Criteria of Stammaitic Intervention in Aggada*

by

Jeffrey L. Rubenstein

Did the Stammaim – the redactors of the Bavli – contribute to the production of Bavli aggada? If so, how can we identify and determine the parameters of their contribution? By "Stammaim" I refer to all post-Amoraic sages, c. 450–700 CE. While in some cases I believe it is possible to distinguish between earlier and later Stammaitic layers, and between Stammaim and Saboraim, here I will suffice with this general distinction between the Amoraim and their successors as a first step to answering these questions.[1]

That the Stammaim took a deep interest in aggada is beyond doubt. (By "aggada" I refer to all non-halakhic sources, including midrash, narratives, ethical sayings, liturgical formulae, historical memories and suchlike). The fact that they included so much aggada in the Bavli – a great deal more proportionately than the redactors of the Yerushalmi – indicates that their concerns went beyond halakha. They probably selected specific aggadic traditions from among the available corpus and decided to omit others.[2] The placement of aggadot and stories in discrete and "unnatural" contexts, which often deviate from the locations of the parallel aggadot in the Yerushalmi, suggests an active interest.[3] And

---

[1] My conception of the Stammaim as the sages who lived in a discrete historical era derives of course from David Weiss Halivni; see *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara: The Jewish Predilection for Justified Law* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 76–104; and now revised slightly in *Meqorot umesorot: bava metsia (*Jerusalem: Magnes, 2003), 1–26. However, in much of this paper I work more closely with Shamma Friedman's definition of the *stam* as a literary stratum defined by literary criteria; see "Pereq ha'isha rabba babavli," *Mehqarim umeqorot*, ed. H. Dimitrovksi (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1977), 283–321. Friedman's reluctance to date the sages who produced the stammaitic stratum (and the "later additions" that post-date this stratum) makes it difficult to know if he and Halivni disagree or agree on this issue. On the definition and dating of the Saboraim see Halivni, *Meqorot umesorot: bava metsia*, 11–16. Halivni recently has revised his periodization and now dates the Stammaim from c. 450–650 CE (oral communication, April 2004) and the Saboraim from 650–750.

[2] See Yaakov Elman, "Righteousness as its Own Reward: An Inquiry into the Theologies of the Stam," *PAAJR* 57 (1990–91), 38.

[3] The extended collections of stories found in the Bavli likewise point to the work of the redactors, unless we wish to posit the existence of lengthy Amoraic narrative compilations.

one can readily identify Stammaitic discussions and analyses of earlier aggadic sources formulated in the same anonymous Aramaic give-and-take characteristic of halakhic sugyot.[4]

A trickier question is the extent to which the Stammaim produced aggada. Were they collectors, transmitters and commentators, or also creators? Did they substantively rework antecedent Amoraic aggadic sources and even formulate new aggadot? Or did they transmit Amoraic traditions in substantially the same form as they received them, adding analysis and comments, but not modifying the core Amoraic tradition to any significant degree? To what extent did they study aggada and to what extent did they create it? Or, to formulate the matter in somewhat different terms: as editor-redactors of the Bavli we can expect that the Stammaim edited and redacted aggadic sources in the same way they edited and redacted halakhic traditions. To say this is almost a tautology. The key question is whether and to what extent they produced aggadot themselves.

Prima facie we should expect the Stammaim to have been creators of aggadic traditions, not mere transmitters. There would seem to be no obvious reason to distinguish halakha from aggada. To the extent that the Stammaim were active and creative in the realm of halakha, we should expect the same of aggada. Indeed, since aggada has less authority than halakha, we should expect the Stammaim to have been more active in the production of aggada. They might well have felt more free to modify aggadic traditions, to rework and change Amoraic aggadic sources, given the lesser stakes involved. The tradition that "Ravina and Rav Ashi are the end of *hora'a*" (bBM 86a) probably pertains to the authority to pronounce halakhic dicta (*meimrot*), what we might call the end of the Amoraic period. It is possible, however, that the Stammaim continued to formulate aggadot even after the end of *hora'a*, just as they continued to subject Amoraic halakhic traditions to dialectical analysis.[5] Stories about the latest Amoraim such as Mar bar Rav Ashi, for example, must have been created in post-Amoraic

---

(In many cases this is unlikely, as the individual stories appear independently outside of the Bavli.) However it should be noted that some briefer collections of Amoraic aggadot can be found in the Yerushalmi; see Catherine Hezser, *Form, Function, and Historical Significance of the Rabbinic Story in Yerushalmi Neziqin* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1993), 269–82, and Leib Moscovitz, "Ledarkhei shiluvan shel ha'aggadot birushalmi: berurim rishonim," *Asufot* 11 (1997), 197–209. On "Story-Cycles" in the Bavli, see Eli Yassif, "The Cycle of Tales in Rabbinic Literature," *JSHL* 12 (1990), 103–46 (Hebrew); and *The Hebrew Folktale*, trans. J. Teitelbaum (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 242–44.

    [4] See e.g. the discursive Aramaic comments to the long aggada at the beginning of Tractate Avodah Zarah on the gentiles and the world to come. For discussion, see Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, *Talmudic Stories: Narrative Art, Composition, and Culture* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 215–19 and the literature cited at 380 n. 2.

    [5] On "the end of *hora'a*" see David Weiss Halivni, *Meqorot umesorot: bava metsia* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2003), 201–21; and see my discussion in *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 5. By the formulation of new aggadot I have in mind such stories as the saga of Rav Kahana, bBQ 117a–b, discussed below.

times.[6] That many stories are anonymous, that is, not attributed to any Amora, may be another indicator of Stammaitic authorship.[7]

If we grant this point, the key question becomes: how do we distinguish Stammaitic aggadot, or the Stammaitic component of aggadot, from Amoraic aggadot or the Amoraic core? Source criticism, namely the comparison of Bavli aggadot with their parallels in the Yerushalmi, in other Palestinian documents, and even within the Bavli itself, provides limited value in many cases, as it is possible that the changes were introduced by Babylonian Amoraim. When source-criticism indicates that lengthy passages were transferred wholesale and incorporated into new narratives or aggadot, it stands to reason that the Stammaim are responsible.[8] These cases are analogous to the transfer of entire halakhic sugyot or substantial components of halakhic *sugyot* from one context to another. Briefer transfers and modifications of traditions, however, could be the work of Amoraim. And in some cases of course no parallel source is extant. Additional criteria are therefore needed to supplement source-criticism.

What then of form-criticism? The prominent formal characteristics of the Stammaitic stratum are found primarily in halakhic, not aggadic, *sugyot*. These include the shifts from the Hebrew of Amoraic dicta to the Aramaic of the Stammaitic commentary; from the terse style of Amoraic dicta to the verbose, expansive style of the Stammaitic analysis; and from apodictic Amoraic pronouncements to the dialogical give-and-take of the Stammaim. Nevertheless, I will argue that form-critical and related criteria can be of significant help in identifying Stammaitic aggadot. Indeed, the same formal criteria used to distinguish Amoraic from Stammaitic halakhic traditions profitably can be applied to aggadic traditions too. Shamma Friedman provides a useful list that includes form-critical criteria in his introduction to "Pereq Ha-Isha Rabba," and uses them to analyze the *sugyot* of that chapter. Here I will apply the same criteria to a variety of aggadic sources to illustrate how the work of the Stammaim can be identified with some degree of confidence.

Friedman's fourteen criteria are as follow:[9]

(1) Hebrew vs. Aramaic
(2) an explanatory, dependent clause is usually editorial

---

[6] See e.g. bBB 12b, the colorful story about how Mar bar Rav Ashi became head of the academy. If the disciples of Mar bar Rav Ashi formulated the story, then we are already in post-Amoraic times.

[7] I am well aware that an Amoraic *ma'ase* or *uvda* may be unattributed. So lack of an attribution is not a sufficient criteria.

[8] See, for example, the beginning of the Bavli's version of the story of R. Shimon bar Yohai and the cave, bShab 33b, which borrows extended passages from bAZ 2b. For discussion see Rubenstein, *Talmudic Stories*, 127–28 and the references there.

[9] Friedman, "Pereq ha'isha rabba babavli," *Mehqarim umeqorot*, ed. H. Dimitrovksi (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1977), 301–308. An English translation of the definition of these criteria appears in the summaries at the end of the book (no page numbers given).

(3) clumsy syntax or unbalanced style
(4) excessive length
(5) resumptive repetition (repetition of the query)
(6) excluding a suspected editorial addition produces a simpler reading
(7) reference to material further on in the *sugya*
(8) vocabulary[10]
(9) grammatical forms frequent in Geonic Aramaic, but rare in Babylonian Aramaic
(10) conflicting word order in the testimonia can indicate that the "wandering" unit was a marginal gloss
(11) a clustering of variant readings characterizes a later insertion
(12) absence of the phrase in manuscripts or parallel passages
(13) Medieval exegesis (*rishonim*) may reflect a shorter text
(14) the shorter text is authentic; preference is to be given to the shortest of proposed Amoraic reconstructions.

