

II

BAVLI BESA CHAPTER TWO

FOLIOS 15B-23B

2:1

- A. [15B] [As for] a festival [that began on Thursday night, such that its conclusion] coincided with the eve of the Sabbath [on Friday night] —
- B. a person should not do cooking to begin with on the festival day [that is, Friday] for the purposes of the Sabbath. [On a festival day one is permitted only to prepare food for that same day. He may not prepare food for use after the festival.]
- C. But [on the festival] he may prepare food for the festival itself, and if he leaves something over, he has left it over for the Sabbath.
- D. And before the eve of the festival day [that is, on Thursday] he may prepare a cooked dish and rely on it [to prepare food on Friday] for the Sabbath. [The preparation of this dish — an erub tabshilin — marks the beginning of the individual's cooking of food for the Sabbath. Once he has begun, on Thursday, to prepare food for the Sabbath, he may continue that preparation, even on the festival day itself.]
- E. The House of Shammai say, “[The erub tabshilin must be comprised of] two dishes.”
- F. And the House of Hillel say, “A single dish [is sufficient].”
- G. But they agree that a fish and the egg [cooked] on it constitute two dishes.
- H. [If] one ate [the erub tabshilin] or [if] it was lost, one should not in the first place cook [food for the Sabbath in reliance] upon it.
- I. But if he left over any amount of it at all, he relies upon it [in order to cook food] for the Sabbath.
- I.1** A. [And before the eve of the festival day [that is, on Thursday] he may prepare a cooked dish and rely on it [to prepare food on Friday] for the Sabbath:]
From which [passage in Scripture] do we know this Mishnaic rule?
- B. Said Samuel, “For Scripture states [Exo. 20:8], ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.’ [This means]: Remember it despite another [holy day] that causes it

to be forgotten.” [Concern for the festival day might eclipse the following Sabbath. Use of the *erub tabshilin* allows one, on the festival day, to remain fully aware of, and to prepare for, the Sabbath that follows.]

- I.2.** A. *What is the reason [that the erub tabshilin must be prepared before the start of the festival]?*
- B. Said Raba, “So that one [will be cognizant of both holy days and] will choose a fine portion [of food] for the Sabbath and a fine portion [of food] for the festival day.”
- C. R. Ashi said, “So that people will say, ‘You may not bake on a festival day for the Sabbath. How much the more [may you not bake] on a festival day for a [following] weekday.’”
- D. *We have learned in the Mishnah* [M. Bes. 2:1D]:
- E. **Before the eve of the festival day one may prepare a cooked dish and rely upon it [to prepare food on Friday] for the Sabbath.1**
- F. *This [statement] makes sense in accordance with the view of R. Ashi, who said [that the reason for the law is] so that people will say, “You may not bake a dish on a festival day for use on the Sabbath.”*
- G. *Thus [M. Bes. 2:1D states explicitly that] before the eve of the festival day one may [begin to prepare food for the Sabbath]; [but] on the festival day [itself one may] not [begin to prepare food for the Sabbath].*
- H. *But in the view of Raba, what is special about the evening of the festival [such that, at that time, he must pick out special food for the Sabbath]? Even on the festival day [itself he could pick out special food for the Sabbath]!*
- I. *That [I] indeed is the case. But [in Raba’s view, M.’s rule] is a preventative measure, lest the individual is negligent [and, failing to have done so before the start of the festival, altogether forgets to pick out special food for the Sabbath]..*
- I.3.** A. [We revert to the original question of unit I, the Scriptural basis for the law of the *erub tabshilin*.] *And a Tannaite authority deduces [the erub tabshilin] from here [Exo. 16:23], ‘[Tomorrow is a day of solemn rest, a holy Sabbath to the Lord]; bake what you will bake and boil what you will boil, [and all that is left over lay by to be kept until the morning].’*
- B. On the basis of this [verse] said R. Eliezer, “[On a festival day] they only bake [for the Sabbath] in reliance upon that which [already] is baked. And they boil [food for the Sabbath] only in reliance upon that which [already] is boiled.”
- C. From this [reasoning] sages found biblical support for the *erub tabshilin*.

Proper Observance of the Festival Day

- I.4.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. There once was an incident involving R. Eliezer, who was sitting and expounding the whole [festival] day concerning the laws of the festival day.
- C. [When] the first group of individuals walked out [in the middle of his lecture] he said, “These are owners of large vats [of wine].” [Eliezer indicated that these were rich gluttons, who preferred going home to a large festival meal than sitting and listening to rabbinic discourse.]

- D. [When] the second group of people [walked out], he said, "These are owners of [smaller] vats."
- E. [When] the third group of individuals [walked out], he said, "These are owners of pitchers."
- F. [When] the fourth group of people [walked out], he said, "These own flasks."
- G. [When] the fifth group of people [walked out, Eliezer] said, "These own glasses."
- H. [When] the sixth group began to walk out, he said [in anger], "These people are cursed."
- I. He cast his eyes upon [his] disciples, [the only ones left in the hall], and their faces began to change. [They paled, thinking that perhaps Eliezer's remark, H, was directed at them, since, by remaining for so long, they forced him to continue lecturing.]
- J. He said to them, "My sons, not of you did I say it. Rather of those who left.
- K. "For they relinquish an everlasting life in order to occupy themselves with immediate gratification."
- L. When, [at the conclusion of the lecture, the students] were leaving, he said to them [citing Neh. 8:10], "'Go your way, eat the fat and drink the sweet wine and send portions to him for whom nothing is prepared; for this day is holy to our Lord and do not be grieved, for the joy of the Lord is your strength.'"
- M. [Eliezer's criticism of those who left the lecture early is challenged.] Said a master, "[Eliezer claimed], 'They relinquish an everlasting life to occupy themselves with a temporal life.'
- N. "[How can Eliezer criticize their actions, since] rejoicing on the festival day is a duty?"
- O. *R. Eliezer speaks in accordance with his own perspective, for he said that rejoicing on the festival day is optional [and not a duty at all].*
- P. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. R. Eliezer says, "A person has nothing to do on a festival day except either to eat and drink or to sit and study."
- R. R. Joshua says, "Split the time in half, half of it for eating and drinking and half of it for [study in] the school house."⁷
- S. Said R. Yohanan, "Both of them [formulated their views by] interpreting the same passage[s in Scripture].
- T. "One verse [Deu. 16: 8] says, '[For six days you shall eat unleavened bread; and on the seventh day there shall be] a solemn assembly *to the Lord* your God; [you shall do no work on it].'
- U. "And a different verse [Num. 29:35] says, '[On the eighth day] a solemn assembly there shall be to you: [you shall do no laborious work].'
- V. "How [does one reconcile the two verses, the first of which indicates that the day is devoted *to the Lord* and the second of which states that the day is *to you*, that is, for the Israelites themselves]?
- W. "[To reconcile the verses] R. Eliezer reasons, 'Either [one dedicates] all of the day *to the Lord* [in accordance with Deu. 16: 8]; or [one reserves] all of it *to you[r]selves*, in accordance with Num. 29:35].'

- X. “But R. Joshua reasons, ‘Split [the day] in half; half *for the Lord* and half *for you*.’”
- Y. [We continue evaluating Eliezer’s statements to his students.] *Who is meant by ‘for whom nothing is prepared,’ [cited by Eliezer at L]?*
- Z. Said R. Hisda, “[It means] for him who did not prepare an *erub tabshilin*.’”
- AA. *There are those who say, “[It refers to] him who did not have the opportunity to prepare an erub tabshilin. [Such an individual should be helped by others.]*
- BB. “But one who is able to prepare an *erub tabshilin* and does not do so is a transgressor [and does not deserve help].”
- CC. *What is the meaning of ‘for the joy of the Lord is your strength’?*
- DD. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, “Said the Holy One, blessed be he, to [the people of] Israel, ‘My children, borrow from me [in order to] sanctify the [festival] day, and trust in me, and I shall pay.’”
- EE. And said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, “One who desires his property to be preserved should plant within it an Ader-tree,
- FF. “as it is said [Psa. 93:4], ‘The Lord on high is mighty [*adir*].’” [The implication is that the planting of the tree will strengthen the individual’s claim to the property on which the tree is located.]
- GG. Alternatively, [the Aramaic name of the tree], Adara, means exactly what the word implies:
- HH. *as people say, “Why [is it called] Adara?*
- II. *“Because it lasts for generations [darei] and generations.”*
- JJ. *A Tannaite authority makes the same point:*
- KK. A field in which is planted an Ader-tree cannot be stolen nor taken through extortion, and its fruits are protected.¹²

Amplifying the statement, 4.DD, “My children, borrow from me [in order to] sanctify the [festival] day, and trust in me, and I shall pay.”

- I.5.** A. *R. Tahlifa the brother of Rabanai [of] Hozaah taught on Tannaite authority, [16A] “A person’s entire allotment [for the year] is determined [by God] between New Year’s Day and the Day of Atonement,*
- B. *“except for the expenses of [celebrating] Sabbaths and the expenses [of celebrating] festivals and the expense of educating his sons in Torah.*
- C. *“For if he spends less [on these things than he should], he is given less.*
- D. *“While if he spends more [than is expected], he is given more.”*
- E. *Said R. Abbahu, “What is the Scriptural basis [for Tahlifa’s claim, A]?*
- F. *“[Psa. 81: 3 reads]: ‘Blow the trumpet at the new moon, at the full moon [Heb. root: KSH], on our feast day.’*
- G. *“On which festival is the moon hidden [Heb. root: KSH]?*
- H. *“We must say it is New Year’s Day, [which falls on the new moon, unlike other festivals, which come in the middle of the month].*
- I. *“And [in the following verse, Psa. 81:4] it is written [regarding this festival], ‘For it is a statute [hoq] for Israel, an ordinance of the God of Jacob.’*

- J. "Where [in Scripture] is it implied that this [word] 'statute' means 'allotment' ?
- K. "For it is written [Gen. 47:22], '[Only the land of the priests did Joseph not buy; for the priests had a fixed allowance from Pharaoh], and lived on the allowance [hoq] that Pharaoh gave them.'"
- L. Mar Zutra said, "From here [we know that 'statute' means 'allowance,' Pro. 30:8], 'Feed me with the bread that is my allowance [hoq].'"

I.6. A. *It is taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. They said concerning Shammai the elder that all of the days of his [life] he would eat with an eye to the honor of the Sabbath.
- C. [If] he found a fine animal, he would say, "This is for the Sabbath."
- D. [If] he found a different animal, finer than the first, he would put aside the second [finer one for the Sabbath] and would immediately] eat the first.
- E. But Hillel the elder had a different trait.
- F. For all of his actions were for the sake of Heaven.
- G. as it is written [Psa. 68:19], 'Blessed be the Lord day by day.'
- H. *Along these same lines it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. The House of Shammai say, "From the first of the week [prepare] for the [coming] Sabbath."
- J. But the House of Hillel say, "'Blessed be the Lord day by day.'"

- I.7.** A. Said R. Hama b. R. Hanina, "One who gives a present to his friend does not have to inform him [about it],
- B. "for it is said [Exo. 34:29], 'Now Moses did not know that the skin of his face glowed.'" [God did not inform Moses that he had given him this gift.]
 - C. They objected, [citing a case in which God informed the Israelites of the gift he was giving them (Exo. 31:13)]: "'[You shall keep my Sabbaths: for this is a sign between me and you throughout your generations], that you may know that I, the Lord, sanctify you.'
 - D. "The holy one, blessed be he, said to Moses, 'Moses, I have a fine gift [for you] in my treasury, and it is called Sabbath, and I desire to present it to [the people of] Israel. Go and inform them.'
 - E. "On this basis, said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, 'One who gives bread to a child must inform its mother.'" [C-E thus shows that, contrary to A-B, one who gives a gift must make it known to the recipient.]
 - F. *There is no contradiction [between A-B and C-E].*
 - G. *This [view, A-B] applies in the case of a gift that will naturally become known, [for instance, when people see Moses' glowing face and inform him].*
 - H. *This [view, C-E] pertains to a gift that will not naturally become known. [This applies to E. Since the child will finish eating the bread before he reaches home, the parents will not know of the gift at all. The giver must therefore inform them.]*
 - I. *[F-H's solution to the problem is criticized.] But the Sabbath is a gift that would naturally become known. [Even so, God informed the Israelites about it, as C-D explains.]*

J. *[The Sabbath is a special case, in which God had to inform the Israelites, since] the reward [one earns for proper observance of the Sabbath] would not naturally have become known.*

I.8. A. [The statement ascribed to Simeon b. Gamaliel, unit VII.E, is discussed in its own light.] Said a master, “On this basis, said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, ‘One who gives bread to a child must inform its mother.’

B. *“What should he do to [the child, as a sign to the parents that the child was given some food]? He smears him with oil or puts eye-shadow on him.”*

C. *But these days, when we are afraid of witchcraft, [what should the individual who gives the child bread do]?*

E. *Said R. Pappa, “He smears on him some of the same thing [that was on the bread he gave him to eat].”*

I.9. A. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “Every commanded duty that the holy one, blessed be he, assigned the Israelites, he gave them publicly,

B. *“except for the Sabbath, which he gave them in secret.*

C. *“For it is said [Exo. 31:17], ‘It is a sign between me and the people of Israel forever.’” [The Hebrew ‘forever,’ le’olam is here read in a second meaning, le’alem, ‘to hide, conceal’.]*

D. *If this is true, [that even the people of Israel received the Sabbath in secret], then gentiles should not be punished [for transgressing] its [rules].*

E. *[In fact God] did make the Sabbath known [to idolaters].*

F. *But he did not make known to them the reward [one earns for its observance].*

G. *And if you wish, I can say: He also made known to them the reward [one earns for observing the Sabbath]. But he did not make known to them the additional soul [e.g., the spiritual enrichment attained through observance of the Sabbath]. For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “The holy one, blessed be he, gives a person an additional soul on the eve of the Sabbath. But at the conclusion of the Sabbath they take it away from him, For it is said [Exo. 31:17], ‘[In six days the Lord made the heaven and earth, and on the seventh day] he rested and was “ensouled”’ [Heb. root: NPS].’ [This means that] once [the Sabbath] has ceased, woe, that [additional] soul [Heb. root: NPS] is lost.”*

III.1 A. **Before the eve of the festival day, one may prepare a cooked dish [and rely upon it to prepare food on the festival itself for the Sabbath] [M. Bes. 2:1D]:**

B. Said Abbaye, “They taught [this rule concerning a cooked dish] only with reference to a cooked dish, but not [with reference to] bread.”

C. *What is special about bread, such that it may not [be used as an erub tabshilin]?*

D. *If I say that we require [for the erub] something that serves as a relish, and that bread [may not be used because it] is not used as a relish,*

E. *[this argument will be rejected through reference to] pearl-barley, which is not a relish [but which may be used as an erub].*

F. *This claim [that pearl-barley is not a relish] is as R. Zira said, “Babylonians are fools, for they eat bread with bread [that is, with pearl-barley].”*

G. *And said R. Nehumi b. Zechariah in the name of Abbaye, “One may make an erub of pearl-barley.”*

- H. *Rather [for an erub tabshilin] we require [a food] that is not commonplace. Now bread is commonplace [such that it may be used as an erub]. But pearl-barley is not commonplace, [and therefore it may be used].*

III.2. A. *There are those who say:*

- B. Said Abbaye, “They taught [the rule of M. **Bes. 2:1D**] only with reference to a cooked dish, but not [with reference to] bread.”
- C. *What is the reason [bread may not be used in an erub]?*
- D. *If I argue that we require [for the erub] something that is not commonplace and that bread is commonplace [so that it may not be used],*
- E. *then what of pearl-barley?*
- F. *It is not commonplace, yet said R. Nehumi b. Zechariah in the name of Abbaye, “They do not use pearl-barley as an erub.” [Contrary to C, the factor that controls whether or not something may be used as an erub therefore cannot be how commonplace a food it is.]*
- G. *Rather, we require [for use in the erub] something that serves as a relish.*
- H. *Now bread does not serve as a relish and pearl-barley likewise does not serve as a relish.*
- I. *[We know that pearl-barley is not a relish] for said R. Zira, “Babylonians are fools, for they eat bread with bread [that is, with pearl-barley].”*

III.3. A. *R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority, “[As for] lentils at the bottom of the pot — one relies upon them as an erub tabshilin.*

- B. *“This applies so long as they are at least of the quantity of an olive’s bulk.”*
- C. Said R. Isaac son of R. Judah, “[As for] the fat that remains on the knife — one may scrape it off and rely upon it as an erub tabshilin.
- D. *“This applies so long as it is at least of the quantity of an olive’s bulk.”*

III.4. A. Said R. Assi said Rab, “Small salted fish [which can be eaten raw] are not subject to the restriction against [eating foods] cooked by gentiles.”

- B. Said R. Joseph, “And if a gentile roasted them, one may rely upon them as an erub tabshilin.
- C. *“But if [the gentile] made them into fish-hash, it is forbidden.” [The dough in the hash must be cooked to be eaten, so that this food is subject to the restriction referred to at*
- D. *It may not be eaten by an Israelite and, accordingly, may not be used as an erub.]*
- E. *This is obvious!*
- F. *What might you have argued [if the law were not stated explicitly, C]?*
- G. **[16B]** *[You might have reasoned that] the fish hash is the primary [element of the food, so that, like the fish themselves, A, this dish is not subject to the restrictions that apply to foods cooked by gentiles]. So we are informed that the flour [in the dish, which must be cooked], is primary.*

III.5. A. Said R. Abba, “[Food set aside as] an erub tabshilin must contain at least an olive’s bulk.”

- B. *They asked him, “[Need it be] a single olive’s bulk [to serve] for all [of the participants], or, perhaps, it must contain an olive’s bulk for each of them?”*

- C. *Come and learn:*
- D. For said R. Abba said Rab, “[Food set aside as] an *erub tabshilin* must contain a [single] olive’s bulk, whether it is for one [person] or for a hundred.”

