

# I.

---

## BAVLI PESAHI CHAPTER ONE

### FOLIOS 2A-21A

#### 1:1

- A. On the night preceding the fourteenth [of Nisan] they seek out leaven by the light of a candle.
  - B. Any location into which [people] do not [ordinarily] bring leaven does not require examination.
  - C. And why did they say, “Two rows in a wine vault [must be searched out]”?
  - D. [This designates] a place into which they bring leaven.
  - E. The House of Shammai say, “Two rows over the entire surface of [the rack of jars in] the wine vault.”
  - F. And the House of Hillel say, “The two outermost rows which are uppermost.”
- I.1** A. *What is the meaning of the word at hand [or] translated “evening” [which can be read to mean “night” or “light”]?*
- B. *R. Huna said, “It means light.”*
  - C. *And R. Judah said, “It means night.”*
    - D. *But do you imagine that the one who says it means light holds that view literally, or that the one who says it means night holds that view literally? But then one may raise the following objection: “As soon as the morning was light, the men were sent away” (Gen. 44: 3), therefore, the word at hand means light.*

- E. *But does the verse say, “the word at hand referred to morning”? The sense is, “the morning was” with the word at hand, as people say, “morning has broken forth.”*
- F. *And that is in accord with what R. Judah said Rab said, for said R. Judah said Rab, “A person should always enter a town with ‘it is good’ (Gen. 1: 4), meaning, with light, and he should always set forth with ‘it is good.’”*
- G. *An objection was raised: “As the light of the morning, when the sun rises” (2Sa. 23: 4), and since the word at hand in that context refers to light, that proves that the word refers to daytime.*
- H. *But is it written, “the word at hand is morning”? What is written is, “as the word of hand of the morning,” and this is the sense of the matter: “And as the light of the morning” in this world, so shall be the rising of the sun to the righteous in the world to come.*
- I. *An objection was raised: “And God called the word at hand day” (Gen. 1: 5), so it must mean that the word at hand means daytime.*
- J. *This is the sense of the statement: “The growing illumination he called day.”*
- K. *Well, then, the sense of “And the darkness he called night” (Gen. 1: 5) should have the same sense, namely, “the growing darkness he called night”! But it is an established fact for us that it is still day until the stars come out!*
- L. *Rather, this is the sense of the matter: The All-Merciful called the light and assigned it its task by day, and the All-Merciful summoned the darkness and assigned its task by night.*
- M. *An objection was raised: “Praise him, all you stars of the word at hand” (Psa. 148: 3), so the word at hand must mean night.*
- N. *This is the sense of the statement: “Praise him all the stars who give light.”*
- O. *Well, then, the stars that give light are the ones who praise him, while the ones that don’t don’t have to! But it is written, “Praise him, all his host” (Psa. 148: 2)! Rather, what this serves to teach us is that the light that the stars give forth also is classified as light.*
- P. *So for what purpose is such information given?*
- Q. *It is in connection with one who takes a vow against enjoying benefit of light, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: He who takes a*

vow not to derive benefit from light is forbidden to derive benefit from the light of the stars.

- R. *An objection was raised:* “The murderer rises with the word at hand, he kills the poor and needy, and in the night he is as a thief” (Job. 24:14). **[2B]** *Now, since it is explicitly stated, in the night he is as a thief, it follows that the word at hand means day.*
- S. *In that case, this is the sense of the matter: If it is as clear to you as light that the thief is coming to take a life, he is a murderer, and the intended victim may be saved even at the cost of the thief’s life, but if you aren’t sure about it, being in doubt as dark as the darkness of the night, you must regard him as a mere thief, and the victim may not be saved at the cost of the thief’s life.*
- T. *An objection was raised:* “Let the stars of the twilight thereof be dark, let him look for the word at hand but have none, neither let it behold the eyelids of the morning” (Job. 3: 9). *Now, since it says, let him look for the word at hand but have none, it follows that the word at hand means day.*
- U. *There Job. is cursing his star, exclaiming, “May it be pleasing to Heaven that I look for light but not see it” [but light is not synonymous with morning (Freedman)].*
- V. *An objection was raised:* “If I say, surely the darkness shall overwhelm me, and the word at hand about me shall be night” (Psa. 139:11) — *so the word at hand must be day [by contrast to night]!*
- W. *In that case, this is the sense of what David said, “I said surely darkness shall overwhelm me in the future world, which is like day; but now even this world, which is like night, is light about me.”*
- X. *An objection was raised:* **R. Judah says, “They seek out [leaven] (1) on the night of the fourteenth, (2) on the fourteenth in the morning, and (3) at the time of removal” [M. 1:3A].** *Now, since R. Judah says, “We search in the word at hand of the fourteenth and in the morning of the fourteenth,” it must follow that the word at hand means, evening.*
- Y. *Yes, it must follow.*
- Z. *An objection was raised:* **From what time on the fourteenth is one prohibited to do labor?**
- AA. **R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “From the time of the word at hand.”**

- BB. **R. Judah says, “From the time of sunrise.”**
- CC. **Said R. Eliezer b. Jacob to R. Judah, “Well, then, where do we find any other example of a day in which for part of the day it is forbidden to do work and part of it it is permitted to do work?”**
- DD. **He said to him, “That day itself will prove its point, for on part of it it is permitted to eat leaven and on part of it it is forbidden to eat leaven” [T. 3:18C-G].**
- EE. *Now, since R. Judah has said, From the time of sunrise, it follows that when R. Eliezer b. Jacob uses the word at hand, he means evening.*
- FF. *Now, what does he mean by the word at hand? The morning star.*
- GG. *If that is the case, then when he says to him, Well, then, where do we find any other example of a day in which for part of the day it is forbidden to do work and part of it it is permitted to do work, why can't he answer him, well, what about the night, which is permitted [though it is part of the day]?*
- HH. *This is the sense of R. Eliezer b. Jacob's reply to him: There is no problem for me, since we find that rabbis distinguish day and night, for it has been taught with reference to a public fast: To what time may one eat and drink? “Until the morning star comes up,” the words of R. Eliezer b. Jacob. R. Simeon says, “Until cockcrow.” But from your perspective, where do we find a case in which in the day itself, rabbis make such a distinction? And he said to him, “That day itself will prove its point, for on part of it it is permitted to eat leaven and on part of it it is forbidden to eat leaven.”*
- II. *Didn't R. Judah give R. Eliezer a good answer?*
- JJ. *This is the sense of what R. Eliezer replied to him: “I am talking to you about doing work, the prohibition of which derives from rabbis, but you are talking to me about leaven, the prohibition of which derives from the Torah. Up to this point the Torah permits, from then, the Torah forbids.”*
- KK. *And the other party?*
- LL. *The additional hours [of prohibition] derive only from rabbis' authority [permitting the first four, forbidding the next two].*
- MM. *And the other party?*

- NN. *It was simply an extension that rabbis made around the Torah.*
- OO. *An objection was raised: They kindle bonfires only for a new moon that appears in its proper time, so as to sanctify it. And when do they light bonfires? On the word at hand following the intercalated day. Doesn't this prove that the word at hand has to mean evening?*
- PP. *Sure does.*
- QQ. *An objection was raised: “If a priest was standing and making offerings on the altar all night long, at the word under discussion [= dawn] he has to sanctify his hands and feet,” the words of Rabbi. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “Once he has sanctified his hands and his feet at the beginning of his service at the altar, even if ten days of continuous service go by, he does not have to sanctify his hands and feet again” [T. [Men. 1:13](#)].*
- RR. *That word is not the same as the one under discussion here.*
- SS. *An objection was raised by Mar Zutra, [\[3A\]](#) “She who produces an abortion on the night [prior to the dawn] of the eighty-first day — The House of Shammai declare [her] exempt from bringing an offering. The House of Hillel declare [her] liable. Said the House of Hillel to the House of Shammai, “What is the difference between the word at hand [= night prior to the dawn] of the eighty-first day from the eighty-first day itself [when she certainly would be liable]?” If it [the night] is equivalent to it [the day] in respect to uncleanness, should it not be equivalent to it in respect to an offering?” [M. [Ker. 1:6A-E](#)]. Now, since the House of Hillel has said to the House of Shammai, What is the difference between the word at hand [= night prior to the dawn] of the eighty-first day from the eighty-first day itself [when she certainly would be liable], it proves that the word at hand refers to the evening.*
- TT. *It certainly does.*
- UU. *An objection was raised: Might one suppose that peace-offerings may be eaten on the evening of the third day?*
- VV. *For that is a logical conclusion: The meat of some sacrifices is to be eaten on the same day as the killing of the animal, and the meat of others over a span of two days and the intervening night. Just as in the case of sacrifices that are to be eaten on the same day as the sacrifice, the night is associated with the prior day [so that the meat may be*

eaten not only on the day that the beast was slaughtered but also the following night], so the case of offerings the meat of which may be eaten over a span of two days and the intervening night is such that the night is associated with the prior day [so that the meat may be eaten not only on the days but also the following night afterward].

- WW. That is why Scripture is constrained to make explicit, “And if anything remain until the third day” (Lev. 19: 6) — while it is still day it may be eaten, but the meat may not be eaten on the word at hand [= evening] of the third day.
- XX. Then might one suppose that it must be burned forthwith [at sunset after the second day]?
- YY. For that is a logical conclusion: The meat of some offerings must be eaten on the day of the sacrifice itself, and the meat of others is to be eaten over a span of two days and the intervening night. Just as what is left over of sacrifices that are to be eaten on the same day must be burned immediately after the period in which eating is permitted has come to an end, so the same rule would apply to the meat of sacrifices that may be eaten during two days and the intervening night, so that burning the leftover meat must immediately follow the end of the span of time that is allotted for eating the meat.
- ZZ. That is why Scripture is constrained to make explicit, “And if anything remain until the third day, it shall be burned with fire” (Lev. 19: 6) — you must burn it by day, not by night.
- AAA. *Now since the language is used*, while it is still day it may be eaten, but the meat may not be eaten on the word at hand [= evening] of the third day, *doesn't it follow that the word at hand means evening?*
- BBB. *That proves it.*
- CCC. *Come and take note:* On the word at hand [= night of the Day of Atonement] one says the Prayer of Seven Blessings and recites the confession; in the morning one says the Prayer of Seven Blessings and makes the confession; during the Additional Prayer one says the Prayer of Seven Blessings and recites the confession; in the afternoon prayer one says the Prayer of Seven Blessings and recites the confession; at the concluding rite one says the Prayer of Seven Blessings and recites the confession; and in the evening, one says the Prayer of Seven Blessings which summarize the Eighteen. And R. Hanina b. Gamaliel

in the name of his fathers says, “One says the Prayer of Eighteen Benedictions, for one has to recite the Prayer that Distinguishes the Holy Day from the Ordinary Day in the paragraph, ‘Who favors man with knowledge.’” *Therefore the word at hand means evening.*

DDD. *Certainly does.*

EEE. *Come and take note of what the Tannaite authority of the household of Samuel taught: On the word at hand [evening] of the fourteenth they search for leaven with the light of a lamp. Therefore the word at hand means evening.*

FFF. *So both R. Huna and R. Judah concur that the word at hand means evening, and there is no dispute, but the one master uses the language that prevails in his locality, and the other in his. In R. Huna’s linguistic province they called night, night break, while in R. Judah’s linguistic province they called it night.\*

- I.2** A. *So how come the Tannaite authority of our passage doesn’t use the language “nights”?*
- B. *He has chosen to use refined language in line with what R. Joshua b. Levi said. For said R. Joshua b. Levi, “A person should never use coarse language, for lo, Scripture circumlocuted using eight letters, so as not to use coarse language, as it is said, ‘Of every clean beast...and of the beasts that are not clean’ (Gen. 7: 2).”*
- C. R. Pappa said, “Nine [letters]: ‘If there be among you any man who is not clean by reason of that which chances by night’ (Deu. 23:11) [the word unclean would have sufficed].”
- D. Rabina said, “Ten, counting the ‘and’ of the word ‘and clean.’”
- E. R. Aha bar Jacob said, “Sixteen: ‘For he thought, something has befallen him, he is not clean, surely he is not clean’ (1Sa. 20:26).”

## **Composite on the Use of Refined Language and Euphemisms in General**

- I.3** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority by the household of R. Ishmael: “A person should always speak in refined language, for note, in the case of the male afflicted by flux [described at Lev. 15], the act is called ‘riding,’ but in connection with a woman, the same is called ‘sitting’ [Lev. 15: 9, 20, saddle/riding for the male, everything on which she sits for the female, but the result is the same uncleanness; sitting is more modest with respect to women]. And Scripture says,*

‘And you shall choose the tongue of the subtle’ (Job. 15: 5), ‘and that which my lips know they shall speak purely’ (Job. 33: 3).”

- B. *What’s the point of the further citation?*
- C. *If you should object, that rule applies when it comes to the Torah, but as to discussions of rabbinical matters, that is not the case, come and take note: And Scripture says, “And you shall choose the tongue of the subtle” (Job. 15: 5). And if you should object, that is the rule when it comes to discussing rabbinical matters, but as to things in general, that is not the case, then: “And that which my lips know they shall speak purely” (Job. 33: 3).*
- D. *So is the word “riding” not used with reference to a woman at all? But how about this: “And Rebecca arose and her girls and they rode upon the camels” (Gen. 24:61)?*
- E. *That was routine, because of fear of camels [they wouldn’t ride sidesaddle].*
- F. *What about: “And Moses took his wife and his sons and set them to ride on an ass” (Exo. 4:20)?*
- G. *That was **[3B]** routine, because of his children.*
- H. *And isn’t it written, “And it was so, as she rode on her ass” (1Sa. 25:20)?*
- I. *That was routine, because of fear of the night. Or if you prefer, I shall say, it wasn’t on account of fear of the night but because of fear of David, or if you prefer, I shall say, it wasn’t because of fear of David but because of fear of the mountain.*

- I.4** A. *Well, do you honestly imagine that the word unclean doesn’t occur in Scripture?! Rather, wherever the two words are equal candidates for use, Scripture will use a more elevated language, but wherever more words would be needed, Scripture uses the briefer form of expression. That is in line with what R. Huna said Rab said, and some say, said R. Huna said Rab in the name of R. Meir, “A person should always repeat a statement to his disciple in economical language.”*
- B. *Then is it so that wherever the two words are equal candidates for use, Scripture will use language that is more honorable? But “riding” and “sitting” are of the same length, and yet “riding” is used.*



C. *But the word riding is spelled without one of its vowel letters, so it is shorter in context.*

**I.5** A. *Two disciples were in session before Rab. One said, "This tradition has made us as tired as exhausted pigs."*

B. *The other said, "This tradition has made us as tired as exhausted kids."*

C. *Rab would not talk to the former of the two any more.*

**I.6** A. *Two disciples were in session before Hillel, one of whom was Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai, and some say, they were before Rabbi, and one of them was R. Yohanan. One of them said, "How come they vintage grapes in a state of cultic cleanness but don't gather olives in a state of cultic cleanness?"*

B. *The other said, "How come they vintage grapes in a state of cultic cleanness but gather olives in a state of cultic uncleanness?"*

C. *He said, "I'm pretty sure that this one is going to give decisions in Israel," and the days were only a few before he gave instruction in Israel.*

**I.7** A. *There were three priests. One said, "I got as much as a bean of showbread."*

B. *The second: "I got as much as an olive."*

C. *The third: "I got as much as a lizard tail."*

D. *They looked into his background and found in him a trace of unfitness.*

E. *But we have learned in the Mishnah: They do not carry a genealogical inquiry backward from [proof that one's priestly ancestor has served] at the altar, or from [proof that one's levitical ancestor has served] on the platform, and from [proof that one's learned ancestor has served] in the Sanhedrin. [It is taken for granted that at the time of the appointment, a full inquiry was undertaken.] [M. San. 4:5A-C]!*

- F. *Don't say "a trace of unfitness" but rather, "a low character that made him unfit."*
- G. *Or if you prefer, I shall say: That case is different, because he drew doubt as to his status upon himself.*

- I.8** A. *There was an Aramaean who would go up and eat Passover-offerings in Jerusalem. He said, "It is written, 'No alien shall eat thereof...no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof' (Exo. 12:43, 48) — but look at me! I'm eating the best of the best!"*
- B. *Said to him R. Judah b. Betera, "So did they give you a piece of the fat tail?"*
  - C. *He said to him, "No."*
  - D. *"So when you go up there again, tell them, give me a piece of the fat tail."*
  - E. *When he went up, he said to them, "From the fat tail give me a piece."*
  - F. *They said to him, "The fat tail goes to the Most High." They said to him, "So who told you to say this?"*
  - G. *He said to them, "R. Judah b. Betera."*
  - H. *They said, "So what's this thing before us?" They looked into his status and found that he was an Aramaean and killed him.*
  - I. *They sent word to R. Judah b. Betera, "Peace be to you, R. Judah b. Betera, for you are up there in Nisibis [in Mesopotamia] but your net is spread out down here in Jerusalem."*

- I.9** A. *R. Kahana got sick; rabbis sent R. Joshua b. R. Idi. They said to him, "Go, find out what's with him."*
- B. *He came. He found him dead. He tore his garment and put the tear behind him and went along weeping.*
  - C. *He came. They said to him, "Has he died?"*
  - D. *He said to them, "I'm not the one who said it: 'For he who brings bad news is a fool' (Pro. 10:18)."*

- I.10** A. *Yohanan of Hukok went to the villages. When he came back, they said to him, "Is the wheat coming along well?"*
- B. He said to them, "The barley is doing fine."
- C. *They said to him, "Go, tell the good news to the horses and asses: 'Barley also and straw for the horses and swift steeds' (1Ki. 5: 8)."*
- D. *What ought he to have said?*
- E. "Last year the wheat was just fine," or, "the lentil crop was just fine."

- I.11** A. **[4A]** *Rab was the son of R. Hiyya's brother and the son of his sister. [Freedman: He was the son of his paternal brother and his mother was Hiyya's sister on his mother's side.] When he went up there [to the Land of Israel], he said to him, "Is Aibu [your father] alive?"*
- B. *He said to him, "Mother is fine."*
- C. *He said to him, "Is your mother fine?"*
- D. *He said to him, "Is Aibu alive?"*
- E. He said to his servant, "Take off my shoes and bring my clothing after me to the bathhouse."
- F. *Three conclusions are to be drawn from the incident:*
- G. *The conclusion is to be drawn: A mourner is forbidden to tie on a sandal.*
- H. *The conclusion is to be drawn: A bad news that comes from afar is to yield a mourning period of only one day.*
- I. *The conclusion is to be drawn: Part of a day of mourning is tantamount to the whole of that day.*

- I.12** A. *There was someone who said, "Judge my case."*
- B. *They said, "That implies that he comes from the tribe of Dan: 'Dan shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel' (Gen. 49:16)."*

- I.13** A. *There was someone who went around saying, [Freedman:] "By the sea-shore thorn bushes are fir trees."*
- B. *They examined his genealogy and found that he comes from Zebulun: "Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea" (Gen. 49:13).*

## Reversion to the Exposition of the Mishnah-Paragraph: The Problem of its Word-Choices

- I.14** A. *Now that we have established it as a fact that all parties concur: the word at hand refers to the evening, then, since according to both R. Judah and R. Meir [below], leaven is forbidden only from the sixth hour and later, shouldn't the search be made in the sixth hour? And should you say, people who are really prompt carrying out the religious duty before it is required to do so, then why not make the search from the morning? For it is written, "And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised" (Lev. 12: 3), and it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The entire day is suitable for the rite of circumcision, but people who are really prompt carry out the religious duty before it is required to do so, as it is said, "And Abraham got up early in the morning" (Gen. 22: 3).*
- B. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "When people are found at home, with the light of a lamp good for making a search, [that is when the search for leaven should be carried on] [thus, evening, not morning]."
- C. *Said Abbaye, "Therefore a neophyte rabbi should not commence his session on the night of the thirteenth leading into the fourteenth, lest he become absorbed in his study and neglect the religious duty."*
- I.15** A. *This question was addressed to R. Nahman bar Isaac: "He who rents out a house to his neighbor from the fourteenth of Nisan — upon whom falls the obligation to search for leaven? Does it fall upon the one who rents out the house, for the leaven is his? Or perhaps on the one who rents the house is responsible for searching for leaven, because the prohibition of the leaven takes effect when it is in his domain?"*
- B. *Come and take note:* He who rents a house to his fellow — it is the obligation of the tenant to provide a mezuzah.
- C. *But in that connection,* said R. Mesharshayya, "The placing of the mezuzah is the obligation of the one who dwells in the house." *But what is the rule in this case?*
- D. *Said to them R. Nahman bar Isaac, "We have the following Tannaite rule: He who rents out a house to his fellow — if before he hands over the keys, the fourteenth of Nisan comes along, then the one who rents out the house has to examine the house for leaven, but if that is after he handed over the keys that the fourteenth of Nisan comes along, the the one who rents the house has to seek out the leaven."*

