

# IX

---

## BABYLONIAN TALMUD

### SOTAH

### CHAPTER NINE

## FOLIOS 44B-49B

9:1-2F

9:1

- A. The rite of the heifer whose neck is to be broken is said in the Holy Language,
- B. since it is said, “If one be found slain in the land lying in the field...”
- C. “Then your elders your judges shall come forth” (Deu. 21: 1-2).
- D. Three from the high court in Jerusalem went forth.
- E. R. Judah says, “Five, since it is said, Your elders — thus, two, and your judges, thus two, and there is no such thing as a court made up of an even number of judges, so they add to their number yet one more.

M. 9:1

- A. [If] it was found hidden under a heap of rocks or hanging from a tree or floating on the surface of water, they did not break the neck of a heifer.
- B. since it is said, On the ground [Deu. 21: 1] — not hidden under a pile of rock.
- C. Lying — not hung on a tree.
- D. In the field — not floating on the water.
- E. [If] it was found near the frontier, near a town which had a gentile majority, or near a town which had no court, they did not break a heifer’s neck.
- F. They measure only from a town which has a court.

M. 9:2

- I.1** A. [The rite of the heifer whose neck is to be broken is said in the Holy Language, since it is said, “If one be found slain in the land lying in the field...”:] *What is the sense [of the statement of B as a proof-text, since it does not indicate that the rite must be conducted in the Hebrew language]?*

- B. *Said R. Abbahu, "This is the sense [of the whole]: As it is said, '...And they shall answer and say...' (Deu. 21: 7). Elsewhere it says, '...And the Levites shall answer and say' (Deu. 27:14).*
- C. *"Just as the 'answering' in the latter passage is to be done in the Holy Language, so here too it must be in the Holy Language."*

**II.1** A. And as to the procedure of the rite of the heifer whose neck is to be broken, how is it to be carried out?

- B. **"If one be found slain in the land lying in the field... then your elders and your judges shall come forth' (Deu. 21: 1-2) — three from the high court in Jerusalem went forth" [M. 9:1A-D].**
- C. **R. Judah says, "Five" [M. 9:1E]:**
- D. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. *"Then your elders and your judges shall come forth' (Deu. 21: 1-2):*
- F. *"Your elders' indicate that two are required.*
- G. *"Your judges' indicates that another two are required.*
- H. *"A court cannot be of an even number, so they add on to their number yet another, lo, there are five," the words of R. Judah.*
- I. *R. Simeon says, "Your elders' indicates that they are two, and a court cannot be an even number, so they add to them yet another, lo, three in all."*
- J. *But R. Simeon also has to deal with the fact that "Your judges" also has been written.*
- K. *That he requires to prove a different point entirely, namely, to indicate that they must be the select among the judges.*
- L. *And R. Judah derives that fact from the use of the word "your elders."*
- M. *And R. Simeon? [He argues as follows:] "If the All-Merciful had written, 'Elders,' I might have reached the conclusion that even ordinary elders of the market place [would suffice]. So the All-Merciful wrote, 'Your elders.'*
- N. *"And if the All-Merciful had written merely, 'Your elders,' I might have reached the conclusion that even members of a lesser sanhedrin would suffice.*
- O. *"Accordingly, the All-Merciful wrote, 'Your judges,' to indicate that they are to be among the select of your judges."*
- P. *And R. Judah derives the lesson from the use of "elders," in the verse, "The elders of the congregation" (Lev. 4:15) [as well as in the present context]. Just as, at that passage, the reference is to select among the congregation, so here too it must be the select among the congregation.*
- Q. *But if in such a way one can derive the besought lesson for the entire rule from the cited passage, then what need is there to say, "Your elders and your judges"? [That is, if Judah can derive from Lev. 4:15 the rule that five elders are necessary, why introduce the exegesis of "and your judges" for proof that five judges are necessary? He has made that point quite admirably on the basis of a different verse.]*
- R. *But the use of the word "and" in the word "and your judges" is what serves to indicate the number [of judges that are required].*

- S. And R. Simeon? **[45A]** *In his view the use of the word “and” bears no supererogatory implications whatsoever.*
- T. *But [in light of B-E and F] then how do you deal with the possibility of the following: “And they shall come forth” (Deu. 21: 2) means that two must do so, “and they shall measure” (ibid.) means that two must do so.*
- U. *In the view of R. Judah, then, there should be nine, and in the view of R. Simeon, lo, there are seven. [That is, the verbs appearing in the same verse appear to add another four judges to the requisite number. The problem confronts both authorities.]*
- V. *[No, in the view of neither party should that conclusion be drawn. For] the cited language is required for the following purpose:*
- W. *As it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “And they shall go forth” (Deu. 21: 2) means, they and not their agents.*
- X. *“And they shall measure” indicates that even if the corpse is found within the limits of a particular town [in which case there is no reason to measure between one town and another], they still should take the measurement.*
- Y. *For it is a religious duty to take up the task of measuring.*

**I.2.** A. *[The formulation of] the Mishnah-paragraph at hand [when it specifies that we deal with members of the sanhedrin] does not accord with the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.*

- B. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “Your elders’ refers to the sanhedrin.*
- C. *“Your judges’ refers to the king and the high priest.”*
- D. *“The king,’ as it is written, ‘Your king by judgment establishes the land’ (Pro. 29: 4).*
- E. *“And the high priest,’ as it is written, ‘And you shall come to the Levitical priests and to the judge who will be...’ (Deu. 17: 9).” [Cohen, p. 227, n. 9: “And” is understood as “even,” therefore the priests acted as judges, and since one in particular is specified in “the judge” it must be the high priest.]*

**I.3.** A. *The following question was raised: Is it solely with reference to the king and high priest that R. Eliezer b. Jacob differs, but, so far as the sanhedrin is concerned, he concurs with either R. Judah or R. Simeon?*

- B. *Or perhaps he differs also with respect to the sanhedrin [insisting that] all those who are present must be members of the sanhedrin?*
- C. *Said R. Joseph, “Come and take note [of the following relevant case]:*
- D. *“[If] the whole of the great sanhedrin was found in Bethpage by a rebellious elder and he rebelled against them [in their entirety], is it possible to suppose that his rebellion is taken into account? [That is, if a local judge rejected the decision of the great sanhedrin and went and ruled contrary to their decision, what is the rule?]*
- E. *“Scripture states, ‘And you will arise and go up to the place...’ (Deu. 17: 8) [at which the great sanhedrin is located].*
- F. *“This teaches that it is the location which indicates [where the rebellion is to be punished. [ If the ruling of the great sanhedrin did not come from Jerusalem, rebellion against that ruling is null.]*

- G. “Now what has happened is that a rebellious elder has come across the great sanhedrin. He can be declared rebellious only by the court of seventy-one. He asked the court at hand — which just happens to be the same membership as the high court in Jerusalem — and then he rejected their ruling. What did he do? He went home and instructed the people to act as he had originally done, without taking account of the ruling of the high court. But if the court did not issue its decision in Jerusalem, the matter is null, as shown in the proof-text.]
- H. *“Now exactly how many [members of the great sanhedrin] had gone forth from Jerusalem? If we say that only part of the court had gone forth, [in such a case can there be a ruling that the man is a rebellious elder? Surely not, for] some of those who had remained behind may be of the same view as the accused. [In the case he can claim minority support. Accordingly, we can invoke the possibility of the man’s being condemned as a rebellious elder] only if, as is self-evident, the whole of the court [great sanhedrin] had gone forth. [So that is the supposition at hand.]*
- I. *“Now for what purpose will the court have gone forth?*
- J. *“If it is for a merely optional matter [and not an obligatory one] can the entire court leave its chambers in such a way?*
- K. *‘And is it not written, ‘Your navel is like a round goblet, wherein no mingled wine is wanting’ (Son. 7: 3). [This is regarded as referring to the sanhedrin and is understood as requiring that at least a third of the sanhedrin must be present at any session.]*
- L. “This indicates, then, that if one of the members has to go forth [e.g., to the toilet], if there are remaining twenty-three members, equivalent to an ordinary, small sanhedrin, he may do so. But if not, he may not do so.
- M. *“Accordingly, it is self-evident that the entire court could have gone forth only to carry out a religious obligation.*
- N. *“And for what purpose? Is it not for the purpose of taking the measurements in connection with a heifer whose neck was to be broken because of the discovery of a neglected corpse.*
- O. *“And this would then represent the theory of R. Eliezer b. Jacob [who thus would require the presence of the entire sanhedrin].”. [The question raised above, A, thus has been answered.]*
- P. *Said Abayye to [Joseph, who has supplied the proof], “Perhaps it was an exodus from the city in order to add to the territorial limits of the city and the courts.*
- Q. *“For we have learned in the Mishnah: **Only a court of seventy-one may add ground to the city and to the courtyards [M. Shebu. 2:2].”***
- R. *But it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Joseph:*
- S. If [a rebellious elder] found the court at Bethpage and rebelled against them, for instance, if the court had gone forth to measure the distance in connection with the breaking of the neck of a heifer or in order to add to the territory of the city and the courtyards,
- T. is it possible that his act of rebellion should take effect?
- U. Scripture says, “And you will arise and you will go up” (Deu. 17: 8), which teaches that it is the location that causes [the law at hand to take effect. If the act

of rebellion does not involve a decision reached by the high court in its proper meeting place, which then is rejected by the elder at hand, the act of rebellion is null.]

The interest in the authority behind an anonymous and official rule carries forward into the next clause as well.

**III.1 A. If [the neglected corpse] was found hidden under a heap of rocks or hanging from a tree [M. 9:2A]:**

- B. *May I propose that the Mishnah-rule at hand accords with the view of R. Judah and not that of rabbis [vis à vis Judah]?*
- C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “And you have forgotten a sheaf in the field’ (Deu. 24:19) — excluding a sheaf that was hidden,” the word of R. Judah. [In the Mishnah’s rule, if a neglected corpse is not in the field but hanging or hidden, it is not within Scripture’s rule about finding the corpse and therefore having to offer the heifer-sacrifice. Judah then would concur, since a sheaf that was hidden does not fall into the category of one that has been forgotten. “Being forgotten” means left lying without care. The act of hiding or burying the sheaf means it is cared for, so too with the corpse.]
- E. And sages say, “‘In the field’ serves to encompass what is hidden.” [So why not the corpse too?]
- F. *Said Rab, “You may even say that the Mishnah’s rule accords with rabbis. Here we deal with the matter of the sense of the verse of Scripture at hand, and there we likewise deal with the same sort of matter.*
- G. *“For it has been written, ‘If one be found slain’ (Deu. 21: 1) — wherever it happens to be found. ‘In the field’ (Deu. 21: 1) — excluding a corpse that is hidden. [In such a case the rite is not carried on.]*
- H. *“And there we deal with the context established by Scripture, for it is written, ‘When you reap your harvest in your field and have forgotten a sheaf’ (Deu. 24:19).*
- I. *“[Explaining the sense of the foregoing]: The act of forgetting must be parallel to the act of harvesting. Just as the harvesting is done in public, so the forgetting is done in public. But then [ — contrary to the verse — ] the All-Merciful has written the word, ‘In the field’ so as to encompass even a sheaf that has been hidden.” [Accordingly, Rab is able to explain how both parties can concur with the rule at hand, with rabbis explaining the verse of Scripture in such a way as to justify the Mishnah’s rule.]*
- J. *And as to R. Judah, he too should derive the rule from the comparison of the act of forgetting to the act of harvesting.*
- K. *That indeed could have been the case. But how does he make use of the phrase, “In the field”?*
- L. *He requires it to include in the category of the forgotten sheaf a patch of standing grain that the farmer has [not harvested but] overlooked.*
- M. *And how do rabbis derive the fact that a patch of standing grain that has been overlooked falls into the category of the forgotten sheaf?*
- N. *They derive it from the statement, “When you harvest your harvest in your field” [with the “forgetting” applying to what is in the field, not only what is harvested].*

- O. *And R. Judah derives that exegesis of the scriptural language to prove the [quite separate] point that R. Abbahu stated in the name of R. Eleazar.*
- P. *For R. Abbahu said R. Eleazar said, "Excluded is the case in which sheaves have been carried [by wind] into the field of the fellow." [That is why Scripture refers to "your field," thus excluding produce belonging to a farmer that has been forgotten in a field not belonging to that farmer.]*
- Q. *And rabbis derive the same lesson from the use of the word "Your" in "your field." [Accordingly, since Scripture speaks of "your field," it must mean exactly what Judah has said. Had that lesson not been intended, the Scripture could have stated merely, "field."]*
- R. *And R. Judah does not derive any lesson from the use of "your" in connection with "field."*

We now pursue a secondary development of the foregoing subject, picking up on 1.P, and ignoring the reason in Mishnah-exegesis that the subject has emerged.

