

III.

BAVLI PESAHI CHAPTER THREE

FOLIOS 42A-50A

3:1

- A. These [things] are removed at Passover:
- B. (1) Babylonian porridge, (2) Median beer, (3) Edomite vinegar, (4) Egyptian barley beer;
- C. (5) dyers' pulp, (6) cooks' starch flour, and (7) scribes' paste.
- D. R. Eliezer says, "Also: Women's ornaments."
- E. This is the general principle: Whatever is made of any kind of grain, lo, this is removed on Passover.
- F. Lo, these matters are subject to an admonition.
- G. But extirpation does not apply to them.

I.1 A. Babylonian porridge:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Three things have been said about Babylonian porridge: it closes the heart, blinds the eyes, and weakens the body.
 - D. it closes the heart: *on account of the whey of milk;*
 - E. blinds the eyes: *because of the salt;*
 - F. and weakens the body: *because of the crusts.*

I.2. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Three things give you lots of shit and bend you over and take away one five hundredth of your vision, and these are they: dark bread, fresh beer, and vegetables?

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

- B. Three things take away your shit and straighten you up and give you good vision and these are they: fine bread, fat meat, and vintage wine.
- C. fine bread: **[42B]** *made of fine meal;*
- D. fat meat: *of a goat that had not given birth;*
- E. and vintage wine: *really old.*

I.4. A. *Whatever is good for the one is bad for the other [the heart, the eyes, respectively], and what is bad for the one is good for the other, except for moist ginger, long peppers, white bread, and vintage wine, which are beneficial for the whole body.*

II.1 A. Median beer:

B. *because they mix barley water in it.*

III.1 A. Edomite vinegar:

B. *because they mix barley into it.*

III.2. A. Said R. Nahman, “In the beginning, when they would bring libation wine from Judah, the wine of Judah didn’t turn vinegar unless they put barley into it, and they would call it simply vinegar. But now the wine of Edom doesn’t turn vinegar until barley is put into it, and they call it Edomite vinegar, in line with the verse, ‘Tyre has said against Jerusalem, I shall be replenished, now that she is laid waste’ (Eze. 26: 2) — if this one is flourishing, this one is laid waste, and if the other one is flourishing, the former is laid waste.”

B. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “Evidence derives from here: ‘and the one people shall be stronger than the other people’ (Gen. 25:23).”

III.3. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. Said R. Judah, “In Judah, to begin with, he who would buy vinegar from a non-observant person didn’t have to give tithe, since it was assumed to derive only from a date palm; but now, he who buys vinegar from a non-observant person has to tithe, since it is assumed to come only from wine.”

C. *So does R. Judah take for granted that a wine-vinegar isn’t subject to tithing? But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who was making wine-vinegar [steeping stalks and skins of pressed grapes in water or pouring water into lees] and put in water by measure and got the same quantity of liquid back is exempt from having to separate tithes. And R. Judah declares him liable [M. Ma. 5:6].***

D. *This is the sense of his statement: non-observant persons are not suspect concerning wine-vinegar.*

E. *If you prefer, I shall say, they are suspect, but there is no problem, the one speaks of that which is made with a strainer, the other speaks of what is made of pits. [Freedman: if made over lees in a strainer, it is wine and subject to tithes; if made with the pits, it is colored water and not subject to tithes.]*

IV.1 A. Egyptian barley beer:

B. *What is the definition of **Egyptian barley beer**?*

C. *R. Joseph made the following Tannaite statement: “Egyptian beer is one part barley, one part safflower, and one part salt.”*

D. *R. Pappa omits barley and substitutes wheat [thus: One part wheat, one safflower, and one salt.] The mnemonic is sisane. They soaked them, roasted them, ground them, and drank them. It is drunk between Passover and Pentecost; for a constipated person, it’s a laxative; for someone with diarrhoea, it binds. But for a sick person and a pregnant woman, it is dangerous.*

V.1 A. dyers' pulp:

- B. *Here they explain it: bran water primed with juice of a plant used for dyeing.*

VI.1 A. cooks' starch flour:

- B. this is a loaf of dough made of grain less than a third grown, which the cook puts on the mouth of the pot, and it draws off the froth.

VII.1 A. scribes' paste:

- B. *Here they explain it: shoemaker's paste.*
- C. R. Shimi of Khuzistan said, "It is a make up used by rich women, and they leave some over for poor women."
- D. *Is that true? And lo, R. Hiyya repeated as a Tannaite statement: there are [on the list of items before us] four kinds of commodities in general use and three kinds that are used in crafts. But if you say that it is a make up used by rich women, then what kind of craft-products are there [since this isn't something used in the work of craftsmen]? Rather, what is it? Shoemaker's paste. And why does he call it scribes' paste?*
- E. *Said R. Oshayya, "In point of fact, it is shoe maker's paste. And why does he call it scribes' paste? Because scribes stick their papyrus-paper together with it."*

VIII.1 A. R. Eliezer says, "Also: women's ornaments:"

- B. *Do you really think it is women's ornaments?! Rather, say, women's make up.*
- C. For said R. Judah said Rab, "Israelite girls [43A] who reached puberty before they reach the normal age of maturity in years [twelve years and a day], if they are poor, may put on a lime-concoction; if they are rich, they put on fine flour; princesses put on oil of myrrh, as it is said, 'Six months with oil of myrrh' (Est. 2:12)."

VIII.2. A. "Six months with oil of myrrh" (Est. 2:12):

- B. *What is oil of myrrh?*
- C. R. Huna bar Hiyya said, "It is stacte."
- D. R. Jeremiah bar Abba said, "It is oil derived from olives not yet a third grown."

VIII.3. A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. R. Judah says, "[**Olives for olive oil**] **from a manured field** refers to olives that are not a third grown. And why is it used for smearing? Because it serves as a depilatory and skin-softener."
- C. Why do they apply it? Because it removes hair and softens the skin.

IX.1 A. This is the general principle: Whatever is made of any kind of grain, lo, this is removed on Passover:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Said R. Joshua, "Now since we repeat in the Mishnah: **Whatever is made of any kind of grain, lo, this is removed on Passover**, why did sages enumerate these as well? It is so that people should be familiar with them and their names."
- D. *That is in line with the incident in which a Westerner came to Babylonia. He had meat with him and said to them, "Bring me a relish."*

- E. *He heard them saying, "Bring him porridge." When he heard "porridge," he abstained.*

X.1 A. Lo, these matters are subject to an admonition:

- B. *Who is the Tannaite authority who holds that real leaven of grain in a mixture, and spoiled leaven as is, are subject to a negative commandment?*
- C. *Said R. Judah said Rab, "It is R. Meir, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Dough beginning to ferment must be burned and one may give it to his dog, but he who eats it is given forty lashes. Now there is a contradiction in the body of that statement. First of all you say, dough beginning to ferment must be burned. Therefore it may not be utilized. And then the Tannaite rule proceeds: and one may give it to his dog. Therefore it is permitted for benefit. So this is the sense of the statement: What is dough beginning to ferment in the opinion of R. Meir must be burned in the opinion of R. Meir, and what is dough beginning to ferment in the opinion of R. Judah must be burned in the opinion of R. Judah. And he may give it to his dog — that is, dough beginning to ferment in the opinion of R. Meir may be given to a dog in R. Judah's opinion. And he who eats it is given forty lashes — that is in the view of R. Meir. So we are informed that R. Meir takes the position that spoiled leaven in its natural state is subject to a negative commandment, all the more so real leaven of grain in a mixture."*
- D. *R. Nahman said, "It is R. Eliezer, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. *"“For leaven of grain, one is liable to extirpation; for a mixture thereof, one is liable only for violating a negative commandment,” the words of R. Eliezer.*
- F. *And sages say, "For what is wholly leaven of grain, one is liable to extirpation, but for a mixture containing it there is no penalty at all."*
- G. *So we derive the rule that in R. Eliezer's opinion leaven of grain in a mixture is subject to a negative commandment, all the more so spoiled leaven as is.*
- H. *So how come R. Nahman does not take the position of R. Judah?*
- I. *He will say to you, "Perhaps R. Meir took the position that he did there only in the case of spoiled leaven as is, but not in the case of what is wholly leaven of grain in a mixture."*
- J. *And how come R. Judah does not take the position of R. Nahman?*
- K. *He will say to you, "R. Eliezer takes the position that he does there only in the case of what is wholly leaven in a mixture, but as to what is spoiled as is, he did not take that view."*
- L. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Judah:*
- M. *"You shall eat nothing leavened" (Exo. 12:20) — this serves to extend the prohibition to **Babylonian porridge and Median beer and Edomite vinegar and Egyptian barley beer**. Might one suppose that for consuming such on Passover, he is liable to extirpation?*
- N. *Scripture says, "For whoever eats that which is leavened shall be cut off" (Exo. 12:19) — for leavened grain that is unadulterated one is punishable by extirpation, and for a mixture of that with other things one is liable for violating a negative commandment.*

- O. *Now of whom have you heard who takes the position that for a mixture of that with other things one is liable for violating a negative commandment? It is R. Eliezer, but as to spoiled leaven as is, he does not take that position. That proves, therefore, that R. Eliezer does not take the view that leaven that is spoiled is subject to a negative commandment.*
- P. *And how on the basis of Scripture does R. Eliezer know that for a mixture of that with other things one is liable for violating a negative commandment?*
- Q. *As it is written, "You shall eat nothing leavened."*
- R. *If so, then he should be liable also to extirpation, since it is written, "For whoever eats that which is leavened...shall be cut off"!*
- S. *He requires that verse to serve the purpose of what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- T. *I know only that one is liable on account of what leavens on its own; if it was leavened through another substance, how do we know that liability is incurred?*
- U. *Because it is said, "For whoever eats that which is leavened shall be cut off."*
- V. *If so, then the teaching concerning the negative commandment would serve this same purpose? [Freedman: that a negative injunction is involved even in respect of that which is made leaven through a foreign substance, how then do we know that even for a mixture a negative injunction is transgressed?]*
- W. *Rather, the operative proof-text for R. Eliezer derives from the reference to "whoever."*
- X. *But with regard to the penalty of extirpation, the same word, "whoever," occurs.*
- Y. *That is required to extend the law to women [who are also subject to the penalty of extirpation].*
- Z. *That women are subject to the law derives from what R. Judah said Rab said, for said R. Judah said Rab, and so too a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], "'When a man or a woman shall commit any sin that men commit' (Num. 5: 6) — in this way Scripture has treated women as equal to men in regard to all penalties that are in the Torah"!*
- AA. *Not at all, it is necessary to prove that fact in this case alone, [43B] for it might have entered your mind to maintain that since it is written, "You shall not eat leavened bread with it, seven days you shall eat unleavened bread with it" (Deu 16: 3), therefore, whoever is subject to the commandment, "arise and eat unleavened bread" is subject to the commandment of not eating leaven. But women, since they are not subject to the commandment, "arise and eat unleavened bread," since that is a religious duty dependent upon time and circumstance, I might say, so too they are not liable to*

observe the prohibition against eating leaven. So we are informed that that is not the case.

