

THE BABYLONIAN BRANCH OF TANNAITIC HEBREW
AND AN ANCIENT SCROLL FRAGMENT
(B. HULLĪN 101a-105a)

SHAMMA FRIEDMAN

In attempting to identify the authentic linguistic forms of Mishnaic Hebrew, scholars have listed surviving archaic orthographies (J.N. Epstein¹) and chosen select representative texts such as MS Kaufmann of the Mishna (E.Y. Kutscher²). In order to refine this process, forms common in the Babylonian Talmud are often discounted since they may have been introduced by copyists influenced by the style of the Babylonian Talmud.

In applying this method, it is necessary to define "Babylonian forms." Due to insufficient research in the field of Babylonian Talmud linguistic studies, the linguistic information from late manuscripts and the printed editions is often the main source in supplying this definition. This approach partially harks back to an assumption that the Babylonian Talmud itself represents a static and somewhat corrupt linguistic tradition, due to the removal of the creators of this Talmud from the popular, authentic Palestinian style. Consequently, there was little incentive for uncovering older Babylonian forms.

We have initiated a historical study of the Babylonian tradition that examines the linguistic typology of extant complete manuscripts and investigates specific Geniza fragments of great antiquity that appear to contain early linguistic traditions, so that we can begin to approach an assessment of linguistic features of the earliest surviving texts of the Babylonian Talmud, and be able to distinguish between this level and

* A fuller version of this paper appears in *JQR* 86 (1995).

1 Epstein 1948.

2 Kutscher 1963.

the standardized language of late medieval texts.³ Preliminary conclusions can already alter the above picture, making it more variegated synchronically and diachronically.⁴

During the Talmudic period, the Babylonian schools probably possessed a linguistic tradition containing many forms currently considered exclusively Palestinian, as can still be demonstrated from early surviving Babylonian Talmud texts. Secondary forms, or emphases,

3 The investigation of complete manuscripts was based upon 81 units (unit = one manuscript per tractate) in the Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text databank at the Saul Lieberman Institute for Talmudic Research of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, which I had designed with specific consideration for linguistic research. See S. Friedman, "A Typology of the Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud Based upon Orthographic and Linguistic Features," *Lěšonenu* 57 (1992) 123-124; idem, "Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud - An Orthographic and Linguistic Typology," *S. Morag Festschrift*.

4 In the course of preparing the typology, I have uncovered various orthographic patterns, which often relate to the so-called Palestinian and Babylonian types. This research may reopen categories of classification and pose questions regarding the various Babylonian centers, their relationship to Palestine, the evolution of linguistic forms within Babylonia, and the types of linguistic environments in the major centers which served as tradents of the Babylonian Talmudic text. For example, a study of the spelling of the names Rabbah and Rava ("The Orthography of the Names רבא and רבא in the Babylonian Talmud" *Sinai* [1992] 140-164 [Hebrew]) indicates similarity between Ashkenazic and Yemenite manuscripts, which maintain, each in their own way, the earlier practice of non-differentiation, versus the Spanish manuscripts, which contain a secondary scholastic differentiation.

Similarly, with regard to one of the characteristic markers of the Palestinian/Babylonian division, M. Bar-Asher (1987: 8; based upon Rosenthal 1981: 74) has suggested the plural form תרנגולין for Palestinian versus תרנגולים for Babylonian. It is quite clear that this constitutes a distinction of linguistic types. However, it would be difficult to argue that תרנגולים goes back to the Babylonian Talmud. The prevalent form in Babylonian manuscripts is תרנגולין. The so-called Babylonian form תרנגולין occurs in less than 10% of all occurrences. Of these, most are in late or Ashkenazic manuscripts. The same applies for תרנגולא, which occurs in late Ashkenazic manuscripts, as against תרנגולא. Clearly preference for this form is a late medieval phenomenon, in which the base form תרנגול influenced the plural and the Aramaic, displacing the older Aramaic תרנגולא, which was, as far as I can determine, prevalent in early texts of both the Palestinian and Babylonian type. תרנגולין is subjectively exotic in that it does not appear in the late printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud. Thus, its disappearance, a post-medieval phenomenon, creates the illusion of תרנגולים being a Babylonian form. Rather, its exclusiveness is later than the Babylonian period, and its sporadic occurrence is early and Palestinian! It occurs in the Rehov inscription: תרנגולא (alongside תרנגולא; Sussmann 1973-1974: 152 n. 472).

