

THE OXFORD DICTIONARY  
OF THE  
JEWISH  
RELIGION

EDITORS IN CHIEF

R. J. Zwi Werblowsky    Geoffrey Wigoder

NEW YORK • OXFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1997

polemic. Ba-Meh Madliqin is not recited when the Sabbath coincides with or immediately follows a holiday.

**BA-MIDBAR.** See NUMBERS, BOOK OF.

**BA-MIDBAR RABBAH.** See NUMBERS RABBAH.

**BAN.** See EXCOMMUNICATION.

**BANET, MORDEKHAÏ** (1753–1829), Moravian rabbi who served in Nikolsburg and Ludenburg, eventually rising to the position of district rabbi of Moravia. The head of a large and renowned *yeshivah* in Nikolsburg, his publications include *Bi'ur Mordekhai* (2 vols. [Vienna, 1805, 1813]), *novellae* on *Sefer Mordekhai* by R. \*Mordekhai ben Hillel; *Parashat Mordekhai* (Szeged, 1889), a collection of *responsa*; and *Maḥashevet Mordekhai* (Mukachevo, 1908), homiletical insights on the Torah. Banet was a staunch opponent of the nascent religious reform movement in Europe. His *responsum* condemning the reformist Hamburg Temple prayer book is included in *Eleh Divrei ha-Berit* (Hamburg, 1819), a collection of such writings by leading traditionalists. He was also a leading critic of Sha'ul ben Tsevi Hirsch \*Berlin's book *Besamim Ro'sh* (Berlin, 1793), which purported to contain previously unknown *responsa* of the eminent medieval halakhist R. Asher ben Yehi'el. Banet deduced that the work, in which R. Asher took positions remarkably similar to those enunciated by champions of the Enlightenment, was a forgery.

• Rubin Faerber, *Pe'er Mordekhai* (Tel Aviv, 1951).

—MARK WASHOFSKY

**BANISHMENT**, expulsion from one's normal residence. Biblical law legislates banishment only in the case of accidental slayers who find \*asylum from blood vengeance in the cities of refuge; the rabbis, however, insisted that this banishment was no mere protective asylum, but had also an atoning function. Banishment from the land is the major punishment that God visits on his people (see EXILE), as it was a punishment in the cases of Adam and Cain. In the Second Temple period, banishment was occasionally decreed as a punishment in criminal cases. Banishment is not recognized in Jewish law as a normal form of punishment, though medieval courts resorted to it in order to rid the community of heretical individuals (see EXCOMMUNICATION). In some periods mystics would take up voluntary exile (*galut*) or wanderings (*gerushim*) to promote mystical atonement.

**BAPTISM**, ritual purification by total immersion in water (*tevilah*). During the Second Temple period, baptism was practiced by many pietist groups and sects (see ESENESES; JOHN THE BAPTIST). It was required of converts to Judaism and became the distinctive conversion rite of the Christian church (*Mk.* 1.9; *Acts* 2.38–41, 8.38, 19.3–5). The practice of total immersion has largely given way in Christianity to a ceremonial sprinkling of water. See also ABLUTION; HEMEROBAPTISTS; MIQVEH.

• Harold Henry Rowley, *From Moses to Qumran* (London and New York, 1963), pp. 211–235. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism* (Hoboken, N.J., 1985), pp. 25–36.

**BAPTISM, FORCED.** See CONVERSION, FORCED.

**BAQQASHAH** (בִּקְשָׁה; entreaty, supplication), name given to two types of *piyyutim* (see PIYYUT). The first consists of works written in prose or rhymed verse (by authors such as \*Sa'adyah ben Yosef Ga'on, \*Baḥya ben Yosef ibn Paquda, and Shelomoh \*ibn Gabirol) with philosophical or theological content, mainly for private meditation. The second type is a shorter composition in the style of Spanish liturgical poetry with a strict rhyming pattern (for example, Yitshaq ben Levi ibn Mar Sha'ul's Elohei 'al Tedineni and El'azar ben Mosheh \*Azikri's later \*Yedid Nefesh). Baqqashot is also the name given to a service of *piyyutim* printed at the commencement of Sephardi prayer books from the seventeenth century on and recited or sung by congregants before the Sabbath Shaḥarit service. In Syria (Aleppo and Damascus) and Morocco, and in related congregations in twentieth-century Erets Yisra'el, the singing of *baqqashot* developed into a more independent liturgical activity.

• Abraham De Sola et al., eds., *The Form of Prayers: According to the Custom of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews* (Philadelphia, 1926), pp. 90–91. Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History*, translated by Raymond P. Scheindlin (Philadelphia, 1993), p. 250.

