of several sayings ascribed to one and the same author. These sayings, which are frequently linked together by the name of their common transmitter as well as by that of their author, were evidently taught in this connected form in the academies, thus finding their way into the appropriate passages of the **Talmudic** text. Such groups of aphorisms are extremely frequent in Babli; and several of them are found in the passage from Ber. 2a-9a which has been analyzed above (regarding Yerushalmi see Frankel, "Mebo," p. 39a). Other circumstances which must be considered in discussing the composition of the text of the **Talmud** are set forth in the account of its origin and redaction given below.

Style and Language.

The remarks already made concerning the relation of the Hebrew and the Aramaic elements in the vocabulary of Yerushalmi apply with little modification to Babli, although the Aramaic of the latter is more nearly akin to the Syriac (the eastern Aramaic dialect then current in Babylonia) and is even more closely related to Mandæan (see Nöldeke, "Mandäische Grammatik," p. xxvi., Halle, 1875; on the Persian elements in the vocabulary of Babli see Jew. Encyc. vii. 313b, s.v. [Judæo-Persian](#)). In regard to Greek and Latin terms Levy makes the incomprehensible

statement ("Neuhebr. Wörterb." iv. 274a) that "no Greek or Latin words are found in the Babylonian **Talmud**." This is, however, incorrect; for a large number of words from the Latin and Greek (see Krauss, "Lehnwörter," i. p. xxiii.) are employed in the **Talmud**, both in the tannaitic passages found in Babli, and in the sayings of Palestinian as well as of Babylonian amoraim, such as Rab (see Bacher, l.c. p. 32). On the exegetic terminology as applied in Biblical and traditional hermeneutics, see Bacher, "Terminologie der Amoräer," Leipsic, 1905. An interesting linguistic peculiarity of Babli is the fact that tannaitic traditions, especially stories, are occasionally given entirely in Aramaic, or an anecdote, begun in Hebrew, is continued in Aramaic (such as the story, designated by תנו רבנן as a baraita, concerning Joshua b. Pera yah and his pupil Jesus [Sanh. 107b]).

The Halakah in Babli.

The contents of the **Talmud**—this term being restricted to Babli, although much which applies to it holds true of Yerushalmi as well—fall into the two main divisions of Halakah and Haggadah. Although, as stated above, the Mishnah itself frequently furnishes the ground for the inclusion of haggadic elements in the **Talmud**, and although the subjects discussed in the Halakah frequently lead of themselves to haggadic treatment, the Haggadah occupies only a secondary position in the **Talmud**, since this is, both in origin and in purpose, a halakic work, and was intended to serve as a commentary on the chief authoritative work of the tannaitic Halakah, the Mishnah of Judah I. Those portions, therefore, which treat of the interpretation of the Mishnah are the substance of the **Talmud**. This interpretation, however, was not merely theoretical, but was primarily devoted to a determination of the rules applying to the practise of the ceremonial law; on the other hand, the development of the Halakah had not ceased in the academies of the Amoraim, despite the acceptance of the Mishnah, so that the opinions and the decisions of the Amoraim themselves, even when they were not based merely on an interpretation of the Mishnah and other tannaitic halakot, became the subject of tradition and comment. In addition to the Mishnah, furthermore, the Midrash (the halakic

exegesis of the Bible) and the Halakah in the more restricted sense became the subject of tradition and of study, and were preserved in different collections as being the other results of the tannaitic period. In this way the **Talmud**, in its strict connotation of the interpretation of the Mishnah, was increased by an inexhaustible mass of material, which afforded the amoraic academies a basis both for the interpretation and for the criticism of the Mishnah; for since the **Talmud** deals with the criticism of the Mishnah, not only in text and meaning, but also in its relation to the baraitot, these baraitot themselves were frequently interpreted in the same way as were mishnaic passages (e.g., R. H. 10a, 12b, 29a), and were supplied with their **Talmud**. Moreover, the **Talmud** was further augmented by the inclusion within it of the views which the scholars expressed in the course of their public, judicial, and other activities, as well as by the data regarding their private lives and their religious practises which were discussed and memorized in the academies. If this brief sketch of the **Talmud** as regards its halakic contents be supplemented by the statement that the sayings of the several amoraim as well as the opposing views of their contemporaries and the members of the academies, whether teachers or pupils, are frequently recorded in connection with the report of the discussions of the academies, a more complete view of the nature of the **Talmud** and a better conception of its form may be gained.

The Framework Anonymous.

The real framework of the **Talmud**, however, on which the entire structure was built, was, as noted above, provided by the questions, comments, and discussions which are based on individual paragraphs of the Mishnah, and which are anonymous, or not ascribed to any author. Appended to these passages and interspersed among them are sayings whose authors are named; and this class frequently preponderates greatly. The anonymous framework of the **Talmud** may be regarded as the warp resulting from the united activity of the members of the academy, and upon which the woof of the **Talmud** was interwoven and developed during three centuries, until its final redaction gave it definitive form. The **Talmud** is really

the work of the body of scholars in the academies, who devoted themselves to it generation after generation, and kept its traditions alive. Although many members of the academie—sthe great as well as the small, teachers as well as pupils—are mentioned as the authors of various sayings and decisions, and as taking part in the discussions and controversies, some of them being deemed scholars worthy of record on account of a single remark, the background of the **Talmud**, or rather the background for those elements regarding whose authorship statements are made, was formed by the united efforts of those who labored to produce that work. The manifold objections and refutations introduced by the word "metibi" (= "they object"), and the questions (generally casuistic in nature) preceded by the formula "ibba'ya lehu" (= "they have asked") refer to this body of scholars, regardless of the date at which they lived.

Redaction.

This allusion to the anonymous framework of the **Talmud** suggests the problem of its redaction, which is partially answered by the allusion itself; for the work began with the inception of the collection, and the first amoraim laid the foundation for the task, which was carried on by succeeding generations, the final result being the **Talmud** in its present form. The system of mishnaic hermeneutics, which was in a sense official, and was at all events sanctioned by the lectures delivered in the academy, was determined as early as the first generation, and remained valid thenceforth. It is interesting to notice that the only certain occurrence of the word "Gemara" in the sense of "Talmud" ('Er. 32b) is found in connection with an account which throws a flood of light upon the first stages of the redaction of the **Talmud**. This account begins with the interpretation of 'Er. iii. 4, and is as follows: "R. iyya b. Abba, R. Assi [Palestinian amoraim in Babylon], and Rabba b. Nathan sat; and beside them sat also Rab Na man. They sat and said [here follows a dialectic discussion on the nature of the place of the tree mentioned in the paragraph of the Mishnah]. Then R. Na man said: 'It is correct; and Samuel also has approved of this explanation.' Then the first three asked: 'Hast thou established this explanation in the Gemara?' [i.e., "Hast

