

I.

BAVLI TRACTATE HAGIGAH CHAPTER ONE

FOLIOS 2A-11B

1:1-2

1:1

- A. All are liable for an appearance offering [before the Lord] (Exo. 23:14, Deu. 16:16)
- B. except for (1) a deaf-mute, (2) an idiot, (3) a minor,
- C. (4) one without pronounced sexual characteristics, (5) one who exhibits the sexual traits of both sexes,
- D. (6) women, (7) slaves who have not been freed,
- E. (8) the lame, (9) the blind, (10) the sick, (11) the old,
- F. (12) and one who cannot go up on foot.
- G. What is the definition of a minor?
- H. “Any who cannot ride on the shoulder of his father to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount,” the words of the House of Shammai.
- I. And the House of Hillel say, “Any who cannot hold his father’s hand to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount,
- J. “as it is written, ‘Three by foot’ [regalim=feet] (Exo. 23:14).”

1:2

- A. The House of Shammai say, “The appearance offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver, and the festal offering at least one maah of silver.”
- B. And the House of Hillel say, “The appearance offering must be at least one maah of silver, and the festal offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver.”

We commence with the standard analysis of the Mishnah’s language, asking what an inclusive formula means to accommodate by inference.

- I.1 A.** [When the framer of the foregoing statement makes explicit use of the inclusionary language, **all**,] *what [classification of persons is] included, [that otherwise would have been omitted]?*
- B. *It is to include a person who is half-slave and half-free. [Such a person is subject to the stated liability of bringing an appearance-offering. But a person who is wholly a slave is exempt from the stated requirement of making the pilgrimage and bringing the offering.]*
- C. *But in the view of Rabina, who has made the statement that one who is half slave and half free [also] is exempt from the obligation of bringing an appearance-offering [in celebration of the pilgrim festival], [in his view] what [classification of persons] is included [by the specification that **all** are subject to the stated obligation]?*
- D. *It is to include a person who is lame on the first day of the festival but is restored [to full activity] on the second day. [A lame person is exempt from the religious obligation of coming up to Jerusalem on the pilgrim festival, since he obviously cannot make the trip. If, however, as of the second day of the festival, the lame person should be healed, then, according to the formulation of the rule at hand, such a person would become obligated, retrospectively, to bring the required appearance-offering as of the first day.]*
- E. *[The foregoing statement rests on the position that on the successive days of the festival, one has the option of meeting an obligation incurred but not met on the earlier day. Thus if one did not make the required appearance-offering on the first day, he is obligated for it but also may make up for it on the later days of the festival. The obligation for one day pertains to, but then may be made up, on the days following, thus, on day three for day two, on day four for day three, and the like. Accordingly, at E we maintain first, that the person becomes obligated on the second day, and, second, that the obligation then is retroactive to the first. So he can make up what he owes. But the obligation to begin with likewise is retroactive. On day two he became obligated for an appearance-offering to cover day one. Accordingly, what we have just proposed] fully accords with the position of him who said that [offerings made on] all [of the days of the festival] serve as a means of carrying out the obligations incurred on each one of them [as just now explained].*
- F. *But in the view of him who says that all of the days of the festival [may serve to make up only for an obligation] incurred on the first day [of the festival alone, so that, first, one does not incur an obligation on a later day of the festival affecting what one owes for an earlier day of the festival, and so that, second, if one is not obligated to bring an appearance-offering on the first day of the festival, he is not obligated to do so on any later day of the festival], what [classification of persons] is included [by use of the inclusionary language, **all**]?*
- G. *It serves to include a person who is blind in one eye. [A person blind in both eyes is exempt from the appearance-offering on the pilgrim festival. One fully sighted, of course, is liable. The intermediate category then is dealt with in the stated formulation].*
- H. *Now that view would not accord with the following teaching on Tannaite authority, as it has been taught:*

- I. **Yohanan b. Dahabbai** says in the name of **R. Judah**, “One who is blind in one eye is exempt from the religious duty of bringing an appearance-offering, for it is said, ‘He will see... he will see...’ (Exo. 23:14) [reading the scriptural language not as ‘make an appearance,’ but, with a shift in the vowels, ‘will see,’].
- J. “[The proposed mode of reading the verse at hand yields the following consequence:] Just as one comes to see [the face of the Lord], so he comes to be seen. Just as one sees with two eyes, so one is seen with two eyes” [cf. T. **Hag. 1:1F-H**]. [The exegesis then excludes a person blind in one eye.]
- K. *If you prefer, [however, we may revert to the earlier proposal, and] state: Indeed, [the use of the inclusionary language **all** is meant] to include a person who is half slave and half free.*
- L. *And now as to the question you raised above [D], that that position would not accord with the opinion of Rabina, that indeed poses no problem.*
- M. [Why not?] The formulation at hand, [which prohibits the half-slave half-free man from bringing the necessary offering] is in line with the original formulation of the Mishnah-law [prior to the debate, cited presently, between the Houses of Shammai and Hillel]. The other formulation [which permits and hence requires the half-slave person, half-free person, in the intermediate status, to bring the appearance-offering] is in line with the posterior formulation of the Mishnah-law.
- N. *For we have learned in the Mishnah [at M. **Git. 4:5**:]*
- O. “He who is half-slave and half-free works for his master one day and for himself one day,” the words of the House of Hillel.
- P. Said to them the House of Shammai, **[2B]** “You have taken good care of his master, but of himself you have not taken care.
- Q. “To marry a slave-girl is not possible, for half of him after all is free [and free persons may marry only other free persons].
- R. “[To marry] a free woman is not possible, for half of him after all is a slave [and slaves may marry only slaves].
- S. “Shall he refrain?
- T. “But was not the world made only for procreation, as it is said, ‘He created it not a waste, he formed it to be inhabited’ (Isa. 45:18).
- U. “But: For the good order of the world, “they force his master to free him.
- V. “And he [the slave] writes him a bond covering half his value.”
- W. **And the House of Hillel reverted to teach in accord with the opinion of the House of Shammai.** [Accordingly, the law prior to the reversion specified at X treated one who is half-slave and half-free as in a fixed category, and such a one would not bring an appearance-offering, since he was partially a slave. But after the reversion, one who was half-slave and half-free could leave that interstitial category easily and so would not be regarded as essentially a slave. Such a one then would be obligated to bring the appearance-offering, there being no permanent lord over him except for the Lord God.]

II.1 A. except for (1) a deaf-mute, (2) an idiot, (3) a minor:

- B. *The Tannaite formulation treats a deaf-mute as comparable to an idiot and a minor: just as an idiot and a minor are not assumed to be persons of sound senses, so too a deaf-mute is not assumed to be a person of sound senses. And so we are informed of that which our Mishnah has stated: **The heresh of which the sages spoke under all circumstances is one who neither hears nor speaks** [M. Ter. 1:2E]. Lo, one who speak but does not hear or hears but does not speak is not liable [to bring the appearance offering].*
- C. *Thus we have learned that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: **One who hears but does not speak — that is a mute. One who speaks but doesn't hear — that is a deaf-mute. And both of these is equivalent to a person of sound mine in every respect** [T. Ter. 1:2]."*
- D. *On what basis do you maintain that **one who speaks but doesn't hear — that is a deaf-mute, and one who hears but does not speak — that is a mute?***
- E. *"But I am as a deaf man, I don't hear, and as a dumb man that doesn't open his mouth" (Psa. 38:14).*
- F. *Or if you prefer, I shall say, it is in line with what people say of a dumb man: "his speech has been taken away from him" [Simon].*

- II.2.** A. ***One who hears but does not speak, one who speaks but doesn't hear:** but hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: One who hears but does not speak, one who speaks but doesn't hear is exempt?*
- B. *Said Rabina, and some say, Raba, "It is a flawed formulation and this is how the Tannaite formulation should be made: **All are liable for an appearance offering [before the Lord] (Exo. 23:14, Deu. 16:16)** and to rejoice as well [in line with Deu. 16:14, that is, by bringing peace offerings in addition] **except for a deaf-mute** who speaks but does not hear, or hears but does not speak, who is exempt from the appearance offering, and even though he is exempt from the appearance offering, he is liable to the offering of rejoicing. And one who neither hears nor speaks, as well as an idiot and a minor, is exempt also from a rejoicing-offering, since these are exempt from all the religious duties that are stated in the Torah.*
 - C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **All are liable for an appearance offering [before the Lord] (Exo. 23:14, Deu. 16:16)** and to rejoice as well [in line with Deu. 16:14, that is, by bringing peace offerings in addition] **except for a deaf-mute** who speaks but does not hear, or hears but does not speak, who is exempt from the appearance offering, and even though he is exempt from the appearance offering, **[3A]** he is liable to the offering of rejoicing. And one who neither hears nor speaks, as well as an idiot and a minor, is exempt also from a rejoicing-offering, since these are exempt from all the religious duties that are stated in the Torah.*
 - D. *How come they are exempt from the appearance offering but liable to the rejoicing offering?*
 - E. *With respect to the appearance offering, we derive a verbal analogy based on the use of the word appearance here and in respect to the commandment for assembly [once in seven years, where it is written, "Assemble the people, the men women and children" (Deu. 31:12), and further, "When all Israel has come to appear" (Deu. 31:11).*

- F. *And as to that item, whence do we know its meaning?*
- G. As it is written, “That they may hear and that they may learn” (Deu. 31:12), *and it has been taught on Tannaite authority*: “That they may hear” — thus excluding one who speaks but doesn’t hear; “and that they may learn” — excluding one who hears but doesn’t speak.

II.3. A. *Well, then, does that bear the implication that one who cannot speak cannot learn? Now lo, there were these two dumb men in the vicinity of Rabbi, who were the sons of the daughter of R. Yohanan b. Gudegada, and others say, sons of the sister of R. Yohanan, and whenever Rabbi would go into the house of study, they would go in and take seats before him, nodding their heads and moving their lips. Rabbi asked for mercy for them, and they were healed, and it turned out that they had learned laws, Sifra, Sifré, and the entire six divisions of the Mishnah!*

- B. *Said Mar Zutra, “Read the verse as though the vowels yielded not, that they may learn but, that they may teach.”*
- C. R. Ashi said, “Certainly it is ‘that they may teach,’ *for if it should enter your mind that the meaning is ‘that they may learn’ with the result that if one cannot speak he cannot learn and if one cannot hear he cannot learn, all that follows from that they may hear.*’ So it most certainly is to be read, that they may teach.

A somewhat complex composite follows, which takes shape in its own terms and then is parachuted into position here. To understand the composite’s development, we address what follows in its own terms, and then account for its inclusion. We have at No. 4 a rule, entirely pertinent to the present Mishnah-paragraph, on the matter of the partially disabled; Tanhum is responsible for No. 4 and No. 5, both of them on the same proposition. No. 6 then takes up a verse treated in No. 5 in connection with Tanhum’s proposition, that is, Song 7:2. And No. 7 adds an exegesis in the name of Tanhum, now on another matter altogether. Then, at No. 8, we resume the exegesis of Deu. 31:12, which is broken off by the intrusion of Tanhum’s set. Tanhum’s set has been inserted whole, and quite properly, since his first two propositions are very much in line with the inquiry at hand.

II.4. A. Said R. Tanhum, “One who is deaf in one ear is exempt from bringing the appearance-offering, as it is said, ‘in their ears’ (Deu. 31:11).”

- B. *But that phrase, “in their ears” (Deu. 31:11), is required to yield the sense, “in the ears of all Israel.”*
- C. *That derives from the language, “before all Israel.”*
- D. *But if it had to derive from the language, “before all Israel,” I might have supposed that even though they didn’t hear [by reason of distance, not deafness]; therefore the All-Merciful has said, “in their ears,” to mean, they have to be able to hear.*

II.5. A. Said R. Tanhum, “One who is lame in one leg is exempt from bringing the appearance-offering, as it is said, ‘feet...’ (Exo. 23:14).”

