

Book Review

Three Commentaries on the Yerushalmi

תלמוד ירושלמי עם פירוש תולדות יצחק ועם פירוש תבונה אשר בירר וליבן
ופירש והגיה והאיר וחידש יצחק אייזיק ב"ר דובער זלה"ה קראסילשציקאוו,
בני-ברק: תש"מ.

תלמוד ירושלמי עם ביאור מסודר מפי השמועה משעורי מורנו רבי חיים
קניבסקי שליט"א, בני ברק: תשנ"ז.

תלמוד ירושלמי עם פירוש ידיד נפש מתורגם ומבואר בתוספת עיונים והשוואות
לתלמוד הבבלי עם פסקי הלכות מהרמב"ם ומהשו"ע יחיאל אברהם ב"ר בנימין
הלוי בר לב, פתח-תקוה: תש"ס.

Reviewed by: HESHEY ZELCER

Three new Hebrew commentaries on *Talmud Yerushalmi* have recently been published in the State of Israel.

The first commentary, the *Toledot Yizhak*, was written in Moscow by R. Yizhak Isaac Krasilschikov in the 1950s and early 1960s, and covers Orders *Zera'im* and *Mo'ed*. To date, the entire *Zera'im* has been published in ten volumes. The effort to publish additional tractates continues, and at least one new tractate on Order *Mo'ed* is currently available in Israel but not yet in the United States. R. Yizhak Isaac Krasilschikov also wrote another commentary, *Tevnah*, but this review focuses only on his primary commentary, the *Toledot Yizhak*.

The second commentary being reviewed was written by R. Zelig Leib Braverman based on the *Yerushalmi* lectures of his father-in-law, R. Hayyim Kanievsky. To date, the entire *Zera'im* and *Mo'ed*

Heshey Zelcer, a businessman, is the author of *Companion Mishnayot, Tractate Niddah* (1994) and *A Guide to the Jerusalem Talmud* (2002).

are available in seven volumes. We hope that, over time, the commentary will be available on the entire *Yerushalmi*.

The third commentary, *Yedid Nefesh*, by R. Yechezkel Avraham Bar Lev, covers the entire *Yerushalmi* and is available in fourteen volumes. A subset of the commentary is also available on the Internet at www.yedidnefesh.com.

The *Yerushalmi*

The *Talmud Yerushalmi*¹ was compiled in the Academy of R. Yoḥanan in the Land of Israel, ca. 220–375. Like its counterpart, the *Bavli*, it is a comprehensive commentary on the *Mishnah* that is also rich in *aggadah*, non-legal material. It was written in a mixture of languages including *Mishnaic* Hebrew, Western Aramaic (*leshon sursit*), some Greek, and a touch of Latin.

After the completion of the two Talmuds, and for many years thereafter, each was authoritative in its own sphere—the *Yerushalmi* in Palestine, and the *Bavli* in Babylonia. In ca. 1038, however, due to the influence of R. Yizḥak b. Ya‘akov Alfasi (the Rif), the supremacy of the Babylonian Talmud was established.²

The *Yerushalmi* text that we have contains many corrupt passages. When a new *Yerushalmi* manuscript was written, errors crept in; and since very few people were learning the *Yerushalmi*, there was no one to correct them. As each subsequent manuscript was copied from the previous one, old errors were copied and new ones were added. This is the main problem with our current text of the *Yerushalmi*. Correcting these errors is very difficult and sometimes impossible, as our printed text of the *Yerushalmi* is based on the Leiden Manuscript,³ the only extant complete manuscript of the *Yerushalmi*. There are, however, various partial manuscripts that can help us reconstruct some corrupted texts.

Despite these problems, the serious student will quickly realize that it is easier to learn the *Yerushalmi* than the *Bavli*. Topics in the *Yerushalmi* are generally much shorter and less complicated.

The Importance of the *Yerushalmi*

Except for *Talmud Bavli*, the *Yerushalmi* is our most important post-*Tannaic* source for determining *halakhab*.⁴ When a *halakbic* ruling is absent, in dispute, or unclear in the *Bavli*, and it is available in the

Yerushalmi, *poskim* generally rely on the *Yerushalmi* to determine the proper ruling.

In addition, the *Yerushalmi* contains a wealth of information about our religion, our culture, and why we do what we do. For example: What is the purpose of the *Berachah Me'ein Sheva* that we recite Friday night after the *Amidah*?⁵ Why are the Ten Commandments not recited daily?⁶ Why does *Krovez li-Purim* contain no insert in the *Amidah* for the blessing of *Et Zemah*?⁷

Studying the *Yerushalmi*

How does one go about studying the *Yerushalmi*? The obvious starting point is the classic Vilna edition, which includes many of the well-known commentaries such as the *Penei Moshe* and *Mar'eh ha-Panim* by R. Moshe Margoliot, *Perush Miba'al Sefer Haredim* by R. Eleazar Azkari, the *Korban ha-Edah* and *Shirei Korban* by R. David Fraenkel, and many others. This edition also contains variant readings from *Yerushalmi* fragments,⁸ the Vatican⁹ and other manuscripts, and of lesser importance, variant readings from other prior printed editions.

Also included toward the back of Order *Zera'im* of the Vilna edition is the commentary of R. Solomon Sirillio for Tractates *Berakhot* and *Pe'ab*, and what is perhaps even more important, the *Yerushalmi* manuscript of R. Solomon Sirillio for the same tractates.

With so many commentaries and variant readings, why does the *Yerushalmi* still feel like a mysterious, esoteric work? The purpose of this review is not to critique the commentaries included in the Vilna edition. They are, as a whole, a fine set of commentaries. They do, however, suffer from a major drawback, which is that the authors of the commentaries published in the Vilna edition did not have access to those same variant readings published therein.

The text of the *Yerushalmi* published in the Vilna edition follows the *editio princeps*, the first printed edition by Daniel Bromberg in Venice (1522–23), which, in turn, is based on the Leiden Manuscript of R. Yehiel Anò of Rome (1289). The text of the Leiden Manuscript has quite a few errors, and many of the commentators in the Vilna edition had no choice but to struggle with this single *Yerushalmi* text.

Fortunately, today we have access to many partial manuscripts which often shed light on obscure and corrupt passages.

The first manuscript to which one should turn is the Vatican Manuscript. This manuscript is very corrupt and there is hardly a line without an error. The copyist who wrote the Vatican Manuscript had absolutely no knowledge of the text he was copying. He therefore made many obvious errors. For example, the letters כו are sometimes copied as מ. A ה is copied as a פ, and a כ as a כ, etc. These errors are easy to discern and interpret. But the weakness of this manuscript is also its greatest strength. The copyist never dared make any “corrections” to the text since he had no knowledge of it. He thus preserved, to a large extent, the integrity of the text of the manuscript from which he copied.