thou included it as a fixed element in the **Talmud**? Na man answers in the affirmative, whereupon a confirmatory amoraic tradition is added; and, in the name of Samuel, Rab Na man interprets the mishnaic passage under consideration in the light of that exegesis]. The term "aba" ("establish") was used in a later age by Sherira Gaon to designate the incorporation of portions that were used to make up the **Talmud** into its text (see Lewy, "Interpretation des Ersten Abschnitts des Palästinischen **Talmud**-Traktates Nesikin," p. 4; Bacher, in "Hebrew Union College Annual," 1904, p. 34), while in the **Talmud** itself the word was applied to the redaction of tannaitic traditions (see R. H. 32a, above; id. 25a; Sanh. 21b; Zeb. 114b). This account, which dates from the beginning of the amoraic period in the Academy of Nehardea, is, curiously enough, an isolated instance; for among the many dates and accounts which the **Talmud** contains in reference to the academy and its members, there is no direct statement concerning the redaction of the text, either in its earlier stages or at its conclusion, although certain statements on divergent traditions of amoraic sayings and discussions afford an idea of the way in which the **Talmudic** text emerged from the various versions given by the scholars and schools that transmitted it. These statements, which have been collected by Lewy (l.c. pp. 4-14), use the verb "tanni" ("pa'el" from תני) in referring to lectures on the **Talmudic** text as well as amoraic sayings or discussions on them (Bacher, "Terminologie der Amoräer," p. 239). Thus it is stated (Shab. 48b; B. B. 86a) that at Sura a certain interpretation was given in the name of isda and at Pumbedita in that of Kahana. There are a number of other similar statements concerning traditions, in regard to differences, as between Sura and Pumbedita, and between Sura and Nehardea, in the wording of the amoraic sayings and in their ascribed authorship (Gi . 35a). Especially frequent is the mention of amoraim of the fourth and fifth centuries as transmitters of these divergent statements, either two amoraim being named as authorities for two different versions, or an amora being cited as opposing another version to an anonymous tradition. As examples of the former may be mentioned Rabba and Joseph (Zeb. 25b), Pappa and Zebid (Shab. 66b), Kahana and Tabyomi (Ned. 16b), Ashi and Mar Zu ra

(Shab. 119a), and Rabina and A a (Ket. 31b); while many other instances are cited by Lewy (l.c.).

Technical Terms for Tradition.

Particularly interesting are the cases in which a divergent account is presented before Ashi, and thus before the one who projected the definitive redaction of the **Talmud**, Ashi appearing in all these cases as representing the version first given. Thus the amora Mordecai said to Ashi: "Thou teachest thus; but we teach differently" (Men. 42b; Ber. 5a). In addition to such statements, which are ascribed to members of the Babylonian academies, and which indicate divergencies in amoraic tradition, the extant text of the **Talmud** contains also a number of other variants, which are included without such statements. These are introduced by such formulas as "And if you will say (וְאִי תִּכְנֶה), referring to other authorities, or "There are those who say," or "There are those who teach," and similar phrases. The expression "another version" (לִישָׁנָה אַחֵרִינָה) frequently appears in the text as a superscription to a divergent account (Naz. 9b; B. . 59a; ul. 119b; Tem. 5a, 6a, 9b; 11b, 30b [comp. Frankel in "Monatsschrift," 1861, x. 262]; Niddah 29a, 38a). All these instances afford an idea, even though but an imperfect one, of the gradual development of the **Talmudic** text. To comprehend why only practically a single **Talmud** was produced, despite the various academies, the great number of authoritative transmitters of the mass of material, and the number of generations that collaborated on the work, it must be borne in mind that there was a continual interchange of ideas between the academies, and that the numerous pupils of the successive generations who memorized the **Talmud**, and perhaps committed at least a part of it to writing, drew from a single source, namely, the lectures of their masters and the discussions in the academies; further, that, since the work on the **Talmud** was continued without interruption along the lines laid down by the first generation of amoraim, all succeeding generations may be regarded as one body of scholars who produced a work which was, to all intents and purposes, uniform. This unity finds its expression in the phraseology adopted in the anonymous framework of the **Talmud**, which terms the authors "we," exactly as a

writer speaks of himself as "I" in an individual work. Examples of this phraseology occur in the following formulas: **והוינו בה** ("We then raised the question"; see Shab. 6b, 71a, 99b; Yoma 74a, 79b; Suk. 33a; Meg. 22a; Yeb. 29b; id. 49a; Gi . 60b; Shebu. 22b; 'Ab. Zarah 35a, 52b; Niddah 6b); **ורמינהו** ("We have opposed [another teaching to the one which has been quoted]"); **תני** ("We have learned," or, in other words, "have received by tradition"), the conventional formula which introduces mishnaic passages; and, finally, **מנא לן** ("Whence have we it?"), the regular preface to an inquiry regarding the Biblical basis of a saying. In all these formulas the "we" denotes the authors of the **Talmud** regarded as a collective unity, and as the totality of the members of the academies whose labors, covering three centuries of collaboration, resulted in the **Talmud**. It was in the Babylonian Academy of Sura, moreover, that the final redaction of the **Talmud** took place, the very academy that took the lead in the first century of the amoraic period; and the uniformity of the **Talmud** was thus assured, even to the place of its origin.

Date of Redaction.

The statements already made concerning the continuous redaction of the Babylonian **Talmud** apply with equal force to the Yerushalmi, this fact being expressed by Lewy (l.c. pp. 14-15) in the following words: "In Palestine, as in Babylon, there may have been different **Talmudim** in the various schools at different periods. . . . Similarly in the Palestinian **Talmud** different versions of amoraic sayings are quoted in the names of different authors, from which it may be inferred that these authors learned and taught different **Talmudim**." Lewy speaks also (l.c. p. 20) of several redactions which preceded the final casting of the Palestinian **Talmud** into its present form. The actual condition of affairs can scarcely be formulated in these terms, however, since the divergencies consist, for the most part, of mere variants in certain sentences, or in the fact that there were different authors and transmitters of them; and although many of these deviations are cited by R. Jonah and R. Jose, who lived and taught contemporaneously at Tiberias, this fact

scarcely justifies the assumption that there were two different **Talmudim**, one taught by Jonah and the other by Jose; it will nevertheless be evident, from the statements cited above, that the **Talmud** existed in some definite form throughout the amoraic period, and that, furthermore, its final redaction was preceded by other revisions. It may likewise be assumed that the contemporaneous schools of Tiberias, Sepphoris, and Cæsarea in Palestine taught the **Talmud** in different redactions in the fourth century. Lewy assumes, probably with correctness, that in the case of Yerushalmi the treatise Nezi in (the three treatises Baba amma, Baba Me i'a, and Baba Batra) was taken from a redaction differing from that of the other treatises. (Allusion has already been made to a difference of content between the first two and the last two orders of the Yerushalmi.) With regard to Babli. Frankel has shown ("Monatsschrift," x. 194) that the treatise Tamid, in which only three chapters out of seven are accompanied by a **Talmud**, belongs to a different redaction from that of the other treatises; and he endeavors to show, in like manner (ib. p. 259), both "that the redactor of the treatise iddushin is not identical with that of Baba Batra and Nedarim," and "that the redactor of the treatise Gi in is not the same as that of Keritot and Baba Batra." However, as these remarks refer to the final redaction of the **Talmud**, they do not touch upon the abstract unity of the work as emphasized above. It is sufficient to assume, therefore, that the final redaction of the several treatises was based on the versions used in the different academies. It may be postulated, on the whole, that the Palestinian **Talmud** received its present form at Tiberias, and the Babylonian **Talmud** at Sura (comp. the passages in Yerushalmi in which הנה [= "here"] refers to Tiberias, and those in Babli in which the same word denotes Sura [Lewy, l.c. p. 4]).

