

**The Soncino Babylonian Talmud**



# PESOCHIM

**Book II**

**Folios 33a-60a**

**TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH  
WITH NOTES**

**CHAPTERS III - V**

*Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771*

[www.613etc.com](http://www.613etc.com)

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

## Pesachim 33a

If he deliberately transgressed in respect of a trespass-offering,<sup>1</sup> [he is punished] by death? It is Rabbi. For it was taught: If he deliberately transgressed in respect of a trespass-offering, — Rabbi said: [He is punished] by death; while the Sages maintain: By a warning.<sup>2</sup> What is Rabbi's reason? —

Said R. Abbahu: He derives identity of law from the fact that 'sin' is written here and in the case of Terumah:<sup>3</sup> just as Terumah involves death, so trespass involves death. And from that [it also follows]: just as Terumah [involves punishment] for as much as an olive, so trespass [involves punishment] for as much as an olive.<sup>4</sup>

Now R. Papa demurred:<sup>5</sup> How do you know that Rabbi holds as the Rabbis;<sup>6</sup> perhaps he agrees with Abba Saul, who said: If it possesses the worth of a Perutah, even if it does not contain as much as an olive?<sup>7</sup> But surely it was R. Papa who said [that] Abba Saul requires both? Hence this proves that he retracted.

Mar the son of Rabina said, This is what he means: No: if you say thus of other precepts — where the unintentional is not treated as intentional, for if he intended cutting what was detached but cut what is attached, he is not culpable;<sup>9</sup> will you say [the same] in the case of trespass, where if he intended to warn himself with wool shearings of Hullin but warmed himself with the wool shearings of a burnt-offering he is liable to a trespass-offering?

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: He means this: If you say thus in the case of other precepts, that is because he who is not engaged therein is not declared culpable like he who is engaged therein, for if he intended picking up that which was detached but he plucked<sup>10</sup> that which is attached [instead], he is not culpable;<sup>11</sup> will you say [the same] of trespass, where if he stretched out his hand to

take a vessel and [incidentally] anointed his hand with holy oil,<sup>12</sup> he is liable for trespass?

The Master said: 'When is this said? When he separates Terumah and it became leaven. But if he separates Terumah of leaven on Passover, all agree that it is not holy.' Whence do we know this? — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, Scripture saith, [The first-fruits of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thy oil ...] shalt thou give to him:<sup>13</sup> but not for its light.<sup>14</sup>

R. Huna son of R. Joshua objected: One must not separate Terumah from unclean [produce] for clean; yet if he separates [thus] unwittingly, his Terumah is valid. Yet why? Let us say, 'for him, but not for his light'? — There is no difficulty: There it enjoyed a time of fitness,<sup>15</sup> whereas here<sup>16</sup> it did not enjoy a time of fitness.<sup>17</sup> And how is it conceivable that it had no time of fitness? E.g. if it became leaven whilst attached [to the soil].<sup>18</sup> But if it became leaven when detached,<sup>19</sup> would it indeed be holy?<sup>20</sup> — Yes, he replied: 'the sentence is by the decree of the watchers, and the matter by the word of the holy ones';<sup>21</sup> and thus do they rule<sup>22</sup> in the academy in accordance with my view.

When R. Huna the son of R. Joshua came,<sup>23</sup>

(1) I.e., he deliberately transgressed where an unwitting transgression involves a trespass-offering.

(2) I.e., flagellation. This is a technical term to denote that he has infringed an ordinary negative injunction, for which he is flagellated.

(3) Trespass: If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord (Lev. V, 15); Terumah: Lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore (Ibid. XXII, 9).

(4) This is the 'axe': according to this R. Hiyya b. Abin is obviously wrong.

(5) In objection to 'those who swung the axe'.

(6) That as much as an olive is the minimum to involve payment or punishment in the case of Terumah.

(7) Hence the same applies to trespass too, and thus R. Hiyya b. Abin's answer is correct.

(8) The Tanna of the cited teaching.

(9) This refers to the Sabbath, when one must not cut or pluck produce growing in the soil ('attached'). In the present case he is not liable to

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

a sin-offering, which is only due when a man sins in ignorance, i.e., where he intended to do what he did, but did not know that it was forbidden.

(10) Lit., 'cut'.

(11) Here he was not engaged in plucking or cutting at all.

(12) There too he was not engaged in anointing at all.

(13) Deut. XVII, 4.

(14) I.e., the priest must be able to consume it himself and not have to burn it for its heat or light. Hence if it is separated in a state in which it cannot be eaten, as here, it does not become Terumah.

(15) Before it became unclean it was fit to be separated as Terumah.

(16) In the case of the leaven Terumah.

(17) It was not fit to be Terumah before Passover as it goes on explaining.

(18) Whilst before it is harvested it cannot be declared Terumah.

(19) I.e., before Passover, so that it was fit to be Terumah before the Festival.

(20) If separated as Terumah during Passover.

(21) Dan. IV, 14; i.e., this is the view of great teachers.

(22) מוריד implies to give a practical, as opposed to a mere theoretical, ruling.

(23) Var. lec. omit, 'came' v. Rashi.

## Pesachim 33b

he said, Scripture saith, The first-fruits [of thy corn, etc.], [implying] that its residue is distinct [in that it becomes permitted] to the Israelite,<sup>1</sup> [thus] this<sup>2</sup> is excluded, since its residue is not [so] distinct.<sup>3</sup>

R. Ala b. R. 'Awia sat before R. Joshua and he sat and said in R. Johanan's name: If grapes are defiled, one may tread them out less than an egg in quantity at a time, and their wine is fit for libations.<sup>4</sup> This proves that he holds that the juice is indeed stored up;<sup>5</sup> [consequently] when is it [the juice] defiled? When he expresses it; [but] when he expresses it, its standard quantity [for defiling] is absent.<sup>6</sup> If so, [he can tread] as much as an egg too, for we learned: If a man unclean through a corpse squeezes out olives or grapes exactly as much as an egg in quantity, they are clean?<sup>7</sup> — There it is [thus] if he did it;<sup>8</sup> here it is in the first instance [when he must not tread as much as an egg]

for fear lest he come to tread<sup>9</sup> more than an egg.<sup>10</sup>

Said R. Hisda to him, Who needs you and R. Johanan your teacher: whither then has their uncleanness<sup>11</sup> gone? This proves that he holds that the juice is indeed absorbed,<sup>12</sup> and since the [solid] eatable is defiled, the juice too is defiled. And do you not hold that the juice is stored up? he replied. Surely we learned: If he who is unclean through a corpse squeezes out olives and grapes exactly as much as an egg in quantity, they are clean. Now it is well if you say that the liquid is stored up: for that reason it is clean. But if you say [that] it is absorbed, why is it clean? —

Said he to him: We discuss here grapes which were not made fit;<sup>13</sup> when [then] do they become fit? when he squeezes them;<sup>14</sup> but when he squeezes them the standard quantity [for defilement] is diminished.<sup>15</sup> For if you should not say thus, [them] when it was taught, 'To what is this like? To Terumah of mulberries and grapes which were defiled, which is not permitted to him either for eating or for burning.'<sup>16</sup> — but surely it may be eaten too, for if he wishes, he can tread them out less than an egg at a time?<sup>17</sup> — Said Raba: It is a preventive measure,<sup>18</sup> lest he come to a stumbling-block through them.<sup>19</sup>

Abaye said to him, Yet do we fear a stumbling-block? Surely it was taught: One may light [a fire] with bread or oil of Terumah which was defiled!<sup>20</sup> — The bread he casts among the wood, he replied, and the oil of Terumah he pours into a repulsive vessel.<sup>21</sup> [It was stated in] the text: 'One may light [a fire] with bread or oil of Terumah which was defiled'.

Abaye said in Hezekiah's name, and Raba said, The School of R. Isaac b. Martha said in R. Huna's name: They learned this of bread only, but not of wheat, lest he come to a stumbling-block through it.<sup>22</sup> But R. Johanan said: Even wheat.<sup>23</sup> But why? Let us fear lest he come to a stumbling-block through it? —

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

As R. Ashi said [elsewhere].

- (1) I.e., by giving the first-fruits, viz., the Terumah to the priest, the residue becomes permitted to the Israelite.
- (2) Leaven separated as Terumah during Passover.
- (3) The residue, being leaven, remains forbidden to the Israelite.
- (4) On the altar. Unclean food less than an egg in quantity cannot defile other eatables. Hence when he treads out the grapes in such small quantities, there is never enough to defile the exuded juice, and the wine manufactured therefrom is clean, and consequently fit for libations on the altar, for which, of course, only undefiled wine is valid.
- (5) It is not joined, as it were, to the outer skin and part of it, but like a liquid that is kept in a vessel. For if it were held to be absorbed and part of the skin, it would become unclean simultaneously with the skin.
- (6) As explained on p. 152, n. 14.
- (7) This person defiles food, and the food in turn, if not less than an egg in quantity, defiles liquids. Here the man does not touch the expressed juice. Now after the first drop issues the residue is less than the necessary minimum and therefore it does not defile the liquid that follows.
- (8) If he squeezes as much as an egg, it is clean.
- (9) I.e., tread out.
- (10) If he comes to ask what to do, he is told to tread it less than an egg at a time. For if he is permitted to tread out exactly as much as an egg, he may exceed it, thus rendering the whole unclean.
- (11) Of the grapes.
- (12) As part of the grape, and does not stand separate.
- (13) To become unclean. Before an eatable can become unclean it must have had moisture upon it.
- (14) I.e., the first drop which exudes and touches the outer skin makes the grapes fit to become unclean.
- (15) For after the first drop has oozed out, less than an egg in quantity is left.
- (16) V. supra 32a.
- (17) If we assume that the liquid is merely stored up. Hence it follows that the liquid is absorbed and is unclean simultaneously with the outer skins of the mulberries and grapes.
- (18) Sc. thus denying him the right to squeeze them out in such small quantities.
- (19) He may eat them whilst treading them.
- (20) And we do not fear that he may come to eat it.
- (21) So that in both cases he is not likely to eat it.
- (22) Even if wheat is thrown among wood it does not become repulsive.
- (23) Is permitted.

## Pesachim 34a

It refers to boiled [grains]. so that they are repulsive; so here too it refers to boiled [grains] which are repulsive.<sup>1</sup>

And where was R. Ashi's [explanation] stated? In reference to what R. Abin son of R. Aha said in R. Isaac's name: Abba Saul was the baker<sup>2</sup> in Rabbi's house, and they used to heat him hot water with wheat of defiled Terumah, wherewith to knead dough in purity. But why? Let us fear lest he come to a stumbling-block through it?<sup>3</sup> — Said R. Ashi: It refers to boiled [grains], which are repulsive.

Abaye b. Abin and R. Hanania b. Abin studied Terumoth<sup>4</sup> at Rabbah's academy. Rabbah b. Mattenah met them [and] asked them, What have you discussed in Terumoth, at the Master's academy? —

Said they to him, But what is your difficulty? He replied. We learned: Plants of Terumah<sup>5</sup> which were defiled, and he [their owner] replanted them, are clean in that they do not defile [other eatables],<sup>6</sup> but they are forbidden to be eaten [as Terumah].<sup>7</sup> But since they are clean in that they do not defile, why are they forbidden to be eaten? —

Said they to him, Thus did Rabbah say: What is meant by 'forbidden'? They are forbidden to lay Israelites. Now what does he inform us? That that which grows of Terumah is [itself] Terumah! [But] we have [already] learned it [elsewhere]: That which grows of Terumah is Terumah?<sup>8</sup> And should you answer: It refers to the second growth,<sup>9</sup> and what does he inform us? [That this law holds good] in respect of that whose seed<sup>10</sup> is not destroyed?<sup>11</sup> But surely we learned this too: [In the case of] Tebel, that which grows out of it is permitted in a species whose seed is destroyed<sup>12</sup> but in the case of a species whose seed is not destroyed, even its second growth<sup>13</sup> is forbidden for eating!<sup>14</sup> — They were silent.

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

Said they to him, Have you heard anything about this? Thus did R. Shesheth say, he answered, what does 'forbidden' mean? They are forbidden to priests, since they became unfit [for eating] through [his] mental neglect.<sup>15</sup> That is correct on the view that mental neglect is an intrinsic disqualification,<sup>16</sup> then it is well. But on the view that mental neglect is a disqualification of defilement,<sup>17</sup> what can be said?<sup>18</sup> For it was stated, [As to] mental neglect: R. Johanan said, It is a disqualification of defilement; while R. Simeon b. Lakish said, It is an intrinsic disqualification.<sup>19</sup> 'R. Johanan said, It is a disqualification of defilement', for if Elijah should come and declare it clean,<sup>20</sup> we heed him.<sup>21</sup> 'R. Simeon b. Lakish said, It is an intrinsic disqualification', for if Elijah should come and declare it clean, we do not heed him.

R. Johanan raised an objection to R. Simeon b. Lakish: R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Beroka said: There was a small passage between the stairway and the altar at the west of the stairway, whither they used to throw disqualified bird sin-offerings until [the flesh] became disfigured<sup>22</sup> and then they passed out to the place of burning.<sup>23</sup> Now it is well if you say that [mental neglect] is a disqualification of uncleanness: therefore it requires disfigurement, lest Elijah may come and declare it clean.<sup>24</sup> But if you say that it is an intrinsic disqualification, what is the need of disfigurement? Surely it was taught, This is the general rule:

- (1) When thrown among the wood.
- (2) Lit., 'mixer' (of dough).
- (3) If the unclean wheat is kept for that purpose, as above.
- (4) The Tractate on the laws of Terumah.
- (5) E.g., cabbages and leeks which were separated as Terumah.
- (6) Because the planting in the ground removes their uncleanness.
- (7) Maharam deletes the bracketed passage. — It is now assumed that the prohibition refers to priests, and they may not be eaten because they are defiled Terumah, v. Ter. IX, 7.

(8) Even in the case of a species whose original seed rots away in the earth.

(9) Lit., 'what is growth of what is grown'.

(10) I.e., the original stock.

(11) E.g., an onion, the original stock of which remains when it is planted. Now its original leaves grow larger, and this is referred to as the growth. But in addition it sends out fresh shoots altogether, which never were Terumah: these are referred to as the second growth, and we are informed that even these are Terumah.

(12) E.g., if Tebel of wheat is sown the crop is not Tebel. Before produce becomes Tebel one may make a light meal of it through he has not yet rendered the tithe and Terumah; but nothing whatsoever may be eaten of it when it reaches the stage of Tebel. Though that which grows from Terumah remains Terumah even if its seed is destroyed, that is merely a Rabbinical stringency, lest the priestly dues are thus evaded. But that which grows of Tebel is not Tebel but ordinary produce of which a light meal may be enjoyed until it becomes Tebel, which happens when it is heaped up in a stack.

(13) As explained in n. 7.

(14) Because it retains the same status as that of its parent stock. The same logically applies to Terumah that is sown.

(15) And not because it is defiled Terumah. The priest must always keep the Terumah in mind; v. Num. XVIII, 8: behold, I have given thee the charge of mine heave offerings — 'charge' implies that

(16) I.e., sacred food, even if proved not to have been defiled, becomes unfit thereby, because this neglect is in itself a disqualification.

(17) I.e., it is not a disqualification in itself, but merely because while the priest was not thinking about it, it might have become defiled.

(18) For it has now been established that even when it is certainly unclean it regains its cleanliness when replanted.

(19) [This question remains unanswered, v. R. Hananel.]

(20) Elijah was regarded as the future resolver of all doubts; cf. B.M., Sonc. ed. p. 6, n. 2.

(21) Declaring the Terumah fit to be eaten.

(22) I.e., by being kept overnight and thus becoming Nothar (v. Glos.)

(23) The reference is to the offerings disqualified through mental neglect.

(24) In which case it should not have been burnt. But when it is disfigured it must be burnt in any case.

## Pesachim 34b

Wherever its disqualification is in itself, it must be burnt immediately; [if it is] in the



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

blood<sup>1</sup> or in its owner,<sup>2</sup> [the flesh] must become disfigured and [then] it goes out to the place of burning. — he must think of it. The Terumah, having once become defiled, however, the priest would dismiss it from his mind, as he would abandon the hope of using it. Said he to him: This Tanna is a Tanna of the School of Rabbah b. Abbuha<sup>3</sup> who maintained: Even Piggul<sup>4</sup> requires disfigurement.<sup>5</sup>

He [R. Johanan] raised an objection to him: If the flesh became unclean or disqualified, or if it passed without the curtains,<sup>6</sup> R. Eliezer said: He [the priest] must sprinkle [the blood];<sup>7</sup> R. Joshua said: He must not sprinkle [the blood].<sup>8</sup> Yet R. Joshua admits that if he does sprinkle [it], [the sacrifice] is accepted.<sup>9</sup> Now, what does ‘disqualified’ mean? Is it not through mental neglect?<sup>10</sup> Now, it is well if you say that it is a disqualification of uncleanness, then it is conceivable that the head-plate makes it accepted.<sup>11</sup> But if you say that it is an intrinsic disqualification why is it accepted?<sup>12</sup> What does ‘disqualified’ mean? It was disqualified by a Tebul yom.<sup>13</sup> If so, it is identical with ‘unclean?’ There are two kinds of uncleanness.<sup>14</sup>

When Rabin went up,<sup>15</sup> he reported this teaching<sup>16</sup> with reference to the Terumah plants before R. Jeremiah, whereupon he observed: The Babylonians are fools. Because they dwell in a land of darkness<sup>17</sup> they engage in dark [obscure] discussions.<sup>18</sup> Have you not heard this [dictum] of R. Simeon b. Lakish in R. Oshaia's name: If the water of the Festival was defiled<sup>19</sup> and he made level contact and then sanctified it, it is clean; if he sanctified it and then made level contact, it is unclean.<sup>20</sup> Now consider: this is ‘sowing’;<sup>21</sup> what does it matter whether he made level contact and then sanctified it or he sanctified it and then made level contact? This proves that ‘sowing’ has no effect upon hekdes<sup>22</sup>; here too sowing has no effect upon Terumah.<sup>23</sup>

R. Dimi sat and reported this teaching.<sup>24</sup> Said Abaye to him, Does he R. Oshaia mean [that]

he sanctified it in a vessel, but if [merely] verbally the Rabbis did not set a higher standard;<sup>25</sup> or perhaps for verbal [sanctification]<sup>26</sup> too, the Rabbis set a higher standard? — I have not heard this, he replied, [but] I have heard something similar to it.

For R. Abbahu said in R. Johanan's name: If grapes were defiled and he trod them and then sanctified them,<sup>27</sup> they are clean;<sup>28</sup> if he sanctified them and then trod them, they are unclean. Now grapes are [a case of] verbal sanctification, yet even so the Rabbis set a higher standard!<sup>29</sup> —

Said R. Joseph: You speak of grapes! We treat here of grapes of Terumah,<sup>30</sup> their verbal sanctification is being tantamount to the sanctification of a vessel.<sup>31</sup> But those that require a vessel [for sanctification,<sup>32</sup> where they are sanctified] verbally [maybe] the Rabbis did not set a higher standard. ‘If he trod them’ — [does that mean] even in great quantity? But did R. Johanan say thus?

Surely R. Johanan said: if grapes are defiled, he may tread them out less than an egg in quantity at a time?<sup>33</sup> — If you wish I can say that here too [it means] less than an egg at a time. Alternatively, I can answer: There the case is that they [the grapes] had come into contact with a first degree [of uncleanness], so that they [the grapes] are a second. But here they come into contact with a second degree, so that they are a third.<sup>34</sup>

Raba said: We too learned [thus]:<sup>35</sup> And he shall put thereto running [living] water in a vessel:<sup>36</sup> [this teaches] that its running must be [directly] into a vessel.<sup>37</sup> ‘And he shall put’ — this proves that it is detached, but surely this is attached!<sup>38</sup>

(1) E.g., if the blood was spilled before it could be sprinkled.

(2) E.g., if he became unclean before the Passover could be eaten and there were no others available to eat it, as the Passover may be eaten only by those registered for it.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(3) [R. Hananel seems to omit 'is a ... who'. R. Simeon b. Lakish could certainly not refer to the School of Rabbah b. Abbuha, who was a disciple of Rab.]

(4) V. Glos. There the flesh itself is certainly disqualified.

(5) 73b.

(6) The partitions of the Temple corresponding to those of the Tabernacle (Jast.). Thus 'without the curtains' means without the enclosures of the Temple Court. This refers to sacrifices of the higher sanctity (v. p. 108, n. 2), whose flesh might not be eaten without these enclosures.

(7) He holds that the blood must be sprinkled even when there is no flesh.

(8) He holds that the blood is dependent on the flesh.

(9) This is a technical term denoting that the sacrifice fulfils its purpose.

(10) For there is no other disqualification, since defilement is stated separately. It cannot mean a disqualification through an illegitimate intention, e.g., if the officiating priest expressed his intention to eat the flesh outside the boundaries or after the time allotted for its eating, for then the blood too is disqualified and can certainly not be sprinkled.

(11) The head-plate worn by the High Priest makes atonement in such a case, even if the flesh is definitely unclean; v. supra 16b. Nevertheless R. Joshua rules that the blood must not be sprinkled at the outset, for he holds that the acceptability conferred by the head-plate is only if it was sprinkled, but it may not be sprinkled in the first place in reliance on the head-plate.

(12) For the head-plate cannot make atonement for such a disqualification.

(13) V. Glos. His touch disqualifies it, as he is not really clean until evening falls.

(14) V. Mishnah supra 14a and note a.l.

(15) From Babylonia to Palestine.

(16) Sc. of R. Shesheth.

(17) Babylonia is possibly so called on account of the Parsees (fire-worshippers). who forbade the Jews to have any light in their dwellings on their (the Parsees') festivals.

(18) I.e. they discuss laws without knowing their true meanings.

(19) 'Festival' without a further determination always means the Feast of Tabernacles. The 'water of the Festival' is that used for libations each day which was drawn the previous evening with great ceremony and joy. Here the reference is to the water for the Sabbath libation; fresh water could not be brought on the Sabbath, and therefore this water had to be made clean.

(20) Unclean water can be purified by placing it in a vessel and immersing the vessel in a Mikweh (ritual bath) until the water in the vessel is level with and just touches the water of the Mikweh. This is called Hashshakah (lit. 'kissing') and the

unclean water thereby becomes one with the Mikweh, which of course is clean. The water libation was sanctified by formal dedication, or by being poured into a sacred service vessel.

(21) The process of leveling is regarded as 'sowing', as though the water were sown in the Mikweh, just as unclean produce becomes clean if it is resown in the earth.

(22) Lit., 'there is no sowing for Hekdesh' — to make it clean. The reason is because a higher standard of purity is required in the case of Hekdesh.

(23) Hence the plants remain unclean in so far that they are forbidden to be eaten.

(24) Of. R. Oshaia.

(25) I.e., by formal dedication, v. n. 4.

(26) And in such a case leveling is considered effective.

(27) For its wine to be used for libations.

(28) V. supra 33b, where R. Johanan holds that the expressed juice of unclean grapes is clean.

(29) In declaring the expressed juice unclean, whereas it would be clean if it were not sanctified.

(30) The sanctification referred to is not as previously assumed (cf. p. 158. n. 11) for libations but for purposes of Terumah.

(31) Since Terumah can only be verbally sanctified, there being no sacred vessels to sanctify them.

(32) Such as wine for libations.

(33) V. supra p. 33f notes.

(34) V. supra 14a, p. 62, n. 2. When the grapes are unclean in the second degree they render the juice unclean in the first degree, it being a general rule that whatever disqualifies Terumah, i.e., eatables unclean in the second degree, defiles liquids in the first degree (supra 14b). But when they are unclean in the third degree they cannot defile liquids. Hence if he first trod them, even in great quantity, they remain clean. But if he first sanctified them, the expressed juice is unclean, because the Rabbis set a higher standard for Terumah.

(35) Viz., that the Rabbis set a higher standard for sacred objects, even when they were verbally sanctified.

(36) Num. XIX, 17.

(37) In which it is sanctified with the ashes of the red heifer, but it must not be collected in another vessel and then poured over into this.

(38) The passage is rather difficult. Rashi: 'And he shall put' implies that Scripture refers to detached water, i.e., water which does not form part of a stream but has been detached and collected in a vessel, whence it is poured into a second vessel containing the ashes. But when the Mishnah states that the running must be direct into the vessel, it insists on attached water, i.e., water forming part of the stream. This must be because the Rabbis set a higher standard. Tosaf.: 'and he shall put'

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

implies that the water is regarded as detached water, which can be defiled, though actually it is running water, as stated, and consequently this proves that by Scriptural law sacred water cannot be made clean by 'leveling' (v. p. 158, n. 4). for leveling only renders it as attached water, whereas we see here that even when attached it is regarded as detached. And just as Scripture thus sets a higher standard for sacred water, so did the Rabbis set a higher standard for Terumah. — Maharsha observes (on Rashi's explanation) that he does not see how this proves that the Rabbis set a higher standard even when they were verbally sanctified.

## Pesachim 35a

but it is a higher standard; so here too it is a higher standard.<sup>1</sup>

R. Shimi b. Ashi said, We too learned thus: When he [an unclean person] has a ritual bath, he may eat tithe; when the sun sets,<sup>2</sup> he may eat Terumah. [Thus] only Terumah, but not sacred food.<sup>3</sup> Yet why so? He is clean? But [you must say] it is a higher standard; so here too it is a higher standard.

R. Ashi said, we too learned [thus]: And the flesh:<sup>4</sup> this is to include fuel and frankincense.<sup>5</sup> Are then fuel and frankincense capable of being defiled?<sup>6</sup> But [you must say] it is a higher standard;<sup>7</sup> so here too it is a higher standard.

**MISHNAH.** THESE ARE THE COMMODITIES WITH WHICH A MAN DISCHARGES HIS OBLIGATION ON PASSOVER:<sup>8</sup> WITH WHEAT, WITH BARLEY, WITH SPELT, WITH RYE,<sup>9</sup> AND WITH OATS. AND THEY DISCHARGE [IT] WITH DEMAI,<sup>10</sup> WITH FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS BEEN SEPARATED, AND WITH SECOND TITHE OR HEKDESH WHICH HAVE BEEN REDEEMED;<sup>11</sup> AND PRIESTS [CAN DISCHARGE THEIR OBLIGATION] WITH HALLAH AND TERUMAH. BUT [A MAN CAN]NOT [DISCHARGE HIS OBLIGATION] WITH TEBEL, NOR WITH FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS NOT BEEN SEPARATED, NOR WITH SECOND TITHE OR HEKDESH WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN

REDEEMED. [AS TO] THE [UNLEAVENED] LOAVES OF THE THANKOFFERING<sup>12</sup> AND THE WAFERS OF A NAZIRITE,<sup>13</sup> IF HE MADE THEM FOR HIMSELF,<sup>14</sup> HE CANNOT DISCHARGE [HIS OBLIGATION] WITH THEM; IF HE MADE THEM TO SELL IN THE MARKET, HE CAN DISCHARGE [HIS OBLIGATION] WITH THEM.

**GEMARA.** A Tanna taught: Kusmin [spelt] is a species of wheat; oats and rye are a species of barley; Kusmin is gulba; Shipon is dishra; Shibolet Shu'al is foxears.<sup>15</sup> Only these<sup>16</sup> [are fit],<sup>17</sup> but not rice or millet. Whence do we know it? —

Said R. Simeon b. Lakish, and thus the School of R. Ishmael taught, and thus the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob taught, Scripture saith, Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it,' seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith:<sup>18</sup> [with regard to] commodities which come to the state of leaven, a man discharges his obligation with unleavened bread [made] thereof; thus these are excluded, which do not come to the state of leaven but to the state of decay.

Our Mishnah does not agree with R. Johanan b. Nuri, who maintains: Rice is a species of corn, and kareth<sup>19</sup> is incurred for [eating it in] its leavened state. For it was taught: R. Johanan b. Nuri Prohibits [the use of] rice and millet, because it is near to turn leaven. The scholars asked: does 'because it is near to turn leaven' mean that it quickly becomes leaven,<sup>20</sup> or perhaps it is near to leaven, but is not completely leaven?<sup>21</sup> —

Come and hear: For it was taught, R. Johanan b. Nuri said: Rice is a species of corn and Kareth is incurred for [eating it in] its leavened state, and a man discharges his obligation with it on Passover. And thus R. Johanan b. Nuri used to say, Karmith [cow-wheat] is subject to Hallah. What is Karmith?— Said Abaye: Shezanitha [weed]. What is Shezanitha? Said R. Papa: A weed found among kalnitha.<sup>22</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of Resh Lakish: [As



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

to] dough which was kneaded with wine, oil or honey, Kareth is not incurred for [eating it in] its leavened state.<sup>23</sup>

Now, R. Papa and R. Huna son of R. Joshua sat before R. Idi b. Abin, while R. Idi b. Abin was sitting and dozing. Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua to R. Papa: What is Resh Lakish's reason? — He replied, Scripture saith, Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it, etc.: [In the case of] the commodities with which a man discharges his obligation in respect of unleavened bread, Kareth is incurred for [eating them in] their leavened state; but [with regard to] this [dough], since a man cannot discharge his obligation therewith, because it is rich mazzah,<sup>24</sup> Kareth is not incurred for its leaven.

R. Huna son of R. Joshua objected to R. Papa: If he dissolves it<sup>25</sup> and swallows it, if it is leaven, he is punished with Kareth; while if it is unleavened bread, he does not discharge his obligation therewith on Passover.<sup>26</sup> Now here, though a man does not discharge his obligation therewith as unleavened bread, yet Kareth is incurred for its leaven? — [Thereupon] R. Idi b. Abin awoke [and] said to them, Children! This is the reason of Resh Lakish, because they are fruit juice,<sup>27</sup>

(1) Sc. that the resowing of Terumah does not permit it to be eaten (supra 34a).

(2) Lit., 'his sun makes evening'.

(3) If his uncleanness requires a sacrifice, e.g.. in the case of a Zab, he may not eat sacred food until he has brought the sacrifice, though he is completely clean.

(4) Lev. VII, 19.

(5) V. supra 24b and notes a.l.

(6) Surely not, as they are not eatables!

(7) Though fuel and frankincense cannot usually be defiled, a higher standard is set when they are to be used in the sacred service.

(8) Unleavened bread is obligatory on the first night of Passover, as it is written, on the fourteenth day of the month at even ye shall eat unleavened bread (Ex. XII, 18). The Mishnah enumerates the species of corn with which this unleavened bread, eaten as an obligation, can be made.

(9) Jast.: others: oats.

(10) V. Glos.

(11) One tenth (tithe) of the produce, called the first tithe, was given to the Levite, and he in turn gave a tenth thereof, called the Terumah of tithe, to the priest. Another tenth of the produce, called the second tithe, was eaten by its owners (Israelites, as opposed to Levites and priests) in Jerusalem, or redeemed and the redemption money was expended in Jerusalem. Hekdesh (q.v. Glos.) could be similarly redeemed. The second tithe reference in the Mishnah is to places outside Jerusalem.

(12) The thanks-offering was accompanied by forty loaves, thirty of which were unleavened.

(13) V. Num. VI, 15.

(14) For his own sacrifice.

(15) Ears of corn fox-tailed in shape. — The other words are the Aramaic in general use.

(16) Enumerated in our Mishnah.

(17) For making unleavened bread as defined on p. 160, n. 8.

(18) Deut. XVI, 3.

(19) V. Glos.

(20) And therefore it is altogether forbidden on Passover, as it turns leaven before it can be baked.

(21) I.e., it can never become completely leaven. Hence R. Johanan b. Nuri prohibits its use on the first night for the fulfillment of one's obligations.

(22) Papaver Spinosum (Jast.).

(23) If no water at all was used in kneading it.

(24) Unleavened bread made with wine, etc. is a rich confection, whereas Scripture prescribes 'bread of poverty' (E.V. affliction — Deut. XVI, 3).

(25) Sc. bread.

(26) Because swallowing soaked bread is not eating.

(27) Sc. wine, oil or honey, date-honey being meant.

## Pesachim 35b

and fruit juice does not cause fermentation.<sup>1</sup>

**AND THEY DISCHARGE THEIR OBLIGATION WITH DEMAI AND WITH THE FIRST TITHE, ETC. DEMAI? But it is not fit for him?<sup>2</sup> — Since if he wishes he can renounce his property, become a poor man, and eat demai,<sup>3</sup> it is fit for him now too. For we learned: The poor may be fed with Demai, and [Jewish] troops [in billets] [may be supplied] with demai.<sup>4</sup> And R. Huna said, It was taught: Beth Shammai maintain: The poor may not be fed with Demai, nor troops in billets; but Beth Hillel rule: The poor may be fed with Demai, also troops in billets.**

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS BEEN SEPARATED.** That is obvious? Since its Terumah has been separated, it is Hullin?<sup>5</sup> — It is necessary [to teach it] only where he anticipated it [in setting it aside<sup>6</sup> while the corn was still] in the ears, and Terumah of the tithe was taken from it, but the great Terumah was not taken from it,<sup>7</sup> this being in accordance with R. Abbahu.

For R. Abbahu said in the name of Resh Lakish: First tithe which he anticipated [the setting aside thereof] in the ears is exempt from the great Terumah, for it is said, then ye shall offer up an heave offering of it for the Lord, a tithe of the tithe:<sup>8</sup> I ordered thee [to offer] ‘a tithe of the tithe’, but not the great Terumah plus the Terumah of the tithe ‘of the tithe’.

Said R. Papa to Abaye: If so, even if he anticipated it in the stack too,<sup>9</sup> let it be exempt? — For your sake Scripture writes, out of all you,’ gifts ye shall offer every heave offering of the Lord,<sup>10</sup> he answered him. And what [reason] do you see [to interpret thus]?<sup>11</sup> — The one has become corn [Dagan], while the other has not become corn.<sup>12</sup>

**THE SECOND TITHE AND HEKDESH WHICH HAVE BEEN REDEEMED,** etc. That is obvious? — We treat here of a case where he assigned<sup>13</sup> the principal but did not assign the fifth:<sup>14</sup> and he [the Tanna] informs us that the fifth is not indispensable.<sup>15</sup>

**AND PRIESTS [DISCHARGE THEIR OBLIGATION] WITH Hallah AND TERUMAH,** etc. This is obvious? — You might say, We require unleavened bread that is equally permitted] to all men. Therefore he informs us, [the repetition] ‘unleavened bread’, ‘unleavened bread’,<sup>16</sup> is an extension.

**BUT NOT WITH TEBEL,** etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only of Tebel made so by Rabbinical law, e.g., if it was sown in an unperforated pot.<sup>17</sup>

**NOR WITH FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS NOT BEEN SEPARATED.** That is obvious? — It is necessary [to state it] only where it had been anticipated [and set aside] in the pile.<sup>18</sup> You might argue as R. Papa proposed to Abaye;<sup>19</sup> hence he [the Tanna] informs us [that it is] as Abaye answered him.

**NOR WITH SECOND TITHE OR HEKDESH WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN REDEEMED,** etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary only where they have been redeemed; and what does they ‘HAVE NOT BEEN REDEEMED’ mean? That they have not been redeemed with their regulations.<sup>20</sup> [Thus:] it is second tithe which he redeemed with uncoined metal,<sup>21</sup> for the Divine Law states, And thou shalt bind up [We-zarta] the money in thine hand,<sup>22</sup> [implying], that which bears a figure [Zurah].<sup>23</sup> [Again it is] Hekdesh which was secularized<sup>24</sup> by means of land,<sup>25</sup> for the Divine Law stated, Then he shall give the money and it shall be assured to him.<sup>26</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One might think that a man can discharge his obligation with Tebel which was not made ready.<sup>27</sup> (But surely all Tebel indeed has not been made ready! —

Rather say, with Tebel which was not made ready with all its requirements, the great Terumah having been separated from it whereas the Terumah of tithe was not separated from it; [or] the first tithe, but not the second tithe, or even the poor tithe).<sup>28</sup> Whence do we know it?<sup>29</sup> Because it is stated, thou shalt not eat leavened bread with it:<sup>30</sup> teaching, [you must eat of] that the interdict of which is on account of ‘thou shalt not eat leavened bread with it’, thus this is excluded, for its interdict is not on account of ‘thou shalt not eat leavened bread with it’ but on account of ‘thou shalt not eat tebel’.<sup>31</sup> Yet whither has the interdict of leaven gone?<sup>32</sup> —

Said R. Shesheth, The author of this is R. Simeon, who maintained, A prohibition

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

cannot fall<sup>33</sup> upon another prohibition.<sup>34</sup> For it was taught, R. Simeon said:

- (1) I.e., 'leavening'.
- (2) Demai may not be eaten until the tithe has been separated.
- (3) A poor man need not separate tithe on Demai.
- (4) They too are regarded as poor, since they are not at home.
- (5) I.e., permitted for food.
- (6) Sc. the separation of the first tithe.
- (7) The great Terumah is a portion of the produce, unspecified by Scripture (the Rabbis prescribed from one fortieth to one sixtieth, according to the owner's generosity), which is the priest's due; for Terumah of tithe v. note on Mishnah supra 35a. The great Terumah must be separated first, and then the first tithe. But here the order was reversed and the Israelite separated his tithe while the grain was yet in the ears.
- (8) Num. XVIII, 26.
- (9) I.e., when it is no longer in the ears but piled up in stacks.
- (10) Ibid. 29; i.e. 'all' is an extension, and shows that the offering is due even in such a case. — 'For your sake' or, 'concerning you' — to refute this possible view.
- (11) To apply the limitation of the first verse to the one case and the extension of the second to the other — perhaps it should be reversed?
- (12) The priestly due, i.e., the great Terumah, is 'the first-fruits of thy corn' (Deut. XVIII, 4). Hence once it is piled up as corn it is due, and the Israelite cannot then evade his obligations by reversing the order. But before it is piled up there is no obligation for the great Terumah; therefore if the Levite receives his first tithe then he is not defrauding the priest.
- (13) Lit., 'gave' — for redemption.
- (14) When a man redeemed second tithe or Hekdesh he added a fifth of its value.
- (15) To the validity of the redemption, and the redeemed produce may be consumed anywhere, even though the fifth has not been added.
- (16) This may refer either to Deut. XVI, 4, 8, or in general to the fact that 'unleavened bread' is repeated several times.
- (17) According to Scriptural law such is not Tebel at all, and therefore I would think that a man discharges his obligation therewith.
- (18) The tithe having been separated but not the great Terumah.
- (19) That it is exempt, supra.
- (20) Lit., 'laws'.
- (21) V. B.M. 47b for the meaning asimon.
- (22) Deut. XIV, 25.
- (23) The image stamped on the coin. This connects zarta with Zurah.

(24) I.e., redeemed, whereby the Hekdesh assumes an ordinary, non-holy character.

(25) I.e., land was given for its redemption.

(26) I.e., it can be redeemed by money, but not by land. Actually there is no such verse, but v. B.M., Sonc. ed. p. 321, n. 1.

(27) For eating, by separating the priestly and the Levitical dues.

(28) In the first, second, fourth, and fifth years after the 'years of release' (Shemittah) the first and second tithes were separated. In the third and sixth years, the first and third tithes were separated, the latter being a poor tithe, i.e., it belonged to the poor.

(29) That he cannot discharge his obligation therewith.

(30) Deut. XVI, 3.

(31) I.e., the unleavened bread which one must eat must be such that, if leavened, it would be forbidden because it is leavened. But in the case of Tebel, if it were leavened it would be forbidden because it is Tebel.

(32) Surely it is still forbidden on account of leaven, Tebel merely being an additional prohibition?

(33) I.e., become operative.

(34) I.e., when a thing is already forbidden on one score, another interdict cannot become operative at the same time.

Thus here the prohibition of Tebel is earlier; consequently the fact that it subsequently became leaven too is ignored, and it is regarded as prohibited on account of Tebel only.

## Pesachim 36a

He who eats Nebelah on the Day of Atonement is not liable [to a sin-offering].<sup>1</sup>

Rabina said, You may even say [that it agrees with] the Rabbis: [the meaning is] that the interdict which is on account of thou shalt not eat leavened bread with it' alone, thus this is excluded, for its interdict is not on account of 'thou shalt not eat leavened bread with it' alone, but also on account of 'thou shalt not eat Tebel'. Is then 'alone' written?<sup>2</sup> —

Rather, it is clearly as R. Shesheth [stated]. Our Rabbis taught. You might think that a man can discharge his obligation with second tithe in Jerusalem; therefore it is stated, the bread of affliction ['Oni],<sup>3</sup> teaching, [it must be] that which may be eaten in grief [Aninuth].<sup>4</sup> thus this is excluded, which is not

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

eaten in grief but [only] in joy;<sup>5</sup> this is the view of R. Jose the Galilean.

R. Akiba said: [The repetition of] ‘unleavened bread’, ‘unleavened bread’, is an extension.<sup>6</sup> If so, what is taught by ‘bread of affliction’ [‘Oni’]? It excludes dough which was kneaded with wine, oil, or honey.<sup>7</sup> What is R. Akiba's reason? — Is then Lehem [bread of] ‘Oni [grief] written? Surely ‘Ani [poverty] is written.<sup>8</sup> And R. Jose the Galilean?<sup>9</sup> — Do we then read it ‘Ani? Surely we read it ‘Oni. And R. Akiba? —

The fact that we read it ‘Oni [is explained] as Samuel's [dictum]. For Samuel said: Bread of ‘Oni [means] bread over which many words are recited [‘Onin].<sup>10</sup> Yet does R. Akiba hold [that] dough which was kneaded with wine, oil, or honey is not [fit]? Surely it was taught: Dough must not be kneaded on Passover with wine, oil, or honey; and if one did knead it, — R. Gamaliel said: It must be burnt immediately;<sup>11</sup> while the Sages say: It may be eaten.

Now R. Akiba related: I was staying [one Passover] with R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and I kneaded dough for them with wine, oil or honey, and they said nothing to me. And though one may not knead, yet one may smooth the surface with them, — this is according to the first Tanna. But the Sages maintain: With that with which one may knead, one may smooth, while with that with which one may not knead, one may not smooth. And they all agree that dough may not be kneaded with lukewarm [water]!<sup>12</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one refers to the first day of the Festival; the other, to the second day of the Festival.<sup>13</sup>

As R. Joshua b. Levi said to his sons: For the first day<sup>14</sup> do not knead [it] for me with milk;<sup>15</sup> from then onwards knead it for me with milk. But it was taught: Dough must not be kneaded with milk, and if one does knead it, the whole loaf is forbidden, because it leads to sin?<sup>16</sup>

Rather, he said this: For the first day do not knead it for me with honey; from then onwards knead [it] for me with honey. Alternatively I can say: After all it means with milk, [but] as Rabina said, [When made] like the eye of an ox, it is permitted;<sup>17</sup> so here too, [it was] like the eye of an ox. ‘And they all agree that dough may not be kneaded with lukewarm [water]’. Why is it different from meal-offerings: for we learned: All meal-offerings<sup>18</sup> are kneaded with lukewarm water, and he [the official in charge] guards them that they should not become in connection with the eating of unleavened bread on the night of Passover. leaven? —

If this was said of [very] careful men [priests], shall it [also] be said of those who are not careful?<sup>19</sup> If so, let it also be permitted to wash [the grain];<sup>20</sup> why did R. Zera say in the name of Rabbah b. Jeremiah in Samuel's name: The wheat for meal-offerings must not be washed? —

The kneading was done by careful men, but the washing would not be done by careful men.<sup>21</sup> Yet must the kneading be done by careful men [priests]; surely it is written, and he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests: and he shall take thereof his handful.’<sup>22</sup> from the taking of the handful and onwards is the duty of the priesthood; this teaches concerning the pouring [of oil] and the mixing,<sup>23</sup> that it is valid [when done] by any man? —

The kneading, granted that it is not [done] by careful men, yet it is [done] in the place of careful men.<sup>24</sup> For a Master said: The mixing is valid [if done] by a lay Israelite; [but if done] without the wall[s] of the Temple Court, it is invalid. Thus this excludes washing, which is not [done] by careful men nor in the place of careful men. And wherein do they [all other meal-offerings] differ from the meal-offering of the ‘omer,<sup>25</sup> for it was taught: The meal-offering of the ‘Omer is washed and heaped up?<sup>26</sup> — A public [offering] is different.<sup>27</sup>



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**Our Rabbis taught:** You might think that a man discharges his duty with first fruits,<sup>28</sup> therefore it is stated, in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread,<sup>29</sup> teaching, [it must be] unleavened bread which is eaten in all your habitations, thus excluding first fruits, which may not be eaten in all your habitations save in Jerusalem [alone]: this is the view of R. Jose the Galilean.

**R. Akiba said:** Unleavened bread and bitter herbs [are assimilated]:<sup>30</sup> just as bitter herbs which are not first fruits [are required],<sup>31</sup> so unleavened bread which is not first fruits [must be eaten]. If so, just as bitter herbs of a species not subject to first fruits [are required], so unleavened bread of a species [of grain] not subject to first fruits [is meant],

(1) Which eating on the Day of Atonement usually incurs, the reference being to eating in ignorance. The reason is that since it is forbidden on the score of Nebelah, the interdict of the Day of Atonement cannot take effect. Thus the same applies here.

(2) Surely not! Scripture does not imply this at all.

(3) Deut. XVI, 3.

(4) Connecting 'Oni (עֲנִי) with Anah (אָנָה) to mourn or grieve, though the former is spelled with an ן, while the latter is with an ם, these letters often being interchangeable in Semitic languages. — Aninuth denotes the state of grief between the death of a near relative, e.g., one's father, and his burial, the bereaved person then being called an Onen.

(5) An Onen (v. preceding note) may not eat second tithe, cf. Deut. XXVI, 14:] I have not eaten thereof (sc. second tithe) in my mourning

(6) V. supra 35b and note a.l. Thus it includes second tithe.