- I.16** A. *This question was addressed to R. Nahman bar Isaac: “He who rents out a house to his neighbor on the fourteenth of Nisan — is the assumption concerning the house that it has been examined for leaven, or is the assumption concerning it that it has not been examined?”*
- B. *So what idiocy is this? Why not just go and ask the guy?*
- C. *So he’s not around to be asked — so what is the rule on putting the tenant to the trouble of making the search?*
- D. *“Of the one who dwells in the house.” But what is the rule in this case?*
- E. *Said to them R. Nahman bar Isaac, “You have learned the following Tannaite rule: All are believed concerning the removal of leaven, even women, even slaves, even minors. Now what is the operative consideration that leads them to be acceptable witnesses to the facts of the matter? [4B] Isn’t it because the house is assumed to have been searched that the authority at hand takes the position, All persons are assumed to be associates [meticulous about observing food laws] when it comes to the search for leaven? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If a fellow [who is meticulous about tithing his produce] died and left a granary full of produce, even though they are only a day old, lo, they are assumed to have been properly tithed. [We assume here, too, that the landlord searched out the leaven and removed it.]*
- F. *But what makes the cases parallel? Maybe that case is different because [a woman, slave or minor] make such a statement?*
- G. *So if these classes of persons make a statement, is there any substance to it [since they are invalid to give testimony]? Rather, what is the meaning of, it is in the assumption that it has been searched out for leaven? Then the passage should be worded simply: All houses are assumed on the fourteenth of Nisan of having been searched out!*
- H. *Rather, it is because of the statement of these that the house is assumed to have been searched.*
- I. *Then, if they hadn’t said so, we would not make such an assumption? In that case, you should be able to reach the solution to the problem: The house is not assumed to have been searched!*
- J. *Not at all. In point of fact, I shall tell you: It is assumed to have been searched, and here with what situation do we deal? It is a case in which we assume that it hasn’t been searched, but persons of the stated categories say, we searched it. Now you might say, rabbis didn’t accord credence to their testimony? So we are informed that, since the inspection of the house for leaven derives from*

*the authority of rabbis, since, by scriptural law, it would be quite sufficient merely to nullify ownership of the leaven, rabbis accorded them credibility in respect to a rule that rabbis themselves have made.*

- I.17** A. *The question was raised: He who rents out a house to his fellow in the assumption that it was searched out for leaven, and the other found that it hadn't been searched out for leaven, what is the law? Do we treat this as a purchase made in error or is that not the case?*
- B. *Come and take note of what Abbayye said, "It is not necessary to say of a town in which people don't pay others to search for leaven, that someone is glad to carry out the religious duty personally; but even in a town in which people pay for doing the search, it would not be a purchase made in error, since it's assumed that someone is perfectly happy to carry out a religious duty with his funds."*
- I.18** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah there: **R. Meir** says, "They eat [leaven] throughout the fifth [hour on the fourteenth of Nisan], and they burn it at the beginning of the sixth hour [noon]." And **R. Judah** says, "They eat [leaven] through the fourth hour, keep it in suspense throughout the fifth hour, and burn it at the beginning of the sixth hour" [M. 1:4]. All parties therefore concur, in any event, that from the sixth hour and onward, leaven is forbidden. What is the scriptural source of that fact?*
- B. *Said Abbayye, "Two pertinent verses of Scripture are as follows: 'Seven days there shall be no leaven found in your houses' (Exo. 12:19), and, further, 'But the first day you shall put away leaven out of your houses' (Exo. 12:15). [Freedman: If the leaven is only put away on the first day, aren't there seven full days without leaven, as intimated by the prior verse?] How so? This formulation serves to encompass under the rule requiring the removal of leaven the fourteenth of Nisan."*
- C. *But maybe it serves to encompass the night of the fifteenth of Nisan as the proper time for removal? For one might suppose that "days" written here means days not nights; so the verse then tells us that even nights are included in the prohibition of having leaven? [Then no prohibition affects any part of the fourteenth of Nisan.]*
- D. *That proof is hardly required, [5A] for lo, the removal of leaven is treated as comparable to the prohibition of eating leavened bread, and the eating of leaven is comparable to the eating of unleavened bread. Putting away leaven is treated as comparable to the prohibition of eating leavened bread: "Seven*

days shall there be no leaven in your houses, for whoever eats that which is leavened — that soul shall be cut off” (Exo. 12:19); and the prohibition of eating leavened bread is comparable to eating unleavened bread: “You shall eat nothing leavened, in all your habitations shall you eat unleavened bread” (Exo. 12:19); and in regard to unleavened bread, it is written, “At evening you shall eat unleavened bread” (Exo. 12:18). [Freedman: Hence no verse would be necessary to show that as soon as evening commences, the leaven must be put away; therefore the verse quoted can only refer to the fourteenth].

- E. *But might I not say that the cited verse encompasses the night of the fourteenth of Nisan to identify that as the right time for removing the leaven?*
- F. *What’s written is “by day.”*
- G. *Then perhaps it has to be removed at dawn [not only from midday]?*
- H. *The word “but” serves to divide the day [assigning the removal of leaven to the midday].*

**I.19** A. *A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated]: “We find that the fourteenth is called the first: ‘On the first, on the fourteenth day of the month’ (Exo. 12: 1).”*

**I.20** A. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “‘The first’ means, the preceding, in line with this usage: ‘Were you born first, before Adam?’ (Job. 15: 7).”*

- B. *What about the following: “You will take for yourself on the first day” (Lev. 23:40) — does this, too, mean, on the preceding day?*
- C. *That case is exceptional, for it is written, “You will rejoice before the Lord your God for seven days” (Lev. 23:40). Just as the seventh refers to the seventh day of the festival itself, so the first in this case must refer to the festival itself.*
- D. *Well, here, too, it is written, “Even the first day you shall put away leaven out of your houses, seven days shall you eat unleavened bread” [so here, first should mean first day, not the preceding day]!*
- E. *If so, Scripture should have written, “first,” but why say “the first”? That proves that matters are as we have said.*
- F. *If so, in the other passage as well, [at Lev. 23:40] we have to ask why it is written “the first”? And further, when it states there, “On the first day shall be a solemn rest and on the eighth day shall be a solemn rest”*

(Lev. 23:39), *why not say in that context: “The first’ means, the preceding”?*

- G. *That case is exceptional, for it is written, “and on the eighth day shall be a solemn rest” (Lev. 23:39). Just as the eighth day is the eighth day of the Festival itself, so the first must refer to the first day of the festival itself.*
- H. *And what’s the point of saying “the first”?*
- I. *It is meant to exclude the intermediate days of the festival [and one may work on those days].*
- J. *But that fact derives from the reference to the first and to the eighth days [thus excluding the intervening festival days from the Sabbath].*
- K. *Still, it is required, for otherwise it might have entered your mind to imagine that since the All-Merciful has written, “and on the eighth day,” the function of the “and” is to add to the matter, thus encompassing even the intermediate days of the festival as well. The use of “the first” informs us that that is not the case.*
- L. *Well, then, let the All-Merciful omit reference both to the “and” and also to the “the” of “the first.” And furthermore, when it says elsewhere, “in the first day you shall have a holy convocation” (Lev. 23: 7), does “first” here refer to the preceding day?!*
- M. *Rather, these three references to “first” serve their own purposes. That is in line with what a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael stated as a Tannaite ruling, for a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [said], “As a reward for observing these three ‘firsts,’ they gained the supererogatory grace for three firsts in connection with which the same word occurs, namely: to wipe out the seed of Esau, to build the house of the sanctuary, and to know the name of the Messiah.*
- N. *“To wipe out the seed of Esau: ‘And the first came forth red, all over like a hairy garment’ (Gen. 25:25).*
- O. *“To build the house of the sanctuary: ‘A glorious throne set on high from the first is the place of our sanctuary’ (Jer. 17:12).*
- P. *“And to know the name of the Messiah: ‘First unto Zion, behold them’ (Isa. 41:27).”*

**I.21** A. *Raba said, “[That leaven is forbidden from midday on the fourteenth of Nisan] derives from the following: ‘You shall not offer the blood of my*



sacrifice with leavened bread' (Exo. 34:25). You may not kill the animal designated as the Passover-offering while there is still leavened bread around."

- B. *But say that for each individual, the time for slaughtering the beast marks the point at which leaven is forbidden?*
- C. *Scripture referred to the time of killing.*
- I.22** A. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **"But on the first day you shall put away leaven out of your houses":**
- C. **"[Leaven is to be removed from the houses] during the day prior to the evening on which the festival day commences.**
- D. **"You maintain that [leaven is to be removed from the houses] during the day prior to the evening on which the festival day commences. But perhaps it is to be done on the festival day itself [that is, not in the morning prior to the eve on which the festival begins, but on that night itself]?"**
- E. **"Scripture is explicit: 'You shall not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread' (Exo. 34:25),**
- F. **"meaning, 'you shall not slaughter the Passover with leaven yet remaining in hand,'"** the words of R. Ishmael.
- G. **R. Aqiba [Mekhilta: Jonathan] says, "This proof is not required. Does not Scripture make explicit the following rule: 'No manner of work shall be done on them' (Exo. 12:16), and the act of burning falls into the classification of work [and so the removal of the leaven cannot be done on the festival day itself].**
- H. **"What then is the sense of Scripture's statement, 'you shall put away leaven out of your houses'?"**
- I. **"It can only mean that [leaven is to be removed from the houses] during the day prior to the evening on which the festival day commences."**
- J. **R. Yosé [Mekhilta: the Galilean] says, "'...you shall put away leaven out of your houses' means that [leaven is to be removed from the houses] during the day prior to the evening on which the festival day commences.**
- K. **"You say that '...you shall put away leaven out of your houses' means that [leaven is to be removed from the houses] during the day prior to the evening on which the festival day commences. But perhaps the sense is that it is to be done on the first festival day of the festival itself [that is, at night]?"**

L. “Scripture says, ‘*but* on the first day you shall put away leaven out of your houses,’ and the force of the ‘*but*’ is to distinguish [the first festival day of the holiday from the preceding day, indicating that prior to the first day the leaven is to be removed]” [Mekhilta Pisha VIII:II.1].

M. *But if it were to mean the festival itself, can that be permitted? Surely putting away leaven is comparable to the prohibition of eating leavened bread. And the prohibition of eating leavened bread is comparable to the duty of eating unleavened bread.*

**I.23** A. Said Raba, [5B] “From what R. Aqiba has said, we may infer three rules: We may infer that the only valid way of removing leaven is by burning; we may infer that kindling was singled out at Exodus 20:10 with reference to Sabbath work to indicate that this is treated as different from other forbidden acts on the Sabbath; we may infer that we do not say, since kindling was permitted when it is necessary for preparing food, it also is permitted when it is not necessary [on the festival].”

**I.24** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. “Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your house” (Exo. 12:19):

C. Why does Scripture say this, when it is stated in any event, “And there shall no leavened bread be seen with you, neither shall there be leaven seen with you in all your borders” (Exo. 13: 7)?

D. Since it says, “Neither shall leaven be seen with you,” the sense is, your own you mustn’t see, but you may see what belongs to others or to the Most High [the Temple]. Might one suppose that one may hide leaven or get involved with bailments of leaven from a gentile? Scripture states flatly, “Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your house” (Exo. 12:19).

E. I know only that that applies to a gentile whom one has not subjugated and who doesn’t live with you in the same courtyard. What about a gentile whom you have subjugated [as a slave] and who lives with you in the same courtyard?

F. Scripture says, “neither shall there be leaven seen with you in all your borders” (Exo. 13: 7).

G. I know only that the rule prohibiting leaven applies to what is in your houses. How about what is located in cisterns, ditches, or caves?

H. Scripture says, “neither shall there be leaven seen with you in all your borders” (Exo. 13: 7).

- I. So I still might maintain that, if it is in the house, one violates the law on the count of its being seen, found hidden or received as a bailment from a gentile. But as regards leaven in “your borders,” one might say, well, what is yours you mustn’t see, but you may see what belongs to others or to the Most High. How, therefore, do we know that what is stated in the one verse pertains also to what is covered by the other?
- J. Scripture uses the word “leaven” two times, establishing a verbal analogy. “Leaven” is stated with reference to houses: “Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your house” (Exo. 12:19), and leaven is stated with reference to the borders, “neither shall there be leaven seen with you in all your borders” (Exo. 13: 7). Just as if leaven is found in the houses, one violates the law on the counts of its being seen, found hidden or received as a bailment from a gentile, so if leaven is found with the borders, one violates the law on the counts of its being seen, found hidden or received as a bailment from a gentile. And just as if leaven is found within your borders, you are not to see it, but you may see that which belongs to others or to the Most High, so if leaven is found within your houses, you are not to see your own, but you may see what belongs to others or to the Most High.

**I.25** A. The master has said: “I know only that that applies to a gentile whom one has not subjugated and who doesn’t live with you in the same courtyard. What about a gentile whom you have subjugated [as a slave] and who lives with you in the same courtyard? Scripture says, “neither shall there be leaven seen with you in all your borders” (Exo. 13: 7) –

- B. [Not taking bailments from a gentile surely refers to him who is subjugated or who lives in the same courtyard, not one who is independent and not living with you, so the proof pertains only to the former, not the latter, hence:] *This proof refers to the latter of the two cases, not the former!*
- C. *Said Abbaye, “Reverse the order of the cases.”*
- D. *Raba said, “In no way reverse the order. It does pertain to the former of the two cases: ‘Your own you are not to see, but you may see what belongs to others or to the Most High. I know only that that applies to a gentile whom one has not subjugated and who doesn’t live with you in the same courtyard. What about a gentile whom you have*

subjugated [as a slave] and who lives with you in the same courtyard? Scripture says, “there shall not be found.””

- E. *But this Tannaite authority wants to find something permitted but adduces in evidence a verse that prohibits!*
- F. It provides the proof he wants because “your” is stated twice [establishing a verbal connection to Deu. 16: 4: “And there shall be no leaven seen unto you in all your borders seven days,” and here “your” is linked with seeing; but it is superfluous here, so it pertains to “shall not be found,” which now is read as limited, “there shall not be found of yours,” but of gentiles it may be found (Freedman)].

**I.26** A. The master has said: Might one suppose that one may hide leaven or get involved with bailments of leaven from a gentile? Scripture states flatly, “Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your house” (Exo. 12:19) –

- B. *But you’ve already said:* “Since it says, ‘Neither shall leaven be seen with you,’ the sense is, your own you mustn’t see, but you may see what belongs to others or to the Most High [the Temple]”!
- C. *No problem, the one speaks of a case in which the Israelite accepts responsibility to make up the loss, the other in which he doesn’t [so in the latter case, it is not his own, in the former, it is].*
- D. *That is in line with what Raba said to the residents of Mehoza, “Remove the leaven belonging to the troops from your houses, for, since if it is stolen or lost, it is within your domain and you have to make it up, it is as though it were yours and it is forbidden.”*
- E. *Well, that poses no problem for him who maintains that what imposes liability for a money payment is tantamount to money [so while the leaven isn’t yours, you bear financial responsibility for it and so it is as though it were yours (Freedman)]. But from the perspective of him who holds that what imposes liability for a money payment nonetheless is not tantamount to money, what is to be said?*
- F. *This case is exceptional, since Scripture says, “...shall not be found...” [Freedman: which implies, even if it is not his own].*
- G. *There are those who say: That poses no problem to him who has said, what imposes liability for a money payment nonetheless is not tantamount to money. [6A] That explains why it was necessary for Scripture to state, “...shall not be found....” But from the perspective*

*of him who holds that what imposes liability for a money payment nonetheless is tantamount to money, what need was there to state, "...shall not be found..."?*

H. *It was indeed necessary to say so, for it might have entered your mind to suppose that, since if the leaven is in existence it has to be returned as is, it is not classified as in the Israelite's domain. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

**I.27** A. *They addressed this question to Raba: "A beast that is liable to be taxed in kind [and so is not wholly owned by the farmer] — is it liable to the law of the firstling or is it not liable to the law of the firstling? Now so long as one can meet his obligation with a money payment [instead of a portion of the beast when it is slaughtered], we are not bothered by the question; it certainly is liable to the law of the firstling. Where the problem arises for us, it is in a case in which one cannot pay off what is owing through a money payment. What is the rule?"*

B. *He said to them, "It is exempt."*

C. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: It is liable?*

D. *That speaks of a case in which one can pay the charge with a money payment.*

E. *There are those who say, said Raba, "A beast that is liable to be taxed in kind [and so is not wholly owned by the farmer] — is it not liable to the law of the firstling, and that is the case even if one can pay off what is owing with a money payment. Dough that is liable to a tax paid in kind is liable to dough-offering, and that is the case even if one can pay off what is owing with a money payment. How come? The status of the beast is going to be known, the status of the dough is not going to be known."*

**I.28** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **A gentile who entered into the courtyard of an Israelite with his dough in his hand — the Israelite is not obligated to remove it. If he deposited the dough with him, he is obligated to remove it.**

C. **If he designated a particular room for it, he is not obligated to remove it,**

D. **"as it is said, "...it will not be found..." [T. Pisha 2:11].**

**I.29** A. *What's the point of the proof-text [which contradicts the proposition to which it is attached]?*

B. *Said R. Pappa, "The proof-text [D] pertains to the initial clause, and this is the sense of the statement: **If he deposited the dough with***

him, he is obligated to remove it, as it is said, ‘...it will not be found....’”

- C. *R. Ashi said, “In point of fact it pertains to the concluding clause, and this is the sense of the statement: **If he designated a particular room for it, he is not obligated to remove it, as it is said, ‘...it will not be found in your houses’** — and lo, this is not his room, for, when the gentile carries the leaven in, he carries it into his own room.”*
- D. *But does that bear the implication that renting a space confers title? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **Even in the situation concerning which they have ruled [that they may] rent, it is not for use as a residence that they ruled that it is permitted, because he brings an idol into it, as it is said, “You shall not bring an abomination into your house” (Deu. 7:26) [M. A.Z. 1:9A-C]**?* *Now, if you should imagine that renting a property confers title, when he brings in his idol, he’s bringing it into his own property!*
- E. *This case is exceptional, since the All-Merciful has formulated the rule in the language, “it will not be found,” meaning, “what is found in your hand,” excluding this, which is not found in your hand.*

**I.30** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “He who finds leaven in his house on the festival turns a utensil over on it.”

B. Said Raba, “If it belongs to the sanctuary, he doesn’t have to do so. *How come? He will keep away from it anyhow.*”

**I.31** A. And said R. Judah said Rab, “[If he found] a gentile’s leaven, he surrounds it with a partition ten handbreadths high, to distinguish it. But if it belongs to the sanctuary, he doesn’t have to do so. *How come? He will keep away from it anyhow.*”

**I.32** A. And said R. Judah said Rab, “**He who departs by sea or leaves by caravan prior to thirty days before the festival is not obligated to remove leaven from his house. If he is leaving within thirty days prior to Passover, he is obligated to remove the leaven [T. Er. 1:4A-D].**”

B. *Said Abbaye, “As to this statement of yours, **If he is leaving within thirty days prior to Passover, he is obligated to remove the leaven, we have made that statement only for a case in which he is planning to***

return, but if he's not planning to return, he doesn't have to remove the leaven."

- C. *Said to him Raba, "So if he's planning to return, then even if he leaves on the New Year [he bears the same responsibility]."*
- D. *Rather, said Raba, "As to that statement of yours, ...**prior to thirty days before the festival is not obligated to remove leaven from his house**, we have made that statement to deal only with a case in which he's not planning to return, but if he's planning to return, then even if he leaves on the New Year [he bears the same responsibility]."*
- E. *Raba is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said Raba, "He who turns his house into a storage house, if this is thirty days prior to Passover, he is not obligated to remove the leaven; if it is within thirty days, he is bound to remove it; and if he did this before thirty days, too, we have made that rule only when he doesn't plan to clear the storage house, but if he plans to clear it out, then even if he did it prior to thirty days before the festival, he has to remove the leaven."*

**I.33** A. *What's the point of this reference to thirty days in particular?*

- B. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. Questions are received concerning the laws of Passover prior to the Passover festival for a period of thirty days.
- D. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Two weeks."
- E. *What's the operative consideration behind the ruling of the first of the two Tannaite authorities?*
- F. **[6B]** For lo, Moses arose on the occasion of the first Passover and gave an admonition concerning the second Passover [a month later]: "Moreover, let the children of Israel keep the Passover in its appointed season" (Num. 11: 2); "And there were certain men, who were unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness" (Num. 9: 6).
- G. And Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel?

- H. *He will say to you, "Since he was involved in the laws of Passover, he admonished them on all the matters pertaining to Passover."*
- I. *What's the operative consideration behind the ruling of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel?*
- J. For lo, Moses arose at the beginning of the month [the first of Nisan, with Passover to follow two weeks later], and gave them an admonition concerning Passover, as it is said, "This month shall be to you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you" (Exo. 12: 2); "Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb according to their fathers' houses" (Exo. 12: 2-3).
- K. *Well, what makes you say that he arose on the first of the month? Maybe it was on the fourth or the fifth of the month? Rather, said Rabbah bar Shimi in the name of Rabina, "Evidence comes from here: 'And the Lord spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai in the first month of the second year' (Num. 9: 1), 'Moreover let the children of Israel keep the Passover in its appointed season' (Num. 9:1 [and from the beginning of the month to Passover is two weeks]."*
- L. *Well, here again, what makes you say that he arose on the first of the month? Maybe it was on the fourth or the fifth of the month? Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "There is a verbal analogy established by the use of the word 'wilderness.' Here it is written, 'In the wilderness of Sinai,' and elsewhere, 'And the Lord spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai in the tent of meeting on the first day of the second month' (Num. 1: 1). Just as in the latter instance it was*



on the first day of the month, so in the present instance it was on the first day of the month.”

