CrossMark

AJS Review 41:2 (November 2017), 333–373
© Association for Jewish Studies 2017
doi:10.1017/S0364009417000411

Transpositions: Text and Reality

Yoav Rosenthal

Abstract: *The final passage of B. Ketubbot discusses the question of living and burial in the Land of Israel or Babylonia. This essay examines one unit within that passage featuring a debate between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira regarding migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel. The unit appears in two different locations in textual witnesses to the Talmud. Its migration and the particular points where it was incorporated suggest that its true place is as a satellite passage alongside the main one. This recognition correlates with other observations arising from an examination of the unit and its relationship to other parts of the passage and parallel sources, leading to the conclusion that though the main text discusses migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel, this unit apparently has a different agenda: to legitimize the very existence of a Jewish center in Babylonia.*

Introduction

The importance of living in the Land of Israel lies at the heart of a lengthy talmudic passage forming the conclusion of B. Ketubbot (110b–112b).[1] This was naturally a sensitive issue for the Jews of Babylonia, a complexity reflected in the passage, as it fluctuates between views vigorously opposed to living anywhere outside the Land of Israel, including Babylonia, positions that permit living in Babylonia, and even an extreme opinion prohibiting migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel. Jeffrey Rubenstein's study of this passage demonstrated that the bulk of the sages who participate in the discussion are Babylonian, or Babylonians who migrated to the Land of Israel.[2] He convincingly assesses that the redacted passage served mainly as an intra-Babylonian inquiry.[3] The discussion sets Babylonian sages who migrated to the Land of Israel, most prominently represented by the third-generation Palestinian Amora R. Elazar b. Pedat, who strenuously rejected the idea of living outside the Land of Israel, against sages

This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 1263/11, for Unknown Traditions of the Babylonian Talmud Preserved in the Cairo Genizah). I am grateful to the anonymous readers for their comments.

1. The final mishnah in Ketubbot features several cases in which a husband seeks to compel his wife to relocate to, or to depart, the Land of Israel or Jerusalem. The value of living in the Land of Israel here is conceived as a halakhic consideration that takes precedence over other halakhic considerations. The Babylonian Talmud characteristically discusses each of the clauses of the mishnah in order. The conclusion of this discussion is followed by the lengthy, detailed, and complex passage described here. The passage is not directly concerned with M. Ketubbot, but evidently was inserted here on account of the preoccupation of the final mishnah with the importance of living in the Land of Israel.

2. Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, "Hitmodedut 'im ma'alot 'Ereẓ Yisra'el: Nituaḥ sugyat Bavli Ketubbot 110a–112b," in *Merkaz u-tefuẓah*, ed. Isaiah Gafni (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 2004), 159–88.

3. Ibid., 162–64.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

resident in Babylonia, the most radical of whom, the second-generation Babylonian Amora Rav Yehudah b. Yeḥezkel, forbade the Jews of Babylonia to migrate to the Land of Israel.

Based on a thorough study of the passage, and in particular an analysis of its textual variants, I will demonstrate that aside from its preoccupation with the question of living in the Land of Israel, the passage contains a hidden response to the Palestinian Jewish arguments in the background of the discussion—left unstated in the passage—that reject the very legitimacy of a Jewish center in Babylonia.

I will focus primarily on the initial sections of the passage: first the introductory baraita (I),[4] which underscores the importance of living in the Land of Israel and objects to living elsewhere, and then the unit (II) concerning the views of Rav Yehudah, who prohibited migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel, and his disciple R. Zeira, who disagreed and sought to migrate to the land.

Pronounced discrepancies between the textual witnesses to the passage demonstrate the existence of two distinct traditions, which record different content in the introductory baraita, each manifesting a link to a different tannaitic source: Tosefta in the prevalent version of the talmudic text, Sifra in what I will refer to as version B of the text. While both versions of the baraita start similarly, as the baraita unfolds the traditions branch apart, with the prevalent tradition dedicated to a rejection of *living outside the Land of Israel*, and the alternative tradition primarily concerned with *one who lives in the land* and *one who leaves it.*

Analysis of the unit that discusses the debate between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira (II) sheds light on the process of redaction, which determined the unit's composition, content, and agenda. Beyond the external appearance of the unit, with its ostensible focus on the question of migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel, a different concern preoccupied the redactor. An inquiry into the text, its redaction, and the textual parallels of the unit demonstrates that the redactor took pains to attribute an oath not to ascend from Babylonia to the Land of Israel "as a wall," that is, en masse, to all of the Amoraim who appear in the unit—Palestinian and Babylonian alike. The oath prohibiting Babylonian Jews from ascending as a wall, promoted relentlessly by the redactor of this unit, is likely a Babylonian response intended to undermine Palestinian Jews' accusations that by failing to ascend as a wall during the Return to Zion, Babylonian Jews had ultimately caused the destruction of the Second Temple—and thus to bolster the legitimacy of the Jewish center in Babylonia.

An examination of the text of this unit (II) discloses two instances of transposition that distinguish its two textual traditions. One transposition, in which a sentence moves from one location to another, sheds light on the work of the redactor, who inserted the oath not to ascend as a wall in a passage to which it was entirely alien. The second, far more profound transposition concerns the point where the entire unit (II) is inserted. In the prevalent tradition of the text, the unit appears immediately after the introductory baraita, while in the alternate

4. Concerning the structure and segmentation of the passage, see appendix A below. All indications of sections of the passage in the present essay follow the legend there.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

version it is placed in an entirely different place later in the passage (III c), far from the introductory baraita. Such a remarkable discrepancy in the placement of an entire unit is rare, and the inquiry below suggests that the entire unit (II) is in fact a satellite unit to the primary passage (III a–b) that was set *alongside* it. It follows from this proposal that the story of Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira, whose natural place is in the section on the question of living in the Land of Israel or Babylonia (III a), was purposely not incorporated within it, but left at its side, while a discussion with a wholly different agenda developed from it, as described above.

This inquiry into the text of the talmudic passage thus contributes to the development and substantiation of insights not only into the transmission of the passage within the manuscripts, but also concerning the content, agenda, redaction, and early form of the passage. Several of these insights extend in their significance beyond the bounds of the present passage, enriching existing scholarship on historical questions regarding the status of the Jewish center in Babylonia and how Babylonian Jewry approached the tension with their Palestinian counterparts, as well as elucidating the early form of passages of the Babylonian Talmud.

*

For the purposes of this discussion, I divide the talmudic passage into four parts:[5] three primary sections and an appendix.[6]

(I) A baraita that discusses the importance of living in the Land of Israel.
(II) An anecdote involving Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira concerned with the question of migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel, followed by a discussion of the anecdote.
(III) A long, complex structure containing the majority of the passage's text, including three homilies by R. Elazar[7] that function as central axes of the section, with a discernible elaboration developed around each. The two initial homilies and their associated sources relate to residence and burial in the Land of Israel, Babylonia, and other lands. The third homily stems from the preceding one,[8] but does not address a person's place of residence or burial. The elaboration that follows wends its way to a lengthy discussion of the fertility of the Land of Israel, both in the future and in the present.

5. See appendix A.

6. Below I shall demonstrate that this division derives for the most part from the data themselves. This division differs from that proposed by Rubenstein in "Hitmodedut."

7. "Anyone who resides in the Land of Israel abides without sin, as is said …"; "[the] dead who are outside the land are not to revive, as is said …"; "boors are not to revive, as is said …."

8. "… are not to revive …; are not to revive …." On the relationship between the statements, see also Y. Kil'ayim 9:4 (32c) and Y. Ketubbot 12:3 (35b), which contain parallels to the second statement by R. Elazar and several other statements cited here in the Bavli in the wake of that statement. There, these are followed by a question asked of many Amoraim, among them R. Elazar: "And even such as Jeroboam son of Nebat and his ilk?" This question is concerned with the fate of the wicked at the time of the resurrection of the dead, and thus parallels R. Elazar's third statement: "boors are not to revive."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(IV) The conclusion of the third section is followed by what may be viewed as an appendix containing a series of statements that return to the subjects with which the previous sections were concerned: (IV a) praise of migrating to and residing in the Land of Israel; (IV b) the pangs of the messiah;[9] (IV c) and praise of the produce that will grow in the Land of Israel in the messianic future.[10]

Section 1: The Objection to Departing or Living Outside the Land: Versions and Parallels of the Baraita

A baraita on the importance of living in the Land of Israel confronts residents of the Diaspora—ostensibly including the Jews of Babylonia—with a tannaitic view that harshly repudiates the notion of living outside the land. The textual witnesses to this baraita reflect two principal versions:[11]

Identical statements appear at the beginning of the baraita in both versions —"Always let a person reside in the Land of Israel …" (a)—followed by the explanation "for anyone who resides …" (b), which draws on Leviticus 25:38. The versions diverge at this point: in the prevalent version, the explanation adheres to the diction of the verse—"for anyone who resides in the Land of Israel is like one who has a God"—and it thus further follows that "anyone who resides outside the land is like one who does not have a God." The explanation, "is like one who does not have a God," elicits an objection, which is followed by another explanation (c), focusing on the grave sin committed by one who resides outside the land: "anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry." A proof for this explanation cited in the final section of the baraita (d), from a homily on David's expulsion, also concludes with the statement that "anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry."

In version B, the explanation (b) at the beginning of the baraita refers only to the positive dimension—"anyone who resides in the Land of Israel"—and the content of the explanation differs: "Scripture represents him *as though he had*

9. This subject likely harks back to Abbaye's comments at the conclusion of the elaboration stemming from R. Elazar's first homily, in the third section of the passage: "Abbaye said, 'We have received as tradition: Babylonia will not see the pangs of the messiah.'…" (III a7) (R. Elazar's second and third homilies and associated sources are concerned with the resurrection of the dead rather than with the generation of the coming of the messiah.)

10. … אמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר רב עתידין כל אילני סרק שבארץ ישראל שיטענו פירות. This statement about the fertility of non-fruit-bearing trees in the time to come, harks back to Rav Dimi's homily on the words ולשורקה בני אתונו given during the course of the discussion of the fertility of the Land of Israel (III c3), which, as previously noted, stemmed from R. Elazar's third homily in the third section of the passage (III c1).

11. The text of the prevalent version presented here and throughout this essay is according to the Soncino 1487 edition. The text of version B is that of Genizah copy G37, unless otherwise indicated. For the signatures of the fragments comprising Genizah copy G37 (as well as the signatures of all other manuscripts and fragments mentioned further on) and selected variants found in other textual witnesses, see appendix B.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven."[12] The beginning of the next stage (c) of version B is similar to that of the prevalent version. However, the statement in version B does not take issue with the previously stated explanation (b), as is the case in the prevalent version, but serves to support the initial explanation by rejecting the simple reading of the verse:[13] "'… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God.' Then does one who resides in the Land of Israel have a God and anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel not have a God?! Rather—to convey to you: anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel has not accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven." For the purpose of rejecting the simple but problematic reading of the verse, the baraita here also refers to one who does not reside in the Land of Israel, and concludes, "Rather—to convey to you: *anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel has not accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven*."[14] In the final section of the baraita (d), version B, like the prevalent version, includes the homily concerning David. Here, however, it serves as an additional example, rather than as proof of the explanation found in the previous section. In this version, "and so too David …" conveys not a conclusion that conforms to what was stated in the previous sections of the baraita, but a similar principle. According to version B, this section concerns not "anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel," but a person who takes action—"*anyone who departs the land*"—whose verdict differs accordingly: "Scripture represents him as though he were engaging in idolatry."[15]

12. It is not impossible that version B also originally contained at this point a reference to one who does not reside in the Land of Israel (something along the lines of "and anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel has not accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven") but that it was lost by scribal error due to its similarity (homoeteleuton). However, such a sentence is absent in the three primary witnesses to version B, viz., G37, G38, and MS Vatican 130, which makes this a less likely possibility. (No evidence of dependence between these witnesses or of an earlier written textual witness has been discovered. Furthermore, G37 appears to have been written from dictation or from the scribe's memory; see n. 101).

13. A reading that in the prevalent version is the cause of the explanation deemed problematic (and ultimately rejected there as well).

14. Thus in G37 and MS Vatican 130, in this instance joined by MS Firkovich. G38 here preserves the unique version [… …] מארץ לחוצה לאו"י [… …]. The baraita, according to this version, appears to be concerned with individuals who leave the Land of Israel to live elsewhere, and not at all with long-time inhabitants of the Diaspora. Due to physical damage to the fragment, it is impossible to ascertain what words preceded and followed these words. If it is assumed that the text followed that of version B (with which it otherwise is in agreement), then the sentence as a whole becomes logically problematic, as the comparison to an individual who has passively failed to accept the yoke of heaven is inappropriate for a person who actively leaves the Land of Israel. On the possibility that this version resulted from emendation see the following note.

15. As noted, in the version found in G38, the previous section (c) also discussed an individual who departs the Land of Israel. It may be that the version in G38 rendered a correction there so as to ensure a parallelism between the sections of the baraita, due to the presence of the words "and so too" with which section d begins. In the other witnesses to version B, the conclusions are very much in agreement with the cases described. Passive abstention is portrayed as analogous to passive abstention, viz., "anyone who does *not* reside in the Land of Israel has *not* accepted upon himself the yoke of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	Prevalent version	Version B
	Our masters related,	Our masters related,
a	"Always let a person reside in the Land of Israel, even in a city that is mostly gentile, and let him not reside outside the land, even in a city that is mostly Israelite,"	"Always let a person reside in the Land of Israel, even in a city that is mostly gentile, and let him not reside outside the land, even in a city that is mostly Israelite,"
b	for anyone who resides in the Land of Israel *is like one who has a God and anyone who resides outside the land is like one who does not have a God*, as is said, '… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God' (Leviticus 25:38).	for anyone who resides in the Land of Israel—«Scripture represents him» *as though he had accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven*, «as is said», '… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God.'
c	«Then does one who resides in the Land of Israel have a God» and anyone who does not reside in the land not have a God?! Rather—to convey to you: anyone who resides outside the land—*it is as though he were engaging in idolatry*,	Then does one who resides in the Land of Israel have a God «and anyone who does not» reside in the Land of Israel not have a God?! Rather—to convey to you: anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel *has not accepted upon himself «the yoke» of heaven*,
d	and so too it says regarding David, 'for they have driven me out today from clinging to the heritage of the Lord, saying, "Go, worship other gods" [1 Samuel 26:19].' Who said to David, 'Go, worship other gods'?! Rather—to express to you: anyone *who resides* outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry."	and so too David says,'for they have driven me out today from clinging to the heritage of the Lord, saying, "Go, worship other gods."' Then who said to David, 'Go, worship other gods'?! Rather—to express to you: *anyone who departs the land for outside the land*—Scripture represents him as though he were engaging in idolatry."

