

IV.

THE STRUCTURE AND SYSTEM OF BABYLONIAN TALMUD HAGIGAH

Whether or not the Talmud of Babylonia is carefully organized in large-scale, recurrent structures and guided by a program that we may call systematic forms the principal question addressed by an academic commentary. The preceding chapters therefore have pointed toward the presentation set forth here.

By “structure” I mean, a clearly-articulated pattern that governs the location of fully-spelled out statements. By “system,” I mean, a well-crafted and coherent set of ideas that explain the social order of the community addressed by the writers of a document, a social philosophy, a theory of the way of life, world view, and character of the social entity formed by a given social group. I see a collective, anonymous, and political document, such as the one before us, as a statement to, and about, the way in which people should organize their lives and govern their actions. At issue then in any document such as the remarkable one before us is simple: does this piece of writing present information or a program, facts to whom it may concern, or a philosophically and aesthetically cogent statement about how things should be?

The connection between structure and system is plain to see. From the way in which people consistently frame their thoughts, we move to the world that, in saying things one way rather than in some other, they wish to imagine the world in which they wish to live, to which they address these thoughts. For if the document exhibits structure and sets forth a system, then it is accessible to questions of rationality. We may ask about the statement that its framers or compilers wished to make by putting the document together as they did. But if we discern no structure and perceive no systematic inquiry or governing points of analysis, then all we find here is inert and miscellaneous information, facts but no propositions, arguments, viewpoints.

Now the Talmud commonly finds itself represented as lacking organization and exhibiting a certain episodic and notional character. That view moreover characterizes the reading and representation of the document by learned and experienced scholars, who have devoted their entire lives to Talmud study and exegesis. It must follow that upon the advocate of the contrary view — the one implicit in the representation of the document for academic analysis — rests the burden of proof. I set forth the allegation that the Talmud exhibits a structure and follows a system and therefore exhibits a commonly-intelligible rationality. The claim to write an academic commentary explicitly states that proposition. For the tractate before us, I have therefore to adduce evidence and argument.

I maintain that through the normal procedures of reasoned analysis we may discern in the tractate a well-crafted structure. I hold that the structure made manifest, we may further identify the purpose and perspective, the governing system of thought and argument, of those who collected and arranged the tractate's composites and put them together in the way in which we now have them. By "structure" I mean, how is a document organized? and by "system," what do the compilers of the document propose to accomplish in producing this complete, organized piece of writing? The answers to both questions derive from a simple outline of the tractate as a whole, underscoring the types of compositions and composites of which it is comprised. Such an outline tells us what is principal and what subordinate, and how each unit — composition formed into composites, composites formed into a complete statement — holds together and also fits with other units, fore and aft. The purpose of the outline then is to identify the character of each component of the whole, and to specify its purpose or statement. The former information permits us to describe the document's structure, the latter, its system.

While the idea of simply outlining a Talmud-tractate beginning to end may seem obvious, I have never made such an outline before, nor has anyone else.* Yet, as we shall now see, the character of the outline dictates all further analytical initiatives. Specifically, when we follow the layout of the whole, we readily see the principles of organization that govern. These same guidelines on organizing discourse point also to the character of what is organized: complete units of thought, with a beginning, middle, and end, often made up of smaller, equally complete units of thought. The former we know as composites, the latter as compositions.

*I have provided complete outlines for the Mishnah and for the Tosefta in relationship to the Mishnah, and, not always in outline form, for the Midrash-compilations of late antiquity as well.

Identifying and classifying the components of the tractate — the composites, the compositions of which they are made up — we see clearly how the document coheres: the plan and program worked out from beginning to end. When we define that plan and program, we identify the facts of a pattern that permit us to say in a specific and concrete way precisely what the compilers of the tractate intended to accomplish. The structure realizes the system, the program of analysis and thought that takes the form of the presentation we have before us. From what people do, meaning, the way in which they formulate their ideas and organized them into cogent statements, we discern what they proposed to do, meaning, the intellectual goals that they set for themselves.

These goals — the received document they wished to examine, the questions that they brought to that document — realized in the layout and construction of their writing, dictate the points of uniformity and persistence that throughout come to the surface. How people lay out their ideas guides us into what they wished to find out and set forth in their writing, and that constitutes the system that defined the work they set out to accomplish. We move from how people speak to the system that the mode of discourse means to express, in the theory that modes of speech or writing convey modes of thought and inquiry.

We move from the act of thought and its written result backward to the theory of thinking, which is, by definition, an act of social consequence. We therefore turn to the matter of intention that provokes reflection and produces a system of inquiry. That

statement does not mean to imply I begin with the premise of order, which sustains the thesis of a prior system that defines the order. To the contrary, the possibility of forming a coherent outline out of the data we have examined defines the first test of whether or not the document exhibits a structure and realizes a system. So everything depends upon the possibility of outlining the writing, from which all else flows. If we can see the order and demonstrate that the allegation of order rests on ample evidence, then we may proceed to describe the structure that gives expression to the order, and the system that the structure sustains.

The present work undertakes the exegesis of exegesis, that is, the explanation of the principles of exegesis and the hermeneutics of a work of exegesis. For the Talmud of Babylonia, like its counterpart in the Land of Israel, is laid out as a commentary to the Mishnah. That obvious fact defines the character of this academic commentary, since we have already faced the reality that our Bavli-tractate is something other than a commentary, though it surely encompasses one. The problems that captured my attention derived from the deeper question of how people make connections and draw conclusions. To ask about how people make connections means that we identify a problem — otherwise we should not have to ask — and what precipitated the problem here has been how a composition or a composite fits into its context, when the context is defined by the tasks of Mishnah-commentary, and the composition or composite clearly does not comment on the Mishnah-passage that is subjected to comment.

The experience of analyzing the document with the question of cogency and coherence in mind therefore yields a simple recognition. Viewed whole, the tractate contains no gibberish but only completed units of thought, sentences formed into intelligible thought and self-contained in that we require no further information to understand those sentences, beginning to end. The tractate organizes these statements as commentary to the Mishnah. But large tracts of the writing do not comment on the Mishnah in the way in which other, still larger tracts do. Then how the former fit together with the latter frames the single most urgent question of structure and system that I can identify.

Since we have already examined enormous composites that find their cogency in an other than exegetical program, alongside composites that hold together by appeal to a common, prior, coherent statement — the Mishnah-sentences at hand — what justifies my insistence that an outline of the document, resting on the premise that we deal with a Mishnah-commentary, govern all further description? To begin with, the very possibility of outlining Babylonian Talmud tractate Hagigah derives from the simple fact that the framers have given to their document the form of a commentary to the Mishnah. It is in the structure of the Mishnah-tractate that they locate everything together that they wished to compile. We know that is the fact because the Mishnah-tractate defines the order of topics and the sequence of problems.

Relationships to the Mishnah are readily discerned; a paragraph stands at the head of a unit of thought; even without the full citation of the paragraph, we should find our way back to the Mishnah because at the head of numerous compositions, laid out in sequence one to the next, clauses of the Mishnah-paragraph are cited in so many words or alluded to in an unmistakable way. So without printing the entire Mishnah-paragraph at the head, we should know that the received code formed the fundamental structure because so many compositions cite and gloss sentences of the Mishnah-paragraph and are

set forth in sequence dictated by the order of sentences of said Mishnah-paragraph. Internal evidence alone suffices, then, to demonstrate that the structure of the tractate rests upon the Mishnah-tractate cited and discussed here. Not only so, but the sentences of the Mishnah-paragraphs of our tractate are discussed in no other place in the entire Talmud of Babylonia in the sequence and systematic exegetical framework in which they are set forth here; elsewhere we may find bits or pieces, but only here, the entirety of the tractate.

That statement requires one qualification, and that further leads us to the analytical task of our outline. While the entire Mishnah-tractate of Hagigah is cited in the Talmud, the framers of the Talmud by no means find themselves required to say something about every word, every sentence, every paragraph. On the contrary, they discuss only what they choose to discuss, and glide without comment by large stretches of the tractate. A process of selectivity, which requires description and analysis, has told the compilers of the Talmud's composites and the authors of its compositions* what demands attention, and what does not. Our outline has therefore to signal not only what passage of the Mishnah-tractate is discussed, but also what is not discussed, and we require a general theory to explain the principles of selection ("making connections, drawing conclusions" meaning, to begin with, making selections). For that purpose, in the outline, I reproduce the entirety of a Mishnah-paragraph that stands at the head of a Talmudic composite, and I underscore those sentences that are addressed, so highlighting also those that are not.

*This statement requires refinement. I do not know that all available compositions have been reproduced, and that the work of authors of compositions of Mishnah-exegesis intended for a talmud is fully exposed in the document as we have it. That is not only something we cannot demonstrate — we do not have compositions that were not used, only the ones that were — but something that we must regard as unlikely on the face of matters. All we may say is positive: the character of the compositions that address Mishnah-exegesis tells us about the concerns of the writers of those compositions, but we cannot claim to outline all of their concerns, on the one side, or to explain why they chose not to work on other Mishnah-sentences besides the ones treated here. But as to the program of the compositors, that is another matter: from the choices that they made (out of a corpus we cannot begin to imagine or invent for ourselves) we may describe with great accuracy the kinds of materials they wished to include and the shape and structure they set forth out of those materials. We know what they did, and that permits us to investigate why they did what they did. What we cannot know is what they did not do, or why they chose not to do what they did not do. People familiar with the character of speculation and criticism in Talmudic studies will understand why I have to spell out these rather commonplace observations. I lay out an argument based on evidence, not on the silences of evidence, or on the absence of evidence — that alone.