III.6. A. *We have learned in the Mishnah* [M. **Bes. 2:1H-I**]:

- B. **[If] one ate [the erub tabshilin] or [if] it was lost, one should not in the first place cook [food for the Sabbath in reliance] upon it.**
- C. **But if he left over any amount of it at all, he relies upon it [in order to cook food] for the Sabbath.**
- D. What is the meaning of “*any amount at all*”?
- E. *Does this not mean [that the individual may rely upon the erub] even though it contains less than an olive’s bulk [of food]?*
- F. *No, [it refers to a case] in which there is [left] an olive’s bulk.*

III.7. A. *Come and learn* [see T. **Y.T. 2:1F**]:

- B. **This cooked dish [referred to at M. **Bes. 2:1H**] is roasted, or even may be pickled, seethed, or boiled, or a kind of fish on which one pours hot water on the eve of the festival day.**
- C. At its beginning, [when it is set aside as an *erub*], and at its end, [after a portion of it has been lost or eaten], it has no set measure.
- D. *Does this not mean that it has no [minimum or maximum] measure at all?*
- E. *No. [It means that] it has no maximum measure, but it does have a minimum measure, [an olive’s bulk].*

III.8. A. Said R. Huna said Rab, “[Food must] intentionally [be set aside as] an *erub tabshilin*.”

- B. *It is obvious that we require the one who sets it aside to do so intentionally.*
- C. *But do we or do we not require cognizance on the part of the one for whom it was set aside?*
- D. *Come and learn:*
- E. *For Samuel set up an erub tabshilin on behalf of all of [the inhabitants of] Nehardea. R. Ammi and R. Assi set up an erub on behalf of all of [the inhabitants of] Tiberias.*
- F. [The following too proves that an *erub* is valid even for a person who was not cognizant of its being set up on his behalf.] Announced R. Jacob b. Idi, “Whoever has not set aside [food as] an *erub tabshilin* should come and rely on mine.”
- G. For what distance [would his *erub* serve]?
- H. Said R. Nehumi b. Zechariah in the name of Abbaye, “As far as the Sabbath boundary.”

III.9. A. *A certain blind man used to recite Tannaite teachings in the presence of Mar Samuel.*

- B. *[One day Samuel] saw that he was sad.*
- C. *He said to him, “Why are you sad?”*
- D. *He answered, “Because I did not set aside an erub tabshilin.”*
- E. *[Samuel] said to him, “Rely upon mine.”*
- F. *A year later [Samuel again] saw that the individual was sad.*

- G. *He said to him, "Why are you sad?"*
- H. *He answered, "Because I did not set up an erub tabshilin."*
- I. *[Samuel] said to him, "You are a transgressor! For everyone else it is permitted [to rely upon my erub]. But for you this is forbidden."*

III.10. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. Y.T. 2:1]:*

- B. **[As for] a festival [the conclusion of] which coincided with the eve of the Sabbath [M. Bes. 2:1A] —**
- C. **[on that festival day] they do not prepare an *erub* either for Sabbath boundaries or for courtyards.** [The *erub* of courtyards renders it permitted, on the Sabbath day, to carry objects from one domain into another. The *erub* of the Sabbath boundary permits one, on a festival or Sabbath, to move from one township to another, even though this means going beyond the limits that normally restrict travel on the Sabbath or festival.]
- D. **Rabbi says, "[On a festival] they prepare an *erub* for courtyards but not for Sabbath boundaries,**
- E. **"for you may forbid him to do [on the following, Sabbath, day] that which [on the festival too] is forbidden to him [i.e., to travel from township to township],**
- F. **"but you may not forbid him [to do on the Sabbath] that which [on the preceding, festival, day] is permitted to him [i.e., to carry from one domain to another]."**
- G. *It is taught on Amoraic authority:*
- H. Rab said, "The decided law accords with the first [cited] authority, [at C]."
- I. But Samuel says, "The decided law accords with Rabbi [D]."

III.11. *A. They asked him, "Does [Samuel believe that] the decided law accords with the position of Rabbi so as to be lenient or stringent?"*

- B. *It is obvious [as we shall see below] that [Samuel thought Rabbi's position is] lenient [and allows one, on the festival day, both to set up an erub of courtyards and an erub of Sabbath boundaries].*
- C. *[This question arose] because R. Eleazar sent [a message] to the diaspora [and said], "[The tradition] is not [properly phrased] as you teach in Babylonia, that Rabbi permits [one to make both an erub of Sabbath boundaries and an erub of courtyards] and that sages forbid [one to make an erub of Sabbath boundaries, permitting one only to set up an erub of courtyards].*
- D. *"Rather Rabbi forbids [one to make an erub of Sabbath boundaries] while sages permit [one to make both an erub of Sabbath boundaries and an erub of courtyards]."*
- E. *What [then is the case]? [Did Samuel mean that the law accords with the position of Rabbi as taught in the Land of Israel or in Babylonia?]*
- F. *Come and learn:*
- G. *When R. Tahlifa b. Abdimi decided a case according to [the judgment of] Samuel,*
- H. *said Rab, "The first legal decision of this young lawyer is harmful."*

- I. *If you reason that, granted, [in Samuel's view Rabbi's opinion] was the lenient [one], this is why [Tahlifa's following it] was harmful. [In following the lenient view, Tahlifa permitted people to do that which in fact is prohibited.]*
- J. *But if you say that [in Samuel's view Rabbi's opinion] was the stringent [one], what harm could there have been? [In this case, Tahlifa simply prohibited people from doing that which, in reality, they were permitted to do. It does not appear as though this would result in any transgression.]*
- K. *[J's reasoning is not to the point.] Since [this opinion] led many people to act in error, [17A] it was harmful. [The stringent ruling prevented people, on the festival day, from establishing an *erub* of courtyards for use on the following Sabbath. Individual's who normally prepared such an *erub* forgot that, this week, none existed. They wound up transgressing Sabbath law by carrying from one domain to another on the holy day. If Tahlifa had ruled correctly, they would have set up the needed *erub* and would not have transgressed by wrongly carrying from domain to domain on the Sabbath.]*
- L. Said Raba, said R. Sehora said R. Huna, "The decided law accords with the position of Rabbi, "that [on a festival day] it is forbidden [to set up either an *erub* of courtyards or an *erub* of Sabbath boundaries on the festival day].

When the Sabbath and a Festival Day Coincide, Other Problems: The Benedictions that are Recited

- III.12.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. Ber. 3:15]:*
- B. **[As for] a festival day that fell on the Sabbath —**
 - C. **the House of Shammai say, "He recites eight [benedictions], [the first three and last three as they are said on every Sabbath and weekday] along with [the benediction] for the Sabbath separately and the one for the festival day separately."**
 - D. **But the House of Hillel say, "He recites seven [benedictions, as normally are said on the Sabbath], beginning with [the wording for] the Sabbath and ending with [the wording for] the Sabbath,**
 - E. **"but reciting [the benediction concerning] the sanctification of the [festival] day in the middle."**
 - F. **Rabbi says, "He even concludes [the whole recitation], 'Blessed [are you, Lord our God, ruler over the universe], who sanctifies the Sabbath, [the people of] Israel and the holy seasons.'"**
 - G. *A Tannaite authority taught in the presence of Rabina, "'Who sanctifies Israel, the Sabbath and the holy seasons.'" [Unlike Rabbi, F, the Tannaite authority mentioned the people of Israel before the Sabbath.]*
 - H. *[Rabina] said to him, "Do, then, [the people of] Israel sanctify the Sabbath? [They do not] for, indeed, the Sabbath was sanctified [by God, at the time of creation] and exists [independently of any actions of Israelites themselves]. [In this regard the Sabbath is unlike festivals, which are consecrated in accordance with Israelites' own actions in fixing the date of the new moon.] [Therefore] say, rather, 'Who sanctifies the Sabbath, [the people of] Israel and the holy seasons.'"*

- I. *Said R. Joseph, “The decided law accords with the opinion of Rabbi, [F], as Rabina explained it.”*

III.13. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. Ber. 3:14, with variations]:*

- B. **[As for] a Sabbath that coincides with a New Moon or the intermediate days of a festival —**
- C. **in the evening, morning and afternoon [prayers] one recites seven [benedictions] and mentions the nature of the occurrence [being celebrated] during the [prayer concerning cultic] worship.** [Reference is to the benediction, commencing with the one that requests restoration of the sacrificial cult. Mention of the New Moon or festival is made here, in the passage beginning *ya’ale veyabo*.]
- D. **And if one did not mention [the specific day in the prayer concerning cultic worship], they make him go back [and repeat that benediction properly].**
- E. **R. Eliezer says, “In the thanksgiving [benediction], during the additional service [recited only on Sabbaths and festivals], he begins with [reference to] the Sabbath and concludes with [reference to] the Sabbath and mentions the [specific] holiness of the day in the middle, [in the *ya’ale veyabo* passage, which Eliezer holds is recited at this point in the service].”**
- F. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel and R. Ishmael the son of R. Yohanan b. Beroqah say, “In any instance in which one is obligated [to recite] seven [benedictions], he begins with the [benedictions for] Sabbath and concludes with the [benedictions for the] Sabbath and mentions the [specific] holiness of the day in the middle.”
- G. *Said R. Huna, “The decided law does not accord with this pair [of authorities].”*

III.14. A. *Said R. Hiyya b. Ashi said Rab, “An individual may set up an *erub* of boundaries on [the first] day [of a two day festival followed immediately by the Sabbath] for use on the second day by making a stipulation. [Only one of the two festival days is a true festival. The individual sets up the *erub* on each of the days, stipulating that his actions are to be deemed valid only on the day that is not a true festival.]*

- B. *Said Raba, “An individual may set up an *erub tabshilin* on [the first] day [of a two day festival] for the second, [which is followed immediately by the Sabbath], by making a stipulation.”*
- C. *[In the view of] the one, [Hiyya b. Ashi], who states [that this may be done in the case of] an *erub* for boundaries, all the more so may this be done in the case of an *erub tabshilin*.*
- D. *But the one, [Raba], who states [that this may be done in case of] an *erub tabshilin*, might [hold that] in the case of an *erub* of boundaries [this may] not [be done]. What is the reason?*
- F. *For [this authority may hold that] the individual is not permitted to acquire a Sabbath residence on [either of] the festival days. [This authority permits one to establish an *erub tabshilin*, by contrast, because it is needed properly to prepare for the Sabbath.]*

III.15. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. Y.T. 2:5, with variations]:*

- B. They do not bake food on the [first] festival day for use on the second.
- C. Actually they said:
- D. [On the first festival day] a woman may fill a pot with meat, even if she needs only one piece.
- E. [A baker] may fill a kettle with water, even if he needs only a single ladleful. [Rashi: At D and E no extra work is required to fill the pot or kettle.]
- F. But he who bakes should bake only what he needs. [This is because extra loaves must be kneaded individually.]
- G. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “A woman may fill up the oven with bread [for baking],
- H. “since bread bakes better when the oven is full.”
- I. Said Raba, “The decided law accords with R. Simeon b. Eleazar.”

III.16. A. *They asked them*, “[As for] one who did not set up an *erub tabshilin* —

- B. “is he forbidden [from baking for the Sabbath] and his flour forbidden [to be used by others, who did set up an *erub*]?”
- C. “Or perhaps he is forbidden [from baking for the Sabbath], while his flour is not forbidden [but may be prepared by others]?”
- D. *What is the practical difference [between the two possibilities]?*
- E. *[The difference is whether or not] he must cede ownership of his flour to others [so as to render it permitted for them to prepare it for the Sabbath]. If you say [as at B] that he is forbidden [from baking for the Sabbath] and that his flour is forbidden [to be used by others], then he must [actually] give up ownership of the flour in favor of others [in order for them to be able to use that flour for the Sabbath]. But if you say [as at C] that he is forbidden [from baking for the Sabbath] but that his flour is not forbidden [to be used], he does not need to cede ownership of his flour to others [in order for them to be able to use it for the Sabbath]. What [is the law, F or G]?*
- F. *Come and learn:*
- G. One who did not set up an *erub tabshilin*, lo, this one may not [on a festival day] bake, cook or put things aside [to be kept warm for the Sabbath].
- H. [He may do this] neither for himself nor for others;
- I. nor may others bake or cook for him.
- J. What should he do [so as to have food for the Sabbath]?
- K. He cedes ownership of his flour to others and they bake for him and cook for him.
- L. *Conclude from this that he is forbidden [from cooking for the Sabbath] and that his flour is forbidden [to be prepared by others for the Sabbath].*
- M. *So [we] conclude from this.*

III.17. A. *The question was raised:* “[If on a festival day] one transgressed and baked [food for the Sabbath, even though an *erub* had not been prepared], what [is the rule]?” [May the food be eaten on the Sabbath?]

- B. *Come and learn:*

- C. [As for] one who has not prepared an *erub tabshilin* — what should he do [so as to be able to eat on the Sabbath]?
- D. He cedes ownership of his flour to others, and they bake for him and cook for him.
- E. **[17B]** *Now, if it were permitted [for the individual who had not prepared an erub tabshilin to go ahead anyway and to cook for the Sabbath and eat what he prepared, D] should have taught* [simply that if one who had not prepared an *erub tabshilin*] transgressed and baked [food anyway], it is permitted [for him to go ahead and eat that food on the following day]. [Instead, D assumes that the individual must give away his flour and have others cook for him. It therefore appears that transgressing and cooking for himself is not an acceptable solution to his problem. He is forbidden to eat on the Sabbath that which he should not have prepared on the festival day in the first place.]
- F. *Said R. Adda b. Mattenah, “[The authority at D] taught a legal remedy [to the problem raised at C], but an illegal remedy he did not teach.”* [In answering C’s question, D’s authority would not suggest that the individual should purposely transgress and, on a festival day, prepare food for the Sabbath without the benefit of an *erub tabshilin*. But contrary to E, this does not necessarily mean that, in that authority’s view, if the individual did transgress and prepare the food, that he is forbidden to go ahead and eat that food on the Sabbath.]
- H. *Come and learn:*
- I. One who has prepared an *erub tabshilin*, lo, [on the festival day] he may bake, cook and set aside [food to be kept warm for the Sabbath].
- J. And if he wishes to eat that which he set aside as an *erub* he has the right [to do so].
- K. [If] he ate it before he had baked, before he had cooked, or before he had set aside [food to be kept warm for the Sabbath], lo, this one may not [on the festival day] bake, cook, or set aside [food to be kept warm for the Sabbath],
- L. either for himself or for others.
- M. And [in this situation] others may not bake or cook for him.
- N. **But he may prepare food for the festival itself, and if he leaves something over, he has left it over for the Sabbath [M. Bes. 2:1C].**
- O. But that is so only if he does not intentionally evade the law [by purposely cooking more than he needs for the festival day so that he will have food left over for the Sabbath].
- P. And if he intentionally evaded the law, it is forbidden [for him to eat on the Sabbath the extra food that he prepared on the festival day]. [By analogy to this rule, one who transgresses and, on a festival day, prepares food for the Sabbath may not, on the Sabbath, eat that which he has prepared.]
- Q. *Said R. Ashi, “Have you referred to intentional evasion of the law! You must say: A case of intentional evasion is different [from the case referred to at A, where the individual completely ignored the law by cooking on a festival for the following Sabbath]. For our rabbis were more strict in [rules concerning intentional evasion of the law] than in cases of deliberate transgression.”* [Rashi: One who evades the law through artifice believes that he is taking advantage of a loophole but is not transgressing. Such activity is dangerous to the legal system as

a whole, since it fosters disrespect for the law. One who is a sinner, by contrast, has no pretensions about honesty and therefore will not serve as an example to law-abiding Israelites. His case therefore may be treated less stringently. It thus is possible that, while one who evades the law is not permitted to benefit from his actions, one who transgresses may later make use of the fruits of his actions.]

- R. [The Shammaites are here shown to be more stringent than the Hillelites regarding the rules of the *erub tabshilin*. Nahman b. Isaac therefore concludes that the Shammaites stand behind the stringent rule.] *R. Nahman b. Isaac said, "This [rule that one who intentionally evades the law may not, on the Sabbath, eat the food he has prepared], is a teaching of Hananiah following the opinion of the House of Shammai.*
- S. *"For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- T. *"Hananiah says, 'The House of Shammai say, '[On a festival day] one may not bake [for the following Sabbath], unless he has prepared an erub with bread.*
- U. *"And one may not cook, unless he has prepared an erub with a cooked dish.*
- V. *"And one may not set aside [food to be kept warm for the Sabbath], unless, before the start of the festival, he had set aside hot foods [to be kept warm]."*
- W. *"But the House of Hillel say, 'One prepares an erub of any single cooked food and, in reliance upon it, does whatever he needs [so as to prepare for the Sabbath]."*
- X. *We learn in the Mishnah [M. Ter. 2:3]:*
- Y. **One who tithes his produce on the Sabbath —**
- Z. **[If he does so] unintentionally, he may eat [the food he has prepared].**
- AA. **[But if he does so] intentionally, he may not eat [the food].**
- BB. *[We might conclude that if, on a festival, an individual deliberately baked without an erub, he may not, on the immediately following Sabbath, eat that which he has prepared. This conclusion is now shown not to follow from the facts at hand.] That is different, since [there the individual] has other produce [that he can eat on the Sabbath]. [Prohibiting him from eating what he tithed on the Sabbath does not prevent him from eating altogether on that day. But prohibiting the individual from eating what he cooked on the festival will force him to go hungry on the Sabbath. Or, in light of this, it is possible that sages will in fact permit him to eat that food on the Sabbath.*
- CC. *Come and learn [M. Ter. 2:3]:*
- DD. **One who immerses [unclean] utensils on the Sabbath —**
- EE. **[If he does so] unintentionally, he may use them.**
- FF. **But [if he does so] intentionally, he may not use them.**
- GG. *[As at E, we might conclude from I that one who intentionally transgresses and cooks on a festival day may not, on the Sabbath, eat the food. This is shown not necessarily to be the case.] This [case, I] is different,⁵¹ since the individual has other dishes [that he can use]. [By contrast, in the case of the food cooked for the Sabbath, the individual has nothing else to eat. Sages may, therefore, permit him to eat that which he transgressed and prepared on the festival day.]*

- HH. *Also it is possible [for the individual to make do on the Sabbath] by borrowing [dishes].*
- II. *Come and learn:*
- JJ. One who cooks on the Sabbath —
- KK. [If he does so] unintentionally, he may eat [the food he has prepared].
- LL. But [if he does so] intentionally, he may not eat [the food].
- MM. [By analogy we would think that one who purposely transgresses festival law and cooks for the Sabbath may not eat that which he prepared.] The prohibition [against cooking] on the Sabbath is different. [Rashi: The prohibition against cooking on the Sabbath is biblical, such that strict treatment is required. But the prohibition against cooking on a festival for the Sabbath is rabbinic, such that sages may in fact permit one who transgresses this law to benefit from his actions. The question of whether or not they did so is not answered.]

