

# III.

## BAVLI TRACTATE HAGIGAH CHAPTER THREE

### FOLIOS 20B-27A

3:1-3

3:1

- A. A more stringent rule applies to Holy Things than applies to heave offering,
- B. for: They immerse utensils inside of other utensils for purification for use with [food in the status of] heave offering,
- C. but not for purification for use with [food in the status of] Holy Things.
- D. [They make a distinction among] outer parts, inside, and holding place in the case of utensils meant for use for heave offering,
- E. but not in the case of utensils meant for use for Holy Things.
- F. He who carries something affected by midras uncleanness [the uncleanness imparted by a person unclean with the fluxes discussed at Lev. 12-15 who sits or lies on objects made for the purpose of sitting or lying] [may also] carry heave offering,
- G. but [he may] not [also carry food in the status of] Holy Things.
- H. The clothing of those who are so clean as to be able to eat heave offering
- I. is deemed unclean in the status of midras uncleanness for the purposes of Holy Things.
- J. The rule for Holy Things is not like the rule for heave offering.
- K. For in the case of [immersion for use of] Holy Things one unties a knot and dries it off, immerses and afterwards ties it up again.
- L. And in the case of heave offering one ties it and then one immerses.

3:2

- A. Utensils which are completely processed in a state of insusceptibility to uncleanness [and so when completed are clean] require immersion for use in connection with Holy Things,
- B. but not for use in connection with heave offering.

- C. A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things,
- D. but not for the purposes of heave offering.
- E. [That which is made unclean in] the fourth remove from the original source of uncleanness in the case of Holy Things is invalid,
- F. but only [that which is made unclean in] the third in the case of heave offering
- G. And in the case of heave offering, if one of one's hands is made unclean, the other is clean.
- H. But in the case of Holy Things one has to immerse both of them.
- I. For one hand imparts uncleanness to the other for the purposes of Holy Things,
- J. but not for the purposes of heave offering.

### 3:3

- A. With unclean hands they eat food which has not been wet down in the case of heave offering,
- B. but not in the case of Holy Things.
- C. [21A] He who [prior to interment of the deceased] mourns his next of kin [without having contracted corpse uncleanness] and one whose atonement rite is not complete [because an offering is yet required] require immersion for the purposes of Holy Things,
- D. but not for the purposes of heave offering.

- I.1** A. [They immerse utensils inside of other utensils for purification for use with food in the status of heave offering, but not for purification for use with food in the status of Holy Things:] *why not* for use with [food in the status of] Holy Things?
- B. Said R. Ila, "Because the weight of the inner utensil interposes [between the outer utensil and the water itself]." [Abraham: it prevents the water from reaching every part of the utensils, thus invalidating the immersion of both the outer and the inner utensils.]
- C. *But since the concluding clause of the Mishnah invokes the consideration of interposition, it would follow that the opening clause is not based on the consideration of interposition, for the Tannaite formulation states: The rule for Holy Things is not like the rule for heave offering. For in the case of [immersion for use of] Holy Things one unties a knot and dries it off, immerses and afterwards ties it up again. And in the case of heave offering one ties it and then one immerses.*
- D. *Both the opening and the closing rules invoke the consideration of interposition, but it was necessary to underline that that consideration operates throughout. For had we been informed of that consideration only for the opening clause, I might have supposed that the operative consideration that it is not permitted to immerse utensils within utensils for food in the status of Holy Things is the weight of the utensils, which causes interposition, but in the latter case, where there is no such consideration of the weight of a utensil, I might have thought it would not be*

*a matter of interposition even for Holy Things. Moreover, if the Mishnah had informed us of the latter clause alone, I might have imagined that the reason that one may not immerse utensils within utensils for food in the status of Holy Things is because of the consideration of [21B] a knot tightens in the water, while in the first of the two clauses, where the water makes the utensil float, that would be no matter of interposition; accordingly, it was necessary to make the point in both instances.*

- I.2.** A. *R. Ila is consistent with opinions stated elsewhere [when he invokes the consideration of interposition], for said R. Ila said R. Hanina bar Pappa, “In the Mishnah-passage before us, there are ten points at which Holy Things exceed in strictness [of rules for safeguarding cultic cleanness] food in the status of heave offering that are set forth; the first five apply to both Holy Things and unconsecrated food prepared according to the rules governing the cleanness of Holy Things, the latter five apply to Holy Things but not to unconsecrated food prepared according to the rules governing the cleanness of Holy Things.*
- B. *“How come? In connection with the first five, there is the possibility of uncleanness such as is decreed by the Torah, so, in these cases, rabbis made a precautionary decree covering both Holy Things and unconsecrated food prepared in accord with the rules governing the cleanness of Holy things. In connection with the latter five, however, in which there is no risk of uncleanness such as is decreed by the Torah, rabbis made precautionary decrees with respect to Holy Things but not with respect to the governance of unconsecrated food prepared in accord with the rules of uncleanness governing Holy Things.”*
- I.3.** A. *Raba said, “Since the second five are governed by the consideration of interposition, the former five cannot be governed by the consideration of interposition; and as to the clause discussed at the outset, the operative consideration is this: it is a precautionary decree, against immersing needles and hooks in a utensil the mouth of which is not the size of the spout of a skin bottle [such as would permit free entry of water], as we have learned in the Mishnah: **The intermingling of immersion pools is through a hole the size of the spout of a water-skin, in the thickness and capacity — [22A] two fingers turned around in full. [If there is doubt whether it is the size of the spout of a water-skin or not the size of the spout of a water-skin, it is unfit, because it derives from the Torah [M. Miq. 6:5A-D].**”*
- B. *[Raba] accords with that which R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha said, “There are eleven points at which Holy Things exceed in strictness food in the status of heave offering that are set forth in our Mishnah; the first six apply to both Holy Things and unconsecrated food prepared according to the rules governing the cleanness of Holy Things, the latter five apply to Holy Things but not to unconsecrated food prepared according to the rules governing the cleanness of Holy Things.”*
- C. *So what’s at issue between Raba’s and R. Ila’s statements?*
- D. *At issue between them is the case of a basket or net that was filled with utensils and immersed. In the opinion of him who has said that the operative consideration is interposition, that consideration applies here too; according to him who maintains that it is a precautionary decree, against immersing needles and*

hooks in a utensil the mouth of which is not the size of the spout of a skin bottle [such as would permit free entry of water], *well, that consideration would not come into play here.*

**I.4.** A. *Raba is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said Raba, “A basket or net that was filled with utensils and immersed — the utensils are clean. But an immersion pool that one divided by using a basket or a net — he who immerses therein has gained nothing from the immersion. For lo, while the earth is wholly perforated [in that water flows through hollows of the earth, and water appearing anywhere is bound to be connected to a large aquifer elsewhere, the connection is not valid (Abraham)], nonetheless, we require that the forty seahs of valid water be collected in a single place. And that is the rule in reference to a utensil that is clean, but in respect to a utensil that is unclean, since the immersion serves quite well for the entire utensil, it serves also for the utensils that are in it. For we have learned in the Mishnah: A bucket which is full of utensils, which one dunked — lo, they [the utensils] are clean. And if it did not immerse, the water is not mingled [with that of the immersion pool], until it [the water in the bucket] is mingled [with the water of the pool] by [a stream) the size of the spout of a water-skin [M. [Miq. 6:2](#)].”*