It follows that the same evidence that justifies identifying the Mishnah-tractate as the structure (therefore also the foundation of the system) of the Talmud-tractate before us also presents puzzles for considerable reflection. The exegesis of Mishnah-exegesis is only one of these. Another concerns the purpose of introducing into the document enormous compositions and composites that clearly hold together around a shared topic or proposition, e.g., my appendix on one theme or another, my elaborate footnote providing information that is not required but merely useful, and the like. My earlier characterization of composites as appendices and footnotes signalled the fact that the framers of the document chose a not-entirely satisfactory way of setting out the materials they wished to include here, for large components of the tractate do not contribute to Mishnah-exegesis in any way at all. If these intrusions of other-than-exegetical

compositions were proportionately modest, or of topical composites negligible in size, we might dismiss them as appendages, not structural components that bear much of the weight of the edifice as a whole. Indeed, the language that I chose for identifying and defining these composites — footnotes, appendices, and the like — bore the implication that what is not Mishnah-commentary also is extrinsic to the Talmud's structure and system.

But that language served only for the occasion. In fact, the outline before us will show that the compositions are large and ambitious, the composites formidable and defining. Any description of the tractate's structure that dismisses as mere accretions or intrusions so large a proportion of the whole misleads. Any notion that "footnotes" and "appendices" impede exposition and disrupt thought, contribute extraneous information or form tacked-on appendages — any such notion begs the question: then why fill up so much space with such purposeless information? The right way is to ask whether the document's topical composites play a role in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the compilers of the Talmud. We have therefore to test two hypotheses:

[1] the topical composites ("appendices," "footnotes") do belong and serve the compilers' purpose, or

[2] the topical composites do not participate in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the Talmud and do not belong because they add nothing and change nothing.

The two hypotheses may be tested against the evidence framed in response to a single question: is this topical composite necessary? The answer to that question lies in our asking, what happens to the reading of the Mishnah-tractate in light of the topical composites that would not happen were we to read the same tractate without them? The outline that follows systematically raises that question, with results specified in due course. It suffices here to state the simple result of our reading of the tractate, start to finish: the question of structure, therefore also that of system, rests upon the position we identify for that massive component of the tractate that comprises not Mishnah-commentary but free-standing compositions and composites of compositions formed for a purpose other than Mishnah-commentary.

The principal rubrics are given in small caps. The outline takes as its principal rubrics two large-scale organizing principles.

The first is the divisions of the Mishnah-tractate to which the Talmud-tractate serves as a commentary. That simple fact validates the claim that the tractate exhibits a fully-articulated structure. But the outline must also underscore that the Mishnah-tractate provides both more and less than the paramount outline of the Talmud-tractate. It is more because sentences in the Mishnah-tractate are not analyzed at all. These untreated Mishnah-sentences are given in bold face lower case caps, like the rest of the Mishnah, but then are specified by underlining and enclosure in square brackets.

Second, it is less because the structure of the tractate accommodates large composites that address topics not defined by the Mishnah-tractate. That brings us to the second of the two large-scale modes of holding together both sustained analytical exercises and also large sets of compositions formed into cogent composites. These are treated also as major units and are indicated by Roman numerals, alongside the Mishnah-paragraphs themselves; they are also signified in small caps. But the principal rubrics that do not focus on Mishnah-commentary but on free-standing topics or propositions or

problems are not given in boldface type. Consequently, for the purposes of a coherent outline we have to identify as autonomous entries in our outline those important composites that treat themes or topics not contributed by the Mishnah-tractate.

I. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 1:1-2

A. ALL ARE LIABLE FOR AN APPEARANCE OFFERING:

1. I:1: When the framer of the foregoing statement makes explicit use of the inclusionary language, all, what [classification of persons is] included, [that otherwise would have been omitted]?

B. EXCEPT FOR (1) A DEAF-MUTE:

1. II:1: The Tannaite formulation treats a deaf-mute as comparable to an idiot and a minor: just as an idiot and a minor are not assumed to be persons of sound senses, so too a deaf-mute is not assumed to be a person of sound senses.

a. II:2: Secondary development of foregoing.

b. II:3: Case illustrative of foregoing. Appeals to the proof text, That they may hear and that they may learn" (Deu. 31:12).

c. II:4: Tanhum: One who is deaf in one ear is exempt from bringing the appearance-offering.

d. II:5: Tanhum: One who is lame in one leg is exempt from bringing the appearance-offering.

I. II:6: Expansion of the exegesis of the proof-text cited in the foregoing item.

II. II:7: Another exegesis of Scripture attributed to Tanhum.

e. II:8: Reversion to the exegesis of Deu. 31:12, continuing II:3: The men come to learn, the women to listen, but why do the children come?

I. II:9: Analytical comment on the foregoing.

C. (2) AN IDIOT, (3) A MINOR:

1. III:1: What is the definition of an idiot?

2. III:2: Continuation of foregoing: That is so only if all of these traits apply simultaneously.

i. III:3: Clarification of a detail of the foregoing.

D. (4) ONE WITHOUT PRONOUNCED SEXUAL CHARACTERISTICS,

(5) ONE WHO EXHIBITS THE SEXUAL TRAITS OF BOTH SEXES,

1. IV:1: Tannaite proof from Scripture for the proposition at hand.

2. IV:2: Continuation and expansion of foregoing.

3. IV:3: As above.

4. IV:4: As above.

E. (6) WOMEN, (7) SLAVES WHO HAVE NOT BEEN FREED,

1. V:1: how on the basis of Scripture do we know that slaves are excluded from the requirement of presenting an appearance offering?

F. (8) THE LAME, (9) THE BLIND, (10) THE SICK, (11) THE OLD,

1. VI:1: Tannaite clarification of the verses of Scripture that sustain this proposition.
2. VI:2: The uncircumcised and the unclean are exempt from making an appearance at festivals.

a. VI:3: Tannaite proof introduced at 2.B. is now spelled out in full.

G. VARIOUS SAGES WEPT UPON READING VERSES THAT INDICATE THE ESTRANGEMENT OF ISRAEL FROM GOD

- I. VI:4: The same proof-text is repeated, now in the context of a sage's weeping when he read said verse. Then comes a set of other verses that prompted weeping on the part of named sages: When R. Huna came to this verse, "he will see, being seen," he wept, saying, "A slave whose master yearns to see him is estranged from him.
- II. VI:5: When R. Huna came to this verse, he wept: "And And you shall sacrifice peace offerings and shall eat there' (Deu. 27:7). A slave whose master yearns to see him is estranged from him.
- III. VI:6: When R. Eleazar came to this verse, he wept: "'And his brothers couldn't answer him, because they were frightened in his presence' (Gen. 45:3).
- IV. VI:7: When R. Eleazar came to this verse, he wept: "'And Samuel said to Saul, why have you disturbed me to bring me up' (1Sa. 28:15).
- V. VI:8: When R. Ammi came to this verse, he wept: "Let him put his mouth in the dust, perhaps there may be hope"
- VI. VI:9: When R. Ammi came to this verse, he wept: "Seek righteousness, seek humility, perhaps shall you be hid in the day of the Lord's anger"
- VII. VI:10: When R. Assi came to this verse, he wept: "Hate the evil and love the good and establish justice in the gate, perhaps the Lord, the God of hosts, will be gracious"
- VIII. VI:11: When R. Joseph came to this verse, he wept: "But there is he who is swept away without judgment" (Pro. 13:23).
- IX. VI:12: When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: "'And you did incite me against him, to destroy him without a cause' (Job. 2:3)
- X. VI:13: When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: "'Behold, he puts no trust in his holy ones' (Job. 15:15)
- XI. VI:14: When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: "And I will come near to you to judgment and I will be a swift witness

against the sorcerers and against the adulterers and against false swearers and against those who oppress the employee in his wages' (Mal. 3:5)

- XII. VI:15: Secondary repetition of the foregoing proposition, without a proof text.
- XIII. VI:16: As above.
- XIV. VI:17: As above.
- XV. VI:18: When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: ““For God shall bring every work into the judgment concerning every hidden thing [whether it be good or whether it be evil]’ (Qoh. 12:14)
- XVI. VI:19: Gloss on foregoing.
- XVII. VI:20: As above.
- XVIII. VI:21: When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: ““And it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles have come upon them’ (Deu. 31:21)
- XIX. VI:22: Gloss on foregoing.
- XX. VI:23: Exegesis of Deu. 31:17.
- XXI. VI:24: As above.
- XXII. VI:25: As above.
- XXIII. VI:26: Exegesis of verse subordinate in the foregoing.
- XXIV. VI:27: Continuation of exegesis of the same passage as is treated in the foregoing.
- XXV. VI:28: For lo, he who forms the mountains and creates the wind and declares to man what his conversation was” (Amo. 4:13). He said, “A slave whose master tells him what his conversation was — has he any remedy?”
- XXVI. VI:29: Gloss on foregoing.
- XXVII. VI:30: Extension of treatment of the theme of the foregoing, on how God knows all secrets.

H. DOES GOD WEEP? EXEGESES OF JER. 13:17

- XXVIII. VI:30: Gloss on foregoing. Introduces the theme of : God’s weeping.
- XXIX. VI:31: as above: God’s weeping.
- XXX. VI:32: as above: God’s weeping.
- XXXI. VI:33: as above: God’s weeping.
- XXXII. VI:34: For three persons does the Holy One, blessed be he, weep every single day: for him who has the opportunity to study the Torah but does not engage in it, for him who does not have the opportunity to engage in study of the Torah

but does so, and for a community leader who lords it over the community.

XXXIII. VI:35: Rabbi was holding the book of Lamentations and reading in it. When he came to the verse, “He has cast down from heaven to the earth” (Lam. 2:1), the scroll fell from his hands.

I. SEEING AND BEING SEEN BY GOD

XXXIV. VI:36: You have greeted me, who can be seen but cannot see; may you enjoy the Heavenly response of greeting him who sees but is not seen.”

XXXV. VI:37: The analogy in the study of Torah: R. Idi father of R. Jacob bar Idi was accustomed to go for three months on the trip and spend one day at the school.

