

II.

BAVLI TRACTATE HAGIGAH CHAPTER TWO FOLIOS 11B-20B

2:1

- A. They do not expound upon the laws of prohibited relationships [Lev. 18] before three persons, the works of creation [Gen. 1-3] before two, or the Chariot [Eze. 1] before one,
- B. unless he was a sage and understands of his own knowledge.
- C. Whoever reflects upon four things — it would have been a mercy had he not been born:
- D. what is above, what is below, what is before, and what is beyond.
- E. And whoever has no concern for the glory of his Maker — it would have been a mercy for him had he not been born.
- I.1 A. *You say to begin with, or the Chariot [Eze. 1] before one, but then you go on to say, unless he was a sage and understands of his own knowledge!?*
- B. *This is the sense of the matter: They do not expound upon the laws of prohibited relationships [Lev. 18] before three persons, the works of creation [Gen. 13] before two, or the Chariot [Eze. 1] before one, unless he was a sage and understands of his own knowledge.*
- II.1 A. They do not expound upon the laws of prohibited relationships [Lev. 18] before three persons:
- B. *How come? Should I say, because it is written, “Whosoever to any that is near of kin to him” (Lev. 18: 6), with the result that the implication of “whosoever” implies two, and “near of kin to him” one, and the All-Merciful has said, “You shall not approach to uncover their nakedness” (Lev. 18: 6) [Abraham: that is, reveal the reasons underlying the laws of the forbidden relations]? But then, it also is written, “Whosoever curses his God” (Lev. 24:15) and “Whosoever gives his seed to Molech” (Lev. 20: 2) — so would the same rule apply to these subjects?*

- C. *Well, these “whosoever” are required to extend the law to gentiles, indicating they are admonished not to curse the Name of God and not to worship idols just as is Israel.*
- D. *If that’s so, then the same usage is required to extend the law against consanguineous marriage to gentiles, making them liable to that law just as is Israel.*
- E. *The rule of the Mishnah therefore derives from the verse of Scripture, “Therefore shall you keep my charge” (Lev. 18:30) — “shall you keep” involves two, “my charge,” one, and the All-Merciful has said, “That you do not do any of these abominable customs.”*
- F. *Well, then, what about the verses, “You shall therefore keep the Sabbath” (Exo. 31:14), “and you shall observe the feast of unleavened bread” (Exo. 12:17), “and you shall keep the charge of the holy things” (Num. 18: 5) — are these passages also subject to the same rule [that they may be expounded before three persons]?*
- G. *Rather, said R. Ashi, “What is the meaning of the statement, **They do not expound upon the laws of prohibited relationships before three persons?** They do not expound the secrets concerning forbidden relationships to three. *Why not? It is a matter of common sense: when three are in session before their master, one engages in analytical argument with his master, and the other two pay close attention to the learning-process; if there are three, one engages in analytical argument with his master, and the other two engage in analytical argument with one another and don’t know, then, what the master is saying, so they will end up permitted what is forbidden in consanguineous relationships!*”*
- H. *Well, now, if that’s what’s at stake, then you can make the same argument with reference to the entirety of the Torah!*
- I. *The matter of consanguineous relationships is exceptional, for a master has said, “**robbery and fornication, which the soul of a man desires and after which he lusts — he who keeps away from them how much the more will attain merit**” [M. Mak. 3:15K].*
- J. *Well, then, if that’s the case, you can make the same rule on the laws concerning robbery!*
- K. *In the case of consanguineous relations, whether the chance is there or not, someone has a real lust; in the case of robbery, if the chance is there, someone will want to take it, but if not, he won’t get involved.*

III.1 A. the works of creation [Gen. 1-3] before two:

- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact?*
- C. *It is as our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *“For ask you now of the days past” (Deu. 4:32) — one may ask, two may not.*
- E. *Might one suppose that a person may raise questions about what is prior to the creation of the world?*
- F. *Scripture states, “Since the day that God created man upon the earth” (Deu. 4:32).*
- G. *Might one suppose that a person may not raise questions about the six days of creation?*

- H. Scripture states, “the days past that were before you” (Deu. 4:32).
- I. Might one suppose one may raise questions about what is above and what is below, what is before and what is after?
- J. Scripture states, “And from one end of heaven to the other” (Deu. 4:32) — thus: “And from one end of heaven to the other” you may raise questions, but you may not raise questions about what is above and what is below, what is before and what is after.
- K. **[12A]** *Now that that fact is derives from the language, “And from one end of heaven to the other” (Deu. 4:32), then what need do I have for the language, “Since the day that God created man upon the earth” (Deu. 4:32)?*
- L. *It is in accord with what R. Eleazar said, for said R. Eleazar, “The first Adam was from earth to the firmament: ‘Since the day that God created man upon the earth’ (Deu. 4:32). But when he went sour, the Holy One, blessed be he, put his hand on him and cut him down to size: ‘you have fashioned me after and before and laid your hand upon me’ (Psa. 89: 5).”*

Disquisition on the Works of Creation

No. 2 is joined to the foregoing because of its proposition concerning the first man; the prior item has closed with the same issue. But, as we see, now commences a topical composite on the topic just now introduced. Once the topic of the works of creation makes its appearance, a full miscellany on the subject is included. I see no organizing proposition, and I also cannot explain why one item comes before some other, or why two items are juxtaposed to one another. If there is a more than random program at hand, I do not grasp its point.

- III.2.** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “The first man stretched from one end of the world to the other, as it is said, ‘Since the day that God created man upon the earth, even the one end of heaven to the other’ (Deu. 4:32). When he turned rotten, the Holy One, blessed be he, put his hand on him and cut him down to size, for it is said, ‘You have hemmed me in behind and before and laid your hands upon me’ (Psa. 139: 5).”
 - B. *If so, then the two verses are contradictory.*
 - C. *This and that refer to a single standard.*
- III.3.** A. And said R. Judah said Rab, “Ten things were created on the first day, and these are they: heaven and earth, chaos and desolation, light and darkness, wind and water, the length of day and the length of night.
 - B. “heaven and earth: ‘In the beginning God created heaven and earth’ (Gen. 1: 1).
 - C. “chaos and desolation: ‘And the earth was chaos and desolation’ (Gen. 1: 2).
 - D. “light and darkness:’ as to darkness, ‘And darkness was upon the face of the deep’ (Gen. 1: 2); as to light, ‘And God said, let there be light’ (Gen. 1: 3).
 - E. “wind and water: ‘And the wind of God hovered over the face of the waters’ (Gen. 1: 2).
 - F. “the length of day and the length of night: ‘And there was evening and there was morning, one day’ (Gen. 1: 5).”

III.4. A. *A Tannaite statement:* “chaos” is a green line that encompasses the whole earth, out of which darkness emerges: “He made darkness his hiding place round about him” (Psa. 18:12).

B. “Desolation:” this refers to [Abraham:] slimy stones that are sunk in the deep, out of which the waters well up: “And he shall stretch over it the line of confusion and the plummet of emptiness” (Isa. 34:11).

III.5. A. *But was the light created on the first day? And isn't it written,* “And God set them in the firmament of the heaven” (Gen. 1:17), and further, “And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day” (Gen. 1:19)?

B. *It is in accord with R. Eleazar, for said R. Eleazar,* “Through the light that the Holy One, blessed be he, created on the first day a person could see from one end of the world to the other. When the Holy One, blessed be he, foresaw the generation of the flood and the generation of the division, and realized that their deeds would be corrupted, he went and hid away that light from them: ‘But from the wicked their light is withheld’ (Job. 38:15).

C. “In behalf of whom did he hide it away? It is for the righteous in the age to come: ‘And God saw the light, that it was good’ (Gen. 1: 4), and ‘good’ refers only to the righteous: ‘say of the righteous that he is good’ (Isa. 3:10). When he saw the light that he had stored away for the righteous, he rejoiced: ‘he rejoices at the light of the righteous’ (Pro. 13: 9).”

III.6. A. *This is in accord with a conflict of Tannaite statements:*

B. “Through the light that the Holy One, blessed be he, created on the first day a person could see from one end of the world to the other,” the words of R. Jacob.

C. And sages say, “It is the very same as the lights, for they were created on the first day but were hung up in the firmament only on the fourth.”

III.7. A. Said R. Zutra bar Tubiah said Rab, “With seven things was the world created: wisdom and understanding, reason and strength, rebuke and might, righteousness and judgment, loving kindness and compassion.

B. “wisdom and understanding: ‘The Lord by wisdom founded the earth and by understanding established the heavens’ (Pro. 3:19).

C. “reason: ‘By his reason the depths were broken up’ (Pro. 3:20).

D. “and strength and might: ‘Who by his strength sets fast the mountains, who is girded about with might’ (Psa. 65: 7).

E. “rebuke: ‘The pillars of heaven were trembling but they became astonished at his rebuke’ (Job. 26:11).

F. “righteousness and judgment: ‘Righteousness and judgment are the foundation of your throne’ (Psa. 89:15).

G. “loving kindness and compassion: ‘Remember, Lord, your compassions and mercies, for they have been from of old’ (Psa. 25: 6).”

III.8. A. And said R. Judah said Rab, “At the moment that the Holy One, blessed be he, created the world, it kept expanding like [Abraham:] two clews of warp, until the Holy One, blessed be he, growled at it and stopped it short: ‘The pillars of heaven were trembling but they became astonished at his rebuke’ (Job. 26:11).”

- B. *That is in line with what R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "What is the meaning of that which is written, 'I am God almighty' (Gen. 17: 1)? 'I am the one who said to the world, 'Enough.'"*
- C. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "At the moment that the Holy One, blessed be he, created the sea, it kept expanding until the Holy One, blessed be he, growled at it and dried it up: 'He rebukes the sea and dries it up and dries up all the rivers' (Nah. 1: 4)."

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

- B. The House of Shammai say, "Heaven was created first, then the earth was created: 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth' (Gen. 1: 1).
- C. And the House of Hillel say, "The earth was created first, then heaven: 'In the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven' (Gen. 2: 4)."
- D. Said the House of Hillel to the House of Shammai, "In accord with your view, someone first builds the upper story, and then the basic house itself: 'It is he who builds his upper chambers in the heaven and has founded his vault upon the earth' (Amo. 9: 6)."
- E. Said the House of Shammai to the House of Hillel, "In your view a person makes the footstool first, then the throne: 'Thus says the Lord, the heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool' (Isa. 66: 1)."
- F. But sages say, "Both were created at the same instant: 'Yes, my hand has laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand has spread out the heavens; when I call to them they stand up together' (Isa. 48:13)."

III.10. *A. And how do the other parties deal with the word "together"?*

- B. *It means, they cannot be separated from one another.*

III.11. *A. One way or the other, the verses contradict one another!*

- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "When they were created, he created heaven, then he created earth, but when he spread them out, he spread out the earth, then he spread out the heaven."

III.12. *A. What is the meaning of the word for heaven?*

- B. Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, "[Reading the Hebrew letters of the word, we find:] 'there is water.'"

III.13. *A. In a Tannaite statement it is set forth: [The letters for the word heaven yield] fire and water, teaching that the Holy One, blessed be he, brought them and combined them with one another and from them made the firmament.*

III.14. *A. R. Ishmael asked R. Aqiba when they were making a trip together, saying, "Now you, who served as disciple of Nahum of Gimzu for twenty two years — the master who would interpret every accusative particle in the Torah — how did he interpret the language, 'accusative particle + heaven' and 'accusative particle + earth'?"*

- B. He said to him, "If Scripture said, omitting the accusative particle, 'heaven and earth,' I might have said, 'heaven' and 'earth' are names of the Holy One, blessed be he. But not that the accusative particle is inserted prior to heaven and earth, it can only mean heaven and earth literally."

- C. [12B] “And why ‘accusative particle + earth’?”
- D. “To give priority to heaven over earth.”

III.15. A. “Now the earth was unformed and void” (Gen. 1: 2):

- B. *Note that the verse places heaven first? So why then does it narrate the process of making the earth first of all?*
- C. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael:*
- D. “The matter may be compared to the case of a mortal king, who said to his staff, ‘I want you at my door at the crack of dawn.’ He got up early and found women and men. Whom does he praise? The one who doesn’t usually get up early but got up early that day.”

III.16. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Yosé says, “Woe for people who see but don’t know what they’re seeing, stand but don’t know what they’re standing on.
- C. “As to the earth, on what does it stand? On pillars: ‘Who sakes the earth out of her place and the pillars thereof tremble’ (Job. 9: 6).
- D. “As to the pillars, they stand on water: ‘To him who spread forth the earth above the waters’ (Psa. 136: 6).
- E. “As to the waters, they are on the mountains: ‘The waters stood above the mountains’ (Psa. 104: 6).
- F. “The mountains are on the wind: ‘For lo, he who forms the mountains and creates the wind’ (Amo. 4:13).
- G. “The wind is on the storm: ‘The wind, the storm makes its substance’ (Psa. 148: 8).
- H. “And the storm is suspended from the arm of the Holy One, blessed be he: ‘And underneath are the everlasting arms’ (Deu. 33:27).”
- I. But sages say, “The world rests on twelve pillars: ‘He set the borders to the peoples according to the number of the tribes of the children of Israel’ (Deu. 32: 8).”
- J. And others say, “Seven pillars: ‘She has hewn out her seven pillars’ (Pro. 9: 1).”
- K. R. Eleazar b. Shammua says, “On one pillar, called righteous: ‘But righteous is the foundation of the world’ (Pro. 10:25).”

