

VII Rabbinic Responses to Graeco-Roman Culture

YARON Z. ELIAV

Viewing the Sculptural Environment: Shaping the Second
Commandment 411

FRITZ GRAF

Roman Festivals in Syria Palaestina 435

Index of Sources 453

Index of Modern Authors 474

Index of Names and Subjects 480

Offprint

**The Talmud Yerushalmi
and Graeco-Roman Culture**

Edited by

Peter Schäfer

III

Mohr Siebeck

This offprint cannot be purchased from a bookstore.

Some Structural Patterns of Yerushalmi *Sugyot*

by

Jeffrey L. Rubenstein

Table of Contents

PETER SCHÄFER	
Preface	IX
<i>I Rabbis and History</i>	
GIDEON BOHAK	
The Hellenization of Biblical History in Rabbinic Literature	3
RICHARD KALMIN	
Jewish Sources of the Second Temple Period in Rabbinic Compilations of Late Antiquity	17
SETH SCHWARTZ	
Rabbinization in the Sixth Century	55
<i>II Rabbinic Institutions and Identity</i>	
CHRISTINE HAYES	
Genealogy, Illegitimacy, and Personal Status: The Yerushalmi in Comparative Perspective	73
CATHERINE HEZSER	
The Social Status of Slaves in the Talmud Yerushalmi and in Graeco-Roman Society	91
ANDREAS LEHNARDT	
The Samaritans (Kutim) in the Talmud Yerushalmi: Constructs of "Rabbinic Mind" or Reflections of Social Reality?	139
HAYIM LAPIN	
Institutionalization, Amoraism, and Yerushalmi <i>Šebfi't</i>	161

Academic Talmud scholarship has paid increasing attention to the *sugya* as the basic literary unit of the Bavli and to the *sugya*'s structure as a key to the organization of traditions. An awareness of the structure can help to identify the components of the *sugya*, to follow the flow of argumentation and to understand the interrelationship of its parts. Structural considerations may also shed light on the transmission of rabbinic traditions, the redactional process, and perhaps even the intellectual life of rabbinic academies, as structure may be related to memorization and performance.

The pioneering article that argued that many Bavli *sugyot* have well-defined structures and that began to describe these structures was "Some Structural Patterns of Talmudic *Sugyot*," published by Shamma Friedman in the *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies - 1973*.¹ Friedman's two extensive commentaries to entire chapters of the Bavli continue this work by describing the structure of each *sugya* he analyzes.² Some of Friedman's students also outline the structures of the *sugyot* discussed in their commentaries to chapters of Talmud.³ In addition, Louis Jacobs has made observations on structure in his literary analyses of Talmudic *sugyot*.⁴

In his programmatic article Friedman adduces four types of evidence to support his claim that many *sugyot* are characterized by precise structures. First, he tabulates all the *sugyot* contained in three chapters of the Bavli, Yevamot 10 and Bava Metsia 1-2, to assess what percent of *sugyot* feature

¹ Jerusalem, 1977: 3:387-402 (Hebrew). Friedman notes that both Avraham Weiss and Louis Ginzberg made occasional observations on structural units. Neither scholar, however, argued this point in a systematic way.

² "Pereq ha'isha rabba bavavli," *Mehqarim umeqorot*, ed. H. Dimitrovksi (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1977), 283-321; *Talmud 'arukh: pereq hasokher 'et ha'omah* (Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1990-96).

³ See e.g. Stephen G. Wald, *BT Pesahim III: Critical Edition with Comprehensive Commentary* (New York and Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary, 2000), 211-39 (Hebrew).

⁴ *Structure and Form in the Babylonian Talmud* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). See too Jacobs, *Studies in Talmudic Logic and Methodology* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1961).

tripartite structures. He finds that 11/18 *sguyot* in Yevamot (61%), and 21/84 in Bava Metsia (25%) are tripartite, a total of 31% overall.

