

Review of the method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot

**Authors:**

Menachem Klein¹ 
Uri Zur² 

Affiliations:

¹Department of Teacher Training, Faculty of Education, Orot Israel College, Elkana, Israel

²Department of Moreshet Israel, Faculty of Social and Humanities, Ariel University, Ariel, Israel

Corresponding author:

Uri Zur,
uriz@ariel.ac.il

Dates:

Received: 28 Apr. 2023

Accepted: 19 Dec. 2023

Published: 26 Feb. 2024

How to cite this article:

Klein, M. & Zur, U., 2024, 'Review of the method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 80(1), a8932. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v80i1.8932>

Copyright:

© 2024. The Authors.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

The background of the Ma'alot article is the method of Talmud instruction at the Volozhyn Yeshiva and Yeshivat Ma'alot and investigating the claim of the management of Yeshivat Ma'alot, the head of the yeshiva, and the teaching staff that the yeshiva is a direct continuation of the famed Volozhyn Yeshiva that operated in 19th-century Europe. This claim can be examined from many angles, but the aim of the current article is to focus on one major angle common to the entire yeshiva world over the generations in Israel and abroad, that is, the method of Talmud instruction. The research setting is based on historical sources for teaching Talmud in yeshivot, physical attendance during lessons, interviews with teachers and students, and criticism brought by them and by the authors. The research methods include describing, comparing and criticising the method of instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot. The research results led to a conclusion regarding the question of whether the above claim is justified. The article fits the scope of the journal because it reveals the teaching methods at Yeshivat Ma'alot.

Contribution: The contribution of the article lies in its being the first to offer a critique of the Talmud instruction method employed at Yeshivat Ma'alot, with the aim of rethinking the current instruction method and creating a possible avenue for changing it and adapting it as much as possible to the students' needs and abilities.

Keywords: Yeshivat Volozhyn; Yeshivat Ma'alot; Talmud instruction; review; R. Nazyb; R. Weitzman.

Introduction

Yeshivat Ma'alot is headed at present by R. Yehoshua Weitzman, who considers it a successor of the Volozhyn Yeshiva in Europe as it was in the time of R. Naftali Zvi Yehuda Berlin of Volozhyn (henceforth: the Nazyb), with regard to the method of Talmud instruction. The Volozhyn Yeshiva (or 'Yeshivat Etz Chaim') was a yeshiva that operated in Volozhyn (Minsk, Belarus) in the 19th century. It served as a prototype of the subsequent Lithuanian yeshivas. The founder of the yeshiva was R. Chaim of Volozhyn and it operated from 1802 to 1892. In 1895, R. Raphael Schapiro reopened the yeshiva, and it continued to operate until the Holocaust. The Nazyb was the head of the Volozhyn Yeshiva from 1853 to 1892.

Yeshivat Ma'alot was established in 1975 in the town of Ma'alot, Israel, as a Zionist response to a terrorist attack that occurred in 1974. Its full name is 'Yeshivat Ma'alot Ya'akov', and it was named after Dr. Yaakov Herzog who was the political advisor of David Ben Gurion, Israel's first prime minister.

The method of Talmud instruction is a dominant element in both yeshivas, as this is an essential foundation of the yeshiva world. This will be the dimension explored in order to reach a conclusion about whether Yeshivat Ma'alot is indeed a successor of the Volozhyn Yeshiva with regard to its method of Talmud instruction, as purported by the head of Yeshivat Ma'alot.

The method of Talmud instruction at the Volozhyn Yeshiva and at Yeshivat Ma'alot shall be presented, followed by criticism of the latter.

Discussion and methods

The method of Talmud instruction at the Volozhyn Yeshiva

The method of Talmud instruction at the Volozhyn Yeshiva was based on a combination of halakha (i.e., rules, the legal part of Jewish traditional literature, e.g., the rules of Maimonides) and aggadah (i.e., legends, the homiletic passages in rabbinical literature, e.g., Midrash Tanchuma) on

Note: Historical Thought and Source Interpretation.

