

VII

BAVLI TRACTATE BEKHOROT CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 43A-46A

From the consideration of blemishes of firstlings, we proceed to blemishes of men who derive from priestly stock. A blemished priest cannot serve in the Temple. Lev. 21:18-20 specifies the following: *For no one who has a blemish shall draw near: a man blind or lame, or one who has a mutilated face or a limb too long, or a man who has an injured foot or an injured hand, or a hunchback or a dwarf, or a man with a defect in his sight or an itching disease or scabs or crushed testicles.*

7:1-2D

7:1

- A. These blemishes [that have been listed in the preceding chapter], whether permanent or transient, disqualify man [from serving in the Temple].
- B. In addition to them in the case of man: (1) the one whose head is wedge-shaped, (2) or turnip-shaped, (3) or hammer-shaped. (4) And the one whose head is sunk in, (5) or flat on the back.
- C. Hump-backs —
- D. R. Judah declares valid.
- E. And sages declare invalid.

7:2A-D

- A. A bald-headed man is invalid.
- B. What is a bald-headed man?
- C. Any who does not have a row of hair going around from ear to ear.

D. But if he has, lo, this one is valid.

- I.1** A. *How so? [Why do these alone mark points of invalidation in a priest?] Lo, there is the case of the wart, which is not specified in the Torah as a blemish in man? And, further, there are the cataract (Lev. 21:20) and the disintegration of the eye [in which the white encroaches on the black or vice versa, Lev. 21:20], which are not listed in the Torah in regard to blemishes affecting animals [but only man]?*
- B. *These are derived, the one from the other, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *In connection with man, a wart is not listed as a blemish, and in connection with a beast, cataracts and disintegration of the eye are not listed as blemishes. How then do we know that what is said with respect to the one applies to the other as well?*
- D. *Scripture states, “A dry scab” [in connection with a human being], and makes the same statement, “A dry scab,” in connection with a beast; and speaks also of “lichen” in regard to a human being and “lichen” in regard to a beast. These serve to establish an analogy between the one and the other.*
- E. *They are free for that purpose, for if not, one could object to the formation of such an analogy on the following grounds: one cannot derive lessons concerning man from rules for the beast, for the beast itself is offered on the altar [so may have to be more perfect]. Nor could one derive rules for the beast from disqualifications affecting man, for man is subject to a great many religious obligations [that obviously the beast does not carry out]. So these expressions are free to serve as they do.*
- F. *Should Scripture have written that a wart is a blemish, and not had to make reference to a dry scab? Then I might have argued, if a wart, which is not disgusting, is a blemish, how much the more so a scab, which is repulsive! So why did Scripture have to mention each the scab twice? It was to leave one over for the present purpose.*
- G. *And if Scripture had stated all blemishes in one context [man or beast], while making reference to wart and dry scab in both connections, in which case I could have inferred the applicability of one entire section of blemishes from the other? [So why mention blind, broken, and lame in the case of both man and beast (Miller & Simon)?]*
- H. *But in connection with which group of blemishes should the Torah have stated them all? If the Torah had listed all of the disqualifying blemishes in the context of a human being, I might have come to the conclusion that whatever invalidates man invalidates a beast; closed hoofs and defective teeth, which do not form*

disqualifications of man, then would not disqualify in a beast [as they do]! And had the Torah written all of the disqualifying blemishes in connection with the beast, I might have reached the conclusion that whatever disqualifies in a beast disqualifies likewise in a man. Then the blemishes of a defective eyebrow and a flat nose, which do not apply to an animal, also should not make a human being invalid as well.

- I. *Then why not have Scripture state them all in connection with one section of blemishes, and as to those blemishes that do not pertain to a human being [hooves, teeth], let Scripture write them solely in connection with a beast, and as to those blemishes that do not pertain to a beast, let Scripture write them solely in connection with man, along with the references to warts and scabs, which occur both in the one context [the human] and in the other [the animal], so that one may be inferred from the other. [Why repeat those items in both contexts?]*
- J. *Rather, matter accord with the statement of the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael. For the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], “Any passage that is stated and then repeated is repeated only on account of something new that is contained in the repetition.”*
- I.2.** A. *Said Raba, “How come Scripture listed blemishes in the setting of a human being, Holy Things, and a firstling? It was, indeed, necessary to specify them in each case. For had Scripture written about blemishes in the case of man, who is subject to a great many religious duties, [an analogy cannot have been drawn to animals]. And rules for man cannot derive from a firstling, since the firstling itself I offered on the altar. The rules for Holy Things cannot have derived from the firstling, for the sanctification of the firstling derives from the womb [and not the declaration of the farmer]. Rules for man cannot derive from Holy Things, for they themselves are offered. Rules for the firstling cannot derive from Holy Things, for the latter are subject to a broader scope of sanctification.*
- B. *“While one cannot derive the rules of one from those affecting some other, is it possible to derive the rules for one from those governing the other two? [I shall now show that that is not feasible either, for] which two? Should Scripture not make mention of firstling, and the rules governing the firstling might then derive from the other two? But what pertains to the other two is that the sanctification affecting them covers a much broader scope, and the blemishes also pertain to those that are not singled out [as firstborn]. If Scripture should not make mention of blemishes affecting Holy Things and the rules governing that classification may then derive from the other two? But what distinguishes the*

other two is that they are holy in and of themselves [and not by act of the farmer who consecrates a beast as Holy Things]. And if Scripture should omit reference to man and we might then derive the blemishes from those other classifications, the distinguishing trait of the others is that they are offered on the altar. So all of them are necessary.