—PETER LENHARDT

**BARAIYTA'** (Aram.; ܒܪܝܝܬܐ), a term referring to a tannaitic pericope appearing in the Talmud, which means "[a tannaitic statement] external [to the Mishnah]." It is used for Midrashic tannaitic material or, more frequently, for halakhic tannaitic material. *Baraiyot* are often parallel to pericopes of existing tannaitic works, such as the Tosefta'. Such *baraiyot* are rarely identical in wording to their parallels. Divergencies, rather than deriving from an independent source, usually resulted from editorial reworking (to achieve harmonization with the Mishnah, for example), especially in the Talmud Bavli. The Talmud Yerushalmi sometimes abbreviates *baraiyot*. Some *baraiyot* in the Talmud Bavli that have no parallels elsewhere may be post-tannaitic creations. The Talmud commonly accords tannaitic statements found in *baraiyot* equal authority to those in the Mishnah and often rules according to *baraiyot* against the Mishnah. Originally there was no special word to designate *baraiyot*; the Talmud Yerushalmi refers both to the Mishnah and to *baraiyot* with the word *matnita'*. Fourth-generation Babylonian amora'im increasingly introduced the term *baraiya'*, paralleling a growing tendency to award the Mishnah canonic status. The term was extended to the various tannaitic works themselves: the Tosefta' and the Midrash, for instance, were referred to as *baraiyot*, in contrast to the Mishnah.

• Chanoch Albeck, *Mehqarim bi-Varaiya' ve-Tosefta' ve-Yohasan le-Talmud*, 4th ed. (Jerusalem 1969). Chanoch Albeck, *Mavo' la-Talmudim* (Tel Aviv, 1987). Jacob Nahum Epstein, *Mavo'ot le-Sifrut ha-Tanna'im* (Jerusalem, 1957). Michael Higger, ed., *Otsar ha-Baraiyot* (New York, 1938–1948).

—SHAMMA FRIEDMAN

**TAITAZAK, YOSEF** (died before 1545), exegete, halakhic scholar, and kabbalist in Salonika. Taitazak went from Spain to Salonika with his father and soon earned a reputation as one of the leading rabbinic authorities there. His students included R. Yitshaq Adarbi, who continued his teacher's exegetical tradition and cited teachings from Taitazak in his works; R. Shemu'el de \*Medina; and R. Shelomoh \*Alkabez. His circle was known for its Talmudic scholarship as well as for its intense kabbalistic pursuits. It was, in fact, the latter which attracted the young ex-Marrano Shelomoh \*Molkho, after his escape from Portugal, to Salonika. Taitazak left no kabbalistic writings. His non-halakhic writings are evidently based on Midrashic and Jewish philosophic texts, including the works of \*Mosheh ben Yehoshu'a of Narbonne and Hasda'i ben Avraham \*Crescas. They also display a deep knowledge of scholastic literature, such as the works of Thomas Aquinas and Aegidius Romanus. Major themes of his philosophical thought include the infinite character of the divine, the nature of the divine light, God as the paradigm of all existence, and the soul as divine in origin. His works include a commentary to *Ecclesiastes*, entitled *Porat Yosef* (Venice, 1576); a commentary to *Daniel* and the Five Scrolls, *Lehem Setarim* (Venice, 1608); and various other works still in manuscript. Taitazak's legal decisions appear in printed *responsa* literature of his period, such as *She'erit Yehudah* of his brother Yehudah and *Avqat Rokhel* by Yosef \*Karo.

\*Bracha Sack, in *Mehqerei Yerushalayim be-Mohashevet Yisra'el* 7 (1988): 341-356. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, *Joseph Karo: Lawyer and Mystic* (London, 1962), index. —BRACHA SACK AND DANIEL ABRAMS

**TAL.** See TEFILLAT TAL.

**TALLIT** (טלית), four-cornered cloth with fringes (cf. *Nm.* 15.38), worn as a prayer shawl during the Shaḥarit and Musaf services. It is called *tallit gadol* (large *tallit*) to distinguish it from the *tallit qatan* (small *tallit*), or *\*tsitsit*, worn beneath the outer garments. The *tallit* is donned before the *\*tefillin* are put on (on those days when *tefillin* are worn). After the recitation of a special blessing, the *tallit* is wrapped around the head and then dropped to the shoulders. The *tallit* must be at least large enough to cover the head and upper body of a youngster. In some areas, particularly in eastern Europe, only married men wore the *tallit*. Sephardim wear it from the age of *bar mitsvah*, as do Jews of German descent, and this has become a widespread practice. The *tallit* should be made of wool with wool fringes attached, but it may be made of other fabrics, in which case the fringes must be made of the same fabric. Today, prayer shawls are often made from silk. Unless an alternative is unavailable, a linen *tallit* should not be used. "To glorify the *mitsvah*," some prayer shawls have a band (*'atarah*) across the top. At the Minḥah and Ma'ariv services, only the officiant wears a *tallit*; on Yom Kippur, worshipers wear their prayer shawls at all five services; and on Tish'ah be-'Av, the *tallit* is worn at the Minḥah service instead of at the Shaḥarit service. Priests called to give the *\*Birkat ha-Kohanim* cover their heads and hands

with their *tallit*. Women are exempt from wearing the *tallit* because the commandment is related to a specific time, but in recent years, it has become the practice for many non-Orthodox women to wear a *tallit*. The biblical prescription ordains that a blue thread be added to the fringes, but although some Hasidic sects still attach a blue thread, most Orthodox Jews do not, since the proper process for making the blue dye (*\*techelet*) is still unclear. The *tallit* is usually decorated by several stripes running from top to bottom near the ends. This design and the blue color of the thread inspired the pattern of the Zionist banner, which was later adopted as the flag of the State of Israel.

