

Redacting Tosafot on the Talmud ***Part II—Editing Methods***

By: ARYEH LEIBOWITZ

Introduction

This article is the second in a series of articles on R. Eliezer of Tuh's redaction of *Tosafot*.¹ R. Eliezer of Tuh was a German Tosafist who flourished in the second half of the thirteenth century.² His most lasting contribution to Torah study is *Tosafot Tuh* (תוספות טוך), an edited version of the great French Tosafist tradition of Talmud study. *Tosafot Tuh* is the “printed” *Tosafot* that appears on the outer margin of the Talmud page in many of the major tractates, including: Tractates *Shabbat*, *Eruvin*, and *Pesahim* in *Seder Moed*, tractates *Yevamot*, *Ketubot*, and *Gittin* in *Seder Nashim*, tractates *Bava Kamma*, *Bava Mezria*, *Bava Batra*, and *Shevuot* in *Seder Nezikin*, tractate *Hullin* in *Seder Kodashim*, and tractate *Niddah* in *Seder Taharot*. Indeed, when people make reference to “*Tosafot*” they are, more often than not, unknowingly referring to *Tosafot Tuh*.

The first article in this series addressed R. Eliezer's sources. It demonstrated that R. Eliezer's primary sources were the Tosafist commentaries that emerged from Ri's academy in Dampierre, France. The primary examples we discussed were the *Tosafot Shanz* of R. Shimshon of Shanz, and the *Tosafot* commentaries of R. Yehudah of Paris, R. Barukh, R. Elhanan of Dampierre, and R. Yehiel of Paris. These highly integrated commentaries generally contained a record of Ri's lectures, with the additions of

¹ The first article in this series is “Redacting Tosafot on the Talmud: Part I – Sources,” *Hakirah* 18 (2014) 235–249. For the development of the Tosafist enterprise as a whole, from its origin through the editing stage undertaken by R. Eliezer, see A. Leibowitz, “The Emergence and Development of Tosafot on the Talmud,” *Hakirah* 15 (2013): 143–163.

² For biographical information regarding R. Eliezer, see E. Urbach, *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1986), 581–585, and A. Leibowitz, “R. Eliezer of Tuh: A German Tosafist,” *Yerushaseinu* 7 (2013): 5–18.

Aryeh Leibowitz is a *Ra"m* at Yeshivat Sha'alvim and serves as the Assistant Dean of the Moty Hornstein Institute for Overseas Students. He is a *musmakb* of RIETS and earned his Ph.D. from Yeshiva University's Bernard Revel Graduate School.

his most celebrated and accomplished students.

This article will explore the editing methods utilized by R. Eliezer when redacting his *Tosafot*. It will discuss the extent that R. Eliezer made changes to the text, and the role that R. Eliezer's own original teachings played in the editing process. The overarching goal will be to determine R. Eliezer's primary objectives in editing his sources.

Syntactical Editing

R. Eliezer's sources were highly developed works that cast the early Tosafist tradition in a sophisticated framework. For this reason, it was often unnecessary for R. Eliezer to edit the passages in his sources. A large number of the inherited passages were already complete and well presented. In such instances, R. Eliezer merely copied the text and included it, as is, in his *Tosafot*.

For this reason, many passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* are strikingly similar to passages in R. Eliezer's source texts, oftentimes bearing little or no signs of editing by R. Eliezer. The most extreme form of this phenomenon is when passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* are exact verbatim copies of an earlier Tosafist source. In these cases, R. Eliezer did not merely *consult*, but rather *copied* from the earlier sources.³

Yet in most cases, passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* are not completely identical to the corresponding passages in R. Eliezer's source text. Nonetheless, the differences are generally slight and non-substantive in terms of content. That is, in many instances we find that the *content* in *Tosafot Tukeh* is practically identical to the content in the source text. This indicates that in many passages R. Eliezer only engaged in syntactic editing.⁴

³ Compare *Tosafot Tukeh* to *Tosafot Shanʿ* in tractate *Bava Batra* 6b *s.v.* עד, *Ketubot* 61b *s.v.* והני, and *s.v.* הלכה. Even when passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* bear definite editing, there are often sections in the passage, even multiple sections that were unaltered. Examples: tractate *Ketubot* 3b *s.v.* ולידרש and *Ketubot* 42a *s.v.* או. R. Eliezer's tendency to leave his source unchanged sometimes resulted in his not even altering statements made in the first person, if the veracity of their intent remained. Hence when R. Shimshon wrote (*Ketubot* 80a *s.v.* ישבע), "As **I** will explain later, with God's help (כמו שאפרש לקמן בעזרת השם)," R. Eliezer has no problem leaving the personal reference untouched, for in his *Tosafot* too he will "explain later, with God's help."