III.1 A. The House of Shammai say, “[The erub tabshilin must be comprised of] two dishes.” [The House of Hillel say, “A single dish.” But they agree that a fish and the egg cooked on it constitute two dishes] [M. Bes. 2:1E-G].

- B. *Our Mishnah does not accord with [the version of] this Tannaite authority [cited in the following].*
- C. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. Y.T. 2:4]:*
- D. **Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel concur that there are to be two dishes.**
- E. **“Concerning what do they differ?**
- F. **“Concerning the case of a fish and the egg cooked on it.**
- G. **“For: The House of Shammai say, ‘They [need] two [separate] dishes, [and the fish and egg are deemed to be only one dish.]’**
- H. **“And the House of Hillel say, ‘[They need only] one dish [such as this one, which is comprised of two different foods].’**
- I. **“And they concur that if one beat up an egg on fish, or if he shreds a leek under a fish, that they constitute two dishes.”**
- J. *Said Raba, “The decided law follows our Tannaite authority [in the version found in the Mishnah], and it accords with the opinion of the House of Hillel, [that one dish is sufficient].”*

IV.1 A. [If] one ate [the erub tabshilin] or [if] it was lost, one should not in the first place cook [food for the Sabbath in reliance upon it] [M. Bes. 2:1H].

- B. Said Abbaye, “We have a tradition:
- C. “If he had begun [preparing] his dough when his *erub* was eaten, he may finish [the preparation of that dough].”

These units do not offer a running-exegesis of each of Mishnah’s statements, such as is familiar from the preceding discussions (and is found as well through the rest of the tractate). Rather, these units take up a thematic concern — the *erub tabshilin* — and discuss each of its constituent issues, without reference to the specific content or organization of the Mishnaic pericope. The Talmudic materials are in three main sections: Scriptural sources, procedures, and anomalies. The

majority of the Talmudic discussion of M. Bes. 2:1 legislates for cases in which the individual does not properly prepare an *erub* before the beginning of the festival-Sabbath sequence. These materials concern whether or not, on the festival itself, one may set up either an *erub tabshilin* or an *erub* of boundaries, and give rules for preparing food on the first day of the festival for the second. The latter issue is an obvious corollary to the larger question of what food preparation is permitted on a festival day. The Talmud then turns to a central theoretical problem concerning the metaphysical effects of a person's actions. One who does not set up an *erub* may not cook for the Sabbath. What, however, of his uncooked foods? May others prepare these for him, or, because of the individual's actions, have they too become forbidden for the Sabbath? Along these same lines, the Talmud considers the problem of an individual who goes ahead and, without having set up an *erub*, prepares food for the Sabbath. May he benefit from his transgression and consume that which he has prepared? The issue remains in the realm of theory, for while many examples are adduced in which people are not allowed to benefit from a transgression, each example is shown to be unlike the case at hand. The unit labeled D in the outline given in Chapter Six concerns the liturgical formulas used on a festival that coincides with the Sabbath, interrupt the otherwise logical redaction of the preceding materials. Perhaps the compositions are found here because they too deal with ambiguous situations. But this explanation is tentative and does not account for these units' specific placement.

2:2-3

2:2

- A. [If the festival day] coincided with the day after the Sabbath, [that is, Sunday],
- B. the House of Shammai say, "They immerse everything before the Sabbath, [so as not to perform a purification rite on a holy day].
- C. And the House of Hillel say, "Utensils [are to be immersed] before the Sabbath,
- D. "but man [may immerse] on the Sabbath [itself, as a mode of Sabbath-enjoyment]."

2:3

- A. And they concur that they effect surface contact between water [that is unclean], contained in a stone utensil, [which is insusceptible to uncleanness, with the water of an immersion pool] in order to render [the unclean water] clean.
- B. But they do not immerse [unclean water in an unclean utensil that contains it, since this will have the effect of purifying the unclean utensil, which is forbidden on the holy day].
- C. And [on a festival day] they immerse [utensils if they are to be changed] from one use to another use, [since such immersion has nothing to do with the removal of uncleanness],

D. or [at Passover] from one association [of individuals joined to make use of a single Passover-lamb] to another [such] association.

I.1 A. [If the festival day coincided with the day after the Sabbath, [that is, Sunday], the House of Shammai say, “They immerse everything before the Sabbath, [so as not to perform a purification rite on a holy day]. And the House of Hillel say, “Utensils [re to be immersed before the Sabbath:”] Now, all concur that, on the Sabbath, a utensil may not [be immersed so as to be purified]. What is the reason [that such purification is forbidden on the Sabbath]?

C. Said Rabbah, “It is a preventative measure, **[18A]** lest someone takes [an unclean utensil] and, [to bring it to an immersion pool], carries it four cubits in public domain, [which is forbidden on the Sabbath].”

D. Said to him Abbaye, “[If] he has a pit [used as an immersion pool] in his courtyard, *what can you say?*” *[In this case, carrying in the public domain is not a concern.]*

E. [Rabbah] said to him, “[Prohibiting him from using] a pit in his courtyard is a preventative measure on account of [the possibility that one will come to err and will make use of] a pit in public domain.”

F. *[Rabbah’s explanation is] well and good with respect to the Sabbath, [on which carrying in public domain is prohibited].*

G. *[But] with respect to a festival day, [on which carrying is permitted], what can you say [to explain why it is prohibited to purify a utensil on it]?*

H. [The answer is that] they instituted a preventative measure [prohibiting purification on] the festival day on account of the [prohibition against purifying utensils on the] Sabbath.

I. *But do we [indeed] enact a preventative measure [so as to protect a law that is itself simply a preventative measure]?*

J. [Five attempts now are made to prove I’s contention, that we do not enact such preventative measures. Each attempt fails.] [As proof that we do not enact such measures], *surely we have learned in the Mishnah [M. Bes. 2:3A-B]:*

K. And they concur that they effect surface contact between water [that is unclean], contained in a stone utensil, [which is insusceptible to uncleanness, with water in an immersion pool] in order to render [the unclean water] clean.

L. But they do not immerse [unclean water in an unclean utensil that contains it].

M. *Now if this is so, [as H suggests, that we commonly institute preventative measures], let us enact a preventative measure against effecting surface contact, [as at K], on account of [the possibility that someone will come to transgress by] immersing [unclean water in an unclean utensil, as at L]!*

N. *[The Talmud explains why, in the specific case of K, a preventative measure was not enacted.] Is it logical, [to expect a preventative measure to be enacted in the case at hand]?*

O. *If he has [much] good water [for drinking], why effect surface contact so as [to purify] this [small amount of water that has become unclean]?*

- P. *Rather, [M. **Bes. 2:3** must refer to a case in which] he does not have [much clean water at all], and since he does not have [much clean water], he is very careful with [that which he does have]. [For the reason given at P, an individual rarely needs to purify drinking water. It is unlikely that occasional immersion of unclean water will lead people to err and perform other, prohibited, acts of purification. Contrary to J, the fact that no preventative measure is enacted in this case therefore does not prove that such preventative measures are not, where needed, employed. The conclusion of H stands.]*
- Q. *[A second attempt is made to substantiate I's challenge to H.] [Abbaye] objected [to H]:*
- R. *"[On a festival day] they may draw water in an unclean bucket, and [as a result the bucket] is [rendered] clean. [This is permitted because the individual's purpose is drawing water, not purifying the bucket. In this case we do not take account of the secondary effect of his actions.]*
- S. *"Now if it is so, [as H claims, that we commonly enact preventative measures], let us enact a preventative measure [against immersing the bucket while one fills it], lest one winds up [on a different occasion] immersing [the unclean bucket] by itself, [without intending to fill it at all]!"*
- T. *[S is unacceptable.] That case [at R] is different [from the one at H and, contrary to S, can lead to no wrong action].*
- U. *Since they permitted him only [to purify the bucket] through the act of drawing water, he will remember [that, on the festival day, it is forbidden to immerse the bucket simply for purposes of purification]. [For this reason, no preventative measure is needed in this particular case. But I's supposition, that such measures never are enacted, remains unproven. H stands.]*
- V. *The following again attempts to support I's challenge to H.] [Abbaye] objected:*
- W. *"[As for] a utensil that was rendered unclean before the eve of the festival, they do not immerse it on the festival day itself.*
- X. *"[If it became unclean] on the festival day, they do immerse it on that [same] festival day.*
- Y. *"Now if it is the case [as H claims, that we enact preventative measures so as to protect a different law], let us enact a prohibition [against immersing the utensil that become unclean] on the festival itself on account of [the possibility that someone may come to believe that it even is permitted to immerse a utensil that become unclean] prior to the eve of the festival!"*
- Z. *[The flaw in Y's reasoning is exposed.] [A utensil's] becoming unclean on a festival day is not a common occurrence,*
- AA. *and rabbis did not enact preventative measures in cases of occurrences that are not common.*
- BB. *[Offering a different case in support of I, Abbaye] objected [see T. **Y.T. 2:9**]:*
- CC. **"A utensil made unclean by a Father of Uncleanness — they do not immerse it on a festival day [see M. **Bes. 2:3B-C**].**
- DD. **"[If it was made unclean] by an Offspring of Uncleanness, they do immerse it on the festival day.**

- EE. *“Now if it is the case [as H claims, that preventative measures are enacted to protect different laws], then let us enact a preventative measure prohibiting this [act of immersing utensils rendered unclean by an Offspring of Uncleanness] on account of [the possibility that someone will come to disregard] this [other prohibition, against immersing that which was rendered unclean by a Father of Uncleanness]!”*
- FF. *[As for utensils rendered unclean] by an Offspring of Uncleanness — in what circumstance are these found [to be a concern at all]?*
- GG. *[They are a concern] only for priests. [Priests eat consecrated foods, which alone are made unclean by utensils rendered impure by an Offspring of Uncleanness. For common Israelites, such utensils are not a concern at all.]*
- HH. *[Yet] priests are careful [not to allow their utensils to be rendered unclean by an Offspring of Uncleanness]. [DD describes a rare occurrence. As AA explains, preventative measures are not enacted in the case of such rare occurrences. But, contrary to I, this does not prove that, in other cases, preventative measures are not used. H’s conclusion therefore stands.]*
- II. *[Another attempt to support I’s challenge to H is made.] Come and learn:*
- JJ. *For said R. Hiyya b. Ashi said Rab, “A menstruating woman who [on a festival day] has no ritually clean clothes [to put on after her own immersion (permitted by the Hillelites, M. **Bes. 2:3D**)] may evade the law [against immersing clothing on the festival] by immersing [herself] while wearing her clothes.”*
- KK. *But if this is the case, [H, that we enact preventative measures], let us enact a preventative measure [prohibiting her from immersing in her clothing], lest she come to immerse [the clothes] by themselves!*
- LL. *That case is different.*
- MM. *Since she was permitted [to purify the clothes] only by wearing them [when she immerses herself], she will remember [that she may not immerse the clothes by themselves]. [No preventative measure is needed, since the woman does not become used to immersing her clothes alone on a festival day or Sabbath. This is different from the case of immersing a utensil. For being permitted to immerse a utensil on a festival day may well lead the individual to believe that he is permitted to perform exactly the same action on the Sabbath. This final challenge to H thus fails.]*
- I.2.** A. *[A new answer is given to the question of why, on a Sabbath or festival, immersing utensils — and clothing — is forbidden.] R. Joseph said, “It is a preventative measure on account of [the possibility that the one who has immersed the clothes will] wring [them].”*
- B. *Said to him Abbaye, “[That explanation] makes sense for the case of clothes, which can be wrung.*
- C. *“But [as for] utensils, which cannot be wrung, what can you say [to explain why they may not be immersed on a Sabbath or festival]?”*
- D. *[Joseph] said to him, “[The prohibition against immersing] these [utensils] is a preventative measure enacted to protect [the prohibition against immersing] these [items of clothing].”*

- E. *[Abbayye] objected [to D's reasoning] using all of these objections [cited in the preceding unit].*
- F. *But [Joseph] responded just as we responded [in the preceding unit].*
- I.3.** A. [Offering yet another explanation for why it is forbidden to immerse utensils on the Sabbath or festival day], R. Bibi said, "This is a preventative measure, lest [knowing that he can immerse the utensils on the festival] one waits [and does not do so early enough]." [By insisting that the individual immerse the utensils before the start of the Sabbath-festival sequence, the Houses, M. **Bes. 2:2**, assure that the individual will have clean dishes for the holy days.]
- B. *A Tannaite teaching accords with [the perspective of] R. Bibi:*
- C. [As for] a utensil that was rendered unclean before the eve of the festival
—
D. they do not [wait to] immerse it on the festival,
E. [as a] preventative measure, lest the individual delays [and immerses it only after he has used it in its unclean state].
- I.4.** A. Raba said, "[One may not immerse utensils on a Sabbath or festival], because this looks like an act of repairing the utensil, [which is forbidden on the holy day]."
- B. *If this is the reason, [it] likewise [should be forbidden for] a person [himself to immerse on a festival day, contrary to the Hillelites' position, M. **Bes. 2:2D**].* [By immersing, people purify themselves so as to be permitted to eat consecrated food. This is an act of repair similar to that undergone by the utensil.]
- C. *[The rule for people is different, since, in immersing], it looks like the person simply is cooling himself.*
- D. *This [reasoning, C] is acceptable for the case of [a person immersing in] clean water, [in which one may indeed wish simply to bathe].*
- E. *But [for the case of immersion in] dirty water, what can you say [to explain why one should be permitted to immerse in such water on a Sabbath or festival]?*
- F. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, "Sometimes a man comes [home] **[18B]** in very hot weather, and, [to cool off], he even bathes in [dirty] water, used for soaking [linen]." [No matter in what kind of water the individual immerses, it therefore looks as though he simply is cooling himself.]
- G. This [reasoning, F] is acceptable for the case of [immersion during] the summer, [when the person may indeed wish to cool off].
- H. [But during] the rainy [winter] season, [when it is cold and people do not bathe to cool off], what can you say [to explain why the individual is permitted to immerse on a Sabbath or festival]?
- I. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, "Sometimes a man returns from the field, filthy with mud and excrement, such that he bathes even during the rainy season." [Because the act of immersion looks simply like bathing, the individual is permitted to immerse on a Sabbath or festival.]
- J. *This [reasoning, I] is acceptable for [the case of immersion on] the Sabbath, [when washing is permitted].*
- K. *[But regarding] the Day of Atonement, [on which washing is forbidden], what can you say [to explain why it should be permitted to immerse on that day]?*

- L. [Raba answers K's question by showing that, by analogy to the law for the Sabbath, ritual immersion is permitted on the Day of Atonement.] *Said Raba, "Is there any [action] which, on the Sabbath, is [not deemed to be in the category of work, such that it is] permitted, but which, on the Day of Atonement, is [considered work so as to be] forbidden? [No, there is not. That which is not work, so as to be permitted on the Sabbath, likewise is permitted on the Day of Atonement.]*
- M. *"Since on the Sabbath [immersing] is permitted, [therefore] on the Day of Atonement it likewise is permitted."*
- N. *[But does Raba really accept [an argument phrased] "Since... [therefore]..."?*
- O. *But [to the contrary] we have learned in the Mishnah [M. Shab. 14:4]:*
- P. **One who has a toothache may not, [on the Sabbath], suck vinegar through [his teeth, as a medication].**
- Q. **But he may dip [his bread in vinegar and eat it] in his usual manner, and if [as a result] he is healed, he is healed, [but is not culpable for using a medication on the Sabbath].**
- R. *Now, we can point out a contradictory passage:*
- S. [On the Sabbath, one who has a toothache] may not suck [vinegar through his teeth] and [then] spit it out.
- T. But, [contrary to M. Shab. 14:4, cited at P], he may suck [vinegar through his teeth] and then swallow it.
- U. *[Solving the apparent contradiction] said Abbaye, "When we learned the Mishnaic passage [cited above at P], we learned it too to state [that, on the Sabbath, one may not] suck [vinegar through his teeth] and [then] spit it out, [but that one may suck the vinegar and then swallow it]."*
- V. *But [solving the contradiction in a different way], Raba said, "You may even state [that Mishnah's rule, P, is correctly phrased, forbidding one even to] suck [vinegar through his teeth] and swallow it.*
- W. *"But this is not contradictory [to the rule at V, which states that one may do so].*
- X. *"This [rule, V, which permits one to suck and then swallow vinegar, applies] before [one has] dipped [bread in the vinegar]. [In this case the individual is considered to drink the vinegar as the start of his meal, as an aperitif. This use of vinegar is permitted on the Sabbath, since it does not treat the vinegar as a medication.]*
- Y. *"[But] this [rule, P, which prohibits sucking and swallowing vinegar, applies] after one has dipped [his bread in the vinegar]." [The individual no longer would drink vinegar as part of his meal. He intends the vinegar only as a medication, a use prohibited on the Sabbath.]*
- Z. *[The point introduced by N now is made.] Now, if [Raba] really accepts [an argument phrased, "Since... therefore..."], we should state [in his name], "Since prior to dipping [his bread in vinegar] one is permitted [to suck vinegar and swallow it, therefore] after [he has] dipped [his bread in vinegar] he likewise is permitted [to suck vinegar and swallow, contrary to what M. Shab. 14:4 states]."*
[In the case at hand, Raba does not use a "Since... therefore..." argument.