Babylonian texts which caused the elimination of this ancient spelling. If anything, it was better preserved by the manuscripts with Babylonian pointing, and, based upon our fragment, it was in use in the early text of the Babylonian Talmud itself. It has also been preserved in the writings of the Babylonian *Gēḏōnīm*.²⁶

The Venice edition of the Jerusalem Talmud does not have any occurrences of *plene* קול וחומר.²⁷ In the several places I checked, it correctly represents MS Leiden. קול וחומר can be found in manuscripts of the Jerusalem Talmud such as MS Escorial.²⁸ In the light of the above, it is questionable whether the general absence of קול וחומר in late, standardized orthography can be attributed to the Babylonian Talmud. It rather represents a return to the defective Palestinian קל וחומר. Pervasive use of קול וחומר, such as in *Sifrā* Vatican 66 (and perhaps in the *Hullīn* scroll) is, consequently, an indicator of the Babylonian practice, and not the Palestinian!

One of the first of the orthographic features of MS Kaufmann studied by Kutscher was the spelling of the name "Hillel."²⁹ Although his main concern was vocalization and pronunciation, he also addressed the orthographic data. He indicates that *yōd* as a *mater lectionis* after the *hē*, i.e., הילל, is most common in MS Kaufmann where, however, he did not find *yōd* after the *lāmed*, i.e., הליל, a spelling which he records from Ginzberg's *Yerushalmi Fragments* and from inscriptions at Bet Shearim.³⁰ Our fragment consistently reads בית היליל, a double *plene* spelling not recorded by Kutscher.

הילל is unknown to me from the complete manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud. The Biblical הלל is regnant in Yemenite and most

26 See S. Assaf, *Responsa Geonica* (Jerusalem, 1942) 49 and n. 9 (Hebrew). The Geonic writings also preserve the spelling קל in contexts where it is clear that a noun is meant (= קילא). See B.M. Lewin, *Otzar ha-Geonim* (Jerusalem, 1931), IV (Maschkin): 27 (at n. 3; Hebrew).

27 According to Kosovsky 1979, 3:694-695. I refer here and elsewhere only to the specific form קל וחומר. As to the plural, Aramaic, etc., the full form is generally found in all the works discussed, such as קולי חומין in the Jerusalem Talmud.

28 See MS Escorial (ed. Lieberman), 5 line 32; but on p. 99 line 14: מקל וחומר.

29 Kutscher 1963: 257-258.

30 See also S.D. Goitein, "Four Old Marriage Contracts from the Cairo Geniza," *L'Ésonénu* 30 (1966) 211; Friedman, "Early Manuscripts," 171 [n. 9 above].

Spanish manuscripts.³¹ In Ashkenazic manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud, however,³² הילל, as recorded in MS Kaufmann, is extremely prevalent (our "Typology" will indicate many similarities between the Ashkenazic Talmud manuscripts and the Palestinian-type orthography). I have found הילל once, in a Yemenite manuscript, JTS Rab 1623 (*Pēs.* 3a). 15th century Ashkenazic halakhic authorities indicate that most of the Talmud manuscripts spell הילל *plene* (in the context of determining the spelling to be used for a bill of divorce);³³ we can now corroborate that this was indeed the spelling in Ashkenazic Talmud manuscripts.

If we assume that our fragment's orthography corresponds to the Tiberian pronunciation "Hillel,"³⁴ then the first *yōd* represents *hīreq*, and the second, *šērē*. Indeed, in this fragment's *plene* system, *yōd* for both *hīreq* and *šērē* in these positions is quite common. Thus, we may have recovered the original Babylonian היליל (no less exotic than its Palestinian counterparts), before it was supplanted by the Biblical הלל.