Read online:

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

the surface of the sugya or within its deeper layers. This method is assumedly applied at Yeshivat Ma'alot, as claimed by the management of the yeshiva. Therefore, firstly the sources and secondly foundations for the method of Talmud instruction at the Volozhyn Yeshiva shall be presented.

R. Abraham Itzhak Hacohen Kook, a disciple of the Nazyb, discussed some points related to the combination of halakha and aggadah in his letter to R. Yitzhak Isaac Halevy (Germany, 1847–1914), as follows:

There is one more partition in which we must form an opening as well, to allow more entrance and exit from boundary to boundary, and that is between the wisdom of the aggadah and the wisdom of the halakha ... hence, in the land of Israel, which is the place of prophecy, the profusion of prophecy has an impression on the order of study and the comprehension is explained based on an inner outlook ... and that was the basis for the study order of the [Talmud] Yerushalmi ... but regarding the sons of Babylonia, who were less affected by the roots of the prophecy, the short form was insufficient and there was need for a lengthier study technique. (Kook 1985a:123–124)

The scholar Blidstein sees an explicit link between R. Kook's words on the combination of halakha and aggadah in the 'Torah of Eretz Israel' and the Nazyb's words in his introduction to the Book of She'iltot (Blidstein 1998). Blidstein says that it is possible to discern a development in the concept of combining halakha and aggadah, which was passed from the Nazyb to R. Kook. In his introduction (Berlin 1999), the Nazyb stresses in several places for the need to combine halakha and aggadah. He says that a Torah scholar must know how to quickly simplify the text and gain wisdom and morals and virtues from it, and that a true Torah scholar is one who combines halakha and aggadah (Berlin 1999).

Elsewhere, the Nazyb notes that the Torah study involves two aspects. One is to interpret every embellishment in the Torah until reaching the ultimate purpose of the halakha. The other is to extract wisdom and knowledge from the precise words in both halakhot and aggadot (Berlin 1999). He says that the combination between halakha and aggadah is manifested in the need to learn the halakhot together with words of wisdom, ethics and virtue that appear in the Aggadah or in the possibility of extracting them from the halakhot in which they are assimilated. The combination of halakha and aggadah is evident in the Talmud Yerushalmi, which connects the wisdom of the heart with the wisdom of actions, aggadah and halakha, and he calls these fire [*esh*] and religion [*dat*] (Berlin 1999).

According to this method, halakha and aggadah are combined when the halakha – namely, the talmudic sugya or the halakhot in the Talmud, is connected to the aggadah – that is, if there is an aggadic element in the sugya or if it is possible to generate additional morals from the halakha, such as words of wisdom and knowledge, ethics, and good and honest manners of conduct.

Based on all the above facts, R. Weitzman, the head of Yeshivat Ma'alot, developed a method of Talmud instruction

that in his opinion reflects the words of R. Kook mentioned earlier, where the aim is to teach Talmud in the proper method, aligned with the 'Torah of Eretz Israel', as discussed further in the text.

The method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot

R. Weitzman formulated rules for teaching Talmud following a principle of the 'Torah of Eretz Israel', namely combining halakha and aggadah. These rules appear in his book of guidance for teaching Talmud (Weitzman 2010). They shall be discussed concisely further in the text.

Rule 1: The Torah has a soul

R. Weitzman writes that just as that which is openly manifest in the Torah is the outward clothing of that which is hidden – which builds and revitalises the manifest, this is also true, according to the Zohar (2nd century AD; see the section 'Criticism of the Talmud instruction method under inspection', no. 4, on the controversy regarding when the Zohar was written), with regard to the oral Torah – the Mishna (end of the 2nd century AD) and Talmud (end of the 5th century AD) (Weitzman 2010). The oral Torah has a manifest dimension, evident in the practical, and an inner and spiritual dimension, which includes the spiritual worlds that are clothed in the practical reality.¹ Based on the Zohar, he contends that the Mishna in its entirety is in fact the outward clothing of the spiritual worlds that are clothed in the practical.

