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Abstract
This article describes the Aramaic of Tractate Karetot of the Babylonian Talmud according to MS Oxford Bodl. heb. b. 1. Tractate Karetot is one of the tractates which exhibit a special kind of Babylonian Aramaic. The first part of the article contains a description of this kind of Aramaic, with an attempt to define its unique features and their origin. MS Oxford Bodl. heb. b. 1 is the oldest dated manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud (BT) to have reached us. The second part of the article describes the features found in this manuscript which are different from the type of Aramaic known from the printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud. This is the first comprehensive description of a manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud outside the Yemenite manuscripts.

Keywords
Babylonian Aramaic, Babylonian Talmud, Karetot

0. Introduction
This article describes the type of Babylonian Aramaic (BA) found in Tractate Karetot according to MS Oxford Bodl. heb. b. 1 (O).¹ This manuscript, found

¹ The following sigla are used for the talmudic manuscripts used in this article: E = Escorial G-I-3; F = Florence II-I-7; G = Göttingen 3; Ha165 = Hamburg 165; He = Jerusalem, Yad Harav Herzog 1; J128 = JTS Rab. 218; J1608 = JTS Rab. 1608; J1623 = JTS Rab. 1623; C = Columbia X895-T141; L = London BL Add. 25717; LH = London BL Harl. 5508; M6 = Munich 6; M95 = Munich 95; M141 = Munich 141; MG = Moscow-Günzburg 1134; O23 = Oxford Opp. Add. fol. 23; O51 = Oxford Bodl. heb. c. 51; O726 = Oxford Opp. 726; O249 = Oxford Opp. 249; P = St. Petersburg RNL Evr. I 187; PA = Paris Alliance H147A; PE = Printed Editions; Ps1337 = Paris 1337; V108 = Vatican 108; V109 = Vatican 109; V110 = Vatican 110; V111 = Vatican 111; V113 = Vatican 113; V115 = Vatican 115; V119 = Vatican 119;
in the Geniza, contains only part of the tractate.\textsuperscript{2} Dated to 1123, it is the oldest dated manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud (BT) to have reached us.\textsuperscript{3} In describing the BA of this manuscript I shall proceed in the two main directions that research in this field has taken in the recent decades.

First, the main breakthrough in the academic study of all rabbinic sources involved grounding the research in reliable sources, such as manuscripts and oral traditions, rather than the printed editions, in which the text was heavily corrupted. Nevertheless, thus far BA has been described only according to Yemenite manuscripts\textsuperscript{4} and the Yemenite oral tradition.\textsuperscript{5} Only a few and incomplete descriptions are based on Geniza fragments.\textsuperscript{6} This article contains the first comprehensive description of a non-Yemenite manuscript.

Second, it has long been known that BA is not uniform and contains many alternative parallel forms.\textsuperscript{7} The causes of this phenomenon may be grouped into

\textsuperscript{2} V\textsuperscript{120} = Vatican 120; V\textsuperscript{122} = Vatican 122; V\textsuperscript{123} = Vatican 123; V\textsuperscript{125} = Vatican 125; V\textsuperscript{140} = Vatican 140; V\textsuperscript{487} = Vatican 487.

\textsuperscript{3} According to Firkowitz, one manuscript, P, contained a colophon with the date corresponding to 1122. However, the colophon is now illegible, and his testimony is doubtful; See Raphael Nathan Nata Rabbinovicz, \textit{Variiae lectiones in Mishnah et in Talmud Babylonicum} (Hebrew) (Munich: Heinrich Ressel, 1877), VIII, p. 9, on Codex 14. He cites Firkowitz’s statement and adds עין ובא ‘and it may be so’. See also S. Schechter and S. Singer (eds.), \textit{Talmudical Fragments in the Bodleian Library} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), p. 6 of the introduction, n. 1; David Rosenthal, \textit{Mishna Aboda Zara: A Critical Edition} (Hebrew), Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, 1980, I, p. 97.

\textsuperscript{4} Yechiel Kara, \textit{Babylonian Aramaic in the Yemenite Manuscripts of the Talmud} (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Language Traditions Project, 1983).


three major types: (1) Archaic Aramaic is used in certain literary genres, such as proverbs and legal documents,\(^8\) and in sayings attributed to certain speakers, notably the earlier\(^9\) and western\(^10\) Amoraim. This type will not be dealt with in this article. (2) A second type of BA resembles the Aramaic of Targum Onqelos and of the Geonim in many respects. This type is used mainly in tractates *Nedarim*, *Nazir*, *Karetot*, *Meila*, *Tamid* (and to some extent in *Temura*). Only one work has so far been devoted solely to this type, which will be referred to here as 'Nedarim Babylonian Aramaic' (=NBA, after the largest tractate in the group).\(^11\) The description given here is the first description of NBA in a tractate other than *Nedarim*.\(^12\) The first part of this article will describe NBA as found in O.\(^3\) (3) Even Standard Babylonian Aramaic (SBA) contains many competitive forms. Although these forms may be used in the same manuscript, in many cases we can discern a consistent difference between manuscripts, or between the printed editions and manuscripts. When one is describing the linguistic tradition of a manuscript, all such differences need to be collected in order to classify the manuscript according to them. The second part of this article will deal with such forms in O.

Some brief descriptions, mentioning unique features of O, were published with the printed edition of O.\(^13\) In the age when this edition appeared, however, more than a century ago, manuscripts were not studied in a systematic way and the printed editions constituted the main source for comparisons. Hence

---

5. Among the various manuscripts, O is unique in its frequent use of NBA forms (see 1.4.2). The decision to base this study on O results from this fact as well.
all features differing from the printed editions were considered unique to O. Today we have descriptions of manuscripts and direct access to them, enabling us to define the nature of such features more precisely. We can conclude that most of them are not unique to O; some are characteristic of NBA, some are characteristic of manuscripts in general (as opposed to printed editions), and some belong to a specific type of BA; only a few are unique to O.

1. NBA features in O

1.1. Introductory remarks

Although NBA forms have been described, there seems to be a fundamental shortcoming in the approach taken so far. All published research has remarked that these forms appear in certain tractates. In fact, they are to be found everywhere in the Babylonian Talmud, leading us to wonder what is unique about these tractates. This problem is greater in the light of the manuscripts, where in all tractates these forms are more common than they are in the printed editions. For example, Kara has pointed out that such forms are quite abundant in Yemenite manuscripts. Similarly, Friedman maintains that in Ashkenazi manuscripts 'something', one of the NBA forms (rather than SBA מידי), is widespread even in the 'regular' tractates.

It is true that in these sources NBA forms are in the minority. But they are also a minority in the 'special' tractates. Accordingly, it is hard to define what

14 See above, nn. 7, 11, and the literature cited in those works.
15 Here are some examples of such forms in the printed editions: נֶנֶנַיָּה לְחַזְקָה וְשָׁפְתִּיָּה 'made for themselves hollowed out areas and settled down in them' (Ber. 54b) (in SBA בֵּיתוֹ וְלֹא אֵין תְאִילוּ בָּרָא; in the printed editions בְּיתוֹ וְלֹא אֵין תְאִילוּ לְחַזְקָה וְשָׁפְתִּיָּה); קַשְׁתָּה 'they have no beard' (Qid. 33b) (in SBA קַשְׁתָּה לֹא רְאוּ אֵין בָּרָא; in the printed editions קַשְׁתָּה לֹא רְאוּ אֵין בָּרָא); 'on a day not his' (B. Qam. 27b) (in SBA 'on a day not his' (B. Qam. 27b) (in SBA רְאוּ אֵין בָּרָא; in the printed editions רְאוּ אֵין בָּרָא).
16 Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, pp. 62-7. Here are some examples from the Yemenite manuscript יִדַעְתָּ וְיָדַעִיתָ 'again, whence do we know that the night is also meant' (103a; in the printed editions יִדַעְתָּ וְיָדַעִיתָ 'we require all [to be] uncircumcised, which is absent' (62b, twice; in the printed editions יִדַעְתָּ וְיָדַעִיתָ 'we require all [to be] uncircumcised, which is absent' (62b, twice; in the printed editions יִדַעְתָּ וְיָדַעִיתָ; 'on a day not his' (B. Qam. 27b) (in SBA רְאוּ אֵין בָּרָא; in the printed editions רְאוּ אֵין בָּרָא). 17 Shamma Friedman, 'The Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud: A Typology Based upon Orthographic and Linguistic Features', in: Moshe Bar-Asher (ed.), Studies in Hebrew and Jewish Languages: Presented to Shelomo Morag (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1996), pp. 163-190 (173, 181 and n. 127). The following is an example from the Ashkenazi manuscript פ and n. 127).
is unique about the 'special' tractates: NBA forms appear everywhere, while most of the forms are of SBA type, in both 'special' and 'regular' tractates.

It is thus clear that the designation 'special' tractates was based on a feeling that such forms are especially abundant in these tractates. Although scholars' intuitions should not be ignored, they are nothing more than that. To firmly establish the linguistic nature of a tractate, one must measure the proportion of NBA forms and compare it with the figures for other tractates. Only if the proportion is significantly higher can we conclude that this tractate is 'special'.

By way of example, take the case of מִדְבַּר, which is more frequent in Ashkenazi manuscripts than in the printed editions. Should we remove it from the list of NBA forms? It depends on how often it appears. The approach proposed here can easily show that מִדְבַּר typifies the 'special' tractates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tractate</th>
<th>מִדְבַּר</th>
<th>Pct. of מִדְבַּר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanhedrin F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedarim V487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedarim V110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetot O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that although מִדְבַּר appears in the Ashkenazi manuscript F of Tractate Sanhedrin, it is infrequent, whereas it is common in two 'special' tractates. This method is the only way to establish their special character.

Below I shall present and discuss the NBA features in O. Then I will determine the proportion of these forms and compare it with other tractates, both 'special' and 'regular'.

1.2. NBA forms in O

In this section I will juxtapose NBA and SBA forms in O (for the exact number of occurrences, see Table 1). Sixteen such forms have been noted by previous scholars; I have added another six.¹⁸

¹⁸ The 16 features described here are listed in the grammars (above, n. 7), and were collected and described according to Tractate Nedarim by Rybak, ‘Nedarim’, pp. 17–18; 74–116. (As stated, though, he notes only on the existence of these forms, with no details of their distribution in comparison with SBA forms). T. Harviainen, ‘Diglossia in Jewish Eastern Aramaic’, StudOr 55 (1984), pp. 97–113, also lists these features, but it seems that he relies on Rybak; his main purpose is to determine the origin of this language. In my discussion I do not deal with lexical items, since many of them are rare and cannot serve as a clear means for typifying a language. I also do not deal with features that do not appear in Karetot.
(1) ... perhaps R. Simeon maintains his view only with regard to a thing that is ready to be tossed (24b). The distribution seems to reflect a difference in function: יִדּוּד 'does the passage mention ‘majority’? (25a); 'fowl and beast are included but no other thing' (21a); יִדּוּד 'perhaps R. Simeon' (24a). wherefore does the Divine Law repeat, You may not eat within your gates' (4b).

(2) 'something; interrogative particle' (SBA - מִיתָא: מָרֵד) 'does the passage mention ‘majority’? (25b). It appears twice: "'fowl and beast are included but no other thing' (21a); יִדּוּד 'perhaps R. Simeon' (24a). The distribution seems to reflect a difference in function: יִדּוּד 'does the passage mention ‘majority’? (25b); 'fowl and beast are included but no other thing' (21a); יִדּוּד 'perhaps R. Simeon' (24a). wherefore does the Divine Law repeat, You may not eat within your gates' (4b).

(3) 'there is not' (SBA - לִדוּ אֵין) appears once;19 יִדּוּד 'perhaps R. Simeon' (24a). wherefore does the Divine Law repeat, You may not eat within your gates' (4b).

(4) יִדּוּד 'there is not' (SBA - לִדוּ אֵין) always - רַדְלָה.21 In לִדוּ אֵין יִדּוּד 'always - רַדְלָה.21 In לִדוּ אֵין יִדּוּד in the BT seems to have influenced

(5) 'to, of' (SBA - רִדְאִי: רִדְאִי) יִדּוּד 'perhaps R. Simeon' (24a). wherefore does the Divine Law repeat, You may not eat within your gates' (4b).