Several of these criteria overlap. For example, #4, "excessive length," and #14, "the shorter text is authentic" essentially pertain to the same phenomenon. For my purposes the fourteen criteria can be subsumed under the seven headings below. Friedman has pointed out that a stronger case can be made when several of the criteria appear in combination, and here I will do the same. In addition, wherever possible I will present source-critical evidence, namely parallel texts from Palestinian compilations, to confirm that traditions were changed in the course of time. The question then becomes, Who introduced the changes, Amoraim or Stammaim?, and these criteria point to the Stammaim.

One additional observation: some of Friedman's criteria are not, strictly speaking, formal. Thus #8, "vocabulary," and #12, "absence of the phrase in manuscripts or parallel passages" have little to do with form. Hence my title "Criteria of Stammaitic Intervention in Aggada" (rather then "form-critical criteria.")

(1) Vocabulary and Geonic forms (#8,#9)

For obvious reasons, when an Amora uses language or phraseology otherwise unattested or rare in Amoraic sources but found in the Stammaitic stratum, one suspects that the Stammaim have reworked or glossed his statement. Similarly, forms known from Geonic literature but rare in the Talmud may be markers of later additions. While in some cases only the formulation may be late, not the content, here I am interested in cases of substantive changes or additions, hence late content too. Late forms, phrases and vocabulary also appear in aggadic materials. In the Bavli's version of the story of the deposition of Rabban Gamaliel,

---

[10] Friedman adds: "[W]hen the concordance indicates that a word or phrase is used overwhelmingly by the late Amoraim or in anonymous passages, its presence within the borders of a statement by an early Amora is suspect."

we learn that the sage was shown white casks full of ashes in a dream, a sign that he had not in fact restricted worthy students from entering the academy: like the casks that contained nothing of value, the students possessed no true merit. The Talmud then comments: ולא היא, ההיא ליתובי דעתיה הוא דאחזו ליה.[11] The phrase ולא היא has long been recognized as an indication of a later gloss.[12] Not surprisingly, the Yerushalmi's version of the story lacks this line, which relates to a theme found in the Bavli's version but completely lacking in the Yerushalmi's: that of access to the academy.[13] Similarly, in the famous story of R. Yehoshua b. Levi's arrival in paradise (bKet 77b), we find the following account:

מכריז אליהו קמיה: פנו מקום לבר ליואי, פנו מקום לבר ליואי. אזל אשכחיה לר' שמעון בן יוחאי
דהוה יתיב על תלת עשר תכטקי פיזא, אמר ליה: את הוא בר ליואי? אמר ליה: הן. נראתה קשת
בימיך? אמר ליה: הן, [א"ל] אם כן אי אתה בר ליואי.
ולא היא, דלא הואי מידי, אלא סבר: לא אחזיק טיבותא לנפשאי.[14]

In both cases the storyteller/redactor that added the clause containing ולא היא seems to have opposed aspects of the earlier narrative. In the first case he apparently disagreed with the dream that implied that Rabban Gamaliel had not prevented worthy students from entering the academy. Or perhaps he was perplexed by such a dream, since the thrust of the story suggests that the Nasi had restricted students from entering the academy and, as a result, limited the resolution of previously intractable issues: once the Nasi is deposed and the doors opened to all "there was not a single law pending in the academy that they did not resolve." This storyteller therefore explained away the dream as a gesture to Rabban Gamaliel. The dream was *not* a true reflection of Rabban Gamaliel's policies, which had indeed limited access to the academy and impeded the halakhic process. In the case of R. Yehoshua b. Levi the later storyteller was puzzled by R. Shimon b. Yohai's charge that essentially disparages the stature of R. Yehoshua b. Levi, otherwise portrayed in the narrative as a hero. He negates R. Yehoshua b. Levi's admission (that he had seen the rainbow), insisting that the rainbow had *not* in fact appeared in the sage's life. The version of this encounter in *Pesiqta deRav Kahana*, though considerably different from the Bavli, lacks

---

[11] bBer 28a. "But this was not so. It (the dream) was only to set his mind at ease."

[12] For references, see Friedman, "Pereq ha'isha rabba," 286 n. 14

[13] See Devora Steinmetz, "Must the Patriarch Know 'Uqtzin? The Nasi as Scholar in Babylonian Aggada," *AJSR* 23 (1998), 163–90.

[14] Translation: Elijah proclaimed before him, "Clear a place for the Son of Levi. Clear a place for the Son of Levi." He [R. Yehoshua b. Levi] went and found R. Shimon bar Yohai who was sitting beside thirteen tables of gold. He said to him, "Are you the Son of Levi?" He said to him, "Yes." He said to him, "Was the rainbow ever seen during your life?" He said to him, "Yes." He said to him, "Then you are not the Son of Levi." But this was not the case. No such thing happened. But he did not wish to claim the credit for himself. (The rainbow is a sign or guarantee that God will not punish the world with a catastrophe like the flood. A holy man represents a similar guarantee by virtue of his merit, and two guarantees are not needed. Hence a rainbow will never be seen during the lifetime of a consummate holy man.)

the assertion of the ולא היא clause such that the acknowledgement that the rainbow had appeared in R. Yehoshua b. Levi's life stands. [15] In their current forms both Bavli narratives essentially contradict themselves: the rainbow appeared in R. Yehoshua b. Levi's life, but actually did not; the dream suggests that Rabban Gamaliel did not restrict worthy students from access to the academy, but actually he did so. Were the ולא היא material original we would expect it to be integrated more smoothly, e.g., "He did not wish to boast and therefore said that the rainbow had not appeared."

Another example of telling vocabulary appears in the Bavli's version of the testament of R. Yehuda HaNasi (bKet 103a–b), presented in Tannaitic Hebrew, ostensibly a *baraita,* and then glossed with explanatory comments. One of the sage's testamentary directives states שמעון בני חכם גמליאל בני נשיא. "My son Shimon will be Sage; my son Gamaliel will be Nasi". The Bavli subsequently explains this directive as a concessive – "although my son Shimon is wise, my son Gamaliel will be Nasi" – and presents a brief discussion of this interpretation attributed to Amoraim:

"שמעון בני חכם [גמליאל בני נשיא]." מאי קאמר? הכי קאמר: אע"פ ששמעון בני חכם, גמליאל בני נשיא. אמר לוי: צריכא למימר? אמר רבי שמעון בר רבי: צריכא לך ולמטלעתך. מאי קשיא ליה? הא קרא קאמר: ואת הממלכה נתן ליהורם כי הוא הבכור (דברי הימים ב' כא ג). ההוא ממלא מקום אבותיו הוה, ורבן גמליאל אינו ממלא מקום אבותיו הוה.[16]

However, this interchange between Levi and R. Shimon is suspect, as it follows the Stam's explanation of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's directive (מאי קאמר? הכי קאמר…). But even if we read it as a direct response to the citation (and not as responding to the Stam's interpretation), the interchange appears to be pseudepigraphic. The locution צריכא למימר of Levi's purported question appears thirty-one times in the Bavli. Twenty-six of these attestations are unambiguously Stammaitic; the other five appear in what are most likely Stammaitic extensions

---

[15] *PRK* 11:15 (190–91). Here R. Shimon bar Yohai asks Elijah whether a rainbow ever appeared during R. Yehoshua b. Levi's life, and concludes from Elijah's affirmative response that R. Yehoshua is unworthy of being received by him. An almost identical version appears in *GenR* 329 (35:12), although some manuscripts lack Elijah's response, leaving the question unanswered: אליהו זכור לטוב ור' יהושע [בן לוי] הוון יתבין תניין כחדא, מטון שמועה מדר' שמעון בן יוחי, אמ' הא מרה דשמעתא ניעול ונישאליה, על אליהו זכור לטוב גביה, אמר ליה מן עמך, אמר ליה גדול הדור הוא ר' יהושע בן לוי, אמר ליה נראתה הקשת בימיו, [א"ל אין. אמר] אם נראתה לית הוא כדיי למחמי סבר אפיי. This version prompted R. Aryeh Hirsch Yellin, author of the *Yefe Eynayim*, to reject the assertion of the ולא היא in the Bavli!