\*Naftali Hoffner, *Dinei Tefilat Yom* (Tel Aviv, 1974). Abraham Israel Kon, *Prayer*, translated by the author from his book *Si'ah Tefillah* (London, 1971). Zeev Meller, "Tallit shel Tefillah," master's thesis, Bar-Ilan University, 1986. —PETER LENHARDT

**TALLIT QATAN.** See TSITSIT.

**TALMID ḤAKHAM** (תלמיד חכם; disciple of the wise), the favorite term in rabbinic literature for a scholar, implying that the true scholar is always a student and that the study of the Torah is never ending. His learning must cover all fields, and no matter what question he is asked in any realm of Jewish law, he should be able to answer immediately (*Shab.* 114a). He is the embodiment of a religious ideal, and, according to the Talmud (*Hor.* 13a), "a *\*mamzer* who is a *talmid ḥakham* takes precedence over a high priest who is an ignoramus." Scholarship must, however, be combined with moral qualities, and a scholar "whose inside is not like his outside is not a real *talmid ḥakham*" (*Yoma* 72b). The rabbis are exacting in the standards of personal conduct they demand from the *talmid ḥakham*; actions considered normal for others would be a "profanation of God's name" (*\*hillul ha-Shem*) in a Torah scholar, even as regards outward appearance. Thus it is said with deliberate hyperbole (*Shab.* 114a) that a *talmid ḥakham* who has a stain on his garment is worthy of the death penalty. Rabbinic law provides certain privileges (e.g., exemption from taxes) for the *talmid ḥakham*.

\*Efraim E. Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1987). —SHMUEL HIMELSTEIN

**TALMUD** (תלמוד; Teaching), name applied to each of two great compilations, distinguished respectively as the Talmud Yerushalmi (Palestinian Talmud) and the Talmud Bavli (Babylonian Talmud), in which are collected the teachings of the major Jewish scholars (*amora'im*) who flourished between 200 and 500 CE, the classic period of rabbinic Judaism.

After the *\*Mishnah* was edited in approximately 200 CE, the sages studied and interpreted it with intense scrutiny during the amoraic period in their two major centers of Palestine and Babylonia, often yielding conflicting opinions that were themselves subject to debate and clarification. The *Mishnah's* laws were extended into general legal principles and, at the same time, were applied to specific new cases. This material forms the basis of the Talmuds, which, however, include additional

genres corresponding to the wide range of intellectual activity carried on by the amora'im, among which are new legal enactments, biblical interpretation, and the recording of the sacred history of their society. Neither Talmud covers the entire span of the Mishnah's six orders. Despite this fact, a popular term for the Talmud is the Shas (an acronym for *shishah sedarim*, "six orders [of the Mishnah]"). However, the central orders Mo'ed, Nashim, and Neziqin are largely included in both. The Talmuds have correctly been described as dealing with religion and ethics, exegesis and homiletics, jurisprudence and ceremonial law, ritual and liturgy, philosophy and science, medicine and magic, astronomy and astrology, history and geography, commerce and trade, politics and social problems. Thus the Talmuds serve as prime source material for knowledge of the real and intellectual world of late antiquity in general, and of classical Jewish law and doctrine in particular.

The two Talmuds are separate works in their final form but in their earlier stages can be viewed as individual records of the same intellectual activity. The two centers were in constant communication; traveling sages (*\*nahotei*) reported the opinions of the Palestinian sages in Babylonia and vice versa.

Materials contained in the Talmudic passages (also called *\*gemara'*) are of three types: pericopes of tannaitic material (see TANNA'); dictums of individual amora'im quoted by name; and later anonymous connective and discursive constructions. Identical or similar passages of tannaitic or amoraic material are often recorded in both Talmuds, with the Talmud Bavli exhibiting a greater tendency to editorial reworking; the anonymous framework (*setam ha-Talmud*) is likewise more extensive in the Talmud Bavli than in the Yerushalmi. The tannaitic material largely parallels passages in existing tannaitic works, but its Hebrew is influenced by later linguistic forms. The amoraic dictums are in amoraic Hebrew or Aramaic, but rarely a mix of the two. The anonymous dialectical framework is essentially in Aramaic. A given textual unit of *gemara'* is called a *sugya'* and usually contains materials of each of the three types.

