

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 2a

### CHAPTER I

MISHNAH. ALL ARE BOUND TO APPEAR [AT THE TEMPLE],<sup>1</sup> EXCEPT A DEAF MAN [HERESH],<sup>2</sup> AN IMBECILE AND A MINOR,<sup>3</sup> A PERSON OF UNKNOWN SEX [TUMTUM],<sup>4</sup> A HERMAPHRODITE,<sup>5</sup> WOMEN, UNFREED SLAVES,<sup>6</sup> THE LAME, THE BLIND, THE SICK, THE AGED, AND ONE WHO IS UNABLE TO GO UP ON FOOT.<sup>7</sup> WHO IS [IN THIS RESPECT DEEMED] A MINOR?<sup>8</sup> WHOEVER IS UNABLE<sup>9</sup> TO RIDE ON HIS FATHER'S SHOULDERS AND GO UP FROM JERUSALEM TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT. [THIS IS] THE VIEW OF BETH SHAMMAI.

BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: WHOEVER IS UNABLE TO HOLD HIS FATHER'S HAND AND GO UP FROM JERUSALEM TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT, FOR IT IS SAID:<sup>10</sup> THREE REGALIM.<sup>11</sup>

BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THE PILGRIMAGE-OFFERING<sup>12</sup> MUST BE WORTH [AT LEAST] TWO PIECES OF SILVER<sup>13</sup> AND THE FESTAL OFFERING<sup>14</sup> ONE MA'AH OF SILVER.<sup>15</sup> BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: THE PILGRIMAGE-OFFERING MUST BE WORTH [AT LEAST] ONE MA'AH OF SILVER AND THE FESTAL SACRIFICE TWO PIECES OF SILVER.

GEMARA. What does [the word] ALL come to include?<sup>16</sup> — It comes to include one who is half a slave and half a freedman.<sup>17</sup> But according to Rabina, who says: One who is half a slave and half a freedman is exempt from appearing [at the Temple], what does [the word] ALL come to include? — It comes to include one who was lame on the first day [of the festival] and became well<sup>18</sup> on the second.

This will be right according to the one who says: All of them<sup>19</sup> can make good [the sacrifices] for one another;<sup>20</sup> but according to the one who says: All of them can make good [the sacrifices] of the first day [only],<sup>21</sup> what does ALL, come to include? — It comes to include a man who is blind in one eye; and it is contrary to the opinion of the following Tanna. For it is taught: Johanan b. Dahabai<sup>22</sup> said in the name of R. Judah: A man who is blind in one eye is exempt from appearing [at the Temple]<sup>23</sup> as it is said:<sup>24</sup> Yir'eh [He will see], Yera'eh [He will be seen].<sup>25</sup>

As He comes to see, so he comes to be seen: just as [He comes] to see with both eyes, so also to be seen with both eyes. Alternatively, I could answer: Actually, it is as I said at first;<sup>26</sup> and as for your objection [arising] from the statement of Rabina, it is not a [valid] objection: the one [teaching]<sup>27</sup> is according to the earlier Mishnah,<sup>28</sup> and the other<sup>29</sup> is according to the later Mishnah.<sup>30</sup> For we have learnt: One who is half a slave and half a freedman serves his master one day and himself the other day: this is the view of Beth Hillel. Said Beth Shammai to them:

---

(1) I.e., at the Temple Court (עזרה), on the three Pilgrim Festivals of Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles; cf. Ex. XXIII, 14, 17; Deut. XVI, 16. The word ראייה (rendered in our text, 'to appear') is understood by Rashi, Maimonides, Jastrow, Danby etc. in the sense of ראיית פנים, the personal appearance of the pilgrim in the Temple. But R. Tam (in Tosaf. a. l.) regards it as referring to the burnt-offering (v. Lev. I, 3f) brought by the pilgrim on his visit to the Temple i.e. it stands for עולת ראייה; cf. end of Mishnah, 4b, 6b et seq.

(2) Explained infra 2b as a 'deaf-mute'.

(3) The deaf man, imbecile and minor are exempted from the observance of this and other positive precepts on account of lack of intelligence. The reason for the exemption of others is explained in the Gemara.

(4) טומטום from טמם 'to fill up stop': one whose genitals are concealed or undeveloped.

(5) אנדרוניום Grk. \*\*.

(6) Explained infra 4a as 'half free'; v. p. 2, n. 6.

- (7) I.e., from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount.
- (8) Ordinarily, a boy up to the age of thirteen years and a day is considered a minor
- (9) I.e., is too young; but as soon as he is old enough he must visit the Temple, because, although exempt by the Law of the Torah till he reaches his majority (v. n. 8), the Rabbis imposed on the father the duty of training him in the observance of the precepts.
- (10) Ex. XXIII, 14.
- (11) רגלים (pl. of רגל) rendered in E.V. by 'times', occurs in this sense again only in Num. XXII, 28, 32, 33. On the basis of Ex. XXIII, 14, the Mishnah often uses רגלים of the three Pilgrim Festivals. But the usual meaning of רגל is 'foot', hence the quotation is understood in our Mishnah as 'three times on foot' i.e., the precept to appear at the Temple applies only to those who can walk.
- (12) עולת ראייה, the word translated above 'to appear' (v. p. 1, n. 1). Here it stands for עולת ראייה, the burnt-offering, which, it was inferred from Ex. XXIII,15 (end), the pilgrim had to bring on visiting the Temple.
- (13) I.e., two ma'ahs, v. n. 4.
- (14) דגניגה, whence our tractate derives its name. It was a peace-offering (cf. Lev. III,15) and was inferred from Lev. XXIII, 41; v. infra 9a.
- (15) A sixth of a denar, v. Glos.
- (16) The word 'ALL' is emphatic'; it implies that persons who might be thought exempt are subject to the commandment; hence the question.
- (17) E.g., he belonged to two masters, and was freed by one of them.
- (18) Lit., 'became straight' (in limb).
- (19) I.e., the seven individual days of the festival.
- (20) I.e., if a man was unfit to bring his sacrifices on the first day of the festival (e.g., if he was exempt on account of lameness) and during the festival he became fit (i.e., regained the use of his leg), it is his duty to make good his sacrificial dues on the day of the festival that he becomes fit.
- (21) I.e., if he was unfit on the first day, he is completely exempt, though he becomes fit in the course of the festival.
- (22) Probably the name means, 'Goldsmith'.
- (23) Or, according to Tosaf. (v. p. 1, n. 1), 'exempt from bringing the pilgrimage-offering'; and so wherever the translation has 'appearing'.
- (24) Ex. XXIII, 17.
- (25) ראה may be vocalised יראה (Kal, 'He will see') or following the Massorah, יראה (Nif'al, 'He will be seen, appear'); cf. Gen. XXII, 14. By combining both readings, it is deduced that the 'seeing' and 'being seen' must be alike in regard to fulness of vision i.e., in regard to the use of both eyes: just as God comes to see the pilgrim with both eyes (an anthropomorphism for full vision necessitated by the desired parallel in respect to man), so when the pilgrim comes to appear before God, he must be able to see with both eyes. So Rashi: but R. Tam (in Tosaf. a.l.) prefers to make man the subject, and construes thus; יראהתיראה just as the pilgrim is seen by God, Who has two eyes (i.e., full vision), so he must see Him (i.e., appear in the Divine presence) with both eyes.
- (26) I.e., that the word all comes to include a half-slave.
- (27) I.e., the statement that unfreed slaves are exempt from visiting the Temple, which Rabina interprets as inferring such as are half free.
- (28) I.e., the Mishnah as it was formulated before the School of Hillel (whose ruling was authoritative against that of the Shammaite School cf. Ber. 36b and Gratz, vol. IV, p. 424, n. 4; Heb. edn. vol. II, p. 172, n. 1) came over to the view of the School of Shammai. משנה ראשונה (rendered, 'the earlier Mishnah') may refer either (a) to a single previous ruling later revised, or (b) to an entire compilation of the Mishnah, in which case it may be rendered, 'the first Mishnah'; cf. J.E. vol. VIII, P. 610f, and refs.
- (29) V. note 4.
- (30) I.e., representing the later opinion of the School of Hillel. Though this second opinion contradicts the first, the earlier ruling was not erased from the Mishnah, on the principle that a Mishnah (ruling) which had once been taught was not to be removed from its place; cf. Yeb. 30a et passim.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 2b

You have made it right for his master,<sup>1</sup> but you have not made it right for himself<sup>2</sup> He may not marry

a bondswoman, nor may he marry a freewoman.<sup>3</sup> Should he abstain [from marriage]? But then was not the world created only for propagation?<sup>4</sup> as it is said:<sup>5</sup> ‘He created it not a waste, He formed it to be inhabited’. For the sake of the social order,<sup>6</sup> therefore, his master must be compelled to set him free, and the latter must give him a bond for the half of his value. Thereupon Beth Hillel retracted and gave their ruling in accordance with the view of Beth Shammai.

EXCEPT A DEAF MAN [HERESH], AN IMBECILE AND A MINOR etc. [Our Mishnah] speaks of HERESH similarly as of the IMBECILE and MINOR: just as the IMBECILE and MINOR lack understanding, so HERESH [means] one that lacks understanding. This teaches us in accordance with that which we have learnt:<sup>7</sup> ‘Wherever the Sages speak of HERESH,<sup>8</sup> [it means] one who can neither hear nor speak.<sup>9</sup> This [would imply] that he who can speak but not hear,<sup>10</sup> hear but not speak is obligated.<sup>11</sup> We have [thus] learnt that which our Rabbis taught.<sup>12</sup> One who can speak but not hear is termed HERESH: one who can hear but not speak is termed Illem [dumb]; both of these are deemed sensible in all that relates to them. And whence [is it deduced] that one who can speak but not hear is termed Heresh, and one who can hear but not speak is termed ‘Illem? — For it is written: But I am as Heresh [a deaf man], I hear not,’ and I am as Illem [a dumb man] that openeth not his mouth.<sup>13</sup> Alternatively, I could explain: As people say,<sup>14</sup> His words have been taken away.<sup>15</sup>

‘One that can speak but not hear, hear but not speak is obligated’. But surely it is taught: One that can speak but not hear, hear but not speak is exempt!<sup>16</sup> — Said Rabina, and according to others, Raba: [Our Mishnah] is defective and should read thus: All are bound to appear [at the Temple] and to rejoice,<sup>17</sup> except a Heresh that can speak but not hear, [or] hear but not speak, who is exempt from appearing [at the Temple];<sup>18</sup> but though he is exempt from appearing, he is bound to rejoice. One, however, that can neither hear nor speak,<sup>19</sup> an imbecile and a minor are exempt even from rejoicing, since they are exempt from all the precepts stated in the Torah,<sup>20</sup> Likewise it is also taught: All are bound to appear [at the Temple] and to rejoice, except a Heresh that can speak but not hear, [or] hear but not speak, who is exempt from appearing; but though he is exempt from appearing

---

(1) I.e., he gets the full benefit of his half-ownership.

(2) R. Meshullam (in Tosaf.) prefers the opposite reading. ‘You have made it right for himself, but you have not made it right at all for his master’; because the latter loses any possible share of the offspring.

(3) Being partly a freedman he may not marry a slave; being partly a slave he may not marry a freewoman; v. Deut. XXIII, 18 and Targum Onkelos a.l.

(4) Lit., ‘for fruitfulness and multiplication’, cf. Gen. I, 28.

(5) Isa. XLV, 18.

(6) Lit., ‘for the sake of the establishment (or improvement) of the world’; cf. Git. IV, 2, 3, where Danby renders; ‘as a precaution for the general good’.

(7) Ter. I, 2.

(8) I.e., together with the Imbecile and Minor.

(9) Tosaf. quotes and explains exceptions to this rule: cf. Meg. 19b and Hul. 2a.

(10) E.g., he was able to hear when born and learnt to speak, but later became deaf.

(11) I.e., to fulfil the precept of appearing at the Temple.

(12) I.e., our Mishnah supports and thus gives validity to the following Baraita. (11) This statement agrees, by implication, with our Mishnah, which puts only a deaf-mute in the same category as an imbecile.

(13) Ps. XXXVIII, 14.

(14) I.e., a popular proverb; v. J.E vol X, p. 226f.

(15) I.e., אִלֵּם (‘dumb’) is an abbreviation of אִשְׁתַּקִּיל מִלְּוִיָּה (‘his words have been taken away’).

(16) I.e., from visiting the Temple; thus the Baraita contradicts our Mishnah.

(17) V. Deut. XVI, 14. Ritually the rejoicing took the form of a sacrificial meal of peace-offerings; cf. infra 8b and Pes. 109a.

(18) And from bringing the accompanying burnt-offering.

(19) I.e., the Heresh of our Mishnah. Thus the fully worded Mishnah would refer to two kinds of Heresh: (a) the partial

Heresh that can either speak or hear, who must 'rejoice', though he is exempt from visiting the Temple; (b) the complete Heresh, who is exempt from both.

(20) Torah primarily refers to the Pentateuch, but also has a wider meaning, which includes the whole Bible and even the entire range of Jewish teaching, both study and practice.

### Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 3a

he is bound to rejoice. One, however, that can neither hear nor speak, an imbecile and a minor are exempt even from rejoicing, since they are exempt from all the precepts stated in the Torah. Why is it that in regard to appearing they are exempt, and in regard to rejoicing they are obligated? With regard to appearing, it is deduced by forming an analogy between the expressions for appearing<sup>1</sup> from [the section] 'Assemble',<sup>2</sup> for it is written: Assemble the people, the men and the women and the little ones;<sup>3</sup> and it is [further] written: When all Israel is come to appear.<sup>4</sup> But whence is it deduced for the latter?<sup>5</sup> — For it is written: That they may hear and that they may learn.<sup>3</sup> And it is taught: 'That they may hear', [this] excludes one that can speak but not hear; 'and that they may learn', [this] excludes one that can hear but not speak. Does this then mean to say that one that cannot talk cannot learn? But behold there were two dumb men in the neighbourhood of Rabbi, sons of the daughter of R. Johanan b. Gudgada, and according to others, sons of the sister of R. Johanan, who, whenever Rabbi entered the College, went in and sat down [before him], and nodded their heads and moved their lips. And Rabbi prayed for them<sup>6</sup> and they were cured,<sup>7</sup> and it was found that they were versed in Halachah,<sup>8</sup> Sifra,<sup>9</sup> Sifre<sup>10</sup> and the whole Talmud!<sup>11</sup> Said Mar Zutra, Read, That they may teach.<sup>12</sup> R. Ashi said: Assuredly it is [to be read]: That they may teach.<sup>13</sup> For if you suppose [that it should be read]: That they may learn, and [argue that] if one cannot talk one cannot learn (and [obviously] if one cannot hear one cannot learn),<sup>14</sup> that follows from [the expression]: That they may hear.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, it must certainly be [read]: That they may teach.<sup>16</sup>

R. Tanhum said: One that is deaf in one ear is exempt from appearing [at the Temple], for it is said: In their ears.<sup>17</sup> But [this expression], 'in their ears', is required [to teach that it<sup>18</sup> must be] in the ears of all Israel!<sup>19</sup> — That can be deduced from [the expression],<sup>20</sup> 'before all Israel'. But if [it were deduced] from [the expression] 'before all Israel', I might say: Even though they did not hear;<sup>21</sup> therefore it is written in the Divine Law:<sup>22</sup> in their ears,' they must be able to hear!<sup>23</sup> — That can be deduced from [the expression], in order that they may hear.<sup>24</sup>

R. Tanhum said: One that is lame in one foot is exempt from appearing [at the Temple], as it is said: Regalim [on foot].<sup>25</sup> But this [word] Regalim is required to exclude people with wooden legs! — That follows from [the word] Pe'amim [steps].<sup>26</sup> For it is taught: 'Pe'amim'; 'Pe'amim' means only feet;<sup>27</sup> and thus it is said: The foot shall tread it down, even the feet of the poor, and the steps of [pa'ame]<sup>28</sup> the needy.<sup>29</sup> And it further says: How beautiful are thy steps [pe'amayik] in sandals, O prince's daughter.<sup>30</sup>

Raba expounded: What is the meaning of the verse: 'How beautiful are thy steps in sandals, O prince's daughter'. [It means:] How comely are the feet of Israel when they go up on the festival pilgrimage. 'Prince's daughter': [means] daughter of Abraham our father, who is called prince, as it is said: The princes of the peoples are gathered together, the people of the God of Abraham.<sup>31</sup> 'The God of Abraham', and not the God of Isaac and Jacob? [It must mean], therefore, the God of Abraham, who was the first of the Proselytes.<sup>32</sup>

R. Kahana said: R. Nathan b. Minyomi expounded in the name of R. Tanhum:<sup>33</sup> What is the meaning of the verse: And the pit was empty, there was no water in it?<sup>34</sup> Since it says that the pit was empty, would I not know that there was no water in it? [It must mean] therefore, there was no water in it, but there were in it snakes and scorpions.

Our Rabbis taught: Once R. Johanan b. Beroka and R. Eleazar Hisma<sup>35</sup> went to pay their respects to R. Joshua at Peki'in.<sup>36</sup> Said he to them: What new teaching was there at the College to-day? They replied: We are thy disciples and thy waters do we drink.<sup>37</sup> Said he to them: Even so, it is impossible for a college session to pass without some novel teaching. Whose Sabbath<sup>38</sup> was it? — It was the Sabbath of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, [they replied].-And what was the theme of his Haggadic<sup>39</sup> discourse to-day? They answered: The section 'Assemble'.<sup>40</sup> And what exposition did he give thereon? 'Assemble the people the men and the women and the little ones'. If the men came to learn, the women came to hear,<sup>41</sup> but wherefore have the little ones to come? In order to grant reward<sup>42</sup> to those that bring them. Said he to them: There was a fair Jewel in your hand, and you sought to deprive me of it.

He further expounded: Thou hast avouched the Lord this day . . . and the Lord has avouched thee this day.<sup>43</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Israel: You have made me a unique object of your love<sup>44</sup> in the world, and I shall make you a unique object of My love in the world.<sup>45</sup> You have made me a unique object of your love, as it is written: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One.<sup>46</sup> And I shall make you a unique object of My love, as it is said:

- 
- (1) I.e., **יֵרָאֵה** ('shall appear') in Ex. XXIII, 17 and **לִרְאוֹת** ('to appear') in Deut. XXXI, 11.
- (2) Deut. XXXI, 10-13. The name is derived from the introductory word in the verse that follows.
- (3) Deut. XXXI, v. 12.
- (4) Ibid. v.11
- (5) I.e., how do we know that a Heresh that can hear or speak is exempt from the precept referred to in Deut. XXXI, 10-13.
- (6) Lit., 'he besought (God's) mercy on this behalf'.
- (7) On the efficacy of prayer, v. J.E. vol. X, pp. 168-169.
- (8) **הַלְכָה** from **הֵלֵךְ** 'to go, follow', means literally 'going', 'walking' then figuratively: 'the teaching which one follows, the rule or state by which one is guided, the categorical religious law', (H. L. Strack, Intro. to the Talmud, p. 6 ¶ 7: v. whole section and refs.). The last meaning applies here. Cf. also the refs. to Halachah in R. T. Herford's *The Pharisees*, esp. Ch. III. V. Glos.
- (9) 'The Book', also called *Torath Kohanim* ('Law of the Priests') is a halachic Midrash on Leviticus.
- (10) **ספרי** or more fully, **ספרי דבי רב** ('the Books of the School of Rab') is a halachic Midrash on Numbers (commencing with Ch. 5) and on Deut. V. Glos.
- (11) **ש"ס** Lit., 'six orders' into which the Mishnah, and consequently the Talmud, which is the commentary on it, is divided. [MS.M. reads, 'Talmud'].
- (12) I.e., **יְלַמְדוּ** (Pi'el) for **יִלְמְדוּ** (Kal). Such textual changes are not to be regarded as serious Biblical emendations, but as part of the exegetical method of the Rabbis for the purpose of halachic and Haggadic deduction.
- (13) I.e., quite apart from the instance of the two dumb scholars, it can be proved that teach is the right reading.
- (14) [MS.M. omits bracketed words which, in fact, are superfluous].
- (15) The underlying reason for excluding the deaf is their inability to learn. If now you suppose that the dumb cannot learn, their exclusion can be inferred from the expression, 'that they may hear', which excludes the deaf, and similarly the dumb, and the words 'that they may learn' are superfluous.
- (16) And the inference that a dumb person cannot learn falls away.
- (17) Deut. XXXI, 11. The plural indicates that those present must be able to hear with both ears; and by analogy (v. supra p. 5, n. 9) we apply this rule also to the law of Ex. XXIII, 17.
- (18) The public reading referred to in the section 'Assemble' (v. p. 5, n. 10); cf. Sot. 41a.
- (19) I.e., in their hearing.
- (20) Deut. *ibid*.
- (21) I.e., were too far away; not that they were deaf.
- (22) Lit., 'The Merciful One wrote', i.e., God revealed through Scripture. V. Bacher, *Exeg. Term.* II, 207f.
- (23) This expression, therefore, cannot be used for the inference that a person deaf in one ear is exempt.
- (24) Ibid. v. 12. Thus 'in their ears' is available for R. Tanhum's teaching.
- (25) Ex. XXIII, 14. V. supra p. 5, n. 10. The word is probably read here **רַגְלַיִם** (dual): the pilgrim must have use of

both feet.

(26) Ex. XXIII, 17. **פעמים** E.V. 'times' (cf. supra p. 1, n. 11) is here understood in its root meaning of 'steps', i.e., only those having their own legs must visit the Temple.

(27) I.e., natural as opposed to artificial feet.

(28) **פעמי** (steps) being parallel to **רגלי** (feet) must mean the same as the latter.

(29) Isa. XXVI, 6.

(30) Cant. VII, 2. The word sandals is additional evidence that **פעמים** refers to natural feet.

(31) Ps. XLVII, 10.

(32) 'Prince' (**נדיב**) means lit., 'one who offers himself willingly' i.e., for God's service. Abraham was the first to confess and worship the Lord, and the reference to the 'princes, the peoples' is to the proselytes who, like Abraham, offer themselves to the service of God.

(33) The name of R. Tanhum is the link between the preceding and the following exposition.

(34) Gen. XXXVII, 24.

(35) In Tr. Soferim the reading is Eleazar b. Hisma. For the cognomen which is not adjectival (i.e., 'muzzled') but locative (prob. a native of Hismeh') v. J.E. Vol. V, p. 99.

(36) Also Beki'in, modern Fukin, in S. Palestine between Lydda and Jabneh (Jast.). It was customary for pupils to visit their teacher on holy days; cf. R.H. 16b.

(37) I.e., disciples may not speak before their teacher (Rashi); or we cannot possibly have anything to teach you.

(38) R. Gamaliel used to lecture on two (or three) Sabbaths and R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah on the third (or fourth) v. Ber. 28a.

(39) Haggadah (**הגדה**), a nomen actionis of **הגיד** (to tell), denotes all scriptural interpretation which is non-halachic (i.e., non-legal) in character (H. L. Strack). V. Glos.

(40) V. supra p. 5, n. 10.

(41) But not to study it fully; cf. J.T., Sot. III, 4. For the status of the woman in Judaism v. J.E. vol. XII, p. 556.

(42) For the Rabbinic conception of reward v. R. T. Herford, op. cit. pp. 123-24, 127-120.

(43) Deut. XXVI, 17-18.

(44) **החמיבה אהת** Jast. 'the only object of your love' (from root meaning 'to fall in love, woo'); Levy, 'Herrscher' (ruler) comparing it, according to Bacher, with Pers. 'Khedive'; Goldschmidt, 'Verherrlichung' (glorification); Rashi, 'sole or unique object of praise'; Aruch, in the name of R. Hai Gaon, 'Unique concept' (**ציור אהת**); Maharsha (quoting Rashi to Deut. XXVI, 17) 'separation. (from root meaning 'to hew').

(45) Aruch reads: 'in this world . . . in the world to come'.

(46) Deut. VI, 4. For different renderings of this verse v. I. Abrahams, A companion to the Auth. Daily Prayer Book, p. LI.

### Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 3b

And who is like unto Thy people Israel, a nation one in the earth.<sup>1</sup> And he<sup>2</sup> also took up the text and expounded: The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails well planted are the words of masters of Assemblies, which are given from one Shepherd.<sup>3</sup>

Why are the words of the Torah<sup>4</sup> likened to a goad? To teach you that just as the goad directs the heifer along its furrow in order to bring forth life to the world, so the words of the Torah direct those who study them from the paths of death to the paths of life. But [should you think] that just as the goad is movable so the words of the Torah are movable;<sup>5</sup> therefore the text says: 'nails'.

But [should you think] that just as the nail diminishes<sup>6</sup> and does not increase, so too the words of the Torah diminish and do not increase; therefore the text says: 'well planted'; just as a plant grows and increases, so the words of the Torah grow and increase.

'The masters of assemblies': these are the disciples of the wise, who sit in manifold assemblies and occupy themselves with the Torah, some pronouncing unclean and others pronouncing clean, some prohibiting and others permitting, some disqualifying<sup>7</sup> and others declaring fit.

Should a man say: How in these circumstances shall I learn Torah?<sup>8</sup> Therefore the text says: ‘All of them are given from one Shepherd’. One God gave them;<sup>9</sup> one leader<sup>10</sup> uttered them from the mouth of the Lord of all creation, blessed be He; for it is written: ‘And God spoke all these words’.<sup>11</sup> Also do thou make thine ear like the hopper<sup>12</sup> and get thee a perceptive heart to understand the words of those who pronounce unclean and the words of those who pronounce clean, the words of those who prohibit and the words of those who permit, the words of those who disqualify and the words of those who declare fit. He [then] spoke to them<sup>13</sup> in the following words: It is not an orphan generation in which R. Eleazar b. ‘Azariah lives. But they could have told him directly!<sup>14</sup> — It was on account of a certain occurrence. For it is taught: Once R. Jose b. Durmaskith<sup>15</sup> went to pay his respects to R. Eliezer at Lod.<sup>16</sup> Said the latter to him: What new thing was taught in College today? He replied: They decided by vote that in Ammon and Moab<sup>17</sup> the tithes of the poor should be given in the seventh year.<sup>18</sup> Said [R. Eliezer] to him: Jose, stretch forth thine hands and lose thy sight.<sup>19</sup> He stretched forth his hands and lost his sight. R. Eliezer [then] wept and said: The counsel of the Lord is with them that fear Him,’ and His covenant, to make them know it.<sup>20</sup> He [then] said to him: Go, say to them: Be not concerned about your voting,<sup>21</sup> thus have I received a tradition from Rabban<sup>22</sup> Johanan b. Zakkai, who heard [it] from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, that it is a halachah of Moses from Sinai<sup>23</sup> that in Ammon and Moab the tithes of the poor is to be given in the seventh year. What is the reason? — Many cities were conquered by those who came up from Egypt, which were not conquered by those who came up from Babylon; since the first consecration<sup>24</sup> held [only] for the time,<sup>25</sup> but did not hold for the future [permanently],<sup>26</sup> therefore they were left<sup>27</sup> in order that the poor might be sustained upon them in the seventh year. It is taught: When his mind was calmed, he said: May it be granted that Jose's sight be restored.<sup>28</sup> And it was restored.

Our Rabbis taught: Who is [deemed] an imbecile? He that goes out alone at night<sup>29</sup> and he that spends the night in a cemetery, and he that tears his garments. It was taught: R. Huna said: They must all be [done] together.<sup>30</sup> R. Johanan said: Even if [he does only] one of them. What is the case? If he does them in an insane manner, even one is also [proof]. If he does not do them in an insane manner, even all of them [prove] nothing? — Actually [it is a case where] he does them in an insane manner. But if he spent the night in a cemetery, I might say: He did [it] in order that the spirit of impurity might rest upon him.<sup>31</sup> If he went out alone at night, I might say: He was seized by lycanthropy.<sup>32</sup> If he tore his garment, I might say: He was lost in thought. But as soon as he does them all,

(1) I Chron. XVII, 21; for thought, cf. Midrash quoted in Tosaf. a.l.

(2) I.e., according to Rashi, R. Eleazar b. ‘Azariah; but according to Maharsha and Goldschmidt, R. Joshua.

(3) Eccl. XII, 11.

(4) The ‘words of the wise’ are identified with ‘the words of the Torah’.

(5) I.e., unstable and of impermanent authority.

(6) The nail driven into the wall makes a hole.

(7) To act as witness, or as priest.

(8) I.e., in view of the contradictory opinions held by the scholars.

(9) I.e., the various opinions do not emanate from different ‘Revelations’, but have their origin in the One Torah, given by the One God. Cf. Tanhuma to Num. XIX, 2, section 8; and ref. to Moses and Akiba Men. 29b.

(10) I.e., Moses. The term ‘Shepherd’ (רעה) is applied in the Bible both to God (e.g., Gen. XLVIII, 15; Ps. LXXX, 2) and to Moses (e.g., Isa. LXIII, 11). Maharsha.

(11) Ex. XX, 1.

(12) אפרנסת According to Jast. from root פרכם (to rub, grind), itself an extension of root פרך (to break). According to Levy, from the Greek. The hopper, being funnel-shaped, more enters it than issues from it, i.e., hear all views, and then sift them and accept the true.

(13) I.e., R. Joshua to his two disciples.

(14) I.e., why did they at first evade R. Joshua's request by saying: We are thy disciples etc.?

- (15) I.e., woman of Damascus.
- (16) Cf. I Chron. VIII, 12; afterwards Lydda and later Diospolis, near Joppa.
- (17) According to Rashi, that part of Ammon and Moab which was subjugated by Sihon and Og, and later was captured from them by the Israelites (v. Num. XXI, 21-35. and Hul. 60b). But according to R. Tam (in Tosaf.), it refers to the rest of Ammon and Moab, not conquered by Sihon and Og.
- (18) In Transjordan, which did not possess the sanctity of Palestine proper, the land did not have to be fallow in the seventh year (cf. Lev. XXV, 2f). Accordingly, the Rabbis ordained that the tithe of the poor, although given the preceding year, should again be given in the seventh year. V. Deut. XIV, 28-29 and Sifre a.l.; cf. also Lev. XXIII, 22 and Deut. XXIV, 19.
- (19) Lit., 'receive thine eyes', a euphemism. He was vexed because R. Jose ascribed an old traditional law to the particular session in his college.
- (20) Ps. XXV, 14.
- (21) I.e., have no scruples concerning it.
- (22) Lit., 'our teacher', the honorific title of several descendants of Hillel, and of R. Johanan b. Zakkai.
- (23) A statute in immemorial usage. V. Strack, op. cit., p. 9 and nn. 17-21.
- (24) I.e., under Joshua: the territory conquered by Israel became holy.
- (25) I.e., till the first exile.
- (26) But the territory occupied by those who returned from Babylon was consecrated for ever.
- (27) I.e., Ammon and Moab were left unconsecrated after the Babylonian captivity.
- (28) Lit., 'that Jose's eyes may return to their place'.
- (29) Cf. Aboth III, 4.
- (30) I.e., a person is not considered legally an imbecile till he performs all the above mentioned acts together. [Var. lec. rightly omit together'].
- (31) I.e., he did it with full understanding for the purpose of conjuring up evil spirits for magical purposes (Rash); or to receive communications from them, cf. LXX in Isa. LXV, 4 (A. W. Streane).
- (32) גַּנְדְּרִיפּוּס corruption of the Grk. \*\* or \*\* sub \*\*: German, Wolfsmuth.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 4a

he becomes like [an ox] who gored an ox, an ass and a camel, and becomes [thereby] a mu'ad [forewarned gorer]<sup>1</sup> in regard to all [animals]. R. Papa said: If R. Huna had heard of that which is taught: Who is [deemed] an imbecile? 'One that destroys all that is given to him'; he would have retracted.<sup>2</sup> The question was raised: When he would have retracted, would he have retracted only with regard to the [case of the] man who tore his garment, because it resembles this [case];<sup>3</sup> or would he have retracted with regard to all of them?<sup>4</sup> — It remains [undecided].

A PERSON OF UNKNOWN SEX [TUMTUM], A HERMAPHRODITE etc.: Our Rabbis taught: [The word] 'males'<sup>5</sup> [by itself] comes to exclude women;<sup>6</sup> [the expression]. 'thy males', comes to exclude the tumtum and hermaphrodite; 'all thy males' comes to include minors.

The Master said: [The word] 'males' comes to exclude women. But why do I need a verse for this? Consider: it is a positive precept dependent on a fixed time, and women are exempt from every positive precept dependent on a fixed time!<sup>7</sup> — It is needed. You might say: We can make a deduction by forming an analogy between the expressions for appearing, from [the section] 'Assemble':<sup>8</sup> just as there women are obligated. so here women are obligated; it therefore teaches us [that it is not so].

The Master said: [The expression]. 'thy males', comes to exclude a tumtum and a hermaphrodite. Granted that with regard to the hermaphrodite it is necessary [for Scripture to exclude him]. You might say that since he has a male aspect, he is obligated; it therefore teaches us that he is sui generis.<sup>9</sup> But the tumtum is a dubious case;<sup>10</sup> is a Biblical text required to exclude a dubious case?<sup>11</sup> — Said Abaye: [It is required for the case] where his testicles are outside.<sup>12</sup>



The Master said: [The expression], 'all thy males', comes to include minors. But we have learnt: EXCEPT AN IMBECILE AND A MINOR! — Said Abaye: There is no contradiction. The one case [speaks] of a minor who is old enough to be initiated,<sup>13</sup> the other of a minor who is not old enough to be initiated. But a minor who is old enough to be initiated is obligated only by Rabbinic enactment!<sup>14</sup> — Yes, it is so; and the Biblical text is merely a support.<sup>15</sup> What then is the purpose of the Biblical text?<sup>16</sup> — To intimate the teaching of 'Others'.<sup>17</sup> For it is taught: Others say: The scraper.<sup>18</sup> the copper-smith<sup>19</sup> and the tanner are exempt from appearing [at the Temple], for it is said: 'All thy males': he that is able to go up [on the pilgrimage] with all thy males. These, therefore, are excluded, because they are not fit<sup>20</sup> to go up with all thy males.

WOMEN AND UNFREED SLAVES etc.: Granted as regards women, as we have said;<sup>21</sup> but as regards slaves, whence do we deduce [their exemption]? — Said R. Huna: Scripture says: before the Lord, God:<sup>22</sup> [this means] one that has one Lord; this one,<sup>23</sup> therefore, is excluded because he has another lord.<sup>24</sup> But why do I need a Biblical intimation for this? Consider: every precept which is obligatory on a woman is obligatory on a slave; every precept which is not obligatory on a woman is not obligatory on a slave; for this is deduced by analogy from [the case of] the woman, through the double occurrence of [the expression] unto her.<sup>25</sup> Said Rabina: It<sup>26</sup> is needed only for [the exemption of] one that is half a slave and half a freedman!<sup>27</sup> This can also be proven; for [the Mishnah] speaks of WOMEN AND UNFREED SLAVES. What is meant by unfreed? Should I say that it means entirely unfreed, then it should simply say, 'Slaves'! Surely, therefore [it must mean] slaves that have not been completely freed. And who are such? Those that are half slaves and half freedmen. Proven.

THE LAME, THE BLIND, THE SICK, THE AGED: Our Rabbis taught: 'Regalim' [on foot].<sup>28</sup> this excludes people with wooden legs. Another interpretation:<sup>29</sup> Regalim: this excludes the lame, the sick, the blind, the aged, and one that cannot go up on foot. 'And one that cannot go up on foot': What does this come to include? — Said Raba: It comes to include

---

(1) Lit., 'forewarned'; an animal whose owner stands forewarned and consequently liable to full indemnity on account of three successive injuries (V. Ex. XXI, 36).

(2) I.e., he would have considered this action by itself as proof of imbecility.

(3) I.e., the case of the man who destroys whatever is given to him.

(4) I.e., he would have agreed entirely with R. Johanan's view.

(5) In the phrase 'all thy males'. Ex. XXIII, 17.

(6) I.e., from obligation to visit the Temple; v. Mishnah, p. 1.

(7) The exemption of women from the performance of these precepts is not due to any inferiority of status, but to delicate consideration for their physical nature; cf. also Kid. 29a and 34af.

(8) V. supra p. 5, n. 10. This law likewise is dependent on a fixed time.

(9) And to be excluded.

(10) Even more dubious than that of the hermaphrodite, because the sexual organs of the former are concealed. Thus the tumtum may be a female and quite exempt from appearing at the Temple.

(11) It would in any case be exempt because obligation could not be proven. For another explanation and reading v. Tosaf. a.l., and Maharsha.

(12) And only the membrum is hidden: being certain of the sex, we might think that he is bound to appear; Scripture therefore prevents this conclusion.

(13) V. Mishnah p. 1, n. 9.

(14) And not by Biblical injunction; therefore the verse cannot refer to this case.

(15) I.e., a confirmation; or perhaps a mnemotechnical aid.

(16) I.e., the word 'all'; for there are no superfluous expressions in the Bible.

(17) I.e., R. Meir, who is quoted under this term subsequent to the unsuccessful conspiracy by R. Nathan and himself against Rabban Simon b. Gamaliel; v. Hor. 13b.

(18) V. Keth. 77a, where this word (מְקַמֵּץ) is explained as (a) one that collects dog's excrements (used, according to Rashi ibid., for steeping clothes prior to laundering, and according to Rashi here, for preparing cordwain); (b) a tanner on a small scale, in contr. to בּוֹרְסֵי a tanner on a large scale.

(19) Explained ibid. as (a) a kettle-smith; (b) one that digs copper in the shaft.

(20) On account of the malodour resulting from these occupations.

(21) V. supra p. 13.

(22) Ex. XXIII, 17.

(23) I.e., the slave.

(24) I.e., a human master in addition to his Divine Master.

(25) V. Deut. XXIV, 3 (of the woman), and Lev. XIX, 20 (of the bondwoman).

(26) I.e., the Biblical intimation.

(27) This is in accordance with 'the earlier Mishnah' (v. supra p. 3, nn. 6, 8), but according to 'the later Mishnah', the master is compelled to free the half slave, who is then bound to appear at the Temple.

(28) V. p. 7, n. 11.

(29) The first interpretation is not quite satisfactory, because the exclusion of people with wooden legs can be deduced from פְּעֻמִּים in Ex. XXIII, 17; cf. p. 7, n. 12.

### Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 4b

a delicate person.<sup>1</sup> For it is written: When ye come to appear before Me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample<sup>2</sup> My courts?<sup>3</sup>

A Tanna taught: The uncircumcised<sup>4</sup> and the unclean<sup>5</sup> are exempt from [bringing] the pilgrimage-offering.<sup>6</sup> Granted as regards the unclean, for it is written: And thither thou shalt come,' and thither ye shall bring.<sup>7</sup> To whomever 'coming' applies, 'bringing' applies; to whomever 'coming' does not apply, 'bringing' does not apply. But whence do we derive [the exemption of] the uncircumcised? — This will be according to R. Akiba, who includes the uncircumcised like the unclean. For it is taught: R. Akiba said: [the expression], what man soever,<sup>8</sup> comes to include uncircumcised.<sup>9</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: An unclean person is exempt from [bringing] the pilgrimage-offering, for it is written: 'And thither thou shalt come; and thither ye shall bring'. To whomever 'coming' applies 'bringing' applies; to whomever 'coming' does not apply 'bringing' does not apply. R. Johanan b. Dahabai said in the name of R. Judah: A person who is blind in one eye is exempt from appearing [at the Temple]. for it is said: Yir'eh<sup>10</sup> [He shall see], Yera'eh [He shall be seen]; just as He comes to see, so He comes to be seen; as He comes to see with both eyes. so also to be seen with both eyes.

R. Huna, when he came to this verse, Yir'eh, Yera'eh,<sup>11</sup> wept. He said: The slave whom his Master longs to see should become estranged from him! For it is written: When ye come to appear<sup>12</sup> before Me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample My courts?<sup>13</sup>

R. Huna, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: And thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings, and shalt eat there.<sup>14</sup> The slave at whose table his Master longs to eat should become estranged from him! For it is written: To what purpose is the abundance of your sacrifices unto Me? saith the Lord.<sup>15</sup>

R. Eleazar, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: And his brethren could not answer him, for they were affrighted at his presence.<sup>16</sup> Now if the rebuke of flesh and blood be such, how much more so the rebuke of the Holy One, blessed be He!

R. Eleazar, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: And Samuel said to Saul: Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring<sup>14</sup> me up?<sup>17</sup> Now if Samuel, the righteous, was afraid of the Judgment, how

much more so should we be! How do we know this about Samuel?<sup>18</sup> — For it is written: And the woman said unto Saul: I see godlike beings coming up out of the earth.<sup>19</sup> ‘Coming up’<sup>20</sup> implies two: one was Samuel, but [who was] the other? Samuel went and brought Moses with him, Saying to him: Perhaps, Heaven fend,<sup>21</sup> I am summoned to Judgment: arise with me,<sup>22</sup> for there is nothing that thou hast written in the Torah, which I did not fulfil.

R. Ami, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: Let him put his mouth in the dust, perhaps there may be hope.<sup>23</sup> He said: All this, and [only] perhaps!<sup>24</sup>

R. Ami, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: Seek righteousness, seek humility, perhaps ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger.<sup>25</sup> He said: All this, and [only] perhaps!

R. Assi, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate, perhaps the Lord, the God of hosts, will be gracious.<sup>26</sup> All this, and [only] perhaps!

R. Joseph, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: But there is that is swept away without judgment.<sup>27</sup> [He said]:<sup>28</sup> Is there anyone who passes away before one's [allotted] time?<sup>29</sup> — Yes, as in the story [heard] by R. Bibi b. Abaye,<sup>30</sup> who was frequently visited by the Angel of death. [Once] the latter said to his messenger: Go, bring me Miriam, the women's hairdresser!<sup>31</sup> He went and brought him Miriam, the children's nurse. Said he to him:<sup>32</sup> I told thee Miriam, the women's hairdresser. He answered: If so, I will take her back. Said he to him: Since thou hast brought her, let her be added.<sup>33</sup> But how were you able to get her?<sup>34</sup> She was holding a shovel in her hand and was heating

---

(1) I.e., one that cannot walk barefoot; and it is forbidden to walk on the sacred Temple Mount with covered feet.

(2) I.e., with shod feet.

(3) Isa. I, 12.

(4) I.e., a Jew that was not circumcised because two of his brothers had died as a result of their circumcision; cf. Shab. 134a and Yeb. 64b.

(5) Cf. Num. XIX, 20.

(6) They are exempt even from sending the offering by a messenger; cf. also p. 1, n. 1.

(7) Deut. XII, 5,6. The verse continues: Your burnt-offerings etc.

(8) Lev. XXII, 4.

(9) I.e., if he is a priest, he is prohibited from eating Terumah (i.e., the priest's share of crop or dough) like a priest who has become unclean.

(10) Ex. XXIII, 17; v. p. 3, n. 3.

(11) Which implies (v. n. 1) that the Divine Master reciprocally comes to meet the human pilgrim.

(12) Lit., ‘to be seen’, as above.

(13) Isa. I, 12.

(14) Deut. XXVII, 7.

(15) Isa. I, 11.

(16) Gen. XLV, 3.

(17) I Sam. XXVIII, 15.

(18) I.e., that it was the Divine Judgment that he feared.

(19) Ibid. v. 13.

(20) Heb. **עלמים** which is plural. The deduction cannot be made from **אלהים** (godlike beings) which is also plural in form, because its meaning is generally singular, viz. God.

(21) Lit., ‘forbearance and peace.’

(22) I.e., to testify on my behalf.

(23) Lam. III, 29.

(24) I.e., after so much suffering, hope of salvation is only problematical.

(25) Zeph. 11,3.

(26) Amos V, 15.

(27) Prov. XIII, 23.

(28) Rashi and Tosaf. delete the words: the question is then asked by the Gemara.

(29) I.e., although the person has committed no sin to merit shortening of life.

(30) An occultist; cf. Ber. 6a where he performed an experiment with the object of seeing demons.

(31) Supposed by Tosaf. to be the Mother of Jesus; cf. Shab. 104b in the earlier uncensored editions. [Her description megaddela (hairdresser) is connected by some with the name of Mary Magdalene whose name was confused with that of Mary, the mother of Jesus, v. Herford R.T. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, pp. 40f].

(32) I.e., the Angel of death to his messenger.

(33) I.e., to the dead.

(34) Since it was not yet her time to die.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 5a

and raking<sup>1</sup> the oven. She took it and put it on her foot and burnt herself; thus her luck was impaired and I brought her. Said R. Bibi b. Abaye to him<sup>2</sup> : Have ye<sup>3</sup> permission to act thus? He answered him: Is it not written: 'There is that is swept away without judgment'? He countered: But behold it is written: One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh!<sup>4</sup> He replied: I have charge of them<sup>5</sup> till they have completed the generation,<sup>6</sup> and then I hand them over to Dumah!<sup>7</sup> He [then] asked him: But after all, what do you do with her years?<sup>8</sup> He replied: If there be a Rabbinic scholar who overlooks his hurt, I shall give them to him in her stead.<sup>9</sup>

R. Johanan, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: And thou didst incite Me against him, to destroy him without cause.<sup>10</sup> A slave whose Master, when they incite him yields,<sup>11</sup> is there any help for him?

R. Johanan, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: Behold, He putteth no trust in His holy ones.<sup>12</sup> If He does not put His trust in His holy ones, in whom will He put his trust? One day he was going on a journey and saw a man gathering figs; he was leaving those that were ripe and was taking those that were unripe. So he said to him: Are not those<sup>13</sup> better? He replied: I need those for a journey: these will keep, but the others will not keep. Said [R. Johanan] this is the meaning of the verse: Behold He putteth no trust in His holy ones.<sup>14</sup> But is it so? For behold there was a disciple in the neighbourhood of R. Alexandri, who died in his youth, and [R. Alexandri] said: Had this scholar wished, he could have lived!<sup>15</sup> If now it be [as R. Johanan said] perhaps he was one of those of whom it is said: 'Behold He putteth no trust in His holy ones'! — That [scholar] was one who had rebelled against his teachers!<sup>16</sup>

R. Johanan, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: And I will come near to you to judgment and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages.<sup>17</sup> A slave whose Master brings him near to judge him, and hastens to testify against him, is there any remedy for him?

Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai said: Woe unto us that Scripture weighs against us light like grave offences.<sup>18</sup>

Resh Lakish<sup>19</sup> said: Whoever wrests the judgment of the proselyte is as if he wrests the judgment of the All-High, for it is said:<sup>20</sup> And that turn aside the proselyte<sup>21</sup> from his right: the consonants [can be read]: And that turn Me aside.<sup>22</sup>

R. Hanina b. Papa said: Whoever does something [wrong] and repents of it, is forgiven at once,<sup>23</sup> for It is said: And [that] fear not Me.<sup>24</sup> But if they do fear Me, they are forgiven at once. R. Johanan,

when he came to the [following] verse, wept: For God shall bring every work into the judgment concerning every hidden<sup>25</sup> thing.<sup>26</sup> A slave to whom his Master accounts errors<sup>27</sup> as wilful offences, is there any remedy for him? What is the meaning of, concerning every hidden thing? — Rab said: This refers to one who kills a louse in the presence of his neighbour, so that he feels disgust thereat. And Samuel said: This refers to one who spits in the presence of his neighbour so that he feels disgust thereat. What is the meaning of, whether it be good or whether it be — evil?<sup>28</sup> — The School of R. Jannai said: This refers to one who gives alms to a poor person publicly,<sup>29</sup> like the story of R. Jannai. He [once] saw a man give a zuz<sup>30</sup> to a poor person publicly, so he said to him: It had been better that you had not given him, than now that you have given him publicly and put him to shame. The School of R. Shila said: This refers to one who gives alms to a woman secretly. for he brings her into suspicion. Raba said: This refers to one who is in the habit of sending his wife on the eve of the Sabbath meat that has not been cut up.<sup>31</sup> But Raba [himself] used to send! — The daughter of R. Hisda<sup>32</sup> is different, for he was sure of her that she was an expert!<sup>33</sup>

R. Johanan, when he came to the [following] verse, wept: And it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles are come upon them.<sup>34</sup> A slave whose Master brings many evils and troubles upon him, is there any remedy for him? What is the meaning of ‘evils and troubles’?<sup>35</sup> — Rab said: Evils which become antagonists<sup>36</sup> to each other, as for instance the [bites of] a wasp and a scorpion.<sup>37</sup> And Samuel said: This refers to one who furnishes money to the poor person [only] in the hour of his extreme distress.<sup>38</sup> Raba said: This is the meaning of the proverb, For [purchasing] provision a zuz is not to be found, for hanging up [in the basket]<sup>39</sup> it can be found.

Then My anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them, and I will hide My face from them.<sup>40</sup> R. Bardela b. Tabyumi said that Rab said: To whomever ‘hiding of the face’ does not apply is not one of them;<sup>41</sup> to whomever [the words] and they shall be devoured<sup>42</sup> does not apply

(1) I.e., raked the fire in (Jast.); Rashi: raked it out.

(2) I.e., the Angel of death.

(3) I.e., the Angel of death and his messenger.

(4) Eccl. I, 4; implying that every generation is complete.

(5) Lit., ‘shepherd them’.

(6) I.e., the years allotted to them.

(7) Lit., ‘Silence’, the Angel in charge of the dead.

(8) I.e., the remaining years which she should have continued to live.

(9) Cf. the ref. to Hezekiah in Yeb. 49a-50a.

(10) Job II, 3.

(11) Lit., ‘allows himself to be incited’.

(12) Job XV, 15.

(13) I.e., the ripe ones.

(14) I.e., God fears that the righteous, like the ripe figs, may later lose their excellence; hence they die young. Cf. Aboth II, 4.

(15) I.e., if he had lived uprightly.

(16) Hence he could not have been one of the ‘holy ones’, and it was his sin that shortened his life. Cf. Kid. 33b on Eccl. XIII, 13.

(17) Mal. III, 5.

(18) In the verse quoted, the grave crimes of sorcery and adultery, for which the penalty is death, are mentioned side by side with the lighter offences of perjury and financial oppression.

(19) Abbrev. for R. Simon b. Lakish.

(20) Ibid.

(21) E.V. ‘stranger’.

(22) **וְזָרִי** for **וְזָרִי**

- (23) Cf. Yoma 85b-86a; also Shebu. 12b.
- (24) Ibid.
- (25) I.e., unwitting errors.
- (26) Eccl. XII, 14.
- (27) I.e., even the slightest offence.
- (28) Ibid. I.e., one is punished for the good as well as for the bad one does.
- (29) An apparently good deed which is really bad.
- (30) A silver coin, one fourth of a shekel, and equal to a denar (denarius). V. Glos.
- (31) I.e., unpurged meat, the forbidden fat, blood vessels etc. not having been removed. The nearness of the Sabbath makes it a busy time for the housewife, who in her hurry may forget to purge the meat.
- (32) I.e., Raba's wife, always referred to as R. Hisda's daughter.
- (33) And would see that it was properly purged before the Sabbath.
- (34) Deut. XXXI, 21.
- (35) I.e., are they not synonymous?
- (36) The Heb., **צרות**, is the same as for 'troubles' above, and is used of the rival wives of one husband; cf. I Sam. I, 6.
- (37) In A.Z. 28b we are told that hot water must be used for a wasp's bite and cold for a scorpion's; the reverse is dangerous. When, therefore, both occur together there is no remedy.
- (38) According to Rashi, this refers to Eccl. XII, 14 and is an example of an apparently good deed which is really bad; for at an earlier stage the help rendered would have been of far greater and more enduring benefit. But according to Tosaf. this is an explanation of Deut. XXXI, 21 and is an instance of added trouble, illustrated in the following proverb. V. n. 9.
- (39) **תליתא**. Rashi renders: 'food which one brings in a basket', that is in time of distress; cf. Pes. III b. Tosaf. translates: 'when one is about to be hanged', and explains thus: A man is threatened with execution unless he offers a ransom; being poor, a small ransom would be accepted. But now the arrangement of a mortgage is offered him; this serves only to aggravate his misfortune, for the ransom price is raised. A third explanation is given by Maharsha a.l.
- (40) Deut. XXXI, 17.
- (41) I.e., the Children of Israel.
- (42) Ibid.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 5b

is not one of them. Said the Rabbis to Raba: To [our] master 'the hiding of the face' does not apply, and [the words] 'And they shall be devoured' do not apply! Said he to them: Do ye know then how much I send secretly to the Court of King Shapur?<sup>1</sup> Even so the Rabbis directed their eyes upon him.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile the Court of King Shapur sent [men], who plundered him.<sup>3</sup> He [then] said: This is it that is taught: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Wherever the Rabbis direct their eyes there is either death or poverty.

And I will hide My face in that day.<sup>4</sup> Raba said: Although I hide My face from them, I shall speak to them<sup>5</sup> in a dream.<sup>6</sup> R. Joseph: said: His hand is stretched over us, as it is said: And I have covered thee in the shadow of My hand.<sup>7</sup>

R. Joshua b. Hanania was [once] at the court of Caesar.<sup>8</sup> A certain unbeliever<sup>9</sup> showed him [by gestures]: A people whose Lord has turned His face from them — He showed him [in reply]: His hand is stretched over us. Said Caesar to R. Joshua: What did he show thee?—A people whose Lord has turned His face from them. And I showed him: His hand is stretched over us.

They [then] said to the heretic:<sup>10</sup> What didst thou show him? A people whose Lord has turned His face from them. And what did he show thee? — I do not know. Said they: A man who does not understand what he is being shown by gesture should hold converse in signs before the king! They led him forth and slew him.

When the soul of R. Joshua b. Hanania was about to go to its rest, the Rabbis said to him: What will become of us at the hands of the unbelievers? He answered them: Counsel is perished from the children,<sup>11</sup> their wisdom is vanished.<sup>12</sup> So soon as counsel is perished from the children,<sup>13</sup> the wisdom of the peoples of the world is vanished.<sup>14</sup> Or I may derive it from here: And he said: Let us take our journey, and let us go, and I will go over against thee.<sup>15</sup>

R. Ila was once walking up the stairs of the house of Rabbi b. Shila, when he heard a child reading the verse: For, lo, He that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what his conversation was.<sup>16</sup> He said: A slave Master declares to him his conversation, is there any remedy for him? — What is the meaning of [the expression] ‘What his conversation was’? — Rab said: Even the superfluous conversation<sup>17</sup> between a man and his wife is declared to a person in the hour of his death. But is it so? Now behold R. Kahana once lay down beneath the bed of Rab,<sup>18</sup> and he heard him converse and jest and perform his needs. [Thereupon] he said: The mouth of Rab is like that of one who has not tasted any food.<sup>19</sup> Said [Rab] to him: Kahana, get out, this is unseemly! — There is no contradiction: In the one case [it is] where he has to procure her favour, in the other, where he has no need to procure her favour.

But if ye will not hear it, My soul shall weep in secret for the pride.<sup>20</sup> R. Samuel b. Inia said in the name of Rab: The Holy One, blessed be He, has a place and its name is ‘Secret’. What is the meaning of [the expression] ‘for the pride’?—R. Samuel b. Isaac said: For the glory<sup>21</sup> that has been taken from them and given to the nations of the world. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: For the glory of the Kingdom of Heaven.<sup>22</sup> But is there any weeping in the presence of the Holy One, blessed be He? For behold R. Papa said: There is no grief in the Presence<sup>23</sup> of the Holy One blessed be He; for it is said: Honour and majesty are before Him; strength and beauty are it<sup>20</sup> His sanctuary!<sup>24</sup> — There is no contradiction; the one case [refers to] the inner chambers,<sup>25</sup> the other case [refers to] the outer chambers. But behold it is written: And in that day did the Lord, the God of Hosts, call to weeping and to lamentation, and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth!<sup>26</sup> — The destruction of the Temple is different, for even the angels of peace wept [over it]; for it is said: Behold for their altar<sup>27</sup> they cried without; the angels of peace wept bitterly.<sup>28</sup>

And mine eye shall drop tears and tears, and run down with tears, because the Lord's flock is carried away captive.<sup>29</sup> R. Eleazar said: Wherefore these three [expressions of] ‘tears’? One for the first Temple, and one for the second Temple, and one for Israel, who have become exiled from their place. But there are some who say: One for the neglect of [the study of] the Torah. This is all right according to the view that [one] is for Israel, who have become exiled from their place: this agrees with that which is written: ‘Because the Lord's flock is carried away captive’. But according to the view that it was for the neglect of [the study of] the Torah, how do you explain [the text], ‘Because the Lord's flock is carried away’? — Since Israel have become exiled from their place. you can have no greater neglect of [the study of] the Torah than this.