Accordingly we assume that Raba never uses such arguments. Contrary to L-M, therefore, he does not permit immersion on the Day of Atonement.]

- AA. *[Perhaps] Raba retracted this statement [cited in his name at V-Y]. [If Raba reverted to Abbaye's position, that according to both sources one always may suck and then swallow vinegar, the contention of Z would fall. For in this case it would appear that Raba does apply a "Since... therefore..." argument, so as to permit sucking and swallowing vinegar at all points in a meal. If this is the case, we also may assume that Raba applies such an argument for the case of immersion on the Day of Atonement.]*
- BB. *[AA's resolution of the matter is not necessarily correct.] But how do we know that he retracted this [view, concerning the sucking and swallowing of vinegar]?*
- CC. *Perhaps he retracted this [other view, regarding immersion on the Day of Atonement]?*
- DD. *[Final proof is offered that Raba indeed holds that one may immerse on the Day of Atonement.] Let this [possibility, raised at CC] not enter your mind!*
- EE. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- FF. Anyone who requires immersion may immerse in the usual way,
- GG. both on the ninth of Ab and the Day of Atonement. [The original contention of this unit thus stands, that the Hillelites permit people to immerse on holy days because doing so is like taking a bath. As Raba argues, this applies even on the Day of Atonement.]

II.1 A. And [the Houses] concur that they effect surface contact between water [that is unclean], contained in a stone utensil, [which is insusceptible to uncleanness, with the water of an immersion pool in order to render the unclean water clean] [M. Bes. 2:3A].

- B. *What [is the meaning of the continuation of the cited passage, which reads]: **But they do not immerse [unclean water in an unclean utensil that contains it]**?*
- C. Said Samuel, "[It means that] on a festival day they do not immerse an [unclean] utensil along with the water it contains in order to purify it [that is, the utensil]."

II.2. A. Who [is the authority behind] this Mishnaic passage, [M. Bes. 2:3A-B, cited in the preceding unit]?

- B. *It is not Rabbi [Judah the Patriarch] and not [the anonymous] rabbis [cited in the following passage].*
- C. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. Y.T. 2:9]:*
- D. **"[On a festival day] they do not immerse a utensil along with the water it contains in order to purify it [that is, the utensil].**
- E. **"And they do not [even] effect surface contact [with the water of an immersion pool] in a stone utensil, [which is insusceptible to uncleanness, vs. M. Bes. 2:3A]" — the words of Rabbi.**
- F. **But sages say, "They do immerse a utensil with the [unclean] water it contains in order to purify [the utensil] [vs. M. Bes. 2:3B].**
- G. **"And they do effect surface contact of [unclean] water in a stone utensil in order to purify it [that is, the water]."**
- H. *Now who [is the authority behind M. Bes. 2:3A-B]?*

- I. *If it is Rabbi, there is a difficulty [explaining his ruling, E] concerning the effecting of surface contact, [which he prohibits, but M. **Bes. 2:3A** permits].*
- J. *If it is rabbis, there is a difficulty [explaining their ruling, F] concerning immersion, [which they permit, but M. **Bes. 2:3B** prohibits].*
- K. *If you wish I can argue [that the authority behind M. **Bes. 2:3A-B** is] Rabbi.*
- L. *[And] if you wish I can argue that [it is] rabbis.*
- M. *If you wish I can argue [as follows] that it is Rabbi:*
- N. *In the first clause of the Tannaite statement, [D, Rabbi refers to] a festival day. [Rashi: On a festival he does not permit immersing an unclean utensil but *does* permit effecting surface contact in a stone utensil.]*
- O. *While in the second clause [of the Tannaite statement, E, which prohibits even effecting surface contact, he refers to] the Sabbath. [But, as we deduced at N, he does permit effecting surface contact on a festival day.]*
- P. *But in Mishnah's rule [at M. **Bes. 2:3A-B** he refers] exclusively to the festival day. [In those rules, just as explained at N-O, Rabbi permits effecting surface contact on a festival but prohibits immersing unclean utensils.]*
- Q. **[19A]** *And if you wish, I can argue that [the authority behind M. **Bes. 2:3A-B**] is rabbis,*
- R. *and the whole of the Mishnaic passage deals with the Sabbath. [Rashi: Sages, F, refer to a feast day, on which they permit immersing a vessel to purify it. But they do not allow this on the Sabbath. At G they refer to the Sabbath, permitting one to effect surface contact on that day. Both rules at M. **Bes. 2:3A-B** refer to the Sabbath, and, like the position of sages, forbid one, on that day, to immerse a utensil to purify it, but allow one to effect surface contact so as to purify water contained in a stone utensil.]*

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

- B. *[As for] a utensil that was rendered unclean before the eve of a festival — they do not immerse it at twilight [on the eve of the festival day]. [Twilight is an ambiguous period, during which it is not clear whether or not the festival already has begun. A utensil may not be immersed during this period, lest it in fact already is the festival. We recall that both Houses, M. **Bes. 2:2**, hold that, on a festival, one may not immerse utensils.]*
- C. R. Simeon Shezuri says, “Even on a regular weekday [that does not precede a festival] they do not immerse [a utensil at twilight], since it must await the setting of the sun, [which signifies the completion of its process of purification].” [After a utensil is immersed, it remains unclean until the sun has set (Lev. 11:32). An individual who immerses a utensil at twilight apparently desires to use it immediately thereafter, since the sun already is setting. But in point of fact, the sun may already have set, such that this utensil actually remains unclean until sunset on the following day. To avoid the potential use of a utensil the purification of which is not complete, Simeon Shezuri states that we do not allow one to immerse utensils at twilight altogether.]
- D. *[In line with C, it is clear that in no case should an individual immerse a utensil at twilight. Why, then, does the authority at B only say that doing so is forbidden on the eve of a festival. This implies that he permits immersing utensils at*

twilight on regular weekdays. How can he permit this?] Does the first cited authority, [at B], not require [one to wait for] the setting of the sun [before making use of a utensil he has immersed]?! [Certainly he does, since this requirement is scriptural. How, then, do we explain the fact that he permits one to go ahead and immerse a utensil at twilight?]

- E. Two explanations are offered, E-I and J-N. The point of each of them is roughly the same. The authority at B permits one to immerse a utensil at twilight because he assumes that the individual who does so knows that the utensil may not be used until after sunset on the following day. The authority at C, by contrast, assumes that the individual does not know the law and will go ahead and use the utensil right away, wrongly thinking that its purification is complete as soon as it becomes dark on that same day.] *Said Raba, "I came upon the rabbinic [disciples] in the academy of Rab,⁶⁹ who sat and said, '[The authorities at A and B] differ concerning whether or not the individual's actions indicate his intentions.*
- F. *"How so for a particular case?*
- G. *"For instance, if someone took a utensil in his hand and went running [close to] twilight to immerse it —*
- H. *"The master [who stands behind B] reasons that, insofar as this individual is running, he certainly knows that [after immersion, the utensil still] must await the setting of the sun [before being deemed completely clean].* [The individual is running so as to immerse the utensil before twilight. If he does not succeed in immersing it early enough, we can be certain that he will wait until sunset on the following day before making use of the utensil he has immersed. B's authority therefore sees no reason to prohibit this individual's immersing of the utensil at twilight.]
- I. *"But the [other] authority, [at C], reasons that the individual is running simply because of his work, [to which he is in a hurry to return].'* [His actions thus do not inform us of his intention to immerse the utensil before twilight. We assume that, not knowing the law, this individual would go ahead and immerse the utensil at twilight and make use of it immediately thereafter. To prevent this, C's authority prohibits immersion at twilight altogether.]
- J. *"Therefore I said to them: All concur that one's intentions can be recognized from his actions. [In the circumstances described at G-I, both authorities therefore would agree that the individual knows that, to use the utensil that evening, he must immerse it before twilight. If he does not succeed in doing this, he will wait to use the utensil until the following evening. In both authorities' views, there is no reason to stop such an individual from carrying out the immersion.]*
- K. *"[The circumstance] concerning which they disagree is one, for instance, in which [on a previous occasion the individual had a utensil that] came into contact with less than a lentil's bulk [of a dead crawling insect], and he had come before the rabbis to ask whether or not [this contact] with less than a lentil's bulk [of dead crawling insect] rendered the utensil unclean.*
- L. *"The master [at C] reasons that, since he did not know this [simple] fact [of law], he also does not know that, [after immersion at twilight, utensils still] must [await] the setting of the sun [on the following day]. [The authority at C therefore does not permit the individual to immerse the utensil at twilight.]*

- M. *“But [this] master, [at B], reasons that the individual only does not know this [rule, concerning the minimum quantity in which a dead insect imparts uncleanness]. But he does know [that utensils immersed at twilight still must await] the setting of the sun [on the following day, which marks the completion of their purification].” [Since B’s authority assumes that the individual knows this, he permits him to immerse a utensil at twilight.]*

III.1 A. And [on a festival day] they immerse [utensils if they are to be changed] from one use to another [M. Bes. 2:3C].

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. Y.T. 2:7]:*
 C. **How so from one use to another ?**
 D. **One who wishes to use in his olive press [a utensil he already has purified for use] at his wine press, or [who wishes to use] at his wine press [a utensil he already has immersed] for [use in] his olive press may do so.** [The change from press to press does not obligate the individual to re-immerses the utensil. If he wishes anyway to immerse it again, he may do so even on a festival day, since this second immersion does not comprise a purification rite.]

III.2. A. How so “from one association to another association” [M. Bes. 2:3D]?

- B. If he had [immersed his utensil with the intention of] eating [the Passover-lamb] with this [particular] association [of individuals gathered for that purpose], but [changed his mind] and desires to eat with a different association, he has that right. [And, should he desire to do so, he even may re-immerses the utensil on the festival day itself. It already is clean, so that the second immersion does not constitute a rite of purification at all.]

The Talmud discusses each of M. Bes. 2:2-3’s points. The Houses, M. Bes. 2:2, agree that utensils may not be immersed on a Sabbath or festival. Discussion of the reason for this, units I:1-3 include a long, secondary, consideration of the types of cases in which preventative measures are enacted. Unit I:4 completes the discussion of M. II:1, 2 examine M. Bes. 2:3A-B and indicate, on the basis of T., which Tannaite authority stands behind M.’s formulation of the Houses’ opinions. II:3 completes the discussion of the first part of this pericope, providing the rule for a case of ambiguity, immersing utensils at twilight. The continuation of the line-by-line explanation of M. is at units III:1, 2, which interpret in turn M. Bes. 2:3C and D.

2:4

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

- I.1 A.** Said Ulla, “The dispute [between the Houses, M. Bes 2:4] concerns [only whether or not it is permitted] to lay hands on a festival peace-offering [= M. Bes. 2:4A vs. E],

- B. “and [whether or not it is permitted] to offer a pilgrimage whole-offering [= M. **Bes. 2:4B** vs. D].
- C. *“For the House of Shammai reason, ‘[In reference to Tabernacles, Lev. 23:41 states], ‘You shall keep [Heb. root: HG] it as a feast [root: HG] to the Lord [seven days in the year].’*
- D. “‘[This implies that] a festival [root: HG] [peace-offering] one may [bring],
- E. “‘but a pilgrimage whole-offering [one] may not [bring].’
- F. *“But the House of Hillel reason, ‘[The cited passage states that you shall keep it as a feast], ‘to the Lord.’*
- G. “‘[This means that] any [sacrifice offered] ‘to the Lord’ [may be brought on a festival day].’
- H. “But [as for] vow and freewill-offerings, all agree that these may not be offered on a festival day, [since they are not particular to the festival at all].”
- I. And thus said R. Adda b. Ahbah, “Vow and freewill-offerings they do not offer on a festival day.”
- J. *There was an objection:*
- K. Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not disagree concerning a whole-offering unrelated to [the celebration of] the festival [e.g., a freewill-offering], that it may not be offered on the festival day. [This is as at H-I. The reason, as before, is that the offering may be brought on any other day. Further, it provides no meat for the one who brings or offers it, such that its being offered does not constitute the preparation of food.]
- L. “[And they did not disagree] concerning festival peace-offerings, that they are offered on the festival day. [This is as at A and M. **Bes. 2:4A** and C. These offerings are specific to the festival and also provide food for the one who brings them. The Houses only dispute whether or not one may lay hands on such offerings.]
- M. “Concerning what did they disagree?
- N. “Concerning [whether or not one may offer] a whole-offering that is for the festival,
- O. “or a peace-offering that is not for the festival. [These offerings are ambiguous. The whole-offering, N, is pertinent to the festival, but provides no food. The peace-offering provides food, but is not brought on account of the festival. Both offerings may be offered at other times altogether.]
- P. “For the House of Shammai say, ‘One may not bring [either of these offerings].’ [This is as above, E and H.]
- Q. “While the House of Hillel say, ‘One may bring [them].’” [This report of the Hillelite’s position contradicts that of Ulla, who says, H, that neither House permits the offering of a whole- or peace-offering that is not for the festival.]
- R. *Solve the problem [of the contradiction between the Tannaite version, K-O, and Ulla’s rendition, A-H] by [revising K-O and] saying:*
- S. *Thus* said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not disagree concerning a whole-offering or peace-offering that is not for the festival, that they may not offer it on a festival day. [This is as Ulla reports, H.]

- T. “[Nor did they disagree] concerning a festival peace-offering, that they may offer it on a festival day, [as in Ulla’s view, D and G].
- U. “Concerning what did they disagree?
- V. “Concerning a festival whole-offering.
- W. “For the House of Shammai say, ‘They may not bring [it].’ [This is as in Ulla’s version, E.]
- X. “But the House of Hillel say, ‘They may bring [it].’ [This is as in Ulla’s version, G.]
- Y. *R. Joseph said, “You have considered [and forced into correlation] unrelated Tannaite teachings.*
- Z. *“[In fact] this [matter] is [subject to dispute among] Tannaite authorities. [Ulla’s version too is based on a Tannaite teaching, as follows.]*
- AA. *“For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- BB. “Peace offerings that are brought on the festival day [to be offered] on account of the festival —
- CC. “The House of Shammai say, ‘One lays hands on them before the eve of the festival and slaughters them on the festival [itself].’
- DD. “But the House of Hillel say, ‘One may lay hands on them on the festival day and slaughter them on the festival day.’
- EE. **[19B]** “But [as for] vow and freewill-offerings, all concur that these may not be offered on a festival day.”

I.2. A. *And these [following] Tannaite authorities [dispute the rule for the vow and freewill-offering] just as do these Tannaite authorities [cited in unit I].*

- B. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. Hag. 1:6]:*
- C. **They do not bring a thank-offering, [which is a freewill peace-offering], on the festival of unleavened bread because of the leaven that accompanies it.** [See Lev. 7:12-15.]
- D. **Nor [do they bring this offering] on Pentecost, because it is a festival day.** [As we shall see below, this is comparable to the Tannaite view recorded at unit I.H and EE.]
- E. **But a person may bring his thank-offering on the festival of Tabernacles.**
- F. **R. Simeon says,** “Lo, [Deu. 16:16] says, ‘Three times shall all your males appear before the Lord your God at the place which he will choose’: at the festival of unleavened bread, at the festival of Pentecost and at the festival of Tabernacles.’
- G. **“[This means that] whatever may be brought on the festival of unleavened bread may [also] be brought on the festival of Pentecost and the festival of Tabernacles.**
- H. **“But all that may not be brought on the festival of unleavened bread may not be brought on the festival of Pentecost or the festival of Tabernacles.”**
- I. **R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says,** “A person may bring his thank offering on the festival of Tabernacles and thereby fulfill his obligation on the count of [a peace-offering of] rejoicing. [This is the same as Simeon b. Eleazar’s view of the Hillelite position, unit I.Q. See below, DD-HH.]