(7) Which makes it into 'rich' Mazzah. The phrase is now translated: bread of poverty. from 'Ani (עֲנִי) poor.

(8) Though the word is read 'Oni, as though spelled with a Waw (עֲוִי), it is actually written 'Ani (עֲנִי), without a Waw.

(9) How does he rebut this?

(10) A long liturgical service — called the Haggadah — is read.

(11) R. Gamaliel holds that it ferments too quickly, and so to prevent it from becoming leaven it must be burnt immediately. But the Sages hold that it can be baked before it is leaven.

(12) This causes fermentation very quickly.

(13) On the night of the first day the Mazzah must be 'bread of poverty', whereas this is a rich

Mazzah; hence it cannot be used. But on the second night any Mazzah is permissible.

(14) I.e., Passover night.

(15) This too makes a 'rich' bread.

(16) One may come to eat it with meat. This refers to the whole year.

(17) I.e., when made very small, so that it is at once entirely eaten up, and nothing is left for later.

(18) Which were offered unleavened.

(19) This is the answer. The preparing of unleavened bread for meal-offerings was in the hands of priests, who were very careful and could be relied upon not to permit it to ferment. But unleavened bread for Passover is made in every home, and the people could not be trusted to take so much care.

(20) I.e., to soak it slightly in water and then pound it so as to remove the bran and make a fine flour.

(21) This was not the priest's duty.

(22) Lev. II, 2.

(23) Which preceded the taking of the handful; v. ibid. 1, 2.

(24) I.e., in the Temple Court, which is frequented by priests, and these would take heed that whoever kneaded it should not permit fermentation.

(25) V. Glos.

(26) For the water to drain off.

(27) This was a public offering, and everything in connection with it, right from the harvesting of the grain, was done under competent guidance and vigilance.

(28) E.g., a priest to whom an Israelite brought the first fruits of his wheat harvest.

(29) Ex. XII, 20.

(30) Num. IX, 11: they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.

(31) For only the seven species enumerated in Deut. VIII, 8, ('a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig trees and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey') are subject to the law of first fruits.

## Pesachim 36b

[and] I will [thus] exclude wheat and barley, which species are subject to first fruits? Hence [the repetition,] 'unleavened bread', 'unleavened bread',<sup>1</sup> is stated as an extension. If [the repetition] 'unleavened bread, unleavened bread' is an extension, then even first fruits too [may be included]? —

**R. Akiba retracted.**<sup>2</sup> For it was taught: You might think that a man can discharge his obligation with first fruits. Therefore it is



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

stated, 'in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread', teaching, [it must be] unleavened bread which is eaten in all your habitations, thus excluding first fruits, which may not be eaten in all your habitations save in Jerusalem [alone]. You might think that I exclude second tithe too,<sup>3</sup> but [the repetition] 'unleavened bread', 'unleavened bread', is stated as an extension. But what [reason] do you see to include second tithe and exclude first fruits? — I include second tithe because it can be permitted [to be eaten] in all habitations,<sup>4</sup> in accordance with R. Eleazar, and I exclude first fruits, for which there is no permission in all habitations.

For R. Eleazar said: Whence do we know in the case of second tithe that became defiled, that we can redeem it even in Jerusalem? From the verse, when thou art not able Se'etho [to bear it].<sup>5</sup> Now se'eth<sup>6</sup> can only refer to eating, as it is said, And he took and sent Mase'oth [messes] unto them from before him.<sup>7</sup> Now, whom do you know to maintain that he fulfils his obligation with second tithe? R. Akiba.<sup>8</sup> Yet he excludes first fruits through [the phrase] 'in all your habitations'.<sup>9</sup> This proves that he retracted. And R. Jose the Galilean, let him deduce it from [the phrase] 'the bread of affliction ['Oni]', implying, that which can be eaten in grief, thus excluding this [sc. first fruits], which can be eaten only in rejoicing?<sup>10</sup> —

He holds as R. Simeon, For it was taught: First fruits are forbidden to an Onen;<sup>11</sup> but R. Simeon permits [them]. What is the reason of the Rabbis?<sup>12</sup> — Because it is written, Thou mayest not eat within thy gates [the tithe of thy corn... nor the heave-offering of thy hand],<sup>13</sup> and a Master said: 'The heave-offering of [Terumoth] thy hand' means first fruits. Thus first fruits are assimilated to tithe: just as tithe is forbidden to an Onen,<sup>14</sup> so are first fruits forbidden to an Onen. And R. Simeon?<sup>15</sup> —

The Divine Law designated them 'Terumah', [hence they are] like Terumah: just as Terumah is permitted to an Onen, so are first

fruits permitted to an Onen. Now R. Simeon: granted that he does not accept the hekdesch,<sup>16</sup> yet 'rejoicing' is nevertheless written in connection therewith, for it is written, and thou shalt rejoice in all the good, etc.<sup>17</sup> — That comes for the time of rejoicing.<sup>18</sup> For we learned: From Pentecost until the Festival [of Tabernacles] he [the Israelite] brings [the first fruits] and recites [the 'confession'];<sup>19</sup> between the Festival and Hanukkah<sup>20</sup> he brings [the first fruits] but does not recite [the 'confession'].

Our Rabbis taught: 'Bread of poverty', this excludes halut<sup>21</sup> and Ashishah [pancake].<sup>22</sup> You might think that a man can discharge his obligation only with coarse bread;<sup>23</sup> therefore [the repetition] 'unleavened bread', 'unleavened bread', is stated as an extension, [intimating] even [if it is] like the unleavened bread of Solomon.<sup>24</sup> If so, why is 'bread of poverty' stated? To exclude Halut and pancakes. And where is it implied that this [word] 'Ashishah' denotes something of value?<sup>25</sup> —

Because it is written, And he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, both to men and women, to everyone a cake of bread, and a good piece of flesh [Eshpar] and an Ashishah,<sup>26</sup> whereon R. Hanan b. Abba said: 'Eshpar' means one sixth [Ehad Mishshishah] of a bullock [Par]; Ashishah means [a cake made with] one sixth of an Ephah [of flour].<sup>27</sup> Now he differs from Samuel, for Samuel said: Ashishah is a cask of wine, for it is written, and love casks of [Ashishe] grapes.<sup>28</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One may not bake a thick loaf on Passover: this is the view of Beth Shammai;

(1) V. supra 35b and note a.l.

(2) From, the view that unleavened bread and bitter herbs are assimilated in this respect, and he accepts the deduction of R. Jose the Galilean.

(3) In Jerusalem, since it may not be eaten outside Jerusalem.

(4) When it becomes defiled as explained below.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(5) Deut. XIV, 24; the next verse states, then thou shalt turn it into money.

(6) תשא, to bear.

(7) Gen. XLIII, 34. Thus he translates the first verse: If thou are not able to eat it — being defiled — then thou shalt turn it into money — i.e., redeem it.

(8) Supra 36a.

(9) Not by assimilating unleavened bread and bitter herbs.

(10) V. supra 36a. Why then does he deduce it from, 'in all your habitations'?

(11) V. supra p. 166, n. 4.

(12) I.e., the first view, which forbids.

(13) Deut. XII, 17.

(14) V. Deut. XXVI, 14.

(15) How does he justify his view?

(16) V. Glos. I.e., even if he rejects the comparison of first fruits and tithe.

(17) Ibid. 11; this refers to first fruits. Since rejoicing is required, an Onen is automatically excluded.

(18) I.e., to teach that the first fruits must be brought to the priest, and the passage relative thereto, called the 'confession', recited at a time of natural rejoicing, viz., during the months of harvesting and collecting the produce from the fields.

(19) Sc. Deut. XXVI, 3-10.

(20) V. Glos. It generally falls towards the end of December.

(21) A rich bread made of dough prepared by stirring the flour with hot water.

(22) Where the dough is made compact and substantial by pressing (Jast.).

(23) Which is really 'bread of poverty'.

(24) I.e., made of the finest flour.

(25) Viz., a rich food.

(26) II Sam. VI, 19.

(27) E.V.: a cake of raisins.

(28) Hos. III, 1; i.e., of wine. E.V.: cakes of raisins.

[this] of a metal oven, did they say [it] of an earthen oven?<sup>5</sup>

Said R. Jeremiah b. Abba, I asked my teacher in private, and who is it? Rab — others state, R. Jeremiah b. Abba said in Rab's name, I asked my teacher in private, and who is it? Our holy Teacher.<sup>6</sup> What is [meant by] a thick bread? Bread in large quantity.<sup>7</sup> And why is it called a thick bread? Because it is much in kneading.<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, in the locality of this Tanna bread in large quantity is called thick bread. [Then] what is the reason:<sup>9</sup> if because he takes unnecessary trouble,<sup>10</sup> — why particularly on Passover: even on any [other] festival too [it is forbidden]? — That indeed is so, but this Tanna was engaged on<sup>11</sup> the festival of Passover. It was taught likewise:<sup>12</sup> Beth Shammai maintain: One may not bake thick bread on a festival,<sup>13</sup> while Beth Hillel permit it.

Our Rabbis taught: You discharge [your obligation] with fine bread,<sup>14</sup> with coarse bread,<sup>15</sup> and with Syrian cakes shaped in figures. although they [the Sages] said, Syrian cakes shaped in figures must not be made on Passover.

Rab Judah said: This thing Boethus b. Zonin asked the Sages: Why was it said [that] Syrian cakes shaped in figures must not be made on Passover? Said they to him, Because a woman would tarry over it and cause it to turn leaven. [But], he objected, it is possible to make it in a mould, which would form it without delay.<sup>16</sup> Then it shall be said, replied they, [that] all Syrian cakes [shaped in figures] are forbidden, but the Syrian cakes of Boethus are permitted!<sup>17</sup>

R. Eleazar b. Zadok said: I once followed<sup>18</sup> my father into the house of R. Gamaliel, and they placed<sup>19</sup> before him Syrian cakes shaped in figures on Passover. Said I, 'Father, did not the Sages say thus, One may not make Syrian cakes shaped in figures on Passover?' 'My son', he replied, 'they did not speak of [the cakes of] all people, but only of those of

## Pesachim 37a

but Beth Hillel permit it. And how much is a thick loaf?<sup>1</sup> Said R. Huna, A handbreadth, because thus we find in the case of the showbread [that it was] a handbreadth.<sup>2</sup>

To this R. Joseph demurred: If they [the Sages] said [this] of men of care,<sup>3</sup> did they say [it] of those who are not careful?<sup>4</sup> If they said [this] of well-kneaded bread, did they say [it] of bread that is not well-kneaded? If they said [this] of dry logs, did they say [it] of damp logs? If they said [this] of a hot oven, did they say [it] of a cool oven? If they said

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

bakers'.<sup>20</sup> Others say, he said thus to him: 'They did not speak of those of bakers, but [only] of those of private people'.<sup>21</sup>

R. Jose said: One may make Syrian cakes like wafers, but one may not make Syrian cakes like rolls. We learned elsewhere:<sup>22</sup> Sponge cakes,<sup>23</sup> honey cakes, paste-balls,<sup>24</sup> cakes made in a mould, and mixed dough<sup>25</sup> are exempt from Hallah.<sup>26</sup> What are cakes made in a mould? — Said R. Joshua b. Levi: That is halutz<sup>27</sup> of private people.<sup>28</sup> Resh Lakish said: These are prepared in an ilpes.<sup>29</sup> While R. Johanan maintained: Those which are prepared in an ilpes are liable [to Hallah], but these [are exempt] because they were prepared in the sun.

An objection is raised: Sponge cakes, honey cakes, and paste-balls: if prepared in an ilpes, they are liable [to Hallah]; if in the sun, they are exempt. This is a refutation of R. Simeon b. Lakish?

Said 'Ulla, R. Simeon b. Lakish can answer you: The case we treat of here is where he [first] heated [the ilpes] and then placed [the dough in it].<sup>30</sup> But what [is the law] if he [first] placed [the dough] and then heated it? Are they indeed exempt! Then instead of teaching [in] the second clause, 'if prepared in the sun, they are exempt', let him draw a distinction in that itself and teach: When is that? E.g., if he heated [it] and then placed [the dough]; but if he [first] placed [the dough] and then heated it, they are exempt? There is a lacuna[in this teaching], and it was thus taught: When is that? If he heated [it] and then placed [the dough]; but if he first for the shape to be exactly right and so may take too long over it. But private people are not so particular. placed [the dough] and then heated it, it becomes as though he prepared it in the sun, and they are exempt.

Come and hear: You discharge your duty with partially baked unleavened bread and unleavened bread which was prepared in an ilpes?<sup>31</sup> — Here too it means that he [first] heats it and then places [the dough]. What is

partially baked unleavened bread?<sup>32</sup> — Said Rab Judah in Samuel's name: Whatever can be broken without threads dragging from it.<sup>33</sup>

Raba said: And the same [rule applies to] loaves of the thankoffering.<sup>34</sup> That is obvious: 'bread' is written here and 'bread' is written there?<sup>35</sup> — You might say, since it is written, and he shall offer one

- (1) Which Beth Hillel permit.
- (2) Though the showbread was unleavened (Men. 27a).
- (3) Sc. the priests.
- (4) Unleavened bread for Passover is made by all, and many cannot exercise sufficient care to prevent the dough from fermenting when it is so thick.
- (5) In the preparation of the showbread all these conditions would be observed; but they might be absent in a private home.
- (6) Viz., R. Judah ha-Nasi.
- (7) Though baked in thin wafers.
- (8) I.e., when sufficient dough is kneaded for many wafers.
- (9) That Beth Shammai forbid it, seeing that we are actually dealing with thin wafers.
- (10) In kneading so much at a time. Though food may be prepared on Festivals, unnecessary trouble is forbidden.
- (11) Lit., 'standing at'.
- (12) That it is forbidden because of the unnecessary labor.
- (13) Here Passover is not mentioned.
- (14) Bread made of fine meal.
- (15) 'Ar.: thick bread.
- (16) Lit., 'immediately'.
- (17) Which is absurd. Most bakers lack these moulds!
- (18) Lit., 'entered after'.
- (19) Lit., 'brought'.
- (20) Who bake for sale. They are more particular
- (21) Because professionals are more expert; also they may have moulds, and so can make them more quickly.
- (22) This is the reading of Ran, and it is so emended here by Bah.
- (23) Cakes made from a spongy dough.
- (24) A kind of cake made of very loose dough.
- (25) A dough of Hullin into which there fell dough of Terumah.
- (26) V. Glos.
- (27) V. p. 170. n. 14.
- (28) I.e., home-made pancakes. They are not made like bread, and only dough made for bread is subject to Hallah.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(29) Jast.: a tightly covered stew pot. I.e., it is not bread at all, Resh Lakish holding that only that which is baked in an oven is bread to be subject to Hallah.

(30) When the ilpes is first heated it is similar to an oven. - Hidbik (הדביק) lit., 'to cause to cleave', the cake being pressed to the side of the pot, which was the ancient method of baking.

(31) Which proves that what is baked in an ilpes is bread, thus refuting R. Simeon b. Lakish.

(32) What is the minimum?

(33) It must be baked at least as much as that.

(34) The thanks-offering was accompanied by forty loaves, which were sanctified by the killing of the sacrifice. As soon as the loaves have arrived at this stage of baking as defined by Rab Judah, they become sanctified by the slaughtering of the sacrifice, and the sacrifice itself valid.

(35) Obviously then the same definition applies to both. Hallah: when ye eat of the bread of the land (Num. XV, 19); the thanks-offering: Lev. VII, 13; with cakes of leavened bread, etc.

## Pesachim 37b

out of each oblation,<sup>1</sup> 'one' [intimating] that he should not take a broken-off piece, whereas here it is as broken off:<sup>2</sup> therefore he informs us [that it is not so].

An objection is raised: The me'isah,<sup>3</sup> Beth Shammai exempt it [from Hallah], while Beth Hillel hold it liable [thereto]. The halitah,<sup>4</sup> Beth Shammai hold it liable [to Hallah], while Beth Hillel exempt [it]. Which is 'Me'isah' and which is 'Halitah'? 'Me'isah' is flour [poured] over boiling water; 'Halitah' is boiling water [poured] over flour.

R. Ishmael b. R. Jose ruled in his father's name [that] both are exempt — others state, that both are liable.

But the Sages maintained: Both the one and the other, if prepared in an ilpes, each is exempt; in an oven, each is liable. Now according to the first Tanna, wherein does Me'isah differ from halitah?<sup>5</sup> —

Said Rab Judah in Samuel's name, and thus did R. Johanan — others state, R. Joshua b. Levi-say: Just as there is a controversy in respect of the one so is there a controversy in respect of the other, and they [the two

clauses] are contradictory, he who learnt the one not having learnt the other.<sup>6</sup> Now it is at all events taught, 'But the Sages maintain: Both the one and the other, if prepared in an ilpes, each is exempt; in an oven, each is liable', which is a refutation of R. Johanan?— R. Johanan can answer you, It is dependent on Tannaim. For it was taught: You might think that Me'isah and Halitah are liable to Hallah, therefore 'bread' is stated.

R. Judah said: Naught is bread save that which is baked in an oven. Now R. Judah is identical with the first Tanna? Hence surely they differ over that which is prepared in an ilpes: the first Tanna holds, That which is prepared in an ilpes is liable; while R. Judah holds, That which is prepared in an oven is exempt! —

No: All (agree) that what is prepared in an ilpes is exempt, but they differ here, e.g., where he rebaked it in an oven,<sup>7</sup> the first Tanna holding [that] since he rebaked it in an oven, it is called 'bread'; while R. Judah holds, Naught is bread save that which is baked in an oven from the very beginning, and since this was not baked in an oven from the very beginning, we do not call it 'bread'. Raba said, What is R. Judah's reason? — Because it is written, ten women shall bake your bread in one oven:<sup>8</sup> bread which is baked in one oven is called bread, but that which is not baked in one oven is not called bread.<sup>9</sup>

Rabbah and R. Joseph were sitting behind R. Zera, and R. Zera was sitting in front of 'Ulla. Said Rabbah to R. Zera, Ask 'Ulla: What if he placed [the dough] within,<sup>10</sup> and boiled it up<sup>11</sup> from without?<sup>12</sup> What shall I ask him, he replied, for if I ask him he will say to me, That then is the [very] preparation of an ilpes!<sup>13</sup> — R. Joseph [then] said to R. Zera, Ask 'Ulla: What if he placed [the dough] inside and the flame is opposite it?<sup>14</sup> What shall I ask him, he replied. for if I ask him he will reply. Most poor people do this.<sup>15</sup>



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**R Assi said: Dough of second tith, according to R. Meir,<sup>16</sup> is exempt from Hallah; according to the Rabbis,<sup>17</sup> it is liable to Hallah.**

- (1) Ibid. 14.
- (2) Since it is not completely baked.
- (3) A paste made of flour poured over boiling water, contrad. to Halitah, where the boiling water is poured over flour, as explained in the text.
- (4) V. preceding note.
- (5) The Mishnah is first dismissed and explained, and then the point of the objection is stated.
- (6) Me'isah and Halitah are alike in law. One Tanna holds that in both Beth Hillel are more lenient, while another holds that Beth Shammai are more lenient in both.
- (7) Sc. that which was prepared in an ilpes in the first place.
- (8) Lev. XXVI, 26.
- (9) Hence this excludes the case where it is first treated in an ilpes.
- (10) Rashi: in an ilpes. Tosaf: in an oven.
- (11) I.e., heated it.
- (12) Rashi: He placed a bread dough in an ilpes, baking it with an outside fire: is it bread or not? Tosaf: He placed in an oven such dough as is generally prepared in an ilpes: does this render it bread or not?
- (13) Which is a point of issue between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish.
- (14) The flame itself bearing directly on the ilpes, which causes it to bake more quickly.
- (15) They cannot afford much fuel, and so they have the flame directly opposite it. Hence this cannot change its status.
- (16) Who holds in Kid. 54b that second tith is sacred, not secular property, but that the Almighty favored the Israelite by permitting him to eat it himself.
- (17) Who hold that it is secular property.

## Pesachim 38a

[As to] unleavened bread of second tith, according to R. Meir, a man cannot discharge his obligation therewith on Passover; according to the Sages, a man can discharge his obligation therewith on Passover. [With regard to] a citron<sup>1</sup> of second tith, according to R. Meir he cannot discharge his obligation therewith on the Festival; according to the Sages, a man can discharge his obligation therewith on the Festival.

**R. Papa demurred: as for dough, it is well, because it is written, of the first of your dough,<sup>2</sup> [implying] of your own.<sup>3</sup> The citron too [is likewise], for it is written, and ye shall take unto yourselves,<sup>4</sup> [implying] it shall be of your own. But as for unleavened bread, is then 'your unleavened bread' written?<sup>5</sup> —**

Said Raba — others state, R. Yemar b. Shalmia: [The meaning of] 'bread' [here] is derived from 'bread' [elsewhere]. Here It is written, the bread of affliction.<sup>6</sup> while there it is written, then it shall be, that when ye eat of the bread of the land [ye shall offer up an heave offering unto the Lord. Of the first of your dough, etc.]:<sup>7</sup> just as there [it means] of your own, so here too [it must be] of your own. Shall we say that [the following] supports him: Dough of second tith is exempt from Hallah: this is the view of R. Meir; but the Sages maintain, It is liable? [You say], 'Shall we say that this Supports him': this is the identical statement! —

This is what he says: Shall we say that since they differ in the case of dough, they differ in respect to those too;<sup>8</sup> or perhaps it is different there, because 'your dough' 'your dough' is written twice?<sup>9</sup>

**R. Simeon b. Lakish asked: Can a man discharge his obligation<sup>10</sup> with the Hallah of second tith in Jerusalem? On the view of R. Jose the Galilean<sup>11</sup> there is no problem; seeing that he does not fulfill his obligation with Hullin,<sup>12</sup> can there be a question about its Hallah? Your question arises on the view of R. Akiba:<sup>11</sup> is it only with Hullin that he can discharge his obligation. because if it is defiled it is permitted in [all] 'habitations',<sup>13</sup> but with Hallah, which if defiled, is not permitted in [all] the 'habitations' and is consigned to the fire,<sup>14</sup> he cannot discharge his obligation: or perhaps we say, since if he had not designated it with the name [of Hallah] and it became defiled, it would be permitted in [all] the 'habitations', and he could discharge [his obligation therewith],**



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

then now too he can discharge [his obligation with it]?<sup>15</sup>

Others state, this is certainly no question. for we certainly say 'since'.<sup>16</sup> Your question arises in respect of Hallah which was bought with the money of second tithe.<sup>17</sup> Now, on the view of the Rabbis there is no question, for since they say that it<sup>18</sup> is to be redeemed, it is [identical with] the tithe [itself].<sup>19</sup> Your question arises on the view of R. Judah who said, It must be buried. For we learned: If that which was bought with second tithe money was defiled, it must be redeemed: R. Judah said, It must be buried.<sup>20</sup> Do we say, since if it were not purchased. and since if he had not designated it with the name [of second tithe] and it became defiled, it would be permitted in [all] 'habitations', and he could discharge his duty therewith, he can [therefore] discharge his duty therewith now too;<sup>21</sup> or perhaps we say one 'since',<sup>22</sup> but we do not say 'since twice'?<sup>23</sup> — said Raba: It is logical that the name of tithe is one.<sup>24</sup>

**THE UNLEAVENED LOAVES OF THE THANKOFFERING AND THE WAFERS OF A NAZIRITE, etc. Whence do we know it? — Said Rabbah, Because Scripture saith,**

- (1) One of the four species which are taken on the Feast of Tabernacles.
- (2) Num. XV, 20.
- (3) And whereas according to R. Meir second tithe is not 'your own'.
- (4) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (5) Surely not! Therefore even if second tithe is not 'yours' according to R. Meir, the law is still complied with by eating second tithe, unleavened bread.
- (6) Deut. XVI, 3.
- (7) Num. XV, 19.
- (8) Sc. the citron and unleavened bread.
- (9) Which lays particular emphasis on 'your', as explained above.
- (10) Relating to the eating of unleavened bread.
- (11) V. supra 36a.
- (12) I.e., with ordinary second tithe after the Hallah has been separated.
- (13) This is a technical term denoting all places outside Jerusalem. I.e., when defiled it can be redeemed even after it has entered Jerusalem and then eaten anywhere. The fact that it might be eaten anywhere strengthens the reason for

assuming that one can discharge his obligation with it, v. supra 36b.

(14) Hallah is like Terumah. Now when the Hallah of second tithe is clean it must be eaten in Jerusalem, like all second tithe, while if it is defiled it may not be eaten at all, like all unclean Terumah. Thus it can never be eaten without Jerusalem.

(15) For the mere fact that it is Hallah is no drawback, as stated in the Mishnah supra 36a, while its being second tithe is not a drawback either, on R. Akiba's view. Why then should it be unfit if it is Hallah of second tithe?

(16) I.e., this last argument is certainly valid.

(17) I.e., second tithe was redeemed, flour was bought with the money, and now Hallah was separated from the dough.

(18) I.e., that which was purchased with second tithe money and which in turn became defiled, v. infra.

(19) And the same law applies.

(20) Its sanctity is too slight to permit of redemption. while it may not be eaten on account of its uncleanness.

(21) I.e., the food that is purchased with second tithe money cannot be more stringently regarded than second tithe itself. For the fact that it cannot be redeemed is not due to its greater sanctity but on the contrary because its sanctity is too slight to be capable of transference.

(22) I.e., in the case of Hallah set aside from the second tithe.

(23) I.e., in the case of Hallah set aside from that which has been purchased with second tithe money.

(24) Whether it is actual tithe or bought with tithe money. Hence they are alike, and therefore he can fulfill his obligations with the Hallah set aside from either.

## Pesachim 38b

**And ye shall guard the unleavened bread:<sup>1</sup> [it must be] unleavened bread which is guarded for the sake of [the precept of eating] unleavened bread, thus excluding this, which is guarded not for the sake of unleavened bread but for the sake of a sacrifice. R. Joseph said, Scripture saith, seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread:<sup>2</sup> [that implies] unleavened bread which may be eaten seven days. Thus excluding this, which is not eaten seven days but [only] a day and a night.<sup>3</sup>**

**It was taught in accordance with Rabbah; it was taught in accordance with R. Joseph.**

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

It was taught in accordance with Rabbah: You might think that he can discharge his obligation with the loaves of the thanks-offering and the wafers of a Nazirite, therefore it is stated, 'And ye shall guard the unleavened bread', teaching [that it must be] unleavened bread which is guarded for the sake of [fulfilling the obligation of eating] unleavened bread, thus excluding this which is guarded not for the sake of unleavened bread but for the sake of a sacrifice.

It was taught in accordance with R. Joseph: You might think that a man can discharge his obligation with the loaves of the thanks-offering and the wafers of a Nazirite; therefore it is said, 'seven days ye shall eat unleavened bread', implying, unleavened bread which may be eaten seven days. thus excluding this, which may not be eaten seven days but [only] a day and a night. Yet deduce it from [the fact that it is designated], 'the bread of affliction', teaching, [it must be] that which may be eaten in grief, thus excluding this, which is not eaten in grief but [only] in joy? — He holds as R. Akiba, who said, 'Ani' is written.<sup>4</sup> Then let him deduce it [from the fact] that it is rich unleavened bread?<sup>5</sup> Said R. Samuel b. R. Isaac: There is [only] a Rebi'ith [of oil], and it is divided among many loaves.<sup>6</sup> Yet deduce it [from the fact] that they might not be eaten in all habitations?<sup>7</sup> — Said Resh Lakish: This proves that the loaves of the thanks-offering and the wafers of the Nazirite could be eaten in Nob and Gibeon.<sup>8</sup>

It was taught. R. Il'ai said: I asked R. Eleazar, How about a man discharging his obligation with the loaves of the thanks-offering and the wafers of a Nazirite? I have not heard, replied he.

[So] I went and asked it before R. Joshua. Said he to me, Surely they [the Sages] said: [AS TO] THE [UNLEAVENED] LOAVES OF THE THANKS OFFERING AND THE WAFERS OF A NAZIRITE, IF HE MADE THEM FOR HIMSELF, HE CANNOT

**DISCHARGE HIS OBLIGATION WITH THEM; IF TO SELL IN THE MARKET, HE CAN DISCHARGE HIS OBLIGATION WITH THEM.** When I went and discussed the matter before R. Eleazar, he said to me, By the covenant! These are the very words which were stated to Moses at Sinai. Others state: By the covenant! Are these the very words which were stated to Moses at Sinai? And is not a reason required?<sup>9</sup> And what is the reason? —

Said Rabbah: Whatever is for market, he may change his mind [about it]. and he says, 'If it is sold, it is sold; if it will not be sold, I will discharge my duty with it'.

- (1) Ex. XII, 17 E.V. translates differently.
- (2) Ibid. 15.
- (3) V. Lev. VII, 15.
- (4) v. Supra 36a for this passage.
- (5) Since he follows the written text, Ani, viz., poverty; for the unleavened cakes brought with a sacrifice were kneaded with oil, which makes them 'rich' bread (supra 36a).
- (6) Only a quarter log of oil was used in the kneading of twenty large loaves: this would not make it rich Mazzah.
- (7) I.e., outside the walls of Jerusalem; v. supra 36a.
- (8) Before the building of the Temple, Israel sacrificed at the 'high places'. altars being erected at Nob and Gibeon, amongst other places. Resh Lakish observes that since we do not deduce the present law from the fact that these loaves might not be eaten in all 'habitations', it follows that there was a time when they were eaten without Jerusalem, viz., during the period of the high places at Nob and Gibeon, v. Zeb. 112b. There is an opposing view, that of R Simeon, that the thanks-offering and the sacrifices of a Nazirite could not be offered at the high places. v. Meg. 9b.
- (9) Do you claim a divine origin for them that you draw this distinction without stating its grounds?

## Pesachim 39a

**MISHNAH.** AND THESE ARE THE HERBS WITH WHICH A MAN DISCHARGES HIS OBLIGATION ON PASSOVER:<sup>1</sup> WITH LETTUCE [HAZARETH]. WITH TAMKA,<sup>2</sup> WITH HARHABIN A,<sup>3</sup> WITH ENDIVES ['ULSHIN] AND WITH MAROR.<sup>4</sup> THE LAW IS COMPLIED WITH BY [EATING THEM] BOTH

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

MOIST [FRESH] AND DRY, BUT NOT PRESERVED [IN VINEGAR], NOR STEWED NOR BOILED.<sup>5</sup> AND THEY COMBINE TO THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE.<sup>6</sup> AND YOU CAN DISCHARGE [YOUR OBLIGATION] WITH THEIR STALK[S]. AND WITH DEMAI, AND WITH FIRST TITHE THE TERUMAH OF WHICH HAS BEEN SEPARATED, AND WITH HEKDESH AND SECOND TITHE WHICH HAVE BEEN REDEEMED.<sup>7</sup>

**GEMARA.** HAZERETH is Hassa [lettuce]; 'ULSHIN is Hindebi [endives]. TAMKA: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: It is called temakta.<sup>8</sup> HARHABINA: R. Simeon b. Lakish said: [It is] the creeper of the palm tree. AND WITH MAROR: merirta.<sup>9</sup> Bar Kappara taught: These are the herbs with which a man discharges his obligation on Passover: with endives, with Tamka, with Harhallin,<sup>10</sup> with Harhabinin,<sup>11</sup> and with lettuce.

R. Judah said: Also with wild [field] endives and with garden endives and with lettuce. 'Garden endives and lettuce': but that is taught in the first section?<sup>12</sup> — This is what he says: Wild endives too are like garden endives and lettuce. R. Meir said: Also with 'Aswaws, and Tura and Mar Yero'ar.<sup>13</sup> Said R. Jose to him: 'Aswaws and Tura are one; and Mar is Yero'ar.<sup>14</sup>

The School of Samuel taught: These are the herbs with which a man discharges his obligation on Passover: With lettuce, with endives, with Tamka, with Harhabinin, with harginin,<sup>15</sup> and with Hardofannim.<sup>16</sup> R. Judah said: Hazereth Yolin [thistles] and willow lettuce too are like them.

R. Judah said in R. Eliezer's name: 'Arkablin too,<sup>17</sup> but I went about to all his [sc. R. Eliezer's] disciples and sought a companion<sup>18</sup> but did not find one, but when I came before R. Eleazar b. Jacob he agreed with my words. R. Judah said: Whatever [plant which] contains an acrid [pungent] sap.

R. Johanan b. Berokah said: Any [plant] the leaves of which look faded [bleached]. Others say: Every bitter herb contains an acrid sap and its leaves are faded. R. Johanan said: From the words of all of them we may learn [that every] bitter herb contains an acrid sap and its leaves are faded.<sup>19</sup> R. Huna said: The Halachah is as the 'Others'.

Rabina found R. Aha son of Raba going in search of Merirta. Said he to him, What is [in] your mind: that it is more bitter? But we learned HAZERETH; and the School of Samuel taught, Hazereth; while R. Oshaia said: The obligation is properly [fulfilled with] Hazereth. And Raba said: What is Hazereth? Hassa. What does Hassa [symbolize]? That the Merciful One had pity [has] upon us.

Further, R. Samuel b. Nahman said in R. Jonathan's name: Why were the Egyptians compared to Maror?<sup>20</sup> To teach you: just as this Maror, the beginning of which is soft while its end is hard,<sup>21</sup> so were the Egyptians: their beginning was soft [mild]. but their end was hard [cruel]!<sup>22</sup> — Then I retract, he replied.

R. Rehumi said to Abaye: How do you know that this 'Maror'<sup>23</sup> means a kind of herb; say that it is the gall of Kufia?<sup>24</sup> — It is like unleavened bread:<sup>25</sup> just as unleavened bread is a product of the earth, so 'Maror' means a product of the earth. Then say it is hirduf?<sup>26</sup> — It is like unleavened bread:<sup>25</sup> just as unleavened bread is a species of plant, so 'Maror' means a species of plant. Then say it is Harzipu?<sup>27</sup> — It must be like unleavened bread: just as unleavened bread is that which can be bought with second tithe money, so Maror' is that which can be bought with second tithe money.<sup>28</sup>

Rabbah son of R. Hanin said to Abaye: Say that Maror means one [herb]?<sup>29</sup> — Merorim [plural] is written. Then say that Merorim means two? — It is like unleavened bread: just as unleavened bread [can be of] many

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

species.<sup>30</sup> so [can] Maror [be of] many species.

Rabbah son of R. Huna said in Rab's name: [Regarding] the herbs whereof the Sages ruled that a man can discharge his duty with them on Passover, they all may be sown in one garden bed. Is this to say that they are not [forbidden] on account of kil'ayim?<sup>31</sup>

Raba objected: [Lettuce] and willow lettuce, [garden] endives and wild endives, [garden] leeks and wild leeks, [garden] coriander and wild coriander, mustard and Egyptian mustard [and] the Egyptian gourd and the bitter gourd, — all these are not Kil'ayim with one another.<sup>32</sup> [Thus] only lettuce with willow lettuce, but not lettuce with endives?<sup>33</sup> And should you answer, They are all taught together, surely Rab said: He teaches them in pairs?

What did Rab mean by 'they are sown'? They are sown according to their law.<sup>34</sup> [You say], 'According to their law!' but we [already] learned it:

- (1) Bitter herbs are eaten on the first two (in Palestine one) nights of Passover, v. Ex. XII, 8.
- (2) A kind of cheveril (Jast.).
- (3) A kind of creeper.
- (4) Lit., 'bitter' (herb). A plant, prob. Cichorium ltybus. Succory (Jast.).
- (5) Shelukin means boiled to a pulp; Mebushalin, boiled in the usual manner.
- (6) That is the minimum quantity which must be eaten; and it can be made up of all these.
- (7) v. p. 161, n. I.
- (8) Rashi: marrubium, hoarhound (Jast.).
- (9) The Aramaic for Maror.
- (10) A prickly plant, thistles.
- (11) Pl. of Harhabina.
- (12) What does R. Judah add?
- (13) Names of bitter herbs. v. next note.
- (14) Jast. ferule. Rashal reads: Aswaws and Tura are one, and it is bitter (mar), and that is (what is called) Mar Yero'ar.
- (15) Jast.: garden ivy.
- (16) Wall ivy.
- (17) Jast.: prickly creepers on palm trees, palm ivy.
- (18) To support me, that he too had heard it from R. Eliezer.
- (19) I.e., all the herbs mentioned by the foregoing teachers possess these two features.

(20) In Ex. I, 14 where the Hebrew for embittered is from the same root as Maror.

(21) The top is soft, while the stalk hardens like wood.

(22) At first they dealt mildly with the Israelites, but subsequently treated them with great cruelty. All this was adduced by Rabina, to show that Merirta was not preferable.

(23) Prescribed in Ex. XII, 8. Merorim, pl. of Maror, is the actual word used there.

(24) Name of a fish, supposed to be identical with colias.

(25) To which it is placed in juxtaposition, *ibid*.

(26) Jast.: a shrub or tree with bitter and stinging leaves, supposed to be rhododaphne, oleander.

(27) Name of a bitter herb, not generally eaten.

(28) This excludes harzipu, for only what is generally eaten can be bought; v. Deut. XIV, 26: all the things enumerated there are normal victuals.

(29) Viz., the most bitter of all.

(30) V. Mishnah Supra 35a.

(31) V. Glos.

(32) Kil. I, 2.

(33) I.e., these are heterogeneous.

(34) I.e., on the contrary, care must be taken not to sow them together, and when they are in one garden-bed the proper space must be left between the separate species.

## Pesachim 39b

A garden-bed which is six handbreadths square, may be sown with five species of seeds, four on the four sides of the bed and one in the middle!<sup>1</sup> —

You might say that this applies only to seeds [cereals]. but not to vegetables;<sup>2</sup> therefore he<sup>3</sup> informs us [otherwise]. Shall we [then] say that vegetables are stronger than seeds?<sup>4</sup> But surely we learned: All Species of seeds may not be sown in one garden-bed [together]. [yet] all species of vegetables [herbs] may be sown in one seed-bed?<sup>5</sup> —

You might say, This Maror<sup>6</sup> is a species of seed [cereal]; hence he informs us [that it is not so].<sup>7</sup> [You say]. 'Seeds'! — Can you think so! But surely we learned, HERBS; and Bar Kappara [also] taught. 'Herbs'; and the School of Samuel [also] taught 'Herbs'?<sup>8</sup> - He needs [to state it about] lettuce;<sup>9</sup> I might argue. since it is destined to harden,<sup>10</sup> we must allow it more space. [For] did not R.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

Jose b. R. Hanina say: If the cabbage stalk hardens, more room is given to it [up to] a Beth roba'?<sup>11</sup> This proves that since it is destined to harden, we allow it more space: so here too we should give it more space. Hence he<sup>12</sup> informs us [otherwise].

**THE LAW IS COMPLIED WITH BY [EATING THEM] BOTH MOIST [FRESH] OR DRY, etc.** R. Hisda said: They learned this only of the stalk; but in the case of the leaves, only moist [fresh] ones, but not dry ones. But since a later clause states, **WITH THEIR STALK**, it follows that the first clause [refers to] leaves? [That clause] indeed gives an explanation: when does he [the Tanna] teach, **BOTH MOIST AND DRY**? In reference to the stalk. An objection is raised: One can discharge [the obligation] with them and their stalks, both moist and dry: this is R. Meir's view. But the Sages maintain: One can discharge [the obligation] with moist [fresh] ones, but one cannot discharge [the obligation] with dry ones. And they agree that one can discharge [the obligation] with them [when] withered,<sup>13</sup> but not [when] preserved, stewed or boiled. This is the general principle of the matter: Whatever has the taste of Maror, one can discharge the obligation with it; but whatever does not possess the taste of Maror, one cannot discharge the obligation with it!<sup>14</sup> — Explain it<sup>15</sup> [as referring] to the stalk.

Our Rabbis taught: One cannot discharge [the obligation] with them [when] withered. In the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Zadok it was said: One can discharge [the obligation] with them [when] withered. Rami b. Hama asked: How about a man discharging his obligation with second tithe Maror in Jerusalem? On R. Akiba's view,<sup>16</sup> there is no question: seeing that he discharges his obligation [there with] in the case of unleavened bread, [the tithing of] which is [enjoined] by Scripture. need you ask about Maror, which is [only] Rabbinical.<sup>17</sup> The question arises on the view of R. Jose the Galilean. What then? Is it only with unleavened bread, which is [tithed] by Scriptural law, that he cannot discharge his

obligation, but with Maror, which is [tithed] by Rabbinical law [only], he discharges his obligation; or perhaps whatever [measure] the Rabbis enacted, they enacted it similar to a Scriptural law?<sup>18</sup> Said Raba: It is logical [that] unleavened bread and Maror [are assimilated].<sup>19</sup>

**MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT SOAK BRAN FOR FOWLS, BUT ONE MAY SCALD IT. A WOMAN MAY NOT SOAK BRAN TO TAKE WITH HER<sup>20</sup> TO THE BATHS,<sup>21</sup> BUT SHE MAY RUB IT ON HER SKIN. AND A MAN MAY NOT CHEW WHEAT AND PLACE IT ON HIS WOUND, BECAUSE IT TURNS LEAVEN.**

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: These are the things which cannot come to fermentation: That which is baked,<sup>22</sup> boiled, and that which is scalded, having been scalded in boiling water. 'That which is boiled'? But while it is being boiled it turns leaven! — Said R. Papa: He means: baked [Mazzah] which was [then] boiled.

It was taught. R. Jose b. R. Judah said: Flour into which there fell a dripping [of water], even all day, does not come to fermentation.<sup>23</sup> Said R. Papa: Provided that it acted drop after drop.<sup>24</sup>

The School of R. Shila said: Wattika<sup>25</sup> is permitted. But it was taught: Wattika is forbidden? — There is no difficulty: here it is such as is prepared with oil and salt;<sup>26</sup> there it is prepared with water and salt.<sup>27</sup> Mar Zutra said: A man must not line a pot with flour of roast grain, lest it had not been properly baked<sup>28</sup> and it comes to leaven.<sup>29</sup> R. Joseph said: A man must not scald

(1) V. Shab. 84b (Sonc. ed.) note a.l. Then what does Rab add?

(2) Because they draw their sustenance more vigorously, hence from a wider area.

(3) Rab.

(4) In drawing from the ground.

(5) Cereal seeds must not be sown within this area, and the statement that five species of seeds may be sown in a plot six handbreadths square applies to vegetables (herbs) only.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(6) I.e., the species enumerated supra in our Mishnah and Gemara.

(7) This answer abandons the previous answer. Seeds (cereals) in fact require more space, for their drawing power is greater, and Rab informs us that Maror belongs to the species of herbs, not seeds, and therefore the more lenient law applies to them.

(8) All these authorities describe Maror as herbs; how then could it be assumed that Maror belongs to the class of cereals?

(9) The last reply to the question, 'What does Rab add', being untenable, another answer is offered.

(10) Its stalk becomes hard and thick.

(11) A piece of ground of the capacity of one roba' (quarter of a Kab) of seed.

(12) Rab.

(13) This is not the same as dry.

(14) Here too R. Meir seems to state that both the herbs themselves (i.e. the leaves) and the stalks may be fresh or dry. And the Mishnah too evidently agrees with R. Meir, since the Rabbis maintain that dried herbs cannot be eaten.

(15) The statement permitting its use dried.

(16) v. supra 36a.

(17) By scriptural law vegetables need not be tithed at all; hence Biblically speaking this Maror is not second tithe.

(18) So that Maror is the same as unleavened bread.

(19) v. supra p. 182, n. 6.

(20) Lit., 'in her hand'.

(21) A bran paste was used as a depilatory or cosmetic.

(22) Once unleavened bread is baked it can never turn leaven.

(23) The incessant dripping prevents fermentation.

(24) Without an appreciable interval between them.

(25) Name of a certain pastry or tart made of flour.

(26) Oil does not cause fermentation.

(27) Then it is forbidden.

(28) Lit., 'boiled'.

(29) Though roast grain is baked, and therefore can never become leaven, yet we fear that it may not have been fully baked, and when the dish is put into the pot with the water this flour will ferment.

And Abaye said: A man must not singe two ears of corn together. lest sap [water] issue from one and the other absorb it, and [thus] it will come to fermentation. Said Raba to him: If so, [forbid] even one also, lest it [the sap] issues from one end and the other end absorbs it? No, said Raba: It is sap [water] of fruit,<sup>2</sup> and sap of fruit does not cause fermentation.

Now Abaye retracted from that [view], because as long as they [the grains] absorb [liquid], they do not ferment.<sup>3</sup> For Abaye said: The jar for roasting [ears of corn]: if it is inverted, it is permitted;<sup>4</sup> if upright, it is forbidden.<sup>5</sup> Raba said: Even if upright it is still permitted [because] it is the sap of fruit, and the sap of fruit does not cause fermentation.

Our Rabbis taught: One may not wash<sup>6</sup> barley on Passover; and if one did wash [them] and they split, they are forbidden;<sup>7</sup> if they did not split, they are permitted. R. Jose said: He can soak them in vinegar. and the vinegar binds them.<sup>8</sup> Samuel said: The Halachah is not as R. Jose.

R. Hisda said in Mar 'Ukba's name: It does not mean literally split, but [if they reach] such [a condition] that if placed on the mouth of a [wine] cask they will split of themselves.<sup>9</sup> But Samuel said: It means literally split. Samuel acted in the vicinity of the home of Bar Hashu [on the view that] 'split' is meant literally.<sup>10</sup>

Rabbah said: A conscientious man should not wash [corn].<sup>11</sup> Why particularly a conscientious man: even any other man<sup>12</sup> too, for surely it was taught: One may not wash barley on Passover? He says thus: He should not wash even wheat, which is hard.<sup>13</sup> Said R. Nahman to him: He who will heed Abba<sup>14</sup> will eat moldy bread.<sup>15</sup> For Surely the household of R. Huna washed [it], and the household of Raba b. Abin washed [it].

