

XIII.

BAVLI KETUBOT CHAPTER THIRTEEN

FOLIOS 104B-112B

13:1

- A. Two judges of civil law were in Jerusalem, Admon and Hanan b. Abishalom.
- B. Hanan lays down two rulings.
- C. Admon lays down seven.
- D. He who went overseas, and his wife [left at home] claims maintenance –
- E. [105A] Hanan says, “Let her take an oath at the end, but let her not take an oath at the outset [that is, she takes an oath when she claims her marriage contract after her husband’s death, or after he returns, that she has not held back any property of her husband].”
- F. Sons of high priests disputed with him and ruled, “Let her take an oath at the outset and at the end.”
- G. Ruled R. Dosa b. Harkinas in accord with their opinion.
- H. Said R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, “Well did Hanan rule, she should take an oath only at the end.”

- I.1** A. *An inconsistent statement was adduced as follows: Three judges of robbery cases were in Jerusalem, Admon b. Gadai, Hanan, the Egyptian, and Hanan b. Abishalom. How do you square three to two, and how do you square civil and robbery?*

- B. *Aren't there then contradictions between the formulations, three and two, and between civil and robbery?*
- C. *Well, as between three and two, there is no real contradiction, since the framer of the passage may count those that make a difference, and not those that do not [and two make the decision, among the three]. But surely, as between the readings, robbery cases and civil cases, there really is a contradiction!*
- D. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "[The courts were one and the same, but] they would issue decrees concerning robbery [decree: GZR, robbery, GZL]."
 E. *That is in accord with what has been taught on Tannaite authority: If a beast broke off a plant – R. Yosé says, "Those who in Jerusalem make decrees say, 'For the plants in the first year of growth, two silver pieces; for those in the second year, four.'"*

- I.2**
- A. *A further contradiction: Three judges of civil law were in Jerusalem, Admon, Hanan, and Nahum.*
 - B. *Said R. Pappa, "Who is the Tannaite authority who repeats, 'Nahum'? It is R. Nathan, in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Nathan says, 'Also Nahum the Mede was among those who make decrees in Jerusalem,' but sages did not concur with him."*
 - C. *And were there no others? Didn't R. Phineas say R. Oshayya said, "There were three hundred ninety-four courts in Jerusalem, corresponding to the number of synagogues and the number of schoolhouses and the number of schools for scribes"?*
 - D. *There were many more, to be sure, but we make reference in particular to judges of civil law.*

- I.3**
- A. Said R. Judah said R. Assi, "The civil judges who were in Jerusalem would collect their salary of ninety-nine maneh from Temple funds. If they didn't find that suitable, they would add to the salary."
 B. "If they didn't find that suitable"? *So are we dealing with money grubbers?*
 C. Rather: "If they didn't find that sufficient," they would give them more, even though they didn't want it.

Judges Who Take Bribes: Topical Composite

- I.4**
- A. *Qarna would get an istira from the party ruled innocent, and an istira from the party ruled guilty, and only then he informed them of his decision.*

- B. *How could he behave in such a way? And is it not written, “And you shall take no gift” (Exo. 23: 8)? And should you say that that rule applies only where the judge does not collect from both litigants, lest he corrupt justice, but Qarna, taking from both parties, would not corrupt justice, well, even if such a practice does not lead to the corruption of justice, is it permitted? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: Why does Scripture say so? Is it to indicate that one should not vindicate the guilty party and condemn the innocent, Scripture in any event says, “You shall take no gift” (Exo. 23: 8). Rather, even if it is to indicate the innocent and condemn the guilty, the Torah has said, “And you shall take no gift” (Exo. 23: 8)?*
- C. *That is the rule where the judge collects under the torah governing bribery, but Qarna took the money under the torah governing a legitimate court salary.*
- D. *Well, then, is it legitimate even to collect court salary? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: **He who takes payment for judging – his judgments are null [M. Bekh. 4:6A-B]**?*
- E. *That is the case if one is paid to give judgment, but Qarna accepted a fee only to cover the loss of a salary that he would have received for other work.*
- F. *So is it permitted to collect a fee only to cover the loss of a salary that he would have received for other work? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: Ugly is the judge who takes a fee for giving a judgment, but his judgment is a valid one. Now how shall we imagine the situation to which that statement pertains? Should we say that it means that he has taken a fee for carrying out the work of a judge? Then how can it be said, his judgment is a valid one, when we have learned, **He who takes payment for judging – his judgments are null**? So it must refer to taking a fee to cover the loss of a salary that he would have received for other work, and it is explicitly made as a Tannaite statement, Ugly is the judge!*
- G. *That is the case, indeed, if one takes a fee for not doing work that one can demonstrate one would have done, but Qarna took a fee for not doing work that he can have proved he would have done, since his regular job was to smell wine at a wine store, and for that he was paid a salary.*
- H. *Along these same lines, R. Huna, when people would come for judgment before him, would say to them, “Supply me with someone to draw water in my stead [and pay the salary I would have received for that work], and I’ll be glad to judge your case.”*

- I.5** A. Said R. Abbahu, “Come and note how the eyes of those who take bribes are blinded. If someone has eye trouble he pays money to an eye doctor. He may or may not be cured, but these judges, by contrast, take what is worth maybe a penny and with it they blind their eyes: ‘For a gift blinds those who have sight’ (Exo. 23: 8).”
- I.6** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
 B. “For a gift blinds the eyes of the sages” (Deu. 16:19) – all the more so fools,
 C. “...and perverts the words of the righteous” (Deu. 16:19) – all the more so the wicked.
 D. *Yeah, but are fools and wicked people likely to be sitting up their on the bench?*
 E. *Rather, this is the sense of the statement:* “For a gift blinds the eyes of the sages” (Deu. 16:19) – even a great sage who takes a bribe will not take his leave of this world without blindness of heart, “...and perverts the words of the righteous” (Deu. 16:19) – **[105B]** even if one is wholly righteous, if he takes a bribe, he will not take his leave of this world without suffering senility.
- I.7** A. When R. Dimi came, he said that R. Nahman bar Kohen gave an interpretation, “What is the meaning of that which is written, ‘The king by justice established the land, but he who loves gifts overthrows it’ (Pro. 29: 4)?
 B. “If the judge is like a king, who needs nothing [from anyone else but knows the law on his own], he will establish the land. But if the judge is like a priest who goes begging at the threshing places [to collect the priestly gifts], he will destroy it.”
- I.8** A. *Said Rabbah bar R. Shila, “A judge who goes around borrowing things is invalid for serving as a judge. But we have made such a statement only concerning one who has nothing to lend to third parties, but if he has things that he can lend to others, then his borrowing makes no difference.”*
 B. *Is that so? And lo, Raba borrowed things from the household of Bar Marion, but they didn’t borrow anything from him!*
 C. *In that case, borrowing from them was intended to give them greater importance [since he didn’t need anything from them].*
- I.9** A. *Said Raba, “How come taking a bribe is forbidden? Once one has taken a bribe from the other, he becomes sympathetic toward him, so that the other becomes the same as the self, and people don’t see their own faults. So what*

is the meaning of the word for bribe? It bears letters that yield, 'He is at one with the giver.'"

- I.10** A. *Said R. Pappa, "Someone should not serve as judge for either one whom he likes or one whom he hates, for someone can see nothing wrong in someone whom he likes, and nothing right in someone whom he hates."*
- I.11** A. *Said Abbaye, "A disciple of rabbis whom people in his neighborhood like – the reason is not because of his superior excellence, but because he doesn't tell people off when it comes to matters having to do with Heaven."*
- I.12** A. *Said Raba, "To begin with, I thought that everybody in Mehoza liked me. When I became a judge, I supposed that some of them would hate me and some of them would like me. When I realized that someone who loses a case today wins tomorrow, I reached the conclusion that, if they like me, everyone will like me, and if they hate me, everyone will hate me."*
- I.13** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
B. *"And you shall take no gift" (Exo. 23: 8) – it goes without saying that one should not take a gift consisting of money, but even a gift made up of words, too, is forbidden.*
C. *For Scripture doesn't say, And you shall take no gain.*
- I.14** A. *What is the definition of a gift made up of words?*
B. *It would be in line with the case of Samuel, who was crossing a river on a ferry, and someone came up and gave him his hand to help him. Samuel said to him, "So what are you doing here?"*
C. *He said to him, "I have a case to plead."*
D. *He said to him, "I am disqualified to judge your case."*
- I.15** A. *Amemar was in session and judging a case. A bird flew down on his head. Someone came up and took it away.*
B. *He said to him, "So what are you doing here?"*
C. *He said to him, "I have a case to plead."*
D. *He said to him, "I am disqualified to judge your case."*
- I.16** A. *Mar Uqba expectorated, so someone came up and covered it up.*
B. *He said to him, "So what are you doing here?"*
C. *He said to him, "I have a case to plead."*

D. *He said to him, "I am disqualified to judge your case."*

I.17 A. *R. Ishmael b. R. Yose – his tenant farmer would ordinarily bring him a basket of produce every Friday; once he brought it to him Thursday. [Ishmael] asked, "How come?"*

B. *He said to him, "I have a case to plead, and I thought that, by the way, I'd bring the master his fruit."*

C. *He would not accept it from him, saying, "I am disqualified to judge your case."*

D. *He called into session a pair of rabbis to try the case for him. While he was going about his business, he thought, "If I want, I could tend in this direction, and if I want, I could swing that way." He exclaimed, "May the souls of those who take bribes be smashed! Now, if, even though I didn't take the fruit, and, if I'd taken it, I was only taking what was mine, I am thinking along these lines, then how much the more will be the mental state of people who take bribes?"*

I.18 A. *R. Ishmael bar Elisha: Someone brought him the first fleece [as a priest]. He said to him, "Where do you come from?"*