Yōd accompanying מילל is regular in this scroll: מילל, מישום. Epstein listed this construction among his Palestinian orthographies, mostly from MS Kaufmann.³⁵ Some of this evidence has been brought into question by Bar-Asher regarding ליסיכה and similar forms involving this word.³⁶ It is found in the Bet Shean inscription,³⁷ other Palestinian type texts,³⁸ in texts with Babylonian vocalization,³⁹ in old Babylonian Talmud

31 A misprint of הילל for הלל crept into Kutscher's representation of the Biblical spelling (p. 12).

32 Such as MS Munich 95, and manuscripts in Florence and the Vatican. Some manuscripts described as Spanish also exhibit this spelling.

33 Y. Satz, *New Responsa of Rabbi Yaacov Molin-Maharil* (Jerusalem, 1977) par. 204, pp. 338-400 (Hebrew): אך שמעתי בשם... או בלא יו"ד... או בלא יו"ד... אך שמעתי בשם... וכו' לדבר עשה, משה לעיני כל ישראל, סוף תיבות הלל מלא... תשובה... גראה דבר פשוט לכתוב הלל חסר כלישנא דקרא... ולמיל בחר גמרות ישונות (= ישונות) שכותבין מלא אין ג' כלל, דהגמרות כותבין בענין שיריון בו הקורא כאלו נקוד, ה"ג כתב הגמרא שמאי ונקראי שמי חסר א' ב"ה, וכן בגמרות ישונות, וכיוצא בו ברוב גמרות שלנו עקיבא בא' וכו'.

34 This assumption will be strengthened if we recall that the Babylonian vowel system did not include a *šēgōl*.

35 Epstein 1948: 1244.

36 Bar-Asher 1977: 84-87. Cf. also Naeh 1990: 283-284.

37 Sussmann 1973-1974: 151 and n. 464.

38 See Sokoloff 1982: 66; Kahana 1982: 131; Z. M. Rabinowitz, *Halakha and Aggada in the Liturgical Poetry of Yannai* (Tel Aviv, 1965) לה (Hebrew).

39 Porath 1938: 13 - שלילייה.

provided here one of the few vocalizations in our fragment: צונין אחר as against צונין בצונין as against צונין are forms dealt with by Epstein⁵⁷ If the context requires the singular, the *plene* spelling here is once again *yōd* for *šērē*. However, צונין is very common in contexts requiring the plural.⁵⁸ Such cases may have resulted from a general tendency to modernize צונין to צונין intending the singular, however, this ultimately invaded plural forms as a hyper-correction.⁵⁹ צונין as the plural did survive in several Ashkenazic and Mediterranean manuscripts (especially in Vatican 125 of *Pēsāḥim*),⁶⁰ which remain unaffected by the mistaken hyper-correction.

Yōd for *šērē* is also found in כין for כן, and with prefixes: מיכין, שכיין (לאחר מכן for לאחר מיכין). On the other hand, כאן is spelled כן, e.g., כן בבהמה. Thus, the useful distinction between *kēn* ("thus") and *kān* ("here"), regularly indicated by *ālef* in the second, באן/כן, is achieved here through the use of *yōd* in the first, כן/כין. Among criteria for reliable Babylonian Talmud manuscripts with regard to Aramaic, Kutscher emphasized *plene* spellings with *ālef*.⁶¹ However, the *Hālākōt Pēsūqōt* manuscript, which was his point of departure, while it does have *plene ālef* in Aramaic contexts, also exhibits a marked tendency to *plene yōd* in its Tannaitic Hebrew contexts.⁶²

In that most of the linguistic studies have dealt with Palestinian Tannaitic Hebrew, the thrust of their analysis of these forms has usually been to emphasize that כן for *kān* is Palestinian.⁶³ It has also often been

57 Epstein 1948: 1242.

58 See Yalon, 1964: 25-36. Cf. *Tosefta* (ed. Lieberman), 1 (Moed): 13 line 21, 133-134 lines 23-34.

59 This explanation seems simpler than those provided in E.Y. Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic* (tr. M. Sokoloff; Ramat-Gan, 1976) 59-60.