Another manuscript that sheds light on many corrupt passages is that of R. Solomon Sirillio, which survives in two manuscript versions known as MS. Paris 1389 (his earlier manuscript) and MS. London 403–405 (his later manuscript). These manuscripts contain many variant readings, some of which are found in the *Rishonim*. When reading these manuscripts, however, it is important to differentiate between variant texts that R. Sirillio copied from an older manuscript (which are more valuable), versus changes he made to the text himself.¹⁰

When studying the *Yerushalmi*, it is important to look up parallel *Tannaic* sources found, for example, in the *Tosefta* and *Bereshit Rabbah*. This helps the reader understand where the *Tannaic* quote ends and where the *Yerushalmi* commentary begins. Also, these parallel sources often contain variant readings that amplify and clarify the topic at hand.

To check the meaning of a word in the *Yerushalmi*, the reader is advised to acquire a good dictionary that contains definitions of Palestinian Aramaic words. Jastrow’s classic *ספר מלים* is an excellent choice, as is Sokoloff’s *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1990).

You may also want to acquire *סינופסיס לתלמוד הירושלמי* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991). This multi-volume work displays the texts of many *Yerushalmi* manuscripts and printed editions arranged side-by-side for easy cross reference. These volumes, however, are very pricey, but are available in many research libraries.

In summary, the classic printed Vilna edition suffers from many shortcomings: 1. The commentators do not make use of the variant readings to help establish the correct text. 2. The uninitiated reader is overwhelmed by the sheer volume of commentaries. 3. The

print quality is very poor, as the volumes sold today are an offset of an offset, etc. 4. Most of the commentators assume that the reader already has a great deal of knowledge of the language of the *Yerushalmi* and of the topic at hand. 5. The commentators sometimes try too hard to reconcile the rulings of the *Yerushalmi* with those of the *Bavli*.

Do any of the three commentaries we are reviewing resolve all or any of these problems? Let us examine them.

R. Krasilschikov

R. Yizḥak Isaac b. Dov Ber Krasilschikov (1888–1965), also known as the *Gaon* of Poltava, wrote a dual commentary on the *Yerushalmi*, in Moscow, during the years 1952–1965.

Before World War II, R. Krasilschikov learned under R. Eliyahu Barukh Kamai, the *rosh yeshivah* of Mir. In 1926, in Poltava, he published *Tevunah*, the first volume of his commentary on the *Rambam*. This was the last Jewish religious work published in Communist Russia.

His commentaries on the *Yerushalmi* were written in secrecy due to fear of, and oppression by, the Communist regime, which had outlawed the study of Torah. Violators of this ban were subject to severe punishment and exile to Siberia. The work of R. Krasilschikov was done without the benefit of any formal academy, and with very few reference works.

On May 12, 1965, R. Yehudah Leib Levin, the chief Rabbi of Moscow, asked R. Harry Bronstein of the Al Tidom Association to accompany him to visit R. Krasilschikov, who was gravely ill. At that meeting, R. Krasilschikov confided that he had written a dual commentary on the *Yerushalmi* that will make it easier for those who wish to study the Jerusalem Talmud. The twenty-volume manuscript was, at that time, hidden in his daughters' houses. On the following day, May 13, 1965, R. Krasilschikov passed away.

R. Bronstein made many attempts to smuggle the manuscript out of Russia. However, on June 5, 1967, he was arrested at the airport in Kiev, declared *persona non grata*, deported from the country, and forbidden to ever again enter any Soviet-controlled state. He then continued his efforts to smuggle the manuscript out through intermediaries.

During his first attempt to smuggle the manuscript out of the country, all twenty volumes were microfilmed and brought to the American Embassy in Moscow, from where they were to be taken out of the country via diplomatic pouch. However, on the night before they were to be flown out, a fire broke out on the eighth floor of the American Embassy and the microfilm was destroyed.

Finally, the first of the twenty volumes was successfully smuggled out of Russia by R. Ya'akov Pollack, the Rabbi of Congregation *Shomrei Emunah* of Borough Park, in Brooklyn, New York.

In 1980, the *Mutzal Me'esh* Institute published, in Bnai Brak, the first volume of R. Krasilschikov's commentary, tractate *Berakhot*. This and subsequent volumes were edited by a team of scholars headed up by R. Dov Weintraub, who also consulted with R. Hayyim Kanievsky.

R. Krasilschikov's Commentary

After struggling with the poor quality of the standard Vilna edition of the *Yerushalmi*, the reader quickly appreciates the beautiful and new typesetting and layout of the *Toledot Yizhak Yerushalmi* (fig. 1). The text of the *Yerushalmi* is in the middle of the page, the *Toledot Yizhak* (a *Rasbi*-type explanation) is in the inner margin, and the *Tevunah* (a *Tosefot*-type commentary) is in the outer margin. On the extreme outer margin are references to *halakhic* works of the *Rambam* and the *Shulhan Arukh*. There are also cross references to parallel passages in other areas of the *Yerushalmi*, *Bavli*, and the *Tosefta*, and to variant readings in other manuscripts, *Yerushalmi* fragments, and other printed editions. On the bottom of each page is another commentary, which for *Berakhot* is that of the *Sefer Haredim*, and for other tractates in *Zera'im* is that of the *Gr"a*. At the end of the volume (or, in the case of *Berakhot*, in a separate volume) are all the standard commentaries of the Vilna edition—all freshly typeset and corrected. It is a joy to use these volumes. While the *Toledot Yizhak* and *Tevunah* commentaries were, of course, written by R. Krasilschikov, the editing and everything else that appears in this edition of the *Yerushalmi* was prepared by the group of scholars headed up by R. Dov Weintraub.

The entire Order *Zera'im* has been published in ten volumes, in two sizes (9 ½ x 13 ½ and 6 ½ x 9 ½), but only the smaller size is currently available in bookstores. The entire Order *Mo'ed* exists in manuscript form, and its earlier tractates are now in the process of being printed.

R. Krasilschikov lived in Russia, completely isolated from Torah scholarship. It is therefore not surprising that he was unaware of many facts that are now common knowledge to scholars of the *Yerushalmi*. Although variant readings from other manuscripts could have helped him come to different, and perhaps better, understanding of various statements in the *Yerushalmi*, he apparently chose not to make use of them. He was probably unaware of the *Genizah* fragments that were discovered in Fostat, and the two pages of the Rambam's *Hilkhot ha-Yerushalmi* that were also discovered in the *Genizah*. This, however, did not prevent the *Toledot Yizhak* from changing certain phrases of the *Yerushalmi* as he saw fit. However, although the *Toledot Yizhak* may not have been aware of all the variant readings, the editors of his work were well aware of them and did an excellent job of documenting these readings on the extreme outer margin of the pages.