B. *He said to him, "From Podunk."*

C. *"So isn't there any priest [in Podunk for you to give the fleece, or] anyone on the road from Podunk to here?"*

D. *He said to him, "I have a case to plead, and I thought that, by the way, I'd bring the master his fleece."*

E. *He would not accept it from him, saying, "I am disqualified to judge your case."*

F. *He called into session a pair of rabbis to try the case for him. While he was going about his business, he thought, "If I want, I could tend in this direction, and if I want, I could swing that way." He exclaimed, "May the souls of those who take bribes be smashed! Now, if, even though I didn't take the fruit, and, if I'd taken it, I was only taking what was mine, I am thinking along these lines, then how much the more will be the mental state of people who take bribes?"*

- I.19** A. *R. Anan: Someone brought him a bale of small marsh fish. He said to him, "So what are you doing here?"*
- B. *He said to him, "I have a case to plead."*
- C. *He would not accept it from him, saying, "I am disqualified to judge your case."*
- D. *He said to him, "I have no problem with your not judging my case, but won't the master accept it so that I won't be stopped from offering my first fruits? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: "And there came a man from Baal-shalishah and brought the man of God bread of the first fruits, twenty loaves of barley and fresh ears of grain in his sack" (2Ki. 4:42) – so was Elisha entitled to eat first fruit? But it is to indicate to you, whoever brings a gift to a disciple of a sage is as though he offered his first fruits'!"*
- E. *He said to him, "We didn't plan to accept your first fruits, but now that you've given me sound reason to, I will accept it." He sent him to R. Nahman. He sent him word, "Will the master try the case of this man, since I, Anan, am invalid to act as judge for him?"*
- F. *He thought, "Since he sent me such a message, it follows that he is his relation."*
- G. *At that moment a suit involving an estate was before him. He said, [106A] "The one represents a positive commandment and the other likewise, but the positive commandment of paying honor to the Torah takes precedence." So he set aside the estate case and called the suit of that man.*
- H. *When the man's contesting party saw this honor that he was paying to the other, he was speechless.*
- I. *Now Elijah would regularly come to R. Anan, repeating to him the Tannaite formulation of the Division of Elijah. But when he did this, the other disappeared. [Anan] sat in a fast and asked for mercy. The other came. But when the other came, he frightened him. He made a box for himself and he sat in it until he had completed the entire division with him, and this is why people refer to the Greater Division of Elijah and the Lesser Division of Elijah.*

- I.20** A. *In the time of R. Joseph there was a famine. Rabbis said to R. Joseph, “Will the master plead for mercy?”*
B. *He said to them, “Now if in the case of Elijah, with whom there remained twenty-two hundred rabbis even when the rabbis left him, he didn’t beg for mercy in a time of famine, how can I beg for mercy?”*
C. *And how do we know that there were so many with him?*
D. *As it is written, “And his servant said, ‘How should I set this before a hundred men’” (2Ki. 4:43)? And what can be the meaning of before a hundred men?*
E. *If we should say that all of them – the twenty loaves of barley, the one loaf of bread of first fruits, and the one loaf of fresh ears of grain, thus twenty-two, was to be set before him, then in a time of famine this would be quite a lot in fact! So it must be concluded, each loaf was set before a hundred men.*

- I.21** A. *When the rabbis took their leave of the household of Rab, they left behind a thousand two hundred rabbis;*
B. *when they took their leave of the household of R. Huna, eight hundred remained.*
C. *When R. Huna would deliver his addresses, he used thirteen intermediaries to serve as loudspeakers.*
D. *When rabbis took their leave after R. Huna’s addresses and shook their garments, the dust rose up and obscured the day, and people in the Land of Israel thought, “So they’ve finished after the discourses of R. Huna over there in Babylonia.”*
E. *When the main body of rabbis took their leave of the households of Rabbah and R. Joseph, four hundred stayed behind, and they described themselves as orphans.*

F. *When rabbis took their leave of the household of Abbaye – others say, the household of R. Pappa, others say, the household of R. Ashi – two hundred were left, and they called themselves “orphans of the orphans.”*

Proper Payment for Services Rendered in the Context of Sanctification

- I.22** A. Said R. Isaac bar Redipa said R. Ammi, “Those who examined animal blemishes in Jerusalem were paid from Temple funds.”
- B. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The disciples of sages who taught the rules of correct slaughter to the priests would collect their salary from Temple funds.”
- C. Said R. Giddal said Rab, “The disciples of sages who teach the laws of taking up the handful of the meal-offering to the priests would collect their salary from Temple funds.”
- D. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “Those who would correct the scripture of writings in Jerusalem would collect their salary from Temple funds.”
- E. Said R. Nahman said Rab, “The women who would weave the Temple curtains would collect their salary from Temple funds, but I say, it is from the money sanctified for the upkeep of the Temple house, since the curtains took the place of the work of the builders.”
- F. *An objection was raised:* Those who wove the Temple curtains, the house of Garmo, in charge of preparing the show bread, the house of Abtinah, in charge of preparing the incense – all of them collected their salary from Temple funds.
- G. *In that case, it is with reference to curtains for the gates, for* said R. Zira said Rab, “There were thirteen curtains in the second Temple, seven for the seven gates, one for the entrance to the entry, one for the entrance to the porch, two at the entrance of the holy place, and two above them, corresponding to them on the second floor [Slotki: to form a partition between the chambers above the holy place].
- I.23** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. The women who would raise their children for performing the rite of the red cow would be paid from Temple funds.
- C. Abba Saul says, “The upper-class women in Jerusalem would maintain them and give them food.”

- I.24** A. *The question was raised by R. Huna to Rab, [106B] “As to the utensils used for the Temple service, what is the law as to their being bought with what is consecrated for the upkeep of the Temple house? Are these classified as utensils for use with the altar, so they would constitute things paid for out of what has been consecrated for the upkeep of the Temple house? Or are they required for the making of the offering, in which case they are paid for out of the Temple treasury?”*
- B. He said to him, “They are paid for only out of the Temple treasury.”
- C. *An objection was raised: “And when they made an end, they brought the rest of the money before the King and Jehoiada, of which were made utensils for the house of the Lord, even utensils with which to minister” (2Ch. 24:14) [so offerings for the upkeep of the Temple house may be used for utensils of ministry].*
- D. *He said to him, “Whoever taught you the Writings didn’t teach you the Prophets: “But there were not made for the house of the Lord cups... for they gave that to them that did the work” (2Ki. 12:14-15).*
- E. *Then what we have is a conflict between verses of Scripture!*
- F. *There is no such conflict: The one refers to a case in which, after the collections were made for the upkeep of the Temple house, there was a surplus, the other, where no surplus remained.*
- G. *So even if there was a surplus, so what? [Can money raised for one purpose be diverted to some other?]*
- H. Said R. Abbahu, “The court itself stipulates in its heart concerning the drinks, that if they are required, they are necessary for that offering and are so used, but, if not, then they shall be used for making utensils of service.”
- I.25** A. *It has been stated by a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael: “Utensils of service were paid for by Temple funds, for Scripture states, ‘The rest of the money’ (2Ch. 24:14) – now what funds produced a surplus? Obviously, Temple funds.”*
- B. *But maybe this refers to the surplus itself?*
- C. The answer accords with what Raba said, “‘The burnt-offering’ (Lev. 6: 5) refers to the first burnt-offering,” [so here, too: “The money” refers to “the first money” [Slotki: the income of the current year, not only the balance].
- D. *An objection was raised: Funds to pay for the incense and all public offerings derived from Temple funds; for the golden altar, frankincense, and utensils of*

service, the money came from the residue of the money paid for drink-offerings; funds for the altar for burnt-offerings, the chambers, and the courts, came from money sanctified for the upkeep of the Temple house; and whatever needs accrued for service outside of the walls of the court were covered by the surplus of the Temple funds; and this explains that which we have learned: The money for the upkeep of the city wall, its towers, and all other needs of the city, derived from the surplus of the Temple funds!

E. *It is subject to dispute among Tannaite formulations, for we have learned in the Mishnah: The surplus of the heave-offering [itself] [of the sheqel]: What did they do with it? [They buy] golden plate for decorating the house of the Holy of Holies. R. Ishmael says, "The surplus of the profits [on wine, oil, and flour sold to people bringing private offerings] goes for [purchase of animals for sacrifice] for 'dessert' [the unused time of the altar], and the surplus of the heave-offering [of the sheqels] is for purchase of utensils for service."* R. Aqiba says, "The surplus of the heave-offering [of the sheqels] goes for 'dessert,' and the surplus of the drink-offerings is for purchase of utensils for service." R. Hananiah, Prefect of the Priests, says, "The surplus of the drink-offerings goes for 'dessert,' and the surplus of the heave-offering [of the sheqels] is for the purchase of utensils for service." But neither one concurred in the matter of profits [both maintaining that profits are not permissible] [M. [Sheb. 4:4](#)].

I.26 A. *As to the word "fruit" [given as the surplus of the profits [on wine, oil, and flour sold to people bringing private offerings] goes for [purchase of animals for sacrifice]], what is the meaning?*

B. *It is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. What did they do with the surplus of the offering? They bought produce at a low price and sold it at a high price, and, with the profits, they bought sacrifices for the time that the altar would otherwise have been left vacant, and that explains the meaning of the statement we have in the Mishnah: "The surplus of the profits [on wine, oil, and flour sold to people

bringing private offerings] goes for [purchase of animals for sacrifice] for ‘dessert’ [the unused time of the altar].”