60 MS Vatican 125 is a prime example of the Mediterranean type. See further Friedman 1992a: 371-372 and n.8.

61 See Kutscher, "Babylonian Talmud," 173, 175 [n. 9 above].

62 See above; also, e.g., גיגיד (pp. קלה, מד), etc.

63 Epstein 1948: 1236-37 includes כן in his list. It should be noted that Epstein, in this case, included even the Babylonian Talmud in his general statement יכן רגיל בכיי (המשנה הירוש' ואף הבבלי ועוד, על-יד כאן, מיכין על-יד מכאן). Nevertheless, this passage is often quoted to establish the Jerusalem Talmud - Babylonian Talmud contrast. Kutscher 1967-1968: 103 and n. 3 (הגרסה בלא אל"ף היא בעיקר הא"י); idem 1972b: 33 (בכ"ף לרוב: כן, ומעוט כאן); Sokoloff 1969: 33; Bar-Asher 1971: 13 (literature cited there in n. 36); M. Assis, "A Fragment of Yerushalmi Sanhedrin," *Tarbiz* 46

stated as a truism that the contrasting orthographies of כן versus כאן (both = "here") represent the contrasting linguistic practices of Palestine versus Babylonia, and that כאן *plene ālef* is a characteristic of the Babylonian Talmud⁶⁴ and under its influence contaminated Palestinian texts. We are now in a position to draw a more complex picture, and even to reverse basic aspects of the above.

כן, the simple and basic form, was in use in Babylonia, as well as Palestine, and appears in old Babylonian Talmud fragments.⁶⁵ It is widely used in Geonic writings.⁶⁶ It survives prominently in Yemenite manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud⁶⁷ and often in Ashkenazic manuscripts.⁶⁸ This meeting of the extremities of the geographic distribution once more indicates the survival of an *original* form.

כאן, with *mater lectionis ālef*, was in use in Palestine from early times. It occurs in all three occurrences of this word in a Palestinian

(1977) 67, to line 4 (Hebrew); Kahana 1982: 132; idem, "New Fragments of the *Mekilta* on Deuteronomy," *Tarbiz* 45 (1985) 491 (Hebrew). See also, cautiously, Wieder, "Three *Derashot*," 23 and n. 10 [n. 50 above].

64 Segal 1936: 158 (בבבלי, להבדיל מן כן - כן). Bendavid 1967: 217 in listing the spellings in two columns, with כן representing "the orthography in the Palestinian books" (as to his reference to Nah 2:16, it must be pointed out that our vocalization is כן) and כאן "in the Babylonian Talmud as in Babylonian Aramaic." See review of scholarly opinion in Friedman, "Early Manuscripts," 19 [n. 9 above]. Bar-Asher 1987: 26: "The division into a Palestinian and a Babylonian branch... features which differentiate the two branches... the marking of a medial *a* by *ā* in the Babylonian branch and the almost complete absence of any representation in the Palestinian branch, e.g., כאן as against כן." Mishor 1990: 257 also summarized the regnant opinion as being in this direction.

65 See Friedman, "Early Manuscripts," 19 [n. 9 above] for data and analysis.

66 See Epstein, 1948: 1237; *Sefer Halachot Pesuqot* (MS Freedberg), index; Assaf, 23, 163, 170 [n. 26 above]; Epstein 1983-1991, 1:150; S. Abramson 1990: 83 n. 38.

67 Most frequently in *Pēsāḥim*, MS Columbia University X893-T141, e.g., 88a: כן במשנה אחרונה כן במשנה ראשונה; 68a: כן במשנה צדיקים כן במשנה שכינה; Bodl. heb. e.51 to *Suk.* 53a: אס אנו כן הכל כן ואס אנו [!] כן מי כן [!].