BB. *Now that they have been encompassed by the commandment, “You shall eat no unleavened bread,” they also are subject to the requirement of eating unleavened bread, in line with the thinking of R. Eleazar, for said R. Eleazar, “Women are liable by the law of the Torah to eat unleavened bread as it is said: ‘You shall eat no leavened bread with it, seven days you shall eat unleavened bread with it’ — whoever is liable not to eat leavened bread is liable to eat unleavened bread, and who might that be? It is women, so that, since they are subject to the rule, ‘You shall eat no leavened bread,’ also are subject to the rule, ”’arise., eat unleavened bread.]”*

CC. *And what makes you prefer to utilize “whoever” to encompass women, thus excluding from penalty a mixture of leaven and other things? Rather, why not say that “whoever” serve to encompass leaven in a mixture [and exclude women from the law]?*

DD. *It stands to reason that when Scripture deals with those who eat the food, it should have in mind to extend the rule to those who eat, while when it speaks of those who eat the food, should it treat of things that are eaten? [Not at all.]*

EE. *Objected R. Nathan father of R. Huna, “Well, then, is it the fact that when Scripture speaks of those that eat a food, it doesn’t speak of what is eaten? But it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘For whoever eats the fat of the beast, of which people present an offering made by fire to the Lord, even the soul that eats it shall be cut off from his people’ (Lev. 7:25) — I know that the law applies only to the fat of unblemished beasts, which is suitable for offering. How do we know that the same pertains to fat of blemished beasts? Scripture says, “of the beast.” And how do we know that it speaks of the fat of unconsecrated beasts? Scripture says, ‘for whoever.’ Now, therefore, here we have a case in which Scripture speaks of those who eat, but it covers also things that are eaten.”*

FF. *In that case, in which there are none who eat to be included, it covers what is eaten; here, where there are those who eat to be included, the framer cannot ignore those who eat and cover what is eaten.*

GG. *Now from the perspective of rabbis, who do not maintain that a negative commandment is violated with a mixture of leaven and something else, they clearly don’t interpret “whoever” as an extension. Then how do they know that women are subject to extirpation for eating leaven [Eliezer using the*

word “whoever” to cover a mixture and to include women, while rabbis don’t treat “whoever” as augmentative at all)?

HH. *While they don’t interpret “whoever” as augmentative, they do interpret “whoever” [at Exo. 21:15, 19] for that purpose.*

II. *Then as to R. Eliezer, why not say, “Whoever” serves to extend the law to women, and “for all” serves to extend the law to a mixture containing leaven [Freedman: teaching that extirpation is involved, not merely a negative commandment]? And should you maintain that R. Eliezer does not derive a lesson from the words, “for all,” it in point of fact has been taught on Tannaite authority: “For you [the Hebrew using the words ‘for all’] shall not burn any leaven...as an offering made by fire to the Lord” (Lev. 2:11) — I know only that the rule that the meal offering must not be leavened if it is burned upon the altar only for the whole of it. How do I know that the same rule applies to part of it? Scripture says, “any leaven” (Lev. 2:11). And how do I know that the same rule applies to the mixture of it? Scripture states, “for any leaven” (Lev. 2:11). Now of whom have you heard who interprets “all” as an augmentative word? It is R. Eliezer, and he too interprets “for any” in this passage.*

JJ. *That’s a problem.*

KK. Said R. Abbahu said R. Yohanan, “With regard to all things that are forbidden in the Torah, a permitted commodity does not combine with a prohibited one [to form the requisite volume to involve a penalty, e.g., an olive’s bulk for eating] except in the case of the prohibitions of a Nazirite, in which case the Torah has said, ‘any infusion of grapes’ (Num. 6: 3).”

LL. And Zeiri said, “Also: ‘you shall not burn any leaven’ (Lev. 1:11).”

MM. *In accord with whom is that conclusion drawn?*

NN. *It is in accord with R. Eliezer, who expounds the word “whoever.”*

OO. *If so, [44A] then with respect to leaven on Passover, that also should be the rule [and that could refer to a mixture of a half olive bulk of leaven and unleavened bread]!*

PP. *True enough, and that serves to exclude the position of Abbayye, who has said, “One may be guilty of burning on the altar [what should not be burned there, that is, leaven] in a volume of less than an olive’s bulk.” So he informs us that there is no guilt on account of burning on the altar [what should not be burned there, that is, leaven] in a volume of less than an olive’s bulk.*

X.2. A. *In session, R. Dimi stated this tradition. Said Abbayye to R. Dimi, “Is it the fact that in respect to whatever is prohibited by the Torah, what is permitted does not join together with what is forbidden to form the requisite volume [except for the stated exceptions]? But haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: The porridge [made from] heave offering, and the garlic and the oil of unconsecrated food, part of which a person who have completed the immersion and awaits sunset for the conclusion of his purification rite [tebul-yom] touched — he has rendered the whole unfit. The porridge [which is made] from unconsecrated food, and the garlic and the oil of heave offering, part of which a person who have completed the immersion and awaits sunset for the conclusion of his purification rite touched — he has rendered unfit only the place which he touched [M. T.Y. 2:3A-D]? And we reflected on that matter: as to the place that he touched, why is it unfit? Isn’t the spice nullified in the much larger volume [being secondary to the mixture]? And said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, ‘What is the reason? Since a non-priest would be flogged on account of eating as much as an olive’s bulk of it [so it is not regarded as nullified, even though it is secondary to the mixture*

(Freedman)]. Now how can we imagine that a person would be liable [since he would not eat an olive's bulk of spice when he ate out of the dish]? Isn't it because what is permitted [to the non-priest] is combined with what is forbidden [to form the requisite volume to incur guilt]?"

- B. Not at all, what is the meaning of "an olive's bulk" here? it means, there is as much as an olive's bulk eaten within the span of time that it would take to eat half a loaf of bread [at which point, he will have eaten as much as an olive's bulk of priestly rations].
- C. *But is the standard, "as much as an olive's bulk within the span of time it takes to eat half a loaf of bread" a measure set forth by the Torah so that one would be flogged?*
- D. *He said to him, "Yup."*
- E. *"If so, then how come rabbis differ from R. Eliezer when it comes to Babylonian porridge [for which he should be liable]" [Freedman: even if flogging is not incurred on account of the mixture, yet there too, in a volume of four eggs of porridge there would be an olive of leaven.]*
- F. *What then? the operative consideration has to be, therefore, that a permitted commodity joins together with a forbidden one to form the requisite volume for incurring a penalty? Then how come rabbis differ with R. Eliezer on account of Babylonian porridge?*
- G. *Forget about Babylonian porridge, for it wouldn't contain as much as an olive's bulk of leaven within the volume one could eat during the span of time it would take to eat half a loaf of bread. For if it is eaten as is, then he gulps it down and eats it,*

and we disregard such a case as extraordinary by the usual standard of normal conduct; but if he dips bread in it and eats it, then it doesn't contain as much as an olive's bulk within the span of time that it would take to eat half a loaf of bread.

- H. *An objection was raised: two pots, one of unconsecrated food, the other of priestly rations, and in front of them are two mortars, one of unconsecrated spices and the other of spices in the status of priestly rations, and they fell into one another — they are permitted [a non-priest may eat the unconsecrated porridge with the consecrated spices], for I say, the spices in the status of priestly rations fell into the porridge in the status of priestly rations, and the unconsecrated spices fell into the unconsecrated porridge. Now, if you maintain that the standard, “as much as an olive's bulk within the span of time it takes to eat half a loaf of bread” is a measure set forth by the Torah, why do we invoke the argument, for I say, the spices in the status of priestly rations fell into the porridge in the status of priestly rations, and the unconsecrated spices fell into the unconsecrated porridge? [The doubt concerns what is forbidden by the law of the Torah.]*
- I. *He said to him, “Forget about spices in the status of priestly rations, for that status derives merely from the ruling of rabbis.”*
- J. *An objection was raised: **if there were before him two bins, one of priestly rations and one of unconsecrated produce, and before them were two seahs of produce in separate containers, one of priestly rations and one of unconsecrated produce, and the produce fell from each of***

the small containers, but it is not known whether it fell from this one into that one,^l or from that one into this one [so we do not know which produce was mixed with which] these are permitted, for lo, I say, “Priestly rations fell into priestly rations, unconsecrated produce fell into unconsecrated produce” [T. Ter. 6:18A-D]. Now, if you maintain that the standard, “as much as an olive’s bulk within the span of time it takes to eat half a loaf of bread” is a measure set forth by the Torah, why do we invoke the argument, for I say,

K. He said to him, “Forget about priestly rations at this time [after the destruction of the Temple], for that status derives merely from the ruling of rabbis.”

