
FINDINGS REGARDING A RESEARCH METHOD ON THE REDACTION OF TRACTATE ERUVIN IN THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD A REVIEW

Uri Zur*

Ariel University, Kiryat Hamada 3, Ariel, 40700, Israel

(Received 25 January 2023, revised 24 April 2023)

Abstract

This article is a review of the book by Professor Noah Aminoah on the redaction of the sugyot in Tractates Shabbat and Eruvin of the Talmud Bavli. This book joins a series of books published by the author on different tractates of the Talmud Bavli, following the same method. This is the first review of any of the books produced by his research on the Talmud's tractates. The review in the article will address Tractate Eruvin and focus on the sources underlying the research, its main theme, the research method, redaction of the sugyot, and his proposals for resolving redaction problems or different problems that emerge from the sugyot. In this article, we will review the book's chapters and present different examples of the sugyot's redaction as evident from the author's research, as well as the importance of the book and its contribution to redaction of sugyot in the Talmud Bavli.

Keywords: Aminoah, Eruvin, tractate

1. Introduction

This is the first research review of the author's (N. Aminoah) series of studies on the redaction of Talmudic sugyot, although it addresses only one [1] and not his other [2-4] books that utilize the same research method, albeit in other tractates of the Talmud Bavli. To date, no consecutive review has been written on any of these books. The review of the book discussed here (or more accurately, the focus on Tractate Eruvin) can also serve as a representative review of his other books that engage in the same type of research. The purpose of the review is to examine the efficacy of the research method with regard to the issue of redacting the different sugyot in the Talmud Bavli, and the solutions proposed by the book's author for redaction issues that arise in the sugyot, issues related to the halakha in the sugya and various general problems.

*E-mail: uriz@ariel.ac.il, phone: 972-3-951-7170, Fax: 972-3-976-5716,
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0959-5122>

2. Method

The author's research in this book, as in his other books on this topic, is based on his doctoral dissertation on Tractate Kiddushin of the Talmud Bavli, which was published as a book, the first in his series of studies on the redaction of sugyot in a specific tractate [5]. In fact, his research method is based on that of Epstein, who dealt in a limited manner with the issue of redacting sugyot in the different tractates, particularly in his book on the literature of the Amoraim, including Tractate Kiddushin [6]. The author's research on Tractate Kiddushin is in fact an extensive and comprehensive study, among other things on the issue of redacting sugyot in Tractate Kiddushin, as is true of the book discussed here as well [1].

The author's main research theme relates to the question of 'how'. Namely, the study deals with the central question: How was the sugya composed, what is the make-up of the sugya, what are the sources that comprise the sugya, what are the different traditions contained in the sugya (for example, a Babylonian tradition or a tradition from the Land of Israel), which Babylonian schools of study comprise the give-and-take in the sugya (for example, a give-and-take from the Pumbedita school or from the Sura school), and who are the Amoraim mentioned in the sugya. In some of the sugyot, the author also discusses the question of 'why'. Namely, why were different sources joined to form a single sugya? This, while raising critical questions and answering them from the perspective of the sugya's redaction.

2.1. *The division of Tractate Eruvin*

The author divided Tractate Eruvin into six chapters. His first chapter notes the tannaitic sources of the Talmudic sugyot in the tractate studied. The second chapter deals with the compilation of the tractate, for example a Pumbedita- or Sura-based compilation, or in the name of a certain sage, for instance R. Hisda, an early compilation, compiling sugyot based on a certain term, such as 'גופא', and the compilation of aggadic sugyot. In the third chapter he deals with the redaction of the sugyot in the tractate, each sugya separately. In the fourth chapter he discusses parallel sugyot, comparing different textual readings of the sugya and indicating the different layers of the sugya discussed, or noting the absence of layers in the sugya. In addition, he notes in the different sugyot layers of interpretation, identical parallels, parallel and transposed sugyot. In the fifth chapter, the author notes different textual readings of the sugya, for instance different readings brought in the sugya by means of the terms 'אי איתמר הכי איתמר', 'איכא דאמר', 'לישנא אהרינא', 'איתמא', 'אמר ליה' אלא.

In the sixth chapter, Bavli-Yerushalmi, the author notes parallel and transposed Babylonian sources in the Talmud Yerushalmi, parallel Land-of-Israel sources, and parallel traditions in the Talmud Bavli and Talmud Yerushalmi.

The author concludes his research by noting the names of the Amoraim in the tractate and adding an index to sources from the Bible, midreshei halakha and aggadah, Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud Bavli, and Talmud Yerushalmi, as well as an abstract in English. Nonetheless, his research lacks a topical index of subjects (the [index of the] names of the Amoraim in the tractate may come in its stead) and a bibliography, where the author may have relied on the absence of such indices in other research books of critical exegesis [7] (only a general index of subjects) [8, 9] (only a bibliography and the source of the photographs).

2.2. The research method

The author begins his discussion of the redaction of the sugyot by subjectively delineating each sugya and its definition [10], followed by noting the topic of the sugya. In principle, he discusses the sugya as it is before us in the printed version. With regard to all the sugyot, the author provides a summary of the sugya. In most of the sugyot he raises critical questions or various queries and answers them using research-based interpretation, reaching a conclusion in light of the redactor's method of redaction or how the material in the sugya was compiled.

In general, he notes the problems that confronted the redactor of the sugya [1, p. 768] and sometimes also the sources available to the redactor when attempting to redact the sugya [1, p. 769].

The author also performs different divisions when analysing the redaction of each sugya, for instance justifications [1, p. 767], decisions (=rulings) [1, p. 790], matters [1, p. 780], different layers [1, p. 782], parts [1, p. 785], sources [1, p. 789], queries [1, p. 791], problems [1, p. 795], levels [1, p. 801], division of the sugya [1, p. 814], possibilities [1, p. 841], situations [1, p. 857], sections [1, p. 857], tales [1, p. 884], phenomena [1, p. 905], questions [1, p. 909], methods [1, p. 941], ways [1, p. 942], difficulties [1, p. 944], forms [1, p. 953].

He indicates different textual readings within the sugya [1, p. 770], separate sugyot included in a single sugya [1, p. 771], early traditions and an early compilation [1, p. 782], decisions of the redactor in the sugya [1, p. 772], midreshei halakha in the sugya [1, p. 811], and deliberations of the Rishonim on a certain issue and their interpretations according to their method [1, p. 822].

The author's research is also objectively fair, and in certain places he notes matters that were not clear to him [1, p. 772] and more (more details will be provided below).

The author's specific method in his study of the sugyot of Tractate Eruvin is based on different sources that underly his research, such as the manuscripts of Tractate Eruvin; MS Munich 95, MS Vatican 109, MS Vatican 127, MS Oxford 366, and comparisons between MS Munich 95 and the printed version in the book *Dikdukei Sofrim* [11], as well as the various Genizah fragments on the tractate.

He also relies on primary sources when these are capable of clarifying how a specific sugya in Tractate Eruvin was redacted, for instance midreshei halakha, Talmud Yerushalmi, Tosefta, parallel sugyot, and midreshei aggadah.

In this way, he also utilizes the sayings of commentators and adjudicators from among the Rishonim, for instance R. Hananel, Rif, Rashi, Maimonides (commentary on the Mishna), Tosafot, Rosh (Rabbenu Asher), Rashba, Ritva. He also builds on later commentators who interpreted Tractate Eruvin, such as the Torat Haim [12], Leshon ha-Zahav [13], and Piryo be-'Eito [14]. He uses the literature of halakhic rules, such as Sefer Kritut and Yad Malakhai, and in some cases he also explains the halakhic rules. He also utilizes the biographies of Talmudic sages [15, 16] and dictionaries [17] when necessary.

The author makes extensive use of general research literature on the Talmud Bavli [18-20], Mishna [21], Baraita [22], Tosefta [23], midreshei halakha [24], Talmud Yerushalmi [25-27], the Savoraim [28], the Geonim [29], realia in the sugyot [30], halakha [31], general literature [32-34] and geographical literature [35-37].

In addition, the author examines the specific research literature on Tractate Eruvin as a whole [6, 38] and other studies that analyse the Mishna on Tractate Eruvin [8] and certain chapters within Tractate Eruvin [39, 40]. He agrees with some of the researcher's opinions [7, p. 941] and disagrees with others [7, p. 775].

In his study within the book discussed here, he utilizes his own books that investigate the redaction in other tractates of the Talmud Bavli [2, 3, 5] and his various articles on the redaction in the different tractates [41-45].

In a small number of places, there are deficiencies or print errors, such as regarding the page numbers of an article [1, p. 906].

3. Results and discussion

The research in the author's book reveals the 'manner of redaction', 'act of redaction', or 'manner of the redactor', as formulated in the author's words. The meaning of these phrases is that the author aimed to show how the redaction was carried out in a specific sugya. The author also presents in his book the 'compilation' of the sugyot. In this term, the author means to explain how different topics were added to a certain sugya even when they were not directly associated with the sugya but rather only indirectly, from associative considerations, such as the tales that are contained in certain sugyot but not in each and every one of them, or other topics that entered the sugya although they have no direct or content-related connection to it.

In some of the research the author also uses the phrase 'it appears to me'. This phrase is utilized when the author has no clear proof to support his suggestions regarding formation of the sugya, but the conduct of the sugya points to them or they are unavoidable in his opinion.