- J. **“But he does not thereby fulfill his obligation on the count of a festival offering, [which he will need to bring in addition, in the form of an animal he had not previously obligated himself to bring for a different purpose].”**
- K. [A running-commentary to T. **Hag. 1:6** now ensues. In the course of this explanation, the Tannaite dispute referred to at A, which I pointed out above at D vs. I, is specified.] Said a master, **“They do not bring a thank-offering, [which is a freewill-offering], on the festival of unleavened bread because of the leaven that accompanies it.**
- L. *This is obvious [and need not have been taught at all]!*
- M. *[Explaining why the teaching is needed] said R. Adda the son of R. Isaac, and some say R. Samuel b. Abba, “Here [in the rule cited at K] we deal with [the bringing of a thank-offering on] the fourteenth [of Nisan, the day before the start of the festival of unleavened bread]; now [the authority behind K’s rule] reasons, ‘They do not bring holy things to the place of disqualification.’” [Since the festival of unleavened bread has not yet begun, offering this sacrifice should be permitted. The bread that accompanies it, however, will not all be eaten by the time the restrictions of the festival begin to apply. That bread therefore will have to be disposed of by burning. To prevent this, the sacrifice is not permitted on that day at all. Had K’s rule not been taught, we would not have known this.]*
- N. **Nor [do they bring this offering] on Pentecost, because it is a festival day.**
- O. *[This authority] holds that vow and freewill-offerings may not be offered on a festival day. [This is one of the disputing views referred to above at A. It is the same as is reported by Ulla, unit I.H, and found in the Tannaite statement, unit I.EE.]*
- P. **But a person may bring his thank-offering on the festival of Tabernacles.**
- Q. *When [during Tabernacles may he bring this offering]?*
- R. *If you wish to say it means [that he may bring it] on the festival day itself, [this cannot be the case, since] to the contrary, you have said: **Nor [do they] bring this offering on Pentecost, because it is a festival.** [It thus is clear that this authority does not allow such an offering to be brought on the festival day itself.]*
- S. *Rather, [the point is that the individual may bring it] on an intermediate day [of Tabernacles, which is not comparable to a festival day].*
- T. **R. Simeon says, “Lo, [Deu. 16:16] says, ‘[Three times shall all your males appear before the Lord your God at the place which he will choose]: at the festival of unleavened bread, at the festival of Pentecost and at the festival of Tabernacles.’**
- U. **“[This means that] whatever may be brought on the festival of unleavened bread may [also] be brought on the festival of Pentecost and the festival of Tabernacles.**
- V. **“But all that may not be brought on the festival of unleavened bread may not be brought on the festival of Pentecost or the festival of Tabernacles.”**
- W. *[The following assumes that Simeon’s statement prohibits the bringing of these offerings even on the intermediate days of the festival.] R. Zira raised a problem concerning this [rule], “If, according to R. Simeon, [on*

an intermediate day of a festival] we are permitted even to gather firewood, can there be a question [but that on such days we are permitted to bring] vow and freewill-offerings?"

- X. *Said Abbaye, "Concerning the offering [of these things] all [indeed] concur, [that one may do so on the intermediate days of the festival]."*
- Y. *"What they dispute is when one is subject [in these offerings' regard] to [Deu. 23:21's injunction], '[When you make a vow to the Lord], you shall not delay [paying it].'*
- Z. *"The first [cited] authority, [C-E], reasons, 'The merciful said [Deu. 23:14], 'Three festivals [in the year you shall keep to me].'*
- AA. *"[This means that one has transgressed the restriction against delaying the payment of one's vows when the three festivals have passed] out of order, [that is, counting a full year from the festival closest to when the vow was made, not from Passover, the first festival in the year]."*
- BB. *"But R. Simeon reasoned, '[The restriction against delaying is transgressed at the end of the three yearly festivals] in their [proper] sequence;*
- CC. *"[but] not [when they have passed] not in their [proper] sequence.'" [Paraphrasing Rashi, Ginsberg, p. 101, note 1, explains: "If the vow to bring the thank-offering is made before Tabernacles, the first Tannaite authority counsels the vower to bring it at the immediately following Feast of Tabernacles. Because, according to him, the three Festivals just mentioned need not be in order of sequence commencing with Passover. Therefore unless he brings it on the immediately following Tabernacles he will have to make a special journey to Jerusalem to offer it, since he cannot bring it either on Passover or the Pentecost, whilst he must not delay beyond them. R. Simeon, however, maintains that he transgresses only if three festivals, taken in order of sequence starting from Passover, pass without his fulfilling the vow. Hence, this is what he means: Whatever comes 'on the Feast of Unleavened Bread,' i.e., whatever was vowed before the Feast of Passover, so that there already was an obligation by Passover, must be brought either at Pentecost or Tabernacles immediately following: but 'Whatever does not come on the Feast of Unleavened bread,' i.e., if there was no obligation then, as he vowed after Passover, need not be brought on the immediately following Festivals of Pentecost or Tabernacles, since he will still have till the Tabernacles of the following year without transgressing the prohibition of 'delaying'"]*

DD. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "A person may bring his thank offering on the festival of Tabernacles."

- EE. *When [in Eleazar b. Simeon's view may he bring it]?*
- FF. *If you say [he means] on the intermediate days of the festival, then [his opinion] is the same as that of the first cited authority, [E, explained at P-S, who permits one to bring such an offering on the intermediate days of the festival].*
- GG. *Therefore [it is clear that Eleazar b. Simeon holds the opposite, that one may bring it] on the festival day [itself],*

- HH. *for he reasons that vow and freewill-offerings are offered on a festival day.*
[= Simeon b. Eleazar, unit I.Q.]
- II. [Eleazar b. Simeon's statement, DD, now is read in light of Y-CC.] *And what is special about Tabernacles, such that he chose [to teach concerning it in particular that one may bring a thank-offering]?*
- JJ. *[In doing this] R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon followed his own particular perspective.*
- KK. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- LL. R. Simeon says, "[Deu. 16:16, cited above at F, which requires all Israelite males to appear at the Temple on the three pilgrimage festivals] need not have referred [by name] to the festival of Tabernacles,
- MM. "since the Scriptural passage [in which Deu. 16:16 is found already] is talking about [Tabernacles, at Deu. 16:13-15].
- NN. "Why [then] is [Tabernacles explicitly] mentioned [at Deu. 16:16]?"
- OO. "To teach that, [in the sequence of festivals, Tabernacles] is last, [coming after Passover and Pentecost]." [This exegesis accounts for Simeon's view above, at BB-CC.]
- PP. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, "[It is explicitly mentioned] to teach that [the advent of Tabernacles] renders one culpable [for delaying the payment of a vow, even if the vow had been made just before that same festival]." [Eleazar b. Simeon's view thus is the same as that described at Z-AA.]
- QQ. **"And thereby fulfill his obligation on the count of [a peace offering of] rejoicing.**
- RR. **"But he does not thereby fulfill his obligation on the count of a festival offering."**
- SS. *It is obvious [that the individual's previously-dedicated thank-offering cannot serve as the festival-offering]! [This is as follows.]*
- TT. [The festival-offering] is a matter of obligation,
- UU. and an obligatory sacrifice may be brought only of unconsecrated [animals or money]. [It may not be brought in the form of animals or bought with money that already is the possession of the Temple, having been previously dedicated to it.]
- VV. *No! It is necessary [to teach explicitly the law of RR].*
- WW. *For [it indicates that] even if, [when he made the vow], he stipulated [that payment would take the place of a festival-offering, his stipulation is not valid and the rule of RR applies].*
- XX. *This is as R. Simeon b. Laqish asked R. Yohanan, "[As for] one who says, 'Lo, I am obligated for a thank-offering, but I shall fulfill this obligation through a festival-offering,'*
- YY. *"[or who says], 'Lo, I am a Nazirite [20A], but I shall [bring the offering required on the day that I] shave [see Num. 6:13-20] out of money [already consecrated] in the status of second tithe' —*
- ZZ. *"what is the rule [whether or not these stipulations are valid]?"*

- AAA. [Yohanan] said to him, “[The individual at XX] is under the vow, but he may not fulfill his obligation [by bringing a festival offering].
- BBB. “[The individual at YY] has become a Nazirite, but he may not [purchase with second tithe-funds the offering required when he] shaves.”

I.3. A. [The point made in the final section of the preceding unit, at QQ-BBB, is developed here and in the following.] *A certain man declared [in his will], “Give four hundred zuz to such-and-so and let him marry my daughter.”*

- B. *Said R. Pappa, “He receives the four hundred zuz, but if he wishes, he need not marry the daughter.”*
- C. *The reason [that Pappa rules this way is that the individual cited at A] said, “Give him [four hundred zuz] and let him marry [my daughter].” [Marriage was not phrased as a condition for receiving the money.]*
- D. *But if he had said, “Let him marry [my daughter] and [then] give him [four hundred zuz]” —*
- E. *If he marries [her], he receives the money. But if he does not marry her, he does not receive the money.*

I.4. A. *Maremar sat [in session] and stated in his own name this tradition [recorded above, 2:XX-BBB].*

- B. *Said Rabina to Maremar, “You are teaching this thus, [in your own name]!*
- C. *“We teach it [as a question] that Resh Laqish asked R. Yohanan.”*

I.5. A. *A Tannaite authority taught in the presence of R. Isaac b. Abba, “[Referring to the ceremonies by which Aaron commenced his priesthood, Lev. 9:16 states], ‘And he offered the [Rashi: obligatory] whole-offering, and he offered it according to the ordinance.’*

- B. *“[This means he offered it] according to the ordinance of a freewill whole-offering.*
- C. *“[This] teaches that the obligatory whole-offering requires a laying on of hands, [as do freewill whole-offerings, Lev. 1: 3-4].”*
- D. *[Isaac b. Abba] said to him, “[The one] who told you [this derived it in accordance with] the House of Shammai.*
- E. *“For they do not infer the rule for obligatory peace-offerings from [the rule for] freewill peace-offerings. [The freewill peace-offering, Lev. 3:2, requires a laying on of hands. Since at M. **Bes. 2:4A** the Shammaites do not require one to lay hands on an obligatory peace-offering, it is clear that they did not infer the rule for the obligatory offering from that for the freewill one. Similarly, at A+B-C, they did not infer that the rule for the obligatory whole-offering is the same as the rule for the freewill whole-offering. Rather, to derive the rule for the obligatory whole-offering, they depended upon Lev. 9:16, cited at A. Unlike the Shammaites, the Hillelites would not have required the exegesis at A-C in order to learn that an obligatory whole-offering requires laying on of hands.]*
- F. *“For if [the rule for the obligatory whole-offering, A-C, were phrased by] the House of Hillel, since they inferred the rule for the obligatory peace-offering*

from the rule for the freewill peace-offering, [Lev. 3:2], they likewise would not require a [special] verse in order to derive the rule for the obligatory whole-offering, since they would infer its rule [directly] from [that for] a freewill whole-offering.” [At M. **Bes. 2:4C-E** the Hillelites permit one on a festival day to lay hands on a obligatory peace-offering. It appears, therefore, that they derived the rule for this offering from that for the freewill peace-offering, Lev. 3:2, on which hands are to be laid. We therefore are sure that they likewise will infer the rule for an obligatory whole-offering from that of a freewill whole-offering, without resorting to a special exegesis, unlike at A-C. Whether or not this actually is the case is argued in the following.]

- G. *But how do you know that [in permitting one to lay hands on an obligatory peace-offering] the House of Hillel infer the rule for the obligatory peace-offering from that of freewill peace-offerings?*
- H. *Perhaps [like the Shammaites they reject the inference described at F], learning [their rule for the obligatory peace-offering, M. **Bes. 2:4C-E**, rather], from the rule for the obligatory whole-offering?*
- I. *[In line with H's reasoning, even the House of Hillel will hold that] the rule for the obligatory whole-offering itself requires a [special] verse, [such as is cited at A]. [If this reasoning is correct, then A-C can derive from either House, regardless of the difference of opinion at M. **Bes. 2:4**.]*
- J. *[The Talmud now shows that, contrary to H-I, we should not assume that the Hillelites do not infer the law for the obligatory peace-offering from that of the freewill peace-offering but do derive it from the obligatory whole-offering.] What is special about freewill peace-offerings that [would lead you to believe that the House of Hillel] do not infer [from them the rule for the obligatory peace-offering]?*
- K. *Because they are frequent. [A freewill peace-offering may be brought at any time, such that the rule regarding laying hands on it need not extend to obligatory peace-offerings, which are offered only on holy days.]*
- L. *[K's reasoning is unacceptable, since following its logic would make it impossible to derive the rule for the obligatory peace-offering at all.] [If K is the case] then [the House of Hillel could not infer the rule for the obligatory peace-offering] from the rule for the obligatory whole-offering either,*
- M. *since [unlike the obligatory peace-offering, the obligatory whole-offering] is totally consumed [on the altar].*
- N. *[It thus is clear that the rule for the obligatory peace-offering] derives from both of these [analogies, from that of the obligatory whole-offering and that of the freewill peace-offering, each of which has a certain similarity to the obligatory whole-offering.]*
- I.6.** A. *But do the House of Shammai, [M. **Bes. 2:4A**], really reason that obligatory peace-offerings do not require laying on of hands?*
- B. *But [to the contrary] thus it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *Said R. Yosé, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not disagree concerning the laying on of hands itself, that it is required [in the case of an obligatory peace-offering].*

- D. “Concerning what did they differ?
- E. “Concerning [whether or not] slaughter must take place immediately after the laying on of hands.
- F. “For the House of Shammai say, ‘This is not necessary.’ [According to the Shammaites, laying on of hands may be carried out prior to the festival and need not be done right before the sacrifice, on the festival day itself. This accounts for their position at M. **Bes. 2:4A**.]
- G. “But the House of Hillel say, ‘It is necessary [that the laying on of hands be performed immediately prior to the slaughter].’” [The Hillelites permit laying on of hands on the festival itself, since this is necessary for the proper conduct of the sacrifice.]
- H. [The Talmud now argues that, contrary to A-B, C-G is simply a second version of the Houses’ dispute, not accepted as having Mishnaic authority.] *[The authority behind M. **Bes. 2:4** phrased [the Houses’ dispute] in accordance with [the tradition of] this [following] Tannaite authority.*
- I. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. Said R. Yosé b. R. Judah, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not disagree concerning [whether or not] the laying on of hands must be followed immediately by the slaughter, for [they concur that] it must.
- K. “Concerning what did they differ?
- L. “Concerning [whether or not, in the case of the obligatory peace-offering] laying on of hands itself [is required].
- M. “For the House of Shammai say, ‘It is not necessary.’
- N. “But the House of Hillel say, ‘It is necessary.’”

- I.7.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. **Hag. 2:11**, with variations]:*
- B.** An incident occurred involving Hillel the elder, who brought his whole-offering into the [Temple-] courtyard on a festival day to lay hands on it.
- C.** The disciples of Shammai the elder ganged up on him.
- D.** They said to him, “What sort of animal is it?”
- E.** He said to them, “It is a female, [which cannot be a whole-offering], and I brought it as a peace-offering!”
- F.** [Hillel] swung its tail at them [to indicate it was a female] and they walked off.
- G.** On that same day the House of Shammai got the upper hand, and they desired to fix the law according to their [opinion, that one does not lay on hands on a festival].
- H.** But there was there a certain old man of the disciples of Shammai the elder, named Baba b. Buta, who knew that the decided law [actually] accords with the perspective of the House of Hillel.
- I.** So he sent **[20B]** and brought all of the sheep of Keder that were in Jerusalem and placed them in the [Temple-] courtyard and said, “Whoever [is obligated to an offering and] wishes to lay on hands may come and lay on hands.”

J. On that same day the House of Hillel got the upper hand [over the House of Shammai], and they fixed the law according to their opinion.

K. And no one there disputed this at all.

I.8. A. [T. Hag. 2:12:] There occurred another incident involving one of the disciples of the House of Hillel who brought his whole-offering to the [Temple-] courtyard in order to lay hands on it.

B. One of the disciples of the House of Shammai found him [there].

C. [The Shammaite] said to him, “What’s this laying on of hands?!”

D. [The Hillelite] answered him, “What about shutting up?!”

E. [The Hillelite thus] silenced him with a rebuke, and [the Shammaite] walked away.

F. [The lesson of A-E’s story is made explicit.] *Said Abbaye, “Therefore a disciple of the sages to whom his companion has said something should not reply with a statement longer than [what the other first] said to him.*

G. “For the one said to him, ‘What’s this laying on of hands?’

H. “And he replied to him, ‘What about shutting up?’”

I.9. A. [The Houses debate whether or not, on a festival day, one may lay on hands so as to offer a pilgrimage whole-offering. The Shammaites hold that one may not; the Hillelites that one may.] *It is taught on Tannaite authority* [T. Hag. 2:10]:

B. The House of Hillel said to the House of Shammai, “If, [on the Sabbath], when it is forbidden [to slaughter] for common use, it [anyway] is permitted [to slaughter sacrifices] for the Most High,

C. “is it not logical that [on a festival], when it is permitted [to slaughter] for common use, [it also] should be permitted [to slaughter sacrifices] for the Most High?” [On such a day it should be permitted to lay hands on and offer a pilgrimage whole-offering.]

D. The House of Shammai said to them, “[The rule for] vow and freewill-offerings will prove [the contrary].

E. “For [on a festival day] it is permitted [to slaughter] for common use, yet [we all agree that] it is forbidden [to slaughter vow and freewill-offerings] for the Most High.” [In the same way, there is no basis for arguing that one may lay on hands and offer a pilgrimage whole-offering.]

F. Said to them the House of Hillel, “[D-E’s analogy is unacceptable.] For if [you have stated E with reference to] vow and freewill-offerings, which are not subject to a fixed time [for being offered],

G. “will you state the same rule for the pilgrimage whole-offering, the time of which is fixed?”

H. Said to them the House of Shammai, “Even [in the case of the pilgrimage whole-offering] there are occasions on which, [like a vow or freewill-offering], its time is not fixed.

I. “For we have learned in the Mishnah [M. Hag. 1:6]:

J. “He who did not make a festival-offering on the first festival day of a festival makes festival-offerings throughout the entire festival and on the last day of the festival [of Tabernacles].” [Like the vow and freewill offerings, the festival

whole-offering thus does not really have a fixed time. The Shammaites' analogy at D-E stands.]

K. Said to them the House of Hillel, "But this [following rule] [indicates] that [the festival offering does in fact] have a fixed time.

L. *"For we have learned in the Mishnah [M. Hag. 1:6]:*

M. **"[But if] the festival passed and he did not make a festival-offering, he is not liable to make it good."** [This offering is restricted to the period of the festival, a set time. Once the festival ends he may not bring it. The Hillelites' claim, at F, therefore stands.]

N. [Arguing on different grounds entirely] said to them the House of Shammai, "Did Scripture not already say [Exo. 12:16], '[On the first day you shall hold a holy assembly, and on the seventh day a holy assembly; no work shall be done on those days; but whatever one must eat, that only may be prepared] for you.'