[16] Translation: "My son Shimon will be the Sage. What did he mean? This is what he meant: even though my son Shimon is sage (=wise), my son Gamaliel will be the Nasi. Levi said, 'Was it necessary to state this?' R. Shimon b. Rabbi said, 'It is necessary for you and your limping.' – What was difficult for him (R. Shimon b. Rabbi, that he belittled Levi's objection)? Does not Scripture state, *He gave the kingdom to Jehoram because he was first born (2 Chr 21:3)?* – He [Jehoram] properly fulfilled the place of his ancestors. Rabban Gamaliel did not properly fulfill the place of his ancestors (and therefore would not have received the office were it not for a specific directive)."

of briefer Amoraic dicta. Four of these gloss statements of Rava (bYev 70a, bYev 88b, bNaz 63b, bNid 50a), and one glosses a statement of Rav Ashi (bMQ 7a). Even if these cases are authentically Amoraic, the earliest attestation is the fourth generation Amora Rava, three generations after Levi. This locution is part of the dialectical portion of the *sugya*, usually following a question framed by היכי דמי or אילימא, which characterize the Stammaitic stratum. Now Levi is mentioned in the next few lines of the *sugya* and may have been "borrowed" here. Furthermore Levi and R. Shimon b. Rabbi study together in bAZ 19a, and are mentioned together in bKet 8a, so the two are an attested unit. In bYev 9a Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says of Levi, "It seems that he (Levi) has no brains in his skull." That Rabbi's son insults Levi here replicates this motif. All the building-blocks required to fashion this interchange were therefore readily available to the redactors. Moreover, the Bavli's version of the testament differs from that of the Yerushalmi, which mentions neither R. Shimon nor Rabban Gamaliel.[17] Certain aspects of the content of the testament suggest that the Bavli's version itself is a reworking of that of the Yerushalmi.[18] The Bavli's version of the testament, in other words, has been reworked, either by Amoraim or Stammaim, and the explanatory comments must be even later. A number of considerations therefore combine with the evidence of the suspiciously late phraseology to argue for a Stammaitic provenance.

Finally, several Bavli stories describe the prowess of a sage in terms of his ability to excel in dialectical debate. The sage effortlessly propounds objections (קושיות) and responses (תשובות) and resolves them with solutions (פרוקי) and answers (תרוצי). When Rav Kahana, for example, arrives in the Land of Israel after fleeing Babylonia, he proves to the students he encounters that he deserves an audience with Resh Laqish by telling them "this objection and that objection, this solution and that solution." (אמר להו: האי קושיא והאי קושיא, והאי פירוקא והאי פירוקא). Subsequently Rav Kahana and R. Yohanan gain and lose status in the academy by either failing to object or objecting (אמר שמעתתא ולֹא אקשי...אמר שמעתתא ואקשי). However, the combination "objections and solutions" (whether in the Hebrew or Aramaic) is extremely rare in Amoraic discourse. The nominal forms appear together only in a statement of the late Amora Ravina in bBQ 14a, and the verbal forms but three other times.[19] The combination appears in several other Bavli stories with late features, such as the stories of R. Yohanan

---

[17] yKet 12:3, 34d = yKil 9:4, 32a.

[18] See Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Patriarchs and Scholarchs," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 48 (1981), 84; Ofra Meir, *Rabbi Judah the Patriarch: Palestinian and Babylonian Portrait of a Leader* (Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuhad, 1999), 300–37 (Hebrew); Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, *The Culture of the Bavli* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 91–93.

[19] The verbal forms appear in bAZ 50b in statements of Sheshet and Ravina and in bBQ 66b (=bKet 42b) attributed to Rava.

and Resh Laqish in bBM 84a and of R. Shimon b. Yohai and the cave in bShab 33b (see below), sometimes with hyperbolic numbers ("twenty four solutions for every objection"), but never appear in the Palestinian parallels to these stories. Daniel Sperber has dated this story of Rav Kahana to Saboraic times based on its content, a polemic touting the superiority of Babylonian tradition, and on parallel motifs in medieval Iranian literature.[20] And Gafni has noted that the manuscripts evince significant textual discrepancies and terms common in Geonic literature, two of Friedman's other criteria (see below).[21] The notion of numerous objections and responses, that is, complex dialectical debate, as the measure of academic ability (rather than, say, precise knowledge of Tannaitic traditions) matches the literary style of the Stammaitic stratum. Here again several factors taken together support the assignment of this story, or at least significant portions of it, to the post-Amoraic period.

(2) Hebrew vs. Aramaic (#1)

Amoraic halakhic sources are generally Hebrew; the Stammaitic comments generally Aramaic. Some aggadot contain Aramaic additions that easily can be distinguished from a Hebrew core. For example, bSanh 11a presents a Hebrew story of Rabban Gamaliel summoning seven elders to intercalate the calendar together with an Aramaic addendum:

ySanh 1:2, 18c	bSanh 11a
מעשה ברבן גמליאל שאמר יקרוני שבעה זקי־נים לעלייה ונכנסו שמנה אמר מי הוא שנכנס שלא ברשות עמד שמואל הקטן על רגליו ואמר אני עליתי שלא ברשות הלכה נצרכה לי ונכנסתי לשאול עליה אמ' לו רבן גמליאל ומה אלדד ומידד שכל ישראל יודעי' שאילו הן שנים אמרתי שאתה אחד מהן ואפילו כן לא עיברוה	מעשה ברבן גמליאל שאמר: השכימו לי שבעה לעלייה, השכים ומצא שמונה. אמר: מי הוא שעלה שלא ברשות? ירד! עמד שמואל הקטן ואמר: אני הוא שעליתי שלא ברשות, ולא לעבר השנה עליתי, אלא ללמוד הלכה למעשה הוצרכתי. אמר לו: שב בני, שב. ראויות כל השנים כולן להתעבר על ידך, אלא אמרו

<div dir="rtl">

בההוא יומא ואפליגינה במילי דאורייא ועברוה   חכמים: אין מעברין את השנה אלא במזומנין
ביומא דבתרי²²   לה

ולא שמואל הקטן הוה, אלא איניש אחרינא,
ומחמת כיסופא הוא דעבד²³

</div>

The shift to Aramaic appears in a postscript to the story, which in and of itself points to a later addition. This addendum, however, amounts to more than a simple clarification or explanation and must be considered a complete reworking of the narrative as it substantively changes the plot. In both the Yerushalmi and the Hebrew of the Bavli, Shmuel HaQatan *was not invited* but shows up in order to learn from his fellow sages, while according to the Aramaic Bavli addendum Shmuel *was invited* but told a white lie in order to protect the dignity of his uninvited colleague. Note that the Bavli story differs from the Yerushalmi story also in Rabban Gamaliel's response to Shmuel, dispensing with the reference to Eldad and Medad. That difference, which appears in the body of the story may be due to Amoraic transmitters of the tradition – at least there is no obvious sign to link the omission to the Stammaim. The addendum, on the other hand, should be attributed to the Stammaim, as there would be little reason for Amoraim to retell a Hebrew tradition into which they have introduced some changes, but then shift to Aramaic.[24] Another factor that points to the Stammaim is the change in theme from the pursuit of Torah to that of shame, namely the importance of preventing the humiliation of others. I have argued elsewhere that several late Bavli stories rework Palestinian sources by adding the theme of shame.[25]

---

[22] Translation: "Once Rabban Gamaliel said, 'Call seven [sages] to my upper-story tomorrow morning [in order to intercalate the year] – and eight entered. He said, 'Who came up here without permission?' Samuel the Little stood up on his feet and said, 'It was I who came up here without permission. I needed to learn about this law and I entered to ask about it.' He [Gamaliel] said to him, 'Sit down, my son, sit down. Even [were this a case such as that of] Eldad and Medad where all Israel knows that they are the two, I would [still] say that you are one of them. [Similarly, in this case I consider you worthy of being one of the seven.].' Nevertheless, they did not intercalate on that day, but they involved themselves in words of Torah, and they intercalated on the next."

[23] Translation: "Once Rabban Gamaliel said, 'Summon seven [sages] to my upper-story tomorrow morning [in order to intercalate the year].' When he arrived there he found eight. He said, 'He who came up here without permission – let him descend.' Samuel the Little stood up and said, 'It was I who came up here without permission. I did not come here to intercalate the year, but I needed to learn the practical law [of how intercalation is done].' He [Gamaliel] said to him, 'Sit down, my son, sit down. It is fitting that all years be intercalated with your [participation]. However, the sages have said, 'The intercalation of the year may be done only by those who were invited.' *And it was not Samuel the Little [who had not been invited] but another man. But he [Samuel] acted this way to avoid shaming [his colleague].*" (The italics represent Aramaic.)

[24] Nor is that type of switch common in Amoraic halakhic dicta. Note that the final sentence of the Yerushalmi's version also shifts to Aramaic. This too may be a later development of an earlier narrative. On language change from Hebrew to Aramaic in the Yerushalmi, see Hezser, *Rabbinic Story in Yerushalmi Neziqin*, 301–2.

[25] See Rubenstein, *Talmudic Stories*, 275–77; *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*, 67–79.

Another example of a shift from Hebrew to Aramaic appears in the Bavli's version of the tradition of the rolling bones of Judah, son of Jacob, found at bMak 11b with parallels at bBQ 92a and bSot 7b.