---

19) אֵין רְזֹה יָדֵכָךְ שְׁקֵלָה זָכָרָה יִדְּבָא.
20) Ex. e.g. אֵין רְזֹה יָדֵכָךְ שְׁקֵלָה זָכָרָה יִדְּבָא 'now here [the designation was made] neither at the time of purchase nor at the time of offering' (28a).
21) Ex. e.g. אֵין רְזֹה יָדֵכָךְ שְׁקֵלָה זָכָרָה יִדְּבָא 'bread is not in its natural state' (5a); יִדּוּד 'the prohibition of the geb ha-nashe is not applicable to them' (21b).}

— E.g. מְלֹא לְיהוָה תַּנְנִי הָעָל הַיָּדוּר לְמֵסְגָּל לְיִדְּבָא מַלְכָּה יִדּוּד 'the matter rests with him' (24a).
22) Ex. e.g. מְלֹא לְיהוָה תַּנְנִי הָעָל הַיָּדוּר לְמֵסְגָּל לְיִדְּבָא מַלְכָּה יִדּוּד 'according to me who hold it is forbidden in its lifetime, [the meaning] is clear' (25a).
23) Ex. e.g. מְלֹא לְיהוָה תַּנְנִי הָעָל הַיָּדוּר לְמֵסְגָּל לְיִדְּבָא מַלְכָּה יִדּוּד 'the first tanna agrees with R. Simeon' (20b).
24) Ex. e.g. מְלֹא לְיהוָה תַּנְנִי הָעָל הַיָּדוּר Lְmֵסְגָּל לְיִדְּבָא מַלְכָּה יִדּוּד 'the first tanna agrees with R. Simeon' (20b).
25) Ex. e.g. מְלֹא Lְיהוָה תַּנְנִי Hָעָל הַיָּדוּר Lְmֵסְגָּל Lְיִדְּבָא מַלְכָּה יִדּוּד 'the first tanna agrees with R. Simeon' (20b).
the use of קְפֶּה in this phrase in O. קְפֶּה was created by assimilation of the d to the m and elision of the glottal stop.

Given the preservation of the d in קְפֶּה, we would also expect קְפֶּה, the original form of קְפֶּה 'before'. However, in O we find only קְפֶּה (12 times), whether in the temporal sense, e.g. "that Jeconiah reigned before him" (3b), or the locative sense, e.g. "and when you are sitting before your teacher" (6a).

(7) "there is" (SBA Kếtא) and its derivatives:

The independent third-person plural pronoun does not appear in the corpus.

The SBA third-person masculine plural remote demonstrative pronoun is Kếtא, derived from Kếtא. In O we have Kếtא, derived from Kếtא (only once): Kếtא that burnt-offering of the bird is sacrificed as a free-will offering, and those coins that remain [he will bring] from his house" (28a).

The SBA third-person masculine plural accusative pronominal suffix is Kếtא, derived from Kếtא. Here it is always Kếtא, derived from Kếtא; Kếtא there is' takes the same suffix: Kếtא. The SBA pronominal suffix Kếtא does not appear. On the other hand, the third-person feminine plural accusative pronominal suffix derived from SBA, Kếtא, does appear, twice, but only in the form Kếtא 'and point out the contradiction between them' (21a, 24b). On the basis of the masculine Kếtא we would expect the feminine Kếtא. It seems that the wide distribution of Kếtא in the BT caused it to appear in O in its SBA form.

26. Kếtא appears here also in V120 L; but I have not found it in other manuscripts of the BT. Rybak, ‘Nedarim’, p. 108, presents Kếtא as an equivalent of SBA Kếtא, as if Kếtא were a pronoun. However, the form adduced by him is a Hebrew one: Kếtא they are before you on the condition that father would come (Ned. 48a); it is derived from the Hebrew הָעֲבָד, and it is taken from the Mishna (Ned. 5.6): Kếtא is derived from some readings (in other versions Kếtא and they are not [unless] …). It has nothing to do with Kếtא. The only correct equivalents of Kếtא are the forms adduced here, Kếtא, Kếtא as a personal pronoun and Kếtא as a demonstrative pronoun.

27. Kếtא, Kếtא ‘he ate them’ (28b); Kếtא, Kếtא ‘let him redeem them’ (37b); Kếtא, Kếtא ‘let him write them’ (5a); Kếtא, Kếtא ‘let him learn them together’ (5a); Kếtא, Kếtא ‘he divided them’ (5a); Kếtא, Kếtא ‘he set them aside’ (26b).

28. So in Geonic Aramaic; see Matthew Morgenstern, ‘Jewish Babylonian Aramaic in Geonic Responsa’ (Hebrew), Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, 2002, p. 115. This is used in Targumic Aramaic; see Gustaf Dalman, Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 2nd edn, 1905), pp. 364, 367. It occurs once in a Yemenite manuscript; see Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 190.
As a copula, the form is always SBA דנה for masculine, דנה for feminine (14 times),\(^{29}\) created by prepending n to SBA דנה.\(^{30}\)

This creates a contradiction with the independent pronoun: and in this pair - are derived from NBA דנה, whereas the copula דנה is derived from SBA דנה. It seems that there is a functional distinction between the SBA and NBA forms in this pair.

SBA דנה was created by borrowing הָוֹ from the singular pronoun.\(^{31}\)

(8) 'you' singular (SBA דנה): each of these forms appears once,\(^{32}\) דנה was created by assimilation of the n to the t.

(9) 'on' (SBA - דנה): in some phrases only - דנה appears: (i) דנה 'according to' (three times),\(^{33}\) (ii) 'to occur';\(^{34}\) (iii) 'why' (once);\(^{35}\) (iv) 'why' (15 times);\(^{36}\) (v) 'therefore' (three times);\(^{37}\) (vi) 'because' (once).\(^{38}\) On the other hand, <הָוֹ is always used before Hebrew words embedded in the Aramaic text.\(^{39}\) In other cases - דנה and <הָוֹ are inter-

\(^{29}\) E.g. 'since a lamb and a bird-offering are both blood offerings' (27b).


\(^{31}\) Ibid., pp. 155–156.

\(^{32}\) 'and you say that there shall be an overweight' (5a), as against 'and are you not of the opinion' (18b).

\(^{33}\) E.g. 'according to R. Simeon' (23b).

\(^{34}\) Only once (usually also according to R. Simeon): 'for I might otherwise have thought, since blood is excluded from the law of sacrilege, it is also excluded from the law concerning the [eating of holy things by a] non-priest' (4b).

\(^{35}\) E.g. 'since a lamb and a bird-offering are both blood offerings' (27b).

\(^{36}\) E.g. 'therefore the Divine Law wrote, And if any one' (22b).

\(^{37}\) E.g. 'because of this the Divine Law wrote, You may not [eat]' (4b–5a). The initial aleph is for <הָוֹ; see Bernardo Geiger, in: Samuel Krauss, *Additamenta ad Librum Aruch Completum* (Hebrew) (Vienna: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1937), p. 31. It should be noted that the original phrase 'immediately' does not occur in the special tractates, but only the late aleph; e.g. Ned. 4a (V487).

\(^{38}\) E.g. 'since [the suspensive guilt-offering] is brought for [the eating of] doubtful [heleb]' (23b); 'it takes effect on the prohibition of heleb' (23b); 'do you point out a contradiction between the unconditional guilt-offering and the suspensive guilt-offering' (24b); 'let him redeem [the coins] upon a bird-offering' (27b). It seems that the Hebrew word influences the choice of the preposition that exists in Hebrew.
changeable.\textsuperscript{40} was created by the common BA shift ‘>’, with assimilation of the \textit{l}.\textsuperscript{41}

(10) יִדְרָי ‘this’ masculine (SBA יִדְרַי): both forms occur.\textsuperscript{42}
(11) יִדְרָי ‘this’ feminine (SBA יִדְרַי): usually יִדְרַי and only rarely יִדְרַמ.\textsuperscript{44}
(12) יִדְרָי ‘these’ (SBA יִדְרַת): usually יִדְרַת and only rarely יִדְרַמ was created by a \textit{š}\textit{n} shift, with elision of the final \textit{n}.

(13) In SBA, the second-person plural participle ends in רֶ- (three occurrences in the same passage).\textsuperscript{47}

(14) In SBA, the second-person plural pronominal suffix ends in ר- (five cases in the same passage).\textsuperscript{48}

(15) The SBA third-person plural pronominal suffix ר- is used here alongside NBA ר- .\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{40} Epstein, \textit{Grammar}, p. 132.
\textsuperscript{41} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘this is not ready to be tossed’ (24b), as opposed to יָדְרִי ‘in this manner’ (21a).
\textsuperscript{42} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘in this R. Simeon and the sages disagree’ (5a).
\textsuperscript{43} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘and he said it about this’ (7a). In one sentence both pronouns occur together: יָדְרִי יָדְרִי both forms occur.
\textsuperscript{44} In the common phrase יָדְרִי יָדְרִי, both forms occur.
\textsuperscript{45} Epstein, \textit{Grammar}, p. 132.
\textsuperscript{46} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘these words refer to definite’ (4b).
\textsuperscript{47} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘the case [fit. these words] only as regards a positive command’ (4b).
\textsuperscript{48} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘you learn’ (6a); יָדְרִי ‘you sit’ (6a); יָדְרִי ‘you ask’ (6a).
\textsuperscript{49} E.g. יָדְרִי ‘your teacher’ (6a [twice]); יָדְרִי ‘your learning’ (6a).
(16) The plural ending:

In verbs (except for יתְחִל verbs), the n is usually dropped, as in SBA: e.g. יתְחִל 'they eat' (24b). But in 20% of the cases the n is preserved; e.g. יתְחִל 'they go' (28a). In יתְחִל verbs, on the other hand, the n is normally preserved; e.g. יתְחִל 'they come' (24a, 26a [twice]). In nouns, the n is always dropped; e.g. יתְחִל 'others' (24a, 28a).

In 24 cases nouns retain the n, but all of them occur in a number, e.g. יתְחִל ילוּדָּה 'let them derive one from two' (5a), and usually also in the noun attached to it, e.g. יתְחִל ילוּדָּה 'two times' (5a).

50 So also: וְאָמֵר 'they say' (18b [3 times], 19b [twice], 24a, 24b); דָּאָר וְאָמֵר 'they learn' (22b); דָּאָר 'they learn' (26b); יָסֲדֵו 'they think' (4b, 22b [3 times], 23b, 25a); קָפַס 'they exempt' (22b); קָפַס 'they are stringent' (4b); קָפַס 'they are written' (25a); קָפַס 'they differ' (20a); קָפַס 'they are' (4b, 26a); קָפַס 'they object' (21b [3 times], 22a [3 times], 24b [twice], 28a [3 times]); קָפַס 'they are' (4b, 26a); קָפַס 'they are' (4b, 26a).

51 So also: יָסֲדֵו 'they learn' (5a); נְבָּעִים 'they are drawn out' (6a); נְבָּעִים 'they remain' (28a); נְבָּעִים 'they are written' (4b [twice]); נְבָּעִים 'they are' (4b, 5a).

52 So also: וְאָמֵר 'they resemble' (19b); וְאָמֵר 'they are' (ca, cb); and only once it is omitted: וְאָמֵר 'they defile' (23b). The final numbers (in the tables) include only strong verbs, not יתְחִל verbs. I omit here the forms יתְחִל, וְאָמֵר, since they were created in a different way, by the analogy of the perfect and the imperfect forms, not by dropping of the final n. On the forms of יתְחִל verbs see below, 2.3.1.4.

53 So also: וְאָמֵר 'others' (21b); וְאָמֵר 'palaces' (6a); וְאָמֵר 'unconsecrated foodstuffs' (4b [twice]); וְאָמֵר 'days' (5b); וְאָמֵר 'stones' (6a); וְאָמֵר 'rules' (21a); וְאָמֵר 'atone' (5b); וְאָמֵר 'leeks' (6a); וְאָמֵר 'logs' (5b); וְאָמֵר 'things' (4b [3 times], 21a [twice], 21b, 22b, 23b, 25b [twice], 27b [twice]); וְאָמֵר 'specifications' (21a); וְאָמֵר 'the first' (24a); וְאָמֵר 'dustheaps' (6a); וְאָמֵר 'verses' (19a); וְאָמֵר 'they are' (4b, 5a); וְאָמֵר 'they are' (4b, 5a); וְאָמֵר 'they are' (4b, 5a); וְאָמֵר 'they are' (4b, 5a).

54 So also: יָסֲדֵו 'they are' (ca, cb); and only once it is omitted: יָסֲדֵו 'they are' (23b). The final numbers (in the tables) include only strong verbs, not יתְחִל verbs. I omit here the forms יתְחִל, וְאָמֵר, since they were created in a different way, by the analogy of the perfect and the imperfect forms, not by dropping of the final n. On the forms of יתְחִל verbs see below, 2.3.1.4.

55 So also: וְאָמֵר 'two witnesses' came and said [the ox] killed [a person], and two others [then came and] said, it did not kill, two and two (24a); וְאָמֵר 'what for what reason did he separate two [sacrifices]?' (24a); וְאָמֵר 'what is the reason of the one who holds him liable to two' (20a); and וְאָמֵר 'from its mention [of knowledge] in two instances you might derive the third' (16a).