I.27 A. *What is the meaning of the statement, But neither one concurred in the matter of profits [both maintaining that profits are not permissible]?*

B. *It is in line with that which we have learned in the Mishnah: As to the surplus of the residue of the [sheqel] chamber: What did they do with it? They purchase with it wine, oil, and fine flour. “And the profit [of the resale] belongs to the Temple,” the words of R. Ishmael. R. Aqiba says, “They do not make money in what belongs to the Temple or in what belongs to the poor” [M. Sheb. 4:3].*

C. *And why is it the case that they do not make money in what belongs to the Temple or in what belongs to the poor?*

D. *Maybe a poor person will appear to them, and they won’t have anything to give to him.*

II.1 A. **He who went overseas, and his wife [left at home] claims maintenance – Hanan says, “Let her take an oath at the end, but let her not take an oath at the outset [that is, she takes an oath when she claims her marriage contract after her husband’s death, or after he returns, that she has not held back any property of her husband].” Sons of high priests disputed with him and ruled, “Let her take an oath at the outset and at the end”:**

B. *It has been stated:*

C. Rab said, **[107A]** “They provide an allowance to a married woman [when the husband is overseas].”

D. Samuel said, “They do not provide an allowance to a married woman [when the husband is overseas].”

E. Said Samuel, “Abba [Rab] concedes to me that for the first three months, they do not do so, since someone would never leave his house empty.”

F. *Furthermore, when they have heard that the man has died, no one differs on the same matter. Where there is a point of difference, it concerns a time at which they have not heard that he has died.*

G. Rab said, “They provide an allowance to a married woman [when the husband is overseas],” for lo, he is obligated to support her.

H. *But on what basis has Samuel said, “They do not provide an allowance to a married woman [when the husband is overseas]”?*

I. *R. Zebid said, “One may propose that he left her bundles of valuables [that she can spend to support herself].”*

J. *R. Pappa said, “We take account of the possibility that he has said to her, ‘Let your wages [which I should receive] go in place of your support.’”*

K. *What is at stake between these two explanations?*

L. At stake between them is an adult woman, whose wages do not suffice, or a minor, whose wages do suffice. [The husband might leave valuables with an adult, not a minor; but she would not have agreed to substitute her wages for her support, and in Zebid’s view she would not get the court to rule that she may be supported, Pappa would hold she can do so; the minor would not be left valuables, but she might have agreed to trade support for wages; Zebid would allow her to get court support, Pappa would not allow it (Slotki)].

M. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **He who went overseas, and his wife [left at home] claims maintenance – Hanan says, “Let her take an oath at the end, but let her not take an oath at the outset [that is, she takes an oath when she claims her marriage contract after her husband’s death, or after he returns, that she has not held back any property of her husband].” Sons of high priests disputed with him and ruled, “Let her take an oath at the outset and at the end.” So what is at issue is the matter of the oath. But we do accord her support.***

N. *Samuel explained the passage to refer to a case in which they heard that he had died.*

O. *Come and take note: One who went overseas and his wife claimed support – the sons of the high priests say, “Let her take an oath.” Hanan says, “She does not*

have to take an oath.” And if he returned and said, “I provided support for her,” he is believed.

P. *Here, too, the passage refers to a case in which they heard that he had died.*

Q. *But lo, the detail is included, And if he returned and said...!*

R. This was after the rumor had come in.

S. *Come and take note: One who went overseas and his wife claims support, if he came and said, “Let her salary take the place of her support payments,” he has the right to do so. If the court went ahead and ordered support for her, what they have ordered is handed over to her [T. Ket. 12:4A-E].*

T. *Here, too, the passage refers to a case in which they heard that he had died.*

U. *Come and take note: He who went overseas, whose wife claims support – the court takes over his estate and supports and provides maintenance for his wife but not for his sons and daughters or something else.*

V. Said R. Sheshet, “This refers to a case in which he supports his wife through a third party.”

W. *If so, then how about his sons and daughters, too?*

X. It is a case in which he supports his wife through a third party, but not his sons or daughters.

Y. *Well, how in the world do you know that for sure [when the passage doesn’t know that distinction]?*

Z. *Said R. Pappa, “It deals with a case in which they have heard from only one witness that he has died. If she wanted to remarry on the strength of the evidence of one witness, she may do so, and therefore we provide her with support; but his sons and daughters, since if they wish to take over his estate, they may not do so merely because one witness says he has died, also are not given support.”*

- II.2** A. *What is something else?*
B. R. Hisda said, “This refers to [Slotki:] cosmetics.”
C. R. Joseph said, “It is funds to give to philanthropy.”
D. *The one who has said it refers to cosmetics all the more so [107B] would concur that it encompasses funds for charity [not to be given in the second version]. The one who says that it is funds for charity will exclude cosmetics [and see that she has money for that], since he does not want her to become disheveled.*

- II.3** A. *Come and take note:* A deceased childless brother’s widow for the first three months after the death of the husband is supported by the estate of the husband. Thereafter she is supported neither from the estate of the husband nor from the estate of the levir. If the levir went to court but then ran off, she is supported by the estate of the levir. If she was subject to the levirate relationship with a minor, she gets nothing from him.
B. *Samuel can say to you, “So what should we take into account in her case [to deprive her of the right to support]? If it is that she has been left with some bundles of valuables, we can say that the levir is not well disposed toward her; and if there is an exchange of her wages for her support, she can say she doesn’t owe him her wages”* [Slotki: hence the indisputable right of the court to grant an allowance out of the absent levir’s estate; in the case of an absent husband, where both possibilities exist, Samuel’s ruling holds].
C. *Come and take note:* **A woman who went with her husband overseas and who returned and said, “My husband has died” – if she wants, she takes her support, if she wants, she collects her marriage settlement. If she said, “My husband has divorced me,” she continues to be supported to the limit of her marriage settlement [T. Ket. 10:3].**

D. *Here, too, the passage refers to a case in which they heard that he had died.*

E. *So how come she gets just up to the value of her marriage settlement?*

F. *It is because she is the one who has caused herself this loss.*

G. *Come and take note:* Under what circumstances have they said, a girl who exercises the right of refusal has no claim on support? You cannot say that it is a case in which she is dwelling under her husband's authority, for lo, her husband is liable to support her. So it must be a case in which her husband has gone overseas. She borrowed money and bought her food. Then she went and declared her refusal to remain wed. *So lo, the operative consideration is that she has exercised the right of refusal. Lo, if she had not done so, we should have provided her with maintenance!*

H. *Samuel can say to you, "So what should we take into account in her case [to deprive her of the right to support]? If it is that she has been left with some bundles of valuables, we can say that to a minor he would leave no such valuables; and if there is an exchange of her wages for her support, she can say that a minor's wages won't be enough."*

II.4 A. *So what's the upshot?*

B. *When R. Dimi came, he said, "There was a case that came before Rabbi in Beth Shearim, and he assigned her support. Another came before R. Ishmael in Sepphoris and he did not assign her support."*

C. *R. Yohanan found this surprising:* "How come R. Ishmael didn't assign her support? Lo, the dispute between the sons of the high priests and Hanan pertains only to the matter of taking an oath, *but as to support, we do assign that to her!*"

D. *Said to him R. Shemen bar Abba, "Our lord, Samuel, in Babylonia has already explained this to refer to a case in which they had heard that the husband had died."*

E. *He said to him, "You certainly solve a lot of problems with that answer."*

F. *When Rabin came, he said, "There was a case that came before Rabbi in Beth Shearim, and he did not assign her*

support. Another came before R. Ishmael in Sepphoris and he did assign her support.”

G. Said R. Yohanan, “How come Rabbi didn’t assign her support? Lo, the dispute between the sons of the high priests and Hanan pertains only to the matter of taking an oath, *but as to support, we do assign that to her!*”

H. Said to him R. Shemen bar Abba, “Samuel, in Babylonia, has already explained this to refer to a case in which they had heard that the husband had died.”

I. *He said to him, “Do you certainly solve so many problems with that answer?”*

J. *And the decided law accords with Rab, and they do provide support for the wife;*

K. *and the decided law accords with what R. Huna said Rab said, for said R. Huna said Rab, “A woman has the right to say, ‘I shall not be supported by you, and I shall not work for you.’”*

L. *And the decided law is in accord with R. Zebid in regard to glazed utensils of earthenware, for said R. Zebid, “As to glazed utensils of earthenware, if they are white or black, they are permitted for use, but if they are green, they are forbidden [being porous, being assumed to have absorbed forbidden substances]. But that is the case only if they have no cracks. But if they are cracked, they are forbidden.”*

13:2

- A. **He who went overseas, and someone went and supported his wife –**
- B. **Hanan says, “He [who did so] has lost his money.”**
- C. **Sons of high priests disputed with him and ruled, “Let him take an oath for however much he has laid out [in support of the wife] and collect [the debt].”**
- D. **Ruled R. Dosa b. Harkinas in accord with their opinion.**
- E. **Said R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, “Well did Hanan rule. He has put his money on the horn of a gazelle.”**

- I.1** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah there: He who is prohibited by vow from deriving benefit from his friend – [108A] he [the friend] nonetheless pays out his sheqel [half-sheqel tax to the Temple], pays back his debt, and returns to him something which he [the one who took the vow] has lost. But in a place in which for this action a reward is paid out, the benefit [of the reward] should fall to the sanctuary [M. Ned. 4:2].*
- B. *Now there is no problem understanding that he may pay his sheqel tax for him, because he is performing a religious duty, and it has been taught on Tannaite authority, The taking up of the heave-offering is made in respect to what is lost, collected, and yet to be collected.*
- C. *And there is no problem understanding that he returns to him something that he has lost, because he is performing a religious duty. But on what basis may he pay back his debt?! Lo, he surely confers a benefit on him!*
- D. *Said R. Oshayya, “Lo, who is the authority behind this rule? It is Hanan, who has said, ‘He [who did so] has lost his money.’”*
- E. *And Raba said, “You may even say that this represents rabbis’ view. Here with what case do we deal? It is one in which the man borrowed the money on condition that he not have to pay it back [except if he feels like it].”*
- F. *Now we can well understand why Raba did not conceive the matter in the way in which R. Oshayya did, since he preferred to interpret the rule in accord with the majority, the rabbis. But how come R. Oshayya did not explain matters as did Raba?*
- G. *R. Oshayya may say to you, “Granting that he has no concrete benefit from the repayment of the debt, [108B] still, doesn’t he get something out of not being ashamed?”*
- H. *Another version: There, too, he has a benefit, namely, not having to be embarrassed to see the other party.*