X.3. A. Now does the rule of the infusion of grapes serve the present purpose [as indicated earlier]? Surely it is required for that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:

B. “An infusion” — [44B] this serves to indicate that the flavor is equivalent to the substance itself, so that, if the Nazirite soaked grapes in water and the water tastes like wine, he is liable.

C. On this basis you draw an analogy to the entirety of the Torah: if to a Nazirite, the prohibition concerning whom is not perpetual [but only for a limited time], and the prohibition concerning whom does not extend to deriving benefit [but only direct personal use], and to the prohibition concerning whom there is the possibility of remission, the rule applies that the flavor is equivalent to the substance itself, then, where there is a mixture of seeds that should not be mixed, in which case the prohibition concerning which is

perpetual, and the prohibition concerning which does extend to deriving benefit [but only direct personal use], and to the prohibition concerning whom there is no possibility of remission, — surely the law also should be that the flavor is equivalent to the substance itself.

- D. And the same applies, so far as two of the three arguments are concerned [the permanent-prohibition doesn't apply], to produce of a tree in the first three years of its growth.
- E. *Lo, who is the authority here? It is rabbis, but R. Yohanan made his statement in accord with the position of R. Aqiba.*
- F. *Which ruling of R. Aqiba is under discussion here? Should we say that it is that of R. Aqiba of our Mishnah, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **R. Aqiba says, “Even if a Nazirite dunked his bread into wine and there is in what is sopped up enough to join together to be in the volume of an olive’s bulk, he is liable” [M. Naz. 6:1E].** But how do you know that what he means is, enough bread and wine? Maybe he means, wine alone? And should you say, well, if it’s the wine alone, why say so? Thus he tells us that he is liable although it is a mixture of bread and wine [the wine not being on its own].*
- G. *Rather, it is the R. Aqiba of the following external Tannaite tradition, as has been taught on Tannaite tradition: R. Aqiba says, “If a Nazirite dunked his bread into wine and ate an olive’s bulk of the bread and the wine combined, he is liable.”*

X.4. A. *And how does R., Aqiba know that the flavor of what is forbidden is treated as*

comparable to the thing itself
[Freedman: since he utilizes
“an infusion” for the present
purpose]?

- B. *He derives it from the prohibition of meat boiled in milk: isn't this merely the flavor, and yet it is forbidden? So here too, the rule is no different.*
- C. *And rabbis?*
- D. *They do not derive the analogy from the case of meat in milk, because that is an anomaly in the Torah and so not generative of an analogy.*
- E. *And what marks its anomalous character? Should we say that the meat on its own is permitted and the milk on its own is permitted, while together they are forbidden? Well, then, what about mixed species or seeds in the vineyard, in which case, this by itself is permitted and that by itself is permitted, but together they are forbidden?*
- F. *Rather, the point is, if he had soaked the meat in milk all day long without boiling it, it would be permitted, while, if he boiled it in milk, it is forbidden? Then R. Aqiba too should concur that the prohibition of meat in milk is anomalous!*
- G. *Rather, he derives the matter from the case of utensils belonging to gentiles. [Utensils in which gentiles have cooked food are forbidden for Israelite use; they have to be purged with boiling water, so that the flavor of food boiled in them*

will not persist.] That is to say: in the case of gentiles' utensils, it is only the flavor that they impart that is involved, and yet they are forbidden; the rule here should be the same.

H. And rabbis?

I. *As a matter of fact, the rule governing utensils of gentiles too is anomalous, for whatever imparts a flavor that will deteriorate is permitted, a rule we derive from the matter of carrion [Freedman: "you shall not eat of any thing that dies of itself, you may give it to a stranger" (Deu. 14:21) — so what a stranger can eat is called carrion, but what is unfit is not called carrion, in the sense that if it imparts a deteriorating flavor it does not render the food forbidden]. Yet here it is forbidden.*

J. And R. Aqiba?

K. *He concurs with what R. Hiyya b. R. Huna said, "The Torah has forbidden the use only of a pot that was used on that very day," so it is still fresh and the flavor doesn't deteriorate.*

L. And rabbis?

M. *A pot used that very day — it isn't possible that it will not slightly worse food cooked in it.*

N. *Said R. Aha b. R. Avayya to R. Ashi, "From the position of rabbis, let us derive the position of R. Aqiba. Specifically, didn't rabbis say, "an infusion" — this*

serves to indicate that the flavor is equivalent to the substance itself, so that, if the Nazirite soaked grapes in water and the water tastes like wine, he is liable. On this basis you draw an analogy to the entirety of the Torah? Then from R. Akiba's viewpoint, we should be able to say: "an infusion" — this serves to indicate that a permitted commodity will join together with a forbidden one. On this basis you draw an analogy to the entirety of the Torah."

- O. He said to him, **[45A]** *"The operative consideration is that the Nazirite and the sin offering are covered by two distinct verses that make the same point, and where you have two distinct verses that make the same point, we do not form an analogy for other distinct matters."*
- P. *As to the Nazirite, it is as we just have said. As to the sin offering, what is the reference?*
- Q. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. "Whatever shall touch...shall be holy" (Lev. 6:20) — might one suppose that that is so even if the latter did not absorb anything from the former?
- S. Scripture says, "in the meat thereof" (Lev. 6:20) — only if it absorbs some of the meat.
- T. Might one suppose that if it touched part of a piece of meat, the whole of it should be invalidated?

- U. Scripture says, “shall touch...”
— only that which touches is invalidated.
- V. [How does this work? One cuts off the part that has absorbed the forbidden flavor “in the meat thereof” (Lev. 6:20) — but not the tendons, bones, horns, or hooves.]
- W. “shall be holy” (Lev. 6:20) — to enter into the same classification as whatever it touches, thus: if it is unfit, then that which it touches shall be unfit; if it is fit, it may be eaten only in accord with the stringencies that affect that which it has touched, so if it is a sin offering, it is eaten only in accord with the strict rules governing the sin offering.
- X. *And rabbis? Shouldn't they maintain the same, namely, the Nazirite and the sin offering are covered by two distinct verses that make the same point, and where you have two distinct verses that make the same point, we do not form an analogy for other distinct matters?*
- Y. *They can answer: both are required in context* [and therefore do illuminate other cases, the one not being deducible from the other (Freedman)].
- Z. And R. Aqiba?
- AA. *So how are both required? There is no problem in the proposition that if Scripture had made the point concerning the sin offering, one could not have derived*

the law for the Nazirite from that case, because we do not derive the rule governing unconsecrated food from that covering Holy Things. But let Scripture state the rule with reference to the Nazirite, and one might then introduce the case of the sin offering and derive the rule therefrom, since all of the prohibitions of the Torah are learned from the case of the Nazirite.

BB. And rabbis?

CC. *They will say to you, "Each is indeed required. The case of the sin offering is required to make the point that what is permitted joins together with what is forbidden to form the requisite volume for liability, and the rule governing unconsecrated food cannot be deduced from the rule governing Holy Things; and 'an infusion' is required to make the point that imparting taste is tantamount to the forbidden substance itself, and from that case you may draw the same principle to cover the entirety of the Torah."*

CC. And R. Aqiba?

DD. *Both cases are required to make the point that what is permitted joins together to form the requisite volume with what is forbidden, so that you really do have two distinct verses that make the same point, we do not form an analogy for other distinct matters.*

X.5. A. *Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana, “Well, what about that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘all the days of his Naziriteship he shall eat nothing that is made of the grape vine, from the husks to the pits’ (Num. 6: 4) — this teaches concerning things that are forbidden to a Nazirite, that they combine with each other? Now, from the perspective of R. Aqiba, if what is forbidden will join together to form the requisite volume with what is permitted, can there be any question concerning the rule governing what is forbidden with what is forbidden?”*

B. *He said to him, “What is forbidden joins with what is permitted at one and the same moment, but what is forbidden joins with what is forbidden even when eaten consecutively.”*

3:2A-G

- A. Dough which is in the cracks of a kneading trough,
- B. if there is an olive’s bulk in a single place —
- C. one is liable to remove it.
- D. And if not, it is deemed null by reason of its inconsequence.
- E. And so with regard to uncleanness:
- F. if one is fastidious about it, it interposes.
- G. And if he wants to keep it, lo, it is deemed equivalent to [and part of] the kneading trough.

I.1 A. [Dough which is in the cracks of a kneading trough, if there is an olive’s bulk in a single place — one is liable to remove it:] said R. Judah said Samuel, “They have learned this rule only concerning a place where the dough doesn’t reenforce the trough, but if the dough reenforces the trough, he is not obligated to remove it” [e.g., if it is at the bottom and holds the liquid in]. *It follows that* in a case in which it is less than an olive’s bulk, even if it is located in a place in which it doesn’t reenforce the trough, he is not liable to remove it.

