

DICTIONARIES OF TALMUD, MIDRASH AND TARGUM III

and

PUBLICATIONS OF *THE COMPREHENSIVE ARAMAIC LEXICON* PROJECT

**A DICTIONARY
OF
JEWISH BABYLONIAN ARAMAIC
OF
THE TALMUDIC AND GEONIC PERIODS**

by

MICHAEL SOKOLOFF



BAR ILAN UNIVERSITY PRESS, RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS, BALTIMORE AND LONDON

Published with the assistance of:

The Milan Roven Chair of Talmudic Studies, Bar Ilan University

The Herman P. and Sophia Taubman Chair of Talmudic Culture, University of California, Berkeley

The "Amos" Fund for the Encouragement of Scholars and Writers, Founded by the President of Israel

The preparation of this volume was made possible in part by a grant from the Program for Research Tools and Reference Works of the United States National Endowment for the Humanities, an independent Federal agency.

To Simone,
רבות בנות עשו חיל ואת עליית על-כף
Proverbs 31:29

ISBN 965-226-260-9

©

Copyright by Bar Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel. All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Israel on acid free paper — 2002
by Graphit Press Ltd., Jerusalem

Bar Ilan University Press
Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel
www.biu.ac.il/Press

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu
ISBN 0-8018-7233-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2002106817

CONTENTS

PREFACE	9
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
INTRODUCTION	13
ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS	25
SOURCES	55
DICTIONARY	69
INDICES:	1241
I. BABYLONIAN TALMUD 1243 / II. GEONIC WRITINGS 1511 / III. WRITINGS OF ANAN 1552 / IV. INCANTATION TEXTS 1563 / V. MASORETIC TEXTS 1581 / VI. VARIA 1582	

PREFACE

The author's aim in preparing the present dictionary was twofold:

1. To provide both students and scholars with an up-to-date tool for an accurate understanding of the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic dialect of the Talmudic and the Geonic Periods.
2. To provide a comparative tool for the Aramaist and Semitic linguist by which to see the relationship between this Aramaic dialect and the other contemporary Eastern Aramaic dialects, viz. Syriac and Mandaic.

Students of Rabbinic literature are mainly interested in reading and understanding texts containing Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, particularly the Babylonian Talmud, which, however, also contains much material written in several varieties of Rabbinic Hebrew. Though the Rabbinic dictionaries since the Middle Ages have traditionally combined both the Aramaic and Hebrew vocabularies of this literature in one volume, such a procedure also has its drawbacks. Indeed, I can only repeat here the words of Th. Nöldeke, written over a century ago:

One could tend to doubt the propriety of a dictionary of the entire old Rabbinic literature. Namely, it is anathema for linguists to find Hebrew and Aramaic together in one lexicon. But on the other hand, this entire literature, as diverse as it is, stands together. And furthermore, Hebrew and Aramaic passages in both Talmuds and in the later Midrashim stand so close that any doubt may be suppressed before practical needs.

Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland 1875, p. 875

However, before such a practical two-language dictionary can be written each of the Hebrew and Aramaic linguistic strands which make up the vocabulary of this literature must first be untangled and treated individually. Moreover, in many places throughout this dictionary the author has noted similar usages between Jewish Babylonian Aramaic and Rabbinic Hebrew where each may serve as the source language for calques in the other.

With the completion of his work on the Rabbinic Aramaic dialects of Eretz Israel and Babylonia, it is the author's hope that in the coming years parallel lexicons of the Hebrew language of these two centers will appear. Only then will it be possible to combine the results into one volume which will accurately reflect the two languages of Rabbinic literature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Financial assistance for the research on this work was provided to the author by the following institutions and funding bodies: The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture; the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities; the Bar Ilan Research Council; the Littauer Foundation. Major funding came through a grant from the United States National Endowment for the Humanities.

The computer programming for the project was carried out at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, during 1987-89, in the framework of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, under the direction of Prof. S.A. Kaufman, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. Additional programming was done at Bar Ilan University by I. Yedidya, of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, and all the programs were run on the Department's Vax computers.

I should like to thank Prof. Z. Ben Hayyim, the former director of the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language of the Academy of the Hebrew Language for providing me with an electronic version of the Aramaic portions of the Babylonian Talmud prepared for the Historical Dictionary, and Z. Bushariya, head of the Historical Dictionary's computing section, for having written the necessary programs to extract them from the complete text.

Conversion of the electronic version into a form suitable for computer analysis was done by Dr. Moshe Hoshen and Dr. Dalia Hoshen. Mr. S. Yahalom checked all of the text references and saved the author from many errors. Ms. S. Butbul checked all of the references in Arabic. Mr. A. Leidner checked all of the cross references in the dictionary. Prof. Sh. Shaked, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who for many years has devoted much of his research to Iranian loanwords in Aramaic, gave generously of his time to check all of the Iranian loanwords and to discuss problems concerning them. Prof. S.A. Kaufman and Prof. S. Friedman, Jewish Theological Seminary, Jerusalem, read through the entire text of the dictionary and provided many corrections. Prof. Y. Sabar, UCLA, placed a pre-publication copy of his dictionary of Jewish Neo-Aramaic at my disposal. Dr. Y. Kara permitted me to use his card file of vocalized words in *Halakhot Gedolot*, Ms. Paris, and the page proofs of *BAYTN*. As in my previous dictionary, D. Louvish read through the entire text with his keen eye in order to correct style and insure consistency.

A fellowship from the Center for Judaic Studies of the University of Pennsylvania enabled the author to devote the academic year 1993-94 to work on the dictionary. Similarly, a grant through the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project enabled him to work full time on the dictionary at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, during the academic year 1997-98. Dr. J.A. Lund of the Project staff was helpful to him in many ways during his stay there.

A few words are in order concerning the production of the book itself. Advances in computer programs over the last decade have considerably diminished both the time and cost of multilingual printing and improved its quality. The entire text of the dictionary was input by the author using the Israeli English-Hebrew version of the DOS wordprocessing program Nota Bene ('Shapirit'), converted by the author into a multilingual version. The resulting dictionary files were then imported into an especially adapted version of the Windows desktop publishing program TAG. I should like to thank Mr. D. Weissman, the author of the TAG program, for all his assistance, as well as Mr. S. Guttman, who designed all of the fonts used in this book. Ms. M. Avisar, director of Bar Ilan University Press, and Ms. A. Lamdan, also of the Press, contributed considerably to the book's production.