- B. *But lo, the word “...feet...” is required to make the point, excluding those with wooden legs.*
- C. *That point derives from the word “steps,” as has been taught on Tannaite authority: “Steps” — steps can only refer to feet, and so Scripture states, “The*

foot shall tread it down, even the feet of the poor, and the steps of the needy” (Isa. 26: 6), and further, “How beautiful are your steps in sandals, o prince’s daughter” (Son. 7: 2).”

II.6. A. *Expounded Raba*, “*What is the sense of what is written*, ‘How beautiful are your steps in sandals, O prince’s daughter’ (Song 7: 2)?

- B. “How beautiful are the steps of Israel when they come up for a festal pilgrimage.
- C. “‘Prince’s daughter:’ daughter of Abraham, our father, who was called a prince, as it is said, ‘The princes of the peoples are gathered together, the people of the God of Abraham’ (Psa. 47:10).
- D. “‘The God of Abraham’ and not the God of Isaac and Jacob?
- E. “The sense is, ‘The God of Abraham, who was first of the converts [to God].’”

II.7. A. Said R. Kahana, “Expounded R. Nathan bar Minyumi in the name of R. Tanhum, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘And the pit was empty, there was no water in it’ (Gen. 37:24)?

- B. “Since it is stated explicitly, ‘And the pit was empty,’ don’t I know that ‘there was no water in it’?
- C. “But the sense of ‘there was no water in it’ is, but there were plenty of snakes and scorpions.”

We now return to the exegesis of Deu. 31:12. The pertinence is self-evident: the offerings at hand are presented on the occasion to which Deu. 31:12 makes reference. But the exposition moves away from the specific problem that has occupied us, namely, the obligatory character of the event and those exempt from obligations. Now we move in a different direction. But the relevance to what has gone before is obvious. So what is somewhat disconcerting, from our perspective, is the insistence upon giving us the entire Tanhum-composite, even though only part of it belongs to the present context. That is, however, how the Talmud’s compilers work with their received material, for reasons amply spelled out elsewhere.

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

- B. There was the case involving R. Yohanan b. Beroqah and R. Eleazar Hisma, who went to greet R. Joshua in Peqiin. **He said to them, “My sons, what was the new point that you had today in school?”**
- C. **They said to him, “We are your disciples, and your water [alone] do we drink.”**
- D. **He said to them, “God forbid! it is impossible that there is a generation of sages that is orphaned [and without suitable guidance]. Whose week was it to teach?”**
- E. **They said to him, “It was the week of R. Eleazar b. Azariah.”**
- F. **He said to them, “And what was the topic of the narrative today?”**
- G. **They said to him, “It was the passage that begins, *Assemble the people, the men and the women and the children* (Deu. 31:12).”**
- H. **He said to them, “And what did he expound in that connection?”**

- I. They said to him, “This is how he interpreted it. ‘The men come to learn, the women to listen, but why do the children come? It is to provide the occasion for the gaining of a reward for those who bring them.’”
- J. He said to them, “You had a good pearl in your hands, and you wanted to make me lose it! If you had come only to let me hear this one thing, it would have been enough for me” [Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XVIII.II.1].

I indent what follows only because the part of the composition at hand that bears relevance to our context has now concluded. But the composition is obviously unitary and coherent, beginning to end, so the purpose at hand — marking off the flow of our Talmud — should not signal any interruption in the unfolding of this wonderful presentation.

- K. “And he further expounded: ‘You have avowed today the Lord, and he has avowed you this day’ (Deu. 26:17-18):
- L. “Said the Holy One, blessed be he, to Israel, ‘You have made me a singular entity in the world, and I shall make you a singular entity in the world.
- M. “‘You have made me a singular entity in the world,’ as it is said, ‘Hear O Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord is one’ (Deu. 6: 4).
- N. “‘And I shall make you a singular entity in the world,’ as it is said, **[3B]** ‘And who is like your people, Israel, a singular nation in the earth’ (1Ch. 17:21).”
- O. **So too he addressed a verse and expounded it as follows: “The words of the wise are as goads and as nails well fastened are those that sit together in groups; they are given from one shepherd” (Qoh. 12:11) —**
- P. **“Why are teachings of the Torah compared to a goad? It is to teach you that just as a goad guides the cow in its furrow, so the words of the Torah guide a person from the ways of death to the ways of life.**
- Q. **“Is it possible to argue that just as a goad may be removed, so the words of the Torah may be moved?**
- R. **“Scripture states, ‘and as nails well fastened.’ Just as nails are well fastened and do not move, so words of the Torah will not be moved. And perhaps, just as a nail diminishes and does not grow, so words of Torah diminish and do not grow? Scripture says, ‘well planted: just as a plant grows and increases, so do words of Torah.**
- S. **““Those that sit together in groups’ are those disciples of sages that go in in groups. These declare prohibited what those declare permitted, these declare unclean what those declare clean, these declare unsuitable what those declare suitable..**
- T. **“Might one then conclude to refrain from learning [since there is so much dissension]?**
- U. **“Scripture says, ‘...they are given from one shepherd.’**
- V. **“One God created them, one responsible authority gave them, the master of all deeds said them.**
- W. **“So you, make your ears like a [Goldin:] hopper and draw into them the words of those who prohibit and the words of those who permit, the words of those who declare unclean and the words of those who declare clean, the**

words of those who prohibit and the words of those who permit” [Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XVIII:II.2].

- X. These are the words that he spoke to them: “A generation is not orphaned in which R. Eleazar b. Azariah dwells.”

Now comes a secondary development, an analytical criticism of the foregoing composition.

II.9. A. *[Instead of saying, We are your disciples, and your water [alone] do we drink”] they could have told him in so many words?*

B. *They circumlocuted because of a particular incident, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **There was the case that R. Yosé the son of the Damascene came to R. Eliezer at Lydda, he [Eliezer] said to him, “What new thing have you [learned] in the school house today?”**

D. **He said to him, “They voted and decided: “Ammon and Moab give poor man’s tithe in the Sabbatical year.”**

E. **R. Eliezer wept, saying, “‘The secret of the Lord is with those that fear him, and he will show them his covenant’ (Psa. 25:14).**

F. **“Go and tell them, ‘Do not be anxious about your vote. I have received a tradition from Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai, who heard it from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, a law given to Moses at Sinai, ‘that Ammon and Moab give poor man’s tithe in the Sabbatical year’” [M. [Yad. 4:3/O-S](#)].**

G. “What’s the reason?

H. “Many cities were conquered by those who came up from Egypt but not by those who came up from Babylonia, . Now since the first act of consecration was for that time but not for all time, Ammon and Moab were left unconsecrated so that the poor might be supported by the produce raised there in the seventh year.”

I. *A Tannaite statement:* after his mind was settled, he said, “May it please God that the eyes of Yosé be put back in place,” and they were.

Given the principles of composition of our Talmud, I do not see how the framers could have improved in any detail upon the coherence and cogency of their presentation. They started with the law at hand, proceeded then to the theological context of the law, defined at Deu. 31:11-12, and worked through the exposition of that passage. If I had to point to a single example of how the Talmud is put together, I would offer the foregoing as the finest case of a cogent and principled exposition that our document provides — among thousands.

III.1 A. [Supply: **an idiot:**]

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **What is the definition of an idiot? It is one who goes out alone at night, who sleeps in a grave yard, who rips his clothing, [and who loses what is given to him [T. [Ter. 1:3](#)].**

III.2. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. R. Huna said, "That is so only if all of these traits apply simultaneously."
- C. R. Yohanan said, "It may be any one of them."
- D. *How so? If he did any one of them in an imbecilic manner, then even one of them would prove he is an imbecile, and if he doesn't do them in an imbecilic manner, then even all of them would prove nothing.*
- E. *In point of fact, he does them in an imbecilic manner.*
- F. Well, as to one **who sleeps in a grave yard**, *might I not say that this is so that an unclean spirit may come to rest on him?* And as to one **who goes out alone at night**, *might I not say that he was seized by [Abraham:] lycanthropy.* And as to one **who rips his clothing**, *might I not say that he was lost in thought? But once he does them all, [4A] he is like an ox that gored an ass and a camel and was declared an attested danger for all purposes.*
- G. *Said R. Pappa, "If R. Huna had heard that which has been taught on Tannaite authority, **What is the definition of an idiot? It is one who who loses what is given to him, he would have retracted.**"*

III.3. A. *The question was raised: if he had retracted, would it have been only from the detail concerning tearing his clothing, which is like this more encompassing definition, or would he have retracted from the entire catalogue?*

B. *Well, fella, you're just going to have to live with that question.*

IV.1 A. **one without pronounced sexual characteristics, (5) one who exhibits the sexual traits of both sexes:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. "Three times in the year all your males shall appear" (Exo. 23:17) — the word "male" by itself serves to exclude women. "Your male" serves to exclude one without pronounced sexual characteristics, and one who exhibits the sexual traits of both sexes. "Your males" serves to include minors.

We now take up three points of clarification of the foregoing, that is to say, a small talmud to the Tannaite proof at hand, comparable to the many talmuds accorded to Mishnah-statements.

IV.2. A. The master has said: "the word 'male' by itself serves to exclude women:"

- B. But why do I require a verse of Scripture to prove that point, since what we have is a commandment involving an affirmative action that depends on a particular occasion for its performance, and women are exempt from any commandment involving an affirmative action that depends on a particular occasion for its performance!
- C. *It was necessary to provide a scriptural proof for that point. For it might have entered your mind to maintain: let us derive the rule governing the appearance offering from the appearance of the same word with reference to the assembly of the congregation once every seven years at Tabernacles. Just as in that case women are liable to attend, so in this case women are liable to attend. So we are informed that that is not so.*

IV.3. A. The master has said: "'Your male' serves to exclude one without pronounced sexual characteristics, and one who exhibits the sexual traits of both sexes:"

- B. *Now there is no problem understanding why it was necessary to find a verse of Scripture to exclude one who exhibits the sexual traits of both sexes. For it might have entered your mind to maintain that since he has a male aspect, he might be obligated, and so we are informed that he constitutes a creature in his own terms [sui generis]. But as to a person without pronounced sexual characteristics, he is subject to doubt as to his status, so is a verse of Scripture required to eliminate one whose status in any event is subject to doubt?*
- C. Said Abbaye, "The verse of Scripture is required to cover an instance in which his balls are outside [and only the penis hidden]." [Abrahams: since we are certain of the gender, we might think he is bound to appear; that is not the case.]

IV.4. A. The master has said: "'Your males' serves to include minors:"

- B. *But haven't we learned in the Mishnah: **except for a deaf-mute, an idiot, a minor?!***
- C. *Said Abbaye, "There is no conflict between the two rules. The one speaks of a minor older enough for schooling, the other of a minor not old enough for schooling."*
- D. *But the obligation of a minor old enough for schooling derives only from the authority of rabbis!*
- E. *True enough, but what we have here is a scriptural indication in the same direction.*
- F. *Well, then, what purpose is really served by the verse of Scripture?*
- G. *It supports the view of "others," as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. Others say, "The dog-shit collector, coppersmith, and tanner are exempt from the appearance offering, as it is said, 'all your males,' meaning, he who can go up on the pilgrimage with all your males, thus excluding these classes of persons, who are not fit to make the pilgrimage with all your males [because they stink]."

V.1 A. **(6) women, (7) slaves who have not been freed:**

- B. *The exclusion of women poses no problem, as we have just said, but how on the basis of Scripture do we know that slaves are excluded from the requirement of presenting an appearance offering?*
- C. Said R. Huna, "Said Scripture, 'before the Lord God' (Exo. 23:17) — he who has only one Lord, thus excluding this one who has yet another lord."
- D. But why do I require a verse of Scripture to prove that point, *since it is the fact that* for all the religious obligations for which a woman is liable, a slave is liable, so it must follow, all the religious obligations for which a woman is not liable, a slave is not liable, since a verbal analogy is formed through the use in both contexts of the language, "unto her" [Deu. 24: 3 for the woman, Lev. 19:20 for the slave-girl]?
- E. *Said Rabina, "The rule was required only to cover the case of one who is half-slave and half-free. A close reading of the language of the passage will yield that same point: **women and slaves who have not been freed.** Now what can be the meaning of the qualifying language, **who have not been freed?** If that were to mean, slaves who were not at all free, then the language, slaves, without further qualification, should have been used. So does this not refer to **who have not***

been wholly freed? *And who might such be? It would be one who is half-slave and half-free."*

F. *That is decisive.*

VI.1 A. (8) the lame, (9) the blind, (10) the sick, (11) the old:

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. "...feet..." — excluding those with wooden legs.