**I.5.** A. *What’s the meaning of the statement, And if it did not immerse?*

B. *This is the sense of that statement: and if but if it was not necessary to immerse the outer utensil [since it was clean to begin with], then the water in it is not mingled [with that of the immersion pool], until it [the water in the bucket] is mingled [with the water of the pool] by [a stream) the size of the spout of a water-skin.*

**I.6.** A. *The difference of opinion between Raba and R. Ila follows the lines of a Tannaite conflict, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **A basket or net that was filled with utensils and immersed — whether this is for the purposes of preparing in them food that was in the status of Holy Things or food in the status of heave-offering, [said basket or net] is clean. Abba Saul said, “It is clean for use with heave offering but not for use with Holy Things” [T. [Hag. 3:4A-F](#)].**

C. *If so, the same rule [that utensils cannot be immersed within utensils] should apply to heave offering too!*

D. *For whom have we stated this rule? It is for those who keep the laws of cultic purity at home [haberim], and people such as they, in the nature of things, really are fully informed of the rules of immersion.*

E. *Well, then, why not say the same of Holy Things just as well!*

F. *[There is a special consideration that operates here.] Someone who does not keep the rules of cultic purity at home also may see that happen [and since he immerses for the sake of eating Holy Things in the Temple], he may go and immerse [his utensils, for use with Holy Things, in that same way].*

G. *Well the same consideration would apply to heave offering — such a person may see that done and may go and immerse in the same manner. [Hence heave offering he may separate will be unclean.]*

- H. *We don't accept heave offering from such a person.* [Only at certain times in the year is heave offering accepted from such a person, specially when he is assumed to be clean, as we shall see presently, and note also M. Toh. 9:4].
- I. *Well, then, let's not accept Holy Things from such a person either!*
- J. *So let's not accept Holy Things from him either.*
- K. *That will create animosity.*
- L. *Well, if we don't accept heave offering [and we don't], that too will create animosity!*
- M. *Well, he really wouldn't care about such a thing, since he can go and give it to some other priest, who is, like himself, an outsider who does not keep the laws of cultic purity in the correct way.*

**I.7.** A. *And who is the Tannaite authority who takes account of the consideration of animosity? It is R. Yosé, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Yosé, "On what account is everyone believed concerning the cultic purity of wine and oil throughout all the days of the year? It is so that everyone should not go and build his own high place and burn a red cow for himself" [cf. T. Hag. 3:19A-B].*

**I.8.** A. *Said R. Pappa, "In accord with what authority do we these days accept testimony from an outsider?"*

B. *In accord with whom? In accord with R. Yosé, obviously.*

**I.9.** A. *But [with respect to No. 6], shouldn't we take account of the possibility of borrowing of utensils, as we've learned in the Mishnah: "A clay utensil affords protection [when it interposes between a corpse and other objects, for example, in a passageway] for all [kinds of substances]," in accord with the opinion of the House of Hillel. The House of Shammai say, "It affords protection only for food, drink, and other clay utensils [none of which may be cleaned in an immersion pool after becoming unclean]." Said to them the House of Hillel, "On what account?" Said to them the House of Shammai, "Because it is deemed unclean when it is in the domain of an am ha'ares, and a utensil which is susceptible to uncleanness cannot afford protection." Said to them the House of Hillel, "But have you not declared clean food or drink which is in [the clay utensil, which is impervious to uncleanness entering it from its outer surfaces]?" Said to them the House of Shammai, "When we declared food and drink located in [the clay utensil] to be clean [when protected by the outer surfaces of the clay utensil from a source of uncleanness], [22B] it was for [the unobservant person] himself that we declared the food and drink to be clean. But when you have declared the utensil to be clean, you have declared it to be clean [for use] both for him [the unobservant person] and for yourself." The House of Hillel reverted and accepted the teaching of the House of Shammai [M. Ed. 1:14].*

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

C. *Said R. Joshua, "I am confounded by your opinion, House of Shammai! Is it possible that a woman should be kneading dough in a trough [with a hatchway, covered by an earthen utensil, leading from it to the lower room in which a course is lying], with the result [because of the transfer of corpse-*

uncleanness through the hatchway] that the woman and the trough are unclean for seven days [with corpse-uncleanness], but the dough itself is clean? so too, if there is in the upper room a flask full of liquid, the flask would contract seven day uncleanness by reason of the corpse, but the liquid should remain clean?"

- D. A disciple among the disciples of the House of Shammai engaged with him in argument, saying, "May I tell you the operative consideration of the House of Shammai?"
- E. He said to him, "Speak."
- F. He said to him, "Does an unclean utensil interpose against uncleanness or does it not interpose against uncleanness?"
- G. "He said to him, "It does not interpose."
- H. "As to the utensil belonging to a person who does not meticulously observe the rules of cultic purity at home, is it unclean or clean?"
- I. He said to him, "Unclean, obviously."
- J. "And if you tell him it is unclean, will he pay any attention to you? [Obviously not!]
- K. "Not only so, but if you say to them that they are unclean, he will tell you, "Mine are clean and yours are unclean" [the House of Shammai declare what cannot be purified as clean for the unobservant person, while what can be purified, such as the trough or flask, are unclean, since the unobservant person will purify what he can but not what he can't purify]. So that's the operative consideration behind the ruling of the House of Shammai" [T. [Ah. 5:11-12](#)].
- L. On the spot R. Joshua went off and threw himself on the graves of the House of Shammai. He said, "I humble myself to you, bones of the House of Shammai! If teachings of yours that are not so obvious as to the reasoning behind them are so impressive, how much the more so the teachings of yours that bear a clear explanation!"
- M. They say: for the rest of his life his teeth got black because of the fasting that he did in penance.
- N. *So in any event, it is stated as part of the Tannaite version: **both for him and for yourself**. Therefore, it follows, we may borrow utensils from them.*
- O. *Sure, but when we borrow from them, we immerse what we borrow.*
- P. *Yeah, but what is made unclean with corpse uncleanness [in which status the utensils are held to be classified] has to be sprinkled on the third and seventh day of the purification process, and people don't lend utensils for seven days.*
- Q. *Well, anyhow, aren't they believed with respect to immersion [that we have to immerse anything we borrow from them]? And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: those not observant at home of the rules of cultic purity nonetheless are believed with respect to the purity of what has to be immersed on account of corpse uncleanness?*
- R. *Said Abbaye, "No problem, the one refers to his body [and he is trusted to attain purity for himself], the other, his utensils." [The outsider is not meticulous about*



the cultic condition of his utensils, and those who observe cultic purity at home must take special precautions on that account.]

- S. *Raba said, "Both refer to his utensils, but no problem; in the one case, he says, 'I never immersed one utensil inside another,' so he is believed; in the other, he says, 'I have immersed one utensil inside another, but I never immersed it in a utensil the mouth of which is not the size of the spout of a skin-bottle.' For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: a person not observant of the rules of cultic purity at home is believed to say, 'This produce has not been rendered susceptible to uncleanness [by being deliberately wet down],'* but he is not believe to say, 'This produce has been rendered susceptible to uncleanness but has not been rendered unclean.'"
- T. *Well, is he believed as to his body anyhow? Hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: An observant person who came to be sprinkled [for corpse uncleanness, saying he's waited the first three days beyond contracting corpse uncleanness] — they sprinkle on him forthwith. If it is an unobservant person who comes to be sprinkled, they sprinkle on him only if he remains in our presence for the third and seventh days?*
- U. Rather, said Abbaye, "On account of the very strict ruling that you have imposed on him at the outset [not believing he has waited three days], you make it a lighter thing for him at the end [trusting him in respect to the immersion after the sprinklings, which he will do properly]."