Second, he presents examples of *sguyot* that contain elegant and complex tripartite structures, some of which feature multiple layers of tripartite units. Third, he looks throughout the Bavli for extended collections of sayings attributed to the same sage or to the same chain of attributions. For example, b. Shab. 140b contains a series of fourteen traditions attributed to Rav Hisda. Friedman finds that groupings of seven are more common than groupings of six, eight or nine, and groupings of fourteen more common than thirteen or twelve.⁵

Fourth, Friedman supports this observation by finding other collections of seven traditions or seven related halakhic questions. B. Suk. 3b–4a, for example, propounds seven halakhic problems concerning maximum and minimum heights of the *sukka*, and b. Yev. 37b–38a discusses seven problems concerning inheritance claims involving a *safeq* (a son whose paternity is in doubt). Although Friedman does not develop these observations into theories to any extent, I think his implicit claim is that the sages made some sort of conscious effort to package traditions in units of three and seven (fourteen is twice seven). Nor does he expatiate on the reason *why* we should find such structures or collections. He hints, however, that these numbers were considered special or lucky, and are particularly common in folklore and literature. The use of such numbers therefore confers upon the collection particular authority or sanctity.⁶

Friedman's article was intended as a preliminary study that raised certain issues, not as a definitive work that reached final conclusions (it was only thirteen pages long). The study, moreover, was limited to the Bavli. I know of no comparable work on the Yerushalmi.⁷ My purpose here is to provide a

⁵ "Structural Patterns," 398–99. The totals: 1 group of six, 8 of seven, 5 of eight, 2 of nine, 0 of twelve and thirteen, 2 of fourteen.

⁶ "Structural Patterns," 391, 397–98.

⁷ Louis Jacobs makes a few observations on the structure of the Yerushalmi parallels to the Bavli *sguyot* he analyzes; see *Structure and Form*, 42–55. In an article on the aggadot incorporated into the Yerushalmi, Leib Moscovitz identifies several collections of aggadic traditions: "Ledarkhei shilvan shel ha'aggadot birushalmi – beirurim rishoniim," *Asuyot* 13 (1998) 197–209; see especially pp. 201–204 and the notes there. Catherine Hezser points to collections of stories in Yerushalmi Neziqin; see *Form, Function and Historical Significance of the Rabbinic Story in Yerushalmi Neziqin* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1993), 269–82. Gary Porton's article on the form, "Until here the text follows the opinion of R. Akiba; according to R. Ishmael, how is the matter proved," does not deal with structure per se. However, these *sguyot* often evince a relatively neat bipartite structure, as the Yerushalmi first derives exegetical support for R. Akiba, and then support for the same law or laws for R. Ishmael. For example, in ySanh 3:9, 21c, the *sguya* justifies three laws for R. Akiba, then those same laws for R. Ishmael, creating an elegantly structured *sguya*. See Gary G. Porton, "According to Rabbi Y: A Palestinian Amoraic Form," *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*, ed. William Scott Green (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978), 173–88.

similar first step, or some first questions, concerning the structure of Yerushalmi *sguyot*. To begin I will simply try to replicate Friedman's approach by searching for evidence comparable to the four types that he adduces.

First, the proportion of tripartite *sguyot*. I analyzed all the *sguyot* in y. Suk. chapters 1–2. In the first chapter 4/18 *sguyot* are tripartite, and in the second chapter 6/25 *sguyot*, a total of 10/43 or 23%. This is not too far from the aggregate of the three Bavli chapters that Friedman tabulated (31%), and similar to the proportion of the two chapters of Bava Metsia (25%).

Second, examples of tripartite structures. The reference letters designate the Hebrew outlines printed at the end of the article.⁸

[A]. The *sguya* provides three explanations for the dispute between R. Shimon and the sages as to whether the ritual *sukka* requires three or four walls. The first explanation is based exclusively on verses from the Torah, the second on a combination of a verse from the Torah and a verse from the Prophets, and the third exclusively on a verse from the Prophets. Thus the *sguya* is crafted with great care.

[B]. This *sguya* contains an internal tripartite unit within each division. The repeated language makes the structure clear.

[C]. We have here an extended story organized into five distinct parts, each of which bears a tripartite structure, with the second part containing a tripartite sub-unit as well.⁹ It is possible that the Yerushalmi redactors simply inserted a narrative source into their text, in which case the structure tells us less about the Yerushalmi than about rabbinic narratives. However, the third section is introduced by a connecting phrase that looks like a redactional link. This section also cites a passage from the Tosefta, which may suggest that the redactors reworked their source and are responsible for the current form of the story. Another Yerushalmi narrative with a tripartite structure is the account of Hillel and the Bnei Betera, y. Pes. 6:1, 33a.