III.17. A. Said R. Judah, “There are two firmaments: ‘Behold unto the Lord your God belongs heaven, and the heaven of heavens’ (Deu. 10:14).”

- B. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “They are seven, and these are they: [following Abraham’s notes:] curtain, firmament, clouds, lofty abode, dwelling, residence, heavy cloud.
- C. “‘curtain:’ is good for nothing, except that it enters in the morning and leaves in the evening and every day renews the word of creation: ‘That stretches out the heavens as a curtain and spreads them out as a tent to dwell in’ (Isa. 40:22);
- D. “‘firmament:’ in this are set sun and moon, stars and constellations, ‘And God set them in the firmament of heaven’ (Gen. 1:17);

- E. “‘clouds:’ is where the millstones stand and grand manna for the righteous: ‘And he commanded the clouds above and opened the doors of heaven and caused manna to rain upon them for food’ (Psa. 78:23-24);
 - F. “‘lofty abode:’ is where the heavenly Jerusalem, the Temple, and the altar are built, and Michael, principal prince, stands and offers an offering on it: ‘I have surely built you a house of lofty above, a place for you to dwell in for ever’ (1Ki. 8:13).
 - G. *“And how do we know that it is called heaven?”* ‘Look down from heaven and see, even from your holy and glorious habitation’ (Isa. 63:15).
 - H. “‘dwelling:’ is where there are platoons of ministering angels, singing by night and silent by day for the sake of Israel’s glory: ‘By day the Lord commands his loving kindness and in the night his song is with me’ (Psa. 42: 9).”
- The next entry is attached to the foregoing, so far as I can see, only because it is in the name of Simeon b. Laqish. Nos. 19, 20, then complement No. 18, then No. 20 resumes the discussion of No. 17.

III.18. A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “For whoever engages in study of the Torah by night — the Holy One, blessed be he, draws out the thread of grace by day: ‘By day the Lord will command his loving kindness, and in the night his song shall be with me’ (Psa. 42: 9). Why is it that ‘By day the Lord will command his loving kindness’? Because ‘in the night his song shall be with me.’”

B. *Some say*, said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “For whoever engages in study of the Torah in this world, which is like the night, — the Holy One, blessed be he, draws out the thread of grace in the world to come, which is like the day: ‘By day the Lord will command his loving kindness, and in the night his song shall be with me’ (Psa. 42: 9). [Supply: Why is it that ‘By day the Lord will command his loving kindness’? Because ‘in the night his song shall be with me.’]”

III.19. A. Said R. Levi, “To whoever abandons teachings of the Torah and takes up trivial teachings do they feed fiery coals: ‘They pluck salt-wort through idle talk and the roots of the broom are their food’ (Job. 30: 4).”

III.20. A. *“And how do we know that it is called heaven?”* ‘Look down from heaven and see, even from your holy and glorious habitation’ (Isa. 63:15).

B. [Resuming the exposition broken off at Nos. 18-19:] “‘residence:’ is where there are stores of snow and hail, the loft of destructive dew and raindrops, the chamber of the whirlwind and the storm, the cave of vapor with doors of fire: ‘The Lord will open unto you his good treasure’ (Deu. 28:12).”

C. *But are these found in the firmament? Aren’t the found on earth, in line with the verse*, “Praise the Lord from the earth, you sea monsters and all deeps, fire and hail, snow and vapor, stormy wind, fulfilling his word” (Psa. 148:7-8)!

D. Said R. Judah said Rab, “David sought mercy for them and brought them down to earth. He said before him, ‘Lord of the world, “You are not a God who has pleasure in wickedness, let not what is evil sojourn with you” (Psa. 5: 5). You are righteous, Lord, don’t let evil sojourn in your abode.’

E. *“And how do we know that it is called heaven?”* ‘Then hear you in heaven, your residence’ (1Ki. 8:39).”

- III.21.** A. [Continuing the same exposition:] “heavy cloud: that is where there are right, judgment, and righteousness, the treasures of life and the treasures of peace and the treasures of blessing, the souls of the righteous and the spirits and souls that are yet to be born, and dew with which the Holy One, blessed be he, in the age to come will revive the dead.
- B. “right and judgment: ‘Right and judgment are the foundations of your throne’ (Psa. 89:15);
- C. “righteousness: ‘And he put on righteousness as a coat of mail’ (Isa. 59:17);
- D. “the treasures of life : ‘For with you is the fountain of life’ (Psa. 86:10);
- E. “the treasures of peace: ‘And called it, the Lord is peace’ (Jud. 6:24);
- F. “the treasures of blessing: ‘He shall receive a blessing from the Lord’ (Psa. 24: 5);
- G. “the souls of the righteous: ‘Yet the soul of my lord shall be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord your God’ (1Sa. 25:29);
- H. “the spirits and souls that are yet to be born: ‘For the spirit that wraps itself is from me, and the souls which I have made’ (Isa. 57: 1);
- I. “and dew with which the Holy One, blessed be he, in the age to come will revive the dead: ‘A bounteous rain did you pour down, God; when your inheritance was weary, you did confirm it’ (Psa. 78:10).
- J. “There too are located the Ofanim and the Seraphim, the Holy Living Creatures, the Ministering Angels, the Throne of God; the King, the living God, high and exalted, dwells over them all in heavy cloud: ‘Extol him who rides upon heavy cloud, whose name is the Lord’ (Psa. 78: 5).”
- K. *“And how do we know that “heavy cloud” is called heaven? It is because of the verbal analogy established by use of the word “ride” in two passages, as follows: “Extol him who rides upon heavy cloud, whose name is the Lord” (Psa. 78: 5), and “Who rides upon the heaven as your help” (Deu. 33:26).*
- L. *“And darkness and cloud and thick darkness surround him: ‘He made darkness his hiding place, his pavilion round about him, darkness of waters, thick clouds of skies’ (Psa. 18:12).”*
- M. *Yes, but is there such a thing as darkness before Heaven? And isn’t it written, “He reveals deep and secret things, he knows what is in the darkness, and the light dwells with him” (Dan. 2:22)?*
- N. *No problem, the one [13A] refers to the inner chambers, the other, the outer.*

III.22. A. And said R. Aha bar Jacob, “There is yet another firmament above the heads of the living creatures: ‘And over the heads of the living creatures there was a likeness of a firmament like the color of the terrible ice, stretched forth over their heads above’ (Eze. 1:22).”

III.23. A. Of matters up to this point you have every right to speak, concerning matters from this point onward, you have not got the right to speak, for so it is written in the book of Ben Sira: “Don’t seek things that are too hard for you, and don’t search out things that are hidden from you; the things that have been permitted to you are what you should think about, and you have no business with things that are secret” (Ben Sira 3:21-22).

This composite on the firmament now concludes with an account of travels through the several layers of heaven. This statement spells out what is at issue in the foregoing cosmological speculations: the grandeur of the universe, the glory of God above it all.

III.24. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, “What answer did the echo give that wicked man when he said, ‘I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High’ (Isa. 14:14)?
- C. “The echo came forth and said, ‘Wicked man, son of a wicked man, grandson of Nimrod the evil, who through his dominion brought about a rebellion by the entire world against me! How long does a man live? Seventy years: ‘The days of our years are three score years and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore years’ (Psa. 90:10). But isn’t it a journey from heaven to the firmament of five hundred years? And the thickness of the firmament is a journey of five hundred years. And so too, between each firmament and the one above it. And now, above them are the holy living creatures, and the feet of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the ankles of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the legs of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the knees of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the thighs of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the bodies of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the necks of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the heads of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the horns of the living creatures are equal to all of them together. Now above them is the throne of glory. The feet of the throne of glory are equal to all of them together, and the throne of glory is equal to all of them. Above them dwells the King, the living and eternal God, high and exalted. And yet you say, “I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High” (Isa. 14:14)? No, “you shall be brought down to the nether world, to the deepest parts of the pit” (Isa. 14:14-15).”

We now revert to the Mishnah’s rule, which once more introduces a massive topical miscellany, this time concerning Ezekiel and his vision of the Chariot. The principles of selection and composition are self-evident and are not to be obscured by the sheer volume of the assembled materials.

IV.1 A. **or the Chariot [Eze. 1] before one:**

- B. *A Tannaite statement of R. Hiyya:* But they hand over to a single individual the main points.
- C. Said R. Zira, “They hand over the main points only to the head of the court and to any person whose heart is anxious with him.”
- D. *There are those who say,* “[...to the head of the court] only if his heart is anxious with him.”

IV.2. A. Said R. Ammi, “They hand over the secrets of the Torah only to one who has five qualities: ‘The captain of fifty and the man of rank and the counsellor and the cunning charmer and the skilful enchanter’ (Isa. 3: 3).”

IV.3. A. And said R. Ammi, “Teachings of the Torah are not to be handed over to gentiles: ‘He has not done so with any nation, and as for his ordinances, they have not known them’ (Psa. 147:20).”

IV.4. A. Said R. Yohanan to R. Eleazar, “Come and I shall instruct you in the works of the chariot.”

B. He said to him, “I have not yet come of age.”

C. By the time he came of age, R. Yohanan had died. Said to him R. Assi, “Come and I shall instruct you in the works of the chariot.”

D. He said to him, “Had I had sufficient merit, I would have studied the same from R. Yohanan, your own master.”

IV.5. A. R. Joseph would study the works of the chariot. The elders of Pumbedita would repeat the Tannaite statements concerning the works of creation. They said to him, “Would the master care to teach us the works of the chariot?”

B. He said to them, “When you care to teach me the works of creation.”

C. After they had taught these to him, they said to him, “Now let the master teach us the works of the chariot?”

D. He said to them, “In that regard we have learned, ‘Honey and milk are under your tongue’ (Son. 4:11) — things that are sweeter than honey and milk should be kept under your tongue.”

E. R. Abbahu said, “The proof derives from this verse: ‘The lambs will be for your clothing’ (Pro. 27:26) — [since the letters for lambs and for mystery are the same, it follows that] things that are the secret of the world should be kept under your clothes.”

F. They said to him, “We have studied in that subject as far as the verse, ‘And he said to me, son of man’ (Eze. 1:27).”

G. He said to them, “Well, that is the very essence of the works of the chariot anyhow.”

H. An objection was raised to that allegation:

I. To what point does the lesson of the work of the chariot extend?

J. Rabbi says, “As far as the latter reference to And I saw’ (Eze. 1:27).”

K. R. Isaac says, “As far as the account of the electrum [Eze. 1:27].”

L. [Here is the solution:] As far as “And I saw” may be taught; from that point onward, we hand on only the main points.

M. There are those who say, As far as “And I saw” we hand on only the main points. From that point, if **he was a sage and understands of his own knowledge**, it is all right, but if not, then nothing more is handed over.

IV.6. A. But do we expound the account of the electrum [Eze. 1:27] at all? And lo, there was the case of a youngster who expounded the account of the electrum, and fire came forth and ate him up!

B. The case of the youngster is exceptional, for he had not yet come of age.

IV.7. A. Said R. Judah [said Rab], “That man is to be remembered for good, by name of Hanina b. Hezekiah, for if it were not for his efforts, the book of Ezekiel would have been hidden away, for what he says contradicts the teachings of the Torah.

B. “What did he do to save the situation? He took up three hundred barrels of oil with him to an upper room and stayed there until he had ironed out all the problems.”

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

- B. There was the case of a youngster, who was reciting in the household of his master the book of Ezekiel, and he understood the account of the electrum, and fire came forth and ate him up.
- C. So they wanted to hide away the book of Ezekiel. Said to them Hananiah b. Hezekiah, "If this one was a sage, then everybody is a sage." [In fact, that case was exceptional; ordinary people won't have to run the risk of understanding the forbidden materials.]

IV.9. A. *So what is the meaning of the electrum?*

- B. Said R. Judah, [13B] "Living creatures talking fire."

IV.10. A. *In a Tannaite formulation it is stated:* [The letters of the word yield the sense:] at times they are silent, at times they speak. When the word goes forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be he, they are silent, and when the word does not go forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be he, they speak.

A systematic exegesis of relevant verses of Ezekiel now gets underway, covering Eze. 1:4-5.

IV.11. A. "And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flesh of lightning" (Eze. 1: 4):

- B. *What is the meaning of ran and returned?*
- C. Said R. Judah, "It is comparable to flame that goes forth from the mouth of a furnace."
- D. *What is the meaning of as the appearance of a flesh of lightning?*
- E. R. R. Yosé bar Hanina, "Like the flame that goes forth from between potsherds" [Abraham: perforated earthen pieces used in smelting gold].

IV.12. A. "And I looked and behold, a stormy wind came out of the north, a great cloud with a fire flashing up, so that a brightness was round about it, and out of the midst thereof as the color of electrum, out of the midst of the fire" (Eze. 1: 4):

- B. Where did [the stormy wind from the north] go?
- C. Said R. Judah said Rab, "It went forth to conquer the whole world under the wicked Nebuchadnezzar. And why so? So that the nations of the world might not say, 'It was into the hand of a mean nation that the Holy One, blessed be he, handed over his children.'- D. "Said the Holy One, blessed be he, said, 'How made me a servant of idolators? It is the iniquities of Israel that brought it about.'"