R. Krasilschikov was also apparently unaware that, despite its name, the *Yerushalmi* was compiled in the northern part of the Land of Israel,¹¹ mostly in Tiberias and partially in Caesarea, but not in Jerusalem.¹² What is more surprising, however, is that the editors of the *Toledot Yizhak* fail to note this error, even while they frequently object to other statements of the author.¹³

R. Ḥayyim Kanievsky

During the year following the death of R. Ya'akov Kanievsky, the Steipler *Gaon*, his son R. Ḥayyim Kanievsky gave a daily lecture on the *Yerushalmi*, Order *Zera'im*. These lectures were recorded by his son-in-law, R. Zelig Leib Braverman, and are the basis for this commentary. R. Ḥayyim Kanievsky lives in Bnai Brak and is a revered leader of the *haredi* community in Israel.

R. Kanievsky's Commentary

R. Hayyim Kanievsky writes, in his introduction to the first volume, that the lectures he gave were based on all the commentaries printed in the standard [Vilna] edition of the *Yerushalmi*, and that he also used many other sources from *Rishonim* and *Abronim*. He notes, also, that his son-in-law, R. Braverman, added some of his own interpretations to the commentary.

R. Hayyim Kanievsky adds that his intent was not to establish *halakhab*, but, rather, to explain the *Yerushalmi*. He gives his qualified blessing for the printed edition, but notes that although he reviewed the entire work, he did not necessarily check everything thoroughly and that he cannot take full responsibility for the commentary.

R. Braverman writes in his introduction that R. H. Kanievsky studied all the commentaries on the *Yerushalmi* and analyzed the variant texts to pave a smooth road for those who would learn from his commentary; to help them easily understand the *Gemara*. When the commentators did not explain the topic adequately, R. H. Kanievsky added his own explanation. He also explained certain passages of the *Gemara* based on the works—some published, and others still in manuscript form—of his father, the Steipler *Gaon*.

The actual layout of this commentary has the text of the *Yerushalmi* on the top of the page, and the explanation on the bottom. Immediately below the text of the *Yerushalmi* are minor comments and revisions to the text of the *Yerushalmi* (fig. 2). The explanation does not attempt to translate every phrase of the *Yerushalmi*; a certain amount of knowledge on the part of the reader is assumed. Insights to difficult *Gemaras* are sometimes brilliant, but phrases which are not familiar to the average person learning the *Yerushalmi* are often ignored. For example, what does the *Gemara* mean by the word *roke'a* or the phrase *emza ha-roke'a* (p. 15)?

R. Yechiel Avraham Bar Lev

R. Bar Lev was born in Tel Aviv in 1943. He attended Ponevezher Yeshivah for four years, and in 1972 he received *semikhab* from R. Ovadia Yosef. In 1976, after receiving his doctorate in educational psychology from the University of Arizona, he returned to Israel. In addition to his commentary on the *Yerushalmi*, R. Bar Lev has also

published numerous books on *Kabbalah*, the *Zohar*, and other subjects. In the introduction to his commentary on the *Yerushalmi*, R. Bar Lev writes that his books have found acceptance in both the *haredi kollelim* and the Zionist *yeshivot*, and that they are being used throughout the world.

R. Bar Lev's Commentary

R. Bar Lev's commentary *Yedid Nefesh*, written over a period of three years,¹⁴ is printed in two columns, with the words of the *Yerushalmi* in bold followed by his own explanation. On the bottom of each page are the *halakhot* of the *Rambam* and the *Shulhan Arukh* as they apply to the issues discussed on that page of the *Gemara* (fig. 3.) On the facing page he includes the corresponding page from the Vilna *Yerushalmi*.¹⁵ Selected tractates of his commentary are also available on-line at yedidnefesh.com.¹⁶

How the three commentaries address some difficult *Gemara* statements:

Let us examine how the different commentaries handle some difficult passages in Tractate *Berakhot*. We will start with *Yerushalmi, Berakhot* 1:1, 2b/26.¹⁷

רבי אומר הלבנה בתקופתה התחיל גלגל חמה לשקע ותחילת
גלגל לבנה לעלות זהו בין השמשות. אמר רבי חנינא סוף גלגל
חמה לשקע ותחילת גלגל לבנה לעלות.

R. [Yehudah ha-Nasi] says: When the moon is full, twilight begins when the sun begins to set and the moon begins to rise. R. Ḥanina says: Twilight begins when the sun is fully set and the moon begins to rise.

There are two difficulties with the above statements. The first is that R. Yehudah ha-Nasi seems to be saying that the period of twilight begins when the bottom of the sun is touching the horizon. It is unlikely, however, that R. Yehudah ha-Nasi meant to say this. There is no authority in the Talmud who says that twilight begins while the sun is totally above the horizon. The second problem is that even in the middle of the lunar month the sun and the moon do

not set and rise, respectively, at the same time. This can easily be verified by the layman, for example by checking the times of sunset and moonrise on the weather page of the *New York Times*. What, then, is R. Yehudah ha-Nasi saying?

R. Krasilschikov addresses the first question posed above. He says that R. Ḥanina is not arguing with R. Yehudah ha-Nasi, but, rather, that R. Ḥanina is saying that the statement of R. Yehudah ha-Nasi was corrupted and that R. Ḥanina is correcting it. R. Krasilschikov does not address the fact that even in the middle of the lunar month the sun and moon do not set and rise, respectively, at the same time.

R. Kanievsky, too, deals with the first question and answers similarly that R. Ḥanina is correcting the wording of the *beraita* and that R. Yehudah ha-Nasi is actually saying that twilight begins when the sun is totally below the horizon. R. Kanievsky, however, also fails to address the fact that the setting of the sun and the rising of the moon, even in the middle of the month, do not occur simultaneously. He does, however, write about the pattern of the rising of the moon as follows: “The new moon appears while it is still light and it remains in the sky for only a short while. The moon remains a bit longer each subsequent night until the middle of the month, when it rises at the beginning of the night, shines all night, and sets in the morning. Toward the end of the month, the moon does not appear until a bit before daybreak. Therefore [our *Gemara*] says that in the middle of the month, the moon rises at the beginning of the night at the time of twilight.”

R. Bar Lev addresses neither of the above difficulties. He says simply that in the middle of the lunar month the moon rises at sunset. He also says that R. Ḥanina argues with R. Yehudah ha-Nasi.

R. Bar Lev’s interpretation is troubling. It seems unusual that R. Yehudah ha-Nasi, the editor of the *Mishnah*, would say that twilight begins when the bottom of the sun is on the surface of the horizon (although in fact the *Yereim* is of the opinion that twilight starts approximately eighteen minutes before sunset). Furthermore, is it possible that R. Yehudah ha-Nasi, the most illustrious *Nasi*, who was responsible for declaring the new moon, was not aware that even in the middle of the lunar month the moon does not rise precisely when the sun sets?¹⁸

Berakhot 1:1, 2c/29 and 2c/43.

אמר רבי חזנא מאיילת השחר עד שיאור המזרח אדם מהלך
ארבעת מילין משיאור המזרח עד שתנץ החמה ארבעת מיל.

R. Ḥazna said: From *ayelet ha-shahar*¹⁹ until the eastern horizon is lit,²⁰ a person could walk four *mi*²¹ (i.e., seventy-two minutes).²² From when the eastern horizon is lit until the sun [begins to] rise, [a person could walk] four *mil* (i.e., seventy-two minutes).