(see image) Page from the First Complete Edition of the Babylonian **Talmud**, Printed by Bomberg, Venice, 1520-23. (From the Sulzberger collection in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York.) The chief data regarding the academies of Palestine and Babylon, whose activity resulted in the **Talmud**, have been set forth elsewhere (see Jew. Encyc. i. 145-148, s.v. [Academies](#)), so that here stress need be laid only on those events in the history of the two schools and of their teachers which are especially noteworthy in

connection with the origin and the final redaction of the two **Talmudim**. It may be said, by way of preface, that the academies of Palestine and Babylon were in constant intercommunication, notwithstanding their geographical position. Many prominent Babylonian scholars settled permanently in Palestine, and many eminent Palestinians sojourned in Babylon for some time, or even for a considerable portion of their lives. In the second half of the third century Babylonian students sought the Palestinian schools with especial frequency, while many pupils of Johanan went during the same period to Babylon; and in the troublous days of the fourth century many Palestinian scholars sought refuge in the more quiet regions along the Euphrates. This uninterrupted association of scholars resulted in an active interchange of ideas between the schools, especially as the activity of both was devoted in the main to the study of the Mishnah. The Jerusalem **Talmud** accordingly contains a large number of sayings by Babylonian authorities, and Babli quotes a still larger number of sayings by Palestinian scholars in addition to the proceedings of the Palestinian academies, while it likewise devotes a very considerable space to the halakic and haggadic teachings of such Palestinian masters as Johanan, Simeon b. La'ish, and Abbahu. Anonymous Palestinian sentences are quoted in Babli with the statement, "They say in the West"; and similar maxims of Babylonian origin are quoted in Yerushalmi in the name of "the scholars there." Both the **Talmudim** thus acquired more traits in common than they had formerly possessed despite their common foundation, while owing to the mass of material which Babli received from the schools of the Holy Land it was destined in a measure to supplant the Palestinian **Talmud** even in Palestine.

Activity of Jonah and Jose.

The history of the origin of Yerushalmi covers a period of two centuries. Its projector was Johanan, the great teacher of Tiberias, who, together with his pupils and contemporaries, some of them of considerable prominence, laid the foundations for the work which was continued by succeeding generations. The extreme importance of Johanan in the genesis of the Palestinian **Talmud** seems to have been the basis of

the belief, which first found expression in the twelfth century, although it is certainly older in origin, that he was the author of Yerushalmi (see Frankel, "Mebo," p. 47b). As a matter of fact, however, almost a century and a half elapsed after the death of Johanan (279) before this **Talmud** received its present form, but it was approximated to this form, toward the end of the fourth century, by Jonah and Jose, the two directors of the Academy of Tiberias. Their joint halakic sentences, controversies, and divergent opinions on the utterances of their predecessors are scattered throughout Yerushalmi; but the conclusion that Jose redacted it twice, which has been drawn from certain statements in this **Talmud**, is incorrect (Frankel, l.c. p. 101a; Weiss, "Dor," iii. 113 et seq., 211; see Lewy, l.c. pp. 10, 17; Halevy, "Dorot ha-Rishonim," ii. 322). Jonah's son Mani, one of the scholars most frequently named in Yerushalmi, seems, after studying at Cæsarea, where noteworthy scholars were living in the fourth century, to have raised the school of Sepphoris to its highest plane; and a large number of the sayings of the "scholars of Cæsarea" was included in Yerushalmi (see "Monatsschrift," 1901, pp. 298-310). The only other halakist of importance among the Palestinian amoraim is Jose b. Abin (or Abun). According to Frankel (l.c. p. 102a), he occupied about the same position in regard to the redaction of Yerushalmi as was held by Ashi in regard to that of Babli (see also Weiss, l.c. iii. 117). The final redaction of the **Talmud** was reserved for the succeeding generation, probably because the activity of the Academy of Tiberias ceased with the discontinuance of the patriarchate (c. 425). This was the time during which Tan uma b. Abba (see Bacher, "Ag. Pal. Amor." iii. 502) made his collection and definite literary arrangement of the haggadic exegesis of the amoraic period.

The beginnings of the Babylonian **Talmud** are associated both with Nehardea, where the study of the tradition had flourished even before the close of the tannaitic period, and with Sura, where Rab founded a new academy which soon surpassed Nehardea in importance. Rab and Samuel, who respectively presided with equal distinction over the two schools, laid the foundation of the Babylonian **Talmud** through their comments on the Mishnah and their other

teachings. Their views are frequently contrasted in the form of controversies; but on the other hand they are often mentioned as the common authors of sentences which were probably transmitted by certain pupils who had heard them from both masters. One of these pupils, Judah b. Ezekiel, when asked to explain some of the more obscure portions of the Mishnah, subsequently alluded plaintively to the "hawayyot" of Rab and Samuel, meaning thereby the questions and comments of the two masters on the entire Mishnah (Ber. 20a and parallels). In like manner, scholars of the fourth century spoke of the hawayot of Abaye and Raba, which formed, as it were, the quintessence of the **Talmud**, and which, according to an anachronistic addition to an old baraita, were even said to have been included in the branches of knowledge familiar to Johanan b. Zakkai (Suk. 28a; B. B. 134a).

Activity of Raba.

The pupils of Rab and Samuel, the leading amoraim of the second half of the third century—Huna, isda, Na man b. Jacob, Sheshet, and the Judah mentioned above, who is especially prominent as a transmitter of the sayings of his two teachers—added a mass of material to the **Talmud**; and the last-named founded the Academy of Pumbedita, where, as at Sura, the development of the **Talmud** was continued. Pumbedita was likewise the birth-place of that casuistic and hair-splitting method of interpreting and criticizing halakic passages which forms the special characteristic of the Babylonian **Talmud**, although the scholars of this academy devoted themselves also to the study of the collections of tannaitic traditions; and at the beginning of the fourth century the representatives of the two movements, "Sinai" Joseph and Rabbah, the "uprooter of mountains," succeeded their master Judah and became the directors of the school. Their sayings and controversies, together with the still more important dicta and debates of their pupils Abaye and Raba, form a considerable part of the material of the **Talmud**, which was greatly increased at the same time by the halakic and haggadic sentences brought from Palestine to Babylon. All the six orders of the Mishnah were then studied, as is stated by Raba (not Rabba; see Rabbinovicz, "Di du e Soferim," on Ta'anit, p. 144),

although in Judah's time the lectures had been confined to the fourth order, or, according to the view of Weiss ("Dor," iii. 187), which is probably correct, to the first four orders (comp. Meg. 28b; Ta'an. 24a, b; Sanh. 106b; Raba's pupil Pappa expresses a similar view in Ber. 20a).