## Pesachim 40a

two grains of wheat together, lest one becomes wedged in the cleft of the other, so that the column of water will not surround it on all<sup>1</sup> sides, and [thus] it will come to fermentation.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

But Raba said: It is forbidden to wash [wheat]. But what of what was taught: You may not wash barley on Passover, [implying] barley only may not [be washed], but wheat is permitted? — He leads to a climax!<sup>16</sup> It is unnecessary [to teach about] wheat, for since it has splits the water enters it;<sup>17</sup> but barley, which is smooth, I would say that it is allowable. Therefore he informs us [otherwise]. Subsequently Raba said: It is permitted to wash [wheat]. For it was taught: One can discharge [the obligation] with fine bread and with coarse bread.<sup>18</sup> Now fine bread is impossible without washing [the grain].

R. Papa raised an objection against Raba: [With regard to] the flours and fine meals of Gentiles, those of villages are clean, while those of towns are unclean. What is the reason that those of villages [are clean]? Is it not because they do not wash [the grain],<sup>19</sup> yet he calls it 'fine meal'?<sup>20</sup> — Explain [this<sup>21</sup> as referring to] 'flour'.

After he [Raba] departed, he [R. Papa] said [to himself]. Why did I not cite him [an objection] from what R. Zera said in R. Jeremiah's name in Samuel's name: The wheat for meal offerings must not be washed; yet he calls it fine meal?<sup>22</sup>

Subsequently Raba said: It is obligatory to wash [the grain].<sup>23</sup> for it is said, And ye shall guard the unleavened bread.<sup>24</sup> Now, if not that it requires washing, for what purpose is the guarding?<sup>25</sup> If guarding for the kneading,<sup>26</sup> the guarding of kneading is not guarding,<sup>27</sup> for R. Huna said: The doughs of a heathen,<sup>28</sup> a man may fill his stomach with them,<sup>29</sup> providing that he eats as much as an olive of unleavened bread at the end. [Thus] only at the end, but not at the beginning:<sup>30</sup> what is the reason?

Because he had not afforded it any guarding. Then let him guard it from the baking and onwards?<sup>31</sup> Hence this surely proves that we require guarding from the beginning. Yet whence [does this follow]: perhaps it is

different there, because when guarding became necessary.<sup>32</sup> he did not guard it;<sup>33</sup> but where he did guard it when guarding became necessary. it may indeed be that the guarding at the kneading is [truly] considered 'guarding'. Yet even so,<sup>34</sup> Raba did not retract. For he said to those who handled sheaves,<sup>35</sup> Handle them for the purpose of the precept.<sup>36</sup> This proves that he holds [that] we require guarding ab initio, from beginning to end. Mar the son of Rabina,

(1) Lit., 'four'.

(2) I.e., produce.

(3) MS.M. reads: as long as they (the liquids) are in motion (boiling), they do not create fermentation.

(4) As the sap which is exuded runs out and is not re-absorbed by the other ears. — Therefore the same will hold good where he sings two ears of corn together, which on this view must be permitted. Thus he retracted from his former view.

(5) Because the sap is retained in the vessel.

(6) The verb connotes to moisten the grain before grinding.

(7) Because then they turn leaven very quickly.

(8) Prevents fermentation.

(9) Then they are forbidden.

(10) And since those about which he was consulted were not actually split. he ruled that they were permitted.

(11) v. p. 186, n.8.

(12) Lit., 'the whole world'.

(13) And consequently is slower to ferment than barley. Others who are not so conscientious may moisten wheat, for only barley is forbidden in the Baraitha.

(14) Lit., 'father'- a title of respect.

(15) I.e., unclean bread, since the wheat was not washed.

(16) Lit., 'he states, it is unnecessary "(to teach, etc.)"'.<sup>17</sup>

(17) And certainly causes it to ferment.

(18) V. supra 37a.

(19) And eatables cannot become unclean unless moisture has previously been upon them.

(20) Which shows that fine bread is possible without washing.

(21) The reference to villages.

(22) Such is prescribed in Scripture for meal-offerings, v. Lev. II, i.

(23) For preparing the unleavened bread.

(24) Ex. XII, 17.

(25) For the grain cannot ferment unless there is moisture upon it.

(26) I.e., that when it is kneaded care must be taken that it does not turn leaven.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(27) This verse implies that at a certain stage of its manufacture the unleavened bread must be guarded for the express purpose of fulfilling the law prescribing the eating of unleavened bread. Hence, if a man eats on the first night of Passover only unleavened bread which was not guarded expressly for that purpose, he does not do his duty. Now Raba states that the guarding that is given to it at the stage of kneading is not considered 'guarding' in this respect.

(28) Which one recognizes as not having turned leaven.

(29) On the first night of Passover.

(30) I.e., the law is complied with only with this unleavened bread which he eats at the end, but not with the heathen's dough which he eats at the beginning. The unleavened bread eaten in fulfillment of the precept comes at the end of the meal with the Paschal lamb, v. infra 119b.

(31) I.e., from when it is prepared for baking. viz., when it is shaped, moistened and put into the oven.

(32) Lit., 'when it entered upon (the need for) guarding'. — I.e., at the beginning of the kneading process — from the moment when water was added to the flour making fermentation possible.

(33) Though it nevertheless remained unleavened.

(34) Though Raba's proof was refuted.

(35) At harvest time, gathering and tying them. Lit., 'turned about'.

(36) Bear in mind that they may be used for that purpose.

vinegar.<sup>14</sup> But some say. He may even put in the vinegar [first] and then add the flour.<sup>15</sup> Who is 'some say'? Said R. Hisda, It is R. Judah. For we learned: [In the case of] a stew pot or a boiling pot<sup>16</sup> which he removed seething [from the fire].<sup>17</sup> he must not put spices therein,<sup>18</sup> but he reads: for the sake of unleavened bread — i.e., take care that no water falls on them and do not store them in a damp place

*(R. Han.)*

*(...may put [spices] into a dish or a tureen. 19)*

R. Judah said: He may put [spices] into anything except what contains vinegar or brine.<sup>20</sup> Yet let us establish it as R. Jose, for it was taught, R. Jose said: He can soak them in vinegar, and the vinegar binds them?<sup>21</sup> — We know R. Jose [to rule thus] only when it is by itself, but not when it is in a mixture. 'Ulla said: Both the one and the other are forbidden,<sup>22</sup> because, 'Go, go, thou Nazirite', say we, 'take the most devious route, but approach not the vineyard'.<sup>23</sup>

R. Papa permitted the stewards of the house of the Resh Galutha<sup>24</sup> to mash a dish with parched grains. Said Raba: Is there anyone who permits such a thing in a place where slaves are found?<sup>25</sup> Others say, Raba himself mashed a dish with parched grains.

**MISHNAH.** FLOUR MAY NOT BE PUT INTO HAROSETH<sup>26</sup> OR IN TO THE MUSTARD,<sup>27</sup> AND IF HE DID PUT [IT], IT MUST BE EATEN IMMEDIATELY;<sup>28</sup> BUT R. MEIR FORBIDS [IT]. ONE MAY NOT BOIL THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE, NEITHER IN LIQUIDS NOR IN FRUIT JUICE.<sup>29</sup> BUT ONE MAY BASTE AND DIP IT IN THEM.<sup>30</sup> THE WATER USED BY A BAKER MUST BE POURED OUT, BECAUSE IT PROMOTES FERMENTATION.

**GEMARA.** R. Kahana said: The controversy is [about putting flour] into mustard; but [if it was put] into Haroseth, all agree that it must be burnt immediately. And it was

## Pesachim 40b

his mother stored [grain] for him in a trough.<sup>1</sup> A certain ship of grain foundered in Hishta,<sup>2</sup> [whereupon] Raba gave permission to sell [the grain]<sup>3</sup> to Gentiles.

Rabbah b. Lewai<sup>4</sup> raised an objection against Raba: [With regard to] a garment wherein kil'ayim<sup>5</sup> is lost,<sup>6</sup> he must not sell it to a Gentile,<sup>7</sup> nor may he make a saddle-cloth for an ass;<sup>8</sup> but it may be made into shrouds for a corpse.<sup>9</sup> What is the reason [that it may] not [be sold] to a Gentile? Surely it is because he might resell it to an Israelite?<sup>10</sup> Subsequently Raba said, Let them sell it to Israelites, a kab<sup>11</sup> at a time,<sup>12</sup> so that it should be consumed before Passover.

Our Rabbis taught: One may not mash a dish on Passover;<sup>13</sup> and he who wishes to mash, must put in the flour and then add the

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

taught likewise: Flour must not be put into Haroseth, and if he did put [it], it must be burnt immediately. [If put] into mustard. —

**R. Meir said: It must be burnt immediately; but the Sages rule: It must be eaten immediately.**<sup>31</sup> **R. Huna the son of Rab Judah said in R. Nahman's name in Samuel's name: The Halachah is as the words of the Sages. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac to R. Huna the son of Rab Judah:**

- (1) For use on the night of Passover. This too was guarded from the beginning.
- (2) A canal in Babylonia. This happened before Passover.
- (3) Which became leaven.
- (4) Or, the Levite.
- (5) V. Glos.
- (6) I.e., a thread of the forbidden material was woven in the cloth, and its place is not known.
- (7) For the latter may resell it to a Jew who will wear it in ignorance of the fact that it contains Kil'ayim.
- (8) Lest he subsequently remove it and sew it into a garment.
- (9) Because it can henceforth not be used for any other purpose, since the raiment of the dead is forbidden for general use. On the other hand, the corpse is not subject to any of the laws of the Torah, v. Shab. 30a.
- (10) Then the same should apply here.
- (11) A measure of capacity one sixth of a se'ah.
- (12) I.e., not selling a large quantity to any single person.
- (13) I.e., make a mash of flour and vinegar in the usual way, which is to put in the vinegar first and then add the flour. This is forbidden, because it easily ferments and becomes leaven.
- (14) The vinegar prevents fermenting.
- (15) Although the vinegar becomes mixed with the rest of the dish when it is put in first, it can still prevent the fermenting of the flour.
- (16) The first means a tightly covered pot.
- (17) At twilight on Friday.
- (18) After the Sabbath commences. The pot is a 'first vessel', i.e., it was used directly on the fire, and its contents, as long as they are seething, cause any condiments put therein to boil likewise. This of course is forbidden on the Sabbath.
- (19) Containing a hot stew. The dish or the tureen is a 'second vessel', I.e., it was not used directly on the fire, and cannot make the spices boil.
- (20) Being sharp. they cause them to boil, though the vinegar or brine is mixed with the rest of the dish. By causing them to boil they prevent fermentation, and the same applies here.

(21) Which prevents fermentation.

(22) Whichever is put first. This was proverbial: a man must not venture into temptation, and a Nazirite, who must not eat grapes, must not even go near a vineyard. Similarly, if a man is permitted to make the mash in one way, he will make it in the other way too.

(23) Jast. s.v. אכונגר conjectures that בורדקי is a corruption of that word.

(24) Exilarch, the official title of the head of Babylonian Jewry.

(25) As in the house of the Exilarch. They are very lax in any case, and such leniency will lead to even greater laxity.

(26) A pap made of fruits and spices with wine or vinegar, used for sweetening the bitter herb on Passover night (Jast.).

(27) Lest the flour become leaven.

(28) Before it can ferment.

(29) Though Scripture only mentions water, v. Ex. XII, 9.

(30) I.e., the flesh may be greased

(31) The greater strength of mustard retards fermentation, hence the controversy. But it ferments very quickly in Haroseth.

## Pesachim 41a

Do you<sup>1</sup> say it in reference to Haroseth<sup>2</sup> or do you say it in reference to mustard? What is the practical difference? asked he. — In respect to R. Kahana's [dictum] — For R. Kahana said: The controversy is [about putting flour] into mustard; but [if it was put] into Haroseth, all agree that it must be burnt immediately.<sup>3</sup> I have not heard it, he replied to him, as if to say, I do not agree with it.

**R. Ashi said: Logic supports R. Kahana, since Samuel said: The Halachah is not as R. Jose.<sup>4</sup> Surely then, since it [vinegar] does not bind, it does indeed cause fermentation?<sup>5</sup> — No: perhaps it neither binds nor promotes fermentation.**

**ONE MAY NOT BOIL, etc. Our Rabbis taught: [Eat not of it raw, nor boiled at all] with water:<sup>6</sup> I only know [that it may not be boiled] in water; whence do we know [it of] other liquids? You can answer, [it follows] a minor,<sup>7</sup> if water, which does not impart its taste,<sup>7</sup> is forbidden; then other liquids, which impart their taste, how much with these**



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

liquids when it is being roasted, and the roasted meat may be dipped into liquids at the time of eating. more so!<sup>8</sup>

Rabbi said: 'With water': I only know it of water; whence do we know [it of] other liquids? Because it is stated, 'nor boiled at all',<sup>9</sup> [implying] in all cases.<sup>10</sup> Wherein do they differ? — They differ in respect of [that which is] roasted in a pot.<sup>11</sup> And the Rabbis: how do they utilize this [phrase] 'nor boiled at all'? — They employ it for what was taught: If he boiled it and then roasted it, or roasted it and then boiled it, he is liable.<sup>12</sup> As for 'if he boiled it and then roasted it, he is liable,' that is well, seeing that he boiled it.<sup>13</sup> But if he roasted it and then boiled it, surely it is 'roast with fire'; why [then is he liable]?—

Said R. Kahana: The author of this is R. Jose. For it was taught: The law<sup>14</sup> is complied with by [eating] an [unleavened] wafer that is soaked<sup>15</sup> or boiled, but not dissolved: this is the view of R. Meir. R. Jose said: The law is complied with by [eating] a wafer that is soaked, but not with one that is boiled, even if not dissolved.<sup>16</sup> 'Ulla said: You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Meir;<sup>17</sup> here it is different, because Scripture saith, 'nor boiled at all', [implying] in all cases.<sup>18</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: You might think that if he roasted it as much as it needs,<sup>19</sup> he should be liable. Therefore it is stated: Eat not of it semi-roast nor boiled at all with water': semi-roast or boiled did I forbid<sup>20</sup> thee, but not that which is roasted as much as it needs.<sup>21</sup> How is that meant? —

Said R. Ashi: That he rendered it charred meat. Our Rabbis taught: You might think that if he ate as much as an olive of raw meat,<sup>22</sup> he should be liable; therefore it is stated, Eat not of it semi-roast [Na] nor boiled at all [with water]: semi-roast and boiled did I forbid thee, but not raw. You might think that it is permitted; therefore it is stated, 'but roast with fire'. How is 'Na'

understood? — Said Rab: as that which the Persians call abarnim.<sup>23</sup>

R. Hisda said: He who cooks [food] in the hot springs of Tiberias on the Sabbath is not culpable;<sup>24</sup> if he boiled the Passover sacrifice in the hot springs of Tiberias, he is culpable. Wherein does the Sabbath differ, that [he is] not [culpable]? Because we require the product of fire,<sup>25</sup> which is absent! Then [in respect to] the Passover sacrifice too it is not a product of fire? —

Said Raba, What is the meaning of his statement,<sup>26</sup> 'he is culpable'? That he transgresses on account of '[Thou shalt not eat...]' but roast with fire.<sup>27</sup> R. Hiyya son of R. Nathan recited this [dictum] of R. Hisda explicitly. [Thus:] R. Hisda said: He who cooks in the hot springs of Tiberias on the Sabbath is not culpable; but if he boiled the Passover sacrifice in the hot springs of Tiberias, he is culpable. because he transgressed on account of 'but roast with fire'.

Raba said: If he ate it semi-roast,

- (1) Lit., 'does the Master'.
- (2) That the paps ferment also with Haroseth.
- (3) Do you too accept this, or do you maintain that there is a controversy in respect of Haroseth too?
- (4) Supra 40a, q.v. in reference to vinegar.
- (5) Which is the reason that flour must not be put into Haroseth, since it contains vinegar, and it further follows that if put into it, it is forbidden. Hence when Samuel said that the Halachah is as the Sages, that it is permitted, he must have referred to mustard, but not to Haroseth.
- (6) Ex. XII, 9.
- (7) Lit., 'which does not lose its taste' (to the substance boiled in it).
- (8) Since the sacrifice now has a foreign flavor.
- (9) The emphatic 'at all' is expressed in Hebrew by the doubling of the verb.
- (10) In whatever it is boiled.
- (11) Without any liquid, save its own juice. If we deduce the interdict of other liquids a minori, this however is permitted. But when we learn it from the emphatic doubling of the verb, even this is forbidden. — The Passover sacrifice was roasted on a spit directly over the fire.
- (12) To flagellation for eating it.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(13) In the first place. It can never be subsequently regarded as 'roast with fire'.

(14) Relating to the eating of unleavened bread on Passover.

(15) In another dish.

(16) Because It is not called bread, notwithstanding that it was previously baked in an oven. Similarly, if the Passover is boiled after being roasted, it is no longer regarded as 'roast with fire'.

(17) Viz., that once baked it retains its name as bread.

(18) Even after roasting. This answers the question, 'And the Rabbis: how do they utilize this (phrase), "nor boiled at all"?'.

(19) I.e., he over-roasted it, thus burning it. I might think that this is not called 'roast with fire' but 'burnt with fire', and therefore he incurs flagellation for eating it.

(20) Lit., 'tell'.

(21) No interdict is violated by eating it thus.

(22) Of the Passover sacrifices.

(23) Half-done meat. v. Jast. s.v. אברנים.

(24) For the desecration of the Sabbath, because this is not really cooking.

(25) Before it can be called cooking.

(26) Lit., 'which he states'.

(27) He is not culpable on account of, 'Thou shalt not eat of it. . . boiled with water' because this is not designated boiling. But the other portion of the verse, 'but roast with fire', is an implied negative injunction, the command being that you must not eat anything which is not roast, and what is boiled in the springs of Tiberias is therefore forbidden by implication. He thus holds that a man is flagellated for an implied negative injunction, i.e., one which is not explicitly stated.

## Pesachim 41b

he is flagellated twice;<sup>1</sup> if he ate it boiled, he is flagellated twice;<sup>2</sup> [if he ate] semi-roast and boiled, he is flagellated thrice. Abaye said: We do not flagellate on account of an implied prohibition. Some maintain: He is not indeed flagellated twice,<sup>3</sup> but he is nevertheless flagellated once.<sup>4</sup> Others say. He is not even flagellated once, because [Scripture] does not particularize its interdict, like the interdict of muzzling.<sup>5</sup>

Raba said: If he [a Nazirite] ate the husk [of grapes]. he is flagellated twice; if he ate the kernel, he is flagellated twice; [for] the husk and the kernel, he is flagellated thrice.<sup>6</sup> Abaye maintained: We do not flagellate on

account of an implied prohibition — Some say: He is indeed not flagellated twice, but he is nevertheless flagellated once.<sup>7</sup> Others maintain: He is not even flagellated once, because [Scripture] does not particularize its interdict, like the interdict of muzzling.

Our Rabbis taught: If he ate as much as an olive of semi-roast [paschal offering] before nightfall,<sup>8</sup> he is not culpable; [if he ate] as much as an olive of semi-roast flesh after dark, he is culpable. If he ate as much as an olive of roast meat before nightfall, he does not disqualify himself from [being one of] the members of the company;<sup>9</sup> [if he eats] as much as an olive of roast meat after dark,<sup>10</sup> he disqualifies himself from [being one of] the members of his company.

Another [Baraita] taught: You might think that if he ate as much as an olive of semi-roast before nightfall he should be culpable; and it is a logical inference: if when he is subject to [the precept] 'arise and eat roast [flesh]',<sup>11</sup> he is subject to [the interdict] 'do not eat it semi-roast'; then when he is not subject to [the precept], 'arise and eat roast', is it not logical that he is subject to [the interdict] 'do not eat it semi-roast'?

Or perhaps it is not so:<sup>12</sup> when he is not subject to [the precept]. 'arise and eat roast', he is subject to, 'do not eat it semi-roast', [while] when he is subject to [the precept], 'arise and eat roast', he is not subject to [the interdict] 'do not eat it semi-roast', and do not wonder [threat], for lo! it was freed<sup>13</sup> from its general interdict in respect to roast.<sup>14</sup>

Therefore it is stated, 'Eat not of it semi-roast'; nor boiled at all [Bashel Mebushshal] with water, but roast with fire'. Now, 'but roast with fire' should not be stated;<sup>15</sup> then why is 'but roast with fire' stated? To teach you: When he is subject [to the command]. 'Arise and eat roast', he is [also] subject to 'Eat not of it semi-toast'; when he is not subject to [the command]. 'Arise and eat

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

roast', he is not subject to, 'Eat not of it semi-roast'.<sup>16</sup>

Rabbi said: I could read 'Bashel'; why is 'Mebushshal' stated [too]? For I might think, I only know it<sup>17</sup> where he boiled it after nightfall. Whence do we know it if he boiled it during the day?<sup>18</sup> Therefore it is stated, 'Bashel Mebushshal', [implying] in all cases. But Rabbi has utilized this 'Bashel Mebushshal' in respect of [flesh] roast[ed] in a pot and [flesh boiled] in other liquids?<sup>19</sup> — If so,<sup>20</sup> let Scripture say either Bashel Bashel or Mebushshal mebushshal:<sup>21</sup> why 'Bashel Mebushshal'? Hence you infer two things from it.

Our Rabbis taught: If he ate roast [paschal offering] during the day. he is culpable; and [if he ate] as much as an olive of semi-roast after nightfall, he is culpable. [Thus] he teaches roast similar to half-roast: just as semi-roast [after nightfall] is [interdicted] by a negative injunction, so is roast [before nightfall] subject to a negative injunction. As for half-roast, it is well: it is written, 'Eat not of it semi-roast'.

But whence do we know [the negative injunction for] roast? Because it is written, 'And they shall eat the flesh in that night': only at night, but not by day. But this is a negative injunction deduced by implication from an affirmative command, and every negative injunction deduced by implication from an affirmative command is [technically] an affirmative command?<sup>22</sup> —

Said R. Hisda, The author of this

- (1) Once on account of the injunction against semi-roast, and again because of the interdict, 'Eat not... but roast with fire'.
- (2) On account of the injunction against boiled flesh, and again as in the case of semi-roast meat.
- (3) Since he is flagellated on account of the direct prohibition, 'Eat not of it semi-roast', or, 'nor boiled', he is not flagellated on account of the implied interdict too.
- (4) Rashi: E.g., he who boils it in the hot springs of Tiberias. Since there is no explicit injunction, we fall back upon the implied injunction. Tosaf.: If he

was merely warned against violating the injunction, 'Eat not of it... but roast with fire'.

(5) V. Deut. XXV, 4. This is an interdict explicitly forbidding a particular action, and this is the model of all interdicts the disregard of which involves flagellation, since it immediately follows the law of flagellation (ibid. v. 3). But the interdict of 'eat not of it... but roast with fire' does not particularize any method of preparation as forbidden.

(6) V. Num. VI, 4: All the days of his Naziriteship he shall eat nothing that is made of the grape vine, from the kernels eaten to the husk. According to Raba, the kernels and the husk are explicitly prohibited, while they are also included in the implied prohibition of 'he shall eat nothing that is made of the grape vine', and the offender is flagellated on account of each.

(7) Rashi: E.g., if he ate the leaves of the vine; cf. n. 2.

(8) Lit., 'while it was yet day' — on the fourteenth of Nisan.

(9) Each paschal offering had to be eaten by one company, the members of which had registered for that particular animal. It might not be eaten by two companies, while on the other hand no man might eat in two separate places. It is now taught that if he eats some roast meat before nightfall, he is not disqualified from eating elsewhere with his company after nightfall, the earlier eating not being regarded as eating of the paschal offering in this sense.

(10) Not in the company where he registered.

(11) I.e., perhaps a different argument is to be used.

(12) I.e., after nightfall.

(13) Lit., 'permitted'.

(14) For even roast paschal offering is not permitted before nightfall, as it is written, 'and they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire', which implies, but not before; at night this implied prohibition is lifted. Hence we might argue: granted that the general interdict is not lifted at the outset in respect of semi-roast too, yet if he ate it he is not liable to punishment.

(15) For the previous verse states: And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire.

(16) I. e., flagellation for eating semi-roast meat of the paschal offering is incurred only on the evening of the fifteenth, when one is bidden to eat the roast of the Passover sacrifice, but not on the day of the fourteenth, before the obligation commences.

(17) That boiled paschal offering flesh must not be eaten.

(18) That even then it may not be eaten at night.

(19) Supra 41a.

(20) That that is its only teaching.

(21) Granted that the repetition is necessary, the same grammatical form could be repeated.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(22) Which does not involve flagellation.

## Pesachim 42a

is Rabbi. For it was taught: Either a bullock or a lamb that hath anything superfluous or lacking in its parts, that mayest thou offer for a freewill-offering; [but for a vow it shall not be accepted]:<sup>1</sup> that thou mayest dedicate<sup>2</sup> for the Temple repair,<sup>3</sup> but thou mayest not dedicate unblemished [animals] for the Temple repair.<sup>4</sup> Hence it was said, Whoever dedicates unblemished [animals] for the Temple repair transgresses an affirmative precept — I only know [that he transgresses] an affirmative precept: whence do we know [that he transgresses also] a negative injunction? Because it is stated, And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying [Lemor]:<sup>5</sup> this teaches concerning the whole section that it is subject to a negative injunction: this is R. Judah's view.<sup>6</sup>

Rabbi asked Bar Kappara: How does that imply it? Said he to him, Because it is written, 'Lemor': a 'not' ['Lo'] was stated in [these] matters .<sup>7</sup> The School of Rab interpreted: Lemor, a negative injunction [law] was stated.

**THE WATER USED BY A BAKER, etc.** One [Baraita] taught: You must pour [it] out on a slope. but you may not pour [it] out on broken [ground].<sup>8</sup> While another [Baraita] taught: You may pour [it] out on broken ground? — There is no difficulty: here it means that it [the water] is abundant, so that it collects;<sup>9</sup> there it means that it is not abundant, so that it does not collect.

Rab Judah said: A woman must knead [unleavened bread] only with water which was kept overnight.<sup>10</sup> R. Mattenah taught this [in a public lecture] at Papunia.<sup>11</sup> On the morrow all took their pitchers and repaired to him and demanded of him, 'Give us water'. Said he to them, 'I meant with water which has been kept overnight'.

Raba lectured: A woman may not knead in the sun, nor with water heated by the sun, nor with water collected<sup>12</sup> from the caldron;<sup>13</sup> and she must not remove her hand from the oven until she has finished all the bread;<sup>14</sup> and she requires two vessels, one with which she moistens [the dough], and the other wherein she cools her hands.<sup>15</sup> is now being discussed, has likewise the same superscription in v. I, q.v. The scholars asked: What if she transgressed and kneaded [in warm water]?

Mar Zutra said: [The bread] is permitted; R. Ashi said: It is forbidden — Mar Zutra said, Whence do I know<sup>16</sup> it?—Because it was taught: One may not wash barley on Passover; and if one did wash [them], if they split they are forbidden; if they did not split, they are permitted.<sup>17</sup>

But R. Ashi says: Will you weave all these things in one web?<sup>18</sup> Where it was stated,<sup>19</sup> it was stated; and where It was not stated, it was not stated.

## CHAPTER III

**MISHNAH.** NOW THE FOLLOWING [THINGS] MUST BE REMOVED<sup>20</sup> ON PASSOVER: BABYLONIAN KUTAH,<sup>21</sup> MEDIAN BEER, IDUMEAN VINEGAR, EGYPTIAN ZITHOM,<sup>22</sup> THE DYER'S BROTH,<sup>23</sup> COOK'S DOUGH,<sup>24</sup> AND THE SCRIBES' PASTE.<sup>25</sup> R. ELIEZER SAID: WOMEN'S ORNAMENTS TOO.<sup>26</sup> THIS IS THE GENERAL, RULE: WHATEVER IS OF<sup>27</sup> THE SPECIES OF CORN<sup>28</sup> MUST BE REMOVED ON PASSOVER. THESE ARE SUBJECT TO A WARNING',<sup>29</sup> BUT THEY DO NOT INVOLVE KARETH.

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: Three things were said of Babylonian kutah: it closes up the heart,<sup>30</sup> blinds the eyes, and emaciates the body. It closes up the heart, on account of the whey of milk; and it blinds the eyes, on account of the salt; and it emaciates the body, on account of the stale crusts.<sup>31</sup>



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**Our Rabbis taught: Three things increase one's motion, bend the stature, and take away a five hundredth part of a man's eyesight. They are these: Coarse black bread, new beer, and raw vegetables.**

**Our Rabbis taught: Three things decrease one's motion, straighten the stature, and give light to the eyes. These are they: White bread, fat meat, and old wine. White bread,**

- (1) Lev. XXII, 23.
- (2) Lit., 'cause to be seized' with sanctity.
- (3) I.e., it must be redeemed and the redemption money devoted to the general needs of the Temple, as apart from sacrifices.
- (4) Since they are fit for the higher sanctity of sacrifices.
- (5) Ibid. I.
- (6) Ex. XII, 8, which
- (7) 'Lemor' is treated as contraction of 'Lo Amur'. I.e., the laws contained in this section are subject to the admonition, 'do not violate them'.
- (8) Rashi: Broken ground contains shallows and cavities where the water will gather. Instead of soaking in, and will thereby cause fermentation. Jast.: the place where water poured out would remain stagnant.
- (9) Hence it may not be poured out there.
- (10) Because in Nisan the water in the wells is warm (v. infra 94b). which hastens fermentation. Therefore it must be drawn the evening before it is required, so that it can cool off.
- (11) A town between Baghdad and Pumbeditha, and included in the juridical district of the latter. Obermeyer, Landschaft, p. 242. — He lectured in Hebrew, using the actual words 'Mayim Shelanu', which may also mean, water belonging to us. — This suggests that Hebrew was sufficiently well known by the masses to make public lectures in that language possible.
- (12) Lit., 'swept out'.
- (13) The last-named is generally warm, and heat hastens fermentation.
- (14) I.e., she must work on the dough all the time until it is baked.
- (15) Her hands too, if heated, induce fermentation.
- (16) Lit., 'says'.
- (17) V. Supra 40a. Thus though it may not be done in the first place, if done it is permitted as long as there are no signs of leavening, and the same applies here.
- (18) You surely cannot bring all cases into one category.
- (19) That it is permitted if done.
- (20) I.e., they must not be used; lit., 'they must pass away' (R. Tam. and Jast.). Rashi: (On account of) the following things you transgress the

injunctions, (leaven) 'shall not be seen' and (leaven) 'shall not be found' (in the house).

(21) V. supra p. 95, nn. 7 and 8.

(22) A kind of beer.

(23) Made of bran, to keep the dye fast.

(24) Which is placed over the pot to absorb the froth.

(25) With which they paste strips of parchment, etc. together. All these are forbidden because they contain the product of cereals which turn leaven.

(26) This is explained in the Gemara.

(27) I.e., contains.

(28) As enumerated in the Mishnah supra 35a.

(29) This is a technical term, denoting a negative injunction, the violation of which is punished by flagellation.

(30) Probably, makes its action sluggish.

(31) Jast.: the decay of the flour-substance.

(32) Lit., 'clean'.

## Pesachim 42b

of fine meal. Fat meat, of a goat which was not opened.<sup>1</sup> Old wine: very old.<sup>2</sup> Everything that is beneficial for the one is harmful for the other,<sup>3</sup> and what is harmful for one is beneficial for the other, save moist zangebila,<sup>4</sup> long peppers, white bread, fat meat and old wine, which are beneficial for the whole body.

**MEDIAN BEER.** Because barley water is mixed into it.

**IDUMEAN VINEGAR.** Because barley is cast into it. R. Nahman [b. Isaac] said:<sup>5</sup> In former times, when they used to bring [wine] libations from Judah, the wine of Judah did not turn vinegar unless barley was put into it, and they used to call it simply vinegar.<sup>6</sup> But now the wine of the Idumeans does not turn vinegar until barley is put into it, and it is called 'Idumean vinegar', in fulfillment of what is said, [Tyre hath said against Jerusalem...] I shall be replenished, now that she is laid waste:<sup>7</sup> if one is full [flourishing] the other is desolate, and if the other is full the first is desolate.<sup>8</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac quoted this: and the one people shall be stronger than the other people.<sup>9</sup>

It was taught, R. Judah said: Originally, he who bought vinegar from an 'am ha-arez<sup>10</sup>

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

did not need to tithe it, because it was a presumption that it was produced from naught but tamad.<sup>11</sup> But now, he who buys vinegar from an 'Am Ha-arez must tithe it.<sup>12</sup> Now does R. Judah hold [that] tamad is not liable to tithing, but we learned: He who makes tamad, pouring water on by measure, and [then] he finds the same quantity, is exempt [from tithing]:<sup>13</sup> but R. Judah declares him liable?<sup>14</sup> This is what he says: The 'Amme Ha-arez were not under suspicion in connection with tamad.<sup>15</sup> Alternatively, they were under suspicion, yet there is no difficulty: the one refers to [tamad made with] the straining bag; the other refers to [tamad made of] kernels.<sup>16</sup>

**AND EGYPTIAN ZITHOM.** What is EGYPTIAN ZITHOM? — R. Joseph learned: [A concoction made of] a third part barley, a third part safflower, and a third part salt. R. Papa omitted barley and substituted wheat. And your token is 'sisane'.<sup>17</sup> They soaked them [these ingredients], then roasted them, ground them and then drank them. From the [Passover] sacrifice<sup>18</sup> until Pentecost, they who are constipated are relieved, while they who are diarrheic are bound. [But] for an invalid and a pregnant woman it is dangerous.<sup>19</sup>

**AND DYER'S BROTH.** Here it is explained: Bran water, with which lacca<sup>20</sup> is primed.

**AND COOK'S DOUGH.** A loaf [i.e., dough] made of corn less than a third grown, which she places on the mouth of the pot and it absorbs the froth.

**AND SCRIBES' PASTE.** Here it is explained: Shoemaker's paste.<sup>21</sup>

R. Shimi of Hozae<sup>22</sup> said: It is a toilet paste used by the daughters of rich men, of which they leave [some] for the daughters of poor men.<sup>23</sup>

But that is not so, for R. Hiyya taught: They are four commodities of general use<sup>24</sup> and three manufacturing commodities.<sup>25</sup> Now if

you say that it is a toilet paste used by the daughters of rich men, what manufacturing commodities are there?<sup>26</sup> What then; [it is] shoemaker's paste? Then why does he call it SCRIBES' PASTE; he should say, cobbler's PASTE? —

Said R. Oshaia to him: In truth it is shoemaker's paste; yet why does he call it: SCRIBES' PASTE? Because scribes too stick their papyrus together with it.

**R. ELIEZER SAID: WOMEN'S ORNAMENTS TOO, etc. WOMEN'S ORNAMENTS!** can you think so!<sup>27</sup> Rather, say, WOMEN'S cosmetics TOO.

For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: [As to] the daughters of Israel

- (1) I.e., which has not given birth to young.
- (2) Rashi: three years old. — But it is doubtful if this would be called very old.
- (3) I.e., what is beneficial for the heart is harmful to the eyes., etc.
- (4) Zingiber, an Arabian spice plant, prob. ginger (Jast.).
- (5) The Yalkut omits b. Isaac; the text infra supports this omission.
- (6) The wine was so good that without barley it would never turn sour.
- (7) Ezek. XXVI, 2.
- (8) Tyre — here represented as synonymous with Edom — and Jerusalem can neither both flourish simultaneously nor both be desolate simultaneously. — True religion and paganism are irrevocably opposed to each other, and the triumph of one must involve the defeat of the other.
- (9) Gen. XXV, 23.
- (10) V. Glos.
- (11) An inferior wine made from the husks of grapes steeped in water. But it was definitely not from wine, for the wine was too good to turn into vinegar.
- (12) Because it is probably from wine, which is nowadays of a poorer quality and readily turns vinegar. Of course, the 'am ha-arez himself should have tithed it, but they were suspected of neglecting tithes, and therefore the purchaser had to render tithe; v. Glos. s.v. Demai.
- (13) Because it is mere water, though it has slightly absorbed the appearance and taste of wine from the husks and kernels.
- (14) Because its appearance and taste determine its status as wine.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(15) Because it was so cheap that even they would not grudge its tithes.

(16) When tamad is made by pouring water over the lees in the strainer, it is wine, and is subject to tithes. But tamad made with kernels is merely colored water, and is not subject to tithes at all.

(17) 'Twigs'. R. Joseph (יוסף) included barley (שערי) both words containing an S (ס and ש) and the two ס in 'sisane' serve as mnemonic for this.

(18) I.e., from Passover.

(19) Because its laxative properties are too great.

(20) So the reading in Maim. and Jast. Lacca is the juice of a plant, used for dyeing.

(21) Perura is a paste made of crumbs.

(22) The modern Khuzestan.

(23) It is a depilatory made of

(24) Lit., 'for the Country'.

(25) Thus he sums up the seven things mentioned in the Mishnah.

(26) This is not all article used in manufacture.

(27) They have nothing to do with leaven.

## Pesachim 43a

who have attained maturity but have not attained [their] years,<sup>1</sup> the daughters of poor men plaster them [the unwanted hairs] with lime; the daughters of wealthy men plaster them with fine flour; while royal princesses, with oil of myrrh as it is written, six months with oil of myrrh.<sup>2</sup> What is oil of myrrh? R. Huna b. Jeremiah said: Sakath.<sup>3</sup> R. Jeremiah b. Abba said: Oil of olives which were not a third grown.

It was taught, R. Judah said: Anpikanin<sup>4</sup> is oil of olives which were not a third grown. And why do [women] rub it in [their skin]? Because it removes the hair and rejuvenates the skin.

**THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: WHATEVER IS OF THE SPECIES OF CORN.** It was taught, R. Joshua said: Now since we learned, **WHATEVER IS OF THE SPECIES OF CORN MUST BE REMOVED ON PASSOVER,** why did the Sages enumerate these? So that fine flour, and wealthy women give the leavings to their poorer sisters, the daughters of scribes, who were generally poor. One should be familiar with them and with their names.<sup>5</sup> As it once happened that a certain Palestinian<sup>6</sup> visited

Babylonia. He had meat with him and he said to them [his hosts], Bring me a relish.<sup>7</sup> He [then] heard them saying, 'Take him kutah'. As soon as he heard kutah, he abstained.<sup>8</sup>

**THESE ARE SUBJECT TO A WARNING'. Which Tanna [holds] that real leaven of corn in a mixture, and spoiled leaven<sup>9</sup> in its natural condition, is subject to a negative injunction?<sup>10</sup> —**

Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: It is R. Meir. For it was taught: Si'ur<sup>11</sup> must be burnt, and he may give it to his dog, and he who eats it is [punished] by forty [lashes].<sup>12</sup> Now this is self-contradictory. You say, 'Si'ur must be burnt': this proves that it is forbidden for use. Then it is stated, 'and he may give it to his dog', which proves that it is permitted for use!

This is its meaning: Si'ur' [i.e., what is Si'ur] according to R. Meir [must be burnt] in R. Meir's opinion, and [what is Si'ur'] according to R. Judah [must be burnt] in R. Judah's opinion. And he may give it to his dog, [i.e., what is Si'ur'] according to R. Meir [may be given to a dog] in R. Judah's opinion. And he who eats it is [punished] by forty [lashes] — this agrees with R. Meir.<sup>13</sup> [Thus] we learn that R. Meir holds that spoiled [leaven] in its natural state<sup>14</sup> is subject to a negative injunction, and all the more real leaven of corn in a mixture.<sup>15</sup>

R. Nahman said, It is R. Eliezer. For it was taught: For real leaven of corn there is the penalty of Kareth; for a mixture of it [one is subject to] a negative injunction: this is the view of R. Eliezer.

But the Sages maintain: For real leaven of corn there is the penalty of Kareth; for the mixture of it there is nothing at all.<sup>16</sup> [Thus] we learn that R. Eliezer holds that real leaven of corn in a mixture is subject to a negative injunction, and all the more spoiled [leaven] in its natural state.<sup>17</sup> Now R. Nahman, what is the reason that he does not say as Rab Judah? —

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

He can tell you: perhaps R. Meir rules [thus] only there, [in respect of] spoiled [leaven] in its natural state, but not [in the case of] real leaven of corn in a mixture. And Rab Judah: what is the reason that he does not say as R. Nahman?

He can tell you: [Perhaps]<sup>18</sup> R. Eliezer rules [thus] only there, [in respect of] real leaven of corn in a mixture, but not [in the case of] spoiled [leaven] in its natural state. It was taught in accordance with Rab Judah:<sup>19</sup> Ye shall eat nothing leavened:<sup>20</sup> this is to include Babylonian kutah and Median beer and Idumean vinegar and Egyptian zithom. You, might think that the penalty is Kareth; therefore it is stated, for whosoever eateth that which is leavened shall be cut off<sup>21</sup> for real leaven of corn there is the penalty of Kareth, but for the mixture of it [you are subject] to a negative injunction. Now, whom do you know to maintain [that] for the mixture of it [you are subject] to a negative injunction?

It is R. Eliezer. Yet he does not state<sup>22</sup> spoiled [leaven] in its natural state. This proves that R. Eliezer does not hold [that] spoiled [leaven] is subject to a negative injunction]. Now R. Eliezer, whence does he know that the mixture of it involves a negative injunction: because it is written, 'ye shall eat nothing leavened'? If so, let him [the offender] be liable to Kareth that real leaven in a mixture is more stringent leaven than spoiled leaven in its natural state. too, since it is written, 'for whosoever eateth that which is leavened . shall be cut off'? —

He requires that for what was taught: ([Ye shall eat nothing] leavened):<sup>23</sup> I only know [that it is forbidden] where it turned leaven of itself; if [it fermented] through the agency of another substance, how do we know it? Because it is stated, for whosoever eateth that which is leavened shall be cut off. If so, [the teaching] of the negative injunction too comes for this purpose?<sup>24</sup> Rather, R. Eliezer's reason is [that he] deduces from

'whosoever'.<sup>25</sup> [But] there too<sup>26</sup> 'whosoever' is written? — He requires that to include women.<sup>27</sup> But women are deduced from Rab Judah's [dictum] in Rab's name.

For Rab Judah said in Rab's name, and the School of R. Ishmael taught likewise: when a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit:<sup>28</sup> the Writ assimilated woman to man in respect of all the penalties which are [decreed] in the Torah? It is necessary:

(1) I.e., they have grown the hair which is the evidence of maturity before the usual age, which is twelve years and a day. They would normally be ashamed and wish to remove it. Tosaf. in Shab, 80b s.v. שְׁהֵיטוֹ omits 'years' and seems to translate: 'who have reached their time (for marriage), and yet have not attained it', so that they wish to make themselves more beautiful.

(2) Est. II, 12 q.v.

(3) Jast.: oil of myrrh or cinnamon.

(4) It is stated in Men. 86a that anpikanin must not be brought with a meal-offering. R. Judah explains what this is.

(5) That all may know that their use is forbidden on Passover.

(6) Lit., 'son of the West'.

(7) To go with the meat.

(8) He knew that it contains milk, whilst they did not.

(9) 'Nuksheh', a leavened substance unfit for food.

(10) Babylonian kutah and Median beer both contain real leaven, but mixed with other substances; while women's paste is simply flour, unmixed, but spoiled and unfit for food.

(11) This is dough which is beginning to ferment, i.e., semi-leaven. At that stage it is unfit for eating, and therefore the same as spoiled leaven; v. infra 48b.

(12) This is the punishment for violating a negative injunction.

(13) V. infra 48b for the controversy between R. Meir and R. Judah as to what constitutes Si'ur', semi-leaven. Now both R. Meir and R. Judah hold that use of Si'ur, as each defines it respectively, is forbidden, and hence it must be burnt. But Si'ur, as defined by R. Meir, is in R. Judah's opinion Mazzah (unleavened bread), but as it is not fit for eating, it must be given to a dog. The final clause teaches this: according to R. Meir, he who eats Si'ur, as defined by himself, is flagellated, though R. Judah holds that at that stage it is Mazzah and may be eaten.

(14) Such as Si'ur.

(15) Rab Judah being of the opinion

(16) No penalty is incurred.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(17) Thus R. Nahman holds that spoiled leaven unmixed is more stringent than real leaven in a mixture.

(18) [Added with MS.M.]

(19) That real leaven mixed is the more stringent.

(20) Ex. XII, 20.

(21) Ibid. 19.

(22) I.e., include.

(23) The bracketed passage is omitted in some edd. as well as supra 28b in the quotation of this Baraitha.

(24) That a negative injunction is involved even in respect of that which is made leaven through a foreign substance.

How then do we know that even for a mixture a negative injunction is transgressed?

(25) Heb. Kol. This is an extension, and so teaches even the inclusion of a mixture.

(26) In reference to Kareth.

(27) That they too are subject to the penalty of Kareth.

(28) Num. V, 6.

## Pesachim 43b

you might argue, since it is written, Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith;<sup>1</sup> whoever is subject to 'arise, eat unleavened bread', is subject to 'thou shalt eat no leavened bread'; hence these women, since they are not subject to, 'arise, eat unleavened bread', because it is an affirmative precept limited to time,<sup>2</sup> I would say that they are also not subject to, 'thou shalt eat no leavened bread'. Hence it [the verse] informs us [otherwise]. And now that they have been included in [the injunction of] 'thou shalt eat no leavened bread', they are also included in respect of eating unleavened bread, in accordance with R. Eleazar.