B. *There are those who repeat this statement with respect to the second clause, namely: And if not, it is deemed null by reason of its inconsequence*

- C. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “They have learned this rule only concerning a place where the dough doesn’t reenforce the trough, but if the dough reenforces the trough, he is not obligated to remove it” [e.g., if it is at the bottom and holds the liquid in]. *It follows that* in a case in which it is an olive’s bulk, even if it is located in a place in which it does reenforce the trough, he is liable to remove it.
- D. *There is a Tannaite formulation in accord with the first version and there is a Tannaite formulation in accord with the second version.*
- E. *There is a Tannaite formulation in accord with the first version:* Dough which is in the cracks of a kneading trough — if it is located in a place in which it reenforces the trough, it does not interpose when the trough is immersed, and one does not violate on its account the rule of Passover; and if it is in a location in which it doesn’t reenforce the trough, it does interpose, and it also does cause the violation of the law of Passover. Under what circumstances? That is in the case of an olive’s bulk. But if it is less than an olive’s bulk, even if it is in a place in which it doesn’t reenforce the trough, it doesn’t interpose and it doesn’t bring about the violation of the law of Passover.
- F. *And there is a Tannaite formulation in accord with the second version:* Dough which is in the cracks of a kneading trough — if it is located in a place in which it reenforces the trough, **[45B]** it does not interpose when the trough is immersed, and one does not violate on its account the rule of Passover; and if it is in a location in which it doesn’t reenforce the trough, it does interpose, and it also does cause the violation of the law of Passover. Under what circumstances? That is in the case of what is less than an olive’s bulk. But if it is an olive’s bulk, even if it is in a place in which it does reenforce the trough, it does interpose and it does bring about the violation of the law of Passover.
- G. *Well, then, these formulations contradict one another!*
- H. *Said R. Huna, “Suppress the less lenient ruling in favor of the more stringent one.”*
- I. *R. Joseph said, “You are prepared to invent Tannaite authorities as you go along! In fact, it is a conflict between Tannaite authorities [and not merely a contradiction between two statements of the same person, one of which then is to be suppressed], for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A loaf that turned mouldy — one is liable to remove it, because it can be crumbled up and used for leaven with many other doughs. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, ‘Under what circumstances? If it is kept for eating. But a mass of yeast that one put aside for storage is treated as null, since the owner has nullified it’ [Freedman: he gave up the nominal use of it as leaven and hence it no longer counts as leaven]. Now, since R. Simeon b. Eleazar has said, the owner has nullified it, it follows that the initial Tannaite authority maintains, the owner has not nullified it. Therefore, he takes the view that in any case in which there is as much as an olive’s bulk, even if the owner nullifies it, it is not nullified.”*
- J. *Said to him Abbaye, “Well, you have sorted matters out for a case in which there is as much as an olive’s bulk, but have you sorted matters out for a case in which there is less than an olive’s bulk? Rather, both one statement and the other represent the position of R. Simeon b. Eleazar, but*

there is no contradiction. The one speaks of a case in which kneading is done, the other, in a place in which kneading is not done.” [Freedman: “Where it does not reenforce” refers in the second version only to a place where no kneading is done at all, e.g., at the upper edge, but dough in the cracks at the sides is regarded as reinforcing the trough, and hence it must be removed; but the first version holds that even in the latter case it does not reenforce the trough, though kneading is done there, while ‘where it serves for reinforcing’ refers to the bottom only. Hence this is what the first Tannaite authority states: where it serves for reinforcing, e.g., at the bottom, he does not transgress even if there is as much as an olive. Where it does not serve for reinforcing, e.g., to support the water, for instance, on the sides, which is a place for kneading yet not a place for the water, if there is as much as an olive, it interposes, and he violates the law; but if there is less than an olive, even if it is in the sides, it does not interpose, for since it does help somewhat to support the dough that is kneaded there, it is nullified. But this Tannaite authority does not discuss dough that is not in the place of kneading, that is, at the upper rim, and he would admit in that case that even if there is less than an olive’s bulk, it is not nullified. The second Tannaite authority rules that if it is in a place where it supports the dough, that is, at the sides, if there is less than an olive’s bulk, it does not interpose; if there is as much as an olive’s bulk, it interposes, and this is the view of the first Tannaite authority too. Where it is not made for reinforcing, at the upper rim, even less than an olive’s bulk interposes, and this too agrees with the first Tannaite authority.]

- K. *Said R. Ashi, “Don’t say that ‘not in the place of kneading’ refers to the back of the trough only; it means, even on the upper rim of the trough.”*
- L. *So what else is new?*
- M. *You might otherwise have said, sometimes it splashes up and touches the spot, so we are informed that that is not the case.*
- N. *Said R. Nahman said Rab, “The decided law accords with R. Simeon b. Eleazar.”*
- O. *Is that true? But hasn’t R. Isaac bar Ashi said Rab [said], “If one plastered the surface [Freedman: of the mass of leaven he set aside for storage] with clay, he has nullified it”? So that is the case if he plastered it but not if he didn’t plaster it!*
- P. *He who repeated this Tannaite formulation didn’t repeat that one.*
- Q. *Others say, “said R. Nahman said Rab, ‘The law is not in accord with R. Simeon b. Eleazar,’ for said R. Isaac bar Ashi said Rab, “If one plastered the surface with clay, he has nullified it, but if not, he has not nullified it.”*

I.2. A. *Said R. Nahman said Samuel, “If there are two half olive’s bulks of dough in the cracks of a kneading trough, with a thread of dough joining them, we examine the case: in any instance in which, if the thread were removed, these*

would be taken up with it, he is liable to remove them, but if not, he is not liable to remove them [T. Pisha 3:1E-G].”

- B. *Said Ulla, “They have made that statement only in the case of a trough, but as to such dough in a room, one way or the other he is liable to remove them. How come? Sometimes he may sweep them and they will tumble together.”*

I.3. A. *Said Ulla, “They asked the following question in the West: what about a room and an upper story, a room and the hall way, two rooms, one inside the other?”*

- B. *These questions stand.*

I.4. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A loaf that got mouldy and is invalidated for eating by a human being but a dog can eat it imparts uncleanness as food in the volume of an egg and is to be burned with unclean food prior to Passover.
- C. In the name of R. Nathan they said, “It does not contract uncleanness as food.”
- D. *In accord with whom is that which we have learned in the Mishnah: **A general rule did they state in connection with clean [foods]: Whatever is set aside for human consumption — it is susceptible to uncleanness until it is unfit for food for a dog. And whatever is not set aside for human consumption-it is insusceptible to uncleanness until it is designated for man [M. Toh. 8:6A-C]?***
- E. *In accord with whom? It is obviously not in accord with R. Nathan.*

I.5. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A trough of tanners into which one put flour — if it is within three days prior to Passover, he is liable to remove it. If it is prior to three days before Passover, he is not liable to remove it.
- C. *Said R. Nathan, “Under what circumstances? If he didn’t put hides into it, but if he put hides into it, even if it is within three days of Passover, he is not liable to remove it.”*
- D. *Said Raba, “The decided law is in accord with R. Nathan — and even one day, or even one hour, prior to Passover.”*

II.1 A. **And so with regard to uncleanness: if one is fastidious about it [a piece of dough], it interposes. And if he wants to keep it, lo, it is deemed equivalent to [and part of] the kneading trough:**

- B. *But are the cases truly comparable? In that case, the matter depends on the quantity of dough, but here, it depends on whether or not he is fastidious about it!*
- C. *Said R. Judah, “Say: but it is not **so with regard to uncleanness.**”*
- D. *Said to him Abbaye, “But the text flatly states **And so with regard to uncleanness!**”*
- E. *Rather, said Abbaye, “This is the sense of the statement: **And so with regard to [46A]** combining for **uncleanness** on Passover. But during the rest of the year, there is a distinction to be drawn. How so? For example, if there are edibles of less than an egg’s volume in quantity, and they were touching this dough: on Passover, when the prohibition of the dough makes the dough consequential, it combines, but during the rest of the year, when the matter depends on whether or not he is meticulous about it, then, **if one is fastidious about it [a piece of***

dough], it joins together. And if he wants to keep it, lo, it is deemed equivalent to [and part of] the kneading trough.”

- F. *Objected Raba, “But is the language, it joins together, used here at all?! Lo, the language that is used is, it interposes!”*
- G. Rather, said Raba, “**And so with regard** to raising the kneading dough to a level of cleanness. *How so? For example, if this kneading trough became unclean and he wanted to immerse it, on Passover the prohibition renders the dough consequential, so it interposes. Then the immersion is null, but during the rest of the year, when the matter depends on whether or not he is meticulous about it, then, if one is fastidious about it [a piece of dough], it interposes. And if he wants to keep it, lo, it is deemed equivalent to [and part of] the kneading trough.*”
- H. *Objected R. Pappa, “But is the language, And so with regard to raising the kneading dough to a level of cleanness used? Lo, the language that is used is, And so with regard to uncleanness.”*
- I. Rather, said Raba, “**And so with regard to bringing uncleanness** to the kneading trough. *How so? For example, if a dead creeping thing touched this dough, then, on Passover the prohibition renders the dough consequential, so it interposes, so uncleanness does not descend on it, but during the rest of the year, when the matter depends on whether or not he is meticulous about it, then, if one is fastidious about it [a piece of dough], it interposes. And if he wants to keep it, lo, it is deemed equivalent to [and part of] the kneading trough.*”

3:2H-J

- H. Dough which is “dumb” —
I. if an equivalent amount has already fermented,
J. lo, this is prohibited.