**II.1 A. [They make a distinction among] outer parts and inside [and holding place in the case of use for heave offering:**

- B. *What is the definition of outer parts and inside?*
- C. *It is in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: A utensil, the outer parts of which have been made unclean with liquids — the outer parts are unclean. If its inside, its rims, hangers, and handles are clean. [If] its inside is made unclean, the whole is unclean [M. Kel. 25:6D-F].*

**III.1 A. ...and holding place:**

- B. *What is the definition of holding place?*
- C. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "It is the part by which one hands the utensil [to someone else], in line with the verse, 'and they handed her parched corn' (Rut. 2:14) [with the words 'holding place' and 'to and' using the same consonants]."
- D. R. Assi said R. Yohanan said, "It is the place that meticulous people hold the cup."

**III.2. A. R. Bibi repeated as a Tannaite statement before R. Nahman: "The distinction between outside and inside applies to no utensil, whether used for Holy Things in the sanctuary or Holy Things in the provinces."**

- B. *He said to him, "What is the definition [or falls into the classification] of Holy Things of the provinces? It is heave-offering, and we have learned in the Mishnah: [They make a distinction among] outer parts and inside [and holding place in the case of use for heave offering! So maybe this refers to unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules of cleanness that apply to Holy Things?*

- C. *“You remind me, in any event, of something that Rabbah bar Abbuha said, namely: ‘There are eleven points at which Holy Things exceed in strictness food in the status of heave offering that are set forth in our Mishnah; the first six apply to both Holy Things and unconsecrated food prepared according to the rules governing the cleanness of Holy Things, the latter five apply to Holy Things but not to unconsecrated food prepared according to the rules governing the cleanness of Holy Things.’”*

**IV.1 A. He who carries something affected by midras uncleanness [the uncleanness imparted by a person unclean with the fluxes discussed at Lev. 12-15 who sits or lies on objects made for the purpose of sitting or lying] [may also] carry heave offering, but [he may] not carry food in the status of Holy Things:**

- B. *Why not Holy Things?*
- C. It is because of a particular incident, for said R. Judah said Samuel, “There was a case of someone who was moving from one place to another a jug of wine in the status of Holy Things, **[23A]** and the thong of his sandal broke, and he took it and put it over the mouth of the jug, from whence it fell into the contained airspace of the jug, which was thereby made unclean. On that occasion they said: **He who carries something affected by midras uncleanness [the uncleanness imparted by a person unclean with the fluxes discussed at Lev. 12-15 who sits or lies on objects made for the purpose of sitting or lying] [may also] carry heave offering, but [he may] not carry food in the status of Holy Things.**”
- D. *If that is the case, then shouldn't the same consideration extend to heave offering?*
- E. *Lo, who is the authority behind this unassigned statement? It is R. Hananiah b. Aqabayya, who has said, “They spoke only concerning the River Jordan alone, and of carriage on a ship, as was the original incident” [T. **Par. 9:9A-D**].*
- F. *And what was the incident?*
- G. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. **A man should not take purification-water and purification-ash and across the Jordan by ship, nor may he stand on one bank and throw them across to the other, nor may he float them on the water, nor may he carry them while riding on a cow or on his fellow in a situation in which his feet do not touch the ground. But he may bring them over on a bridge; all the same are the Jordan and all other rivers.**
- I. **R. Hanania b. Aqiba says, “They spoke only concerning the River Jordan alone, and of carriage on a ship, as was the original incident” [T. **Par. 9:9A-D**].**
- J. *What is the specific incident to which R. Judah said Rab made reference?*
- K. Said R. Judah said Rab, “There was the incident involving a man who was carrying purification water and purification ashes across the Jordan in a ship, and about an olive's bulk of corpse matter was found stuck to the bottom of the ship. At that moment they said, ‘**A man should not take purification-water and purification-ash and across the Jordan by ship.**’”

**IV.2. A. The question was raised: Since the incident involved an unclean sandal, what is the rule governing a clean one? Since it happened with an open jug, what is the**



rule for a closed one? What is the law if someone violated the rule and carried them that way?

- B. R. Ila said, "If he violated the rule and carried them in that way, the contents of the jug are unclean."
- C. R. Zira said, "If he violated the rule and carried them in that way, the contents of the jug are clean."

**V.1 A. Utensils which are completely processed in a state of insusceptibility to uncleanness [and so when completed are clean] require immersion for use in connection with Holy Things, but not for use in connection with heave offering:**

- B. *So who is the one who has completed the processing of the utensils? Should we say that an observant person has completed them? In that case, why do they require immersion? So it must be an unobservant person, in which case, how can they ever be referred to as having been completed in a state of insusceptibility of uncleanness?*
- C. *Said Rabbah b. R. Shila said R. Mattenah said Samuel, "In point of fact it is a case in which an observant person has completed them. The utensil requires immersion on account of the consideration of the possibility that the spit of an unobservant person has fallen on the utensil."*
- D. *So when will the spit have fallen on the utensil? Should we say that it is prior to the completion of the utensil? Then it is not a utensil at that point [and not susceptible to uncleanness]. So it must be afterward. But then, would the craftsman not take precautions for the protection of the utensils from such spit?*
- E. *In point of fact, it is prior to the completion of the utensil, but it is possible that, at the moment at which the utensil was finished, the spit was still wet.*

**V.2. A. The utensil requires immersion but waiting until sunset for the completion of the purification process is not required, from which it follows that our Mishnah-paragraph is not in accord with R. Eliezer.**

- F. *For we have learned in the Mishnah: A reed which one cut off [for use as a container] for [ashes of] the purification [rite] — R. Eliezer says, "He immerses it forthwith." R. Joshua says, "He makes it unclean and [then] immerses it" [M. Par. 5:4A-C]. Now we reflected on this rule: who is the one who cut it off? If we say that it was cut off by an observant person, then what need is there for immersion? So it must be that an unobservant person cut it off. But in that case how can R. Joshua say, **He makes it unclean and [then] immerses it?** It's already unclean. And said Rabbah bar Shila said R. Mattenah said Samuel, "In point of fact it was a case in which it was cut off by an observant person, and the consideration of spit from an unobservant person that can have fallen on it." Now when should that be? If we say it is prior to the cutting off, then at that point it was not a utensil, hence was then insusceptible to uncleanness. But if it were after it was cut off, then the man would have taken special precautions to protect it from such a thing. But in point of fact, it was prior to the cutting off, but it is possible that at the moment that he cut off the reed, the spit was still wet. Now, there is no problem in understanding in that context the position of R. Joshua, and it is on that account that there is the*

*occasion to pay attention to the Sadducees, such as we have learned in the Mishnah: **And they would render the priest who burns the cow unclean, because of the Sadducees, so that they should not say, “It is done by one on whom the sun has set [for the completion of his purity rite]” [M. Par. 3:7H-I].** But from the perspective of R. Eliezer, if you say that in general we require sunset to complete the process of purification, then that would explain how in this case we pay attention to the position of the Sadducees. But if you say that in general we don’t require waiting for sunset, then what recognition do we give in our procedure to the contrary opinion of the Sadducees? [So our Mishnah-paragraph cannot accord with his view.]*