For R. Eleazar said: Women are subject to the [precept of] eating unleavened bread by the law of Scripture, for it is said, Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; [seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread [therewith]: whoever is subject to 'thou shalt eat no leavened bread', is subject to the eating of unleavened bread; and these women, since they are subject to [the injunction of] 'thou shalt eat no leavened bread', are [also] subject to, 'arise, eat unleavened bread'. And why do you prefer<sup>3</sup> [to assume] that this

'whosoever is to include women, while you exclude its mixture; say that it is to include the mixture?<sup>4</sup> — It is logical that when treating of eaters [Scripture] includes eaters; [but] when treating of eaters, shall it include things which are eaten?<sup>5</sup>

To this R. Nathan the father of R. Huna demurred: Then wherever [Scripture] treats of eaters does it not include things eaten? Surely it was taught: For whosoever eateth the fat [Heleb] of the beast, of which men present an offering [made by fire to the Lord, even the soul that eateth it shall be cut off from his people]:<sup>6</sup> I only know it of the Heleb of unblemished [animals], which are fit to be offered [as sacrifices]; whence do we know it of the Heleb of blemished animals? Therefore it is stated, 'of the beast'.<sup>7</sup> Whence do we know it of the Heleb of Hullin? Because it is stated, 'For whosoever',<sup>8</sup> Thus here, though [Scripture] treats of eaters, yet it includes things eaten? —

Since there are no eaters there [to be included],<sup>9</sup> it includes things eaten. Here, however, that there are eaters [to be included],<sup>10</sup> he cannot abandon eaters and include things eaten. Now as to the Rabbis who do not accept the view [that a negative injunction is violated through] a mixture, they do not interpret 'whosoever' [as an extension]. But then how do they know [that] women [are liable to Kareth]?<sup>11</sup> — They do not interpret 'whosoever' [as an extension], but they do interpret 'for whosoever' [as such].<sup>12</sup>

Then [according to] R. Eliezer, say that 'whosoever' is to include women; 'for whosoever' is to include the mixture [of leaven]?<sup>13</sup> And should you answer, R. Eliezer does not interpret 'for whosoever' [as an additional extension] surely it was taught: For ye shall not burn any leaven...[as an offering made by fire unto the Lord]:<sup>14</sup> I only know it of the whole of it;<sup>15</sup> whence do I know [even] part of it?<sup>16</sup> Because 'any' [Kol] is stated. Whence do we know [that] its mixture<sup>17</sup> [is forbidden]? Because it is stated

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

for any [Ki Kol]. Whom do you know to interpret Kol [as any extension]? R. Eliezer; and he [also] interprets 'for any' [Ki Kol]. This is [indeed] a difficulty.

R. Abbahu said in R. Johanan's name: In all the prohibitions of the Torah, a permitted [commodity] does not combine with a prohibited [commodity],<sup>18</sup> except in the [case of the] prohibitions of a Nazirite, for lo! the Torah said, [any] infusion [of grapes].<sup>19</sup>

While Ze'iri said: Also 'ye shall not burn any leaven'.<sup>20</sup> With whom [does this agree]? With R. Eliezer, who interprets kol.<sup>21</sup> If so,

- (1) Deut. XVI,3.
- (2) Lit., 'caused by the time'. I.e., it is performed at certain times or seasons, and it is shown in Kid. 29a that women are exempt from such.
- (3) Lit., 'what (reason) do you see?'
- (4) While the limitation excludes women.
- (5) Surely not.
- (6) Lev. VII, 25.
- (7) Implying whether it is fit for sacrificing or not.
- (8) Which is an extension.
- (9) For the inclusion of women in the prohibition and penalty follows from Rab's dictum supra 43a bottom.
- (10) Viz., women, as explained supra.
- (11) For eating leaven. For R. Eliezer interprets 'whosoever' in both cases, one as including a mixture, and the other as including women. But since the Rabbis do not interpret 'whosoever' as an extension, there is nothing to intimate the inclusion of women.
- (12) Written in connection with Kareth, Ex. XXI, 15 and 19.
- (13) Teaching that Kareth is involved, and not merely a negative precept.
- (14) Lev. II, 11. For...any (E.V. For ye shall make no...) is Ki...Kol, the same words which are translated for whosoever' in the previous verses.
- (15) I.e., where the whole of that which is burnt on the altar consists of leaven.
- (16) Leaven must not even be used as part of the offering.
- (17) I.e., anything containing a mixture of leaven.
- (18) The minimum quantity to involve punishment is as much as an olive. Now, if a man eats half that quantity of Heleb together with half that quantity of permitted meat simultaneously, the latter does not combine with the former, that it should be regarded as though he had eaten the full quantity of prohibited food.
- (19) Num. VI, 3: neither shall he drink any infusion of grapes. By this the Talmud

understands that he must not eat bread steeped in wine. Now bread itself is permitted, yet Scripture forbids the combination of bread and wine as though that also were forbidden, and if the two together amount to an olive, punishment is involved. For if Scripture refers to a case where the wine itself contains that quantity, why state it at all; obviously the wine is not less prohibited merely because it has been absorbed by the bread?

(20) Cf. Lev. I, 11. Rashi: if the priest put half an olive of leaven and half an olive of Mazzah, not mixed together but each separately distinguishable, upon the altar, he incurs punishment. Tosaf. explains it differently.

(21) Supra: 'whence do I know (even) part of it', etc. He understands this to mean that there is half an olive of each.

## Pesachim 44a

in the matter of leaven too?<sup>1</sup> — That indeed is so; yet this<sup>2</sup> is to reject [the ruling] of Abaye, who said, There is burning [on the altar] in respect of less than an olive;<sup>3</sup> therefore he informs us that there is no burning for less than an olive.

R. Dimi sat and reported this discussion. Said Abaye to R. Dimi: And [in] all [other] prohibitions of the Torah, does not a permitted commodity combine with a prohibited [commodity]? Surely we learned: If the mikpeh<sup>4</sup> is of Terumah, while the garlic and the oil are of Hullin, and a Tebul Yom touched part of it, he disqualifies all of it.<sup>5</sup> If the Mikpeh is of Hullin, while the garlic and the oil is of Terumah, and a Tebul Yom touches part of it, he disqualifies only the place which he touches. Now we pondered thereon: why is the place where he touches unfit? Surely the seasoning<sup>6</sup> is nullified in the greater quantity?<sup>7</sup>

And Rabbah b. Bar Hanah answered: What is the reason? Because a lay Israelite is flagellated on its account for [eating] as much as an olive.<sup>8</sup> How is that conceivable?<sup>9</sup> Is it not because the permitted [commodity] combines with the forbidden [commodity]?— No: what does 'as much as an olive' mean: that there is as much as an olive within the time of eating half [a loaf].<sup>10</sup> Is then 'as much

# PESOCHEM - 33a-60a

as an olive within the time of eating half [a loaf]’ a Scriptural [standard]?<sup>11</sup> Yes, he answered him. If so, why do the Rabbis disagree with R. Eliezer in reference to Babylonian kutah?<sup>12</sup> —

What then: [the reason is] because the permitted [commodity] combines with the prohibited commodity? Then after all why do the Rabbis differ from R. Eliezer in the matter of Babylonian kutah? But leave Babylonian kutah alone,<sup>13</sup> because it does not contain as much as an olive within the eating of half [a loaf]. [For] if [it is eaten] in its natural state,<sup>14</sup> so that he gulps it down and eats it, we disregard such a fancy as being exceptional.<sup>15</sup> While if he dips [bread] into it<sup>16</sup> and eats it, it does not contain as much as an olive within the time of eating half [a loaf].

He raised all objection against him: If there are two [stew] pots, one of Hullin and the other of Terumah, and in front of them are two mortars, one containing [condiments of] Hullin and the other containing Terumah, and the latter fell into the former, they are permitted,<sup>17</sup> for I assume: the Terumah fell into the Terumah, and the Hullin fell into the Hullin. Now if you say that as much as an olive within the [time of] eating half [a loaf] is a Biblical [standard], why do we say, ‘for I assume, the Terumah’, etc.?<sup>18</sup> — Leave the Terumah of condiments alone, he replied, which is [only] Rabbinical.<sup>19</sup>

He raised an objection against him: [If there are] two baskets, one containing Hullin and the other containing Terumah, and in front of them are two se'ah [of provisions], one of Hullin and the other of Terumah and these fell into those, they are permitted, for I assume: the Hullin fell into Hullin, [and] the Terumah fell into the Terumah. Now if you say that as much as an olive within the eating of half [a loaf] is a Scriptural [standard], why do we say, ‘because I assume’ [etc.]?<sup>20</sup> —

Leave the Terumah [set aside] kutah there is as much as an olive of leaven, and for that he should be liable. at the present time<sup>21</sup> he

answered him, which is only Rabbinical. Now does this [law of] the infusion [of grapes] come for this purpose?<sup>22</sup> It is required for what was taught: ‘An infusion’:

(1) There too he learns that there is a negative injunction in respect of the mixture of leaven; hence he should likewise assume that it refers to half all olive of each.

(2) Sc. the particular mention of the burning of leaven on the altar.

(3) Even if one burns less than an olive of leaven on the altar, he is culpable, since the leaven itself, whatever its quantity, involves punishment.

(4) Jast.: a stiff mass of grist, oil and onions.

(5) A Tebul Yom (v. Glos.) disqualifies Terumah. Since the main part of the dish is Terumah, even the Hullin too becomes unfit, because it is subsidiary to the Terumah.

(6) I.e., the garlic and oil.

(7) As explained in n. 4, it is merely subsidiary to the main dish.

(8) Hence it is not regarded as nullified, in spite of its subsidiary nature.

(9) "When a lay Israelite eats as much as an olive of that dish, he has not eaten that quantity of Terumah. Why then is he flagellated?

(10) I.e., if he eats as much as half a loaf of eight average eggs in size, this half constituting an average meal, within the time that the normal eater requires for a meal, he will have eaten as much as an olive of Terumah, and for that he is culpable. [According to Maim. Yad ‘Erubin., half a loaf is equivalent to three average eggs].

(11) That flagellation is incurred. — Flagellation is only imposed for the violation of a law of Scripture.

(12) Even if flagellation is not incurred on account of the mixture, yet there too in a quantity of four eggs of

(13) I.e., do not ask a question from it.

(14) I.e., by itself, and not as a relish with something else.

(15) Lit., ‘his mind is nullified by the side of every man. It is not considered eating, and therefore does not involve punishment. — Punishment is incurred only when forbidden, food is eaten in the normal way.

(16) Rashi; Jast.: if he spreads it (on bread).

(17) The pot of Hullin is permitted to a lay Israelite.

(18) For of course it might have been the reverse; how then can we make this lenient assumption when there is a doubt of a Scriptural prohibition?

(19) By Scriptural law no Terumah is required for these; hence the entire prohibition in this case is only Rabbinical.

(20) V. n. 6.

(21) After the destruction of the Temple.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(22) V. Supra 43b bottom.

## Pesachim 44b

[this is] to intimate that the taste is as the substance itself, so that if he [the Nazirite] steeped grapes in water and it possesses the taste of wine, he is culpable.<sup>1</sup> From this you may draw a conclusion for the whole Torah.<sup>2</sup> For if a Nazirite, whose prohibition is not a permanent prohibition, and his prohibition is not a prohibition of [general] use,<sup>3</sup> and there is a release for his prohibition,<sup>4</sup> yet [Scripture] made the taste tantamount to the substance in his case; then Kil'ayim, the prohibition of which is a permanent prohibition, and whose prohibition is a prohibition of [general] use, and there is no release from its prohibition, is it not logical that the taste should be treated as tantamount to the substance itself? And the same applies to 'Orlah by two [arguments]!<sup>5</sup>—

The authority for this is the Rabbis, which R. Johanan<sup>6</sup> stated [his ruling] in accordance with R. Akiba. Which [ruling of] R. Akiba [is alluded to]? Shall we say, R. Akiba of our Mishnah, for we learned: 'R. Akiba said: If a Nazirite soaked his bread in wine, and it contains sufficient to combine as much as an olive, he is culpable'? But whence [do you know that he means sufficient] of the bread and the wine; perhaps [he means] of the wine alone?<sup>7</sup> And should you say, [if] of the wine alone, why state it? He informs us thus: [He is culpable] although it is a mixture!<sup>8</sup>—

Rather it is R. Akiba of the Baraita. For it was taught, R. Akiba said: If a Nazirite soaked his bread in wine and ate as much as an olive of the bread<sup>9</sup> and the wine [combined] he is culpable. Now [according to] R. Akiba, whence do we know that the taste [of forbidden food] is like the substance itself?<sup>10</sup>— He learns it from [the prohibition of] meat [seethed] in milk; is it not merely a taste,<sup>11</sup> and it is forbidden? so here too<sup>12</sup> it is not different. And the Rabbis?<sup>13</sup>— We cannot learn from meat [seethed] in milk,

because it is an anomaly.<sup>14</sup> Yet what is the anomaly? Shall we say because this [sc. meat] by itself is permitted, and that [sc. milk] by itself is permitted, while in conjunction they are forbidden, but [with] Kil'ayim too, this [species] by itself is permitted, and that [species] by itself is permitted, yet in conjunction they are forbidden?—

Rather [the anomaly is] that if he soaked it all day in milk it is permitted,<sup>15</sup> yet if he but seethed it [in milk] it is forbidden. Then R. Akiba too? [The prohibition of] meat [seethed] in milk is certainly an anomaly?<sup>16</sup>—

Rather he learns it from the vessels of Gentiles.<sup>17</sup> The vessels of Gentiles, is it not merely a flavor [which they impart]? Yet they are forbidden; so here too it is not different. And the Rabbis?<sup>18</sup>—

The vessels of Gentiles too are an anomaly, for whatever imparts a deteriorating flavor is permitted,<sup>19</sup> since we learn it from Nebelah,<sup>20</sup> yet here it is forbidden.<sup>21</sup> But R. Akiba [holds] as R. Hiyya the son of R. Huna, who said: The Torah prohibited [it] only in the case of a pot used on that very day, hence it is not a deteriorating flavour.<sup>22</sup> And the Rabbis?—

A pot used on that very day too, it is impossible that it should not slightly worsen [the food cooked in it]. R. Aha son of R. 'Awia said to R. Ashi: 'From the Rabbis let us learn the view of R. Akiba. Did not the Rabbis say, "An infusion": [this is] to intimate that the taste is tantamount to the substance itself. From this you may draw a conclusion for the whole Torah?' Then according to R. Akiba too [let us say]: 'An infusion': this is [to intimate] that the permitted commodity combines with the forbidden commodity. From this you may draw a conclusion for the whole Torah?<sup>23</sup>—

Said he to him,

(1) For eating it. '



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(2) I.e., that the taste of all forbidden food is forbidden just as the substance itself. [That is provided the forbidden substance consisted originally of the size of an olive. This requirement distinguishes this principle from that of R. Johanan, in virtue of which what is permitted combines with what is forbidden, even though the latter is less in size than an olive's bulk.]

(3) Though he may not eat grapes or drink wine, etc. he may benefit from them.

(4) He can be absolved of his vow, whereupon it all becomes permitted.

(5) Rashi: 'Orlah too is forbidden for use and there is no release for its prohibition. The third argument however cannot be applied here, as 'Orlah is not permanently forbidden, since it is permitted after three years. Tosaf. explains it differently. — But incidentally we see that 'an infusion' is required for a different purpose.

(6) Supra 43b bottom.

(7) Viz., that the bread had soaked up that quantity of wine. Yet the term 'combine' is applicable, because the wine is not separate now but is spread through the bread.

(8) Of bread and wine, the wine not standing alone.

(9) The wine had not soaked through the whole olive-bulk of the bread, so that part of the bread is by itself; and the only reason for culpability must be the principle enunciated by R. Johanan.

(10) Since he utilizes 'an infusion' for the purpose just stated.

(11) Which the meat has received from the milk.

(12) I.e., in respect of all other forbidden food.

(13) Why cannot they learn it in the same way?

(14) Lit., 'a new law', i.e., it is peculiarly different from other laws, and therefore does not provide a basis for analogy.

(15) By Scriptural law, even to eat it; Scripture forbids it only when cooked in milk.

(16) How then can he derive it thence?

(17) Lit., 'the exudings (from the vessels) of Gentiles', i.e., vessels in which Gentiles cooked food. These must be purged with boiling water (this is called Hag'alah) before they may be used, because they exude a flavor of the food which was boiled in them.

(18) V. n. 6.

(19) I.e., when the imparted flavor spoils the taste of the permitted food.

(20) Deut. XIV, 21: Ye shall not eat of

(21) They assume that the flavor exuded by the vessel has a deteriorating effect.

(22) Because it is still fresh.

(23) Then why did R. Johanan (Supra 43b bottom) limit this principle to a Nazirite, seeing that his statement is in accordance with R. Akiba?

Because a Nazirite and a sin-offering are two verses with the same teaching,<sup>1</sup> and they do not illumine [other cases].<sup>2</sup> 'A Nazirite', that which we have stated. What is the reference to the sin-offering? —

For it was taught: whatsoever shall touch in the flesh thereof shall be holy;<sup>3</sup> you might think, even if it did not absorb [of the flesh of the sin-offering]; therefore it is stated, 'in the flesh thereof'.<sup>4</sup> Only when it absorbs in the flesh?<sup>5</sup> 'Shall be holy', to be as itself, so that if it [the sin-offering] is unfit, that [which touches it] becomes unfit; while if it is fit, that may be eaten [only] in accordance with its stringencies.<sup>6</sup> Anything that dieth of itself (Nebelah); thou mayest give it unto the stranger. Hence whatever is fit for a stranger is designated Nebelah, but what is unfit is not designated Nebelah, in the sense that if it imparts a deteriorating flavor it does not render the food forbidden. Then, according to the Rabbis too, let a Nazirite and a sin-offering be two verses with the same teaching and they do not illumine [other cases]? —

They can answer: these are indeed [both] necessary.<sup>7</sup> And R. Akiba?<sup>8</sup> How are they [both] necessary? It is well [to say] that if the Merciful One wrote it in respect to a sin-offering, [the case of] a Nazirite could not be derived from it, because we cannot derive Hullin from sacred sacrifices.<sup>9</sup> But let the Merciful One write it in respect to a Nazirite, and then the sin-offering would come and be derived from it, seeing that all the prohibitions of the Torah are learnt from a Nazirite.

But the Rabbis can answer you: they [both] are indeed required; the sin-offering, to [show that] the permitted combines with the forbidden, while Hullin cannot be deduced from sacred sacrifices; and 'an infusion', to intimate that the taste is as the substance itself, and from this you may draw a conclusion for the whole Torah.

# PESOCHEM - 33a-60a

But R. Akiba maintains: both [are required] for [teaching] that the permitted combines with the forbidden, so that they are two verses with the same teaching, and all [instances of] two verses with the same teaching do not illumine [other cases].

R. Ashi said to R. Kahana: Then as to what was taught, [All the days of his Naziriteship shall he eat] nothing that is made of the grape vine, from the husks to the kernels;<sup>10</sup> this teaches concerning a Nazirite's prohibited commodities, that they combine with each other; — seeing that according to R. Akiba [even] the forbidden with the permitted combine, is it necessary [to state] the forbidden with the forbidden?<sup>11</sup> —

Said he to him: The forbidden with the permitted [combine only when eaten] together; the forbidden with the forbidden, [even when eaten] consecutively<sup>12</sup> which absorbs some of it. — Thus here too the permitted flesh combines with the forbidden, and all is regarded as forbidden.

**MISHNAH.** [WITH REGARD TO] THE DOUGH IN THE CRACKS OF THE KNEADING TROUGH, IF THERE IS AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE IN ONE PLACE, HE IS BOUND TO REMOVE [IT]; BUT IF NOT, IT IS NULLIFIED THROUGH THE SMALLNESS OF ITS QUANTITY.<sup>13</sup> AND IT IS LIKEWISE IN THE MATTER OF UNCLEANNES: IF HE OBJECTS TO IT, IT INTERPOSES;<sup>14</sup> BUT IF HE DESIRES ITS PRESERVATION,<sup>15</sup> IT IS LIKE A KNEADING-TROUGH.<sup>16</sup>

**GEMARA.** Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They learned this<sup>17</sup> only of a place where it [the dough] does not serve<sup>18</sup> for reinforcing [the trough]; but where it serves for reinforcing [it], he is not bound to remove it.<sup>19</sup> Hence it follows that [where there is] less than an olive, even if it does serve for reinforcing [it], he is not obliged to remove it. Others recite it in reference to the second clause: BUT IF NOT, IT IS NULLIFIED THROUGH THE SMALLNESS OF ITS QUANTITY.

Said Rab Judah in Samuel's name: They learned this only where it serves for reinforcing [the trough]; but where it does not serve for reinforcing [it], he is bound to remove it. Whence it follows that if there is as much as an olive, even where it serves for reinforcing [it], he is bound to remove it.

It was taught as the former version; It was taught as the latter version. It was taught as the former version: Dough in the cracks of the kneading trough, where it serves for reinforcing, it does not interpose,<sup>20</sup> and he [its owner] does not transgress.<sup>21</sup> But [if it is] in a place where it does not serve for reinforcing, it interposes, and he transgresses. When is this said? Where there is as much as an olive. But if there is less than an olive, even where it does not serve for reinforcing, it does not interpose, and he does not transgress. Again, it was taught as the latter version: Dough in the cracks of a kneading trough, where it serves for reinforcing,

(1) Lit., 'which come as one'.

(2) V. Supra p. 119, n. 2.

(3) Lev. VI, 20. 'Holy' means 'forbidden', in the sense that any other flesh which touches this flesh of the sin-offering becomes subject to the same laws and limitations as those to which the sin-offering is subject.

(4) Literal translation. I.e., it is forbidden only if it absorbs some of the sin-offering within itself.

(5) [The text of cur. edd. is difficult. A better reading is preserved in the Sifra a.l. 'till it absorbs', omitting the words 'in the flesh', and the deduction being from the word 'thereof'.]

(6) A sin-offering must be eaten within the sacred precincts, by male priests, and for one day and night only; similarly the food

(7) And where that is so, they do illuminate other cases, since neither could be deduced from the other.

(8) Does he not admit this?

(9) The latter being naturally more stringent. Hence the fact that there the permitted combines with the forbidden does not prove that it will also do so in the case of Hullin, where the interdicted food is not sacred.

(10) Num. VI, 4.

(11) Surely it is obvious; why then is the verse required?

(12) For further notes on the whole discussion beginning with R. Abbahu's dictum in the name of

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

R. Johanan on page 43b, v. Nazir, Sonc. ed. pp. 128ff.

(13) I.e., he has abandoned the normal use of the dough in flavor of the trough.

(14) V. infra n. 8; if he objects to it, it is regarded as a foreign body.

(15) I.e., he wants the dough to be there to close the crack.

(16) And it does not interpose.

(17) That if there is as much as an olive in one place it must be removed.

(18) Lit., 'it is not made for'.

(19) E.g., if the crack is at the bottom of the trough, and the dough fills it and so prevents the water from running out. It is then regarded as part of the trough, not as dough, and therefore it need not be removed. But if the crack is high up, it does not serve this purpose and must be removed.

(20) When a utensil is ritually unclean and cleansed in a ritual bath, nothing must interpose between the utensil and the water of the bath (called a Mikveh); otherwise the ablution is invalid. This dough, since it reinforces the trough, is counted as part of itself and not as a foreign body, and therefore it is not an interposition between the trough and the water; hence the ablution is valid.

(21) The law of Passover by leaving it there and not removing it.

## Pesachim 45b

it does not interpose, and he does not transgress; [if it is] in a place where it does not serve for reinforcing, it interposes, and he transgresses. When is this said? When there is less than an olive; but if there is as much as an olive, even in a place where it serves for reinforcing, it interposes, and he transgresses. Then these are contradictory?— Said R. Huna: Delete the more lenient [Baraitha] in favor of<sup>1</sup> the more stringent.

R. Joseph said: You quote Tannaim at random!<sup>2</sup> This is a controversy of Tannaim. For it was taught: If a loaf went moldy, he is bound to remove it, because it is fit to crumble and leaven many other doughs with it.

R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: When is this said? If it is kept for eating. But a mass<sup>3</sup> of Se'or which he put aside for sitting, he has nullified it.<sup>4</sup> Now, since R. Simeon b. Eleazar said, 'He

has nullified it', it follows that the first Tanna holds that he has not nullified it. This proves that he holds, wherever there is as much as an olive, even if he nullifies it, it is not nullified.

Said Abaye to him: You have reconciled it where there is as much as an olive; [yet] have you reconciled it [where there is] less than an olive? Rather both the one and the other are [the rulings of] R. Simeon b. Eleazar, yet there is no difficulty: one [is taught where it is] in the place of kneading; the other, where it is not in the place of kneading.<sup>5</sup>

R. Ashi said: Do not assume that 'not in the place of kneading' means on the back of the trough [only], but [it means even] on the [upper] rim of the trough. That is obvious? — You might say, it sometimes splashes up and reaches there;<sup>6</sup> hence he informs us [otherwise].

R. Nahman said in Rab's name: The Halachah is as R. Simeon b. Eleazar. Yet that is not so, for R. Isaac b. Ashi said in Rab's name: If he plastered its surface<sup>7</sup> with clay, he has nullified it. [Thus,] only if he plastered it, but not if he did not plaster it?<sup>8</sup> He who recited this did not recite that.<sup>9</sup> Others state, R. Nahman said in Rab's name: The Halachah is not as R. Simeon b. Eleazar, for R. Isaac b. Ashi said in Rab's name: If he plastered its surface with clay, he has nullified it, etc.

R. Nahman said in Samuel's name: [If there are] two half olives<sup>10</sup> and a thread of dough joining<sup>11</sup> them, we see: wherever if the thread were taken up these would be carried with it, he is bound to remove [them];<sup>12</sup> but if not, he is not bound to remove [them].

Said 'Ulla: This was said only of [dough in] a kneading trough; but [if they are] in the house, he is bound to remove [them].<sup>13</sup> What is the reason? Because he may sometimes sweep them and they will fall together.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

‘Ulla said: They asked in the West [Palestine]: What of a room<sup>14</sup> and an upper storey; what of a room and the [entrance] hall; what of two rooms, one within the other?<sup>15</sup> The questions stand.

Our Rabbis taught: If a loaf went moldy and it became unfit for human consumption, yet a dog can eat it, it can be defiled with the uncleanness of eatables, if the size of an egg, and it may be burnt together with an unclean [loaf] on Passover.<sup>16</sup>

In R. Nathan's name it was ruled: It cannot be defiled [as an eatable]. With whom agrees the following which we learned: A general principle was stated in respect to the laws of [ritual] cleanness: Whatever is set aside for human consumption is unclean,<sup>17</sup> until it becomes unfit for a dog to eat? With whom [does this agree]? It is not in accordance with R. Nathan.

Our Rabbis taught: [With regard to] the trough of tanners<sup>18</sup> into which he put flour,<sup>19</sup> [if] within three days [before Passover], he is bound to remove it;<sup>20</sup> [if] before three days, he is not bound to remove it.<sup>21</sup>

Said R. Nathan: When is this said? If he did not put hides into it; but if he put hides into it, even [if it is] within three days, he is not bound to remove [the flour].<sup>22</sup> Raba said: The Halachah is as R. Nathan, even [if it is] one day, and even one hour [before Passover].

AND IT IS LIKEWISE IN RESPECT TO UNCLEANNESS: IF HE OBJECTS TO IT, IT INTERPOSES; BUT IF HE DESIRES ITS PRESERVATION, IT IS LIKE THE KNEADING-TROUGH. How compare: there the matter is dependent on the quantity [of the dough], [whereas] here the matter is dependent on [his] objecting [to it]?

Said Rab Judah, Say: But in respect to uncleanness it is not so.

Said Abaye to him, But he states, AND IT IS LIKEWISE IN RESPECT TO

UNCLEANNESS? Rather, said Abaye, He means it thus: AND IT IS LIKEWISE

(1) Lit., ‘before’.

(2) There is no reason for assuming that both Baraithas represent the view of the same Tanna.

(3) Kopeth really means a low seat or block.

(4) I.e., he gave up the nominal use of it as Se’or and hence it no longer counts as leaven.

(5) in the second Baraitha, ‘where it does not serve for reinforcing’, refers only to a place where no kneading is done at all, e.g. at the upper edge; but dough in the cracks at the sides is regarded as reinforcing the trough, and hence it must be removed. But the first Baraitha holds that even in the latter case it does not reinforce it, though kneading is done there, while ‘where it serves for reinforcing’ refers to the bottom only. Hence this is what the first Tanna states: Where it serves for reinforcing, e.g., at the bottom, he does not transgress even if there is as much as an olive. Where it does not serve for reinforcing (i.e., to support the water), e.g., in the sides, which is a place for kneading yet not a place for the water, if there is as much as an olive, it interposes, and he transgresses. But if there is less than an olive, even if it is in the sides it does not interpose, for since it does help somewhat to support the dough which is kneaded there (viz., that it should not sink into the crack), it is nullified. But this Tanna does not discuss dough which is not in the place of kneading, viz., at the upper rim, and he would admit in that case that even if there is less than an olive it is not nullified. While the second Tanna rules thus: If it is in the place where it affords support to the dough, i.e., in the sides, if there is less than an olive it does not interpose; if there is as much as an olive, it interposes, and this is the view of the first Tanna too. While where it is not made for reinforcing (or, supporting), i.e., at the upper rim, even less than an olive interposes, and this too agrees with the first Tanna.

(6) So that the rim is regarded as a place of kneading and must be removed, even if less than an olive. [MS.M. omits ‘and reaches there’. V. also Rashi.]

(7) Sc. that of the mass of Se’or which he set aside for sitting.

(8) Whereas R. Simeon b. Eleazar holds that it is nullified in any case.

(9) There are two opposing views on Rab's ruling.

(10) I.e., two pieces of dough, each the size of half an olive. — The reference is to the cracks in the kneading trough.

(11) Lit., ‘between’.

(12) Because it is all one.

(13) Even if they are not thus united by a thread of dough.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(14) Bayith in the Talmud often has the meaning of a room in a house.

(15) I.e., if there is half an olive in one and half in the other: do we fear here too that they may be swept together?

(16) V. supra 15b.

(17) I.e., subject to defilement as an eatable.

(18) Into which they put hides for tanning.

(19) Which is used in the tanning process.

(20) Because it is still regarded as flour, and of course it is leaven.

(21) Because by Passover it will be so spoiled through the odor of the trough, even if there are no hides in it, that it will not be regarded as flour.

(22) Because the hides utterly spoil it.

## Pesachim 46a

**IN RESPECT TO combining for UNCLEANNESS on Passover, whereas during the rest of the year there is a distinction. How is that? E.g., if there are eatables less than an egg in quantity,<sup>1</sup> and they were in contact with this dough: on Passover, when its prohibition renders the dough important,<sup>2</sup> it combines.<sup>3</sup> [But] during the rest of the year, when the matter is dependent on [his] objecting, IF HE OBJECTS TO IT,<sup>4</sup> it combines; [while] IF HE DESIRES ITS PRESERVATION, IT IS LIKE THE KNEADING-TROUGH.**

To this Raba demurred: Does he then teach, it combines; surely he teaches, IT INTERPOSES! Rather, said Raba: [The meaning is], AND IT IS LIKEWISE IN RESPECT TO cleaning<sup>5</sup> the kneading-trough. How is that? E.g., if this kneading-trough became unclean, and he wishes to immerse it. On Passover, when its interdict [renders it] important, IT INTERPOSES, and the immersion is not efficacious for it. But during the rest of the year the matter is dependent on his objecting: IF HE OBJECTS TO IT, IT INTERPOSES, WHILE IF HE DESIRES ITS PRESERVATION, IT IS LIKE THE KNEADING-TROUGH.

To this R. Papa demurred: Does he teach, And it is likewise in respect to cleanness? Surely he teaches, AND IT IS LIKEWISE IN RESPECT TO UNCLEANNESS!

Rather, said R. Papa: [The meaning is], AND IT IS LIKEWISE IN RESPECT TO causing UNCLEANNESS to descend upon the kneading-trough. How so? E.g., if a Sherez touched this dough: on Passover, when its interdict [renders it] important, IT INTERPOSES,<sup>6</sup> and uncleanness does not descend upon it;<sup>7</sup> [but] during the rest of the year, when the matter is dependent on [his] objecting, IF HE OBJECTS TO IT, IT INTERPOSES; WHILE IF HE DESIRES ITS PRESERVATION, IT IS LIKE [i.e., identical with] THE KNEADING-TROUGH.<sup>8</sup>

*MISHNAH.* [REGARDING] 'DEAF' DOUGH,<sup>9</sup> IF THERE IS [A DOUGH] SIMILAR TO IT WHICH HAS BECOME LEAVEN,<sup>10</sup> IT IS FORBIDDEN.

*GEMARA.* What if there is no [dough] similar to it? — Said R. Abbahu in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: [The period for fermentation is] as long as it takes a man to walk from the Fish Tower [Migdal Nunia] to Tiberias, which is a mil.<sup>11</sup> Then let him say a mil? — He informs us this, [viz.,] that the standard of a mil is as that from Migdal Nunia to Tiberias.<sup>12</sup> R. Abbahu said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: For kneading, for prayer, and for washing the hands, [the standard is] four mils.<sup>13</sup>

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Aibu stated this,<sup>14</sup> and he stated four [laws] about it,<sup>15</sup> and one of them is tanning. For we learned: And all these, if he tanned them or trod on them to the extent of tanning,<sup>16</sup> are clean,<sup>17</sup> excepting a man's skin. And how much is 'the extent of tanning'? — Said R. Aibu in R. Jannai's name: The extent of walking four mils.

R. Jose son of R. Hanina said: They learned this only [about going on] ahead: but [as for going] back, he need not return even a mil.<sup>18</sup> Said R. Aha: And from this [we deduce]: it is only a mil that he need not go back, but less than a mil he must go back.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**MISHNAH. HOW DO WE SEPARATE Hallah ON THE FESTIVAL [FROM DOUGH WHICH IS] IN [A STATE OF] UNCLEANNES?<sup>19</sup> R. ELIEZER SAID: IT MUST NOT BE DESIGNATED WITH THE NAME [OF Hallah] UNTIL IT IS BAKED.<sup>20</sup> THE SON OF BATHYRA SAID: LET IT [THE DOUGH] BE CAST INTO COLD WATER.<sup>21</sup> SAID A. JOSHUA:**

- (1) This being the minimum standard which can defile.
- (2) Lit., it's prohibition is important .
- (3) With the eatables. I.e., the dough, if an olive in quantity, is important in so far as its prohibition necessitates its removal, and owing to this it combines with the eatables to the standard of an egg, whereby if unclean they can together defile other food.
- (4) Which gives it an importance.
- (5) Lit., 'bringing it up' — from its uncleanness.
- (6) Between the Sherez, (v. Glos.) and the trough.
- (7) The trough does not become unclean, for we do not regard the Sherez, as having touched it.
- (8) So that the trough becomes unclean through the contact of the Sherez with the dough.
- (9) An idiomatic expression: dough in which it is doubtful whether leavening has set in or not. Another reading: 'potsherd' dough, i.e., dough whose surface has gone hard and smooth and contains no splits, which are the usual signs of fermentation, and thus there is doubt.
- (10) I.e., dough which was kneaded at the same time.
- (11) Two thousand cubits. This is generally regarded as an eighteen minutes' walk. If it is eighteen minutes since the dough was kneaded (before being set in the oven), it is leaven.
- (12) I.e., that they are a mil apart.
- (13) A paid kneader must go four mils to immerse the kneading vessels, if they are unclean. A man on a journey, when he wishes to stop for the night, must go on another four mils if there is a synagogue within that distance, to pray there. Similarly, he must go on four mils ahead to procure water for washing his hands prior to eating; but if no synagogue or water is available within that distance, he is not bound to undertake a longer journey.
- (14) In the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish, and not R. Abbahu.
- (15) Not three; i.e., the three already mentioned and another.
- (16) Hides were spread out to be trodden on, and this was part of the tanning process.
- (17) In Hul. 122a a number of animals are enumerated whose skins are the same as their flesh in respect of defilement, as they are likewise

accounted as eatables (several animals unfit for food are included in the list). But if he tanned them, etc. they are clean, i.e., they lose the status of flesh and thus become clean.

(18) E.g., to procure water, etc.

(19) The reference is to Passover. Unclean Hallah may not be eaten by the priest. Now this Hallah may not be baked, since it cannot be eaten, and only the preparation of food is permitted on a Festival; it cannot be kept until evening, as it may turn leaven; nor may it be burnt or given to dogs, for sacred food must not be destroyed thus on a Festival. The actual Festival days are meant, i.e., the first and the last days (outside Palestine, the first two and the last two), but not the Intermediate Days, which possess only a semi sanctity.

(20) I.e., the dough must first be baked, and then all the unleavened matzoth are put in a basket, and one Mazzah or so is declared Hallah for all. Usually Hallah must be separated from the dough, but when this is impossible, or if it was not done, it is separated from the baked bread.

(21) I.e., the Hallah must be separated from the dough in the usual way and placed in cold water until evening, to prevent it from fermenting.

## Pesachim 46b

**NOW THIS IS THE LEAVEN CONCERNING WHICH WE ARE WARNED WITH [THE INJUNCTIONS], 'IT SHALL NOT BE SEEN , AND 'IT SHALL NOT BE FOUND,<sup>1</sup> BUT HE SEPARATES IT AND LEAVES IT UNTIL THE EVENING, AND IF IT FERMENTS IT FERMENTS.<sup>2</sup>**

**GEMARA.** Shall we say that they differ in respect of goodwill benefit, R. Eliezer holding, Goodwill benefit is considered money, while R. Joshua holds, Goodwill benefit is not money?<sup>3</sup> — No: all hold [that] goodwill benefit is not money, but here they differ in respect to 'since'. For R. Eliezer holds: We say, since if he desires, he can have it [sc. the designation of Hallah] revoked,<sup>4</sup> it is his property.<sup>5</sup> While R. Joshua holds: We do not say, since.<sup>6</sup> It was stated: [With regard to] one who bakes [food] on a Festival for [consumption on] a weekday, —

**R. Hisda said: He is flagellated; Rabbah said: He is not flagellated. 'R. Hisda said, He is flagellated': We do not say, Since if guests**

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

visited him it would be fit for him [on the Festival itself].<sup>7</sup> Rabbah said: He is not flagellated: we say, 'since'. Said Rabbah to R. Hisda, According to you who maintain, We do not say, 'since', how may we bake on a Festival for the Sabbath?<sup>8</sup> — On account of the 'erub<sup>9</sup> of dishes, he answered him. And on account of an 'Erub of dishes we permit a Biblical prohibition! —

Said he to him, By Biblical law the requirements of the Sabbath may be prepared on a Festival, and it was only the Rabbis who forbade it, lest it be said, You may bake on a Festival even for weekdays;<sup>10</sup> but since the Rabbis necessitated an 'Erub of dishes for it,<sup>11</sup> he has a distinguishing feature.<sup>12</sup>

He [Rabbah] raised an objection against him: [In the case of] an animal at the point of death,<sup>13</sup> he must not slaughter it<sup>14</sup> save when there is time to eat as much as an olive of it roast before night.<sup>15</sup> [Thus, it states when] he is able to eat [thereof], [that is] even if he does not wish to eat. Now according to me, who maintain that we say, 'since', it is well: since if he desires to eat, he is able to eat, for that reason he may slaughter. But according to you who maintain, we do not say, 'since', why may he slaughter? Said he to him, On account of the loss of his money. And on account of the loss of his money we permit a Biblical prohibition! Yes, he replied: on account of the loss of his money he determined in his heart to eat as much as an olive, and as much as an olive of flesh is impossible [to obtain] without slaughtering.

He [Rabbah] raised an objection against him:  
The showbread

(1) I.e., even if it does turn leaven it is not subject to these prohibitions. The Gemara explains the reason.

(2) It does not matter.

(3) Goodwill benefit is a man's right to dispose of property to whomever he desires, though he may not keep it, and it is disputed whether such a right is accounted as of monetary worth. Naturally, even if it is, its value is small. Thus an Israelite must separate Hallah, but he can give it to any

priest he desires, and a friend of a particular priest might pay him a trifle to give it to that priest. Now, it has been stated supra 5b that the interdict against leaven being seen or found in the house applies only to one's own leaven. Now if goodwill benefit ranks as money, the Hallah is accounted the Israelite's property, and therefore it is subject to this interdict: hence R. Eliezer holds that the dough must first be baked.

But if goodwill benefit does not rank as money, the Hallah is not accounted the Israelite's property, and therefore it is separated from the dough, and it does not matter if it turns leaven.

(4) When a man declares anything sacred, as Hallah, it is really the equivalent of a vow that this shall be sacred, and therefore he can be absolved of it, whereby his declaration is annulled, just as in the case of other vows.

(5) Until he gives it to the priest. Therefore it is subject to these injunctions.

(6) We disregard this possibility, since in fact he has not revoked it. Hence it is not his property. But v. infra 48a, p. 227f.

(7) Therefore his action is not culpable.

(8) But that we use this argument: since it is fit (of use) for him on that same day if he is visited by guests.

(9) V. Glos.

(10) Which is definitely forbidden.

(11) I.e., for cooking on a Festival for the Sabbath.

(12) Which makes it clear to him that cooking on Festivals is not permitted indiscriminately, but only for the Festival or the Sabbath.

(13) Lit., 'in danger' — of death. Hence the owner wishes to slaughter it before it dies, which would render its flesh Nebelah (v. Glos).

(14) On a Festival.

(15) Lit., 'while it is yet day', — i.e., on the Festival itself.

## Pesachim 47a

is eaten on the ninth, the tenth, or the eleventh [day],<sup>1</sup> neither earlier nor later.<sup>2</sup> How so? Normally it is eaten on the ninth [day]: it is baked on the eve of the Sabbath [and] eaten on the Sabbath [of the following week], [which is] on the ninth. If a Festival occurred on the eve of the Sabbath, it is eaten on the Sabbath, on the tenth.<sup>3</sup> [If] the two Festival days of New Year<sup>4</sup> [occurred before the Sabbath], it is eaten on the Sabbath on the eleventh day, because it [the baking of the showbread] does not override either the Sabbath or the Festival. Now if you say [that] the requirements of the Sabbath may be

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

prepared on a Festival, why does it not override the Festival?<sup>5</sup> —

Said he to him, A near shebuth they permitted; a distant shebuth they did not permit.<sup>6</sup> Then according to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, who said on the authority of R. Simeon the son of the Segan:<sup>7</sup> It overrides the Festival, but it does not override the fast-day,<sup>8</sup> what is to be said?<sup>9</sup> — They differ in this: one Master holds, They permitted a near shebuth, [but] a distant shebuth they did not permit; while the other Master holds: a distant shebuth too they permitted.<sup>10</sup>

R. Mari raised an objection: The two loaves<sup>11</sup> are eaten neither less than two [days after baking] nor more than three [days after baking].<sup>12</sup> How so? They were baked on the eve of the Festival [and] eaten on the Festival, [i.e.,] on the second [day]. If the Festival fell after the Sabbath,<sup>13</sup> they are eaten on the Festival, on the third [day], because it [the baking] does not override either the Sabbath or the Festival.<sup>14</sup> But if you say [that] the requirements of the Sabbath may be prepared on the Festival, seeing that [those] of the Sabbath are permitted on the Festival, is there a question about [those] of the Festival on the Festival! There it is different, because Scripture saith, [Save that which every man must eat, that only may be done] for you:<sup>15</sup> ‘for you’, but not for the Most High.<sup>16</sup> Then according to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel who said on the authority of R. Simeon the son of the Segan: It overrides the Festival, what is there to be said? — He holds as Abba Saul, who interpreted: ‘for you’, but not for Gentiles.<sup>17</sup>

R. Hisda sent to Rabbah by the hand of R. Aha son of R. Huna: But do we say ‘since’? Surely we learned: One may plow one furrow, and be culpable for it on account of eight negative injunctions. [Thus:] he who plows with an ox and an ass [together], which are sacred, [and the furrow consists of] Kil’ayim in a vineyard,

(1) After it is baked. The showbread was generally baked on Friday, placed on the Table in the Temple on the Sabbath, and removed the following Sabbath and eaten; when it was removed it was replaced by fresh bread.

(2) Lit., ‘less’... ‘more’.

(3) For it would have to be baked on Thursday.

(4) Even in Palestine, where all festivals were kept one day only, in accordance with Scripture, New Year was

sometimes kept two days v. R.H. 30b.

(5) Since baking on a Festival for the Sabbath (without an ‘Erub) is thus but a Rabbinical prohibition (a shebuth; v. Glos.) and as such does not apply to the Temple.

(6) I.e., they permitted the abrogation of the shebuth in the Temple when it was shortly required, viz., for that same Sabbath, but not when it would only be required a week later.

(7) V. supra 14a, p. 62, n. 1.

(8) Sc. the baking of the showbread. The Fast-day is the Day of Atonement.

(9) Why may it not be baked on the Festival? Tosaf.: On my view, says Rabbah, there is no difficulty, as I maintain that this is precisely the point of the controversy: the first Tanna holds that the requirements of the Sabbath may not be prepared on a Festival, while R. Simeon b. Gamaliel holds that they may be prepared. But on your view that the first Tanna too holds that the requirements of the Sabbath may be prepared on a Festival, but that here it is forbidden as a distant shebuth, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel should merely state that even a distant Shebuth is permitted.

(10) And that is what R. Simeon b. Gamaliel really means.

(11) Which were brought on Pentecost, v. Lev. XXIII, 17.

(12) The figures are inclusive of the day on which they were baked.

(13) I.e., on Sunday, so that they would be baked on the previous Friday.

(14) Hence they could not be baked on the Festival itself and eaten on the same day.

(15) Ex. XII, 16.

(16) The two loaves, as well as the showbread, are sacred, and regarded as being ‘for the Most High’.

(17) Lit., ‘strangers’, v. Bez 20b.