- I.1** A. But what is the law if there is no dough similar to it?
- B. Said R. Abbahu said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “The period for fermenting is the time it takes for someone to walk from the Fish Tower to Tiberias, which is a mile.”
- C. *So why not say, “a mile”?*
- D. *By formulating matters in this way, he informs us that the length of time it takes to walk a mile is the time it takes for someone to walk from the Fish Tower to Tiberias.*
- I.2.** A. Said R. Abbahu said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “For kneading, prayer, and washing hands, the requisite distance one may be prepared to go [e.g., to immerse kneading utensils, to go to find a synagogue for prayer, to find water for washing hands] is four miles.”
- B. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “Aibu said this, and he stated four laws about it, and one of them has to do with tanning. For we have learned in the Mishnah: In the case of the following, their skin is equivalent to their flesh: the skin of a human being. and the skin of a domesticated pig...and all of them which one tanned, or on which one trampled so that they are fit for use, are clean,*

and do not impart food uncleanness, except for the skin of man [M. Hul. 9:2A, B, F-G]. *And how much is on which one trampled so that they are fit for use? Said R. Aibu said R Yannai, 'Enough time for walking four miles.'*

- C. Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, "They have repeated that rule only in respect to making a further trip forward [toward the place in the direction of which he was going anyhow, but as to backtracking, he doesn't have to backtrack for even a mile.]"
- D. *Said R. Aha, "And from this we deduce: only a mile he need not backtrack, but less than that he must backtrack [e.g., for water for washing hands or for finding a synagogue for prayer]."*

3:3

- A. **How [on the festival] do they set apart the dough-offering [if the dough is in a state of] uncleanness?**
- B. **R. Eliezer says, "A woman should not designate [the dough-offering] before it is baked."**
- C. **R. Judah b. Betera says, "She should put it into cold water."**
- D. **Said R. Joshua, [46B] "This is not the sort of leaven concerning which people are warned under the prohibitions, 'Let it not be seen' (Exo. 13: 7), and 'Let it not be found' (Exo. 12:19)."**
- E. **"But she separates it and leaves it until evening."**
- F. **"And if it ferments, it ferments."**

- I.1** A. *May we say that the issue that is subject to dispute is whether or not good will possesses monetary value, with R. Eliezer in the position of the view that good will possesses monetary value, and R. Joshua, good will does not possess monetary value? [Freedman: if good will benefit ranks as money, the dough offering belongs to the Israelite and is subject to the prohibition against leaven; if it belongs to a third party, it doesn't. Eliezer holds that the dough must be baked. But if the good will doesn't rank as money, the dough offering doesn't belong to the Israelite, and it is separated from the dough without regard to whether or not it leavens.]*
- B. *Not at all. Both parties concur that good will does not possess monetary value. Here what is at issue is the power of the claim of "since," namely: R. Eliezer maintains, we do invoke the argument, since, if he wants, he can revoke the designation of dough offering, it is his property, and R. Joshua maintains that we do not invoke that argument.*

Free-Standing Composite Inserted for Formal Reasons

- I.2.** A. *It has been stated:*
- B. One who baked [bread] on a festival day for use on a [following] weekday —
- C. R. Hisda says, "He receives stripes."
- D. Rabbah says, "He does not receive stripes."

E. R. Hisda says, "He [is deemed a transgressor and] receives stripes. *[This is because] we do not invoke the argument: since, if visitors dropped by, [the bread] would be permitted for him [to serve to them on the festival day itself, therefore], even though [he does not have visitors, the bread] is permitted for use by him.*"

F. Rabbah said, "He does not receive stripes. *[For] we do invoke the argument, Since, if [visitors dropped by, he may use the bread for them, therefore, even though no visitors came, he may use the bread on a festival day and is not culpable for baking it].*"

G. Said Rabbah to R. Hisda, "From your perspective, that we do not invoke the argument: since, if visitors dropped by, [the bread] would be permitted for him [to serve to them on the festival day itself, therefore], even though [he does not have visitors, the bread] is permitted for use by him, how are people going to bake on a festival for use on the Sabbath? *[The only way is because we do invoke the argument, since, if he is visited by guests, he can use the bread on that day, he may bake it on that day and use it on the next.]*"

H. He said to him, "It is on the strength of the fictive fusion meal that permits cooking from one day for the next."

I. "Well, then, on the strength of the fictive fusion meal that permits cooking from one day for the next, do we release a prohibition that derives from the Torah?!"

J. He said to him, "On the strength of the law of the Torah, the needs of the Sabbath may be carried out on a festival day; it was merely rabbis who forbade it, lest people say, 'It is permitted to bake on a festival day even for use on weekdays,' and, since rabbis also required a fictive fusion meal permitting the cooking of food from the one day for the other, there is a distinguishing feature to prevent people from reaching that conclusion."

K. **An objection was raised: A beast on the point of death one should not slaughter [on the festival day, so as to avoid its dying and become carrion], unless there is sufficient time [on the festival day] so that he is able to eat of it an olive's bulk of flesh that has been roasted. [The animal thus will have been slaughtered for use on the festival day, which is permitted.] [M. Bes. 3:3A-B].** *So the language is, so that he is able.... And that is the case even though he doesn't want to eat it. Now, in my [Rabbah's] view, maintaining that we do invoke the argument, "since," there is no problem; since he wants to eat, he is able to eat, and that is why he may slaughter the beast. But according to your view, in holding we do not invoke the argument of "since," why may he slaughter?*

L. He said to him, "Because of the loss of capital."

M. *Well, then, on account of the loss of capital are we going to release a prohibition of the Torah?!*

N. He said to him, “Well, yes, because, on account of the loss of capital the man has decided to eat an olive’s bulk of the meat, and he can’t get an olive’s bulk of the meat without slaughtering the animal.”

O. An objection was raised: The show bread [47A] is eaten neither less than nine nor more than eleven days [after being baked]. How so? [If] it is baked on the eve of the Sabbath and eaten on the Sabbath [in the following week], [that would be an example of eating them] nine days [after they are baked]. [If] the festival coincided with the eve of the Sabbath, it is eaten ten [days after being baked]. [In the case of] two festival days of the New Year [that is, if the New Year began on Thursday and the Day of Atonement fell on the following Sabbath], it is eaten eleven [days after being baked]. And [baking it] does not override either the Sabbath or the festival [M. Men. 11:9E-J]. Now, if you maintain that the requirements of the Sabbath may be carried out on the festival, why does baking the shoe bread not override the restrictions of the festival?

P. He said to him, “What is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of importance for something fairly near at hand may be permitted; what is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of consequential only much later on is not permitted.” [Freedman: if it were of immediate importance, the deed prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest would have been permitted; but when the Day of Atonement falls on a Friday, even if the vegetables are trimmed, they cannot be cooked on the Sabbath, so the sounding of the ram’s horn would matter only for later Days of Atonement, and in such a case the prohibition by reason of Sabbath rest is not superseded.]

Q. And in line with the statement, Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says in the name of R. Simeon, son of the Prefect, “It overrides the festival, but it does not override the fast day” [M. Men. 11:2K], what is to be said?

R. This is what is under dispute: the one master maintains, What is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of importance for something fairly near at hand may be permitted; what is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of consequential only much later on is not permitted, and the other holds, what is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of consequential only much later on is also permitted.

S. Objected R. Mari, “The two loaves are eaten, neither earlier than two [days] nor later than three [days after being baked]. How so? [If] they are baked on the eve of the festival and eaten on the festival, [that would be an example of eating them] two days [after being baked]. [If] the festival fell after the Sabbath, they are eaten three days [after being baked] — And [baking it] does not override either the Sabbath or the festival [M. Men. 11:9A-D]. Now, if you maintain that the requirements of the Sabbath may be carried out on the festival, since the requirements of the Sabbath may be prepared on

the festival, is there any problem about requirements of the festival being carried out on the festival itself?

T. *That case is exceptional, since Scripture said, “except that which every one must eat, that only may be done for you” (Lev. 23:17) — meaning, “for you,” but not for the Most High.*

U. *And in line with the statement, **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says in the name of R. Simeon, son of the Prefect, “It overrides the festival, but it does not override the fast day” [M. Men. 11:2K], what is to be said?***

V. *He concurs with Abba Saul, who has said, “‘for you’ — not for gentiles.”*

W. *R. Hisda sent word to Rabbah via R. Aha bar R. Huna: “Do we really invoke the argument, ‘since...’? But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **There is one who ploughs a single furrow and is liable on eight counts of violating a negative commandment: [specifically, it is] he who (1) ploughs with an ox and an ass [Deu. 22:10], which are [2, 3] both Holy Things, in the case of (4) [ploughing] Mixed Seeds in a vineyard [Deu. 22:9], [47B] (5) in the Seventh Year [Lev. 25:41, (6) on a festival [Lev. 23: 7) and who was both a (7) priest [Lev. 21: 1] and (8) a Nazirite [Num. 6:6] [ploughing] in a graveyard [M. Mak. 3:9A-B]. But if we really invoke the argument, ‘since...,’ shouldn’t he also be liable for ploughing on the festival, since that action is suitable for covering the blood of a bird [if he slaughters one]?”***

X. *Said to him R. Pappa bar Samuel, “The reference is to smooth, round stones” [which form the aftermath of the ploughing, and these aren’t fit for covering blood (Freedman)].*

Y. *But they can be crushed and so used for covering blood.*

Z. *So is crushing stones permitted on the festival day?*

AA. *They would be suitable for crushing with the back of the hand [in an unusual way, and that is not forbidden by the Torah].*

BB. *We are dealing with rocky ground.*

CC. *So can anybody sow on it?*

DD. *It is an area that is rocky on top but sandy underneath.*

EE. *Well, then, derive the same fact, that he is not liable, simply because it is loose earth [and therefore no punishment is inflicted]?*

FF. *Rather, said Mar bar R. Ashi, “It speaks of clay.”*

GG. *So can anyone sow on clay?*

HH. *It refers to swampy earth.*

II. *Objected Abbaye, “ One who, on a festival day, boils the sciatic sinew in milk and eats it is flogged on five counts: for eating the sinew, cooking on a festival day [what is not ordinarily eaten]; boiling the sinew in milk, eating meat with milk, and kindling a fire. But if, it were as you maintain, we invoke the argument, “since,” then one should not be*

liable on the count of kindling a fire, since it is suitable for his legitimate requirements.”