- I.34** A. *[Since Num. 1:1 refers to events that took place a month later than Num. 9:1], why not write about the events of the first month first, then the events of the second month?*
- B. *Said R. Menassaya bar Tahalipa in the name of Rab, “That is to say, considerations of chronological order do not pertain in the Torah.”*
- C. *Said R. Pappa, “We have made that statement only with reference to two subjects [that are distinct from one another], but as to a single topic, what is discussed earlier is prior and what is discussed later is posterior. For if you don’t take that view, then how can you apply the principle that in the case of an encompassing generalization and a particularization of the foregoing, covered by the generalization is only what is specified in the particularization? For perhaps the order is the opposite, with the particularization and then the generalization? And, furthermore, where you do have a particularization followed by a generalization, in which case the generalization is treated as adding to the particularization, perhaps it is a generalization followed by a particularization after all!”*
- D. *Well, if that’s the issue, then maybe the same consideration may be addressed even if we say that that statement pertains also to two distinct subjects?*

*For that poses no problem to him who has said, if there are a generalization and a particularization that are separate from one another, we do not judge them by the principle of a generalization and a particularization, but from the angle of the one who has said that we do invoke that principle of exegesis, what is to be said?*

- E. *Even from the perspective of him who has said that we do invoke that exegetical principle, that is only the case if both are on the same subject, but if they deal with two distinct subjects, we do not do so.*

- I.35** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “He who searches for leaven has also to declare the leaven null [abandoned property].”
- B. *How come? Should we say it is because of the crumbs? But they are of no account. And should you say, since he keeps them along with his house, they are taken into account, hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: **If there were late figs, while he guards his field on account of grapes, or late grapes, while he guards his field on account of cucumbers and gourds, then, when the owner is meticulous about them, they are forbidden to outsiders by reason of theft and they also are subject to tithes, but if the owner is not meticulous about them, they’re not forbidden to outsiders by reason of theft and they are exempt from tithes [as ownerless] [T. Ma. 3:12D-I]**?*
- C. *Said Raba, “It is a precautionary measure, lest he find a fine loaf of bread and form the intention of keeping it.”*
- D. *So if he finds it, he can nullify it.*
- E. *Maybe he’ll find it after the prohibition of leaven sets in, and it will not be in his domain [so that his general statement of nullification won’t take effect]. For said R. Eleazar, “There are two things that do not fall within the domain of a person but that are regarded by Scripture as though they were within his domain: a pit dug in public domain, and leaven after the midday of the eve of Passover.”*

- F. *Well, why not let him nullify it at the fourth or fifth hour [anytime before noon? Why make it happen the preceding evening, when he's making the search (Freedman)]?*
- G. *Since it's not a time at which the prohibition takes effect nor a time for making the search for leaven, he may err and not nullify it.*
- H. **[7A]** *Well, then, why not let him nullify it at the sixth hour [when he won't forget it, but is now burning the leaven that he owns]?*
- I. *Since it is subject to the prohibition on rabbinical authority, it is in the status of a prohibition deriving from Scripture, so he no longer owns it and therefore cannot nullify it. For said R. Giddal said R. Hiyya bar Joseph said Rab, "He who with his leaven betroths a woman from the sixth hour and onward, even with wheat of Cordyene [which doesn't leaven easily], they do not take account of the possibility that his act of betrothal may be valid." [The wheat is valueless.]*
- J. *But is it the fact that after the prohibition has taken effect, he cannot nullify it? And lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If someone was sitting in the schoolhouse and remembered that he had leaven in his house, he may nullify it in his head, all the same being a Sabbath and a festival day. Now as to the Sabbath, you have no problem in finding a relevant occasion, for example, if the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with the Sabbath, but as to a festival day, wouldn't this be after the prohibition had taken effect?*
- K. *Said R. Aha bar Jacob, "Here we deal with the case of a disciple in session before his master, who remembered that he has a rolled dough in his house and is concerned that it may leaven; he goes ahead and nullifies it before it leavens. A close reading of the language before us yields that point, since it says, if someone was sitting in the schoolhouse."*
- L. *That proves it.*
- I.36** A. *Said Rabbah bar R. Huna said Rab, "If a loaf turned mouldy, if the unleavened part forms the greater part of the whole, it is permitted."*
- B. *Now what can this passage mean? Should we say that the owner knew that it had leavened? Then even if the unleavened part formed the greater part of the whole, what difference would that make? So it must be a case in which we don't know whether it has leavened or whether it is not leavened. But then, why invoke the rule if the unleavened part forms the greater part of the whole, even if not, let us invoke as our criterion the status of the last of the batch to be put there? [Freedman: Let us assume that this loaf is of the latest batch that*

was put there; if it is unleavened, since a bread bin is cleared out every day to prevent the bread from going mouldy, particularly so in this case, where there was a search for leaven prior to the festival.] *For haven't we learned in the Mishnah: Money which was found before cattle dealers — throughout the year, it is deemed money in the status of second tithe. [If it is found] on the Temple mount, it is assumed to be unconsecrated money. [If it is found] in Jerusalem during a pilgrim festival, it is assumed to be money in the status of second tithe. And at all other times of the year, it is deemed to be unconsecrated [M. Sheq. 7:2], on which said R. Shemayyah bar Zira, "How come? It is because the markets of Jerusalem are ordinarily swept every day." Therefore, we do invoke the principle, our criterion is the status of the last of the batch to be put there, and these coins are different ones. So here, too, let's invoke the criterion, the earlier bread is gone, and this is current!*

- C. *No, this case is different, because the moldiness indicates its status [it's been there a long time].*
- D. *Well, now, if the moldiness indicates its status, then even if the unleavened part is the greater part, what difference does it make anyhow?*
- E. *Said Rabbah, "Don't word it as, if the unleavened part forms the greater part, but rather say, which has been there for many days of unleavened bread."*
- F. *If so, then what's the point?*
- G. *Not at all, it was necessary to cover the case in which it is very mouldy. You might have maintained, since it's very mouldy, it's obvious that it is authentic leaven; so we are informed that, since many days of unleavened bread have gone by, we say, "every day hot unleavened bread was baked and tossed there, and that made it very mouldy."*

**I.37** A. *Well, now, do we maintain the principle that our criterion is the status of the last of the batch to be put there? And lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, "In the case of a chest that has been used for money in a secular status and money in the status of tithe, if the greater part is secular, then it is secular, and if the greater part is in the status of second tithe, then it is in the status of second tithe." But why should this be the case? Why not invoke the principle that our criterion is the status of the last of the batch to be put there?*

B. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Here with what situation do we deal? It is a case in which it was used for money in secular status and money in*

the status of second tithe, and it is not known which of them was put in at the end.”

- C. R. Zebid said, “It would be a case in which it was used for second piles of money [both on the same day].”
- D. R. Pappa said, “For example, if it was found in a hole.” [Freedman: We cannot assume that the earlier coins had been removed while these were of the most recent deposit, since it might have been overlooked in a hole.]

**I.38** A. Said R. Judah, “One who makes a search for leaven has to recite a blessing.”

B. *What is the blessing that he recites?*

C. R. Pappi said in the name of Raba, “He says, ‘Blessed are you...who has commanded us to burn leaven.’”

D. R. Pappa said in the name of Raba, “...concerning the burning of leaven.”

E. *As to the phrase, “to burn,” there is no disagreement, since it certainly speaks of what is to be done in the future. [7B] Where there is a dispute, it concerns the use of the phrase, concerning the burning of leaven. The one authority maintains that that bears the sense of what is done in the past, while the other takes it to refer to the future.*

F. *An objection was raised: Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision [which is about to take place]!*

G. *Well, then, how’s he supposed to say it? To circumcise? But isn’t it acceptable if he himself doesn’t do the circumcision? [The obligation is the father’s, not the one who actually does the operation.] Then what’s to say about the father of the son?*

H. *That’s quite correct* [and he has to say, “to circumcise”].

I. *An objection was raised: Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us concerning ritual slaughter.*

J. *Well, then, here, too, how’s he supposed to say it? To slaughter? But isn’t it acceptable if he himself doesn’t do the slaughter? Then what is to be said in the case of the Passover sacrifice and others as well [where the owner is obligated to do the slaughter]?*

K. *That’s quite correct* [and he has to say, “to slaughter”].

L. *An objection was raised: One who makes a lulab for himself says, “Praised [be Thou, O Lord...], who gave us life and preserved us*

and brought us to this occasion.” When he takes it [in hand] to carry out his obligation, he says, “Praised [be Thou, O Lord...] who has sanctified us through his commandments and commanded us concerning the taking of the lulab” [T. Ber. 6:10, 6:9, trans. T. Zahavy].

- M. *That case is exceptional, since, at the very moment at which he lifts it up, he has fulfilled his obligation.*
- N. *If so, then instead of the language, **to carry out his obligation**, the language that should be used should be: once he has carried out his obligation.*
- O. *That’s quite true, but since the framer of the passage planned to proceed to deal with “to sit in the sukkah” in the next clause, he stated in the first clause by way of parallel, **to carry out his obligation**. For it goes on to say: **One who makes a sukkah for himself says, “Praised [be Thou, O Lord...] who has brought us to this occasion.” [One who] enters to dwell in it says, “Praised [be Thou, O Lord... [who has sanctified us through his commandments and commanded us to dwell in the sukkah” [T. Ber. 6:9].***
  - P. *And the decided law is: He says “concerning the burning of leaven.”*

**I.39** A. *So in any event, it is clear, all parties concur that we have to recite a blessing before doing the action. How do we know it?*

- B. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “In the case of carrying out all religious duties, one says a blessing prior [to doing] them and then goes on to carry them out.”
  - C. *How do we know that the language “over” means, prior to the performance of the deed?*
  - D. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “Said Scripture, ‘Then Ahimaaz ran by the way of the Plain and caught up with the Cushite’ (2Sa. 18:23) [Freedman: passed in front of him, and similarly here, where the same root occurs, it means, in front of or prior to].”*
  - E. *Abbaye said, “From the following: ‘And he himself passed over before them’ (Gen. 33: 3); ‘and their kind*

has passed on before them and the Lord is at the head of them' (Mic. 2:13)."

- I.40** A. *Members of the household of Rab said, "That is so, except in the case of an immersion or the sounding of the shofar."*
- B. *As for an immersion pool, that is not hard to understand: The person has not yet been made fit [by immersion, until after he has immersed, so he recites the blessing afterward]; but how come in the case of the sounding of the ram's horn? Should you say, because he may make the sound incorrectly? Then the same consideration applies to ritual slaughter or to circumcision as well!*
- C. *Rather, said R. Hisda, "It was stated as: except for immersion alone."*
- D. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. *He who has immersed and come up out of the water, when he comes up, he says, "Blessed...who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us concerning immersion."*

**II.1** A. **They seek out leaven by the light of a candle:**

- B. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*
- C. Said R. Hisda, "We draw a verbal analogy via the common appearances of the words 'finding' in two verses, 'searching' in two, and 'lamps' in two. 'Finding' in two: 'Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses' (Exo. 12:19), linked to, 'and he searched and began at the eldest and left at the youngest and the cup was found in Benjamin's sack' (Gen. 44:12); 'finding' thus is linked to searching,' and searching is linked to lamps in the following: 'and it shall come to pass at that time that I will search Jerusalem with lamps' (Zep. 1:12), and 'lamps' is linked to 'lamp': 'The soul of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the innermost parts of the belly' (Pro. 20:27)."

- II.2** A. *A Tannaite teaching of the household of R. Ishmael: On the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan, they search for leaven by the light of a lamp. Even though there is no firm proof for that proposition, there is at least a hint of it: "Seven*

days shall there be no leaven in your houses” (Exo. 12:19); “and he searched and began at the eldest and left at the youngest and the cup was found in Benjamin’s sack” (Gen. 44:12); “it shall come to pass at that time that I will search Jerusalem with lamps” (Zep. 1:12), “The soul of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the innermost parts of the belly” (Pro. 20:27).

- B. *What’s the point of the series of quotations?*
- C. *If you should maintain that the language, “at that time” is a lenient ruling of the All-Merciful, namely, “I won’t search Jerusalem with the light of a torch, which gives a lot of light, but only with the light of a lamp, which gives much less, so that a major sin will turn up but a minor peccadillo won’t turn up, then come and take note: “The soul of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the innermost parts of the belly” (Pro. 20:27).*

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

- B. They don’t seek out leaven by the light of the sun or by the light of the moon or by the light of a torch, but only by the light of a candle, [8A] because the light of a candle is best for searching out leaven. And even though there is no clear proof of that proposition, there is at least a hint of it: “Seven days shall there be no leaven in your houses” (Exo. 12:19); “and he searched and began at the eldest and left at the youngest and the cup was found in Benjamin’s sack” (Gen. 44:12); “it shall come to pass at that time that I will search Jerusalem with lamps” (Zep. 1:12), “The soul of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the innermost parts of the belly” (Pro. 20:27).

**II.4** A. *As to the light of the sun, how is it to be defined? Should I say that it pertains to a courtyard, hasn’t Raba said, “As to a courtyard, it is not necessary to inspect for leaven there, since the ravens are common there”?*

- B. *So it must make reference to a portico.*
- C. *But didn’t Raba say, “A portico is searched by its own natural light”?*
- D. *No, that pertains only to a skylight in a room.*
- E. *Well, then, what part of the room? Should it be in the part that is facing the skylight, then that’s the same as a portico, so it must be on the sides.*

**II.5** A. *And not with a torch? But didn’t Raba say, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘And his brightness was as the light, he had rays coming*



forth from his hand, and there was the hiding of his power' (Hab. 3: 4)? To what are the righteous to be compared in the presence of God? To a lamp before a torch"? And said Raba, "To use a torch for the rite of dividing the Holy Day from an ordinary day is the most elegant way of carrying out that religious duty."

- B. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "In the case of this [a lamp], one can poke it into holes and cracks but in the case of the other, one can't poke it into holes and cracks."
- C. R. Zebid said, "This sheds its light in front, but that sheds its light behind."
- D. *R. Pappa said, "With a torch one is concerned, but with a lamp one isn't concerned [about setting the house on fire]."*
- E. *Rabina said, "The light of the one is steady, the light of the other wavers."*

**III.1 A. Any location into which [people] do not [ordinarily] bring leaven does not require examination:**

- B. *What is encompassed by the augmentative language, any location?*
- C. *It is to encompass that which is dealt with in what our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **The holes of a room on the top and on the bottom, the roof of the verandah, the roof of a turret, a cow's stable, hen coops, straw shed, storehouses of wine and oil do not require inspection [cf. T. Er. 1:3].**
- E. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "A bed that divided a room and leaves a space requires inspection."**

**III.2** A. *By contrast:* A hole that lies in the property between someone and his neighbor [in a wall between two rooms or houses] — this party examines the area as far as his hand can reach, and that one inspects the area as far as his hand can reach, and the rest they nullify in their hearts. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "A bed that divides a house, with wood and stone arranged under it, leaving a space, does not require inspection." *So, it would appear, the rulings concerning the bed are contradictory, and the rulings concerning the holes are contradictory!*

- B. *The rulings concerning the holes are not contradictory: The one speaks of the holes at the top and bottom, the other, holes in the middle of the wall.*
- C. *And the rulings concerning the bed are contradictory: The one speaks of a bed that is raised, the other, when that is low down. [Freedman: If the bottom of the bed is raised above the ground, the space beneath it can be used easily; if it's low, even if a space is left it is not easy to use and doesn't have to be searched.]*

- III.3** A. Is it the fact that **storehouses of wine** do not require inspection? *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: Storehouses of wine require inspection, storehouses of oil do not require inspection?*
- B. *Here with what situation do we deal? With a case in which he draws supplies from that area.*
  - C. *Well, then, why not say the same in the matter of the storehouses of oil?*
  - D. In the case of oil, there is a pretty clear amount that is going to be consumed at a meal, but as to wine, there is no limit to what will be drunk.

- III.4** A. *R. Hiyya taught as a Tannaite statement: They treat the stores of beer in Babylonia as they do stores of wine in the Land of Israel, in a case in which one draws supplies from them.*

- III.5** A. Said R. Hisda, "A storehouse for fish doesn't have to be inspected."
- B. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: They do have to be inspected?*
  - C. *No problem, the one speaks of big fish, the other, little ones [the former will be subject to a fixed limit, the latter may be drawn upon irregularly and the latter storage area has therefore to be inspected].*

- III.6** A. Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, "Salt sheds and wax sheds have to be inspected."

- III.7** A. Said R. Pappa, "Storehouses for fuel and dates have to be inspected."

- III.8** A. *A Tannaite statement: They do not require someone to poke his hand into holes and cracks to inspect the area, because it's dangerous.*
- B. *What's dangerous about it? Should I say, because of the danger that a scorpion is there? Well, when the man used the space, how did he use it anyhow?*
  - C. *No, it was necessary to cover the case of a wall that collapsed.*

- D. *If it was a wall that collapsed, then how come it has to be inspected? Haven't we learned in the Mishnah: **Leaven on which a house fell down in ruins — lo, it is tantamount having been removed [M. Pes. 2:3E]**?*
- E. *That refers to a place that the dog can't search out, here we deal with an area that a dog can search out.*
- F. But lo, said R. Eleazar, "People who are agents to carry out a religious duty are never injured" [so why worry about the scorpion anyhow]?
- G. *Said R. Ashi, "Maybe he lost a needle and he came to look for it."*
- H. *But in such a case, that's hardly equivalent to doing a religious duty?*
- I. *Hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: He who says, "This sela will be for charity so that my son may live," or, "so that I may have the merit of belonging to the world to come," [8B] lo, this one is entirely righteous [even if he has a selfish motive, and the same is so in the case at hand (Freedman)]?*
- J. *Maybe after he looked for the leaven, he'll come back to look for the needle.*
- K. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "It is because of danger of gentiles, and it is in accord with Pelimo. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: As to a hole in a wall between a Jew's and an Aramaean's house, one searches as far as his hand reaches, and the rest he annuls in his heart. Pelimo said, 'He doesn't search the spot at all, because of the danger.'*"
- L. *Now what can be the danger here? Should I say, the danger of witchcraft? Then when he used it, how did he use it anyhow?*
- M. *In that case, when he used the space, it was daylight, and there was light, so the gentile wouldn't pay attention, but here it is by night, and he has a lamp in hand, so the gentile will take note of what's going on [and suspect witchcraft]!*
- N. But lo, said R. Eleazar, "People who are agents to carry out a religious duty are never injured"!
- O. *A situation in which there is every possibility of injury is different, as it is said, "And Samuel said, How can I go? If Saul hears it, he will kill me. And the Lord said, Take a heifer with you (1Sa. 16: 2)."*

[Freedman: Samuel was afraid though engaged on a divine mission, because it was naturally dangerous.]

**Those who are agents to carry out a religious duty  
are not injured either when they go or when they come back**

**III.9** A. *They asked Rab: "What is the law on scholars who live out of town in regard to coming to the academy early in the morning or after nightfall?"*

B. *He said to them, "Let them come, and I'll take responsibility on my own neck."*

C. *"What about going home after dark?"*

D. *He said, "I don't know."*

**III.10** A. *It has been stated:*

B. Said R. Eleazar, "Those who are agents to carry out a religious duty are not injured either when they go or when they come back."

C. *In accord with what authority does he make that statement?*

D. *It is in accord with the following Tannaite authority, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Isi b. Judah says, "Since the Torah has said, 'No man shall desire your land when you go up to appear before the Lord your God' (Exo. 34:24), that teaches that your cow may graze in the meadow and no beast will hurt it; your chicken will scratch on the dung heap and no weasel will injure it. Now doesn't this yield a conclusion a fortiori: If these, who are vulnerable to injury, are not going to be injured, people, who are not vulnerable to injury, all the more so! I know only that that is so en route to do the deed. How do I know that the same is so en route home? Scripture says, 'And you shall turn in the morning and go back to your tents' (Deu. 16: 7). This teaches that you will go and find your tent in one piece."*

E. *Well, if that's so even on his way home, why make the point in regard to his trip out to do the deed?*

F. *It is in accord with R. Ammi, for said R. Ammi, "Anyone who has real estate goes up for the pilgrim festival, and any who doesn't own real estate doesn't go up for the pilgrim festival."*

**III.11** A. Said R. Abin bar R. Ada said R. Isaac, "How come there are no fruits from Gennesaret in Jerusalem? So the festival pilgrims won't say, 'If we'd merely come up so as to eat the fruits of Gennesaret in Jerusalem, it would have been

enough for us,' so that the pilgrimage will not have been done for its own sake."

