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Abstract: The present article is a study of the Genizah fragment containing parts of various sugyot from tractate Eruvin in the Babylonian Talmud. The principal focus is on the peculiarities of the Aramaic sections seen in contrast with the Hebrew parts of the text. The article introduces the ancient Aramaic wording in the fragment, emphasizing the consistent use of Aramaic, the elements of Aramaic grammar, the clarity of the usage and the precision of the linguistic specification. Proceeding along the same lines, the article also considers the relatively rare use of terminology in connection with the name of one of the Tannaim, as well as the use of Hebrew and a particular problem arising in connection with the fragment’s content – an issue which also arises in other versions of the same text.

Keywords: Genizah. Talmud. Hebrew.

Resumo: O presente artigo é um estudo do fragmento de Genizah contendo partes de vários sugyot do tratado Eruvin no Talmude da Babilônia. O foco principal é as peculiaridades das seções aramaicas vistas em contraste com as partes hebraicas do texto. Este trabalho apresenta a antiga redação aramaica no fragmento, enfatizando o uso consistente dessa língua, os elementos da gramática, a clareza do uso e a precisão da especificação linguística. Procedendo nas mesmas linhas, o artigo também considera o uso relativamente raro da terminologia em conexão com o nome de um dos Tanaim, bem como o uso do hebraico e um problema particular que surge em conexão com o conteúdo do fragmento e em outras versões do mesmo texto.


1 Description of the Genizah Fragment

The Genizah fragment’s signature is “Cambridge U-L T-S F1(2) 114”. FGP n. C93384. The fragment is described in the catalogue entry on the Friedberg site. It consists of a pair of paper sheets with a visible lacuna between them, which are damaged at the edges. Sheet measurements: 23.7 by 17.7 cm. Each sheet contains 20 lines and the writing style is Oriental Intermediate. The approximate date of the writing is in the
11th century. The supposed place where the copy was prepared is the Land of Israel, Egypt, Babylon, or Syria. The fragment is written on paper; the color of the ink is faded black.

In terms of calligraphy, the writing is legible but not ornate. The scribe observed the left margin by crowding extra words. In passages quoted from the Bible, the scribe put the (gershayyim) cantillation mark above each word.

The fragment consists of two pages which do not form a sequence. The right-hand column is taken up by the text of the Babylonian Talmud, tractate Eruvin 54a, beginning with the words "לשרך תהי רפאות הפשוק" until "الفסק לו אין ועד סלה".

The left-hand column has the text from Eruvin 63b, "ברכה عليه תבוא נדה אשתו אם" until "נטריה מאן האידנא דעד", and from 63a "יין רביעית שתה שמואל אמר יהודה רב אמר מציאה מחוץ" – non-consecutively, with gaps.

2 The Text of the Printed Version (bEruvin 54a)1

If he [a man] feels pains in his bowels, let him engage in the study of the Torah, since it is said, It shall be a healing to thy navel.1 If he feels pain in his bones, let him engage in the study of the Torah, since it is said, And marrow to thy bones.2 If he feels pain in all his body, let him engage in the study of the Torah, since it is said, And healing to all his flesh.3 R. Judah son of R. Hiyya remarked: Come and see how the dispensation [measure] of mortals is not like that of the Holy One, blessed be He. In the dispensation of mortals, when a man administers a drug to a fellow it may be beneficial to one limb but injurious to another, but with the Holy One, blessed be He, it is not so. He gave a Torah to Israel and it is a drug of life for all his body, as it is said, And healing to all his flesh.4

R. Ammi said: What is the exposition of the Scriptural text, For it is pleasant thing if thou keep them within thee: let them be established altogether upon thy lips?5 When are the words of the Torah “pleasant”? “When thou keepest them within thee”. And when wilt thou keep them within thee? When they will “be established altogether upon thy lips”. R.