IV.13. A. "Now as I behold the living creatures, behold one wheel at the bottom near the living creatures" (Eze. 1: 5):

- B. Said R. Eleazar, "This refers to a certain angel, who stands on the earth with his head reaching upward to the living creatures."
- C. *In a Tannaite statement it is taught:* his name is Sandalfon. He is taller than his fellows by a distance of a five hundred year journey. He stands behind the chariot and wreathes crowns for his Maker.
- D. *Is that so now? And isn't it written,* "Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place" (Eze. 3:12)? *It follows that as to his place, no one knows it!*

E. *[Sandalfon] says the name over the crown, and the crown on its own goes and sets on his head.*

IV.14. A. Said Raba, “Whatever Ezekiel saw, Isaiah saw. What is Ezekiel like? He is like a bumpkin who saw the king. What is Isaiah like? He is like a city-slicker who saw the king.”

IV.15. A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘I will sing to the Lord, for he is highly exalted’ (Eze. 15: 1)? ‘A song for him who is exalted over the most exalted ones.’”

B. *For a master has said*, “The king of the wild beasts is the lion. The king of domesticated beasts is the ox. The king of fowl is the eagle. But man is exalted above them all — and the Holy One, blessed be he, is exalted above them all and above the entire world as well.”

IV.16. A. One verse of Scripture states, “As for the likeness of their faces, they had the face of a man and they four had the face of a lion on the right side and they four had the face of an ox on the left side” (Eze. 1:10). And another verse of Scripture says, “And everyone had four faces, the first face was the face of the cherub, and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion and the fourth the face of an eagle” (Eze. 10:14) — *but there is no mention of the face of an ox!*

B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Ezekiel sought mercy for it, and it was changed to that of a cherub. He said before him, ‘Lord of the world, shall the prosecuting attorney [the ox, calling to mind the sin with the golden calf] turn into the defense attorney [the chariot would intercede for Israel]?’”

IV.17. A. *What is the meaning of a cherub?*

B. Said R. Abbahu, “Like a baby-face, for in Babylonia they call a child ‘baby-face’ [which shares the consonants of the word for cherub].”

C. *Said R. Pappa to Abbaye*, “But what about the verse of Scripture, ‘the first face was the face of the cherub, and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion and the fourth the face of an eagle’ (Eze. 10:14)? *Isn’t the face of a cherub the same as the face of a man?*”

D. *“The one is big, the other little.”*

IV.18. A. One verse of Scripture states, “Each one had six wings” (Isa. 6: 2), and another, “Each one had four wings” (Eze. 1: 6)!

B. *No problem*, the one [Isa. 6: 2] speaks of the time that the house of the sanctuary was standing, the other, the time that the house of the sanctuary was not standing. It is as though the wings of the living creatures were diminished on account of its destruction.

C. *By which of them were they diminished?*

D. Said R. Hananel said Rab, “They were the ones with which they sang their song. For here it is written: ‘and with two did he fly, and one called to another and said’ (Isa. 6: 2), and elsewhere, ‘will you set your eyes upon it? it is gone’ (Pro. 23: 5).”

- E. *And our rabbis say, "They were those with which they covered their feet: 'and their feet were straight feet' (Eze. 1: 7). But if the wings had not been removed, how could he have known that fact?"*
- F. *Well, maybe they were exposed so he saw them, for if you don't say that, then from the words "as for the likeness of their faces, they had the face of a man" (Eze. 1:10) you might also infer that the wings covering them were taken away! So these must have been exposed, and he saw them, and here too, they were exposed and he saw them!*
- G. *But how are the cases parallel? While it is customary to show one's face before one's master, it surely is not customary to show one's feet before one's master!*

IV.19. A. One verse of Scripture states, "Thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him" (Dan. 7:10), and another, "Is there nay number of his armies" (Job. 25: 3).

- B. *No problem, the one speaks of the time that the house of the sanctuary was standing, the other, the time that the house of the sanctuary was not standing. It is as though heavenly family were diminished on account of its destruction.*

IV.20. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Rabbi says in the name of Abba Yosé b. Dosai, "'Thousand thousands ministered to him' (Dan. 7:10) — that is the number of a single one of his platoons, but of his platoons there is no fixed number."
- C. And R. Jeremiah bar Abba said, "'Thousand thousands ministered to him' (Dan. 7:10) — at the fiery stream [alone was that number], as it is said, 'A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him, thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him' (Dan. 7:10)."

IV.21. A. *Whence does the fiery stream flow?*

- B. From the sweat of the living creatures.
- C. And whither does it pour out?
- D. Said R. Zutra b. Tobiah said Rab, "On the heads of the wicked in Gehenna: 'Behold a storm of the Lord has gone forth in fury, yes, a whirling storm, it shall whirl upon the head of the wicked' (Jer. 23:19)."
- E. And R. Aha bar Jacob said, "It pours out on those who pressed forward: 'who pressed forward before their time, whose foundations was poured out as a stream' (Job. 22:16)."
- F. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. R. Simeon the Pious says, "This refers to the nine hundred and seventy four generations who pushed themselves forward to be created [14A] prior to the creation of the world and were not created. The Holy One, blessed be he, went and planted them in every generation, and they form the arrogant that are in each generation."
- H. And R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "'who pressed forward' is said by way of blessing: these are the disciples of sages, who wrinkle their brows [using the consonants of the word for press forward] over the teachings of the Torah in this world. The Holy One, blessed be he, will reveal to them a secret in the world to come: 'To whom a secret is poured out as a stream.'"

- IV.22.** A. *Said Samuel to Hiyya b. Rab, “Son of illustrious parents, come and I’ll tell you one of those superb statements that your father would say: ‘Every day ministering angels are created in the fiery stream and sing their song and then cease to be: “They are new every morning, great is your faithfulness” (Lam. 3:23).”*
- B. *This differs from what R. Samuel bar Nahmani said, for said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “From every single word that comes forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be he, is created a single angel: ‘By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth’ (Psa. 33: 6).”*
- IV.23.** A. One verse of Scripture states, “His raiment was as white as snow and the hair of his head like pure wool” (Dan. 7: 9), but elsewhere it is written, “His locks are curled and black as a raven” (Son. 5:11)! [Is he old or young?]
- B. *No problem, the one speaks of [God when he is] in session, the other, when he is at war.*
- C. *For a master has said, “You have none more fitting for the session of learning in law than an elder, and none more fitting for war than a boy.”*
- IV.24.** A. One verse of Scripture states, “His throne was fiery flames” (Dan. 7: 9), but elsewhere it is written, “Till thrones were places, and one that was ancient of days did sit” (Dan. 7: 9)!
- B. *No problem, the one is for him, the other for David, in line with what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *“One is for him, the other for David,” the words of R. Aqiba.*
- D. *Said to him R. Yosé the Galilean, “Aqiba, how long are you going to treat in a profane way the Presence of God?”*
- E. *“Rather, one is for bestowing judgment, the other for bestowing righteousness.”*
- F. *Did he accept this answer or not?*
- G. *Come and take note, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. *“One is for bestowing judgment and the other for bestowing righteousness,” the words of R. Aqiba.*
- I. *Said to him R. Eleazar b. Azariah, “Aqiba, what business have you in matters of lore? Go spend your time on rules governing the skin disease [of Lev. 13] and uncleanness imparted through overshadowing of the corpse [in Ohalot M. Num. 19:1ff.]. Rather, one is a throne for a seat, the other for a footstool for his feet, in line with this verse: ‘The heaven is my throne and the earth is my footrest’ (Isa. 66: 1).”*

A systematic Exegesis of Isaiah 3:5-7

Now follows a set of exegesis of Isaiah 3:5ff.; I cannot explain why it has been introduced here, since I see no connection to the foregoing.

- IV.25.** A. *When R. Dimi came, he said, “With eighteen curses did Isaiah curse Israel, and he didn’t calm down until he had stated to them the following verse of Scripture: ‘The child shall behave insolently against the aged and the base against the honorable’ (Isa. 3: 5).”*

- B. *What were these eighteen curses?*
- C. “For behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, does take away from Jerusalem and from Judah stay and staff, every stay of bread and every stay of water; the mighty man and the man of war; the judge, the prophet, the diviner, and the elder; the captain of fifty and the man of rank and the counsellor, the wise charmer and the skilful enchanter. And I will give children to be their princes and babies shall rule over them” (Isa. 3: 1-4).
- D. “stay:” this refers to masters of Scripture.
- E. “and staff:” this refers to masters of the Mishnah,
- F. for example, R. Judah b. Tema and his colleagues.
- G. *There was a difference of opinion on this matter between R. Pappa and rabbis. One said, “There were six hundred orders of the Mishnah, and the other, three were seven hundred orders of the Mishnah” [instead of the mere six we now have.*
- H. “every stay of bread:” this refers to masters of Talmud-analysis: “Come and eat of my bread and drink of the wine that I have mixed” (Pro. 9: 5).
- I. “and every stay of water:” this refers to masters of lore, who entice a person’s heart like water through their lore.
- J. “the mighty man:” this refers to a master of traditions.
- K. “and the man of war:” this refers to one who knows how to give and take in the war over the Torah.
- L. “the judge:” this refers to a judge who judges truly and fairly.
- M. “the prophet:” this means what it says.
- N. “the diviner:” this refers to the king: “A divine sentence is in the lips of the king” (Pro. 16:10).
- O. “and the elder:” this is someone suited to the session.
- P. “the captain of fifty:” don’t read “captive of fifty” but read the letters as though they vowels to yield, “the captain of the Pentateuch,” that is, this one knows how to give and take in the Five Parts of the Torah.
- Q. Another interpretation of “the captain of fifty:” *this is in accord with R. Abbahu, for said R. Abbahu, “On this basis we learn that a public interpreter of Scripture is not to be appointed who is not yet fifty years of age.”*
- R. “and the man of rank:” this refers to someone on whose account favor is shown for an entire generation,
- S. for instance: R. Hanina b. Dosa on high; R. Abbahu at the court of Caesar.
- T. “and the counsellor:” this is one who knows how to intercalate years and determine the beginning of the new month [through lunar observation].
- U. “the wise:” this is a disciple who brings wisdom to his masters;
- V. “charmer:” this is one who, at the moment he begins to teach words of Torah, everybody becomes as dumb [silent to hear what he will say].
- W. “and the skilful:” this refers to someone who understands one thing from another.
- X. “... enchanter:” this refers to one who is worthy of being given words of Torah, which were given in a whisper [like enchantments].

- Y. “And I will give children to be their princes:”
- Z. *What is the meaning of that clause?*
- AA. Said R. Eleazar, “This refers to people who are utterly emptied of religious deeds [since the words for ‘children’ and ‘emptied’ use the same letters].”
- BB. “and babies shall rule over them” (Isa. 3:1-4):
- CC. *Said R. Pappa bar Jacob, “These are foxes sons of foxes.”*
- DD. “And he didn’t calm down until he had stated to them the following verse of Scripture: ‘The child shall behave insolently against the aged:’” people who are empty of religious deeds but behave arrogantly toward those who are as filled with good deeds as a pomegranate is filled with seeds.
- EE. “‘and the base against the honorable’ (Isa. 3: 5):” this refers to those who regard weighty commandments as equivalent to light ones, and they come and behave arrogantly toward those for whom light commandments appear as weighty ones.”

IV.26. A. Said R. Qattina, “Even at the time of the fall of Jerusalem, faithful people did not cease from among them: ‘For a man shall take hold of his brother of the house of his father: You have a mantle, you be our ruler’ (Isa. 3: 6). Things on account of which people hide out as in a garment you have ‘under your hand’ (Isa. 3: 6).”

IV.27. A. “And this ruin” (Isa. 3: 6):

- B. *What is the meaning of “And this ruin” (Isa. 3: 6)?*
- C. Things that people do not grasp unless they stumble on their account are “under your hand.”

IV.28. A. “On that day he shall take [an oath] saying, I am not a healer, for in my house is neither bread nor a mantle, you shall not make me ruler of a people” (Isa. 3: 7):

- B. “he shall take:” the word “take” refers to taking an oath, in line with the verse, “You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain” (Exo. 20: 7).
- C. “I am not a healer:” “I was not among those who are bound to the house of study.”
- D. “for in my house is neither bread nor a mantle:” “For I am not master of Scripture, Mishnah, or learning.”
- E. *But maybe that situation was exceptional, for if he had said to them, “I do have knowledge,” they would have said to him, “Well, then, tell us about it”?*
- F. *But he ought to have said, “So I learned and forgot.”*
- G. *So why does it say, “I am not a healer”?*
- H. It must mean, I am not a healer in any way.
- I. Is that so? But didn’t Raba say, “Jerusalem was destroyed only once faithful people had disappeared from among them, as it is said, ‘Run you to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem and see now and know and look in the spacious piazzas there, see if you can find a man, if there be any who does justly, who seeks truth, and I will pardon him’ (Jer. 5: 1)”?
- J. *No problem, [14B] the one speaks of matters concerning the Torah, the other, commercial relationships. So far as matters of the Torah, there were such people, but in matters of business relationships, there were no such people.”*

We conclude this exposition with a specific case involving the exposition of the works of the Chariot. And this leads directly into another large exercise, this one on the affects of studying the Chariot-mystery upon those who do so.