Midrash Tannaim to Deut 33:7 (214)	GenR 97:8 (1217) (cf. Sifre Devarim #348 [406–7])	bMak 11b
יחי ראובן ואל ימת (דברים לג ו) **וזאת ליהודה ויאמר** (דברים לג ז) ווכי מה ענין זה לזה לפי שעשה יהודה מה שעשה ועמ' צדקה ממני כיון שראה ראובן שעמד יהודה והודה אף הוא עמד והודה הוי יהודה גרם לראובן לעשות תשובה עליהם הוא מפרש בקבלה **אשר חכמים יגידו** (איוב טו יח) מה שכר נטלו על כך **להם לבדם ניתנה הארץ** (איוב טו יט)...	ואף ראובן לא הודה במעשיו אלא מכחו שליהודה, כיון שראה ראובן את יהודה שהודה, עמד הוא והודה כל מעשיו, ולפי שגרם יהודה לראובן לעשות תשובה, לפיכך סמכו משה רבינו לו **שנ' יחי ראובן ואל ימות** (דברים לג ו), וכת' בתריה **וזאת ליהודה ויאמר** (דברים לג ז) על שניהם הוא א' **אשר חכמים יגידו ולא כחדו מאבותם** (איוב טו יח).[26]	(A) וא"ר שמואל בר נחמני א"ר יוחנן: מאי דכתיב **יחי ראובן ואל ימות וזאת ליהודה** (דברים לג ז), וכת' כל אותן מ' שנה שהיו ישראל במדבר, עצמותיו של יהודה היו מגולגלין בארון, עד שעמד משה ובקש עליו רחמים, אמר לפניו: רבונו של עולם, מי גרם לראובן שיודה? יהודה, **וזאת ליהודה שמע ה' קול יהודה** (דברים לג ו)
ואל עמו תבי' שיכנס עם אבות לקבורה....[27]		(B) עאל איבריה לשפא. לא הוה קא מעיילי ליה למתיבתא דרקיע **ואל עמו תביאנוי** (דברים לג ז).
		לא הוה קא ידע למישקל ומיטרח בשמעתא בהדי רבנן **ידיו רב לו** (דברים לג ז).
		לא הוה ידע לפרוקי קושיא **ועזר מצריו תהיה** (דברים לג ז).[28]

---

[26] Translation: Reuben too confessed to his deeds only because of the example of Judah. When Reuben saw that Judah confessed, he arose and confessed all of his deeds. And because Judah inspired Reuben to repent, our Teacher Moses juxtaposed him [Judah] with him [Reuben], as it says, *May Reuben live and not die...(Deut 33:6)*, and after that is written *And this he said of Judah (Deut 33:7)*. About the two of them it says, *That which wise men have acknowledged from their fathers, and have not withheld (Job 15:18)*.

[27] Translation: *May Reuben live and not die...(Deut 33:6). And this he said of Judah (Deut 33:7)*. What does the one have to do with the other? Because Judah did what he did, namely he arose and said, *She is more in the right than I (Gen 38:26)*. When Reuben saw that Judah arose and confessed, he too arose and confessed. Thus Judah inspired Reuben to repent. About the two of them it says in the Writings, *That which wise men have acknowledged....(Job 15:18)*. What reward do they receive for this? *To whom alone the land was given (Job 15:19)...And restore him to his people (Deut 33:7)*. That he should be buried with his forefathers.

[28] Translation: During the entire forty years that the Israelites were in the desert, the bones of Judah rolled around in the coffin, until Moses stood up and prayed for him. He said, "Master

The abrupt shift from Hebrew to Aramaic following the citation of the first clause of Deut 33:7 (at Section B) suggests a secondary development, presumably a Stammaitic addition to the Amoraic aggada attributed to R. Shmuel b. Nahmani in the name of R. Yohanan. The focus of the aggada changes at that point from the bones of Judah in the coffin to the fate of his soul in the next world. As noted above, the motif of "solving an objection" seems to be post-Amoraic. The concept of a heavenly academy, as opposed to a heavenly court, may also be of Stammaitic provenance.[29] In addition, there are some significant textual variants, another of Friedman's criteria (see below).[30] In this case the Palestinian parallels are less helpful, as they focus mostly on the juxtaposition of the references to Reuben in Deut 33:6 and Judah in 33:7. They share the idea that Judah was responsible for Reuben's confession, and *Midrash Tannaim* refers to Judah's burial. Clearly they lack all concern for Judah's posthumous situation. Was this secondary development added by Babylonian Amoraim or Stammaim? The evidence points to the Stammaim.

(3) Kernel and explanatory, dependent clause (#2)

Friedman's second criterion distinguishes the kernel of an Amoraic dictum from an explanatory portion, typically appearing as a dependent clause: the kernel is Amoraic while the explanation is post-Amoraic. This phenomenon is quite common in stories. In the lengthy account of R. Shimon bar Yohai, for example, the sage's weathered appearance upon emerging from the cave distresses his father-in-law, R. Pinhas b. Yair, who exclaims, "Alas that I see you so" (bShab 33b). R. Shimon responds, "Happy that you see me so. For if you did not see me so, you would not find me so [learned]." This interchange is followed by an explanatory comment.

---

of the universe! Who caused Reuben to confess? Judah! As it says, *And this he said of Judah! Hear, O Lord the voice of Judah (Deut 33:7)*. [At that point] his bones entered their sockets. [Yet] they did not let him [Judah] enter the heavenly academy [because of the ban]. [Moses prayed,] *"[Hear, O Lord the voice of Judah] and restore him to his people" (Deut 33:7)*. [Yet] he did not know how to engage in the give-and-take of debate with the sages. [Moses prayed], "*Let his hands strive for him*" (ibid.) (i.e. give him the strength to 'fight' in academic debate.). [Yet] he did not know how to solve an objection (*lefaroqei qushya*). [Moses prayed,] "*Help him against his foes*" (ibid.)

[29] See Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, "The Rise of the Babylonian Talmudic Academy: A Reexamination of the Talmudic Evidence," *Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal* 1 (2002), 55–68 (www.biu.ac.il/JS/JSIJ/ jsij1.html); and David Goodblatt, *Rabbinic Instruction in Sasanian Babylonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 76–92.

[30] bMak 11b. Parallels at bBQ 92a and bSot 7b. Certain manuscripts of the parallels read "conform his tradition to the law" (*salqa shmayta aliba dehilkheta*) in place of "solve an objection." These versions reflect different evaluations of the types of academic ability.

אמר לו: אוי לי שראיתיך בכך! – אמר לו: אשריך שראיתני בכך, שאילמלא לא ראיתני בכך – לא מצאת בי כך.

דמעיקרא כי הוה מקשי רבי שמעון בן יוחי קושיא – הוה מפרק ליה רבי פנחס בן יאיר תריסר פירוקי, לסוף כי הוה מקשי רבי פנחס בן יאיר קושיא – הוה מפרק ליה רבי שמעון בן יוחי עשרין וארבעה פירוקי.[31]

The comment explains in hyperbolic fashion exactly how learned R. Shimon became while in the cave. Not only is the comment a dependent clause, but at precisely this point the language shifts from Hebrew to Aramaic and the voice from first to third person.[32] The parallel versions of the story in the Yerushalmi, *Genesis Rabbah* and other Palestinian midrashim lack the comment.[33] Again it contains the late locution "objections and responses" (see above).

The lengthy narrative of Qamza, Bar Qamza and the destruction of the temple includes several example of this phenomenon:

LamR 4:2 (ed. Buber, p. 71b)	LamR 4:2 (Geniza text; ed. Rabinowitz, p. 154)[34]	bGit 56a
קם בלליא ועשאן מומין בסתר, ושדא בהון מומא בניב שפתים, ואימא בדוקין שבעין, **דוכתא דלדידן הוי מומא, ולדידהו לא הוי מומא**, כיון שראה אותן הכהן...[35]	...הוא בלילייה ויהב בהון מומין דלא מנכרין. כיון דחמא יתהון...[36]	בהדי דקא אתי שדא ביה מומא בניב שפתים, ואמרי לה בדוקין שבעין, **דוכתא דלדידן מומא ולדידהו לאו מומא**. סבור רבנן לקרוביה...[37]

The explanatory clause "a place that we consider a blemish but they do not consider a blemish" seems to be a later addition. It attempts to clarify why the Romans would not understand that the Jews rejected their sacrifice on account of the blemish rather than as an act of rebellion as Bar Qamza charges. After all, Romans would hardly sacrifice blemished animals to their own gods. (In bAZ 51a the Bavli explicitly claims that gentiles may sacrifice animals with blem-

---

[31] Translation: "For originally when R. Shimon bar Yohai raised an objection (*qushia*), R. Pinhas b. Yair solved it with twelve solutions (*paroqei*). Subsequently when R. Pinhas b. Yair objected, R. Shimon bar Yohai solved it with twenty-four solutions."