D. Another matter: "...feet..." — excluding excluding **(8) the lame, (9) the blind, (10) the sick, (11) the old**, as well as one who cannot go up on foot.

E. As to "as well as one who cannot go up on foot," *what does that serve to add to the list?*

F. *Said Raba, "It serves to add to the list [4B] a person in delicate condition [and cannot walk barefooted], for it is written, 'When you come to appear before me, who has required this from you, to trample my courts [barefooted]'* (Isa. 1:12)."

VI.2. A. A Tannaite statement: The uncircumcised and the unclean are exempt from making an appearance at festivals.

B. *Now there is no problem finding grounds for the exclusion of the unclean person, since it is written, "And there you shall come and there you shall bring" (Deu. 12: 5, 6) — whoever is subject to bringing offerings is subject to coming and whoever is not subject to bringing offerings is not subject to coming to begin with [and an unclean person cannot present offerings], but how on the basis of Scripture do we know that an uncircumcised person is not subject to the requirement?*

C. *It is in accord with R. Aqiba, who treats the uncircumcised person as comparable to the unclean person, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. R. Aqiba says, "'The duplicated formulation yielding 'whatever man' (Lev. 22: 4) serves to encompass under the law an uncircumcised man [who may not eat heave offering, just like an unclean priest]."

The Tannaite syllogism presented at 2.B is now given in full.

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

B. **An unclean person is exempt from making an appearance at festivals [bringing the appearance-offering], for it is said, "And there you shall come and there you shall bring" (Deu. 12: 5, 6) — whoever is subject to bringing offerings is subject to coming and whoever is not subject to bringing offerings is not subject to coming to begin with [and an unclean person cannot present offerings] [T. Hag. 1:1].**

C. R. Yohanan b. Dahabbai says in the name of R. Judah, "One who is blind in one eye is exempt from the religious duty of bringing an appearance-offering, for it is said, 'He will see... he will see...' (Exo. 23:14) [reading the scriptural language not as 'make an appearance,' but, with a shift in the vowels, 'will see']. [The proposed mode of reading the verse at hand yields the following consequence:] Just as one comes to see [the face of the Lord], so he comes to be seen. Just as one sees with two eyes, so one is seen with two eyes" [cf. T. Hag. 1:1F-H].

Various Sages Wept upon Reading Verses that Indicate the Estrangement of Israel from God

Connected to the foregoing through No. 5 is a sequence of compositions joined into a composite by the common trait that named sages wept upon reading a given verse. The connection at the outset is self-evident, and the rest follows.

- VI.4.** A. *When R. Huna came to this verse, “he will see, being seen,” he wept, saying, “A slave whose master yearns to see him is estranged from him: ‘When you come to appear before me, who has required this of you, to trample my courts’ (Isa. 1:12).”*
- VI.5.** A. *When R. Huna came to this verse, he wept: “And And you shall sacrifice peace offerings and shall eat there’ (Deu. 27: 7). A slave whose master yearns to see him is estranged from him: ‘to what purpose is the abundance of your sacrifices to me, says the Lord’ (Isa. 1:11).”*
- VI.6.** A. *When R. Eleazar came to this verse, he wept: ““And his brothers couldn’t answer him, because they were frightened in his presence’ (Gen. 45: 3) — if they were frightened before his rebuke, how much the more so on account of the rebuke of the Holy One, blessed be he!”*
- VI.7.** A. *When R. Eleazar came to this verse, he wept: ““And Samuel said to Saul, why have you disturbed me to bring me up’ (1Sa. 28:15) — if Samuel, a righteous man, was afraid of judgment, how much the more so should be bel”*
- B. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact concerning Samuel himself? “And the woman said to Saul, I see godlike beings coming up out of the earth” (1Sa. 28:13) — the use of the plural refers to two, one, Samuel, and as to the other?*
- C. *Samuel went and brought Moses along, saying to him, “Perhaps, God forbid, I am summoned to judgment; get up with me, for nothing that you have written in the Torah have I not carried out!”*
- VI.8.** A. *When R. Ammi came to this verse, he wept: “Let him put his mouth in the dust, perhaps there may be hope” (Lam. 3:29). He said, “After all that, merely ‘perhaps’?!”*
- VI.9.** A. *When R. Ammi came to this verse, he wept: “Seek righteousness, seek humility, perhaps shall you be hid in the day of the Lord’s anger” (Zep. 2: 3). He said, “After all that, merely ‘perhaps’?!”*
- VI.10.** A. *When R. Assi came to this verse, he wept: “Hate the evil and love the good and establish justice in the gate, perhaps the Lord, the God of hosts, will be gracious” (Amo. 5:15). He said, “After all that, merely ‘perhaps’?!”*
- VI.11.** A. *When R. Joseph came to this verse, he wept: “But there is he who is swept away without judgment” (Pro. 13:23). He said, “Well, is there really someone who passes away not at his proper time?”*
- B. *Well, yes, as a matter of fact, in line with that which concerns R. Bibi bar Abbaye. The angel of death frequently stopped by. Once he said to his messenger, “Go, bring me Miriam the woman’s hairdresser.” He went and brought him Miriam the children’s nurse.*

- C. *He said to him, "But I explicitly told you, Miriam the woman's hairdresser."*
- D. *He said to him, "So then I'll take her back."*
- E. *He said to him, "Naw, forget it, since you're brought her, let her count. But how in the world were you able to grab her?"*
- F. *"She was holding a shovel in her hand and heating [5A] and raking the fire. She took it and put it on her foot and burned herself. At that moment her astrological sign lost its power, so I brought her."*
- G. *Said to him R. Bib bar Abbaye, "Do you people have the right to act in that way?"*
- H. *He said to him, "Well, isn't it written, 'But there is he who is swept away without judgment' (Pro. 13:23)?"*
- I. *He said to him, "But it's also written, 'One generation passes away and [at the right moment] another generation comes' (Qoh. 1: 4)."*
- J. *He said to him, "I'm in charge of them until they have completed the generation, then I hand them over to Silence [the angel of death]."*
- K. *He said to him, "Well, in the end, how did you dispose of the woman's extra years [which she did not live out]?"*
- L. *He said to him, "Well, if there's a neophyte rabbi who ignores an insult, I add them to his years in her stead."*

VI.12. A. *When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: "And you did incite me against him, to destroy him without a cause' (Job. 2: 3) — a slave whose master, when incited, yields — does he have a remedy?"*

VI.13. A. *When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: "Behold, he puts no trust in his holy ones' (Job. 15:15) — if he doesn't have trust in his holy ones, then in whom will he trust?"*

- B. *One day he was going on the road. He saw someone gathering figs, leaving the ripe ones and picking the unripe ones. He said to him, "Aren't those better?"*
- C. *He said to him, "I need those for a trip, these will keep, those won't."*
- D. *He said, "That is in line with the verse of Scripture, "Behold, he puts no trust in his holy ones' (Job. 15:15)."*
- E. *Well, is that so? And note, there was the case of a disciple who lived in the vicinity of R. Alexandri; the disciple died young, and [Alexandri] said, "If this one of the rabbis wanted, he could have lived." But if matters were as R. Yohanan has said, maybe he was one of those of whom Scripture says, "Behold, he puts no trust in his holy ones' (Job. 15:15).*
- F. *That disciple had rebelled against his masters [and wasn't one of the holy ones, his sin shortened his life].*

VI.14. A. *When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept: "And I will come near to you to judgment and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers and against the adulterers and against false swearers and against those who oppress the employee in his wages' (Mal. 3: 5) — a slave whose master draws him near for judgment and also runs to testify against him — can he have any remedy?"*

VI.15. A. Said Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, “Woe is us, that Scripture has weighed equally against us the lightest-weight as the heaviest weight sins.”

VI.16. A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Whoever corrupts the judgment of a proselyte is as though he had corrupted the judgment of the Most High, for it is said, ‘And that turn aside the proselyte from his right’ (Mal. 3: 5) — with the word ‘turn’ written to be read ‘and that turn me aside.’”

VI.17. A. Said R. Hanina b. Pappa, “Whoever does a bad thing but regrets it is forgiven forthwith: ‘and that do not fear me’ (Mal. 3: 5) — lo, if they fear me, they are forgiven forthwith.”

VI.18. A. *When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept:* “‘For God shall bring every work into the judgment concerning every hidden thing [whether it be good or whether it be evil]’ (Qoh. 12:14) — a slave whose master weighs against him equally inadvertent and deliberate sins — can he have any remedy?”

VI.19. A. *What is the meaning of,* concerning every hidden thing?

B. Said Rab, “This one refers to someone who kills a louse in front of someone else, so that the other is disgusted by it.”

C. And Samuel said, “This is someone who spits in front of someone else, so that the other is disgusted by it.”

VI.20. A. *What is the meaning of* whether it be good or whether it be evil (Qoh. 12:14)?

B. *Said a member of the household of R. Yannai,* “This is one who in public gives a poor person charity.”

C. *It is along the lines of what happened with R. Yannai. He saw someone give some coin to a poor person in public. He said to him, “It would have been better if you’d given him nothing than giving him money and shaming him.”*

D. *A member of the household of R. Shila said,* “This is one who in secret gives charity to a woman, *for he calls her into suspicion.*”

E. Raba said, “This refers to someone who sends his wife on the eve of the Sabbath meat that has not been chopped up [with forbidden things removed].”

F. *But Raba himself sent meat that way!*

G. *Well, his wife, the daughter of R. Hisda, was exceptional, so he could rely on her knowledge of matters.*

VI.21. A. *When R. Yohanan came to this verse, he wept:* “‘And it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles have come upon them’ (Deu. 31:21) — a servant whose master brings evil and trouble upon him — can he have any remedy?”

VI.22. A. *What is the meaning of* evils and troubles?

B. Said Rab, “...evils that work together to make troubles, *for instance, the bite of a wasp and a scorpion.*”

C. And Samuel said, “This refers to someone who provides money to a poor man only when he is really in trouble.”

D. *Said Raba, "That's in line with what people say: 'To buy provisions, you can't get a penny, but to get money or get hung, you can find a penny.'"*

VI.23. A. "Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them and I will hide my face from them" (Deu. 31:17) —

B. Said R. Bardela b. Tabyumi said Rab said, "One who is not subject to 'the hiding of the face' is is not one of them [Israel]. Whoever is not subject to 'and they shall be devoured' (Deu. 31:17) **[5B]** is not one of them.

VI.24. A. *Rabbis said to Raba, "But the master is not subject to 'the hiding of the face' is is not one of them [Israel] nor subject to 'and they shall be devoured' (Deu. 31:17)!"*

B. *He said to them, "So do you people know how much I have to send on the sly to the court of King Shapur?"*

C. *Nonetheless, rabbis cast their [evil] eye upon them. In the meanwhile, the members of the court of Shapur the King sent to plunder him. He said, "This is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, 'Wherever sages set their eyes against someone, the upshot is either death or poverty.'"*

VI.25. A. "Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them and I will hide my face from them" (Deu. 31:17):

B. Said Raba, "Said the Holy One, blessed be he, 'Even though I have hidden my face from them, in a dream I shall speak with him' [Num. 12:6]."