The dictionary is dedicated to my wife, Simone, without whose support it could not have been written.

M.S.

INTRODUCTION

0.0 Introduction

0.1 Jewish Babylonian Aramaic¹ was the spoken and written language of the Jewish communities in parts of what are today Iraq and Iran during the Sasanian and post-Sasanian Periods (3rd–11th cents. CE), corresponding to the Amoraic, Savoraic, and Geonic Periods of Jewish chronology. Together with Syriac and Mandaic, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic forms the eastern branch of Middle Aramaic,² which has survived to the present day in the modern Aramaic dialects spoken by Jews, Christians, and Mandaeans in an area ranging from Eastern Turkey to Iran.³

1.0 Sources

1.1 The following are the sources of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic:

1.1.1 **The Babylonian Talmud**⁴ – Edited during the Sasanian Period in the 5th–6th cents. CE in the various academies of Jewish Babylonia, this compendium of Jewish law and lore, which is organized as a commentary on thirty-seven of the tractates of the Mishna, is our main source for knowledge of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.⁵

1.1.2 **Geonic Literature**⁶ – During the post-Talmudic Period (6th–11th cents. CE) the heads of the academies in Jewish Babylonia, called the Geonim, wrote commentaries on the Babylonian Talmud, responsa, monographs on aspects of Jewish law, and lexicographical works, much of them in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.⁷

1.1.3 **Writings of Anan** – Anan b. David (8th cent. CE), the founder of a sect which was a forerunner of Karaism, compiled an exegetical work on the Pentateuch on the basis of

1 For a survey of this dialect, see: E.Y. Kutscher, *EJ* 2:278ff., w. prev. lit. For an earlier and still valuable survey, see: Rosenthal, *AF* 212-223.

2 For a study of the division of these dialects, see: D. Boyarin, *Kearns Vol* 613-649.

3 On the division of the modern dialects, see: Hoberman, *Syntax* 3-9, w. prev. lit.

4 For a general introduction to this text, see: *EJ* 15:755; Strack-Stemberger 190-224.

5 While there is still no up-to-date grammar based on manuscript materials, the following grammatical works may be consulted: Eps, *Gr* [see the programmatic review article of Kut, *Studies* 227–255 (Hebrew)]; Kara [the Yemenite manuscript tradition]; Morag [the Yemenite oral tradition of the verb]; Schlesinger, *Satzlehre* [syntax based mainly on the printed edition].

6 For a general introduction to the Geonic Period and its literature, see: Brody, *Geonim*. A convenient description of the collections of Geonic *Responsa* may be found in Groner, *Hai Gaon* 173-187.

7 The period between the Talmudic and the Geonic Periods is referred to as the Savoraic Period which, while being extremely important for the crystallization of the text of the Babylonian Talmud and for the foundation of the Geonic institutions, is more or less a dark age from which little concrete data has survived. For a survey, see: Ephrati, *Savoraic Period*; Brody *Geonim* 4–10.

his principles and beliefs. Parts of this work have survived in manuscripts from the Geniza and in substantial quotations in the works of later Karaite authors.⁸

1.1.4 **Magical texts** – By the end of the twentieth century, about two hundred and fifty Jewish magic bowls from Iraq and Iran, dating between the 5th–8th cents. CE, had been published by a number of scholars in varying degrees of accuracy, though a far greater number of bowls still remains to be published in both public and private collections.⁹ Though the dialect of these texts is not identical with the standard Jewish Babylonian Aramaic¹⁰ of the literary texts and includes many archaic and dialectal features, the importance of these texts cannot be overstated, since they are the only epigraphic remains of this dialect which have survived from antiquity.¹¹ Additionally, *Harba de-Moše* “The Sword of Moses”, a book of magical practice, dates from this period.

1.1.5 **Babylonian Masora** – Many of the notes in the various Babylonian Masoretic treatises are written in the dialect of the Geonic Period.¹²

2.0 Lexicography of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic¹³

2.1 General Dictionaries of the Modern Period¹⁴

2.1.1 Modern lexicography of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic begins with J. Buxtorf’s *Lexicon*¹⁵ and concludes with M. Jastrow’s *Dictionary*, completed in 1903.¹⁶ All of the dictionaries published in this period attempted to include in one volume the entire Hebrew and Aramaic

⁸ On Anan and his work, see: L. Nemoj, *Karaite Anthology*, New Haven 1952 3-20.

⁹ For a survey of the major publications of these texts, see: *AMB* 13–21, supplemented now by additional texts which have been published by the same authors in *MSF*. The bowls in the collection of the British Museum have recently been published (see: Segal, *CAMIB*). Several large collections of bowls are currently in the process of being published: 1. The Iraq Museum collection, Baghdad (E. Hunter); 2. the Moussaieff collection, London (Sh. Shaked); 3. the Schøyen collection, Oslo (Sh. Shaked and D. Levene). The combined number of bowls in these collections is now over one thousand, and hence they will add much to our previous knowledge of this genre of texts.

¹⁰ Recently, the first and so-far only known bowl in standard Jewish Babylonian Aramaic was published. See: Ch. Müller-Kessler–Th. Kwasman, Bowl. For a discussion of the various forms of Aramaic in the bowl texts, see: Ch. Müller-Kessler, *Handbook of Magic Bowls in Koiné Babylonian Aramaic*, Groningen 2001 [forthcoming].

¹¹ Rossell, *Handbook*, includes a grammar and glossary of the texts published until that time (1958), but in light of the fact that many of these texts were incorrectly copied and many new texts have now been published, this work is sorely out-of-date. For grammatical details, one may now consult Juusola, *Peculiarities*. It has been clear for a long time now that most of the Jewish incantation bowl texts [i.e. those written in Hebrew characters] were composed in a *koiné* which contains lexical items properly belonging to Syriac or Mandaic. See, especially: Harviainen; Müller-Kessler–Kwasman, Bowl 159.

¹² This material was dealt with in pioneering studies by P. Kahle, Y. Yeivin, and G. Weil. The field has recently been summarized by Ofer, *BMs*.

¹³ For a general survey, see: E.Y. Kutscher, The Present State of Research into Mishnaic Hebrew (especially Lexicography) and its Tasks, *Archive* 1 (1972) 3–28 [Hebrew]; English summary, pp. III–X.