Our Rabbis taught: Over three the Holy One, blessed be He, weeps every day: over him who is able to occupy himself with [the study of] the Torah and does not; and over him who is unable to occupy himself with [the study of] the Torah and does; and over a leader who domineers over the community.

Rabbi was once holding the Book of Lamentations and reading therein: when he came to the verse, He hath cast down from heaven unto the earth,<sup>30</sup> it fell from his hands. He said: From a roof so high to a pit as deep!<sup>31</sup>

Rabbi and R. Hiyya were once going on a journey. When they came to a certain town, they said: If there is a rabbinical scholar here, we shall go and pay him our respect. They were told: There is a rabbinical scholar here<sup>32</sup> and he is blind.<sup>33</sup> Said R. Hiyya to Rabbi: Stay [here]; thou must not lower

thy princely dignity;<sup>34</sup> I shall go and visit him. But [Rabbi] took hold of him and went with him. When they were taking leave from him,<sup>35</sup> he said to them: Ye have visited one who is seen but does not see; may ye be granted to visit Him who sees but is not seen. Said [Rabbi to R. Hiyya]: If now [I had hearkened to you] you would have deprived me of this blessing. They [then] said to him: From whom didst thou hear this?<sup>36</sup> -I heard it at a discourse of R. Jacob's. For R. Jacob of Kefar Hitya,<sup>37</sup> used to visit his teacher every day. When he became old, the latter said to him: Let the master not trouble himself since he is unable. He replied: Is it a small thing that is written concerning the Rabbis? And he shall still live alway. he- shall not see the pit; when he seeth that wise man die.<sup>38</sup> Now if he who sees wise men at their death shall live, how much more so [he who sees them] in their life.

R. Idi, the father of R. Jacob b. Idi, used to spend three months on his journey and one day at the school;<sup>39</sup> and the Rabbis called him 'One day scholar'. So he became dispirited, and applied to himself the verse: I am as one that is a laughing-stock to his neighbour etc.<sup>40</sup> Said to him R. Johanan: I beg of you. do not bring down punishment upon the Rabbis. R. Johanan then went forth to the College and delivered the [following] exposition: Yet they seek Me day by day, and delight to know My ways.<sup>41</sup> Do they then seek Him by day, and do not seek Him by might? It comes to tell you. therefore, that whoever studies the Torah even one day in the year, Scripture accounts it to him as though he had studied the whole year through. And similarly in the case of punishment, for it is written: After the number of the days in which you spied out the land.<sup>42</sup> Did they then sin forty years? Was it not forty days that they sinned? It must come to teach you, therefore, that whoever commits transgression even one day in the year, Scripture accounts it to him as though he had transgressed the whole year through.

WHO IS [IN THIS RESPECT DEEMED] A MINOR? WHOEVER IS UNABLE TO RIDE ON HIS FATHER'S SHOULDERS etc. R. Zera demurred thereto:

(1) Also Sapor or Shapur II, son of Hormuzd, King of Persia C.E. 310-379. His accession preceded his birth; he warred against Rome. V. Gibbon, CC. 18, 24, 25; cf. also Ber. 56a, B.B. 115b and Pes. 54a.

(2) I.e., in suspicion; elsewhere in anger. cf. Ber. 38a, Shab. 34b.

(3) I.e., seized his property.

(4) Deut. XXXI, 18.

(5) Lit., 'to him' as in Num. XII, 6.

(6) According to Rashi, the inference is drawn from 'in that day'; but at night, in dreams, God would speak to them; cf. *ibid.* Maharsha prefers this explanation: God would deny them His 'face', I.e., the direct communion of Moses which was 'mouth to mouth', but He would still speak to them in dreams; cf. *ibid.* 6-7.

(7) Isa. LI, 16.

(8) I.e., Hadrian, v.J.E. vol. VII, pp. 290-292.

(9) אפיקורוס. Levy and others derive it from \*\* Epicurus, an Epicurean; Maimonides and Jast. connect with Heb. הפקר from rt. פקר. A term applied to unbelievers generally, Jew or Gentile. MS.M.: 'Min' (v. next note), a Jewish sectary, probably a Judeo-Christian. V. J.E. vol. I, pp. 665-666 and Vol. VIII, pp. 594-595.

(10) מין, probably from meaning 'species', hence sectarian. V. preceding note

(11) Or 'prudent' (E.V.).

(12) Jer. XLIX, 7' where it is a question.

(13) I.e.' Children of Israel.

(14) I.e., the polemics of the unbelievers will cease. [A somewhat roundabout way of saying that the Jewish religion would never want a defender so long as it was attacked'] Herford *op. cit.*, p. 266.

(15) Gen. XXXIII, 12. I.e., Esau (Gentiles and unbelievers generally) will keep abreast of Jacob (Israelites), but not gain advantage over him.

(16) Amos IV, 13. E.V. 'thought'.

(17) The 'jesting' referred to in the following story.

(18) Not to spy. but to learn from the Master's conduct; v. Ber. 62a.



- (19) I.e., he was ravenous in his desires like a newly-wed.
- (20) Jer. XIII, 17.
- (21) Lit., 'pride'.
- (22) Which suffers through Israel's downfall. Cf. Meg. 29 on Isa. II, 27, and Mekilta to Ex. XV, 2.
- (23) Lit., 'before', a euphemism for 'on the part of'.
- (24) Ps. XCVI, 6.
- (25) I.e., in the innermost recesses called 'Secret' there is weeping, though outwardly ('before him' v. n. 4) there is no sign of grief, only 'Honour etc.'
- (26) Isa. XXII, 12. 'Call' denotes publicly; grief, therefore, is to be found in 'the outer chambers'!
- (27) אַרְאֵלִים (E.V. 'their valiant ones cried without') is here connected with אַרְיֵאֵל (Isa. XXIX, 1), 'the altar hearth', Cf. Rashi to verse.
- (28) Isa. XXXIII, 7.
- (29) Jer. XIII, 17. E. V. 'And mine eye shall weep sore and run down down etc.'
- (30) Lam. II, 1.
- (31) I.e., how great was Israel's downfall, for what could be higher than heaven and lower than earth!
- (32) From root meaning 'to learn': lit., 'one that has caught fire by associating with Rabbis'; cf. Aboth, II, 10 (Jastrow). Or from root meaning 'to gather, establish' sc. halachoth (Levy).
- (33) Lit., 'Light of the eyes', a 'euphemism'.
- (34) Rabbi was the Nasi ('Prince') i.e., the president of the Sanhedrin.
- (35) I.e., the blind scholar.
- (36) I.e., that to visit a scholar is so meritorious.
- (37) Perhaps Hattin (Robinson, Bibl. Researches, iii, 34.) N.W. of Tiberias. V. also Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, p. 207.
- (38) Ps. XLIX, 10, 11.
- (39) It took him six months to travel to the school and back; in order to be with his family for the festivals of Passover (essentially a home festival) and Tabernacles (cf. Deut. XVI, 14) he was able to remain at the school only one day.
- (40) Job XII, 4.
- (41) Isa. LVIII, 2.
- (42) Num. XIV, 34. v. whole verse.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 6a

Who brought him thus far?<sup>1</sup> — Said Abaye to him: Thus far his mother brought him,<sup>2</sup> since she is bound to rejoice<sup>3</sup> [on the festival]; from here onward, if he is able to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount holding his father's hand, he is obligated, and if not, he is exempt.

Rabbi objected on behalf of Beth Hillel to the view of Beth Shammai: But Hannah went not up; for she said unto her husband: Until the child be weaned, when I will bring him up.<sup>4</sup> Now Samuel was [already] able to ride on his father's shoulders!<sup>5</sup> — Said his father<sup>6</sup> to him: But according to thy own reasoning there is a difficulty: was not Hannah herself bound to rejoice [on the festival]?<sup>7</sup> The explanation, therefore, must be that Hannah saw that Samuel was exceptionally delicate, and she feared that the journey might unduly fatigue Samuel.<sup>8</sup> R. Simeon<sup>9</sup> asked: What [is the law], according to the view of Beth Shammai, respecting a minor who is lame,<sup>10</sup> and according to both views, respecting one who is blind?<sup>11</sup> — What is the case? Shall one say that it is a case of a lame child who will never be able to walk,<sup>12</sup> and of a blind child who will never be able to see? Now [in such cases] a major is exempt, can there be any question about a minor?<sup>13</sup> — No, [the question] is necessary with respect to a lame child who may [eventually] be able to walk<sup>14</sup> and with respect to a blind child who may [eventually] be able to see. What [is the law then]? — Abaye said: Wherever a major is obligated according to the law of the Torah, we also initiate a minor according to Rabbinic law; wherever a major is exempt according to the law of the Torah, a minor is also exempt according to Rabbinic law.

BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THE PILGRIMAGE-OFFERING MUST BE WORTH [AT LEAST]

TWO PIECES OF SILVER etc. Our Rabbis taught: Beth Shammai say: The pilgrimage-offering [must be worth at least] two pieces of silver and the festal-offering one ma'ah of silver, because the pilgrimage-offering is offered up entirely to God,<sup>15</sup> which is not the case with regard to the festal-offering;<sup>16</sup> furthermore, we find that for the Festival of Weeks<sup>17</sup> Scripture has enjoined more burnt-offerings than peace-offerings.<sup>18</sup> But Beth Hillel say: The pilgrimage-offerings [must be at least] one ma'ah of silver and the festal-offering two pieces of silver, because the festal-offering obtained prior to the Revelation,<sup>19</sup> which is not the case with regard to the pilgrimage-offering. Furthermore, we find that in the case of 'the princes',<sup>20</sup> Scripture enjoined more peace-offerings than burnt-offerings.

Now why do not Beth Hillel agree with Beth Shammai? — As for your saying that the pilgrimage-offering is more important because it is entirely offered up to God, on the contrary, the festal-offering is more important, because in it there are two meals.<sup>21</sup> And as for your saying that we should learn by analogy from the Feast of Weeks, [I contend that] we should form an analogy between the offering of an individual and the offering of an individual,<sup>22</sup> but we should not form an analogy between the offering of an individual and an offering of the community.<sup>23</sup> And why do not Beth Shammai agree with Beth Hillel? — As for your saying that the festal-offering is more important because it obtained prior to the Revelation, [I contend] that the pilgrimage-offering also obtained prior to the Revelation.<sup>24</sup> And as for your saying that we should learn by analogy from 'the princes'. [I contend that] we have to form an analogy between something that applies to [future] generations<sup>25</sup> and something [else] that applies to [future] generations;<sup>26</sup> but we should not form an analogy between something that applies to [future] generations and something that does not apply to [future] generations.<sup>27</sup> Now according to Beth Hillel, why is the festal-offering singled out as obtaining prior to the Revelation? Because it is written: And they sacrificed sacrifices of peace-offerings.<sup>28</sup> Surely the pilgrimage-offerings must also [have been offered up then]; [for] behold, it is written: And they offered burnt-offerings!<sup>29</sup> — Beth Hillel are of the opinion that the burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the 'continual burnt-offering'.<sup>30</sup> And Beth Shammai? — They are of the opinion that the burnt-offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was a pilgrimage-offering.<sup>31</sup>

Abaye said: Beth Shammai and R. Eleazar and R. Ishmael are all of the opinion that the burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness was a pilgrimage-offering. And Beth Hillel and R. Akiba and R. Jose the Galilean are all of the opinion that the burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the 'continual burnt-offering'. 'Beth Shammai', as we have said [above]. 'R. Ishmael', for it is taught: R. Ishmael said: The general directions were given at Sinai,<sup>32</sup>

---

(1) I.e., from his house to Jerusalem. The fact that he could travel to Jerusalem shows that he is old enough to do without his mother; at that age he is also old enough to be able to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount by holding his father's hand. What point, therefore, is there in defining a minor as one that is unable even with the aid of his father to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount, when the prior journey to Jerusalem shows that he is old enough to do this and therefore no longer a minor?

(2) Thus the assumption that he was old enough to do without his mother is wrong.

(3) I.e., in order to fulfil the commandment to rejoice she must go to Jerusalem (cf. Deut. XIV, 26); but she is not subject to the commandment to appear before the Lord on the Temple Mount.

(4) I Sam. I, 22. According to the Talmud a child is weaned at the end of 24 months.

(5) According to Rashi a child can do that at the end of a year. The Shammaite view, therefore, must be wrong.

(6) The other reading, Abaye, is an anachronism; [unless we read 'Said Abaye' omitting 'to him'.]

(7) She ought therefore to have gone up to the Sanctuary (then at Shiloh) and taken Samuel with her even before he was weaned.

(8) Thus the case of Samuel cannot be regarded as a support for the Hillelite view.

(9) I.e., R. Simeon b. Lakish, v. Pes. 119a.

(10) Beth Shammai require a child to go up to the Temple (as part of his initiation or religious training) as soon as he can do so by riding on his father's shoulders. Since the lame child could go up to the Temple Mount in this manner, is he bound to do this? But the question is not applicable to Beth Hillel, because they require the child to be able to walk.

(11) This question is applicable to Beth Hillel, too, because the blind child could go up the Temple Mount by holding his father's hand.

(12) Lit., 'become straight'.

(13) His initiation would serve no purpose, for even on becoming of age he will be exempt.

(14) I.e., before he becomes of age. The question is: must we train him now because when he grows up he will be fit and therefore bound to 'appear', or shall we exempt him on account of his present defects?

(15) Lit., 'the Most-High'.

(16) Which is partly burnt, and partly eaten by pilgrims and priests.

(17) This is the Talmudic sense of **עצרת**; but in the Bible it means (a) a general assemblage (e.g. Jer. IX, 1) (b) a sacred assembly (e.g. Isa. I, 13), but especially the last day of Passover (Deut. XVI, 8) or of Tabernacles (Lev. XXIII, 36, Num. XXIX, 35).

(18) V. Lev. XXIII, 18, 19: the festal offering (**הגִּידָה**) belonged to the class of peace-offerings (**שְׁלָמִים**); v. supra n. 2.

(19) V. Ex. XXIV, 5, which is taken to refer to a time prior to the Revelation though it occurs after the Decalogue; cf. Shab. 88a, where the building of the altar and the offering of sacrifices thereon by 'the young men of the children of Israel', (taken by the Rabbis to be the firstborn) is said to have taken place on the fifth Sivan, a day before the Revelation.

(20) I.e., the heads of the tribes mentioned at the dedication of the altar in Tabernacles; v. Num. VII, 87,88.

(21) For the altar and for man.

(22) I.e., the pilgrimage and festal-offerings which were private offerings should be compared with the offerings of 'the princes', which were also private offerings.

(23) I.e., the offerings prescribed for the Feast of Weeks, which were provided from the Temple treasury.

(24) V. Ex. XXIV, 5.

(25) I.e., the pilgrimage and festal-offerings.

(26) I.e., the public offerings of the Feast of Weeks.

(27) I.e., the prince's offerings.

(28) Ibid.

(29) Ibid. The pilgrimage-offering was a burnt-offering.

(30) V. Num. XXVIII, 2-6: this was a daily public offering from which no inference could be drawn regarding the pilgrimage-offerings.

(31) Because the expression 'they saw God' (Ex. XXIV, 11) which, being similar to the expression 'shall appear' (Ex. XXIII, 17). is taken to imply that it was offered as a pilgrimage celebration.

(32) I.e., many precepts were left vague at Sinai, which were explained in full detail after the erection of the Tabernacle; cf., for example, Ex. XX, 24 with the detailed instructions concerning the sacrifices in Lev. I-VII.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 6b

and the details in the Tent of Meeting.<sup>1</sup> But R. Akiba said: The general directions and the details were given at Sinai<sup>2</sup> and repeated in the Tent of Meeting and enjoined a third time in the Plains of Moab.<sup>3</sup> Now if you suppose that the burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the [statutory] continual burnt-offering<sup>4</sup>, is it possible for a sacrifice not to require flaying and dissection at first<sup>5</sup> and later to require flaying and dissection?<sup>6</sup>

'R. Eleazar', for it was taught: It is it continual burnt-offering, which was offered in Mount Sinai.<sup>7</sup> R. Eleazar said: The manner of its offering was enjoined at Sinai, but it was not actually offered up.<sup>8</sup> R. Akiba said: It was offered up and was never discontinued. But how am I to explain [the verse]: Did you bring unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?<sup>9</sup> — The tribe of Levi, who were not guilty of idol worship.<sup>10</sup> offered them up.<sup>11</sup>

‘Beth Hillel’, as we have said [above]. ‘R. Akiba’, also, as we have said [above]. ‘R. Jose the Galilean’, for it is taught: R. Jose the Galilean said: Three precepts are enjoined upon Israel when they make their pilgrimage at a festival: the pilgrimage-offering and the festal-offering and the rejoicing.<sup>12</sup> The pilgrimage-offering has something that the other two have not,<sup>13</sup> and the festal-offering has something that the other two have not; and the rejoicing has something that the other two have not. The pilgrimage-offering has something that the other two have not, for the pilgrimage-offering is offered entirely to God, which is not the case with the other two. The festal-offering has something that the other two have not, for the festal-offering obtained prior to the Revelation,<sup>14</sup> which was not the case with the other two. The rejoicing has something which the other two have not, for the rejoicing applies to both men and women,<sup>15</sup> which is not the case with the other two.<sup>16</sup>

With reference to R. Ishmael, why do you represent him as agreeing with Beth Shammai?<sup>17</sup> [Because you argue]: If it were supposed that the burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the continual burnt-offering, is it possible for a sacrifice not to require flaying and dissection at first and later to require flaying and dissection? But behold R. Jose the Galilean said [distinctly]<sup>18</sup> that the burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the continual burnt-offering; [and yet he held that] at first it did not require flaying and dissection, and later it did require flaying and dissection. For it is taught: R. Jose the Galilean said: The burnt-offering which the Israelites offered in the wilderness did not require flaying and dissection, because flaying and dissection came into force only from [the erection of] the Tent of Meeting onward!<sup>19</sup> — Strike out R. Ishmael from here.<sup>20</sup>

R. Hisda asked: How is this verse to be understood: And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings [namely] lambs, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord?<sup>21</sup> Or Perhaps both were oxen?<sup>22</sup> What difference does it make? Mar Zutra said: In regard to the punctuation.<sup>23</sup> R. Abba, the son of Raba, said: In regard to one who says: I vow [to offer] a burnt-offering like the burnt-offering which Israel offered in the wilderness. What [must he offer]? Were they oxen or lambs? — It remains [undecided].

We have learnt elsewhere:<sup>24</sup> The following things

---

(1) Cf. Lev. I, 1.

(2) Though not mentioned in connection with the Revelation but in other parts of the Torah e.g.. Leviticus.

(3) Cf. Deut. I, 5f.

(4) Enjoined by God for all time, and not offered by individuals at their own discretion as pilgrimage-offerings.

(5) Since, according to R. Ishmael, the laws of flaying and dissection as details were laid down only at the Tent of Meeting.

(6) The burnt-offerings mentioned in Ex. XXIV, 5, before the Revelation at the Tent of Meeting, were offered up whole, whilst the continual burnt-offering. like all burnt-offerings, required flaying and dissection, v. Lev. I, 6; therefore it must be pilgrimage-offerings that are referred to in Ex. XXIV, which they offered on their own accord and which were consequently not subject to any of the detailed laws governing burnt-offerings (Rashi).

(7) Num. XXVIII, 6.

(8) Thus the burnt-offerings brought by the ‘young men’ (Ex. XXIV, 5) must have been pilgrimage-offerings.

(9) Amos V, 25. This implies, contrary to R. Akiba's view, that in the wilderness the regular public sacrifices were not offered, because Israel was under divine censure.

(10) Cf. Ex. XXXII, 26.

(11) I.e., they offered the continual burnt-offerings at their own expense (Rashi).

(12) The spirit of festive joy was expressed by a sacrificial feast; if the offerings brought in fulfillment of vows, as free-will gifts or as tithe, did not suffice for all, additional peace-offerings had to be brought as offerings of rejoicing.

(13) I.e., is superior in a certain respect to the other two.

(14) The peace-offerings which the ‘young men’ also offered at Sinai (Ex. XXIV,5) though not offered on a festival, are

called festal-offerings (הגִּיגָה) because they were the fulfilment of Ex. V, 1. As R. Jose holds that the pilgrimage-offerings were not prior to the Revelation, he is in agreement with Beth Hillel.

(15) V. Deut. XIV, 26. The Tosefta reading is: For the offerings of rejoicing can be offered during any of the seven days' **שְׁבַע יָמֵי לֵיל תְּשִׁלּוּמֵי כָל שְׁבַע יָמֵי**

(16) Which, being precepts not expressly enjoined upon women, and being dependent on a fixed time (v. p. 13, n. 4) are incumbent on men only.

(17) The question is against Abaye's statement above (p. 28): since the Hillelite view is the more authoritative, Abaye should avoid representing R. Ishmael as agreeing with Beth Shammai.

(18) I.e., it is clearly inferred from the Baraitha just quoted.

(19) Thus the reasoning which sought to make R. Ishmael agree with Beth Shammai is wrong.

(20) I.e., from the list of those who hold the Shammaite view.

(21) Ex. XXIV, 5.

(22) I.e., the burnt-offerings as well as the peace-offering.

(23) **פִּיּוּסוֹק טַעֲמִים**. According to Rashi, the Neginoth or cantillation signs are referred to: the first interpretation would require the word **עֲלֹת** to have a disjunctive accent (e.g.. ethnahta, as in our texts), and the second would require a conjunctive accent (e.g.. Pashta or Rebia'). But actually the Neginoth are of Post-Talmudic origin; v. J.E. Vol. I p. 157, 6, prg. 7. For doubtful verse-division cf. also Yoma 5a-b. V. also Ned., Sonc. ed., p. 113, n. 5.

(24) Pe'ah. I, 1.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 7a

have no prescribed limit:<sup>1</sup> the [crop of the] corner of a field [to be left for the poor],<sup>2</sup> the first fruits,<sup>3</sup> the visiting of the Temple [Re'ayon],<sup>4</sup> deeds of loving-kindness,<sup>5</sup> and the study of the Torah. R. Johanan said: We were of the opinion that the visiting of the Temple [with an offering] had no maximum limit, but that it had a minimum limit,<sup>6</sup> till R. Oshaya Berabbi<sup>7</sup> came and taught that the visiting of the Temple [with an offering] has no maximum nor minimum limit.<sup>8</sup> But the Sages said: The pilgrimage-offering<sup>9</sup> must be worth [at least] one ma'ah of silver and the festal-offering two pieces of silver.

What is meant by Re'ayon? — R. Johanan says: [It means] appearing<sup>10</sup> in the Temple Court.<sup>11</sup> Resh Lakish says: [It means] appearing with a sacrifice.<sup>12</sup> Concerning the first day<sup>13</sup> of the Festival, all are agreed that the visit must be accompanied by an offering; they differ only with regard to the other days of the festival. [Further] if a man brings [an offering] every time that he comes, all are agreed that we are to accept it from him; they differ only with regard to a man who comes and does not bring [an offering]. R. Johanan is of the opinion that [Re'ayon means] appearing at the Temple Court; he need not therefore bring [an offering] whenever he comes. Resh Lakish says: [Re'ayon means] appearing with an offering; thus he must bring [an offering] whenever he comes.

Resh Lakish put an objection to R. Johanan. [It is written]: None shall appear before Me empty!<sup>14</sup> — He replied to him: [This refers] to the first day of the Festival.<sup>15</sup>

He [again] put an objection to him: 'None shall appear before Me empty': [this means one must bring] animal sacrifices.<sup>16</sup> You say, animal sacrifices, but perhaps [it means] birds or meal-offerings? [Nay], you may deduce it by analogy. A festal-offering is prescribed for man<sup>17</sup> and a pilgrimage-offering is prescribed for God:<sup>18</sup> just as the festal-offering prescribed for man is an animal sacrifice,<sup>19</sup> so the pilgrimage-offering prescribed for God is an animal sacrifice. And what is meant by animal sacrifices? Burnt-offerings. You say burnt-offerings, but perhaps [it means] peace-offerings? [Nay], you may deduce it by analogy: a festal-offering is prescribed for man and a pilgrimage-offering is prescribed for God: just as the festal-offering which is prescribed for man is one that is fitting<sup>20</sup> for him, so the pilgrimage-offering which is prescribed for God must be one that is fitting<sup>21</sup> for Him. And so it is right, that your table should not be full and the table of the Master empty!<sup>22</sup> — He replied: [This refers] to the first day of the festival.

[Again] he Put an objection to him: R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Three times in the year were the Israelites commanded to go on pilgrimage: on the Feast of Unleavened Bread, on the Feast of Weeks and on the Feast of Booths; and they must not appear in divisions,<sup>23</sup> for it is said: All thy males;<sup>24</sup> and they must not appear empty-handed for it is said: None shall appear before Me empty!<sup>25</sup> — He replied: [This refers] to the first day of the festival.

R. Johanan put an objection to Resh Lakish: [It is written]: Yir'eh [He will see]. Yera'eh [He will be seen];<sup>26</sup> just as I [come] free,<sup>27</sup> so you [come] free! — All, therefore, must agree that if a person comes and does not bring [an offering] that he may enter [the Temple Court] and present himself and go out.<sup>28</sup> They differ only with regard to a person who comes and brings [an offering]. R. Johanan, who says [Re'ayon means] appearing in the Temple Court, [holds] that there is no limit to 'appearing', but that there is a limit to the offerings. And Resh Lakish says: [Re'ayon means] appearing with an offering; thus there is no limit to the offerings either. R. Johanan put an objection to him: [It is written]: Let thy foot be seldom in thy Friend's house!<sup>29</sup> — There it refers to sin-offerings.<sup>30</sup> as R. Levi [taught]. For R. Levi pointed to a contradiction; it is written: 'Let thy foot be seldom in thy Friend's house', and it is written: I will come into Thy house with burnt-offerings!<sup>31</sup> There is no contradiction: the one case refers to sin-offerings and trespass-offerings; the other case refers to burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. It has also been taught thus: 'Let thy foot be seldom in thy Friend's house': the verse speaks of sin-offerings and trespass-offerings. You say of sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, but perhaps it is of nought but burnt-offerings and peace-offerings? When it says: 'I will come to Thy house with burnt-offerings, I will perform unto Thee my vows', behold burnt-offerings and peace-offerings are mentioned; how now shall I explain [the verse]: 'Let thy foot be seldom in thy Friend's house'? The verse speaks of sin-offerings and trespass-offerings.

'And they must not appear in divisions etc.' R. Joseph thought to explain it [thus]: If a man has ten sons, they should not make the pilgrimage five one day and five the next day.<sup>32</sup>

(1) I.e., fixed by Scripture.

(2) V. Lev. XIX, 9 and XXIII, 22; the Rabbis fixed the minimum at a sixtieth of the field.

(3) Deut. XXVI, 1-11.

(4) ראיין, ראיין or ראיין lit., 'appearing' sc. at the Temple Court; secondarily, it means the sacrifice brought on the occasion of the Temple visit; cf. end of page, and p. 1, n. 1.

(5) It includes all deeds of kindness; but for almsgiving the Rabbis prescribed a limit, v. Keth. 50a.

(6) prescribed by Scripture i.e., the ma'ah or two ma'ahs mentioned in the Mishnah.

(7) ברבי: According to Rashi, 'great in his generation, i.e., eminent; according to Levy and Jastrow, 'belonging to a school of an eminent teacher' (contra. of בי רבי); a title of scholars, most frequently applied to disciples of R. Judah ha-Nasi and his contemporaries, but also to some of his predecessors and sometimes to the first Amoraim; v. Naz., Sonc. ed., p. 64, n. 1.

(8) V. p. 31. n. 7.

(9) Heb. ראיה v. n. 5, and p. 31, n. 10.

(10) The different form of the word implies a different meaning from ראיה; the latter in this context would mean 'the (cost of the) pilgrimage burnt-offering'; the former signifies 'appearing' in the Temple.

(11) I.e., there is no limit to the number of visits, but only one sacrifice need be brought.

(12) I.e., however many visits are made to the Temple Court a sacrifice must be brought every time.

(13) Lit., 'the essential part'.

(14) Ex. XXIII, 15. Thus the visitor to the Temple must always bring an offering.

(15) But on all subsequent visits no offering need be brought.

(16) זבחים signifies sacrifices slaughtered with a knife, i.e., בהמות ('beasts') in contradistinction to עופות ('birds'), for which מליקה ('pinching the neck with finger nail') is prescribed.

(17) הדיוט Grk. \*\* a private man (as opposed to a priest, officer etc.), a commoner; ignoble, ignorant (Jast.). Here it means the pilgrim (as opposed to God), for whom the festal-offering was intended to provide the festive meal.

- (18) Lit., 'the Most High'. The words 'before Me' (in Ex. XXIII, 15) imply that the pilgrimage-offering was prescribed primarily as a sacrifice to God in contradistinction to the festal-offering which was to provide food for the worshipper.
- (19) Cf. Ex. XXIII, 18 where **הֶלֶב הַגִּי** ('the fat of any festal-offering') implies that it was an animal, for birds have no **הֶלֶב**, fat to be burnt on the altar.
- (20) I.e., it provides him with meat for his feast.
- (21) I.e., a burnt-offering.
- (22) Thus an offering should be brought on each visit to the Temple, which refutes R. Johanan.
- (23) Lit., 'by halves'. Explained infra p. 34.
- (24) Ex. XXIII, 17.
- (25) This apparently supports Resh Lakish.
- (26) V. p. 3, n. 3.
- (27) I.e., without sacrifices.
- (28) This new view of the controversy shows that the previous arguments between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish were not actually advanced by the Rabbis named but by later scholars, v. Tosaf. Bek. 4b, s.v. **אֵינְם**,
- (29) Prov. XXV, 17. I.e., one should not bring too many sacrifices to the House of God. There is possibly a play here on the word **רֶגֶל** which means 'foot' and also 'pilgrimage-festival'. For the term 'Friend' understood of God, cf. the terms of endearment in Cant. which the Rabbis interpreted as expressing the loving relationship between Israel and God.
- (30) I.e., the verse means: Avoid the necessity of bringing sin-offerings.
- (31) Ps. LXVI, 13. Thus it is good to bring sacrifices.
- (32) Taking **לְחֵצַיִן** literally. i.e., 'by halves'.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 7b

Said Abaye to him: This is obvious; which of them would you make transgressors and which of them would you make zealous?<sup>1</sup> What then is the purpose of the verse?<sup>2</sup> To intimate the teaching of 'Others'.<sup>3</sup> For it is taught: 'Others' Say: The scraper, the copper-smith and the tanner are exempt from appearing [at the Temple]; for it is said, 'All thy males': he who is able to go on the pilgrimage with 'all thy males'; these [then] are excluded, because they are unable to go up with all thy males.<sup>4</sup>

MISHNAH. BURNT-OFFERINGS DURING THE MID-FESTIVAL<sup>5</sup> ARE TO BE BROUGHT FROM [ANIMALS BOUGHT WITH] UNCONSECRATED MONEY,<sup>6</sup> AND PEACE-OFFERINGS,<sup>7</sup> [ALSO] FROM [ANIMALS BOUGHT WITH SECOND] TITHE MONEY.<sup>8</sup> ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF PASSOVER, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: [THEY MUST BE BROUGHT] FROM [ANIMALS BOUGHT WITH] UNCONSECRATED MONEY; AND BETH HILLEL SAY: [THEY CAN BE BROUGHT ALSO] FROM [ANIMALS BOUGHT WITH SECOND] TITHE MONEY. ISRAELITES<sup>9</sup> MAY FULFIL THEIR OBLIGATION<sup>10</sup> WITH VOW-OFFERINGS, FREEWILL-OFFERINGS<sup>11</sup> AND TITHE OF CATTLE;<sup>12</sup> AND THE PRIESTS WITH SIN-OFFERINGS AND TRESPASS-OFFERINGS.<sup>13</sup> FIRSTLINGS,<sup>14</sup> THE BREAST AND THE SHOULDER,<sup>15</sup> BUT NOT WITH BIRD-OFFERINGS,<sup>16</sup> NOR MEAL-OFFERINGS.<sup>17</sup>

GEMARA. Accordingly, it is during the mid-festival only that burnt-offerings are brought from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money, but on the festival [they may be brought] also from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money. [But] why? It is obligatory, and everything that is obligatory must be brought from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money! And if you say: It comes to teach us this, [to wit,] that burnt-offerings can be brought during the mid-festival but not on the festival;<sup>18</sup> then this will be according to Beth Shammai!<sup>19</sup> For we have learnt: Beth Shammai say. One may bring peace-offerings [on the festival]<sup>20</sup> without laying the hands<sup>21</sup> upon them; but not burnt-offerings.<sup>22</sup> But Beth Hillel say, One may bring peace-offerings and burnt-offerings [on the festival] and lay the hands upon them!<sup>23</sup> — [Our Mishnah] is defective, and it should read thus: Burnt-offerings, vow-offerings and freewill-offerings are brought during the mid-festival, but they may not be brought on the festival.<sup>24</sup> But the pilgrimage burnt-offering is brought even on the

festival;<sup>25</sup> and when it is brought,<sup>26</sup> it must be brought only from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money; but the peace-offerings of rejoicing can be brought also from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money.<sup>27</sup> And regarding the festal-offering of the first festival day of Passover, Beth Shammai say: [It must be brought from animals bought with] unconsecrated money; and Beth Hillel say: [It can be brought] also from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money.<sup>28</sup> It has also been taught thus: Burnt-offerings, vow-offerings and freewill-offerings are brought during the mid-festival but not on the festival. But the pilgrimage burnt-offering is brought even on the festival; and when it is brought, it is brought only from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money; but the peace-offerings of rejoicing can be brought also from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money. And regarding the festal-offering of the first festival day of Passover,<sup>29</sup> Beth Shammai say: [It must be brought] from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money; but Beth Hillel say: [It can be brought] also from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money. Why is the festal-offering of the first festival day of Passover different?<sup>30</sup> — It comes to teach us this: Only the festival-offering of the fifteenth [of Nisan must be brought from animals bought with unconsecrated money] but not the festal-offering of the fourteenth [of Nisan].<sup>31</sup>

- 
- (1) All the ten are bound to visit the Temple on the first day; if, now, five at a time went up, the first group would be doing their duty scrupulously and the second five would be remiss.
- (2) ‘All thy males,’ teaching that they must not appear in divisions.
- (3) V. p. 14, n. 5.
- (4) ‘They must not appear in divisions’ means, therefore, that all the Israelites must form one group; if the scraper etc. were to go on the pilgrimage they would have to form, because of their malodour, a separate group, which is forbidden.
- (5) מועד lit., ‘appointed time,’ i.e., the intermediate days of Passover and Sukkoth as opposed to יום טוב, festival days (called in the Bible מקרא קדש ‘holy convocation’). In the Bible מועד includes both festival and intermediate days, cf. e.g. Lev. XXIII, 4.
- (6) As opposed to animals bought with Second Tithe money (v. infra, n. 8). All obligatory offerings had to be brought from unconsecrated animals (cf. Men. 82a and infra p. 36).
- (7) Brought to provide sufficient meat for the pilgrim and his family so that they might keep the festival with rejoicing (cf. Deut. XIV, 26).
- (8) Cf. Deut. XIV, 22f. The tithe was separated in the first, second, fourth and fifth year of the seven year cycle, after terumah (‘heave-offering’) had been given to the Priest and First Tithe to the Levite. It was to be consumed in Jerusalem or the money with which it was redeemed spent there (v. Danby, P. 73, n. 6).
- (9) As opposed to priests.
- (10) I.e., of ‘rejoicing’ on the festival by offering peace-offerings wherewith to provide themselves with meat for the feast. Thus it is unnecessary to bring special sacrifices for this purpose, if the vow-offerings etc. provide sufficient for the family's needs.
- (11) Cf. Mishnah Meg. I, 6.
- (12) V. Lev. VII, 31-39.
- (13) Brought by pilgrims and of which only the priests may eat; v. Num. XVIII, 9f.
- (14) V. ibid. 17-19.
- (15) V. Lev. VII, 29f.
- (16) They were sin-offerings.
- (17) V. Lev. II, 1. The bird and meal-offerings would not provide a feast suited to the occasion of rejoicing.
- (18) I.e., it is forbidden to offer the pilgrimage burnt-offerings on the festival (when all manner of work is prohibited), even though it is an obligatory offering of the festival, because there is time to bring the offering the next day.
- (19) Whose opinion is invalid against that of Beth Hillel.
- (20) Because they supply the pilgrim with his feast.
- (21) Cf. Lev. III, 2 and infra 16a. The act of laying on of the hands, which causes the pilgrim to support himself on the animal, is forbidden by the Rabbis on Festival and Sabbath on account of shebuth (‘abstention, rest’, v. Glos.) i.e., it is an action out of keeping with the restful character of the holy day. though it is not actually included in one of the thirty-nine categories of labour (v. Mishnah Shab. VII, 2) and cf. Mishnah Bez. V, 2.
- (22) Exceptions were the continual burnt-offerings and the additional offerings, which were permitted to be offered



because they had an appointed time (cf. Num. XXVIII, 2 **במועדו**); otherwise, Beth Shammai explained 'unto you' in Ex. XII, 16 to mean: for yourselves offer sacrifices but not entirely for God.

(23) Since it is permitted to bring them, the laying on of the hands is also permitted. V. Bez. 19b.

(24) Even according to Beth Hillel.

(25) Though it could be brought during the mid-festival, Lev. XXIII, 4 ('and ye shall keep it a feast') is taken by Beth Hillel to imply that it should be offered on the first day of the festival.

(26) [Wilna Gaon emends 'when they are brought' referring to all the mentioned offerings].

(27) V. p. 36, n. 1, and infra p. 39.

(28) Explained infra.

(29) As distinct from the festal-offering of the fourteenth of Nisan; v. next note.

(30) I.e., why is it specifically mentioned?

(31) If the paschal lamb did not suffice for the company a festal-offering could be sacrificed in addition (cf. Sifre to Deut. XVI, 2 and Pes. 69b). This festival-offering was not obligatory, hence even Beth Shammai would agree that it could be brought from the Second Tithe.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 8a

Thus he holds that the festal-offering of the fourteenth [of Nisan] is not enjoined by the Torah.

The Master said [above]: 'Beth Hillel say: [The festal-offering of the first day of the festival can be brought also] from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money'. Why? It is obligatory, and everything that is obligatory must be brought only from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money!<sup>1</sup> — 'Ulla said: When he supplements [the unconsecrated by that of the Second Tithe].<sup>2</sup> Hezekiah said: One animal may be supplemented by another animal, but money may not be supplemented by money. And R. Johanan said: Money may be supplemented by money, but one animal may not be supplemented by another animal. There is a teaching agreeing with Hezekiah and there is a teaching agreeing with R. Johanan. There is a teaching agreeing with R. Johanan: [it is written]: After the tribute,<sup>3</sup> this teaches that a man must bring his obligatory offering from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money. And whence [do we know] that if he desires to mix he may mix?<sup>4</sup> The text teaches: According as the Lord, thy God, shall bless thee.<sup>5</sup> There is a teaching agreeing with Hezekiah: [The expression] 'after the tribute' teaches that a man may bring his obligatory offering from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money. Beth Shammai say: The first [festival] day from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money.<sup>6</sup> thenceforward<sup>7</sup> [also] from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money. Beth Hillel say: The first meal<sup>8</sup> from [animals bought with] unconsecrated money. thenceforward<sup>9</sup> from [animals bought with Second] Tithe money. And the remaining days of Passover, a man may fulfil his obligation<sup>10</sup> [also] with the tithe of cattle.<sup>11</sup> Why may he not [do so] on the festival?<sup>12</sup> — R. Ashi said: Lest he come to separate tithe on the festival; and it is impossible to separate tithe on the festival on account of the [marking with] red paint.<sup>13</sup> What evidence is there that the [word] 'tribute' indicates that which is unconsecrated? — Because it is written: And the King Ahasuerus laid tribute upon the land.<sup>14</sup>

ISRAELITES MAY FULFIL THEIR OBLIGATION WITH VOW-OFFERINGS AND FREEWILL-OFFERINGS. Our Rabbis taught: [It is written], And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast.<sup>15</sup> This includes all kinds of rejoicings as [festival] rejoicing.<sup>16</sup> Hence the Sages said: Israelites may fulfil their obligation with vow-offerings, freewill-offerings and tithe of cattle; and the priests with sin-offering and guilt-offering, and with firstlings, and with the breast and the shoulder; one might [think] also with bird-offerings and meal-offerings, [therefore] Scripture teaches: 'And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast'.

---

(1) Cf. p. 36.

(2) If he has a large company and the festival-offering from his unconsecrated means (**וְהוֹלִי**) will not suffice, he is permitted to add thereto from the Second Tithe: according to Hezekiah, it means that he may purchase other

festival-offerings with Second Tithe money; according to R. Johanan, he may add Second Tithe money in order to purchase a larger animal. The former deems it better that one should satisfy one's obligation to bring the festival-offering from unconsecrated means by bringing therefrom a complete offering i.e., the first, though by itself inadequate for the company; the latter prefers that every morsel of the festival-offering should contain a percentage purchased with unconsecrated money (Rashi). Tosaf. explains that R. Johanan objects to 'dividing one's obligation' by spreading it over two animals.

(3) Deut. XVI, 10.

(4) The expression 'mix' supports R. Johanan, because it is applicable to money and not to animals.

(5) Ibid. I.e., with both unconsecrated and consecrated means.

(6) Because it is obligatory then.

(7) Though still termed festival-offerings, they are really peace-offerings of rejoicing.

(8) I.e., the first festal-offering.

(9) Even on the same day.

(10) 'To rejoice'.

(11) And also of course with offerings bought with Second Tithe money.

(12) I.e., satisfy his obligation after the first meal with tithe cattle, just as he may buy an offering with Second Tithe money.

(13) Every tenth animal was designated as tithe by being marked with red paint (Bek. IX, 7); on a holy day painting, being regarded as work, is prohibited.

(14) Esth. X, 1. The word used here **בִּמְדָּ**, and **בִּמְדָּ** in Deut. XVI, 10 are from the same root.

(15) Deut. XVI, 14, which refers to Sukkoth, but by analogy is applicable to each of the three pilgrim festivals.

(16) I.e., the precept to rejoice can be fulfilled only by having meat at the feast (cf. Pes. 119a), but the flesh of any kind of sacrifice will do.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 8b

only with those [offerings] from which the festal-offering can be brought;<sup>1</sup> these, then, are excluded Since the festal-offering cannot be brought from them. R. Ashi said: It is to be deduced from [the expression]. 'And thou shalt rejoice'; these, then, are excluded because there is no [festive] joy in them. But what does R. Ashi do with [the expression]. 'in thy feast'.<sup>2</sup> — To intimate what R. Daniel b. Kattina learnt. For R. Daniel b. Kattina said that Rab said: Whence [is it derived] that marriages<sup>3</sup> may not take place during the mid-festival? Because it is said: 'And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast', but not in thy wife.<sup>4</sup>

MISHNAH. HE THAT HAS MANY TO EAT [WITH HIM] AND FEW POSSESSIONS,<sup>5</sup> OFFERS MANY PEACE-OFFERINGS AND FEW BURNT-OFFERINGS,<sup>6</sup> [HE THAT HAS] MANY POSSESSIONS AND FEW TO EAT [WITH HIM] BRINGS MANY BURNT-OFFERINGS<sup>7</sup> AND FEW PEACE-OFFERINGS. [HE THAT HAS] FEW OF EITHER, FOR HIM IS PRESCRIBED:<sup>8</sup> ONE MA'AH OF SILVER', 'TWO PIECES OF SILVER'.<sup>9</sup> HE THAT HAS MANY OF BOTH, OF HIM IT IS SAID: EVERY MAN SHALL GIVE AS HE IS ABLE, ACCORDING TO THE BLESSING OF THE LORD THY GOD, WHICH HE HATH GIVEN THEE.<sup>10</sup>

GEMARA. Whence shall he bring many peace-offerings? Behold He has not! — Said R. Hisda: He may supplement [unconsecrated money with Second Tithe money] and bring a large bull.<sup>11</sup> Said R. Shesheth to him: Behold they said: One may supplement beast with beast! What did he mean? Should one say he meant this: Behold they said: One may supplement beast with beast, but not money with money; then he should say to him: One may not supplement money with money!<sup>12</sup> — He must, therefore, have meant this: Behold they said: One may also supplement beast with beast!<sup>13</sup> According to whom will this be? It will be neither according to Hezekiah nor according to R. Johanan.<sup>14</sup> And should you say: It is only the Amoraim<sup>15</sup> who differ [about it],<sup>16</sup> but the Baraitas<sup>17</sup> do not differ;<sup>18</sup> but behold it says: The first meal must come from unconsecrated money!<sup>19</sup> — The

first meal means that the amount of the value of a first meal<sup>20</sup> must be from unconsecrated money.<sup>21</sup>

‘Ulla said that Resh Lakish said: If a man set aside ten beasts for his festal-offering [and] he offered up five on the first day of the festival, he may offer up the other five on the second day of the festival;<sup>22</sup> R. Johanan said: Since he has interrupted [the offer- above) and not leave R. Hisda to infer what is prohibited from a statement of what is permitted. ings]. he cannot offer any more. R. Abba said: But they do not differ: the one speaks of an instance where he did not declare his intention, and the other speaks of an instance where he did declare his intention.<sup>23</sup> What is the case of the one who had not declared his intention?<sup>24</sup> — Should one say that there is no time left in the day to offer them, then the reason for his not offering them was because there is no time left in the day!<sup>25</sup> [Should one say], therefore, that he had no [more] people to eat with him!<sup>25</sup> - — No, it refers to a case where there was time left in the day [to offer] and he had people to eat with him; seeing that he did not offer them on the first day [of the festival] it proves that he left them over [intentionally].<sup>26</sup> And so it stands to reason;<sup>27</sup> for when Rabin came [from Palestine] he said that R. Johanan said: If a man set aside ten beasts for his festal-offering, [and] he offered five the first day of the festival, he may offer the other five on the second day of the festival. [Now the two statements of R. Johanan] contradict one another! Surely, therefore, you must learn from this that in the one case he does not declare his intention and in the other he does declare his intention. Proven.

It is also reported:<sup>28</sup> R. Shaman b. Abba said that R. Johanan said:

---

(1) V. p. 33, n. 3. Cf. also infra 10b.

(2) I.e., since Scripture has no redundant expressions, what teaching does he derive from it.

(3) Lit., ‘they may not take wives’.

(4) V. M.K. 8b.

(5) I.e., cattle (cf. Aramaic נכסין cattle, herd), which, in contradistinction to land (immovable property), originally constituted essential (movable) wealth. The root נכח means to slaughter; cf. Latin pecunia from pecus (Goldschmidt). Cf. also chattels from cattle. Jastrow offers a different explanation.

(6) Respectively for festal and pilgrimage sacrifices.

(7) In accordance with Deut. XVI, 17.

(8) By the Rabbis.

(9) V. p. 2, nn. 2, 4.

(10) Deut. XVI, 17.

(11) V. p. 38, the views of Hezekiah and R. Johanan.

(12) I.e., let R. Shesheth, who follows Hezekiah's view, say distinctly what is prohibited (exactly as Hezekiah does

(13) I.e., and not merely money with money.

(14) As neither of them permits the supplementing of both money with money and beast with beast.

(15) Lit., ‘speakers’: the Talmudic scholars who were active from the time of the conclusion of the Mishnah (C. 220 C.E.) to the end of the fifth century, and compiled almost the whole of the Gemara; v. Glos. s.v. Amora. Here Hezekiah and R. Johanan are referred to.

(16) I.e., regarding the permissibility of supplementing money with money and adding beast to beast.

(17) Lit., ‘extraneous (teachings)’: the generic term for Tannaitic teachings not included in the Mishnah, v. Glos.

(18) The Baraithas quoted above (pp. 38, 39) in support of Hezekiah and R. Johanan respectively do not contradict each other regarding the permissibility of adding money to money, only regarding the adding of beast to beast, which the first Baraitha prohibits and the second permits. Thus R. Shesheth will agree with the second Baraitha which permits the adding of beast to beast as well as money to money.

(19) This presumably means that the whole of the flesh of the first meal must come from unconsecrated money, which in turn shows that the Baraitha refers to the supplementing of beast with beast and not of money with money.

(20) [I.e., the amount required to constitute generally a first festal meal and not, as assumed, the whole of the first meal. The text is in slight disorder].

(21) Thus the Baraitha may refer both to animals and money.

(22) Rashi explains: One must not suppose that by offering the remaining beasts on the second day (i.e., the first day of

the mid-festival) he is transgressing the commandment to keep one day as a feast i.e., to offer his festal offerings on the first day (deduced infra p. 44 from Lev. XXIII, 41, 'and ye shall keep it (only) a feast'), for the second day he is merely 'compensating' for the dues of the first. But according to R. Hananel (quoted in Tosaf. ד"ה חזר ) יום טוב שני ('the second day') means, or should read, יום טוב אחרון ('the last day of the festival'); and he explains that one should not think that since vow-offerings and freewill-offerings cannot be brought on a festival day, therefore the remaining beasts may not be offered then; for these sacrifices are to be regarded as festal-offerings not as vow- or freewill-offerings, since in the first place they were set aside for that purpose. This interpretation is supported by the J.T.

(23) I.e., he said explicitly I set all of them aside for the first day; if then he offers some on the second day, they are merely 'compensation' for the first day.

(24) That you rule that he cannot offer them any more.

(25) But his intention was to offer them on the first day.

(26) In order to provide a feast for the second day.

(27) I.e., that R. Johanan would grant that if he declared his intention to offer them all on the first day, he may offer the remaining beasts on the second.

(28) This is an Amoraic (v. p. 41, n. 3) corroboration to the effect that where it is evident that the pilgrim did not intend in the first instance to hold over some of the offerings for the second day, R. Johanan would agree with Resh Lakish.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 9a

They taught this<sup>1</sup> only [of a case] when it had not ended, but if it had ended, he may offer the rest [on the second day]. What does 'ended' mean? Shall one say [it means]: he had ended<sup>2</sup> his sacrifices? What [in that case] should he offer? It must mean, therefore, that the day had not ended,<sup>3</sup> but if the day had ended,<sup>4</sup> he may offer the rest [on the second day].

MISHNAH. HE WHO DID NOT BRING HIS FESTAL-OFFERING ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL, DAY OF THE FEAST [OF TABERNACLES], MAY BRING IT DURING THE WHOLE OF THE FESTIVAL, EVEN ON THE LAST FESTIVAL DAY<sup>5</sup> OF THE FEAST [OF TABERNACLES]. IF THE FESTIVAL, PASSED AND HE DID NOT BRING THE FESTIVAL OFFERING, HE IS NOT BOUND TO MAKE IT GOOD. OF SUCH A PERSON IT IS SAID: HE THAT IS CROOKED CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT AND THAT WHICH IS WANTING CANNOT BE RECKONED.<sup>6</sup> R. SIMEON B. MENASYA SAID: WHO IS IT 'THAT IS CROOKED' WHO 'CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT'? HE THAT HAS CONNECTION WITH A FORBIDDEN RELATION<sup>7</sup> AND BEGETS BY HER BASTARD ISSUE. SHOULD YOU SAY THAT IT APPLIES TO A THIEF OR ROBBER, BUT THEN HE IS ABLE TO MAKE RESTITUTION AND BE MADE STRAIGHT. R. SIMEON B. YOHAI SAID: ONLY HE CAN BE CALLED 'CROOKED' WHO WAS STRAIGHT AT FIRST AND BECAME CROOKED. AND WHO IS THIS? — A DISCIPLE OF THE SAGES WHO FORSAKES THE TORAH.

GEMARA. Whence do we know this?<sup>8</sup> — R. Johanan in the name of R. Ishmael said: [The expression] 'Azereth ['solemn assembly'] is used of the seventh day of Passover,<sup>9</sup> and [the expression] 'Azereth is used of the eighth day of the Feast [of Tabernacles].<sup>10</sup> Just as there it<sup>11</sup> intimates that one can make good [thereon the festal-offering due on the first day] so here<sup>12</sup> it intimates that one can make good [thereon the festal-offering of the first day]. And it is free [for interpretation];<sup>13</sup> for were it not free one might object: whereas [this<sup>14</sup> applies] to the seventh day of Passover which is not differentiated from the preceding [days], can you say this of the eighth day of the Feast [of Tabernacles] which is differentiated from the preceding [days].<sup>15</sup> But it is not so;<sup>16</sup> it is quite free [for interpretation]. Consider, what does 'Azereth mean? [Evidently it means], restrained ['Azur]<sup>17</sup> in respect of doing work. But behold it is written: Thou shalt do no work;<sup>18</sup> wherefore, then, has the Divine Law written 'Azereth?<sup>19</sup> You must infer therefrom [that it is] in order to leave it free [for interpretation]. But the Tanna<sup>20</sup> [of the following Baraitha] deduces it from here. For it is taught: And ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord seven days.<sup>21</sup> One might think that he must go on

bringing festal-offerings the whole of the seven days. Scripture, therefore, says, 'it': on it [only] are you to offer festal-offerings, but you are not to offer festal-offerings on all the seven days. If so, why does it say, 'seven'? To intimate that one may make good [the festal-offering during the seven days of the festival]. And whence [do we learn] that if he did not bring the festal-offering on the first festival day of the Feast [of Tabernacles] that he can go on bringing it during the course of the whole Festival, even on the last festival day? Scripture says: Ye shall keep it in the seventh month.<sup>22</sup> If, now, [it is to be kept] in the seventh month, one might think that one can go on bringing the festal-offering throughout the whole month, therefore Scripture says. 'it':<sup>23</sup> on 'it' [only] are you to offer festal-offerings, but you are not to offer festal-offerings outside it.

And what is the nature of this 'making good'? — R. Johanan says: They<sup>24</sup> make up for the first day;<sup>25</sup> and R. Oshaiah says: They make up for one another.<sup>26</sup> What is the [practical] point at issue between them? — R. Zera said: [The case of] a man who was lame<sup>27</sup> on the first day [of the festival] and became well on the second day is the point of issue between them. R. Johanan says: They make up for the first day; since on the first day he was not qualified [to bring the festal-offering], he is not qualified on the second. And R. Oshaiah says: They make up for one another; although he was not qualified on the first day he is qualified on the second. But could R. Johanan have said this? For behold Hezekiah said: If [a Nazirite] became defiled during the day [of the eighth] he has to bring [a sacrifice], but during the night [preceding the eighth] he does not have to bring [a sacrifice].<sup>28</sup> But R. Johanan said: Also [if he was defiled] during the night, he must bring [a sacrifice]!<sup>29</sup> — Said R. Jeremiah: The case of uncleanness is different,<sup>30</sup> because it can be made good [as is the case with the sacrifice] on the Second Passover.<sup>31</sup> R. Papa demurred to this: It is right according to the view that the Second Passover

- 
- (1) I.e., the Baraitha quoted infra pp. 44-45 which deduces from Lev. XXIII, 41 that the festal-offering is to be offered on the first day only.
- (2) נָמַר ('he ended') is both transitive and intransitive.
- (3) And he refrained from offering the remaining beasts.
- (4) And he had no opportunity of offering all his sacrifices.
- (5) Which is regarded as a separate festival, nevertheless one can make good thereon the festal-offering due on the first day of Tabernacles.
- (6) Eccl. I, 15.
- (7) V. Lev. XVIII, 6-18.
- (8) I.e., that if the festal-offering was not brought earlier, it can still be offered up on the last day of Tabernacles.
- (9) Deut. XVI, 8.
- (10) Lev. XXIII, 36; Num. XXIX, 35.
- (11) I.e., in the case of the seventh day of Passover which is essentially part of the Passover Festival.
- (12) I.e., in the case of the eighth day of Tabernacles, even though it has the status of a separate festival; v. infra 17a.
- (13) I.e., the word עֲצֵרֶת is redundant; this makes the inference by analogy irrefutable.
- (14) That one can make good on the last day the festal-offering of the first.
- (15) Cf. Yoma 3a.
- (16) לֹא הִי לֹא אֵין 'No', 'it is not so'.
- (17) Cf. A.V. Marg. 'restraint' in Deut. XVI, 8; Lev. XXIII, 36.
- (18) Deut. XVI, 8.
- (19) V. p. 7, n. 8.
- (20) An authority quoted in Mishnah and Baraitha in contradistinction to Amora such as R. Johanan above. V. Glos.
- (21) Lev. XXIII, 41.
- (22) Ibid. I.e., you can bring the festal-offering on every festival day in the month.
- (23) The second 'it' of the verse.
- (24) I.e., the days of the festival following the first.
- (25) I.e., the first day of the festival is the specific day for the festival-offering. If a man was liable to bring it on the first day but did not, he may make it good on a subsequent day of the festival; but if he was exempt on the first day, he is no

longer bound to bring the offering.