- B. Along these same lines, said R. Dosetai b. R. Yannai, "How come the hot springs of Tiberias aren't in Jerusalem? So the festival pilgrims won't say, 'If we'd merely come up to bathe in the hot springs of Tiberias [in Jerusalem], it would have been enough for us,' so that the pilgrimage will not have been done for its own sake."

**IV.1 A. And why did they say, "Two rows in a wine vault [must be searched out"]? [This designates] a place into which they bring leaven:**

B. *So who in the world ever mentioned a wine vault anyhow?*

C. *This is the sense of the statement: Any location into which [people] do not [ordinarily] bring leaven does not require examination. Stores of wine and oil don't require inspection. And why did they say, "Two rows in a wine vault [must be searched out"]? [This designates] a place into which they bring leaven, on which one regularly draws for supplies.*

**V.1 A. The House of Shammai say, "Two rows over the entire surface of [the rack of jars in] the wine vault":**

B. Said R. Judah, "The two rows of which they have spoken run from the ground to the ceiling."

C. And R. Yohanan said, "It is a single row in the shape of a right angle" [Freedman: the front row and the whole of the upper layer].

D. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Judah, and it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan.*

E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Judah: The House of Shammai say, "Two rows over the entire surface of [the rack of jars in] the wine vault," and the two rows of which they have spoken are from the ground to the rafters.*

F. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan: "Two rows over the entire surface of [the rack of jars in] the wine vault," the outer one that faces the door, the upper one that faces the ceiling; but the area within this and below is not subject to inspection.*

**VI.1 A. And the House of Hillel say, "The two outermost rows which are uppermost":**

- B. Rab said, “The upper row and the one beneath it” [in the outermost row facing the door (Freedman)].
- C. And Samuel said, “The upper row and the one inside of that.”
  - D. *What’s the basis for Rab’s position?*
  - E. *He places a heavy emphasis on **outermost** .*
  - F. *Sure, but the word **uppermost** also occurs!*
  - G. *That is to exclude those beneath the lower one* [Freedman: all the rows from the third from the top and downwards].
- H. And Samuel said, “The upper room and the one inside of that.”
  - I. *What’s the basis for his position?*
  - J. *He places a heavy emphasis on **uppermost**.*
  - K. *Sure, but the word **outermost** also occurs!*
  - L. *That serves to exclude the inner rows of the inner space* [Freedman: those within the second row of the top layer].
  - M. *R. Hiyya repeated the Tannaite rule in accord with Rab. But all the Tannaite authorities repeated the Tannaite rule in accord with Samuel, and the decided law is in accord with Samuel.*

## 1:2

- A. [9A] They do not scruple that a weasel might have dragged [leaven] from house to house and place to place.
- B. For if so, [they will have to scruple that the weasel has dragged leaven] from courtyard to courtyard and from town to town,
- C. [so] there is no end to the matter.

- I.1 A. *So the operative consideration clearly is that we have not seen the weasel take the leaven; but if we had seen the animal take it, then we should take account of the possibility that there has been leaven contamination and the house requires inspection. But why should that be the case? Why not suppose that the animal has eaten the food? Haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **Dwelling places of gentiles [in the Land of Israel] are unclean. How long must [the gentile] remain in them for them to require examination [to determine their status]? Forty days, even though there is no woman with him. [M. Oh. 18:7B-C]. [What do they examine? The deep drains and foul water. The House of Shammai say, “Also the rubbish heaps and loose dirt.” And***

the House of Hillel say,] “Any place which the pig or the weasel can reach does not require examination” [M. Oh. 18:8]?

- B. *Said R. Zira, “No problem, the one deals with meat, the other, bread; in the case of meat, the weasel will leave nothing, but in the case of bread there are leavings.”*
- C. *Said Raba, “But how are the cases parallel? In that case, there is no problem, because it’s a case of supposition: Suppose there was a burial there, suppose there wasn’t; and if you suppose there was, then suppose the weasel ate it. But here, there is no doubt that the weasel has taken leaven, so who is to say that the animal ate it? Here what we have therefore is what is subject to doubt as against what is subject to certainty, and a doubt cannot override a certainty.”*
- D. *Well, then, is it a fact that a doubt cannot override a certainty? But lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If a fellow [who is meticulous about tithing his produce] died and left a granary full of produce, even though they are only a day old, lo, they are assumed to have been properly tithed. [We assume here, too, that the landlord searched out the leaven and removed it.] Now, here is a case in which the produce certainly had been subject to tithing but untithed, and it is a matter of doubt whether or not they have been tithed, and here the matter of doubt does override a certainty.*
- E. *In that case, as a matter of fact, it is a matter of certainty that comes and overrides a matter of certainty, in accord with what R. Hanina of Khuzistan said, for said R. Hanina of Khuzistan, “It is an established assumption that an associate will not produce something that is not properly prepared under his own auspices.”*
- F. *Or, if you prefer, I shall say, it is a matter of conflict between two doubts, for say, to begin with, that it may not have been liable to tithing, in line with what R. Oshayya said, for said R. Oshayya, “One may practice the legal fiction concerning his crop, so exempting it from liability to tithe, of bringing it in for storage together with chaff, so that his cattle may eat it. He may bring it in, along these same lines and with the same result, through the roof or the back enclosure.”*
- G. *So can’t a doubt override a certainty? But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: **Said R. Judah, “There was the case of the servant girl of an olive farmer [or: tax collector] in Rimmon, who threw an abortion into a cistern. A priest [9B] came and looked to see what she threw in — to***

ascertain whether it was male or female — [and so may or may not have overshadowed corpse and been made unclean]. The case came before sages, and they declared him clean, on the grounds that the weasel or panther will drag it away forthwith” [T. **Ahilot 16:13A**]?

- H. *Now, here is a case in which the girl assuredly threw the abortion into the pit, but it is only a matter of doubt whether or not the animals have dragged the abortion away by that time, and yet the matter of doubt comes and overrides the matter of certainty!*
- I. *Don't say, **who threw an abortion into a cistern**, but rather say, who threw something that looked like an abortion into a cistern. In that case it is a matter of two doubts in conflict.*
- J. *But the language that is used is, **looked to see what she threw in — to ascertain whether it was male or female!***
- K. *This is the sense of the statement: to know whether it was wind that she had aborted or a premature foetus; and should you say it was a premature foetus, then it was **to ascertain whether it was male or female**.*
- L. *And if you prefer, I shall say: In that case it was a matter of conflict between two matters of certainty, since the weasel and the panther are found in the vicinity, they certainly dragged it away *by that time*; for even though they may have left something over, still, it is certain that they had dragged it away *by that time*.*

- I.2** A. *But do we invoke the argument, we do not take account of the possibility that a weasel may have dragged off the leaven? Surely the latter clause of the same rule states as the Tannaite wording: What he leaves over [after the search, for breakfast the next morning] he must put away in a discrete place, so there should be no need for a search for it [since otherwise a weasel may drag it away (Freedman)]!*
- B. *Said Abbaye, “No problem, the one speaks of a search on the fourteenth of Nisan, the other, on the thirteenth. If it is on the thirteenth, in which case there is plenty of bread in all the houses, a weasel doesn't hide leaven; on the fourteenth, when there isn't a lot of bread around in the houses, he does hide it.”*
- C. *Said Raba, “So is a weasel such a great prophet as to know, today is the fourteenth, so people aren't going to bake until evening, and I'd better leave some bread over and hide it for later?”*
- D. *Rather, said Raba, “What he leaves over [after the search, for breakfast the next morning] he must put away in a discrete place, lest a weasel*



seize it in his presence, and it be necessary to make an inspection in search of it.”

E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in line with the view of Raba:* He who wants to eat leaven after the search has taken place — what should he do? What he leaves over [after the search, for breakfast the next morning] he must put away in a discrete place, lest a weasel seize it in his presence, and it be necessary to make an inspection in search of it.

F. R. Mari said, “Lest he leave ten loaves and find only nine.”

- I.3** A. Nine packages of unleavened bread and one of leavened bread, *and a rat came along and took one, and we don't know whether he took the unleavened bread of the leavened bread — if one package was taken, and a rat came and stole it, then that is along the lines of the conclusion of that which we have learned on Tannaite authority as follows:* If there were nine stores, all of them selling properly slaughtered meat, and one of them selling carrion meat, and one purchased meat from one of them and does not know from which of them he has made the purchase — his doubt is resolved in favor of a prohibition. But if the meat should turn up, then one follows the status of the majority [of the stores, and it is permitted].
- B. If there were two packages, one of unleavened bread and the other of leavened bread, and before them there were two rooms, one inspected, the other not, and two rats came; one took unleavened bread and the other took leavened bread, *and we don't know which rat entered which room — that's the case of the two bins, concerning which it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* **If there were before him two bins, one of priestly rations and one of unconsecrated produce, and before them were two seahs of produce in separate containers, one of priestly rations and one of unconsecrated produce, and the produce fell from each of the small containers, but it is not known whether it fell from this one into that one,<sup>1</sup> or from that one into this one [so we do not know which produce was mixed with which] these are permitted, for lo, I say, “Priestly rations fell into priestly rations, unconsecrated produce fell into unconsecrated produce” [T. [Ter. 65:18A-D](#)].**
- C. *Well, I can well maintain that [10A] in the case of priestly rations, which derives from the authority of the rabbis, I would well say, “Priestly rations fell into priestly rations, unconsecrated produce fell into unconsecrated produce.”*

*But in the case of leaven, the prohibition of which derives from the authority of the Torah, do we invoke such a claim?*

- D. *Well, then, is the search for leaven done on the authority of the Torah? It's done on the authority of rabbis, for, by the law of the Torah, it's quite sufficient to nullify it.*
- E. *If there is one package of leaven, and, before it, are two rooms that have been searched, and a rat came and took it, but we don't know whether he went into this room or that room — that is equivalent to the case of the two paths, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **Two paths, one unclean and one clean — [If] he walked in one of them and prepared food requiring conditions of cleanness, and his fellow came and walked in the second and prepared clean things — R. Judah says, "If they are interrogated, this one by himself and this one by himself, they are clean. And if they are interrogated, the two of them at one time, they are unclean."** R. Yosé says, "**One way or the other, they are unclean**" [M. **Toh. 5:5**]. And said Raba, *and some say*, R. Yohanan, "If they come at one time, all parties concur that they are unclean; if they come sequentially, all parties concur that they are clean. The dispute concerns only a case in which someone came to ask a question concerning both his own status and his colleague's. *R. Yosé compares the case to an inquiry that is simultaneous for both, and R. Judah compares the case to a sequential inquiry.*"*
- F. *If it is a matter of doubt whether or not the rat went into one of the rooms, that is in line with the case of the plain, on which R. Eleazar and rabbis differed, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **One entered the valley during the rainy season — . and the uncleanness is in a certain field, and he said, "I walked in that place, but I do not know whether I entered that particular field, or whether I did not enter [it]" — R. Eleazar declares clean. And sages declare unclean** [M. **Toh. 6:5**]. For R. Eleazar says, "If the doubt concerns entering the area, he is clean; if there is doubt about whether he had contact with the uncleanness, he is unclean."*
- G. *If he went into the room with leaven but the owner searched and didn't find it, we have the controversy of R. Meir and rabbis, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **For R. Meir said, "Anything which is assumed to be unclean remains perpetually in its status of uncleanness until it will be known to you where the uncleanness is."** And sages say, "**One examines until one reaches rock or virgin soil**" [M. **Nid. 9:5K-L**].*

- H. *If the rat went in and the householder searched and found the leaven, that brings us to the dispute of Rabbi and Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “A field in which a grave has been lost — he who enters the field is unclean. If a grave is found in that field, he who enters the field is clean. For I say, ‘The very grave that had originally been lost is the one that has now been found,’” the words of Rabbi. And Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “The entire field must be examined.”*
- I. *If someone left nine packages and ten were found, we deal with the dispute between Rabbi and rabbis, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: **If one set aside [for safekeeping coins in the status of second tithe in the value of] a maneh, but [later, when he went back], found [there coins in the value of] two hundred zuz [that is, two maneh] – “Unconsecrated [coins] and [the original coins in the status of] second tithe have been mixed together”– the words of Rabbi. But sages say, “All [of the coins that the individual finds] are unconsecrated [i.e., none of them are coins that the individual originally set aside] [T. M.S. 5:7].”***
- J. *If he left ten and found nine, that brings us to the latter part of the same Tannaite rule: **If he set aside [coins in the status of second tithe in the value of] two hundred zuz but [later] found [coins in the value of only] a maneh — “[The coins that he finds are deemed consecrated, in the theory that] one maneh was left behind while one maneh was carried off”– the words of Rabbi. But sages say, “All [of these coins] are unconsecrated [i.e., they are not the coins that the individual originally left behind]” [T. M.S. 5:7].***
- K. **[10B]** *If he left the leaven in one corner and found it in another, that intersects with the dispute of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel and rabbis, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: An ax that was lost in the house — the house is unclean, for I assume that an unclean person went in and took it out. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “The house is clean, for I assume the owner has lent it to a third party and forgotten, or he took it from this corner and left it in some other corner and forgot.”*
- L. *So who in the world ever spoke about a corner?*
- M. *The formulation is flawed, and this is the proper Tannaite framing of the passage: An ax that was lost in a house — the house is unclean, for I assume that an unclean person went in and took it out. If he left it in one corner and found it in another corner, the house is unclean, for I assume that an unclean person went in and took it from this corner and left it in another corner. Rabban*

Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “The house is clean, for I assume the owner has lent it to a third party and forgotten, or he took it from this corner and left it in some other corner and forgot.”

- I.4** A. Said Raba, “A rat enters with a loaf of bread in its mouth, and the owner went in after it and found crumbs — he has to inspect the area for leaven, since it’s not the rat’s way to make crumbs.”
- B. And said Raba, “If a child went in, with a loaf of bread in his hand, and the householder went in after him and found crumbs, it is not necessary to conduct an inspection, since it is routine for a child to leave crumbs.”
- C. *Raba raised this question: “If a rat went in with a loaf of bread in its mouth, and the rat came out with the loaf of bread in its mouth, what is the law? Do we say that the loaf that he went in with is the same as the loaf that he came out with? Or maybe it’s another one? And if you should say, the loaf he brought in is the same as the loaf he took out, then what if a white rat went in with a loaf in its mouth, but a black rat came out with a loaf in its mouth? This is certainly a different one, or maybe this one grabbed it from the other? And if you say, rats don’t grab from each other, what if a rat went in with a loaf in its mouth, and a weasel came out with a loaf in its mouth? A weasel certainly does grab from a rat, or maybe it’s a different one, for if it had grabbed it from the rat, the rat would have been in the weasel’s mouth [not just the bread]? And if you should say, if it had grabbed the bread from the mouth, the rat would have been in its mouth, what if the rat came in with a loaf in its mouth and a weasel came out with a loaf and a rat in its mouth? Here it is surely the same? Or, maybe, if it were the same, the loaf should have been in the rat’s mouth, or maybe it fell out of the rat’s mouth because of fear, and the weasel took it?”*
- D. So you’re going to live with that problem.
- I.5** A. *Raba raised this question: “If there is a loaf of bread on the top rafters, does he have to take a ladder to get it down, or doesn’t he have to? Do we say rabbis don’t put a person to that much trouble, and, since it can’t come down on its own, he’s not going to end up eating it? Or maybe, it may fall down, and he’ll end up eating it? And if you should say, maybe it’ll fall down and he’ll end up eating, it, if there is a loaf in a pit, does he have to get a ladder to take it up or not? Here it is certainly not going to come up on its own? Or maybe he may go down to do whatever he has to do and end up eating it? And should you say, maybe he’ll climb down and do what he has to do and*

*end up eating it, what if a loaf is in a snake's mouth? Does he have to get a snake charmer to take it out or doesn't have to get a snake charmer for that purpose? Rabbis have put him to trouble through his own person, but didn't impose monetary costs on him in this connection — or maybe it doesn't matter?"*

B. *So you're going to live with that problem.*

### 1:3

- A. **R. Judah says, "They seek out [leaven] (1) on the night of the fourteenth, (2) on the fourteenth in the morning, and (3) at the time of removal."**
- B. **And sages say, "[If] one did not seek out [leaven] on the night of the fourteenth, he may seek it out (1) on the fourteenth.**
- C. **"If he did not seek it out on the fourteenth, let him seek it out (2) at the appointed time [11 A.M. to 12 noon on the fourteenth].**
- D. **"[If] he did not seek it out at the appointed time, let him seek it out (3) after the appointed time [to nightfall]."**
- E. **And what he wishes to hold over [for food until the time for burning leaven], let him leave in a discrete place, so that it shall not require examination afterward.**

**I.1** A. *What's the scriptural basis for the ruling of R. Judah?*

- B. *R. Hisda and Rabbah bar R. Huna both say, "The three searchings correspond to the three references in the Torah to 'putting away,' as follows: 'And there shall no leavened bread be seen with you, neither shall there be leaven seen with you' (Exo. 13: 7); 'seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses' (Exo. 12:19); 'and even on the first day shall you put away leaven out of your houses' (Exo. 12:15)."*
- C. *Objected R. Joseph, "R. Judah says, 'Anyone who has not made a search for leaven at these three occasions may not again do so.'" Therefore it is only in the time from then and onward that they dispute [after the time of removal. All concur that only one search is necessary, in Judah's case, either in the evening or in the morning (Freedman)].*
  - D. *Mar Zutra repeated the matter in this way: "Objected R. Joseph, 'R. Judah says, "Anyone who has not made a search for leaven at these three occasions may not again do so.'" Therefore they differ on whether or not he can understand a further search."*

- E. *Rather, R. Judah also speaks of a case in which he has not searched [in the evening but plans to in the morning], and this is what is at issue between the authorities before us: [Judah] takes the view that only prior it is forbidden [one has to search at that time], but afterward it is not, as a preventive measure lest he come to eat of the leaven; and rabbis maintain that we make no such precautionary decree.*
- F. *But does R. Judah make a precautionary decree lest someone come to eat of the leaven? And haven't we learned in the Mishnah: **After the sheaf of first barley was offered, they go out and find the market of Jerusalem full of meal and parched grain [of new produce] — [11A] “not with the approval of sages,” the words of R. Meir. R. Judah says, “With the approval of sages did they do so” [M. Men. 10:5A-C]***? So it is clear that R. Judah made no such precautionary decree lest people eat the new crop prior to the offering of the sheaf of first barley, [for example, while they were preparing it for market]!
- G. *Said Rabbah, “The case of the new produce is different, for, since the man is permitted to pluck the grain only by hand [but not to reap it in an ordinary manner with a sickle (Cashdan)], he will remember [not to eat while plucking it].”*
- H. *Said to him Abbayye, “That poses no problem as to reaping the grain. But what will you say about grinding and sifting it [so how will the person be reminded that it is new produce, which cannot be eaten]?”*
- I. *That poses no problem. Grinding could be done on a handmill, sifting on the back of the sieve [and these variations of the normal procedure would produce the same effect].*
- J. *And what about the matter of irrigated fields, where it is permitted to reap prior to the presentation of the sheaf of first barley? For we have learned in the Mishnah: **They reap [the crop before the omer] in irrigated fields in valleys, but they do not heap it up [M. Men. 6:8A]**. And we have it as an established fact that that accords with the position of R. Judah, so what is to be said in that regard?*
- K. *Rather, said Abbayye, “People will ordinarily keep far from new produce prior to the waving of the sheaf of first barley, but they will*

*not ordinarily keep far from eating leaven [which they are accustomed to do].”*

- L. *Said Raba, “Do the two statements of R. Judah conflict, but do the two statements of anonymous rabbis vis-à-vis R. Judah not conflict? [That would be an absurd result.]”*
- M. *Rather, said Raba, “The two statements of R. Judah do not conflict, as we have explained [in what Abbayye has said], and the two statements of anonymous rabbis vis-à-vis R. Judah do not conflict. The only purpose of the search for leaven is for the man to burn it himself, so he’s obviously not planning to eat it.”*
- N. *R. Ashi said, “The two statements of R. Judah do not conflict, for our Mishnah has addressed **meal and parched grain**.”*  
[These cannot be eaten if not cooked, and hence there will be no problem about forgetting not to eat the food prior to the presentation of the sheaf of first barley.]
- O. *But this statement of R. Ashi is preposterous. For that poses no problem if the grain has been parched, but what is to be said about the period prior to the parching of the grain [when it can be eaten without further processing]? And should you maintain that, here, too, the grain will only be plucked by hand and not reaped, as Rabbah proposed, then there is this question: What about grain from an irrigated field, where it is permitted to reap in the normal way? It must follow, therefore, that this statement of R. Ashi is preposterous.*

- I.2** A. *So in any case in which one would not normally desist, would R. Judah issue a precautionary decree? Haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **A person should not pierce an eggshell with oil and put it on the opening of a lamp so that [the oil] will drip [out and sustain the lamp], even if it is made out of earthenware, and R. Judah permits [doing so] [M. Shab. 2:4A-C]?***
- B. *In that case, because of the generally strict rules that govern the Sabbath, the man will indeed desist.*
  - C. *But then there is a conflict of rulings concerning the Sabbath that are assigned to R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If on the Sabbath the cord of a bucket broke, one should not fix it but merely make a slip knot. R. Judah says, “One may wind a hollow belt*



or fascia around it, on condition that he not tie it with a slip knot.” *It follows therefore that there is a contradiction between one statement of R. Judah and another, and so, too, between one statement of rabbis and another!*

- D. *There is no contradiction between one statement of rabbis and another: oil from one source can be confused with oil from another, but no one can confuse looping with knotting.*
- E. *And there is a contradiction between one statement of R. Judah and another: In that case it is not because looping may be mistaken for knotting, but because looping itself is knotting.*
- F. *Well, there is still a conflict between two positions taken by rabbis, for we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- G. **They tie a bucket with a belt but not with a rope.**
- H. **R. Judah permits [tying with a rope].**
- I. **A governing principle did R. Judah state, “On account of any sort of knot which does not last they are not liable” [M. [Shab. 15:2D-F](#)].**
- J. **But not with a rope:** *What sort of rope? Should one say, a rope in general, then why say, R. Judah permits [tying with a rope]? This is a permanent knot [so how could he permit using it]? So it must refer to a weaver’s rope.*
- K. *That bears the implication, then, that rabbis take the view that we make a precautionary decree against using a weaver’s rope on account of rope in general.*
- L. *Not at all: One rope can be confused with another, but looping cannot be confused with knotting.*
- M. *So in any case in which someone would not ordinarily abstain, doesn’t R. Judah issue a precautionary decree? But hasn’t it been taught as follows on Tannaite authority:*
- N. **A firstling which suffered from a congestion of blood, even though [if one does not let blood] it [may] die –**
- O. **“they do not draw blood from it,” the words of R. Judah.** [Judah has the animal not bled even if no permanent blemish is inflicted, lest one do so even by making a permanent blemish; Judah forbids a



precautionary decree, though people are pretty careful not to blemish Holy Things (Freedman)].

