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**Stages in the Redaction of the Talmud**

**VI. Later Additions to the Gemara**

We will conclude our discussion of this topic with one last aspect of the redaction of the Gemara: later additions that entered into the Gemara, during the time of the *Savoraim* and sometimes even later.

The term *Savoraim* is itself shrouded in a degree of obscurity. It is difficult to define the beginning and end of the period,[[1]](#footnote-1) and it is even harder to identify what led it to be regarded as a distinct period. I will first present basic information about the period of *Savoraim*, and from there we will move to the presence of the *Savoraim* in the Talmud.

The most basic source for this period is the Epistle of Rav Sherira Gaon. We saw above (section II) Rav Sherira Gaon's discussion of how the Gemara came into being until Rav Ashi and Ravina. Rav Sherira continues from there and describes the next historical stage:

After that, even though there was certainly no *hora’a* [authoritative teaching], there were *Savoraim* who offered explanations that were close to *hora’a*. They were called our Rabbis the *Savoraim*. Everything that was pending, they explained. (Epistle of Rav Sherira Gaon pp. 69-70)

What is included in the Savoraic activity of "offering explanations that were close to *hora’a*"? Sources among the *Geonim* and *Rishonim* tell us about two main types of Savoraic activity in the Babylonian Talmud:[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. Savoraic passages:

Rav Sherira Gaon adds:

We received [by way of a tradition] from the early authorities that the Gemara on [the *mishna* that states that] a woman is “acquired” [i.e., a marriage is effected] in three ways, where we learned at the beginning "From where are these things derived," until "With money – from where is this derived" (*Kiddushin* 3b) – all those answers and objections that are resolved in the Gemara, it was our later Rabbis the *Savoraim* who resolved them and fixed them [in the Gemara]. (Ibid. p. 71)

Rav Sherira Gaon attests to a tradition he had received, according to which the opening passage of tractate *Kiddushin* is of Savoraic origin.[[3]](#footnote-3) Indeed, an examination of this passage indicates that it deviates in several ways from an ordinary Talmudic passage. Here is a representative portion of the passage, relating to the first sentence of the *mishna* – "A woman is ‘acquired’ in three ways":

Now, why does he [the *Tanna*] choose to teach *shalosh* [three, feminine form]? Let him teach *shelosha* [three, masculine form]!Because he desires to state *derekh* [way], which is feminine, as it is written: "And you shall show them the way wherein [*bah*, feminine form] they must walk" (*Shemot* 18:20).

But that which was taught: "A *zav* [man who experienced a discharge] is examined in seven [*shiv'a*, masculine form] ways [*derakim*]" (Mishna *Zavim* 2:2) – let him teach *sheva* [seven, feminine form]! Because he desires to state *derekh*, which we find designated as masculine, as it is written: "They shall come out against you in one way [*be-derekh echad*], and flee before you seven ways [*shiv'a derakhim*]" (*Devarim* 28:7).

If so, the verses are contradictory, and the *mishnayot* are also contradictory![[4]](#footnote-4)

The verses are not contradictory: Here [in the first verse quoted], the reference is to the Torah, which is a feminine noun, as it is written: "The law [*torah*] of the Lord is perfect [*temima*], restoring [*meshivat*] the soul" (*Tehillim* 19:8): the feminine form is written. There, however, the reference is to war, and it is the practice of man to wage war, not of woman; therefore, it is written in the masculine form.

The *mishnayot* are [likewise] not contradictory: here, since the reference is to a woman, it is taught in the feminine form. There, the reference being to a man, since it is common for a man to be examined [to determine the cause of his emission] but not for a woman, for a woman becomes impure even through an accident, the masculine form is taught.