These variants differ not only in the particulars of their content,[16] but also in their primary focus. In the prevalent version, the baraita in its entirety relates to a

heaven," while action is portrayed as analogous to action, viz., by virtue of actively departing the land, one resembles a person who actively engages in idolatry.

16. In the prevalent version: "anyone who resides in the Land of Israel *is like one who has a God*, and anyone who resides outside the land *is like one who does not have a God*" (b); "*anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry*" (c, d). Version B:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

person *who resides outside the Land of Israel*. This is reflected in the words "let him not reside outside the land" (a), the explanation that "anyone who resides outside the land is like one who does not have a God" (b), the rejection of this explanation (c), and the conclusion that "anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry" (c, d). In version B, meanwhile, the case of one who resides outside the land does not appear at all in sections b and d, and even when it does, in section c, it is invoked not in order to offer information about such a person, but as proof of the conclusion in section b, which refers exclusively to one who resides in the Land of Israel. In sum, the baraita in version B focuses primarily on *one who resides in the Land of Israel* (a, b, c) and *one who resides in the land and leaves it* (d).

A comparison of the two different versions of the baraita to parallel sources yields additional insights into the distinction between these versions. The principal parallels are in T. Avodah Zarah 4:5 (ed. Zuckermandel, p. 466) and Sifra, *Be-har Sinai*, *par.* 5:4 (ed. Weiss, p. 109c). A more partial parallel appears in Mekhilta Devarim 11:31–32.[17]

The statement at the beginning of the baraita (a), which appears in identical form in the two versions, has a parallel in the Tosefta and in Mekhilta Devarim.[18] As noted above, the versions of the baraita in the Babylonian Talmud from here on diverge, and as we shall see, there is an affinity between this divergence and the discrepancies between the parallel sources. The first explanation (b) given in the prevalent version—"for anyone who resides in the Land of Israel is like one who has a God, and anyone who resides outside the land is like one who does not have a God, as is said, '… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God'"—resembles the equivalent homily in the Tosefta: "And it says, '… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God': All the while that you are in the Land of Canaan, indeed, I am unto you a God. [If] you are not in the Land of Canaan,[19] as it were, I am not unto you a God."

Meanwhile, the parallel explanation offered in version B—"for anyone who resides in the Land of Israel—Scripture represents him *as though he had accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven*, as is said, '… to give you the Land of Canaan, to

"anyone who resides in the Land of Israel … *it is as though he had accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven*" (b); "anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel *has not accepted upon himself the yoke of heaven*" (c); "*anyone who departs* the land for outside the land … *it is as though he were engaging in idolatry.*"

17. Menahem Kahana, *Kit'e midreshe ha-halakhah min ha-genizah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2005), 347. A comparative table of both versions of the baraita and its parallels is provided in appendix C, below.

18. In the source quoted there: "Hence they said, 'Let a person reside in the Land of Israel in a city that is entirely gentile, and let a person not reside outside the land in a city that is entirely Israelite ….'" See also Menahem Kahana, "Ma'alat yeshivat 'Ereẓ Yisra'el bi-Mekhilta Devarim," *Tarbiz* 62 (1993): 505–7.

19. The condition "[If] you are not *in* the Land of Canaan" recorded in the Tosefta is somewhat different from the condition in the Bavli, viz., "who does not *reside* in the Land of Israel." It emphasizes one's actual presence in the land rather than one's place of residence.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be unto you a God'"—closely resembles the source quoted in Sifra to this verse: "Hence they said, 'Anyone who lives in the Land of Israel *accepts upon himself the kingdom*[20] *of heaven* and anyone who departs for outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry.'" This dual position, which addresses both one who lives in the Land of Israel and one who departs for elsewhere, appears again later in Sifra, in a tradition that parallels section d of the baraita in the Bavli: "And so too it says regarding David, 'Accursed are they before the Lord, for they have driven me out today from clinging to the heritage of the Lord, saying, "Go, worship other gods."' Then did it occur to us that King David engages in idolatry? Rather, [this means] that he would expound and say, 'Anyone who lives in the Land of Israel *accepts upon himself the kingdom of heaven and anyone who departs for outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry.*'"

The clear affinity between version B and Sifra is in the view that "anyone who lives in the Land of Israel accepts upon himself the kingdom of heaven." Further, version B mirrors the Sifra's statement that "anyone who departs for outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry," an argument that appears in version B of the baraita at the end of section d: "Rather—to express to you:[21] anyone who departs the land for outside the land—Scripture represents him as though he were engaging in idolatry." In this final part of the baraita, meanwhile, the Sifra and version B are joined by the Tosefta's testimony, which also contains the homily about David that concludes with the words: "Rather, [this means] that David would expound and say, 'Anyone who abandons the Land of Israel in time of peace[22] *and departs—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry.*'" The additional support furnished by the Tosefta to the previous sources lends credence to the proposition that the original subject of the homily concerning David was the case of an individual who *departs* the land—in contrast to the prevalent version of the baraita, in which this homily too refers to one who *resides* outside the land.[23]

20. On the form and meaning of the expression in the textual witnesses to Sifra and of version B, see appendix B below and sources cited there.

21. See the version preserved in MS London and MS Oxford of Sifra: אלא ללמדך.

22. The addition of the words "in time of peace" (which appear in all textual witnesses of the Tosefta) presumably is intended to exculpate David, who was compelled to leave at a time that was not a "time of peace." We may also wonder whether the homilist's personal history played a role in the addition of these words.

23. Either version of the homily is plausible. Since David did not settle outside the land, but was driven away "from clinging to the heritage of the Lord," the tradition about "anyone who departs," recorded in Sifra, Tosefta, and version B is apt. However, the homily also is coherent in its prevalent form. According to this version, the sense of the verse is that those who are outside "the heritage of the Lord" (i.e., those who reside outside the Land of Israel) are comparable to worshipers of other gods, so that the import of driving David out of "the heritage of the Lord," in effect, is to tell him, "Go, worship other gods." It is true that the phrase "anyone who resides outside the land" in the conclusion of section d of the prevalent version may be an emendation whose purpose is to establish an equivalency between the conclusion of this section and of section c, inspired by the expression "and so too" at the beginning of section d. By the same token, the phrase "as though he were engaging in idolatry" that appears in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notwithstanding the many differences between the two versions of the baraita in the Bavli and the evident affinity between version B and Sifra and between the prevalent version and Tosefta, the general structure of the Babylonian baraita in both its versions is unique. The principal feature that sets this baraita apart from its parallels is the objection expressed in section c, which rejects the conclusion based on Leviticus 25:38: "… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God."—"Then does one who resides in the Land of Israel have a God and anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel not have a God?!" This objection, found only in the various versions of the baraita in the Bavli, dismisses the view sustained in the Tosefta: "All the while that you are in the Land of Canaan, indeed, I am unto you a God. [If] you are not in the Land of Canaan, as it were, I am not unto you a God." It stands to reason that the originator of the Babylonian baraita was familiar with a source like that in the Tosefta, which may even have provided the statement at the beginning (a) of the Babylonian baraita. However, an objection to the view of the Tosefta is then posed (c), as the Babylonian homilist finds this view problematic.[24] The prevalent version explicitly rejects the opinion of the Tosefta (b, c), and in the wake of this objection records its own, unique view: "Rather—to convey to you: anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry." While this judgement is severe, the statement focuses on the guilt of the person, avoiding the potential theological implications of the alternative wording, which evokes the talmudic objection. This attitude toward one "who resides outside the land" is found in no other source. The uniqueness of this view, espoused exclusively by the prevalent version of the baraita, is again underscored in section d, which stands apart from the parallel sources that discuss an individual who departs the land.

Version B, meanwhile, advocates a different view from the outset (b), recalling the position of the Sifra. The view of the Tosefta is hidden in version B, noted only as an inadmissible possibility within the context of the homily cited as support for the preferred view of the baraita (c).

We may thus conclude that both versions originate from a baraita that objected to a position similar to that expressed in the Tosefta regarding one who resides outside the Land of Israel. This objection could possibly represent a Babylonian position that is unwilling to accept the idea that "one who lives outside the land is like one who does not have a God." However, disagreement took hold over the course of establishing the emended view put forward by the new baraita, resulting in two variant traditions: the prevalent version, which adopts a unique position focused on one who lives outside the land, and version B, in which the baraita adopts a position similar to that of the Sifra, addressing an individual who resides in but subsequently leaves the Land of Israel.

prevalent version at the end of section c may have been inspired by the conclusion at the end of section d, i.e., the emender thus established an equivalency between the conclusions of the two sections by selecting the case at the end of section c and the argument at the end of section d.

24. As it appears to have a theological implication (albeit one more subdued than the formulation in Tosefta: "[If] you are not in the Land of Canaan, as it were, *I am not unto you a God*").

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Section 2: Migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel and the Injunction against "Ascent as a Wall"

The difference in the person addressed by the two versions of the baraita is also significant for understanding the talmudic passage's redaction and its agenda. Is the baraita cited by the Talmud in order to discuss Jews who live outside the Land of Israel—including those of Babylonia—as in the baraita's prevalent version, or is the talmudic passage principally concerned with the Jews of the Land of Israel, praising those who reside there and deprecating those who leave, as in version B of the baraita?

The talmudic passage contains no direct discussion of the baraita.[25] In most versions,[26] the baraita is immediately followed by a source concerning the question of living in Babylonia (II a), an anecdote familiar from other places in the Talmud,[27] expressing tension among the second and the third generation of Babylonian Amoraim regarding the desire of some of them to migrate to the Land of Israel. Focused on the Jews of the Diaspora, it is a natural sequitur to the prevalent version of the baraita: "R. Zeira was avoiding Rav Yehudah because he wanted to ascend to the Land of Israel, for Rav Yehudah said, 'Anyone who ascends from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive injunction, as is said, "To Babylonia shall they be brought and there shall they be until the day I recall them, says the Lord" (Jeremiah 27:22).'"

R. Zeira, a third-generation Babylonian Amora, wishes to migrate to the Land of Israel, as have various Babylonian sages before him, as well as several of his contemporaries,[28] despite the unambiguous view of his teacher, Rav Yehudah, the preeminent—and perhaps exclusive—representative of the view that migration to the Land of Israel is forbidden.[29] A comparison of the anecdote

25. However, as I shall demonstrate below, several sources in the passage are related to the baraita, and especially to its parallel traditions.

26. All textual witnesses to the prevalent version; MS Firkovich, which contains a hybrid version of the baraita; and MS Vatican 130, in which the text of the baraita represents version B.

27. B. Berakhot 24b, Shabbat 41a. Both parallels contain a continuation not cited here. The versions of Berakhot are in disagreement as to whether the figure in question is R. Zeira (thus MS Paris, MS Oxford 366, MS Firenze [main text], London BL Or. 5558 N/17–18) or R. Abba (MS Munich 95, MS Firenze as emended [with the word "Abba" added above the line], Soncino 1487 edition, T–S 18 F 1.1; T–S AS 95.356 has [.]אבּ ר׳, while Fragment Göttweig, Bibliothek des Benediktinerstifts Cod. 358, reads רבא, and in Firkovich Evr. I 184–86 the word is רבה). On these variants, see, e.g., Raphaelo Rabbinovicz, *Dikduke soferim: Berakhot* (Munich: 'Ohel Ya'akov, 1867), 120–21, § f.

28. Such as the sages named at the beginning of the fourth section of the passage (IV a) (see also Rubenstein, "Hitmodedut," 162–63). The scope of the phenomenon is difficult to estimate; see, e.g., Isaiah M. Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 75: "The brave *few* who nevertheless left Babylonia for the Land …." For an opposing view, see, e.g., Judith Hauptman, "'Aliyah' and 'Yeridah' in Rabbinic Sources," in *Israel and the Diaspora in Jewish Law*, ed. W. Jacob and M. Zemer (Pittsburgh, PA: Freehof Institute of Progressive Halakhah; Tel Aviv: Rodef Shalom Press, 1997), 104: "… R. Zera chose to depart Babylonia for Israel, as did *many others*."

29. The position espoused by Rav Yehudah presumably should be understood in the context of, inter alia, his efforts to establish and promote Pumbedita as a Babylonian center of learning following the destruction of Nehardea.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as recounted here to its parallel sources shows that what primarily interests the redactor is not the anecdote itself, but rather the underlying reasons for Rav Yehudah's and R. Zeira's positions.[30] Unlike in the parallel sources, only the beginning of the anecdote is told here, up to the point where Rav Yehudah's view is presented. The passage then continues with an inquiry into the rationales of Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira. Rav Yehuda's position—here as in the parallel sources—relies on the verse in Jeremiah: "To Babylonia shall they be brought and there shall they be until the day I recall them." Yet as stated immediately in the Talmud, this verse does not express what Rav Yehudah sought to derive from it: it discusses not the exile of the people of Judea, but the transport of the temple's vessels to Babylonia. The argument is presented on behalf of R. Zeira (II b): "And R. Zeira? That is written about [the] vessels of service."

The strength of this objection might suggest that Rav Yehudah originally intended to use this verse as an *'asmakhta'* (support) for his ruling, and not necessarily as the source of his position. Rav Yehudah may only have sought to use the verse in Jeremiah to *express* the principle at the core of his opinion, "To Babylonia shall they be brought and there shall they be"—whatever has been brought to Babylonia must there remain—"until the day I recall them." Surely enough, in response to this argument, an unattributed proposal is presented that Rav Yehudah actually derived the prohibition against migration to the Land of Israel from a different verse, from the Song of Songs (II c): "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem, by gazelles or by deer of the field, that you not disturb and not arouse this love before it wishes."[31] Thus, because the verse Rav Yehudah cites is difficult to understand as the source of his position per se, an alternative scriptural basis is proposed. From this point, unattributed talmudic comments take the place of comments attributed to R. Zeira and Rav Yehudah themselves, growing distant from what is directly known of Rav Yehudah's view and the competing opinion espoused by his disciple R. Zeira—and thus enabling us to trace the course of the unit's redaction as well as its agenda.