- P.       **And sages say, “one draws blood from it,**
- Q.       **“on condition that one not make a blemish in it [M. Bekh. 5:2D-G].**
- R.       In that case the consideration is that, since the person is agitated [11B] about his property, we maintain that, *if you permit him to bleed it where no permanent blemish would be inflicted, he may come to do the same even in a case in which a permanent blemish would be inflicted. Rabbis, by contrast, hold that, if you don’t permit him to do so at all, he will all the more likely end up doing just that!*
- S.       *So do we maintain that from R. Judah’s viewpoint we invoke the argument, since the person is agitated about his property...? But haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, “They do not curry cattle on the festival day, because doing so makes a wound. But they may comb them.” And sages say, “They do not curry them. Also: they do not comb them.” [M. Bes. 2:8]? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: What is currying and what is combing? Currying [is done with a brush with] small [bristles], which cause wounds. Combing [is done with a brush with] large [bristles], which do not cause wounds [T. Yom Tob 2:17].*
- T.       *In the other case, if you leave the beast alone, it will die, we invoke the argument, since the person is agitated about his property..., but here, if you ignore the animal, it will be a matter of pain in general, we don’t invoke the argument, since the person is agitated about his property....*
- U.       *Well, then, with respect to R. Judah’s position, how does he differentiate the case of leaven, in which instance he makes a precautionary decree, from the case of scraping, in which instance he doesn’t make a precautionary decree?*
- V.       *One piece of bread can be confused with another, but no one will confuse currying and scraping.*

## 1:4

- A.       **R. Meir says, “They eat [leaven] throughout the fifth [hour on the fourteenth of Nisan], and they burn it at the beginning of the sixth hour [noon].”**

- B. And R. Judah says, "They eat [leaven] through the fourth hour, keep it in suspense throughout the fifth hour, and burn it at the beginning of the sixth hour."

### 1:5

- A. And further did R. Judah say, "Two [unfit] loaves of bread of a thank-offering which were invalid were left lying on the roof of the portico [of the Temple].
- B. "So long as they are lying there, everybody eats [leaven].
- C. "[When] one of them is removed, they suspend and do not eat [leaven] but also do not burn it.
- D. "[When] the second one of them is removed, everybody begins burning [the leaven]."
- E. Rabban Gamaliel says, "[Leaven] in the status of unconsecrated food is eaten through the fourth hour, and [leaven in the status of] heave-offering through the fifth. Then they burn at the beginning of the sixth hour."

**I.1** A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah:* [If] one [of the witnesses] says, "It was on the second of the month," and one of the witnesses says, "It was on the third of the month," their testimony stands. For one of them may know about the intercalation of the month, and the other one may not know about the intercalation of the month. [If] one of them says, "On the third," and one of them says, "On the fifth," their testimony is null. [If] one of them says, "At two," and one of them says, "At three," their testimony stands. [If] one of them says, "At three," and one of them says, "At five," their testimony is null. R. Judah says, "It stands." [If] one of them says, "At five," and one of them says, "At seven," their testimony is null. For at five the sun is at the east, and at seven the sun is at the west [M. San. 5:3].

- B. Said Abbaye, "When you look into the matter, you will conclude, in the opinion of R. Meir, someone never makes a mistake as to the hour, but in the opinion of R. Judah, someone may make a mistake by half an hour.

C. "In the opinion of R. Meir, someone never makes a mistake as to the hour: *The event took place at the end of the second and beginning of the third hour, so, when one witness says, it was during the second hour, he means, at the end thereof, and when the other says, during the third hour, he means, at the outset.*

D. “In the opinion of R. Judah, someone may make a mistake by half an hour: *The event took place in the middle of the fourth hour; he who says it was in the third hour referred to the end of the third, making a mistake of half an hour; and if he said it was in the fifth hour, he meant at the beginning of the fifth, erring by half an hour.*”

E. *There are those who say:*

F. Said Abbaye, “When you look into the matter, you will conclude, in the opinion of R. Meir, someone makes a mistake only by a bit, but in the opinion of R. Judah, someone may make a mistake by a bit more than an hour.

G. “In the opinion of R. Meir, someone makes a mistake only by a bit: *The event took place at the end of the second and beginning of the third hour, and one of them made a mistake by just a bit.*

H. “In the opinion of R. Judah, someone may make a mistake by a bit more than an hour: *The event took place at the end of the third hour or at the beginning of the fifth, [12A] and one of them erred by just over an hour.*”

I. R. Huna b. R. Judah went and reported this tradition before Raba. He said, “Now, if we had subjected these witnesses to a close examination, and the one who said it was at three meant it was at the beginning of the third hour, and the one who said it was at five meant, it was at the end of the fifth hour, so that we should have testimony that conflicts, in which case, we would not inflict the death penalty, now, shall we go and inflict the death penalty on the basis of a matter of doubt? But the All-Merciful has said, ‘then the congregation shall judge...and the congregation shall deliver’ (Num. 35:24-25) [giving the benefit of the doubt to the accused]?”

J. Rather, said Raba, “In the opinion of R. Meir, someone may err by two hours less a bit, and in the opinion of R. Judah, someone may err by three hours, less a bit.

K. “In the opinion of R. Meir, someone may err by two hours less a bit: *When the incident took place, it was either at the beginning of the second hour or at the end of the third, and one of them erred by two hours less a bit.*

L. “In the opinion of R. Judah, someone may err by three hours, less a bit: *When the incident took place, it was either at the beginning of the*

*third hour or at the end of the fifth, and one of them erred by three hours less a bit."*

- M. *We have learned in the Mishnah: They interrogated [the witness] with seven points of interrogation: (1) In what septennate? (2) In what year? (3) In what month? (4) On what day of the month? (5) On what day [of the week]? (6) At what time? (7) In what place? [M. San. 5:1A-B]. And we have learned in the Mishnah: What is the difference between interrogation [about the date, time, and place] and examination [about the circumstances]? In the case of interrogation, [if] one witness says, "I don't know the answer," the testimony of the witness is null. [In the case of] examination, [if] one of the witnesses says, "I don't know," or even if both of them say, "We don't know," their testimony nonetheless stands. All the same are interrogation and examination: When [the witnesses] contradict one another, their testimony is null [M. San. 5:2C-F]. And we reflected in this way: What validates the distinction between interrogation and examination? In the case of interrogation, if one of them said, "I don't know," their testimony is null, *because in this case you have testimony which is not subject to the test of conspiratorial perjury*. In the case of examination, if one of them said, "I don't know," their testimony nonetheless stands, *because you do have testimony which you can subject to the test of conspiratorial perjury*. Now, if you maintain that one may err by so much, then even the examinations concerning which hour constitute testimony that is not subject to cross-examination, for they can well assert, "But we made a mistake"!*
- N. *We allow them the whole of the error, that is, according to R. Meir, we allow them from the beginning of the first hour to the end of the fifth; and by reason we should give them even more at the outset, but people don't make a mistake between day and night. According to R. Judah, we allow them from the beginning of the first hour to the end of the sixth as a permissible range of error, and by reason we should allow them even more at the beginning, [12B] but people don't make a mistake between day and night. And by reason we should allow them more at the end, but at the fifth hour, the sun is in the east, and at the seventh, it is in the west.*
- O. *We have learned in the Mishnah:*
- P. **R. Meir says, "They eat [leaven] throughout the fifth [hour on the fourteenth of Nisan], and they burn it at the beginning of the sixth hour [noon]."**

- Q. And R. Judah says, “They eat [leaven] through the fourth hour, keep it in suspense throughout the fifth hour, and burn it at the beginning of the sixth hour.”
- R. *Now from the perspective of Abbaye with regard to the position of R. Meir, holding that R. Meir maintains someone makes no mistake at all, why not let someone eat leaven for the whole of the six hours? And even in accord with the version that allows that someone may err by a little, let someone eat leaven to the end of the sixth hour! And, moreover, from the perspective of Abbaye with regard to the position of R. Judah, who has said, someone may err by as much as half an hour, why not let people eat leaven down to half an hour before the sixth hour; and even in the version that holds, someone may err by an hour and a bit, why not let people eat leaven to the end of the fifth hour?*
- S. Said Abbaye, “The right to give testimony is assigned to meticulous persons, while eating leaven is something that anybody may do.”
- T. *Now from the perspective of Raba with regard to the position of R. Meir, holding that R. Meir maintains someone makes a mistake by as much as two hours less a bit why not prohibit eating leaven from the beginning of the fifth hour?*
- U. *In the fifth hour the sun is at the east, in the seventh, it’s at the west [and the prohibition of leaven starts in the seventh hour, so there’s no possibility of error (Freedman)].*
- V. *Well, then, we should be able to eat leaven during the sixth hour!*
- W. Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “At the sixth hour the sun stands at the meridian [and error is possible].”
- X. *And, moreover, from the perspective of Raba with regard to the position of R. Judah, who has said, someone may err by as much as three hours less a bit, then, we shouldn’t eat leaven from the beginning of the fourth hour?*
- Y. *At the fifth hour the sun is in the east, at the seventh, in the west — all the more so in the fourth!*
- Z. *If so, we should be able to eat leaven during the fifth hour!*
- AA. Abbaye explained this matter within the framework of Raba’s position: “The right to give testimony is assigned to meticulous persons, while eating leaven is something that anybody may do.”
- BB. *But said Raba, “That’s not the operative consideration behind R. Judah’s position. But R. Judah is consistent with his position, which is: The sole valid form of*

*removing leaven is by burning; rabbis, for their part, have therefore given him an honor for collecting fuel for the burning.*”

- CC. *Rabina objected to Raba:* “Said R. Judah, ‘When is that the case? It is prior to the deadline for removing leaven, but at the deadline for removing leaven, a valid form of removal is any means whatsoever!’”
- DD. Rather, said Raba, “It is a precautionary decree on account of the conditions that may prevail on a cloudy day.”
- EE. *If that’s so, then even at the fourth hour we shouldn’t be able to eat leaven.*
- FF. Said R. Pappa, “The fourth hour is when people generally eat.”

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

- B. The first hour is the mealtime for gladiators; the second, for robbers, the third, for heirs, the fourth, for laborers, the fifth, for disciples of sages, and the sixth, for everybody else.
- C. Now is that so? And didn’t R. Pappa say, “The fourth hour is the time for the main meal of everybody?”
- D. Rather: The fourth is the time for everyone, the fifth the mealtime for workers, the sixth, the mealtime for disciples of sages. From that point onward in the day, it is like throwing a stone into a barrel [and no benefit will come of the meal].
- E. *Said Abbayye, “But we have made that statement only of one who has tasted nothing in the morning, but if someone has eaten something in the morning, there is no problem.”*

**I.3** A. Said R. Ashi, “As is the dispute in regard to testimony, so there is a dispute with regard to eating leaven.” [Freedman: Just as Meir and Judah differ on possible errors in respect to the time to which testimony pertains, so with regard to the prohibition of leaven do they dispute.]

- B. *That’s obvious: That’s what we just now said!*
- C. *In this statement he tells us that the answers that we gave are valid, and you don’t have to say that before us is a conflict of Tannaite rulings.*

**I.4** A. Said R. Shimi bar Ashi, “The rule applies only to differences in hours [of the day, for there is a margin of error]. But if one of them says, ‘It was before dawn,’ and the other says, ‘It was after dawn,’ their testimony is null.”

- B. *That is self-evident.*

- C. Rather: If one of them says, “It was before dawn,” and the other says, “It was just during sunrise....”
- D. *That, too, is self-evident.*
- E. *[No, it requires explicit statement, for] what might you have thought? Both of them are talking about the same thing, and the one who said [13A] it was during sunrise was standing in the glow beforehand, he saw only a gleam [but thought it was sunrise]. So we are informed that we do not [treat that as a routine margin of error].*

## I.5

- A. Said R. Nahman said Rab, “The law is in accord with R. Judah.”
- B. *Said Raba to R. Nahman, “Why doesn’t the master say, ‘the decided law is in accord with R. Meir,’ for a Tannaite authority has presented an unattributed law in accord with his position, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **So long as it is permitted to eat [leaven], one feeds [it] to domestic cattle, to a wild beast, and to fowl [M. 2:1A-B]**?”*
- C. *That is not classified as an unattributed ruling, since there is the problem of the language, permitted [which yields the conclusion that the unattributed ruling really belongs to Gamaliel, as we shall see below].*
- D. *“Well, then, why doesn’t the master say, ‘the decided law accords with the position of Rabban Gamaliel,’ since he is the one who brings about a compromise?”*
- E. *He said to him, “Rabban Gamaliel is not the one who takes the middle position. He states what is in fact his own position. But if you prefer, I shall say, Rab made his statement in accord with the following Tannaite authority, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘If the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with the Sabbath, they must remove everything prior to the Sabbath, and they burn produce in the status of priestly rations whether it is unclean, held in suspense, or clean; but of priestly rations that are clean, they hold over enough food for two meals, so as to eat it up to the fourth hour,’ the words of R. Eleazar b. Judah of Bartota, which he stated in the name of R. Joshua. They said to him, ‘Priestly rations that are clean are not to be burned, since someone may turn up to eat that food.’ He said to them, ‘They already looked for someone and didn’t find anyone [who was of the priestly caste].’ They said to him, ‘Such persons may have spent the night outside the city wall.’ He said to them, ‘In accord with your position, even priestly rations that are held in suspense [by reason of their possibly not being unclean] also shouldn’t be burned, maybe Elijah will come along and declare them actually clean?’ They said to him, ‘Well, the Israelites have already been assured, thank you very much, that*

Elijah is simply not going to come on the eve of the Sabbath or on the eve of a Festival, so as not to cause a lot of trouble to people.’ They say: They didn’t move from the spot before fixing the law in accord with the position of R. Eleazar b. Judah of Bartota which he said in the name of R. Joshua. *Now doesn’t this mean*, even in regard to eating [and leaven may be eaten up to the fourth hour, the basis of Rab’s ruling]?”

F. *Said R. Pappa in the name of Raba*, “No, it was only in respect to removing the leaven.”

**I.6** *A. And so, too, Rabbi takes the position assigned to R. Nahman. For said Rabin bar R. Ada*, “There was the case of someone who deposited a saddlebag full of leaven with Yohanan of Haquq, and rats made holes in it, and leaven burst out. He came before Rabbi. At the first hour, he said to him, ‘Wait,’ at the second, ‘Wait,’ at the third, ‘Wait,’ at the fourth, ‘Wait’, at the fifth, ‘Go, sell it in the market.’” *Doesn’t this mean, to gentiles, and the ruling accords with the position of R. Judah?*

B. *Said R. Joseph*, “No, it means, to Israelites, in accord with the position of R. Meir.”

C. *Said to him Abbayye*, “*If it is to Israelites, then why shouldn’t he keep it for himself?*”

D. *It is because of suspicion [that he doesn’t keep it for himself], for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. If the charity fund collectors run out of poor among whom to distribute the money, they change the small change into large coins [to protect the money] with outsiders, but not out of their own funds.

F. If supervisors of the soup kitchen run out of poor to feed, they may sell the food to others but not to themselves, since it is said, “And you shall be guiltless towards the Lord and towards Israel” (Num. 32:22).

G. *Said R. Ada bar Mattenah to R. Joseph*, “*You explicitly said to us: ‘Go and sell it to gentiles, in accord with the position of R. Judah.’*”

H. *Said R. Joseph*, “*In accord with which authority does this ruling of Rabbi concur? It is in accord with the view of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for we have learned in the Mishnah:*

I. **“He who deposits produce with his fellow**

J. **“even if it is going to go to waste —**



- K. “[the fellow] should not touch it.
- L. “Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, ‘He sells them in the presence of a court,
- M. “‘for he is in the position of one who thereby restores what is lost to its rightful owner’” [M. **B.M. 3:6**].
- N. *Said to him Abbaye, “But was it not explicitly stated in that regard, said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, ‘There is a dispute [13B] only when the rate of wastage is normal. But when the rate of wastage is abnormal, all concur that the produce is to be sold by court order’? All the more so here, where it would be entirely lost [if it is not sold prior to the point at which leaven is forbidden]!”*

**II.1** A. And further did R. Judah say, “Two [unfit] loaves of bread of a thank-offering which were invalid were left lying on the roof of the portico [of the Temple]. So long as they are lying there, everybody eats [leaven]. [When] one of them is removed, they suspend and do not eat [leaven] but also do not burn it. [When] the second one of them is removed, everybody begins burning [the leaven]”:

- B. *A Tannaite authority repeated before R. Judah the formulation [for the statement, on the roof of the portico of the Temple, “on top of the Temple.”*
- C. *He said to him, “Well, then, does he have to hide them? [They have to be exposed!] Rather, repeat: on the roof of the Temple portico.”*
- D. *Said Rahba said R. Judah, “The Temple mount consisted of a double colonnade.”*
- E. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: The Temple mount consisted of a double colonnade.*
- F. *R. Judah says, “It was called a double colonnade: a colonnade within a colonnade.”*

**II.2** A. Two [unfit] loaves of bread of a thank-offering which were invalid:

- B. *Why were they invalid?*
- C. *Said R. Hanina, “Since they were many, they were made invalid by being kept overnight. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: They do not bring a thank-offering, [which is a freewill peace-offering], on the festival of unleavened bread because of the leaven that accompanies it [T. Hag. 1:6].”*
- D. *That’s obvious.*
- E. *Said R. Adda the son of R. Isaac, and some say R. Samuel b. Abba, “Here we deal with [the bringing of a thank-offering on] the fourteenth [of Nisan, the day*

*before the start of the festival of unleavened bread]; now the authority at hand reasons, They do not bring Holy Things to the place of disqualification. [Avery-Peck: Since the festival of unleavened bread has not yet begun, offering this sacrifice should be permitted. The bread that accompanies it, however, will not all be eaten by the time the restrictions of the festival begin to apply. That bread therefore will have to be disposed of by burning. To prevent this, the sacrifice is not permitted on that day at all. Had the rule not been taught, we would not have known this.] So everybody brought the offerings on the thirteenth, and, since they were numerous, the bread became unfit by being kept overnight.”*

- F. In the name of R. Yannai they said, “They were really valid, *and why did they call them invalid?* It is because the animal-offering had not been slaughtered along with them.” [Freedman: We need not assume that the reference is to loaves that were unfit through having been kept overnight; but even if the sacrifice had not been slaughtered, they also are so designated, because the loaves may not be eaten until the thanksgiving-offering is killed in their regard.]
- G. *So why not slaughter it?*
- H. *Because the animal that had been designated had been lost.*
- I. *So bring another and slaughter that one?*
- J. It’s a case in which the owner had said, “This is a thank-offering, and this is the bread that goes with it,” *in line with Rabbah’s position*, for said Rabbah, “[If someone said,] ‘This animal shall be a thank-offering, and these are the loaves that will accompany it,’ if the bread was lost, he presents other bread with the thank-offering. If the animal designated as the thank-offering was lost, he may not designate another to go along with the bread.”
- K. *What is the operative consideration?*
- L. The bread is on account of the animal designated as the thank-offering, but the animal designated as a thank-offering is not on account of the bread.
- M. *Well, then, why not redeem the loaves and let them be released as unconsecrated? Rather, in point of fact, we deal with a case in which the offering was killed in regard to the loaves, but the blood was poured out [so the loaves cannot be redeemed].*
  - N. *In accord with whom then? It is in accord with Rabbi, for said Rabbi, “In accord with whom, then, is this explanation tendered? It accords with Rabbi, who has said, “Two components of a rite that together render the priests’ share of the meat of the offering permissible for*

them to eat may nonetheless individually raise the offering to the level of sanctity each on its own.”