Now, why does he teach *shalosh*? On account of *derakhim* [ways]! Then let him teach *devarim* [things] and *shelosha*? Because he wishes to mention intercourse, which is designated "way," as it is written: "And the way of a man with a maid… such is the way of an adulterous woman" (*Mishlei* 30:19). (*Kiddushin* 2b)

What is striking about this passage is that it contains no names of *Amoraim* – it is a totally anonymous back-and-forth – and that there is no halakhic discussion or mention of halakhic ramifications. It should also be noted that the passage is located at the beginning of the tractate, a fact that should be taken together with the fact that there is testimony about another passage at the beginning of a tractate that it is Savoraic. Rabbi Yitzchak bar Abba Mari, author of the *Ittur*,[[5]](#footnote-5) draws a comparison between the passage at the beginning of *Kiddushin* and the passage at the beginning of tractate *Bava Metzia*:

I have heard that "Let us see from whom he took the money" (*Bava Metzia* 2b) is an insertion in the books. It stands to reason that it is the text of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, from the beginning of the chapter until: "Say that our *mishna*" (ibid. 3a), like the text at the beginning of *Kiddushin*. The wording, "Let us see from whom he took the money," does not belong here, for our *mishna* of "two who are holding" is not dealing with the [previous] owner of the sold object, and it should have said, "Let us see to whom he gave the money"… Rather in the review of *Kiddushin*, it was written here. (*Me'a She'arim* on the *Rif*, *Bava Metzia*, 12)

The *Ittur*’s argument is based on a question on the Gemara’s wording,[[6]](#footnote-6) which does not seem to make sense and indicates to him that we are not in fact dealing here with the words of the Gemara, but rather with a Savoraic insertion.

There is additional early testimony to this assertion regarding the passage at the beginning of tractate *Bava Metzia*:

And we have heard from our master… "In the case of a bought article, let us see from whom he took the money"… All of these words are the words of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, and not the words of the Talmud. Something like this happened in *Kiddushin* as well, and also in another place. The explanation of this is that all of these words were an explanation in the margin of the text, and it was copied into the body of the text and became the accepted version.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Based on these sources, some have tried to find other passages with similar characteristics: passages at the beginning of tractates that deal with linguistic and stylistic matters, such as the openings of tractates *Eiruvin*, *Yevamot*, *Nedarim*, *Sota*, and *Shevuot*, even though there is no early testimony about the origin of these passages; and passages containing expressions found in the opening passage of tractate *Kiddushin*.[[8]](#footnote-8)

2. Savoraic additions to existing passages:

We have already mentioned Rav Sherira Gaon's words about the activity of the *Savoraim*: "There were *Savoraim* who offered explanations that were close to *hora’a*… Everything that was pending, they explained." The early work, *Seder Tannaim ve-Amoraim*,[[9]](#footnote-9)addresses this issue in a broader manner, though in somewhat vague language:

And after them came our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, by whose merit the heavens were stretched and the earth was spread [over the water], until Rav Gida and Rav Simona, who were the end of the *Savoraim*. They did not add anything of their own, but only fixed the chapters in their proper order. (*Seder Tannaim ve-Amoraim* part I)

Efrati[[10]](#footnote-10) argued on the basis of these two sources:

This paragraph in *Seder Tannaim ve-Amoraim* speaks explicitly in praise of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, "by whose merit the heavens were stretched" and the sheets of the Talmud were expanded, and the earth too was spread out below them because of their interpretative additions and their completions in the deciding of the *halakha*. They did not add to that of others, "but only fixed the chapters in their proper order."

The two early sources from the time of the *Geonim* about our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, which have survived in our hands, also agree about the work of the *Savoraim*. They imply the very opposite of what had been agreed upon and accepted until now. The work of the *Savoraim* was not an ephemeral enterprise that disappeared immediately after its inception. Rather, it grew stronger over the course of five generations. Our Rabbis the *Savoraim* were those who brought the Babylonian Talmud to the enhanced state in which it reached the *Geonim*.

It is difficult to accurately assess the scope of these instances, as it is difficult to establish definitive criteria on whose basis it can be argued that a certain part of a Talmudic passage is Savoraic. However, there are various cases among the *Geonim* and *Rishonim*[[11]](#footnote-11) where it is noted that a certain part of a Talmudic passage is a Savoraic addition that entered into the Talmud after its redaction, and it is possible that from these testimonies we can deduce the characteristics of Savoraic additions.