The suggestion to corroborate Rav Yehudah's view with the verse from the Song of Songs introduces three rounds of discussion, each of which includes a homiletic interpretation proposed in support of Rav Yehudah, which is then rejected in keeping with R. Zeira's position:

30. In both parallel sources—B. Berakhot 24b and B. Shabbat 41a—the anecdote begins as it does here: R. Zeira, who wishes to migrate to the Land of Israel, is avoiding Rav Yehudah, who forbids this. However, each of the parallels then proceeds with an account of the actions then taken by R. Zeira (or R. Abba; see below) because he wishes to hear words of Torah from his teacher before departing. The content that R. Zeira (or R. Abba) heard and the context in which he heard it differ from one parallel to the other, but the introduction and the central motif (listening secretly and the final sentence, "If I had come only to hear only this matter—enough") are identical, and it may be that all of the parallels are based on a single collection (cf. B. Bava Meẓi'a 85a).

31. The Talmud reads the verse from the Song of Songs in accordance with the rabbinic view that the subject of the book is the relationship between God and the Jewish nation: the adjuration in this verse not to disturb the love "before it wishes" is taken to mean that as long as Israel remains in exile, they may not perform actions to arouse that love, but instead must wait until God sees fit to redeem them.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(II c) And Rav Yehudah? Another verse is written: "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem, by gazelles or by deer of the field [that you not disturb and not arouse this love before it wishes]."
(II d) And R. Zeira? That [means] that Israel are not to ascend as a wall.
(II e) And Rav Yehudah? Another "I adjure" is written.
(II f) And Rabbi Zeira? He requires that in accordance with R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina, who said, "Why these three adjurations?
One—that Israel not ascend as a wall;
and one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel that [they] not rebel against the nations of the world;
and one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured the nations of the world that [they] not excessively subjugate Israel."

(II g) And Rav Yehudah? "That you not disturb and not arouse" is written.
(II h) And R. Zeira? He requires that in accordance with R. Levi, who said, "Why these six adjurations?
Three—those that we have said.
The others—that [they] not reveal the end, and that [they] not distance[32] the end, and that [they] not reveal the mystery to the nations of the world."

The three rounds of discussion revolve around three adjurations in the Song of Songs.[33] In response to the proposal to support Rav Yehudah's view with one of the adjurations that forbid disturbing the love "before it wishes,"[34] the counter-argument proposes that R. Zeira understands this adjuration not as a prohibition pertaining to *individuals*, but as requiring "that Israel[35] not ascend as a

32. G37: יזחקון. MS Moscow: ?יזחק. MS Vatican 113: תרחקו. MS Munich: תדחקו. MS Firkovich: יזחקו. MS Vatican 130: ידחקו. On the interchange of *yeraḥaku* and *yidḥaku*, see, e.g., Rashi ad loc., s.v. *ve-she-lo yeraḥaku 'et ha-kez*.

33. There are four adjurations in the Song of Songs. Two are identical: "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem, by gazelles or by deer of the field, that you not disturb and not arouse this love before it wishes" (השבעתי אתכם בנות ירושלם בצבאות או באילות השדה אם תעירו ואם תעוררו את האהבה עד שתחפץ; 2:7; 3:5). The third, though similar in content, is shorter and uses different phrasing: "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem: why would you disturb and why would you arouse this love before it wishes?" (השבעתי אתכם בנות ירושלם מה תעירו ומה תעוררו את האהבה עד שתחפץ; 8:4). These three adjurations prohibit disturbing the love before it wishes, while the content of a fourth runs counter to them: "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem: if you find my beloved, what shall you tell him? That I am lovesick" (5:8).

34. In MS Vatican 130, copy G37, and the printed text, the Talmud here quotes the adjuration in Song of Songs 2:7 and 3:5 (the preference for these verses is buttressed somewhat by the final homily in this unit, a discourse by R. Elazar [II i] that refers to the words "by gazelles or by deer of the field," which occur only in these two verses). MS Moscow contains what appears to be an abbreviated quotation of this verse: השבעתי בנות ירושל׳ אם [… … …] את האהבה עד שתחפץ. "That you not" (אם) is inappropriate for a citation of 8:4; also possible is that the scribe combined the omission of "by gazelles or by deer of the field" of 8:4 with "that you not" of 2:7 and 3:5. The other textual witnesses contain an inconclusive quotation limited to the initial words of the verse: "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem."

35. In MS Vatican 130 and copy G37, as well as MS Munich 95, the word "Israel" is absent here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wall"—*communally.*[36] The selection of this particular proscription as the subject of the adjuration is the first indication of the discussion's underlying agenda, and indeed the focus on the proscription against ascending "as a wall" will be evident later in the passage as well. In answer to this argument on behalf of R. Zeira, the passage intimates that according to Rav Yehudah too, one of the adjurations instructs the Jews not to ascend as a wall—notwithstanding that he derived the prohibition against individual migration from one of the other adjurations that forbid disturbing the love (II e).

The passage continues (II f): "And R. Zeira? He requires that in accordance with R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina, who said, 'Why these three adjurations? ….'" That is to say, all of the relevant adjurations[37] have already been expounded as referring to other topics, and none of them is available to be used to derive the prohibition against individual migration to which Rav Yehudah subscribes.

Yet despite the unequivocal diction of the question—"Why these *three* adjurations?"—the presumption that R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina referred to three adjurations at all is not obvious. While the first adjuration issues a specific requirement—"that [they] not ascend as a wall"— the latter two only provide general adjurations: "that [they] not rebel …" and "that [they] not excessively subjugate …" (II f).[38] Indeed, the manner in which the Talmud reports the adjurations in the words of R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina indicates the foreignness of the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall" as it appears here:

> One[39]—that Israel[40] not ascend as a wall (A)
> and one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel that [they] not rebel against the nations of the world (B)

36. All textual witnesses other than G37 read both here and below (in comments by R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina) ***b****e-ḥomah* (בחומה) or ***k****e-ḥomah* (כחומה). The frequent exchange of *bet* and *kaf*, resulting from the similarity in the orthography of these letters in many manuscripts, makes it impossible to determine which version is more correct. The exception, copy G37, in both instances reads שלא יעלו חֵימה. That this reading of the copy, with a *yod*, is the correct one is not entirely clear in either of the two locations, but in any event the text seems to read חימה, presumably a corrupt form. (On the corruptions in G37, see below, though the corruption here nevertheless may be graphical in nature.) Meanwhile, the absence of the prepositional letter (*bet* or *kaf*) may be evidence that such a reading conforms to the original. As much is indicated by the form of this expression in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim: שלא יעלו חומה; אם חומה הוא – אלו ישראל העלו חומה מבבל… אילו עלו חומה מן הגולה … (according to MS Vatican 76 prior to emendation). On the meaning of the expression, see primarily sources cited below, whose sense is that the meaning of the expression is *together, as a single, massive, united body.* Rashi comments: שלא יעלו בחומה—"together, with a strong hand."

37. Presumably, the three adjurations that forbid disturbing the love.

38. This discrepancy alone is not conclusive, as might be determined based on, e.g., R. Ḥelbo's homily in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim (see below).

39. MS Munich 95 and MS Vatican 113 read "one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel" (MS Munich 95 has אחת שהשביע הק׳ב׳ה׳ את ישראל; MS Vatican 113 has אחת שהשביע הק׳ את ישר׳).

40. MS Vatican 130 and copy G37 omit the word "Israel" both here and above. (There the word "Israel" is absent in MS Munich 95 as well [here MS Munich has שהשביע הק׳ב׳ה׳ את ישראל שלא יעלו כחומה].)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured the nations of the world that [they] not excessively subjugate Israel (C).

The second and the third adjurations have a literary style in common: "that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel" (B)—or "the nations of the world" (C)—"that [they] not …." In contrast, the first adjuration, "that Israel not ascend as a wall" (A), appears in the vast majority of textual witnesses[41] in abbreviated form—"that [they] not …"—without the introductory phrase "that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured …."[42] The foreignness of the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall" (A) is evident from the discrepancies found among the textual witnesses as well. In most of these, the sequence of adjurations is that presented here, with the prohibition against ascending as a wall followed by two adjurations "that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel" (B) or "the nations of the world" (C). In the version preserved in Genizah copy G37, however, the adjuration שלא יעלו חומה (A) is the third of the series, following the two that start with "that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured" (B, C).[43] The adjuration's migration within the textual witnesses from one point in the text to another may indicate that it was a later addition, and its placement in G37 further highlights its foreignness. In copy G37, as in MS Vatican 130, this adjuration appears not only without the introductory phrase "that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel," but with no mention of Israel whatsoever. Because this version does not clearly indicate who is adjured, the placement of the adjuration not to ascend as a wall *after* the adjuration addressed to the nations of the world gives the misleading impression that it too is addressed to them. The glaring dissonance in the text of G37, together with the foreign style of the adjuration not to ascend as a wall and its varying placement, is cause for suspicion that the adjuration was added to the Talmud here alongside the two adjurations invoked by R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina (B, C).

Decisive evidence that the adjuration not to ascend as a wall is a foreign addition to R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina's comments may be found in the Palestinian version of his homily, in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim 2:7:[44]

41. Thus it appears in manuscripts representing both versions of the baraita above, viz., all manuscripts that represent version B and most of the manuscripts representing the prevalent version. There are two exceptions among the manuscripts of the prevalent version. It is easy to see that this expression may have been added in these two manuscripts in order to create a uniform style within the adjurations. It is far less plausible that all other manuscripts, from both traditions, would have struck this from their text for no apparent reason.

42. In the text of MS Vatican 130 and G37, which in this adjuration omit the term "Israel," the foreignness of these words is still more conspicuous. According to R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina, the adjurations are addressed to two different entities, viz., Israel and the nations of the world. Why then would he omit the addressee, "Israel," from this adjuration?

43. For a comparison of the text of copy G37 and the Soncino 1487 edition in the entire section (II), see appendix D.

44. Quotations from Midrash Shir Ha-shirim here and throughout this essay are according to MS Vatican 76.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ר' יוסי בר' חנינא אמ' שתי שבועות יש כאן אחת לישראל ואחת לאומות העולם
נשבע לישראל שלא ימרדו על עול מלכיות
ונשבע למלכיות שלא יקשו עול על ישראל שאם מקשים עול על ישראל הם גורמים לקץ לבוא
שלא בעונתו

> R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina said, "*Two* adjurations are there here: one for Israel, and one for the nations of the world. [He] had Israel swear that [they] would not rebel against the yoke of the kingdoms, and [He] had the kingdoms swear that [they] would not overburden Israel with the yoke, for if they [were to] overburden Israel with the yoke, they [would] cause the end to come not at its time."

According to the testimony of Midrash Shir Ha-shirim, in his original homily R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina indeed spoke of only two adjurations.[45] The Talmud's "three adjurations" then in fact are only two, to which was added—with coarse strokes—a third adjuration, which already had been placed in the mouth of R. Zeira: "that [they] not ascend as a wall."[46]

Recognizing that the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall" was added to R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina's comments in the redaction process sheds light on the Talmud's decision to invoke this adjuration in examining the view of R. Zeira in the previous stage of the discussion. As noted above, the Talmud (II d) proposed that R. Zeira does not accept Rav Yehudah's view because the verse "I adjure you …" refers to the adjuration not to ascend as a wall, rather than to the migration of individuals, as argued by Rav Yehudah (II c). If the comments by R. Yose

45. It is difficult to ascertain to which "two adjurations" R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina referred. He may have had in mind the dual verbs "disturb" and "arouse" found in the three verses that prohibit disturbing the love. Also possible, though less likely, is that he intended the two identical verses (2:7 and 3:5) or the two distinct expressions forbidding the addressees to disturb the love (2:7 and 3:5 vs. 8:4). In my view, most probably he intended the two contrary adjurations: one of Israel (2:7; 3:5; 8:4) that proscribes any act that would disturb the love before it wishes, whose violation would distance the love, and another of the nations of the world (5:8), whose violation would arouse the love ("they [would] cause the end to come not at its time," as R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina says in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim). Such an interpretation accords with the scriptural context of the adjuration, which comes after the woman is beaten and injured: "The watchmen who move about the city found me, beat me, injured me; the keepers of the walls took my mantle from upon me. I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem: if you find my beloved, what shall you tell him? That I am lovesick."

46. The same number of adjurations is given explicitly in the Bavli at the beginning of R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina's comments: "Why these *three* adjurations?" Since the redactor has an interest in a discussion of *three* adjurations, it is clear that the three in question are those that forbid disturbing the love (2:7; 3:5; 8:4). The same is implied by the explanation offered according to Rav Yehudah's view—"'That you not disturb and not arouse' is written"—which according to the Talmud is the basis of the six adjurations referenced in the homily by R. Levi: three adjurations derived from the three verses that forbid disturbing the love, and an additional three adjurations derived from the dual actions used in these verses, viz., "disturb" and "arouse." Though it is true that the terminology "that you not … that you not …" (אם… אם…) occurs in only two verses, while the third instead has "why … and why …" (מה… ומה…), the central elements "disturb" and "arouse" recur across the three verses. Notwithstanding, the terminology "that you not … and that you not …" (which is found in all of the textual witnesses) clearly is recognized as symbolizing two adjurations—perhaps evidence of an implicit recognition by the Talmud that R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina personally referred to only two adjurations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. R. Ḥanina that the redactor had before him had included only two adjurations, without "that [they] not ascend as a wall," then it would have been natural for him to choose to have R. Zeira voice the adjuration described by R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina that addresses Israel: "that [they] not rebel against the nations of the world."[47] Since, instead, "that [they] not ascend as a wall" is cited, it stands to reason that this represents a conscious and deliberate choice by a redactor who insisted on placing the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall" in the mouths of both R. Zeira and R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina.