ואתאי דרבי חייא כרבי יודה. דתני בשם רבי יודה עוביו של
רקיע מהלך חמשים שנה. אדם בינוני מהלך ארבעים מיל ביום.
עד שהחמה נוסרת ברקיע מהלך חמשים שנה אדם מהלך ארבעת
מיל. נמצאת אומר שעוביו של רקיע אחד מעשרה ביום.

It turns out that R. Ḥiyya's view is in accordance with that of R. Yudah, for we learned, in the name of R. Yudah, that the thickness of the *roke'a*²³ is a walking distance of fifty years. An average person can walk forty *mil* in a day. It would take a person fifty years to walk the distance through which the sun passes the *roke'a*. During the time the sun passes through the *roke'a*, a person [here on earth] could walk four *mil*. This proves that the width of the *roke'a* is one tenth of a day.

The name Ḥazna, as it appears in our statement above, is very unusual. Checking the name Ḥazna in R. Kosovsky's concordance²⁴ on the *Yerushalmi* shows that this is the only spot in the entire *Yerushalmi* that references the name R. Ḥazna. A parallel *Gemara* in *Yerushalmi Yoma* 3:2, 40b/29 shows the name as Ḥanina. *Beresbit Rabbah* 50 shows the same statement with the name R. Ḥanina. The Leiden Manuscript and the Vatican Manuscript also show the name as R. Ḥanina. It is also easy to imagine how a ך and a ך near each other as ךי could be mistaken for a ך. It is therefore probable that the correct reading is חנינא.

In the second statement above, the Vatican Manuscript reads R. Ḥanina instead of R. Ḥiyya. This is definitely a much better reading, because in the second statement the *Gemara* is making the point that the view of R. Ḥiyya (read, R. Ḥanina) is consistent with

the view of R. Yudah. Both of the above statements are indeed consistent. In the first statement, the *Gemara* says that in the period from *ayelet ha-shahar* until *ya'ir ha-mizrah*, a person can walk four *mil*—which was known to be one-tenth of a day (seventy-two minutes), and that from then until sunrise a person could also walk four *mil*. The second statement states that over a day (a twelve-hour period, which is 720 minutes), a person could walk forty *mil*. The two statements are thus consistent. In 72 minutes a person walks four *mil*, and in 720 minutes a person walks forty *mil*.

With all of the above in mind, it would make the most sense to say that the author of both statements is R. Ḥanina. How do our three commentaries compare to this analysis?

R. Krasilschikov, in the first statement above, emends R. Ḥazna to read R. Ḥanina. In the second statement he is silent and makes no change.

R. Kanievsky, in the first statement, leaves the name as Ḥazna, and in the second statement he changes R. Ḥiyya to R. Ḥazna. In other words, he recognizes that the *Gemara* is equating the two statements, but instead of correcting the names of both to R. Ḥanina, he leaves the erroneous name R. Ḥazna in the first statement, and he substitutes one error for another when, in the second statement, he changes R. Ḥiyya to R. Ḥazna.

R. Bar Lev seems oblivious to all of the above issues. He leaves R. Ḥazna in the first statement and leaves R. Ḥiyya in the second statement. He misses the point the *Gemara* is making by equating the two statements, and he misses the errors in the names R. Ḥazna and R. Ḥiyya.

Berakhot 1:1, 2c/52

תני עץ חיים אחד מששים לגן. וגן אחד מששים לעדן. (בראשית ב) ונהר יוצא מעדן להשקות את הגן. תמצית כור תרקב שותה. תמצית כוש מצרים שותה. נמצאת אומר מצרים מהלך ארבעים יום וכוש מהלך שבע שנים ועוד.

We learned, the tree of life is one-sixtieth the size of the Garden, and the Garden is one-sixtieth of Eden. It also says (*Bereshit* 2:10): *A river issued from Eden to water the garden.* After watering land that needs a *kor*²⁵ of water, you still have three *kan*²⁶ of water left. Therefore if it takes a person

forty days to walk across Egypt, it would take a person seven years and more to walk across Kush.

If it takes forty days to walk across Egypt, it would take 2,400 (40 x 60) days to walk across Kush, which is sixty times the size of Egypt. 2,400 divided by 365 days equals 6 years and 210 days. The Gr'a therefore says that the reading of our *Gemara*, **שבע שנים ועוד**, should actually read **שבע שנים**, implying that it takes approximately seven years to walk across Kush. R. Shlomo Goren says: If you divide 2,400 by 354 days (the number of days in a lunar year), you come up with 6, remainder 276. He therefore says that **ועוד** should read **ועור**, and that the ו denotes six years and that the numerical value of **עור** indicates 276 days. What probably happened is that the *Yerushalmi* originally stated **שבע שנים**. A person who was reading the manuscript put a note on the margin indicating that it is not exactly seven years but rather 6 years and 276 days. Someone who later copied the manuscript did not understand the comment but he nevertheless inserted it erroneously into the text of the *Yerushalmi*.²⁷

R. Krasilschikov follows the explanation of the *Sefer Haredim* which does the arithmetic and says the correct version should be **שש שנים ועוד**, six years plus.

R. Kanievsky does not do the arithmetic and just repeats the phrase of the *Gemara* that it is seven years plus.

R. Bar Lev says that according to his calculations, it should be a bit less than seven years.

Berakhot 3:5, 6d/31

רבי *זעורא רבי יעקב בר זבדי הוו יתבין חמין ציאתה. קם רבי יעקב בר זבדי רקק עלה. אמר ליה רבי זעורא מן ימא לטיגנא.

(*זעורא ובכ"ר ובכ"ס ובד"ק זעירא)

R. Ze'eira and R. Ya'akov b. Zavdi were sitting when they noticed some excrement [near them]. R. Ya'akov b. Zavdi got up and spit upon it whereupon R. Ze'eira said: [The spitting helps only for a short time, as] from *yamma* to *tigna*.

The phrase *min yamma li-tigna* is mentioned in *Yerushalmi Gittin* 6:2, 48a/21, in *Yerushalmi Kiddushin* 2:1, 62b/12, and also in *Bavli*

Kiddushin 44a. Rashi in *Kiddushin* explains that it refers to the amount of time from when a fish is pulled out of the water until it is put into the frying pan. *Tosefot*, however, quotes *Rabbeinu Ḥananel*, who says that it refers to two cities that are near each other. I, personally, prefer Rashi's interpretation.

R. Krasilschikov follows *Rabbeinu Ḥananel*'s explanation and says it refers to two cities that are near each other, and that the *Gemara* implies that the effect of the spitting will not last long.

R. Kanievsky follows Rashi's explanation that it refers to a very short time span, from when a fish is pulled out of the sea until it is put into a frying pan.