The Talmuds are the outgrowth of the intense scholarly activity of generations of sages and their institutions of learning, of which they represent only a partial distillation. The literary expressions of this activity were transmitted orally, compiled and edited, and eventually committed to writing. The compilation of the Talmud Yerushalmi (c.400 CE) preceded that of the Talmud Bavli by about one hundred years. As a result, the Yerushalmi often preserves more pristine and accurate versions of material; the more developed Bavli achieved a greater sophistication of juristic abstraction and dialectic analysis. Disseminated throughout the entire Jewish world (including Palestine) under the aegis of the Babylonian gaonate, the Talmud Bavli became the source of all legal authority for subsequent Jewish law and has been subjected to extended and diverse scholastic treatment over the last fifteen hundred years.

**The Talmud Bavli.** The *sugya'* is the basic literary unit of the Talmud Bavli; one or more can appear for any

specific *mishnah*. The *sugya'* is presented dialectically, with all material appearing in a connected succession of questions and answers. A linear reading of Talmud Bavli *sugyot* leads to a perception of them as a flowing record of live debate in the amoraic academies. Actually they are careful literary constructions. In their earlier stages they often contained unconnected tannaitic and amoraic dictums around which was woven the anonymous framework connecting the parts into a whole, sometimes through an adaptation of their basic meaning. A monolithic reading of a *sugya'* yields an extended inquiry of dogmatic quality; a critical reading reveals a skillful composition of independent components with precise literary shape and a dual level of meaning.

The Talmud Bavli is based on diverse literary sources. Dictums of Babylonian amora'im are the main building blocks, with an amoraic statement or dispute often serving as the point of departure for a *sugya'* in place of a *mishnah* or *baraiyta'*. The use of Palestinian literary sources is evident, whether in a single tannaitic pericope (*baraiyta'*) or amoraic dictum, or in longer units such as entire Palestinian *sugyot*, collections of statements by a given authority, or a complex aggadic composition artistically re woven into the Talmud Bavli *sugya'*.

The amora'im were a society of masters and their disciples, whose activity extended over more than five generations in several centers. In the first generation (early 3d cent. CE), *\*Shemu'el* was the outstanding authority in the academy of *\*Nehardea*, and *\*Rav* emigrated from Palestine and established a center of learning in *\*Sura*. In the fourth generation under *\*Abbaye* at *\*Pumbedita*, and afterwards under *\*Rava'* in *Maḥoza*, amoraic activity reached its acme. Fifth-generation *rav* *\*Ashi* is considered the editor of the Talmud Bavli in traditional writings. While earlier amora'im concentrated more upon the detailed legal exegesis of the Mishnah, later generations developed sophisticated juristic principles. The Talmud Bavli might be considered the most developed work of legal conceptualization of antiquity.

The final literary touches to the Talmud were the work of the *savora'im* (see SAVORA'). Concepts in the Talmud Bavli were extended to logical completeness and harmony, more so than in the Talmud Yerushalmi. Legal positions in the Talmud Bavli were attributed to individual tanna'im in quasi-quotations (*de-amar*, "who said," has the force of "who held") more encompassing and balanced than actual quotations. Harmonizations were suggested for uneven juxtapositions in the Mishnah. *Savoraic sugyot* used hermeneutic methods (see HERMENEUTICS) in explicating the language of the Mishnah. Precise language and technical terminology were gradually developed.

The Talmud Bavli contains rich aggadic passages (see AGGADAH) that often exhibit unbridled imaginative embellishments when compared to their Yerushalmi parallels. The *\*Aramaic* used in the Talmud has affinities with Syriac, Mandaic, and other eastern dialects.

The compilation or editing of the Talmud Bavli was not performed in a uniform manner; thus *Nedarim*, *Nazir*, and *Keritot*, *Me'ilah*, and *Tamid* can be distinguished

from the rest of the tractates largely by the different technical terminology that appears in them. This group of tractates contains early amoraic strata, on the one hand, and, on the other, an anonymous editorial stratum composed later than the rest of the Talmud. Several middle stages of development are apparently missing. Both chronological and geographic factors have been considered by scholars in explaining the uniqueness of this group of tractates.

In addition to printed editions of the Talmud Bavli (the first published in Venice, 1520–1523), about two hundred codices of one or several tractates have been preserved (c.11th–15th cent.) as have many manuscript fragments, perhaps from as early as the eighth or ninth century. It was too difficult to produce the entire Talmud in one codex or even a coordinated set of codices; the Munich Codex must be considered a carefully planned exception in this regard. The textual variants that can be culled from this corpus and from quotations in medieval literature are significant for scholarly research. Some scholars had suggested that these variants derived from the oral transmission of the Talmud after its editing, which did not produce a fixed text but only fixed contents. More recent research has indicated that a relatively fixed text of the tractates existed after their editing, but the transmission of the text was sometimes in the hands of conservative tradents and at other times handled in a liberal manner, allowing some early tradents to update vocabulary and terminology and perform other editorial functions. Basic reworking was extremely rare; however, a manuscript text of *Mo'ed Qatan* with far-reaching variants has recently been brought to scholarly attention.