⁴ This suggestion is verifiable in tractates *Ketubot* and *Bava Batra*. *Tosafot Shanʿ* on these two tractates are extant and a comparison of *Tosafot Tukeh* with *Tosafot Shanʿ* shows that many passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* closely parallel the *Tosafot Shanʿ* passages. Note that in some cases it is hard to determine if the slight syntactical differences are due to actual editing undertaken by R. Eliezer, or if they stem

Non-Substantive Editing

Beyond mere syntactical changes, R. Eliezer did engage in actual editing of his source material. Often, though, it was limited and had little bearing on the intent of the original source. For instance, R. Eliezer sometimes rearranged the order of presentation in a specific passage, seemingly in an attempt to convey the material in a clearer fashion.⁵

R. Eliezer also added attributions into the text. This occurs most often with regard to the teachings of Ri. Since R. Eliezer's sources emerged from Ri's academy, many of the sources did not state Ri's name explicitly. Instead, they simply referred to Ri with the title "my teacher" (רבי), or omitted a reference to him completely and appended a signature of "מ"ר," meaning "מפי רבי," to the end of the passage. As editor, R. Eliezer changed "my teacher" to "Ri," or deleted the "מ"ר" signature from the end of the passage, replacing it with phrases like "Ri answered," or "Ri explained" at the beginning of the passage.⁶

from textual variations, a common occurrence when material is transmitted by hand from generation to generation. See the following example from *Bava Batra* 6a s.v. מהו (the differences are underlined).

<p>תוספות טוך ו ע"א ד"ה מהו וא"ת והיכי הוי ס"ד דמצי למימר ליה הכי דאטו משום דקדם זה ועשה הורע כחו ויכול לדחוקן זה לעשות כל הכותל ויש לומר דס"ד כיון דאם לא קדם זה ועשה זה...</p>	<p>תוספות שאנץ ו ע"א ד"ה מהו וא"ת והיכי ס"ד דהוה מצי למימר הכי דאטו מייירי משום דקדם זה ועבד הורע כחו ויכול זה לדחוקן לעשות כל הכותל ויש לומר דס"ד כיון דאם לא קדם ועשה חצי הכותל...</p>
--	--

⁵ Compare *Tosafot Tukt Bava Batra 7a s.v. אספלידא* to *Tosafot Shanẓ*.

⁶ Scores and scores of examples of this are readily verifiable in tractates in which *Tosafot Shanẓ* is extant, such as tractates *Ketubot* and *Pesahim*. There are also examples of R. Eliezer deleting a signature of "ת"ם," which refers to R. Tam, from the end of a passage and inserting "R. Tam explained" to the beginning of the passage, see *Pesahim 2a s.v. וכאור*. At times, it appears that R. Eliezer had conflicting reports as to the proper attribution, and he had to make a decision regarding which source to follow. Such is the case in *Bava Batra 6a s.v. ומודה* that provides a definition of two words mentioned in the Talmud. Whereas *Tosafot Shanẓ*'s only attribution of the definitions is the מ"ר signature appended to the end of the passage, indicating that R. Shimshon heard the definitions from Ri, other sources attribute the material to R. Tam (see *Tosafot Yesbanim al Massekhet Bava Batra*). R. Eliezer apparently conjectured that Ri himself had heard the definitions from R. Tam and subsequently taught it to R. Shimshon, and hence R. Eliezer attributed it to the earlier R. Tam.

Besides Ri, R. Eliezer also introduced attributions to R. Shimshon. As discussed in the previous article, *Tosafot Shanʕ* not only was a conduit for the teachings of R. Tam and Ri, but also contained many of R. Shimshon's own original insights. R. Shimshon indicated his own contributions by introducing them with relevant terms, such as “It appears to me (ונראה לי).” When R. Eliezer included this material in *Tosafot Tukh* he removed these phrases, replacing them with explicit attributions to R. Shimshon. In such situations, R. Eliezer generally used the acronym “רשב”א,” which stands for “רבינו שמשון בן אברהם.” Attributions to R. Shimshon appear frequently in *Tosafot Tukh* on certain tractates and reflect the many original insights of R. Shimshon that R. Eliezer chose to include in *Tosafot Tukh*.⁷

Condensing and Abridging

R. Eliezer also engaged in more significant forms of editing, such as condensing and abridging of his source texts. Research reveals that many passages in *Tosafot Tukh* are shortened versions of parallel passages in R. Eliezer's source texts. It appears that this form of editing was engaged in often by R. Eliezer, and various traditions suggest that it earned R. Eliezer his fame. The 15th-century German Talmudist R. Yisrael Isserlin (*Terumat ha-Deshen*, תרומת הדשן) writes regarding *Tosafot Tukh*, “We drink from the waters of *Tosafot Shanʕ* that were shortened by R. Eliezer of Tukh,” and his younger Italian contemporary R. Yosef Colon (Maharik, מהרי”ק) remarks, “*Tosafot Tukh* in many places is merely a shortened version of *Tosafot Shanʕ*.”⁸

In this study we utilize two distinct verbs—“condensing” and “abridging”—to differentiate between two distinct undertakings of R. Eliezer in shortening passages from his sources. “Condensing” describes R. Eliezer's method of shortening the text *without removing any substantive material*. This form of shortening is generally syntactical and stylistic in

⁷ Examples abound; see for instance *Ketubot* 3a s.v., *Pesahim* 5a s.v. לא and 27b s.v. מה. Besides attributions to Ri and R. Shimshon, R. Eliezer also made other attributions based on the various sources that were available to him. Hence, we find in tractate *Ketubot* 2a s.v. שאם and 2b s.v. פשיט that although *Tosafot Shanʕ* recorded the material anonymously, the same material appears in *Tosafot Tukh* with attribution to R. Tam.