(26) I.e., each day makes up for the preceding in the sense that it puts a new liability on the pilgrim; thus on whichever day of the festival he becomes qualified, he is bound to bring his offerings.

(27) And therefore exempt; v. p. 1.

(28) If a Nazirite (v. Num. VI, 2f) becomes defiled, he must wait seven days, and bring a sacrifice on the eighth, before he again begins to observe the days of his Naziritehood. One sacrifice will suffice for several defilements if the lapse between any two is less than eight days. But if he became defiled on the eighth day, he must bring a sacrifice for the previous defilement, since it was already due, and also for the subsequent defilement, since it occurred in a new period of eight days. If, however, the second defilement occurred on the night preceding the eighth, a second sacrifice has not to be brought, since the first cannot be offered till the morning, (for sacrifices are offered only during the day), the obligation to bring a sacrifice cannot be said to have yet fallen due and consequently the question of making good does not in his view arise. Cf. Ker. II, 3.

(29) Because he has already been purified by ritual immersion (טבילה) on the seventh day, and the sun of that day has set (הערב שמש). Now this statement seems to show that R. Johanan holds that though one is not qualified to bring a sacrifice (e.g., the Nazirite on the night preceding the eighth day), one may make up for it later.

(30) I.e., a sacrifice which cannot be offered on account of uncleanness is exceptional.

(31) Which is offered to make good the nonobservance of the First Passover sacrifice owing to a disqualification of uncleanness. V. Num. 10f. Thus those who are unfit to bring the paschal lamb on the First Passover may bring it on the Second, and similarly in other cases of uncleanness; but in all other cases of disqualification, R. Johanan would hold that an offering which could not be brought on one day cannot be made good.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 9b

makes up for the First;<sup>1</sup> but what is to be said according to the view that the Second [Passover] is a separate festival?<sup>2</sup> — Therefore, said R. Papa, R. Johanan must be of the opinion that the night [before the day on which the sacrifice is due] is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period.<sup>3</sup> But how could R. Johanan have said this?<sup>4</sup> For behold R. Johanan said: If [a zab]<sup>5</sup> had one emission in the night and two in the [following] day, he must bring [a second offering],<sup>6</sup> but [if he had] two in the night and one in the day, he has not to bring [a second offering].<sup>7</sup> Now if you imagine that R. Johanan is of the opinion that the night [before the day on which the sacrifice is due] is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period, then even [if he had] two [emissions] at night and one in the day he must bring [a second offering]! — R. Johanan said this only according to the view that the night [before] is regarded as belonging to the preceding period.<sup>8</sup> But according to this view it is surely obvious!<sup>9</sup> — It is required for the case where there are two [emissions] in the day and one the [preceding] night. You might have thought [the decision] to be according to the objection of R. Shisha son of R. Idi, it therefore teaches us that it is according to R. Joseph.<sup>10</sup>

IF THE FESTIVAL PASSED AND HE DID NOT BRING THE FESTIVAL OFFERING, HE IS NOT BOUND TO MAKE IT GOOD. OF SUCH A PERSON IT IS SAID: HE THAT IS CROOKED CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT AND THAT WHICH IS WANTING CANNOT BE RESTORED. Bar He-He<sup>11</sup> said to Hillel: [Instead of] the [expression] ‘to be reckoned’ it ought to be ‘to be filled’!<sup>12</sup> It must refer, therefore, to one whose fellows reckoned him<sup>13</sup> for [the performance of] a religious act, but he would not be reckoned with them. It has also been taught thus: ‘He that is crooked cannot be made straight’: this refers to one who neglected to read the morning Shema’ or the evening Shema’,<sup>14</sup> or he neglected the morning prayer<sup>15</sup> or the evening prayer. And that which is wanting cannot be reckoned’; this refers to one whose fellows resolved<sup>16</sup> on [the performance of] a religious act and he would not be reckoned with them.

Bar He-He said to Hillel: Then shall ye again discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not.<sup>17</sup> ‘The righteous’ is the same as ‘he that serveth God’; ‘the wicked’ is the same as ‘he that serveth Him not’! — He answered him: He that serveth Him and he that serveth Him not both refer to such as are perfectly righteous; but he that

repeated his chapter a hundred times is not to be compared with him who repeated it a hundred and one times.<sup>18</sup> Said [Bar He-He] to him: And because of once he is called 'he that serveth Him not'? — He answered: Yes, go and learn from the mule-drivers market; ten parasangs for one zuz,<sup>19</sup> eleven parasangs for two zuz.

Elijah<sup>20</sup> said to Bar He-He, and others say, to R. Eleazar: What is the meaning of the verse: Behold I have refined thee but not as silver; I have tried thee in the furnace of affliction?<sup>21</sup> It teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, went through all the good qualities in order to give [them] to Israel, and He found only poverty.<sup>22</sup> Samuel said, and others say. R. Joseph: This accords with the popular saying: Poverty befits Israel like a red trapping a white horse.<sup>23</sup> R. SIMEON B. MENASYA SAID: WHO IS IT 'THAT IS CROOKED' WHO 'CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT'? HE THAT HAS CONNECTION WITH A FORBIDDEN RELATION AND BEGETS BY HER BASTARD ISSUE etc. Only if he begets, but not if he does not beget. But behold it is taught: R. Simeon b. Menasya said: If a man steal, he can return the theft and [so] become straight; but he that has connection with a married woman and makes her prohibited unto her husband is banished from the world and passes away.<sup>24</sup> (R. Simeon b. Yohai said: One does not say: Examine the camel, examine the pig,<sup>25</sup> Only examine the lamb.<sup>26</sup> And who is this? A disciple of the wise who has forsaken the Torah. R. Judah b. Lakish said: Any disciple of the wise who has forsaken the Torah, of him Scripture says: As a bird that wandereth from her nest, so is a man that wandereth from his place.<sup>27</sup> And it further says : What unrighteousness have your fathers found in me, that they are gone far from me?)<sup>28</sup> — There is no contradiction: the one case refers to his unmarried sister,<sup>29</sup> the other refers to a married woman.<sup>30</sup> Or I might say: Both are cases of married women; but there is no contradiction: in the one case

---

(1) V. Pes. 93a.

(2) This excludes the explanation that a sacrifice, not offered in time owing to uncleanness, can be made good later.

(3) [Lit., 'is not (deemed as) wanting time'. I.e., the fact that one cannot bring an offering on the night preceding the day on which it is due, is not regarded as a disqualifying factor, and consequently in the case of a Nazirite the night preceding the eighth day completes the eight days' period, so that the sacrifice may be said to fall due thereon, though he is actually prevented from offering it because it is still night. For this reason the sacrifice which was not offered at night can be made good on the following morning, and should he in the meantime suffer a second defilement, he has to bring a second sacrifice, whereas in the case of the festival-offering where he was lame on the first day, there was no obligation whatsoever resting on him to bring a sacrifice and consequently this cannot be made good].

(4) I.e., that the night preceding the day on which a sacrifice is due is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period.

(5) זב, one who suffers from gonorrhoea (v. Lev. XV). After the first emission he is considered a בעל קרי and is unclean for the day; after the second, he is מטא, (unclean in the degree of zab), and has to count seven clean days, wash his garments, have ritual immersion and wait for sunset; after the third, he has, in addition, to bring sacrifices on the eighth day (cf. Ned. 43b). This zab had counted seven days and was to bring his offerings on the morrow, and in the meantime he saw further discharges.

(6) Because the first emission is counted with the two of the morning.

(7) Because the two nocturnal emissions make him unclean within the period of the first defilement, i.e., before the eighth day.

(8) But his own view is the reverse.

(9) As his own opinion the statement would have point in as much as it tells us his personal view; otherwise the teaching is an obvious corollary of the principle that the night before belongs to the preceding period.

(10) V. Ker. 8a, where R. Joseph seeks to prove R. Johanan's view that the first emission in the evening is counted with the two of the morning (cf. n. 1). and R. Shisha argues against the former's proof.

(11) V. Aboth, Sonc. ed, p. 77, n. 6. (Ch. V, 23).

(12) I.e., the expression 'that which is wanting' (חסרון) requires as its antonym 'to be filled' (להמלאות) not 'to be reckoned' להמנות lit., to be numbered'.

(13) I.e., asked him to join them.

(14) A biblical reading consisting of Deut. VI, 4-9 and an additional sentence; ibid. XI, 13-21; Num. XV, 37-41; the

name is derived from its first word — שמוע. V. P.B. pp. 40-42.

(15) The prayer par excellence, called also 'Amidah ('standing prayer') and the 'eighteen (really nineteen) blessings'. V. P.B. pp. 44f.

(16) Lit., 'reckoned themselves'.

(17) Mal. III, 18.

(18) Possibly a pun is intended here: the initial letters of עבד אלהים לא, ר ('he that serveth God and he') = 101; and of לא עבדו ('serveth Him not') = 100. V. Marginal Gloss. in cur. edd.

(19) A silver coin, quarter of a shekel, and equal to a denar, v. Glos.

(20) For Elijah in Rabbinic literature v. J.E. vol. V, pp. 122f, espec. p. 124f. Cf. also supra pp. 17f. regarding the Angel of death.

(21) Isa. XLVIII, 10.

(22) The word for 'affliction' (עני) also means poverty.

(23) V. Lev. Rab. ss. 13 and 35 for parallel readings.

(24) I.e., the wrong they have done is irreparable. This statement of R. Simeon b. Menasya, which declares that connection with a prohibited relation, even if there be no issue, is irreparable, contradicts his statement in the Mishnah. The other dicta are quoted merely because they form part of the Baraita (Tosef.).

(25) I.e., to see if they are without blemish and so fit for sacrifice, for they are unfit to start with. Likewise 'made crooked' can only refer to one who was originally worthy and later degenerated. V. R. Simeon b. Yohai's statement in Mishnah.

(26) Which is fit for sacrifice unless it becomes blemished.

(27) Prov. XXVII, 8.

(28) Jer. II, 5.

(29) The wrong then becomes irreparable only when there is issue.

(30) A stranger's connection with her, even if no issue results, makes her prohibited to her husband.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 10a

it was against her will,<sup>1</sup> in the other it was with her consent. Or you may say: in both cases it was against her will but there is no contradiction: the one case concerns a priest's wife<sup>2</sup> and the other an Israelite's wife.

Neither was there any peace to him that went out or came in,<sup>3</sup> Rab said: As soon as man goes forth from Halachic<sup>4</sup> to Scripture study he no longer has peace.<sup>5</sup> And Samuel said: It means one who leaves Talmud for Mishnah.<sup>6</sup> And R. Johanan said: Even [if he goes] from Talmud to Talmud.<sup>7</sup>

MISHNAH. [THE LAWS CONCERNING] THE DISSOLUTION OF VOWS<sup>8</sup> HOVER IN THE AIR AND HAVE NOUGHT TO REST ON.<sup>9</sup> THE LAWS CONCERNING THE SABBATH, FESTAL-OFFERINGS, ACTS OF TRESPASS<sup>10</sup> ARE AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR, FOR THEY HAVE SCANT SCRIPTURAL BASIS BUT MANY LAWS. [THE LAWS CONCERNING] CIVIL CASES AND [TEMPLE] SERVICES,<sup>11</sup> LEVITICAL CLEANNESS AND UNCLEANNES, AND THE FORBIDDEN RELATIONS<sup>12</sup> HAVE WHAT TO REST ON,<sup>13</sup> AND IT IS THEY THAT ARE THE ESSENTIALS OF THE TORAH.

GEMARA. It is taught: R. Eliezer said: They<sup>14</sup> have something to rest on, for it is said: When one shall clearly utter<sup>15</sup> [a vow], when one shall clearly utter [a vow]:<sup>15</sup> one [intimates] an utterance to bind, and the other an utterance to dissolve. R. Joshua said: They have something to rest on, for it is said: Wherefore I swore in My wrath.<sup>16</sup> [It means,] I swore in My wrath,<sup>17</sup> but I retracted.<sup>18</sup> R. Isaac said: They have something to rest on, for it is said: Whosoever is of a willing heart.<sup>19</sup> Hanania, son of the brother of R. Joshua, said: They have something to rest on, for it is said: I have sworn, and I have confirmed it, to observe Thy righteous ordinances.<sup>20</sup> Rab Judah said that Samuel said: Had I been there I should have said to them: My [Scriptural proof] is better than yours, for it is said: He shall not break his word.<sup>21</sup> 'He' may not break it, but others may dissolve it for him. Raba said: To



all these [proofs] objection can be made except to that of Samuel, against which no objection can be raised. For against R. Eliezer [it may be objected]: Perhaps [the verse is to be explained] according to R. Judah, who said it in the name of R. Tarfon. For it is taught: R. Judah said in the name of R. Tarfon: Indeed, neither of them becomes a Nazirite, because Naziriteship can be assumed only by clear utterance.<sup>22</sup> Against R. Joshua [it may be objected]: Perhaps this is the meaning of the verse: I swore in My wrath and did not retract'. Against R. Isaac [it may be objected]: Perhaps [the verse comes to] exclude the view of Samuel. For Samuel said: Though he determined in his heart,<sup>23</sup> he must still utter it with his lips.<sup>24</sup> And [the verse]<sup>25</sup> teaches us that even though he did not utter it with his lips [it is binding]. Against Hanania, the son of the brother of R. Joshua [it may be objected]: Perhaps [the verse is to be explained] according to R. Giddal who said it in the name of Rab. For R. Giddal said that Rab said: Whence [is it to be deduced] that one may take an oath to fulfil a precept?<sup>26</sup> For it is said: 'I have sworn, and I have confirmed it, to observe Thy righteous ordinances'.<sup>27</sup> But against Samuel's proof no objection can be raised. Raba, and some say, R. Nahman b. Isaac, said: This is the meaning of the popular saying: Better one grain of pungent pepper than a basketful of pumpkins.<sup>28</sup>

THE LAWS CONCERNING THE SABBATH. But they are written [in Scripture]!<sup>29</sup> — No, it is necessary [to state this] for the teaching of R. Abba. For R. Abba said: He who digs a hole on the Sabbath and requires it only for the sake of its earth is not liable for it.<sup>30</sup> According to which authority [will this be]? According to R. Simeon, who said: one is not liable for work [performed on the Sabbath] which is not required for itself.<sup>31</sup> — You may even say that it is according to R. Judah.<sup>32</sup> there<sup>33</sup> one is improving.<sup>34</sup> here<sup>35</sup> one is spoiling.<sup>36</sup> But why does it say: AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR?<sup>37</sup>

- 
- (1) In this case she may continue to live with her husband.
  - (2) In this case even if it was against her will she may no longer live with her husband (cf. Keth. 51b).
  - (3) Zech. VIII, 10.
  - (4) V. Glos. s.v. Halachah.
  - (5) Because the Halachah provides the ultimate ruling for conduct; cf. Hershon, Talmudic Miscellany, Ch. XI, No. 33, and the lines in Longfellow's 'Golden Legend' beginning: The Kabbala and Talmud lore, etc. (quoted in Streane's Chagigah).
  - (6) Without the Talmudic explanation and discussion the Mishnah may be misleading.
  - (7) According to Rashi, from the Palestinian Talmud (or Jerusalemi) to the Babylonian Talmud which was more difficult; cf. Sanh. 24a and B.M. 85b. But according to Tosaf., from either to the other before the first is properly understood.
  - (8) By a Sage, to whom the person who makes the vow explains his original intention which did not include the special circumstances that now cause him to regret the vow; thus a פתח הרטה ('a way of retraction') is found whereby the vow can be annulled. V. Ned. 9a, 10b.
  - (9) I.e., in Biblical teaching, and depend only on oral tradition; but cf. Num. XXX, 8-9.
  - (10) The misappropriation of holy things to secular use. V. Lev. V, 14-16.
  - (11) I.e., the offering of sacrifices.
  - (12) V. Lev. XVIII, 6f.
  - (13) [MS.M.: 'have on whom to rest', i.e., have good authority. V. Zeitlin, JQR. (N.S.) VII, p. 500].
  - (14) I.e., the laws concerning the dissolution of vows.
  - (15) Twice: in Lev. XXVII, 2 and Num. VI, 2.
  - (16) Ps. XCV, R.
  - (17) I.e., hastily, but in calmer mood I regretted the oath and retracted. The verse refers to God, of course; but the inference is drawn from the anthropomorphism for ill-considered human vows.
  - (18) The 'change of mind' attributed here to God with regard to the generation of the wilderness must be explained by reference to Sanh. 110b where the view is expressed that they have a share in the world to come, i.e., they were not permitted to enter Canaan, their earthly possession, but it was granted them to enter their Heavenly heritage.
  - (19) Ex. XXXV, 5. But if the heart be no longer willing it is possible for the vow to be dissolved (cf. discussion in Shab. 26b).

- (20) Ps. CXIX, 106. But where instead of confirmation there is retraction, the person may be released from his vow.
- (21) Num. XXX, 3.
- (22) If the assumption of the state of Nazir (v. Num. VI) was made the forfeit of a wager between two, R. Tarfon holds that neither loser nor winner is a Nazir, because Naziriteship must be explicitly vowed and cannot be assumed conditionally. This he deduces from one of the two verses cited by R. Eliezer (cf. Nazir 32b Mishnah and 34a top).
- (23) To swear a certain oath.
- (24) Otherwise it is no oath and he is not liable.
- (25) Cited by R. Isaac.
- (26) I.e., it is meritorious to do this that he may fulfil the precept with greater zeal.
- (27) V. Ned. 7b.
- (28) I.e., a sharp mind is better than mere learning.
- (29) Why then does the Mishnah say that there is little Scriptural basis for them?
- (30) But if he required the hole itself, he would be guilty of building on the Sabbath, v. Shab. 73b.
- (31) E.g., a hole dug for the sake of its earth. R. Simeon stated this principle in connection with carrying out the dead on the Sabbath (v. Shab. 93a).
- (32) Who holds that one may not carry a corpse out on the Sabbath for burial (v. *ibid.*).
- (33) I.e., in the case of the corpse.
- (34) I.e., burying the corpse and achieving something desired.
- (35) I.e., in the case of the digging of a hole.
- (36) The hole does not improve the ground nor is it desired for itself.
- (37) Implying that some kind of support is afforded by the Torah.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 10b

— Because the Torah prohibited [on the Sabbath] purposed work,<sup>1</sup> yet purposed work is not mentioned in Scripture.<sup>2</sup> [LAWS CONCERNING] FESTAL-OFFERINGS. But they are written [in Scripture]!<sup>3</sup> — No, it is necessary in the light of what R. Papa said to Abaye: Whence [do we know] that [the verse]: And ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord<sup>4</sup> signifies sacrifice? Perhaps the Divine Law means: Celebrate a Festival!<sup>5</sup> — If so, when it is written, That they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness,<sup>6</sup> would that also mean: Celebrate a festival! And should you say that it indeed means that, surely it is written: And Moses said: ‘Thou must also give into our hand beasts of killing and burnt-offerings’!<sup>7</sup> — Perhaps the Divine Law means this: Eat ye and drink and celebrate a festival before Me!<sup>8</sup> — Do not think of this; for it is written: Neither shall the fat of My feast remain all night until the morning.<sup>9</sup> If now you suppose that it means a festival<sup>10</sup> [only], has a festival fat? — But perhaps the Divine Law means this: the fat that is offered during the course of the festival should not remain overnight!<sup>11</sup> — If so, then [it would imply] that only during the festival the fat may not remain overnight, but throughout the year<sup>12</sup> it may remain overnight; [but behold] it is written: All night unto the morning!<sup>13</sup> — [But] perhaps from this [verse alone] one would know it merely as a positive precept, therefore Scripture wrote the other [verse to enjoin it] as a prohibition!<sup>14</sup> — [To enjoin it] as a prohibition there is another verse: Neither shall any of the flesh, which thou sacrificest the first day at even, remain all night until the morning<sup>15</sup> — [But] perhaps [this was required] in order to impose upon him two prohibitions and one positive precept! — Rather, it can be deduced from [the word] ‘wilderness’ which occurs in two passages. Here it is written: That they may hold a feast unto Me in the wilderness.<sup>16</sup> And elsewhere it is written: Did ye bring unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness?<sup>17</sup> Just as in the latter verse [it means] sacrifices, so in the former [it means] sacrifices. Why then does it say: AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR?<sup>18</sup> — [Because] no inference may be drawn concerning statements of the Torah from statements of the Prophets.<sup>19</sup>

ACTS OF SACRILEGE. But they are written [in Scripture]! Rami b. Hama said: It is required only for that which we have learnt. If the agent did his errand [committing thereby an act of sacrilege],<sup>20</sup> the householder<sup>21</sup> is guilty of sacrilege;<sup>22</sup> if he did not do his errand, the agent is guilty

of sacrilege. But why should he<sup>23</sup> be guilty if he did his errand? Shall one man sin and another become liable!<sup>24</sup> That is why [the Mishnah says]: AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR. Raba said: But what is the objection? Perhaps sacrilege is different, since we compare it with terumah<sup>25</sup> through the analogous expressions for ‘sin’ [which occur in connection with both laws]:<sup>26</sup> just as there<sup>27</sup> the agent of a person is like himself<sup>28</sup>, so here the agent of a person is like himself. Rather, said Raba, it must be required for the [following] teaching; If the householder remembered,<sup>29</sup> but the agent did not remember, the agent is guilty of sacrilege. What has the poor agent done!<sup>30</sup> That is why [the Mishnah says]: AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR. R. Ashi said: What is the objection? Perhaps it is like [every other] case where one spent [in error] sacred money for secular purposes!<sup>31</sup> Rather, said R. Ashi, it must be required for that which we have learnt. If a man took away a stone or a beam from Temple property, he is not guilty of sacrilege; but if he gave it to his fellow,<sup>32</sup> he himself is guilty, but his fellow is not guilty.<sup>33</sup> See now, he has taken it, what difference does it make whether he or his fellow [keeps it]! Therefore it says: LIKE MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR. But what is the objection? Perhaps it is [to be explained] according to Samuel. For Samuel said: Here

---

(1) Lit., ‘work of thought’ (cf, Ex. XXXV, 35 where it is rendered in E.V. ‘skillful workmanship’) i.e., work that achieves the purpose primarily intended; v. supra n. 9. The various kinds of work prohibited on the Sabbath are deduced from the different kinds of work involved in the Tabernacle; cf. Shab. 73a (Mishnah) Rashi a.l.

(2) It is only deduced from the juxtaposition of the section concerning the Sabbath and the section concerning the construction of the Tabernacle in Ex. XXXV.

(3) Ex. XII, 14; Lev. XXIII, 41.

(4) Ibid.

(5) I.e., without sacrifices. Tosaf. a.l. suggests: Celebrate it with dances, taking the rt. **חוג** to mean to dance’; cf. Ps. CVII, 27.

(6) Ex. V, 1.

(7) Ibid. X, 25.

(8) The ‘beasts for killing’ (Heb. **זבחים**, E.V. ‘sacrifices’) would thus not refer to sacrifices (i.e., ‘peace-offerings’) but to animals killed for meat only.

(9) But should be burnt on the altar before dawn. Ibid. XXIII, 18.

(10) Heb. **חג**, which can mean both festival and festal-offering; cf. **חגיגה**, the Rabbinic word for festal-offering, which is derived from the same root.

(11) But it does not follow that there is an obligation to bring a festal-offering.

(12) I.e., in the case of other sacrifices offered at non-festival times.

(13) Lev. VI, 2, which refers to all occasions, not just to festivals: it teaches us that the limbs and fat of sacrifices slaughtered during the day may be burnt on the altar all night but not thereafter.

(14) The neglect of an ordinary positive precept is not indictable; but the transgression of a prohibition entails the bringing of a sin-offering, if the offence was committed unwittingly, or the punishment of stripes (maximum thirty-nine), if the transgression was wittingly committed, unless a severer penalty is ordained by Scripture. Exceptions not involving stripes are (a) ‘a prohibitive precept transformed into a mandatory law’ i.e., when the transgression must be repaired by a succeeding act; (b) a prohibition the transgression of which involves no action. Hence, the prohibition here referred to does not involve stripes.

(15) Deut. XVI, 4.

(16) Ex. V, 1.

(17) Amos V, 25.

(18) For deduction by analogy is considered support for a law.

(19) Heb. **קבלה** Lit., ‘tradition’, a designation for post-Pentateuchal books of the Bible, which are deemed of lesser authority than the Pentateuch or Torah. V. Bacher, Exeg. Term. I, 166, II, 185.

(20) E.g., sacred money was mixed with secular money, and not knowing of this, he asked the agent to buy a garment for him with the money.

(21) I.e., the one who instructed the agent.

(22) I.e., he has to refund the value of the sacred property plus a fifth and bring a trespass-offering.

(23) I.e., the householder.

(24) It is a Talmudic principle that no one is considered an agent or messenger for the committal of sin, i.e., the transgressor is liable whether he commits the sin on his own behalf or for another.

(25) A portion of the produce, between a fortieth and a sixtieth, given to the priest. V. Glos.

(26) Lev. V, 15 (trespass), and Num. XVIII, 32 (terumah).

(27) I.e., in the case of terumah.

(28) Deduced from the words, 'Ye also', in Num. XVIII, 28.

(29) Before the agent committed sacrilege by spending the money for secular use.

(30) He did not know that he was misappropriating sacred money; why then should he be held responsible?

(31) Though a person committed sacrilege in error he is held responsible; so too here in the case of the agent.

(32) By this act he takes it out of the possession of the Temple.

(33) Derived from Lev. V, 16.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 11a

it refers to the treasurer [of the Sanctuary] to whom the building stones had been entrusted, so that wherever it is, it is in his possession!<sup>1</sup> Rather [it can be explained] from the latter part [of the Mishnah]. If he built it into his house, he is not guilty of sacrilege until he dwells under it to the value of a perutah.<sup>2</sup> See now, he has effected a change therein,<sup>3</sup> what difference does it make whether he dwells [under it] or does not dwell [under it]!<sup>4</sup> Therefore it says: LIKE MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR. But what is the objection? Perhaps it is [to be explained] according to Rab. For Rab said: It refers to a case where he placed it over a roof-aperture,<sup>5</sup> [in which case] if he dwells in [the house] he is [guilty of sacrilege]. If he does not dwell in [the house] he is not [guilty]! — Therefore, it must be after all as Raba said: and as for your objection that the same applies to any person who spent [in error] sacred money for secular purposes, [one may answer]: There<sup>6</sup> he knew full well that he had sacred money, he should therefore have taken care; but here,<sup>7</sup> how could he know? Therefore [the Mishnah says]: AS MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A HAIR<sup>8</sup>

SCANT SCRIPTURAL BASIS BUT MANY LAWS. A Tanna taught: [The laws concerning defilement through] leprosy-signs<sup>9</sup> and tent-covering<sup>10</sup> have scant Scriptural basis and many laws. [You say] leprosy-signs have scant Scriptural basis? [On the contrary] leprosy-signs have considerable Scriptural basis! — R. Papa said: It means as follows: Leprosy-signs have considerable Scriptural basis and few laws, [defilement through] tent-covering has scant Scriptural basis and many laws. But what practical difference does it make? — If you are in doubt about anything concerning leprosy-signs search the Bible, but if you are in doubt about anything concerning [defilement through] tent-covering search the Mishnah.<sup>11</sup>

CIVIL CASES. But they are written [in Scripture]!<sup>12</sup> — It is necessary only for the teaching of Rabbi. For it is taught: Rabbi said: Life for life<sup>13</sup> [means] monetary compensation. You say [it means] monetary compensation; but perhaps [it means] actual life? — 'Giving' is mentioned below,<sup>14</sup> and 'giving' is mentioned above:<sup>15</sup> just as in the latter case [it means] monetary compensation, so in the former case [it means] monetary compensation.

TEMPLE SERVICES. But they are written [in Scripture]! — It refers only to the carrying of the blood [to the altar]. For it is taught: And they shall present;<sup>16</sup> this [means] the receiving of the blood.<sup>17</sup> Now the Divine Law used for it an expression of 'carrying', as it is written: And the priest shall present<sup>18</sup> the whole and make it smoke upon the altar,<sup>19</sup> and the Master said: This [means] the carrying<sup>20</sup> of the pieces [of the offering] to the altar ramp.<sup>21</sup> This is to tell us that the 'carrying' [of the blood] is not to be excluded from the category of 'receiving' [the blood].<sup>22</sup>

[LAWS OF] LEVITICAL CLEANNESS. But they are written [in Scripture]! — It refers only to the measure of a ritual bath, which is not stated in Scripture. For it is taught: And he shall bathe in

water,<sup>23</sup> [this means] in water of a ritual bath;<sup>24</sup> all his flesh: [this means in] water which covers all his body. And how much is this? A cubit<sup>25</sup> by a cubit to the height of three cubits; and the Sages fixed the measure of the ritual bath water at forty se'ahs.<sup>26</sup>

[LAWS CONCERNING LEVITICAL] UNCLEANNESS. But they are written [in Scripture]! — It refers only to [defilement caused by touching a part of a dead] creeping creature, which is the size of a lentil; this is not stated in Scripture. For it is taught: In them:<sup>27</sup> I might think [it means] all of them,<sup>28</sup> therefore Scripture teaches: 'Of them'.<sup>29</sup> I might then think [it means] even a part of them,<sup>30</sup> therefore Scripture says: 'in them'. How is this to be explained? [It means that he is not defiled] till he touches a part of one which is as the whole of one. The Sages fixed the measure at the size of a lentil, for a snail<sup>31</sup> is at first the size of a lentil. R. Jose b. R. Judah said: [It must be] the size of the tail of a lizard.<sup>32</sup>

FORBIDDEN RELATIONS. But they are written [in Scripture]!

- (1) Thus he does not commit sacrilege till he gives it (i.e., the stone or beam) into the possession of his fellow.
- (2) A small coin. V. Glos.
- (3) E.g., by chiselling the beam or stone and fixing it into the house: through this alteration it becomes his own property.
- (4) He has already misappropriated sacred property.
- (5) אַרְוֵה (cf. Hos. XIII, 3; II Kings VII, 2), an aperture in the roof leading to the ground floor (answering to the Greek hypaithron, Roman compluvium), contrad. from חַלְוֵה a garret-window in the wall projecting above the flat roof (Jast.); cf. also Levy s.v. By placing the beam over the aperture he in no way alters it and can always restore it, and is thus not guilty of sacrilege till he dwells in the house and enjoys the use of it.
- (6) I.e., in the case quoted in the objection.
- (7) I.e., in the case of the agent.
- (8) For though the agent could hardly avoid the sacrilege, he is deemed to have committed sacrilege in error and is held responsible.
- (9) V. Lev. XIII-XIV.
- (10) V. Num. XIX, 14, from which it is inferred that men and utensils under the same 'tent' (i.e., overshadowed by the same covering) as a corpse suffer corpse-defilement.
- (11) I.e., oral tradition.
- (12) I.e., why then does the Mishnah say that they merely have something to rest on?
- (13) Ex. XXI, 23.
- (14) I.e., in our own case.
- (15) Ex. XXI, 22 (the preceding verse).
- (16) Lev. I, 5.
- (17) It is inferred from the fact that this clause comes immediately after the injunction to slaughter the animal; therefore it is taken to refer to the 'receiving' of the blood, for the blood cannot be 'carried' till it is 'received'.
- (18) E.V. 'offer', though it is the same verb as in verse 5.
- (19) Lev. I, 13.
- (20) It cannot mean the burning of the pieces, for that is distinctly mentioned afterwards.
- (21) I.e., the inclined plane leading to the altar. Cf. Mid. III, 3.
- (22) I.e., though it is a part of the offering-service that can be omitted (e.g., if the animal is slaughtered close to the altar, so that the blood can be sprinkled forthwith), nevertheless if it is not omitted, it is an essential part of the service and is subject to all its conditions.
- (23) Lev. XV, 16. This is evidently the verse intended. The words אֵת בִּשְׂרוֹ ('his flesh'), which really belong to Lev. XIV, 9 must be deleted.
- (24) Lit., 'gathering' of water, which must contain water directly from a river or a spring, or rain water led directly to it; but מֵי שְׂאוּבֵי (lit., 'drawn water i.e., water from a receptacle) if added to the ritual bath above a certain measure, invalidates it.
- (25) A measure equal to the distance from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger (cf. Kel. XVII, 9.10).
- (26) Measure of capacity, equal to six kabs; v. Pes. 109a.

(27) Lev. XI, 31 בָּהֶם; E. V. 'whosoever doth touch' them'.

(28) I.e., he becomes unclean when he touches the whole of the unclean animal.

(29) Ibid. v. 32.

(30) I. e., however small.

(31) חֲמַט (cf. ibid. 30). Rashi renders, 'snail'; Jast., 'lizard (chameleon)'; Levy, 'Bindschleiche' (slowworm, blindworm), or 'Eidechse' (lizard); Goldschmidt, 'Schnecke' (snail), 'skink' or 'Blindschleiche'; B.D.B., a kind of lizard. From Hul. 122a it seems to be a vertebrate. Danby translates it there 'land crocodile'.

(32) הַלְטָאָה (cf. ibid.) Jast. regards the first ה, as part of the word, except in Mishnah, Tosefta and Sifra, where it is the definite article attached to לְטָאָה. The tail of the הַלְטָאָה writhes after being cut off, thus showing independent life; hence it meets the requirements of the verse by being a part of an unclean animal and yet an entire life by itself, and is suitable as a measure for defilement. It is bigger than a lentil.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 11b

— This refers only to his daughter by a woman whom he had forced; this case is not written [in Scripture]. For Raba said: R. Isaac b. Abdimi told me, It is to be deduced by analogy from [the words] 'they', 'they',<sup>1</sup> and from [the words] 'lewdness', 'lewdness'.<sup>2</sup>

IT IS THEY THAT ARE THE ESSENTIALS OF THE TORAH, These are and those are not!<sup>3</sup> — Say, therefore, these and those are essentials of the Torah.

## CHAPTER II

MISHNAH THE [SUBJECT OF] FORBIDDEN RELATIONS<sup>4</sup> MAY NOT BE EXPOUNDED IN THE PRESENCE OF THREE,<sup>5</sup> NOR THE WORK OF CREATION<sup>6</sup> IN THE PRESENCE OF TWO, NOR [THE WORK OF] THE CHARIOT<sup>7</sup> IN THE PRESENCE OF ONE, UNLESS HE IS A SAGE AND UNDERSTANDS OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE. WHOSOEVER SPECULATES UPON FOUR THINGS, A PITY<sup>8</sup> FOR HIM! HE IS AS THOUGH HE HAD NOT COME INTO THE WORLD, [TO WIT], WHAT IS ABOVE,<sup>9</sup> WHAT IS BENEATH,<sup>10</sup> WHAT BEFORE, WHAT AFTER.<sup>11</sup> AND WHOSOEVER TAKES NO THOUGHT FOR THE HONOUR OF HIS MAKER,<sup>12</sup> IT WERE A MERCY<sup>13</sup> IF HE HAD NOT COME INTO THE WORLD.

GEMARA. You say at first: NOR [THE WORK OF] THE CHARIOT IN THE PRESENCE OF ONE;<sup>14</sup> and then you say: UNLESS HE IS A SAGE AND UNDERSTANDS OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE! — This is the meaning: the forbidden relations may not be expounded to three,<sup>15</sup> nor the work of creation to two, nor [the work of] the chariot to one, unless he is a Sage and understands of his own knowledge.<sup>16</sup>

THE FORBIDDEN RELATIONS MAY NOT BE EXPOUNDED IN THE PRESENCE OF THREE. What is the reason? Shall one say, because it is written: Whosoever to any that is near of kin to him?<sup>17</sup> 'Whosoever'<sup>18</sup> [implies] two, 'near of kin to him' [implies] one; and the Divine Law said: Ye shall not approach to uncover their nakedness.<sup>19</sup> But then since it is written: Whosoever curseth his God,<sup>20</sup> Whosoever giveth of his seed unto Molech,<sup>21</sup> are these [passages] also [to be interpreted] thus! — These, therefore, must be required to make Gentiles subject to the prohibition concerning blasphemy<sup>22</sup> and idolatry like the Israelites; then this [verse]<sup>23</sup> is also required to make Gentiles subject to the prohibition concerning the forbidden relations like the Israelites!<sup>24</sup> It must be inferred, therefore, from the verse: Therefore shall ye keep My charge.<sup>25</sup> 'Ye shall keep' [implies] two,<sup>26</sup> 'My charge' [implies] one; and the Divine Law said: That ye do not any of these abominable customs.<sup>27</sup> But then since it is written: Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore,<sup>28</sup> And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread,<sup>29</sup> And ye shall keep the charge of the holy things,<sup>30</sup> are these [passages] also [to be interpreted] thus! — Therefore, said R. Ashi, THE FORBIDDEN RELATIONS MAY NOT BE EXPOUNDED IN THE PRESENCE OF THREE must mean: the

secrets<sup>31</sup> of the forbidden relations may not be expounded to three.<sup>32</sup> What is the reason? It is a logical conclusion:<sup>33</sup> when two sit before their master, one engages in discussion with his master and the other inclines his ear to the instruction; but [when there are] three, one engages in discussion with his master, and the other two engage in discussion with one another and do not know what their master is saying, and may come to permit that which is prohibited in the matter of the forbidden relations. If so, [the rule should apply to] the whole Torah also!<sup>34</sup> The [subject of] forbidden relations is different, for the master said:<sup>35</sup> Robbery and the forbidden relations, a man's soul covets and lusts for them. If so, [the rule should apply to] robbery also! [In the case of] the forbidden relations, whether [the opportunity] be before him or not before him, a man's inclination is strong; [in the case of] robbery, if [the opportunity] is before him, his inclination is strong, but if it is not before him, his inclination is not strong.

**NOR THE WORK OF CREATION IN THE PRESENCE OF TWO.** Whence [do we infer] this? — For the Rabbis taught: For ask thou now of the days past,<sup>36</sup> one may inquire,<sup>37</sup> but two may not inquire. One might have thought that one may inquire concerning the pre-creation period, therefore Scripture teaches: Since the day that God created man upon the earth.<sup>38</sup> One might have thought that one may [also] not inquire concerning the six days of creation,<sup>39</sup> therefore Scripture teaches: The days past<sup>40</sup> which were before thee.<sup>41</sup> One might have thought one may [also] inquire concerning what is above and what is below, what before and what after, therefore the text teaches: And from one end of heaven unto the other.<sup>42</sup> [Concerning the things that are] from one end of heaven unto the other thou mayest inquire, but thou mayest not inquire what is above, what is below, what before, what after.

(1) The word **הנה** ('they') occurs in Lev. XVIII, 17 in connection with a legitimate daughter, and *ibid.* v. 10 in connection with the grand-daughter of an illegitimate wife (*v. Yeb.* 97a). By analogy, we infer that an illegitimate daughter is also a forbidden relation.

(2) Having established an analogy between the legitimate and illegitimate daughter (*v. n.* 7), we go farther and say the word **זמה** ('lewdness'), which implies the penalty of burning (*v. ibid.* XX, 14) for connection with one's legitimate daughter, applies also to connection with one's illegitimate daughter; *v. Yeb.*, *Sonc. ed.*, p. 4, nn. 8-12.

(3) I.e., the laws explicitly stated in Scripture are essentials of the Torah, and those not so explicitly stated are not!

(4) *V.* p. 50, n. 8.

(5) I.e., it is forbidden to expound this subject in the presence of more than two.

(6) *V. Gen.* I, 1-3; *J.E.* vol. IV, pp. 280f,s. 'Cosmogony', and vol. VIII, p. 235. The term **מעשה בראשית** (Work of Creation) does not include the whole Talmudic cosmogony, only its esoteric aspects. The cosmogonic details mentioned *infra* in the Gemara (pp. 63f), such as the ten elements, the ten agencies etc., do not form part of the secret doctrine of Ma'aseh Bere'shith, for the Mishnah expressly forbids the teaching of the creation mysteries in public. The views recorded in the Talmud regarding the work of creation seem to belong chiefly to the realm of Aggadah. As regards their origin, they cannot with certainty be connected with the theosophic and cosmogonic doctrines of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, nor with Gnosticism; nor on the other hand can the mysticism of the Geonic period (e.g., as preserved in *Sefer Yezirah* with reference to the heavenly halls, angelology etc.) be regarded as a direct continuation of the Talmudic doctrines.

(7) *V. Ezek.* I, 4f, X, and *Isa.* VI; cf. *Meg.* IV, 10; and *v. J.E.* vol. VIII, p. 498. The mysteries of Creation and the Chariot were favourite themes with the mystics; for further information *v. J.E.* vol. III, p. 456f, s. 'Cabala'.

(8) Heb. **רתוי** or **רתוי**; but *Mishnah ed.*, MS. M. and *var. lec.* in Aruch have **ראוי** ('he is looked upon as though'). Jastrow, who takes **רתוי** to mean 'relief, mercy, pity', renders as in text; Rashi translates: 'it were better for him', taking the root meaning to be 'mercy'; Levy translates: 'it were more advantageous for him'; Goldschmidt and Danby: 'it were better'.

(9) Sc., the sky stretching over the heads of the 'living creatures of the Chariot (Rashi).

(10) Sc., the 'living creatures'.

(11) I.e., beyond the sky eastward and westward (Rashi). This makes the reference spatial, and this explanation is supported by the use of the terms *infra* (p. 62); but from the Gemara 16a and the *Tosef.* it is clear that the terms have also a temporal significance. i.e., what happened before Creation and what will happen hereafter (*Tosaf. a.l.*).

- (12) Explained infra 16a.
- (13) V. p. 59, n. 5.
- (14) This means, apparently, that a person is not permitted to study the mysteries of the Chariot even by himself, although the fact that he can study without the aid of a teacher shows that he is a Sage and understands of his own knowledge.
- (15) I.e., the number refers to the pupils and does not include the teacher.
- (16) I.e., is able to speculate by himself. Such a disciple will not require to ask his teacher questions, for these mysteries may not be explained explicitly. D.S. omits the 'and'; cf. p. 77.
- (17) Lev. XVIII, 6.
- (18) Heb. **שני שני** lit., 'man man', i.e., two men, as a minimum.
- (19) Ibid. I.e., to reveal the reasons underlying the laws of the forbidden relations.
- (20) Ibid. XXIV, 15.
- (21) Ibid. XX, 2.
- (22) Lit., 'blessing of God', a euphemism.
- (23) Ibid. XVIII, 6.
- (24) For the seven 'Noachian Precepts' which all humanity, Gentiles as well as Jews, must observe v. Sanh. 56a-b, (Sonc. ed. pp. 381-2 and nn. a.l.)
- (25) Lev. XXIV v. 30.
- (26) The plural ('Ye') implies at least two.
- (27) Ibid. V. p. 60, n. 8.
- (28) Ex. XXXI, 14.
- (29) Ibid. XII, 17.
- (30) Num. XVIII, 5.
- (31) I.e., according to Rashi, such forbidden relations as are not explicitly mentioned in Scripture, but are inferred, e.g., a man's daughter by a woman he violated, the mother of his father-in-law, or the mother of his mother-in-law (v. Sanh. 75a); according to Maharsha, the secrets of the reasons for the prohibitions; according to Goldschmidt, the details and subtleties of the subject.
- (32) **לשלושה**: this marginal correction is indubitably correct as against **בשלושה** ('in the presence of three'), of cur. edd.
- (33) I.e., it is founded on reason and not deduced from Scripture.
- (34) I.e., that not more than two pupils may study with the master.
- (35) Mak. 23b.
- (36) Heb. lit., 'the first days', i.e., the days of creation; Deut. IV, 32.
- (37) I.e., one pupil may study with the master.
- (38) Ibid.
- (39) I.e., up to the creation of man; for the verse quoted above permits inquiry only from the time of the creation of Adam, which occurred at the end of the sixth day.
- (40) Heb. lit., 'the first days', i.e., even from the first day onward.
- (41) Ibid.
- (42) Ibid.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 12a

But now that this<sup>1</sup> is inferred from [the expression] 'From one end of heaven unto the other',<sup>2</sup> wherefore do I need [the expression], 'Since the day that God created man upon the earth'? — To intimate that which R. Eleazar taught. For R. Eleazar said: The first man [extended]<sup>3</sup> from the earth to the firmament, as it is said: Since the day that God created man upon the earth;<sup>4</sup> but as soon as he sinned,<sup>5</sup> the Holy One, blessed be He, placed His hand upon him and diminished him,<sup>6</sup> for it is said: Thou hast fashioned me<sup>7</sup> after and before,<sup>8</sup> and laid Thine hand upon me.<sup>9</sup>

Rab Judah said that Rab said: The first man [extended]<sup>10</sup> from one end of the world to the other,<sup>11</sup> for it is said: 'Since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from one end of heaven to the



other'; as soon as he sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, placed His hand upon him and diminished him, for it is said: 'And laid Thine hand upon me'. If so, the verses<sup>12</sup> contradict one another! — They both [have] the same dimensions.<sup>13</sup>

Rab Judah further said that Rab said: Ter<sup>14</sup> things were created the first day, and they are as follows: heaven and earth, Tohu [chaos], Bohu [desolation],<sup>15</sup> light and darkness, wind and water, the measure of day and the measure of night.<sup>16</sup> Heaven and earth, for it is written: In the beginning God created heaven and earth.<sup>17</sup> Tohu and Bohu, for it is written: And the earth was Tohu and Bohu.<sup>18</sup> Light and darkness: darkness, for it is written: And darkness was upon the face of the deep;<sup>18</sup> light, for it is written: And God said, Let there be light.<sup>19</sup> Wind and water, for it is written: And the wind<sup>20</sup> of God hovered over the face of the waters.<sup>21</sup> The measure of day and the measure of night, for it is written: And there was evening and there was morning, one day.<sup>22</sup> It is taught: Tohu is a green line that encompasses the whole world, out of which darkness proceeds, for it is said: He made darkness His hiding-place round about Him.<sup>23</sup> Bohu, this means the slimy<sup>24</sup> stones that are sunk in the deep, out of which the waters proceed, for it is said: And he shall stretch over it the line of confusion [Tohu] and the plummet of emptiness [Bohu].<sup>25</sup>

But was the light created on the first day? For, behold, it is written: And God set them in the firmament of the heaven,<sup>26</sup> and it is [further] written: And there was evening and there was morning a fourth day<sup>27</sup> — This is [to be explained] according to R. Eleazar. For R. Eleazar said: The light which the Holy One, blessed be He, created on the first day, one could see thereby from one end of the world to the other; but as soon as the Holy One, blessed be He, beheld the generation of the Flood and the generation of the Dispersion,<sup>28</sup> and saw that their actions were corrupt, He arose and hid it from them, for it is said: But from the wicked their light is withholden.<sup>29</sup> And for whom did he reserve it? For the righteous in the time to come,<sup>30</sup> for it is said: And God saw the light, that it was good;<sup>31</sup> and 'good' means only the righteous, for it is said: Say ye of the righteous that he is good.<sup>32</sup> As soon as He saw the light that He had reserved for the righteous, He rejoiced, for it is said: He rejoiceth at the light of the righteous.<sup>33</sup> Now Tannaim [differ on the point]: The light which the Holy One, blessed be He, created on the first day one could see and look thereby from one end of the world to the other; this is the view of R. Jacob. But the Sages say: It<sup>34</sup> is identical with the luminaries;<sup>35</sup> for they were created on the first day, but they were not hung up [in the firmament] till the fourth day.<sup>36</sup>

R. Zulra b. Tobiah said that Rab said: by ten things<sup>37</sup> was the world created: By wisdom<sup>38</sup> and by understanding,<sup>39</sup> and by reason,<sup>40</sup> and by strength,<sup>41</sup> and by rebuke,<sup>42</sup> and by might,<sup>43</sup> by righteousness and by judgment,<sup>44</sup> by lovingkindness and by compassion.<sup>45</sup> By wisdom and understanding, for it is written: The Lord by wisdom founded the earth; and by understanding established the heavens.<sup>46</sup> By reason, for it is written: By His reason<sup>47</sup> the depths were broken up.<sup>48</sup> By strength and might, for it is written: Who by His strength setteth fast the mountains, Who is girded about with might.<sup>49</sup> By rebuke, for it is written: The pillars of heaven were trembling, but they became astonished at His, rebuke.<sup>50</sup> By righteousness and judgment, for it is written: Righteousness and judgment are the foundation of Thy throne.<sup>51</sup> By lovingkindness and compassion, for it is written: Remember, O Lord, Thy compassions and Thy mercies; for they have been from of old.<sup>52</sup> Rab Judah further said: At the time that the Holy One, blessed be He, created the world, it went on expanding like two clues<sup>53</sup> of warp, until the Holy One, blessed be He, rebuked it and brought it to a standstill, for it is said: 'The pillars of heaven were trembling, but they became astonished at His rebuke'. And that, too, is what Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the verse, I am God Almighty?<sup>54</sup> [It means], I am He that said to the world: Enough!<sup>55</sup> Resh Lakish said: When the Holy One, blessed be He, created the sea, it went on expanding, until the Holy One, blessed be He, rebuked it and caused it to dry up, for it is said: He rebuketh the sea and maketh it dry, and drieth up all the rivers.<sup>56</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Beth Shammai say: Heaven was created first and afterwards the earth was created, for it is said: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.<sup>57</sup> Beth Hillel say: Earth was created first and afterwards heaven, for it is said: In the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven.<sup>58</sup> Beth Hillel said to Beth Shammai: According to your view, a man builds the upper storey [first] and afterwards builds the house! For it is said: It is he that buildeth His upper chambers in the heaven,<sup>59</sup> and hath founded His vault upon the earth.<sup>60</sup> Said Beth Shammai to Beth Hillel: According to your view, a man makes the footstool [first], and afterwards he makes the throne!<sup>61</sup> For it is said: Thus saith the Lord, The Heaven is My throne and the earth is My footstool.<sup>62</sup> But the Sages say: Both were created at the same time.<sup>63</sup> For it is said: Yea, Mine hand hath laid the foundation of the earth, and My right hand hath spread out the heavens: When I call unto them they stand up together.<sup>64</sup> And the others?<sup>65</sup> What is the meaning of ‘together’? — [It means] that they cannot be loosened from one another.<sup>66</sup> However, the verses contradict one another! — Resh Lakish answered: When they were created, He created heaven [first], and afterwards He created the earth; but when He stretched them forth He stretched forth the earth [first], and afterwards He stretched forth heaven.

What does ‘heaven’ [Shamayim] mean? R. Jose b. Hanina said: It means, ‘There is water’.<sup>67</sup> In a Baraita it is taught: [It means], ‘fire and water’<sup>68</sup>; this teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, brought them and mixed<sup>69</sup> them one with the other and made from them the firmament.

R. Ishmael questioned R. Akiba when they were going on a journey together, saying to him: Thou who hast waited<sup>70</sup> twenty-two years upon Nahum of Gimzo,<sup>71</sup> who used to explain the [particle] Eth<sup>72</sup> throughout the Torah, [tell me] what exposition did he give of [Eth] the heaven and [Eth] the earth?<sup>73</sup> Said [R. Akiba] to him: If it had said, ‘heaven and earth’, I could have said that Heaven and Earth<sup>74</sup> were names of the Holy One, blessed be He.<sup>75</sup> But now that it says: ‘[Eth] the heaven and [Eth] the earth’, heaven [means] the actual heaven, and earth [means] the actual earth.

- 
- (1) I.e., that inquiry may not go beyond the first day of creation.
  - (2) I.e., since one may not inquire beyond the extent of heaven, it follows that one may not inquire beyond the time of its existence, i.e., concerning what happened prior to the creation.
  - (3) I.e., in height: this is the usual explanation. But Goldschmidt suggests that the meaning might also be: his vision extended from earth to heaven. Cf. R. Eleazar's statement *infra* p. 63 and n. 2 a. 1.
  - (4) The verse continues, (lit.) ‘and unto the end of heaven’.
  - (5) Lit., ‘became of bad odour’.
  - (6) The Yalkut Shim'oni (S. 827, Deut. IV, 32) adds ‘and brought him down to one hundred cubits’. This is probably derived from the word כַּפְּכָה ‘Thine hand’ in the verse that follows, the numerical value of כָּף (‘hand’) being a hundred. Cf. also B.B. 75a (and Rashbam a.l.) and Sanh. 100a (and Rashi a.l.).
  - (7) Heb., צִרְתָּנִי lit., (as E.V.) ‘Thou hast hemmed me in’. Here, however, it is taken to mean the same as יִצְרָתִי ‘fashioned, created’.
  - (8) I.e., there were, so to speak, two creations of man: the first when he extended to heaven, the second when his stature was reduced.
  - (9) Ps. CXXXIX, 5.
  - (10) V. p. 62, n. 10.
  - (11) I.e., lying down, he stretched from east to west, which is calculated to be a journey of five hundred years; v, Tosaf.
  - (12) I.e., the parts of Deut. IV, 32 quoted by R. Eleazar and Rab Judah respectively.
  - (13) The distance from east to west is the same as from the earth to heaven, v. *infra* 13a. But in Tam. 31b-32a (the Scholars of the South, i.e., of Alexandria) are reported to have said, in reply to a question put to them by Alexander the Great, that the distance from east to west is greater than that from earth to heaven.
  - (14) The older schools refer to a lesser number of elements viz., eight, six, four, three, or even two. Cf. Gen. Rab. X, 1; Pirke R. Eliezer III; Ex. Rab. XIII; Jellinek, B.H. ii, 23-29, Intro. Xlii; also *infra*, where Tahu and Bohu are the two primal elements whence the other two, darkness and water, emanate. V. further, Slavonic Book of Enoch (24-30).
  - (15) A.V. ‘without form, and void’; R. V., ‘waste and void’; American Jewish Version, ‘unformed and void’ (Gen. I, 2).
  - (16) I.e., night and day comprising together twenty-four hours. (Rashi, Jast.). Goldschmidt trans. ‘the nature of day etc.’;

cf. Ber. 11b.

(17) Gen. I, 1,

(18) Ibid., v. 2.

(19) Ibid.; v. 3.

(20) E.V. 'spirit'.

(21) Ibid., v. 2.

(22) Ibid.,v. 5.

(23) Ps. XVIII, 12.

(24) Heb., מְפֹלְמוֹת, which Jastrow renders, 'smooth (chaotic) stones'. Levy: 'stones sunken in the primal mire, chaos'; cf. also Targ. to Job XXVIII, 3; Zeb. 54a, Bez. 24a.

(25) Isa. XXXIV, 11.

(26) Gen. I, 17.

(27) Ibid., v. 19.