56 So also: וְאָמֵר 'two thousands' (5a); וְאָמֵר 'two prohibitions' (4b [twice]); וְאָמֵר 'three prohibitions' (4b); וְאָמֵר 'thirty days' (27a). In three cases only the number ends with n: וְאָמֵר 'two prohibitions' (4b); וְאָמֵר 'two prohibitions' (4b). In one case the attribute וְאָמֵר 'many' substitutes for the number and behaves similarly: וְאָמֵר 'many' times (23b). 'Others' occurs only twice: וְאָמֵר 'twelve logs' (5b); וְאָמֵר 'twelve logs' (5b). The absolute state is used also in Syriac when attached to numbers;
The uniformity in O is impressive: almost all numbers and the nouns they modify end with \( n \). Note also the distinction between verbs and nouns: whereas in verbs the \( n \) is retained in 20\% of the cases, it never survives in nouns except for the condition described.\(^{56}\)

Scholars have described these sixteen features as typifying NBA. My investigations have uncovered six more. They are of the same type as the features discussed above: they are also usual in Ţargumic or Geonic language, and their linguistic character is also more archaic.

(17) \( \text{from} \) (SBA -\( \text{a} \)): in SBA the \( n \) of the preposition \( \text{from} \) tends to assimilate to the following consonant. Although this also predominates in O,\(^{57}\) in many cases (21%) the \( n \) is preserved.\(^{58}\) In one sentence both forms occur: 'it was not changed from its original things by a] non-priest' (4b).\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{56}\) Rybak, ‘Nedarim’, p. 86, combines the participle with the noun. According to Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', p. 156, in Geonic language there is a clear distinction between the participle, where the \( n \) ending is frequent, and the noun, where it is almost non-existent (except for numbers). From this he adds a proof for the claim (advanced previously by Epstein and Morag) that the -\( ay \) endings in the noun and in the participle stems from two different developments: in the participle it results from dropping of the final \( n \), while in the noun it results from the shift -\( ay \) > -\( ay \) > -\( e \).

\(^{57}\) E.g. \( \text{from before an old man} \) \( \text{from} \) \( \text{from these coins} \) \( \text{from the sacred} \) \( \text{from bread} \) \( \text{from parched grain} \) \( \text{from a comparison} \). Omitted from the count are two cases where I cannot decide whether the word is Hebrew or Aramaic: ʼfoodstuffs’ (2b); 'fifty’ (27a).

\(^{58}\) E.g. 'from \( \text{a} \) law which is a subject of a mere negative command is illuminated by its context which is also the subject of a mere negative command, but a law which is the subject of a mere negative command is not illuminated by its context which is the subject of a negative command involving \( \text{karet} \)’ (4b); 'I, too, [derived it] from this text’ (25b).

\(^{59}\) E.g. ‘is this law derived from here, is it not rather derived from the following’ (4b); So also: \( \text{from} \) \( \text{from} \) \( \text{from} \) \( \text{from} \) \( \text{from} \).
This feature, not previously identified as NBA, is quite common in Tractate Nedarim, even in the printed editions; e.g. (according to the printed editions):

- ידוּדִים עַלָּהּ מַמְתַחְתָּ (5a); ידוּדִים עַלָּהּ מַמְתַחְתָּ מִדָּמְתַחְתָּ (5a); ידוּדִים עַלָּהּ מַמְתַחְתָּ מִדָּמְתַחְתָּ מִדָּמְתַחְתָּ (5a).

- תֵּבֶּה (28a); תֵּבֶּה תֵּבֶּה (40a); תֵּבֶּה תֵּבֶּה (40a).

- 'from this verse' (72b); 'from this' (72b); 'from this' (72b).

The situation in O supports the conclusion that it is a feature of NBA.60

In SBA, the n was assimilated to the following consonant (as in Hebrew). As with all the other differences between them, the SBA form is later than the NBA form.61

(18) ידכְּנִים 'so' (SBA ידכְּנִים): the demonstrative pronoun in O is usually the SBA ידכְּנִים, without the original final n.62 However, when the pronoun is combined with -N to form the expression הִיא אֲחָכִיב 'therefore’, the n is always retained.63 This is another case influenced by the frequency of the form—in this case ידכְּנִים—in SBA; by the same token, the retention of the n in אֲחָכִיב is due to the absence of ידכְּנִים in SBA (see below, § 20). In the printed editions אֲחָכִיב appears only once, in Tractate Nedarim,64 but it is widespread in the manuscripts of Nedarim65 and hence should be included in the list of NBA forms. This form also appears in a manuscript of Me ila, another of ‘special’ tractates.66

[---]

character' (5a); 'we may derive the law above from the law below' (22b [twice]); 'we may not derive the law above from the law below' (22b). See also: ידכְּנִים מַמְתַחְתָּ ידכְּנִים מַמְתַחְתָּ (22b)....
(19) 'how' (SBA: מִי קָאָר) appears several times in O;67 and מִי קָאָר once.68 It too should be included in the list of NBA forms.70

(20) 'therefore' is regular in BA;71 but O employs מִי קָאָר instead.72 (albeit without the final n) appears in the printed editions almost exclusively in the 'special' tractates;73 and only once inHorayot.74 There are more occurrences in manuscripts of the 'special' tractates.75 Unlike other features, here the connection between the SBA and NBA forms is not obvious, so we cannot decide that one of them is more archaic.

(21) 'twelve' (SBA: נב' הרא'ר): In O נב' הרא'ר does not appear, while in the printed editions of the BT נב' הרא'ר appears only
once, again in Tractate Karetot (in a passage not included in O).\footnote{78} It seems, then, that it too is a NBA form.\footnote{79}

(22) 'therefore, consequently' (SBA הילכלך also הילכלך: in contrast to the regular phrase הילכלך, there are 15 occurrences of the phrase הילכלך in the BT, at least in one of the variant readings: seven in O (usually together with other manuscripts),\footnote{80} five in Tractate Karetot according to other manuscripts (in passages missing in O),\footnote{81} twice in Tractate Nedérim,\footnote{82} and once in Tractate Héryot.\footnote{83} Only six in the printed editions (four in Karetot,

\footnote{77} Proef 3. 4-9-2007:12.18, page 14.

Scholars have included as NBA only ב. בת ימיין only ב. בת ימיין —only those forms that do not appear once more in a Hebrew context: therefore the order of the Prophets is Yéhoshúa... (B. Bat. 14b [O249]; in the printed editions הילאך) appears. It seems obvious that if there were a hundred' (Horayot 3b [Ps 1337 s.a.m ei n PE]).
one in *Nedarim*, and one in *Horayot*).\(^8^4\) The abundance of the form in *Karetot*, as well as its appearance in *Nedarim*, indicates that it is a feature of NBA. It should be noted that O is the only manuscript that always uses *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din* and *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din*. In this case, as with all the other NBA features, it seems clear that *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din* is the original form, which yielded the SBA forms *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din* and *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din* by elision of the glottal stop.\(^8^5\)

Table 1: SBA and NBA forms in O (absolute number and percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBA forms</th>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>NBA</th>
<th>Pct. NBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תב</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מדרס</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לאמ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לא Toastr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דר</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קדם</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צו</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גמר</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טל</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שדר</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מדר</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חל</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שח</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמח</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רק</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נג</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חיב</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ניב</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אמס</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>היר</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>海岛</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the overall proportion of NBA forms in O is 35%.

---

\(^8^4\) See previous notes.

\(^8^5\) *
awal
c
din* is the original form; see J.N. Epstein, *Studies in Talmudic Literature and Semitic Languages* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), I, p. 208; idem, *Grammar*, p. 142. It seems that the interchange of *i* and *o* in the common forms *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din* and *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din* can be explained by the original form: both vowels exist in *
awal
c
din*
awal
c
din*, but only one could survive after the elision...
1.3. Comparison with other tractates

As stated at the outset, the mere appearance of NBA traits in a corpus has little significance. In order to determine the uniqueness of the special tractates, one should specify the proportions of these forms and the SBA ones and compare the result with the 'regular' tractates. Accordingly I have compared all the features discussed above with the situation in five tractates: Nedarim and Meيلة, which are 'special' tractates, and Pesahim, Shabbat, and Beqa, which are 'regular' tractates. In all tractates the manuscript selected is the one considered to be the best (and which has been selected for investigation by the Historical Dictionary Project of the Hebrew Language Academy). Thus we have a comparison of three 'special' tractates with three 'regular' ones. The 'regular' tractates were selected so to represent three manuscript traditions: Yemenite, Ashkenazi, and Spanish. This allows us to measure the exact rate of NBA traits in both the 'special' and the 'regular' tractates.

of the glottal stop; this is the explanation offered by Bacher, 'Talmudical Fragments', pp. 147–148. Accordingly, there is no need to see the (Geonic) ה"ח כיוון as the original form and to assume that כיוון is a result of ooı shift (as Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', p. 71).

For Nedarim V487 (reaches only until f. 20); for Meيلة F, for Pesahim J1623; for Shebho 누 V140; for Beqa G. The texts are available at http://hebrew-treasures.huji.ac.il. On the principles used to select the manuscripts for this project see Eljakim Wajsberg, 'Hatza li-Qvi at Beanim Leshoniyyim be-Ha-Talmud ha-Bavli', Zichronot ha-Akademiyu la-Lashon ha-Ivrit (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1988), XXVIII–XXX, pp. 338–345.

J1623 is Yemenite, V140 is Ashkenazi, and G is Spanish. See the classification by Friedman, 'The Manuscripts', pp. 183–185.

In the investigation, when possible, I used the site of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (see above, n. 86), and the Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank of The Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmudic Research. Most features were checked throughout the whole tractates. However, some features are too widespread for a complete examination, so they were checked only until f. 20: in Pesahim, Shabbat, and Beqa י"ע, י"פ, י"פ; in Pesahim, also י"מ, י"מ. Here are some notes on the investigation: י"ט: י"ט is not included; י"ט only phrases opening with י"ט, י"ט, י"ט were checked; י"ט: only the participle was checked, and the numbers do not include י"ט verbs; י"ט: only phrases starting with י"ט, י"ט, י"ט were checked; י"ט: י"ט, י"ט and י"ט were also checked (although the independent pronoun itself does not appear in O), but the numbers do not include the copula י"ט, as this form has no equivalent NBA form ending with י"ט.
Table 2. Absolute number of NBA and SBA forms in the Selected Tractates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>NBA</th>
<th>Karetot</th>
<th>Nedaram</th>
<th>Me’ila</th>
<th>Pesahim</th>
<th>Shebu’ot</th>
<th>Be’ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נִוְתִּים</td>
<td>נַעֲשָׁה</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִדּוּנִים</td>
<td>מִירִים</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כַּמָּא</td>
<td>לַחְצָו</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קֶרְטֶת</td>
<td>כֶּלֶם</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָרָא</td>
<td>נָרָא</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַדוֹרִים</td>
<td>יִדּה</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זְקַנְיָה</td>
<td>זְקַנְיָה</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַן</td>
<td>מַן</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַיָּה</td>
<td>הַיָּה</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 250 133 171 70 153 49 1411 26 744 5 746 11

Table 3. Percentage of NBA Forms (Zero means that only SBA forms occur; a dash means that neither form is represented in the tractate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>NBA</th>
<th>Karetot</th>
<th>Nedaram</th>
<th>Me’ila</th>
<th>Pesahim</th>
<th>Shebu’ot</th>
<th>Be’ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נִוְתִּים</td>
<td>נַעֲשָׁה</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִדּוּנִים</td>
<td>מִירִים</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כַּמָּא</td>
<td>לַחְצָו</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לַחְצָו</td>
<td>כַּמָּא</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לַחְצָו</td>
<td>לַחְצָו</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זְקַנְיָה</td>
<td>זְקַנְיָה</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַן</td>
<td>מַן</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַיָּה</td>
<td>הַיָּה</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>נְפָּשִׁים</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these tables a sharp distinction is discerned: the rate of NBA features in the ‘special’ tractates is 24%–35%, but only 0.67%–1.81% in the ‘regular’ tractates. The preference for NBA features in the ‘special’ tractates is thus solidly established. Also, it is clear that O contains more NBA forms than the other MSS examined.

We should stress two more points about O: first, ten of the NBA forms are the only form used in O: תיר, האבר, (נחת, קדמאה, דלי, הל איא, עות, נדה, אבר). No other MS has so many NBA forms to the exclusion of the corresponding SBA form (Nedarim, four; Me’ila, one). Second, only in O are all 22 forms represented; Nedarim has only 13 of them and Me’ila only 11.