⁸ *Terumat ha-Deshen* #19 and *She'elot u-Teshuvot Maharik* #160 and #211. Note R. Avraham Shoshana's introduction to *Tosafot ha-Rosh al Massekhet Pesahim* (Jerusalem, 2006), 31, where he states that unlike Rosh who often quotes *Tosafot Shanʕ* verbatim, R. Eliezer often paraphrased the *Tosafot Shanʕ* in order to present the material in a more condensed fashion.

nature. “Abridging” describes R. Eliezer’s method of shortening the text by *removing substantive material*, such as questions, proof texts, or additional answers for the sake of brevity. This form of shortening is much more significant as it affects the actual content of the source passage.

When R. Eliezer *condensed* material his goal was to rewrite the Tosafist teachings in a more terse fashion. Condensed passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* contain little alterations of the passage’s content. R. Eliezer deleted superfluous material and shortened language, while maintaining the overall content and intent of the passage.⁹

In a more aggressive form of condensing, R. Eliezer sometimes removed the question from his source, but recorded the answer in a way that the original question could still be inferred. In such cases, the attuned reader is still able to determine the question based on context, even though the question is not stated explicitly. Indeed, the “unstated yet implied question” is one of the hallmarks of the printed *Tosafot*.¹⁰ Similar to

⁹ An illustration: In tractate *Bava Batra* 6b *s.v.* *Tosafot Tukeh* condenses the question asked by *Tosafot Shanz*, recording it in a much more succinct fashion. In this specific example, the question remains the same, yet half as many words are utilized.

<p>תוספות שאנץ בב"ב ו' ע"ב ד"ה שתי וא"ת ותחתון אמאי יסייע לעליון [כל כך לא יסייע לעליון] אלא כדי שיהא גבוה ד' אמות מקרקעית חצר התחתון דמהשת'א לא יוכל לראות עוד בחצר העליון והעליון יבנה לבדו עד שיהא גבוה מקרקעית הצירו כדי שלא יראה בחצר התחתון</p>	<p>תוספות טוך בב"ב ו' ע"ב ד"ה שתי וא"ת ותחתון למה יסייע לעליון דמכי מטי לארבע אמות ולא יוכל התחתון לראות בחצר העליון יבנה העליון</p>
--	---

¹⁰ An example is found in tractate *Bava Batra* 6b *s.v.* *האי*. *Tosafot Shanz* records an inquiry and solution proposed by R. Tam. *Tosafot Shanz* reads as follows:

תימ'ה אמאי קא מייתי הכא מילת'א דרבינא דבשלמ'א מילת'יה דרב נחמ'ן דכווי מייתי אידי דפליג רב הונא ורב נחמ'ן דאסמ'ך לפלגא ואמר'נן ומוד'ה רב נחמ'ן באפריזא ובקביעת'א דכשורי והכשורי מעמיד'ן בתוך הטי אלא מילת'יה דרבינא לקמ'ן בחזקת הבתים הוה ליה לאתויי. ואמר לי ר"ת דאמתני'תן קאי וה"פ האי כשור'א דמטלתא שהניחן על הכותל עד תלתין יומין לא הוי חזקה דהוי בחזק'ת שלא נתן עד שיביא ראיה מכאן ואילך הוי בחזקת שנתן.

In *Tosafot Tukeh* the inquiry has been removed and the solution is rewritten in a way that the original inquiry can be inferred, although it is not stated explicitly. The abridged text in *Tosafot Tukeh* reads:

אומר ר"ת דאמתני' קאי דעד שלשים יום לא הוי חזקה והוי בחזקת שלא נתן מכאן ואילך הוי בחזקת שנתן ואתי שפיר דנקטיה הכא ולא בחזקת הבתים

Another good illustration of this phenomenon can be found in tractate *Pesahim* 6b *s.v.* אבל.

what R. Eliezer did with questions, we also find many cases where he rewrote answers and proofs in a way that they could be inferred, but are not stated explicitly.¹¹

A much more significant form of shortening undertaken by R. Eliezer was when he *abridged* the material in his source text. Many early Tosafist compositions were quite verbose and contained long-winded dialectics. This style provided a broad perspective on the dialectic discussion, but also confounded the issues and served as a weighty impediment for even the most accomplished scholars.