C. R. Joseph said, "His hand is stretched out over us: 'And I have covered you in the shadow of my hand' (Isa. 51:16)."

VI.26. A. *R. Joshua b. Hananiah was present at the court of Caesar. An unbeliever made a gesture to him: "A people whose Lord has turned his face from them."*

B. *By gestures he replied to him, "His hand is stretched over us."*

C. *Said Caesar to R. Joshua, "So what did he signal to you?"*

D. *"A people whose Lord has turned his face from them."*

E. *"And I signaled to him, 'His hand is stretched over us.'"*

F. *Then they said to the heretic, "What did you signal to him?"*

G. *"A people whose Lord has turned his face from them."*

H. *"And what did he signal to you?"*

I. *"Who in the hell knows."*

J. *They said, "A person who doesn't know what someone is signalling to him dares to converse in signals before the king!" They took him out and killed him.*

VI.27. A. *When R. Joshua b. Hananiah was dying, said to him rabbis, "What's going to be with us on account of the unbelievers?"*

B. He said to them, "'Counsel has perished from the children, their wisdom is vanished' (Jer. 49:7). As soon as counsel has perished

from the children [of Israel], the wisdom of the nations of the world vanishes.

- C. *“And if you prefer, I shall make the point from the following: ‘And he said, let us take our journey and let us go, and I will go over against you’ (Gen. 33:12)” [gentiles can keep up with Israel but not gain advantage (Abraham)].*

VI.28. A. *R. Ila was once walking up the stairs of Rabbah bar Shila. He heard a child’s voice, reciting this verse: “For lo, he who forms the mountains and creates the wind and declares to man what his conversation was” (Amos 4:13). He said, “A slave whose master tells him what his conversation was — has he any remedy?”*

VI.29. A. *What is the meaning of the phrase, what his conversation was?*

- B. Said Rab, “Even the chitchat between a man and his wife is reported back to someone at the time that he is dying.”
- C. *Well, now, is that so? And note: R. Kahana lay down under Rab’s bed [to learn how the master had sexual relations], and he heard him “converse” and “play” and do what he needed to do. He said, “It seems that Rab’s tongue has never tasted ‘the dish’!”*
- D. *He said to him, “Kahana, get out of there! That’s not done!”*
- E. *No problem, in the one case, he did it because he had to seduce her, in the other, he didn’t have to seduce her.*

Does God Weep? Exegeses of Jer. 13:17

VI.30. A. “But if you won’t obey it, my soul shall weep in secret for the pride” (Jer. 13:17):

- B. Said R. Samuel bar Inayya in the name of Rab, “The Holy One, blessed be he, has a place which is called ‘Secret.’”

VI.31. A. *And what is the meaning of for the pride?*

- B. Said R. Samuel bar Isaac, “Because of the pride of Israel that has been taken from them and handed over to the nations of the world.”
- C. R. Samuel bar Nahmani said, “Because of the pride of the kingdom of heaven.”

VI.32. A. *But does the Holy One, blessed be he, ever have weeping in his presence? Didn’t R. Pappa say, “There is no grieving before the Holy One, blessed be he: ‘Honor and majesty are before him, strength and beauty are in his sanctuary’ (Psa. 96: 6)”?*

- B. *No problem, the one speaks of the inner chambers [the secret room, where there is weeping], the other, the outer chambers.*
- C. *Yes, but what about: “And in that day did the Lord the God of hosts call to weeping and to lamentation and to baldness and to girding with sackcloth” (Isa. 22:12)?*
- D. *What involves the destruction of the house of the sanctuary is exceptional, since even the angels of peace wept, as it is said, “Behold for their altar they cried without, the angels of peace wept bitterly” (Isa. 33: 7).*

- VI.33.** A. “And my eye shall drop tears and tears and run down with ears because the Lord’s flock is carried away captive” (Jer. 13:17):
- B. Said R. Eleazar, “For what are these three tears? One is for the first sanctuary, one for the second, and one for Israel, which has gone into exile from their rightful place.”
 - C. *And there are those who say, “One is for the neglect of the Torah.”*
 - D. *Now there is no problem with the position of him who has said, and one for Israel, which has gone into exile from their rightful place, for that is in line with what is written, “because the Lord’s flock is carried away captive” (Jer. 13:17). But from the perspective of him who has said, One is for the neglect of the Torah, what is the sense of because the Lord’s flock is carried away captive” (Jer. 13:17)?*
 - E. Since the Israelites have gone into exile from their rightful place, you have no occasion for neglect of the Torah that is greater than that single fact!

VI.34. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. For three persons does the Holy One, blessed be he, weep every single day: for him who has the opportunity to study the Torah but does not engage in it, for him who does not have the opportunity to engage in study of the Torah but does so, and for a community leader who lords it over the community.

VI.35. A. *Rabbi was holding the book of Lamentations and reading in it. When he came to the verse, “He has cast down from heaven to the earth” (Lam. 2: 1), the scroll fell from his hands. He said, “From so high a roof to so deep a pit.”*

Seeing and Being Seen by God

- VI.36.** A. *Rabbi and R. Hiyya once took a trip together. When they came to a certain town, they said, “Is there a neophyte rabbi here, whom we should go and greet?”*
- B. *They said to them, “There is a neophyte rabbi here, but he is blind.”*
 - C. *Said R. Hiyya to Rabbi, “Stay here. Don’t lower your patriarchal office. I’ll go and greet him.” But Rabbi held on to him and went with him.*
 - D. *When they were taking their leave of him, he said to them, “You have greeted me, who can be seen but cannot see; may you enjoy the Heavenly response of greeting him who sees but is not seen.”*
 - E. *[Rabbi] said to [Hiyya], “Now look at this! You might have kept from me such a blessing!”*
 - F. *They said to him, “From whom have you heard such a thing?”*
 - G. *“From the session of R. Jacob I heard it. For R. Jacob of Hittayya would greet his master every day. When he got old, the master said to him, ‘Let the master not trouble himself, because the master can’t really do it.’ He said to him, ‘Is it such a small thing that concerning the rabbis it is written, ‘And he shall still live always, he shall not see the pit, when he sees that wise man die’ (Psa. 49:10-11)? Now if one who sees sages in their death will live, how much the more so he who sees them when they are alive!”*

VI.37. A. *R. Idi father of R. Jacob bar Idi was accustomed to go for three months on the trip and spend one day at the school* [Abraham: it took him six months to travel to school and back, so as to be with his families on the festivals of Passover and Tabernacles]. *Rabbis called him, “The master’s household member for a day!” He was depressed, reciting in his own regard the verse, “I am as one who is a laughing stock to his neighbor” (Job. 12: 4).*

- B. *Said to him R. Yohanan, “By your leave, don’t bring punishment on the rabbis.”*
- C. *R. Yohanan went out to the house of study and expounded this verse: “‘Yet they seek me day by day and delight to know my ways’ (Isa. 58: 2) — now is it the fact that they seek him by day and they don’t seek him by night? Rather, the verse comes to tell you: whoever is engaged in study of the Torah for even one day a year Scripture credits as though he were engaged in it for the entire year. And so too is the rule governing punishment: ‘After the number of the days in which you spied out the land’ (Num. 14:34) — and did they sin for all forty years? And wasn’t it only for forty days that they sinned? But it is to tell you, ‘whoever does a transgression even one day a year is regarded by Scripture as though he had transgressed for the entire year.’”*

We now proceed to the exposition of the next clause of the Mishnah, this long and complex composite having worked its way to its conclusion.

VII.1 A. **What is the definition of a minor? “Any who cannot ride on the shoulder of his father to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount,” the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel say, “Any who cannot hold his father’s hand to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount, as it is written, ‘Three [festivals, involving a pilgrimage] by foot’ [regalim=feet] (Exo. 23:14):”**

- B. *Objected R. Zira, [6A] “So who carried him up to now?”* [Abraham: from his house to Jerusalem; the fact that he could travel to Jerusalem shows that he is old enough to do without his mother; at that age he is also old enough to be able to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount by holding his father’s hand; what point is there in defining a minor as one who is unable even with the aid of his father to go up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount, when the prior journey to Jerusalem shows that he is old enough to do this and therefore no longer a minor?]

Said to him Abbaye, “Up to now, because his mother was obligated in regard to the rejoicing offering, his mother brought him; from this point, if he can go up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount holding his father’s hand, he is obligated, and if not, he is exempt.”

VII.2. A. Rabbi [better: Raba] responded in behalf of the House of Hillel to the House of Shammai as follows: “‘But Hannah didn’t go up, for she said to her husband, until the child is weaned, when I’ll bring him up’ (1Sa. 1:22). [That would be at the end of two years.] *But Samuel was perfectly ready to ride on his father’s shoulders.*”

- B. His father [better: Abbaye] said to him, “*But by your reasoning, the case of Hannah herself should present a problem! Wasn’t Hannah obligated to rejoice on the festival* [so she should have gone up to the sanctuary and taken Samuel even before he was weaned (Abraham)! *Rather, Hannah realized that Samuel was*

exceptionally frail and was concerned on account of Samuel's frailty in respect to making such a trip."

- VII.3.** A. R. Simeon raised this question: "As to a lame minor in the position of the House of Shammai, or a blind minor in respect to both views, what is the law?"
- B. *So how are we to understand the case? Should we say the question concerns a lame one who cannot ever walk, or a blind one who cannot ever see? Then in such cases an adult is exempt, so can there be an issue about a minor?*
- C. *Not at all, the question concerns a lame child who can some day walk and a blind child who can some day see. What is the law?*
- D. *Said Abbaye, "In any case in which an adult is obligated by the law of the Torah, then by the authority of rabbis we also educate a minor, and in any case in which an adult is exempt from the obligation by the law of the Torah, by the rule of rabbis a minor also is exempt."*

VIII.1 A. The House of Shammai say, "The appearance offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver, and the festal offering at least one maah of silver:"

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **The House of Shammai say, "The appearance offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver, and the festal offering at least one maah of silver: for the burnt offering is a kind of offering that is wholly given to the Most High, which is not the case with the festal offering. Furthermore, we find that, for the Festival of Pentecost Scripture has multiplied the requirement of burnt offerings more than peace offerings" [Abraham: in line with Lev. 23:18-19, the festal offering is a peace offerings].**
- D. **And the House of Hillel say, "The appearance offering must be at least one maah of silver, and the festal offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver: for a festal offering was required prior to the Revelation of the Torah at Sinai, which is not the case of the appearance-offering. And, furthermore, we find that in the offerings of the Princes, Scripture required more peace offerings than whole offerings" [T. Qid. 1:4].**

VIII.2. A. *And how come the House of Hillel do not rule as do the House of Shammai?*

- B. *As to your statement, the appearance offering is more important, since it is wholly offered up to the Most High, to the contrary, the festal offering is the more important, because in it are two meals [one for the altar, one for the pilgrim]. And as to your statement that we should invoke the analogy of the Festival of Pentecost, we draw an analogy governing the offering of a private person from the rule governing an offering of a private person, and we do not draw an analogy for the rule governing the offering of a private person from the rule governing the offering of the community.*
- C. *And how come the House of Shammai do not rule as do the House of Hillel?*
- D. *As to your statement that the festal offering is more important, because it was in existence prior to the Revelation of the Torah at Mount Sinai, the appearance also was in existence prior to the giving of the Torah at Mount Sinai, and as to your statement that we should invoke the governing analogy of the offerings of the Princes, well, we should draw the analogy for the rule governing an offering that applies to all generations from the rule of an offering that applies to all generations,*

but we should not draw an analogy for something that applies for all generations from the rule governing an offering that applies only once and not for all generations.