Since the author focuses and devotes a main part of his research to the question of the sugyot's redaction in the entire tractate, from beginning to end, rather than sporadically, he has no need for studies that deal specifically or randomly with certain sugyot in that tractate, because they are not relevant for his research that focuses on the entire tractate systematically, sugya by sugya.

The author presents many varied findings with regard to different types of redaction. Below, we shall present the different types of findings arising from his research, together with examples.

3.1. Findings related to the formative-stylistic aspect of the sugya

3.1.1. Form and style

Uniform style [1, p. 767], opening question [1, p. 781], the Talmudic give-and-take and its style [1, p. 782], similarity in the distinction between singular and plural in a certain topic [1, p. 782], paraphrase in the words of the baraita [1, p. 784], stylistic uniformity and the tendency to style uniformity and use of phrases [1, p. 790], similar linguistic style [1, p. 796], objections with the same style [1, p. 798], redaction style that involves transferring the sayings of an Amora to another Amora from one place to another [1, p. 801], stylistic difference [1, p. 803], content-related connection [1, p. 803], chaining [1, p. 803], joining two traditions in the “צריכותא” style [1, p. 805], ordering from the strict to the lenient [1, p. 805], Talmudic style by elimination [1, p. 816], a redactor or copyists added words to the Amora’s statement in order to arrive at a uniform style [1, p. 829], mere stylistic and linguistic redaction in a Pumbedita-based sugya [1, p. 844], redaction through *pilpul* [1, p. 849], difficulty in the assumption that two Amoraim stated their sayings in the same clumsy style [1, p. 858], essential style for the sayings of one Amora that is not necessary at all for another [1, p. 858], the style of presenting the problem with the term ‘להו’ לאיבעיא’ in the sugya is strange [1, p. 869], the stylistic rule common in Babylonia using the term ‘זו ואין צריך לומר זו’ [1, p. 900], the design of the sugya as a give-and-take is not based on the sayings of the Amora but rather initiated by the redactor of the sugya who redacted the entire sugya with its three parts [1, p. 935].

3.1.2. The association

Associative connection [1, p. 773], the sayings of the Amora were compiled in the sugya associatively [1, p. 789], the compiler compiled a sugya associatively [1, p. 792], an associative justification that has an advantage [1, p. 799], an associative connection [1, p. 803], compiling a baraita associatively [1, p. 817], the first part of a sugya with its appendices was compiled in the sugya associatively [1, p. 882], the second part of the sugya too was compiled associatively in order to discuss the first part [1, p. 882], a certain affair, the third, was compiled at first for a sugya on a certain topic and only subsequently did later compilers with an associative approach compile the first and second affairs and place them before the third [1, p. 884], the sayings of the Amora were included in the sugya due to an associative justification [1, p. 903], the redactors suggested a third affair in the sugya associatively [1, p. 907], the compiler included the amoraic dispute due to the associative connection of the dispute’s language [1, p. 926], a sugya compiled out of place only due to the associative

connection between the sayings of the Amora and a section of the mishna [1, p. 931], the compilers compiled the sugya associatively following the sayings of the Amora [1, p. 964], the last part of the sugya was transferred to Tractate Eruvin from Tractate Shabbat associatively [1, p. 956].

3.1.3. Routine (*Ashgara*)

A linguistic routine usage (*ashgara*) [1, p. 792], the sayings of the Amora were suggested in a routine usage - *ashgara* following the inclination to stylistic uniformity [1, p. 818], the name of the Amora (Rava) was added to the name of another Amora (Abaye) in a routine usage (*ashgara*) from two previous phrases that contain the names of a pair of Amoraim [1, p. 825], a halakhic ruling was transferred, through a routine usage (*ashgara*) by Amoraim or Savoraim, from a ruling of an Amora elsewhere [1, p. 852], the name of the Amora was included in a sugya through a routine usage (*ashgara*) [1, p. 872], linguistic substitutions via a routine usage (*ashgara*) [1, p. 922], the Amora's original textual reading was replaced through a routine usage (*ashgara*) with the sayings of another Amora [1, p. 924], the decisions (*pesikot*) bearing the phrase 'halakha, custom, and the people act' were transferred to the sugya through a routine usage (*ashgara*) [1, p. 876].

3.1.4. Chaining (*Shilshul*)

The progression of the sugya through chaining (*shilshul*) [1, p. 795], the sugya encompasses various matters of give-and-take that progress from each other through chaining (*shilshul*) or are connected to each other in a content-related or fundamental association [1, p. 826], the sugya progresses from the give-and-take in the halakha of the Amora through chaining (*shilshul*) [1, p. 915].

3.1.5. Chronological and non-chronological

Chronological order [1, p. 782], compiling the names of the Amoraim by chronological order [1, p. 840], the sugya includes a chronological order of the sources (baraitot, amoraic statements) in affiliation with the mishna [1, p. 863], the order of responders to the give-and-take in the sugya is not chronological [1, p. 913], a change from the chronological order of the Amoraim mentioned in the sugya [1, p. 949].

3.2. *The findings arising when analysing the redaction of the sugyot*

3.2.1. Give-and-take in the sugya

Connecting the parts of a give-and-take to transform them into a single solid give-and-take [1, p. 770], the redactor does not always add the give-and-take to form a single solid entity [1, p. 782], a give-and-take that could not be

flawlessly joined was proposed at the end of the sugya [1, p. 782], integrating a give-and-take within an earlier compilation [1, p. 784], reaching decisions through give-and-take [1, p. 788], the sugya contains options for interpretation through a give-and-take [1, p. 793], a long-winded give-and-take [1, p. 809], an anonymous give-and-take and sources of a give-and-take that the sugya's redactor added as a give-and-take to statements previously available to him [1, p. 812], a give-and-take composed by the sugya's redactor [1, p. 813], three baraitot that were joined to form a single solid sugya through a give-and-take and in affiliation with the mishna discussed [1, p. 816], a sugya constituting a single solid give-and-take that includes four parallel tannaitic sources that complement the mishna, and though each could be interpreted separately they were offered in the sugya as parts of the sugya and as arguments in the give-and-take on the sugya [1, p. 819], the conclusion in the give-and-take is reached via elimination [1, p. 830], the order of the sages' appearance in the give-and-take attests to a 'סוגייה ערוכה' [1, p. 830], the importance of the artificial give-and-take should not be minimized [1, p. 841], the natural give-and-take [1, p. 885], the an anonymous give-and-take occurred in practice [1, p. 885], the sugya contains a give-and-take that explains the reason for the amoraic dispute [1, p. 886], managing the give-and-take in different ways [1, p. 887-888], a give-and-take that is mostly artificial [1, p. 888], the give-and-take in the sugya primarily discusses the issue of the superfluousness of sections when employing the regular methods and known manners of expression [1, p. 888], the give-and-take arouses many difficulties and the Rishonim were very challenged by it [1, p. 893], the sugya includes a give-and-take concerning the identification of the Tanna in the mishna [1, p. 894], the give-and-take between the Amoraim is unclear [1, p. 896], an anonymous give-and-take [1, p. 898], the sugya includes a give-and-take concerning the amoraic dispute [1, p. 912], an anonymous give-and-take [1, p. 924], a give-and-take of the 'סתמא דגמרא' [1, p. 931].

3.2.2. The inclination of the redactor/s as evident in the redaction

The inclination of the sugyot redactor in the ruling [1, p. 773], the main part of the sugya includes 1erences involving a certain Amora and they indicate the redactor's inclination to support the opinion of that Amora [1, p. 819], the inclination of the Babylonian redactors to add all the sources on one topic to a single give-and-take [1, p. 821], the sugya's redactor was inclined to the opinion of a certain Amora and the lore combined three sources in one give-and-take in order to generate a decision that follows the method of that Amora [1, p. 836], the redactor does not want to rule on a certain topic and further on in the give-and-take his inclination to 1rain from ruling on that topic is conspicuous [1, p. 838], the obvious inclination of the redactor is to rule according to the opinion of a certain Tanna [1, p. 937], the sugya's redactor is inclined to take a hard line with regard to a certain permit on the Sabbath [1, p. 957], compilers who had before them the sources and objections of the Amora were inclined to permit a certain topic (making a sound on the Sabbath) and they rejected the objections of the Amora [1, p. 962].