[D]. The *sguya* applies the same midrash attributed to R. Yaakov bar Aha in the name of R. Eleazar to teach that three laws of the tithe (*maaser*) also apply to first fruits.¹⁰ Though not very elaborate, the repetition makes the structure particularly clear.

[E]–[F]. Both of these *sguyot* are bipartite, not tripartite. The precise parallelism and repetitions reveal a deliberate process of structuring material. That is, these *sguyot*, though relatively brief, differ qualitatively from a *sguya* which simply quotes two Amoraic dicta or offers two comments to the Mishna and

⁸ I have cited the Yerushalmi according to the first edition (Venice, 1523).

⁹ For detailed analysis of the structure see Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, "Elisha ben Abuya: Torah and the Sinful Sage," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 7 (1998), 141–222.

¹⁰ The reading in the first part should be "bar Aha," consistent with the second and third parts. R. Yaakov bar Aha regularly cites R. Eliezer in the Yerushalmi. "Bar Hama" is a corruption.

then proceeds in a haphazard manner. Friedmann does not comment on bipartite *sugyot*, although they are certainly present in the Bavli. But if we are interested in structure as an indication of redactional activity, then complex bipartite *sugyot* should be included as well.

Third, collections of seven or fourteen sayings attributed to one sage. Friedmann found these series by scanning the concordance to the Bavli under the heading *ve'amar* for repetitions. Six consecutive identical listings on the same folio or upon two consecutive folios often indicated a series of seven, as the first tradition would be introduced by *'amar* rather than *ve'amar*. In this respect the Bavli differs significantly from the Yerushalmi. A review of all listings of both *'amar* and *ve'amar* in the Order of *Zeraim* in the concordance to the Yerushalmi yields no series of five, six or seven, and only a handful of series of three or four. Of course it is possible that the Yerushalmi employs a different quotation formula for such series, such as "R. X *beshem* R. Y...." which is particularly common. However, a review of the entries under *beshem* in the Order of *Zeraim* yielded only nine series of three or more: seven series of three, one of four and one of seven. (And that series of seven is suspect; see the discussion of [I] below.) In the Order of *Neziqin* I found no instances of three or more, even adopting a loose standard of what constitutes a collection. These results are unimpressive, indicating either that such series were not collected and transmitted in Amoraic times or that they were generally not of interest to the Yerushalmi redactors.

Let us briefly examine a few examples of these series:

[G]. Three rulings attributed to R. Abbahu in the name of R. Yohanan, all of which concern the re-use of foodstuffs that became impure. The three statements have almost identical form and similar content. The Yerushalmi redactors may well have received this unit intact from Amoraic times.

[H]. The traditions of R. Hizqiah in the name of R. Yirmiah are aggadic, as are the bulk of Friedmann's examples of collections. The final three have a common form, quoting R. Shimon directly, whereas the first tradition does not cite his words. The first tradition, however, connects to the preceding discussion which deals with the blessing recited upon seeing a rainbow. It seems that the redactors inherited a collection of four traditions about R. Shimon b. Yohai attributed to R. Hizqiah in the name of R. Yirmiah, and they inserted the entire collection into the *sugya* in the ninth chapter of Berakhot on account of the association with the rainbow.

[I]. This brief *sugya* in Sheviit contains the sole series of seven Amoraic statements identified through the methods mentioned above. Note, however, that the first three dicta comment on the Mishna. There follow two exegetical traditions about fruit yields, and two more exegetical traditions cited in other sages' names concerning eschatological times. It therefore appears that the redactors combined several earlier units of traditions attributed to R. Yonah.

Fourth, Friedmann identified other collections of seven related traditions. These series are more difficult to locate as there is no simple way to scan for them in a concordance. I have been unable to find many such units in the Yerushalmi. The relatively large collections of traditions that I have identified do not seem to be organized in units of any particular number. Such collections include:

(a) Seven stories of Pinhas b. Yair, y. Dem. 1:3, 21d-22a.¹¹

(b) Six stories in which heretics come and ask R. Simlai to explain a verse appear in y. Ber. 9:1, (11)[12]d. In each case the verse can be interpreted as evidence of a plurality of gods. In the last five stories the students say, "You answered him with a straw, but what do you say to us?" and R. Simlai offers a more satisfactory explanation.¹²