II.1 A. In addition to them in the case of man:

- B. *What is the source of this rule?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, “Said Scripture, ‘No man of the seed of Aaron the priest who has a blemish’ (Lev. 21:21) — a man who is like the offspring of Aaron [meaning, an average-looking bloke] will be subject to invalidation by blemishes.”
- D. **[43B]** *What is the difference between a priest who has suffered a blemish and one who is simply “not like the offspring of Aaron”?*
- E. *The difference is whether or not the actual liturgy [the act of service] has been rendered secular. If the man suffers a blemish [of the kind that are listed], then the actual liturgy has been rendered secular, for it is written, “Because he has a blemish, that he not profane...” (Lev. 21:23). If one is simply not “like the offspring of Aaron,” then the actual liturgy has not been rendered secular.*
- F. *What is the difference between one who is “not like the offspring of Aaron” and one who is unfit simply for appearance’ sake? It is whether or not a positive commandment has been violated [if a priest not like the offspring of Aaron officiates, that is all right, but one who is not like the offspring may not; this rule is treated as a positive commandment (Miller & Simon)].*

III.1 A. the one whose head is wedge-shaped:

- B. *His head is like a basket.*

IV.1 A. or turnip-shape:

- B. *His head looks like a turnip.*
- C. *A Tannaite version: the neck stands in the center of the head.*

V.1 A. or hammer-shaped:

- B. *his head looks like a mallet.*

VI.1 A. And the one whose head is sunk in:

- B. *there is an angle in the front of the head [which recedes abruptly].*

VII.1 A. or flat on the back:

- B. *This refers to the back part of the head.*
- C. *So people say, “A piece is taken off [as though a portion were missing].”*

- D. *A Tannaite version: one whose neck is sunk [too short, with the head hidden between the shoulders], one whose neck is too long and thin.*

VIII.1 A. Hump-backs — R. Judah declares valid. And sages declare invalid:

- B. *If the hump has a bone, all parties concur that he is invalid. Where there is no bone, that is subject to dispute.*
- C. *The one party says, “Lo, he is not like the offspring of Aaron.”*
- D. *The other party says, “It is simply the swelling of the flesh.”*

IX.1 A. A bald-headed man is invalid. What is a bald-headed man? Any who does not have a row of hair going around from ear to ear:

- B. *Said Raba, “This rule pertains only where the man does not have a line of hair from ear to ear in the back part of the head but has it in the front; but where he has a line of hair in both the back part and the front, he is suitable for the Temple service. And that is certainly so where he has a line of hair in the back part but not in the front part.”*
- C. *There are those who repeat this statement of his with reference to the second clause, namely: **But if he has, lo, this one is valid:***
- D. *Said Raba, “This rule pertains only where the man does have a line of hair from ear to ear in the back part of the head but does not have it in the front; but where he has a line of hair in both the back part and the front, he is unsuitable for the Temple service. And that is certainly so where he has a line of hair in the front part but not in the back part. And that is certainly the rule [that the man is unfit to serve] where he has no line of hair at all.”*

IX.2. A. Said R. Yohanan, “Bald-heads, dwarfs, and bleary-eyed are unfit for the priesthood, because they are not like the offspring of Aaron.”

- B. *But have we not learned in the Mishnah the exclusion of both bald-headedness and dwarfs?*
- C. *It was necessary for him to present the rule governing the exclusion of the bleary-eyed. And as to the other two items, you might have supposed that they were unfit only for appearance’ sake.*
- D. *But lo, the Tannaite version excludes all those that are covered by “appearance’ sake,” when it says, **And he whose eyelashes have fallen out is invalid, for appearance’s sake [M. 7:3H-I].***
- E. *What might you have thought? That he states one case [the hairless eyelid] and the same consideration applies to all that follow that point on the list, [but the items on the first part of the list, such as those before us, are excluded as “not*

like the offspring of Aaron; Yohanan says that the reason given below applies here too].

- F. *But does not the Tannaite author of the passage repeat that the consideration is “appearance’ sake” wherever such an item is listed, e.g., **And [if] his teeth are taken out, he is invalid, for appearance’s sake [M. 7:4D]**?*
- G. *Rather, his statement serves to exclude that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. *Bald-heads, dwarfs, and the bleary-eyed are fit for the priesthood, and are listed as disqualified only for appearance’ sake.*
- I. *And who is this Tannaite authority?*
- J. *It is R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- K. *R. Judah says, “Scripture says, ‘...the priests...’ (Lev. 1: 8) — including bald-heads.”*

I.1 begins with the analysis of the generative statement before us, which claims that the list is accurate for all detail in the case of blemishes affecting priests. No. 2 develops the mode of inquiry set forth at No. 1 for the purpose of Mishnah-exegesis. Certainly No. 2 forms a satisfying composition, one that exhibits that beautiful clarity and incisiveness of thought that make the Talmud a pleasure to study. II.1 begins with a standard question. III.1, IV.1, V.1, VI.1, VII.1, VIII.1, IX.1 — all gloss lightly. No. 2 augments the Mishnah’s rule.