Rab's activity marks the culmination of the work on the **Talmud**. The time had now come when the preservation and arrangement of the material already collected were more important than further accretions. Na man b. Isaac, pupil and successor of Raba (d. 352), whom he survived but four years, expressed the task of the epigoni in the following words (Pes. 105b): "I am neither a sage nor a seer, nor even a scholar as contrasted with the majority. I am a transmitter ["gamrana"] and an arranger ["sadrana]." The combination of the former term with the latter, which occurs only here, very concisely summarizes the activity of the redactor. It is clear that Na man b. Isaac actually engaged in this task from the fact that he is mentioned as the Babylonian amora who introduced [Mnemonics](#) ("simanim"), designed to facilitate the memorizing and grouping of **Talmudic** passages and the names of their authors. The mnemonics ascribed to him in the **Talmud** (see J. Brüll, "Die Mnemotechnik des **Talmuds**," p. 21; Bacher, "Ag. Bab. Amor." p. 134), however, constitute only a very small part of the simanim included in the text of that work. These again form but a remnant of the entire mass of what N. Brüll ("Jahrb." ii. 60) terms the "mnemotechnic apparatus," of which only a portion was included in the printed text of the **Talmud**, although many others may be traced both in the manuscripts of the **Talmud** and in ancient citations (see N. Brüll, l.c. pp. 62 et seq., 118 et seq.). The material, to which the epigoni of the second half of the fourth century had added little, was now ready for its final redaction; and it was definitively edited by [Ashi](#) (d. 427), who during his long period of activity infused fresh life into the Academy of Sura. In view of his recognized authority, little was left for the two succeeding generations, except to round out the work, since another redaction was no longer possible. The work begun by Ashi was completed by Rabina (Abina), whose death in 499 marks, according to an ancient tradition, the end of the amoraic period and the

completion of the redaction of the **Talmud**.

Committed to Writing.

The date at which the **Talmud** was committed to writing is purely conjectural. The work itself contains neither statements nor allusions to show that any complete or partial copy of the work redacted and completed by Ashi and Rabina had been made in their days; and the same lack of information characterizes both Yerushalmi and the Mishnah (the basis of both the **Talmudim**), as well as the other works of the tannaitic period. There are, however, allusions, although they are only sporadic, which show that the Halakah and the Haggadah were committed to writing; for copies were described as being in the possession of individual scholars, who were occasionally criticized for owning them. This censure was based on an interdiction issued in the third century, which forbade any one to commit the teachings of tradition to writing or to use a manuscript of such a character in lecturing (see *Gi . 60a*; *Tem. 14b*). Replying to the scholars of Kairwan, Sherira Gaon in his letter (ed. Neubauer, "M. J. C." i. 26) alludes to this prohibition as follows: "In answer to your question asking when the Mishnah and the **Talmud** were respectively committed to writing, it should be said that neither of them was thus transmitted, but both were arranged [redacted] orally; and the scholars believe it to be their duty to recite them from memory, and not from written copies." From the second part of this statement it is evident that even in Sherira's time the "scholars," a term here restricted to the members of the Babylonian academies, refrained from using written copies of the **Talmud** in their lectures, although they were sufficiently familiar with it to be able to recite it from memory. The statement that the exilarch Na ronai (8th cent.), who emigrated to Spain, wrote a copy of the **Talmud** from memory (see Brüll, "Jahrb." ii. 51), would show that the scholars of the geonic period actually knew the work by heart. Although this statement is not altogether free from suspicion, it at least proves that it was believed to be within the powers of this exilarch to make a copy of the **Talmud** without having an original at hand. This passage also throws light upon the period of the development and redaction of the **Talmud**, during

which the ability to memorize the mass of material taught in the schools was developed to an extent which now transcends conception.

On the other hand, Sherira's statement shows that his denial of the existence of the **Talmud** and the Mishnah in written form was limited to an officially recognized redaction; for manuscripts of the kind mentioned by him were then current, as they had been in the geonic period, despite the interdiction; for they were used at least as aids to study, and without them the **Talmud** could not possibly have been memorized. In like manner, this prohibition, in the light of Sherira's words, does not preclude the existence of private copies of portions of the traditional literature, even in earlier times. The concealed rolls ("megillot setarim") with halakic comments which Rab found in the house of his uncle iyya (Shab. 6b; B. M. 92a), as well as the notebooks () mentioned at the beginning of the amoraic period and in which such scholars as Levi b. Sisi, Joshua b. Levi, Ze'iri, and ilfai or Ilfa (Shab. 156a; Yer. Ma'as. 49d, 60b; Men. 70a), entered sentences, some of them halakic in character, indicate that such personal copies were frequently used, while the written Haggadah is repeatedly mentioned. It may therefore be assumed that the Mishnah and other tannaitic traditional works were committed to writing as early as the time of the Amoraim. In like manner, there may have been copies of the amoraic comments on the Mishnah, as aids to the memory and to private study. In the early part of the fourth century Ze'era disputed the accuracy of the halakic tradition taught by the Babylonian amora Sheshet, and as he based his suspicions on Sheshet's blindness, he evidently believed that it was impossible for the Babylonian scholar to confirm and verify his knowledge by the use of written notes (see Bacher, "Ag. Pal. Amor." iii. 4). When Ashi undertook the final redaction of the **Talmud** he evidently had at his disposal notes of this kind, although Brüll (l.c. p. 18) is probably correct in ascribing to Rabina the first complete written copy of the **Talmud**; Rabina had as collaborators many of the Saboraim, to whom an ancient and incontrovertible tradition assigns numerous additions to the **Talmudic** text.

No Formal Ratification.

When Rabina died a written text of the **Talmud** was already in existence, the material contributed by the Saboraim being merely additions; although in thus extending the text they simply continued what had been done since the first redaction of the **Talmud** by Ashi. The Saboraim, however, confined themselves to additions of a certain form which made no change whatsoever in the text as determined by them under the direction of Rabina (on these saboraic additions as well as on other accretions in Babli, see the statements by Brüll, l.c. pp. 69-86). Yet there is no allusion whatever to a formal sanction of the written text of the **Talmud**; for neither did such a ratification take place nor was a formal one at all necessary. The Babylonian academies, which produced the text in the course of 300 years, remained its guardians when it was reduced to writing; and it became authoritative in virtue of its acceptance by the successors of the Amoraim, as the Mishnah had been sanctioned by the latter and was made the chief subject of study, thus becoming a basis for halakic decisions. The traditions, however, underwent no further development; for the "horayot," or the independent exegesis of the Mishnah and the halakic decisions based on this exegesis, ceased with Ashi and Rabina, and thus with the completion of the **Talmud**, as is stated in the canon incorporated in the **Talmud** itself (B. M. 86a). The Mishnah, the basal work of halakic tradition, thenceforth shared its authority with the **Talmud**.

Among the Jews who came under the influence of western Arabic culture the belief that the **Talmud** (and the Mishnah) had been redacted orally was superseded by the view that the initial redaction itself had been in writing. This theory was first expressed by R. Nissim of Kairwan ("Maftaḥ", p. 3b), although even before his time the question addressed, as already noted, to Sherira Gaon by the Jews of Kairwan had shown that they favored this view, and the gaon's response had received an interpolation postulating the written redaction of the **Talmud**.