* I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Ezra Chwat for his assistance in describing the fragment and to the Manuscripts Department and the Institute of Hebrew Manuscript Facsimiles at the National Library in Jerusalem. Also, I would to thank The Syndics of Cambridge University Library for their permission to use the image Cambridge U-L T-S F1 (2)114.

1 Prv. 3:8.
2 Prv. 3:8.
3 Prv. 4:22.
4 Prv. 4:22.
5 Prv. 22:18.
Zera said, [this may be derived] from the following: A man hath joy in the answer of his mouth; and a word in due season, how good is it! When “hath a man joy”? When he has an “answer in his mouth”. Another version: “When hath a man joy in the answer of his mouth”? When the “word is in due season; O, how good is this”! R. Isaac said, This may be derived from the following: But the word is very high unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it; When “is it very high unto thee”? When it is “in thy mouth and in thy heart to do it”. Raba said, It may be derived from the following: Thou hast given him his heart’s desire, and the utterance of his lips Thou hast not withholden. Selah? When “hast Thou given him his heart’s desire”? At the time when “Thou hast not withholden the utterance of his lips. Selah.”

Raba pointed out an incongruity: It is written, Thou hast given him his heart’s desire, and it is also written, And the utterance of his lips Thou hast not withholden. Selah? If he is worthy, “Thou hast given him his heart’s desire,” but if he is unworthy, “The utterance of his lips Thou hast not withholden. Selah”.

It was taught at the school of R. Eliezer B. Jacob: Wherever [in Scripture] the expression of nezah, selah or waed occurs the process to which it refers never ceases.

3 Eruvin 63b- 64b

Raba said: If one’s wife is a menstruant may be blessing come upon him. This [Raba’s view], however, is not very logical, for who watched him [The husband] until that time?

[64a] Rab Judah stated in the name of Samuel: He who has drunk a quarter of a log of wine must not give a legal decision. “This ruling” observed R. Nahman, “is not a very fine one, because in my own case, before I drink a quarter of a log of wine my mind is not clear”.

Said Raba to him: Why did the Master speak in such a manner? Did not R. Aha b. Hanina in fact state, “What is the exposition of the Scriptural text, But he that keepeth company with harlots loses his substance?” Whosoever says, “This ruling is a fine one” or “That ruling is not a fine one loses the substance of the Torah”? – “I withdraw”, the other replied.

Rabbah son of R. Huna ruled: One who is under the influence of drink must not pray, but if he did pray his prayer is regarded as a proper one. An intoxicated man must not pray, and if he did pray his prayer is an abomination. How are we to understand the expression of “One who is under the influence of drink” and how

---

6 Prv. 15:23.
7 Dt. 30:14.
8 The man who by his presence provides a moral safeguard.
9 Prv. 29:3.
that of “man intoxicated man”? – As follows. When R. Abba b. Shumani and R. Menashya b. Jeremiah of Difti were taking leave from each other at the ford of the river Yopati they suggested, “Let each one of us say something that the other has never heard before, for Mari son of R. Huna laid down: The best form of taking leave of a friend is to tell him a point of the halachah, because he would remember him for it”. “What is to be understood”, one of them began, by “one who is under the influence of drink” and what by "an intoxicated man”? The former is one who is able to speak in the presence of a king, the latter is one who is unable to speak in the presence of a king. “What”, the other began, “should he who took possession of the property of a proselyte10 do that he shall be worthy of retaining it? Let him purchase with it a scroll of the Law”. R. Shesheth said: Even [64b] a husband [should act in a similar manner] with his wife’s estate. Raba said: Even a man who engaged in trade and made a large profit should act in a similar manner. R. Papa said: Even he who has found something [should act in the same manner]. [Epstein Ed.]