O. "[This indicates that, on the festival, one may prepare what is needed for human consumption but not] for the Most High."

P. Said to them the House of Hillel, "But does [Scripture] not state [Lev. 23:41], '[You shall keep it as a feast] for the Lord.'

Q. "[This indicates that] anything that is 'for the Lord' [may be prepared].

R. "If so, why does Scripture state, 'for you'?

S. "[This means one may prepare food] 'for you [Israelites]' but not for gentiles; 'for you [Israelites]' but not for dogs."

I.10. A. [The Hillelite argument of the preceding unit is rephrased, citing T. Hag. 2:10.] **Abba Saul would phrase [the argument of the Hillelites] in other language: "Now if, at a time at which your own oven is closed, the oven of your Master is open, at a time at which your oven is open, should not the oven of your Master be open?"**

B. **"And in the same way it is logical that your table should not be full while that of your Master lies barren."**

C. *Concerning what [do Abba Saul, A-B, and the authority behind the version of the dispute recorded in I:9] differ?*

D. *One authority, [Abba Saul], reasons [that] vow and freewill-offerings are offered on a festival day. [Abba Saul therefore does not record the response of the Shammaites, unit 9:D-E, which assumes that, on a festival day, these sacrifices may not be offered.]*

E. *But [the other] authority reasons [that] they do not offer [vow or freewill-offerings] on a festival day.*

I.11. A. Said R. Huna, "To [explain] the position of the one who states that vow and freewill-offerings may not be offered on a festival day, *do not argue that according to Scripture [these offerings indeed] are fit [to be brought], but that rabbis prohibited them [from being offered on the festival itself] as a preventative measure, lest one delay [and, planning to wait and pay the vow on the coming festival, winds up not paying it on time at all]. [In this view, which Huna rejects, the prohibition against offering a vow or freewill-offering on a festival is understood to be simply*

a rabbinic enactment, designed to prevent people from waiting until the last minute to fulfill their obligation to a freewill-offering.]

- B. “Rather [one can argue that] even according to Scripture, [vow and freewill-offerings] are not fit [to be brought on a festival day].
- C. “For in the case of the two loaves of bread [that are brought on Pentecost, Lev. 23:15], which are an obligation pertinent to the festival day itself, such that there is no need to enact a preventative measure lest one delay [and plan to bring the offering at the very last minute], even so [the preparation of these loaves] does not override the Sabbath or [Pentecost] festival [itself].” [It thus is shown from Scripture that even obligations that must be fulfilled by a certain date do not override a festival. On this basis, one can argue that vow and freewill-offerings may not be brought on a festival.]

I.12. A. *The question was raised: “In the opinion of the one who says that vow and freewill-offerings are not offered on a festival day, if one transgressed and slaughtered them [anyway], what [is the law whether or not the blood may be sprinkled on the altar]?”*

- B. Raba said, “He tosses the blood so as to render the meat permitted for consumption [on the festival day].” [Raba permits the completion of this part of the sacrifice for purposes of preparing the meat for consumption on the festival day.]
- C. Rabbah b. R. Huna said, “He tosses the blood in order to offer the sacrificial parts [after the conclusion of the festival], at eventide.”
- D. *[Both authorities permit tossing the blood, but for different reasons.] [In light of their different phrasings of the law], in what case will they disagree?*
- E. *They differ concerning a case in which the meat was rendered unclean or was lost.*
- F. *In Raba’s view, [in such circumstances] he may not sprinkle the blood, [since doing so does not render meat permitted for consumption on the festival day].* [While tossing blood is not actually deemed a form of work, it is forbidden by Raba under the general restrictions of the festival day, which only permit activities dedicated to the preparation of food.]
- G. *In Rabbah b. R. Huna’s view, he does sprinkle, [so as to complete the offering in all events].*
- H. [A problem is raised with Rabbah b. Huna’s perspective.] *They objected:* [As for] lambs [prescribed by Lev. 23:19 as offerings] for the festival of Pentecost that one slaughtered under a different designation [e.g., as whole-offerings instead of peace-offerings] or that one slaughtered before or after their [fixed] time —
 - I. their blood should be tossed and the meat should be eaten.
 - J. But if it was a Sabbath, [the blood] should not be tossed.
 - K. And if he tossed [it anyway], **[21A]** it is acceptable, on the condition that [he will] offer the sacrificial parts at eventide.
 - L. [The passage states that the individual’s actions are acceptable and that the sacrificial parts should be offered] ‘If he tossed [the blood anyway].’

- M. *[This indicates that] post facto this is permitted; [but] de jure [he should] not [toss the blood].*
- N. *This presents no problem for Raba, [B].*
- O. *But this does present a problem for Rabbah b. R. Huna, [C].* [He permits the individual to go ahead with the sacrifice *de jure*, contrary to K.]
- P. *[This indeed] is a problem.*
- Q. *But [rather than conceding, but to resolve the difficulty] if you wish, I can argue: The restrictions against performing acts of labor are different [and more stringent] on the Sabbath than the restrictions against performing acts of labor on a festival day. [If this is the case, K's rule for the Sabbath has no implications for the rule for the festival, C.]*

I.13. A. R. Awia the elder asked R. Huna, “[As for] an animal half of which belongs to a gentile and half of which belongs to an Israelite —

- B. “what is the rule whether or not one may slaughter it [to obtain meat] on a festival day?”
- C. [Huna] said to him, “It is permitted.”
- D. [Awia] said to him, “What is the difference between this case and [the case of] vow and freewill-offerings?” [The latter are owned, as it were, by the Israelite and God. The Israelite therefore should be permitted to slaughter these offerings on the festival day, contrary to what is assumed throughout the preceding.]
- E. *[Huna] replied to him [with a non sequitur, changing the subject], “A raven flies...”*
- F. *After [Awia] left, [Huna's] son, Rabbah, said to him, “Was that not R. Awia the elder, who you, master, have praised as a great man?” [Why, then, did you dismiss him so harshly?]*
- G. *[Huna] said to him, “How should I have treated him?”*
- H. “I am today [in the situation of someone who has cried out, Son. 2: 5], ‘Sustain me with raisins, refresh me with apples.’” [Rashi: It was a festival day on which Huna had presented a discourse, leaving him tired and hungry.]
- I. *“Yet [despite my hunger and fatigue] he asked me something that required reasoning!”*
- J. *Now what is the reason [for the difference between the law for the animal, A-C, and the vow or freewill-offering, D+E]?*
- K. An animal half of which belongs to a gentile and half of which belongs to an Israelite may be slaughtered on a festival day because it is impossible [for the Israelite to eat even so little as] an olive's bulk of meat without slaughtering [the animal]. [Since the Israelite slaughters this animal to prepare food for himself, he may do so on a festival day.]
- L. But [as for] vow and freewill-offerings —
- M. it is forbidden to slaughter them on a festival day, *since when the priests receive [their portion of the sacrifices], they receive it from the table of the Most High.* [The priests eat of the sacrifice as guests of God, but have no proprietary right to it. The slaughter thus is entirely for God, so as to be forbidden on the festival day.]

- I.14.** A. Said R. Hisda, “An animal half of which belongs to a gentile and half of which belongs to an Israelite may be slaughtered on a festival day, because it is impossible [for the Israelite to eat even so little as] an olive’s bulk without slaughtering [the animal].
- B. [A contrasting case is cited.] “[As for] dough half of which belongs to a gentile and half of which belongs to an Israelite —
- C. “it is forbidden to bake it on a festival day,
- D. “for certainly it is possible to divide it in half during the kneading.” [There is no need for the Israelite to bake the gentile’s half, and therefore he may not do so on a festival day.]
- E. *R. Hana b. Hanilai objected [citing M. Hal. 1:8]:*
- F. **“[As for] dogs’ dough — when shepherds will eat [part of] it [and leave the rest for the dogs], (1) it is subject to the separation of dough-offering, (2) they set up an erub with it, (3) they make a partnership-erub with it, (4) they recite the blessing [for bread] over it, (5) they say a common grace over it, (6) it may be baked on a festival day, (7) and one fulfills the obligation [to eat unleavened bread] on Passover by means of it.**
- G. *“But why [may it be baked on a festival day]?”*
- H. *“Certainly it is possible for one to divide it during the kneading, [so as to separate out the portion intended for the dogs]!”*
- I. [Hisda responds:] “[The case of] dogs’ dough is different, *since* it is possible to satisfy [the dogs] with carrion.” [*Since*, if the individual had carrion, he could feed it to the dogs, therefore we treat the dogs’ dough as though it were entirely for people. This holds even if the individual in fact has no carrion and will feed the dogs part of the dogs’ dough.]
- J. *[An objection is raised to the claim that Hisda would respond as at I.] But does R. Hisda actually use [arguments phrased], Since, if...?*
- K. *For [to the contrary] it is taught on Amoraic authority:*
- L. One who baked [bread] on a festival day for use on a [following] weekday —
- M. R. Hisda says, “He receives stripes.”
- N. Rabbah says, “He does not receive stripes.”
- O. [The position of each authority is explained.] R. Hisda says, “He [is deemed a transgressor and] receives stripes.
- P. *“[This is because] we do not reason: Since, if visitors dropped by, [the bread] would be permitted for him [to serve to them on the festival day itself, therefore], even though [he does not have visitors, the bread] is permitted for use by him.”*
- Q. Rabbah said, “He does not receive stripes.
- R. *[For] we reason: Since, if [visitors dropped by, he may use the bread for them, therefore, even though no visitors came, he may use the bread on a festival day and is not culpable for baking it].”*
- S. [From O-P it is clear that Hisda does not make use of the type of argument imputed to him at I. A different response Hisda might give to G-H is suggested.]

Rather, do not say [that Hisda responded to Hana b. Hanilai], *Since it is possible [to satisfy the dogs with carrion, therefore, even if the individual has no carrion, he is permitted to bake all of the dogs' dough]. Instead [assume that F refers to] a case in which he [actually] does have carrion, such that it certainly is possible to satisfy [the dogs] with it. [In this case, the dogs' dough surely will all be used for the Israelite himself, such that there is no question that it is permitted to bake all of it on a festival day.]*

- I.15.** A. [The mode of argumentation referred to in the preceding unit is applied in a different case, B-O, leading to the dispute at P-CC.] *They asked Rab, "[As for] the [Israelite] inhabitants of a rural community who they obligated to supply bread for [foreign] troops — what is the rule whether or not they may bake it on a festival day?"*
- B. *[Huna] said to them, "Let us see: If [the villagers] can give [some of this] bread to a child, and [the soldiers] do not object,*
- C. *"then [in theory] each and every [loaf] is fit for an [Israelite] child, and it [therefore] is permitted [to bake it on a festival day].*
- D. *"But if [the bread can] not [be given to a child without the soldiers' objecting], it is forbidden [to bake the bread on a festival]."*
- E. *But [to the contrary] it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. Y.T. 2:6]:*
- F. **There was an incident concerning Simeon of Teman, who did not come to the school house on the eve [of a festival].**
- G. **At dawn, R. Judah b. Baba came upon him. He said to him, "Why did you not come last night to the school house?"**
- H. **He said to him, "A gentile troop came to our city and desired to plunder the whole city. So we slaughtered for them a calf and fed them and gave them drink and sent them off in peace."**
- I. **Said [Judah b. Baba] to him, "I would be surprised if the good you did is not lost in the damage you did.**
- J. *"For, lo, Torah states [Exo. 12:16], '[On the first day you shall have a holy assembly, and on the seventh day a holy assembly; no work shall be done on those days; but what every soul must eat, that only may be prepared] for you.'*
- K. *"[Food therefore may be prepared 'for you'] but not for gentiles."*
- L. *[A problem with Judah b. Baba's response, I-J, is raised.] But why [should it have been forbidden for the villagers to prepare the calf]?*
- M. *For [the calf] was fit to be eaten by them! [Therefore, whether or not they actually consumed it themselves, its preparation should have been permitted, just as at C.]*
- N. *[Explaining T. Y.T. 2:6's case] said R. Joseph, "The calf was unfit for [consumption by Israelites]." [Judah b. Baba's ruling therefore is explained by D. Huna's teaching does not contradict the Tannaite case.]*
- O. *[Joseph's resolution to the problem at hand is challenged.] But even so, [the meat] was fit for [consumption by] dogs! [One can,*

therefore, argue that its preparation was permitted on a festival day, contrary to what Judah b. Baba states.]

- P. *[The question is whether or not food's being permitted for consumption by dogs renders its preparation permitted on a festival day.] [This issue is under dispute by] Tannaite authorities.*
- Q. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- R. "[Exo. 12:16 states], 'But what every soul must eat, that alone may be prepared for you.'
- S. "Since [Scripture] states 'every soul,' I might reason that even animals are included, [such that, on a festival day, food may be prepared for dogs and other animals].
- T. "[We know that the word 'soul' pertains to animals], for it is stated [Lev. 24:18], 'He who kills the soul of an animal shall make restitution.'
- U. "[In order to indicate that S's reasoning is wrong], Scripture says [at the end of the verse], 'for you.'
- V. "[This teaches that food may be prepared] **[21B]** 'for you' but not for dogs." [One who follows this view will agree with Joseph, N, against the anonymous statement, O.]
- W. [The preceding, R-V, is] the words of R. Yosé the Galilean.
- X. R. Aqiba says, "Even the soul of an animal is included [in Exo. 12:16's definition of for whom food may be prepared on a festival].
- Y. "If this is the case, why does Scripture state [at the end of the verse], 'for you'?
- Z. "[It indicates that food may be prepared] 'for you [Israelites]' but not for gentiles." [In line with Aqiba's view, O's challenge to N stands. The food could be eaten by dogs, and therefore Israelites were permitted to prepare it on the festival. Under C's reasoning, the preparation is permitted even if the food ultimately will be eaten by a gentile. On a festival, Israelites only are prohibited from cooking exclusively for gentiles. The question of why Judah b. Baba disagreed with Simeon of Teman's actions remains unanswered.]
- AA. And by what logic should we include dogs [and permit one to prepare food for them on a festival day] but exclude gentiles, [and prohibit an Israelite to prepare food exclusively for them on that day]?
- BB. I include dogs, for you are responsible for their being fed.
- CC. But I exclude gentiles, since you are not responsible for their food.

I.16. A. [Unit 15.R-V is evaluated.] *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "Now, according to R. Yosé the Galilean, who said, '[Exo. 12:16 means that, on a festival day, food may be prepared] 'for you [Israelites]' but not for dogs —*

- B. *“why on a festival day are we permitted [to spread] date-stones [as fodder for cattle]?”*
- C. *[Joseph] said to him, “Because they are fit for kindling [as a cooking fire].”* [The date-stones may be handled by virtue of their permitted purpose. This applies even though they ultimately are to be put to a use that, in itself, would not be allowed. This is the same point made by unit 15.B-C and M.]
- D. *[Abbaye responded, “Your explanation] makes sense for the case of dry [date-stones, which can, in fact, be kindled].*
- E. *“For the case of moist [ones], what can you say [to explain why, on a festival, these may be spread as fodder for cattle]?”*
- F. *[Joseph] said to him, “They are fit for burning in a big fire, [in which even damp fuel will eventually burn].”* [C’s explanation thus suffices.]
- G. *[C+F] makes sense for a festival day, [when making a cooking fire is permitted].*
- H. *For the Sabbath, what can you say [to explain why date-stones may be spread as fodder]?*
- I. *[On the Sabbath] one may carry them with bread,*
- J. *as [in the perspective of] Samuel.*
- K. For said Samuel, “[On the Sabbath] one may do whatever he needs, [carrying items that themselves are forbidden to be handled], together with bread.”

- I.17.** A. [The Talmud begins by evaluating the statement of Huna, unit 15.B-D, that, on a festival day, an Israelite may prepare food for a gentile so long as that food potentially can be eaten by the Israelite himself. It then turns to a quite separate matter.] *But [Huna] differs with R. Joshua b. Levi.*
- B. For said R. Joshua b. Levi, “They invite a gentile to a meal on the Sabbath, but they do not invite a gentile to a meal on a festival day,
- C. *“as a preventative measure, lest, on account of [the gentile], he cooks more [than he would have needed for himself alone].”* [Unlike Huna, Joshua b. Levi does not reason that, since the Israelite himself can eat the food, it is permitted to prepare it for a gentile. Inviting a gentile for a Sabbath-meal, B, should present no problem, since preparation for that meal takes place before the start of the holy day, when there is no restriction upon what the Israelite may cook.]
- D. [We now find that even inviting a gentile for the Sabbath-meal creates a problem.] R. Aha b. Jacob said, “Even on

the Sabbath it is forbidden [to invite a gentile for a meal], because of the [wine] left at the bottom of the glasses.” [The dregs in the Israelite’s cup may be collected and used. Those of the gentile may not be used and therefore should not be handled at all on the Sabbath. Aha does not permit a gentile to dine with an Israelite on the Sabbath, since this could lead to the forbidden handling of the wine the gentile leaves in his cup.]