JJ. *He said to him, “Then delete kindling a fire, but add to the list instead eating the sinew of carrion.”*

KK. *“But did not R. Hiyya repeat as a Tannaite statement, “One is flogged on two counts for eating it and on three for coking it,” but if it were as you say, then there should be three counts for eating it on account of which he is liable to a flogging!”*

LL. *“So instead, delete kindling a fire and substitute using firewood from a storehouse [not designated for use that day].”*

MM. *“Sure, but is using firewood from a storehouse [not designated for use that day] a violation of the law of the Torah?”*

NN. He said to him, “Well, yes: ‘And it shall come to pass on the sixth day that they shall prepare that which they bring in’ (Exo. 16: 5), and the admonition derives from the same place, namely, ‘you shall not do any manner of work’ (Exo. 20:10).”

OO. *He said to him, “But you are the one who said, ‘I asked R. Hisda,’ and other say, ‘I asked R. Huna,’ the following question: ‘what if he brought a lamb from the field and slaughtered it as a continual burnt offering on a festival?’ [may it be offered?],’ and you said to us, ‘He said to me, “It is written, ‘and a lamb” (Eze. 45:15) — but not a firstling; ‘one’ but not the tithe; ‘of the flock’ excluding a sheep to old to be a lamb but too young to be a ram; [48A] ‘out of the two hundred’ — out of the residue of the two hundred which was left in the vault, on the basis of which we learn that the produce of a tree in the first three years of its growth, which may not be used, is nullified in a mixture of more than two hundred times its volume of permitted produce; ‘From the liquor of Israel’ (Eze. 45:15), with the meaning that, from that which is permitted to Israel[’s priesthood]. On the strength of that, they have said, ‘They may not present drink offerings from produce that is liable to tithes but not yet tithed.’ Might one suppose one may not present libations from what has not been designated for that purpose? But say: just as what is liable to tithing but not yet tithed is distinctive in that an intrinsic prohibition governs its use [and it cannot be used for libations because it itself is forbidden], so whatever is subject to a prohibition on its own account may not be used for a libation, which therefore excludes from such a prohibition what is not designated for use, since it is not its intrinsic character that prevents its being used but a prohibition on an extrinsic count that prevents its being used.”’* Now, *if you maintain that the prohibition of what has not been designated in advance for use derives from the Torah, then what difference does it make to me whether it is a prohibition deriving from the character of the thing itself or a prohibition deriving from an extrinsic consideration? And furthermore, you are the one who has said, ‘To the Sabbath applies the principle that distinctions are made, for purposes of assessing the number of counts on which one may be liable for a single action, among*

diverse types of labor, but to festivals does not apply the principle that distinctions are made, for purposes of assessing the number of counts on which one may be liable for a single action, among diverse types of labor.” [Freedman: yet here, where we treat of a festival, you rule he is separately culpable for using what has not been designated for use on that day and also for boiling the sinew.]

PP. *Rather: delete lighting and substitute the wood of an asherah-tree, and the admonition concerning it derives from the following: “And there shall cleave nothing of the accursed thing to your hand” (Deu. 13:18).*

QQ. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to Abbaye, Well, now, why not inflict a flogging also on the count of ‘And you shall not bring an abomination into your house’ (Deu. 7:26)?”*

RR. *Rather, delete lighting and substitute wood that has been consecrated, the admonition of which derives from the following: “and you shall burn their Asherim with fire...you shall not do so to the Lord your God” (Deu. 12: 3-4).*

SS. *Said R. Ammi bar Hama, “Lo, the dispute between R. Hisda and Rabbah carries forward the argument of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, for R. Eliezer maintains that we do invoke the argument, ‘since...,’ and R. Joshua holds that we don’t invoke the argument, ‘since....’”*

TT. *Said R. Pappa, “But maybe R. Eliezer takes the view that he does there, that we invoke the argument, ‘since...,’ because, when the unleavened bread goes into the oven, each piece is fit for the householder himself to eat [if he takes dough offering from it] [Freedman: though he will eventually separate one piece of unleavened bread for all, and that is not fit for eating, if he wants, he can take a piece from each piece of unleavened bread, so he will have baked every one for eating, so we say, since it would be permitted in the latter case, it is also permitted in the former]. But here, they are fit for guests, but not for the householder, so I might say, here too he would concur that we do not invoke the argument, ‘since....’”*

UU. *Said R. Shisha b. R. Idi, “And maybe that’s not so, for R. Joshua takes the position that he does there, that we don’t invoke the argument, ‘since...,’ only because in that case, there is one piece of unleavened bread that is fit neither for the householder nor for the guests, but here, in which case it is fit at least for guests, maybe we do indeed invoke the argument, ‘since’?”*

VV. *Rabbis stated this matter of R. Ammi bar Hama before R. Jeremiah and R. Zira. R. Jeremiah accepted it; R. Zira didn’t accept it. Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zira, “A matter that has posed problems for us for lo, these many years, namely, concerning what do R. Eliezer and R. Joshua differ, now has been solved in the name of an eminent authority, so shouldn’t we accept it?”*

WW. *He said to him, “So how can I accept it, for it has been taught as a Tannaite statement: said to him R. Joshua, ‘In accord with your*

position, lo, he violates the law, “You shall not do any manner of work” (Exo. 20:10),’ *and he shut up and had no answer for him. But if this were a correct account of matters, he should have said to him, ‘The operative consideration behind my ruling is that we do invoke the argument, ‘since....’*”

XX. *He said to him, “Well, in accord with your reasoning, lo, we have learned as a Tannaite ruling in an formulation external to the Mishnah: said to him R. Eliezer, ‘In accord with your position, lo, he violates the rules against leaven’s being seen or being found,’ and he shut up and had no answer for him, so here too couldn’t he answer him? Surely he does answer him on the strength of the passage in the Mishnah at hand, which we have learned as follows: **This is not the sort of leaven concerning which people are warned under the prohibitions, ‘Let it not be seen’ (Exo. 13: 7), and ‘Let it not be found’ (Exo. 12:19).** But she separates it and leaves it until evening. And if it ferments, it ferments. But, as a matter of fact, he kept his silence in the formulation of the Tannaite statement external to the Mishnah, but he did answer him in our Mishnah-paragraph. And here too, we may say, he was silent before him in a composite of Tannaite teachings, but he did answer him in another such composite.”*

I.3. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. Rabbi says, “The decided law is in accord with R. Eliezer.”

C. R. Isaac said, “The decided law is in accord with Ben Betera.”

I.4. A. **What is the requisite volume of dough [that one may knead on Passover without its fermenting]?**

B. R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “In the case of wheat flour, two qabs; in the case of barley flour, three qabs.”

C. R. Nathan says in the name of R. Eliezer, “Matters are reversed” [T. **Pisha 3:8Eff**].

D. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “In the case of wheat flour, three qabs; in the case of barley flour, four qabs”?*

E. *No problem, the one speaks of poor quality, the other, good quality grain.*

F. *Said R. Pappa, “That implies that poor wheat is more inferior to good than poor barley to good, for in the one case the differential is a third, in the other, a fourth.”*

I.5. A. *Said Rab, “A qab of Meloga-wheat is the standard for Passover [and one may not knead more dough than that at one time], and so for dough-offering.”*

B. *But haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **[48B] Five-fourths [qab] of flour is subject to dough offering [once made into dough]. [If] it [i.e., the flour] and its leaven, fine bran, and coarse bran [together comprise] five-fourths [qab, the whole] is subject [to dough offering once made into dough] [M. Hal. 2:6A-B]?***

C. *This is the sense of what he has said, “A qab of Meloga-wheat too is equivalent to that volume.”*

I.6. A. *Said R. Joseph, “Our women are accustomed to bake a measure of three-fourths of a qab at a time on Passover.”*

B. *Said to him Abbayye, “What are you thinking, that that is a stringency? It’s a stringency, all right, but one that produces a lenient ruling, because doing so in such a small volume exempts the dough from dough offering.”*

C. *He said to him, “They act in accord with what R. Eliezer says, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **R. Eliezer says, ‘Also: One who scrapes [loaves of one-qab portions from the sides of an oven] and puts [the loaves] in a basket — the basket combines them [into a single portion large enough so as to be subject] to dough offering’ [M. Hal. 2:4B].** And said R. Judah said Samuel, ‘The law accords with R. Eliezer.’”*

D. *He said to him, “Lo, it has been stated in that connection: said R. Joshua b. Levi, ‘They have made that rule only in the case of loaves of bread in Babylonia, which cleave to one another, but not of narrow rolls.’”*

E. *Lo, it has been stated in that regard: even of narrow rolls.*

I.7. A. *R. Jeremiah raised this question: “As to a board that has no edges, what is the law [on its combining loaves that are placed on it to subject the entire volume to the requirement of dough offering, if the individual loaves are of insufficient size to be subject on their own]? Do we require that the loaves be within a common vessel, and that condition is not met, or within the contained air space of a vessel, and that condition is met?”*

B. *That question stands.*

I.8. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *R. Eliezer says, “The basket combines the loaves [to form the requisite volume for liability to dough offering].”*

C. *R. Joshua says, “Baking them together in the oven combines them.”*

D. *Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Babylonian loaves, which cleave together, combine to form the requisite volume].”*

3:4

A. **Rabban Gamaliel says, “Three women knead dough together and [then] bake in the oven one after the other in sequence.”**

B. **And sages say, “Three women work with the dough. One kneads, while the next rolls out, and the third bakes.”**

C. **R. Aqiba says, “All women, all wood, and all ovens are not to be taken as equivalent.**

D. **“This is the general rule: [If] the dough swells, let her slap it with cold water.”**

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

B. *A woman kneads the dough and forms it in shape, while her companion kneads in her stead; she bakes the formed dough and her companion shapes the dough in her stead; the third woman kneads; the first having beaked kneads again, her*

companion bakes in her place, the third shapes her dough, and so the wheel turns. So long as all are engaged in working the dough, it won't end up fermenting.