## Pesachim 47b

and it is the seventh year, on a Festival, [and he is] a priest and a Nazirite, [while this furrow is] in unclean ground.<sup>1</sup> Now if we say ‘since’, let him not be liable for plowing [on the Festival], since it is fit for covering the blood of a bird?<sup>2</sup> —



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

Said R. Papa b. Samuel: The reference is to smooth, round stones.<sup>3</sup> [But] they are fit for crushing?<sup>4</sup> — Is then crushing permitted on the Festival?<sup>5</sup> But they are fit for crushing in an unusual manner?<sup>6</sup> — The reference is to rocky ground.<sup>7</sup> Is then rocky ground capable of being sown? — It is rocky ground above, but powdered [loose] earth beneath. Then deduce it [that he is not culpable] because of the loose earth?<sup>8</sup> But said Mar the soil of R. Ashi: The reference is to clayey earth.<sup>9</sup> And is clayey earth capable of being sown? — It refers to swampy earth.<sup>10</sup>

Abaye raised an objection against him:<sup>11</sup> He who cooks the thigh sinew<sup>12</sup> on a Festival and eats it is flagellated five times. He is flagellated on account of cooking the sinew on a Festival;<sup>13</sup> he is flagellated on account of eating the sinew; he is flagellated for cooking meat in milk; he is flagellated for eating meat [cooked] in milk;<sup>14</sup> and he is flagellated on account of lighting [a fire].<sup>15</sup> But if we say, 'since', let him not be liable on account of lighting, since it is fit for him for his [legitimate] needs? — Said he to him, Omit lighting and substitute the thigh sinew of a Nebelah.<sup>16</sup>

But R. Hiyya taught: He is flagellated twice for his eating and thrice for his cooking; now if this is correct,<sup>17</sup> he should say, thrice for his eating? — Rather, omit lighting and substitute the wood of mukzeh.<sup>18</sup> And is Mukzeh a Scriptural [interdict]? — Yes, he replied, for it is written, And it shall come to pass on the sixth day that they shall prepare that which they bring in;<sup>19</sup> and its 'warning' [injunction] is [learnt] from here, [viz.,] from, thou shalt not do any manner of work.<sup>20</sup>

Said he to him, But it was you who said, I asked of R. Hisda, — others state, I asked of R. Huna: What if he brought a lamb from the meadow<sup>21</sup> and slaughtered it as a continual burnt-offering<sup>22</sup> on a Festival?<sup>23</sup> And you said to us: He answered me, [It is written], And a lamb,<sup>24</sup> [implying], but not a firstling;<sup>25</sup> one, but not the tithe;<sup>26</sup> of the flock, this is to exclude a palges;<sup>27</sup>

(1) V. Mak., Sonc. ed. p. 149, n. 1-9.

(2) When a bird is slaughtered its blood must be covered, v. Lev. XVII, 13. This plowing crushes the earth and makes it fit for that purpose, and since a bird might be slaughtered on the Festival, that too would be necessary.

(3) The plowing breaks up the earth into smooth, round lumps; these are not fit for covering the blood, for which crushed, dust-like earth is required. Rashi, however, merely reads: stones; v. Tosaf. s.v. באבנים מקורסלות.

(4) And then be used for covering the blood.

(5) Surely not.

(6) Lit., 'as with the back of the hand'. Such a crushing is not Scripturally forbidden but merely as a Shebuth (v. Glos.). That being so, flagellation, which is administered for the violation of a Scriptural prohibition, should not be incurred.

(7) Harder than ordinary stones; this cannot be crushed.

(8) This makes his action non-punishable.

(9) With which blood may not be covered.

(10) Which is fit for sowing, yet cannot be crushed into dust for covering blood.

(11) Against Rabbah.

(12) Which may not be eaten, v. Gen. XXXII, 32.

(13) Which is a forbidden labor, since it is not the preparation of food which may be eaten.

(14) These are two separate offences.

(15) Which is likewise prohibited on a Festival, save when required for cooking permitted food, v. Bez. 12a.

(16) I.e., it was the thigh sinew of a Nebelah, and he is flagellated for eating Nebelah.

(17) Sc. the proposed emendation.

(18) v. Glos. this may not be handled on Festivals. — He is thus flagellated not for lighting but for putting it to use.

(19) Ex. XVI, 5. This teaches that only what is 'prepared', as opposed to Mukzeh, may be handled on Sabbaths and Festivals.

(20) Ex. XX, 10. Flagellation is administered only for the violation of a negative injunction, not an affirmative precept. The first verse quoted belongs to the latter category, hence the second verse must be added. Thus, since the use of Mukzeh is forbidden by the first verse, making a fire with it is all ordinary labor forbidden by the second. — Though the second verse refers to the Sabbath, whereas we are here treating of the Festival, these two are alike in respect to work, save that the preparation of food is permitted on Festivals, but not on the Sabbath. Once however it is shown that a particular action is forbidden, it does not matter whether it is the Sabbath or a Festival.

(21) Outside the town. Animals that graze there are brought home (i.e., into town) only' at intervals, not every evening, and therefore they are Mukzeh, and may not be slaughtered on

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

Festivals unless designated for that purpose on the eve of the Festivals.

(22) V. Num. XXVIII, 3.

(23) May it be offered?

(24) Ezek. XLV, 15, whence the whole verse which follows is quoted.

(25) A 'lamb' implies both male and female, whereas a firstling applies only to males.

(26) I.e., the tithe of animals cannot be dedicated for a daily burnt-offering. 'One' implies that it stands by itself, whereas the tithe is one out of ten.

(27) A sheep beyond the age of כֶּבֶשׂ (lamb) and below that of אֵילָן (ram). — Jast.; i.e., a sheep in its thirteenth month. 'Of' is partitive and implies limitation.

## Pesachim 48a

out of the two hundred,[i.e.,] out of the residue of the two hundred which was left in the vault, whence we learn that 'Orlah is nullified in [an excess of] two hundred;<sup>1</sup> from the well-watered pastures of Israel: from that which is permitted to Israel. Hence it was said, One may not bring drink-offerings from tebel.<sup>2</sup> You might think, he must not bring [them] from Mukzeh [either], then say: Just as Tebel is distinguished in that its intrinsic prohibition causes it,<sup>3</sup> so everything whose intrinsic prohibition causes it [may not be used], thus Mukzeh is excluded, because not its intrinsic prohibition causes it, but a prohibition of something else causes it.<sup>4</sup> Now if you say that the prohibition of Mukzeh is Scriptural, what does it matter<sup>5</sup> whether it is an intrinsic prohibition or a prohibition through something else? Moreover, it was you who said, There is separation of labors on the Sabbath,<sup>6</sup> but there is not separation of labors on a Festival!<sup>7</sup> —

Rather, delete lighting and substitute the wood of the asherah,<sup>8</sup> while its 'warning' [injunction] is [learnt] from here, [viz.,] And there shall cleave naught of the accursed thing to thy hand.<sup>9</sup>

R. Aha son of Raba said to Abaye, Then let him be flagellated on account of, And thou shalt not bring an abomination into thy house<sup>10</sup> too? — Rather, delete lighting and substitute the wood of Hekdesh, while the

'warning' is [learnt] from here, [viz.,] and ye shall burn their Asherim with fire... ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God.<sup>11</sup>

Rami b. Hama said: This [controversy] of R. Hisda and Rabbah is the controversy of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua.<sup>12</sup> For R. Eliezer holds, We say, 'since',<sup>13</sup> while R. Joshua holds, We do not say since'.

Said R. Papa: Yet perhaps R. Eliezer rules that we say 'since', there only, because when they go into the oven, each one is fit for himself;<sup>14</sup> but here that it is fit for visitors only, but it is not fit for himself,<sup>15</sup> perhaps it is indeed [the fact] that we do not say 'since'?

R. Shisha son of R. Idi said: Yet perhaps it is not so:<sup>16</sup> R. Joshua may rule that we do not say, 'since', only there, where there is one [Mazzah] that is not fit either for himself or for visitors; but here that it is at least fit for visitors, perhaps it is indeed [the fact] that we say 'since'?

The Rabbis reported this [Rami b. Hama's statement] before R. Jeremiah and R. Zera. R. Jeremiah accepted it: R. Zera did not accept it.

Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zera: A matter which has been a continual difficulty to us for many years, [viz.,] wherein do R. Eliezer and R. Joshua differ, now [that] it has been explained in the name of a great man, shall we then not accept it? Said he to him, How can I accept it? For it was taught, R. Joshua said to him: According to your words,<sup>17</sup> he transgresses on account of thou shalt not do any manner of work,<sup>18</sup> and he was silent before him. But if this is correct,<sup>19</sup> let him answer him, My reason is on account of 'since'? —

Then on your view, replied he, as to what was taught in a Baraita, R. Eliezer said to him: According to your words, behold, he violates, 'it shall not be seen' and 'it shall not be found', and he was silent before him; could he indeed not answer him; surely he answers

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

him in the Mishnah, for we learned: **NOT THIS IS LEAVEN ABOUT WHICH WE ARE WARNED, IT SHALL NOT BE SEEN', AND 'IT SHALL NOT BE FOUND'**. But [what we must say is that] he was silent before him in the Baraitha, yet he answered him in our Mishnah. So here too, say that he was silent before him in a teaching,<sup>20</sup> yet he answered him in another collection [of Baraithas]. It was taught, Rabbi said: The Halachah is as R. Eliezer; while R. Isaac said: The Halachah is as the Son of Bathyra. And what<sup>21</sup> is the standard of dough?<sup>22</sup> —

R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Berokah said: In the case of wheat, two Kabs; in the case of barley, three Kabs. R. Nathan said on R. Eleazar's authority: The rulings are [to be] reversed.<sup>23</sup> But it was taught, R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah said: In the case of wheat, three labs, and in the case of barley, four Kabs? — There is no difficulty: One refers to inferior [corn]; the other to superior corn.<sup>24</sup>

R. Papa observed: This proves, Poor wheat is more inferior to good wheat than poor barley is inferior to good barley, for whereas there [there is a difference of] a third, here [there is a difference of] a quarter.

Rab said: A Kab of Meloga<sup>25</sup> [is the standard] for Passover,<sup>26</sup> and it is likewise in respect of Hallah.<sup>27</sup> But we learned:

(1) 'Out of the two hundred' is unintelligible in itself. Hence the Talmud assumes that it refers to the wine of the drink-offering (libation) which accompanied the continual burnt-offering (Num. XXVIII, 7f), and the meaning is this: if one part of forbidden wine, sc. wine of 'Orlah, as much as is required for the drink-offering, becomes mixed with two hundred times as much permitted wine, so that when the required quantity is removed from the wine-vault there still remains two hundred times as much, then it may be used, the 'Orlah having been nullified by the excess. — This is actually deduced from elsewhere (in Sifre), and this verse is merely quoted as support.

(2) V. Glos.

(3) I.e. Tebel is unfit for drink-offerings because it is forbidden in itself.

(4) I.e., it is not forbidden, in itself, save that its owner has voluntarily put it out of use for the time being.

(5) Lit., 'what is it to me?'

(6) If a man performed two labors on the Sabbath in one state of unawareness, or one labor twice, each time having been unaware of the Sabbath (though he was reminded in the interval), he is liable on account of each separately.

(7) Yet here, where we treat of a Festival, you rule that he is separately culpable for Mukzeh and for boiling the sinew.

(8) V. Glos. He used that for fuel, and is flagellated on that account.

(9) Deut. XIII, 18.

(10) Ibid. VII, 26.

(11) Ibid. XII, 3f.

(12) In the Mishnah Supra 46a.

(13) Though he will eventually separate one Mazzah for all, and that is not fit for eating, yet if he wishes he can take a piece from each Mazzah, and so he will have baked every one for eating. Hence we say, since it would be permitted in the latter case, it is also permitted in the former.

(14) As explained in n. 11.

(15) As far as he is concerned he is definitely baking it for the week, while he has not invited visitors.

(16) This too is a criticism of Rami b. Hama's statement.

(17) I.e., if he does as you say.

(18) Ex. XX, 10.

(19) Rami b. Hama's explanation.

(20) Mathnitha, especially collection of Mishnah not embodied in the Mishnah of R. Judah, as Baraitha, Tosaf., etc. contrad. to Mathnithin, our Mishnah (Jast.).

(21) Lit., 'how much?'

(22) Which one can knead on Passover and keep it from fermenting.

(23) Three in the case of wheat, and two in the case of barley, for barley ferments more quickly.

(24) Two Kabs of superior wheat is the equivalent of three Kabs of inferior wheat; while three Kabs of superior barley is the equivalent of four Kabs of inferior barley.

(25) Supposed to be a place in Babylon.

(26) One must not knead more dough than that.

(27) That is the smallest quantity subject to Hallah.

## Pesachim 48b

Slightly more than five quarters<sup>1</sup> of flour are subject to Hallah?<sup>2</sup> — This is what he says: A Kab of Meloga too is the equivalent of this quantity. R. Joseph said: Our women are accustomed to bake a kapiza<sup>3</sup> at a time on

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

Passover. Said Abaye to him, What is your intention? To be stricter!<sup>4</sup> [But] it is strictness which leads to [unwarranted] leniency, as [the woman] exempts it from Hallah?<sup>5</sup> —

Said he: They do as R. Eliezer. For we learned, R. Eliezer said: If he removes [loaves from the oven] and places [them] in a basket, the basket combines them in respect of Hallah;<sup>6</sup> whereon Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The Halachah is as R. Eliezer.

Said he to him, But it was stated thereon, R. Joshua b. Levi said: They taught this only of Babylonian loaves, which cleave to each other,<sup>7</sup> but not [of] cracknels?<sup>8</sup> — Surely it was stated thereon, R. Hanina said: Even cracknels. R. Jeremiah asked: What of a board which has no ledges?<sup>9</sup> Do we require the inside of a vessel, which is absent here; or perhaps we require the air space of a vessel, which is present? The question stands. It was taught: R. Eliezer said: The basket [only] combines them; R. Joshua said: The oven combines them;<sup>10</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Babylonian loaves which cleave to each other combine.<sup>11</sup>

**MISHNAH.** R. GAMALIEL SAID: THREE WOMEN MAY KNEAD AT THE SAME TIME<sup>12</sup> AND BAKE IN ONE OVEN, ONE AFTER THE OTHER. BUT THE SAGES RULE: THREE WOMEN MAY BE ENGAGED ON DOUGH AT THE SAME TIME,<sup>13</sup> ONE KNEADING, ANOTHER SHAPING AND A THIRD BAKING.<sup>14</sup> R. AKIBA SAID: NOT ALL WOMEN AND NOT ALL KINDS OF WOOD AND NOT ALL OVENS ARE ALIKE.<sup>15</sup> THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: IF IT [THE DOUGH] RISES, LET HER WET<sup>16</sup> IT WITH COLD WATER.<sup>17</sup>

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: Having kneaded [the dough] she forms it [in shape], while her companion kneads in her place; having formed [the dough] she bakes it, and her companion shapes [the dough] in her place, while the third [woman] kneads. [The first] having baked, she kneads [again], and

her companion bakes in her place, while the third shapes [her dough]. And thus the round revolves.<sup>18</sup> As long as they are engaged [in working] on the dough, it does not come to fermentation.

**R. AKIBA SAID: NOT ALL WOMEN,** etc. It was taught, R. Akiba said: I discussed [the matter] before R. Gamaliel: Let our Master teach us: Does this<sup>19</sup> refer to energetic women or to women who are not energetic; to damp wood or to dry wood; to a hot oven or to a cool oven? Said he to me, You have naught else save what the Sages learned: **IF IT RISES, LET HER WET IT WITH COLD WATER.**

**MISHNAH.** SI'UR<sup>20</sup> MUST BE BURNT, WHILE HE WHO EATS IT IS NOT CULPABLE; SIDDUK<sup>21</sup> MUST BE BURNT, WHILE HE WHO EATS IT [ON PASSOVER] IS LIABLE TO KARETH. WHAT IS SI'UR? [WHEN THERE ARE LINES ON THE SURFACE] LIKE LOCUSTS' HORNS;<sup>22</sup> SIDDUK IS WHEN THE CRACKS HAVE INTERMINGLED WITH EACH OTHER: THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. JUDAH. BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: REGARDING THE ONE AND THE OTHER,<sup>23</sup> HE WHO EATS IT IS LIABLE TO KARETH.<sup>24</sup> AND WHAT IS SI'UR? WHEN ITS SURFACE IS BLANCHED, LIKE [THE FACE OF] A MAN WHOSE HAIR IS STANDING [ON END].

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: What is Si'ur? Whenever its surface is blanched, like [the face of] a man whose hair is standing on end; Sidduk is [when there are lines on the surface] like locusts' horns: this is R. Meir's view. But the Sages maintain: What is Si'ur? [When the lines on its surface are] like locusts' horns; Sidduk is when the cracks have intermingled with each other; and in both cases, he who eats it is liable to Kareth. But we learned: **SI'UR MUST BE BURNT, WHILE HE WHO EATS IT IS NOT CULPABLE . . . THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. JUDAH?** Say according to R. Meir, in both cases,<sup>25</sup> he who eats it incurs kareth.<sup>26</sup> Raba said: What is R. Meir's reason? There is not



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

a single crack on the surface for which there are not many cracks below [the surface].<sup>27</sup>

- (1) Lit., 'five quarters and more'. I.e., quarters of a Kab, = one and one fourth logs.
- (2) v. Hal. II, 6.
- (3) A measure=three-fourths of a Kab; v. Obermeyer, p. 241, n. 1.
- (4) For the permitted quantity is larger.
- (5) If she baked a Kab of Meloga at a time, she would have to separate Hallah, whereas now she is exempt.
- (6) I.e., they are counted as one, if together they make up the minimum quantity.
- (7) Lit., 'bite of each other'. They were wide, and when set in the oven they stuck to each other, owing to lack of space; therefore they all count as one.
- (8) A kind of narrow roll.
- (9) Does it combine the loaves placed upon it?
- (10) If they are baked together in an oven, even if they are not subsequently placed together in a basket, they are all counted as one in respect of Hallah.
- (11) But not cracknels.
- (12) Lit., 'as one'.
- (13) Not all kneading at the same time, which would necessitate too long a wait when they come to bake if after each other.
- (14) V. Gemara.
- (15) Hence the views of R. Gamaliel and the Sages are unacceptable.
- (16) Lit., 'polish'.
- (17) Which retards fermentation.
- (18) This is the explanation of the Sage's ruling: **THREE WOMEN MAY BE ENGAGED ON DOUGH AT THE SAME TIME.**
- (19) Sc. the ruling that three women may knead or may be working on dough at the same time.
- (20) V. supra p. 203.
- (21) Dough, the surface of which is cracked through fermentation. This is completely leaven.
- (22) I.e., small lines are just beginning to appear.
- (23) I.e., both stages as defined by R. Judah.
- (24) Even at the earlier stage it is no longer Si'ur.
- (25) Sc. both Si'ur and Sidduk, as defined by R. Judah.
- (26) Because he regards both as Sidduk.
- (27) Hence even when the cracks on the surface are still separate, they already cross below the surface.

## Pesachim 49a

**MISHNAH.** IF THE FOURTEENTH [OF NISAN] FALLS ON THE SABBATH, EVERYTHING MUST BE REMOVED<sup>1</sup> BEFORE THE SABBATH:<sup>2</sup> THIS IS R. MEIR'S VIEW; WHILE

THE SAGES MAINTAIN: [IT MUST BE REMOVED] AT ITS [USUAL] TIME;<sup>3</sup> R. ELEAZAR B. ZADOK SAID: TERUMAH [MUST BE REMOVED] BEFORE THE SABBATH,<sup>4</sup> AND HULLIN AT ITS [USUAL] TIME.<sup>5</sup>

**GEMARA.** It was taught, R. Eleazar b. Zadok said: My father once spent a week in Yabneh,<sup>6</sup> when the fourteenth fell on the Sabbath, and there came Zonin, R. Gamaliel's deputy,<sup>7</sup> and announced: 'The time has come to remove the leaven', and I followed my father and we removed the leaven.

**MISHNAH.** HE WHO ON HIS WAY<sup>8</sup> TO SLAUGHTER HIS PASSOVER SACRIFICE OR TO CIRCUMCISE HIS SON<sup>9</sup> OR TO DINE AT A BETROTHAL<sup>10</sup> FEAST AT THE HOUSE OF HIS FATHER-IN-LAW, AND RECOLLECTS THAT HE HAS LEAVEN AT HOME, IF HE IS ABLE TO GO BACK, REMOVE [IT], AND [THEN] RETURN TO HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY,<sup>11</sup> HE MUST GO BACK AND REMOVE [IT]; BUT IF NOT, HE ANNULS IT IN HIS HEART. [IF HE IS ON HIS WAY] TO SAVE [PEOPLE] FROM HEATHENS<sup>12</sup> OR FROM A RIVER OR FROM BRIGANDS<sup>13</sup> OR FROM A FIRE OR FROM A COLLAPSE [OF A BUILDING], HE ANNULS IT IN HIS HEART.<sup>14</sup> [BUT IF] TO APPOINT A SABBATH STATION FOR A VOLUNTARY [SECULAR] PURPOSE,<sup>15</sup> HE MUST RETURN IMMEDIATELY. SIMILARLY, HE WHO WENT OUT OF JERUSALEM AND RECOLLECTED THAT HE HAD HOLY FLESH WITH HIM,<sup>16</sup> IF HE HAS PASSED SCOPUS,<sup>17</sup> HE BURNS IT WHERE HE IS;<sup>18</sup> BUT IF NOT, HE RETURNS AND BURNS IT IN FRONT OF THE TEMPLE<sup>19</sup> WITH THE WOOD OF THE [ALTAR] PILE.<sup>20</sup> AND FOR WHAT [QUANTITY] MUST THEY RETURN? R. MEIR SAID: FOR BOTH,<sup>21</sup> WHEN THERE IS AS MUCH AS AN EGG; R. JUDAH SAID: FOR BOTH, WHEN THERE IS AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE; BUT THE SAGES RULE: HOLY FLESH, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE; WHILE LEAVEN, [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS AN EGG.<sup>22</sup>

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**GEMARA.** But the following contradicts it: He who is on his way to partake of a betrothal feast in his father-in-law's house or to appoint a Sabbath station for a voluntary purpose must return immediately? Said R. Johanan, There is no difficulty: one is [according to] R. Judah: the other is [according to] R. Jose. For it was taught: The betrothal feast is a voluntary [function]; this is R. Judah's view.

R. Jose said: It is a religious [function]. But now that R. Hisda said: The controversy is in respect of the second feast,<sup>23</sup> but in respect to the first feast all agree that it is a religious [function], you may even say [that] both are [according to] R. Judah, yet there is no difficulty; one refers to the first feast, while the other refers to the second feast. It was taught, R. Judah said: I have heard only of the betrothal feast,<sup>24</sup> but not of [the feast in connection with] espousal gifts.<sup>25</sup>

Said R. Jose to him: I have heard of [both] the feast of betrothal and [that] of espousal gifts. It was taught, R. Simeon said: Every feast which is not in connection with a religious deed, a scholar must derive no enjoyment thereof.<sup>26</sup> What, for instance? — Said R. Johanan: E.g., [the feast at the betrothal of] the daughter of a priest to an Israelite,<sup>27</sup> or the daughter of a scholar to an ignoramus. For R. Johanan said: If the daughter of a priest [marries] an Israelite, their union will not be auspicious. What is it?<sup>28</sup>

Said R. Hisda: [She will be] either a widow or a divorced woman, or she will have no seed [children].<sup>29</sup> In a Baraitha it was taught: He will bury her or she will bury him, or she will reduce him to poverty. But that is not so, for R. Johanan said: he who desires to become wealthy, let him cleave to the seed of Aaron, [for it is all the more] that the Torah and the priesthood will enrich them? — There is no difficulty: one refers to a scholar;<sup>30</sup> the other refers to an 'am ha-arez.<sup>31</sup>

R. Joshua married a priest's daughter. Falling sick, he said, Aaron is not pleased that I should cleave to his seed [and] possess a son-in-law like myself. R. Idi b Abin married a priest's daughter, and there came forth from him two ordained sons — R. Shesheth the son of R. Idi and R. Joshua the son of R. Idi. R. Papa said: Had I not married a priest's daughter, I would not have become wealthy.<sup>32</sup> R. Kahana said: Had I not married a priest's daughter, I had not gone into exile.<sup>33</sup> Said they to him, But you were exiled to a place of learning! — I was not exiled as people are [generally] exiled.<sup>34</sup>

R. Isaac said: Whoever partakes of a secular feast eventually goes into exile, for it is said, and [ye that] eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; and it is written, therefore now shall they go captive at the head of them that go captive.<sup>35</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Every scholar who feasts much in every place eventually destroys his home, widows his wife, orphans his young, forgets his learning,<sup>36</sup> and becomes involved in many quarrels;<sup>37</sup> his words are unheeded, and he desecrates the Name of Heaven and the name of his teacher and the name of his father, and he causes an evil name for himself, his children, and his children's' children until the end of time.<sup>38</sup> What is it?<sup>39</sup>

Said Abaye: He is called, a heater of ovens. Raba said: A tavern dancer! R. Papa said: A plate licker. R. Sheimaiah said: A folder [of garments] and a man who lies down [to sleep].<sup>40</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Let a man always sell all he has and marry the daughter of a scholar, for if he dies or goes into exile, he is assured that his children will be scholars. But let him not marry the daughter of an 'Am Ha-arez, for if he dies or goes into exile, his children will be 'Amme Ha-arez.

Our Rabbis taught: Let a man always sell all he has and marry the daughter of a scholar, and marry his daughter to a scholar. This

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

may be compared to [the grafting of] grapes of a vine with grapes of a vine, [which is] a seemly and acceptable thing. But let him not marry the daughter of an 'Am Ha-arez; this may be compared to [the grafting of] grapes of a vine with berries of a thorn bush, [which is] a repulsive

- (1) I.e., destroyed.
- (2) Save what is required for the Sabbath itself.
- (3) On the morning of the fourteenth.
- (4) Because if any is left over none can eat it; neither Zarim nor cattle.
- (5) Because it is easy to find eaters for it.
- (6) The famous town to the north-west of Jerusalem, seat of R. Johanan b. Zakkai's academy and Sanhedrin after the destruction of Jerusalem.
- (7) The superintendent of the Academy.
- (8) Lit., 'is going'.
- (9) In ancient days and until comparatively recently this was done in the Synagogue.
- (10) Erusin denotes the first stage of marriage, v. Glos.
- (11) He himself being the bridegroom. A 'betrothal feast' is considered a religious duty, v. Gemara.
- (12) Rashi: Jews who are being pursued.
- (13) Var. lec.: a robber band.
- (14) If 'robber band' is read before, this must be deleted. Even if there is time to return, he must not go back.
- (15) On the Sabbath a man must not go more than two thousand cubits beyond the town boundary; this outside limit is called the Tehum. But before the Sabbath commences he can appoint any spot within the Tehum as the station where he will spend the Sabbath, and then he may proceed two thousand cubits beyond that spot; he does that by taking some food to the place, which he will eat on the Sabbath.
- (16) Holy flesh, if taken without Jerusalem, becomes unfit and must be burnt.
- (17) An eminence northeast of Jerusalem, whence the Temple can be seen. To-day it is the site of the Hebrew University.
- (18) And need not return to Jerusalem.
- (19) [Birah. This is variously explained in Zeb. 104b as the Temple Mount itself, a place in the Temple Mount, and a tower in the Temple Mount.]
- (20) I.e., wood arranged in a pile for use on the altar. — V. Supra 24a.
- (21) Sc. leaven and sacred flesh.
- (22) These are the minima for which one must return.

(23) After the betrothal the bridegroom (Arus) sent gifts to his bride, in connection with which there was a second feast at the father-in-law's house.

(24) As being a religious function.

(25) Siblonoth.

(26) I.e., must not partake of it.

(27) I.e., a non-priest. She blemishes her family by marrying beneath her.

(28) In what respect will it be unfortunate?

(29) Rashi: because it is written, And if a priest's daughter be married unto a common man, which is followed by, But if a priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child (Lev. XXII, 12f). — Hence such a union was looked upon with disfavor, and R. Johanan maintains that the feast is not a true religious one.

(30) If a scholar marries into a priestly family he brings honor upon it.

(31) V. Glos.

(32) He was a wealthy brewer.

(33) From my home in Babylonia to Palestine; v. B.K. 117a.

(34) Voluntarily; but I had to flee.

(35) Amos VI, 4, 7.

(36) Lit., 'his learning is forgotten from him'.

(37) Lit., 'come upon him'.

(38) Lit., 'until the end of all generations'. — His fondness for feasting elsewhere leads him to do the same in his own home, and to make it possible he must sell his furniture, etc. Seeing himself on the road to ruin, he wanders into exile, leaving his wife and children, widowed and orphaned, he wastes his time, so forgets his learning. This involves him in disputes on learning. Or, his poverty involves him in disputes with tradesmen because he cannot settle his bills. Again, the banqueting table itself is a fruitful source of quarrels (Rashi and Maharsha).

(39) How does he bring his name, etc. into contempt?

(40) Where he is, being too drunk to go home. — Or, the son of a heater of ovens, etc. with reference to his children. The translation follows Maharsha, bar (בַּר) being understood as 'a man who'. The alternative is Rashi's.

## Pesachim 49b

and unacceptable thing.

**Our Rabbis taught:** Let a man always sell all he has and marry the daughter of a scholar. If he does not find<sup>1</sup> the daughter of a scholar, let him marry the daughter of [one of] the great men of the generation.<sup>2</sup> If he does not find the daughter of [one of] the great men of the generation, let him marry the daughter of

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

the head of synagogues. If he does not find the daughter of the head of synagogues,<sup>3</sup> let him marry the daughter of a charity treasurer. If he does not find the daughter of a charity treasurer, let him marry the daughter of an elementary school-teacher, but let him not marry the daughter of an 'am ha-arez, because they are detestable and their wives are vermin, and of their daughters it is said, Cursed be he that lieth with any manner of beast.<sup>4</sup>

It was taught, Rabbi said: An 'am ha-arez may not eat the flesh of cattle, for it is said, This is the law [Torah] of the beast, and of the fowl;<sup>5</sup> whoever engages in [the study of] the Torah may eat the flesh of beast and fowl, but he who does not engage in [the study of] the Torah may not eat the flesh of beast and fowl.

R. Eleazar said: An 'am ha-arez, it is permitted to stab him [even] on the Day of Atonement which falls on the Sabbath. Said his disciples to him, Master, say to slaughter him [ritually]? He replied: This [ritual slaughter] requires a benediction, whereas that [stabbing] does not require a benediction.

R. Eleazar said: One must not join company with an 'am ha-arez on the road, because it is said, for that [the Torah] is thy life, and the length of thy days;<sup>6</sup> [seeing that] he has no care [pity] for his own life,<sup>7</sup> how much the more for the life of his companions! R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Johanan's name: One may tear an 'Am Haarez like a fish! Said R. Samuel b. Isaac: And [this means] along his back.

It was taught, R. Akiba said: When I was an 'am ha-arez<sup>8</sup> I said: I would that I had a scholar [before me], and I would maul him like an ass. Said his disciples to him, Rabbi, say like a dog! The former bites and breaks the bones, while the latter bites but does not break the bones, he answered them.

It was taught, R. Meir used to say: Whoever marries his daughter to an 'am ha-arez, is as though he bound and laid her before a lion: just as a lion tears [his prey] and devours it and has no shame, so an 'am ha-arez strikes and cohabits and has no shame.

It was taught, R. Eliezer said: But that we are necessary to them for trade, they would kill us. R. Hiyya taught: Whoever studies<sup>9</sup> the Torah in front of an 'am ha-arez, is as though he cohabited with his betrothed in his presence,<sup>10</sup> for it is said, Moses commanded us a law, an inheritance [Morashah] of the congregation of Jacob:<sup>11</sup> read not Morashah but Me'orasah [the betrothed].<sup>12</sup> Greater is the hatred wherewith the 'Amme Ha-arez, hate the scholar than the hatred wherewith the heathens hate Israel, and their wives [hate even] more than they. It was taught: He who has studied and then abandoned [the Torah] [hates the scholar] more than all of them.<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Six things were said of the 'Amme ha-arez': We do not commit testimony to them; we do not accept testimony from them; we do not reveal a secret to them; we do not appoint them as guardians for orphans; we do not appoint them stewards<sup>14</sup> over charity funds; and we must not join their company on the road. Some say, We do not proclaim their losses too.<sup>15</sup> And the first Tanna?<sup>16</sup> — Virtuous seed may sometimes issue from him, and they will enjoy<sup>17</sup> it, as it is said, He will prepare it, and the just shall put it on.<sup>18</sup>

**SIMILARLY, HE WHO WENT OUT OF,** etc. Shall we say that R. Meir holds, only as much as an egg is of importance, whereas R. Judah holds, Even as much as an olive too is of importance?<sup>19</sup> But the following contradicts it: For what [minimum] quantity<sup>20</sup> must they recite grace in common?<sup>21</sup> Until as much as an olive.<sup>22</sup> R. Judah said: Until as much as an egg! —

Said R. Johanan: The discussion<sup>23</sup> must be reversed. Abaye said, After all you need not



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

reverse [it]: there they differ in [the interpretation of Scriptural] verses, [whereas] here they differ in a matter of logic. 'There they differ in [the interpretation of] verses': R. Meir holds: And thou shalt eat,<sup>24</sup> this refers to eating; and be satisfied, this means drinking, and eating is [constituted] by as much as an olive.<sup>25</sup> While R. Judah holds: 'And thou shalt eat and be satisfied' [implies] eating in which there is satisfaction [of one's hunger], and what is that? As much as an egg. 'Here they differ in a matter of logic', for R. Meir holds: Its return is like its defilement;<sup>26</sup> just as its defilement requires as much as an egg, so does its return require as much as an egg. While R. Judah holds, its return

- (1) I.e., cannot obtain.
- (2) Gedole Ha-dor, title probably designating the civil leaders of the community. v. Buchler, *Sepphoris*, p. 9.
- (3) [The archi synagogos, the supreme authority over the synagogues in the town; v. *Git.*, Sonc. ed. p. 202, n. 5.]
- (4) Deut. XXVII, 21.
- (5) Lev. XI, 46.
- (6) Deut. XXX, 20.
- (7) In that he forsakes the Torah.
- (8) R. Akiba was a poor, illiterate shepherd before he became a scholar; v. *Ned.* 50a.
- (9) Lit., 'engages in'.
- (10) So great is the affront which the 'am ha-arez feels when Torah is studied in his presence, v. *Rashi*.
- (11) *Ibid.* XXXIII, 4.
- (12) Thus the Torah is as the bride of the whole of Israel.
- (13) More than any 'am ha-arez hates the scholar.
- (14) The Heb. is the same as in the previous phrase. Epitropos is a steward who looks after another person's estates, etc.
- (15) He who finds lost property is bound to proclaim it; if the owner is an 'am ha-arez, he is not bound to proclaim it.
- (16) Why does he omit this?
- (17) Lit., 'eat'.
- (18) Job XXVII, 17.
- (19) I.e., worthy of being taken into account.
- (20) Lit., 'how far?'
- (21) When three or more people dine together they must recite grace in common, prefacing it with the statement, 'Let us say grace', and they must not separate before this is done, even if each intends reciting grace alone. Here the question is: what is the minimum meal for which this is necessary?

(22) That is the minimum. Until ('ad) is meant in a diminishing sense.

(23) I.e., the opinions,

(24) Deut. VIII, 10.

(25) This is the minimum called eating, e.g., for eating this quantity of forbidden food liability is incurred; the command to eat unleavened bread on the first night of Passover means at least as much as an olive. The verse continues: and thou shalt bless the Lord thy God — i.e., recite grace.

(26) I.e., the same quantity of leaven which is subject to defilement as an eatable necessitates returning in order to remove it.

## Pesachim 50a

is like its prohibition: just as its prohibition is for as much as an olive,<sup>1</sup> so its return is for as much as an olive.

It was taught, R. Nathan said: Both<sup>2</sup> have the standard of two eggs; but the Sages did not agree with him. And it shall come to pass in that day that there shall not be light, but heavy clouds [Yekaroth] and thick [We-kippa'on];<sup>3</sup> what does Yekaroth We-kippa'on mean? — Said R. Eleazar: This means, the light which is precious [Yakar] in this world, is yet of little account [Kapuy]<sup>4</sup> in the next world.<sup>5</sup> R. Johanan said: This refers to Nega'im and Ohaloth,<sup>6</sup> which are difficult [heavy] in this world yet shall be light [easily understood] in the future world.

While R. Joshua b. Levi said: This refers to the people who are honored in this world, but will be lightly esteemed in the next world. As was the case of R. Joseph the son of R. Joshua b. Levi, [who] became ill and fell into a trance. When he recovered, his father asked him, 'What did you see?' 'I saw a topsy-turvy world', he replied, 'the upper [class] underneath and the lower on top' he replied: 'My son', he observed, 'you saw a clear world.'<sup>7</sup> And how are we [situated] there?' 'Just as we are here, so are we there. And I heard them saying, "Happy is he who comes hither with his learning in his hand". And I also heard them saying, "Those martyred by the State, no man can stand within their barrier".'<sup>8</sup> Who are these [martyrs]? Shall we say, R. Akiba and his

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

companions?<sup>9</sup> is that because they were martyrs of the State and nothing else?<sup>10</sup> Rather [he meant] the martyrs of Lydda.<sup>11</sup> In that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses [Meziloth Ha-sus]: HOLY UNTO THE LORD.<sup>12</sup> What does 'Meziloth Ha-sus' [intimate]? —

Said R. Joshua b. Levi: The Holy One, blessed be He, is destined to add to Jerusalem as far as a horse can run and cast its shadow [Mazzil — under itself].<sup>13</sup> R. Eleazar said: All the bells which are hung on a horse between its eyes shall be holy unto the Lord.<sup>14</sup>

While R. Johanan said: All the spoil which Israel shall take spoil [from morning] until a horse can run and cast its shadow [under itself] shall be holy unto the Lord. As for him who explains it [as referring to] all the spoil which Israel shall take spoil, it is well: hence it is written, and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the basins before the altar.<sup>15</sup> But according to those who give the [other] two explanations, what is [the relevance of] 'and the pots in the Lord's house shall be' [etc.]?—

[The verse] states another thing, viz., that Israel will become wealthy, make votive offerings, and bring them [to the Temple]. As for him who says [that it means] spoil, it is well: that is what is written, and in that day there shall be no more a trafficker in the house of the Lord of hosts.<sup>16</sup> But according to those who give the [other] two explanations, what does and there shall be no more a trafficker [Kena'ani] [etc.] mean? —

Said R. Jeremiah: No poor man shall be here.<sup>17</sup> And how do we know interdict. A passage describing the death of great scholars, ten in number, is found in the liturgies for the Day of Atonement and the Fast of Ab. Some of the most famous of them were R. Gamaliel, R. Judah b. Baba and R. Akiba. that [Kena 'Ani] connotes a merchant?—

Because it is written, And Judah saw there the daughter of a certain Canaanite [Kena'ani]:<sup>18</sup> what does 'Kena'ani' mean? Shall we say, literally a Canaanite: is it possible that Abraham came and admonished Isaac, Isaac came and admonished Jacob,<sup>19</sup> and then Judah went and married [a Canaanite]!

Rather, said R. Simeon b. Lakish: [It means] the daughter of a merchant, as it is written, As for the trafficker [Kena'an], the balances of deceit are in his hand,<sup>20</sup> Alternatively, I can quote this: Whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers [Kin'anehah] are the honorable of the earth.<sup>21</sup> And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall the Lord be One, and His name one:<sup>22</sup> is He then not One now? —

Said R. Aha b. Hanina: Not like this world is the future world. In this world, for good tidings one says, 'He is good, and He doeth good', while for evil tidings he says, 'Blessed be the true Judge';<sup>23</sup> [whereas] in the future world it shall be only 'He is good and He doeth good'.<sup>24</sup> 'And His name one': what does 'one' mean? Is then now His name not one? —

Said R. Nahman b. Isaac; Not like this world is the future world. [In] this world [His name] is written with a Yod he<sup>25</sup> and read as Alef Daleth;<sup>26</sup> but in the future world it shall all be one: it shall be written with Yod he and read as Yod he. Now, Raba thought of lecturing it at the session, [whereupon] a certain old man said to him, It is written, le'alem.<sup>27</sup> R. Abina pointed out a contradiction: It is written, this is my name, to be hidden; [and it is also written],<sup>28</sup> and this is my memorial unto all generations?<sup>29</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Not as I [i.e., My name] and written am I read: I am written with a Yod he, while I am read as Alef Daleth.<sup>30</sup>

# PESOCCHIM - 33a-60a

## CHAPTER IV

**MISHNAH.** WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM TO DO WORK ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER UNTIL MIDDAY ONE MAY DO [WORK]; WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM NOT TO DO [WORK], ONE MAY NOT DO [WORK]. HE WHO GOES FROM A PLACE WHERE THEY WORK TO A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT WORK, ON FROM A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT WORK TO A PLACE WHERE THEY DO WORK, WE LAY UPON HIM THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHENCE HE DEPARTED AND THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHITHER HE HAS GONE;

- (1) V. p. 238, n. 12.
- (2) The leaven and the holy flesh.
- (3) Zech. XIV, 6.
- (4) Lit., 'light', 'floating'.
- (5) For the light of this world will pale into insignificance before the greater light of the next. He translates the verse: And it shall come... the light will not be precious but (only) of small account.
- (6) The laws of leprosy and the defilement of tents through a dead body.
- (7) In which people occupy the positions they merit.
- (8) They occupy such an exalted position in the next world that they are unapproachable.
- (9) Who were executed or martyred by the Roman State at various times for their insistence on teaching the Torah in spite of the Roman
- (10) Surely they had other claims to eminence too!
- (11) Two brothers, Lulianus and Papias, who took upon themselves the guilt for the death of the Emperor's daughter, so as to save the people as a whole; v. Ta'an. 18b. Lydda was a district in Asia Minor, to which belonged the city Laodicea, which city it denotes here.
- (12) Zech. XIV, 20.
- (13) Rashi: i.e., as far as a horse can run from the morning until midday, when its shadow (Zel) is directly beneath it.
- (14) I.e., they shall be votive offerings to the Sanctuary.
- (15) Ibid. Even the pots shall be of gold and silver, owing to the abundance of spoil.
- (16) Ibid. 21. The Temple Treasurers will not need to buy or sell for the Temple, on account of the great wealth of the spoil.
- (17) Reading Kena'ani as Kan 'ani, here is a poor man.
- (18) Gen. XXXVIII, 2.
- (19) Not to marry a Canaanite; v. Ibid. XXIV, 3; XXVIII, 1.

- (20) Hos. XII, 8.
- (21) Isa. XXIII, 8.
- (22) Zech. XIV, 9.
- (23) V. Ber. 54a.
- (24) For there will never be any evil tidings there.
- (25) YHWH = Yod he Waw he, the letters of the Tetragrammaton.
- (26) Adonay = Alef Daleth Nun Yod.
- (27) To hide it. This is explained anon.
- (28) The bracketed word is added in var. lec.
- (29) Ex. III, 15. The actual reading is: this is my name for ever. (Le'olam, לעולם); but it is written, to be hidden (Le'alem, לעלם). Thus this indicates that God's name must be kept secret; whereas 'this is my memorial', etc. implies that He is to be known by this name. Another version, accepting the reading Le'olam (for ever) explains the difficulty thus: since God states this is my name, it is obvious that He is to be known by it: why then add, 'and this is my memorial', etc.?
- (30) The importance attributed to the Divine Name was owing to the fact that it was not regarded simply as a designation, but was held to express the essence of the Godhead. The right way of pronouncing the Tetragrammaton was not generally known, being preserved as an esoteric teaching. Cf. Kid., Sonc. ed. p. 361, n. 6. and Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 407, n. 2.

## Pesachim 50b

**AND A MAN MUST NOT ACT DIFFERENTLY [FROM LOCAL CUSTOM] ON ACCOUNT OF THE QUARRELS [WHICH WOULD ENSUE]. SIMILARLY, HE WHO TRANSPORTS SABBATICAL YEAR PRODUCE FROM A PLACE WHERE IT HAS CEASED TO A PLACE WHERE IT HAS NOT CEASED OR FROM A PLACE WHERE IT HAS NOT CEASED TO A PLACE WHERE IT HAS CEASED,<sup>1</sup> IS BOUND TO REMOVE IT.<sup>2</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: 'DO YOU TOO GO OUT AND BRING [PRODUCE] FOR YOURSELF.<sup>3</sup>**

**GEMARA.** Why particularly THE EVE OF PASSOVER? Even on the eve of Sabbaths and Festivals too? For it was taught: He who does work on the eve of Sabbaths or Festivals from minhah<sup>4</sup> and onwards will never see a sign of blessing?<sup>5</sup> — There it is forbidden only from Minhah and onwards, but not near to<sup>6</sup> Minhah; [whereas] here it is [forbidden]

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

from midday. Alternatively, there he merely does not see a sign of blessing,<sup>7</sup> yet we do not place him under the ban; [whereas] here we even place him under the ban. [To turn to] the main text: He who does work on the eve of the Sabbath and on the eve of Festivals from Minhah and onwards, and at the termination of the Sabbath or at the termination of a Festival, or at the termination of the Day of Atonement, or wherever there is the [least] suspicion of sin,<sup>8</sup> which is to include a public fast,<sup>9</sup> will never see the sign of a blessing.

**Our Rabbis taught:** Some are industrious and profit [thereby,] while others are industrious and suffer loss; some are indolent<sup>10</sup> and profit [thereby], while others are indolent and suffer loss. An industrious man who profits, — he who works the whole week but does not work on the eve of the Sabbath. An industrious man who suffers loss, — he who works the whole week and works on the eve of the Sabbath. An indolent man who profits, — he who does not work the whole week and does not work on the eve of the Sabbath.<sup>11</sup> An indolent man who suffers loss, — he who does not work the whole week but works on the eve of the Sabbath.