To further highlight the similarity between the inner dimension of the written Torah and the inner dimension of the oral Torah, he cites the following in the introduction to his book:

Just as in the written Torah, the inner dimension is lofty and the actual words are only the covering, this is also true of the oral Torah, where the inner dimension is clothed in the words of the stories and tales. All this seems clear from the Talmud's authors. (Herschman 1889:15–16)

The inner dimension is clothed in the words of the oral Torah by combining halakha and aggadah.

Combining halakha and aggadah requires special instruction methods for teaching Talmud. In his instruction method, R. Weitzman implements in practice the words of R. Kook, who wrote of the need to develop special instruction methods in order to combine halakha and aggadah: 'The halakha and the aggadah must be united. We call for creating such channels within the manners of study, wherein halakha and aggadah will become connected in and of themselves' (Kook 1985b).

The first rule in this instruction method is: The Torah has a soul, and this endeavours to define the Torah as the halakhic talmudic sugya, and the soul of the Torah as Aggadah,

1. Zohar, Pinchas, 604, p. 232.

namely, the halakha sugya contains within it an entire spiritual world.

This rule, as all the other rules in the method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot, to be discussed further in the text, necessitates the preparation of ways for implementing this manner of teaching in practice.

Rule 2: The attempt to connect the generality of the sugya to its specifics

This rule is based on the words of R. Kook, who writes about utilising rules as part of the instruction method within the 'Torah of Eretz Israel' (Weitzman 2010):

We must rise to the level of understanding the generalities and the generalities of those generalities ... that is the special virtue of the Torah of Eretz Israel ... hence only in the land of Israel ... are Torah scholars ready ... if they wish to put their advantage to use ... to approach the depths of Torah from above, from the general to the specific. (Kook 2016:194–195)

The ability to converge the many details into one unifying generality is related, according to R. Kook, to the Torah of Eretz Israel, which examines things from the top down. In order to reach the depths of the Torah, the connection between halakha and aggadah which will give deep meaning to the sugyot studied, it is necessary to occupy oneself with the generalities and to view the sugyot inclusively (Cherlow 1998; Hachohen 1995; Hershcovitch 2007). Namely, the connection between halakha and aggadah is manifested in an ability imparted only to scholars in the land of Israel, to connect the panoramic generality in the sugya to its vertical details, and this is the 'Torah of Eretz Israel'.

Rule 3: Identifying asymmetrical controversies in the sugya

This rule is based on the preliminary premise that the opinions of the disputed sages in the sugya usually contradict each other (when they do not, the controversy is defined as an asymmetrical controversy, as in the example below from Tractate Berakhot 4b). According to R. Weitzman, the opinions in a controversy are usually opposites, dichotomous and decisive, such as: valid [*kasher*] or invalid [*pasul*], forbidden or permitted. If this is not so, it is necessary to closely inspect their wording and understand the reason for this. In some cases, the words of the two sides in the controversy seem to indicate that their opinions do not differ but rather address different cases (as in the example discussed further). Therefore, in his opinion it is necessary to detect whether the controversy between the disputed sages in the sugya is a real dispute or stems from different situations, whereupon the redaction of the sugya created an artificial controversy.

The asymmetrical controversy (Zur 2001) should lead the students to identify the foundations of the sages' controversy (e.g. in Berakhot 4b, the controversy between R. Johanan and R. Jehoshua ben Levy on the topic of what should come first, Kri'at Shema' or the prayer of Shmone Esreh. According to R. Johanan, Kri'at Shema' should come first, followed by

Shmone Esreh. According to R. Jehoshua ben Levy, Shmone Esreh should be said first and then Kri'at Shema') and how it is manifested in the asymmetrical controversy between the disputed sages (Weitzman 2010). Such a controversy can lead to comprehension of the sugya that reveals the spiritual world within it, reflecting a type of connection between halakha and aggadah, and one must be capable of identifying such controversies.