As for the difference between the ‘special’ and the ‘regular’ tractates, in addition to the final result, we should note that in the ‘special’ tractates some NBA forms are in the majority, whereas they are always in the minority in the ‘regular’ tractates.

### 1.4. The distribution of NBA and SBA forms

Having described NBA forms in O, I will now discuss the scope of their use: first, forms that could be expected but do not appear (1.4.1); and second, differences in the distribution of the forms from manuscript to manuscript (1.4.2) and between the various forms (1.4.3).

#### 1.4.1. Expected forms that do not appear in NBA

Certain forms that could be expected, based on the NBA forms that are found in the ‘special’ tractates, do not appear:

(1) From קדמאה, two processes produced the SBA קדמא: assimilation of the $d$ and elision of the glottal stop. The presence of both forms in O suggests that these two processes did not always take place. Accordingly, we would expect to meet forms that underwent only one of these processes, i.e., קדמא.
In fact, we find either the original קְמָה or the late קְמָה קָמָה (only in the phrase קָפָא קָמָה). In my opinion, this shows that the only form in the spoken language was the late קְמָה. The archaic קְמָה was directly borrowed from ancient sources, so it could only be borrowed as it was.

(2) Similarly, two changes produced the form נָה לֹא from נָה נָה לֹא: a $n$ shift and elision of the final $n$. We could expect to find forms that exhibit only one shift, i.e. נָה נָה נָה, לֹא, but these forms do not appear in the 'special' tractates. This again shows that the composers of the text could take a form either from archaic sources or from the spoken language, but did not know the intermediate forms.

(3) Based on the appearance of קְמָה, without assimilation of the $d$, one could also expect the form קְמָה נָה, the precursor of קְמָה לֹא 'before'. However, this form never appears. This also shows that the preservation of the $d$ is not a natural phonetic feature, but a borrowing from classical sources.

(4) On the basis of נָה נָה לֹא (=SBA -א ), we would expect forms like נָה נָה נָה נָה לֹא (=אמָא), נָה נָה נָה נָה נָה לֹא (=אמָא), and the like. Nevertheless, נָה נָה never appears in such fixed collocations. It seems that נָה נָה was intentionally taken from classical sources, but in common BA expressions, where the original נָה נָה was no longer evident, they used only the regular forms.

(5) The BA copula נָה נָה לֹא was created by prefixing בו to the pronoun נָה נָה נָה נָה. Since the classic pronoun נָה נָה נָה נָה and its derivatives are common in NBA, we would also expect a copula in the form נָה נָה נָה נָה, the like. Nevertheless, נָה נָה never appears in such fixed collocations. It seems that נָה נָה was intentionally taken from classical sources, but in common BA expressions, where the original נָה נָה was no longer evident, they used only the regular forms.

These considerations show that NBA was created by borrowing features from classical sources (see 1.5.1).

---

89) Since in O קְמָה is restricted to this phrase, this phrase was not counted among SBA features in the tables presented above.

90) Regarding the last two paragraphs, in manuscripts we do find several examples of the proposed forms; e.g., אָמֶר (Pes. 18a [J1623]); בָּאָמֶר (Nazz. 31a [V160]; נָה לֹא (Pes. 25b [J1623]); נָה נָה (Pes. 35a [J1623]). However, they do not appear in O, are not abundant in the special tractates as we would expect them to be, are not used in Geonic language (according to Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', p. 121), and are so rare that they may be scribal errors.
1.4.2. The difference among manuscripts in the distribution of NBA forms

The description in this article is based on O. When we look at other manuscripts of Tractate *Kareitot*, we encounter numerous differences regarding the use of NBA forms: an NBA form is found in a certain place in one manuscript, while in another manuscript it is found in a different place. Let me adduce two cases of the plural demonstrative pronoun לְהַלְוִי (SBA יְהוֹלֵי) (f. 4a): O has לְהַלְוִי Мֹלֵיהָ מִלְיוֹלָם these words refer to defilement’, where M95 V119 V120 L F all have מָלְיוֹלָה מִלְיוֹלָה מִלְיוֹלָה ‘Because there is written in Scripture concerning it these two texts’ (V119 F PE), but מָלְיוֹלָה in O M95 V120. In the first case מָלְיוֹלָה appears only in O, while in the second case it appears only in other manuscripts.

Moreover, it is possible to rank the manuscripts according to their use of NBA forms: some use them more and some less. An examination of some sections clearly shows that NBA features are more common in O than in all other manuscripts. To check this point I examined three passages. The following are examples of variant readings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NBA</th>
<th>SBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מְהַהֲמָה מֵאֲקָדוּל מַלְיוֹלָה לְהַלְוִי</td>
<td>‘this is why two verses are written’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O V119 L F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְהַהֲמָה מֵאֲקָדוּל מַלְיוֹלָה לְהַלְוִי</td>
<td>‘this law derived from here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M95 V120 L F PE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְהַהֲמָה מֵאֲקָדוּל מַלְיוֹלָה לְהַלְוִי</td>
<td>‘these words refer to defilement’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O V119 L F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91) Rosenthal, ‘Kareitot’, p. 98, comes to the same conclusion, and proves it by three forms which were only preserved in O. On p. 250, n. 15, he adds that M95 contains the smallest number of such forms, which also corresponds with my findings at the end of this paragraph. According to Rosenthal, pp. 128–135, 247, a (literary) tradition which resembles the tradition of *Halakhot Gedolot* penetrated the tradition of O, such as different formulation of claims, additional or different components of the talmudic discussions, etc. This shows that O may have been influenced by the tradition from which *Halakhot Gedolot* stems. It should be considered whether this contributed to the frequency of these forms in O. I have nothing clear to say on this point.

92) (1) 4b; (2) 5b–6a (from אֲפָרָם בַּדַּר תְּשׁוֹבָה מְכַהוֹ הַדַּר); there are many NBA forms in this passage; (3) 21a. The special nature of O is mostly felt in the third segment, where nine NBA forms appear, eight of them not found in the other manuscripts, which use SBA forms instead: e.g. מְכַהוֹ הַדַּר but no other thing’ (M95 V119 V120 L F PE).

Only once in this segment does the NBA form appear in all manuscripts: ‘we study in such a manner’ (O M95 V119 V120 L F PE).

93) Only the participle is counted, not the noun.
The following table represents only cases of difference between manuscripts in the sample passages (cases where all the manuscripts agree are not counted in this table, whether the form is NBA or SBA). The result is a clear ranking of the manuscripts with regard to their use of NBA forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pct. NBA forms</th>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>NBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the differences among the manuscripts with regard to the totals is that only readings that are relevant for our discussion are counted, not readings that differ in the phrasing of the sentence.
It is thus obvious that there are various degrees of use of NBA forms and that O exhibits a particular tendency to use them.

1.4.3. The difference in the distribution of NBA forms

Even when NBA forms are used, there is a significant difference in the frequency of the various forms: some are dominant while others are rare. There is no obvious linguistic explanation for these differences. For example, whereas the endings יד, יב, יכ, יג - appear always with a final n in O, the forms יד, יב, יכ, יג - are infrequent, even though both groups represent the same phonetic phenomenon—retention of the final n.

It seems to me that the clue is the general distribution of the terms (in either the SBA or NBA form) in the BT: the more common a term, the less often it appears in its NBA form. To demonstrate this, I compared the rate of the NBA form in O with the frequency of the term in the BT. To gauge the latter, I used the numbers of occurrences (SBA+NBA) in all six tractates surveyed (Table 2). The result is very clear.\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Occurrences in BT sample</th>
<th>Pct. use in Karesot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ר&quot;פ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ר&quot;פ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הואדרין</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ&quot;ד</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה&quot;ב</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה&quot;ב</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ&quot;ד</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) The numbers are not absolutely accurate, since several items were checked only until f. 20 (see above, n. 88). The items that are relevant to this table are: יד, יב. A full investigation
All the forms that are used in O to the exclusion of the SBA form are relatively infrequent in the BT (2–163 in the sample). On the other hand, all the forms that have a rate under 50% are frequent (165–674 occurrences in the sample). It is thus clear that the NBA form is used less for common BT idioms.

This result proves that the linguistic situation represented by O is specific to the text of the BT and cannot reflect a natural, spoken language, since in a spoken language it is hard to see why the distribution in the BT should affect the choice of form.

1.5. The background and use of NBA

The facts adduced in the previous paragraph allow us to discuss some fundamental issues regarding NBA.

1.5.1. NBA and other types of ‘Standard Literary Babylonian Aramaic’

In comparison with SBA, all the unique features of NBA are archaic. Many of them are also found in other types of Babylonian Jewish Aramaic: the language of Targum Onqelos, the language of the incantation bowls, and geonic Aramaic. At present, though, it is impossible to conclude that all of these types derive from a single ‘Standard Literary Babylonian Aramaic’. First, NBA has to be fully described before a conclusion can be reached. Second, the description based on O makes it obvious that NBA, despite many

would increase the numbers and strengthen our conclusion; as for כָּרְתָּא, the number is so small that a full investigation cannot change the results.

96 To this we may add the cases of וַיִּירָאָה וַיֵּרָא, in which the SBA forms are used in O only in expressions which are common in the BT.
97 As well as Targum Jonathan on the Prophets. I will not go here into the much-discussed matter of the place and date of origin of these Targumim, as the findings presented here do not contribute to this problem.
99 See Hannu Juusola, *Linguistic Peculiarities in the Aramaic Magic Bowl Texts* (Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society, 1999), pp. 246, 248, 250. The description given here is based only on *Tractate Karetot*. Previous descriptions are partial or problematic, as is shown by the many corrections offered here.
affinities with these types, is not identical with them. Actually, all these types of Aramaic differ from one other.

1.5.2. The origin of this language

The basic question regarding NBA is: do the unique features of this language derive from a different dialect of a spoken Aramaic or do they come directly from archaic sources? The first hypothesis posits that two versions of Babylonian Aramaic were spoken during the amoraic period. One is reflected in SBA; the other, which preserved archaic forms, was used in the composition or editing of the 'special' tractates. However, the considerations adduced above (1.4.1) lead to the conclusion that this language has no background in a spoken language. Rather, it was created as a purely literary language, with archaic features borrowed from classical sources in order to give it a classical flavour. This means that only SBA reflects the spoken Aramaic of the Babylonian Jews. This spoken language was used for the BT because the BT was created orally. Various types of literary Aramaic were created, in addition to SBA, by borrowing archaic elements from older sources. This is true for the incantation bowls as well as for the geonic books and responsa, which were written rather than oral. One of these literary types is used extensively in the 'special' tractates. Some of its features penetrated the 'regular' tractates, too, to a limited extent, presumably during their transmission in the geonic period.

---

100 For example, in Targum Onqelos the prefix of third masculine imperfect is yod, while here it is n or l (2.3.1.2); the usual infinitive of the pa'el and afl'el conjugations are qattala and aqtala, while here the SBA forms are used, e.g. רイメージ זאיר (3b), רイメージ זאיר (21b). The same is true for the incantation bowls: the forms עשת (vs. ב)2; the third person pronominal suffix for plural nouns פ (vs. פ, as in singular nouns); the particle פ (vs. פ); and the 3rd masculine imperfect with yod: all these are typical of the incantation bowls but do not appear in O.

101 See Juusola, *Bowl Texts*, pp. 20, 248. This is why I use a specific term for this language, 'NBA', without deciding about the exact relationship among these dialects.

102 This is the view expressed by Harviainen, 'Diglossia', pp. 111–113, according to which this dialect is the rural language, while SBA is the urban one.

103 This is the view of Müller-Kessler and Kwasman, 'Bowl', p. 191, regarding Targum Onqelos and the incantation bowls; Juusola, *Bowl Texts*, pp. 248, 250, regarding NBA and geonic language, and p. 252, regarding the incantation bowls; and Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', pp. 13–15, regarding the geonic language.
1.5.3. The use of SBA alongside NBA forms

Another fundamental question is how this hybrid, in which NBA and SBA forms are used side by side, was created. Two conjectures suggest themselves. Perhaps the original text contained only NBA forms, which were replaced by SBA forms during the transmission process; it is only our text which is mixed and corrupted, whereas the original text was uniform and pure.\(^{104}\) Alternatively, a mixed language was used from the very beginning and the linguistic situation in our text is not far from the original.

At first glance, it seems that our findings support the first suggestion: the many variant readings between manuscripts in this respect (1.4.2) are best explained by the assumption that the original text contained only NBA forms, which were replaced by their SBA equivalents by different copyists in various degrees. If so, in every case of difference among manuscripts the NBA form is the original one, and a manuscript that contains more NBA forms is closer to the original text. Common terms tend to appear in their SBA form (1.4.3) because the copyists were more likely to introduce SBA in such familiar cases.