Still, "that [they] not ascend as a wall" is not a creation of the redactor of this talmudic unit. This adjuration too appears in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim 2:7, where it is credited to an Amora: "R. Ḥelbo said, 'Four adjurations are there here. [He] adjured Israel that [they] not rebel against the kingdoms, and that [they] not press the end, and that [they] not reveal their mysteries to the nations of the world, *and that* [*they*] *not ascend* [*as*] *a wall from the exile*."[48] This homily by R. Ḥelbo is the counterpart to that attributed in the Talmud to R. Levi[49] (II h), which marks the conclusion of the talmudic inquiry into the views of Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira. It thus is clear that the talmudic redactor decided to attribute the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall," with which he apparently was familiar from R. Levi's homily,[50] to all of the Amoraim whom he recruited for inclusion in this unit:[51] the Babylonian Rav Yehudah (II e), the Babylonian-Palestinian R. Zeira (II d), and two strictly Palestinian Amoraim, R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina (II f) and R. Levi (II h).

47. What is required in the text is a well-known adjuration that enjoys a consensus of opinion—a requirement satisfied by the adjuration "that [they] not rebel against the nations of the world," to which both R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina and R. Levi subscribe. (Similarly, in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim, this is the only adjuration that is agreed upon by R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina and R. Ḥelbo; see below.) In terms of the content of the adjuration, refuting the argument of Rav Yehudah requires reference to an adjuration to Israel not to disturb the love. This is effectively satisfied by "that [they] not rebel against the nations of the world" (an adjuration whose general nature makes it slightly preferable for the purpose of the Talmud to the specific adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall").

48. Thus all textual witnesses of Midrash Shir Ha-shirim except Oxford Bodl. Heb. d. 47/7: ושלא יעלו חרמה שלגולה; see Tamar Kadari, *Midrash Shir HaShirim Rabbah: A Synoptic Edition* (Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies, 2014), http://www.schechter.ac.il/מדרש_מפעל_מחקר_ומכוני_ספריה; Kadari, "Shene kit'e genizah le-midrash shir ha-shirim rabbah," *Kovez 'al yad: Minora Manuscripta Hebraica* 20 (2011): 38–39. In both works, the text of the Oxford fragment is copied as חרמה, with no indication of uncertainty. The upper section of the *resh*, however, has been truncated, perhaps in an attempt to emend that letter to a *vav*.

49. In both the Talmud and Midrash Shir Ha-shirim, the adjurations' content is similar. Additionally, this homily assumes a number of adjurations that is twice the number given in R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina's homily. Since the six adjurations discussed by R. Levi are presented in the Talmud as a solution to the doubling of R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina's three adjurations ("disturb … arouse …"), whether R. Levi's original comments referred to a total of six adjurations, as in the Talmud, also must be viewed with considerable doubt.

50. Because the homily attributed by the Talmud to R. Levi alludes only to the adjuration not to ascend as a wall, which it cites with the expression "Three—those that we have said," the very part of the tradition that apparently is true to the original is not quoted directly.

51. See also Rubenstein, "Hitmodedut," 169.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notably, in contrast to the tendency of the wider passage to concentrate on comments by Babylonian Amoraim and Babylonian Amoraim who migrated to the Land of Israel,[52] the adjuration not to ascend as a wall is specifically ascribed by the Talmud here to two Palestinian Amoraim. In the text of Midrash Shir Ha-shirim, meanwhile, the adjuration "that [they] not ascend [as] a wall" appears only in R. Ḥelbo's homily, not in R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina's words or those of any other sage. R. Ḥelbo—unlike R. Levi, who is credited with the parallel homily in the Talmud—apparently was a Babylonian sage and disciple of Rav Huna[53] who migrated to the Land of Israel.[54] Thus Midrash Shir Ha-shirim includes this adjuration only in the comments of a Babylonian Amora who migrated to the Land of Israel, while in the Talmud it is attributed to none other than two Palestinian Amoraim, and ascribed to a Babylonian Amora (Rav Yehudah) and to a Babylonian Amora who migrated to the Land of Israel (R. Zeira) only in unattributed comments.

The redactor's apparent effort to attribute the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall" to all of the Amoraim who appear in this unit raises the question of his motive in doing so. As noted by Saul Lieberman,[55] the adjuration not to ascend as a wall must be understood in the context of a comparison of all of the sources that invoke it. Aside from the talmudic passage discussed here, and R. Ḥelbo's comments in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim, the remaining sources that refer to ascent as a wall represent the contrary Palestinian view, which harshly deprecates the failure of Babylonian Jewry to ascend as a wall at the time of the Return to Zion. According to these sources, Palestinian Jews of the amoraic period cast upon their Babylonian contemporaries the guilt of their distant forefathers who had declined to migrate to the Land of Israel. They hated the Babylonians for their ancestors' failure to migrate to the land in the days of Ezra,[56] and castigated their Babylonian contemporaries with the accusation that their forefathers destroyed the temple, because had they ascended as a wall, the Second Temple would not have been destroyed.[57]

52. As observed by Rubenstein, ibid.

53. B. Yevamot 64b; B. Menaḥot 31b, 32b.

54. See, e.g., Ḥanokh Albeck, *Mavo' la-talmudim* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1969), 325–26.

55. Saul Lieberman, "Kakh hayah ve-kakh yihyeh: Yehude 'Ereẓ Yisra'el ve-yahadut ha-'olam bi-tekufat ha-mishnah ve-ha-talmud," in *Meḥkarim be-torat 'Ereẓ Yisra'el* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1991), 333–34.

56. B. Yoma 9b (according to MS New York, Enelow 271): "R. Shimon b. Lakish was swimming in the Jordan. Rabbah b. Bar Ḥannah came [and] offered him a hand. He said to him, '[I swear] by God that *I hate you*, as is written, "If she is a wall, we will build upon her a parapet of silver, and if she is a door, we will enclose her with a board of cedar." *If you had made yourselves like a wall* [כחומה] *and ascended in the days of Ezra*, you would have been made comparable to silver, over which decay has no power. Now that you have ascended in poverty [בדלות], you are made comparable to cedar, over which decay has power.'" See also Midrash Shir Ha-shirim 8:10: "Reish Lakish said, 'When I would see them gathering in the market, I would say to them, "Scatter yourselves."' He said to them, 'At your ascent you did not make yourselves like a wall [חומה], and here you have come to make a wall [חומה]?!'"

57. Midrash Shir Ha-shirim 8:10: "'If she is a wall'—*if Israel had brought up a wall* [העלו חומה] *from Babylonia, the temple would not have been destroyed that second time*. R. Zeira went out to the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Against this backdrop, the adjuration not to ascend as a wall should likely be seen as a response by Babylonian Jewry[58] to those grave accusations. In attributing the adjuration against ascent as a wall[59] to all of the Amoraim who appear in the debate over the question of migration to the Land of Israel from Babylonia, the redactor sought to declare that irrespective of the debate over whether the law permits individuals to migrate, no one questions that the Babylonian Jewish community is enjoined from ascending as a wall. This is the reason the adjuration is attributed to R. Zeira (II d), the Babylonian who migrated to the Land of Israel and settled there, and the reason the adjuration is placed in the mouths of two Palestinian Amoraim, R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina (II f) and R. Levi (II h), whereas the arguments voiced by Palestinian Amoraim against Babylonian Jews for their failure to ascend as a wall are wholly omitted.[60] The redactor's work thus creates the impression that the adjuration not to ascend as a wall is a consensus shared by the Amoraim of the Land of Israel (II f, II h), the Babylonian Rav Yehudah (II e), R. Zeira, a Babylonian who migrated to the Land of Israel (II d), and perhaps even—implicitly—R. Elazar, another Babylonian who migrated to the Land of Israel and whose comments conclude the unit (II i): "R. Elazar said, 'The Holy One, blessed is He, said to Israel, "If you honor the adjuration, it is well, but if not, I [will] make your flesh forfeit like the gazelles and like the deer of the field."'"[61]

The Homilies of R. Elazar and Rav Anan and Their Relationship to the Baraita and Parallels

The next unit of the talmudic passage (III), which has a long, complex structure, begins with a homily by R. Elazar[62] that harks back to the topic of the baraita

market to buy something. He said to the one who was weighing, 'Weigh properly,' and he said to him, 'You may not come before us here—*you Babylonians, whose forefathers destroyed the temple*.' At that time, R. Zeira said, 'Were my forefathers not like the forefathers of these?' He entered the college and heard the voice of R. Ila sitting [and] expounding, '*If they had ascended [as] a wall* [עלו חומה] *from the exile,* the temple would not have been destroyed a second time.' He said, '*'Am ha-'areẓ* has taught me well …'" (thus MS Vatican 76 prior to emendation).

58. Lieberman, "Kakh hayah ve-kakh yihyeh," 334.

59. Possibly the tradition originated in the homily by R. Ḥelbo, a Babylonian who migrated to the Land of Israel. As discussed above, the homily attributed to R. Levi in the Bavli parallels that of R. Ḥelbo in Midrash Shir Ha-shirim, which is the only source in all of Palestinian literature that refers to an adjuration not to ascend as a wall.

60. These arguments are found elsewhere in the Talmud (B. Yoma 9b), demonstrating that this accusation of Babylonian Jewry was known in Babylonia.

61. In this homily, R. Elazar refers to a definite, known adjuration ("the adjuration") without specifying its content. The inclusion of his homily concerning the undefined adjuration at the conclusion of a discussion whose focus is the adjuration not to ascend as a wall raises the question of whether the redactor thus sought to include R. Elazar among the sages holding forth on the central adjuration in this unit: "that [they] not ascend as a wall."

62. As mentioned above, the second unit of the discussion (II) concludes with a homily by R. Elazar (II i). This is then followed by the third part of the passage, which also begins with a homily attributed to R. Elazar (III a1). To be sure, it is clear that the two homilies are unrelated: each

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

found in all versions (most notably version B) at the beginning of the passage—the importance of living in the Land of Israel: "R. Elazar said, 'Anyone who resides in the Land of Israel abides without sin, as is said, "And an inhabitant shall not say, I am ill. The nation that dwells there shall be forgiven of sin" (Isaiah 33:24).'" This homily is apparently based on an earlier homily authored by R. Meir.[63] We should also note an affinity between this homily and a statement that appears in two of the sources that parallel the baraita quoted at the beginning of the talmudic passage: T. Avodah Zarah 4:5 and Mekhilta Devarim 11:31–32:[64] "Living in the Land of Israel is commensurate with all of the commandments in the Torah." In these two sources, this statement is associated with the saying at the beginning of the baraita in the Talmud: "Always let a person reside in the Land of Israel, even in a city that is mostly gentile, and let him not reside outside the land, even in a city that is mostly Israelite."[65] This strengthens the link between R. Elazar's homily (III a1) and the baraita (I) at the beginning of the passage. The relationship between these parallel sources to the baraita and the talmudic passage becomes still more evident as the passage proceeds. Two amoraic statements appearing in the continuation of the passage have counterparts in the parallel sources: Rav Anan's homily[66] ("Anyone who is buried in the Land of Israel—it is as though he [were] buried beneath the altar …,"[67] III a2) and R. Elazar's second homily ("[The] dead who are outside the land are not to revive …," III b1).[68]

clearly relates to the distinct content of the unit of which it is a part: the homily by R. Elazar's homily concerning the adjuration relates to the difference of opinion between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira and its focus on the adjurations in the Song of Songs, while the next homily by R. Elazar, rather than relate to the subjects treated in the first, introduces the third section of the passage.

63. "R. Meir would say, 'Anyone who lives in the Land of Israel—the Land of Israel atones for him, as is said, "The nation that dwells there shall be forgiven of sin" [Deuteronomy 32:43]'" (Sifrei Devarim, *pis.* 333 [ed. Finkelstein, p. 383]. A similar homily appears in Mekhilta Devarim to this verse: וְכִפֶּר… עַמּוֹ מיכן א' ר' מאיר כל היו〈ש〉ב בארץ ישר' ארץ ישר' מכפרת לו שנ' העם הי〈ו〉שֹׁב בה נשוא עון [according to Kahana, *Kit'e midreshe ha-halakhah*, 357]). In comparison to the wording of R. Meir's homily (ארץ ישראל מכפרת לו), the homily ascribed to R. Elazar in the Talmud (שרוי בלא עון) more closely resembles the phrasing of Isaiah (העם היושב בה נשוא עון). Rav Anan's statement cited subsequent to that by R. Elazar and R. Elazar's next statement also are based on tannaitic sources; see below.

64. In Mekhilta, the statement appears in the context of a homily on Deuteronomy 32:43, spoken by Tannaim who were poised to leave the Land of Israel. On this source, see Kahana, "Ma'alat yeshivat 'Ereẓ Yisra'el," 501–13.

65. The statement that "living in the Land of Israel is commensurate with all of the commandments that are in the Torah" appears in the Tosefta immediately following the statement that appears at the beginning of the baraita in the talmudic passage, and in Mekhilta Devarim immediately prior to this statement. For a detailed comparison, see appendix C below.

66. Rav Anan's homily has a counterpart both in the Tosefta and in the Mekhilta immediately following the statement paralleling section I a of the baraita.

67. On the juxtaposition of burial and residence, see Menahem Kister, "'Iyyun be-'avot de-Rabbi Natan nusaḥ A perek 17: 'Arikhah ve-naftule masorot," in *Meḥkere Talmud 3*, ed. David Rosenthal and Yaakov Sussmann (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2005), 735–38.

68. R. Elazar's homily has a counterpart in the Mekhilta. In the Talmud, R. Elazar's homily is presented in two stages (the second following a question by R. Abba b. Memmel) (III b1). Both are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In crafting the initial stages of the passage's third section, the redactor incorporated amoraic sources[69] related to the sources that parallel the introductory baraita, but that are absent from the baraita itself. The redaction thus supplies those elements absent from the baraita with which the talmudic passage begins, drawing on content that appears in parallels but was known to the redactor in its amoraic form.

Genizah Fragments: Transposition of the Discussion of "Ascent as a Wall"

The relationship revealed between the initial stages of the third section of the passage (III a1, III a2, III b1) and the baraita (I) with its parallel sources now demonstrates that the second section of the passage (II)—the unit that discusses the anecdote about Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira—actually seperates two related sections. Surely enough, in the Genizah copies G37 and G38 of the talmudic text, the third section, beginning with R. Elazar's statement, *appears immediately after the close of the baraita*, functioning as a natural continuation of the baraita with which the passage commences.