J. AND ONE WHO CANNOT GO UP ON FOOT. WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF A MINOR? “ANY WHO CANNOT RIDE ON THE SHOULDER OF HIS FATHER TO GO UP FROM JERUSALEM TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT,” THE WORDS OF THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI. AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, “ANY WHO CANNOT HOLD HIS FATHER’S HAND TO GO UP FROM JERUSALEM TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT.”

1. VII:1: “So who carried him up to now?” The fact that he could travel to Jerusalem shows that he is old enough to do without his mother; at that age he is also old enough to be able to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount by holding his father’s hand; what point is there in defining a minor as one who is unable even with the aid of his father to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount, when the prior journey to Jerusalem shows that he is old enough to do this and therefore no longer a minor?
2. VII:2: Reply to the House of Shammai in behalf of the House of Hillel.
3. VII:3: As to a lame minor in the position of the House of Shammai, or a blind minor in respect to both views, what is the law?

K. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “THE APPEARANCE OFFERING MUST BE WORTH AT LEAST TWO PIECES OF SILVER, AND THE FESTAL OFFERING AT LEAST ONE MAAH OF SILVER.” AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, “THE APPEARANCE OFFERING MUST BE AT LEAST ONE MAAH OF SILVER, AND THE FESTAL OFFERING MUST BE WORTH AT LEAST TWO PIECES OF SILVER.”

1. VIII:1: Tannaite amplification of the dispute and its terms.
2. VIII:2: And how come the House of Hillel do not rule as do the House of Shammai?
 - a. VIII:3: The House of Shammai, R. Eleazar, and R. Ishmael all take the view that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the appearance offering.
 - b. VIII:4: Continuation of foregoing.
 - c. VIII:5: Exegesis of proof-text utilized in foregoing.

3. VIII:6: Conflict of the rule of the present Mishnah-paragraph with an intersecting passage.

- a. VIII:7: Gloss on foregoing: What is the meaning of “appearance”?
- b. VIII:8: Continuation of foregoing.
- c. VIII:9: As above.

II. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 1:3-4

A. BURNT OFFERINGS [FOR APPEARANCE OFFERINGS] FOR THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS OF A FESTIVAL DERIVE FROM [BEASTS BOUGHT WITH] UNCONSECRATED MONEY. BUT PEACE OFFERINGS [FOR FESTAL OFFERINGS] MAY COME FROM MONEY IN THE STATUS OF SECOND TITHE.

ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY (OF PASSOVER), THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “[THE OFFERING MUST DERIVE] FROM UNCONSECRATED MONEY.” AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, “[IT MAY DERIVE] FROM MONEY IN THE STATUS OF SECOND TITHE.”

1. I:1: So it is in particular on the intermediate days of the festival that burnt offerings are brought via animals purchased with unconsecrated funds, but for the festival day itself they may derive even from animals bought with money in the status of second tithe. Now why should that be the case?

- a. I:2: Gloss on foregoing.
- b. I:3: As above.
 - I. I:4: Gloss on the gloss.
 - II. I:5: Same.

B. ISRAELITES [BUT NOT PRIESTS] FULFILL THEIR OBLIGATION [IN THE CASE OF] [PEACE OFFERINGS OF REJOICING] THROUGH OFFERINGS BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF VOWS AND AS THANK OFFERINGS, AND THROUGH TITHE OF CATTLE [LEV. 27:32]. AND PRIESTS [DO SO] THROUGH SIN OFFERINGS, GUILT OFFERINGS [NUM. 18:91, FIRSTLINGS, AND THROUGH THE BREAST AND SHOULDER, BUT NOT THROUGH FOWL OR MEAL OFFERINGS.

1. II:1: Tannaite proof of the proposition, based on Scripture.

III. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 1:5

A. HE WHO HAS MANY WHO EAT WITH HIM AND LIMITED PROPERTY BRINGS MANY PEACE OFFERINGS BUT FEW WHOLE OFFERINGS.

[IF HE HAS] ABUNDANT PROPERTY AND FEW WHO EAT WITH HIM, HE BRINGS ABUNDANT WHOLE OFFERINGS AND ONLY A FEW PEACE OFFERINGS. IF BOTH THIS AND THAT ARE LIMITED, CONCERNING SUCH A PERSON IT IS SAID, “ONE MAAH OF SILVER AND TWO PIECES OF SILVER [ARE TO BE THE VALUE OF THE OFFERING].” [IF] HE HAS AN ABUNDANCE OF BOTH, CONCERNING THIS ONE IT IS SAID, “EVERY MAN SHALL GIVE AS HE IS ABLE, ACCORDING TO THE BLESSING OF THE LORD THY GOD WHICH HE HAS GIVEN YOU” (DEU. 16:17).

- 1. I:1: Where is he going to get many peace offerings anyhow?
- 2. I:2: If one has designated ten beasts for his festal offering and offered five of them on the first day, he may go and offer up the other five on the second day.

IV. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 1:6-7

A. HE WHO DID NOT MAKE A FESTAL OFFERING ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF A FESTIVAL MAKES FESTAL OFFERINGS THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE FESTIVAL, INCLUDING THE LAST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL [OF TABERNACLES].

1. I:1: Scriptural foundations for this rule.
2. I:2: Same as above, but a different proof.
3. I:3: What is the meaning of “making good”?

B. [BUT IF] THE FESTIVAL PASSED AND HE DID NOT MAKE A FESTAL OFFERING, HE IS NOT LIABLE TO MAKE IT GOOD. OF SUCH A PERSON IT IS SAID, “THAT WHICH IS CROOKED CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT, AND THAT WHICH IS WANTING CANNOT BE RECKONED” (QOH. 1:15).

1. II:1: What is required for the formulation of that verse is not ‘to be reckoned’ but ‘to be filled.’ So this must refer to one whose associates included him in a count for carrying out a religious deed but who refused to join them.
 - a. II:2: Further saying assigned to the authority behind II:1.
 - b. II:3: As above.
 1. II:4: gloss on foregoing.

C. R. SIMEON B. MENASIA SAYS, “WHAT IS THAT WHICH IS CROOKED WHICH CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT? THIS IS ONE WHO HAS SEXUAL RELATIONS WITH WOMAN IN A FORBIDDEN RELATIONSHIP AND PRODUCES A MAMZER FROM HER. IF YOU SHOULD CLAIM THAT IT APPLIES TO A THIEF OR A ROBBER, HE CAN MAKE RESTITUTION AND BE MADE STRAIGHT.”

R. SIMEON B. YOHAI SAYS, “THEY CALL THAT WHICH IS CROOKED ONLY ONE WHO WAS STRAIGHT TO BEGIN WITH AND WHO BECAME CROOKED. WHAT IS SUCH A PERSON? IT IS A DISCIPLE OF A SAGE WHO TOOK HIS LEAVE OF THE TORAH.”

1. III:1: Tannaite complement to the Mishnah’s rule.
 - a. III:2: Completion of foregoing.

V. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 1:8

A. THE ABSOLUTION OF VOWS HOVERS IN THE AIR, FOR IT HAS NOTHING [IN THE TORAH] UPON WHICH TO DEPEND.

1. I:1: Tannaite amplification of this statement: The absolution of vows certainly has that on which to depend.
2. I:2: Critique of foregoing.
3. I:3: Critique of foregoing.

B. THE LAWS OF THE SABBATH — LO, THEY ARE LIKE MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A STRING:

1. II:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!
2. II:2: Gloss of foregoing.
3. II:3: as above.

C. FESTAL OFFERINGS — LO, THEY ARE LIKE MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A STRING:

1. III:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself.

D. AND SACRILEGE — LO, THEY ARE LIKE MOUNTAINS HANGING BY A STRING:

1. IV:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself

E. FOR THEY HAVE LITTLE SCRIPTURE FOR MANY LAWS.

1. V:1: the laws covering skin ailments described in Lev. 13-14 and uncleanness conveyed by a corpse in a tent involve little Scripture and many laws.

F. LAWS CONCERNING CIVIL LITIGATIONS — HAVE MUCH ON WHICH TO DEPEND:

1. VI:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself.

G. THE SACRIFICIAL CULT — HAVE MUCH ON WHICH TO DEPEND:

1. VII:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself.

H. THINGS TO BE KEPT CULTICALLY CLEAN — HAVE MUCH ON WHICH TO DEPEND:

1. VIII:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself.

I. SOURCES OF CULTIC UNCLEANNESS — HAVE MUCH ON WHICH TO DEPEND:

1. IX:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself.

J. AND PROHIBITED CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES — HAVE MUCH ON WHICH TO DEPEND.

1. X:1: But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself.

K. AND BOTH THESE AND THOSE [EQUALLY] ARE THE ESSENTIALS OF THE TORAH.

1. XI:1: gloss on the reading of the Mishnah.

VI. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 2:1

A. THEY DO NOT EXPOUND UPON THE LAWS OF PROHIBITED RELATIONSHIPS [LEV. 18] BEFORE THREE PERSONS, THE WORKS OF CREATION [GEN. 1-3] BEFORE TWO, OR THE CHARIOT [EZEK. 1] BEFORE ONE, UNLESS HE WAS A SAGE AND UNDERSTANDS OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE.

1. I:1: You say to begin with, or the Chariot [Ezek. 1] before one, but then you go on to say, unless he was a sage and understands of his own knowledge!? Clarification of the formulation of the Mishnah.