Rav Sherira Gaon himself brings two examples of Savoraic additions to an existing passage, which meet the criterion of "explanations that were close to *hora’a*." One of them is found in the following Talmudic passage:

Rav Chiya bar Rav Ashi said in the name of Rav Chisda: One who is being led out to execution is given a goblet of wine containing a grain of frankincense, in order to benumb his senses, for it is written: "Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to the bitter in soul" (*Mishlei* 31:6). And it has also been taught [in a *baraita*]: The noble women in Jerusalem used to donate and bring it. If these did not donate it, who provided it? As for that, it is certainly logical that it should be provided out of the public [funds]: Since it is written: "Give," [the implication is] of what is theirs. (*Sanhedrin* 43a)

The passage seems quite routine: the Gemara discusses the law that someone who is being taken out for execution must be given wine containing a grain of frankincense, in order to benumb his senses, and cites a *baraita* that says the customary practice was that the wine and frankincense would be donated by the noble women of Jerusalem. The Gemara then asks: Who must provide these things if the women of Jerusalem fail to do so? It answers that the obligation falls on the entire community. Rav Sherira Gaon notes:

Everything that was pending, they explained, such as Rav Rachumi and Rabba… and Rav Ravai from Rov, for it is explained in tractate *Sanhedrin* that Rav said: One who is being led out to execution is given to drink… And we ask: If these did not donate it, who provided it? Rav Ravai from Rov said: It is certainly logical that it should be provided out of the public [funds], since it is written: "Give." (Epistle of Rav Sherira Gaon pp. 70-71)

The name of Rav Ravai from Rov does not appear in the manuscripts or printed editions, but does appear in the commentary of Rabbeinu Chananel as well. Since this is a sage who is counted among the *Savoraim*, it is clear that we are dealing here with a Savoraic addition.

Rav Sherira Gaon’s second example is found in a passage dealing with midrashic expositions related to the names of the cities in the tribal territory of Yehuda:

If that is so, the verse "Tziklag and Madmana and Sansana" (*Yehoshua* 15:31) should also [convey a lesson]?… Rav Acha from Bei Choza'a expounded it as follows: If one has just cause of complaint against his neighbor for taking away his livelihood [*tza'akat legima*] and is silent [*domem*], He that abides in the bush [*sneh*] will espouse his cause. (*Gittin* 7a)

Rav Sherira Gaon writes about this as follows (ibid. p. 70): "Such as Rav Rachumi and Rabba and Rav Yosef and Rav Achai from Bei Chatim, who said in *Ha-Meivi Get mi-Medinat ha-Yam*: ‘And Tziklag, etc.’ And Bei Chatim is a city near Neharda'a." Rav Sherira Gaon maintains that the reference is to Rav Achai from Bei Chatim, who is counted among the *Savoraim*.

Some have identified Rav Achai from Bei Chatim with the Savoraic sage who appears in many places in the Gemara simply as "Rav Achai."[[12]](#footnote-12) Interestingly, when Rav Achai is mentioned, he appears together with unusual language, such as "Rav Achai asked [*parikh*],"[[13]](#footnote-13)when an objection is raised in his name, or "Rav Achai answered [*pashit*]*,*"[[14]](#footnote-14) when he offers an answer. The *Rishonim* noted the unusual language, and among other things, it was explained in the name of the Rashbam:

"Rav Achai asked [*parikh*]" – His wording is strange everywhere, as we find at the beginning of *Ketubot*: "Rav Achai answered [*pashit*].” For this reason, Rabbeinu Shmuel would say that he is the Rav Achai who wrote the *She'iltot*, who was one of our Rabbis the *Savoraim* who came after Ravina and Rav Ashi and added *hora’a*, and afterwards his words were written at the end of the Talmud. (*Tosafot Zevachim* 102b, s.v. *parikh*)

The identification of Rav Achai with Rav Achai of Shabcha, author of the *She'iltot*, is difficult, for Rav Achai of Shabcha was a *Gaon* who lived in the eighth century,[[15]](#footnote-15) and not in the period of the *Savoraim*. In any case, his identification as one of the early *Savoraim* is definitely recognized and accepted,[[16]](#footnote-16) and his appearance in various passages is seen as part of the Savoraic additions to the Talmud.