13:3

- A. **Admon lays down seven.**
- B. **He who died and left sons and daughters,**
- C. **when the property is ample,**
- D. **the sons inherit, and the daughters receive support [from the estate].**
- E. **[And when] the property is negligible, the daughters receive maintenance, and the sons go out begging at [other peoples’] doors.**
- F. **Admon says, “Do I lose because I am male?”**

G. Said Rabban Gamaliel, “I prefer Admon’s opinion.”

I.1

- A. *What’s the point of the statement?*
- B. *Said Abbaye, “This is the point of the statement: **Because I am male** and suitable to engage in Torah study, **do I lose?**”*
- C. *Said to him Raba, “So if he is engaged in Torah study he inherits, and if he isn’t engaged in Torah study he doesn’t inherit?!”*
- D. *Rather, said Raba, “This is the point of the statement: **Because I am male** and suitable to inherit a large estate, **do I lose** my rights of inheritance in a small estate?”*

13:4

- A. **He who claims that his fellow [owes him] jugs of oil, and the other party admitted that he owes him [empty] jugs –**
- B. **Admon says, “Since he has conceded part of the claim, let him take an oath.”**
- C. **And sages say, “This is not concession along the lines of the original claim .”**
- D. **Said Rabban Gamaliel, “I prefer Admon’s opinion.”**

I.1

- A. *One may then infer that, from the viewpoint of rabbis, if one laid claim for wheat and barley, and the other party conceded the claim for barley, the bailee is exempt from having to take an oath? Then we may say that we have a refutation of the statement that R. Nahman said Samuel said, for R. Nahman said Samuel said, “If he claimed wheat and barley and the other conceded one of them, he is liable.”*
- B. *Said R. Judah said Rab, “It is a case in which he claimed a specific measure of oil.”*
- C. *Well, if that’s the case, then what can possibly be the reason for the view of Admon? Rather, said Raba, “All parties concur that in a case in which the claimant said, ‘I have a bailment of the contents of ten jars of oil in your tank,’ the claim is for the oil but not the jars; and if he said, ‘You owe me ten jars full of oil,’ he claims both the oil and the jars. Where they differ is a case in which he said to him, ‘I have ten jugs of oil in your possession.’ Admon says, ‘In this formulation there is an allusion to the jugs as well,’ and rabbis maintain, ‘In this formulation there is no allusion to the jugs as well.’”*
- D. *So the operative consideration is that in this formulation there is no allusion to jugs, from which it would follow that if there were in this formulation an*

allusion to jugs, he would have been liable to take an oath. *Then may we say that we have a refutation of the statement that R. Hiyya bar Abba said, for said R. Hiyya bar Abba, "If the one laid claim for wheat and barley and the other conceded the claim for one of them, he is exempt"?*

- E. Said R. Shimi bar Ashi, "Such a claim is treated as though he had claimed a pomegranate with its peel" [Slotki: between the oils and the jars in which it is kept there exists a connection similar to that of the pomegranate and its peel; but between wheat and barley there is no such connection; an admission of one of the two in the former cases may be regarded as an admission of the same kind as the claim, though admission of one of the two in the latter case cannot be so regarded].
- F. *Objected Rabina to this statement: "A pomegranate without its peel isn't going to last, but oil can be kept without its jugs. Rather, here, with what situation do we deal? It is one in which he said to him, 'I have a bailment of ten jugs of oil in your domain,' and the other said to him, 'As to the oil, there was never such a transaction, and as to the jars, I owe you five, but I don't owe you the other five!' Admon says, 'In this formulation there is an allusion to the jugs as well,' and since he has to take an oath as to the jugs, he likewise is subjected to an augmented oath as to the oil, and rabbis maintain, 'In this formulation there is no allusion to the jugs as well, with the result that what the one claimed, the other did not concede, and what the other conceded, the one did not claim.'"*

13:5

- A. **He who agrees to give money to his son-in-law but then stretched out the leg [defaulted] –**
- B. **[109A] let her sit until her head turns white.**
- C. **Admon says, "She can claim, 'If I had made such an agreement in my own behalf, well might I sit until my head grows white. Now that father has made an agreement concerning me, what can I do? Either marry me or let me go!'"**

- I.1** A. *Our Mishnah paragraph is not in accord with the Tannaite authority of the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Yosé b. R. Judah, "There is no dispute between Admon and sages concerning a case in which the father made an arrangement in her behalf of funds to be paid to the son-in-law and then absconded, for the girl can say, 'Abba made an agreement in my regard, so what can I do about it?' Where*

there is a difference, it is a case in which the girl herself made the agreement in her own behalf, for sages say, ‘Let her sit until her head turns white,’ and Admon says, ‘She can say, “I thought that Father would give the money for me, but now that Father is not giving the money for me, what can I do? Either marry me or free me.”’” Said Rabban Gamaliel, “I prefer the position of Admon” [T. [Ket. 12:4F-K](#)].

- I.2**
- A. A Tannaite statement:
 - B. Under what circumstances? In the case of an adult, but, as to a minor, they use force....
 - C. *Upon whom do they use force? Should I say, on the father? Then it should be just the opposite!*
 - D. So, said Raba, “They use force against the husband, to divorce her.”
- I.3**
- A. Said R. Isaac b. Eleazar in the name of Hezekiah, “In any place in which Rabban Gamaliel said, ‘I prefer the position of Admon,’ the law is in accord with him.”
 - B. *Said Raba to R. Nahman, “Is that the case even in a Tannaite statement external to the Mishnah?”*
 - C. *He said to him, “So did we say, in the Mishnah? What we said was, in any place!”*
 - D. Said R. Zira said Rabbah bar Jeremiah, “In two matters in which Hanan made his statement, the law is in accord with him; in the seven matters in which Admon made his statements, the law is not in accord with him.”
 - E. *What’s the point of this statement? Should I say, this is the point of the statement:* In two matters in which Hanan made his statement, the law is in accord with him – and with those who follow the same lines, and in the seven matters in which Admon made his statements, the law is not in accord with him – or with those who follow the same lines, well, then, did not R. Isaac b. Eleazar in the name of Hezekiah state, “In any place in which Rabban Gamaliel said, ‘I prefer the position of Admon,’ the law is in accord with him”?
 - F. *Rather, this is the sense of his statement:* In two matters in which Hanan made his statement, the law is in accord with him – and with those who follow the same lines, and in the seven matters in which Admon made his statements, the law is not in accord with him – *but lo,*

it does not accord with those who follow his line, but it accords with his position in all his rulings.

G. *But lo*, did not R. Isaac b. Eleazar in the name of Hezekiah state, “In any place in which Rabban Gamaliel said, ‘I prefer the position of Admon,’ the law is in accord with him”? *The sense is then, that is the case where he made such a statement, but not where he did not make such a statement!*

H. *Rather, this is the sense of the statement:* In two matters in which Hanan made his statement, the law is in accord with him – and with those who follow the same lines, and in the seven matters in which Admon made his statements, there are those among them in which the law is in accord with his position, and there are those among them in which the law is not in accord with his position but with him who follows his view, for in any situation to which Rabban Gamaliel made the statement, “I prefer the position of Admon,” the law is in accord with Admon’s position, but not in any other situation.

13:6

- A. He who contests [another’s] ownership of a field, but he himself is a signatory on it [the documents of ownership] as a witness –
- B. Admon says, “He can claim, ‘The second [owner of the property] was easier for me, and the first was harder than he [for purposes of repossessing the field which in any case is mine].’”
- C. And sages say, “He has lost every right.”
- D. [If] he made his field a boundary mark for another person, he has lost every right.

- I.1** A. [He who contests [another’s] ownership of a field, but he himself is a signatory on it [the documents of ownership] as a witness – Admon says, “He can claim, ‘The second [owner of the property] was easier for me, and the first was harder than he [for purposes of repossessing the field which in any case is mine]’”:] Said Abbaye, “This rule has been laid down only in the case of a witness, but not in the case of a judge, in which instance he does not lose his title. *For R. Hiyya set forth the Tannaite statement*, ‘The witnesses sign a bond only if they have read it, **[109B]** but judges may well sign onto a document even though they have not read it.’”