B. THEY DO NOT EXPOUND UPON THE LAWS OF PROHIBITED RELATIONSHIPS [LEV. 18] BEFORE THREE PERSONS

1. II:1: Scriptural basis for the rule concerning Lev. 18.

C. THE WORKS OF CREATION [GEN. 1-3] BEFORE TWO:

1. III:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact?

D. DISQUISITION ON THE WORKS OF CREATION

2. III:2: The first man stretched from one end of the world to the other.

3. III:3: Ten things were created on the first day.
 - a. III:4: Analysis of foregoing.
 - b. III:5: As above.
 - c. III:6: Through the light that the Holy One, blessed be he, created on the first day a person could see from one end of the world to the other. This is attached as a complement to the foregoing, though the proposition stands on its own. The next independent unit starts at III:7.
4. III:7: With seven things was the world created: wisdom and understanding, reason and strength, rebuke and might, righteousness and judgment, loving kindness and compassion.
5. III:8: At the moment that the Holy One, blessed be he, created the world, it kept expanding like two clews of warp, until the Holy One, blessed be he, growled at it and stopped it short.
6. III:9: Which was created first, heaven or earth, dispute of the Houses of Shammai and Hillel.
 - a. III:10: Gloss on III.9.
 - b. III:11: Gloss on III.9.
7. III:12: What is the meaning of the word for heaven?
8. III:13: The letters for the word heaven yield] fire and water.
9. III:14: how to interpret the language, ‘accusative particle + heaven’ and ‘accusative particle + earth’?
10. III:15: Re Gen. 1:2: Note that the verse places heaven first? So why then does it narrate the process of making the earth first of all?
11. III:16: As to the earth, on what does it stand? On pillars.
12. III:17: There are two firmaments.
 - a. III:18: For whoever engages in study of the Torah by night — the Holy One, blessed be he, draws out the thread of grace by day.
 - b. III:19: Whoever abandons teachings of the Torah and takes up trivial teachings do they feed fiery coals.
13. III:20: And how do we know that it is called heaven?
14. III:21: Continues No. 20.
15. III:22: There is yet another firmament above the heads of the living creatures.
16. III:23: Of matters up to this point you have every right to speak, concerning matters from this point onward, you have not got the right to speak.
17. III:24: What answer did the echo give that wicked man when he said, ‘I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High’ (Isa. 14:14)?...

E. OR THE CHARIOT [EZEK. 1] BEFORE ONE:

1. IV:1: But they hand over to a single individual the main points.

2. IV:2: They hand over the secrets of the Torah only to one who has five qualities.
3. IV:3: Teachings of the Torah are not to be handed over to gentiles.
4. IV:4: Said R. Yohanan to R. Eleazar, "Come and I shall instruct you in the works of the chariot."
5. IV:5: R. Joseph would study the works of the chariot. The elders of Pumbedita would repeat the Tannaite statements concerning the works of creation. They said to him, "Would the master care to teach us the works of the chariot?"
6. IV:6: Continuation.
7. IV:7: That man is to be remembered for good, by name of Hanina b. Hezekiah, for if it were not for his efforts, the book of Ezekiel would have been hidden away, for what he says contradicts the teachings of the Torah.
8. IV:8: There was the case of a youngster, who was reciting in the household of his master the book of Ezekiel, and he understood the account of the electrum, and fire came forth and ate him up.
9. IV:9: Reverts to IV.6.
10. IV:10: The letters of the word yield the sense: at times they are silent, at times they speak.
11. IV:11: "And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flesh of lightning" (Eze. 1:4): What is the meaning of "ran and returned"?
12. IV:12: "And I looked and behold, a stormy wind came out of the north, a great cloud with a fire flashing up, so that a brightness was round about it, and out of the midst thereof as the color of electrum, out of the midst of the fire" (Eze. 1:4): Where did [the stormy wind from the north] go?
13. IV:13: "Now as I behold the living creatures, behold one wheel at the bottom near the living creatures" (Eze. 1:5): Said R. Eleazar, "This refers to a certain angel, who stands on the earth with his head reaching upward to the living creatures."
14. IV:14: Whatever Ezekiel saw, Isaiah saw.
15. IV:15: What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, 'I will sing to the Lord, for he is highly exalted' (Exo. 15:1).
16. IV:16: One verse of Scripture states, "As for the likeness of their faces, they had the face of a man and they four had the face of a lion on the right side and they four had the face of an ox on the left side" (Eze. 1:10). And another verse of Scripture says, "And everyone had four faces, the first face was the face of the cherub, and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion and the fourth the face of an eagle" (Eze. 10:14) — but there is no mention of the face of an ox!
17. IV:17: What is the meaning of a cherub?
18. IV:18: One verse of Scripture states, "Each one had six wings" (Isa. 6:2), and another, "Each one had four wings" (Eze. 1:6)!

19. IV:19: One verse of Scripture states, “Thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him” (Dan. 7:10), and another, “Is there nay number of his armies” (Job. 25:3).
20. IV:20: Rabbi says in the name of Abba Yosé b. Dosai, “‘Thousand thousands ministered to him’ (Dan. 7:10) — that is the number of a single one of his platoons, but of his platoons there is no fixed number.”
21. IV:21: Continuation of foregoing: Whence does the fiery stream flow?
22. IV:22: Every day ministering angels are created in the fiery stream and sing their song and then cease to be.
23. IV:23: One verse of Scripture states, “His raiment was as white as snow and the hair of his head like pure wool” (Dan. 7:9), but elsewhere it is written, “His locks are curled and black as a raven” (Son. 5:11)! Is he old or young?
24. IV:24: One verse of Scripture states, “His throne was fiery flames” (Dan. 7:9), but elsewhere it is written, “Till thrones were places, and one that was ancient of days did sit” (Dan. 7:9)!

F. A SYSTEMATIC EXEGESIS OF ISAIAH 3:5-7

1. IV:25: With eighteen curses did Isaiah curse Israel, and he didn’t calm down until he had stated to them the following verse of Scripture: ‘The child shall behave insolently against the aged and the base against the honorable’ (Isa. 3:5).
2. IV:26: Even at the time of the fall of Jerusalem, faithful people did not cease from among them.
3. IV:27: “And this ruin” (Isa. 3:6): What is the meaning of “And this ruin” (Isa. 3:6)?
4. IV:28: “On that day he shall take [an oath] saying, I am not a healer, for in my house is neither bread nor a mantle, you shall not make me ruler of a people” (Isa. 3:7).

G. A SPECIFIC CASE INVOLVING THE EXPOSITION OF THE WORKS OF THE CHARIOT.

1. IV:29: Yohanan b. Zakkai, who was riding on an ass and going along the way, with R. Eleazar b. Arakh driving the ass behind him. He said to him, “My lord, repeat for me a chapter of the work of the chariot.” He said to him, “Isn’t this what I have repeated for you people: **‘THEY DO NOT EXPOUND UPON THE LAWS OF PROHIBITED RELATIONSHIPS [LEV. 18] BEFORE THREE PERSONS, THE WORKS OF CREATION [GEN. 1-3] BEFORE TWO, OR THE CHARIOT [EZEK. 1] BEFORE ONE, UNLESS HE WAS A SAGE AND UNDERSTANDS OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE’ [M. 1:1].**”

H. FOUR ENTERED PARADISE, AND WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM, SPECIFICALLY THE FOLLOWING: BEN AZZAI, BEN ZOMA, THE OUTSIDER, AND R. AQIBA: THE CASE OF BEN ZOMA

1. IV:30: Four entered Paradise, and these are they: Ben Azzai, Ben Zoma, the Outsider, and R. Aqiba.
2. IV:31: They asked Ben Zoma, “What is the law on castrating a dog?”

3. IV:32: They asked Ben Zoma, “A virgin-girl who got pregnant — what is the law on her marrying a high priest?...”
4. IV:33: There is the incident involving R. Joshua b. Hananiah, who was standing on the stairs at the Temple mountain, and Ben Zoma saw him but didn’t get up before him. He said to him, “Whence and whither, Ben Zoma?”
5. IV:34: Now note, when did “the spirit of God hover over the face of the waters”? It was on the first day. But the division took place on the second day: “And let it divide the waters from the waters” (Gen. 1:6).
- a. IV:35: And how big a space was it?

I. THE OUTSIDER OR AHER [ELISHA B. ABBUYAH]

1. IV:36: The Outsider cut down the shoots.
2. IV:37: After he had gone forth to wicked ways, the Outsider asked R. Meir, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘God has made even the one as well as the other’ (Qoh. 7:14)?”
- a. IV:38: Continuation of foregoing.
3. IV:39: After he had gone forth to bad ways, the Outsider asked R. Meir, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘Gold and glass cannot equal it, neither shall the exchange thereof be vessels of fine gold’ (Job. 28:17)?”
4. IV:40: There was an incident involving the Outsider, who on the Sabbath was riding on a horse, and R. Meir was walking after him to study Torah from him directly. He said to him, “Meir, go back, for I have been measuring by the hooves of my horse, so I know that up to this point is the Sabbath limit.”
5. IV:41: [Meir] overcame his opposition and took him to a school house. He said to a youngster, “Cite the verse that you’re learning.”
6. IV:42: When the Outsider died, they said, “Let him not be judged, and let him not come into the world to come...”
7. IV:43: Said R. Yohanan, “It’s some miracle to burn his master! There was one among us, and we couldn’t save him [all the rest of the scholars being unable to retrieve the Outsider]. If I took him by the hand, who could have seized from from me?”
8. IV:44: The daughter of the Outsider came before Rabbi. She said to him, “My lord, feed me.”
9. IV:45: Now how could R. Meir have studied Torah from the Outsider?
10. IV:46: When R. Dimi came, he said, “They say in the West: R. Meir ate the date and tossed away the pit.”
11. IV:47: Why are disciples of sages compared to a nut? To tell you: just as a nut, even though it is covered with mud and shit, the contents are unaffected, so a disciple of sages, even though he has gone wrong, his Torah still is not made disreputable.
12. IV:48: Rabbah bar Shila came across Elijah. He said to him, “So what’s the Holy One, blessed be he, up to these days?” He said to him, “He’s reciting traditions in the authority of all the rabbis, but in the authority of R. Meir he’s not

citing a thing.” He said to him, “How come?” He said to him, “It is because he learned traditions on the authority of the Outsider.”

a. IV:49: Samuel came across R. Judah, who was leaning on a door bolt and weeping. He said to him, “Sharp-wit! How come you’re weeping?” He said to him, “Is it such a small thing that is written concerning our rabbis, ‘Where is he who counted, where is he who weighed? Where is he who counted the towers’ (Isa. 33:18)? ‘Where is he who counted’ — for they would count all the letters in the Torah? ‘Where is he who weighed’ — for they would weigh all of the arguments a fortiori in the Torah? ‘Where is he who counted the towers’ — for they would counted the three hundred decided laws that concern the ‘tower that flies in the air’

13. IV:50: They said concerning the Outsider, when he stood up in the house of study, many heretical books fell from his lap.