The unit centered on the anecdote about Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira (II) is entirely absent from G38. Copy G37 testifies that this absence may possibly be misleading: copy G37 is significantly more expansive than G38, and *the entire second section appears in the middle of the expansive third section*, quite far from its location in most textual witnesses and immediately before another homily by R. Elazar, "Boors are not to revive …" (III c1).[70] It thus may be that the relatively limited surviving text of G38 only appears deficient, and the second section appeared later in that manuscript, as it does in G37. In any event, whether the second section of the passage indeed was incorporated further on in these copies, far from its place in the other textual witnesses, or—even more so—if this section was in fact absent from G38, these two Genizah

found in the Mekhilta. The wording of R. Elazar's statement amplifies the homily as it appears in the Mekhilta. The Mekhilta states that the dead of the Land of Israel "are to revive first" (see also Reish Lakish, quoting Bar Kappara, in Y. Kil'ayim 9:4 [32c]; Y. Ketubbot 12:3 [35b]; Bereshit Rabbah 97 [MS Vatican 30] [ed. Theodor–Albeck, p. 1239]), whereas R. Elazar states that they are "not to revive" at all. Nonetheless, the relationship between the two sources is clear.

69. The statement by R. Elazar that introduces the third section, Rav Anan's statment, and R. Elazar's second statement.

70. That the section is incorporated so far from its locus in other witnesses makes it difficult to argue that it was absent in the vorlage of G37, was inserted in that copy's margin, and from there found its way to the wrong place in G37. (See also n. 101 below on the possibility that G37 reflects a version of the Talmud that the scribe had committed to memory. According to this prospect, it is even less likely that the second section was inserted based on the copy's vorlage.) For the same reason, it is implausible that the second section in its entirety is a late addition that initially was written in the margin of the vorlage of an early manuscript and thence made its way to two separate locations within the main text.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fragments together may be taken to indicate that section II was added to the talmudic passage at a relatively late stage of its development.[71]

Transposition—certainly transposition between two such distant locations—is not one of the more common variations in the text of the Talmud.[72] To examine the significance of such an exceptional variation we must first consider the location where the second section appears in G37: in the middle of the third section, before R. Elazar's homily, "Boors are not to revive, as is said, 'The dead shall not live, the inanimate shall not rise …' [Isaiah 26:14]" (III c1). As noted above, the third section of the passage features three homilies by R. Elazar that function as central axes around which the section develops. The two initial homilies by R. Elazar and their associated sources are concerned with the question of residence and burial in the Land of Israel, Babylonia, and other lands. The third ("Boors are not to revive …," III c1) does not relate to these questions, and draws the discussion in other directions.[73] Thus in G37 section II—the unit including the debate between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira—immediately follows the treatment of the passage's main question, namely, a person's place of residence and burial, and in turn is followed by the passage's transition to the next topic.

We might describe the transposition thus: section II, the debate between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira, appears in the textual witnesses either *prior to* or immediately *following* the extended amoraic unit on living and burial in the Land of Israel.

71. In this view, the second section was absent in the initial stage. When it was incorporated, some inserted it where it appears in standard editions, while others placed it where it appears in G37 (and perhaps still others did not incorporate it at all).

72. See below.

73. This homily by R. Elazar and an associated exchange between him and R. Yoḥanan are followed by three statements by R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef (III c2–3). The two initial statements discuss the revival of the righteous in the time to come. The topic of these dicta is related to the discussion of the lot of the righteous in the time to come that precedes R. Elazar's third homily (III c1). However, R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef's two statements, which depict the resurrection of the righteous, do not address the question of the righteous who died *outside the Land of Israel*, which is the focus of the previous statements. The statement that the "righteous are destined to ripple forth and arise in Jerusalem" also focuses on *how* the righteous will be resuscitated, as does the second statement by R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef, and does not address the question of the resuscitation of righteous individuals who died outside the Land of Israel; cf. Rubenstein, "Hitmodedut," 177. The version noted by Rubenstein, ibid., n. 53, שמבצבצין ועולין לירוש׳, also need not include those buried in the Diaspora. In any event, the bulk of textual witnesses read מירושלים (which accords with the phrasing of the verse here expounded; thus MS Munich, MS Vatican 113, and MS Vatican 130 ["to blossom forth from Jerusalem"]), or בירושלים (printed editions, copy G37 ["to go out in Jerusalem"]). The two statements by R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef thus parallel R. Elazar's third statement about boors: they will not be resuscitated, whereas the righteous will, with no reference to their burial place. R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef's two statements on the resurrection of the righteous in the time to come are followed by a third statement of his, concerning the fertility of the Land of Israel, which initiates a complex passage on that subject. In sum, R. Elazar's third statement (III c1) marks the beginning of a new part of this passage that breaks from the preceding discussion of residence and burial in the Land of Israel or elsewhere. Still, the redactor carefully assured continuity from one part of the passage to another by flanking R. Elazar's third statement with discussions of two different aspects of the resurrection of the righteous.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It follows that this section must be viewed not as the second section of the passage, but as an independent unit external to the primary amoraic passage (III a–b) that exists alongside or cascades around the discussion of a person's place of residence.[74]

At the stage of the consolidation of the text of the passage and certainly upon its commitment to writing, there was a need to place the independent unit on the debate between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira at one particular point or another. However, the unit's placement may not just be an arbitrary choice; it may be related to the variants of the baraita at the beginning of the passage as well. In the prevalent version of the text, the unit was positioned prior to the third section, immediately following the baraita with which the passage begins—a location that serves to underscore its affinity with the baraita as presented in the prevalent version, in which the focus is on *one who resides outside the land*. In G37, meanwhile, the independent unit was positioned within the third section, immediately following the discussion of residence and burial in the Land of Israel or in Babylonia. This placement highlights the external nature of this unit in relation to the primary passage as well as preserves the natural progression from the baraita at the beginning of the passage to section III. As previously noted, this progression is evident primarily in version B of the baraita, whose focus is *one who resides in the Land of Israel*. Thus, there is a link between the discrepant versions of the baraita and the alternate locations of the independent unit[75]—a link that, together with the nature of the textual variants here,[76] bolsters the perception that there are two different textual traditions of this talmudic passage.[77]

74. This unit thus differs from the following appendices appearing at the conclusion of the passage, one of which returns to the subject of migrating to and living in the Land of Israel (IV a). Unlike the later appendices, which belong to the *conclusion* of the passage, this unit proceeds *alongside* it.

75. In Genizah copies G37 and G38, which represent version B of the baraita, with its focus on residents of the Land of Israel, the baraita is immediately followed by the third section of the passage, whose initial stages are based on the baraita, and which begins with a discussion of one who resides in the Land of Israel. On the other hand, in textual witnesses to the prevalent version of the baraita, which focuses on the residents of the Diaspora, it is immediately followed by the second section of the passage, whose topic is the Jews of Babylonia. MS Vatican 130, as to a lesser extent MS Firkovich, contains a hybrid version: they present the baraita entirely (MS Vatican 130) or partially (MS Firkovich) as in version B, but place the second section of the passage immediately following the baraita, as in the prevalent version of the passage.

76. First, there are two competing transmissions of a baraita. Second, a redacted unit of text is transposed in what seem to be different executions of the same intention, viz., to place the unit alongside the primary passage.

77. In the scope of the present essay, I cannot describe in any detail the picture that emerges from the text of the entire chapter, but I would note that the general picture of the text discussed in this essay is in keeping with that which emerges from other textual variants in the chapter. In more than one instance, G37 contains variants that differ substantially from the prevalent text (though they are generally less important than the variants presented here). In these cases, G37 appears to represent an alternate transmission—albeit with the inclusion of several corruptions and apparently not consistently adhering to that transmission (which is to say that the text of G37 was somewhat influenced by the prevalent version). As is the case here, both MS Vatican 130 and to a lesser

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally and notably, Rav Yehudah's view—"Anyone who ascends from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive injunction" (II a), a statement found in the beginning of the independent unit—fits naturally within the third section, in the excursus, whose subject is living in Babylonia.[78] This structure contains, inter alia, a statement by Shmuel quoted by Rav Yehudah ("Just as one is forbidden to depart the Land of Israel for Babylonia, thus one is forbidden to depart Babylonia for other lands," III a5) and a statement by Rav Yehudah himself[79] ("Anyone who resides in Babylonia—it is as though he were residing in the Land of Israel …," III a6).[80] Clearly, the natural place for Rav Yehudah's statement that "anyone who ascends from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive injunction" is in the excursus, which is concerned with living in Babylonia,[81] alongside his two other statements. These three statements together consist of three increasingly strident expressions of Rav Yehudah's view requiring that

degree MS Firkovich in some instances present versions reflecting the tradition represented by G37, but they do so on only partially. These versions should therefore be regarded as hybrids. I intend to present a detailed discussion of the text of this chapter in a separate study.

78. The excursus, which precedes R. Elazar's second homily, contains a series of statements about living in Babylonia and the destiny of Babylonian Jews in the end of days and at the time of the resurrection of the dead (III a5–7). Interposed between R. Elazar's first two homilies in section III of the passage are a number of statements about burial in the Land of Israel and a statement regarding departure from the Land of Israel (cf. Y. Mo'ed Katan 3:1 [81c]). These are followed by this excursus on Babylonian Jews.

79. Thus in four textual witnesses, representing both traditions: MS Vatican 113, Soncino 1487, G37, and MS Firkovich. MS Munich 95 reads אמר רב יהודה אמ׳ רב, and G68 has אמ׳ ר׳ אלעזר, while the version in MS Vatican 130 is א׳ רב יוסף. All that can be deciphered here in the text of MS Moscow is […] ?? א׳ רב. (These ambiguous and illegible letters at the end of a line—apparently line filler—are all that is left of the Amora's name; at the beginning of the next line, where the name of the Amora would be expected to appear, the panel is torn.)

80. This statement presents a scriptural reference: "… as is said, 'Ho, [to] Zion, escape, you living with the daughter of Babylonia'" (Zechariah 2:11). This verse in Zechariah calls on all the Jews of Babylonia to leave their place of residence and escape to the Land of Israel, in contradiction with Rav Yehudah's view that they must remain in Babylonia "until the day I recall them." Rav Yehudah audaciously chooses this very verse to corroborate his contrary opinion: "Anyone who resides in Babylonia—it is as though he were residing in the Land of Israel!" It stands to reason that this homily by Rav Yehudah, or at least its meaning as apprehended by the passage's redactor, must be understood in light of its location in the passage, between a statement regarding the resurrection of the dead and another that discusses the pangs of the messiah. Based on the context, Rav Yehudah's statement seems chiefly concerned with the resurrection of the dead: by stating that "anyone who resides in Babylonia—it is as though he were residing in the Land of Israel," he implies that a resident of Babylonia, like an individual who resides in the Land of Israel, "abides without sin" (as stated by R. Elazar in his homily at the beginning of section III) and merits eternal life. The dead will not be resurrected in Babylonia, but in the end of days, Babylonian Jewry's dead will escape to the Land of Israel: הוי ציון המלטי, יושבת בת בבל ("Ho, [to] Zion, escape, you living with the daughter of Babylonia").

81. The other statements in the excursus, all attributed to Babylonian Amoraim, also favor living in Babylonia. These statements distinguish between various places in Babylonia, as well as between the "virtuous of Babylonia" and the "virtuous who are in other lands" (and by extension between the virtuous and those who are not).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one live in Babylonia.[82] However, his third and most extreme statement —"Anyone who ascends from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive injunction"—appears neither in the excursus on living in Babylonia nor elsewhere in the extended amoraic passage on residence and burial in the Land of Israel or outside it, but in the unit that exists parallel to and alongside this passage. Notably, Rav Yehudah's statement forbidding migration to the Land of Israel is not cited independently either here or in any other instance, but instead always appears in the context of his debate with his student R. Zeira (or R. Abba). It thus may be that the reservations expressed by R. Zeira regarding Rav Yehudah's view is what motivated the redactor to incorporate the entire anecdote outside of the structure that advocates for living in Babylonia.

"Ascent as a Wall": The Composition of a Passage and Its Agenda

The principal points considered thus far concerning the independent unit that features the difference of opinion between Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira (section II) are as follows:

1. The most natural and logical place for Rav Yehudah's objection to the migration of individuals from Babylonia to the Land of Israel found at the beginning of the unit (II a) is alongside other statements attributed to him that appear in the excursus on living in Babylonia, in section III of the passage (III a5–6).
2. The entire unit (II) was incorporated into different textual witnesses in two different and quite distant locations, immediately before or immediately after the principal amoraic passage (III), with its discussion of one's place of residence and burial (III a–b). This transposition and the specific points where the unit is inserted (prior to III a or prior to III c) appear to indicate that it was originally intended to be incorporated not in a particular location, but outside of and alongside the passage.
3. The redaction of this unit (II) focuses on the adjuration "that [they] not ascend as a wall." The concept of not ascending as a wall is not germane to the topics discussed in section III. From a comparison to other sources, it is quite clear that this adjuration responds to the grave charges leveled by Palestinian Jewry against their Babylonian Jewish brethren for the latter's failure to ascend en masse when they became able to return to the Land of Israel at the time of the Return to Zion.