IV.29. *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B.** There is the case of R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, who was riding on an ass and going along the way, with R. Eleazar b. Arakh driving the ass behind him. He said to him, “My lord, repeat for me a chapter of the work of the chariot.”
- C.** He said to him, “Isn’t this what I have repeated for you: ‘They do not expound upon the laws of prohibited relationships [Lev. 18] before three persons, the works of creation [Gen. 1-3] before two, or the Chariot [Eze. 1] before one, unless he was a sage and understands of his own knowledge’ [M. 1:1].”
- D.** He said to him, “My lord, Will you give me permission to state in your presence something that you have taught me?”
- E.** He said to him, “Speak.”
- F.** Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai immediately got down off the ass and wrapped himself in his cloak and sat down on a rock under an olive tree.
- G.** He said to him, “My lord, how come you dismounted?”
- H.** He said to him, “Is it possible that you should expound the works of the chariot, with the Presence of God with us, the ministering angels accompanying us, and I should ride an ass?”
- I.** R. Eleazar b. Arakh immediately commenced the topic of the works of the chariot and gave his exposition. And fire came down from heaven and surrounded all the trees in the field. They all commenced and said a song.
- J.** What song did they say? “Praise the Lord from the earth, ...you sea monsters and all deeps, ...fruitful trees and all cedars...hallelujah” (Psa. 148: 7, 9, 14).
- K.** An angel responded from the fire and said, “That is precisely the works of the chariot.”
- L.** Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai stood up and kissed him on his head and said, “Blessed is the Lord, the God of Israel, who gave a son to our father, Abraham, who knows how to discern and investigate, and to expound the works of the chariot. There is one who expounds well but doesn’t carry out well, carries out well but doesn’t expound well, but you expound well and you carry out well what you expound.
- M.** “Happy are you, our father, Abraham, that Eleazar b. Arakh has come forth from your loins.”
- N.** Now when this was told to R. Joshua, he and R. Yosé the priest were walking on the way. They say, “Let us too expound the works of the chariot.”
- O.** R. Joshua gave the first exposition. Now that day was the summer solstice, but [while it never rains at that season,] the heavens became overcast with clouds, and some sort of a rainbow appeared in the cloud, and the ministering angels got together and came to listen, like people who get

together and come to enjoy the entertainments that are made for the groom and bride.

- P. R. Yosé the Priest went and told these things to Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, who said, “Happy are you and happy is your mother, happy the eyes that have seen such a thing. And to too, you and I in my dream were reclining on Mount Sinai, and an echo came forth from Heaven to us, saying, ‘Come on up here, come on up here,’ here are great banquet halls and fine dining tables set up for you, you, your disciples, and your disciples’ disciples all are destined for the third rank [firmament of heaven]”[T. Hag. 2:1F-Q].
- Q. *Well is that so now? And hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “There are three that laid matters out: R. Joshua laid matters out before Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai, R. Aqiba laid matters out before R. Joshua, Hanania b. Hakinai laid matters out before R. Aqiba..[T. Hag. 2:2A-C].
- S. *But we note that R. Eleazar b. Arakh is not reckoned among those who did so!*
- T. *One who gave a presentation and before whom others gave a presentation he reckons, one who gave a presentation but others didn’t give a presentation he doesn’t reckon.*
- U. *But then what about Hananiah b. Hakinai, before whom no one laid matters out, and yet he is reckoned!*
- V. *Well, anyhow, he laid matters out before one who laid matters out before others.*

Four entered Paradise, and what happened to them, specifically, the following: Ben Azzai, Ben Zoma, the Outsider, and R. Aqiba.

Connected to the foregoing in theme and proposition, the following forms the framework for a large and systematic exposition of the dangers of speculating on the matters treated in our Mishnah-paragraph. The issue is expounding topics that are best left alone. Here we see the result of doing so: death, madness, apostasy, and transcendence, covering Ben Azzai, Ben Zoma, the Outsider, and Aqiba, respectively. Since Ben Azzai died on the spot, nothing more is said about him. The others are given substantial composites.

IV.30. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Four entered Paradise, and these are they: Ben Azzai, Ben Zoma, the Outsider, and R. Aqiba.
- C. Said to them R. Aqiba, “When you get to stones of pure marble [that look like water], don’t say ‘Water, water,’ for it is said, “He who speaks falsehood shall not be established before my eyes” (Psa. 101: 7).”
- D. Ben Azzai peeked and died. In his regard Scripture says, “Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints” (Psa. 116:15).
- E. Ben Zoma peeked and was smitten, and of him Scripture says, “You have found honey? eat so much as is enough for you, lest you be filled up with it and vomit it out” (Pro. 25:16).
- F. The Outsider cut down the shoots.
- G. R. Aqiba got out in one piece.[T. Hag. 2:3-4].

The Case of Ben Zoma

IV.31. A. *They asked Ben Zoma, “What is the law on castrating a dog?”*

B. He said to them, “‘Neither shall you do this in your land’ (Lev. 22:24) means, to none that is in your land may you do this [even to a dog, which cannot be sacrificed, is not to be mutilated].”

IV.32. A. *They asked Ben Zoma, “A virgin-girl who got pregnant — what is the law on her marrying a high priest? Do we take account of the allegation [later on] assigned to Samuel, for said Samuel, [15A] ‘I can have sexual relations a number of times [with a virgin] without producing a drop of blood’? Or maybe experts such as Samuel are uncommon?”*

B. *He said to them, “Experts such as Samuel are uncommon, but we take account of the possibility that she can have gotten pregnant while taking a bath [from sperm floating in the water].”*

C. But didn’t Samuel say, “An emission of sperm that does not shoot forth like an arrow cannot impregnate”?

D. *But to begin with, the sperm did shoot forth like an arrow.*

IV.33. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **There is the incident involving R. Joshua b. Hananiah, who was standing on the stairs at the Temple mountain, and Ben Zoma saw him but didn’t get up before him. He said to him, “Whence and whither, Ben Zoma?”**

C. **He said to him, “I was examining the space between the upper water and lower water, and the distance between the one and the other is no more than three fingerbreadths alone: ‘And the spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters’ (Gen. 1: 2) — like a dove that hovers over her young without actually touching them.”**

D. **Said R. Joshua to his disciples, “Ben Zoma is already outside.”[T. Hag. 2:6].**

IV.34. A. *Now note, when did “the spirit of God hover over the face of the waters”? It was on the first day. But the division took place on the second day: “And let it divide the waters from the waters” (Gen. 1: 6).*

IV.35. A. *And how big a space was it?*

B. Said R. Aha bar Jacob, “A hair’s breadth.”

C. *And rabbis said, “Like the space between the boards of a landing bridge.”*

D. *Mar Zutra, and some say, R. Assi, said, “Like two cloaks spread over one another.”*

E. *And some say, like the space between two cups tilted over one another.*

Aher [Elisha b. Abbuyah]

IV.36. A. **The Outsider cut down the shoots:**

B. In his regard, Scripture says, “Don’t let your mouth bring your flesh into guilt” (Qoh. 5: 5).

C. *So what’s the point?*

- D. *He saw that Metatron had gotten permission to sit and write down the merits of Israel.*
- E. *He said, "We have learned as a tradition that above, there is no sitting and no standing, no competition, no front-or-back, and no weariness. So is it possible, God forbid, that there are two divinities?"*
- F. *So they took out Metatron and flogged him with sixty lashes of fire, saying to him, "How come when you saw him, you didn't rise before him?"*
- G. *At that moment he was given permission to blot out the merits of the Outsider. An echo at that moment came forth and said, "'Return you backsliding children' (Jer. 3:22) — except for The Outsider."*
- H. *He said, "Since that man [=I] has been driven out of that world, I may as well go and have a good time in this world." So that is how he went forth to bad ways.*
- I. *He went out and found a whore and solicited her. She said to him, "So aren't you Elisha b. Abbuyah?"*
- J. *On the Sabbath he pulled up a radish out of its bed [which may not be done on the Sabbath], and gave it to her. Then she said to him, "This man is a rank outsider."*

IV.37. A. [After he had gone forth to wicked ways,] the Outsider asked R. Meir, *"What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, 'God has made even the one as well as the other' (Qoh. 7:14)?"*

- B. *He said to him, "What it means is, for everything that the Holy One, blessed be he, he created a counterpart: for mountains, he created hills; for seas, he created rivers."*
- C. *He said to him, "That is now how R. Aqiba, your master, explained it. Rather: he created righteous and he created wicked, he created the Garden of Eden and he created Gehenna: each one has two portions, one in the Garden of Eden, one in Gehenna. If the righteous man has adequate merit, he takes his share and the share of his fellow in the garden of Eden. If the wicked one proves culpable, he takes his share and the share of his fellow in Gehenna."*

IV.38. A. *Said R. Mesharshayya, "What verse of Scripture makes this point? With reference to the righteous: 'Therefore in their land they shall possess double' (Isa. 61: 7). In the case of the wicked: 'And destroy them with repeated destruction' (Jer. 17:18)."*

IV.39. A. [After he had gone forth to bad ways,] the Outsider asked R. Meir, *"What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: 'Gold and glass cannot equal it, neither shall the exchange thereof be vessels of fine gold' (Job. 28:17)?"*

- B. *He said to him, "The teachings of the Torah are as hard to acquire as golden vessels and as easy to destroy as glass ones."*
- C. *He said to him, "That is now how R. Aqiba, your master, explained it. Rather: **Just as golden utensils, once broken, can be fixed, while glass utensils have no remedy when broken except to be melted down,** so a disciple of a sage, even though he has gone sour, still can be fixed." [Cf. ARN: teachings of Torah are as hard to acquire as golden vessels and easy to destroy as glass ones]. [Goldin: Scripture compares gold to glass — even as gold vessels can be mended after they*

have been broken, and glass vessels cannot be mended when they are broken unless they are restored to their original state (Fathers According to R. Nathan XXIV:VI.1)].

- D. He said to him, "You too: come back."
- E. He said to him, "Haven't I heard from behind the veil: 'Return you backsliding children' (Jer. 3:22) — except for The Outsider."

IV.40. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. There was an incident involving the Outsider, who on the Sabbath was riding on a horse, and R. Meir was walking after him to study Torah from him directly. He said to him, "Meir, go back, for I have been measuring by the hooves of my horse, so I know that up to this point is the Sabbath limit."
- C. He said to him, "You too: come back."
- D. He said to him, "Haven't I heard from behind the veil: 'Return you backsliding children' (Jer. 3:22) — except for The Outsider."

IV.41. A. *[Meir] overcame his opposition and took him to a school house. He said to a youngster, "Cite the verse that you're learning."*

- B. He said to him, "'There is no peace, says the Lord, for the wicked' (Isa. 48:22)."
- C. *He took him to another synagogue, and said to a youngster, "Cite the verse that you're learning."*
- D. He said to him, "'For though you wash yourself with niter and use a lot of soap, yet your iniquity is marked before me, says the Lord God' (Jer. 2:22)."
- E. *He took him to another synagogue, and said [15B] to a youngster, "Cite the verse that you're learning."*
- F. He said to him, "And you, you are spoiled, what are you doing, that you clothe yourself with scarlet, that you adorn yourself with ornaments of gold, that you enlarge your eyes with paint? In vain do you make yourself look pretty' (Jer. 4:30)."
- G. *He took him to another synagogue, and kept on until he had visited thirteen school houses. In all of them the youngsters cited verses along these same lines. In the end, he said to the last, "Cite the verse that you're learning."*
- H. He said to him, "'What do you have to do to declare my statutes' (Psa. 50:16)."
- I. *But that child stumbled over his words and the verse sounded as though he had said to him, "And to Elisha God says...."*
- J. *Some say, he had a knife with him, and he cut him up and send him to thirteen synagogues. And there are some who say, "He said, 'If I had a knife with me, I would have chopped him up.'"*

IV.42. A. *When the Outsider died, they said, "Let him not be judged, and let him not come into the world to come."*

- B. *"Let him not be judged: since he engaged in the Torah; and let him not come into the world to come: because he sinned."*
- C. *Said R. Meir, "It would be better if he were changed and brought into the world to come. When shall I die, so that I may make smoke rise from his grave [as a sign that he was punished but then got to come to the world to come]!"*
- D. *When R. Meir died, smoke did rise from the Outsider's grave."*

IV.43. A. *Said R. Yohanan, "It's some miracle to burn his master! There was one among us, and we couldn't save him [all the rest of the scholars being unable to retrieve the Outsider]. If I took him by the hand, who could have seized from from me?"*

B. He said, "When shall I die, so that I may extinguish the smoke from his grave."

C. *When R. Yohanan died, smoke did cease from the Outsider's grave.*

D. The eulogizer commenced: "Even the door keeper [of hell] could not withstand our lord."

IV.44. A. *The daughter of the Outsider came before our lord [Rabbi Judah the Patriarch]. She said to him, "My lord, feed me."*

B. He said to her, "Whose daughter are you?"

C. She said to him, "I'm the daughter of the Outsider."

D. He said to her, "Is there still any seed of his in the world? And lo, it is written, 'He shall have neither son nor son's son among his people, nor any remaining in his dwellings' (Jos. 18:19)."

E. She said to him, "Remember his Torah and don't remember his actions."

F. On the spot fire came down and surrounded Rabbi's bench. Rabbi wept and said, "If that is what happens to those who dishonor [the Torah], how much more is coming for those who honor it!"