14. IV:51:1: Nimos the weaver asked R. Meir, “Does all the wool that is put into the dyeing kettle come up properly died?” [Abraham: does the study of the Torah protect all students from sin?]

J. AQIBA

1. IV:52: R. Aqiba went down in one piece and got out in one piece: In his regard, Scripture says, “Draw me, we will run after you” (Son. 1:4).

2. IV:53: What verse of Scripture did he expound? Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “‘And he came from the myriads holy’ (Deu. 33:2) — [since the words for came and sign use the same consonants, the sense is] he is a sign among his myriad.”

a. IV:54: Six traits have been stated with respect to demons, three like human beings, three like ministering angels.

K. WHOEVER REFLECTS UPON FOUR THINGS — IT WOULD HAVE BEEN A MERCY HAD HE NOT BEEN BORN: WHAT IS ABOVE, WHAT IS BELOW, WHAT IS BEFORE, AND WHAT IS BEYOND.

1. V.1: Now there is no problem understanding why it is bad to reflect on **what is above, what is below, and what is beyond..** But as to **what is before**, what was, was [so what difference does it make]?

L. AND WHOEVER HAS NO CONCERN FOR THE GLORY OF HIS MAKER — IT WOULD HAVE BEEN A MERCY FOR HIM HAD HE NOT BEEN BORN.

1. VI:1: What’s the point? R. Abba said, “This refers to someone who gazes at the rainbow.”

a. VI:2: Expounded R. Judah b. R. Nahmani, R. Simeon b. Laqish’s public representative, “Whoever looks at three things — his eyes grow dim: the rainbow, the patriarch, and the priests.”

I. VI:3: Expounded R. Judah b. R. Nahmani, R. Simeon b. Laqish’s public representative. Same attribution for an unrelated saying.

VII. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 2:2

A. YOSÉ B. YOEZER SAYS NOT TO LAY ON HANDS. YOSÉ B. YOHANAN SAYS TO LAY ON HANDS. JOSHUA B. PERAHYAH SAYS NOT TO LAY ON HANDS. NITTAI THE ARBELITE SAYS TO LAY ON HANDS. JUDAH B. TABBAI SAYS NOT TO LAY ON HANDS. SIMEON B. SHATAH SAYS TO LAY ON HANDS. SHEMAYAH SAYS TO LAY ON HANDS. ABTALYON SAYS NOT TO LAY ON HANDS. HILLEL AND MENAHEM DID NOT DIFFER.

1. I:1: Tannaite recapitulation of the Mishnah's statement. Judah: Simeon b. Shatah was patriarch, Judah b. Tabbai was head of the court; vs. Meir.
 - a. I:2: In line with the foregoing, who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority, Meir or Judah?
 - b. I:3: Gloss on foregoing.
 - c. I:4: Conclusion of foregoing.

B. MENAHEM DEPARTED, SHAMMAI ENTERED. SHAMMAI SAYS NOT TO LAY ON HANDS. HILLEL SAYS TO LAY ON HANDS. THE FIRST-NAMED WERE PATRIARCHES, AND THE SECOND TO THEM WERE HEADS OF THE COURT.

1. II:1: So where did Menahem go?
2. II:2: Continuation of foregoing.

C. ...NOT TO LAY ON HANDS...TO LAY ON HANDS:

1. III:1: The considerations of Sabbath rest should never be minor in your view, for lo, the laying on of hands on the festival day is subject to prohibition only by reason of the considerations of the rest that are operative for the Sabbath and festivals, and yet the preeminent authorities of that generation were divided on the matter.
2. III:2: That the issue before us is considerations of Sabbath rest] implies that the laying on of hands must be done with all one's strength.
3. III:3: That the issue before us is considerations of Sabbath rest implies that it is forbidden on the festival or Sabbath to make use of the sides of the beast, of a tree, and the like For if it should enter your mind to suppose that the sides are permitted, then let the hands be laid on at the side of the beast. So it must follow that it is forbidden on the festival or Sabbath to make use of the sides of the beast, of a tree, and the like.

VIII. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 2:3-4

A. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, "THEY BRING PEACE OFFERINGS [ON A FESTIVAL DAY] BUT DO NOT LAY HANDS ON THEM. BUT [THEY DO] NOT [BRING] WHOLE OFFERINGS [AT ALL]." AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, "THEY BRING [BOTH] PEACE OFFERINGS AND WHOLE OFFERINGS, AND THEY LAY HANDS ON THEM."

PENTECOST THAT COINCIDED WITH A FRIDAY — THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, "THE DAY OF SLAUGHTERING [THE WHOLE OFFERING BROUGHT IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT OF APPEARING BEFORE THE LORD] IS ON THE DAY AFTER THE SABBATH [SUNDAY]." AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, "THERE IS NO DAY OF

SLAUGHTERING.” BUT THEY CONCUR THAT IF IT COINCIDED WITH THE SABBATH, THE DAY OF SLAUGHTERING [THE WHOLE OFFERING] IS AFTER THE SABBATH. AND THE HIGH PRIEST DOES NOT PUT ON HIS GARMENTS.

1. I:1: Since we take for granted that offerings not presented on the festival of Pentecost may be presented a day later, under the specified circumstances, just as is the case with the week-long celebrations of Passover and Tabernacles, how on the basis of Scripture do we know that offerings required for Pentecost can be made up throughout seven days [like Tabernacles and Passover?]

B. AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, “THERE IS NO DAY OF SLAUGHTERING:”

1. II:2: What is the meaning of that statement? Isn't it, there is no day of slaughtering at all? The offering cannot be made good later on.
2. II:3: the period for making up the festival sacrifices is a week.
 - a. II:4: Secondary comment on foregoing. Status of acts of labor on the intermediate days of the festival.
 - I. II:5: “You shall do no sort of servile labor” (Lev. 23:7) — this teaches that it is forbidden to perform acts of servile labor on the intermediate days of the festival.
 - II. II:6: just as the seventh day is subject to restraint of servile labor, so the first six days are likewise restrained as to servile labor.

C. AND THEY ARE PERMITTED TO CONDUCT A LAMENTATION OR TO HOLD A FAST, SO AS NOT TO AFFIRM THE OPINION OF THOSE WHO SAY, “THE DATE OF PENTECOST [MUST ALWAYS FALL] AFTER THE SABBATH [ON SUNDAY].”

1. III:1: Tannaite amplification.

IX. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 2:5-7

A. FOR PURPOSES OF CULTIC PURIFICATION, IT IS SUFFICIENT IF THEY WASH THE HANDS FOR EATING UNCONSECRATED FOOD, TITHE, AND HEAVE OFFERING

AND FOR EATING FOOD IN THE STATUS OF HOLY THINGS [IT IS SUFFICIENT ONLY IF] THEY IMMERSE; AND AS TO [THE PREPARATION OF] PURIFICATION WATER [THROUGH THE BURNING OF THE RED COWL, IF ONE'S HANDS ARE MADE UNCLEAR, HIS ENTIRE BODY IS DEEMED TO BE UNCLEAR AS WELL.

1. I:1: But for the eating of unconsecrated food and second tithe, is it necessary to have a cultic rinsing of the hands at all? And by way of contrast, a contrary rule is given.
2. I:2: The matter of intentionality is now introduced, which is the operative variable: he who rinses his hands, if he did so with the intention [that the hands be clean for the various purposes stated], his hands are clean for that purpose, but if he did not do so with such an intention, his hands are unclear.
 - a. I:3: And on what basis do you maintain that for the purpose of eating unconsecrated food, immersion or rinsing of hands does not require correct intentionality?

- I. I:4: If one immersed and came up out of the water, he may confirm his action with the intention of serving any purpose that he wishes.
 - A. I:5: Tannaite authority behind a detail in the foregoing is identified.
 - B. I:6: Clarification of the position of the Tannaite authority identified in I:5.

B. HE WHO IMMERSSES FOR THE EATING OF UNCONSECRATED FOOD AND IS THEREBY CONFIRMED AS SUITABLE FOR EATING UNCONSECRATED FOOD IS PROHIBITED FROM EATING TITHE.

[IF] HE IMMERSSED FOR EATING TITHE AND IS THEREBY CONFIRMED AS SUITABLE FOR EATING TITHE, HE IS PROHIBITED FROM EATING HEAVE OFFERING. [IF] HE IMMERSSED FOR EATING HEAVE OFFERING AND IS THEREBY CONFIRMED AS SUITABLE FOR EATING HEAVE OFFERING, HE IS PROHIBITED FROM EATING FOOD IN THE STATUS OF HOLY THINGS. [IF] HE IMMERSSED FOR EATING FOOD IN THE STATUS OF HOLY THINGS AND IS THEREBY CONFIRMED AS SUITABLE FOR EATING FOOD IN THE STATUS OF HOLY THINGS, HE IS PROHIBITED FROM ENGAGING IN THE PREPARATION OF PURIFICATION WATER. [IF, HOWEVER], ONE IMMERSSED FOR THE MATTER REQUIRING THE MORE STRINGENT RULE, HE IS PERMITTED TO ENGAGE IN THE MATTER REQUIRING THE LESS STRINGENT RULE. [IF] HE IMMERSSED BUT WAS NOT CONFIRMED, IT IS AS THOUGH HE DID NOT IMMERSE.