- III.2.** A. *R. Jeremiah raised the following question, "[If] the sheaves were carried [by the wind] into one's own field, what is the law? Do we regard the contained airspace above a field as equivalent to the field?*
- B. *"Or is it not regarded as equivalent to the field? [That is to say, the sheaves fell in the farmer's field during the harvest, but not into the ground. They fell on a rock or in some way remained suspended above the farmer's field.]"*
- C. *Said R. Kahana to R. Pappa, and some say that R. Kahana said it to R. Zebid, "You may find an answer to the question that R. Abbahu has raised in the name of R. Eleazar from the statement, 'Excluded is the case in which the sheaves were blown into the field of one's fellow.' Accordingly, we may say that if the sheaves were carried by the wind into one's fellow's field, then the rule applies [that the sheaves are not regarded as having fallen into the category of 'forgotten,' but if the sheaves were in one's own field [but not on the ground], they do fall into the category of forgotten sheaves."*
- D. *But, according to the present ruling, if [you draw the parallel you propose, then] if the sheaves were brought by the wind into one's fellow's field, they would be exempted from the category of forgotten sheaves, but if they were merely lying [e.g., on a rock], they would not be exempted from the category of forgotten sheaves.*
- E. *And yet, we require that the sheaves be lost in the harvest in "your field" and here we do not have "your field" but your neighbor's field. [So we have an absurd result, if we draw the analogy just now proposed!]*
- F. *But the rule must be that if the sheaves were carried by the wind into one's fellow's field, and even if they were resting on a rock, they do not fall into the category of the forgotten sheaf.*
- G. *And as to the language used, "Blow," that is used because you would find an exemplary case only where the wind actually blew the sheaf into the neighbor's field.*
- H. *Come and take note [of another route to the answer of Jeremiah's question]:*



- I. As regards a sheaf that the householder picked up in order to take it to the city for sale [M. **Pe. 6:3C**], and that he set on top of another sheaf, and then left behind both [the top and the bottom sheaves],
- J. the bottom sheaf is subject to the restrictions of the forgotten sheaf, and the top sheaf is not subject to the restrictions of the forgotten sheaf.
- K. R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, “Both of them are not subject to the restrictions of the forgotten sheaf, the bottom sheaf because it is covered and so removed from sight, and the top because it is suspended [not lying on the ground]” [T. **Pe. 3:3**].
- L. *Accordingly, there is no difference of opinion [about the one on the top] but only about the one on the bottom.*
- M. But as to the one on the top, all parties concur that it does not fall into the category of a forgotten sheaf. [What is suspended thus does not fall into the category of the forgotten sheaf, and the contained airspace is not equivalent to the field itself, the answer to Jeremiah’s inquiry at A].
- N. *No, the present case is different [from the one concerning which Jeremiah asked], for, since the farmer has taken hold of the sheaf, he has acquired possession of it. [So it cannot fall into the category of a forgotten sheaf.]*
- O. *If so, then why frame matters in terms of “on top of its fellow”? Even if the sheaf were on the ground itself, [it would fall into the same category].*
- P. *That is indeed the case, and the reason that the framer of the passage has phrased matters as, “On top of its fellow,” is on account of the case of the sheaf on the bottom.*
- Q. *Why then speak of the matter in terms of “because it is suspended” [since that detail has no bearing on the issue]?*
- R. *It should read, “Because it is in the category of something that is suspended.” [Cohen, p. 23, n. 2: It is exempt from the law of the forgotten sheaf because, having been in the owner’s hand, it is like something suspended and not lying upon the ground.]*

Now we revert to the topic of the Mishnah. What we have is reasonably contiguous to the Mishnah-clause that is treated in the present composite, namely, the condition in which the neglected corpses turn up. But the entry bears closer ties to No. 2 than appear on the surface, since in the foregoing we have dealt with forgotten sheafs, one on top of the other, and here we deal with two neglected corpses, one on top of the other. It will quickly become apparent that No. 3 is correctly positioned in sequence to No. 2, and the whole then form a cogent statement, with No 3 leading us back to No. 1 via No. 2.

- III.3.** A. Said Abayye, “Lo, I am like Ben Azzai in the marketplaces of Tiberias [ready to meet all comers and to answer their questions].”
- B. *One of the rabbis asked Abayye, “In the case of two neglected corpses, one of top of the other, from what point does [the court] take the measurement?*
- C. *“Is it that since we have two things of the same category, the one on the bottom is regarded as hidden, and the one on the top is not regarded as suspended, so therefore one takes the measurement from the upper corpse.*

- D. *“Or perhaps we have a case of two things of the same category, in which case, the one of the top is regarded as suspended, and the one on the bottom is not regarded as hidden, and, therefore, one takes the measurement from the lower corpse?”*
- E. *“Or perhaps where you have two things of the same category, you have to rule that the one on the bottom is regarded as hidden, and the one on the top is regarded as floating, and one takes the measurement neither from the bottom nor from the top?”*
- F. *He said to him, [45B] “You have learned the following Tannaite teaching:*
- G. **“As regards a sheaf that the householder picked up in order to take it to the city for sale, and that he set on top of another sheaf, and then left behind both the top and the bottom sheaves, the bottom sheaf is subject to the restrictions of the forgotten sheaf, and the top is not subject to the restrictions of the forgotten sheaf.**
- H. **“R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, ‘Both of them are not subject to the restrictions of the forgotten sheaf, the bottom sheaf because it is covered [hidden] and so removed from sight, and the top sheaf because it is suspended [not lying on the ground]’ [T. Pe. 3:3].”**
- I. *In proposing to derive the answer from the cited passage, [Abbayye] took the position that the Tannaite authorities at hand concurred with R. Judah, who said, “In the field,” thus excluding one that was hidden.*
- J. *Would they not then have differed in the following way:*
- K. One authority holds the view that, where we have two things of the same category, you have a case of one that is hidden, and the other authority took the view that you do not have the case in which one of them was hidden. [This would then allow us to refer to the problem addressed to Abayye and to solve it by way of analogy, e.g., to C or D).]
- L. *No, if the authorities at hand concur with the principle of R. Judah, then all parties concur that where you have two things that fall into the same category, you have a case in which the lower of the two is regarded as hidden [C]. Here, then, the authorities at hand differ in the matter of R. Judah and rabbis.*
- M. *Rabbis here concur with rabbis [vis à vis Judah], and R. Simeon b. Judah concurs with R. Judah. [Judah regards the hidden sheaf as not falling into the category of the forgotten sheaf.]*
- N. *If that is the case, then why refer to a sheaf on top of another sheaf? Even if the sheaf were in dirt or pebbles, it would also fall under the same rule.*
- O. *That is indeed the case. But by framing matters in this way, we see the extent to which R. Judah is willing to go.*
- P. *For he has taken the position that even when we have something together with something else of the same category, we have a case in which the former is regarded as hidden [under the latter (C)].*
- The composite, Nos. 1-3, has come to a conclusion and shown itself remarkably cogent. We now turn to further exegeses of the relevant proof-text, Deu. 21: 1.

### III.4. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. “Slain [by the sword]” (Deu. 21: 1) — but not strangled.



- C. “Slain” — and not writhing.
- D. “On the ground” — not hidden in a pile of rock.
- E. “Fallen” — and not hanging in a tree.
- F. “In the field” and not floating on the water [M. 9:2A-D].
- F. And R. Eleazar says, “Under all the cited circumstances, if it was a slain man, they conduct the rite of breaking the heifer’s neck on that account,” [T. Sot. 9:1B].
- H. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. Said R. Yosé bar Judah, “They said to R. Eleazar, ‘Do you not concur that if he was strangled, lying in a dung-heap, that they do not break the heifer’s neck on that account?’
- J. “On this account, it is said, ‘Slain,’ but not strangled.
- K. “Here too, in the ground, and not hidden in a heap of dirt,
- L. “Fallen,’ and not hanging in a tree.
- M. “In the field,’ and not floating on the water” [T. Sot. 9:1B-C].
- N. *And R. Eleazar [argues that] an extra time, “slain,” is written [which appears four times in Deu. 21: 1-9 and so encompasses the cases Eleazar maintains lead to the heifer-rite.]*

The exegesis of the next clauses of the Mishnah proceeds rapidly, clause by clause.

**IV.1 A. If it was found near the frontier, or near a town which had a gentile majority, etc. [M. 9:2E]:**

- B. For it is written, “Be found.” Thus is excluded a commonplace event [such as is finding a neglected corpse in the specified situations].

**V.1 A. Or near a town which had no court [M. 9:2E]:**

- B. For we require that there be “elders of the town” [such as Deu. 21: 1 mentions] and in the town without a court, there are no elders.

**VI.1 A. They measure only from a town, etc. [M. 9:2F]:**

- B. *That is self-evident. Since reference is made to a town which had no court, surely I know full well that they measure only from a town which has a court!*
- C. *Lo, we are informed that the following rule applies, as we have learned on Tannaite authority:*
- D. How do we know that if the neglected corpse is found near a town in which there is no court, they ignore that town and measure to a town which has a court?
- E. Scripture says, “And the elders of the city which is nearest to the slain man shall take...” (Deu. 21: 3) — under all circumstances.

The exposition of the Mishnah-paragraph proceeds in the expected manner, namely, the phrase-by-phrase exegesis of scriptural foundations for Mishnaic rules.

**9:2G-4**

- G. “[If] it was found exactly between two such towns, then the two of them bring two heifers,” the words of R. Eliezer.
- H. And Jerusalem does not have to bring a heifer whose neck is to be broken.

- A. “[If] its head is found in one place and its body in another place, they bring the head to the body,” the words of R. Eliezer.
- B. R. Aqiba says, “They bring the body to the head.”

- A. From what point did they measure?
- B. R. Eliezer says, “From his belly-button.”
- C. R. Aqiba says, “From his nose.”
- D. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “From the place at which he was turned into a corpse — from his neck.”

**I.1 A.** “[If] it was found exactly between two such towns, then the two of them bring two heifers,” the words of R. Eliezer:] *What is the basis for R. Eliezer’s view [at M. 9:2G]?*

- B. *He holds that it is entirely feasible to measure exactly to “the nearest” (Deu. 21: 3), and even if there are several nearby [towns].*

**II.1 A.** And Jerusalem does not have to bring a heifer whose neck is to be broken [M. 9:2H]:

- B. *For [in context] Scripture has stated, “To inherit it” (Deu. 21: 1),*
- C. *and [Eliezer] takes the view that Jerusalem was not divided up among [and inherited by] the tribes. [Accordingly, it does not fall into the relevant category.]*

**III.1 A.** If its head is found in one place, etc. [M. 9:3A]:

- B. *What is at issue between [the contending authorities]?*
- C. *If we maintain that it is with respect to taking the measurement that they differ, for, since it is stated at the end, From what point did they measure [M. 9:4A], it follows that at the opening clause, it is not with the measuring itself that we deal.*
- D. *Said R. Isaac, “It is on the issue of whether the neglected corpse has acquired possession of the place at which it is lying that they differ.*
- E. *“And this is the sense of the passage: ‘The neglected corpse is to be buried in the place in which it is located.*
- F. **“Where its head is situated in one place and its body in some other, they bring the head to the body,” the words of R. Eliezer [M. 9:3A].**
- G. **“R. Aqiba says, ‘They bring the body to the head’ [M. 9:3B].**
- H. *“Then what is at stake in the dispute? [Accordingly], one party takes the view that the body lies in the place in which it fell, and it is the head that rolled away when it fell.*
- I. *“The other authority takes the position that the head is located where it fell, and the body is what has moved away.”*

**IV.1 A.** From what point did they measure [M. 9:4]:

- B. *What is at issue in the present dispute?*
- C. *One authority maintains that the source of life is in the nose [through breathing], and the other party holds that the source of life is in the belly-button.*

- D. *May I maintain that the parties at hand differ along the same lines as the following Tannaite authorities?*
- E. Whence is the embryo formed? From the head, as it is said, “You are he who took me out of my mother’s womb” (Psa. 71: 6), and it further is written, “Cut off your hair and cast it away” (Jer. 7:29).
- F. Abba Saul says, “It is from the belly button, and it sends forth its roots in all directions.” [So Abba Saul concurs with Eliezer.]
- G. *You may even hold, in regard to the position of Abba Saul, that he takes the stated view [in opposition to Aqiba’s] only with regard to the formation of the embryo [but would accord with Aqiba in the present instance].*
- H. *For when the foetus is formed, it takes shape from the center, but, so far as the source of life, all parties concur that it is in the nose, as it is written, “All in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life” (Gen. 7:22).*

**V.1 A. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “From the place at which he was turned into a corpse, from his neck” [M. 9:4D]:**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob?*
- C. As it is written, “To lay you upon the necks of the wicked who are slain” (Eze. 21:34).  
The Talmud systematically cites and lightly glosses or provides scriptural bases for the rules of the Mishnah-paragraph.