R. Eliezer's abridgments generally deleted proofs, digressions, and other non-vital steps from a discussion. But in some cases, R. Eliezer even removed entire discussions—such as, a question and its answer—from a passage.¹² In most of these instances it appears that R. Eliezer abridged the material simply because the discussion was too long. For the sake of brevity, he apparently felt justified in deleting any material that could be removed without sacrificing the major points of the passage.¹³

In most cases of abridgment R. Eliezer deleted material completely, leaving no trace. This placed R. Eliezer's indelible mark on the tradition he was transmitting. Yet, there are some exception cases where R. Eliezer explicitly noted that he was omitting material or not giving the topic full treatment, by writing, “And this is not the place to elaborate (אין להאריך) (כאן),”¹⁴ or by directing the reader to another location where he elaborated

¹¹ For example, in *Tosafot Shanz Bava Batra* 5b *s.v.* ואפילו a proof is recorded in the name of Rivam but then rejected by R. Samson's teacher (Ri). However in *Tosafot Tukeb* the proof of Rivam and the rejection of Ri have been condensed, with R. Eliezer writing in place of the proof and rejection: “And don't bring a proof from...”

¹² Abridgment, both in its lesser and more extreme form, is demonstrable throughout many tractates of *Tosafot Tukeb*. For a number of examples, compare *Tosafot Tukeb* with *Tosafot Shanz* at the beginning of tractate *Pesahim*. Note especially *Tosafot Tukeb* 2a *s.v.* אור and compare it with the much longer and richer parallel passage in *Tosafot Shanz*. See also *Pesahim* 40b *s.v.* האלפס.

¹³ One such justification is cases where later Tosafists rejected a suggestion made by an earlier master, or when a Tosafist recanted his own suggestion. An example is *Ketubot* 19b *s.v.* אמר. The *Tosafot Tukeb* passage is identical to the corresponding passage in *Tosafot Shanz* except that an additional answer ascribed to Ri, plus Ri's own recanting of this additional answer, is omitted from *Tosafot Tukeb*.

¹⁴ Such is the case in tractate *Ketubot* 57a where *Tosafot Shanz s.v.* שתיים elaborates on a particular issue and in *Tosafot Tukeb* the issue only appears briefly followed by “and this is not the place to elaborate (אין להאריך כאן).”

more on the topic.¹⁵

R. Eliezer's abridging of his source texts demonstrates that he was not merely a passive editor, but an active and creative participant in the Tosafist enterprise. The removal of content took editorial confidence and reflects R. Eliezer's important role in the transmission of the Tosafist tradition.¹⁶ Although the Talmud (*Pesahim* 3b) instructs a teacher to teach his student in a terse fashion, it is still a testament to R. Eliezer's scholarship and greatness that he was successful in producing an accepted work that deleted material of the earlier generations.

R. Eliezer's abridging of the Tosafist tradition made it more approachable, and likely contributed to the long-term popularity of the Tosafist teachings.¹⁷ In fact, there were those who saw the abridgement as a sign of generational decline, and as an attempt by R. Eliezer to make the study of the Tosafist teachings easier.¹⁸ However, not everyone saw the terseness of R. Eliezer's *Tosafot* in this way. Quite the contrary, there were those who saw its terseness as an impediment to clearly understanding the

¹⁵ See *Shabbat* 78b s.v. ת"ק where R. Eliezer refers the reader to the parallel passages and writes, "However, I have explained in *Bava Kamma*, *Bava Mezja*, and *Gittin*... and there I elaborated more." See *Gittin* 2a s.v. ואם, *Bava Kamma* 8b s.v. דינא and *Bava Mezja* 13b s.v. הא.

Another example, this one more extreme, appears in tractate *Ketubot* 3a s.v. ואפקיהו. Instead of recording the long discussion found in *Tosafot Shanʿaz*, R. Eliezer simply directs the reader to *Tosafot Tukh* on tractate *Gittin* 33a s.v. ואפקינהו where the same issue is addressed at length. In this case, the passage in *Tosafot Shanʿaz* on *Ketubot* is a couple of hundred words long, while the passage in *Tosafot Tukh* on *Ketubot* consists of only three words: "בריש השולח פירשתי."

¹⁶ It should be noted that there are no indications that R. Eliezer sought to *replace* the earlier Tosafist commentaries with his *Tosafot*. He did not necessarily think that his commentary would be so dominant in subsequent generations that it would eradicate the memory of the earlier commentaries. It is likely that in R. Eliezer's mind the earlier texts would always be available, and one who wished to consult the long-winded primary sources would always have the opportunity to do so.