THE CLOTHING OF ORDINARY FOLK IS IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS FOR ABSTAINERS [WHO EAT UNCONSECRATED FOOD IN A STATE OF CULTIC CLEANNESS]. THE CLOTHING OF ABSTAINERS IS IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS FOR THOSE WHO EAT HEAVE OFFERING [PRIESTS]. THE CLOTHING OF THOSE WHO EAT HEAVE OFFERING IS IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS FOR THOSE WHO EAT HOLY THINGS [OFFICIATING PRIESTS].

THE CLOTHING OF THOSE WHO EAT HOLY THINGS IS IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS FOR THOSE ENGAGED IN THE PREPARATION OF PURIFICATION WATER.

YOSEF B. YOEZER WAS THE MOST PIOUS MAN IN THE PRIESTHOOD, BUT HIS HANDKERCHIEF WAS IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS SO FAR AS EATING HOLY THINGS WAS CONCERNED. FOR HIS WHOLE LIFE YOHANAN B. GUDEGEDAH ATE HIS FOOD IN ACCORD WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF CLEANNESS APPLYING TO HOLY THINGS, BUT HIS HANDKERCHIEF WAS IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS SO FAR AS THOSE ENGAGED IN THE PREPARATION OF PURIFICATION WATER WERE CONCERNED.

1. I:1: In accord with what authority is our Mishnah-paragraph?
 - a. I:2: The solution to the foregoing introduces the exegetical principle that the number of removes of uncleanness built into the structure of our Mishnah-paragraph bears implications on intersecting problems, thus: unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules governing Holy Things is tantamount to Holy Things. On what basis?

Since the Mishnah-formulation does not include that type of food as a distinct level of purity.

C. THE ROLE OF INTENTIONALITY IN MATTERS OF UNCLEANNES

1. I:3: If someone's head-band fell from him and he said to his fellow, "Give it to me," and he gave it to him, the headband is unclean." The reason is that we cannot assume that he took it upon himself to guard it from uncleanness while he handled it, since the owner did not ask whether he was clean or not, nor can we say that the owner guarded it against defilement while it was not in his possession.
2. I:4: If one's garments for the Sabbath were mixed up with his garments for everyday and he put them on, they are made unclean.
3. I:5: There was a case involving two women, who were associates [and committed to the rules of cultic cleanness outside of the Temple], who mixed up their clothes in the bath house. The case came before R Aqiba, who declared the clothing unclean even though both women observed the same rules.

X. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:1-3

A. A MORE STRINGENT RULE APPLIES TO HOLY THINGS THAN APPLIES TO HEAVE OFFERING, FOR: THEY IMMERSE UTENSILS INSIDE OF OTHER UTENSILS FOR PURIFICATION FOR USE WITH [FOOD IN THE STATUS OF] HEAVE OFFERING, BUT NOT FOR PURIFICATION FOR USE WITH [FOOD IN THE STATUS OF] HOLY THINGS.

1. I:1: Why is it the rule that that mode of purification does not serve for food at the level of Holy Things? The consideration of interposition.
 - a. I:2: Ila, the authority cited at I:1 is consistent with rulings of his stated in other connections.
2. I:3: Another approach to the reading of the Mishnah-paragraph.
 - a. I:4: Raba, the authority cited at I:3 is consistent with rulings of his stated in other connections.
 1. I:5: Gloss on foregoing.
3. I:6: The difference of opinion between Raba and R. Ila follows the lines of a Tannaite conflict.
 - a. I:7: Who is the Tannaite authority who takes for granted the premise of the foregoing, namely, concern for animosity among those excluded from the system at hand?
 1. I:8: In accord with what authority do we these days accept testimony from an outsider?
 - b. I:9: with respect to I:6 shouldn't we take account of the possibility of borrowing of utensils?

B. [THEY MAKE A DISTINCTION AMONG] OUTER PARTS, INSIDE, [AND HOLDING PLACE IN THE CASE OF UTENSILS MEANT FOR USE FOR HEAVE OFFERING, BUT NOT IN THE CASE OF UTENSILS MEANT FOR USE FOR HOLY THINGS]:

1. II:1: What is the definition of "outer parts and inside"?

C. AND HOLDING PLACE [IN THE CASE OF UTENSILS MEANT FOR USE FOR HEAVE OFFERING, BUT NOT IN THE CASE OF UTENSILS MEANT FOR USE FOR HOLY THINGS]:

1. III:1: What is the definition of “holding place”?
2. III:2: The distinction between outside and inside applies to no utensil, whether used for Holy Things in the sanctuary or Holy Things in the provinces.

D. HE WHO CARRIES SOMETHING AFFECTED BY MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS [THE UNCLEANNESS IMPARTED BY A PERSON UNCLEAN WITH THE FLUXES DISCUSSED AT LEV. 12-15 WHO SITS OR LIES ON OBJECTS MADE FOR THE PURPOSE OF SITTING OR LYING] [MAY ALSO] CARRY HEAVE OFFERING, BUT [HE MAY] NOT [ALSO CARRY FOOD IN THE STATUS OF] HOLY THINGS.

1. IV:1: Why not Holy Things?
 - a. IV:2: Analytical question on cases cited in foregoing: Since the incident involved an unclean sandal, what is the rule governing a clean one? Since it happened with an open jug, what is the rule for a closed one? What is the law if someone violated the rule and carried them that way?

E. THE CLOTHING OF THOSE WHO ARE SO CLEAN AS TO BE ABLE TO EAT HEAVE OFFERING IS DEEMED UNCLEAN IN THE STATUS OF MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS FOR THE PURPOSES OF HOLY THINGS. THE RULE FOR HOLY THINGS IS NOT LIKE THE RULE FOR HEAVE OFFERING. FOR IN THE CASE OF [IMMERSION FOR USE OF] HOLY THINGS ONE UNTIES A KNOT AND DRIES IT OFF, IMMERSSES AND AFTERWARDS TIES IT UP AGAIN. AND IN THE CASE OF HEAVE OFFERING ONE TIES IT AND THEN ONE IMMERSSES.

UTENSILS WHICH ARE COMPLETELY PROCESSED IN A STATE OF INSUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS AND SO WHEN COMPLETED ARE CLEAN REQUIRE IMMERSION FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH HOLY THINGS, BUT NOT FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH HEAVE OFFERING.

1. V:1: Who is the one who has completed the processing of the utensils? Should we say that an observant person has completed them? In that case, why do they require immersion? So it must be an unobservant person, in which case, how can they ever be referred to as having been completed in a state of insusceptibility of uncleanness?
2. V:2: The utensil requires immersion but waiting until sunset for the completion of the purification process is not required, from which it follows that our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with R. Eliezer.

F. A UTENSIL UNITES EVERYTHING CONTAINED THEREIN FOR THE PURPOSES OF HOLY THINGS, BUT NOT FOR THE PURPOSES OF HEAVE OFFERING.

1. VI:1: Where in Scripture do we find proof for this proposition?

G. [THAT WHICH IS MADE UNCLEAN IN] THE FOURTH REMOVE FROM THE ORIGINAL SOURCE OF UNCLEANNESS IN THE CASE OF HOLY THINGS IS INVALID, BUT ONLY [THAT WHICH IS MADE UNCLEAN IN] THE THIRD IN THE CASE OF HEAVE OFFERING

1. VII:1: Tannaite complement: How do we know that that which is unclean by a source of uncleanness in the fourth remove from the original source of uncleanness in the case of Holy Things is invalid?

H. AND IN THE CASE OF HEAVE OFFERING, IF ONE OF ONE'S HANDS IS MADE UNCLEAN, THE OTHER IS CLEAN. BUT IN THE CASE OF HOLY THINGS ONE HAS TO IMMERSER BOTH OF THEM. FOR ONE HAND IMPARTS UNCLEANNESS TO THE OTHER FOR THE PURPOSES OF HOLY THINGS, BUT NOT FOR THE PURPOSES OF HEAVE OFFERING.

1. VIII:1: When the hands are connected [touching one another], this rule applies, but not when they are not connected.
2. VIII:2: Review of foregoing.
3. VIII:3: In point of fact what we have is a conflict between Tannaite rulings.

I. WITH UNCLEAN HANDS THEY EAT FOOD WHICH HAS NOT BEEN WET DOWN IN THE CASE OF HEAVE OFFERING, BUT NOT IN THE CASE OF HOLY THINGS.

1. IX:1: Tannaite complement: the special consideration that is accorded to Holy Things what imparts to them susceptibility to uncleanness under all circumstances.

J. HE WHO [PRIOR TO INTERMENT OF THE DECEASED] MOURNS HIS NEXT OF KIN [WITHOUT HAVING CONTRACTED CORPSE UNCLEANNESS] AND ONE WHOSE ATONEMENT RITE IS NOT COMPLETE [BECAUSE AN OFFERING IS YET REQUIRED] REQUIRE IMMERSION FOR THE PURPOSES OF HOLY THINGS, BUT NOT FOR THE PURPOSES OF HEAVE OFFERING.

1. X:1: How come? Since up to this point they were forbidden to eat Holy Things, rabbis imposed on them the obligation of a cultic immersion.

XI. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:4

A. A MORE STRINGENT RULE APPLIES TO HEAVE OFFERING [THAN WITH HOLY THINGS]: FOR: IN JUDAH PEOPLE ARE DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY IN REGARD TO THE PRESERVATION OF THE CLEANNESS OF WINE AND OIL [FOR USE ON THE ALTAR — THAT IS, FOOD IN THE STATUS OF HOLY THINGS] THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.

1. I:1: why in Judah but not in Galilee?

B. BUT [ONLY] IN THE TIME OF PRESSING THE WINE AND CRUSHING THE OLIVES ALSO FOR THE PURPOSES OF HEAVE OFFERING [ARE THEY DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY].

1. II:1: contradictory Tannaite ruling, in which it is assumed that other people won't protect the cleanness of the oil.
2. II:2: They taught this rule with reference to Galilee.