(c) Ten parables appear in y. Ber. 9:1, (12)[13]a. The first eight compare a human patron to God, the final two compare a human relative to God. The organization of this series, however, is confused. The *sugya* begins by introducing four discourses (*shittim*) of R. Yudan in the name of R. Yitzhaq, followed by four parables comparing a human patron to God. Between the first and the second parables the *sugya* brings several associated traditions in the name of other sages. The fifth parable is attributed to R. Yudan "in his own name," and concludes that all who cry to God will be saved. This is followed by two related stories, similar in form, of people who invoked the name of a powerful human and were saved, which conclude that those who cry to God will *a fortiori* be saved. There follow two additional patron parables attributed to R. Pinhas, one in the name of R. Zeira, and one in the name of R. Tanhum b. Hanilai, and a third parable attributed to R. Abbahu in the name of R. Eleazar. The *sugya* then introduces another story of someone who cried to God and was saved, followed by two more parables about human relatives. A much neater organization would have started with the ten parables and continued with three stories of cries to God. The back and forth movement and interruptions between types of sources suggests that the redactors combined several collections of patron and relative parables, and interspersed associated traditions. They seem to have added one collection to another in an accretive manner, without reorganizing the *sugya* such that similar traditions followed consecutively.

(d) In y. A.Z. 3:1, 42c there is a series of eleven traditions that begin, "When R. X died ... (*kededamakh*)," followed by one that begins, "R. X died (*damakh*)," and then three that begin, "When R. X was dying ..." (*mi damakh*). Moreover,

¹¹ Cf. Eli Yassif, *The Hebrew Folktales*, trans. J. S. Teitelbaum (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 115-27. Another example may be found in y. A.Z. 3:2, 42c-d, a list of various objects that are worshipped, commenting to m. A.Z. 3:2. The Mishnah claims that idolators worship idols in the shape of hands and feet. The Yerushalmi cites seven biblical verses, with brief explanations indicating what object was worshipped.

¹² Cf. Genesis Rabba 8:9, ed. J. Theodor and H. Albeck (Reprint; Jerusalem 1965 [Berlin, 1912-36]), 62-63, for a partial parallel in which the heretics ask R. Simlai about three verses.

two of the traditions that begin, "When R. X died ..." continue with "R. X died" and "As R. X died ..." (referring to the same sage). So we have either a collection of fifteen stories of the deaths of sages or of seventeen traditions which use the verb "die" (*damakh*).

(c) Seven halakhic questions posed to R. Eleazar in the form, "Rav Yehuda sent to ask R. Eleazar," appear in y. Qid. 1:4, 60b-c.

Now an interesting question is whether certain collections of traditions appear in both Talmuds. I therefore checked all of the collections of seven that Friedman identified in the Bavli for parallels in the Yerushalmi. Friedman found nine collections of traditions attributed to a given sage or the same chain of transmission (e.g. seven traditions of R. Yohanan in the name of R. Shimon bar Yohai), and four collections of seven related halakhic problems (e.g. the questions about dimensions of a *sukka*). Of the nine series attributed to a sage, only that found in b. B. Q. 11 a-b, seven traditions attributed to Ulla in the name of R. Eleazar, has a close parallel in the Yerushalmi, namely this very collection of questions Rav Yehuda sent to ask R. Eleazar. Six of the seven Bavli traditions of b. B. Q. 11 a-b appear in this series, and the seventh is discussed immediately preceding it (the Yerushalmi adds a seventh one not found in the Bavli to complete its septet). This suggests at least that some of these series originated in Palestine; they are not simply the creations of Bavli Amoraim or redactors. On the other hand, of the four series of seven halakhic problems, two have rough parallels in the Yerushalmi. In one case the Yerushalmi *sugya* contains two of the problems, in the other case four or five.¹³ Neither is as neat as the series in the Bavli which contain repeated introductory formulae.¹⁴

Concluding observations: Clearly this is a very preliminary study which examines but a small sample of material. I offer these conclusions as questions for consideration.