68 *Bāvā Mēšī' ā*, MS Florence: של תורה מיכן ואילך של דבריהם. See also MS Vatican 122, *Hullin* 63a, 102b. The Spanish manuscripts were apparently more systematically corrected to כאן. In MS Hamburg, p. 62 line 31, *ālef* was added above מיכן. (We have also noticed in connection with רבא-רבה, n. 3 above, that the correcting process of the Spanish tradition is still operating in the interlinear corrections of MS Hamburg.) Regarding this *ālef* see also Kutscher, "Babylonian Talmud," 175 [n. 9 above] (some slight corrections are required there).

letter⁶⁹ from the fifth or sixth century.⁷⁰ Even though *ālef* as a *mater lectionis* is a relatively rare phenomenon in Palestinian orthography, there are a sufficient number of occurrences enabling us to consider it a regular feature,⁷¹ especially if we are open to the possibility of a plurality of forms in use at the same time. This plurality will be better understood if we consider differences of registers, with the *plene* tendency greater in popular or non-literary writing.⁷² According to this analysis,⁷³ the minority of *plene* spellings for כּאן in the so-called "reliable" texts of the Palestinian tradition are not necessarily corruptions ("under the influence of the Babylonian Talmud").⁷⁴ Rather, they may equally well be sporadic use of an authentic Palestinian option.

In surveying the usages of כּאן/כּאן in Tannaitic literature represented by selected "reliable" manuscripts,⁷⁵ a different picture is presented by each manuscript. Several present mixed usage with כּאן in greater representation than found in MS Kaufmann.⁷⁶ It must yet be determined

69 See Mishor 1989; idem 1990. Mishor ascribed a revolutionary nature to this finding in terms of accepted scholarship (1989: 226, 254) and singled it out for inclusion in his brief English summaries in both these publications, e.g., 1989: IV: "...Some features however are surprising, e.g., alef as *mater lectionis* in כּאן, or the lack of -l after קידם both generally considered Babylonian features."

70 Engel 1989.

71 Qimron 1974-1975: 133-146.

72 Writing material can also be a factor.

73 The specific occasion, namely, differentiation between homographs, is, of course, an additional factor in כּאן/כּאן. Cf. Qimron 1974-1975: 139 (and English summary). Difference in registers should also be brought to bear in explaining such usages as כּאן as against the more literary כּאן, a parallel pattern that spans the millenia; see Mishor 1989: 263-264.

74 Mishor 1989: 254 has also indicated that the idea of Babylonian Talmud influence is prevalent in modern scholarship. There had often been a tendency to minimize the number of occurrences of כּאן in MS Kaufmann, perhaps indicating that they were considered an embarrassment. Epstein 1948 does not list any, in that he was interested in documenting כּאן. See also Kutscher 1967-1968: 103 n. 3; Sarfatti 1970: 18-19; Sokoloff 1969: 33; idem 1971: 24 n. 313; idem 1982: 64, and n. 63 above.

75 *Materials*, microfiches 10059-10098. What should be a truism still needs to be emphasized: these manuscripts, even when included in *Materials*, do not present Tannaitic orthography itself, but rather its medieval representations.

76 This usage is largely a function of the specific manuscript, e.g., for *Sifrē Dēvārīm* the Historical Dictionary (*Materials*) uses MS London British Museum Add. 16,406 (=Cat. 341) for the end of the work, at which point the citations have mostly כּאן, in contrast to the primary manuscript. For *Sifrē Zūṭā*, the Geniza fragments have כּאן,

to what degree we have an expanding usage of an earlier Palestinian option, gradually allowing the popular form to play a greater role in literary texts, or to what degree do we have influence of Babylonian Talmud type spelling being exerted (the explanation usually given by Kutscher). However, this second possibility must now be redefined as being the influence of a *later, developed, secondary* style of Babylonian Talmud transmission, and not an inherent characteristic of the Babylonian Talmud itself. In fact, as far as we can determine, the earliest Babylonian Talmud texts used כּאן for *kān*, the required distinction achieved by using *Yōd* for *kān*: כּאן, is a spelling found in our *Hullin* fragment and often in Geonic literature.⁷⁷ The Babylonian Talmud styles that began to use כּאן utilized,⁷⁸ in essence, an early Palestinian popular form.

