of collecting *hălākōth* (“ legal decisions ”) has been ascribed. The ensuing period of the *Tannā'īm, “* teachers ” (about A.D. 10-220), is that of the growth of the Mishnah.@@1 Among the best known representatives of the schools are Rabban (a title given to Hillel’s descendants) Gamaliel, the Phil-Hellene and teacher of the apostle Paul (Acts xxii. 3) and his son Simeon (Josephus, *Life,* § 38 seq., *Wars,* iv. 3, 9), and Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, founder of the seat of learning at Jamnia (Jabneh). A little later (about 90-130 a.d.) are the famous Gamaliel II., Eliezer b. Hyrqanos (at Lydda), and Ishmael b. Elisha, the last of whom founded the school at Usha and is renowned for his development of the rules of exegesis framed by Hillel. With Rabbi Aqība (*q.v.*) and the synods of Jamnia (about 90 and 118 a.d.) a definite epoch in Judaism begins. At Jamnia, under the presidency of Gamaliel II. and Eleazar b. Azariah, a collection of traditional *halakoth* was formed in the tractate *'Eduyyōth* (larger than and not to be identified with IV., 7 above). Here, too, was discussed the canonicity of the Song of Songs and of Ecclesiastes, and it is probable that here Aqība and his colleagues fixed the official text of the canonical books. Aqîba had an important share in the early develop­ment of the Mishnah (Strack, pp. 19, 89) ; and, in the collecting of material, he was followed notably by the school of Ishmael (about 130-160 A.d.), which has left its mark upon the early halakic Midrashim (see Midrash, § 5, r-3). The more interesting names include R. Meir, a well-known haggadist, R. Simeon b. Yohai, R. Jose b. Ḥalaphta and R. Jehudah b. 'El'ai. But, as collections of decisions were made by prominent teachers from time to time, confusion was caused by their differences as regards both contents and teaching *(Sotah,* 22a; *Shabb.* 138*b*). Consequently, towards the close of the second century a thoroughly comprehensive effort was made to reduce the *halakoth* to order. Judah, grandson of Gamaliel II., known as the Prince or Patriarch (nāsī'), as *Rabbēnū* (“ our teacher ”), or simply as “ Rabbi ” *par excellence,* was the editor. He gathered together the material, using Meir’s collection as a basis, and although he did not. write the Mishnah as it now is, he brought it into essentially its present shape. His methods were not free from arbitrariness; he would attribute to “ the wise ” the opinion of a single authority which he regarded as correct; he would ignore conflicting opinions or those of scholars which they themselves had afterwards retracted, and he did not scruple to cite his own decisions.@@

The period of the *’Ămōrā’īm, “* speakers, interpreters,” (about 220-500 Λ.D.), witnessed the growth of the Gcmara, when the now “ canonical ” Mishnah formed the basis for further ampli­fication and for the collecting of old and new material which bore upon it. In Palestine learning flourished at Caesarea, Sepphoris, Tiberias and Usha; Babylonia had famous schools at Ñehardea (from the 2nd century a.d.), Sura, Pumbeditha and elsewhere.@@Of their teachers (who were called Rabbi and Rab respectively) several hundreds are known. R. Ḥiyya was redactor of the *Siphrā* on Leviticus (Midrash, § 5, 2); to him and to R. Hoshaiah the compilation of the *Tōsephtā* is also as­cribed. Abbā Arīka or Rab, the nephew of the first mentioned, founded the school of Sura (219 a.d.). Rab and Shemuel (Samuel) “ the astronomer ” (died 254 λ.d.) were pupils of “ Rabbi ” *(i.e.* Judah, above), and were famed for their know­ledge of law; so numerous were their points of difference that the Talmud will emphasize certain decisions by the statement that the two were agreed. The Gemara is much indebted to this pair and to Joḥanan b. Nappāḥā (199-279). The latter, founder of the great school of Tiberias, has indeed been

venerated, on the authority of Maimonides, as the editor of the Palestinian Talmud; but the presence of later material and of later names, *e.g.* Manī b. Jona and Jose b. Abin (Abun), refute this view. The Babylonian Rabbah b. Naḥmani (d. c. 330) had a dialectical ability which won him the title “ uprooter of moun­tains.” His controversies with R. Joseph b. Ḥiyya (known for his learning as “ Sinai ”), and those between their disciples Abayi and Rābā are responsible for many of the minute discussions in the Babylonian Gemara. Meanwhile the persecutions of Constantine and Constantius brought about the decay of the Palestinian schools, and, probably in the 5th century, their recension of the Talmud was essentially complete. In Babylonia, however, learning still flourished, and with Rab Ashi (352-427) the arranging of the present framework of the Gemara may have been taken in hand. Under Rabba Tosěpha'a (died 470) and Rabina, *i.e.* Rab Abina (died 499), heads of the academy of Sura, the Babylonian recension became practically complete.