3.2.3. *Manners of redacting a sugya*

Resolving contradictions between baraitot [1, p. 769], early glosses [1, p. 777], transferring sugyot [1, p. 778], learning by analogy [1, p. 788], analogous route [1, p. 800], terms that are not known to the Talmud Yerushalmi [1, p. 793], the 'סתמא הקדומה' [1, p. 800], differences in linguistic usages [1, p. 804], a logical opinion [1, p. 809], an amoraic interpretation by analogy (in the method of "ריבוי מיעוט וריבוי") as in other places in the Talmud [1, p. 811], an anonymous homilies in the sugya [1, p. 811], the Aramaic language, terminology and homiletic method in a certain sugya are entirely Babylonian [1, p. 811], dragging interpretations and dragging incidents [1, p. 813], sources that discuss the laws of vows in association with *erubin* were attached to a section in the mishna in *Eruvin* that deals with matters related to vows [1, p. 814], an objection and resolution to the Amora were transferred from Tractate *Berakhot* to a sugya in Tractate *Eruvin* [1, p. 815], an analogous route following the method of a certain Amora [1, p. 821], the artificial aspect of the sugya [1, p. 840], following redaction of the sugya different textual readings were formed at the beginning of the give-and-take [1, p. 841], the analogy in the sugya [1, p. 843], when redacting a certain sugya, three sugyot were combined [1, p. 846], the Sura-based redaction [1, p. 847], a sugya that follows the compilation of sugyot on halakhic rules [1, p. 851], within the main sugya, an additional sugya was encompassed by means of the term 'גופא' [1, p. 853], a very artificial resolution [1, p. 856], the original rejection by the Amora in the phrase 'ליתנהו להני כללי' referred to halakhic rules [1, p. 861], a sugya as a type of combined interpretations and supplements to the mishna [1, p. 863], a later addition to the sugya [1, p. 868], the tale was moved to the end of the sugya [1, p. 868], the contradiction between the mishna and the baraita was interpreted as a type of 'חסורי מחסרא' in the redaction of the sugya [1, p. 871], the sugya contains halakhic sources and tales on a certain topic [1, p. 875], redaction of the sugya in a new redaction [1, p. 876], a sugya compiled from an early layer and a later layer [1, p. 890], the structure of the sugya is a combination of sources with a give-and-take that concerns them or problems with a clarification of the solutions to them [1, p. 892], others too were involved in formulating the textual reading of the sugya [1, p. 896], the sugya includes a collection of amoraic sources on a certain topic and a give-and-take on them [1, p. 901], a compilation of the tale in the Talmud Yerushalmi [1, p. 906], the tales presented in the Talmud Bavli that appear in the Talmud Yerushalmi as well are never identical in their details and textual reading [1, p. 906-907], the compilation of the sugya not in its natural place is because the give-and-take in the sugya contains a list of sources and give-and-take that were already discussed in the previous sugya and the two sugyot seem connected as a single continuity [1, p. 915], one sugya has a Pumbedita-based redaction and the other a Sura-based redaction [1, p. 917], a sugya that is seemingly the opposite of another [1, p. 920], the language of the statement in the Talmud Bavli appears to have been corrected or to include an added interpretation [1, p. 922], two weak resolutions in the sugya [1, p. 930], transferal of part of a sugya in Tractate *Berakhot* to Tractate *Eruvin* [1, p. 933],

part of the sugya that does not connect to the previous sugya is from a different tradition [1, p. 933-934], the sugya contains a give-and-take and interpretation that pertain to the sayings of the Tanna in the mishna [1, p. 942], the sugya includes a give-and-take that relates to the halakhot in the mishna [1, p. 943], the decision containing the form 'יהאידנא' is a later addition [1, p. 950], a sugya from a Sura-based redaction (from the school of Rav Pappa) [1, p. 952], a linguistic phrase as a halahic term [1, p. 952], a sugya from a Pumbedita-oriented redaction (from the school of Rav Bivi son of Abaye) (953), a sugya that is entirely 'סתמא דגמרא' [1, p. 953], a lengthy sugya that contains a list of sources, tales, and give-and-take [1, p. 953], the sugya is comprised of sources of give-and-take on a certain topic [1, p. 960], a sugya that deals with a give-and-take on a certain halakhic issue [1, p. 961], the sugya mentions a list of tannaitic sources and halakhic sources that record various things that are forbidden on the Sabbath [1, p. 962], a sugya based on two statements of primary Amoraim that were said with Ierence to the מדרש הכתוב [1, p. 963].

3.2.4. The activity of the sugya's redactor/s

The redactor separated between the Amora's sayings [1, p. 771], the Babylonian redactors of the sugya interpret the amoraic dispute in affiliation with halakhic terms instigated in Babylonia [1, p. 782], the redactor of the sugya rejects the Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 788], the difference in location in the sayings of the Amora (Abaye) indicates that his sayings were transferred from another tractate (Yoma) to Tractate Eruvin and are not an authentic part of the redactor's compilation in Eruvin [1, p. 790], the redactors of the sugya suggest their own solution in the sugya [1, p. 793], the redactors of the sugya added a give-and-take to the baraita from a Mehoza-based tradition in Tractate Shabbat to Tractate Eruvin [1, p. 797], the redactor interprets all the additional sources according to his method [1, p. 798], the redactor raises the inquiries according to his method in a manner of problems and their solution, objections and resolutions, in a Talmudic give-and-take [1, p. 798], the redactor offers solutions to both sides of the question according to his method, in the assumptions and in the interpretation of the sources [1, p. 798], the redactor of the sugya utilizes a customary Babylonian method of a 'פשיטא' objection [1, p. 802], the redactors of the sugya included a decision (=ruling) that was placed on its own because it was already very common [1, p. 803], an objection generated by the redactor [1, p. 810], the redactor recognizes that a phrase from the mishna constitutes material for an objection and give-and-take [1, p. 813], the redactor suggests a Pumbedita-oriented section of gemara for the give-and-take regarding the sayings of the Amora [1, p. 813], the redactor suggests an explanation for the sayings of the Amora [1, p. 813], a redactor or editor adds the term 'גופא' before the sayings of the Amora because the sayings of the same Amora were mentioned in the preceding give-and-take [1, p. 814], the redactors of the sugyot do not distinguish between the words of the baraita and the words of the accurate phrase and they relate to this accurate phrase as part of the baraita [1, p. 816] the compilers included a baraita that is not on the same topic as the section in order

to indicate two traditions that follow the method of Beit Shamai [1, p. 816], the authors of the sugya were compelled to correct or explain a baraita arbitrarily [1, p. 817], the redactor of the 'צריכותא' suggests his interpretation symmetrically for a give-and-take elsewhere [1, p. 828], identification of the sugya's redactor as affiliated with Sura [1, p. 828], the redactor used amoraic sources at his disposal, interprets them, and merges them into a single solid entity, with the intention of reaching a ruling on a certain legal issue [1, p. 830], the redactor of the sugya decided to merge all the sources into a single solid give-and-take [1, p. 831], the redactor presented the story of the encounter between two Amoraim as decisive [1, p. 835], the redactor of the sugya decided that the tale the Amora heard is the same as that in the sugya, but in a different form [1, p. 835], the redactor of the sugya had an aggadic source regarding seven sayings ('שמועות') of the Amora [1, p. 838], the redactor distinguished between the discussion of each section in the mishna [1, p. 839], the sugya's redactors added an artificial give-and-take [1, p. 841], the redactors of the first part of a certain sugya were unaware of the Sura-based tradition of the Amora (Rav Hisda) [1, p. 844], the redactors explored the lutation of the ruling based on the halakhic rules [1, p. 847], the redactor wanted to prove that the halakha follows the opinion of a certain Amora, through a give-and-take [1, p. 849], the compilers join a sugya on a certain topic to a give-and-take in another sugya on that topic and in light of the identical name of the Tanna in both sugyot [1, p. 850], the sugya's redactor perceives the word 'smiling' as ridicule [1, p. 850], transferal of justifications by the sugya's redactor [1, p. 854], the redactor had his own source for a 'גזירה שווה' (*gzera shava*) (analogy) [1, p. 856], the redactor used a baraita to explain the opinion of the sages regarding the 'גזירה שווה' (*gzera shava*) (analogy) [1, p. 857], the sugya's redactors phrase the sayings of the Amora as relating to each of the sections in the mishna [1, p. 858], the redactor compiles the sources he had before him [1, p. 858], the redactor included a give-and-take in the last part of the sugya in light of the response of the Amora based on the given mishna [1, p. 859], the redactor merged two early traditions, one from Sura and the other from Pumbedita, and connected them by means of a previous baraita [1, p. 859], a redactor affiliated with Pumbedita had two sources, one in the name of an Amora and the other a tale in the name of another Amora, and the redactor interpreted them as one side in a previous amoraic dispute [1, p. 859], the redactor explains the double halakha using the term 'צריכא' [1, p. 862], the sugya's redactors left the Pumbedita-based sugya in place and suggested the parallel and additional traditions available to them as well [1, p. 864], the redactors redacted the sugya following two separate traditions [1, p. 867], the Sura-based redactor joined two traditions in the sugya [1, p. 867], the sugya's redactor proposes two options in the name of the Amora [1, p. 868], the sugya's redactor joined two sugyot to form a single sugya and attached it to the mishna [1, p. 872], the sugya's redactor suggests his explanations in the method of the Amoraim in the talmudic style of give-and-take [1, p. 873], redactors after the era of a certain Amora added a give-and-take on the conclusion of that Amora [1, p. 874], the redactor suggested statements of Amoraim on a certain topic [1, p. 876], the redactors added a give-and-take following the tradition of Rava's