[32] In this case the shift from Hebrew to Aramaic is less probative, as the preceding portion appears in Aramaic. The Hebrew may be a function of the stock expressions ("Happy that I see you so"). Nonetheless, the immediately preceding statement appears in Hebrew.

[33] *GenR* 79:6 (941–45); *PRK* 11 (191–94); *QohR* 10:8 (26b).

[34] Zvi Rabinowitz, *Ginze Midrash* (Tel Aviv, 1976), 154.

[35] Translation: "He arose secretly at night and made blemishes in them, and made a blemish in them in the upper lip, or I could say in the withered spots of the eye, a place which we (Jews) consider a blemish, but they (Romans) do not consider a blemish. When the priest saw them..."

[36] Translation: "He [arose] at night and made in them blemishes that were not visible. When he [the priest] saw them..."

[37] Translation: "While he was traveling he made a blemish in it, in the upper lip, and some say in the withered spots of the eye, a place which we (Jews) consider a blemish, but they (Romans) do not consider a blemish. The rabbis considered offering it..."

ishes in the דוקין שבעין.) It appears that the clause was later added to texts of *Lamentations Rabbah* due to the influence of the Bavli, as it is completely lacking in the Geniza text of *Lamentations Rabbah* published by Rabinowitz, and is redundant in Buber's text: "he secretly made blemishes, and caused a blemish in it." In fact, the Stammaim may well have added the details of the location as well, בניב שפתים, ואמרי לה בדוקין שבעין ("in the upper lip, and some say in the withered spots of the eye"), as an attempt to delineate a type of marginal blemish, although these words do not appear in a dependent clause.[38] Neither "upper lip" nor "withered spots of the eye" appears outside of the Bavli except in *Lamentations Rabbah* here, another indication that the text was changed to conform to the Bavli.

(4) Reference to material further on in the *sugya* (#7)

Cross-references to traditions that appear further on in an aggadic *sugya* or story-cycle point to Stammaitic intervention as the order of stories is a function of their redactional setting. For the same reason I would argue that this is true of references to independent traditions or narratives that appear *earlier* in an aggadic *sugya*. It is theoretically possible, of course, that Amoraim made references to other Amoraic traditions, and that these independent traditions were subsequently juxtaposed by the redactors. But when the referents appear in close proximity to the reference it seems more likely to attribute the reference to Stammaim who were in the process of creating the *sugya* or reworking a proto-*sugya*. A straightforward instance of reference to material that appears later in the *sugya* appears at the beginning of the story of R. Yohanan b. Zakkai discussed above (bGit 55b):

**אמר רבי יוחנן, מאי דכתיב: (משלי כח יד) אשרי אדם מפחד תמיד ומקשה לבו יפול ברעה? אקמצא
ובר קמצא חרוב ירושלים, אתרנגולא ותרנגולתא חרוב טור מלכא, אשקא דריספק חרוב ביתר.**
אקמצא ובר קמצא חרוב ירושלים, דההוא גברא...[39]

The other two stories appear somewhat later in the *sugya* (bGit 57a). One may conjecture that originally these two stories followed directly, as the three in-

---

[38] In bBekh 28a a Babylonian Amora claims that certain Tannaim even permit such blemishes in some cases. In bHul 128b an Amora likewise suggests that Tannaim disagreed whether the "upper lip" counts as a limb vis-à-vis impurity caused by severed limbs (*ever min hehai*). (The phrase ניב שפתים, with the *qeri* נוב שפתים, appears in Isa 57:19, and this verse is frequently cited in rabbinic sources.)

[39] Translation: "R. Yohanan said: What [is meant] by the scripture, *Happy is the man who is cautious always, but he who hardens his heart falls into misfortune (Prov 28:14)*? Jerusalem was destroyed because of Qamza and Bar Qamza. Tur Malka was destroyed because of a cock and a hen. Bethar was destroyed because of the shaft of a litter. Jerusalem was destroyed because of Qamza and Bar Qamza. For a certain man..."

deed form a unit, as Pinhas Mandel has argued.[40] Each story attributes conflict between Jews and Romans to misunderstandings and includes the phrase מרדו בך יהודאי. Later, other material was interpolated, including the lengthy story of Titus, which separated the latter two stories from that of Qamza and Bar Qamza. The interpolator (or a still later redactor) probably inserted this cross-reference to ensure that the audience appreciate that the three stories form a unit.[41] That this section is an interpolation is abundantly clear from the fact that the verse R. Yohanan cites applies only to the first story, not to the subsequent stories, but the reference follows his introductory dictum. Moreover the text repeats the phrase אקמצא ובר קמצא חרוב ירושלים, a type of "resumptive repetition" (see #6 below). It should be noted that in this case the Stammaitic contribution is not as much creative as editorial or stylistic, as it does not transform the core Amoraic source. Nonetheless, we see the propensity of the Stammaim to interpolate material within earlier aggadic sources.

Another example appears in the cycle of seven stories about rabbis and wives in bKet 62a–b.[42] The fourth story tells of R. Hananiah b. Hakhinai, whose return home after twelve years of Torah study so surprised his wife that she died, although fortunately his prayers succeeded in resuscitating her. The fifth story begins:

רבי חמא בר ביסא אזיל יתיב תרי סרי שני בבי מדרשא. כי אתא, אמר: לא איעביד כדעביד בן חכינאי, עייל יתיב במדרשא, שלח לביתיה.[43]

The reference to the immediately preceding story suggests that the redactors who constructed the *sugya*, or who were aware of the sequence of stories, are responsible at least for the words אמר: לא איעביד כדעביד בן חכינאי, which can be removed without cost to the sense of the story.[44] This explicit reference to the

---

[40] Pinhas Mandel, "'Aggadot hahurban: bein bavel le'erets yisra'el," *Center and Diaspora: The Land of Israel and the Diaspora in the Second Temple, Mishna and Talmud Periods*, ed. I. Gafni (Jerusalem: Shazar Center, 2004), 141–58 (Hebrew).

[41] It is also possible the reference was added before the interpolation of the Titus material for the same reason – so that the audience consider the three stories as a unit.

[42] On these stories see Yonah Fraenkel, *Iyyunim be'olamo haruhani shel sipur ha'aggada* (Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuhad, 1981), 99–115; Daniel Boyarin, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 142–56; Shulamit Valler, *Woman and Womanhood in the Stories of the Babylonian Talmud*, trans. Betty Rozen (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 51–72; Rubenstein, *The Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*, 67–79.

[43] Translation: R. Hama b. Bisa went and sat for twelve years in the academy. When he [prepared] to come [home] he thought, "I won't do as did the Son of Hakhinai." He went and sat in the study-house [of his town], and sent [word] to his home.

[44] In my judgment it is extremely unlikely that this reference is part of the original Amoraic tradition which points to an independent, well-known story about R. Hananiah b. Hakhinai. Amoraic stories are generally self-contained and rarely refer to data that do not play an important role in the primary narrative; see Yonah Fraenkel, "Hermeneutic Problems in the Study of the Aggadic Narrative," *Tarbiz* 47 (1978), 157–63 (Hebrew). And see the next note.

poor judgment of his colleague makes the lesson obvious – that a sage should not surprise his wife after a long absence. No one said that the Stammaim were subtle – here they hit us over the head with the message. Yet I think we can go even further. The didactic point is actually communicated by the juxtaposition of the two stories. Parallel versions of the story of R. Hananiah b. Hakhinai are attested in the Yerushalmi and in *Leviticus Rabbah* without the accompanying story of R. Hama, which in fact has no parallel elsewhere. It seems possible that the redactors constructed the entire story of R. Hama to serve as a contrast to that of R. Hananiah b. Hakhinai.[45]

A somewhat different example of this phenomenon is the exchange between R. Tarfon and the sages concerning the honor of parents in bQid 31b. To R. Tarfon's boast that he allowed his mother to climb upon him to ascend to her bed, the sages reply עדיין לא הגעת לחצי כיבוד, כלום זרקה ארנקי בפניך לים ולא הכלמתה.[46] Reference to throwing a wallet into the sea is something of a non-se-quitor here (ארנקי מאן דכר שמיה). And it is gratuitous: the first half of the sages' response stands well on its own. In the Yerushalmi's version R. Tarfon's mother recounts his deed and the sages respond, אפילו הוא עושה כן אלף אלפים אדיין לחצי הכיבוד שאמרה התורה לא הגיע (yQid 1:7, 61b).[47] No mention of a wallet, though a close parallel to the first half of his statement in the Bavli. Yet on the next folio in the Bavli R. Eliezer explains the extent of the commandment of honoring parents as follows: שאלו את ר"א: עד היכן כיבוד אב ואם? אמר להם: כדי שיטול ארנקי ויזרקנו לים בפניו, ואינו מכלימו (bQid 32a).[48] The redactors seem to have taken R. Eliezer's definition from the subsequent portion of the *sugya* and tacked it on to the end of the story of R. Tarfon, creating a more dramatic response by the sages.