Finally, the *Sabōrā’ē, “* explainers, opiners ” (about 500-540), made some additions of their own in the way of explanations and new decisions. They may be looked upon as the last editors of the now unwieldy thesaurus; less probable is the view, often maintained since Rashi (11th century), that it was first written down in their age.@@

4. *The Two Talmuds.—*The Palestinian recension of the Mish­nah and Gemara is called “ the Talmud of the Land of Israel,” or “ T. of the West ”; a popular but misleading name is “ the Jerusalem Talmud.” It is an extremely uneven compilation. “ What was reduced to writing does not give us a work carried out after a preconcerted plan, but rather represents a series of jottings answering to the needs of the various individual writers, and largely intended to strengthen the memory ” (Schechter). Political troubles and the unhappy condition of the Jews probably furnish the explanation; hence also the abundance of Palestinian haggadic literature in the Midrashim, whose “ words of blessing and consolation ” appealed more to their feelings than did the legal writings. The Pal. Talmud did not attain the eminence of the sister recension, and survives in a very incomplete form, although it was perhaps once fuller. It now extends only to Orders I.-IV., with the omission of IV. 7 and 9, and with the addition of part of VI. 7.@@The Babylonian Talmud (or Tal. Babli) contains the Gemara to 36½ tractates, but the material is relatively very full, and it is about three times as large as the Pal., although the Gemara there extends to 39 tractates. In the latter the Gemara follows each paragraph of the Mishnah; in the former, references are usually made to the leaves (the two pages of which are called *a* and *b*), the enumera­tion of the *editio princeps* being retained in subsequent editions. The Mishnah is written in a late literary form of Hebrew; but the Gemara is in Aramaic (except the *Baraithas),* that of the Bab. T. being an Eastern Aram. dialect (akin to Mandaitic), that of the Pal. T. being Western Aram. (akin to Biblical Aram. and the Targums). Greek was well understood in cultured Palestine; hence the latter recension uses many Greek terms which it does not explain; whereas in the Bab. T. they are much less common, and are sometimes punningly interpreted@@ The Pal. Tal. is the more concise, but it is remarkable for the numerous repetitions of the same passages; these are useful for the criticism of the text, and for the light they throw upon the incompleteness of the work of compilation. The Bab. Tal., on the other hand, is diffuse and freer in its composition, and it is characterized by the exuberance of Halakah, which is usually rather subtle and far-fetched. Both Talmuds offer a good field for research (see below). Especially interesting are the *Baraithas* which are preserved in the Gemara in *Hebrew,* they are “ external ” decisions not included in the more authoritative

@@@n the various teachers, especially the Haggadists, see W. Bacher, *Agada der Babylon. Amoräer* (Strassburg, 1879), *A. d. Tannaiten* (1884, new edition begun in 1903), *A. d. Pal. Amoräer* (1892).

@@@ee the criticisms in *Jew. Ency.,* viii. 612, and J. Bassfreund, *Monatsschrift f. d. Gesch. u. Wissens. d. Judentums,* 1907, pp. 427 sqq. On the earlier stages, see *Jew. Ency.,* viii. 610, and Hastings' *Dict. Bible,* v. 61, col. 2, with the references.

@@@n these schools, see art. Jews, § 42 seq. ; and *Jew. Ency.,* i. 145-148.

@@@ee Strack, p. 16 seq. The view has little in its favour, although memory played a more important part then than now. For early mnemonic aids to the Mishnah, see Strack, p. 68, *Jew. Ency.,xii.* 19.

@@@he Mishnah was first critically edited by W. H. Lowe (Cam­bridge, 1883).

@@@he Greek words are treated by S. Krauss and I. Löw, *Griech. u. Lat. Lehnwörter* (Berlin, 1898-9). For the Persian elements in the Bab. T., see *Jew. Ency.,* vii. 313.