school [1, p. 878], the compiler of the sugya continued to compile other sources on a certain topic in accordance with the previous sugya [1, p. 878], the redactors added sources and a give-and-take to expand the sugya [1, p. 879], the redactor concluded the sugya with aggadic homilies [1, p. 879], the compiler compiled a tale third in the order of tales in the sugya in order to follow it with the give-and-take in the amoraic dispute on the term 'גופא' [1, p. 884], the sugya's redactor joined the sayings of the Amoraim, who were unaware of each other, to form a single sugya [1, p. 886], the author of the sugya used the interpretive give-and-take in the baraita as material for reaching a decision concerning the sayings of the Amora [1, p. 888], the sugya's redactor disregarded another sugya [1, p. 888], the redactor combined different sources to form a single sugya [1, p. 889], the redactors combined all the sources to form a single sugya based on positioning the baraita as the decisive halakha [1, p. 890], the redactor, based on the talmudic style, first suggests the sayings of the Amora and then the baraita [1, p. 897], the sugya's redactor had two tales that were recited together in the Pumbedita tradition and the lore he compiled them together in the sugya as well [1, p. 899], the redactor explains the stylistic duplication of the halakha, recited both positively and negatively, based on the baraita that was attached to the mishna [1, p. 900], the sugya's redactor redacted the sugya by adding a justification that follows the Amora's method and combined his interpretation with the problem of another Amora [1, p. 900], the redactor placed the sayings of the later Amoraim before those of the earlier Amora because they were transmitted together from a Pumbedita source [1, p. 902], the sugya's redactors interpreted the sayings of the Amora as an interpretation in different words [1, p. 904], the sugya's redactor redacted it according to two separate traditions, a Pumbedita tradition and a Mehoza tradition [1, p. 906], the redactors placed the interpretative options after the tale [1, p. 907], the redactors included in the sugya the first tale brought in the name of the Amora because they wanted to back up his testimony with that of a Babylonian, although they had a Land of Israel tradition concerning the testimony of that Amora [1, p. 907], the redactor linked the Pumbedita tradition to the Sura tradition [1, p. 910], the redactor separated a certain law from a list of sources or halakhot because the law there is different [1, p. 910], the sugya's redactor is affiliated with Sura [1, p. 910], the compiler placed the baraita in the vicinity of a baraita on the matter under discussion [1, p. 912], the sugya's redactor merged all the sources in a single give-and-take by rendering them material for clarifying the halakha according to one of the parties in the amoraic dispute [1, p. 914], the sugya's redactor wanted to discuss all the sources that were before him on a certain topic [1, p. 916], the sugya's redactor wanted to discuss the method of the based on several sources that appeared relevant [1, p. 917], the redactor utilized two short give-and-take sugyot from two schools of different Amoraim and redacted them together with additional sources to form a single solid give-and-take [1, p. 918], the author of the sugya suggests a new interpretation of the sugya [1, p. 919], the author of the sugya preferred to gloss the sugya and switched the names of the Amoraim [1, p. 920], the author of the sugya resolved an objection by interpreting the statement in a customary manner

of interpretation [1, p. 922], the sugya's redactors transferred a common expression of the Amora to his words in a sugya in Tractate Eruvin [1, p. 923], the sugya's redactor connected the sugya to one of two different schools of study [1, p. 924], the redactor melded the Mehoza tradition within the Pumbedita sugya [1, p. 926], an early Pumbedita tradition was integrated within a redacted sugya by a compiler [1, p. 926], reciters combined baraitot with the sugya and added the phrase 'תניא כוותיה' [1, p. 929], the textual reading that was before the sugya's redactor was a faulty reading [1, p. 932], the sugya's redactor is familiar with a certain halakhic concept and uses it in the give-and-take [1, p. 933], the sugya's redactor proposes the sayings of the Amora within and as part of the give-and-take in the mishna [1, p. 933], the redactor was familiar with the sugya in Tractate Rosh Hashana and with the ruling of the Amora and he therefore engaged in a give-and-take involving intention-dependent options that were used to help explain the dispute and were ultimately rejected [1, p. 936], the redactor presents all the different options in a common Talmudic style of give-and-take [1, p. 937], the redactor is interested in the extra give-and-take in order to combine all the midrashic sources and give-and-take that he found in Tractate Menahot [1, p. 937], the redactor combines in the give-and-take additional tannaitic sources via *pilpul* [1, p. 937], the three parts of the sugya constitute a single sugya redacted by a single redactor [1, p. 938], a sugya merged from several amoraic sources by a redactor to form a single give-and-take in order to produce a unified sugya [1, p. 939], the redactor, in the way of sugya redactors, saw fit to merge all the sources to form a single solid give-and-take sugya [1, p. 940], a reason [=justification] that was not accepted as logical by the sugya's redactor was not brought forth in the give-and-take and was also not made part of the give-and-take [1, p. 940], the redactor explains the preferences of the Tannaim [1, p. 941], the sugya's redactor joined all the sources to form a single solid sugya [1, p. 942], in the sugya redactor's opinion, a mishna not ascribed to a specific sage represents the opinion of all the Tannaim [1, p. 942], the redactor explains the sayings of the Amora using a fairly artificial explanation [1, p. 943], the sugya's redactor had a Pumbedita tradition regarding the sayings of the Amora that were rejected by another Amora [1, p. 944], the redactor raised a question the like of which appears in other places in the Talmud [1, p. 945], the redactor placed the give-and-take before the Amora's interpretation of the baraita [1, p. 947], the redactor added the baraita to the first part of the sugya to form a single solid sugya [1, p. 947], the sugya's redactor interpreted the sayings of the Amora [1, p. 948], the sugya's redactor was familiar with the opinion of the Amora and used his method to explain the sayings of another Amora as well [1, p. 948], the sugya's redactors engage in give-and-take based on concepts and sources that in their time were already widespread and familiar to them [1, p. 949], the sugya's redactors were those who rejected the interpretation of the Amora [1, p. 949], the sugya's redactors rejected the sayings of the Amora by glossing his words using the term 'אי איתמר הכי איתמר' [1, p. 949], the sugya's redactors expanded the give-and-take in the sugya [1, p. 950], the redactors raised a Talmudic-style objection to the sayings of the Amoraim [1, p. 951], the sugya's redactor had two baraitot for the give-and-take on the mishna [1, p.

957], the redactor reduces the permit given for the Sabbath [1, p. 958], the redactors added a give-and-take on a certain question according to the study method customary in Babylonia [1, p. 958], the sugya's redactors had the *Sifrei ba-Midbar* and they distinguished between the opinion of the Tanna and the opinion of the Amora [1, p. 964], the sugya's redactors wanted to merge the sayings of the Amora to form a single continuity with the sugya of the give-and-take in the sayings of another Amora [1, p. 964], the redactors did not take into account that the sayings of the Amora cannot be joined to the tannaitic dispute based on a logical argument stemming from a lenient or strict approach [1, p. 964], the redactors of the sugya formulated their sayings in the Talmudic style of 'לימא מסייע ליה', 'לימא כתנאי' [1, p. 964].

3.2.5. Methods utilized in the redaction of sugyot

Methods customarily used in Babylonia with regard to measurements [1, p. 787], the interpretation of the sugya has a result (or implications) for halakha [1, p. 794], when the entire give-and-take is in an interpretive context it will be in the form of 'תתם' (anonymous) [1, p. 794], adding interpretations or forming a chain of additional difficulties deriving from the reply of the Amora Rabbah by those in the next generations [1, p. 795], there is a basic assumption that in the Talmud, Amoraim attribute sayings to previous Amoraim if it appears to them that these follow the view of those Amoraim [1, p. 795], a customary Babylonian method of forming a superfluous addition using the term 'צריכי' [1, p. 811], in the Babylonian 'צריכותא' method it is not possible to learn two things from one word [1, p. 811], the sayings of the Amora were melded with the tale in the redaction just as many places were melded with tannaitic sources and rabbinical give-and-take [1, p. 820], only the name of one Amora (Abaye) from the pair of Amoraim (Abaye and Rava) should be recited, because he (Abaye) was the one who rejected the sayings of his teachers [1, p. 825], although only the first topic is related to the sugya's section, two other matters were included as well [1, p. 836], a unique method of 'גזירה שווה' (*gzera shava*) (analogy) utilized by the Amora [1, p. 855-856], compiling the custom of the Amora at the end of the matter because it constitutes a ruling in the dispute [1, p. 859], the give-and-take is the Talmudic way [1, p. 862], in the late redaction the method whereby it is not possible to learn two matters from a certain place had already become well established [1, p. 864], the specification whereby it is possible to learn two matters from a single place also became well established in later generations, but there were still those who expressed reservations at this way of studying [1, p. 864], transfer of the entire sugya from another place to the current place by the compilers of the tractate [1, p. 872], following on sources and tales on a certain topic and with regard to a certain Amora, the redactors also compiled other sources on that topic [1, p. 875], the compiler redacted additional midreshei aggadah, following midrashim on a certain topic [1, p. 877], reciters began the amoraic dispute with the term 'גופא' instead of another term because the sayings of the Amoraim were mentioned following the give-and-take in the previous sugya [1, p. 887], the sugya is an interpretation based on the customary

methods [1, p. 888], the sugya is not ascribed to a certain Amora and it has a distinctly Babylonian style and methods [1, p. 895], a method that occurs repeatedly with the wording '...ואידך...ואידך' [1, p. 898], a query that appears several times in the Talmud [1, p. 944], the mishna was interpreted in the sugya using the method of 'חיסורי מהסרא' [1, p. 945].