However, this explanation depends on one of the central issues of talmudic philology: the process that produced so many variant readings among talmudic manuscripts. The explanation offered here assumes that the variant readings were created by corruption of a single original copy. Scholars today offer another view: that many of the variant readings are the result of a certain fluidity in the phrasing of the talmudic discussions in the final stages of its oral transmission. Hence these variant readings do not stem from corruption of the ‘correct’ text, but survived the crystallization stage of the talmudic text.\(^{105}\) If we accept this view, we can also accept the second hypothesis: that a mixed language was already in use during the creation and crystallization of the original text. The numerous variant readings reflect variants in the phrasing of the BT, before

\(^{104}\) This is the view expressed by some scholars; see Rybak, 'Nedarim', pp. 124–126. Their view, though, that the entire Talmud was initially written in this kind of language cannot be accepted. According to this view, it would be impossible to explain why only tractates which were not studied during the Geonic period (the special tractates) preserved Geonic features, while the rest of the BT, which was studied in the Geonic period, did not preserve such features; See J.N. Epstein, *Introduction to Amoraitic Literature* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Magnes and Dvir, 1962), p. 56. It seems rather that the NBA features in other tractates are late penetrations.

\(^{105}\) This approach is best introduced in the works of E.S. Rosenthal; see e.g. his 'The History of the Text and Problems of Redaction in the Study of the Babylonian Talmud' (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 57 (1987–1988), pp. 1–36.
it was committed to writing, among the various transmitters, who differed in their affinity for NBA forms. Naturally, for common terms these transmitters tended to use SBA forms more extensively. And if we accept the suggestion expressed above, that the unique features of NBA are borrowed directly from archaic sources and do not reflect a spoken language, it is quite logical to encounter a mixed language in which literary and spoken features are used side by side.

2. Description of O

The first part of this article discussed the NBA features in O. Now I will describe all the other features that reflect a type of BA different from that of the printed editions. The situation in O will be compared with other manuscripts of the BT.

Although NBA forms as such will not be discussed below, it must be noted that some of these forms may also reflect NBA. Due to the limited scope of this study, however—tractate Karetot alone, with comparison to other tractates—I cannot prove that they are features of NBA. Further research, based on a comprehensive investigation of all the ‘special’ tractates, may add some of them to the list of NBA forms.

2.1. Spelling

2.1.1. ל yan כ ר י נ ‘a prohibition; not’: usually ל yan כ ר י כ, once ל yan כ ר י ל. The latter spelling is rare (I have found it only twice in other manuscripts). To the four known spellings of this word, ל yan כ ר י ל, ל yan כ ר י כ, ל yan כ ר י י, ל yan כ ר י ו, we should now add this spelling.

---

106) The unclear connection between O and the tradition of Halakhot Gedolot (see above, n. 91) seems to point to the same direction, according to which the connection with a Geonic tradition also caused the tradition of O to use these traits more extensively.

107) This is how Juusola, Bowl Texts, pp. 250–252, explains the similar mixture of forms in the bowl texts. The first possibility offered here, that the mixture is a result of the transmission process, is of course impossible in the bowl texts.

108) ‘kindling was singled out [in Scripture] in order to establish for it a prohibition’ (20b).

109) ‘is it not because we say, as it absorbs, so it exudes?’ (Ps. 74b [M95]); ‘one that is of age, who is eligible to effect a sale, was meant, but not a minor who is ineligible to effect a sale’ (Ket. 69b [V113]).

The spelling of the plural form is always without aleph.\(^{111}\) The spelling is widespread in tannaitic and BT manuscripts.\(^{112}\)

2.1.2 The name פֶּסֶת בָּדַר (a place name): in the printed editions, this name is always spelled as a single word, פסבדרבא. In manuscripts the separated spelling is widespread, preserving the original components of the word.\(^{113}\) The separated form appears once in O.\(^{114}\)

2.1.3 Denoting final vocalic a with aleph or with he: as is usual in the BT, final vocalic a is denoted by aleph. In the following categories he is used in O:

1. When the base form ends with aleph (to avoid the spelling לְ), e.g. קָרָא תָּכָנָה 'first' (21a); קָרָא 'verse' (23b). This is also the regular orthography of the printed editions. (2) Numbers always end with he.\(^{115}\) (3) In the verb, the third-person feminine singular perfect and participle usually end with aleph (43 times); e.g. קָרָא 'she came up' (28b), אָסָפָר 'it is probable' (24a); but in seven cases we find he.\(^{116}\) With regard to numbers, this can be a Hebrew influence: since some Hebrew and Aramaic numbers are identical (רבע, ארבעה, נשיאת, נשיאת, נשיאת, נשיאת), it could be that this group was first spelled as in Hebrew and the practice then spread to all numbers. Because this suggestion does not account for the feminine forms, however, we may suggest that this is a retained ancient feature: because in BA the determinate form of the noun became predominant, the ancient feminine ending almost disappeared; for

---

111 E.g. اللازمة לְלֵית הַלְּדָה 'three prohibitions' (4b).
112 E.g. נדר שלוש 'five prohibitions' t. B. Me. 10:3 MS Vienna 46 (see Saul Lieberman [ed.], The Tosefta: The Order of Nezikin [New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1988], p. 117); נדר לְלֵית אָסָפָר 'eight prohibitions' (Pers. 47a [V15]).
113 On the origin of this name see Ben-Zion Eshel, Jewish Settlements in Babylonia during Talmudic Times (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), p. 211.
114 For the writing of numbers in BA with final aleph, see Friedman, 'Early Manuscripts', p. 14.
115 Perfect: היא עשה 'it was forbidden' (25a); אמרה 'she said' (28b). Participle: היא 'it comes again' (14b), היא 'it is offered as a sacrifice' (28a); ידוע 'it is known' (23a [twice]).
example, in BA the form מָלֵלֶת 'queen' does not exist, but only מָלֵלֶת (the original spelling of the determinate). These two categories, numbers and feminine verb forms, are the only ones that retain the original feminine ending in BA, therefore they are spelled with הֶ (the original spelling of the feminine ending). ⑫

2.1.4 אֲלַא 'but': this word is always spelled defectively in O,⑬ and never אֲלַי as in "Babylonian" manuscripts.⑭ Yavin's conclusion that 'a manuscript in which this word is spelled always defectively is probably Palestinian' ⑮ has to be re-examined, because the defective spelling is widespread in ancient and reliable manuscripts of the BT.

2.1.5 אֲלַא = אֲלַי or not': two examples show the defective and connected spelling.⑯ In other instances the spelling is as usual.⑰

2.1.6 -גָּדֲלָה 'as': when the comparative preposition גָּדֲלָה is followed by a phrase that begins with dalet, BA usually employs the combined spelling גָּדֲלָה; this is also the common spelling in O: לְכָּרֵי אֲשֶּׁר 'as it is said' (4b).⑱ The spelling גָּדֲלָה occurs once: רָדַּת וְהָרַע נְבִּי מִרְדֵּי אַבֶּקֶל 'as it is said, The blood found on a loaf of bread must be scraped away and the loaf may be eaten' (22a). Although this spelling is used mainly in Yemenite manuscripts,⑲ it is also found in non-Yemenite manuscripts ⑳ and is regular in the geonic literature.⑳

⑬ Although it can be argued that in the verb, too, it is a Hebrew influence, since many Aramaic verb forms resemble their Hebrew equivalents. Bacher, 'Talmudical Fragments', p. 148, writes that [in O] "the status emphaticus is always written with י instead of א and offers two examples, הָלְא and גָּדֲלָה. Both cases are not in status emphaticus: גָּדֲלָה is in status absolutes (as always for numbers), and the be of יאָשְׁנָה is a pronominal suffix (see below, 2.2.1.1). The status emphaticus is always written in O with aleph, as is usual in the BT.

⑭ E.g. גָּדֲלָה 'however, as for the sages, what is their reason' (4b).


⑯ Yavin, 'The spelling of אֲלַא', p. 258.

⑰ See Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', p. 23; M. Schlesinger, Satzlehre der Aramäischen Sprache des Babylonischen Talmuds (Leipzig: Asia Major, 1928), pp. 246–247, does not mention this spelling. Rybak, 'Nedarim', p. 100, included the separated spelling among the features of NBA. According to the data presented here, though, it should be removed from
2.2. Phonology

2.2.1. Weakening of guttural

2.2.1.1. Dropping of aleph

2.2.1.1.1 In אֵל verbs in the itpe’il conjugation, the aleph always drops out:

The fact that in O the aleph is always dropped casts doubt on the reliability of the Yemenite oral tradition in this respect.130

2.2.1.1.2. -a’a-a shift: this shift is common in BA.131 O, however, sometimes preserves the original form in three words that usually show this shift: (1) קראתא איהו 'verse' is usually written קראתא קראתא קראתא (34 times), but the original form appears twice. In the printed editions, the form קראתא קראתא, for some reason, appears only in the phrase קראותא רמא (46 times);134 but even this also appears as קרא קרא קרא. Except for this phrase, in the printed editions we find only קראתא קרא קרא קראתא 'first'. קָשִׁול appears only in the phrase קָשִׁול כָּפָא 'the first tanna'. The original

this list. The separated spelling is common in manuscripts, while the connected spelling is common in the printed editions. Rybak himself offered examples for the separated spelling only from manuscripts (n. 113), and only the phrase כָּפָא אַל אַל פָּרָה from the printed editions (n. 112). This phrase has nothing to do with the phrase discussed here, since the dalalet does not follow כָּפָא and cannot be attached to it. כָּפָא אַל פָּרָה is very widespread in the printed editions everywhere in the BT, e.g. כָּפָא אַל פָּרָה (Ber. 25a et passim), so it certainly cannot be an NBA feature.

127 So also: מִיתָבְרֵי (15b); מִיתָבְרֵי: 'it was said' (25a); מִיתָבְרֵי: 'it is forbidden' (25a).

128 Morag, Babylonian Aramaic, p. 169.


133 E.g. מַחֲרֶה וּמַחֲרֶה מַחֲרֶה 'it is written in the verse [lit. the verse wrote]' (27b).

134 E.g. מַחֲרֶה וּמַחֲרֶה מַחֲרֶה 'what is the verse, They shall fear You while the sun endures' (Ber. 9b).

135 In manuscripts, too, except for the phrase מַחֲרֶה וּמַחֲרֶה, the full form occurs very rarely. I have found only the following cases: מַחֲרֶה וּמַחֲרֶה 'this verse' (Ber. 50a [F]; Nid. 16b; V111); also Zeb. 2b [Co]; Tem. 5b [F].
form כַּלִּלָּה דִּרְעָא – הָאָמְרוּ הָאָמְרוּ – הָאָמְרוּ 'last': only the original form כַּלִּלָּה דִּרְעָא 'the last generalization' (21a) (three times).

2.2.1.3 The verb וְאָבִיטָא רָאָא appears 12 times in the expression וְאָבִיטָא רָאָא 'on our original assumption' and the like (e.g., Shab 97b), and twice in the phrase וְאָבִיטָא רָאָא 'an accident which may be foreseen ... an unforeseeable accident' (BM 94b). These phrases, where the verb וְאָבִיטָא רָאָא ends with a consonant, prove that the original form has a prefixed aleph: רָאָא. When the first component is כַּלִּלָּה דִּרְעָא, with a final vowel, the printed editions have only כַּלִּלָּה דִּרְעָא, with elision of the -א between two a vowels (similar to the above-mentioned shift כַּלִּלָּה דִּרְעָא כַּלִּלָּה דִּרְעָא). In O, too, the original aleph has usually vanished (8 times), but it is preserved once.

2.2.1.2 Final he in the third-person feminine singular pronominal suffix

2.2.1.2.1 In the printed editions the spellings תְּפֵא תְּפֵא and תְּפֵא תְּפֵא interchange with the same function and the final aleph appears even when the third-person feminine pronominal suffix is expected; e.g., בַּא תְּפֵא דָּרַר 'this itself is a prohibition' (Er 99a). This seems to be a result of the muting of the (originally consonantal) final he. O displays final he whenever the pronominal suffix is expected: בַּא תְּפֵא תְּפֵא 'this itself is a defilement' (21a); בַּא תְּפֵא מְשַׁמְשָׁמָה 'from the field itself' (24b), as well as in reference to a previous discussion, e.g. תְּפֵא אָמְרֵי רַיְיָת [the] above [text stated]: R. Yoḥanan said (27a). Where the pronominal suffix is not required, the word is spelled with final aleph: תְּפֵא תְּפֵא. Whereas these forms only occur with תְּפֵא תְּפֵא 'there [it is] money, but here, since it is the body [which is involved],

---

136 See N. Berggren, ‘Philological Studies’ (Hebrew), Litz 40 (1976), pp. 163–166 (166). Sokoloff, Dictionary, p. 346, also states that the full form is the original one.