- O. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* The lambs that are presented at Pentecost sanctify the bread only when they are slaughtered. How so? “If the officiating priest slaughtered them for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, the bread is likewise sanctified. If the officiating priest slaughtered them not for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood not for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, the bread is not sanctified. If the officiating priest slaughtered them for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood not for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, the bread is sanctified but not sanctified,” the words of Rabbi.
- P. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “Under no circumstances is the bread sanctified unless the officiating priest slaughtered them for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated, and tossed their blood for the classification for which the beasts were originally designated.”
- Q. *You may even say that it accords with the position of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon. For here with what sort of a case are we dealing? It is one in which* the officiating priest received the blood in a cup, and then the cup was poured out, *and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon concurs with his father, who has said, “In any case in which the blood is ready to be sprinkled, it is as though it were sprinkled.”*

**II.3.** A. *A Tannaite statement:* In the name of R. Eleazar they said, “They were valid So long as both were there, all the people ate leaven. When one was removed, they kept the leaven in suspense, not eating or burning it; when both were taken away, all began burning their leaven.

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

- B. Abba Saul says, [14A] “There were two cows that would plow on the Mount of Olives. So long as both were plowing, everybody ate leaven. When one of them was taken away, they kept the leaven in suspense, not eating or burning it; when both were taken away, all began burning their leaven.

## 1:6

- A. R. Hananiah, Prefect of the priests, says, “In the days of the priests they never refrained from burning meat which had been made unclean by an Offspring of uncleanness with meat which had been made by a Father of uncleanness,
- B. “even though they [thereby] add uncleanness to its uncleanness [that of the meat made unclean by an Offspring of uncleanness].”
- C. Added R. Aqiba and said, “In the days of the priests they never refrained from burning oil [in the status of heave-offering] made invalid by one who had immersed in that same day, in a lamp which had been made unclean by one who had contracted corpse uncleanness,
- D. “even though they [thereby] add uncleanness to its uncleanness [that of the heave-offering oil invalidated by one who had immersed on that same day].”

## 1:7

- A. Said R. Meir, “From their opinions we learn that they burn [leaven in the status of] heave-offering which is [cultically] clean with that which is [cultically] unclean on Passover.”
- B. Said to him R. Yosé, “That is not the right conclusion [to draw by analogy from the opinions of Hananiah and Aqiba].
- C. “For R. Eliezer and R. Joshua concur that they burn this by itself and that by itself.
- D. “Concerning what did they differ?
- E. “Concerning that whose status [as to cultic cleanness] was subject to suspension and concerning that which is certainly cultically unclean.’
- F. “For R. Eliezer says, ‘This is to be burned by itself, and that is to be burned by itself.’
- G. “And R. Joshua says, ‘Both of them together [are to be burned].’”

- I.1** A. [Even though they [thereby] add uncleanness to its uncleanness:] *Well, now, meat that has been made unclean by an offspring of uncleanness — in what remove of uncleanness is it? It is in the second remove of uncleanness. Now, when one burns it with meat that was made unclean by a generative source of uncleanness, in what remove of uncleanness is that? It is in the second remove of uncleanness. So what we have is something unclean in the*

*second remove of uncleanness, along with something else unclean in the second remove of uncleanness, so what's the sense of the allegation, **even though they [thereby] add uncleanness to its uncleanness?***

- B. *Said R. Judah, "Here we are dealing with the offspring of an offspring of uncleanness, in which case we have what is unclean in the third remove of uncleanness, and the framer of the passage takes the view that what is unclean in the third remove of uncleanness may be raised to a higher level and be made unclean in the second remove of uncleanness."*
- C. *But isn't it the simple fact that food does not impart uncleanness to food? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Might one maintain that food may impart uncleanness to food? Scripture says, "But if water be put on seed and any of their carcass fall thereon, it is unclean" (Lev. 11:38). It is unclean, but it does not impart its status of uncleanness to what is like it.*
- D. *Well, now, that poses no problem to the position of Abbaye, who takes the view that they spoke in context only of unconsecrated food, but, as to food in the status of priestly rations and Holy Things, such food can impart its status to other food. And, further, along these same lines, it poses no problem to R. Ada bar Ahbah in the name of Raba, too, who has said, "They made this statement only with respect to unconsecrated food and food in the status of priestly rations, but so far as Holy Things are concerned, it does impart its status to other food." But what about what Rabina said in the name of Raba, namely, "Scripture sets forth a law without qualifications," there is no distinction to be drawn between unconsecrated food and food in the status of priestly rations or Holy Things: In none of these cases does food impart its status to other food"? What is to be said in that case? [What situation can our rule possibly contemplate?]*
- E. *Here, with what situation do we deal? It is liquid along with meat, in which case, the meat contracts uncleanness from the liquid.*
- F. *If so, then, instead of the language, **meat which had been made unclean by an Offspring of uncleanness with meat which had been made by a Father of uncleanness**, what we should have is **meat which had been made unclean by an Offspring of uncleanness with liquid!***
- G. *Rather, while, as a matter of fact, by the law of the Torah, food does not impart uncleanness to food, by the law of rabbis, it does.*

**II.1 A. Added R. Aqiba and said, "In the days of the priests they never refrained from burning oil [in the status of heave-offering] made invalid by one who**

had immersed in that same day, in a lamp which had been made unclean by one who had contracted corpse uncleanness, even though they [thereby] add uncleanness to its uncleanness [that of the heave-offering oil invalidated by one who had immersed on that same day]”:

- B. *Well, now, oil that has been made invalid by contact with what is unclean in the status of having immersed and awaiting sunset for the completion of the rite of purification, at what remove is such a thing? It is in the third remove of uncleanness. And when it is lit in a lamp that was made unclean by what has been made unclean by a corpse, what does it become? Unclean in the second remove. So what does he tell us? That what is unclean in the third remove may be made unclean in the second remove? But he’s just said so in the former statement [A]!*
- C. *Said R. Judah, “Here we deal with a lamp made of metal, and the All-Merciful has said, [14B] ‘And whoever touches one that is slain by the sword’ (Num. 19:16) — the sword is in the remove of uncleanness of the corpse itself, and so is a generative source of uncleanness. Now, R. Aqiba maintains that what is unclean in the third remove may be made unclean in the first remove [and that is a new point].”*
  - D. *Now what forces R. Judah to interpret the statement to deal with a lamp made of metal? Why not say it is a lamp made of earthenware, and what is the sense of **even though they [thereby] add**? While in the first clause it was unclean and now it is unclean, in the present clause, it was unfit but it now it is unfit?*
  - E. *Said Raba, “Our Mishnah paragraph bothered him. Why does it formulate matters in the specific language, **in a lamp which had been made unclean by one who had contracted corpse uncleanness**? The passage could as well have used the language, in a lamp which had been made unclean by one who had contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing. Now what object permits us to differentiate between uncleanness contracted from a corpse and uncleanness contracted from a dead creeping thing? It is a metal object [which alone is unclean in the remove of that from which it contracts uncleanness].”*
- II.2 A. *Said Raba, “That proves that R. Aqiba takes the position that the uncleanness of liquid so far as imparting uncleanness to other things derives from the Torah, for if you should maintain that it derives from the authority of rabbis,*

*as to this lamp, how does it affect the oil? If it is by rendering the oil unfit, it is already unfit [and what difference does it make whether it is in the third or first remove of uncleanness anyhow]?"*

- B. *Well, how does that follow? Maybe now it imparts uncleanness to other things only by the authority of rabbis?*
- C. *If its power to convey uncleanness derived only from the authority of rabbis, then why say that it was made unclean by a generative source of uncleanness? Even if it were made unclean by what was unclean in the first or second remove, it would also be unclean in the first remove, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **Whatever spoils heave-offering renders the liquid unclean, to be in the first [remove], to render something unclean at one [further] remove and to render [heave-offering] unfit at one [still further, namely, a third] remove, (except for what is immersed and awaits sunset for the completion of the rite of purification) [M. Par. 8:7A-B].** That proves it derives from the Torah.*

**III.1 A.** **Said R. Meir, "From their opinions we learn that they burn [leaven in the status of] heave-offering which is [cultically] clean with that which is [cultically] unclean on Passover":**

- B. *From whose opinions? Should I say, from the opinion of R. Hanina, Prefect of the priests? Then are the cases parallel? There we deal with what is unclean and what is unclean, but here we deal with what is clean and what is unclean. So it must be on the basis of the opinion of R. Aqiba. But there, too, are the cases parallel? In that instance we deal with what is unfit and unclean, but here we deal with what is clean and unclean.*
- C. *So must we say that [since Meir derives the law from the prior statements], R. Meir holds the view that our Mishnah addresses what is a generative source of uncleanness as defined by the Torah and an offspring of uncleanness as defined by rabbis [Freedman: a utensil made unclean by a liquid and in its turn imparting uncleanness to meat; the second contamination is only rabbinical, for by scriptural law, liquid cannot impart uncleanness to a utensil], which, from the perspective of the law of the Torah, is completely clean? **[15A]** And what is the meaning of the phrase, **From their opinions?** It means, From the opinion of R. Hanina, the Prefect of the priests [Freedman: and the analogy is thus: Just as rabbinically unclean meat may be burned together with scripturally unclean meat, though the former is scripturally clean, so may clean food in the status of priestly rations be burned together with unclean food in the status of*

priestly rations during the sixth hour, though the former is then only rabbinically forbidden, since by scriptural law, the prohibition of leaven takes effect at the seventh hour, while the latter is already scripturally forbidden for use on account of its uncleanness].

- D. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish in the name of Bar Qappara, "Our Mishnah paragraph speaks of a generative source of uncleanness as defined by the Torah, and an offspring of uncleanness as defined by the Torah. And what is the meaning of the phrase, **From their opinions?** It means, From the opinion of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua."* [Freedman: Meir does not refer to the Mishnah at all but to rulings of some other sages; strictly speaking, therefore, this Mishnah paragraph is irrelevant in its present position but it is included because the subject of burning unclean together with clean is dealt with there.]
- E. *Which teaching of R. Joshua? Should I say, it is the following teaching of R. Joshua, which we have learned in the Mishnah: **A jug of [wine in the status of] heave-offering concerning which there arose a suspicion of uncleanness — R. Eliezer says, "If it was lying in an exposed place, he should place it in a concealed place. And if it was uncovered, he should cover it."** R. Joshua says, "If it was lying in a concealed place, he should place it in an exposed place. And if it was covered, he should uncover it." Rabban Gamaliel says, "Let him not do anything new with it" [M. Ter. 8:8]? [Freedman: Since a doubt has arisen you are no longer bound to protect it and may even place it where the risk of contamination is greater than at present; thus Joshua holds that since it is only fit for lighting one may cause it to become unclean, and this furnishes the basis for Meir's analogy.] *But are the cases truly parallel? In that case, one is involved in indirect action, where here, one makes it unclean by direct action!**
- F. *Rather, it is the following teaching of R. Joshua, which we have learned in the Mishnah: [As to] **a jug [of wine in the status of heave-offering] which broke in the upper vat, and the lower [vat] is unclean — R. Eliezer and R. Joshua agree that if he can save from it a fourth in a state of cleanness, he should save [it]. But if not: R. Eliezer says, "Let it go down [into the lower vat] and be made unclean. But let him not make it unclean with his hand [through his own actions]" [M. Ter. 8:9].** R. Joshua says, "He may even impart uncleanness to it with his own hands."*
- G. *But if that were the source, then, instead of the language, **From their opinions,** what should be said is, from his opinion!*



- H. *This is the sense of the statement that he has made:* From the dispute of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua we learn. *And a close reading of the language of the Mishnah supports that view, for the language is:* **For R. Eliezer and R. Joshua concur...** [proving that this follows a dispute between them].
- I. *Yes, that proves the point.*
- J. And so said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “*Our Mishnah paragraph speaks of a generative source of uncleanness as defined by the Torah, and an offspring of uncleanness as defined by the Torah. And what is the meaning of the phrase, **From their opinions?** It means, From the opinion of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua.*”
- K. *Objected Raba to R. Nahman, “Said R. Yosé, ‘The matter that is under discussion is not entirely similar to that which is adduced as proof. For, when our masters gave testimony, about what did they testify? It was about meat that was made unclean by an offspring of uncleanness, indicating that we burn it together with meat that was made unclean through a generative source of uncleanness, then, as a matter of fact, this is unclean and that is unclean! If it was about oil that was rendered unfit by what had gone through immersion and awaits sunset for the completion of the rites of purification, which is lit in a lamp that was made unclean by one suffering corpse uncleanness, then one is unfit and the other is unclean. So we, too, admit in the case of priestly rations that were made unclean through an offspring of uncleanness that one may burn them together with priestly rations made unclean by a generative source of uncleanness. But how shall we burn what is held in suspense with what is unclean? Maybe Elijah will come and purify it?!’* [15B] *As to what has been rendered refuse by a priest’s improper intention, what is left over, and what are unclean Holy Things, the House of Shammai say, “They do not burn them together,” and the House of Hillel say, “They do burn them together”*” [T. **Pisha 1:6**]. *Now, if you maintain that R. Meir formulates his position on the strength of R. Joshua’s statement, then why does R. Yosé reply to him on the strength of the statement of R. Hanina, Prefect of the priests?!*”
- L. *Said R. Nahman to him, “R. Yosé did not fathom R. Meir’s reasoning, for he thought that R. Meir made his statement on the strength of that of R. Hanina, Prefect of the Priests, so he said to him, ‘I state this law on the basis of the position of R. Joshua,’ and the other replied, ‘Even on the strength of R.*

*Joshua's position, the cases are hardly analogous. For R. Eliezer and R. Joshua concede that one burns this by itself and that by itself."*

- M. *But why are the cases not analogous? They are entirely analogous* [Freedman: for the wine in the cask is clean; since it is fated to be lost, he nonetheless make it unclean].
- N. *That case is exceptional, since there is a loss of unconsecrated food* [if the food in the status of priestly rations is not made unclean and allowed to flow into the lower part of the vat (Freedman)].
- O. *Objected R. Jeremiah, "But our Mishnah paragraph also involves the loss of wood"* [for fuel, if two fires are to be made instead of one (Freedman)].
- P. Said a certain elder to him, "Well, they took account of substantial loss, but not trivial loss."

- III.2** A. Said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, "There is a dispute concerning the situation that prevails at the sixth hour, but at the seventh hour [when the prohibition takes effect against leaven] all concur [Yosé, too] that we burn them together" [Freedman: since they are then scripturally forbidden, so even clean priestly rations now are the same as unclean].
- B. *Said R. Zira to R. Assi, "May we then say that R. Yohanan takes the position that our Mishnah paragraph pertains to a generative source of uncleanness as defined by Scripture, and an offspring of uncleanness as defined by rabbis? And what is the meaning of the phrase, **From their opinions**? It means, From the opinion of R. Hanina, Prefect of the priests."* [Freedman: Just as that which is only rabbinically unclean may be burned together with what is scripturally unclean, so in the sixth hour, the priestly rations consisting of leaven is then only rabbinically forbidden and may be burned with the unclean priestly rations that are scripturally forbidden.]
- C. *He said to him, "Yes."*
- D. *So, too, it has been stated:*
- E. *Said R. Yohanan, "Our Mishnah paragraph pertains to a generative source of uncleanness as defined by Scripture, and an offspring of uncleanness as defined by rabbis. And what is the meaning of the phrase, **From their opinions**? It means, From the opinion of R. Hanina, Prefect of the priests. And there is a dispute concerning the situation that prevails at the sixth hour, but at the seventh hour [when the prohibition takes effect against leaven] all concur that we burn them together."*

- F. *May we say that the following supports his position: As to what has been rendered refuse by a priest's improper intention, what is left over, and what are unclean Holy Things, the House of Shammai say, "They do not burn them together," and the House of Hillel say, "They do burn them together"? [Since the first two are scripturally forbidden, they may be burned together with unclean meat, though they are contaminated, and the same applies to clean priestly rations consisting of leaven, at the seventh hour (Freedman).]*
- G. That case is exceptional, since they are subject to uncleanness by reason of rabbinical decree, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **As to what has been rendered refuse by a priest's improper intention and what is left over from an offering beyond the valid time for eating it impart uncleanness to hands [cf. M. cited at B. Pes. 120A, below].**
- H. *May we say that the following supports his view: A loaf that got mouldy and is invalidated for eating by a human being but a dog can eat it imparts uncleanness as food in the volume of an egg and is to be burned with unclean food prior to Passover. [That is, even if it is priestly rations, and that must be Yosé's view, since Meir permits them to be burned together even if the loaf is fresh, so it proves that Yosé agrees where it is quite unfit for human consumption, and the same is so for clean priestly rations in the form of leaven at the seventh hour (Freedman).]?]*
- I. *That case is exceptional, since the loaf is nothing more than dirt.*
- J. *If so [if it is the fact that Meir's position rests on Hanina's statement,] then what is the meaning of **For R. Eliezer and R. Joshua concur that they burn this by itself and that by itself?** [Freedman: Surely Yosé's argument that Eliezer and Joshua concur is irrelevant, since Meir isn't speaking of their view at all.]*
- K. *This is what R. Yosé meant to say to R. Meir: "Even in accord with R. Joshua, who takes a lenient view in connection with what priestly rations that are held in suspense and that are unclean, that is not the case of what is assuredly clean or unclean [such as the items to which Meir makes reference]."*
- L. *If so [if it is the fact that Meir's position rests on Hanina's statement,] then what's the point of the language, **That is not the***

**right conclusion [to draw by analogy from the opinions of Hananiah and Aqiba]? It is a perfectly fine analogy! [Freedman: In the sixth hour the leaven is rabbinically forbidden, and on Yohanan's view, there is no difference according to Yosé between what is unclean and what is forbidden for any other reason, since he maintains that in the seventh hour Yosé agrees that they may be burnt together because both are then scripturally forbidden, and the same principle should apply equally to Meir.]**

- M. *Said R. Jeremiah, "In our Mishnah paragraph we deal with meat that was made unclean by liquid that was made unclean by a dead creeping thing, and, as a matter of fact, R. Meir is consistent with views of his expressed elsewhere, and R. Yosé is consistent also with views of his expressed elsewhere. Thus, R. Meir is consistent with views of his expressed elsewhere, for he has said, 'The capacity of liquid to impart uncleanness to other things derives only from rabbinical decree.' R. Yosé is consistent also with views of his expressed elsewhere, for he has said, 'The capacity of liquid to impart uncleanness to other things derives only from the Torah.' For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [16A] 'A matter of doubt concerning liquids, if this is as to whether they have contracted uncleanness, the doubt is resolved as unclean, and if it is as to whether they have been made clean, the doubt is resolved as clean,' the words of R. Meir. And so did R. Eleazar rule in accord with his opinion. And R. Judah says, 'In all instances it is resolved as unclean.' R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, 'As to food, it is unclean, as to utensils, it is clean' [T. Toh. 5:10C-E]."* Liquid can be made unclean by scriptural law, so the doubt is resolved as unclean. But whether or not it can make other things unclean by the law of the Torah is subject to doubt; Meir holds it cannot impart uncleanness to either food or utensils, Judah says it makes both unclean, and Yosé and Simeon distinguish the one from the other (Freedman).]
- N. *But does R. Eliezer hold that liquid is susceptible to uncleanness at all? And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer says, "[By the law of the Torah,] uncleanness in no way pertains to liquids. You may know that that is so, for lo, testified R. Yosé b. Yoezer of Seredah about (1) an qamsa locust, that it is clean [for eating]; and about (2) liquid in the slaughterhouse, that it is insusceptible to uncleanness; and (3) that one who touches a corpse [alone, and not what that person in turn will touch] is unclean. And they called him Yosé the Easy-going [M. Ed. 8:4]?"*

*Now, from the perspective of Samuel, there is no problem, since in his view, the sense that they are clean is, only in so far as imparting uncleanness to other liquids, but they are unclean in themselves. But from the perspective of Rab, who held that they are unclean in a literal way, even in their own regard, what is to be said?*

- O. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "He makes reference to only one ruling" [he agrees with Meir that liquid is clean in other regards but not that it is unclean on its own (Freedman)].*
- P. *But lo, the language is used, **in accord with his opinions!** That implies that there are several such opinions. And furthermore, he says, and so...! [Freedman: This language suggests he agrees with him entirely.]*
- Q. *That's a problem.*

**III.3** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

- B. [Supply:] **And about liquid in the slaughterhouse, that it is insusceptible to uncleanness:** What is the meaning of "insusceptible to uncleanness"?
- C. Said Rab, "The liquid is actually insusceptible to uncleanness."
- D. And Samuel said, "The liquid does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness [to dry foods on which it falls], but it itself is susceptible to uncleanness."
- E. Rab said, "The liquid is actually insusceptible to uncleanness": *He is of the opinion that the uncleanness imputed to liquid derives from the authority of rabbis, and when rabbis made a decree imputing uncleanness to liquids, that was of only a general order, but they did not make that decree in regard to liquids that flow from the slaughterhouse.*
- F. Samuel said, "The liquid does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness [to dry foods on which it falls], but it itself is susceptible to uncleanness": *He is of the opinion that the uncleanness of liquids derives from the authority of the Torah, and the power of liquids to impart susceptibility to other things derives from the authority of rabbis, and when rabbis made a decree imputing uncleanness to liquids, that was of only a general order, but they did not make that decree in regard to liquids that flow from the slaughterhouse.*
- G. *Said R. Huna bar Hinena to his son, "When you go to the presence of R. Pappa, raise this question to him: Did Samuel*

say, The liquid does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness [to dry foods on which it falls], but it itself is susceptible to uncleanness? *Then in this connection recite the verse, ‘And meat that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten’ (Lev. 7:19).’* [Freedman: Hence if the liquid is unclean, the Holy Things that touch it may not be eaten.]