3.2.6. *The activity of later Amoraim/redactors*

Later redactors would not leave any objection unresolved [1, p. 779], the final redactor [1, p. 781], late Amoraim or perhaps Savoraim, who believe that stylistic alternatives are meaningful, decided to form a 'צריכותא' [1, p. 803], late Amoraim or perhaps Savoraim included a ruling in a sugya that was recited separately with the intention of honing the students' minds [1, p. 803], late Amoraim or perhaps Savoraim did not want to leave statements with no give-and-take [1, p. 803], late redactors [1, p. 804, 809], late redactors, Stamaim, or even Savoraim or Geonim, added the word 'פשיטא' to give the sugya the sense of a give-and-take [1, p. 808], a late redactor added a proof to the sayings of the Amora but rejected the latter's words for halakhic purposes [1, p. 814], in a later period, that of the Savoraim or Geonim, someone did not discern the redaction, glossed a question of the sages, and also corrected and read the sayings of the Amora as 'gemara' per se [1, p. 820], the late redactor interprets the sayings of the Tanna as parallel to the give-and-take on the sayings of another Tanna [1, p. 827], the location of the sayings of the Amoraim was changed in the late redaction of the sugya [1, p. 828], in the late redactions, also anonymous sayings of give-and-take were included in the sugya [1, p. 828], in late redactions, the give-and-take in each of the responses of the two Amoraim to a single Amora was expanded [1, p. 836], the second part of a certain sugya originates from another redactor and is later [1, p. 845], a later redactor (affiliated with Sura?) had, in addition to the Pumbedita-affiliated sugya, another two sugyot [1, p. 847], the redactors (from the school of Rav Ashi?) continued the initial tradition in the sugya by drawing from other traditions [1, p. 847], the first ruling in the sugya, by a certain Amora, is doubtful and appears to have been added by Savoraim [1, p. 848], a late sugya from the time of the Stamaim or Savoraim [1, p. 850], an anonymous give-and-take by a late redactor [1, p. 852], sayings by a late redactor or reciters who were not familiar with the tosefta [1, p. 854], a textual reading added by glossers in order to position the halakha on one side of the amoraic dispute, according to the rule explained by Rashi [1, p. 860], a late redactor compiled the sayings of the Amora in the style of a Talmudic give-and-take [1, p. 860], a late redactor merged two parts to form a single sugya by means of a give-and-take [1, p. 861] by rendering the sayings of the Amora as a resolution of an objection on another Amora [1, p. 863], the sugya was subjected in late generations to redactors from Sura [1, p. 864], the quoting of a section from the baraita was probably performed by Amoraim or Savoraim [1, p. 868], late redactors detected a contradiction between the mishna and the baraita [1, p. 875], late redactors specified and distinguished between the wording of the mishna and the wording of the baraita [1, p. 875], the [late] redactors used the

wording of the sugya from the academy of a certain Amora [1, p. 875], a late redactor added the give-and-take and explanations in the Land of Israel tales [1, p. 882], a later Sura-affiliated redactor compiled and added the second part of the sugya [1, p. 882-883], a late sugya by the Stamaim or even by the Savoraim [1, p. 889], the interpretive manner of the term 'זה הכלל' is very late, i.e. from the time of the Savoraim [1, p. 890], a late redactor added the Land of Israel tradition to the sugya and engaged in a give-and-take concerning the explanations [1, p. 890], a Stamaim- or Savoraim-affiliated redactor transferred the objection of the Amora from another place to the current sugya [1, p. 893], a final and late redactor added a Sura-affiliated tradition to the existing sugya [1, p. 894], the late redactors decided to add a note [1, p. 896], late redactors examined all the sections of the mishna [1, p. 897], the late redactor merged several traditions to form a single solid give-and-take within the sayings of the Amoraim [1, p. 913], the redactor of the late sugya had a late interpretive tradition [1, p. 921], late Amoraim encountered difficulties with a strange textual reading of the statement [1, p. 922], late Amoraim were not familiar with the Pumbedita-affiliated sugya [1, p. 930], the names of the late Amoraim in the sugya indicate that the sugya is of Sura origin [1, p. 931], the give-and-take of the late Amoraim in the sugya, namely the Stamaim, generated a change in the chronological order of the Amoraim mentioned in the sugya [1, p. 949], a late redactor compiled an aggadic tradition regarding a certain biblical verse because the homiletic interpretations also include that of a certain Amora [1, p. 950], at a certain stage or at a late stage, a Savora or Gaon truncated the homiletic interpretation of the Amora from the aggadic tradition and placed it prior to the baraita [1, p. 950], a late redactor merged two traditions to form one [1, p. 953], redactors, Amoraim from late generations, joined the Mehoza tradition to the Pumbedita sugya [1, p. 955], late redactors dropped the sayings of the Amora because they already exist in Tractate Shabbat [1, p. 955], the sayings of the Amora appeared to late redactors redundant [1, p. 955-956], a sugya compiled in the school of Rav Ashi and that added nothing, aside from changes in the versions and errors that do not deviate from the sayings of the sages mentioned [1, p. 956], late redactors added the Pumbedita tradition to the Sura tradition [1, p. 956], the redactors in the fifth generation or later are those who melded the Land of Israel tradition with the early tradition and they interpreted it and engaged in give-and-take with regard to it [1, p. 960], an entire sugya that ended with the school of Rav Ashi [1, p. 961].

3.2.7. Traditions and sources in the study of redaction

A Pumbedita tradition and a Mehoza tradition [1, p. 780], a Pumbedita tradition from the school of Abaye [1, p. 784], a Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 788], a Mehoza tradition [1, p. 790], a sura tradition [1, p. 797], a Land of Israel tradition [1, p. 787], tannaitic sources [1, p. 787], a Land of Israel tradition in the name of Resh Lakish [1, p. 788], two traditions that contradict each other [1, p. 788], the commentators linked sources based on an analogy from another place in Eruvin [1, p. 790], an early tradition [1, p. 804], a textual reading by copyists

[1, p. 808], substitutions in the Land of Israel tradition [1, p. 809], an alternative tradition [1, p. 810], the authors of the sugyot had before them Land of Israel sources ascribed to certain sages [1, p. 811], transmitting a tradition in the name of the Amora was transferred in an analogy from Tractate Bava Metzia to Tractate Eruvin [1, p. 811], a puzzling version in a sugya that includes many substitutions [1, p. 821], the [extensive] entrenchment of a textual reading, so much so that we no longer find the original reading in the manuscripts and prints [1, p. 825], uniting different traditions within the Mehoza-based sugya [1, p. 828], a source of the Sura tradition in Babylonia was switched with the words of the Tanna in the baraita [1, p. 833], a sugya that contained an early Sura element was joined by Pumbedita sources and give-and-take [1, p. 833], A Sura-based addition to a Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 834], a resolution added from the authors of the Sura tradition, who accepted a customary distinction as a halakhic distinction [1, p. 834], sources compiled in the sugya following the first version of the tale [1, p. 835], two other sources became linked associatively to the Amora's parallel tradition [1, p. 835], a tradition concerning the Amora's learning was included in an early Pumbedita compilation [1, p. 836], in the Land of Israel too there were differing traditions [1, p. 837], the initial textual reading of the sugya [1, p. 841], varying phrases were generated throughout the evolving stages of the give-and-take's tradition [1, p. 843], an early Pumbedita-based sugya from the time of the Amoraim Raba and Abaye [1, p. 843], the first part of a certain sugya is a Pumbedita sugya from the school of Abaye that survived in its current form [1, p. 844], a reconstruction of two traditions from the school of Abaye [1, p. 846], many Land of Israel traditions arrived in Babylonia in the fourth generation of the Amoraim [1, p. 846], dual traditions [1, p. 846], the sugya includes the phenomenon of different traditions [1, p. 863], in Abaye's generation, many Land of Israel traditions arrived in Babylonia [1, p. 864], the school of Rava was familiar with the halakha brought in the name of a certain Amora from a Mehoza tradition and not from a Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 878], the sugya contains early sources and Land of Israel tales on a certain topic [1, p. 880], the sources of the sugya are Amoraim in the first generations from two traditions, one Babylonian and the other Land of Israel, and they were gathered together in Babylonia [1, p. 881], the sugya's redactor had a Pumbedita tradition, a tradition regarding a tale [1, p. 881], the first sources in the sugya are from a Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 882], a sugya that is very late [1, p. 890], an early Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 895, 925], the sugya is based on two Land of Israel traditions in the name of the Amora [1, p. 896], a sugya from a Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 898], the tannaitic tradition [1, p. 902], a Sura tradition from the school of Rav Ashi [1, p. 903], connecting the Pumbedita tradition with the Sura tradition [1, p. 903], although most of the sources in the sugya are Pumbedita-based, the redaction is Sura-based [1, p. 904], a sugya formed by a late redaction [1, p. 905], the tradition of the give-and-take has an early source [1, p. 919], the sugya contains parts of an early tradition and parts of a later tradition [1, p. 929], give-and-take traditions were also compiled outside the mishna, by topic [1, p. 931], in the amoraic tradition in Babylonia a complementary and interpretive baraita was attached to the mishna [1, p. 948], the Pumbedita tradition included

sources ascribed to specific Amoraim [1, p. 948], a sugya formed by joining a Pumbedita tradition and a Mehoza tradition [1, p. 954], the Mehoza tradition also included a Land of Israel tradition [1, p. 955], the main part of the early tradition is a Pumbedita tradition [1, p. 959], a sugya from the school of Rava into which was blended a sugya from the school of Rav Ashi [1, p. 961].