(28) I.e., the generation which built the Tower of Babel, and in consequence God confounded their language and scattered them over the earth. V. Gen. XI, 9.

(29) Job. XXXVIII, 15.

(30) I.e., the Messianic era; cf. Aboth II, 16.

(31) Gen. I, 4.

(32) Isa. III, 10. E.V. 'that it shall be well with him.

(33) Prov. XIII, 9. E.V. 'the light of the righteous rejoiceth.'

(34) I.e., the light created on the first day.

(35) V. Gen. I, 14f (E.V. 'lights').

(36) Cf. Gen. Rab. I, 14, and Rashi to Gen. I, 14.

(37) I.e., potencies or agencies. A lesser number is mentioned by the older school (cf. p. 63, n. 5). Cf. Ab. V, 1; also the 'Ten Sefirot' in J. E. vol. XI, p. 154f.

(38) I.e., the ability to understand what one learns.

(39) I.e., deductive power.

(40) I.e., deliberative contemplation.

(41) I.e., physical strength.

(42) I.e., the application of restraint or limitation.

(43) I.e., moral power.

(44) I.e., the enforcement of justice.

(45) I.e., the feeling which prompts the action of lovingkindness.

(46) Prov. III, 19.

(47) E.V. 'knowledge'.

(48) Ibid. v. 20.

(49) Ps. LXV, 7.

(50) Job XXVI, 11. I.e., at first the pillars of heaven were weak and shaky, till God rebuked them, when, like a person taken aback by astonishment, they stiffened and hardened (V. Rashi on verse). E.V. renders tremble and are astonished etc.'

(51) Ps. LXXXIX, 15.

(52) Ibid, XXV, 6.

(53) A clue of thread, of rope, etc. (Jast.).

(54) Gen. XVII, 1; XXXV, 11.

(55) אֱלֹהֵי 'Almighty', is explained as a compound of אֱלֹהֵי 'who (said)', אֵין 'Enough'.

(56) Nah. I, 4.

(57) Gen. I, 1.

(58) Ibid. II, 4.

(59) Thus heaven was the upper storey.

(60) Amos IX, 6.

(61) The size of the footstool cannot be determined till the throne has been made.

(62) Isa, LXVI, 1.

(63) C. Taylor in 'Sayings of the Jewish Fathers', p. 107. n. 40, points out that 'the three views' (of the Schools of Shammai and Hillel, and of the Sages) may be taken as texts for three philosophies, viz., idealism, evolutionism and dualism (quoted by Streane).

(64) Ibid. XLVIII, 13. From the word 'together' the inference is drawn that heaven and earth are coeval.

(65) I.e., what reply have the Schools of Shammai and Hillel to the argument of the Sages?

(66) Thus 'together' refers to their physical structure and not to their time of origin.

(67) I.e., שמים is explained as a compound of שם ('there') and מים ('water').

(68) I.e., שמים is explained as a compound of אש ('fire') and מים ('water'), the א of אש being omitted.

(69) Lit., 'mixed by beating'.

(70) I.e., hast been his disciple. Cf. Ber. 47b: 'Even if one has studied the Bible, and the Mishnah, but has failed to wait upon scholars, he is considered an 'Am ha-arez (ignoramus); The ministrations (of the disciples to the doctors) of the Law is greater than the direct teaching thereof'.

(71) In Judea (v. G. A. Smith's 'The historical Geography of the Holy Land', p. 202, n. 1). Heb. גם זו, always in two words, and explained (Ta'an. 21a, J. Shek. V, 15) as a sobriquet given to the scholar on account of his motto גם זו לטובה ('This, too, will be for the best'), with which he explained his trust in the goodness of Providence even in the most trying circumstances (v. Ta'an 21a). He interpreted the whole Torah according to the rule of רבוי ומיעוט ('amplification and limitation', v. Shebu. 26a).

(72) Heb. את, which is either (a) the sign of the defined object as in Gen. I, 1, or (b) the preposition meaning with. Nahum of Gimzo explained every instance of the accusative particle as indicating the inclusion in the object of something besides that which is explicitly mentioned. For the sole exception (Deut. X, 20), v. Pes. 22b, where 'Nehemiah the Imsoni' is an error for 'Nahum the Gimsoni' or man of Gimzo (v. Graetz in MGWJ., 1870, p. 527). The interpretation of את given here is grammatical rather than Midrashic or homiletical. For the רבוי explanation of את in this verse, which includes the sun and moon etc., v. Gen. Rab. I, 14.

(73) Gen. I, 1.

(74) This is the reading of Bah and Maharsha: cur. edd. omit the words, 'and the earth'.

(75) And the subject of ברא ('He created').

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 12b

But why do we have '[Eth] the earth'?<sup>1</sup> — To put heaven before earth.<sup>2</sup>

'And the earth was unformed and void'.<sup>3</sup> Consider: [Scripture] began at first with heaven, why then does it proceed to relate [first] the work of the earth?<sup>4</sup> — The School of R. Ishmael taught: It is like a human king<sup>5</sup> who said to his servants: Come early to my door. He rose early and found women and men. Whom does he praise? The ones who are not accustomed to rise early but yet did rise early.<sup>6</sup>

It is taught: R. Jose says: Alas for people that they see but know not what they see, they stand but know not on what they stand. What does the earth rest on? On the pillars, for it is said: Who shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble.<sup>7</sup> The pillars upon the waters, for it is said: To Him that spread forth the earth above the waters.<sup>8</sup> The waters upon the mountains, for it is said: The waters stood above the mountains.<sup>9</sup> The mountains on the wind, for it is said: For, lo, He that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind.<sup>10</sup> The wind upon the storm, for it is said: The wind, the storm maketh its substance.<sup>11</sup> Storm is suspended on the arm of the Holy One, blessed be He, for it is said: And underneath<sup>12</sup> are the everlasting arms.<sup>13</sup> But the Sages say: [The world] rests on twelve pillars,<sup>14</sup> for it is said: He set the borders to the peoples according to the number [of the tribes] of the children of Israel.<sup>15</sup> And some say seven pillars, for it is said: She hath hewn out her seven pillars.<sup>16</sup> R. Eleazar b. Shammua' says: [It rests] on one pillar, and its name is 'Righteous', for it is said: But 'Righteous' is the foundation of the world.<sup>17</sup>

R. Judah said: There are two firmaments, for it is said: Behold, unto the Lord thy God belongeth heaven, and the heaven of heavens.<sup>18</sup> Resh Lakish said: [There are] seven, namely, Wilon,<sup>19</sup>

Rakia',<sup>20</sup> Shehakim,<sup>21</sup> Zebul,<sup>22</sup> Ma'on,<sup>23</sup> Makon,<sup>24</sup> 'Araboth.<sup>25</sup> Wilon serves no purpose except that it enters in the morning and goes forth in the evening<sup>26</sup> and renews every day the work of creation, for it is said: That stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain,<sup>27</sup> and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in.<sup>28</sup> Rakia' is that in which sun and moon, stars and constellations are set, for it is said: And God set them<sup>29</sup> in the firmament [Rakia'] of the heaven.<sup>30</sup> Shehakim is that in which millstones stand and grind<sup>31</sup> manna for the righteous for it is said: And He commanded the skies [Shehakim] above, and opened the doors of heaven; and He caused manna to rain upon them for food etc.<sup>32</sup> Zebul is that in which [the heavenly] Jerusalem<sup>33</sup> and the Temple and the Altar are built, and Michael, the great Prince,<sup>34</sup> stands and offers up thereon an offering, for it is said: I have surely built Thee a house of habitation [Zebul], a place for Thee to dwell in for ever.<sup>35</sup> And whence do we derive that it is called heaven? For it is written: Look down from heaven, and see, even from Thy holy and glorious habitation.<sup>36</sup> Ma'on is that in which there are companies of Ministering Angels, who utter [divine] song by night, and are silent by day for the sake of Israel's glory,<sup>37</sup> for it is said: By day the Lord doth command His lovingkindness,<sup>38</sup> and in the night His song is with me.<sup>39</sup>

Resh Lakish said: Whoever occupies himself with [the study of] the Torah by night, the Holy One, blessed be He, draws over him a chord of lovingkindness<sup>40</sup> by day, for it is said: 'By day the Lord doth command His lovingkindness'? Because 'by night His song<sup>41</sup> is with me'. And there are some who say: Resh Lakish said: Whoever occupies himself with the study of the Torah in this world, which is like the night, the Holy One, blessed be He, draws over him a chord of lovingkindness in the world to come, which is like the day,<sup>42</sup> for it is said: 'By day the Lord doth command His lovingkindness, for by night His song is with me'.

R. Levi said: Whoever leaves off the study of the Torah and occupies himself with idle talk, he is made to eat coals of broom,<sup>43</sup> for it is said: They pluck salt-wort through idle talk,<sup>44</sup> and the roots of the broom are their food.<sup>45</sup>

And whence do we derive that it<sup>46</sup> is called heaven? — For it is said: Look forth from Thy holy habitation [ma'on], from heaven.<sup>47</sup> Makon<sup>48</sup> is that in which there are the stores of snow<sup>49</sup> and stores of hail, and the loft of harmful dews and the loft of raindrops,<sup>50</sup> the chamber of the whirlwind and storm,<sup>51</sup> and the cave of vapour, and their doors are of fire, for it is said: The Lord will open unto thee His good treasure,<sup>52</sup> But are these to be found in the firmament? Surely, they are to be found on the earth, for it is written: Praise the Lord from the earth, ye sea-monsters, and all deeps; fire and hail, snow and vapour, stormy wind, fulfilling his word!<sup>53</sup> — Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: David entreated concerning them, and caused them to come down to the earth. He said before Him: Lord of the universe, Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness; let not evil sojourn with Thee;<sup>54</sup> righteous art Thou, O Lord, let not evil sojourn in Thy abode.<sup>55</sup> And whence do we derive that it<sup>56</sup> is called heaven? For it is written: Then hear Thou in heaven, Thy dwelling place [Makon].<sup>57</sup>

'Araboth is that in which there are Right and Judgment and Righteousness,<sup>58</sup> the treasures of life and the treasures of peace and the treasures of blessing, the souls of the righteous and the spirits and the souls<sup>59</sup> which are yet to be born, and dew wherewith the Holy One, blessed be He, will hereafter revive the dead. Right and Judgment, for it is written: Right<sup>60</sup> and judgment are the foundations of Thy throne.<sup>61</sup> Righteousness, for it is written: And He put on righteousness as a coat of mail.<sup>62</sup> The treasures of life, for it is written: For with Thee is the fountain of life.<sup>63</sup> And the treasures of peace, for it is written: And called it, 'The Lord is peace'.<sup>64</sup> And the treasures of blessing, for it is written: he shall receive a blessing from the Lord.<sup>65</sup> The souls of the righteous, for it is written: Yet the soul of my lord shall be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God.<sup>66</sup> The spirits and the souls which are yet to be born, for it is written: For the spirit that enwrappeth itself is from Me, and the souls which I have made.<sup>67</sup> And the dew wherewith the Holy One, blessed be He, will hereafter revive the dead, for it is written: A bounteous rain didst Thou pour down, O God; when Thine

inheritance was weary, Thou didst confirm it.<sup>68</sup> There [too] are the Ofanim<sup>69</sup> and the Seraphim,<sup>70</sup> and the Holy Living Creatures,<sup>71</sup> and the Ministering Angels,<sup>72</sup> and the Throne of God; and the King, the Living God, high and exalted, dwells over them in 'Araboth, for it is said: Extol Him that rideth upon Araboth<sup>73</sup> whose name is the Lord.<sup>74</sup> And whence do we derive that it<sup>75</sup> is called heaven? From the word 'riding', which occurs in two Biblical passages. Here it is written: 'Extol Him that rideth upon Araboth'. And elsewhere it is written: Who rideth upon the heaven as thy help.<sup>76</sup> And darkness and cloud and thick darkness surround Him, for it is said: He made darkness His hiding-place, His pavilion round about Him, darkness of waters, thick clouds of skies.<sup>77</sup> But is there any darkness before Heaven?<sup>78</sup> For behold it is written: He revealeth the deep and secret things; He knoweth, what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with Him.<sup>79</sup> — There is no contradiction: the one [verse]<sup>80</sup>

(1) I.e., the first Eth in the verse has been explained; but what is the purpose of the second?

(2) I.e., to show that the creation of the heaven preceded that of the earth. Had this second Eth been omitted, I might have thought that heaven and earth were created at the same time.

(3) Gen. I, 2.

(4) I.e., its development from a state of dark chaos to light and ordered life.

(5) Lit., 'a king of flesh and blood'.

(6) Rashi explains the application of the parable thus: Since heaven was summoned to appear first, the earth was in the position of one not accustomed to rise early; furthermore, all the work of the earth is slow, whilst the work of heaven is swift. Nevertheless, the earth appeared equally early with heaven, for they were created at the same time (according to the view of the Sages, v. p. 66), therefore Scripture begins to relate the work of the earth first. But Maharsha explains that the earth obeyed God's will first and came into being before heaven (according to the view of Beth Hillel, *ibid.*) just as the women in the parable actually came before the men.

(7) Job IX, 6.

(8) Ps. CXXXVI, 6.

(9) *Ibid.* CIV, 6.

(10) Amos IV, 13. The mention of the mountains and the wind in the same verse shows that the former were dependent or suspended upon the latter.

(11) So Rashi. E.V., 'Stormy wind, fulfilling His word. Ps. CXLVIII, 8.

(12) Sc. all creation.

(13) Deut. XXXIII, 27.

(14) The pillars here refer to those mentioned by R. Jose (v. *supra*), who, however, did not give their number.

(15) Deut. XXXII, 8.

(16) Prov. IX, 1.

(17) *Ibid.* X, 25. E.V., 'But the righteous is an everlasting foundation'. Maharsha compares this discussion of the number of the pillars with the discussion of the number of the precepts in Mak., Sonc. ed., pp. 169f.

(18) Deut. X, 14.

(19) I.e., 'Curtain', from Lat. *Velum*.

(20) I.e., 'Expanse, firmament'.

(21) Lit., 'Clouds', from **שָׁחַק**, 'dust' (cf. Isa. XL, 15).

(22) B.D.B.: 'Elevation, height, lofty abode'; N.H., 'Temple'. Jastrow: '(place of offering or entertainment) residence, especially Temple'.

(23) I.e., 'Dwelling, habitation'.

(24) I.e., 'Fixed or established place, foundation, residence'.

(25) V. Ps, LXVIII, 5. Lev: Perhaps from **עָרַב**, 'to be dark' (cf. **עָרַב** evening) and syn. with **עֲרַפֵּל**: (thick darkness, heavy cloud, in which God dwells; cf. Ex. XX, 18).

(26) According to Rashi, Wilon ('Curtain') draws in every morning, and thus causes the light of day to become visible; in the evening it draws out and hides the daylight. This process constitutes the renewal of the work of creation. But Tosaf. explains that Wilon produces the light of day, and when it withdraws at night darkness prevails.

(27) Thus there is a curtain-like heaven.

(28) Isa. XL, 22.

- (29) I.e., the heavenly luminaries.
- (30) Gen. I, 17.
- (31) There is probably a play here on the meaning of שִׁחַק (the root of shehakim), which means 'to rub away, pulverize, grind' (cf. Ex. XXX, 36 and Job, XIV, 19).
- (32) Ps. LXXVIII, 23, 24.
- (33) Cf. Ta'an. 5a: 'The Holy One blessed be He, said: I shall not enter the Jerusalem which is above, until I enter the Jerusalem which is below'.
- (34) Michael is Israel's Guardian Angel; cf. Dan. XII, 1 and Yoma 77a. Num. Rab. s. 2, Hul. 40a.
- (35) I Kings VIII, 13; the earthly Temple corresponds to the heavenly Sanctuary.
- (36) Isa. LXIII, 15.
- (37) Because Israel utters God's praise by day.
- (38) By silencing the angels by day. God shows lovingkindness to the children of Israel, who are thus permitted to win divine grace by their prayer. Cf. also A.Z. 3b on the same verse.
- (39) Ps. XLII, 9. I.e., by night the song of the angels joins mine (says Israel), which I uttered by day (Rashi).
- (40) I.e., of His protection.
- (41) I.e., the Torah.
- (42) Cf. Aboth IV, 16,17.
- (43) This is the punishment for slander and a figurative expression for Gehinnom; cf. Yal. Shim. s. 120, Midr. Till. to Ps. CXX, and Gen. Rab. 98.
- (44) Heb. שִׁיב, which may represent two totally different words of identical spelling: one means 'shrub' (or, according to some, 'wormwood') which is the natural meaning here, the other means 'complaint, musing, talk', which is the sense in which it is homiletically understood by R. Levi.
- (45) Job. XXX, 4.
- (46) I.e., Ma'on: the explanation of the seven heavens is here resumed.
- (47) Deut. XXVI, 15.
- (48) According to Rashi, this heaven contains stores of punishments, the snow etc. being employed not for the world's benefit, but for retribution, Tosaf., however, holds that the contents of Ma'on are used for good as well as evil, and compares Ta'an. 3b and Isa. LV, 10.
- (49) For these stores cf. Job XXXVIII, 22f also Isa. XXIX, 6.
- (50) Rashi: to smite down the produce.
- (51) Omitted by R. Elijah of Wilna,
- (52) Deut, XXVIII, 12; implying also the existence of a bad store, i.e., of punishments; but the "Ein Jacob' reads here Jer. L, 25.
- (53) Ps. CXLVIII, 7, 8.
- (54) Ibid. V, 5.
- (55) Note how the Talmudic explanation of the verse transforms the negative description of God into a positive one, and changes ('with Thee' into 'in thy abode' to prevent any misconception about God's perfection.
- (56) I.e., Makon.
- (57) I Kings VIII, 39.
- (58) Heb. צְדָקָה, which implies righteous actions and is often used in the sense of charity.
- (59) Rashi explains that either 'spirits' and 'souls' are synonymous, or else 'spirit' means the soul that has bodily form (ectoplasm?).
- (60) E.V. 'Righteousness'.
- (61) Ps. LXXXIX, 15.
- (62) Isa LIX, 17.
- (63) Ps. XXXVI, 10.
- (64) Judg. VI, 24. Rashi renders: He (the Lord) called it (peace) unto Him.
- (65) Ps. XXIV, 5.
- (66) 1 Sam. XXV, 29.
- (67) Isa. LVII, 1.
- (68) Ps. LXVIII, 10. The verse refers to the Revelation at Sinai, when, according to the Midrash, the souls of the children of Israel momentarily left their bodies, but God with His bounteous rain or dew of resurrection revived them.

Cf. Cant. Rab. to Cant. V, 6.

(69) Lit., 'Wheels', i.e., wheel-like angels; v. Ezek. I, 15f.

(70) V. Isa. VI, 2; in Rabbinic literature they are understood to be angels of fire, cf. Deut. Rab. s. 11. But v. B. D. B. s.v.

(71) V. Ezek. I, 5f.

(72) Apparently distinct from those dwelling in Ma'on (v. p. 70).

(73) A.V. 'upon the heavens'; R.V. 'through the deserts'.

(74) Ps. LXVIII, 5.

(75) I.e., Araboth.

(76) Deut. XXXIII, 26.

(77) Ps. XVIII, 12.

(78) I.e., God.

(79) Dan. II, 22.

(80) I.e., the latter.

### Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 13a

refers to the inner chambers,<sup>1</sup> the other to the outer chambers. And R. Aha b. Jacob said: There is still another Heaven above the heads of the living creatures, for it is written: And over the heads of the living creatures there was a likeness of a firmament, like the colour of the terrible ice, stretched forth over their heads above.<sup>2</sup> Thus far you have permission to speak, thenceforward you have not permission to speak, for so it is written in the Book of Ben Sira:<sup>3</sup> Seek not things that are too hard for thee,<sup>4</sup> and search not things that are hidden from thee. The things that have been permitted<sup>5</sup> thee, think thereupon; thou hast no business with<sup>6</sup> the things that are secret.<sup>7</sup>

It is taught: R. Johanan b. Zakkai said: What answer did the Bath Kol<sup>8</sup> give to that wicked one,<sup>9</sup> when he said: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High?<sup>10</sup> A Bath Kol went forth and said to him: O wicked man, son of a wicked man, grandson<sup>11</sup> of Nimrod, the wicked, who stirred the whole world to rebellion against Me<sup>12</sup> by his rule. How many are the years of man? Seventy, for it is said: The days of our years are threescore years and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore years.<sup>13</sup> But the distance from the earth to the firmament is a journey of five hundred years, and the thickness of the firmament is a journey of five hundred years, and likewise [the distance] between one firmament and the other.<sup>14</sup> Above them<sup>15</sup> are the holy living creatures: the feet<sup>16</sup> of the living creatures are equal to all of them [together];<sup>17</sup> the ankles of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the legs of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the knees<sup>18</sup> of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the thighs of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the bodies of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the necks of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the heads of the living creatures are equal to all of them; the horns of the living creatures are equal to all of them. Above them is the throne of glory; the feet of the throne of glory are equal to all of them; the throne of glory is equal to all of them. The King, the Living and Eternal God, High and Exalted, dwelleth above them. Yet thou didst say, I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High! Nay<sup>19</sup>, thou shalt be brought down to the nether-world, to the uttermost parts of the pit.<sup>20</sup>

NOR [THE WORK OF] THE CHARIOT IN THE PRESENCE OF ONE. R. Hiyya taught: But the headings of chapters<sup>21</sup> may be transmitted to him. R. Zera said: The headings of chapters may be transmitted only to the head of a court<sup>22</sup> and to one whose heart is anxious within him.<sup>23</sup> Others say: Only if his heart is anxious within him.<sup>24</sup> R. Amimi said: The mysteries of the Torah may be transmitted only to one who possesses five attributes, [namely], The captain of fifty, and the man of rank, and the counsellor, and the cunning charmer, and the skillful enchanter.<sup>25</sup> R. Ammi further said: The teachings of the Torah are not to be transmitted to an idolater,<sup>26</sup> for it is said: He hath not dealt so with any nation; and as for His ordinances, they have not known them.<sup>27</sup>



R. Johanan said to R. Eleazar: Come, I will instruct you in the 'Work of the Chariot'.<sup>28</sup> He replied: I am not old enough.<sup>29</sup> When he was old enough, R. Johanan died.<sup>30</sup> R. Assi [then] said to him: Come, I will instruct you in the "Work of the Chariot". He replied: Had I been worthy, I should have been instructed by R. Johanan, your master.

R. Joseph was studying the 'Work of the Chariot'; the elders of Pumbeditha<sup>31</sup> were studying the 'Work of Creation'. The latter said to the former: Let the master teach us the 'Work of the Chariot'. He replied: Teach me the 'Work of Creation'. After they had taught him, they said to him: Let the master instruct us in the 'Work of the Chariot'. He replied: We have learnt concerning it: Honey and milk are under thy tongue.<sup>32</sup> The things that are sweeter than honey and milk should be under thy tongue.<sup>33</sup> R. Abbahu said: [It<sup>34</sup> is inferred] from this verse: The lambs [Ke-basim] will be for thy clothing.<sup>35</sup> The things which are the mystery [Kibshono] of the world should be under thy clothing.<sup>36</sup> They<sup>37</sup> [then] said to him: We have already studied therein as far as, And He said unto me: 'Son of man'.<sup>38</sup> He replied: This is the very [portion of the] 'Work of the Chariot'.<sup>39</sup>

An objection was raised: How far does [the portion of] the 'Work of the Chariot' extend? Rabbi said: As far as the second And I saw.<sup>40</sup> R. Isaac said: As far as Hashmal<sup>41</sup> — As far as 'I saw'<sup>42</sup> may be taught;<sup>43</sup> thenceforward, [only] the heads of chapters<sup>44</sup> may be transmitted. Some, however, say: As far as 'I saw', the heads of chapters may be transmitted; thenceforward, if he is a Sage able to speculate by himself, Yes; if not, No. But may one expound [the mysteries of] Hashmal? For behold there was once a child<sup>45</sup> who expounded [the mysteries of] Hashmal, and a fire went forth and consumed him! — [The case of] the child is different, for he had not reached the [fitting] age. Rab Judah said: That man be remembered for blessing,<sup>46</sup> namely, Hananiah b. Hezekiah: but for him, the Book of Ezekiel would have been withdrawn,<sup>47</sup> for its words contradict the words of the Torah.<sup>48</sup> What did he do? Three hundred garab<sup>49</sup> of oil were brought up to him, and he sat in an upper chamber and expounded it.

The Rabbis taught: There was once a child who was reading at his teacher's house the Book of Ezekiel, and he apprehended what Hashmal was,<sup>50</sup> whereupon a fire went forth from Hashmal and consumed him. So they<sup>51</sup> sought to suppress the Book of Ezekiel, but Hananiah b. Hezekiah said to them: If he was a Sage, all are Sages!<sup>52</sup> What does [the word] Hashmal mean?-Rab Judah said:

---

(1) Cf. supra p. 23, n. 5.

(2) Ezek. I, 22.

(3) Cf. Ecclesiasticus III, 21, 22. The author, whose full name seems to have been Jesus b. Simeon b. Eleazar b. Sira, is the only writer of the Old Testament or Apocrypha who signed his work (v. *ibid.* L, 27). His date falls in the first third of the second century B.C.E. He wrote in Hebrew, the Greek translation being made by his grandson, of whom it is known that he went to Egypt in 132; the greater part of the Hebrew original has been recovered from the Cairo Genizah. According to Tosef. Yad. II, 13, the writings of Ben Sira do not defile the hands, i.e., are uncanonical, and so rank the works of 'Minim' or heretics. Eccl. Rab. XII, 11 forbids one to have Ben Sira's book in the house. R. Akiba (J. Sanh. 28a) includes the readers of uncanonical writings such as those of Ben Sira among those who have no share in the world to come; v. further the discussion in Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 680f and nn. a.l. on R. Akiba's prohibition. The exclusion of Ecclesiasticus from the canon and the prohibitions with which it was surrounded were probably due to its epicurean and Sadducean tendencies. Notwithstanding, the book remained popular with Jews, and is frequently quoted in early Jewish literature as well as in the Talmud and Midrash. V. J.E. vol. XI, pp. 388f.

(4) E.V. 'that are above thy strength'.

(5) E.V. 'commanded'.

(6) E.V. 'no need of'.

(7) For a variant version of this quotation v. Gen. Rab. VIII, which contains two additional clauses.

(8) Lit., 'daughter of a voice'. According to Lampronti, Levy, Kohut (*Aruch Completum*) and Jast., it means an echo'; but L. Blau holds (J.E. vol. II, pp. 588f) that it means 'sound', 'resonance'. For its secular use, v. Ex. Rab. XXIX, end; bit in our passage and Rabbinic literature passim, it refers to a heavenly or divine voice.

- (9) I.e., Nebuchadnezzar, who, in R. Johanan b. Zakkai's time, possibly suggested Titus.
- (10) Isa. XIV, 14.
- (11) As Tosaf. a.l. points out, this statement is not to be taken literally; Nebuchadnezzar is to be regarded as a spiritual descendant of Nimrod because of the similarity of their deeds (the latter persecuted Abraham — cf. Targ. pseudo-Jonathan to Gen. XIV, I; Gen. R. XLII, 5; Cant. R. VIII, 8 — and the former led into captivity Abraham's descendants) and of their place of origin (Babylon).
- (12) Lit., 'against himself', an obvious emendation, dictated by a pious desire to avoid blasphemy, of 'against Me' i.e., God. In 'Er. 53a the text has been 'corrected' as here; but in Pes. 94b, Gen. R. s. 26 etc., the original reading is preserved.
- (13) Ps. XC, 10.
- (14) V. p. 69.
- (15) I.e., the seven heavens; v. n. 5.
- (16) I.e., the thickness of the hooves.
- (17) I.e., 15 (7 heavens and 8 interspaces) X 500 years. But in J. Ber. 13a the figure is given as 515, the numerical sum of **ישרה**, 'upright'; cf. Ezek. I, 7 (Tosaf.).
- (18) Properly, the knee and its surrounding parts; cf. Hul. 76a.
- (19) E.V. 'Yet' etc.
- (20) Isa. XIV, 14f.
- (21) Probably, the leading words of each section or subject (cf. Rashi a.l. and Jast. s. **פרק**). Levy explains it as 'the interpretations of single verses'. V. infra p. 77.
- (22) Ab Beth din, lit., 'Father of a Beth din' (house of judgment). The Beth din consisted of three (according to another view, five) members for monetary cases, and of twenty-three for capital cases; whilst the Beth din ha-Gadol ('High Court'), or Great Sanhedrin, was comprised of seventy elders and the Nasi, who acted as president. The Ab Beth din of the Sanhedrin was the vice-president and most important of the seventy members (cf. Sanh. I, 1-4, Sonc. ed. pp. 1-4; and J.E. vol. lii, pp. 114f).
- (23) I.e., he is reverential and not given to levity.
- (24) I.e., one must have both qualifications viz., be the head of a court and reverential.
- (25) Isa. III, 3. For the explanation of these qualifications v. p. 85.
- (26) This, and not Cuthean (substituted on account of the censorship), is undoubtedly the correct reading. Dicta of this kind were directed against heathens, and were inspired by the fear lest the knowledge of the Torah be unscrupulously used against Jews. Cf. the story of the Roman commissioners referred to in B.K., Sonc. ed., p. 215; also R. Johanan's statement in Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 400 and Num. Rab. s. 13.
- (27) Ps. CXLVII, 20,
- (28) The 'Work of the Chariot' and the 'Work of Creation' mentioned in the next passage, were Baraitas (Rashi), which apparently, took the relevant passages of Genesis and Ezekiel as the basis of their expositions.
- (29) Cf. p. 85, where the 'captain of fifty', mentioned supra as one of the qualifications of the man to whom the mysteries of the Torah may be transmitted, is explained as one who is fifty years of age.
- (30) Lit., 'R. Johanan's soul was at rest' (cf. Isa. LVII, 2).
- (31) Lit., 'mouth of Beditha' (a canal of the Euphrates). It was the seat of a great Jewish academy.
- (32) Cant. IV, 11.
- (33) I.e., the mysteries of the Chariot may not be taught, cf. our Mishnah (p. 59). The Rabbis considered the whole of Canticles as a figurative expression of the mystical relationship between God and Israel; thus the verse quoted, which the Bridegroom says to the Bride, is really the injunction of God to Israel.
- (34) I.e., the prohibition to teach the 'Chariot' mysteries.
- (35) Prov. XXVII, 26.
- (36) I.e., in thy bosom, a secret. The reading in MS.M. brings the Midrashic deduction out more clearly: Read not kebasim ("lambs") but kebushim ("hidden things") things which are the mystery (kibshono) of the world must be kept under one's clothing'.
- (37) I.e., the elders of Pumbeditha.
- (38) Ezek. II, 1.
- (39) I.e., if you have learnt thus far, you have learnt much, for this passage included the very verses (Ezek. I, 27, 28) the teaching of which the Rabbis prohibited.

(40) Ezek. I,27, excluding Hashmal;v. n. 12.

(41) Ibid.,including Hashmal(E.V. 'electrum'). By Hashmal, the whole subject thereof, which is described in this verse, is meant, not merely the word itself, which already occurs in v. 4. The objection here raised is that the statements of Rabbi and R. Isaac apparently contradict the statement of R. Joseph above, which seemed to imply that the passage dealing with the 'Work of the Chariot' extended to Ezek. II, 1.

(42) I.e., 'I saw' according to Rabbi, or 'Hashmal' according to R. Isaac,

(43) I.e., Rabbi and R. Isaac indicated not how far the 'Work of the Chariot' extended, but how far therein it was permissible to teach.

(44) V. p. 75,n. 3.

(45) Aram. נוקא, a term applicable to a boy from infancy to school age. Hot-tinger's view (De Incestu etc., p. 54, quoted by A. W. Streane) that not a child in years but in knowledge of Talmud is meant is unlikely. Cf. the frequent use of the term in the Zohar.

(46) Cf. Neh. V, 19.

(47) Heb. ננני lit., 'hidden, stored away', i.e., declared un-canonical. The idea and name of the Greek 'Apocrypha' have often been traced to this technical significance of the verb ננני in the Talmud; but this is denied by G. F. Moore, v. J.E., vol. II, pp. 1-2 and 6.

(48) Cf. Ezek, XVIII, 4, 20 with Ex. XX, 5, XXIV, 7; Ezek. XLIV, 31 with Lev. XXII, 8; Ezek. XLIV, 22 with Lev. XXI, 14; also Ezek. XLV, 20, which mentions a sacrifice for the seventh day of the first month, entirely unknown from the Torah. V. Rashi to the above verses of Ezek., and Men. 45a, and Kid. 78a.

(49) 'A bottle, keg', as a 'measure (Jast.); 'an earthen jar', (Levy). The oil was to provide light for study.

(50) Jast. translates: 'speculated over the Hashmal'. Had the child drawn a picture of it? (V. J.E. vol. III, p. 148, s. 11).

(51) I.e., the Rabbis.

(52) I.e., the case of the child is exceptional: having a Sage's understanding of the mysteries of Hashmal, he endangered his life by his speculation; but ordinary readers of Ezekiel would not run any risk.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 13b

Living creatures speaking fire.<sup>1</sup> In a Baraitha it is taught: [Hashmal means], At times they are silent, at times they speak.<sup>2</sup> When the utterance goes forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, they are silent, and when the utterance goes not forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, they speak.

And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning.<sup>3</sup> What is the meaning of 'ran and returned'? — Rab Judah said: Like the flame that goes forth from the mouth of a furnace.<sup>4</sup> What is the meaning of 'as the appearance of a flash of lightning'? — R. Jose b. Hanina said: Like the flame that goes forth from between the potsherds.<sup>5</sup>

And I looked, and, behold a stormy wind came out of the north, a great cloud with a fire flashing up, so that a brightness was round about it; and out of the midst thereof as the colour of electrum [Hashmal], out of the midst of the fire.<sup>6</sup> Whither did it<sup>7</sup> go? Rab Judah said that Rab said: It went to subdue the whole world under the wicked Nebuchadnezzar. And wherefore all this? — That the peoples of the world might not say: Into the hand of a low people the Holy One, blessed be he, delivered His children,<sup>8</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Who caused Me to be a servant to idol-worshippers? The iniquities of Israel, they caused Me.

Now as I beheld the living creatures, behold one wheel at the bottom hard by the living creatures.<sup>9</sup> R. Eleazar said: [It means] a certain angel, who stands on the earth and his head reaches unto the living creatures. In a Baraitha it is taught: His name is Sandalfon;<sup>10</sup> he is higher than his fellows by a [distance of] five hundred years' journey, and he stands behind the Chariot and wreathes crowns<sup>11</sup> for his Maker. But is it so? Behold it is written: Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place,<sup>12</sup> accordingly, no one knows His place!<sup>13</sup> — He<sup>14</sup> pronounces the [Divine] Name over the crown, and it goes and rests on His head.<sup>15</sup>

Raba said: All that Ezekiel saw Isaiah saw.<sup>16</sup> What does Ezekiel resemble? A villager who saw the king.<sup>17</sup> And what does Isaiah resemble? A townsman who saw the king.<sup>18</sup>

Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the verse: I will sing unto the Lord, for He is highly exalted?<sup>19</sup> [It means] a song to him who is exalted over the exalted ones.<sup>20</sup> For a Master said: The king of the wild animals is the lion; the king of the cattle is the ox; the king of the birds is the eagle; and man is exalted over them; and the Holy One, blessed be He, is exalted over all of them, and over the whole world.

One verse says: As for the likeness of their faces, they had the face of a man; and they four had the face of a lion on the right side, and they four had the face of an ox on the left side etc.<sup>21</sup> And [elsewhere] it is written: And everyone had four faces; the first face was the face of the cherub, and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion, and the fourth the face of an eagle;<sup>22</sup> but the ox is not mentioned! — Resh Lakish said: Ezekiel entreated concerning it and changed it into a cherub. He said before Him:<sup>23</sup> Lord of the universe, shall an accuser<sup>24</sup> become an advocate!<sup>25</sup> What is the meaning of cherub? — R. Abbahu said: Like a child [Rabia];<sup>26</sup> for so in Babylonia a child is called Rabia. R. Papa said to Abaye: But according to this, [what is the meaning of] the verse, ‘The first face was the face of the cherub, and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion, and the fourth the face of an eagle’: are not the face of the cherub and the face of a man the same! — [The one is] a big face, and [the other is] a small face.<sup>27</sup>

One verse says: Each one had six wings,<sup>28</sup> and another verse says: And every one had four faces, and every one of them had four wings!<sup>29</sup> — There is no contradiction: the one<sup>30</sup> refers to the time when the Temple was no longer standing,<sup>31</sup> [when] as it were,<sup>32</sup> the wings of the living creatures were diminished. Which of them were taken away? — R. Hananel said that Rab said: Those with which they utter song. [For] here<sup>33</sup> it is written: And with twain he did fly. And one called unto another and said;<sup>34</sup> and [elsewhere] it is written: Wilt thou set thine eyes upon it? It is gone.<sup>35</sup> But our Rabbis said: Those with which they cover their feet, for it is said: And their feet were straight feet,<sup>36</sup> and if [these wings] had not been taken away, whence could he have known!<sup>37</sup> — Perhaps, [the feet] were exposed and he saw them. For if you do not say so, [then from the words], As for the likeness of their faces, they had the face of man,<sup>38</sup> [one might infer] likewise that [the wings covering them] were taken away! They<sup>39</sup> must therefore have been exposed, and he saw them; similarly here, they<sup>40</sup> were exposed, and he saw them. But how can they be compared? Granted that it is customary to expose one's face before one's master, but it is not customary to expose one's feet before one's master!

One verse says: Thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him;<sup>41</sup> and another verse says: Is there any number of His armies?<sup>42</sup> — There is no contradiction: the one<sup>43</sup> refers to a time when the Temple was standing, and the other refers to a time when the Temple was no longer standing; [when] as it were, the heavenly household<sup>44</sup> was diminished.

It is taught: Rabbi said in the name of Abba Jose b. Dosai: ‘Thousand thousands ministered unto ‘Him’, — this is the number of one troop; but of His troops there is no number. But Jeremiah b. Aba said: ‘Thousand thousand ministered unto Him’ — at the fiery stream,<sup>45</sup> for it is said: A fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him; thousand thousands ministered unto Him and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him.<sup>41</sup> Whence does it come forth? — From the sweat of the ‘living creatures’, And whither does it pour forth? R. Zutra b. Tobiah said that Rab said: Upon the head of the wicked in Gehinnom,<sup>46</sup> for it is said: Behold, a storm of the Lord is gone forth in fury,<sup>47</sup> yea, a whirling storm; it shall whirl upon the head of the wicked.<sup>48</sup> But R. Aha b. Jacob said: Upon those who pressed forward,<sup>49</sup> for it is said: Who pressed forward<sup>50</sup> before their time, whose foundation

was poured out as a stream.<sup>51</sup> It is taught: R. Simeon the Pious said: These are the nine hundred and seventy four generations who pressed themselves forward to be created<sup>52</sup>

- 
- (1) I.e. **השמל** is explained as an abbreviation of **היות אש ממללות**
- (2) I.e., Hashmal is an abbreviation of **השות ממללות**, 'silent, speaking'.
- (3) Ezek. 1,14.
- (4) I.e., a brick-kiln.
- (5) I.e., perforated earthen pieces used in smelting gold. **בזק** (E.V. 'flash of lightning') is here explained in its Aramaic sense of 'a fragment, piece of pottery'.
- (6) Ibid. v. 4.
- (7) I.e., the stormy wind coming out of the north.
- (8) Cf. for the thought Git. 56b=Sanh. 104b, (Sonc. ed., p. 710), 'Whoever distresses Israel becomes a chief'.
- (9) Ezek. I, 15.
- (10) Perhaps from Grk. \*\* == cobrother. Sandalfon is described as brother of Metatron; v. J.E. vol. XI, pp. 39-40; cf. also Longfellow's poem 'Sandalphon'.
- (11) I.e., offers up the prayers of the righteous.
- (12) Ezek. III, 12.
- (13) I.e., the vagueness of the expression 'from His place' indicates that God's place is unknown even to His angels.
- (14) I.e., Sandalfon,
- (15) [MS.M. 'in its place : i.e., the prayer is effective.]
- (16) V. Isa. VI, 1 ff: Despite the differences between the descriptions given by Isaiah and Ezekiel, they both saw identical visions of God's glory.
- (17) According to Rashi, the point is that the rustic — to whom the sight of the king is a novelty — is naturally inclined to give his impressions at length. But Tosaf. explains that the villager has to give a detailed description of the royal splendour in order to convince his hearers that he actually saw the king. Likewise Ezekiel, to whom was granted the rare distinction, of prophecy outside Palestine, had to prove by a detailed account that he actually beheld the Divine Glory though he dwelt by the river Chebar.
- (18) The townsman — to whom the king is a familiar sight is not inclined to indulge in any lengthy description (Rashi); nor does he have to go into details in order to convince his hearers of the truth of his statement (Tosaf.).
- (19) Ex. XV, 1.
- (20) This is an explanation of the words of the text, **גאה גאה** (E.V. 'highly exalted'), which mean lit., 'to be exalted he is exalted'.
- (21) Ezek. I, 10.
- (22) Ezek. X, 14.
- (23) I.e., Ezekiel before God.
- (24) The ox would be a reminder of Israel's sin in connection with the golden calf.
- (25) Israel required the Divine Chariot to intercede for them. Cf. R.H. 26a.
- (26) The word **כרוב** ('Cherub') is explained as composed of **כ** ('like') and **רביא**='רוב' ('a growing boy'). For modern suggestions regarding the root-meaning of the word v. B.D.B. s.v.
- (27) I.e., the face of a man and the face of a boy.
- (28) Isa. VI, 2.
- (29) Ezek. I, 6. It is assumed that the 'Seraphim' of Isaiah and the 'living creatures' of Ezekiel had originally the same number of wings.
- (30) I.e., Isa. VI, 2.
- (31) I.e., the time for the destruction of the Temple had come. Ezekiel prophesied the event, and lived to learn of the fulfilment of his prophecy, as well as to foretell the rebuilding of the Sanctuary.
- (32) Lit., 'as though it were possible', refers to an allegorical or anthropomorphous expression with reference to the Lord (Jast.), or, as here, to the celestial creatures.
- (33) Ibid. vv. 2, 3.
- (34) The juxtaposition of the two verses shows that with the wings with which they flew they also uttered God's praise.
- (35) Lit., 'cause to fly'; cf. also rest of verse, Prov. XXIII, 5. The occurrence of the word fly in the two passages shows that it is the wings with which the heavenly beings fly (i.e., utter their song to God) that are gone. This verse in Proverbs

is understood by the Rabbis to refer to the neglect of the study of the Torah (cf. Rashi a. l., and Ber. 5a, Meg. 18a): the meaning would seem to be that when the Torah is neglected the divine song of the angels is silenced.

(36) Ezek. I, 7.

(37) I.e., that their feet were straight.

(38) Ibid. I, 10,

(39) I.e., their faces.

(40) I.e., their feet.

(41) Dan. VII, 10.

(42) Job. XXV, 3.

(43) I.e., the verse in Job.

(44) Heb. פמליא from Lat. Familia.

(45) I.e., the verse gives the number only of those attending God at the fiery stream, but not of all His angels, which are innumerable.

(46) I.e., 'place of punishment of the wicked in the hereafter, hell' (Jast.). Cf. II Kings XXIII, 10; Jer. VII, 31, 32, etc.; II Chron. XXVIII, 3.

(47) Heb. חמה understood in the sense of חמה, 'hot', is taken as a reference to the fiery stream.

(48) Jer. XXIII, 19.

(49) So Jast. and Levy; v. infra n. 7. Goldschmidt trans., die verdrängt worden sind' (who were suppressed or displaced); Rashi trans., 'who were decreed (to be created)', MS.M. adds here, 'before their time'.

(50) E.V. 'who were snatched away'.

(51) Job XXII, 16. The word 'stream' is the link between this verse and Dan. VII, 10.

(52) According to the Rabbinic interpretation of Ps. CV, 8, the Divine Plan originally envisaged the creation of a thousand generations prior to the giving of the Torah, but foreseeing their wickedness, God held back nine hundred and seventy-four generations, and gave the Torah at the end of twenty-six generations from Adam (cf. Gen. V, XI, Ex. VI, 16-20, and Seder 'Olam Ch. 1). The translation here follows the text of MS. M. 2 (v. D.S. a.I. n. 20) viz. שקומטו להיבראות (pu'al) עצמן להיבראות (pi'el) cur. edd.:

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 14a

before the world was created, but were not created: the Holy One, blessed be He, arose and planted them<sup>1</sup> in every generation, and it is they who are the insolent<sup>2</sup> of each generation. But R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The words, Asher Kummetu,<sup>3</sup> indicate blessing: these are the scholars who wrinkle themselves<sup>4</sup> over the words of the Torah in this world, [wherefore] the Holy One, blessed be He, shall reveal a secret to them in the world to come, for it is said: 'To whom a secret<sup>5</sup> is poured out as a stream'. Samuel said to R. Hiyya b. Rab: O son of a great man,<sup>6</sup> come, I will tell thee something from those excellent things which thy father has said. Every day ministering angels are created from the fiery stream, and utter song, and cease to be,<sup>7</sup> for it is said: They are new every morning: great is Thy faithfulness.<sup>8</sup> Now he differs from R. Samuel b. Nahmani, for R. Samuel b. Nahmani said that R. Jonathan said: From every utterance that goes forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, an angel is created,<sup>9</sup> for it is said: By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.<sup>10</sup>

One verse says: His raiment was as white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool;<sup>11</sup> and [elsewhere] it is written: His locks are curled and black as a raven!<sup>12</sup> — There is no contradiction: one verse<sup>13</sup> [refers to God] in session,<sup>14</sup> and the other in war.<sup>15</sup> For a Master said: In session none is more fitting than an old man, and in war none is more fitting than a young man.

One passage says: His throne was fiery flames;<sup>16</sup> and another Passage says: Till thrones were places, and One that was ancient of days did sit!<sup>17</sup> — There is no contradiction: one [throne] for Him, and one for David; this is the view of R. Akiba. Said R. Jose the Galilean to him: Akiba, how long wilt thou treat the Divine Presence as profane!<sup>18</sup> Rather, [it must mean], one for justice and one for grace.<sup>19</sup> Did he accept [this explanation from him, or did he not accept it? — Come and hear:

One for justice and one for grace; this is the view of R. Akiba. Said R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah to him: Akiba, what hast thou to do with Aggadah?<sup>20</sup> Cease thy talk, and turn<sup>21</sup> to [the laws concerning defilement through] leprosy-signs and tent-covering!<sup>22</sup> Rather, [it must mean] one for a throne and one for a stool; the throne to sit upon, the stool for a footrest, for it is said: The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My foot-rest.<sup>23</sup>

When R. Dimi came,<sup>24</sup> he said: Eighteen curses did Isaiah pronounce upon Israel, yet he was not pacified<sup>25</sup> until he pronounced upon them this verse: The child shall behave insolently against the aged, and the base against the honourable.<sup>26</sup> Which are the eighteen curses? — It is written: For, behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, doth take away from Jerusalem and from Judah stay and staff every stay of bread, and every stay of water,' the mighty man, and the man of war; the judge and the prophet, and the diviner, and the elder; the captain of fifty; and the man of rank, and the counsellor, and the wise charmer, and the skillful enchanter. And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them.<sup>27</sup> 'Stay' — this means the masters of the Bible.<sup>28</sup> 'Staff' — this means the masters of the Mishnah, like R. Judah b. Tema and his colleagues. R. Papa and our Rabbis dispute therein: one says that there were<sup>29</sup> six hundred orders of the Mishnah, and the other that there were seven hundred orders of the Mishnah.<sup>30</sup> 'Every stay of bread' — this means the masters of Talmud,<sup>31</sup> for it is said: Come, eat of My bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled.<sup>32</sup> 'And every stay of water' — this means the masters of Aggadah, who draw the heart of man like water by means of the Aggadah. 'The 'mighty man' — this means the masters of traditions.<sup>33</sup> 'And the man of war' — this means one who knows how to dispute<sup>34</sup> in the warfare of the Torah. 'The judge — this means a judge who passes judgment in strictest accord with truth — 'The prophet' — according to the literal meaning of the word. 'The diviner' — this means the King, for it is said: A divine sentence is in the lips of the King.<sup>35</sup> 'The elder' — this means one who is worthy to sit in session.<sup>36</sup> 'The captain of fifty': do not read 'the captain of fifty' but 'the captain of the Pentateuch';<sup>37</sup> it means one who knows how to argue in the five books of the Torah. Another explanation: 'the captain of fifty' — as R. Abbahu [taught]. For R. Abbahu said. From here [we learn] that a Methurgeman<sup>38</sup> may not be appointed over a congregation, who is less than fifty years of age. 'And a man of rank' — this means one for whose sake favour is shown to his [entire] generation, like R. Hanina b. Dosa,<sup>39</sup> for instance, on high;<sup>40</sup> [or] below,<sup>41</sup> like R. Abbahu at the court of Caesar.<sup>42</sup> 'The counsellor' — [this means] one who knows how to determine the intercalation of years<sup>43</sup> and the fixation of months.<sup>44</sup> 'And the wise [man]'<sup>45</sup> -this means a disciple who makes his teachers wise. 'Charmer' — at the moment that he begins a Torah<sup>46</sup> — discourse, all become dumb. 'And the skillful ['man']<sup>47</sup> — this means one who understands one thing from another.<sup>48</sup> 'Enchanter' — this means one who is worthy to have imparted to him the words of the Torah, which was given in a whisper.<sup>49</sup> 'And I will give children to be their princes': what is the meaning of [the words], 'I will give children to be their princes'? R. Eleazar said: It means persons who are empty<sup>50</sup> of good deeds.<sup>51</sup> 'And babes shall rule over them'. R. Aha<sup>52</sup> b. Jacob said: [It means] foxes sons of foxes.<sup>53</sup> 'But he was not pacified<sup>54</sup> until he said to them: The child shall behave insolently against the aged': — those persons who are empty of good deeds shall behave insolently against such as are filled with good deeds<sup>55</sup> as a pomegranate [with seeds]. 'And the base against the honourable': those to whom weighty [precepts] appear as light ones<sup>56</sup> will come and behave insolently against those to whom light [precepts] appear as weighty ones.<sup>57</sup>

R. Kattina said: Even at the time of Jerusalem's downfall honest men did not cease from among them, for it is said: For a man shall take hold of his brother of the house of his father: 'Thou hast a mantle, be thou our ruler'!<sup>58</sup> Matters on account of which men hide themselves as in a garment<sup>59</sup> thou hast 'under thy hand'.<sup>60</sup> And this ruin:<sup>61</sup> what is the meaning of [the expression] 'and this ruin'? — Matters which people do not grasp unless they stumble over them<sup>62</sup> are under thy hand'. In that day shall he take<sup>63</sup> [an oath], saying: I am not<sup>64</sup> a healer, for in my house is neither bread nor a mantle; ye shall not make me ruler of a people.<sup>65</sup> — Shall he take, 'Take' expresses an oath, for it is said: Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God [in vain].<sup>66</sup> I am not a healer:' I was<sup>67</sup> not of

those who are bound to the Schoolhouse.<sup>68</sup> For in my house is neither bread nor a mantle, — for I possess no knowledge of Bible or Mishnah or Gemara, But perhaps that case<sup>69</sup> is different; for had he said to them, I have knowledge, they would have said to him, Tell us then! — He could have answered that he had learnt but had forgotten; why then does it say: ‘I am not a healer’? [It must mean], I am not a healer at all.<sup>70</sup> But is it so? Behold Raba said: Jerusalem was not destroyed until honest men ceased therefrom, for it is said: Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly, that seeketh truth;<sup>71</sup> and I will pardon him.<sup>72</sup> — There is no contradiction:

(1) I.e., distributed them over the later generations; cf. Yoma 38b, ‘The Holy One, blessed be He, saw that the righteous were few, so He arose and planted them in every generation’. Another reading has ‘banished them’, but the meaning remains unchanged (v. Tosaf. a.I.).

(2) Cf. Aboth V, 20, (Sonc. ed., p. 73f).

(3) Rendered above, ‘who pressed forward’.

(4) So Jast.: from the root meaning ‘to compress, curl’; hence it can be understood in the sense of ‘to wrinkle (the brow)’ as well as ‘to press forward’ (as above). Levy and Goldschmidt render by ‘sich zusammendrängen’ (press themselves together, limit themselves).

(5) **סודם**, ‘their foundation’ is here taken to mean the same as **סודם**, ‘their secret

(6) Lit., ‘son of a lion’.

(7) Cf. the lines in Longfellow's Sandalphon (quoted by Streane): ‘The Angels of Wind and of Fire Chant only one hymn, and expire With the song's irresistible stress’,

(8) Lam. III, 23. I.e., great is Thy praise on account of them (Rashi).

(9) But not from the fiery stream, as Rab holds.

(10) Ps. XXXIII, 6.

(11) Dan, VII, 9.

(12) Cant. V, 11.

(13) I.e., Dan. VII, 9.

(14) I.e., sitting in judgment; cf. *ibid.* v. 10.

(15) Canticles is interpreted by the Rabbis as referring in greater part to the Exodus (note that the book is read in the synagogue during Passover) when God appeared as a warrior (cf. Ex. XV, 3).

(16) Dan. VII, 9.

(17) *Ibid.*, beginning of the verse. The plural implies two thrones, whereas the first passage speaks of only one.

(18) By asserting that David occupies a place next to God.

(19) Lit., ‘righteousness’, but used here, apparently, in the sense of ‘lovingkindness, grace’.

(20) For Haggadah v. Glos. s. Aggadah. R. Eleazar b. ‘Azariah regards even this explanation as dangerous, because it implies a duality of character on the part of God, and militates against the fundamental Jewish concept of God's perfect unity.

(21) The two verbs in the English are represented by one in the Hebrew viz. **כִּלְךְ** which is really a combination of **כִּלְךְ וְלָךְ**, ‘cease and go (elsewhere)’.

(22) V. p. 56, nn. 5 and 6. R. Akiba's intellectual gifts were best suited to Halachah, not Haggadah. The laws relating to defilement by leprosy and tent-covering form two of the most difficult tractates of the Halachah.

(23) E. V. foot-stool’, Isa. LXVI, 1.

(24) I.e., from Palestine to Babylonia.

(25) Lit., ‘his mind was not cooled’.

(26) *Ibid.* III, 5.

(27) *Ibid.* vv. 1-4.

(28) The Bible being Israel's stay’. In this vein the Gemara explains the rest of the quotation.

(29) I.e., in the days of R Judah b. Tema and his colleagues.

(30) The Mishnah is now divided into six orders, V. J.E. vol, VIII, p, 615.

(31) This included the discussions ‘if the Amoraim added to the Mishnah. The decisions of the experts in Talmud could be relied upon, but those who gave decisions on the basis of the Mishnah only were called ‘destroyers of the world’ (Sot. 22a); cf. supra p. 50. Thus, the masters of the Talmud were, so to speak, as essential to Israel as bread itself.



(32) Prov. IX, 5.

(33) Lit., 'things heard' i.e., oral reports of a halachic character — legal decisions — which were carefully handed down by teacher to disciple. These traditions of legal traditions were veritable living 'books of reference'.

(34) Lit., 'to take up and give'. The expression is primarily a commercial term, denoting 'buying and selling' or any financial transaction. Here it is used in the transferred sense of being able to deal with the argumentation essential to the study of the Torah. A distinction is here drawn between the keen-minded debater ('the man of war') and the expert in traditions ('the mighty man'): the latter is remarkable chiefly for his learning, the former is distinguished for his reasoning power and mental acumen.

(35) Ibid. XVI, 10.

(36) I.e., as counsellor.

(37) חמשים 'fifty', is explained as חומשים 'fifths', i.e., the five books of the Pentateuch. V. Kid. 33a.

(38) Lit., 'interpreter', i.e., the translator into Aramaic (or Greek) of the Biblical portion read at services, V. J.E. VIII, p. 521.