II.1 A. **If he made his field a boundary mark for another person, he has lost every right:**

B. Said Abbayye, “This rule has been laid down only if it was **for another person**, but if it was for himself, he has not lost every right. For he may claim, ‘If I hadn’t done that for him, he would not have sold the field to me.’ *For then what can you say? He should have made a declaration of some sort? He can reply, ‘Your friend has a friend, and the friend of your friend has a friend’ [so he would have heard about it].*”

II.2 A. *There was someone who made a field a boundary mark for a third party, and one of the witnesses contested its ownership but then died. A guardian was appointed over his estate. The case came before Abbayye, who cited to the guardian, “If he made his field a boundary mark for another person, he has lost every right.”*

B. *He said to him, “If the father of the orphans were alive, couldn’t he have claimed, ‘I conceded to him only one furrow of the field [just next to the field that was sold, and the estate should reclaim the rest of the field (Slotki)]’?”*

C. *He said to him, “Well said! For said R. Yohanan, ‘If he claimed, saying, “I conceded to him only one furrow of the field,” he is believed.’ Go, give him one furrow.”*

D. *On the furrow was a clump of palm trees, and the guardian said to Abbayye, “If the father of the orphans were alive, couldn’t he have made the plea, ‘But I bought it back from him’?”*

E. *He said to him, “Well said! For said R. Yohanan, ‘If he claimed, “But I bought it back from him,” he is believed.”*

F. *Said Abbayye, “Someone who appoints a guardian over an estate should appoint someone like this fellow, who really knows how to turn matters in favor of orphans.”*

13:7

A. **He who went overseas, and the right-of-way to his field was lost –**

B. **Admon says, “Let him go the shortest way.”**

C. **And sages say, “Let him purchase a right-of-way with a hundred manehs [if need be],**

D. **“or let him fly through the air.”**

- I.1** A. *What can possibly form the operative consideration in the mind of rabbis? Didn't Admon make a plausible statement?*
- B. *Said R. Judah said Rab, "'Here, [in explanation of rabbis' position,] with what sort of a situation do we deal? It is one in which the property of four persons surrounded the field on all four sides [Slotki: so that each person pleads that it was not in his field but in one of the others that the lost path lay].'"*
- C. *If so, then what is the operative consideration behind Admon's ruling?*
- D. *Said Raba, "It is a case in which all four persons derive their right of ownership for four persons, or where four persons derive it from one prior owner, all concur that the adjacent property owners can refuse him. Where there is a dispute, it involves a case in which there is one owner, who derived his rights of ownership from four prior owners. Admon takes the view that the man whose right-of-way has been lost can say to him, 'In any event, my right-of-way runs through your fields,' and the rabbis take the view that the other party can reply, 'Well, if you shut up, no problem, but if not, I'll return the deeds to their original owners, and you cannot call them to court.'" Now may we say that R. Abba takes the position of rabbis here, and R. Jeremiah concurs with the thinking of Admon?*
- E. *R. Abba may say to you, "I take the view that I do even within the position of Admon. Admon takes the position that he does in that case only because the man who has lost his right-of-way can say to the other, 'Whichever way you want it, my sole path lies in your fields.' Rabbis take the view that the other party can say to him, 'Well, if you shut up, no problem, but if not, I'll return the deeds to their original owners, and you cannot call them to court.'" "*

I.2 A. *There was a dying man who said to them, "A palm tree to my daughter," but the male heirs divided the estate and didn't give her the palm tree. R. Joseph considered ruling, "That is in line with our Mishnah paragraph." [Slotki: Like the owners of the adjacent fields, each of whom shifts the responsibility for the path onto the others, so each brother can shift the responsibility for the palm tree onto the other brothers.]*

B. *Said to him Abbayye, "So are they really parallel? In that case, each individual has the power to dismiss the claimant, but here, the palm tree is held in common."*

C. *So what's their remedy?*

D. *They have to hand over the palm tree and then go and divide up the estate again.*

I.3 A. *There was a dying man who said to them, “A palm tree to my daughter,” but when he died, he left two halves of a palm tree. In session R. Ashi found this difficulty: “Does someone call two halves of a palm tree a palm tree, or is that not the case?”*

B. *Said R. Mordecai to R. Ashi, “This is what Abimi of Hagronayya said in the name of Raba, ‘Someone will call two halves of a palm tree a palm tree.’”*

13:8

A. [110A] **He who produces a bond of indebtedness against someone else, and the other brought forth [a deed of sale to show] that the other had sold him a field –**

B. **Admon says, “He can claim, ‘If I owed you money, you should have collected what was coming to you when you sold me the field.’”**

C. **And sages say, “This [first] man was smart in selling him the field, since he can take it as a pledge.”**

I.1 A. *What can possibly form the operative consideration in the mind of rabbis? Didn’t Admon make a plausible statement?*

B. *In a locale in which one pays the money first and then writes a deed, all parties concur that he can say to him, ‘He can claim, “If I owed you money, you should have collected what was coming to you when you sold me the field.”’ Where there is a dispute, it pertains to a locale in which they write the deed first and then give the money. Admon reasons that the claimant ought to have articulated his motive, and rabbis maintain that the claimant can reply, ‘So your friend has a friend, and the friend of your friend has a friend’ [so it would get back to him, which is contrary to my interests].”*

13:9

A. **Two who produced bonds of indebtedness against one another –**

B. **Admon says, “If I had actually owed you any money, how is it possible that you borrowed from me?”**

C. **And sages say, “This one collects his bond of indebtedness, and that one collects his bond of indebtedness.”**

I.1 A. *It has been stated:*

- B. Two who produced bonds of indebtedness against one another –
- C. R. Nahman said, “The one collects what is owing to him, and the other collects what is owing to him.”
- D. R. Sheshet said, “*So what’s the point of trading moneybags?* Rather, the one holds on to what is his, and the other holds on to what is his.”

I.2 A. *All parties concur that if each party possesses land of the highest quality, or land of middling quality, or land of miserable quality, they certainly would be in a situation of trading moneybags. Where there is a dispute, it concerns a case in which this one has land of middling quality and that, of miserable quality. Then, R. Nahman takes the view that the one collects what is owing to him, and the other collects what is owing to him, in the theory that the assessment for a creditor who is seizing land of a debtor is made on the basis of what belongs to the debtor, so that the owner of the land of miserable quality goes and seizes the land of middling quality belonging to the other, which then becomes the best; and the other can take from him only land of the most miserable quality. R. Sheshet takes the view that in that case, too, it is merely a trade of moneybags, because he maintains that the assessment for a creditor who is seizing land of a debtor is made on the basis of a generally prevailing criterion of land classification; then, when in the end the original owner of the land of middling quality seizes property of the other, he is taking back land that is of the classification only of his own middling quality land.*

B. *Well, from the perspective of R. Nahman, on what basis do you maintain that the owner of land of miserable quality makes his seizure first? Why not have the owner of the land of middling quality make his seizure first, grabbing the worst quality property of the other, and then let the other seize that property [Slotki: the other could not seize medium quality property, which is now his best]?*

C. *The rule is required to deal with a case in which the holder of the land of miserable quality made his claim first.*

D. *Oh, come on now! When they present their claims, surely they come simultaneously! Rather, the rule is necessary to cover a case in which one party has land of the highest quality and of middling quality, and the other party holds land only of the most miserable quality. One authority holds, the assessment is made in terms of*

property owned by the debtor, *and the other party takes the view that the assessment is made in terms of the quality of property in general.*

E. *[As against the position of R. Sheshet,] we have learned in the Mishnah: And sages say, “This one collects his bond of indebtedness, and that one collects his bond of indebtedness.”*

F. *R. Nahman explains as follows: “According to R. Sheshet, this refers to a case in which one had borrowed for ten years, the other for five [Slotki: so that it is advantageous to the debtor of the loan for the longer period that his bond not be balanced against the other’s].”*

G. *How can such a situation be imagined? Should I say that the first claimant’s bond is for ten years, the second, for five, then in such a case would Admon ever say, “If I had actually owed you any money, how is it possible that you borrowed from me”! Lo, the time for repayment hasn’t come yet. And if the first was for five years and the second for ten, what sort of a situation can be contemplated? If the time to repay the bond had come, then how can rabbis possibly have explained their position? And if the time for payment had not come, then that is the fact, so how can Admon possibly have explained his position?*

H. *The rule was required to deal with a case in which the holder of the bond bearing the earlier collection date, that is, the five-year bond, came to borrow on the very day on which the five years came to an end. The one set of authorities take the view that someone may well borrow money for a single day [so both bonds are valid], and the other master maintains that it is not common for someone to borrow money for a single day [so he accepts the claim, “If I had actually owed you any money, how is it possible that you borrowed from me”].*

I. *R. Ammi bar Hama said, “Here we deal with a case in which one of the bonds derives from an estate, which can recover a debt but from which a debt cannot be recovered [through seizure of land].”*

J. *But lo, the language is used, This one collects his bond of indebtedness, and that one collects his bond of indebtedness!*

K. *[The sense must be:] This one collects his bond of indebtedness, and that one is entitled to collect his bond of indebtedness but collects nothing.*

L. Said Raba, “There are two pertinent objections to that explanation. *First of all, the language is used, This one collects his bond of indebtedness, and that one collects his bond of indebtedness! And second, couldn't the other party permit the estate to seize a piece of his real estate and then seize it back, in line with what R. Nahman said, for said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, ‘If an estate seized real estate in collection of a debt owing to the deceased, the creditor may then go and seize it from the estate’?*”

M. *That's a solid objection.*

N. *Why not assign the rule to a case in which the estate owns land of the most miserable quality, and the other party owned land of both the best and middling quality, in which case the estate goes and collects the debt from land of middling quality, and then they permit him to seize land of their worst quality? For even if, in general terms, we classify real estate in accord with a single, prevailing criterion, still, a debt may be collected from an estate only out of land of the most miserable quality.*

O. *That is the case, in particular, where the creditor has not yet seized land belonging to the estate, but if he has seized land, he keeps it.*

13:10

- A. There are three provinces in what concerns marriage: (1) Judah, (2) Transjordan, and (3) Galilee.
- B. They do not remove [wives] from town to town or from city to city [in another province].
- C. But in the same province, they do remove [wives] from town to town or from city to city,
- D. [110B] but not from a town to a city, and not from a city to a town.
- E. They remove [wives] from a bad dwelling to a good one but not from a good one to a bad one.
- F. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Also not from a bad one to a good one, for the good one is a test [puts her to the proof].”