(1) We need some criteria for qualitatively evaluating the structure of *sugyot*. Friedman, if I understand him correctly, counts as a tripartite structure both a *sugya* loosely constructed around three Amoraic dicta, as well as a very elegant, orderly *sugya* with multiple tripartite subunits (and I have done the same.) But certainly there is a substantive difference between such structures. There also seems to me no reason to ignore structures other than tripartite, such as the bipartite structures noted above. A complex and perfectly balanced bipartite structure is more significant than a crude tripartite *sugya*. The degree to which a structure is objective and to what extent it is in the eye of the beholder is also an open question. A biblical scholar, Mike Butterworth, has claimed that with enough ingenuity one can find even a chiasmic structure in a miscellaneous

¹³ b. Suk. 3b-4b = y. Suk. 1:1, 51d; b. Yev. 37b-38a = y. Yev. 4:2, 5d.

¹⁴ I have not included here such units as, "There are seven kinds of pietists (*perushim*)," y. Ber. 9:5, (13)[14]d; or "R. Levi said: Because the ten commandments are contained within them [the two paragraphs of the Shema]," followed by ten references; y. Ber. 1:4, 3c.

collection of verses.¹⁵ In order to compare the Bavli and Yerushalmi and make intelligent conclusions, these issues must be addressed.

(2) That being said, many differences between the Bavli and Yerushalmi, and in some respects the major overall difference between the two Talmuds, are often attributed to the post-Amoraic redactors of the Bavli (the Stammaim). They subjected Amoraic traditions to an extensive, active and comprehensive editing process, created complex *sugyot* and formed the intricate texture of argumentation. The Yerushalmi, by contrast, is often said to have a very thin redactional layer. Amoraic traditions were simply recorded at some point without being subjected to an active, interventionist editorial process. While nothing I have presented negates this general view, the presence of tripartite *sugyot* (as well as elegant bipartite *sugyot*) in roughly the same proportion as found in the Bavli suggests that the Yerushalmi redactors were somewhat more active than has been recognized. True, the Yerushalmi *sugyot* are not as complex or extensive as those of the Bavli. But this is a distinction of degree, not kind. Of course this assumes that the structures are the work of the redactors and not the organization of traditions for transmission in Amoraic times. That many of these *sugyot* include considerable unattributed material and juxtapose Amoraic who lived at different times supports assigning responsibility to the redactors. At all events, these highly structured *sugyot* may either call for a reassessment of the nature of the redactional process of the Yerushalmi or a reassessment of the degree of formulated *sugyot* in Amoraic times.

(3) The scarcity of many series of seven traditions or of seven halakhic problems in the Yerushalmi is potentially significant. I would suggest that these collections primarily served a mnemonic function, as did the tripartite structures of *sugyot*. It is easier to memorize a body of traditions if one knows that there are a certain standard number. Thus many mishnahs begin, "There are ten (seven, eight etc.) such-and such ..." The larger collections in the Yerushalmi, by contrast, seem to have been assembled by the redactors out of smaller units of traditions by accretion. They were not packaged in series of seven specifically. This difference may have implications regarding the process of transmission and preservation of traditions in the two centers. It is possible, for example, that Babylonian sages operated in a more dominantly oral milieu.¹⁶ However, the presence of at least one such series in the Yerushalmi suggests that more data be examined before any conclusions are made.

¹⁵ See Mike Butterworth, *Structure and the Book of Zechariah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 1-61.

¹⁶ Yaakov Eilman, "Orality and the Redaction of the Babylonian Talmud," *Oral Tradition* 14/1 (1999), 52-99, points to evidence indicating that a higher degree of orality characterized the Sasanian culture of Persia than the Graeco-Roman culture of Palestine.