4 The Text of the Genizah Fragment

4.1 The First Page11

10 Who died without any Jewish issue and thus had no legal heirs.
11 Eruvin 54a.
12 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "עホーム".
13 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אפראת".
14 Prov. 3:8. MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "לשרך".
15 Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בצセットה". MS Munich 95 misses the word.
16 Prov.3:8: "ושקוי". Also, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version.
17 MS Munich 95 misses the words: "בצセットה".
18 Vatican 109 misses the word: "בכד".
19 Vatican 109: "בכד".
20 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בכד".
21 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בכד".
22 Prov. 4:22.
23 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "יירס". Oxford 366: "יירס".
24 The printed version misses the word: "בררה".
25 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109 and the printed version: "יירס". Oxford 366: "יירס".

---

10 Who died without any Jewish issue and thus had no legal heirs.
11 Eruvin 54a.
26 Oxford 366 misses the words: "ומדה נשא".
27 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "וראיה".
28 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "שלא".
29 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "כמהד".
30 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109 and the printed version: "מדת".
31 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "מדה".
32 MS Munich 95: "-pagination".
33 Vatican 109, Oxford 366: "וכלבריה". MS Munich 95 added: "_pagination".
34 The printed version: "הלה יפה".
35 The printed version: "ויהיה נשא".
36 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "ליראה".
38 Vatican 109, Oxford 366: "נסם". The printed version has: "נסם". MS Munich 95 added: "נסם של אריה".
39 Prov. 4:22: "לכולם הוא למזוןアイテム". Vatican 109 added: "_pagination".
40 Vatican 109: "_pagination".
41 Prov. 22:18. MS Munich 95, Oxford 366 miss the words: "ederation על שפתיך". Vatican 109 added: "ederation על שפתיך".
42 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "_pagination".
43 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "_pagination".
44 Vatican 109, Oxford 366: "_pagination".
45 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "_pagination".
46 The printed version: "_pagination".
47 MS Munich 95: "Pagination". Vatican 109: "Pagination".
48 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "pagination".
49 Prov. 15:23. Oxford 366 misses the words: "_pagination".
50 MS Munich 95: "pagination". Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "_pagination".
וכתי מאמца облаטה, ואמר להם: "לא יכתי שמאת אליש בֵּינֵי וּלי.

57 MS Munich 95, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "כמי". The printed version added: "לא אמרתי שמאת אליש בֵּינֵי וּלי".

58 MS Munich 95: "בֵּיתך". Vatican 109 misses the word: "בֵּיתך".

59 Vatican 109: "בדבר".

60 MS Munich 95, Oxford 366 miss the words: "בדבר".

61 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בדבר".

62 Dt. 30:14. Vatican 109, Oxford 366 miss the words: "בדבר".

63 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "בֵּיתך".

64 Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בדבר".

65 Vatican 109 and the printed version miss the words: "בדבר". Oxford 366 musses the word: "בדבר".

66 Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בדבר".

67 MS Munich 95 misses the words: "בדבר". Oxford 366: "bsd פֹּלֶעֶב בֵּן". "bsd פֹּלֶעֶב בֵּן". The letter "ב" are to complete the end of the line.

68 Vatican 109 and the printed version: "בדבר".

69 MS Munich 95 misses the words: "בדבר".

70 oxford 366 misses the words: "ןָתַתְך" apparently by homeoteleuton from "ןָתַתְך" [17=15 מִתָּה יְהוָה וּלְךָ לְעַל הַגָּדֶה] [15=17 יִדְּבְּרָה [פּוֹדֵד] בֵּיתֵךְ] בֵּיתֵךְ וּלְעַל הַגָּדֶה].

71 oxford 366 misses the word: "בֵּיתך".

72 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109: "בדבר".

73 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109: "בדבר".

74 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "בדבר" and has: "ואמר ר" [17 יִדְּבְּרָה]. Oxford 366: "בדבר". The printed version added: "בדבר".
5 The Second Page

The printed version has: "א"ר"א".

Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "נכרא". MS Munich 95 misses the words: "זוכ".

The word is truncated. Vatican 109: "א"ור"א".