- H. *Said R. Shisha b. R. Idi, “It would be comparable to what is in the fourth remove in the case of Holy Things” [unfit but not able to impart uncleanness to other Holy Things that touch it].*
- I. *Objected R. Ashi to this proposition, “What is in the fourth remove in the case of Holy Things is not called unclean, but this is called unclean!”*
- J. *That’s a problem.*
- K. *Come and take note: “And all drink that may be drunk in any utensil shall be unclean” (Lev. 11:34) [thus liquid becomes unclean].*
- L. *What is the meaning here of “unclean”? It means, imparts susceptibility to uncleanness.*
- M. *But the power to impart susceptibility to uncleanness derives from the opening part of the verse of Scripture, namely, “all food that may be eaten, on which water comes, shall be unclean”!*
- N. *The one makes reference to liquid that is detached, the other, to liquid that is still attached to the ground [for example, a pit]. And both had to be made explicit. For had we been informed of the rule governing what is detached, that might have been because that liquid is taken into account, but as to liquid in the ground, I might have thought that that was not the case. And if the Tannaite rule covered only liquid attached to the ground, I might have thought that that is because the liquid is standing in place and so is taken into account, but as to what is detached, I might have thought that that is not the case. So both were required.*
- O. *Come and take note: “Nonetheless, a fountain or pit wherein is a gathering of water shall be clean” (Lev. 11:36).*
- P. *What is the meaning here of “clean”? It means, clean of its uncleanness [thus a thing or person that is unclean and immersed in an immersion pool or a fountain or pit, he will be clean, but not in bath water; this has nothing to do with the cleanness of the water itself].*

- Q. But can detached liquid make food susceptible to uncleanness? And didn't R. Yosé bar Hanina say, "As to liquid in the slaughterhouse, it is not sufficient that they are insusceptible themselves to uncleanness, but that they also do not impart to other food susceptibility to uncleanness"?
- R. *Interpret the statement to speak of blood [not water].* For said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that blood of Holy Things does not make anything susceptible to uncleanness? As it is said, 'You shall pour it on the earth as water' (Deu. 12:24) — blood that is poured out like water imparts susceptibility to uncleanness, **[16B]** blood that is not poured out does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness."
- S. *Objected R. Samuel bar Ammi*, "Lo, what about the blood that is drained out last [after the first rush], which is poured out like water but doesn't impart susceptibility to uncleanness?"
- T. *Said to him R. Zira*, "Ignore blood that is drained out last, for that doesn't impart susceptibility to uncleanness even in the case of secular food!"
- U. *R. Samuel bar Ammi received the operative verse from him, namely*, "The All-Merciful has said, 'Only be sure that you don't eat the blood, for the blood is the life' (Deu. 12:23) — the blood with which the life expires is called blood, blood with which life doesn't expire [that is, the residual blood under discussion here] is not called blood."
- V. *Come and take note*: If the blood of an offering was made unclean and inadvertently was sprinkled, it is acceptable; if this was done deliberately, it is not accepted.
- W. *That rule derives only from the authority of rabbis, and doesn't accord with the position of R. Yosé b. Yoezer of Seredah [whose position is under discussion here].*
- X. *Come and take note*: For what does the high priest's headplate atone? For blood, meat, and forbidden fat, that had become unclean whether inadvertently or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, whether in the case of an offering in behalf of an individual or an offering in behalf of the community.

- Y. *That rule derives only from the authority of rabbis, and doesn't accord with the position of R. Yosé b. Yoezer of Seredah [whose position is under discussion here].*
- Z. *Come and take note: "And Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the Holy Things" (Exo. 28:38) [the high priest's headplate atones for faults in connection with the offering] — and what is the iniquity for which the headplate atones? If you should say that it is for the sin of making the offering refuse, lo, it is stated to the contrary, "It shall not be accepted" Lev. 19: 7). If you say, it is the sin of leaving the meat over beyond the proper time, lo, it is stated, "Neither shall it be imputed to him" (Lev. 7:18). Lo, it can bear the iniquity only for the sin of uncleanness, for that is remitted from the prevailing prohibition when it comes to the offering of the community. Does this not refer to uncleanness of blood?*
- AA. Said R. Pappa, "No, uncleanness affecting the handfuls of meal-offering burned on the altar."
- BB. *Come and take note: "If one bears Holy Things [unclean meat] in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt touches bread or pottage or wine or oil or meat, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, no" (Hag. 2:12) — [17A] and said Rab, "The priests erred." [Freedman: The unclean meat was a dead creeping thing, which is a generative source of uncleanness; it is held in the skirt of a garment, which touched bread; the bread touched pottage, the pottage touched wine, the wine touched oil or some other food. Is this last unclean? That is, is there a fourth remove in the case of Holy Things? The point here is that wine and oil are unclean, though they are liquids in the Temple, and that contradicts Rab. If uncleanness of liquids is rabbinical, then the rabbinical decree didn't apply to the Temple, and that contradicts Rab, who holds they are literally unclean.]*
- CC. *Is this addressed against any position but that of Rab? But Rab repeated as the Tannaite rule, "Liquids of the slaughterhouse," but liquids of the altar can become unclean.*

### **III.4** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

- B. *Rab said, "The priests erred."*
- C. *And Samuel said, "The priests never erred."*



- D. *Rab said, "The priests erred": He asked them whether there was a fourth remove in regard to Holy Things, and they told him it was clean [there being no fourth remove].*
- E. *And Samuel said, "The priests never erred": He asked the priests whether there is a fifth remove as to Holy Things, and they said to him that it is clean [since there is no fifth remove taken into account].*
- F. *Now there is no problem for Rab in the statement of Scripture, "bread or pottage or wine or oil." But from Samuel's perspective, whence does he know that there are five steps in the process of contact from one to the next?*
- G. *Is it written, "and his skirt touched the bread"? What is written is, "and touch with that by his skirt," meaning, he touched what was touched by his skirt. [Freedman: The dead creeping thing in the skirt touched something that in turn touched the bread, which is therefore at the second remove, so the oil would be at the fifth remove.]*
- H. *Come and take note: "Then said Haggai, If one that is unclean by a corpse touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, It shall be unclean" (Hag. 2:13) — now there is no problem for Samuel, for, since at this point, the priests made no error, so at the prior point they also made no error. But from Rab's perspective, how come in the one place they made a mistake and in the other not?*
- I. *Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, "They were experts in the matter of corpse uncleanness but not experts in the matter of the uncleanness of a dead creeping thing."*
- J. *Rabina said, "There it concerned a fourth remove, here, a third." [Freedman: They didn't know that there was a fourth remove, but his second question related to the third remove.]*
- K. *Come and take note: "Then answered Haggai and said, So is this people and so is this nation before me, says the Lord, and so is every work of their hands, and that which they offer there is unclean" (Hag. 2:14) — now, from Rab's perspective, there is no problem in the fact that he says "unclean," but from Samuel's perspective, why unclean?*

- L. *He was expressing surprise* [that they could know the laws and yet their work is unclean (Freedman)].
- M. *But lo, what is written is*, and so is every work of their hands!
- N. Said Mar Zutra, and some say, R. Ashi, "Since their deeds were perverse, Scripture treats them as though they made the offerings in a state of uncleanness."

**III.5** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

- B. *Rab repeated as the Tannaite rule, "Liquids of the slaughterhouse."*
- C. *And Levi repeated as the Tannaite rule, "Liquids of the altar [can become unclean]."*
- D. *For Levi there is no problem if he accepts the opinion of Samuel, who has said, "They are insusceptible to uncleanness so far as imparting uncleanness to other things, but they themselves are unclean." You would find such a case if they all touched what was unclean in the first remove.* [Freedman: Haggai asked in his first question about successive stages of uncleanness and they answered that the oil is clean, since it touched wine, which is a liquid of the altar and can become unclean but cannot impart uncleanness; in the second question each touched the first mentioned, that is, what was unclean with corpse uncleanness, and they rightly answered that they are unclean.] *But if he concurs with Rab, who has said, "They are literally insusceptible," how would you find such a case?*
- E. *So you are forced to maintain that he concurred with Samuel's view.*
- F. *And from Samuel's perspective, there is no problem if he concurs with Rab, who repeated the rule as, "Liquids of the slaughterhouse," but liquids of the altar can impart uncleanness in the fourth remove to other liquids, so it is only at the fourth remove that there can be no fifth remove, but what is unclean at the third remove can impart uncleanness to something to make it unclean at the fourth remove. But if he accords with Levi, who has repeated as the Tannaite rule, "Liquids of the altar [can become unclean]," why specify that what is at the fourth remove does not make something unclean*

*at the fifth, since even what is at the second or third remove, there would be no fourth remove! So you have to reach the conclusion that he accords with the thinking of Rab.*

- III.6** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Rab, it has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Levi:*
- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Levi: Blood, wine, oil, and water, liquids of the altar, that contracted uncleanness inside the veils, and that the priest took outside, are clean [not imparting uncleanness to other liquids, because when they became unclean they were liquids of the altar]. If they contracted uncleanness outside and the priest brought them inside, they are unclean [imposing uncleanness on other things].*
- C. *Is that so? But didn't R. Joshua b. Levi say, "Concerning liquids of the altar they did not say 'clean' except when they are in their proper location"? Isn't that intended to exclude a case in which they were made unclean within the veils and then were brought outside?*
- D. *No, it was to exclude the case in which they contracted uncleanness and then were brought inside.*
- E. *But the language that is used is, in their proper location!*
- F. *This is the sense of the statement: They said that they were clean only if they were made unclean in their place [inside the veils].*
- G. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Rab: Blood, water, and liquids of the slaughterhouse, which contracted uncleanness, whether located in utensils or on the ground, are insusceptible to uncleanness. [17B] R. Simeon says, "If it was located in utensils, it is unclean, but if it is on the ground, it is insusceptible to uncleanness."*

**III.7** A. Said R. Pappa, “Even from the perspective of him who has said that the uncleanness of liquid derives from the Torah, the fact that the liquid of the slaughterhouse is not unclean is a law that derives from tradition.”

- B. Said R. Huna b. R. Nathan to R. Pappa, “Then what R. Eliezer said, namely, ‘[By the law of the Torah,] uncleanness in no way pertains to liquids. You may know that that is so, for lo, **testified R. Yosé b. Yoezer of Seredah about liquid in the slaughterhouse, that it is insusceptible to uncleanness**’ [M. Ed. 8:4] — if it is a traditional law, can we derive proof from this [since these liquids form a distinct category]?”
- C. Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “And lo, R. Simeon said, ‘The uncleanness of liquid derives from the Torah.’ For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, ‘As to food, it is unclean, as to utensils, it is clean**’ [T. Toh. 5:10C-E]. And yet here, R. Simeon says, ‘When the liquid is in utensils, it imparts susceptibility to uncleanness, but if it is on the ground, it is insusceptible.’ But if this is a traditional law, then what difference does it make to me whether it is in utensils or on the ground?”
- D. That’s a problem.
- E. Said R. Pappa, “As to what you have said, if it is on the ground, it is insusceptible, that has been taught only with reference to water, but as to blood, that is not the case. And as to water, too, that has been stated only if there is a quarter-log of water, so that at least needles or hooks can be immersed in it, but if it is less than a quarter-log, it is unclean” [so the testimony concerns water, not blood (Freedman)].

**III.8** A. The master has said: **And R. Judah says, “In all instances it is resolved as unclean”** [T. Toh. 5:10C-E] –

- B. Does that then bear the implication that R. Judah takes the view that it is on the authority of the Torah that unclean liquid bears the power to impart uncleanness to utensils? But haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **All utensils have outsides and an inside. “For example, the mattresses, and the pillows, and the sacks, and the packing bags,”** the words of R. Judah [M. Kel. 25:1A-B]. [If] they were made unclean on the inside, the outside is unclean as well; if they were

made unclean on their outer parts, what is in their inner part is clean. Said R. Judah, “Under what circumstances? If they were made unclean with liquid. But if they were made unclean by a dead creeping thing, if the inside of the utensil was made unclean, the outer part also was made unclean. If the outer part was made unclean, the inner part also was made unclean”? *Now, if you suppose that the uncleanness of liquid so far as imparting uncleanness to utensils derives from the authority of the Torah, then what difference does it make to me whether the uncleanness comes about for the utensil from liquids or from a dead creeping thing?*

- C. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “R. Judah retracted his opinion.”
- D. *Rabina said, “In point of fact he never retracted his view. But the one speaks of liquid made unclean by unclean hands, the other, liquid made unclean by a dead creeping thing.”*
- E. *If so, then instead of framing the Tannaite rule in the language, Under what circumstances? If they were made unclean with liquid. But if they were made unclean by a dead creeping thing, if the inside of the utensil was made unclean, the outer part also was made unclean. If the outer part was made unclean, the inner part also was made unclean, the whole should have been formulated in a single coherent statement in the following manner: Under what circumstances? In the case of liquid made unclean by the hands, but if it was liquid made unclean by a dead creeping thing, then, if the inside of the utensil was made unclean, the outer part also was made unclean. If the outer part was made unclean, the inner part also was made unclean. So it is better as we repeated the matter to begin with, namely: “R. Judah retracted his opinion.”*

**III.9** *A. The question was raised: Did he retract his opinion in respect to utensils alone, while in the matter of food, he accords with R. Yosé and R. Simeon [that liquid imparts uncleanness on the strength of the authority of the Torah], or perhaps he retracted his view entirely, conforming now to the position of R. Meir [liquids do not impart uncleanness even on the authority of rabbis]?*

- B. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “Come and take note: **A cow which drank purification water — its flesh is unclean for**

twenty-four hours. R. Judah says, [18A] **“It is annulled in its intestines”** [M. Par. 9:5E-G]. Now, if you should imagine that he retracted his opinion in respect to utensils alone, while in the matter of food, he accords with R. Yosé and R. Simeon [that liquid imparts uncleanness on the strength of the authority of the Torah], why should it be the case that **it is** wholly **annulled in its intestines**? Granting that a weighty form of uncleanness has not been effected, a light form of uncleanness at least ought to have been imparted here [the water is at least the same as any other liquid and is therefore unclean and it should impart uncleanness to the meat (Freedman)]/

- C. *What is the meaning of the language, “It is annulled in its intestines”? What it means is, it also has been nullified from imparting a weighty uncleanness, but it does impart a light uncleanness.*
- D. *Then it follows that the initial Tannaite authority maintains that it is unclean even in a weighty form of uncleanness, but surely he has said, its flesh is unclean!*
- E. *The formulation of the passage is flawed, and this is the valid Tannaite formulation: A cow which drank purification water — its flesh is unclean. Under what circumstances? In connection with a minor form of uncleanness, but as to a weighty form of uncleanness, that is not the case. For R. Judah says, “It is annulled in its intestines.”*
- F. R. Ashi said, “In point of fact it is wholly annulled in its intestines, because it has become nothing more than a disgusting fluid” [and being not potable, it does not have the power of imparting uncleanness].

**III.10** A. R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, “As to food, it is unclean, as to utensils, it is clean” [T. Toh. 5:10C-E]:

- B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “R. Yosé has made this statement in accord with the theory of his master, R. Aqiba, who interprets the word ‘it shall be unclean’ to be read as ‘it shall impart uncleanness,’ for we have learned in the Mishnah: **On that day did R. Aqiba expound as follows: “And every earthen vessel**

into which any of them falls, whatsoever is in it conveys uncleanness” (Lev. 11:33). It does not say, “it will be unclean” but “will convey uncleanness” — that is, to impart uncleanness to other things. Thus has Scripture taught concerning a loaf of bread unclean in the second remove, that it imparts uncleanness in the third remove [to a loaf of bread with which it comes into contact]’ [M. Sot. 5:2A-B].”

- C. *And here, how does he read the pertinent verse [in regard to liquid]?*
- D. “And all drink that may be drunk in every such utensil shall be unclean” (Lev. 11:34) — it will impart uncleanness in regard to food.
- E. You say it is to impart uncleanness in respect to food. But maybe it means only, it will impart uncleanness in respect to liquid?
- F. You may say: That’s not how it was.
- G. *What is the meaning of, that’s not how it was?*
- H. Said R. Pappa, “We don’t find a case in which a source of uncleanness imparts uncleanness to what is equivalent to itself” [that is, liquid can impart uncleanness to food but not to liquid].
- I. *Rabina said, “From the body of the verse itself you cannot say, ‘it will impart uncleanness’ so far as unclean liquid is concerned. For if you think that the clause, ‘it shall be unclean’ in the second part of the verse pertains to imparting uncleanness to liquid, while ‘it shall be unclean’ in the first part of the verse also deals with uncleanness of liquid, then the Torah can as well have combined them and stated the whole in one piece, namely: ‘All food that may be eaten, on which water comes, and all drink that may be drunk, in every such utensil shall be unclean.’ But why does Scripture now go to the trouble of using the language, ‘Shall be unclean,’ two times? ‘shall be unclean’ in the first part speaks of unclean liquids, ‘shall be unclean’ in the second pertains to uncleanness of food.”*
- J. *But maybe it speaks of imparting uncleanness to utensils?*
- K. But does not the opposite of that proposition derive from an argument a fortiori, namely: If a utensil, which imparts uncleanness to liquids, does not impart uncleanness to another utensil, then all the more so should it be the rule that liquids, which contract uncleanness from a utensil, should not impart uncleanness to utensils!