- E. *And from the perspective of the House of Hillel, what distinguishes the festal offering that it applies before the giving of the Torah at Mount Sinai? Because it is written, "They sacrificed sacrifices of peace offerings" (Exo. 24: 5)? But with respect to the appearance offering, it is also written, "And they offered up burnt offerings" (Exo. 24: 5) [into which category the appearance offering falls].*
- F. *Well, the House of Hillel take the view that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the daily whole offering.*
- G. *And the House of Shammai?*
- H. *The House of Shammai take the view that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the appearance offering.*

VIII.3. A. *Said Abbaye, "The House of Shammai, R. Eleazar, and R. Ishmael all take the view that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the appearance offering. The House of Hillel, R. Aqiba, and R. Yosé the Galilean, all take the view that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the daily whole offering."*

- B. *The House of Shammai: as we have just said.*
- C. *R. Ishmael: as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *R. Ishmael says, "The generative principles were set forth at Sinai, [6B] but the details were set forth only in the tent of meeting." [Freedman: hence until the tent of meeting was set up, burnt offerings were not flayed and cut up.]*
- E. *R. Aqiba says, "The generative principles and also the details were set forth at Sinai; they were repeated in the tent of meeting; they were restated yet again in the plains of Moab."*
- F. *Now if you take the view that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness was the daily whole offering, then is there the possibility that at first the sacrifice did not require flaying and chopping up but only later on would require flaying and chopping up?*
- G. *R. Eleazar: as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. *It is a daily whole offering, which was offered at Mount Sinai" (Num. 28: 6):*
- I. *R. Eleazar says, "While the rites concerning it were stated at Sinai, the offering itself was not presented." [Abraham: so the burnt offerings brought by the young men of Exo. 24: 5 must have been appearance offerings.]*
- J. *R. Aqiba says, "It was offered up and was never discontinued."*
- K. *Then how am I to interpret the verse, "Did you bring me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness for forty years, O House of Israel" (Amo. 5:25) [which suggests that regular public offerings were not offered]?*
- L. *The tribe of Levi, which did not serve the idol, were the ones who offered it up.*
- M. *The House of Hillel: as we have just said.*
- N. *R. Aqiba: as we have just said too.*
- O. *R. Yosé the Galilean: as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- P. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “Three religious duties were assigned to Israel in connection with their coming up for a festival: the appearance offering, the festal offering, and the offering of rejoicing. There is a rule pertaining to the appearance offering which does not apply to the other two, and there is a rule governing the festal offering that does not apply to the other two, and there is a rule governing the rejoicing offering that does not apply to the other two.
- Q. There is a rule pertaining to the appearance offering which does not apply to the other two: for the appearance offering is wholly offered up to the Most High, which is not the case with the other two.
- R. and there is a rule governing the festal offering that does not apply to the other two: for the festal offering was carried on prior to the Revelation at Mount Sinai, which is not the case with the other two.
- S. and there is a rule governing the rejoicing offering that does not apply to the other two: for the rejoicing offering pertains not only to men but also to women, which is not the case with the other two [T. **Qid. 1:4F-K**].

VIII.4. A. *And how come you have determined that R. Ishmael accords with the House of Shammai?*

- B. *If it should enter your mind that the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness were the daily whole offering, then is there a class of offerings that to begin with did not require flaying and cutting up but later on required flaying and cutting up?*
- C. *But lo, R. Yosé the Galilean has said, “The burnt offering that the Israelites offered up in the wilderness was the daily holy offering,” and to begin with it did not require flaying and cutting up but in the end it did! For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé the Galilean says, “The burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness did not require flaying and cutting up, because flaying and cutting up are procedures that are carried on only from the tent of meeting and therefore.”*
- D. *Then take R. Ishmael’s name from this list.*

VIII.5. A. *R. Hisda raised this question: “As to this verse, what does it mean: ‘And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt offerings, lambs, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen, to the Lord’ (Exo. 24: 5)? Maybe they both were oxen [the burnt offerings and the peace offerings]?”*

- B. *Yeah, yeah, so who cares?*
- C. *Mar Zutra said, “It has to do with the punctuation of the verse.”*
- D. *R. Aha b. Raba said, “It pertains to the case of him who says, ‘Lo, incumbent on me is a burnt offering like the burnt offering that the Israelites offered in the wilderness.’ So what does he owe? Oxen or lambs?”*

E. *The question must stand.*

VIII.6. A. [Supply: **The House of Shammai say, “The appearance offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver, and the festal offering at least one maah of**

silver.” And the House of Hillel say, “The appearance offering must be at least one maah of silver, and the festal offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver:”] *We have learned in the Mishnah there: These are things which have no [specified] measure: (1) [the quantity of produce designated as] peah, [7A] [the quantity of produce given as] firstfruits, [the value of] the appearance offering, [the performance of] righteous deeds, and [time spent in] study of Torah [M. Pe. 1:1A-B].*

- B. Said R. Yohanan, “We have the theory that the appearance offering has no upper limit as to value, but it does have a lower limit as to value. Then came R. Oshayya beRibbi and taught: the appearance offering has neither an upper nor a lower limit as to its value. But sages say, **‘The appearance offering must be at least one maah of silver, and the festal offering must be worth at least two pieces of silver.’**”

VIII.7. A. *What is the meaning of “appearance”?*

- B. R. Yohanan said, “It means, making an appearance in the Temple court [at least one time bringing a sacrifice along].”
- C. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “It means, making an appearance through an offering” [Abraham: with a sacrifice brought with every appearance].
- D. *As to the principal day of the Festival [which is the first day] all parties concur that making an appearance must be along with an offering. Where there is a disagreement, it concerns the other days of the festival. Not only so, but all parties concur that every time that one comes bringing an offering, we do accept it from him. Where there is a disagreement it concerns coming to the Temple but not bringing an offering. Thus:*
- E. *R. Yohanan has the theory, “It means, making an appearance in the Temple court:” for each occasion on which one comes, one need not bring an appearance-offering.*
- F. *And R. Simeon b. Laqish has the theory, “It means, making an appearance through an offering:” every time one comes, one has to bring an appearance-offering.*
- G. *R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan, “‘None shall appear before me empty-handed’ (Exo. 23:15).”*
- H. He said to him, “That speaks of the principal day of the Festival.”
- I. *He objected: “‘None shall appear before me empty-handed’ (Exo. 23:15) [but must present] animal offerings. You say it means animal offerings. But perhaps it means that fowl or meal offerings would suffice. And that stands to reason. Here we find a reference to a festal offering presented by a common person, and, further, an appearance offering is required for the Most High [Exo. 23:15, the festal offering is described as one for God, not for provision of food for the worshipper]. Just as the festal offering required for the common person involves an animal offering, so the appearance offering stated with reference to the Most High should involve an animal offering. And what might that be? Burnt offerings. You say that it should be burnt offerings. But perhaps the offering should fall into the category of peace offerings. And that stands to reason. We find a reference to a festal offering presented by an ordinary person, and we find a reference to an appearance offering for the Most High. Just as the festal offering stated with*

regard to a common person must be one that is fitting to him, so an appearance offering that is stated with reference to the Most High likewise must be one that is fitting for him. And that stands to reason, so that your table should not be full of meat, while the stable of your Lord is empty.”

J. He said to him, “That speaks of the principal day of the Festival.”

K. *He objected:* “R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, ‘On the occasion of three pilgrim festivals a year the Israelites are commanded to come up to Jerusalem on the festival, the festival of unleavened bread, the festival of weeks, and the festival of tabernacles, and they may not appear by halves, because it is said, “All your males” (Exo. 23:17); and they must not appear empty-handed, for it is said, “None shall appear before me empty handed” (Exo. 23:15).’”

L. He said to him, “That speaks of the principal day of the Festival.”

M. *Objected R. Yohanan to R. Simeon b. Laqish,* “The references, ‘he will see,’ ‘he will be seen’ establish a verbal analogy: just as I come with nothing in hand, so you come with nothing in hand.”

VIII.8. *A. So as to an occasion on which a person comes without bringing an offering, all parties concur: someone comes and makes an appearance and then goes out. Where there is a difference of opinion, it concerns a case in which someone comes and brings an offering:*

B. *R. Yohanan, who said,* “It means, making an appearance in the Temple court,” *maintains that it is with reference to making an appearance that is not subject to a limit, but as to offerings, there is most certainly a limit.*

C. *And R. Simeon b. Laqish, who said,* “It means, making an appearance through an offering,” *holds that even as to an offering there is no limit.*

D. *R. Yohanan objected to R. Simeon b. Laqish,* “‘Let your foot be seldom in your friend’s house’ (Pro. 25:17) [so one shouldn’t bring too many sacrifices to the house of God (Abraham)].”

E. *That refers to sin offerings and guilt offerings, in line with what R. Levi said, for R. Levi contrasted verses of Scripture: “It is written, ‘Let your foot be seldom in your friend’s house’ (Pro. 25:17), but also, ‘I will come into your house with burnt offerings’ (Psa. 66:13). There is, however, no contradiction, the one speaks of sin offerings and cult offerings, the other, burnt offerings and peace offerings.”*

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

G. “Let your foot be seldom in your friend’s house” (Pro. 25:17): Scripture speaks of sin offerings and guilt offerings.

H. You say that Scripture speaks of sin offerings and guilt offerings. But perhaps it speaks of burnt offerings and peace offerings?

I. When Scripture says, “I will come to your house with burnt offerings, I will carry out to you my vows,” behold that covers burnt offerings and peace offerings. So what is the sense of “Let your foot be seldom in your friend’s house” (Pro. 25:17)? Scripture speaks of sin offerings and guilt offerings.

VIII.9. *A. “and they may not appear by halves, because it is said, ‘All your males’ (Exo. 23:17):”*

- B. *R. Joseph considered ruling, “Someone who has ten sons — they should not come up five now, five tomorrow.”*
- C. **[7B]** *Said to him Abbaye, “Obvious — which ones among them are you going to treat as transgressors, and which ones among them are you going to treat as zealous!”*
- D. *So then as to the verse of Scripture, what purpose does it serve?*
- E. *It supports the view of “others,” as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. Others say, “The dog-shit collector, coppersmith, and tanner are exempt from the appearance offering, as it is said, ‘all your males,’ meaning, he who can go up on the pilgrimage with all your males, thus excluding these classes of persons, who are not fit to make the pilgrimage with all your males [because they stink].”

I.1 explains the formulation of the Mishnah’s statement. II.1 likewise comments on the word-choices of the Mishnah, with a secondary expansion and a thematic appendix at Nos. 2-9. III.1-2+3 revert to the exposition of the Mishnah-clause, now its second component. IV.1+2-4 provide a Tannaite complement to the Mishnah-statement. V.1, VI.1 go through the same process. Then the Mishnah-list is augmented by further entries, Nos. 2-3. Nos. 4-37 form a thematic appendix, composed of clearly-differentiable units and as a whole tacked on for obvious reasons. VII.1-3 gloss the Mishnah-paragraph. VIII.1-2+4-5 complement with a Tannaite statement, explaining the positions of the Mishnah’s disputants. The continuation, VIII.6+7-9 then points to disharmonies between our Mishnah-statement and an intersecting one. No. 2-3, with a footnote to No. 3 at No. 4, proceed to another detail of the same statement.