### 9:5-6

- A. **The elders of Jerusalem took their leave and went away.**
- B. **The elders of that town bring “a heifer from the herd with which labor had not been done and which had not drawn the yoke” (Deu. 21: 3).**
- C. **But a blemish does not invalidate it.**
- D. **They brought it down into a rugged valley (and rugged is meant literally, hard, but even if it is not rugged, it is valid).**
- E. **And they break its neck with a hatchet from behind.**
- F. **And its place is prohibited for sowing and for tilling, but permitted for the combing out of flax and for quarrying stones.**

**M. 9:5**

- A. **The elders of that town wash their hands in the place in which the neck of the heifer is broken, and they say,**
- B. **“Our hands have not shed this blood, nor did our eyes see it” (Deu. 21: 7).**
- C. **Now could it enter our minds that the elders of a court might be shedders of blood?**
- D. **But [they mean:] He did not come into our hands so that we sent him away without food.**
- E. **And we did not see him and let him go along without an escort.**
- F. **[46A] And [it is] the priests [who] say, “Forgive, O Lord, your people Israel, whom you have redeemed, and do not allow innocent blood in the midst of your people, Israel” (Deu. 21: 8).**

- G. They did not have to say, “And the blood shall be forgiven them” (Deu. 21: 8).
- H. But the Holy Spirit informs them, “Whenever you do this, the blood shall be forgiven to you.”

M. 9:6

- I.1 A. [With reference to M. 9:5C, **But a blemish does not invalidate it**], a blemish should invalidate a heifer [used for the present rite], on the basis of an argument a fortiori [as follows]:
  - B. Now if the red cow [used for preparing purification-water, Num. 19: 1ff.], which is not rendered invalid by years [should it be beyond a certain age, e.g., one year], is rendered invalid by appearance of a blemish, the heifer, which is rendered invalid by years [since the heifer has to be under a year old] should surely be rendered invalid by a blemish.
  - C. *No, the case [of the red cow] is different, for Scripture has [found it necessary to] make explicit, “On which there is no blemish” (Num. 19: 2), so it follows that a blemish invalidates the red cow, but [there being no Scriptural proof-text here] a blemish need not invalidate a heifer.*
  - D. [Having treated “on which” as restrictive, we now ask] But other acts of labor also should not invalidate the red cow [either]. [Cohen, p. 236, n. 7: Since it is merely stated, “On which never came yoke,” and not, as with the heifer, “wherewith it has not been wrought and which has not drawn” (Deu. 21: 3), the “wherewith” restricting it to the heifer.]
  - E. Then why did R. Judah say Rab said, “If one placed on [a red cow] a bundle of sacks, it is disqualified, but in the case of the heifer, [it is disqualified] only if it actually draws [a load, e.g., a wagon].”
  - F. *The case of the red cow really is different [from the present one], for we derive the sense of the word “yoke” [used at the passage of the red cow] from the sense of the word as it is used in connection with the heifer. [That is why the argument at D is wrong. The operative proof is not as supposed here.]*
  - G. *But let the rule governing the heifer itself derive from the sense of the word “yoke” used in connection with the red cow. [Why not just reverse matters?]*
  - H. *The All-Merciful [in composing the Torah] has excluded [that possibility] by using the word “wherein.”*
  - I. *But that word also occurs with reference to the heifer!*
  - J. *The word used in the context of the heifer serves [a different purpose, namely] to exclude Holy Things from the rule that invalidation occurs when work is done with a beast. [If one does work with beasts that have been designated for use as sacrifices and hence fall into the category of Holy Things, the beasts remain valid for their sacred purpose].*
  - K. *It might have entered your mind to propose that we draw an argument a fortiori from the case of the heifer [to prove the very opposite, thus:] Now if an act of labor invalidates a beast for use as a heifer, but said beast is not eliminated by reason of a blemish, animals set aside as Holy Things, which will be eliminated from use if a blemish appears on them, all the more so should be rendered invalid if*

an act of work is done with them! [The very premise of the foregoing argument thus is rejected.]

- L. *No, one may register the following flaw in the argument at hand: The distinguishing trait of the animal used for the heifer [which renders it different from the animal designated for Holy Things] is that age invalidates it for use [should it be more than a year old]. But in the case of animals designated for use as Holy Things, do you mean to say that there is no possibility of invalidating such beasts by reason of age? [That is simply false. Age is a consideration in some instances.]*
- M. *But a verse of Scripture is required to specify just those animals that are disqualified as offerings by reason of age [e.g., Num. 28:19, for the Passover]. [But the generality of animals to be used for Holy Things are not affected by age.]*
- N. *But does the fact that an act of labor does not invalidate animals set aside as Holy Things derive from the present context at all?*
- O. *It derives from the following: “Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen or scurvy or scabbed — you shall not offer these to the Lord” (Lev. 22:22).*
- P. *These in particular you shall not offer, but you may offer Holy Things with which an act of labor has been carried out.*
- Q. *[Now the limiting specification “Wherewith” which has been stated with regard to the heifer] is nonetheless necessary. It might have entered your mind to argue that the prohibition of labor applies not in a case in which an act of permitted labor has been performed, but in a case in which an act of prohibited labor [e.g., on the Sabbath] has been performed [with the animals set aside for the cult], the animal should be forbidden.*
- R. *Accordingly, it was necessary [to make it clear that an animal with which a prohibited act of labor has been performed also may be used for the cult, under all circumstances.]*
- S. *And lo, the following verse would have yielded the same proposition: “Neither from the hand of a stranger shall you offer the bread of your God of any of these” (Lev. 22:25) — These you may not offer but you may offer Holy Things with which an act of labor has been performed.*
- T. *[No, as before] the cited verse is necessary. I might have taken the view that the rule [permitting an animal to be used in the sacrificial cult even though an act of labor has been performed with it applies to a case] in which the act of labor was carried out when the beast had not yet been consecrated. But if an act of labor was carried out with the beast once it was in the status of Holy Things, I might have maintained that then the beast is forbidden for use in the cult.*
- U. *Accordingly, the cited proof is necessary to exclude even that possibility.*

We take up a secondary inquiry, addressing the disqualification of the red cow by reason of its bearing a load of sacks. This has nothing to do with the topic before us, the heifer offered to expiate the sin of the neglected corpse, but serves as an appendix to the foregoing. But once again, we quickly see that the topical appendix is tacked on for substantive, not only formal reasons, as we return to the heifer offered for the neglected corpse, now building arguments on the case of the

heifer that form the mirror image of arguments presented at I.1 on the foundations of the red cow.

- I.2.** A. *Returning to the body [of the text cited just now (I.1.E)]:* R. Judah said Rab said, “If one placed on [a red cow] a bundle of sacks, it is disqualified, but in the case of the heifer, it is disqualified only if it actually draws a load.”
- B. *The following objection was raised to the cited statement:*
- C. “...[a red heifer without defect, in which there is no blemish, and upon which] a yoke [has never come] (Num. 19: 2) —
- D. I know only that [the heifer is disqualified if it has carried] a yoke.
- E. How do I know that other acts of labor [also will disqualify the beast, should it carry out such acts of labor, inclusive of A’s]?
- F. You may state the following argument a fortiori: Now if a heifer, which will not be invalidated by a blemish, will be invalidated by the performance of other acts of labor [apart from bearing a yoke], a red cow, which will be invalidated by a blemish, should surely be invalidated by the performance of other acts of labor [not only by drawing a load].
- G. And should you prefer, [I offer as an argument an exegesis:] “yoke,” is stated, and elsewhere, “yoke” is also stated, [with the consequence that an analogy is established]. Just as in that later context [in which the heifer appears], the performance of other acts of labor [beyond actually drawing the yoke] invalidates the beast, so here too the performance of other acts of labor invalidates the beast.
- H. *Why would one prefer this other argument [instead of F’s]?*
- I. *If you should say, there is the following problem with the argument a fortiori, [there is an exegetical basis for the same proposition. The weakness of the a fortiori argument is this:] what distinguishes the case of the heifer is the fact that age serves as an invalidating factor, [but that is not an issue with the red cow].*
- J. [Another problem with the argument a fortiori is this:] Beasts set apart for use as Holy Things will prove to the contrary [to F], for a blemish invalidates in their case, while an act of labor does not invalidate them.
- K. [Consequently, the exegetical argument is the best one:] Here, “yoke” is stated, and elsewhere, “yoke” is also stated, [with the consequence that an analogy is established]. Just as in that later context the performance of other acts of labor invalidates the beast, so here too the performance of other acts of labor invalidates the beast.
- L. But from the very source of your reasoning [we may raise a fresh problem]: Just as [in that other case, the beast is invalidated only] if it will actually draw [the yoke, not merely bear its weight], so here too [the beast is invalidated only] if it will actually draw [the weight of the yoke, not merely bearing it].
- M. *That in fact is a dispute among Tannaite authorities, for there are those who derive the besought proof from the case of the heifer, and there are those who derive the besought proof from the body of the red cow itself. [So the issue of A is which case — heifer, cow — supplies the governing analogy.]*
- N. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- O. “Yoke” (Num. 19: 2) — I know only that [the heifer is disqualified if it has drawn] a yoke.



- P. How do I know that other acts of labor [also will disqualify the beast]?
- Q. Scripture says, “Upon which a yoke has never come” (Num. 19: 2) — under any circumstances. [That is, work of any sort — even only bearing the weight of the yoke.]
- R. If so, why does Scripture specify, “A yoke”?
- S. [It is to indicate the following:] a yoke invalidates whether at the time of labor or not at the time of labor [that is, whether or not it has been drawn, not merely carried].
- T. But other acts of labor invalidate the beast only if they are performed in the time of labor.
- U. *And may I say*, “Upon which [a yoke] has never come” (Num. 19: 2) constitutes a general principle.
- V. “Yoke” constitutes a limiting statement to that general principle.
- W. We have a general principle followed by a limiting and specific statement. Included in the general principle therefore is only what the limiting statement has made explicit. The consequence then is that if it is a yoke, it falls in the category of that which will invalidate, but other things do not.
- X. The word “which” — to the contrary — serves as a mode of encompassing [things not made explicit].
- Y. *And so it has been taught on Tannaite authority*: in connection with a heifer along these same lines:
- Z. “Yoke” (Deu. 21: 3).
- AA. I know only that the heifer is invalidated by [drawing] a yoke. How do I know that other acts of labor will also invalidate the heifer?
- BB. Scripture states, “Which has never been worked” (Deu. 21: 3) — under any circumstances.
- CC. If so, why does Scripture refer to “a yoke”?
- DD. A yoke invalidates the heifer whether it is used during the time of work or it is not used during the time of work.
- EE. But other acts of labor invalidate the beast only if they are performed during the time of work [and not purposelessly or at random].
- FF. *But may I say*, “Which has not been worked” constitutes a generalization.
- GG. “A yoke” then serves as a specific limitation of the foregoing.
- HH. We have therefore a general principle followed by a limiting and specific statement. Included in the general principle therefore is only what the limiting statement has made explicit. The consequence then is that if it is a yoke, it falls in the category of that which will invalidate, but other things do not.
- II. The word “which” — to the contrary — serves as a mode of encompassing [things not made explicit].
- We now take up the blemish that is caused by working the heifer, a refinement of Nos. 1-2.