Based on the above, it appears that the anecdote about Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira served as a starting point around which an entire unit was developed, whose main purpose was to corroborate the proscription against ascending as a wall—a

82. First of these is the statement attributed by Rav Yehudah to Shmuel that equates the distinction between Babylonia and the Land of Israel with that between Babylonia and other lands. This is followed by Rav Yehudah's statement equating Babylonia to the Land of Israel. Last in the series is Rav Yehudah's extreme statement forbidding migration from Babylonia to the Land of Israel.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prohibition of special importance for the Jews of Babylonia. To this end, the redactor of the passage employed R. Zeira's reservations concerning Rav Yehudah's extreme view as a device to further his own argument, that is, that all Amoraim, including R. Zeira himself and the Amoraim of the Land of Israel, acknowledge the existence and the authority of the adjuration not to ascend as a wall. The proscription against ascending as a wall differs fundamentally from the subjects treated by the primary passage, and therefore this unit was set outside of the primary passage, or more specifically, alongside it. The arguments made by the Jews of the Land of Israel against those in Babylonia appear to have been a source of significant aggravation for that anonymous redactor who decided to assemble a special, independent unit to mount a response to these contentions. These arguments assaulted the very legitimacy of the notion of a Jewish center in Babylonia, and the echoes of these contentions were yet audible a significant time after they were first pronounced. The adjuration not to ascend as a wall undermines the arguments of Palestinian Jewry, and thus bolsters the legitimacy of the idea of a Jewish center in Babylonia.[83] The redaction presenting this adjuration as a universal consensus, even on the part of the Amoraim of the Land of Israel, accords neatly with this agenda, even if it significantly postdated the time of the Amoraim who appear in the passage.

As for the time frame when the unit was *created*,[84] the transposition may indicate that it is late in its entirety, dating to an early stage of the transmission of the Talmud. However, given the uniqueness of this transposition and the appraisal that the unit was initially intended to exist alongside the longer passage, the transposition cannot attest to the time of the unit's creation. Indeed, it may have been created at the same time that the other sections of the passage

83. Gafni, *Land*, 74.

84. The time at which the unit was created cannot be determined based on available historical data. In view of the attribution of the oath not to ascend as a wall at the latest to R. Ḥelbo, a third- to fourth-generation Amora who migrated from Babylonia to the Land of Israel, it may be that this unit was developed in Babylonia as early as the middle of the amoraic period, shortly after the time of the Amoraim invoked here. On the other hand, given that the Palestinian objection to the failure of Babylonian Jews to ascend as a wall challenges the very legitimacy of a Jewish center in Babylonia, the echoes of these contentions well may have been audible even a significant time after they were first pronounced, and they may have triggered the formulation of the passage at any point in the periods during which the conflict between the Palestinian and the Babylonian center was ongoing. The redaction thus would accord with nearly any time in the centuries during which Babylonian Jews sought to bolster the status of the Babylonian center, whether due to the center's inferior position during the beginning of the period, out of the Babylonians' ambition to attain status commensurate with that of the Palestinian center, or in tandem with their demand in later periods for leadership of the Jewish world. On the enduring pertinence of this motivation, see, e.g., Isaiah Gafni, "How Babylonia Became 'Zion': Shifting Identities in Late Antiquity," in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, ed. L. I. Levine and D. R. Schwartz (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 333–48, and sources listed there.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were redacted,[85] created at a later stage,[86] or possibly composed in an earlier era and inserted here fully formed.[87]

Textual Traditions and the Early Form of the Passage

Aside from clarifying the passage's content and exposing its agenda, this investigation enriches our understanding of the passage's history and early form, and enhances our knowledge of the traditions of the Talmud and the phenomena that characterized the early stages of its transmission.

Above I discussed two loci that feature pronounced discrepancies between the textual witnesses of the passage in B. Ketubbot 110b–111b. The analysis of the passage's introductory baraita (I) and its variants evinces the existence of two textual traditions, each of which manifests a relationship with a different parallel baraita known to us from tannaitic sources. Distinctions between different textual traditions that employ different baraitot have been noted in previous studies.[88] In textual traditions that do not reflect alternate redactions—a category that would appear to include the present passage[89]—use of different tannaitic sources may indicate the degree of license that existed at the time the traditions came into being. In such a case, the two traditions represent two different implementations of an "instruction"[90] to incorporate a baraita at a particular point in the passage,[91] and the discrepancy between traditions may demonstrate that in the early form of the passage, that is, before the traditions split apart, there was at this point only an allusion to or a partial quotation from a baraita. Yet the phenomenon before us is more complex: the differences in evidence between the traditions of the text of the baraita, as discussed above, are compounded by the fact that there is one section of the baraita (I c) that is unique to the two Babylonian traditions and

85. It may be that the redactor decided in advance not to incorporate the story of Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira within the primary passage, intending instead to use it as a matrix for the development of this unit.

86. Perhaps, for instance, the story of R. Zeira and Rav Yehudah originally appeared within the primary passage, and at a later date was removed from there to serve as the foundation for the development of the unit focused on the prohibition against ascending as a wall.

87. On this possibility, see, e.g., Yoav Rosenthal, "On the Early Form of Bavli Mo'ed Katan 7b–8a," *Tarbiz* 77 (2008): 62–65. According to the proposal advanced there, it is in fact an amoraic passage that was placed alongside a generic (*setami*) one. This is not the place to consider the question of when generic passages were composed, as determining this depends primarily on the evidence available in each given passage, and as noted, the data here are equivocal as to the relative date of the text.

88. Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "The History of the Text and Problems of Redaction in the Study of the Babylonian Talmud," *Tarbiz* 57 (1987): 17–18; Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "The Renderings of TB Tractate 'Temurah,'" *Tarbiz* 58 (1989): 329.

89. Reference to different tannaitic sources may of course represent different redactions (See Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "Renderings of TB Tractate 'Temura'"). However, based on all of the data emerging from an examination of the textual witnesses in the present chapter, this is not likely to be the case here.

90. Regarding such "instructions," see Yoav Rosenthal, "Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Karetot: A Study of Its Textual Traditions" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 2003), 215–18.

91. Thus in the example offered by Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "History of the Text."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

absent in the parallel sources. This section objects to a view similar to that of the Tosefta and defiantly asks, "Then does … anyone who does not reside in the Land of Israel not have a God?!," and in doing so perhaps presents a Babylonian position. The presence of this section in both traditions of the Bavli demonstrates that what we have before us is not merely a baraita mechanically completed in a different way in each tradition.

We may reasonably conclude that the early form of the passage indeed contained an "instruction" to incorporate a baraita here, but also contained this reservation (I c), potentially a Babylonian addendum inserted by the redactor of the passage. Both traditions preserved the reservation found in the passage from which they emerged, while the remaining sections of the baraita were filled out independently in each tradition based on a baraita familiar to its originator, and possibly also with reference to the continuation of the passage, which takes varied forms in the different traditions.

The second discrepancy is found in the unit featuring the story of Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira (II). Here, the prominent divergence is a transposition in which the location of the entire unit changes, each textual tradition having incorporated the unit in an entirely different place. The transposition of an entire unit—a rare phenomenon in any event[92]—here is particularly unusual because of the considerable distance between the two points where the unit appears and because these two locations both are reasonable prospects for the insertion of the unit. Given the great distance between the two points, it does not seem

92. For a transposition somewhat similar to that examined here, see Yoav Rosenthal, "On the Early Form of Bavli Mo'ed Katan 7b–8a." There I proposed that the passage at B. Mo'ed Kaṭan 7b–8a had within it an amoraic unit whose place was determined to be alongside the primary passage, and it was inserted at different points in different traditions. There, however, the unit was placed in locations close to each other, and both placements appear mistaken. For an entire passage incorporated in two entirely different locations in different manuscripts, see Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "History of the Text," 31–36. That transposition, however, is fundamentally different from the transposition described here. There, the unit in question is an addendum at the end of the chapter that in several manuscripts was relocated to its natural place in the chapter. On a discrepancy regarding the order of passages, see Mordechai Sabato, *A Yemenite Manuscript of Tractate Sanhedrin and Its Place in the Text Tradition* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi; Hebrew University, 1998), 279–80. Transpositions found in several places in fragments from the Cairo Genizah will soon be published under the rubric of *Unknown Traditions of the Babylonian Talmud Preserved in the Cairo Genizah*, a project under my direction; see the unnumbered note at the beginning of this essay.

Significantly, there are instances even within the text of the Talmud where different traditions place a given unit in different locations, a phenomenon for which appropriate turns of phrase were reserved (e.g., …איכא דמתני לה א).

Note also the need to distinguish between transpositions of the sort discussed here and those far more common transpositions of a brief unit of verbiage that in all variants appears adjacent to the same other text. Such instances generally reflect the belated insertion of text that presumably had been written into the margins of a written copy; see, e.g., Shamma Friedman, "A Critical Study of Yevamot X with a Methodological Introduction," in *Texts and Studies*, vol. 1 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1977), 305–6. It behooves us also to differentiate between transpositions where the locus of a text changes, which as indicated are rare, and other discrepancies where the elements of a unit are reordered, which are common.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plausible that the transposition emerged from a development in a written text, with the unit entering at different locations as a result, for instance, of having been written into the margin. It rather seems far more likely that the transposition before us originated at an early stage—either a late stage of redaction or an early stage of oral transmission—when the place of the unit was established *alongside* the primary passage, but no specific point was designated. This transposition thus reflects two variant implementations of the same determination that the unit ought to appear alongside the primary passage. This became necessary when the full form of the passage was established in a given tradition—certainly if the passage was written, but even if it was fixed in oral form.

The two phenomena that I have described here thus join the conclusions of prior studies[93] to lend credence to the prospect of an early stage[94] in which the passages of the Talmud had undergone redaction but were yet in a more primordial, elemental form, including "instructions" and allusions. It is my view that such a configuration of the passages brought about the prominent discrepancies between the various textual traditions that have reached us, including those in B. Ketubbot 110b–112b.

Yoav Rosenthal
Hebrew University

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

93. Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "History of the Text"; Eliezer S. Rosenthal, "Renderings of TB Tractate 'Temura'"; Yoav Rosenthal, "Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Karetot"; Yoav Rosenthal, "On the Early Form of Bavli Mo'ed Katan 7b–8a"; See also Adiel Schremer, "Between Text Transmission and Text Redaction: Fragments of a Different Recencion of TB Moed-Qatan from the Genizah," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 375–99.

94. The data available are insufficient for a sound assessment of the date of this stage. However, this is an early stage relative to other stages that are attested by most of the textual variants found in the manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud.

Appendix A: B. Ketubbot 110a–112b: A Detailed Outline of the Talmudic Passage (According to the Soncino 1487 Edition)

I a תנו רבנן לעולם ידור אדם בארץ ישראל אפי' בעיר שרובה גוים ואל ידור בחוצה לארץ ואפי' בעיר שרובה ישראל

I b שכל הדר בארץ ישראל דומה כמי שיש לו אלוה וכל הדר בחוצה לארץ דומה כמי שאין לו אלוד שנ' לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלדי'

I c «וכי הדר בארץ ישראל יש לו אלוה» וכל שאינו דר בארץ אין לו אלוה אלא לומר לך כל הדר בחוצה לארץ כאילו עובד ע"ז

I d וכן בדוד הוא או' כי גרשוני היום מהסתפ' בנחלת ה' לאמר לך עבוד אלהי' אחרים מי א"ל לדוד לך עבוד אלהים אחרים אלא לומר לך כל הדר בחוצה לארץ כאילו עובד ע"ז

II a ר' זירא הוה קמישתמיט מיניה דרב יהודה דבעא למיסק לארץ ישר' דא' רב יהודה כל העולה מבבל לארץ ישראל עובר בעשה שנ' בבלה יובאו ושמה יהיו עד יום פקדי אותם נאם ה'

II b ור' זירא? ההוא בכלי שרת כתיב

II c ורב יהודה? כתיב קרא אחרינ' השבע' אתכם בנו' ירושל' בצבאו' או באיילות השדה וגו'

II d ור' זירא? ההוא שלא יעלו ישראל בחומה

II e ורב יהודה? השבעתי אחרינא כת'

II f ור' זירא? ההוא מיבעי ליה לכדר' יוסי בר' חנינא דא' שלש שבועות הללו למה אחת שלא יעלו ישר' בחומה ואחת שהשביע הק"בה את ישר' שלא ימרדו באומו' העולם ואחת שהשביע הק"בה את אומות העולם שלא ישתעבדו בהן בישר' יותר מדאי

II g ורב יהודה? אם תעירו ואם תעוררו כת'

II h ור' זירא? מיבעי ליה לכדר' לוי דא' שש שבועות הללו למה תלתא הני דאמרן אינך שלא יגלו את הקץ ושלא ירחקו את הקץ ושלא יגלו הסוד לאומו' העולם

II i בצבאו' או באיילו' השד' א"ר אלע' אמ' להם הק"בה לישר' אם אתם מקיימי' את השבועה מוטב ואם לאו אני מתיר את בשרכ' כצבאו' ובאילו' השד'

III a1 א"ר אלע' כל הדר בארץ ישר' שרוי בלא עון שנ' בל יאמר שכן חליתי העם היושב בה נשוא עון

א"ל רבה לרב אשי אנן בסובלי חלאים מתנינן לה

III a2 אמ' רב ענן כל הקבור בארץ ישר' כאילו קבור תחת המזבח כת' הכא מזבח אדמה תעשה לי וכת' התם וכפר אדמתו עמו

III a3 עולא הוה רגיל דהוה סליק לארץ ישרא' נח נפשיה בחוצה לארץ אתו אמרו לי' לר' אלעזר אמ' אנת עולא על אדמה טמא' תמות אמרו לו ארונו בא אמ' להם אינו דומה קולטתו מחיי' לקולטתו לאחר מיתה

III a4 ההוא גברא דנפלה ליה יבמה בי חוזאה אתא לקמיה דר' חנינא אמ' ליה מהו למיחת ויבמה א"ל אחיו נשא גויה ומת ברוך שהרגו והוא ירד אחריו

III a5 אמ' רב יהוד' אמ' שמו' כשם שאסור לצא' מארץ ישר' לבבל כך אסור לצאת מבבל לשאר ארצות

רבה ורב יוסף דאמרי תרויהו אפי' מפומבדית' לבי כובי …

רבה ורב יוסף דאמ' תרויהו כשרין שבבבל ארץ ישר' קולטתן כשרין שבשאר ארצות בבל קולטתן

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

למאי אילימא ליוחסין והאמ' מר כל הארצות עיסה לארץ ישראל וארץ ישראל עיסה לבבל אלא לעינין קבורה

III a6 אמ' רב יהודה כל הדר בבבל כאילו דר בארץ ישראל שנ' הוי ציון המלטי יושבת בת בבל

III a7 אמ' אביי נקיטינן בבל לא חזיא חבליה דמשיח תרגום' אהוצל דבנימן וקרו ליה קרנא דשיזבתא

III b1 אמ' ר' אלעזר' מתים שבחוצה לארץ אינם חיים שנ' ונתתי צבי בארץ חיים ארץ שצביוני בה מתיה חיים שאין צביוני בה אין מתיה חיים

מתיב ר' אבא בר ממל ...