The definitive redaction of the Babylonian **Talmud** marks a new epoch in the history of the Jewish people, in which the **Talmud** itself becomes the most important

factor, both as the pivotal point of the development and the manifestation of the spirit of Judaism, and as a work of literature deeply influenced by the fortunes of those who cherished it as their palladium. On the internal history of Judaism the **Talmud** exerted a decisive influence as the recognized source for a knowledge of tradition and as the authoritative collection of the traditional religious doctrines which supplemented the Bible; indeed, this influence and the efforts which were made to escape from it, or to restrict it within certain limits, constitute the substance of the inner history of Judaism. The Babylonian academies, which had gradually become the central authority for the entire Jewish Diaspora, found their chief task in teaching the **Talmud**, on which they based the answers to the questions addressed to them. Thus was evolved a new science, the interpretation of the **Talmud**, which produced a literature of wide ramifications, and whose beginnings were the work of the Geonim themselves.

Influence of the **Talmud**.

The **Talmud** and its study spread from Babylon to Egypt, northern Africa, Italy, Spain, France, and Germany, regions destined to become the abodes of the Jewish spirit; and in all these countries intellectual interest centered in the **Talmud**. The first great reaction against its supremacy was Karaism, which arose in the very strong-hold of the Geonim within two centuries after the completion of the **Talmud**. The movement thus initiated and the influence of Arabic culture were the two chief factors which aroused the dormant forces of Judaism and gave inspiration to the scientific pursuits to which the Jewish spirit owed many centuries of marvelous and fruitful activity. This activity, however, did not infringe in the least on the authority of the **Talmud**; for although it combined other ideals and intellectual aims with **Talmudic** study, which it enriched and perfected, the importance of that study was in no wise decried by those who devoted themselves to other fields of learning. Nor did the speculative treatment of the fundamental teachings of Judaism lower the position of the **Talmud**; for Maimonides, the greatest philosopher of religion of his time, was likewise the greatest student of the **Talmud**, on which work he endeavored to base his philosophic views. A dangerous

internal enemy of the **Talmud**, however, arose in the Cabala during the thirteenth century; but it also had to share with the **Talmud** the supremacy to which it aspired.

([see image](#)) Page from Tractate *iddushin* of the Babylonian

Talmud, Sabbionetta, 1559. (From the Sulzberger collection in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York.) During the decline of intellectual life among the Jews which began in the sixteenth century, the **Talmud** was regarded almost as the supreme authority by the majority of them; and in the same century eastern Europe, especially Poland, became the seat of its study. Even the Bible was relegated to a secondary place, and the Jewish schools devoted themselves almost exclusively to the **Talmud**; so that "study" became synonymous with "study of the **Talmud**." A reaction against the supremacy of the **Talmud** came with the appearance of Moses Mendelssohn and the intellectual regeneration of Judaism through its contact with the Gentile culture of the eighteenth century, the results of this struggle being a closer assimilation to European culture, the creation of a new science of Judaism, and the movements for religious reform. Despite the Karaite inclinations which frequently appeared in these movements, the great majority of the followers of Judaism clung to the principle, authoritatively maintained by the **Talmud**, that tradition supplements the Bible; and the **Talmud** itself retained its authority as the work embodying the traditions of the earliest post-Biblical period, when Judaism was molded. Modern culture, however, has gradually alienated from the study of the **Talmud** a number of Jews in the countries of progressive civilization, and it is now regarded by the most of them merely as one of the branches of Jewish theology, to which only a limited amount of time can be devoted, although it occupies a prominent place in the curricula of the rabbinical seminaries. On the whole Jewish learning has done full justice to the **Talmud**, many scholars of the nineteenth century having made noteworthy contributions to its history and textual criticism, and having constituted it the basis of historical and archeological researches. The study of the **Talmud** has even attracted the attention of non-Jewish scholars; and it has been included in the curricula of universities.

Edict of Justinian.

The external history of the **Talmud** reflects in part the history of Judaism persisting in a world of hostility and persecution. Almost at the very time that the Babylonian savoraim put the finishing touches to the redaction of the **Talmud**, the emperor Justinian issued his edict against the abolition of the Greek translation of the Bible in the service of the Synagogue, and also forbade the use of the **Halakha**, or traditional exposition of Scripture. This edict, dictated by Christian zeal and anti-Jewish feeling, was the prelude to attacks on the **Talmud**, conceived in the same spirit, and beginning in the thirteenth century in France, where **Talmudic** study was then flourishing. The charge against the **Talmud** brought by the convert Nicholas Donin led to the first public disputation between Jews and Christians and to the first burning of copies of the work (Paris, 1244). The **Talmud** was likewise the subject of a disputation at Barcelona in 1263 between Moses ben Na' man and Pablo Christiani. In this controversy Na' manides asserted that the haggadic portions of the **Talmud** were merely "sermones," and therefore devoid of binding force; so that proofs deduced from them in support of Christian dogmas were invalid, even in case they were correct.

Attacks on the **Talmud**.

This same Pablo Christiani made an attack on the **Talmud** which resulted in a papal bull against it and in the first censorship, which was undertaken at Barcelona by a commission of Dominicans, who ordered the cancelation of passages reprehensible from a Christian point of view (1264). At the disputation of Tortosa in 1413, Geronimo de Santa Fé brought forward a number of accusations, including the fateful assertion that the condemnations of pagans and apostates found in the **Talmud** referred in reality to Christians. Two years later, Pope Martin V., who had convened this disputation, issued a bull (which was destined, however, to remain inoperative) forbidding the Jews to read the **Talmud**, and ordering the destruction of all copies of it. Far more important were the charges made in the early part of the sixteenth century by the convert Johann Pfefferkorn, the agent of the

Dominicans. The result of these accusations was a struggle in which the emperor and the pope acted as judges, the advocate of the Jews being Johann Reuchlin, who was opposed by the obscurantists and the humanists; and this controversy, which was carried on for the most part by means of pamphlets, became the precursor of the Reformation. An unexpected result of this affair was the complete printed edition of the Babylonian **Talmud** issued in 1520 by Daniel Bomberg at Venice, under the protection of a papal privilege. Three years later, in 1523, Bomberg published the first edition of the Palestinian **Talmud**. After thirty years the Vatican, which had first permitted the **Talmud** to appear in print, undertook a campaign of destruction against it. On New-Year's Day (Sept. 9), 1553, the copies of the **Talmud** which had been confiscated in compliance with a decree of the Inquisition were burned at Rome; and similar burnings took place in other Italian cities, as at Cremona in 1559. The [Censorship](#) of the **Talmud** and other Hebrew works was introduced by a papal bull issued in 1554; five years later the **Talmud** was included in the first Index Expurgatorius; and Pope Pius IV. commanded, in 1565, that the **Talmud** be deprived of its very name. The first edition of the expurgated **Talmud**, on which most subsequent editions were based, appeared at Basel (1578-1581) with the omission of the entire treatise of 'Abodah Zarah and of passages considered inimical to Christianity, together with modifications of certain phrases. A fresh attack on the **Talmud** was decreed by Pope Gregory XIII. (1575-85), and in 1593 Clement VIII. renewed the old interdiction against reading or owning it. The increasing study of the **Talmud** in Poland led to the issue of a complete edition (Cracow, 1602-5), with a restoration of the original text; an edition containing, so far as known, only two treatises had previously been published at Lublin (1559-76). In 1707 some copies of the **Talmud** were confiscated in the province of Brandenburg, but were restored to their owners by command of Frederick, the first king of Prussia. The last attack on the **Talmud** took place in Poland in 1757, when Bishop Dembowski, at the instance of the Frankists, convened a public disputation at Kamenetz-Podolsk, and ordered all copies of the work found in his bishopric to be confiscated and burned by the hangman.