1:3-4

1:3

- A. **Burnt offerings [for appearance offerings] for the intermediate days of a festival derive from [beasts bought with] unconsecrated money.**
- B. **But peace offerings [for festal offerings] may come from money in the status of second tithe.**
- C. **On the first festival day (of Passover),**
- D. **the House of Shammai say, “[The offering must derive] from unconsecrated money.”**
- E. **And the House of Hillel say, “[It may derive] from money in the status of second tithe.”**

1:4

- A. **Israelites [but not priests] fulfill their obligation [in the case of] [peace offerings of rejoicing] through offerings brought in fulfillment of vows and as thank offerings,**
- B. **and through tithe of cattle [Lev. 27:32].**
- C. **And priests [do so] through sin offerings, guilt offerings [Num.18:91, firstlings, and through the breast and shoulder,**
- D. **but not through fowl or meal offerings.**

- I.1** A. [Burnt offerings [for appearance offerings] for the intermediate days of a festival derive from [beasts bought with] unconsecrated money. But peace offerings [for festal offerings] may come from money in the status of second tithe:] So it is in particular on the intermediate days of the festival that burnt offerings are brought via animals purchased with unconsecrated funds, but for the festival day itself they may derive even from animals bought with money in the status of second tithe. Now why should that be the case? This represents an obligatory offering, and any obligatory offering may derive only from unconsecrated funds.
- B. *And should you propose, so the rule comes to inform us that burnt offerings may be presented during the intermediate days of the festival but not on the festival itself, then this will accord only with the House of Shammai. For we have learned in the Mishnah: The House of Shammai say, “[On a festival day] they bring peace-offerings, but they do not lay hands on them. But [they do] not [bring] whole-offerings [at all].” And the House of Hillel say, “They bring peace-offerings and whole-offerings, and they lay hands on them” [M. Bes. 2:4A-E].*
- C. *The text before us is flawed, and this is how it should read:* Burnt offerings, offerings in fulfillment of vows, and freewill offerings are presented on the intermediate days of the festival, but on the festival day itself they are not presented; and a burnt offering for appearance offerings may be presented even on the festival day itself. Now when these offerings are presented, they must derive only from animals purchased with unconsecrated money, but as to animals presented under the rubric of peace offerings of rejoicing, these may be brought even from animals bought with coins in the status of second tithe. As to the festal offering presented on the first day of Passover, **the House of Shammai say, “[The offering must derive] from unconsecrated money.” And the House of Hillel say, “[It may derive] from money in the status of second tithe.”**
- D. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. Burnt offerings, offerings in fulfillment of vows, and freewill offerings are presented on the intermediate days of the festival, but on the festival day itself they are not presented; and a burnt offering for appearance offerings may be presented even on the festival day itself. Now when these offerings are presented, they must derive only from animals purchased with unconsecrated money, but as to animals presented under the rubric of peace offerings of rejoicing, these may be brought even from animals bought with coins in the status of second tithe. As to the festal offering presented on the first day of Passover, **the House of Shammai say, “[The offering must derive] from unconsecrated money.” And the House of Hillel say, “[It may derive] from money in the status of second tithe.”**
- I.2.** A. *And what is the reason that the festal offering presented on the first day of Passover is singled out?*
- B. *Said R. Ashi, “It is to inform us that the festal offering presented on the fifteenth of Nisan must be purchased with unconsecrated funds, but the festal offering for the fourteenth need not. [8A] Therefore he takes the view that presenting a festal offering on the fourteenth of Nisan is not a rule that derives from the Torah.”*

I.3. A. The master has said: And the House of Hillel say, “[It may derive] from money in the status of second tithe:”

- B. *But why should this be the case?* It is obligatory, and any obligatory offering derives only from unconsecrated funds.
- C. Said Ulla, “This rule pertains when the householder supplements the unconsecrated money with funds in the status of second tithe.”
- D. Hezekiah said, “They may supplement one animal with another, but not money with money.”
- E. And R. Yohanan said, “They may supplement money with money in a different category, but they may not supplement one another with another.”
- F. *There is a Tannaite formulation of the rule in accord with Hezekiah, there is also a Tannaite formulation of the rule in accord with R. Yohanan.*
- G. *There is a Tannaite formulation of the rule in accord R. Yohanan:*
- H. “After the tribute” (Deu. 16:10) — this teaches that a person may present an obligatory offering only from unconsecrated resources. And how do we know that if he wanted to mix, he may mix? “According as the Lord your God shall bless you” (Deu. 16:10). [“Mixing” can be done only with money, obviously not with animals.]
- I. *There is a Tannaite formulation of the rule in accord with Hezekiah:*
- J. “After the tribute” (Deu. 16:10) — this teaches that a person may present an obligatory offering only from unconsecrated resources.
- K. The House of Shammai say, “As to the beast to be presented on the first festival day, it must derive from unconsecrated funds. For beasts offered from that point onward, the funds may be in the status of second tithe.
- L. And the House of Hillel say, “The first meal must derive from animals bought from unconsecrated funds; from that point onward, it may derive from second tithe as well.”
- M. And as to the other days of Passover, a person may fulfil his obligation with a beast that was designated as tithe.

I.4. A. What differentiates the first day of the festival?

- B. Said R. Ashi, “This is a precaution, lest one end up designating second tithe on the festival itself, and it is not possible to designate tithe on the festival day because of having to mark the designated beast with red paint.”

I.5. A. And how do we know that the word “tribute” means, what is unconsecrated?

- B. “And King Ahasuerus laid tribute upon the land” (Est. 10: 1).

II.1 A. Israelites [but not priests] fulfill their obligation [in the case of] [peace offerings of rejoicing] through offerings brought in fulfillment of vows and as thank offerings, and through tithe of cattle [Lev. 27:32]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And you shall rejoice in your feast” (Deu. 16:14) — covering all manner of rejoicing under the rubric of rejoicing.

- D. On the strength of this exegesis, sages have said: **Israelites [but not priests] fulfill their obligation [in the case of] [peace offerings of rejoicing] through offerings brought in fulfillment of vows and as thank offerings, and through tithe of cattle [Lev. 27:32]. And priests [do so] through sin offerings, guilt offerings [Num. 18:9], firstlings, and through the breast and shoulder.**
- E. Might one suppose that they may do so also through fowl or meal offerings?
- F. Scripture states, “And you shall rejoice in your feast” (Deu. 16:14) — **[8B]** that is, only from species from which the festal offering can be brought, excluding these categories, from which the festal offering cannot be brought.
- G. *R. Ashi said, “The same conclusion derives from the language, ‘And you shall rejoice’ — excluding these, in which there is no genuine rejoicing.”*
- H. *And how does R. Ashi deal with the phrase, in your feast?*
- I. *He interprets that along the lines of what R. Daniel bar Qattina said, for said R. Daniel bar Qattina said Rab, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that people may not take wives on the intermediate days of the festival? As it is said, ‘You shall rejoice in your feast’ (Deu. 16:14), meaning, in your feast — not in your new wife.”*
I.1, with footnotes at Nos. 2, 3+4-5, investigates the premises of the rule of the Mishnah. II.1 adds a Tannaite complement to the topic of the Mishnah-sentence.

1:5

- A. **He who has many who eat with him and limited property brings many peace offerings but few whole offerings.**
- B. **[If he has] abundant property and few who eat with him, he brings abundant whole offerings and only a few peace offerings.**
- C. **If both this and that are limited, concerning such a person it is said, “One maah of silver and two pieces of silver [are to be the value of the offering]” [M. 1:2B].**
- D. **[If] he has an abundance of both, concerning this one it is said, “Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he has given you” (Deu. 16:17).**
- I.1** A. **[He who has many who eat with him and limited property brings many peace offerings but few whole offerings:]** — *so where is he going to be a lot of peace offerings, since he’s got nothing?*
- B. Said R. Hisda, “He may supplement unconsecrated funds with money in the status of second tithe and present a big bull.”
- C. Said to him R. Sheshet, “Lo, they have said: ‘they supplement beast with beast.’”
- D. *So what’s the sense of this statement of his? Should we say that this is what he meant: “He may supplement unconsecrated funds with money in the status of second tithe and but they do not supplement funds with other funds”? Then let him say in so many words, He may not supplement unconsecrated funds with money in the status of second tithe. So this is the sense of what he meant to say to him: Lo, they have said: they also supplement beast with beast.*
- E. *Then accord to which authority would such a statement be made, for it cannot accord with either Hezekiah or R. Yohanan [neither of who allows supplementing*

both money with money and beast with beast (Abraham)] *And should you say, what we have is a conflict of Amoraic opinion, but so far as Tannaite formulations, there is no such conflict, as a matter of fact, we have the following: the first meal must come from unconsecrated funds [the entirety of the meat of the first meal must come from unconsecrated money, so that would allow supplementing the beast with beast, but not money and money (Abraham)].*

F. *What is the meaning of “the first meal”? It means, “the amount of the value of the first meal must derive from unconsecrated funds.”*

I.2. A. Said Ulla said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “If one has designated ten beasts for his festal offering and offered five of them on the first day, he may go and offer up the other five on the second day.”

B. And R. Yohanan said, “Once he has left off making the offering, he can’t offer any more.” [Abraham: one must not suppose that by offering the remaining beasts on the second day, that is, the intermediate days of the festival, he violates the commandment to keep one day as a feast, for the second day is merely compensation for the dues of the first.]

C. *Said R. Abba, “But there really is no dispute between them. The one speaks of a case in which he did not declare a particular intention with respect to these beasts, the other where he did.”* [If he said, I designate these ten beasts for the first day and offers some on the second day, they are merely compensation for the first day (Abraham)].”

D. *Well, then, which is the case in which one has not specified his intention for the beasts [in which case one would maintain the beasts cannot be offered after the first day]? Should we say that there is insufficient time left in the day to offering them all? Then the reason for his not offering them is that there is no time left. So therefore it must be that he had no more people to consume the meat with him! [But he really intended to offer them on the first day.]*

E. *Not at all, the rule covers a case in which there was time left in the day, and there were enough people to eat the meat with him. But since he didn’t offer them on the first day, that proves he deliberately left them over. And that would be reasonable, for when Rabin came, he said R. Yohanan [said], “If one has designated ten beasts for his festal offering and offered five of them on the first day, he may go and offer up the other five on the second day.”*

F. *Well, it would certainly appear that we have a conflict between the statements attributed to him! So doesn’t it follow that the one speaks of a case in which he did not declare a particular intention with respect to these beasts, the other where he did?*

G. *It certainly does.*

H. *It has also been stated along these lines:*

I. Said R. Shemen bar Abba said R. Yohanan, **[9A]** “They stated this rule [the festal offering is offered only on the first day] only in a case in which the day had not ended, but if the day came to an end, he may offer the rest on the second day.”

J. *Now what is the meaning of “ended”? Should we say, “ended” means, he ended his sacrifices? Then what is he supposed to offer? So it must mean that the day had not ended; but if the day had ended, he may offer the rest the next day.*

I.1 asks an obvious question of Mishnah-exegesis. No. 2 forms a distinct item, connected to the theme of the Mishnah only in a very general way.

1:6-7

1:6

- A. **He who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival [of Tabernacles].**
- B. **[But if] the festival passed and he did not make a festal offering, he is not liable to make it good.**
- C. **Of such a person it is said, "That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be reckoned" (Qoh. 1:15).**

1:7

- A. **R. Simeon b. Menasia says, "What is that which is crooked which cannot be made straight?"**
- B. **"This is one who has sexual relations with woman in a forbidden relationship and produces a mamzer from her.**
- C. **"If you should claim that it applies to a thief or a robber, he can make restitution and be made straight."**
- D. **R. Simeon b. Yohai says, "They call that which is crooked only one who was straight to begin with and who became crooked. What is such a person? It is a disciple of a sage who took his leave of the Torah."**

- I.1** A. **[He who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival of Tabernacles:] *how on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact?***
- B. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Ishmael, "With respect to the seventh day of Passover, the word 'solemn assembly' occurs, and with reference to the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles, the word 'solemn assembly' occurs. Just as in the latter case the rule is that one can make good on the later days of the festival a festal offering due on the first day, so here it means that one can make good on an intermediate day the festal offering owing for the first day."
 - C. *And the phrase is free and available for that purpose, for if it were not free and available to establish a verbal analogy, one could point to the following flaw in the comparison of the two components of the analogical comparison: the distinguishing trait of the seventh day of Passover is that it is not separate from the prior days, but can you say the same of the Eighth Day of Tabernacles, which is a distinct holy day, separate from the prior days?*
 - D. *But no, it is in point of fact entirely available for interpretation. For what is the meaning of the letters translated "solemn assembly"? They yield the sense, Stop [doing work]. But isn't it written, "You shall do no work" (Deu. 16: 8)? So why has Scripture written the word "solemn assembly" here? It must be to allow the word to stand free for the purpose just now specified.*

I.2. A. *But the following Tannaite authority derives the same rule from a passage to be cited, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “You shall keep it a feast to the Lord [by offering a festal offering] for seven days” (Deu. 16: 8) —
- C. might one suppose that one must go on presenting festal offerings for the entirety of the seven days?
- D. Scripture says, “it” — “it” you shall observe with a festal offering, but you don’t observe all seven days with festal offerings.
- E. So why does Scripture say, “seven” — this refers to the possibility of making up on later days offerings not presented on the first day that were required.
- F. And how on the basis of Scripture do we know that **he who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival of Tabernacles?**
- G. Scripture says, “You shall keep it in the seventh month” (Lev. 23:41).
- H. If it is the fact, then, that “You shall keep it in the seventh month” (Lev. 23:41), might one suppose that one may continue making festal offerings, as owed, throughout the entire month?
- I. Scripture says, “it” — “it” you observe through a festal offering, and you don’t make a festal offering outside of it.