¹⁴ The history of Talmudic lexicography from the Geonic Period to present times has yet to be written. The most important work on the earlier period is still the study in Eps, *GC* קמז-ט. On the transmission of the lexical traditions of the Geonim to the West, see: Eps, *StI* 33–34.

¹⁵ This dictionary was first published in 1639 and went through a number of editions during a period of over two centuries. The last edition, edited by B. Fischer, appeared in 1868.

¹⁶ For a bibliography of lexical works on Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, see: Strack-Stemberger 160-162.

vocabulary of Rabbinic literature in its widest sense (viz. the various Rabbinic Hebrew dialects, the Aramaic of the various Targums, the two Talmuds, and the Midrashim). During the twentieth century, Jastrow’s English work achieved a wide circulation and pre-eminence among both scholars and laymen, though in some respects (e.g. etymology) it represents a regression from the achievements of nineteenth century Talmudic lexicography. Thus, Levy in his *Wörterbuch* extensively employed the Syriac lexicon as far as it was available to him with good results,¹⁷ and in many cases he was able to establish the correct etymology of a word or to decide between variant readings on the basis of that language.¹⁸ Though Jastrow is clearly dependent upon his predecessors, his dictionary is certainly much more than a reworking of Levy’s *Wörterbuch* into English. In many cases only the trained eye of the scholar can decide which of the two lexica is to be preferred regarding a specific lexeme.

2.1.2 The third complete dictionary from modern times, Kohut’s edition of the *Aruch*,¹⁹ written in Rabbinic Hebrew, is both underestimated and underemployed today, for reasons which will readily be apparent. Kohut’s aim was twofold: 1. To edit a critical edition of the *Aruch* of Nathan b. Yehiel of Rome (10th cent.); 2. to use this as a basis for writing a complete modern Rabbinic lexicon. As it stands, however, the work suffers from severe structural defects. Kohut retained the original medieval biliteral ordering of the *Aruch*, which also included verbs and nouns in the same entry, and thus, for the modern reader finding a particular entry is a both time-consuming and daunting task. While his own erudite notes are often very valuable, their being interspersed among the text of the *Aruch* and its commentators often requires careful reading to know where one ends and the other begins. Kohut’s well-known propensity to see Persian loanwords everywhere²⁰ has added to the general perception that many of his etymologies are farfetched. On the other hand, he employed many textual sources not exploited by other lexicographers (e.g. *Midrash Haggadol*), quoted extensively from the *variae lectionis* of Rabbinowicz’ *Diqduqei Soferim* (1865–1897) and cited many medieval scholars. Moreover, he was the only lexicographer to exploit the new Geonic sources which began to appear towards the end of the nineteenth century, especially in the later volumes of the work and in the *Additamenta et Corrigenda*. Nevertheless, in spite of the corrections to be found in *Additamenta ad librum Aruch Completum*, this work remains basically unwieldy for the modern scholar and student, though much important information may be garnered from a systematic reading of the work.

2.2 Specialized Works

2.2.1 In addition to the general Rabbinic lexica just described, a number of specialized works have been produced dealing with various aspects of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, e.g.

¹⁷ Though not stated anywhere in his introduction, he most likely used Castellus, *Lexicon*, the only available dictionary at the time.

¹⁸ In this he was preceded by A. Geiger, who published a series of important articles in which he utilized the Syriac lexicon. See, e.g. *Jüdische Begriffe und Worte innerhalb der syrischen Literatur*, *ZDMG* (1866) 487–492.

¹⁹ See: Kohut, *AC*.

²⁰ See the extensive review of W. Bacher, *ZDMG* 47 (1893) 487–514, especially 501–510. Kohut’s excesses were subsequently corrected by B. Geiger in *AAC*.

loanwords,²¹ *Realia*,²² flora and fauna,²³ and terminology.²⁴ While the quality of these works varies, much valuable lexical material which has never been incorporated in any Rabbinic dictionary is available in them, in the main since most of these works appeared after the publication of the existing dictionaries.

3.0 The Purpose of the Present Work

3.1 Since the beginning of the twentieth century no complete dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic has appeared,²⁵ even though the results of much important textual and lexical work by various scholars have made a new comprehensive work imperative. While much material was collected in *Addimenta ad librum Aruch Completum*, published in 1936, even the contributions of this work remain inaccessible to a large degree to the general reader because of the enforced structure of the book, which followed the order of *Aruch Completum*. Moreover, since the appearance of this work, many new lexical studies have appeared in both books and in articles.²⁶

3.2 More basically, access to the primary sources of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, especially the actual manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud, is now greater than it was when all the previous dictionaries were written.²⁷ Until quite recently, scholars almost exclusively employed the printed text of the Babylonian Talmud as the basis for their work and culled variants from the volumes of *Diqduqei Soferim*, as far as they were available at the time. Today, with the availability of facsimile editions of many Talmudic manuscripts²⁸ and electronic editions of nearly all of them,²⁹ there is convenient direct access to the original texts, and the textual basis of a modern dictionary can rest on much firmer ground.

21 Akkadian: Kaufman, *AIOA*; Greek: Krauss, *Lehnw*; Sperber, *GLLT*; Persian: Geiger, *AAC* (passim); S. Telegdi, *JAs*, 1935 178-256; Shaked, *Elr*.

22 E.g. Krauss, *TalArch*; id., *Qadmoniot*; Brand, *Ceramics*.

23 Löw, *Pfl*; idem, *Flora*; idem, *Fauna*.

24 Bacher, *Term*.

25 The only value of Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, published in 1922, is for the vocalization of the Onkelos-type Targums taken from Yemenite manuscripts. It has no independent value for Jewish Babylonian Aramaic. E.Z. Melammed's מלון ארמי-עברי לתלמוד בבלי (*Dictionnaire araméen-hébreu*), Jerusalem 1992, is a didactic work geared to laymen and not a scientific dictionary.

26 The many contributions of J.N. Epstein towards the elucidation of the vocabulary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic which are now conveniently available in *Eps*, *CG*, *St1*, and *St2*, overshadow the work of all other scholars.

27 For a list of the manuscripts, see: M. Krupp, Manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud, in: S. Safrai (ed.), *The Literature of the Sages*, Assen/Maastricht 1987 346-365.