- E. [The validity of Aha b. Jacob’s statement is argued.] *If [Aha’s reasoning] is correct, then [one likewise can argue that] ours [i.e., Israelites’ dregs] too [should be forbidden to be handled on the Sabbath]!* [Rashi: This would be because they are unseemly.]
- F. *[E is unacceptable, since] ours are fit for giving to fowl.* [The fact that the dregs are unseemly does not prevent their use in bird feed. In light of this permitted purpose, they may be handled on the Sabbath.]
- G. *Then theirs too are fit [for use in] bird [feed].* [This being the case, contrary to what Aha b. Jacob says, gentiles should be permitted to dine with Israelites on the Sabbath. For the wine they leave in their cups may be handled.]
- H. [The flaw in G’s reasoning is exposed.] *[Israelites] are forbidden to derive any benefit from theirs [that is, the gentiles’ dregs].* [The gentile may have poured out some wine as a libation. Since, on the Sabbath, the gentile’s cup cannot be cleared from the table, the gentile should not be invited to dine with an Israelite, as Aha argues.]
- I. *[Another challenge to Aha’s ruling is proposed.] [Gentiles should be permitted to eat with an Israelite on the Sabbath, and the Israelite] should be permitted to remove [the dregs of the gentile’s wine] together with the cup!* [The cup itself may be moved. There should be nothing wrong with taking away the dregs in the same action.]
- J. [Supporting I:] *For did not Raba say: “When [on the Sabbath] we were in the house of R. Nahman, we moved a brazier along with the ashes it contained, even though it also contained slivers of [unburned] wood”?* [The ashes had been set aside for use in covering spit or other unseemly things. The wood, by contrast, had no permitted use and therefore normally could not be moved on the Sabbath at all. I’s point is that, just as one may move the wood by virtue of the ashes, so one should be permitted to move the gentile’s dregs by virtue of the cup which contains them.]
- K. *[The difference between the case of the slivers of wood and the gentile’s dregs is specified.] There [in the case of the brazier, the wood] is not subject to a prohibition against*

- [the Israelite's] deriving benefit from it. [This accounts for why the slivers of wood may be moved on the Sabbath.]*
- L. *But here, [in the case of the dregs], these are subject to a prohibition [against the Israelite's] deriving any benefit from them. [Even by virtue of the cup, the dregs therefore may not be moved on the Sabbath. Aha b. Jacob, D, is correct. On a Sabbath Israelites should not invite gentiles to dine with them, since it is forbidden, after the meal, to move the gentile's cup.]*
- M. *[A final attempt is made to disprove Aha b. Jacob's claim.] Said R. Aha of Difti to Rabina, "Let [the gentile's cup] be deemed equivalent to a chamber pot, [which may be moved on account of unseemliness]!"*
- N. *[Rabina] said to him, "[On the Sabbath] may one purposely make [something into] a chamber pot [simply so as to be permitted to move it]?" [Certainly not! M's proposal is unacceptable, such that L's conclusion stands.]*
- I.18.** A. *Raba took Mar Samuel out for a walk, and [Samuel] gave a discourse: "They invite a gentile to a meal on the Sabbath but not on a festival day,*
- B. *"as a preventative measure, lest, on account of [the gentile], he cooks more [than he would have needed for himself alone]."*
- C. *[As for] Maremar and Mar Zutra — when a gentile would drop in on them on a festival day, they would say to him, "If you are satisfied with what we have prepared for ourselves, that is good.*
- D. *"But if not, we cannot prepare anything on your account."*

Units I:1-6 contain Amoraic discussions detailing the issue between the Houses of Hillel and Shammai, M. Bes. 2:4. The dispute is interpreted in two different ways, units I and VI. Units II-V develop unit I, listing Tannaite interpretations of the Houses' positions and developing for vow and freewill-offerings the rules cited in unit I:1. I:7-10 take up T.'s materials. These complement M. Bes. 2:4 with stories of a parallel dispute between Hillel and disciples of Shammai (units I:7-8) and then supplement each House's view in a protracted debate (units I:9-10). The debate draws in its wake units I:11-12, which again concern why one may not offer a vow or freewill-offering on a festival. The materials on the vow and freewill-offering lead to yet a further digression. Unit I:13 mentions a case in which an Israelite and gentile jointly own an animal. In unit I:14 the Talmud again refers to such a case, asking whether or not an Israelite may cook food of which he owns only half. Along these same lines, units I:15-18 discuss in general terms the conditions under which an Israelite may cook that which he or other Israelites will not eat on a festival day. As is clear, by this point in the Talmud's materials, the

issue of the first Talmudic units — and indeed the theme of M. Bes. 2:4 — have been forgotten.

2:5

- A. The House of Shammai say, “[On a festival day] a person may not heat water for his feet,
 - B. “unless it is also suitable for drinking.”
 - C. But the House of Hillel permit.
 - D. A person may make a fire and warm himself by it.
- I.1** A. *The question was raised:* This [rule, which permits one to make a] fire, [M. **Bes. 2:5D**] — who taught it?
- B. *Is it the opinion of both [Houses], insofar as the House of Shammai distinguishes between a case of benefit to the whole body, [which they permit], and a case of benefit to a single limb, [which they prohibit, M. **Bes. 2:5A**]?*
 - C. *Or perhaps the House of Hillel taught this rule, while the House of Shammai did not teach it [at all]?*”
 - D. *[To answer A’s question] come and learn:*
 - E. The House of Shammai say, “[On a festival day] a person may not make a fire and warm himself by it.”
 - F. But the House of Hillel permit.

The Talmud cites a House’s dispute unknown to Mishnah and Tosefta. It thereby determines which of the Houses stands behind the anonymous rule of M. **Bes. 2:5D**.

2:6

- A. In three rulings does Rabban Gamaliel impose the more stringent ruling, in accord with the opinion of the House of Shammai:
 - B. (1) They do not cover up hot food on the festival day for use on the Sabbath.
 - C. (2) And they do put together a candlestick on the festival day.
 - D. (3) And [on a festival] they do not bake bread into large loaves but only into small ones.
 - E. Said Rabban Gamaliel, “Never in my father’s house did they bake bread into large loaves but only into small ones.”
 - F. They said to him, “What shall we make of your father’s house?”
 - G. “For they imposed on themselves a strict rule, while imposing a lenient rule for all Israelites,
 - H. “so that [Israelites] might bake large loaves and thick cakes.”
- I.1** A. [They do not cover up hot food on the festival day for use on the Sabbath:] *Under what circumstances [does the question arise of whether or not, on a festival day, one may cover up hot food for use on the Sabbath, M. **Bes. 2:6B**]?*
- B. *If it is a case in which the individual set up an erub tabshilin, [so as to be permitted to prepare food for the Sabbath], what is the reason that the House of Shammai, [whose opinion Gamaliel follows, prohibit one to cover up the food]?*

- C. *And if it is a case in which the individual did not set up an erub tabshilin, what is the reason that the House of Hillel, [assumed to have the view opposite that of the Shammaites, permit one to cover up the food]?*
- D. *Said R. Huna, “Indeed, I can explain to you that it is a case in which the individual did not set up an erub tabshilin.*
- E. *“But, [even so, food] that is necessary for his sustenance rabbis, [who follow the Hillelite position], permit him [to set aside for the Sabbath].” [This answers the question posed at C.]*
- F. *Now, [in explaining the matter in this way], R. Huna proved consistent with principles espoused by him elsewhere.*
- G. *For said R. Huna, “[As for] someone who did not set up an erub tabshilin — they bake for him one loaf of bread, cook for him one hot dish, [22A] and light a candle for him.” [The point, as at E, is that the individual is given the minimum he needs to survive.]*
- H. *[Following this same perspective], in the name of R. Isaac they said, “They even grill for him a small fish.”*
- I. *Along these same lines it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. *[As for] someone who did not set up an erub tabshilin — they bake for him one loaf of bread, set aside [to keep warm] for him one hot dish, light a candle for him and they warm up for him one jug of water.”*
- K. *And some say, “They even grill for him a small fish.”*
- L. *[Raba now argues B’s alternative, that M. Bes. 2:6B refers to a case in which the individual did set up an erub tabshilin.] Raba said, “Indeed [this is a case in which] he had set up [an erub tabshilin], but, [even so, the Shammaites prohibit his setting aside food], since setting [aside food for the Sabbath] is different [from cooking], insofar as it is evident that he is carrying out this [storing away of food] only for the Sabbath.” [When he cooks, the individual appears to be preparing food for the festival day itself. The erub tabshilin therefore is effective in rendering cooking for the Sabbath permitted. When the individual covers food to keep warm, by contrast, he clearly does not intend to use that food on the festival day itself. According to the Shammaites, the erub therefore does not render it permitted to set aside food to keep warm for the Sabbath.]*
- M. *Objected Abbayye [to L’s reasoning]: “Hananiah says, ‘The House of Shammai say, ‘[On a festival day] one may not bake [for the following Sabbath] unless he has prepared an erub with bread.*
- N. *““And one may not cook unless he has prepared an erub with a cooked dish.*
- O. *““And one may not set aside [food to keep warm for the Sabbath] unless, before the start of the festival, he had set aside hot foods [to be kept warm].”*
- P. *“[According to the cited passage] if, [before the festival], he had set aside hot foods [to keep warm for the Sabbath] he may [on the festival day itself] set aside [more food in the same way].*
- Q. *“And this is the case even though his actions [in doing this] make evident that he intends this food [he is setting aside] for the Sabbath!” [Since, in the cited circumstance, the Shammaites in fact permit one to cover foods to keep warm for the Sabbath, Raba’s explanation of M. Bes. 2:6B, L, is unacceptable.]*

- R. [Abbaye explains why at M. **Bes. 2:6B** in particular the Shammaites do not permit the individual, who has set up an *erub tabshilin*, to set aside foods for the Sabbath.] Rather, said Abbaye, “[M. **Bes. 2:6B** concerns], for instance, a case in which he had set up an *erub* for one purpose, [e.g., cooking food], but had not set up an *erub* for this [other] purpose, [that is, for setting aside foods to keep warm]. [And M. **Bes. 2:6B** thus is phrased according to] Hananiah’s report, and it follows the opinion of the House of Shammai.”

II.1 A. And they do not put together a candlestick on the festival day [M. **Bes. 2:6C].**

- B. [In putting together a candlestick] what would he be doing [that could be considered work so as to be forbidden on a festival day]?
- C. Said R. Hinena b. Bisna, “We deal here with a candlestick composed of [separate] joints, such that [when one sets it up] it looks as though he is building.
- D. “For the House of Shammai reason, [The restriction against] building [on a festival day] applies to utensils.”
- E. “But the House of Hillel, [who do not prohibit what is described at A], reason, [The restriction against] building does not apply to utensils, and [the restriction against] tearing down does not not apply to utensils.””

II.2. A. [On a festival] Ulla visited the home of R. Judah and his [that is, Ulla’s] attendant arose and set up a lamp.

- B. R. Judah objected to Ulla, “One who [on a Sabbath] puts oil in a lamp is culpable for kindling, [since he thereby causes the lamp to burn longer], and he who [on a festival] removes [oil] from it is culpable for extinguishing, [since he thereby causes the lamp to go out sooner, which is forbidden on a festival].”
- C. [Ulla] said to him, “[The attendant did] not [do it] under my direction, [and I am not responsible]!”

II.3. A. Said Rab, “Snuffing a wick is permitted [on a festival day].”

- B. Abba b. Marta asked Abbaye, “What [is the law whether or not it is permitted on a festival day] to extinguish a lamp for some other reason [i.e., to darken the room in order to engage in sexual intercourse]?”
- C. [Abbaye] said to him, “[This is not permitted, since] it is possible [to have intercourse] in a different room, [without extinguishing the lamp at all].”
- D. [Abba asked], “If he does not have a different room, *what is the law?*”
- E. [Abbaye responded], “It is possible to set up a partition, [so as again not to need to extinguish the lamp].”
- F. [Abba asked], “[If] he does not have something with which to make a partition, *what is the law?*”
- G. [Abbaye responded], “It is possible to cover [the lamp] with a utensil, [such that again he need not extinguish it].”
- H. [Abba asked], “[If] he does not have a utensil, *what is the law?*”
- I. [Abbaye] said to him, “It is forbidden [to extinguish the lamp].”
- J. [Abba b. Marta] objected [citing T. **Y.T. 3:13**]:
- K. “[On a festival day] they do not extinguish a [burning] log in order to save it [for use on a different day].

- L. **“But if it is in order not to allow the house to fill up with smoke or [so that it will not burn what is cooking in] the pot, it is permitted [to do this].”**
[Contrary to what Abbayye claims, it appears from K-L that in order to derive benefit on the festival day itself (Rashi), it is permitted to extinguish a fire.]
- M. *[Abbayye] said to him, “This [statement cited at K-L] is the opinion of R. Judah; but I am speaking from the perspective of rabbis, [who do not permit extinguishing the log for any reason].”*

- II.4.** A. Abbayye asked Rabbah, “What [is the law whether or not it is permitted] to extinguish a conflagration on a festival day?
- B. *“Where there is a danger to life, I would not ask this question,*
- C. *“since [I know that, in such a situation], even on the Sabbath it is permitted [to put out the fire].*
- D. *“The case about which I ask involves a loss of money.*
- E. *“What [is the law whether or not, to prevent loss of money, one may, on a festival day, extinguish a fire]?”*
- F. [Rabbah] said to him, “It is forbidden.”
- G. *[Abbayye] objected [citing T. Y.T. 3:13]:*
- H. **“[On a festival day] they do not extinguish a [burning] log in order to save it [for use on a different day].**
- I. **“But if it is in order not to allow the house to fill up with smoke, or [so that it will not burn what is cooking in] the pot, it is permitted [to do this].”**
- J. *[Rabbah responded], “This [statement at I] is the opinion of R. Judah. But [at F] I am speaking from the perspective of rabbis.”*

- II.5.** A. R. Ashi asked Amemar, “What [is the law whether or not one may] put on mascara [for medicinal purposes] on a festival day?
- B. *“In a case in which there is a danger [to health], such as a discharge, pricking pain, tearing, inflammation or the beginning of an eye-disease, I would not ask this question, [for I know that in such a case] even on the Sabbath it is permitted [to use a medicine].*
- C. *“The instance for which I ask the question is one in which the eye-disease is almost cured, and [the individual wishes to use the mascara only to] brighten the eye [and cover up the final signs of the illness].*
- D. *“What [is the law whether or not, in such a case, one may use the mascara on a festival day]?”*
- E. [Amemar] said to him, “It is forbidden.”
- F. *[Ashi] objected [citing T. Y.T. 3:11]:*
- G. **“[On a festival day] they do not extinguish a log...”**
- H. *And [Amemar] responded just as we responded [that the rule cited at G accords with the view of Judah alone].*

- II.6.** A. Amemar permitted one to have mascara put on his eye [for medicinal purposes] by a gentile on the Sabbath.
- B. *Some say: Amemar himself had mascara put on his eye by a gentile on the Sabbath.*

- C. *Said R. Ashi to Amemar, "[In permitting this], what is your reasoning?*
- D. *"[Do you permit it] because Ulla the son of R. Illai said, 'All that is needed by a sick person may be done [for him] on the Sabbath by a gentile'?"*
- E. *"And [further do you base your opinion upon the fact that] R. Hamnuna said, '[As for] any [medical] matter that does not represent a real danger [to life], one instructs a gentile and [on the Sabbath] he performs [the desired procedure]'?"*
- F. *[Ashi now shows that D and E's statements do not support Amemar's ruling, A+B.] "[Ulla and Hamnuna's] statements apply only where [the one the gentile is helping] does not directly assist [in the completion of the medical procedure].*
- G. *"But [in the procedure described at A+B, you], Master, play a direct role by closing and opening [your eye]." [On the Sabbath a gentile therefore may not perform this procedure for an Israelite.]*
- H. *[Amemar] said to him, "R. Zebid held the same position as you, but I responded to him that helping is not tangible [and therefore is of no consequence]."*

II.7. A. *Amemar permitted [an Israelite] to put mascara on his eye [for medicinal purposes] on the second day of the New Year's festival.*

- B. *Said R. Ashi to Amemar, "But thus said Raba, '[If an Israelite] dies on the first day of a festival, gentiles should take care of him, [preparing the shrouds and digging the grave].*
- C. *"[But if he dies] on the second day of a festival, Israelites [themselves] may take care of him.*
- D. *"And [this rule, that on the second day an Israelite may do the work], applies even in the case of [the second day of] the New Year's festival,*
- E. **[22B]** *"which is unlike the rule for an egg." [Ashi's point is that, just as the egg remains forbidden on the second festival day, so it should remain forbidden for an Israelite to put on mascara on that day.]*
- F. *[Amemar] said to him, "I reason as do the Nehardeans, who hold [that] even in the case of an egg, [C's leniency applies, and an Israelite may cook it on the second day of the New Year's festival].*
- G. *"For what can you be thinking [to deem the second day of the New Year's festival a true holy day]? [Do you believe that] perhaps they will intercalate Elul, [such that the New Year's festival actually will fall on the second day of the celebration]? [That is not going to occur, since] thus said R. Hinena b. Kahana, 'From the days of Ezra and on, we do not find that Elul has ever been intercalated.'"*

III.1 A. **And [on a festival] they do not bake bread into large loaves but only into small ones [M. Bes. 2:6D].**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *The House of Shammai say, "On Passover they do not bake thick [unleavened] loaves, [lest the dough become leavened during the preparation and baking]."*
- D. *But the House of Hillel permit.*
- E. *And how much [is regarded as] 'thick loaves'?*
- F. *Said R. Huna, "A handbreadth.*

- G. “For thus we have found with respect to the showbread, [that it was] a handbreadth [in thickness].”
- H. [Joseph objects that the conditions under which showbread and unleavened bread for Passover are prepared differ. He suggests that, contrary to F-G, one is not permitted to bake unleavened bread so thick as a handbreadth.] *R. Joseph objected:* “If they said, [G, that the maximum thickness of a handbreadth is imposed] upon experts [who bake showbread], will they say [this same rule] for non-experts, [that is, householders, who bake unleavened bread]? [No! Non-experts, who work slowly, must produce thinner loaves, that are less likely to leaven.]
- I. “If they stated [G’s rule] for well-kneaded [show]-bread, will they state [the same rule] for bread that is not well-kneaded? [Surely not!]
- J. “If they stated [G’s rule] for [show-bread, baked in a very hot fire] on dry wood, will they state [the same rule] for [unleavened bread, baked in people’s homes over the low heat of] damp wood? [The latter will need to remain a long while in the oven and so is likely to leaven.]
- K. “If they stated [G’s rule] for [show-bread, baked in a] hot oven, will they state [the same rule] for [unleavened bread, baked in people’s homes in] a cool oven?¹³⁴ [This is just as at J.]
- L. “If they stated [G’s rule] for [show-bread, baked in] a metal oven, will they state [the same rule] for [unleavened bread, baked in people’s homes in] a clay oven? [Certainly not! Since no response is given, Joseph’s criticism of Huna’s statement, F-G, stands. An alternative definition of the term “thick loaves” is given in the following, independent, unit.]