I.3. A. *What is the meaning of “making good”?*

- B. R. Yohanan said, “What is offered on the later days make up for what should have been offered on the first day of the festival.” [Abraham: if a man was liable to bring an offering on the first day and didn’t, he may make it good; but if he was exempt on the first day, he is no longer bound to bring the offering.]
- C. R. Oshayya said, “They make up for one another” [Abraham: each day makes up for the preceding in the sense that it puts a new liability on the pilgrim; thus on whichever day of the festival he becomes qualified to make an offering, he is bound to bring his offerings.]
- D. *What is at issue between them?*
- E. Said R. Zira, “One who was a cripple on the first day but healed on the second *is what is at issue between them:*
- F. “R. Yohanan said, ‘What is offered on the later days make up for what should have been offered on the first day of the festival,’ *and since he was not suitable to bring an offering on the first day, he also is not suitable on the second.*
- G. “R. Oshayya said, ‘They make up for one another,’ *so even though he was not suitable on the first day, he is suitable on the second.*”
- H. *But did R. Yohanan say any such thing? And didn’t Hezekiah say, “If a Nazirite became unclean by day on the eighth day, he has to bring a second offering; if it was on the night of the eighth day, he does not have to bring an offering.” But R. Yohanan says, “Even if the uncleanness took place on the night of the eighth day, he has to bring an offering.” [That is because he was already purified by immersion on the seventh day, with sunset on that day; this seems to show Yohanan holds even though one is not qualified to bring a sacrifice, that is, the*

Nazirite on the night preceding the eighth day, he may make up for it later (Abraham)].

- I. *Said R. Jeremiah, "The case of uncleanness is exceptional, since so far as that is concerned, there is the possibility of making it up on the second Passover [which one observes if he is unclean on the first]."*
- J. *Objected R. Pappa to this proposition, "Well, that poses no problem to him who has said, 'the second Passover [9B] makes up for the first, but to the view of him who has said, the second Passover is a festival unto itself, what is to be said?'"*
- K. *Rather, said R. Papa, "R. Yohanan must take the view that the night prior to the day on which a sacrifice is due is not classified as belonging to the period prior to the obligatory time for the offering" [and is no disqualifying factor, so in the case of the Nazirite, the night preceding the eighth day completes the period of eight days that he must wait, so the sacrifice is owing at that point, though it cannot be made because it is still night, and therefore the sacrifice not offered at night can be made good the next morning; if the Nazirite should suffer a second uncleanness, he has to bring a second sacrifice; in the case of the festival offering, if the man was lame on the first day, he was not obligated at all to bring a sacrifice, so this can't be made up (Abraham)].*
- L. *But did R. Yohanan say any such thing? And didn't R. Yohanan say, "If one saw a flux by night and two on the next day, he brings an offering. If he saw two by night and one the next day, he does not bring an offering"? Now if you should imagine that R. Yohanan takes the view, "The night prior to the day on which a sacrifice is due is not classified as belonging to the period prior to the obligatory time for the offering," then even if he saw two by night and one the next day, he should have to bring an offering!*
- M. *When R. Yohanan made that statement, it was within the perspective of him who says, "The night prior to the day on which a sacrifice is due is not classified as belonging to the period prior to the obligatory time for the offering."*
- N. *Yeah, but from that viewpoint, what he has said is pretty obvious! [It is a corollary of the principle that the night before belongs to the preceding period (Abraham).]*
- O. *It is necessary to address the case in which there were two emissions in the day and one the prior night. You might have thought that the decision accords with the objection of R Shisha b. R. Idi, so we are informed that the law accords with R. Joseph. [Reference is made to b. Ker. 8A: For R. Yohanan said, "If one saw a flux by night and two on the next day, he brings an offering. If he saw two by night and one the next day, he does not bring an offering." Said R. Joseph, "You may know that it is the rule that if he saw one by night and two the following day, he brings an offering, for lo, the first issue is regarded as a mere discharge of semen, but if two more issues are produced, they combine with one another." [To the contrary,] said R. Sheshet b. R. Idi, "What value do you see in this argument? The first flux of the man afflicted by flux took place at a time that was suitable for offerings, but when you have the case of 'one by night,' where the issue was at a time that was not fit for the bringing of offerings, if R. Yohanan had not maintained for us that they do combine with one another, I should have thought that they do not combine"]*

II.1 A. He who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival [of Tabernacles]. [But if] the festival passed and he did not make a festal offering, he is not liable to make it good. Of such a person it is said, “That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be reckoned” (Qoh. 1:15):

- B. *Said Bar Hé-Hé to Hillel, “What is required for the formulation of that verse is not ‘to be reckoned’ but ‘to be filled.’ So this must refer to one whose associates included him in a count for carrying out a religious deed but who refused to join them.”*
- C. *And so too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered” (Qoh. 1:15): this speaks of one who has failed to recite the *Shema* in the evening or in the morning, or the Prayer in the evening or in the morning.
- E. “And that which is wanting cannot be numbered.” This speaks of one whose friends formed an association to carry out a religious duty in common, and who was not counted with them [so did not get the share of the reward for the deed].

The composite now proceeds to other sayings assigned to Bar He He, first in the formal model of the foregoing.

II.2. A. *Said Bar Hé-Hé to Hillel, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘Then you shall again discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him who serves God and him who does not’ (Mal. 3:18)? ‘The righteous’ is the same as ‘he who serves God,’ ‘the wicked’ is the same as ‘he who doesn’t.’”*

- B. He said to him, “‘he who serves...he who doesn’t...’ *both refer to those who are completely righteous*, but he who has repeated his chapter in memorization one hundred times is not the same as he who repeated it a hundred and one times.”
- C. *He said to him, “So for one time is he called ‘he who doesn’t!’”*
- D. *He said to him, “Yup. Go learn from what goes on in the ass-drivers’ market: ten parasangs go for one zuz, eleven for two.”*

II.3. A. *Said Elijah to Bar Hé-Hé, and some say, to R. Eleazar, “What’s the sense of the verse of Scripture: ‘Behold I have refined you but not as silver, I have tried you in the furnace of afflictions’ (Isa. 48:10)?*

- B. “This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be he, reviewed all the good qualities so as to give them to Israel, but found only poverty.”

II.4. A. *Said Samuel, and some say, R. Joseph, “That’s in line with what people say: ‘poverty fits Israel like a red ribbon on a white horse.’”*

III.1 A. **R. Simeon b. Menasia** says, “What is that which is crooked which cannot be made straight? This is one who has sexual relations with woman in a forbidden relationship and produces a mamzer from her. If you should claim that it applies to a thief or a robber, he can make restitution and be made straight:”

- B. **and produces a mamzer from her, then that verse applies, but if he does not produce a mamzer from her, then it doesn’t!? But lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Menassayya** says, “If someone steals, it’s

possible for him to return the stolen property and straighten matters, out, so too, if someone robs; but he who has sexual relations with a married woman and prohibits her from returning to her husband will be banished from the world and go his way” [since what he has done is beyond repair] [T. Hag. 1:7D-F].

- C. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, “People don’t say, ‘examine the camel, examine the pig,’ but only, ‘examine the lamb.’ And who is such as that? IT is a disciple of a sage who abandoned the Torah.”
- D. R. Judah b. Laqish says, “Any disciple of a sage who abandoned the Torah — concerning him Scripture says, ‘As a bird that wanders from her nest, so is a man who wanders from his place’ (Pro. 27: 8), and further, ‘What unrighteousness have your fathers found in me that they have gone far from me’ (Jer. 2: 5)” [T. Hag. 1:8].
- E. *[Reverting to the question raised at A-B:] No problem, the one refers to his sister who is unmarried [in which case the crooked cannot be made straight only if there is offspring], the other to a married women. And if you prefer, I shall say, no problem. Both refer to a married woman, but there is still no contradiction, the one [10A] refers to rape, the other, seduction. And if you want, I shall say, both refer to rape, and there is still no problem, the one speaking of the wife of a priest, the other, the wife of an Israelite.*

III.2. A. Neither was there any peace to him who went out or came in” (Zech. 8:10):

- B. Said Rab, “Once a person has left the study of law for the study of Scripture, he will never again have peace.”
- C. And Samuel said, “This speaks of one who abandons talmud for the study of the Mishnah.”
- D. And R. Yohanan said, “Even one of the six divisions of the Mishnah for some other of the six divisions of the Mishnah.”

I.1+2 ask a familiar exegetical question on the scriptural origin of the Mishnah’s rule. No. 3 then goes on to explain words and phrases in the Mishnah-paragraph itself, and this introduces a fresh question altogether. II.1+2-4 works on the formulation of the Mishnah-sentence. III.1+2 introduces another exegetical problem.

1:8

- A. The absolution of vows hovers in the air, for it has nothing [in the Torah] upon which to depend.
- B. The laws of the Sabbath, festal offerings, and sacrilege — lo, they are like mountains hanging by a string,
- C. for they have little Scripture for many laws.
- D. Laws concerning civil litigations, the sacrificial cult, things to be kept cultically clean, sources of cultic uncleanness, and prohibited consanguineous marriages have much on which to depend.
- E. And both these and those [equally] are the essentials of the Torah.

I.1 A. [The absolution of vows hovers in the air, for it has nothing [in the Torah] upon which to depend:] *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Eliezer says, “The absolution of vows certainly has that on which to depend, namely: the two usages of the phrase, ‘when one shall clearly utter a vow,’ ‘when one shall clearly utter a vow’ (Lev. 27: 2, Num. 6: 2) — the one speaks of clearly uttering a vow to bind, the other, an utterance to release the vow.”
- C. R. Joshua says, “The absolution of vows certainly has that on which to depend, as it is said, ‘Wherefore I swore in my wrath’ (Psa. 95:11) — ‘in my wrath I swore, but now I retract.’”
- D. R. Isaac says, “The absolution of vows certainly has that on which to depend, as it is said, ‘Whosoever is of a willing heart’ (Exo. 35: 5)” [Abraham: but if the heart be no longer willing, it is possible for the vow to be dissolved].
- E. Hananiah, nephew of R. Joshua, says, “The absolution of vows certainly has that on which to depend, as it is said, ‘I have sworn and I have confirmed it, to observe your righteous ordinances’ (Psa. 119:106)” [Abraham: but where instead of confirmation there is retraction, the person may be released from his vow].

I.2. A. *Said R. Judah said Samuel, “If I’d been there, I’d have said to them: my proof is better than yours, namely: ‘he shall not break his word’ (Num. 30: 3) — he shall not break it, but others may break it for him.”*

I.3. A. *Said Raba, “All of them are flawed except for Samuel’s, which has no flaw. For with reference to R. Eliezer’s statement, perhaps the verse is to be read in accord with what R. Judah said in the name of R. Tarfon, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says in the name of R. Tarfon, ‘**R. Judah in the name of R. Tarfon says, ‘None of them is a Nazirite, because vows on becoming a Nazirite must be set forth with certainty’** [T. Naz. 3:19P].*

- B. *“With reference to what R. Joshua said, it is possible that this is the sense of the statement: ‘in my anger I swore,’ and I won’t retract.*
- C. *“With reference to what R. Isaac said, perhaps the verse serves to exclude the point of Samuel, for said Samuel, ‘Even though one has made up his mind in his heart, he still has to express his thought with his lips’ [and otherwise it is not a valid vow]. And so the verse serves to inform us that even if he did not express his oath with his lips, it is still binding.*
- D. *“With reference to what Hananiah, nephew of R. Joshua said, perhaps the verse is to be read in line with what R. Giddal said Rab said, for said R. Giddal said Rab, ‘How on the basis of Scripture do we know that one may take an oath to carry out a religious duty? ‘I have sworn and I have confirmed it, to observe your righteous ordinances’ (Psa. 119:106).*
- E. *“But as to Samuel’s, there is no flaw.”*
- F. *Said Raba, and some say, R. Nahman bar Isaac, “That’s in line with what people say: better is one grain of sharp pepper than a whole basket of pumpkins.” [Abraham: a sharp mind is better than mere learning.]*

II.1 A. **The laws of the Sabbath... — lo, they are like mountains hanging by a string, for they have little Scripture for many laws:**

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!*
- C. *No, the observation does apply in line with what R. Abba said, for said R. Abba, “He who digs a hole on the Sabbath and needs the whole only for the dirt is*

exempt [from culpability].” [Abraham: if he needed the hole itself, this would be building on the Sabbath.]