¹⁷ R. Eliezer's goal of abridging the early Tosafist material was not unique. The verbose nature of the early works was bemoaned by other Tosafists as well. They too sought to abridge the long-winded dialectics. With a similar stated goal, the French Tosafist R. Moshe of Coucy introduced his popular work *Sefer Mizvot Gedolot* (Semag, סמ"ג), stating that he wished to record the "foundations of the commandments according to tradition *without* all of their long-winded dialectics (חילוקיהם באור)." Although R. Moshe's halakhic work was of a different nature than R. Eliezer's *Tosafot*, the identification of the long-windedness of the earlier Tosafist works is the same.

¹⁸ *Orbot Zadikim*, Chapter Twenty-Seven.

Tosafist teachings. In fact, R. David Messer Leon, a sixteenth-century Italian Talmudist, saw the terseness of *Tosafot Tukh* as a testimony to its complexity and sophistication. He notes the great challenge facing a person who wishes to master R. Eliezer's work, and hence he states proudly that his culture's custom is to study the "deep and terse [*Tosafot*] of Tukh."¹⁹

The above attitudes, however, are not contradictory. While R. Eliezer's intent was likely to simplify the Tosafist corpus, it was only his contemporaries and immediate successors that benefitted from his shortening of the text. The level of scholarship in R. Eliezer's day, which included a familiarity with the Tosafist tradition, coupled with access to the earlier source texts, allowed his contemporaries and immediate successors to appreciate his shortening of the Tosafist teachings. However, by the time of R. David, and even more so in contemporary times, the terseness of *Tosafot Tukh* often makes it more challenging to study.²⁰

Integration

Another significant form of editing undertaken by R. Eliezer was "integration." In our context, integration means the splicing together of material from two or more source texts to create one new unified passage. The necessity for integration was directly reflective of the success and growth of the Tosafist movement. The increase of Tosafist teachers, academies, and students in the generations following R. Tam led to a proliferation of Tosafist commentaries.²¹ As the Tosafist corpus burgeoned, constant integration was necessary to avoid inundation. When new commentaries emerged, Tosafists studied them and integrated their teachings with those from other works. This produced further integrated works. Within a short time these further integrated works had to again be integrated with the new commentaries that continually appeared. The result of this multi-level

¹⁹ *Kavod Hakhamim* (Berlin, 1899), 129.

²⁰ We should also note that R. Eliezer's tendency to condense and abridge the earlier material is not absolute. There are a few times that instead of condensing or abridging, R. Eliezer's *Tosafot Tukh* are actually wordier and contain more content. For example, in tractate *Ketubot* 3a s.v. שבת R. Eliezer's redaction is both more verbose than *Tosafot Shanʿaz* and includes material not found in *Tosafot Shanʿaz*, i.e. it is not condensed or abridged. However, these instances are the exception and not the rule.

²¹ According to R. Hayyim Yosef David Azulai (Hida, *Shem ha-Gedolim Ha-Shalem, Seferim*, section ת, #56) each of the major Tosafists wrote a commentary on the entire Talmud.

integration was that the later generations received highly integrated works that reflected the best of the Tosafist tradition.

Critical integration of the early teachings of R. Tam and his colleagues had already been done by Ri and his students. They surveyed the earliest Tosafist writings—the teachings of R. Tam, Riba, Raban, Rashbam and R. Meshulam, among others—in order to collect and collate the best questions, most cogent answers, and sharpest insights. This early integration established the landscape of the future Tosafist commentaries, highlighting the focal issues in each tractate that would be addressed by future generations. The result of this early integration was the highly developed commentaries that emerged from Ri’s academy and served as the source texts for R. Eliezer.²²

Like Ri, R. Eliezer engaged in integration. R. Eliezer’s integration of material was done in two distinct forms. In some cases, R. Eliezer took an entire passage from one source and included it alongside a passage from another source. In such cases, the actual passages remain the same. They are simply placed alongside one another. But in other cases, R. Eliezer integrated material from a passage in one source directly into a passage from another source. The result in these cases was a new creation—a single passage that consisted of material from both the primary passage and the augmenting source.²³

It is important to stress that R. Eliezer’s integration was different from the early integration done by Ri and his students. They integrated using the original teachings of the early Tosafists, but R. Eliezer integrated using their already integrated commentaries. That is, R. Eliezer was integrating material that had already gone through a process of integration. Using the works of Ri’s academy, R. Eliezer spliced together material to produce *further* integrated passages.

It is our contention that because R. Eliezer inherited works that were themselves already integrated, he did not utilize the original commentaries of R. Tam, Riba, or other early Tosafist masters when producing *Tosafot Tukeb*. The teachings of the early Tosafists were already integrated into the Tosafist corpus well before R. Eliezer flourished, and they were already part and parcel of the Tosafist tradition that he inherited. For this reason,

²² For more on integration and Ri’s role in integrating early Tosafist material, see A. Leibowitz, “The Emergence and Development of Tosafot on the Talmud,” *Hakirah* 15 (2013): 153–155.

²³ In many tractates it appears that R. Eliezer chose one commentary to be the primary source. For example, in tractate *Ketubot*, R. Eliezer generally used *Tosafot Shanz* as his primary source, but he integrated into the *Tosafot Shanz* passages material from the commentaries of Ri’s other students.