7:2E-I

- E. **[If] he does not have eyebrows,**
 - F. **[or] if he has only one eyebrow,**
 - G. **he is that gibben [Lev. 14: 9] of which the Torah speaks.**
 - H. **R. Dosa says, “Any whose eyebrows hang down.”**
 - I. **R. Hananiah b. Antigonus says, “He who has two backs and two backbones.”**
 - I.1** A. *But does the word “gibben” mean that one has no eyebrows? And an objection is to be raised: The word gibben means that he has lush eyebrows. How do we know that a priest is unsuitable if he has no eyebrows or if he has only one eyebrow? Scripture states, ‘or a gibben’ (Lev. 21:20) [so gibben by itself does not mean one has no eyebrows or only one eyebrow].*
 - B. *Said Raba, “The case of one eyebrow derives from the fact that the phrase is, ‘or a gibben’ [meaning, just one].”*
- II.1** A. **R. Dosa says, “Any whose eyebrows hang down:”**

- B. *Does this then imply that a person with a double back or double spine can live? Has it not been stated:*
 - C. In the case of giving birth to a creature that has a double back or a double spine,
 - D. Rab said, “If it was a woman who miscarried, it is not classified as an offspring; if it was an animal that miscarried, the creature may not be eaten [since it is an abortion and it is carrion, not subject to correct slaughter].”
 - E. *This objected was already raised by R. Shimi b. Hiyya, and he said to him, “Are you Shimi? The Mishnah means, where the spine was merely curved [so appearing doubled, even though it was not].”*
- I.1 clarifies the meaning of a word. II.1 investigates the broader implication of the Mishnah’s rule.

7:3

- A. **The man who is flat-nosed is invalid.**
 - B. **What is the man who is flat-nosed?**
 - C. **He who paints both eyes in one movement.**
 - D. **[If] (1) both eyes are above, or (2) both eyes are below, or (3) one eye is above and one eye is below [so that] he sees the room and the attic simultaneously,**
 - E. **(1) those who cover [their eyes from] the sun,**
 - F. **(2) [if he has unmatched [eyes],**
 - G. **(3) [if he has] bleary [eyes], — [he is disqualified].**
 - H. **And he whose eyelashes have fallen out is invalid,**
 - I. **for appearance’s sake.**
- I.1** A. **[The man who is flat-nosed is invalid. What is the man who is flat-nosed? He who paints both eyes in one movement:]** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. One who can paint both of his eyes in one movement is such because his nose is depressed between the eyes.
 - C. How do we know that one whose nose is turned up, obstructed, or overhands his lips [is unfit for the priesthood]? Because of the verse that states,] “or a person with a depressed nose” (Lev. 21:18) [and the “or” is augmentative].
 - D. R. Yosé says, “That word refers only to one who can paint both of his eyes in one movement.”
 - E. They said to him, “You go to far, **[44A]** for even though one cannot pain both of his eyes in one movement, he may still fall into that same classification.”

II.1 A. [If] (1) both eyes are above, or (2) both eyes are below, or (3) one eye is above and one eye is below [so that] he sees the room and the attic simultaneously:

B. *What is the meaning of the phrase, [If] (1) both eyes are above, or (2) both eyes are below? If I say that both eyes are above means that they are always focused above, or both eyes are below and both eyes are below means that they are always focused below, and means that one eye sees below and one sees above, then that is the same as he sees the room and the attic simultaneously!*

C. *Rather, both eyes are above means that they stand above [at the top of the forehead], or both eyes are below means that they stand at the bottom of the forehead,, and one eye above and one eye below means that one eye is located above, one below. And even where the eyes are properly located, there is still that unfitness in which he sees the room and the attic simultaneously.*

II.2. A. *What is the source of this rule?*

B. *It is as our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. *“in his eye” (Lev. 21:20) — whatever is in his eye.*

D. *On this basis sages have said: [If] (1) both eyes are below, or (2) both eyes are above, or (3) one eye is above and one eye is below [so that] he sees the room and the attic simultaneously; or if he is talking with his fellow and someone else says, “he is talking with me.”*

II.3. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *“Blind” (Lev. 21:18) —*

C. *whether blind in both eyes or blind in one eye.*

D. *How do we know that if one has white spots on the cornea, or eyes dripping with water, [one is blemished] with perpetual blemishes? Scripture states, “a blind man” (Lev. 21:18).*

E. *Said Raba, “What need do I have for such a proof? For the All-Merciful has written, ‘a blind man, with a cataract or a blinding [of black and white] in his eye’ (Lev. 21:18) [and any of these blemishes can have been derived from the classification defined by the other]. But all of them are required, each for its own sake. For if the All-merciful had made reference in Scripture only to ‘blind,’ we might have supposed that the operative consideration is that the eyes are not there [having been removed], but in cases in which there are white spots on the cornea or dripping eyes, which are permanent blemishes but the eyes are yet present, that is not so. So Scripture says, ‘a blind man.’ And if the All-Merciful*

had said only, 'man,' we might have thought that the operative consideration is that the eyes cannot see at all, though they are there; but there is merely defective vision, that is not a blemish. So the All-Merciful refers to cataracts. And if the All-Merciful had made reference only to cataracts, we might have supposed that the operative consideration is that there is defective vision, but if there is a confusion of the colors in the eye, it is not a blemish. So the All-Merciful refers explicitly to a blending of the black and white of the eye. And if the All-Merciful had made reference only to a blending of the black and white of the eye, we might have supposed that the operative consideration was that there is a blending of the colors in the eye, but where the eyes are located in different places from the normal [too high, too low], that is not a blemish. So the All-Merciful says, 'in his eye.'"