- I.1** A. *There is no problem understanding why one may not remove a wife from city to town, since in a city you can get everything, but not in a town. But why can't you move a wife from a town to a city?*

- B. *That supports the position of R. Yosé bar Hanina, for said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that life in cities is hard? ‘And the people blessed all men that willingly offered themselves to dwell in Jerusalem’ (Neh. 11: 2).”*

II.1 A. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Also not from a bad one to a good one, for the good one is a test [puts her to the proof]”:

- B. *What is the meaning of the good one is a test [puts her to the proof]?*
C. *It is in line with what Samuel said, for said Samuel, “The change in diet [for rich meals] is the beginning of stomachache.”*

II.2 A. It is written in the book of Ben Sira: “‘All the days of the poor are evil’ (Pro. 15:15, Ben Sira 31: 5).”

B. *But aren’t there Sabbaths and festival days?*

C. *It is in line with what Samuel said, for said Samuel, “The change in diet [for festival meals] is the beginning of stomachache.”*

II.3 A. Ben Sira says, “Also the nights. Lower than other roofs is his roof, and on the top of the mountain is his vineyard; the rain of other roofs is on his roof, and the earth of his vineyard is washed down into the vineyards of others.”

13:11

- A. All have the right to bring up [his or her family] to the Land of Israel, but none has the right to remove [his or her family] therefrom.
B. All have the right to bring up to Jerusalem, but none has the right to bring down –
C. all the same are men and women.
D. [If] one married a woman in the Land of Israel and divorced her in the Land of Israel, he pays her off with the coinage of the Land of Israel.
E. [If] he married a woman in the Land of Israel and divorced her in Cappadocia, he pays her off in the coinage of the Land of Israel.
F. [If] he married a woman in Cappadocia and divorced her in the Land of Israel, he pays her off in the coinage of the Land of Israel.
G. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “He pays her off in the coinage of Cappadocia.”
H. If he married a woman in Cappadocia and divorced her in Cappadocia, he pays her off in the coinage of Cappadocia.

- I.1** A. **[All have the right to bring up [his or her family] to the Land of Israel, but none has the right to remove [his or her family] therefrom:]** *What does the language, All have the right to bring up, serve to encompass?*
- B. *He means to encompass slaves. [If a person overseas owns a circumcised slave whom he wishes to sell, the slave may impose upon the master the requirement that the sale take place only in the Land of Israel.]*
- C. *But in the view of him who repeats the tradition at hand in such wise as to make explicit reference to slaves [along with others specified, upon all of whom one may impose the requirement of emigrating from the Exile to the Land of Israel], what [classification of persons is to be] included [by the formulation using the inclusionary language, all]?*
- D. *It is meant to encompass [a move from] a lovely home [in the Exile] to a mean hovel [in the Land of Israel].*
- E. *[And when the framer of the same passage uses the language,] But all may not remove [a person from the Land of Israel to the Exile, M. Ket. 13:11], what [classification of persons does he mean] to include?*
- F. *It is to include a slave who fled from overseas to the Land [of Israel]. For we say to him, "Sell him here and go," so as to foster Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel.*

- II.1** A. **All have the right to bring up to Jerusalem, [but none has the right to bring down]:**
- B. *What [classification of cases does this formulation mean] to include?*
- C. *It would be a case in which one proposed to move from a mean hovel [in Jerusalem] to a lovely home [outside of Jerusalem].*
- D. *As to the language, but none has the right to bring down, what is encompassed under this augmentative language?*
- E. *This encompasses even moving from a poor to a fine house. And since the language was used in the one clause, but none has the right to remove [his or her family] therefrom, the same formulation governed the other: but none has the right to bring down.*

- II.2** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **If the husband wants to go up but the wife doesn't, they force her to go up, and if not, she must go forth without receiving her marriage settlement. If she wants to go up to the Land of Israel and he doesn't,**

they force him to emigrate, and if he doesn't agree, he has to divorce her and pay off her marriage settlement.

- C. If she wants to go down and he doesn't, she is forced not to emigrate, and if it does not do any good to pressure her, she is divorced and not paid her marriage settlement. If he wants to go down and she doesn't, he is pressured not to go down, but if that does no good, he has to divorce her and pay off her marriage settlement [T. **Ket. 12:5J-L**].

III.1 A. [If] one married a woman in the Land of Israel and divorced her in the Land of Israel, he pays her off with the coinage of the Land of Israel. [If] he married a woman in the Land of Israel and divorced her in Cappadocia, he pays her off in the coinage of the Land of Israel. [If] he married a woman in Cappadocia and divorced her in the Land of Israel, he pays her off in the coinage of the Land of Israel:

- B. *There is a contradiction in the wording of this rule. First of all, the Tannaite formulation goes, [If] one married a woman in the Land of Israel and divorced her in the Land of Israel, he pays her off with the coinage of the Land of Israel. Therefore the operative criterion is the currency of the locale in which the indenture was accepted [which is the Land of Israel]. But then the passage proceeds: [If] he married a woman in the Land of Israel and divorced her in Cappadocia, he pays her off in the coinage of the Land of Israel. Therefore the operative criterion is the currency of the place in which the payment is carried out!*
- C. *Said Rabbah, "This is repeated in the framework of the lenient rulings of the marriage settlement, the operative theory being that the marriage settlement derives from the authority of rabbis. And as to the statement, **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel** says, 'He pays her off in the coinage of Cappadocia,' he takes the position that the marriage settlement derives from the authority of the Torah."*

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

- B. **He who produces a bond of indebtedness against his fellow and "Babylonia" is written therein collects on the strength of that document in the coinage of Babylonia.**
- C. **If in it is written, "the Land of Israel," he collects in the currency of the Land of Israel.**

- D. If it is written out without further specification, if he produced it in Babylonia, he collects in Babylonian currency; if he produced it in the Land of Israel, he collects in the currency of the Land of Israel.
- E. If it refers to “silver,” without further specification, then the borrower may pay in any way he likes.
- F. But this ruling does not apply to the marriage settlement [T. Ket. 12:6A-G].

III.3 A. *To what does that make reference?*

B. *Said R. Mesharshayya, “It refers to the first clause [Slotki: unlike a creditor, who collects in the currency of the place of issue, the woman collects her marriage settlement only in the cheaper currency], thus excluding the position of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, who takes the position that the marriage settlement derives from the authority of the Torah.”*

III.4 A. If it refers to “silver,” without further specification, then the borrower may pay in any way he likes:

- B. *Might one say that reference is made to unminted silver?*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “It is written in the document, ‘minted....’”*
- D. *Maybe it means small change?*

E. *Said R. Pappa, “Who ever heard of small change made of silver!”*

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

- B. Someone should always live in the Land of Israel, even in a town in which the majority is gentile, but not abroad, even in a town with an Israelite majority.
- C. For whoever lives in the Land of Israel is as though he has the true God, but whoever lives abroad is as though he has no God: “To give you the land of Canaan, to be your God” (Lev. 25:38).
- D. So does someone who does not live in the Land of Israel have no God! Rather, it is to tell you, whoever lives abroad is as though he worships idols. And so in the case of David Scripture says, “For they have driven me out this day that I should not cleave to the inheritance of the Lord, saying, ‘Go, serve other gods’” (1Sa. 26:19). Now who in the world ever said to David, “Go, serve other gods”? But it tells you that whoever lives outside of the Land of Israel is regarded as though he worshipped idols [T. A.Z. 4:3-5].

- III.6** A. *R. Zira was avoiding R. Judah, for [the former] wanted to go up to the Land of Israel, while R. Judah held, “Whoever goes up from Babylonia to the Land of Israel violates a positive commandment, for it is said, [111A] ‘They shall be brought to Babylonia and there they shall be until the day that I remember them, says the Lord’ (Jer. 27:22).”*
- B. And R. Zira?
- C. *That verse refers to the utensils of service.*
- D. And R. Judah?
- E. *There is yet another verse of Scripture: “I adjure you, daughters of Jerusalem, by the gazelles and by the hinds of the field, that you do not awaken or stir up love until it please” (Son. 2: 7).*
- F. And R. Zira?
- G. *That verse means that the Israelites should not go up en masse.*
- H. And R. Judah?
- I. *There is another reference as well to, “I adjure you” (Son. 3: 5).*
- J. And R. Zira?
- K. *That is required in line with what R. Yosé b. R. Hanina said, for he said, “What need is served by these three references to oaths? One is that the Israelites should not go up en masse, one is that the Holy One, blessed be He, has imposed an oath on Israel not to rebel against the nations of the world, and one refers to the fact that the Holy One, blessed be He, imposed an oath on the gentiles not to oppress Israel too much.”*
- L. And R. Judah?
- M. Scripture says, “That you do not awaken or stir up.”
- N. And R. Zira?
- O. *That is required in line with what R. Levi said, “What is the purpose of the six oaths? Three serve the purpose we have specified, and as to the others, what they mean is, not to reveal the end time, not to delay the end time, and not to tell gentiles the secret of the end time.”*

III.7 A. “...by the gazelles and by the hinds of the field...” (Son. 2: 7):

B. Said R. Eleazar, “Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to Israel, ‘If you carry out the oath, well and good, and if not, I shall permit your flesh like that of gazelles and hinds.’”

III.8 A. Said R. Eleazar, “Whoever lives in the Land of Israel dwells without sin: ‘And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick, the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity’ (Isa. 38:24).”

B. *Said Raba to R. Ashi, “We repeat this verse with reference to those who bear disease.”*

III.9 A. Said R. Anan, “Whoever is buried in the Land of Israel is as though he were buried under the altar. Here it is written, ‘An altar of earth you shall make to me’ (Deu. Exo. 20:21), and elsewhere, ‘And his land does make expiation for his people’ (Deu. 32:42).” [The translations are Slotki’s.]

III.10 A. *Ulla would regularly go up to the Land of Israel. He died abroad. They came and told R. Eleazar. He said, “You, Ulla – ‘should you die in an unclean field’ (Amo. 7:17)?”*

B. They told him, “His bier has come.”

C. He said to them, “Being gathered in [to the Land] when alive is not the same thing as being gathered into the Land after death.”