R. Eliezer is not to be credited as the one that introduced the teachings of the early Tosafists into the discussions found in *Tosafot Tukeh*.

The veracity of this contention is validated by Tosafist commentaries that predate R. Eliezer and clearly demonstrate that the teachings of the early Tosafists were integrated into the Tosafist corpus generations before R. Eliezer flourished. Take for example *Tosafot Shanz* on tractate *Ketubot*. Practically every reference to early Tosafists that appears in *Tosafot Tukeh* is already integrated into the Tosafist discussion in *Tosafot Shanz*.

Let us look in-depth at one additional example. Analysis provides clear evidence that R. Eliezer is not to be credited with the integration of early Tosafist teachings that appear in *Tosafot Tukeh* on tractate *Shabbat*. Besides R. Tam, whose name is quoted close to two hundred times throughout *Tosafot Tukeh* on tractate *Shabbat*, many other early Tosafists occupy a prominent position in the work. Riba appears over fifty times in *Tosafot Tukeh* on tractate *Shabbat*, including two passages (20a *s.v.* איבעיא and 23a *s.v.* מנכה) that conclude with a signature of Riba, indicating that the entire passage reflects Riba's opinion, and likely his actual wording. R. Yosef b. Moshe Porat (רב פורת) was a younger French contemporary of R. Tam from Troyes who studied with R. Tam's older brother, Rashbam. R. Porat's name appears close to fifty times in *Tosafot Tukeh* on tractate *Shabbat*, including passages that contain a signature of R. Porat's name. Rashbam appears over thirty times, most often with the deferential title "Rabbenu Shmuel." Included in Rashbam's appearances are dialectic debates between Rashbam and an early German Tosafist, R. Eliezer b. Nathan (Raban, ראב"ן). Other early Tosafists that appear in R. Eliezer's redaction, albeit to a lesser degree than the above-mentioned Tosafists, are R. Isaac b. Meir, R. Yaakov of Corbeil, and R. Eliyahu of Paris, who each appear a handful of times.

Recently, a manuscript of a *Tosafot* commentary on tractate *Shabbat* composed by an early student of Ri who flourished before R. Shimshon of Shanz, was printed as *Tosafot Ri ha-Zaken ve-Talmido ve-Risbonei Ba'alei ha-Tosafot al Massekhet Shabbat*, ed. A. Shoshana (Jerusalem, 2007). In this manuscript the teachings of basically all the aforementioned early Tosafists already appear, fully integrated into the text. The fact that these teachings were already integrated generations before R. Eliezer began producing his *Tosafot Tukeh* indicates that R. Eliezer inherited the integration of these early Tosafist teachings and did not integrate these teachings himself.²⁴

²⁴ Another example is a manuscript of a Tosafist commentary on tractate *Bava Kamma* redacted by an anonymous student of R. Tam, printed as "Tosafot

In truth, it is hard to identify integration in *Tosafot Tukeh*. This is because R. Eliezer generally made no indication of his sources when he engaged in integration. Since the sources from which R. Eliezer drew were primarily only *reporting* material from earlier generations, he seemingly felt no need to indicate which particular student of Ri provided him with the early material. Only when a source contributed original material did R. Eliezer provide attribution to his source.²⁵

For this reason, many passages in *Tosafot Tukeh* do not contain direct references to R. Eliezer's immediate sources nor do they provide specific indications of which source text they were drawn from. For instance, let us assume a particular discussion appeared in both *Tosafot Shanz* and *Tosafot R. Yehudah*. Both sources recorded a question and an answer in the

Talmid Rabbenu Tam ve-Rabbenu Eliezer," ed. M. Blau, *Shitat ha-Kadmonim al Massekhet Bava Kamma* (New York, 1977), 1–282. The manuscript contains teachings from at least seven early Tosafist works, including *Tosafot ha-Ri*, *Tosafot Ri ha-Lavan*, *Tosafot Rivam*, and *Tosafot Rashbam*. The teachings of various early Tosafists contained in this anonymous commentary appear throughout R. Eliezer's *Tosafot*, and demonstrate that the integration of these teachings was completed a number of generations before R. Eliezer flourished.