28 H. Strack published in facsimile the Munich Ms. of the entire Talmud in 1912 (v. Strack, Munich). L. Goldschmidt published the Hamburg Ms. of Tractate *Neziqin* in 1914 (v. Goldschmidt, Nez). S. Abramson published in facsimile a Spanish manuscript of *'Avoda Zara* in 1957 in New York (v. Abramson, AZ). Facsimiles of the most of Talmudic manuscripts in the Vatican Library—the largest collection in the world—with the exception of those to *Pesahim*—were published by Makor Press in the 1960's.

29 The Academy of the Hebrew Language has prepared electronic texts of what is considered to be the most reliable manuscript of each tractate (see: E. Weissberg, מצע לעיבור 12 מסכתות נוספות של התלמוד הבבלי, *PAHL* 28-30 [1981-83] 332-345) and has recently made them available on CD-ROM (See: *The Hebrew Language Historical Dictionary Project, Ancient Literature Section, Ma'agarim*, Jerusalem 2001). The Lieberman Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America has prepared to date electronic editions of ca. two hundred manuscript units [one unit equals the text of one manuscript of one tractate] which currently complement the

4.0 Methodology³⁰

4.1 General Considerations

4.1.1 Over and above all of the technical problems lies the methodological problem of a dialect dictionary *vis-à-vis* a text dictionary.³¹ The tradition of Rabbinic lexicography, starting from the *Aruch*, was to combine all of the various Hebrew and Aramaic lexical items found in Rabbinic literature in the widest sense, stemming from both Babylonia and Palestine, in one work.³² While this procedure is convenient for studying the bilingual Rabbinic literature, a gradual appreciation of the need to treat each language and dialect separately³³ has highlighted the deficiencies in the state of Rabbinic lexicography. The following are the most salient ones:

4.1.1.1 The existing dictionaries combine in one entry Babylonian, Palestinian, and Targumic Aramaic words from various periods. Since morphologically similar words even in closely related dialects can frequently differ in both meaning and nuance, their consolidation in one dictionary when unmarked is often misleading.³⁴

4.1.1.2 The compilers of the earlier Rabbinic dictionaries sought to achieve lexical—no dialectal—completeness. It was felt that as long as a word was quoted from one dialect, there was no need to give references to it for each dialect in which it occurred. Consequently, the absence of a reference to a word in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic in the existing dictionaries does not necessarily mean that this word is not attested in that dialect.³⁵

4.1.1.3 Since the time of the *Aruch*, the compilers of the dictionaries viewed themselves as text commentators as well as lexicographers. As a result, the dictionaries tend to give extended explanations of the text, beyond the necessity of its simple meaning, when it contains a difficult or rare word.³⁶ On the other hand, most words of high frequency, even if they have a variegated semantic range, tend to be almost entirely disregarded.³⁷

4.1.1.4 All of the previous dictionaries are based on the late (nineteenth cent.) and textually corrupt printed editions of the Babylonian Talmud.³⁸ The availability today of nearly

work done by the Academy but will eventually include all of the manuscripts. While the entire database of the Lieberman Institute can be accessed by means of a search engine which allows simple, Boolean, and wildcard searches, the CD-ROM of the Academy can only be searched for the lexico-morphologically analyzed Hebrew words, and not Aramaic.

30 See: Sok, *Progress*.

31 See, e.g. *Eps*, *St1* 34.

32 Cf. Kutscher's criticism [op. cit., n. 13].

33 The author's *DJPA* was the first dictionary of a Rabbinic dialect to be written along these lines.

34 This is especially the case with Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*.

35 Many Jewish Babylonian Aramaic words, even some occurring in the printed editions are absent from the lexica. See: Sok, *Progress* 195³³.

36 The fact that many of the explanations of the *Aruch* derive either from Geonic sources or from the commentaries of R. Hananel or R. Gershom may explain this phenomenon. In modern times, this tendency was continued in Levy, *TMW*, which explains the large size of that work.

37 The reader may compare, for example, the length of the entries of הדר vb., נחת vb., and סלק vb. in the present dictionary with that of its predecessors.

38 For a history of the printing of the Talmud from the sixteenth until the twentieth century, see: Rabbinowicz,

all of the existing Talmudic manuscripts as well as many Geniza fragments³⁹ provides an entirely new textual basis for the lexicon. The republication over the last century of critical editions of a large amount of Geonic material⁴⁰ and the editing of numerous original responsa and other Geonic works, especially those discovered in the Cairo Geniza,⁴¹ has provided the lexicographer of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic with new sources, both primary and secondary, for his work.

4.1.2 Until recently it was either impossible or impractical to excerpt every instance of a lexeme in a given corpus unless it was of limited size. The compilers of the previous Rabbinic dictionaries produced their works by preparing slips with selected text references. A historical study of these dictionaries would probably show that each author built upon the work of his predecessors and added additional, newly collected, material. Notwithstanding the monumental efforts expended by the Kasowski family in producing manual concordances of all of the major texts of the Rabbinic literature, including the Babylonian Talmud,⁴² this procedure has been a limiting factor for every lexicographer of these texts. However, with the introduction of the electronic computer into the field of text processing, the goal of producing a Key Word in Context (KWIC) concordance of even a very large corpus to serve as a database for its semantic analysis has become a reality.⁴³ The basis of the present dictionary was a database in the form of a KWIC of the entire corpus.

4.2 The textual components utilized for preparing this database were the following:

4.2.1 The Aramaic texts

4.2.1.1 **The Babylonian Talmud** – The Academy of the Hebrew Language's Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language provided the author with the Aramaic portions of the entire Babylonian Talmud in electronic form, from the text editions prepared by the dictionary staff, for each tractate according to the manuscript considered to be its best overall representative.⁴⁴ This raw material was reworked in the following fashion: The running text

Ma'amar; M.J. Heller, *Printing the Talmud*, New York 1992. On the Spanish and Portuguese incunabulae, see: Dimitrovsky, *SB*.

39 All of these manuscripts are now accessible on microfilm in the Institute of Microfilm Manuscripts of the National and Hebrew University Library, Jerusalem, in facsimile editions, or in electronic form (see *supra*, n. 29), but the lack of a complete catalog of all the Talmudic Geniza fragments makes their utilization difficult. (The catalog prepared under the auspices of the Mishna Project of the Israel Academy of Sciences has not been published to date; see: Y. Sussmann, Talmud Fragments in the Cairo Geniza, *Te'uda* 1 [1980] 7–20 [Heb].) Several volumes of photographs of Talmudic Geniza fragments have been published (See: Katsch, *GTB* I, II; Golinkin, *GRH*). On vocalized Geniza fragments, see: Morag, *VTM*. The author would like to thank the Lieberman Institute, Jerusalem, for letting him utilize its extensive collection of photographs of Geniza manuscripts from various libraries.