**I.3.** A. *Said R. Abbahu*, “*I asked R. Yohanan*, ‘What is the extent to which the drawing of the yoke [must be carried out so as to invalidate the heifer]?’”

B. He said to me, “[The beast must draw the burden] the space of a yoke.”

- C. *They asked, "Its length or its breadth?"*
- D. *One of the rabbis, and R. Jacob was his name, said to them, "What R. Yohanan said was explained to me to mean the drawing of the yoke to its breadth, a handbreadth."*
- E. *And why not then say, "A handbreadth"?*
- F. *Lo, we are taught [by the formulation in this wise] that a yoke is a handbreadth in breadth.*
- G. *What practical difference does it make?*
- H. *For buying and selling.*

We revert to the topic of the Mishnah.

- I.4.** A. Said R. Yohanan b. Saul, "Why has the Torah made explicit, '[They] shall bring the heifer down to a valley' (Deu. 21: 4)?"
- B. "Said the Holy One, blessed be he, 'Let something which has never yielded fruit and have its neck broken in a place which does not yield fruit, and let it achieve atonement for one [the neglected corpse] whom people did not allow to produce fruit.'"
  - C. *What is the sense of "fruit"?*
  - D. *If we should say the reference is to sexual procreation, then an old man or a castrated man who was found as a neglected corpse should not cause us to break the heifer's neck [since that would not be a consideration].*
  - E. *Rather, "fruit" means the doing of religious duties. [Cohen, p. 240, n. 2: Which produces a harvest of merit; and he was prevented by his murder from doing this.]*  
The next phrases of the Mishnah come to the fore and are dealt with in a familiar way.

**II.1 A. They brought it down into a rugged valley (and rugged is meant literally, hard...) [M. 9:5D]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. How do we know that the word "rugged" means "hard"?
- D. As it is said, **[46B]** "Rugged is your dwelling place and your nest is set in the rock" (Num. 24:21), and it says, "Hear, O mountains, the Lord's controversy, and you rugged foundations of the earth" (Mic. 6: 2).
- E. Others say, "How do we know that the word 'rugged' means 'old'?"
- F. "As it is said, 'It is an old nation, it is an ancient nation' (Jer. 5:15)."

**III.1 A. And they break its neck with a hatchet from behind [M. 9:5E]:**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis [for doing it from behind]?*
- C. The law derives from the shared use of the word "breaking" [in the present connection and also with regard to the mode of putting to death] the bird offered as a sin-offering [Lev. 5: 8].

**IV.1 A. And its place is prohibited for sowing and for tilling [M. 9:5F]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. "[And the elders of that city shall bring the heifer down to a valley...] which is neither plowed nor sown..." (Deu. 21: 4):

- D. “That qualification applies to the past, [but in the future, the valley may be ploughed or sown],” the words of R. Josiah.
- E. R. Jonathan says, “The qualification pertains to the future.”
- F. *Said Raba, “It applies to the future, for no party can differ, since it is written, ‘It will not be sown.’ Where there is a disagreement, it concerns the past.*
- G. *“R. Josiah reasons, ‘Is it written, ‘It will not be tilled’?”*
- H. *“And R. Jonathan reasons, ‘Is it written, “Which has never been worked”?”*
- I. “And R. Josiah holds, ‘Which...’ refers to what has been done in the past.
- J. “And R. Jonathan takes the view that the word ‘which’ serves to encompass [diverse kinds of agricultural labor, but has no bearing upon the present issue at all].”

**V.1 A. But it is permitted for the combing out of flax and for quarrying stones [M. 9:5F]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “Which is neither plowed nor sown” (Deu. 21: 4):
- D. I know only that sowing is prohibited. How do I know that other forms of labor also are prohibited?
- E. Scripture says, “Which is neither plowed...,” in any way at all.
- F. If so, why does Scripture then say, “Nor sown”?
- G. It is to inform you that, just as sowing is distinctive in that it is done with the substance of the ground itself, so anything that is done with the substance of the ground itself falls under that same prohibition.
- H. Excepted then are combing out of flax and quarrying stones, which are not done with the substance of the ground itself.
- I. *But may I propose to read matters differently, namely, “which is neither plowed” serves as a general principle, “nor sown” constitutes a specific example. We thus have the case of a general principle and a specific application of that principle.*
- J. *Encompassed within the general principle is only what is made explicit in the specification. It would follow that sowing is included in the prohibition, but other forms of labor are not.*
- K. [That possibility is excluded because] “which” serves as an encompassing statement.

**VI.1 A. The elders of that town wash their hands, etc. [M. 9:6]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And all the elders of that town nearest to the slain man shall wash their hands over the heifer whose neck was broken in the valley” (Deu. 21: 6) —
- D. There is no need to make explicit the fact that it was the heifer “whose neck was broken,” [since that fact is obvious].
- E. Why therefore does Scripture specify, “Whose neck was broken”?
- F. It is to indicate that the act takes place in the place in which the act of breaking the heifer’s neck took place.
- G. **“And they shall say, ‘Our hands did not shed this blood, neither did our eyes see it shed’” (Deu. 21: 7) —**

- H. How could it enter our minds that the elders of a court might be shedders of blood?
- I. But they mean: He did not come into our hands so that we sent him away without food. And we did not see him and let him go along without an escort [M. 9:6C-E].

**VII.1** A. [NOW COULD IT ENTER OUR MINDS THAT THE ELDERS OF A COURT MIGHT BE SHEDDERS OF BLOOD? BUT [THEY MEAN:] HE DID NOT COME INTO OUR HANDS SO THAT WE SENT HIM AWAY WITHOUT FOOD. AND WE DID NOT SEE HIM AND LET HIM GO ALONG WITHOUT AN ESCORT:] *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Meir would say, “They compel [people to provide] an escort, for there is no limit to the reward for doing so.
- C. “For it is said, ‘And the spies saw a man coming out of the city, and they said to him, “Pray, show us the way into the city, and we will deal kindly with you”’ (Jud. 1:24).
- D. “And it is written, ‘And he showed them the way into the city’ (Jud. 1:25).
- E. “And what was the kindness that they did for him?
- F. “That that entire city ‘they smote with the edge of the sword, but they let the man and all his family go’ (Jud. 1:25).”

### **Exegesis of the Story of Providing an Escort, Jud. 1:24ff.**

- VII.2.** A. “And the man went to the land of the Hittites and built a city, and called its name Luz, that is its name to this day” (Jud. 1:26).
- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - C. [“That is its name to this day” is shown by the fact that] it is that same Luz in which people dye the blue [for show-fringes, Num. 15:38].
  - D. That is the same Luz to which Sennacherib came without disturbing the town, so too Nebuchadnezzar without destroying it.
  - E. And also the angel of death has no right to pass that way.
  - F. But as to old people there, when they become tired of life [Cohen], they go outside the wall and die.
  - G. Now this yields an argument a fortiori: If this Canaanite, who did not say a word and did not walk on his own two feet, brought salvation for himself and to his descendants for all generations,
  - H. someone who actually escorts [a traveller] by walking along on his own two feet with him — all the more so [will get a good reward].

- VII.3.** A. In what way did [the man] show the way?
- B. Hezekiah said, “He mouthed a few words.”
  - C. R. Yohanan said, “He just pointed with his finger.”
  - D. *A Tannaite teaching consistent with the view of R. Yohanan [is as follows]:*
  - E. It was merely because this Canaanite pointed with his finger that he brought salvation for himself and his descendants for all generations.

## Providing an Escort for Travellers

- VII.4.** A. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “He who goes along the way without an escort should occupy himself with Torah.
- B. “For it is said, ‘For they shall be escort of grace for your head and chains about your neck’ (Pro. 1: 9).”
- C. And R. Joshua b. Levi said, “On account of the four steps that Pharaoh took in accompanying Abraham, as it is said, ‘And Pharaoh gave men charge concerning him’ (Gen. 12:20), Pharaoh [had the merit of] enslaving [Abraham’s] descendants for four hundred years.
- D. “So it is said, ‘And shall serve them and afflict them four hundred years’ (Gen. 15:13).”

- VII.5.** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “Whoever escorts his fellow for four cubits [even] in town is never injured.”
- B. *Rabina escorted Raba bar Isaac four cubits in town. Injury threatened him, but he was saved from it.*

- VII.6.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. A master escorts his disciple to the outskirts of the town.
- C. A fellow accompanies his fellow to the Sabbath limit of the town.
- D. A disciple escorts his master without limit.
- E. But how far [is the minimum]?
- F. Said R. Sheshet, “Up to a parasang.”
- G. But that pertains only to one’s master who was not his principal teacher. As to one’s principal master, it must be three parasangs.

- VII.7.** A. *R. Kahana escorted R. Shimi bar Ashi from the Head of the Canal to “[The Town] among the Palms” in Babylonia. When they got there, he said to him, “Is it certain what you say, that these palm trees of Babylonia come from the time of the first Adam?”*
- B. *He said to him, “You remind us of something that R. Yosé bar Hanina said, ‘What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture? “Through a land where no one passed or lived” (Jer. 2: 6)?*
- C. *“Now if no one passed through the land, where would someone have lived? Rather, it is the land concerning which the first Adam made a decree for habitation will be inhabited, and a land concerning which the first Adam did not make a decree will not be inhabited.”*
- D. *R. Mordecai escorted R. Ashi from Hageronia to Be Kipi, and some say, to Be Dura.*

## If the men of Jericho had given an escort to Elisha, he would not have called up the bears against the children

- VII.8.** A. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Meir, “Whoever does not escort someone or is not escorted is as if he sheds blood.
- B. “For if the men of Jericho had given an escort to Elisha, he would not have called up the bears against the children.

- C. “For it is said, ‘And he went up from there to Bethel, and while he was going up on the way, some small boys came out of the city and jeered at him, saying, “Go up, you baldie! Go up, you baldie!”’
- D. What they said to him was, “Go up, you who made this place bald for us.”

**VII.9.** A. *What is the meaning of “small boys”?*

- B. Said R. Eleazar, “‘Boys’ in that they were bare of religious duties, ‘small’ that they were small of faith.”
- C. *A Tannaite statement:*
- D. “They really were youths, but they despoiled themselves like little boys.”
- E. *To this objected R. Joseph, “And perhaps they were so called because of the place in which they were located?”*
- F. *“Is it not written, ‘Now the Syrians on one of their raids had carried off a little maid from the land of Israel’ (2Ki. 5: 2).”*
- G. *“Now we raised the question, ‘What is the sense of girl and little’?”*
- H. “And R. Pedat said, ‘She was a little girl from a town called “Young.”’
- I. *“Accordingly, in that case, do we not have a specification of the name of the place? Here we have a specification of the name of the place.”*

**VII.10.** A. “And he turned around and when he saw them, he cursed them in the name of the Lord” (2Ki. 2:24):

- B. *What did he see [when “he saw them”]?*
- C. *Said Rab, “He really saw them, as it is taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, ‘In any place in which sages gaze, there is either death or poverty.’”*
- D. And Samuel said, “He saw that all of their mothers had become pregnant with them on the Day of Atonement.”
- E. And R. Isaac Nappaha said, “He saw that their hair was braided in the Amorite [Roman] way.”
- F. R. Yohanan said, “He saw that in them was not a trace of a religious duty.”
- G. *But is it possible that in their seed afterward there might have been?*
- H. Said R. Eleazar, “Neither in them nor in their seed unto all generations.”

**VII.11.** A. “And two she-bears came out of the woods and tore forty-two of the boys” (2Ki. 2:24):

- B. **[47A]** Rab and Samuel: One of them said, “It was a miracle.”
- C. The other said, “It was a miracle within a miracle.”
- D. *The one who said, “It was a miracle” held that while there was a forest, there were really no bears.*
- E. *The one who said, “It was a miracle within a miracle” maintained that there was no forest and there were no bears.*
- F. *But why not have bears without a forest anyhow?*
- G. *[Otherwise] the bears would have been scared away [without a forest in which to take refuge].*

The next set deals with the theme of the loss of Israelite children, a theme provoked by the foregoing story.