3.2.8. Various manifestations in the sayings of the sages/Amoraim within the sugya

The sayings of the Amora in the sugya are not in their proper place [1, p. 784], the alternative interpretation of Rav Ashi follows his method in many sugyot [1, p. 784], Rav Ashi's alternative interpretation [1, p. 784], the sayings of the Amoraim were moved to after the lengthy give-and-take in order to 'hone' the students' minds [1, p. 785], an early redacted sugya from the school of Abaye [1, p. 787], 'סתמא קדומה' for the sayings of the Amora [1, p. 800], a Pumbedita sugya from the school of Abaye [1, p. 801], a Mehoza sugya from the school of Raba [1, p. 801], different versions in the sayings of the Amora in the Land of Israel that were brought to Babylonia prevent the possibility of a certain praise [1, p. 801], a special manifestation in the sugya, brought in the name of a certain Amora who is mentioned in the midpoint of the matters discussed in the sugya [1, p. 827], an entire extensive sugya attached to the mishna, from the school of Rava [1, p. 827], the sugya was supplemented in the academy of the student Amora following the Mehoza sugya from his teacher's academy [1, p. 827], the alternating names of a certain Amora are routine [1, p. 837], an early sugya redacted by the school of Rava [1, p. 863], an entire sugya attached to the mishna by the school of Abaye [1, p. 863], the sayings of the Amora appear to be an academic rather than a practical exercise [1, p. 868], the entire sugya is Pumbedita-oriented [1, p. 875], a Pumbedita sugya redacted by the school of Rava [1, p. 877], an entire tradition from the school of Rava [1, p. 885], an early give-and-take from the school of Abaye [1, p. 885], the Amora's specific reading of the baraita is clearly artificial [1, p. 889], the initial textual reading by the school of Abaye [1, p. 896], Amoraim from the fifth generation ruled between two traditions [1, p. 897], the sayings of the Amoraim are based on a tannaitic source and hence their identical phrasing [1, p. 903], the Amoraim did not read tales as sources but rather as a story with a halakhic or moral lesson [1, p. 906], the Amora usually conveyed early Land of Israel traditions [1, p. 923], the Amora utilized the interpretive method of 'היסורי מהסרא' that he endorsed [1, p. 946], the sayings of the Amora in the sugya do not pertain to the mishna, rather they were transferred to Tractate Eruvin from Tractate Betza [1, p. 951], including the ruling by the Amora is what caused the interpretation problems of the Rishonim [1, p. 957], the Babylonian Amora did not have the Land of Israel tradition that arrived in Babylonia [1, p. 959], the 'נחותי' Amoraim from the fourth generation are those who brought many Land of Israel traditions to Babylonia [1, p. 959], the sayings of the Amora themselves had already been included in Tractate Eruvin in light of their compatibility with the words of the

mishna [1, p. 963], judging by the names of the Amoraim, the sugya had already been completed in the first generations of the Amoraim [1, p. 964].

3.3. A sugya demonstrating the manner of research

We have chosen to present a sample sugya that will demonstrate the author's manner of research. The sugya relates to the side-posts of a courtyard (Eruvin 12a-12b). The following is the text of the printed version, in short (Vilna edition).

“R. Sheshet in the name of R. Jeremiah b. Abba who had it from Rab stated: The Sages agree with R. Eliezer in the case of the side-posts of a courtyard. R. Nahman, however, stated: The *halachah* is in agreement with the ruling of R. Eliezer in respect of the side-posts of a courtyard. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: Who [are they that] `agree` [with R. Eliezer]? Rabbi. [But since R. Nahman said,] `The *halachah* is` it follows that some differ; who is it that differs from his view? - The Rabbis. For it was taught. A courtyard may be converted into a permitted domain by means of one post, but Rabbi ruled: Only by two posts. R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan: A courtyard requires two side-posts. Said R. Zera to R. Assi: Did R. Johanan give such ruling? Did not you yourself state in the name of R. Johanan that the side-posts of a courtyard must have [a width of] four handbreadths? And should you suggest [that the meaning is] four [handbreadths] on one side and four on the other, surely [it may be retorted] did not R. Adda b. Abimi recite in the presence of R. Hanina or, as some say, in the presence of R. Hanina b. Papi: [The ruling applies to a case where] the small courtyard was ten, and the large one eleven cubits? - When R. Zera returned from his sea travels he explained this [contradiction]... and that which R. Adda b. Abimi recited is [the view of] Rabbi who holds the same view as R. Jose.”

“R. Joseph laid down in the name of Rab Judah who had it from Samuel that a courtyard may be converted into a permitted domain by means of one side-post. Said Abaye to R. Joseph: Did Samuel lay down such a ruling? Did he not in fact say to R. Hanina b. Shila, ‘Do not you permit the use [of a courtyard] unless [there remained] either the greater part of the wall or two strips of it’ - The other replied: I know only of the following incident that occurred at Dura di-ra‘awatha where a wedge of the sea penetrated into a courtyard and [when the question] was submitted to Rab Judah he required the gap [to be provided with] one strip of board only. ‘You’, [Abaye] said to him, ‘speak of a wedge of the sea; but in the case of water the Sages have relaxed the law. As [you may infer from the question] which R. Tabla asked of Rab: Does a suspended partition convert a ruin into permitted domain? And the other replied: A suspended partition can effect permissibility of use in the case of water only, because it is only in respect of water that the Sages have relaxed the law.’”

“Does not the difficulty at any rate remain? - When R. Papa and R. Huna son of R. Joshua returned from the academy [of Rav] they explained it: [A side-post] on one side [of a gap] must be four [handbreadths] wide but where there is one] on either side any width whatever is enough. R. Papa said: If I had to point

out a difficulty it would be this. For Samuel said to R. Hananiah b. Shila, 'Do not you permit the use [of a courtyard] unless [there remained] either the greater part of the wall or two strips of it'. Now what was the need for 'the greater part of the wall'? Is not a strip of four handbreadths [in width] enough? And should you reply that 'the greater part of the wall' referred to a wall of seven [handbreadths in width] where four handbreadths constitute the greater part of the wall, [the objection might be raised,] why should it be necessary to have four handbreadths, when three and a fraction are enough, since R. Ahli, or it might be said R. Yehiel, ruled [that no provision was necessary where a gap is] less than four [handbreadths in width]? - If you wish I might reply: One ruling deals with a courtyard and the other with an alley. And if you prefer I might reply: [The ruling] of R. Ahli himself [is a point in dispute between] Tannas. Our Rabbis taught: From a wedge of the sea that ran into a courtyard no water may be drawn on the Sabbath unless it was provided with a partition that was ten handbreadths high. This applies only where the breach was wider than ten cubits but [if it was only] ten [cubits wide] no provision whatever is necessary. 'No water may be drawn' [you say] but the movement of objects is inferentially permitted; [but why?] Has not the courtyard a gap that opens it out in full on to a forbidden domain? [12b] - Here we are dealing [with a fallen wall] stumps of which remained.'" [46]

The author discussed this sugya [1, p. 790-792] and *in the first stage* he begins by setting the boundaries of the sugya and he notes where the sugya begins ('R. Sheshet in the name of R. Jeremiah bar Abba who had it from Rab') (12a) and where it ends ('Here we are dealing [with a fallen wall] stumps of which remained') (12b).

Then, *in the second stage*, he notes the topic of the sugya: permitting the use of a courtyard that was fully breached on one side or that was breached on this side by more than ten handbreadths.

In the third stage he presents three ruling traditions that are contained in the sugya - a Mehoza tradition in the name of 'R. Sheshet in the name of R. Jeremiah bar Abba who had it from Rab' and R. Nahman, a Land of Israel tradition in the name of sages from the Land of Israel, R. Assi in the name of Johanan, R. Zera, R. Adda bar Abimi in the presence of R. Hanina, R. Abba, Rabbi, and R. Jose, and a Pumbedita tradition in the name of R. Joseph, Rab Judah, Samuel, and Abaye. Further on in the sugya there is a give-and-take from the Sura sages R. Papa and R. Huna son of R. Joshua, and finally the rest of the sugya in the name of '*stam ha-gemara*', which notes two ways of resolving the first previous problem ('*kashya*') - in the name of R. Ahli or it might be R. Yehiel, and the second in the name of R. Ahli.

In the fourth stage the author raises five queries that arise from the sugya in its current form [1, p. 791-792].

In the fifth stage the author notes that he resolves all these queries based on the redaction of the sugya. He explains that the last redactor of the sugya, who had the various traditions before him, wished to connect the Mehoza tradition with the Land of Israel tradition and he did this by using the words of R. Nahman bar Isaac. He notes the routine usage - *ashgara* (a stylistic means

mentioned above) of the word *perashuha* (=explain it), which originated from the phrases of R. Papa and R. Huna son of R. Joshua.

In the sixth stage, the author expresses his opinion about the redaction of the sugya in light of his entire discussion and says: “The more it seems that the compiler thought, associatively [another stylistic means mentioned above], that this sugya dealing with the courtyard should be compiled here in the midst of sugyot whose content deals with the laws of alleys” [1, p. 792].

3.4. Research method

3.4.1. Enumeration

One dominant research method that underlies the author’s conclusions is enumeration. The following are several select examples (available in the footnotes).

The author enumerates explanations that use a certain phrasing [1, p. 768], a resolution in a style that is routine in the Talmud Bavli, in the name of a certain Amora [1, p. 788], a phrase that recurs in several places in the Talmud Bavli [1, p. 792], the baraita is compiled in affiliation with the Mishna in a Talmudic style by elimination [1, p. 816], the use of the term 'צריכותא' in the Talmud [1, p. 845], a certain comment by an Amora [1, p. 871], the number of places where a certain Amora is mentioned [1, p. 920], a certain phrasing in the name of the Amora [1, p. 923], a recurring or similar reference in the name of the Amora [1, p. 927], the number of places where a certain justification said by Amoraim appears [1, p. 939], examples in the Talmud of a question raised by the redactor [1, p. 945], the sayings of a certain Amora that recur several times in Tractates Shabbat and Eruvin [1, p. 953], the number of times the Amora rejects the words of the sages using a certain phrase [1, p. 956], examples of adding a concluding question to the give-and-take [1, p. 958-959], places in the Talmud that contain a certain expression [1, p. 960], places where a certain midrash halakha appears [1, p. 963], the number of places where the Amora explains the tannaitic dispute using a certain phrase 'ישניהם מקרא אחד דרשוי' [1, p. 964].