III.11 A. *There was someone to whose lot a levirate widow fell in Khuzistan. He came before R. Hanina. He said to him, “What is the law on going down there to enter into levirate marriage?”*

B. He said to him, “His brother married a gentile and died, blessed be the Omnipresent, who killed him – and is this one going to follow him?!”

III.12 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “Just as it is forbidden to go forth from the Land of Israel to Babylonia, so it is forbidden to go forth from Babylonia to any other country.”

B. *Rabbah and R. Joseph both said, “Even from Pumbedita to Be Kubé.”*

III.13 A. *There was someone who went forth from Pumbedita to Be Kubé. R. Joseph excommunicated him.*

B. *Someone went forth from Pumbedita to Astonayya. He died.*

C. *Said Abbaye, “If that neophyte rabbi had wanted it, he would still be alive.”*

III.14 A. *Rabbah and R. Joseph both said, “The truly suitable persons in Babylonia – the Land of Israel receives them. The truly fit persons in other countries – Babylonia receives them.”*

B. *For what purpose are they classified as truly suitable? Should one say, this is as to genealogy? But did not a master state, "All other countries are like gross dough [not fine flour] in comparison to the Land of Israel, and the Land of Israel is like gross dough by comparison to Babylonia"? So it must have to do with burial.*

- III.15** A. Said R. Judah, "Whoever dwells in Babylonia is as though he dwelt in the Land of Israel: 'Ho, Zion, escape, you who dwells with the daughter of Babylonia' (Zec. 2:11)."

**The Messianic Age, the Age to Come,
In the Context of Residence in the Land of Israel**

- III.16** A. Said Abbaye, "We hold a tradition that Babylonia will not see the birth pangs of the Messiah." He explained this to speak to Husal in Benjamin, which he called, "the corner of refuge."

- III.17** A. Said R. Eleazar, "The dead that are abroad will not come back to life: 'And I will set glory in the land of the living' (Eze. 26:20) – the dead buried in the land where I have my desire will live, but the dead of the land in which I have no desire won't live."

- B. Objected R. Abba bar Mammal, "'Your dead shall live, my dead bodies shall arise' (Isa. 26:19) – *doesn't* 'your dead shall live' mean, they will live among the dead that are in the Land of Israel, *and doesn't* 'my dead bodies shall arise' mean, to the dead outside of the Land; *and doesn't* 'and I will give glory in the Land of Israel' refer to Nebuchadnezzar, *concerning whom the All-Merciful has said, 'I will bring against them a king who is as swift as a stag'?*"
- C. He said to him, "My lord, I expound another verse of Scripture: 'He who gives breath to the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein' (Isa. 42: 5)."
- D. *But isn't it written, My dead bodies shall arise?*
- E. *That refers to abortions.*
- F. *And R. Abba bar Mammal – how does he interpret the verse, He who gives breath to the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein?*
- G. *He requires it in line with what R. Abbahu said, for said R. Abbahu, "Even a Canaanite slave girl located in the Land of Israel is certain that she will belong to the world to come. Here it is written, 'He who gives breath to the people upon it,' and elsewhere, 'Abide you here with the ass' (Gen. 22: 5) – 'a people that are like an ass.'"*

III.18 A. “And spirit to them that walk therein”:

B. Said R. Jeremiah bar Abbah said R. Yohanan, “Whoever walks four cubits in the Land of Israel is certain that he will belong to the world to come.”

III.19 A. Then according to R. Eleazar, won’t the righteous who are outside of the Land live [at the end of time]?

B. Said R. Ilai, “It will come about through rolling [to the Land].”

C. Objected R. Abba Sala the Elder, “Won’t the rolling hurt the righteous?”

D. Said Abbaye, “Underground passages will be made for them.”

III.20 A. “You shall carry me out of Egypt and bury me in their burial ground” (Gen. 47:30):

B. Said Qarna, “There is something hidden here. Jacob our father knew full well that he was completely righteous, and, if the dead who are outside of the Land will live, why in the world did he make so much trouble for his children? It is since he might not have sufficient grace accorded to him to roll through the paths.”

C. Along these same lines you say, “And Joseph imposed an oath on the children of Israel saying, ‘...you will carry up my bones from here’” (Gen. 50:25):

D. Said R. Hanina, “There is something hidden here. Joseph knew full well that he was completely righteous, and, if the dead who are outside of the Land will live, why in the world did he make so much trouble for his brothers over a trip of four hundred parasangs? It is since he might not have sufficient grace accorded to him to roll through the paths.”

III.21 A. *His brothers [in the Land of Israel] sent word to Rabbah*, “Jacob our father knew full well that he was completely righteous, and, if the dead who are outside of the Land will live, why in the world did he make so much trouble for his children? It is since he might not have sufficient grace accorded to him to roll through the paths.”

B. Ilfa adds, “There was the case of someone who was anguished about a woman and who wanted to emigrate. When he heard this, he accepted his bachelorhood until the day of his death.”

III.22 A. Even though you are a great sage, studying on one’s own is not the same as learning from one’s master. And if you should

say you have no master [in the Land but only abroad], you will certainly have a master [in the Land]!

B. And who is it? It is R. Yohanan.

C. If you do go up, take cautions about three matters: Don't sit too much, for sitting is bad for the behind.

D. Don't stand too much, for standing is bad for the heart.

E. And don't walk too much, for walking is bad for the eyes.

F. Rather, divide your time into three parts, a third for sitting, a third for standing, a third for walking.

G. Any sitting that does not involve leaning – standing is better than that.

H. Standing *do you say!* But didn't you say, "Standing is bad for the heart"? Rather, sitting [111B] that does not involve leaning – standing with something for leaning is better than that.

III.23

A. [Reverting to the message to Rabbah:] And so they said, "Isaac, Simeon, and Oshayya said the same thing, namely, 'The decided law is in accord with R. Judah in respect to mules.'"

B. *So it was taught on Tannaite authority: A mule in heat is not mated with a horse or an ass, but only with one of its own species [T. Kil. 1:8A-B].*

III.24 A. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Isaac refers to R. Isaac Nappaha, Simeon refers to R. Simeon b. Pazzi, and some say, R. Simeon b. Laqish; Oshayya refers to R. Oshayya b. Rabbi."

III.25 A. Said R. Eleazar, "Boors will not live [in the age to come]: 'The dead will not live' (Isa. 26:14)."

B. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. "The dead will not live" (Isa. 26:14):

D. Might one suppose that this refers to everybody?

E. Scripture says, "The lax will not rise" (Isa. 26:124) – referring to those that are lax in studying the teachings of Torah.

F. *Said R. Yohanan [to Eleazar], "It gives no pleasure to their master [God] that you should talk of them in that way. The verse refers to those who are lax to such an extent as to worship idols."*

- G. He said to him, “I am expounding a different verse of Scripture, namely, ‘For your dew is as the dew of light, and the earth shall bring the dead to life’ (Isa. 26:19) – whomever makes use of the light of the Torah – the light of the Torah will resurrect, and whomever does not make use of the light of the Torah – the light of the Torah will not resurrect.”
- H. *Since he saw that he was pained*, he said to him, “My lord, I have found a remedy for them from the Torah itself: ‘But you who cleave to the Lord your God are alive every one of you this day’ (Deu. 4: 4) – now is it really possible to cleave to the Presence of God? Isn’t it written, ‘For the Lord your God is a devouring fire’ (Deu. 4:24)? Rather, whoever marries his daughter to a disciple of a sage, whoever does business in behalf of disciples of sages, whoever gives benefit to disciples of sages out of his own property is regarded by Scripture as though he cleaved to the Presence of God.”
- I. So too: “To love the Lord your God, to hearken to his voice, and to cleave to him” (Deu. 30:20):
- J. Now is it really possible for a mortal to cleave to the Presence of God? Rather, whoever marries his daughter to a disciple of a sage, whoever does business in behalf of disciples of sages, whoever gives benefit to disciples of sages out of his own property is regarded by Scripture as though he cleaved to the Presence of God.”

III.26 A. Said R. Hiyya bar Joseph, “The righteous are destined to break through the earth and come up at Jerusalem: ‘And they shall blossom out in the city like grass of the earth’ (Psa. 72:16), and ‘city’ is only Jerusalem: ‘For I will defend this city’ (2Ki. 19:34).”

- B. And said R. Hiyya bar Joseph, “The righteous are destined to rise from the grave wearing their own clothing, for there is an argument a fortiori to that effect based on a grain of wheat: If a grain of wheat, buried naked, sprouts with all manner of coverings, all the more so the just, buried in their shrouds!”
- C. And said R. Hiyya bar Joseph, “The Land of Israel is destined to bring forth baked cakes of the highest quality and silk clothing: ‘There will be a rich grainfield in the land’ (Psa. 72:16).”

III.27 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “There will be a rich grainfield in the land upon the top of the mountains” (Psa. 72:16):
- C. Say: Wheat is destined to grow as tall as a palm tree and grow on the top of the mountains.

- D. And should you suppose that it will be trouble to cut it, Scripture says, “Its fruit shall rustle like Lebanon” (Psa. 72:16) – the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring a wind from his treasure house and it will blow on it and loosen its fine flour, and someone will walk out into the field and pick up merely a handful and out of that will have enough to provide for himself and his entire household.

III.28 A. “With the kidney fat of wheat” (Deu. 32:14):

- B. Say: Wheat is destined to be as large as the two kidneys of a big bull.
C. And don’t find this surprising, for lo, a fox once made his nest in a turnip, and when the residue was weighed, it weighed sixty pounds by the pound weight of Sepphoris.

III.29 A. *It was taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Joseph, “There was a case of someone at Shihin, whose father left him three mustard twigs, and one of them was split and produced nine qabs of mustard, and its wood was enough to cover a potter’s hut.”