A more subtle case appears in a story found in the long *sugya* concerning the virtues of the Land of Israel at the end of Tractate Ketubot.

---

[45] The concluding line of the story ("Rami b. Hama applied to him the verse, *The threefold cord is not readily broken (Qoh 4:12)* – this applies to R. Oshaya, son of R. Hama b. Bisa.") is borrowed verbatim from bBB 59a. The references to the stature of Bisa is out of place in Ketubot, which does not mention him, but fits well in Bava Batra, which cites a tradition in his name. See too Hanokh Albeck, *Mavo latalmudim* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1969), 478.

[46] Translation: "You have not attained half the honor due to her: has she thrown a wallet into the sea before you and yet you did not shame her?"

[47] Translation: "Even had he done so one thousand thousand times he would not have attained half the honor that the Torah requires." In this version her slipper breaks while she walks in the courtyard and R. Tarfon places his hands beneath her feet until she alights upon her bed.

[48] Translation: "They asked of R. Eliezer: What is the limit of the commandment of honoring one's father and mother? He said to them: [Even] such that he takes a wallet and throws it into the sea in his presence, and he does not shame him."

yPeah 7:3, 20a	bKet 112a
דלמא רבי אבהו ורבי יוסי בן חנינא ור' שמעון בן לקיש עברו על כרם דורון אפיק לון אריסא חדא פרסיקא אכלון אינון וחמריהון ואייתרון ושערונה כהדין לפיסא דכפר חנניה מחזיק סאה של עדשים	רבי חלבו ור' עוירא ור' יוסי בר חנינא איקלעו לההוא אתרא, אייתו קמייהו אפרסקא דהוה כאילפס כפר הינו, ואילפס כפר הינו כמה הוי? ה' סאין, אכלו שליש והפקירו שליש ונתנו לפני בהמתן שליש
בתר יומין עברון תמן אפיק לון תרי תלת לגוא ידיה אמרו ליה מן ההוא אילנא אנן בעיי אמר לון מיניה אינון וקרון עלוי ארץ פרי למלחה מרעת יושבי בה (תהלים ק"ז ל"ג) [49]	לשנה איקלע ר' אלעזר להתם ואייתו לקמיה, נקטו בידיה ואמר: ארץ פרי למלחה מרעת יושבי בה: (תהלים ק"ז ל"ג) [50]

These are clearly two versions of the same story: in both the farmers present three rabbis with a peach, the size of the fruit decreases, and the same biblical verse is cited as explanation. The Yerushalmi's version reads much more smoothly. The same rabbis who had eaten from the gigantic peach subsequently return, see the reduced size of the fruit, and thereupon ask to partake from the same tree as on their previous visit. The Bavli's version, by contrast is somewhat difficult. Instead of the same three rabbis returning it is R. Eleazar who subsequently visits the place. The Bavli accordingly jettisons the request to eat from the same tree, as he had not been there before. His citation of the verse makes less sense. It cannot explain the astonishing *decrease* in size, as in the Yerushalmi, since he had not seen the giant peaches previously. Rather it simply explains the small size of the fruit he receives. But what then is the connection to the first half of the story? Of course we could suggest that the three rabbis told him about the peach, but that datum is hardly self-evident, and should be given in the story.

I would therefore suggest that the redactors intentionally replaced the return of the same three sages with a visit by R. Eleazar. They did so because the *sugya* includes many Palestinian traditions that celebrate the advantages of living in the Land of Israel and detail the disadvantages of living in the diaspora. A number

---

[49] Translation: "Once R. Abbahu and R. Yose b. Hanina and R. Shimon b. Laqish passed by a certain vineyard in Doron. The farmer brought them a peach. They and their ass-drivers ate, and there was some left over. They measured its size as equal to a pot of Kefar Hananiah that holds a seah of lentils. Some time later they passed by [again]. He brought them two or three [peaches] in the palm of his hand. They said, 'We want from that same tree.' He said to them, 'I brought you from that tree.' They applied the verse, *[God turns] fruitful land into a salty marsh because of the wickedness of its inhabitants (Ps 107:34)*."

[50] Translation: "R. Helbo, R. Avira and R. Yose bar Hanina visited a certain place (in the Land of Israel). They brought them a peach as big as a pot of Kefar Hino. And how big is a pot of Kefar Hino? Five se'ah. They ate one-third, renounced ownership of one-third and gave one-third to their beasts. The following year R. Eleazar visited there and they brought him [a peach]. He took it in one hand and said, '*[God turns] fruitful land into a salty marsh because of the wickedness of its inhabitants (Ps 107:34).*'"

of the most pro-Israel and anti-diaspora traditions are attributed to R. Eleazar, including "He who dwells in the Land of Israel lives without sin" and "The dead outside of the Land will not live [again]" (bKet 111a). Much of the *sugya* attempts to neutralize traditions that denigrate diaspora life, an obvious interest of Babylonian sages. The change to R. Eleazar in the story is thus very effective and ironic. The most ardent pro-Israel advocate sees with his own eyes that the yield of crops in the Land of Israel is reduced by sin, and acknowledges that truth with his own mouth, thus neutralizing his claim that those in the land of Israel live without sin. It is theoretically possible that we are dealing with a scribal error or random mistake in transmission. But it would be an unusual scribal error to replace the names of the three sages with R. Eleazar, and likewise it is hard to see how in the course of oral transmission such a confusion would occur. And given the clear motivation for the change, I would argue that it was intentional.[51] Now since the juxtaposition of the story with the previous traditions of R. Eleazar is a function of the redactional setting, the change was probably made by the redactors who created the *sugya*. This is technically not a reference, but rather a subtle allusion to traditions found elsewhere in the *sugya*, with a profoundly subversive and ironic effect. But I think it can be grouped in this category.

(5) Significant textual variations (#10–#13)

Friedman's tenth through thirteenth criteria relate to textual variations: fluctuation of the location of a paragraph in the manuscripts, concentration of variants in one place, absence of a paragraph in the manuscripts and a briefer text attested among the *rishonim*. Textual variations are particularly common in aggadic sources. As is well known, in the story of Rav Kahana in bBQ 117a–b, there are significant variations among the manuscript traditions in the depiction of the academy. The seven rows and seven cushions upon which R. Yohanan sits do not appear in the Geniza fragment and appear in ms Hamburg as marginal glosses.[52] Here too the content, the depiction of a highly developed Babylonian academy, suggests the post-Amoraic setting.[53]

---

[51] Note that the shift to R. Eleazar also requires that the reference to the fruit from the previous year be omitted (since in this case it is not the same sage who returns). This too suggests that we are probably not dealing with a simple scribal error (in which case only the names should change) but an intentional tampering.

[52] Gafni, "The Babylonian *Yeshiva*," 297–99. See now Shamma Friedman, "The Aggadah of Rav Kahana and Rabbi Yohanan (Bava Qamma 117a–b) and the Hamburg-Geniza Recension" (Hebrew), *Meyer S. Feldblum Memorial Volume* (forthcoming).

[53] Some of these glosses may well be what Friedman considers "later additions" that postdate the main editorial stratum. As noted at the outset of the paper, I am not distinguishing between these layers here.

In the Bavli's story of Elisha b. Abuya, the scene describing his encounter with a harlot appears in two different places in the manuscripts, and in one manuscript it appears in both places (bHag 15a).[54] It is likely the paragraph originated as a gloss that entered the manuscripts in two different places. This scene, incidentally, does not appear in the Yerushalmi's version of the story.

In the "Tractate on Dreams," the long aggadic *sugya* towards the end of Bavli Berakhot, manuscript variations are pervasive (bBer 54a–57b). Certain sections appear in significantly different locations. The order of items within certain units varies. For example, the number and order of items in the list of dreams of plants and animals differ in the manuscripts (bBer 56b). Other variants contain late vocabulary. Thus printings of a tradition at bBer 57a reads as follows.

הרואה אווז בחלום יצפה לחכמה, שנאמר חכמות בחוץ תרנה (משלי א כ), והבא עליה הוי ראש
ישיבה. אמר רב אשי. אני ראיתיה ובאתי עליה וסלקית לגדולה.