Various works entitled *Introduction to the Palestinian Talmud*, in which the Talmud Bavli is used as a point of comparison for the Talmud Yerushalmi, contain much of the scholarly enterprise describing literary aspects of the Talmud Bavli. Abraham Weiss has written extensively on the Talmud Bavli. Several English translations of the Talmud are available, notably the Soncino Talmud (London, 1935–1952), as is a dictionary devoted exclusively to Babylonian Aramaic. Scholars are at work on the first modern edition of the Talmud Bavli with a critical commentary.

**The Talmud Yerushalmi.** Also called the Jerusalem Talmud, the Talmud Yerushalmi is the commentary on the Mishnah produced in Palestine during the third and fourth centuries CE. Some medieval scholars termed this work *Talmud ha-Ma'arav* or *Talmuda' di-Venei Ma'arava'*, although Talmud Yerushalmi, which is actually a misnomer since it was produced in Galilee and not in Jerusalem, is more commonly used.

The Talmud Yerushalmi includes the orders Zera'im, Mo'ed, Nashim, and Neziqin (except for tractates 'Eduyyot and Avot), and part of tractate *Niddah*. The final chapters of tractates *Shabbat* (chaps. 20–24), *Makkot* (chap. 3), and *Niddah* (chaps. 4ff.) are no longer extant and were apparently lost during the early medieval period. By contrast, there is no conclusive evidence that the Talmud Yerushalmi ever contained Qodashim and

Tohorot, although Palestinian amora'im clearly studied these orders of the Mishnah.

The Talmud Yerushalmi includes the dictums of hundreds of amora'im. Five generations of Palestinian amora'im and perhaps a few sixth-generation scholars are cited. Likewise, Babylonian amora'im from the first three generations are cited, although there is hardly any mention of later Babylonian scholars. No explicit information about the Talmud Yerushalmi's redaction or chronology has been preserved in its pages or in the works of reliable post-Talmudic chroniclers; hence, the identity and date of the work's redactor(s) cannot be determined with certainty. However, it would appear that the bulk of the redaction took place in Tiberias, although material from other academies (e.g., Sepphoris and Caesarea) is also cited frequently. Since the latest named scholars flourished at the end of the fourth century, it reasonably may be assumed that the work was redacted at that time, although it is possible that some activity took place later. Some scholars have suggested, on the basis of its unpolished style, that the work was concluded in haste and never adequately edited due to the difficulties prevailing in fourth-century Palestine. Conscious stylistic decisions, however, also may have played a part.

The Talmud Yerushalmi contains numerous *baraiyot*, many of which bear a strong resemblance to the *baraiyot* in the \*Tosefta', although it is clear that the *baraiyot* in the Yerushalmi as a whole were not derived from the Tosefta'. Likewise, the Talmud Yerushalmi cites many halakhic *midrashim* as well as several hundred aggadic passages, both isolated dictums and complete pericopes, many of which closely resemble classic Palestinian aggadic *midrashim* (*Genesis Rabbah*, *Leviticus Rabbah*, etc.). These nonlegal passages occur in virtually all of the tractates. The *aggadah* is both tannaite (much of it paralleling the *aggadah* in the Tosefta') and amoraic. Virtually all aggadic genres are represented in the work: biblical exegesis, homiletics and hermeneutics, history (as seen through rabbinic eyes), exempla, and other tales.

The nonlegal material serves diverse functions: illustrating (and occasionally even contradicting) halakhic rulings cited in the legal portions of the Talmud; supplementing and explaining aggadic passages in the Mishnah; and expanding the purview of the primary discussion with tangential material. Some of the *aggadot* were ostensibly taken en bloc from ancient aggadic compendiums, and certain passages were apparently introduced by ancient copyists, although most of the nonlegal material was presumably included there by the work's authors or redactors.

The *aggadah* in the Talmud Yerushalmi generally lacks a clear-cut ideological or theological orientation. In addition, it is generally devoid of the literary embellishments characteristic of the nonlegal material in the Talmud Bavli and is often considered more historically reliable than its Babylonian counterpart.

The Talmud Yerushalmi's principal concern is explication of the Mishnah, usually interpreted in accordance

with the plain sense of the text. The complex dialectic characteristic of the Talmud Bavli is rarely found in its Palestinian counterpart. The give and take in the Talmud Yerushalmi is generally shorter and more straightforward than in the Bavli.

One of the most prominent features of the Talmud Yerushalmi is the frequent citation of identical pericopes in different places. These pericopes were presumably copied by scribes, who sought to enlarge the scope of the work by duplicating relevant material wherever feasible. However, some of these parallel pericopes were apparently duplicated or briefly alluded to by the authors and editors and later filled in by copyists.