(see image) PAGE FROM TRACTATE SHABBAT OF THE ROMM

EDITION OF THE BABYLONIAN **TALMUD**, WILNA, 1886. The external history of the **Talmud** includes also the literary attacks made upon it by Christian theologians after the Reformation, since these onslaughts on Judaism were directed primarily against that work, even though it was made a subject of study by the Christian theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1830, during a debate in the French Chamber of Peers regarding state recognition of the Jewish faith, Admiral Verhuell declared himself unable to forgive the Jews whom he had met during his travels throughout the world either for their refusal to recognize Jesus as the Messiah or for their possession of the **Talmud**. In the same year the Abbé [Chiarini](#) published at Paris a voluminous work entitled "Théorie du Judaïsme," in which he announced a translation of the **Talmud**, advocating for the first time a version which should make the work generally accessible, and thus serve for attacks on Judaism. In a like spirit modern anti-Semitic agitators have urged that a translation be made; and this demand has even been brought before legislative bodies, as in Vienna. The **Talmud** and the "Talmud Jew" thus became objects of anti-Semitic attacks, although, on the other hand, they were defended by many Christian students of the **Talmud**.

In consequence of the checkered fortunes of the **Talmud**, manuscripts of it are extremely rare; and the Babylonian **Talmud** is found entire only in a Munich codex (Hebrew MS. No. 95), completed in 1369, while a Florentine manuscript containing several treatises of the fourth and fifth orders dates from the year 1176. A number of **Talmudic** codices containing one or more tractates are extant in Rome, Oxford, Paris, Hamburg, and New York, while the treatise Sanhedrin, from Reuchlin's library, is in the grand-ducal library at Carlsruhe. In the introduction to vols. i., iv., viii., ix., and xi. of his "Di du e Soferim, Variæ Lectiones in Mischnam et in **Talmud** Babylonicum," which contains a mass of critical material bearing on the text of Babli, N. Rabbinovicz has described all the manuscripts of this **Talmud** known to him, and has collated the Munich manuscript with the printed editions, besides giving in his running notes a great number of readings collected with much skill and learning from other manuscripts and various ancient sources. Of this work, which is

indispensable for the study of the **Talmud**, Rabinovicz himself published fifteen volumes (Munich, 1868-86), containing the treatises of the first, second, and fourth orders, as well as two treatises (Zebahim and Menachot) of the fifth order. The sixteenth volume (Shulchan Aruch) was published posthumously (completed by Ehrentreu, Przemyśl, 1897). Of the Palestinian **Talmud** only one codex, now at Leyden, has been preserved, this being one of the manuscripts used for the editio princeps. Excepting this codex, only fragments and single treatises are extant. Recently (1904) Luncz discovered a portion of Yerushalmi in the Vatican Library, and Ratner has made valuable contributions to the history of the text in his scholia on Yerushalmi ("Sefer Ahabat Yisroel we-Yerushalayim"), of which three volumes have thus far appeared, comprising Berakot, Shabbat, Terumot, and Challah (Wilna, 1901, 1902, 1904).

Early Editions.

The first edition of Babli (1520) was preceded by a series of editions, some of them no longer extant, of single treatises published at Soncino and Pesaro by the Soncinos. The first to appear was Berakot (1488); this was followed by the twenty-three other tractates which, according to Gershon Soncino, were regularly studied in the yeshivot. The first edition by Bomberg was followed by two more (1531, 1548), while another was published at Venice by Giustiniani (1546-51), who added to Bomberg's supplements (such as Rashi and the Tosafot, which later were invariably appended to the text) other useful marginal glosses, including references to Biblical quotations and to parallel passages of the **Talmud** as well as to the ritual codices. At Sabbionetta in 1553, Joshua Boaz (d. 1557), the author of these marginalia, which subsequently were added to all editions of the **Talmud**, undertook a new and magnificent edition of the **Talmud**. Only a few treatises were completed, however; for the papal bull issued against the **Talmud** in the same year interrupted the work. As a result of the burning of thousands of copies of the **Talmud** in Italy, Joseph Jabez published a large number of treatises at Salonica (1563 et seq.) and Constantinople (1583 et seq.). The mutilated Basel edition (1578-81) and the two editions which first appeared in Poland have been mentioned above. The

first Cracow edition (1602-5) was followed by a second (1616-20); while the first Lublin edition (1559 et seq.), which was incomplete, was followed by one giving the entire text (1617-39); this was adopted for the Amsterdam edition (1644-48), the partial basis of the edition of Frankfort-on-the-Oder (1697-99). Many useful addenda were made to the second Amsterdam edition (1714-19), which was the subject of an interesting lawsuit, and which was completed by the edition of Frankfort-on-the-Main (1720-22). This latter text has served as the basis of almost all the subsequent editions. Of these the most important are: Prague, 1728-39; Berlin and Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1734-39 (earlier ed. 1715-22); Amsterdam, 1752-65; Sulzbach, 1755-63, 1766-70; Vienna, 1791-1797, 1806-11, 1830-33, 1840-49, 1860-73; Dyhernfurth, 1800-4, 1816-21; Slawita, Russia, 1801-6, 1808-13, 1817-22; Prague, 1830-35, 1839-46; Wilna and Grodno, 1835-54; Czernowitz, 1840-49; Jitomir, 1858-64; Warsaw, 1859-64, 1863-67 et seq.; Wilna, 1859-66; Lemberg, 1860-65 et seq.; Berlin, 1862-68; Stettin, 1862 et seq. (incomplete). The edition of the Widow and Brothers Romm at Wilna (1886) is the largest as regards old and new commentaries, glosses, other addenda, and aids to study.

Two other editions of Yerushalmi have appeared in addition to the editio princeps (Venice, 1523 et seq.), which they closely follow in columniation—those of Cracow, 1609, and Krotoschin, 1866. A complete edition with commentary appeared at Jitomir in 1860-67. The latest edition is that of Piotrkow (1898-1900). There are also editions of single orders or treatises and their commentaries, especially noteworthy being Z. Frankel's edition of Berakot, Pe'ah, and Demai (Breslau, 1874-75).

"Variæ Lectiones" and Translations.

A critical edition of Babli has been proposed repeatedly, and a number of valuable contributions have been made, especially in the huge collections of variants by Rabbinovicz; but so far this work has not even been begun, although mention should be made of the interesting attempt by M. Friedmann, "Kritische Edition des Traktates Makkoth," in the "Verhandlungen des

Siebenten Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses, Semitische Section," pp. 1-78 (Vienna, 1888). Here the structure of the text is indicated by such external means as different type, sections, and punctuation. The edition of Yerushalmi announced by Luncz at Jerusalem promises a text of critical purity.