137 E.g. סְפִּי דָּמְא אֲבֶפֶת הָלָלִות מְלֶאכָה I might have thought the law referred to defilement (4b).

138 So also: שְׁפִּי דָּמְא אֲבֶפֶת מְלֶאכָה אֲבֶפֶת מְלֶאכָה, and not שְׁפִּי דָּמְא אֲבֶפֶת מְלֶאכָה 'for I might otherwise have thought, since blood is excluded from the law of sacrifice, it is also excluded from the law concerning the [eating of holy things by a] non-priest' (4b). I have found in manuscripts only two more instances (both in Yemenite manuscripts): סְפִּי דָּמְא אֲבֶפֶת מְלֶאכָה (Pes. 2a [J162]; Suk. 352 [J218]).

139 So also: אֶשְׁפִּי דָּמְא אֲבֶפֶת מְלֶאכָה 'this in itself is a contradiction' (Ber. 8b), as against אֶשְׁפִּי דָּמְא אֲבֶפֶת מְלֶאכָה (Shab. 34b). According to Waisberg, ‘Hatze at ha-Exponot’, p. 341, since the forms מְלֶאכָה and מְלֶאכָה in manuscripts, it is impossible to decide which is correct. However, it is possible to decide which is the original.
I might say [it is] not [so] (26a), where the form כמות נאם itself parallels the form כמות נאם (ground form: qray) which appears three times in O. The form כמות appears twice. On the other hand, the plural of נאם (ground form: tanay) is always נאם. It seems that the original yod is preserved in the form כמות, without the typical eastern shift -א to -א, which is reflected in the forms כמות and נאם. The forms מsandbox נאם, נאם, כמות, כמות, נאם, כמות, נאם, כמות, נאם, כמות and the like appear mainly in Yemenite manuscripts and in Geonic literature, and only rarely in other sources.147

2.2.2.1 Plural ending of words ending in -ay: in the printed editions the plural form of דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה /דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה (ground form: qray) is always דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה, which appears three times in O. The form דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה appears twice. On the other hand, the plural of דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה (ground form: tanay) is always דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה. It seems that the original yod is preserved in the form דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה, without the typical eastern shift -א to -א, which is reflected in the forms דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה and נאם. The forms מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה, דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה, דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה, דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה and the like appear mainly in Yemenite manuscripts and in Geonic literature, and only rarely in other sources.147

141 E.g. מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה (Ber. 38a).
143 מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה (4b); מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה ‘two verses’ (4b); מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה ‘from verses he cannot learn it’ (19a).
144 מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה (4b); מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה (4b).
145 מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה ‘it is [a difference between] tanaim’ (22a, 25a); מsandbox דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה ‘two tanaim’ (23b).
146 According to Morgenstern, ‘Babylonian Aramaic’, p. 73, the spellings ר ר and ר ר reflect the same pronunciation. However, since in O we do not find spellings like ר ר, ר ר and the like, and the spelling ר ר occurs only when the pronunciation -ay- is possible, it seems that the spelling ר ר reflects the latter pronunciation.
147 For the Yemenite manuscripts and Geonic literature see Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, pp. 130–131. He does not bring דַּקָּרָא רַאְמָה itself, but it is very widespread in Yemenite manuscripts,
2.2.2.2. Once ḫw has instead of ה, found in all the other manuscripts. The waw seems to represent ה, which in turn represents ה, thus making the shift ḫw-ו. Both phenomena are known: ו for ה is widespread, and ו for ה is typical of Geonic literature, e.g. קְרָא יָדְרָק. In Yemenite manuscripts we also find יוד or וו for ה, i.e. יוד = הוּדֶר, יָדֶר.\(^{151}\)

2.3. Morphology

2.3.1. The verb

2.3.1.1. Third-person feminine singular perfect

This form shows a clear distinction between strong and ליל verbs. In strong verbs, the third-person feminine singular perfect ends with a vowel, as in סְלֵלָה קְרָא יָדְרָק ‘it ascended’ (28b),\(^ {152}\) and only once with a zero ending: הַלְּא אֲתָנְבֵּדֶה מִתְסַבְּבֶּה ‘his plan was not performed’ (20a).\(^ {153}\) The vowel ending is also typical of Geonic literature. On the other hand, for ליל verbs the usual ending is -t,

\(^{151}\) See Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 45.

\(^{152}\) To the verse ‘can living animals be rejected or not?’ (27a),\(^ {49}\) Yeb. 49a (Mishnah Berakhot, 5b): ‘can a man obtain atonement with the increase of consecrated property or not?’ (27a);\(^ {150}\) see B. Lewin (ed.), Orzeh ha-Gaonim (Haifa: n.p., 1928), I, p. 24. It seems that the original form is ה; see Morgenstern, ‘Babylonian Aramaic’, p. 71. I did not find in O ו for ה. On the other hand, there are some cases of ה for ו (only in Hebrew): לְמַעַרְכָּה בִּנְאָה וְאֶל נֶפֶל הַכְּלָל אֶל וַחֲמוֹר הַלְּאִמְרָה הַרִאשׁון (5a); לְמַעַרְכָּה בִּנְאָה וְאֶל נֶפֶל הַכְּלָל אֶל וַחֲמוֹר הַלְּאִמְרָה (5a). For experimenting or with the intention to hand it over to the community’ can living animals be rejected or not?’ (27a);\(^ {153}\) see J.N. Epstein, Mavo le-Nusah ha-Mishna (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Magnes and Divri, 2nd edn, 1964), II, pp. 1062–1064. Although he adduces many cases, not all of them stem from the same reason: some result from a phonetic change, and others from a syntactic one, because waw can also connect alternative cases. Here the process is phonetic.

\(^{153}\) See also: ‘she said’ (28b); ‘it was forbidden’ (25a).

\(^{150}\) See Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 121.

\(^{150}\) On the dropping of the final vowel and the consequent merging of the masculine and the feminine forms, see Kutscher, ‘Review’, pp. 168–169; Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 121.
the classic form, as in יָּכְּרָה ‘she came’ (4b); only once do we encounter a final vowel: אַּכְּרָה (9a). The ending -ay, typical of BA, is not used. The ending -t, normal in O, is rare in both the Yemenite manuscripts and Geonic literature; thus its prevalence here seems to be an early feature, not part of NBA or the Geonic language.

The appearance of -t only in יָּכְּרָה verbs is unique: in other Aramaic dialects this ending is preserved in both strong verbs and יָּכְּרָה verbs. In BA, on the other hand, it usually drops from both strong verbs (the regular ending being -a) and from יָּכְּרָה verbs (the ending being -ay). Only in O is there a distinction between the two categories, with the -t retained only in יָּכְּרָה verbs. This can be explained in two ways. The survival of the -t may be due to the preceding long vowel, found only in יָּכְּרָה verbs. There could also be a morphological motivation: dropping the final t would have produced forms like בֹּטָא, identical to the masculine. To preserve the gender distinction, then, the -t was preserved specifically in יָּכְּרָה verbs.

2.3.1.2. Prefix of the third-person masculine imperfect

The prefix of the third-person masculine imperfect is usually n-, e.g. נִתְנָה ‘let him bring’ (5a) and always in the plural forms. Initial l- occurs in

---

154 So also: יָּכְרָה ‘she was’ (6a [twice]); וַיָּכְרָה (18b).
156 Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 161.
158 According to Rybak, ‘Nedarim’, p. 91, in Tractate Nedarim the -t ending is also found in the strong verbs. Since, however, he does not supply any numbers, it is difficult to know whether this is the typical ending or occurs rarely, as in SBA. He also claims that this is typical of the Geonic language, but this does not seem to be true (according to Morgenstern; see above, n. 157).
159 The ending -at does exist in יָּכְּרָה verbs, but it is rare as in strong verbs; see e.g. Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 161.
160 This explanation has been offered by Zeev Ben-Ḥayyim for Hebrew, in which the t is also preserved only in יָּכְּרָה verbs; see Moshe Bar-Asher, ‘The Historical Unity of Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew Research’ (Hebrew), Language Studies 1 (1985), pp. 75–99 (90 and n. 65). The long vowel itself, which appears only in יָּכְּרָה verbs, according to Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen (Halle: Niemeyer, 1927), p. 154, is influenced by the masculine form. However, it can also be a result of the process -ayt->aat; see, e.g., Bar-Asher, ‘Unity’, p. 90.
161 In the regular form, which ends with -ay, this problem is avoided by the y, which appears only in the feminine form; i.e. masculine יָּכְּרָה, feminine יָּכְּרָה.
162 So also: מִנָּה ‘let him say’ (5a); מֵתָה ‘let him write’ (26a).
163 E.g. יָּכְּרָה ‘let them be learnt’ (5a).
a minority of instances. 164 The actual count is \( n \sim 72 \) times and \( l \sim 10 \) times (88\% \( n \)-). In BA \( l \)- seems to predominate.165 In the Yemenite manuscripts, though, \( n \)- is regular; in some of them the ratio is similar to that in O.166 In Geonic literature there is no tendency in either direction and no distinction can be discerned between these two prefixes.167 Therefore the extensive use of \( n \)- in certain manuscripts does not connect them with the Geonic language. Apparently the original prefix in BA is \( l \)-, and the \( n \) results from the \( l \sim n \) shift.168

The classic prefix \( y \)- appears in two cases. BA employs this prefix when there is an intentional reference to classical or western Aramaic.169 This may account for the following occurrence in O, which relates to the High Priest in the Temple Period: אַחַת מַעֲשֵׂי נְחַבְּרָה אֶל נָא יָאִי טֶפֶן לָא שָׁמַיִם 'he came and waved his hand, if goat’s flesh were best let it be offered for the daily sacrifice’ (28b). The other occurrence deals with an incantation. Still, the general formulation is typical of BA, including forms with prefix \( n \)-, so the \( y \)- is strange: אַחַת מַעֲשֵׂי נְחַבְּרָה אֶל נָא יָאִי טֶפֶן לָא שָׁמַיִם [ ... ] וּפֵרַדְרֵדְוֵי אִבְּבֵּי עָשֶׂר אֵל שָׁמַיִם אָ גַר אָ לָא נָרְבָּא הָרִ辏ֵי 'when one wishes to know whether he will survive the coming year …, and if one is about to engage in business and wishes to know whether he will succeed or not, let him get a cock and feed it’ (3b).

2.3.1.3. Assimilation of \( t \) in the itpe’il and itpa’al

In the itpe’il and itpa’al conjugations, assimilation of the \( t \) is very common in BA. In O the \( t \) is frequently preserved. In the following cases it is always preserved: (1) יָאִי טֶפֶן as a result of the elision of the aleph, e.g. יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it was said’ (22a).170 (2) יָאִי טֶפֶן as a result of the elision of the aleph, e.g. יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it is broken’ (6a); (3) when the first radical is a sibilant (and there is metathesis with the \( l \)), e.g. יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘to be allowed’ (26a).171

---

164 E.g. יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘let him bring’ (28b); יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘let him interpret’ (19a); יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘let him say’ (3a).
165 Epstein, Grammar, p. 31.
166 Kara, Yemenite Manuscripts, p. 149.
170 So also; עָשָׂר יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it was forbidden’ (25a); עָשָׂר יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it is forbidden’ (25a).
171 So also; עָשָׂר יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it was needed’ (27b); עָשָׂר יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it is reasonable’ (24a); עָשָׂר יָאִי טֶפֶן ‘it is kept’ (26b). For these three categories see I. Rosenberg, Das Aramäische Verbum im babylonischen Talmud (Marburg: Oscar Ehrhardt, 1888), p. 6.
When the first radical is a guttural (including ר), the t is preserved in ten out of twenty cases (50%); e.g. 'it is seen' (24b).172 When the first radical is not a guttural, the t is preserved in seven out of 21 cases (33%); e.g. 'it is needed' (4b) (twice).173 There thus seems to be a slightly greater tendency to preserve the t before gutturals.174

The overall rate of preservation is 41%, which seems to be higher than usual in the BT. The following may illustrate the difference: in the verb אנסין/אנסין 'they resemble' (19b), O preserves the t in three of its five occurrences, while in the printed editions of the BT it is preserved in only five out of more than 1,000 occurrences.175 This trait, of course, shows a tendency for archaism.