- VII.12.** A. Said R. Hanina, “On account of the forty-two offerings which Balak, king of Moab, made, forty-two children were cleaved from Israel.”
- B. Is that so? And did not R. Judah say Rab said, “A person should always keep busy in Torah and religious deeds even though it is not for its own sake, for from doing these things not for their own sake, one comes to do them for their own sake”?
- C. For it was on account of the reward owing for the forty-two sacrifices that Balak, king of Moab, offered, that he had the merit that Ruth should come forth from him, from whom Solomon would come forth,
- D. concerning whom it is written, “A thousand burnt-offerings did Solomon make” (1Ki. 3: 4).
- E. And R. Yosé b. Honi said, “Ruth was the daughter of Eglon, the son of Balak.”
- F. *[Balak] lusted, however, only to curse Israel* [and his reward was in the death of the children here (Cohen, p. 245, n. 12)].

We now revert to our topic.

- VII.13.** A. “Now the men of the city said to Elisha, ‘Behold, the situation of this city is good, as my lord sees; [but the water is bad and the land is unfruitful]” (2Ki. 2:19):
- B. But if “the water is bad and the land is unfruitful,” what good could it have been?
- C. Said R. Hanina, “The charm of a place affects the people who live there.”
- D. Said R. Yohanan, “There are three kinds of charm: the charm that a place has for the people who live there, the charm that a woman has for her husband, and the charm of a purchase for the one who has bought it.”

**VII.14.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Elisha bore three illnesses,
- C. one because he brought the she-bears against the children, one because he pushed Gehazi away with both hands, and one on account of which he died.
- D. For it is said, “Now Elisha had fallen sick of the ailment of which he died” (2Ki. 13:14).

No. 14 completes the exposition of Elisha, intruded because of the allegation that failure to send company with him led to the disaster of his curse. Since Elisha’s relationship with Gehazi has emerged, we now tack on a composite on that theme.

**VII.15.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Under all circumstances the left hand should push away and the right hand should draw near,
- C. not in the manner of Elisha, who drove away Gehazi with both hands, nor in the manner of Joshua b. Perahiah, who drove away one of his disciples with both his hands.

## **The Story of Elisha and Gehazi**

**VII.16.** A. *What is the case with Gehazi?*

- B. As it is written, “And Naaman said, ‘Be pleased to accept two talents’” (2Ki. 5:23).
- C. And it is written, “But he said to him, ‘Did I not go with you in spirit when the man turned from his chariot to meet you? Was it a time to accept money and garments, olive orchards and vineyards, sheep and oxen, menservants and maidservants’” (2Ki. 5:26).
- D. *But did he receive all these things? He got only silver and garments.*
- E. Said R. Isaac, “At that moment Elisha was occupied with the study of the list of eight dead creeping things [M. **Shab. 14:1**, Lev. 11:29ff.].
- F. “He said to Gehazi, ‘Wicked one! The time has come to receive the reward for the eight dead creeping things: “Therefore the leprosy of Naaman shall cleave to you and to your descendants forever”” (2Ki. 8:27).”

**VII.17.** A. “Now there were four men who were lepers [at the entrance to the gate]” (2Ki. 7: 3):

- B. R. Yohanan said, “This refers to Gehazi and his three sons.”
- C. “And Elisha went to Damascus” (2Ki. 8: 7):
- D. Why did he go? Said R. Yohanan, “He went to bring Gehazi back in penitence, but he did not repent.
- E. “He said to him, ‘Repent.’
- F. “He said to him, ‘This is the tradition that I have received from you: “Whoever has both sinned and caused others to sin will never have sufficient means to do penitence.””

**VII.18.** A. *What had he done?*

- H. *Some say*, “He hung a loadstone on the sin[ful statue built by] Jeroboam and suspended it between heaven and earth.”
- I. *Others say*, “He carved on it the Name of God, so that it would say, ‘I [am the Lord your God]... You shall not have [other gods...]’ (Exo. 20: 1-2).”
- J. *Still others say*, “He drove rabbis away from his presence, as it is said, ‘And the sons of the prophets said to Elisha, “See now the place where we dwell before you is too small for us”” (2Ki. 6: 1). *The sense then is that up to that time, it was not too small.*”

## **The Story of Joshua b. Perahiah and the Disciple**

**VII.19.** A. *What is the case with Gehazi?*

- B. *When King Yannai killed the rabbis, his sister hid Simeon b. Shatah. R. Joshua b. Perahiah went and fled to Alexandria, in Egypt. When peace returned, Simeon b. Shatah sent word, “From Jerusalem, the holy city, to you, Alexandria in Egypt, my sister: ‘My beloved is dwelling in your midst, and I am dwelling desolate.’”*
- C. *He concluded, “That means that things are o.k. with him.” When he was coming back, he stayed at a certain inn. They rose to pay him honor properly. They paid him great honor. He took his seat and was praising the place, “What a fine inn this is.”*

- D. Said to him, one of his disciples, "My lord, her eyes are bleary."
- E. He said to him, "Wicked! Is that what's on your mind?!"
- F. *He called forth four hundred ram's horns and excommunicated him. Every day the disciple came to him, but he would not accept him. One day, when he was reciting the Shema, the other came before him. He was thinking of accepting him back. He gestured to him with his hand. The other thought that he was decisively rejected. He went and set up a brick and bowed down to it.*
- G. *The other said to him, "Repent."*
- H. He said to him, "This is what I have received as a teaching from you: 'Whoever has both sinned and caused others to sin will never have sufficient means to do penitence.'"
- I. For a master has said, "[That same disciple] practiced enchantment and incited and misled Israel and made them sin."

**VII.20.** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "Also in one's natural impulse, as to a child or a woman, one should push away with the left hand and draw near with the right hand."

The exegesis of the Mishnah-sentences is carried on in a systematic way. Once the theme of providing an escort comes to the fore, however, we have a rather substantial exercise of expounding on that theme and on biblical passages that illustrate it. As is common, when a passage of Scripture is adduced in evidence, discussion may veer off to treat that passage in its own terms. But so far as the whole reveals a simple plan, it is to spell out what is important about the statements of the Mishnah, then to discourse in a more expansive way about its theme.

**9:7-10**

- A. [If] the murderer was found before the neck of the heifer was broken, it [simply] goes forth and pastures in the herd.
- B. [If the murderer is found] after the neck of the heifer is broken, it is to be buried in its place.
- C. For to begin with it was brought in a matter of doubt. It has atoned for the matter of doubt on which account it was brought and which has gone its way.
- D. [If] the neck of the heifer was broken and afterward the murderer was found, lo, this one is put to death.

**M. 9:7**

- A. [If] one witness says, "I saw the murderer," and one witness says, "You did not see him."
- B. [If] one woman says, "I saw him," and one woman says, "You did not see him,"
- C. they would go through the rite of breaking the neck of the heifer.
- D. [If] one witness says, "I saw," and two say, "You did not see," they would break the neck of the heifer.

- E. [If] two say, “We saw,” and one says to them, “You did not see,” they did not break the neck of the heifer.

M. 9:8

- A. When murderers became many, the rite of breaking the heifer’s neck was cancelled.
- B. [This was] when Eleazar b. Dinai came along, and he was also called Tehinah b. Perishah. Then they went and called him, “Son of a murderer.”
- C. When adulterers became many, the ordeal of the bitter water was cancelled.
- D. And Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai cancelled it, since it is said, “I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom, nor your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery, for they themselves go apart with whores” (Hos. 4:14).
- E. When Yosé b. Yoezer of Seredah and Yosé b. Yohanan of Jerusalem died, the grape-clusters were cancelled,
- F. since it is said, “There is no cluster to eat, my soul desires the first ripe fig” (Mic. 7: 1).

M. 9:9

- A. Yohanan, high priest, did away with the confession concerning tithe.
- B. Also: He cancelled the rite of the Awakeners and the Stunners [47B].
- C. Until his time a hammer did strike in Jerusalem.
- D. And in his time no man had to ask concerning doubtfully-tithed produce.

M. 9:10

- I.1** A. [[If] the neck of the heifer was broken and afterward the murderer was found, lo, this one is put to death:] How do we know that if after the neck of the heifer is broken, the murderer is found, [the rite already accomplished] does not exempt [the murderer] [M. 9:7D]?
- B. Scripture states, “And no atonement can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, except by the blood of him who shed it” (Num. 35:33).

**II.1** A. If one witness says, I saw the murderer, etc. [M. 9:8A]:

- B. *The reason [that in the case in which one says he saw the murderer and one says that the alleged witness did not see the murderer] is that the other witness contradicted him.*
- C. *Lo, if the contrary witness had not contradicted him, then a single witness would be believed [to forestall the rite of breaking the heifer’s neck].*
- D. *How do we know this fact?*
- E. *As our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. “And it is not known who has struck him” (Deu. 21: 1) —
- G. Lo, if it were known who struck him, even if it is only one person at the other end of the world, they would not break the heifer’s neck.
- H. R. Aqiba says, “How do we know that in the case of a sanhedrin that saw someone kill, but the members did not know who it was, they did not break the heifer’s neck?
- I. “Scripture states, ‘Our eyes did not see’ (Deu. 21: 7).

- J. “But in this case, they did see [so they do not break the heifer’s neck].”
- K. *Now that you have maintained [C] that a single witness is indeed believed, how is it possible for another individual witness to contradict the former?*
- L. And has not Ulla stated, “In any case in which the Torah has lent credence to the testimony of a single witness, lo, [such a one is as if he were] two witnesses.”
- M. Now [in the present instance, where one witness is believed and accorded the status of two, we must then note that] the statement of a single witness in a case in which there are two contrary witnesses [bears no credence whatsoever].
- N. *Ulla may say to you, “Repeat as the wording of the Tannaite formulation of the Mishnah [at M. 9:8C], **They would not go through the rite of breaking the neck of the heifer.**”*
- O. *And so did R. Isaac say, “Repeat as the wording of the language of the Tannaite formulation of the Mishnah in this way: **They would not go through the rite of breaking the neck of the heifer.**”*
- P. *But R. Hiyya said, “Repeat the Tannaite formulation in the language: **They would break the neck of the heifer [as at M. 9:8C].**”*
- Q. *Then to R. Hiyya, the view of Ulla presents a problem.*
- R. It presents no problem. Here, [where we do break the neck of the heifer], it is where two witnesses testify simultaneously [so that the contradiction registers prior to the acceptance of one of the witness’s testimony that he knows who has committed the murder].
- S. But there [where we do not break the neck of the heifer] it is where two witnesses testify one after the other, [in which case the one who claims to know is believed as if he were two witnesses, and the later testimony against his is null].
- T. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **If one witness says, “I saw,” and two say, “You did not see,” they would break the neck of the heifer [M. 9:8D].***
- U. *Lo, if it was one against the other one, they would not break the neck of the heifer. This then would be a refutation of the view of R. Hiyya.*
- V. *But in accord with your mode of analysis, let us look at the end of the same passage:*
- W. **If two say, “We saw,” and one says to them, “You did not see,” they did not break the neck of the heifer [M. 9:8E].**
- X. Lo, if it were one against the other, they would break the neck of the heifer.
- Y. *[To solve the internal contradictions just now pointed out,] we propose that the whole of the Mishnah-paragraph at hand deals with those who are invalid to give testimony at all, and it accords with that which R. Nehemiah has said.*
- Z. For [Nehemiah] has said, “In any context in which the Torah has lent credence to the testimony of an individual witness, one should follow the views of the majority, and treat two women testifying against an individual man as equivalent to two men testifying against an individual man.”
- AA. *And some say, “Whenever an individual witness turns up who is valid to begin with, then even a hundred women are equivalent to an individual man. [Thus it is one against one.]”*

- BB. *In the present case, then, with what do we deal? We take up a case in which a woman came to begin with.*
- CC. *And the response of R. Nehemiah bears the following sense:*
- DD. R. Nehemiah says, "In any place in which the Torah has lent credence to an individual witness, follow the majority of views.
- EE. "And treat a case in which two women testify against an individual woman as equivalent to the testimony of two men testifying against an individual man. [The two determine the outcome.]
- FF. *"But in the case of two women who testify against an individual man, it should be treated as equivalent to a case in which you have half and half [an equal number of contradictory witnesses]."*
- GG. *Why should [the Mishnah-rule] deal with a case in which people who are invalid to give testimony make an appearance?*
- HH. *What might you have said [had such a matter been omitted? When we follow the majority viewpoint, it is to impose a strict ruling, but if it is to impose a lenient ruling, we do not do so.*
- II. *Accordingly, we are informed that that is not the case.*

### **III.1 A. When murderers became many, etc. [M. 9:9A]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **[Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai says] "When murderers became many, the rite of breaking the heifer's neck was annulled [M. 9:9A],**
- D. **"for the heifer whose neck is to be broken is brought only in a case of doubt.**
- E. **"But now there are many who commit murder in public [T. Sot. 14:1].**
- F. **"When adulterers became many, the ordeal of the bitter water was cancelled [M. 9:9],**
- G. **"for the ordeal of the bitter water is performed only in a case of doubt.**
- H. **"But now there are many who see [their lovers] in public [T. Sot. 14:2]."**

### **IV.1 A. When adulterers became many, etc. [M. 9:9C]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. "And the man shall be free from iniquity" (Num. 5:31).
- D. When the husband is free from iniquity, then the bitter water puts his wife to the test. If the husband is not free from iniquity, the water will not put his wife to the test.