II.1 A. R. Aqiba says, "All women, all wood, and all ovens are not to be taken as equivalent. This is the general rule: [If] the dough swells, let her slap it with cold water:"

B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. Said R. Aqiba, "I reasoned before Rabban Gamaliel: 'Let our master teach us, does this rule pertain to energetic women or slothful ones, damp or dry wood, a hot or a cool oven?' He said to me, 'You have for guidance only that which sages have repeated, **This is the general rule: [If] the dough swells, let her slap it with cold water.**'"

3:5

A. **"Dough beginning to ferment is to be burned, but the one who eats it is exempt.**

B. **"Dough which is wholly fermented must be burned, and the one who eats it is liable to extirpation.**

C. **"What is the definition of dough beginning to ferment?**

D. **"That [on which streaks begin to appear] like locust's horns.**

E. **"And that which is wholly fermented?**

F. **"Dough on which the cracks are all entangled together," the words of R. Judah.**

G. **And sages say, "As to both this one and that one, the one who eats it is liable to extirpation."**

H. **And what is the definition of that which is beginning to ferment?**

I. **Dough whose surface turns white like a man whose hair stands on end.**

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

B. "What is the definition of dough that is beginning to ferment?

C. "It is any the surface of which is blanched like a man with his hair standing on end.

D. "As to dough that is wholly fermented? That [on which streaks begin to appear] like locust's horns," the words of R. Meir.

E. And sages say, "What is the definition of dough that is beginning to ferment?

F. "That [on which streaks begin to appear] like locust's horns.

G. "As to dough that is wholly fermented? That on which the cracks have intermingled with each other."

H. And in both cases, one who eats it is subject to extirpation.

I. *But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **Dough beginning to ferment is to be burned, but the one who eats it is exempt. Dough which is wholly fermented must be burned, and the one who eats it is liable to extirpation...the words of R. Judah**"!*

J. *Say: In the opinion of R. Meir, in both cases, one who eats it is subject to extirpation.*

- K. *Said Raba, "What is the operative consideration in the mind of R. Meir? In no case you haven't got a single crack on the surface without many more cracks below the surface."*

3:6

- A. [49A] The fourteenth [of Nisan] which coincides with the Sabbath —
- B. they remove all [the leaven]
- C. "before the Sabbath," the words of R. Meir.
- D. And sages say, "At its proper time."
- E. R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq says, "[Leaven which is] heave offering is to be removed before the Sabbath, and that which is unconsecrated should be removed at its proper time."

I.1 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Eleazar bar Sadoq says, "Once father spent the Sabbath in Yavneh, when the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with the Sabbath, and Zonen, the appointee of Rabban Gamaliel, came and said, 'The time for removing leaven has arrived,' and I followed father, and we removed the leaven" [T. **Pisha 3:11C**].

3:7-8

3:7

- A. He who goes to slaughter his Passover lamb, to circumcise his son, or to eat the betrothal meal at his father-in-law's house,
- B. and remembers that he has left some leaven in his house,
- C. if he can go back and remove it and go on to do his religious duty, let him go back and remove it.
- D. But if not, let him nullify it in his heart.
- E. [If he was going] to help against an invasion or to save someone from drowning in a river, from thugs, from a fire, or from a suddenly collapsed house, let him nullify it in his heart.
- F. [If he was going] to enjoy the festival rest on a pleasure jaunt, let him go back immediately [and remove the leaven].

3:8

- A. And so too: He who went forth from Jerusalem and remembered that he had in hand meat in the status of Holy Things,
- B. if he had already passed Mount Scopus, he burns it right where he is.
- C. But if not, let him go back and burn it before the Temple pile with wood which has been set aside for the altar hearth.
- D. And for how much [leaven or meat of Holy Things] do they return?
- E. R. Meir says, "This and that are subject to the measure of an egg's bulk."
- F. R. Judah says, "This and that are subject to the measure of an olive's bulk."
- G. And sages say, "Flesh in the status of Holy Things [A] is subject to the measure of an olive's bulk."
- H. "And leaven [M. **3:7B**] is subject to the measure of an egg's bulk."

I.1 A. [He who goes to slaughter his Passover lamb, to circumcise his son, or to eat the betrothal meal at his father-in-law's house, and remembers that he has left some leaven in his house, if he can go back and remove it and go on to do his religious duty, let him go back and remove it. But if not, let him nullify it in his heart:] *By way of contradiction:* he who is going to eat the betrothal banquet in his father-in-law's house or to establish a Sabbath residence for an optional purpose must go home immediately.

B. *Said R. Yohanan, "There is no problem, the one represents the position of R. Judah, the other, R. Yosé, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: 'The betrothal banquet in his father-in-law's house is optional,' the words of R. Judah; R. Yosé says, 'It is a religious duty.'"*

C. *And now that R. Hisda has said, "The dispute concerns the second banquet, but as to the first, all concur that it is a religious duty," you may even say that both accord with R. Judah but there is no problem, the one refers to the first, the other, the second.*

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

B. *Said R. Judah, "I have heard only the formulation that speaks of the betrothal banquet, but not concerning betrothal gifts."*

C. *Said to him R. Yosé, "I have heard the formulation concerning the betrothal meal and gifts too."*

A Meal as a Religious Duty Marriage to a Disciple of a Sage

The Unlettered Person and the Disciple of the Sage

I.3. A. *R. Simeon says, "Any meal that is not in fulfillment of a religious duty — a disciple of a sage has no right to derive benefit from it."*

B. *Like what, for instance?*

C. *Said R. Yohanan, "For instance, the betrothal feast for the daughter of a priest marrying an Israelite, or the daughter of a disciple of sage marrying an unlettered man."*

D. *For said R. Yohanan, "When priest's daughter marries an Israelite, the match will never work."*

E. *In what way?*

F. *Said R. Hisda, "Either she will be widowed, or she will be divorced, or she won't have children."*

G. *In a Tannaite formulation it is stated: either he will bury her or she will bury him or she will bring him down to poverty.*

H. *But is that so? Lo, said R. Yohanan, He who wants to get rich will cleave to the seed of Aaron, for all the more will the Torah and the priesthood enrich them"!*

I. *No, problem, in the one case it's to a disciple of a sage [who is a priest], in the other, to an unlettered man [who is a priest].*

- I.4.** A. *R. Joshua married a priest-woman. He got sick. He said, "It doesn't please Aaron that I should cleave to his seed and that he should have a son in law like me."*
- B. *R. Idi bar Abin married a priest-woman. He had two sons who were ordained, R. Sheshet b. R. Idi and R. Joshua b. R. Idi.*
- C. *Said R. Pappa, "If I hadn't married a priest's daughter, I wouldn't have gotten rich."*
- D. *Said R. Kahana, "If I hadn't married a priest's daughter, I would not have gone into exile [from Babylonia to the Land of Israel]."*
- E. *They said to him, "Lo, you went into exile to a place of the Torah."*
- F. *"I wasn't exiled in the way people are exiled in general [but I had to run away]."*

I.5. A. *Said R. Isaac, "Whoever derives benefit from an optional banquet in the end will go into exile: 'And you that eat lambs out of the flock and calves out of the midst of the stall' 'therefore now shall they go captive at the head of those who go captive' (Amo. 6: 4, 7)."*

I.6. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *Any disciple of a sage who indulges himself in feasting everywhere he goes in the end will destroy his home and widow his wife and orphan his 'pigeons' and his learning will be forgotten by him and much contention will overtake him and his opinion will not be listened to and profanes the Name of Heaven, the name of his master, and the name of his father, and brings a bad name on his children and grandchildren for all generations to come.*
- C. *So how does he accomplish all this?*
- D. *Said Abbaye, "They call him, oven-heater."*
- E. *Raba said, "They call him, tavern-dancer."*
- F. *R. Pappa said, "A plate-licker."*
- G. *R. Shemayya said, "A garment-folder, a sleep-around."*

I.7. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *A person should always sell everything he has so as to marry the daughter of a disciple of a sage, for if he should die or go into exile, he will be secure that his children will be disciples of sages. But he should not marry the daughter of an unlettered man, for if he should die or go into exile, his children will be unlettered."*

I.8. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *A person should always sell everything he has so as to marry the daughter of a disciple of a sage and marry off his daughter to a disciple of a sage. It is comparable to grafting grapes of a vine with grapes of a vine that is right and proper. But let him never marry the daughter of an unlettered man. It is comparable to grafting grapes of a vine with berries of a bush, which is disgusting [49B] disreputable."*

I.9. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A person should always sell everything he has so as to marry the daughter of a disciple of a sage. If he cannot get the daughter of a disciple of a sage, he should marry the daughter of one of the principal authorities of the generation. If he cannot get the daughter of one of the principal authorities of the generation, he should marry the daughter of one of the heads of a synagogue. If he cannot get the daughter of one of the heads of a synagogue, he should marry the daughter of one of the charity collectors. If he cannot get the daughter of one of the charity collectors, he should marry the daughter of one of the primary school teachers. But he should not marry the daughter of an unlettered person, because they are an abomination, and their wives are dead creeping things, and concerning their daughters Scripture says, “Cursed be he who lies with any manner of beast” (Deu. 27:21).

I.10. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Rabbi says, “An unlettered person is forbidden to eat beef: ‘This is the Torah of the beast and of the fowl’ (Lev. 11:46) — whoever is engaged in the Torah is permitted to eat beef and chicken, and whoever is not engaged in Torah study is forbidden to eat beef and chicken.”