(39) Cf. Ta'an. 24b-25a: 'Every day a Bath Kol goes forth and says: The whole world is fed for the sake of Hanina, my son; Yet is Hanina, my son, satisfied with a kab of carobs from Sabbath eve to Sabbath eve'. Cf. also Ber. V, 5.

(40) I.e., in heaven.

(41) I.e., on earth.

(42) I.e., the proconsular government. V. Sanh. 14a and Keth. 17a.

(43) The Jewish year consists ordinarily of twelve lunar months (v. n. 5). In order to prevent the festivals from falling in the wrong seasons, it was necessary periodically to adjust the lunar calendar to the solar year: this was achieved by introducing an intercalary month (Adar II) between Adar and Nisan. V., further, Sanh. 2a (Sonc. ed., p. 1) and 10a (p. 42f); also J.E. vol. III, p. 498f.

(44) I.e., determination of the beginning of a month by the first appearance of the new moon. As the moon revolves round the earth in approx. twenty-nine and a half days, the Jewish months consists, alternately, of twenty-nine or thirty days.

(45) The expression 'wise (E. V. cunning) charmer' is clearly intended in the verse to refer to one person; but the Gemara interprets 'wise' and 'charmer' as a composite phrase referring to two distinct types.

(46) Used here not in its restricted meaning of the Pentateuch, but in its wider connotation of Jewish teaching based on Scripture; cf. Aboth I, 1 (Sonc. ed., p. 1, n., 1).

(47) Here, as above (v. n. 6), Isaiah's description of one type of person is made to refer to two types.

(48) I.e., is able himself to draw conclusions on the basis of the knowledge imparted to him.

(49) On account of Satan (Aruch). But Jast. prefers the reading of MS.M. (cf. Rashi l.c.) which he renders: 'that is he to whom are handed over the secrets of the Law which are communicated in a low voice'. Cf. p. 75 and nn. 4 and 5.

(50) The word נערים ('children') in the verse is explained as meaning מנוערים ('empty'); literally, the latter means, 'shaken out, emptied'.

(51) Lit., 'commandments', precepts (of the Torah)', hence religious or meritorious deeds.

(52) Var. lec.: but Bah reads R. Papa b. J.

(53) The word תעלולים ('babes') in the verse is explained as a derivative of תעלוא ('fox'), with the meaning, 'double foxes i.e., second generation of foxes.

(54) V. p. 84, n. 6.

(55) This is an explanation of the word קזן (aged) in the verse, which must necessarily have the opposite meaning of נער ('child' i.e., one empty of good deeds). Note also that zaken is explained elsewhere as one who is both learned (v. Sifra Kedoshim Par. 3' Ch. VII, and Kid. 32b) and practised in the Torah and its precepts (v. Ber. 39a). Cf. also p. 109 (The Elder).

(56) The word נקלה ('base') in the verse is here explained as a derivative of קל ('light').

(57) There is a play here on the word נכבד ('honourable'), the root of which also means, 'heavy, weighty'.

(58) Isa. III, 6.

(59) I.e., feel ashamed in their ignorance of them — namely the teachings of the Torah — should be detected.

(60) I.e., knowest well; the expression is quoted from the end of v. 6 (ibid.).

(61) Lit., 'and this stumbling'; ibid,

(62) I.e., which they learn only through their mistakes.

(63) E.V. 'swear'.

(64) E.V. will not be’.

(65) Ibid. 7.

(66) Ex, XX, 7. The bracketed words are omitted in cur. edd. but not in the "Ein Jacob’.

(67) The Heb. verb in the verse, which, being in the imperfect form should ordinarily denote the future or at least the present tense, is here understood as having a past meaning, viz., ‘I used not to be’,

(68) Lit., ‘of those who bind (themselves) in the Schoolhouse’.

(69) I.e., the case referred to in Isaiah is no proof of real honesty, because (according to the argument which follows) falsehood could easily have been detected.

(70) I.e., I have never studied. This voluntary admission proves his honesty.

(71) Heb. אִמּוּנָה which is only a slight variant of אֱמֶנֶת ‘honesty’.

(72) Jer. V, 1.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 14b

the one [verse] refers to religious matters,<sup>1</sup> the other to business. In regard to religious matters, there were [honest men left]; in regard to business, there were no [honest men left].

Our Rabbis taught: Once R. Johanan b. Zakkai was riding on an ass when going on a journey, and R. Eleazar b. ‘Arak was driving the ass from behind. [R. Eleazar] said to him: Master, teach me a chapter of the ‘Work of the Chariot’.<sup>2</sup> He answered: Have I not taught you<sup>3</sup> thus: ‘Nor [the work of] the chariot in the presence of one, unless he is a Sage and understands of his own knowledge’? [R. Eleazar] them said to him: Master, permit me to say before thee something which thou hast taught me.<sup>4</sup> He answered, Say on! Forthwith R. Johanan b. Zakkai dismounted from the ass, and wrapped himself up,<sup>5</sup> and sat upon a stone beneath an olive tree. Said [R. Eleazar] to him: Master, wherefore didst thou dismount from the ass? He answered: Is it proper that whilst thou art expounding the ‘Work of the Chariot’, and the Divine Presence is with us, and the ministering angels accompany us, I should ride on the ass! Forthwith, R. Eleazar b. ‘Arak began his exposition of the ‘work of the Chariot’, and fire<sup>6</sup> came down from heaven and encompassed<sup>7</sup> all the trees in the field; [thereupon] they all began to utter [divine] song. What was the song they uttered? — Praise the Lord from the earth, ye sea-monsters, and all deeps . . . fruitful trees and all cedars . . . Hallelujah.<sup>8</sup> An angel<sup>9</sup> [then] answered<sup>10</sup> from the fire and said: This is the very ‘Work of the Chariot’. [Thereupon] R. Johanan b. Zakkai rose and kissed him on his head and said: Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, Who hath given a son to Abraham our father, who knoweth to speculate upon, and to investigate, and to expound the ‘Work of the Chariot’ — There are some who preach well but do not act well, others act well but do not preach well, but thou dost preach well and act well. Happy art thou, O Abraham our father, that R. Eleazar b. ‘Arak hath come forth from thy loins. Now when these things were told R. Joshua, he and R. Jose the priest<sup>11</sup> were going on a journey. They said: Let us also<sup>12</sup> expound the ‘Work of the Chariot’; so R. Joshua began an exposition. Now that day was the summer solstice;<sup>13</sup> [nevertheless] the heavens became overcast with clouds and a kind of rainbow<sup>14</sup> appeared in the cloud, and the ministering angels assembled and came to listen like people who assemble and come to watch the entertainments<sup>15</sup> of a bridegroom and bride. [Thereupon] R. Jose the priest went and related what happened before R. Johanan b. Zakkai; and [the latter] said: Happy are ye, and happy is she that bore you;<sup>16</sup> happy are my eyes that have seen thus. Moreover, in my dream, I and ye were reclining<sup>17</sup> on Mount Sinai, when a Bath Kol<sup>18</sup> was sent to us,<sup>19</sup> [saying]: Ascend hither, ascend hither! [Here are] great banqueting chambers, and fine dining couches prepared for you; you and your disciples and your disciples’ disciples are designated for the third class.<sup>20</sup> But is this so?<sup>21</sup> For behold it is taught: R. Jose b. R. Judah said: There were three discourses:<sup>22</sup> R. Joshua discoursed before R. Johanan b. Zakkai, R. Akiba discoursed before R. Joshua, Hanania b. Hakinai discoursed before R. Akiba; — whereas R. Eleazar b. ‘Arak he does not count! — One who discoursed [himself], and others discoursed before him, he counts; one who discoursed [himself], but others did not discourse before him, he does not count. But behold there is Hanania b. Hakinai before whom others did not discourse, yet he counts him! — He at least discoursed before one who discoursed [before others].<sup>23</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Four men entered the 'Garden',<sup>24</sup> namely, Ben 'Azzai<sup>25</sup> and Ben Zoma,<sup>26</sup> Aher,<sup>27</sup> and R. Akiba. R. Akiba said to them: When ye arrive at the stones of pure marble,<sup>28</sup> say not, water, water!<sup>29</sup> For it is said: He that speaketh falsehood shall not be established before mine eyes.<sup>30</sup> Ben 'Azzai cast a look and died. Of him Scripture says: Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.<sup>31</sup> Ben Zoma looked and became demented.<sup>32</sup> Of him Scripture says: Hast thou found honey? Eat so much as is sufficient for thee, lest thou be filled therewith, and vomit it.<sup>33</sup> Aher mutilated the shoots.<sup>34</sup> R. Akiba departed unhurt.

Ben Zoma was asked: Is it permitted to castrate a dog?<sup>35</sup> He replied: Neither shall ye do this in your land,<sup>36</sup> — [this means], to none that is in your land shall ye do thus.<sup>37</sup> Ben Zoma was [further] asked: May a high priest marry a maiden who has become pregnant?<sup>38</sup> Do we [in such a case] take into consideration Samuel's statement, for Samuel said,

(1) Lit., 'words of the Torah'.

(2) V. p. 59, n. 4.

(3) Plural, i.e. R. Eleazar and his fellow-students.

(4) The fact that R. Johanan b. Zakkai had in the past taught the 'Chariot' mysteries to R. Eleazar is difficult to reconcile with the former's present refusal to teach his disciple. It seems best to omit, with the J.T., the word rendered 'which thou hast taught me'. For two suggested explanations, if this word is retained, v. Maharsha a.I.

(5) I.e., put round him his tallith. The latter was a four-cornered garment (similar to the Roman pallium) adorned with fringes (in accordance with Num. XV, 38f), which was worn in Talmudic times by scholars, distinguished persons, and those who led in prayers. Its use at prayers is still preserved, and has given rise to its popular designation of 'prayer-shawl'. By wrapping himself in his tallith, R. Johanan b. Zakkai showed his sense of the holiness of the occasion. V. further J.E., vol. XI, pp' 67f and Elbogen, *Der Jud, Gottesdienst* pp. 499f.

(6) Cf. p. 77, n. 9.

(7) Var. lec.: covered; intertwined; hedged in,.

(8) Ps. CXLVIII, 7, 9, 14. This reference to trees is the clue which points to these verses as the trees' psalm. The Jerusalem Talmud reads instead I Chron. XVI, 33.

(9) Another reading has 'angel of death', which Tosaf. rejects.

(10) I.e., spoke with reference to R. Eleazar's exposition of the 'Chariot' mysteries.

(11) For R. Johanan b. Zakkai's opinion of these two disciples and R. Eleazar v. Aboth, II, 8, 9.

(12) Being only two, they would not be infringing the Mishnah law concerning the study of the 'chariot' mysteries.

(13) Lit., 'the cycle of Tammuz' (fourth month). On such a day the sky in Palestine should be cloudless.

(14) Cf. Ezek. I, 28.

(15) Heb. **מְזֻמְזֵי**. Levy deriving the word from the Greek 'smiling', especially 'friendly smiling', translates it, 'Belustigungen' (entertainments, merrymakings), which agrees with Rashi's explanation and the variant reading of the Jerusalem Talmud viz., 'rejoicing'. Jast. gives the word a Hebrew origin (v.s.v.) and explains it to mean, music, sweet melodies'; he renders our passage — 'the musical entertainments at a wedding.

(16) I.e., your respective mothers; they were not brothers.

(17) I.e. as at a banquet, when the guests used to recline on couches (cf. Ex. Rab 25).

(18) V. p. 73, n. 12.

(19) Lit., 'given upon us'.

(20) Of the seven classes (v. Midr. Till. to Ps. XI, 7) admitted (after death) into God's presence.

(21) I.e., that R. Eleazar b. 'Arak discoursed on the 'Chariot' mysteries before his master.

(22) I.e., only in three instances did disciples discourse on the 'Work of the Chariot' before their teachers.

(23) Hanina b. Hakinai has to be mentioned on account of R. Akiba, to show that the latter not only discoursed himself but that also another discoursed before him; but R. Eleazar b. 'Arak did not discourse before a teacher who in his turn discoursed before others, nor did any one discourse before him, hence he is not counted.

(24) Paradise, Heb. **פֶּרֶדֶם** (cf. Cant. IV, 13, Eccl. II, 5, Neh. II, 8), 'enclosure, preserve, garden, park' (v. B. D. B. s.v.). L. Blau (*Alitjudisches Zauberwesen*, pp, 115f) seeks to prove that this account of the entry of the four Rabbis into Paradise is to be understood literally (v. also J.E. vol. V, p. 683). This view is shared, among others, by J. Levy and L.

Ginzberg (v. J.E. vol. V, pp. 138f). On the other hand, M. Jast. (Dictionary) and Goldschmidt consider 'Pardes' a figurative expression for the mystical realm of theosophy. Rashi explains that the four scholars ascended to heaven, and Tosaf. adds that it only appeared to them that they did so. Similarly, R. Hai Gaon, who discusses the whole Baraitha in a responsum (quoted by Ha-Kohef in 'Ein Jacob), and R. Hananel explain that the entry of the Rabbis into the 'Garden' was only a vision. Both these authorities refer to the comment on the passage contained in the mystical works 'Hekaloth Rabbathi' and 'Hekaloth Zutarthi' (v. J.E. vol. VI, pp. 332-3). V. further J.E. vol. IX, pp. 515f.

(25) V. Ab. IV, 2, (Sonc. ed., p. 44, n. 1).

(26) V. ibid. Mishnah I, (Sonc. ed., P 43, n. 1).

(27) Lit. 'another', by which term, Elisha b. Abuyah is referred to after his apostasy. V. J.E. vol. V, pp. 138f, and Ab. IV, 20 (Sonc. ed., p. 55 n. 1, where instead of 'disciple of R. Meir', read 'teacher of R. Meir'). Cf. also the term 'Others' supra p. 14.

(28) Giving the illusion of water.

(29) I.e., how can we proceed!

(30) Ps. CI, 7.

(31) Ibid. CXVI, 15.

(32) Lit., 'stricken'.

(33) Prov. XXV, 16,

(34) I.e., apostatized. Scholars differ greatly regarding the nature of Aher's defection: he has been variously described as a Persian, Gnostic or Philonian dualist; as a Christian; as a Sadducee; and as a 'victim of the inquisitor Akiba', in J.E., V. 183 and bibliography.

(35) Castrated animals may not be offered as sacrifices (v. n. 12,); therefore castration is forbidden in the case of animals of the type that can be offered up. But a dog may not only not be offered itself, but even its price or equivalent may not be used for offerings (v. Tem. 30a-b). Hence the question whether the prohibition of castration applies even to a dog. Cf. also Shab. 111a.

(36) Lev. XXII, 24. The beginning of the verse reads: 'That which hath its stones bruised . . . or cut, ye shalt not offer unto the Lord'.

(37) I.e., even an animal like the dog, which cannot be offered as a sacrifice, may not be mutilated.

(38) The high priest may marry a virgin only (v. Lev. XXI, 13). The question here is: If the girl claims that despite her pregnant condition she is still a virgin, may the high priest marry her? Or if he married her without knowing of her pregnancy and actually found her to have the signs of virginity, but subsequently learnt that she was pregnant before marriage, may she remain his wife?

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 15a

I can have repeated sexual connections without [causing] bleeding;<sup>1</sup> or is perhaps the case of Samuel rare?<sup>2</sup> He replied: the case of Samuel is rare, but we do consider [the possibility] that she may have conceived in a bath.<sup>3</sup> But behold Samuel said: A spermatic emission that does not shoot forth like an arrow cannot fructify! — In the first instance, it had also shot forth like an arrow.

Our Rabbis taught: Once R. Joshua b. Hanania was standing on a step on the Temple Mount, and Ben Zoma saw him and did not stand up before him.<sup>4</sup> So [R. Joshua] said to him: Whence and whither, Ben Zoma?<sup>5</sup> He replied: I was gazing between the upper and the lower waters,<sup>6</sup> and there is only a bare three fingers' [breadth] between them, for it is said: And the spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters<sup>7</sup> — like a dove which hovers over her young without touching [them].<sup>8</sup> Thereupon R. Joshua said to his disciples: Ben Zoma is still outside.<sup>9</sup> See now, when was it that 'the spirit of God hovered over the face of the water? On the first day [of Creation]; but the division took place on the second day, for it is written: And let it divide the waters from the waters!' And how big [is the interval]? R. Aha b. Jacob said, As a hair's breadth; and the Rabbis said: As [between] the boards of a landing bridge. Mar Zutra, or according to others R. Assi, said: As [between] two cloaks spread one over the other; and others say, as [between] two cups tilted one over the other.<sup>10</sup>

Aher mutilated the shoots.<sup>11</sup> Of him Scripture says: Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into

guilt.<sup>12</sup> What does it refer to? — He saw that permission was granted to Metatron<sup>13</sup> to sit and write down<sup>14</sup> the merits of Israel. Said he: It is taught as a tradition that on high<sup>15</sup> there is no sitting<sup>16</sup> and no emulation, and no back,<sup>17</sup> and no weariness.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps, — God forbid! — there are two divinities! [Thereupon] they led Metatron forth, and punished him with sixty fiery lashes,<sup>19</sup> saying to him: Why didst thou not rise before him when thou didst see him? Permission was [then] given to him to strike out the merits of Aher. A Bath Kol<sup>20</sup> went forth and said: Return, ye backsliding children<sup>21</sup> — except Aher.<sup>22</sup> [Thereupon] he said: Since I<sup>23</sup> have been driven forth from yonder world,<sup>24</sup> let me go forth and enjoy this world. So Aher went forth into evil courses.<sup>25</sup> He went forth, found a harlot and demanded her. She said to him: Art thou not Elisha b. Abuyah? [But] when he tore a radish<sup>26</sup> out of its bed on the Sabbath and gave it to her, she said: It is another [Aher].<sup>27</sup> After his apostasy, Aher asked R. Meir [a question], saying to him: What is the meaning of the verse: God hath made even the one as<sup>28</sup> well as the other?<sup>29</sup> He replied: It means that for everything that God created He created [also] its counterpart. He created mountains, and created hills; He created seas, and created rivers. Said [Aher] to him: R. Akiba, thy master, did not explain it thus, but [as follows]: He created righteous, and created wicked; He created the Garden of Eden,<sup>30</sup> and created Gehinnom.<sup>31</sup> Everyone has two portions, one in the Garden of Eden and one in Gehinnom. The righteous man, being meritorious,<sup>32</sup> takes his own portions and his fellow's portion in the Garden of Eden. The wicked man, being guilty,<sup>33</sup> takes his own portion and his fellow's portion in Gehinnom. R. Mesharsheya said: What is the Biblical proof for this? In the case of the righteous, it is written: Therefore in their land<sup>34</sup> they shall possess double.<sup>35</sup> In the case of the wicked it is written: And destroy them with double destruction.<sup>36</sup>

After his apostasy, Aher asked R. Meir: What is the meaning of the verse: Gold and glass cannot equal it; neither shall the exchange thereof be vessels of fine gold?<sup>37</sup> He answered: These are the words of the Torah, which are hard to acquire like vessels of fine gold, but are easily destroyed<sup>38</sup> like vessels of glass. Said [Aher] to him: R. Akiba, thy master, did not explain thus, but [as follows]: Just as vessels of gold and vessels of glass, though they be broken, have a remedy,<sup>39</sup> even so a scholar, though he has sinned, has a remedy.<sup>40</sup> [Thereupon, R. Meir] said to him: Then, thou, too, repent! He replied: I have already heard from behind the Veil:<sup>41</sup> Return ye backsliding children — except Aher.

Our Rabbis taught: Once Aher was riding on a horse on the Sabbath,<sup>42</sup> and R. Meir was walking behind him to learn Torah<sup>43</sup> at his mouth. Said [Aher] to him: Meir, turn back, for I have already measured by the paces of my horse that thus far extends the Sabbath limit.<sup>44</sup> He replied: Thou, too, go back! [Aher] answered: Have I not already told thee that I have already heard from behind the Veil: 'Return ye backsliding children' — except Aher. [R. Meir] prevailed upon him and took him, to a schoolhouse. [Aher] said to a child: Recite for me thy verse!<sup>45</sup> [The child] answered: There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked.<sup>46</sup> He then took him to another schoolhouse.<sup>47</sup> [Aher] said to a child: Recite for me thy verse! He answered: For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before Me, saith the Lord God<sup>48</sup>. He took him to yet another schoolhouse, and [Aher] said

- 
- (1) I.e., without the woman losing her virginity.
  - (2) Exceptional cases are not taken into account; the marriage, therefore, would be illegal.
  - (3) Into which a male had discharged semen.
  - (4) He was so lost in thought that he failed to show the respect of disciple to master. Cf. the parallel passage, Gen. Rab. II, 4, which contains interesting variants.
  - (5) I.e., what is the trend of your thoughts? The parallel passage (in Gen. Rab.) has **מֵאֵין הַרְגָלִים**, 'whence the feet'?
  - (6) V. Gen. I, 6-7.
  - (7) Ibid. v. 2.
  - (8) Cf. the parallel passage in J. Hag. II, 1, where B. Zoma quotes Deut. XXXII, 11; and v. Rashi to this verse.
  - (9) I.e., out of his mind (R. Hai Gaon). The reading in Gen. Rab. is 'is gone'. (12) Gen. I, 6.

(10) [For an attempt to explain the passage v. Weinstein Zur Genesis der Agada, p. 199, Ben Zoma in his view was an adherent of the view that water was the primordial matter out of which the world was created, V. also Graetz, Gnosticismus, pp. 57, 97. We have, however, lost the key to enable us to explain with certainty the thought-forms underlying this and similar Talmudic passages.]

(11) V. supra p. 91, n. 10.

(12) Eccl. V, 5. (A.V. 6); v. rest of verse.

(13) The name of one of the highest angels. Various derivations of the word have been suggested. Cf. Levy and Jast. s.v. For an illuminating article on the character, activities and identity of Metatron, v. J.E. vol. VIII, p. 519.

(14) The sentence may also be rendered thus: 'He saw M. to whom permission was given to be seated while writing down etc.' (Jast.).

(15) I.e., in heaven.

(16) MS.M. (v. Rabb. D.S. a.I.) reads: 'no standing and no sitting' i.e., no effort and no rest. This reading, in reverse order, was known to Maim. (Comm. on Mishnah Sanhedrin, ch. 10); but Rashi deletes the words 'no standing'.

(17) I.e., the angels have faces in all directions (Rashi), Jast. explains i.e., everything is in sight. Maim. (loc. cit.) renders: 'no division'.

(18) Maim. 'no junction'.

(19) I.e., he was beaten with 'heated disks or rings strung on a lash' (Jast.). The purpose of the punishment was to show that M. had no more power than others (Tosaf.).

(20) V. p. 73, n. 12.

(21) Jer. III, 22.

(22) According to our passage, Aher was guilty of the heresy of dualism. L. Ginzberg (J.E. vol. V, pp. 138-139) denies all historic worth to the story given here, which, on account of its reference to Metatron — which he declares to be a specifically Babylonian idea — and its lack of connection with the introductory words, he declares to be of late origin. Ginzberg prefers the parallel account in J. Hag. II, 1, where it is related that when Elisha saw a scholar he slew him, that he enticed the young from studying the Torah, and that he informed against the Jews when they sought to perform the work they were ordered to do on the Sabbath in a manner not to break the Law, These events undoubtedly refer to the period of the Hadrianic persecutions. In the J.T. two reasons are mentioned for his apostasy: according to some, he saw one man break the precept of Deut. XXII, 7, without coming to harm, and another observe it and get killed; according to others, he saw the tongue of the great scholar R. Judah Nahtum in the mouth of a dog. The J.T. also gives a different version of the verses discussed by Elisha with R. Meir, and of what R. Meir said on his master's death (v. J.E. vol. VIII, p. 434).

(23) Lit., 'that man', a frequent euphemism for I or thou (to avoid ominous speech or curse).

(24) I.e. 'he would have no share in the world to come (cf. Sanh. 90a (Sonc. ed., p. 601).

(25) Lit., 'evil growth', hence, 'evil rearing, manners, ways'. The stories that follow show the expression to mean here moral depravity and apostasy.

(26) Strictly, the soft tuber of the radish; cf. 'Er. 28b.

(27) 'Aher' is thus explained to mean 'another person'. Ginzberg (op. cit.) takes the view that it is a euphemism for a vile thing (cf. דבר אהר). V. p. 91, n. 3.

(28) Lit., 'corresponding to', or 'over against'.

(29) Eccl. VII, 14.

(30) I.e., Paradise, for the righteous in the life hereafter.

(31) V. p. 82, n. 1; cf. J.E. vol. V, pp. 582f. Whereas R. Meir explains the verse as referring to physical counterparts of nature R. Akiba understands it to speak of moral contrasts with their consequent reward and punishment. Cf. n. 6.

(32) Lit., 'having been declared innocent, i.e., In the Heavenly Court,

(33) Lit., 'having been declared guilty'.

(34) I. e., Paradise.

(35) Isa. LXI, 7.

(36) Jer. XVII, 18.

(37) Job. XXVIII, 17.

(38) I.e., forgotten.

(39) I.e., can be repaired.

(40) I.e., can repent.

(41) Heb. פרגוד, from Latin paragenda = a garment ornamented with a border (so called because of its phrygian origin). For other derivations v. Levy s.v. Here pargod denotes the 'curtain of heaven' and corresponds to Wilon (v. p. 69, n. 5). V. also p. 101.

(42) V. Bez. V, 2.

(43) V. Glos.

(44) I.e., two thousand cubits (in all directions) from the place where a person makes his abode for the Sabbath, beyond which it is forbidden to go on the day of rest; cf. Shab. XXIV, 5; 'Er. IV, 3; V, 7.

(45) I.e., the verse which thou hast studied today. The answer thus obtained was considered to have the authority of an oracle.

(46) Isa, XLVIII, 22.

(47) The expression used here and in the rest of this passage is בֵּי כְנִישְׁתָּא, lit., 'House of Assembly, Synagogue'. But above, 'schoolhouse' translated בֵּי מִדְרָשָׁא, lit., 'House of study'. For the use of the Synagogue as a school and for the exact signification of the Aramaic terms v. S. Krauss, TA. III, p. 204f.

(48) Jer. II, 22.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 15b

to a child: Recite for me thy verse! He answered: And thou, that art spoiled, what doest thou, that thou clothest thyself with scarlet, that thou deckest thee with ornaments of gold, that thou enlargest thine eyes with paint? In vain dost thou make thyself fair etc.<sup>1</sup> He took him to yet another schoolhouse until he took him to thirteen schools: all of them quoted in similar vein. When he said to the last one, Recite for my thy verse, he answered: But unto the wicked God saith: 'What hast thou to do to declare My statutes etc.?'<sup>2</sup> That child was a stutterer, so it sounded as though he answered: 'But to Elisha<sup>3</sup> God saith'. Some say that [Aher] had a knife with him, and he cut him up and sent him to the thirteen schools: and some say that he said: Had I a knife in my hand I would have cut him up.

When Aher died,<sup>4</sup> they said:<sup>5</sup> Let him not be judged, nor let him enter the world to come. Let him not be judged, because he engaged in the study of the Torah; nor let him enter the world to come, because he sinned. R. Meir said: It were better that he should be judged and that he should enter the world to come. When I die I shall cause<sup>6</sup> smoke to rise from his grave.<sup>7</sup> When R. Meir died, smoke rose up from Aher's grave. R. Johanan said: [What] a mighty deed to burn his master! There was one amongst us, and we cannot save him;<sup>8</sup> if I were to take him by the hand, who would snatch him from me! [But] said he:<sup>9</sup> When I die, I shall extinguish the smoke from his grave.<sup>10</sup> When R. Johanan died, the smoke ceased from Aher's grave. The public mourner<sup>11</sup> began [his oration] concerning him<sup>12</sup> thus: Even the janitor<sup>13</sup> could not stand before thee, O master!

Aher's daughter [once] came before Rabbi and said to him: O master, support me! He asked her: 'Whose daughter art thou?' She replied: I am Aher's daughter. Said he: Are any of his children left in the world? Behold it is written: He shall have neither son nor son's son among his people, nor any remaining in his dwellings.<sup>14</sup> She answered: Remember his Torah<sup>15</sup> and not his deeds. Forthwith, a fire came down and enveloped Rabbi's bench.<sup>16</sup> [Thereupon] Rabbi wept and said: If it be so on account of those who dishonour her,<sup>17</sup> how much more so on account of those who honour her!

But how did R. Meir learn Torah at the mouth of Aher? Behold Rabbah b. Bar Hana said that R. Johanan said: What is the meaning of the verse, For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts?<sup>18</sup> [This means that] if the teacher is like an angel of the Lord of hosts, they should seek the Law at his mouth, but if not, they should not seek the Law at his mouth! — Resh Lakish answered: R. Meir found a verse and expounded it [as follows]: Incline thine ear, and hear the words of the wise, and apply thy heart unto my knowledge.<sup>19</sup> It does not say, 'unto their knowledge', but 'unto my knowledge'.<sup>20</sup> R. Hanina said, [he decided it] from here: Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also

thine own people, and thy father's house etc.<sup>21</sup> The verses contradict one another!<sup>22</sup> There is no contradiction: in the one case Scripture refers to an adult,<sup>23</sup> in the other to a child. When R. Dimi came [to Babylon] he said: In the West,<sup>24</sup> they say: R. Meir ate the date and threw the kernel<sup>25</sup> away.

Raba expounded: What is the meaning of the verse: I went down to the garden of nuts, to look at the green plants of the valley etc.<sup>26</sup> Why are the scholars likened to the nut? To tell you that just as [in the case of] the nut, though it be spoiled with mud and filth, yet are its contents not contemned, so [in the case of] a scholar, although he may have sinned, yet is his Torah not contemned.

Rabbah b. Shila [once] met Elijah.<sup>27</sup> He said to him: What is the Holy One, blessed be He, doing? He answered: He utters traditions in the name<sup>28</sup> of all the Rabbis, but in the name of R. Meir he does not utter. Rabbah asked him, Why? — Because he learnt traditions at the mouth of Aher. Said [Rabbah] to him: But why? R. Meir found a pomegranate; he ate [the fruit] within it, and the peel he threw away! He answered: Now<sup>29</sup> He says: Meir my son says: When a man suffers,<sup>30</sup> to what expression does the Shechinah give utterance? 'My head is heavy, my arm is heavy'.<sup>31</sup> If the Holy One, blessed be He, is thus grieved over the blood of the wicked, how much more so over the blood of the righteous that is shed. Samuel found Rab Judah leaning on the door-bolt weeping. So he said to him: O, keen scholar,<sup>32</sup> wherefore dost thou weep? He replied: Is it a small thing that is written concerning the Rabbis?<sup>33</sup> Where is he that counted, where is he that weighed? Where is he that counted the towers?<sup>34</sup> 'Where is he that counted?' — for they counted all the letters in the Torah. 'Where is he that weighed?' — for they weighed the light and the heavy<sup>35</sup> in the Torah. 'Where is he that counted the towers?' — for they taught three hundred halachoth<sup>36</sup> concerning a 'tower which flies in the air'.<sup>37</sup> And R. Ammi said: Three hundred questions<sup>38</sup> did Doeg<sup>39</sup> and Ahitophel<sup>40</sup> raise concerning a 'tower which flies in the air'. Yet we have learnt: Three kings and four commoners<sup>41</sup> have no share in the world to come. What then shall become of us? Said [Samuel] to him. O, keen scholar, there was impurity<sup>42</sup> in their hearts. — But what of Aher?<sup>43</sup> — Greek song did not cease from his mouth.<sup>44</sup> It is told of Aher that when he used to rise [to go] from the schoolhouse,<sup>45</sup> many heretical books<sup>46</sup> used to fall from his lap.

Nimos the weaver<sup>47</sup> asked R. Meir: Does all wool that goes down into the [dyeing] kettle come up [properly dyed]?<sup>48</sup> He replied: All that was clean on its mother<sup>49</sup> comes up [properly dyed], all that was not clean on its mother does not come up [properly dyed].

R. Akiba went up unhurt and went down<sup>50</sup> unhurt; and of him Scripture says: Draw me, we will run after thee.<sup>51</sup> And R. Akiba too the ministering angels sought to thrust away; [but] the Holy One, blessed be He, said to them: Let this elder be, for he is worthy to avail himself of My glory.

---

(1) Ibid. IV, 30.

(2) Ps. L, 16.

(3) The child pronounced וְלִרְשָׁעִים ('and unto the wicked') like וְלִרְשָׁעֵי אֵלִישָׁע ('and unto Elisha'). Note that ר and ר are both gutturals.

(4) Lit., 'his soul rested'.

(5) I.e., in heaven,

(6) By my prayer.

(7) I.e., as a sign that he was judged and punished for his sins.

(8) I.e., one scholar among us went astray, yet all of us together have not the power to save him!

(9) Var. lec. omit 'said he',

(10) I.e., as a sign that he was forgiven.

(11) V. S. Krauss, T.A. II, p. 68.

(12) I.e., R. Johanan.

(13) I.e., of hell.

(14) Job. XVIII, 19. The verse forms part of a description of the fate of the wicked; cf. v. 5. In the eyes of Bildad (v. I),



Job was an infidel.

(15) I.e., his vast knowledge of the Torah. Though theory should not be divorced from practice, the study of the Torah is in itself a merit: cf. Ab. IV, 5.

(16) Cf. p. 89.

(17) I.e., the Torah.

(18) Mal. II, 7.

(19) Prov. XXII, 17.

(20) Since the heart may not be applied to their knowledge, it shows that the acts of the wise men referred to must be wicked. Nevertheless, their words may be listened to. Thus R. Meir could learn from Aher, provided he did not imitate the latter's deeds.

(21) Ps. XLV, 11. I.e., hearken to the words of the wise, but forget their actions, if they are wicked.

(22) I.e., the two verses contradict Mal. II,7 quoted above.

(23) An adult, unlike a child, can use discrimination, and avoid the teacher's wrongdoing; hence the last two verses permit him to learn even from a heretic.

(24) I.e., Palestine, which is west of Babylonia.

(25) So Rashi and Levy; Jast. trans., 'peel'. V. D.5. a.I. n. 30.

(26) Cant. VI, 11.

(27) For Elijah in Rabbinic literature v. J.E. vol. V, pp. 122ff(especially p. 124).

(28) Lit., 'from the mouth'.

(29) I.e., since you have pleaded for him,

(30) The passage refers to capital punishment, v. Sanh. 46a.

(31) Lit., 'I am lighter than my head etc.', a euphemistic expression for feeling heavy, giddy. weak; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., pp. 304, 306. The anthropomorphism is intended to show how near God is to man and how real is His sorrow for him in the time of his trouble, even though he be a delinquent and fully deserve his punishment.

(32) Shinena, lit., 'sharp one'; aliter 'man with long (sharp) tooth'.

(33) I.e., about those who went astray into evil courses.

(34) Isa. XXXIII, 18.

(35) I.e., expounded the Torah according to the hermeneutical rule of קל (light, unimportant) וחומר (heavy, important) i.e., by arguing from minor to major and vice versa.

(36) I.e., fixed traditional laws, V. Glos.

(37) An obscure expression for which Rashi both here and Sanh. 106b (Sonc. ed., p. 727) offers several interpretations. The most likely explanations relate the 'flying tower' to the laws of defilement. It could then mean: (a) A portable turret-shaped conveyance, in which an Israelite entered heathen land, which is regarded as levitically unclean; v. Tosef. Oh. and Rashi to Sanh. l.c. 'Flying' will thus mean 'moving' i.e., being carried. (b) An open chest or cupboard containing a levitically unclean object, which stands in an open space; v. Oh. IV, If. In this case, it is best to read 'open', or, as in the Mishnah 'standing'. The following are less plausible explanations: — (a) The upper stroke of the letter lamed, i.e., they taught three hundred traditions concerning so insignificant a matter. (b) The tower of Babel. (c) A tower suspended in mid-air by magic. Cf. Sanh. 68a (Sonc. ed., p. 462), concerning the planting of cucumbers by magic.

(38) An indication of their profound learning. V. the variant reading in Sanh, l.c.

(39) Cf. I Sam. XXI, 8 where 'the chiefest of the herdmen' is explained by Rashi as 'the head of the Beth din'.

(40) Cf. II Sam. XVI, 23.

(41) The three kings are, Jeroboam, Ahab and Manasseh; the four commoners, Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel and Gehazi. Thus their profound learning did not save Doeg and Ahitophel. V. Sanh. 90a, (Sonc. ed., pp. 602f).

(42) Lit., 'clay', i.e., heathen sensuality (Jast.). Aliter: 'gnawing worm'; 'jealousy', i.e., evil thoughts (Levy). Whatever the exact rendering, the meaning is: They were wickedly inclined from the beginning, hence their knowledge of the Torah could not protect them.

(43) I.e., why did not his study of the Torah save him?

(44) Rashi reads: 'from his house'. Why Greek song should have been the cause of Aher's corruption is not clear. Rashi says that he transgressed the prohibition against music after the destruction of the Temple (v. Git. 7a; cf. Isa. XXIV, 9). Maharsha rightly objects that this does not explain the word Greek: the Gemara could have simply stated that song did not cease from his mouth. He suggests, therefore, that the Greek songs were tainted by heresy. Perhaps the simplest explanation is that Aher's devotion to Greek literature eventually led him to accept ideas which were contrary to Jewish

teaching.

(45) I.e., before his apostasy.

(46) Lit., 'books of Minim' (v. Glos. s.v. Min).

(47) גֵּרְדִי, Lat. gerdino. Cf. R. Isaac the Smith, R. Johanan the Sandalmaker etc. Being a weaver, the allegory employed by Nimos is appropriate. But Jast. holds that גֵּרְדִי equals (by transposition) גֵּרְדִי and means 'of Gadara'. He also regards נִימוֹס as a shortened form of אֲבִנְיָמוֹס (cf. Gen. Rab. s. 65), who, he thinks, is to be identified with the cynic philosopher Oenomaus.

(48) Rashi explains: does the study of the Torah serve to protect all students from sin? Jast.: i.e., does every student of mystic philosophy escape death or scepticism? (So too Aruch). Note Oenomaus was a cynic.

(49) I.e., when the sheep was sheared, i.e., all who begin the study of the Torah when they are free from sin; or (following Jast. and Aruch), all who engage in mystic speculation in perfect purity, like R. Akiba. Cf. Ab. III, 9 (Sonc. ed., p. 32).

(50) Cf. 'entered . . . departed' supra pp. 90-91.

(51) Cant. I, 4. I.e., R. Akiba was able to follow God right into Paradise, or (according to the other opinions) into the deepest mysteries of theosophy.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 16a

— By what Biblical exposition was he able to learn this?<sup>1</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said that R. Johanan said: And He came from the myriads holy<sup>2</sup> — He is the Sign<sup>3</sup> among His myriad. And R. Abbahu said: He is preeminent above ten thousand<sup>4</sup> — He is the Example<sup>5</sup> among His myriad. And Resh Lakish said: The Lord of hosts is His names<sup>6</sup> — He is the Lord among His host. — And R. Hiyya b. Abba said that R. Johanan said: But the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was 'not in the fire; and after the fire a still small voice.'<sup>7</sup> And behold, the Lord passed by.<sup>8</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Six things are said concerning demons:<sup>9</sup> in regard to three, they are like the ministering angels; and in regard to three, like human beings. 'In regard to three they are like the ministering angels': they have wings like the ministering angels; and they fly from one end of the world to the other like the ministering angels; and they know what will happen like the ministering angels. [You say], 'They know' — you cannot mean that!<sup>10</sup> — Rather, they hear from behind the Veil<sup>11</sup> like the ministering angels. 'And in regard to three, they are like human beings': they eat and drink like human beings; they propagate like human beings; and they die like human beings. Six things are said of human beings: in regard to three, they are like the ministering angels, and in regard to three, they are like beasts. 'In regard to three, they are like the ministering angels': they have understanding like the ministering angels; and they walk erect like the ministering angels; and they can talk in the holy tongue<sup>12</sup> like the ministering angels. 'In regard to three, they are like beasts': they eat and drink like beasts; and they propagate like beasts, and they relieve themselves like beasts.

WHOSOEVER SPECULATES UPON FOUR THINGS, IT WERE A MERCY IF<sup>13</sup> HE HAD NOT COME INTO THE WORLD etc. Granted as regards what is above, what is beneath,<sup>14</sup> what [will be] after,<sup>15</sup> that is well. But as regards what was before — what happened, happened!<sup>16</sup> — Both R. Johanan and Resh Lakish say: It is like a human king who said to his servants: Build for me a great palace upon the dunghill.<sup>17</sup> They went and built it for him. It is not the king's wish [thenceforth] to have the name of the dunghill mentioned.

WHOSOEVER TAKES NO THOUGHT FOR THE HONOUR OF HIS MAKER, IT WERE A MERCY IF HE HAD NOT COME INTO THE WORLD. What does this mean? R. Abba said: It refers to one who looks at the rainbow. R. Joseph said: It refers to one who commits transgression in secret. 'One who looks at a rainbow', for it is written: As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.<sup>18</sup> R. Joseph said: 'It refers to one who commits a transgression

in secret', in accordance with R. Isaac's teaching. For R. Isaac said: When anyone commits a transgression in secret, it is as though he thrust aside the feet of the Divine Presence, for it is said: Thus saith the Lord: The heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool.<sup>19</sup> But is this so? For behold R. Elai the elder said: If a man sees that his [evil] inclination is prevailing upon him, let him go to a place where he is not known, and put on black garments,<sup>20</sup> and wrap himself up<sup>21</sup> in black garments, and let him do what his heart desires;<sup>22</sup> but let him not profane the Name of Heaven publicly! — There is no contradiction. The one case speaks of one who is able to overcome<sup>23</sup> his [evil] inclination; the other case of one who is not able to overcome his [evil] inclination.

R. Judah b. R. Nahmani, the speaker<sup>24</sup> of Resh Lakish expounded: Anyone who looks at three things, his eyes become dim; at the rainbow, and at the Prince,<sup>25</sup> and at the priests. At the rainbow, because it is written: As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain . . . This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.<sup>26</sup> At the Prince, for it is written: And thou shalt put of thy honour upon him.<sup>27</sup> One who looks at the priests — at the time when the Temple existed, when they stood upon their platform<sup>28</sup> and blessed Israel with the Distinguished Name<sup>29</sup> [of God]. R. Judah son of R. Nahmani, the speaker of Resh Lakish expounded: What is the meaning of the verse: Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a familiar friend.<sup>30</sup> If the evil inclination say to thee: Sin and the Holy One, blessed be He, will pardon, believe it not, for it is said: 'Trust ye not in a friend', and 'friend' [Rea'] means none other than one's evil inclination, for it is said: For the inclination<sup>31</sup> of man's heart is evil [Ra'].<sup>32</sup> And 'familiar friend' means none other than the Holy One, blessed be He, for it is said: Thou art the familiar friend of my youth.<sup>33</sup> Perhaps thou wilt say: Who testifies against me? The stones of a man's home and the beams of his house testify against him, for it is said: For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it.<sup>34</sup> But the Sages say: A man's soul testifies against him, for it is said: Keep the doors of thy mouth from her that lieth in thy bosom.<sup>35</sup> What is it that lies in a man's bosom? You must say, it is the soul. R. Zerika said: Two ministering angels that accompany him testify against him, for it is said: For He will give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.<sup>36</sup> But the Sages<sup>36</sup> say: A man's limbs testify against him, for it is said: Therefore ye are My witnesses,<sup>37</sup> saith the Lord, and I am God.<sup>38</sup>

MISHNAH. JOSE B. JO'EZER<sup>39</sup> SAYS THAT [ON A FESTIVAL-DAY] THE LAYING ON OF HANDS [ON THE HEAD OF A SACRIFICE]<sup>40</sup> MAY NOT BE PERFORMED;<sup>41</sup> JOSEPH B. JOHANAN SAYS THAT IT MAY BE PERFORMED.<sup>42</sup> JOSHUA B. PERAHIA SAYS THAT IT MAY NOT RE PERFORMED; NITTAI THE ARBELITE<sup>43</sup> SAYS THAT IT MAY BE PERFORMED. JUDAH B. TARBAL SAYS THAT IT MAY NOT BE PERFORMED; SIMEON A. SHETAH SAYS THAT IT MAY BE PERFORMED. SHEMAIAH SAYS THAT IT MAY BE PERFORMED; ABTALION SAYS THAT IT MAY NOT BE PERFORMED.<sup>44</sup> HILLEL AND MENAHEM DID NOT DIFFER. MENAHEM WENT FORTH,<sup>45</sup> SHAMMAI ENTERED.<sup>46</sup> SHAMMAI SAYS THAT IT MAY NOT BE PERFORMED; HILLEL SAYS THAT IT MAY BE PERFORMED.

(1) Lit., 'what did he expound'? i.e., from which verse did R. Akiba learn to distinguish God's Presence so as to avoid Aher's error of dualism, or (according to another interpretation of Rashi) so as not to look in the direction of the Shechinah (Divine Presence)?

(2) Deut. XXXIII, 2.

(3) ואתה ('and He came') is explained as ואתה ('and His sign'). Jast. translates: 'He is the ensign among his myriad'. Goldschmidt: 'He is distinguished among his myriads'.

(4) Cant. V, 10.

(5) Heb. דוגמא. There is a play here on the text דגול מרבבה ('pre-eminent among the thousand') from which דוגמא is derived. The expositions of the different Rabbis have the common object of showing that God's Presence could be distinguished from his myriad attendants; fine shades of difference are not necessarily to be sought. But for the thought underlying this particular homiletical play, cf. Lev. XIX, 2. Jast. translates: 'He is exemplified by His myriad (of

angels)', i.e., the Divine nature is recognized indirectly from the nature of His ministering angels, v. Cant. Rab. to V, 9. But this seems hardly in keeping with the line of thought demanded by the context. Goldschmidt: 'He is marked out among his myriads'.

(6) Isa. XLVIII, 2.

(7) 1 Kings XIX, 11, 12. Thus the Divine Presence could be distinguished from the rest of the theophany.

(8) .Ibid. v. 11; in the Bible this clause precedes the previous quotation.

(9) V. J.E. vol. IV, pp. 514f, and Nachmanides on Lev. XVII, 7.

(10) Prescience is a divine attribute,

(11) V. p. 95, n. 10.

(12) The power of learning to speak the Hebrew language is common to all men.

(13) The wording here is slightly different from the Mishnah text (s.v.), but does not alter the meaning.

(14) Cf. p. 59, n. 7 and Deut. XXXIII, 27.

(15) I.e., in the hereafter.

(16) I.e., it is no longer a secret.

(17) The dunghill here represents the primordial chaos; the palace, ordered creation.

(18) Ezek. I, 28. Since the rainbow was symbolic of the Divine Glory, it was irreverent to gaze at it.

(19) Isa. LXVI, 1. But he that sins in secret denies this, for he implies that God has no access to his hiding-place.

(20) In the hope that exile and mourning clothes (cf. Shab. 114a, Jannai's request) would cool his passion and cause him to abandon his wicked intention.

(21) To produce a serious frame of mind; cf p. 88, n. 9.

(22) I.e., should his passion remain unmastered, let him at least commit the sin in secret. But R. Hananel deprecates the thought that the Talmud permits sin even in such circumstances and interprets our passage thus: certainly the effect of exile and dark garments will be to conquer the man's evil inclination, so that he will then be able to do what his heart truly desires, i.e., serve God.

(23) Lit., 'bend'.

(24) Methurgeman. Lit., 'interpreter', used here in the sense of Amora, 'speaker'; v. J.E. vol. VIII, p. 521.

(25) Heb. Nasi; v. infra p. 105, n. 6.

(26) Ezek. I, 28.

(27) Num. XXVII, 20. Moses' face could not be gazed at; v. Ex. XXXIV, 29-35. A part of Moses' honour belonged not merely to Joshua but to every Jewish leader.

(28) V. J.E. vol. V, p. 9 (s.v. Dukan).

(29) I.e., pronounced the Shem ha-meforash, the Tetragrammaton (יהוה), instead of the usual substitute אדני when uttering the sacerdotal blessing. Num. VI, 24-26. cf. Sot. VII, 6; and Sanh. 90a (Sonc. ed., p. 602). The exact meaning of the term Shem ha-meforash is obscure: v. Levy and Jast and J.E. vol. XI, pp. 262f. Tosaf. (a.l.) points out that outside the Temple too, e.g., in the provinces, it was forbidden to look at the priests during the pronouncement of the sacerdotal blessing, the reason according to the J.T. being to prevent the distraction of the people's attention.

(30) Mic. VII, 5.

(31) E.V. 'imagination'.

(32) Gen. VIII, 21, Only the vowels differentiate רע (friend) from רע (evil).

(33) Jer. III, 4.

(34) Hab. II, 11.

(35) Ps. XCI, 11.

(36) In Ta'an. the reading is, 'Some say' = R. Nathan (v. Hor. 13b; cf. p. 14, n. 5).

(37) I.e., ye yourselves (sc. your very bodies) testify to your own sins.

(38) Isa. XLIII, 12.

(39) In Tem. 16a: Joseph b. Jo'ezer. For the successive generations of scholars mentioned here v. Aboth I, 4-12 (Sonc. ed., pp. 3-8 and nn. a.l.).

(40) Cf. Lev, 1, 4.

(41) The same restrictions regarding work applied to Festival-days as to the Sabbath, except in respect of work essential to the preparation of food, which was permitted on the Festivals (v. Bez. V, 2). Now the 'laying on of the hands' had to be performed with all one's strength, so that the weight of the person was supported by the animal; and this was considered an infringement of the Sabbath rule not 'to make use' of an animal. The point of the controversy, therefore, is

this: Had the laying on of the hands to be done immediately prior to the slaughter, and consequently could be regarded as essential to the preparation of food, i.e., the sacrificial meal; or could this be done on the preceding day, so that the profanation of the holyday by this act became unnecessary, although the slaughtering took place on the Festival day? V. Bez. II, 4 and Bertinoro a.l.

(42) In the J. Hag. II, 2 we are told: At first there was no controversy in Israel except over the laying on of the hands alone. But Shammai and Hillel arose and made them four (in Bab. Shab. 14b, only three points of dispute are mentioned; cf. Tosaf. to our passage). When the disciples of the School of Hillel increased, and they did not study sufficiently under their masters (lit., 'did not sufficiently minister to their masters'), the controversies in Israel increased, and they became divided into two companies, the one declaring unclean, the other declaring clean. And (the Torah) will not again return to its (uncontroversial) place until the son of David (i.e., the Messiah) will come. For the meaning and importance of this controversy v. further Weiss, Dor I, 103f; Frankel, Hodegetica in Mischnam pp. 43-44; Jacob Levi, in Ozar Nehmod III, Vienna 1860. [The controversy has also been ingeniously interpreted as referring to the question of 'acceptance of authority' and not the laying on of hands. V. Zeitlin, JQR, (N.S.) VII, pp. 499ff; Sidon A, Gedenkbuck Kaufmann, pp. 355ff and Bornstein, A. Hatekufah IV, p. 396.]

(43) I.e., of Arbel, on the borders of Lake Galilee. V. Ab. I, 6 (Sonc. ed., p. 5, n. 3.).

(44) This pair is exceptional in so far as the first Sage permits and the second prohibits.

(45) V. p. 108.

(46) I.e., in the former's place as Head of the Court.

## **Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 16b**

THE FORMER [OF EACH] PAIR WERE PRINCES<sup>1</sup> AND THE LATTER WERE HEADS OF THE COURT.<sup>2</sup>

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: The three of the former pairs<sup>3</sup> who said that the laying on of the hands may not be performed, and the two of the latter pairs who said that it may be performed, were Princes, and the others were Heads of the Court — this is the view of R. Meir. But the Sages say: Judah b. Tabbai was Head of the Court, and Simeon b. Shetah was Prince. Who taught the following teaching of our Rabbis? R.<sup>4</sup> Judah b. Tabbai said: May I see consolation,<sup>5</sup> if I did not have a Zomem<sup>6</sup>-witness put to death as a demonstration<sup>7</sup> against the Sadducees<sup>8</sup> who said that Zomemim-witnesses were not to be put to death unless [through their false evidence] the accused had [already] been put to death. Said Simeon b. Shetah to him: May I see consolation, if thou didst not shed innocent blood. For the Sages said: Zomemim-witnesses are not put to death until both of them have been proved Zomemim; and they are not flogged<sup>9</sup> until both of them have been proved Zomemim; and they are not ordered to pay money [as damages]<sup>10</sup> until both of them have been proved Zomemim. Forthwith Judah b. Tabbai undertook never to give a decision except in the presence of Simeon b. Shetah.<sup>11</sup> All his days Judah b. Tabbai prostrated himself on the grave of the executed man, and his voice used to be heard. The people believed that it was the voice of the executed man; [but] he said to them: 'It is my voice. Ye shall know this [by the fact that] on the morrow [when] I die my voice will not be heard'.<sup>12</sup> R. Aha the son of Raba said to R. Ashi: But perhaps he<sup>13</sup> appeased him, or [the deceased] summoned him to judgment!<sup>14</sup> — According to whom will this<sup>15</sup> be? Granted, if you say [it is according to] R. Meir, who said that Simeon b. Shetah was Head of the Court [and] R. Judah b. Tabbai was Prince, that is why he decided points of law in the presence of Simeon b. Shetah; but if you say [it is according to] the Rabbis, who say that Judah b. Tabbai was Head of the Court [and] Simeon b. Shetah was Prince, how may the Head of the Court decide points of law in the presence of the Prince!<sup>16</sup> — No, 'he undertook' is to be understood with reference to association. [He said]: I will not even join [with other judges to give a decision, unless Simeon b. Shetah is present].<sup>17</sup> MENAHEM WENT FORTH AND SHAMMAI ENTERED etc. Whither did he go forth? Abaye said: He went forth into evil courses.<sup>18</sup> Raba said: He went forth to the King's service. Thus it is also taught: Menahem went forth to the King's service, and there went forth with him eighty pairs of disciples dressed in silk.

R. Shimon b. Abba said that R. Johanan said: Never let [the principle] of Shebuth<sup>19</sup> [Rest] be unimportant in thy eyes. For the laying on of the hands [on a Festival-day] is [prohibited] only on account of Shebuth, yet the great men of the age differed thereon.<sup>20</sup> But is this not already quite clear!<sup>21</sup> — It is required on account of a precept [the fulfilment of which is prohibited] as Shebuth.<sup>22</sup> But is not that too quite clear!<sup>23</sup> — [It is required] to contradict the view that they differ regarding the laying on of the hands itself: thus he teaches us that it is in regard to Shebuth that they differ.<sup>24</sup>

Rami b. Hama said: You can deduce from this<sup>25</sup> that the laying on of hands must be done with all one's strength; for if you suppose that one's whole strength is not required, what [work] does one do by laying on the hands?<sup>26</sup> An objection was raised: [It is written]: Speak unto the sons of Israel . . . and he shall lay his hands.<sup>27</sup> The sons of Israel lay on the hands but the daughters of Israel do not lay on the hands. R. Jose and R. Simeon<sup>28</sup> say: The daughters of Israel lay on the hands optionally.<sup>29</sup> R. Jose said: Abba Eleazar told me: Once we had a calf which was a peace-sacrifice, and we brought it to the Women's Court,<sup>30</sup> and women laid the hands on it — not that the laying on of the hands has to be done by women, but in order to gratify the women.<sup>31</sup> Now if you suppose that we require the laying on of the hands to be done with all one's strength, would we, for the sake of gratifying the women, permit work to be done with holy sacrifices!<sup>32</sup> Is it to be inferred, therefore, that we do not require all one's strength? — Actually, I can answer you that we do require [it to be] with all one's strength, [but the women] were told to hold their hands lightly.<sup>33</sup> If so, [what need was there to say], 'not that the laying on of the hands has to be done by women'? He could [more simply] have pointed out that it was no laying on of the hands at all! R. Ammi said: His argument runs: Firstly and secondly. Firstly, it was no laying on of the hands at all, and secondly, it was [done] In order to gratify the women.<sup>34</sup>

R. Papa said: One may conclude from this<sup>35</sup> that it is forbidden [on a holy day to make use of] the sides [of an animal].<sup>36</sup> For if you suppose that it is permitted [to make use of] the sides, let the hands be laid on the side.<sup>37</sup> It must be concluded, therefore, that it is forbidden to make use of the sides.<sup>38</sup>

---

(1) Heb. Nasi, i.e., President of the Sanhedrin. V. J.E. vol. IX, pp. 171-2; and Strack's Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p. 1072, n. 3.