- F. *Said Raba, "It follows that every case of blindness derive from the verse, 'man. Every case of defective vision derives from the reference to cataracts. Every case of confusion of colors in the eye derives from the reference to confusion. Every case of a different location from the norm of the eyes we derive from the reference to 'in his eye.'"*

III.1 A. those who cover [their eyes from] the sun,:

- B. *R. Joseph stated as a Tannaite version, "It is one who hates the sun."*

IV.1 A. if he has unmatched [eyes]:

- B. *R. Huna indicated by gestures: "One eye like ours, one like theirs."*
 C. *R. Judah found this irritating.*
 D. *An objection was raised: "One whose eyebrows lie is one whose eyebrows overshadow his eyes. One with unmatched eyes is one who has one black and one white eyebrow."*
 E. *A Tannaite version: "Any pair of eyes that is not properly matched is called 'unmatched.'"*

V.1 A. [if he has] bleary [eyes]:

- B. *One whose eyes are bleared, granulated; weeping, dripping, running.*
 C. *A Tannaite version: [Miller & Simon:] zevir, lufyon, and tamir are blemishes. Zevir is one whose eyes are unsteady; lufyon is one who has thick and connected eyebrows; tamir is one whose eyebrows are gone.*
 D. *And are these among disqualifying blemishes? Have we not learned in the Mishnah: **And he whose eyelashes have fallen out is invalid, for appearance's sake** [but this is not an actual blemish]?*

- E. *There is no contradiction, in the one case the root remains, in the other case the root does not remain.*

I.1 introduces a Tannaite complement, defining and providing the scriptural basis for, the Mishnah's rule. II.1, 2 go through exactly the same procedure. That a single program governs here is shown by the inclusion of Raba's now-formulaic analysis. III.1, IV.1, V.1 all provide minor glosses.

7:4-5D

7:4

- A. (1) [If] his eyes are as large as those of a calf,
- B. (2) or as small as those of a goose,
- C. (3) [if] his body is too big for his limbs,
- D. (4) or too small for his limbs,
- E. (5) [if] his nose is too big for his limbs,
- F. (6) or too small for his limbs — [he is disqualified].
- G. [If he is] *simmem* or *simmea* — [he is disqualified].
- H. What is the meaning of *simmea*?
- I. That his ears are too small.
- J. And of *simmen*?
- K. That his ears look like sponges.

7:5A-D

- A. (1) [If] his upper lip stuck out over the lower,
 - B. (2) or the lower stuck out over the upper,
 - C. lo, this is a blemish.
 - D. And [if] his teeth are taken out, he is invalid, for appearance's sake.
- I.1** A. Said Rab, "Our lord, Moses, had arms ten cubits long: 'And he spread abroad the tent over the tabernacle' (Exo. 40:19). Who spread it out? It was our lord, Moses, who spread it out. And it is written, 'Ten cubits shall be the length of the board' (Exo. 26:16)."
- B. Said R. Shimi bar Hiyya to Rab, "If so, you have treated our lord, Moses, as though he were blemished, *for we have learned in the Mishnah: [if] his body is too big for his limbs, or too small for his limbs!*"
- C. *He said to him, "Shimi, what I mean is the cubit of the tabernacle."*

II.1 A. [if] his nose is too big for his limbs:

B. *A Tannaite version:* the width of a small finger.

III.1 A. [If he is] *simmem* or *simmea* — [he is disqualified]:

B. *A Tannaite version:* also a *semeah*.

C. *Rabbis did not know what a simeah was. They heard a Tai-Arab say, "Anyone want a semeah?" And they found it was a shaggy goat.*

III.2. A. Said R. Hisda, "A goat that has no horns, and a ewe that has horns, are suitable for the altar."

B. *So too it was taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. There are traits that are like blemishes but are not classified as blemishes, and they slaughter beasts in the animal [since these are not blemishes that disqualify] but not in the provinces, and what are these? A goat that has no horns, and a ewe that has horns, are suitable for the altar, a *semeah*, a *summum*, and a *somea*."

III.3. A. Said R. Hisda said Amemar, "If its horns and the bony inside were removed, the animal is unfit for the altar, but the beast may not be redeemed [if it was consecrated] merely on that account [since it is unfit for the altar, but otherwise not sufficiently blemished to be redeemed and discarded]. If the hooves were removed together with the bony inside, the animal is unfit, and it may be redeemed on account of that blemish."

E. *An objection was raised:* If its horns and the bony inside were removed, the animal is unfit for the altar, but the beast may be redeemed.

F. *There is no contradiction. In the one instance [where the beast may be redeemed] the horns were uprooted, in the other, they were merely leveled.*

G. *But if the horns were merely leveled, is the beast unfit for the altar at all? And an objection was raised: If a red cow has horns and hooves that are black, let him lop off the black top of the horns and hooves [M. Par. 2:2].*

H. *Explain:* [Miller & Simon:] *the lopping off is from the top part of the bony inside.*

I.1 makes use of our Mishnah-paragraph for its own purposes but does not contribute to the elucidation of the rule. II.1 augments the Mishnah's rule. III.1 explains the language of the Mishnah and Nos. 2, 3 then are tacked on because of the explanation.