IV.45. A. *Now how could R. Meir have studied Torah from the Outsider? And didn't Rabbah bar bar Hannah say R. Yohanan [said], "What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture: 'For the priest's lips should keep knowledge and they should seek the Torah at his mouth, for he is a messenger of the Lord of Hosts' (Mal. 2: 7)? It means this: If the master is like an angel of the Lord, then seek Torah from his mouth, but if not, do not seek Torah from his mouth"?*

B. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "R. Meir identified a verse of Scripture and expounded it, namely: 'Incline your ear and hear the words of the wise and apply your heart to my knowledge' (Pro. 22:17). What is says is not 'their knowledge' but 'my knowledge.'"*

C. *R. Hanina said, "He derived it from here: 'Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline your ear; forget also your own people and your father's house' (Psa. 45:11)." [Abraham: listen to the words of the wise but forget their actions if they are wicked.]*

D. *The verses of Scripture contradict one another!*

E. *No they don't, in the one case it speaks of an adult, in the other, a minor.*

IV.46. A. *When R. Dimi came, he said, "They say in the West: R. Meir ate the date and tossed away the pit."'*

IV.47. A. *Expounded Raba, "What is the meaning of this verse: 'I went down to the garden of nuts, to look at the green plants of the valley' (Song 6:11)? Why are disciples of sages compared to a nut? To tell you: just as a nut, even though it is covered with mud and shit, the contents are unaffected, so a disciple of sages, even though he has gone wrong, his Torah still is not made disreputable."*

- IV.48.** A. *Rabbah bar Shila came across Elijah. He said to him, “So what’s the Holy One, blessed be he, up to these days?”*
- B. *He said to him, “He’s reciting traditions in the authority of all the rabbis, but in the authority of R. Meir he’s not citing a thing.”*
- C. *He said to him, “How come?”*
- D. *He said to him, “It is because he learned traditions on the authority of the Outsider.”*
- E. *He said to him, “But why? R. Meir found a pomegranate. He ate the pulp and tossed away the peel.”*
- F. *He said to him, “Now [since you gave such a good argument,] he’s saying, ‘Meir, my son, says, “**When a person is distressed, what words does the Presence of God say? As it were: ‘My head is in pain, my arm is in pain’. If thus is the Omnipresent distressed on account of the blood of the wicked when it is shed, how much the more so on account of the blood of the righteous!’** [M. San. 6:5A-B].”*
- IV.49.** A. Samuel came across R. Judah, who was leaning on a door bolt and weeping. He said to him, “Sharp-wit! How come you’re weeping?”
- B. *He said to him, “Is it such a small thing that is written concerning our rabbis, ‘Where is he who counted, where is he who weighed? Where is he who counted the towers’ (Isa. 33:18)? ‘Where is he who counted’ — for they would count all the letters in the Torah? ‘Where is he who weighed’ — for they would weigh all of the arguments a fortiori in the Torah? ‘Where is he who counted the towers’ — for they would counted the three hundred decided laws that concern the ‘tower that flies in the air’ [that is, the laws governing the status of the contents of a closed cabinet not standing on the ground]! And said R. Ammi, ‘Four hundred questions did Doeg and Ahitophel raise concerning the “tower flying in the air,” and they could not answer any one of them.’ And yet we have learned in the Mishnah: **Three kings and four ordinary folk have no portion in the world to come.... Four ordinary folk: Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi** [M. San. 1:2A, F]. So what will become of us!”*
- C. *He said to him, “Sharp-wit! there was dirt in their hearts.”*
- D. *And what about the Outsider?*
- E. *Never did Greek song leave his lips.*
- IV.50.** A. They said concerning the Outsider, when he stood up in the house of study, many heretical books fell from his lap.
- IV.51.** A. *Nimos the weaver asked R. Meir, “Does all the wool that is put into the dyeing kettle come up properly dyed?” [Abraham: does the study of the Torah protect all students from sin?]*
- B. *He said to him, “All that was clean on its mother comes up properly dyed, all that wasn’t doesn’t.”*

Aqiba

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

C. And R. Aqiba too did the ministering angels want to push away. Said to them the Holy One, blessed be he, “Let this sage be, for he is worth of making use of the honor that is coming to me.”

2. A. [16A] *What verse of Scripture did he expound?*

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

C. And R. Abbahu said, “‘He is preeminent above ten thousand’ (Son. 5:10) — [since the words for preeminent and example use the same consonants, the sense is] he is the example among his myriad.”

D. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “‘The Lord of hosts is his name’ (Isa. 48: 2) — he is the lord in his host.”

E. And R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan [said], “‘But the Lord was not in the wind, and after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake, and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire, and after the fire a still small voice’ (1Ki. 19:11) — ‘and behold the Lord passed by’ (1Ki. 19:11).”

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

B. Six traits have been stated with respect to demons, three like human beings, three like ministering angels.

C. Three like ministering angels: they have wings, like ministering angels; they go from one end of the world to the other, like ministering angels; they know what is going to happen, like ministering angels.

D. “They know” *do you imagine?* *Rather:* they hear from behind the veil, like ministering angels.

E. Three like human beings: they eat and drink like human beings, they procreate like human beings, and they die like human beings [Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XXXVII:III.1]

F. Six traits have been stated with respect to humanity, three like traits of a beast, three like traits of ministering angels.

G. Three in which humanity is like ministering angels: people have understanding like ministering angels, they walk standing up, like ministering angels, and they make use of the Holy Language, like ministering angels.

H. Three in which humanity is like the beast: people eat and drink like a beast, procreate like a beast, and shit like a beast [The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XXXVII:II.1].

The sequence of topical composites, amplifying the themes of the Mishnah-paragraph, is now completed, and we revert to the Mishnah’s next statement.

V.1 A. Whoever reflects upon four things — it would have been a mercy had he not been born: what is above, what is below, what is before, and what is beyond:

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

- C. *Both R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar said, “The matter may be compared to the case of a mortal kind, who said to his staff, ‘Built me a big palace on a land-fill. They went and built it for him. It is certainly not what the king wants to call to mind there was a landfill there!’”*

VI.1 A. And whoever has no concern for the glory of his Maker — it would have been a mercy for him had he not been born.

- B. *What’s the point?*
- C. R. Abba said, “This refers to someone who gazes at the rainbow.”
- D. R. Joseph said, “This refers to someone who commits idolatry in secret.”
- E. Someone who gazes at the rainbow: “As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day, so was the appearance of the brightness round about; this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord” (Eze. 1:28).
- F. R. Joseph said, “This refers to someone who commits idolatry in secret.” *that is in line with what R. Isaac said, for* said R. Isaac, “Whoever secretly carries out a transgression is as though he stepped on the feet of the Presence of God: ‘Thus said the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool’ (Isa. 66: 1).”
- G. *Now is that so? But didn’t* R. Ilai the Elder say, “If someone sees that his impulse to sin is overpowering him, he should go somewhere where nobody knows him and put on ordinary clothing and cloak himself in ordinary clothing and do what he wants, but let him not profane the Name of Heaven by a public scandal.”
- H. *There is no contradiction, the one speaks of a case in which he can control his urge, the other, a case in which he cannot control his urge.*

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

- B. “the rainbow: ‘As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day, so was the appearance of the brightness round about; this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord’ (Eze. 1:28).
- C. “the patriarch: ‘And you shall assign to him some of the honor owing to you’ (Num. 27:20). [Abraham: Moses’s face was not to be gazed at, so too, then, Joshua’s and this goes on for every authority.]
- D. “and the priests: ‘at the time that the house of the sanctuary stood, when they would stand on the platform and bestow a blessing on Israel using the fully-articulated name of God.”

VI.3. A. Expounded R. Judah b. R. Nahmani, R. Simeon b. Laqish’s public representative, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘Don’t trust a friend, and don’t put confidence in a buddy’ (Mic. 7: 5)?

- B. “If the impulse to do evil tells you, ‘Sin, and the Holy One, blessed be he, will forgive you,’ don’t you believe it! ‘Don’t trust a friend...’ [since the word for friend and evil use the same consonants, this yields the conclusion:] the meaning of ‘wicked’ here is only, ‘the impulse to do evil,’ in line with the verse, ‘For the inclination of man’s heart is evil’ (Gen. 8:21).

- C. “And the meaning of ‘buddy’ here is only the Holy One, blessed be he, in line with the verse, ‘You are the buddy of my youth’ (Jer. 3: 4).
- D. “Now perhaps you might imagine, ‘Who will testify against me?’ Well, the very stones of the house and the beams of the house of a person are the witnesses against him, as it is said, ‘For the stone shall dry out of the wall and the beam out of the timber shall answer it’ (Hab. 2:11).”
- E. And sages say, “A man’s own soul testifies against him: ‘Keep the doors of your mouth from her who lies in your bosom’ (Mic. 7: 5). Now what is that which lies in a man’s bosom? You have to say, it is the spirit.”
- F. R. Zeriqa said, “Two ministering angels who keep someone company are the ones who will testify against him: ‘For he will give his angels charge over you, to keep you in all your ways’ (Psa. 91:11).”
- G. And sages say, “A man’s own limbs will testify against him: ‘Therefore you are my witnesses, says the Lord, and I am God’ (Isa. 43:12).”

I.1 analyzes the language of the Mishnah and explains its sense. II.1 explains the Mishnah-rule. III.1+2 proceed to find in Scripture the source for the Mishnah-rule. There follows an anthological appendix on the theme introduced, quite tangentially, in the opening unit. This runs from No. 3 through No. 25. IV.1 expounds the Mishnah-clause, and there follows another thematic appendix. V.1, VI.1+2-3 ask obvious exegetical questions.

2:2

- A. **Yosé b. Yoezer says not to lay on hands. Yosé b. Yohanan says to lay on hands.**
- B. **Joshua b. Perahyah says not to lay on hands. Nittai the Arbelite says to lay on hands.**
- C. **Judah b. Tabbai says not to lay on hands. Simeon b. Shatah says to lay on hands.**
- D. **Shemayah says to lay on hands. Abtalyon says not to lay on hands.**
- E. **Hillel and Menahem did not differ.**
- F. **Menahem departed, Shammai entered.**
- G. **Shammai says not to lay on hands. Hillel says to lay on hands.**
- H. **[16B] The first-named were patriarchs, and the second to them were heads of the court.**

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

- B. **The three authorities of the former pairs, who ruled not to lay on hands, and the two authorities of the latter pairs, who ruled to lay on hands, were patriarchs, and those second to them were heads of the court,” the words of R. Meir.**
- C. **And sages [T.: R. Judah] say, “Simeon b. Shatah was patriarch, Judah b. Tabbai was head of the court” [T. Hag. 2:8C-D].**

I.2. A. *Who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Said R. Judah b. Tabbari, "May I never see consolation if I did not put to death a single perjured witness. This was to root out from the heart of the Boethusians the position that they stated: 'a perjured witness could be put to death only after the person whom he had accused had actually been executed.'"
- C. Said to him Simeon b. Shatah, "May I never see consolation, if you have not shed innocent blood. For lo, sages have said, 'Perjured witnesses are put to death only if both of them have been proved perjurers, and they are flogged only if both of them have been proved perjurers, and they don't pay monetary compensation unless both of them have been proved perjurers.'"
- D. Forthwith R. Judah b. Tabbari undertook never to give a decision unless it was in the presence of Simeon b. Shatah.
- E. For all of the rest of his days did R. Judah b. Tabbari prostrate himself on the grave of that slain man [the false witness], and his screams were heard abroad.
- F. People thought, "This is the scream of the slain man."
- G. He said, "It was my very own scream. You may know that that is the fact, for when I die, you will not hear the scream any more" [T. [San. 6:6E-J](#)].

I.3. A. Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, "But maybe he ultimately appeased him, or the deceased call him to judgment [so that wouldn't prove that the voice was that of the deceased]!"

I.4. A. Who is the Tannaite authority who is responsible for this story? If you claim that it is R. Meir, who has said, "Simeon b. Shatah was head of the court and R. Judah b. Tabbari was patriarch," then this is in line with the pledge that he would give instruction in the law only on the say-so of Simeon b. Shatah. But if you say that it is rabbis, who maintain that Judah b. Tabbari was head of the court and Simeon b. Shatah was patriarch, then if the head of the court is present with the patriarch, who gives instruction in the law?

B. No, what is the meaning of the phrase, **never to give a decision unless it was in the presence of Simeon b. Shatah**? It referred to voting along with others, meaning, "I won't even join other judges to give a decision unless Simeon is there]."

II.1 A. Menahem departed, Shammai entered:

- B. So where did Menahem go?
- C. Abbaye said, "He went off to a life of bad conduct."
- D. Raba said, "He went off to the royal service."

II.2. A. So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. Menahem went off to the royal service, and with him went eight pairs of disciples, dressed in silk.

III.1 A. [Supply: ...not to lay on hands...to lay on hands:] Said R. Shemen bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "The considerations of Sabbath rest should never be minor in your view, for lo, the laying on of hands on the festival day is subject to prohibition only by reason of the considerations of the rest that are operative for the Sabbath

and festivals, and yet the preeminent authorities of that generation were divided on the matter.”