3.4.2. Integrity and objectivity

The author indicates a textual reading in the Bavli that appears to lack logic [1, p. 748], notes the initial version of the sugya [1, p. 769], raises doubts regarding the existence of a routine usage (*ashgara*) in the analogy on the Amora’s words [1, p. 771], notes an unreasonable answer [1, p. 794], rules as in Rashi’s commentary [1, p. 805], contends that according to the mishna it is not clear to what the Tanna is referring [1, p. 806], it appears to him that the Amora’s name is an addition [1, p. 810], doubts whether the Amora’s words are indeed his own [1, p. 811], notes his suggestions [1, p. 811], indicates that a certain expression is appropriate, although it is not often used in the Talmud Bavli [1, p. 816], notes something that is unreasonable [1, p. 832], the sources for determining the names of the Tannaim are not clear to him [1, p. 833], doubts

whether there had been one story in two versions or two separate stories [1, p. 835], notes that a copyist made an error because the name of the Amora appears in the next sugya as well [1, p. 840], notes that switching the names of certain Amoraim is something that was done by copyists [1, p. 840], indicates that the Tosafot rejected the reading of the printed version [1, p. 841], explains that the term 'צריכותא' is a stylistic setting that aims to prove that a double halakha or ruling were brought because each of them contains some innovation; or: if either of them had been stated separately we could have reached a mistaken understanding [1, p. 845], indicates a unique place in the Talmud where the name of the Amora is mentioned as the one who stated the 'צריכותא' [1, p. 845], notes the error of the person who recited the ruling of the Amora [1, p. 852], notes a certain method (chaining) of learning from biblical verses [1, p. 856], rejects the opinion of his teacher [E.Z. Melamed] [1, p. 857], admits that he does not know the original version of the Amora's sayings [1, p. 858], extensively cites the opinion of another researcher on the sugya in question [1, p. 860], indicates a puzzling phenomenon in the sugya [1, p. 861], contends that it is not clear whether three sections of the mishna belong to the dispute in the sugya [1, p. 861], indicates a linguistic phrase utilized by many Amoraim [1, p. 862], notes reasons underlying his suggestion to identify a certain Amora [1, p. 867], suggests glossing the textual reading contained under the term 'איבעיא להו' [1, p. 869], suggests a reading of his own for the interpretive problem [1, p. 869], in his opinion, the interpretation of one of the Rishonim does not seem right [1, p. 893], suggests a wording of his own for the Amora's question [1, p. 893], indicates a faulty tradition and suggests reconstructing it based on the Talmud Yerushalmi [1, p. 899], indicates that despite much deliberation on the sugya he found no other explanation than that written by another researcher (D. Halivni) [1, p. 909], contends that a halakha of a certain Amora generates interpretive difficulties [1, p. 915], criticizes the interpretations of the commentators that are indeed required by the sugya but do not suit the words of the baraita [1, p. 920], contends that the order of the give-and-take in the sugya is not acceptable [1, p. 920], thinks that the Amora's reading does not suit the phrasing in the sugya [1, p. 924], notes a question in the sugya as very puzzling [1, p. 924], learns an opinion of a certain Amora from the 'היסורי מהסרא' [1, p. 924], it appears to him that the opposite version attached to the mishna is indeed a faulty version [1, p. 927], he has no explanation how the name of a certain Amora was added [1, p. 928], notes a sugya that does not belong to the current mishna and that relates to mishnayot in another chapter [1, p. 931], notes that a certain sugya led to deliberations by many commentators [1, p. 933], does not know why Rashi decided to add a certain matter involving a prohibition to his commentary at this point in the sugya, where it is in fact discussed further on in the sugya [1, p. 936], notes that he analyzes the sugya differently and the lore does not accept the sayings of another researcher [1, p. 937], clarifies that through a sophisticated give-and-take we reached what the redactor showed us in all three parts of the sugya [1, p. 938], notes that the Rishonim deliberated on a certain sugya [1, p. 939], the name of the Amora seems to have been introduced later by means of reciters [1, p. 940], notes that the sayings of the Amora were stated in another

place but are not contained in the Talmud as it is before us [1, p. 945], clarifies that a certain Amora is wont to suggest an interpretation even if it is distant from the wording of the mishna or baraita [1, p. 947], indicates short baraitot suggested in the Talmud using the term 'תנא' [1, p. 948], indicates a question and answer that were added by the redactor [1, p. 959], the opinion of one of the researchers (D. Halivni) does not appear to him to be correct [1, p. 959], notes that it is not clear to him how a sentence with an unclear meaning was merged within the give-and-take, and it is not clear where it was taken from and what it insinuates [1, p. 960], notes that the first commentators deliberated with regard to a certain sentence within the sugya and that there are different textual readings [1, p. 960], it is not clear to him from where the words of the Amora were quoted and who quoted them in the sugya [1, p. 962], indicates a strange explanation in the sugya [1, p. 963].

4. Conclusions

The research on Tractate Eruvin is based on the assumption that rather than being composed by a single individual, the Talmud Bavli encompasses sources from several types, times, and places. It consists of biblical verses, tannaitic sources, amoraic statements, amoraic give-and-take, matters pertaining to tales, ethics, and medicine.

An amoraic give-and-take surrounding a single matter is called a *sugya*. When several sugyot are joined together they can be defined as a *siddur* (here: compilation) of sugyot. The Amoraim joined sources together and connected them to form a single entity and if it was not for the names of the Amoraim we would have thought that everything we have before us originates from a single source. A review of each tractate reveals the names of dozens of Amoraim. Some take part in the give-and-take and some are quoted in it. Some are from the Land of Israel and some from Babylonia. When we find the names of Amoraim from the Land of Israel in a sugya, this indicates that it contains a Land of Israel tradition. When the sources originate from Babylonian Amoraim, this means that the sugya contains a Babylonian tradition, but in many sugyot there is a merging of Land of Israel and Babylonian traditions. The dominant tradition in the sugya can be revealed by analyzing the sugya. Thus, it is possible to identify whether the Land of Israel tradition was melded into the Babylonian tradition or the opposite. When we expose the Land of Israel or Babylonian traditions, we can find sugyot originating from an early tradition of the first Amoraim or from a late tradition of the last Amoraim. Some early and late traditions are intermixed. In Babylonian traditions as well, the participating Amoraim can be from Pumbedita or Sura or Mehoza or some other town. Naturally, there are queries in the sugya that arise from different aspects of the sugya. The method embraced by the author is that of resolving all queries by analyzing how the sugya was redacted.

The author examined the compilation of the sugyot, namely how the sequence of sources was compiled in sugyot when it is possible to prove that they were intentionally rather than incidentally compiled. For example,

collecting all the statements, interpretations, notes, and comments voiced by the sages of Pumbedita in Chapters 1, 2, expressly shows that these are sources of whom the latest is Abaye. Hence, all these sources are an early Pumbedita-based tradition.

Another method utilized by the author to reveal an early tradition is by comparing a list of sugyot in the Talmud Bavli to parallel sugyot in the Talmud Yerushalmi. If these include identical or similar sources and the Amoraim mentioned are from the first generations, this means that we are dealing with an early tradition.

The author notes that aggadic materials were added at times associatively when compiling the sugyot. Since the Talmud Bavli as it is before us is compiled in affiliation with the Mishna, aggadic materials are not distinct but rather they are always part and parcel of a sugya with a halakhic core. For example, in the context of the *deyomdin* that should be placed around a pit (Eruvin 18a), the homiletic interpretations of R. Jeremiah b. Eleazar regarding 'דיו פרצוף פנים' (i.e. the first man had two full faces) are proposed.

Thus, R. Hisda too compiled a collection of aggadic material following the discussion on 'בורגנין ופסי ביראות' (isolated huts and strips [of wood] around wells) (Eruvin 21a). R. Hisda cited a halakha in the name of Mari son of R. Huna, i.e. Mari bar Mar, and consequently the compiler compiled here six homilies by R. Hisda in a legend in the name of Mari bar Mar. Namely, the compiler took homilies from an early compilation, originating from the academy of R. Hisda. However, this compilation was redacted in the academy of Rava.

We encounter the issue of the redaction or manner of redaction in identical or similar sugyot in the same tractate or in two different tractates. At times, in one place where the sugya is cited, the entire tradition appears, and in another only certain parts of it that were appropriate for that place. When these two places are compared it is necessary to analyse the sugya in order to understand why it is repeated or to clarify the initial location of the contents brought in the sugya.

The issue of reliability differs by type of source. When comparing identical sources located in two or more places in the Talmud Bavli, the differences are usually minimal. When comparing statements as well, the differences between versions are usually insignificant, as a statement (*מימרה*, *memra*) is a halakhic expression and sometimes the version has meaning as well. When comparing parallel sugyot, it is nearly impossible to find identical details and textual readings. With regard to aggadic, ethical, and medical contents, there are many significant differences between these tales and stories. Accordingly, we can usually determine the original version only after analysing the sugya.