The Rambam as well noted the Savoraic origin of various passages in the Gemara. For example, it is stated in a *baraita*:

If a loaf of bread was on a shelf, and under it was an “impure shelf” – even though [the arrangement indicates that] if [the loaf] fell, it would have been impossible for it not to touch the impure object, [the loaf is considered to be] pure, because I say that a pure person [could have] entered there and removed it [from the shelf and placed it on the ground without touching it to the impure object]. (*Nidda* 4a).[[17]](#footnote-17)

The Gemara wonders why we are lenient in such a case, against the principle of "uncertain impurity in a private domain is regarded as impure," and offers a second answer:

And if you wish, I will say: Here we are dealing with impurity by Rabbinic law. [The *baraita*] is indeed precise, as it is taught: "A shelf" [*madaf*], as it is written: "A driven [*nidaf*] leaf" (*Vayikra* 26:36). (Ibid. 4b)

The Gemara suggests that this is the law only in the case of Rabbinic impurity, and it proves this from the *baraita's* use of the world "*madaf*," which suggests something light, like a leaf that is driven by the wind (Rashi). The Rambam, however, explains the word "*madaf*" differently, and relates to the Gemara’s explanation as follows:

And this word, namely, "*madaf*," some have used for another matter of impurity… And regarding that matter, they said in the Talmud: "What is '*madaf*'? As it is written: 'The sound of a driven [*nidaf*] leaf.'" That is to say, a matter of movement. This explanation is not from the Gemara itself. Rather it is an insertion from the commentary of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, which the copyists inserted among the words [of the Gemara] without commenting about it. But this matter with which we are dealing here regarding the impurity of a "*madaf*" stems from "*nadaf*," which is derived from what we say: "Its scent *nodef*," that is, it spreads and gives off its smell to a far distance. (Rambam, *Commentary to the Mishna*, *Zavim* 4:6)

The Rambam says the sentence that infers from the word "*madaf*" that we are dealing with a minor degree of impurity, like "a driven leaf," is not part of the actual Gemara, but rather a Savoraic explanation, which at a certain point made its way into the body of the Talmudic text.

At this point, the question must be raised: Does the fact that a particular passage in the Gemara is attributed to the *Savoraim* mean that its force is less binding than an ordinary Amoraic passage? Is our commitment to the Gemara a commitment to a historical period, or a commitment to a text as it is found before us? Here are two examples that show that different *Rishonim* maintained that there is indeed such a distinction to be made:

1. The Rambam elsewhere gives expression to the large gap between the words of the Gemara and the words of the *Savoraim*. The Gemara discusses laws governing a "comprehensive prohibition" and interprets a *mishna* as referring to a particular case: "But in which respect is it more comprehensive here? When the grandfather had another son; as the new prohibition comprises also the other son, it becomes operative with regard to [the offender] himself" (*Keritot* 14b).[[18]](#footnote-18) This sentence is difficult, and the Rambam writes about it as follows:

What is more persuasive in my opinion is that this wording is an explanation, perhaps that of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*. I have already dealt several times with the explanation of this expression, and in my opinion, it is entirely a mistake**.** (Rambam, *Commentary to the Mishna*, *Keritot* 3:5)[[19]](#footnote-19)

The Rambam suggests that the interpretation in the Gemara is actually a Savoraic passage, and therefore he can say about it that "in my opinion it is entirely a mistake," and propose another explanation.