2.3.1.4. Plural participle of Hebrew verbs
In the plural participle of Hebrew verbs, O displays four different endings: (i) ֤: יָפִיעֵי 'they come' (24a);176 (ii) יָפִיע 'they come' (23b);177 (iii) יָפִיע 'they are' (5a, 4b); (iv) יָפִיע 'they defile' (21b). The most common of these is י (4 out of 10), which is typical of Targumic Aramaic. Scholars believe that this ending

---

172 So also: מַעֲשֵׂה 'he benefited' (26b); מַעֲשֵׂה 'it is done' (24b); מַעֲשֵׂה 'he is liable' (22a, 26a); מַעֲשֵׂה 'let him be liable' (18b); מַעֲשֵׂה 'he is lost' (24a).
173 So also: יָפִיע 'he was obliged' (24a); יָפִיע 'it is explained' (4b); יָפִיע 'it is atoned' (23b); יָפִיע 'it was included' (4b) (note that in five out of the seven cases, the middle radical is a guttural); as against: יָפִיע 'he is liable' (22a, 26a); יָפִיע 'let him be liable' (18b); יָפִיע 'it was asked' (27a); יָפִיע 'they are divided' (21b); יָפִיע 'it was established' (18a) (twice); יָפִיע 'let it be established' (18a); יָפִיע 'he intended' (20a); יָפִיע 'he intended' (19b); יָפִיע 'he is atoned' (24a); יָפִיע 'it is explained' (26b).
175 The Geonic literature, too, in most cases the t is assimilated but tends to survive when the first radical is a guttural; see Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', pp. 134–135.
176 Even in these cases, four are in proverbs, where a classic style is to be expected: רְפֵאָה 'the people of the house of Rab Hisda—bread of the finest grade flour to dogs, and it is not needed' (M. Qaf. 28a).
177 So also: מָאָס (26a) (twice); מָאָס 'they resemble' (4b).
178 So also: מָאָס (26a) (twice); מָאָס 'they resemble' (4b).
is foreign to BA. Based on O, however, we must conclude that it was used in a certain type of BA, one similar neither to the known type of BA nor to the Geonic type. On the other hand, the typical ending in BA, which is the most common in Yemenite manuscripts and in Geonic literature, is ‘-’, which is only the second most-common in O.

2.3.1.5. Other forms

2.3.1.5.1. We are dealing: only this form appears. This form is common in manuscripts, whereas the printed editions have only .

2.3.1.5.2. The prefix - is typical of BA, but the loss of the medial w is unique. In the printed editions, - is used only as a concessionary form, e.g. ‘granted that Ezra ordained immersion, did he ordain throwing?’ (Ber 22b), never in the indicative mood. With regard to the root hwy, loss of the medial w in the imperfect forms is common in Galilean Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew, but also

---


179) Because of the dissimilarity with the Geonic language, it is not like that this is a feature of NBA.

180) The numbers of occurrences are small, so the findings here may be insignificant.

181) E.g. ‘what are we dealing with in this case’ (4b).

182) According to Kutscher, ‘Review’, p. 175, is common in MS Ha165 and in Halakhot Pesuqot. Actually, it is very common in all BT manuscripts. See also Morag, ‘Notes’, p. 67.

183) ‘he should make it a habit to see on New Year gourd and rubya’ (6a).

184) According to the other manuscripts, the form is . It seems that since this form is not known in BA, it was replaced by the Hebrew counterpart, by changing the prefix into yod. The fact that the context leads one to expect an Aramaic form here is further evidence of the superiority of O.

185) Scholars have also noted only this use; see Levias, Grammar, p. 197; Sokoloff, Dictionary, p. 371. The form מין, brought by Levias, Grammar, p. 198 (from Mak. 4b [should be 4a]), according to the context, is a Hebrew word. On other forms, which belong to a special kind of Aramaic, see Morag, Babylonian Aramaic, p. 235. However, the forms adduced by him are real western forms, since they also contain the prefix y for the 3rd masculine imperfect, while the prefix here is eastern.

186) Dalman, Grammatik, p. 352.

happens in incantation texts from Babylon\(^{188}\) and in Syriac,\(^{189}\) which shows that it is not strange for Eastern Aramaic.

2.3.2. Nouns

2.3.2.1 ha\(^{ah}\) economical ‘other’: the form ha\(^{ah}\) aerial, typical of BA, appears once.\(^{190}\) The feminine form ha\(^{ah}\) aerial, which is derived from this ground form, also appears.\(^{191}\) The form ha\(^{ah}\) aerial also appears three times, however.\(^{192}\) This form also seems to be behind the defective spelling ha\(^{ah}\) aerial\(^{193}\) (to be read ol\(^{ah}\) aerial): because it is hard to assume a defective spelling for a hiriq\(^{194}\) (hiriq\(^{195}\)), a reading with qames\(^{196}\) (qames\(^{197}\)) is preferable. The form ha\(^{ah}\) aerial does not appear in the printed editions and is also very rare in manuscripts.\(^{198}\) It is, however, the normal

---

\(^{188}\) E.g. 2.={['p,][p,][p,][p,][p,][p,] }}^{244}\) see Juusola, Bowl Texts, pp. 189–190. His reference to BA has to be corrected, because he relies on Epstein, who did not mention the unique usage in BA. Juusola ascribes this form to the ancient jussive, but this cannot be the case, since the jussive form is not used in Late Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew. It seems that a phonetic shift was at work here; see Z. Ben-Hayyim, The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1977), V, p. 121 n. 8.\(^{189}\)

\(^{190}\) Nöldeke, Grammar, p. 134.

\(^{191}\) ‘even though I did not sin others might have sinned’ (244).

\(^{192}\) ‘another thing’ (21a).

\(^{193}\) ‘perhaps others might come’ (244);

\(^{194}\) ‘other coins’ (28a).

\(^{195}\) ‘other foodstuffs’ (21b);

\(^{196}\) ‘in other foodstuffs’ (21b);

\(^{197}\) ‘in other coins’ (28a).

\(^{198}\) Except for the cases cited here, I found only three cases in the Yemenite MS Co: ‘alternative reading’ (Pes. 69b); ‘the other is’ (Pes. 70b); ‘and in another ba\(^{ah}\) aerial, it is said’ (Zeb. 42b). Three times a defective spelling of the first syllable occurs: ‘to appoint another’ (Meg. 6b [Co]); ‘and on other days’ (M. Qa. 10b [Vo68]); ‘in this other’ (Ned. 22a [MG]; and similarly M95). A defective spelling is widespread only in the feminine plural, in manuscripts as well as in the printed editions, e.g. ‘other things’ (Ber. 14b [F]); ‘other things’ (Erub. 54b [O35]); ‘additional hundred [fats]’ (B. Meg. 83a [Ha165]); ‘to have sexual desire for others’ (Sanh. 45a [He]). It seems to me that this spelling, although defective, reflects the regular form, denoting the reading ol\(^{ah}\) aerial. The reason for a defective spelling specifically in this form is that this is the only form in which the i vowel is in a syllable closed by a shwa quiescent (originally open, but closed by the silencing of the shwa mobile; compare Morag, Babylonian Aramaic, pp. 93–95). For the tendency to defective spelling of such a syllable in the BT see Yochanan Breuer, The
form in other dialects, such as biblical Aramaic, *Onqelos*, Western Aramaic, and the Geonic language.\textsuperscript{195}

2.3.2.2 *ספננה* ‘learning, legal tradition’: The common form in Aramaic appears here together with *ספננה* The latter form, which occurs only once in the printed editions\textsuperscript{197} and rarely in manuscripts,\textsuperscript{198} is the regular form in Western Aramaic and Syriac and also appears in Geonic Aramaic.\textsuperscript{199}

2.3.3. Prepositions

2.3.3.1 *ככ* ‘when’: according to Rybak, the temporal preposition *ככ* (separated) is used in NBA, as opposed to SBA *ככ* (connected).\textsuperscript{200} As such, it is merely a difference in spelling. I disagree, because in BA the temporal preposition is not *ככ* but *ככ*.\textsuperscript{201} Furthermore, the connected preposition *ככ* indicates not time but comparison—as in BA the temporal preposition is not *ככ* but *ככ*.\textsuperscript{201} It seems strange. It is true that in *Halakhot Pesuqot* the reh is vocalized with *patah*, as he adds there. But it seems that in the Geonic language the form is indeed different, as here.

*Hebrew in the Babylonian Talmud according to the Manuscripts of Tractate Pesahim* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2002), p. 39. Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 106, vocalizes the plural feminine form with a *qametz* in the reh, apparently because of the defective spelling. According to this, the feminine plural is derived from *ספננה*, while all the other forms are derived from *ספננה*, which seems strange. It is true that in *Halakhot Pesuqot* the reh is vocalized with *patah*, as he adds there. But it seems that in the Geonic language the form is indeed different, as here.

\textsuperscript{195} E.g. *ספננה* ‘another witness’ (Robert Brody [ed.], *Teshuva Rav Natronai Bar Hila Gaon* [Jerusalem and Cleveland: Ofq Institute, 1994], p. 494).

\textsuperscript{199} E.g. *דיבר* רבי ראביה ממרח על חוררה רמא, יד יוחנן מרוכך מיא המשך מיא המשך משותפין *וכך* and when you study any teaching, do so by the side of water, for as the water is drawn out, so your learning may be prolonged’ (6a).

\textsuperscript{197} As a plural form: *ספננה* ‘the legal traditions were stated upon each other’ (Men. 43a [twice]).

\textsuperscript{198} E.g. *דיבר* רבי ראביה ממרח עלי השפיות מוסיפה ‘so that you should not say the legal tradition according to him’ (*Pes. 10a* [*J633*]); *ספננה* ‘the legal tradition will be clarified’ (*Pes. 88a* [*Co*]); *ספננה* ‘to start in [stating] a legal tradition’ (*Pes. 117a* [*Co*]), and several other cases.


\textsuperscript{201} Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, p. 1156, introduces the entity *ספננה* and suggests that since this form is rare, as compared with the common *ספננה*, it may have been borrowed from other Jewish Aramaic dialects.

\textsuperscript{200} Rybak, ‘*Nedarim*’, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{201} Compare e.g. (according to the printed editions) ‘when Rabbi saw him’ (*Ned. 41a*; cited by Rybak, ‘*Nedarim*’, p. 99 n. 108) with *ככ* רבי ראביה ‘when he saw a good dream’ (*Ber. 55b*).
here too it refers to a sloping wall’ (Shab. 5a)—and has no relation with the separated רכ. According to this analysis, we have on the one hand רכ (rare) and רכ (common) as temporal prepositions, and on the other hand -רכ as a comparison preposition. The temporal רכ seems to have been created by the addition of ר after רכ. In O the common רכ is used, but once we have -רכ evidence of this origin of the temporal רכ. 

...the scholars have come on account of rain’ (Ta'an. 23b[ LH]);... 

202 On this comparison preposition see above, 2.1.6. 
203 Compare also Dalman, Grammatik, p. 234 n. 4. 
204 E.g. 'when one compounds half the prescribed quantity he is exempted’ (5a). 
205 E.g. 'when he becomes aware of his sin, after he had offered the suspensive guilt-offering, he need not bring a sin-offering’ (26b; printed editions). A similar expression appears three times, and only is used: 'when one becomes aware [of the sin] after the Day of Atonement he should not need to bring a sin-offering' (16a, 26b [twice]). 
206 On some other instances see Schlesinger, Satzlehre, p. 245. The spelling רכ is common when quoting Palestinian sages, or in stories of Palestinian origin, e.g. ‘R. Yofanan said, I remember when four seahs (of grain) cost a selah’ (Ta'an. 19b); מ. רכ תחת רכ מ. רכ TRE. In manuscripts, both spellings are widespread. The difference between them is purely one of spelling. However, in O we have without ל (only once): 'it was thus essential that the Divine Law should write, You may not [eat], in order to make it the subject of a negative command’ (4b–5a). This form appears in other manuscripts as well. A determination of the original spelling seems to

207 See also Schlesinger, Satzlehre, p. 245. The spelling רכ is common when quoting Palestinian sages, or in stories of Palestinian origin, e.g. ‘R. Yofanan said, I remember when four seahs (of grain) cost a selah’ (Ta'an. 19b); מ. רכ תחת רכ מ. רכ TRE. In manuscripts, both spellings are widespread. The difference between them is purely one of spelling. However, in O we have without ל (only once): 'it was thus essential that the Divine Law should write, You may not [eat], in order to make it the subject of a negative command’ (4b–5a). This form appears in other manuscripts as well. A determination of the original spelling seems to
depend on the origin of this word: according to Kutscher, it is derived from ליל 'shadow'; if so, the l is part of the root.\footnote{Kutscher, 'Review', p. 160; idem, 'The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon', in: Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (eds.), Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Scripta Hierosolymitana, 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958), pp. 1–35 (n. 30).} According to Epstein, though, it is derived from -ל口头 לא מ糧 = 'regarding the part which is deserved for'; if so, the l is an added preposition.\footnote{Epstein, Grammar, p. 138. See also Epstein, Studies, I, p. 106, where he interprets the phrase as a reflection of ממון לא מ糧. ממון, substituting for ממון שומע, as always in the printed editions: ממון שומע is part of the root. In any case, the lack of the l seems to support Epstein's view.\footnote{Of course, it can also be claimed that the l was omitted by a wrong analysis. Sokoloff, Dictionary, p. 140, who adds the l when it is missing in the quotation, seems to be of this opinion.\footnote{18b, 21a, 20a, 23b (twice).}} Accordingly, the different spellings may reflect different analyses of whether the l is part of the root. In any case, the lack of the l seems to support Epstein's view.