### **V.1 A. Since it says, I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom, etc. [M. 9:9D].**

- B. *What is the purpose of adding, "Since it says..."?*
- C. *If you should propose that his own sin [will impede the use of the water], but the sin of his sons and daughters will not, then come and take note:*
- D. "I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom, nor your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery" (Hos. 4:14).
- E. *And should you say that the transgression of a man's wife will matter, but the transgression of an unattached woman will not, come and take note:*
- F. "For they themselves go apart with whores" (Hos. 4:14).



- G. *What is the meaning of the phrase, “And the people that does not understand shall be overthrown” (Hos. 4:14)?*
- H. Said R. Eleazar, “Said the prophet to Israel, ‘If you are strict with ourselves, the water will put your wives to the test, and if not, the water will not put your wives to the test.’”

**V.2. A. When hedonists became many [fierce wrath came upon the world, and glory of Torah ceased.]**

- B. **[When those who went about whispering in judgment multiplied, conduct deteriorated,] the laws were perverted, and [T.:] the Holy Spirit ceased in Israel [T. [Sot. 14:3](#)].**
- C. **When those who displayed partiality in judgment multiplied, the commandment, You shall not respect persons in judgment (Deu. 1:17) was annulled, and You shall not be afraid of anyone (Deu. 1:17) ceased.**
- D. **And they removed the yoke of Heaven from themselves, and accepted the authority of the yoke of mortal man [T. [Sot. 14:4](#)].**
- E. When those who went about whispering in judgment multiplied, fierce wrath multiplied for Israel, and the Presence of God went away.
- F. For it is said, “He judges among the judges” (Psa. 82: 1).
- G. **When people multiplied whose “heart goes after their gain” (Eze. 33:31), those who call “bad good and good bad” (Isa. 5:20) multiplied.**
- H. **When those who call bad good and good bad multiplied, there multiplied also those who cry, “Woe, woe, for the world.”**
- I. **When those who draw out their spit became many, the arrogant became many, and disciples became few, and the Torah reverted only to those who study it.**
- J. **When the arrogant became many, Israelite girls began to accept marriage with the arrogant, for our generation sees only the surface [T. [Sot. 14:8](#)].**
- K. *Is this true? And did not a master say, “One who is arrogant is not accepted even by the members of his household, as it is said, ‘A haughty man one cannot abide at home’ (Hab. 2: 5), even in his own house.*
- L. *“At first they gather round him, but in the end they find him repulsive.”*
- M. **When they who compel people to be their business-agents became many, bribing became commonplace, and justice was perverted, [And they went backward and not forward (Jer. 7:24). And about them is said what is said about the sons of Samuel, “Yet his sons did not walk in his ways, but turned aside after gain; they took bribes and perverted justice” (1Sa. 8: 3)] [T. [Sot. 14:5](#)].**
- N. **When there multiplied [judges who say,] “I accept your favor,” and “I appreciate your favor,” there was a multiplication of: Every man did that which was right in his own eyes (Jud. 17: 6).**
- O. *And the whole kingdom went rotten, declining more and more.*
- P. **And when there multiplied: Every man did that which was right in his own eyes, common sorts became exalted, and people of stature became humbled.**
- Q. *And the whole kingdom went rotten, declining more and more.*

- R. When envious men and plunderers multiplied ( — they are those who shed blood — ) those who hardened their heart multiplied, everybody closed his hand, and transgressed that which is written in the Torah, Take heed lest there be a base thought in your heart... and your eyes be hostile to your poor brother and you give him nothing (Deu. 15: 9) [T. [Sot. 14:7](#)].
- S. When there multiplied those “who stretched forth necks and wanton eyes” (Isa. 3:16), the ordeal of the bitter water became common.
- T. But it was suspended.
- U. [T.:] When the haughty of heart became many, contentiousness increased in Israel ( — they are those who shed blood).
- V. When those who accept gifts became many, the days became few, and the years were shortened.
- W. When the proud of heart became many, disputes multiplied in Israel.
- X. When disciples of Shammai and Hillel who had not served the masters sufficiently well became many, disputes became many in Israel, and [the Torah was] made into two Torahs [T. [Sot. 14:9](#)].
- Y. When those who accept charity from gentiles became many — as it were — did the gentiles begin to become smaller and the Israelites to become exalted?
- Z. Quite the opposite: it is not easy for Israel in the world [T. [Sot. 14:10](#)].

**VI.1** A. When Yosé b. Yoezer died, etc. [M. [9:9E](#)]:

- B. *What is a grape cluster?*
- C. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “A man in whom is everything.”

**VII.1** A. Yohanan, high priest, did away with the confession concerning tithe, etc. [M. [9:10A](#)]:

- B. *What was the reason for his action?*
- C. Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “Because people were not giving [tithe] in the proper way.
- D. *“For the All-Merciful has said that people should give it to the Levites [\[48A\]](#), while we give it to the priests.”*
- E. *But let the farmer say the confession dealing with the other tithes?*
- F. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Any household that does not say the confession for first tithe may not again say the confession for the other tithes.”
- G. *What is the reason?*
- H. Said Abayye, “It is because that is what Scripture mentions first, *which bears the implication that they would separate it [first]*.”

**VIII.1** A. [B: *Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*] Also: he decreed concerning the confession [concerning tithes] and annulled [the rules of] doubtfully tithed produce [M. [9:10A, D](#)].

- B. For he sent to all the towns of Israel and found that they were separating only the great heave-offering alone. As to first tithe and second tithe, some of them separated these tithes, and some of them did not.
- C. He said to them, “Just as the great heave-offering, if neglected, is a transgression punishable by death, so tithing the heave-offering, if neglected,

is a transgression analogous [in regard to heave-offering] to certainly untithed produce [and punishable by death]. [T.: “So let people designate heave-offering and heave-offering of the tithe and give it to the priest; as to second tithe, let them render it unconsecrated in exchange for coins. And as to the rest of the tithes, e.g., poorman’s tithe, let him who wants to collect from his fellow produce evidence in behalf of his claim” [so now people do not have to ask, etc., as at M. 9:10D] [T. Sot. 13:10].

- D. [B.:] He went and made the following ordinance for them: “He who purchases produce from an ordinary person [not reliable as to tithing] sets aside from them first tithe and second tithe.
- E. “From the first tithe he separates heave-offering of tithe and he gives it to the priest.
- F. “And as to the second tithe, he brings it up and eats it in Jerusalem.
- G. “As to first tithe and tithe set aside for the poor man, he who lays claim on his fellow bears the burden of proof.”
- H. He made two such ordinances, and he annulled the confession to be said by the fellows [who observe the law], but he made a decree governing doubtfully tithed produce belonging to ordinary folk [not known to observe the law].

**IX.1. A. Also: He cancelled the rite of the Awakeners [M. 9:10B]:**

- B. *What are the awakeners?*
- C. Said Rahbah, “Every day the Levites were standing on the platform, saying, ‘Rouse yourself! Why do you sleep, O Lord’ (Psa. 44:23).
- D. “Said to them Yohanan, ‘Now is there such a thing as sleep before Him? And has it not already been said, “Lo, the Guardian of Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps” (Psa. 121: 4).
- E. ““But so long as Israel is immersed in pain and the nations of the world are immersed in prosperity, as it were, “Rouse yourself! Why do you sleep”” [T. Sot. 13:9].

**X.1 A. And the stunners [M. 9:10B]:**

- B. *What are the stunners?*
- C. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “They would knock the calf between its horns, so that blood would flow into its eyes.
- D. “*He came and annulled that rite, because it looked as though it was inflicting a disfiguring blemish.*”
- E. *In a Tannaite tradition it was taught: They would hit it with staves, just as they would do in idolatrous worship.*
- F. Said to them, “How long are you going to feed carrion-meat to the altar.”
- G. *Carrion? Lo, it was properly slaughtered.*
- H. **Rather, terefah-meat.” [T. Sot. 13:10A-B].**
- I. *For it is possible that the membrane of the brain might be pierced in the rite.*
- J. He went and arranged for them rings on the ground [to hold the beast, so it would not move at the slaughter].

**XI.1 A. Until his time a hammer did strike in Jerusalem [M. 9:10C]:**

B. on the intermediate days of the festival [T. **Sot. 13:10C**].

**XII.1** A. And in his time no man had to ask concerning doubtfully-tithed produce [M. **9:10D**]:

B. *As has been explained.*

The bulk of the Talmud is devoted to the elucidation or amplification of the Mishnah's statements.

### 9:11-13

A. When the Sanhedrin was cancelled, singing at wedding feasts was cancelled, since it is said, "They shall not drink wine with a song" (Isa. 24: 9).

M. 9:11

A. When the former prophets died out, the Urim and Tummim were cancelled.

B. When the sanctuary was destroyed, the Shamir-worm ceased and [so did] the honey of supim.

C. And faithful men came to an end,

D. since it is written, "Help, O Lord, for the godly man ceases" (Psa. 12: 2).

E. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "R. Joshua testified, 'From the day on which the Temple was destroyed, there is no day on which there is no curse, and dew has not come down as a blessing. The good taste of produce is gone.'"

F. R. Yosé says, "Also: the fatness of produce is gone."

M. 9:12

A. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "[When] purity [ceased], it took away the taste and scent; [when] tithes [ceased], they took away the fatness of corn."

B. And sages say, "Fornication and witchcraft made an end to everything."

M. 9:13

**I.1** A. [When the Sanhedrin was cancelled, singing at wedding feasts was cancelled, since it is said, "They shall not drink wine with a song" (Isa. 24: 9):] *How do we know that it is with reference to the nullification of the sanhedrin that the cited verse of Scripture [Isa. 24: 9] was written?*

B. Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua, "It is because Scripture has stated, 'The elders have ceased from the gate, the young men from their music' (Lam. 5:14). [At the gate the elders took up their position as judges.]"

**I.2.** A. Said Rab, "The ear that hears song should be ripped off."

B. Said Raba, "Song in the house means destruction on the threshold, as it is said, 'Their voice shall sing in the windows, desolation shall be in the thresholds, for he has laid bare the cedar work' (Zep. 2:14)."

**I.3.** A. What is the meaning of "He has laid bare the cedar work" (Zep. 2:14)?

B. Said R. Isaac, "Is a house with cedar panelling a town? Rather: Even a house that is paneled with cedar will be destroyed." [Cohen, p. 257, n. 4: "Hath laid bare" is connected with a root for the word "to be razed."]