7:5E-K

- E. [44B] (1) If his breasts like like those of a woman,
- F. (2) [if] his belly is swollen,
- G. (3) [if] his bellybutton protrudes,
- H. (4) [if] he is smitten with epilepsy, even once in a while,
- I. (5) [if] lockjaw affects him,
- J. (6) the one whose testicles are too large,
- K. (7) and the one whose penis is too large,

Excursus on Urinating

I have no idea why the following composite, concerning urinating, has been inserted here. The probable reason is the allusion at I:1C to a swollen belly, which would then link the composite to M. 7:5F. On that basis — a slight point of intersection — the whole has been inserted. The Mishnah-exegesis commences at II:1.

- I.1** A. Said R. Abba b. R. Hiyya bar Abba, “One may urinate in public but not drink water in public.”
- B. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - C. One may urinate in public but not drink water in public.
 - D. There was the case of someone who tried to urinate in public but did not do so, and it turned out that his belly became swollen.
 - E. *Samuel had to urinate on the Sabbath before a festival day. He spread a cloak [so that his hearers could not see him do so]. He came before his father, who said to him, “I will pay you four hundred zuz to retract [by urinating in public and so showing that that is acceptable], for you had a cloak to spread out, but what about someone who doesn’t? Is he going to hold it in and so endanger his health?”*
 - F. *On the junction of a landing bridge [so Miller & Simon] Mar b. R. Ashi had to urinate. They said to him, “Your mother-in-law is coming.” He said to them, “I’ll even piss in her ear [but I won’t hold it in].”*
 - G. *But might I suppose that the swelling of his body [in the story told at D] was because of swallowing a leech?*
 - H. *In the case at hand he urinated after a delay.*
- I.2.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. There are two holes in a man, one for urine, one for semen, and the distance from the one to the other is no broader than a garlic-peel.

C. If one has to urinate and one channel interferes with the other, he is impotent.

I.3. A. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘There shall not be male and female barren among you or among your cattle’ (Deu. 7:14)? When will there not be a male barren among you? When you are at a level with your animals [and not hold in your urine].”*

B. *Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “‘There shall not be male barren among you’ (Deu. 7:14) — your house will not be barren of disciples, ‘or a female barren,’ — your prayers will not be barren before the Lord. And when will this be the case? When you put yourself on the same level with your beast [and urinate anywhere you have to, without holding in].”*

I.4. A. *Said R. Pappa, “A man should not urinate in a clay utensil or on a hard place. For Rab said, ‘The drains of Babylonia carry water down to En Etam.’”*

I.5. A. *Said Abbaye, “A woman must not stand up before a child and urinate, but if she does it sideways, there is no objection.”*

I.6. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “[Miller & Simon:] A suppressed discharge produces dropsy. Urine in the urinary duct produces jaundice.”*

C. *Said Rabbah bar R. Huna said R. Qattina said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Too much blood brings on skin disease; too much semen brings on leprosy; too much excrement brings on dropsy; too much urine brings on jaundice [so one should make efforts to excrete these fluids regularly].”*

II.1 A. **[if] lockjaw affects him:**

B. *What causes this?*

C. *Nala [a spirit of stupidity brought about by a demon (Miller & Simon)].*

D. *A Tannaite statement: the spirit of the demon that causes nervous prostration [so Miller & Simon] comes upon him.*

III.1 A. **the one whose testicles are too large, and the one whose penis is too large:**

B. *A Tannaite statement: the former statement refers to the testicles, the latter to the penis.*

C. *A Tannaite statement: the former refers to testicles that are too large, the latter to the penis that is too large.*

D. *How big?*

- E. *R. Judah showed, "A penis down to the knee-joint."*
- F. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. *R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "If it is down to the knee-joint, the man is unfit; if it is above it, he is fit."*
- H. *Some say, "If it is down to the knee-joint, he is fit; if it is below that point, he is unfit."*

I have not got the slightest idea why the whole of part I has been inserted; II.1 and III.1 gloss lightly.

7:5L-Q

- L. (8) [if] he has no testicles,
 - M. (9) or has only one testicle.
 - N. this is "he that has his stones broken" (Lev. 21:20) of which the Torah speaks.
 - O. *R. Ishmael says, '[Scripture refers to] any who has testicles crushed.'*
 - P. *R. Aqiba says, "It refers to any who has wind in his testicles."*
 - Q. *R. Hananiah b. Antigonus says, "It refers to any whose complexion is very dark."*
- I.1** A. *The reason that R. Ishmael found the opinion difficult to accept [if he has no testicles, or has only one testicle, this is "he that has his stones broken" (Lev. 21:20) of which the Torah speaks] is that, if that were the sense of Scripture, it should have said, 'deficient in testicles.' Therefore he says that it is any who has testicles crushed."*
- B. *The reason that R. Aqiba found the opinion difficult to accept [any who has wind in his testicles] is that, if that were the sense of Scripture, it should used the passive participle. He therefore says that it means, any who has wind in his testicles. "*
 - C. *The reason that R. Hanina found the opinion [any who has wind in his testicles] difficult to accept is that, if that were the sense of Scripture, it should used the word for wind. He therefore says that it means, any whose complexion is very dark."*
 - D. He maintains that it is permitted to remove a letter from word word and add another letter and interpret the text.
 - E. *But then is this simply not one who is like an Ethiopian?*
 - F. *R. Hanina b. Antigonus does not repeat refer to "Ethiopian" [below, and so he includes it here, not repeating the matter].*

The scriptural foundations of the several opinions are spelled out, a common approach.