- B. *Well, that's pretty obvious!*
- C. Considerations of Sabbath and festival rest are part of the religious duty of those occasions!
- D. *Well, that's pretty obvious too.*
- E. *It was necessary to make that point, to dismiss the opinion of him who has said, "What is subject to dispute is the matter of laying on of hands at all." So we are informed that it is in respect to considerations of Sabbath rest, not the laying on of hands itself, that is subject to dispute. [Everyone agrees that obligatory peace offerings require the laying on of hands.]*

III.2. A. Said R. Ammi bar Hama, “[That the issue before us is considerations of Sabbath rest] implies that the laying on of hands must be done with all one’s strength. For if it should enter your mind that we do not require that it should be done with all one’s strength, then what work is done in laying on of hands at all?”

- B. *An objection was raised: “Speak to the sons of Israel...and he shall lay his hands...” (Lev. 1: 2-4) — the sons of Israel lay on hands, but the daughters of Israel don’t lay on hands.”*
- C. R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, “Daughters of Israel as an optional matter also may lay on hands.”
- D. Said R. Yosé, “Abba Eleazar reported to me: “Once we had a calf that was designated as a sacrifice of peace offerings, and we brought it to the women’s court, and women laid hands on it, not because laying on of hands is an obligation for women, but only in order to please the women.””
- E. *Now if you should imagine that the laying on of hands must be done with all one’s strength, then merely on account of pleasing the women, would we have performed an act of labor on Holy Things? So doesn’t that imply that the laying on of hands need not be done with all one’s strength?*
- F. *Not at all. I shall say to you that we do require that it be done with all one’s strength, but the women were instructed to put their hands on only lightly.*
- G. *Well, if that’s so, then what’s the point of the qualifying language, not because laying on of hands is an obligation for women, but only in order to please the women? Why not say simply, it really wasn’t an act of laying on of hands at all!*
- H. Said R. Ammi, “The form of argument runs, first..., and moreover...: first, there is no requirement of laying on of hands at all; and, furthermore, it was only to please the women.

III.3. A. Said R. Pappa, “ “[That the issue before us is considerations of Sabbath rest] implies that it is forbidden on the festival or Sabbath to make use of the sides [of the beast, of a tree, and the like]. For if it should enter your mind to suppose that the sides are permitted, then let the hands be laid on at the side of the beast. So it must follow that it is forbidden on the festival or Sabbath to make use of the sides [of the beast, of a tree, and the like].”

- B. **[17A]** R. Ashi said, “You may even take the position that it is permitted on the festival or Sabbath to make use of the sides [of the beast, of a tree, and the like].

But any part of the beast that is connected to the back is classified as part of the back [e.g., like the head].”

I.1+2-4 provide Tannaite complements to the Mishnah-statement. II.1-2 answer an obvious exegetical question. III.1-3 identify what is at issue in the Mishnah, and expand on that theory of matters.

2:3-4

2:3

- A. **The House of Shammai say, “They bring peace offerings [on a festival day] but do not lay hands on them. But [they do] not [bring] whole offerings [at all].”**
- B. **And the House of Hillel say, “They bring [both] peace offerings and whole offerings, and they lay hands on them.”**

2:4

- A. **Pentecost that coincided with a Friday —**
- B. **The House of Shammai say, “The day of slaughtering [the whole offering brought in fulfillment of the requirement of appearing before the Lord] is on the day after the Sabbath [Sunday].”**
- C. **And the House of Hillel say, “There is no day of slaughtering.”**
- D. **But they concur that if it coincided with the Sabbath, the day of slaughtering [the whole offering] is after the Sabbath.**
- E. **And the high priest does not put on his garments.**
- F. **And they are permitted to conduct a lamentation or to hold a fast,**
- G. **so as not to affirm the opinion of those who say, “The date of Pentecost [must always fall] after the Sabbath [on Sunday].”**

The issue of the Mishnah’s rule is how we deal with the presentation of the peace offerings and comparable offerings on the festival day itself. The House of Shammai maintain that peace offerings may be presented, but without the laying on of hands, which is a superfluous act of labor and therefore omitted. The House of Hillel maintain that the presentation of the offerings overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath. In line with this same view, we take up the question of Pentecost. The House of Shammai invent a “day of slaughtering,” which is to take place after the Sabbath. Thus on Friday, the festival, the whole offering presented in fulfillment of the requirement of appearing before the Lord may not be presented; the offering of course cannot be made on the Sabbath itself. So on Sunday following, a “day of offering” is celebrated. It follows, of course, that one can make up later on an offering not presented when due, on the Sabbath itself. So much for M. 2:3. The House of Hillel maintain in M. 2:3 that the various offerings due on festival days are presented on those days, overriding the prohibition of the Sabbath. But they do concede that if Pentecost coincided with the Sabbath, the whole offering for Pentecost is presented the next day, Sunday; that day, however, is not celebrated as a holy day in other regards. Now, since the Houses concur that “if it coincided with the Sabbath, the day of slaughtering [the whole offering] is after the Sabbath,” it follows that one can make up on a later day an offering due on the festival but not presented on that day. Since at issue is Pentecost in particular, we begin with the question of how Scripture indicates that, in this respect, Pentecost is in the category of Tabernacles and Passover, even though the latter

comprise a week and the former only a single festival day. This is surely a secondary consideration; it is the premise of the Mishnah's rule, which focuses upon a different topic of debate altogether.

- I.1** A. Said R. Eleazar said R. Oshaia, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that offerings required for Pentecost can be made up throughout the following seven days [like Tabernacles and Passover]? 'Three times a year shall all your males appear before the Lord your God in the place he shall choose, on the feast of unleavened bread, and on the feast of weeks, and on the feast of tabernacles, and they shall not appear before the Lord your God empty handed' (Deu. 16:16). Scripture thus treats as comparable the festival of Pentecost and the festival of unleavened bread: just as the offerings for the festival of unleavened bread can be made up throughout seven days, so offerings required for Pentecost can be made up throughout seven days."
- B. *So why not say:* Scripture treats it as comparable to the festival of Tabernacles: just as the offerings for the festival of Tabernacles can be made up throughout eight days, so offerings required for Pentecost can be made up throughout eight days?
- C. The eighth day happens to be a festival entirely unto itself [and is not part of Tabernacles].
- D. *Well, I have no problem concurring that* the eighth day happens to be a festival entirely unto itself [and is not part of Tabernacles], *but that consideration is pertinent only to the* fact that the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly constitutes a festival unto itself for the matters of balloting to see which priest does what job, for the saying of the blessing for the season, for the character of the holiday as distinct from the Festival of Sukkot [so the sukkah is not used], the sacrifice, the psalm, and the benediction. [In all these aspects it is a completely distinct holy day and not a continuation of the Festival of *Sukkot*]. *But, so far as the issue of whether or not* the offerings for the festival of Tabernacles can be made up throughout eight days, it is the fact that the offerings for the first day of the festival of Tabernacles can be made up throughout eight days, including the eighth. *For we have learned in the Mishnah:* **He who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival [of Tabernacles] [M. Hag. 1:6].**
- E. If you hold onto a great deal, you hold nothing, but if you hold onto a little, you will hold onto it. [Abraham: we can't go wrong comparing Pentecost with Passover, but we may err if we compare it with Tabernacles' eight days.]
- F. *Then what purpose in law was served by Scripture's reference to the festival of Tabernacles?*
- G. *It was to compare that festival to the festival of unleavened bread.* Just as in the case of the festival of unleavened bread, the pilgrim has to spend the night in Jerusalem, so on the festival of Pentecost, the pilgrim has to stay the night in Jerusalem [on the intermediate days of the festival].
- H. **[17B]** *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact for Passover?*

- I. “And you shall turn in the morning and go home” (Deu. 16: 7) [having spent the prior night in Jerusalem].

We now proceed from the premise of the Mishnah to its problematic, which is, the dispute between the Houses. Now the language of the House of Hillel requires clarification. The Mishnah-passage is cited and then glossed. The effect is to underscore the comparability of Pentecost to the other festivals.

II.1 A. We have learned in the Mishnah: Pentecost that coincided with a Friday —

The House of Shammai say, “The day of slaughtering [the whole offering brought in fulfillment of the requirement of appearing before the Lord] is on the day after the Sabbath [Sunday].” And the House of Hillel say, “There is no day of slaughtering:”

- B. *What is the meaning of that statement? Isn't it, there is no day of slaughtering at all? [The offering cannot be made good later on.]*
- C. *No, what it means is that it does not require a day of slaughtering [in its own terms, since it can be made good throughout the seven days, line with Oshayya's view that offerings required for Pentecost can be made up throughout seven days].*
- D. *Then what are we told that we didn't already know, that we can offer up the sacrifice on its proper day [the festival itself, as the House of Hillel maintain]? In point of fact, the same authorities have already conducted a dispute on that very same matter, as we have learned in the Mishnah: The House of Shammai say, “They bring peace offerings [on a festival day] but do not lay hands on them. But [they do] not [bring] whole offerings [at all].” And the House of Hillel say, “They bring [both] peace offerings and whole offerings, and they lay hands on them”!*
- E. *It was necessary to state the issue twice, for if we had been informed of the dispute only in the latter case [when the festival does not coincide with Friday], I might have supposed that it is only in that case in which the House of Shammai take the view they do, because it is possible to bring the offerings the next day, but in the case in which Pentecost coincides with a Friday, I might suppose that they concur with the House of Hillel. And we had been informed only of the dispute in the former case, I might have that thought it is in that situation in particular that the House of Hillel take the view that they do, because it is not possible to bring the offering the next day, but in the latter case, they might concur with the House of Shammai. So it was necessary to state the issue twice.*

We now revert to the issue of I.1, linking the present clarification to the proposition presented above?

- F. *Come and take note: he who did not bring his festal offering on the seven days of Passover or on the eight days of Tabernacle or on the first festival day of the festival of Pentecost can no longer bring that offering. Doesn't this refer to the festival day of the festival of Pentecost?*
- G. *No, it refers to the day for slaughter [of the festival sacrifices]. [Therefore these can be made good on the day of slaughter, contrary to Oshayya's point.]*

- H. *If so, doesn't it bear the implication that there is only one day for slaughter [but Oshayya says the Pentecost sacrifices can be made good for a whole week (Abraham)]?*
- I. *Read: "on the days for slaughter" [including seven days].*
- J. *Come and take note of that which Rabbah bar Samuel presented as a Tannaite statement: "The Torah has said, 'count a month of days [Num. 11:20], and [after counting twenty nine days, the thirtieth day] is to be sanctified as the new moon, and, further, 'sanctify the festival of Pentecost' [Lev. 23:15-16]. Just as the new moon festival is assigned to the days by which it is determined [that is, is determined by numbering units of days, on one of which it falls (Abraham)], so too the offerings of the festival of Pentecost are brought on only one day"! Doesn't this yield the proposition that we draw an analogy from the matter of the month: just as the celebration of the new month and its offerings take place on one day, the same is so for Pentecost?*
- K. *Said Raba, "But do you really find that self-evident? Do we reach the date of Pentecost by counting days? We count the weeks too, for said Abbaye, 'It is a religious duty to count the days, as it is written, "You shall count fifty days" (Lev. 23:16), and it is a religious duty to count the weeks, "Seven weeks shall you count for yourself" (Deu. 16: 9). Furthermore, it is written, "the festival of weeks" (Deu. 16:10)."*

II.2. A. [Proving that the period for making up the festival sacrifices is a week,] *a Tannaite authority of the Household of R. Eliezer b. Jacob [said], "And you shall make proclamation' (Lev. 23:21), 'and when you reap' (Lev. 23:22) — so which is the festival on which you both proclaim and also reap? You have to admit: it is the festival of Pentecost that is under discussion. And when does this take place? Should you say it is done on the festival day itself? But is it permitted to reap on a festival day? So it has to refer to the period after the festival, and it follows that it is still possible to make up the offerings."*

II.3. A. *And even though that which R. Eleazar said R. Oshayya said, the statement of R. Eliezer b. Jacob also is required to make the same point. For if we had to depend solely on what R. Eleazar said R. Oshayya said, I might have drawn the conclusion, just as in the period during which an offering for the feast of unleavened bread can be made up, it is forbidden to do work, so in the period during which the offering for the festival of Pentecost may be made good, it is forbidden to do work. Consequently we are given the formulation of R. Eliezer b. Jacob. And if we had in hand only the formulation of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, [18A] I should not have known how many days are allotted for making up the offering. So we are informed of what R. Eleazar has said R. Oshayya has said.*

B. *And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "And the festival of harvest' (Exo. 23:16) — which is the festival on which you both present a festal offering and also harvest? You have to say, it is the festival of Pentecost. And when does this take place? Should you say it is done on the festival day itself? But is it permitted to reap on a festival day? So it has to refer to the period after the festival, and it follows that it is still possible to make up the offerings."*

C. *Said to him R. Yohanan, "Well, what about the following: 'the feast of ingathering' (Exo. 23:16, 34:22) — so which is the festival on which it is*

permitted both to present the festal offering and also to gather in the harvest? You have to say it is the festival of Tabernacles. *And when does this take place? Should you say it is done on the festival day itself? But is it permitted to reap on a festival day? So it has to refer to the intermediate days of the festival. But is work permitted on the intermediate days of the festival? So it must refer to the festival that comes at the season of ingathering, and here too, it must refer to the festival that comes at the season of reaping*" [Abraham: and not, as Simeon b. Laqish maintains, a festival time at which feasting and reaping are combined].