- E. *Said R. Ashi, "That bears the inference that when destruction gets under way, it begins on the threshold, as it is said, 'Desolation shall be in the thresholds.'*
- F. *"Or, if you prefer, derive the same fact from the following: 'And the gate is smitten with destruction' (Isa. 24:12)."*
- G. *Said Mar, son of R. Ashi, "I myself have seen [the demon of destruction], and he gores like an ox."*

- I.4.** A. *Said R. Huna, "It is permitted for sailors and ploughmen to sing, but it is forbidden for weavers to sing. [For the former it assists in the labor.]"*
- B. *R. Huna annulled singing. A hundred geese [used for celebrations] went for a zuz, and a hundred seahs of wheat for a zuz, but there was no demand. R. Hisda came and nullified [the decree]. People went looking for one goose for a zuz and could not find it.*
  - C. *R. Joseph said, "If men sing and women respond, it is [merely] licentious. When women sing and men join it, it is like fire in straw."*
  - D. *What practical difference does this make?*
  - E. *To make efforts to wipe out the latter [sort of situation] before trying to wipe out the former.*

- I.5.** A. *Said R. Yohanan, "Whoever drinks to four kinds of instruments brings five kinds of punishment to the world,*
- B. *"as it is said, 'Woe to those who rise early in the morning that they may run after strong drink, who tarry late into the evening until wine inflames them! They have lyre and harp, timbrel and lute, and wine at their feasts; but they do not regard the deeds of the Lord or see the work of his hands' (Isa. 5:11-12).*
  - C. *"What is written immediately thereafter? 'Therefore my people go into exile for want of knowledge' (Isa. 5:13) — [so the named instruments] bring exile into the world.*
  - D. *"Their honored men are dying of hunger' (Isa. 5:13) — they bring famine into the world.*
  - E. *"And their multitude is parched with thirst' — they cause people who study Torah to forget what they know.*
  - F. *"The man is bowed down and men are brought low' (Isa. 5:15) — they cause humiliation for those who hate God [that is, God].*
  - G. *"For 'man' refers only to the Holy One, blessed be he, as it is said, 'The Lord is a man of war' (Exo. 15: 3).*
  - H. *"And the eyes of the haughty are humbled' (Isa. 5:15) — For [these named instruments, played for wine-drinking] cause Israel's lowliness.*
  - I. *"And what is written thereafter? 'Thereafter [48B] Sheol has enlarged its appetite and opened its mouth beyond measure, and the nobility of Jerusalem and her multitude go down, her throng and he who exults in her' (Isa. 5:14)."*

## **II.1 A. When the former prophets died out [M. 9:12A]:**

- B. *Who are the former prophets?*

- C. Said R. Huna, "These are David, Samuel, and Solomon."
- D. *R. Nahman said, "In the time of David, sometimes things worked out [when the Urim and Thumim were consulted], sometimes they did not work out, for lo, he asked Zadoq and things worked out, then he asked Abiathar and things did not work out for him,*
- E. *"as it is said, 'And Abiathar went up' (2Sa. 15:24). [At issue is consultation with the Urim and Thumim]."*
- F. Rabbah bar Samuel raised the objection, "'And he set himself to seek God all the days of Zechariah who had understanding in the vision of God' (2Ch. 26: 5).
- G. *"Does this not refer to consultation with the Urim and Thummim?"*
- H. No, it was consultation through the prophets.
- J. Come and take note: [T.:] **When the first Temple was destroyed, the kingship was removed from the House of David.**
- K. **The Urim and Tummim ceased [M. 9:12A].**
- L. **The cities of refuge came to an end.**
- M. **And if someone wants you to cite, "The governor told them that they were not to partake of the most holy food until there should be a priest to consult Urim and Thummim" (Ezr. 2:63),"**
- N. **say to him, "This is like a man who says to his friend, 'Until the dead will live,' or, 'Until Elijah will come'" [T. Sot. 13:2].**
- O. *Rather, said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "What is meant by 'former' prophets? It is used to distinguish Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, who are the latter prophets."*
- P. *For our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. **When the latter prophets died, that is, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, then the Holy Spirit came to an end in Israel.**
- R. **But even so, they made use of an echo.**
- S. **Sages gathered together in the upper room of the house of Guria in Jericho, and a heavenly echo came forth and said to them, "There is a man among you who is worthy to receive the Holy Spirit, but his generation is unworthy of such an honor." They all set their eyes upon Hillel, the elder.**
- T. **And when he died, they said about him, "Woe for the humble man, woe for the pious man, the disciple of Ezra" [T. Sot. 13:3].**
- U. **Then another time they were in session in Yabneh and heard an echo saying, "There is among you a man who is worthy to receive the Holy Spirit, but the generation is unworthy of such an honor."**
- V. **They all set their eyes upon Samuel the younger.**
- W. **At the time of his death what did they say? "Woe for the humble man, woe for the pious man, the disciple of Hillel the Elder!"**
- X. **Also: he said at the time of his death, "Simeon and Ishmael are destined to be put to death, and the rest of the associates will die by the sword, and the remainder of the people will be up for spoil. After this, the great disasters will fall."**



- Y. Also concerning R. Judah b. Baba they ordained that they should say about him, “Woe for the humble man, woe for the pious man, disciple of Samuel the Small.” But the times did not allow it [T. **Sot. 13:4**].
- Z. For they do not raise a lamentation for those who are put to death by the government.

**III.1 A. When the sanctuary was destroyed, the Shamir-worm ceased [M. 9:12B]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “With a shamir-worm Solomon built the Temple, as it is said, ‘There was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was being built (1Ki. 6: 7),’ the words of R. Judah.
- D. Said to him R. Nehemiah, “They sawed with a saw outside, as it is said, ‘All these were of costly stones... sawed with saws in the house and outside’ (1Ki. 7: 9).
- E. “Why does Scripture say, ‘Inside the house and outside?’ Inside the house they were not heard, for they prepared them outside and brought them inside.”
- F. Said Rabbi, “The opinion of R. Judah seems to me preferable in regard to the stones of the sanctuary, and the opinion of R. Nehemiah in regard to the stones of [Solomon’s] house” [T. **Sot. 15:1**].
- G. *And in the view of R. Nehemiah, what purpose did the Shamir-worm serve?*
- H. *It was in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. On the stones [on the priest’s ephod and breastplate] they do not write in ink, since it is said, “Like the engravings of a signet” (Exo. 28:11), nor do they cut into them with a knife, for it is stated, “In their settings” (Exo. 28:20).
- J. Rather, one writes on them with ink and shows the shamir on the outside, and they split [along the written lines] on their own like a fig that splits in the summer but loses nothing, or like a ravine that splits in the rainy season and loses nothing.

**III.2. A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority:**

- B. [What is the character of this shamir-worm?] It is the size of a barley-grain and a creature from the six days of Creation.
- C. When they put it on stones or on beams, they open up before it like the pages of a notebook. And not only so, but when they put it on iron, [the iron] splits and falls apart before it. And nothing can stand before it.
- D. How is it kept? They wrap it in tufts of wool and put it in a lead tube full of barley-bran.

**III.3. A. Said R. Ammi, “When the first Temple was destroyed, use of fringed silk and white glass [Cohen] was dropped.”**

- B. It was taught on Tannaite authority to the same effect:
- C. When the first Temple was destroyed, [use of] fringed silk, white glass, and iron chariots was dropped.
- D. And some say, “Also congealed wine that comes from Senir and looks like fig-cakes.”

**IV.1 A. And so did the honey of supim [M. 9:12B]:**

- B. *What is honey of supim?*
- C. Said Rab, "It is fine flour that rises to the top of the sieve and looks like dough kneaded with honey and oil."
- D. Levi said, "It is two loaves of bread that cleave to the oven on opposite walls and rise until they touch one another."
- E. R. Joshua b. Levi said, "It is honey that comes from the hills (sofim)."
- F. *What implies that view?*
- G. *It is in accord with R. Sheshet's explanation, " [Cohen:] When the bees spring forth and fly in the heights of the world and collect honey from the herbage on the mountains."*

**IV.2.** A. *We have learned in the following passage of the Mishnah:*

- B. **Any unbroken stream [of fluid] is insusceptible to uncleanness, except for thick honey and porridge [M. Mak. 5:9A-B].**
- C. *What is the meaning of the word used here for thick?*
- D. Said R. Yohanan, "It is honey used for a base for thinning [hence, thick to begin with]."
- E. R. Simeon b. Laqish, "It is called by the name of the place from which it comes, as it is written, 'Zif, Telem, and Bealoth' (Jos. 15:24)."
- F. "Along these same lines you may cite the following: 'When the Zifites came and said to Saul, "Does not David..."' (Psa. 54: 2)."
- G. *Who are the Zifites?*
- H. Said R. Yohanan, "They are people who falsify [ZYP] their opinions [speaking hypocritically]."
- I. R. Eleazar says, "They are called by the name of the place from which they come,
- J. "as it is written, 'Zif, Telem, and Bealoth' (Jos. 15:24)."

**V.1 A. And faithful men came to an end [M. 9:12C]:**

- B. Said R. Isaac, "These [men of faith] were those who had believed in the Holy One, blessed be he."
- C. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. R. Eliezer the Great says, "Whoever has a piece of bread in his wallet and says, 'What shall I eat tomorrow' is only one of those of little faith."
- E. *That is in line with what R. Eleazar said, "What is the meaning of that which is written, 'For who has despised the day of small things' (Zec. 4:10)?"*
- F. "Who caused the table of the righteous to be despoiled in the age to come?"
- G. "It was the smallness [of spirit] that characterized them, for they did not believe in the Holy One, blessed be he."
- H. Raba said, "These are the infant children of wicked Israelites, [49A] who will despoil the judgment against their fathers in time to come, saying before [God], 'Lord of the ages, since you are going to exact punishment from them in the future, why have you ground their teeth down now [by letting us die and so bereaving them in this world]?"

## Disciples of Sages and Study of the Torah

The composite that follows takes up the theme of the study of Torah and its affect upon the disciples. It is included because 2.C, in the model of 2.A, refers to the power of prayer, citing that of Habakkuk to explain why disciples of sages have adequate support for their studies. 2.A-D speak of those who believe in God, pursuing the general theme of the Mishnah-sentence, now with special attention to prayer.

- V.2.** A. Said R. Ilai son of Yebarekhia, “Were it not for David’s prayer[‘s effectiveness], all Israelites would be garbage-dealers,  
B. “for it is said, ‘Grant fear of them, O Lord’ (Psa. 9:21).”  
C. Said R. Ilai, son of Yebarekhia, “If it were not for the prayer of Habakkuk, two disciples of sages would have to cloak themselves in a single garment when studying Torah.  
D. “For it is said, ‘O Lord, I have heard the report of you and I am afraid, O Lord, revive your work in the midst of the years’ (Hab. 3: 2).  
E. “Do not read, ‘in the midst of the years’ but ‘in the drawing together of two.’”
- V.3.** A. Said R. Ilai, son of Yebarekhia, “If two disciples of sages go along without words of Torah between them, they are worthy of being burned in fire,  
B. “as it is said, ‘And it came to pass, as they still went on, that, behold, a chariot of fire’ (2Ki. 2:11).  
C. *“The reason [that the chariot of fire appeared] is that they were talking. Lo, if there had not been talk [of Torah], they would have been worthy of being burned.”*
- V.4.** A. Said R. Ilai, son of Yebarekhia, “If there are two disciples of sages who live in the same town and are not easy with one another in the law, one will die and the other will go into exile,  
B. “as it is said, ‘That the manslaughter may flee there, who slays his neighbor without knowledge’ (Deu. 4:42).  
C. “‘Knowledge’ refers only to Torah, as it is said, ‘My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge’ (Hos. 4: 6).”
- V.5.** A. Said R. Judah, son of R. Hiyya, “Any disciple of a sage who occupies himself in Torah in conditions of poverty will have his prayer heard,  
B. “as it is said, ‘For the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem; you shall weep no more; he will surely be gracious to you at the sound of your cry; when he shall be here, he will answer you’ (Isa. 30:19).  
C. “And the passage continues, ‘The Lord will give you bread in adversity and water in affliction’ (Isa. 30:20).”  
D. R. Abbahu says, “They give him satisfaction even from the splendor of God’s presence,  
E. “as it is said, ‘Your eyes will see your teacher’ (Isa. 30:20).”  
F. R. Aha bar Hanina said, “It is even the case that the veil will not be closed before him,  
G. “as it is said, ‘Your teacher will no more be hidden’ (Isa. 30:20).”