- C. Said Rab, **[23B]** “[Our Mishnah can accord with Eliezer, if we recognize that] they treat it as though it had been made unclean by a dead creeping thing [in all other cases, that form of uncleanness is such as to require waiting until sunset, and in this case, we don’t wait for sunset, so there can be perfectly adequate occasion to signal our rejection of the Sadducean theory].”
- D. Well, then, by the same reasoning, the utensil should not impart uncleanness to a human being [since a utensil made unclean by a dead creeping thing is a derivative of uncleanness and not a generative source of uncleanness, but only a generative source of uncleanness can impart uncleanness to a human being]. *But how come it has been taught on Tannaite authority: He who cuts it and immerses it himself requires immersion? So it must follow that they treat it as though it had been made unclean by a corpse.*
- E. *Well, if that’s the case, then the purification-process should involve sprinkling with purification-water on the third and seventh days after the event of contamination! But how come then it has been taught on Tannaite authority: He who cuts it and immerses it himself requires immersion — that is to say, immersion but not sprinkling on the third and seventh days!*
- F. Rather, they have treated the case as though it had been made unclean, but it was in the seventh day after the occasion of contamination [thus still requiring immersion, and still able to impart uncleanness to a human being].
- G. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: In no detail did sages ever innovate in matters having to do with the rite of the red cow? [Abraham: while the actual defilement of the priest does not involve any change in the laws of levitical purity, the attribution of corpse-defilement to the reed cut in purity represents a complete innovation.]*
- H. “[The point of that statement,]” said Abbayye, “is: they never ruled that a spade is treated as a seat so as to be made unclean in the rubric of a seat on which a person afflicted with flux has sat [so sages didn’t declare an object not susceptible to a given type of uncleanness to be susceptible to that type, as the instance here; a space is not treated as a seat for the present purpose; but they didn’t refrain from attributing to a utensil that was not unclean the kind of uncleanness to which it was in any event susceptible; thus a reed pipe, though clean, could be classified as made unclean by corpse-uncleanness, since it is subject to that form of uncleanness in any event (Abraham)].”
- I. *That [statement of Abbayye’s] is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: “And he who sits on any thing” (Lev. 15: 6) — might one*

suppose that if one turned over a seah-measure and sat down on it, or a tarqab-measure and sat down upon it, it will be unclean? Scripture states, “On which he who has an issue has sat” (Lev. 15: 6), meaning, that which is designated as an object for sitting, which then excludes something concerning which people may say, “Get up and let us do our work with that object.”

**VI.1 A. A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering:**

- B. *Where in Scripture do we find proof for this proposition?*
- C. Said R. Hanina, “Said Scripture, ‘One golden pan of ten shekels, full of incense’ (Num. 7:14) — the pan thus unites all the contents into one.”
- D. Objected R. Kahana, “**Added R. Aqiba, ‘Fine flour, incense, frankincense, and coals, part of which one who had immersed on that selfsame day touched — he has invalidated the whole quantity of them’** [M. Ed. 8:1D-E] [so the utensil unites its contents]. *Now lo, this is an addition on the part of rabbis [and not based on the Torah]! How so? Since the opening part of the clause has, R. Simeon b. Beterah testified concerning ashes from a purification offering, part of which an unclean person touched, that [the unclean person] has imparted uncleanness to all of it* [M. Ed. 8:1A-C], *and it goes on to state as the Tannaite formulation, Added R. Aqiba, [‘Fine flour, incense, frankincense, and coals, part of which one who had immersed on that selfsame day touched — he has invalidated the whole quantity of them’* [M. Ed. 8:1D-F] *[it follows that it is sages, not Scripture, that made the rule].”*
- E. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish in the name of Bar Qappara, [24A] “[Aqiba’s rule] is required only to cover the residue of the meal-offering. On the basis of the law of the Torah, whatever requires use of a utensil is such that the utensil unites its contents, and whatever doesn’t require the use of a utensil is such that the use of a utensil does not unite its contents. Now rabbis have come along and made the precautionary decree that even though the use of a utensil is not required, nonetheless a utensil does unite the contents.”*
- F. *Well, that poses no problems in the case of fine flour, but as to incense, and frankincense, what is to be said [since these do require use of a utensil, so the utensil will unite their contents under the Torah’s law, yet Aqiba refers only to what rabbis have added to the list]?*
- G. Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “It would involve a case in which one heaped them up on a hide. According to the Torah, while something that has a contained space [unlike the hide] can unite its contents, what has no inside cannot do so, *then rabbis came along and made the decree that even something that has no contained space can serve to unite its contents.*”
- H. *That teaching of R. Hanina would then take issue with what R. Hiyya bar Abba said, for said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “This Mishnah-paragraph [that is before us in M. Hagigah] was formulated in response to R. Aqiba’s testimony.”*

**VII.1 A. [That which is made unclean in] the fourth remove from the original source of uncleanness in the case of Holy Things is invalid, but only [that which is made unclean in] the third in the case of heave offering:**

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

- C. Said R. Yosé, “How do we know that that which is unclean by a source of uncleanness in the fourth remove from the original source of uncleanness in the case of Holy Things is invalid [M. Hag. 3:2E-F]? And it is a matter of logic. Now if one who has not completed his atonement rites is permitted [to touch] food in the status of priestly rations, but is invalid to do so in the case of Holy Things, that which is made unclean by a source of uncleanness so that it is in the third remove, which is invalid in the case of food in the status of priestly rations, surely should impart invalidity [to Holy Things which come into contact with it] at the Fourth remove from the original source of uncleanness! We have learned in Scripture [M. Sot. 5:3A-B] that that which is made unclean by a source of uncleanness in the third remove from the original source of uncleanness invalidates [what it touches], and in connection with that which is unclean in the fourth remove we derive the same lesson by an argument *a fortiori*” [T. Hag. 3:18].
- D. And whence indeed is there proof from the Torah that that which is unclean in the third remove in the case of Holy Things [invalidates what it touches]?
- E. It is on the basis of the following verse of Scripture: “And flesh [in the status of Holy Things] which touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten” (Lev. 7:19).
- F. Do we not deal with that which has touched something at a second remove from uncleanness, and the All-Merciful has said, “It shall not be eaten” [that is, then, at the third remove from the original source of uncleanness]?
- G. *And as to the uncleanness at the fourth remove, this is proven by the argument a fortiori such as we have given above.*

**VIII.1 A. And in the case of heave offering, if one of one’s hands is made unclean, the other is clean. But in the case of Holy Things one has to immerse both of them. For one hand imparts uncleanness to the other for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering:**

- B. Said R. Shizbi, “When the hands are connected [touching one another], this rule applies, but not when they are not connected.” [Abraham: The rule that one hand imparts uncleanness to the other in connection with Holy Things applies only to a case in which the unclean hand is actually touching the clean hand at the moment at which the latter is in contact with Holy Things.]
- C. *Abbaye objected to this interpretation of the Mishnah: “ ‘A hand that is dry [and unclean] imparts uncleanness to the other hand [which was formerly clean] so as to have the latter impart uncleanness to Holy Things, but not to heave offering,’ the words of Rabbi. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, ‘It serves to render it invalid [for eating] but not unclean [to impart uncleanness to something that touches it].’ [Cf. T. Hag. 3:10]. Now, if you say that this refers also to a case in which the hands are not connected to one another, then the fact that the hand is dry but has the power to impart unfitness is noteworthy; but if you say it refers only to a case in which the hands are connected but not when they are not connected, then what is so remarkable about the hand’s being dry?”* [Abraham: if the case is one in which the hands are not connected, then the fact that the clean hand, through having been previously in contact with the dry, unclean hand, is able to defile Holy Things represents a new point of Rabbis: one hand possessing uncleanness at the second remove can convey uncleanness to the

other hand even without the help of moisture, with the uncleanness being of the same grade; if the unclean hand was wet, this would not be remarkable, since uncleanness at the second remove renders liquids unclean in the first remove, and these then in turn impart to the other hand uncleanness in the second remove. But if the Mishnah-rule speaks solely of a case in which the hands are connected, the fact that the hand is dry is pointless, for the defilement of Holy Things would have to be accounted for as a precautionary decree, lest the unclean hand touch Holy Things, and in that case, it would make no difference whether the unclean hand was wet or dry, since it is unclean at the second remove, it can defile Holy Things with uncleanness at the third remove.]