MS Munich 95: "דכתי".

Eruvin 63b.

MS Munich 95 and the printed version: "מעба".

Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "מעה". MS Munich 95 misses the words: "זוכ".

Eruvin 64a. Oxford 366: "נגריה".

MS Munich 95 and the printed version: "נשתא". Vatican 109, Oxford 366: "נשתא".

Oxford 366 added: "א"ל יתפלל".

HANANEL, R. Eruv., 64a and MS Munich 95: "למא".

MS Munich 95 added: "זוכ".

Oxford 366 and the printed version: "שמועה". MS Munich 95 misses the words: "זוכ" שמועה". Vatican 109 has: "שמועה". The letters: "שמ" are to complete the end of line.

HANANEL, R. Eruv., 64a and Oxford 366: "לא".

MS Munich 95: "רבעיתא".

Oxford 366: "צרוביתא".

HANANEL, R. Eruv., 64a: "רבא". MS Munich 95 misses the word: "רבא".


Vatican 109 and the printed version: "רבעיתא". Oxford 366: "רבעיתא".

Prv. 29:3.

MS Munich 95, Oxford 366: "שמועה". The printed version misses the word: "שמועה".
בי א_geom רבחו ברhoot התבשה 97 אל יטפל 98.

 رمضان ורב הונא 99, והיתפלל 100.

 תפילתו 101 ב mechanically תפילה 102. כ Scarborough 103 אלייתפלל 104, ואותו 105 התפילה 106.


 והוה 114, Ка 115, מיפטר 116, דלא שמיעא לי 117, המתפילה 118, מרחפת, 120, מריה 121, מריה 122, דליתפלה 123, דליתפלה 124, ורב 125, הונה 126.

 97 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "הונה".
 98 HANANEL, R. Eruv, 64a misses the words: "דמע בר".
 99 MS Munich 95 added: "ניי".
 100 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "יתפלל".
 101 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "תפלתו". R. HANANEL, R. Eruv, 64a: "(תועבה)".
 102 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "תפלה".
 103 Vatican 109 and the printed version: "שיכור".
 104 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "ואם".
 105 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109 and the printed version: "התפלל".
 106 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "זמי".
 107 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "זמי".
 108 MS Munich 95, Oxford 366: "שכור".
 109 MS Munich 95 misses the words: "כ ר".
 110 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "הוו כי". Dik dukei Sofrum, Eruv. 64a, p. 130, n. 300 indicates other variants. Vatican 109: "דְּרֵשׁוֹת". Oxford 366: "דְּרֵשׁוֹת". The printed version has: "דרו". Massoret HaShas, Eruvin 64a: "דרו".
 111 MS Munich 95: "ר". The printed version: "רו".
 112 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "קא".
 113 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109: "מיפטרי". The printed version has: "מפטרי".
 114 The printed version has: "אמערא".
 115 MS Munich 95: "willReturn". ESHEL, B. Z. Jewish Settlements in Babylonia During Talmudic Times, Talmudic Onomasticon, Jerusalem 1979, p. 171. The printed version has: "willReturn". Oxford 366 misses the words: "וזה כי מיפטר אברך נהר יเพชร" by mistake (homeoteleuton) of the words "וזה מיפטר" (31) –בשל "וזה מיפטר" (32).
 116 The printed version has: "שהי".
 117 The printed version misses the word: "ר".
 118 MS Munich 95: "ceptors".
 119 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "מילתא".
 120 The printed version has: "שסייר".
 121 The printed version misses the word: "לחל פ".
 122 MS Munich 95, Oxford 366 miss the words: "לא שמיעא לי להבריה".
בר דרבי בר אבא ליעל[35]. The printed version has: "במותך". Ber, 31a: "ברא". Oxford 366: "בר". Massoret HaShas, Eruvin 64a: "בר בריה".
133 The printed version has: "בר".
134 The printed version has: "בר".
135 MS Munich 95, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "בריה". Vatican 109: "בריה". Oxford 366: "בריה". BERACH, "בריה". Massoret HaShas, Eruvin 64a: "בריה".
136 The printed version misses the words: "בר יהוה רב אבא ליעל". Oxford 366 misses the word: "ליעל".
137 MS Munich 95 and the printed version: "אלא".
138 Oxford 366: "אלא".
139 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אלא".
140 Oxford 366 misses the word: "מ windowHeight".
141 MS Munich 95: "פירות". Oxford 366: "בריה". Vatican 109: "בריה". Massoret HaShas, Eruvin 64a: "בריה".
142 The printed version misses the words: "בר יהוה רב אבא ליעל". Oxford 366 misses the word: "ליעל".
143 MS Munich 95 and the printed version: "לא".
144 Oxford 366: "מאמר".
145 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "לא".
146 Oxford 366 misses the word: "מאמר".
147 MS Munich 95 misses the word: "אמר".
148 Oxford 366: "אמר".
149 The printed version has: "אמר".
151 MS Munich 95 added: "אמר".
153 MS Munich 95: "אמר". Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
154 Vatican 109: "אמר".
155 Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
156 Eruvin 64b. MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
6 The Content of the Fragment