40 E.g. *Šeel*; *HG*; *HP*; *IŠGF*.

41 E.g. *TGHark*; *Geon*; *TGAs27/28/33/44*.

42 See: C.J. & B. Kasowski, *TTCV*. The textual basis for this work was the Vilna edition; hence, it could not be used as the basis for the work on the present dictionary.

43 For a description of the author's similar project for producing *DJPA*, see: Sok, *JPA* Final Report; *idem*, The New Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic: A Description of the Dictionary and its Compilation, *HL*, 33–35 (1992) 65–78 (Hebrew).

44 See above, n. 29. On the authority of the late E.S. Rosenthal, the Academy chose Yemenite manuscripts as its

was divided into lines corresponding to those in the standard Vilna edition, and the Hebrew words necessary for its comprehension were added to give a coherent text.

4.2.1.2 **Geonic texts** – The following Geonic texts were incorporated into the database: *Halakhot Pesuqot*,⁴⁵ *Še'elot*,⁴⁶ *Iggeret Rav Šarrira Gaon*,⁴⁷ the Formularies of Se'adya Gaon and Hayya Gaon,⁴⁸ and a selection of the responsa, mostly from the Geniza.⁴⁹

4.2.1.3 **Incantation bowls and magical texts** – The texts published until the 1990's were provided in electronic form by D. Sperling, who incorporated into them the important corrections and revised readings of J.N. Epstein.⁵⁰ The last decade has seen a marked increase in the publication of these texts,⁵¹ not all of which could be included in the electronic database.⁵² In addition to the bowls, the magical text *Harba de-Mošē*⁵³ was also incorporated into the database.

4.2.1.4 **Anan's Book of Commandments** – All of the surviving portions of this text both from the Geniza and from medieval Karaite books,⁵⁴ were incorporated into the database.

4.3 Preparation of the Database⁵⁵

4.3.1 The database was prepared by using an analytical concordancing program, designed for the use of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (CAL) Project.⁵⁶ The basic components of this program are the following:

4.3.1.1 **Outline Lexicon** – A list containing each lemma of the dictionary, its part of speech, and a gloss.

4.3.1.2 **Analytical Table** – A list of the prefixes and suffixes occurring with verbs and nouns in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.

4.3.1.3 **Morphological Parser** – A program which utilizes the two previous files to give a morpho-lexical analysis of each string in the text.

basic text for those tractates for which these have survived (for details on these manuscripts, see *Kara* 1-11). Evidence of the Yemenite tradition for other tractates was called by the author from the extensive Aramaic quotations from the Babylonian Talmud found in *Midrash Haggadol* and *Sefer Ha-Ma'asim*.

45 See: Brody, Geonim 217ff.

46 See: *ib.* 202ff.

47 See: *ib.* 20ff.

48 See: *ib.* 264

49 See above, n. 7.

50 See: Eps, *StI* 329-374.

51 See above, n. 9.

52 The author has tried to include all new lexical items appearing in these texts in the dictionary.

53 This text was originally published in Gaster, *HM*. A new critical edition of the text (see: Harari, *HM*) has now been prepared with the use of additional manuscripts.

54 This text was also the subject of a lexical study by Eps, *StI* 71–84.

55 A more detailed discussion of this phase of the work is given in Sok, *JBA* Final Report.

56 The CAL Project, directed by S. A. Kaufman, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, has been supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities since 1987. Since 1992, the present dictionary project has been included under the funding of the CAL Project. The analytical programs which were written for the CAL Project between 1987-90 were modified for the use of the present project by I. Yedidya, Bar Ilan University.

4.3.2 With the aid of these programs, a lemfile⁵⁷ was sequentially prepared from each of the sources of the dictionary, e.g. one tractate or a group of tractates. Since a large percentage of the vocabulary is extremely rare, and common words may occur in a wide variety of spellings and morphological forms, intensive manual input was also necessary to produce the final accurate version of each lemfile. After the first corrected lemfiles were produced, pair files⁵⁸ were generated from them, which could be employed to speed up analysis of the new material by correctly analyzing recurring strings in new texts. The most useful derivative of the lemfiles was a KWIC concordance of the entire textbase which served as the database for the writing of the dictionary.

4.4 Comparative and Etymological Data

4.4.1 The existing dictionaries of the related Aramaic dialects were checked to provide comparative and etymological data, which were helpful both in determining the correct morphological form of the entries and in delimiting their range of meanings. All cognates in the other Eastern Aramaic dialects (Syriac, Mandaic) are cited, while data from other Aramaic dialects are only quoted either when comparative data is lacking in these two dialects or for special illustrative purposes.⁵⁹ Since the Aramaic vocalization tradition of Targumic Aramaic originated in Babylonia, cognates from this dialect are quoted whenever available.⁶⁰ The origin of all loanwords deriving from Akkadian, Hebrew, Persian, and Greek is given.

4.5 Secondary Literature

4.5.1 Both traditional and scientific literature dealing with Jewish Babylonian Aramaic is quite extensive, and any attempt on the part of an individual lexicographer to encompass it all is a major undertaking. In order to reduce this task to a reasonable size, no attempt was made to determine priority in the establishment of a particular meaning or form, but rather, when references are given, the author's intention is to point out to the reader an up-to-date discussion which takes into account the results of the relevant previous literature. The literature cited is limited to philological discussions only, since references to the exegetical literature properly belong to a text commentary.⁶¹

5.0 The Entries

5.1 All Aramaic common words appearing in the texts of the corpus have been included, with the following exceptions:

57 A lemfile consists of a line for each word in a source text and has four fields: Lemma – part of speech – string from text – coordinate.

58 A line in a pair file includes two consecutive words in a text, together with the lexico-morphological analysis of the first word. Such pairs comprise minimal syntactic units.

59 As a rule, cognates from the modern Eastern Aramaic dialects are not quoted, unless they can make a significant contribution to the semantic elucidation of a word.

60 Similarly, comparative material from Rabbinic Hebrew is quoted as far as possible with Babylonian vocalization from Yeivin, *BV*.