**VIII.2.** A. *So too it has been stated:*

- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "They spoke in this rule only about his own hand, [24B] but not about the hand of his fellow." [Abraham: if he touched with his unclean hand another person's hand, the latter's hand is not made unclean.]
- C. And R. Yohanan said, "All the same are his hand and the hand of his fellow: with that hand in particular, he can impart uncleanness to the other hand so that it renders Holy Things invalid but not unclean."
- D. *On what basis [is such a conclusion drawn]?*
- E. *On the basis of what follows in the second clause, **For one hand imparts uncleanness to the other for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering.** Now why was it necessary to make this point again, when the opening clause has covered it? So is not the intent to indicate that covered under the law is the hand of his fellow. And, moreover, R. Simeon b. Laqish himself retracted, for said R. Jonah said R. Ammi said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "All the same are his hand and the hand of his fellow: with that hand in particular, he can impart uncleanness to the other hand so that it renders Holy Things invalid but not unclean."*

**VIII.3.** A. *In point of fact what we have is a conflict between Tannaite rulings, for we have learned in the Mishnah: "Whatever imparts unfitness to heave offering imparts uncleanness to hands, putting them into the second remove of uncleanness. One hand imparts uncleanness to the second," the words of R. Joshua. And sages say, "That which is unclean in the second remove does not put [something else into uncleanness at] the second remove" [M. Yad. 3:2A-C]. Isn't it the implication then, it doesn't impart uncleanness at the second remove from itself, but it can impart uncleanness at the third [hence invalidating, if not contaminating, heave offering]?"*

- B. *But maybe the sense is, it doesn't impart uncleanness at the second remove or at the third?*
- C. *Rather, here is the evidence that the subject is at issue among Tannaite rules, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **"A hand that is dry [and unclean] imparts uncleanness to the other hand [which was formerly clean] so as to have the latter impart uncleanness to Holy Things, but not to heave offering," the words of Rabbi.**

- E. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “It serves to render it invalid [for eating] but not unclean [to impart uncleanness to something that touches it]” [Cf. T. Hag. 3:10].

**IX.1 A.** With unclean hands they eat food which has not been wet down in the case of heave offering, but not in the case of Holy Things:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Said R. Hanina b. Antigonus, “Does any consideration that something is dry pertain in respect to Holy Things? [The distinction between what is wet, which is susceptible to uncleanness, and what is dry, which is not, applies only to unconsecrated food.] But isn’t the special consideration that is accorded to Holy Things what imparts to them susceptibility to uncleanness under all circumstances?” [T. Hag. 3:12A-C].
- D. *The rule applies only to a case “in which someone else stuck a piece of Holy Things into his mouth, or he himself picked it up with a toothpick or a piece of wood and wanted to eat horseradish that was not consecrated or onion with it. In the case of Holy Things, rabbis prohibited doing so [so that his hands would not touch the Holy Things in his mouth or impart uncleanness to his spit which would have the same effect], but in the case of heave offering, they did not enact such a prohibition” [T. Hag. 3:12A-C].*

**X.1 A.** He who [prior to interment of the deceased] mourns his next of kin [without having contracted corpse uncleanness] and one whose atonement rite is not complete [because an offering is yet required] require immersion for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave offering:

- B. *How come?*
- C. *Since up to this point they were forbidden to eat Holy Things, rabbis imposed on them the obligation of a cultic immersion.*

I.1+2-5, with a miscellany at Nos. 6-8, explain the operative consideration in the Mishnah-rule. II.1 and III.1 explain references in the Mishnah-statement. IV.1 explains a distinction important in the Mishnah-rule. IV.2, with a footnote at No. 3, complements the detail at hand. V.1 asks the obvious question of Mishnah-exegesis; No. 2 then addresses a secondary consideration. VI.1 finds a scriptural basis for the Mishnah’s rule. VII.1 adds a Tannaite complement in amplification of the Mishnah’s rule. VIII.1, 2-3 work out the conditions under which the Mishnah’s rule holds good. IX.1 provides a Tannaite complement, and X.1 explains the Mishnah’s rule. The entire set, therefore, forms a composite devoted to Mishnah-commentary.

**3:4**

- A. **A more stringent rule applies to heave offering [than with Holy Things]:**
- B. **For: in Judah people are deemed trustworthy in regard to the preservation of the cleanness of wine and oil [for use on the altar — that is, food in the status of Holy Things] throughout the year.**
- C. **But [only] in the time of pressing the wine and crushing the olives also for the purposes of heave offering [are they deemed trustworthy].**



- D. After the time of pressing the wine and crushing the olives has passed, [if] one brought to [a priest] a jug of wine in the status of heave offering, he should not accept it from him.
- E. But he simply leaves it for the next season of pressing the wine.
- F. But if he said to him, “I set apart in this jug of wine a quarter-log which is in the status of Holy Things,” then he is deemed trustworthy [and the jug is accepted].
- G. As to jugs of wine and oil [25A] in which wine or oil in the status of heave offering has been mixed, [common people] are deemed trustworthy in their regard at the time of pressing the wine and crushing the olives,
- H. and for seventy days before the pressing of the wine as well.

**I.1** A. [For in Judah people are deemed trustworthy in regard to the preservation of the cleanness of wine and oil for use on the altar:] *why in Judah but not in Galilee?*

- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Because a strip of land inhabited by Samaritans separates the two [Jewish] provinces.”
- C. *Well, then, why not put it into a chest, box, or cupboard [and carry it in that, and these protect what is in them from uncleanness such as passage through gentile territory would impart]?*
- D. *Now who is the authority behind our Mishnah-rule? It is Rabbi, who maintains that a tent that is in motion is not classified as a tent [such as could interpose between uncleanness without and clean things within], for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. He who enters the land of the peoples riding in a box, chest, or cupboard —
  - F. Rabbi declares him unclean.
- G. R. Yosé b. R. Judah declares him clean.
- H. *So why not bring it in a tightly sealed earthenware utensil [which would protect the contents from uncleanness]?*
- I. Said R. Eliezer, “They teach [as the Tannaite formulation]: ‘Holy Things are not saved from uncleanness in a tightly sealed jug.’”
- J. *But haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: The purification [jar containing mixed ashes and water] is not afforded protection by a tightly sealed cover. Doesn’t this imply, But Holy Things are afford protection by a tightly sealed cover?*
- K. *No, what is implied [and clearly stated, is:] And [but] water which is not mixed is afforded protection by a tightly sealed cover [M. Par. 11:1H-I].*
- L. *But didn’t Ulla say, “The observant folk in Galilee do prepare Holy Things in a condition of cleanness?”*
- M. Sure, and they leave it, and when Elijah comes, he’ll declare it clean.