- [A] סוכה א, א, נ"ב ע"א
- ר"ש אמר ארבע ורבנן אמרי שלש [א]
- [1] מה שעמון דרבנן סכות סכות חרי שלש. אחת למעלה. ושתיים למטה. והשלשית מדבריהן.
- [2] מה שאמא דרי שמעון. סכת סכת סוכות מלא. חרי ארבע. אחת למעלה. ושלוש למטה ודברי בעית מדבריהן.
- [ב] ר' חייא בר אבא אמר תרין אמורין. חד אמר שעמון דרבנן וחד חורה אמי שעמא דרי שמעון.
- [1] מה שעמון דרבנן. וסוכה תהיה לצל יומם מחורב. חרי אחת למעלה. סוכות סוכות. חרי שלש.
- [2] מה שעמא דרבי שמעון. וסוכה תהיה לצל יומם מחורב. חרי אחת למעלה. סכת סכת סוכות מלא. חרי ארבע.
- [ג] רבנן דקיסרין שמעון שעמא דרבי שמעון ושעמון דרבנן מן קדיין קרייא. וסוכה תהיה לצל יומם מחורב. חרי אחת. ולמחסה למסחר. חרי שתיים. מורם וממטר.
- [1] רבנן עבדין מורם וממטר אחת.
- [2] רבי שמעון עבד מורם וממטר שתיים.
- [B] ברכות ד, א, ע"א-ב
- מאיכן למדו שלש תפילות?
- [א] ר' שמואל בר נחמני אמי כנגד גי פעמים שהיום משתנה על הבריות
- [1] בשחר צדי"ן ארי לומר...
[2] במנחה צדי"ן אדם לומר...
[3] בערב צדי"ן לומר...
[ב] רבי יהושע בן לוי אמר תפילות מאבות למדום
- [1] תפילת השחר מאברהם...
[2] תפילת המנחה מיצחק...
[3] תפילת הערב מעקב...
[ג] ורבנן אמרו תפילות מתמידין גמרו
- [1] תפילת השחר מתמיד של שחר...
[2] תפילת המנחה מתמיד של בין...
[3] תפילת הערב לא מצאו כמה לתלושה ושנו אותה סתם. הוא היא דתנין...
... אמר רבי תחומא עוד היא קבעו אותה כנגד איכל איכרים ופדרים...

- [C] חגיגה ב, ג, ע"ז ע"ב-ג
- [א] אחר הצניץ וקציץ בשיעות [=חוספתא חגיגה ב,ג]
- [1] מנ אחר? אלישע בן אבויה שהיה חורג רבי חורה. אמרין כל תלמיד דהוה חמי ליה משבח באורית הוה קשיל ליה
- [2] ולא עוד אלא דהוה עליל לבית ועדא...
... עליו הכתוב אומר אל תתן את פיך לחשיא את בשרך...
[3] אוף בשע' שומרא הוון משענין לון משולין...
[ב] ר"מ הוה תיב דרש בבית מדרשא דשיכרית. עבר אלישע רביה... אחון ואמרון ליה...
[1] אי"ל מה הויתה דרש... אי"ל... אמר ווי דמוכדין ולא משכחין עקיבה רבך לא הוה דרש כן...
[2] אמר ליה ומה הויתה דרש חובן... אי"ל
[1.2] לאדם שהוליד...
[2.2] לאדם שעשה סחורה...
[3.2] לאדם שלמד תורה...
אמר ווי דמוכדין ולא משכחין עקיבה רבך לא הוה דרש כן אלא... ובי הוה המעשה...
[3] אמר ליה ומה הויתה דרש חובן אי"ל...
[ג] וכל דא מן הן אותה ליה?
[1] אלא פעם אחת היה יושב ושונה בבקע, גיניסר...
[2] ויש אומי ע"י שראה לשונו של רבי יהודה הנחום...
[3] ויש אומרים אמו כשהיתה מעוברת בו היתה עוברת...
[ד] לאחר ימים חלה אלישע. אחון ואמרון לרבי מאיר הא רבך באיש. אל בעי מבקרתיה ואשכחיה באיש...
[1] מן דקברוניה ירדה האש מן השמים ושרפה את קברו. אחון ואמרון לר"מ הא קבריה דרבך אייקר. נפק בעי מבקרתיה ואשכחיה אייקר...
[3] אמרון לר"מ. אין אמרין לך כהווא עלמא למאן את בעי למבקר? לאבך או לדבך...
[ח] לאחר ימים הלכו בנותיו לישראל צדקה מרי
[1] גור רבי ואומר...
[2] באותה שעה בכה רבי וגור...
[3] אמר מה אם זה...
...