III.2. A. *Said R. Jeremiah b. Abba, “I asked my teacher privately — and who is that? Rab — ‘What is [meant by] ‘thick loaves’?”*

- B. “[And he replied], ‘A large quantity [of bread].’” [M. **Bes. 2:6D** prohibits baking on the festival more than is needed for that day.]
- C. *Some report [A-B as follows]:*
- D. *Said R. Jeremiah b. Abba said Rab, “I asked my teacher privately — and who is that? Our holy Rabbi [Judah the Patriarch] — ‘What is meant by ‘thick loaves’?”*
- E. “[And he replied], ‘A large quantity of bread.’”
- F. *Now, why do they call it ‘thick loaves’?*
- G. *For it requires much kneading.*
- H. *Alternatively, in the locale of this Tannaite authority, they called a large quantity of bread ‘thick loaves’.*
- I. *Now, [what is the reason much bread may not be prepared]?*
- J. *It is because [its preparation entails] unnecessary toil.*
- K. [The preceding discussion now is related to the Houses’ dispute concerning Passover, unit IX.C-D] *Why, then, speak specifically about Passover?*
- L. *Even on other festival days [this same restriction against baking much bread should apply]!*

- M. *That is so, but the Tannaite authority [chose to teach in particular] about the festival of Passover.*
- N. *[A different answer to K's question is suggested.] It also is taught on Tannaite authority [that the rule for baking much bread on a festival is under dispute]:*
- O. The House of Shammai say, "[On a festival day] they do not bake thick loaves."
- P. But the House of Hillel permit.

Gamaliel's three stringent rulings are discussed in turn. Unit I:1 refers to M. **Bes. 2:6B**; units II:1-7 to M. **Bes. 2:6C**; and units III:1-2 to M. **Bes. 2:6D**. The discussions of M. **Bes. 2:6B** and D are straightforward. Unit I:1 questions whether the rule about covering up hot food for the Sabbath applies in a case in which the individual has set up an *erub*. Units III:1-2 question the meaning of "thick loaves."

2:7

- A. **Also: [Gamaliel] gave us three rulings to impose a lenient opinion:**
- B. **They sweep between the couches.**
- C. **And they put spices on the fire on a festival day.**
- D. **And they prepare a kid roasted whole on Passover night [as was done in the Temple].**
- E. **But sages prohibit.**
- I.1 A.** **[And they put spices on the fire on a festival day:]** Said R. Assi, "The dispute [in which sages, unlike Gamaliel, prohibit one to put spices in the fire on a festival day] concerns [only an instance in which the individual desires] to perfume [his clothing].
- B. "But [if he desires simply] to smell [the burning spices], all concur that it is permitted [to put the spices on the fire]."
- C. [The passage introduced here ultimately shows, J-O, that contrary to Assi's claim, B, authorities other than Gamaliel do not even permit one to put spices on the fire so as to enjoy their smell on a festival day. The intervening material, D-I, is irrelevant to the present objection.] *They objected [to Assi's claim, B]:*
- D. They do not sweep between the couches on a festival day,
- E. but in the house of Rabban Gamaliel, they did sweep, [as at M. **Bes. 2:7B**].
- F. [Claiming that C is not accurate] said R. Eleazar b. Sadoq, "Many times I followed my father into the house of Rabban Gamaliel, and they would not sweep between the couches on a festival day.
- G. "Rather, they would sweep there before the eve of the festival and would spread out sheets [between the couches].
- H. "On the next day, when the guests entered, they would remove the sheets and, as a result, the room automatically was swept."
- I. [It is objected that Eleazar b. Zadoq's description cannot be what M. **Bes. 2:7B** means.] They said to him, "If this is the case, then even on the Sabbath it should

be permitted to do this, [since what D-F describes does not constitute work]!”
[Since M. **Bes. 2:7B** does not permit sweeping between the couches on the Sabbath, Gamaliel could not have intended what Eleazar b. Sadoq claims, F-H. Rather, Gamaliel permits one physically to sweep there on a festival day.]

- J. [We now come to the issue at hand.] And they do not put spices on the fire on a festival day,
- K. but in the house of Rabban Gamaliel they did put [spices on the fire].
- L. [L-O = T. Y.T. 2:14, with major variations.] [Claiming that B is not accurate] **said R. Eleazar b. Sadoq, “Many times I followed my father into the house of Rabban Gamaliel, and they did not put the spices [in the fire] on the festival day.**
- M. **“Rather, they brought in perforated iron balls and filled them with smoke [of incense] before the eve of the festival and stopped up their holes before the eve of the festival.**
- N. **“On the next day, when the guests arrived, they would open the holes and, as a result, the room automatically would be perfumed.”**
- O. **They said to him, “If this is the case, then even on the Sabbath it should be permitted to do this, [since what is described at M-N entails no work].”**
[Since Gamaliel, M. **Bes. 2:7C**, does not permit one “to put spices on a fire” on the Sabbath, he cannot mean what Eleazar b. Sadoq claims. Rather, on a festival, he permits one physically to place spices in a fire for people to smell.]
- P. [A secondary conclusion from N-O is that, contrary to Assi, B, rabbis disagree with Gamaliel even concerning putting spices on a fire for people to smell. To resolve this difficulty, Assi’s statement is revised.] *Rather, if [Assi’s statement] was made [at all], thus it was phrased:*
- Q. Said R. Assi, “The dispute [in which sages, unlike Gamaliel, prohibit one to put spices in the fire on a festival day] concerns [a case in which the individual wishes] to smell [the burning spices].
- R. “But [if he desires] to perfume [his clothing, Gamaliel concurs with sages that this] is forbidden.”

I.2. A. *The question was raised:* What is the law [whether or not on a festival day one may] smoke [fruit by placing it over burning spices]?”

- B. R. Jeremiah b. Abba said Rab [said], “It is forbidden.”
- C. But Samuel said, “It is permitted.”
- D. R. Huna said, “It is forbidden, because [sprinkling the spices on the coals partially] extinguishes [them].”
- E. *Said to him R. Nahman, “Let the master say [it is forbidden] because it kindles [the spices]!”*
- F. [Indicating why he referred to extinguishing the coals, Huna] said to him, “His first [action, in sprinkling the spices], extinguishes [the coals], while afterwards [the spices] are kindled.”
- G. [The previously cited authorities hold that what is described at A is forbidden because it causes forbidden extinguishing and kindling of fire on a festival day. Judah agrees and suggests a way one may smoke fruit without engaging in these

forbidden activities.] Said R. Judah, “[Smoking fruit] on coals is forbidden, [for the reasons given at D-F].

- H. **[23A]** “[But smoking it] over a [hot] shard is permitted.” [The consideration of extinguishing a fire does not apply here. Further, the spices are ignited in an unusual way, not forbidden on a festival (Rashi).]
- I. But Rabbah said, “[Smoking fruit] over a shard likewise is forbidden, *since he thereby creates a fragrance [in the shard].*” [This is forbidden on a festival day.]
- J. [For the same reason] Rabbah and R. Joseph, the two of them, say, “Turning a box [of aromatics] over on a silk garment is forbidden on a festival day.
- K. “What is the reason?
- L. “For it creates a fragrance [in the garment].”
- M. [An apparent contradiction is cited and resolved.] But how is this [case, cited at J-L], different from [the rule that, on a festival day], one may rub [aromatic wood] to increase its fragrance and smell it, and that one may cut off a piece of it and smell it? [Here too, the individual creates a fragrance. Yet doing so on a festival day is permitted.]
- N. [The difference between the two cases is specified.] There [at M] the fragrance already is present, and he [simply] increases its [strength].
- O. Here [in the cases at I+J-M] he actually creates a [new] fragrance [in the fruit that is smoked or the garment that is scented].
- I.3.** A. [The previous unit’s authorities prohibited smoking fruit on a festival day. In this unit, the opposite view is taken.] Raba said, “[Smoking fruit by placing spices] on [burning] coal also is permitted,
- B. “for it is just like [cooking] meat on charcoal.” [Cooking the meat causes the coals to be partially extinguished, makes fats catch fire, and allows an aroma to enter the charcoal itself. Yet this is permitted on a festival day. In the same way, one should be permitted to put spices on a fire.]
- C. [Raba’s point is phrased again in the following story.] R. Gabiha of Be Katil expounded at the door of the exilarch’s house: “[On a festival day] kittura is permitted.”
- D. Said Amemar, “What is meant by kittura, [a word with two meanings]?
- E. “If it refers to plaiting the sleeves [of garments, how can it be permitted on a festival day, since] this is a craftsman’s work?
- F. “And if it refers to smoking [fruit, it likewise should be forbidden, since] this extinguishes [the coals on which the spices are placed]!”
- G. Said R. Ashi to [Amemar], “Indeed it refers to smoking.
- H. “[But this is permitted, since] it is just like [cooking] meat on charcoal, [as at A-B].”
- I. There are those who report [the preceding discussion as follows]:
- J. Said Amemar, “What is meant by kittura?
- K. “If it refers to plaiting the sleeves [of garments], this is a craftsman’s work [and so should be forbidden].
- L. “And if it refers to smoking [fruit, it likewise should be forbidden, since] it creates a [new] fragrance [in the coals].”

- M. *Said R. Ashi, "I explained it to him, and in the name of a great man I explained it to him:*
- N. *"Indeed [it refers to] smoking [fruit, but this is permitted because] it is just like [cooking] meat on charcoal."*

II.1 A. And they prepare a kid roasted whole [on Passover night, as was done in the Temple] [M. Bes. 2:7D]:

- B. *It is taught on Tannaite authority [see T. Y.T. 2:15]:*
- C. **R. Yosé says, "Todos of Rome taught the community of Rome the custom of eating lambs roasted whole on Passover eves.**
- D. **"[Rabbinic authorities] sent [word] to him: "If you were not Todos, we would have sentenced you to excommunication.**
- E. **"For you have caused the people of Israel to eat holy things outside [of Jerusalem]."**
- F. *Do you really mean [to say] "holy things"?*
- G. *Rather, say, "[Foods that are] similar to holy things."*

Unit I:1 explains the dispute between Gamaliel and sages, M. **Bes. 2:7C+E**, concerning whether or not, on a festival day, one may put spices in a fire. Units I:2 asks whether it is permitted on a festival day to smoke fruit over burning spices. It may be forbidden, unit II, because it entails both extinguishing and kindling of fire. Or perhaps it is permitted because it is comparable to other cooking procedures. The final unit takes up M. **Bes. 2:7D**, citing T. in order to explain why sages prohibit roasting a kid whole on Passover eve.

2:8

- A. **In three matters does R. Eleazar b. Azariah permit and do sages prohibit.**
- B. **[Eleazar b. Azariah's] cow goes forth [on the Sabbath] with a strap which is between its horns [cf., M. Shab. 4:5];**
- C. **they curry cattle on a festival day;**
- D. **and [on a festival day] they grind pepper in its pepper-mill [in the normal manner].**
- E. **R. Judah says, "They do not curry cattle on the festival day,**
- F. **"because doing so makes a wound.**
- G. **"But they may comb them."**
- H. **And sages say, "They do not curry them.**
- I. **"Also: they do not comb them."**

- I.1 A. [Eleazar b. Azariah's cow goes forth [on the Sabbath] with a strap which is between its horns:] Shall it be said that R. Eleazar b. Azariah had only one cow, [which went out on the Sabbath with a strap between its horns, M. Bes. 2:8B]?**
- B. *But [to the contrary] thus said Rab, and some say [thus] said R. Judah said Rab, "Thirteen thousand calves was the tithe [given from] R. Eleazar b. Azariah's herd each year."*

- C. *[To solve the apparent contradiction between M. Bes. 2:8B and the statement here at B], it is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. The cow [referred to at M. Bes. 2:8B] was not his [personally].
- E. Rather, it belonged to his neighbor.
- F. But since he did not prevent her [when she let it go out on the Sabbath wearing the strap], they called it his.

II.1 A. They curry cattle on a festival day [M. Bes. 2:8C].

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [see T. Y.T. 2:17]:*
- C. **What is currying and what is combing?**
- D. **Currying [is done with a brush with] small [bristles], which cause wounds**
- E. **Combing [is done with a brush with] large [bristles], which do not cause wounds [T. Yom Tob 2:17]**
- F. Now, [M. Bes. 2:8 offers] three disputing views with regard to this question [of whether or not, on a festival, one may comb, curry, or both]:
- G. R. Judah, [M. Bes. 2:8E-G], reasons, “[Even] an unintentional act, [such as causing wounds through currying], is forbidden [on a festival day].
- H. “But [while] currying, [done with a brush with] small [bristles], which cause wounds, [is forbidden on a festival], combing [is done with a brush with] large [bristles], which do not cause wounds.
- I. *“And we do not enact a preventative measure [so as to prohibit] combing [on a festival day] on account of [the possibility that someone might also come to] curry.”*
- J. *And rabbis, [M. Bes. 2:8H-I], also reason as does R. Judah that [even] an unintentional act [such as causing wounds through currying] is forbidden [on a festival day].*
- K. But [contrary to Judah, they hold that] we enact a preventative measure [prohibiting] combing on account of [the possibility that someone will come to] curry [as well].
- L. *But R. Eleazar b. Azariah, [M. Bes. 2:8C], reasons as does R. Simeon, who said, “An unintentional act [such as the causing of wounds] is permitted [on a festival day].*
- M. “ [Therefore] both currying and combing are permitted [on that day].”
- N. Said Raba said R. Nahman said Samuel, and some say, said R. Nahman alone, “The decided law accords with [the opinion of] R. Simeon, for, indeed, R. Eleazar b. Azariah concurs with him.”
- O. *Said Raba to R. Nahman, “Let the master state, “The decided law accords with [the position of] R. Judah, for, indeed, sages concur with him.””*
- P. [Nahman] said to him, “I hold as R. Simeon. And moreover, R. Eleazar b. Azariah concurs with him.”

Unit I:1 explains M. Bes. 2:8B. Unit II:1 explains the views of Eleazar b. Azariah, Judah and sages at M. Bes. 2:8C, E-F and H-I.

2:9

- A. [23B] A pepper-mill is susceptible to uncleanness by reason of constituting three distinct sorts of utensils:
- B. because it forms a receptacle,
- C. and because it is a metal utensil,
- D. and because it constitutes a sieve.

I.1 A. *It is taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The lower part [of a pepper-mill is susceptible to uncleanness] because it forms a receptacle.
- C. The middle part [is susceptible to uncleanness] because it constitutes a sieve.
- D. The upper part [is susceptible to uncleanness] because it is a metal utensil.

The Talmud relates the three types of utensils referred to at M. **Bes. 2:9** to the three parts of a pepper-mill.

2:10

- A. A child's wagon is susceptible to midras-uncleanness,
- B. and may be handled on the Sabbath,
- C. but may be dragged [on the Sabbath] only over other articles [e.g., matting].
- D. R. Judah says, "[On the Sabbath] no utensil may be dragged, except for a wagon, because it presses down [the earth and does not break through the surface]."

I.1 A. A child's wagon is susceptible to *midras*-uncleanness, [M. **Bes. 2:10A**], *because [the child] supports [himself] on it.*

B. And it may be handled on the Sabbath, [M. **Bes. 2:10B**], *because it is subject to the law of a utensil.*

II.1 A. But [the wagon] may be dragged [on the Sabbath] only over other articles [e.g., matting] [M. **Bes. 2:10C**].

- B. Over other articles, yes [it may be dragged].
- C. Upon the ground, no [it may not be dragged].
- D. *What is the reason [for C]?*
- E. *For it makes a rut, [which is forbidden on the Sabbath].*
- F. *Who [is the authority behind this rule]?*
- G. *It is R. Judah, for he said, "[Even] an unintentional act, [such as making a rut], is forbidden." [See 2:8.II.1.]*
- H. *For if it were [the opinion of] R. Simeon, [he would permit dragging the wagon over ground, since] he says, "An unintentional act is permitted [on the Sabbath]."*
- I. *[Illustrating Simeon's view] it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. **Y.T. 2:18**]:*
- J. R. Simeon says, "A person may drag a bed, chair, or stool [on the Sabbath],
- K. "so long as he does not intend to create a rut [in the dirt floor]."
- L. *[Contrary to G, M. Bes. 2:10D is clear that Judah in fact permits dragging a wagon on the Sabbath.] Cite the final clause [of M. **Bes. 2:10**]:*

- M. **R. Judah says, “No utensils may be dragged [on the Sabbath] except for a wagon, because it presses down [on the earth but does not cause a rut].”**
- N. Because it presses down [without making a rut it] is indeed [permitted to drag it on the Sabbath].
- O. But it does not make a rut! [This is contrary to what is claimed above, D-G.]
- P. *[Solving the problem:] There are two different Tannaite authorities who differ concerning the opinion of R. Judah. [One authority’s view is cited at M. **Bes. 2:10C**; the other’s version of Judah’s statement is at M. **Bes. 2:10D**.]*

Unit I:1 explains M. Bes. 2:10A. Objects such as chairs and beds, intended to support humans’ weight, are subject to *midras*-uncleanness. A child’s wagon is in this category. Unit II:1 explains M. Bes. 2:10C+D, ultimately indicating that both of those rules are Tannaite versions of Judah’s opinion.