2. Another example can be found in the words of the *Rishonim* relating to a statement of Rava:

Rava said: The law is that *chametz* [leaven] in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, is forbidden [even] when there is a minute quantity, in accordance with Rav; when not in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, it is permitted, in accordance with Rabbi Shimon. (*Pesachim* 30a)

According to this version, the prohibition of a mixture of *chametz* is even when there is only a small quantity; that is, even when there is only a small quantity of *chametz* in the mixture, it is not nullified and the entire mixture is prohibited. Thus ruled many of the *Rishonim*, and this is the ruling that has been accepted as the *halakha*.[[20]](#footnote-20)

However, other *Rishonim* did not have the reading: "When there is a minute quantity, in accordance with Rav" – e.g., Rabbeinu Tam (in *Tosafot*, *Pesachim* 30a, s.v. *amar*), and apparently the Rif (*Pesachim* 7b in the Alfasi), who writes: "Rava said: The law is that *chametz*, in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, is forbidden. And from the fact that he does not mention a measure, infer from this that [it is forbidden even] when there is a minute quantity." The *Ba'al ha-Ma'or* drew a similar inference (ibid., 8a): "From his words you learn that what we find written in all of our copies of the Gemara, 'when there is a minute quantity, in accordance with Rav,' is not from the Gemara itself, but rather it was hanging [there] from the early commentaries and the copyists inserted it into the books." While it is true that the Rif inferred from Rava’s wording that even a minute quantity of *chametz* renders a mixture prohibited, his words imply that this is *his* position, not an explicit decision that the Gemara recorded in Rava’s name – which opens the possibility of disagreeing with the decision. The author of the *Sefer ha-Manhig*[[21]](#footnote-21)writes in similar fashion:

Rava said: The law is that *chametz* in its time, whether [mixed] with its own kind or with a different kind, is forbidden. [This means: in a mixture with sixty times more of the permitted substance. And we don't read] with a minute quantity, in accordance with Rav, for that is the reading of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*.(*Ha-Manhig*, *Hilkhot Pesach*)

These *Rishonim* therefore disagree with the opinion that *chametz* prohibits a mixture even with only a minute quantity, and maintain that the prohibition of *chametz* is nullified with sixty times more of permitted substance, like most other prohibited foods that became mixed with permitted food. Other *Rishonim*, such as the Ramban in *Milchamot Hashem* (there), maintain that these words are part of the Gemara itself: "The ancient books in Babylonia were already examined based on an inquiry of the French Sages, and so it was found in the reliable versions of the early *Geonim*." This is an interesting case, in which a very practical question raised by the early authorities was closely connected to the question of whether two words in the Gemara are from the Amoraic period, or are a Savoraic (or even later) addition.[[22]](#footnote-22)

(Translated by David Strauss)