**Raba said:** As to these women of Mahuza,<sup>12</sup> though they do not work on the eve of the Sabbath, it is because they are used to indulgence [indolence], seeing that they do not work every day either. Yet even so, we call them, an indolent person who profits'.<sup>13</sup>

**Raba opposed [two verses].** It is written, For thy mercy is great unto the heavens;<sup>14</sup> whereas it is also written, For thy mercy is great above the heavens?<sup>15</sup> How is this [to be explained]? Here it refers to those who perform [God's behest] for its own sake;<sup>16</sup> there it refers to those who perform [it] with an ulterior motive.<sup>17</sup> And [this is] in accordance with Rab Judah.

**For Rab Judah said in Rab's name:** A man should always occupy himself with Torah and

good deeds, though it is not for their own sake, for out of [doing good] with an ulterior motive there comes [doing good] for its own sake.

**Our Rabbis taught:** He who looks to the earnings of his wife or of a mill will never see a sign of blessing. 'The earnings of his wife' means [when she goes around selling wool] by weight.<sup>18</sup> '[The earnings of] a mill' means its hire.<sup>19</sup> But if she makes [e.g., woolen garments] and sells them, Scripture indeed praises her, for it is written, she maketh linen garments and selleth them.<sup>20</sup>

**Our Rabbis taught:** He who trades in cane and jars will never see a sign of blessing. What is the reason? Since their bulk is large, the [evil] eye has power over them.

**Our Rabbis taught:** Traders in market-stands<sup>21</sup> and those who breed small cattle,<sup>22</sup> and those who cut down beautiful trees,<sup>23</sup> and those who cast their eyes at the better portion,<sup>24</sup> will never see a sign of blessing. What is the reason? Because people gaze at them.<sup>25</sup>

**Our Rabbis taught:** Four Perutoth never contain a sign of blessing:<sup>26</sup> the wages of clerks, the wages of interpreters,<sup>27</sup> the profits of orphans,<sup>28</sup> and money that came from oversea countries. As for the wages of interpreters, that is well, [the reason being] because it looks like wages for Sabbath [work]; orphans money too, because they are not capable of renunciation;<sup>29</sup> money which comes from overseas, because a miracle does not occur every day.<sup>30</sup> But what is the reason for the wages of writers? — Said R. Joshua b. Levi: The men of the Great Assembly<sup>31</sup> observed twenty-four fasts so that those who write Scrolls, Tefillin and meZuzoth<sup>32</sup> should not become wealthy for if they became wealthy they would not write.

**Our Rabbis taught:** Those who write Scrolls, Tefillin, and Mezuzoth, they, their traders and their traders' traders,<sup>33</sup> and all who engage [in trade] in sacred commodities,<sup>34</sup>



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

which includes the sellers of blue wool,<sup>35</sup> never see a sign of blessing. But if they engage [therein] for its own sake,<sup>36</sup> they do see [a sign of blessing].

The citizens of Beyshan<sup>37</sup> were accustomed not to go from Tyre to Sidon<sup>38</sup> on the eve of the Sabbath. Their children went to R. Johanan and said to him, For our fathers this was possible; for us it is impossible. Said he to them, Your fathers have already taken it upon themselves, as it is said, Hear my son, the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the teaching of thy mother.<sup>39</sup>

The inhabitants of Hozai<sup>40</sup> were accustomed to separate Hallah on rice.<sup>41</sup> [When] they went and told it to R. Joseph he said to them, Let a lay Israelite eat it in their presence:<sup>42</sup> Abaye raised an objection against him: Things which are permitted, yet others treat them as forbidden,<sup>43</sup>

(1) The law concerning produce of the Sabbatical year is this: as long as there is produce in the field available for animals, a man may keep produce at home as his private property; but when the produce in the field has ceased, — the animals having consumed it, he must carry out the produce from his home and declare it free for all. Having done this, he may then take back into the house whatever he needs for his private use (Tosaf. 52b, s.v. *מתבערין*).

(2) I.e., place it at everybody's disposal.

(3) This is explained in the Gemara.

(4) The afternoon service, and the time for same — beginning generally two and a half hours before nightfall.

(5) I.e., the money earned then will not be profitable.

(6) I.e., before.

(7) I.e., it is inadvisable.

(8) As he may continue work after the Sabbath or Festival has actually commenced; or begin before they have quite terminated.

(9) Proclaimed on account of rain, when work was forbidden, Ta'an. 12b. On other fast days work is permitted.

(10) Lit., 'low'.

(11) Though his abstention then is due to indolence, not to respect for the Sabbath, he is nevertheless rewarded, since in fact he does abstain.

(12) V. p. 20, n. 5.

(13) [Var. lec. (v. Rashi); These women of Mahuza, although the reason they do no work. . . Sabbath is that they are used . . . yet even so are called, etc.]

(14) Ps. LVII, 11.

(15) Ibid. CVIII, 5.

(16) Lit., 'name'. To them, His mercy is great above the heavens.

(17) Lit., 'not for its own name'.

(18) Jast.; i.e., trading in wool, but not making it up; this realizes very little profit and is not a dignified occupation for a woman.

(19) But trading in mills, buying and selling them, is profitable.

(20) Prov. XXXI, 24. This occurs in the description of the 'woman of valor'.

(21) [Heb. Simta. Tosef. Bek. II has Shemittah, the Sabbatical year when trading with produce is forbidden.]

(22) Sheep, goats, etc.

(23) To sell for their timber.

(24) When sharing with their neighbor.

(25) Market traders are exposed to the public gaze, and so to the evil eye, which is a potent source of misfortune. The other three incur the ill-will of people, the first because breeding small animals was generally frowned upon.

(26) Perutah was the smallest coin. I.e., the monies earned by the four things enumerated.

(27) Officials who spoke the Sabbath lectures of the Sages to the congregation; the Sage whispered his statements to the interpreter, and he explained them to the people. Also, those who publicly interpreted and translated the weekly readings of the Law on the Sabbath.

(28) Orphans' money was sometimes entrusted to people to trade with, and they kept half the profit for themselves for their labor.

(29) He may take more than his due, and a minor cannot legally renounce it in his favor.

(30) Considerable danger attended the transport of freights at sea, and one might very easily suffer loss.

(31) A body of one hundred and twenty men founded by Ezra, regarded as the bearers of Jewish teaching and tradition after the Prophets; v. Ab. I, 1.

(32) V. Glos.

(33) All who trade in these, whether directly or indirectly.

(34) Lit., 'work'.

(35) Wool dyed blue for insertion in garments as fringes; v. Num. XV, 38.

(36) To benefit the community, profit being a secondary consideration.

(37) Beyshan (Scythopolis) in Galilee (Jast.). [Beyshan was, however, far too distant from Tyre to enable its inhabitants to go there and back in one day. It must therefore be located in the neighborhood of Tyre and it is identified with the

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

village at Abasiya, N.E. of Tyre (Hurwitz, Palestine, p. 112).]

(38) On the coast of Palestine. Friday was market day at Sidon (Rashi).

(39) Prov. I, 8.

(40) Known to-day as Khuzistan, in S. W. Persia; Obermeyer, pp. 204ff.

(41) Which is necessary by law.

(42) Hallah may be eaten by a priest only. Thus he intimated that this was not Hallah.

(43) Lit., 'practice a prohibition in connection with them'.

## Pesachim 51a

you may not permit it in their presence? Said he to him, Yet was it not stated thereon, R. Hisda said: This refers to Cutheans.<sup>1</sup> What is the reason in the case of Cutheans? Because they confound one thing [with another]!<sup>2</sup> Then these people too [being ignorant] confound one thing [with another]? —

Rather, said R. Ashi, we consider: if most of them eat rice [bread], a lay Israelite must not eat it [the Hallah] in their presence, lest the law of Hallah be [altogether] forgotten by them; but if most of them eat corn [bread], let a lay Israelite eat it in their presence, lest they come to separate [Hallah] from what is liable upon what is exempt, and from what is exempt upon what is liable.<sup>3</sup> [It was stated in] the text: 'Things which are permitted, yet others treat them as forbidden, you may not permit it in their presence.

Said R. Hisda: This refers to Cutheans'. Yet not [to] all people? Surely it was taught: Two brothers may bathe together,<sup>4</sup> yet two brothers do not bathe [together] in Cabul.<sup>5</sup>

And it once happened that Judah and Hillel, the sons of R. Gamaliel, bathed together in Cabul, and the whole region criticized them, saying, 'We have never seen such [a thing] in [all] our days;' whereupon Hillel slipped away and went to the outer chamber,<sup>6</sup> but he was unwilling to tell them, 'You are permitted [to do this]'. [Again,] one may go out in slippers on the Sabbath,<sup>7</sup> yet people do not go out in slippers in Beri.<sup>8</sup>

And it once happened that Judah and Hillel, the sons of R. Gamaliel, went out in slippers on the Sabbath in Beri, whereupon the whole district criticized them, saying, 'We have never seen such [a thing] in [all] our days'; so they removed them and gave them to their [non-Jewish] servants, but they were unwilling to tell them, 'You are permitted [to wear these].' Again, one may sit on the stools of Gentiles on the Sabbath,<sup>9</sup> yet people do not sit on the stools of Gentiles on the Sabbath in Acco.<sup>10</sup>

And it once happened that R. Simeon b. Gamaliel sat down on the stools of Gentiles on the Sabbath in Acco, and the whole district criticized him, saying, 'We have never seen such [a thing] in [all] our days'. [Accordingly] he slipped down on to the ground, but he was unwilling to tell them, 'You are permitted [to do this]'.<sup>11</sup> —

The people of the coastal region, since Rabbis are not common among them, are like Cutheans.<sup>12</sup> As for [not sitting on] Gentiles' stools, that is well, [the reason being] because it looks like [engaging] in buying and selling. [That they do not go out] in slippers too [is understandable], lest they fall off and they come to carry them four cubits in the street. But what is the reason that [brothers] do not bathe [together]? —

As it was taught: A man may bathe with all, except with his father, his father-in-law, his mother's husband and his sister's husband.<sup>13</sup> But R. Judah permits [a man to bathe] with his father, on account of his father's honour,<sup>14</sup> and the same applies to his mother's husband. Then they [the people of Cabul] came and forbade [it] in the case of two brothers on account of [bathing with] his sister's husband.<sup>15</sup>

It was taught: A disciple must not bathe with his teacher, but if his teacher needs him, it is permitted.

When Rabbah b. Bar Hanah came,<sup>16</sup> he ate of the stomach fat.<sup>17</sup> Now, R. 'Awira<sup>18</sup> the Elder

# PESACHIM - 33a-60a

and Rabbah son of R. Huna visited him; as soon as he saw them, he hid<sup>19</sup> it [the fat] from them. When they narrated it to Abaye he said to them, 'He has treated you like Cutheans'. But does not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah agree with what we learned: WE LAY UPON HIM THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHENCE HE DEPARTED AND THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHITHER HE HAS GONE? —

Said Abaye: That is only [when he goes] from [one town in] Babylonia to [another in] Babylonia, or from [a town in] Palestine to [another in] Palestine, or from [a town in] Babylonia to [another in] Palestine; but not [when he goes] from [a place in] Palestine to [another in] Babylonia, [for] since we submit to them,<sup>20</sup> we do as they.<sup>21</sup> R. Ashi said: You may even say [that this holds good when a man goes] from Palestine to Babylonia; this is, however, where it is not his intention to return; but Rabbah b. Bar Hanah had the intention of returning.

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said to his son: My son, do not eat [this fat], whether in my presence or not in my presence. As for me who saw R. Johanan eat [it], R. Johanan is sufficient [an authority] to rely upon in his presence and not in his presence. [But] you have not seen him [eat it]; [therefore] do not eat, whether in my presence or not in my presence. Now, [one statement] of his disagrees with [another statement] of his. For Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: R. Johanan b. Eleazar related to me: I once followed R. Simeon son of R. Jose b. Lakuna into a kitchen garden,

(1) The people whom Shalmaneser settled in Samaria after the deportation of the Ten Tribes. They formally accepted Judaism, but as they retained many heathen practices, their religious status fluctuated, until they were finally declared heathens. In the present passage they are treated as Jews, but so lax as to require special laws.

(2) If they were treated with leniency in one case, their laxity in general would increase.

(3) Hallah can be separated from one piece of dough upon another piece, providing that both are liable; but if one is liable while the other is not, the

separated piece is not Hallah, while the other remains forbidden as Tebel. Hence if they separate Hallah from rice dough, which is really exempt, upon dough of wheat, which is liable, the latter remains Tebel, and by eating it they transgress. Again, if they separate Hallah from wheat dough upon itself and upon a rice dough, the former is not Hallah but likewise Tebel, and when it is given to the priest he eats Tebel.

(4) Lit., 'as one' — without fear that this may induce a desire for pederasty.

(5) A place southeast of Acco. Though the fear of pederasty may seem far-fetched, this is not so when its prevalence in the Roman Empire is remembered; v. Weiss, Dor, 11, 21f.

(6) Of the baths.

(7) Though they are loose-fitting; we do not fear that they may fall off and the wearer will thus come to carry them in the street, which of course is forbidden.

(8) A town in Galilee.

(9) When they are engaged in business, and we do not fear that the Jew who sits down there will be suspected of doing the same.

(10) A town and harbor on the coast of Phoenicia.

(11) In all these instances Jews are referred to, yet we see that this law holds good.

(12) In that leniency may lead to laxity, where there is none to show them the difference between what is mere stringency and what is really prohibited by law.

(13) In their case this may lead to impure thoughts.

(14) He can perform some services for him and help him.

(15) Lest the latter be thought permitted too.

(16) From Palestine to Babylonia.

(17) The stomach is partly curved, like a bow, and partly straight, like the string of a bow, which is the meaning of the present word. The fat on the straight part of the stomach is really permitted, but in Babylonia it was treated as forbidden.

(18) Alfasi and Rosh read: 'Awia.

(19) Lit., 'covered'.

(20) We accept their jurisdiction.

(21) I.e., a Palestinian going to Babylonia may retain his home practice, for this cannot give rise to quarrels.

## Pesachim 51b

and he took the after-growth of the cabbage<sup>1</sup> and ate it, and he gave [some] to me and said to me, 'My son, in my presence you may eat,<sup>2</sup> when not in my presence, you may not eat [it]. I who saw R. Simeon b. Yohai eat [it], — R. Simeon B. Yohai is [great] enough to rely upon in his presence and not in his presence;

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

[but] you may eat in my presence, but do not eat [when] not in my presence'.<sup>3</sup> What is [this reference to] R. Simeon?

For it was taught, R. Simeon said: All after-growths are forbidden,<sup>4</sup> except the after-growth of the cabbage, because there is none like them among the vegetables of the field;<sup>5</sup> but the Sages maintain, All after-growths are forbidden. Now, both [state their views] on the basis of R. Akiba. For it was taught: Behold, we may not sow, nor gather in our increase.<sup>6</sup>

R. Akiba said: Now, since they do not sow, whence can they gather?<sup>7</sup> Hence it follows that the after-growth is forbidden.<sup>8</sup> Wherein do they differ? The Rabbis hold, We preventively forbid the after-growth of cabbage on account of other after-growths in general; whereas R. Simeon holds: We do not preventively forbid the after-growth of cabbage on account of [other] after-growths in general.<sup>9</sup>

**HE WHO GOES FROM A PLACE, etc. As for [teaching], HE WHO GOES FROM A PLACE WHERE THEY DO WORK TO A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT WORK... WE LAY UPON HIM THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHITHER HE HAS GONE, AND A MAN MUST NOT ACT DIFFERENTLY, ON ACCOUNT OF THE QUARRELS, that is well, and he must not work. But [if he goes] FROM A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT WORK TO A PLACE WHERE THEY DO WORK... A MAN MUST NOT ACT DIFFERENTLY, BECAUSE OF THE QUARRELS — [that is] he is to work? But you say, WE LAY UPON HIM THE RESTRICTION OR THE PLACE WHITHER HE HAS GONE AND THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHENCE HE HAS DEPARTED! —**

Said Abaye: It refers to the first clause.<sup>10</sup> Raba said: After all it refers to the second clause, but this is its meaning: This does not come within [the scope of] differences which

cause quarrels. What will you say: He who sees will say, '[He regards] work as forbidden?'<sup>11</sup> [No:] they will indeed say, 'How many unemployed are there in the market place!'<sup>12</sup> R. Safra said to R. Abba:<sup>13</sup> For instance I,<sup>14</sup> who know [the art] of fixing the New Moon,<sup>15</sup>

(1) Rashi: It was in a Sabbatical year, and after the time when provisions must be removed from the house; v. p. 243, n. 1. Tosaf. maintains that 'and he took' implies that he pulled it out of the earth; thus it was still available for cattle, and therefore it was before the time of removal.

(2) Because you can rely upon me.

(3) Whereas Rabbah b. Bar Hanah told his son not to rely upon him even in his presence.

(4) After the time of removal (Rashi); v. however next note.

(5) Rashi offers two explanations the first of which he rejects. The second, about which he is also doubtful, is this: cabbages remain in the ground right through winter, whereas the after-growths of other vegetables are consumed earlier: hence we are more lenient with cabbages, because we can never apply to them the principle, 'when it ceases for the beasts in the field, it must cease — (i.e., be removed from) the man in the house'. V. p. 251, n. 1, for a different interpretation.

(6) Lev. XXV, 20.

(7) Then why state 'nor gather in our increase'?

(8) And to this they refer.

(9) R. Tam: the reference is to the time before the removal. Both R. Simeon and the Rabbis accept R. Akiba's view that the after-growth is Scripturally forbidden, but only that after-growth which is similar to sowing (seeds), for the verse, 'we may not sow, nor gather in our increase, implies that 'our increase,' which refers to the after-growth, is similar to what 'we may not sow'; but the cabbage plant has more affinity to trees than to seeds (v. Keth. 111b), hence it is not forbidden by Biblical law. This view is held by both, and they differ whether the cabbage after-growth is Rabbinically forbidden as a preventive measure or not. Another explanation is given in Tosaf. on quite different lines.

(10) I.e., HE MUST NOT ACT DIFFERENTLY if he goes FROM A PLACE WHERE THEY DO WORK TO A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT WORK.

(11) Though we permit it; do you fear that this will lead to strife?

(12) Raba explains the Mishnah thus: IF A MAN GOES FROM A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT WORK TO A PLACE WHERE THEY WORK... WE IMPOSE UPON HIM THE RESTRICTION OF THE PLACE WHENCE HE



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

HAS DEPARTED. For the general principle that a man MUST NOT ACT DIFFERENTLY from the rest of the people was only ON ACCOUNT OF THE QUARRELS, whereas here we have no fear.

(13) Var. lec. Raba.

(14) [So Tosaf. and MS. M., cur. edd. 'we'.]

(15) By Biblical law Festivals are holy on the first and the seventh days only (Pentecost one day altogether). But owing to uncertainty in early time about the exact day of New Moon, i.e., when the month began, it became a binding practice in the Diaspora to observe two days instead of one, and this remained binding even when New Moon was ascertained by mathematical calculation, which obviated all doubt.

## Pesachim 52a

in inhabited places I do not work,<sup>1</sup> because it is a change [which would lead to] strife. [But] how is it in the wilderness? —

Said he to him, Thus did R. Ammi say: In inhabited regions it is forbidden; in the desert it is permitted. R. Nathan b. Asia went from Rab's academy [in Sura]<sup>2</sup> to Pumbeditha on the second Festival day of Pentecost, [whereupon] R. Joseph put him under the ban. Said Abaye to him, Yet let the master punish him with lashes? —

Said he to him, I have treated him more severely, for in the West [sc. Palestine] they take a vote for punishing a disciple with lashes, yet they do not take a vote on the ban.<sup>3</sup> Others say, R. Joseph had him lashed.

Said Abaye to him, Yet let the Master ban him, for Rab and Samuel both said: We impose the ban for [the violation of] the two Festival days of the Diaspora? —

Said he to him, That refers only to an ordinary person, but here it is a scholar, so I did what was better for him, for in the West they take a vote for punishing a disciple with lashes, yet they do not take a vote on the ban.

**SIMILARLY, HE WHO TRANSPORTS SABBATICAL-YEAR PRODUCE, etc. Does then R. Judah not accept what we learned, WE LAY ON HIM THE RESTRICTIONS**

**OF THE PLACE WHENCE HE DEPARTED AND THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE PLACE WHITHER HE HAS GONE? —**

Said R. Shisha the son of R. Idi, R. Judah says<sup>4</sup> a different thing, and this is its meaning: or from a place where it has not ceased to a place where it has not ceased, and then he heard that it had ceased in his town, he is bound to remove it.

R. Judah said: [He can say,]<sup>5</sup> 'Do you too go out and procure [produce] for yourself from the place whence I have obtained it', since it has not ceased for them.<sup>6</sup> Shall we say that R. Judah [thus] rules leniently? But surely R. Eleazar said, R. Judah did not rule otherwise than stringently?<sup>7</sup> Rather, reverse it: He is not bound to remove it.<sup>8</sup>

R. Judah said: [His townspeople can say to him], 'Do you too go out [now] and obtain [produce] from the place whence you brought it [the produce you possess], and lo! it has ceased'.<sup>9</sup> Abaye said: In truth it is as taught,<sup>10</sup> and this is what he states: Or from a place where it has not ceased to a place where it has ceased, and [then] he brought it back to its place, and it has still not ceased [there], he is not bound to remove it.

R. Judah said: [They can say to him,] 'Go out and do you too bring [produce] from the place whence you have [now] brought it, and lo! it has ceased [there]'.

To this R. Ashi demurred: According to R. Judah, has he then caught them [these restrictions] up on the back of an ass!<sup>11</sup>

Rather, said R. Ashi, [This enters] in the controversy of the following Tannaim. For we learned: If a man preserves three [kinds of] preserves in one barrel,<sup>12</sup> — R. Eliezer said: One may eat [in reliance] upon the first [only];<sup>13</sup> R. Joshua said: Even [in reliance] upon the last;<sup>14</sup> R. Gamaliel said: Whatever kind has ceased from the field, he must

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

remove that kind from the barrel, and the Halachah is as his ruling.<sup>15</sup>

Rabina said, [It enters] into the controversy of the following Tannaim. For we learned:<sup>16</sup> One may eat dates until the last in Zoar is finished;<sup>17</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said:

- (1) On the second day of Festivals. [I.e., when I happen to be in Babylon, v. infra p. 52a.]
- (2) [Var. lec. 'Biram' on the West bank of the Euphrates. v. Asheri and MS.M. In Biram, which was the home of R. Nathan b. Asia, only a one day Festival was observed, v. R.H., Sonc. ed. p. 100, n. 2 and Obermeyer, p. 99].
- (3) As the ban would damage his prestige more than corporal punishment. This proves that the ban is a severer punishment.
- (4) [Var. lec. omit 'R. Judah' the reference being to the first Tanna, v. Rashi.]
- (5) To the people of the place whence he came.
- (6) Thus, he does not regard the practice of his own town, since they too can do as he.
- (7) In this connection.
- (8) I.e., insert the addition in the Mishnah thus: Or if he goes from a place where it has not ceased to a place where it has not ceased, and he then learns that it has ceased in his own town, he is not bound to remove it, as one cannot speak of the restrictions of the place whence he came, for when he left it there were as yet no restrictions.
- (9) I.e., the fact remains that by now it has ceased in your own town, and the resultant law applies to yourself too just as to us.
- (10) It refers to two dissimilar places, not to two similar places.
- (11) So that he brings them back with him! The produce has neither grown in that second town nor does he consume it there: how then can he be subject to the restrictions of that place?
- (12) I.e., three different vegetables. These may 'cease from the field' at different times — the reference is to the Sabbatical year.
- (13) As soon as the first kind 'ceases from the field', he must declare the whole free to all, because their being preserved together makes them as one.
- (14) He may go on eating of all three until the last kind has ceased from the field.
- (15) Now in the Mishnah there is the same controversy. The first Tanna agrees with R. Joshua's lenient view, and this is what he means: If a man carries various kinds of produce from a place where they have not ceased to a place where all of them have ceased, he is bound to remove them. But if only some kinds have ceased, he may eat even of the kind which has ceased. R. Judah rules, One can say to him, 'Go out and do you too

bring of that kind from the field', i.e., you will not find of that kind, and therefore you must remove it in accordance with R. Gamaliel.

(16) [The teaching that follows is not a Mishnah but a Baraitha, Tosef. Sheb. VII. Read accordingly with MS. M.: 'It has been taught'.]

(17) Dates may be eaten in the whole of Judea until the last palm tree is finished in Zoar, a town near the Dead Sea (Gen. XIII, 10) particularly well-stocked with palm trees (v. Deut. XXXIV, 3, though 'the city of palm trees' mentioned there refers to Jericho, not Zoar).

## Pesachim 52b

One may eat [in reliance] on those that are among the upper [overarching] boughs but one may not eat [in reliance] on those that are among the single prickly branches.<sup>1</sup> We learned elsewhere: There are three [separate] districts<sup>2</sup> in respect of removal: Judea, Transjordan and Galilee;<sup>3</sup> and there are three districts in each of them separately.<sup>4</sup> Then why did they say, There are [only] three districts in respect of removal?<sup>5</sup> Because in each one they may eat until it [the produce] has ceased in the last [region] thereof.<sup>6</sup> Whence do we know it? —

Said R. Hama b. 'Ukba in the name of R. Jose b. Hanina, Scripture saith, [And the Sabbath-produce of the land shall be food for you...] and for thy cattle, and for the beasts that are in thy land:<sup>7</sup> as long as the [wild] beasts can eat in the field, feed the cattle in the house;<sup>8</sup> when there is no more for the beasts in the field, make an end of it for the cattle in the house;<sup>9</sup> and we have it on tradition that the beasts in Judea do not live on the produce of Galilee, and the beasts in Galilee do not live on the produce of Judea.<sup>10</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Produce which went from the Land<sup>11</sup> abroad<sup>12</sup> must be removed wherever it is.<sup>13</sup> R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: They must go back to their [original] place and be removed, because it is said, 'in thy land'. But you have utilized this?<sup>14</sup> — Read therein, 'in the land', 'in thy land'.<sup>15</sup> Alternatively, [it is deduced] from, 'that are [Asher] in thy land'.<sup>16</sup>

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

R. Safra went from the Land abroad, [and] he had with him a barrel of wine of the Sabbath year. Now, R. Huna the son of R. Ika and R. Kahana accompanied him. He asked them, Is there anyone who has heard from R. Abbahu<sup>17</sup> [whether] the Halachah is as R. Simeon b. Eleazar or not? —

Said R. Kahana to him: Thus did R. Abbahu say: The Halachah is as R. Simeon b. Eleazar. R. Huna the son of R. Ika [however] said to him, Thus did R. Abbahu say: The Halachah is not as R. Simeon b. Eleazar. Said R. Safra, Accept this ruling of R. Huna,<sup>18</sup> because he is meticulously careful to learn the laws from his teacher, like Rehabah of Pumbeditha. For Rehabah said in Rab Judah's name: The Temple Mount consisted of a double colonnade, [i.e.,] a colonnade within a colonnade.<sup>19</sup> [Thereupon] R. Joseph applied to him [R. Safra] the verse, My people ask counsel at their stock, and their staff [Makkelo] declareth unto them:<sup>20</sup> whoever is lenient [Mekal] to him, to him he concedes [right].<sup>21</sup>

R. Elai cut down date-berries of the Sabbatical year.<sup>22</sup> How might he do thus: the Merciful One said, [It... shall be] for food,<sup>23</sup> but not for destruction? And should you answer that is only where it has reached<sup>24</sup> [the stage of] fruit,<sup>25</sup> but not where it has not reached [the stage of] fruit, — surely R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: The calyxes<sup>26</sup> of 'Orlah are forbidden, because they became a guard for the fruits. Now, when is it a guard for the fruits? When they are unripe berries, yet he calls them fruits! —

R. Nahman ruled as R. Jose. For we learned, R. Jose said: The [berries of 'Orlah] in the budding stage [Semadar] are forbidden, because they count as fruit; whereas the Rabbis disagree with him.

To this R. Shimi of Nehardea demurred; yet do the Rabbis disagree with R. Jose in respect to other trees,<sup>27</sup> — surely we learned, From when may you not cut down trees in

the Sabbatical year?<sup>28</sup> Beth Shammai maintain: All trees [may not be cut down] from when they bring forth;<sup>29</sup> but Beth Hillel rule: The carob trees from when they form chains [of carobs]; the vine trees,

(1) The lower portion of the palm tree near the roots is surrounded with single prickly, thorn-like branches. Now, when a wind blows, the falling dates are retained both among the ordinary (upper) branches as well as the prickly ones. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel rules that you may eat only as long as there are dates among the higher branches, which are accessible; but those (in the prickly branches must be disregarded, since animals cannot take them because of the prickles. In our Mishnah the first Tanna means: When they have completely ceased, even from the prickly branches, he must remove them. Whereas R. Judah maintains that unless one can go and bring them, i.e., unless they are accessible, he must remove them, which means even if there are still dates on these thorn branches.

(2) Lit., 'countries'.

(3) In each the time of removal is when the produce has 'ceased from the field' in that particular district.

(4) The produce ceasing in each at a different time.

(5) Instead of nine.

(6) Rash: until it has ceased in the last subdivision. Tosaf. explains it differently v. Shebi. IX, 2-3.

(7) Lev. XXV, 6f.

(8) I.e., domestic animals.

(9) I.e., you must no longer keep the produce in the house for your private needs.

(10) I.e., they do not stray so far in search of food (Rashi).

(11) I.e., Palestine, 'the Land' par excellence.

(12) Lit., 'to without the Land.'

(13) The law of sabbatical produce, being dependent on the soil, is binding in Palestine only, v. Kid. 36b; yet it is also binding upon Palestine produce, even when transplanted elsewhere. Nevertheless, he is not bound to take it back to Palestine for removal, but can do it wherever he is.

(14) To show that one district cannot rely on another.

(15) I.e., Scripture could have written 'in the land', which would suffice for the present exegesis. In thy land intimates both.

(16) Asher is superfluous; hence it can be used for this purpose.

(17) Who was his teacher.

(18) Lit., 'hold... in your hand'.

(19) V. supra 13b and Bezah, Sonc. ed. p. 54, n. 9. The point of the quotation is not clear. In Ber. 33b Rashi explains that Rehabah was careful to use

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

the word setaw, the exact word used by his teacher, though the passage is based on a Mishnah (v. Supra 11b), where the word iztaba is used.

(20) Hos. IV, 12.

(21) A humorous play on words, connecting Makkal, a staff, with Mekal, he is lenient.

(22) I.e., before they ripened and were fit for food (R. Hananel); Rashi: he cut down the palm tree before the dates had ripened.

(23) Lev. XXV, 6.

(24) Lit., 'descended to'.

(25) I.e., when it is ripe.

(26) Which surround the date in its early stage.

(27) Apart from the vine, to which the above refers.

(28) As stated above, they must be used for food, not for destruction. Now the question is: at what stage are their fruits regarded as food, so that the tree must not be cut down, but left until its fruit ripens.

(29) Rashi explains here: the first leaves (preceding the fruits); but in Ber. 36b Rashi explains: when they bring forth the fruit; Strashun accepts the latter view.

## Pesachim 53a

from when they form kernels;<sup>1</sup> olive trees, from when they blossom;<sup>2</sup> and all other trees, from when they bring forth. Now R. Assi said thereon: Boser [half-ripe fruit], Girua' [formation of kernels], and the white bean are identical.<sup>3</sup> 'The white bean can you think so!<sup>4</sup> —

Rather, say, its size is that of the white bean. Now, whom do you know to maintain that Boser is fruit, but not Semadar? The Rabbis.<sup>5</sup> Yet it is stated, 'and all other trees, from when they bring forth?'<sup>6</sup> — Rather, R. Il'ai cut down Nishane.<sup>7</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One may eat grapes [of the Sabbatical year] until the espalier branches of okels are finished. If there are later ones than these, one may eat [in reliance] on them.<sup>9</sup> One may eat olives until the last of Tekoa<sup>10</sup> is finished.

R. Eliezer said: Until the last of Gush-Heleb<sup>11</sup> is finished, so that a poor man should go out and not find a quarter<sup>12</sup> either on the branches or on the stem. One may eat dried

figs until the unripe figs [Pagge] of Beth Hini<sup>13</sup> are finished.

Said R. Judah: The unripe figs of Beth Hini were not mentioned except in connection with tithe, for we learned,<sup>14</sup> The unripe figs of Beth Hini and the dates<sup>15</sup> of Tobanya<sup>16</sup> are subject to tithe.<sup>17</sup> 'One may eat dates until the last in Zoar is finished; R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: One may eat [in reliance] on those that are among the upper [overarching] branches, but you may not eat [in reliance] on those that are among the single prickly branches.' But the following contradicts this: One may eat grapes until Passover; olives until Pentecost; dried figs until Hanukkah;<sup>18</sup> [and] dates until Purim.<sup>19</sup> Now R. Bibi said, R. Johanan transposes the last two!<sup>20</sup> — Both are one [the same] limit. Alternatively, surely it is explicitly taught, 'If there are later ones than these, one may eat [in reliance] on them.'<sup>21</sup>

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: An indication of mountainous country is [the presence of] millin;<sup>22</sup> an indication of valleys is palm trees; an indication of streams is reeds; an indication of lowlands is the sycamore tree. And though there is no proof of the matter, there is an allusion to the matter, for it is said, And the king made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones, and cedars made he to be as the sycamore trees that are in the lowland, for abundance.<sup>23</sup> 'An indication of mountainous country is [the presence of] Millin; an indication of valleys is palm trees.' The practical difference is in respect of first fruits. For we learned: First fruits are not brought of any save the seven species,<sup>24</sup> nor of the palm trees in the highlands nor of the fruits in the valleys.<sup>25</sup> 'An indication of streams is reeds.' The practical difference is in respect of the rough valley' [Nahal Ethan].<sup>26</sup> 'An indication of lowlands is the sycamore tree.' The practical difference is in respect of buying and selling.<sup>27</sup> Now that you have arrived at this, all the [others] too are in respect of buying and selling.



# PESOCCHIM - 33a-60a

**MISHNAH.** WHERE IT IS THE PRACTICE TO SELL SMALL CATTLE<sup>28</sup> TO HEATHENS, ONE MAY SELL; WHERE IT IS THE PRACTICE NOT TO SELL,<sup>29</sup> ONE MAY NOT SELL. AND IN ALL PLACES ONE MAY NOT SELL LARGE CATTLE TO THEM, [NOR] CALVES OR FOALS, WHETHER SOUND OR MAIMED.<sup>30</sup> R. JUDAH PERMITS IN THE CASE OF A MAIMED [ONE].<sup>31</sup> THE SON OF BATHYRA PERMITTED IT IN THE CASE OF A HORSE.<sup>32</sup> WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM TO EAT ROAST [MEAT] ON THE NIGHT OF PASSOVER, ONE MAY EAT[IT]; WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM NOT TO EAT [IT],<sup>33</sup> ONE MAY NOT EAT [IT].

**GEMARA.** Rab Judah said in Rab's name: A man is forbidden to say, 'This meat shall be for Passover,' because it looks as though he is sanctifying his animal and eating sacred flesh without [the Temple]. Said R. Papa: This applies only to meat, but not to wheat, because he means, It is to be guarded [from fermenting] for Passover. But not 'meat'? An objection is raised: R. Jose said, Thaddeus of Rome<sup>34</sup> accustomed the Roman [Jews] to eat helmeted goats<sup>35</sup> on the nights of Passover. [Thereupon] they [the Sages] sent [a message] to him: If you were not Thaddeus, we would proclaim the ban against you, because you make Israel eat sacred flesh without [the Temple]. 'Sacred flesh' — can you think so?<sup>36</sup> —

Rather say,

- (1) Or, ovules containing moisture (v. Jast. s.v. גרע II).
- (2) I.e., when their blossoms, a calyx-like growth, come forth.
- (3) Lit., 'that is Boser, that is', etc. I.e., the three terms indicate the same stage. The Mishnah often speaks of these.
- (4) We are discussing the vine!
- (5) For R. Jose maintains that even Semadar, which denotes an earlier stage, is fruit.
- (6) Thus they agree with R. Jose in respect to other trees.
- (7) Stunted dates of palms whose fruit never matures.
- (8) Cur. ed. 'Ar. (also quoted by Rashi) reads: Abel, i.e., the branches of Abel Cheramim (lit., 'the palm of the vine-yards' — v. Jud. XI, 33), situate six or seven Roman miles from

Philadelphia (Rabbath-Ammon), and as its name implies, famous for its vineyards; v. J.E. s.v.

- (9) I.e., as long as they are yet on the branches.
- (10) A city of southern Judea often mentioned in the Bible (e.g., II Sam. XIV, 2f; Amos I, 1; II Chron. XI, 6), and famous for the abundance of its olives, v. Men. 85b.
- (11) Lit., 'fat ground', (Gush-heleb) or Giscala in Galilee, not far from Tyre (Neub. Geogr. p. 230), was rich in oil; Josephus, Vita, 13; Men. 85b; v. J.E. s.v. Giscala.
- (12) I.e., a log.
- (13) Bethania, near Jerusalem; v. Neub. op. cit., 149f. Pagge are probably a species of figs that never reach full maturity, but are nevertheless fit for eating.
- (14) 'We learned' is absent in this passage as quoted in 'Er. 28b. [It is a Baraitha (Tosef. Sheb. VII) and not a Mishnah.]
- (15) Ahina (pl. Ahini) is a species of late and inferior dates.
- (16) Name of a certain place.
- (17) But these figs do not determine the time for the removal of figs.
- (18) The Feast of Lights, commencing on the twenty-fifth of Kislef and lasting for eight days. It generally fails in the latter half of December.
- (19) 'Lots' — the minor Festival in celebration of Haman's downfall. It is held on the fourteenth of Adar, and generally occurs in March.
- (20) I.e., dried figs until Purim, and dates until Hanukkah. By then the various kinds mentioned have disappeared from the field; thus this conflicts with the previous statement.
- (21) Thus even if these are different time-limits, the later one is stated in accordance with this teaching.
- (22) Milla pl. Millin, a species of oak from which the gall-nut is collected (*quercus infectoria*). Jast.
- (23) I Kings X, 27.
- (24) Enumerated in Deut. VIII, 8; a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig trees and pomegranates; a land of olive trees and honey.
- (25) Because these are of inferior quality. The same idea is expressed by R. Simeon b. Gamaliel when he says that palm trees are an indication of valleys, i.e., the best grow in the valleys. His other statements bear a similar meaning.
- (26) V. Deut. XXI, 4. Nahal is a stream which in summer dries up and leaves a valley bed. The presence of reeds along the margin of the valley indicates that this is a fitting place for the purpose.
- (27) If a man sells a lowland estate it must contain sycamores (Rashi). Or, if a man sells sycamore trees, guaranteeing them to be of the best quality, they must be from lowland country.
- (28) E.g., sheep and goats.
- (29) For fear that large cattle too may be sold to them; v. n. 5.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(30) Large cattle, because they are thereby deprived of the Sabbath rest (v. A.Z. 15a); calves or foals, being the young of large cattle, as a preventive measure; maimed, likewise as a preventive measure on account of whole animals.

(31) Because it is unfit for work and will immediately be killed for food. Therefore the few will not see it in the heathen's possession, and so will not come to sell him others too.

(32) The main use of a horse is for riding, and riding on the Sabbath, even by a Jew, is not regarded as Scripturally forbidden but merely as a shebuth (v. Glos.).

(33) This means after the destruction of the Temple. While the Temple stood the Passover sacrifice was eaten roast (Ex. XII, 8). Consequently, when the Temple was no more it became the practice to refrain from eating roast meat on the night of Passover, so that it should not appear that a sacrifice was brought without the Temple, which is forbidden.

(34) Lit., 'a man of Rome'.

(35) Goats roasted whole with the entrails and the legs on the head, like a helmet (the verb Kalas denotes to put on a helmet). That is how the Passover sacrifice was roasted, v. infra 74a.

(36) Surely the goats were not dedicated as sacrifices.

## Pesachim 53b

It is near to making Israel eat sacred flesh without [the Temple].<sup>1</sup> [Thus,] only a 'helmeted' goat,<sup>2</sup> but not if it is not 'helmeted'? — I will tell you: if it is 'helmeted', there is no difference whether he stated<sup>3</sup> or he did not state; [but] if it is not 'helmeted', if he specified, it is [forbidden]; if he did not specify, it is not [forbidden].

R. Aha learned this Baraitha as [the statement of] R. Simeon.<sup>4</sup>

To this R. Shesheth demurred: It is well according to him who learns it as [the statement of] R. Jose; then it is correct. But according to him who learns it as [the statement of] R. Simeon, is it correct? Surely we learned, R. Simeon declares him exempt, because he did not make the offering in the way which people make [this] offering!<sup>5</sup>

Said Rabina to R. Ashi: And is it correct [even] according to him who learns it as [the statement of] R. Jose? Surely Raba said: R.

Simeon stated this according to the view of R. Jose, who maintained: A man is held responsible for his last words too. Surely then, since R. Simeon agrees with R. Jose, R. Jose also agrees with R. Simeon?<sup>7</sup> — No: R. Simeon agrees with R. Jose, but R. Jose does not agree with R. Simeon.<sup>8</sup> The scholars asked: Was Thaddeus, the man of Rome, a great man or a powerful man?<sup>9</sup> —

Come and hear: This too did Thaddeus of Rome teach: What [reason] did Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah see that they delivered themselves, for the sanctification of the [Divine] Name,<sup>10</sup> to the fiery furnace? They argued a minori to themselves: if frogs, which are not commanded concerning the sanctification of the [Divine] Name, yet it is written of them, and they shall come up and go into thy house... and into thine ovens, and into thy kneading troughs:<sup>11</sup> when are the kneading troughs to be found near the oven? When the oven is hot.<sup>12</sup> We, who are commanded concerning the sanctification of the Name, how much the more so.<sup>13</sup>

R. Jose b. Abin said: He cast merchandise into the Passover-sacrifice at the time of roasting, this is not the way in which people consecrate animals: therefore his words are invalid. pockets of scholars.<sup>14</sup> For R. Johanan said: Whoever casts merchandise into the pockets of scholars will be privileged to sit in the Heavenly Academy, for it is said, for wisdom is a defence even as money is a defence.<sup>15</sup>

*MISHNAH.* WHERE IT IS THE PRACTICE TO LIGHT A LAMP [AT HOME] ON THE NIGHT OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT,<sup>16</sup> ONE MUST LIGHT [ONE]; WHERE IT IS THE PRACTICE NOT TO LIGHT [A LAMP], ONE MUST NOT LIGHT [ONE]. AND WE LIGHT [LAMPS] IN SYNAGOGUES, SCHOOL-HOUSES, AND DARK ALLEYS, AND FOR THE SAKE OF INVALIDS.

*GEMARA.* It was taught: Whether they maintained that we should light [lamps] or they maintained that we should not light

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

[them], both intended [it] for the same purpose.<sup>17</sup>

R. Joshua said, Raba lectured: Thy people also shall all be righteous, they shall inherit the land for ever:, etc.<sup>18</sup> whether they maintained that we should light [lamps] or they maintained that we should not light [them], both intended naught but the same purpose.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: We do not recite a blessing over light except at the termination of the Sabbath, since it was then created for the first time.<sup>19</sup> Said a certain old man to him-others state, Rabbah b. Bar Hanah — 'Well spoken! and thus [too] did R. Johanan say.

'Ulla was going along, riding an ass, while R. Abba proceeded at his right and Rabbah b. Bar Hanah at his left. Said R. Abba to 'Ulla: Do you indeed say in R. Johanan's name: We do not recite a blessing over light except at the termination of the Sabbath, since it was then created for the first time? 'Ulla turned round and looked at Rabbah b. Bar Hanah with displeasure.<sup>20</sup> Said he to him, I said it not in reference to that but in reference to this.<sup>21</sup> For a Tanna recited before R. Johanan, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: When the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, even where they maintain that we must not light [a lamp], we do light [it] in honor of the Sabbath; which R. Johanan followed with the remark,<sup>22</sup> But the Sages forbid it. Said he to him, Let it be this.<sup>23</sup> R. Jose applied to this the verse, Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water';

(1) I.e., it is similar to sacrifices,

(2) Should be forbidden.

(3) That it was for Passover.

(4) Not R. Jose.

(5) V. Men. 103a. If a man declares, 'I vow a meal-offering of barley', the first Tanna rules that he must bring a meal-offering of wheat. For a man's liabilities are determined by his first words only, where these contradict his last words. Thus, when he declared, 'I vow a meal-offering', this is a binding vow; when he adds 'of barley', this is impossible, since only wheat is permitted;

therefore his first words are binding. But R. Simeon maintains that he must be judged by his last words too: hence he really meant a meal-offering of barley, thinking that this is permitted; consequently his entire statement is invalid, and he is exempt. Now, in this case, how could it be regarded as near to sacred flesh? He did not consecrate the animal whilst alive, and even if he designated it a

(6) Lit., 'seized'.

(7) That a vow made in an unusual manner is not binding. Hence the same difficulty arises according to R. Jose.

(8) He maintains that even when a vow is not made in a usual manner it must be taken into account, because no man speaks without a purpose. Hence though R. Simeon bases his ruling on R. Jose's view, R. Jose himself does indeed hold that a man is held responsible for his last words too, but only when both his first words and his last can take effect (v. Tem. 25b); but where his last words would completely nullify his statement, as here, they are disregarded; hence the vower is liable to a wheat meal-offering (Maharsha). So here too, if he declared at the roasting, 'This be for a Passover sacrifice', though such a vow is unusual, I would say that he means that a sacrifice shall be bought with its monetary value. Thus it is 'near to sacred flesh' on R. Jose's view. But according to R. Simeon this is a real difficulty, which remains unanswered.

(9) Lit., 'a man of fists'. — On what grounds did they refrain from imposing the ban?