7:6A-S

- A. (1) He who knocks together his ankles or his knees,
- B. [45A] (2) and one who has swellings [in the feet],
- C. (3) and one who is bow-legged.
- D. Who is bow-legged?
- E. Any who puts together his soles and whose knees do not touch one another.
- F. (1) [If] he has a swelling on the big toe,
- G. (2) [if] his heel juts out backward,
- H. (3) [if] his sole is as wide as that of a goose,
- I. (4) [if] his toes lie one above the other,
- J. (5) or are webbed to the middle-joint,
- K. he is valid.
- L. [If they are webbed] below the middle joint [at the toes] and one cut it [the tissue], he is valid.
- M. [If] there was an extra finger on him and he cut it off, if there is a bone in it, he is invalid. And if not, he is valid.
- N. [If] he has excess on his hands and feet — six in each limb, twenty-four in all —
- O. R. Judah declares valid.
- P. And sages declare invalid.
- Q. He who is ambidextrous —
- R. Rabbi declares invalid.
- S. And sages declare valid.

I.1 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Broken footed” (Lev. 21:19) —
- C. I know only that one who is broken fitted is unfit for the priesthood. How do I know that the law encompasses **him who knocks together his ankles or his knees, one who has swellings [in the feet], and one who is bow-legged?**
- D. Scripture states, “or broken footed.”

I.2. A. *A Tannaite version:* as to one who has swellings in his feet or one who has a file-shaped leg —

- B. said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “The former has too many calves, the other, none.”

II.1 A. [If he has a swelling on the big toe, if his heel juts out backward:

- B. Said R. Eleazar, “In the latter case, his leg comes out in the middle of the foot.”

III.1 A. [if] his sole is as wide as that of a goose:

- B. *Said R. Pappa, “That is not to say the feet are squared and not separated, even if they are square but separated, he is unfit.”*

IV.1 A. [if] his toes [or: fingers] lie one above the other, or are webbed to the middle-joint, he is valid:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “Broken handed” — I know only that a broken hand renders the priest blemished. How do I know that **[if] his toes [or: fingers] lie one above the other, or are webbed to the middle-joint** and he cut them, he is unfit?
- D. *But have you not stated in the Mishnah that he is valid?*
- E. Rather, if he did not cut them.
- F. And what is the source of that rule?
- G. “Broken handed.”

V.1 A. [If] there was an extra finger on him and he cut it off, if there is a bone in it, he is invalid. And if not, he is valid:

- B. Said Rabbah b. b. Hannah said R. Yohanan, “That is so only when it is counted in the row of the fingers of the hand.”
- C. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* If [a redundant finger] grows a nail, even if it has no nail, imparts uncleanness when it is touched or when it is carried. It also imparts uncleanness in a tent. And it is counted in the number of one hundred and twenty-five limbs.”
- D. Said Rabbah b. b. Hannah said R. Yohanan, “That is so only when it is counted in the row of the fingers of the hand.”
- E. Said R. Hisda, “This matter did Our Great Rabbi state — may the Omnipresent be his support! — ‘A redundant finger that has a bone but no nail imparts uncleanness if it is touched or carried but it does not impart uncleanness in a tent.’”
- F. Said Rabbah b. b. Hannah said R. Yohanan, “That is so only when it is not counted in the row of the fingers of the hand.”
- G. Said R. Hanina, “They have treated their own teachings as equivalent to the teachings of prophecy. *For how do you want matters? If it is a valid limb, then it*

should also impart uncleanness in a tent [as does a limb of the body], and if it is not a valid limb, then it also should not impart uncleanness to one who touches or carries it!"

- H. Said R. Huna b. Manoah in the name of R. Aha b. R. Iqa, "The operative consideration is the rule of a bone which is the size of a barley-seed [which imparts uncleanness to one who carries or touches it but does not impart uncleanness when in the tent as does a corpse]."
- I. R. Pappa, "It is a decree that he is unclean when the additional finger is not counted with the others on account of the case in which the additional finger is counted with the others."
- J. *If that is the case, then even when the additional finger is not counted with the others, it still should impart uncleanness when in a tent!*
- K. *Rabbis made a distinction so that on account of such a case people not burn food that is in the status of heave-offering or Holy Things.*

V.2. A. There we have learned in the Mishnah: These contaminate in the Tent: a quarter-qab of bones from the larger part of the frame [of the skeleton] or from the larger number;] and the larger part of the frame or the larger number of the corpse, even though there is not among them a quarter-qab, are unclean. How much is the "larger number"? One hundred twenty-five [M. Oh. 2:1A-C].

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. What is the definition of "the larger part of the frame"? It is the two legs and a thigh, since these make up the greater part of the height of a tall person.
- D. What is the greater number of joints and limbs? One hundred twenty five.
- E. *Said Rabina to Raba, "Does the Tannaite authority come to teach us arithmetic [that the majority of 248 is 125]?"*
- F. *He said to him, "It is to tell us of the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. *"If one has two few, he has only two hundred joints [having been born with two fingers lacking on each hand, two twos on each foot, so eight, and every finger has six bones, forty-eight joints lacking therefore, and he has two hundred joints of the 248 that the body contains], and if he has two many, he has two hundred eighty, then all of them are counted in the number of one hundred twenty-five.' What is the operative consideration? We follow the rule that pertains to the majority."*

V.3. A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “There was a case in which the disciples of R. Ishmael dissected the body of a whore who had been condemned by the government to death by burning. They examined and they found in her two-hundred fifty joints and limbs. [Add: They came and asked R. Ishmael, ‘How many joints does the human body have,’ and he replied to them, ‘Two hundred forty eight.’]