No special problems are to be detected in the fragment in forming a clear understanding of the content, except for one instance (common to all the versions). This is the question: who said "דאמר מר רבי חנה" etc. (33) (or: "דאמר מר רבי חנה" in the printed version), whether one (or both) of the Sages previously mentioned are meant – R. Abba ben Shumani and R. Menashya ben Jeremiah of Difty – or whether this is an addition made by the compilers of the sugya, inserted here in connection with the dialogue unfolding between the two.

According to commentators’ opinion, the words “דאמר מר רבי חנה" are part of the dialogue between the two Sages – R. Abba ben Shumani and R. Menashya ben Jeremiah of Difty – where both rely on this passage in suggesting that they part ways in light of a Torah interpretation or a Halakhic point which they had not each heard from his fellow. But scholars are of the opinion that this pronouncement made by Mari son of R. Huna was inserted by the compilers of the sugya as a way of expressing agreement or support for the suggestion of the Sages mentioned above to part ways due to a Halakhic point. This is buttressed by noting that in tractate Berakhot, the same words have been inserted along with the term: "וכן מציא" as a way of expressing agreement with the Baraita preceding them. Grounding for the view that these words form an insertion made by later compilers consists in the fact that the two Sages, R. Abba ben Shumani and R. Menashya ben Jeremiah of Difty, could not have cited anything said by Mari son of R. Huna, considering that they lived before his time. That is, the words of Mari son of R. Huna were added by

---

149 HANANEL, R. Eruv, 64a musess the words: "רב פפא". Oxford 366 misses the word: "פפא".
150 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
151 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
152 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
153 MS Munich 95, Vatican 109, Oxford 366 and the printed version: "אמר".
155 ALBECK, Ch. Introduction to the Talmud, Bavli and Yerushalmi, Tel-Aviv 1969. p. 203-204 n. 114 [Hebrew].
156 Ber. 31a.
someone else who was unaware of the difference between these two early Amoraim and Mari son of R. Huna who lived later than they did.¹⁵⁸

The term כ משנה in tractate Berakhot lends support to the wording in the fragment: דתני (33) (so, too, the version in MS Oxford 366) as opposed to what the printed version has: אמרי.

7 The Hebrew Language of the Fragment

In terms of language, the fragment makes relatively abundant use of matres lectionis, primarily in Biblical verses, differently from the way the same passages appear in the Bible. The use of the letter י as a mater lectionis is relatively abundant, for instance: לשריך (1), ושוריך (2), ומזרת (4), מצדה (4), מבריך (2) (לצדו, לצדו), במשה (8), מבריך (2) (לצדו, לצדו) by contrast with the Biblical verses, in which this י does not appear.