**II.1** A. But [only] in the time of pressing the wine and crushing the olives also for the purposes of heave offering [are they deemed trustworthy]:

- B. *By way of contradiction: He who completes [gathering] his olives but left aside one basket should give it to a poor priest [before the olives become susceptible to uncleanness, so the priest will prepare the oil in a state of*

cleanness] [cf. **M. Toh. 9:4A**]. [So it is assumed that other people won't protect the cleanness of the oil.]

- C. *Said R. Nahman, "No problem, the one speaks of early ripening olives [gathered in season, where the unobservant person is trusted], the other, late ripening olives [which are not seasonal, and the outsider isn't trusted to tithe them properly]."*
- D. *Said to him R. Adda bar Ahbah, "What for instance?"*
- E. *For instance, those of your ancestors."*

**II.2.** A. R. Joseph said, "They taught this rule with reference to Galilee."

- B. *Objected Abbaye, "TransJordan and Galilee — lo, they are equivalent to Judah: they are believed concerning wine at the wine-vintage, concerning oil at the oil-pressing season, but not concerning wine at the time of pressing olive oil, or concerning oil at the time of vintaging wine [T. Hag. 3:31]. Rather, the better explanation is the one we got to begin with."*

**III.1** A. After the time of pressing the wine and crushing the olives has passed, [if] one brought to [a priest] a jug of wine in the status of heave offering, he should not accept it from him. But he simply leaves it for the next season of pressing the wine:

- B. *They raised this question of R Sheshet: "If the priest violated the rule and accepted it, may he then leave it for the next year's vintage?"*
- C. *He said to them, [25B] "You have learned the following Tannaite rule: A haber [associate, who observed the laws of cleanness and tithing in a meticulous manner] and an am haares [and outsider, who did not] who inherited [the property of] their father, [who was] an am haares — he [the haber brother] may say to him [the am haares brother], "You take the wheat in such-and-such a place and I [will take] the wheat in such-and-such a place; you [take] the wine in such-and-such a place and I [will take] the wine in such-and-such a place." But he may not say to him, "You take the wheat and I will take the barley; you take the wet produce [susceptible to uncleanness] and I will take the dry [insusceptible] produce" [M. Dem. 6:8]. And in that connection, there is a Tannaite observation, That associate must burn what is wet down but may leave what is dry [T. Dem. 6:8F]. But why should this be the case? Let him leave it for the next vintage [and that shows the priest may not keep it for the next vintage, since this rule makes no provision for such an action]."*
- D. *The rule pertains to something that is not subject to a fixed processing season.*
- E. *Well, why not leave it for the next pilgrim festival?*
- F. *The rule pertains to something that won't last that long.*

**IV.1** A. But if he said to him, "I set apart in this jug of wine a quarter-log which is in the status of Holy Things," then he is deemed trustworthy [and the jug is accepted]:

The discussion addresses another Mishnah-passage, not the one at hand. But at the extension at No. 2, the Mishnah-passage before us contributes a fact that solves the problem under study, and the whole has been inserted here on that account.

- B. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: And the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel agree that they examine the soil for one who makes the Passover, and they do not examine the soil for one who would eat heave offering [M. Oh. 18:4C].* [They do not rely upon examination in the latter case.]
- C. *What is the sense of they examine?*
- D. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "One [who wants to remain uncontaminated by corpse matter] in a *beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter] blows away the earth and goes along his way."
- E. R. Hiyya bar Abba in the name of Ulla said, "A *beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter] that has been trodden down is no longer a source of uncleanness."
- F. As to those who wish to eat the Passover offering, sages did not confirm their rule where the penalty of extirpation was involved [and the uncleanness attaching to a grave area is an enactment of rabbis], but in the case of those who eat heave offering, they did maintain their ordinance, in a case in which death at the hand of Heaven was involved. [Abraham: unwittingly eating heave offering when one is unclean is subject to death at the hands of heaven; extirpation is the more severe penalty. Rabbis waived their enactment regarding the grave area in the case of the Passover sacrifice, because it is subject to a fixed time, but not in connection with heave offering, for which there is no fixed time; the priest has to avoid such an area or purify himself as unclean by corpse-uncleanness and only then eat heave offering.]

We proceed to a theoretical question that is provoked by the intersecting Mishnah-rule. Now we see why the intersecting Mishnah-passage has been inserted.

- IV.2.** A. *The question was raised: if one investigated an area for the purpose of eating his Passover offering, what is the rule as to his eating heave offering in any event?*
- B. Ulla said, "If one investigated an area for the purpose of eating his Passover offering, he is permitted to eat his heave offering in reliance upon that original investigation."
- C. Rabbah bar Ulla said, "If one investigated an area for the purpose of eating his Passover offering, he is forbidden to eat his heave offering in reliance upon that original investigation."
- D. *Said to him a certain elder, "Don't take issue with Ulla, for we have learned in the Mishnah a rule in accord with his position, namely: But if he said to him, "I set apart in this jug of wine a quarter-log which is in the status of Holy Things," then he is deemed trustworthy [and the jug is accepted]. Now, since he is believed in respect to Holy Things, he is also believed in respect to heave-offering. Here too, since he is believed in respect to the Passover, he is also believed in regard to heave offering."*

- V.1** A. **As to jugs of wine and oil in which wine or oil in the status of heave offering has been mixed, [common people] are deemed trustworthy in their regard at the time of pressing the wine and crushing the olives:**
- B. *A Tannaite statement: common folk are not believed either with respect to casks or in respect to heave offering.*

- C. ...casks of what? Should I say, casks of Holy things? But since common folk are trusted in respect to Holy Things, shouldn't they also be trusted in respect to the casks? But if it is casks containing food in the status of heave offering, then that's pretty obvious! For if they're not trusted in respect to heave offering, then should they be trusted in respect to the casks?
- D. Rather, what it refers to is empty casks that contained Holy Things, and that is during the other days of the year, or casks filled with food in the status of heave offering, and that is in the time of pressing the wine or crushing the olives.
- E. We have learned in the Mishnah: **As to jugs of wine and oil in which wine or oil in the status of heave offering has been mixed...** doesn't this mean, mixed up with food in the status of heave offering? [Abraham: and yet the Mishnah tells us, he is trusted in regard to the utensils.]
- F. Said the household of R. Hiyya, "...in which Holy Things have been mixed up."
- G. But is there a consideration of mixing up when it comes to Holy Things [such as applies in the case of heave offering]? [Abraham: the concept of mixing up applies in the case of heave offering, because all untithed produce contains a part that must eventually be set apart as heave offering, but that is not the case with Holy Things, which do not have to be separated from untithed produce.]
- H. The household of R. Ilai said, "It is a case in which he prepares his liable, but untithed produce, in a state of cleanness, so as to remove from it libations [for the altar]" [Abraham: unconsecrated produce, Holy Things, and heave offering all are mixed together, and since he is trusted in regard to Holy Things, he is also trusted here in regard to both the heave offering and also the casks].