I.11. A. Said R. Eleazar, “As to an unlettered man, it is permitted to stab him on the Day of Atonement that coincides with the Sabbath.”

- B. His disciples said to him, “My lord, say: to slaughter him properly?”
C. He said to him, “But that requires the recitation of a blessing, but this doesn’t require the recitation of a blessing.”
D. Said R. Eleazar, “As to an unlettered person, it is forbidden to accompany him on a trip: ‘For the Torah is your life and the length of your days’ (Deu. 30:20) — since he has no concern for his own life, how much the less will he care about the lives of those with him.”
E. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Yohanan, “As to an unlettered person, it is permitted to rip him open like a fish.”
F. Said R. Samuel bar Isaac, “And that is down the back.”

I.12. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Aqiba, “When I was an unlettered man, I said, ‘Would that I could lay my hands on a disciple of a sage, and I should bite him like an ass.’”
C. His disciples said to him, “My lord, say: like a dog?”
D. He said to them, “This one bites and breaks the bone, but that one bites without breaking the bone.”

I.13. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Meir would say, “Whoever marries his daughter off to an unlettered man is as though he tied her up and laid her out before a lion. Just as a lion tramples the prey and eats it shamelessly, so the unlettered man beats up his wife and rapes her shamelessly.”

I.14. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Eliezer says, “If they didn’t need us for trade, they would kill us.”

I.15. A. *R. Hiyya made the following Tannaite statement:* “Whoever engages in Torah study before an unlettered person is as though he had sexual relations with his fiancée in his presence: ‘Moses commanded us a Torah, an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob’ (Deu. 33: 4) — don’t read the letters translated as ‘inheritance’ in that manner, but read them as though they were written, ‘betrothed woman.’”

I.16. A. Greater is the hatred with which unlettered persons hate the disciple of a sage than the hatred with which idolators hate Israel — and their wives are even worse!

B. If someone repeated Tannaite traditions but then abandoned them, he hates [the disciple of a sage] most of all.

I.17. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. Six things were stated with reference to unlettered persons: they don’t give testimony in their behalf or accept testimony from them or tell them a secret or appoint them as guardians of orphans or appoint them as charity collectors or join them on a trip.

C. And there are those who say, “They also do not go in search of them in connection with something found that they have lost.”

D. *And the initial Tannaite authority?*

E. *“On occasion proper children may come forth from them and benefit from the find, as it is said, ‘he will prepare it and the just shall put it on’ (Job. 27:17).”*

II.1 A. **And so too: He who went forth from Jerusalem and remembered that he had in hand meat in the status of Holy Things, if he had already passed Mount Scopus, he burns it right where he is. But if not, let him go back and burn it before the Temple pile with wood which has been set aside for the altar hearth. And for how much [leaven or meat of Holy Things] do they return? R. Meir says, “This and that are subject to the measure of an egg’s bulk.” R. Judah says, “This and that are subject to the measure of an olive’s bulk.” And sages say, “Flesh in the status of Holy Things [A] is subject to the measure of an olive’s bulk. And leaven [M. 3:7B] is subject to the measure of an egg’s bulk:”**

B. *Does that bear the implication that R. Meir maintains that what is of the volume of an egg is taken into account, while R. Judah maintains that what is of the volume of an olive is taken into account? Then by contrast, note the following: What is the least [that one must eat in order to] invite others [to recite a blessing on his account]? At least an olive’s bulk. R. Judah says, “At least an egg’s bulk” [M. Ber. 7:2B-D].*

C. Said R. Yohanan, “The attributions are to be reversed.”

D. *Abbayye said, “It is by no means necessary to reverse them. In that instance, they differ as to the interpretation of verses of Scripture, in this case, they differ as to a matter of reasoning.*

E. *“In that instance, they differ as to the interpretation of verses of Scripture: R. Meir takes the view that the verse, ‘and you shall eat’ (Deu. 8:10) refers to eating; ‘and be satisfied’ refers to drinking,’ so eating involves an olive’s bulk in volume at*

a minimum. *R. Judah maintains that the verse, 'and you shall eat and be satisfied' (Deu. 8:10) refers to eating that satisfies, and how much food is that? The volume of an egg's bulk.*

- F. *"In this case, they differ as to a matter of reasoning: for R. Meir maintains that the same volume of leaven that would be contract uncleanness as food is the volume that has to be present for someone to return and remove it [And for how much leaven or meat of Holy Things do they return]: just as it must be at least of the bulk of an egg to contract uncleanness, so to return to remove it, it must be of the bulk of an egg. And R. Judah maintains that the volume that has to be removed [50A] corresponds to the volume that is subject to prohibition. Just as the volume that is forbidden is an olive's bulk, so the volume that has to be present for someone to have to return to remove it is an olive's bulk."*

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

- B. R. Nathan says, "The measure for both this and that is two egg's bulks."
C. But sages did not concur.

II.3. A. "And it shall come to pass in that day that there shall not be light but heavy clouds and thick" (Zec. 14: 6):

- B. *What is the meaning of "heavy...thick..."?*
C. Said R. Eleazar, "This refers to the light that is precious in this world but light in the world to come."
D. R. Yohanan said, "This refers to tractates Negaim and Ohalot, which are weighty [with problems] in this world but will be light [and easy] in the world to come."
E. And R. Joshua b. Levi said, "This refers to people who are valued in this world but lightweight in the world to come."

II.4. A. *That is in line with what happened to Joseph b. R. Joshua. He fell sick and went into a coma. Afterward his father said to him, "So what did you see?"*

- B. "I saw an upside down world, what is on high is down below, and what is below is on high."
C. He said to him, "You saw a world of clarity."
D. *"And as to us, how are we perceived?"*
E. *He said to him, "As we are valued here, so we are valued there. I heard them saying, 'Happy is he who comes here with his learning fully in hand.' And I heard them saying, 'As to those put to death by the government, no creature can stand within their precincts.'"*
F. *Who might these be? Should I say, R. Aqiba and his colleagues? But was this the only merit that they had? Even without this! So it must refer to those who were put to death at Lud.*

II.5. A. "in that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, 'Holy Unto the Lord'" (Zec. 14:20):

- B. *What is the meaning of the bells of the horses?*
C. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, "In the future the Holy One, blessed be he, will add to Jerusalem land as far as a horse can run and cast its shadow under itself" [Freedman/Rashi: as far as a horse can run from morning until midday, when its

shadow is directly beneath it] [the play being on the letters in the word bell, which are shared with the word shadow].

- D. R. Eleazar said, “All the bells that are hung on a horse between its eyes will be ‘holy unto the Lord’ [Freedman: votive offerings of the sanctuary].”
- E. And R. Yohanan said, “All the spoil that the Israelites will take from morning until the time that a horse can run and cast its shadow under itself shall be holy unto the Lord.”
- F. *Now there is no problem in understanding the position of him who has said, “All the spoil that the Israelites will take from morning until the time that a horse can run and cast its shadow under itself shall be holy unto the Lord,” for that is in line with the verse, “And the pots in the Lord’s house shall be like the basins before the altar” (Zec. 14:20). But from the perspective of those who explain the matter otherwise, what is the point of “And the pots in the Lord’s house shall be like the basins before the altar” (Zec. 14:20)?*
- G. *That verse goes on to another point, namely: Israel will become wealthy enough to make votive offerings and present them at the altar.*
- H. *Now there is no problem in understanding the position of him who has said, “All the spoil that the Israelites will take from morning until the time that a horse can run and cast its shadow under itself shall be holy unto the Lord,” for that is in line with the verse, “and in that day there shall be no more traders in the house of the Lord of hosts” (Zec. 14:20). But from the perspective of those who explain the matter otherwise, what is the point of “and in that day there shall be no more traders in the house of the Lord of hosts” (Zec. 14:20)?*
- I. Said R. Jeremiah, “There won’t be any more poor there.”
- J. *So how do we know that the word translated “trader,” which is Kenaani [Canaanite] refers to merchants?*
- K. *““And Judah saw there the daughter of a certain Canaanite” (Gen. 38: 2), and what can Canaanite mean here? Should I say that it is actually a Canaanite? But then is it possible that Abraham should come and admonish Isaac, Isaac should come and admonish Jacob, and yet Judah should go and marry such a one? Rather, said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “The daughter of a merchant, in line with the verse: ‘As for the Canaanite, the balances of deceit are in his hand, he loves to oppress’ (Hos. 12: 8).*
- L. *If you prefer: ‘Whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honorable of the earth’ (Isa. 23: 8).”*

II.6. A. “And the Lord will be king over all the earth, in that day the Lord shall be one and his name one” (Zec. 14: 9):

B. *Does that mean that, at this time, he’s not one?!*

C. Said R. Aha bar Hanina, “Not like this world is the world to come. In this world, **for good tidings, he says, ‘Blessed... who is good and does good.’ And for bad tidings he says, ‘Blessed... the true judge’ [M. Ber. 9:2E-F].** But in the world to come, it will be only, ‘... who is good and does good.’”

II.7. A. “and his name one” (Zec. 14: 9):

- B. *What is the meaning of and his name one? Does that mean that, at this time, his name is not one?!*
- C. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “Not like this world is the world to come. In this world, while his name is written with a YH[WH], it is read with EL [elohim]. But in the world to come, it shall be one: it will be written with YH and read with YH.”

II.8. A. *Raba considered giving a lecture on that in the public session. Said to him a certain said, “...the word is so written that it can be read, ‘to conceal.’”*

II.9. A. R. Abina contrasted verses: “‘This is my name,’ as against, ‘this is my memorial’ (Exo. 3:15). Said the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘It is not in the way that I am written that I am to be read. My name is written with a YH but is read with AD [YHWH as against Adonai].’”