1. There are different opinions regarding the time of the Savoraic period. Rashi defined the end of the Amoraic period as the time of Ravina and Rav Ashi, for until then there was "certainly *hora’a*" (as cited above), and from that point on, there were only "explanations that are close to *hora’a*." Rav Sherira Gaon explicitly mentions the time defined as "the end of *hora’a*" – in the year 811 (p. 95) of the era of contracts, which is the year 500 C.E. Rav Sherira Gaon does not note the end of Savoraic period, but he provides a list of the generations of *Savoraim* (pp. 97-99), followed by a list of *Geonim* beginning in the year 900, which is 589 C.E. (p. 100). From here we may conclude (see Y. A. Efrati, *Tekufat ha-Geonim ve-Sifruta*, Jerusalem 5733, p. 34) that according to Rav Sherira Gaon, the Savoraic period spanned the years 500-589. In contrast, the "first" Ra'avad in his *Sefer ha-Kabbala* lists five generations of *Savoraim*, after which he notes: "Rav Shishna died in the year 4449, and he was the end of our Rabbis the *Savoraim*, five generations over 187 years." That is to say, according to him, the Savoraic period continued until the year 689 C.E., a hundred years longer than what would appear from the Epistle of Rav Sherira Gaon. Various scholars have proposed different approaches to the topic (for a summary, see Efrati, pp. 35-62). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Regarding this topic, see, among others: B.M. Lewin, "*Rabbanan Savorai ve-Talmudam*," in: *Azkara*, Jerusalem 5697, pp. 145-208; A. Weiss, *Ha-Yetzira shel ha-Savoraim*, Jerusalem 5713; Efrati (above, note 1), pp. 63-70; Y. S. Spiegel, "*Leshonot Peirush ve-Hosafot Me'ucharot be-Talmud ha-Bavli*," *Te'uda* 3, 5743, pp. 91-112. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This was also pointed out by the Ramban (*Kiddushin* 3a, s.v. *matzinu*): "We find in a responsum of the *Geonim* that the entire passage until here is from after the period of *hora’a*, and it was Rav Huna Gaon of Sura who taught it." The Ramban adds that this information does not detract from the importance of what is said here: "But nevertheless we troubled ourselves to explain it, to raise objections and to resolve them, for the Gemara of our Rabbis the *Savoraim* is precise." According to him, the Savoraic Gemara is also accurate and requires study. The Ritva there as well (s.v. *kibalnu*) mentions the name of Rav Huna Gaon, but does not note that he is a *Savora*. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. That is to say, there are contradictory sources, both in the wording of the Torah and in the wording of the *mishnayot*, on the question of whether the word "*derekh*" is masculine or feminine. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 1122-1193, Provence. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Gemara understands the *mishna* of "two people holding a garment" as also referring to a case of sale, where the two people argue about who purchased the garment. The Gemara questions this understanding: "If a sale, let us see from whom he [the seller] took the money." The *Ittur* notes that the question should have focused on the two litigants, and therefore the question should have been: "Let us see to whom he gave the money." [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *Otzar ha-Geonim*, *Bava Metzia*, Jerusalem 5703, *Peirushim*, p. 3. Later, we will see that in certain manuscripts this passage does not even appear. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See, for example, Weiss (above, note 3), pp. 9-15. Among the rest of what he says there: "In almost every tractate, the first passage is impressed to some degree by a later seal" (p. 9); "This is roughly the nature of the first passage of every tractate from the perspective of the time of its formation. The entire essence of these passages is usually a lecture with a character of its own" (p. 15). Regarding the unique character of the first passages as introductory passages, see also Y. Brandes, "*Ha-Meshukha ha-Rishona*," in: A. Bazak (ed.), *Al Derekh ha-Avot*, Alon Shevut 5761, pp. 33-47. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Seder Tannaim ve-Amoraim* is a work of unknown authorship from the Geonic period, likely composed by one of the *Geonim* of Sura. The book is divided in two: the first part deals with development of the Oral Law until the end of the period of the *Savoraim*, while the second part deals with the rules of halakhic decision-making in the literature of *Chazal.* [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Above, note 1, p. 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. An extensive list is brought by Spiegel (above, note 3). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See ed. Lewin, ibid., note 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *Ketubot* 47a, *Kiddushin* 13a, *Zevachim* 102b, *Chullin* 65b, *Bekhorot* 6a, *Nidda* 33a. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. *Ketubot* 2b. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Ravi Achai of Shabcha is mentioned in the Epistle of Rav Sherira Gaon, p. 103, among the sages of Pumbedita, and his immigration to *Eretz Yisrael* is related there. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See, for example, Efrati (above, note 1), p. 123, note 14. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The meaning of the *baraita* is as follows (according to Rashi, ad loc.): If a pure loaf of bread was sitting on a "*madaf*" – a shelf resting on legs – and below that shelf is "an impure shelf," i.e., a garment that had contracted a minor degree of impurity, and now a person comes and finds the bread on the ground next to the garment, the loaf is considered to be pure. Even though it is clear that if it fell to the ground, it must certainly have touched the garment and become impure, we assume leniently that someone came and took the bread and placed it on the ground, and thus it never touched the impure garment. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The discussion in that passage is very complex, and therefore we will not discuss the specifics of its content in this framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. The quotation is taken from the final version of the Rambam's commentary, as it appears in the Kafih edition; see note 32 there regarding the reading found in the initial version, where the Rambam tries to explain the Gemara. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. *Shulchan Arukh,* *Orach Chaim*, 447:1. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Rabbi Avraham bar Natan of Lunel ("Ha-Raavan ha-Yarchi"), ca.1155-1215, Provence-Spain. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. For more on this topic, see *Torah Shleima* 10-11, New York 5706, Addenda, pp. 282-284. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)