In sum, these rules are intended to connect between the halakha and the aggadah as R. Weitzman sees them. The method of Talmud instruction that he developed, which is based on these three rules, was intended to connect the halakha and the aggadah as part of the 'Torah of Eretz Israel'. The application of his method of Talmud instruction, that is, the combination of halakha and aggadah, is manifested in practice as follows. The halakha is the talmudic sugya, and the aggadah include the words of the Zohar (which he considers the Torah of Eretz Israel). In short, in his method the halakha and aggadah should be connected by linking the talmudic sugya with the Zohar.

Results

The critique levelled at the method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot

The critique voiced regarding the method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot consists of three types of criticism. Firstly, it includes self-criticism by the method's initiator – R. Weitzman. Secondly, criticism by a student of the yeshiva who left it and moved to another (name withheld for anonymity purposes). Thirdly, criticism by the current author (M.K.), as an active participant who visited the yeshiva and studied there under this method of Talmud instruction.

Criticism of the method of Talmud instruction by the head of the yeshiva

R. Weitzman, who developed the method of Talmud instruction based on the abovementioned rules as part of the 'Torah of Eretz Israel', raised several points of criticism in an interview the author conducted with him (on 31 May 2023, M.K.):

- Stressing the significance of understanding the deep spiritual level of sugyot in the Talmud Bavli might cause one to relinquish the simpler primary level of study, which does not strive to reach the deep spiritual level. As a result, the student does not study the primary level that includes understanding the literal meaning of the sugya and the major opinions within it. Consequently, the student also does not reach the inner level of study that connects halakha and aggadah and this might result in a waste of time that could have been spent on Torah study.
- Some of the students study sugyot in various tractates and 'suggest ideas' that in their opinion connect between the halakha and the aggadah, without first learning the commentaries of the Rishonim and Acharonim on

the sugyot. Not all students have the necessary patience to study the sugyot with the commentaries both panoramically (i.e. learning the simple level of the sugya and discussing the opinions of the Rishonim and Acharonim on the subject) and vertically (i.e. learning the parallel sugyot in the Talmud Yerushalmi, midreshei halakha, and teachings of the geonim on the topic of the sugya), and consequently they are incapable of connecting the halakha and the aggadah.

- Many students do not manage to internalise this method of instruction and are unable to learn in this method, as this requires a high level of intelligence and motivation, considerable perseverance and lengthy practice in internalising this unique method of instruction, which does not suit everyone.
- This method of instruction requires freedom of thought in order to successfully connect the halakhic and aggadic components. Students are required to employ freedom of thought that may prove inconsistent with the regular frameworks of Talmud instruction, such as the study programme, regular lessons, methodology, etc. This inconsistency prevents some of the students from reaching a higher level of studies.

Criticism of the method of Talmud instruction at Yeshivat Ma'alot, voiced by a student who discontinued his studies

In an interview conducted by the current author (on 04 November 2021) with a student who left Yeshiva Ma'alot for another yeshiva because of his personal criticism of the method of Talmud instruction at the former, four main points of criticism regarding the method of Talmud instruction employed at the yeshiva, which had caused him to leave for another yeshiva were revealed:

- The method of teaching talmudic sugyot combined with the Zohar and other books of Kabbalah without first learning the realistic dimension of the text makes instruction of the Talmud in this method impractical and disconnected from reality. The need to seek the hidden spiritual layers within each sugya harbours many dangers, as this search becomes more dominant than the heart of the matter, namely, the content of the sugya, that is, the words of the tanna or amora. In his opinion, this method of instruction is not realistic and also does not connect with other insights that arise from the sugya.
 - The rules that R. Weitzman developed for this method of instruction were designed by him alone, and so were the technique and contents deriving from it. In his opinion, instruction of a sugya in such a cyclic manner, where the discourse is closed and its laws and rules are predetermined, bars anyone with critical awareness from studying in this method. The rules form a constant route within the instruction method and make it hard to study critically in a way that seeks to see all aspects of the sugya.
3. In addition (as stated by R. Weitzman himself), in this method of instruction, based on these rules, spreading the method throughout the yeshiva world is more

important than its actual implementation by the students. He says that a large part of the students in the yeshiva do not study according to the method developed by the head of the yeshiva and do not feel committed to it.

Most of the students study in the method customary in most yeshivot. This means learning the literal meaning of the sugya and discussing the commentaries of the major Rishonim and Acharonim. This is because the students feel that the method of instruction under inspection, which lays more emphasis on the spiritual dimension, is hard to implement and less intended for them.

In practice, the yeshiva also allows students who do not utilise its proposed method of Talmud instruction to study at the yeshiva, and quite a few indeed do so. This shows that the yeshiva itself is aware of the failures of the instruction method developed by the head of the yeshiva.

- This instruction method, which includes extensive studying of the sugya in the Talmud Bavli and combines parallel passages in the Talmud Yerushalmi, midreshei halakha, and teachings of the Geonim that are linked to the sugya, is not applicable for most students. According to the testimony of the student who left, only the head of the yeshiva studies using this method, while the rest of the students study the sugya in a much more limited manner, with no parallels from the Talmud Yerushalmi, midreshei halakha, and teachings of the Geonim.

Criticism of the Talmud instruction method under inspection, by the current author (M.K.)

The author's criticism is based on his visit to the yeshiva, participation in lessons, conversations with the students, and conclusions from the interview he conducted with the head of the yeshiva (on 31 May 2021, M.K.). The following are four main points of criticism:

- The criticism is based on the 'test of results' regarding the Talmud instruction method at the yeshiva, following the rules developed by the head of the yeshiva (as part of the 'Torah of Eretz Israel').

In the 'test of results' the question examined was: Does this method of instruction generate Torah scholars or does it fail to prove itself capable of producing Torah scholars? In light of the author's visit to the yeshiva, participation in lessons, and as testified by the head of the yeshiva and the students in interviews with them (on 31 May 2021, M.K.), he reached the conclusion that the yeshiva does not produce Torah scholars and no prominent Torah scholars are known to have studied using this instruction method.

Hence, it can be said that such a Talmud instruction method that is incapable of producing prominent and well-known scholars contains a fundamental flaw.

Therefore, this instruction method is unsuitable for general teaching of Talmud at a yeshiva. This is also evident in the limited number of students who utilise this method, and the fact that no significant scholars are

continuing this method. All that can be said is that this is a unique method of instruction that is suited only for those few who desire it.