The earliest allusion to a translation of the **Talmud** is made by Abraham ibn Daud in his historical "Sefer ha-abbalah" (see Neubauer, "M. J. C." i. 69), who, referring to Joseph ibn Abitur (second half of 10th cent.), says: "He is the one who translated the entire **Talmud** into Arabic for the calif Al-akim." The tradition was therefore current among the Jews of Spain in the twelfth century that Ibn Abitur had translated the **Talmud** for this ruler of Cordova, who was especially noted for his large library, this tradition being analogous to the one current in Alexandria in antiquity with regard to the first Greek translation of the Bible. No trace, however, remains of Joseph Abitur's translation; and in all probability he translated merely detached portions for the calif, this work giving rise to the legend of his complete version. The need of a translation to render the contents of the **Talmud** more generally accessible, began to be felt by Christian theologians after the sixteenth century, and by Jewish circles in the nineteenth century. This gave rise to the translations of the Mishnah which have been noted elsewhere (see Jew. Encyc. viii. 618, s.v., [Mishnah](#)). In addition to the complete translations mentioned there, single treatises of the Mishnah have been rendered into Latin and into modern languages, a survey being given by Bischoff in his "Kritische Geschichte der Thalmud-Uebersetzungen," pp. 28-56 (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1899). Twenty treatises of Yerushalmi were translated into Latin by Blasio Ugolino in his "Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum," xvii. (1755), xxx. (1765); and the entire text of this **Talmud** was rendered into French by Moïse Schwab ("Le **Talmud** de Jérusalem," 11 vols., Paris, 1871-1889). The translation by Wünsche of the haggadic portions of Yerushalmi has already been mentioned; and an account of the translations of single portions is given by Bischoff (l.c. pp. 59 et seq.). In 1896 L. Goldschmidt began the translation of a German version of Babli, together with the text of Bomberg's first edition; and a number of volumes have already

appeared (Berlin, 1898 et seq.). The insufficiency of this work apparently corresponds to the rapidity with which it is issued. In the same year M. L. Rodkinson undertook an abridged translation of the Babylonian **Talmud** into English, of which seven volumes appeared before the translator's death (1904); Rodkinson's point of view was quite unscholarly. Of translations of single treatises the following may be mentioned (see Bischoff, l.c. pp. 68-76): Earlier Latin translations: Ugolino, *Ze a im*, *Mena ot* (in "Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum," xix.), *Sanhedrin* (ib. xxv.); G. E. Edzard, *Berakot* (Hamburg, 1713); F. B. Dachs, *Sukkah* (Utrecht, 1726). Noteworthy among the Jewish translators of the **Talmud** are M. Rawicz (*Megillah*, 1863; *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 1886; *Sanhedrin*, 1892; *Ketubot*, 1897); E. M. Pinner (*Berakot*, 1842, designed as the first volume of a translation of the entire **Talmud**); D. O. Straschun (*Ta'anit*, 1883); and Sammter (*Baba Me i'a*, 1876). Their translations are entirely in German. Translations published by Christian scholars in the nineteenth century: F. C. Ewald (a baptized Jew), *'Abodah Zarah* (Nuremberg, 1856); in 1831 the Abbé Chiarini, mentioned above, published a French translation of *Berakot*; and in 1891 A. W. Streane prepared an English translation of *agigah*. A French version of several treatises is included in J. M. Rabinovicz's works '*Législation Civile du Talmud*' (5 vols., Paris, 1873-79) and '*Législation Criminelle du Talmud*' (ib. 1876), while Wünsche's translation of the haggadic portions of *Babli* (1886-89) has been mentioned above.

Function in Judaism.

To gain a comprehensive view of the **Talmud** it must be considered as a historical factor in Judaism as well as a literary production. In the latter aspect it is unique among the great masterpieces of the literatures of the world. In form a commentary, it became an encyclopedia of Jewish faith and scholarship, comprising whatsoever the greatest representatives of Judaism in Palestine and in Babylon had regarded as objects of study and investigation and of teaching and learning, during the three centuries which elapsed from the conclusion of the *Mishnah* to the completion of the **Talmud** itself. When the *Mishnah*, with the many

ancient traditions to which it had given rise since the latter centuries of the Second Temple, was incorporated into the **Talmud** as its text-book, the **Talmud** became a record of the entire epoch which was represented by the Jewish schools of Palestine and Babylon, and which served as a stage of transition from the Biblical period to the later aspect of Judaism. Although the **Talmud** is an academic product and may be characterized in the main as a report (frequently with the accuracy of minutes) of the discussions of the schools, it also sheds a flood of light on the culture of the people outside the academies. The interrelation between the schools and daily life, and the fact that neither teachers nor pupils stood aloof from that life, but took part in it as judges, instructors, and expounders of the Law, caused the **Talmud** to represent even non-scholastic affairs with an abundance of minute details, and made it an important source for the history of civilization. Since, moreover, the religious law of the Jews dealt with all the circumstances of life, the **Talmud** discusses the most varied branches of human knowledge—astronomy and medicine, mathematics and law, anatomy and botany—thus furnishing valuable data for the history of science also.

([see image](#)) Page From The Latest Edition of the Jerusalem **Talmud**, Printed at Piotrkow, 1899-1903.(In the possession of J. D. Eisenstein, New York.)The **Talmud**, furthermore, is unique from the point of view of literary history as being a product of literature based on oral tradition and yet summarizing the literature of an entire epoch. Aside from it, those to whose united efforts it may be ascribed have left no trace of intellectual activity. Though anonymous itself, the **Talmud**, like other products of tannaitic and amoraic literature, cites the names of many authors of sayings because it was a universal practise to memorize the name of the author together with the saying. Many of these scholars are credited with only a few sentences or with even but one, while to others are ascribed many hundreds of aphorisms, teachings, questions, and answers; and the representatives of Jewish tradition of those centuries, the Tannaim and the Amoraim, received an abundant compensation for their renunciation of the fame of authorship when tradition preserved their names together with their various expositions, and thus rescued even the least of them from oblivion. The

peculiar form of the **Talmud** is due to the fact that it is composed almost entirely of individual sayings and discussions on them, this circumstance being a result of its origin: the fact that it sought especially to preserve the oral tradition and the transactions of the academies allowed the introduction only of the single sentences which represented the contributions of the teachers and scholars to the discussions. The preservation of the names of the authors of these apothegms, and of those who took part in the discussions, transactions, and disputations renders the **Talmud** the most important, and in many respects the only, source for the period of which it is the product. The sequence of generations which constitute the framework of the history of the Tannaim and Amoraim may be determined from the allusions contained in the **Talmud**, from the anecdotes and stories of the academies, and from other valuable literary material, which exhibit the historical conditions, events, and personages of the time, not excepting cases in which the facts have been clothed in the garb of legend or myth. Although it was undertaken with no distinctly literary purpose, it contains, especially in its haggadic portions, many passages which are noteworthy as literature, and which for many centuries were the sole repositories of Jewish poetry.

Its Authority.