The language of the Talmud Yerushalmi is a mixture of Galilean Aramaic and Hebrew. The work is formulated in a terse, allusive, and often cryptic style, as a result of which the meaning of numerous passages remains obscure, despite the best efforts of exegetes.

The numerous dictums of Babylonia amora'im cited in the Talmud Yerushalmi frequently differ in form and content from their parallels in the Talmud Bavli. (The same holds true for the dictums of Palestinian scholars that appear in the Bavli.) Very few complete *suvoṭ* of Babylonian provenience are found in the Yerushalmi. Thus, while its scholars were clearly acquainted with many Babylonian teachings, they apparently were not familiar with the Talmud Bavli as such. Similarly, the Talmud Yerushalmi, as it now stands, was apparently unknown to the scholars of the Talmud Bavli, although they were clearly familiar with many of the teachings of their Palestinian counterparts.

The text of the Talmud Yerushalmi is relatively corrupt. Few text witnesses are extant, and these witnesses apparently derive from a common ancestor as evidenced by the presence of similar discriminative errors. Only one manuscript of all of the Talmud Yerushalmi is extant (MS Leiden, Scaliger 3, 13th cent.). Other manuscripts include MS Vatican 133 (highly corrupt, on Zera'im and tractate *Sotah*), MS Escorial (Neziqin), and Cairo Genizah fragments. Superior readings are frequently found in medieval testimonia.

The Talmud Yerushalmi was first printed (without commentaries) in Venice in 1523 and 1524 by Daniel Bomberg from a corrected version of MS Leiden (although these corrections are often unfounded). The most important later editions, all of which are based on the Venice edition, were published in Krotoszyn in 1866 (without commentaries); in Zhitomir between 1860 and 1867; in Piotrków between 1899 and 1901; and in Vilna in 1922 (a photographic reproduction of the Piotrków edition, with additional commentaries).

Hardly any medieval commentaries on the Talmud Yerushalmi are extant, although medieval commentators on the Talmud Bavli frequently cite and discuss individual passages. The first extant commentary on a major portion of the Yerushalmi was written in the sixteenth century by R. Shelomoh Sirillio (on Zera'im and tractate *Sheqalim*). The only commentary on the complete work is *Penei Mosheh*, by R. Mosheh \*Margalit, who also composed a more in-depth commentary on se-

lect sections (*Mar'eh ha-Panim*). Other important commentators include R. Eliyahu of Fulda (17th–18th cent.), R. David \*Franckel (18th cent.), and R. \*Eliyahu ben Shelomoh Zalman of Vilna (the Vilna Ga'on), whose comments on the Yerushalmi were recorded by his students. Modern scholars, particularly Louis \*Ginzberg, Jacob Nahum \*Epstein, and Saul \*Lieberman, have significantly advanced the understanding of the Talmud Yerushalmi, although there is still no comprehensive commentary or critical edition.

Medieval halakhists generally considered the Talmud Yerushalmi less authoritative than its Babylonian counterpart, although their views about the extent of its authority vary considerably. Some scholars disregarded the work almost entirely (including most ge'onim), while others accorded it a position of prominence in deciding halakhic issues (e.g., Maimonides).