The above should shift the emphasis somewhat to the provenance of the *specific* manuscript being used. It may turn out that Spanish manuscripts have a proclivity to כּאן *plene*.⁷⁹ That appears to be the case in Babylonian Talmud manuscripts regarding מכּאן/מכּאן, an exchange of forms which should be studied independently of כּאן/כּאן.⁸⁰

A further feature of our fragment is that compound words with חוּא maintain *ālef*. Thus, במשחור, משחור, as against the common משחור.⁸¹ The two above-mentioned *plene* forms can still be found in Yemenite

the primary manuscript כּאן.

77 *Sefer Halachot Pesuqot*, index, p. ריא; Assaf, 155 n. 21 [n. 26 above]; Epstein 1983: 150; Lewin, IV (Yom Tov: 33 [n. 26 above]); In magic bowls: Epstein 1983: 344. For a survival of כּאן in a complete Talmud manuscript, cf. JTS Rab. 1623 (Yemenite), Pës. 74a: !כּבלעה כּאן פּלטה. It may owe its survival to the scribe's difficulty in identifying this word in the given idiomatic context. Unclear context is often the guarantor of survival for early orthography. This can be exemplified by a case of כּאן *Bah* to *Bēr*. 7a. no. ב corrects a surviving כּאן אף (as in MS Paris 671). See also Lieberman 1955-1988, 5 (Moed Qatan): 1261-1262. Perhaps the ambiguity of this passage helped to preserve the defective spelling in the Tosefta manuscripts.

78 It sometimes happened that *ālef* was used when the context indicates *kēn*. See material collected by S. Abramson, "Some Linguistic Remarks on the *Sēlīhā* אל נא רפּא", *Lēšonēnu* 39 (1975) 160 (Hebrew). Cf. in Friedman 1982: 205.

79 See n. 68 above.

80 מכּאן is more frequent in Ashkenazic manuscripts; Spanish manuscripts tend more to מכּאן; Yemenite manuscripts have only מכּאן.

81 See Porath 1938: 10, 11 n. 2; Epstein 1929: 58 line 8; B.M. Lewin, *Methiboth* (Jerusalem, 1933) XXVI (Hebrew).

and Spanish Babylonian Talmud manuscripts.⁸² Another *plene* form, והלוא (for והלא), is known from Palestinian type Mishna manuscripts,⁸³ and found in Yemenite and Mediterranean Babylonian Talmud manuscripts.⁸⁴ A *plene wāw* spelling in our text is שלוש for שלש. This *plene* spelling is quite rare in Ashkenazic manuscripts, but found in the other types.

Concerning ממנו/הימנו and the question of Palestine versus Babylonia, our fragment presents the reading ממנה twice in *Hul.* 102a in quoting *Tēh.* 1:3: והאוכל אבר מן החי ממנה. This reading agrees with that of the reliable Mishna codices (MSS Kaufmann, Parma, Cambridge). Some of the textual witnesses to *b. Hullin* here, including the printed editions have this reading; others, however, read הימנה.⁸⁵

At this point, we will turn briefly to two additional, noteworthy linguistic and stylistic features in our scroll fragment. In *Hul.* 102a we find וכי איצריך קרא in place of the usual איצריך קרא.⁸⁶ This assimilation of the *tāw* of the *itpē'el* and its substitutes (*dālet*, *ṭet*) known in Palestinian

82 Especially JTS Rab. 1623 *Pēsāhim*. Bendavid 1967: 217 assigns מה הוא to Palestine and מהו to Babylonia. However, the defective form is well known from Palestinian-type manuscripts. See Bar-Asher 1983b: 142-143; Kahana 1982: 132.