R. Bar Lev explains as follows: "He [R. Ze'eira] is saying that the saliva does not help because in a short while the saliva will evaporate and the excrement will be uncovered. And he [R. Ze'eira] is saying that just as the distance from *Yamma* to *Tigna* is short, so, too, the saliva will evaporate quickly." R. Bar Lev definitely explained our *Gemara* correctly and perhaps he is implying, like R. Ḥananel, that *Yama* and *Tigna* are two cities—but he does not say so explicitly. Sometimes, when a Hebrew/Aramaic paragraph is translated into Hebrew and a word or two is unclear, it is easiest to just repeat the same words in the Hebrew translation. It is easy—but it leaves the reader in the dark.

Berakhot 6:1 10a/37

רבי יעקב בא אחא אמר איתפלגון רב *נחמן ורבנן. ר' *נחמן אמר המוציא לחם מן הארץ. ורבנן אמרי מוציא לחם מן הארץ. אתיא אילין פלוגותא כאינון פלוגותא. לפת רבי חיננא בר יצחק ורבי שמואל בר אימי. חד אמר לפת לא פת היתה. וחרנה אמר לפת לא פת היא עתידה להיות (תהלים עב) יהי פיסת בר בארץ בראש הרים.

(*נחמן ובכ"ר נחמיה)

R. Ya'akov b. Aha says: R. Nehemiah and the Sages disagree [with each other]. R. Nehemiah says: [Before eating bread] he recites, *Who brings forth bread from the earth*. The Sages say, however, that he says, *brings forth bread from the earth*. The end result is that the above argument is based on the same reasoning as the following argument. R.

Hinana b. Yizhak and R. Shmuel b. Immi (Ammi)[disagree over the implication of the word for vegetables, *lefet*]. One says *lefet* implies, 'Was not bread just like it?' The other says *lefet* implies, 'Will not bread be just like it?' [In Psalms 72:16 it states:] *Let abundant grain be in the land, to the tops of the mountains.*

The ambiguity of the above *Gemara* revolves around the words **המוציא** and **מוציא**. One implies the past and the other implies the future. To properly understand our *Gemara*, it is necessary to refer to a parallel passage in *Beresbit Rabbah* 15:7 which states: **רבי נחמיה אמר** **המוציא לחם מן הארץ שכבר הוציא לחם מן הארץ**. *R. Nehemiah says the correct reading is המוציא—that Hashem already extracted bread from the earth.* **ורבנן אמרי מוציא לחם מן הארץ שהוא עתיד להוציא לחם מן הארץ**. *The Sages say that the correct reading is מוציא, which implies that Hashem will—in the future—take out bread from the earth.*

Before the sin in the Garden of Eden there was no need to process grain, since bread itself grew directly from the earth. This is consistent with the view of R. Nehemiah, who says that the blessing should contain the word **המוציא**, which implies that Hashem, in the past, took out bread from the earth.

Psalms 72:16, however, is saying that in the future, there will be an abundance of grain that will reach the top of the mountain, and that, literally, 'bread will arise from the ground at the top of the mountains.' This is consistent with the view of the Sages who say that the correct word is **מוציא**, which implies that Hashem will cause bread, in the future, to come out of the earth.

R. Krasilschikov reinterprets our *Gemara* to be consistent with *Bavli Berakbot* 38a: Both R. Nehemiah and the Sages hold that the word **מוציא** implies only the past. R. Nehemiah, however, is unsure whether the blessing should contain the word **מוציא** or **המוציא**. R. Krasilschikov then goes on to say that in *Bavli*, R. Nehemiah holds that it is better to say **מוציא** which implies only the past and is consistent with all other blessings. Here in the *Yerushalmi*, however, R. Nehemiah holds that it is better to say **המוציא**, even though it also implies the future, so that the letter **מ** at the end of **העולם** does not get 'swallowed' into the letter **מ** of **מוציא**. The Sages say, however, that either **מוציא** or **המוציא** may be said because they both imply the past.

R. Krasilschikov forces the meaning of our *Gemara* and ignores the wording of *Beresbit Rabbah* 15:7.

R. Kanievsky explains that [R. Naḥman] holds that the proper word is **המוציא** because it implies the future. The [Sages] hold that the proper word is **מוציא** is because it implies the past. R. Kanievsky's explanation is contrary to *Beresbit Rabbah* 15:7.

R. Bar Lev explains that R. Naḥman holds that the proper word is **המוציא**, which implies the past, and the Sages hold that one should say **מוציא** because **מוציא** implies the past. The first part of R. Bar Lev's interpretation matches the *Midrash Rabbah*. The second part does not.

Summary


R. Krasilschikov's commentary is elaborate, clear, and to the point. He is very honest and questions those *Gemaras* that seem illogical, even if he is not always able to provide a convincing solution. If someone is new to the *Yerushalmi* and will be purchasing only one set, then this is definitely the one to buy. The only shortcoming of this commentary is that the author had no access to some manuscripts and chose to ignore references to others. This shortcoming is partially rectified by the editors who note variant readings in the outer margins of each page.

R. Kanievsky's commentary is good and occasionally brilliant,²⁸ but it suffers from two shortcomings. One is that it is too concise, and he sometimes assumes that the reader already has a lot of knowledge about the *Yerushalmi*. Someone who never learned the *Yerushalmi* will come across many phrases that will seem puzzling and which will not be addressed in his commentary. The other shortcoming is that he, too, does not make adequate use of other manuscripts and fragments that have been discovered in the past century. When he does note variant readings, it is more likely a reading found in the *Rishonim* or one that was emended by the Gr"a. He also occasionally notes variant readings in the Amsterdam edition.

The Bar Lev edition, although it is the only one of the three to cover the entire *Yerushalmi*, is the weakest of all. Like the others, it does not take variant readings into account. Unlike the others, however, it does not even stop to ask the questions that should bother anyone trying to understand the *Yerushalmi*. It does, however,

discuss at the bottom of each page the actual *halakhab* pertaining to the issues discussed in the *Yerushalmi*. It also has the advantage of having selected tractates available on the Internet.²⁹

The defect that is common to all of the above commentaries is that they fail to take into account the modern scholarly research that has been done on the *Yerushalmi*³⁰ and variant readings in other manuscripts. Sometimes they even fail to take into account parallel texts in the *Tosefta* and *Midrash Rabbah*.

There are, however, superior commentaries on individual tractates. These include: For Tractate *Berakhot* (Chapters 1-5), R. Shlomo Goren (Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1961). For Tractate *Pe'ah*, R. Adin Steinsaltz (Jerusalem: The Israel Institute for Talmudic Publications, 1987). For Tractate *Shevi'it*, R. Yehuda Feliks (Jerusalem: Zur-Ot, 1980). The quality of any new commentary should be measured against these. 