(2) Heb. Ab beth din, Father of the Court; i.e., Vice-president of the Sanhedrin; cf. p. 75, n. 5.

(3) Heb. זוגות (Zugoth), Grk. \*\*. The term is applied only to the five pairs of leading teachers mentioned in our Mishnah (cf. Pe'ah II, 6); they were followed by the period of the Tannaim (v. Glos.). V. Ab. I, 4 (Sonc. ed., p. 3. n. 8); and supra p. 105, n. 6.

(4) [Var. lec. rightly omit: 'R'].

(5) A euphemistic form of oath, meaning, 'may I not live to see the consolation of Zion'. According to this explanation (given by Tosaf. and Jast.), Judah b. Tabbai and his colleague looked forward to fuller restoration of Israel's glory than was achieved in their day, v. Mak., Sonc. ed., p. 27, n. 7. Levy, however, trans: 'May I not behold the eternal salvation (ewige Heil) etc.'; and Rashi (Mak. 5b, the alternative explanation), interprets thus: He swore by the life of his children; might he receive condolences on their passing (if etc.).

(6) Lit., 'planning (evil)'. with reference to Deut. XIX, 19; hence the technical name for false witnesses whose evidence has been refuted by other witnesses testifying that the former were with them at another place at the time of the crime, v. Mak. 5a (Sonc. ed., p. 19f). If the Zomemim secure by their false testimony the conviction (but not the punishment) of an innocent person, the Rabbis held them to be amenable to the law of retaliation; v. Deut. XIX, 21 and Mak. 5b (Sonc. ed., p. 25).

(7) Lit., 'in order to remove (the false opinion) from their heart'.

(8) V. the usual works of reference, and R. Leszynsky, Die Sadduzaer.

(9) V. Deut. XXV, 2-3 and Mak. 22af (Sonc. ed., p. 155f, and notes a.l).

(10) Each of the three punishments referred to is retaliatory, i.e., the Zomemim-witness had intended to secure a false conviction involving the said penalty. The flogging of Zomemim-witnesses, however, may not always represent the carrying out of the lex talionis: lashes were sometimes inflicted as a substitute penalty; cf. Mak. I, If.

(11) Who would correct him, if necessary.

- (12) The text is idiomatically in the third person.
- (13) I.e., Judah b. Tabbai.
- (14) R. Aha's point is that the cessation of the voice on Judah b. Tabbai's death is no proof that it was his. For the phenomenon might be explained in this way: whilst Judah was alive, the wrongfully executed man cried out his protest from the grave; but when Judah b. Tabbai died he ceased to call either because he had been appeased by him, or because he had now been able to summon him before the Heavenly Tribunal.
- (15) I.e., the Baraita about Judah b. Tabbai.
- (16) Cf. the principle invoked against the youthful Samuel in Ber. 31b (Whoever decides a point of law in the presence of his teacher deserves death). Cf. also J. Hag. II, 2 ed. 77d, where historical evidence is cited in favour of the view that Judah b. Tammai was Prince, and also in support of the opposite opinion (Tosaf.).
- (17) So Rashi; but Tosaf. explains that he undertook never to join in voting against R. Simeon b. Shetah's opinion. According to either interpretation, the purpose of the answer is to show that Judah b. Tabbai could have been the Head of the Court, for his vow did not imply that he ever gave or proposed to give a decision in the presence of his superior, the Nasi.
- (18) V. p. 94 n. 3
- (19) שבות, lit., 'rest, abstention from secular occupation', hence, 'an occupation, on the Sabbath and Festivals, forbidden by the Rabbis as being out of harmony with the celebrations of the day' (Jast.) Cf. Ex. X, 3, 15.
- (20) V. Bez. V, 2. By laying on the hands on an animal with pressure, one 'makes use of it', and therefore infringes the principle of Shebuth, just as much, as by riding on it, which is prohibited in the above Mishnah.
- (21) I.e., Shebuth is clearly mentioned in the Mishnah; v. n. 3.
- (22) Otherwise one might have thought that the importance of the religious act would override the prohibition of Shebuth.
- (23) I.e., from the Mishnah; v. n.3
- (24) V. Bez. 20a, where the opinion of R. Jose b. R. Judah is mentioned, viz., that the point of difference between Shammai and Hillel is whether obligatory peace-offerings require laying on of hands, the view of Shammai being that only freewill-offerings require it.
- (25) Lit., 'hear from it!', i.e., from R. Johanan's statement, which makes Shebuth the ultimate point of dispute in the Mishnah.
- (26) All should agree, therefore, to permit it on the holy day.
- (27) Lev. I, 2-4.
- (28) This, and not 'R. Ishmael', is the correct reading; cf. 'Er. 96b, and R.H. 33a, etc.
- (29) I.e., it is neither an obligatory precept (חובה) nor a meritorious religious act (מצוה), but a religiously indifferent act which women are permitted to perform for their own gratification.
- (30) V. Mid. II,5.
- (31) So that they should feel that they have had a share, like men, in the sacrificial rites of their offering.
- (32) Laying on the hands with all one's strength is work (cf. p. 108, n. 3), which must not be performed with animals once they have been dedicated to the Temple. (Cf. Deut. XV, 19 and Bek. II, 2-3).
- (33) Lit., 'cause to float'.
- (34) [MS. M.: 'Thus he says not that the laying on of hands by women is deemed valid, since there was no laying on of hands at all, but (the object was) to gratify the women'. A reading which is preferable to that of cur. edd. V. D.S.]
- (35) V. p. 108, n. 8.
- (36) Similarly of the sides of a tree etc.; v. Shab. 154b-155a, and p. 108, n. 3.
- (37) [Rashi reads simply: 'Let the hands be laid on', i.e., since the head on which the laying on of the hands is done is like the sides of the animal.]
- (38) Actually, the laying on of the hands had to be performed on the side, i.e., of the head.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 17a

R. Ashi said: You may even say that it is permitted [to use] the sides,<sup>1</sup> but all that is connected with the back<sup>2</sup> is as the back.<sup>3</sup>

MISHNAH; BETH SHAMMAI SAY: PEACE-OFFERINGS<sup>4</sup> MAY BE BROUGHT [ON THE FESTIVAL-DAY],<sup>5</sup> AND THE HANDS NOT LAID THEREON;<sup>6</sup> BUT NOT BURNT-OFFERINGS!<sup>7</sup> AND BETH HILLEL SAY: BOTH PEACE-OFFERINGS AND BURNT-OFFERINGS MAY BE BROUGHT,<sup>8</sup> AND THE HANDS LAID THEREON. IF THE FESTIVAL OF WEEKS<sup>9</sup> FELL ON A FRIDAY,<sup>10</sup> BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THE DAY FOR SLAUGHTER<sup>11</sup>, IS AFTER THE SABBATH. AND BETH HILLEL SAY: THE DAY FOR SLAUGHTER IS NOT AFTER THE SABBATH.<sup>12</sup> THEY AGREE, HOWEVER, THAT IF IT FALL ON THE SABBATH, THE DAY FOR SLAUGHTER IS AFTER THE SABBATH.<sup>13</sup> THE HIGH PRIEST DOES NOT [IN THAT CASE] PUT ON HIS [SPECIAL] ROBES,<sup>14</sup> AND MOURNING<sup>15</sup> AND FASTING<sup>16</sup> ARE PERMITTED, IN ORDER NOT TO CONFIRM THE VIEW OF THOSE WHO SAY THAT THE FESTIVAL OF WEEKS [INVARIABLY] FOLLOWS THE SABBATH.<sup>17</sup>

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said that R. Oshaia said: Whence is it to be deduced that [the offerings of] the Feast of Weeks can be made good throughout seven days? It is said: On the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and on the Feast of Weeks, and on the Feast of Tabernacles;<sup>18</sup> thus [Scripture] compares the Feast of Weeks with the Feast of Unleavened Bread: just as [the offerings of] the Feast of Unleavened Bread can be made good throughout seven days,<sup>19</sup> so too [the offerings of] the Feast of Weeks can be made good throughout seven days. But let me say that [Scripture] compares [the Feast of Weeks] to the Feast of Tabernacles; just as [the offerings of] the Feast of Tabernacles can be made good throughout eight days, so too [the offerings of] the Feast of Weeks can be made good throughout eight days! — The eighth day is a festival by itself.<sup>20</sup> [But] is not<sup>21</sup> the statement that the eighth is a festival true only in regard to<sup>22</sup> the Balloting [by the watches],<sup>23</sup> [the recital of the benediction of] the Season,<sup>24</sup> [the name of] the Festival,<sup>25</sup> [the prescribed number of] Sacrifices,<sup>26</sup> the [Temple] Song,<sup>27</sup> and the Blessing;<sup>28</sup> but regarding the making good [of the offerings] it makes good for the first [day of Tabernacles].<sup>29</sup> For we have learnt: He who did not bring his festal offering on the first festival day of the Feast, may bring it during the whole of the Festival even on the last festival day!<sup>30</sup> If you take hold of much, you do not hold it; but if you take hold of a little, you hold it.<sup>31</sup> For what legal instruction, then, did the Divine Law write [again here] the Feast of Tabernacles?<sup>32</sup> — To compare it with the Feast of Unleavened Bread: just as the Feast of Unleavened Bread requires [the pilgrim] to stay the night [in Jerusalem], So too, the Feast of Tabernacles requires [the pilgrim] to stay the night.<sup>33</sup> And whence do we deduce it in the case of the former?

---

(1) As a matter of fact, R. Ashi holds the reverse view, i.e., he agrees with R. Papa (v. Shab. 155a); nevertheless he shows here that the conclusion cannot be drawn from R. Johanan's statement (Tosaf.).

(2) I.e., is parallel with the back, like the head.

(3) Which may not be made use of on holy days.

(4) I.e., festal-offerings and offerings of rejoicings (v. pp. 2, n. 3 and 30. n. 1 and Pes. 119a).

(5) Because they are required for food (v. p. 104, n. 12). V. Bez. 19af; there Tosaf. points out, is the original and proper place of our passage, whereas here it is introduced only incidentally. The fuller discussion on the Mishnah found in Bez. further tends to show that the latter tractate was complete before Hag. (Tosaf.).

(6) V. p. 104 and nn. 11,12. Since Beth Shammai held that the slaughtering of the animal need not necessarily follow immediately upon the laying on of the hands, the latter rite could be performed on the eve of the Festival, and the former on the Festival-day itself.

(7) I.e., the pilgrimage burnt-offerings; v. p. 2, n. 1. By emphasizing the expression 'unto you' in Ex. XII, 16, it was deduced that only food for human needs could be prepared on the Festival, but not altar-food. Since burnt-offerings were



wholly consumed on the altar and no part reserved for human consumption (as in the case of the sacrifices), they could not, according to the Shammaite view, be brought by individuals. The statutory public burnt-offerings, however, were permitted.

(8) For the reason v. Bez. 19a. The Hillelites agreed, however, that vow and freewill-offerings could not be offered up.

(9) Heb. **עצרת**, lit., '(sacred) assembly'; v. p. 27, n. 3.

(10) Lit., 'eve of Sabbath'.

(11) I.e., of the pilgrimage burnt-offerings, which, according to Beth Shammai, could not be offered up on the Festival day and a fortiori on the Sabbath; hence the offering was postponed till Sunday, for the Pentecost sacrifices could be offered throughout seven days in the same way as the Passover and Sukkoth offerings (v. pp. 111f and cf. pp. 43f).

(12) But on the Festival day. Var. lec., 'it has no day for slaughter' (omitting the words, 'after the Sabbath'); v. p. 113, n. 6.

(13) No private offering, except the Passover sacrifice, could override the Sabbath.

(14) According to Rashi, this refers to his private festival garments worn by him at home and in the street; when people would see the High Priest in his ordinary clothes, they would realize that the day was not, as the Sadducees maintained (v. infra, n. 5) a holy day. But Tosaf. argues that the reference is to the High Priest's eight sacerdotal vestments, which he wore on Festivals when he would officiate at the Temple service (v. Yoma VII, 5) and adduces the J.T. in support of this view.

(15) Heb. **הספד**: for its exact signification v. S. Krauss, T.A. II, p. 68; cf. also Jast. and Levy, s.v.

(16) Both mourning and fasting are prohibited on a festival-day.

(17) I.e., the Sadducees, who understood the word 'Sabbath' in Lev. XXIII, 11, 15 literally, and hence maintained that Pentecost must always fall on a Sunday, for it is written: 'And ye shalt count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath . . . even unto the morrow after the seventh week shall ye number fifty days' (Lev. XXIII, 15-16). But the Pharisees explained the word 'Sabbath' to mean 'day of rest', i.e., 'holy day' (cf. Lev. XXIII, 32, 39; Ibn Ezra to v. 11 (ibid.) and Men. 65a), and referred it to the first festival day of Passover. This same controversy formed part of the dispute between the Rabbanites and the Karaites some eight hundred years later.

(18) Deut. XVI, 16.

(19) Cf. pp. 43f.

(20) I.e., it does not form part of the Feast of Sukkoth.

(21) Lit., 'say'.

(22) The following six points of difference are expressed in the original by the abbreviation **פז"ר קש"ב**, formed out of the initials of the Hebrew words; v. fol. nn.

(23) **פ"ים**; the ballot or allotment in regard to the Temple services decided by a show of fingers on the part of the priests present; cf. Yoma II, 1f. Throughout the seven days of Sukkoth, the public sacrifices were offered up by the priest-watches according to rota; but on the eighth day the offerings were allotted by ballot. (V. Suk. 55b).

(24) **זמן** (cf. Eccl. III, 1): the blessing at the end of the benediction recited on the entrance of a festival, which refers to the return of the festival season, viz., 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, Who hast kept us alive, sustained us, and enabled us to reach this season'. The recital of this blessing on the eighth day of Sukkoth distinguishes it as an independent festival from the other days of Tabernacles. On the last day of Passover, on the other hand, it is not said, because the seventh day is regarded as an integral part of the Feast of unleavened Bread. V. also n. 6.

(25) **רגל** 'pilgrimage-festival'. Three explanations of the meaning of the term have been suggested (v. Tosaf. a.I.). Rashi: It is a distinct festival in as much as it enjoys a special name, viz., Shemini 'Azereth and not Sukkoth. R. Tam: It is a separate festival in the sense that it requires the pilgrim to spend the night following its termination in Jerusalem (Suk. 47a). R. Hananel: It is a separate festival in regard to the thirty days of semi-mourning for the dead. If the period of mourning began on the eve of Sukkoth, it is able to annul seven days out of the thirty in addition to the fourteen cancelled by the end of the first seven days of Tabernacles (cf. M.K. 24a).

(26) **קרבן** V. Num. XXIX, 12-38.

(27) **שיר**: Tosaf. (s. v. **פז"ר**) suggests that Ps. XII (note the caption) was said (cf. Sof. XIX and J.T.); and whereas the Psalms allocated for the different weekdays of Tabernacles were not completed each day but spread over two days (v. Suk. 55a), on the eighth day the psalm was completed.

(28) **ברכה**: according to Rashi, the people blessed the king on the eighth day, as it is written I Kings VIII, 66; according to R. Tam (l.c.) this refers to the special mention of Shemini 'Azereth in the Grace after meals and in the 'Amidah (v. Glos.); cf. Suk. 47a.

(29) I.e., Shemini 'Azereth is a continuation of Sukkoth, and if the private offerings due on the first could not be brought till the eighth day, they may still be offered up then.

(30) V. p. 43. Since in regard to making good the offerings the eighth day is an essential part of Sukkoth, then the question (p. 111). Why not compare Pentecost with Sukkoth instead of Passover, still stands.

(31) A popular proverb meaning that one can make sure of a little, but not of much, i.e., when one is confronted, as in our case, with two possibilities, one greater than the other, the smaller should be chosen for safety, for it is bound to be right in so far as it is included in the greater: thus we cannot go wrong by comparing Pentecost with the seven days of Passover, but we may err in comparing it with the eight of Tabernacles. For the proverb cf. 'every one who adds, lessens' (Talmud) and the French, 'qui trop embrasse mal etreint'.

(32) If it is not to teach us about Pentecost, It seems superfluous, for it has already been mentioned elsewhere; and it is a rule that nothing in the Torah is redundant.

(33) I.e., of the weekday of the Festival.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 17b

— It is written: And thou shalt turn in the morning, and go into thy tents.<sup>1</sup>

We have learnt: IF THE FEAST OF WEEKS FALL ON A FRIDAY, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THE DAY FOR SLAUGHTER IS AFTER THE SABBATH. AND BETH HILLEL SAY: IT HAS NO DAY FOR SLAUGHTER. Surely [this means] that it has no day for slaughter at all!<sup>2</sup> — No, [it means] that it does not require a [special] day for slaughter.<sup>3</sup> But what then does it teach us, that we can offer up [the sacrifice] on its proper day?<sup>4</sup> Behold they already dispute thereon once; for we have learnt: Beth Shammai say: Peace-offerings may be brought [on the Festival-day] and the hands not laid thereon; but not burnt-offerings. And Beth Hillel say: Both peace-offerings and burnt-offerings may be brought, and the hands laid thereon!<sup>5</sup> — [Both statements are] required. For if [the Mishnah] had taught us [only that they differ] in the [latter] case,<sup>6</sup> [I might have thought] in that case [only] Beth Shammai hold this view, because it is possible [to bring the offerings] on the following day: but in the [former] case,<sup>7</sup> I might have thought that they agreed with Beth Hillel.<sup>8</sup> And if [the Mishnah] had taught us [only that they differ] in the [former] case, [I might have thought] in this case [only] Beth Hillel hold this view, because it is not possible [to bring the offering] on the following day; but in the [latter] case, I might have thought that they agree with Beth Shammai.<sup>9</sup> [Therefore both statements are] required.

Come and hear: He who does not bring his festal-offering during the seven days of Passover, or the eight days of Tabernacles, or on the first<sup>10</sup> festival-day of the Feast of Weeks, can no longer bring his offering. This must surely mean on the festival-day [proper] of the Feast of Weeks!<sup>11</sup> — No, [it means] on the day for the slaughter.<sup>12</sup> If so, let us conclude therefrom that there is [only] one day for slaughter!<sup>13</sup> — Read, 'on the days for slaughter'<sup>14</sup>

Come and hear: Rabbah b. Samuel learnt: Count the days,<sup>15</sup> and sanctify the New Moon Day;<sup>16</sup> Count the days,<sup>17</sup> and sanctify the Feast of Weeks.<sup>18</sup> Just as the New Moon Festival belongs to its class [of days] by which it is determined,<sup>19</sup> so the Feast of Weeks belongs to its class<sup>20</sup> by which it is determined. Surely [then the Feast of Weeks] is compared with the New Moon Festival because just as [the offerings of] the New Moon Festival [are to be brought] on one day, so too [the offerings of] the Feast of Weeks [are to be brought] on one day!<sup>21</sup> — Raba answered: How can you think so? Do we then count for the Feast of Weeks [only] the days and not the weeks? Behold Abaye said: It is a precept to count the days,<sup>22</sup> for it is written: Ye shall number fifty days;<sup>23</sup> and it is a precept to count the weeks,<sup>24</sup> for it is written: Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, it is written: The Feast of Weeks.<sup>26</sup>

The School of R. Eleazar b. Jacob taught:<sup>27</sup> Scripture says: And ye shall make proclamation,<sup>28</sup> and And when ye reap.<sup>29</sup> Which is the Feast on which you proclaim and reap? You must say: It is the

Feast of Weeks.<sup>30</sup> [Now] when? Should one say on the Festival-day [itself], is reaping then permitted on the Festival-day! It must refer, therefore, to [the period after the Feast] when the offerings can still be made good.<sup>31</sup>

Now although the statement of R. Eleazar in the name of R. Oshaia has been quoted,<sup>32</sup> [the teaching] of R. Eliezer b. Jacob is also required. For if we had [only] the statement of R. Eleazar in the name of R. Oshaia, I might say: Just as [in the period] during which the offering can be made good in the case of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, it is forbidden to do work,<sup>33</sup> so too [in the period] during which the offering can be made good in the case of the Feast of Weeks, it is forbidden to do work; therefore we are told the teaching of R. Eliezer b. Jacob. And if we had [only] the teaching of R. Eliezer b. Jacob

- 
- (1) Deut. XVI, 7. But the preceding night must be spent in Jerusalem.
  - (2) I.e., if the sacrifice was not offered up on the festival-day, it cannot be made good later. This contradicts R. Oshaia's statement, p. 111.
  - (3) Since the offering can be brought on the festival-day; but actually the offering can be made good throughout seven days, as R. Oshaia taught.
  - (4) I.e., on the festival itself, that is, according to Beth Hillel.
  - (5) In view of this statement of the point at issue between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel at the beginning of the Mishnah, why does the Mishnah teach us later that they differ in regard to Pentecost which fell on a Friday, if the point of dispute, according to the interpretation just given, is exactly the same?
  - (6) I.e., where a Festival does not fall on a Friday.
  - (7) I.e., where Pentecost falls on a Friday.
  - (8) Because, since the sacrifice could not be offered up the following day, which was the Sabbath, and consequently would have to be left over till the Sunday, there was the danger that the pilgrim might neglect to bring it altogether.
  - (9) Because it was possible to bring the offering the following day, and negligence, therefore, need not be feared.
  - (10) [Omitted in MS.M.]
  - (11) Thus the offerings of Pentecost cannot be made good after the festival, which refutes R. Oshaia.
  - (12) The festival sacrifices, therefore, can be made good on the day for slaughter; thus the objection against R. Oshaia's statement falls away.
  - (13) Whereas R. Oshaia argued that the Pentecost sacrifices could be made good throughout seven days.
  - (14) The plural could include seven days.
  - (15) The Torah nowhere actually enjoins the counting of the days of each month: the expression is an instance of Midrashic licence. The Hebrew months, being lunar, vary in length from twenty-nine to thirty days (v. J.E. s. Calendar).
  - (16) By the offering of 'additional sacrifices' (v. Num. XXVIII, 11-15).
  - (17) I.e., fifty, v. infra, n. 8.
  - (18) By offering the festival sacrifices.
  - (19) Lit., 'belongs to its numbered ones, i.e., it is determined by numbering units of days, on one of which it falls.
  - (20) I.e., the period during which the festival sacrifices can be brought is equal to the class or unit by which it is determined. If the latter is a week, the sacrificial-period is a week; if it is a day, the offering-period is also a day; cf. R.H., Sonc.ed., p. 14, nn. 10 and 11.
  - (21) This would contradict the view that the Pentecost sacrifices can be made good the whole week.
  - (22) In order that we may sanctify the Feast of Weeks on the fiftieth day (Tosaf.).
  - (23) Lev. XXIII, 16.
  - (24) To teach us that the period in which the festival sacrifices may be made good is a full week.
  - (25) Deut. XVI, 9.
  - (26) Ibid. v. 10.
  - (27) I.e., derived the post-festal sacrificial period of the Feast of Weeks in the following way.
  - (28) Lev. XXIII, 21. I.e., proclaim a holy convocation or festival.
  - (29) Ibid, v. 22.
  - (30) To which the Biblical passage refers.
  - (31) Which supports R. Oshaia.

(32) V. p. 111.

(33) For the prohibition of work during the mid-festival period, v. infra and pp. 117f.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 18a

, I would not know how many [days];<sup>1</sup> therefore we are told the statement of R. Eleazar In the name of R. Oshaia.

Resh Lakish said: [It is written]: And the Feast of Harvest.<sup>2</sup> Which is the Feast on which you feast and harvest? You must say: It is the Feast of Weeks. [Now] when? Should one say on the festival-day [itself]? Is reaping then permitted on the festival-day? It must refer, therefore, to [the period after the Feast] when the offerings can still be made good. Said R. Johanan [to him]: Now accordingly, [since it is written], the Feast of Ingathering<sup>3</sup> [one can likewise argue thus]: ‘Which is the Feast on which there is ingathering? You must say: It is the Feast of Tabernacles. When? Should one say on the festival-day [itself]. is work then permitted on a festival-day! It must refer, therefore, to the mid-festival days’.<sup>4</sup> But is [work] then permitted on the mid-festival days? It must mean, therefore, the Feast that comes at the season of ingathering. Similarly here [it means] the Feast that comes at the season of reaping.<sup>5</sup>

It follows therefore that both<sup>6</sup> are of the opinion that on the mid-festival days it is forbidden to do work. Whence is this derived? — For our Rabbis taught: The Feast of Unleavened Bread shalt thou keep; seven days.<sup>7</sup> This teaches concerning the mid-festival days that work thereon is forbidden:<sup>8</sup> this is the view of R. Josiah. R. Jonathan says: This is unnecessary.<sup>9</sup> [It can be proved by] an argument a minore ad majus. If on the first and seventh days, which have no sanctity<sup>10</sup> before or after them, work is forbidden, how much more so is it right that work should be forbidden on the mid-festival days, which have sanctity before and after them. — But the six working days<sup>11</sup> disprove<sup>12</sup> [this argument] for they have sanctity<sup>13</sup> before them and after them, and yet work thereon is permitted! — [No], whereas [this applies] to the six working days which have no additional sacrifice, can you say [the same] of the mid-festival days which have an additional sacrifice?<sup>14</sup> — But the New Moon Day disproves this [argument]; for it has additional sacrifices, and yet work thereon is permitted! — [No], whereas [this applies] to the New Moon Day which is not called a ‘holy convocation’, can you say [the same] of the mid-festival days which are called ‘holy convocation’?<sup>15</sup> Since it is called ‘holy convocation’ it is only right that work thereon should be forbidden.

Another [Baraita] taught: Ye shall do no matter of servile work<sup>16</sup> — this teaches that it is forbidden to do work on mid-festival days:<sup>17</sup> this is the view of R. Jose the Galilean. R. Akiba says: This is unnecessary. It is said: These are the appointed seasons of the Lord, etc.<sup>18</sup> Whereof does the verse speak? If of the first day, behold it has already been said: Solemn rest.<sup>19</sup> If of the seventh day,<sup>20</sup> behold, it has already been said: Solemn rest.<sup>21</sup> The verse, therefore, must speak only of the mid-festival days, to teach thee that it is forbidden to do work thereon.

Another [Baraita] taught: Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread; and on the seventh day shall be restraint [of work]<sup>22</sup> unto to the Lord.<sup>23</sup> Just as the seventh day is under restraint [in respect of work],<sup>24</sup> so the six days are under restraint [in respect of work] — If [you should think that] just as the seventh day is under restraint in respect of all manner of work, so the six days are under restraint in respect of all manner of work; therefore Scripture teaches: ‘And on the seventh day shall be restraint [of work]’ — only the seventh day is under restraint in respect of all manner of work, but the six days are not under restraint in respect of all manner of work. Thus Scripture left it to the Sages<sup>25</sup> to tell you on which day [work] is forbidden, and on which day it is permitted;<sup>26</sup> which manner of work is forbidden, and which is permitted.<sup>27</sup>

AND MOURNING AND FASTING ARE PERMITTED, IN ORDER NOT TO CONFIRM THE VIEW OF THOSE WHO SAY THAT THE FESTIVAL OF WEEKS [INVARIABLY] FOLLOWS THE SABBATH: But behold it is taught:<sup>28</sup> It happened that Alexa<sup>29</sup> died at Lod, and all Israel assembled to mourn for him, but R. Tarfon did not permit them, because it was the festival-day of the Feast of Weeks. [Now] can you possibly suppose that it was [actually] the festival day? How could they come on the festival-day? You must say, therefore, because it was the day for slaughter!<sup>30</sup> — There is no contradiction: in the one case,<sup>31</sup> the festival-day [of the Feast of Weeks] fell after the Sabbath;<sup>32</sup> in the other case,<sup>33</sup> the festival-day fell on the Sabbath.<sup>34</sup>

(1) Sc. are allowed for making good the offerings of the Feast of Weeks.

(2) Ex. XXIII, 16.

(3) Ibid. and XXXIV, 22.

(4) Lit., 'the profane part of the festival', i.e., the six half-festive days between the first day of Tabernacles, which is a festival-day proper, and the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, which is likewise a festival-day. The same term applies also to the five intermediate days of Passover. This period would correspond to that after the Feast of Weeks when the offerings can still be made good.

(5) And not, as Resh Lakish would have it, a festival time at which feasting and reaping are combined.

(6) Since Resh Lakish does not object to R. Johanan's statement regarding the prohibition of work on the mid-festival days, it follows that he must agree.

(7) Ex. XXIII, 15.

(8) 'Keep' is taken invariably to imply prohibition of work. By connecting the words 'seven days' with the verb 'keep', the prohibition is extended to the mid-festival days.

(9) I.e., the verse is not needed for the proof.

(10) I.e., holy days.

(11) Lit., 'six days of the beginning of (creation)'; cf Ex. XX, 9-11.

(12) Lit., 'prove' sc. the contrary.

(13) I.e., the Sabbath.

(14) V. Num. XXVIII, 19-24, and XXIX, 13-16.

(15) V. Lev. XXIII, and Num. XXVIII and XXIX. 'Holy' implies the prohibition of work.

(16) Lev. XXIII, 7.

(17) This teaching is deduced by connecting the end of v. 7 with the words 'seven days' in the following verse.

(18) Ibid. v. 4 and 37.

(19) Lev. XXIII, v. 39.

(20) V. next note. The reading should be emended to the 'eighth day' (v. R. Hananel a.I.), for nowhere is the term 'solemn rest' applied to the seventh day of a festival.

(21) Ibid.

(22) E.V. 'a solemn assembly'!

(23) Deut. XVI, 8.

(24) For the verse concludes: 'Thou shalt do no work therein'.

(25) I.e., since the verse indicates only that the prohibition of work does not apply uniformly to all the days of the festival, it must be the intention of Scripture to let the Sages decide how the prohibition did apply.

(26) I. e., which day is a festival day proper, and which only a mid-festival day. For the fixing of the calendar, V. J.E. vol. III, pp. 498f.

(27) I.e., on mid-festival days: work which could not be postponed without incurring irretrievable loss was permitted.

(28) This is the correct reading viz., והתניא ('it is taught' by the Tannaim), not והאיתמר ('it is stated' by the Amoriam).

(29) Abbreviated form of the name Alexander. (12) Lydda in South Palestine (Roman name, Diospolis).

(30) Thus R. Tarfon forbade mourning on the slaughtering day, which contradicts the Mishnah.

(31) I.e., the case of Alexa.

(32) I.e., in the middle of the week, so that the slaughtering day was not on a Sunday. Mourning, therefore, was prohibited in accordance with regular Jewish law.

(33) I.e., that of the Mishnah.

(34) Consequently the slaughtering day was on a Sunday, and, therefore, as a demonstration against the erroneous view of the Sadducees, the ordinary rule prohibiting mourning on the slaughtering day was waived.

### **Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 18b**

MISHNAH. THE HANDS HAVE TO BE RINSED<sup>1</sup> FOR [EATING] UNCONSECRATED [FOOD],<sup>2</sup> AND [SECOND] TITHE,<sup>3</sup> AND FOR TERUMAH [HEAVE-OFFERING];<sup>4</sup> BUT FOR HALLOWED THINGS<sup>5</sup> [THE HANDS] HAVE TO BE IMMersed.<sup>6</sup> IN REGARD TO THE [WATER OF] PURIFICATION,<sup>7</sup> IF ONE'S HANDS BECAME DEFILED, ONE'S [WHOLE] BODY IS DEEMED DEFILED.<sup>8</sup> IF ONE BATHED<sup>9</sup> FOR UNCONSECRATED [FOOD], AND INTENDED TO BE RENDERED FIT SOLELY<sup>10</sup> FOR UNCONSECRATED [FOOD], ONE IS PROHIBITED FROM [PARTAKING OF SECOND] TITHE.<sup>11</sup> IF ONE BATHED FOR [SECOND] TITHE, AND INTENDED TO BE RENDERED FIT SOLELY FOR [SECOND] TITHE, ONE IS PROHIBITED FROM [PARTAKING OF] TERUMAH. IF ONE BATHED FOR TERUMAH, AND INTENDED TO BE RENDERED FIT SOLELY FOR TERUMAH, ONE IS PROHIBITED FROM [PARTAKING OF] HALLOWED THINGS. IF ONE BATHED FOR HALLOWED THINGS, AND INTENDED TO BE RENDERED FIT SOLELY FOR HALLOWED THINGS ONE IS PROHIBITED FROM [TOUCHING THE WATERS OF] PURIFICATION. IF ONE BATHED FOR SOMETHING POSSESSING A STRICTER [DEGREE OF SANCTITY], ONE IS PERMITTED [TO HAVE CONTACT WITH] SOMETHING POSSESSING A LIGHTER [DEGREE OF SANCTITY]. IF ONE BATHED BUT WITHOUT SPECIAL INTENTION,<sup>12</sup> IT IS AS THOUGH ONE HAD NOT BATHED. THE GARMENTS OF AN AM HA-AREZ<sup>13</sup> POSSESS MIDRAS<sup>14</sup> -UNCLEANNES FOR PHARISEES;<sup>15</sup> THE GARMENTS OF PHARISEES POSSESS MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES FOR THOSE WHO EAT TERUMAH; THE GARMENTS OF THOSE WHO EAT TERUMAH POSSESS MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES FOR [THOSE WHO EAT] HALLOWED THINGS; THE GARMENTS OF [THOSE

it yet does not render the person fit to eat food possessing any degree of sanctity. Similarly, in the cases that follow, intention for one degree of sanctity does not enable one to partake of food having a higher degree of sanctity. WHO EAT] HALLOWED THINGS POSSESS MIDRAS — UNCLEANNES FOR [THOSE WHO OCCUPY THEMSELVES WITH THE WATERS OF] PURIFICATION. JOSE B. JO'EZER<sup>16</sup> WAS THE MOST PIOUS IN THE PRIESTHOOD, YET HIS APRON WAS [CONSIDERED TO POSSESS] MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES FOR [THOSE WHO ATE] HALLOWED THINGS. JOHANAN B. GUDGADA USED ALL HIS LIFE TO EAT [UNCONSECRATED FOOD] IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PURITY REQUIRED FOR HALLOWED THINGS, YET HIS APRON WAS [CONSIDERED TO POSSESS] MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES FOR [THOSE WHO OCCUPIED THEMSELVES WITH THE WATER OF] PURIFICATION.

GEMARA. Do unconsecrated food and [Second] Tithe then require rinsing of the hands? Now we can show this to conflict with [the following Mishnah]: For terumah and first fruits<sup>17</sup> one may incur the penalty of death,<sup>18</sup> or [a fine of] an [added] fifth,<sup>19</sup> and they are prohibited to non-priests<sup>20</sup> and they are the property of the priest,<sup>21</sup> and are neutralized in one hundred and one [parts],<sup>22</sup> and require rinsing of the hands,<sup>23</sup> and sunset;<sup>24</sup> these [rules] apply to terumah and first fruits but not to [Second] Tithe.<sup>25</sup> How much less then to unconsecrated food. Thus there is a contradiction in regard to [Second] Tithe and a contradiction also in regard to unconsecrated food! Granted that in regard to [Second] Tithe [it can be shown that] there is no contradiction: the one [Mishnah]<sup>26</sup> is according to R. Meir and the other is according to the Rabbis. For we have learnt: Whosoever requires immersion by enactment of the Scribes<sup>27</sup> defiles hallowed things<sup>28</sup> and invalidates terumah,<sup>29</sup> but is permitted<sup>30</sup> [to eat] unconsecrated food and [Second] Tithe — this is the view of R. Meir; but the Sages prohibit in the case of [Second] Tithe. In regard to unconsecrated food, however, there is a contradiction! — There is no contradiction: the one case<sup>31</sup> refers to eating [unconsecrated food] and the other to

touching [it]. To this R. Shimi b. Ashi demurred: The Rabbis differ from R. Meir only in regard to the eating of [Second] Tithe, but in regard to the touching of [Second] Tithe and the eating of unconsecrated food they do not differ!<sup>32</sup> — Both [Mishnahs], therefore, must refer to eating; but there is no contradiction: the one<sup>33</sup> refers to the eating of bread, the other<sup>34</sup> refers to the eating of fruit. For R. Nahman said: Whosoever rinses his hands for fruit belongs to the haughty of spirit.<sup>35</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: He who raises his hands, if he did so with intention,<sup>36</sup> his hands are [levitically] clean; but if he did so without intention, his hands are unclean. Similarly one who bathes<sup>37</sup> his hands, if he did so with intention, his hands are clean, but if he did so without intention his hands are unclean. — But behold it is taught: Whether he did it with intention or without intention, his hands are clean! — R. Nahman answered: There is no contradiction: the one [statement]<sup>38</sup> refers to unconsecrated food,

- 
- (1) I.e., in the manner prescribed in Yad. I, 1. Lit., ‘take for the hands’, an elliptical phrase for ‘take water for the hands’.
- (2) As opposed to tithe etc.; cf. p. 35, n. 6.
- (3) V. p. 35, n. 8.
- (4) V. Glos.
- (5) I.e., such as are offered in the Temple, and if not wholly devoted to the altar, have to be eaten in the Temple Court.
- (6) I.e., in a valid immersion pool (Mikweh) containing not less than forty se'ahs of undrawn water (cf. Trac. Mikwa'oth).
- (7) V. Num. VIII, 7 (A.V. ‘purifying’; R.V. ‘expiation’) and ibid. XIX.
- (8) In regard to lesser degrees of sanctity, it is possible for the hands only to become defiled e.g., by touching unclean food etc.; but in this case the whole body would require ritual immersion.
- (9) V. n. 11.
- (10) The clause, ‘and intended . . . solely’ translates only one Heb. word **הוֹחִיז**, denom. of **הִזְקָה** (v. Dictionaries) = lit., ‘presumed or considered himself (to have taken the ritual bath) etc.’
- (11) Actually, unconsecrated food does not require ritual immersion, unless one desires to eat it in purity, and even so the immersion does not require intention’; but even if there is definite intention to eat ordinary food in purity,
- (12) I.e., merely for the sake of physical cleanliness: such an immersion does not fit one for any sanctified food.
- (13) Lit., ‘people of the land’, hence generally ‘illiterate, ignorant’, (opp. to Talmid Hakam, ‘a disciple of the wise’). Here it is used in a technical sense, and refers to one who is ignorant of the Torah and fails to observe the laws of purity and impurity, and is not scrupulous in setting aside the tithes from his produce (opp. to Haber, ‘an associate’, who strictly observes the Law). V. Glos.
- (14) Lit., ‘place of treading or pressure’, denotes levitical impurity arising in an object from contact with gonorrhoeist who sits, lies, rides upon or leans against it; in general= **אב הטומאה**, the first degree of impurity. V. Lev. XII, 2; XV, 2-25; and cf. Nid. VI, 3 with explan. ibid. 49b. The reason for this Rabbinic enactment is the fear that the wife of the Am ha-arez may have sat on the garments when she was in a menstruous condition. V. Hul. 35 (and infra 19b. Tosaf. s. **בגדי**).
- (15) Those who strictly observe the Mosaic Law and the Rabbinic regulations, particularly in regard to tithing and purity. To their body belong also the Haberim (Associates); v. Mishnah Dem. II, 3, and Moore III, 26. For further information, v. J.E. vol. IX, pp. 661f, and R. T. Herford's ‘The Pharisees’.
- (16) V. Aboth I, 4 (Sonc. ed., p. 3, nn. 4-6).
- (17) Deut. XXVI, 1ff. For the analogy between terumah and first fruits v. Mak. 17a (Sonc. ed., pp. 121-2).
- (18) I.e., if a non-priest eats thereof of set purpose; v. Lev. XXII, 9, 10, the context of which refers particularly to terumah. Cf. also Hul. I, 9.
- (19) I.e., if a non-priest eats thereof in error he must not only pay the value of the amount consumed but must also add thereto a fifth of the value by way of fine; v. ibid. v. 14. This fifth is not analogous to the added fifth that must be paid in redeeming Second Tithe in order that the produce may be eaten outside Jerusalem and the redemption money spent in food and drink in Jerusalem: hence the Mishnah excludes Second Tithe from all these rules.
- (20) I.e., by a prohibitory law of the Torah.
- (21) I.e., he may sell them and purchase with the money whatever he desires, e.g., land, slaves, unclean animals etc.; or he may betroth a woman therewith.

- (22) E.g., if one se'ah of terumah fell into one hundred se'ahs of unconsecrated produce making one hundred and one in all, any one se'ah may be taken out and given to a priest and the rest is permitted to a non-priest. But if there are not at least one hundred se'ahs of terumah the whole produce becomes prohibited to non-priests.
- (23) The hands are considered, by Rabbinic enactment, to suffer levitical impurity in the second degree, and therefore, unless washed, can invalidate terumah by defiling it with impurity in the third degree.
- (24) If a priest became unclean through some defilement mentioned in the Torah, he not only requires ritual immersion, but he must also wait till sunset before he may partake of terumah. V. Yeb. 74b.
- (25) Here the Mishnah ends, excluding explicitly from the above rules, which include the rinsing of the hands, Second Tithe and also by obvious implication — as the Gemara goes on to point out — ordinary food.
- (26) I.e., the latter.
- (27) I.e., although ritually clean from the point of view of the Biblical law. This category includes those who eat or drink what is unclean; vessels that have touched unclean liquids; and the hands: these are all unclean in the second degree. V. Zab. V, 12 and Shab. 14b.
- (28) Being impure in the second degree he is able to impart impurity to hallowed things in the third degree: in turn the hallowed things are capable of disqualifying in the fourth degree.
- (29) The terumah becomes itself disqualified but cannot disqualify anything else.
- (30) This positive expression (as opposed to the negative formula 'but does not disqualify') implies permission to eat as well as touch,
- (31) I.e., our Mishnah, which requires rinsing of the hands for ordinary food.
- (32) V. supra, n. 6; similarly the phrase, 'but the Sages prohibit', refers only to eating Second Tithe but not to touching it. But regarding unconsecrated food there is no dispute: even the Sages agree that it may be eaten without rinsing of the hands. The original question, therefore, remains: the Mishnahs contradict one another!
- (33) Our own Mishnah, which requires rinsing of the hands for unconsecrated food.
- (34) The second Mishnah quoted, which excepts Second Tithe (and consequently unconsecrated food) from rinsing of the hands and the other regulations applying to terumah and first fruits.
- (35) I.e., is affectedly or ostentatiously scrupulous.
- (36) Cf. our Mishnah p. 120, n. 1.
- (37) I.e., in a ritual bath containing at least forty se'ahs of water: this represents a higher degree of purification.
- (38) I.e., the second Baraitha, which does not require intention.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 19a

the other to [Second] Tithe. — And whence do you infer that unconsecrated food does not require intention?<sup>1</sup> — For we have learnt: If a wave was sundered [from the sea] and contained forty se'ahs<sup>2</sup> and it fell upon a person or upon vessels [that were unclean], they become clean. Thus a person is likened to vessels: just as vessels have no intention<sup>3</sup> so too [the Mishnah] speaks of a person who had no intention. But why so? Perhaps we are dealing with a case where one was sitting and waiting for the wave to become sundered, and so vessels are likened to a person; just as a person is capable of intention, so too in the case of the vessels one had intention with regard to them! And should you say: If it is a case of one who sits and waits [for the wave to be sundered], what need is there to teach it?<sup>4</sup> [I will answer]: You might have thought it should be prohibited, as a preventive measure, [to bathe in a detached wave] lest one come to battle in a torrent of rainwater,<sup>5</sup> or that we ought to prohibit, as a preventive measure, [immersion in] the ends<sup>6</sup> [of the wave] on account of the crest,<sup>7</sup> therefore [the Mishnah] teaches us that we make no such prohibition. — (And whence do you infer that one may not immerse [vessels] in the crest [of the wave]? — For it is taught: One may immerse [vessels] in the ends [of the wave] but not in the crest, because one may not immerse in the air.)<sup>8</sup> — Rather [is it<sup>9</sup> to be inferred] from that which we have learnt: If produce fell into a channel of water, and one whose hands were unclean put out [his hands] and took it, his hands became clean<sup>10</sup> and [the law], if [water] be put on,<sup>11</sup> does not apply to the produce;<sup>12</sup> but if [he did so] in order that<sup>13</sup> his hands should be rinsed, his hands become clean, but [the law], 'If [water] be put on', applies to the produce.<sup>14</sup>



Rabbah<sup>15</sup> put an objection to R. Nahman: IF ONE BATHED FOR UNCONSECRATED [FOOD], AND INTENDED TO BE RENDERED FIT SOLELY FOR UNCONSECRATED [FOOD], ONE IS PROHIBITED FROM [PARTAKING OF SECOND] TITHE.<sup>16</sup> [Thus] if one intended to be rendered fit [therefor], One may [eat unconsecrated food], but if one did not intend to be rendered fit [therefor], one may not [eat unconsecrated food]!<sup>17</sup> — This is the meaning: Even though one had intention for unconsecrated, one is still prohibited from [partaking of Second] Tithe.<sup>18</sup>

He put [another] objection to him: IF ONE BATHED, BUT WITHOUT SPECIAL INTENTION, IT IS AS THOUGH ONE HAD NOT BATHED. Surely it means that he is as though he had not bathed at all!<sup>19</sup> — No, [it means that] he is as though he had not bathed for [Second] Tithe, but did bathe for unconsecrated food. He<sup>20</sup> thought [at first] that he<sup>21</sup> was merely putting him off,<sup>22</sup> [but] he went forth, examined [the matter] and found that it is taught: If one bathed, but without special intention, one is prohibited [from partaking of Second] Tithe, but one is permitted [to partake of] unconsecrated [food].

R. Eleazar said: If a man bathed and came up,<sup>23</sup> he may intend to be rendered fit for whatever he pleases. An objection was raised: If he still has one foot in the water, and he had intended to be rendered fit for something of lesser [sanctity], he may intend to be rendered fit for something of higher [sanctity]; but once he has come up he can no longer have intention. Surely [it means that] he can no longer have any intention at all!<sup>24</sup> — No, [it means that] if he still [has one foot in the water] even though he intended to render himself fit [for a lesser degree of sanctity], he may still intend to render himself [fit for a higher degree of sanctity];<sup>25</sup> but once he has come up, if he had no intention to be rendered fit [for anything at all], he may now intend to be rendered fit, but if he had intention to be rendered fit [for any particular degree of sanctity] he may no longer intend to be rendered fit [for any higher degree of sanctity].<sup>26</sup> — Who is the author of the teaching: ‘If he still has one foot in the water etc.’?<sup>27</sup> R. Pedath said: It is according to R. Judah. For we have learnt: If an immersion pool was measured and found to contain exactly forty se'ahs [of water], and two persons went down and immersed themselves therein one after the other, the first person is clean, but the second is unclean.<sup>28</sup> R. Judah said: If the feet of the first person were [still] touching the water [when the second person immersed himself] the second person is also clean.<sup>29</sup> R. Nahman said that Rabbi b. Abbuha said: The dispute<sup>30</sup> concerns [only] the Rabbinical degrees [of purity],<sup>31</sup> but in a case of purification from [real] uncleanness,<sup>32</sup> all would agree that the second person remains unclean. This then is in agreement with the view of R. Pedath.<sup>33</sup> Another version is: R. Nahman said that Rabbi b. Abbuha said: The dispute concerns purification from [real] uncleanness, but in regard to the Rabbinical degrees [of purity], all would agree that the second person too becomes clean. Thus he differs from the view of R. Pedath.<sup>34</sup>

‘Ulla said: I asked R. Johanan: According to R. Judah, is it permissible to immerse needles and hooks in the [wet] head of the first [bather]?<sup>35</sup> Does R. Judah accept [only] the principle of connecting downward,<sup>36</sup> but not of connecting upward;<sup>37</sup> or, perhaps, R. Judah accepts the principle of connecting upward as well? — He replied: Ye have learnt it; If a wady has three depressions, one at the top, one at the bottom and one in the middle, the one at the top and the one at the bottom containing twenty se'ahs each and the middle one forty se'ahs, and a torrent of rainwater passes between them,<sup>38</sup> R. Judah says: Meir used to say: One may immerse in the top one.<sup>39</sup>

---

(1) On immersion.

(2) The minimum quantity required for ritual immersion. For se'ah, v. Glos.

(3) On being immersed.

(4) I.e., since the immersion was intentional, the case is ritually quite normal and requires no specific mention.

(5) Rashi gives two reasons for the unsuitability of a torrent of rainwater, containing forty se'ahs, for ritual immersion;

(a) since the water flows down a steep incline, the forty se'ahs cannot be regarded as being in one place or connected (v. Toh. VIII, 9), and consequently the bather does not immerse himself in forty se'ahs of water at one and the same time;

- (b) rain-water can be used for immersion only in the form of a stagnant pool but not when it forms a flowing current (v. Supra to Lev. XI, 36).
- (6) Lit., 'heads' i.e., the lower part of the wave as it reaches the ground.
- (7) Lit., 'arches, bows' i.e., caps of a wave, billow-crests, surf.
- (8) Though the ends of the wave have touched the ground, the crest of the wave is regarded as still being suspended in the air, and consequently may not be used for immersion, for no immersion may take place in the air.
- (9) That no intention is required for unconsecrated food.
- (10) Though the person's intention was solely to take out the produce and not to purify the hands. Thus it is seen that unconsecrated food does not require intention.
- (11) Lev. XI, 38.
- (12) I.e., the produce does not become, through contact with the water, susceptible to defilement in accordance with law referred to in the verse. Only when the owner is pleased with the wetting of the produce does it become susceptible to defilement (v. Kid. 59b), which is not the case here. The Mishnah text (Maksh. IV, 7) reads 'are clean' for 'the law, "If water be put on ", does not apply to the produce'.
- (13) The Mishnah text reads: 'he purposed, intended' for 'in order that'.
- (14) Since he took the produce out of the water with the purpose of cleansing his hands, it is clear that he is pleased with the wetting of the produce, for he benefits by it; consequently, the produce becomes susceptible henceforward to defilement.
- (15) Var. lec. Raba.
- (16) The Hebrew here is identical with the Mishnayoth version, which differs very slightly from our own Mishnah reading.
- (17) This shows, apparently, that intention is required even for unconsecrated food.
- (18) But actually unconsecrated food does not require intention.
- (19) I.e., he is not rendered fit even for unconsecrated food.
- (20) I.e., Rabbah.
- (21) I.e., R. Nahman.
- (22) I.e., with casuistical arguments, which, in point of fact, were untrue.
- (23) I.e., left the water completely. Some texts known to Tosaf. actually added the words, 'and is still wet'; but in any case it has to be understood in this sense.
- (24) I.e., no new intention of his is of any effect.
- (25) I.e., he may now decide for which degree of sanctity he wishes the immersion to serve.
- (26) For with the completion of immersion the first intention becomes effective.
- (27) V. p. 125 (end).
- (28) Inevitably some water clings to the body of the first bather; consequently the second bather immerses himself in less than the prescribed minimum of forty se'ahs of water.
- (29) On the principle that the water connects downward' (v. p. 127. n. 2), i.e., since the feet of the first bather are still in the immersion pool, the water on his body is regarded as forming part of the water in the pool, thus helping to restore the required volume of forty se'ahs.
- (30) I.e., between R. Judah and the Rabbis.
- (31) E.g., the specific degrees of purity discussed in our Mishnah.
- (32) I.e., defilement according to the law of the Torah.
- (33) Who explains the Baraitha, 'If he still has one foot etc.' to be according to R. Judah and not the Rabbis: thus he holds that the Rabbis reject the principle of 'connecting downward' even in regard to the Rabbinical degrees of purity, for the whole question of intention in regard to any specific degree of purity is based on Rabbinic enactment.
- (34) For according to R. Nahman, the Baraitha 'If he still has one foot etc.', represents the view of the Rabbis as well as of R. Judah, for he holds that in regard to the Rabbinical degrees of purity, the Rabbis agree with R. Judah in accepting the principle of 'connecting downward'.
- (35) Whilst he is still in the water.
- (36) Lit., 'stretch, bring down'.
- (37) I.e., does R. Judah accept the principle of connecting only in the downward direction, as in the case of the two bathers above, where the water on the body of the first bather is regarded as connected with the water in the pool; but not in the upward direction, so that the water in the pool should be considered as connected with the water on the bather's

head, and thus enable needles etc. to be purified in the water clinging to the bather's head.

(38) Thus connecting them.

(39) And, of course, in the bottom one; for those who hold the principle of 'connecting upward', certainly accept the principle of 'connecting downward'. Since R. Judah quoted R. Meir's view without contradicting it, the presumption is that he concurs in it. This explanation follows Rashi's text and interpretation. For a different reading and explanation v. Tosaf. s. רבי

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 19b

— But it is taught: R. Judah said: Meir used to say: One may immerse in the top one, but I say: [One may immerse only] in the bottom one, but not in the top one! He<sup>1</sup> replied: If it is [expressly] taught, it is taught.<sup>2</sup>

IF ONE BATHED FOR UNCONSECRATED [FOOD] AND INTENDED TO BE RENDERED FIT SOLELY FOR UNCONSECRATED [FOOD] etc. According to whom will our Mishnah be? — [Presumably] it is according to the Rabbis, who distinguish between unconsecrated [food] and [Second] Tithe.<sup>3</sup> — But [then] how will you understand the second part [of the Mishnah]? THE GARMENTS OF AN 'AM HA-AREZ POSSESS MIDRAS-UNCLEANNESS FOR PHARISEES; THE GARMENTS OF PHARISEES POSSESS MIDRAS-UNCLEANNESS FOR THOSE WHO EAT TERUMAH:<sup>4</sup> this will be according to R. Meir, who said that unconsecrated [food] and [Second] Tithe are [in this respect] the same. Thus the first part [of the Mishnah] will be according to the Rabbis and the second part according to R. Meir! — Indeed, the first part [of the Mishnah] is according to the Rabbis and the second part according to R. Meir. R. Aha b. Adda teaches [also] in the second part [of the Mishnah] five degrees<sup>5</sup> and attributes it all to the Rabbis. R. Mari said: It follows that unconsecrated [food] which was prepared according to the purity of hallowed things<sup>6</sup> is like hallowed things. Whence [is this to be inferred]? —

---

(1) I.e., R. Johanan.

(2) I.e., I am prepared to retract.

(3) V. p. 122 ('For we have learnt: Whosoever requires. . . Tithe').

(4) But not Second Tithe, which shows that it belongs to the same category as unconsecrated food.

(5) I.e., he adds those who eat Second Tithe, as representing a separate degree of purity, in between the Pharisees and those who eat terumah.

(6) A person who is accustomed to eat hallowed things would make it a rule to eat even unconsecrated food according to the purity required by hallowed things, so that his household should be well-trained in the vigilance necessary for the higher degree of purity.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 20a

From the fact that [the Mishnah] does not teach it as a [special] degree [of purity].<sup>1</sup> — But perhaps the reason why [the Mishnah] does not teach it as a [special] degree of purity is because if it is like terumah, behold [the Mishnah] deals with terumah; and if it is like unconsecrated [food], behold [the Mishnah] deals with unconsecrated [food]!<sup>2</sup> For it is taught:<sup>3</sup> Unconsecrated [food] which was prepared according to the purity of hallowed things is like unconsecrated [food]. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok says: It is like terumah. — Rather [is it to be inferred] from the second part [of the Mishnah]. JOSE B. JO'EZER WAS THE MOST PIOUS IN THE PRIESTHOOD, YET HIS APRON WAS [CONSIDERED TO POSSESS] MIDRAS-UNCLEANNESS [FOR THOSE WHO ATE] HALLOWED THINGS. JOHANAN B. GUDGADA USED ALL HIS LIFE TO EAT [UNCONSECRATED FOOD] IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PURITY REQUIRED FOR HALLOWED THINGS, YET HIS APRON WAS [CONSIDERED TO POSSESS] MIDRAS-UNCLEANNESS FOR [THOSE WHO OCCUPIED THEMSELVES WITH THE WATER OF] PURIFICATION. [Only] for [those who occupied themselves with the water of]

purification, but not for hallowed things; thus [the Mishnah] holds that unconsecrated [food] which was prepared according to the purity of hallowed things is like hallowed things.