(10) This is one of the great principles of Judaism: a man must by his actions sanctify the Divine Name, i.e., prove his deep conviction of the truth of Judaism even to the extent of suffering for it, and thereby shed luster and glory upon it.

(11) Ex. VII, 28.

(12) And yet at God's command they entered them.

(13) This quotation shows that he was a great scholar.

(14) I.e., he gave them opportunities for trading.

(15) Eccl. VII, 12. R. Johanan translates: he will enter within the precincts (lit., 'shadow') of wisdom, who brings a scholar within the protection of his wealth.

(16) I.e., before it commences, so that it should burn through the night.

(17) viz., to curb their desire for sexual indulgence. The former argued that this would be the better effected by the presence of a lamp, because darkness is generally required; while the latter held that a lamp would strengthen his desire, as he could see his wife by the light.

(18) Isa. LX, 21.

(19) Lit., 'that was the beginning of its creation' on the evening of the first day.

(20) For misrepresenting R. Johanan's view.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

- (21) [MS. M.: I did not say this but that.]  
(22) Lit., 'and R. Johanan answered after him'.  
(23) I admit this to be right.

## Pesachim 54a

but a man of understanding will draw it out.<sup>1</sup> 'Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water' — this applies to 'Ulla;<sup>2</sup> 'but a man of understanding will draw it out' — this applies to Rabbah b. Bar Hanah.<sup>3</sup> And in accordance with whom did they hold their view?<sup>4</sup> —

In accordance with the following which R. Benjamin b. Japheth said in R. Johanan's name: We recite a blessing over light both at the termination of the Sabbath and at the termination of the Day of Atonement, and that is the popular practice. An objection is raised: We do not recite a blessing over light except at the termination of the Sabbath, since it was then created for the first time; and as soon as he sees [it] he immediately recites a blessing. R. Judah said: He recites them<sup>5</sup> in order over the cup [of wine].

Now R. Johanan said thereon: The Halachah is as R. Judah? —

There is no difficulty: here the reference is to light that has burnt over the Sabbath;<sup>6</sup> there it refers to light which issues from tinder and stones.<sup>7</sup> One [Baraita] taught: We can recite a blessing over light which issues from tinder and stones; [while] another taught: We cannot recite a blessing over it? —

There is no difficulty: one refers to the termination of the Sabbath, [and] the other refers to the termination of the Day of Atonement. Rabbi used to 'scatter' them.<sup>8</sup> R. Hiyya 'collected' them.<sup>9</sup> R. Isaac b. Abdimi said: Though Rabbi scattered them, he subsequently repeated them in [their] order over the cup [of wine], so as to quit his children and household [of their obligation].<sup>10</sup> Yet was light created at the termination of the Sabbath? Surely It was taught: Ten things were created on the eve of

the Sabbath at twilight. These are they: the well,<sup>11</sup> the manna, the rainbow,<sup>12</sup> the writing<sup>13</sup> and the writing instrument[s], the Tables,<sup>14</sup> the sepulcher of Moses, the cave in which Moses and Elijah stood,<sup>15</sup> the opening of the ass's mouth,<sup>16</sup> and the opening of the earth's mouth to swallow up the wicked.<sup>17</sup>

R. Nehemiah said in his father's name: Also fire and the mule.<sup>18</sup>

R. Josiah said in his father's name: Also the ram<sup>19</sup> and the Shamir.<sup>20</sup>

R. Judah said: Tongs too, a new thing to the person, since he did not benefit from the light during the day. He used to say: Tongs are made with tongs;<sup>21</sup> then who made the first tongs? Hence in truth it was<sup>22</sup> a Heavenly creation. Said they to him, it is possible to make it in a mould and shape it simultaneously.<sup>23</sup> Hence in truth it is of human manufacture!<sup>24</sup> —

There is no difficulty: one refers to our fire, the other to the fire of the Gehenna.<sup>25</sup> Our fire [was created] at the termination of the Sabbath; the fire of the Gehenna, on the eve of the Sabbath. Yet was the fire of the Gehenna created on the eve of the Sabbath? Surely it was taught: Seven things were created before the world was created, and these are they: The Torah, repentance, the Garden of Eden, Gehenna, the Throne of Glory, the Temple, and the name of the Messiah. The Torah, for it is written, The Lord made me [sc. the Torah] as the beginning of his way.<sup>26</sup> Repentance, for it is written, Before the mountains were brought forth, and it is written, Thou turnest man to contrition, and sayest, Repent, ye children of men.<sup>27</sup> The Garden of Eden, as it is written, And the Lord planted a garden in Eden from aforetime.<sup>28</sup> The Gehenna, for it is written, For Tophet [i.e., Gehenna] is ordered of old.<sup>29</sup> The Throne of Glory and the Temple, for it is written, Thou throne of glory, on high from the beginning, Thou place of our sanctuary.<sup>30</sup> The name of the Messiah, as it is written, His [sc. the Messiah's] name shall



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

endure forever, and has exited before the sun!<sup>31</sup> —

I will tell you: only its cavity was created before the world was created, but its fire [was created] on the eve of the Sabbath. Yet was its fire created on the eve of the Sabbath? Surely it was taught, R. Jose said: The fire which the Holy One, blessed be He, created on the second day of the week shall never be extinguished,<sup>32</sup> as it is said, And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have rebelled against me,' for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched?<sup>33</sup>

Again, R. Bana'ah son of R. 'Ulla said: Why was 'it was good' not said concerning the second day of the week?<sup>34</sup> Because the fire of the Gehenna was created therein. Also R. Eleazar said, Although 'it was good' was not said in connection with it, yet He re-included it in the sixth, as it is said, And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good.<sup>35</sup> —

Rather, the cavity [was made] before the world was created, and its fire on the second day of the week; while as for our fire, on the eve of the Sabbath He decided<sup>36</sup> to create it, but it was not created until the termination of the Sabbath. For it was taught, R. Jose said: Two things He decided to create on the eve of the Sabbath, but they were not created until the termination of the Sabbath, and at the termination of the Sabbath the Holy One, blessed be He, inspired Adam with knowledge of a kind similar to Divine [knowledge],<sup>37</sup> and he procured two stones and rubbed them on each other, and fire issued from them; he also took two [heterogeneous] animals and crossed them, and from them came forth the mule.

R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: The mule came into existence in the days of Anah, for it is said, This is the Anah who found the mules<sup>38</sup> in the wilderness.<sup>39</sup> Those who interpret symbolically<sup>40</sup> used to say: Anah was unfit,<sup>41</sup> therefore he brought unfit [animals]<sup>42</sup> into

the world, for it is said, These are the sons of Seir the Horite [. . . And Zibeon and Anah],<sup>43</sup> while it is written, And these are the children of Zibeon: Aiah and Anah.<sup>44</sup> Hence it teaches that Zibeon cohabited with his mother and begat Anah by her. But perhaps there were two Anahs?

Said Raba: I say a thing which [even] King Shapur could not say, and who is that? Samuel. Others say, R. Papa said: I say a thing which even King Shapur did not say, and who is that? Raba.<sup>45</sup> The Writ saith, that is Anah [meaning], that is the original Anah.<sup>46</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Ten things were created on the eve of the Sabbath at twilight, and these are they: The well, manna, the rainbow, writing, the writing instruments, the Tables, the sepulcher of Moses and the cave in which Moses and Elijah stood, the opening of the ass's mouth, and the opening of the earth's mouth to swallow up the wicked. While some say, Also Aaron's staff, its almonds and its blossoms.<sup>47</sup> Others say, The harmful spirits [demons] too. Others say, Also

- (1) Prov. XX, 5.
- (2) Who understood from R. Abba the error of Rabbah b. Bar Hanah.
- (3) He understood why 'Ulla looked at him with displeasure, though he gave no reason.
- (4) viz., 'Ulla and Rabbah, who would not accept R. Abba's ruling.
- (5) Various blessings which are to be recited on the termination of Sabbath.
- (6) It had burnt during the day. Nevertheless it had observed the Sabbath, as it were, in that it was lit in permitted circumstances, e.g.. for an invalid or a woman about to be delivered of child. Or in the case of the Day of Atonement, it had been lit prior to its commencement. There a blessing is recited at the termination of the latter too, because it is as a.....
- (7) I.e., which is made now. A blessing over this is recited only at the termination of the Sabbath, when light was likewise created for the first time, but not at the termination of the Day of Atonement.
- (8) Immediately he saw light after the termination of the Sabbath he recited the appropriate blessing. Later, when spices were brought to him, he recited

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

a further blessing over them. Thus the blessings were 'scattered'.

(9) He recited both blessings together over a cup of wine, as is the present practice.

(10) I.e., he recited the blessings a second time on their behalf.

(11) The Well of Miriam which followed the Israelites in the Wilderness; v. Num. XXI, .16-18, which some relate to this.

(12) V. Gen. IX, 13f.

(13) I.e., the shape of letters.

(14) Ex. XXXII, 16.

(15) When God allowed them to see His glory; v. Ex. XXXIII, 22; I Kings XIX, 9.

(16) Num. XXII, 28.

(17) Ibid. XVI, 30. That these last two should happen when the need arose was decreed at the time of the creation.

(18) The mule is regarded as a hybrid, as stated *infra*. But according to R. Nehemiah, the first was created directly, and was not the result of cross-breeding.

(19) Which Abraham offered as a substitute for Isaac, Gen. XXII, 13; it was ordained at the Creation that the ram should thus be ready to hand.

(20) A legendary worm used for the building of the Temple. It was laid upon the stones and cut through them, and so obviated the need for iron tools, in conformity with Ex. XX, 22; v. I Kings VI, 7 and Git. 68a.

(21) The already manufactured tongs must hold the iron on the anvil as it is beaten out into another pair of tongs.

(22) Lit., 'was this not, etc.?'

(23) Without beating it out.

(24) For the whole passage v. Ab. V, 5 and notes a.l. in Sonc. ed. pp. 62-64. — This shows that fire was created already on Sabbath eve.

(25) Hell or purgatory.

(26) Prov. VIII, 22.

(27) Ps. XC, 2f. 'Before', etc. applies to 'repent'.

(28) Gen. II, 8.

(29) Isa. XXX, 33.

(30) Jer. XVII, 12.

(31) Ps. LXXII, 17. — Thus the Gehenna was created before the world. — The general idea of this Baraita is that these things are indispensable pre-requisites for the orderly progress of mankind upon earth. The Torah, the supreme source of instruction; the concept of repentance, in recognition that 'to err is human', and hence, if man falls, the opportunity to rise again; the Garden of Eden and the Gehenna, symbolizing reward and punishment; the Throne of Glory and the Temple, indicating that the goal of Creation is that the Kingdom of God (represented by the Temple) shall be established on earth, as it is in heaven; and finally, the name of the Messiah, i.e.,

the assurance that God's purpose will ultimately be achieved.

(32) Because it is the fire of the Gehenna.

(33) Isa. LXVI, 24.

(34) In which the world was created.

(35) Gen. I, 31.

(36) Lit., 'it came up in (His) intention'.

(37) Lit., 'of above'.

(38) E.V. 'hot Springs'.

(39) Gen. XXXVI, 24.

(40) דורשי המורות Lit., 'those who interpret (Scripture) as jewels', i.e., as ethical teachings. Levi connects the phrase with דורשי המורות a beautiful and graceful gazelle, i.e., those who teach with charming and graceful interpretations.

(41) Pasul, i.e., the issue of an incestuous union.

(42) I.e., the offspring of heterogeneous breeding, i.e., one sees in this the teaching that evil begets evil.

(43) Gen. XXXVI, 20.

(44) Ibid. 24. In the first verse Anah appears as Zibeon's brother, whereas in the second he is his son.

(45) Shapur I, King of Persia, was a contemporary of Samuel, while Shapur II was a contemporary of Raba. These names are applied here to Samuel and Raba, as indicating their acknowledged authority in learning. v. MGWJ. 1936, p. 217.

(46) Identical with the first mentioned.

(47) V. Num. XVII, 23. This too was ordained at the Creation.

## Pesachim 54b

### Adam's raiment.<sup>1</sup>

**Our Rabbis taught: Seven things are hidden<sup>2</sup> from men. These are they: the day of death, and the day of comfort,<sup>3</sup> the depth [extent] of judgment;<sup>4</sup> and a man does not know what is in his neighbor's heart; and a man does not know from what he will earn; and when the Davidic dynasty will return;<sup>5</sup> and when the wicked kingdom<sup>6</sup> will come to an end.**

**Our Rabbis taught: Three things [God] willed to come to pass,<sup>7</sup> and if He had not willed them, it would be but right that He should will them. And these are they: Concerning a corpse, that it should become offensive; and concerning a dead person, that he should be forgotten from the heart; and concerning produce, that it should rot;<sup>8</sup> and some say, concerning coins, that they should enjoy currency.<sup>9</sup>**

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**MISHNAH.** WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM TO DO WORK ON THE NINTH OF AB,<sup>10</sup> ONE MAY DO IT; WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM NOT TO DO WORK, ONE MAY NOT DO IT. AND IN ALL PLACES SCHOLARS CEASE [FROM WORK ON THAT DAY]. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: A MAN MAY ALWAYS MAKE HIMSELF A SCHOLAR.<sup>11</sup>

**GEMARA.** Samuel said: There is no public fast in Babylonia save the Ninth of Ab alone.<sup>12</sup> Shall we say that Samuel holds, [with regard to] the Ninth of Ab, its twilight is forbidden;<sup>13</sup> but Samuel said: [with regard to] the Ninth of Ab, its twilight is permitted? And should you say, Samuel holds, The twilight of every public fast is permitted, — surely we learned: One must eat and drink while it is yet day. Now what is this to exclude is it not to exclude twilight? No: it is to exclude after nightfall. Shall we say that this supports him? [It was taught:] There is no difference between the Ninth of Ab and the Day of Atonement except that with the latter, its doubt is forbidden, while with the former, its doubt is permitted. What does ‘its doubt is permitted’ mean? Surely [that refers to] twilight? — No, [but] as R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said,<sup>14</sup> It is in respect of the fixing of New Moon; so here too it is in respect of the fixing of the New Moon.<sup>15</sup>

Raba lectured: Pregnant women and suckling women must fast and complete [the fast] on that day [the Ninth of Ab], just as they fast and complete [the fast] on the Day of Atonement; and the twilight thereof is forbidden. And they said likewise in R. Johanan's name. Yet did R. Johanan say thus?

Surely R. Johanan said: The Ninth of Ab is not like a public fast. Surely that means in respect of twilight? — No: in respect of work.<sup>16</sup> [You say], ‘Work’! we have learned it: WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM TO DO WORK ON THE NINTH OF AB, ONE MAY DO IT; WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM NOT TO DO WORK, ONE MAY NOT DO IT.

And even R. Simeon b. Gamaliel merely says that if he sits and does not work it does not look like conceit, yet he certainly does not forbid it? —

Rather, what does ‘is not like a public fast’ mean? In respect of the Ne'ilah service.<sup>17</sup> But surely R. Johanan said: Would that a man would go on praying all day!<sup>18</sup> — There it is a [statutory] obligation, whereas here It is voluntary.<sup>19</sup> Another alternative [answer] is, ‘What does ‘it is not like a public fast’ mean? In respect of the twenty-four [benedictions].<sup>20</sup>

R. Papa said: What does ‘it is not like a public fast’ mean? It is not like the first ones but like the last [ones].<sup>21</sup> An objection is raised: There is no difference between the Ninth of Ab and the Day of Atonement except that with the latter, its doubt is forbidden, while with the former, its doubt is permitted. Now what does ‘its doubt is permitted’ mean? Does it not refer to its twilight? —

Said R. Shisha son of R. Idi: No: [It is meant] in respect of the fixing of New Moon. Hence in all [other] regulations they are alike. This supports R. Eleazar. For R. Eleazar said: A man is forbidden to dip his finger in water on the Ninth of Ab, just as he is forbidden to dip his finger in water on the Day of Atonement. An objection is raised: There is no difference between the Ninth of Ab and a public fast except that on one work<sup>22</sup> is forbidden, while on the other work is permitted, where it is customary. This [implies that] in all [other] matters they are both alike; whereas in respect to a public fast it was taught, When they [the Sages] ruled, Bathing is forbidden, they spoke only of the whole body, but not of a man's face, hands, and feet?<sup>23</sup> —

Said R. Papa:

(1) This probably refers to Gen. III, 21: And the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife garments of skins, and clothed them (Rashi).

(2) Lit., ‘covered’.

(3) No man knows when he will be relieved of his anxieties.

(4) Sc. Divine Judgment (Rashi).

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(5) This was probably said in order to discourage those who tried to calculate the advent of the Messiah on the basis of Scripture; cf. Sanh. 97a.

(6) A covert allusion to Rome (Rashi).

(7) Lit., 'came up in (God's) intention to be created'.

(8) If kept too long. This is necessary in order to restrain the producer from withholding supplies and thus artificially raising the prices.

(9) For the benefit of the poor who have no other means of obtaining sustenance (v. Marginal Glosses).

(10) Which is a fast-day in commemoration of the destruction of the Temple.

(11) I.e., he may abstain from work even if he is not a scholar.

(12) I.e., if a public fast is proclaimed, it does not commence on the previous evening, nor is work forbidden, even where it is the practice not to work on the Ninth of Ab. (The Day of Atonement, of course, stands in a different category entirely.) In the whole of the subsequent discussion 'public fast' does not mean one of the statutory fasts, but a fast proclaimed on account of drought or disaster, etc.

(13) I.e., it is forbidden to eat at twilight on the eve of the fast, since he regards the twilight as possessing the full rigors of a fast-day. Twilight is a period of doubt, and it is not certain whether it is day or night.

(14) v. infra.

(15) E.g., if a man is in the wilderness and does not know what day was fixed as New Moon, he must observe two Days of Atonement (his doubt could only be whether the previous month had consisted of twenty-nine days or thirty days), but only one day as the Ninth of Ab.

(16) On the fast-day itself. On a specially proclaimed public fast work is forbidden, whereas on the Ninth of Ab it is permitted.

(17) On specially proclaimed public fast-days an extra service was added at the end of the day', called Ne'ilah, which means 'closing'. R. Johanan states that there is no Ne'ilah on the Ninth of Ab.

(18) If a man does not remember whether he has recited his statutory prayers, R. Johanan rules that he should recite them now, though there is an opposing view that a man must not pray when in this doubt. Now, since R. Johanan holds that a man must pray when in doubt, why should there not be a Ne'ilah service on the Ninth of Ab, seeing that it is like a specially proclaimed public fast in many respects?

(19) On a public fast-day Ne'ilah is obligatory; on the Ninth of Ab a man may recite it if he desires.

(20) On public fast-days six benedictions were added to the usual eighteen which constituted the 'Prayer' par excellence (Ta'an. 15a). R. Johanan teaches that these are not recited on the Ninth of Ab.

(21) In times of drought three public fasts were proclaimed, which began at daybreak. But if the drought nevertheless continued, another three were proclaimed, and these began the previous evening (v. Ta'an. Mishnah 10a and 12b). R. Johanan thus ruled that the Ninth of Ab begins on the previous evening, and eating is forbidden from twilight.

(22) Lit., 'the doing of work'.

(23) Which shows that on the Ninth of Ab washing of face and hands and feet is permitted.

## Pesachim 55a

The Tanna teaches a series of leniencies.<sup>1</sup> AND IN ALL PLACES SCHOLARS, etc. Shall we say that R. Simeon b. Gamaliel holds that we do not fear [the appearance of] conceit, while the Rabbis hold that we do fear [the appearance of] conceit? But we know them [to hold] the reverse! For we learned: A bridegroom, if he wishes to recite the reading of the shema'<sup>2</sup> on the first night, he may recite it. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Not everyone who wishes to assume<sup>3</sup> the name [reputation] may assume it.<sup>4</sup> —

Said R. Johanan: The discussion must be reversed. R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said, Do not reverse it. The Rabbis are not self-contradictory: here, since everybody works, while he [alone] does not work, it looks like conceit; but there, since everybody recites [the Shema'] and he too recites [it], it does not look like conceit. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel too is not self-contradictory: There only, since devotion is required, while we are witnesses that he cannot devote his mind,<sup>5</sup> it looks like conceit. But here it does not look like conceit, [for] people will say, 'It is work that he lacks: go out and see how many unemployed there are in the market place!'

*MISHNAH.* BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN,<sup>6</sup> IN JUDEA THEY USED TO DO WORK ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER UNTIL MIDDAY, WHILE IN GALILEE THEY DID NOT WORK AT ALL. [AS FOR] THE NIGHT,<sup>7</sup> — BETH SHAMMAI FORBID [WORK], WHILE BETH HILLEL PERMIT IT UNTIL DAYBREAK.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**GEMARA.** At first he [the Tanna] teaches custom,<sup>8</sup> and then he teaches a prohibition? — Said R. Johanan, There is no difficulty: one is according to R. Meir; the other, according to R. Judah. For it was taught, R. Judah said: In Judea they used to do work on the eve of Passover, until midday, while in Galilee they did not work at all.

Said R. Meir to him: What proof is Judea and Galilee for the present [discussion]?<sup>9</sup> But where they are accustomed to do work, one may do it, [while] where they are accustomed not to do [work], one may not do it. Now, since R. Meir states [that it is merely a matter of] custom, it follows that R. Judah states [that it is] a prohibition.<sup>10</sup> Yet does R. Judah hold that work on the fourteenth is permitted?<sup>11</sup>

Surely it was taught, R. Judah said: He who weeds on the thirteenth and [an ear of corn] is uprooted in his hand, must replant it in swampy [damp] soil, but must not replant it in a dry place.<sup>12</sup> Thus, only on the thirteenth, but not on the fourteenth,<sup>13</sup> Now consider: we know that R. Judah maintains: Any grafting which does not take root within three days will never take root. Then if you think that work may be done on the fourteenth, why [state] the thirteenth; surely there is the fourteenth, the fifteenth and part of the sixteenth?<sup>14</sup> —

Said Raba: We learned [this] of Galilee. But there is the night?<sup>15</sup> — Said R. Shesheth: This is according to Beth Shammai.<sup>16</sup> R. Ashi said: In truth it is as Beth Hillel, [yet the night of the fourteenth is not stated] because it is not the practice of people to weed at night — Rabina said: After all it refers to Judea, but in respect to taking root we do say once that part of the day is as the whole of it, but we do not say twice that part of the day is as the whole of it.<sup>17</sup>

**MISHNAH.** R. MEIR SAID: ANY WORK WHICH HE BEGAN BEFORE THE FOURTEENTH, HE MAY FINISH IT ON THE FOURTEENTH; BUT HE MAY NOT BEGIN IT

**AT THE OUTSET ON THE FOURTEENTH, EVEN IF HE CAN FINISH IT [ON THE SAME DAY]. BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: THREE CRAFTSMEN MAY WORK ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER UNTIL MIDDAY, AND THESE ARE THEY: TAILORS, HAIRDRESSERS, AND WASHERMEN. R. JOSE B. R. JUDAH SAID: SHOEMAKERS TOO.<sup>18</sup>**

**GEMARA.** The scholars asked: Did we learn [that it may be finished] when required for the Festival, but when not required for the Festival he may not even finish it; or perhaps we learned [that he must not begin work] when it is not required for the Festival, but when it is required we may indeed begin it; or perhaps, whether it is needed for the Festival or it is not needed, he may finish but not start? —

Come and hear: But he may not begin at the outset on the fourteenth even a small girdle, [or] even a small hair-net — What does ‘even’ imply? Surely, even these which are required for the Festival, he may only finish, but not begin; whence it follows that where it is not required [for the Festival], we may not even finish! — No: after all, even when it is not required we may indeed finish [the work], and yet what does ‘even’ connote? Even these too, which are small. For you might argue, their beginning, that is the end of their work;<sup>19</sup> then we should even begin them at the very outset; therefore he informs us [that it is not so].

Come and hear: R. Meir said: Any work which is required for the Festival,

(1) The whole series of ‘there is no difference’, etc. is taught by the same Tanna, and in each he merely wishes to intimate a point of leniency. Thus he first teaches that the Ninth of Ab is not more lenient than the Day of Atonement save that the doubt of the former is permitted. Then he states that the Ninth of Ab is not more lenient than public fasts save that work is permitted on the former. But he does not refer to the reverse cases where the Ninth of Ab is more stringent; hence you cannot deduce that they are alike in all other matters.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(2) 'Hear' — the passage commencing 'Hear O Israel', etc. (Deut. VI, 4f). This is recited every morning and evening, but a bridegroom is exempt on the evening of his marriage.

(3) Lit., 'take'.

(4) Unless he has a reputation for great piety, as otherwise it looks like an unwarrantable assumption of piety (Rashi in Ber. 17b).

(5) His feelings are obviously such that unless he is extremely pious he cannot recite the Shema' with proper devotion.

(6) This is a continuation of the last Mishnah.

(7) Following the thirteenth day of Nisan.

(8) The preceding Mishnah regards abstention from work a mere custom and in this Mishnah it is treated as a prohibition!

(9) I.e., why cite Judea and Galilee? the matter is everywhere determined by local custom.

(10) Viz., that in Judea it is held to be permitted, while in Galilee it is held to be definitely prohibited, and not merely dependent on custom.

(11) According to the views held in Judea.

(12) It takes root in damp soil more quickly. Now the 'Omer (v. Glos. and Lev. XXIII, 10-14) is effective in permitting everything which has taken root before it is waved; hence it is desirable that this should take root before the Omer is waved on the sixteenth of the month.

(13) For it is obvious that the law is so stated as to give the latest possible time.

(14) And it is a principle that part of the day counts as the whole day; thus there is time for it to take root even if it is replanted on the fourteenth.

(15) Following the thirteenth, when it is permissible even in Galilee.

(16) Who in our Mishnah forbid the night.

(17) For if he weeds some time on the fourteenth we would have to count the rest of the day as a complete day, and also the beginning of the sixteenth until the waving of the 'Omer as another complete day.

(18) These may work everywhere.

(19) I.e., they require so little time.

when it is required for the Festival, we may only finish, but not begin.

Come and hear: R. Meir said: Any work which is required for the Festival, he may finish it on the fourteenth; but that which is not required for the Festival is forbidden; and one may work on the eve of Passover until midday where it is customary [to work]. [Thus,] only where it is the custom, but if it is not the custom, it is not [permitted at all]. Hence this proves that when required for the Festival it is [permitted], but when it is not required for the Festival it is not [permitted]. This proves it.

**BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN, THREE CRAFTSMEN [etc.]. A Tanna taught: Tailors, because a layman<sup>2</sup> may sew in the usual way on the intermediate Days;<sup>3</sup> hairdressers and washer-men, because he who comes from overseas and he who comes out of prison may cut their hair and wash [their garments] on the Intermediate Days.<sup>4</sup>**

R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Shoemakers too, because the Festival pilgrims<sup>5</sup> repaired their shoes on the Intermediate Days. Wherein do they differ? — One Master holds, We learn the beginning of the work from the end of the work;<sup>6</sup> while the other Master holds, We do not learn the beginning of the work from the end of the work.

**MISHNAH. ONE MAY SET UP CHICKEN-HOUSES FOR FOWLS ON THE FOURTEENTH,<sup>7</sup> AND IF A [BROODING] FOWL RAN AWAY,<sup>8</sup> ONE MAY SET HER BACK IN HER PLACE; AND IF SHE DIED, ONE MAY SET ANOTHER IN HER PLACE. ONE MAY SWEEP AWAY FROM UNDER AN ANIMAL'S FEET ON THE FOURTEENTH,<sup>9</sup> BUT ON THE FESTIVAL<sup>10</sup> ONE MAY REMOVE [IT] ON A SIDE [ONLY].<sup>11</sup> ONE MAY TAKE UTENSILS [TO] AND BRING [THEM BACK] FROM AN ARTISAN'S HOUSE, EVEN IF THEY ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR THE FESTIVAL.**

## Pesachim 55b

he may finish it on the fourteenth.<sup>1</sup> When is that? When he began it before the fourteenth; but if he did not begin it before the fourteenth, he must not begin it on the fourteenth, even a small girdle, even a small hair-net. [Thus,] only when required for the Festival, but not when it is not required! — No: the same law holds good that even when it is not required for the Festival we may also finish it, and he informs us this: that even

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

**GEMARA.** Seeing that you may [even] set [the fowls for brooding], is there a question about putting back?<sup>12</sup> — Said Abaye: The second clause refers to the Intermediate Days of the Festival.<sup>13</sup>

**R. Huna said:** They learnt this<sup>14</sup> only [when it is] within three [days] of her rebellion,<sup>15</sup> so that her heat<sup>16</sup> has not yet left her, and after three days of her brooding, so that the eggs are quite spoiled.<sup>17</sup> But if it is after three days since her rebellion, so that her heat has left her, or within three days of her brooding, so that the eggs are still not completely spoiled,<sup>18</sup> we must not put [her] back.<sup>19</sup>

**R. Ammi said:** We may even put her back within [the first] three days of her brooding.<sup>20</sup> Wherein do they differ? — One Master holds, They [the Sages] cared about a substantial loss, but they did not care about a slight loss; while the other Master holds: They cared about a slight loss too.

**ONE MAY SWEEP AWAY FROM UNDER [etc.].** Our Rabbis taught: The manure which is in the court-yard may be moved aside; that which is in the stable and in the court-yard may be taken out to the dunghill. This is self-contradictory: you say, The manure which is in the court-yard may [only] be moved aside; then he [the Tanna] teaches, that which is in the stable and in the court-yard may [even] be taken out to the dunghill? —

Said Abaye, There is no difficulty: one refers to the fourteenth [of Nisan]; the other, to the Intermediate Days. Raba said: Both refer to the Intermediate Days, and this is what he says: If the courtyard became like a stable,<sup>21</sup> it may be taken out to the dunghill.

**ONE MAY TAKE UTENSILS [TO] AND BRING [THEM BACK] FROM AN ARTISAN'S HOUSE.** R. Papa said: Raba examined us. We learned: ONE MAY TAKE [UTENSILS TO] AND BRING UTENSILS FROM AN ARTISAN'S HOUSE, EVEN IF THEY ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR THE FESTIVAL. But the following contradicts it:

One may not bring utensils from an artisan's house, but if he fears that they may be stolen, he may remove them into another courtyard?<sup>22</sup> And we answered, There is no difficulty: Here it means on the fourteenth; there, on the Intermediate Days. Alternatively, both refer to the Intermediate Days, yet there is no difficulty: here it is where he trusts him;<sup>23</sup> there, where he does not trust him.

And thus it was 'taught: One may bring vessels from the artisan's house, e.g., a pitcher from a potter's house, and a [glass] goblet from a glass-maker's house; but [one may] not bring wool from a dyer's house nor vessels from an artisan's house.<sup>24</sup> Yet if he [the artisan] has nothing to eat, he must pay him his wages and leave it [the utensil] with him; but if he does not trust him, he places them in a nearby house; and if he is afraid that they may be stolen, he may bring them secretly home.<sup>25</sup> You have reconciled [the contradictions on] bringing; but [the contradictory statements on] taking [the utensils to the artisan's house] present a difficulty, for he teaches, 'One must not bring [from the artisan's house]', hence how much more that we must not take [them to his house]!<sup>26</sup> — Rather, it is clear [that it must be reconciled] as we answered it at first.<sup>27</sup>

**MISHNAH. SIX THINGS THE INHABITANTS OF JERICHO DID: THREE THEY [THE SAGES] FORBADE THEM,<sup>28</sup> AND THREE [THEY] DID NOT FORBID THEM. AND IT IS THESE WHICH THEY DID NOT FORBID THEM: THEY GRAFTED PALM TREES ALL DAY,<sup>29</sup> THEY 'WRAPPED UP' THE SHEMA,<sup>30</sup> AND THEY HARVESTED AND STACKED [THEIR PRODUCE] BEFORE [THE BRINGING OF] THE 'OMER.<sup>31</sup> AND IT IS THESE WHICH THEY FORBADE THEM: THEY PERMITTED [FOR USE] THE BRANCHES — [OF CAROB OR SYCAMORE TREES] BELONGING TO HEKDESH,<sup>32</sup>**

- (1) Even where it is customary not to do any work.
- (2) I.e., a man who is not a craftsman in this particular trade.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

- (3) Lit., 'the non-holy (portion) of the Festival'; v. p. 16, n. 4. Only professional work is forbidden, but not the work a non-professional does at home.
- (4) Hence on the fourteenth, which is certainly lighter than the Intermediate Days, these may be done in general, and even by professionals.
- (5) v. Deut. XVI, 16.
- (6) Making shoes is the beginning; repairing them is the end. Just as repairing is permitted, so is making them permitted.
- (7) I.e., you may put in eggs for brooding (Jast.). Rashi reads 'and' instead of 'FOR', and renders: One may set up dove-cots and fowls (to brood).
- (8) From its eggs.
- (9) Sc. the dung, and throw it away.
- (10) Which of course is stricter.
- (11) But not sweep it altogether away.
- (12) It is obvious!
- (13) A fowl may not be set to brood then, but she may be put back.
- (14) That she may be put back even on the Intermediate Days of the Festival.
- (15) I.e., of her running away.
- (16) The desire to hatch.
- (17) They can no longer be eaten, being too addled.
- (18) They can still be eaten.
- (19) In the Intermediate Days.
- (20) Since the eggs have been slightly spoiled, and not all people would eat them. (15) After three days there is a substantial loss, as the eggs are quite unfit; but within three days the loss is only slight, since some people would eat them.
- (21) It contains so much manure that it cannot be moved aside.
- (22) Near the artisan's house, where it is better guarded, but he may not take them home if it is a long distance.
- (23) Either that the artisan will not dispose of them, or that he will not claim payment a second time.
- (24) The latter two when they are not needed for the Festival.
- (25) Not publicly, as that would give a too workday appearance to these days.
- (26) While the question of trusting does not arise here.
- (27) viz., that our Mishnah refers to the fourteenth, while the Baraita refers to the Intermediate Days.
- (28) Lit., 'stayed their hand'.
- (29) Of the fourteenth.
- (30) I.e., they recited it without the necessary pauses, v. Gemara 56a.
- (31) V. Glos. and Lev. XXIII, 10-14. Rashi deletes HARVESTED, as that was quite permissible as far as Jericho was concerned, since no 'Omer could be brought from Jericho which was situated in a valley. V. Men. 71a, 8a.

(32) I. e., the branches which grew after the trees had been vowed to the Sanctuary.

## Pesachim 56a

AND THEY ATE THE FALLEN FRUIT FROM BENEATH [THE TREE] ON THE SABBATH, AND THEY GAVE PE'AH<sup>1</sup> FROM VEGETABLES; AND THE SAGES FORBADE THEM.

*GEMARA.* Our Rabbis taught: Six things King Hezekiah did; in three they [the Sages] agreed with him, and in three they did not agree with him — He dragged his father's bones [corpse] on a rope bier,<sup>2</sup> and they agreed with him; he crushed the brazen serpent,<sup>3</sup> and they agreed with him; [and] he hid the book of remedies,<sup>4</sup> and they agreed with him. And in three they did not agree with him: He cut [the gold off] the doors of the Temples<sup>5</sup> and sent them to the King of Assyria,<sup>6</sup> and they did not agree with him; and he closed up the waters of Upper Gihon,<sup>7</sup> and they did not agree with him;<sup>8</sup> and he intercalated [the month of] Nisan in Nisan,<sup>9</sup> and they did not agree with him.

THEY GRAFTED PALM TREES ALL DAY. How did they do it? — Said Rab Judah: They brought a fresh myrtle, the juice of bay-fruit and barley flour which had been kept<sup>10</sup> in a vessel less than forty days,<sup>11</sup> and boiled them together and injected [the concoction] into the heart of the palm tree; and every [tree] which stands within four cubits of this one, if that is not treated likewise immediately withers. R. Aha the son of Raba said: A male branch was grafted on to a female [palm tree].<sup>12</sup>

THEY 'WRAPPED UP' THE SHEMA'. What did they do? — Rab Judah said, They recited, Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One<sup>13</sup> and did not make a pause.<sup>14</sup> Raba said: They did make a pause, but [the meaning is] that they said [And these words, which I command thee] this day shall be upon thy heart,<sup>15</sup> which implies, this day



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

[shall they be] upon thy heart, but to-morrow [they shall] not [be] upon thy heart.

Our Rabbis taught: How did they ‘wrap up’ the Shema? They recited ‘Hear O Israel the Lord our God the Lord is One’ and they did not make a pause: this is R. Meir’s view. R. Judah said: They did make a pause, but they did not recite, ‘Blessed be the name of His glorious Kingdom forever and ever.’<sup>16</sup> And what is the reason that we do recite it? — Even as R. Simeon b. Lakish expounded.

For R. Simeon b. Lakish said: And Jacob called unto his sons, and said: Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you [that which shall befall you in the end of days].<sup>17</sup> Jacob wished to reveal to his sons the ‘end of the days’,<sup>18</sup> whereupon the Shechinah departed from him. Said he, ‘Perhaps, Heaven forefend! there is one unfit among my children,<sup>19</sup> like Abraham, from whom there issued Ishmael, or like my father Isaac, from whom there issued Esau.’ [But] his sons answered him, ‘Hear O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is One:<sup>20</sup> just as there is only One in thy heart, so is there in our heart only One.’ In that moment our father Jacob opened [his mouth] and exclaimed, ‘Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom forever and ever.’

Said the Rabbis, How shall we act? Shall we recite it, — but our Teacher Moses did not say it. Shall we not say it — but Jacob said it! [Hence] they enacted that it should be recited quietly. R. Isaac said, The School of R. Ammi said: This is to be compared to a king’s daughter who smelled a spicy pudding.<sup>21</sup> If she reveals [her desire], she suffers disgrace;<sup>22</sup> if she does not reveal it, she suffers pain.<sup>23</sup> So her servants began bringing it to her in secret. R. Abbahu said: They [the Sages] enacted that this should be recited aloud, on account of the resentment of heretics.<sup>24</sup> But in Nehardea, where there are no heretics so far, they recite it quietly.

Our Rabbis taught: Six things the inhabitants of Jericho did, three with the consent of the

Sages, and three without the consent of the Sages. And these were with the consent of the Sages: They grafted palm trees all day [of the fourteenth], they ‘wrapped up’ the Shema’, and they harvested before the ‘omer.<sup>25</sup> And these were without the consent of the Sages: They stacked [the corn] before the ‘omer,<sup>26</sup> and they made breaches in their gardens and orchards to permit the poor to eat the fallen fruit in famine years on Sabbaths and Festivals, and they permitted [for use] the branches of carob and sycamore trees belonging to Hekdesh: this is R. Meir’s view.

Said R. Judah to him, If they did [these things] with the consent of the Sages, then all people could do so! But they did both without the consent of the Sages, [save that] three they forbade them [to do], and three they did not forbid them [to do]. And it is these which they did not forbid them: They grafted palm trees the whole day, and they ‘wrapped up’ the Shema’, and they stacked [the corn] before the ‘Omer. And it is these which they forbade them to do: They permitted [for use] branches of Hekdesh of carob and sycamore trees, and they made breaches in their garden and orchards to permit the poor to eat the fallen fruit in famine years on Sabbaths and Festivals; they gave Pe’ah from vegetables; and the Sages forbade them. Yet does R. Judah hold that the reaping was not with the consent of the Sages? Surely we learned: The inhabitants of Jericho reaped before the ‘Omer with the consent of the Sages and stacked before the ‘Omer without the consent of the Sages, but the Sages did not forbid them to do it.

(1) V. Glos. Pe’ah is exempt from tithes, and the poor, by eating the vegetables without tithing them in the belief that they were Pe’ah, ate Tebel (v. Glos.).

(2) Instead of showing him the honor due to a king. He did this in order to effect atonement for him, his father (Ahaz) having been very wicked.

(3) Set up by Moses, Num. XXI, 8f; v. II Kings XVIII, 4.

(4) Because they cured so quickly that illness failed to promote a spirit of contrition and humility. V. Ber. 10b.

(5) Or, he cut down the doors, etc.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

- (6) Sennacherib, as a bribe to leave him in peace; v. II Kings XVIII, 16.
- (7) v. II Chron. XXXII, 1-4.
- (8) In both cases he should have trusted in God.
- (9) Ibid. XXX, 1-3. The Talmud holds that he effected this by declaring Nisan an intercalated month, calling it the second Adar, after it (Nisan) had already commenced. (Since the Jewish year which is lunar is some eleven days shorter than the solar year, it is necessary periodically to lengthen it by the intercalation of a second Adar, the last month of the civil year. In ancient times this was done not by mathematical calculation, as nowadays, but according to the exigencies of the moment, but this had to be done before Nisan actually commenced, v. Sanh. 12b and Ber. 10a).
- (10) Lit., 'cast'.
- (11) Lit., 'over which forty days had not passed'.
- (12) Jast. translates: they put the male flower (scatter the pollen) over the female tree. — But he does not regard the operation described by Rab Judah as grafting.
- (13) Deut. VI, 4.
- (14) Before proceeding with the next verse, And thou shalt love, etc.: 'One' (Heb. **אֶחָד**) must be prolonged in utterance, which creates a pause, but they did not do thus (Rashi). Tosaf.: they did not pause between 'Hear O Israel' and 'the Lord', etc. thus read together it is a prayer that God may hearken to Israel, which of course gives a completely wrong sense in this instance.
- (15) Deut. VI, 6. Reading it without a pause at 'day' as is indicated in the E.V.
- (16) Before 'and thou shalt love', etc.
- (17) Gen. XLIX, 1.
- (18) The final universal redemption, v. Dan. XII, 13.
- (19) Lit., 'in my bed'.
- (20) 'Israel' referring to their father.
- (21) And conceived a strong desire for it.
- (22) Through her lack of self-control.
- (23) Through her restraint.
- (24) Heb. min, sectarian. They might think that the Jews were cursing them.
- (25) V. supra p. 277, n. 6.
- (26) As it is quite unnecessary, for the produce will not suffer loss if it is left unstacked until after the 'Omer, and while engaged in stacking it, they might come to eat it.

## Pesachim 56b

Whom do you know to maintain [that] they forbade and did not forbid?<sup>1</sup> R. Judah. Yet he teaches, They reaped with the consent of the Sages? — Then according to your reasoning, [surely] these are four! Rather, delete reaping from this. 'And they permitted

the branches of carob and sycamore trees of Hekdesh.' They said: Our fathers sanctified naught but tree trunks, hence we will permit [for use] the branches of Hekdesh of carob and sycamore trees. Now we discuss the growth which came after that;<sup>2</sup> so that while they held as he who rules, There is no trespass-offering [due] when [one benefits from] what grows, the Rabbis held, Granted that there is no trespass-offering [due], there is nevertheless a prohibition. 'And they made breaches [etc.]'

'Ulla said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: The controversy is in respect of [the dates of] the upper branches, for the Rabbis held, We forbid them preventively, lest he go up and cut them off, while the inhabitants of Jericho held, We do not forbid them preventively, lest he go up and cut them off. But as for the dates which are among the lower branches, all agree that it is permitted.<sup>3</sup>

Said Rabbah to him, But they are mukzeh?<sup>4</sup> And should you say, [that is] because they [the dates] were fit for [his] ravens,<sup>5</sup> [I would rejoin], — seeing that that which is ready<sup>6</sup> for man is not ready for dogs, for we learned, R. Judah said, If it was not Nebelah from the eve of the Sabbath, it is forbidden, because it is not of that which is ready,<sup>7</sup> then shall what is ready for birds be [regarded as] ready for human beings?<sup>8</sup> — Yes, he replied. That which is ready for human beings is not ready for dogs, for whatever is fit for a man, he does not put [it] out of his mind;<sup>9</sup> [but] that which is ready for birds is [also] ready for human beings,<sup>10</sup> [for] his mind is [set] upon it.

When Rabin came,<sup>11</sup> he said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: The controversy is in respect of [the fallen dates] among the lower branches, the Rabbis holding, That which is ready for birds is not ready for man, while the men of Jericho hold, That which is ready for birds is ready for man. But [the fallen dates] on the place are permitted now that they have fallen to earth, for since none grow

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

there, there was never any fear that he might go up and cut off the growing dates. —

Though this explanation removes several difficulties, Tosaf. observes that it raises a practical difficulty: how is one to distinguish between those which fell down before the Festival and those which fell on the Festival itself, and those which had fallen on the upper branches in the first place and those which had first fallen on the lower branches? upper branches, all agree that they are forbidden; we forbid [them] preventively, lest he ascend and cut off [some dates].

**AND THEY GAVE PE'AH FROM VEGETABLES.** Yet did not the inhabitants agree with what we learned: They stated a general principle in respect to Pe'ah: whatever is an eatable, and is guarded, and its growth is from the earth, and is [all] gathered simultaneously,<sup>12</sup> and is collected for storage,<sup>13</sup> is subject to Pe'ah. 'Whatever is an eatable' excludes the after-growth of woad<sup>14</sup> and madder;<sup>15</sup> 'and is guarded' excludes hefker;<sup>16</sup> 'and its growth is from the earth' excludes mushrooms and truffles;<sup>17</sup> 'and is [all] gathered simultaneously' excludes the fig tree;<sup>18</sup> 'and is collected for storage excludes vegetables!<sup>19</sup> —

Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: The reference is to turnip tops, and they differ [in respect to what] one collects for storing by means of something else:<sup>20</sup> one Master holds, If he takes it in for storage by means of something else it is designated storage; while the other Master holds, What he takes in for storage by means of something else is not designated storage.<sup>21</sup>

**Our Rabbis taught:** At first they used to leave Pe'ah for turnips and cabbages. R. Jose said: Also for porret. While another [Baraita] taught: They used to give Pe'ah for turnips and porret; R. Simeon said: For cabbage too.

(1) I.e., who makes this distinction, but not the distinction between with and without their consent.

(2) Sc. after the trees had been dedicated.