[D] ביכורים, ב, ס"ד ע"ד

- [א] שגנוין הבאת מקום דכתיב...
 [1] עד כדון מעשר, ביכור' מניין
 [2] כיי דאמר רבי יעקב בר חמא בשם רבי לעזר הקדוש העלין משמע
 [ב] ושגנוין וידיו דכתיב...
 [1] עד כדון מעשר, ביכורין מניין
 [2] כיי דאמר רבי יעקב בר אחא בשם ר' לעזר הקדוש העלין משמע
 [ג] ואסורין לאונן דכתיב...
 [1] עד כדון מעשר ביכורין מניין
 [2] כיי דאמר ר' יעקב בר אחא בשם ר' לעזר הקדוש העלין משמע

[E] ע"ז א, ד, ל"ט ע"ד

- ישראל שחולך ליריד לזקחין ממנו מפני שהוא כמציל מידן, ובחזירה אסור
 ... ובגדום בין חולקין בין באין מותר
 [א] רבי בא ברבי חייה בר בא בשם רבי יוחנן אם היה פונדק מותר
 [2] רבי זעירא בעי בידיד אסור ובפונדק מותר. דילמא בפדגמשיא
 אמרה רבי יוחנן
 [3] אחא ר' בא ברבי דרבי חייה בר בא בשם רבי יוחנן. אם היה פונדק מותר
 בפרקמשיא אמר ר' יוחנן.
 [ב] ר' אבהו בשם ר' יוחנן החליף בהמה בעבודה וזה אסורה.
 [2] רב חסדא בעי אילו השתחוה... דילמא בפדגמשיא שנכנסה קודם ליריד
 איתאמרת
 [3] אחא רבי זעירא ר' אבהו בשם ר' יוחנן החליף בהמה בעבודה וזה אסרה.
 בפדגמשיא שנכנסה קודם ליריד איתאמרת

[F] תרומות ז, ה, מ"ד ע"ד

- [א] רבי שמעון בן לקיש בשם בר קפרא אמר. והיא שיש בשנייה רוב.
 [ב] ר' יוחנן אמי אף על פי שאין בשנייה רוב.
 [א] מחלפה ששתיה דרבי שמעון בן לקיש. תמן הוא אומר ספקן בשל ברוב.
 והכא אמר הכין
 [2א] תמן בשם גרמיה. והכא בשם בר קפרא.
 [ב] מחלפה ששתיה דרבי יוחנן. תמן הוא אמר כוליה נעשו הזכית. והכא את
 אמר הכין.
 [2] שנייא היא הכא שיש לו במה לתלות.

[G] תרומות ט, ח, מ"ו ע"ד

רבי אבהו בשם רבי יוחנן שיתלי תרומה שנשמאת שותל ועושה אותן תרומי ואם
 היו תרומי מעיקרן כבר נדחו
 רבי אבהו בשם רבי יוחנן מים שנישמאו משיקן ועושה אותן מי חג ואם היו
 מי חג מעיקרן כבר נדחו
 רבי אבהו בשם רבי יוחנן האנים וענבים שנישמאו סוחטין ועושה אותן תרומה ואם
 היו תרומה מעיקרן כבר נדחו

[H] ברכות טב, י"ג ע"ד

רבי חזקיה בשם רבי ירמיה כל ימיו של רבי שמעון בן יוחי לא נראתה הקשת
 בענן.
 רבי חזקיה בשם רבי ירמיה כן הוזה רבי שמעון בן יוחי אומר בקעה בקעה...
 רבי חזקיה בשם רבי ירמיה כן הוזה רבי שמעון בן יוחי אומר אני ראיתי בני
 העולם הבא...
 רבי חזקיה בשם ר' [רמיה] כן הוזה ר' שמעון בן יוחי או יקרב אברהם מן גביה
 ועד גבי' ואנא מיקרב מן גביי ועד סוף כל דרי'

[I] שביעית ד, י, לה ע"ג

"נפנים משיגרעין". אמר רבי יונה משיחלו מים כמה דאת אמר...
 "יזיזים משינצו". אמר רבי יונה משהכניסו רובע.
 מה רובע נין או רובע זיתים. אמר רבי יונה לאי דו נין שהוא עושה רובע זיתים.
 אמר רבי יונה. כתיב כי ישל זחיר. חד לתלת מאה וארבעין קיים בת.
 אמר רבי יונה. כתיב כי עץ נשא פריו. מגיד שלא נשא פריו בעולם הזה...
 בר תניא. המת בשבע שני גוג אין לו חלק לעתיד לבוא... שמע ר' יוסי ואמר...
 אמר רבי יונה בשם רבי חמא
 רבי יונה בשם רבי חייה בר אשי עתידין הן חברין להתייגע מבתי כנסיות
 לבתי מדרשות...