One Geniza fragment, albeit incomplete, seems to preserve a similar reading. A second Geniza fragment, however, reads בא עליה מובטח שהוא בן העולם הבא. Ms Munich 95 reads בא עליה יצפה לגדולה in place of הוי ראש ישיבה, which matches Rav Ashi's statement. The term ראש ישיבה, I have argued elsewhere, probably derives from a later period, in my opinion the post-Amoraic period, after the development of academies.[55] A few paragraphs later we have in the printings הנכנס לאגם בחלום – נעשה ראש ישיבה, ליער – נעשה ראש לבני כלה. The term לבני כלה does not appear in the manuscripts. Ms Oxford reads ראש לחברו; ms Paris reads ראש לחבריו; ms Florence and ms M read ראש לבני גולה. The *kallah* is also a Babylonian institution that probably developed in a later period. In all likelihood these traditions – probably the entire *sugya* – were either formulated or reworked in post-Amoraic times.

(6) Removing text produces a smoother reading (#6, #3).

Friedman's sixth criterion is "excluding a suspected editorial addition produces a simpler reading." This can be grouped with his third criterion "clumsy syntax or unbalanced style." In both the addition of later material disrupts a smooth and straightforward flow. We find, for example, the following dialogue between Rav Pappa and Abaye in bBer 20a.

---

[54] Ms Munich 6 narrates the encounter after the scene in which Elisha and Meir visit the synagogues, while MSS London 400 (Harley 5508) and Göttingen 3 repeat the encounter there.

[55] Rubenstein, "The Rise of the Babylonian Rabbinic Academy."

bTa 24a–b	bBer 20a
א' ל' רב פפא לאביי מאי שנא קמאי דאתרח' להו רבה גזר תעניתא, בעי רחמי ולא אתא מיטרא.	
אמרו ליה: והא רב יהודה כי הוה גזר תעניתא אתא מיטרא.	ניסא ומאי שנא לן דלא מתרחיש לן ניסא?
אמר להו:	
מאי אעביד?	
אי משום תנויי – אנן עדפינן מיניה דבשני דרב יהודה כוליה תנויי בנזיקין הוה, ואנן קא מתנינן טובא, וכי מטי רב יהודה גבי האשה שכובשת ירק בקדירה ואמרי לה זיתים שכבשן בטרפיהן טהורין אמר הויא אמר דרב ושמואל קא חזינא הכא. ואנן קא מתנינן בעוקצין תליסר מתיבתא. ואילו רב יהודה, כי הוה שליף חד מסאנא – אתי מיטרא. ואנן קא צווחינן כולי יומא וליכא דאשגח בן	אי משום תנויי בשני דרב יהודה כולהו תנויי בנזיקין הוו ואנן קמתנינן שיתא סדרייה וכי הוה מטי רב יהודה בעוקצין בהאשה שכובשת ירק בקדירה ואמרי לה זיתים שכבשן בטרפיהן טהורים א' הויא א דרב ושמו' קחזינא הכא ואנן קמתנינן בעוקצין תלי סרי מתיבתא ואילו רב יהודה כי הוה שליף מסאניה הוה אתי מטרא ואנן צוחינן וליכא דמשגח בן
אי משום עובדא – אי איכא דחזא מידי לימא!	
אבל מה יעשו גדולי הדור שאין דורן דומה יפה.⁵⁶	א' ל' קמאי הוו מסרו נפשיהו על קדושת השם ואנן לא מסרינן נפשין אקדושת השם⁵⁷

The interchange reads much more smoothly without the lengthy middle section with its nested questions and answers. Remove the section and Abaye answers the question directly. Moreover, the references to the breadth and depth of

---

⁵⁶ Translation: Rabba decreed a fast. He prayed but no rain came down. They said to him, "Behold, when Rav Yehuda decreed a fast, rain came down." He said to them, "What can I do? If it is on account of learning – in the years of Rav Yehuda their studies were limited to [the Order of] Damages. But we study more. And when Rav Yehuda came to [the Mishna], 'A woman who pickles a vegetable in a pot (=mTah 2:1)', and some say to [the law] 'Olives pressed with their leaves are pure (=mUq 2:1)', he would say, 'I see (difficulties) here (in this one Mishna equal to) the disputations of Rav and Shmuel,' whereas we teach thirteen sessions on [Tractate] Uqtsin! Yet when Rav Yehuda [merely] took off his shoe, rain would fall. Whereas we afflict ourselves and cry out, and no one pays attention to us. And if it [lack of rain] is on account of a failing, if anyone has seen anything [wrong that I have done], let him say it! But what can the great ones of a generation do, when their contemporaries do not appear to be worthy."

⁵⁷ Text according to ms Florence. There are numerous textual variants. Translation: Rav Papa said to Abaye: "What is the difference between the early sages, for whom miracles happened, and us, for whom no miracles happen? If it is on account of learning – in the years of Rav Yehuda their studies were limited to [the Order of] Damages. But we study all six Orders [of the Mishna]. And when Rav Yehuda came to the Mishna in Tractate Uqtsin, 'A woman who pickles a vegetable in a pot (=mTah 2:1)', and some say to [the law] 'Olives pressed with their leaves are pure (=mUq 2:1)', he would say, 'I see (difficulties) here (in this one Mishna equal to) the disputations of Rav and Shmuel,' whereas we teach thirteen sessions on [Tractate] Uqtsin! Yet when Rav Yehuda [merely] took off his shoe, rain would fall. Whereas we afflict ourselves and cry out, and no one pays attention to us." He said to him, "The early sages were willing to give up their lives to sanctify [God's] name. We are unwilling to give up our lives to sanctify [God's] name." On the apparently mistaken reference to a Mishna in Uqtsin, see *Diqduqei Soferim*, ad loc., and Malter's note (*The Treatise Taanit*, p. 107).

contemporary study, the entire six[58] orders of Mishna and thirteen sessions on Tractate Uqtsin, suggests a highly developed institutional curriculum, probably reflecting the post-Amoraic situation. The middle section, in fact, appears almost verbatim in bTa 24a–b, as can be seen in the left hand column, and appears in similar form in bSanh 106b. (bTa 24a–b is probably a composite; the middle section interpolated from elsewhere too, for similar reasons. And textual variants within this section are copious.)

Another example appears in the aforementioned story of R. Shimon b. Yohai and the cave. After emerging from the cave and visiting the baths, R. Shimon opines:

GenR 79:5–6 (940)	bShab 33b
	אמר: הואיל ואיתרחיש ניסא – איזיל אתקין מילתא
[ויבא יעקב שלם] (בראשית לג יח) *שלם בגופו* לפי שכת' **והוא צלע על ירכו** (בראשית לב לב) ברם הכא שלם בגופו, שלם בבניו לפי שכת' **ויאמר אם יב' עשו אל המחנה האחת והכהו** (בראשית לב ט) ברם הכא שלם בבניו, שלם בממונו אפעלגב דאמר ר' אבין בשם ר' אחא ט' שנים היה מכבד את עשו באותו הדורון ברם הכא שלם בממונו, ר' יוחנן אמר שלם בתלמודו אבל יוסף שכח **כי נשני אלהים את כל עמלי** (בראשית מא נא). **ויחן את פני העיר** (בראשית לג יח) חנן את הפנים שבעיר, התחיל משלח להם דוריות, ד"א **ויחן את פני העיר** התחיל מעמיד (את) הטליסין ומוכר בזול הד' אמ' שאדם צריך להחזיק טובה למקום שיש לו הנייה ממנו[59]	דכתיב **ויבא יעקב שלם** (בראשית לג יח) ואמר רב: שלם בגופו, שלם בממונו, שלם בתורתו. **ויחן את פני העיר** (בראשית לג יח). אמר רב: מטבע תיקן להם, ושמואל אמר: שווקים תיקן להם, ורבי יוחנן אמר: מרחצאות תיקן להם
	אמר: איכא מילתא דבעי לתקוני[60]

---

[58] Y. Sussman, *Sugiot bavliot lesdarim zera'im vetaharot* (Dissertation; Hebrew University, 1969), 44–74, suggests the original reading is "four orders," based on attestations in the *rishonim*. But no manuscript preserves this reading, though there are other variants. (And some manuscripts of bTa 24b read "six" in place of "more" [*tuva*]).

[59] *And Jacob came whole (*shalem*) (Gen 33:18).* Whole in body. For it says, *He limped on his hip (Gen 32:32).* Yet here he was whole in body. Whole in his family. For it says, *If Esau comes to the one camp and attacks it (Gen 32:9).* Yet here he was whole in his [entire] family. Whole in his wealth. Although R. Avin stated in the name of R. Aha, 'He honored Esau with that gift for nine years' (cf. Gen 32:14). Yet here he was whole in his wealth. R. Yohanan says, "Whole in his learning. However, Joseph forgot his, *God has made me forget completely my labor (Gen 41:51)*". – *And he was gracious to the city (Gen 33:18).* He was gracious to the notables of the city, and began to send them gifts. Another interpretation: He began to establish markets and sell cheaply. From this we learn that one owes gratitude to a place from which one has benefited.