**VI.1 A. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says in the name of R. Joshua, “From the day on which the Temple was destroyed, there is no day,” etc. [M. 9:12E]:**

- B. Said Raba, “Every day’s curse is greater than that of the day before,
- C. “as it is said, ‘In the morning, you will say, “Would that it were evening!” and in the evening you will say, “Would that it were morning”’ (Deu. 28:67).”
- D. *Which morning [can be meant]?*
- E. *If one might propose that it is the morning of the coming day, who knows what will happen on it?*
- F. *Rather, the meaning can be only the morning of the preceding day [since it was less difficult than today’s].*
- G. *How can the world stand?*
- H. *It rests on the Holy [holy holy] of the order [the doxology].* [Cohen, p. 264, n. 4: “The doxology of the order.” This name is given to the passage recited at the conclusion of the morning service, which begins, “And a Redeemer shall come unto Zion,” and which consists of Scriptural verses including the doxology in Hebrew and Aramaic. It was designed according to Rashi to take the place of the daily study of the law which is enjoined upon every Jew.]
- I. *[And this is accompanied by the response of] “His great name [may be blessed, sanctified, etc.],” said after the study of lore.*
- J. *So it is said, “A land of thick darkness, as darkness itself, a land of the shadow of death, without any order” (Job. 10:22).*
- K. *Lo, if there are orders [Scriptural readings], they shine out of thick darkness.*

**VII.1 A. Dew has not come down as a blessing. The good taste of produce is gone [M. 9:12E].**

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “[When] purity [ceased], it took away the taste and scent; [when] tithes [ceased], they took away the fatness of corn” [T. 15:2H-M. 9:13].**

**VII.2. A. R. Huna came across a juicy date. He took it and wrapped it in his mantel.**

- B. *Rabbah, his son, came along. He said to him, “I smell the odor of a fat date.”*
- C. *He said to him, “My son, there is purity in you.”*
- D. *He gave it to him. Along the while Abba, [Rabbah’s] son, came. [Rabbah] took it and gave it to him [Abba, his son].*
- E. *[Huna] said to [Rabbah], “My son, you have made my heart happy, but you have ground down my teeth.”*
- F. *That is what people say, “The father loves the son, and the son loves his sons.”*
- G. *R. Aha bar Jacob raised R. Jacob, the son of his daughter. When he grew up, he said to him, “Bring me some water.”*
- H. *He said to him, “I am not your son. [There is no religious duty incumbent on me to do so.]”*
- I. *That is what people say, “Raise me, raise me, I am your daughter’s son.”*

With the noted intrusion, the bulk of the Talmud serves to amplify the Mishnah’s statements, commonly with the Tosefta’s complement.

## 9:14-15

- A. In the war against Vespasian they decreed against the wearing of wreaths by bridegrooms and against the wedding-drum.
- B. In the war against Titus they decreed against the wearing of wreaths by brides.
- C. And [they decreed] that a man should not teach Greek to his son.
- D. In the last war [Bar Kokhba's] they decreed that a bride should not go out in a palanquin inside the town.
- E. But our rabbis [thereafter] permitted the bride to go out in a palanquin inside the town.

M. 9:14

- A. When R. Meir died, makers of parables came to an end.
- B. When Ben 'Azzai died, diligent students came to an end.
- C. When Ben Zoma' died, exegetes came to an end.
- D. When R. Joshua died, goodness went away from the world.
- E. When Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel died, the locust came, and troubles multiplied.
- F. When R. Eleazar b. Azariah died, wealth went away from the sages.
- G. When R. Aqiba died, the glory of the Torah came to an end.
- H. When R. Hanina b. Dosa died, wonder-workers came to an end.
- I. When R. Yosé Qatnuta died, pietists went away.
- J. (And why was he called Qatnuta? Because he was the least of the pietists.)
- K. When Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai died, the splendor of wisdom came to an end.
- L. When Rabban Gamaliel the Elder died, the glory of the Torah came to an end, and cleanness and separateness perished.
- M. When R. Ishmael b. Phabi died, the splendor of the priesthood came to an end.
- N. When Rabbi died, modesty and fear of sin came to an end.
- O. B.: Our rabbis have taught: R. Pinhas b. Yair says, "When the Temple was destroyed, associates became ashamed and so did free men, and they covered their heads.
- P. "And wonder-workers became feeble. And violent men and big talkers grew strong.
- Q. "And none expounds and none seeks [learning] and none asks.
- R. "Upon whom shall we depend? Upon our Father in heaven."
- S. R. Eliezer the Great says, "From the day on which the Temple was destroyed, sages began to be like scribes, and scribes like ministers, and ministers like ordinary folk.
- T. "And the ordinary folk [49B] have become feeble.
- U. "And none seeks.
- V. "Upon whom shall we depend? Upon our Father in heaven."

- W. With the footprints of the Messiah: presumption increases, and dearth increases.
- X. The vine gives its fruit and wine at great cost.
- Y. And the government turns to heresy.
- Z. And there is no reproof.
- AA. The gathering place will be for prostitution.
- BB. And Galilee will be laid waste.
- CC. And the Golan will be made desolate.
- DD. And the men of the frontier will go about from town to town, and none will take pity on them.
- EE. And the wisdom of scribes will putrefy.
- FF. And those who fear sin will be rejected.
- GG. And the truth will be locked away.
- HH. Children will shame elders, and elders will stand up before children.
- II. “For the son dishonors the father and the daughter rises up against the mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man’s enemies are the men of his own house” (Mic. 7: 6).
- JJ. The face of the generation in the face of a dog.
- KK. A son is not ashamed before his father.
- LL. Upon whom shall we depend? Upon our Father in heaven.
- MM. [The Bavli cites the following under the signal, Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority, while the Mishnah cites the same passage as part of its repertoire:] R. Pinhas b. Yair says, “Heedfulness leads to cleanliness, cleanliness leads to cleanness, cleanness leads to abstinence, abstinence leads to holiness, holiness leads to modesty, modesty leads to the fear of sin, the fear of sin leads to piety, piety leads to the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, and the resurrection of the dead comes through Elijah, blessed be his memory, Amen.”]

**M. 9:15**

- I.1 A.** [In the war against Vespasian they decreed against the wearing of wreaths by bridegrooms and against the wedding-drum:]
- B. Said Rab, “The statement concerning [the prohibition of wreaths, **M. 9:14A**] pertains only to those made of salt and brimstone, but one made of myrtle and roses is permitted” [T. **Sot. 15:8B**].
- B. And Samuel says, “Even one of myrtle and roses is forbidden. But one made of reeds and rushes is permitted.”
- C. Levi said, “Even one made of reeds and rushes is forbidden.”
- D. And so did Levi repeat the Tannaite teaching: “Even one made of reeds and rushes is forbidden.”
- II.1 A.** Against the wedding drum [**M. 9:14A**]:
- B. *What is a wedding drum?*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “It is a drum with one bell.”*
- D. *Rabbah bar R. Huna made a tambourine for his son’s wedding.*

- E. *His father came and broke it.*
- F. *He said to him, "It might serve instead of a drum with one bell [so would lead to law-violation]. Go, make one by stretching a skin over the mouth of a pitcher or a jug."*

**III.1 A. In the war against Titus they decreed against the wearing of wreaths by brides [M. 9:14B]:**

- B. *What are wreaths for brides?*
- C. Said Rabbah bar Hanan said R. Yohanan, "A tiara made of gold."
- D. *It was taught on Tannaite authority along these same lines:*
- E. **What are crowns for brides? Golden tiaras.**
- F. **But one may make for a bride a woolen cap [T. Sot. 15:8D].**
- G. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. They also made a decree against a canopy used by bridegrooms.
- I. What is a canopy used by bridegrooms?
- J. One made of crimson silk embroidered with gold.
- K. *A teaching on Tannaite authority maintains the same view:*
- L. What is a canopy used by bridegrooms? It is one made of crimson silk embroidered with gold.
- M. But one may make a framework of lathes and suspend on it anything one wants.

**IV.1 A. And that a man should not teach Greek to his son [M. 9:14C]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. When the kings of the Hasmonean house fought one another, Hyrcanus was outside and Aristobulus was inside [Jerusalem]. Every day [the people inside] would lower a basket of denars, and those outside would raise up animals for the daily whole-offering. There was there [among the besieging forces] an elder, who was familiar with Greek learning. He spoke with them concerning Greek learning, saying to them, "So long as they carry out the Temple service, they will not be given over into your hands."
- D. The next day when the insiders lowered a basket of denars, the outsiders sent up a pig.
- E. When the pig got half way up the wall, it dug its hoof into the wall. The land of Israel quaked and moved four hundred parasangs.
- F. At that time they ruled, "It is forbidden for someone to raise pigs, and it is forbidden for anyone to teach Greek learning to his son."
- G. *Concerning that year, we have learned: The sheaf of first grain had to come from the gardens of Zarifim and the two loaves from the valley of En Soker [M. Men. 10:2].*
- H. *Is it so [that one may not teach his children Greek]?*
- I. And did not Rabbi say, "In the land of Israel why use Syriac? Let it be either the Holy Language or the Greek language."
- J. And R. Joseph said, "In Babylonia why use Aramaic? Either use the Holy Language or use the Persian language [Pahlavi]."



- K. *[But we have to make a distinction, teaching] the Greek language as one thing, and Greek learning as something else.*
- L. *But is Greek learning, for its part, forbidden at all?*
- M. And did not R. Judah say Samuel said in the name of R. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “*What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture: ‘My eye affects my soul, because of all the daughters of my city’ (Lam. 3:51)?*”
- N. “There were a thousand children in my father’s house, five hundred of them studied Torah, and five hundred studied Greek learning.
- O. “And I am the only one of them who has survived here, and my father’s brother’s son [survived] in Asia.”
- P. *The household of Rabban Gamaliel is in a separate category [and may study Greek], for they had a relationship with the government.*
  - Q. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - R. To cut the hair in front — lo, this is one of the “ways of the Amorites” [which is forbidden].
  - S. Abtilus b. Reuben was permitted to cut his hair in front, because he had a relationship to the government.
  - T. The household of Rabban Gamaliel did they permit to study Greek learning, because they had a relationship to the government.

**V.1 A. In the last war they decreed that a bride should not go out in a palanquin [M. 9:14D]:**

- B. *What is the reason?*
- C. *On account of modesty.*

**VI.1 A. When R. Yohanan... died, [the splendor of] wisdom came to an end [M. 9:15K]:**

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **When R. Eliezer died, the scroll of the Torah was hidden away:**
- D. **When R. Joshua died, counsel ceased, and reflection ended in Israel [M. 9:15D].**
- E. **When R. Aqiba died, the [strong] arms of Torah were taken away, and the springs of wisdom ceased [cf. M. 9:15G].**
- F. **When R. Eleazar b. Azariah died, the crown of wisdom ceased, for “The crown of the wise is their riches” (Pro. 14:24) [cf. M. 9:15, T. Sot. 15:3].**
- G. **[B. lacks:] When Ben Azzai died, the diligent students came to an end [M. 9:15B, T. Sot. 15:4].**
- H. **[B. lacks:] When Ben Zoma died, the exegetes came to an end [M. 9:15C].**
- I. **When R. Hanina b. Dosa died, wonder-workers came to an end in Israel [M. 9:15H].**
- J. **When Abba Yosé b. Qitnit of Qatanta died, piety became small in Israel.**
- K. **Why was he called a man of Qatanta? Because he was among the least of the pious [T. Sot. 15:5 A-D].**

**VII.1** A. When Ben Azzai died, diligent students came to an end. When Ben Zoma died, exegetes came to an end. When Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel died, the locust came and troubles multiplied [M. [Sot. 9:15B-C, E](#)].

B. When Rabbi died, troubles were doubled [T. [Sot. 15:5F](#)].

**VIII.1** A. When Rabbi died, modesty and fear of sin came to an end [M. [9:15N](#)]:

B. *Said R. Joseph to the Tannaite [repeater of traditions who served Joseph's circle], "Do not recite [in your version] the word 'modesty,' for there is yet I."*

C. *Said R. Nahman to the Tannaite [repeater of traditions of his circle], "Do not recite [in your version] the word 'fear of sin' for there is I."*

The Talmud does a fine job of lightly glossing the Mishnah's statements.