B. “They said to him, ‘Lo, we have found two hundred fifty-two.’

C. “He said to them, ‘Perhaps you examined a woman, in which case Scripture assigns two additional hinges in her sexual organ, and two doors in the womb.’”

V.4. A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. R. Eleazar says, “Just as a house has hinges, so a woman’s body has hinges in the sexual organ: ‘She bowed herself and brought forth, her pains came suddenly upon her’ (1Sa. 4:19).”

C. R. Joshua says, “Just as a house has hinges, so a woman’s womb has hinges: ‘Because it shut not up the doors of my mother’s womb’ (Job. 3:10).”

D. R. Aqiba says, “Just as a house has a key, so a woman has a key: ‘And opened her womb’ (Gen. 30:22).”

E. *Is there not a problem for R. Aqiba in terms of what the disciples of R. Ishmael stated?*

F. *Perhaps since it is small, while the woman was being dissected, it dissolved.*

V.5. A. Said Raba, “And all these [five additional limbs that are in a woman] do not impart uncleanness when in the shadow of a tent [that is, if these joints from a deceased woman are in a tent, they are not regarded as corpse-matter, such as to impart uncleanness to everything else that is in the tent with them]: ‘This is the law when a man dies in a tent’ (Num. 19:14) — something that is equal in both genders [imparts uncleanness in a tent, but not something that is limited to only one gender].”

B. *Said to him Abbayye, “And does not a man have some additional limbs [which we have said belong only to a woman, that is, hinges]? And is it not written, ‘pangs have taken hold of me the pangs of a woman in travail’”?*

- C. These are mere hinges of flesh without bones.
- D. And is it not written, “O my lord, by reason of the visions, my pains have come upon me” (Dan. 10:16)?
- E. *Here too, these are hinges of flesh. And that is a reasonable supposition, because if you do not say so, then how do we ever come up with the number of two-hundred and forty-eight limbs, which otherwise applies to neither a man nor a woman?*

VI.1 A. **[45B] [If] he has excess on his hands and feet — six in each limb, twenty-four in all — R. Judah declares valid. And sages declare invalid:**

- B. Said R. Isaac, “And both parties interpret a single verse of Scripture: ‘And there was yet a battle in Gath where there was a man of great stature, who had six fingers on every hand and six toes on every foot, twenty-four in all’ (2Sa. 21:20)
—
- C. *“one authority sees this as a disparaging observation, and the other authority sees it as praise.”*

VI.2. A. Said Rabbah, “Why does Scripture say both ‘six...,’ ‘six...,’ and ‘twenty-four in all’?”

- B. *“It was necessary to count them up. For if the All-Merciful had said only ‘six fingers’ and ‘six toes,’ I might have thought that one reference to six spoke of one hand, the other six, to one leg. Therefore the All-Merciful species, ‘twenty-four.’ And if the All-Merciful had said only twenty-four,’ I might have supposed that the intent was five fingers on one hand, seven on the other, and the same for the feet. Therefore the All-Merciful says both ‘six...,’ ‘six...,’ and ‘twenty-four in all.’”*

VI.3. A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **Said R. Judah, “There was the case of someone who came before R. Tarfon, with additional fingers and toes, six in each case, twenty-four in all. He said to you, “May people like you become more numerous in Israel.” [This proves that additional fingers are marks of strength.]**
- C. **Said to him R. Yosé, “Does proof come from that case? What he really said to him was, ‘May people like you become few in Israel, along with mamzerim and Netinim.’”**

VII.1 A. **He who is ambidextrous — Rabbi declares invalid. And sages declare valid:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **If one is left-handed or left-legged — he is invalid.**

D. **He who is ambidextrous —**

E. **Rabbi declares invalid.**

F. **And sages declare valid.**

G. *One authority takes the view that it is unusual weakness affecting the right hand.*

H. *The other authority maintains that it is unusual strength affecting the left hand.*

I.1 provides a scriptural basis for the Mishnah's rule. No. 2 amplifies the rule. II.1, III.1, IV.1 gloss. V.1 moves beyond mere gloss and pursues its own interests. No. 2 is tacked on because of the general interests of No. 1; it has no bearing on our Mishnah's interests. The secondary accretions, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, likewise are tacked on in the agglutination of No. 1, prior to insertion here, where they have no role to play. VI.1 reverts to clarification of the Mishnah, once more by asking what scriptural foundations can be located for the positions set forth in there. No. 2 glosses the foregoing. No. 3 is then tacked on for obvious reasons. VII.1 then provides a minor gloss to the Mishnah's rule.

7:6T-X

T. **The (1) Ethiopian [swarthy], and (2) the red-skinned, and (3) the albino, and (4) the giant, and (5) the dwarf, and (6) the deaf-mute, and (7) the imbecile, and (8) the drunkard, and (9) the one who has clean nega'im**

U. **are invalid among men, and valid among beasts.**

V. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "An imbecile among beasts is not the choicest."**

W. **R. Eliezer says, "Also: those who have dangling warts**

X. **"are invalid among men, and valid among beasts."**

I.1 A. The Ethiopian:

B. that is unusually dark-complexioned.

II.1 A. and the red-skinned:

B. blotchy-skinned.

III.1 A. and the albino:

B. with red spots on the face.

C. *Is this true? There was someone who cried out, "Who wants to buy luqiani," which turned out to be white flowers.*

D. Rather, **The Ethiopian:** that is unusually dark-complexioned; **and the red-skinned:** blotchy-skinned; **and the albino:** one with white spots on his face, as

we know from the case of someone who cried out, "Who wants to buy luqiani," which turned out to be white flowers.