#### **VI.1 A. and for seventy days before the pressing of the wine as well:**

- B. Said Abbaye, "That bears the implication that the tenant farmer has the obligation to provide jugs seventy days prior to the pressing season."
- I.1 provides a reason behind the implication of the rule of the Mishnah. II.1 harmonizes Mishnah-rules. III.1 raises a theoretical question that depends on the Mishnah-law. IV.1-2 are tangential to our Mishnah-statement; because our passage contributes to the solution of the problem of that composition, the whole is inserted here. It is very common my experience that, when at first I see no reason for a composite's being utilized at a given point, there will be clear warrant for doing so in some detail of said composite. It seems to me a fixed rule that, where there is some more relevant composition or composite for use in the clarification of a Mishnah-paragraph, a composition in which said paragraph takes only a tangential role will not be inserted; in the rare instance in which such an insertion is made, it will be only after the complete exposition of the Mishnah-paragraph entirely for its own integral purposes. Here is solid evidence of the working of fixed and (to us) rational rules of composite-making, even where the discourse appears quite beside the point. V.1 presents a Tannaite qualification of the Mishnah-rule. VI.1 presents a secondary implication of the Mishnah-rule.

### **3:5**

- A. **From Modiin and inwards [toward Jerusalem, people] are deemed trustworthy in regard to the status of clay utensils.**
- B. **From Modiin and outwards, they are not deemed trustworthy.**

- C. How so?
- D. A potter who sells pots —
- E. [if] there came within the border of Modiin [toward Jerusalem] that potter, those pots, and those purchasers —
- F. he is deemed trustworthy.
- G. [If] he went beyond the limit, he is not deemed trustworthy.

- I.1** A. *A Tannaite statement:* Modiim is sometimes classified as inwards and sometimes classified as outwards. How so? If the potter is going out and the observant person coming in [the potter thus entering town from inside, the observant person from the outside], it is classified as within. If both are coming in **[26A]** or both going out, it is classified as outwards.
- B. *Said Abbaye, “So we have learned the rule as a Tannaite statement in the Mishnah: A potter who sells pots who came within the border of Modiin [toward Jerusalem] — so the operative consideration is that it is classified as within that he is trusted; but in Modiin itself, he is not trusted. Then note what follows: [If] he went beyond the limit, he is not deemed trustworthy. So within Modiin itself, he is trusted. So isn’t it to be deduced that in the one case, the potter is going out and the observant person coming in, in the other, both are coming in or both going out?”*
- C. *That is the correct deduction.*

- II.1** A. *[...are deemed trustworthy in regard to the status of clay utensils:] a Tannaite statement:*
- B. They are believed in regard to small earthenware jugs that are used for Holy Things [which pilgrims have to use, but not big jars, which can be bought only in Jerusalem itself (Abraham)].
- C. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “That is so only if they can be taken in one hand.”
- D. And R. Yohanan said, “Even if they can’t be held in one hand.”
- E. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “They have stated that rule only if they are empty, but not if they are full.”
- F. R. Yohanan said, “The rule applies even if they are full, and even if if his head covering has fallen into the utensil.”
- G. And said Raba, “And R. Yohanan concedes concerning the liquid itself that they are unclean. And don’t find that anomaly surprising, for lo, you can have a case in which flagons are full of liquid, with the flagons unclean with a seven-day uncleanness, while the liquid is held still to be clean.”

I.1, II.1 add Tannaite complements to the reading of the Mishnah-rule.

### 3:6

- A. Tax collectors who went into a house,
- B. and so too thieves who returned objects [they had stolen],
- C. are deemed trustworthy to state, “We did not touch them [and make them unclean].”
- D. And in Jerusalem they are deemed trustworthy in matters concerning Holy Things,

**E. and at the time of the festivals, also concerning matters touching on heave offering.**

**I.1 A. [Tax collectors who went into a house, and so too thieves who returned objects [they had stolen], are deemed trustworthy to state, “We did not touch them [and make them unclean]”:] by way of contradiction: The tax collectors who entered the house — the whole house is unclean [M. Toh. 7:6A-B]!**

**B. No problem, the one speaks of a case in which there was a gentile with them, the other not, for we have learned in the Mishnah: If there is a gentile with them, they are believed to state, “We did not enter.” But they are not believed to state, “We entered, but we did not touch [anything]” [M. Toh. 7:6C-D].**

**C. Yeah, so if there’s a gentile with them, what difference does it make anyhow?**

**D. R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar —**

**E. One said, “The fear of the gentile inhibits them.”**

**F. The other said, “The fear of the government inhibits them.”**

**G. So what’s the difference?**

**H. The difference is the effect of a gentile who is of no consequence.**

**II.1 A. and so too thieves who returned objects [they had stolen]:**

**B. by way of contradiction: The thieves who entered the house — unclean is only the place [trodden by] the feet of the thieves [M. Toh. 7:6G].**

**C. Said R. Phineas in the name of Rabbah, “It is a case in which the thieves have repented. A close reading of the Mishnah supports that view:who returned objects [they had stolen].”**

**D. That’s decisive.**

**III.1 A. And in Jerusalem they are deemed trustworthy in matters concerning Holy Things:**

**B. A Tannaite statement: They are believed with reference to big earthenware utensils that are to be used for Holy Things [and small ones a fortiori]. Why so? Because they do not make kilns in Jerusalem [so these have to be brought from elsewhere and people not meticulous about observing cultic cleanness will be believed in regard to their status].**

**IV.1 A. and at the time of the festivals, also concerning matters touching on heave offering:**

**B. What is the source in Scripture of this rule?**

**C. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Said Scripture, ‘So all the men of Israel were gathered against the city, associated as one man’ (Jud. 20:11) — Scripture has treated them as made up entirely of associates [when it comes to Jerusalem].”**

**I.1, II.1 harmonize Mishnah-paragraphs. III.1 glosses the Mishnah-rule. IV.1 finds a scriptural source for the Mishnah’s rule.**

### **3:7A-C**

**A. He who opens up a jug of wine or broke into dough [to sell them] for the needs of a festival —**

**B. R. Judah says, “He finishes [selling them after the festival].”**



**C. And sages say, “He does not finish [selling them after the festival].”**

- I.1** A. *R. Ammi and R. Isaac Nappaha were in session in the anteroom of R. Isaac Nappaha. One of them commenced, saying, “What is the law about leaving [this open wine or dough] for some later festival [and selling them at that time, as though they were clean in line with the view of sages here]?”*
- B. *Said the other, “But everybody is going to be able to touch it, and can you say, leave it over for another festival?”*
- C. *He said to him, “So up to now hasn’t everyone been able to handle it?”*
- D. *He said to him, “But how are the situations comparable? Up to now, the All-Merciful has treated as clean any uncleanness affecting an unobservant person. But now, that uncleanness is confirmed as unclean retrospectively.”*
- E. *May we say that this follows the lines of a conflict of Tannaite formulations? for one Tannaite statement has it: he may leave it over for another festival, but it has been taught on Tannaite authority: he may not leave it over for another festival? So doesn’t this indicate that there is a conflict of Tannaite formulations?*
- F. *Not at all, the Tannaite formulation that holds, he may leave it over, represents the position of R. Judah, and the one that maintains, he may not leave it over, stands for the view of rabbis.*
- G. *But do you really maintain that that is the case? All R. Judah said was that he may finish selling what he has opened, [not that he may leave it over for the next festival]. Rather, the formulation that maintains, he may not leave it over, is according to R. Judah, and the one that says, he may leave it over, concurs with rabbis, but “he may not leave it” means, there is no requirement that he leave it.*
- I.1 asks a theoretical question provoked by the Mishnah-rule.