83 Epstein 1948: 1246. Cf. Qimron 1986: 21.

84 והלוא in Mediterranean manuscripts, especially *Bērākōt*, MS Paris; והלא in Yemenite manuscripts (e.g., *Mēg* 7a, MS Columbia).

85 In the first occurrence, MS Vatican 121 has הימנה, as does MS Munich 95 (with changed word order: והאוכל הימנה אבר מן החי). In the second, MS Munich reads הימנה and MS Hamburg reads הימנה. Space does not permit a full description of the data concerning the distribution of ממנו/הימנו; however, let us just add that early Babylonian Mishna types, most closely represented for us by the manuscripts with Babylonian vocalization and Babylonian secondary features, were less inhibited about maintaining the *hē* forms. The earliest recital tradition of the Babylonian Talmud also included some use of *hē* forms for Tannaitic Hebrew, and, consequently, it remains in all Babylonian Talmud manuscript types. It would appear, however, in connection with this word, that a tendency formed towards the higher register ממנו in an early period. This style, represented in the few occurrences in our *Hullin* fragment, is faithfully preserved in the Yemenite tradition, and also appears in the Spanish manuscripts. It is suggestive of a conservative textual tradition, for which the lower register הימנו may have provided some embarrassment. The prolific use of הימנו and associated forms, is, therefore, not a trait of the Babylonian Talmud, but of its Mediterranean and Ashkenazic reading, perhaps due to Palestinian influence!

86 Among the complete manuscripts, cf. *Yōmā* 74b, MS Munich 6; *Häg.* 17b, MS Vatican 171.

Aramaic, and also found in Babylonian, has recently been discussed by Z. Ben-Hayyim.⁸⁷ Note also תא שמע אמי רב for the more usual דאמר, with *dālet*. The short form is also found in complete manuscripts of all types, but in a clear minority. It is most probably the original style, tending to expansion by -ד in later texts.

In conclusion it may still be hazardous to suggest anything about the orthography and linguistic features of the first written texts embodying the Babylonian Talmud. Nonetheless, it seems clear that the late standardized Babylonian Talmud is a less probable witness of such traditions than the fragment of a scroll containing *Hullin* that we have discussed here.

The extraordinary ancient tradition of the fragment is demonstrated by such spellings as יום הכפרים (= *Yōm ha-Kippūrīm*), דכל עלמא (for דכולי דכולי), קול וחומר (for קל וחומר), בית הליל (קל וחומר), (עלמא), כן with *ālef*, cannot be considered a Babylonian marker as against Palestinian כן. Our text uses כן for *kān* and כין for *kēn*. Similarly, our text uses ממנו where other manuscripts have הימנו, and, consequently, could not serve to corroborate a position that הימנו was more inherent to the Babylonian Talmud, and ממנו to the Jerusalem Talmud. Prevalence of הימנו is not a general Babylonian feature, but rather a characteristic of its Mediterranean and Ashkenazic tradition, which may have originally derived from southern Italy, and consequently maintains a Palestinian linguistic connection, exemplified by הימנו.

Writing the text of the Babylonian Talmud on a scroll is certainly a mark of antiquity. This may be the earliest fragment of the Babylonian Talmud whose linguistic features have been examined, providing some historic depth to studies of Babylonian linguistic tradition.

The long-standing practice of seeking a Palestinian connection for texts containing a linguistic tradition earlier than the standardized Babylonian Talmud should give way to an acceptance and appreciation that ancient, pristine linguistic forms, including some of Tannaitic

87 Z. Ben-Hayyim, "Word-Studies III," *Tarbiz* 50 (1980-1981) 207-208 (Hebrew; English Summary, p. XII).

Hebrew, survived in early Babylonian Talmud texts. This realization will help us bring the secondary Babylonian features and tendencies into sharper focus, subsequently, enabling these, and their relative statistical trends and internal developmental history, to provide an authentic contrast to the Palestinian tradition.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW CONJUGATIONS FROM
BIBLICAL ROOTS THAT SURVIVED IN
MISHNAIC HEBREW