- L. *But maybe I may say: They do not impart uncleanness to utensils when the liquid is made unclean by a utensil, but liquid that is made unclean by a dead creeping thing should impart uncleanness to utensils?*
- M. *But does Scripture speak of liquid that is made unclean by a dead creeping thing? [18B] And is it not a fact that derives from an argument a fortiori, as follows: If liquid that is made unclean by a utensil imparts uncleanness, how much the more so will liquid made unclean by a dead creeping thing impart uncleanness! So it is sufficient that what is deduced by this argument serve as the premise [Scripture does not state that water made unclean by a dead creeping thing can impart uncleanness to something else; that is merely deduced (Freedman)].*
- N. *How does [Yosé] interpret the “shall be unclean” of the first part of the verse?*
- O. *“All the food therein that may be eaten, that on which water comes shall be unclean”; “it shall impart uncleanness” in regard to liquid.*
- P. *You say that it imparts uncleanness to liquid, but maybe it means that it shall impart uncleanness to a utensil?*
- Q. *Say as follows: It is an argument a fortiori, that if a liquid that imparts uncleanness to food cannot impart uncleanness to a utensil, then food, which cannot impart uncleanness to food, surely cannot impart uncleanness to a utensil. So how shall I read “shall be unclean”? It imparts uncleanness to liquid, which is susceptible to uncleanness. And why in particular liquid? Is it because it is susceptible to uncleanness? Deduce the same from the fact that there is nothing else left? [Freedman: Yosé holds that liquid can defile other liquid and must read Lev. 11:33 accordingly; now food or liquid is in the second remove and on this interpretation produces a third remove, so there is a third remove in the case of unconsecrated food.]*
- R. *This is the sense of his statement: And should you say, food is subject to a more stringent rule, since it imparts uncleanness to liquid, and so it can impart uncleanness to utensils as well, so we are informed to the contrary, there also is a more strict rule pertaining to liquid, since liquid is susceptible to uncleanness. And what makes liquids susceptible? It is because they can contract uncleanness without a*



*prior stage of preparation for susceptibility to uncleanness [while food is susceptible only after it has been deliberately wet down].*

**III.11** A. *[Reverting to the statement of Rabina: Why does Scripture now go to the trouble of using the language, “shall be unclean,” two times? “Shall be unclean” in the first part speaks of unclean liquids, ‘shall be unclean’ in the second pertains to uncleanness of food,] “It shall be unclean” — indicating that it cannot render unclean what is in its own classification — does that proposition derive from that verse? Surely it derives from the following: “But if water be put on seed and any of their carcass fall thereon, it is unclean” (Lev. 11:38). It is unclean, but it does not impart its status of uncleanness to what is like it.*

B. *The one speaks of liquid that is made unclean by a dead creeping thing, the other, liquid that is made unclean by a utensil. And both are required. For if we’d been informed about the matter of liquid that is made unclean by a utensil, that would have been because they are not subject to a stringent source of uncleanness, but as to liquid that is made unclean by a dead creeping thing, which is a stringent source of uncleanness, I might argue that that really would create uncleanness to what is like it. And if we’d be informed of liquid made unclean by a dead creeping thing, and all the more so, what is made unclean through a utensil? The answer is, what can be inferred by an argument a fortiori, Scripture will still take the trouble of writing out in full.*

**III.12** A. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “But lo, said Raba, ‘R. Yosé as a matter of fact does not accept the reasoning of R. Aqiba, nor does R. Aqiba accept the reasoning of R. Yosé!’”*

B. *He said to him, “R. Yosé stated the matter in accord with the theory of his master, R. Aqiba, but he does not concur with the master’s view.”*

C. *Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana, “As to the proposition that R. Yosé does not concur with R. Aqiba, that is no problem, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Yosé, ‘How do we know that that which is unclean by a source of uncleanness in the fourth remove*

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

- D. *He said to him, “Because a Tannaite authority would never ignore the possibility of saying that there is a fourth remove in the case of priestly rations and a fifth remove in the case of Holy Things, and we should then say that this accords with R. Aqiba”* [Freedman: for Aqiba must hold that view if he accepts Yosé’s argument, and in the whole of the literature this position would have been preserved somewhere, if he held it].
- E. *“So on the strength of such an argument are we supposed to go and rely on this?”*

- F. *R. Ashi, and some say, R. Kahana, went out, made an inquiry, and found the following, which we have learned in the Mishnah: A utensil unites everything contained therein for the purposes of Holy Things, but not for the purposes of heave-offering. [That which is made unclean in] the fourth remove from the original source of uncleanness in the case of Holy Things is invalid, but only [that which is made unclean in] the third in the case of heave-offering [M. Hag. 3:2C-F], and said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “This Mishnah paragraph [that is before us in M. Hagigah] was formulated in response to R. Aqiba’s testimony.” And we have learned in the Mishnah: Added R. Aqiba, “Fine flour, incense, frankincense, and coals, part of which one who had immersed on that selfsame day touched — he has invalidated the whole quantity of them” [M. Ed. 8:1D-E] [so the utensil unites its contents]. Thus there is a fourth remove but not a fifth for Holy Things, a third remove but not a fourth for priestly rations.*
- G. Therefore he maintains that the power of a utensil to unite its contents derives from the rabbis’ authority, and he disagrees with R. Hanina, who holds that it derives from the Torah: “One golden pan of ten sheqels full of incense” (Num. 7:14) — the Torah thus treats as one everything that is in the pan.

### III.13

- A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: And concerning a needle found in the flesh [of a Temple-offering], that [in such a case, assuming the needle to have been unclean], the knife [with which the animal was slaughtered] and the hand remain clean, but the meat is unclean. But if it was found in the excrement, all is deemed clean [M. Ed. 2:3Gff.].*
- B. Said R. Aqiba, “Thus we have the unearned merit of proving that uncleanness of hands does not pertain to the Temple.”
- C. [19B] *But why not say, uncleanness of hands and utensils does not pertain to the Temple?*
- D. Said R. Judah said Rab, and some say, R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “The rule governing hands was repeated as law prior to the decree in regard to utensils [and the one who gave this testimony didn’t know about the latter].”
- E. *Said Raba, “But both were enacted on the same day, for we have learned in the Mishnah: [And eighteen rules did they decree on that very day:] These render heave-offering unfit: He who eats food unclean in the first remove;*

and he who eats food unclean in the second remove; and he who drinks unclean liquid; he whose head and the greater part of whose body enters drawn water; and one who was clean on whose head and the greater part of whose body three logs of drawn water fall; and a scroll, and hands, and a person who has completed his rites of purification and awaits sunset to be completely clean [a tebul yom]; and food and utensils which have been made unclean by [unclean] liquids [M. [Zab. 5:12](#)]!”

- F. *Rather, said Raba, “Omit reference to the uncleanness of a knife, since even in respect to unconsecrated food it is not unclean, for what has the knife touched to make it unclean? Should we say, the meat? But food can’t impart uncleanness to utensils! And should we say, the needle? Well, a utensil can’t impart uncleanness to another utensil.”* [Freedman: This is the case even with rabbinical law, which holds that only a liquid imparts uncleanness to utensils.]
- G. *Now what’s going on with this needle [that the meat is unclean]? Should we say that it is subject to doubt? And lo, it has been stated: R. Eleazar and R. Yosé b. R. Hanina — one said, “They made no decree concerning uncleanness for spit in Jerusalem that is subject to doubt,” and the other said, “They did not make a decree concerning uncleanness for a utensil in Jerusalem that was subject to doubt [and that would include a needle]”!*
- H. *Said R. Judah said Rab, “For instance, if someone lost a needle that was made unclean by a person unclean with corpse uncleanness, and he recognized it in the meat.”*
- I. *R. Yosé b. R. Abin said, “For instance, it was a muzzled cow that came from outside of Jerusalem” [and it must have swallowed the needle outside, where a doubtfully unclean utensil is unclean, and the same is so even in Jerusalem (Freedman)].*

### **III.14** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

- B. *R. Eleazar and R. Yosé b. R. Hanina —*
- C. *one said, “They made no decree concerning uncleanness for spit in Jerusalem that is subject to doubt.”*
- D. *And the other said, “They did not make a decree concerning uncleanness for a utensil in Jerusalem that was subject to doubt [and that would include a needle].”*
- E. *We have a Mishnah formulation that pertains to spit, and we have a Mishnah formulation that pertains to utensils.*

- F. *We have a Mishnah formulation that pertains to spit, for we have learned in the Mishnah: “All drops of spit which are found in Jerusalem are assumed to be clean, except for those [found in] the Upper Marketplace,” the words of R. Meir. R. Yosé says, “On the ordinary days of the year, those found in the middle of the road are unclean, and those found on the sides are clean. And at the time of the festival, those [found] in the middle of the road are clean, and those [found] on the sides are unclean, for, because at festival time they who are unclean are few in number, they withdraw to the sides of the road” [M. Sheq. 8:1].*
- G. *The Mishnah rule was required to make the point, even though it is an established fact that a person afflicted with flux uncleanness [described at Lev. 15] has passed through the area.*
- H. *And we have a Mishnah formulation that pertains to utensils, as we have learned in the Mishnah: “All utensils found in Jerusalem, on the path down to an immersion pool, are assumed to be unclean. If they are found on the path up from the immersion pool, they are assumed to be clean. For the way down is different from the way up,” the words of R. Meir. R. Yosé says, “All of them are clean, except for a basket, shovel, or pick, which are particularly used for digging graves” [M. Sheq. 8:2].*
- I. *Lo, in general, the utensils are assumed to be clean.*
- J. *Well, then, by the same reasoning, look at what proceeds: If they are found on the path up from the immersion pool, they are assumed to be clean. So, in general, the utensils are assumed to be unclean.*
- K. *So the first clause makes its point in a precise way, the second not so, and the intent is to exclude the narrow paths [near main roads]. [Freedman: These are used for both descent and ascent, hence utensils found there were declared unclean, since they were certainly unclean in the first place, and our only doubt is whether they were lost on the way to the bath or from it; but utensils found in the rest of Jerusalem, if we don’t know whether they were unclean, are deemed clean.]*

**III.15** A. [With reference to the following: **And concerning a needle found in the flesh of a Temple-offering, that in such a case, assuming the needle to have been unclean, the knife with which the animal was slaughtered and the hand remain clean, but the meat is unclean.**

**But if it was found in the excrement, all is deemed clean [M. Ed. 2:3Gff.],]** *now, from the perspective of Rab, who said, “For instance, if someone lost a needle that was made unclean by a person unclean with corpse uncleanness, and he recognized it in the meat,” since the master has said, ““And whoever touches one that is slain by the sword’ (Num. 19:16) — the sword is in the remove of uncleanness of the corpse itself,” both man and utensils also should be held to be unclean by reason of the needle!*

- B. Said R. Ashi, “That is to say, the Temple courtyard is held to be public domain, and since we deal with what is subject to doubt in public domain, we resolve matters of doubt about uncleanness in public domain to be clean.” But in private domain, a matter of doubt in respect to the object is resolved as unclean [so the person and the knife here would be unclean].
- C. But what we have here is a matter of doubt concerning the needle, and the needle is something that cannot be interrogated, and a matter of doubt concerning anything that cannot be interrogated, whether in public domain or private domain is resolved as clean.
- D. But the reason at hand is that it is a doubt about uncleanness that arises on account of a human being [the man who was involved with the animal, and if a knife touched the needle, it would have been through the man’s action], and said R. Yohanan, “In the case of a matter of doubt that comes about through the action of a human being, [20A] an inquiry is made, just as though it were something that can be interrogated [since it is not treated as automatically clean (Freedman)], and that is so even in the case of a utensil lying on the ground.

**III.16** A. [With reference to the following: **And concerning a needle found in the flesh of a Temple-offering, that in such a case, assuming the needle to have been unclean, the knife with which the animal was slaughtered and the hand remain clean, but the meat is unclean. But if it was found in the excrement, all is deemed clean [M. Ed. 2:3Gff.],]** **And the meat is unclean:** *But how was this meat rendered susceptible to uncleanness anyhow? Should we say that it has been rendered susceptible to uncleanness by blood? And lo, said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that blood of Holy Things does not make anything susceptible to*

uncleanness? As it is said, ‘You shall pour it on the earth as water’ (Deu. 12:24) — blood that is poured out like water imparts susceptibility to uncleanness, blood that is not poured out does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness.” *So must it have been made unclean through the liquid in the slaughterhouse! But lo*, “As to liquid in the slaughterhouse, it is not sufficient that they are insusceptible themselves to uncleanness, but that they also do not impart to other food susceptibility to uncleanness”! *So it must have been rendered susceptible to uncleanness by the attitude of special regard that is shown to Holy Things [which are fit to become unclean even without being wet down, and so have to be protected with great care from sources of uncleanness].*

- B. *Well, I can well concede that the attitude of special regard for Holy Things serves to render the thing itself unfit [to be eaten or used by the priests], but is it sufficient also to impart susceptibility to uncleanness so that [the meat] should impart uncleanness at the first and second remove beyond itself? If that were the case, then you should be able to solve the conundrum presented by R. Simeon b. Laqish: “If the dry part of a meal-offering becomes unclean, does it transmit uncleanness to the first and second removes?” [Obviously, it would do just that.]*
- C. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “It would be a case in which the cow was designated as a peace-offering, and it was taken through a river and the owner slaughtered it, with moist liquid still on it. [The water makes the beast fit to contract uncleanness, and the animal was led through the water just prior to its slaughter.]”

**III.17** A. [With reference to the following: **And concerning a needle found in the flesh of a Temple-offering, that in such a case, assuming the needle to have been unclean, the knife with which the animal was slaughtered and the hand remain clean, but the meat is unclean. But if it was found in the excrement, all is deemed clean** [M. Ed. 2:3Gff.],] *But if it was found in the excrement, all is deemed clean: But then wouldn't the excrement go and impart uncleanness to the meat?*

- B. Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “We deal with thick shit” [which doesn’t flow back onto the meat].

- C. R. Ashi said, “You may even say that it was watery shit. It is no longer liquid capable of imparting susceptibility to uncleanness because it is disgusting fluid [and what no one would drink will not impart susceptibility to uncleanness].”

**III.18** A. *A Tannaite authority recited as a Tannaite tradition before R. Sheshet: [1] A dead creeping thing imparts uncleanness to liquid, and [2] liquid imparts uncleanness to the utensil, and [3] the utensil imparts uncleanness to food, and [4] food imparts uncleanness to liquid. Thus we have learned that there are three removes of uncleanness in the case of a dead creeping thing.*

B. *Yeah, sure, but you just counted four!*

C. *Take off “liquid” in the opening clause.*

D. *To the contrary, take off “liquid” in the closing clause.*

E. *We find only a single Tannaite authority who takes the view that liquid imparts uncleanness to utensils, and that is R. Judah — and he retracted! And your mnemonic is brewing beer [first is the utensil, then food — dates — then liquid from the dates].*

**III.19** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah there: [As to] the insect which is found in the oven, the bread which is in it [is unclean in the] second [degree of uncleanness], for the oven [is unclean in the] first [degree of uncleanness] [M. Kel. 8:5E-H]!*

B. *Said R. Adda bar Ahbah to Raba, “But why not regard the oven as though it were entirely filled with uncleanness [since its airspace is unclean, even if the creeping thing never gets to the sides], in which case the bread would be in the first remove of uncleanness?”*

C. *He said to him, “We don’t invoke the conception, ‘But why not regard the oven as though it were entirely filled with uncleanness,’ for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Might one suppose that all utensils will contract uncleanness from the air space of an earthenware utensil? [20B] Scripture states, ‘Whatever is in it shall be unclean...all food therein that may be eaten,’ meaning, food contracts uncleanness from the contained air space of a clay utensil, but utensils do not contract uncleanness from the contained air space of a clay utensil.”*



### III.20

A. R. Hisda contrasted two rulings concerning Passover and harmonized them as follows: “Did R. Joshua say, ‘Both of them [unclean priestly rations and priestly rations the status of which is subject to doubt] may be burned together’? And by contrast: Said R. Yosé, ‘The matter that is under discussion is not entirely similar to that which is adduced as proof. For, when our masters gave testimony, about what did they testify? It was about meat that was made unclean by an offspring of uncleanness, indicating that we burn it together with meat that was made unclean through a generative source of uncleanness, then, as a matter of fact, this is unclean and that is unclean! If it was about oil that was rendered unfit by what had gone through immersion and awaits sunset for the completion of the rites of purification, which is lit in a lamp that was made unclean by one suffering corpse uncleanness, then one is unfit and the other is unclean. So we, too, admit in the case of priestly rations that were made unclean through an offspring of uncleanness that one may burn them together with priestly rations made unclean by a generative source of uncleanness. But how shall we burn what is held in suspense with what is unclean? Maybe Elijah will come and purify it!’ [T. **Pisha 1:6**].”

- B. And he harmonized the matter as follows: “Our Mishnah rule conforms with R. Simeon in respect to the position of R. Joshua, the other, R. Yosé in respect to the position of R. Joshua [and the two disciples differ on the master’s position], for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘If the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with the Sabbath, they must remove everything prior to the Sabbath, and they burn produce in the status of priestly rations whether it is unclean, held in suspense, or clean,’ the words of R. Meir. R. Yosé says, ‘They burn the clean by itself, what is held in suspense by itself, and the unclean by itself.’ Said R. Simeon, ‘R. Eliezer and R. Joshua did not dispute the matter of what is clean or unclean, in which case they do not burn them together; nor concerning what is held in suspense and what is surely clean, in which case they burn these together; concerning what did they dispute? It concerned burning together what is held in suspense and what is unclean. For R. Eliezer says, “This is to be burned by itself, and that is to be burned by itself,” and R. Joshua says, “Both of them are to be burned together.”’”
- C. But our Mishnah paragraph accords with R. Yosé [so how can it stand for the position of R. Simeon]?

- D. *This is the sense of what R. Yosé said to R. Meir: “Even in respect to the position of R. Simeon with regard to the view of R. Joshua, who takes up a lenient position, when he takes up a lenient position, it concerns priestly rations the status of which is held in suspicion and unclean priestly rations together, but when it comes to burning together what is definitely clean and what is definitely unclean, that is not his position.*

**III.21** A. R. Yosé bar Hanina contrasted a ruling on priestly rations with one on Passover and ironed out the difference, as follows: “Did R. Joshua say, ‘Both of them [unclean priestly rations and priestly rations the status of which is subject to doubt] may be burned together’? And by contrast: **A jug of [wine in the status of] heave-offering concerning which there arose a suspicion of uncleanness — R. Eliezer says, ‘If it was lying in an exposed place, he should place it in a concealed place. And if it was uncovered, he should cover it.’ R. Joshua says, ‘If it was lying in a concealed place, he should place it in an exposed place. And if it was covered, he should uncover it.’ Rabban Gamaliel says, ‘Let him not do anything new with it’ [M. Ter. 8:8]. So indirect action is allowed, but not taking affirmative action on one’s own.**”

- B. *And he ironed out the problem: “The one represents the position of R. Simeon on the ruling of R. Joshua, the other, the position of R. Yosé on the ruling of R. Joshua” [Freedman: who says, how can we burn even priestly rations the status of which is subject to doubt together with unclean priestly rations, and he will certainly not permit more than indirect action].*

**III.22** A. R. Eleazar contrasted two rulings on the matter of priestly rations and ironed out the difference, as follows: “Did R. Joshua say that indirect action is allowed, but not taking affirmative action on one’s own? And by contrast: **[As to] a jug [of wine in the status of heave-offering] which broke in the upper vat, and the lower [vat] is unclean — R. Eliezer and R. Joshua agree that if he can save from it a fourth in a state of cleanness, he should save [it]. But if not: R. Eliezer says, ‘Let it go down [into the lower vat] and be made unclean. But let him not make it unclean with his hand [through his own actions]’ [M. Ter. 8:9]. R. Joshua says, ‘He may even impart uncleanness to it with his own hands.’”**

- B. *And he ironed out the problem: “That case is different, since it involves the loss of unconsecrated food.”*

- C. *Objected Raba, "But our Mishnah paragraph also involves the loss of wood" [for fuel, if two fires are to be made instead of one (Freedman)].*
- D. *Said Abbaye to him, "Well, they took account of substantial loss, but not trivial loss."*

- III.23** A. *And on what basis should you maintain that they took account of substantial loss, but not trivial loss? As has been taught on Tannaite authority: If a cask of oil of clean priestly rations broke in the upper vat, and in the lower vat is unclean unconsecrated produce, R. Eliezer concedes to R. Joshua that if one can save of it a quarter-log in a state of cleanness, he should do so [Freedman: the loss of unconsecrated produce is slight, since the defiled priestly rations can be used for lighting], but if not, he should let it flow down and contract uncleanness, but he should not take action on his own to render it unclean.*
- B. *Now what differentiates oil? Because it is fit for lighting? But wine is fit for sprinkling.*
  - C. *And should you say, sprinkling is null, didn't Samuel say in the name of R. Hiyya, "People drink wine at a cost of a sela for a log, but they sprinkle with wine at a cost of two selas for a log of wine"? [Freedman: so it is even more important].*
  - D. *Why is oil exceptional? It is because it can be used for kindling. But wine can also be used for sprinkling. And should you maintain that sprinkling is not anything to be taken into account, did not Samuel say in the name of R. Hiyya, "To drink it, you pay a sela for a log of wine, but to sprinkle it, you pay two selas for a log of wine"?*
  - E. *Here with what sort of a case do we deal? It is one in which the wine is new [and not usable for sprinkling].*
  - F. *So it could be kept and allowed to age?*
  - G. *He may use it for the wrong purpose.*
  - H. *So why not take account of the possibility in the case of [unclean] oil that he may use it for the wrong purpose?*
  - I. *He would keep the oil in a filthy jug.*
  - J. *So he can keep the wine in a filthy jug.*
  - K. *Since the wine is needed for sprinkling, how can it be held in a filthy jug?*

- L. *The concern about some sort of improper use of the substance is subject to dispute between Tannaite authorities, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. A jug of wine in the status of heave-offering that was made unclean –
- N. The House of Shammai say, “It is to be poured out.”
- O. And the House of Hillel say, “It is to be used for sprinkling.”
- P. Said R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé, “I shall mediate. [If it became unclean] in the house it should be used for sprinkling; in the field, it is to be entirely pilled out.”
- Q. There are some who say, “If it is old, it may be used for sprinkling, but if it was new, it is to be entirely spilled out.”
- R. They said to him, **[21A]** “A compromise based on a third approach to the problem is not taken into account.”
- S. Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “There is a dispute in a case in which it fell into less than a hundred seahs of unclean unconsecrated produce, but if it fell into a hundred seahs of unclean unconsecrated produce, all concur that it must be allowed to descend into the lower vat and contract uncleanness, but he still must not impart uncleanness to it with his own hands.”
- T. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* If a cask of oil of clean priestly rations broke in the upper vat, and in the lower vat are a hundred parts of unclean unconsecrated produce, R. Eliezer concedes to R. Joshua that if one can save of it a quarter-log in a state of cleanness, he should do so. But he should not impart uncleanness to it by his own affirmative action.
- U. *But the formulation,* R. Eliezer concedes to R. Joshua, *really should be,* R. Joshua concedes to R. Eliezer!
- V. *Said Raba, “Reverse the names accordingly.”*
- W. *R. Huna b. R. Joshua said, “In point of fact, don’t reverse them. Here with what situation do we deal? It is with a utensil the inner side of which is clean, but the outer side of which is unclean. What might you have thought? We should make a precautionary decree, taking account of the possibility that the outside of the utensil may touch the priestly rations? So we are informed that that is not the case.”*