C. AFTER THE TIME OF PRESSING THE WINE AND CRUSHING THE OLIVES HAS PASSED, [IF] ONE BROUGHT TO [A PRIEST] A JUG OF WINE IN THE STATUS OF HEAVE OFFERING, HE SHOULD NOT ACCEPT IT FROM HIM. BUT HE SIMPLY LEAVES IT FOR THE NEXT SEASON OF PRESSING THE WINE.

1. III:1: If the priest violated the rule and accepted it, may he then leave it for the next year's vintage?

D. BUT IF HE SAID TO HIM, "I SET APART IN THIS JUG OF WINE A QUARTER-LOG WHICH IS IN THE STATUS OF HOLY THINGS," THEN HE IS DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY [AND THE JUG IS ACCEPTED].

1. IV:1: intersecting Mishnah-rule is examined. The examination has no bearing on this Mishnah-passage.
2. IV:2: if one investigated an area for the purpose of eating his Passover offering, what is the rule as to his eating heave offering in any event? The present Mishnah-passage contributes to the solution of the problem of IV:1.

E. AS TO JUGS OF WINE AND OIL IN WHICH WINE OR OIL IN THE STATUS OF HEAVE OFFERING HAS BEEN MIXED, [COMMON PEOPLE] ARE DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY IN THEIR REGARD AT THE TIME OF PRESSING THE WINE AND CRUSHING THE OLIVES:

1. V:1: common folk are not believed either with respect to casks or in respect to heave offering.

F. AND FOR SEVENTY DAYS BEFORE THE PRESSING OF THE WINE AS WELL:

1. VI:1: That bears the implication that the tenant farmer has the obligation to provide jugs seventy days prior to the pressing season.

XII. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:5

A. FROM MODIIN AND INWARDS [TOWARD JERUSALEM]:

1. I:1: Modiim is sometimes classified as inwards and sometimes classified as outwards.

B. ...ARE DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY IN REGARD TO THE STATUS OF CLAY UTENSILS.

FROM MODIIN AND OUTWARDS, THEY ARE NOT DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY. HOW SO? A POTTER WHO SELLS POTS — [IF] THERE CAME WITHIN THE BORDER OF MODIIN [TOWARD JERUSALEM] THAT POTTER, THOSE POTS, AND THOSE PURCHASERS — HE IS DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY. [IF] HE WENT BEYOND THE LIMIT, HE IS NOT DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY.

1. II:1: They are believed in regard to small earthenware jugs that are used for Holy Things.

XIII. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:6

A. TAX COLLECTORS WHO WENT INTO A HOUSE;

1. I:1: a contradictory statement of the Mishnah is harmonized with this one.

B. AND SO TOO THIEVES WHO RETURNED OBJECTS [THEY HAD STOLEN], ARE DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY TO STATE, "WE DID NOT TOUCH THEM [AND MAKE THEM UNCLEAR]."

1. II:1: a contradictory statement of the Mishnah is harmonized with this one.

C. AND IN JERUSALEM THEY ARE DEEMED TRUSTWORTHY IN MATTERS CONCERNING HOLY THINGS,

1. III:1: They are believed with reference to big earthenware utensils that are to be used for Holy Things [and small ones a fortiori]. Why so? Because they do not make kilns in Jerusalem.

D. AND AT THE TIME OF THE FESTIVALS, ALSO CONCERNING MATTERS TOUCHING ON HEAVE OFFERING.

1. IV:1: What is the source in Scripture of this rule?

XIV. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:7A-C

A. HE WHO OPENS UP A JUG OF WINE OR BROKE INTO DOUGH [TO SELL THEM] FOR THE NEEDS OF A FESTIVAL — R. JUDAH SAYS, “HE FINISHES [SELLING THEM AFTER THE FESTIVAL].” AND SAGES SAY, “HE DOES NOT FINISH [SELLING THEM AFTER THE FESTIVAL].”

1. I:1: What is the law about leaving this open wine or dough for some later festival and selling them at that time, as though they were clean in line with the view of sages here?

XV. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:7D-G

D. AFTER THE FESTIVAL WAS OVER, THEY UNDERTOOK THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE COURT. [IF] THE FESTIVAL ENDED BEFORE A FRIDAY, THEY DID NOT UNDERTAKE THE PURIFICATION, BECAUSE OF THE HONOR OWING TO THE SABBATH, R. JUDAH SAYS, “ALSO NOT BEFORE THURSDAY, FOR THE PRIESTS ARE NOT FREE.”

1. I:1: For the priests were not yet free from the duty of removing the ashes which pertains from the festival itself.

XVI. Mishnah-Tractate Hagigah 3:8

A. HOW DO THEY UNDERTAKE THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE COURT? THEY IMMERSE THE UTENSILS WHICH WERE IN THE SANCTUARY, AND SAY TO THEM, “BE CAREFUL NOT TO TOUCH THE TABLE AND RENDER IT UNCLEAN.”

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: “Be careful not to touch the table or the candlestick.” Now why does our Tannaite authority not make reference to the candlestick or the table?

B. ALL UTENSILS WHICH WERE IN THE TEMPLE HAVE DUPLICATES AND TRIPLICATES, SO THAT IF THE ORIGINALS ARE MADE UNCLEAN, THEY MAY BRING THE DUPLICATES IN THEIR PLACE. ALL UTENSILS WHICH WERE IN THE TEMPLE REQUIRE IMMERSION, EXCEPT FOR THE GOLDEN ALTAR AND THE COPPER ALTAR, FOR THEY ARE IN THE STATUS OF THE GROUND [AND INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNES TO BEGIN WITH],” THE WORDS OF R. ELIEZER.

1. II:1: proofs from Scripture are given.

C. AND SAGES SAY, “BECAUSE THEY ARE PLATED [WITH METAL, GOLD OR COPPER].”

1. III:1: To the contrary, since they are overlaid, they should have been susceptible to uncleanness.

a. III:2: Topical insertion: The fire of Gehenna does not rule over disciples of sages, via an argument a fortiori based on the salamander...The fire of Gehenna does not rule over the sinners of Israel, via an argument a fortiori based on the altar of gold...

Points of Structure

1. DOES BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE HAGIGAH FOLLOW A COHERENT OUTLINE GOVERNED BY A CONSISTENT RULES?

The fact that we may outline the document in a consistent manner and explain the inclusion of each composition and composite and the location thereof — here, not somewhere else, in this particular context, not in some other — proves that the compilers of the tractate do follow a coherent outline. That outline is supplied by the Mishnah, and most of the compositions and composites in the tractate have been made up or chosen because of their usefulness in amplifying the Mishnah-tractate that is subject to discussion.

2. WHAT ARE THE SALIENT TRAITS OF ITS STRUCTURE?

The tractate does contain some striking and massive topical or thematic composites, but while the tractate looks to be padded by their inclusion, in fact, every one of the large-scale composites has been selected because it expounds a topic introduced by the Mishnah. With only a few important exceptions, treated presently, we can account for the inclusion of every massive miscellany simply by referring to the Mishnah-tractate. That fact emerges most strikingly in Chapter Two, where one of the most remarkable composites in the entire Talmud — the exquisite presentation of the Outsider, with its moving portrait of the heretic-master and the loyal, orthodox disciple — turns out to fit in quite naturally to a larger exegetical program. The character of the tractate as a Mishnah-commentary is seen in page after page, and most of the units of the foregoing outline amply instantiate the fact that the Bavli is a commentary to the Mishnah, and whatever message its compilers wished to set forth beyond that of the Mishnah, whatever means they chose to use to recast or revise the meaning of the Mishnah — all emerge in a single mode.

3. WHAT IS THE RATIONALITY OF THE STRUCTURE?

It suffices to state simply that what makes sense derives its rationality from the statements of the Mishnah, and its logic from the sequence in which those statements are made in the Mishnah.

4. WHERE ARE THE POINTS OF IRRATIONALITY IN THE STRUCTURE?

The following are the exceptions to the rule that our outline has highlighted: I:F, G, H; VI:D (with attention to E), F, G, H, I, J; IX:C. These are not minor exceptions; they form an important component of the volume of the tractate as a whole. Remove them, and the tractate loses approximately a fourth of its sheer volume.

Points of System

1. DOES THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE HAGIGAH SERVE ONLY AS A REPRESENTATION OF THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME?

For the reasons given above, the answer is a qualified positive. But we note that the Bavli's compilers have not found it necessary to say something about everything. Interesting omissions are at III.B, IV.C, VIII.A, an important omission; IX.A, B, X.E, XII.B. It may be of interest to observe that all omitted clauses and sentences form integral parts of statements that are subjected to principled analysis. It would be difficult to make a case that the specified items are completely bypassed. But the line by line or statement by statement pattern that governs throughout does not apply to these items.

2. HOW DO THE TOPICAL COMPOSITES FIT INTO THE TALMUD-TRACTATE HAGIGAH AND WHAT DO THEY CONTRIBUTE THAT THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME WOULD LACK WITHOUT THEM?