61 No attempt was made to include literature dealing with commentaries on the text, and as a rule, secondary

5.1.1 **Words quoted from pre-Amoraic sources not properly belonging to Jewish Babylonian Aramaic** – e.g. *Megillat Ta'anit*, Aramaic citations from the Tannaitic literature, the Targumim to the Pentateuch and the Prophets.⁶²

5.1.2 **Archaic words occurring in writs**⁶³ – While scholars have previously noted the occurrence of various dialects in the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic literature, research on this subject has not reached the point which would permit labeling all such words with certainty as archaic. However, some words in the dictionary have been labeled 'archaic' or 'dialectal', since they clearly do not belong to the mainstream of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.

5.1.3 **Personal**⁶⁴ and **geographic**⁶⁵ names – Since these categories require special treatment, they have not been included in the dictionary, though gentilics derived from them have been listed.

5.1.4 **Non-Aramaic words** – Original non-Aramaic words have been included only when it is clear from a modification of their morphological form or from a clear semantic usage that they may be classified as loanwords and not as transcriptions.

5.2 Orthography

5.2.1 Though the orthography of the European and eastern (non-Yemenite) manuscripts is somewhat more explicit than that of the printed editions,⁶⁶ more radical orthographical differences are found both in the original Geonic texts and in the Yemenite manuscripts, which derive directly from the Geonic tradition of Babylonia.⁶⁷ The importance of this explicit orthography for the information it contains on the phonology of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic in the Geonic Period cannot be overstated, and these spellings have been quoted in the entries. Nevertheless, an eclectic approach, conforming more or less to the traditional orthography was felt to be more appropriate for the headwords of the entries, in order to make the use of the dictionary easier for the reader.

5.3 Vocalization

5.3.1 Previous modern dictionaries have vocalized the lexemes either on the basis of the traditional Ashkenazic pronunciation or as reconstructions based on the word's supposed etymology.⁶⁸ A 'correct' reading of a Jewish Babylonian Aramaic word⁶⁹ may be ascertained through a variety of methods:

literature was restricted to modern authors, though much important material may be culled from traditional commentators.

62 These are generally cited in the Babylonian Talmud as כדמתרגמינן or כדמתרגם רב יוסף.

63 See: Kutscher, *Studies* 417-430 [Hebrew].

64 There is as yet no comprehensive study of the personal names in the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic literature in light of the contemporary onomasticon.

65 On the GN's, see: Eshel, *JS*; Oppenheimer, *BJ*.

66 I.e. they employ more vowel letters.

67 This includes many explicit spellings without laryngeals or pharyngeals, corresponding more closely to the actual spoken language. Many examples may be found in *Kara (passim)*.

68 It may be pointed out also here that the same applies to the vocalization of Rabbinic Hebrew in the dictionaries, which can be greatly improved on the basis of reliable manuscripts from European libraries and the Cairo Geniza (see, e.g.: Kutscher, *Studies* 73-168).

69 This is clearly a theoretical concept, since a reasonable goal is the determination of the probable pronunciation

5.3.1.1 **Explicit vocalizations in manuscripts** – Sporadic vocalizations are found in both Geniza and non-Geniza Talmudic manuscripts.⁷⁰ The only extensively vocalized texts of the Geonic Period are Ms. Sasoon 263 of *Halakhot Pesuqot*⁷¹ and the Paris Ms. (Bibliothèque Nationale 1402) of *Halakhot Gedolot*.⁷²

5.3.1.2 **Explicit plene orthography** – This is often helpful in determining the vocalization, especially of the internal [ā] vowels.⁷³

5.3.1.3 **The Yemenite reading tradition**⁷⁴ – This derives directly from Babylonia of the Geonic Period and is the only tradition with any claim to authenticity.⁷⁵ However, it also should be used with caution, since the Yemenites today are entirely dependent on the printed text,⁷⁶ and they have also been influenced by Targumic Aramaic of the Onkelos type.⁷⁷

5.3.1.4 **The vocalization of Syriac**⁷⁸ **and the plene orthography of Mandaic** – These may be helpful in deciding the preferred vocalization of a word, especially when the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts offer equivocal evidence.

5.3.1.5 **The original form of loanwords borrowed from Akkadian, Persian, Greek, and Hebrew** – All of these languages explicitly indicate vowels in their orthographic systems, and they are often helpful in establishing a preferred form of a loanword in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.

5.3.2 In sum, the normalized Tiberian vocalization given for the headwords in most entries in this dictionary should thus be regarded as a guideline towards the preferred pronunciation but not as an absolute determination.

5.4 Structure of the Entries

5.4.1 An individual lexical entry is divided into the following parts:

5.4.1.1 **Lemma** – This is the most basic form of the lexeme, e.g. a triradical root of a

of the word in the Geonic Period. As is explained here, the vocalizations proposed in this dictionary have a rational basis, since they are derived from both internal and external evidence, as opposed to the mainly theoretical considerations employed in previous dictionaries. Since the Geonic Period lasted until the eleventh cent. CE, well after the end of the Talmudic Period, and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic continued to be spoken long after the Muslim conquest, it is quite possible that the evidence in our possession does not reflect the pronunciation of even late Talmudic Babylonia.

⁷⁰ For the former, see: Morag *VTM*.

⁷¹ The lower five lines of each page are vocalized. See: S. Morag, *Lešonenu* 32 (1968) 67-88.

⁷² One hundred and twenty pages of this fully vocalized manuscript have survived. See: S. Morag, *PWCJS* 2 (1969) 89-94.

⁷³ When spellings of this type occur, they are noted both in the entry and in the lemma.

⁷⁴ For a description of this tradition and previous works on the subject, see: Morag 35-62.

⁷⁵ A full-fledged study of the verb is Morag. A comprehensive study of the noun prepared by S. Morag and Y. Kara is forthcoming. Both of these studies are based on the vocalized edition of the Vilna edition according to the Yemenite tradition, prepared by R. Y. 'Amr, and from recordings of informants.

⁷⁶ On deviation from the printed text in the Yemenite reading tradition, see: Morag, *Kētiv* and *Qēre* 34-45.

⁷⁷ On this issue, see: D. Boyarin, *JNES* 37 (1978) 141-160.

⁷⁸ See: Brock, *LS*. The Syriac vocalization tradition is based on the medieval indigenous lexica, e.g. *BBah* and *BAlī*.

verb, an emphatic form of a noun, etc. Homographs⁷⁹ of each part of speech are distinguished by numbers. Since the exact vocalization of most of the nouns is not known from the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic tradition itself,⁸⁰ it was not possible to follow any consistent ordering on the basis of nominal patterns. Indeed, a comparison with the dictionaries of the related dialects of Syriac and Mandaic has shown that the same groups of homographs are numbered differently by different lexicographers.