Another source is a manuscript fragment of *Tosafot Shanz* on *Bava Batra* 5b–9a, printed as "Tosafot Shanz al Massekhet Bava Batra," ed. Y. Lifshitz, *Hiddushei ha-Rishonim Massekhet Bava Batra* (Jerusalem, 1991). Every single teaching of an early Tosafist master that appears in *Tosafot Tukeh* on *Bava Batra* 5a–9a is already present in this manuscript fragment of *Tosafot Shanz*. Additionally, there is a more complete *Tosafot* commentary on tractate *Bava Batra* printed under the title *Tosafot Yesbanim al Massekhet Bava Batra*, ed. Y. Amrani (Jerusalem, 1997) that predates *Tosafot Tukeh*, according to Y. Lifshitz, "Tosafot Ketav Yad le-Massekhet Bava Batra," *Sefer ha-Zikaron leha-Rav Yizhak Nisim*, Vol. 3, ed. M. Benayahu (Jerusalem, 1985), 27–68. There is no direct indication that R. Eliezer had access to this specific text, but it is still significant that a large number of the early Tosafist teachings that appear in *Tosafot Tukeh Bava Batra*, such as those of R. Abraham (5a *s.v.* ארבע), R. Hayyim Cohen (58b *s.v.* אנבג, 74a *s.v.* פסקי, 82a *s.v.* בצרן, 86b *s.v.* כדאמר, 88b *s.v.* התם, 92b *s.v.* אי, 111a *s.v.* קל, 134b *s.v.* פלומי), R. Eliezer of Palira (79b *s.v.* אימר), and R. Jacob of Orleans (128b *s.v.* ואפילו) are already present in *Tosafot Yesbanim*.

²⁵ The best examples of this are the many original contribution of R. Shimshon that R. Eliezer included in his *Tosafot*. We noted earlier that R. Shimshon included many original contributions in his *Tosafot Shanz*. When R. Eliezer recorded these original contributions he included the appropriate attribution to R. Shimshon. Hence, when *Tosafot Shanz* contained an original question of R. Shimshon—indicated by "יקשה לי" in *Tosafot Shanz*—R. Eliezer recorded it in his *Tosafot* as "וקשה לרשב"א" and when R. Shimshon provided an original perspective, "ונראה לי," R. Eliezer wrote, "ונראה לרשב"א."

name of R. Tam, but *Tosafot R. Yebudah* also contained an additional answer suggested by Ri. R. Eliezer would record in *Tosafot Tukeh* the question and answer of R. Tam followed by the answer of Ri. R. Eliezer would not note that he received the question and first answer from *Tosafot Shanz* and *Tosafot R. Yebudah*, nor would he report that it was the *Tosafot R. Yebudah* that provided the second answer. This is because both *Tosafot Shanz* and *Tosafot R. Yebudah* were merely relaying material.²⁶ However, had R. Yehudah of Paris, the author of *Tosafot R. Yebudah*, recorded his own answer then R. Eliezer would have referenced R. Yehudah's name as the source for that answer.

For the above reason it is also difficult to measure with any certainty the extent of R. Eliezer's use of integration. Moreover, even relatively late material found in *Tosafot Tukeh* was often integrated before R. Eliezer. For example, *Tosafot Tukeh* on tractate *Bava Batra* includes references to R. Menahem, R. Ezra, and Rizba.²⁷ However, practically all of the material from these later Tosafists is also found in earlier Tosafist works, demonstrating that this material was already incorporated into the Tosafist corpus before R. Eliezer.²⁸ We see that even some of the later material in *Tosafot Tukeh* was not necessarily integrated by R. Eliezer himself, but may have been inherited by R. Eliezer from his sources.

²⁶ *Tosafot R. Yebudah* contain many teachings from R. Elhanan. When R. Eliezer included the teaching of R. Elhanan he would quote it in the name of R. Elhanan and make no reference to *Tosafot R. Yebudah*, the conduit through which R. Eliezer received the teaching of R. Elhanan.

²⁷ R. Menahem: 26a *s.v.* עד, 84a *s.v.* האי, 96b *s.v.* כל, 135a *s.v.* חזינא, R. Ezra: 28a *s.v.* אי, and Rizba: 8b *s.v.* אכפיה, 12b *s.v.* כגון, 13a *s.v.* אית, 13b *s.v.* ומסיים, 18a *s.v.* היר, 22b *s.v.* זאת, 23a *s.v.* והתניא, 23b *s.v.* רוב, 24a *s.v.* ושמע, 25a *s.v.* מקום, 25b *s.v.* אפומא.

²⁸ The earlier work is *Tosafot Yesbanim al Massekhet Bava Batra*, ed. Y. Amrani (Jerusalem, 1997). That it predates *Tosafot Tukeh* is shown by Y. Lifshitz, "Tosafot Ketav Yad le-Massekhet Bava Batra," *Sefer ha-Zikaron leha-Rav Yizhak Nisim*, Vol. 3, ed. M. Benayahu (Jerusalem, 1985), 27–68. I write "practically" because the reference to Rizba on 12b is not found in the *Tosafot Yesbanim*.