\* Chanoch Albeck, *Mavo' la-Talmudim* (Tel Aviv, 1987). Baruch M. Bokser, "An Annotated Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the Palestinian Talmud," in Jacob Neusner, ed., *The Study of Ancient Judaism II* (New York, 1981), pp. 1–119. Baruch M. Bokser, "Talmudic Studies," in *The State of Jewish Studies*, edited by Shaye J. D. Cohen and Edward L. Greenstein (Detroit, 1990), pp. 80–112. Robert Brody, "Sifrut ha-Ge'onim v'ha-Teqst ha-Talmudi," in *Mehqeret Talmud*, edited by Ya'aqov Sussman and David Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1990), vol. 1, pp. 237–303. Jacob Nahum Epstein, *Mevo'ot le-Sifrut ha-Amora'im* (Jerusalem, 1962). Shamma Friedman, "Introduction," *Talmud 'Arukh: Perek ha-Sokher et ha-Omanin Bavli Bava' Metsi'a*, Text Volume (Jerusalem, 1996). Shamma Friedman, "Literary Development and Historicity in the Agadic Narrative of the Babylonian Talmud," in *Community and Culture: Essays in Jewish Studies in Honor of the Ninetieth Anniversary of the Founding of Gratz College, 1895–1985*, edited by Nahum M. Waldman (Philadelphia, 1987), pp. 67–80. Shamma Friedman, "The Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud: A Typology according to Orthography," in *Studies in Hebrew and Jewish Languages: Presented to Shlomo Morag*, edited by Moshe Bar-Asher (Jerusalem, 1996), in Hebrew with English summary. Shamma Friedman, "On the Origin of Textual Variants in the Babylonian Talmud," *Sidra* 7 (1991): vi–vii, 67–102, in Hebrew with English summary. Louis Ginzberg, "The Palestinian Talmud," in *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud* vol. 1, pp. xiii–1 (New York, 1941). Abraham Goldberg, "The Babylonian Talmud," in *The Literature of the Sages*, edited by Shmuel Safrai (Assen and Philadelphia, 1987), pt. 1, pp. 323–345. D. Goodblatt, "The Babylonian Talmud," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschungen*, edited by Hildegard Temporini (Berlin and New York, 1979); appeared also in *The Study of Ancient Judaism*, edited by Jacob Neusner (New York, 1981). David Weiss Halivni, *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara: The Jewish Predilection for Justified Law* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986). Judith Hauptman, *Development of the Talmudic Sugya: Relationship between Tannaitic and Amoraic Sources* (Lanham, Md., 1988). Marvin J. Heller, *Printing the Talmud: A History of the Earliest Printed Editions of the Talmud* (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1992). Louis Jacobs, *Structure and Form in the Babylonian Talmud* (Cambridge, 1991). Richard L. Kalmin, *The Redaction of the Babylonian Talmud: Amoraic or Saboraic?* (Cincinnati, 1989). Richard L. Kalmin, *Sages, Stories, Authors, and Editors in Rabbinic Babylonia* (Atlanta, 1994). Julius Kaplan, *The Redaction of the Babylonian Talmud* (New York, 1933). Saul Lieberman, *Al ha-Yerushalmi* (Jerusalem, 1929). Saul Lieberman, *Mehqerim be-Torat Erets Yisra'el*, edited by David Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1991), pp. 165–328. Eli'ezer S. Rosenthal, "The History of the Text and Problems of Redaction in the Study of the Babylonian Talmud," *Tarbiz* 57 (1987): i–ii, 1–36, in Hebrew with English summary. Yo'av Rosenthal, "'Iqarav ve-'Afa'afav' shel Bavli Shevu'ot 42a–b," in *Mehqeret Talmud: Qovets . . . le-Zikro shel Prof. Eli'ezer Shimshon Rosenthal*, edited by Moshe Bar-Asher and David Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1993), vol. 2, pp. 517–525. 'Adi'el Schremer, "Between Text Transmission and Text Redaction: Fragments of a Different Recension of TB Mo'ed-Qatan from the Genizah," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): ii–iii, 375–399, in Hebrew with English summary. 'Adi'el Schremer, "Fragments of Lishana Aharina of Bavli Moed Qatan from the Geniza," *Sidra* 9 (1993): viii–ix, 117–161, in Hebrew with English summary. Jacob S. Spiegel, "Comments and Late Additions in the Babylonian Talmud," in *Mehqerim be-Sifrut ha-Talmud, be-lashon Hazal, svi-Parshanut ha-Miqra*, edited by Mordecai Akiba Friedman, Abraham Tal, and Gerson Brinn Te'udah, vol. 3 (Tel Aviv, 1983), in Hebrew with English summary. Hermann Leberecht Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (New York, 1959), pp. 1–198, 237–327. Hermann Leberecht Strack and Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, rev. and updated ed., translated by Markus Bockmuehl (Minneapolis,

1992), pp. 208–244. Ya'aqov Sussman, "Ve-Shuv li-Yerushalmi Neziqin," in *Mehqerei Talmud*, edited by Ya'aqov Sussman and David Rosenthal (Jerusalem, 1990), vol. 1, pp. 55–133. Abraham Weiss, *Al ha-Yetsirah ha-Sifrutit shel ha-'Amora'im* (New York, 1962).

—SHAMMA FRIEDMAN AND LEIB MOSCOVITZ

**TALMUD, BURNING OF THE.** In the year 1240, the apostate Nicholas Donin laid a charge before the authorities in northern France that the \*Talmud contained blasphemies against Jesus. The Jews were compelled to surrender their copies of the Talmud pending clarification of the charge; this took the form of the Disputation of \*Paris, at the end of which Louis IX ordered that all copies of the Talmud be confiscated and burned. Twenty-four cartloads were consigned to the flames in 1242. The occasion was commemorated in R. \*Me'ir ben Barukh of Rothenburg's dirge Sha'ali Serufah be-'Esh, which was subsequently included in the dirge of the Ashkenazi rite recited on 9 Av. The precedent of 1242 was followed in later centuries; instances of Talmud burnings are recorded in Italy, Poland, and elsewhere. After 1242 the popes continued to advocate burning the Talmud. In general, although censored, the Talmud was not burned on a large scale until a renewed order in 1552 by Pope Julius III led to a big bonfire in Rome (commemorated thereafter by an annual fast among the Jews of Rome), followed by many others in Italy under the instructions of the \*Inquisition. It was reported that in Venice over a thousand copies of the Talmud and other sacred literature were burned. The last such public burning was held in Kamieniec-Podolski in Poland in 1757, when a thousand copies were put into a pit and burned following a \*disputation between the Jews and the Frankists (see FRANK, YA'AOV), who played a leading role in hunting down copies of the Talmud for incineration.