5.4.1.2 **Part of Speech** – The following parts of speech are distinguished: adjective, adverb, conjunction, interjection, noun, preposition, pronoun, verbal noun. Homographs belonging to different parts of speech are numbered separately.

5.4.1.3 **Gloss** – The English gloss given at the beginning of the entry is intended to give a general idea of the meaning of the lexeme, while more exact nuances are given in detail in the semantic section.

5.4.1.4 **Comparative and Etymological Data** – The purpose of this section is to indicate the relationship of the lexeme to the cognates in other Aramaic dialects, starting with the closely related eastern dialects of Syriac and Mandaic, then the other Aramaic dialects, and finally other Semitic languages. The source of all loanwords is indicated.

5.4.1.5 **Semantic section** – This section documents the various meanings and usages of each lexeme. For the more common lexemes, a morphological survey has also been given. Citation length has been kept to a minimum and additional examples are often quoted by reference only. Wherever possible, care has been taken to quote examples from a variety of sources from both the Talmudic as well as the post-Talmudic Periods.

In spite of the efforts of many commentators and lexicographers over the centuries, the meanings of many lexemes are still either uncertain or unclear. Since repeating the speculations of one's predecessors, when they are based on mere conjectures or on incorrect etymological assumptions, does nothing to further the understanding of a particular lexeme, in such cases the author has simply registered his ignorance of the word's meaning.

5.4.1.6 **Lexical section** – Unlike other Jewish Aramaic dialects, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic has been intensively scrutinized since Geonic times by the scholars who studied the Babylonian Talmud. When doubts arose, these scholars often turned to the Geonic academies in Babylonia, where Jewish Babylonian Aramaic was still a living language, to inquire into the meanings of particular words. The replies to these queries, as far as they have survived and have been published, are an invaluable repository of native lexical information, which in many cases is our only source of knowledge for a word's meaning. This material has been quoted at the end of each relevant entry in its original language. Additionally, the traditional Yemenite pronunciation is given here.

5.4.1.7 **Bibliography** – Because of the immense literature on the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts, it would be foolhardy to claim that anything close to bibliographic completeness has been achieved. No attempt has been made to discuss the history of a derivation or an etymology, but rather the latest discussion known to the author is quoted

⁷⁹ I.e. words whose consonantal skeletons are identical but which the author considers to be distinct from a morphological point of view.

⁸⁰ I.e. from ancient vocalized texts.

where he felt it to be necessary, and the reader may follow backward from there the thread of the discussion back from there. Comments referring essentially to the text and not to the lexicon have not been included, since they properly belong in a commentary.

5.5 References

5.5.1 The following principles have been employed in providing references to the texts:

5.5.1.1 References to the Babylonian Talmud are given according to the folio, side, and line of the standard Vilna edition, even though the text quoted from manuscript sources may often differ significantly from that of the printed edition. The reader may see the entire context of the default manuscript sources of the Babylonian Talmud from the CD-ROM of the Academy of the Hebrew Language and that of the other manuscripts from the Lieberman Institute database. In cases where the text is significantly different or totally lacking in the Vilna edition, e.g. passages found only in the manuscripts or censored passages, the reference reflects the place where the citation would have been had it been printed.

5.5.1.2 Each text is cited according to a principal manuscript witness indicated in the Sources of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic.⁸¹ No specific indication is given when the default manuscript is the source.

5.5.1.3 When a citation is quoted from a non-default source, this is indicated in the reference in the following manner, e.g.: *Ber* 5b(25; M), i.e. *Berakhot*, according to Munich Ms. 95 (and not Oxford, Ms. Opp. Add. Fol. 23, the default manuscript); *Meg* 11b(23; MGG 345:7), i.e. *Megilla*, according to the quotation in *Midrash Haggadol*, Genesis, p. 345, l. 7 (and not New York, Columbia X893-T141).

5.5.1.4 When an additional reading is cited from a non-default source, this is indicated by placing the siglum of the source in square brackets following the word, e.g.: *Ara* 21b(23) [Var: דעשויה TGhark 166:2] means that the variant reading to the text cited from *Arakhin* is cited from the collection of Geonic responsa in TGhark, p. 166, l. 2.

5.5.1.5 Only published material has been employed for the Geonic sources, and this has been cited according to the pagination and line numbering of the printed Talmudic text. If a citation was republished in *Otzar Hagaonim*, this source is generally quoted since it is most easily accessible to the reader. However, since the material in *Otzar Hagaonim* covers only the tractates *Berakhot-Sanhedrin*, material from other tractates is cited from the original publications. When material has been published several times, a later editor may present a more accurate text, and this has been preferred.⁸²

⁸¹ The first manuscript listed for each tractate is the default.

⁸² E.g., the responsa of R. Natronai Gaon have now been reedited in Brody, *TRN*, and hence they are cited according to this edition.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAC	S. Krauss et al., תוספות ערוך השלם (<i>Addimenta ad librum Aruch Completum</i>), Vienna 1937
AASOR	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
AASQ	W. Arnold & P. Behnstedt, <i>Arabisch-Aramäische Sprachbeziehungen im Qalamūn (Syrien)</i> , Wiesbaden 1993
Abramson, AZ	S. Abramson (ed.), מסכת עבודה זרה, כתב יד בית המדרש לרבנים בניו יורק (<i>Tractate 'Abodah Zarah of the Babylonian Talmud</i>), New York 1957
Abramson, BB	Idem, תלמוד בבלי, מסכת בבא בתרא, תרגום ופרש ש' אברמסון (<i>Tractate Bava Batra</i> , translated with a commentary), Jerusalem 1958
Abramson, RaH	Idem, ספר פירושי רבנו חננאל לתלמוד (Commentary of R. Ḥananel to the Talmud), Jerusalem 1995
abs.	absolute
AC	A. Kohut (ed.), ספר ערוך השלם ... מאת רבינו נתן בן יחיאל, Nathan b. Yeḥiel, <i>Aruch Completum sive lexicon vocabula et res, quae in libris targumicus, talmudicus et midraschicis²</i> , Vienna 1928
AcIr	<i>Acta Iranica</i>
ACSUp	A. Kohut, חזן הערוך (<i>Supplement to "Aruch Completum"</i>), Vienna 1928
AD	v. Driver, AD
Addai	G. Phillips, <i>The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle</i> , London 1876
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
AltFor	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i>
af.	<i>af'el</i>
Agnon Vol	B. Kurzweil (ed.), יובל שי, מאמרים לכבוד ש"י עגנון (<i>Yuval Shai, A Jubilee Volume dedicated to S.Y. Agnon on occasion of his Seventieth Birthday</i>), Ramat Gan 1958
Agur	S. Buber (ed.), אגור כולל הקדמה וקצת הוספות על ספר הערוך מאת ה"ר שמואל ב"ר יעקב גמע ז"ל (<i>Einleitung und Ergänzungen zum Aruch von Rabbi Samuel ben Jacob G'ama</i>), Breslau 1868
AHw	W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> , 3 vols., Wiesbaden 1965–1981
Aḥ	Aḥiqar [OfA framework story and proverbs; cited according to TADC 1.1]