Another example is in tractate *Shabbat*. *Tosafot Tukeh* in tractate *Shabbat* contains material from later Tosafist generations, such as teachings of Rizba (58b *s.v.* אלא) and R. Shimshon of Coucy (28b *s.v.* ור"י). However, their teachings also appear in *Tosafot ha-Rosh* and suggest that R. Eliezer did not integrate these teachings himself. Yet this is not the case with all the material from Ri's students. There are many examples in *Tosafot Tukeh* on tractate *Shabbat* where material might have been integrated by R. Eliezer. In these cases, the material does not appear in extant earlier works, nor in *Tosafot ha-Rosh*. These examples include R. Eliezer's direct references to R. Elhanan (2a *s.v.* שתיים and 54b *s.v.* מעשר), R. Yonah (39b *s.v.* ממעשה), and R. Shmuel of Verdun (112b *s.v.* אבל).

Conclusion

This article has focused on R. Eliezer's editing methods in producing *Tosafot Tukeb*. It has identified a number of different forms of editing undertaken by R. Eliezer. In some cases, R. Eliezer included passages from his sources with few alterations. In these instances, he was seemingly satisfied with the content and presentation of the material in his source text. Indeed, there are even passages that he copied verbatim from his sources and included untouched in *Tosafot Tukeb*. Other passages were included in *Tosafot Tukeb* with only minimal editing. Much of this minimal editing was in the realm of attribution, style, and presentation.

There were also many passages in which R. Eliezer altered the actual content of his source material. When he did alter the content, it was generally in the form of condensing the text or abridging the material. R. Eliezer also integrated material from the different sources available to him. In this realm, this article suggested that R. Eliezer generally did not utilize the actual writings of the early Tosafists, but integrated using the already integrated commentaries that emerged from Ri's academy. Hence, much of the material included by R. Eliezer in *Tosafot Tukeb* had already undergone integration and editing by earlier generations.

Our presentation differs from that of Prof. Ephraim E. Urbach in his well-known work *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot* (Jerusalem, 1986). Although Urbach explicitly acknowledges that *Tosafot Tukeb* was largely based on the commentaries of Ri's students, he understates the extent of R. Eliezer's dependence on these sources. For example, in his treatment of the *Tosafot Tukeb* on tractate *Bava Batra*, Urbach claims that "a significant source that was utilized by [R. Eliezer] was the *Tosafot* commentary of R. Isaac b. Mordekhai [Rivam]."²⁹ It appears, however, that Rivam's commentary was not actually utilized by R. Eliezer, for the teachings of Rivam were *already integrated* into the Tosafist corpus years prior to R. Eliezer's *Tosafot Tukeb*. We know this from the above-quoted manuscript fragment of *Tosafot Shanẓ* on *Bava Batra* 5b – 9a. In this manuscript the teachings of Rivam already appear fully integrated into the *Tosafot Shanẓ*.³⁰ This manuscript fragment indicates that R. Eliezer did not utilize the *Tosafot* of Rivam in redacting *Tosafot Tukeb* on tractate *Bava Batra*, but rather, R. Eliezer drew the teachings of Rivam from *Tosafot Shanẓ*.

²⁹ *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 639

³⁰ Rivam's opinion in *Tosafot Tukeb* 5b *s.v.* נ"י appears in *Tosafot Shanẓ* 5b *s.v.* ונאפילו, and was therefore integrated into the discussion by R. Shimson, or possibly by Ri. Similarly, Rivam's question that appears in *Tosafot Tukeb* 6a *s.v.* כל also appears already in the parallel passage in *Tosafot Shanẓ*.

Similarly, in Urbach's treatment of tractate *Shabbat*, he maintains that it was R. Eliezer himself who integrated the *Tosafot Shanʕ* with the *Tosafot* of R. Porat. Urbach writes, "[R. Eliezer] integrated the *Tosafot* of R. Yosef b. R. Moshe—R. Yosef Porat, the student of Rashbam—with the *Tosafot* of *Rash mi-Shanʕ*."³¹ Here too, manuscript research indicates that this is not correct. The earlier-referenced Tosafist commentary on tractate *Shabbat*, authored by an early student of Ri, contains the teachings of R. Tam, Riba, and R. Porat *already integrated* with one another, indicating that the integration of the teachings of R. Porat and Riba not only predated R. Eliezer, but even predated R. Shimshon himself.

Final Thoughts

Based on the conclusions of this article regarding R. Eliezer's editing methods and the conclusions of the first article in this series regarding R. Eliezer's sources, we are now able to assess the nature of *Tosafot Tukeb*. The research from these two articles has shown that R. Eliezer's work relied heavily on his source texts from Ri's academy. He drew his material consistently from these texts, and he left much of the content unchanged, as he utilized material that was already integrated and edited. The findings of our research point to an extreme faithfulness by R. Eliezer to his sources, and demonstrate that more than an "originator," R. Eliezer was a faithful "transmitter" of the rich Tosafist tradition.

In the next article in this series we will discuss the various types of passages found in *Tosafot Tukeb*, and consider the place of R. Eliezer's own original teachings and those of his teachers and contemporaries in the production of *Tosafot Tukeb*. The result will hopefully be a clear understanding of the nature of *Tosafot Tukeb* and an outline of its salient characteristics. 

³¹ *Ba'alei ha-Tosafot*, 603