IV.1 A. the giant:

- B. R. Zebid taught on Tannaite authority, "That means someone very tall."
- C. *Is this so? And has not R. Abbahu taught on Tannaite authority, "How do we know that the Holy One, blessed be he, finds glory in tall people? 'Yet I destroyed the Amorite before them, who was as tall as the cedars' (Amo. 2: 9)."*
- D. Said R. Pappa, "'The giant' here is one who was tall, thin, and unshapely."

IV.2. A. Simeon b. Laqish, "A very tall man should not marry a very tall woman, lest their children be like ships' masts. A dwarf-man should not marry a dwarf-woman, lest their children be like Lilliputians. A man with an unusually white skin should not marry a woman with the same unusually white skin, lest their children be albinos. A very dark complexioned man should not marry a woman with the same skin, lest their children be black pots."

V.1 A. the deaf-mute, and (7) the imbecile, and (8) the drunkard:

- B. *But does not a drunkard simply profane the liturgy of the offering? How is this defect parallel with the blemishes that disqualify a priest?*
- C. *This speaks of other things from which one can become drunk, not in accord with the position of R. Judah.*
- D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. If one has eaten preserved figs from Keilah or drunk milk and fermented honey and then entered the Temple, he is liable."

I.1, II.1, III.1 gloss the language of the Mishnah. IV.1 does the same, and No. 2 is tacked on. V.1 raises its own question of detail.

7:7

- A. **These are valid among men and invalid among beasts:**
- B. **(1) progenitor and his offspring [M. Hul. 5:1],**
- C. **(2) and a terefah,**
- D. **(3) and one born from the side,**
- E. **(4) and that upon whom a sin was committed,**
- F. **(5) and one who killed a man.**
- G. **He who marries women that are forbidden is invalid until he will vow not to derive benefit.**

H. And he who contracts corpse-uncleanness is invalid until he will undertake not to contract corpse-uncleanness.

I.1 A. These are valid among men and invalid among beasts: a progenitor and his offspring:

- B. *What is the meaning of a progenitor and his offspring? Shall I say that the meaning is, "Aaron and his sons," and, along these same lines, a he-goat and its offspring? But does the rule pertain, and has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. The law against killing an animal and the offspring on the same day applies to females, not males.
- D. Rather, the Mishnah refers to a she-goat and its young. *And along the same lines here, a woman-priest and her son.*
- E. But does a woman priest ever officiate at the altar? [Obviously not!] Rather, it refers to Aaron and his sons [a father and a son may officiate on the same day], and the corresponding case is a he-goat and its offspring.
- F. *They say in the West in the name of R. Yosé, "This proves that Hanania is the Tannaite authority behind this Mishnah-paragraph. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The law against offering the beast and the son applies to females, not males. Hananiah says, 'It applies to males and to females.'"*

II.1 A. He who marries women that are forbidden is invalid until he will vow not to derive benefit [from her]:

- B. *A Tannaite statement: He takes a vow not to derive benefit from her and then may perform the Temple liturgy; then he descends from the altar and issues the writ of divorce.*
- C. *But do we not take account of the possibility that, afterward, he may go to a sage, who will release him from his vow [in which case the service he will have performed will prove retrospectively to have been done by an invalid priest]?*
- D. The authority behind that statement takes the view that to remit a vow, one has to specify the details of the vow.
- E. *That poses no problem to the one who maintains the view that to remit a vow, one has to specify the details of the vow. But from the perspective of the one who holds the view that to remit a vow, one does not have to specify the details of the vow, what is to be said?*
- F. *We impose a vow on him in public [before ten people, in which case no sage can remit the vow].*

- G. *That poses no problem to the view of him who maintains that a vow imposed on a person in public cannot be invalidated at all. But from the perspective of him who holds that a vow imposed on a person in public can be invalidated, what is there to be said?*
- H. *We impose a vow on him [46A] that is dependent on the wishes of the community at large.*
- I. *Said Amemar, "The law is that even in the opinion of him who maintains that a vow imposed in public still may be subject to remission, a vow that is made dependent on the wishes of the community at large may not be remitted; and that is so in the case of an optional matter. But as to a matter that is obligatory, there can be remission."*
- J. *That would be illustrated by the case of a school teacher who was prohibited by R. Aha by vow from teaching any longer, because he mistreated the children. Rabina reinstated him, since no one could be found who was as effective a teacher as he had been.*

III.1 A. And he who contracts corpse-uncleanness is invalid until he will undertake not to contract corpse-uncleanness:

- B. *What is the difference between this case, in which it is sufficient for him to give such an undertaking, and the case prior, in which we impose a vow on the man?*
- C. *In that other case, sexual desire may impel the man to violate his undertaking.*

I.1 provides an important clarification, with which the passage is unintelligible. II.1 specifies the procedures contemplated by the Mishnah's rule. III.1 explains the language-choices of the framer of the Mishnah.