2.3.4. Proper nouns

2.3.4.1 ברוך, etc.: the common names ברך and ברך, as always in the printed editions, are not used in O, but only ברך and ברך. These forms are common in manuscripts.\footnote{Aaron Hyman, Toldoth Tannaim Ve'Amoraim (Hebrew) (London: Express, 1910), I, p. 89.} ברך and ברך are common in the Palestinian Talmud.\footnote{E.g. Kes. 53a (P); Pes. 34a (V109); Pes. 8b (J1623).}
2.3.4.2. Accordingly: In contrast with the common אירא, יריא, איריא is widespread in Geonic literature and Yemenite manuscripts.

Here we find only אירא, יריא. It has been suggested that אירא results from a partial assimilation of the vowel to the r. Since, however, it is derived from the adjective יריע 'little' (with omission of the guttural), the name probably depends on the form of the adjective. As Kutscher has pointed out, in various Aramaic dialects there is a shift from the original יריע to the late יריע. The proper noun would have undergone a parallel shift, from אירא to יריא. In any case, according to both explanations the אירא of the Geonic literature is late, and the form used in O, which is also standard in most manuscripts and the printed editions, is the original form.

In most cases the form is יריע: in contrast, יריא occurs only three times. The long form, which predomina
tes here, appears in the printed editions in only about 20% of the occurrences.

---

217 See Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', p. 76. Except for Yemenite manuscripts, I have found it only in two phrases in eastern manuscripts: [אסייה] לברת רבי יריע נקק 'the sages said it before R. Yirmeya and R. Zora, R. Yirmeya accepted it and R. Zora did not accept it, R. Yirmeya said to R. Zora' (Pes. 48a [M134]); מְהיָא ייָדִיק אֲדוֹן, ייָדִיק אֲדוֹן, ייָדִיק אֲדוֹן, ייָדִיק אֲדוֹן. In any case, according to both explanations, ‘our Mishna is in accord with R. Zora, who said’ (Yev. 104b [M141]).

218 E.g. רבי יריע only interpreted Rabbi’s view (18b); רבי יריעה only interpreted Rabbi’s view (22a).

219 Morgenstern, 'Babylonian Aramaic', p. 76. The difficulty in this suggestion is that such an assimilation tends to appear only in a closed syllable; see Breuer, Hebrew, p. 167.


221 E.g. הנני מנייה אֲדוֹן 'R. Zera only interpreted Rabbi’s view' (18b); הנני מנייה אֲדוֹן 'R. Yirmeya asked R. Zera' (22a).


223 E.g. הנני מנייה אֲדוֹן 'R. Zera only interpreted Rabbi’s view' (18b). In one case the forms interchange in the same passage: הנני מנייה אֲדוֹן רבי יריע נקק 'there is a contradiction between [one saying] of R. Yofanan and [another saying] of R. Yofanan, and there is a contradiction on [one saying] of R. Simeon Ben Laqish and [another saying] of R. Simeon Ben Laqish, it will be granted that there is no contradiction between [one saying] of R. Yofanan and [another saying] of R. Yofanan ... but with Resh Laqish there is a difficulty' (19a).
2.4. Words and phrases

2.4.1 רביards 'master, teacher': in BA this word refers only to God. In O there is one case where it refers to a human being: 'when you wish to come before your teacher [to learn], revise at first your Mishna and then go to your teacher; and when you are sitting before your teacher look at the mouth of your teacher' (6a). The fourfold repetition proves that it cannot be a scribal error. In all other manuscripts, the form is רב and the like, derived from the standard term רב. In Mishnaic Hebrew, too, רב usually refers to God, as in BA, and rarely to a human being. is the standard rendering of תרגüm ענגלס for the Hebrew אדוא. In this case, O displays a typical trait of תרגום ענגלס.

2.4.2 'derived [for me]'. This phrase does not exist in the printed editions, but is common in manuscripts. The reading of the printed editions is always different.

---

224 E.g. Good greetings to the good teacher from the good Lord who from His bounty dispenses good to His people' (Ta'an. 24b [O23]); He said to him, My lord, Moses, wipe them out of the world' (H.S. Horovitz ed., Siphre D'be Rab [Leipzig: Fock, 1917], p. 96). This case may have been influenced by the Aramaic Targum on the verse cited, which translates, as always, רב מז'וש. See also Eliezer Ben Yehuda, A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Hemda and Ehud Benyehuda, 1951), XIII, p. 6373.

225 Sokoloff, Dictionary, p. 1073, also cites only this case from the BT, to which he adds two more cases from geonic responsa.

226 E.g. 'My lord Moses, forbid them' (Num 11:28): He said to him, My lord, Moses, wipe them out of the world' (H.S. Horovitz ed., Siphre D'be Rab [Leipzig: Fock, 1917], p. 96). This case may have been influenced by the Aramaic Targum on the verse cited, which translates, as always, רב מז'וש. See also Eliezer Ben Yehuda, A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Hemda and Ehud Benyehuda, 1951), XIII, p. 6373.

227 E.g. 'My master, Abraham' (Gen 24:12).

228 E.g.: 'is this law derived from here, is it not rather derived from the following?' (4b); 'is not the application of קרת rather derived from the term “all blood”? (4b).

229 E.g.: 'is this law derived from here, is it not rather derived from the following?' (4b); 'is not the application of קרת rather derived from the term “all blood”? (4b).
2.4.3. ‘all [lit. the whole world]’; each of these expressions appears once in O.\(^{230}\) In the BT, כל עולם \(\text{O}^{231}\) appears almost exclusively in Yemenite manuscripts (37 times, vs. 95 times for כל עולם\(\text{O}^{231}\)).

2.5. Summary of O

The first part of this article dealt with NBA forms. The second part discussed the other features of O, which represent a type of BA different from that known from the printed editions. These features can be divided into two kinds:

1. Features that do not appear in the printed editions but are frequent in manuscripts. For these, O is a good representative of reliable manuscripts. These features include: the separated spelling ל"ה; preservation of the original he of the third-person feminine singular pronominal suffix in the forms סמך מה וה; the form יִושֶׁב, יִושֶׁב; the phrase לכל עולם dl. יִושֶׁב, יִושֶׁב; and the proper nouns אֶרֶץ, אֶרֶץ. Especially interesting are features known mainly from Yemenite manuscripts (some also from Geonic literature): the spelling of the comparison expression - יי—ך; preservation of the original yod in the plural form ירי; the shift יי—ך; the prevalence of the n prefix for third-person masculine imperfect forms, such as רה—ך; and the phrase לכל עולם dl. ירי. Since O is not Yemenite, the existence of these forms in O proves that they are not late or Yemenite innovations. It should be stressed that O cannot be classified in the same group of the Yemenite manuscripts or the Geonic literature, since many features typical of Yemenite manuscripts and Geonic literature are absent from it; e.g. אֶרֶץ. The case of אֶרֶץ is especially instructive; according to the analysis of this name, here the Geonic language displays a late feature, as do the manuscripts that follow it. This means that when a manuscript resembles the Geonic language, each feature must be considered separately in determining whether the form is early or late.

2. O includes a relatively large number of features that are rare even in manuscripts: the spelling ל"ה; preservation of the original aleph in the forms ל"ה; and in the phrase לכל עולם dl. ירי; the nominal forms בָּלָה וְאֵשֶׁת קְרַאת; and addition of ל in the temporal expression - יי—ך (the origin of ל). Four features have not been found in any other manuscripts: retention

\(^{230}\) E.g. דַּלִּיל עָלָם dl. ירי. 'all agree that it is permitted' (Psa. 27a [J1623]). Except for the Yemenite manuscripts, it appears only here and once more (TAsan. 25a [O23]) and in some Geniza fragments; see Friedman, 'Scroll Fragment', p. 24; idem, 'Early Manuscripts', p. 17; idem, 'The Manuscripts', p. 176.
of the ending -ti in the third-person feminine singular perfect of ḫal verbs, as ḫal;\textsuperscript{232} the prevalence of the ending -an in the plural participle of ḫal verbs; \textsuperscript{232} in free use; and \textsuperscript{232} to denote a human being. Almost all these features do appear in other Aramaic dialects. Their presence in O proves that they are part of a certain type of BA.

3. Conclusions

In this article, two aspects of the language of Tractate Karetot have been examined according to MS O.

Tractate Karetot is one of the tractates which show a unique kind of BA. In the first part of the article, the typical features of this Aramaic dialect were examined. The list of these features has been corrected: some forms have been added\textsuperscript{234} and others removed.\textsuperscript{234} In addition, a new approach has been proposed for working with this material. To date scholars have been content to show that such forms appear in these tractates. Such an approach is not satisfactory, since these forms appear everywhere in the BT, even in the printed editions, and more extensively in manuscripts. According to the approach proposed here, the exact rate of these forms has to be measured, in comparison with the ‘regular’ tractates. It was found that the proportion of these forms is between 25\% and 33\%, whereas in the ‘regular’ tractates it is between 0.67\% an 1.81\%.

Another conclusion is that O has a greater tendency to use these features than all other manuscripts examined. The most important finding, made possible only thanks to this approach, is that NBA features tend to appear less often in locutions that are frequent in the BT. Consequently, the current linguistic situation of the ‘special’ tractates must be unique to the BT and cannot reflect a living, spoken language. In my opinion, such an approach must be adopted in all future research on this topic. Moreover, it should be used in all domains of research into BA. As is well known, one of the problems in the study of BA is that various forms serve in the same function side by side. Exact measurement of the ratio of competing forms is the only way to define the status of every corpus and to enhance our understanding of the situation in BA.

\textsuperscript{232} The form itself, of course, is known in other traditions, too, but the fact that it is used almost exclusively is unique to O.

\textsuperscript{235} 1.2, 17–22.

\textsuperscript{234} See 2.1.6; 2.3.1.1; 2.3.1.4; 2.3.3.1.
In the second part, all the other features were described. These reveal a type of BA different from that known from the printed editions. Some of them are known from manuscripts, while others are unique to O.

When examining differences between manuscripts, one tends to wonder which is the original form and which is the corrupt form created by copyists. For example, it seems that the spelling שמש is the original, whereas מַמָּס was created by copyists who did not pronounce the final be and consequently replaced it with the normal BA mater lectionis for final vocalic a. In most cases, though, both competing forms seem to be original. This conclusion can be reached in two cases: (1) when both forms are very common in manuscripts; (2) when only one is widespread, but linguistic considerations show that the competing form, too, is original. For example, the form שמש is so widespread that it must be authentic, yet the form מַמָּס preserves the original aleph and must therefore also be authentic. Because it is implausible that copyists corrected the common שמש to the original מַמָּס, the existence of מַמָּס shows that it too survived in a certain type of BA. Differences of this sort include מַמָּס and שמש. In the cases of מַמָּס and שמש, the authenticity of the irregular forms is confirmed by other dialects.

Special attention should be paid to cases where two competing original forms appear in the BT but a certain manuscript adheres to only one of them. A good example is the use of prefix n- or l- for the third-person masculine imperfect. Most manuscripts use both, with a preference for l-. There is no reason to doubt that a similar situation existed in the spoken BA. In some manuscripts, such as O, though, n- is used almost exclusively. It is difficult to imagine that it was the copyists who decided to prefer this prefix. It seems that such sub-groups, reflected in consistent differences between manuscripts, also reflect sub-groups in the spoken language, perhaps in different places. Another example is the מַמָּס third-person feminine singular perfect אֶשָּׁה, dominant in BA, and מַמָּס, dominant in O.

Describing and explaining the inventory of differences within BA is the major challenge of the study of this dialect. Descriptions of various manuscripts and the unique nature of each will provide a clearer picture of the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud.\footnote{An attempt in this direction, though mainly based on orthographic features (which have less significance for the picture of the spoken language), has been introduced by Friedman, 'The Manuscripts'.}