R. Jonathan b. Eleazar said: If a man's wrap<sup>4</sup> fell from off him, and he said to his fellow,<sup>5</sup> 'Give it to me', and he gave it to him, it is unclean.<sup>6</sup> R. Jonathan b. Amram said: If by mistake a man put his Sabbath garments on instead of his weekday garments, they become unclean.<sup>7</sup> R. Eleazar b. Zadok said: Once two scholarly<sup>8</sup> women took one another's garments by mistake in the bathhouse, and the matter came before R. Akiba, and he declared them unclean. To this R. Oshaia demurred: If so, if a man stretched forth his hand to the basket with the intention of taking wheat bread and there came up in his hand barley bread, has it also become unclean? And should you say 'It is so'; then behold it is taught: If one guards a jug on the assumption that it is [a jug] of wine, and it is found to be [a jug] of oil, it is clean so as not to defile! — But according to your reasoning, how do you understand the concluding clause [of the Baraitha]: But it may not be consumed? Why? — Said R. Jeremiah: It refers to a case where [the keeper] says: I guarded it against anything that might defile it,<sup>9</sup> but not against anything that might invalidate it.<sup>10</sup> But can anything be half-guarded? — Indeed; for it is taught: If a man stretched forth his hand into the basket, and the basket was on his shoulder and the shovel was in the basket, and his mind was on the basket but not on the shovel, the basket is clean and the shovel is unclean. [Now it says] 'The basket is clean'? [Surely] the shovel should make the basket unclean! — One vessel does not make another unclean.<sup>11</sup> Then it should make the contents<sup>12</sup> of the basket unclean! — Rabina said: It refers to a case where [the keeper] says: I guarded it [the shovel] against anything that might defile it, but not against anything that might invalidate it.<sup>13</sup> In any case, there is a contradiction!<sup>14</sup> And furthermore, Rabbah b. Abbuha raised an objection: Once a woman came before R. Ishmael and said to him: Master, I have woven this garment in purity,<sup>15</sup> but it was not in my mind to guard it in purity.<sup>16</sup> But as a result of the cross-examination to which R. Ishmael subjected her, she said to him: Master, a menstruous woman pulled the cord<sup>17</sup> with me. Said R. Ishmael: How great are the words of the Sages, who used to say: If one had the intention to guard a thing, it is clean; if one did not have the intention to guard it, it is unclean. There was another story of a woman who came before R. Ishmael. She said to him: Master, I wove this cloth in purity, but it was not in my mind to guard it. But as a result of the cross-examination to which R. Ishmael subjected her, she said to him: Master, a thread broke<sup>18</sup> and I tied it with my mouth.<sup>19</sup> Said R. Ishmael: How great are the words of the Sages who used to say: If it is in one's mind to guard a thing it is clean; if it is not in one's mind to guard it, it is unclean.<sup>20</sup>

Granted in regard to [the teaching of] R. Eleazar b. Zadok, [it can be explained that] each one [of the women] says [to herself]: 'My companion is the wife of an 'am ha-arez'; and [consequently] she takes her mind off it. In regard to [the teaching of] R. Jonathan b. Amram too [it can be explained that] since a man takes special care of Sabbath garments,<sup>21</sup> [it is as though] he took his mind off them. But in regard to [the teaching of] R. Jonathan b. Eleazar [it can be objected] that he could [still] guard it in the hand of his companion! — R. Johanan answered: It is a presumable certainty that one does not guard what is in the hand of his companion. — Indeed no?

---

(1) Viz. that the garments of Pharisees who eat unconsecrated food in ordinary purity possess midras-uncleanness for those who eat unconsecrated food according to the purity required by hallowed things. The omission of this category proves, according to R. Mari, that it belongs to the same degree of purity as hallowed things themselves, which are already mentioned in the Mishnah.

(2) I.e., the fact that unconsecrated food prepared according to the purity of hallowed things is not mentioned in the Mishnah as a separate degree of purity does not necessarily prove that it is like hallowed things. On the contrary, it may belong to one of the other degrees of purity specified in the Mishnah, such as ordinary unconsecrated food or terumah.

(3) I.e., we actually find Tannaim disputing as to whether it is like ordinary food or like terumah; but no one takes the view that it is like hallowed things.

(4) So Jast.; Levy, 'Hulle'; Goldschmidt, 'Kopftuch'. Cf. אפר ('headband') in I Kings XX, 38, 41, which belongs to the same root as our word מעפרת, with interchange of א and ע.

- (5) I.e., one as observant of the laws of purity as himself (R. Hananel).
- (6) Even though the person, who picked it up was clean, for we cannot assume that he took it upon himself to guard it from impurity whilst he handled it, since the owner did not inquire whether he was clean or not; nor can we say that the owner guarded it against defilement whilst it was not in his possession (v. R. Johanan's answer p. 131).
- (7) This apparently teaches the principle that if a man guards something on the assumption that it is one thing and finds it to be another, it is unclean.
- (8) Lit., 'associates i.e., knowing and observing the Laws of purity. V. p. 120, n. 4.
- (9) I.e., so that in turn it could make other things unclean.
- (10) I.e., from being used, but would not make it capable of imparting impurity. This shows that although the keeper may be mistaken regarding the identity of the object guarded, his guarding nevertheless remains effective for the purpose intended, which, in this case, was that the oil should not be defiled.
- (11) Although a vessel can defile food.
- (12) Figs (Rashi).
- (13) From being used at the outset in connection with clean foodstuffs. The shovel, being 'a utensil', can only be invalidated by unclean liquids (Tosaf). Rashi suggests, alternatively, that 'it' may refer to the food adhering to the shovel. — This Baraitha thus shows that a thing can be guarded 'by half'.
- (14) I.e., the statement in the Baraitha that the oil remains clean supports R. Oshaia and contradicts the view that a mistake in regard to the identity of an object serves to make it unclean.
- (15) I.e., I know, as a matter of fact, that from the moment three fingers by three of cloth — the minimum area susceptible to defilement — were woven it was not made unclean.
- (16) I.e., I did not actually intend to guard it against defilement.
- (17) So that uncleanness may have been communicated through her shaking the web.
- (18) Before she commenced to weave: the rules of uncleanness did not yet apply then.
- (19) She had not yet purified herself by immersion from the impurity of her menstruous condition, so that her saliva possessed uncleanness in the first degree (אב הטומאה). Thus although to begin with the moistened thread could not affect the purity of the cloth (hence she paid no attention to it), nevertheless if the thread remained wet when the web was three fingers by three it would defile the cloth, although the woman had since purified herself by immersion. So Rashi; for another explanation v. Tosaf. s. v. נִימָא.
- (20) From all this, It is clear that the deciding factor in keeping an object clean is the intention to guard it against uncleanness; but it is not necessary to know the identity of the object guarded.
- (21) Whereas he thought them to be his week-day clothes.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 20b

But behold it is taught: If a man's ass-drivers and workmen<sup>1</sup> were laden with [levitically] clean goods, even if he withdrew from them more than a mil<sup>2</sup> his clean goods<sup>3</sup> remain clean.<sup>4</sup> But if he said to them: Go ye, and I shall come after you, then as soon as they are hidden from his sight, his clean goods become unclean. — In what respect is the first case different from the second?<sup>5</sup> R. Isaac Nappaha<sup>6</sup> said: In the first case he purifies his ass-drivers and workmen for this purpose.<sup>7</sup> — If so, [it applies to] the second case too! — An 'am ha-arez does not mind another's touching.<sup>8</sup> — If so, [it applies to] the first case too! — It is a case where [the master] can come upon them [suddenly] by a roundabout path.<sup>9</sup> — If so [it applies to] the second case too! — Since he said to them, 'Go ye, and I shall come after you', their minds are at ease.<sup>10</sup>

## CHAPTER III

MISHNAH. GREATER STRINGENCY APPLIES TO HALLOWED THINGS<sup>1</sup> THAN TO TERUMAH:<sup>12</sup> FOR VESSELS WITHIN VESSELS<sup>13</sup> MAY BE IMMERSED [TOGETHER] FOR TERUMAH, BUT NOT FOR HALLOWED THINGS. THE OUTSIDE AND INSIDE AND HANDLE<sup>14</sup> [OF A VESSEL ARE REGARDED AS SEPARATE] FOR TERUMAH,<sup>15</sup> BUT NOT FOR HALLOWED THINGS.<sup>16</sup> HE THAT CARRIES ANYTHING POSSESSING MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES<sup>17</sup> MAY CARRY [AT THE SAME TIME] TERUMAH,<sup>18</sup> BUT NOT

HALLOWED THINGS. THE GARMENTS OF THOSE WHO EAT TERUMAH POSSES<sup>15</sup> MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES FOR [THOSE WHO EAT] HALLOWED THINGS.<sup>19</sup> THE RULE [FOR THE IMMERSION OF GARMENTS]<sup>20</sup> FOR [THOSE WHO WOULD EAT OF] TERUMAH IS NOT LIKE THE RULE FOR [THOSE WHO WOULD EAT OF] HALLOWED THINGS: FOR IN THE CASE OF HALLOWED THINGS, HE MUST [FIRST] UNTIE [ANY KNOTS<sup>21</sup> IN THE UNCLEAR GARMENT], DRY IT<sup>22</sup> [IF IT IS WET, THEN] IMMERSE IT, AND AFTERWARDS RETIE IT; BUT IN CASE OF TERUMAH, IT MAY [FIRST] BE TIED AND AFTERWARDS IMMERSED. VESSELS THAT HAVE BEEN FINISHED IN PURITY<sup>23</sup> REQUIRE IMMERSION [BEFORE THEY ARE USED] FOR HALLOWED THINGS, BUT NOT [BEFORE THEY ARE USED] FOR TERUMAH. A VESSEL UNITES ALL ITS CONTENTS [FOR DEFILEMENT] IN THE CASE OF HALLOWED THINGS,<sup>24</sup> BUT NOT IN THE CASE OF TERUMAH.<sup>25</sup> HALLOWED THINGS BECOME INVALID<sup>26</sup> [BY UNCLEANNES] AT THE FOURTH REMOVE, BUT TERUMAH [ONLY BY UNCLEANNES] AT THE THIRD REMOVE.<sup>27</sup> IN THE CASE OF TERUMAH, IF ONE HAND OF A MAN BECAME UNCLEAR,<sup>28</sup> THE OTHER REMAINS CLEAR, BUT IN THE CASE OF HALLOWED THINGS, HE MUST IMMERSE BOTH [HANDS], BECAUSE THE ONE HAND DEFILES THE OTHER FOR HALLOWED THINGS BUT NOT FOR TERUMAH. DRY FOODSTUFFS<sup>29</sup> MAY BE EATEN WITH UNWASH ED HANDS,<sup>30</sup> WITH TERUMAH, BUT NOT WITH HALLOWED THINGS.<sup>31</sup>

(1) Who belonged to the category of 'am ha-arez.

(2) I.e., unbeknown, to them. A mil=two thousand cubits (Jast.).

(3) E.g., wine in earthenware jars.

(4) Because the men touch only the exterior of the vessels, which, being earthenware, are not defiled within by the contact of a defiling object on the outside (cf. Hul. 25a). The fear of their master who could arrive at any moment would deter the men from attempting to touch the contents of the vessels. This proves that, contrary to R. Johanan's statement, a man can guard what is in another's hand.

(5) Rashi prefers to delete this sentence. If it is retained, he interprets it as a continuation of the argument against R. Johanan, thus: — If you contend that a man cannot guard what is in another person's hand, then why is the first case decided differently from the second? Tosaf., however, explains it as a rejoinder in defence of R. Johanan's teaching: Granted that the first case of the Baraita seems to contradict R. Johanan, but how can the second case be explained otherwise than as a support? One must answer, therefore, with R. Isaac Nappaha, that the first case too does not really contradict R. Johanan, because the men were specially purified for the purpose.

(6) I.e., the smith.

(7) Consequently the goods remain clean; for even if the men touch the goods they cannot defile them. But if the men had not been specially purified, R. Johanan's principle that one cannot guard what is in another's hand would hold good.

(8) I.e., though the workmen, being clean, cannot defile the goods, they might allow them to be defiled by other people touching them.

(9) I.e., the fear that he might come upon them by surprise would deter them from permitting a stranger to touch the goods.

(10) That he will not surprise them, and thus whatever they do will not be observed by their master.

(11) I.e., sacrificial flesh, mealofferings and drink-offerings.

(12) In the eleven cases (according to Raba), or ten (according to R. Ela), that follow. For further differences, v. the Mishnah pp. 119-121. The latter are not included in our Mishnah because (according to Tosaf. s.v. **הומו**) they do not involve the risk of an eventual violation of the law of purity (**דדרא דטומאה**).

(13) I.e., any articles susceptible to defilement. According to Rashi (a.l.), both the exterior and interior vessels are unclear; according to Tosaf. (22a, s.v. **באי**) only the interior vessels re unclear.

(14) **בית הצביטה** 'the place of holding', v. infra p. 143, n. 13.

(15) I.e., if these parts can be used separately they are regarded, in the case of terumah, as distinct utensils, so that if one of them becomes defiled the others remain unaffected. This rule applies, as the Gemara explains, only in the case of Rabbinical degrees of uncleanness, v. Kel. XXV, 6f

(16) In the case of hallowed things, if one part becomes defied, the whole vessel is rendered unclear.

(17) E.g., if he wears the shoe of a gonorrhoeist. V. p. 120, n. 3.

- (18) I.e., if the terumah is in an earthenware vessel, which he touches only from without. Cf. p. 132, nn. 1 and 2.
- (19) V. p. 120, where the same statement is found.
- (20) In respect of the law of **הַצִּיצוֹת** ('Interposition, all intervening object'). Cf. 'Er. 4a.
- (21) Because they resemble an intervening object.
- (22) Here the moisture is deemed to resemble an intervening object.
- (23) I.e., from the moment that they reached the stage when they could be termed vessels, and consequently became susceptible to defilement, they were carefully guarded from uncleanness.
- (24) If an unclean person touched one portion of hallowed food in a vessel, all the other pieces, although not in contact with it, are rendered equally unclean by the unifying effect of the vessel.
- (25) In the case of terumah, the portion to touched by the unclean person contracts uncleanness at the first remove (v. infra n. 7); if another portion touches it, the second contracts uncleanness at the second remove, and any portion touching the latter suffers uncleanness at the third remove; the rest remain clean.
- (26) But cannot, in turn, render anything else invalid.
- (27) If A is a 'Father of uncleanness' (i.e., suffers from primary uncleanness, which can convey uncleanness even to men and vessels; those that come in contact with it are termed 'offspring of uncleanness', and can convey uncleanness only to foodstuff and liquids) and touches B, and B touches C, and C touches D, if D is a hallowed thing it becomes invalid; and if C is terumah it becomes invalid; but if D is terumah it does not become invalid (Danby, *The Mishnah*, p. 214. n. 9).
- (28) I.e., contracted a Rabbinic (as opposed to Pentateuchal) grade of uncleanness, which defiles the hand without affecting the rest of the body.
- (29) I.e., ordinary food which has never been rendered susceptible to uncleanness by coming in contact with water; v. p. 124, nn. 5-9.
- (30) Lit., 'unclean hands'; though these suffer from levitical uncleanness, the food is not affected because it has never become susceptible to uncleanness.
- (31) V. the explanation in the Gemara, pp. 154f(24b).

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 21a

A MOURNER [PRIOR TO THE BURIAL OF THE DECEASED],<sup>1</sup> AND ONE WHO NEEDS TO BRING HIS ATONEMENT SACRIFICE [IN ORDER TO COMPLETE HIS PURIFICATION]<sup>2</sup> REQUIRE IMMERSION FOR HALLOWED THINGS,<sup>3</sup> BUT NOT FOR TERUMAH.<sup>4</sup> GEMARA. Why not in the case of hallowed things?<sup>5</sup> R. Ela said: Because the weight of the [inner] vessel forms an interposition.<sup>6</sup> — But since the latter clause [of the Mishnah] is based on [the rule of] interposition.<sup>7</sup> For it is taught in the latter clause: THE RULE [FOR THE IMMERSION OF GARMENTS] FOR [THOSE WHO WOULD EAT OF] TERUMAH IS NOT LIKE THE RULE FOR [THOSE WHO WOULD EAT OF] HALLOWED THINGS: FOR IN THE CASE OF HALLOWED THINGS, HE MUST [FIRST] UNTIE [ANY KNOTS IN THE UNCLEAN GARMENT], DRY IT [IF IT IS WET, THEN] IMMERSE IT, AND AFTERWARDS RETIE IT; BUT IN THE CASE OF TERUMAH, IT MAY [FIRST] BE TIED AND AFTERWARDS IMMersed! — Both the former clause and the latter clause are based on [the rule of] interposition, and they are both required. For if [the Mishnah] taught us the former clause [only], I might have thought that the reason why it is not [permitted to immerse vessels within vessels] for hallowed things is because of the weight of the vessel [which interposes], but in the latter clause where there is no weight of a vessel [to interpose], I might have thought that it would not be deemed an interposition even for hallowed things; and if [the Mishnah] taught us the latter clause, I might have thought that the reason why it is not [permitted] in the case of hallowed things is because

(1) Heb. **אֲנִי**, opposed to **אֲבִי**, a mourner during the week following the burial. It is assumed here that the mourner had not become defiled by the corpse.

(2) E.g., a gonorrhoeist who, after duly immersing himself on the seventh day of his uncleanness, has awaited sunset on that day, and now has only to bring his sacrifice on the morrow in order to complete his purification.

(3) In the latter case after bringing the prescribed sacrifices.

- (4) Which may be eaten not only without immersion, but even before the sacrifices marking the completion of purification have been brought.
- (5) The question refers to the beginning of the Mishnah, i.e., why may not vessels within vessels be immersed for hallowed things just as for terumah?
- (6) The weight of the inner vessel prevents the water from reaching every part of the vessels, thus invalidating the immersion both of the outer and inner vessels. V. infra p. 139.
- (7) If the purpose of the two clauses is identical viz., to teach us that in the case of hallowed things even that which resembles interposition invalidates, but in the case of terumah only proper interposition, then the Mishnah should have contained one of the two clauses, not both.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 21b

a knot becomes tightened<sup>1</sup> in water, but in [the case of] the former clause, where the water causes the vessel to float, it would not be deemed an interposition; therefore [both clauses] are required.<sup>2</sup> R. Ela [in explaining the former clause to be based on the rule of interposition] is consistent in his view. For R. Ela said that R. Hanina b. Papa said: Ten distinctions [of hallowed things over terumah] are taught here.<sup>3</sup> The former five apply both to hallowed things and to unconsecrated [food] prepared according to the purity of hallowed things: the latter [five] apply to hallowed things, but not to unconsecrated [food] prepared according to the purity of hallowed things. What is the reason? — The former five, which involve the risk of eventual violation of the law of Impurity according to the Torah,<sup>4</sup> the Rabbis enacted both in regard to hallowed things and in regard to unconsecrated [food] prepared according to the purity of hallowed things. The latter [five], which do not involve the risk of the eventual violation of the law of purity according to the Torah, the Rabbis enacted in regard to hallowed things, but not in regard to unconsecrated [food] prepared according to the purity of hallowed things. Raba said: Since the latter clause is based on [the rule of] interposition, the former clause cannot be based on [the rule of] interposition; and as to the former clause, the reason is this: It is a Precautionary enactment so that one might not immerse needles and hooks in a vessel the mouth of which is not the size of the spout of a skin-bottle.<sup>5</sup> As we have learnt: The union of immersion pools [requires a connecting stream]<sup>6</sup> the size of the spout of a skin-bottle in breadth

---

(1) Thus approximating to interposition.

(2) Actually the latter clause is required because it also contains the rule: 'He must dry it (if it is wet)'. But this is not taken into account in our argument either because, (a) even if it were based on the principle of interposition it was held to follow from the first clause, or (b) it may be based not on the principle of interposition but on the fact that the original moisture could re-defile the garment and so render the Immersion useless.

(3) Since eleven points of difference are actually mentioned in the Mishnah, two, according to It. Ela, must be clue to the same reason and hence are counted as one.

(4) I.e., as opposed to Rabbinic degrees of purity. For an explanation of how this violation of the Torah law of purity can come about v. Rashi s.v. **דָּרָא** ; for a discussion of the latter five distinctions v. Tosaf. s.v. **בְּתַרְיִיתָא** .

(5) In which case the immersion would be invalid, because the water in the vessel would not be regarded as connected with the water in the immersion pool, for the minimum size of the connecting stream (as explained in the following Mishnah) must be equivalent to the area of the tube of a skin-bottle.

(6) I.e., two adjoining pools can be combined to make up the prescribed quantity of forty se'ahs of water if there is an aperture in between allowing a stream (of the size mentioned) to flow between them.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 22a

and in area, [namely, One in which] two fingers can make a complete revolution. Thus he [Raba] agrees with R. Nahman who said that Rabbah b. Abbuha said: Eleven distinctions are taught here: the former six apply both to hallowed things and to unconsecrated [food] which was prepared according to the purity of hallowed things; the latter [five] apply to the hallowed things, but not to unconsecrated [food] prepared according to the purity of hallowed things. What is [the practical



difference] between [the explanations of] Raba and R. Ela? There is [a practical difference] between them [in the case of] a basket or a net<sup>1</sup> which was filled with vessels and immersed. According to the view that [the former clause] is based on [the rule of] interposition, it applies [here too]; according to the view that [the former clause] is a Precautionary enactment lest one immerse needles and hooks in a vessel the mouth of which is not the size of the spout of a skin-bottle, [it does not apply here, because] there is no basket or net the mouth of which is not the size of a skin-bottle. Now Raba is consistent in his view. For Raba said: If one filled a basket or net with vessels and immersed them, they become clean;<sup>2</sup> but if an immersion-pool be divided by a basket or net, then whoever immerses himself therein, his immersion is not effective,<sup>3</sup> for the earth is wholly perforated,<sup>4</sup> nevertheless we require that there should be forty se'ahs [of undrawn water] in one place. Now this applies only to a clean vessel,<sup>5</sup> but' [in the case of] an unclean vessel,<sup>6</sup> since the immersion is effective for the entire vessel itself,<sup>7</sup> it is effective also for the vessels which are in it. For we have learnt:<sup>8</sup> If one filled vessels with vessels and immersed them, these [interior vessels also] become clean.<sup>9</sup> But if he did not immerse [the outer vessel], then the water [in it] mingled [with the water of the immersion-pool] does not count as mingled unless [the water in the outer vessel and immersion-pool] are mingled [by a stream] the size of the spout of a skin-bottle.<sup>10</sup> What is the meaning of 'But if he did not immerse [the outer vessel] etc.'? — This is the meaning: But if he did not require to immerse [the outer vessel],<sup>11</sup> then the water [in it] mingled [with the water of the immersion-pool] does not count as mingled unless [the water in the outer vessel and the immersion-pool] are mingled [by a stream] the size of the spout of a skin-bottle. Now the point of difference between Raba and R. Ela<sup>12</sup> is the subject of dispute between Tannaim. For it is taught: If a basket or net was filled with vessels and immersed, they become clear both for hallowed things and for terumah. Abba Saul says: For terumah, but not for hallowed things. If so, it should apply to terumah too!<sup>13</sup> — For whom do we state this rule?<sup>14</sup> For Associates.<sup>15</sup> Associates know [the rules of immersion] very well. If so, it should apply to hallowed things too!<sup>16</sup> — An 'am ha-arez may see it and go and immerse [likewise]. In the case of terumah too an 'am ha-arez may see it, and go and immerse [likewise]!<sup>17</sup> — We do not accept it from him.<sup>18</sup> Let us not accept hallowed things either from him! — He would bear animosity.<sup>19</sup> In the case of terumah too he will bear animosity! — [In the case of terumah], he does not mind, for he can go and give it to his fellow, a priest, who is an 'am ha-arez. And who is the Tanna who takes account of animosity? — It is R. Jose. For it is taught: R. Jose said: Wherefore are all trusted throughout the year in regard to the cleanness of the wine and oil [they bring for Temple Else]?<sup>20</sup> It is in order that every one may not go and give and build a high place<sup>21</sup> for himself, and burn a red heifer<sup>22</sup> for himself. R. Papa said: According to whom is it that we accept nowadays the testimony of an 'am ha-arez? According to whom? According to R. Jose.<sup>23</sup> But should we not apprehend [the contingency] of borrowing [by an Associate]?<sup>24</sup> For we have learnt:<sup>25</sup> An earthenware vessel protects everything [therein from contracting uncleanness from a corpse that is under the same roof].<sup>26</sup> so Beth hillel. Beth Shammai say: It protects only foodstuffs and liquids and [other] earthenware vessels.<sup>27</sup> Said Beth Hillel to Beth Shammai: Wherefore? Beth Shammai answered: Because it is unclean on account of the 'am ha arez,<sup>28</sup> and an unclean vessel cannot interpose. Said Beth Hillel to them: But have ye not declared the foodstuffs and liquids therein clean? Beth Shammai answered: When we declared the foodstuffs and liquids therein clean,

---

(1) A wicker or network in the wine or oil Press (Jast.), used for straining; cf. A.Z. 56b.

(2) Even for hallowed things.

(3) For the requisite forty se'ahs of water are to be found in neither division, and though, through the meshes of the network, the water flows from one part of the pool to the other, this is not considered a proper connection for the reason that follows.

(4) I.e., water flows through the hollows of the earth, and water appearing at any particular spot is bound to be connected underground to some big stream elsewhere, yet this connection is not valid, for we require (as the Gemara goes on to say) forty se'ahs of water in one place.

(5) I.e., the rule that the immersion of an article in a vessel with all aperture less than the size of the mouth of a skin-bottle is invalid applies only if the outer vessel is clean, and consequently does not itself require immersion.

- (6) Which itself requires immersion.
- (7) Even if the vessel's mouth is less than the prescribed size, its interior is nevertheless purified by the water of the immersion-pool, for we argue that in the same manner as it became defiled so it is also purified.
- (8) Heb. דתני i.e., we have learnt in a Mishnah viz., Mi!. VI, 2. But the Mishnah text differs somewhat from the quotation here, reading as follows: 'If a bucket filled with vessels was immersed, they (also) become clean; but if he did not immerse (the bucket), the water (in it) does not count as mingled unless etc.'. These var. lec. made R. Samson b. Abraham of Sens (in his commentary to Mik.) conclude that our quotation was not the actual Mishnah from Mik., but a Baraita corresponding to it. Other var. lec. are 'and immersed it' for 'and immersed them', and 'in the mingled water' for 'the mingled water'. Both R. Asher b. Jehiel and R. Abraham of Sens had the second reading, the latter referring the phrase specifically to the examples of 'mingled waters' enumerated in Mik. V, 6, the former explaining it more generally of all instances of reservoirs united by a connecting stream. The reacting 'the water (in it) does not count as mingled' is undoubtedly the smoothest.
- (9) I.e., irrespective of the size of the outer vessel's mouth. This immersion is valid for terumah only (v. the Mishnah p. 133).
- (10) I.e., unless the outer vessel's mouth is that size.
- (11) I.e., because it was levitically clean.
- (12) I.e., Raba explains the first clause of the Mishnah to be based on the rule that the unification of immersion-pools requires a connecting stream at least the size of a skin-bottle spout in thickness, and consequently articles immersed in a basket or net, the mouth of which is invariably large, can be used even for hallowed things in accordance with the first view in the Baraita. R. Ela explains the same clause with reference to the rule of interposition, and consequently articles immersed in a basket or net, just as those immersed in any other receptacle, may be used only for terumah in accordance with Abba Saul.
- (13) I.e., the prohibition against immersing vessels within vessels, according to either explanation, should apply to terumah as well as hallowed things.
- (14) Concerning the immersion of vessels within vessels.
- (15) V. p. 120, n. 2. The 'am ha-arez would not even wish to know the laws of immersion, let alone observe them.
- (16) I.e., if the Mishnah applies only to Associates, who observe all the laws meticulously, why are they not permitted to immerse vessels within vessels for hallowed things?
- (17) And as he cannot be trusted to observe properly the rules of immersion, the hallowed contents of the vessels would become defiled!
- (18) Terumah is accepted from an 'am ha-arez only at the seasons of wine-presses and olive-vats (v. infra 24b, and Toh. IX, 4), when all purify their vessels properly under associate supervision (according to Rashi). or when all are regarded for the time as Associates (according to Tosaf. s.v. אש; cf. infra 26a).
- (19) For were they not Jews?
- (20) Wine for libations, oil for the preparation of meal-offerings.
- (21) When these were prohibited: v. J.E. vol. VI, pp. 387-389 (particularly the last section, p. 389, s. 'Rabbinic attitude').
- (22) V. Num. XIX, 2ff; cf. also R. Judah's statement (quoted in Tosaf. a.l. s. אש, as R. Jose's) in Tosef. Hagigah III, that all are to be trusted to look after the ashes of the red heifer.
- (23) But not the other Rabbis; v. Pes. 42b.
- (24) I.e., should we not prohibit the immersion of vessels within vessels for terumah even by Associates, lest the 'am ha-arez see it and do likewise (but without observing all the prescribed laws). and an Associate go and borrow the vessels from him?
- (25) I.e., that it is permitted to borrow vessels from an 'am ha-arez.
- (26) I.e., if its lid is fixed on; or if the corpse is in a room below and the earthen vessel covers the hatchway between the lower room and the upper room, it protects everything in the upper chamber. Cf. Num. XIX, 15, and Oh. V, 3.
- (27) Kel. X, 1.
- (28) Being the vessel of an 'am ha-arez, it is unclean to begin with, before ever it is placed over the hatching or articles are put in it.

we declared them clean [only] for [the 'am ha-arez]. himself;<sup>1</sup> but should we [therefore] declare [also] the vessel clean, which would make it clean for thee as well as for him?<sup>2</sup> It is taught: R. Joshua said: I am ashamed of your words, O Beth Shammai! Is it possible that if a woman [in the upper chamber] kneads [dough] in a trough,<sup>3</sup> the woman and the trough become unclean for seven days, but the dough remains clean; that if there is [in the upper room] a flask<sup>4</sup> full of liquid, the flask contracts seven-day uncleanness, but the liquid remains clean!<sup>5</sup> [Thereupon] one of the disciples of Beth Shammai joined him [in debate] and said to him: I will tell thee the reason of Beth Shammai. He replied, Tell then! So he said to him: Does all unclean vessel bar [the penetration of uncleanness] or not? He replied: It does not bar it. — Are the vessels of an 'am ha-arez clean or unclean? He replied: Unclean. — And if thou sayest to him [that they are] unclean, will he pay any heed to thee? Nay, more, if thou sayest to him [that they are] unclean, he will reply: Mine are clean and thine are unclean.<sup>6</sup> Now this is the reason of Beth Shammai. Forthwith, R. Joshua went and prostrated himself upon the graves of Beth Shammai. He said: I crave your pardon,<sup>7</sup> bones of Beth Shammai. If your unexplained teachings are so [excellent], how much more so the explained teachings. It is said that all his days his teeth were black by reason of his fasts. Now it says, 'For thee as well as for him';<sup>8</sup> accordingly we may borrow from them! — When we borrow [vessels] from them, we immerse them.<sup>9</sup> If so, Beth Hillel could have replied to Beth Shammai: When we borrow [vessels] from them, we immerse them! — That which is rendered unclean by a corpse requires sprinkling on the third and seventh day,<sup>10</sup> and people do not lend a vessel for seven days. — But are they not trusted in regard to immersion?<sup>11</sup> For behold it is taught: The 'am ha-arez is trusted in regard to the purification by immersion of that which is rendered unclean by a corpse! Abaye answered: There is no contradiction: the one [teaching] refers to his body,<sup>12</sup> the other to his vessels. Raba answered: Both refer to his vessels; but there is no contradiction: the one refers to a case where he says: I have never immersed one vessel in another;<sup>13</sup> the other refers to a case where he says: I have immersed [one vessel in another], but I have not immersed in a vessel the mouth of which is not the size of the spout of a skin-bottle. For it is taught: An 'am ha-arez is believed if he says: The produce has not been rendered susceptible [to uncleanness],<sup>14</sup> but he is not believed if he says: The produce has been rendered susceptible [to unclean ness], but it has not been made unclean.<sup>15</sup> — But is he trusted in regard to his body? For behold it is taught: If an Associate comes to receive sprinkling,<sup>16</sup> they at once sprinkle upon him; but if an 'am ha-arez comes to receive sprinkling, they do not sprinkle upon him until he observes before us the third and seventh day! — Abaye answered: As a result of the stringency you impose upon him at the beginning,<sup>17</sup> you make it easier for him, at the end.<sup>18</sup> **THE OUTSIDE AND THE INSIDE.** What is meant by **THE OUTSIDE AND THE INSIDE**? — As we have learnt: If the outside of a vessel was rendered Unclean<sup>19</sup> by [unclean] liquid,<sup>20</sup> [only] its outside becomes unclean; but the inside, rim, hanger<sup>21</sup> and handles,<sup>22</sup> remain clean. But if the inside became unclean,<sup>23</sup> the whole is unclean. **AND HANDLE.** What is meant by the **HANDLE**? Rab Judah said that Samuel said: The part by which one hands<sup>24</sup> it; and thus it says: And they handed<sup>25</sup> her parched corn.<sup>26</sup> R. Assi said that R. Johanan said: The part where the fastidious hold<sup>27</sup> it. R. Bebai recited before R. Nahman: There is no differentiation [in the case of uncleanness] between the outside and the inside of any vessel,<sup>28</sup> be it [for] the hallowed things of the Sanctuary,<sup>29</sup> be it [for] the hallowed things of the provinces.<sup>30</sup> Said [the latter] to him: What is meant by 'the hallowed things of the provinces'? Terumah. But we have learnt: **THE OUTSIDE AND INSIDE AND HANDLE [ARE REGARDED AS SEPARATE] FOR TERUMAH!** Perhaps you mean unconsecrated food prepared according to the purity of hallowed things. [Indeed], you have recalled something to my mind. For Rabbah b. Abbuha<sup>31</sup> said: Eleven distinctions are taught here [in our Mishnah]: the former six apply both to hallowed things and to unconsecrated [food] which was prepared according to the purity of hallowed things; the latter [five] apply to hallowed things, but not to unconsecrated [food] prepared according to the purity of hallowed things. **HE THAT CARRIES ANYTHING POSSESSING MIDRAS-UNCLEANNES MAY CARRY [AT THE SAME TIME] TERUMAH, BUT NOT HALLOWED THINGS.** Why not hallowed things? — Because of a certain occurrence. For Rab Judah said that Samuel said: Once someone was conveying a jar of consecrated wine from one place to another

- (1) The foodstuffs and liquids of an 'am ha-arez are unclean; hence Associates would eschew them in any case.
- (2) I.e., all Associate may borrow the vessel of an 'am ha-arez. The Mishnah text differs from our own in several details. The most important var. lec. is: 'But when thou declarest the vessel clean, thou declarest it so for thyself as well as for him,. The Mishnah then concludes: 'Beth Hillel retracted and gave their ruling according to Beth Shammai
- (3) And the hatchway leading from it to the lower room in which the corpse is lying was covered by an earthen vessel.
- (4) Heb. לֹגֵיץ = לֹגֵץ (the usual and correct form) of the Mishnah and MS.M.; larger than a כּוּם (cup) and smaller than a כּד (jug) — cf. Bez. 15b. Here, it would be made of metal or wood.
- (5) In accordance with your view that an earthenware vessel affords no protection to anything apart from foodstuffs, liquids and earthenwares. Cf. Oh. V, 4.
- (6) Because of the intransigence of the 'am ha-arez in regard to things which cannot be purified, e.g.. foodstuffs and earthenware vessels (the latter have to be broken), therefore Beth Shammai declared them clean i.e.,for the 'am ha-arez, only; but vessels (like the trough and the flask) which can be purified by immersion are declared unclean, for the 'am ha-arez will in such instance, where there is a remedy pay heed to Rabbinic injunction, and purify the vessels: so Rashi. But Tosaf. (s.v. כּלוּם), holding the view that the 'am ha-arez never conforms to Rabbinic ruling, explains the passage in the following lines: An Associate may never use food or drinks belonging to an 'am ha-arez, for the latter does not observe the laws of purity; hence there is no need, in our case, to declare them impure, for they do not affect Associates. But immersible vessels may be borrowed from an 'am ha-arez, for they can be purified by immersion; hence, In our case, they have to be declared unclean so that Associates should not use them without first purifying them.
- (7) Lit., 'I humble myself to you'.
- (8) V. p. 141, and cf. n. 2.
- (9) Lest the 'am ha-arez immersed them In a vessel, without observing the prescribed rules.
- (10) V. Num. XIX, 18ff.
- (11) For Associates we are told have to immerse any vessels borrowed from an 'am ha-arez.
- (12) For which he is trusted.
- (13) In this case he is believed.
- (14) I.e., by being wetted; v. p. 124, nn. 6-9.
- (15) This shows that he could not be relied on in a matter which required scrupulous care, and similarly in regard to the regulation relating to the size of the mouth of the immersing vessel.
- (16) Declaring that he has duly waited the first three days. Sprinkling takes place on the third and seventh day after defilement by a corpse.
- (17) By not believing that he waited three days.
- (18) I.e., he is trusted in regard to the immersion following the sprinklings; for this he carries out with due care, as he is anxious to complete his purification.
- (19) Only in the case of vessels made of wood or metal can the outside be defiled: earthen vessels are rendered unclean only from the inside (v. Lev. XI, 33).
- (20) According to the laws of the Torah only 'a father of uncleanness' (v. p. 134, n. 7) can defile vessels; but the Rabbis enacted that all unclean liquids should defile vessels on account of fluid issuing from a gonorrhoeist, which is a 'father of uncleanness' (v. Nid. 7a). In order, however, to prevent terumah or hallowed things from being burnt in consequence of contact with vessels defiled by liquids, a distinction was made to mark the Rabbinic (as opposed to Torah) character of the defilement viz. that if the outside of a vessel became thus defiled, the inside etc. should remain clean (v. Bek. 38a).
- (21) Lit., 'ear' i.e., ear-shaped handle.
- (22) Lit., 'its hands' = 'place of holding' in our Mishnah, v. p. 133, n. 4. The different parts of the vessel enumerated here have a distinct use; hence they are treated as separate utensils, and remain clean, if the outside only of the vessel be defiled.
- (23) Even according to Rabbinic law only.
- (24) I.e., holds it and reaches it to another.
- (25) E.V. 'reached'.
- (26) Ruth II, 14.
- (27) I.e., the handle. Heb. (in edd.) צוֹבְעִין, prob. denominative from אֶצְבַּע, 'finger' (cf. Aramaic צְבַעָא ) i.e., grip with fingers (v. Levy s.v.). J.T. has בֵּית הַצְּבִיעָא in the Mishnah instead of our בֵּית הַצְּבִיטָה ; undoubtedly, R. Johanan, the editor of the Pal. Talmud, was explaining the J.T., rather than the Babylonian reading.

According to Rashi, **צובעין = מטבילין** i.e., dip the food: he explains that a cavity was made in the bottom (under the rim?) of the vessel where mustard or vinegar was placed, and the food dipped there. The MS.M. reading is **צובטין**; the J.T. III,1 has, 'By which the cleanly take hold of it'; Aruch: '... drink'; v. D.S. a.I.

(28) Lit., 'all vessels have no outside', i.e., if the outside became defiled, the whole vessel is rendered unclean.

(29) I.e., sacrifices.

(30) I.e., sacred gifts, like terumah, which can be eaten in any part of Palestine.

(31) R. Nahman's teacher.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 23a

, when the thong of his sandal<sup>1</sup> broke, and he took it and placed it on the mouth of the jar, and It fell into the hollow<sup>2</sup> of the jar, which was thus rendered unclean. At that time they enjoined: He that carries anything possessing midras-uncleanness may carry [at the same time] terumah, but not hallowed things. — If so, [it should be forbidden to carry] terumah too! — This is according to R. Hananiah b. Akabia who said: They Prohibited it only on the Jordan and in a ship and according to [the circumstances of] the occurrence.<sup>3</sup> What is this? — It is taught: A man shall not take water of purification or ashes of purification,<sup>4</sup> and convey them over the Jordan in a ship, nor stand on one side [of a river] and throw them to the other side, nor float them over the water, nor ride upon all animal or his fellow, unless his feet touch the ground;<sup>5</sup> but one may unhesitatingly convey them over a bridge, be it across the Jordan or any other river. R. Hananiah b. Akabia says: They prohibited it only on the Jordan and in a ship and according to [the circumstances of] the occurrence. What was the occurrence? — Rab Judah said that Rab said: Once someone was conveying water of purification on the Jordan in a ship, and a [piece of a] corpse the size of an olive was found stuck in the bottom of the ship.<sup>6</sup> At that time they enjoined: A man shall not take water of purification and ashes of purification and convey them over the Jordan in a ship. A question was raised: [It happened with] all unclean sandal; what of a clean sandal?<sup>7</sup> [It happened with] all open jar, what of a closed jar?<sup>8</sup> How is it if a man transgressed and carried [them thus]? — R. Ela said: If he transgressed and carried [them thus], they are unclean. R. Zera said: If he transgressed and carried [them thus] they are clean. VESSELS THAT HAVE BEEN FINISHED IN PURITY etc. Who finished them? Should one say that an Associate finished them, then why do they require immersion? If, on the other hand, an 'am ha-arez, finished them, can they be called 'finished in purity'? — Rabbah b. Shilah said that R. Mattenah said that Samuel said: Actually, [one can say] that an Associate finished them, yet [the vessel requires immersion] lest the spittle of an 'am ha-arez<sup>9</sup> [fell upon it].<sup>10</sup> — When could it have fallen [upon it]? Should one say, before he finished it, then it is not yet a vessel!<sup>11</sup> If, on the other hand, after he had finished it, then he would surely take good care of them! — Actually, [one can say that it fell upon it] before he finished it, but perhaps at the time when he finished it, it was still moist.<sup>12</sup> [It states:] It requires [only] immersion, but not sunset;<sup>13</sup> our Mishnah, therefore, is not according to R. Eliezer. For we have learnt: If a [reed] pipe<sup>14</sup> was cut<sup>15</sup> for [putting therein ashes of] purification, R. Eliezer says: It must be immersed forthwith; R. Joshua says: It must [first] be rendered unclean, and then immersed.<sup>16</sup> Now we raised the point: Who could have cut it? Should one say that an Associate cut it, then why is immersion required?<sup>17</sup> If, on the other hand, an 'am ha-arez cut it, how can R. Joshua, in such a case, say: It must [first] be rendered unclean, and then immersed? Behold, it is already unclean! Now Rabbah b. Shila said that R. Mattenah said that Samuel said: Actually, [you can say] that an Associate cut it, yet [immersion is required] lest the spittle of an 'am ha-arez [fell upon it]. — [Again] when could it have fallen [upon it]? Should one say before he cut it, then it is not yet a vessel! If, on the other hand, after he had cut it, he would surely take good care of it! Actually, [you can say that it fell on the vessel] before he cut it, but perhaps at the time that he cut it, it was still moist. Granted [then] according to R. Joshua, a distinction is thus made, [as a demonstration] against the Sadducees.<sup>18</sup> For we have learnt: They used to render the priest that was to burn the [red] heifer unclean,<sup>19</sup> as a demonstration against the view of the Sadducees,<sup>20</sup> who used to say:<sup>21</sup> It must be performed [only] by those on whom the sun had set.<sup>22</sup> But according to R. Eliezer, granted if you say that in an other cases we do require sunset,<sup>23</sup> a

distinction is thus made [as a demonstration] against the Sadducees, but if you say that in other cases [too] we do not require sunset, what distinction is there, [as a demonstration] against the Sadducees?<sup>24</sup> — Rab answered:

---

(1) Which possessed midras-uncleanness. J.T.: ‘his sandal got torn off’ (v. Tosaf. s.v. **וּנְפִסְקָה** ).

(2) Lit., ‘air’.

(3) I.e., R. Hananiah, taught that a Rabbinic decree consequent upon a certain incident was always restricted to the actual circumstances of the incident. In our case, the occurrence was in connection with hallowed things; therefore the Rabbinic prohibition affects only hallowed things.

(4) V. Num. XIX.

(5) Since a person travelling in a ship does not touch the ground with his feet, the Rabbis enacted that anyone carrying water or ashes of purification may not journey with his feet lifted off the ground.

(6) The moment the piece of corpse was overshadowed by a person or object, it caused all under the same covering or overshadowing to become unclean for seven days: v. Num. XIX, 14 and Oh. II, 1.

(7) I.e., does the prohibition referred to in our Mishnah extend also to a person wearing a clean sandal?

(8) Into which nothing could fall.

(9) Who, we are afraid, may be suffering from gonorrhoea, in ‘which case any fluid coming from him is a ‘father of uncleanness;’ cf. p. 143, n.6.

(10) Unobserved by the Associate.

(11) And cannot, therefore, be defiled.

(12) In Nid. VII, I, we learn that spittle etc. convey uncleanness when wet, but not when dry.

(13) Otherwise it would be specifically mentioned. Cf p. 121, n. 9.

(14) Cf. Kel. XVIII, 7.

(15) I.e., from the ground, so that it was still clean.

(16) R. Eliezer and R. Joshua agree that being a vessel, and therefore subject to defilement, the reed pipe has to be immersed and then used for the ashes of the red heifer before sunset, the underlying motive being to demonstrate against the Sadducees, who held that any thing or person to be employed in connection with the red heifer must, if unclean, first be completely purified, i.e., must wait for sunset after immersion; whereas the Rabbis held that immersion without sunset was sufficient; and although the Sadducean view in this case was stricter than the Pharisaic, the Rabbis nevertheless demonstrated against the Sadducees in order to uphold the authority of the Oral Law, which the latter repudiated. The only difference between R. Eliezer and R. Joshua is as to whether the vessel should first be defiled (and thus rendered unclean according to the Law of the Torah, which the Sadducees also recognized), or immersed forthwith (being regarded as unclean by Rabbinic enactment only). Cf. the defilement of the priest referred to on p. 147, and another demonstration against the Sadducees mentioned on p. 111.

(17) Seeing that the reed pipe is actually clean, the fact that we require its immersion without the awaiting of sunset cannot be regarded as a demonstration against the Sadducees, who postulate sunset only for the unclean; the immersion, therefore, would be pointless.

(18) For Once the reed pipe is defiled, the Sadducees require sunset In addition to Immersion.

(19) Either (according to Tosaf. who quotes the Tosef. in support) by his fellow priests laying their hands on him (for compared with him all were unclean; v. p. 121), or (according to Rashi and Maimonides) he was defiled by means of a (dead) reptile or an equivalent source of uncleanness.

(20) Lit., ‘to bring forth (the false opinion) from the heart of the Sadduces’. The Mishnah, Par. III, 7’ from which this passage is quoted, has simply, ‘because of the Sadducees’.

(21) The Mishnah text has, ‘that they should not say’, and our reading as a var. lec.

(22) V. p. 146, n. 8.

(23) I.e., that an vessels finished in purity (in circumstances as described by Rabbah b. Shila) require sunset In addition to immersion before being used for hallowed things, and that only for the ashes of the red heifer is immersion alone sufficient.

(24) We must conclude, therefore, as suggested above, that our Mishnah is not according to R. Eliezer.

## **Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 23b**

They rendered it as though defiled by a [dead] reptile.<sup>1</sup> — If so, it should not render a person unclean;<sup>2</sup> why then is it taught: He who cuts it and immerses it requires immersion? — [You must say], therefore, They rendered it as though defiled by a corpse. If so, it should require sprinkling on the third and seventh day; why then is it taught: He who cuts it and immerses it requires immersion? [implying only] immersion, but not sprinkling on the third and seventh day! — [You must say], therefore, They rendered it as though in its seventh day after defilement by a corpse.<sup>3</sup> But surely it is taught: They never introduced any innovation in connection with the [red heifer!<sup>4</sup> — Abaye answered: [It means] that they never said that a spade, [for instance], should be rendered unclean as a seat [on which a gonorrhoeist sat].<sup>5</sup> As it is taught: And he that sitteth on any thing.<sup>6</sup> I might [have thought] that if [the gonorrhoeist] inverted a se'ah [measure] and sat upon it, [or] a Tarkab<sup>7</sup> [measure] and sat upon it, it should become unclean, therefore the text teaches us: And he that sitteth on any thing whereon, [he that hath the issue] Sat ... shall become unclean;<sup>8</sup> [meaning] that which is appointed for sitting;<sup>9</sup> but that is excluded In regard to which we can say, Stand up that we may do our work.<sup>10</sup> A VESSEL UNITES ALL ITS CONTENTS [FOR DEFILEMENT] IN THE CASE OF HALLOWED THINGS, BUT NOT IN THE CASE OF TERUMAH. Whence is this deduced? R. Hanin said: Scripture says: One golden pan of ten shekels, full of incense:<sup>11</sup> thus, the verse made an the contents of the pan one. R. Kahana raised an objection: [We have learnt], R. Akiba added<sup>12</sup> [with regard to] the fine flour<sup>13</sup> and the incense, the frankincense and the coals,<sup>14</sup> that if one who had taken an immersion that day [but had not yet awaited sunset]<sup>15</sup> touched a part thereof, he renders the whole in valid.<sup>16</sup> Now this is [an enactment] of the Rabbis!<sup>17</sup> Whence [is this proven]? — Since it teaches in the first clause: R. Simeon b. Bathyra testified concerning the ashes of purification that if an unclean person touched a part thereof, he rendered the whole unclean; and then it teaches: R. Akiba added:<sup>18</sup> — Resh Lakish answered in the name of Bar Kappara

(1) I.e., you can still say our Mishnah is according to R. Eliezer, even if he holds the view that in other cases too we do not require sunset for vessels finished in purity, for here the vessel is made to assume the uncleanness of an object defiled by a (dead) reptile (in respect of communicating defilement), which object in all other cases requires sunset. Thus a distinction is made, which clearly rejects the Sadducean view.

(2) Only a 'father of uncleanness' can defile a person; whereas a vessel defiled by a dead reptile would be an 'offspring of uncleanness'.

(3) I.e., as though in its seventh day after the sprinkling: it would still require immersion and could defile a person.

(4) Whereas the actual defilement of the priest (v. p. 147) does not involve any change in the laws of levitical purity, the attribution of corpse-defilement to the reed cut in purity represents a complete Innovation.

(5) A gonorrhoeist defiles an object on which he sits, making it a 'father of uncleanness' provided (as the following Baraita explains) it is an object appointed for sitting. Now the Rabbis never enacted a new law in connection with the red heifer, whereby an object on susceptible to a given type of uncleanness should become susceptible to it, e.g., that a spade should become defiled as the seat of a gonorrhoeist: in this sense they introduced no innovations. But they did not refrain from attributing to a vessel the kind of uncleanness to which it was susceptible, even though it had not actually been defiled. Thus the reed pipe, though clean, could be regarded as though defiled by a corpse, since it could be subject to corpse-defilement.

(6) Lev. XV, 6.

(7) Grk. \*\*, terkab (for another derivation v. Jastrow s.v.) == three kabs or a half se'ah, a dry measure.

(8) Heb. טמא ; in the verse וטמא ('and shall be unclean').

(9) This is deduced apparently from the word ישב ('sat'), which, being vocalized as the imperfect instead of the perfect (ישב), can imply repeated action i.e., that it did not just happen on this one occasion that someone sat on it, but that it was customary to use it as a seat (v. Rashi here and to Lev. XV, 4). B. Epstein in Torah Temimah (ibid. N. 20) explains the deduction to be drawn from the word כלי (E.V. 'thing but really 'vessel, article') i.e., an article appointed for sitting.

(10) I.e., it excludes any article which has its own specific use and was not intended as a seat.

(11) Num. VII, 14 et passim.

(12) I.e., to R. Simeon b. Bathyra's statement (quoted infra; v. 'Ed. VIII, 1 (Sonc. ed., p. 47).

(13) Used for a meal-offering; cf. Lev. II, 1ff.

(14) Carried by the High Priest into the Holy of Holies for the purpose of producing the cloud of incense (cf. Lev. XVI, 12); this rule of defilement did not apply to the coals gathered every day by ordinary priests. It should be noted that though frankincense and coal are ordinarily not susceptible to uncleanness, they are rendered so in this case on account of their sanctity.

(15) Which would I have completed his purification; thus, he is still partially unclean and renders invalid (though he does not defile) Terumah and hallowed things.

(16) Because the vessel unites an its contents. The point in R. Akiba's addition is either (a) that a vessel is able to unite its contents even for invalidation and not for defilement only (Bertinoro); or (b) that even flat vessels, not hollowed like a receptacle, can unite their contents (Maim. following our Gemara; v. p. 150).

(17) Whereas R. Hanin derived the rule from the Torah.

(18) R. Simeon b. Bathyra's testimony is definitely of Rabbinic origin, for from the verse quoted above one could only deduce that the rule applied to offerings on the altar, but not to the ashes of the red heifer. Since R. Akiba's statement is an addition to a Rabbinic rule, it follows that it must itself be a Rabbinic enactment.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 24a

: It<sup>1</sup> refers only to the remains of the meal-offering,<sup>2</sup> for according to the Torah that which requires the vessel,<sup>3</sup> the vessel unites, that which does not require the vessel,<sup>4</sup> the vessel does not unite; and the Rabbis came and decreed that even though it does not require the vessel, the vessel should unite it. Granted with regard to the fine flour, but how are the incense and the frankincense to be explained?<sup>5</sup> — R. Nahman answered that Rabbah b. Abbuha said: For instance, if he heaped them upon a leather spread: according to the Torah, that which has an inside<sup>6</sup> can unite [its contents], that which has no inside, cannot unite [them]; and the Rabbis came and enacted that even that which has no inside should unite [its contents]. Now R. Hanin's teaching win conflict with that of R. Hiyya b. Abba, for R. Hiyya b. Abba said that R. Johanan said: This Mishnah<sup>7</sup> was taught as a resent of R. Akiba's testimony.<sup>8</sup> HALLOWED THINGS BECOME INVALID [BY UNCLEANNESS] AT THE FOURTH REMOVE. It is taught: R. Jose said: Whence [is it deduced] that hallowed things become invalid [by uncleanness even] at the fourth remove? Now it is [to be deduced by] conclusion ad majus: if one who [only] needs to bring his atonement sacrifice [in order to complete his purification]<sup>9</sup> is, whilst being permitted [to partake] of terumah, [nevertheless] disqualified for hallowed things,<sup>10</sup> how much more so should uncleanness at the third remove, which renders terumah invalid,<sup>11</sup> produce in the case of hallowed things uncleanness at the fourth remove.<sup>12</sup> Thus, we learn uncleanness at the third remove in respect of hallowed things from the Torah, and uncleanness at the fourth remove by means of an a fortiori argument. Whence [do we deduce] from the Torah uncleanness at the third remove in respect of hallowed things? It is written: And the flesh that toucheth a thing unclean thing shall not be eaten;<sup>13</sup> we are surely dealing [here with a case] where it may have touched something suffering from uncleanness [even] at the second remove,<sup>14</sup> yet the Divine Law says it 'shall not be eaten 'Uncleanness at the fourth remove by means of? an a fortiori argument'; as we have said [above]. IN THE CASE OF TERUMAH, IF [ONE HAND OF A MAN] BECAME etc. R. Shezbi said: They taught [this only] of a case where [the hands] are connected,<sup>15</sup> but not where they are not connect ed.<sup>16</sup> Abaye put an objection to him: [It is taught]: A dry [unclean] hand renders the other unclean so as to render hallowed things unclean,<sup>17</sup> but not terumah this is the view of Rabbi. R. Jose son of R. Judah says: so as to render invalid,<sup>18</sup> but not unclean. Now granted, if you say that [it refers also to] a case where [the hands] are not connected, [then the fact that the hand is] 'dry' is in that case remarkable; but if you say that [it refers only to] a case where [the hands] are connected, but not where they are not connected, what is there remarkable about [the hand being] 'dry'?<sup>19</sup> It is also<sup>20</sup> taught: Resh Lakish said: They taught [this only] of his [own hand], but not of the hand of his fellow.<sup>21</sup>

---

(1) I.e., R. Akiba's testimony.