(3) Mekabedoth are the upper branches on which dates grow; Kipin are the lower branches where dates do not grow. Rashi: they differ in respect of the dates which fell on the Festival and were caught on these upper branches. Since they are high up, he must climb up to get them, and the Rabbis held that we fear that this will lead him to pull off some dates still on the branches, which is forbidden; while the inhabitants of Jericho held that there was no need to fear this. But all agree that he may take those which had been caught by the lower branches, for no dates grow there in any case, that we should fear that he will pull some off. Tosaf.: the reference is to dates which fell off before the Festival commenced, being caught either by the upper or the lower branches, and then they fell to the ground on the Festival. The Rabbis held that those which had been caught on the upper branches are forbidden, for since they were there at twilight, when the Festival was about to commence, and also there are dates growing on these upper branches, we fear that he might ascend and pluck some; while the inhabitants of Jericho did not thus forbid them, preventively, since they were already detached on the eve of the Festival. But all agree that those which had fallen on the lower branches in the first (4) v. Glos. Rashi: on the eve of the Sabbath or Festival at twilight they were Mukzeh on account of the prohibition of cutting them off then from the tree, and consequently they remain so for the whole day, even after they fall. (Mukzeh is always determined by the status of an object at twilight of the Sabbath or Festival.) Tosaf.: they were Mukzeh at twilight because one must not make use of a tree on the Sabbath or Festival, e.g., by climbing it, taking articles which had been suspended upon it, etc.

(5) If he has ravens at home, they could have eaten these dates on the Sabbath even while they were still on the tree; since they are fit for his birds, they are also regarded as fit for himself too.

(6) Mukan, a technical term denoting the opposite of Mukzeh.

(7) If an animal dies on the Sabbath, the first Tanna holds that the carcass may be cut up for dogs. But R. Judah rules as stated. For while alive it could have been ritually killed and then permitted for human consumption; hence it was ready not for dogs but for human beings, and thus R. Judah holds that its readiness for human beings does not make it ready for dogs too.

(8) Surely not!

(9) To think of giving it to dogs.

(10) Even if it is fit for dogs.

(11) From Palestine to Babylonia.

(12) I.e., the whole of the crop ripens about the same time.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(13) Lit., 'he brings it in to keep'. This applies to cereals in general, which are stored in granaries for long periods.

(14) GR. \*\*, isatis tinctora, a plant producing a deep blue dye.

(15) Both are used as dyes.

(16) V. Glos.

(17) Though these grow in the earth, they were held to draw their sustenance mainly from the air.

(18) Whose fruits are likewise excluded.

(19) Which must be eaten fresh.

(20) R. Han.: i.e., by means of pickling.

(21) It must be capable of storing in its natural state.

## Pesachim 57a

Shall we say that there are three Tannaim [in dispute]? — No: there are [only] two Tannaim [in dispute], the first Tanna opposed to<sup>1</sup> R. Simeon being R. Jose, while the first Tanna opposed to R. Jose is R. Simeon. And what does 'too' mean? It refers to the first mentioned.<sup>2</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The son of Bohayon<sup>3</sup> gave Pe'ah from vegetables, and his father came and found the poor laden with vegetables and standing at the entrance to the kitchen garden. Said he to them, 'My sons, cast it from you, and I will give you twice as much of tithed [produce]; not because I begrudge it to you, but because the Sages said, You must not give Pe'ah from vegetables.' Why had he to say to them, 'Not because I begrudge it to you?' So that they should not say, 'He is merely putting us off.'

Our Rabbis taught: At first they used to place the skins of sacrifices in the chamber of Beth Ha-Parwah.<sup>4</sup> In the evening they used to divide them among the men of the paternal division,<sup>5</sup> but men of violence<sup>6</sup> used to seize [more than their due share] by force. So they enacted that they should divide them every Sabbath eve, so that all the 'wards' came and received their portions together.<sup>7</sup> Yet the chief priests still seized [them] by force; thereupon the owners<sup>8</sup> arose and consecrated them to Heaven.<sup>9</sup> It was related: It did not take long before they covered the whole Temple with gold plaques a cubit square of

the thickness of a gold Dinar. And on festivals they used to lay them together<sup>10</sup> and place them on a high eminence on the Temple Mount, so that the Festival pilgrims might see that their workmanship was beautiful,<sup>11</sup> and that there was no imperfection in them.

It was taught, Abba Saul said: There were sycamore tree-trunks in Jericho, and the men of violence seized them by force, [whereupon] the owners arose and consecrated them to Heaven. And it was of these and of such as these that Abba Saul b. Bothnith said in the name of Abba Joseph b. Hanin: 'Woe is me because of the house of Boethus; woe is me because of their staves!<sup>12</sup> Woe is me because of the house of Hanin, woe is me because of their whisperings!<sup>13</sup> Woe is me because of the house of Kathros,<sup>14</sup> woe is me because of their pens!<sup>15</sup> Woe is me because of the house of Ishmael the son of Phabi,<sup>16</sup> woe is me because of their fists! For they are High Priests<sup>17</sup> and their sons are [Temple] treasurers and their sons-in-law are trustees and their servants beat the people with staves.'<sup>18</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Four cries did the Temple Court cry out. The first: 'Depart hence, ye children of Eli,' for they defiled the Temple of the Lord. And another cry: 'Depart hence, Issachar of Kefar Barkai, who honors himself while desecrating the sacred sacrifices of Heaven'; for he used to wrap his hands with silks and perform the [sacrificial] service.<sup>19</sup> The Temple Court also cried out: 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and let Ishmael the son of Phabi, Phineas's disciple,<sup>20</sup> enter and serve in the [office of the] High Priesthood.' The Temple Court also cried out: 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and let Johanan the son of Narbai,<sup>21</sup> the disciple of Pinkai,<sup>22</sup> enter and fill his stomach with the Divine sacrifices.

It was said of Johanan b. Narbai that he ate three hundred calves and drank three hundred barrels of wine and ate forty se'ah of young birds as a desert for his meal.<sup>23</sup> It was said: As long as Johanan the son of



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

Narbai lived,<sup>24</sup> Nothar<sup>25</sup> was never found in the Temple.

What was the fate of<sup>26</sup> Issachar of Kefar Barkai? It was related: The king and queen<sup>27</sup> were sitting: the king said, 'Goat's [flesh] is better,' while the queen said, 'Lamb is better'. Said they, Who shall decide?<sup>28</sup> The High Priest, who offers up sacrifices every day. So he came,

- (1) Lit., 'of'.
- (2) Thus: the first Tanna states turnips and cabbages, whereupon R. Jose says, for porret too, just as for turnips, but not for cabbages; similarly R. Simeon in the second Baraitha.
- (3) The name of a certain man.
- (4) Name of a Persian builder and Magian, after whom a compartment in the Temple was supposed to have been named (Jast.).
- (5) The priests were divided into 'wards', (משמר), each 'ward' officiating a week at a time in the Temple; these were further subdivided into paternal divisions (Beth ab), of which each officiated one day in the week.
- (6) Among the priests (Rashi). Lit., 'men of (strong) arms'.
- (7) Cur. edd.; Rashi's reading seems to be: so that the whole ward (sing.) i.e., all the paternal divisions, etc. This is more correct, and if our reading is retained it must also be understood in the same sense. — The larger number present would act as a check.
- (8) I.e., all the priests of each ward.
- (9) Sc. for the Temple.
- (10) The word really means 'fold them', but as gold plates of that thickness could hardly be folded, it must be understood as translated.
- (11) For the sacrifices, with the skins of which these were brought, were mostly offered by the Festival pilgrims.
- (12) With which they beat the people.
- (13) Their secret conclaves to devise oppressive measures.
- (14) Supposed to be identical with GR. \*\*, Josephus, Antiquities XX, 1, 3.
- (15) With which they wrote their evil decrees.
- (16) He himself was religious and held in high repute, as is seen below (v. also Par. III, 5; Sot. IX, 5; Yoma 35b), but he did not restrain his sons from lawlessness; in the passage of Josephus too, already cited, reference is only made to his children.
- (17) The High Priesthood by this time was a source of great political power. Once a man became a High Priest he retained much of his power, and perhaps his title too, even if he was deposed; hence there were often several High

Priests at the same time; v. Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, p. 445, n. 30; pp. 633f; 718.

(18) For this passage cf. Josephus, Antiquities XX, 8,8.

(19) This disqualifies the sacrifice.

(20) In his zeal for God.

(21) [Ananias son of Nebedus. v. Josephus, Antiquities XX, 5, 2.]

(22) Perhaps this is a nickname formed by a play on words, פִּינֹקָא (here פִּינֹקָא) being a meat dish; i.e., the gourmand.

(23) The marginal note softens this statement by observing that this was eaten by his whole household, which was very numerous

(24) Lit., '(during) all the days of', etc.

(25) V. Glos.

(26) Lit., 'what happened to?'

(27) Hasmonean monarchs [In Ker. 28b: King Yannai and the Queen. The name Jannai appears in the Talmud as a general name for kings of the Hasmonean dynasty.]

(28) Lit., '(from) whom is it proved?'

## Pesachim 57b

[and] indicated with his hand,<sup>1</sup> 'If the goat were better, let it be offered for the daily sacrifice'. Said the king, 'Since he had no fear of my royal person, let his right hand be cut off.' But he gave a bribe [and] they cut off his left hand [instead]. Then the king heard [of it] and they cut off his right hand [too].

Said R. Joseph: Praised be the Merciful One Who caused Issachar of Kefar Barkai to receive his deserts in this world.

R. Ashi said: Issachar of Kefar Barkai had not studied the Mishnah. For we learned, R. Simeon said: Lambs take precedence over goats in all places.<sup>2</sup> You might think that that is because they are the best of their species, therefore it is stated, And if he bring a lamb as his offering.<sup>3</sup>

Rabina said: He had not even studied Scripture either, for it is written, If [he bring] a lamb... And if [his offering be] a goat:<sup>4</sup> if he wishes, let him bring a lamb; if he wishes, let him bring a goat.<sup>5</sup>

(1) I.e., in a contemptuous fashion.

(2) Wherever both are mentioned together in the same verse the lamb is stated first.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(3) Lev. IV, 32; this is given as an alternative to a goat, which is prescribed earlier in the same section in v. 28.

(4) Lev. III, 7, 12.

(5) And neither is preferable to the other.

## Pesachim 58a

### CHAPTER V

**MISHNAH.** THE [AFTERNOON] TAMID<sup>1</sup> IS SLAUGHTERED AT EIGHT AND A HALF HOURS<sup>2</sup> AND IS OFFERED AT NINE AND A HALF HOURS.<sup>3</sup> ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER<sup>4</sup> IT IS SLAUGHTERED AT SEVEN AND A HALF HOURS AND OFFERED AT EIGHT AND A HALF HOURS, WHETHER IT IS A WEEKDAY OR THE SABBATH. IF THE EVE OF PASSOVER FELL, ON SABBATH EVE [FRIDAY], IT IS SLAUGHTERED AT SIX AND A HALF HOURS AND OFFERED AT SEVEN AND A HALF HOURS, AND THE PASSOVER OFFERING AFTER IT.<sup>5</sup>

**GEMARA.** Whence do we know it? — Said R. Joshua b. Levi, Because Scripture saith, The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning, and the other lamb shalt thou offer between the two evenings:<sup>6</sup> insert<sup>7</sup> it between the two 'evenings', [which gives] two and a half hours before and two and a half hours after<sup>8</sup> and one hour for its preparation.<sup>9</sup>

Raba objected: ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER IT IS SLAUGHTERED AT SEVEN AND A HALF HOURS AND OFFERED AT EIGHT AND A HALF HOURS, WHETHER IT IS A WEEKDAY OR THE SABBATH. Now if you think that [it must be slaughtered] at eight and a half hours according to Scriptural law, how may we perform it earlier?

Rather, said Raba: The duty of the tamid<sup>10</sup> properly [begins] from when the evening shadows begin to fall.<sup>11</sup> What is the reason? Because Scripture saith, 'between the evenings', [meaning] from the time that the sun commences to decline in the west. Therefore on other days of the year, when there are vows and freewill-offerings,<sup>12</sup> in

connection with which the Divine Law states, [and he shall burn] upon it the fat of the peace-offerings [He-shelamim],<sup>13</sup> and a Master said, 'upon it' complete [Shalem] all the sacrifices,<sup>14</sup> we therefore postpone it two hours and sacrifice it at eight and a half hours.<sup>15</sup> [But] on the eve of Passover, when there is the Passover offering after it, we advance it one hour and sacrifice<sup>16</sup> it at seven and a half hours. When the eve of Passover falls on the eve of the Sabbath, so that there is the roasting too [to be done], for it does not override the Sabbath,<sup>17</sup> we let it stand on its own law, [viz.,] at six and a half hours.

Our Rabbis taught: Just as its order during the week, so is its order on the Sabbath: these are the words of R. Ishmael. R. Akiba said: Just as its order on the eve of Passover. What does this mean? — Said Abaye, This is what it means: Just as its order on a weekday which is the eve of Passover, so is its order on the Sabbath which is the eve of Passover:<sup>18</sup> these are the words of R. Ishmael.

R. Akiba said: Just as its order on the eve of Passover which falls on the eve of the Sabbath, so is its order on the Sabbath;<sup>19</sup> and our Mishnah which teaches, WHETHER ON A WEEKDAY OR THE SABBATH, agrees with R. Ishmael. Wherein do they differ? — They differ as to whether the additional sacrifices<sup>20</sup> take precedence over the [burning of the frankincense in the] censers:<sup>21</sup> R. Ishmael holds, The additional offerings take precedence over the [burning of the frankincense in the] censers: therefore he [the priest] sacrificed the additional sacrifices at six hours, [burned the incense in] the censers at seven, and sacrificed the Tamid at seven and a half [hours].

R. Akiba holds: [The burning of the frankincense in] the censers takes precedence over the additional sacrifices: [hence] the [burning in the] censers took place at five [hours], the additional offering at six hours, and the Tamid was sacrificed at six and a half hours. To this Raba demurred: Does then R. Akiba teach, Just as its order on the

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

eve of Passover which falls on the Sabbath, so is its order on the Sabbath; surely he teaches, 'Just as its order on the eve of Passover,' without qualification?

Rather, said Raba, This is what he means: Just as its order on the weekdays in general,<sup>22</sup> so is its order on the Sabbath which is the eve of Passover:<sup>23</sup> these are the words of R. Ishmael.

R. Akiba said: Just as its order on the eve of Passover;<sup>24</sup> hence our Mishnah which teaches, **WHETHER ON WEEKDAYS OR ON THE SABBATH** agrees with R. Akiba. Wherein do they differ? — They differ in the heating of the flesh.<sup>25</sup> R. Ishmael holds, We fear for the heating of the flesh; while R. Akiba holds: We do not fear for the heating of the flesh.

(1) The daily burnt-offering: one was brought every morning and another every afternoon. Num. XXVIII, 4.

(2) The day being counted from sunrise to sunset, i.e., about six a.m. to six p.m.

(3) The sacrificial ceremonies took an hour.

(4) The Heb. is in the plural: on the eves of Passovers.

(5) When the eve of Passover falls on a Friday, time must be left for roasting the Passover offering before the Sabbath commences; hence the earlier hour of the Tamid.

(6) Ibid. Literal translation. 'Evening' (ערב 'Ereb) is defined as the whole afternoon until nightfall.

(7) Lit., 'divide'.

(8) Lit., 'here'...'there'.

(9) Thus the 'two evenings' are from midday (= six) until eight and a half hours, and from nine and a half hours until nightfall (= twelve).

(10) The slaughtering of it.

(11) Lit., 'decline'. The sun reaches its zenith at midday and then begins to decline in the west, the decline being perceptible from half an hour after midday, and this is regarded as the falling of the evening shadows.

(12) These are two technical terms: a 'vow' is a votive sacrifice, the particular animal having been unspecified when the vow was made; in a freewill-offering a particular animal was specified at the time of the vow. The difference is that in the former case, if the animal which he subsequently dedicates dies or is rendered unfit before it is sacrificed, he must bring another; but in the latter case he has no further obligation.

(13) Lev. VI, 5.

(14) Rashi: upon it, Sc. the morning Tamid, to which the verse refers, complete, etc. i.e., all the sacrifices of the day are to be brought after the morning Tamid, but not after the afternoon Tamid, which must be the last of the day. This exegesis connects shelamim with Shalem (whole, complete). Jast. translates: with it (the evening sacrifice) cease all sacrifices (none can be offered after it). This is simpler, but not in accordance with the context.

(15) To allow time for the voluntary offerings.

(16) Lit., 'make'.

(17) Though the roasting is a precept, yet it may not be done on the Sabbath.

(18) I.e., in both cases the Tamid is slaughtered at seven and a half hours.

(19) Hence in both cases it is slaughtered at six and a half hours. For since no vows are offered on the Sabbath, it is unnecessary to delay the Tamid, which is therefore sacrificed as early as possible, to leave ample time for the Passover sacrifice.

(20) Offered on Sabbaths, New Moons, and Festivals; midday (six hours) was the earliest time when they could be offered. — In memory of these additional sacrifices there is now an Additional Service (Musaf) on these days.

(21) Two censers of frankincense stood by the rows of showbread; this showbread was set on the Table every Sabbath and removed and replaced by fresh bread the following Sabbath. At the same time the frankincense was burnt, and after that the priests ate the showbread. The removing, replacing and burning of the incense took an hour.

(22) During the year.

(23) Viz., at eight and a half hours. For the flesh of the Passover sacrifice may not be roasted until evening, therefore it is inadvisable to slaughter it earlier, lest the flesh became overheated and putrid, and consequently the Tamid is slaughtered at the usual time.

(24) Viz., at seven and a half hours, so likewise on

(25) v. p. 289. n. 5; also perhaps, the shrinking of the flesh caused by overheating; v. Jast. s.v. נמר and Rashi on Gen. XLIII. 30.

## Pesachim 58b

If we do not fear, let us sacrifice it at six and a half [hours]?<sup>1</sup> — He holds that the [burning of the frankincense in the] censers takes precedence over the additional sacrifices: [hence] he sacrificed the additional sacrifices at six hours, [performed the burning in] the censers at seven, and sacrificed the Tamid at seven and a half.

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

To this Rabbah b. ‘Ulla ‘demurred: Does he then teach, Just as its order on weekdays [in general], so is its order on the Sabbath which is the eve of Passover: these are the words of R. Ishmael? [Surely] he teaches, ‘so is its order on the Sabbath,’ without qualification!

Rather, said Rabbah b. ‘Ulla, this is what he means: Just as its order on a weekday in general, so is its order on the Sabbath in general:<sup>2</sup> these are the words of R. Ishmael.

R. Akiba said: Just as its order on the eve of Passover in general, so is its order on the Sabbath in general:<sup>3</sup> [hence] our Mishnah which teaches, **WHETHER ON WEEKDAYS OR ON THE SABBATH** agrees with all.<sup>4</sup> Wherein do they differ? — They differ as to [whether there is] a preventive measure on account of vows and freewill-offerings.

R. Ishmael holds: We enact a preventive measure for the Sabbath on account of weekdays;<sup>5</sup> while R. Akiba holds: We do not enact a preventive measure. If we do not enact a preventive measure, let us sacrifice it at six and a half?<sup>6</sup> — He holds the Sabbath. Since many are to be offered, we must start as early as possible. that the additional sacrifices take precedence over [the burning of the frankincense in] the censers: [hence] the additional sacrifices are [offered] at six hours, the [burning in the] censers at seven, and he sacrifices the Tamid at seven and a half [hours].

An objection is raised: The Tamid, during the whole year it is offered according to its law, [viz.] it is slaughtered at eight and a half [hours] and offered at nine and a half hours. But on the eve of Passover it is slaughtered at seven and a half and offered at eight and a half; if it [the eve of Passover] fell on the Sabbath, it is as though it fell on a Monday.<sup>7</sup> R. Akiba said: As its order is on the eve of Passover. As for Abaye, it is well;<sup>8</sup> but according to Raba it is a difficulty?<sup>9</sup> — Raba can answer you: Do not say, It is the same as

when it falls on a Monday. but say, it is the same as a Monday in general.<sup>10</sup>

An objection is raised: If it falls on the Sabbath, it is as its order during the whole year: these are the words of R. Ishmael.<sup>11</sup>

R. Akiba said: It is as its order on the eve of Passover in general.<sup>12</sup> Now as for Raba, it is well;<sup>13</sup> but according to Abaye it is difficult?— Abaye answers you: Do not say, ‘It is as its order during the whole year,’ but say, It is as its order in all [other] years:<sup>14</sup> these are the words of R. Ishmael. R. Akiba said: It is as the order when the eve of Passover falls on the eve of the Sabbath.<sup>15</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: How do we know that there must not be anything before the morning tamid?<sup>16</sup> Because it is said, and he shall lay the burnt-offering in order upon it.<sup>17</sup> What is the exegesis?<sup>18</sup> — Said Raba: The burnt-offering implies the first burnt-offering.<sup>19</sup> And how do we know that nothing may be offered after the evening Tamid? Because it is stated, and he shall burn upon it the fat of the peace-offerings.<sup>20</sup> What is the exegesis?<sup>21</sup> Said Abaye: After it<sup>22</sup> [sc. the morning Tamid] [you may sacrifice] peace-offerings, but not after its companion [sc. the evening Tamid] [may you sacrifice] peace-offerings. To this Raba demurred: Say [then], it is only peace-offerings that we may not present,<sup>23</sup> yet we may present burnt-offerings? Rather, said Raba: Ha-shelamim implies, upon it complete all the sacrifices.<sup>24</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The [evening] Tamid is [sacrificed] before the Passover offering, the Passover offering is [sacrificed] before the [burning of the evening] incense, the incense before [the kindling of] the lights;

(1) Since there are many Passover sacrifices, while there is no need to delay it on account of vows, which are not offered on the Sabbath.

(2) In both cases the Tamid is slaughtered at eight and a half hours, though on the Sabbath no voluntary sacrifices are offered.

(3) Viz., in both cases the Tamid is slaughtered at seven and a half hours.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(4) For their controversy does not refer to the eve of Passover at all.

(5) If we permit him to slaughter the afternoon Tamid on Sabbath at seven and a half hours, he may slaughter it at the same hour during the week too, leaving no time for voluntary offerings, which are disqualified if brought after the afternoon Tamid.

(6) For it is a general principle that all precepts must be performed as early as possible.

(7) Lit., 'the second (day) of the week' — there are no specific names for the days of the week in Hebrew, except of course, for the Sabbath. — I.e., it is the same as when it falls during the week, Monday being mentioned as an example (Rashi and Tosaf.).

(8) For since R. Ishmael says that if it falls on the Sabbath it is the same as when it falls on a Monday, R. Akiba must mean, Just as its order on the eve of Passover which falls on the eve of the Sabbath.

(9) For Raba interprets R. Ishmael's statement thus: just as its order on weekdays in general, etc. But since R. Ishmael concludes, it is the same as when it falls on a Monday, i.e., a weekday in general, it is obvious that he does not refer to a weekday in general in the first half of his statement.

(10) An ordinary weekday which is not Passover eve when the Tamid is slaughtered at eight and a half hours, because we fear for the overheating of the flesh.

(11) I.e., the Tamid is slaughtered at eight and a half hours, because we fear for the overheating of the flesh.

(12) It is slaughtered at seven and a half hours.

(13) For this is exactly as Raba interprets the Baraitha.

(14) I.e., just as in all other years when the eve of Passover falls on an ordinary weekday and the Tamid is slaughtered at seven and a half hours, so likewise when it falls on the Sabbath.

(15) Viz., the Tamid is slaughtered at six and a half hours.

(16) Rashi: nothing must be burnt upon the wood pile before the morning Tamid, after the latter has been laid in order upon it. Tosaf.: no voluntary offering may be sacrificed before the morning Tamid. Tosaf. accepts Rashi's interpretation as an alternative.

(17) Lev. VI, 5. This follows, 'and the priest shall kindle wood on it every morning' (ibid.) showing that immediately after the wood pile is kindled, the Tamid is the first thing to be burnt.

(18) How is it implied that 'the burnt-offering' mentioned in the verse refers to the morning Tamid?

(19) The def. art. points to some particular sacrifice, viz., the first burnt-offering mentioned in the chapter on sacrifices, Num. XXVIII, which

is the daily morning Tamid, and this verse teaches that it must be the first thing to ascend the altar every day. and nothing else may take precedence over it.

(20) Ibid.

(21) How is it implied in this verse?

(22) Taking עליה ('upon it') in this sense.

(23) After the evening Tamid.

(24) v. supra p. 288, n. 5.

## Pesachim 59a

let that in connection with which Ba-'ereb [at evening] and ben Ha-'arbayim [between the evenings]<sup>1</sup> are said be deferred after that in connection with which Ba-'ereb is not said, save ben ha-'arbayim alone.<sup>2</sup> If so, let [the burning of] the incense [and the kindling of] the lights also take precedence over the Passover offering, [for] let that in connection with which Ba-'Ereb and Ben Ha-'Arbayim are stated be deferred after that in connection with which naught save ben ha-'arbayim alone is said?<sup>3</sup> —

There it is different, because Scripture expressed a limitation, 'it'. For it was taught: [Aaron and his sons shall set it in order, to burn] from evening to morning;<sup>4</sup> furnish it with its [requisite] measure, so that it may burn from evening to morning. Another interpretation: you have no [other] service which is valid from evening to morning save this alone. What is the reason? Scripture saith, 'Aaron and his sons shall set it in order, to burn from evening to morning': 'it' [shall be] from evening to morning, but no other thing shall be from evening until morning;<sup>5</sup> and [the burning of] the incense is likened to [the kindling of] the lights.<sup>6</sup>

Now it was taught in accordance with our difficulty: The [evening] Tamid is [sacrificed] before [the burning of] the incense, the incense is [burnt] before [the kindling of] the lamps, and the lamps are [kindled] before [the sacrificing of] the Passover offering: let that in connection with which Ba-'ereb and Ben Ha-'arbayim are stated be deferred after that in connection with which naught save

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

ben ha-'arbayim alone is stated. But 'it' is written?<sup>7</sup> —

That 'it' is required to exclude a service of the inner [Temple]; and what is it? [The burning of] the incense.<sup>8</sup> You might think But in connection with the former only ben ha-'arbayim is stated, Num. XXVIII,6: and the other lamb shalt thou offer at dusk (Ben Ha'arbayim). that I would say, since it is written, And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at dusk, he shall burn it,<sup>9</sup> say, let us first light the lamps and then burn the incense; therefore the Merciful One expressed a limitation, 'it'. Then what is the purpose of, 'at dusk he shall burn it'? — This is what the Merciful One saith: When thou lightest the lamps, the incense must [already] be burning.

Our Rabbis taught: There is nothing which takes precedence over the morning Tamid except [the burning of] the [morning] incense alone, in connection with which 'in the morning, in the morning' is stated; so let [the burning of the] incense, in connection with which 'in the morning, in the morning,' is stated, for it is written, And Aaron shall burn thereon incense of sweet spices, in the morning, in the morning,<sup>10</sup> take precedence over that in connection with which only one 'morning' is stated.<sup>11</sup> And there is nothing which may be delayed until after the evening Tamid save [the burning of] the incense, [the lighting of] the lamps, [the slaughtering of] the Passover sacrifice, and he who lacks atonement<sup>12</sup> on the eve of Passover, who performs ritual immersion a second time<sup>13</sup> and eats his Passover sacrifice in the evening.

R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka said: He who lacks atonement at any other time of the year too, who performs ritual immersion and eats of sacred flesh in the evening.<sup>14</sup> According to the first Tanna, it is well: let the affirmative precept of [eating] the Passover sacrifice, which involves kareth,<sup>15</sup> come and override the affirmative precept of completion.<sup>16</sup> which does not involve kareth.<sup>17</sup> But according to R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, wherein is

this affirmative precept stronger than the other affirmative precept? — Said Rabina in R. Hisda's name: We treat here of a sin-offering of a bird, the blood of which alone belongs to the altar.<sup>18</sup>

R. Papa said: You may even say [that we treat of] an animal sin-offering: he takes it up and keeps it overnight on the top of the altar.<sup>19</sup> But there is the guilt-offering?<sup>20</sup> As for R. Papa. it is well: hence we keep it overnight. But according to R. Hisda, what can be said? — I will tell you: It means where he has offered up his guilt-offering.<sup>21</sup> But there is the burnt-offering?<sup>22</sup> And should you answer, The burnt-offering is not indispensable,<sup>23</sup> surely it was taught.

R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Berokah said: Just as his sin-offering and his guilt-offering are indispensable for him, so is his burnt-offering indispensable for him. And should you answer, It means where he has offered his burnt-offering; yet can his burnt-offering be offered first before his sin-offering? Surely it was taught: And he shall offer that which is for the sin-offering first:<sup>24</sup> for what purpose is this stated? If to teach that it comes before the burnt-offering, surely it is already said, And he shall prepare the second for a burnt-offering, according to the ordinance?<sup>25</sup> But this furnishes a general rule for all sin-offerings, that they take precedence of all burnt-offerings which accompany them; and we have an established principle<sup>26</sup> that even a bird sin-offering takes precedence of an animal burnt-offering!<sup>27</sup> —

Said Raba, The burnt-offering of a leper is different, because the Merciful One saith,

(1) E.V.: 'at dusk'.

(2) This is why the evening Tamid is before the Passover sacrifice. For in connection with the latter both these expressions are used: Ex. XII, 6: and the whole assembly... shall kill it at dusk (ben ha-'arbayim); Deut. XVI, 6: thou shalt sacrifice the Passover-offering at even (Ba-'ereb).

(3) For only ben ha-'arbayim is stated in connection with the former two, Ex. XXX, 7f: And Aaron shall burn thereon incense of sweet spices... And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at dusk (ben

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

ha-'arbayim), he shall burn it, 'ben ha-'arbayim' applying to both the burning of the incense and the lighting of the lamps.

(4) Ex. XXVII, 21.

(5) Hence nothing may come after the kindling of the lights, and consequently the slaughtering of the Passover offering must take precedence.

(6) Just as no service after the former is valid, so is no service valid after the latter.

(7) Implying that nothing must be done after the kindling of the lights.

(8) For it is logical that a service similar to itself should be excluded, the kindling of the lamps likewise being a service in the inner Temple, and 'it' shows that no other inner service may take place after the kindling of the lamp. But the Passover offering was sacrificed in the outer Court.

(9) Ex. XXX, 7.

(10) Ibid.; E.V.: 'every morning'. The literal translation is given in the text, and the repetition implies an earlier hour.

(11) Num. XXVIII, 4: The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning.

(12) The technical designation, of an unclean person who may not eat holy flesh until he has brought a sacrifice after regaining his cleanliness, viz., a Zab and a Zabah (v. Glos.). a leper and a woman after childbirth. If one of these forgot to bring his sacrifice before the evening Tamid was sacrificed on the eve of Passover, he must bring it after the Tamid, since otherwise he may not partake of the Passover offering in the evening, which is obligatory.

(13) Though he must perform ritual immersion the previous day, this being necessary before the purificatory sacrifice may be offered, he nevertheless repeats it before partaking of holy flesh.

(14) If he brought a peace-offering that day but forgot to bring his purificatory sacrifice, he must bring it even after the afternoon Tamid, so that he may eat the flesh of his peace-offering in the evening. R. Ishmael regarding this too as obligatory.

(15) If unfulfilled, v. Num. IX, 13.

(16) V. supra 58b bottom: 'after it complete all the sacrifices'.

(17) Even if a sacrifice is unlawfully brought after the evening Tamid it is not punished by Kareth.

(18) R. Ishmael, in speaking of one who lacks atonement during the rest of the year, refers to a poor leper, who brought a bird for his sin-offering. This was eaten by the priests, and nothing of it was burnt on the altar, whereas the affirmative precept of 'completion' is written in reference to burning on the altar (v. Lev. VI, 5: and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace-offerings). and hence applies only to animal sacrifices, the fat of which was burnt on the altar.

(19) He slaughters the sacrifice after the evening Tamid, but carries the animal on to the top of the altar and leaves it there overnight, postponing the burning of the fat until after the Tamid of the following morning.

(20) Required by a leper; even if poor, he brought a lamb, v. Lev. XIV, 21.

(21) But had forgotten about the sin-offering.

(22) Likewise required by a leper. *ibid.* 19, 22. This of course was burnt on the altar (v. n. 4).

(23) To the eating of sacred flesh.

(24) Lev. V, 8, q.v.

(25) *Ibid.* 10.

(26) Binyan Ab, a building up of a principle (or class). i.e., a conclusion by analogy.

(27) V. Zeb. 90b.

## Pesachim 59b

And the priest shall [have] offer[ed] the burnt offering.<sup>1</sup> [implying], that which he has already offered.<sup>2</sup>

R. Shaman b. Abba said to R. Papa: According to you who maintain [that] he takes it up and keeps it overnight on the top of the altar, shall we arise and do a thing to the priests whereby they may come to a stumbling-block, for they will think it is of that day. and thus come to burn it?<sup>3</sup> — he priests are most careful, replied he.

R. Ashi said to R. Kahana-others state, R. Huna the son of R. Nathan [said] to R. Papa: But as long as the emurim<sup>4</sup> have not been burnt, the priests may not eat the flesh?<sup>5</sup> For it was taught: You might think that the priests should be permitted [to partake] of the breast and the thigh before the burning of the Emurim: therefore it is stated, And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar,<sup>6</sup> and then follows, but the breast shall be Aaron's and his sons'. And as long as the priests have not eaten [it], the owners obtain no atonement, for it was taught: And they shall eat those things wherewith atonement was made:<sup>7</sup> this teaches that the priests eat [it] and the owners obtain atonement! —

Said he to him, Since it is impossible,<sup>8</sup> they [the Emurim] are treated<sup>9</sup> as though they were defiled or lost. For it was taught: You might think that if the Emurim were defiled

# PESOCHEM - 33a-60a

or lost, the priests have no right to the breast or the thigh, therefore it is stated, 'But the breast shall be Aaron's and his sons', in all cases.

R. Kahana opposed [two verses]: It is written, neither shall the fat of My feast remain all night until the morning;<sup>10</sup> [thus] it is only 'until the morning' that 'it shall not remain all night,' but it may be kept for the whole night;<sup>11</sup> but it is written, and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace-offerings,<sup>12</sup> [implying,] after it complete all the sacrifices?<sup>13</sup> He raised the difficulty; and he himself answered it: That is where they were left over.<sup>14</sup>

R. Safra pointed out a contradiction to Raba: It is written, neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the Passover be left unto the morning;<sup>15</sup> thus it is only 'unto the morning' that 'it shall not be left,' but it may be kept all night;<sup>16</sup> but it is written, The burnt-offering of the Sabbath [shall be burnt] on its Sabbath,<sup>17</sup> but not the burnt-offering of a weekday on the Sabbath, nor the burnt-offering of a weekday on a Festival? —

Said he to him, R. Abba b. Hiyya has already pointed out this contradiction to R. Abbahu, and he answered him, We treat here of the case where the fourteenth falls on the Sabbath,<sup>18</sup> for the fats of the Sabbath may be offered on the Festival. Said he to him, Because the fats of the Sabbath may be offered on the Festival, we are to arise and assume that this verse is written [only] in respect of the fourteenth which falls on the Sabbath?<sup>19</sup> Leave the verse, he answered, for it is compelled to establish its own [particular] case.<sup>20</sup>

**MISHNAH.** IF A MAN SLAUGHTERED THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE,<sup>21</sup> AND HE CAUGHT [THE BLOOD] AND WENT AND SPRINKLED IT FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE;<sup>22</sup> OR FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE AND FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE; OR FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE AND FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE;<sup>23</sup> IT IS DISQUALIFIED. HOW

IS 'FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE AND FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE' MEANT? IN THE NAME OF THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE [FIRST] AND [THEN] IN THE NAME OF A PEACE-OFFERING. 'FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE AND FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE' [MEANS] IN THE NAME OF A PEACE-OFFERING [FIRST] AND [THEN] IN THE NAME OF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING.

**GEMARA.** R. Papa<sup>24</sup> asked: Did we learn [of a dual intention expressed even] in respect to one service,<sup>25</sup> or did we learn [only of a dual intention expressed] at two separate services? Did we learn [of a dual intention expressed even] in respect of one service, this being in accordance with R. Jose, who maintained, A man is responsible for<sup>26</sup> his last words too;<sup>27</sup> for if [it agreed with] R. Meir, surely he said, Seize [i.e., determine the matter by] the first expression;<sup>28</sup>

(1) Lev. XIV, 20; the bracketed additions show the meaning which the verse is capable of bearing, by treating ויהלל as a pluperfect, beside its usual and obvious meaning.

(2) Hence although the sin-offering should come before the burnt-offering, yet the possible meaning of this verse teaches that even if the order is reversed it is valid. Therefore we can explain the present Baraitha as meaning that he had already sacrificed his burnt-offering.

(3) During the night the limbs of the sacrifices of the previous day are burnt, all before the Tamid of the following morning. Here, however, the animal sin-offering which was kept untouched overnight must be burnt after the morning Tamid, whereas the priest may confuse it with the rest and burn it before.

(4) V. Glos.

(5) And in consequence atonement is incomplete, so that the owner may not partake of the Passover sacrifice in any case, if his sin-offering is left overnight.

(6) Lev. VII, 31.

(7) Ex. XXIX, 33.

(8) To burn the Emurim after the evening Tamid, on account of the affirmative precept of 'completion'.

(9) Lit., 'they (the Sages) treated them'.

(10) Ex. XXIII, 18.

(11) I.e., the priest has the whole night in which to burn the fat, providing that nothing is left by the morning.

(12) Lev. VI, 5.



# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

(13) V. supra 58b. Thus nothing may be done after the evening Tamid.

(14) Of the sacrifices whose blood was sprinkled before the evening Tamid. Immediately the blood is sprinkled the fat, etc. is ready for burning on the altar, and therefore even if it is delayed, its ultimate burning during the night is regarded as following the Tamid of the previous morning, not that of the evening.

(15) Ex. XXXIV, 25.

(16) During which the altar portions of the Passover sacrifice are burnt. Although these, strictly speaking, belong to a sacrifice which has been offered on a weekday, i.e., the fourteenth, yet they may be burnt on the night of the Festival.

(17) Num. XXVIII, 10.

(18) I.e., only then is the implication of the first verse applicable.

(19) Surely there is no warrant for this limitation.

(20) Since there is a contradiction, the verse itself proves that it can only relate to this particular instance.

(21) Lit., 'not for its own name', i.e., as a different sacrifice. E.g., when he killed it he stated that it was for a

peace-offering, not for a Passover sacrifice.

(22) Slaughtering the sacrifice, catching the blood, going with it to the side of the altar where it is to be sprinkled, and sprinkling it, are regarded as four distinct services, any of which, if performed with an illegal intention, disqualifies the Passover sacrifice.

(23) I.e., one of the services was for its own sake and another was for a different purpose, in the order stated.

(24) Rashal reads: Raba.

(25) I.e., even if he declared at one of the services, e.g., the slaughtering, that he was doing it for its own purpose and for another purpose.

(26) Lit., 'seized'.

(27) v. supra 53b. Hence since his last words were illegal, the sacrifice is disqualified.

(28) Where the two parts of a man's statement are mutually exclusive, regard the first only.

connection with two services, according to both R. Meir and R. Jose it was disqualified by the first [wrongful intention], for according to R. Jose too, he holds that a man is held responsible for his last words also?<sup>2</sup> — Rather, [the problem refers] to [where it was done] for its own purpose [first] and then for another purpose: what then? —

Come and hear: IF A MAN SLAUGHTERED THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE AND CAUGHT [THE BLOOD]. AND WENT AND SPRINKLED IT FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE: how is it meant? Shall we say, [literally] as he teaches it,<sup>3</sup> why must he intend all of them [for a wrong purpose]? From the first it is disqualified! Hence he must teach thus: IF A MAN SLAUGHTERED THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE, or even if he slaughtered it for its own purpose, but HE CAUGHT [ITS BLOOD], AND WENT AND SPRINKLED IT FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE,<sup>4</sup> or even if he slaughtered it, caught [its blood], and went [with it] for its own purpose, but SPRINKLED IT FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE, so that it is [a question of] two services.<sup>5</sup>

Then consider the second clause: FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE AND FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE: how is it meant? Shall we say, in respect of two services: then it is identical with the first clause! Hence it must surely be in respect of one service, and this agrees with R. Jose, who maintained: A man is held responsible for his last words too!—

## Pesachim 60a

or perhaps we learned [it only] in respect to two services, and even according to R. Meir, who said, 'Seize the first expression.' that applies only in the case of one service, but in the case of two services he agrees that it is disqualified?<sup>1</sup> — I will tell you: to which [case does this problem refer]? Shall we say, to [the case where it was] for another purpose [first] and [then] for its own purpose, then whether it was in connection with one service or in

No. After all it refers to two services,<sup>6</sup> but the first clause [discusses] where he is standing at [engaged in] the slaughtering and intends [with due purpose] in respect of the slaughtering, or again<sup>7</sup> he is standing at the sprinkling and intends [for another purpose] in respect of sprinkling.<sup>8</sup> While the second clause means when he is standing at the slaughtering and intends in respect of the sprinkling, when he [for instance] declares,

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

‘Behold, I slaughter the Passover sacrifice for its own purpose, [but] to sprinkle its blood for another purpose’; and he [the Tanna] informs us that you can intend at one service for another service,<sup>9</sup> and that is R. Papa’s question.<sup>10</sup>

Come and hear: **OR FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE AND FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE, [IT] IS DISQUALIFIED.** How is it meant? If we say, in the case of two services, [then] seeing that where [if the first is] for its own purpose and [the second is] for another purpose, you say that it is disqualified, is it necessary [to state it where it is first] for another purpose and [then] for its own purpose?<sup>11</sup> Hence it must surely refer to one service, and since the second clause refers to one service, the first clause too refers [also] to one service! — No, after all it refers [only] to two services, and logically indeed it is not required, but because he speaks of ‘**FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE AND FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE,**’ he also mentions ‘**FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE AND FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE.**’<sup>12</sup>

Come and hear: If he killed it [the Passover sacrifice] for those who cannot eat it or for those who were not registered for it,<sup>13</sup> for uncircumcised<sup>14</sup> or for unclean persons,<sup>15</sup> it is disqualified. Now here it obviously refers to one service, and since the second clause refers to one service, the first clause too treats [also] of one service!<sup>16</sup> — What argument is this? The one is according to its nature, while the other is according to its nature; the second clause [certainly] refers [only] to one service, while the first clause may refer either to one service or to two services.<sup>17</sup>

Come and hear: [If he killed it] for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it, it is fit. How is it meant? Shall we say, at two services:<sup>18</sup> and the reason [that it is fit] is because he intended it [for non-eaters] at the sprinkling, for there can be no [effective] intention of eaters at the sprinkling;<sup>19</sup> hence [if it were] at one service, e.g. at the slaughtering, where an intention with

reference to eaters is effective, it would be disqualified, but we have an established law that if some are eaters it is not disqualified?<sup>20</sup>

(1) On the first hypothesis the Mishnah refers even to one service, and will certainly also hold good in the case of two services; while on the second hypothesis the Mishnah refers to two services only, but will not hold good in the case of one service; Rashi *infra* 60b. s.v. **טִיפָא בַעבוּדָה אָחַת** and as is evident from the context.

(2) I.e., they too must be taken into account, but his first words certainly cannot be ignored.

(3) Viz., that all four services were performed for another purpose.

(4) [The text seems to be in slight disorder, v. D.S. The general meaning is, however, clear.]

(5) I.e., this clause states the case of a legal purpose at one service and an illegal purpose at another service.

(6) And still the two clauses are not identical as it goes on explaining.

(7) [MS.M. omits: ‘or again’.]

(8) [‘Slaughtering’ and ‘sprinkling’ are taken merely as examples, the same applying to the other services. Each was performed with the due or undue intention, as the case may be, in respect of itself.]

(9) And that such intention is taken into account, so that if it is illegitimate the sacrifice is disqualified.

(10) Riba: that is why R. Papa asks his question, because the Mishnah affords no solution. Rashba: R. Papa’s question as to whether the Mishnah may refer to two services is in such conditions, viz., where an illegitimate intention for one service is expressed in the course of another service.

(11) For the very first intention is illegitimate and disqualifies it; how then is it to regain its validity? The same difficulty arises if the Mishnah refers to one and the same service, but then it can be answered that the Mishnah informs us in the first clause (‘**FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE AND FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE**’) that we do not determine the matter purely by his first words, and in the second clause (‘**FOR ANOTHER PURPOSE AND FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE**’) that the matter is not determined purely by his last words, but that due weight must be given to both.

(12) For the sake of parallelism.

(13) Every Paschal lamb required its registered consumers before it was slaughtered, in accordance with Ex. XII, 4. In the present instance he enumerated those for whom he was slaughtering it, all of whom, however, were incapable of eating through old age or sickness (Rashi: none others had registered for it; Tosaf.: others who were capable had also registered for it,

# PESOCHIM - 33a-60a

---

but he ignored them in his declaration), or had not registered for this particular animal.

(14) 'Uncircumcised' in this connection always means men whose brothers had died through circumcision, and they were afraid of a similar fate. These may not eat thereof, *ibid.* 48.

(15) Who may likewise not eat it, being forbidden all sacred flesh. *Lev. XXII, 4ff.*

(16) The Mishnahs printed on 59b and 61a are actually clauses of the same Mishnah.

(17) I.e., either also to one service or exclusively to two services. And the question is, to which?

(18) Thus: at the slaughtering he declared that it was for those who can eat, and at the sprinkling he declared that it was for those who cannot eat (*R. Han.*).

(19) I.e., an intention with respect to the eaters expressed at the sprinkling is of no account.

(20) Since even if only one desired to eat of it the whole animal must be killed, *v. infra* 61a.