III.30 A. Said R. Simeon b. Tahalipa, “Father left us a cabbage stalk, and we would climb up and down it with a ladder.”

III.31 A. “And the blood of the grape you drank foaming wine” (Deu. 32:14) –

- B. say: This world is not like the world to come. In this world there is the trouble that goes into harvesting the grapes and treading them, but in the world to come, a person will bring along a single grape on a wagon or a boat, put it in the corner of his house, and then draw on its contents as if it were a big cask of wine, while the wood that goes without will be used for cooking fires.
C. And there won’t be a grape that will not contain at least thirty barrels of wine: “And the blood of the grape you drank foaming wine” (Deu. 32:14) – read the letters that yield “foaming” as though they read “the measure, a homer” [thirty seahs].

III.32 A. *When R. Dimi came, he said, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘Binding his foal onto the vine’ (Gen. 49:11)?*

- B. “You will have not a single vine in the Land of Israel that does not require all of the residents of a town to harvest it.
C. “And as to, ‘And his ass’s colt to the choice vine’ (Gen. 49:11)? You won’t find a single wild tree in the Land of Israel that doesn’t produce a load of produce for two she-asses.

- D. “And should you suppose that it won’t contain wine, it is stated, ‘He washes his garments in wine’ (Gen. 49:11).
- E. “And should you say it isn’t red, it is said, ‘And of the blood of the grape you drank foaming wine’ (Deu. 32:24).
- F. “And should you suppose that it will not inebriate, it is said, ‘His vesture’ [using letters that yield ‘incite, agitate’ (Slotki)].
- G. “And should you suppose it is bland, it is said, ‘His eyes shall be red with wine’ (Gen. 49:12), so any tongue that taste it will say, ‘To me, to me.’
- H. “And lest you think it will be all right for youngsters but not for old folks, it is said, ‘And his teeth white with milk’ (Gen. 49:12) – don’t read the letters that yield ‘teeth white’ as such, but rather as though their vowels yielded, ‘To him who is advanced in years.’”
 - I. *What’s the simple sense of the verse of Scripture?*
 - J. *When R. Dimi came, he said, “Said the gathering of Israel before the Holy One, blessed be He, ‘Lord of the world, just give me a wink, and that will be sweeter than wine, and show me your teeth, and that will be sweeter than milk.’”*
 - K. *That supports what R. Yohanan said, for said R. Yohanan, “The one who shows a smile to his fellow is better than one who gives him milk to drink: ‘And his teeth white with milk’ – don’t read the letters that yield ‘teeth white’ but rather ‘showing the teeth [in a smile].”*

The Remarkable Productivity of the Land of Israel

- III.33** A. *R. Hiyya bar Adda was an elementary teacher for the children of R. Simeon b. Laqish. He took a three-day absence and did not come. When he came, he said to him, “Why were you absent?”*
- B. *He said to him, “Because my father left me one espalier, and on the first day I was absent, I cut three hundred grape clusters from it, each yielding a keg; on the second, three hundred, each two of which yielded a keg. On the third day, three hundred, three each of which yielded a keg. And I renounced my ownership of more than half of the yield.”*
- C. *He said to him, “Well, if you hadn’t been absent, it would have yielded even more.”*
- III.34** A. *R. Ammi bar Ezekiel visited Bené Beraq. He saw goats grazing under fig trees, with honey flowing from the figs, and milk running from the goats, and*

the honey and milk mingled. He said, "That is in line with 'a land flowing with milk and honey' (Exo. 3:8, Num. 13:27)."

- III.35** A. Said R. Jacob b. Dosetai, "From Lud to Ono is three Roman miles. Once I got up early at dawn and I walked up to my ankles in fig honey."
- III.36** A. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "I personally saw the flood of milk and honey of Sepphoris, and it extended over sixteen square miles."*
- III.37** A. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, "I personally saw the flood of milk and honey of the entirety of the Land of Israel, [112A] and it extended from Be Mikse to the Fort of Tulbanqi, twenty-two parasangs long, six parasangs wide."*
- III.38** A. *R. Helbo, R. Avira, and R. Yosé bar Hanina came to a certain place. They brought before them a peach as large as a pot of Kefar Hino – and how big is that? Five seahs. A third of the peach they ate, a third they declared ownerless, and a third they placed before their animals.*
- B. *The next year R. Eleazar came there. They brought one to him. He took it into his one hand and said, "'A fruitful land into a salt waste, for the wickedness of them that dwell therein (Psa. 107:34).'"*
- III.39** A. *R. Joshua b. Levi came to Gabela. He saw vines heavy with grape clusters, standing up like calves. He said, "Calves among the vines?"*
- B. *They said to him, "All they are are clusters of ripe grapes."*
- C. He exclaimed, "Land, land, hold back your produce? To whom do you yield it? To those Arabs who stood against us on account of our sins?"
- D. *A year later R. Hiyya came there. He saw them standing like goats. He said, "Goats among the vines?"*
- E. *They said to him, "All they are are clusters of ripe grapes. Get out of here, don't do to us what your friend did."*
- III.40** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. What is the extent of the blessings that are bestowed on the Land of Israel?
- C. A bet seah produces fifty thousand kor.
- D. But in Zoan, when it was settled, a bet seah yielded only seventy kor.
- E. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. Said R. Meir, "I saw in the valley of Bet Shean that a bet seah yielded seventy kor."

G. Now you have no finer land among all the lands than the land of Egypt: “Like the garden of the Lord in the land of Egypt” (Gen. 13:10), and in all of the land of Egypt, there is no finer area than Zoan, *where they would raise their kings*: “For his princes are at Zoan.” And, moreover, you have in the Land of Israel no rockier ground than at Hebron, *where the dead were buried*. And nonetheless, Hebron was seven times more productive than Zoan: “And Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt,” (Num. 13:22), *and what is the sense of built? Should one suppose that it means, literally, built?* But is it possible for someone to build a house for his younger son before he builds one for his older son, as it is said, “And the sons of Ham, Cush and Mizraim and Put and Canaan” (Gen. 10: 6)? But the sense is, it is seven times more fertile than Zoan.

H. *That is the case of rocky ground*, but as to ground that is not rocky, it is five hundred times more fertile. *And that is the case* when the land is not blessed, but when it is blessed, “And Isaac sowed in that land and the land in the same year yielded a hundred fold.”

III.41 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. Said R. Yosé, “A seah’s land in Judah would yield five seahs: a seah of flour, a seah of fine flour, a seah of bran, a seah of coarse bran, and a seah of cibarium [Slotki].”

III.42 A. *A certain Sadducee said to R. Hanina, “It is quite right that you should sing the praises of your land. My father left me one bet seah in it, and from that ground I get oil, wine, grain, pulse, and my cattle feed on it.”*

III.43 A. *Said an Amorite to someone who lives in the Land of Israel, “How much do you collect from that date tree on the bank of the Jordan?”*

B. *He said to him, “Sixty kor.”*

C. *He said to him, “You haven’t improved it, you’ve ruined it, because we used to collect from it a hundred and twenty kor.”*

D. *“Well, I was talking to you about the yield of only one side.”*

III.44 A. *Said R. Hisda, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘I give you a pleasant land, the heritage of the deer’ (Jer. 3:19)? How come the Land of Israel is compared to a deer? To tell you, just as a deer’s hide cannot, when flayed, contain its flesh, so the Land of Israel cannot contain its produce [there being insufficient facilities to store that much].*

- B. "Another explanation: Just as the deer is swiftest of all wild beasts, so the Land of Israel is the swiftest among all the lands in ripening its fruit.
- C. "Might you say, just as the deer is swift but its meat is not fat, so the Land of Israel ripens swiftly, but its produce is not fat, Scripture says, 'flowing with milk and honey,' which are richer than milk, sweeter than honey."

III.45 A. *When R. Eleazar went up to the Land of Israel, he said, "I have escaped one thing." When he was ordained, he said, "Now I have escaped two." When they seated him on the council for intercalating the year, he said, "Now I have escaped three: 'And my hand shall be against the prophets that see vanity...they shall not be in the council of my people' (Eze. 13: 9) – this refers to the council for intercalating the year. '...neither shall they be written in the register of the house of Israel' (Eze. 13: 9) – this refers to ordination. '...neither shall they enter into the Land of Israel' (Eze. 13: 9) – this means what it says."*

III.46 A. *When R. Zira went up to the Land of Israel, he did not find a ferry to cross the river, so he took hold of a rope bridge and crossed. A Sadducee said to him, "Hasty people, you put your mouths before your ears ['we shall do and we shall listen'], you still as always hold on to your rashness."*

B. *He said to him, "A place that Moses and Aaron did not have the heavenly favor of seeing – as for me, who is going to tell me that I am going to have the grace of entering it [which accounts for my haste]!"*

III.47 A. *R. Abba would kiss the cliffs of Akko.*

B. *R. Hanina would go out and repair the roads.*

C. *R. Ammi and R. Assi [112B] would get up and move from sun to shade and from shade to sun.*

D. *R. Hiyya bar Gameda would roll himself in the dust of the land: "For your servants take pleasure in her stones and love her very dust."*

III.48 A. Said R. Zira said R. Jeremiah bar Abba, "'The generation to which the son of David will come will be marked by persecution of disciples of sages.' Now, when I said this before Samuel, he said, 'Test after test: "And if there be yet a tenth of it, it shall again be eaten up" (Isa. 6:11).'"

III.49 A. *R. Joseph repeated as a Tannaite statement, "Plunderers and plunderers of the plunderers."*

III.50 A. Said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, “All of the barren trees that are located in the Land of Israel are destined to bear fruit: ‘For the tree bears its fruit, the fig tree and vine yield their strength’ (Joe. 2:22).”