- There was difficulty in combining the Zohar in instruction of the Talmudic sugya. As part of the study, the author examined many examples of sugyot in the Talmud Bavli according to the instruction method developed by the head of the yeshiva and reached the conclusion that combining the Zohar in the sugya was not well-established and did not contribute to teaching the sugya. Anyone who uses this instruction method to teach a talmudic sugya will find it hard to adequately and properly combine the Zohar with the sugya studied.
- There is a major discrepancy between the ideal whereby teaching the Talmud Yerushalmi is a significant part of teaching the sugya in the Talmud Bavli and actual reality. The head of the yeshiva and other teachers claim that teaching the Talmud Yerushalmi is an integral part of their method of teaching the Talmud Bavli. In practice, the study programme includes only one tractate from the Talmud Yerushalmi, that is, Tractate Shvi'it. This tractate is taught once every 7 years in preparation for the year of Shmita and in its midst. With this exception, no other tractates from the Talmud Yerushalmi are systematically taught at the yeshiva. Nonetheless, it is notable that the head of the yeshiva and other teachers often make comparisons between sugyot in the Talmud Bavli and a parallel sugyot in the Talmud Yerushalmi, as necessary within their comprehensive lessons (*iiyun*). Therefore, it can be said that there is no consistent and significant teaching of the Talmud Yerushalmi as part of the Talmud instruction method developed by the head of the yeshiva ('Torah of Eretz Israel').
- The inspected instruction method, which combines halakha and aggadah, is applied mainly through attempts to combine or connect the Zohar with sugyot from the Talmud Bavli. This point of departure is based on the customary Orthodox conception whereby the Zohar was written by R. Shimon Bar Yochai (in the land of Israel, 2nd century AD). However, this point of departure is doubtful, as evident both in the rabbinical literature (Cohen 2018) and in the research literature (Lachover & Tishby 1982). If the time of the Zohar is seen as originating later, in the middle of the Rishonim period (12th–13th century AD), then it would be anachronistic to teach the Talmud Bavli in light of the Zohar. It cannot be said that the Zohar underlies the core idea guiding the tannaim and amoraim, as well as the first commentators on the gemara, if the Zohar itself was written in a later period, after the conclusion of the Talmud.

Conclusion

The head of Yeshivat Ma'alot, R. Weitzman, considers the yeshiva a successor of the Nazyb's Volozhyn Yeshiva with regard to teaching Talmud. R. Kook, a disciple of the Nazyb, wrote about the need for an instruction method that connects halakha and aggadah, particularly in the land of Israel, which is a place of prophecy. In his introduction to the Book of

She'iltot, the Nazyb emphasises the need to connect halakha and aggadah. He argues that a real Torah scholar combines halakha and aggadah. In his opinion, this connection is facilitated by connecting the wisdom of the heart – aggadah, with the wisdom of actions – halakha. This connection is particularly evident in the Talmud Yerushalmi.

R. Weitzman, the head of the yeshiva, developed a method for instruction of the Talmud that connects halakha and aggadah. In his opinion, this method is part of the 'Torah of Eretz Israel'. He formulated rules for teaching Talmud in this way, of which three are considered primary rules. The first rule is the awareness that there is a spiritual world within the halakhic sugya and there is a need to reveal this world. The second rule is examining the sugya in an inclusive way and tying the details within the sugya to a single generality. The third rule is detecting asymmetrical controversies in the sugya and clarifying the reason for them. The clarification enables a more accurate identification of the foundations of the rabbinical controversy in the sugya, and sometimes it has implications for the connection between halakha and aggadah.

However, this method of instruction has been subjected to a great deal of criticism. First and foremost is the criticism of the head of the yeshiva himself, who developed the method. He raises four main points of criticism regarding his instruction method. The first is that stressing the significance of understanding the spiritual depth of the sugyot makes it hard to study the literal meaning of the sugya. The second is that some students contrive ideas that seemingly connect halakha and aggadah. The third is that this method of instruction requires a high level of intelligence and perseverance and is therefore not suitable for everyone. The fourth is that the freedom of thought necessary in order to successfully connect halakha and aggadah might clash with the regular frameworks at the yeshiva.

Another criticism is that of a student who left the yeshiva, who raises additional points of criticism. The search for the spiritual key within the sugya makes the inspected method of instruction unpractical. The rules of instruction in this method are predetermined and prevent critical study. A large part of the students at the yeshiva do not study using this instruction method because it is hard to implement.

The current author (M.K.) raises another point of criticism. In the test of results, this method of instruction is faulty because it does not manage to produce Torah scholars. In addition and with regard to the method itself, teaching of the Talmud Yerushalmi, which constitutes a major part of the inspected method of instruction for teaching sugyot in the Talmud Bavli, is rarely implemented. Moreover, an important principle in this method of instruction is that of combining the Zohar with the contents of the sugya, but attempts at connecting them are not well-established and do not contribute to comprehension of the sugya.