• Salo W. Baron, "The Burning of the Talmud in 1553, in Light of Sixteenth-Century Catholic Attitudes toward the Talmud," in *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: From Late Antiquity to the Reformation* (New York, 1991). Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (New York, 1966).

**TALMUD COMMENTARIES.** The first Talmud commentaries covering full tractates appeared at the beginning of the eleventh century CE in Kairouan, the North African center of Jewish learning. Rabbi \*Ḥanan'el ben Ḥushi'el wrote a commentary that summarized the basic Talmudic argument and clarified difficult sections. His short elucidations became the model for later Talmud commentaries. Ḥanan'el's contemporary, R. \*Nissim ben Ya'aqov ben Nissim ibn Shahin, wrote a work called *Sefer Mafteah Man'ulei ha-Talmud* in which he defined difficult terms and explained complex concepts by comparing their uses in different sections of the Talmud and other rabbinic works. Though his commentary is wide-ranging, it, too, did not cover the Talmud's argument in a line-by-line fashion. Only fragments of these commentaries have survived.

The most famous commentary on the Talmud was written by \*Rashi. It covers nearly the entire Talmud and is the first line-by-line Talmudic commentary. Rashi's extremely concise comments help connect one point to another, clarify difficult terms, and fill in the

lacunae that the Talmud's terseness often generates. To this day, all traditional editions of the Talmud include Rashi's indispensable aid to Talmud study.

Despite its general excellence, Rashi's commentary occasionally exhibited contradictions. Sometimes a wider reading of the Talmud itself indicated that Rashi's commentary was not as cogent as it could be. This led to the \**tosafot* (additions), whose authors, the tosafists, sought to correct and improve Rashi's work. Once, however, the work of uncovering and correcting flaws and contradictions in Rashi's commentary began, the tosafists recognized that the Talmud often contradicted itself. Given their view that the Talmud was a well-edited, authoritative statement of the Jewish tradition, they turned to harmonizing discrepancies between Talmudic passages. They often claimed that contradictory passages, for all their similarities, in fact discussed different cases. Thus, they created or recognized subtle distinctions between Talmudic sources that broadened the scope of Jewish legal rubrics and concepts. This movement began in the twelfth century and continued until the late fourteenth century, spreading from Germany and France to Spain.

Between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, the tosafists' successors commented less on the Talmud than on Rashi and *tosafot*. The most famous of their super-commentaries are those by Shemu'el Eli'ezer \*Edels, \*Me'ir ben Gedalyah of Lublin, and Shelomoh \*Luria. In the eighteenth century, however, interest in the neglected Talmud Yerushalmi began to flourish, and two major commentaries were written on it: *Penei Mosheh*, by Mosheh \*Margalit; and *Qorban ha-'Edah*, by David \*Franckel. Both are line-by-line commentaries on the Talmud Yerushalmi modeled on Rashi's work.

With the birth of modern critical-historical Talmudic studies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scholars have distinguished between the Talmud's attributed dictums and its unattributed editorial comments and connectives. Two modern scholars have written Talmud commentaries to individual tractates, trying to solve textual problems and difficulties in content by using this distinction as the basis of their commentaries; they are David Weiss Halivni (*Meqorot u-Mesorot*) and Shamma Y. Friedman (*Ha-'Ishah Rabbah and Talmud 'Arukh*). Their commentaries take up problems generated by Talmudic passages rather than individual lines. Adin Steinsaltz has returned to Rashi's style of leading the student through the Talmud's arguments step by step. His work on several tractates has appeared in Modern Hebrew and English.

• Ḥayyim Yosef David Azulai, *Sifrei Shem ha-Gedolim*, 2 vols. (repr. Jerusalem, 1980). Baruch M. Bokser, "An Annotated Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the Palestinian Talmud," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II*, vol. 19.2 (Berlin, 1979), pp. 139–256. David Goodblatt, "The Babylonian Talmud," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II*, vol. 19.2 (Berlin, 1979), pp. 257–336. Ezra Z. Melamed, *Pirquet Mavo' le-Sifrut ha-Talmud* (Jerusalem, 1973), contains a description of commentaries on the Talmud Yerushalmi. Adin Steinsaltz, *The Talmud: The Steinsaltz Edition: A Reference Guide* (New York, 1989). Efraim E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1955). Shelomoh Yosef Zevin, *Ishim ve-Shitot* (Tel Aviv, 1958).

—MICHAEL CHERNICK

**TALMUD TORAH** (תַּלְמוּד תּוֹרָה; study of the Torah), a term that refers both to Torah \*study and to the place in which education, particularly of an elementary nature,