ISAAC GLUSKA

1. The Nature of the Root

There are different conceptions of the root. Brockelmann¹ distinguishes between: 1) *root* (Wurzel), which refers to the three consonants that represent the basic meaning of a group of words; 2) *base*, which refers to basic noun and verb forms, which he assumes to be even more ancient than the grammatical categories of noun and verb;² and 3) *stem* (Stamm), which refers to what is generally known as בניין or משקל. When discussing the verb, Gesenius³ uses the term *stem* for בניין. Moscati⁴ considers the root to be a group of consonants (usually three) which are connected with the basic meaning of the word. In the present work, we will use the operative definition adopted by Bergsträsser:⁵ "Denjenigen Lautbestandteil, in dem die Bedeutungsgemeinschaft der Glieder einer Wortsippe ihren Ausdruck findet, der, ihnen allen gemeinsam, den ihren Bedeutungen gemeinsamen Vorstellungselementen entspricht, nennen wir die Wurzel dieser

1 GVG 1:285.

2 "Vielleicht sind diese Basen überhaupt schon älter als die grammatischen Kategorien Nomen und Verb" (GVG 1:287). Brockelmann is probably referring to the basic forms of קטל and קטל.

3 GKC 114.

4 S. Moscati et al., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1969) 71. Cf. L. Bloomfield, *Language* (New York, 1935) 243: "In the Semitic languages the roots consist of an unpronounceable skeleton of three consonants; accordingly, every primary word adds to the root a morphologic element which consists of a vowel-scheme."

5 G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1918-1929) 2:1.

SCRIPTA HIEROSOLYMITANA
PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

VOLUME XXXVII

2301 p.c.
PB 1943

37

1998

4

STUDIES IN MISHNAIC HEBREW

EDITED BY
MOSHE BAR-ASHER

ASSISTANT EDITOR
STEVEN E. FASSBERG

THE MAGNES PRESS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM

Distributed by The Magnes Press
P.O. Box 7695, Jerusalem 91076, Israel
Fax: 972-2-5633370

7
60.2

©
All rights reserved by
The Magnes Press
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem 1998

492.470.4 (08):016.492.470.4

ISSN 0080-8369

Printed in Israel
Typesetting: Hazon Fetaya, Jerusalem

CONTENTS

Preface		7
Introduction	The Study of Mishnaic Hebrew Grammar Based on Written Sources: Achievements, Problems, and Tasks. Moshe Bar-Asher	9
	The Study of Mishnaic Hebrew - The Oral Evidence: Nature and Appraisal. Shelomo Morag	43
Moshe Azar	The Conditional Clause in Mishnaic Hebrew	58
Moshe Bar-Asher	The Formation of the <i>Nifal</i> III-y Participle in Mishnaic Hebrew	69
Yaakov Bentolila	Mishnaic Hebrew in a Medieval French-Italian Tradition: Points of Interest	87
Gabriel Birnbaum	Studies in Determination in Mishnaic Hebrew	107
Yoḥanan Breuer	On the Hebrew Dialect of the <i>Āmōrā'im</i> in the Babylonian Talmud	129
Steven E. Fassberg	Constructions of Purpose and Intended Result in the Hebrew of the Mishna	151
Shamma Friedman	The Babylonian Branch of Tannaitic Hebrew and an Ancient Scroll Fragment (<i>b. Hullin</i> 101a-105a)	164
Isaac Gluska	The Development of New Conjugations from Biblical Roots that Survived in Mishnaic Hebrew	181
Menahem Zevi Kaddari	On Deontic Modality in Mishnaic Hebrew	197
Yechiel Kara	Yemenite Traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew in the Tractate <i>Kēlīm</i>	218
Menahem Kister	Lexicographical Problems - Early and Late	244
Aharon Maman	Karaites and Mishnaic Hebrew: Quotations and Usage	264