א"ל ר' מקרא אחר אני דורש נותן נשמה לעם עליה ורוח להול' בה

...

III b2 ולר' אלע' צדיקי' שבחוצה לארץ אינם חיים

א"ר אילא על ידי גילגול

מתקיף לה אבא סלא רבה גילגול לצדיקי' צער הוא

אמ' אביי מחילות נעשו' להם בקרקע

ונשאתני ממצרי' וקברתני בקבורתם אמר קרנא דברים בגו יודע היה יעקב אבינו שצדיק גמור היה ואם מתים שבחוצה לארץ חיים למה הטריח את בניו

שמא לא יזכה למחילות

כיוצא בדבר אתה אומ' ...

שלחו ליה אחוה לרבה יודע היה יעקב שצדיק היה וכו'

III c1 אמ' ר' אלעזר עמי הארצות אינן חיים שנ' מתים בל יחיו וגומ' ...

...

III c2 א"ר חייא בר' יוסף עתידין צדיקים שמבצבצין ועולים בירושלים ...

ואמר ר' חייא בר' יוסף עתידים צדיקים שיעמדו במלבושיהן ...

III c3 ואמ' ר' חיי' בר' יוסף עתיד' ארץ ישראל שתוציא גלוסקאות וכלי מילת ...

...

... זבת חלב ודבש שמנים מחלב ומתוקים מדבש

IV a ר' אלע' כי הוה סליק לארץ ישראל אמ' ...

ר' זירא כי הוה סליק לארץ ישראל ...

ר' אבא ... ; ר' חנינא ... ; ר' אמי ור' אסי ... ; ר' חייא בר גמדא ... .

IV b אמר ר' זירא <אמר> רבה בר ירמיה דור שבן דוד בא קטיגורי' בתלמידי חכמים

...

IV c אמ' רב חיי' בר אשי אמ' רב עתידין כל אילני סרק שבארץ ישראל שיטענו פירות ש' כי עץ נשא פריו תאנה וגפן נתנו חילם

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I a **Our masters related, "Always let a person reside in the Land of Israel, even in a city that is mostly gentile, and let him not reside outside the land, even in a city that is mostly Israelite,"**

I b for anyone who resides in the Land of Israel is like one who has a God and anyone who resides outside the land is like one who does not have a God, as it is said, '… to give you the Land of Canaan, to be unto you a God' [Leviticus 25:38].

I c «Then does one who resides in the Land of Israel have a God» and does anyone who does not reside in the land not have a God?! Rather—to express to you: anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry.

I d And so too it says regarding David, 'for they have driven me out today from clinging to the heritage of the Lord, saying, "Go, worship other gods" [1 Samuel 26:19].' Who said to David, 'Go, worship other gods'?! Rather—to express to you: anyone who resides outside the land—it is as though he were engaging in idolatry."

II a **R. Zeira would avoid Rav Yehudah because he wanted to ascend to the Land of Israel, for Rav Yehudah said, "Anyone who ascends from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive injunction, as is said, 'To Babylonia shall they be brought and there shall they be until the day I recall them, says the Lord' [Jeremiah 27:22]."**

II b And R. Zeira? That is written about [the] vessels of service.

II c And Rav Yehudah? Another verse is written: "I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem, by gazelles or by deer of the field [that you not disturb and not arouse this love before it wishes]" [Song of Songs 2:7].

II d And Rabbi Zeira? That [means] that Israel are not to ascend as a wall.

II e And Rav Yehudah? Another "I adjure" is written.

II f And Rabbi Zeira? He requires that in accordance with R. Yose b. R. Ḥanina, who said, "Why these three adjurations? One—that Israel not ascend as a wall; and one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured Israel that [they] not rebel against the nations of the world; and one—that the Holy One, blessed is He, adjured the nations of the world that [they] not excessively subjugate Israel."

II g And Rav Yehudah? "That you not disturb and not arouse" is written.

II h And Rabbi Zeira? He requires that in accordance with R. Levi, who said, "Why these six adjurations? Three—those that we have said. The others—that [they] not reveal the end, and that [they] not distance the end, and that [they] not reveal the mystery to the nations of the world."

II i "… By gazelles or by deer of the field …" R. Elazar said, "The Holy One, blessed is He, said to Israel, 'If you honor the adjuration, it is well, but if not, I [will] make your flesh forfeit like the gazelles and like the deer of the field.'"

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

III a1 **R. Elazar said, "Anyone who resides in the Land of Israel abides without sin, as is said, 'And an inhabitant shall not say, "I am ill." The nation that dwells there shall be forgiven of sin' [Isaiah 33:24]."**
Rabbah said to Rav Ashi, "We apply it to those who suffer from illnesses."

III a2 Rav Anan said, "Anyone who is buried in the Land of Israel—it is as though he [were] buried beneath the altar. Here is written, 'An altar of soil you shall make for me' [Exodus 20:24], and there is written, 'His soil shall atone [for] His people' [Deuternonomy 32:43]."

III a3 Ula would ascend regularly to the Land of Israel. He passed away outside the land. They came and told R. Elazar. He said, "You, Ula, on impure land you would die?!" They said to him, "His coffin is coming." He said to them, "[An instance where] it receives one while yet alive is not comparable to [an instance where] it receives one after death."

III a4 [There was] a certain man who was left a childless brother's widow in Bei Ḥoza'ah. He came before R. Ḥanina. He said to him, "What is [the law] with regard to descending and marrying her?" He said to him, "His [i.e., your] brother took a gentile and died—blessed is He who killed him!—and he [i.e., you] would descend after him?"

III a5 Rav Yehudah said [that] Shmuel had said, "Just as one is forbidden to depart the Land of Israel for Babylonia, thus one is forbidden to depart Babylonia for other lands."
Rabbah and Rav Yosef both say, "Even from Pumbedita to Bei Kovei …"
Rabbah and Rav Yosef both say, "The virtuous of Babylonia—the Land of Israel receives them. The virtuous who are in other lands—Babylonia receives them."
For what purpose? If one were to say for the purpose of pedigrees—but did the master not say, "All the lands are *'isah* relative to the Land of Israel, and the Land of Israel is *'isah* relative to Babylonia"? Rather—concerning burial.

III a6 Rav Yehudah said, "Anyone who resides in Babylonia—it is as though he were residing in the Land of Israel, as is said, 'Ho, [to] Zion, escape, you that dwells [with] the daughter of Babylon' [Zechariah 2:7]."

III a7 Abbaye said, "We have received as tradition: Babylonia will not see the pangs of the messiah." It was interpreted regarding Huẓal of Benjamin and was called the Corner of Refuge.

III b1 **R. Elazar said, "[The] dead who are outside the land are not to revive, as is said, 'I shall emplace *ẓevi* in the land of the living' [Ezekiel 26:20]: a land in which is my desire [*ẓivyon*]—its dead revive; in which my desire is not—its dead do not revive."**
R. Abba b. Memmel rejoined …
He said to him, "My master, I expound another verse: 'who gives a soul to the nation upon it and a spirit to those walking within it' [Isaiah 42:5]."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

…

III b2 Yet according to R. Elazar, the righteous who are outside the land are not to revive?
R. Ila said, "By rolling."
Abba Sala Rabbah challenges this: "Rolling would be a source of pain for the righteous!"
Abbaye said, "Subterranean passages are made for them in the earth."
"You shall carry me from Egypt and bury me in their grave." Karna said, "Cryptic things! Our father Jacob knew that he was a thoroughly righteous person, and if the righteous who are outside the land are to revive, why did he trouble his sons?
Perhaps he would not merit subterranean passages.
Similarly, you would say …"
The brothers of Rabbah sent to him, "Jacob knew that he was a thoroughly righteous person …"

III c1 R. Elazar said, "Boors are not to revive, as is said, 'The dead shall not live, [the inanimate shall not rise]' [Isaiah 26:14]."

…

III c2 R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef said, "[The] righteous are destined to ripple forth and arise in Jerusalem …"
And R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef said, "[The] righteous are destined to stand up in their garments …"

III c3 And R. Ḥiyya b. Yosef said, "The Land of Israel is destined to yield refined cakes and garments of fine wool …

…

"'Flowing with milk and honey'—fatter than milk and sweeter than honey." …

IV a R. Elazar, upon ascending to the Land of Israel, said …
R. Zeira, upon ascending to the Land of Israel …
R. Abba …; R. Ḥanina …; R. Ammi and R. Assi …; R. Ḥiyya b. Gamda

…

IV b R. Zeira said [that] Rabbah b. Yirmeyah ‹had said›, The generation when the son of David comes—a prosecution [*kategorya*] of scholars

…

IV c Rav Ḥiyya b. Ashi said [that] Rav had said, "All the non-fruit-bearing trees of the Land of Israel are destined to be laden with fruit, as is said, 'For the tree bears its fruit, the fig and vine give their bounty' [Joel 2:22]."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix B: Selected Variants in the Baraita at the Beginning of the Passage[95]

	Version B (according to copy G37)[97]	Prevalent version (according to Soncino 1487 edition)[96]
	תנו רבנן	תנו רבנן
I a	לעולם ידור[98] אדם בארץ ישראל אפילו בעיר שרובה גוים	לעולם ידור אדם בארץ ישראל אפי' בעיר שרובה גוים
	ואל ידור חוצה לארץ אפילו בעיר שרוב[ה] ישראל	ואל ידור בחוצה לארץ ואפי' בעיר שרובה ישראל
I b	שכל הדר בארץ ישראל «מעלה עליו הכת'»[99] **כאילו קיבל עליו עול שמים**[100]	שכל הדר בארץ ישראל **דומה כמי שיש לו אלוה** **וכל הדר בחוצה לארץ**[105] **דומה כמי שאין לו אלוד**
	[שנ'] לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלהים	שנ' לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלדי'[106]
I c	וכי הדר[101] בארץ ישראל יש לו אלוה	«וכי הדר בארץ ישראל יש לו אלוה»[107]
	וכ̊[ל שאינו] דר בארץ ישר'[102] אין לו אלו‹ה›	וכל שאינו דר בארץ[108] אין לו אלוה
	אלא לומר לך	אלא לומר לך
	כל שאינו דר בארץ ישר'[103] **לא קיבל עליו [עול] שמים**.[104]	כל הדר בחוצה לארץ[109] **כאילו עובד ע"ז**.
I d	וכן דויד או'	וכן בדוד הוא או'
	כי גרשוני היום מהסתפח בנחלת י'י לאמר לך עבוד אלהים אחרים̊	כי גרשוני היום מהסתפ' בנחלת ה' לאמר לך עבוד אלהי' אחרים
	וכי מי א' לו לדויד לך עבוד א'ים אחרים	מי א"ל לדוד לך עבוד אלהים אחרים
	אלא לומר לך כל **היוצא מארץ חוצה לארץ**	אלא לומר לך כל **הדר** בחוצה לארץ
	מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו עובד עבודה זרה	כאילו[110] עובד ע"ז

95. Text-marking conventions: ‹›: addition to the text by the copyist; ( ): erasure by the copyist; [ ]: physical defect (parenthetical reconstructions are intended to facilitate reading and should not be viewed as representing a proposed restoration of the text); å (letter with circle above): a letter whose decipherment is in doubt; ?: an illegible letter; « »: reconstructed text based on other witnesses.

96. This version is represented (with a few variations) in MS Munich Hebr. 95, MS Vatican Ebr. 113, MS Moscow, Ginsburg 1339, copy G68, the Soncino 1487 edition, and partially in MS St. Petersburg, Firkovich Evr. I 187. Designations of Genizah copies are according to the Talmud Bavli with *Dikduke soferim ha-shalem*: Ketubbot (Jerusalem: Yad Harav Herzog, 1977). Copy G68 includes two joined Genizah fragments, viz., Cambridge University Library T–S F 2 (1).33 and T–S F 2 (1).66. The text in the table, as noted above, is based on that of the Soncino 1487 edition. In one instance (c), I have supplied text that is absent in the Soncino edition according to that found in the other witnesses. The inserted words are bracketed with guillemets.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

97. This version is represented in two eastern Genizah copies, viz., G37 and G38; MS Vatican Ebr. 130; and partially in MS Firkovich. Fragment G37 is a joining of the two fragments, T–S F 2(2).20 and St. Petersburg Antonin, B 291. In G38, the primary fragment is New York, JTS ENA 2081/7, which is torn and lacks a substantial part of the text. According to Y. Sussmann, ed., *Thesaurus of Talmudic Manuscripts* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2012), 2:594, no. 6413, a companion to this fragment is T–S AS 93.566. In a recent update of the *Thesaurus of Talmudic Manuscripts* at http://www.genizah.org, fragment T–S AS 93.496 was added to this copy. However, additional inquiry is in order before the two AS fragments are incorporated with the New York fragment. As noted, version B in the table above is according to G37. Where the fragment is torn or illegible, I have augmented the text according to other witnesses or based on context. The insertions, bracketed with guillemets, are intended to facilitate reading and should not be viewed as representing a proposed restoration of the text. In one instance I have provided the version found in MS Vatican 130, rather than that of G37, in guillemets (see below).

98. MS Vatican 130: לעולם יחזר אדם וידור.

99. Thus, correctly, in MS Vatican 130: "Scripture represents him" (מעלה עליו הכת׳). G37 has "of him Scripture says" (עליו הכתוב או׳), a turn of phrase that functions to introduce a scriptural quotation and thus is inappropriate in his context. In all probability this term inadvertently found its way into G37 due to the words עליו הכתוב that are common to the two expressions. The version in G37 is characterized by the presence of several errors, mostly phonetic corruptions, which indicates that the scribe either wrote from dictation or transcribed a version that he had committed to memory. Several of these corruptions demonstrate that the scribe did not always understand the content of the material that he was transmitting (e.g., 107b: למדּ פסלה instead of לא מתפיס לה; פטרי טובי instead of פתריתו בה; 110b: על מה instead of אלמא [twice]; מכוליה instead of מקולי; משען instead of מה שאין. 111a: ושם תהי instead of ושמתיה; etc.). The mistaken version here (עליו הכתוב או׳), together with several additional phenomena that do not accord with a text written from dictation, indicates somewhat in favor of the likelihood that the scribe transmitted a version that he had committed to memory while taking some license, and with occasional errors. Take for example 110a: בהדין א׳ אדמון (הדין is not appropriate here), or instances of confusion between Hebrew and Aramaic: 110b: שכתיב ביה (instead of דכתיב ביה); 111b: בלבושיהון (twice: an Aramaic suffix appended to a Hebrew word).