[60] Translation: He [R. Shimon bar Yohai] said, "Since a miracle occurred I will go and fix something, since it says, *And Jacob came whole (*shalem*) (Gen 33:18).* And Rav said, "Whole

R. Shimon b. Yohai's remark reads much more smoothly without the lengthy digression invoking Jacob's precedent. His initial observation would then connect directly to the concluding question. This example in fact resembles Friedman's fifth criterion, חזרה על הקושיא פעמים or "resumptive repetition." In halakhic discussions the Stammaim sometimes append an explanation to an Amoraic question and then repeat the question at the end of the explanation such that the answer follows the question directly. Here too the addition of an explanation for R. Shimon's decision to benefact the city based on Jacob's actions prompts a repetition of his question. Of course in this case it is impossible that the Tanna cites the Amoraic opinions – we are dealing with an obvious interpolation by later hands borrowed from a source similar to that of *Genesis Rabbah*. Nevertheless, the form-critical criteria in and of themselves help identify the later addition and suggest that the Stammaim, not Amoraim, are responsible for the insertion of the material here, though clearly not for its contents.

Let me invoke one final example of a more limited addition which resembles Friedman's halakhic examples, most of which are clauses or brief sentences. In the Bavli's version of the story of Honi the Circle-Drawer, Shimon b. Shetah sends to him as follows (bTa 23a):

שלח לו שמעון בן שטח: אלמלא חוני אתה – גוזרני עליך נידוי
אילו שנים כשני אליהו [שמפתחות גשמים בידו של אליהו] לא נמצא שם שמים מתחלל על ידך?
אבל מה אעשה לך שאתה מתחטא לפני המקום ועושה לך רצונך, כבן שמתחטא על אביו ועושה לו
רצונו.⁶¹

The middle line appears to be a later addition that attempts to clarify the technical legal basis for the ban. It interrupts the smooth flow from the first to third line by adding a second and perhaps third subjunctive clause. The printings have improved the awkward syntax with שאילו in place of אילו. There are also significant textual variants. The bracketed portion, an effort to enhance the explanation, does not appear in all text witnesses. In its place the Pesaro printing reads שנשבע הקב"ה שאין הגשמים יורדין. Of course the original version in the Mishna lacks the line completely (mTa 3:8).⁶²

---

in his body, whole in his money, whole in his Torah." *And he was gracious to the city (Gen 33:18).* Rav said, "He established coinage for them." And Shmuel said, "He established markets for them." And R. Yohanan said, "He established bathhouses for then." He [R. Shimon bar Yohai] said, "Is there something to fix?"

⁶¹ Translation: Shimon b. Shetah sent to him: "Were you not Honi, I would place you under a ban. If these years were like the years in the time of Elijah [for the keys to rain were in the hands of Elijah], would you not have profaned Heaven's Name? But what can I do to you? For you are impertinent before the Omnipresent, just as a son is impertinent before his father and yet he grants his desire."

⁶² Malter points out (p. 97) that the motif of keys of rain borrows from a proximate source. The PT reads: שלח לו שמעון בן שטח אמר לו צריך אתה לנדות שאילו נגזרה גזירה כשם שנגזרה בימי אליהו לא נמצאתה מביא את הרבים לידי חילול השם שכל המביא את הרבים לידי חילול השם צריך נידוי. It thus contains a parallel to the middle portion of the Bavli but omits the ending, which makes for a smoother reading. The last line, a direct citation from the Mishna, appears somewhat later

(7) Excessive length (#4, #14)

Friedman's fourth criterion, "excessive length," and fourteenth criterion, "the shorter text is authentic," relate to the well known distinction between the verbosity of the Stammaitic layer and the terse, apodictic style of Amoraic dicta. Although narratives are almost by definition more verbose than legal dicta, many stories attributed to Amoraim far exceed even the most lengthy Amoraic legal traditions or narratives found in Tannaitic sources. The story of Moses visiting the school of R. Akiba in bMen 29b is attributed to Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav, but the length of the story goes far beyond the typical dicta of early Amoraim.[63] The lengthy story of the attempted deposition of Rabban Shimon b. Gamaliel at the end of Horayot is ostensibly attributed to R. Yohanan (bHor 13b–14a). Of course one can argue that his opening statement does not extend through the whole story and was not intended to be taken as such. (Whatever "intended" might mean here.) But that is exactly the point. The length of the story suggests that the Stammaim have built upon the initial Amoraic statement, or integrated the statement into a story of their own creation. The lengthy story of Hananiah, nephew of R. Yehoshua, who annoyed his Palestinian colleagues by intercalating the calendar in Babylonia, is attributed to R. Abahu by Rav Safra (bBer 63a). The version in the Yerushalmi is transmitted anonymously (ySanh 1:2, 19a). There may well be an Amoraic core in all of these cases, but the narratives appear to have been reworked substantially by the Stammaim. Several unattributed narratives are also extremely lengthy (by Talmudic standards), suggesting a post-Amoraic origin.[64]

(8) Other criteria

Besides Friedman's criteria, which were based on his study of halakhic *sugyot*, there may be criteria characteristic of aggadic material specifically. For example, a phenomenon related to the tendency of the Stammaim to refer to proximate sto-

---

in the PT *sugya* (yTa 3:9, 67a). So the redactors may have inherited a tradition similar to that of the PT and reorganized it.

[63] Several rather lengthy stories are attributed to "Rav Yehuda in the name of Rav." It is possible that this chain of attribution became a stock phrase to open stories in post-Amoraic times. See for example the stories at bGit 58a. Alternatively, we could posit that some brief narratives articulated by early Amoraim were progressively retold and embellished over the succeeding generations and into Stammaitic times. As argued above, the lesser degree of authority invested in aggadic traditions rendered them more susceptible to reworking.

[64] See Friedman, "The Further Adventures of Rav Kahana," 259. This criterion requires additional study, as there are some lengthy stories in the Yerushalmi, which are clearly of Amoraic, or at least non-Stammaitic, origin. See e.g. the story of Elisha b. Abuya, yHag 2:1, 77b–c.

ries or traditions is the recycling of material within a story, which often produces a type of doubling. Motifs, dialogue and other elements of Bavli stories often appear elsewhere in the same story or complex of stories in a slightly modified fashion. These elements typically appear but once in the parallel versions in Palestinian sources. The redactors seem to have used this technique to expand and rework the briefer versions of the stories they received. This is technically not a form-critical criteria as the reduplicated elements can take many forms. It is closer to a source-critical tool with the sources being the Palestinian parallel and the Bavli story itself.[65] For example, in the Bavli's version of the story of Elisha b. Abuya, first R. Meir, and later R. Yohanan, intercede to ameliorate Elisha's posthumous punishment (bHag 15b). The Yerushalmi reports R. Meir's efforts alone (yHag 2:1, 77c). In the Yerushalmi's version of the "Oven of Akhnai," R. Eliezer tries to prove his case by summoning the carob tree to uproot itself. In the Bavli R. Eliezer first calls on the carob tree, then the aqueduct, and then the walls of the school-house (bBM 59a–b; yMQ 3:1, 81c–d). In the Bavli's story of R. Shimon bar Yohai and the cave, there are two periods in a cave, two appearances of a heavenly voice and two murders by lethal vision, compared to one of each in the Palestinian parallels.[66] Clearly more work must be done to delineate other such criteria.

Conclusion

The same form-critical and other criteria that help identify Stammaitic intervention in halakhic sources profitably can be used to identify Stammaitic intervention in aggadic sources. Given the somewhat weaker prominence of formal characteristics of aggadic materials as opposed to halakhic traditions (e.g. Hebrew Amoraic dicta vs. Aramaic Stammaitic explanations), source-critical considerations should be used in tandem. In general, where source-criticism reveals that the Bavli version of a tradition differs substantially from its parallels in Palestinian documents, the formal and other criteria discussed above suggest that the Stammaim, not the Amoraim, are responsible for the reworking.[67] This paper attempted to identify some examples of those Stammaitic contributions to

---

[65] Friedman discusses examples of this phenomenon in "La'aggada hahistorit," 128–39. In his words, ורגילה התלמוד להעביר סממני סגנון ומליצות מענין לענין.

[66] bShab 33b–34a vs. yShev 9:1, 38d; *GenR* 79:6 (941–45); *PRK* 11 (191–94). See Rubenstein, *Talmudic Stories*, 121–24.

[67] Let me hasten to add that I am speaking in very general terms here. Given the complexities of these processes every source must be examined on its own terms. There are certainly cases where the Bavli version is primary and the Yerushalmi's version is secondary, which will require a different analysis of the history of the tradition.

the production of narratives and aggada in the Bavli. The contributions are quite diverse, ranging from brief editorial notes, glosses and additions to the end of an earlier narrative and interpolations from other Amoraic sources to wholesale reworkings of Amoraic narratives and the production of new aggadot. The extent and nature of each type of activity hopefully will be clarified by further research.