After the completion of the **Talmud** as a work of literature, it exercised a twofold influence as a historical factor in the history of Judaism and its followers, not only in regard to the guidance and formulation of religious life and thought, but also with respect to the awakening and development of intellectual activity. As a document of religion the **Talmud** acquired that authority which was due to it as the written embodiment of the ancient tradition, and it fulfilled the task which the men of the Great Assembly set for the representatives of the tradition when they said, "Make a hedge for the Torah" (Ab. i. 2). Those who professed Judaism felt no doubt that the **Talmud** was equal to the Bible as a source of instruction and decision in problems of religion, and every effort to set forth religious teachings and duties was based on it; so that even the great systematic treatise of Maimonides, which was intended to supersede the **Talmud**, only led to a more thorough

study of it. In like manner, the Shulchan Aruk of Joseph Caro, which achieved greater practical results than the Mishneh Torah, of Maimonides, owed its authority to the fact that it was recognized as the most convenient codification of the teachings of the **Talmud**; while the treatises on the philosophy of religion which strove as early as the time of Saadia to harmonize the truths of Judaism with the results of independent thinking referred in all possible cases to the authority of the **Talmud**, upon which they could easily draw for a confirmation of their theses and arguments. The wealth of moral instruction contained in the **Talmud** exercised a profound influence upon the ethics and ideals of Judaism. Despite all this, however, the authority enjoyed by it did not lessen the authority of the Bible, which continued to exercise its influence as the primal source of religious and ethical instruction and edification even while the **Talmud** ruled supreme over religious practise, preserving and fostering in the Diaspora, for many centuries and under most unfavorable external conditions, the spirit of deep religion and strict morality.

The history of Jewish literature since the completion of the **Talmud** has been a witness to its importance in awakening and stimulating intellectual activity among the Jews. The **Talmud** has been made the subject or the starting-point of a large portion of this widely ramified literature, which has been the product of the intellectual activity induced by its study, and to which both scholars in the technical sense of the word and also a large number of the studious Jewish laity have contributed. The same faculties which had been exercised in the composition of the **Talmud** were requisite also for the study of it; the **Talmud** therefore had an exceedingly stimulating influence upon the intellectual powers of the Jewish people, which were then directed toward other departments of knowledge. It is a noteworthy fact that the study of the **Talmud** gradually became a religious duty, and thus developed into an intellectual activity having no ulterior object in view. Consequently it formed a model of study for the sake of study.

The **Talmud** has not yet entirely lost its twofold importance as a historical factor within Judaism,

despite the changes which have taken place during the last century. For the majority of Jews it is still the supreme authority in religion; and, as noted above, although it is rarely an object of study on the part of those who have assimilated modern culture, it is still a subject of investigation for Jewish learning, as a product of Judaism which yet exerts an influence second in importance only to the Bible.

The following works of traditional literature not belonging to the **Talmud** have been included in the editions of Babi: [Abot de-Rabbi Natan](#); [Derek Ere Rabbah](#); [Derek Ere Zu a Kallah](#); [Sema ot](#); [Soferim](#).

Bibliography: The manuscripts, editions, and translations have been discussed in the article. For an introduction to the **Talmud** the following works may be mentioned in addition to the general ones on Jewish history: Weiss, Dor, iii.;

Halevy, Dorot ha-Rishonim, ii., Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1901;

H. L. Strack, Einleitung in den **Talmud**, 2d ed., Leipsic, 1894 (covers the Mishnah also and contains an extensive bibliography of the **Talmud**);

M. Mielziner, Introduction to the **Talmud**, Cincinnati (also gives good bibliography of the **Talmud**; the second part of this work contains a clear discussion of the hermeneutics and the methodology of the **Talmud**). On the Palestinian **Talmud**: Z. Frankel, Mebo, Breslau, 1870;

J. Wiener, Gib'at Yerushalayim, Vienna, 1872 (reprinted from Ha-Sha'ar);

A. Geiger, Die Jerusalemische Gemara, in his Jüd. Zeit. 1870, pp. 278-306 (comp. Monatsschrift, 1871, pp. 120-137);

I. Lewy, Interpretation des Ersten Abschnitts des Palästinischen **Talmud**-Traktates Nesikin, in Breslauer Jahresbericht, 1895, pp. 1-19. On the Babylonian **Talmud**: Z. Frankel, Beiträge zur Einleitung in den **Talmud**, in Monatsschrift, 1861, pp. 168-194, 205-212, 258-272;

N. Brüll, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Babylonischen **Talmuds** als Schriftwerkes, in his Jahrb. 1876, ii. 1-123. On the earlier works introductory to the **Talmud**: J. H. Weiss, in Bet **Talmud**, i., ii., Vienna, 1881, 1882;

Samuel b. Hophni, Madkhal ila 'al-Talmud (= "Introduction to the **Talmud**"; this is the earliest work bearing the title and is known only through a quotation in the lexicon of Ibn Jana , s.v. **תלמוד**);

Samuel ha-Nagid, Mebo ha-Talmud (forming an appendix to the first volume of modern editions of the **Talmud**);

Joseph ibn 'A nin, an introduction to the **Talmud** (Hebr. transl. from the Arabic), edited in the Jubelschrift des Breslauer Seminars zum Siebzigen Geburtstage Frankels, 1871.

For other works on the subject [see Talmud Hermeneutics](#);
 a list is given in Jellinek, on res ha-Kelalim, Vienna, 1878. General
 articles on the **Talmud** in reviews and encyclopedias: Emil Deutsch,
 in Quarterly Review, 1867, frequently reprinted and translated;
 J. Derenbourg, in Lichtenberg's Encyclopédie des Sciences
 Religieuses, 1882, xii. 1007-1036;
 Arsène Darmesteter, in R. E. J. xviii. (Actes et Conférences, pp.
 ccclxxxi.-dcxlii.);
 S. Schechter, in Hastings, Dict. Bible, extra vol., 1904, pp. 57-66;
 E. Bischoff, Talmud-Katechismus, Leipsic, 1904.

On the literature of the **Talmud** commentaries see [Talmud
 Commentaries](#). On grammatical and lexicographical aids to the
 study of the **Talmud** see Jew. Encyc. vi.80, s.v. [Grammar,
 Hebrew](#), and ib. iv. 580-585, s.v. [Dictionaries,
 Hebrew](#).

On the terminology of the **Talmud** see, in addition to the works on
Talmudic methodology: A. Stein, Talmudische Terminologie,
 Alphabetisch Geordnet, Prague, 1869;
 W. Bacher, Die Exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen
 Traditionslitteratur: part i., Die Bibelexegetische Terminologie der
 Tannaiten, Leipsic, 1899 (original title, Die Aelteste Terminologie der
 Jüdischen Schriftauslegung);
 part ii., Die Bibel- und Traditionsexegetische Terminologie der
 Amoräer, ib. 1905.

This article is Rated: 2.74

Please rate this article: **Poor** **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **Excellent**
[Most Popular](#) [Recently Visited](#) [Highest Rated](#)

Conceived, created, and funded by
 The Kopelman Foundation

search powered by
HUNDERSTONE
 Document Retrieval & Management

Copyright 2002 JewishEncyclopedia.com. All rights reserved. [Privacy](#) [Terms of Use](#) [Contact](#)