AhSy	Syriac version of Aḥiqar [cited according to F.C. Conybeare et al., <i>The Story of Aḥiqar</i> , Cambridge 1913]
AI	C. Bartholomae, <i>Altiranisches Wörterbuch</i> , Strassburg 1904 [cited by column]
AIOA	S. Kaufman, <i>The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic</i> , Chicago 1974
AIRJL	שנתון המשפט העברי (<i>Annual of the Institute for Research in Jewish Law</i>)
AIT	J.A. Montgomery, <i>Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur</i> , Philadelphia 1913
AJSLL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
Akk	Akkadian
Albeck	Ch. Albeck, מבוא לתלמודים (<i>Introduction to the Talmud, Babli and Yerushalmi</i>), Tel Aviv 1969
ALBH	P.V. Mankowski, <i>Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew</i> , Winona Lake 2000
Alf	R. Isaac Alfasi
Alon, Jews	G. Alon, <i>Jews, Judaism and the Classical World</i> , Jerusalem 1977
AM	E.S. Drower (ed.), <i>Aspar Malwāšia</i> , London 1949
AMB	J. Naveh & Sh. Shaked, <i>Amulets and Magic Bowls</i> , Jerusalem 1985
AMD1	T. Abusch & K. van der Toorn (eds.), <i>Mesopotamian Magic, Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives</i> (Ancient Magic and Divination, I), Groningen 1999
Anan	השריד והפליט מספרי המצות הראשונים לבני מקרא (<i>Anan's Books of Commandments</i>), in A. Harkavy, <i>Aus der ältesten Karäischen Gesetzbüchern</i> (Studien und Mitteilungen aus der Kaiserlichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek, VIII.1), St. Petersburg 1903 (Sources III)
AnanEps	Fragments of <i>Anan</i> published in J.N. Epstein, <i>Tarbiz</i> 7 (1936) 289–290 (= ST1 644–651; Sources III)
AnanMann	Fragments of <i>Anan</i> published in J. Mann, <i>Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy</i> , 1 (1919) 329–353 (Sources III)
AnanSch	Fragments of <i>Anan</i> published in S. Schechter, <i>Documents of Jewish Sectararies</i> , 2, Cambridge 1910 (Sources III)
AnanSok	Fragments of <i>Anan</i> published in M.N. Sokolova, <i>Izvestia akademii Nauk SSSR</i> , 1928, 243–254 (Sources III)
ANES	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i> (formerly <i>Abr Nahrain</i>)
AOFCI	I. Eph'al & J. Naveh, <i>Aramaic Ostraca of the Fourth Century B.C. from Idumaea</i> , Jerusalem 1996
app.	apparently
appos.	apposition
Ar	<i>Aruch</i> (הערוך; v. AC)
Ara	' <i>Arakhin</i> (ערכין; Sources I)

Arab	Arabic
Archive	ערכי המילון החדש לספרות חז"ל (<i>Archive of the New Dictionary of Rabbinical Literature</i>), Ramat Gan 1972+ →
Armen	Armenian
ARN	S. Schechter (ed.), מסכת אבות דרבי נתן (<i>Aboth de Rabbi Nathan</i>), Vienna 1887 [A = א נוסחא; B = ב נוסחא]
ArOr	<i>Archiv Orientalni</i>
As	Ms. from Aras
AS	<i>Alei Sepher</i> (עלי ספר)
Asaf	ספר אסף הרופא (The Book of Asaf, the Physician), ed. S. Muntner, <i>Qorot</i> , 3 (1965)–6 (1972) [cited by paragraph number]
Assaf, Tequfat	S. Assaf, תקופת הגאונים וספרותה (The Geonic Period and its Literature), Jerusalem 1955
astron.	astronomical
ATŠ	E.S. Drower (ed.), <i>The Thousand and Twelve Questions (Alf Trisar Šuialia)</i> Berlin 1960
ATTM	K. Beyer, <i>Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer</i> , Göttingen 1984
ATTME	Idem, <i>Ergänzungsband</i> , Göttingen 1994
Audo	T. Audo, סנהדרין הלוצא סהודא (<i>Treasure of the Syriac Language</i>), 2 vols., Losser–Holland 1985 [Reprint]
Av	Avestan
Avishur, Elements	Y. Avishur, העברית שבערבית היהודית (<i>Hebrew Elements in Judaeo-Arabic</i>), Tel Aviv–Jaffa 2001
AZ	' <i>Avoda Zara</i> (עבודה זרה; Sources I)
Azar, Syntax	M. Azar, תחביר לשון המשנה (<i>The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew</i>), Jerusalem 1995
b.	son/daughter of
BA	Biblical Aramaic
Bacher, SH	W. Bacher (ed.), ספר השרשים (<i>Sepher Haschoraschim, Würzelwörterbuch der hebräischen Sprache von Abulwalid Ibn G'anah</i> (R. Jona), aus dem Arabischen in's Hebräische übersetzt von Jehuda ibn Tibbon, Berlin 1896
Bacher, Term	W. Bacher, <i>Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur</i> , 2 vols., Leipzig 1899–1905
BAlI	Isho bar Ali, <i>Syrisch-Arabische Glossen</i> (א-ב), ed. G. Hoffmann, Kiel 1874; <i>The Syriac-Arabic Glosses</i> (ג-ד), ed. R.J.H. Gottheil, Rome 1908–1928
Barth, Pron	J. Barth, <i>Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen</i> , Leipzig 1913
BAš	<i>Beiträge zur Assyriologie</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>