100. MS Vatican 130: שכל הדר בארץ ישראל […ַ …]. G38: עול מלכות שמים. (For the version in Sifra, see appendix C below.) On עול מלכות שמים and עול שמים, see Eliashiv Fraenkel, "Kabbalat 'ol malkhut shamayim," *'Oqimta* 2 (2014): 1–8, and sources cited there.

101. MS Firkovich: …וכי תעלה על דעתך שכל הדר.

102. Fragment G38: ??עֹ?ן כ? (the original apparently read בארץ כנען). MS Vatican 130: הדר בכל הארצות.

103. MS Firkovich: שכל מי שאינו דר בארץ ישראל. MS Vatican 130: כל מי שאינו דר בארץ ישר׳. G38: […]מארץ לחוצה לאר[. …], concerning which see below.

104. G37: שמים […]לא קיבל עליו. MS Vatican 130, MS Firkovich: לא קיבל עליו עול שמים. G38: physical defect.

In the prior section (b), MS Firkovich follows the prevalent version: שכל הדר בארץ ישראל דומה כמי שיש לו אלוה וכל הדר בחוצה לארץ דּמֵה כמי שאין לו אלוה.

105. MS Munich 95: וכל מי שאינו דר בארץ.

106. MS Vatican 113: לתת לכם את ארץ כנע׳ אני י״י א׳היכם.

107. The bracketed text appears in all direct textual witnesses except the Soncino 1487 edition. (The sentence also is absent from a fragment containing *Ma'amadot* liturgy, Nahum Collection 253/270–277.) It is impossible to ascertain what text appeared here in G68 due to physical damage to the fragment, but it is evident from the size of the affected area that even before the fragment became torn, there was a significant lacuna at this point. (The text continues with the quotation from David: […] הסתפח בנחלת י״י לאמר לך עבוד אלהים אחרים . .)

108. MS Vatican 113: …בארץ כנען. MS Munich 95: …בארץ ישראל. MS Moscow: […]רץ בחוֹצֹה ל?ֹ (presumably the original read בחוצה לארץ [והדר]).

109. MS Vatican 113: כל מי שאינו דר בארׄ כנע׳. MS Munich 95: כל שאין בארץ. MS Moscow: […]בחוֹצֹה לֹארץ. In G68 here there is a sizeable lacuna.

110. MS Vatican 113, MS Munich 95: …מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix C: The Baraita at the Beginning of the Passage and Its Parallels

	Bavli: Prevalent version	Bavli: Version B	T. Avodah Zarah 4:5[111]	Sifra, *Be-har*, *par.* 5:4[112]	Mekhilta Devarim[113]
					… וישבתם בה ושמרתם לעשות
					אמרו **ישיבת ארץ יש' שקולה כנגד כל מצות שבתורה**
					אֹ[מ'] ר' יונתן נודר אני מחוצה לארץ לעולם
					ט' וכבר היה … «וירש' או' ויש' בה ושמרת[ ] לעשות את החק' הא' ואת המש' **אמרו ישיבת ארץ יש' שקולה כנגד כל המצות» שבתורה** חזרו ובאו להן לארץ.
		תנו רבנן			**י' מיכן אמרו**
I a	**תנו רבנן** לעולם ידור אדם בארץ ישראל אפי' בעיר שרובה גוים ואל ידור בחוצה לארץ ואפי' בעיר שרובה ישראל	לעולם ידור אדם בארץ ישראל אפילו בעיר שרובה גוים ואל ידור חוצה לארץ אפילו בעיר שרוב[ה] ישראל	ישרה אדם בארץ ישר' אפי' בעיר שרובה גוים ולא בחוצה «לארץ»[114] אפי' בעיר שכולה ישראל		ידור אדן בארץ יש' בעיר שכולה גוים ואל ידור אדן בחוצה לארץ בעיר שכולה יש'
			מלמד שישיבת ארץ ישראל שקולה כנגד כל מצות שבתורה והקבור בארץ כאלו קבור תחת המזבח		הקבור בה כקבור בירוש' והקבור בירוש' כקבור תחת כסא הכבוד

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*contd.*)

Mekhilta Devarim	Sifra, *Be-har*, *par.* 5:4	T. Avodah Zarah 4:5	Bavli: Version B	Bavli: Prevalent version
יא' וכן הוא אומ' ונתתי צבי בארץ חיים ארץ שמיתיה חיים תחילה לכל הארצות יש אומ' ארבעים יום ויש אומ' ארבעים שנה שנ' נותן נשמה לעם עליה וג'[115]		לא יצא אדן בחוצה לארץ אלא אם כן היו חטין סאתים בסלע אמ' ר' שמעון במי דברים אמורים בזמן שאינו מוצא ליקח אבל בזמן שמוצא ליקח אפי' סאה בסלע לא יצא וכן היה ר' שמעון או' אלימלך מגדולי הדור ומפרנסי צבור היה ועל שיצא לחוץ לארץ מת הוא ובניו ברעב והיו כל ישראל קיימין על אדמתן שנ' ותהם כל העיר עליהן מלמד שכל העיר קיימת ומת הוא ובניו ברעב		

Continued

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	Bavli: Prevalent version	Bavli: Version B	T. Avodah Zarah 4:5	Sifra, *Be-har*, *par.* 5:4	Mekhilta Devarim
I b			הרי הוא או' ושבתי בשלום אל בית אבי שאין תל' לו' והיה ייי לי לאלים ואו' לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלים		
	שכל הדר בארץ ישראל **דומה כמי שיש לו אלוה** וכל הדר בחוצה לארץ **דומה כמי שאין לו אלוה**	שכל הדר בארץ ישראל עליו הכתוב או' כאילו **קיבל עליו עול שמים**	כל זמן שאתם בארץ כנען **הרי אני לכם אלוה** אין אתם בארץ כנען **כביכול אין אני לכם אלוה**		
	שנ' לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלהים	[שנ'] לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלהים		לתת לכם את ארץ כנען להיות לכם לאלהים	
I c	«וכי הדר בארץ ישראל יש לו אלוה» וכל שאינו דר בארץ אין לו אלוה	וכי הדר בארץ ישראל יש לו אלוה וכ[ל שאינו] דר בארץ ישר' אין לו אלו«ה»			
	אלא לומר לך	אלא לומר לך		מיכן אמרו כל היושב בארץ ישראל **מקבל עליו מלכות שמים**[116]	
	כל הדר בחוצה לארץ **כאילו עובד ע"ז**	כל שאינו דר בארץ ישר' **לא קיבל עליו [עול] שמים**		וכל היוצא לחוצה לארץ **כאילו עובד עבודה זרה**	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	Bavli: Prevalent version	Bavli: Version B	T. Avodah Zarah 4:5	Sifra, *Be-har*, *par.* 5:4	Mekhilta Devarim
			וכן הוא או' כארבעים אלף חלוצי הצבא עברו ואומ' כי נתן בידי את ישבי וגו' וכי עלת על דעתך שישראל מכבשין את הארץ לפני המקום אלא כל זמן שהן עליה כילו נכבשת אינן עליה כילו (נכבשת) אינה מכובשת		
I d	וכן בדוד הוא או' כי גרשוני היום מהסתפח בנחלת ה' לאמר לך עבוד אלהים אחרים מי א"ל לדוד לך עבוד אלהים אחרים אלא לומר לך	וכן דויד או' כי גרשוני היום מהסתפח בנחלת י"י לאמר לך עבוד אלהים אחרים וכי מי א' לו לדויד לך עבוד א'ים אחרים אלא לומר לך	וכן דוד הוא או' כי גרשוני היום וגו' וכי עלת על דעתך שדוד המלך עובד ע"ז היה אלא שהיה דוד דורש ואו'	וכן בדוד הוא אומר[117] ארורים הם לפני יי' כי גרשוני היום מהסתפח בנחלת יי' לאמר לך עבוד אלהים אחרים וכי עלת על דעתינו[118] שדוד המלך עובד עבודה זרה אלא שהיה דורש ואומר[119] **כל היושב בארץ ישראל מקבל עליו מלכות שמים**[120] **וכל היוצא לחוצה לארץ**[121] כאלו עובד ע"ז	
	כל הדר בחוצה לארץ כאילו עובד ע"ז	**כל היוצא מארץ חוצה לארץ** מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו עובד עבודה זרה	**כל המניח ארץ ישראל** בשעת שלום ויוצא כילו עובד ע"ז		

Continued

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bavli: Prevalent version	Bavli: Version B	T. Avodah Zarah 4:5	Sifra, *Be-har*, *par.* 5:4	Mekhilta Devarim
		וכן הוא או' ונטעתם בארץ הזאת באמת «בכל לבי ובכל נפשי כל זמן שהן עליה כאילו נטוען הן לפני באמת בכל לבי ובכל נפשי הא אינן עליה כאילו»[122] אינן נטוען לפני באמת לא בכל לבי ולא בכל נפשי		

111. Insertion is from MS Vienna. Pronounced textual variants are indicated in nn.
112. Ed. Weiss, 109c. Insertion is according to Venice 1545 edition. (Text is absent in MS Vatican 66.) Pronounced textual variants are indicated in nn.
113. Kahana, *Kit'e midreshe ha-halakhah*, 347. The supplemental text bracketed with guillemets is according to Kahana, "Ma'alat yeshivat 'Ereẓ Yisra'el," 505–7.
114. Thus in MS Erfurt, printed editions, and T–S Or. 1080.13.69. MS Vienna: בחוצה לעיר.
115. Cf. B. Ketubbot 111a.
116. Firkovich fragment, Ebr. II A 270: מקבל עליו (עול) מל[ ]ת שמים.
117. Most witnesses: וכן דוד אומר. MS London: וכן דוד הוא אומר. MS Parma: וכן אמ' דוד.
118. MS Vatican 31: וכי תעלה על דעתך. MS London: וכי עלתה על דעתך. Firkovich fragment: וכי עלתה על דעתנו.
119. MS London, MS Oxford: אלא ללמדך. MS Vatican ebr. 31: absent.
120. Firkovich fragment: מקבל שם שמים.
121. MS Parma: וכל היושב בחוצה לארץ.
122. Bracketed text is according to MS Erfurt.

Appendix D: Section 2—The Anecdote of Rav Yehudah and R. Zeira and Its Discussion: A Textual Comparison of the Printed Version and the Version of Genizah Copy G37

	Soncino 1487 edition	Copy G37
II a	ר' זירא הוה קמישתמיט מיניה דרב יהודה דבעא למיסק לארץ ישר' דא' רב יהודה כל העולה מבבל לארץ ישראל עובר בעשה שנ' בבלה יובאו ושמה יהיו עד יום פקדי אותם נאם ה'	ורב זעוֹרא הוה קא משתמט מינ?ה דרב יהודה דבעי מיסק לארעא דישראל א' רב יהודה כל העולה מבבל לאר?ץ ישראל עובר בעושה שנ' בבלה יובאו ושמה יְהיוּ עד יום פ' א' נ' י'י
II b	ור' זירא ההוא בכלי שרת כתיב	ור' זעירא ה?? בכלם כתיבְ
II c	ורב יהודה כתיב קרא אחרינ' השבע' אתכם בנו' ירושל' בצבאו' או באיילות השדה וגו'	רב יהודה כְּתוֹב קְריאה אחורנא השבעתי אתכֶם בְּנוֹת יירְשלים בְּ?? [..]ילוֹ? ה?הּ אִם תעירו אם תעוררו את האהבה עד שתחפץ
II d	ור' זירא ההוא שלא יעלו ישראל בחומה	ור' זעורא ההוא [.]לֹא יעלוֹ חוֹמה :
II e	ורב יהודה השבעתי אחרינא כת'	רב יהודה כתיב (?) קְרֵיָא אחורנה השבעתי אתכם בנות ירושלים וגו'
II f	ור' זירא ההוא מיבעי ליה לכדר' יוסי בר' חנינא דא' שלש שבועות הללו למה אחת שלא יעלו ישר' בחומה ואחת שהשביע הק"בה את ישר' שלא ימרדו באומו' העולם ואחת שהשביע הק"בה את אומות העולם שלא ישתעבדו בהן בישר' יותר מדאי	[...] הא מבעי ליה לכי דר' (?) יוסי בר חנינא דאמ' ר' יוסי בר חנינא שלוש שבועות [..]ה למה אחת שהישבע ה'ק'בה' את ישראל שלא ימרדו באומות העולם ואחת שיהישביע ה'קבה' את אומות העולם שלא ישעבדון את ישראל יותר מִ<י>דַּי ואחת שלא יעֲלוֹ חימה:
II g	ורב יהודה אם תעירו ואם תעוררו כת'	ורב יהודה אם תעירו אם תעוררו כת'
II h	ור' זירא מיבעי ליה לכדר' לוי דא' שש שבועות הללו למה תלתא הני דאמרן אינך שלא יגלו את הקץ ושלא ירחקו את הקץ ושלא יגלו הסוד לאומו' העולם	ורבי זעירא מבעי ליה לכדרבי לוי דאמ' ר' לוי שש שבועות הללו למה תלת הני דא' ואידך שלא יגלו את הקץ שלא ירַחקון את הקץ שלא יגלון סוד העיבור
II i	בצבאו' או באיילו' השד'	מאי כצבאות או בְּאילות (עֲ)<ה>שדה
	א"ר אלע' אמ' להם הק"בה לישר' אם אתם מקיימי' את השבועה מוטב ואם לאו אני מתיר את בשרכ' כצבאו' ובאילו' השד'	א' ר' אלעזר אמַר להם הקבה לישראל אם אתם שומרים את השבועה מוטב ואם לאו הריאני מתיר את בשרכם כצבאות וכאילות השדה:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0364009417000411 Published online by Cambridge University Press