מאימתי פרק ראשון ברכות ז

מאימתי קורין את שמע בערבין משעה שהכהנים נכנסין לוכל בתרומתן עד סוף האשמורת הראשונה דברי ר"א. וחכמים אומרים עד חצות. ר"ג אומר עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. מעשה ובאו בניו מבית המשתה ואמרו לו לא קרינו את שמע אמר להן אם לא עלה עמוד השחר חייבין אתם לקרות. ולא זו בלבד אמרו אלא כל שאמרו חכמים עד חצות מצותן עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. הקטר חלבים ואיברים מצותן עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. כל הנאכלין ליום אחד מצותן עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. אם כן למה אמרו חכמים עד חצות כדי להרחיק את האדם מן העבירה: גמ' און תנינן משעה שהכהנים נכנסין לוכל בתרומתן. תני רבי חייא משעה שדרך בני אדם נכנסין לאכול פיתן בלילי שבת. ותני עלה קרובים דבריהם להיות שוין. איתא חמי משעה שהכהנים נכנסין לוכל בתרומתן יממא הוא ועם כוכביא הוא משעה שדרך בני אדם נכנסין לאכול פתן בלילי שבת שעה ותרתילי ליליא הוא ואת אמרת קרובים דבריהן להיות שוין אמר רבי יוסי

ביאור

מתני'. מאימתי וכו'. תנא אקרא קאי דכתיב בשכבך ובקומך שחייב אדם לקרות שמע שחרית וערבית ומאימתי הוא זמן ק"ש של ערבית: משעה שהכהנים נכנסים לוכל בתרומתן. כהנים שנטמאו וטבלו שאינם אוכלים בתרומה עד שיעריב שמשן ומשאלו נכנסין לוכל בתרומה היינו עם צאת הכוכבים היא זמנה של ק"ש ערבית דמקמי הכי לאו זמן שכיבה היא, ועד אימת הוא הולך וקורא: עד סוף האשמורה הראשונה. שהלילה נחלק לג' משמרות ועד סוף האשמורה הראשונה דהיינו שליש הלילה הולך וקורא דס"ל לר"א דעד היא שעתא זמן שכיבה הוא שבג"א הולכין לשכב ומשעבר זמן זה תו לא קריגין ב"י ובשכבך: עד חצות. ס"ל דעד חצות אכתתי מקרי ובשכבך דאיכא מעוט שאין ישנים עד חצי הלילה: עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. פליג אר"א וחכמים דאיגהו מפרשי בשכבך כל זמן שבני אדם עסוקין בשכיבה פ"י שהולכין לשכב אבל ר"ג ס"ל דכל הלילה זמן שכיבה היא דאיהו מפ' ובשכבך כל זמן שבני אדם שוכבין על מטתם: כל שאמרו חכמים עד חצות. כגון נאכלין ליום א' דלקמי' זמנן עד

שיעלה עמוד השחר דכל שנוהג בלילה זמנו כל הלילה: הקטר חלבים ואיברים. של קרבנות שקרבנו ביום זמן הקטרתן כל הלילה שלאחריו אבל אם לא העלן למזבח עד עמוד השחר נפסלו בלינה כדכתיב לא ילין לבוקר: כל הנאכלין ליום א'. כגון הטאת ותודה שזמנן ביום הקרבנות ולילה שלאחריו נמי זמנן כל הלילה: א"כ למה אמרו חכמים עד חצות. בנאכלין ליום א': כדי להרחיק את האדם מן העבירה. שלא יבא לאכול אחר עמוד השחר ויתחייב כרת משום נותר, והקטר חלבים ואימורים דקתני הכא לא אמרו בו חכמים עד חצות כלל ולא נקט להו הכא אלא להודיע שכל דבר הנוהג בלילה כשר כל הלילה והכי נמי תנן פרק שני דמגילה כל הלילה כשר לקצירת העומר ולהקטיר חלבים ואיברים, רש"י.

גמ'. תני ר' חייא. שעור אחר לזמן ק"ש של ערבית ותני עלה שאין חלוק הרבה בזמן בין ב' השעורים אלא קרובין דבריהן להיות שוין. ופריך: יממא הוא ועם כוכביא. מכי סליק יומא ועם צאת הכוכבים מיד הגיע שעתן לאכול בתרומה: שעה ותרתילי ליליא הוא. שעה ותרתילי לאחר צאת

Fig. 2, R. Kanievsky

מתנני' מאימתי קורין את שמע בערבין? מתי מתחיל זמן ק"ש בערב? משעה שהכהנים נכנסין לוכל בתרומתן כהן שניטמא אסור לאכול תרומה עד שישביל ותשקע השמש. ומהזמן הזה מתחילים לקרות ק"ש בערב עד סוף האשמורת הראשונה עד סוף השלש הראשון של הלילה, שהלילה נחלק לשלש אשמורות דברי ר"א. והכמים אומרים, עד חצות זמן ק"ש עד חצות הלילה ר"ג אומר, עד שיעלה עמוד השחר כלומר, כל הלילה מעשה ובאו בניו מבית המשטה ואמרו לו לא קרינו את שמע. אמר להן, אם לא עלה עמוד השחר חייבין אתם לקרות. ולא זו בלבד לא רק בק"ש זמנה כל הלילה אלא כל

שאמרו חכמים עד חצות, מצותן מצווים או לעשות עד שיעלה עמוד השחר ומביא דוגמאות הקטר חלבים ואיברים של קרבנות מצותן עד שיעלה עמוד השחר, כל הקרבנות הנאכלים ליום אחד. מצותן מצוה לאכלם עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. אם כן למה אמרו חכמים עד חצות, כדי להרחיק את האדם מן העבירה. ג' אן תנין או למדנו במשנה שזמן קריאת ק"ש של ערבית משעה שהכהנים נכנסין לוכל בתרומתן. הני רבי היא למדנו זמן אחר משעה שדרך בני אדם נכנסין לאכול פיתן בלילי שבת. ותני עלה ואמר שם, אף שאין אלה זמנים שווים קרובים דבריהן להיות שוין.

מאימתי קורין את שמע בערבין? בבבלי מסכת ברכות דף ב ע"א. תנא היכא קאי דתני מאימתי ותו מאי שנא דתני בערבית ברישא לתני דשמורת ברישא תנא אקרא קאי דכתיב בשכבך ובקומך והכי קתני זמן קריאת שמע דשכיבה אימת משעה שהכהנים נכנסין לאכול בתרומתן ואי בעית אימא יליף מבריתו של עולם דכתיב ויהי ערב ויהי בקר יום אחד אי הכי סיפא דתני בשחר מברך שתיים לפניה ואחת לאחריה ובערב וברך שתיים לפניה ושתיים לאחריה לתני דערבית תנא פתח בערבית והדר תני בשחרית עד דקאי בשחרית פריש מילי דשמורת והדר פריש מילי דערבית. אמר מר משעה שהכהנים נכנסים לאכול בתרומתן מכדי כהנים אימת קא אכלי תרומה משעת צאת הכוכבים לתני משעת צאת הכוכבים מלחא אגב ארתיה קמשמע לן כהנים אימת קא אכלי בתרומה משעת צאת הכוכבים והא קמשמע לן דכפרה לא מעכבא כדתניא ובא השמש וסתר ביאת שמשו מעכבתו מלאכול בתרומה ואין כפרתו מעכבתו מלאכול בתרומה ומאי דהאי ובא השמש ביאת השמש והאי וסתר וסתר יומא דף ב ע"ב, דילמא ביאת אורו הוא ומאי וסתר סתר גברא אמר דבה בר רב שילא אם כן לימא קרא וסתר מאי וסתר סתר יומא כדאמרי אינשי איערב שמשא ואדכי יומא.