The tractate's two massive miscellanies, serving Chapters One and Two, respectively, impart to the topic a profound, theological dimension. First of all, they identify the deeper religious experience inherent in the topic; then they point to the religious message to be drawn therefrom. We deal with a truly amazing transformation of a Mishnah-tractate by the Talmud-tractate that re-presents it. To understand what is to come, we have to keep in mind that the hagigah- or festal-offering, and the appearance-offering, bring Israel into the Temple for a pilgrimage to see God, as Scripture says in so many words. So the topic of the Mishnah-tractate, the rules governing these offerings, as Chapter One lays out the topic, carries in its aftermath the profound issue, what does it mean to see God? That accounts, in the Mishnah-tractate itself, for the inclusion of Chapter Two, with its disruptive statements at M. 2:1-2 about the Chariot and the Works of Creation, the Torah that pertains to them, and the rules governing who may or may not be taught those topics. These represent the counterpart to the appearance-offering, that is to say, this is where, in the Torah, Israel sees God, just as much as, in the Temple, in the rites, Israel sees God. Now our sages in the Talmud take up the two topics — the festal and appearance offering, the counterpart to appearing before God in the study of the Torah — and spell out dimensions of those topics that the Mishnah-tractate simply does not explore. Whatever place the Mishnah-tractate assumes for itself in the system of the Mishnah, in the Talmud's recasting of that system, the tractate is given a massive position in the center of the religious statement that the Talmud's framers mean to make. This is in two parts, as we shall now see: Israel's historical condition, taken up in Chapter One, and Israel's encounter with God through the person of our sages of blessed memory, taken up in Chapter Two. The former makes the point that God weeps for Israel's present circumstance, missing Israel and yearning to see Israel in the Temple once more. The second makes the point that it is through Torah-study that our sages now meet God, as once, and once more in time to come, meeting God took place and will take place in the Temple. Now to the specifics of this remarkable transformation of a rather dry and technical tractate of the Mishnah.

I.F: To this point, the Talmud has given a discussion of the rules of the appearance offering, with special attention to whom need not present one. The vast insertion, F-H, then adds a stunning and jarring point, deriving from the present of the

compilers of the Talmud. Israel as a whole cannot now present the appearance offering, since making an appearance in Jerusalem at the Temple is rendered moot by the destruction of the Temple. So added to the list of those who do not make the pilgrimage is the entire people of Israel. Not only the lame, blind, sick, and old, but all Israel are now exempt — and what an exemption! The inclusion of the composite, formed around the theme of sages' weeping upon encountering various verses of Scripture, is accomplished in a simple way. A proof-text vital for the exposition of a Mishnah-rule is now treated in its own context, which is a formal one. But the formal construction turns out remarkably, since this and the other verses that provoked tears make the same point, which is, Israel is estranged from God and cannot make the pilgrimage to greet him. This is spelled out in so many words. Women, slaves, the lame, and so on, are excluded from the pilgrimage; then the slave is made to stand for Israel: a slave whose master yearns to see him is estranged from him.” The profound irony of the sentence cannot be missed: the master owns the slave and the slave possesses no independent power of will for that reason. Yet the master yearns for the slave but is estranged from him. Beyond that one scarcely need to go. The inclusion of the entire formal set imparts to the tractate a depth that, on its own, the Mishnah-tractate simply lacks; the Mishnah's rule for an aspect of the pilgrimage festival now are recast into that one context that in the Mishnah's presentation the topic lacks, which is, the historical one. The Mishnah's framers of the tractate on the pilgrimage simply ignore the context in which the tractate is set forth; the Talmud's commentators' intrusion of the proposition at hand, at this very point, imparts to the Mishnah's presentation an irony and a message of tragedy but also hope — God yearns for a reconciliation, the study of the pilgrim offering then underscoring the coming reward for penitence — that the Mishnah-tractate simply lacks.

I.G: Without the intrusion of I.G, the statement of I.F lacks symmetry. Sages weep at Israel's condition. But so does God. The message of I.F, the tragedy of estrangement, now finds its completion: God weeps too. The juxtaposition of VI:34 and VI:35 is jarring, since the one speaks of the domestic condition of Israel, which is measured by study of the Torah and the character of the community's leadership, and the public condition of Israel, signaled by the book of Lamentations. It would be difficult to miss the point expressed through that juxtaposition of otherwise unrelated compositions. And for reasons of a shared hero, Rabbi, VI:36 is tightly linked to the foregoing, yielding a message that transcends the formal point of intersection. That is to bring us back to the topic of our tractate, the pilgrimage to see and by seen by God. Nor can VI:37 be dismissed as tacked on, since the analogy is then drawn between Temple and Torah-study, and that analogy is specific and not merely generic: one goes to the Temple for a day, makes the offering, and goes home; one may do the same, making a pilgrimage for three months to an academy, spending a day, and going home.

I.H: The foregoing remark shows that this composite is integral to the message of I.F, G. The massive miscellanies of Chapter Two are all grouped together and organized in a coherent program. They expand upon the theme of the Mishnah, first, the works of Creation, then the vision of the Chariot. The several units flow naturally from one to the

next. There is nothing miscellaneous about the compositions, nothing disorganized about the composite.

VI.D: To understand what is at stake in VI.D-J, we recall the point of intersection between Chapters One and Two of the Mishnah-tractate, which is, the appearance offering, the being seen by, and seeing, God. At that point, the matters of the works of creation and of the chariot enter in; these are, in the Torah, the specific statements that concern God's presence in the world: through creation, the Creator is made known; through the vision of the Chariot, Ezekiel recorded seeing God. So the topic is natural to the deeper concern of the Mishnah-tractate. This unit treats the works of creation.

VI.E: The Mishnah's next topic, and this composite, as much as the ones fore and aft, serves the purpose of Mishnah-commentary. But the commentary takes a very particular form. The Mishnah refers to a topic. The topic then takes over and a vast collection on Ezekiel and his vision follows; some of the compositions form subunits, e.g., exegeses of Eze. Chapter One; some then trail off into discussions of angels and other subtopics.

VI.F: I am somewhat puzzled by the inclusion of this miscellany on Isa. 3:5-7. Perhaps because Isaiah had a vision of God, he came to mind when Ezekiel's vision was presented. That seems a somewhat flimsy reason for IV:25-28. But I can think of nothing more substantial.

VI.G: There can be no doubt about why this item is included, since it reverts to Ezekiel's vision (and makes all the more difficult to explain the appearance of VI.F). From this point to the end, the presentation flows inexorably. First we have the presentation of a scene involving the work of the chariot, and VI.G, and this is a prologue to VI.H. G-H certainly form a continuous statement, and the whole form an admirable fit with the exposition of Ezekiel's Chariot-vision.

VI.H: The four who "entered paradise" are those who have taken up the study of Heavenly mysteries. Here we see an exposition of what happens to those who pursue that subject. The principal figures are Ben Zoma, who went mad, and the Outsider, or Elisha b. Abbuyah.

VI.I: This wonderful composite forms a striking counterpart to Chapter One's exposition of the sage as counterpart to God. Sages weep, God weeps, at Israel's condition. So mastery of the Torah produces a human being in God's model. But learning in the mysteries discussed here, which falls into the category of Torah-study, may also have a different result: an apostate-sage, not only a sage gone mad. The Outsider then forms in Chapter Two the mirror-image of the sage who weeps like God at Israel's estrangement from God. The arrangement of the items in VI.I is logical and orderly, from beginnings with Meir to end, the sad and lonely death.

VI.J: The fact that the several items are carefully compiled to make a single point emerges when we consider the Aqiba-collection. Given the huge number of stories at hand, we must regard the selection as careful and deliberate. Aqiba is introduced for a purpose, and both of the operative items serve that purpose.

IX.C: This exposition is coherent with the foregoing and simply expands in more abstract terms on precisely the issues of its context.

3. CAN WE STATE WHAT THE COMPILERS OF THIS DOCUMENT PROPOSE TO ACCOMPLISH IN PRODUCING THIS COMPLETE, ORGANIZED PIECE OF WRITING?

Mishnah-tractate Hagigah Chapter One deals with the festal and appearance offerings. The Talmud imparts to those offerings a profound message: they signal the character of Israel's relationship with God. When Israel can make the pilgrimage to see and be seen by God, as the offering's very name indicates, that is a mark of Israel's relationship with God. That Israel cannot make the pilgrimage at this time evokes weeping not only among sages but also in God; the condition of Israel, the slave whose master yearns for him, is marked by the tragic flaw of estrangement. Study of the rules of who makes the pilgrimage then is made into an occasion for reflection upon the condition of Israel and what is required to correct that condition, which is, study of the Torah under the guidance of the sages. Sages' weeping for Israel, like God's, marks the point of commensurability; sages' mastery and teaching of the Torah form the measure of Israel's hope; and God's weeping for Israel's condition brings assurance that the estrangement is only for the moment, but reconciliation will be forever. That is the theological depth to which reflection on the rather dry topic of our tractate has drawn our sages of blessed memory in their composition of Chapter One of this tractate.

The expansion of Chapter Two centers upon two accounts of studying the works of creation and the chariot, Yohanan ben Zakkai's disciple, and the four famous sages. The warning of the Mishnah-rule is amply instantiated. But the power of including the sages' encounter with the mysteries is such as to change the face of the tractate once again. What happens when sages glimpse Paradise? Two play minor roles, Ben Azzai and Aqiba. The principal players are Ben Zoma, who went out of his mind, and the Outsider, who left the holy community of Israel. They represent what we may call an anti-pilgrimage, that is, a journey made for sacred purposes but with a bad end. Ben Zoma ended up insane. The Outsider is introduced to show that the wrong kind of Torah-study, in the present context, leads to the oblivion of apostasy; mastery of the Torah by itself does not save the Outsider. His own disciple, who has mastered his Torah but done so in a proper manner, attests to the tragedy involved in improper utilization of Torah-learning. So the free-standing exposition, which turns from what is studied to what happens to those who undertake the particular topics of Torah-learning, makes its own point.

The tractate in the Mishnah's version tells about the pilgrimage in three aspects: the trip to Jerusalem, who goes and who need not; seeing God and being seen by God, not now in the context of the sanctuary but in the setting of the Torah, therefore in creation and in the chariot; and the rites of purification involved in the pilgrimage. The tractate in the Talmud adds two further topics to the presentation: Israel's condition of estrangement, the end for the time being of pilgrimage to see God; and seeing God in the Torah, with the apostate-sage the complement to the now-estranged Israel. Just as Israel is estranged from God, so the sage has become estranged from the Torah. Wrong learning, for the latter, like wrong attitudes and actions, for the former, account for the end of the occasion for seeing and being seen by God. Then right learning in the Torah form the goal of today's pilgrimage, so that tomorrow's may once more be a journey to see God in the Temple, not alone in the Torah.