We conclude by proofs for the proposition that is taken for granted, that servile labor is forbidden on the intermediate days of the festival. What follows is a topical appendix of standard proofs for that conventional proposition.

- D. *[Without an objection from Simeon b. Laqish to the claim that work is forbidden on the intermediate days of the festival], does it follow that both of them take the position that work on the intermediate days of the festival is forbidden? And whence in Scripture do we derive that fact?*
- E. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. **"On the first day you shall hold a holy assembly, and on the seventh day a holy assembly" The feast of unleavened bread you shall keep, seven days" (Exo. 23:15):**
- G. **"This teaches that work is forbidden on the intermediate days of the festival," the words of R. Josiah.**
- H. **R. Jonathan says, "Such proof is not required. It can be proven by an argument a fortiori, namely:**
- I. **"If the first festival day of the festival and the last, before which or after which no sanctification occurs, lo, those days are forbidden for servile labor, the intermediate days of the festival, before which and after which sanctification occurs, surely should be forbidden for carrying on servile labor."**
- J. **[That argument fails, for the anomaly presented by] the six weekdays of creation will prove the contrary.**
- K. **Sanctification occurs before those six days and afterwards, yet performing servile labor is permitted on those days. Accordingly, they will provide evidence for the intermediate days of the festival, that, even though sanctification occurs before or after those days, it should be permitted to perform servile labor on those days.**
- L. **No, if you invoke the case of the six days of creation, on which no additional offering is presented in the temple, on account of which it is permitted to perform acts of servile labor on those days, will you say the same of the intermediate days of the festival, on which an additional offering is presented in the temple, on account of which it should be forbidden to perform acts of servile labor on those days.**
- M. **Now lo, the days in celebration of the appearance of the new moon will prove to the contrary, for on those days an additional offering is presented in the temple, and yet it is permitted to perform acts of servile labor despite that**

fact. So too in the case of the intermediate days of the festival, even though there is an additional offering in the temple on those days, it should be permitted to perform acts of servile labor on those days.

- N. No, if you have invoked the anomaly of the days on which the new moon appears, which are not classified as days of a holy assembly, will you say the same of the intermediate days of the festival, which fall into the classification of days of holy assembly?
- O. Therefore it should be forbidden to perform acts of servile labor on the intermediate days of a festival [Mekhilta attributed to R. Ishmael Pisha IX:I.2-2].

II.4. A. *It has been further taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “‘You shall do no sort of servile labor’ (Lev. 23: 7) — this teaches that it is forbidden to perform acts of servile labor on the intermediate days of the festival,” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- C. R. Aqiba says, “Such a scriptural proof is hardly required, for lo, Scripture says, ‘These are the appointed seasons of the Lord’ (Lev. 4, 37). Concerning what day does Scripture speak? If it is concerning the first day of the festival, it is stated in any event, ‘a day of solemn rest’ (Lev. 23:39), and if for the seventh day, the same pertains. So the verse must speak only of the intermediate days of the festival, and it teaches that it is forbidden to perform acts of servile labor on the intermediate days of the festival.”

II.5. A. *It has been further taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “Six days shall you eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day there is restraint [of servile labor] for the Lord” (Deu. 16: 8) — just as the seventh day is subject to restraint of servile labor, so the first six days are likewise restrained as to servile labor.
- C. Well what about the proposition: just as the seventh day is subject to restraints on all types of labor, so the six days should be subject to restraints as to all types of labor?
- D. Scripture is clear, “And on the seventh day there is restraint [of servile labor] for the Lord” (Deu. 16: 8) — the seventh day is subject to restraint of all kinds of labor, but the first six days are not subject to that blanket restriction.
- E. Lo, Scripture has assigned only to sages the task of telling you which day is forbidden, which permitted, which kind of labor is forbidden, which kind permitted.

III.1 A. **And those days are permitted for the conduct of a lamentation or for holding a fast, so as not to affirm the opinion of those who say, “The date of Pentecost [must always fall] after the Sabbath [on Sunday]:”**

- B. *Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. There was the case of Alexa, who died in Lud, and all the Israelites assembled to mourn him, but R. Tarfon didn’t let them, because it was the festival day of Pentecost [T. Hag. 2:13E-F].

- D. *Does it enter your mind that it really was **the festival day of Pentecost**? If it were the festival day, would they have assembled? Rather, it was because it was the day of slaughter. [Tarfon then contradicts the rule of the Mishnah.]*
- E. *No problem, in the case of Alexa, it was the festival day that coincided with Sunday [so the slaughtering day was not on Sunday, and mourning was permitted as it would always be on a festival], but the case of the Mishnah speaks of the festival day that coincided with the Sabbath [leaving the slaughtering day on Sunday, and the rule of the Mishnah therefore has to be invoked].*

I.1 finds a scriptural foundation for the Mishnah's rule. The set at II.1ff. invokes the rule of the Mishnah in expanding on the discussion of No. 1, and, by the way, also clarify the sense of language in the Mishnah-paragraph. One may well consider unit II to form a continuation of unit I, but the rhetoric of II.1 leaves the impression that it is a direct inquiry into the Mishnah, and that is why I identify it in the way I do. III.1 adds a Tannaite complement.

2:5-7

2:5

- A. [18B] [For purposes of cultic purification, it is sufficient if] they wash the hands for eating unconsecrated food, tithe, and heave offering;
- B. and for eating food in the status of Holy Things [it is sufficient only if] they immerse;
- C. and as to [the preparation of] purification water [through the burning of the red cow], if one's hands are made unclean, his entire body is deemed to be unclean as well.

2:6

- A. He who immerses for the eating of unconsecrated food and is thereby confirmed as suitable for eating unconsecrated food is prohibited from eating tithe.
- B. [If] he immersed for eating tithe and is thereby confirmed as suitable for eating tithe, he is prohibited from eating heave offering.
- C. [If] he immersed for eating heave offering and is thereby confirmed as suitable for eating heave offering, he is prohibited from eating food in the status of Holy Things.
- D. [If] he immersed for eating food in the status of Holy Things and is thereby confirmed as suitable for eating food in the status of Holy Things, he is prohibited from engaging in the preparation of purification water.
- E. [If, however], one immersed for the matter requiring the more stringent rule, he is permitted to engage in the matter requiring the less stringent rule.
- F. [If] he immersed but was not confirmed, it is as though he did not immerse.

2:7

- A. The clothing of ordinary folk is in the status of midras uncleanness for abstainers [who eat unconsecrated food in a state of cultic cleanness].

- B. The clothing of abstainers is in the status of midras uncleanness for those who eat heave offering [priests].
- C. The clothing of those who eat heave offering is in the status of midras uncleanness for those who eat Holy Things [officiating priests].
- D. The clothing of those who eat Holy Things is in the status of midras uncleanness for those engaged in the preparation of purification water.
- E. Yosef b. Yoezer was the most pious man in the priesthood, but his handkerchief was in the status of midras uncleanness so far as eating Holy Things was concerned.
- F. For his whole life Yohanan b. Gudegedah ate his food in accord with the requirements of cleanness applying to Holy Things, but his handkerchief was in the status of midras uncleanness so far as those engaged in the preparation of purification water were concerned.

I.1 A. [For purposes of cultic purification, it is sufficient if they merely wash the hands for eating unconsecrated food, tithe, and heave offering:] *But for the eating of unconsecrated food and second tithe, is it necessary to have a cultic rinsing of the hands at all? And by way of contrast: As regards food in the status of heave-offerings and first fruits, non-priests who eat them are liable to death if they eat the offering intentionally, or to pay the offering's value and an added fifth [if they eat the offering unintentionally. They are forbidden for use by non-priests, since they are priestly property. They are neutralized, losing their consecrated status, in a mixture with at least one hundred and one parts of unconsecrated food. They require washing of the hands on the part of any priest before he may handle them, and, after ritual immersion, an unclean priest must await sunset before he may handle them. Lo, these rules pertain to food in the status of priestly rations ["heave offering"] and first fruits, but not to tithe. [And they may not be separated from a clean batch or dough or produce on behalf of an unclean batch of dough or produce] [M. Hal. 1:9A-F; cf. also M. Bik. 2:1]! but not to tithe — all the more so, not to unconsecrated food! So there is a contradiction between one ruling concerning second tithe and another, likewise a contradiction between one ruling concerning unconsecrated food and another!*

- B. *Now there really is no problem in the two rulings concerning second tithe, there being no contradiction, since the one represents the position of R. Meir, the other of rabbis, as we have learned in the Mishnah: Whoever [or whatever] requires immersion in water according to the rules of the scribes (1) renders the holy things unclean and (2) spoils heave offering. "And he is permitted in respect to unconsecrated food and tithe," the words of R. Meir. And sages prohibit in the case of tithe [M. Par. 11:5A-C].*
- C. *But in respect to the two positions in regard to unconsecrated food, there really is a problem!*
- D. *In respect to the two positions in regard to unconsecrated food, there also is no contradiction, the one [where we have to wash hands] involves eating, the other [where there is no requirement to wash hands for cultic cleanness] is in the context of merely touching the produce.*

- E. *Objected R. Shimi bar Ashi, “The rabbis differ from R. Meir’s view only in respect to eating second tithe, but as to touching it or eating unconsecrated food, there is no difference of opinion at all” [sages concur that as to eating unconsecrated food, it may be eaten without washing hands, so the contradiction stands].*
- F. *Rather, both rules pertaining to eating unconsecrated food, but there still is no contradiction, for the Mishnah requiring rinsing hands prior to eating unconsecrated food refers to eating bread, the other, eating fruit. For said R. Nahman, “Whoever rinses his hands prior to eating fruit is a big showoff.”*

We proceed to a secondary analysis of the rules taken for granted in the foregoing. Now the matter of intentionality is introduced as the principal variable, and then, at No. 3ff., the consideration of intentionality is itself tested.

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

- B. **He who rinses his hands, if he did so with the intention [that the hands be clean for the various purposes stated], his hands are clean for that purpose, but if he did not do so with such an intention, his hands are unclean.**
- C. **So too, he who immerses his hands, if he immersed with the correct intentionality, his hands are clean, and if he did not have proper intentionality, his hands are unclean [T. Hag. 3:2A-D].**
- D. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **...whether or not it was with the intention of becoming clean, his hands are clean [T. Hag. 3:2E-F].**
- F. *Said R. Nahman, “No problem, the one pertains to unconsecrated food, [19A] the other to tithe.”*

The premise of the foregoing is now examined: that correct intentionality is not required for hand-washing when unconsecrated food is concerned. The relevance of the appendix is underscored by the fact that our Mishnah-paragraph contributes to the solution of the free-standing problem that is investigated here. So the editor has enriched our appreciation of the Mishnah-paragraph’s larger legal and theoretical context, both by the unfolding of the argument from No. 2 to No. 3, and also by his resort in this secondary context to the Mishnah-paragraph’s own facts — a profound demonstration of the deep unity of the law.

- I.3.** A. *And on what basis do you maintain that for the purpose of eating unconsecrated food, immersion or rinsing of hands does not require correct intentionality? Because we have learned in the Mishnah: **A wave which broke off, and in it are forty seahs — and it fell on man and on utensils — they are clean [M. Miq. 5:6A-C].** Now the Tannaite rule treats as comparable man and utensils. [But then intentionality is ruled out, utensils not possessing the possibility of an independent act of free will.] Just as, in the case of utensils, there is no consideration of intentionality in the purification effected by the wave, so in the case of man, there is no consideration of intentionality in the process of purification.*
- B. *But why should that be the case? Maybe the rule refers to someone who was sitting and waiting for the next wave, wondering when the wave will break, and*

then the utensils are treated as comparable to the man: just as in the case of the man, intentionality is involved in the process, so in the matter of utensils, it is a case in which the owner intends for them to be purified. And if you should say, well, then, what is implied in the description of the case as one in which someone is sitting and waiting for the wave to break? It might have entered your mind to suppose that there should be a precautionary decree against doing so, out of consideration that someone who may bathe in a detached wave may also come to immerse in a torrent of rainwater [which is not a suitable medium for purification]; or, along these same lines, we should make a decree against immersing at the ends of the wave on account of the crest. So we are informed that we make no such precautionary decrees.

- C. *And on what basis do you maintain that one may not immerse utensils in the crest of a wave?*
- D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **A wave of water that was detached from the sea or from the river — they do not immerse in it, for they do not immerse in air** [T. **Miq. 4:5A-C**].*
- E. *[That intentionality is not required in immersion for unconsecrated food] rather derives from that which we have learned in the Mishnah: **Pieces of fruit which fell into a water channel — he whose hands were unclean reached out and took them — his hands are clean, and the pieces of fruit are insusceptible to uncleanness. And if he gave thought that his hands should be rinsed off, his hands are clean, and the pieces of fruit are under the law, If water be put** [M. **Mak. 4:7**].*
- F. *Objected Rabbah to R. Nahman, “**He who immerses for the eating of unconsecrated food and is thereby confirmed as suitable for eating unconsecrated food is prohibited from eating tithe.** So it is only if he is **confirmed** that that is the case, but if he is not confirmed, that is not the case. [If the intention is that he may eat unconsecrated food, he may eat it, but not if that was not the intention.]”*
- G. *This is the sense of the statement: even though he is confirmed in regards his intentionality for unconsecrated food, he is forbidden to eat tithe. [Abraham: but actually, unconsecrated food does not require intention.]*
- H. *He objected: “[If] **he immersed but was not confirmed [by reason of intentionality for some particular purpose], it is as though he did not immerse** [M. **2:6F**]. Surely that means, it is as though he had not immersed at all.”*
- I. *“No, it means, as though he had not immersed for tithe, but he has immersed so far as unconsecrated food is concerned.”*
- J. *[Rabbah] supposed that he was merely dismissing him, but he went out, looked into the matter, and found that it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [If] he immersed but was not confirmed [by reason of intentionality for some particular purpose], he is forbidden to eat tithe, but is permitted so far as as unconsecrated food is concerned.*

Another, tertiary issue is now taken up: at what point is the matter of intentionality resolved?