II.2. A. *In accord with which authority is this ruling?*

- B. It is in accord with R. Simeon, who has said, “For work that is not required to accomplish its own purpose one is exempt from culpability.”
- F. *You may even say that it is in accord with R. Judah. In the case of culpability for carrying a corpse, that is culpability on account of improving [that is, accomplishing one’s desired purpose], but here, one is simply accomplishing pointless destruction [since the hole doesn’t improve the ground and it is not wanted in itself (Abraham)].*

II.3. A. *What is the meaning of like mountains hanging by a string?*

- B. **[10B]** Because the Torah has prohibited purposive labor, but purposive labor is never written down in the Torah.

III.1 A. **festal offerings...have little Scripture for many laws:**

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself [at Exo. 12:14, Lev. 23:41]!*
- C. *No, the observation is required in line with what R. Pappa said to Abbaye, “How do we know that the verse, ‘and you shall keep it a feast to the Lord’ (Lev. 23:41) means that one makes a sacrifice? Maybe the sense of the Torah is, ‘celebrate a festival’?”*
- D. *If so, then when Scripture says, “That they may hold a feast to me in the wilderness” (Exo. 5: 1) — does that also mean merely, “celebrate a festival”? And should you say, yes indeed! isn’t it written, “And Moses said, You must also give into our hand beasts for killing and burnt offerings” (Exo. 10:25)?*
- E. *But maybe this is the sense of Scripture: “Eat and drink and celebrate a festival before me”?*
- F. *Don’t imagine it! For it is written, “Neither shall the fat of my feast remain all night until the morning” (Exo. 23:18) — so if you think that all this means is, celebrate a festival, then is there fat associated with a festival?*
- G. *But maybe this is the sense of the All-Merciful: Neither shall the fat that is offered during the course of my feast remain all night until the morning?*
- H. *Well, then, that would bear the sense, only during the festival may fat not remain overnight, but through the ordinary days of the year, it may remain overnight, but by contrast: “All night unto morning” (Lev. 6: 2) [which speaks of the entire year, not only festivals]!*
- I. *But maybe if I had to derive the fact from that verse alone, I would know it only as a positive commandment, and Scripture presented the other verse as a negative one?*
- J. *There already is a negative commandment, in the verse: “Neither shall any of the meat which you sacrifice the first day at evening remain all night until the morning” (Exo. 12:14).*
- K. *But maybe that is required to impose liability for violating two negative commandments and a positive one?*
- L. *Rather, the appearance of the word “wilderness” which occurs in two distinct passages yields the point, namely: here we find, “that they may hold a feast for me*

in the wilderness” (Exo. 5: 5) and elsewhere, “Did you bring to me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness” (Amo. 5:25). Just as the latter verse refers to sacrifices, so the former does.

M. *Then what is the sense of the phrase, **like mountains hanging by a string?***

N. *Teachings of the Torah we do not derive from teachings of [prophetic] tradition.*

IV.1 A. and sacrilege... have little Scripture for many laws:

B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!*

C. *Said R. Ammi bar Hama, “That is required in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: **[If the agent] did not carry out his errand [in committing an act of sacrilege], the agent [is responsible and inadvertently] has committed the act of sacrilege [M. Me. 6:1C-D].** But why should the householder be guilty if the agent carried out his commission? Should one man sin and another bear liability? That is why it is said: **like mountains hanging by a string.**”*

C. *Said Raba, “But what’s the problem? Maybe the matter of sacrilege is exceptional, because the laws are derived by analogy with the laws governing the designation of priestly rations, by reason of the occurrence of the word ‘sin’ in both contexts [Lev. 5:15 for sacrilege, Num. 18:32 for priestly rations]? Just as in that other context, a man’s agent is equivalent to the man himself, so here too, the man’s agent is equivalent to the man himself.”*

D. *Rather, said Raba, “The statement is required in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. *if the householder realized [before the agent spent the money for a secular purpose][but the agent didn’t realize what he was doing, then the agent is guilty of sacrilege. But what has this poor agent done?! [He didn’t know he was committing sacrilege with consecrated funds, so why is he responsible?] That is why it is said: **like mountains hanging by a string.**”*

F. *Said R. Ashi, “But what’s the problem? Maybe the matter is comparable to any other case in which one spends sacred money for secular purposes by mistake?” [Abraham: though a person commits sacrilege in error, he is held responsible; here too the agent.]*

G. *Rather, said R. Ashi, “The statement is required in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: **[If] one took a stone or a beam from what is consecrated, lo, this one has not committed an act of sacrilege. [If] he gave it to his fellow, he has committed an act of sacrilege. But his fellow has not committed an act of sacrilege [M. Me. 5:4A-J].** Since he has taken it, what difference does it make to me whether he is the one who kept it or his fellow is the one who kept it? That is why it is said: **like mountains hanging by a string.**”*

H. *But what’s the problem? Maybe it is in accord with Samuel, for said Samuel, “Here **[11A]** we deal with the Temple treasurer, to whom the building stones had been handed over, so that, wherever the property is located, it is in his possession” [Abraham: thus he does not commit sacrilege until he gives the stone or the beam into the possession of his fellow]. Rather, it is from the concluding part of the same passage that the pertinence derives, namely: **[If] he built it into the structure of his house, lo, this one has not committed an act of sacrilege — until he actually will live under it [and enjoys its use] to the extent of a***

perutah's worth [M. Me. 5:4]. *But since he has made a change in the character of the object, what differences does it make to me whether he dwells under it or doesn't dwell under it? That is why it is said: like mountains hanging by a string."*

- I. *But what's the problem? Maybe it's in line with what Rab said, for said Rab, "It would refer to a case in which he placed it over a hole in the roof [in which case the beam is not changed, but it also is not used until the man lives in the house under the roof]." Then, if he dwells under it, he is guilty of sacrilege, if not, not.*
- J. *Rather, in point of fact it must accord with what Raba said, and as to your objection, "But what's the problem? Maybe the matter is comparable to any other case in which one spends sacred money for secular purposes by mistake," in such a case the one who did so full well knew that he had sacred money, so he should have been careful, but here [in the case of the agent] how was he to know? That is why it is said: like mountains hanging by a string.*

V.1 A. for they have little Scripture for many laws:

- B. *A Tannaite statement: the laws covering skin ailments described in Lev. 13-14 and uncleanness conveyed by a corpse in a tent involve little Scripture and many laws.*
- C. *The laws covering skin ailments described in Lev. 13-14 involve little Scripture and many laws?! To the contrary, there are a great many relevant verses of Scripture!*
- D. *Said R. Pappa, "This is the sense of the statement: The laws covering skin ailments described in Lev. 13-14 involve a great many relevant verses of Scripture, but not a great many laws. The laws on uncleanness conveyed in tents involve little Scripture and many laws."*
- E. *Yeah, so what difference does it make anyhow?*
- F. *Well, if you've got a matter of doubt in regard to the skin ailment presented in Lev. 13-14, look in verses of Scripture; if you've got a matter of doubt in regard to a matter involving uncleanness conveyed by a corpse in a tent, like in the Mishnah.*

VI.1 A. Laws concerning civil litigations...have much on which to depend:

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself [so why does the Mishnah say that they merely have something on which to depend (Abraham)]?!*
- C. *No, the observation is required in line with what Rabbi said, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *Rabbi says, "'You shall give life for life' (Exo. 21:23). That means that monetary compensation is paid.*
- E. *"You maintain that monetary compensation is paid. But perhaps it means that a life must actually be taken?*
- F. *"The word 'giving' is stated here [at Exo. 21:23] and the same word is stated elsewhere ["If no accident follow, he shall give what the judges determine"].*
- G. *"Just as in that passage what is at hand is a monetary payment, so here what is expected is a monetary payment."*

VII.1 A. ...the sacrificial cult:

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!*
- C. *No, the observation is required in particular with respect to the conveying of the blood, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “And they shall present” (Lev. 1: 5) — this refers to the receiving of the blood.
- E. *And the All-Merciful has used the word “present” to mean carrying the blood, in line with the usage in the verse: “And the priest shall present the whole and make it smoke upon the altar” (Lev. 1:13), and the master has said, “This speaks of carrying the limbs to the altar.”*
- F. *That bears the implication that carrying of the blood is not removed from the classification of receiving the blood [Abraham: though it is part of the service that can be omitted, it still is essential and is subject to all its conditions].*

VIII.1 A. ...things to be kept cultically clean:

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!*
- C. *No, the observation is required in particular with respect to the minimum measure of an immersion pool, which is not spelled out in Scripture, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “And he shall bath in water” (Lev. 15:16) — this refers to the water of an immersion pool.
- E. “...all of his flesh” (Lev. 15:16) — it must be water such that can cover the whole of his body, and how much might that be? A cubit by a cubit buy three cubits. Sages have estimated that the water in an immersion pool must be forty seahs in volume.

IX.1 A. ...sources of cultic uncleanness:

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!*
- C. *No, the observation is required to cover the size of a dead creeping thing that can impart uncleanness through touching, which is not defined in Scripture, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “...in them...” (Lev. 11:31) — might I think that it must be by the whole of the body of the dead creeping thing? Scripture says, “...in them...,” [meaning, part of them, however small].
- E. Might one thing that that may be by any minute part of them?
- F. Scripture says, “...in them...” How so? It must be such that one touches part of the creature that is equivalent to the whole of it. Sages estimated that measure as the size of a lentil, for a snail [as a whole but tiny creature] to begin with is the size of a lentil.
- G. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “The size of the tail of a lizard.”

X.1 A. ...prohibited consanguineous marriages:

- B. *But these are stated in writing in Scripture itself!*
- C. *No, the observation is required only to cover the case of [11B] his daughter by a woman he has raped, which is not covered by Scripture, for said Raba, “Said to me R. Isaac bar Abedimi, ‘The matter derives from the verbal analogy established by the appearance of the word “they” [at Lev. 18:10, which refers to the daughter of his son or his daughter born of a woman he has raped, but not with the daughter herself], and the occurrence of the same word [with reference to the daughter, who*

is treated as equivalent to the daughter of the son or the daughter of the daughter. Slotki: by this analogy, the inference is arrived at that intercourse even with a daughter from an outraged woman is forbidden.] *And, further, the matter derives from the verbal analogy established by the appearance of the word “lewdness”* [at Lev. 18:10, the penalty is not mentioned there; but at Lev. 20:14, the penalty of burning with fire is stated. Slotki: thus it is shown that the very foundation of the prohibition of sexual intercourse with a daughter from an outraged woman, as well as the death penalty of burning which the crime involves, are entirely dependent on inferences arrived at by exposition].”

XI.1 A. And both these indeed are the essentials of the Torah:

B. *These but not those?*

C. *Rather, say: both these and those [equally] are the essentials of the Torah.*

I.1, with its talmud at Nos. 2-3, adds a Tannaite complement to the Mishnah-sentence. II.1, with its talmud at No. 2, comments on the allegation of the Mishnah. No. 3 continues the exposition of the Mishnah's language. IV.1 challenges the allegation of the Mishnah. V.1 goes over a complementary Tannaite statement. VI.1-XI.1 continue the systematic, uniform glossing of the Mishnah-statements. This is an unusually clear example of talmud as Mishnah-commentary, pure and simple. Readers will have noticed numerous instances in which a single program of exegesis extends through sizable composites of commentaries to discrete sentences or even paragraphs of the Mishnah.