Furthermore, both in rabbinical literature and in the research literature, there are those who set the writing of the Zohar at a time that post-dates the conclusion of the Talmud and therefore teaching Talmud in light of the Zohar is anachronistic.

Notably, the comparison in this article between the Volozhyn Yeshiva and Yeshivat Ma'alot is an outcome of the claim put forth by R. Weitzman, the head of Yeshivat Ma'alot, that the method of teaching at Yeshivat Ma'alot, that is, systematic study that connects halakha and aggadah, continues the teaching method at the Nazyb's Volozhyn Yeshiva. The Nazyb, however, was unable to implement this teaching method at the Volozhyn Yeshiva and R. Kook, his student, was unable to implement the Nazyb's teaching method at his own yeshiva. R. Weitzman of Yeshivat Ma'alot boasts that he managed to implement the Nazyb's teaching method where both the Nazyb and his student R. Kook failed. This claim justifies proper research investigation to examine its truthfulness. The article's findings lead to the conclusion that Yeshivat Ma'alot cannot be seen as a successor of the Volozhyn Yeshiva, at least regarding the method of Talmud instruction; hence, the claim of the head of the yeshiva cannot be accepted.

As this is the conclusion arising from the article, we suggested, from a practical angle and in light of the criticism mentioned earlier, including that of the head of the yeshiva himself regarding his method of Talmud instruction, that perhaps the time has come for a change or reorganisation of the Talmud instruction method practiced in the yeshiva, while adapting it as much as possible to the students' needs and abilities.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no financial or personal relationship(s) that may have inappropriately influenced them in writing this article.

Authors' contributions

Both authors, M.K. and U.Z., contributed to the writing, review and editing of the article.

Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency of the authors.

References

- Berlin, N.Z.Y., 1999, *Kidmat ha-Emek, Sheiltot de-Rav Achai Gaon*, vol. 1, pp. 5–36, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem.
- Blidstein, G. J., 1998, 'The "Torah of Eretz Israel" in the Works of Rabbi N.Z. Berlin of Volozhyn', in A. Ravitsky (ed.), *The land of Israel in modern Jewish thought*, pp. 478–479, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, Jerusalem.
- Cherlow, Y., 1998, *Torat Eretz Israel le-Or Mishnat ha-Reiya*, p. 150, Sifrei ha-Golan, Hispin.
- Cohen, D., 2018, *Hug ha-Reiya*, vol. 1, Ariel, Jerusalem.
- Hacohen, A., 1995, 'Torat Eretz Israel be-vet midrasho shel ha-Reiya Kook', *Alon Shvut* 7, 119–120, 113–132.
- Herschman, S., 1889, *Bet Avot*, pp. 15–16, Herschman Shmuel, Berlin.
- Hershcovitch, M., 2007, *Torat Eretz Israel: Hora'at ha-Talmud be-Mishnat ha-Reiya: Hagut, Hazon ve-Ma'asseh*, pp. 17–35, Nehorai, Nechalim.
- Kook, A.I., 1985a, *Eigrot ha-Reiya*, vol. 1, pp. 123–124, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem.
- Kook, A.I., 1985b, *Orot ha-Kodesh*, vol. 1, p. 25, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem.
- Kook, A.I., 2016, *Orot ha-Torah*, pp. 194–195, Sderot Hatora Insitute, Sderot.
- Lachover, Y. & Tishby, I., 1982, *The wisdom of the Zohar*, vol. 1, pp. 28–108, Mossad Bialik, Jerusalem.
- Weitzman, Y., 2010, *Meitav ha-Aretz: Kelalei Limud ve-Shi'urim le-Orah shel Torat Eretz Israel*, pp. 3–52, 85–91, Yeshivat Ma'alot, Ma'alot.
- Zur, U., 2001, 'Shikulim shel simetriya ba-Talmud ha-Bavli', *Higayon* 5, 70–84.