I.4. A. Said R. Eleazar, “If one immersed and came up out of the water, he may confirm his action with the intention of serving any purpose that he wishes.”

B. *An objection was raised: If he still had his feet in the water, if he immersed for the most minor kind of uncleanness but then he became confirmed for the most stringent kind of uncleanness, what he has done is done and valid. Once he has come up out of the immersion pool, he may no longer form an intention as to confirming his status in any other way [T. Hag. 3:1C]. Doesn't this mean, he may not confirm his status in any way at all?*

C. *No, what it means is this: if he is still in the water, even though he has not formed an intention, he may now do so; but once he has come up out of the water, if he had not formed an intention, he may do so, but if he had formed an intention, he may not then shift the intentionality for any other purpose [but the original one]. [Abraham: with the completion of immersion the first intention becomes effective.]*

I.5. A. *Who is the Tannaite authority who stands behind the formulation, If he still had his feet in the water?*

B. *Said R. Pedat, “It is R. Judah, for we have learned in the Mishnah: An immersion pool which contains exactly forty seahs — two people went down and immersed in it, one after the other — the first is clean, and the second is unclean. R. Judah says, “If the feet of the first one were touching the water [as the second immersed], even the second person is clean” [M. Miq. 7:6A-D].” [Simon: On the principle “stretch and bring down,” whereby a partition is imagined to be lengthened so as to reach the ground from which it is separated by a short distance, here too, the first man is treated as forming part of the partition of the pool reaching down to the pool proper; this principle may be adopted even if that of connection is not.]*

C. *Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “The dispute concerns the removes of uncleanness, which derive from the authority of rabbis, but so far as movement from uncleanness to cleanness is concerned, all parties concur that the second party is unclean,” and that is in line with what R. Pedat has said [since he reads the formulation, If he still had his feet in the water in accord with Judah and rabbis; in regard to rabbinic removes of uncleanness and cleanness, rabbis concur with Judah in accepting the principle “stretch and bring down” (Abraham)].*

D. *There are those who say: said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “The dispute concerns the case of movement from uncleanness to cleanness, but so far as the removes of uncleanness and cleanness, which rabbis have defined, all parties concur that also the second party is clean,” and that differs from the view of R. Pedat.*

I.6. A. *Said Ulla, “I asked R. Yohanan: according to the position of R. Judah, what is the law as to immersion of needles and hooks in the wet head of the first bather while he is still in*

the water? *Is it the fact that R. Judah accepts the principle of connecting downward, but not of connecting upward [so water in the pool is considered as connected with the water on the bather's head, thus purifying the needles on the bather's head]? Or perhaps R. Judah accepts the principle of connecting upward as well?"*

- B. *He said to him, "You have learned the following Tannaite rule: **Three holes containing water in a gulch, the lowest and the uppermost are of twenty seahs each, and the middle one is forty seahs — the rivulet of rain-water enters into them and flows out of them [connecting them] — R. Judah says, [19B] "[R.] Meir would say, 'They dunk in the uppermost one'" [T. Mid. 3:4G-K].***
- C. *But it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "[R.] Meir would say, 'They dunk in the uppermost one, 'and I say, 'In the lowest one and not in the top one'" [T. Mid. 3:4G-K].*
- D. *He said to him, "So if that's how it's been taught on Tannaite authority, that's the way it is."*

The inquiry into the authority behind the rule of the next clause of our Mishnah-paragraph leads us through the analysis of the premises of further clauses of the same large statement.

II.1 A. He who immerses for the eating of unconsecrated food and is thereby confirmed as suitable for eating unconsecrated food is prohibited from eating tithe:

- B. *In accord with what authority is our Mishnah-paragraph?*
- C. *It is in accord with rabbis, who make a distinction between unconsecrated food and second tithe.*
- D. *Then what about the further clause of our Mishnah-paragraph: **The clothing of ordinary folk is in the status of midras uncleanness for abstainers [who eat unconsecrated food in a state of cultic cleanness]. The clothing of abstainers is in the status of midras uncleanness for those who eat heave offering [priests].** [Abraham: this shows that second tithe is in the same category as ordinary food.] *Now this then accords with R. Meir, who maintains that unconsecrated food and second tithe in this aspect are one and the same. So is the upshot that the first part of the passage accords with rabbis and the second part with R. Meir?**
- E. *Yes indeed, the first part of the passage accords with rabbis and the second part with R. Meir.*
- F. *R. Aha bar Adda repeated the Tannaite formulation of the second part of the Mishnah in five removes of uncleanness [Abraham: adding those who eat second tithe as a separate level of purity between Pharisees and those who eat heave offering], and he then interprets the entire passage to accord with rabbis.*

We now take up a theoretical problem to which our rule contributes, but which has nothing to do with the amplification of our Mishnah-rule. It concerns the status of

unconsecrated food that is preserved in conditions of cleanness required, in fact, only for Holy Things. Is the treatment of that unconsecrated food as if it were Holy Things sufficient to classify the unconsecrated food as Holy Things? That theoretical question is important at M. Toh. 2:2ff. and is introduced here because of the implications of our law for the solution of the problem. The point of contact is the statement at II.1.F; since we do take account of the structure of the passage — four or five removes of uncleanness — we ask about another consideration that would involve the specification of a number of distinct removes of uncleanness other than the one before us. So No. 2 is integral to the foregoing, even though it moves in its own direction.

- II.2.** A. Said R. Mari, “*It follows from that, then, that unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules governing Holy Things is tantamount to Holy Things. On what basis? [20A] Since the Mishnah-formulation does not include that type of food as a distinct level of purity.*”
- B. *But perhaps the reason that the passage does not present food of that status as a distinct level of cleanness is, if it is heave offering, then anyhow the Mishnah-passage deals with heave offering, and if it is equivalent to unconsecrated food, so, the passage covers unconsecrated food just as well. For lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules governing Holy Things is tantamount to unconsecrated food. R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq says, “Lo, it is equivalent to heave offering.”*
- C. *Rather, the proposition derives from the concluding part of the same passage: Yosef b. Yoezer was the most pious man in the priesthood, but his handkerchief was in the status of midras uncleanness so far as eating Holy Things was concerned. For his whole life Yohanan b. Gudegedah ate his food in accord with the requirements of cleanness applying to Holy Things, but his handkerchief was in the status of midras uncleanness so far as those engaged in the preparation of purification water were concerned — so that was in respect to those engaged in the preparation of purification water, but it was not in respect to Holy Things, from which it must follow that he takes the view, Unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules governing Holy Things is tantamount to Holy Things.*

The Role of Intentionality in Matters of Uncleanness

The following compositions address the general problem of intentionality in matters of uncleanness, but do not contribute in a specific way to the elucidation of our Mishnah-paragraph, which, we have now established, treats that same general problem. Hence we have a topical appendix.

- II.3.** A. Said R. Jonathan b. Eleazar, “If someone’s head-band fell from him and he said to his fellow, ‘Give it to me,’ and he gave it to him, the headband is unclean” [Abraham: for we cannot assume that he took it upon himself to guard it from uncleanness while he handled it, since the owner did not ask whether he was clean or not, nor can we say that the owner guarded it against defilement while it was not in his possession].

- II.4.** A. Said R. Jonathan b. Amram, “If one’s garments for the Sabbath were mixed up with his garments for everyday and he put them on, they are made unclean.” [Abraham: if someone protects something assuming it is one thing and finds it to be another, it is unclean.]
- II.5.** A. Said R. Eleazar bar Sadoq, “There was a case involving two women, who were associates [and committed to the rules of cultic cleanness outside of the Temple], who mixed up their clothes in the bath house. The case came before R. Aqiba, who declared the clothing unclean [even though both women observed the same rules].”
- B. *Objected R. Oshayya, “What about the following case: if someone poked his hand into a basket to take out a loaf of wheat bread and took up a loaf of barley bread, in such a case too is the loaf unclean? And should you say, yessirree! hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: he who keeps a jug assuming it is wine and it turns out to be oil, it is clean, not imparting uncleanness?”*
- C. *While, according to your reasoning, note the concluding part of the same: but it is forbidden for eating. Now why should that be the case?*
- D. Said R. Jeremiah, “It is a case in which he says, ‘I guarded it from whatever might impart uncleanness, but not from whatever might render the food unfit for eating in a state of cultic cleanness.’”
- E. *Well, is there any such thing as guardianship by halves, for one thing but not for something else?*
- F. *Well, as a matter of fact, there is, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **If the basket was still on his shoulder and a shovel was in it, and the man said, “and the man said, “I was attentive to the basket, but I was not attentive to the shovel,” the basket is clean, and the shovel unclean [T. Toh. 8:13C-D].***
- G. But won’t the shovel impart its uncleanness to the basket?
- H. A utensil does not impart uncleanness to another utensil.
- I. But will not the shovel impart uncleanness to what is in the basket?
- J. *Said Rabina, “This is the sense of the statement: It is a case in which the man said, ‘I kept it from something that imparts uncleanness but I did not keep it from something that renders it invalid.’”*
- K. *Well, then, that’s a real problem.*
- L. *Moreover, Rabbah bar Abbuha objected as follows: “There was the case of a woman who came before R. Ishmael and said to him, ‘My lord, I was weaving this cloth in a state of cleanness, but I didn’t have the intention of guarding it in a state of cleanness,’ and in the midst of cross-examining her, as R. Ishmael was asking her questions, she said to him, ‘My lord, a menstruating woman came and pulled the rope with me.’ Said R. Ishmael, ‘How great are the words of sages, who said, “It is was in someone heart to preserve the cultic cleanness of an object, it is clean, if it was not in one’s intention to do so, it is unclean.”’ And there was yet another case that came before R. Ishmael, in which a woman came to him and said to him, ‘My lord, I was weaving this covering in a state of cleanness, but I didn’t have the intention of guarding it,’ and through the cross examination that R. Ishmael conducted, she said to him, ‘My lord, a thread broke, and I tied it up with*

my mouth.’ Said R. Ishmael, ‘How great are the words of sages, who said, “It is was in someone heart to preserve the cultic cleanness of an object, it is clean, if it was not in one’s intention to do so, it is unclean”’ [T. **Kel. B.B. 1:1B-C**].”

- M. *Now there is no problem in connection with the statement of R. Eleazar bar Sadoq: each of the women says, “My companion is the wife of an ordinary person [who does not keep the laws of cultic cleanness at home], and so she takes her mind off it. And there is no problem with respect to what R. Jonathan b. Amram said: since someone takes special care of clothing for the Sabbath, it is as though he took his mind off them [and for these considerations, the items are unclean]. But in the matter of R. Jonathan b. Eleazar, couldn’t he still guard it when it is in the possession of his companion?*
- N. Said R. Yohanan, “It is a presumption that someone doesn’t guard what is in the hand of his companion.”
- O. *Well so he doesn’t, doesn’t he? [20B] Then what about that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: **If one’s asses and workers were bearing foods that were in the condition of cultic cleanness and passing some distance before him, even if they were more than a mile away, lo, these are clean, because they are assumed to be watched. If he said to them, “Go out, and I shall come after you,” once they have left his eyesight, lo, these are unclean [T. **Tohorot 6:16A-C**]**?* *What differentiates the first from the second case [in that the former case involves unclean people, but they are not assumed to have imparted uncleanness to the foods that they are carrying]?*
- P. Said R. Isaac, “In the former case, he has made his ass-drivers and workers pure to carry out the task [and that is why they do not impart uncleanness to the food].”
- Q. *If so, the second case also [should involve the same preparation, so why in the second case are the foodstuffs now deemed unclean]?*
- R. A person not meticulous about preserving the cultic cleanness of food will not be meticulous about contact with his [unclean] fellow.
- S. *If so, the first case also should involve the same consideration!*
- T. We deal with a case in which the owner could come upon them by some circuitous route [so the workers would know that they are being watched].”
- U. *If so, then the same consideration should apply in the second case!*
- V. *Since he has said to them, “**Go out, and I shall come after you,**” they rely on his statement [and would be careless.] [“...under supervision,” means that the gentile is afraid to tamper with the wine because he might be observed by the owner.]*

I.1 raises a question on the law of the Mishnah and its harmony. No. 2+3-4, with its own appendix at Nos. 5-6, proceed to a Tannaite complement of a fundamental detail, which is the role of intentionality in the process of purification. II.1 identifies the authority behind our unattributed Mishnah-rule. No. 2 raises its own issue, flowing from No. 1. Nos. 3-5 continue the analysis of the same principle, the role of attitude or intentionality.