ובשולחן ערוך אורח חיים סימן רלה סעיף א: זמן קריאת שמע בלילה משעת יציאת שלשה כוכבים קטנים. ואם הוא יום מעונן ימתין עד שיצא הספק מלבו. ואם קראת קודם לכן, חזר וקרא אותה בלא ברכות, ואם הצבור מקדימים לקרות ק"ש מבעוד יום, קרא עמהם קריאת שמע וברכותיה ויתפלל עמהם. ובשנינינו זמן, קרא קריאת שמע בלא ברכות. הגה: וסיהו לא יתחד ויתפלל בלילה אע"פ שהצבור מקדימים הרבה לפני הלילה, אלא איכ הוא רגיל בשאר פרישות וחסידות דאז לא מתחזי כיוהרא מה שיתחד ויתפלל (מרדכי ריש ברכות והגהות מיימוני פ"ג מהלכות תפלה ותרומת הדשן ס"א).

ובסעיף ב: אסור להתחיל לאכול חצי שעה סמוך לזמן ק"ש של ערבית, ואם התחיל לאכול אחר שהגיע זמנה, מפסיק וקרא ק"ש בלא ברכותיה וגומר סודתו. ואח"כ קרא אותה בברכותיה ומתפלל. הגה: אבל אין צריך להפסיק לתפלה, המזיל להתחיל לאכול; אבל אם לא התחיל לאכול אע"פ שנטול ידיו, צריך להפסיק (ר"ן פ"ק דשבת), ואם אין שהות להתפלל, מפסיק אף לתפלה.

ובסעיף ג: לכתחלה צריך לקרות ק"ש מיד בצאת הכוכבים, חתנה עד חצי הלילה; ואם עבר ואיחר וקרא עד שלא עלה עמוד השחר, יצא ידי חובתו. ובסעיף ד: הקורא ק"ש של ערבית אחר שעלה עמוד השחר, קודם הניח החמה נפ"י יציאת החמה מענין הנצו הרמונים (ש"ר השו"ת ג, יא, ז, יג). לא יצא ידי חובתו אלא אם כן היה אנוס. כגון שכור או חולה וכיוצא בהן; ואנוס שקרא אז לא יאמר השכיבנו, דכיון שעלה עמוד השחר אינו זמן שכיבה. הגה: אבל שאר הברכות, דהיינו שנים שלפני ק"ש וברכת אמת ואמונה עד השכיבנו, אומר (סור ומרדכי והגהות מיימוני ועיל סימן נ"ח סעיף ה).

הקטר חלבים ואיברים וכו' עד עמוד השחר. רמב"ם הלכות מעשה הקרבנות פרק ד הלכה ב: כל שקרבן מתיריו ביום מעליו אותו על המזבח כל הלילה, כיצד זבחים שנוקד דמם כיום מקטירין אימוריהן בלילה עד שיעלה עמוד השחר. וכן איברי העולות מקטירין אותן בלילה עד שיעלה עמוד השחר, וכדי להרחיק מן הפשיעה אמרו חכמים שאין מקטירין האימורין האיברי העולה אלא עד חצות הלילה.

ובהלכות טעמה הקרבנות פרק י הלכה ה: כל אלו הנאכלין ליום וליילה דין תורה שהן נאכלין עד שיעלה עמוד השחר וכדי להרחיק מן העבירה אמרו חכמים שאין נאכלין אלא עד חצות הלילה.

Fig. 3, R. Bar Lev

NOTES

The author thanks Nina Ackerman Indig for editing this article.

¹ The *Talmud Yerushalmi* is also known as the Jerusalem Talmud, *Talmud* or *Gemara of the Inhabitants of the West*, *Talmud de-Ereẓ Yisrael*, or, more recently, as the Palestinian Talmud.

² On *Bavli Ervin* 104b, the Rif writes as follows, “Since the *sugya* of our *Gemara* (the Babylonian Talmud) permits it, it is of no concern to us that the *Gemara of the Inhabitants of the West* forbids it, because we rely on our *Gemara* since it is later in time, and they (the Sages in Babylonia) were more versed in the *Gemara of the Inhabitants of the West* than we are. Were they not convinced that this statement of the *Gemara of the Inhabitants of the West* is not to be relied upon, they would not have permitted it.”

³ The Leiden Manuscript was written in 1289 by R. Yeḥiel (Ano) b. R. Binyamin ha-Rofeh of Rome, a well-known scholar, poet, copyist, and the author of a book on piety, *Ma'alot ha-Middot*.

⁴ See *Yad Malachi, Kelalei ha-Shas*, pp. 177–178.

⁵ Contrast the reason provided in *Bavli Shabbat* 24b, *ורבנו הוא דתקוני משום סכנה*, with that provided in *Yerushalmi Berakhot* 8:1, 11d/55 *במקום שאין יין שליח ציבור עובר לפני התיבה ואומר ברכה אחת מעין שבע חזרת השייך*. R. Krasilschikov explains that *Berachah Me'ein Sheva* serves as an abridged *חזרת השייך*. During the weekdays we do not have *חזרת השייך* for *Ma'ariv* because it is *רשות* and therefore we are not concerned that one who is unable to recite the *Amidah* will not fulfill his obligation. On Friday night, however, if there is no wine for *Kiddush*, then one who is unable to recite the *Amidah* will also not fulfill his biblical obligation of *Kiddush*. We therefore recite an abridged version after the *Amidah* in the synagogue which enables all those who hear it to fulfill their biblical obligation of *Kiddush*.

⁶ In *Yerushalmi Berakhot* 1:5, 3c/28 it states: “It would have been proper to recite the Ten Commandments every day. Why then do we not recite it? Because of the complaints of the *minim* (Christians?); they should not say that only [the Ten Commandments] were given to Moshe at Sinai.”

⁷ A footnote on p. 788 of the ArtScroll *Nusach Ashkenaz Siddur* states as follows: “The *Krovetz* is recited during *Shacharis* on Purim. It consists of poetic stanzas that are inserted just before the conclusion of the blessings of *Shemoneh Esrei* during the *chazqan's* repetition. The only blessing where

this is not done is *את צמח דוד*, *The offspring of David*, since the Purim miracle came about through descendants of King Saul.” The real reason why there is no insert for the blessing of *את צמח* on Purim is because that blessing did not exist at that time in the Land of Israel. It was combined with the blessing of *בונה ירושלים*. See *Yerushalmi Berakhot* 2:4, 5a/8. See also *Tosefot Ry”d* on *Bavli Ta’anit* 13a.