(2) I.e., the rule to which R. Akiba testified is certainly of Rabbinic origin; but this does not conflict with the view of R. Hanin who derives our Mishnah teaching from the Bible, for R. Akiba refers only to the remains of the meal eaten by the



Priests (v. Lev. II, 3 et passim) to which the Biblical law (as the Gemara goes on to explain) does not apply.

(3) For the service in connection therewith, e.g., the incense; v. Num. VII, 14 quoted on p. 149.

(4) E.g., the remains of the meal-offering which are eaten by the priests.

(5) Since they require the vessel, the vessel unites them according to the law of the Torah: why then are they included in R. Akiba's testimony, which refers only to Rabbinical enactments?

(6) I.e., is hollowed like a receptacle.

(7) I.e., our Mishnah.

(8) I.e., it is of Rabbinic, not of Torah origin.

(9) V. p. 135, n. 4.

(10) V. Yeb. 74b (Sonc. ed., pp. 502-3).

(11) V. Sot. 29a (Sonc. ed., p. 143).

(12) Thus rendering the hallowed things invalid. For this method of argument cf. B.K. 24bff (Sonc. ed., p. 125ff). The principle of **דיו לבא מן הדין להיות כנדון** ('It is quite sufficient that the law in respect of the thing inferred should be equivalent to that from which it is derived') discussed *ibid.*, does not apply here, for otherwise the 'a fortiori' argument becomes valueless, for we know from Scripture that uncleanness at the third remove invalidates hallowed things; and those, too, who hold the principle of 'Dayyo' even where the purpose of the 'a fortiori' argument is defeated, would nevertheless not apply it here, since we are dealing only with Rabbinical not Torah degrees of impurity.

(13) With reference to the flesh of peace-offerings; Lev. VII, 19.

(14) So that the hallowed flesh (of the peace-offering) is made to suffer uncleanness at the third remove. The Gemara assumes here that the term 'unclean thing,' can include something suffering from second-grade uncleanness, because we find that an object possessing uncleanness at the second remove is termed 'unclean' by Scripture; v. Lev. XI, 33, where the vessel possesses uncleanness at the first remove and its contents, therefore, uncleanness at the second remove.

(15) I.e., the rule in the Mishnah that one hand defiles the other for hallowed things applies only (according to Rashi) to a case where the unclean hand is actually touching the clean hand at the time when the latter is in contact with hallowed things, the reason for this Rabbinic enactment being the fear lest the unclean hand touch the hallowed things. But Tosaf. (s.v. **בתי בורין**) explains the case to be one where the clean hand is touching the unclean hand whilst the latter is in contact with a defiling object (e.g., a sacred Scroll), and we are afraid that the clean hand may also touch the defiling object.

(16) I.e., (according to Rash), if, after the unclean hand had been removed from the clean, the latter touched hallowed things. these would remain clean, for one hand cannot convey to the other uncleanness even at the third remove so as to render, in turn, hallowed things invalid.

(17) I.e., at the third remove: third-grade uncleanness can, in turn, produce in hallowed things fourth grade uncleanness. Unwashed hands are generally regarded as possessing uncleanness at the second remove.

(18) I.e., the second hand can convey at the third remove to hallowed things a fourth-grade uncleanness, which disqualifies them but does not enable them to defile.

(19) If the case is one in which the hands are not connected, then the fact that the clean hand, through having been previously in contact with the dry unclean hand, is able to defile hallowed things constitutes a new point of Rabbinic law, viz., that one hand possessing uncleanness at the second remove can convey to the other hand, without the help of moisture, uncleanness of the same grade; were the unclean hand wet this would not, of course, be remarkable, for since second-grade uncleanness renders liquids, by Rabbinic enactment, unclean at the first remove, the moisture on the unclean hand would in turn convey to the other hand uncleanness at the second remove. But if the Mishnah refers only to a case where the hands are connected, the fact that the hand is dry is pointless. for the defilement of the hallowed things would in that instance perforce have to be accounted for as a preventive prohibition lest the unclean hand touch the hallowed things (v. p. 151, n. 6). and in that case it would make no difference whether the unclean hand were wet or dry, for since it possesses second-grade uncleanness, it can defile hallowed things with uncleanness at the third remove.

(20) [MS.M. omits 'also' which in fact is difficult to explain.]

(21) I.e., if he touched with his unclean hand another person's hand, the latter's hand is not defiled.

## **Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 24b**

But R. Johanan said: Be it his [own] hand or the hand of his fellow; [and] with that<sup>1</sup> hand he can [defile the other hand]<sup>2</sup> so as to render [hallowed things] invalid but not unclean.<sup>3</sup> Whence [is this

deduced]? — From the fact that [the Mishnah] teaches in the second clause that the one hand defiles the other for hallowed things but not for terumah. Why am I told this again? Behold it has already been taught in the first clause!<sup>4</sup> You must surely infer from this that it comes to include the hand of his fellow. And Resh Lakish, too, retracted; for R. Jonah said that R. Ammi said that Resh Lakish said: Be it his own hand or the hand of his fellow, with that hand [he can defile the other] so as to render [hallowed things] invalid but not unclean. Now [whether the second hand] renders [hallowed things] invalid but not unclean is [disputed by] Tannaim. For we have learnt: Whatsoever renders terumah invalid<sup>5</sup> defiles the hands with uncleanness at the second remove, and one hand renders the other unclean: this is the view of R. Joshua. But the Sages say: the hands possess uncleanness at the second remove, and that which possesses uncleanness at the second remove cannot convey uncleanness at the second remove to anything else.<sup>6</sup> Surely, [the meaning is], it cannot convey uncleanness at the second remove, but it can convey uncleanness at the third remove!<sup>7</sup> — Perhaps, it does not convey uncleanness either at the second or the third remove!<sup>8</sup> --Rather [is it disputed by] the following Tannaim. For it is taught: A dry [unclean] hand renders the other unclean so as to render unclean in the case of hallowed things, but not in the case of terumah: this is the view of Rabbi. R. Jose son of R. Judah says: That hand [can defile another] so as to render [hallowed things] invalid but not unclean. DRY FOODSTUFFS MAY BE EATEN WITH UNWASHED HANDS etc. It is taught: R. Hanina b. Antigonos said: Is there [a distinction in favour of] dryness in regard to hallowed things?<sup>9</sup> Does not then the honour<sup>10</sup> in which hallowed things are held render them fit [for uncleanness]?<sup>11</sup> It refers only to a case where his companion<sup>12</sup> inserted [the consecrated food] into his mouth,<sup>13</sup> or he himself picked it up with a spindle<sup>14</sup> or whorl,<sup>15</sup> and he wanted to eat unconsecrated horseradish or onion with it,<sup>16</sup> then in the case of hallowed things the Rabbis prohibited it,<sup>17</sup> in the case of terumah the Rabbis did not prohibit it.<sup>18</sup> A MOURNER [PRIOR TO THE BURIAL OF THE DECEASED] AND ONE WHO NEEDS TO BRING HIS ATONEMENT SACRIFICE [IN ORDER TO COMPLETE HIS PURIFICATION] etc. What is the reason? — Since up till now they were prohibited [from partaking of hallowed things],<sup>19</sup> the Rabbis required them to take an immersion. MISHNAH. GREATER STRINGENCY APPLIES TO TERUMAH [THAN TO HALLOWED THINGS], FOR IN JUDEA<sup>20</sup> THEY<sup>21</sup> ARE TRUSTED IN REGARD TO THE PURITY OF [HALLOWED] WINE AND OIL THROUGHOUT THE YEAR,<sup>22</sup> AND ONLY AT THE SEASON OF THE WINE-PRESSES AND OLIVE-VATS<sup>23</sup> IN REGARD TO TERUMAH. IF [THE SEASON OF] THE WINE-PRESSES AND OLIVE-VATS WAS PASSED, AND ONE<sup>24</sup> BROUGHT TO HIM<sup>25</sup> A JAR OF WINE OF TERUMAH, THE LATTER MAY NOT ACCEPT IT FROM HIM. HOWEVER, [THE ‘AM HA-AREZ] MAY LEAVE IT FOR THE COMING [SEASON] OF THE WINE-PRESS.<sup>26</sup> BUT IF HE SAID TO HIM,<sup>27</sup> ‘I HAVE SET APART THEREIN A QUARTER LOG<sup>28</sup> AS A HALLOWED THING’,<sup>29</sup> HE IS TRUSTED [IN REGARD TO THE PURITY OF THE WHOLE].<sup>30</sup> IN REGARD TO JUGS OF WINE AND JUGS OF OIL

(1) I.e., the first hand.

(2) [So Rash. Tosaf. (s.v. **תוס** fol. 24a) on the basis of another reading refers it to the hand of his fellow: ‘Be it his own hand or the hand of his fellow (that hand can defile) so as to render invalid etc.’]

(3) Resh Lakish on the other hand, holds, it appears, that the hallowed things are rendered unclean; cf. his retraction ‘Infra (v. Tosaf. *ibid.*).

(4) I.e., that in the case of hallowed things he must immerse both hands.

(5) I.e., any-thing suffering from second-grade uncleanness; cf. Zab. V, 12.

(6) I.e., one hand cannot convey the same grade of uncleanness to the other; this shows that R. Joshua holds the opposite view. The text in the Mishnah, apart from minor differences, omits the words ‘the hands possess uncleanness at the second remove’.

(7) Thus enabling it to invalidate terumah.

(8) I.e., the Sages may hold that since, as they observe, the hand possesses second-grade uncleanness, it cannot defile the other hand at all, so that, unlike our own mishnah, they would not accept any distinction in this respect between terumah and hallowed things. In other words, possibly the Tannaim do not differ as to whether the second hand invalidates or defiles hallowed things, but as to whether the second hand does or does not become defiled at all; on the view however

that it does, an may agree with R. Joshua that it is rendered unclean at the second remove.

(9) This distinction obtains only in the case of unconsecrated food, which does not become susceptible to uncleanness till it has been once wetted (cf. p. 124, nn. 6f). R. Hanina b. Antigonus assumes that the Mishnah refers to consecrated foods and that their 'dryness' means that they have not yet been fitted for uncleanness.

(10) Lit., 'love'.

(11) Following is the Tosefta reading, which differs in several respects from our passage: 'R. H b. A. said: Is there (a distinction in favour of) dry things in regard to hallowed things? (It must refer to a case), therefore, where he picks up the cake with a spindle or a chip of wood and he eats with it an (unconsecrated) olive or onion; (it is permitted) in the case of terumah but not in the case of hallowed things'. The version of the Tosefta quoted by Tosaf. (s.v. **סוף**) corresponds more nearly to our own, but likewise omits the sentence, 'Does not then the honour in which hallowed things are held render them fit for (uncleanness)?', and makes the answer appear to be part of R. H. b. A.'s statement instead of a reply by others to his question.

(12) Whose hands were leviticany clean.

(13) Because the eater's hands were not clean.

(14) Jast.: reed, especially reed used as spindle (v. Ar. s.v.); also as fork.

(15) Heb. **כרכר**; Levy reads, **כרכד** from Grk. \*\* == \*\* (shuttle). The spindle and whorl, being small flat pieces of wood, do not come within the category of 'Kelim' (vessels or articles), and consequently are not susceptible to defilement.

(16) For the hands, which possess second-grade uncleanness, do not defile dry unconsecrated foods, since the latter are not susceptible to uncleanness at the third remove (V. p. 155, n. 2).

(17) Lest his hands touch the consecrated food in his mouth, or defile it indirectly by rendering the saliva unclean.

(18) Though unclean hands can invalidate terumah, the Rabbis relied on the eaters of terumah taking due care, and imposed no prohibition in this case. According to the Gemara's explanation, therefore, the Mishnah does not refer to consecrated but to unconsecrated food; and 'dry' does not mean that the food had not become susceptible to uncleanness, but simply that it was dry at the moment for were it wet, then the hands would convey to the liquid uncleanness at the first remove (cf. P. 152, n. 4), which would render the unconsecrated food unclean at the second remove, and the latter in turn would disqualify the terumah by conveying to it uncleanness at the third remove (so Rashi here). Another view (refuted by Rashi here, although accepted by him apparently in his note to the Mishnah) takes 'dry' to mean that the unconsecrated food had not yet been fitted for uncleanness.

(19) And also of Second time, but lot of terumah, v. Yeb. 68b (Sonc. ed., p. 458).

(20) V. infra p. 156.

(21) The 'amme ha-arez.

(22) If an 'am ha-arez set aside wine and oil for Temple use (for libations and meal-offerings respectively) during the seasons of the winepresses and olive-vats, he may be trusted in regard to their purity throughout the year (for another explanation v. Tosaf. s.v. **שבייהודה**). For though an 'am ha-arez, could not be trusted in respect to terumah, he could be relied up on strictly to observe the laws of purity in respect to hallowed things.

(23) When everyone can be trusted to purify his vessels: cf. Toh. IX, .

(24) V. n. 5; lit., 'they'.

(25) I.e., an Associate priest.

(26) And then give it to the priest.

(27) I.e., the 'am ha-arez owner to the priest.

(28) A log == six eggs.

(29) I.e., he had put a quarter log of wine in a vessel to be used as a drink-offering.

(30) For since he is trusted in regard to the hallowed things, i.e., the drink-offering, he is also trusted in regard to the terumah.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 25a

THAT ARE MIXED UP,<sup>1</sup> THEY ARE TRUSTED DURING THE SEASON OF THE WINE-PRESSES AND THE OLIVE-VATS AND PRIOR TO [THE SEASON OF] THE WINE-PRESSES SEVENTY DAYS.<sup>2</sup> GEMARA. In Judea but not In Galilee: what is the reason? Resh Lakish said: Because a strip of [land inhabited by] Cutheans<sup>3</sup> separates them.<sup>4</sup> — Let it be

brought then in a box, chest or turret!<sup>5</sup> — This is according to Rabbi, who said: A tent in motion is not to be considered a tent.<sup>6</sup> For it is taught: One who enters Gentile territory in a box, chest or turret, Rabbi declares to be unclean, and R. Jose b. Judah to be clean.<sup>7</sup> — But let it be brought in an earthenware vessel fitted with a close-bound covering!<sup>8</sup> R. Eliezer<sup>9</sup> said: They teach:<sup>10</sup> Hallowed things are not protected<sup>11</sup> by a close-bound covering. — But it is taught: The [water of] purification is not protected by a close-bound covering. Surely this implies that hallowed things are protected! — No, it implies that water which is not yet sanctified<sup>12</sup> is protected by a close-bound covering.<sup>13</sup> — But ‘Ulla said: The Associates prepare [their hallowed things]<sup>14</sup> in purity in Galilee!<sup>15</sup> — They let them remain; and when Elijah comes<sup>16</sup> he will purify them.<sup>17</sup> **AND ONLY AT THE SEASON OF THE WINE-PRESSES AND OLIVE VATS IN REGARD TO TERUMAH.** Now we shall point to a contradiction. He<sup>18</sup> who finished [gathering] his olives, let him leave<sup>19</sup> one basket [for terumah] and give it to a poor priest!<sup>20</sup> — R. Nahman said: There is no contradiction: the one [Mishnah]<sup>21</sup> refers to early-ripening [olives],<sup>22</sup> and the other refers to later ripening [olives].<sup>23</sup> Said R. Adda b. Ahaba to him: Which [are caned late-ripening]? Like those of your fathers. R. Joseph said: They taught this of Galilee.<sup>24</sup> Abaye put an objection to him: Transjordan and Galilee are like Judea: they are trusted [there] in regard to the wine during the wine-season, and in regard to the oil during the oil-season; but not in regard to the wine during the oil-season, and not in regard to the oil during the wine-season? — The best [explanation],<sup>25</sup> therefore, is that which was given at first.<sup>26</sup> **IF [THE SEASON OF] THE WINE-PRESSES AND OLIVE-VATS WAS PASSED, AND ONE BROUGHT TO HIM A JAR OF WINE OF TERUMAH, THE LATTER MAY NOT ACCEPT IT FROM HIM. HOWEVER, [THE ‘AM HA-AREZ,] MAY LEAVE IT FOR THE COMING [SEASON] OF THE WINE-PRESS.** R. Shesheth was asked: If [the priest] transgressed and accepted It, may he leave it for the next [season of the] winepress?-He answered them: Ye have learnt it:

(1) Explained in Gemara (p. 161) to mean that unconsecrated wine terumah and drink-offering are mixed together, though, as a rule, the expression is a technical term for the admixture of secular produce with terumah in proportions sufficient to make the whole prohibited to non-priests. **המדומעות** In (‘mixed up’) is f. pl. part. pu'al, from (pi'el), denom. of **דמע** == ‘(sacred) fruit’, from rt **דמע** == ‘flow, weep’; cf. Ex. XXII, 28.

(2) When it is customary to begin purifying the vessels for the wine. Though normally the ‘am ha-arez is not trusted in regard to his jugs even during the vat-season, in this case he is trusted, because he is believed in regard to the drink-offering therein; v. p. 161, n. 1.

(3) I.e., Samari-tans; v. II Kings XVII, 24, 29, and J.E. vol. IV, p. 398. For the Talmudic attitude to Samaritans, v. /E. vol. X, p. 672f (s. Religion). For censorial influence on word, v. last, s.v. **כותי**.

(4) The Sages declared heathen territory to be unclean, for fear of defilement by an undiscovered grave; v. Shab. 14b-15a. Thus even Associates could not bring sacred things (e.g., libations) from Galilee to the Temple, which was in Judah.

(5) I.e., a kind of chest or case. These receptacles, it is held, could protect their contents against defilement.

(6) I.e., such a receptacle. technically termed a tent, does not protect its contents from defilement.

(7) V. Naz. 55a (Sonc. ed., p. 204 notes).

(8) V. Nun., XIX, 15.

(9) Read with MS.M.: R. Eleazar.

(10) Heb. **שׁוֹנֵי** an unusual expression for a Baraita teaching, for which the most common formula is **תְּנִיא** (it is taught).

(11) Lit., ‘delivered’, . sc. from defilement.

(12) I.e., the ashes of the red heifer had not yet been put in.

(13) And may afterwards be used with the ashes for sprinkling.

(14) I.e., their wine and oil for Temple use (Rashi).

(15) Which, Implies that there is a way of transporting them in purity to the Temple.

(16) Rashi reads, ‘Maybe Elijah will come’. For the concept of Elijah as the solver of religious controversies and legal disputes v. Men. 45b; Ab. R. N. xxxiv; Num. I lab. III, near the end. For the general Rabbinic concept of Elijah v. J.E. pp. 122-127.

(17) I.e., reveal a path by ‘which the hallowed things can be brought, which does not lead through heathen territory. [The

Associates, accordingly, who lived during the Temple times and who were anxious to express their devotion, to it, would prepare their wine and oil in purity in the expectation that Elijah might come and direct them, through a clean path enabling them to bring these to the Temple. Rashi, Nid. 6b, refers this to the period after the Destruction of the Temple, when the Associates would follow this practice in the expectation that the Temple might be rebuilt in their days.]

(18) I.e., an ‘am ha-arez.

(19) Var. lec., ‘and left’.

(20) Heb. **לְעֵינֵי הַכֹּהֵן** (this reading is supported by Maimonides) i.e., the ‘am ha-arez, must give the olives to the priest before they become susceptible to uncleanness, so that the priest may prepare the olive-oil himself in purity. A poor priest is mentioned, because a rich one would not accept such terumah, as he would not wash to bother himself with the pressing of a small quantity of olives. But ‘Aruk and Tosaf and so apparently Rashi (v. Tosaf.) read, **לְעֵינֵי הַכֹּהֵן**, ‘in the presence of the priest’, I.e., so that the priest may be sure that the olives have not been rendered susceptible to uncleanness. According to either reading this Mishnah shows that the ‘am ha-arez is not to be trusted even during the season, and thus contradicts our own Mishnah.

(21) I.e., our own.

(22) Which are gathered at the normal season: consequently the ‘am ha-arez is trusted.

(23) Since these are gathered after the normal season, the ‘am ha-arez is no longer trusted in regard to terumah.

(24) The second Mishnah (Toh. IX, 4), according to which the ‘am ha-arez not to be trusted at all, refers to Galilee, whereas our own Mishnah according to which the ‘am ha-arez is to be trusted during the proper season, expressly refers to Judah. Tosaf. a.I. explains that the Galileans were rich and produced so much olive oil that their season continued much later.

(25) Lit., ‘the white (explanation)’.

(26) I.e., R. Nahman's.

## **Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 25b**

If an Associate and an ‘am ha-arez inherited [jointly] from their father, who was an ‘am ha-arez, [the Associate] may say to the other: ‘Take thou the wheat that is in one place, and I [shall take] the wheat that is in the other place; [or] take thou the wine that is in the one place, and I [shall take] the wine that is in the other’. But he may not say to him: ‘Take thou the liquid [produce] and I [shall take] the dry;’<sup>1</sup> [or] take thou the wheat and I [shall take] the barley’,<sup>2</sup> And it is taught with , regard to this: That Associate burns the liquid [produce]<sup>3</sup> and leaves the dry. Why now? Let him leave it for the coming [season of the] wine-press! — [It refers] to something which has no pressing [season].<sup>4</sup> — Let him leave it then for the [next] Festival!<sup>5</sup> — [It refers] to something which cannot be kept till the Festival. BUT IF HE SAID TO HIM, I HAVE SET APART THEREIN A QUARTER LOG AS A HALLOWED THING’, HE IS TRUSTED [IN REGARD TO THE PURITY OF THE WHOLE]. We have learnt there: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel agree that for the purpose of preparing the Passover sacrifice one may investigate [a field containing a ploughed grave],<sup>6</sup> but not for the purpose of eating terumah.<sup>7</sup> What is meant by ‘investigate’? — Rab Judah said that Samuel said: A man blows [on the ground]<sup>8</sup> of a Beth ha-Peras<sup>9</sup> [grave area] and proceeds. But R. Hiyya b. Abbah in the name of ‘Ulla said: A Beth ha-peras which has been trodden is clean.<sup>10</sup> In the case of those who go to prepare the Passover sacrifice, [the Sages] did not maintain their enactment<sup>11</sup> where kareth [extinction]<sup>12</sup> was involved; in the case of those who go to eat terumah, they maintained their enactment where death [at the hands of Heaven] was involved.<sup>13</sup> A question was asked: If one investigated [a Beth Peras] for his Passover sacrifice, may he [also] eat his terumah? Rabbah b. ‘Una said: If one investigated [a Beth Peras] for his Passover sacrifice, he may not [also] eat his terumah. Said an old [scholar] to him: Do not dispute with ‘Ulla, for we have learnt according to his view: BUT IF HE SAID TO HIM, ‘I HAVE SET APART THEREIN A QUARTER-LOG AS A HALLOWED THING’, HE IS TRUSTED [IN REGARD TO THE PURITY OF THE WHOLE]. Thus, since he is trusted in regard to hallowed things, he is trusted also in regard to terumah.<sup>14</sup> Likewise In our case, since he is credited [to be clean] in regard to the Passover sacrifice, he is credited [to be clean] also in regard to terumah. IN. REGARD TO JUGS OF WINE AND JUGS OF OIL etc. A Tanna taught: They are not trusted either in regard to the casks or in regard to the

terumah. Casks of what? If they are casks of hallowed things, then since they are trusted in regard to the hallowed things, they are to be trusted also in regard to the casks! If, on the other hand, they are casks of terumah, this is obvious? For if they are not trusted in regard to terumah, are they to be trusted in regard to the casks! it must refer, therefore, to empty [casks] of hallowed things<sup>15</sup> at any time of the year,<sup>16</sup> or to full [casks] of terumah at the time of the vats.<sup>17</sup> We have learnt: IN REGARD TO JUGS OF WINE AND JUGS OF OIL THAT ARE MIXED UP: surely [it means] mixed up with, terumah!<sup>18</sup> — The School of R. Hiyya said: [It means] mixed up with hallowed things. — But does ‘mixing up’ obtain in the case of hallowed things?<sup>19</sup> The School of R. Ila'i said: It is a case where he prepares his untithed produce<sup>20</sup> in purity in order to take therefrom drink-offerings.<sup>21</sup> PRIOR TO [THE SEASON OF] THE WINE-PRESSES SEVENTY DAYS. Abaye said: From this is to be deduced that it is obligatory on the aris [tenant]<sup>22</sup> to see to the provision of the jugs seventy days before the pressing-season.

MISHNAH. FROM MODI'IM<sup>23</sup> INWARDS<sup>24</sup> [THE POTTERS] ARE TRUSTED IN REGARD TO EARTHENWARE VESSELS; FROM MODI'IM OUTWARDS THEY ARE NOT TRUSTED.<sup>25</sup> FOR INSTANCE: IF THE POTTER WHO SELLS THE POTS ENTERED<sup>26</sup> INWARDS OF MODI'IM, THEN THE SAME POTTER<sup>27</sup> IN REGARD TO THE SAME POTS<sup>28</sup> AND IN REGARD TO THE SAME BUYERS<sup>29</sup> IS TRUSTED. BUT IF HE WENT OUT [FROM MODI'IM OUTWARDS] HE IS NOT TRUSTED.

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: Modi'im [itself] is sometimes [considered] as inwards, sometimes as outwards. For instance: If the potter is going Out and the Associate is coming in,<sup>30</sup> it is [considered] as inwards.<sup>31</sup> If both are coming in

(1) The former being susceptible to uncleanness, but not the latter.

(2) In regard to each kind of produce, the Associate may chose for himself the produce that has not been rendered susceptible to uncleanness, or which he knows still to be clean. But he is not entitled to exchange one kind of produce for another the heritage, and by so doing he would transgress Lev. XIX, 14, ('nor put a stumbling-block before the blind'). The principle (as Rashi explains) on which this Mishnah is based is that of **בְּרִירָה** (retrospective selection or designation; v. last. s.v.), which applies to different parts of the same produce, but not to different kinds of produce, because on the father's death a share in each kind of produce comprising the heritage falls in each heir.

(3) I.e., if he is a priest and inherits oil which is terumah, he may use it for kindling his lamp.

(4) I.e., no special manufacturing season, e.g., beer or meat. According to this explanation, 'burn' means 'destroy'.

(5) When the produce of the 'am ha-arez, is considered clean: v. pp, 165-6.

(6) I.e., if a man who is going to prepare his Passover sacrifice must traverse a field containing a ploughed grave, he may walk through the field provided he investigates his path so as to avoid defilement by contact with splintered bones; for bones from the size of a barley grain (unless they comprise a quarter-kab of the larger bones or the greater number of the bones, when they defile in accordance with the law of tent-covering'; v. p, 56, n. 6 and Oh. II, 1) defile only when touched or carried.

(7) Investigation cannot be relied upon; v. p, 160, n. 5.

(8) In order to blow away from his path any bone-splinters large enough to de-file by contact (v. supra, n. 6): the bigger bones he would see and avoid.

(9) **פֶּרֶס** == 'half' sc. furrow (cf Tosef. Neg. VII, 10, where Peras == 'half a loaf'. **בֵּית פֶּרֶס** (the area of, i.e., a square, Peras) is a technical term for a field, the area of fifty square cubits (a square half-furrow) rendered unclean on account of crushed bones carried over it from a ploughed grave; v. M.K. 5b and D.S. a.l. note; Oh. XVII, 1 where ten cubits represents the size of the full furrow; and Nid. 57a. The above explanation of Beth Peras follows Jastrow's view (v. Dict. s. **פֶּרֶס**) and adopts the reading **חֲצִי מֵעֵנָה** ('half a furrow') instead of the usual reading **מִלֵּא מֵעֵנָה** ('a full furrow') In M.K. 5b. I Rashi (to Nid. 57a) explains Peras from rt. meaning 'to break' i.e., an area of crushed bones; Maim. (to Oh. XVII) from rt. meaning 'to extend' i.e., area of extension; v. also Levy s.v.

(10) It should be investigated then by seeing whether it has been trodden or not.

(11) The uncleanness of a Beth Peras is a Rabbinic law.

(12) **כֶּרֶת** = **הִכְרַת** (Niph. infin.), 'to be cut off'; cf. the recurrent Pentateuchal formula, 'that soul shall be cut off

from among his people'. It is a term for divine punishment (opp. to **מיתה** capital punishment) incurred for thirty-six kinds of transgression (v. Ker. I, 1), including neglect to offer the Passover sacrifice at the proper time; v. Num. IX, 13. The nature of the punishment is variously explained: (a) childlessness (Rashi to Shab. 25a, s. **זכרת**); (b) premature death (M .K. 28a); (c) extinction of soul (Sanh. 64b). Maim. (Teshubah Ch. VIII) holds that kureith means that the soul perishes completely; but this view is controverted by Nahmanides (Comm. to Pentateuch end of **אזרה**).

(13) E.g., for wittingly eating terumah when he was unclean. Kureith is the severer penalty; nevertheless the Rabbis waived their enactment regarding a Beth Peras in the case of the Passover sacrifice, because it has a fixed time. But in the case of terumah, for the eating of which there is no fixed time, the priest must either avoid the Beth Peras by taking a longer route, or else if he traverses it, he must purify himself in accordance with the law of corpse-defilement, before partaking of the terumah (cf. our passage in Pes. 92b with Rashi and Tosaf. a.l.).

(14) For it would be unseemly that part of the wine should be offered as a libation, whilst another part, intended as terumah, should be considered unclean.

(15) Once the hallowed contents have been emptied out, the 'am ha-arez cannot be relied upon in regard to the purity of his vessels. —

(16) In regard to hallowed things, there is no distinction between the vat-seasons and the rest of the year.

(17) Though the 'am ha-arez was trusted at the appropriate pressing-season in regard to the terumah, in order that the Associate priests might not be deprived of the greater part of their dues, he was not trusted in regard to the vessels (cf. p. 163, 'And do not wonder, etc.'). Thus the priest could not accept the terumah in the original vessels, but had to empty it into his own.

(18) And yet he is trusted, the Mishnah tells us, in regard to the vessels! V. p. 156, n. 6.

(19) 'Mixing up' necessarily obtains in the case of terumah, because an untithed produce contains a part which must event many be set apart as terumah; but not so hallowed things, which have not perforce to be separated from the untithed produce. V. next note.

(20) Heb. tebel i.e., produces in that stage in which the separation of levitical and priestly shares respectively is required before one may partake of them; eatables forbidden pending the separation of sacred gifts. tebel, however, is not subject to tithes until it is brought home (Jast. s.v. **טבל**).

(21) I.e., unconsecrated produce, hallowed produce, and terumah are all mixed together; and since he is trusted in regard to the hallowed produce, he is also trusted in regard to both the terumah and the vessels on the principle explained on p. 161, n. 1.

(22) A sub-farmer who tills the owner's ground for a given share in the produce.

(23) In Mishnah edd., Modi'ith; also occurs as Moda'ith and Modi'im. V. I Macc. II,1. Described in pes. 93fi (q.v.) as fifteen mil — each of two thousand cubits or three thousand five hundred feet — from Jerusalem. Perhaps it is to be identified with the modern Amdiyeh, seventeen miles north-west of Jerusalem.

(24) I.e., towards Jerusalem.

(25) I.e., potters, who are 'amme ha-arez are trusted within this radius from Jerusalem in regard to small, essential earthenware vessels like pots and cups, because no furnaces, whether for pottery or lime, were permitted in Jerusalem on account of the smoke.

(26) Note the var. lec. in the Gemara quotation (v. p. 163, n. 4).

(27) I.e., who brought the vessels inwards of Modi'im; but should be transfer them to another potter (who is an 'am ha-arez) they may not be purchased.

(28) I.e., which the potter himself bought; but he is not trusted in regard to vessels he may have acquired from a local potter.

(29) I.e., only if the Associate buyers themselves saw the potter bring the vessels in, may they buy them from him.

(30) I.e., if the potter enters Modi'im from inwards and the Associate from out-wards.

(31) As the potter is leaving the inward area, the Associate is permitted to buy from him, in order that he should not be left without vessels.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 26a

or both are going Out [it is considered] as outwards.<sup>1</sup> Abaye said: We have also learnt [accordingly]: IF THE POTTER WHO SOLD THE POTS ENTERED INWARDS OF MODI'IM.<sup>2</sup> Thus, it is only because it is inwards of Modi'im [that he is trusted], but in Modi'im itself he is not trusted. Consider

now the latter part [of the Mishnah]: IF HE WENT OUT, HE IS NOT TRUSTED. THUS, IN MODI'IM ITSELF HE IS TO BE TRUSTED! It is clearly, then, to be deduced from this, that, in the one case,<sup>3</sup> the potter is going out and the Associate is coming in; In the other case, both are going out or both are coming in. Proven. A Tanna taught: They are trusted [only] in regard to small earthenware vessels for hallowed things.<sup>4</sup> Resh Lakish said: only if they can be taken in one hand. But R. Johanan said: Even if they cannot be taken in one hand. Resh Lakish said: They taught this Only of empty [vessels], but not of full ones. But R. Johanan said: Even of full ones, and even if his head-covering<sup>5</sup> is in it. Raba said: But R. Johanan admits that the liquid itself is unclean.<sup>6</sup> And do not wonder at the [anomaly] for in the case of a jar full of liquid, the jar is unclean for seven days, but the liquid is clean.<sup>7</sup> MISHNAH. IF TAX-COLLECTORS ENTERED A HOUSE,<sup>8</sup> AND SIMILARLY IF THIEVES RESTORED [STOLEN] VESSELS<sup>9</sup> THEY ARE BELIEVED IF THEY SAY: WE HAVE NOT TOUCHED [ANYTHING].<sup>10</sup> AND IN JERUSALEM THEY<sup>11</sup> ARE TRUSTED IN REGARD TO HALLOWED THINGS,<sup>12</sup> AND DURING A FESTIVAL<sup>13</sup> ALSO IN REGARD TO TERUMAH.

GEMARA. Now we shall point to a contradiction: If tax collectors entered a house, the whole house is rendered unclean!<sup>14</sup> — There is no contradiction: In the one case, a Gentile was with them;<sup>15</sup> in the other case, there was no Gentile with them. For we have learnt: If a Gentile is with them, they are believed if they say, 'We have not entered [at all]'; but they are not believed if they say, 'We entered but we did not touch [anything]'. — What difference does it make if a Gentile be with them? R. Johanan and R. Eleazar [explain it]: one says, They are afraid of the Gentile;<sup>16</sup> the other says. They are afraid of the Government.<sup>17</sup> What is the practical difference between them? — There is [a practical difference] between them when the Gentile is not of high standing.<sup>18</sup> AND SIMILARLY IF THIEVES RESTORED [STOLEN] VESSELS. Now we shall point to a contradiction: If thieves entered a house, It is not rendered unclean, except for the place where the feet of the thieves have trodden!<sup>19</sup> — R. Phinehas said in the name of Rab:<sup>20</sup> [The Mishnah speaks of a case] when they have repented.<sup>21</sup> It is moreover to be deduced, for [the Mishnah] teaches: [If the thieves] restore the vessels.<sup>22</sup> Proven. AND IN JERUSALEM, THEY ARE TRUSTED IN REGARD TO HALLOWED THINGS. A Tanna taught: They are trusted in regard to large earthenware vessels for hallowed things.<sup>23</sup> Why an this?<sup>24</sup> — Because no furnaces were erected in Jerusalem.<sup>25</sup> AND DURING A FESTIVAL ALSO IN REGARD TO TERUMAH. Whence is this deduced? — R. Joshua b. Levi said: Scripture Says: So all the men of Israel were gathered against the city, associated<sup>26</sup> as one man:<sup>27</sup> thus the verse made them an Associates.<sup>28</sup> MISHNAH. IF [AN ASSOCIATE] OPENED HIS JAR [OF WINE] OR BROKE INTO HIS DOUGH [TO SELL THEM] ON ACCOUNT OF THE FESTIVAL,<sup>29</sup> R. JUDAH SAYS,<sup>30</sup> HE MAY FINISH [SELLING THEM AFTER THE FESTIVAL];<sup>31</sup> BUT THE SAGES SAY, HE MAY NOT FINISH.<sup>32</sup> GEMARA. R. Ammi and R. Isaac Nappaha<sup>33</sup> sat in the anteroom<sup>34</sup> of R. Isaac Nappaha. One began and said: May he leave it for another Festival?<sup>35</sup> — Said the other to him: The hands of an touch it, and you say, Leave it for another Festival! Said the former: Did not, till now, the hands of an touch it?<sup>36</sup> — [The other] replied to him: What a comparison! It is alright up to now, because the Divine Law purified the uncleanness of the 'am ha-arez a during the Festival, but now it is unclean [retrospectively].<sup>37</sup> Shall we say that Tannaim differ thereon?<sup>38</sup> For one [Baraita] taught: He may leave it for another Festival; and another [Baraita] taught: He may not leave it for another Festival. Surely, Tannaim differ thereon! — No; the one [Baraita], which teaches that he may leave it, is according to R. Judah; the other which teaches that he may not leave it, is according to the Rabbis. But can you possibly think so! Behold, R. Judah said: He may finish [selling them]!<sup>39</sup> — Rather, [the Baraita] which teaches that he may not leave it is according to R. Judah, and the one that teaches that he may leave it is according to the Rabbis:<sup>40</sup> and 'he may not leave it' means that there is no need for him to leave it.

MISHNAH. AS SOON AS THE FESTIVAL WAS OVER, THEY CLEARED UP<sup>41</sup> FOR THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE COURT, IF THE FESTIVAL TERMINATED ON FRIDAY,



THEY DID NOT CLEAR UP ON ACCOUNT OF THE HONOUR DUE TO THE SABBATH.<sup>42</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: NEITHER ON THURSDAY,<sup>43</sup> FOR THE PRIESTS WERE NOT [YET] FREE.<sup>44</sup> GEMARA. A Tanna taught: For the priests were not [yet] free from [the prior duty of] removing the ashes.<sup>45</sup> MISHNAH. HOW DID THEY CLEAR UP FOR THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE COURT? THEY IMMERSED THE VESSELS WHICH WERE IN THE TEMPLE, AND THEY USED TO SAY TO THEM:<sup>46</sup> 'TAKE HEED

(1) In the first case, the Associate must wait till the potter comes inwards of Modi'im; in the second case, since the Associate did not avail himself of the opportunity of buying before he reached the city, he may no longer do so. It follows, a fortiori, that if the Associate is going outward and the potter coming inward, that the former must return and buy his vessels in the inward area.

(2) V. supra p. 162, n. 5.

(3) I.e., the latter.

(4) I.e., the statement in the Mishnah that from Modi'im inwards the potters are trusted in regard to earthenware vessels, refers only to small vessels for hallowed things, which are essential to the pilgrims, but not to large vessels like wine jars, which may be bought only in Jerusalem itself (v. p. 165).

(5) אֶפְקָרְסוֹתוֹ ; also אֶפְקָרְסוֹתוֹ אֶפְקָרְסִין ; cf. Peshita to Judg. XIV, 2 for Heb. סְדִינִים , Goldschmidt trails: 'Kopfhulle'; Levy, 'Hulle'; Jast., 'underwear'. Rashi annotates: Even if they are full of his own liquid, which is not hallowed! Whatever the exact signification of the word, the general meaning is clear: even if his profane things are in it, the vessel is considered clean; (v. however, D.S. II. 40). MS.M. has: 'Even if his head-covering fell therein

(6) Though the containing vessel is clean.

(7) V. p. 141, nn. 4-5.

(8) I.e., if Jewish tax-collectors, acting on behalf of a non-Jewish government. entered a Jewish house in order to seize pledges for the taxes due. Cf. Toh. VII, 6.

(9) Or simply 'articles'.

(10) I.e., they are trusted in regard to hallowed things but not terumah; so Rashi, who regards the whole of our Mishnah as a further exemplification of leniency in regard to hallowed things as compared with terumah (v. p. 155f); the Tosef., that he quotes in support of his view, corresponds to the reading in our edd. Tosaf. (s.v. הַגְּבֵאִין ), on the other hand, refers the Mishnah to terumah as well and quotes in support a different version of the same Tosef. statement.

(11) I. e., the 'amme ha-arez.

(12) V. Gemara infra p. 165.

(13) When an are considered to be clean; cf. p. 165, n. 11 and p. 166.

(14) I.e., an the utensils are to be regarded as unclean, for it is to be presumed that the tax-collectors touched them.

(15) I.e., in the latter case, the tax-collectors are not believed if they say that they have not touched, because they are bound, in the presence of the Gentile, to have searched everything.

(16) Lest he punish them.

(17) Lest the Gentile inform against them.

(18) In which case he himself has not the power to punish them, but he is able to inform against them.

(19) Now if the place on which they stood is unclean, then certainly the vessels they took and are now returning must be unclean!

(20) In Yeb. 22b, R. Papa; in B.M. 62a, Raba; in B.K. 94b and Sanh. 85a simply: As R. Phinehas said.

(21) I.e., only if, in consequence of their repentance, they restored the stolen vessels, are they believed, in accordance with our Mishnah, if they say that they have not been touched.

(22) Showing their repentance.

(23) And, a fortiori, in regard to small vessels. The J.T. distinctly states that they are trusted in regard to the purity of an vessels for hallowed things.

(24) The question refers also to the regulations regarding small vessels contained in the preceding Mishnah (p. 162).

(25) For making either small or large vessels. Consequently, permission was granted to buy vessels from the 'am ha-arcs. In the case of small vessels, which were in greater demand, the permission was extended to a fifteen mile radius round Jerusalem; in the case of large vessels, purchase was permitted only in Jerusalem.

(26) E.V. 'knit together'.

(27) Judg. XX, 11.

- (28) Similarly, at Festivals when all the men of Israel were gathered', they were to be regarded as Associates.
- (29) Although the goods are touched by 'amme ha-arez, they remain clean throughout the Festival (cf. p. 164, n. 6).
- (30) The order of the disputants is reversed in Rashi.
- (31) Otherwise the vendors will be discouraged from sending their goods, and the pilgrims will not have sufficient food; v. Bez. 11b.
- (32) I.e., he may not send the goods, because they are considered unclean retrospectively (v. infra n. 8 and cf. next Mishnah).
- (33) I.e., 'smith'.
- (34) Lit., 'curtain'; 'curtained enclosure'.
- (35) The question refers to the view of the Sages in the Mishnah, i.e., may the goods be kept till the following Festival, when again they are regarded as clean?
- (36) I.e., during the Festival so many amme ha-arez touched it, and yet it is considered clean throughout the festive period.
- (37) An Associate may never sell unclean goods; and although throughout the Festival the goods were held to be clean, immediately after the Festival the concession ceases, and the goods become retrospectively unclean, because they were touched by 'amme ha-arez.
- (38) I.e., on the question raised above as to whether the wine etc. may be left for another Festival.
- (39) After the Festival and need not leave them over for the next Festival.
- (40) Rashi reverses the order of the disputants; cf. p. 165, n. 12.
- (41) Lit., 'removed', sc. the utensils, which, having been touched during the Festival by 'amme ha-arez, now become retrospectively unclean.
- (42) Every priest had to make preparations for the Sabbath, in his own home.
- (43) But waited till after the Sabbath.
- (44) V. Gemara.
- (45) Which, were piled up during the whole of the Festival in the centre of the altar, called Tappuah (Apple); v. Tam. II, 2.
- (46) I.e., to the 'amme ha-arez priests who went to prostrate themselves in the Hekal (i.e., the Holy Hall where the golden altar etc. stood). Ordinary Israelites, on the other hand, were not permitted to pass even between the Entrance Hall and the altar.

## **Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 26b**

THAT YE TOUCH NOT THE TABLE [AND THUS RENDER IT UNCLEAN]'.<sup>1</sup> ALL THE VESSELS THAT WERE IN THE TEMPLE HAD SECOND AND THIRD SETS, SO THAT IF THE FIRST WERE RENDERED UNCLEAN, THEY MIGHT BRING A SECOND SET IN ITS PLACE. ALL THE VESSELS THAT WERE IN THE TEMPLE REQUIRED IMMERSION,<sup>2</sup> EXCEPT THE ALTAR OF GOLD<sup>3</sup> AND THE ALTAR OF BRONZE,<sup>4</sup> FOR THEY WERE ACCOUNTED AS THE GROUND:<sup>5</sup> THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ELIEZER. BUT THE SAGES SAY: BECAUSE THEY WERE OVERLAID [WITH METAL].<sup>6</sup>

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: 'Take heed lest ye touch the Table or the Candlestick'. — Why does not our Tanna mention the Candlestick? — In connection with the Table, there is written [the word] 'Tamid' [perpetual];<sup>7</sup> in connection with the Candlestick, there is not written [the word] 'Tamid'.<sup>8</sup> And the other [Tanna]?<sup>9</sup> — Since it is written: And the Candlestick over against the Table,<sup>10</sup> it is as though [the word] 'Tamid' were written in connection there-with.<sup>11</sup> And the other [Tanna]?<sup>12</sup> -That [verse] comes merely to fix its place. But I can, [on the contrary,] deduce it<sup>13</sup> from the fact that [the Table] is a wooden utensil made for resting [things on it],<sup>14</sup> and any wooden utensil made for resting [things on it] is not subject to uncleanness! — What is the reason? — We require it to be like a sack:<sup>15</sup> Just as a sack is movable both full and empty, so everything that is movable both full and empty [is susceptible to uncleanness].<sup>16</sup> This, too, is movable both full and empty. As Resh Lakish [said]: for Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the verse, Upon the clean, table?<sup>17</sup> , The inference is that it is susceptible to uncleanness. But why? It is a wooden utensil made for resting

[things on it], and cannot, therefore, contract uncleanness! It teaches, therefore, that they used to lift it and show thereon to the Festival pilgrims the showbread, and to say to them: Behold the love in which you are held by the Omnipresent; it is taken away as [fresh as] it is set down. For R. Joshua b. Levi said: A great miracle was Performed in regard to the showbread: As [fresh as] It was when set down, so was it taken away. For it is said: To put hot bread it the day when it was taken away.<sup>18</sup> But I can deduce this<sup>19</sup> from the fact that it is overlaid!<sup>20</sup> For behold we have learnt: If a table or a side-table<sup>21</sup> was damaged,<sup>22</sup> or was overlaid with marble,<sup>23</sup> but room was left<sup>24</sup> for setting cups thereon, it remains susceptible to uncleanness.<sup>25</sup> R. Judah said: There must be room [also] for Setting Portions [of food thereon].<sup>26</sup> And should you say, Acacia wood<sup>27</sup> is valuable and is not nullified [by the plating], this would be quite right according to Resh Lakish, who said: They taught this<sup>28</sup> only of utensils of common wood,<sup>29</sup> which come from overseas, but utensils of polished wood<sup>30</sup> are not nullified But what can one say according to R. Johanan, who said: Even vessels of polished wood become nullified [by the plating]? And should you say: The one [Mishnah] refers to a fixed<sup>31</sup> covering, the other to a covering that is not fixed,<sup>32</sup> behold Resh Lakish asked R. Johanan: [Does it<sup>33</sup> apply only] to a fixed covering, or [also] to a covering that is not fixed? [Only] to overlaid rims, or [also] if the rims are not overlaid? And he answered him: It makes no difference whether the covering is fixed or the covering is not fixed; whether the rims are overlaid or the rims are not overlaid! Rather, [must you say], the Table is different

(1) I.e., the table of the showbread, which could not be removed for immersion since the showbread was to be on it continually, v. Gemara. Some texts add: 'And the Candlestick'; but v. p. 168.

(2) On account of the uncleanness contracted during the Festival.

(3) V. Ex. XXX, 1ff.

(4) V. Ex. XXVII, 1ff and I Kings VIII, 64.

(5) Utensils of earth are not susceptible to uncleanness; v. pp. 170- 171 and cf. Sheb. X, 7; Uk, III, 10.

(6) Explained infra 27a; cf. Kel. XI, 2, 4, 6.

(7) V. Ex. XXV, 30 ('always').

(8) Actually, the word 'Tamid' is used of the Temple lamp (cf. Ex. XXVII, 20, 'to cause a lamp to burn continually'); but, as Rashi points out, it has not the same meaning when applied to the Candlestick as when applied to the Table. In the case of the latter, 'perpetual' means 'day and night', for the showbread remained on the Table from Sabbath to Sabbath. In the case of the former, it merely means 'every night', as the expression from evening unto morning' (ibid. XXVII, 21) indicates (v. Men. 89a); thus, the Candle-stick could be removed during the day. For a similar use of the word 'Tamid' cf. Ex. XXIX, 38 and Lev. VI, 13. For the difficulty raised by the statement in Tam. 30b that the western lamp of the Candlestick burned an day, v. Tosaf. a.I. (s.v. **מְנוֹרָה**).

(9) I.e., why does the Tanna of the Baraitha include the Candlestick?

(10) Ex. XXVI, 35.

(11) I.e., the meaning of the verse is — so long as the Table is there so long must the Candlestick be over against it.

(12) I.e., why does the Tanna of our Mishnah exclude the Candlestick?

(13) I.e., the insusceptibility of the Table to uncleanness.

(14) So Jast. and Levy; But Rashi explains: a wooden utensil intended to rest in one place; and Goldschmidt translates: 'Ein ruhendes Holzger\_t'.

(15) I.e., in order to be susceptible to uncleanness, we require a wooden utensil to be like a sack, for they are mentioned together in one verse (Lev. XI, 32) in respect of defilement.

(16) This would exclude wooden vessels not intended to be moved at all or such as cannot be moved when full because of their liability to break i.e., a vessel containing forty se'ahs of liquid or two kors of dry goods.

(17) Lev. XXIV, 6.

(18) I Sam. XXI, 7. I.e., it was still 'hot breath in the day when it was taken away'.

(19) I.e., that the Table was susceptible to uncleanness even though intended for resting things on it (or to rest in one place).

(20) With gold; since metal utensils are not likened to a sack, they are susceptible to defilement even if they are not intended to be moved.

(21) **דולפיקי** (delphica, sub. mensa) a three-legged table used as a toilet table or a water, contrad. from **שלהן** (eating

table); (last.).

(22) If it is so damaged as to be useless for its original purpose, it becomes insusceptible to uncleanness.

(23) Stone vessels are not susceptible to uncleanness.

(24) I.e., part of the table was left undamaged or uncovered with marble.

(25) Because it is still useful for its original purpose.

(26) Otherwise, it does not serve the purpose of a table, and consequently becomes insusceptible to uncleanness. For a fuller explanation of the principles involved, v. תפארת ישראל to the Mishnah, Kel. XXII, 1. According to either view, however, it is evident that an object's insusceptibility to uncleanness is dependent on the covering: if the marble can render a table unsusceptible to defilement, then a fortiori, the gold plating renders the Sanctuary Table susceptible to defilement.

(27) Of which the Table was made: v. Ex. XXV, 23.

(28) I.e., that the covering is an-important and nullifies the wood.

(29) Or foresters' apparel (i.e., leather covers), Jast. Aliter (on basis of other reading): camping apparel', Jast.; Levy: eingewirkte Kleidung\_cke.

(30) Probably coral-wood (so Jast.). Levy 'Kostbare Holzart' (s.v. מסימום ).

(31) Lit., 'standing', i.e., fixed e.g., with nails.

(32) The covering of the Temple Table (of which our Mishnah speaks) was not fixed.

(33) I.e., the Mishnah of the table and side-table, which teaches that the susceptibility of the table to uncleanness depends on the covering.

## Talmud - Mas. Chagigah 27a

for the Divine Law cans it Wood.<sup>1</sup> For it is written: The altar, three cubits high, and the length thereof two cubits, was of food, and so the corners; the length thereof and the walls thereof, were also of wood; and he said unto me: 'This is the table that is before the Lord'.<sup>2</sup> — [The verse] begins with the altar and ends with the table! R. Johanan and Resh Lakish both explain: At the time when the Temple stood, the altar used to make atonement for a person; now a person's table makes atonement for him.<sup>3</sup> ALL THE VESSELS IN THE TEMPLE HAD SECOND SETS ETC. THE ALTAR OF BRONZE<sup>4</sup> for it is written: An altar of earth<sup>5</sup> thou shalt make unto Me.<sup>6</sup> 'THE ALTAR OF GOLD', for it is written: The candlestick and the altars;<sup>7</sup> thus, the altars are likened one to another. BUT THE SAGES SAY: BECAUSE THEY WERE OVERLAID [WITH METAL]. On the contrary, since they were overlaid, they were susceptible to uncleanness!<sup>8</sup> — Read: 'But the Sages declared them Unclean because they were overlaid'. Or, alternatively, I can explain: The Rabbis say it to R. Eliezer: What have you in mind?<sup>9</sup> The fact that they were overlaid?<sup>10</sup> But their Plating was quite nullified in regard to them.<sup>11</sup> R. Abbahu said that R. Eleazar said: The fire of Gehinnom<sup>12</sup> has no power over the Scholars. It is an ad majus conclusion [to be drawn] from the salamander.<sup>13</sup> If now [in the case of] the salamander, which is [only] an offspring of fire, he who anoints himself with its blood is not affected by fire, how much more so the Scholars, whose whole body is fire, for it is written: Is not My word like as fire? saith the Lord.<sup>14</sup> Resh Lakish said. The fire of Gehinnom has no power over the transgressors of Israel. It is an ad majus conclusion [to be drawn] from the altar of gold. If the altar of gold, on which there is only a denar thickness of gold,<sup>15</sup> is not affected through so many years by the fire, how much less so the transgressors of Israel, who are full of good deeds<sup>16</sup> as a pomegranate [is of seeds]; for it is written, Thy temples are like a pomegranate split open.<sup>17</sup> Read not 'thy temples' [rakkathek] but 'thy worthless ones' [rekanim shebak].<sup>18</sup>

(1) Even when overlaid. Hence, it has to be regarded as a wooden utensil made for resting things on it, and, but for the fact that it used to be lifted to exhibit the showbread on it, would not be susceptible to uncleanness.

(2) Ezek. XLI, 22.

(3) Through the hospitality shown to poor guests. Cf. R. Johanan's statements about 'a mouthful of food' at the end of San. 103b (Sonc. ed., p. 705).

(4) Sc. is accounted as the ground.

(5) Understood here to refer to the altar of bronze; but v. Tosaf s.v. מזבה.

- (6) Ex. XX, 24.
- (7) Num. III, 31.
- (8) For were they not overlaid with metal, they would belong to the category of wooden utensils made for resting things on them which are insusceptible to uncleanness (v. p. 168).
- (9) I.e., what is your reason for declaring the altars to be insusceptible to uncleanness solely on the ground that Scripture terms them earth, but not because they are utensils made for resting things on them?
- (10) And are consequently to be regarded as metal vessels, which are susceptible to uncleanness.
- (11) Because Scripture terms them 'wood' (Ezek. XLI, 22; cf. p. 170).
- (12) V. p. 82, n. 1.
- (13) A fabulous animal generated in fire which, according to the Midrash, must burn incessantly for seven days and nights; but Rashi here postulates seven years, and the Aruch (s.v.) seventy years. For a fun account of the legend, v. J. E. vol. X, pp. 646-7.
- (14) Jer. XXIII, 29.
- (15) Denarius, v. Glos. For Moses wonder at the miracle, v. Tosaf. s.v. **וְשֵׁשׁ**.
- (16) Lit., 'precepts'.
- (17) Cant. IV, 3.
- (18) Lit., 'thy empty ones'. The thought is the reverse of Eccl. VII, 20; there is none in Israel that sinneth, and yet doeth not good, for even the transgressors, devoid of merit as they may seem, still have innumerable good deeds to their credit.