**3:7D-G**

- D. After the festival was over, they undertook the purification of the Temple court.**
- E. [If] the festival ended before a Friday, they did not undertake the purification,**
- F. because of the honor owing to the Sabbath,**
- G. R. Judah says, “Also not before Thursday, for the priests are not free.”**
- I.1** A. *A Tannaite statement: For the priests were not yet free from the duty of removing the ashes [which pertains from the festival itself].*
- I.1 complements the Mishnah with a Tannaite addition.

**3:8**

- A. How do they undertake the purification of the Temple court? They immerse the utensils which were in the Sanctuary, and say to them, [26B] “Be careful not to touch the table and render it unclean.”**
- B. All utensils which were in the Temple have duplicates and triplicates, so that if the originals are made unclean, they may bring the duplicates in their place.**
- C. All utensils which were in the Temple require immersion,**

- D. except for the golden altar and the copper altar,
- E. “for they are in the status of the ground [and insusceptible to uncleanness to begin with] ,” the words of R. Eliezer.
- F. And sages say, “Because they are plated [with metal, gold or copper].”

**I.1** A. *A Tannaite statement*: “Be careful not to touch the table or the candlestick.”

- B. *Now why does our Tannaite authority not make reference to the candlestick or the table?*
- C. *In regard to the table, it is written “perpetual” [at Exo. 25:30], in regard to the candlestick, that word is not used in that same sense.*
- D. *And the other Tannaite authority?*
- E. *Since it is written, “And the candlestick over against the table” (Exo. 26:35), it is as though “perpetual” were written in that same connection.*
- F. *And the other Tannaite authority?*
- G. *That serves only to define the place where it is to be located.*
- H. *But to the contrary, I can deduce the insusceptibility of the table to uncleanness from the fact that it is a wooden utensil made for laying things thereon, and a wooden utensil used for laying things thereon is not subject to uncleanness. How come? We invoke the analogy of a sack: just as a sack is movable both when full and when empty, so everything that is movable full and empty is susceptible to uncleanness [since Lev. 11:32 refers to uncleanness for a wooden utensil and a sack in the same verse].*
- I. *But this too can be carried full or empty, in line with what R. Simeon b. Laqish said, for said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the phrase, ‘upon the pure table’ (Lev. 24: 6)? It is that it can become unclean. And yet, it is an article made of wood, and the fact is that an object made of wood that is made to set at rest cannot receive uncleanness. So the usage bears the lesson that they would lift it up and show the pilgrims the show bread that was on it, saying, ‘Behold God’s love for you! The bread when it is taken out is as fresh as it is when it is laid forth on the table a week earlier [and that miracle shows how much God loves you]’ [The table could be moved and therefore was subject to uncleanness, so ‘pure’ used in connection with the table bears the sense of, ‘free from the uncleanness that can be contracted.’]”*
- D. [Supply: *What is the meaning of “Behold God’s love for you”?*]
- E. *It is in accord with what R. Joshua b. Levi said, for said R. Joshua b. Levi, “The great miracle that took place with the show bread was that when it was removed it was as fresh as when it was set on the table, in line with this verse: ‘to put hot bread in the day that it was taken away’ (1Sa. 21: 7).”*
- F. *[But that the table was susceptible to uncleanness even though it is used simply for holding things on it] you may derive from the fact that it is plated with gold, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **The table and the side table (1) which were damaged or (2) which one covered with marble and on which one left a place for placing the cups are unclean. R. Judah says, “A place for leaving pieces” [M. Kel. 22:1].** [Susceptibility to uncleanness depends on the covering; if marble, which is insusceptible, can render it insusceptible, then gold plate, which is susceptible to uncleanness as metal, obviously will render the table susceptible.]*

*And should you say, well, the underlying acacia wood itself is valuable and is not nullified by plating, that would accord only with the position of R. Simeon b. Laqish, who has said, “The rule [that covering is determinative and nullifies wood] pertains only to utensils of common wood, which come from abroad, but as to utensils of polished wood, the wood is not nullified.” But what about the position of R. Yohanan, who has said, “Even utensils of polished wood are nullified by plating”? And should you say, the one speaks of permanent plating, the other, plating that is not permanent [and the covering of the Temple table is not permanent], note that R. Simeon b. Laqish asked R. Yohanan, “Does this pertain to permanent plating or only to temporary plating, only to overlaid rims or also to rims not overlaid?” and he answered him, “There is no distinction between permanent and temporary plating, nor between plating that overlays the rims and that which does not.” The table of the sanctuary was exceptional, [27A] since the All-Merciful classified it as wood: “The altar was of wood, three cubits high, and the length was two cubits, and the corners and the length and walls were of wood, and he said to me, this is the table that is before the Lord” (Eze. 41:22).*

- G. The verse comments with the altar and ends up with the table!
- H. *Both R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar said, “When the house of the sanctuary stood, the altar atoned for a person, but now that the house of the sanctuary no longer is standing, a person’s table atones for him.”*

**II.1 A. All utensils which were in the Temple have duplicates and triplicates, so that if the originals are made unclean, they may bring the duplicates in their place. All utensils which were in the Temple require immersion, except for the golden altar and the copper altar, “for they are in the status of the ground [and insusceptible to uncleanness to begin with],” the words of R. Eliezer:**

- B. With reference to the copper altar: “An altar of earth you shall make for me” (Exo. 20:24).
- C. with reference to the golden altar: “The candlestick and the altars” (Num. 3:31), thus comparing the altars to one another.

**III.1 A. And sages say, “Because they are plated [with metal, gold or copper]:”**

- B. *To the contrary, since they are overlaid, they should have been susceptible to uncleanness.*
- C. *Say: And sages declare them unclean, because they are plated [with metal, gold or copper].*
- D. *Or, if you prefer, I shall say, rabbis made that statement to R. Eliezer, namely: “What’s your opinion? Is it because they are overlaid? But the plating is treated as null in their regard [since they are classified as wood].”*

We conclude with a proposition that is inserted because reference is made to the altar of gold.

**III.2. A. Said R. Abbahu said R. Eleazar, “The fire of Gehenna does not rule over disciples of sages, via an argument a fortiori based on the salamander: if a salamander, which is an offspring of fire — one who anoints himself with its blood is not affected by fire, how much the more so disciples of the Torah, the very essence of which is fire: ‘Is not my word like fire, says the Lord’ (Jer. 23:29).”**

**III.3.** A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “The fire of Gehenna does not rule over the sinners of Israel, via an argument a fortiori based on the altar of gold: if the altar of gold, on which is only a denar of gold overlay, is not affected through years and years of fire, how much less the transgressors of Israel, who are as full of religious duties as a pomegranate is of seeds, for it is written, ‘Your temples are like a pomegranate split open’ (Son. 4: 3). Don’t read the letters that spell ‘your temples’ that way, but read them as though they bore vowels that yield ‘your worthless ones.’”

I.1 complements the Mishnah with a Tannaite addition. II.1, III.1 gloss the Mishnah statements. III.2, 3 are tacked on because No. 3 refers to the topic of No. 1. This is one of the few compositions in the entire tractate that lacks a clear relationship to a proposition in the Mishnah-paragraph.