Use of the mater lectionis י by contrast with the verse as it appears in the text of the Bible, with no י. Deviation from the language of the verse: רועה (16) by contrast with the form in the Biblical verse: רועה.

The mater lectionis י is also appear in the Hebrew (and later in the Aramaic) words: שכור (30), but not consistently throughout: שכור (29, 36) by contrast with the verse as it appears in the text of the Bible, with no י. Deviation from the language of the verse: רועה (16) by contrast with the form in the Biblical verse: רועה.

The word: בפני, which appears in the fragment here, is made more precise in the context of speaking before the king because its meaning is: in the presence of the king, albeit the word: לפני is not an error insofar as its meaning is: facing or opposite the king, and this is what appears in the printed version, MS Munich 95 and MS Oxford 366. It is also the more common in Talmudic sugyot.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ HALIVNI, D. Sources and Traditions, Tractate Erubin, Jerusalem 1982. p. 170. [Hebrew].
¹⁵⁹ SUKK, 38b.
Even the word: (39) מחל, which appears in the fragment here, is more precise since its meaning is: some part (of the proselyte’s possessions) by contrast with the printed version, MS Munich 95, and MS Oxford 366: הבן ובתים which has the meaning of: all (i.e., in all the possessions of the proselyte). This last version did not prevent commentators from interpreting this word along the same lines as the wording in the fragment: some part and not all (the possessions of the proselyte). 160

Additions which make no difference in understanding the fragment and are not significant for the fragment overall: הדבר המא (14), שיעל (34).

8 The Aramaic Language in the Fragment

The text written in Aramaic in the fragment makes use of ʼא as a mater lectionis in the word: (30) (2*) האם, which is the ancient written form in Aramaic; however, later in the fragment, the word appears without the mater lectionis: (36) (2*) דמי.

The fragment makes use of the Aramaic plural suffix (6) זמר for the Hebrew word נפש. And is more consistent from the point of view of the Aramaic: (32) (33) מת afore, as opposed to the printed version: זמר, זמר.

It is precise with regard to grammatical usage in Aramaic: (31) א is to emphasize the second person as opposed to the absence of this word in a different version of the text. In terms of language, the fragment is imprecise in the word (31) היא as compared to other versions: היא or היא.

Similarly, the fragment is clear in terms of language in its use of the third-person pronoun: (33) (32) (31) מAward, as compared to the absence of this word in the printed version. More precise linguistic itemization is to be found in the fragment – (32) (33) (31) מAward, (20) מAward – in comparison with the absence of these words in the printed version.

The fragment contains this term: (20) התא (20) התא. This is rare in connection with the Tanna’s name, רבי אליעזר בן יהודה. 161 More common in the Babylonian Talmud is the expression: רבי אליעזר בן יהודה. 162

9 Summary

The Genizah fragment makes abundant use of various matres lectionis. The fragment is consistent in the way it makes use of Aramaic, as well as consistently grammatical in its Aramaic usage. In terms of language, it is more specific and is therefore clearer than the printed version. There are a few cases of imprecise usage. The fragment

160 RASHI. Eruvin 64a, s.v. Yikach.
161 YEV, 37b.
162 San. 90b; Hul. 132b; Hag. 17b.
163 Pes. 35a; Mena. 70b.
preserves a version of the text which is closer to the primary one by using the term: דתני (33. It is also the only version in which the word (19) appears in a statement made in the name of ר' אליעזר בן יעקב. There are no phrases in the fragment which can affect the way the text should be understood by contrast with other versions. The fragment raises the question which is common to all other versions, as well, in connection with attributing the statement made by Mari son of R. Huna: should this be associated with Amoraim mentioned earlier in the fragment or with later compilers of the sugya? Traditional commentators attribute this statement to the Amoraim mentioned earlier, while more modern researchers for various reasons associate it with the sugya’s later compilers.
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