⁸ *Yerushalmi Fragments from the Genizah* was published by Prof. Louis Ginzberg in 1909 and reprinted in 1970. These fragments are referred to as *שרידי ירושלמי*.

⁹ The Vatican Manuscript is referred to as *כתב יד רומי*.

¹⁰ For example, in the Vilna edition, the text at the beginning of *Berakhot* 1:1 reads: *שעה ותרתני ליליא הוא*, *it is an hour or two into the night*. In R. Sirillio’s manuscript it reads: *שעה ותרתני עשורי ליליא הוא*, *an hour and two-tenths (72 minutes) into the night*. This is a very significant difference. However, in his commentary R. Sirillio writes: *שעה ותרתני ליליא הוא כן מצאתי בספרים וני”ל*. *דותרתי עישורי הוא דגרסינן*. In other words, the version from which R. Sirillio was copying had the same text that we now have in the Vilna edition, and R. Sirillio, on his own, decided to emend the text.

¹¹ See *A Guide to the Jerusalem Talmud*, pp. 21–22, for a discussion of where the *Yerushalmi* was compiled.

¹² On p. 15, in the beginning of the introduction to *Berakhot*, the *Toledot Yizhak* writes, “The saying of our Sages, may their memory be a blessing, in *Zobar*, *Naso*, ‘Everything depends on luck, even a Torah in the Ark,’ proves true, as witnessed by all, in the *Talmud Yerushalmi* that was established in the city that was once referred to as ‘She that was great among nations. The princess among states,’ a multitude of people in our land, the ‘Land of Israel,’ in the city of Jerusalem, which is the great city in which R. Yohanan cast a great light on the *Mishnayot* that the Sages taught in their concise style.”

¹³ See, for example, the notes of the editors of the *Toledot Yizhak* on *Berakhot*, pp. 5, 6, 21, 22, 35, 38, and many more.

¹⁴ Contrast the mere three years spent by R. Bar Lev on the entire *Yerushalmi* with the fifteen years spent by R. Krasilschikov on just *Zera’im* and *Mo’ed*, and the difference in depth between the two commentaries is readily understood.

¹⁵ The Vilna edition is actually printed two different ways. One version contains references to variant readings (*שנויי נוסחאות*), and the other does

not. It is unfortunate that R. Bar Lev chose to include the version of the Vilna edition that does not include the variant readings—especially since he does not deal with variant readings in his own commentary.

¹⁶ On his web site it states, “Rav Bar Lev has been privileged to be the first to publish a commentary on the entire *Yerushalmi*.” This, of course, is inaccurate. R. Moshe Margoliot, in the late 1700s, wrote a dual commentary on the entire *Yerushalmi* which he titled *Penai Moshe* and *Mar’eh ha-Panim*.

¹⁷ All references to the *Yerushalmi* are usually provided in two ways: 1. To chapter and ruling (משנה), e. g., 3:5 which stands for Chapter 3, Ruling 5, and 2. To the page, column, and line number in the *editio princeps* (first edition, Venice, 1522–23). Each page of the *editio princeps* has four columns, two on the front and two on the back, and are referred to as columns: a, b, c, and d. For example, 6d/31 stands for page 6, column d, line 31. See *A Guide to the Jerusalem Talmud*, pp. 214–235, for a cross reference from the Vilna Edition to the *editio princeps*.

¹⁸ Both Prof. L. Ginzberg and R. Shlomo Goren deal with this issue extensively. They both point out that for the moon to rise as the sun sets, the sun, earth, and moon, at that moment, would need to be in perfect 180-degree alignment. (The moon at that point would not be visible because it would be eclipsed—but that is a separate issue.) R. Goren explains that if we take into account parallax (the distortion based on viewing the sun and moon from the surface of the earth, as opposed to viewing them from the center of the earth) and refraction (the distortion based on the fact that light bends), then, when we see the sun touching the bottom of the horizon, it is actually totally below the horizon—from an astronomical point of view (i.e., from the perspective of a theoretical person who is standing in the center of the earth). There is no question that the effect of parallax was understood by astronomers at the time of R. Yehudah ha-Nasi. There is no evidence, however, that the effect of refraction was understood—but perhaps a case can be made from our *Gemara* that indeed it was understood by R. Yehudah ha-Nasi.

¹⁹ Two hours and twenty-four minutes (2 times 72 minutes) before sunrise, the first light of dawn is visible.

²⁰ עלות השחר, or seventy-two minutes before sunrise.

²¹ The *Arukh* equates the word מיל with the Roman/Greek mile, which is one thousand steps, or two thousand cubits. The term mile as it is used today is 1,760 yards. However, the *halakhic mil* as defined by the Ḥazon Ish

(who defines a cubit as 22.7 inches) is 1,258 yards, and according to Naéh (who defines a cubit as 18.9 inches), a *mil* is 1,049 yards.

²² An average person, walking at an average pace, can walk a *mil* in 18 minutes. To walk four *mil* is thus the equivalent of 72 minutes.

²³ An approximate translation of *roke'a* is heaven, and the Sages account for seven such heavens.

²⁴ *Concordance to the Talmud Yerushalmi*, by Moshe Kosovsky (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1979).

²⁵ According to Naéh, a *kor* is 248 liters, and according to the *Hazon Ish*, 430 liters. If a certain quantity of water (a *kor*) is needed to water a certain amount of land (Kush) then it would be natural for one-sixtieth of that amount to be left after usage. This leftover water could then be used for another purpose.

²⁶ The word *תרקב* is interpreted as *תרי וקב* “two and a *keav*,” or three *keav*, the volume displaced by 72 eggs. This is one-sixtieth of the volume of a *kor* which is the volume displaced by 4,320 eggs.

²⁷ It is also possible that the word *ועוד* is a *סמן*, or mnemonic marker, that identifies the four statements that are about to follow. This type of marker is quite common in *Talmud Bavli*, and according to Prof. Louis Ginzberg (*Some Abbreviations Unrecognized or Misunderstood in the Text of the Jerusalem Talmud* [New York: JTS, 1914]) this marker is misunderstood in various places in the Jerusalem Talmud. In our case, perhaps, the word *ועוד* is a signpost for the four following statements which begin, *ויכולו, עוביו, וכשם, די אשמורות*.

²⁸ For example, in *Berakhot* 5:1 the *Yerushalmi* reads, *רבי יוסי בי רבי אבין רבי, אבהו בשם רבי יוחנן וחברייא (תהלים פד) ה' צבאות אשרי אדם בוטח בך*. R. Kanievsky innovatively translates *וחברייא* as ‘and its twin verse,’ as opposed to the more usual translation, ‘and the group.’

²⁹ On R. Bar Lev’s web site it states, “With Heaven’s help, all 14 volumes will be on the web site for the benefit of students.”

³⁰ I suspect that the authors are unfamiliar with the works of such modern scholars as Prof. L. Ginzberg, R. Saul Lieberman, R. Shlomo Goren, and Prof. D. Sussman.