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Neusner finds the following structure in the mishnaic tractate:

1:1-6 opening proem
2:1-3:2 miscellanies
3:3-8 prologue
4:1-8:10 skin of flesh
9:1-3 boil and burning
10:1-9 scall
10:10 bald spot
11:1-12 garments
12:1-13:12 houses
14:1-13 Appendix: purification rites.

Translation and commentary conclude this volume.

The following volume contains a commentary on *Sifra Parashot Negaim* and *Me fora* and a final section of conclusions concerning the literary traits
of Sifra and the relation between Sifra and M.-T. He finds that named authorities in Sifra appear almost exclusively in material shared with M.-T. Unlike M.-T. the preponderance of pericopae are exegetical; this is nearly exclusively so in its independent material. He finds a very simple exegetical form in several continuous sections which he identifies as early and dialectic exegesis, a later stratum used to prove the fallibility of logic and the perfection of Scripture. He finds that Sifra and M.-T. draw from a common body of “free floating pericopae” in a form usually “primary to the editorial and redactional purposes of Mishnah-Tosefta and secondary to Sifra.” A few subjects are treated in one body, but not in the other. Yet he does not venture a general opinion on the relationship between Sifra and M.-T.

As in his discussions of Kelim and Ohaloth, he concludes this study with a full translation of M.-T., analyses of form and formulary patterns and attributions, followed by chapters on the weaving of the Law and the weavers of the Law, as it developed in Yavneh and Usha. The penultimate chapter is a reconsideration of assignments, attestations and attributions and he concludes by considering “Negaim before 70.” J. OuELLETrE contributes an appendix of notes on the Syriac text of Aphrahat, and the book concludes with indices of parts VI-VIII, biblical and talmudic references and a general index.

In the reconsideration of assignments, attestations and attributions NeUSNER refines his methods with 4 gradations of certainty: 1) cases in which a clear development can be seen with attestation of names; 2) Ushan rules which bear no relation to Yavnean issues; 3) anonymous rules which are congruent with a generation and its principles; 4) anonymous arguments dated on conjectural grounds.

He finds no evidence for a long development of ideas between Bible and Mishnah, which might have suggested a long pre-70 tradition. The Yavneans appear to begin with Scripture; Akiba makes the major contribution by distinguishing between nega‘ and sara‘at. Nega‘ is then treated as the primary, general disease which must be checked and controlled under rabbinic supervision.

The manuscript citations are not always complete in vol. 6 and sometimes lead to confusion. Examples include M. 4:11H QHH—K, Katsh, C + Sifra (Ms. 66) = QYH*; PB = QYHY; P = KYHH; Sifra (QA, Wilna, Weiss) = KHH; M. 10:3G Katsh, C, P, N agree with Pa; M. 14:10H all Mss read Akiba, but M. 14:10M Jacob is read by Katsh, C, N, P, PB. M. 1:4A is also omitted by Katsh and its quotation in T.B. Zev. 88b. In vol. 7 this reviewer found several readings in Ms. Vat. 66 agreeing with the M.-T. tradition against the text translated here. On p. 19 (N 1:5U) R. Yos6: Vat. 66, GRA, lemma of Sens and Pardo read Judah, agreeing with the Mishnah text; p. 26 (N 2:3C) R. Meir: Vat. 66 reads Shimeon, agreeing with M.; p. 29 (N 2:10C) Ishmael: Vat. 66 reads Gamaliel, agreeing with M; p. 31 (N II:5Q) water: Weiss and Vat. 66 read milk, agreeing with M.; p. 32 (N II:6T) Said R. Yosé—they say: omitted by Vat. 66 and T. 1:1. Other Mss were not available to this reviewer. One wonders if this is a significant tendency within Vat. 66 to