With regard to tannaitic sources, they can be discerned in light of the Tannas' names or their unique style and Hebrew language. In the Talmud Bavli, the tannaitic source is quoted using constant quoting terms according to the function of the tannaitic source in the sugya, for example when it is quoted as a tannaitic source attached to a Mishna using the term 'תנו רבנן' (*tanu rabbanan*) or 'תניא' (*tanya*). However, most tannaitic sources are not a collection of tannaitic sources taken from the halakhic assemblages of a religious academy, rather they

are part of the sugya. Namely, the sources as they appear before us are arguments within the amoraic give-and-take. This means that the tannaitic source is not precisely as it was in the tannaitic academy. Hence, we find parallel tannaitic sources with differences in style, version, and halakha.

The Amoraim usually saw the tannaitic source as a valid source that has greater validity than the sayings of Amoraim. Albeck, however, showed that some tannaitic sources quoted from an assemblage of amoraic baraitot are not as valid as sources quoted with the term 'תנו רבנן' (*tanu rabbanan*), as the latter were taken from a tannaitic assemblage [16, p. 28].

In Tractate Eruvin, the sugya's redactor indicates at times which assemblage was the tannaitic source, for example: Tanna Dvei R. Ishmael, Tanna Dvei Shmuel, Tanna Dvei Eliahu, and so on. This is also true of baraitot transmitted from Amoraim, such as Tanei Rav Yosef, Tanei Rav Kahana, and others.

In his research on the redaction of sugyot in Tractate Eruvin, the author analysed the sugyot from different aspects; first and foremost: what is the topic of the sugya, and accordingly determined its boundaries. For example, the first three pages of Tractate Eruvin, 2a-b to 3a. The first seven lines deal with a comparison between the first mishna in Eruvin and the first mishna in Tractate Sukkah, and this is a sugya in itself.

From there (from line 8) to the middle of 3a there is another sugya. The topic of the sugya is the dispute between Tanna Kama and Rab Judah on the subject of 'הכשר מבו'י'. Three Amoraim disagreed as to their interpretation of the tannaitic dispute. These were Rab Judah in the name of Rab (2a), R. Hisda (2b), and R. Nachman bar Isaac (3a). Their interpretation of the dispute was not brought in the sugya one after the other, however, but rather in a give-and-take sequence in the chaining method. Namely, the parts of the give-and-take are linked and continuous. Within the give-and-take there are also other matters, linguistic matters, and difficulties that arise from the give-and-take, as well as queries concerning style. For example, "ר' יהודה מכשיר עד ארבעים ועד המישים" (2b). Another example is when one of the Amoraim justifies his words and these contradict other matters he said, as well as problems and solutions - these too were included within the sugya.

A special matter that is also related to ways of redacting the sugyot are different textual readings of sources introduced by the Amoraim themselves. These are usually brought with terms denoting quotations, such as: readings with the term 'אי איתמר הכי איתמר', readings with the term 'איכא דאמר'י', readings with the term 'לישנא אחרינא' or 'ואמר'י', and readings with the term 'לישנא אחרינא'.

Moreover, there is a list of similar if not identical sugyot that are located both in the Talmud Bavli and in the Talmud Yerushalmi. In some, the tradition is Land of Israel-oriented, meaning that they originated from the Land of Israel, from where they reached Babylonia. In addition, the parallel sugyot can teach us that traditions that had already been shaped in the Land of Israel and then reached Babylonia changed and evolved over the generations, and that these sugyot existed prior to the current version of the Talmud and they too were redacted in later generations.

Acknowledgement

The current author was a student of the reviewed book's author. This article was written in honour of Professor N. Aminoah's ninetieth birthday.

References

- [1] N. Aminoah, *The Redaction of the Shabbat and Eruvin Tractates of the Babylonian Talmud*, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies. Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 2016.
- [2] N. Aminoah, *The Redaction of the Tractate Betza Rosh-hashana and Ta'anith in the Babylonian Talmud*, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies. Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 1986.
- [3] N. Aminoah, *The Redaction of the Tractate Sukkah and Moed-Katan in the Babylonian Talmud*, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies. Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 1988.
- [4] N. Aminoah, *The Redaction of the Brakhot Tractate of the Babylonian Talmud*, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 2022.
- [5] N. Aminoah, *The Redaction of the Tractate Qiddushin in the Babylonian Talmud*, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies. Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 1977.
- [6] J.N. Epstein, *Introduction to Amoraitic Literature Babylonian Talmud and Yerushalmi*, Magnes, Jerusalem, 1962.
- [7] D. Halivni, *Sources and Traditions, A Source Critical Commentary on the Talmud Tractates Erubin and Pesahim*, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Jerusalem, 1982.
- [8] A. Goldberg, *The Mishna Treatise Eruvin Critically Edited*, Magnes, Jerusalem, 1986.
- [9] S. Safrai and Z. Safrai, *Mishnat Eretz Israel Tractate Eruvin*, The E.M. Liphshitz Publishing House College, Jerusalem, 2009.
- [10] S. Friedman, *Mechkarim ve-Massorot*, **1** (1978) 316
- [11] R. Rabinovicz, *Dikdukei Sofrim*, Ma'ayan ha-Hokhma, Jerusalem, 1960, 316.
- [12] A. Schor, *Torat Haim*, vol. 1, M. Katz, Jerusalem, 1969.
- [13] Z. Ben Elazar, *Leshon ha-Zahav, Eruvin*, A. Fischer, Jerusalem, 1976.
- [14] I. Halewy, *Piryo be-'Eito on Rashi Commentary to Tractate Eruvin*, Friedman, Bnei-Beraq, 1971.
- [15] A. Hyman, *Toldoth Tannaim ve-Amoraim*, Kirya Ne'emana, Jerusalem, 1964.
- [16] C. Albeck, *Introduction to the Talmud, Babli and Yerushalmi*, Dvir, Tel Aviv, 1969.
- [17] N. Ben Jehiel, *Aruch ha-Shalem*, Kohut edition, Shilo, Jerusalem, 1970.
- [18] A. Weiss, *Hithavut ha-Talmud bi-Shlemuto*, The Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, New York, 1943.
- [19] A. Weiss, *Mechkarim ba-Talmud*, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1975.
- [20] E.Z. Melamed, *Perkei Mavo le-Sifrut ha-Talmud*, Gal'or, Jerusalem, 1973.
- [21] J.N. Epstein, *Mavo le-Nossach ha-Mishna*, Magnes, Jerusalem, 1964.
- [22] C. Albeck, *Mechkarim ba-Baraita ve-Tosefta ve-Yachassan la-Talmud*, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 1969.
- [23] S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshutah*, vol. 3, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, 1962.

- [24] E.Z. Melamed, *Halachic Midrashim of the Amoraim in the Babylonian Talmud*, Magnes, Jerusalem, 2011.
- [25] S. Liebermann, *Ha-Yerushalmi Kiphshuto*, Drom, Jerusalem, 1934.
- [26] M. Assis, *A Concordance of Amoraic Terms Expressions and Phrases in the Yerushalmi*, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, 2010.
- [27] Z.M. Dor, *The Teachings of Eretz Israel in Babylon*, Dvir, Tel Aviv, 1971.
- [28] J.E. Ephrathi, *The Savoraic Period and its Literature*, Agudath Bnai Asher, Petach Tikva, 1973.
- [29] B.M. Lewin, *Otzar haGaonim Tractate Erubin*, vol. 3, The Hebrew University Press Association, Jerusalem, 1930.
- [30] Y. Brand, *Ceramics in Talmudic Literature*, Mossad Harav Kook, 1953.
- [31] E.E. Urbach, *Ha-Halakha Mekoroteha ve-Hitpatchuta*, Yad la-Talmud, Jerusalem, 1984.
- [32] I.H. Weiss, *Dor Dor ve-Dorshav*, vol. 3, Ziv, Jerusalem, 1964.
- [33] E.Z. Melamed, *An Introduction to Talmudic Literature*, Melamed, Jerusalem, 1973.
- [34] Y.D. Gilat, *The Teachings of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos*, Dvir, Tel Aviv, 1968.
- [35] B.Z. Eshel, *Jewish Settlements in Babylonia during Talmudic Time Talmudic Onomasticon*, Magnes, Jerusalem, 1979.
- [36] P. Neaman, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Geography*, Chechik, Tel Aviv, 1963.
- [37] A. Oppenheimer, *Babylonia Judaica in the Talmudic Period*, Reichert, Wiesbaden, 1983.
- [38] J.H. Dünner, *Hagahot al Massekhet Eruvin, Beitza ve-Sukkah*, Slobotzky, Frankfurt a. Main, 1896.
- [39] U. Zur, *Orr Israel, Sugyot be-Massekhet Eruvin*, The Habermann Institute for Literary Research, Lod, 1999.
- [40] A.A. Stollman, *BT Eruvin Chapter X*, The Society for the Interpretation of the Talmud, Jerusalem, 2008.
- [41] N. Aminoah, *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 9 (1985) 15.
- [42] N. Aminoah, *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 10 (1989) 77.
- [43] N. Aminoah, *Te'uda*, 3 (1983) 35.
- [44] N. Aminoah, *Rev. Etud. Juives*, 145(1-2) (1986) 5.
- [45] N. Aminoah, *Early Talmud to the Seventh Chapter of Tractate Berakhot*, in *Neti'ot Ledavid*, Y. Elman, E.B. Halivni & Z.A. Steinfeld (eds.), Orhot Press, Jerusalem, 2004, 143.
- [46] I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Mo'ed, 'Erubin*, vol. 2, The Soncino Press, London, 1935, 790.